

## INFINITE COGRAPHS AND CHAIN COMPLETE N-FREE POSETS

IMED ZAGUIA

**ABSTRACT.** We give a necessary and sufficient condition for a  $P_4$ -free graph to be a cograph. This allows us to obtain a simple proof of the fact that finite  $P_4$ -free graphs are finite cographs. We also prove that chain complete posets whose comparability graph is a cograph are series-parallel.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The graphs we consider are undirected, simple and have no loops. That is, a *graph* is a pair  $G := (X, E)$ , where  $E$  is a subset of  $[X]^2$ , the set of 2-element subsets of  $X$ . Elements of  $V$  are the *vertices* of  $G$  and elements of  $E$  its *edges*. The *complement* of  $G$  is the graph  $\overline{G}$  whose vertex set is  $X$  and edge set  $\overline{E} := [X]^2 \setminus E$ . If  $A$  is a subset of  $X$ , the pair  $G|_A := (A, E \cap [A]^2)$  is the *graph induced by  $G$  on  $A$* . Unless otherwise stated the graphs we consider are not necessarily finite.

**Definition 1.** *A graph  $G$  is called complement reducible, a cograph for short, if every induced subgraph of  $G$  with at least two vertices is either disconnected or the complement to a disconnected graph.*

Cograpghs were introduced in the early 1970s by Lerchs [9, 10] who studied their structural and algorithmic aspects. Cograpghs independently arose in the study of empirical logic where they were called hereditary dacey graphs (see [2, 13]).

**Definition 2.** *The path  $P_n$  is the graph whose vertex set is  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ , for a positive integer  $n$ , and edge set  $E = \{\{i, j\} : |i - j| = 1\}$ . A graph is  $P_n$ -free if it has no  $P_n$  as an induced subgraph.*

**Remark 1.**

- *A graph  $G$  is  $P_4$ -free if and only if its complement  $\overline{G}$  is  $P_4$ -free.*
- *The class of  $P_4$ -free graphs is hereditary, that is, if  $G$  is a  $P_4$ -free and  $H$  is an induced subgraph of  $G$ , then  $H$  is a  $P_4$ -free.*

The following characterization of finite cograpghs was obtained by several authors and can be found in [9, 2, 13]. For several equivalent characterization of finite cograpghs see Theorems 11.3.3 and 11.3.5 from [1].

**Theorem 1.** *A finite graph is a cograph if and only if it has no  $P_4$  as induced subgraph.*

---

*Date:* March 17, 2022.

*2010 Mathematics Subject Classification.* 06A6, 06F15.

*Key words and phrases.* (partially) ordered set;  $N$ -free; cograph; chain complete; series-parallel.

The author is supported by CDARP and NSERC.

The implication  $\Rightarrow$  is true even if the graph is assumed to be infinite. On the other hand the implication  $\Leftarrow$  is false in the infinite case. Consider the graph  $\mathcal{H} = (\mathbb{Z}, E)$  whose vertex set is the set of integers  $\mathbb{Z}$  and edge set  $E = \{\{i, j\} : i \text{ is even and } i < j\}$ . It follows from the definition of  $\mathcal{H}$  that the even integers form an infinite clique and the odd integers form an infinite independent set. We now prove that  $\mathcal{H}$  does not have  $P_4$  as an induced subgraph, yet  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $\overline{\mathcal{H}}$  are connected. Suppose for a contradiction that there are integers  $i, j, k, l$  such that  $\mathcal{H}_{\{i, j, k, l\}}$  is  $P_4$  and assume without loss of generality that  $\{i, j\}, \{j, k\}, \{k, l\}$  are its edges. Then  $i$  cannot be even because otherwise  $k$  and  $l$  must be odd and hence cannot form an edge contradicting our assumption. By symmetry  $l$  cannot be even. It follows then that  $i$  and  $l$  are odd and  $j$  and  $k$  are even. Since  $\{i, j\}, \{k, l\}$  are edges we infer that  $j < i$  and  $k < l$ . Since  $\{j, l\}$  is not an edge and  $j$  is even and  $l$  is odd it follows that  $l < j$ . Hence we have  $k < l < j < i$  and therefore  $\{k, i\}$  is an edge contradicting our assumption. This proves that  $\mathcal{H}$  does not have  $P_4$  as an induced subgraph. One can easily see that  $\mathcal{H}$  and its complement are connected hence  $\mathcal{H}$  is not a cograph.

