

Decomposition horizons: from graph sparsity to model-theoretic dividing lines

Samuel Braunfeld  

Computer Science Institute of Charles University (IUUK), Praha, Czech Republic

Jaroslav Nešetřil  

Computer Science Institute of Charles University (IUUK), Praha, Czech Republic

Patrice Ossona de Mendez  

Centre d'Analyse et de Mathématiques Sociales (CNRS, UMR 8557), Paris, France and
Computer Science Institute of Charles University, Praha, Czech Republic

Sebastian Siebertz  

University of Bremen, Bremen, Germany

Abstract

Let \mathcal{C} be a hereditary class of graphs. Assume that for every p there is a hereditary NIP class \mathcal{D}_p with the property that the vertex set of every graph $G \in \mathcal{C}$ can be partitioned into $N_p = N_p(G)$ parts in such a way that the union of any p parts induce a subgraph in \mathcal{D}_p and $\log N_p(G) \in o(\log |G|)$. We prove that \mathcal{C} is (monadically) NIP. Similarly, if every \mathcal{D}_p is stable, then \mathcal{C} is (monadically) stable. Results of this type lead to the definition of decomposition horizons as closure operators. We establish some of their basic properties and provide several further examples of decomposition horizons.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Theory of computation \rightarrow Finite Model Theory; Mathematics of computing \rightarrow Graph theory

Keywords and phrases Finite model theory, first-order transductions, structural graph theory

Funding This paper is part of a project that has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No 810115 – DYNASNET) and from the German Research Foundation (DFG) with grant agreement No 444419611. Samuel Braunfeld is further supported by Project 21-10775S of the Czech Science Foundation (GAČR).



1 Introduction

In the late 90's, Baker [2] introduced the shifting strategy, allowing a linear time approximation scheme for independent sets on planar graphs. The idea is to start a breadth-first search at a vertex v of a planar graph, which partitions the vertex set of the graph into layers L_1, \dots, L_h . Then, for given $s \in [D]$, by deleting all the layers L_i with $i \equiv s \pmod{D}$, one gets a graph with bounded treewidth on which a maximum independent set can be found in linear time. Considering all the possible values of s , we obtain a $(1 + 1/D)$ -approximate solution of the problem. Note that grouping the layers L_i with i in a same class modulo D yields a partition of the vertex set into D parts V_0, \dots, V_{D-1} such that the union of any $p < D$ of them induces a subgraph with treewidth at most $3p + 4$.

This approach was further developed by DeVos, Ding, Oporowski, Sanders, Reed, Seymour, and Vertigan [7], who proved in particular that for every proper minor closed class of graphs \mathcal{C} and every integer p , there exists an integer N_p such that the vertex set of every graph $G \in \mathcal{C}$ can be partitioned into N_p parts, each p of them inducing a subgraph with treewidth at most $p - 1$.

This result has been further extended by two of the authors of the present paper in a characterization of both bounded expansion classes and nowhere dense classes. Before stating these results, recall that the *treedepth* of a graph G is the minimum depth of a rooted forest F , such that G is a subgraph of the closure of F (the graph obtained from F by adding edges between each vertex and its ancestors). With this definition in hand, the characterization theorems read as follows.

► **Theorem 1** ([16]). *A class \mathcal{C} has bounded expansion if and only if, for every parameter p , there is an integer N_p such that the vertex set of each graph $G \in \mathcal{C}$ can be partitioned into at most N_p parts, each p of them inducing a subgraph with treedepth at most p .*

► **Theorem 2** (see [17, 18]). *A class \mathcal{C} is nowhere dense if and only if, for every parameter p and for every graph $G \in \mathcal{C}$ there is an integer $N_p(G) \in |G|^{o(1)}$, such that the vertex set of G can be partitioned into at most $N_p(G)$ parts, each p of them inducing a subgraph with treedepth at most p .*

The notions of classes with bounded expansion and of nowhere dense classes are central to the study of classes of sparse graphs [17]. Note that the treewidth of a graph is bounded from above by its treedepth and hence by the result of DeVos et al. [7] and Theorem 1 every proper minor closed class has bounded expansion. Surprisingly, it appeared that for monotone classes of graphs, the notion of nowhere dense class of graphs coincides with fundamental dividing lines introduced in modern model theory [22]:

► **Theorem 3** ([1]). *For a monotone class of graphs \mathcal{C} , the following are equivalent:*

- (1) \mathcal{C} is nowhere dense;
- (2) \mathcal{C} is stable;
- (3) \mathcal{C} is monadically stable;
- (4) \mathcal{C} is NIP;
- (5) \mathcal{C} is monadically NIP.

For general hereditary classes of graphs, we do not have the collapse of the notions of stability, monadic stability, NIP, and monadic NIP stated in Theorem 3 for monotone classes. However, we still have the following collapses:

► **Theorem 4** ([5]). *A hereditary class of graphs \mathcal{C} is monadically NIP if and only if it is NIP; it is monadically stable if and only if it is stable.*

All undefined notions will be formally defined in Section 2. The study of monadic stability and monadic NIP and their relations with first-order transductions [3] opened the way to the study of *structurally sparse* classes of graphs, that is of classes of graphs that are first-order transductions of classes of sparse graphs [6, 10, 11, 19–21]. Intuitively, a (first-order) transduction is a way to construct a set of target graphs from the vertex-colorings of a source graph by fixed first-order formulas, and, by extension, a new class of graphs from a given class of graphs (see Section 2.3).

Extending Theorem 1, first-order transductions of bounded expansion classes have been characterized in terms of low shrubdepth colorings. Recall that the shrubdepth of a class of graphs \mathcal{C} is the minimum integer p such that \mathcal{C} is a transduction of a class of depth- p rooted forests.

