

Complementation in T-perfect Graphs

Yixin Cao*

Shenghua Wang*

Abstract

Inspired by applications of perfect graphs in combinatorial optimization, Chvátal defined t -perfect graphs in 1970s. The long efforts of characterizing t -perfect graphs started immediately, but embarrassingly, even a working conjecture on it is still missing after nearly 50 years. Unlike perfect graphs, t -perfect graphs are not closed under substitution or complementation. A full characterization of t -perfection with respect to substitution has been obtained by Benchetrit in his Ph.D. thesis. Through the present work we attempt to understand t -perfection with respect to complementation. In particular, we show that there are only five pairs of graphs such that both the graphs and their complements are minimally t -imperfect.

1 Introduction

Partly motivated by Shannon's work on communication theory, Berge proposed the concept of perfect graphs, and the two perfect graph conjectures [3], both settled now. Chvátal [9] and Padberg [20] independently showed that the independent set polytope of a perfect graph (the convex hull of incidence vectors of independent sets of the graph) is determined by non-negativity and clique inequalities, and this is part of efforts trying to characterize the independent set polytope of a graph [20, 18, 19, 9]. Chvátal [9] went further to propose a class of graphs directly defined by the properties of their independent set polytopes. A graph is t -perfect if its independent set polytope can be fully described by non-negativity, edge, and odd-cycle inequalities. The class of t -perfect graphs and the class of perfect graphs are incomparable: C_5 is t -perfect but not perfect, while K_4 is perfect but not t -perfect. Similar as perfect graphs, the maximum independent set problem can be solved in polynomial time in t -perfect graphs [15]; see also Eisenbrand et al. [11].

The progress toward understanding t -perfection has been embarrassingly slow. While the original paper of Berge [2] on perfect graphs already contains several important subclasses of perfect graphs, thus far, only few graph classes are known to be t -perfect. Because of the absence of odd cycles, bipartite graphs are trivial examples, and this can be generalized to almost bipartite graphs [12]. Another class is the series-parallel graphs [4]. Extending these two classes, Gerards [13] showed that any graph contains no $odd-K_4$ (a subdivision of K_4 in which every triangle of K_4 becomes an odd cycle) is t -perfect.

The strong perfect graph theorem states that a graph G is perfect if and only if G does not contain any odd hole (an induced cycle of length at least four) or its complement [8]. In other words, the minimally imperfect graphs (imperfect graphs whose proper induced subgraphs are all perfect) are odd holes and their complements. Naturally, we would like to know minimally t -imperfect graphs, whose definition is more technical and is left to the next section. However, even a working conjecture on them is still missing. Full success has only been achieved on special graphs, e.g., claw-free graphs [7] and P_5 -free graphs [5]. In summary, known minimally t -imperfect graphs include $(3, 3)$ -partitionable graphs [10, 6], odd wheels [21], even Möbius ladders [22], and the complements of some cycle powers ($\overline{C_7}$, $\overline{C_{13}^3}$, $\overline{C_{13}^4}$, $\overline{C_{19}^7}$); see Figures 1 and 2. Note that Figure 2(f) is precisely $\overline{C_{10}^2}$, while all even Möbius ladders are also complements of cycle powers.

A particularly nice property of perfect graphs is that they are closed under complementation, known as the weak perfect graph theorem [17], also a trivial corollary of the strong perfect graph theorem. The key step of proving the weak perfect graph theorem is the Replication Lemma: The class of perfect

*Department of Computing, Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong, China. Supported in part by the Hong Kong Research Grants Council (RGC) under grants 15201317 and 15226116, and the National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC) under grant 61972330. yixin.cao@polyu.edu.hk, shenghua.wang@connect.polyu.hk.




Figure 1: Some minimally t -imperfect graphs. Shown here are $W_3, W_5, M_4, M_6, \overline{C_7}$, and $\overline{C_{10}^2}$.




Figure 2: The $(3, 3)$ -partitionable graphs (the notation will be introduced in Section 2).

graphs is closed under (clique) substitution. As evidenced by K_4 , t -perfection is closed under neither substitution nor complementation, and this may partially explain the difficulty in characterizing t -perfect graphs. Benchetrit [1] has fully characterized t -perfection with respect to substitution. The purpose of this paper is to understand t -perfection with respect to complementation. In particular, we want to know whether there exist minimally t -imperfect graphs whose complements are also minimally t -imperfect. If we check Figure 1 carefully, we may find that with few exceptions, ($W_3, W_5, W_7, \overline{C_7}$, and $\overline{C_{10}^2}$), the complements of all the others contain a K_4 , hence not minimally t -imperfect graphs. On the other hand, it is quite obvious that the graphs in the second row of Figure 2 are precisely the complements of those in the first. Our main result is that the ten $(3, 3)$ -partitionable graphs are all the minimally t -imperfect graphs whose complements are also minimally t -imperfect.

Theorem 1. *Let G be a minimally t -imperfect graph. The complement of G is minimally t -imperfect if and only if G is a $(3, 3)$ -partitionable graph.*

By the Ramsey theorem, a graph on 18 or more vertices contains a K_4 or its complement. Thus, it suffices to consider graphs of no more than 17 vertices.¹ We start from an easy observation that such a graph contains a 5-hole. Fixing a 5-hole C , we study the connection between C and other vertices, and it turns out that the graph cannot have more than ten vertices. Moreover, all such graphs follow a few simple patterns, and a careful inspection of these patterns leads to the main result. As a byproduct, we characterize all self-complementary t -perfect graphs that are not perfect.

Theorem 2. *Let G be a self-complementary graph that is not perfect. Then G is t -perfect if and only if G is one of the five graphs in Figure 3.*

All the other self-complementary t -perfect graphs are perfect. Although there is an infinite number of self-complementary graphs that are perfect, e.g., obtained by the 4-path addition [16], almost all

¹However, there are already 12005168 non-isomorphic graphs of 10 vertices (<http://oeis.org/A000088>).




Figure 3: Self-complementary t-perfect graphs that contain a C_5 , shown by thick lines (the notation will be introduced in Section 2).

of them contain a K_4 , hence not t-perfect. Indeed, with the same argument by Ramsey theorem, a self-complementary t-perfect graph has at most 17 vertices. We believe the number is very small.

2 Core graphs

All graphs discussed in this paper are undirected and simple. The vertex set and edge set of a graph G are denoted by, respectively, $V(G)$ and $E(G)$. Throughout the paper, we use n to denote $|V(G)|$, the *order* of G . The two ends of an edge are *neighbors* of each other, and the number of neighbors of $v \in V(G)$, denoted by $d(v)$, is its degree. For a subset $U \subseteq V(G)$, let $G[U]$ denote the subgraph of G induced by U , whose vertex set is U and whose edge set comprises all the edges whose both ends are in U , and let $G - U = G[V(G) \setminus U]$, which is simplified as $G - v$ if U comprises of a single vertex v . A *clique* is a set of pairwise adjacent vertices, and an *independent set* is a set of vertices that are pairwise nonadjacent. The complement \overline{G} of a graph G is defined on the same vertex set as G and two distinct vertices of \overline{G} are adjacent if and only if they are not adjacent in G . Note that a clique of G is an independent set of \overline{G} . A graph is *almost bipartite* if there is a vertex whose deletion leaves the graph bipartite.

For $\ell \geq 1$, we use P_ℓ and K_ℓ to denote the path graph and complete graph, respectively, on ℓ vertices. For $\ell \geq 3$, we use C_ℓ and W_ℓ to denote, respectively, the ℓ -cycle and the ℓ -wheel, which is obtained from a C_ℓ by adding a new vertex and making it adjacent to all vertices on the cycle; note that W_3 is precisely K_4 . For $\ell \geq 4$, an induced ℓ -cycle is also called an ℓ -hole. An ℓ -cycle, ℓ -hole, or ℓ -wheel is *odd* if ℓ is odd. For $k \geq 1$, the k th power of C_ℓ , denoted by C_ℓ^k , is obtained from C_ℓ by adding an edge between any two vertices of distance at most k . For $k \geq 2$, the $(2k)$ th even Möbius ladder is C_{4k}^{2k-2} . For integers $p, q \geq 2$, a graph G is (p, q) -partitionable if $n = pq + 1$ and for every vertex $v \in V(G)$, the set $V(G) \setminus \{v\}$ can be partitioned into q independent sets of order p and can be partitioned into p cliques of order q .

The *independent set polytope* of a graph G is the convex hull of the characteristic vectors of all independent sets in G . For a graph G , let $P(G)$ denote the polytope defined by

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq x_v &\leq 1 && \text{for every vertex } v \in V(G), \\ x_u + x_v &\leq 1 && \text{for every edge } uv \in E(G), \\ \chi(V(C)) &\leq \frac{|V(C)| - 1}{2} && \text{for every induced odd cycle } C \text{ in } G. \end{aligned}$$

It is worth pointing out that the last constraints can be imposed on all odd cycles instead of only induced ones, and there would be more constraints, but they determine the same polytope. Since the characteristic vector of every independent set of G is in $P(G)$, the independent set polytope of a graph G is contained in $P(G)$, while the other direction is not true in general. A graph G is *t-perfect* if $P(G)$ is precisely the independent set polytope of G . It is not difficult to see that every vector in the independent set polytope of G also satisfies the clique constraints

$$\sum_{v \in K} x_v \leq 1 \quad \text{for every clique } K \text{ of } G.$$

Since the vector $(\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3})^T$ is in $P(K_4)$ but does not satisfy the clique constraint, K_4 is not t-perfect.

A graph G is *perfect* if neither G nor \overline{G} contains an odd hole [2, 8]. The independent set polytope of a perfect graph is determined by non-negativity and clique inequalities [9, 20]. If a perfect graph G contains no K_4 , then every clique of G has order at most three, and hence any clique constraint in G is one of the three in the definition of $P(G)$.

Proposition 3. *Every K_4 -free perfect graph is t -perfect.*

It is easy to verify that t -perfection is preserved under vertex deletions: For every $v \in V(G)$, the polytope $P(G-v)$ is the intersection of $P(G)$ with the face $x_v = 0$. Moreover, t -perfection is also preserved under t -contractions at a vertex v with $N(v)$ being an independent set—contracting $N(v) \cup \{v\}$ into a single vertex [14]. Any graph H that can be obtained from G by a sequence of vertex deletions and t -contractions is a t -minor of G , and H is a *proper t -minor* of G if H has fewer vertices than G . Therefore, t -perfection is closed under taking t -minors. A graph is *minimally t -imperfect* if it is t -imperfect but all its proper t -minors are t -perfect, e.g., K_4 .