In this paper we generalize Theorem 1 to infinite graphs and obtain in route a simple proof of it. Let  $G = (X, E)$  be a graph. For  $x \in X$  we denote by  $N(x) := \{y \in X : \{x, y\} \in E\}$  and set  $inc(x) := X \setminus (N(x) \cup \{x\})$ . Define

$$N_x := \{y \in N(x) : y \text{ is adjacent to all elements of } inc(x)\}.$$

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $G = (X, E)$  be a connected  $P_4$ -free graph of any cardinality. There exists  $x \in X$  such that  $N_x \neq \emptyset$  if and only if  $\overline{G}$  is not connected.*

As a consequence we obtain the following result which clearly implies Theorem 1.

**Corollary 3.** *Let  $G = (X, E)$  be a connected  $P_4$ -free graph of any cardinality. If there exists  $x \in X$  such that  $G_{inc(x)}$  has finitely many connected components, then  $\overline{G}$  is not connected.*

The proof of these two results will be given in Section 2.

There is an interplay between  $P_4$ -free graphs and a class of partially ordered sets. Throughout,  $P := (X, \leq)$  denotes a partially ordered set, poset for short. For  $x, y \in V$  we say that  $x$  and  $y$  are *comparable* if  $x \leq y$  or  $y \leq x$ ; otherwise we say that  $x$  and  $y$  are *incomparable*. A set of pairwise incomparable elements is called an *antichain*. A *chain* is a totally ordered set. The *comparability graph*, respectively the *incomparability graph*, of  $P$  is the graph, denoted by  $Comp(P)$ , respectively  $Inc(P)$ , with vertex set  $X$  and edges the pairs  $\{u, v\}$  of comparable distinct vertices (that is, either  $u < v$  or  $v < u$ ) respectively incomparable vertices.

A 4-tuple  $(a, b, c, d)$  of distinct elements of  $X$  is an  $N$  in  $P$  if  $b > a$  and  $b > c$ ,  $d > c$  and if these are the only comparabilities between the elements  $a, b, c, d$ . The poset  $P$  is  $N$ -free if it does not contain an  $N$ . We mention the following result that connects  $P_4$ -free graphs to  $N$ -free posets.

**Proposition 4.** *A graph is  $P_4$ -free if and only if it is the comparability graph of an  $N$ -free poset.*

Indeed, using the characterisation of comparability graphs [4, 6] one can easily see that  $P_4$ -free graphs are comparability graphs. Jung [7] gave a direct proof of Proposition 4 without using the characterisation of comparability graphs from [4, 6].

Finite  $N$ -free posets can be constructed from the 1-element poset using disjoint and linear sum. Let  $I$  be a poset such that  $|I| \geq 2$  and let  $\{P_i\}_{i \in I}$  be a family of pairwise disjoint nonempty posets that are all disjoint from  $I$ . The *lexicographical sum*  $\sum_{i \in I} P_i$  is the poset

defined on  $\bigcup_{i \in I} P_i$  by  $x \leq y$  if and only if

- (a) There exists  $i \in I$  such that  $x, y \in P_i$  and  $x \leq y$  in  $P_i$ ; or
- (b) There are distinct elements  $i, j \in I$  such that  $i < j$  in  $I$  and  $x \in P_i$  and  $y \in P_j$ .

If  $I$  is a totally ordered set, then  $\sum_{i \in I} P_i$  is called a *linear sum*. On the other hand, if  $I$  is unordered (antichain), then  $\sum_{i \in I} P_i$  is called a *disjoint sum*. A poset is *connected* if it is not a disjoint sum and it is *co-connected* if it is not a linear sum.

Let  $\mathcal{SP}$  denote the set of finite posets containing the 1-element poset and which is closed under linear sum and disjoint sum. The set  $\mathcal{SP}$  is called the set of series-parallel posets.

**Theorem 5.** *Let  $P = (X, \leq)$  be a finite poset. Then  $P$  is  $N$ -free if and only if  $P \in \mathcal{SP}$ .*

This theorem is false in the infinite case. Indeed, a poset whose comparability graph is  $\mathcal{H}$  is  $N$ -free and yet it is connected and co-connected. On the other hand we can replace the finiteness condition in Theorem 5 by chain completeness to obtain a similar result, thus generalizing Theorem 5. A poset  $P$  is *chain complete* if every nonempty chain has a supremum and an infimum.