► **Theorem 5** ([11]). *A class \mathcal{C} is a first-order transduction of a class with bounded expansion if and only if, for every parameter p , there is an integer N_p and a class \mathcal{D}_p with bounded shrubdepth, such that the vertex set of each graph $G \in \mathcal{C}$ can be partitioned into at most N_p parts, each p of them inducing a subgraph in \mathcal{D}_p .*

Theorem 5 can be seen as a generalization of Theorem 1 as shrubdepth is a dense analogue of treedepth. On the other hand, only one direction of Theorem 2 has been extended to transductions of nowhere dense classes.

► **Theorem 6** ([9]). *Let \mathcal{C} be a first-order transduction of a nowhere dense class. Then, for every parameter p there is a class \mathcal{D}_p with bounded shrubdepth, such that for every graph $G \in \mathcal{C}$ there is an integer $N_p(G) \in |G|^{o(1)}$, with the property that the vertex set of G can be partitioned into at most $N_p(G)$ parts, each p of them inducing a subgraph in \mathcal{D}_p .*

Similar decompositions, where p parts induce a subgraph with bounded rankwidth were introduced in [14], while classes having such decompositions where p parts induce a subgraph with bounded linear rankwidth were discussed in [21]. However, it was not known whether such classes are monadically NIP. This question, which appears for instance in [21, Figure 3] and again in [20], will get a positive answer as a direct consequence of our main result.

The theoretical significance of first-order transductions of nowhere dense classes is witnessed by the following conjecture.

► **Conjecture 7** ([10]). *A class of graphs is monadically stable if and only if it is a first-order transduction of a nowhere dense class of graphs.*

In view of all these results, the following strengthening of Conjecture 7 seems plausible.

► **Conjecture 8.** *For a hereditary class of graphs \mathcal{C} , the following properties are equivalent:*

- (1) \mathcal{C} is a first-order transduction of a nowhere dense class;
- (2) \mathcal{C} admits low shrubdepth decompositions with $n^{o(1)}$ parts;
- (3) \mathcal{C} is monadically stable;
- (4) \mathcal{C} is stable.

By Theorem 4, properties (3) and (4) are equivalent, and, by Theorem 6, property (1) implies property (2). As Conjecture 7 asserts that properties (1) and (3) are equivalent, the only missing implication (that would not result from Conjecture 7) is that property (2) implies one of the other properties.

1.1 Main result

We show that NIP and stability are fixed under taking decompositions as in Theorems 1, 2, 5, and 6.

► **Theorem 9.** *Let \mathcal{C} be a hereditary graph class. Suppose that for every parameter p there is an NIP (resp. stable) class \mathcal{D}_p such that for every graph $G \in \mathcal{C}$ there is an integer $N_p(G) \in |G|^{o(1)}$, with the property that the vertex set of G can be partitioned into at most $N_p(G)$ parts, each p of them inducing a subgraph in \mathcal{D}_p . Then \mathcal{C} is NIP (resp. stable).*

In particular, this proves that property (2) implies property (4) in Conjecture 8, and so it follows that Conjectures 7 and 8 are equivalent. As mentioned after Conjecture 7, this also proves that classes admitting low (linear) rankwidth decompositions are monadically NIP.

To place this theorem in a broader context, we introduce the notion of decomposition horizons. These seem to be of significant independent interest, and we prove some general properties. The main result can then be stated as “NIP (resp. stability) is a decomposition horizon”.

2 Preliminaries

We assume familiarity with first-order logic and graph theory and refer e.g. to [8, 12] for background and for all undefined notation.

2.1 Basic graph theory

The vertex set of a graph G is denoted as $V(G)$ and its edge set as $E(G)$. All graphs considered in this paper are finite. We denote by K_t the complete graph on t vertices and by $K_{s,t}$ the complete bipartite graph (or *biclique*) with parts of size s and t .

For a graph G and a subset A of vertices of G we denote by $G[A]$ the subgraph of G induced by A . For a graph G and an integer p , the p th subdivision $G^{(p)}$ of G is the graph obtained by replacing each edge of G by a path of length $p + 1$. A class of graphs \mathcal{C} is *monotone* (resp. *hereditary*) if every subgraph (resp. induced subgraph) of a graph in \mathcal{C} also belongs to \mathcal{C} .

Classes with bounded expansion and nowhere dense classes may be defined in several equivalent ways (see [17]). In this paper, it will be convenient to use the following characteristic properties as definitions. A class \mathcal{C} has *bounded expansion* if there exists a function $f_d : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ with the following property: if H is a graph with the property that $H^{(p)}$ is a subgraph of a graph in \mathcal{C} , then the average degree of H is at most $f_d(p)$. A class \mathcal{C} is *nowhere dense* if there exists a function $f_\omega : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ with the following property: if H is a graph with the property that $H^{(p)}$ is a subgraph of a graph in \mathcal{C} , then the clique number of H is at most $f_\omega(p)$.

2.2 Basic model theory

In this paper we consider either graphs or Σ -*expanded graphs*, that is, graphs with additional unary relations in Σ (for a set Σ of unary relation symbols). We usually denote graphs by G, H, \dots and Σ -expanded graphs by $G^+, H^+, G^*, H^*, \dots$, but sometimes we will use G, H, \dots for Σ -expanded graphs as well. We shall often use the term ‘‘colored graph’’ instead of Σ -expanded graph. In formulas, the adjacency relation will be denoted as $E(x, y)$. Whenever we speak of formulas we will mean first-order formulas.

A class \mathcal{C} is *unstable* if there exists a formula $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ such that, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exist a graph $G \in \mathcal{C}$ and $2n$ tuples of vertices $\bar{u}_1, \dots, \bar{u}_n \in V(G)^{|\bar{x}|}$ and $\bar{v}_1, \dots, \bar{v}_n \in V(G)^{|\bar{y}|}$ with

$$G \models \varphi(\bar{u}_i, \bar{v}_j) \iff i \leq j.$$

If \mathcal{C} is not unstable, then it is *stable*.

