

META-THEOREMS FOR GRAPH POLYNOMIALS

JOHANN A. MAKOWSKY

ABSTRACT. In this paper I survey the sources of inspiration for my own and co-authored work in trying to develop a general theory of graph polynomials. I concentrate on meta-theorems, i.e., theorem which depend only on the form infinite classes of graph polynomials are defined in some formalism, and not on the actual meaning of the particular definitions.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
1.1. One, two, many graph polynomials	2
1.2. Meta-theorems	2
1.3. Towards a general theory of graph polynomials	3
Acknowledgements	4
The MATRIX Institute	4
2. Prerequisites	4
3. Graph polynomials defined by recurrence relations	5
3.1. Universal graph polynomials	6
3.2. Substitution instances and prefactors	6
3.3. Universality	7
3.4. Recipe theorems	7
3.5. Recursive Definitions and Explicit Definitions of Graph Polynomials	8
4. Complexity of Evaluating Graph Polynomials	8
4.1. Complexity: Fixed Parameter Tractability	8
4.2. Complexity: Dichotomy Theorems	9
5. Graph Polynomials with Unimodal Coefficients	10
5.1. Real-rooted and unimodal graph polynomials	10
5.2. Almost Unimodality of the Coefficients	12
6. Harary polynomials	13
7. Weakly Distinguishing Polynomials	13
7.1. Weakly distinguishing on a graph property \mathcal{C}	14
7.2. Small Addable Classes of Graphs	14
7.3. Weakly distinguishing Harary polynomials	15
8. Semantic vs syntactic properties of graph polynomials	15
9. Conclusions and Suggestion for Further Research	16
References	17

Date: May 10, 2024.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 05, 05C10, 05C30, 05C31, 05C69, 05C80 .

Key words and phrases. Graph polynomials, second order logic, meta-theorems.

Based on my talks given at the MATRIX-Institute workshop, September 2023.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. One, two, many graph polynomials. In my paper [Mak08] I set myself the goal of developing a general theory of graph polynomials. The paper was written after my realization, together with Boris Zilber, that there are many more naturally occurring graph polynomials than are treated in the literature, see my papers [Mak23] and Kotek, Makowsky and Zilber [KMZ08]. In analogy to the matching polynomial or the independence polynomial, which use the number of k -matchings or k -independent sets as coefficients of a generating function, one can use the number of configurations on k vertices (or edges) given by a description in some logical formalism as coefficients of a generating function. The domination polynomial is a good example, but there are no limits in creating such graph polynomials. We also noticed that counting the number of conditional colorings treated in the literature gives graph polynomials in the number of colors which I named later Harary polynomials, see Section 6. Earlier attempts to define large classes of graph polynomials go back to Farrell [Far79].

The abundance of naturally defined graph polynomials led some mathematicians in search of a topic to define somehow an arbitrarily defined new graph polynomial, say $F(G; x)$, and investigate it by dealing with one or more of the following questions:

- (i) Compute $F(G_n; x)$ for selected graph families $G_n : n \in \mathbb{N}$;
- (ii) Find $F(G; x)$ -unique graphs;
- (iii) Interpret $F(G; a)$ for selected values $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ in terms of graph theoretic properties of G ;
- (iv) Interpret the polynomials $F(G_n; x)$ for certain sequences of graphs G_n ;
- (v) Compare the distinguishing power of $F(G; x)$ to the distinguishing power of some other graph polynomial $F'(G; x)$.
- (vi) Is $F(G; x)$ in some sense “equivalent” to some previously studied graph polynomial $F_0(G; x)$?
- (vii) Where are the roots of $F(G; x)$ located?

The same questions can also be asked for multivariate polynomials.

Some of the more exciting papers in graph polynomials have dealt with such questions, but more recently I have seen many papers where the choice of $F(G; x)$ is badly, if at all, motivated, and only a few answers to these questions were given.

1.2. Meta-theorems. The purpose of this paper is to show what I had, and still have, in mind by a “general theory of graph polynomials” in [Mak08].

Let me first give a (admittedly trivial) example of a meta-theorem.

Assume we want to show that a certain graph property, say triangle-free, is hereditary (closed under induced subgraphs).§ We can show this directly in the framework of graphs. But we can also observe that triangle-free can be expressed by a universal first order formula ϕ :

$$\phi : \forall u, v (E(u, v) \leftrightarrow E(v, u)) \wedge \forall u, v, w (\neg E(u, v) \vee \neg E(v, w) \vee \neg E(w, u)).$$

Now it is easy to show that any graph property expressible by a universal first order formula ψ is hereditary. This is a *meta-theorem* since it uses only the fact that ψ is a universal first order formula, irrespective of the particular meaning of ψ . If we allow infinite graphs as well, the well known Łoś-Tarski Theorem asserts that the converse is true as well:

Theorem 1.1 (Łoś-Tarski Theorem). *Let \mathcal{A} be a class of (possible infinite) graphs axiomatizable by a set of first order sentences $\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}$. Then \mathcal{A} is hereditary if and only if $\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}$ is logically equivalent to a set of universal first order sentences.*

If restricted to finite structures, Tait [Tai59] showed that it is wrong even if $\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}$ is finite.

There is another way of formulating a meta-theorem for hereditary classes of graphs. A class of finite graphs \mathcal{A} is hereditary if and only if it can be characterized by a (possibly infinite) set $\text{Forb}_{\mathcal{A}}$ of forbidden induced subgraphs. There the mere existence of $\text{Forb}_{\mathcal{A}}$, irrespective of the elements of $\text{Forb}_{\mathcal{A}}$ guarantees that \mathcal{A} is hereditary. This can also be formulated in infinitary logic by a universal formula of $\mathcal{L}_{\infty, \omega}$, see [RW95]. Applied to graph polynomials rather than graph properties we should look for theorems of the following type:

Let \mathcal{F} be a class of graph polynomials and \mathcal{C} a class of graphs, both defined in some logical formalism. Then for every $G \in \mathcal{C}$ and $F(G; \bar{x}) \in \mathcal{F}$ the graph polynomial $F(G; \bar{x})$ exhibits a characteristic behaviour or property irrespective of the particular meaning of the definition of \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{C} .

This can be viewed as a meta-theorem if it only depends on the form of how \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{C} are defined, and not on the particular choice of these definitions.

An early, possibly the earliest, meta-theorem in graph theory is the Specker-Blatter Theorem from 1981, [BS81, Spe90, FKM11].

Theorem 1.2 (Specker-Blatter Theorem). *Let ϕ is a formula in Monadic Second Order Logic in the language of graphs. Let $S_{\phi}(n)$ be number of binary relation $E \subset [n]^2$ such that graph $G = ([n], E)$ satisfies ϕ . Then sequence $S_{\phi}^m(n) = S_{\phi}(n) \pmod{m}$ is ultimately periodic with*

$$S_{\phi}^m(n) = S_{\phi}^m(n + p_{m, \phi})$$

for all $n \geq q_{m, \phi}$.

We consider this a meta-theorem, since ultimate periodicity is a consequence of the syntactic form of ϕ only (but the values $p_{m, \phi}, q_{m, \phi}$ depend on m and ϕ). At the time of publication in 1981 (and till 2000) this theorem was widely unnoticed. For its history and recent developments, see [FM24b].

1.3. Towards a general theory of graph polynomials. Since the publication of [Mak08] my collaborators and I have achieved some progress in developing the modest beginnings of such a general theory. In the following sections we give examples and discuss such meta-theorems in detail.

In Section 3 we discuss theorems inspired by results about the Tutte polynomial and Tutte-Grothendieck invariants (TG-invariants) and similar theorems. More generally, we outline our results from [GKM12] about unwinding recursive definition of graph polynomials.

In Section 4 we review general theorems about the complexity of evaluating graph polynomials. This includes Fixed Parameter Tractable (FPT) cases for graph classes of bounded width (tree-width, clique-width, rank-width, etc), and dichotomy theorems for graph polynomials arising from partition functions.

In Section 5 we discuss general theorems about real-rooted graph polynomials and graph polynomials where the coefficients satisfy concavity conditions. The

special cases of graph polynomials where the coefficients are unimodal is here of special interest.

