

Cographs: Eigenvalues and Dilworth Number

EBRAHIM GHORBANI

Department of Mathematics, K. N. Toosi University of Technology,

P. O. Box 16315-1618, Tehran, Iran

School of Mathematics, Institute for Research in Fundamental Sciences (IPM),

P. O. Box 19395-5746, Tehran, Iran

e_ghorbani@ipm.ir

January 3, 2022

Abstract

A cograph is a simple graph which contains no path on 4 vertices as an induced subgraph. The vicinal preorder on the vertex set of a graph is defined in terms of inclusions among the neighborhoods of vertices. The minimum number of chains with respect to the vicinal preorder required to cover the vertex set of a graph G is called the Dilworth number of G . We prove that for any cograph G , the multiplicity of any eigenvalue $\lambda \neq 0, -1$, does not exceed the Dilworth number of G and show that this bound is tight. G. F. Royle [The rank of a cograph, *Electron. J. Combin.* 10 (2003), Note 11] proved that if a cograph G has no pair of vertices with the same neighborhood, then G has no 0 eigenvalue, and asked if beside cographs, there are any other natural classes of graphs for which this property holds. We give a partial answer to this question by showing that an H -free family of graphs has this property if and only if it is a subclass of the family of cographs. A similar result is also shown to hold for the -1 eigenvalue.

Keywords: Cograph, Eigenvalue, Dilworth number, Threshold graph

AMS Mathematics Subject Classification (2010): 05C50, 05C75

1 Introduction

A cograph is a simple graph which contains no path on four vertices as an induced subgraph. The family of cographs is the smallest class of graphs that includes the single-vertex graph and is closed under complementation and disjoint union. This property justifies the name ‘cograph’

standing for ‘complement reducible graph’ which was coined in [7]. However, this family of graphs was initially defined under different names [16, 17, 20, 21, 29, 31] and since then has been intensively studied. It is well known that any cograph has a canonical tree representation, called a cotree. This tree decomposition scheme of cographs is a particular case of the modular decomposition [12] that applies to arbitrary graphs. Partly because of this property, cographs are interesting from the algorithmic point of view (see [3, p. 175]). As pointed out in [28], cographs have numerous applications in areas like parallel computing [26] or even biology [11] since they can be used to model series-parallel decompositions. For an account on properties of cographs see [3].

Cographs have also been studied from an algebraic point of view. Based on a computer search, Sillke [30] conjectured that the rank of the adjacency matrix of any cograph is equal to the number of distinct non-zero rows in this matrix. The conjecture was proved by Royle [27]. Since then alternative proofs and extensions of this result have appeared [2, 5, 15, 28]. Furthermore, in [19] an algorithm is introduced for locating eigenvalues of cographs in a given interval. In [13], we present a new characterization of cographs; namely a graph G is a cograph if and only if no induced subgraph of G has an eigenvalue in the interval $(-1, 0)$. In [13], it is also shown that the multiplicity of any eigenvalue of a cograph G does not exceed the total number of duplication and coduplication classes of G (see Section 2 for definitions) which is not greater than the sum of the multiplicities of 0 and -1 as eigenvalues of G .

In this paper we explore further properties of the eigenvalues (of the adjacency matrix) of a cograph. We consider a relation on the vertex set of a graph G as follows. We define $u \prec v$ if the open neighborhood of u is contained in the closed neighborhood of v . It turns out that ‘ \prec ’ is a preorder (that is reflexive and transitive) which is called the vicinal preorder. The minimum number of chains with respect to the vicinal preorder required to cover the vertex set of a graph G is called the Dilworth number of G . In Section 3, we prove that for any cograph G , the multiplicity of any eigenvalue $\lambda \neq 0, -1$, does not exceed the Dilworth number of G and show that this bound is best possible. This was first conjectured in [13]. In [27], Royle proved that if a cograph G has no duplications, then G has no 0 eigenvalue, and asked if beside cographs, there are any other natural classes of graphs for which this property holds. In Section 4, we give a partial answer to this question by showing that an H -free family of graphs \mathcal{F} has this property if and only if \mathcal{F} is a subclass of the family of cographs. A similar result is also shown to hold for the -1 eigenvalue. It is also observed that these results can be stated in terms of the existence of a basis consisting of weight 2 vectors for the eigenspace of either 0 or -1 eigenvalues.