We say that a graph G is a *core graph* if neither G nor its complement contains a t -imperfect graph as a proper t -minor. By definition, any t -minor of a core graph is also a core graph. Moreover, if G is a core graph, then G is either t -perfect or minimally t -imperfect, and so is \overline{G} ; it is possible that G is t -perfect while \overline{G} is minimally t -imperfect, e.g., C_7 and $\overline{C_7}$. However, there are t -perfect graphs that are not core graphs, e.g., C_9 and $\overline{K_5}$.

Proposition 4. *A core graph cannot contain a K_4 or its complement as a proper induced subgraph.*

By Proposition 3, any $\{K_4, \overline{K_4}\}$ -free perfect graph is a core graph. Therefore, we focus on core graphs that are not perfect. Such a graph cannot contain an odd hole longer than seven or its complement as a proper induced subgraph.

Proposition 5. *Let G be a core graph different from C_7 and $\overline{C_7}$. Every odd hole in G is a C_5 . Moreover, if G is t -imperfect, then G contains a C_5 .*

Proof. For the first assertion, note that $\overline{C_7}$ is t -imperfect, so the only core graph that contains C_7 as an induced subgraph is C_7 itself; and for $k \geq 4$, the hole C_{2k+1} contains a $\overline{K_4}$. For the second assertion, note that if G does not contain a C_5 , then G is perfect, hence t -perfect by Propositions 3 and 4. \square

As we will see, 5-holes are pivotal in core graphs. First, every C_5 in a core graph different from $\overline{W_5}$ is dominating: Every other vertex is adjacent to at least two vertices on it.

Lemma 6. *Let G be a core graph different from W_5 and its complement. If G contains a 5-hole C , then for every $u \in V(G) \setminus V(C)$, either*

- i) u has exactly two neighbors on C , and they are consecutive on C ; or
- ii) u has exactly three neighbors on C , and they are not consecutive on C .

Proof. We consider the subgraph G' of G induced by u and the five vertices on C . If u is adjacent to all vertices on C , then G' is a W_5 . Since W_5 is t -imperfect, $G = G'$, a contradiction. If u is adjacent to four vertices or three consecutive vertices on C , then K_4 is a proper t -minor of G' , with t -contraction at a non-neighbor of u on C . Noting that the complement of C is a C_5 , we end with the same contradictions on \overline{G} if u has zero or one neighbor on C , or its two neighbors on C are not consecutive. \square

The next proposition further stipulates the relationship between a 5-hole and other vertices in a core graph.

Proposition 7. *In a core graph, every pair of consecutive vertices on a 5-hole has at most one common neighbor.*

Proof. Let G be a core graph, and let $v_1v_2v_3v_4v_5$ be a 5-hole in G . Suppose for contradiction that there are two vertices $x, y \in N(v_2) \cap N(v_3)$. By Lemma 6, neither of x and y is adjacent to v_1 or v_4 . But then dependent on whether they are adjacent, x and y either form a K_4 with $\{v_2, v_3\}$, or a $\overline{K_4}$ with $\{v_1, v_4\}$, both contradicting Proposition 4. The same argument applies to other edges on the 5-cycle. \square

As a consequence of Proposition 4 and Ramsey theorem, a core graph has at most 17 vertices. Propositions 6 and 7 together imply a tighter upper bound on those that are not perfect.

Corollary 8. *If a core graph contains a C_5 , then it has at most ten vertices.*

Let G be a core graph that contains a 5-hole, and we use the following notations for its vertices and edges, where the indices are always understood as modulo 5. We fix a 5-hole C and number its vertices as v_1, \dots, v_5 in order, and let $U = V(G) \setminus V(C)$. According to Lemma 6, each vertex in U is adjacent to two consecutive vertices on C . If a vertex in U is adjacent to v_i and v_{i+1} , $i = 1, \dots, 5$, then we denote it as u_{i+3} ; by Lemma 7, this is well defined. The five edges on C are all the edges among v_1, \dots, v_5 . For each u_i , the two edges $u_i v_{i+2}$ and $u_i v_{i+3}$ must exist in G . Apart from these $2|U| + 5$ edges, by Lemma 6, the other possible edges are among U or $u_i v_i$, $i = 1, \dots, 5$; they are called *potential edges*. Shown in Figures 4(a, b) are two *pattern graphs*, from which we can obtain different particular graphs, with different materializations of potential edges. We use (1324) to denote the graph of pattern Figure 4(b) in which U induces a path, with edges $u_1 u_3$, $u_2 u_3$, and $u_2 u_4$. In case that $G[U]$ is not connected, we use \parallel to separate its components, e.g., $(14\parallel 23)$ in Figure 4(d). Moreover, we cap an index i with \circ to denote the presence of the edge $u_i v_i$, e.g., $(1\overset{\circ}{3}24)$ in Figure 4(c).




Figure 4: Two patterns (a, b) and two particular graphs (c, d) of the second pattern. In the patterns, potential edges are depicted as thin green lines, while normal ones as thick black lines; no other edges can exist.

The proof of the following proposition is given in the Appendix.

Proposition 9. *The following graphs are t -perfect: (12) , $(1\parallel 2)$, $(1\overset{\circ}{2})$, $(\overset{\circ}{1}\parallel 2)$, $(\overset{\circ}{1}2)$, $(1\parallel 23)$, $(\overset{\circ}{3}1\overset{\circ}{2})$, $(\overset{\circ}{1}\overset{\circ}{3}\parallel 2)$, $(1\parallel \overset{\circ}{2}4)$, $(14\overset{\circ}{2})$, $(1\parallel \overset{\circ}{2}4)$, $(14\overset{\circ}{2})$, $(\overset{\circ}{1}\parallel \overset{\circ}{2}\parallel 4)$, $(\overset{\circ}{1}24)$, $(\overset{\circ}{1}2\overset{\circ}{4})$, $(1\overset{\circ}{3}4\overset{\circ}{2})$, $(1\overset{\circ}{3}4\overset{\circ}{2})$, $(\overset{\circ}{1}\overset{\circ}{3}4\overset{\circ}{2})$, $(\overset{\circ}{1}2\overset{\circ}{4}3)$, $(2\overset{\circ}{3}14)$, $(2\overset{\circ}{3}\overset{\circ}{1}4)$, $(2\overset{\circ}{3}\overset{\circ}{1}4)$, (1432) , $(\overset{\circ}{1}2\overset{\circ}{4}\overset{\circ}{3}\overset{\circ}{1})$, $(12\overset{\circ}{4}3)$, $(1\overset{\circ}{3}241)$, $(1\overset{\circ}{3}24)$, $(14\parallel 23)$, $(14\overset{\circ}{3}2)$, $(1\overset{\circ}{3}\parallel 24)$, and $(241\overset{\circ}{3})$.*

As easy consequences of Lemma 6, we have the following observations on core graphs. Here $i = 1, \dots, 5$.

- Obs.1) If both $u_i v_i$ and $u_{i+1} u_{i+2}$ are in $E(G)$, then at least one of $u_i u_{i+1}$ and $u_i u_{i+2}$ is in $E(G)$; otherwise, v_{i+4} has four neighbors on the 5-cycle $u_i v_i u_{i+2} u_{i+1} v_{i+3}$. By symmetry, if both $u_i v_i$ and $u_{i-1} u_{i-2}$ are in $E(G)$, then at least one of $u_i u_{i-2}$ and $u_i u_{i-1}$ is in $E(G)$.
- Obs.2) If both $u_i u_{i+1}$ and $u_i u_{i+3}$ are in $E(G)$, then at least one of $u_i v_i$ and $u_{i+1} u_{i+3}$ is in $E(G)$; otherwise, v_{i+3} has three consecutive neighbors on the 5-cycle $u_i u_{i+1} v_{i+4} v_i u_{i+3}$. By symmetry, if both $u_i u_{i-1}$ and $u_i u_{i-3}$ are in $E(G)$, then at least one of $u_i v_i$ and $u_{i-1} u_{i-3}$ is in $E(G)$.
- Obs.3) Suppose, all of $u_{i-2} u_{i-1}$, $u_{i-1} u_{i+1}$, and $u_{i+1} u_{i+2}$ are in $E(G)$. If $u_{i-1} v_{i-1}$ or $u_{i+1} v_{i+1}$ is in $E(G)$, then at least one of $u_{i-1} u_{i+2}$, $u_{i-2} u_{i+1}$, and $u_{i-2} u_{i+2}$ is in $E(G)$; otherwise, v_{i-1} or v_{i+1} has four neighbors on the 5-cycle $u_{i-2} u_{i-1} u_{i+1} u_{i+2} v_i$.
- Obs.4) If $u_{i-1} u_{i+1} \in E(G)$ and $u_{i-1} v_{i-1}, u_{i+1} v_{i+1} \notin E(G)$, then $u_{i+1} u_{i+2}, u_{i-1} u_{i-2} \notin E(G)$, and $u_i u_{i-1}, u_i u_{i+1} \in E(G)$; otherwise, the neighborhood of u_{i-2}, u_{i+2} , or, respectively, u_i on the 5-cycle $u_{i-1} u_{i+1} v_{i-1} v_i v_{i+1}$ does not satisfy Lemma 6.
- Obs.5) If $u_i u_{i+1} \notin E(G)$ and at least one of u_i and u_{i+1} is adjacent to u_{i+3} , then at most one of $u_i v_i$ and $u_{i+1} v_{i+1}$ can be in $E(G)$; otherwise, u_{i+3} has three consecutive neighbors on the 5-cycle $u_i v_i v_{i+1} u_{i+1} v_{i+3}$.
- Obs.6) If $u_{i+1} v_{i+1}$ is in $E(G)$ and none of $u_{i+1} u_{i+2}$, $u_{i+2} u_{i-2}$, and $u_{i-1} u_{i-2}$ is in $E(G)$, then $u_{i+1} u_{i-2}$, $u_{i+2} u_{i-1}$, and $u_{i+1} u_{i-1}$ cannot be all present in G ; otherwise, v_{i+1} has four neighbors on the 5-cycle $u_{i-1} u_{i+2} v_i u_{i-2} u_{i+1}$. By symmetry, if $u_{i-1} v_{i-1}$ is in $E(G)$ and none of $u_{i+1} u_{i+2}$, $u_{i+2} u_{i-2}$, and $u_{i-1} u_{i-2}$ is in $E(G)$, then $u_{i+1} u_{i-2}$, $u_{i+2} u_{i-1}$, and $u_{i+1} u_{i-1}$ cannot be all present in G .

