

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN MINIMUM RANK PROBLEM PARAMETERS FOR COBIPARTITE GRAPHS

LOUIS DEAETT AND DEREK YOUNG

ABSTRACT. For a simple graph, the minimum rank problem is to determine the smallest rank among the symmetric matrices whose off-diagonal nonzero entries occur in positions corresponding to the edges of the graph. Bounds on this minimum rank (and on an equivalent value, the maximum nullity) are given by various graph parameters, most notably the zero forcing number and its variants. For a matrix, replacing each nonzero entry with the symbol $*$ gives its zero-nonzero pattern. The associated minimum rank problem is to determine, given only this pattern, the smallest possible rank of the matrix. The most fundamental lower bound on this minimum rank is the triangle number of the pattern. A cobipartite graph is the complement of a bipartite graph; its vertices can be partitioned into two cliques. Such a graph corresponds to a zero-nonzero pattern in a natural way. Over an infinite field, the minimum rank of the graph and that of the pattern obey a simple relationship. We show that this same relationship is followed by the zero forcing number of the graph and the triangle number of the pattern. This has implications for the relationship between the two minimum rank problems. We also explore how, for cobipartite graphs, variants of the zero forcing number and other parameters important to the minimum rank problem are related, as well as how, for graphs in general, these parameters can be interpreted in terms of the zero-nonzero patterns of the symmetric matrices associated with the graph.

1. INTRODUCTION

The question of how a combinatorial description of a matrix allows bounds to be placed on its rank is a well-studied one (see, e.g., [4, 9, 11, 15, 16]). Our work here bears on two different variants of this problem, one for zero-nonzero patterns, and one for simple graphs.

The *zero-nonzero pattern* of a matrix is a specification of exactly which entries of the matrix are zero and which are nonzero. More formally, we say that a *zero-nonzero pattern matrix* is a matrix with entries from the set $\{0, *\}$. Where no confusion may result, we refer to a zero-nonzero pattern matrix as just a *zero-nonzero pattern* or even simply as just a *pattern*, when the context makes it clear what is meant.

Given a matrix A , the *zero-nonzero pattern of A* is the matrix that results from replacing each nonzero entry in A with a $*$. Given a zero-nonzero pattern matrix \mathcal{Y} , the *minimum rank* of \mathcal{Y} over the field \mathbb{F} is the smallest rank of a matrix with entries in \mathbb{F} and the zero-nonzero pattern \mathcal{Y} . We write $\text{mr}(\mathcal{Y})$ to denote the minimum rank of \mathcal{Y} over the real numbers or some other field given in context.

The problem of relating the combinatorics of a pattern to its minimum rank is known as the minimum rank problem for zero-nonzero patterns. For this problem, a fundamental lower bound is provided by the *triangle number* of the pattern, which we now define.

Definition 1.1. A square zero-nonzero pattern is said to be a *triangle* if some permutation of its rows, followed by some (independent) permutation of its columns results in a pattern that is lower-triangular with only $*$ entries on its diagonal. The *triangle number* of a pattern \mathcal{Y} , denoted by $\text{tri}(\mathcal{Y})$, is the size of a largest submatrix of \mathcal{Y} that is a triangle.

A natural question then becomes: Under what conditions is the minimum rank of a pattern actually given by its triangle number? For example, this question was the focus of [5, 15, 16]. In examining small examples, equality between the minimum rank and the triangle number seems common, and the phenomenon whereby a gap may exist between the two remains poorly understood.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 05C50; Secondary: 15B35.

Key words and phrases. minimum rank; inverse eigenvalue problem; matrix pattern; zero forcing; maximum nullity.

A different minimum rank problem starts not with a pattern but with a simple graph G and asks for the smallest rank of a symmetric matrix whose zero-nonzero pattern off the diagonal matches that of the adjacency matrix of G . This is known as the minimum rank problem for graphs. (See [14, Section 2.1] and the survey [8].) In the context of the inverse eigenvalue problem for graphs [12], this corresponds to finding the maximum multiplicity of an eigenvalue of a symmetric matrix meeting this combinatorial description.

A *loop graph* is a graph which allows loops (but not multiple edges). Throughout what follows, every graph is a simple graph (i.e., without loops or multiple edges) except when specifically indicated otherwise. In particular, we often let \hat{G} be a *looping* of some specific simple graph G , meaning that \hat{G} is a loop graph produced from G by adding loops to some of the vertices of G . For a graph G , we write $|G|$ to denote the number of vertices in the graph.

The *set of symmetric matrices over \mathbb{F} described by the graph G* , denoted by $\mathcal{S}(G, \mathbb{F})$, is the set of symmetric matrices over \mathbb{F} whose (i, j) -entry is nonzero if $\{i, j\}$ is an edge in G and 0 otherwise, when $i \neq j$. When we write only $\mathcal{S}(G)$, we mean to denote $\mathcal{S}(G, \mathbb{F})$ where \mathbb{F} is the field of real numbers, or some other field given in context. The *minimum rank of a graph G over the field \mathbb{F}* is the minimum rank over $\mathcal{S}(G, \mathbb{F})$. We use $\text{mr}(G)$ for the minimum rank over the real numbers or some other field given in context. Similarly, the *maximum nullity of a graph G over the field \mathbb{F}* is the maximum nullity over $\mathcal{S}(G, \mathbb{F})$. We use $M(G)$ to represent the maximum nullity over the real numbers or some other field given in context. The *positive semidefinite minimum rank of a graph G* , denoted by $\text{mr}_+(G)$, is the minimum rank over all positive semidefinite matrices of $\mathcal{S}(G, \mathbb{R})$. Similarly, the *positive semidefinite maximum nullity of a graph G* , denoted by $M_+(G)$, is the maximum nullity over all positive semidefinite matrices of $\mathcal{S}(G, \mathbb{R})$.

Let G be a simple graph such that every vertex is labeled as filled or unfilled. The *zero forcing rule* for G is defined as follows: a filled vertex v forces an unfilled vertex u to be filled if u is the only neighbor of v which is unfilled. A set $F \subseteq V(G)$ is a *zero forcing set* of G if $V(G)$ is completely filled after some number of repeated applications of the zero forcing rule. The *zero forcing number* of a graph G , denoted by $Z(G)$, is the smallest cardinality of a zero forcing set for G .

The *positive semidefinite zero forcing rule* for G is defined as follows: considering the subgraph of G formed by deleting all of its filled vertices, if a filled vertex v has just one neighbor u in some connected component of that subgraph, then v can force u . A set $F \subseteq V(G)$ is a *positive semidefinite zero forcing set* if $V(G)$ is completely filled after some number of repeated applications of the positive semidefinite zero forcing rule. The *positive semidefinite zero forcing number* of a graph G , denoted by $Z_+(G)$, is the smallest cardinality of a positive semidefinite zero forcing set for G .

The *loop zero forcing rule* for a loop graph is the same as the ordinary zero forcing rule, but without the requirement that a vertex needs to be filled in order to force. A set of vertices is a *loop zero forcing set* if every vertex in the loop graph becomes filled after some number of repeated applications of the loop zero forcing rule. By the *zero forcing number* of a loop graph we mean the smallest size of a loop zero forcing set for that loop graph.

A separate zero forcing parameter that is defined for a simple graph, but in terms of loopings of that graph, is the *enhanced zero forcing number*, denoted $\hat{Z}(G)$, which is the maximum value of the zero forcing number of a looping \hat{G} of G .

We now define some notation and terms for all zero forcing rules. In the case where v forces u to become filled, we say v *forces* u , or write $v \rightarrow u$, and refer to this as a *single force* (or *standard force*). We note that any force that could occur under the zero forcing rule could also occur under the positive semidefinite zero forcing rule. Of course, the converse is not true. When we wish to indicate that a particular force could occur under the positive semidefinite zero forcing rule but not under the ordinary zero forcing rule, we refer to the force as a *strictly positive semidefinite force*.

The following notions were originally introduced for simple graphs in [1]; our terminology differs slightly. A *forcing sequence* is a (possibly empty) sequence of forces. A *forcing sequence from $F \subseteq V(G)$* (with respect to some fixed forcing rule) is a sequence of forces, say of length k , such that, starting with F as the initially filled set, for all i with $1 \leq i \leq k$, after the first $i - 1$ forces in the sequence have occurred, the chosen forcing rule allows the i th force to occur.

A *complete forcing sequence from F* is a forcing sequence from F after which no further forces are possible. When there is a complete forcing sequence from F in which the vertices that force are exactly those in $R \subseteq V(G)$, we say that F is a set from which R can be the set of vertices that force.

Note that if F is a zero forcing set, then by definition a complete forcing sequence from F ends with all vertices filled. An *optimal zero forcing set* is a zero forcing set of smallest cardinality among all zero forcing sets. An *optimal forcing sequence* is a complete forcing sequence from an optimal zero forcing set.

Every forcing sequence gives rise to a collection of *forcing chains*, where each forcing chain is a maximal sequence of vertices (v_0, v_1, \dots, v_k) with the property that, for each i with $1 \leq i \leq k$, the force $v_{i-1} \rightarrow v_i$ occurs somewhere in the forcing sequence. By the maximality of the chain, the vertex v_0 must be initially filled. Since each vertex can force only once, the forcing chains partition the set of vertices that are filled at the point where every force in the forcing sequence has occurred. We refer to k as the *length* of the forcing chain. (So a chain of length 0 corresponds to an initially filled vertex that never forces.)

The *Hadwiger number* of a graph G , denoted by $h(G)$, is the largest k such that G contains a k -clique as a minor. We write $\delta(G)$ for the smallest degree of a vertex in G , and use $\text{tw}(G)$ to denote the treewidth of G , which we define in Section 4.

Theorem 1.2 ([2, Figure 1.1]). *For all graphs G ,*

$$(1.1) \quad \delta(G) \leq \text{tw}(G) \leq Z_+(G) \leq \hat{Z}(G) \leq Z(G)$$

and

$$(1.2) \quad h(G) - 1 \leq M_+(G) \leq M(G) \leq \hat{Z}(G) \leq Z(G).$$

The work of [4] established a connection between the minimum rank problem for zero-nonzero patterns and the minimum rank problem for graphs in the special case of graphs that satisfy the following definition.

Definition 1.3. A graph is said to be *cobipartite* if its complement is bipartite; equivalently, its vertex set can be partitioned into two cliques.

In particular, for a cobipartite graph with a partition into cliques of sizes m and n , an $m \times n$ zero-nonzero pattern can be associated to the graph such that the $*$ entries in the pattern occur in positions corresponding to the edges between the two cliques. A result of [4] then shows that the minimum rank of the pattern and the maximum nullity of the graph obey a simple relationship (see Theorem 4.10). We will show that in this situation, the bounds on those parameters given above, namely the triangle number of the pattern and the zero forcing number of the graph, obey this same relationship.

2. TRIANGLES AND ZERO FORCING SETS

In this section, we explore how the most fundamental combinatorial lower bounds for the minimum rank problem for zero-nonzero matrix patterns and the minimum rank problem for simple graphs, given by the triangle number and the zero forcing number, respectively, share a strong relationship in their underlying combinatorics. Specifically, various zero forcing parameters can be given interpretations in terms of the presence, in zero-nonzero patterns associated with the graph, of triangular submatrices satisfying certain constraints.