2 Preliminaries

In this section we introduce the notations and recall a basic fact which will be used frequently. The graphs we consider are all simple and undirected. For a graph G , we denote by $V(G)$ the vertex set of G . For two vertices u, v , by $u \sim v$ we mean u and v are adjacent. If $V(G) =$

$\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$, then the *adjacency matrix* of G is an $n \times n$ matrix $A(G)$ whose (i, j) -entry is 1 if $v_i \sim v_j$ and 0 otherwise. By *eigenvalues* and *rank* of G we mean those of $A(G)$. The multiplicity of an eigenvalue λ of G is denoted by $\text{mult}(\lambda, G)$. For a vertex v of G , let $N_G(v)$ denote the *open neighborhood* of v , i.e. the set of vertices of G adjacent to v and $N_G[v] = N_G(v) \cup \{v\}$ denote the *closed neighborhood* of v ; we will drop the subscript G when it is clear from the context. Two vertices u and v of G are called *duplicates* if $N(u) = N(v)$ and called *coduplicates* if $N[u] = N[v]$. Note that duplicate vertices cannot be adjacent while coduplicate vertices must be adjacent. We write $u \equiv v$ if u and v are either duplicates or coduplicates. A subset S of $V(G)$ such that $N(u) = N(v)$ for any $u, v \in S$ is called a *duplication class* of G . Coduplication classes are defined analogously. If $X \subset V(G)$, we use the notation $G - X$ to mean the subgraph of G induced by $V(G) \setminus X$.

An important subclass of cographs are *threshold graphs*. These are the graphs which are both a cograph and a split graph (i.e. their vertex sets can be partitioned into a clique and a coclique). For more information see [3, 23].

Remark 1. (*Sum rule*) Let \mathbf{x} be an eigenvector for eigenvalue λ of a graph G . Then the entries of \mathbf{x} satisfy the following equalities:

$$\lambda \mathbf{x}(v) = \sum_{u \sim v} \mathbf{x}(u), \quad \text{for all } v \in V(G). \quad (1)$$

From this it is seen that if $\lambda \neq 0$, then \mathbf{x} is constant on each duplication class and if $\lambda \neq -1$, then \mathbf{x} is constant on each coduplication class.

3 Dilworth number and multiplicity of eigenvalues

In this section we recall a preorder on the vertex set of a graph which is defined in terms of open/closed neighborhoods of vertices. In [13], it was conjectured that the multiplicity of eigenvalues of any cograph except for 0, -1 is bounded above by the maximum size of an antichain with respect to this preorder. We prove this conjecture in this section.

Let G be a graph and consider the following relation on $V(G)$:

$$u \prec v \text{ if and only if } \begin{cases} N[u] \subseteq N[v] & \text{if } u \sim v, \\ N(u) \subseteq N(v) & \text{if } u \not\sim v, \end{cases}$$

or equivalently

$$u \prec v \text{ if and only if } N(u) \subseteq N[v].$$

It is easily verified that ' \prec ' is a *preorder* that is reflexive and transitive [10]. This preorder is called *vicinal preorder*. Note that ' \prec ' is not antisymmetric, since $u \prec v$ and $v \prec u$ imply only $u \equiv v$.

We consider the chains and antichains in G with respect to the vicinal preorder. The minimum number of chains with respect to the vicinal preorder required to cover $V(G)$ is called the




Figure 1: A threshold graph: V_i 's are cliques, U_i 's are cocliques, each thick line indicates the edge set of a complete bipartite subgraph on some U_i, V_j

Dilworth number of G and denoted by $\nabla(G)$. This parameter was first introduced in [10] (see also [3]). Also we refer to [23, Chapter 9] for several interesting results on Dilworth number and its connection with other graph theoretical concepts. Note that by Dilworth's theorem, $\nabla(G)$ is equal to the maximum size of an antichain of $V(G)$ with respect to the vicinal preorder.

Remark 2. (*Structure of threshold graphs*) As it was observed in [24] (see also [1, 14]), the vertices of any threshold graph G can be partitioned into t non-empty coduplication classes V_1, \dots, V_t and t non-empty duplication classes U_1, \dots, U_t such that the vertices in $V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_t$ form a clique and

$$N(u) = V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_i \text{ for any } u \in U_i, 1 \leq i \leq t.$$

For an illustration of this structure with $t = 5$, see Figure 1.

