

On Calculating the Chromatic Symmetric Function

Nima Amoei Mobaraki^{*1}, Yasaman Gerivani^{†1,2}, and Sina Ghasemi Nezhad^{‡1}

¹Department of Mathematical Sciences, Sharif University of Technology, Tehran, Iran

²Department of Chemical and Petroleum Engineering, Sharif University of Technology, Tehran, Iran

Abstract

This paper investigates methods for calculating the chromatic symmetric function (CSF) of a graph in chromatic-bases and the m_λ -basis. Our key contributions include a novel approach for calculating the CSF in chromatic-bases constructed from forests and an efficient method for determining the CSF in the m_λ -basis. As applications, we present combinatorial proofs for two known theorems that were originally established using algebraic techniques. Additionally, we demonstrate that an algorithm introduced by Gonzalez, Orellana, and Tomba arises as a special case of our proposed method.

1 Introduction

In the year 1995, Stanley introduced a symmetric function for a simple graph G as described below:

Definition 1.1. [1] Let G be a finite graph with vertex set $V(G)$. The *chromatic symmetric function* (CSF) of G , denoted by $X_G(x)$, is defined as follows:

$$X_G(x) \triangleq \sum_{\kappa} \prod_{v \in V(G)} x_{\kappa(v)},$$

where the sum ranges over all proper colorings $\kappa : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^+$. A proper coloring κ assigns a color (a positive integer) to each vertex such that no two adjacent vertices share the same color.

By setting $x_i = 1$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $x_j = 0$ for $j > k$, we obtain $\chi_G(k)$, the one-variable chromatic polynomial that counts the number of proper colorings of G with k colors. In his seminal paper, Stanley expressed X_G using classical bases of symmetric functions, proved many results, and proposed several conjectures related to X_G . This graph-based symmetric function has attracted significant interest since; see, for example, [6, 7, 8, 10, 14, 15, 19].

Most research related to X_G revolves around two main conjectures: the *e-Positivity Conjecture* [1], which states that if a poset is $(3 + 1)$ -free, then its incomparability graph is a nonnegative linear combination of elementary symmetric functions; and the *Tree Isomorphism Conjecture*, which posits that the CSF distinguishes non-isomorphic trees. The first conjecture was proved recently by Hikita [17], but the later one is only known to hold for trees with fewer than 30 vertices [11] and has been verified for certain subclasses of trees [6, 12]. Another area of focus has been finding families of graphs for which X_G is Schur positive, primarily due to connections to the representation theory of the general linear and symmetric groups.

Another line of research investigates generalized versions of the CSF, which contain X_G as a specialization, for example, the q -quasisymmetric function of Shareshian and Wachs [9], non-commutative versions [3], a rooted version [18], and weighted versions [13].

*nima.amoei.mobaraki@gmail.com

†gerivaniyasaman@gmail.com

‡sina.ghaseminejad@gmail.com

Recent investigations into X_G have tried using a linear combination relation. In a recent paper, Alieste-Prieto, De-Mier, Zamora, and a second author [14] introduced the *Deletion-Near-Contraction* relation (DNC relation). This relation appeared to be useful in [16]. Another relation introduced by Orellana and Scott [7] will be the base of our work in Section 3.

Several results connected to the Tree Isomorphism Conjecture have been derived by relating X_G to other polynomials, such as the *subtree polynomial* of Chaudhary and Gordon [6], the W -polynomial of Noble and Welsh [12], the *Tutte polynomial*, and others. For example, Martin, Morin, and Wagner [6] proved several results related to X_T for a tree T using the subtree polynomial, particularly showing that the girth of a graph can be recovered from X_G . In another example, Loeb1 and Sereni [12] showed that caterpillars are distinguished by the CSF using the W -polynomial.

Cho and van Willigenburg [8] defined multiplicative bases of symmetric functions from any sequence of connected graphs $\{G_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ such that for each n , the graph G_n has n vertices. This type of basis is called *chromatic-basis* and is interesting because it gives us a wide range of bases. Gonzalez, Orellana, and Tomba have shown many results on a chromatic-basis called the *star-basis*. In Section 3, we prove some results on calculating the CSF in a given chromatic-basis and its consequences.

Our central intuition in this paper is to try and relativize graphs. We believe relativizing graphs to each other is a concept with a lot of potential to work on, especially in areas where algebraic structures are defined on graphs, and we need to find connections between them. With this in mind, in Section 3, we relativize graphs with an equal number of vertices and introduce a method to calculate the CSF of forests in a forest-basis, where by a forest-basis we mean a chromatic-basis that only contains the CSF of forests. In Section 4, we relativize a graph G to graphs with fewer vertices and introduce a linear relation to find the coefficients of X_G in m_λ -basis.

In Section 3, we define an operation on graphs inspired by a relation introduced in [7] and use it to find routes between graphs, connecting them both in a combinatorial sense and an algebraic sense, resulting in a method to calculate the CSF in a forest-basis. As applications, we will provide combinatorial proof for two known theorems, namely the chromatic-basis theorem of Cho and van Willigenburg [8] and the equivalency of the U -polynomial and the CSF over forests shown by Loeb1 and Sereni [2]. Both of these theorems previously had algebraic proofs. Furthermore, we show that the algorithm provided in [16] can be viewed as a special case of our method.

In Section 4, we use an approach inspired by the *reconstruction conjecture*. We exploit the number of morphisms of smaller graphs to a graph G , ultimately resulting in a relation between the smaller graphs CSF and X_G . This approach determines almost all of the coefficients of X_G in m_λ -basis.

2 Preliminaries

For the basic concepts in graph theory, we refer the reader to any standard introductory text, such as [4]. For convenience, we outline some of the key definitions here. For information regarding the reconstruction conjecture, we refer the reader to [5].

A *graph* G is an ordered pair (V, E) , where V is a finite set of *vertices* and E is a multiset of *edges*. Each edge e is an unordered pair of two distinct vertices u and v , which are called the *endpoints* of e . Note that our graphs are *simple*, meaning that we do not allow for parallel edges and loops. A *loop* in G is an edge connecting a vertex to itself, while two edges are *parallel* if they connect the same vertices.

Let \mathbb{Z}^+ denote the set of positive integers. A *proper coloring* of G is a function $\kappa : V \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $\kappa(u) \neq \kappa(v)$ whenever u and v are adjacent. If the image of κ is restricted to the subset $\{1, 2, \dots, k\}$, we say that κ is a *k -coloring* of G . The total number of k -colorings of G is denoted by $\chi_G(k)$, and $\chi_G(k)$ is known to be a polynomial in k , called the *chromatic polynomial* of G .

A *subgraph* $G' \subseteq G$ of a graph $G = (V, E)$ is a graph $G' = (V', E')$ such that $V' \subseteq V$ and $E' \subseteq E$, and for each edge $e \in E'$, the endpoints of e are included in V' . A subgraph is said to be *induced* by the vertex set $V' \subseteq V$ if every edge in E with both endpoints in V' is also included in E' .

Definition 2.1. [2] The U -polynomial $U_G(x, y)$, which is a special case of the W -polynomial, of a graph G with vertex set $V(G)$ and edge set $E(G)$ is a multivariate polynomial defined as follows:

Let $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots)$ and y be commuting indeterminates. For a subset $A \subseteq E(G)$, let $k(G|_A)$ be the number of connected components of the subgraph induced by A . The U -polynomial is given by:

$$U_G(x, y) \triangleq \sum_{A \subseteq E(G)} \left(\prod_{i=1}^{|V(G)|} x_i^{c_i(A)} \right) (y-1)^{|A| - k(G|_A)},$$

where $c_i(A)$ denotes the number of components of $G|_A$ with i vertices.

Remark 2.2. As demonstrated in [10], the U -polynomial of a forest F can be expressed as follows:

$$U_F(x) = \sum_{A \subseteq E(F)} x_{\lambda(A)} = \sum_{A \subseteq E(F)} x_{\lambda(E(F) \setminus A)}.$$

Here, $\lambda(A) = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_\ell)$ is the partition induced by the number of vertices on each connected component of $G|_A$, and $x_{\lambda(A)}$ is the monomial $x_{\lambda_1} \cdots x_{\lambda_\ell}$. Also, as defined in [10], the *restricted U -polynomial* of a forest F , given a positive integer k , is defined as:

$$U_F^k(x) \triangleq \sum_{\substack{A \subseteq E(F) \\ |A| \leq k}} x_{\lambda(A)}.$$

Definition 2.3. A *partition* of $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, denoted by $\lambda \triangleq (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_\ell)$, is a sequence of positive integers $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \lambda_i = n$. This is written as $\lambda \vdash n$. Throughout this paper, we assume that the parts λ_i are arranged in descending order.