Recall that the minimum rank problem for graphs is to determine, for a given simple graph G , the minimum rank among all matrices in $\mathcal{S}(G)$. Any given matrix in $\mathcal{S}(G)$ has a specific zero-nonzero pattern; off the diagonal, this must match that of the adjacency matrix of G , but on the diagonal it is unrestricted. Hence, there are $2^{|G|}$ zero-nonzero patterns possible for A , given only that $A \in \mathcal{S}(G)$. For notational convenience, we define the set of all such zero-nonzero patterns as follows.

Definition 2.1. For a graph G , let $\mathcal{S}_{\text{znz}}(G)$ denote the set containing the $2^{|G|}$ distinct zero-nonzero patterns belonging to matrices in $\mathcal{S}(G)$.

For each zero-nonzero pattern, its triangle number gives a lower bound on the rank of any matrix with that pattern. Since we are interested in the smallest rank of a matrix in $\mathcal{S}(G)$, it is therefore natural to consider what information about this minimum rank can be obtained from the triangle numbers of the individual patterns in $\mathcal{S}_{\text{znz}}(G)$. One possibility is to consider the minimum triangle number over all patterns in $\mathcal{S}_{\text{znz}}(G)$. This value represents the best possible lower bound on the minimum rank of G provided by the triangle numbers of the possible patterns alone. This bound turns out to be exactly the information captured by the enhanced zero forcing number $\hat{Z}(G)$, as the following theorem shows.

Theorem 2.2. *Let G be a graph. Then*

$$\hat{Z}(G) = |G| - \min\{\text{tri}(\mathcal{A}) : \mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{znz}}(G)\}.$$

To prove the above theorem, we need to note that the enhanced zero forcing number is somewhat different from other zero forcing parameters, in that it is not defined solely in terms of a particular zero forcing rule on the graph G . Instead, it is defined as the largest zero forcing number over all loopings \hat{G} of G . These loopings correspond exactly to the patterns in $\mathcal{S}_{\text{znz}}(G)$. Hence, to prove Theorem 2.2, it suffices to show that, for each such looping, its zero forcing number is given by $|G|$ minus the triangle number of the corresponding zero-nonzero pattern. This fact is a corollary (Corollary 2.4 below) of the following theorem, which gives a precise connection between zero forcing sets of a particular looping of G and triangles in the zero-nonzero pattern corresponding to that looping.

Theorem 2.3. *Let \hat{G} be a looping of a simple graph G , let \mathcal{A} be the zero-nonzero pattern of the (looped) adjacency matrix of \hat{G} , and let R and C be subsets of $V(G)$ with $|R| = |C|$. Then $\mathcal{A}[R, C]$ is a triangle if and only if $V(G) \setminus C$ is a loop zero forcing set for \hat{G} from which R can be the set of vertices that force.*

Proof. Let $k = |R| = |C|$. Suppose first that $\mathcal{A}[R, C]$ is a triangle. Then a permutation of the rows indexed by R and a permutation of the columns indexed by C exist such that, when these are applied to the submatrix $\mathcal{A}[R, C]$, the result is a matrix that is lower-triangular with only $*$ entries on its diagonal.

Let v_1, \dots, v_k be the vertices in R , in the order they would occur after this permutation of the rows is applied. Similarly, let $v_{\pi(1)}, \dots, v_{\pi(k)}$ be the vertices in C , again in the order they would occur after the permutation of the columns is applied.

It now suffices to show that, from a state in which $V(G) \setminus C$ is the set of filled vertices, i.e., a state in which $v_{\pi(1)}, \dots, v_{\pi(k)}$ are precisely the vertices of G that are not filled,

$$(2.1) \quad v_1 \rightarrow v_{\pi(1)}, \dots, v_k \rightarrow v_{\pi(k)}$$

is a possible forcing sequence. To this end, we make two observations for each $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. First, since the permuted submatrix has only $*$ entries on its diagonal, v_i is adjacent to $v_{\pi(i)}$. Second, since the permuted submatrix has only 0 entries above its diagonal, v_i is not adjacent to $v_{\pi(j)}$ for any $j > i$. Hence, for each $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, after the first $i-1$ forces in the list (2.1) have occurred, $v_{\pi(i)}$ is the unique unfilled neighbor of v_i in the graph, so that the i th force can also occur, which completes this direction of the proof.

Now let R and C be subsets of $V(G)$ such that $V(G) \setminus C$ is a loop zero forcing set from which a forcing sequence exists in which the vertices that force are exactly those in R . In particular, let v_1, \dots, v_k be the vertices in R , listed in the order in which they force, and define $\pi(1), \dots, \pi(k)$ so that $C = \{v_{\pi(1)}, \dots, v_{\pi(k)}\}$ and so that (2.1) gives a forcing sequence from $V(G) \setminus C$.

Then, at the point when the force $v_i \rightarrow v_{\pi(i)}$ is about to occur, $v_{\pi(i)}$ must be the unique unfilled neighbor of v_i . Since, at that same point, each $v_{\pi(j)}$ for $j > i$ is unfilled (since it will be forced later on), it follows that v_i is not adjacent to $v_{\pi(j)}$ for any $j > i$. Hence, $\mathcal{A}_{i\pi(j)} = 0$ for $j > i$. And $\mathcal{A}_{i\pi(i)} = *$ holds because v_i is adjacent to $v_{\pi(i)}$. This shows that $\mathcal{A}[R, C]$ is a triangle, in particular because applying permutations so that the rows indexed by v_1, \dots, v_k and the columns indexed by $\pi(1), \dots, \pi(k)$ occur in the order listed will produce a matrix that is lower-triangular with $*$ entries on its diagonal. \square

From Theorem 2.3, the following corollary follows immediately.

Corollary 2.4. *Let G be a graph, let \hat{G} be a looping of G , and let $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{znz}}(G)$ be the zero-nonzero pattern of \hat{G} . Then the zero forcing number of \hat{G} is given by $|G| - \text{tri}(\mathcal{A})$.*




FIGURE 1. For the graph G above, every $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{znz}}(G)$ has the form given, where the symbol “?” denotes an entry that could be either 0 or *.

As discussed above, Theorem 2.2 now follows directly from Corollary 2.4. In particular, $\hat{Z}(G)$, being the largest zero forcing number of a looping of G , is seen to equal $|G|$ minus the smallest triangle number of an $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{znz}}(G)$, which gives Theorem 2.2.

In contrast with $\hat{Z}(G)$, the ordinary zero forcing number $Z(G)$ is defined in terms of a zero forcing process that makes no reference to loopings of the graph. Even so, $Z(G)$ turns out to have a natural interpretation in terms of the presence of triangles within the patterns in $\mathcal{S}_{\text{znz}}(G)$, which correspond to these loopings. In particular, we can understand the zero forcing number in terms of the locations of submatrices that remain triangles regardless of what zero-nonzero pattern occurs on the diagonal.

Definition 2.5. Let G be a graph and let R and C be subsets of $V(G)$ with $|R| = |C|$. We say that (R, C) is a *persistent triangle* of G if $\mathcal{A}[R, C]$ is a triangle for every $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{znz}}(G)$. In this case, we call the value of $|R| = |C|$ the *size* of the triangle.

Our next theorem shows how persistent triangles of G are related to zero forcing sets of G . Before stating this theorem, we present the following example to illustrate this relationship.

Example 2.6. For the graph G shown in Figure 1, any $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{znz}}(G)$ has the form given there. Now note that $\{1, 2, 6, 7\}$ is a zero forcing set for G , from which a possible sequence of forces is $1 \rightarrow 3, 2 \rightarrow 4, 3 \rightarrow 5$. In this sequence, the set of vertices that force is $\{1, 2, 3\}$. The set of vertices that get forced necessarily has the same size, and is $\{3, 4, 5\}$. Hence, letting $R = \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $C = \{3, 4, 5\}$, we have that $V(G) \setminus C$ is a zero forcing set for G from which R can be the set of vertices that force.

Now note that the submatrix of \mathcal{A} with rows indexed by R and columns indexed by C is

$$\begin{matrix} & 3 & 4 & 5 \\ \begin{matrix} 1 \\ 2 \\ 3 \end{matrix} & \begin{bmatrix} * & 0 & 0 \\ * & * & 0 \\ ? & * & * \end{bmatrix} \end{matrix}.$$

In particular, this submatrix is a triangle regardless of whether the entry in its bottom-left corner (a diagonal entry from \mathcal{A}) is * or 0. In particular, then, $\mathcal{A}[R, C]$ is a triangle for every $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{znz}}(G)$. Per Definition 2.5, this means that (R, C) is a persistent triangle of G .

The next theorem states that the relationship illustrated by Example 2.6, between zero forcing sets of a graph G and persistent triangles of G , holds in general.

Theorem 2.7. *Let G be a graph and let R and C be subsets of $V(G)$ with $|R| = |C|$. Then (R, C) is a persistent triangle of G if and only if $V(G) \setminus C$ is a zero forcing set for G from which R can be the set of vertices that force.*

We prove Theorem 2.7 by first establishing the following lemma. It says that being a zero forcing set for a graph is equivalent to being a zero forcing set for every looping of the graph, and that this equivalence preserves the set of vertices that do the forcing.

Lemma 2.8. *Let G be a graph with $F, R \subseteq V(G)$. The following are equivalent.*

- (1) *The set F is a zero forcing set for G from which R can be the set of vertices that force.*

- (2) For every looping \hat{G} of G , the set F is a zero forcing set from which R can be the set of vertices that force.

Proof. Suppose first that (1) holds. Let \hat{G} be any looping of G . Under loop zero forcing, the presence or absence of a loop on a vertex has no effect on its ability to force when it is filled. As a result, any vertex that could force under the ordinary zero forcing rule could also do so under the loop zero forcing rule, regardless of the looping. Hence, F is a loop zero forcing set for \hat{G} from which the exact same vertices, namely those in R , can be taken to force, so that (2) holds.

Now assume that (1) does not hold. Then, starting with F as the set of filled vertices and letting, at each step, some vertex of R force until no further such forces are possible, we obtain a set F' with $F \subseteq F' \subset V(G)$ such that from F' no vertex in R can force. We use F' to construct a looping \hat{G} that contradicts (2).

In \hat{G} , each vertex with a loop will be in R , and, in particular, $x \in R$ receives a loop if and only if x is unfilled and has exactly one unfilled neighbor in G (when F' is the set of filled vertices). This leaves each such x with two unfilled neighbors in \hat{G} , one of which is its own loop. Hence, in \hat{G} every unfilled vertex in R has either zero or at least two unfilled neighbors. So no unfilled vertex in R can force in \hat{G} . At the same time, no filled vertex of R can force in \hat{G} either, since no ordinary force was possible from this vertex in G (again, with F' as the set of filled vertices).

By the above, it is not possible for F' to force all of \hat{G} with only vertices in R forcing. Since $F \subseteq F'$, this must be true of F as well. So (2) does not hold. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.7. By Definition 2.5, the condition that (R, C) is a persistent triangle of G means that $\mathcal{A}[R, C]$ is a triangle for every $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{znz}}(G)$. By Theorem 2.3, this is equivalent to saying that for every looping \hat{G} , the set $V(G) \setminus C$ is a zero forcing set for \hat{G} from which R can be the set of vertices that force. By Lemma 2.8, this is in turn equivalent to the statement that $V(G) \setminus C$ is a zero forcing set for G from which R can be the set of vertices that force. \square

The persistent triangles of G are defined in terms of triangles in the patterns in $\mathcal{S}_{\text{znz}}(G)$. The following corollary shows that $Z(G)$ can be understood entirely in these terms.