From the structure of threshold graphs it is clear that if G is a threshold graph, then $\nabla(G) = 1$. In [6, 10], it was observed that the converse is also true. We give its simple argument here. If $\nabla(G) = 1$, then all the vertices of G form a chain $v_1 \prec v_2 \prec \dots \prec v_n$. First note that $v_i \sim v_{i+1} \not\sim v_{i+2}$ is impossible for any i ; since otherwise $N[v_i] \subseteq N[v_{i+1}]$ and $N(v_{i+1}) \subseteq N(v_{i+2})$. Hence, $v_i \in N(v_{i+1}) \subset N(v_{i+2})$, and thus $v_{i+2} \in N(v_i) \subset N[v_{i+1}]$ which means $v_{i+1} \sim v_{i+2}$, a contradiction. So there must exist some j such that $v_1 \not\sim \dots \not\sim v_j \sim \dots \sim v_n$. It turns out that G is a split graph as the vertices v_1, \dots, v_j form a coclique and the vertices v_{j+1}, \dots, v_n form a clique. Note that any induced subgraph of G has Dilworth number 1. As $\nabla(P_4) = 2$, G has no induced subgraph P_4 , so G is also a cograph which in turn implies that G is a threshold graph.

The next result shows that when vicinal preorder is a total order, i.e. the whole $V(G)$ itself is a chain, a strong constraint is imposed on the multiplicities of the eigenvalues. This result was first proved in [18] (see [13] for a simpler proof).

Lemma 3. ([18]) *Let G be a threshold graph. Then any eigenvalue $\lambda \neq 0, -1$ is simple.*

Motivated by this result, we [13] investigated the connection between eigenvalue multiplicity and Dilworth number of cographs (as an extension of threshold graphs). As the vertices of any graph G can be partitioned into $\nabla(G)$ chains and so into $\nabla(G)$ threshold subgraphs, we conjectured [13] that the Dilworth number is an upper bound for the multiplicity of any eigenvalues $\lambda \neq 0, -1$ in cographs. We prove this conjecture in the next theorem. Before that we present the following crucial lemma on the structure of cographs.

Lemma 4. *Let G be a cograph with Dilworth number $k \geq 2$. Then there exists a vertex-partition of G into k threshold graphs such that one of the threshold graphs H of the partition has the property that all the vertices of H have the same neighborhood in $G - V(H)$.*

Proof. Note that $N_G(u) \subseteq N_G[v]$ if and only if $N_{\overline{G}}(v) \subseteq N_{\overline{G}}[u]$. It follows if we have $u_1 \prec u_2 \prec \dots \prec u_\ell$ in G , then we have $u_\ell \prec \dots \prec u_2 \prec u_1$ in \overline{G} . This in particular implies that $\nabla(G) = \nabla(\overline{G})$ and that if the assertion holds for G , then it also holds for \overline{G} . Since connected cographs have disconnected complements (because any cograph is either a union or join of two smaller cographs), we may assume that G is disconnected. Also we may suppose that G has no isolated vertices.

We now proceed by induction on $k \geq 2$. First let $k = 2$. As G is disconnected, it is a union of two threshold graphs for which the assertion trivially holds. Now, let $k \geq 3$. If G has a connected component with Dilworth number at least 2, then we are done by the induction hypothesis. Otherwise, all connected components of G are threshold graphs for which the assertion holds as well. \square

We are now in a position to prove the main result of the paper.

Theorem 5. *For any cograph G , the multiplicity of any eigenvalue $\lambda \neq 0, -1$, does not exceed the Dilworth number of G . Moreover, there are an infinite family of cographs for which this bound is tight.*

Proof. Let G be a cograph, $\nabla(G) = k$ and $\lambda \neq 0, -1$ be an eigenvalue of G . We proceed by induction on k . If $k = 1$, then G is a threshold graph and the assertion follows from Lemma 3. Let $k \geq 2$, and the theorem hold for graphs with Dilworth number at most $k - 1$. If G is disconnected, we are done by the induction hypothesis. So we may assume that G is connected. For a contradiction, assume that $\text{mult}(\lambda, G) \geq k + 1$. By Lemma 4, G contains a threshold subgraph H' such that any two vertices of H' have the same neighborhood in $G - V(H')$ with $G - V(H')$ having Dilworth number $k - 1$. Then $H' = H \cup I$ where I (possibly empty) is the subgraph consisting of isolated vertices of H' and H is a connected threshold graph with at least one edge. Let V_1, \dots, V_t and U_1, \dots, U_t be the partition of $V(H)$ according to Remark 2. Let $u_t \in U_t$. There is a k -dimensional subspace Ω of eigenvectors of G for λ which vanishes on u_t . Let $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$. Note that $N_H(u_t) = V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_t$. By the sum rule and since $\mathbf{x}(u_t) = 0$,