For $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, let the *partition number* $p(n)$, represent the number of distinct partitions of n .

For a partition $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_\ell)$, define the *length* of λ , denoted by $\ell(\lambda)$, the number of parts in λ .

Definition 2.4. Let G be a graph with n vertices. The *partition function* of G is defined as:

$$\text{Part}(G) \triangleq \lambda, \text{ where } \lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_\ell) \vdash n,$$

with λ_i representing the size of the i -th connected component of G .

Definition 2.5. Let λ and $\mu = (\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_\ell)$ be two partitions of $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. We say that μ is *finer* than λ , or equivalently, that λ is *coarser* than μ , denoted by $\mu \leq \lambda$, if λ can be obtained by replacing some of the parts μ_i in μ with their sum.

Definition 2.6. Assume that $\lambda \vdash n$ is a partition such that $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_k, 1, 1, \dots, 1)$, with $\lambda_k > 1$. We call $\lambda^* \triangleq (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_k)$ the *reduced form* of λ . Furthermore, two partitions λ^1 and λ^2 are called *equivalent* if their reduced forms are equal. In addition, a partition $\lambda^1 \vdash n$ can be *s-reduced* if there is a partition $\lambda^2 \vdash s$ such that $s \leq n$ and λ^1 and λ^2 are equivalent. λ^2 is called the *s-reduced form* of λ^1 .

Definition 2.7. Let A be a set of graphs. We define *graph vector space* of A , denoted by $\mathcal{V}(A)$, as:

$$\mathcal{V}(A) \triangleq \text{span} \{X_G \mid G \in A\}.$$

Theorem 2.8. [7] Let G be a graph where $e_1, e_2, e_3 \in E(G)$ form a triangle. Define the following subgraphs:

- $G_{2,3} = (V(G), E(G) \setminus \{e_1\})$,
- $G_{1,3} = (V(G), E(G) \setminus \{e_2\})$,
- $G_3 = (V(G), E(G) \setminus \{e_1, e_2\})$.

Then the CSF X_G of G can be expressed as:

$$X_G = X_{G_{2,3}} + X_{G_{1,3}} - X_{G_3}.$$

Corollary 2.9. [7] Let G be a graph with the adjacent edges $e_1 = vv_1$, $e_2 = vv_2$, and $e_3 = v_1v_2 \notin E(G)$; that is, e_1 and e_2 meet at the vertex v , but there is no edge connecting v_1 to v_2 . Define the following graphs:

- $G_{1,3} = (V(G), (E(G) \setminus \{e_2\}) \cup \{e_3\})$,
- $G_{2,3} = (V(G), (E(G) \setminus \{e_1\}) \cup \{e_3\})$,
- $G_1 = (V(G), E(G) \setminus \{e_2\})$,
- $G_3 = (V(G), (E(G) \setminus \{e_1, e_2\}) \cup \{e_3\})$.

Then the CSF X_G of G can be expressed as:

$$X_G = X_{G_{2,3}} + X_{G_1} - X_{G_3}.$$

Definition 2.10. Given two graphs G and H , such that $|V(G)| > |V(H)|$. We define the *induced subgraph count* of H in G , denoted by $\binom{G}{H}$, as:

$$\binom{G}{H} \triangleq |\{G' \mid G' \text{ is an induced subgraph of } G \text{ which is isomorphic to } H\}|.$$

Definition 2.11. We define three families of graphs as follows:

- Define \mathcal{G}_n to be the family of all graphs with n vertices.
- Define \mathcal{F}_n to be the family of all forests with n vertices.
- Define \mathcal{T}_n to be the family of all trees with n vertices.

Definition 2.12. Let $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_\ell)$ be a partition of n . The following are some notable graphs constructed based on this partition, which will be used frequently throughout this paper:

- We define P_λ as $\bigsqcup_{i=1}^{\ell} P_i$, where each P_i is a path with λ_i vertices.
- We define ST_λ as $\bigsqcup_{i=1}^{\ell} ST_i$, where each ST_i is a star with λ_i vertices.
- We define K_λ as a complete ℓ -partite graph where the i -th part has λ_i vertices.

3 Steps, Routes and Marches

We start this section by defining our main operation on graphs and will prove some results. Using them, in Subsection 3.1, we first prove the chromatic-basis theorem shown by Orellana and Scott [7]. Then, we prove a weaker version of the DNC-relation and will show that the algorithm provided in [16] can be viewed as a special case of our method. In Subsection 3.2, we prove one of the main results of this paper, which gives us the equivalency of the CSF and the U -polynomial on trees as a result.

Definition 3.1. Let G_1 be a simple graph where v_1, v_2 and v_3 are three of its vertices such that v_1, v_2 and v_1, v_3 are adjacent, but v_2, v_3 are not. We achieve three new graphs by modifying G_1 :

mod1 We obtain graph G_2 by removing the edge v_1, v_3 and adding the edge v_2, v_3 .

mod2 We obtain graph P_1 by removing the edge v_1, v_2 .

mod3 We obtain graph N_1 by removing the edges v_1, v_2 and v_1, v_3 , and adding the edge v_2, v_3 .

Using these modifications and the resulting graphs, we define the following concepts:

- a) Define the $\text{step}(G_1 \rightarrow G_2)$ to be the ordered pair (P_1, N_1) .
- b) P_1 and N_1 are called the *positive remainder* and the *negative remainder* of the march respectively. Also, the set $Re = \{P_1, N_1\}$ is called the *remainder set* of the step. Note that remainders have one less edge than G_1 and G_2 .
- c) The graph G_1 is called *stepable* to G_2 , if there exist three vertices in G_1 with the above condition such that performing mod1 on these vertices results in G_2 . Note that this relation is symmetric, meaning that if G_1 is stepable to G_2 , then so is G_2 to G_1 .
- d) We call a sequence of graphs $R = (G_1, G_2, \dots, G_{k-1}, G_k)$ a *route* from G_1 to G_k , if for each $1 \leq i < k$, the graph G_i is stepable to G_{i+1} . Note that if $R = (G_1, G_2, \dots, G_{k-1}, G_k)$ is a route from G_1 to G_k , then $R^{-1} = (G_k, G_{k-1}, \dots, G_2, G_1)$ is a route from G_k to G_1 .
- e) Given two routes $R_1 = (G_1, G_2, \dots, G_{k-1}, G_k)$ and $R_2 = (H_1, H_2, \dots, H_{t-1}, H_t)$ such that $G_k = H_1$, we can concatenate these two and achieve $R_1 \parallel R_2 = (G_1, G_2, \dots, G_{k-1}, G_k = H_1, H_2, \dots, H_{t-1}, H_t)$, which is a route from G_1 to H_t .
- f) Let $R = (G_1, G_2, \dots, G_{k-1}, G_k)$ be a route from a graph G_1 to a graph G_k , and for each $1 \leq i < k$, we have $\text{step}(G_i \rightarrow G_{i+1}) = (P_i, N_i)$. A *march*($G_1 \rightarrow G_k$) with respect to R is an ordered pair (P, N) such that $P = (P_1, P_2, \dots, P_{k-1})$ and $N = (N_1, N_2, \dots, N_{k-1})$.
- g) The sequences P and N are called the *positive remainders* and the *negative remainders* of the mentioned march respectively.

Note that by Corollary 2.9 for a $\text{step}(G_1 \rightarrow G_2) = (P_1, N_1)$ we have:

$$X_{G_1} = X_{G_2} + X_{P_1} - X_{N_1}. \quad (1)$$

Now, consider a $\text{march}(G_1 \rightarrow G_k) = (P, N)$ along a route $R = (G_1, G_2, \dots, G_{k-1}, G_k)$, where for each $1 \leq i < k$, we have $\text{step}(G_i \rightarrow G_{i+1}) = (P_i, N_i)$. Applying step formula (Equation (1)) iteratively, we obtain:

$$X_{G_1} = X_{G_k} + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} X_{P_i} - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} X_{N_i}. \quad (2)$$

Equation (2) is the core relation we will use in this section. It has two essential properties. Firstly, note that the only graph with the same number of edges as G_1 is X_{G_k} . All other graphs have precisely one less edge. Secondly, the two sigmas on the right-hand side of the equation have the same number of graphs, and there is a bijection between them.