Corollary 2.9. *Let G be a graph. Then $|G| - Z(G)$ is the size of a largest persistent triangle of G .*

Proof. Let k be the size of a largest persistent triangle of G . Let F be a zero forcing set with $|F| = Z(G)$. Let $C = V(G) \setminus F$. Theorem 2.7 says that G has a persistent triangle of size $|C| = |G| - Z(G)$. So $k \geq |G| - Z(G)$.

For the reverse inequality, let (R, C) be a persistent triangle of G with $|R| = |C| = k$. Then Theorem 2.7 gives that $V(G) \setminus C$ is a zero forcing set for G of size $|G| - k$. So, $|G| - k \geq Z(G)$. Thus, $k \leq |G| - Z(G)$. \square

As Corollary 2.9 shows, $Z(G)$ precisely captures the best bound on $M(G)$ that can be witnessed by some fixed indices locating a submatrix that is a triangle within every pattern in $\mathcal{S}_{\text{znz}}(G)$. On the other hand, $\hat{Z}(G)$ captures the possibility that the largest triangle within each pattern from $\mathcal{S}_{\text{znz}}(G)$ may be in a different location depending upon the pattern of the diagonal. In particular, when a gap occurs such that $\hat{Z}(G) < Z(G)$, this is precisely because every pattern in $\mathcal{S}_{\text{znz}}(G)$ has a triangle that is larger than the largest persistent triangle (so that necessarily these triangles do not all occur in the same location).

Beyond requiring that a fixed location give a submatrix that is a triangle regardless of the zero-nonzero pattern of the diagonal entries, we may require that the location excludes diagonal entries altogether. This stronger notion of a triangle associated with G can be formalized as follows.

Definition 2.10. Let G be a graph and let R and C be subsets of $V(G)$ with $|R| = |C|$. When (R, C) is a persistent triangle of G and $R \cap C = \emptyset$, we say that (R, C) is an *immutable triangle* of G . In particular, this occurs when, for every $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{znz}}(G)$, the submatrix $\mathcal{A}[R, C]$ is a triangle with no entries coming from the diagonal of \mathcal{A} . Again in this case, we refer to the value of $|R| = |C|$ as the *size* of the immutable triangle.

In the same way that persistent triangles associated with G correspond to zero forcing sets, those that are immutable triangles correspond to zero forcing sets of a special type.




FIGURE 2. The set $\{1, 2, 3\}$ is a direct zero forcing set for G_1 and for G_2 . Each graph is partitioned according to the pattern \mathcal{Y} (see Definition 3.1).

Definition 2.11. Let G be a graph. We say that a zero forcing set F for G is a *direct zero forcing set* if there is a complete forcing sequence from F such that all vertices that force are in F .

The following observation follows easily from Definition 2.11.

Observation 2.12. Let F be a zero forcing set for a graph. Then F is a direct zero forcing set if and only if there is a complete forcing sequence from F with each of the resulting forcing chains of length 0 or 1.

Definition 2.13. Let G be a graph. The *direct zero forcing number* of G , denoted by $Z_d(G)$, is the smallest size of a direct zero forcing set for G .

Definition 2.14. We say that a graph G is *directly forceable* if $Z_d(G) = Z(G)$.

The *propagation time* for a graph G is defined in [13, Definition 1.3]. It follows from Observation 2.12 that the class of directly forceable graphs includes all graphs with propagation time 1, a class investigated in [13]. The following shows that the directly forceable graphs give a strict generalization of this class.

Example 2.15. Let G be either of the graphs G_1 and G_2 shown in Figure 2. Then $F = \{1, 2, 3\}$ is a zero forcing set for G from which $3 \rightarrow 6, 2 \rightarrow 5, 1 \rightarrow 4$ is a complete forcing sequence. In that sequence, only vertices in F force, showing that F is a direct zero forcing set for G . As there are no zero forcing sets of smaller size, F is an optimal zero forcing set, and hence G is directly forceable. Note, however, that by [13, Proposition 3.12], the propagation time of G is not 1.

Theorem 2.16. Let G be a graph and let R and C be subsets of $V(G)$ with $|R| = |C|$. Then (R, C) is an *immutable triangle* of G if and only if $V(G) \setminus C$ is a direct zero forcing set for G from which R can be the set of vertices that force.

Proof. Let $F = V(G) \setminus C$. First assume (R, C) is an immutable triangle of G . By definition, (R, C) is a persistent triangle of G as well. It follows by Theorem 2.7 that F is a zero forcing set for G from which R can be the set of vertices that force. Since (R, C) is an immutable triangle of G , we have $R \cap C = \emptyset$, so that $R \subseteq V(G) \setminus C = F$. That is, only vertices in F force, and therefore F is a direct zero forcing set.

Now suppose F is a direct zero forcing set for G from which R can be the set of vertices that force. Theorem 2.7 gives that (R, C) is a persistent triangle of G . Since F is direct zero forcing set, only vertices in F force. That is, $R \subseteq F = V(G) \setminus C$, and hence $R \cap C = \emptyset$, so that (R, C) is an immutable triangle of G . \square

The following corollary now follows from Theorem 2.16 exactly as Corollary 2.9 follows from Theorem 2.7.

Corollary 2.17. Let G be a graph. Then $|G| - Z_d(G)$ is the size of a largest immutable triangle of G .

When a zero forcing set F for a graph G forces via a certain set of forcing chains, the set of vertices that occur as the first vertex in some chain is just F . Hence, F represents a way of choosing one endpoint from each chain. If we exchange each vertex of F with the opposite endpoint of its chain, the resulting set F' is called a *reversal* of F [1, Definition 2.5]; we say that F' is the reversal of F with respect to that particular sequence of forces. Note that there may be vertices that are in both F and F' , namely any

vertices in chains of length 0. It is not difficult to see that F' is also a zero forcing set for G [1, Theorem 2.6] with $|F'| = |F|$.

When F is a direct zero forcing set, and F' is the reversal of F with respect to some sequence of forces as given by Observation 2.12, it follows from that observation that F' is also a direct zero forcing set. Moreover, if we let W be the set of vertices occurring as the first vertices of the (original) forcing chains of length 1, then we first observe that W is precisely the set of vertices that at some point force during the sequence of forces from F that we originally considered. We next observe that $F' = V(G) \setminus W$. The above observations suffice to prove the following lemma, which we will find useful in Section 4.

Lemma 2.18. *Let F be a direct zero forcing set for a graph G . In some complete forcing sequence from F with each of the resulting forcing chains of length 0 or 1, let W be the set of vertices that force. Then $V(G) \setminus W$ gives a reversal of F that is also a direct zero forcing set for G of size $|F|$.*

3. TRIANGLE NUMBERS OF PATTERNS AND ZERO FORCING NUMBERS OF GRAPHS

The results of the previous section allow us to start with a graph G and understand different zero forcing bounds for G in terms of the presence of specific types of triangles within the patterns associated to G , namely those in $\mathcal{S}_{\text{znz}}(G)$. In this section, we explore connections in the other direction; that is, starting with an arbitrary zero-nonzero pattern \mathcal{Y} , we examine how a graph G may have the property that the triangles within \mathcal{Y} correspond to specific zero forcing sets of G . One construction of such a graph recalls the way in which a bipartite graph is naturally constructed from a $(0, 1)$ -matrix; constructing a cobipartite graph from \mathcal{Y} in a similar way (see Definition 4.2) gives the sort of connection described above. We will see, however, that this cobipartite graph is only one among a more general class of graphs that share the desired connection with \mathcal{Y} . Corollary 3.6 that follows allows us to study these graphs more generally, while the next section, Section 4, examines the cobipartite case in more detail.

Definition 3.1. Let \mathcal{Y} be an $m \times n$ zero-nonzero pattern, let G be a graph on $m + n$ vertices, and let $V_r = \{r_1, \dots, r_m\}$ and $V_c = \{c_1, \dots, c_n\}$ be disjoint subsets of $V(G)$ with $V(G) = V_r \cup V_c$. We say that (V_r, V_c) is a *partition of G according to \mathcal{Y}* if there is an edge from r_i to c_j in G exactly when the (r_i, c_j) -entry of \mathcal{Y} is nonzero.

Example 3.2. Let G be either of the graphs G_1 and G_2 shown in Figure 2. Let $V_1 = \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $V_2 = \{4, 5, 6\}$. Then (V_1, V_2) is a partition of G according to \mathcal{Y} . Intuitively, this means that the pattern \mathcal{Y} can be taken to describe precisely the edges of the graph that have one endpoint in V_1 and the other in V_2 . The other edges, those with both endpoints in V_1 or both endpoints in V_2 , have no bearing on whether or not (V_1, V_2) is a partition of the graph according to \mathcal{Y} .

When a graph G does have a partition according to \mathcal{Y} , there is a relationship between the triangles in \mathcal{Y} and certain zero forcing sets for G .

Definition 3.3. Let G be a graph, let V_1 and V_2 be subsets of $V(G)$, and let F be a zero forcing set for G . We say that F *forces from V_1 to V_2* if $V_1 \subseteq F$ and there exists a complete forcing sequence from F such that every vertex that forces is in V_1 and every vertex that gets forced is in V_2 .

Observation 3.4. *A zero forcing set F can satisfy Definition 3.3 only when it is a direct zero forcing set, since the definition implies that every vertex that forces is an element of F .*

Note that, for any graph G , and any arbitrary subsets V_1 and V_2 of its vertices, there does exist at least one zero forcing set F for G that forces from V_1 to V_2 , since one can always take $F = V(G)$. Hence, the minimum to which the following theorem refers is always well-defined.

Theorem 3.5. *Let \mathcal{Y} be an $m \times n$ zero-nonzero pattern and let G be a graph with a partition (V_1, V_2) according to \mathcal{Y} . Let k be the smallest size of a zero forcing set F for G that forces from V_1 to V_2 . Then*

$$\text{tri}(\mathcal{Y}) = m + n - k.$$

Proof. Letting F be a zero forcing set that forces from V_1 to V_2 , there is some complete forcing sequence from F such that, with R the set of vertices in the sequence that force and C the set of those that get forced (so that $C = V(G) \setminus F$), we have $R \subseteq V_1$ and $C \subseteq V_2$. Then (R, C) is a triangle, of size

$m+n-|F|$, within every matrix in $\mathcal{S}_{\text{znz}}(G)$, by Theorem 2.7. Since (V_1, V_2) is a partition of G according to \mathcal{Y} , the fact that $R \subseteq V_1$ and $C \subseteq V_2$ implies that this corresponds to a triangle within \mathcal{Y} . Choosing F with size k thus gives $\text{tri}(\mathcal{Y}) \geq m+n-k$.

Now suppose that a largest triangle within \mathcal{Y} has rows indexed by R and columns indexed by C . Then $\text{tri}(\mathcal{Y}) = |C|$. Since (V_1, V_2) is a partition of G according to \mathcal{Y} , we have $R \subseteq V_1$ and $C \subseteq V_2$. Since the triangle is within \mathcal{Y} , it is an immutable triangle. Hence, letting $F = V(G) \setminus C$, we have by Theorem 2.16 that F is a zero forcing set for G from which R can be the set of vertices that force. And, of course, the set of vertices that get forced is simply $V(G) \setminus F = C$. Since $R \subseteq V_1$ and $C \subseteq V_2$, it follows that F forces from V_1 to V_2 . Thus, $k \leq |F|$. The above now yields

$$\text{tri}(\mathcal{Y}) = |C| = |V(G) \setminus F| = m+n-|F| \leq m+n-k. \quad \square$$

Theorem 2.7 showed how the presence of a triangle in a fixed location within every pattern of $\mathcal{S}_{\text{znz}}(G)$ is equivalent to the existence of a corresponding zero forcing set for G . Theorem 3.5 gives a connection between zero forcing sets for a graph and triangles in a different way, by showing that when the vertex set of G is partitioned such that the pattern \mathcal{Y} gives the edges crossing this partition (Definition 3.1), the largest size of a triangle within \mathcal{Y} is equal to the smallest size of a zero forcing set for G that forces from one side of the partition to the other (Definition 3.3). Therefore, when some *optimal* zero forcing set meets this restriction, we can express the value of $Z(G)$ in terms of the size of a largest triangle within \mathcal{Y} . In particular, we have the following immediate corollary of Theorem 3.5.

