

COMMENTS ON $\mathcal{O}(M \cdot N)$ ALGORITHMS FOR THE RECOGNITION AND ISOMORPHISM PROBLEMS ON CIRCULAR-ARC GRAPHS

TOMASZ KRAWCZYK

ABSTRACT. In the work [*$\mathcal{O}(m \cdot n)$ algorithms for the recognition and isomorphism problems on circular-arc graphs*, *SIAM J. Comput.* 24(3), 411–439, (1995)], Wen-Lian Hsu claims three results concerning the class of circular-arc graphs:

- the design of so-called *decomposition trees* that represent the structure of all normalized intersection models of circular-arc graphs,
- an $\mathcal{O}(nm)$ recognition algorithm for circular-arc graphs,
- an $\mathcal{O}(nm)$ isomorphism algorithm for circular-arc graphs.

In [*Discrete Math. Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 15(1), 157–182, 2013] Curtis, Lin, McConnell, Nussbaum, Souignac, Spinrad, and Szwarcfiter showed that Hsu’s isomorphism algorithm is incorrect. In this note, we show that the other two results – namely, the construction of decomposition trees and the recognition algorithm – are also flawed.

1. INTRODUCTION

Given a family \mathcal{F} of sets, the *intersection graph* of \mathcal{F} is obtained by representing every set in \mathcal{F} by a vertex and connecting two vertices by an edge if and only if their corresponding sets have non-empty intersection. A graph G is:

- a *circular-arc graph* if G is the intersection graph of arcs of a circle,
- a *circle graph* if G is the intersection graph of chords of a circle,
- a *permutation graph* if G is the intersection graphs of chords spanned between some two disjoint arcs of a circle.

In the work [*$\mathcal{O}(m \cdot n)$ algorithms for the recognition and isomorphism problems on circular-arc graphs*, *SIAM J. Comput.* 24(3), 411–439, (1995)] [6], Wen-Lian Hsu presents three results concerning the class of circular-arc graphs. The first of these results claims a construction of a *decomposition tree* of a circular-arc graph, a data structure intended to represent the set of all its *normalized intersection models* (an analogue of the PQ-tree for an interval graph). *Normalized intersection models* (formally defined in Section 2) of a circular-arc graph reflect the neighborhood relation between its vertices and can be seen as its canonical representations; in particular, any intersection model can be made normalized by possibly extending some of its arcs. Based on these decomposition trees, Hsu claims $\mathcal{O}(nm)$ -algorithms for both the recognition and isomorphism problem for circular-arc graphs.

In this short note we show that the description of the normalized intersection models given by Hsu in [6] is not correct. Specifically, we show the following:

Counterexample 1.1. *There are circular-arc graphs whose all normalized models do not follow the description given by Hsu.*

As a result, the decomposition trees developed by Hsu, along with his polynomial-time algorithms for recognizing and testing isomorphism of circular-arc graphs, are incorrect. We note that Curtis, Lin, McConnell, Nussbaum, Soulignac, Spinrad, and Szwarcfter [2] identified a different flaw in Hsu’s isomorphism algorithm already in 2013. The approach used by Hsu (described below) determines somehow the main steps that need to be taken to describe the structure of the normalized models of a circular-arc graph. In this paper, we also identify several errors in Hsu’s work, showing that these steps were either partially or entirely incorrectly accomplished.

To describe the structure of the normalized models of a circular-arc graph Hsu uses a method that has its roots in the work of Gallai. In his seminal paper [5] from 1967 Gallai introduced a data structure, called *modular decomposition tree*, which keeps a track of all *modules* of a simple graph G . We recall that a set $M \subseteq V(G)$ is a *module* of G if every vertex from outside M is either adjacent to all vertices in M or non-adjacent to all vertices in M . In the same work Gallai described the structure of all transitive orientations of a comparability graphs. In particular, Gallai proved that:

- (G1): If G is *prime* (contains only trivial modules, $V(G)$ and $\{v\}$ for all $v \in V(G)$), then G has a unique transitive orientation (up to reversal).
- (G2): Otherwise, the structure of all transitive orientations of G can be described (and represented) by means of the modular decomposition tree of G .

