

Cofibration category structures on the category of graphs

Shuchita Goyal

Department of Mathematics
Krea University
Sri City, India

shuckriya.goyal@gmail.com

Rekha Santhanam *

Department of Mathematics
Indian Institute of Technology Bombay
Mumbai, India

reksan@iitb.ac.in

Abstract

In this article, we show that there is no cofibration category structure on the category of finite graphs with \times -homotopy equivalences as the class of weak equivalences. Further, we show that it is not possible to enlarge the class of weak equivalences to get cofibration category structure on the category of finite graphs without including morphisms where domain and codomain have non-isomorphic stiff subgraphs.

Keywords: Cofibration category, Category of finite graphs, \times -homotopy equivalences, stiff graphs.

MSC 2020: 05C10; 18N40; 55P99

1 Introduction

Let \mathcal{G} denote the category of finite undirected graphs without multiple edges, with graph morphisms being functions on vertices which preserve edges. The category \mathcal{G} with \times -homotopy equivalences forms a category with weak equivalences, and we denote it by $(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{W}_\times)$. The notion of \times -homotopy equivalences was defined by Dochtermann in [3], and Chih and Scull [2], gave a construction of the homotopy category of graphs with respect to \times -homotopy equivalences.

Let \mathcal{W}_\times denote the class of \times -homotopy equivalences in \mathcal{G} . In [5], we showed that there is no model structure on \mathcal{G} with \mathcal{W}_\times as the class of weak equivalences, irrespective of the choice for the class of cofibrations and fibrations. In the proof we used the fact that in a model category, acyclic cofibrations have left lifting property with respect to fibrations.

The advantage of defining a model structure on $(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{W}_\times)$ is that we can construct homotopy pushouts in \mathcal{G} . This would potentially simplify computing the

*Corresponding author.

neighbourhood/hom complexes of graphs since they take double mapping cylinders of graphs to homotopy pushouts in spaces [6].

A cofibration category is a category with distinguished classes of weak equivalences and cofibrations satisfying compatibility conditions (cf. Definition 2.4). This is a weaker notion than that of a model structure, but several of the homotopy theoretic constructions can still be defined. In particular, we can define homotopy pushouts in a cofibration category. In a recent article, Carranza, Doherty, Kapulkin, Opte, Saruzola and Wong [1] gave a construction of a cofibration category structure on the category of digraphs.

In this article, we prove that there is no choice of the class of cofibrations for which $(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{W}_\times)$ is a cofibration category (cf. Theorem 3.6 and Corollary 3.3). The class of \times -homotopy equivalences classify graphs up to their stiff subgraphs. We then enlarge \mathcal{W}_\times , the class of weak equivalences in \mathcal{G} to \mathcal{W} (cf. Definition 4.1), a class of maps that preserve all the stiff subgraphs up to isomorphism. We show that this class \mathcal{W} does not satisfy the 2 out of 6 property (cf. Proposition 4.2). Moreover, extending this class of weak equivalences \mathcal{W} to \mathcal{W}_{new} that satisfies the 2 out of 6 property will include morphisms between graphs having non-isomorphic stiff subgraphs (cf. Theorem 4.5). This then implies that there is no cofibration structure on finite graphs with weak equivalences classifying stiff subgraphs.

2 Preliminaries

We consider the category of finite graphs \mathcal{G} , namely, finite undirected graphs without multiple edges with morphisms as vertex set maps preserving edges. An edge in a graph with the same endpoints is called a *loop*, and the endpoint vertex is often referred to as a *looped vertex*. A graph without multiple edges and loops is called a *simple graph*.

Definition 2.1. A vertex $v \in G$ is said to *fold* to a vertex $v' \in G$, if every neighbour of v is also a neighbour of v' , i.e., if the set of neighbours of v , $N(v) \subseteq N(v')$. We note that the map $f : G \rightarrow G - v$ that maps each vertex (other than v) of G to itself, and v to v' is a graph map. In such a case, we call f a *fold map* that folds G to $G - v$.

A graph is *stiff* if there is no fold in that graph.

Definition 2.2. Let $G, H \in \mathcal{G}$ be two graphs. The (categorical) *product* of G and H is defined to be the graph $G \times H$ whose vertex set is the Cartesian product, $V(G) \times V(H)$, and $(g, h)(g', h') \in E(G \times H)$ whenever $gg' \in E(G)$ and $hh' \in E(H)$.

