

Simpler and efficient characterizations of tree t -spanners for graphs with few P_4 's and (k, ℓ) -graphs

Fernanda Couto^a, Luís Cunha^{b,**} and Diego Ferraz^c

^a*Departamento de Ciência da Computação, Universidade Federal Rural do Rio de Janeiro, Nova Iguaçu, Rio de Janeiro, Brasil*

^b*Departamento de Ciência da Computação, Universidade Federal Fluminense, Niterói, Rio de Janeiro, Brasil*

^c*COPPE, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brasil*

E-mail: fernandavdc@ufrj.br [F. Couto]; lflignacio@ic.uff.br [L. Cunha]; ferrazda@cos.uff.br [D. Ferraz]

Received DD MMMM YYYY; received in revised form DD MMMM YYYY; accepted DD MMMM YYYY

Abstract

A tree t -spanner of a graph G is a spanning tree T in which the distance between any two adjacent vertices of G is at most t . The smallest t for which G has a tree t -spanner is called tree stretch index. The t -admissibility problem aims to decide whether the tree stretch index is at most t . Regarding its optimization version, the smallest t for which G is t -admissible is the stretch index of G , denoted by $\sigma_T(G)$. Given a graph with n vertices and m edges, the recognition of 2-admissible graphs can be done $O(n + m)$ time, whereas t -admissibility is NP-complete for $\sigma_T(G) \leq t$, $t \geq 4$ and deciding if $t = 3$ is an open problem, for more than 20 years. Since the structural knowledge of classes can be determinant to classify 3-admissibility's complexity, in this paper we present simpler and faster algorithms to check 2 and 3-admissibility for families of graphs with few P_4 's and (k, ℓ) -graphs. Regarding $(0, \ell)$ -graphs, we present lower and upper bounds for the stretch index of these graphs and characterize graphs whose stretch indexes are equal to the proposed upper bound. Moreover, we prove that t -admissibility is NP-complete even for line graphs of subdivided graphs.

Keywords: 3-admissibility; Stretch index; graphs with few P_4 's; (k, ℓ) -graphs; structural characterization

1. Introduction

A tree t -spanner of a graph G is a spanning tree T of G in which the distance between every pair of vertices is at most t times their distance in G or, equivalently, the distance between two adjacent vertices of G is at most t in T (cf. Cai and Corneil (1995); Couto et al. (2020); Couto and Cunha (2020)). If a graph has a tree t -spanner, then it is called a *tree t -spanner admissible graph* (or simply *t -admissible*).

^{**} Author to whom all correspondence should be addressed (e-mail: lflignacio@ic.uff.br).

The parameter t of a tree t -spanner is called the *tree stretch factor*, denoted by $\sigma(T)$, and the smallest t for which G is t -admissible is the *tree stretch index* of G , denoted by $\sigma_T(G)$. The t -admissibility problem aims to decide whether $\sigma_T(G) \leq t$. The problem of determining the *tree stretch index* of G is also called the MINIMUM STRETCH SPANNING TREE PROBLEM (MSST). From now on, when we refer to MSST, we are dealing with the decision version of this problem.

On the 2-admissibility problem

Cai and Corneil (1995) proved that t -admissibility is NP-complete, for $t \geq 4$, whereas 2-admissible graphs can be recognized in $O(|V| + |E|)$ time. However, the characterization of 3-admissible graphs is still an open problem. The characterization of 2-admissible graphs (Theorem 1.1) deals with triconnected components of a connected graph, defined as any maximal subgraph that does not contain two vertices whose removal disconnects the graph. A *nonseparable* graph is a graph without a *cut vertex*, i.e., a vertex whose removal disconnects the graph. A *star* with $n + 1$ vertices is the complete bipartite graph $K_{1,n}$. A *v-centered star* is a star centered on v .

Theorem 1.1. *Cai and Corneil (1995) A nonseparable graph G is 2-admissible if and only if G contains a spanning tree T such that for each triconnected component H of G , $T \cap H$ is a spanning star of H .*

So far, there are not studies regarding structural characterization of 2-admissible graphs. Theorem 1.1 can be used in order to develop an $O(n + m)$ time algorithm (see Cai and Corneil (1995)), which consists, in a nutshell, of: i) finding universal vertices in each triconnected component of a graph G ; or ii) verifying that in each biconnected component of G with adjacent vertices u and v , forming a vertex cut of length two, the corresponding edge uv belongs to a tree 2-spanner of G . The resulted subgraph H considering i) and ii) is a tree 2-spanner of G if and only if H is a spanning tree of G .

The above strategy is a constructive algorithm and do not provide directly structural characterizations for graphs to be 2-admissible without considering their spanning tree. Since the recognition of 3-admissible graphs is an open problem, there are graph classes whose stretch indexes are bounded by specific values, such as cographs or split graphs (*cf.* Couto and Cunha (2020)). Moreover, there are not many studies developing algorithms in order to determine the exact value of the stretch indexes for graph classes which are 3-admissible in a better way than the recognition of general 2-admissible graphs.