**Theorem 6.** *Every chain complete  $N$ -free poset is a linear sum or a disjoint sum of chain complete  $N$ -free posets.*

## 2. A GENERALISATION OF THEOREM 1

Let  $G = (X, E)$  be a graph. A subset  $A$  of  $X$  is called a *module* in  $G$  if for every  $v \notin A$ , either  $v$  is adjacent to all vertices of  $A$  or  $v$  is not adjacent to any vertex of  $A$ . Clearly, the empty set, the singletons in  $X$  and the whole set  $X$  are modules in  $G$ ; they are called *trivial*. A graph is called *prime* if all its modules are trivial. With this definition, graphs on a set of size at most two are prime. Also, there are no prime graphs on a three-element set.

The graph  $P_4$  is prime. In fact, as it is well known, every prime graph contains an induced  $P_4$  (Sumner [12] for finite graphs and Kelly [8] for infinite graphs). It follows that no  $P_4$ -free graph on at least 3 vertices is prime.

**Lemma 7.** *Let  $G = (X, E)$  be a connected  $P_4$ -free graph of any cardinality and  $x \in X$ . Every connected component of  $\text{inc}(x)$  is a module in  $X$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $C$  be a connected component of  $\text{inc}(x)$  and suppose for a contradiction that it is not a module in  $G$ . Then  $C$  has at least two elements and there exists  $y \notin C$  such that  $y$  is adjacent to some vertex of  $C$  and not adjacent to another of vertex of  $C$ . Clearly we must have  $y \in N(x)$ . Now  $y$  induces a partition of the vertices of  $C$  into two subsets: the set  $C_1$  of the vertices adjacent to  $y$  and the set  $C_2$  of those vertices not adjacent to  $y$ . Since  $C$  is connected there are vertices  $a \in C_1$  and  $b \in C_2$  which are adjacent. But then  $\{x, y, a, b\}$  is a  $P_4$  in  $G$  contradicting our assumption. The proof of the lemma is now complete.  $\square$

**Lemma 8.** *Let  $G = (X, E)$  be a connected  $P_4$ -free graph of any cardinality and  $x \in X$ . Every connected component of  $inc(x)$  induces a partition of  $N(x)$  into two subsets  $N_1(x)$  and  $N_2(x)$  such that every element of  $N_1(x)$  is adjacent to every element of  $N_2(x)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $C$  be a connected component of  $inc(x)$ . Set  $N_1(x) := \{y \in N(x) : \text{for all } c \in C, \{y, c\} \in E\}$  and  $N_2(x) := \{y \in N(x) : \text{for all } c \in C, \{y, c\} \notin E\}$ . Clearly,  $\{N_1(x), N_2(x)\}$  is a partition of  $N(x)$  (follows from Lemma 7). Now suppose for a contradiction that there are vertices  $y_1 \in N_1(x)$  and  $y_2 \in N_2(x)$  such that  $\{y_1, y_2\} \notin E$ . Then  $\{c, y_1, x, y_2\}$  is a  $P_4$  in  $G$  where  $c \in C$ . A contradiction. The proof of the lemma is now complete.  $\square$

We now proceed to the proof of Theorem 2.

*Proof.*  $\Rightarrow$  Suppose  $N_x \neq \emptyset$  and set  $N'_x := X \setminus N_x$  and note that  $x \in N'_x$ . We prove that every vertex of  $N_x$  is adjacent to every vertex of  $N'_x$ . All we have to do is to prove that every vertex of  $N_x$  is adjacent to every vertex of  $N(x) \setminus N_x$ . So let's assume for a contradiction that there exist  $y_1 \in N_x$  and  $y_2 \in N(x) \setminus N_x$  such that  $\{y_1, y_2\} \notin E$ . Since  $y_2 \notin N_x$  there must be a connected component  $C$  of  $inc(x)$  and  $c \in C$  such that  $\{y_2, c\} \notin E$ . But then  $\{y_2, x, y_1, c\}$  is a  $P_4$  in  $G$  which is impossible.

$\Leftarrow$  Now suppose that  $\overline{G}$  is not connected. There exists then a partition  $\{X_1, X_2\}$  of  $X$  such that every vertex of  $X_1$  is adjacent to every vertex of  $X_2$  and let  $x \in X_1$ . It follows then that  $inc(x) \in X_1$ . Hence, there exists  $y \in X_2$ , and therefore in  $N(x)$ , which is adjacent to all vertices of  $inc(x)$ , that is,  $N_x \neq \emptyset$ . The proof of the theorem is now complete.  $\square$

We now proceed to the proof of Corollary 3.