In Section 6 we review some results about Harary polynomials.

In Section 7 we discuss a conjecture by Bollobás, Pebody and Riordan which states that the Tutte polynomial is almost complete. A graph polynomial $F(G; \bar{x})$ is almost complete if almost all graphs are F -unique. We contrast this to graph polynomials $F(G; \bar{x})$ being weakly distinguishing if almost all graphs G have a F -mate and prove a meta-theorem about weakly distinguishing graph polynomials.

In Section 8 We briefly introduce and discuss the distinction between syntactic and semantic statements about (families of) graph polynomials.

Finally, in Section 9 we draw conclusions and suggest some further research along the lines described in this paper.

Acknowledgements. My PhD students of the last 25 years, Udi Rotics [Rot98], Ilia Averbouch [Ave11], Tomer Kotek [Kot12] and Vsevolod Rakita [Rak23], contributed much to these developments. So did my co-authors, Benny Godlin, Orli Herscovici, Emilia Katz, Elena Ravve and Ruixue Zhang. Markus Bläser, Holger Dell, Andrew Goodall, Miki Hermann and Steve Noble joined me in studying the complexity of graph polynomials. I would like to thank Graham Farr, Kerri Morgan, Vsevolod Rakita, Elena Ravve and Peter Tittmann for reading and commenting on earlier drafts of this paper. Their observations and suggestions were all incorporated into the final version.

The MATRIX Institute. Two events of the MATRIX Institute had great impact on my work described in this paper: the Tutte Centenary Retreat in December 2017 and the Workshop on Uniqueness and Discernment in Graph Polynomials in October 2023. I would like to thank the MATRIX Institute and the organizers of these meetings for their fruitful initiatives: Graham Farr, Dillon Mayhew, Kerri Morgan, James Oxley and Gordon Royle in 2017, and Jo Ellis-Monaghan, Iain Moffatt, Kerri Morgan and Graham Farr in 2023.

2. PREREQUISITES

This paper is not self-contained. We assume the reader is somehow familiar with the concepts listed below.

Graphs: We consider a simple graph as relational structure $G = (V(G), E(G))$ where $V(G)$ is the universe (the set of vertices) and $E(G) \subseteq V(G)^2$ is a binary relation. We denote by $n(G) = |V(G)|$ the number of vertices, by $m(G) = |E(G)|$ the number of edges, and $k(G)$ the number of connected components of G . G may have loops, directed edges, but no multiple edges. Let $e \in E(G)$ be an edge of G . We denote by G_{-e} , $G_{/e}$ and $G_{\uparrow e}$ the graph obtained from G by, respectively, removing, contracting and extracting the edge e . Edge extraction removes not only $e = (u, v)$ but also the vertices $u, v \in V(G)$.

If we allow multiple edges, we consider the graph as an hypergraph $H = (V(H), E(H), inc)$ with two disjoint sets of vertices $V(H)$ and edges $E(H)$ and a binary incidence relation $inc \subseteq V(H) \times E(H)$ with $inc(u, e)$ if and only if u is a vertex of e .

A graph property is *hereditary* if its closed under induced subgraphs, *monotone* if its closed under (not necessarily induced) subgraphs, and it is *minor-closed* if it is closed under minors.

Logics: We assume the reader is familiar with the various fragments of Second Order Logic SOL such as Monadic Second Order Logic MSOL, possibly augmented by modular counting quantifiers CMSOL, etc. For references see [EF99, Lib04], In SOL graphs $G = (V(G), E(G))$ and graphs as hypergraphs $H = (V(H), E(H), inc)$ are bi-interpretable. In MSOL or CMSOL this is not the case. We write $MSOL_g$ for the former and $MSOL_h$ for the latter (and the same for CMSOL). This distinction is crucial in Section 4 and also in the monograph of Courcelle and Engelfriet [CE12].

SOL-definable graph polynomials: Given a fragment \mathcal{L} of SOL we denote by $GP(\mathcal{L})$ the family of graph polynomials definable in \mathcal{L} . The exact formalism is described in [KMZ11]. A special univariate case looks like this

$$F(G; x) = \sum_{A \subset V(G): (G(V), E(G), A) \models \phi} x^{|A|}$$

or

$$F(G; x) = \sum_{B \subset E(G): (G(V), E(G), B) \models \phi} x^{|A|}$$

where ϕ is a formula in \mathcal{L} .

Harary polynomials: Harary polynomials are of the form

$$(2.1) \quad \chi_{\mathcal{A}}(G; x) = \sum_{i \geq 1} b_i^{\mathcal{A}}(G) x_{(i)},$$

where $b_i^{\mathcal{A}}(G)$ is the number of partitions of $V(G)$ into i non-empty parts, where each part induces a graph in \mathcal{A} , and $x_{(i)}$ is the falling factorial.

Harary polynomials are special cases of generalized chromatic polynomials as described in [MZ06, KMZ08, KMZ11]. They are the counting analogues of conditional colourings as defined in [Har85].

One could look at the case where \mathcal{A} is definable in some fragment of SOL. However, Theorem 6.1 shows that under very conditions on \mathcal{A} the resulting polynomial is not MSOL-definable.

Complexity classes: For complexity classes see [Pap94, AB09]. The complexity zoo is a webpage: https://complexityzoo.net/Complexity_Zoo, with a printable version [AKG05].

In this paper in Section 4 three complexity classes are used: Polynomial time **P**, the counting class **#P** (sharp **P**), and the complexity class FPT of Fixed Parameter Tractable problems. A parametrized graph problem consists of pairs $A = (G, p(G))$ with G a graph and $p(G)$ a graph parameter of G . We say that A is in FPT for $p(G)$ if membership in A can be solved in time $f(p(G))n^d$ for a function $f(p(G))$ and a constant $d \in \mathbb{N}$ not dependent on G .

Good references for FPT are the monographs [DF99, FG06]. For complexity of graph polynomials see also [Mak06, GHK⁺18].

Tree- and other widths: We assume the reader is familiar with the notions of tree-width and clique-width. A survey of various notions of graph width can be found in [HOSG08].

3. GRAPH POLYNOMIALS DEFINED BY RECURRENCE RELATIONS

Let $G = (V(G), E(G))$ be a graph. For an edge $e \in E(G)$ we denote by $n(G), m(G), k(G)$ the number of vertices, edges and connected components of a

graph $G = (V(G), E(G))$. For an edge $e \in E(G)$ we denote by $G_{-e}, G_{/e}, G_{\uparrow e}$ the graph obtained from G by deleting, contracting or extracting the edge e .

3.1. Universal graph polynomials. Here we discuss meta-theorems for graph polynomials of the following form:

Let \mathcal{F} be a class of graph polynomials defined by a recursion. Then there exists a universal graph polynomial $U_{\mathcal{F}}(G : \bar{x})$ such that every graph polynomial $F(G; \bar{y})$ can be written as

$$F(G; \bar{y}) = g(n(G), m(G), k(G)) \cdot U_{\mathcal{F}}(G : \bar{i}(\bar{y})).$$

In words, $F(G; \bar{y})$ is the product of a function which depends only on $n(G), m(G), k(G)$, and a substitution instance of $U_{\mathcal{F}}(G : \bar{x})$.

We consider such theorems as meta-theorems when the existence of the universal polynomial for a class of graph polynomials \mathcal{F} depends only on the form of the recursion in which \mathcal{F} is defined. The logical formalism for the meta-theorem is therefore given by the recursions.

A good source for the classical theorems of this form is [Aig07]. The newer results were obtained in oral collaboration with Bruno Courcelle [Cou08], with my PhD student Ilia Averbouch [Ave11], and with my seminar students Benny Godlin and Emilia Katz [GKM12].

3.2. Substitution instances and prefactors. Two graphs are *similar* if they have the same number of **V**ertices $n(G)$, **E**dges $m(G)$ and **C**onected components $k(G)$. If any of these three graph parameters differ on two graphs, they are in an obvious way non-isomorphic. In principle other notions of similarity with respect to a finite set of graph parameters can be considered. So far this possibility has not yet been investigated by us and in the literature. but in this paper we disregard this possibility.