Contributions

We develop faster and simpler ways to determine stretch indexes for: graphs with few P_4 's, i.e. graphs with a bounded number of induced P_4 's; and subclasses of (k, ℓ) -graphs, i.e. graphs whose vertex sets can be partitioned into k independent sets and ℓ cliques.

Both classes have already been considered by Couto and Cunha (2019, 2020), by an extensive study on P *versus* NP-complete dichotomy regarding t -admissibility. Section 2 is devoted to study of admissibility for graphs with few P_4 's, which have stretch index equal to 2 or 3. The proposed strategies are simpler and faster than the application of Cai and Corneil's recognition algorithm for cographs, P_4 -sparse graphs and P_4 -tidy graphs. Section 3 presents structural characterizations for 3-admissible (k, ℓ) -graphs, such

as $(1, 1)$ - and $(0, 2)$ -graphs. Moreover, regarding $(0, \ell)$ -graphs, lower and upper bounds for the stretch index are presented, as well as a characterization of graphs that have stretch indexes equal to the proposed upper bound. We also settle that t -admissibility is NP-complete for line graphs of subdivided graphs, which turns t -admissibility closely related to the edge t -admissibility problem, as proposed by Couto et al. (2020). Section 4 concludes the paper with final remarks and open questions.

Preliminaries. Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, $d_G(x, y)$ denotes the distance between x and y in G and $d_G(v)$, the degree of v in G . A *pendant vertex* is a vertex of degree 1. A *non-edge* of a spanning tree T is an edge of $G \setminus T$. A p -path (or a path P_{p+1}) is a path formed by p edges ($p + 1$ vertices). Given a graph G , its *line graph* $L(G)$ is obtained as follows: $V(L(G)) = E(G)$; $E(L(G)) = \{\{uv, uw\} | uv, uw \in E(G)\}$. I.e., each edge of G is a vertex of $L(G)$ and if two edges share an endpoint, then their corresponding vertices are adjacent in $L(G)$. The *distance between two edges* e_1 and e_2 of G , for $e_1, e_2 \in E(G)$ is the distance between their corresponding vertices in $L(G)$. The subdivided graph of G is the one so that each edge $vw \in E(G)$ becomes a path v, x, w , where x is a new vertex.

2. Graphs with few P_4 's

Graphs with few P_4 's can be constructed by a finite number of operations, as union and join. Given graphs $G_i = (V_i, E_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, p$, we formally define the union and the join operations, resp., as follows: $G_1 \textcircled{\cup} \dots \textcircled{\cup} G_p = (V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_p, E_1 \cup \dots \cup E_p)$; $G_1 \textcircled{\cap} \dots \textcircled{\cap} G_p = (V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_p, E_1 \cup \dots \cup E_p \cup \{xy | x \in V_i, y \in V_j, i \neq j, 1 \leq i, j \leq p\})$.

A *cograph* is a P_4 -free graph. A trivial graph is a cograph, and any other can be obtained by disjoint union or join operations of cographs. Lemma 2.1 states that any graph obtained by the join of two graphs, $G = G_1 \textcircled{\cap} G_2$, is a 3-admissible graph.

Lemma 2.1. [Couto and Cunha (2019)] *Given graphs G_1 and G_2 , and $G = G_1 \textcircled{\cap} G_2$, we have that G is 3-admissible.*

As a direct consequence of Lemma 2.1, we have that cographs are 3-admissible. Moreover, Lemma 2.1 implies that, if G is a cograph, then $\sigma_T(G) \leq 3$. Interestingly, having a universal vertex is also a necessary condition for a cograph to be 2-admissible, according to Couto and Cunha (2019). Hence, 2-admissibility recognition can be done in $O(n)$ time for cographs, for n being the number of vertices of a given cograph G , by checking whether G has a universal vertex.

A graph is P_4 -sparse if for each set of 5 vertices, there is at most one induced P_4 . A graph G is P_4 -tidy if, for each induced P_4 of G , say P , there is at most one vertex $v \in V(G) \setminus V(P)$ such that $V(P) \cup \{v\}$ induces at most two P_4 's in G .

Stretch index vs spider operation. A graph G is a *spider* if its vertex set can be partitioned into \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{K} and \mathcal{R} such that (i) \mathcal{K} is a clique, \mathcal{S} is an independent set and $|\mathcal{S}| = |\mathcal{K}| \geq 2$; (ii) each vertex of \mathcal{R} is adjacent to all vertices of \mathcal{K} (a join operation) and is non-adjacent to any vertex of \mathcal{S} ; (iii) There is a bijection $f : \mathcal{S} \mapsto \mathcal{K}$ such that, for all $x \in \mathcal{S}$, either $N(x) = \{f(x)\}$, called a *thin spider*, or $N(x) = \mathcal{K} - \{f(x)\}$, called a *thick spider*.