$$0 = \lambda \mathbf{x}(u_t) = \sum_{v \in V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_t} \mathbf{x}(v) + \alpha,$$

where α is the sum of entries of \mathbf{x} on the neighbors of u_t outside H' ; by the way H' is chosen, this is constant for all the vertices of H' . Let $v_t \in V_t$. Then

$$N_H(v_t) = U_t \cup V_1 \cup \cdots \cup V_t \setminus \{v_t\}.$$

By Remark 1, for all vertices $u \in U_t$ we have $u \equiv u_t$, and thus $\mathbf{x}(u) = \mathbf{x}(u_t) = 0$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda \mathbf{x}(v_t) &= \sum_{v \in N_H(v_t)} \mathbf{x}(v) + \alpha \\ &= -\mathbf{x}(v_t) + \sum_{v \in V_1 \cup \cdots \cup V_t} \mathbf{x}(v) + \alpha \\ &= -\mathbf{x}(v_t) + \lambda \mathbf{x}(u_t) \\ &= -\mathbf{x}(v_t). \end{aligned}$$

As $\lambda \neq -1$, it follows that $\mathbf{x}(v_t) = 0$. Again by Remark 1, we have $\mathbf{x}(v) = 0$ for all $v \in V_t$. Now let $u_{t-1} \in U_{t-1}$. We have $N_H(u_{t-1}) = V_1 \cup \cdots \cup V_{t-1}$, and since $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$ on V_t ,

$$\lambda \mathbf{x}(u_{t-1}) = \sum_{v \in V_1 \cup \cdots \cup V_{t-1}} \mathbf{x}(v) + \alpha = \sum_{v \in V_1 \cup \cdots \cup V_t} \mathbf{x}(v) + \alpha = \lambda \mathbf{x}(u_t) = 0.$$

Again, it follows that $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$ on U_{t-1} . Let $v_{t-1} \in V_{t-1}$. Then

$$N_H(v_{t-1}) = U_t \cup U_{t-1} \cup V_1 \cup \cdots \cup V_t \setminus \{v_{t-1}\}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda \mathbf{x}(v_{t-1}) &= -\mathbf{x}(v_{t-1}) + \sum_{v \in U_t \cup U_{t-1} \cup V_1 \cup \cdots \cup V_t} \mathbf{x}(v) + \alpha \\ &= -\mathbf{x}(v_{t-1}) + \sum_{v \in V_1 \cup \cdots \cup V_{t-1}} \mathbf{x}(v) + \alpha \\ &= -\mathbf{x}(v_{t-1}) + \lambda \mathbf{x}(u_{t-1}) \\ &= -\mathbf{x}(v_{t-1}). \end{aligned}$$

As $\lambda \neq -1$, it follows that $\mathbf{x}(v_{t-1}) = 0$. By Remark 1, we have $\mathbf{x}(v) = 0$ for all $v \in V_{t-1}$.

Continuing this procedure, we alternately choose vertices $u_{t-2}, v_{t-2}, \dots, u_1, v_1$ where similar to the above argument we see that \mathbf{x} vanishes on $U_{t-2}, V_{t-2}, \dots, U_1, V_1$. So $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$ on the whole $V(H)$ and we must have $\alpha = 0$ which in turn implies that \mathbf{x} is zero on I . Hence we conclude that \mathbf{x} is zero on $V(H')$. It turns out that if for any $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$ we remove the entries corresponding to the vertices of H' from \mathbf{x} , the resulting vector is an eigenvector of $G - V(H')$ for eigenvalue λ . This means that the graph $G - V(H')$ with Dilworth number $k - 1$ has the eigenvalue λ with multiplicity k , which is a contradiction. Hence the assertion follows.