A class \mathcal{C} is *independent* if there exists a formula $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ such that, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exist a graph $G \in \mathcal{C}$ and $n + 2^n$ tuples of vertices $\bar{u}_1, \dots, \bar{u}_n \in V(G)^{|\bar{x}|}$ and $\bar{v}_\emptyset, \dots, \bar{v}_{[n]} \in V(G)^{|\bar{y}|}$ with

$$G \models \varphi(\bar{u}_i, \bar{v}_J) \iff i \in J.$$

If \mathcal{C} is not independent, then it is *dependent* (or *NIP*).

Finally, we say a class \mathcal{C} is *monadically stable* (resp. *monadically NIP*) if every expansion \mathcal{C}^+ of \mathcal{C} by unary predicates is stable (resp. NIP).

2.3 Transductions

For a set Σ of unary relations, the *coloring operation* Γ_Σ maps a graph G to the set $\Gamma_\Sigma(G)$ of all its Σ -expansions.

A *simple interpretation* I of graphs in Σ -expanded graphs is a pair $(\nu(x), \eta(x, y))$ consisting of two formulas (in the first-order language of Σ -expanded graphs), where η is symmetric and anti-reflexive (i.e. $\models \eta(x, y) \leftrightarrow \eta(y, x)$ and $\models \eta(x, y) \rightarrow \neg(x = y)$). If G^+ is a Σ -expanded graph, then $H = \mathsf{I}(G^+)$ is the graph with vertex set $V(H) = \nu(G^+)$ and edge set $E(H) = \eta(G^+) \cap \nu(G^+)^2$.

A *transduction*¹ T is the composition $\mathsf{I} \circ \Gamma_\Sigma$ of a coloring operation Γ_Σ and a simple interpretation I of graphs in Σ -expanded graphs. In other words, for every graph G we have $\mathsf{T}(G) = \{\mathsf{I}(H^+) : H^+ \in \Gamma_\Sigma(G)\}$. We denote by Id the *identity transduction*, which is such that $\text{Id}(\mathbf{A}) = \{\mathbf{A}\}$ for every structure \mathbf{A} . The transduction T is *quantifier-free* if all the formulas defining the interpretation part of T are quantifier-free. A *subset complementation* transduction is defined by the quantifier-free interpretation on a Σ -expansion (with $\Sigma = \{M\}$) by $\eta(x, y) := (x \neq y) \wedge \neg(E(x, y) \leftrightarrow (M(x) \wedge M(y)))$. In other words, the subset complementation transduction complements the adjacency inside the subset of the vertex set defined by M . We denote by $\oplus M$ the subset complementation defined by the unary relation M . A *perturbation* is a composition of (a bounded number of) subset complementations. For a class \mathcal{D} and a transduction T we define $\mathsf{T}(\mathcal{D}) = \bigcup_{G \in \mathcal{D}} \mathsf{T}(G)$ and we say that a class \mathcal{C} is a *T -transduction* of \mathcal{D} if $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathsf{T}(\mathcal{D})$.

3 Π -decompositions

In this section, we generalize the construction in Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 and establish some of its abstract properties. We define a *hereditary class property* to be a downset Π of hereditary graph classes, that is, a set of hereditary classes such that if $\mathcal{C} \in \Pi$ and \mathcal{D} is a hereditary class with $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$, then $\mathcal{D} \in \Pi$.

► **Definition 10.** *Let Π be a hereditary class property, let $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be a non-decreasing function and let p be a positive integer. We say that a class \mathcal{C} has an f -bounded Π -decomposition with parameter p if there exists $\mathcal{D}_p \in \Pi$ such that, for every graph $G \in \mathcal{C}$, there exists an integer $N \leq f(|G|)$ and a partition V_1, \dots, V_N of the vertex set of G with $G[V_{i_1} \cup \dots \cup V_{i_p}] \in \mathcal{D}_p$ for all $i_1, \dots, i_p \in [N]$.*

When f is a constant function, we say that \mathcal{C} has a *bounded-size Π -decomposition* with parameter p ; when f is a function with $f(n) = n^{o(1)}$, we say that \mathcal{C} has a *quasi-bounded-size Π -decomposition* with parameter p . If a class \mathcal{C} has a bounded-size (resp. a quasi-bounded-size) Π -decomposition with parameter p for each positive integer p , we say that \mathcal{C} has *bounded-size Π -decompositions* (resp. *quasi-bounded-size Π -decompositions*).

For instance, by Theorem 1 and Theorem 2, considering the hereditary class property “bounded treedepth”, we have that a class \mathcal{C} has bounded-size bounded treedepth decompositions if and only if it has bounded expansion, and it has quasi-bounded-size bounded treedepth decompositions if and only if it is nowhere dense.

¹ In this paper, we don’t consider the possibility for a transduction to blow up vertices; what we call transduction here is called a *non-copying transduction* in [6].

With these definition in hand, it is natural to consider the following constructions of graph class properties:

► **Definition 11.** For a hereditary class property Π we define the properties Π^+ (resp. Π^*) as follows:

- $\mathcal{C} \in \Pi^+$ if \mathcal{C} has bounded-size Π -decompositions;
- $\mathcal{C} \in \Pi^*$ if \mathcal{C} has quasi-bounded-size Π -decompositions.

Note that $\Pi \subseteq \Pi^+ \subseteq \Pi^*$ and that $\Lambda \subseteq \Pi$ implies both $\Lambda^+ \subseteq \Pi^+$ and $\Lambda^* \subseteq \Pi^*$. Also note that Π^+ and Π^* are hereditary class properties. The next lemma shows that $\Pi \mapsto \Pi^+$ is a closure operator.

► **Lemma 12.** Let Π be a hereditary class property, let f, g be non-decreasing functions, let p be a non-negative integer, let Λ be the hereditary class property “has an f -bounded Π -decomposition with parameter p ”, and let Υ be the hereditary class property “has a g -bounded Λ -decomposition with parameter p ”.