Jamison and Olariu (1992) constructively characterized P_4 -sparse graphs. A graph G is P_4 -sparse if and only if for each one of its induced subgraphs H , exactly one of the following conditions is satisfied: (i) H is disconnected; (ii) \overline{H} is disconnected; (iii) H is isomorphic to a spider. Note that items (i) and (ii) suggest the union and the join operations applied in a cograph construction. In order to construct a P_4 -sparse graph, an operation concerning item (iii) is defined in the following. Let $G_1 = (V_1, \emptyset)$ and $G_2 = (V_2, E_2)$ be two disjoint graphs, where $V_2 = \{v\} \cup \mathcal{K} \cup \mathcal{R}$ and such that: (a) $|\mathcal{K}| = |V_1| + 1 \geq 2$; (b) \mathcal{K} is a clique; (c) $x \in \mathcal{R}$ is adjacent to each vertex $x' \in \mathcal{K}$ and x is not adjacent to v ; (d) there exists a vertex $v' \in \mathcal{K}$ such that $N_{G_2}(v) = \{v'\}$ or $N_{G_2}(v) = \mathcal{K} \setminus \{v'\}$. Choose a bijective function $f : V_1 \mapsto \mathcal{K} \setminus \{v'\}$ and define the operation $\textcircled{2}$ as follows: $G_1 \textcircled{2} G_2 = (V_1 \cup V_2, E_2 \cup E')$, where $E' = \{xf(x) \mid x \in V_1\}$, if $N_{G_2}(v) = \{v'\}$, or $E' = \{xz \mid x \in V_1, z \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \{v'\}\}$, if $N_{G_2}(v) = \mathcal{K} \setminus \{v'\}$.

A graph is a spider if and only if it can be obtained by the two proper induced subgraphs generated by $\textcircled{2}$. Moreover, a spider is P_4 -sparse if and only if the subgraph induced by \mathcal{R} is P_4 -sparse Jamison and Olariu (1992). In this way, a graph G is P_4 -sparse if and only if G can be obtained from trivial graphs, by applying, in any order, operations $\textcircled{0}$, $\textcircled{1}$ and $\textcircled{2}$ a finite number of times.

As a consequence, each P_4 -sparse graph has an associated tree, called *PS-tree*. Essentially, in a PS-tree, leaves are the vertices of the graph, each internal node is labeled by 0, 1 or 2 (accordingly to the operation applied to the associated subtree). See Jamison and Olariu (1992) for construction details.

Lemma 2.2. [Couto and Cunha (2019)] *Let G be a spider graph. If G is a thin spider, then $\sigma_T(G) = 2$. Otherwise, $\sigma_T(G) = 3$.*

Lemma 2.3. *Let G be a P_4 -sparse graph, then $\sigma_T(G) \leq 3$.*

Proof. Let T be the PS-tree of G rooted in r . Since G must be connected, then r has label either 1 or 2. In each case, we analyze the possible root's subtrees. If r 's label is equal to 1, then there is a $\textcircled{1}$ operation, and by Lemma 2.1, we have that G is 3-admissible. If r 's label is equal to 2, then G is a spider graph, and 3-admissible by Lemma 2.2. \square

Lemma 2.4. [Couto and Cunha (2019)] *If G is a connected P_4 -sparse graph which is not a thin spider and without a universal vertex, then $\sigma_T(G) = 3$.*

Theorem 2.1. [Couto and Cunha (2019)] *A P_4 -sparse graph G is 2-admissible if and only if either G has a universal vertex; or G is a thin spider.*

Proof. Clearly, if G has a universal vertex or if G is a thin spider, then $\sigma_T(G) = 2$. For the converse, suppose G is not a thin spider and does not have a universal vertex. So, its PS-tree's root has label 2 (in this case G is a thick spider) or 1. Hence, by Lemmas 2.2 and 2.4, resp., $\sigma_T(G) = 3$. \square

Giakoumakis et al. (1997) described a recognition algorithm to spider graphs and the corresponding triple $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{K}, \mathcal{R})$ to spider partitions in linear time. Hence, given a P_4 -sparse graph, based on Theorem 2.1, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 2.2. *2-admissibility can be decided in $O(n)$ time for P_4 -sparse graphs with n vertices.*

Proof. By the degree sequence of a P_4 -sparse graph G , we can check if there is a universal vertex or if there are pendant vertices associated to the independent set \mathcal{S} of a thin spider. \square

A natural generalization of P_4 -sparse graphs are the P_4 -tidy graphs. A graph H is an *almost-spider* graph if H can be constructed from a spider graph $G = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{K}, \mathcal{R})$ by adding a vertex v' which is either a false twin of v or a true twin of v , such that $v \in \mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{K}$ Jamison and Olariu (1995). Hence, we call H a \mathcal{P} -false-almost-spider and \mathcal{P} -true-almost-spider, resp., where \mathcal{P} is the set to which v belongs, i.e., $\mathcal{P} \in \{\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{K}\}$. In the same way, if G is a thin (or thick) spider, then H is a *true* or *false-almost-thin* (or *thick*)-spider. A P_4 -tidy graph G can be constructed by the following way: i) $G_1 \textcircled{0} G_2$, for G_1 and G_2 being P_4 -tidy graphs; ii) $G_1 \textcircled{1} G_2$, for G_1 and G_2 being P_4 -tidy graphs; iii) G is a spider; iv) G is an almost spider; v) G is P_5 , C_5 , $\overline{P_5}$, or K_1 . Since PS -trees represent P_4 -sparse graphs, we can develop in a similar way a tree representation of a P_4 -tidy graph Giakoumakis et al. (1997).