Our first goal in this section is to show that for forests F_1 and F_k , if one starts from F_1 and performs the step function enough times in a proper route, then they will obtain F_k as a result if and only if $\text{Part}(F_1) = \text{Part}(F_k)$. To prove this, we use the path graphs as a go-between. In the following two lemmas, we show that if the above condition is satisfied, one can find a suitable route from a forest F to its corresponding path graph.

Lemma 3.2. *Given a tree T_1 with n vertices, there is a route $R = (T_1, T_2, \dots, T_k)$ from T_1 to T_k , where T_k is the path graph P_n .*

Proof. We proceed by induction on the longest path length in T_1 . For the base case, consider P_n , which has the longest possible path length. In this case, let T_2 be one of the graphs that are stepable from P_n ; then the route $R = (T_1 = P_n, T_2, T_3 = P_n)$ is a valid route from P_n to P_n .

Now, assume that T_1 is not a path graph. Let L be one of its longest paths, and let v_1 be a vertex on L with $\deg(v_1) > 2$. Such a vertex must exist, as T_1 is not a path graph. Let v_2 and v_3 be vertices adjacent to

v_1 such that v_2 lies on L while v_3 does not. Applying `mod1` produces a new graph T_2 in which L has been extended to a longer path L' , now the longest path in T_2 .

By the induction hypothesis, a route $R' = (T_2, T_3, \dots, T_k = P_n)$ exists from T_2 to P_n . Since T_1 is steppable to T_2 , we can extend R' to form $R = (T_1, T_2, \dots, T_k = P_n)$, establishing a valid route from T_1 to P_n . \square

Lemma 3.3. *Given a forest F_1 with $\text{Part}(F_1) = \lambda$, there is a route $R = (F_1, F_2, \dots, F_k)$ from F_1 to F_k , where F_k is the graph P_λ .*

Proof. To construct the route, assume $F_1 \neq P_\lambda$. Let T_1, T_2, \dots, T_t represent the connected components of F_1 that are not paths, and consider T_1 , a tree with q vertices. By Lemma 3.2, there exists a route $R' = (H_1, H_2, \dots, H_t)$ from $H_1 = T_1$ to $H_t = P_q$. This route allows us to construct $R_1 = (F_1, F_2, \dots, F_{t_1}, F_t)$, where each F_i is derived from F_1 by replacing T_1 with H_i . Since each H_i is steppable to H_{i+1} , so is F_i to F_{i+1} , making R_1 a route from F_1 to H_t . As H_t includes one additional path component compared to F_1 , we can repeat this process to generate routes R_1, R_2, \dots, R_{t-1} , where for each $1 \leq i \leq t-2$, route R_i is from K_i to K_{i+1} , with $K_1 = F_1$ and $K_t = P_\lambda$. Notably, K_{i+1} has one additional path component compared to K_i due to the method we used. Concatenating these routes yields $R = R_1 \parallel R_2 \parallel \dots \parallel R_{t-2} \parallel R_{t-1}$, forming a route from $K_1 = F_1$ to $K_t = P_\lambda$, as desired. \square

In the preceding lemmas, stars could replace paths using a different routing method. Similarly to the previous approach, which increased the length of the longest path in the graph or a component, this method adjusts the maximum degree of the graph or a component, transforming them into star graphs. Consequently, we can derive a route from the initial graph to ST_λ . This is particularly interesting since by the end of this section it can be used as a routing method to use when you want to find the CSF in the chromatic-basis made by star graphs. This is interesting since it must give us the same values as the algorithm introduced in [16], but it uses a different approach.

Now, we prove our desired statement by using the path graphs as a go-between.

Proposition 3.4. *For any two forests F_1 and F_k , there exists a route $R = (F_1, F_2, \dots, F_k)$ from F_1 to F_k if and only if $\text{Part}(F_1) = \text{Part}(F_k)$.*

Proof. First, observe that since each step between graphs preserves both the size and the number of connected components, the partition function of the graph remains unchanged. Thus, two graphs with different partition functions cannot have a route. For the converse, by Lemma 3.3, there exist routes $R_1 = (H_1 = F_1, H_2, \dots, H_t = P_\lambda)$ and $R_2 = (K_1 = F_k, K_2, \dots, K_s = P_\lambda)$, where $\lambda = \text{Part}(F_1) = \text{Part}(F_k)$. Hence, $R_1 \parallel R_2^{-1} = (H_1 = F_1, H_2, \dots, H_t = P_\lambda = K_s, \dots, K_2, K_1 = F_k)$ is a route from F_1 to F_k . \square

From this point forward in this section, our primary approach is to relativize the CSF of a given graph to other graphs using the above proposition and Equation (2).

In the first subsection, as applications, we use the above tools to prove two already-known facts using combinatorial methods. The first is [8, Theorem 5], which is the theorem that first introduced the idea of a chromatic-basis, and the second is the algorithm proposed by [16] for calculating the CSF in the star-basis using DNC-relation. We will show that this algorithm is a special case of our new calculating method.

In the second subsection, using the same method, we prove one of our main theorems, and from this theorem, we will infer an already known fact, which is U -polynomial and the CSF are equivalent for forests.

3.1 Chromatic-bases and the DNC-Relation

Definition 3.5. Given an integer n , we assign a graph G_λ to each $\lambda \vdash n$ such that $\text{Part}(G_\lambda) = \lambda$. We define a *chromatic-basis* with respect to this assignment to be:

$$B \triangleq \{X_{G_\lambda} \mid \lambda \vdash n\}.$$

A *forest-basis* is a chromatic-basis with all the graphs G_λ being forests.

We aim to prove that a forest-basis is a \mathbb{Q} -basis of Λ^n . We first prove that a forest-basis B is a generator set for $\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{G}_n)$. Then, by proving that the dimension of $\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{G}_n)$ equals $p(n)$, we conclude that $\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{G}_n) = \Lambda^n$. Therefore, show that B is a \mathbb{Q} -basis of Λ^n .

Our approach is to use induction. To prove the statement for a general graph, we first prove it for forests. This is relatively straightforward due to the properties of Equation (2). After that, in 3.7, we show that every non-forest graph has a route to a 'good' graph, and by 'good' graph, we mean a graph containing a cycle of length 3. The 'good' graph allows us to use the relation of Theorem 2.8 and turn the 'good' graph into three other graphs with fewer edges. From that point, the induction will do the rest.

Lemma 3.6. *A forest-basis B is a generator set for $\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{F}_n)$.*

Proof. Let F be a forest with partition $\text{Part}(F) = \lambda$, where $\lambda \vdash n$. Consider the set B to be an arbitrary forest-basis $\{X_{F_\mu} \mid \mu \vdash n\}$. We will prove the lemma by induction on the number of edges of the graph. If the graph has no edges, then it corresponds to the forest $F_{(1,1,\dots,1)}$, which always is a member of B . Hence, the base case holds. For the inductive step, assume that for any forest with fewer edges than F , the forest lies in the span of the forest-basis B . Now, consider the forest $F_\lambda \in B$ with partition $\text{Part}(F_\lambda) = \lambda$. By Proposition 3.4, there exists a route $R = (F_1 = F, F_2, \dots, F_k = F_\lambda)$ from F to F_λ . This route can be described as $\text{march}(F \rightarrow F_\lambda) = (P, N)$, and using the march formula (Equation (2)), we have that:

$$X_F = X_{F_\lambda} + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} X_{P_i} - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} X_{N_i},$$

where P_i s and N_i s are forests with fewer edges than F . By the induction hypothesis, since P_i s and N_i s have fewer edges than F , they lie within the span of B . Additionally, F_λ is itself an element of B . Therefore, we conclude that F is generated by the forest-basis B . \square

Proposition 3.7. *Let G be a graph that contains a cycle. Then there exists a graph G' with girth, i.e. the length of its shortest cycle, equal to 3, and a route from G to G' .*

Proof. Let $C = v_1, v_2, \dots, v_g$ be a cycle of length $g > 3$ in G . For each $1 \leq i \leq g-2$, define G_i as the graph obtained from G by removing the edge v_2v_3 and adding the edge v_2v_{i+2} . Let us denote G' as the last of these graphs that is, $G' = G_{g-2}$. Observe that for each $1 \leq i \leq g-3$, the graph G_i is stepable to G_{i+1} , which implies that the sequence $R = (G_1 = G, G_2, \dots, G_{g-2} = G')$ forms a route from G to G' . Since G' 's girth equals 3, this concludes the proof. \square

Lemma 3.8. *A forest-basis B is a generator set for $\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{G}_n)$.*

Proof. Let G be a graph with partition $\text{Part}(G) = \lambda$, where $\lambda \vdash n$. If G is a forest, the result follows directly from Lemma 3.6. Therefore, it suffices to prove the lemma for the case where G contains at least one cycle.