The above-mentioned results of Gallai have turned out to be widely used to describe the structure of some geometric intersection graphs, especially those related to partial orders. Among them are, for example, permutation graphs [3], interval graphs¹ [1], or trapezoid graphs [8]. In particular, Properties (G1) and (G2) allow to show that for every graph G from each of those graph classes, if a certain graph G' associated with G is prime², then G has a unique intersection model (up to some normalizations and reflections), and otherwise, if G' is not prime, the structure of all intersection models of G can be represented by the modular decomposition tree of G' . As for circular-arc graphs, the work [9] of Spinrad from 1988 is the first that allows to describe, in the way given above, the structure of the normalized models of certain graphs in this class, namely those that are *co-bipartite* (whose vertex set can be partitioned into two cliques). See [7] where we briefly outline the influence of Spinrad’s work [9] on the development of the method applied in [6] and in [7].

In [6] Hsu tries to use Gallai’s framework to describe the structure of the normalized models of any circular-arc graph G . For this purpose, Hsu transforms every normalized model R of G to a chord model D by converting each arc $R(v)$ into a chord $D(v)$ with the same endpoints as $R(v)$, for every $v \in V(G)$. The crucial observation of Hsu is that the

¹A reader familiar with PQ-trees and modular decomposition trees might easily observe that the PQ-tree representing the structure of intersection models of an interval graph can be easily obtained from its modular decomposition tree.

² $G' = G$ if G is an interval or a permutation graph, G' is so-called *split* of G if G is a trapezoid graph.

resulting chord model D represents the same circle graph G_c , regardless of a normalized model R of G . Then, Hsu tries to describe the structure of the chord models of G_c that correspond to the normalized models of G – such models of G_c are called *conformal* to G (shortly, conformal). To this end, Hsu attempts to prove the properties similar to (G1) and (G2):

(H1): If G_c is prime, then G_c has a unique conformal model (up to reflection).

(H2): Otherwise, the structure of the conformal models of G_c can be described by means of the modular decomposition tree of G_c .

When G is co-biparite, G_c is a permutation graph, and hence Property (H1) follows by (G1) and Property (H2) follows by (G2) and by the work [9] of Spinrad – see [7] for more details.

We want to emphasize that Property (H1) is crucial for the method as the structure of the conformal models is “build” upon the unique conformal models of prime subgraphs of G_c (the role of (H1) is similar to the role of the fact that every prime subgraph has a unique transitive orientation in the description of the structure of all transitive orientations of a comparability graph). In Subsection 3.1 we show that the “proof” of (H1) proposed by Hsu (Theorem 5.7 in [6]) is not correct – it is based on two claims, both of which are shown to be false in Section 3. Nevertheless, the statement of Property (H1) is true, which follows from the proof presented in [7].

To accomplish (H2) Hsu divides the description of the structure of the conformal models of G_c into three cases: when G_c is disconnected, when the complement $\overline{G_c}$ of G_c is disconnected, and when both G_c and $\overline{G_c}$ are connected. Hsu’s work [6] correctly deals with the case when $\overline{G_c}$ is disconnected (then, each component of $\overline{G_c}$ induces a co-bipartite circular-arc graph), it is incorrect when both G_c and $\overline{G_c}$ are connected, and it is incomplete (and also incorrect) when G_c is disconnected.

For the case when both G_c and $\overline{G_c}$ are connected, Hsu first “proves” Property (H1). Next, Hsu tries to partition the set $V(G_c)$ into so-called *consistent modules* of G_c , which were supposed to satisfy the following property:

(H3): For every conformal model D and every consistent module M of G_c there are two disjoint arcs A_M and B_M of the circle such that each arc A_M and B_M contains one endpoint of every chord from $D(M)$ and no endpoint of any other chord from $D(V \setminus M)$ (it means, in particular, that $G_c[M]$ is a permutation graph). Moreover, there is a unique circular order (up to reflection) in which the arcs A_M and B_M associated with distinct consistent modules M of G_c may occur around the circle in all conformal models of G_c .

In Subsection 3.2 we show that the “consistent modules” determined by Hsu do not satisfy Property (H3). This enables us, in particular, to construct a circular-arc graph claimed by Counterexample 1.1. Hence, the theorems from [6] “proving” Property (H3) for the “consistent modules” determined by Hsu are also not correct – see Subsection 3.2 for more details.

The description of Hsu is also not correct in the case when G_c is disconnected (the errors mentioned above are transferred to the description of the conformal models of

some components of G_c). Moreover, this part of Hsu's work is missing many important ingredients (the consistent modules are not defined for all components of G_c) – we refer to Section 4 for more details.