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let I_n be the graph with vertex set $\{0, 1, \dots, n\}$ and edge set $\{ij : |i - j| \leq 1\}$. We note that the graph I_n folds down to a single looped vertex for any, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and is said to be *contractible*.

Definition 2.3. [3] Two graph maps $f, g : A \rightarrow B$ are said to be \times -*homotopic*, if for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a graph map $F : A \times I_n \rightarrow B$ such that $F|_{A \times \{0\}} = f$

and $F|_{A \times \{n\}} = g$. Two \times -homotopic maps are denoted as $f \simeq_{\times} g$. A graph map $f : A \rightarrow B$ is a \times -homotopy equivalence, if there exists a graph map $g : B \rightarrow A$ such that $gf \simeq_{\times} 1_A$ and $fg \simeq_{\times} 1_B$, where 1_X denotes the identity map on X .

By a *stiff subgraph* of a graph G , we always mean a subgraph of G , which is stiff, that G folds down to and denote it by G_s . We note that a graph G , via different sequences of folds, may fold down to different subgraphs of it, but all of these subgraphs are isomorphic [3, Proposition 6.6].

Definition 2.4. [7] A category with weak equivalences and cofibrations as distinguished subclasses of morphisms is called a *cofibration category* if the following axioms are satisfied:

1. Weak equivalences satisfy ‘2 out of 6’ property, i.e., for any three composable morphisms $f : A \rightarrow B$, $g : B \rightarrow C$, $h : C \rightarrow D$, if hg, gf are weak equivalences, then so are f, g, h and hgf .
2. Every isomorphism of the category is an acyclic cofibration, i.e. a map which is a weak equivalence and a cofibration.
3. An initial object exists in the category.
4. Every object X of the category is cofibrant, i.e., the map from the initial object to X is a cofibration.
5. Cofibrations and acyclic cofibrations are preserved under cobase change.
6. Every morphism in the category factors as a composite of a cofibration followed by a weak equivalence.

3 Non existence of cofibration category structure on $(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{W}_{\times})$

We now consider the category of graphs, \mathcal{G} , with \times -homotopy equivalences. An empty graph is a graph whose vertex set and edge set are empty. One can easily verify that an empty graph is an initial object in \mathcal{G} , and hence the axiom (3) of Definition 2.4 is satisfied. Recall that \mathcal{W}_{\times} denotes the class of \times -homotopy equivalences.

Lemma 3.1. *The class \mathcal{W}_{\times} satisfies the ‘2 out of 6’ property.*

Proof. Consider the following diagram in \mathcal{G}

$$A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{g} C \xrightarrow{h} D$$

where $gf, hg \in \mathcal{W}_{\times}$. We show that all of f, g, h, hgf belongs to \mathcal{W}_{\times} . Since $gf \in \mathcal{W}_{\times}$, there exists graph maps $\alpha : C \rightarrow A$, $F : C \times I_{n_1} \rightarrow C$ and $F' : A \times I_{n_2} \rightarrow A$ for some

natural numbers n_1, n_2 such that $F : gf\alpha \simeq_{\times} 1_C$, $F' : \alpha gf \simeq_{\times} 1_A$. Similarly for hg , there exists $\beta : D \rightarrow B$, $G : D \times I_{n_3} \rightarrow D$ and $G' : B \times I_{n_4} \rightarrow B$ for some naturals n_3, n_4 such that $G : hg\beta \simeq_{\times} 1_D$, $G' : \beta hg \simeq_{\times} 1_B$.

Now consider the map $\alpha g\beta : D \rightarrow A$. Using associativity of graph maps, $(\alpha g\beta)(hg f) = \alpha g(\beta hg)f$. Since $G' : \beta hg \simeq_{\times} 1_B$, $\alpha g G' f : \alpha g(\beta hg)f \simeq_{\times} \alpha g 1_B f = \alpha gf \simeq_{\times} 1_A$ (via F'). Again using the associativity, we get $(hg f)(\alpha g\beta) = h(gf\alpha)g\beta$. Since $F : gf\alpha \simeq_{\times} 1_C$, $h(gf\alpha)g\beta \simeq_{\times} h 1_C g\beta = hg\beta \simeq_{\times} 1_D$ (via G). Therefore, $hg f$ is a \times -homotopy equivalence and thus $hg f \in \mathcal{W}_{\times}$.