Finally, we present an infinite family of graphs for which the multiplicity of an eigenvalue $\lambda \neq 0, -1$ is equal to the Dilworth number. It is easy to construct disconnected cographs for which the

equality holds (just take k copies of a fixed threshold graph). Here we show that the bound can be achieved by connected cographs. Let $s, k \geq 1$ and $G = G(s, k) := K_1 \vee (K_{s, \dots, s} \cup (s^2 - s)K_1)$, in which $K_{s, \dots, s}$ is a complete k -partite graph with parts of size s , and ‘ \vee ’ denotes the join of two graphs. Let v be the vertex of G adjacent to all the other vertices, B_1, \dots, B_k be the parts of the complete k -partite subgraph, and C be the set of $s^2 - s$ pendant vertices. It is easily seen that $B_1, \dots, B_k, \{v\}, C$ make an equitable partition¹ of G , with the quotient matrix

$$Q = \left(\begin{array}{ccc|cc} & & & 1 & 0 \\ & & & \vdots & \vdots \\ & s(J_k - I_k) & & 1 & 0 \\ \hline s & \cdots & s & 0 & s^2 - s \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{array} \right),$$

where J_k is the $k \times k$ all 1's matrix. Now, we have

$$Q + sI = \left(\begin{array}{ccc|cc} s & \cdots & s & 1 & 0 \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ s & \cdots & s & 1 & 0 \\ \hline s & \cdots & s & s & s^2 - s \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 & s \end{array} \right).$$

It is seen that all the rows of $Q + sI$ can be obtained by linear combinations of the last two rows. So $\text{rank}(Q + sI) = 2$ which means $\lambda = -s$ is an eigenvalue of Q with multiplicity k and thus an eigenvalue of G with multiplicity at least k . Also the vertices of G can be partitioned into k chains with respect to vicinal preorder, namely $C \cup B_1 \cup \{v\}, B_2, \dots, B_k$. Hence $\nabla(G) \leq k$. \square

Remark 6. Theorem 5 cannot hold for general graphs. Here we describe a family of counterexamples. For any positive integer n , the *cocktail party graph* $\text{CP}(n)$ is the graph obtained from the complete graph K_{2n} by removing a perfect matching. In fact, $\text{CP}(n)$ is the complete n -partite graph $K_{2, \dots, 2}$. Let H be a graph with vertices v_1, \dots, v_n , and a_1, \dots, a_n be non-negative integers. The *generalized line graph* $L(H; a_1, \dots, a_n)$ consists of disjoint copies of $L(H)$ and $\text{CP}(a_1), \dots, \text{CP}(a_n)$ together with all edges joining a vertex $\{v_i, v_j\}$ of $L(H)$ with each vertex in $\text{CP}(a_i)$ and $\text{CP}(a_j)$. It is known that all the eigenvalues of generalized line graphs are greater than or equal to -2 . Moreover, by Theorem 2.2.8 of [8], if H has m edges and if not all a_i 's are zero, then

$$\text{mult}(-2, L(H; a_1, \dots, a_n)) = m - n + \sum_{i=1}^n a_i. \quad (2)$$

Consider the generalized line graph $G = G(k) := L(K_{1,k}; k, 1, \dots, 1)$. In fact G is obtained from the graph $K_k \vee \text{CP}(k)$ by attaching two pendant vertices to each of the vertices of K_k . Let u_1, \dots, u_k be the vertices of K_k , U_1, \dots, U_k be the parts of $\text{CP}(k)$, and w_{i1}, w_{i2} be the pendant

¹For the definition and properties of equitable partitions, we refer to [4, p. 24].

vertices attached to u_i , for $i = 1, \dots, k$. Then for each i , $\{u_i, w_{i1}, w_{i2}\} \cup U_i$ form a chain, so $\nabla(G) \leq k$. On the other hand, U_1, \dots, U_k is an antichain in the vicinal preorder of G , so $\nabla(G) \geq k$. Thus we have $\nabla(G) = k$. However by (2), $\text{mult}(-2, G) = 2k - 1$.

Remark 7. The bound given in Theorem 5 can be arbitrarily loose. To see this, let r_1, \dots, r_k be distinct integers greater than 1 and $G = K_{r_1, \dots, r_k}$. Clearly, G is a cograph with $\nabla(G) = k$. However, all the non-zero eigenvalues of G are simple (see [9, Theorem 1]).

4 H -free graphs that only (co)duplications reduce their rank

In [13] a characterization of cographs based on graph eigenvalues was given; namely a graph G is a cograph if and only if no induced subgraph of G has an eigenvalue in the interval $(-1, 0)$. In this section we give another characterization for the family of cographs which is based on the presence of eigenvalue 0 or -1 in connection with the existence of duplications or coduplications.