Although Hsu's work [6] is flawed, the approach taken in it is appropriate. In [7] we assume a different definition of conformal models, which allows us to describe the structure of all normalized models of a circular-arc graph using the same method. We want to mention that, despite the errors, Hsu's work had a great influence on the work done in [7] – we refer to [7] when we mention the ideas of Hsu used in this work. In particular, Hsu's ideas have significantly contributed to understanding the structure of the normalized models, even in cases where bugs were identified.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we introduce the notation from Hsu's work [6] that is needed to present counterexamples to the aforementioned (false) claims made by Hsu.

For a simple graph G , by $V(G)$ and $E(G)$ we denote the vertex set and the edge set of G , respectively. For v in $V(G)$, we denote by $N(v)$ (or $N_G(v)$) the set consisting of v and all vertices adjacent to v in G . Vertices v_1 and v_2 in G are said to form a *similar pair* if $N(v_1) \setminus \{v_1\} = N(v_2) \setminus \{v_2\}$. A vertex v in G is said to be a *D-vertex* (short for *dominating*) if $N(v) = V(G)$. For a set $M \subseteq V(G)$ by $G[M]$ we denote the subgraph of G induced by the set M .

2.1. The modular decomposition and the join decomposition.

2.1.1. *Modular decomposition.* Let G be a graph. A *module* M of G is a subset of $V(G)$ such that between M and each vertex v in $V(G) \setminus M$ there are either no edges or all possible edges. Module M is *connected* iff $G[M]$ is connected. Module M is *complement connected* iff the complement of $G[M]$ is connected. An unconnected module is called a *parallel module*. A connected module whose complement is unconnected is called a *series module*. A module that is both connected and complement connected is called a *neighborhood module*. A module M of size greater than 1 is *nontrivial* if $M \neq V(G)$. A graph G is *s-inseparable* if it does not contain any nontrivial module. See page 416, lines 24 to 30. A graph G which is s-inseparable is also called *prime*.

By definition, every module is exactly one of these three types. The modular decomposition starts with the module $V = V(G)$ and creates a corresponding root node in the decomposition tree labelled with S, P, or N, depending on the type of V . Then it decomposes this module into components M_1, M_2, \dots, M_k using one of the following rules:

- if V is a series module, then M_1, \dots, M_k are the connected components of \overline{G} ,
- if V is a parallel module, then M_1, \dots, M_k are the connected components of G ,
- if V is a neighborhood module, then M_1, \dots, M_k are the maximal modules of G different than V .

For each M_i , find the modular decomposition tree of $G[M_i]$ and make its root node a son of the root node representing $V(G)$. The resulting tree is called a *modular decomposition*

tree of G ; it is proven in [5] that the modular decomposition tree of G is unique. See page 416, lines -18 to -7.

2.1.2. *Join decomposition.* A graph G is said to have a *join* if V can be partitioned into V_0, V_1, V_2 , and V_3 with $V_0 \cup V_1 \geq 2$ and $V_2 \cup V_3 \geq 2$ such that every possible edge exists between V_1, V_2 and no edge exists between $V_0, V_2 \cup V_3$, or between $V_0 \cup V_1, V_3$. In this case, we say G is *decomposable into H_1 and H_2* where H_1 is the induced subgraph of $G[V_0 \cup V_1]$ with an extra vertex v_1 adjacent to every vertex in V_1 and H_2 is the induced subgraph of $G[V_2 \cup V_3]$ with an extra vertex v_2 adjacent to every vertex in V_2 . If the above holds, then (V_0, V_1, V_2, V_3) is a *join* of G_c and H_1 and H_2 is a *decomposition of G_c induced by the join (V_0, V_1, V_2, V_3)* . A graph G is said to be *j -inseparable* if it does not contain any join. See page 417, lines -7 to -1.

2.2. **Circular-arc graphs and its normalized models.** Given a circular-arc model R of a circular-arc graph G such that all arcs in R have pairwise distinct endpoints, Hsu distinguishes five possible relationships on a pair of arcs u_1 and u_2 in R , shown in Figure 2.1. See page 413, lines -11 to -3, in [6].




FIGURE 2.1. From left to right: u_1 and u_2 are independent, u_1 contains u_2 , u_1 is contained in u_2 , u_1 and u_2 cover the circle, and u_1 and u_2 strictly overlap.