Corollary 3.6. *Let \mathcal{Y} be an $m \times n$ zero-nonzero pattern and let (V_1, V_2) be a partition of a graph G according to \mathcal{Y} . If there exists an optimal zero forcing set F for G that forces from V_1 to V_2 , then*

$$(3.1) \quad Z(G) = m+n-\text{tri}(\mathcal{Y}).$$

Example 3.7. Let the graph G , the pattern \mathcal{Y} , and $V_1, V_2 \subseteq V(G)$ be as in Example 3.2. Then it is straightforward to check that $Z(G) = 3$, and $F = \{1, 2, 3\}$ is an optimal zero forcing set for G that forces from V_1 to V_2 . Thus, by Corollary 3.6, the triangle number of \mathcal{Y} must satisfy $3+3-\text{tri}(\mathcal{Y}) = Z(G) = 3$. Indeed, it is easy to see that in fact $\text{tri}(\mathcal{Y}) = 3$.

Given a zero-nonzero pattern \mathcal{Y} , we may wish to find a graph G satisfying the hypotheses of Corollary 3.6, so that (3.1) will apply. The requirement that G has a partition (V_1, V_2) according to \mathcal{Y} determines the edges between V_1 and V_2 , but then edges within each V_i must be chosen to ensure that some optimal zero forcing set forces from V_1 to V_2 . In the next section, we show that one way to achieve this is to include all possible edges within each of V_1 and V_2 , thus producing a cobipartite graph. In this case, the relationship turns out to be very strong between the pattern \mathcal{Y} and the graph G , both in terms of their minimum rank (or maximum nullity) parameters, and in terms of the combinatorial bounds on those parameters.

4. COMBINATORIAL BOUNDS FOR COBIPARTITE GRAPHS AND PATTERNS

Recall from Definition 1.3 that a graph is said to be cobipartite when its complement is bipartite or, equivalently, when it is possible to partition its vertex set into two cliques. In the special case where this gives a partition of the graph according to some specific zero-nonzero pattern, it was shown in [4] that (over an infinite field, and subject to a mild nondegeneracy condition; see Definition 4.4) the minimum rank of the graph and the minimum rank of the zero-nonzero pattern must be equal. The main result of this section, Theorem 4.8, shows that in this same situation the combinatorial bounds on those two parameters obey the same relationship.

Definition 4.1. Let G be a graph. A *clique partition* (V_1, V_2) of G is a partition of the vertex set of G into two cliques. (Note that this exists exactly when G is cobipartite.)

Definition 4.2. Let \mathcal{Y} be an $m \times n$ zero-nonzero pattern and G be a graph on $m+n$ vertices. We say that G is the *cobipartite graph associated with \mathcal{Y}* if there exists a clique partition (V_r, V_c) of G that is a partition of G according to \mathcal{Y} (see Definition 3.1).

Example 4.3. Both of the graphs G_1 and G_2 shown in Figure 2 are partitioned according to the pattern \mathcal{Y} given there. The graph G_1 is not cobipartite; the set $\{2, 3, 4\}$ of vertices induces an odd cycle in its complement. The graph G_2 is cobipartite; both $(\{1, 2, 3\}, \{4, 5, 6\})$ and $(\{2, 3\}, \{1, 4, 5, 6\})$ are clique partitions of the graph. The former is a partition of G_2 according to \mathcal{Y} , and hence G_2 is the cobipartite graph associated with \mathcal{Y} .

In comparison to the standard way in which a bipartite graph is associated with a rectangular $(0, 1)$ -matrix, the cobipartite graph associated with \mathcal{Y} is the complement of the bipartite graph that would be associated with the $(0, 1)$ -matrix whose zero-nonzero pattern is complement of \mathcal{Y} (i.e., the pattern obtained from \mathcal{Y} by replacing each of its $*$ entries with 0 and vice versa).

Definition 4.4. Let G be a graph. We say that G is *saturated* with respect to the clique partition (V_1, V_2) of G if every vertex in V_1 is adjacent to some vertex in V_2 , and vice versa.

Example 4.5. As noted in Example 4.3, the graph G_2 of Figure 2 has both $(\{1, 2, 3\}, \{4, 5, 6\})$ and $(\{2, 3\}, \{1, 4, 5, 6\})$ as clique partitions. It is easy to verify that G_2 is saturated with respect to the first of these partitions, but with respect to the second it is not, since vertex 4 has no neighbor in the set $\{2, 3\}$.

The following lemma shows that when a cobipartite graph is saturated with respect to some clique partition, Corollary 3.6 can be applied, giving the powerful connection of Theorem 4.8, which follows.

Lemma 4.6. *Let G be a cobipartite graph that is saturated with respect to the clique partition (V_1, V_2) . Then there is an optimal zero forcing set F for G such that F forces from V_1 to V_2 .*

Proof. Let F be an optimal zero forcing set for G . Fix a complete forcing sequence from F and let v be the first vertex to force according to this sequence; say v forces w . We will initially assume that $v \in V_1$.

We first show it is no loss of generality to assume that $V_1 \subseteq F$. There are two cases.

First, suppose $w \in V_2$. As w is the unique unfilled neighbor of v , and every vertex of $V_1 \setminus \{v\}$ is a neighbor of v , it must be that every vertex of V_1 is initially filled, so that $V_1 \subseteq F$.

Now suppose $w \in V_1$. As w is the unique unfilled neighbor of v , and every vertex of $V_1 \setminus \{v\}$ is a neighbor of v , then it must be that every vertex of $V_1 \setminus \{w\}$ is initially filled. Since G is saturated with respect to clique partition (V_1, V_2) , there must exist some $x \in V_2$ that is adjacent to v . In order for v to force w , it must be that x is initially filled. So now consider the set $F' = (F \setminus \{x\}) \cup \{w\}$. With this set F' as the set of initially filled vertices, x is the unique unfilled neighbor of v . Hence, a forcing a sequence from F' can begin with v forcing x , and proceed after that point as with the forcing sequence from F that we considered originally. Since we have $V_1 \subseteq F'$ and $|F'| = |F| = Z(G)$, we let F' replace F , so that we again have $V_1 \subseteq F$.

We next argue that there is a complete forcing sequence from F with the property that only vertices in V_1 force. This follows from the fact that $V_1 \subseteq F$. In particular, suppose that at some point a vertex $w \in V_2$ is to force. The vertex to be forced, say x , must also be in V_2 . Since w and x are both in the clique V_2 , and since every vertex in V_2 is adjacent to w , every vertex in $V_2 \setminus \{x\}$ must be filled before this force can occur. But, since $V_1 \subseteq F$, this implies that every vertex in G other than x is initially filled. And, since G is saturated with respect to clique partition (V_1, V_2) , it must be that x has some neighbor $v \in V_1$. Thus, at the point in the sequence when w was to force x , we may let v force x instead. This gives a sequence such that only vertices in V_1 force.

Hence, only vertices in V_1 force, and all of these vertices are initially filled (i.e., $V_1 \subseteq F$). So F is a direct zero forcing set for G .

Finally, we assumed at the start of the proof that $v \in V_1$. If $v \in V_2$ instead, then the above argument gives a direct zero forcing set F for G with $V_2 \subseteq F$ that forces from V_2 to V_1 . By Lemma 2.18, there is a reversal of F that gives a direct zero forcing set F' for G with $V_1 \subseteq F'$. Then the above argument shows that F' forces from V_1 to V_2 . \square

Example 4.7. The graph shown in Figure 3 shows that the condition of G being saturated is essential for Lemma 4.6. For $V_1 = \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $V_2 = \{4, 5, 6\}$, a clique partition of G is given by (V_1, V_2) , but G is not saturated with respect to this partition. Moreover, while in fact $Z(G) = 3$, clearly no zero forcing

set of this size can force from V_1 to V_2 , as such a set would necessarily be equal to V_1 , and clearly then would fail to force the entire graph.




FIGURE 3. A cobipartite graph that is not saturated with respect to the partition shown. For this graph, every zero forcing set must include vertices on both sides of the partition.

Theorem 4.8. *Let \mathcal{Y} be an $m \times n$ zero-nonzero pattern and let G be the cobipartite graph associated with \mathcal{Y} . If G is saturated with respect to the corresponding clique partition, then*

$$(4.1) \quad Z(G) = m + n - \text{tri}(\mathcal{Y}).$$

Proof. Let (V_1, V_2) be the clique partition of G with vertices in V_1 corresponding to the rows of \mathcal{Y} and those in V_2 corresponding to the columns. Since G is saturated with respect to this partition, Lemma 4.6 gives an optimal zero forcing set F for G that forces from V_1 to V_2 . Hence, Corollary 3.6 gives the desired equality. \square

Note that it is also possible to obtain Theorem 4.8 by combining Theorems 20, 44, and 45 from [17].




FIGURE 4. The graph G shown above is the cobipartite graph associated with the pattern \mathcal{Y} given, with the dashed line indicating the corresponding partition of G into cliques. Note that G is saturated with respect to this partition.

Example 4.9. Let G be the graph shown in Figure 4. Then G is the cobipartite graph associated with the pattern \mathcal{Y} given there, and is saturated with respect to this partition. Since \mathcal{Y} is itself a triangle, $\text{tri}(\mathcal{Y}) = 3$, and so from Theorem 4.8 we have $Z(G) = 3 + 3 - 3 = 3$.

When the cobipartite graph G associated with the zero-nonzero pattern \mathcal{Y} is saturated with respect to the corresponding partition, Theorem 4.8 gives a relationship between the parameter $Z(G)$ that bounds the maximum nullity $M(G)$ on the one hand and the parameter $\text{tri}(\mathcal{Y})$ that bounds the minimum rank $\text{mr}(\mathcal{Y})$ on the other. It was previously shown in [4] that the corresponding quantities that are bounded, namely $M(G)$ and $\text{mr}(\mathcal{Y})$, obey exactly the same relationship, at least when considered over an infinite field.

Theorem 4.10 ([4, Theorem 3.1]). *Let G be the cobipartite graph associated with the $m \times n$ zero-nonzero pattern \mathcal{Y} , and suppose G is saturated with respect to the corresponding partition. Then, over an infinite field, $\text{mr}(\mathcal{Y}) = \text{mr}(G)$, or, equivalently,*

$$(4.2) \quad M(G) = m + n - \text{mr}(\mathcal{Y}).$$

In addition, over the reals, $\text{mr}(\mathcal{Y}) = \text{mr}_+(G)$, or, equivalently,

$$M_+(G) = m + n - \text{mr}(\mathcal{Y}).$$

Combining Theorems 4.8 and 4.10 gives the following result that, for a pattern \mathcal{Y} , relates the question of whether $\text{mr}(\mathcal{Y}) = \text{tri}(\mathcal{Y})$ to that of whether $M(G) = Z(G)$ for the associated cobipartite graph G .