*Proof.* We prove that  $N_x \neq \emptyset$  holds in the case where  $G_{inc(x)}$  has finitely many connected components. According to Lemma 7, every connected component of  $inc(x)$  induces a partition of  $N(x)$  into two subsets  $N_1(x)$  and  $N_2(x)$  such that every element of  $N_1(x)$  is adjacent to every element of  $N_2(x)$  and every vertex of  $N_1(x)$  is adjacent to all vertices of  $inc(x)$ . Among all connected components of  $inc(x)$  choose one, say  $C$ , that has the smallest (with respect to set inclusion)  $N_1(x)$ . We now prove that every vertex of  $N_1(x)$  is adjacent to every vertex not in  $N_1(x)$ . It is enough to prove that every vertex in  $N_1(x)$  is adjacent to every vertex in every connected component of  $inc(x)$ . Suppose not and let  $C'$  be a connected component of  $inc(x)$  and let  $c' \in C'$  such that  $\{y_1, c'\} \notin E$  for some  $y_1 \in N_1(x)$ . Let  $y_2 \in N(x) \setminus N_1(x)$ . Then we must have  $\{y_2, c'\} \in E$  because otherwise the partition induced by  $C'$  on  $N(x)$  generates a smaller  $N_1(x)$  than that of  $C$  contradicting our choice of the connected component  $C$ . Note that  $\{y_2, y_1\} \in E$ . But then  $\{c', y_2, y_1, c\}$  is a  $P_4$  for every  $c \in C$  which is impossible. The proof of corollary is now complete.  $\square$

### 3. A PROOF OF THEOREM 6

A subset  $A$  of  $X$  is called a *module* in a poset  $P = (X, \leq)$  if for all  $v \notin A$  and for all  $a, a' \in A$

$$(1) \quad (v < a \Rightarrow v < a') \text{ and } (a < v \Rightarrow a' < v).$$

The empty set, the singletons and the whole set  $X$  are modules and are said to be *trivial*. The notion of a module for general relational structures was introduced by Fraïssé [3] who used the term "interval" rather than module. A poset is *prime* if all its modules are trivial. We recall the following result (see [8]).

**Theorem 9.** *A poset  $P$  is prime if and only if  $\text{Comp}(P)$  is prime.*

It follows from Proposition 4 and Theorem 9 and the fact that no  $P_4$ -free graph on at least three vertices is prime that no  $N$ -free poset on at least 3 vertices is prime.

**Lemma 10.** *Let  $P = (X, \leq)$  be a poset. Then  $P$  is  $N$ -free if and only if for all  $x \in X$  every connected component of  $\text{inc}(x)$  is a module in  $P$ .*

*Proof.* Assume that every connected component of  $\text{inc}(x)$  is a module and suppose for a contradiction that  $(X, \leq)$  has an  $N$ . Then there are  $a, b, c, d$  such that  $(a, b, c, d)$  is an  $N$ . Hence,  $\{c, d\} \subseteq \text{inc}(a)$  and  $b > c$  but  $b$  is incomparable to  $d$  contradicting our assumption that the connected component of  $\text{inc}(a)$  containing  $\{c, d\}$  is a module in  $(X, \leq)$ .

Now let  $x \in X$  and let  $C$  be a connected component of  $\text{inc}(x)$  and suppose for a contradiction that it is not a module in  $(X, \leq)$ . Note that  $C$  has at least two elements. There exists then  $y \notin \text{inc}(x)$  that partitions  $C$  into two nonempty subsets: the subset  $C_1$  consisting of those elements of  $C$  comparable to  $y$  and the subset  $C_2$  consisting of those elements of  $C$  incomparable to  $y$ . Note that since  $C$  is convex  $y$  is either smaller than all elements of  $C_1$  or is larger than all elements of  $C_1$ , say  $y$  is lesser than all elements of  $C_1$ . We claim that  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  are connected components of  $C$  contradicting the connectedness of  $C$ . Indeed, if not, then there exists  $z \in C_1$  and  $t \in C_2$  such that  $t < z$ . But then  $(t, z, y, x)$  is an  $N$  in  $(X, \leq)$  contradicting our assumption.  $\square$