Table 1: Graphs of pattern Figure 4(a). The columns are for combinations of edges among U ; the cases with only u_2u_3 and only $\{u_1u_3, u_2u_3\}$ are omitted because they are symmetric to respectively, u_1u_2 and $\{u_1u_2, u_1u_3\}$. The rows are possible combinations of edges between U and C . The invocation of an observation means that this configuration violates this observation.

	all	$\{u_1u_2, u_1u_3\}$	$\{u_1u_2, u_2u_3\}$	$\{u_1u_2\}$	$\{u_1u_3\}$
all	$d(u_1) = 5$	$d(u_1) = 5$	$d(u_2) = 5$	Obs.1 ($i = 3$)	$(\overset{\circ}{1}\overset{\circ}{3} \overset{\circ}{2})$
$\{u_1v_1, u_2v_2\}$	$d(u_1) = 5$	$d(u_1) = 5$	$d(u_2) = 5$	$d(u_3) = 2$	$(\overset{\circ}{1}\overset{\circ}{3} \overset{\circ}{2})$
$\{u_1v_1, u_3v_3\}$	$d(u_1) = 5$	$d(u_1) = 5$	$(\overset{\circ}{1}\overset{\circ}{2}\overset{\circ}{3})$	Obs.1 ($i = 3$)	$d(u_2) = 2$
$\{u_2v_2, u_3v_3\}$	$d(u_2) = 5$	$(\overset{\circ}{3}\overset{\circ}{1}\overset{\circ}{2})$	$d(u_2) = 5$	Obs.1 ($i = 3$)	$\cong (\overset{\circ}{1}\overset{\circ}{3} \overset{\circ}{2})$
$\{u_1v_1\}$	$d(u_1) = 5$	$d(u_1) = 5$	$(\overset{\circ}{1}\overset{\circ}{2}\overset{\circ}{3})$	$d(u_3) = 2$	$d(u_2) = 2$
$\{u_2v_2\}$	$d(u_2) = 5$	Obs.4 ($i = 2$)	$d(u_2) = 5$	$d(u_3) = 2$	Obs.4 ($i = 2$)
$\{u_3v_3\}$	$d(u_3) = 5$	$(\overset{\circ}{3}\overset{\circ}{1}\overset{\circ}{2})$	$\cong (\overset{\circ}{1}\overset{\circ}{2}\overset{\circ}{3})$	Obs.1 ($i = 3$)	$d(u_2) = 2$
none	$\overline{G} \cong (\overset{\circ}{1} \overset{\circ}{2} \overset{\circ}{4})$	Obs.4 ($i = 2$)	(123)	$d(u_3) = 2$	$d(u_2) = 2$

All graphs of pattern Figure 4(a) are summarized in Table 1 and characterized in Lemma 10.

Lemma 10. *Let G be a core graph of order eight. At least one of G and \overline{G}*

i) is t -perfect; or

ii) has a degree-2 vertex in U .

Proof. Note that if the degree of a vertex is five in G , then its degree in \overline{G} is two. According to Table 1, it suffices to show that graphs $(\overset{\circ}{1}\overset{\circ}{3}||\overset{\circ}{2})$, $(\overset{\circ}{1}\overset{\circ}{3}||\overset{\circ}{2})$, $(\overset{\circ}{1}\overset{\circ}{2}\overset{\circ}{3})$, $(\overset{\circ}{3}\overset{\circ}{1}\overset{\circ}{2})$, $(\overset{\circ}{1}\overset{\circ}{2}\overset{\circ}{3})$, $(\overset{\circ}{3}\overset{\circ}{1}\overset{\circ}{2})$, $(\overset{\circ}{1}||\overset{\circ}{2}||\overset{\circ}{4})$, and (123) are t -perfect. We have seen in Proposition 9 that $(\overset{\circ}{1}||\overset{\circ}{2}||\overset{\circ}{4})$, $(\overset{\circ}{3}\overset{\circ}{1}\overset{\circ}{2})$, and $(\overset{\circ}{1}\overset{\circ}{3}||\overset{\circ}{2})$ are t -perfect. The graph $(\overset{\circ}{1}\overset{\circ}{3}||\overset{\circ}{2})$ is t -perfect because $(\overset{\circ}{1}\overset{\circ}{3}||\overset{\circ}{2})$ is isomorphic to $(\overset{\circ}{2}\overset{\circ}{4}\overset{\circ}{1}\overset{\circ}{3}) - u_1$, and $(\overset{\circ}{2}\overset{\circ}{4}\overset{\circ}{1}\overset{\circ}{3})$ is t -perfect. On the other hand, $(\overset{\circ}{3}\overset{\circ}{1}\overset{\circ}{2})$, $(\overset{\circ}{1}\overset{\circ}{2}\overset{\circ}{3})$, and (123) are isomorphic to, respectively, $(1\overset{\circ}{2}\overset{\circ}{4}\overset{\circ}{3}\overset{\circ}{5}\overset{\circ}{1}) - \{u_1, u_2\}$, $(1\overset{\circ}{2}\overset{\circ}{4}\overset{\circ}{3}\overset{\circ}{5}\overset{\circ}{1}) - \{u_3, u_4\}$, $(1\overset{\circ}{2}\overset{\circ}{3}\overset{\circ}{4}\overset{\circ}{5}\overset{\circ}{1}) - \{u_1, u_5\}$, and $(1\overset{\circ}{2}\overset{\circ}{3}\overset{\circ}{4}\overset{\circ}{5}\overset{\circ}{1}) - \{u_1, u_5\}$, all t -perfect. \square

3 Degree-bounded core graphs of order nine

According to Propositions 6 and 7, every core graph of order nine is of the pattern in Figure 4(b). Throughout this section, let G denote a core graph of order nine where the degree of every vertex is between three and five. (The reason of imposing degree constraints will become clear shortly.) We consider whether edges u_iu_{i+1} , $i = 1, 2, 3$ are present in G .

Proposition 11. *Let G be a degree-bounded core graph on nine vertices. If for all $i = 1, 2, 3$, the edge u_iu_{i+1} is in $E(G)$, then G is an induced subgraph of a $(3, 3)$ -partitionable graph.*

Proof. We argue first that none of u_1u_4 , u_1u_3 , and u_2u_4 can be present in G ; i.e., $u_1u_2u_3u_4$ is an induced path in G . Suppose that $u_1u_4 \in E(G)$, then by Obs.4 (with $i = 5$), at least one of u_4v_4 and u_1v_1 is in $E(G)$. We may assume that $u_4v_4 \in E(G)$, and the other case is symmetric. Since $\{u_1, u_4, u_2, v_4\}$ is not a clique, $u_2u_4 \notin E(G)$. By Obs.2 (with $i = 1$), $u_1v_1 \in E(G)$, and then since $\{u_1, u_3, u_4, v_1\}$ is not a clique, u_1u_3 cannot be present. But then $G - \{v_2, v_3\}$ is isomorphic to \overline{C}_7 , a contradiction. Thus, $u_1u_4 \notin E(G)$. By Obs.2 (with $i = 2$), (noting $u_1u_2 \in E(G)$), the presence of u_2u_4 would imply the presence of u_2v_2 , but then $d(u_2) = 6$. Thus, $u_2u_4 \notin E(G)$, and by a symmetric argument, $u_1u_3 \notin E(G)$.

Now that none of u_1u_4 , u_1u_3 , and u_2u_4 is present, we consider all possible combinations of edges $\{u_iv_i \mid i = 1, \dots, 4\} \cap E(G)$. If none of them is in $E(G)$, then G is isomorphic to $(123451) - u_1$. If all of them are in $E(G)$, then G is isomorphic to $(\overset{\circ}{1}\overset{\circ}{2}\overset{\circ}{3}\overset{\circ}{4}\overset{\circ}{5}\overset{\circ}{1}) - u_1$. If only one u_iv_i is in $E(G)$, then G is isomorphic to $(\overset{\circ}{1}\overset{\circ}{2}\overset{\circ}{3}\overset{\circ}{4}\overset{\circ}{5}\overset{\circ}{1}) - u_3$ or $(123\overset{\circ}{4}\overset{\circ}{5}\overset{\circ}{1}) - u_4$. If only one u_iv_i is absent, then G is isomorphic to $(\overset{\circ}{1}\overset{\circ}{2}\overset{\circ}{3}\overset{\circ}{4}\overset{\circ}{5}\overset{\circ}{1}) - u_4$ or $(1\overset{\circ}{2}\overset{\circ}{3}\overset{\circ}{4}\overset{\circ}{5}\overset{\circ}{1}) - u_1$. Otherwise, exact two of edges u_iv_i are in $E(G)$, then G is isomorphic to one of $(\overset{\circ}{1}\overset{\circ}{2}\overset{\circ}{3}\overset{\circ}{4}\overset{\circ}{5}\overset{\circ}{1}) - u_4$, $(\overset{\circ}{1}\overset{\circ}{2}\overset{\circ}{3}\overset{\circ}{4}\overset{\circ}{5}\overset{\circ}{1}) - u_1$, $(\overset{\circ}{1}\overset{\circ}{2}\overset{\circ}{3}\overset{\circ}{4}\overset{\circ}{5}\overset{\circ}{1}) - u_2$, and $(123\overset{\circ}{4}\overset{\circ}{5}\overset{\circ}{1}) - u_2$. \square

In the rest, for at least one of $i = 1, 2, 3$, the edge $u_i u_{i+1}$ is absent from G . In the second case, we assume that both $u_1 u_2$ and $u_2 u_3$ are absent from G ; see Figure 5(b).




Figure 5: Refined patterns on nine vertices, the potential edges in Figure 4(b) but absent here are emphasized by red dashed lines. (a) all the three edges $u_1 u_2$, $u_2 u_3$, and $u_3 u_4$ are present; (b) both $u_1 u_2$ and $u_2 u_3$ are absent; (c) $u_2 u_3$ is absent but both $u_1 u_2$ and $u_3 u_4$ are present; (d) $u_1 u_2$ is absent but $u_2 u_3$ is present.