Regarding the presence of eigenvalue 0 in cographs, Royle [27] proved the following result confirming a conjecture by Sillke [30].

Lemma 8. *If a cograph G has no duplications, then $A(G)$ has full rank.*

The following result concerning -1 eigenvalues is also implicit in [27] (see also [3, 5, 28]).

Lemma 9. *If a cograph G has no coduplications, then $A(G) + I$ has full rank.*

We say that a graph G satisfies *Duplication-Rank Property* (DRP for short) if the following holds:

$$G \text{ has a duplication, or } A(G) \text{ has full rank.}$$

Similarly, we say that G satisfies *Coduplication-Rank Property* (CDRP for short) if:

$$G \text{ has a coduplication, or } A(G) + I \text{ has full rank.}$$

Lemma 8 says that cographs satisfy DRP. Motivated by this, Royle [27] posed the following question:

Beside cographs, are there any other natural classes of graphs for which DRP holds?

For a given graph H , the family of H -free graphs is the set of all graphs which do not contain H as an induced subgraph. A ‘natural’ class of graphs is the family of H -free graphs for a specific graph H . Here we give the answer to the Royle’s question for H -free families of graphs. The same result is given for graphs with CDRP.

For a graph H , we denote the family of H -free graphs by $\mathcal{F}(H)$. We say that $\mathcal{F}(H)$ satisfies DRP (or CDRP) if any $G \in \mathcal{F}(H)$ does. Also by $H \leq G$, we mean that H is an induced subgraph of G .




Figure 2: P_5 with its 0-eigenvector shown on the above and -1 -eigenvector on the below




Figure 3: A graph in $\mathcal{F}(\overline{K_3}) \cap \mathcal{F}(P_5) \cap \mathcal{F}(2K_2)$ and its 0-eigenvector

The following result shows that if an H -free family of graphs satisfies DRP or CDRP it must be contained in the family of cographs.

Theorem 10. *Let $\mathcal{F}(H)$ be the family of H -free graphs.*

- (i) $\mathcal{F}(H)$ satisfies DRP if and only if H is an induced subgraph of P_4 .
- (ii) $\mathcal{F}(H)$ satisfies CDRP if and only if H is an induced subgraph of P_4 .

Proof. (i) If $H \leq P_4$, then $\mathcal{F}(H) \subseteq \mathcal{F}(P_4)$, and so by Lemma 8, $\mathcal{F}(H)$ satisfies DRP, showing the ‘sufficiency’. For the ‘necessity,’ assume that for a given graph H , $\mathcal{F}(H)$ satisfies DRP. We show that $H \leq P_4$.

If H has one or two vertices, then $H \leq P_4$, and we are done. Let H have three vertices. If $H = P_3$ or $H = P_2 \cup P_1$, then $H \leq P_4$. We show that it is impossible that $H = K_3$ or $\overline{K_3}$. Note that $P_5 \in \mathcal{F}(K_3)$ and it does not satisfy DRP as it has no duplications but has a 0 eigenvalue (its 0-eigenvector is illustrated in Figure 2). The graph depicted in Figure 3 belongs to $\mathcal{F}(\overline{K_3})$ but it does not satisfies DRP; it has no duplications and has a 0 eigenvalue (its 0-eigenvector indicated in the picture). Hence the assertion follows for three-vertex graphs.

Suppose that H has four vertices. If $H = P_4$, there is nothing to prove. If $K_3 \leq H$ or $\overline{K_3} \leq H$, then $\mathcal{F}(K_3) \subseteq \mathcal{F}(H)$ or $\mathcal{F}(\overline{K_3}) \subseteq \mathcal{F}(H)$ and so $\mathcal{F}(H)$ does not satisfies DRP. It remains to consider 4-vertex bipartite graphs with no 3-coclique. Besides P_4 , there are only two such graphs, namely $K_{2,2}$ and $2K_2$. But P_5 is a $K_{2,2}$ -free graph not satisfying DRP and the graph of Figure 3 is a $2K_2$ -free graph not satisfying DRP. Therefore, the assertion holds for four-vertex graphs.