Following Hsu (see page 414, lines 3 to 8), two vertices v_1 and v_2 in a graph G are said to be:

- (1) *independent* if v_1 is not adjacent to v_2 .
- (2) *strictly adjacent* if v_1 is adjacent to v_2 but neither $N(v_1)$ nor $N(v_2)$ is contained in the other.
- (3) *strongly adjacent* if v_1 and v_2 are strictly adjacent but every w in $V(G) \setminus N(v_1)$ satisfies $N(w) \subseteq N(v_2)$ and every w' in $V(G) \setminus N(v_2)$ satisfies $N(w') \subseteq N(v_1)$.
- (4) *similar* if $N(v_1) \setminus \{v_1\} = N(v_2) \setminus \{v_2\}$.

Definition [page 414, lines -14 to -5] Let G be a circular-arc graph containing neither similar pairs nor D -vertices. A circular-arc model R for G is said to be a normalized model (N-model) if every pair of arcs u_1 and u_2 in R and their corresponding vertices v_1 and v_2 in G satisfy the following conditions:

- (1) u_1 is independent of $u_2 \iff v_1$ is not adjacent to v_2 .
- (2) u_1 is contained in $u_2 \iff N(v_1) \subseteq N(v_2)$.

- (3) u_1 strictly overlaps with $u_2 \iff v_1$ and v_2 are strictly but not strongly adjacent.
 (4) u_1 and u_2 cover the circle $\iff v_1$ and v_2 are strongly adjacent.

Hsu showed that, if G contains neither similar pairs nor D-vertices, every circular-arc model of G can be turned into a normalized one by possibly extending some of its arcs. Figure 2.2.(A) shows an exemplary circular-arc graph and Figure 2.2.(B) presents one of its normalized models.





(A) A circular-arc graph G (B) Normalized model R of G (C) Associated chord model D of G_c (D) Graph G_c and its maximal non-trivial modules M_1, M_2, M_3, M_4

FIGURE 2.2. Counterexample 1.1: $V(G_c)$ is a neighbourhood module, M_1, M_2, M_3, M_4 are all parallel children of $V(G_c)$ in the modular decomposition tree of G_c , and M_1 and M_4 are not consistent.

Definition [page 420, lines 11 to 12] Associate with each graph G the graph G_c that has the same vertex set as G such that two vertices in G_c are adjacent iff they are strictly but not strongly adjacent in G .

Consider a circular-arc graph G with an N -model R . Associate with each arc in R a chord that connects its two endpoints. The resulting chord model D is called an associated chord model for G . Since two arcs cross in R exactly when their corresponding chords in D cross, this chord model gives rise to the circle graph G_c . [...] Although there can be many associated chord models for G , they all give rise to the unique circle graph G_c defined above. See page 420, lines -15 to -10, and Figure 2.2 for an illustration.

Next, Hsu lists some properties of the chord models D of G_c obtained from the normalized models R of G . For every vertex $u \in V(G)$ let I_u be the set of vertices not adjacent

to u in G_c , and let

$$\begin{aligned} L_u &= \{v \in I_u : N(v) \subsetneq N(u) \text{ or } u \text{ and } v \text{ are strongly adjacent}\}, \\ R_u &= \{v \in I_u : u \text{ and } v \text{ are disjoint or } N(u) \subsetneq N(v)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Hsu notes that for every $u \in V$ the chords representing the vertices from the set L_u are on one side of $D(u)$ and the chords representing the vertices from the set R_u are on the other side of $D(u)$. Based on this observation, Hsu assumes the following definition:

Definition [page 424, lines 18 to 20] *A chord model D of G_c is conformal if for every vertex u of G the chords associated with vertices in L_u are on one side of the chord of $D(u)$ and those associated with vertices in R_u are on the other side of the chord of $D(u)$.*

Then, Hsu proves the following:

Theorem 5.6 [page 424, lines -18 to -17] *Let G be a circular-arc graph [...]. Then a model for G_c is conformal if and only if it is a chord model corresponding to some normalized model for G .*

In Hsu's work the description of the structure of the conformal models of G_c is split into three parts, corresponding to the cases when $V(G_c)$ is a series, neighbourhood, or parallel module in the modular decomposition tree of G_c . Hsu's work [6] correctly deals with the case where $V(G_c)$ is series, it is not correct when $V(G_c)$ is a neighborhood module, and is incomplete (and also not correct) when $V(G_c)$ is a parallel module.