Just as with the previous lemma, this lemma will be proven by induction on the number of edges of the graph. Let g denote the girth of G . If $g = 3$, then by Theorem 2.8, we can express G in terms of graphs $G_{2,3}$, $G_{1,3}$, and G_3 , each having fewer edges than G , such that:

$$X_G = X_{G_{2,3}} + X_{G_{1,3}} - X_{G_3}.$$

By the induction hypothesis, the graphs $G_{2,3}$, $G_{1,3}$, and G_3 are in the span of the forest-basis B . Thus, G is also generated by B .

Now, consider the case where $g > 3$. Using the result from Proposition 3.7, there is a route from G to a graph G' with a girth equal to 3. This route can be described as $\text{march}(G \rightarrow G') = (P, N)$, and by using the march formula (Equation (2)), we obtain the following relation:

$$X_G = X_{G'} + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} X_{P_i} - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} X_{N_i}.$$

By a similar argument to that used in the proof of Lemma 3.6, each P_i and N_i lies in the span of the forest-basis B . Moreover, since G' is a graph with girth 3, it can also be generated by B , as shown earlier. Combining these results, we conclude that G can be generated by the forest-basis B . \square

Lemma 3.9. *The dimension of the $\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{G}_n)$ equals $p(n)$.*

We postpone the proof of this lemma until the end of Section 4. There, we will provide a family of graphs whose CSFs are independent.

Definition 3.10. Let $\{G_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ be a set of connected graphs such that G_k has k vertices for each k , and let $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_\ell)$ be a partition. Then,

$$G_\lambda \triangleq G_{\lambda_1} \sqcup \dots \sqcup G_{\lambda_\ell}.$$

That is, G_λ is the graph whose connected components are $G_{\lambda_1}, \dots, G_{\lambda_\ell}$.

The following theorem is a weaker version of the theorem shown in [8] since we are only proving the theorem for the case forests. Although our statement is weaker, but our proof is combinatorial and shows how these bases actually span to generate the space, while the proof provided in [8] is algebraic and based on the independence of graphs CSFs.

Theorem 3.11. *Let $\{T_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ be a set of trees such that T_k has k vertices for each k . Then,*

$$\{X_{T_\lambda} \mid \lambda \vdash n\}$$

is a \mathbb{Q} -basis of Λ^n . Plus, we have that:

$$\Lambda = \mathbb{Q}[X_{T_1}, X_{T_2}, \dots],$$

and the X_{T_k} s are algebraically independent over \mathbb{Q} .

Proof. According to the Lemmas 3.8 and 3.9, the set $\{X_{T_\lambda} \mid \lambda \vdash n\}$ is a \mathbb{Q} -basis for Λ^n . Therefore, since $X_{T_\lambda} = X_{T_{\lambda_1}} \cdot X_{T_{\lambda_2}} \cdot \dots \cdot X_{T_{\lambda_\ell}}$, where $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_\ell)$, we can deduct that:

$$\Lambda = \mathbb{Q}[X_{T_1}, X_{T_2}, \dots].$$

Therefore, the X_{T_k} s are algebraically independent over \mathbb{Q} . \square

The following definition and the two corollaries after that are handy tools that we will exploit in the next subsection.

Definition 3.12. Let B be a chromatic-basis defined in Definition 3.5. For a graph G with n vertices, we define $X_{G,B}$ as the CSF of G expressed in the chromatic-basis B . For $\lambda \vdash n$, we denote by $[\lambda]X_{G,B}$ the coefficient of $X_{G,B}$ with respect to $X_{G_\lambda} \in B$.

The following corollaries are particularly important since they actually show how a forest F with $\text{Part}(F) = \lambda$ can be a representative of λ inside a chromatic-basis. Note that the forest-basis B in these corollaries is unrelated to F itself. So, not only λ can represent a non-zero coefficient, but it represents a coefficient equal to one. In the next subsection, we will discuss the coefficients of the CSF shown in a forest-basis more thoroughly.

Corollary 3.13. *Let G be a graph with n vertices such that $\text{Part}(G) = \lambda$. If $[\mu]X_{G,B} \neq 0$, then $\mu \leq \lambda$.*

Proof. We use induction on the number of edges of the graph. For the base case, consider an edgeless graph. We examine two cases:

- **G is a forest:** In this case, using Proposition 3.4 there exists a route from G to F_λ , where $X_{F_\lambda} \in B$. Using the marching formula (Equation (2)) on R , we get:

$$X_G = X_{F_\lambda} + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} X_{P_i} - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} X_{N_i}.$$

Firstly, note that P_i s and N_i s have fewer edges than G . Also, for all $1 \leq i \leq k-1$, we have $\text{Part}(P_i) \leq \lambda$ and $\text{Part}(N_i) \leq \lambda$. This implies that if $\mu \vdash n$ such that $[\mu]X_{G,B} \neq 0$ and $\mu \not\leq \lambda$, then by the induction hypothesis, $[\mu]X_{P_i,B} = 0$ and $[\mu]X_{N_i,B} = 0$. Since $[\mu]X_{F_\lambda,B} \neq 0$ only if $\lambda = \mu$, we achieve the desired result.

- **G has a cycle:** In this case, by Proposition 3.7, there exist a graph G' and a route from G to G' such that G' contains a triangle. By Theorem 2.8, there exist graphs G_1 , G_2 and G_3 such that $X_{G'} = X_{G_1} + X_{G_2} - X_{G_3}$. Applying Equation (2), we have:

$$X_{G,B} = X_{G',B} + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} X_{P_i,B} - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} X_{N_i,B} = X_{G_1,B} + X_{G_2,B} - X_{G_3,B} + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} X_{P_i,B} - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} X_{N_i,B}.$$

Since all P_i s, N_i s, and G_j s have fewer edges than G , and we also have $\text{Part}(P_i) \leq \lambda$, $\text{Part}(N_i) \leq \lambda$ and $\text{Part}(G_j) \leq \lambda$, the result follows by the induction hypothesis. □

Corollary 3.14. *Let F be a forest such that $\text{Part}(F) = \lambda$. Then $[\lambda]X_{F,B} = 1$.*

Proof. By Proposition 3.4, there exists a route $R = (F_1 = F, F_2, \dots, F_{k+1} = F_\lambda)$. Applying the marching formula (Equation (2)) to R , we obtain:

$$X_F = X_{F_\lambda} + \sum_{i=1}^k X_{P_i} - \sum_{i=1}^k X_{N_i}.$$

Note that $\ell(\text{Part}(P_i))$ and $\ell(\text{Part}(N_i))$ are both equal to $\ell(\lambda) + 1$, for all $1 \leq i \leq k$. Therefore, by Corollary 3.13, we conclude that $[\lambda] \left(\sum_{i=1}^k X_{P_i} - \sum_{i=1}^k X_{N_i} \right) = 0$. Thus, $[\lambda]X_{F,B} = [\lambda]X_{F_\lambda,B} = 1$, as desired. □

Now, for the last statement of this subsection, we prove a weaker version of the DNC-relation first shown in [14]. An important use of the DNC-relation is in the algorithm provided in [16]. This algorithm's objective is similar to what we have done so far in this section. It uses the relation to calculate the coefficients of the CSF of a graph in the star-basis, which is the chromatic-basis made by ST_λ s. In fact, this algorithm is so similar to our work that it can be viewed as an instance of it. In the following proposition, we show that the relation, in the case of the forests, can be viewed as a route. This means that the relation is actually a method of making routes. Routes that can connect any forest to the correlated ST_λ . So, in the case of forests, the mentioned algorithm is actually the method we introduced, but with a specified routing algorithm.