Proposition 12. *Let G be a degree-bounded core graph on nine vertices. If both $u_1 u_2$ and $u_2 u_3$ are absent from G , then G is isomorphic to one of $(1\dot{3}\dot{4}\dot{2})$, $(1\dot{3}\dot{4}2)$, $(\dot{1}\dot{3}\dot{4}2)$, $(1\dot{3}\|\dot{2}4)$, and $(\dot{2}41\dot{3})$.*

Proof. We first argue that the edge $u_1 u_3$ must be present. Suppose for contradiction that $u_1 u_3$ is absent. Note that $u_2 v_2 \in E(G)$, as otherwise $\{u_1, u_2, u_3, v_2\}$ forms an independent set. The edge $u_3 v_3$ cannot be in $E(G)$, as otherwise u_1 has only one neighbor on the 5-cycle $u_3 v_3 v_2 u_2 v_5$, contradicting Lemma 6. Then $d(u_3) > 2$ forces $u_3 u_4 \in E(G)$. By Obs.1 (with $i = 2$), $u_2 u_4 \in E(G)$, and by Obs.5 (with $i = 1$), $u_1 v_1 \notin E(G)$. Since $d(u_1) > 2$, the edge $u_1 u_4$ must be present. Now that $u_3 u_4 \in E(G)$ and $u_1 v_1 \notin E(G)$, Obs.4 (with $i = 5$) implies $u_4 v_4 \in E(G)$. But then $d(u_4) = 6$, contradicting that G is degree-bounded.

Now that $u_1 u_3 \in E(G)$, by Obs.4 (with $i = 2$), at least one of $u_1 v_1$ and $u_3 v_3$ is present.

Assume first that $u_1 v_1 \in E(G)$. By Proposition 4, at least one of $u_3 u_4$, $u_2 u_4$, and $u_3 v_3$ is in $E(G)$, as otherwise $\{u_2, u_3, u_4, v_3\}$ forms an independent set. We argue that $u_3 u_4 \in E(G)$. Suppose for contradiction that $u_3 u_4 \notin E(G)$. If $u_2 u_4 \in E(G)$, then by Obs.5 (with $i = 1$), $u_2 v_2 \notin E(G)$; and by Obs.6 (with $i = 5$), Obs.4 (with $i = 3$), and Obs.5 (with $i = 3$), $u_1 u_4 \notin E(G)$, $u_4 v_4 \in E(G)$, and $u_3 v_3 \notin E(G)$. Then $u_1 v_3 v_2 u_4 u_2 v_5 u_3$ is a 7-cycle in G , contradicting Proposition 5. Thus, $u_2 u_4 \notin E(G)$, and $u_3 v_3 \in E(G)$. By Obs.5 (with $i = 3$), $u_4 v_4 \notin E(G)$. Since $d(u_4) > 2$, $u_1 u_4 \in E(G)$ and by Obs.5 (with $i = 1$), $u_2 v_2 \notin E(G)$. But then $d(u_2) = 2$, a contradiction. Now that $u_3 u_4 \in E(G)$, the edge $u_1 u_4$ cannot exist, as otherwise $\{u_1, u_3, u_4, v_1\}$ forms a clique. By Obs.2 ($i = 3$), $u_3 v_3 \in E(G)$. If $u_2 v_2 \in E(G)$, then by Obs.1 (with $i = 2$), $u_2 u_4 \in E(G)$, which violates Obs.5 (with $i = 1$). Since $d(u_2) > 2$, the edge $u_2 u_4$ must be present. Obs.4 (with $i = 3$), together with the fact that $u_2 v_2 \notin E(G)$, implies $u_4 v_4 \in E(G)$. Thus, G is $(\dot{1}\dot{3}\dot{4}2)$.

In the rest of the proof, $u_1 v_1 \notin E(G)$ and $u_3 v_3 \in E(G)$. Since $d(u_2) > 2$, at least one of $u_2 v_2$ and $u_2 u_4$ needs to be present. Note that the presence of $u_2 v_2$ implies the presence of $u_2 u_4$, by Lemma 6 applied on vertex u_4 and the 5-cycle $u_3 v_3 v_2 u_2 v_5$. If $u_2 u_4 \in E(G)$, but $u_2 v_2$ is not, then by Obs.4 (with $i = 3$), $u_4 v_4 \in E(G)$. The edge $u_3 u_4$ is in $E(G)$, as otherwise u_1 has three consecutive neighbors on the 5-cycle $u_3 v_3 v_4 u_4 v_1$, contradicting Lemma 6. Since $d(u_4) < 6$, the edge $u_1 u_4$ cannot be present. Then G is $(1\dot{3}\dot{4}2)$. Now that both $u_2 u_4$ and $u_2 v_2$ are present, the only potential edges that have not been excluded are $u_4 v_4$, $u_3 u_4$, and $u_1 u_4$. Note that the presence of $u_3 u_4$ implies the presence of $u_4 v_4$; otherwise, by Obs.4 (with $i = 5$), $u_1 u_4 \notin E(G)$, but then v_3 has three consecutive neighbors on the 5-cycle $u_1 v_4 u_2 u_4 u_3$, contradicting Lemma 6.

- If none of $u_4 v_4$, $u_3 u_4$, and $u_1 u_4$ is present, then G is $(1\dot{3}\|\dot{2}4)$.
- If $u_1 u_4$ is in $E(G)$ but $u_4 v_4$ and $u_3 u_4$ are not, then G is $(\dot{2}41\dot{3})$.
- Otherwise, we must have $u_4 v_4 \in E(G)$. Then $u_3 u_4$ must be present as well, as otherwise $u_3 v_3 v_4 u_4 v_1$ is a 5-cycle on which u_1 has three consecutive neighbors, contradicting Lemma 6. Since $d(u_4) < 6$, the edge $u_1 u_4$ cannot be present, and G is $(1\dot{3}\dot{4}\dot{2})$. \square

Note that it is symmetric to Proposition 12 if both $u_2 u_3$ and $u_3 u_4$ are absent. Next we consider the situation that $u_2 u_3$ is absent but both $u_1 u_2$ and $u_3 u_4$ are present; see Figure 5(c).

Proposition 13. *Let G be a degree-bounded core graph on nine vertices. If both u_1u_2 and u_3u_4 are in $E(G)$ but u_2u_3 is not, then G is isomorphic to one of $(1\dot{2}\dot{4}\dot{3})$, $(\dot{1}\dot{2}\dot{4}\dot{3}\dot{1})$, $(\dot{1}\dot{2}\dot{4}\dot{3})$, $(1\dot{2}4\dot{3}\dot{5}\dot{1}) - u_2$, and $(\dot{1}\dot{2}4\dot{3}\dot{5}\dot{1}) - u_5$.*

Proof. We start by arguing that u_1u_4 is absent, and at least one of u_2v_2 and u_3v_3 is present. Suppose for contradiction that $u_1u_4 \in E(G)$. By Obs.4 (with $i = 5$), at least one of u_4v_4 and u_1v_1 is in $E(G)$. If u_4v_4 is in $E(G)$ but u_1v_1 is not, then by Obs.2 (with $i = 1$), $u_2u_4 \in E(G)$; then $d(u_4) = 6$, a contradiction. A symmetric argument applies if u_1v_1 is in $E(G)$ but u_4v_4 is not. Now that both u_1v_1 and u_4v_4 are in $E(G)$, neither of u_1u_3 and u_2u_4 can be in $E(G)$, as otherwise $\{u_3, u_1, u_4, v_1\}$ or, respectively, $\{u_1, u_4, u_2, v_4\}$ forms a clique. But then v_4 has four neighbors on the 5-cycle $u_1u_4u_3v_5u_2$, contradicting Lemma 6. In the rest, $u_1u_4 \notin E(G)$. For u_2v_2 and u_3v_3 , if both of them are absent, then by Obs.2 (with $i = 3$), u_1u_3 has to be absent as well (note that u_3u_4 is in $E(G)$ while u_3v_3 and u_1u_4 are absent). By a symmetric argument, the edge u_2u_4 is also absent. But then $u_1v_3v_2u_4u_3v_5u_2$ is a 7-cycle in G , contradicting Proposition 5.

Since u_2v_2 and u_3v_3 are symmetric, it suffices to consider $u_2v_2 \in E(G)$. By Obs.1 (with $i = 2$), $u_2u_4 \in E(G)$. If none of the remaining undecided potential edges, u_1v_1 , u_3v_3 , u_4v_4 , and u_1u_3 , is in $E(G)$, then G is isomorphic to $(1\dot{2}4\dot{3}\dot{5}\dot{1}) - u_2$. If $u_1u_3 \in E(G)$, then by Obs.2 (with $i = 3$), $u_3v_3 \in E(G)$. The edge u_1v_1 is in $E(G)$, as otherwise u_4 has four neighbors on the 5-cycle $u_1u_3v_1v_2u_2$, contradicting Lemma 6. A symmetric argument enables us conclude that $u_4v_4 \in E(G)$. Then G is $(\dot{1}\dot{2}\dot{4}\dot{3}\dot{1})$. Now that $u_1u_3 \notin E(G)$, which implies u_3v_3 is not in $E(G)$ either, as otherwise, u_1u_2 is in $E(G)$ but neither of u_2u_3 and u_1u_3 is, contradicting Obs.1 (with $i = 3$). If u_1v_1 is in $E(G)$ but u_4v_4 is not, then G is isomorphic to $(\dot{1}\dot{2}4\dot{3}\dot{5}\dot{1}) - u_5$; if u_4v_4 is in $E(G)$ but u_1v_1 is not, then G is $(1\dot{2}\dot{4}\dot{3})$; otherwise, both u_1v_1 and u_4v_4 are in $E(G)$, and G is $(\dot{1}\dot{2}\dot{4}\dot{3})$. \square

In the last case, u_2u_3 is in $E(G)$, but at least one of u_1u_2 and u_3u_4 is not. We may assume without loss of generality that u_1u_2 is absent; see Figure 5(d).

Proposition 14. *Let G be a degree-bounded core graph on nine vertices. If u_2u_3 is in $E(G)$ but u_1u_2 is not, then G is isomorphic to one of $(2\dot{3}\dot{1}4)$, $(2\dot{3}\dot{1}4)$, $(2\dot{3}\dot{1}4)$, $(1\dot{4}\dot{3}2)$, $(1\dot{3}\dot{2}41)$, $(1\dot{3}\dot{2}4)$, $(14|23)$, $(1\dot{4}\dot{3}\dot{2})$, $(\dot{1}\dot{2}4\dot{3}\dot{5}\dot{1}) - u_3$, $(1\dot{2}4\dot{3}\dot{5}\dot{1}) - u_3$, and $(\dot{1}\dot{2}4\dot{3}\dot{5}\dot{1}) - u_1$.*

Proof. Consider first that u_3u_4 is in $E(G)$. We argue that neither of u_1v_1 and u_1u_3 cannot be present. If u_1v_1 is in $E(G)$, then by Obs.1 (with $i = 1$), $u_1u_3 \in E(G)$. As a result, $u_1u_4 \notin E(G)$, as otherwise $\{u_1, u_3, u_4, v_1\}$ is a clique. But then $u_3v_3 \in E(G)$ by Obs.2 (with $i = 3$), and $d(u_3) = 6$, a contradiction. Likewise, the existence of u_1u_3 would force $u_3v_3 \in E(G)$ by Obs.4 (with $i = 2$), then $d(u_3) = 6$. Now u_1 is adjacent to neither of u_3 and v_1 , the edge u_1u_4 must be present to avoid $d(u_1) > 2$. Moreover, $u_4v_4 \in E(G)$ by Obs.4 (with $i = 5$), and then from $d(u_4) < 6$ it can be inferred $u_2u_4 \notin E(G)$. If neither of the undecided potential edges, u_2v_2 and u_3v_3 , is present, then G is $(1\dot{4}\dot{3}2)$; if only u_2v_2 is present, then G is isomorphic to $(1\dot{2}4\dot{3}\dot{5}\dot{1}) - u_3$; if only u_3v_3 is present, then G is $(1\dot{4}\dot{3}\dot{2})$; otherwise, both are present, and G is isomorphic to $(\dot{1}\dot{2}4\dot{3}\dot{5}\dot{1}) - u_3$.