Then every class $\mathcal{C} \in \Upsilon$ has an h -bounded Π -decomposition with parameter p , where

$$h(n) = g(n) f(n)^{\binom{g(n)-1}{p-1}}.$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{C} \in \Upsilon$. By definition, there exists a class $\mathcal{D}_\Lambda \in \Lambda$ with the property that every graph $G \in \mathcal{C}$ has a vertex partition into $g(|G|)$ parts $V_1(G), \dots, V_{g(|G|)}(G)$, each p inducing a subgraph in \mathcal{D}_Λ . Also, there exists a class $\mathcal{D}_\Pi \in \Pi$ with the property that every graph $H \in \mathcal{D}_\Lambda$ has a vertex partition into $f(|H|)$ parts $W_1(H), \dots, W_{f(|H|)}(H)$, each p inducing a subgraph in \mathcal{D}_Π .

Let $G \in \mathcal{C}$, let $N_\Lambda = g(|G|)$ and let $N_\Pi = f(|G|)$. For each subset I of $[N_\Lambda]$ of size p , denote by G_I the subgraph of G induced by the union of the parts $V_i(G)$ with $i \in I$. Note that $N_\Pi \geq f(|G_I|)$. As above, we denote by $W_1(G_I), \dots, W_{N_\Pi}(G_I)$ the parts of the Π -decomposition of G_I . For $i \in [N_\Lambda]$, let $\mathcal{I}_i = \binom{[N_\Lambda] \setminus \{i\}}{p-1} \cup \{i\}$ and let \mathcal{F}_i be the set of all functions $f : \mathcal{I}_i \rightarrow [N_\Pi]$. For $i \in [N_\Lambda]$ and $f \in \mathcal{F}_i$ we define

$$Z_{i,f} = V_i \cap \bigcap_{I \in \mathcal{I}_i} W_{f(I)}(G_I).$$

It is easily checked that the sets $Z_{i,f}$ partition $V(G)$. Moreover, let $i_1, \dots, i_p \in [N_\Lambda]$, and let $f_1 \in \mathcal{F}_{i_1}, \dots, f_p \in \mathcal{F}_{i_p}$. Let $I \in \binom{[N_\Lambda]}{p}$ include i_1, \dots, i_p . Then, $G[Z_{i_1, f_1} \cup \dots \cup Z_{i_p, f_p}]$ is an induced subgraph of $G_I[W_{f_1(I)}(G_I) \cup \dots \cup W_{f_p(I)}(G_I)]$. Hence, $G[Z_{i_1, f_1} \cup \dots \cup Z_{i_p, f_p}] \in \mathcal{D}_\Pi$. It follows that G has an h -bounded Π -decomposition with parameter p , where $h(n) = g(n) f(n)^{\binom{g(n)-1}{p-1}}$. ◀

Considering the case where $g(n) = O(1)$ and where $f(n)$ is either $O(1)$ or $n^{o(1)}$, we get the following.

► **Corollary 13.** For every hereditary class property Π , we have $(\Pi^+)^+ = \Pi^+$ and $(\Pi^*)^+ = \Pi^*$.

► **Question 1.** Is there a hereditary (NIP) class property Π such that $\Pi^* \neq (\Pi^*)^*$?

► **Lemma 14.** Let \mathcal{C} have an f_i -bounded Π_i -decomposition with parameter p , for $i = 1, 2$. Then, \mathcal{C} has an $f_1 f_2$ -bounded $\Pi_1 \cap \Pi_2$ -decomposition with parameter p .

Proof. By assumption, for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$, there exist $\mathcal{D}_i \in \Pi_i$ such that every graph $G \in \mathcal{C}$ has a vertex partition into $N_i \leq f_i(|G|)$ parts $V_{i,1}, \dots, V_{i,N_i}$, each p parts inducing a graph in \mathcal{D}_i . Consider the partition of the vertex set of G into the sets $W_{i,j} = V_{1,i} \cap V_{2,j}$. Then,

any p parts $W_{i_1, j_1}, \dots, W_{i_p, j_p}$ induce a subgraph H , which is an induced subgraph of both $G[\bigcup_{k=1}^p V_{1, j_k}]$ and $G[\bigcup_{k=1}^p V_{2, j_k}]$, thus $H \in \mathcal{D}_1 \cap \mathcal{D}_2$. It follows that \mathcal{C} has an $f_1 f_2$ -bounded Π -decomposition with parameter p . ◀

As $(\Pi_1 \cap \Pi_2)^+ \subseteq \Pi_1^+ \cap \Pi_2^+$ and $(\Pi_1 \cap \Pi_2)^* \subseteq \Pi_1^* \cap \Pi_2^*$, we deduce

► **Corollary 15.** *For every two hereditary class properties Π_1 and Π_2 , we have*

$$(\Pi_1 \cap \Pi_2)^+ = \Pi_1^+ \cap \Pi_2^+ \quad \text{and} \quad (\Pi_1 \cap \Pi_2)^* = \Pi_1^* \cap \Pi_2^*$$

In particular, $\Pi = \Lambda_1^+ = \Lambda_2^+$ implies $\Pi = (\Lambda_1 \cap \Lambda_2)^+$ and $\Pi = \Lambda_1^ = \Lambda_2^*$ implies $\Pi = (\Lambda_1 \cap \Lambda_2)^*$.*

This corollary suggests the following problem.