A graph polynomial $f(G; \bar{x})$ is a VEC-invariant if it is invariant under similar graphs. If a graph polynomial $F(G; \bar{x})$ satisfies

$$F(G; \bar{x}) = f(G; \bar{x}) \cdot F'(G; \bar{x})$$

for some VEC-invariant $f(G; \bar{x})$, we call $f(G; \bar{x})$ a *prefactor*.

Let $\bar{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_k)$. $F'(G; \bar{x})$ is a *substitution instance* of $F(G; \bar{x})$ if there are polynomials $s_i \in \mathbb{R}[\bar{x}] : i \in [k]$ such that

$$F'(G; \bar{x}) = F(G; s_1(\bar{x}), \dots, s_k(\bar{x})).$$

The substitutions can be rational function in the indeterminates, but it is important that the substitutions do not depend on G .

Example 3.1. The *bivariate Potts model* is the graph polynomial

$$Z(G; y, q) = \sum_{A \subseteq V(G)} y^{|A|} q^{k(G[A])}.$$

$G[A]$ is the spanning subgraph of G with edges in A . For the chromatic polynomial we have

$$\chi(G; x) = Z(G; x, -1).$$

There is no prefactor $\chi(G; x)$ is a substitution instance of $Z(G; y, q)$.

Example 3.2. Let $T(G; x, y)$ be the Tutte polynomial and $\chi(G; x)$ be the chromatic polynomial. We have

$$\chi(G; x) = (-1)^{n(G)-k(G)} x^{k(G)} \cdot T(G; 1-x, 0).$$

Here $f(G; x) = (-1)^{n(G)-k(G)} x^{k(G)}$ is a prefactor and $T(G; 1-x, 0)$ is a substitution instance of $T(G; x, y)$.

3.3. Universality. Let \mathcal{F} be a class of graph polynomials. A graph polynomial $F_0(G; \bar{x}) \in \mathcal{F}$ is *universal for \mathcal{F}* if every graph polynomial $F(G; \bar{x}) \in \mathcal{F}$ can be written as a product of a VEC-invariant and a substitution instance of $F_0(G; \bar{x})$.

A graph polynomial $F(G; \bar{x})$ is a *DC-invariant (aka deletion-contraction invariant or chromatic invariant)* if there are polynomials $g_1(\bar{x}), g_2(\bar{x}) \in \mathbb{Z}[\bar{x}]$ such that

$$F(G; \bar{x}) = g_1(\bar{x}) \cdot F(G_{-e}; \bar{x}) + g_2(\bar{x}) \cdot F(G_{/e}; \bar{x})$$

and $F(G; \bar{x})$ is multiplicative, i.e.,

$$F(G \sqcup G'; \bar{x}) = F(G; \bar{x}) \cdot F(G'; \bar{x}),$$

Theorem 3.3. $Z(G; y, q)$ is universal for DC-invariants.

For a proof see [Aig07]. There are quite a few similar theorems in the literature.

3.4. Recipe theorems. A *Tutte-Grothendieck invariant (TG-invariant)* on graphs is a graph polynomial $F(G; \bar{x})$ such that

- (i) $F(G; \bar{x})$ is *multiplicative* and
- (ii) there are polynomials $g_1(\bar{x}), \dots, g_5(\bar{x}) \in \mathbb{Z}[\bar{x}]$ and $F(G; \bar{x})$ satisfies the recurrence relation:

$$F(G; \bar{x}) = \begin{cases} g_1(\bar{x}) & \text{if } G = K_1; \\ g_2(\bar{x})F(G-e) & \text{if } e \text{ is a loop;} \\ g_3(\bar{x})F(G/e) & \text{if } e \text{ is a bridge;} \\ g_4(\bar{x}) \cdot F(G-e; \bar{x}) + g_5(\bar{x}) \cdot F(G_{/e}; \bar{x}) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

D. Welsh, [Wel93, Wel99] coined the term *Recipe Theorem* for the following:

Theorem 3.4 (T. Brylawski, 1972, [Bry72]). *The graph polynomial*

$$U(G; w, q, v) = w^{m(G)} Z(G; q, \frac{q}{w})$$

is a TG-invariant and any other TG-invariant is a substitution instance of $U(G; \bar{x})$ up to a prefactor.

In our terminology, this says that $U(G; \bar{x})$ is universal for TG-invariants. Theorem 3.4 is further discussed in [BO92, Zas92]. The recipe here is the explicit definition of $U(G; w, q, v)$.

In his PhD thesis my former student, I. Averbouch, studied various other recurrence relations RR for polynomial graph invariants for which an RR-universal graph polynomial exists. All his examples are multiplicative with respect to disjoint unions of graphs, see [Ave11]. Among them we have

U_{DC} : Generalizing the chromatic polynomial, based on edge deletion and edge contraction. This is universal for chromatic (DC)-invariants.

U_M : Generalizing the matching polynomial, based on edge deletion and edge extraction.

$U_{\mathbb{E}}$: Generalizing both the matching and the chromatic polynomial, based on edge deletion, contraction and edge extraction, This is universal for \mathbb{E} -invariants, see [AGM10].

U_{VE} : Generalizing the Subgraph Component Polynomial from [TAM11] based in vertex deletion and vertex contraction and vertex extraction.

The interlace polynomial was introduced in [ABS04]. Courcelle [Cou08] proved a Recipe Theorem generalizing the various interlace polynomials and the independence polynomial, based on pivoting and local complementation.

3.5. Recursive Definitions and Explicit Definitions of Graph Polynomials.

All the universal graph polynomials of the previous section not only have a recursive definition, but also an explicit form as a graph polynomial.

Even if the class \mathcal{F} of graph polynomials has a recursive definition it may not have a universal polynomial $U_{\mathcal{F}}$. Nevertheless, under certain circumstances, the polynomials in \mathcal{F} may be of some specific form, say definable in second order logic SOL.

Let \mathcal{F} be a class of graph polynomials which are well-defined by some (linear) recurrence relation. Then every $F \in \mathcal{F}$ can be written explicitly as a polynomial where the coefficients can be derived from the recurrence relation.

Again, we consider such theorems as meta-theorems when the existence of the explicit polynomial and its coefficients depend only on the form of the recursion in which \mathcal{F} is defined.

The technical apparatus needed to prove such a theorem is developed in [GKM12] and is rather involved. Due to lack of space, we refer the curious reader to [GKM12] in order to explore how such a theorem can be formulated.

4. COMPLEXITY OF EVALUATING GRAPH POLYNOMIALS

Another very early meta-theorem in graph theory was the following observation of Courcelle [CM93, Cou93]:

Theorem 4.1. *Let $TW(k)$ be the class of graphs of tree-width at most k and let P be a graph property definable in monadic second order logic MSOL. Then checking whether a graph $G \in TW(k)$ has property P is in FPT.*

Here we think of this as a meta-theorem, because the conclusion only depends on the form of the formula which defines P .

4.1. Complexity: Fixed Parameter Tractability. Our meta-theorem here is of the following form:

Let $GP(\mathcal{L})$ be the class of graph polynomials definable in the language of graphs in some fragment \mathcal{L} of SOL. Let $W(k)$ be the class of graphs of width at most k . Then evaluating $F(G; \bar{x}) \in GP(\mathcal{L})$ for $G \in W(k)$ is fixed parameter tractable in the parameters k and the \mathcal{L} -formulas involved in the definition of $F(G; \bar{x})$, irrespective of the particular meaning of the formulas involved in defining $F(G; \bar{x})$.

The width of a graph can be any notion of width for graphs as discussed in [HOSG08].

The extension of Courcelle’s Theorem to graph polynomials was part of the PhD theses of Udi Rotics [Rot98] and later of Tomer Kotek [Kot12], and published in the papers [CMR01, Mak04, KMZ08, KMR13, KMR18].