Next, we note that the composition of two \times -homotopy equivalences is again a \times -homotopy equivalence and a map *i.e.* \times -homotopic to a weak equivalence is itself a weak equivalence. Consider $\beta : D \rightarrow B$. Since the map hg is a \times -homotopy equivalence and $G : hg\beta \simeq_{\times} 1_D$, therefore β is also a \times -homotopy equivalence, *i.e.* $\beta \in \mathcal{W}_{\times}$. So, $\beta(hg f) = (\beta hg)f \simeq_{\times} f$ implying that $f \in \mathcal{W}_{\times}$. A similar argument shows that h is also a \times -homotopy equivalence. Finally, observe that $\beta h : C \rightarrow B$ is a left \times -homotopy inverse of g while $f\alpha : C \rightarrow B$ is a right inverse. Therefore, $\beta h \simeq_{\times} (\beta h)g(f\alpha)$ and $(\beta h)g(\beta h) \simeq_{\times} f\alpha$ implies that $g(\beta h) \simeq_{\times} g(\beta h)g(f\alpha) \simeq_{\times} g(f\alpha) \simeq_{\times} 1_C$, and hence g is also a weak equivalence.

Therefore \mathcal{W}_{\times} satisfies ‘2 out of 6’ property. \square

We now prove that if there is a cofibration category structure on $(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{W}_{\times})$, then the class of cofibrations is a subclass of inclusions.

Proposition 3.2. *Let $f : A \rightarrow B$ be a graph map which is a \times -homotopy equivalence and not injective. Then there exists a graph C and a map $g : A \rightarrow C$ such that the cobase change map from $C \rightarrow P$ is not a \times -homotopy equivalence, where P is the pushout of the diagram $B \xleftarrow{f} A \xrightarrow{g} C$.*

Proof. Let $f(a_1) = f(a_2)$ for two distinct vertices $a_1, a_2 \in V(A)$.

If A is simple, then B is simple, as f is a \times -homotopy equivalence. Note that $f(a_1)$ is not a looped vertex, therefore $a_1 a_2 \notin E(A)$. Let C be the graph with $V(C) = V(A)$ and $E(C) = E(A) \cup \{a_1 a_2\}$. Let $g : A \rightarrow C$ be the graph inclusion. Then C is simple, but the pushout of the diagram $B \xleftarrow{f} A \xrightarrow{g} C$ is not simple and hence not \times -homotopy equivalent to C .

If A is not simple, but neither of a_1 or a_2 is looped, then we construct C as $C = (A \sqcup C_7)/a_1 \sim 1$, where 1 is a vertex in C_7 with an edge added between a_1, a_2 . Then the pushout has a C_7 with a looped vertex as a stiff subgraph. Any other copy of such a graph in C has to arise from one in A and therefore B . This implies C is not \times -homotopy equivalent to the pushout.

If either a_1 or a_2 in A is looped, then we can add a loop at 1 or a_2 in C appropriately to repeat the previous argument. \square

Corollary 3.3. *If there exists a cofibration structure on $(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{W}_{\times})$ then cofibrations have to be a subclass of induced inclusions.*

Proof. By Proposition 3.2 we know that cofibrations have to be a subclass of inclusions. In [5, Remark 3.2], we have shown that if for any $f : A \rightarrow B$ which is

a \times -homotopy equivalence and a non-induced graph inclusion, there is a graph C and a graph map $g : A \rightarrow C$ such that the cobase change of f along g is not a \times -homotopy equivalence.

Thus any class of cofibrations on (\mathcal{G}, \times) , if it exists, has to be a subclass of induced inclusions. \square

If the class of cofibrations is induced inclusions, then for any graph map $f : A \rightarrow B$, we can construct a new graph M_f such that $A \subseteq M_f$ is an induced subgraph and $M_f \simeq_{\times} B$. Then this construction gives a factorisation of any graph map $f : A \rightarrow B$ as a composition of an induced inclusion followed by a weak equivalence. We give this construction next.