In the rest, u_3u_4 is not in $E(G)$. We consider the potential edges incident to u_1 and u_4 ; note that their degrees are at least three. By Obs.1 (with $i = 1$), the presence of u_1v_1 implies the existence of u_1u_3 ; likewise, u_4v_4 implies $u_2u_4 \in E(G)$.

- Case 1, u_1v_1 is in $E(G)$. Note that if u_2u_4 is in $E(G)$, then u_4v_4 must be in $E(G)$ as well; otherwise $u_2v_2 \in E(G)$ by Obs.4 (with $i = 3$), contradicting Obs.5 (with $i = 1$). First, if $u_4v_4 \in E(G)$, then by Obs.5 (with $i = 1$), $u_2v_2 \notin E(G)$. A symmetric argument implies $u_3v_3 \notin E(G)$. Note that $u_1u_4 \notin E(G)$, as otherwise $G - \{v_2, v_3\}$ is isomorphic to $\overline{C_7}$. Then G is isomorphic to $(1\dot{2}4\dot{3}\dot{5}\dot{1}) - u_1$. Second, if u_1u_4 is in $E(G)$ but u_4v_4 and u_2u_4 are not, then by Obs.5 (with $i = 1$), $u_2v_2 \notin E(G)$. Dependent on whether u_3v_3 is present or not, G is either $(2\dot{3}\dot{1}4)$ or $(2\dot{3}\dot{1}4)$.
- Case 2, u_4v_4 is in $E(G)$. It is symmetric to case 1.
- Case 3, u_1u_3 is in $E(G)$ but u_1v_1 and u_4v_4 are not. By Obs.4 (with $i = 2$), $u_3v_3 \in E(G)$. If u_2u_4 is in $E(G)$, then by Obs.4 (with $i = 3$), $u_2v_2 \in E(G)$. Dependent on whether u_1u_4 is in $E(G)$ or not, G is either $(1\dot{3}\dot{2}4)$ or $(1\dot{3}\dot{2}41)$. If u_1u_4 is in $E(G)$ but u_2u_4 is not, then $u_2v_2 \notin E(G)$, as otherwise $u_2u_3u_1u_4v_2$ is a 5-cycle, on which v_4 has two non-consecutive neighbors, contradicting Lemma 6. Then G is $(2\dot{3}\dot{1}4)$.
- Case 4, u_2u_4 is in $E(G)$ but u_1v_1 and u_4v_4 are not. It is symmetric to case 3.

Now that all of u_1v_1 , u_4v_4 , u_1u_3 , and u_2u_4 are absent, the edge u_1u_4 must be present to ensure $d(u_1) > 2$. Then $u_3v_3 \notin E(G)$, as otherwise u_2 has only one neighbor on the 5-cycle $u_1u_4v_1u_3v_3$, contradicting Lemma 6. A symmetric argument implies $u_2v_2 \notin E(G)$. Thus, G is $(14||23)$. \square

By Propositions 11–14, a degree-bounded core graph of order nine is one of $(1\dot{3}\dot{4}\dot{2})$, $(1\dot{3}\dot{4}\dot{2})$, $(\dot{1}\dot{3}\dot{4}\dot{2})$, $(\dot{1}\dot{2}\dot{4}\dot{3})$, $(\dot{1}\dot{2}\dot{4}\dot{3}\dot{1})$, $(1\dot{2}\dot{4}\dot{3})$, $(1\dot{3}\dot{2}\dot{4})$, $(1\dot{3}\dot{2}\dot{4}\dot{1})$, $(2\dot{3}\dot{1}\dot{4})$, $(2\dot{3}\dot{1}\dot{4})$, $(2\dot{3}\dot{1}\dot{4})$, $(\dot{2}\dot{4}\dot{1}\dot{3})$, $(1\dot{4}\dot{3}\dot{2})$, $(14||23)$, $(1\dot{4}\dot{3}\dot{2})$, $(1\dot{3}||\dot{2}\dot{4})$, or a proper induced subgraph of a $(3, 3)$ -partitionable graph.

Lemma 15. *All degree-bounded core graphs of order nine are t-perfect. Only $(\dot{1}\dot{2}\dot{3}\dot{4}\dot{5}\dot{1}) - u_2$, $(123\dot{4}\dot{5}\dot{1}) - u_2$, $(\dot{1}\dot{2}\dot{4}\dot{3}\dot{5}\dot{1}) - u_1$, $(1\dot{3}\dot{2}\dot{4})$, and $(\dot{2}\dot{4}\dot{1}\dot{3})$ of them are self-complementary graphs.*

We are now ready to prove Theorem 2.

Proof of Theorem 2. The sufficiency is quite obvious. One may easily verify that C_5 , $(\dot{2}\dot{4}\dot{1}\dot{3})$, $(1\dot{3}\dot{2}\dot{4})$, $(1\dot{2}\dot{3}\dot{4})$, $(\dot{1}\dot{2}\dot{3}\dot{4})$, and $(\dot{1}\dot{3}\dot{2}\dot{4})$ are all self-complementary. Since all of them contain a C_5 , they are not perfect. We have seen that $(\dot{2}\dot{4}\dot{1}\dot{3})$ and $(1\dot{3}\dot{2}\dot{4})$ are t-perfect; on the other hand, $(1\dot{2}\dot{3}\dot{4})$, $(\dot{1}\dot{2}\dot{3}\dot{4})$, and $(\dot{1}\dot{3}\dot{2}\dot{4})$ are isomorphic to $(123\dot{4}\dot{5}\dot{1}) - u_2$, $(\dot{1}\dot{2}\dot{3}\dot{4}\dot{5}\dot{1}) - u_2$, and $(1\dot{2}\dot{4}\dot{3}\dot{5}\dot{1}) - u_1$ respectively, hence t-perfect as well.

For the necessity, suppose that G is a self-complementary t-perfect graph and not perfect. Since both G and \overline{G} are t-perfect, G is a core graph. By Corollary 8, $5 \leq n \leq 10$. Since the order of a self-complementary graph is either $4k$ or $4k + 1$ for some $k \geq 0$, we can have $n \in \{5, 8, 9\}$. Since G is not perfect, it contains an odd hole, and by Proposition 5, every odd hole in G is a 5-cycle. If $n = 5$, then G is C_5 .

If $n = 9$, then G is of pattern Fig. 4(b). We argue that G is degree bounded. Every vertex in C has degree at least three and at most five. Suppose that one vertex $u \in U$ has degree two, then it is not adjacent to any other vertex in U . But then the degree of u in \overline{G} is six; thus there is a degree-6 vertex, which has to be in U . But then we have a vertex in U that is nonadjacent to others in U , and another vertex in U that is adjacent to all of the others in U , a contradiction. By Lem. 15, G is one of $(\dot{1}\dot{2}\dot{3}\dot{4})$, $(\dot{2}\dot{4}\dot{1}\dot{3})$, $(\dot{1}\dot{3}\dot{2}\dot{4})$, $(1\dot{2}\dot{3}\dot{4})$, and $(1\dot{3}\dot{2}\dot{4})$.

It remains to show that there is no graph of order 8 satisfying the conditions. Let G be a core graph of order 8. We may assume that the indices for the three vertices in U are not consecutive: If G is of pattern Figure 4(a), then we can consider its complement. (With different choices of 5-cycles, a core graph may be of more than one patterns.) If there is a vertex x of degree 2, then $x \in U$, and the two neighbors of x are adjacent. Then in \overline{G} , every vertex in U has degree at least three, which means x is mapped to a vertex y in C . However, if y has degree two, then its two neighbors are not adjacent in \overline{G} , a contradiction. Therefore, the minimum degree is at least three, and since G is self-complementary, the maximum degree is at most four. By Lemma 10, G can only be one of $(\dot{1}\dot{3}||\dot{2})$, $(\dot{1}\dot{3}||\dot{2})$, $(\dot{1}\dot{2}\dot{3})$, $(\dot{3}\dot{1}\dot{2})$, $(\dot{1}\dot{2}\dot{3})$, $(\dot{3}\dot{1}\dot{2})$, $(\dot{1}||\dot{2}||\dot{4})$, and (123) , but none of them is self-complementary. \square

4 Proof of Theorem 1

Bruhn and Stein [6] showed that the $(3, 3)$ -partitionable graphs are minimally t-imperfect.² Therefore, we only need to show the sufficiency in Theorem 1. We say that a clique K of a connected graph G is a *clique separator* of G if $G - K$ is not connected.

Lemma 16 (Chvátal [9], Gerards [14]). *No minimally t-imperfect graph contains a clique separator.*

Throughout this section, we assume that both G and its complement \overline{G} are minimally t-imperfect graphs. By Lemma 16, neither G nor \overline{G} can have a clique separator. Thus, for each vertex $u \in U$, we have

$$2 < d(u) < n - 3. \quad (1)$$

Note that if $d(u) = n - 3$, then u has two neighbors in \overline{G} , which is a clique separator.

Note that G is a core graph. By Proposition 5 and Corollary 8, the order of G is between five and ten. Recall that every almost bipartite graph, which contains a vertex whose deletion leaves the graph bipartite, is t-perfect [12]. The only core graph of order five is C_5 . Both core graphs of order six, (1)

²They showed that those containing C_{10}^2 are minimally t-imperfect, while $(1\dot{2}\dot{4}\dot{3}\dot{5}\dot{1})$ and $(\dot{1}\dot{2}\dot{4}\dot{3}\dot{5}\dot{1})$, which are complements to each other, are referred to an unpublished manuscript or Bruhn. For the sake of completeness, we provide a proof at the appendix.

and $(\dot{1})$, are almost bipartite, e.g., removing v_3 . There are 16 core graphs of order seven, (12) , $(\dot{1}2)$, $(1\dot{2})$, $(\dot{1}\dot{2})$, $(1\|2)$, $(\dot{1}\|2)$, $(1\|\dot{2})$, $(\dot{1}\|\dot{2})$, and their complements. All the listed eight graphs become bipartite after removing v_4 , hence almost bipartite. By Lemma 10 and the degree requirements (1), G cannot have order eight either. Likewise, by Lemma 15, all core graphs of order nine satisfying (1) are t -perfect. Therefore, we are only left with $n = 10$.