Theorem 4.11. *Let G be the cobipartite graph associated with the $m \times n$ zero-nonzero pattern \mathcal{Y} , and suppose G is saturated with respect to the corresponding partition. Then, over any field, $M(G) = Z(G)$ implies $\text{mr}(\mathcal{Y}) = \text{tri}(\mathcal{Y})$. Moreover, when the field is infinite, the converse also holds.*

Proof. By Theorem 4.8, the statement that $M(G) = Z(G)$ is equivalent to $M(G) = m + n - \text{tri}(\mathcal{Y})$. Since G has $m + n$ vertices, this is equivalent to $m + n - \text{mr}(G) = m + n - \text{tri}(\mathcal{Y})$, which is clearly equivalent to $\text{mr}(G) = \text{tri}(\mathcal{Y})$. Over an infinite field, Theorem 4.10 gives that this is equivalent to $\text{mr}(\mathcal{Y}) = \text{tri}(\mathcal{Y})$.

Now, without any restriction on the field, assume $M(G) = Z(G)$. Then, by the above, $\text{mr}(G) = \text{tri}(\mathcal{Y})$. Note that every matrix in $\mathcal{S}(G)$ has a submatrix with the zero-nonzero pattern \mathcal{Y} , which implies that $\text{mr}(G) \geq \text{mr}(\mathcal{Y}) \geq \text{tri}(\mathcal{Y})$. So here we have equality throughout. In particular, then, $\text{mr}(\mathcal{Y}) = \text{tri}(\mathcal{Y})$. \square




FIGURE 5. The bipartite graph shown above is the complement of the cobipartite graph G associated with the given zero-nonzero pattern \mathcal{Y} (taken from [6, Example 25]) satisfying $\text{mr}(\mathcal{Y}) > \text{tri}(\mathcal{Y})$ over every field.

Example 4.12. The 8×7 zero-nonzero pattern \mathcal{Y} given in Figure 5 was shown in [6, Example 25] to have $\text{tri}(\mathcal{Y}) = 4 < \text{mr}(\mathcal{Y})$ over every field. Hence, taking G to be the 15-vertex cobipartite graph associated with \mathcal{Y} gives $M(G) < Z(G)$ over every field, by Theorem 4.11. (The complement of G is shown in Figure 5.)




FIGURE 6. The pentasun graph, also called the 5-sun or 5-corona (left) and the extended pentasun graph (right)

Letting P be the pentasun graph shown in Figure 6, it is proved in [10, Example 4.1] that $M(P) < Z(P)$ over every field, the same gap exhibited by the graph G of Example 4.12. But [2, Example 2.25] shows that in fact $\hat{Z}(P) < Z(P)$, which in some sense explains the gap, since $M(P) \leq \hat{Z}(P)$ over every field. It is then natural to ask whether or not this same situation explains the gap for the graph G .

Hence, we turn our attention to $\hat{Z}(G)$ and other zero forcing parameters for cobipartite graphs. In particular, because Theorem 1.2 gives

$$Z_+(G) \leq \hat{Z}(G) \leq Z(G),$$

we will gain information about all three of these parameters by proving a strong result about $Z_+(G)$. For this, we first need the two following lemmas.

Lemma 4.13. *Let G be a cobipartite graph and let F be a positive semidefinite zero forcing set for G . Then, in any fixed forcing sequence from F , any force that is a standard force is followed only by standard forces. That is, all of the strictly positive semidefinite forces occur before any of the standard forces.*

Proof. Let (A, B) be a clique partition of G . Fix any forcing sequence from F and consider the first standard force in this sequence. By symmetry, we may assume that the vertex that forces is $a \in A$. After this force occurs, every neighbor of a is filled; in particular, every vertex in A is filled. It is not hard to see that therefore no subsequent force can be a strictly positive semidefinite force. \square

Lemma 4.14. *Let G be a cobipartite graph with clique partition (A, B) . Let F be a positive semidefinite zero forcing set for G and suppose $|F| = Z_+(G) < Z(G)$. If, in some complete forcing sequence from F , the first vertex to force is in A , then A contains at least two initially unfilled vertices.*

Proof. Fix some complete forcing sequence from F , and let $a \in A$ be the first vertex to force in this sequence. This first force must be a strictly positive semidefinite force since, otherwise, by Lemma 4.13, all forces would be standard forces, contradicting $Z_+(G) < Z(G)$. Hence, the initially unfilled subgraph of G must have at least two connected components. This implies that each of A and B contains at least one unfilled vertex, and that no unfilled vertex in A is adjacent to any unfilled vertex in B .

Assume for the sake of contradiction that some vertex y is the unique vertex in A that is initially unfilled. Then y has no unfilled neighbors in A , and, by the above, y has no unfilled neighbors in B either. Since y has no unfilled neighbors, we can consider the set $F' = (F \setminus \{a\}) \cup \{y\}$ as an initially-filled set. A possible first force from F' is then to let y force a . Following that force, the set of filled vertices is strictly a superset of F , showing that F' is a zero forcing set. But since that first force from F' is a standard force, Lemma 4.13 shows that F' is actually a standard zero forcing set. Since $|F'| = |F| = Z_+(G)$, this contradicts $Z_+(G) < Z(G)$. \square

We are now prepared to prove that the ordinary zero forcing number and the positive semidefinite zero forcing number are equal for every cobipartite graph. Note that this does not require any assumption that the cobipartite graph is saturated with respect to any partition.

Theorem 4.15. *If a graph G is cobipartite, then $Z_+(G) = Z(G)$.*

Proof. Let G be a cobipartite graph with clique partition (A, B) and let F be a positive semidefinite zero forcing set for G with $|F| = Z_+(G)$. Since $Z_+(G) \leq Z(G)$, it suffices to show that $Z(G) \leq Z_+(G) = |F|$. So assume for the sake of contradiction that $|F| = Z_+(G) < Z(G)$.

Fix a complete forcing sequence from F . If the first force in the sequence is a standard force, then Lemma 4.13 implies that F is a standard zero forcing set, contradicting $|F| < Z(G)$. Hence, the first force is a strictly positive semidefinite force. Assume without loss of generality that the first vertex to force is in A , and call this vertex a_1 . By Lemma 4.14, there are at least two initially unfilled vertices in A , and so it must be some vertex $b_1 \in B$ that is forced by a_1 .

By the above, we may let $a_1 \rightarrow b_1, a_2 \rightarrow b_2, \dots, a_k \rightarrow b_k$ be an initial subsequence of the forces such that each $a_i \in A$ and each $b_i \in B$ and such that each of the forces is a strictly positive semidefinite force. In addition, we take k to be as large as possible, meaning that both F and the sequence of forces from F are chosen so as to maximize the length of the initial subsequence with these properties.

As noted above, at least two vertices of A are initially unfilled. Among those vertices, let y be the one that is ultimately the first to be forced, and let x be the vertex that forces it. By the choice of y , at the point when x is to force y , there are at least two unfilled vertices in A (including y) and therefore it must be that $x \in B$.

Since the first force, namely $a_1 \rightarrow b_1$, is a strictly positive semidefinite force, there must initially be two connected components induced by the set of unfilled vertices. So, since $y \in A$ is initially unfilled, it must be that every neighbor of y in B is initially filled. That is, $N(y) \cap B \subseteq F$. In particular, $x \in F$.

Now let $F' = (F \setminus \{x\}) \cup \{y\}$. Then $|F'| = |F|$ and it follows from the above that every neighbor of y in B is in F' except for x . Therefore, when F' is taken as the initially filled set, y begins with a single unfilled neighbor in B , namely x .

Since the initial force $a_1 \rightarrow b_1$ from F was a strictly positive semidefinite force, the vertices in $V(G) \setminus F$ induce two connected components. We claim this is also true of the vertices in $V(G) \setminus F'$. To see this, note that there is only one vertex that is in F but not in F' , namely x . Hence, at the point where F' is the set of filled vertices, if the unfilled vertices induce a single connected component, then there must be an edge from $x \in B$ to some unfilled vertex of A . That vertex cannot be y , since $y \in F'$ is filled. Therefore, it must be that x is adjacent to some other vertex $z \in A \setminus F'$. But this implies that, under the original sequence of forces from F , there are two unfilled vertices of A , namely y and z , both adjacent to x at the point when the force $x \rightarrow y$ is to occur. (Recall that y was chosen as the first vertex of A to be forced.) This is clearly a contradiction, and hence we have shown that the vertices in $V(G) \setminus F'$ induce two connected components.

We may now argue as follows. Take F' to be the initially filled set. Before any forces occur, y is filled and has a single unfilled neighbor in B , namely x . Since the unfilled vertices induce two connected components, any unfilled neighbors of y in A are irrelevant, and y can force x . After this force occurs, the set of filled vertices is a superset of F . Therefore, we may take $y \rightarrow x, a_1 \rightarrow b_1, a_2 \rightarrow b_2, \dots, a_k \rightarrow b_k$ as the initial $k + 1$ forces. Each of these features a vertex in A forcing a vertex in B while some vertex of A remains unfilled, and so these are all strictly positive semidefinite forces. After these forces are complete, the forcing can proceed exactly as it would have following the first $k + 2$ forces from F , until ultimately all vertices of G are filled.

Hence, F' is a positive semidefinite zero forcing set for G with $|F'| = |F| = Z_+(G)$ such that some complete forcing sequence from F' begins with $k + 1$ strictly positive semidefinite forces from A to B . But F was chosen so as to maximize k , so this is a contradiction. \square

Corollary 4.16. *If a graph G is cobipartite, then $Z_+(G) = \hat{Z}(G) = Z(G)$.*

Proof. By Theorem 1.2, we have $Z_+(G) \leq \hat{Z}(G) \leq Z(G)$. Theorem 4.15 then gives equality throughout. \square

Example 4.17. As noted in Example 4.12, the graph G on 15 vertices given in Figure 5 has $M(G) < Z(G)$ over every field. Corollary 4.16 now gives the stronger inequality of $M(G) < \hat{Z}(G) = Z(G)$ over every field. That is, the maximum nullity $M(G)$ is not only strictly less than the zero forcing number $Z(G)$, but is in fact less than the enhanced zero forcing number $\hat{Z}(G)$, and this gap persists over every field.

The smallest graph already known to display such a gap is the extended pentasun graph shown in Figure 6, also with 15 vertices. Letting P denote this graph, $M(P) = 2$ holds over every field, as can be calculated using, e.g., [3, Theorem 2.3], while [18, Proposition 6.1] gives $\hat{Z}(P) = Z(P) = 3$.

Another related example is the Heawood graph, which we denote here by H . It happens that H is bipartite, so that its complement \overline{H} is cobipartite. In fact, [2, Observation A.21] gives $M(\overline{H}) = 10$, while $\hat{Z}(\overline{H}) = Z(\overline{H}) = 11$, so that \overline{H} displays the same gap observed above. Moreover, \overline{H} has only 14 vertices. But here the gap relies on properties of the real field; the discussion in [6, Example 37] together with Theorem 4.10 show that in fact $M(\overline{H}) = 11 = \hat{Z}(\overline{H}) = Z(\overline{H})$ over every infinite field of characteristic 2.

The following theorem extends the equivalence given by Theorem 4.11 to the enhanced zero forcing number, and, over the real numbers, to the positive semidefinite setting as well.