Now let H have five or more vertices. Let H' be a five-vertex graph with $H' \leq H$. As $\mathcal{F}(H') \subseteq \mathcal{F}(H)$, the family $\mathcal{F}(H')$ also satisfies DRP. By the argument for four-vertex graphs, P_4 is the only four-vertex graph with $\mathcal{F}(P_4)$ satisfying DRP. It follows that all four-vertex




Figure 4: A graph in $\mathcal{F}(\overline{K_3}) \cap \mathcal{F}(2K_2)$ and its -1 -eigenvector

induced subgraphs of H' must be isomorphic to P_4 . There is a unique graph H' with this property, namely the 5-cycle C_5 . However, $P_5 \in \mathcal{F}(C_5)$ and it does not satisfy DRP. It turns out that for no graph H with five or more vertices, $\mathcal{F}(H)$ satisfies DRP. This completes the proof.

(ii) Similar to the proof of (i), the ‘sufficiency’ follows from Lemma 9. For the ‘necessity,’ assume that $\mathcal{F}(H)$ satisfies CDRP. There is nothing to prove if H has one or two vertices. Let H have three vertices. If $H = P_3$ or $H = P_2 \cup P_1$, then $H \leq P_4$. Note that P_5 does not satisfy CDRP (as shown in Figure 2) but belongs to $\mathcal{F}(K_3)$ and the graph of Figure 4 does not satisfy CDRP but belongs to $\mathcal{F}(\overline{K_3})$. Hence the assertion follows for three-vertex graphs.

Suppose that H has four vertices. If $H = P_4$, there is nothing to prove. If $K_3 \leq H$ or $\overline{K_3} \leq H$, then $\mathcal{F}(K_3) \subseteq \mathcal{F}(H)$ or $\mathcal{F}(\overline{K_3}) \subseteq \mathcal{F}(H)$ and so $\mathcal{F}(H)$ does not satisfy CDRP. It remains to consider $H = K_{2,2}$ and $2K_2$. But P_5 is a $K_{2,2}$ -free graph not satisfying CDRP and the graph of Figure 4 is a $2K_2$ -free graph not satisfying CDRP. Therefore, the assertion holds for four-vertex graphs.

Now let H have five or more vertices. Let H' be a five-vertex graph with $H' \leq H$. As $\mathcal{F}(H') \subseteq \mathcal{F}(H)$, the family $\mathcal{F}(H')$ also satisfies CDRP. By the argument for four-vertex graphs, we have that all four-vertex induced subgraphs of H' must be isomorphic to P_4 and so $H' = C_5$. However, $P_5 \in \mathcal{F}(C_5)$ and it does not satisfy CDRP. It turns out that for no graph H with five or more vertices, $\mathcal{F}(H)$ satisfies CDRP, completing the proof. \square

Any pair of duplicate vertices u, v in a graph G give rise to a null-vector of $A(G)$ of weight two (the vector whose components corresponding to u, v are $1, -1$, and zero elsewhere). Conversely, any null-vector \mathbf{x} of $A(G)$ of weight two comes from a pair of duplicate vertices. To see this, suppose that x_u and x_v are the two non-zero components of \mathbf{x} . As $A(G)$ is a $0, 1$ -matrix, we must have $x_u = -x_v$. It turns out that the rows of $A(G)$ corresponding to u and v are identical which means that u and v are duplicates. Hence, we observe that any null-vector of $A(G)$ of weight two corresponds with a pair of duplicate vertices in G . Similarly, null-vectors of $A(G) + I$ of weight two correspond to pairs of coduplicate vertices. In [28] (see also [13]) it is shown that if G is a cograph, then the null-space of $A(G)$ (resp. $A(G) + I$) has a basis consisting of the weight-two null-vectors corresponding to duplicate (resp. coduplicate) pairs. Hence the following can be deduced from Theorem 10.

Corollary 11. Let $\mathcal{F}(H)$ be the family of H -free graphs.

- (i) For all graphs $G \in \mathcal{F}(H)$ the null-space of $A(G)$ has a basis consisting of vectors of weight two if and only if H is an induced subgraph of P_4 .
- (ii) For all graphs $G \in \mathcal{F}(H)$ the null-space of $A(G) + I$ has a basis consisting of vectors of weight two if and only if H is an induced subgraph of P_4 .

Acknowledgments

The research of the author was in part supported by a grant from IPM (No. 95050114).