► **Problem 1.** *Is it true that for every hereditary class property Π there is an inclusion-minimum class Λ with $\Lambda^+ = \Pi^+$ with $\Lambda^* = \Pi^*$?*

► **Lemma 16.** *Let $(\Pi_i)_{i \in I}$ be a family of hereditary class properties indexed by a set I . Then \mathcal{C} has an f -bounded $\bigcup_{i \in I} \Pi_i$ -decomposition with parameter p if and only if \mathcal{C} has an f -bounded Π_i -decomposition with parameter p for some $i \in I$.*

In particular, $(\bigcup_{i \in I} \Pi_i)^+ = \bigcup_{i \in I} \Pi_i^+$ and $(\bigcup_{i \in I} \Pi_i)^ = \bigcup_{i \in I} \Pi_i^*$.*

Proof. Assume \mathcal{C} has an f -bounded $\bigcup_{i \in I} \Pi_i$ -decomposition with parameter p . Then, there exists $\mathcal{D} \in \bigcup_{i \in I} \Pi_i$ such that every graph $G \in \mathcal{C}$ has a vertex partition into $f(|G|)$ parts, any p of them inducing a subgraph in \mathcal{D} . Thus, for some $i \in I$ we have $\mathcal{D} \in \Pi_i$, hence \mathcal{C} has an f -bounded Π_i -decomposition with parameter p .

Conversely, if \mathcal{C} has an f -bounded Π_i -decomposition with parameter p for some $i \in I$ it obviously has an f -bounded $\bigcup_{i \in I} \Pi_i$ -decomposition with parameter p . ◀

► **Definition 17.** *We say that a hereditary class property Π is a decomposition horizon if $\Pi^* = \Pi$. If Λ is a hereditary class property, the decomposition horizon of Λ is the smallest decomposition horizon including Λ .*

According to Lemma 16, $\bigcup_{k \geq 1} \overbrace{\Lambda^* \cdots \Lambda^*}^{k \text{ times}}$ is a decomposition horizon, which is obviously the smallest decomposition horizon including Λ . Thus, the decomposition horizon of a hereditary class property is well-defined. Also note that if Π is a decomposition horizon, then $\Pi^+ = \Pi$.

► **Example 18.** For a graph H , let Φ_H be the hereditary class property of all hereditary classes excluding the graph H . Then, for every graph H , the hereditary class property Φ_H is a decomposition horizon.

Proof. More generally, as it is not possible to partition $V(H)$ without some $|H|$ parts inducing H , for every non-decreasing function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, if a hereditary class \mathcal{C} has f -bounded Φ_H -decompositions, then $H \notin \mathcal{C}$ and thus $\mathcal{C} \in \Phi_H$. ◀

As both \emptyset and the set of all hereditary classes are hereditary class properties, the next result is a direct consequence of Corollary 15 and Lemma 16.

► **Corollary 19.** *Both the set of all hereditary properties Π with $\Pi^+ = \Pi$ and the set of all decompositions horizons define a topology on hereditary graph classes.*

The following immediate lemma shows that Π -decompositions behave nicely with respect to quantifier-free transductions.

► **Lemma 20.** *Let T be a quantifier-free transduction. If a class \mathcal{C} has an f -bounded Π -decomposition with parameter p , then $\mathsf{T}(\mathcal{C})$ has an f -bounded $\mathsf{T}(\Pi)$ -decomposition with parameter p , where $\mathsf{T}(\Pi) = \{\mathcal{D} : \exists \mathcal{D}' \in \Pi \text{ with } \mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathsf{T}(\mathcal{D}')\}$.*

► **Corollary 21.** *For every quantifier-free transduction T we have $\mathsf{T}(\Pi^+) \subseteq \mathsf{T}(\Pi)^+$ and $\mathsf{T}(\Pi^*) \subseteq \mathsf{T}(\Pi)^*$.*

For every perturbation P we have $\mathsf{P}(\Pi^+) = \mathsf{P}(\Pi)^+$ and $\mathsf{P}(\Pi^) = \mathsf{P}(\Pi)^*$. In particular, if Π is a decomposition horizon, then $\mathsf{P}(\Pi)$ is a decomposition horizon.*

Also, if Π is a decomposition horizon, then the hereditary class property “perturbation of a class in Π ” is a decomposition horizon.

Proof. The second property follows from the easily checked property of perturbations that if $G' \in \mathsf{P}(G)$, then $G \in \mathsf{P}(G')$. The last property follows from Lemma 16, by considering all possible perturbations. ◀

Note that Lemma 20 extends to general structures. However, in this latter case, there can be some shift in the value of the parameter.

4 Some decomposition horizons

In this part, we prove that the several hereditary class properties are decomposition horizons. Some have a clear graph-theoretic definition, like Δ (bounded maximum degree), Δ_k (bounded maximum degree after deletion of at most k vertices), Δ_ω (bounded maximum degree after deletion of a bounded number of vertices), Σ (weakly sparse), and nowhere dense; some have more model-theoretic significance: mutually algebraic, stable, and NIP. That the hereditary class properties “stable” and “NIP” are decomposition horizons are the main results of this paper.

► **Theorem 22.** *The class property $\Delta =$ “bounded maximum degree” is the decomposition horizon of $\Lambda =$ “bounded connected components”. Moreover, $\Lambda^* = \Lambda^+ = \Delta$.*

Proof. Assume that the maximum degree of the graphs in a class \mathcal{C} is unbounded. Then, the class contains, for every integer n , a graph G_n with $n + 1$ vertices and a universal vertex v_n . In any N -coloring of G_n , some subgraph induced by two colors is a connected subgraph with maximum degree is at least n/N . Thus, $\Delta^* \subseteq \Delta$, which means that Δ is a decomposition horizon.

We first show $\Delta \subseteq \Lambda^+$: Let $\mathcal{C} \in \Delta$ and let d be the maximum degree of the graphs in \mathcal{C} . Fix a positive integer p . Let G^p be the p th power of G , that is, the graph obtained from G by placing an edge between any two points at distance at most p . For every graph $G \in \mathcal{C}$, consider a proper coloring of G^p with $d^p + 1$ colors. Then, every path of length p of G gets at least $p + 1$ colors. Thus, every p classes induce a graph in Λ . Thus, $\Delta \subseteq \Lambda^+$. Moreover, as $\Lambda \subseteq \Delta$ we have $\Lambda^* \subseteq \Delta^* = \Delta$. Thus, $\Delta \subseteq \Lambda^+ \subseteq \Lambda^* \subseteq \Delta$. ◀

From this it will follow that “bounded maximum degree after deletion of k vertices”, and “bounded maximum degree after deletion of a bounded number of vertices” are decomposition horizons.