Proposition 3.15. *Let G_1 be a graph, and let wu be one of its edges. Let v_1, \dots, v_k be the vertices adjacent to u but not to w . Define G_2 as the graph obtained from G_1 by removing each edge uv_i and adding the edge wv_i for each $1 \leq i \leq k$. If we define $P' = G_1 - \{wu\}$ and $N' = G_2 - \{wu\}$, then:*

$$X_{G_1} = X_{G_2} + X_{P'} - X_{N'}.$$

Proof. For each $0 \leq i \leq k$, define the graph H_i as the graph obtained from G_1 by removing the edges uv_1, \dots, uv_i and adding the edges wv_1, \dots, wv_i . Note that by definition, $H_0 = G_1$ and $H_k = G_2$. Since H_i is steppable to H_{i+1} for each $0 \leq i \leq k-1$, the sequence $R = (H_0 = G_1, H_1, \dots, H_k = G_2)$ forms a route from G_1 to G_2 . Describing this route as $\text{march}(G_1 \rightarrow G_2) = (P, N)$, the marching formula (Equation (2)) gives:

$$X_{G_1} = X_{G_2} + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} X_{P_i} - \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} X_{N_i}.$$

Observing that $N_i = P_{i+1}$ for each $0 \leq i \leq k-2$, and noting $P_0 = P'$ and $N_{k-1} = N'$, we conclude:

$$X_{G_1} = X_{G_2} + X_{P'} - X_{N'},$$

as required. \square

As shown in the proof, the relation is equivalent to finding a route between G_1 and G_2 , and by considering the march of this route and applying Equation (2) we will end up with the desired relation. Note that, in the case of forests, none of the neighbors of u can be adjacent to w , except for w itself. So, in this case, the above relation will be the same as the DNC-relation.

3.2 CSF, U-Polynomial and the Tree Conjecture

In this subsection, our aim is to prove Theorem 3.21. This theorem shows, in the case of forests, how much the U -polynomial behaves like the CSF when viewed in the proper chromatic-basis. To prove the theorem, we first show that the relation of Equation (1) is still true if we replace the CSF with the U -polynomial. This is particularly important since our work in this section is almost entirely based on this relation. So, having this relation be true for U -polynomials means that we can import most of our tools from the CSF to the U -polynomial.

Lemma 3.16. *Let F_1 be a forest where v_1, v_2 , and v_3 are three of its vertices such that v_1, v_2 and v_1, v_3 are adjacent, but v_2, v_3 are not. Let F_2, P_1 , and N_1 be the forests obtained by performing **mod1**, **mod2**, and **mod3** operations on F_1 . Then we have:*

$$U_{F_1} = U_{F_2} + U_{P_1} - U_{N_1}.$$

Proof. Let $e_1 = v_1v_2$, $e_2 = v_1v_3$, and $e_3 = v_2v_3$. For each $A \subseteq E(F_1)$, define $A' \subseteq E(F_2)$ as follows:

- if $e_2 \notin A$, then $A' = A$,
- if $e_2 \in A$, then $A' = (A - \{e_2\}) \cup \{e_3\}$.

Note that for each $A \subseteq E(F_1)$, there is exactly one corresponding $A' \subseteq E(F_2)$. By definition, $U_F(x) = \sum_{A \subseteq E(F)} x_{\lambda(A)}$. For each A , we aim to enumerate and compare $x_{\lambda(A)}$ in $[\lambda(A)]U_{F_1}$ and $x_{\lambda(A')}$ in $[\lambda(A')]U_{F_2}$. We proceed by dividing the statement into two cases:

- $e_1 \in A$: If $e_2 \notin A$, then $e_3 \notin A'$. Therefore, $\text{Part}(F_1|_A) = \text{Part}(F_2|_{A'})$, which implies $x_{\lambda(A)} = x_{\lambda(A')}$. If $e_2 \in A$, then $e_3 \in A'$. In this situation, we observe that in both $\text{Part}(A)$ and $\text{Part}(A')$, the components that do not include vertices v_1, v_2 , and v_3 are identical. Additionally, the component that includes any one of these vertices in A will contain the other two vertices as well, since v_3 is connected to v_1 via e_2 , and v_1 is connected to v_2 via e_1 . This structure holds similarly for A' . The rest of these two components are thus equivalent by the definition of **mod1**. Since these three vertices are connected by two edges in each of the components, we conclude that $x_{\lambda(A)} = x_{\lambda(A')}$. Therefore, we can write:

$$\sum_{e_1 \in A \subseteq F_1} x_{\lambda(A)} - \sum_{e_1 \in A' \subseteq F_2} x_{\lambda(A')} = 0.$$

- $e_1 \notin A$: We know that $P_1 = G_1 - e_1$ and $N_1 = G_2 - e_1$. Therefore, we can say that A is a subset of edges of P_1 and A' is a subset of edges of N_1 , each containing the exact same vertices and edges as F_1 and F_2 , respectively. In fact, the set of all subsets A that do not contain e_1 makes up the set of all subsets of P_1 , and similarly, the set of all subsets A' that do not contain e_1 makes up the set of all subsets of N_1 . Using these facts, we can write:

$$\sum_{e_1 \notin A \subseteq F_1} x_{\lambda(A)} = \sum_{A \subseteq P_1} x_{\lambda(A)} = U_{P_1}, \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{e_1 \notin A' \subseteq F_2} x_{\lambda(A')} = \sum_{A' \subseteq N_1} x_{\lambda(A')} = U_{N_1}.$$

Combining these results, we get:

$$U_{F_1} - U_{F_2} = U_{P_1} - U_{N_1},$$

as desired. \square

Now that we have established that the relation also holds for U -polynomials, we start proving the theorem. For a forest F , let us call the number $\ell(\text{Part}(F))$ its *level*. The following lemma shows how the CSF and the U -polynomial in forest-basis act the same.

Lemma 3.17. *Let F_1 and F_2 be forests with n vertices such that $\text{Part}(F_1) = \text{Part}(F_2)$. Let B be a forest-basis. Then, for all $\lambda \vdash n$, such that $\ell(\lambda) = \ell(\text{Part}(F_1)) + 1$, we have:*

$$[\lambda]X_{F_1, B} - [\lambda]X_{F_2, B} = [\lambda]U_{F_1} - [\lambda]U_{F_2}.$$

Proof. By previous discussion, there exists a route R from F_1 to F_2 with $k-2$ forests between them, yielding:

$$X_{F_1} = X_{F_2} + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} X_{P_i} - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} X_{N_i}.$$

By Corollaries 3.13 and 3.14, we know that for each $1 \leq i \leq k-1$, the value of $[\lambda]X_{P_i}$ is either zero or one, depending on whether $\text{Part}(P_i) = \lambda$. The same holds for $[\lambda]X_{N_i}$. Therefore, we can express:

$$[\lambda]X_{F_1} - [\lambda]X_{F_2} = \#_{\lambda}P_i - \#_{\lambda}N_i,$$

where $\#_{\lambda}P_i$ and $\#_{\lambda}N_i$ represent the number of P_i and N_i forests such that $\text{Part}(P_i) = \lambda$ and $\text{Part}(N_i) = \lambda$, respectively. On the other hand, with respect to the route R , we have:

$$U_{F_1} = U_{F_2} + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_{P_i} - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_{N_i}.$$

By the same reasoning, $[\lambda]U_{P_i}$ is also either zero or one, depending on whether $\text{Part}(P_i) = \lambda$. Thus, we get:

$$[\lambda]U_{F_1} - [\lambda]U_{F_2} = \#_{\lambda}P_i - \#_{\lambda}N_i = [\lambda]X_{F_1} - [\lambda]X_{F_2},$$

completing the proof. \square

Note that the relation shown in this lemma happens at exactly one level higher than the level of F_1 and F_2 . Also, you might have noticed that we did not use the elements of basis B in the proof, meaning that it does not matter how you choose the basis as long as it remains a forest-basis. You can even choose different bases for F_1 and F_2 , and the lemma will still hold. All these notions point to the fact that the U -polynomial behaves almost the same as the CSF in the case of forests.

Definition 3.18. Let G be a graph with n vertices such that $\text{Part}(G) = \mu$, and let B be a chromatic-basis such that $X_{G, B}(x) = \sum_{\lambda \vdash n} c_{\lambda} X_{G_{\lambda}}$. For a $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \cup \{0\}$, we define $X_{G, B}^k(x)$ to be:

$$X_{G, B}^k(x) \triangleq \sum_{\substack{\lambda \vdash n \\ \ell(\lambda) \leq \ell(\mu) + k}} c_{\lambda} X_{G_{\lambda}}.$$

A new question that comes to mind after Lemma 3.17 is how far can we go in terms of levels and still have the relation to be true? We try to answer this question in the following proposition. We will call this number the *corner number* in Definition 3.20.