Theorem 4.18. *Let \mathcal{Y} be an $m \times n$ zero-nonzero pattern and let G be the cobipartite graph associated with \mathcal{Y} . Suppose G is saturated with respect to the corresponding clique partition. Then, over an infinite field, the following are equivalent.*

- (1) $\text{mr}(\mathcal{Y}) = \text{tri}(\mathcal{Y})$

- (2) $M(G) = Z(G)$
 (3) $M(G) = \hat{Z}(G)$

In addition, over \mathbb{R} , the above statements are equivalent to $M_+(G) = Z_+(G)$.

Proof. Theorem 4.11 states that (1) and (2) are equivalent. In addition, $Z(G) = \hat{Z}(G)$ by Corollary 4.16, and hence (2) is equivalent to (3) as well.

Turning to the situation over \mathbb{R} , we have by Theorem 4.15 that $Z(G) = Z_+(G)$, and hence the statement that $M_+(G) = Z_+(G)$ is equivalent to the statement that $M_+(G) = Z(G)$. Since it follows from the second part of Theorem 4.10 that $M_+(G) = M(G)$, this in turn is equivalent to $M(G) = Z(G)$, which is (2). \square




FIGURE 7. The graph G shown is the cobipartite graph associated with the pattern \mathcal{Y} , but is not saturated with respect to the corresponding clique partition (due to the column in \mathcal{Y} with only 0 entries).

Example 4.19. Let G be the graph shown in Figure 7. Then G is the cobipartite graph associated with the pattern \mathcal{Y} given there, but is not saturated with respect to the corresponding clique partition. Since G has a clique of size 4, we have $h(G) \geq 4$. Hence, we may apply Theorem 1.2 to obtain

$$3 \leq h(G) - 1 \leq M(G) \leq \hat{Z}(G) \leq Z(G) \leq 3,$$

where the final inequality follows from verifying that $\{1, 2, 3\}$ is a zero forcing set. In particular, then, $M(G) = Z(G) = 3$, and hence $\text{mr}(G) = 7 - M(G) = 4$. Meanwhile, it is clear that $\text{mr}(\mathcal{Y}) = \text{tri}(\mathcal{Y}) = 3$. Hence, $\text{mr}(\mathcal{Y}) < \text{mr}(G)$, showing that the condition that G be saturated is essential to Theorem 4.10.

4.1. Treewidth and cobipartite k -trees. Of the parameters mentioned in Theorem 1.2, the only one not yet treated here is $\text{tw}(G)$. In particular, while the theorem gives $\text{tw}(G) \leq Z_+(G) \leq \hat{Z}(G) \leq Z(G)$ for every graph G , we saw in Corollary 4.16 that when G is cobipartite, $Z_+(G) = \hat{Z}(G) = Z(G)$. Hence, it is natural to ask whether this equality can be extended to include $\text{tw}(G)$. We will show that this question has a negative answer for cobipartite graphs in general, but a positive one when G happens also to be a k -tree, defined as follows.

Definition 4.20. For each integer $k \geq 1$, a graph is said to be a k -tree if it can be constructed by starting with a $(k + 1)$ -clique and iteratively repeating this step (at least zero times): Choose a set of k vertices that induce a clique and add a new vertex that is adjacent to exactly those k vertices. A *linear k -tree* is a k -tree that either is a $(k + 1)$ -clique, or has exactly two vertices of degree k .

Example 4.21. The graph G of Example 4.9, shown in Figure 4, is a 3-tree, as it can be formed by starting with a clique with vertex set $\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, then adding vertex 5 with neighborhood $\{2, 3, 4\}$, and finally adding vertex 6 with neighborhood $\{3, 4, 5\}$. Since vertices 1 and 6 are the only two vertices of degree 3, by definition G is a linear k -tree.

Definition 4.22. Let G be a graph. Then the *treewidth* of G , denoted $\text{tw}(G)$, is the smallest integer k such that G is a subgraph of some k -tree.

Corollary 4.16 shows that the latter four parameters appearing in the inequality (1.1) are equal whenever G is cobipartite. The next example shows that this result cannot be extended to include the treewidth.




FIGURE 8. The graph H above is cobipartite with $\text{tw}(G) < Z(G)$. It is the cobipartite graph associated with the zero-nonzero pattern shown, and is saturated with respect to the corresponding clique partition.

Example 4.23. Let H be the graph shown in Figure 8. Then H is obtained from the graph G shown in Figure 4 by deleting the edge between 2 and 5. Since G is a 3-tree, this shows that $\text{tw}(H) \leq 3$. Since $\delta(H) = 3$, we have by Theorem 1.2 that $\delta(H) = \text{tw}(H) = 3$. Note that H is still cobipartite, and saturated with respect to the same partition as G . At the same time, removing that edge from G decreases the triangle number of the corresponding zero-nonzero pattern to 2, so that Theorem 4.8 gives $Z(H) = 3 + 3 - 2 = 4$. We can now apply Corollary 4.16 to obtain

$$\delta(H) = \text{tw}(H) = 3 < 4 = \hat{Z}(H) = Z_+(H) = Z(H).$$

On the other hand, we will show in Corollary 4.29 that equality among all of the parameters appearing in (1.1) in fact must occur for a cobipartite graph that is actually a k -tree. For convenience in what follows, for the remainder of the section we let k represent an arbitrary positive integer.

Theorem 4.24 ([2, Lemma 2.37]). *Let G be a linear k -tree. Then $Z(G) = k$.*

Theorem 4.25. *If G is a linear k -tree, then $h(G) - 1 = M(G) = Z(G) = k$.*

Proof. Let G be a linear k -tree. Then, by definition, G contains a $(k + 1)$ -clique as a subgraph, so that $k + 1 \leq h(G)$. Hence, using Theorem 1.2, we have

$$k \leq h(G) - 1 \leq M(G) \leq Z(G) = k,$$

where the final equality follows from Theorem 4.24. \square

The lemmas that follow will allow us to exploit the above results in the cobipartite case specifically.

Lemma 4.26. *In a k -tree that is not a clique, no two vertices of degree k can be adjacent.*

Proof. Toward a contradiction, let G be a k -tree that is not a clique in which some two vertices of degree k are adjacent. Since G is not a clique, we may assume without loss of generality that in the construction of G as a k -tree, one of these was the last vertex to be added. Call this vertex w . Let v be some other supposed vertex of degree k that is adjacent to w . Then $G \setminus w$ is a k -tree in which v has degree $k - 1$. But this is a contradiction, since every vertex of a k -tree has degree at least k . \square

Lemma 4.27. *Every k -tree has at least two vertices of degree k .*

Proof. Suppose this is false; let H be a minimal counterexample. Since H is a k -tree, it must contain at least one vertex of degree k . Since H is a counterexample, it contains exactly one such vertex. Clearly, then, H is not a clique. Hence, we may consider the last vertex that was added in its construction as a k -clique; call this vertex z . Then $H \setminus z$ is a k -tree that, by the minimality of H , must have at least two vertices of degree k . Let x and y be two of these. Since H is a counterexample, these no longer have degree k as vertices in H , and so it must be that z is adjacent to both of them. Since the neighborhood of z forms a clique, it follows that x and y are adjacent in $H \setminus z$. But $H \setminus z$ is a k -tree, so this contradicts Lemma 4.26. \square

Theorem 4.28. *Every cobipartite k -tree is a linear k -tree.*

Proof. Let G be a k -tree that is cobipartite, say with clique partition (V_1, V_2) . If G is itself a clique, then G is a linear k -tree by definition. Hence, suppose G is not a clique. Then it suffices to show that G has exactly two vertices of degree k . We have by Lemma 4.27 that G contains at least two vertices of degree k . Since V_1 and V_2 are both cliques, it follows from Lemma 4.26 that each contains at most one vertex of degree k . Therefore, V_1 and V_2 each contains exactly one vertex of degree k . So G contains exactly two such vertices, as desired. \square

While Example 4.23 shows that a cobipartite graph G may exhibit a gap such that $\text{tw}(G) < Z(G)$, combining Theorems 4.28 and 4.25 shows that this cannot occur for a cobipartite graph that is a k -tree.

Corollary 4.29. *Let G be a cobipartite k -tree. Then $h(G) - 1 = M(G) = Z(G) = k$.*

For a general graph G , almost all of the combinatorial parameters included in [2, Figure 1.1] are shown there to be between a lower bound of $h(G) - 1$ and an upper bound of $Z(G)$. Since any graph with a clique of size $Z(G) + 1$ satisfies $Z(G) \leq h(G) - 1$, all of those parameters are equal, and in particular

$$h(G) - 1 = \text{tw}(G) = M_+(G) = M(G) = Z_+(G) = \hat{Z}(G) = Z(G)$$

for every such graph G .

5. UNSATURATED COBIPARTITE GRAPHS

Many of our results so far have focused on the case of a cobipartite graph that is saturated with respect to some partition of its vertices into two cliques. When a cobipartite graph does not satisfy this condition, we refer to it as an *unsaturated cobipartite graph*. In this section, we turn our attention to such graphs.

The condition of being saturated means (Definition 4.4) that each vertex in each clique is adjacent to some vertex in the other clique. Hence, to understand the zero forcing number of unsaturated cobipartite graphs, we need to account for the way in which the zero forcing number is affected by the presence of vertices that violate this condition. Since a saturated cobipartite graph can always be obtained by deleting all such vertices, we examine what effect this deletion has on the zero forcing number. For this, we wish to employ some useful results from [7]; the following definitions make it easier to do so.

Definition 5.1. Let $k \geq 1$ be an integer and let (v_0, v_1, \dots, v_k) be a forcing chain. Then v_0 is the *source* vertex of the forcing chain and v_k is its *terminal* vertex.

Note that the definition of source vertex and terminal vertex requires that the chain consist of more than one vertex; by definition, a forcing chain of length 0 has neither a source vertex nor a terminal vertex.

Definition 5.2. A vertex is said to be *critical* if there exists some optimal forcing sequence in which it does not force or get forced. It is said to be *uncritical* if, for all optimal forcing sequences, it is either the terminal or the source vertex of the chain in which it resides.

To say that a vertex v is critical is the same as saying that there exists a set of forcing chains, from some optimal zero forcing set F , such that the chain containing v contains no other vertices. (Note how this implies that $v \in F$.) Following Definition 5.1, in this situation v is considered to be neither a source vertex nor a terminal vertex, and hence is not uncritical. Therefore, a critical vertex cannot be uncritical. (A vertex can, on the other hand, be neither critical nor uncritical.) Meanwhile, considering reversals shows that an uncritical vertex must be both a terminal vertex for some optimal forcing sequence and a source vertex for some other such sequence.

The main role for the notions of critical and uncritical vertices is in accounting for the effect that removing a vertex has on the zero forcing number.

Theorem 5.3 ([7, Theorem 2.7]). *A vertex z of G is critical if and only if $Z(G \setminus z) = Z(G) - 1$.*

Proposition 5.4. *Let z be an uncritical vertex in G . Then $Z(G \setminus z) = Z(G)$.*

Proof. Since z is an uncritical vertex, it is a terminal vertex with respect to a complete forcing sequence from some optimal zero forcing set F . Hence, F is also a zero forcing set for $G \setminus z$, where the forces occur as in G . Thus, $Z(G) \geq Z(G \setminus z)$. Suppose for the sake of contradiction that $Z(G) > Z(G \setminus z)$. Let F' be an optimal zero forcing set for $G \setminus z$. It follows that $F' \cup \{z\}$ is an optimal zero forcing set for G from which there is some forcing sequence of which z is a critical vertex. But this is impossible, since z is an uncritical vertex. \square

Note that [7, Example 2.9] shows that the converse of Proposition 5.4 is false.