Definition 3.4. Let $A, G \in \mathcal{G}$ be graphs, and $f : A \rightarrow G$ be a graph map. The *quotient* of G by $f(A)$, denoted by $G/f(A)$, is the graph defined as,

$$\begin{aligned} V(G/f(A)) &= V(G)/V(f(A)), \\ E(G/f(A)) &= \{ \{ [x], [y] \} \subseteq V(G)/V(f(A)) \mid xy \in E(G) \}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $f : A \rightarrow B$ be a graph map. We define M_f to be the quotient graph such that $V(M_f) = V\left((A \times I_1) \bigsqcup_i B\right) = \left(V(A \times I_1) \cup V(B)\right)/f(a) \sim (a, 0)$ and $[x][y] \in E(M_f)$ if and only if there exist $x' \in [x], y' \in [y]$ such that $x'y' \in E(A \times I_n) \cup E(B)$.

It is easy to see that A is an induced subgraph of M_f . Furthermore, for every $a \in V(A)$, the vertex $[f(a)]$ folds to the vertex $(a, 1) \in V(M_f)$ and hence $M_f \simeq_{\times} B$.

However we have shown that if the class of weak equivalences are the \times -homotopy equivalences [5, Lemma 3.2 and Proposition 3.1], then cofibrations need to satisfy further properties, which are stated below.

Definition 3.5. An induced inclusion $A \subseteq B$ of graphs is a *quasi-cofibration* if B can be folded to its stiff subgraph via a composition of relative and restricted folds in the codomain with respect to the domain graph, and no other folds are possible at any stage.

Let the class of quasi-cofibrations be denoted by \mathcal{C} . The fact that \mathcal{C} satisfies axiom (2) and (4) of Definition 2.4 is then immediate from the definition.

By the definition of quasi-cofibrations and the discussion from [5, Section 3], \mathcal{C} satisfies axiom (5) of Definition 2.4. We now show that \mathcal{C} , however, will not satisfy axiom (6).

Theorem 3.6. *There is no cofibration category structure on \mathcal{G} with \times -homotopy equivalences as weak equivalences.*

Proof. We have already shown that any class of cofibrations if it exists, is a subclass of quasi-cofibrations. Let $h : A \rightarrow B$ be a graph map between two stiff graphs A and B such that $|V(B)| < |V(A)|$. We prove this theorem by showing that maps of the form h cannot be factored as a quasi-cofibration followed by a \times -homotopy equivalence.

On the contrary, we assume that there is such a factorization $A \xrightarrow{f} B' \xrightarrow{g} B$, i.e., $h = gf$ with f a quasi-cofibration and g a \times -homotopy equivalence.

We first note that $B' \simeq_{\times} B$ and B implies that $|V(B'_s)| = |V(B)|$, where B'_s denotes a stiff subgraph of B' . Therefore $|V(B)| < |V(A)|$ implies that after a few relative folds in B' with respect to A , there will be some restricted folds as well, which is a contradiction to the fact that A is stiff. \square

For example, the natural map $f : C_6 \rightarrow K_2$ cannot be factored as a quasi-cofibration followed by a weak equivalence.

4 Enlarging the class of weak equivalences

In [4, Theorem 5.3] Droz points out that there is a continuum of model structures on the category of graphs, and each of them will give rise to a cofibration structure. We have now shown that none of these arise with \times -homotopy equivalences as the weak equivalences. Then a natural question is whether we can enlarge the class of weak equivalences in a way that they preserve the inherent property of \times -homotopy equivalences, i.e., maps having isomorphic stiff subgraphs.

Recall that any \times -homotopy equivalence can be written as a composition of folds, isomorphism and unfolds. To see this, let $g : A \rightarrow B$ be a \times -homotopy equivalence. Since any two \times -homotopy equivalent graphs have isomorphic stiff subgraphs, $A_s \cong B_s$ [3, Proposition 6.6], there is an isomorphism $g' : A_s \rightarrow B_s$ such that the following diagram commutes,

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{g} & B \\ \text{fo}_A \downarrow & & \downarrow \text{fo}_B \\ A_s & \xrightarrow{g'} & B_s \end{array}$$

where fo_A and fo_B denotes map that folds A and B to their stiff subgraphs respectively. We can enlarge the class \mathcal{W}_{\times} to contain graph maps which when restricted to a stiff subgraph of A is an isomorphism onto its image. Further, we want the image of a stiff subgraph of A to be isomorphic to a stiff subgraph of B .