Proposition 3.19. *Let F_1 and F_2 be forests with n vertices such that $\text{Part}(F_1) = \text{Part}(F_2) = \mu$. Let B be a forest-basis. If for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \cup \{0\}$ we have $X_{F_1, B}^k - X_{F_2, B}^k = 0$, then the following statements hold:*

- There exist sets $\{P_i : i \in \{1, \dots, t\}\}$ and $\{N_i : i \in \{1, \dots, t\}\}$ such that $\ell(\text{Part}(P_i)) = \ell(\text{Part}(N_i)) = \ell(\mu) + k + 1$, and

$$X_{F_1} - X_{F_2} = \sum_{i=1}^t X_{P_i} - \sum_{i=1}^t X_{N_i} \quad \text{and} \quad U_{F_1} - U_{F_2} = \sum_{i=1}^t U_{P_i} - \sum_{i=1}^t U_{N_i}.$$

- For all $\lambda \vdash n$ such that $\ell(\lambda) \leq \ell(\mu) + k + 1$, we have:

$$[\lambda]X_{F_1, B} - [\lambda]X_{F_2, B} = [\lambda]U_{F_1} - [\lambda]U_{F_2}.$$

Proof. We prove both statements by induction on k . Lemma 3.17 acts as the basis of induction for $k = 0$. Now, assume the statement holds for $k - 1$. Then, there exist sets of size t containing P_i s and N_i s such that $\ell(\text{Part}(P_i)) = \ell(\text{Part}(N_i)) = \ell(\mu) + k$ and we have:

$$X_{F_1} - X_{F_2} = \sum_{i=1}^t X_{P_i} - \sum_{i=1}^t X_{N_i}.$$

Since $X_{F_1}^k - X_{F_2}^k = 0$, let λ be a partition with length $\ell(\mu) + k$. Then,

$$[\lambda]X_{F_1} - [\lambda]X_{F_2} = \sum_{i=1}^t [\lambda]X_{P_i} - \sum_{i=1}^t [\lambda]X_{N_i} = 0.$$

By Corollaries 3.13 and 3.14, $[\lambda]X_{P_i}$ and $[\lambda]X_{N_i}$ are either zero or one, depending on whether $\text{Part}(P_i) = \lambda$ and $\text{Part}(N_i) = \lambda$ or not. Thus, the number of P_i s and N_i s with partition λ is equal. This argument holds for each partition of length $\ell(\mu) + k$, allowing us to pair each P_i with partition λ^i with an N_i of the same partition. Without loss of generality, we assume that P_i is paired with N_i . Consequently, we can write:

$$X_{F_1} - X_{F_2} = \sum_{i=1}^t (X_{P_i} - X_{N_i}).$$

Since P_i and N_i are paired with the same partitions, there exists a route R between P_i and N_i , allowing us to express $X_{P_i} - X_{N_i}$ as:

$$X_{P_i} - X_{N_i} = \sum_{j=1}^{t'_i} X_{P'_{ij}} - \sum_{j=1}^{t'_i} X_{N'_{ij}}.$$

Substituting into our equation, we can write:

$$X_{F_1} - X_{F_2} = \sum_{i=1}^t \left(\sum_{j=1}^{t'_i} X_{P'_{ij}} - \sum_{j=1}^{t'_i} X_{N'_{ij}} \right),$$

where $\ell(\text{Part}(P_i)) = \ell(\text{Part}(N_i)) = \ell(\mu) + k + 1$. Thus, the statement holds for k . Furthermore, by Lemma 3.16 and the fact that $[\lambda]U_F$ is either zero or one depending on whether $\text{Part}(F) = \lambda$ or not when $\ell(\lambda) = \ell(\text{Part}(F))$, the same argument applies.

For the second statement, by Lemma 3.17, the base case $k = 0$ is proved. Assume the statement holds for $k - 1$; we will prove it holds for k . If $\ell(\lambda) \leq \ell(\mu) + k$, the induction hypothesis holds and we are done. So suppose that $\ell(\lambda) = \ell(\mu) + k + 1$. In the previous step, we showed that if $X_{F_1}^k - X_{F_2}^k = 0$, there exist two sets containing P_i s and N_i s with $\ell(\text{Part}(P_i)) = \ell(\text{Part}(N_i)) = \ell(\mu) + k + 1$ such that:

$$X_{F_1} - X_{F_2} = \sum_{i=1}^t X_{P_i} - \sum_{i=1}^t X_{N_i} \quad \text{and} \quad U_{F_1} - U_{F_2} = \sum_{i=1}^t U_{P_i} - \sum_{i=1}^t U_{N_i}.$$

For an arbitrary partition λ with $\ell(\lambda) = \ell(\mu) + k + 1$, we can write:

$$[\lambda]X_{F_1} - [\lambda]X_{F_2} = \sum_{i=1}^t [\lambda]X_{P_i} - \sum_{i=1}^t [\lambda]X_{N_i}.$$

By Corollaries 3.13 and 3.14, $[\lambda]X_{P_i}$ and $[\lambda]X_{N_i}$ are either zero or one depending on whether their partition equals λ . Thus, we can write:

$$[\lambda]X_{F_1} - [\lambda]X_{F_2} = \#_{\lambda}P_i - \#_{\lambda}N_i,$$

where $\#_{\lambda}P_i$ and $\#_{\lambda}N_i$ denote the number of P_i s and N_i s with $\text{Part}(P_i) = \lambda$ and $\text{Part}(N_i) = \lambda$, respectively. The same holds for U -polynomials, as we have:

$$[\lambda]U_{F_1} - [\lambda]U_{F_2} = \sum_{i=1}^t [\lambda]U_{P_i} - \sum_{i=1}^t [\lambda]U_{N_i},$$

and $[\lambda]U_{P_i}$ and $[\lambda]U_{N_i}$ are either zero or one depending on whether their partition equals λ . Hence, we conclude that:

$$[\lambda]U_{F_1} - [\lambda]U_{F_2} = \#_{\lambda}P_i - \#_{\lambda}N_i = [\lambda]X_{F_1} - [\lambda]X_{F_2}.$$

This completes the proof. \square

Again, note that the choice of B does not matter and can even be different for F_1 and F_2 . Now, we define the *corner number* formally.

Definition 3.20. Let F be a forest with n vertices such that $\text{Part}(F) = \lambda$, and let B be an arbitrary chromatic-basis such that $X_{F'}$ where F' is a forest and $\text{Part}(F') = \lambda$. We say k is F 's *corner number* with respect to B if $X_{F,B}^{k-1} = X_{F'}$ but $X_{G,B}^k \neq X_{F'}$.

Note that since for $k = 0$, we have $X_{G,B}^k = X_{F'}$. Thus, the corner number of forest F with respect to a forest-basis B is at least 1. Now, as a result of the proposition, we achieve our desired theorem.

Theorem 3.21. Let F_1 and F_2 be forests with n vertices such that $\text{Part}(F_1) = \text{Part}(F_2) = \mu$. Let B be a forest-basis such that $X_{F_2} \in B$. Then, for all $\lambda \vdash n$ such that $\ell(\lambda) \leq k$, and $\lambda \neq \mu$, the following holds:

$$[\lambda]X_{F_1,B} = [\lambda]U_{F_1} - [\lambda]U_{F_2},$$

where k is the corner number of F_1 with respect to B . Also, for $\lambda = \mu$ we have $[\lambda]X_{F_1,B} = 1$ and $[\lambda]U_{F_1} - [\lambda]U_{F_2} = 0$.

Proof. The theorem follows directly from Proposition 3.19. \square

The most important aspect of this theorem is how we proved it. Note that although we have restricted the forest-basis B by putting X_{F_2} inside, the rest of B is still entirely arbitrary. Furthermore, by proving Lemma 3.16 and Proposition 3.19, we showed that one way to view these polynomials is by defining them only using a simple relation, meaning that you can define problems like the tree conjecture without defining a meaningful function, such as the CSF or the U -polynomial. In this section, we have mostly avoided what the CSF and the U -polynomial actually are and instead try to relativize graphs using their properties. One could probably argue that the main idea of this paper is to relate graphs to each other.