The following theorems give us tools to identify when a vertex that is contained in a clique of a graph is critical or uncritical.

Theorem 5.5. *Let G be a graph, let T be a clique in G , and let z be a vertex of T with $\deg(z) = |T| - 1$. Then z is either a critical vertex or an uncritical vertex, and it follows that $Z(G \setminus z) \in \{Z(G), Z(G) - 1\}$.*

Proof. Suppose z is not a critical vertex and not an uncritical vertex. Then there exist vertices u and v such that u forces z and z forces v in some optimal forcing sequence. But since $\deg(z) = |T| - 1$, only vertices in T are adjacent to z . Hence, u and v are both in T , and therefore are adjacent, which contradicts that u has exactly one unfilled neighbor when it forces z . Hence, z must be either critical or uncritical, and the claim that $Z(G \setminus z) \in \{Z(G), Z(G) - 1\}$ follows from Theorem 5.3 and Proposition 5.4. \square

Proposition 5.6. *Let G be a graph, let T be a clique in G , and let z be a vertex of T with $\deg(z) = |T| - 1$. Suppose that z is not the only vertex in T of degree $|T| - 1$, that some vertex in T has a neighbor outside of T , and that for each vertex in T , its set of neighbors outside of T is either empty or forms a clique. Then z is a critical vertex.*

Proof. By hypothesis, there exists some $v \in T$ with $v \neq z$ and $\deg(v) = |T| - 1$. Suppose for the sake of contradiction that z is not critical. By Theorem 5.5, each of z and v must be critical or uncritical. So z is uncritical.

Case 1: v is critical. Since z is uncritical, by definition z is a terminal or source vertex for every optimal forcing sequence. Since v is critical, there exists some optimal forcing sequence in which v neither forces nor gets forced; in particular, with this sequence, v is not a terminal or source vertex. But since v and z are adjacent twins, we can swap their roles in the forcing process to obtain an optimal forcing sequence such that z is not a terminal or source vertex, contradicting the above.

Case 2: v is uncritical. Recall that so is z . This means that for any optimal forcing sequence, each one is either a source or terminal vertex. Moreover, since v and z are adjacent twins, we claim that they cannot both be source vertices. To see this, suppose otherwise, and assume without loss of generality that v forces before z . The contradiction is that then v would at that point have two unfilled neighbors, both the one that it is assumed to force, and also the one that z is supposed to force later on. By considering reversals, v and z cannot both be terminal vertices either.

Hence, one of v and z is source and the other is terminal. Without loss of generality, say v is terminal and z is source. Suppose first that z forces some $y \neq v$. Then, since v is a neighbor of z , it must be that v is forced by some vertex x before this occurs. By the choice of z and v , we have $x, y \in T$, so that x and y are adjacent. But then, at the point when x is to force v , the vertices v and y are distinct unfilled neighbors of x , which is a contradiction.

Finally, suppose z forces v . By hypothesis, some vertex in T has a neighbor outside of T . So there exists an $x \in T$ other than z and v . If v were the only initially unfilled vertex in T , then we could take $(F \setminus \{x\}) \cup \{v\}$ as the initially filled set and let v force x as the initial force, with the subsequent forces proceeding as before. But then z would neither force nor get forced, and hence would be critical, contradicting that z is uncritical.

Hence, some vertex $y \in T$ with $y \neq v$ is initially unfilled as well. Since y is a neighbor of z , it must be that y is forced before the point at which z is to force v , requiring that a vertex outside of T forces y . By assumption, the neighbors of y outside of T form a clique. It follows that once y is forced, so are all of its neighbors outside of T . Therefore, at the point at which z is to force v , we can instead let y force v . This again gives an optimal forcing sequence in which z does not force or get forced, implying that z is critical, and contradicting that z is uncritical. \square

Proposition 5.7. *Let G be a graph, let T be a clique in G , and let z be a vertex of T with $\deg(z) = |T| - 1 \geq 1$. Suppose that z is the only vertex in T of degree $|T| - 1$ and that \overline{T} is a clique. Then z is an uncritical vertex.*

Proof. Suppose $\deg(z) = |T| - 1$ and no other vertex in T has this property. Theorem 5.5 gives that z is either critical or uncritical. Suppose for the sake of contradiction that z is critical; from some optimal zero forcing set F , fix an optimal forcing sequence in which z does not force or get forced. As $\deg(z) = |T| - 1 \geq 1$, we have $|T| \geq 2$.

Case 1: $T \subseteq F$. Since $|T| \geq 2$, there exists $x \in T$ with $x \neq z$. Consider the set $F \setminus \{x\}$. Since $z \in T$, $z \neq x$, and $T \subseteq F$, it follows that $z \in F \setminus \{x\}$. Since $\deg(z) = |T| - 1$ and z is in the clique T , it follows that $N(z) \setminus \{x\} \subseteq T \setminus \{x\} \subseteq F \setminus \{x\}$. Hence, with $F \setminus \{x\}$ as the initially filled set of vertices, $z \rightarrow x$ can be the first force, after which the forcing can proceed as in the original sequence from F . But this gives a forcing sequence from $F \setminus \{x\}$ that ends with all vertices filled, which contradicts that F is an optimal zero forcing set for G .

Case 2: $T \not\subseteq F$. Then some $v \in T$ is initially unfilled. First suppose that there does not exist an optimal forcing sequence from F in which a vertex in \overline{T} can force v . Hence, some $x \in T$ forces v . By our assumptions on z , neither x nor v is equal to z . In particular, each of x and v has degree greater than $|T| - 1$, and so is adjacent to some vertex in \overline{T} . Hence, let $a \in \overline{T}$ be adjacent to v and let $b \in \overline{T}$ be adjacent to x .

Since T is a clique, at the point when x forces v , it must be that $T \setminus \{v\}$ is filled. At that point, by our assumption in this case, a cannot force v . Hence, either a is unfilled, or some neighbor $w \neq v$ of a is unfilled. In the latter case, $w \in \overline{T}$, since every vertex in $T \setminus \{v\}$ is filled. Either way, we have that \overline{T} contains some unfilled vertex. It follows that no vertex in \overline{T} could have forced before x forced v . Similarly, since T is a clique and v is unfilled, no vertex in T could have forced either. Thus, x is the first vertex to force, implying that $b \in F$. Hence, let $F' = (F \setminus \{b\}) \cup \{v\}$ and consider the sequence of forces from F' where $x \rightarrow b$ is the first force and the rest of the forces occur as in the forcing sequence from F . This shows that F' is an optimal zero forcing set such that $T \subseteq F'$. By the argument of Case 1, this gives a contradiction.

Now suppose v gets forced by a vertex in \overline{T} . Since T is a clique and v is unfilled, all vertices that force before v is forced must be in \overline{T} . Hence, the forces that happen before v gets forced are not dependent on z being filled. Since T is a clique, if a vertex $x \in T$ gets forced by a vertex in \overline{T} , without loss of generality say v forces x . Then x must be the last vertex to get forced in G since \overline{T} is filled when x got forced and T is a clique. By construction of G , there exists $b \in \overline{T}$ such that x is adjacent to b . Thus, b can force x . This shows there exists a complete forcing sequence from F in which no vertex in T forces. Hence, all forces in the zero forcing sequence are independent of z being filled. Thus, F can force $V(G) \setminus \{z\}$ without z being filled. Therefore, $F \setminus \{z\}$ can force $V(G) \setminus \{z\}$ and v can force z last. This shows that $F \setminus \{z\}$ is a zero forcing set, which contradicts that F is an optimal zero forcing set. \square

Example 5.8. Proposition 5.7 requires that the set of vertices outside of the clique T must themselves form a clique (implying that the graph is cobipartite). In Proposition 5.6, the conditions on those vertices are weaker. The graph in Figure 9 shows that these weaker conditions would not be enough for Proposition 5.7. The clique T indicated there satisfies the conditions of Proposition 5.6, and even the stronger condition that the set of vertices outside of T that are adjacent to some vertex in T induces a clique. Nevertheless, vertex 1 is critical (and therefore not uncritical), since there is an optimal zero forcing set (the vertices shown as filled in the figure) from which there is a complete sequence of forces such that vertex 1 neither forces nor gets forced.

Definition 5.9. When a graph G is not saturated with respect to a partition (V_1, V_2) of its vertex set, this is because some vertex in V_1 (or, respectively, V_2) is not adjacent to any vertex in V_2 (respectively, V_1). We say that such a vertex is *unsaturated* with respect to that partition. Where there is no risk of ambiguity and the partition can be understood from the context, we may simply refer to it as an *unsaturated vertex*.




FIGURE 9. Graph showing that Proposition 5.7 requires a stronger condition on the vertices outside of T than does Proposition 5.6.

Theorem 5.10. *Let G be a graph that is cobipartite with clique partition (V_1, V_2) such that V_1 has $k_1 \geq 1$ unsaturated vertices. Let H be the graph obtained by deleting all of the unsaturated vertices in V_1 . Then*

$$Z(G) = Z(H) + k_1 - 1.$$

Proof. Note that the unsaturated vertices of V_1 are precisely those with degree $|V_1| - 1$. We may delete them one at a time. Each of these deletions that does not remove the last such vertex decreases the zero forcing number by 1, by Proposition 5.6 and Theorem 5.3. Finally, when there is exactly one such vertex remaining, removing it has no effect on the zero forcing number, by Propositions 5.7 and 5.4. Hence, $Z(H) = Z(G) - (k_1 - 1)$, from which the result follows. \square

Theorem 5.11. *Let G be a graph that is cobipartite with clique partition (V_1, V_2) such that the number of unsaturated vertices in V_1 and the number in V_2 are $k_1 \geq 1$ and $k_2 \geq 1$, respectively. Let H be the graph obtained by deleting all of the unsaturated vertices in G . Then*

$$Z(G) = Z(H) + (k_1 - 1) + (k_2 - 1).$$

Proof. Let H' be the result of deleting from G all of the unsaturated vertices in V_1 . Then the unsaturated vertices of V_2 still exist in H' , and H is the result of deleting them from H' . One application of Theorem 5.10 gives $Z(G) = Z(H') + (k_1 - 1)$, while a second application (applied to H') gives $Z(H') = Z(H) + (k_2 - 1)$. Combining these equations gives the desired result. \square

For many of the results regarding cobipartite graphs in Section 4, an essential hypothesis was that the graph be saturated with respect to some partition. We are now prepared to see that in most cases, this assumption is in fact essential. For instance, the next result shows that this hypothesis cannot be dropped from Theorem 4.8.