In the rest of this section, the order of G is ten. Our analysis is based on whether (123451) is a (not necessarily induced) subgraph of G . The arguments here are somewhat similar to that in Section 3. Let us start with an easy case, where all the five edges $u_i u_{i+1}$ for $i = 1, \dots, 5$ are in $E(G)$; see Figure 6(a). Recall that all the indices are understood as modulo 5.




Figure 6: (a) All the five edges $u_i u_{i+1}$ for $i = 1, \dots, 5$ are present; (b) both $u_2 u_3$ and $u_3 u_4$ are absent while $u_2 u_4$ is present; (c) all the edges among u_2, u_3, u_4 are absent; (d) $u_1 u_2$ is absent, while only $u_2 u_3$ and $u_1 u_5$ are present.

Proposition 17. *If for all $i = 1, \dots, 5$, the edge $u_i u_{i+1}$ is in $E(G)$, then G is one of the $(3, 3)$ -partitionable graphs.*

Proof. We first argue that U induces a cycle. Suppose for contradiction that $u_1 u_3$ is present. By Obs.4 (with $i = 2$), at least one of $u_1 v_1$ and $u_3 v_3$ is in $E(G)$. Since they are symmetric, we consider $u_1 v_1 \in E(G)$. Since $\{u_1, u_3, u_4, v_1\}$ is not a clique, $u_1 u_4 \notin E(G)$. Then by Obs.2 (with $i = 3$), $u_3 v_3 \in E(G)$, and since $\{u_1, u_3, u_5, v_3\}$ is not a clique, $u_3 u_5 \notin E(G)$. But then $G - \{v_4, v_5, u_2\}$ is isomorphic to $\overline{C_7}$, and G is not minimally t -imperfect.

Now that $G[U]$ is a C_5 , dependent on the combination of edges $u_i v_i$, $i = 1, \dots, 5$, we are in one of the $(3, 3)$ -partitionable graphs that contain (123451) . \square

The following two propositions deal with the case where for some $i = 1, \dots, 5$, both edges $u_i u_{i-1}$ and $u_i u_{i+1}$ are absent, Proposition 18 for $u_{i-1} u_{i+1}$ being present, and Proposition 19 for otherwise; see Figure 6(b, c).

Proposition 18. *Let $i = 1, \dots, 5$. If neither $u_i u_{i-1}$ nor $u_i u_{i+1}$ is in $E(G)$, then $u_{i-1} u_{i+1}$ cannot be in $E(G)$ either.*

Proof. Assume without loss of generality $i = 3$; i.e., both $u_2 u_3$ and $u_3 u_4$ are absent, and we show by contradiction that $u_2 u_4$ cannot be in $E(G)$. By Obs.4 (with $i = 3$), at least one of $u_2 v_2$ and $u_4 v_4$ is in $E(G)$. Since they are symmetric, we may consider $u_2 v_2 \in E(G)$.

Suppose that $u_4 u_5 \in E(G)$. Then $u_2 u_5 \notin E(G)$, as otherwise, $\{u_2, u_4, u_5, v_2\}$ is a K_4 . By Obs.2 (with $i = 4$), $u_4 v_4 \in E(G)$. If $u_1 u_2 \in E(G)$, then $u_1 u_4 \notin E(G)$ because $\{u_2, u_1, u_4, v_4\}$ cannot be a K_4 ; by Obs.3 (with $i = 3$), $u_1 u_5 \in E(G)$, but then $G - \{u_3, v_1, v_5\}$ is a $\overline{C_7}$, a contradiction to Proposition 5. Now that $u_1 u_2 \notin E(G)$. The edge $u_1 u_5$ is not in $E(G)$, as otherwise $u_2 v_2$ is in $E(G)$ and both $u_1 u_2$ and $u_2 u_5$ are not, a contradiction to Obs.1 (with $i = 2$). By Obs.5 (with $i = 1$), $u_1 v_1$ cannot be in $E(G)$ either. The set $\{u_2, u_1, u_5, v_1\}$ is an independent set in G , a contradiction. In the rest, $u_4 u_5 \notin E(G)$.

Suppose $u_3 u_5 \in E(G)$. By Obs.5 (with $i = 2$), $u_3 v_3 \notin E(G)$. Further, By Obs.6, 4, and 5 (with $i = 1$, $i = 4$, and $i = 4$ respectively), $u_2 u_5 \notin E(G)$, $u_5 v_5 \in E(G)$, and $u_4 v_4 \notin E(G)$. Hence, $u_2 v_4 v_3 u_5 u_3 v_1 u_4$ is a 7-cycle in G , contradicting Proposition 5. Thus, $u_3 u_5 \notin E(G)$.

Suppose $u_4 v_4 \in E(G)$. By Obs.5 (with $i = 4$), $u_5 v_5 \notin E(G)$. Since $\{u_1, u_5, u_4, v_5\}$ cannot be an independent set, at least one of $u_1 u_4$ and $u_1 u_5$ needs to be present. By Obs.1 (with $i = 4$), if $u_1 u_5 \in E(G)$,

then $u_1u_4 \in E(G)$ as well. Therefore, we always have $u_1u_4 \in E(G)$. Since $\{u_1, u_2, u_4, v_4\}$ cannot induce a K_4 in G , $u_1u_2 \notin E(G)$. By Obs.5 (with $i = 1$), $u_1v_1 \notin E(G)$. Since $\{u_2, u_1, u_5, v_1\}$ is not an independent set, at least one of u_1u_5 and u_2u_5 is in $E(G)$. If u_1u_5 is in $E(G)$, then by Obs.1 (with $i = 2$), $u_2u_5 \in E(G)$ and $G - \{u_3, v_1, v_5\}$ is isomorphic to $\overline{C_7}$. Otherwise, by Obs.6 (with $i = 3$), u_2u_5 has to be absent as well, and then $\{u_2, u_1, u_5, v_1\}$ is an independent set.

Therefore, none of u_3u_5 , u_4u_5 , and u_4v_4 can be in $E(G)$, and then $\{u_3, u_4, u_5, v_4\}$ forms an independent set, contradicting Proposition 4. \square

Proposition 19. *For all $i = 1, \dots, 5$, at least one of u_iu_{i-1} and u_iu_{i+1} is in $E(G)$.*

Proof. Assume without loss of generality, let $i = 3$. Suppose for contradiction that neither u_2u_3 nor u_3u_4 is in $E(G)$. By Proposition 18, $u_2u_4 \notin E(G)$. Thus, $u_3v_3 \in E(G)$, as otherwise $\{u_2, u_3, u_4, v_3\}$ forms an independent set. As a result, $u_2v_2 \notin E(G)$, as otherwise u_4 has only one neighbor on the 5-cycle $u_3v_3v_2u_2v_5$. Moreover, u_1u_2 must be in G : Otherwise, by Proposition 18, (noting that $u_2u_3 \notin E(G)$), u_1u_3 cannot be in $E(G)$ either, then $\{u_1, u_2, u_3, v_2\}$ forms an independent set. By Obs.1 (with $i = 3$), $u_1u_3 \in E(G)$, and then by Obs.5 (with $i = 3$), $u_4v_4 \notin E(G)$. Since $\{u_1, u_5, u_4, v_5\}$ does not induce an independent set, at least one of u_1u_5 , u_4u_5 , u_5v_5 , and u_1u_4 is in $E(G)$.

First, suppose that u_1u_5 is in $E(G)$. Then u_3u_5 is not in $E(G)$, as otherwise $\{u_3, u_5, u_1, v_3\}$ induces a K_4 . By Obs.2 (with $i = 1$), $u_1v_1 \in E(G)$. The edge $u_4u_5 \notin E(G)$, as otherwise contracting Obs.1 (with $i = 3$). But then $\{u_3, u_4, u_5, v_4\}$ forms an independent set.

Second, suppose that u_4u_5 is in $E(G)$. By Obs.1 (with $i = 3$), $u_3u_5 \in E(G)$. If u_1v_1 is in $E(G)$, then by Obs.1 (with $i = 1$), $u_1u_4 \in E(G)$, which means that $G - \{u_2, v_4, v_5\}$ is isomorphic to $\overline{C_7}$. Thus, $u_1v_1 \notin E(G)$; a symmetric argument enables us to conclude that $u_5v_5 \notin E(G)$. Since neither of u_2u_4 and u_5v_5 is in $E(G)$, from Obs.2 (with $i = 5$) we can conclude that, $u_2u_5 \notin E(G)$. By a symmetric argument we have u_1u_4 is not in $E(G)$ either. Now that none of u_1v_1 , u_5v_5 , u_2u_5 , and u_1u_4 is in $E(G)$, there is a 7-cycle $u_5u_4v_1v_5u_2u_1v_3$. Therefore, $u_4u_5 \notin E(G)$.

Third, suppose u_5v_5 is in $E(G)$. By Obs.1 (with $i = 5$), $u_2u_5 \in E(G)$. The edge $u_3u_5 \in E(G)$, as otherwise $\{u_3, u_4, u_5, v_4\}$ forms an independent set. But then $G - \{v_1, v_2, u_4\}$ is isomorphic to $\overline{C_7}$. Therefore, $u_5v_5 \notin E(G)$.

Last, suppose u_1u_4 is in $E(G)$. By Obs.6 (with $i = 2$), $u_3u_5 \notin E(G)$. But then $\{u_3, u_4, u_5, v_4\}$ forms an independent set.

In summary, none of u_1u_5 , u_4u_5 , u_5v_5 , and u_1u_4 can be in $E(G)$, and thus $\{u_1, u_5, u_4, v_5\}$ forms an independent set. \square

In the remaining case, u_iu_{i+1} for some $i = 1, \dots, 5$ is absent, but both $u_{i+1}u_{i+2}$ and u_iu_{i-1} are present. Moreover, by Proposition 19, at least one of $u_{i+2}u_{i+3}$ and $u_{i-1}u_{i-2}$ is in $E(G)$. See Figure 6(d).