3. $V(G_c)$ IS A NEIGHBOURHOOD MODULE

3.1. Conformal models of prime graphs G_c . When $V(G_c)$ is a neighborhood module of G_c , Hsu considers first the case when G_c is s-inseparable (if G_c is s-inseparable, then both G_c and $\overline{G_c}$ are connected, and $V(G_c)$ is a neighbourhood module in G_c). For this case Hsu "proves" the following:

Theorem 5.7 [page 425, lines 16 to 17] *Let G be a circular-arc graph. If G_c is s-inseparable, then G has a unique N-model.*

The "proof" of Theorem 5.7 is split into two cases depending on whether G_c is j-inseparable. If G_c is j-inseparable, then G_c has a unique chord model [4], and hence G has a unique N-model.

So, the interesting case is when G_c is not j-inseparable, that is, when G_c has a join (V_0, V_1, V_2, V_3) . First, Hsu observes that $V_i \neq \emptyset$ for $i = 1, \dots, 4$ as G_s is s-inseparable. Then, the proof is based on two claims; we show that both of them are false.

First, the "proof" of Theorem 5.7 "shows" the following property of the graph G_c and the join (V_0, V_1, V_2, V_3) of G_c :

Claim A [page 425, line -23 to -18]: *If $|V_1| > 0$ and there exists a vertex s in V_1 that is adjacent to all other vertices in $V_1 \cup V_2$, then it is easy to verify that $G_c \setminus \{s\}$ is s-inseparable. We can proceed with the construction below to show that $G_c \setminus \{s\}$ has a unique conformal model, and, furthermore, there is a unique way to insert the chord of s into this model. The argument is symmetric if such a vertex s belongs to V_2 .*

We show that Claim A is false. To show a counterexample, we first define an auxiliary circular-arc graph G^s : the vertex set of G^s is $\{s, s_1, \dots, s_6\}$, the edges of G^s can be read from the intersection model R^s of G^s shown in Figure 3.1(A). We leave the reader to verify that the model R^s is normalized (the vertices s_1, \dots, s_6 induce a cycle in G^s and hence every two consecutive vertices of this cycle strictly but not strongly overlap).




FIGURE 3.1. Counterexample to Claim A.

Next, we define a circular-arc graph G by taking G^s and two its isomorphic copies, say G^v and G^u over the vertex sets $\{v, v_1, \dots, v_6\}$ and $\{u, u_1, \dots, u_6\}$, respectively. Again, we define the edges of G by providing an intersection model R of G . Given the schematic view of the model R as shown in Figure 3.1(D), we obtain the intersection model R for G as follows. We take the circular-arc model R^s of G^s and we paste its arcs into the circle such that:

- the arc $R^s(s)$ has the same endpoints as the oriented chord s^0s^1 and is on the left side of this chord if we traverse it from s^0 to s^1 ,
- the endpoints of the remaining arcs of R^s are squeezed such that they all fit the colourful arc adjacent to the head of the chord s^0s^1 .

We proceed analogously with the models R^v and R^u , which represent G^v and G^u in the same way as R^s represents G^s . Again, we leave the reader to verify that R is a normalized model of G . The associated circle graph G_c as well as its join (V_0, V_1, V_2, V_3) are shown in Figure 3.1(E). Note that:

- G_c is s-inseparable as G_c has no non-trivial modules,
- vertex s in V_1 is adjacent to all other vertices in $V_1 \cup V_2$.

That is, G_c , (V_0, V_1, V_2, V_3) , and s satisfy the assumptions of Claim A. The graph $G_c \setminus \{s\}$, however, is not s-inseparable as $G_c \setminus \{s\}$ is disconnected. So, Claim A is false.

Then, the proof assumes that G_c has a join (V_0, V_1, V_2, V_3) such that no vertex from $V_1 \cup V_2$ is adjacent to all other vertices in $V_1 \cup V_2$. Let H_1 and H_2 be the decomposition of G_c induced by (V_0, V_1, V_2, V_3) . In this setting, the following property of H_1 and H_2 is claimed.

Claim B [page 425, line -19 to -16]: *Therefore, assume no such vertex s exists. Then it is easy to verify that the corresponding two component graphs, H_1 and H_2 of G_c (the existence of the substitution in either H_1 or H_2 would imply the existence of one in G_c), are s-inseparable.*




FIGURE 3.2. Counterexample to Claim B.