Lemma 2.5. *Let G be an almost-spider graph, then $\sigma_T(G) \leq 3$.*

Proof. Fig. 1 depicts all almost-spider graphs and their solutions. □




Fig. 1. Almost spider graph H obtained from spider graph G , v and v' are twin vertices. Bold edges are tree spanners of H . a) H is a \mathcal{S} -false-almost-thin-spider. $\sigma_T(G) = 2$ and $\sigma_T(H) = 2$; b) \mathcal{K} -false-almost-thin-spider. $\sigma_T(G) = 2$ and $\sigma_T(H) = 3$; c) \mathcal{S} -true-almost-thin-spider. $\sigma_T(G) = 2$ and $\sigma_T(H) = 2$; d) \mathcal{K} -true-almost-thin-spider. $\sigma_T(G) = 2$ and $\sigma_T(H) = 2$; e) \mathcal{S} -false-almost-thick-spider. $\sigma_T(G) = 3$ and $\sigma_T(H) = 3$; f) \mathcal{K} -false-almost-thick-spider. $\sigma_T(G) = 3$ and $\sigma_T(H) = 3$; g) \mathcal{S} -true-almost-thick-spider. $\sigma_T(G) = 3$ and $\sigma_T(H) = 3$; h) \mathcal{K} -true-almost-thick-spider. $\sigma_T(G) = 3$ and $\sigma_T(H) = 3$.

By cases i) - v) to construct a P_4 -tidy graph and results above, if G is a P_4 -tidy graph, then G is 3-admissible, excepted if G is a C_5 .

Lemma 2.6. *Let G be an almost-spider graph. G is 2-admissible if and only if G is a \mathcal{S} -almost-thin-spider (false or true), or is a \mathcal{K} -true-almost-thin-spider.*

Proof. Clearly, if G is an almost spider, as described above, it is 2-admissible. Conversely, suppose G is a 2-admissible almost-spider, and, by contradiction, that G is either an almost-thick-spider or a \mathcal{K} -false-almost-thin-spider. It is easy to see that if G is an almost-thick-spider the stretch index is at least 3, since the addition of a true or false twin to a thick spider cannot decrease its parameter. So, suppose G is a \mathcal{K} -false-almost-thin-spider by the addition of a false twin v of $u \in \mathcal{K}$. Note that $H = \mathcal{K} \cup \mathcal{R} \cup \{v\}$ is a triconnected component. Since G is 2-admissible, there is a spanning tree of G such that $T \cap H$ is a star. Since v nor u are universal in H , they are leaves of the star. Thus the vertex in \mathcal{S} that is adjacent to both is apart from one of them in T by a distance of at least 3, a contradiction. □

Similarly to Theorem 2.1, we are able to characterize the P_4 -tidy graphs that are 2-admissible.

Theorem 2.3. *A P_4 -tidy graph G is 2-admissible if and only if either: G has a universal vertex; or G is a thin spider; or G is a \mathcal{S} -almost-thin-spider (false or true); or G is a \mathcal{K} -true-almost-thin-spider.*

Proof. If G is one of the graphs described above, then G is 2-admissible by Lemmas 2.2 and 2.6. Conversely, suppose G is a P_4 -tidy graph 2-admissible but it is distinct of each graph above. Hence, we have that G does not have a universal vertex and it is of the following cases: i) G is \mathcal{K} -false-almost-thin-spider; ii) G is \mathcal{S} -almost-thick-spider (false or true); iii) G is a thick spider; iv) G is a join of two P_4 -tidy graphs. If G is one of cases i)-iii), then, by Lemmas 2.4 and 2.6, we have a contradiction. If G is a join of two P_4 -tidy graphs G_1 and G_2 , then: if G_1 or G_2 is connected, then G is a triconnected graph, and since G does not have a universal vertex, then $\sigma_T(G) \geq 3$, a contradiction; if both G_1 and G_2 are disconnected and G is a triconnected graph, then similarly to the previous case, $\sigma_T(G) \geq 3$. Now, if G_1 and G_2 are disconnected and G is not a triconnected graph, then $\min\{|V(G_1)|, |V(G_2)|\} = 2$, and since there is not a universal vertex in G , then there is an induced C_k , $k \geq 4$, in G , which implies $\sigma_T(G) \geq 3$, a contradiction. \square

Theorem 2.4. *2-admissibility can be decided in $O(n)$ time for P_4 -tidy graphs with n vertices.*

Proof. By the degree sequence of a P_4 -tidy graph G , we can check if G has universal vertices in $O(n)$ time. Additionally, from the recognition of thin spider graphs we can check if G is a thin spider, by looking for pendant vertices associated to the independent set \mathcal{S} of G . Moreover, we can also check if G is a \mathcal{S} -almost-thin-spider (false or true) or if it is a \mathcal{K} -true-almost-thin-spider in $O(n)$ time, by checking if exactly one of the vertices in \mathcal{K} has a degree greater than the number of the other vertices of \mathcal{K} . \square

3. Stretch index for (k, ℓ) -graphs

Couto and Cunha (2020) settled the NP-completeness of MSST for (k, ℓ) -graphs, for $k + \ell \geq 3$. Regarding some other values of k and ℓ , there is no characterization on the 2-admissibility of $(0, 2)$ -graphs. (k, ℓ) -graphs fit on the framework of MSST interesting classes, since $(0, 2)$ -graphs are 3-admissible whereas for $(2, 0)$ -graphs the MSST is known to be NP-complete for $t \geq 5$ Brandstadt et al. (2007). Although for several values of k and ℓ , MSST is NP-complete, we can determine the stretch index for some (k, ℓ) -graphs in polynomial-time.