Finally, we can deduce a previously achieved result in [2] from our theorem.

Corollary 3.22. For two forests F_1 and F_2 , we have $X_{F_1} = X_{F_2}$ if and only if $U_{F_1} = U_{F_2}$.

Proof. The corollary follows directly from Theorem 3.21. \square

Another paper worth mentioning is the work of Chan and Crew [15]. Although their approach is different from ours, some of their results are achievable through ours. For instance, Theorem 3.1 or Lemma 3.3 can be inferred from Equation (2).

4 Homomorphisms and Calculating the CSF

The primary source of inspiration for this section was the reconstruction conjecture. Since this conjecture is known to be true for the case of forests [5], a reasonable approach for tree conjecture would be to check whether one can reach the deck of cards of a forest only having its CSF. To walk down this road, one needs to find a connection between the induced subgraphs with one less vertex and the CSF of the main tree under study. Thus, in this section, we develop a linear relation that can give us most of the CSF of our main graph by having these induced subgraphs and their CSF. In this section, our basis of interest for the CSF is the m_λ -basis.

Definition 4.1. Given a graph G with n vertices and a partition $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_\ell) \vdash n$, we say a set

$$P = \{\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{\lambda_1}\}, \{v_{\lambda_1+1}, \dots, v_{\lambda_1+\lambda_2}\}, \dots, \{v_{\lambda_1+\dots+\lambda_{\ell-1}+1}, \dots, v_n\}\}$$

is an *independent λ -partition* of G if, for every $P \in A$, there is no edge e between the vertices in P . Each set $P \in A$ is called a *part* of A . Moreover, P is a *k -part* of A if it contains k elements.

Definition 4.2. Given two graphs H and G with an isomorphism $\phi : H \rightarrow G$, for an independent λ -partition $P = \{Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_\ell\}$ of H , we define $\phi(P)$ as:

$$\phi(P) \triangleq \{\phi(Q_1), \phi(Q_2), \dots, \phi(Q_\ell)\},$$

where $\phi(Q_i) = \{\phi(v) \mid v \in Q_i\}$. Note that $\phi(P)$ is itself an independent λ -partition of G .

The idea behind Theorem 4.3 is to see induced subgraphs of our graph G as separate smaller graphs embedded in G by a morphism. We can use this view to induce G 's independent partitions onto smaller graphs and vice versa, resulting in the desired relation.

Theorem 4.3. For a given graph G with n vertices and a partition $\lambda^1 = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_\ell) \vdash n$, we have:

$$c_{\lambda^1}^G = \binom{n-m}{k-m}^{-1} \sum_{H:|V(H)|=k} c_{\lambda^2}^H \binom{G}{H},$$

where $\lambda^1 \sim \lambda^2$, $\lambda^{1*} \vdash m$, and $\lambda^2 \vdash k$.

Proof. We aim to enumerate all independent λ^1 -partitions of G . First, we introduce a method to enumerate these sets using independent λ^2 -partitions of all k -vertex subgraphs of G . Second, we show that each independent λ^1 -partition of G is counted at least once using this method. Lastly, we prove that each independent λ^1 -partition of G is enumerated exactly $\binom{n-m}{k-m}$ times; thus, by dividing the total count $\sum_{H:|V(H)|=k} c_{\lambda^2}^H \binom{G}{H}$ by this factor, we obtain $c_{\lambda^1}^G$.

Let H be a graph with k vertices. Note that if there is no subgraph K of G isomorphic to H , then $\binom{G}{H} = 0$. For each graph H with k vertices, and each subgraph of G isomorphic to H , let $\phi_H^K : H \rightarrow K$ be a fixed isomorphism from H to K . Let $P_1, P_2, \dots, P_{c_{\lambda^2}^H}$ be the $c_{\lambda^2}^H$ distinct independent λ^2 -partitions of H . Define $W = \{\{v_i\} \mid v_i \in (G - K)\}$. Then, for each P_j , let P'_j be the union of $\phi_H^K(P_j)$ with W . Since $\lambda^1 \sim \lambda^2$, each P'_j is an independent λ^1 -partition of G . For each H , we apply the $\binom{G}{H}$ fixed isomorphisms from H to distinct subgraphs of G , and for each H there are $c_{\lambda^2}^H$ independent λ^2 -partitions. Thus, we generate $\sum_{H:|V(H)|=k} c_{\lambda^2}^H \binom{G}{H}$ independent λ^1 -partitions in G ; however, these partitions are not necessarily distinctive.

We now claim that the described method enumerates each independent λ^1 -partition of G at least once. Let P'_k be an independent λ^1 -partition of G . Since P'_k contains $n - m$ number of 1-parts, let W represent all 1-parts of P'_k . By selecting $k - m$ elements from W along with $P'_k - W$, we obtain a k -vertex subgraph of G , denoted as K . Let H' be a graph isomorphic to K . Since H' contains k vertices, it has already been counted in $\sum_{H:|V(H)|=k} c_{\lambda^2}^H \binom{G}{H}$. Therefore, P'_k has been enumerated at least once.

Finally, we determine how many times each independent λ^1 -partition has been enumerated. Let P'_k be an independent λ^1 -partition of G . As noted, P'_k has $n - m$ 1-parts; we choose $k - m$ of these 1-parts and exclude

the others to obtain a smaller set, denoted P_j . Let K be the graph containing all vertices in the parts of P_j . Since $\lambda^{1*} \vdash m$ and $\lambda^2 \vdash k$, we know K contains k vertices, and P_j is an independent λ^2 -partition of K . This subgraph K is isomorphic to a graph H with k vertices, and thus H maps to G via the fixed map ϕ_H^K . Since ϕ_H^K is an isomorphism, $\phi_H^{K^{-1}}(P_j)$ is an independent λ^2 -partition of H . To satisfy $\lambda^1 \sim \lambda^2$, all parts of P'_k and P_j with more than one vertex must match, and for the 1-parts, we have $\binom{n-m}{k-m}$ choices. Note that for parts with more than 1 vertex, since we fixed the isomorphism between H and K , the matching between non 1-parts of H and G comes canonically with respect to this isomorphism. Thus, each λ^1 -partition is counted exactly $\binom{n-m}{k-m}$ times. \square

We proved that the relation between c_λ^G s and c_λ^H s is linear. Now, to calculate c_λ^G s, we shall create a matrix containing the information we need. Lemma 4.5 and Corollaries 4.6, 4.7 and 4.8 are the results concerning this matrix.

Definition 4.4. Let $\lambda^1, \lambda^2, \dots, \lambda^{p(n)}$ represent all partitions of n , and let G_1, G_2, \dots, G_s be a family of graphs with n vertices. We define the λ -matrix of this family as follows, where c_i^j indicates $c_{\lambda^i}^{G_j}$:

$$\begin{bmatrix} c_1^1 & c_2^1 & c_3^1 & \cdots & c_{p(n)-1}^1 & c_{p(n)}^1 \\ c_1^2 & c_2^2 & c_3^2 & \cdots & c_{p(n)-1}^2 & c_{p(n)}^2 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ c_1^{s-1} & c_2^{s-1} & c_3^{s-1} & \cdots & c_{p(n)-1}^{s-1} & c_{p(n)}^{s-1} \\ c_1^s & c_2^s & c_3^s & \cdots & c_{p(n)-1}^s & c_{p(n)}^s \end{bmatrix}$$

Lemma 4.5. For the graph K_λ , where $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_\ell) \vdash n$, and for any partition $\lambda' = (\lambda'_1, \lambda'_2, \dots, \lambda'_r) \vdash n$, it holds that $c_{\lambda'}^{K_\lambda} \neq 0$ if and only if $\lambda' \leq \lambda$.

Proof. In Theorem 4.3, we established that c_λ^G represents the number of independent λ -partitions of G . Therefore, $c_{\lambda'}^{K_\lambda}$ is the number of λ' -partitions in K_λ . Let $A = \{P'_1, P'_2, \dots, P'_r\}$ be an independent λ' -partition of K_λ and assume $B = \{P_1, P_2, \dots, P_\ell\}$ is the unique independent λ -partition of K_λ .