Theorem 4.2 (Courcelle-type theorems for graph polynomials). *Let $TW(k)$ be the graphs of tree-width at most k and $GP(\text{MSOL})$ be the class of MSOL-definable graph polynomials. Let $F(G; \bar{x}) \in GP(\text{MSOL})$ and $\bar{a} \in \mathbb{Z}^s$. Then evaluating $F(G; \bar{a})$ is in FPT in the parameters k and the MSOL-formulas involved in the definition of $F(G; \bar{x})$.*

Similar theorems are true for $CW(k)$, the graphs of clique-width at most k and for graph polynomials in $GP(\mathcal{L})$, where \mathcal{L} ranges over logics which are variations of MSOL.

4.2. Complexity: Dichotomy Theorems. A precursor to dichotomy theorems in complexity theory is Schaefer’s theorem which shows that the boolean satisfiability problem is either NP-complete or in P depending only on the syntactic description of the class of formulas considered, [Sch78]. In our sense this can be also viewed as a meta-theorem.

The first dichotomy theorem for graph polynomials is due to Linial [Lin86] and shows that evaluation of the chromatic polynomials $\chi(G; a)$ is #P-hard for all complex values $a \in \mathbb{C}$ with the exception of $a = 0, 1, 2$. This was generalized by Jaeger et al. in [JVW90]. It describes the complexity of evaluating the Tutte polynomial and shows that evaluation of $T(G; a, b)$ is #P-hard for all complex values $(a, b) \in \mathbb{C}^2$ with the exception of $(a, b) \in A$ where $A \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ is an algebraic set of dimension 1.

As a meta-theorem it takes the following form:

Let \mathcal{F} be a class of graph polynomials in r indeterminates and $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{F}} \subseteq \mathbb{C}^r$. For every $F(G; \bar{x}) \in \mathcal{F}$ and every $\bar{a} \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{F}}$ evaluating $F(G; \bar{a})$ is #P-hard. For $\bar{a} \notin \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{F}}$ it is in P.

In [KMR13] we say that $F(G; \bar{x})$ has the *Difficult Point Property* if such an $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{F}}$ exists. See also [GHK⁺18].

In the case of [JVW90] \mathcal{F} is the class of TG-invariants because the Tutte polynomial is universal for TG-invariants, and $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{F}}$ is an algebraic set in \mathbb{C}^r of dimension $< r$. The same holds also for E-invariants and similar cases, [Hof10, Ave11].

Let $A = A_H$ be the weighted adjacency matrix of a simple graph $H = (V(H), E(H))$ where $a_{i,j}$ is the weight of the edge $(i, j) \in E(H)$. Given a graph $G = (V(G), E(G))$ we look at

$$Z_A(G) = \sum_{\sigma: V \rightarrow [k]} \prod_{(i,j) \in E(G)} A_{\sigma(i), \sigma(j)}.$$

If all the weights have value 1, this counts the number of homomorphisms from G to H . If some of the values $a_{i,j}$ are treated as indeterminates we get graph polynomials in at most $n(G)^2$ variables.

In [BG05] the following is shown:

Theorem 4.3 (Bulatov and Grohe, 2005). *Let the weights of H be non-negative and real.*

- (i) If H is connected, then evaluating $Z_A(G)$ is in \mathbf{P} if H is not bipartite and the row rank of A_H is at most 1, or H is bipartite and the row rank of A_H is at most 2. Otherwise it is $\sharp\mathbf{P}$ -hard.
- (ii) If H is not connected, then evaluating $Z_A(G)$ is in \mathbf{P} if each of its connected components satisfies the corresponding condition stated above. Otherwise evaluating $Z_A(G)$ is $\sharp\mathbf{P}$ -hard.

This generalizes [DG00]. There is a rich literature of similar dichotomy theorems in relation to Constraint Satisfaction Problems, see the references in [BG05].

Further instances of the dichotomy meta-theorem can be found in [BH07, BDM10, GHK⁺18].

5. GRAPH POLYNOMIALS WITH UNIMODAL COEFFICIENTS

Read [Rea68] conjectured already in 1968 that the absolute values of the coefficients of the chromatic polynomial are unimodal. This has triggered interest in the question of the unimodality of the coefficients of various graph polynomials. The conjecture was finally proved by Huh [Huh12]. The case of the independence polynomial was discussed in [AMSE87]. More details follow in subsection 5.1

The results in this section were inspired by the papers [BBP22, BB22, BC18], where the concept of almost unimodal graph polynomial was introduced, see subsection 5.2. These authors were discussing almost unimodality of particular graph polynomials such as the domination and independence polynomials, whereas we, in V. Rakita's thesis [Rak23] and [MR23], were interested in formulating meta-theorems. In this case, the meta-theorems have the following form:

Let \mathfrak{A} be a family of graph properties given by a set of forbidden induced subgraphs $\text{Forb}_{\mathfrak{A}}$ and $\mathcal{A} \in \mathfrak{A}$. Let $c_i^{\mathcal{A}}(G)$ be the number of subsets $S \subseteq V(G)$ of a graph G with $|S| = i$ such that $G[S] \in \mathcal{A}$. Then the graph polynomials of the form

$$F_{\mathcal{A}}(G; x) = \sum_{i=0}^{d(G)} c_i^{\mathcal{A}}(G) x^i$$

share a certain behaviour which only depends on the existence of $\text{Forb}_{\mathfrak{A}}$ irrespective of particular elements in $\text{Forb}_{\mathfrak{A}}$.

We first give some background on unimodality and almost-unimodality of polynomials and only then state our meta-theorems.

5.1. Real-rooted and unimodal graph polynomials. Let $F(x) \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ be an univariate polynomial of degree d with real coefficients,

$$F(x) = \sum_{i=0}^d a_i x^i.$$

- (i) $F(x)$ is *real-rooted* if all its roots are in \mathbb{R} .
- (ii) The coefficients of $F(x)$ are *log-concave* if for all $1 \leq j \leq d-1$

$$a_j^2 \geq a_{j-1} a_{j+1}.$$
- (iii) The coefficients of $F(x)$ are *α -concave* if for all $1 \leq j \leq d-1$

$$a_j^2 \geq \alpha \cdot a_{j-1} a_{j+1}.$$

- (iv) The coefficients of $F(x)$ are *unimodal with mode k* if $a_i \leq a_j$ for $0 \leq i < j \leq k$ and $a_i \geq a_j$ for $k \leq i < j \leq d$.
- (v) $F(x)$ is *absolute unimodal with mode k (log-concave)* if the absolute values of a_i are unimodal (log-concave).
- (vi) These definitions, except for (i), apply to any sequence $a_i, 0 \leq i \leq d$, even if it not interpreted as a sequence of coefficients of a polynomial.

Theorem 5.1 (Folklore). *(i) implies (ii), (ii) implies (iv) and none of the reverse implications holds.*

The first part of the theorem is Newton’s theorem. For a proof one may consult [Brä15].

Actually, Kurtz in [Kur92] analyzed the situation further.

Theorem 5.2. *Let $F(x) \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ be an univariate polynomial of degree $d \geq 2$ with real coefficients,*

$$F(x) = \sum_{i=0}^d a_i x^i.$$

- (i) *If $F(x)$ is real-rooted, then its coefficients are α -concave with*

$$\alpha(d, i) = \frac{d - i + 1}{d - i} \cdot \frac{i + 1}{i}.$$

- (ii) *If the coefficients of $F(x)$ are 4-concave then all its roots are real and distinct.*

The sequence $\binom{n}{i}$ of the number of subsets of order i of $V(G)$ is log-concave, hence unimodal. More interestingly, let $m_i(G)$ be the number of edge independent subsets (matchings) of $E(G)$ of order i . The numbers $m_i(G)$ are also the coefficients of the matching generating polynomial

$$M(G; x) = \sum_i m_i(G) x^i.$$

Theorem 5.3. *$M(G; x)$ is real-rooted, hence unimodal.*

There are two independent proofs of this. It follows from the fact that all the roots of $M(G; x)$ are real for all graphs G , [HL70], see also [Gut16], using Theorem 5.1. Unimodality was also shown directly by A. Schwenk, [Sch81].