3.1. $(1, 1)$ -graphs

A graph $G = (X, Y)$ is a *split graph*, also called a $(1, 1)$ -graph, if and only if it can be partitioned into a clique X and a stable set Y . In terms of forbidden subgraphs, they are $\{2K_2, C_4, C_5\}$ -free graphs.

Lemma 3.1. *If G is a split graph, then $\sigma_T(G) \leq 3$.*

Proof. We obtain a spanning tree T for a split graph $G = (X, Y)$ as follows. Set any vertex x in X to be the center of a star which includes each other vertex of X . Next, for each vertex $y \in Y$, choose an edge incident to y , arbitrarily, and make y a pendant in T . It remains to show that the distance between

two adjacent vertices v, w in G is at most 3 in T . i) $v, w \in X$: since we have a star in T with respect to X , then $d(v, w) = 2$. ii) $v \in X, w \in Y$: the worst case occurs when $d_G(w) \geq 2$ and v is a leaf of the star in T . In this case, $d(v, w) = 3$ by the path vxw , where xw belongs to T . \square

In Proposition 3.1 we characterize the stretch indexes for split graphs.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $G = (X, Y)$ be a split graph which is not a tree. Thus, $\sigma_T(G) = 2$ if and only if either: i) $d_G(y) = 1, \forall y \in Y$, or ii) $\exists x \in \bigcap_{y \in Y} N_G(y), x \in X$ such that $d_G(y) \geq 2$.*

Proof. If G satisfies i) or ii), then G contains a tree 2-spanner which can be constructed following Lemma 3.1, and, particularly in case ii), consider any vertex x satisfying conditions required in ii) to be center of the star. Conversely, by contradiction, since $\sigma_T(G) = 2$, for each pair of vertices in X there is in T either an edge or a P_3 centered in a vertex v of G . If $v \in X$, then the minimum stretch spanning subtree with respect to X is a star. Otherwise, $v \in Y$ and each vertex of the clique would be a leaf of the star centered in v . Once there are two vertices in Y with degree at least 2 without an adjacent vertex in common, in the first case, for any center of the star we have chosen regarding the clique's vertices, there is a vertex of the stable set such that all its neighbors are leaves of the star, which implies $\sigma_T(G) \geq 3$. In the second case, $\sigma_T(G) \geq 3$ anyway, because, by hypothesis, there exist at least two more vertices in Y with degree at least 2, and they will be adjacent only to the leaves of the star centered in v . \square

Theorem 3.1. *2-admissibility can be decided in $O(n)$ time for split graphs with n vertices.*

Proof. Given a split graph G , first we apply a preprocessing procedure by removing all pendant vertices of G , since these edges must belong to any tree t -spanner of G . The removal of such edges can be done in $O(n)$ time. After this step, we check the existence of a universal vertex, which can be done also in $O(n)$ by the degree sequence of G . \square

3.2. $(0, 2)$ -Graphs

$(0, 2)$ -Graphs are 3-admissible, cf. Couto and Cunha (2020), and, in this work we characterize 2-admissible $(0, 2)$ -graphs. Given a $(0, 2)$ -partition $X = (K^1, K^2)$ of a graph G , let $H_X = G[V_{H_X}]$ be G 's transversal subgraph with respect to X , where V_{H_X} is the set of vertices incident to each transversal edge of G , i.e., edges with one extreme in K^1 and the other in K^2 .

Lemma 3.2. *Let G be a graph without a universal vertex and $X = (K^1, K^2)$ be a $(0, 2)$ -partition of G . If there exists a distinct $(0, 2)$ -partition for G , say $X' = (K^{1'}, K^{2'})$, then $H_X \simeq H_{X'} \simeq G$.*

Proof. Let $G = (K^1 \cup K^2, E)$ be a $(0, 2)$ -graph and H_X be its transversal subgraph with respect to X . Suppose there is a distinct $(0, 2)$ -partition for G , say $X' = (K^{1'}, K^{2'})$. Since there is no universal vertex in G , there is $V' \subseteq K^1$ and $V'' \subseteq K^2$ such that $(K^1 \setminus V') \cup V'' = K^{1'}$ and $(K^2 \setminus V'') \cup V' = K^{2'}$. Thus $N(V') \supseteq K^2 \setminus V''$ and $N(V'') \supseteq K^1 \setminus V'$. Therefore, there is a transversal edge incident to each vertex of G , and so $H_X \simeq G$. Moreover, for each $v \in V'$, $N_{K^{1'}}(v) \supseteq K^1 \setminus V'$ and for each $w \in V''$, $N_{K^{2'}}(w) \supseteq K^2 \setminus V''$. Hence, there are transversal edges incident to all vertices of G considering the partition X' , and consequently $H_{X'} \simeq G$. \square