For any P'_i that contains some $v \in P_j$, if there exists any $u \in P'_i$ such that $u \notin P_j$, then there must be no edges connecting v to u , which would contradict the definition of K_λ . Consequently, if A is an independent λ' -partition of K_λ , then each part of A is a subset of a part in the λ -partition B . This means that by taking the union of the parts of A contained within each part of B , we can reconstruct B without putting any two adjacent vertices together. Therefore, if $c_{\lambda'}^{K_\lambda} \neq 0$, then $\lambda' \leq \lambda$. Conversely, if $\lambda' \leq \lambda$, we can partition the parts of the independent λ -partition to achieve λ' , implying that $c_{\lambda'}^{K_\lambda} \neq 0$. \square

Corollary 4.6. The λ -matrix of all graphs with n vertices is of full rank.

Proof. The rank of the λ -matrix is at most $p(n)$, the number of partitions of n . We construct $p(n)$ graphs with n vertices and demonstrate that their λ -matrix is of full rank. Let $\lambda^1, \lambda^2, \dots, \lambda^{p(n)}$ be all partitions of n , ordered by length from shortest to longest. The order among partitions of the same size is arbitrary. We claim that the following square matrix, in which c_i^j represents $c_{\lambda^i}^{K_{\lambda^j}}$, is of full rank:

$$\begin{bmatrix} c_1^1 & c_2^1 & c_3^1 & \cdots & c_{p(n)-1}^1 & c_{p(n)}^1 \\ c_1^2 & c_2^2 & c_3^2 & \cdots & c_{p(n)-1}^2 & c_{p(n)}^2 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ c_1^{p(n)-1} & c_2^{p(n)-1} & c_3^{p(n)-1} & \cdots & c_{p(n)-1}^{p(n)-1} & c_{p(n)}^{p(n)-1} \\ c_1^{p(n)} & c_2^{p(n)} & c_3^{p(n)} & \cdots & c_{p(n)-1}^{p(n)} & c_{p(n)}^{p(n)} \end{bmatrix}$$

Observe that the main diagonal contains $c_{\lambda^i}^{K_{\lambda^i}}$, and for any K_λ , we have $c_\lambda^{K_\lambda} = 1$. Therefore, each entry on the main diagonal is equal to one. Additionally, for each diagonal element c_i^i , the length of the partition assigned to each row increases or remains the same as we proceed down the columns. By Lemma 4.5, for

each column i , any entry c_j^i where $j < i$ is zero. This property makes the matrix upper triangular with all diagonal elements equal to one. Hence, the matrix is of full rank. \square

Now, we can prove Lemma 3.9.

Proof of Lemma 3.9. The result follows from Corollary 4.6, where it was established that the λ -matrix corresponding to all graphs K_λ is of full rank. Thus, we complete the proof. \square

Corollary 4.7. *The λ -matrix of all forests with n vertices is of full rank.*

Proof. The result follows directly from Theorem 3.11. \square

Additionally, it has been proved by Gonzalez, Orellana, and Tomba in [16] that the rank of λ -matrix of all Trees equals $p(n) - n + 1$. Also, a similar version of our λ -matrix is introduced in the mentioned paper and is called n -CSF matrix.

Corollary 4.8. *For a graph G with n vertices and an integer $k < n$, if $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_{p(k)}$ are all the partitions of n that can be k -reduced and $\mathcal{H} = \{H_1, H_2, \dots, H_s\}$ is the family of all graphs with k vertices. Then, if $c_i^j = c_{\lambda^i}^{H_j}$ and $M_i = \binom{n-m_i}{k-m_i}$, where $\lambda^{i*} \vdash m_i$ and λ^i is the k -reduced form of λ^i , we have:*

$$\left[\begin{pmatrix} G \\ H_1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \begin{pmatrix} G \\ H_2 \end{pmatrix} \quad \cdots \quad \begin{pmatrix} G \\ H_s \end{pmatrix} \right] \begin{bmatrix} c_1^1 & c_2^1 & c_3^1 & \cdots & c_{p(n)-1}^1 & c_{p(n)}^1 \\ c_1^2 & c_2^2 & c_3^2 & \cdots & c_{p(n)-1}^2 & c_{p(n)}^2 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ c_1^{s-1} & c_2^{s-1} & c_3^{s-1} & \cdots & c_{p(n)-1}^{s-1} & c_{p(n)}^{s-1} \\ c_1^s & c_2^s & c_3^s & \cdots & c_{p(n)-1}^s & c_{p(n)}^s \end{bmatrix} = [M_1 c_1 \quad M_2 c_2 \quad \cdots \quad M_{p(k)} c_{p(k)}].$$

Proof. The result follows directly from Theorem 4.3. \square

Returning to the reconstruction conjecture, an intriguing question arises: is it possible to reconstruct a tree's deck of cards using λ -matrices? Given that λ -matrices are of full rank, one might initially hope that they could allow for complete recovery of the cards. However, this is not the case. The number of forests and trees with n vertices far exceeds $p(n)$, the dimensions of the corresponding spaces. Consequently, it is impossible to recover data from the larger space using information derived from the smaller space. Nevertheless, the full rank of the matrix imposes constraints on the possible configurations of the cards, making this an interesting avenue for further investigation.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to express their gratitude to Farid Aliniaefard for his invaluable supervision and assistance throughout this project, which would have been impossible without his help and insights.

References

- [1] Richard P Stanley. “A symmetric function generalization of the chromatic polynomial of a graph”. In: *Advances in Mathematics* 111.1 (1995), pp. 166–194.
- [2] 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.
- [3] David D Gebhard and Bruce E Sagan. “A chromatic symmetric function in noncommuting variables”. In: *Journal of Algebraic Combinatorics* 13.3 (2001), pp. 227–255.
- [4] Douglas Brent West et al. *Introduction to graph theory*. Vol. 2. Prentice hall Upper Saddle River, 2001.
- [5] Frank Harary. “A survey of the reconstruction conjecture”. In: *Graphs and Combinatorics: Proceedings of the Capital Conference on Graph Theory and Combinatorics at the George Washington University June 18–22, 1973*. Springer. 2006, pp. 18–28.
- [6] Jeremy L Martin, Matthew Morin, and Jennifer D Wagner. “On distinguishing trees by their chromatic symmetric functions”. In: *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A* 115.2 (2008), pp. 237–253.
- [7] Rosa Orellana and Geoffrey Scott. “Graphs with equal chromatic symmetric functions”. In: *Discrete Mathematics* 320 (2014), pp. 1–14.
- [8] Soojin Cho and Stephanie van Willigenburg. “Chromatic bases for symmetric functions”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1508.07670* (2015).
- [9] John Shareshian and Michelle L Wachs. “Chromatic quasisymmetric functions”. In: *Advances in Mathematics* 295 (2016), pp. 497–551.
- [10] José Aliste-Prieto, Anna de Mier, and José Zamora. “On trees with the same restricted U-polynomial and the Prouhet–Tarry–Escott problem”. In: *Discrete Mathematics* 340.6 (2017), pp. 1435–1441.
- [11] Sam Heil and Caleb Ji. “On an algorithm for comparing the chromatic symmetric functions of trees”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.07363* (2018).
- [12] Martin Loeb1 and Jean-Sébastien Sereni. “Isomorphism of weighted trees and Stanley’s isomorphism conjecture for caterpillars”. In: *Annales de l’institut Henri Poincaré D* 6.3 (2019), pp. 357–384.
- [13] Logan Crew and Sophie Spirkl. “A deletion–contraction relation for the chromatic symmetric function”. In: *European Journal of Combinatorics* 89 (2020), p. 103143.
- [14] José Aliste-Prieto et al. “Marked graphs and the chromatic symmetric function”. In: *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics* 37.3 (2023), pp. 1881–1919.
- [15] William Chan and Logan Crew. “A graph polynomial from chromatic symmetric functions”. In: *Journal of Graph Theory* 105.4 (2024), pp. 633–651.
- [16] Michael Gonzalez, Rosa Orellana, and Mario Tomba. “The chromatic symmetric function in the star-basis”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.06002* (2024).
- [17] Tatsuyuki Hikita. “A proof of the Stanley-Stembridge conjecture”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.12758* (2024).
- [18] Nicholas A Loehr and Gregory S Warrington. “A rooted variant of Stanley’s chromatic symmetric function”. In: *Discrete Mathematics* 347.3 (2024), p. 113805.
- [19] Bruce E Sagan and Foster Tom. “Chromatic symmetric functions and change of basis”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.06155* (2024).