Let  $P = (V, \leq)$  be a poset and  $x \in V$ . We define

$$C_x^+ := \{y : y > x \text{ and } y \text{ is comparable to all elements of } \text{inc}(x)\},$$

and

$$C_x^- := \{y : y < x \text{ and } y \text{ is comparable to all elements of } \text{inc}(x)\}.$$

$$\text{Set } C_x := C_x^- \cup C_x^+.$$

**Lemma 11.** *Let  $P = (V, \leq)$  be a connected  $N$ -free poset. There exists  $x \in X$  such that  $C_x \neq \emptyset$  if and only if  $P$  is a linear sum.*

*Proof.* Suppose  $C_x \neq \emptyset$  and set

$$C'_x := \{y : y \text{ is comparable to } x \text{ and } y \text{ is incomparable to some element of } \text{inc}(x)\}.$$

Clearly  $\{C_x, C'_x\}$  is a partition of the set of elements comparable to  $x$ . We prove that every element of  $C_x^-$  is below every element of  $C'_x$  and that every element of  $C'_x$  is below every element of  $C_x^+$ . We notice at once that no element of  $C'_x$  is above some element of  $C_x^+$ . Suppose for a contradiction that there exists  $z > x$  and  $z \in C'_x$  such that  $z$  is incomparable to some element  $y \in C_x^+$ . Let  $t \in \text{inc}(x)$  be such that  $t < y$ . Then  $(t, y, x, z)$  is an  $N$  in  $P$  contradicting our assumption that  $P$  is  $N$ -free. This proves that every element of  $C'_x$  is below every element of  $C_x^+$ . Similarly we prove that every element of  $C'_x$  is above every element of  $C_x^-$ . Setting  $P_1 = C_x^-$ ,  $P_2 = C'_x \cup \text{inc}(x)$ , and  $P_3 = C_x^+$  we now have that  $P$  is the linear sum of  $P_1, P_2, P_3$  over the total order  $1 < 2 < 3$ .

Now suppose that  $P$  is a linear sum, that is,  $P = \sum_{i \in I} P_i$  and  $I$  is totally ordered. Let  $i \in I$  and  $x \in P_i$ . Then  $\text{inc}(x) \subseteq P_i$ . Hence every element  $y \in P_j$  for  $j \neq i$  is necessarily in  $C_x$  proving that  $C_x \neq \emptyset$  as required.  $\square$

We now proceed to the proof of Theorem 6.