► **Theorem 23.** *Let k be a non-negative integer. The class property $\Delta_k =$ “bounded maximum degree after deletion of at most k vertices” is a decomposition horizon.*

Proof. Assume that the maximum degree of the graphs in a class \mathcal{C} remains unbounded after deletion of k vertices. Then, the class contains, for every integer n , a graph H_n with at least $k + 1$ vertices with degree at least n . By taking an induced subgraph, we get a graph G_n with at most $(k + 1)(n + 1)$ vertices, including k vertices with degree at least n . In any N -coloring of G_n , some subgraph induced by $2(k + 1)$ colors is a connected subgraph with at least $k + 1$ vertices with degree at least n/N . Thus, $\Delta_k^* \subseteq \Delta_k$, which means that Δ_k is a decomposition horizon. \blacktriangleleft

► **Corollary 24.** *The class property $\Delta_\omega =$ “bounded maximum degree after deletion of a bounded number of vertices” is a decomposition horizon.*

Proof. Let $\Delta_k =$ “bounded maximum degree after deletion of at most k vertices”. Then, $\Delta_\omega = \bigcup_{k \geq 0} \Delta_k$. So, the result follows from Lemma 16. \blacktriangleleft

► **Theorem 25.** *The class property “transduction of a class with bounded maximum degree” is a decomposition horizon.*

Proof. As noted in [6], a class \mathcal{C} is a transduction of a class with bounded maximum degree if and only if it is a perturbation of a class with bounded maximum degree. Thus, by Theorem 22 and Corollary 21, we are finished. \blacktriangleleft

It is also noted in [6] that “transduction of a class with bounded maximum degree” is equivalent to the model-theoretic property of “mutually algebraic”, which [15] in turn shows is equivalent to the model-theoretic property “monadic NFCP”.

Recall that a class is *weakly sparse* (or *biclique-free*) if, for some integer t , no graph in the class contain $K_{t,t}$ as a subgraph. One of the most famous results in extremal combinatorics provides an upper bound of the maximum number of edges $\text{ex}(n, K_{s,t})$ of a graph with n that does not contain $K_{s,t}$.

► **Theorem 26** (Kővári–Sós–Turán [13]). *For every two integers $t \geq s \geq 2$,*

$$\text{ex}(n, K_{s,t}) \leq \frac{1}{2}(t-1)^{\frac{1}{s}} n^{2-\frac{1}{s}} + \frac{1}{2}(s-1)n.$$

With this theorem in hand, we prove

► **Theorem 27.** *The hereditary class property $\Sigma =$ “weakly sparse” is a decomposition horizon.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{C} be a hereditary class with a quasi-bounded-size weakly-sparse decomposition with parameter 2. Then, there exists a weakly sparse class \mathcal{D} such that, for every $\epsilon > 0$ and every large integer n , every graph $G \in \mathcal{C}$ with n vertices has a vertex partition into at most n^ϵ parts, each two parts inducing a subgraph in \mathcal{D} .

Assume for contradiction that \mathcal{C} is not weakly sparse. As \mathcal{C} is hereditary, for every integer n , \mathcal{C} contains a graph G_n of order $2n$ with a $K_{n,n}$ spanning subgraph. Partitioning the vertex set of G_n into n^ϵ classes, some 2 classes induce a subgraph $H_n \in \mathcal{D}$ with at least $n^{2-2\epsilon}$ edges. According to the Kővári–Sós–Turán theorem, if n is sufficiently large, then H_n contains a subgraph isomorphic to $K_{t,t}$ if $t < 1/2\epsilon$. Considering smaller and smaller values of ϵ , this contradicts the assumption that \mathcal{D} is weakly sparse. \blacktriangleleft

For the next proposition we use the following characterization of nowhere dense classes.

► **Lemma 28** (See, e.g. [17]). *For a hereditary class of graphs \mathcal{C} , the following is equivalent:*

1. \mathcal{C} is somewhere dense (i.e. not nowhere dense);
2. for some integer p and every integer n , the p th-subdivision of K_n is a subgraph of some graph in \mathcal{C} ;
3. for some integer p and $\epsilon > 0$, for every integer k there exists in \mathcal{C} a graph with a spanning p -subdivision of a graph H with $n \geq k$ vertices and at least $n^{1+\epsilon}$ edges.

► **Theorem 29.** *The hereditary class property “nowhere dense” is a decomposition horizon.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{C} be a hereditary class with quasi-bounded-size nowhere dense decompositions. Assume for contradiction that \mathcal{C} is not nowhere dense. Then, according to Lemma 28, there exists an integer p such that, for every integer n , the class \mathcal{C} contains a graph G_n with the p th-subdivision of K_n as a spanning subgraph. Considering a nowhere dense decomposition with parameter $(p+1)$, we get that there exists a nowhere dense class \mathcal{D} such that, for every $\epsilon > 0$ and every sufficiently large integer n , the graph G_n has a vertex partition into at most n^ϵ classes, each $(p+1)$ parts inducing a subgraph in \mathcal{D} . In particular, there exists in \mathcal{D} a graph H_n that has a spanning subgraph which is the p -th subdivision of a graph with $k \leq n^{1/2}$ vertices and at least $n^{1-(p+1)\epsilon} \geq k^{2-2(p+1)\epsilon}$ edges. According to Lemma 28, this contradicts the assumption that \mathcal{D} is nowhere dense. ◀

We now prove our main results, that “NIP” and “stable” are decomposition horizons. We will use the following characterization of NIP in hereditary classes.