Proposition 20. *If there is an $i = 1, \dots, 5$ such that u_iu_{i+1} is not in $E(G)$, then G is one of the $(3, 3)$ -graphs.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, let $i = 1$. Then $u_1u_2 \notin E(G)$, u_2u_3 and u_1u_5 are in $E(G)$, and at least one of u_3u_4 and u_4u_5 is in $E(G)$. We show by contradiction that u_3u_4 and u_4u_5 cannot be both in $E(G)$. In particular, we show that none of u_1v_1 , u_2v_2 , u_1u_3 , u_2u_5 , and u_3u_5 is in $E(G)$, and then $u_1v_4u_2u_3v_1v_2u_5$ is a 7-cycle.

- If u_3u_5 is in $E(G)$, then by Obs.4 (with $i = 4$), at least one of u_3v_3 and u_5v_5 is in $E(G)$. If u_3v_3 is in $E(G)$ but u_5v_5 is not, then by Obs.2 (with $i = 5$), $u_1u_3 \in E(G)$, which means $d(u_3) = 7$, a contradiction. A symmetric argument applies if u_5v_5 is in $E(G)$ but u_3v_3 is not. Hence, both u_3v_3 and u_5v_5 are in $E(G)$. As a result, neither u_1u_3 nor u_2u_5 can be in $E(G)$, as otherwise $\{u_3, u_1, u_5, v_3\}$ or, respectively, $\{u_5, u_2, u_3, v_5\}$ forms a clique. However, the vertex v_3 has four neighbors on a 5-cycle $u_3u_5u_1v_4u_2$. Therefore, $u_3u_5 \notin E(G)$.
- If u_1v_1 is in $E(G)$, then by Obs.1 (with $i = 1$), $u_1u_3 \in E(G)$. Note that $u_1u_4 \notin E(G)$, as otherwise $\{u_1, u_3, u_4, v_1\}$ forms a cliqued. By Obs.2 (with $i = 3$), $u_3v_3 \in E(G)$. But then $G - \{v_4, v_5, u_2\}$ is isomorphic to $\overline{C_7}$. Therefore, $u_1v_1 \notin E(G)$. By a symmetric argument, $u_2v_2 \notin E(G)$.
- Now that none of u_1v_1 , u_2v_2 , and u_3u_5 is in $E(G)$, from Obs.2 (with $i = 1$) it can be inferred $u_1u_3 \notin E(G)$, and then by Obs.2 (with $i = 2$), $u_2u_5 \notin E(G)$.

Thus, at most one of u_3u_4 and u_4u_5 is in $E(G)$. We may assume without loss of generality that u_3u_4 is in $E(G)$ and u_4u_5 is not; the other case is symmetric.

We argue that none of u_1u_3 , u_3u_5 , u_1v_1 , and u_5v_5 can be in $E(G)$. Suppose that u_1u_3 is in $E(G)$. By Obs.2 (with $i = 1$), at least one of u_1v_1 and u_3u_5 is in $E(G)$. If $u_3u_5 \in E(G)$, then $u_3v_3 \notin E(G)$, as otherwise $\{u_3, u_1, u_5, v_3\}$ forms a clique. On the other hand, by Obs.4 (with $i = 2$), at least one of u_1v_1 and u_3v_3 is in $E(G)$. Therefore, we always have $u_1v_1 \in E(G)$. Then $u_1u_4 \notin E(G)$, as otherwise $\{u_1, u_3, u_4, v_1\}$ forms a clique. By Obs.2 (with $i = 3$), $u_3v_3 \in E(G)$, which further implies $u_3u_5 \notin E(G)$ because $d(u_3) < 6$. But then all of u_1u_5 , u_1u_3 , u_3u_4 , and u_3v_3 are in $E(G)$ and none of u_1u_4 , u_3u_5 , and u_4u_5 is in $E(G)$, contradicting Obs.3 (with $i = 2$). Therefore, $u_1u_3 \notin E(G)$. By a symmetric argument, we can conclude that u_3u_5 cannot be in $E(G)$ either. Now that none of u_1u_3 , u_3u_5 , u_1u_2 , and u_4u_5 is in $E(G)$, together with the fact that both u_2u_3 and u_3u_4 are in $E(G)$, from Obs.1 (with $i = 1$ and $i = 5$), it can be inferred that both u_1v_1 and u_5v_5 cannot be in $E(G)$.

At least one of u_4v_4 and u_1u_4 is in $E(G)$, as otherwise $u_1v_4v_5u_3u_4v_2u_5$ is a 7-cycle. If u_4v_4 is in $E(G)$, then Obs.1 (with $i = 4$) will force u_1u_4 in $E(G)$ as well. On the other hand, u_1u_4 is in $E(G)$ and Obs.4 (with $i = 5$) will force u_4v_4 in $E(G)$ as well. Therefore, both u_4v_4 and u_1u_4 are in $E(G)$. Moreover, at least one of u_2v_2 and u_2u_5 is in $E(G)$, as otherwise $u_5v_2v_1u_3u_2v_4u_1$ is a 7-cycle. By a symmetric argument, both u_2v_2 and u_2u_5 are in $E(G)$. Note that u_2u_4 cannot be in $E(G)$, as otherwise $G - \{v_1, v_5, u_3\}$ is isomorphic to $\overline{C_7}$. Dependent on whether u_3v_3 is in $E(G)$, the graph is isomorphic to either (1^243^51) or its complement. \square

The discussion on the order of G and Propositions 17–20 imply Theorem 1.

References

- [1] Johann Benchetrit. *Geometric Properties of the Chromatic Number: Polyhedra, Structure and Algorithms*. Ph.D. thesis, Université de Grenoble, 2015.
- [2] Claude Berge. Les problèmes de coloration en théorie des graphes. *Publ. Inst. Statist. Univ. Paris 9*, pages 123–160, 1960.
- [3] Claude Berge. Perfect graphs. In *Six Papers on Graph Theory*, pages 1–21. Calcutta: Indian Statistical Institute, 1963.
- [4] Mouloud Boulala and Jean-Pierre Uhry. Polytope des independants d’un graphe serie-parallele. *Discrete Mathematics*, 27(3):225–243, 1979. doi:10.1016/0012-365X(79)90160-2.
- [5] Henning Bruhn and Elke Fuchs. t-perfection in P_5 -free graphs. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 31(3):1616–1633, 2017. doi:10.1137/16M1059874.
- [6] Henning Bruhn and Maya Stein. t-perfection is always strong for claw-free graphs. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 24(3):770–781, 2010. doi:10.1137/090769508.
- [7] Henning Bruhn and Maya Stein. On claw-free t-perfect graphs. *Mathematical Programming*, 133:461–480, 2012. doi:10.1007/s10107-010-0436-9.
- [8] Maria Chudnovsky, Neil Robertson, Paul D. Seymour, and Robin Thomas. The strong perfect graph theorem. *Annals of mathematics*, 164(1):51–229, 2006. doi:10.4007/annals.2006.164.51.
- [9] Václav Chvátal. On certain polytopes associated with graphs. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 18:138–154, 1975. doi:10.1016/0095-8956(75)90041-6.
- [10] Vásek Chvátal, Ronald L. Graham, André F. Perold, and Sue Whitesides. Combinatorial designs related to the strong perfect graph conjecture. *Discrete Mathematics*, 26(2):83–92, 1979. doi:10.1016/0012-365X(79)90114-6.
- [11] Friedrich Eisenbrand, Stefan Funke, Naveen Garg, and Jochen Köneemann. A combinatorial algorithm for computing a maximum independent set in a t-perfect graph. In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, January 12-14, 2003, Baltimore, Maryland, USA*, pages 517–522. ACM/SIAM, 2003. URL: <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=644108.644194>.

- [12] Jean Fonlupt and Jean-Pierre Uhry. Transformations which preserve perfectness and h-perfectness of graphs. In Achim Bachem, Martin Grötschel, and Bernhard Korte, editors, *Bonn Workshop on Combinatorial Optimization*, volume 66 of *North-Holland Mathematics Studies*, pages 83–95. North-Holland, 1982. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-0208\(08\)72445-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-0208(08)72445-9).
- [13] Albertus M. H. Gerards. A min-max relation for stable sets in graphs with no odd- K_4 . *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 47(3):330–348, 1989. doi:[10.1016/0095-8956\(89\)90032-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0095-8956(89)90032-4).
- [14] Albertus M. H. Gerards and F. Bruce Shepherd. The graphs with all subgraphs t-perfect. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 11(4):524–545, 1998. doi:[10.1137/S0895480196306361](https://doi.org/10.1137/S0895480196306361).
- [15] Martin Grötschel, László Lovász, and Alexander Schrijver. Relaxations of vertex packing. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 40(3):330–343, 1986. doi:[10.1016/0095-8956\(86\)90087-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0095-8956(86)90087-0).
- [16] Ken-ichi Kawarabayashi, Atsuhiko Nakamoto, Yoshiaki Oda, Katsuhiko Ota, Shinsei Tazawa, and Mamoru Watanabe. On separable self-complementary graphs. *Discrete Mathematics*, 257(1):165–168, 2002. doi:[10.1016/S0012-365X\(02\)00399-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0012-365X(02)00399-0).
- [17] László Lovász. Normal hypergraphs and the perfect graph conjecture. *Discrete Mathematics*, 2(3):253–267, 1972. doi:[10.1016/0012-365X\(72\)90006-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0012-365X(72)90006-4).
- [18] George L. Nemhauser and Leslie E. Trotter Jr. Properties of vertex packing and independence system polyhedra. *Mathematical Programming*, 6(1):48–61, 1974. doi:[10.1007/BF01580222](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01580222).
- [19] George L. Nemhauser and Leslie E. Trotter Jr. Vertex packings: Structural properties and algorithms. *Mathematical Programming*, 8(1):232–248, 1975. doi:[10.1007/BF01580444](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01580444).
- [20] Manfred W. Padberg. Perfect zero-one matrices. *Mathematical Programming*, 6(1):180–196, 1974. doi:[10.1007/BF01580235](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01580235).
- [21] Alexander Schrijver. *Combinatorial Optimization: Efficiency and Polyhedra*, volume 24 of *Algorithms and Combinatorics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003.
- [22] F. Bruce Shepherd. Applying Lehman’s theorems to packing problems. *Mathematical Programming*, 71:353–367, 1995. doi:[10.1007/BF01590960](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01590960).

Appendix: Omitted Proofs

The following sufficient condition for t -perfection is due to Benchetrit [1].