By Lemma 3.2, we can assure that Lemma 3.3 provides the correct answer by the analysis of any $(0, 2)$ -partition.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $G = (K^1 \cup K^2, E)$ be a $(0, 2)$ -graph with the transversal subgraph of G with respect to the $(0, 2)$ -partition (K^1, K^2) given by H . G is 2-admissible if and only if either G has a universal vertex, G has a cut-vertex or H is a strict 2-connected graph that has not an induced C_4 .*

Proof. Clearly, if G has a universal vertex, then $\sigma_T(G) = 2$. If G has a cut-vertex v , there is a bi-star with one center vertex in v and the other in a neighbor of v from the other clique, and $\sigma_T(G) = 2$. If H is a strict 2-connected graph, $|N_{K^1}(K^2)| = 2$, w.l.g., and, once H has not an induced C_4 , there is a C_4 in H , say $abcd$ with chord ac , where $a, b \in K^1$. Since H is strict 2-connected, only a can have other neighbors in K^2 . We construct a tree 2-spanner for G which is a bi-star as follows: a is one center of the bi-star whose leaves are $V(K^1) \setminus \{a\} \cup \{c\}$, and c is the other center of the bi-star whose leaves are $V(K^2) \setminus \{c\}$. It is easy to see that $\sigma_T(G) = 2$. For the converse, suppose $\sigma_T(G) = 2$, and, by contradiction, that there is not a universal nor a cut-vertex in G and that H is either a 3-connected graph or is strict 2-connected with an induced C_4 . First, suppose H is triconnected. Note that G is not 3-connected, because there is not a universal vertex in G . Since $\sigma_T(G) = 2$, there is a spanning tree T of G such that $T \cap H$ is a star. Whatever the center is, there is a vertex in K^1 or K^2 which is not adjacent to the center, once there is not a universal vertex in G , and the distance between this vertex and at least one of its neighbors of G in T is at least 3. Now, suppose H is strict 2-connected with an induced C_4 , say $abcd$. In this case, G is clearly strict 2-connected, and, w.l.g., $N_{K^1}(K^2) = \{a, b\}$. If K^1 and K^2 are both triconnected, then there is a spanning tree T whose intersection with K^1 and K^2 are stars, thus T is a bi-star and the distance in T between two adjacent vertices of the C_4 is 3. If both are strict 2-connected, they are K_3 's, and we have 2 possibilities: either both are treated as stars in the tree 2-spanner, or at least one of them is a path. In both cases, the stretch index is at least 3. If only one between K^1 and K^2 is triconnected, say K^1 , then again there is a spanning tree T whose intersection with K^1 is a star, and similarly to the previous arguments, the distance between two adjacent vertices of the C_4 is at least 3 in T . Thus, both cases lead us to contradictions. \square

Theorem 3.2. *2-admissibility can be decided in $O(n + m)$ time for $(0, 2)$ -graphs with n vertices and m edges.*

Proof. Assuming that G is a $(0, 2)$ -graph, we check the three situations of Lemma 3.3. Firstly, we check the existence of a universal vertex, which can be done in $O(n)$ time by the degree sequence of G . Secondly, in order to find a cut-vertex in G , we use a depth-first search algorithm, which can be done in $O(n + m)$ time. For the third condition, we use a depth-first search algorithm to check if H is 2-connected, where H is the transversal subgraph of G with respect to a $(0, 2)$ -partition, and, in order to detect the existence of an induced C_4 in H , we delete all non transversal edges of G . After this step, if it remains a $2K_2$ subgraph, it means that the G contains an induced C_4 . This strategy can be done in $O(n + m)$ time. \square

3.3. $(0, \ell)$ -graphs

Couto and Cunha (2019) settled that t -admissibility is NP-complete for $(0, \ell)$ -graphs with n vertices

even if ℓ is a linear function on n . In spite of that, bounds for the stretch index on $(0, \ell)$ -graphs can be obtained, as stated in Theorem 3.3.

The *inflation* of a graph G is the graph H obtained by replacing each vertex v of G by a clique of size $d(v)$, and each edge uv of G by an edge between two vertices of the corresponding cliques of H in such a way that the edges of H which come from the edges of G form a matching of H Favaron (1998).

The class of graphs obtained by inflation is equivalent to the line graphs of subdivided graphs da Silva (2021). Note that subdivided graphs is a subclass of bipartite graph. Couto et al. (2020) proposed the *edge t -admissibility* problem, which consists of solving t -admissibility for line graphs. The authors proved that *edge t -admissibility* is NP-complete even for bipartite graphs, i.e. t -admissibility is NP-complete for line graphs of bipartite graphs.

A *generalized inflation* of a graph G is a graph H obtained by replacing each vertex v of G by a clique of size at least $d(v)$, and the remaining construction follows similarly to the inflation of a graph Barboza Queiroz (2020). Note that any generalized inflation graph H obtained by a graph G is a $(0, \ell)$ -graph, for values of $\ell = n(G)$.

Fig. 2 depicts generalized inflation graphs with their corresponding tree spanners.