► **Theorem 30** ([5]). *For a hereditary class \mathcal{C} the following conditions are equivalent:*

1. \mathcal{C} is NIP,
2. \mathcal{C} is monadically NIP,
3. \mathcal{C} does not admit pre-coding (by an existential formula).

We recall that a class \mathcal{C} admits pre-coding if there is a formula $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, z)$ (with parameters) and, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, a graph $G_n \in \mathcal{C}$ containing tuples \bar{a}_i for $i \in [n]$, \bar{b}_j for $j \in [n]$, and singletons $c_{i,j}$ for $(i, j) \in [n] \times [n]$ such that the following holds for every $(i, j) \in [n] \times [n]$.

- $G_n \models \varphi(\bar{a}_i, \bar{b}_j, c_{i,j})$
- $G_n \models \neg\varphi(\bar{a}_i, \bar{b}_k, c_{i,j})$ for $k > j$
- $G_n \models \neg\varphi(\bar{a}_h, \bar{b}_j, c_{i,j})$ for $h < i$

(The definition of pre-coding given in [5] is slightly different, but easily seen to be equivalent.)

► **Theorem 31.** *The hereditary class property “NIP” is a decomposition horizon.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{C} be a hereditary class with quasi-bounded-size NIP decompositions. Then, for every p there is a hereditary NIP class \mathcal{D}_p with the property that the vertex set of every graph $G \in \mathcal{C}$ can be partitioned into $N_p(G) = |G|^{o(1)}$ parts in such a way that the union of any p classes induces a subgraph in \mathcal{D}_p . Assume for contradiction that \mathcal{C} is not NIP. Then, according to Theorem 30, \mathcal{C} admits pre-coding by an existential formula $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, z)$. Let p be the number of variables in φ (bound or free) plus the number of parameters. Consider an arbitrary integer n and let $\epsilon > 0$ be such that $\epsilon < 1/(2pn)$. By assumption, there exists, for every integer m , a graph $G_m \in \mathcal{C}$ as in the definition of pre-coding. For $i, j \in [m]$, let $Z_{i,j}$ be the set of the vertices appearing in $\bar{a}_i, \bar{b}_j, c_{i,j}$, or in a minimal set of vertices used to witness the existential quantifiers in $G_m \models \varphi(\bar{a}_i, \bar{b}_j, c_{i,j})$. Note that $|Z_{i,j}| \leq p$. Let $Z = \bigcup_{i,j \in [m]} Z_{i,j}$ and let \bar{d} be the parameters of φ interpreted in G_m . As φ is existential, it follows that we may assume $G_m = G_m[Z \cup \bar{d}]$, and thus that $|G_m| \leq pm^2$. (Note that we have also $|G_m| \geq m^2$ as all the vertices $C_{i,j}$ are obviously distinct.) As $N_p(G) = |G|^{o(1)}$, for sufficiently

large m we have $N_p(G_m) < m^\epsilon$. Consider a partition of $V(G_m)$ into $N = N_p(G_m)$ parts V_1, \dots, V_N such that the union of any p parts belongs to \mathcal{D}_p . By iterating the pigeonhole principle, there exists a subset $I \in \binom{[N]}{p}$ such that $G_m[\bigcup_{i \in I} V_i]$ includes the sets $Z_{i,j}$ for at least $m^{2-p\epsilon}$ pairs $(i, j) \in [m] \times [m]$, as well as \bar{d} . According to the Kővári–Sós–Turán theorem (Theorem 26), there exists (assuming m is sufficiently large) subsets $S, T \subseteq [m]$ of size at least n such that for all $(i, j) \in S \times T$, we have $Z_{i,j} \subseteq G_m[\bigcup_{i \in I} V_i]$. In particular, φ defines a pre-coding configuration of size n in $G_m[\bigcup_{i \in I} V_i]$. As n is arbitrary and as $G_m[\bigcup_{i \in I} V_i] \in \mathcal{D}_p$, we infer that φ witnesses that \mathcal{D}_p admits pre-coding, contradicting the assumption that \mathcal{D}_p is NIP. \blacktriangleleft

The special case of bounded-size bounded linear cliquewidth decompositions settles positively the conjecture that every class with low linear-rankwidth covers is monadically NIP. Similarly, classes with low rank-width colorings (introduced in [14]) are monadically NIP.

We now move on to the analogue of Theorem 31 for stable covers. However, we require only that \mathcal{D}_2 (hence \mathcal{D}_1 , since we may assume without loss of generality that $\mathcal{D}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{D}_2 \subseteq \dots$) is stable, the other classes \mathcal{D}_p being only required to be NIP.

► **Theorem 32** ([5]). *For a hereditary class \mathcal{C} the following conditions are equivalent:*

1. \mathcal{C} is stable,
2. \mathcal{C} is monadically stable.

This result actually follows from Theorem 30 and the following theorem

► **Theorem 33** ([20]). *A monadically NIP class of graphs is monadically stable if and only if it has a stable edge relation.*

► **Theorem 34.** *Let \mathcal{C} be a hereditary class of graphs. Assume that \mathcal{C} has quasi-bounded-size NIP decompositions as well as a quasi-bounded-size stable decomposition for parameter 2. Then \mathcal{C} is stable.*

In particular, the hereditary class property “stability” is a decomposition horizon.