Consider a circular-arc graph G whose normalized model R is shown in Figure 3.2(A). The associated circle graph G_c and its join (V_0, V_1, V_2, V_3) are shown in Figure 3.2(C), the chord model D associated with R is shown in Figure 3.2(B), and the decomposition H_1 and H_2 of G_c induced by the join (V_0, V_1, V_2, V_3) is shown in Figure 3.2(D). Note the following properties of G_c , H_1 , and H_2 :

- G_c is s-inseparable as G_c has no non-trivial modules and there is no vertex s in $V_1 \cup V_2$ adjacent to all other vertices in $V_1 \cup V_2$,

- H_1 contains a non-trivial module $\{u_3, v\}$ and H_2 contains a non-trivial module $\{u, v_3\}$.

In particular, Claim B is also false.

The “proof” of Theorem 5.4 is concluded as follows. Since H_1 and H_2 are s-inseparable, they have unique chord models by induction. Eventually, there is a unique way to compose those models to get a conformal model of G_c .

3.2. Consistent modules. The precise definition of the consistent modules (they are also called as T-submodules in [6]) of G_c is given in Section 6.1. Since it is very technical, we list only their properties as proven by Hsu.

Lemma 6.5 [page 428, -2 – page 429, line 2] *Let M be a T-submodule that gives rise to a permutation graph. Let D be any conformal model for G_c . Then the endpoints of chords of M can be partitioned into two sets A_1, A_2 such that each chord of M has one endpoint in A_1 and the other in A_2 and those endpoints in A_1 (resp., A_2) are consecutive in D .*

Theorem 6.6 [page 429, lines -15 to -11] *Consider a neighborhood module $V(G_c)$. Let $V' = \{v_1, \dots, v_r\}$ be a set of representatives from the maximal consistent submodules M^1, \dots, M^{p^3} in the consistent partition of $V(G_c)$. Then there is a unique conformal model for V' . Furthermore, this model is independent of the v_i selected (we shall refer to the subgraph induced on V' as the representative graph for $V(G)$).*

In fact, the above two lemmas would assert Property (H3) of the consistent modules of G_c . Note that, if G_c is a permutation graph (as it is for the case when G is co-bipartite), then one could take the children of $V(G_c)$ as the consistent modules of G_c (all modules in the modular decomposition tree of G_c are “consistent” in all permutation models of G_c). Hence, to determine the consistent modules of G_c Hsu focuses his attention on the children of $V(G_c)$ in the modular decomposition tree of G_c . Hsu rightly notices that they might be no longer consistent when G_c is not a permutation graph. In fact, assuming that M_1, \dots, M_k are the children of $V(G_c)$ in the modular decomposition tree of G_c , Hsu “proves” the following lemma:

Lemma 6.3 [Page 428, lines 11–12] *If a maximal submodule M_i of $V(G_c)$ is not consistent, then it is a series module.*

However, the above lemma is also false, as parallel children of $V(G)$ might also be not consistent. This enables us to construct the graph claimed by Counterexample 1.1.

Counterexample 1.1. Consider a circular-arc graph G shown in Figure 2.2.(A). Its normalized model R is shown in Figure 2.2.(B), an associated chord model D in Figure 2.2.(C), and the circle graph G_c associated to G and its partition into maximal non-trivial modules M_1, \dots, M_4 in Figure 2.2.(D). Note that $V(G)$ is the neighbourhood module in the modular decomposition tree of G_c , and each M_i is a parallel child of $V(G)$. Note that the modules M_1 and M_4 are not consistent in D . One can also check that the model R and its reflection are the only two normalized models of G . Since both of them

³The statement of Theorem 6.6 contains a typo – we should have $r = p$.

do not follow the description given by Hsu (it is claimed in [6] that only series children of $V(G)$ might be not consistent), the graph G proves the statement of Counterexample 1.1.

The graph G also shows that, assuming Hsu's partition into "consistent modules", Lemma 6.5 and Theorem 6.6 from [6] are also false.

4. $V(G_c)$ IS A PARALLEL MODULE

In the case where $V(G_c)$ is a parallel module, the description given by Hsu is incomplete (and also not correct). In particular, Hsu constructs so-called "consistent module tree" for each component C of G_c basing on the consistent modules (T-submodules) of the component C . As is written in [6] (see page 435, lines 27 to 29): *We shall first construct a consistent decomposition tree T for the subgraph $G_c[C]$ and then insert the vertices of K into conformal models of appropriate T-submodules. For any T-submodule M in C , let* and then a description of the tree T for the component C follows.