Proposition 5.12. *Let \mathcal{Y} be an $m \times n$ zero-nonzero pattern and let G be the cobipartite graph associated with \mathcal{Y} , with (V_1, V_2) the corresponding clique partition of G . If V_1 contains $k_1 \geq 1$ unsaturated vertices and V_2 contains no unsaturated vertices, then*

$$Z(G) = m + n - \text{tri}(\mathcal{Y}) - 1.$$

Proof. Let \mathcal{Y}' be the pattern that results from deleting from \mathcal{Y} each row and column consisting entirely of zeros. Then the size of \mathcal{Y}' is $m' \times n'$ where $m' = m - k_1$. Moreover, $\text{tri}(\mathcal{Y}) = \text{tri}(\mathcal{Y}')$. Let G' be the result of deleting all unsaturated vertices from G . Then G' is the cobipartite graph associated with \mathcal{Y}' and is saturated with respect to the corresponding clique partition. Hence, Theorem 4.8 gives

$$(5.1) \quad Z(G') = m' + n - \text{tri}(\mathcal{Y}') = (m - k_1) + n - \text{tri}(\mathcal{Y}).$$

Using Theorem 5.10, we have

$$(5.2) \quad Z(G') = Z(G) - (k_1 - 1).$$

Combining (5.1) and (5.2) then gives

$$Z(G) - (k_1 - 1) = (m - k_1) + n - \text{tri}(\mathcal{Y}),$$

which simplifies to $Z(G) = m + n - \text{tri}(\mathcal{Y}) - 1$. \square

Proposition 5.13. *Let \mathcal{Y} be an $m \times n$ zero-nonzero pattern and let G be the cobipartite graph associated with \mathcal{Y} , with (V_1, V_2) the corresponding clique partition of G . If V_1 contains $k_1 \geq 1$ unsaturated vertices and V_2 contains $k_2 \geq 1$ unsaturated vertices, then*

$$Z(G) = m + n - \text{tri}(\mathcal{Y}) - 2.$$

Proof. Let \mathcal{Y}' be the pattern that results from deleting from \mathcal{Y} each row and column consisting entirely of zeros. Then the size of \mathcal{Y}' is $m' \times n'$ where $m' = m - k_1$ and $n' = n - k_2$. Moreover, $\text{tri}(\mathcal{Y}) = \text{tri}(\mathcal{Y}')$. Let G' be the result of deleting all unsaturated vertices from G . Then G' is the cobipartite graph associated with \mathcal{Y}' and is saturated with respect to the corresponding clique partition. Hence, Theorem 4.8 gives

$$(5.3) \quad Z(G') = m' + n' - \text{tri}(\mathcal{Y}') = (m - k_1) + (n - k_2) - \text{tri}(\mathcal{Y}).$$

Using Theorem 5.11, we have

$$(5.4) \quad Z(G') = Z(G) - (k_1 - 1) - (k_2 - 1).$$

Combining (5.3) and (5.4) then gives

$$Z(G) - (k_1 - 1) - (k_2 - 1) = (m - k_1) + (n - k_2) - \text{tri}(\mathcal{Y}),$$

which simplifies to $Z(G) = m + n - \text{tri}(\mathcal{Y}) - 2$. □

The next result now follows immediately from Theorem 4.8 and Propositions 5.12 and 5.13.

Theorem 5.14. *Let \mathcal{Y} be an $m \times n$ zero-nonzero pattern and let G be the cobipartite graph associated with \mathcal{Y} . Then G is saturated with respect to the corresponding clique partition if and only if*

$$Z(G) = m + n - \text{tri}(\mathcal{Y}).$$

The above results show how the condition of G being saturated is essential for the relationship between $Z(G)$ and $\text{tri}(\mathcal{Y})$ given by Theorem 4.8. Example 4.19 showed that this condition is essential also for Theorem 4.10, which gives the same relationship for the parameters $M(G)$ and $\text{mr}(\mathcal{Y})$. The following corollary of Proposition 5.13 allows that example to be generalized.

Corollary 5.15. *Let \mathcal{Y} be an $m \times n$ zero-nonzero pattern and let G be the cobipartite graph associated with \mathcal{Y} . If G is not saturated with respect to the corresponding clique partition, then*

$$M(G) < m + n - \text{tri}(\mathcal{Y}),$$

or, equivalently, $\text{tri}(\mathcal{Y}) < \text{mr}(G)$.

Proof. When G is not saturated with respect to the clique partition corresponding to \mathcal{Y} , we have by Theorems 1.2 and 5.14 that $M(G) \leq Z(G) < m + n - \text{tri}(\mathcal{Y})$, implying that $\text{tri}(\mathcal{Y}) < \text{mr}(G)$. □

We may now regard Example 4.19 as a special case of a more general situation. In particular, consider any zero-nonzero pattern \mathcal{Y} such that $\text{mr}(\mathcal{Y}) = \text{tri}(\mathcal{Y})$. (In particular, by the results of [5, 15, 16], any pattern with fewer than 7 rows will have this property.) Add at least one row or column of all 0 entries to \mathcal{Y} to produce \mathcal{Y}' . Then the cobipartite graph G' associated with \mathcal{Y}' will not be saturated with respect to the corresponding partition of G' into cliques, and so Corollary 5.15 can be applied to give $\text{mr}(\mathcal{Y}') = \text{tri}(\mathcal{Y}') < \text{mr}(G')$.

Finally, we turn our attention to Theorem 4.18, which showed, in the case where G is saturated, that over any infinite field, $M(G) = Z(G)$ is equivalent to $\text{mr}(\mathcal{Y}) = \text{tri}(\mathcal{Y})$. It is natural to ask whether this equivalence persists even in the unsaturated case. In the present work, we were not able to settle this question completely. The situation is as follows.

In the saturated case, Theorem 4.10 gives

$$(5.5) \quad M(G) = m + n - \text{mr}(\mathcal{Y}),$$

while Theorem 4.8 gives the same relationship for the corresponding combinatorial bounds, namely

$$(5.6) \quad Z(G) = m + n - \text{tri}(\mathcal{Y}).$$

By Theorem 5.14, the introduction of unsaturated vertices creates a gap between the left- and right-hand sides of (5.6). This gap is given explicitly by Propositions 5.12 and 5.13, and the question is whether

an equal gap always occurs between the two sides of (5.5). Adding unsaturated vertices to G simply adds rows and columns of all 0 entries to \mathcal{Y} , which clearly has no effect on the right-hand side of (5.5); the question, then, rests entirely on how adding unsaturated vertices affects the maximum nullity, and whether the effect must match that on the zero forcing number.

Question 5.16. Let G be a graph that is cobipartite with clique partition (V_1, V_2) such that the number of unsaturated vertices in V_1 and the number in V_2 are k_1 and k_2 , respectively. Let H be the graph obtained by deleting all unsaturated vertices from G . Must the equation

$$M(G) = \begin{cases} M(H) + (k_1 - 1) + (k_2 - 1) & \text{if } k_1 \geq 1 \text{ and } k_2 \geq 1, \\ M(H) + (k_1 - 1) & \text{if } k_1 \geq 1 \text{ and } k_2 = 0 \end{cases}$$

hold in every case?

In light of Propositions 5.12 and 5.13, the equivalence given by Theorem 4.18 between $M(G) = Z(G)$ and $\text{mr}(\mathcal{Y}) = \text{tri}(\mathcal{Y})$ persists in the unsaturated case if and only if Question 5.16 has an affirmative answer.

REFERENCES

- [1] Francesco Barioli, Wayne Barrett, Shaun M. Fallat, H. Tracy Hall, Leslie Hogben, Bryan Shader, P. van den Driessche, and Hein van der Holst. Zero forcing parameters and minimum rank problems. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 433(2):401–411, 2010. doi:10.1016/j.laa.2010.03.008.
- [2] Francesco Barioli, Wayne Barrett, Shaun M. Fallat, H. Tracy Hall, Leslie Hogben, Bryan Shader, P. van den Driessche, and Hein van der Holst. Parameters related to tree-width, zero forcing, and maximum nullity of a graph. *J. Graph Theory*, 72(2):146–177, 2013. doi:10.1002/jgt.21637.
- [3] Francesco Barioli, Shaun Fallat, and Leslie Hogben. Computation of minimal rank and path cover number for certain graphs. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 392:289–303, 2004. doi:10.1016/j.laa.2004.06.019.
- [4] Francesco Barioli, Shaun M. Fallat, H. Tracy Hall, Daniel Hershkowitz, Leslie Hogben, Hein van der Holst, and Bryan Shader. On the minimum rank of not necessarily symmetric matrices: a preliminary study. *Electron. J. Linear Algebra*, 18:126–145, 2009. doi:10.13001/1081-3810.1300.
- [5] Rafael Cantó and Charles R. Johnson. The relationship between maximum triangle size and minimum rank for zero-nonzero patterns. In *Mathematical papers in honour of Eduardo Marques de Sá*, volume 39 of *Textos Mat. Sér. B*, pages 39–48. Univ. Coimbra, Coimbra, 2006.
- [6] Louis Deaett. Matroids and the minimum rank problem for matrix patterns. *Amer. Math. Monthly*, 127(9):771–788, 2020. doi:10.1080/00029890.2020.1801078.
- [7] Christina J. Edholm, Leslie Hogben, My Huynh, Joshua LaGrange, and Darren D. Row. Vertex and edge spread of zero forcing number, maximum nullity, and minimum rank of a graph. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 436(12):4352–4372, 2012. doi:10.1016/j.laa.2010.10.015.
- [8] Shaun M. Fallat and Leslie Hogben. The minimum rank of symmetric matrices described by a graph: A survey. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 426(2):558–582, 2007. doi:10.1016/j.laa.2007.05.036.
- [9] Wei Fang, Wei Gao, Yubin Gao, Fei Gong, Guangming Jing, Zhongshan Li, Yanling Shao, and Lihua Zhang. Minimum ranks of sign patterns and zero-nonzero patterns and point-hyperplane configurations. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 558:44–62, 2018. doi:10.1016/j.laa.2018.08.019.
- [10] AIM Minimum Rank-Special Graphs Work Group. Zero forcing sets and the minimum rank of graphs. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 428(7):1628–1648, 2008. doi:10.1016/j.laa.2007.10.009.
- [11] Daniel Hershkowitz and Hans Schneider. Ranks of zero patterns and sign patterns. *Linear and Multilinear Algebra*, 34(1):3–19, 1993. doi:10.1080/03081089308818204.
- [12] Leslie Hogben. Spectral graph theory and the inverse eigenvalue problem of a graph. *Electron. J. Linear Algebra*, 14:12–31, 2005. doi:10.13001/1081-3810.1174.
- [13] Leslie Hogben, My Huynh, Nicole Kingsley, Sarah Meyer, Shanise Walker, and Michael Young. Propagation time for zero forcing on a graph. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 160(13-14):1994–2005, 2012. doi:10.1016/j.dam.2012.04.003.
- [14] Leslie Hogben, Jephian C.-H. Lin, and Bryan L. Shader. *Inverse problems and Zero Forcing for Graphs*, volume 270 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, [2022] ©2022. doi:10.1090/surv/270.
- [15] Charles R. Johnson and Joshua A. Link. The extent to which triangular sub-patterns explain minimum rank. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 156(10):1637–1651, 2008. doi:10.1016/j.dam.2007.08.040.
- [16] Charles R. Johnson and Yulin Zhang. On the possible ranks among matrices with a given pattern. *Discrete Math. Algorithms Appl.*, 2(3):363–377, 2010. doi:10.1142/S1793830910000711.
- [17] C.-H. Lin. Applications of zero forcing number to the minimum rank problem. Master’s thesis, National Taiwan University, 2011.

- [18] Jephian C.-H. Lin. Odd cycle zero forcing parameters and the minimum rank of graph blowups. *Electron. J. Linear Algebra*, 31:42–59, 2016. doi:[10.13001/1081-3810.2836](https://doi.org/10.13001/1081-3810.2836).

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, QUINNIPIAC UNIVERSITY, HAMDEN, CT 06518, USA (LOUIS.DEAETT@QUINNIPIAC.EDU)

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, MOUNT HOLYOKE COLLEGE, SOUTH HADLEY, MA 01075, USA (DY-
OUNG@MTHOLYOKE.EDU)