Proposition 21 ([1]). *Let K be a clique of a graph G . If $G - v$ is t -perfect for every $v \in K$, then G is t -perfect.*

Proposition 9 (restated). *The following graphs are t -perfect: (12) , $(1\|\dot{2})$, $(1\dot{2})$, $(\dot{1}\|\dot{2})$, $(\dot{1}\dot{2})$, $(1\|\dot{2}3)$, $(\dot{3}1\dot{2})$, $(\dot{1}\dot{3}\|\dot{2})$, $(1\|\dot{2}4)$, $(14\dot{2})$, $(1\|\dot{2}\dot{4})$, $(14\dot{2})$, $(\dot{1}\|\dot{2}\|\dot{4})$, $(\dot{1}\dot{2}4)$, $(\dot{1}\dot{2}\dot{4})$, $(1\dot{3}\dot{4}\dot{2})$, $(1\dot{3}\dot{4}2)$, $(\dot{1}\dot{3}\dot{4}\dot{2})$, $(\dot{1}\dot{2}\dot{4}3)$, $(2\dot{3}14)$, $(2\dot{3}\dot{1}4)$, $(2\dot{3}\dot{1}4)$, $(1\dot{4}32)$, $(\dot{1}\dot{2}\dot{4}\dot{3}\dot{1})$, $(1\dot{2}\dot{4}3)$, $(1\dot{3}\dot{2}41)$, $(1\dot{3}\dot{2}4)$, $(14\|\dot{2}3)$, $(1\dot{4}\dot{3}\dot{2})$, $(1\dot{3}\|\dot{2}4)$, and $(\dot{2}41\dot{3})$.*

Proof. Graphs (12) , $(1\|\dot{2})$, $(1\dot{2})$, $(\dot{1}\|\dot{2})$, and $(\dot{1}\dot{2})$ are almost bipartite graph, hence t -perfect. For each of the other graphs, we find a 3-clique K and then use Proposition 21. To show $G - v$ is t -perfect for every $v \in K$, we either directly show that it is isomorphic to a t -perfect graph, or show that it is a K_4 -free perfect graph (Proposition 3). The details are listed in Table 2, where \star means that the graph is a K_4 -free perfect graph. \square

Lemma 22. *Graphs $(1\dot{2}43\dot{5}1)$ and $(\dot{1}\dot{2}43\dot{5}\dot{1})$ are minimally t -imperfect.*

Proof. First, we show that neither of $(1\dot{2}43\dot{5}1)$ and $(\dot{1}\dot{2}43\dot{5}\dot{1})$ is t -perfect. Let G be either of them, and let $x = (\frac{1}{3}, \dots, \frac{1}{3})^T$. It is not difficult to use the definition to verify that x is in $P(G)$. On the other hand, x is not in the independent set polytope of G because the maximum independent sets for both graph have order three, while the sum of elements in x is $\frac{10}{3}$. Thus, the independent set polytope of G is different from $P(G)$.

We now argue that every proper t -minor of G is t -perfect. Since $N(v)$ is not an independent set for every $v \in V(G)$, it suffices to show that $G - v$ is t -perfect for every $v \in V(G)$. This can be further simplified by the following two observations. First, $G - u_2 \cong G - u_5$ and $G - u_3 \cong G - u_4$. Second, $G - u_i \cong G - v_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, 5$. It is easy to verify that both $(1\dot{2}43\dot{5}1) - u_1$ and $(\dot{1}\dot{2}43\dot{5}\dot{1}) - u_1$ are isomorphic to $(\dot{1}32\dot{4})$, while $(1\dot{2}43\dot{5}1) - u_2 \cong (21\dot{3}4)$ and $(\dot{1}\dot{2}43\dot{5}\dot{1}) - u_2 \cong (21\dot{3}\dot{4})$ and $(1\dot{2}43\dot{5}1) - u_3 \cong (1\dot{4}\dot{3}\dot{2})$ and $(\dot{1}\dot{2}43\dot{5}\dot{1}) - u_3 \cong (1\dot{4}\dot{3}\dot{2})$. To prove the t -perfection of the five graphs $(\dot{1}32\dot{4})$, $(21\dot{3}4)$, $(21\dot{3}\dot{4})$, $(1\dot{4}\dot{3}\dot{2})$, and $(1\dot{4}\dot{3}\dot{2})$ -perfect, we use similar arguments as those in Proposition 9, and the details are listed in Table 3. \square




Figure 7: Some t-perfect graphs

Table 2: For the proof of Proposition 9

	$K = \{a, b, c\}$	$G - a$	$G - b$	$G - c$
$(1 23)$	$\{v_3, v_4, u_1\}$	*	*	(12)
$(1 \overset{\circ}{2}4)$	$\{v_1, v_2, u_4\}$	*	*	$(1 \overset{\circ}{2})$
$(14\overset{\circ}{2})$	$\{v_1, v_2, u_4\}$	*	$(1 \overset{\circ}{2})$	$(1 \overset{\circ}{2})$
$(1 \overset{\circ}{2}\overset{\circ}{4})$	$\{v_1, v_2, u_4\}$	*	*	$(1 \overset{\circ}{2})$
$(14\overset{\circ}{2})$	$\{v_1, v_2, u_4\}$	*	*	$(1 \overset{\circ}{2})$
$(\overset{\circ}{1} \overset{\circ}{2} \overset{\circ}{4})$	$\{v_1, v_2, u_4\}$	*	*	$(\overset{\circ}{1} \overset{\circ}{2})$
$(\overset{\circ}{1}\overset{\circ}{2}4)$	$\{v_1, v_2, u_4\}$	*	*	$(\overset{\circ}{1}\overset{\circ}{2})$
$(\overset{\circ}{1}\overset{\circ}{2}\overset{\circ}{4})$	$\{v_4, v_5, u_2\}$	*	*	$(\overset{\circ}{1} \overset{\circ}{2} \overset{\circ}{4} - u_2)$
$(\overset{\circ}{3}1\overset{\circ}{2})$	$\{v_1, v_5, u_3\}$	$(\overset{\circ}{1}\overset{\circ}{2}\overset{\circ}{4} - u_1)$	$(1\overset{\circ}{2})$	$(1\overset{\circ}{2})$
$(\overset{\circ}{1}\overset{\circ}{3} \overset{\circ}{2})$	$\{v_4, v_5, u_2\}$	$(1\overset{\circ}{2})$	$(1\overset{\circ}{2})$	$(\overset{\circ}{1}\overset{\circ}{2}\overset{\circ}{4} - u_1)$
$(1\overset{\circ}{3}\overset{\circ}{4}\overset{\circ}{2})$	$\{v_4, v_5, u_2\}$	$(1 \overset{\circ}{2}\overset{\circ}{4})$	*	$(\overset{\circ}{1}\overset{\circ}{2}4)$
$(1\overset{\circ}{3}\overset{\circ}{4}\overset{\circ}{2})$	$\{v_4, v_5, u_2\}$	*	*	$(\overset{\circ}{1}\overset{\circ}{2}4)$
$(\overset{\circ}{1}\overset{\circ}{3}\overset{\circ}{4}\overset{\circ}{2})$	$\{v_4, v_5, u_2\}$	*	*	$(\overset{\circ}{1}\overset{\circ}{2}4)$
$(\overset{\circ}{1}\overset{\circ}{2}\overset{\circ}{4}3)$	$\{v_1, v_5, u_3\}$	*	*	$(\overset{\circ}{1}\overset{\circ}{2}4)$
$(2\overset{\circ}{3}14)$	$\{v_4, v_5, u_2\}$	*	*	$(14\overset{\circ}{2})$
$(2\overset{\circ}{3}\overset{\circ}{1}4)$	$\{v_4, v_5, u_2\}$	*	*	$(14\overset{\circ}{2})$
$(23\overset{\circ}{1}4)$	$\{v_3, v_4, u_1\}$	*	*	$(1 23)$
$(14\overset{\circ}{3}2)$	$\{v_3, v_4, u_1\}$	*	*	$(1\overset{\circ}{2}3451) - \{u_3, u_4\}$
$(\overset{\circ}{1}\overset{\circ}{2}\overset{\circ}{4}\overset{\circ}{3}\overset{\circ}{1})$	$\{v_4, v_5, u_2\}$	$(\overset{\circ}{1}\overset{\circ}{2}\overset{\circ}{4})$	*	$(\overset{\circ}{1}\overset{\circ}{2}4)$
$(1\overset{\circ}{2}\overset{\circ}{4}3)$	$\{v_3, v_4, u_1\}$	*	*	$(\overset{\circ}{1}\overset{\circ}{2}\overset{\circ}{4}3) - u_1$
$(1\overset{\circ}{3}\overset{\circ}{2}41)$	$\{v_4, v_5, u_2\}$	*	*	$(14\overset{\circ}{2})$
$(1\overset{\circ}{3}\overset{\circ}{2}4)$	$\{v_4, v_5, u_2\}$	*	*	$(1 \overset{\circ}{2}4)$
$(14 23)$	$\{v_3, v_4, u_1\}$	$(1 23)$	*	$(1 23)$
$(14\overset{\circ}{3}2)$	$\{v_3, v_4, u_1\}$	*	*	$(1234\overset{\circ}{5}1) - \{u_1, u_2\}$
$(1\overset{\circ}{3} \overset{\circ}{2}4)$	$\{v_4, v_5, u_2\}$	$(1 \overset{\circ}{2}4)$	*	$(1 \overset{\circ}{2}4)$
$(\overset{\circ}{2}41\overset{\circ}{3})$	$\{v_4, v_5, u_2\}$	$(14\overset{\circ}{2})$	*	$(14\overset{\circ}{2})$

Table 3: For the proof of Lemma 22

	$K = \{a, b, c\}$	$G - a$	$G - b$	$G - c$
$(\overset{\circ}{1}32\overset{\circ}{4})$	$\{v_3, v_4, u_1\}$	*	*	$(23\overset{\circ}{1}4) - u_4$
$(21\overset{\circ}{3}4)$	$\{v_1, v_2, u_4\}$	*	*	$(23\overset{\circ}{1}4) - u_4$
$(21\overset{\circ}{3}\overset{\circ}{4})$	$\{v_1, v_2, u_4\}$	*	*	$(23\overset{\circ}{1}4) - u_4$
$(14\overset{\circ}{3}\overset{\circ}{2})$	$\{v_3, v_4, u_1\}$	*	*	$(\overset{\circ}{1}\overset{\circ}{2}\overset{\circ}{3}45\overset{\circ}{1}) - \{u_4, u_5\}$
$(14\overset{\circ}{3}\overset{\circ}{2})$	$\{v_3, v_4, u_1\}$	*	*	$(\overset{\circ}{1}\overset{\circ}{2}\overset{\circ}{3}45\overset{\circ}{1}) - \{u_4, u_5\}$