Let $in_i(G)$, $0 \leq i \leq n(G)$, the sequence of the number of vertex independent subsets of $V(G)$ of order i . Denote by $I(G; x) = \sum_i in_i(G) x^i$ the independence polynomial of G . Real-rootedness, and unimodality of $I(G; x)$ has been studied extensively, see e.g. [ZW20][BC18][CP17] for some recent results and [LM05][LM06] for a general introduction.

Theorem 5.4. *(i) $I(G; x)$ is not unimodal, [AMSE87].*

- (ii) *For claw-free graphs the sequence of coefficients of $I(G; x)$ is real-rooted, hence unimodal, [CS07, Ben18].*

However, it is easily seen that the set of counterexamples G for (i) given in [AMSE87] has measure 0 among the random graphs $\mathcal{G}(n, p)$. Similarly for (ii), it is easily seen that the claw-free graphs have measure 0 among the random graphs $G(n, p)$.

This leaves open whether $I(G; x)$ is real-rooted, or at least unimodal, for other graph classes. Specifically, we may ask whether the *independence polynomial* $I(G; x)$ is unimodal for “most graphs”, in the following sense:

Definition 5.5. Let P be a graph polynomial. We say P is *almost unimodal* if for almost all graphs G the polynomial $P(G; x)$ is unimodal. In other words, P is almost unimodal if for random graphs $G \in \mathcal{G}(n, 1/2)$ we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(P(G(n, 1/2), x) \text{ is unimodal}) = 1.$$

Problem 5.1. *Is $I(G; x)$ almost unimodal?*

Let $\chi(G, x) = \sum_i c_i(G)x^i$ be the chromatic polynomial of G . The case of the chromatic polynomial of a graph is slightly different. The sequence $c_i(G)$ is alternatingly positive and negative. However, it was conjectured by R.C. Read, [Rea68], that the absolute values $|c_i(G)|$ form a unimodal sequence. J. Huh, [Huh12] finally proved the conjecture.

Theorem 5.6 (J. Huh, 2012). *For every graph G the chromatic polynomial $\chi(G, x)$ is absolute unimodal. In fact the sequence $|c_i(G)|$ is log-concave.*

5.2. Almost Unimodality of the Coefficients. Let

$$F(G; x) = \sum_{i=0}^{d(G)} a_i(G)x^i$$

be a graph polynomial. $F(G; x)$ is (almost) unimodal if for (almost) all graphs G , the sequence $a_i(G)$ is unimodal.

Recall that for a graph property \mathcal{A} $c_i^{\mathcal{A}}(G)$ is the number of subsets $S \subseteq V(G)$ of a graph G with $|S| = i$ such that $G[S] \in \mathcal{A}$.

The following two theorems are proved in [MR23].

Theorem 5.7 (Almost Unimodality Theorem). *If \mathcal{A} is a non-trivial co-hereditary graph property then for almost all graphs G , the sequence $c_i^{\mathcal{A}}(G), 0 \leq i \leq n(G)$ is unimodal. In other words*

$$F_{\mathcal{A}}(G; x) = \sum_{i=0}^{d(G)} c_i^{\mathcal{A}}(G)x^i$$

is almost unimodal.

$F(G; x) = \sum_{i=0}^{d(G)} a_i(G)x^i$ is real-rooted if all its roots are real. Real-rooted univariate polynomials are unimodal.

Theorem 5.8 (Real-rootedness Theorem). *Let \mathcal{A} be hereditary and such that it contains a graph $G \in \mathcal{A}$ which is neither a clique nor an edgeless graph. Then $F_{\mathcal{A}}(G; x)$ is real-rooted if and only if $G \in \mathcal{A}$.*

In [MRB14, Theorem 4.17] it is shown that for every univariate graph polynomial $F(G; x)$ with integer coefficient there is a graph polynomial $F_1(G; x)$ with integer coefficients with the same distinguishing power¹ such that all the roots of $F_1(G; x)$ are real.

¹For a precise notion one can use s.d.p.-equivalence, see Section 8.

6. HARARY POLYNOMIALS

A graph property \mathcal{A} is *trivial* if it is empty, finite, cofinite, or it contains all finite graphs (up to isomorphisms). Let \mathcal{A} be a non-trivial graph property.

Harary polynomials are of the form

$$(6.1) \quad \chi_{\mathcal{A}}(G; x) = \sum_{i \geq 1} b_i^{\mathcal{A}}(G) x_{(i)},$$

where $b_i^{\mathcal{A}}(G)$ is the number of partitions of $V(G)$ into i non-empty parts, where each part induces a graph in \mathcal{A} , and $x_{(i)}$ is the falling factorial.

Harary polynomials are special cases of generalized chromatic polynomials as described in [MZ06, KMZ08, KMZ11]. They are the counting analogues of conditional colourings as defined in [Har85].

A meta-theorem could be formulated as follows:

Let \mathfrak{P} a class of graph properties such as hereditary, monotone or minor-closed classes. If $\mathcal{A} \in \mathfrak{P}$ then the Harary polynomials $\chi_{\mathcal{A}}(G; x)$ exhibit a certain behaviour.

The main questions in V. Rakita's thesis and in [Rak23, HMR20] ask whether Courcelle's Theorem and its variations can be applied to Harary polynomials for non-trivial graph properties. This amounts to asking:

- (i) Are there non-trivial graph properties \mathcal{A} such that the Harary polynomial $\chi_{\mathcal{A}}(G, x)$ is MSOL_g-definable?
- (ii) Are there non-trivial graph properties \mathcal{A} such that the Harary polynomial $\chi_{\mathcal{A}}(G, x)$ is an \mathbb{E} -invariant and hence MSOL_h-definable?

Recall that a graph property \mathcal{A} is *hereditary* (*monotone*, *minor-closed*) if it is closed under taking induced subgraphs (subgraphs, minors). Clearly, if \mathcal{A} is minor-closed, it is also monotone, and if \mathcal{A} is monotone, it is also hereditary.

A graph property \mathcal{A} is *ultimately clique-free* if there exist $t \in \mathbb{N}$ such that no graph $G \in \mathcal{A}$ contains a K_t , i.e., a complete graph of order t . Analogously, \mathcal{A} is *ultimately biclique-free* if there exist $t \in \mathbb{N}$ such that no graph $G \in \mathcal{A}$ has $K_{t,t}$ as a subgraph (not necessarily induced). $K_{t,t}$ is the complete bipartite graph on two sets of size t . Clearly, ultimately biclique-free implies ultimately clique-free, but not conversely.

Theorem 6.1. *Let \mathcal{A} be a graph property and $\chi_{\mathcal{A}}(G, x)$ the Harary polynomial associated with \mathcal{A} .*

- (i) *If \mathcal{A} is hereditary, monotone, or minor closed, then $\chi_{\mathcal{A}}(G; x)$ is an \mathbb{E} -invariant if and only if $\chi_{\mathcal{A}}(G; x)$ is the chromatic polynomial $\chi(G; x)$.*
- (ii) *If \mathcal{A} is ultimately clique-free (biclique-free), $\chi_{\mathcal{A}}(G; x)$ is not MSOL_g-definable.*

7. WEAKLY DISTINGUISHING POLYNOMIALS

This section is based on V. Rakita's MSc thesis, [Rak20] and on [MR19]. It was inspired by the Conjecture of Bollobás, Pebody and Riordan (Conjecture 1) below, in attempt to identify graph polynomials P where there are many graphs G which are not P -unique. We follow the terminology of [MR19].

7.1. Weakly distinguishing on a graph property \mathcal{C} . For a graph property \mathcal{C} , denote by $\mathcal{C}(n)$ the graphs of order n in \mathcal{C} . We only consider properties such that $\mathcal{C}(n)$ is non-empty for all sufficiently large n .

Let P be a graph polynomial. We say that two non-isomorphic graphs G and H are P -mates if $P(G) = P(H)$, and that G is P -unique if it has no P mates. P is *trivial* if all graphs G, H are P -mates. P is *complete* if all graphs G are P -unique.

In this section we investigate conditions which imply that almost all graphs in \mathcal{C} have a P -mate. More formally, we give the following definitions:

Let $\mathcal{G}(n)$ be the family of graphs of order n with $V(G) = \{1, \dots, n\}$. Let P be a graph polynomial and let $U_P(n)$ be the set of P -unique graphs in $\mathcal{G}(n)$.