Fig. 2. On the left: a connected graph G whose bold edges correspond to a tree 2-spanner T . On the middle and on the right: the inflation graph H and a generalized inflation graph Q of G , resp. Considering the last two graphs, bold edges of H and Q belong to their tree spanners from T . The remaining edges for the tree spanners of H and of Q must be stars centered in vertices adjacent to distinct cliques of graphs H and Q .

Lemma 3.4. *Any generalized inflation graph H of a connected graph G has stretch index equal to $\sigma(H) = 2\sigma(G) + 1$.*

Proof. Consider a cycle of G obtained by a sequence of vertices that corresponds to a longest $\sigma(G)$ -path $P_{\sigma(G)+1} = u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{\sigma(G)+1}$ of a tree $\sigma(G)$ -spanner of G .

Since each added clique of H corresponding to a vertex v in cycle of G has size at least 2 in H because $d_G(v) \geq 2$, then H has a cycle of size $2(\sigma(G) + 1)$ obtained by a sequence of vertices $u_1^1, u_1^2, u_2^1, u_2^2, \dots, u_{\sigma(G)+1}^1, u_{\sigma(G)+1}^2, u_1^1$, where u_i^1 and u_i^2 , for $i = 1, \dots, \sigma(G) + 1$, are two vertices of the clique corresponding to $u_i \in P_{\sigma(G)+1}$. Since inside an added clique of a longest path in any tree $\sigma(H)$ -spanner of H we must consider as few edges as possible, then we use a unique edge for each added clique in a longest path for any tree t -spanner of H . It implies that in a $(2\sigma(G) + 1)$ -path $P_{2(\sigma(G)+1)}$ in T . Hence, $\sigma(H) \geq 2\sigma(G) + 1$.

For the upper bound, note that each edge of a tree $\sigma(G)$ -spanner of G has a corresponding edge in H . Hence, we construct the spanning tree T of H as follows: add to T the edges of H that correspond to the edges of a tree $\sigma(G)$ -spanner of G ; now, for each added clique K of H add to T a spanning star of K centered in a vertex w such that $d_H(w) \geq |K|$. Therefore, note that there is a path in T given by

$P_{2(\sigma(G)+1)} = u_1^1, u_1^2, u_2^1, u_2^2, \dots, u_{2(\sigma(G)+1)}^1, u_{2(\sigma(G)+1)}^2$, implying $\sigma(H) \leq 2\sigma(G) + 1$. \square

Corollary 3.1. *If G is a cycle graph C_ℓ , then any generalized inflation graph of G has stretch index equal to $2\ell - 1$.*

Proof. Let H be any generalized inflation graph of $G = C_\ell$. Note that $\sigma(C_\ell) = \ell - 1$. Hence, by Lemma 3.4, $\sigma(H) = 2(\ell - 1) + 1 = 2\ell - 1$. \square

Corollary 3.2. *t -admissibility is NP-complete for generalized inflation graphs.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.4, G is t -admissible if and only if its inflation graph H is $(2t + 1)$ -admissible. Since t -admissibility is NP-complete for an arbitrary connected graph G , then it is NP-complete for its inflation graph H , which is equivalent to line graph of the subdivision of G , as proved by Barboza Queiroz (2020). \square

Corollary 3.3. *t -admissibility is NP-complete for line graphs of subdivided graphs.*

Note that generalized inflation graphs are a proper subset of $(0, \ell)$ -graphs. Besides of that, for any $(0, \ell)$ -graph H we can transform it into a graph G , that we call G a *subadjacent graph* of H in the following way: by transforming each clique K of the $(0, \ell)$ partition of H into a unique vertex u_K of G , and for each set of edge between cliques K and K' of H we consider an edge $u_K u_{K'}$ of G .

Theorem 3.3. *Let G be a $(0, \ell)$ -graph distinct of a tree. Hence, $2 \leq \sigma(G) \leq 2\ell - 1$.*

Proof. For the lower bound, note that any complete graph $K_{\ell'}$ is a $(0, \ell)$ -graph, $\ell' \geq \ell$, and $\sigma(K_{\ell'}) = 2$. Hence, for any $(0, \ell)$ -graph G , $\sigma(G) \geq 2$. For the upper bound, we first analyze the structure of any $(0, \ell)$ -graph. We can partition the set of $(0, \ell)$ -graphs into two sets: i) the subset A of the $(0, \ell)$ -graphs which are generalized inflation graphs; ii) the subset B of the $(0, \ell)$ -graphs which are not generalized inflation graphs. Case i) The generalized inflation graphs with maximum stretch index are those graphs H obtained from graphs G with maximum stretch index. Those graphs G are the cycle graphs, and from Corollary 3.1, the stretch index for the graphs that belong to A is upper bounded by $2\ell - 1$. Case ii) The graphs that belong to B are not inflation graphs. In this case, for any graph H in B we can consider its subadjacent graph G . Hence, we have that the stretch index of H is equal to $2\sigma(G) + 1$, for some subadjacent graph G , by the same argument given in Lemma 3.4. Therefore, any subadjacent graph G isomorphic to a cycle graph correspond to a graph H for which any edge of H is between two vertices inside a clique of a $(0, \ell)$ partition, or it is between two consecutive cliques associated to two consecutive vertices of the cycle graph G . The worst case occurs when the set of edges between two consecutive cliques form a matching, otherwise there would be a vertex y_K in a clique K adjacent to a vertex in consecutive cliques K' and K'' , hence it would be possible to create a spanning tree of H only using y_K on a $\sigma(H)$ -path. Hence, H has $\sigma(H) = 2\sigma(G) + 1 = 2\ell - 1$ because G is a cycle graph. Suppose that a subadjacent graph G of H is non isomorphic to a cycle graph, then there are edges between non consecutive vertices of a cycle, which correspond to a stretch index of G less than $n(G) - 1$, hence, less then the stretch index of a cycle graph, and by Lemma 3.4, $\sigma(H) < 2(n(G) - 1) + 1 = 2n(G) - 1$. \square