Proof. According to Theorem 31 \mathcal{C} is (monadically) NIP. Assume for contradiction that \mathcal{C} is not stable. As \mathcal{C} is monadically NIP and unstable, graphs in \mathcal{C} contain (according to Theorem 33) arbitrarily large semi-induced half-graphs. As \mathcal{C} is hereditary, \mathcal{C} contains, for each integer m a graph H_m on $2m$ vertices containing a half-graph of order m as a semi-induced subgraph. Consider any integer n . Then there exists an integer m such that $m/N_2(G_m)^2 \geq n$. It follows that H_m contains a 2-colored graph containing a half-graph of order n as a semi-induced subgraph, which contradicts the assumption that \mathcal{C} has a quasi-bounded-size stable decomposition with parameter 2. \blacktriangleleft

5 Discussion

We have proved that several hereditary graph properties are decomposition horizons. We have chosen to give direct proofs for some of them where we instead could have used Corollary 15. For instance:

- “nowhere dense” is a decomposition horizon, as it is the intersection of the decomposition horizons “stable” and “weakly sparse”;
- “bounded maximum degree after deletion of a bounded number of vertices” is a decomposition horizon, as it is the intersection of “transduction of a class with bounded degree” and weakly sparse.

Our examples include an infinite countable chain of decomposition horizons (Corollary 24), witnessing some richness of the inclusion order on decomposition horizons. Note that this order is a distributive lattice (by Corollary 15 and Lemma 16).

While it is natural to conjecture that stable hereditary classes of graphs are exactly those hereditary classes with quasi-bounded-size bounded shrub-depth decompositions, NIP hereditary classes seem to be more elusive. It was proved in [4] that for hereditary classes of ordered graphs, being NIP is equivalent to having bounded twin-width. On the other hand, classes with quasi-bounded-size bounded twin-width decompositions are NIP (as classes with bounded twin-width are NIP) and include transductions of nowhere dense classes (thus, conjecturally, all stable hereditary classes). Hence, it is a natural question whether every NIP hereditary class has quasi-bounded-size bounded twin-width decompositions.

References

- 1 H. Adler and I. Adler. Interpreting nowhere dense graph classes as a classical notion of model theory. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 36:322–330, 2014.
- 2 B. S. Baker. Approximation algorithms for NP-complete problems on planar graphs. *Journal of the ACM*, 41(1):153–180, 1994.
- 3 J. T. Baldwin and S. Shelah. Second-order quantifiers and the complexity of theories. *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic*, 26(3):229–303, 1985.
- 4 E. Bonnet, U. Giocanti, P. Ossona de Mendez, P. Simon, S. Thomassé, and S. Toruńczyk. Twin-width IV: ordered graphs and matrices. In *STOC 2022: Proceedings of the 54th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, 2022. doi:10.1145/3519935.3520037.
- 5 S. Braunfeld and M. C. Laskowski. Existential characterizations of monadic NIP. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.05120*, 2022.
- 6 S. Braunfeld, J. Nešetřil, P. Ossona de Mendez, and S. Siebertz. On the first-order transduction quasiorder of hereditary classes of graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.14412*, 2022.
- 7 M. DeVos, G. Ding, B. Oporowski, D. P. Sanders, B. Reed, P. D. Seymour, and D. Vertigan. Excluding any graph as a minor allows a low tree-width 2-coloring. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 91(1):25–41, 2004.
- 8 R. Diestel. Graph theory, volume 173 of. *Graduate texts in mathematics*, page 7, 2012.
- 9 J. Dreier, J. Gajarský, S. Kiefer, M. Pilipczuk, and S. Toruńczyk. Treelike decompositions for transductions of sparse graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.11082*, 2022.
- 10 J. Gajarský, P. Hliněný, J. Obdržálek, D. Lokshtanov, and M.S. Ramanujan. A new perspective on FO model checking of dense graph classes. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-First Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS)*, pages 176–184. ACM, 2016. doi:10.1145/3383206.
- 11 J. Gajarský, S. Kreutzer, J. Nešetřil, P. Ossona de Mendez, M. Pilipczuk, S. Siebertz, and S. Toruńczyk. First-order interpretations of bounded expansion classes. In *45th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP 2018)*, volume 107 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 126:1–126:14, 2018.
- 12 W. Hodges. *Model theory*, volume 42. Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- 13 T. Kővári, V. T. Sós, and P. Turán. On a problem of K. Zarankiewicz. *Colloquium Mathematicum*, 3:50–57, 1954. doi:10.4064/cm-3-1-50-57.
- 14 O.-j. Kwon, M. Pilipczuk, and S. Siebertz. On low rank-width colorings. In *Graph-theoretic concepts in computer science*, volume 10520 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pages 372–385. Springer, Cham, 2017.
- 15 M. C. Laskowski. Mutually algebraic structures and expansions by predicates. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 78(1):185–194, 2013.
- 16 J. Nešetřil and P. Ossona de Mendez. Grad and classes with bounded expansion I. Decompositions. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 29(3):760–776, 2008. doi:10.1016/j.ejc.2006.07.013.

- 17 J. Nešetřil and P. Ossona de Mendez. *Sparsity (Graphs, Structures, and Algorithms)*, volume 28 of *Algorithms and Combinatorics*. Springer, 2012. 465 pages.
- 18 J. Nešetřil and P. Ossona de Mendez. On low tree-depth decompositions. *Graphs and Combinatorics*, 31(6):1941–1963, 2015. doi:10.1007/s00373-015-1569-7.
- 19 J. Nešetřil and P. Ossona de Mendez. Structural sparsity. *Uspekhi Matematicheskikh Nauk*, 71(1):85–116, 2016. (Russian Math. Surveys 71:1 79-107). doi:10.1070/RM9688.
- 20 J. Nešetřil, P. Ossona de Mendez, M. Pilipczuk, R. Rabinovich, and S. Siebertz. Rankwidth meets stability. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 2014–2033, 2021. doi:10.1137/1.9781611976465.120.
- 21 J. Nešetřil, P. Ossona de Mendez, R. Rabinovich, and S. Siebertz. Linear rankwidth meets stability. In Shuchi Chawla, editor, *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 1180–1199, 2020.
- 22 S. Shelah. *Classification theory: and the number of non-isomorphic models*, volume 92. Elsevier, 1990.