Definition 7.1. P is *weakly distinguishing* if

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|U_P(n)|}{|\mathcal{G}(n)|} = 0$$

and that P is *almost complete* if

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|U_P(n)|}{|\mathcal{G}(n)|} = 1$$

In [BPR00], Bollobás, Pebody and Riordan conjectured:

Conjecture 1 (BPR-conjecture). *The chromatic and Tutte polynomials are almost complete.*

In [MZ19], the analogous question for r -regular hypergraphs was considered, and for $r \geq 3$ the conjecture was refuted. In [Noy03] it was observed, as a remark in the conclusions, that the independence polynomial $In(G; x)$ is weakly distinguishing on all finite graphs. Clearly, we are interested in identifying \mathcal{C} as large as possible.

The meta-theorems I have in mind can be of two forms:

Let \mathcal{F} be a class of graph polynomials and $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{F}}$ be a family of graphs. Then almost every $G \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{F}}$ is F -unique.

Let \mathcal{F} be a class of graph polynomials and $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{F}}$ be a family of graphs. Then almost every $G \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{F}}$ has a F -mate.

To make these into meta-theorems, \mathcal{F} or $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{F}}$ should be given in a framework of logic or of recursive definitions.

Problem 7.1. *Is the universal \mathbb{E} -invariant $U_{\mathbb{E}}$ from section 3 almost complete?*

7.2. Small Addable Classes of Graphs. In this subsection the terminology is from [MSW05, MSW06].

Definition 7.2. (i) We say a graph property \mathcal{A} is *decomposable* if it is closed under disjoint union, and for all $G \in \mathcal{A}$ every component of G is in \mathcal{A} .

(ii) We say a graph property \mathcal{A} is *bridge addable* if for each graph $G \in \mathcal{A}$ and every two vertices u, v in different components of G the graph obtained by adding an edge between u and v is also in \mathcal{A} .

(iii) We say a graph property \mathcal{A} is *addable* if it is decomposable and bridge addable.

- (iv) Let \mathcal{A} be a graph property, and denote by \mathcal{A}_n the graphs of order n in \mathcal{A} . We say that a graph property \mathcal{A} is *small* if there exists a constant $a > 0$ such that $|\mathcal{A}_n| \leq a^n n!$ for all sufficiently large n .

Being small is a purely technical condition needed in [MSW06]. In [NSTW06] it is shown that a proper minor closed graph property is small.

In [RM19] it was proven that an infinite number of graph polynomials, among them the independence, clique and harmonious polynomials, are weakly distinguishing on the class of small addable graphs.

In particular the following theorem is shown:

Theorem 7.3. *Let $F(G; \bar{x})$ be a chromatic invariant, a TG-invariant, or even an DCE-invariant. Then $F(G; \bar{x})$ is weakly distinguishing on the class of small addable graphs. In particular this holds also for the class of proper minor-closed addable graphs.*

7.3. Weakly distinguishing Harary polynomials.

Definition 7.4 (R-class). Let \mathcal{C} be a graph property. \mathcal{C} is an *R-class* if

- (i) \mathcal{C} is closed under disjoint unions, and
- (ii) every connected component of $G \in \mathcal{C}$ is at least 2-connected.

Examples 7.5. The following are *R-classes* of graphs:

- (i) The closure $DU(\mathcal{C})$ under disjoint unions of any class \mathcal{C} where all its connected members are at least 2-connected. In particular, when \mathcal{C} consists of all complete graphs $K_n, n \geq 3$, grids $Grid_{m,n} : m, n \geq 2$, wheels $W_n : n \geq 2$, etc.
- (ii) Any addable class where all its connected members are at least 2-connected.

Definition 7.6 (R-Harary polynomial). The Harary polynomial $H_{\mathcal{C}}(G; x)$ is an *R-Harary polynomial* if \mathcal{C} is an *R-class*.

Proposition 7.7. *Let $H_{\mathcal{C}}(G; x)$ be an R-Harary polynomial. Let G be a graph, and let A, B be a partition of the vertices of G such that $G[A]$ and $G[B]$ are at least 2-connected, and there is at most one edge between A and B . Then*

$$H_{\mathcal{C}}(G; x) = H_{\mathcal{C}}(G[A]; x) \cdot H_{\mathcal{C}}(G[B]; x).$$

Corollary 7.8. *Let \mathcal{A} be a non-empty small addable property, and \mathcal{C} and $H_{\mathcal{C}}(G; x)$ as above. Then $H_{\mathcal{C}}(G; x)$ is weakly distinguishing on \mathcal{A} .*

8. SEMANTIC VS SYNTACTIC PROPERTIES OF GRAPH POLYNOMIALS

Let \mathcal{A} be a graph property. Two graph polynomials $F_1(G, \bar{x}), F_2(G, \bar{x})$ are (*s.d.p*)-equivalent on \mathcal{A} , written as $F_1 \sim_{s.d.p}^{\mathcal{A}} F_2$, if for all similar graphs $G_1, G_2 \in \mathcal{A}$ we have

$$F_1(G_1, \bar{x}) = F_1(G_2, \bar{x}) \text{ if and only if } F_2(G_1, \bar{x}) = F_2(G_2, \bar{x}).$$

(*s.d.p*)-equivalent stands for Distinguishing Power on Similar graphs.

Example 8.1. Let $m_k(G)$ be the number of k -matchings of a graph G . The matching generating polynomial

$$m(G; x) = \sum_k m_k(G) x^k$$

and the matching defect polynomial

$$M(G; x) = \sum_k (-1)^k m_k(G) x^{n-2k}$$

are for every graph G different polynomials, but they are $(s.d.p)$ -equivalent.

Let \mathcal{F} be a family of graph polynomials and $\hat{\mathcal{F}}$ be its closure under $(s.d.p)$ -equivalence, i.e., $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \hat{\mathcal{F}}$, and if $F \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}$ and F' is $(s.d.p)$ -equivalent to F then $F' \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}$. We call a true statement Φ about \mathcal{F} a *semantic statement* if Φ also holds for $\hat{\mathcal{F}}$.

Example 8.2. Let \mathcal{F} be a family of graphs and \mathcal{A} be a graph property.

We look at the following statements:

- (i) For every $F_1, F_2 \in \mathcal{F}$ and every $G \in \mathcal{A}$ we have $F_1(G; \bar{x}) = F_2(G; \bar{x})$.
 - (ii) For every $F_1, F_2 \in \mathcal{F}$ we have $F_1(G; \bar{x}) \sim_{s.d.p}^{\mathcal{A}} F_2(G; \bar{x})$.
- (i) is not a semantic property of \mathcal{F} , whereas (ii) is.

Both statements are true when \mathcal{F} just contains the characteristic polynomial of the adjacency matrix, and the matching defect polynomial and \mathcal{A} are the forests, [GG81] and [God93, Chapter 2, Corollary 1.4].

The distinction between semantic and syntactic statements about graph polynomials was developed in the author's graduate courses on graph polynomials starting in 2005 and first explicitly discussed and published in [MRB14]. There it is shown that statements about the location of the roots of graph polynomials are syntactic, see also [MRK19]. Using the same methods one can show that statements about universality, complexity, unimodality or being a Harary polynomial are syntactic. In contrast to this, statements about completeness, almost-completeness, weakly distinguishing, etc are semantic statements.

9. CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTION FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

We have discussed graph polynomials from the point of view of meta-theorems. Peter Tittmann's encyclopedic book [Tit24] surveys the landscape of graph polynomials. The recent paper by Graham Farr and Kerri Morgan, [FM24a], somehow bridges the two points of view.

We now discuss possible directions of further research towards more meta-theorems.

Universal polynomials and recurrence relations.

Problem 9.1. *Characterize recurrence relations defining a class of graph polynomials which have a universal polynomial.*

Problem 9.2. *Characterize recurrence relations defining a class of graph polynomials such that each of its graph polynomials can be written in an explicit form. In other words, simplify the framework of [GKM12]*

Complexity of evaluation.