Note that as consequence of previous results, we have that if a graph is a $(0, \ell)$, then its stretch index is at most $2\ell - 1$ and the equality holds if a graph is a generalized inflation graph of a cycle graph. One may ask if such a condition is also necessary, but the answer is no. An example of a $(0, \ell)$ -graph that is

not a generalized inflation graph of a cycle graph and has stretch index equal to $2\ell - 1$ is a cycle power graph C_6^2 , which can be constructed from a cycle C_6 , adding edges from vertices at a distance equal to 2 in C_6 . Note that such a graph is a $(0, 2)$ -graph and $\sigma(C_6^2) = 3$, as proved by Couto and Cunha (2020) the stretch index of any cycle power graph.

As a direct consequence of the arguments given in Case ii) of Theorem 3.3, we have Corollary 3.4.

Corollary 3.4. *A $(0, \ell)$ -graph H has $\sigma(H) = 2\ell - 1$ if and only if the two following restrictions hold: i) the subgraph of H is a cycle graph; and ii) there is not a vertex w in H belonging to a clique K of a $(0, \ell)$ partition such that w is adjacent to vertices belonging to two other cliques K' and K'' of the $(0, \ell)$ partition of H .*

4. Conclusions

The 3-admissibility has been studied for many years, and several classes are known to be 3-admissible. Tracking these classes and structurally characterizing them sounds good when studying the tractability of the 3-admissibility, which is the greatest problem we aim to solve. In this work we determine strategies for determining the stretch indexes' for split graphs and cographs, known to be 3-admissible (c.f. Brandstadt et al. (2007); Couto and Cunha (2020)), and we deal with their superclasses: (k, ℓ) -graphs and graphs with few P_4 's. As a byproduct, we prove that t -admissibility is NP-complete for line graphs of subdivided graphs, corresponding to an advance regarding the edge t -admissible problem, proposed by Couto et al. (2020). Regarding $(0, \ell)$ -graphs, we present lower and upper bounds for the stretch index, in such a way that we are able to determine graph classes that have stretch indexes reaching either the lower or the upper bound and characterize graphs that have stretch index equal to the proposed upper bound. For graphs with few P_4 's, our characterizations yield to simpler and faster algorithms in order to determine their stretch indexes. An interesting question is: Is it possible to develop faster algorithms for some other graph classes already classified according to their admissibility?

Acknowledgments

This study was financed by CAPES - Finance Code 001, and by FAPERJ.

References

- Barboza Queiroz, A., 2020. Dominação Total e Aliança Defensiva Global em Grafos Clique Expandidos. Master's thesis, University of Rio de Janeiro.
- Brandstadt, A., Dragan, F.F., Le, H.O., et al., 2007. Tree spanners for bipartite graphs and probe interval graphs. *Algorithmica* 47, 1, 27–51.
- Cai, L., Corneil, D.G., 1995. Tree spanners. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.* 8, 3, 359–387.
- Couto, F., Cunha, L., 2019. Hardness and efficiency on minimizing maximum distances for graphs with few P_4 's and (k, ℓ) -graphs. *Electronic Notes in Theor. Comp. Sci.* 346, 355–367.
- Couto, F., Cunha, L., 2020. Hardness and efficiency on minimizing maximum distances in spanning trees. *Theor. Comp. Sci.* 838, 168–179.

- Couto, F., Cunha, L., Posner, D., 2020. Edge tree spanners. *18th Cologne-Twente Workshop on Graphs and Combinatorial Optimization*. Vol. AIRO Springer series, pp. 1–12.
- Favaron, O., 1998. Irredundance in inflated graphs. *Journal of Graph Theory* 28, 2, 97–104.
- Giakoumakis, V., Roussel, F., Thuillier, H., 1997. On P4-tidy graphs. *Discrete Mathematics and Theor. Comp. Sci.* 1.
- Jamison, B., Olariu, S., 1992. A tree representation for P4-sparse graphs. *Discrete Appl. Math.* 35, 2, 115–129.
- Jamison, B., Olariu, S., 1995. P-components and the homogeneous decomposition of graphs. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.* 8, 3, 448–463.
- da Silva, R.L.O., 2021. Aspectos Computacionais de Convexidade em Grafos de Linha. Ph.D. thesis, University of Rio de Janeiro.