*Proof.* Let  $P = (V, \leq)$  be a connected  $N$ -free poset and let  $x \in X$ . Now assume  $P$  to be chain complete and let  $C$  be a maximal chain containing  $x$  and let  $\mathfrak{s}$ , respectively  $\mathfrak{i}$ , be its supremum, respectively its infimum. Then  $\mathfrak{s}$  or  $\mathfrak{i}$  is comparable to all elements of  $inc(x)$ . If not, then  $\mathfrak{s}$  is incomparable to some element  $y_{\mathfrak{s}}$  of  $inc(x)$  and  $\mathfrak{i}$  is incomparable to some element  $y_{\mathfrak{i}}$  of  $inc(x)$ . From the connectedness of  $P$  and our assumption that  $P$  is  $N$ -free we deduce that there exists  $z$  comparable to  $\mathfrak{s}$  and  $y_{\mathfrak{s}}$ . Then  $z \notin inc(x)$  because otherwise  $z$  is in the connected component  $C(y_{\mathfrak{s}})$  of  $inc(x)$  containing  $y_{\mathfrak{s}}$  and hence  $y_{\mathfrak{s}}$  is comparable to  $\mathfrak{s}$  since  $C(y_{\mathfrak{s}})$  is a module (see Lemma 10) contradicting our assumption that  $\mathfrak{s}$  is incomparable to  $y_{\mathfrak{s}}$ . Clearly we must have  $z < x$ . Similarly there exists  $z'$  comparable to  $\mathfrak{i}$  and  $y_{\mathfrak{i}}$  and  $x < z'$ . Assume that  $z'$  is incomparable to  $\mathfrak{s}$ . Then  $y_{\mathfrak{i}} < \mathfrak{s}$  because otherwise  $(y_{\mathfrak{i}}, z', x, \mathfrak{s})$  is an  $N$  in  $P$ . In particular,  $y_{\mathfrak{s}}$  and  $y_{\mathfrak{i}}$  are incomparable (this is because  $y_{\mathfrak{s}}$  is incomparable to  $\mathfrak{s}$  and  $y_{\mathfrak{i}} < \mathfrak{s}$  and hence by Lemma 10  $y_{\mathfrak{s}}$  and  $y_{\mathfrak{i}}$  are in different connected components of  $inc(x)$ ). Also,  $z'$  is incomparable to  $y_{\mathfrak{s}}$  because otherwise  $(y_{\mathfrak{s}}, z', y_{\mathfrak{i}}, \mathfrak{s})$  is a  $N$  in  $P$ . But then  $z < y_{\mathfrak{i}}$  because otherwise  $(y_{\mathfrak{i}}, z', z, y_{\mathfrak{s}})$  is an  $N$  in  $P$ . Then  $\mathfrak{i} < z$  because otherwise  $(\mathfrak{i}, x, z, y_{\mathfrak{i}})$  is an  $N$  in  $P$  which is impossible. But then  $\mathfrak{i} < y_{\mathfrak{i}}$  since  $z < y_{\mathfrak{i}}$  contradicting our assumption that  $\mathfrak{i}$  is incomparable to  $y_{\mathfrak{i}}$ . Hence our assumption that  $z'$  is incomparable to  $y_{\mathfrak{s}}$  is false, that is,  $z' < \mathfrak{s}$ . Similarly we prove that  $z$  is comparable to  $\mathfrak{i}$ , that is,  $\mathfrak{i} < z$ . Hence  $y_{\mathfrak{s}}$  and  $y_{\mathfrak{i}}$  are incomparable (this is because  $y_{\mathfrak{s}}$  and  $y_{\mathfrak{i}}$  are in different connected components of  $inc(x)$ ). But then  $(y_{\mathfrak{i}}, \mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{i}, y_{\mathfrak{s}})$  is an  $N$  in  $P$  and this is impossible. Therefore  $\mathfrak{s}$  or  $\mathfrak{i}$  is comparable to all elements of  $inc(x)$ . The conclusion of the theorem follows from Lemma 11. The proof of the theorem is now complete.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] Brandstädt, Andreas; Le, Van Bang; Spinrad, Jeremy P. (1999), *Graph Classes: A Survey*, SIAM Monographs on Discrete Mathematics and Applications, ISBN 978-0-89871-432-6.
- [2] D.J. Foulis, *Empirical logic*, Xeroxed course notes, Univ. of Massachusetts (1969–1970).
- [3] R. Fraïssé. *L'intervalle en théorie des relations; ses généralisations; filtre intervallaire et clôture d'une relation.* (French) [The interval in relation theory; its generalizations; interval filter and closure of a relation]. Orders: description and roles. (L'Arbresle, 1982), 313–341, North-Holland Math. Stud., 99, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1984.
- [4] A. Ghoulà-Houri, *Caractérisation des graphes nonorientés dont on peut orienter les arêtes de manière à obtenir le graphe d'une relation d'ordre*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, **254** (1962), 1370–1371.
- [5] T. Gallai. Transitivity orientable graphen. Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar. 18 (1967), 25–66 (English translation by F. Maffray and M. Preissmann in J.J. Ramirez-Alfonsin and B. Reed (Eds), Perfect graphs, Wiley 2001, pp.25–66.
- [6] P.C. Gilmore and A. J. Hoffman, *A characterization of comparability graphs and of interval graphs*, Canad. J. Math. **16** (1964), 539–548.
- [7] H. A. Jung, *On a class of posets and the corresponding comparability graphs*, Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B **24** (1978), 125–133,
- [8] D. Kelly, *Comparability graphs*, in Graphs and Orders, I. Rival ed., NATO Adv. Sci. Inst. Ser. C Math. Phys. Sci. **147** (1985), 3–40.
- [9] H. Lerchs, *On cliques and kernels*, Dept. of Comp. Sci., University of Toronto (March 1971).
- [10] H. Lerchs, *On the clique-kernel structure of graphs*, Dept. of Comp. Sci., 1 University of Toronto I (October 1972)
- [11] D. Seinsche, (1974), *On a property of the class of  $n$ -colorable graphs*, Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B **16** (2), 191–193,
- [12] D.P. Sumner, Graphs indecomposable with respect to the X-join, Discrete Math., **6** (1973), 281–298.
- [13] D.P. Sumner, *Dacey graphs*, J. Austral. Math. Soc. **18** (1974), 492–502,

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS & COMPUTER SCIENCE, ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE, P.O.Box 17000,  
STATION FORCES, KINGSTON, ONTARIO, CANADA K7K 7B4  
*E-mail address:* `zaguia@rmc.ca`