References

- [1] M. Andelić and S.K. Simić, Some notes on the threshold graphs, *Discrete Math.* **310** (2010), 2241–2248.
- [2] T. Biyikoğlu, S.K. Simić, and Z. Stanić, Some notes on spectra of cographs, *Ars Combin.* **100** (2011), 421–434.
- [3] A. Brandstädt, V.B. Le, and J.P. Spinrad, *Graph Classes: A Survey*, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 1999.
- [4] A.E. Brouwer and W.H. Haemers, *Spectra of Graphs*, Springer, New York, 2012.
- [5] G.J. Chang, L.-H. Huang, and H.-G. Yeh, On the rank of a cograph, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **429** (2008), 601–605.
- [6] V. Chvátal and P.L. Hammer, Aggregation of inequalities in integer programming, *Ann. Discrete Math.* **1** (1977), 145–162.
- [7] D.G. Corneil, H. Lerchs, and L.S. Burlingham, Complement reducible graphs, *Discrete Appl. Math.* **3** (1981), 163–174.
- [8] D. Cvetković, P. Rowlinson, and S. Simić, *Spectral Generalizations of Line Graphs, On Graphs with Least Eigenvalue -2* , London Math. Society Lecture Note Series, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2004.
- [9] F. Esser and F. Harary, On the spectrum of a complete multipartite graph, *European J. Combin.* **1** (1980), 211–218.
- [10] S. Földes and P.L. Hammer, The Dilworth number of a graph, *Ann. Discrete Math.* **2** (1978), 211–219.

- [11] J. Gagneur, R. Krause, T. Bouwmeester, and G. Casari, Modular decomposition of protein-protein interaction networks, *Genome Biology* **5** (2004), R57.
- [12] T. Gallai, Transitiv orientierbarer graphen, *Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar* **18** (1967), 25–66.
- [13] E. Ghorbani, Spectral properties of cographs and P_5 -free graphs, *Linear Multilinear Algebra*, to appear.
- [14] F. Harary, The structure of threshold graphs, *Riv. Mat. Sci. Econom. Social.* **2** (1979), 169–172.
- [15] L.-H. Huang, B.-S. Tam, and S.-H. Wu, Graphs whose adjacency matrices have rank equal to the number of distinct nonzero rows, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **438** (2013), 4008–4040.
- [16] A.K. Kelmans, The number of trees in a graph. I, *Autom. Remote Control* **26** (1965), 2118–2129.
- [17] A.K. Kelmans, The number of trees in a graph. II, *Autom. Remote Control* **27** (1966), 233–241.
- [18] D.P. Jacobs, V. Trevisan, and F. Tura, Eigenvalue location in threshold graphs, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **439** (2013), 2762–2773.
- [19] D.P. Jacobs, V. Trevisan, and F. Tura, Eigenvalue location in cographs, *Discrete Appl. Math.* **245** (2018), 220–235.
- [20] H.A. Jung, On a class of posets and the corresponding comparability graphs, *J. Combin. Theory Series B* **24** (1978), 125–133.
- [21] H. Lerchs, On cliques and kernels, Technical Report, Dept. of Comp. Sci., Univ. of Toronto, 1971.
- [22] J. Liu and H.S. Zhou, Dominating subgraphs in graphs with some forbidden structures, *Discrete Math.* **135** (1994), 163–168.
- [23] N.V.R. Mahadev and U.N. Peled, *Threshold Graphs and Related Topics*, Annals of Discrete Mathematics, NorthHolland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1995.
- [24] P. Manca, On a simple characterisation of threshold graphs, *Riv. Mat. Sci. Econom. Social.* **2** (1979), 3–8.
- [25] A. Mohammadian and V. Trevisan, Some spectral properties of cographs, *Discrete Math.* **339** (2016), 1261–1264.
- [26] K. Nakano, S. Olariu, and A. Zomaya, A time-optimal solution for the path cover problem on cographs, *Theoret. Comput. Sci.* **290** (2003), 1541–1556.
- [27] G.F. Royle, The rank of a cograph, *Electron. J. Combin.* **10** (2003), Note 11.

- [28] T. Sander, On certain eigenspaces of cographs, *Electron. J. Combin.* **15** (2008), Research Paper 140.
- [29] D. Seinsche, On a property of the class of n -colorable graphs, *J. Combin. Theory Series B* **16** (1974), 191–193.
- [30] T. Sillke, Graphs with maximal rank, <https://www.math.uni-bielefeld.de/~sillke/PROBLEMS/cograph>.
- [31] D.P. Sumner, Dacey graphs, *J. Austral. Math. Soc.* **18** (1974), 492–502.