Problem 9.3. *Are there other graph parameters besides variants of width for which Courcelle-like theorems like Theorem 4.2 can be established?*

Problem 9.4. *Characterize classes of graph polynomials which satisfy a dichotomy theorem.*

Unimodality. If $A \subseteq V(G)$ is independent in G , so are the subsets of A . Let $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \wp(V(G))$ be closed under subsets. Let $c_i^{\mathcal{A}}(G)$ be the number of sets of size i in \mathcal{A} . We define a graph polynomial

$$P^{\mathcal{A}}(G; x) = \sum_i c_i^{\mathcal{A}}(G)x^i.$$

Problem 9.5. *Under what condition on \mathcal{A} , besides being closed under subsets, is $P^{\mathcal{A}}(G; x)$ almost unimodal? In particular, is the Independence polynomial almost unimodal.*

Harary polynomials. Let \mathfrak{A} a family of graph properties and let for $\mathcal{A} \in \mathfrak{A}$ $\chi_{\mathcal{A}}(G; x) = \sum_{i \geq 1} b_i^{\mathcal{A}}(G)x_{(i)}$ be its Harary polynomials.

Problem 9.6. *Find conditions for large families \mathfrak{A} such that all its Harary polynomials are mutually incomparable in distinguishing power.*

Weakly distinguishing graph polynomials.

Problem 9.7. *Is the most general \mathbb{E} -invariant almost complete?*

Problem 9.8. *Is there a SOL-definable (MSOL-definable) graph polynomial which is almost complete?*

Semantic vs syntactic statements. We have noted that most of our meta-theorems are of syntactic nature, i.e., they make statements which refer to the syntactic form in which the graph polynomials are represented, rather than to their distinguishing power.

Problem 9.9. *Find more meta-theorems which are semantic statements.*

REFERENCES

- [AB09] S. Arora and B. Barak. *Computational Complexity: A modern approach*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- [ABS04] Richard Arratia, Béla Bollobás, and Gregory B Sorkin. The interlace polynomial of a graph. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 92(2):199–233, 2004.
- [AGM10] Ilija Averbouch, Benny Godlin, and Johann A Makowsky. An extension of the bivariate chromatic polynomial. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 31(1):1–17, 2010.
- [Aig07] Martin Aigner. *A course in enumeration*, volume 238. Springer Science & Business Media, 2007.
- [AKG05] Scott Aaronson, Greg Kuperberg, and Christopher Granade. The complexity zoo, 2005.
- [AMSE87] Yousef Alavi, Paresh J Malde, Allen J Schwenk, and Paul Erdős. The vertex independence sequence of a graph is not constrained. *Congressus Numerantium*, 58(15-23):2, 1987.
- [Ave11] I. Averbouch. *Completeness and Universality Properties of Graph Invariants and Graph Polynomials*. PhD thesis, Technion - Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa, Israel, 2011.
- [BB22] Iain Beaton and Jason I Brown. On the unimodality of domination polynomials. *Graphs and Combinatorics*, 38(3):1–10, 2022.
- [BBP22] Caroline Barton, Jason I Brown, and David A Pike. Acyclic polynomials of graphs. *Australian Journal of Combinatorics*, 82(2):146–181, 2022.
- [BC18] Jason I Brown and Ben Cameron. On the unimodality of independence polynomials of very well-covered graphs. *Discrete Mathematics*, 341(4):1138–1143, 2018.
- [BDM10] Markus Bläser, Holger Dell, and Johann A Makowsky. Complexity of the bollobás–riordan polynomial. exceptional points and uniform reductions. *Theory of Computing Systems*, 46(4):690–706, 2010.

- [Ben18] Ferenc Bencs. Christoffel-Darboux type identities for the independence polynomial. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, 27(5):716–724, 2018.
- [BG05] A. Bulatov and M. Grohe. The complexity of partition functions. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 348:148–186, 2005.
- [BH07] Markus Bläser and Christian Hoffmann. On the complexity of the interlace polynomial. *arXiv preprint arXiv:0707.4565*, 2007.
- [BO92] Thomas Brylawski and James Oxley. The Tutte polynomial and its applications. *Matroid applications*, 40:123–225, 1992.
- [BPR00] Béla Bollobás, Luke Pebody, and Oliver Riordan. Contraction–deletion invariants for graphs. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 80(2):320–345, 2000.
- [Brä15] Petter Brändén. Unimodality, log-concavity, real-rootedness and beyond. *Handbook of enumerative combinatorics*, 87:437, 2015.
- [Bry72] Thomas H Brylawski. A decomposition for combinatorial geometries. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 171:235–282, 1972.
- [BS81] Christian Blatter and Ernst Specker. Le nombre de structures finies d’une th’eorie ‘a caract’ere fin. *Sciences Mathématiques*, pages 41–44, 1981.
- [CE12] Bruno Courcelle and Joost Engelfriet. *Graph structure and monadic second-order logic: a language-theoretic approach*, volume 138. Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- [CM93] B. Courcelle and M. Mosbah. Monadic second–order evaluations on tree–decomposable graphs. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 109:49–82, 1993.
- [CMR01] B Courcelle, JA Makowsky, and U Rotics. On the fixed parameter complexity of graph enumeration problems definable in monadic second-order logic. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 108(1):23–52, 2001.
- [Cou93] B. Courcelle. Graph grammars, monadic second-order logic and the theory of graph minors. *Contemporary Mathematics*, 147:565–590, 1993.
- [Cou08] B. Courcelle. A multivariate interlace polynomial and its computation for graphs of bounded clique-width. *The Electronic Journal of Combinatorics*, 15:R69, 2008.
- [CP17] Jonathan Cutler and Luke Pebody. Maximal-clique partitions and the roller coaster conjecture. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 145:25–35, 2017.
- [CS07] Maria Chudnovsky and Paul Seymour. The roots of the independence polynomial of a clawfree graph. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 97(3):350–357, 2007.
- [DF99] R.G. Downey and M.F Fellows. *Parameterized Complexity*. Springer, 1999.
- [DG00] M. Dyer and C. Greenhill. The complexity of counting graph homomorphisms. *Random Structures and Algorithms*, 17.3-4:260 – 289, 2000.
- [EF99] Heinz-Dieter Ebbinghaus and Jörg Flum. *Finite model theory*. Springer Science & Business Media, 1999.
- [Far79] E.J. Farrell. On a general class of graph polynomials. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 26:111–122, 1979.
- [FG06] J. Flum and M. Grohe. *Parameterized complexity theory*. Springer, 2006.
- [FKM11] Eldar Fischer, Tomer Kotek, and Johann A Makowsky. Application of logic to combinatorial sequences and their recurrence relations. *Model Theoretic Methods in Finite Combinatorics*, 558:1–42, 2011.
- [FM24a] Graham Farr and Kerri Morgan. Graph polynomials: Some questions on the edge. submitted, 2024.
- [FM24b] Eldar Fischer and Johann A Makowsky. Extensions and Limits of the Specker-Blatter Theorem. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, vv:xx–yy, 2024.
- [GG81] Chris D Godsil and Ivan Gutman. On the theory of the matching polynomial. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 5(2):137–144, 1981.
- [GHK⁺18] Andrew Goodall, Miki Hermann, Tomer Kotek, Johann A Makowsky, and Steven D Noble. On the complexity of generalized chromatic polynomials. *Advances in Applied Mathematics*, 94:71–102, 2018.
- [GKM12] Benny Godlin, Emilia Katz, and Johann A Makowsky. Graph polynomials: From recursive definitions to subset expansion formulas. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, 22(2):237–265, 2012.
- [God93] C.D. Godsil. *Algebraic Combinatorics*. Chapman and Hall, 1993.
- [Gut16] Ivan Gutman. A survey on the matching polynomial. *Graph Polynomials*, pages 73–95, 2016.