Definition 4.1. Let \mathcal{W} be the class of maps in \mathcal{G} given by maps $f : A \rightarrow B$ such that, for any subgraph $T \subseteq A$, $T \simeq A_s$, $f|_T : T \rightarrow f(T)$ is an isomorphism and $f(T) \simeq B_s$.

Note that if $f : A \rightarrow B$ is in \mathcal{W} and A folds down to a stiff subgraph T it is possible that B does not fold down to $f(T)$. However, this class does not satisfy the 2 out of 3 property and hence does not satisfy the 2 out of 6 property as we show next.

Proposition 4.2. The morphism class \mathcal{W} in \mathcal{G} does not satisfy the 2 out of 6 property.

Proof. Since 2 out of 6 property implies the 2 out of 3 property, to prove this statement, it is sufficient to give an example in \mathcal{W} which does not satisfy 2 out of 3 property. Let A be a graph obtained from taking a wedge of C_5 , with the graph C_3 along an edge (cf. Figure 1). Also, let B and C be the graphs as shown on the right side of Figure 1. It is easy to see that A is a stiff graph, and hence it is its only stiff subgraph. Further, note that in B , the vertices a, d folds to x ; c, e folds to y and b fold to z . Therefore, the stiff subgraph B_s of B is isomorphic to A .




Figure 1: Counterexample (2 out of 3 property in \mathcal{W})

Now, define $f : A \rightarrow B$ as the inclusion map, and $g : B \rightarrow C$ be the map that sends $\{a, d, x\}$ to x , $\{c, e, y\}$ to y , $\{b, z\}$ to z , $1 \mapsto 1$, $2 \mapsto 2$, $3 \mapsto 3$. By definition $f \in \mathcal{W}$ as A itself is stiff and so is gf . If $T = \{a, b, c, d, e, x\} \subseteq V(B)$ and $B[T]$ is the subgraph of B induced by the set T , then $B[T] \cong B_s$, a stiff subgraph of B , however, $g(B[T])$ is isomorphic to a C_3 which is not isomorphic to a stiff subgraph of C , thereby implying that g does not belong to \mathcal{W} . Therefore, \mathcal{W} does not satisfy the 2 out of 3 property. \square

Corollary 4.3. *The category \mathcal{G} with the class of morphisms \mathcal{W} is not a category with weak equivalences. In particular, \mathcal{G} is not a cofibration category with \mathcal{W} as weak equivalences.*

However, \mathcal{W} does have several nice properties that weak equivalences are expected to satisfy.

Lemma 4.4. *Let \mathcal{W} be the class of morphisms as defined in Definition 4.1. Then*

1. \mathcal{W} is closed under compositions.
2. All isomorphisms, folds, unfolds are in \mathcal{W} , hence all the \times -homotopy equivalences are in \mathcal{W} .
3. Not every map in \mathcal{W} is a \times -homotopy equivalence.

4. Given composable graph morphisms f and g , if $g, gf \in \mathcal{W}$ then $f \in \mathcal{W}$.

- Proof.* 1. Compositions are preserved in \mathcal{W} . Let $f : A \rightarrow B$ and $g : B \rightarrow C$ be in \mathcal{W} . Then for any subgraph T of A isomorphic to A_s , $T \rightarrow f(T)$ is an isomorphism such that $f(T)$ is isomorphic to B_s . Then $g|_{f(T)}$ is an isomorphism onto $g(f(T))$ and $g(f(T))$ is isomorphic to C_s .
2. It is straightforward to check that all the isomorphisms, folds and unfolds belong to \mathcal{W} . Note that every \times -homotopy equivalence $A \rightarrow B$ is a composition of folds, isomorphisms and unfolds; and since all of these are in \mathcal{W} which is closed under taking compositions, every \times -homotopy equivalence is in \mathcal{W} .
3. To show that not every weak equivalence is a \times -homotopy equivalence, consider the graphs A, B with $V(A) = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$, $E(A) = \{12, 23, 13, 14, 45\}$, and $V(B) = \{a, b, c\}$, $E(B) = \{ab, bc, ac\}$ (see Figure 2).




Figure 2: Map in $\mathcal{W} \setminus \mathcal{W}_\times$

Clearly $A_s \cong B_s \cong K_3$, a complete graph on 3 vertices. Let $f : A \rightarrow B$ be the map that sends $1 \mapsto a$, $\{2, 4\} \mapsto b$ and $\{3, 5\} \mapsto c$. Then f maps A_s isomorphically onto $B_s = B$ but f is not a \times -homotopy equivalence.