Each component C of G_c is either a neighborhood or a series module in G_c . In the case when C is a neighborhood component in G_c , the consistent modules (T-modules) of C , as we have seen in the previous section, are not determined correctly by Hsu. Nowhere in [6] we found how Hsu defines consistent modules (T-modules) for series components of G_c .

REFERENCES

- [1] Kellogg S. Booth and George S. Lueker. Testing for the consecutive ones property, interval graphs, and graph planarity using pq-tree algorithms. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 13(3):335–379, 1976.
- [2] Andrew R. Curtis, Min Chih Lin, Ross M. McConnell, Yahav Nussbaum, Francisco J. Souignac, Jeremy P. Spinrad, and Jayme Luiz Szwarcfiter. Isomorphism of graph classes related to the circular-ones property. *Discret. Math. Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 15(1):157–182, 2013.
- [3] Ben Dushnik and E. W. Miller. Partially ordered sets. *Amer. J. Math.*, 63:600–610, 1941.
- [4] Csaba P. Gabor, Kenneth J. Supowit, and Wen-Lian Hsu. Recognizing circle graphs in polynomial time. *J. ACM*, 36(3):435–473, 1989.
- [5] Tibor Gallai. Transitiv orientierbare Graphen. *Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hung.*, 18(1–2):25–66, 1967.
- [6] Wen-Lian Hsu. $O(m \cdot n)$ algorithms for the recognition and isomorphism problems on circular-arc graphs. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 24(3):411–439, 1995.
- [7] Tomasz Krawczyk. On the structure of normalized models of circular-arc graphs – Hsu's approach revisited. *manuscript*.
- [8] Tze-Heng Ma and Jeremy P. Spinrad. On the 2-chain subgraph cover and related problems. *J. Algorithms*, 17(2):251–268, 1994.
- [9] Jeremy P. Spinrad. Circular-arc graphs with clique cover number two. *J. Comb. Theory B*, 44(3):300–306, 1988.

(T. Krawczyk) FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS AND INFORMATION SCIENCE, WARSAW UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, WARSAW, POLAND

Email address: tomasz.krawczyk@pw.edu.pl

Tomasz Krawczyk
Faculty of Mathematics and Information Science
Warsaw University of Technology
Koszykowa 75, 00-662 Warszawa, Poland
email: tomasz.krawczyk@pw.uj.edu.pl

Dear Editors,

I would like to submit the following paper for consideration in the *SIAM Journal on Computing*:

CORRIGENDUM: $\mathcal{O}(m \cdot n)$ algorithms for the recognition and isomorphism problems on circular-arc graphs

In the work under this title, published in [*SIAM J. Comput.* 24(3), 411–439 (1995)], Wen-Lian Hsu presents three results concerning the class of circular-arc graphs:

- the design of decomposition trees that represent the structure of all normalized intersection models of circular-arc graphs,
- an $\mathcal{O}(nm)$ recognition algorithm for circular-arc graphs,
- an $\mathcal{O}(nm)$ isomorphism algorithm for circular-arc graphs.

In [*Discrete Math. Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 15(1), 157–182 (2013)], Curtis, Lin, McConnell, Nussbaum, Souignac, Spinrad, and Szwarcfiter showed that Hsu’s isomorphism algorithm is incorrect. In the submitted paper, we show that the other two results – the decomposition trees and the recognition algorithm – are also flawed.

We are also attaching a paper that uses the same approach as Hsu and solves the problems considered by Hsu (with the exception of the recognition algorithm). An earlier version of this paper was rejected by the *SIAM Journal on Computing* (SICOMP manuscript #M131760 and #M131760R). We intend to publish the results of this work in another journal. However, the main results presented in the attached article are already claimed, albeit with errors, in Hsu’s work. To date, there has been no correction indicating that these results – particularly the description of the structure of normalized models of circular-arc graphs – are incorrect. We would like to emphasize that our work was rejected because one of the reviewers claimed it was too similar to Hsu’s work, despite our detailed report of the errors in Hsu’s work provided in the appendices.

In our opinion, it is important and appropriate to rectify which results in Hsu’s work and which parts of his work are incorrect.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Tomasz Krawczyk, PhD