- [Har85] F. Harary. Conditional colorability in graphs. In *Graphs and Applications, Proc. First Col. Symp. Graph Theory (Boulder, Colo., 1982)*, pages 127–136. Wiley-Intersci. Publ., Wiley, New York, 1985.
- [HL70] Ole J Heilmann and Elliott H Lieb. Monomers and dimers. *Physical Review Letters*, 24(25):1412, 1970.
- [HMR20] Orli Herscovici, Johann A Makowsky, and Vsevolod Rakita. Harary polynomials. *Enumerative Combinatorics and Applications*, 1, 2020.
- [Hof10] C. Hoffmann. *Computational Complexity of Graph Polynomials*. PhD thesis, Universität des Saarlandes, Saarbrücken, 2010.
- [HOSG08] Petr Hliněný, Sang-il Oum, Detlef Seese, and Georg Gottlob. Width parameters beyond tree-width and their applications. *The computer journal*, 51(3):326–362, 2008.
- [Huh12] June Huh. Milnor numbers of projective hypersurfaces and the chromatic polynomial of graphs. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 25(3):907–927, 2012.
- [JVW90] F. Jaeger, D.L. Vertigan, and D.J.A. Welsh. On the computational complexity of the Jones and Tutte polynomials. *Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.*, 108:35–53, 1990.
- [KMR13] T Kotek, JA Makowsky, and EV Ravve. A computational framework for the study of partition functions and graph polynomials. In *Proceedings of the 12th Asian Logic Conference*, pages 210–230. World Scientific, 2013.
- [KMR18] Tomer Kotek, Johann A Makowsky, and Elena V Ravve. On sequences of polynomials arising from graph invariants. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 67:181–198, 2018.
- [KMZ08] T. Kotek, J.A. Makowsky, and B. Zilber. On counting generalized colorings. In *Computer Science Logic, CSL'08*, volume 5213 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 339–353, 2008.
- [KMZ11] T. Kotek, J.A. Makowsky, and B. Zilber. On counting generalized colorings. In M. Grohe and J.A. Makowsky, editors, *Model Theoretic Methods in Finite Combinatorics*, volume 558 of *Contemporary Mathematics*, pages 207–242. American Mathematical Society, 2011.
- [Kot12] T. Kotek. *Definability of combinatorial functions*. PhD thesis, Technion - Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa, Israel, March 2012.
- [Kur92] David C Kurtz. A sufficient condition for all the roots of a polynomial to be real. *The american mathematical monthly*, 99(3):259–263, 1992.
- [Lib04] L. Libkin. *Elements of Finite Model Theory*. Springer, 2004.
- [Lin86] Nathan Linial. Hard enumeration problems in geometry and combinatorics. *SIAM Journal on Algebraic Discrete Methods*, 7(2):331–335, 1986.
- [LM05] Vadim E Levit and Eugen Mandrescu. The independence polynomial of a graph-a survey. In *Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Algebraic Informatics*, volume 233254, pages 231–252. Aristotle Univ. Thessaloniki Thessaloniki, 2005.
- [LM06] Vadim E Levit and Eugen Mandrescu. Independence polynomials and the unimodality conjecture for very well-covered, quasi-regularizable, and perfect graphs. In *Graph theory in Paris*, pages 243–254. Springer, 2006.
- [Mak04] J.A. Makowsky. Algorithmic uses of the Feferman-Vaught theorem. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 126.1-3:159–213, 2004.
- [Mak06] J.A. Makowsky. From a zoo to a zoology: Descriptive complexity for graph polynomials. In A. Beckmann, U. Berger, B. Löwe, and J.V. Tucker, editors, *Logical Approaches to Computational Barriers, Second Conference on Computability in Europe, CiE 2006, Swansea, UK, July 2006*, volume 3988 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 330–341. Springer, 2006.
- [Mak08] Johann A Makowsky. From a zoo to a zoology: Towards a general theory of graph polynomials. *Theory of Computing Systems*, 43(3):542–562, 2008.
- [Mak23] Johann A Makowsky. How I got to like graph polynomials. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.02933*, 2023.
- [MR19] Johann A Makowsky and Vsevolod Rakita. Weakly Distinguishing Graph Polynomials on Addable Properties. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.06037*, 2019.
- [MR23] Johann A Makowsky and Vsevolod Rakita. Almost unimodal and real-rooted graph polynomials. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 108, 2023.
- [MRB14] Johann A Makowsky, Elena V Ravve, and Nicolas K Blanchard. On the location of roots of graph polynomials. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 41:1–19, 2014.

- [MRK19] Johann A Makowsky, Elena V Ravve, and Tomer Kotek. A logician’s view of graph polynomials. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 170(9):1030–1069, 2019.
- [MSW05] Colin McDiarmid, Angelika Steger, and Dominic JA Welsh. Random planar graphs. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 93(2):187–205, 2005.
- [MSW06] Colin McDiarmid, Angelika Steger, and Dominic JA Welsh. Random graphs from planar and other addable classes. In *Topics in discrete mathematics*, pages 231–246. Springer, 2006.
- [MZ06] J.A. Makowsky and B. Zilber. Polynomial invariants of graphs and totally categorical theories. MODNET Preprint No. 21, [http://www.logique.jussieu.fr/modnet/Publications/Preprint%20 server](http://www.logique.jussieu.fr/modnet/Publications/Preprint%20server), 2006.
- [MZ19] JA Makowsky and RX Zhang. On p-unique hypergraphs. *Australasian Journal of Combinatorics*, 73(3):456–465, 2019.
- [Noy03] Marc Noy. Graphs determined by polynomial invariants. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 307(2):365–384, 2003.
- [NSTW06] Serguei Norine, Paul Seymour, Robin Thomas, and Paul Wollan. Proper minor-closed families are small. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 96(5):754–757, 2006.
- [Pap94] C. Papadimitriou. *Computational Complexity*. Addison Wesley, 1994.
- [Rak20] V. Rakita. On weakly distinguishing graph polynomials. Master’s thesis, Technion - Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa, Israel, 2020.
- [Rak23] V. Rakita. *On generating and Harary polynomials of graphs*. PhD thesis, Technion - Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa, Israel, 2023.
- [Rea68] Ronald C Read. An introduction to chromatic polynomials. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory*, 4(1):52–71, 1968.
- [RM19] Vsevolod Rakita and Johann A Makowsky. On Weakly Distinguishing Graph Polynomials. *Discrete Mathematics & Theoretical Computer Science*, 21, 2019.
- [Rot98] U. Rotics. *Efficient Algorithms for Generally Intractable Graph Problems Restricted to Specific Classes of Graphs*. PhD thesis, Technion- Israel Institute of Technology, 1998.
- [RW95] Eric Rosen and Scott Weinstein. Preservation theorems in finite model theory. In *Logic and Computational Complexity: International Workshop LCC’94 Indianapolis, IN, USA, October 13–16, 1994 Selected Papers*, pages 480–502. Springer, 1995.
- [Sch78] T.J. Schaefer. The complexity of satisfiability problems. In *Proceedings 10th Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC’78), San Diego (California, USA)*, pages 216–226, 1978.
- [Sch81] Allen J Schwenk. On unimodal sequences of graphical invariants. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 30(2):247–250, 1981.
- [Spe90] Ernst Specker. Application of logic and combinatorics to enumeration problems. In *Ernst Specker Selecta*, pages 324–350. Springer, 1990.
- [Tai59] William W. Tait. A counterexample to a conjecture of scott and suppes. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 24(1):15–16, 1959.
- [TAM11] Peter Tittmann, Ilya Averbouch, and Johann A Makowsky. The enumeration of vertex induced subgraphs with respect to the number of components. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 32(7):954–974, 2011.
- [Tit24] Peter Tittmann. Graph polynomials: The eternal book. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/377572474_Graph_Polynomials_The_Eternal_Book, 2024.
- [Wel93] D.J.A. Welsh. *Complexity: Knots, Colourings and Counting*. Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- [Wel99] Dominic Welsh. The Tutte polynomial. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 15(3-4):210–228, 1999.
- [Zas92] Thomas Zaslavsky. Strong Tutte functions of matroids and graphs. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 334(1):317–347, 1992.
- [ZW20] Bao-Xuan Zhu and Qingxiu Wang. Unimodality of independence polynomials of rooted products of graphs. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh Section A: Mathematics*, 150(5):2573–2585, 2020.

DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE, TECHNION - IIT, HAIFA, ISRAEL
Email address: `janos@cs.technion.ac.il`