4. Let $f : A \rightarrow B$, $g : B \rightarrow C$ be graph maps. Let g and gf be in \mathcal{W} . Let $S \subseteq A$ be a subgraph such that $S \cong A_s$. Then $gf|_S$ maps S isomorphically to $gf(S)$, a subgraph isomorphic to the stiff subgraph of C . Also, $gf|_S$ being an isomorphism implies that $f|_S$ is injective and hence $f|_S : S \rightarrow f(S)$ is an isomorphism. Since $S \cong A_s \cong B_s$, $S \cong f(S)$ imply that $f(S) \cong B_s$. Thus $f \in \mathcal{W}_{\text{new}}$.

□

We now show that we cannot extend this class \mathcal{W} to a class \mathcal{W}_{new} which satisfies the 2 out of 6 property, and morphisms have isomorphic stiff subgraphs.

Theorem 4.5. *Let \mathcal{W}_{new} be the smallest class of morphisms containing \mathcal{W} and satisfying the 2 out of 6 property. Then \mathcal{W}_{new} contains graph morphisms where the domain and codomain have non-isomorphic stiff subgraphs.*

Proof. We construct graphs A, B, C, D and composable graph maps $f : A \rightarrow B$, $g : B \rightarrow C$ and $h : C \rightarrow D$ such that the domain and codomain of f have non isomorphic stiff subgraphs but $gf, hg \in \mathcal{W}_{\text{new}}$. Consider the graph D with the vertex set $V(D) = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$ and the edge set $E(D) = \{11, 12, 14, 23, 24, 25, 33, 34, 44, 55\}$. Let A, B, C be induced subgraphs of D on vertex sets $\{1\}$, $\{1, 2, 3\}$, $\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ respectively (see Figure 3). Then $A \subset B \subset C \subset D$. Let $f : A \rightarrow B$, $g : B \rightarrow C$ and $h : C \rightarrow D$ be the induced inclusions. Then we note that the graphs A and B are stiff. Moreover, in C , the sequence of folding 3 to 4, then 4 to 1, and finally 2 to 1 implies that the stiff subgraph C_s of C is A . Similarly the sequence of folding 3 to 4 followed by 4 to 1 in D gives the stiff subgraph D_s of D which is isomorphic to B .




Figure 3: The 2 out of 6 implying existence of some unwanted maps in \mathcal{W}_{new}

With this, it is clear that gf and hg both belong to \mathcal{W} , and hence belong to \mathcal{W}_{new} . Thus by the 2 out of 6 property of \mathcal{W}_{new} , we have $f, g, h, hgf \in \mathcal{W}_{\text{new}}$. In particular, $f : A \rightarrow B$ is a weak equivalence. However, the stiff subgraphs of A and B are non-isomorphic. \square

Therefore via Theorem 4.5, we have shown that it is not possible to extend the class of \times -homotopy equivalences in a manner that gives rise to a cofibration category where weak equivalences distinguish graphs having non-isomorphic stiff subgraphs.

References

- [1] Daniel Carranza, Brandon Doherty, Chris Kapulkin, Morgan Opie, Maru Sarazola and Liang Ze Wong. Cofibration category of digraphs for path homology, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2212.12568>, 2022.
- [2] Tien Chih and Laura Scull. A homotopy category for graphs. *J. Algebraic Combin.*, 53(4):1231–1251, 2021.
- [3] Anton Dochtermann. Hom complexes and homotopy theory in the category of graphs. *European J. Combin.*, 30(2):490–509, 2009.

- [4] Jean-Marie Droz. Quillen model structures on the category of graphs. *Homology Homotopy Appl.*, 14(2):265–284, 2012.
- [5] Shuchita Goyal and Rekha Santhanam. (Lack of) Model Structures on the Category of Graphs. *Applied Categorical Structures*, 9:671–683, 2021.
- [6] Takahiro Matsushita. Homotopy types of the Hom complexes of graphs. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 63:216–226. 2017.
- [7] Karol Szumiło. Two models for the homotopy theory of cocomplete homotopy theories. *Homology, Homotopy and Applications*, 18(2):345–357, 2016.