

# Resolving Prime Modules: The Structure of Pseudo-cographs and Galled-Tree Explainable Graphs

Marc Hellmuth<sup>1,\*</sup> and Guillaume E. Scholz<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science, Stockholm University, SE-10691 Stockholm, Sweden*

*marc.hellmuth@math.su.se*

<sup>2</sup>*Bioinformatics Group, Department of Computer Science & Interdisciplinary Center for Bioinformatics, Universität Leipzig, Härtelstraße 16–18, D-04107 Leipzig, Germany.*

*\*corresponding author*

## Abstract

The modular decomposition of a graph  $G$  is a natural construction to capture key features of  $G$  in terms of a labeled tree  $(T, t)$  whose vertices are labeled as “series” (1), “parallel” (0) or “prime”. However, full information of  $G$  is provided by its modular decomposition tree  $(T, t)$  only, if  $G$  is a cograph, i.e.,  $G$  does not contain prime modules. In this case,  $(T, t)$  explains  $G$ , i.e.,  $\{x, y\} \in E(G)$  if and only if the lowest common ancestor  $\text{lca}_T(x, y)$  of  $x$  and  $y$  has label “1”. Pseudo-cographs, or, more general, GATEX graphs  $G$  are graphs that can be explained by labeled galled-trees, i.e., labeled networks  $(N, t)$  that are obtained from the modular decomposition tree  $(T, t)$  of  $G$  by replacing the prime vertices in  $T$  by simple labeled cycles. GATEX graphs can be recognized and labeled galled-trees that explain these graphs can be constructed in linear time.

In this contribution, we provide a novel characterization of GATEX graphs in terms of a set  $\mathfrak{F}_{\text{GT}}$  of 25 forbidden induced subgraphs. This characterization, in turn, allows us to show that GATEX graphs are closely related to many other well-known graph classes such as  $P_4$ -sparse and  $P_4$ -reducible graphs, weakly-chordal graphs, perfect graphs with perfect order, comparability and permutation graphs, murky graphs as well as interval graphs, Meyniel graphs or very strongly-perfect and brittle graphs.


**Keywords:** gatex graph, pseudo-cograph, galled-tree, graph classes, forbidden subgraphs

## 1 Introduction

Cographs can be generated from the single-vertex graph  $K_1$  by complementation and disjoint union [6, 62, 64]. This definition associates a vertex labeled tree, the cotree, with each cograph, where a vertex label “0” denotes a disjoint union, while “1” indicates a complementation. Each cograph  $G$  is explained by its cotree  $(T, t)$ , i.e.,  $\{x, y\}$  is an edge in  $G$  precisely if the lowest common ancestor  $\text{lca}_T(x, y)$  of  $x$  and  $y$  has label  $t(\text{lca}_T(x, y)) = 1$ . Cographs are exactly the graphs containing no induced  $P_4$  (a chordless path with four vertices) and many NP-complete problems become polynomial-time solvable, when the input is a cograph [2, 6, 16].

Cotrees are a special case of the much more general modular decomposition tree (MDT) [7, 12, 23, 56]. A *module*  $M$  in a graph  $G$  is a subset of the vertices of  $G$  such that every  $z \in V(G) \setminus M$  is either adjacent to all or none of the vertices in  $M$ . A *prime module*  $M$  is a module that is characterized by the property that both, the induced subgraph  $G[M]$  and its complement  $G[\overline{M}]$ , are connected subgraphs of  $G$ . Cographs are characterized by the absence of prime modules. Hence, for non-cographs, the MDT has, in addition to the labels “0” and “1”, vertices that are labeled as *prime*. As a consequence, not all structural information of non-cographs  $G$  is provided by its MDT, i.e.,  $G$  cannot be recovered just by the information of its MDT alone. It is natural to ask, therefore, whether the MDT can be modified in a such a way that vertices  $v$  with label *prime* are resolved by relabeling the vertices of the MDT or by replacing  $v$  by other labeled graphs to obtain a labeled tree or network that explains  $G$ . The latter idea has been, in particular, fruitful for graphs with a “bounded number” of  $P_4$ s [42–44], cumulating in a framework for trees with four labels to explain general graphs [45, 46].

An independent motivation to manipulate the MDT of a given graph recently arose in biology, more precisely in molecular phylogenetics [17, 18, 29, 35, 36, 48, 49]. In particular, orthology, a key concept in evolutionary biology and phylogenetics, is intimately tied to cographs [29]. Two genes in a pair of related species are said to be orthologous if their last common ancestor was a speciation event. The orthology relation on a set of genes forms a cograph [29, 30]. This relation can be estimated directly from biological sequence data, albeit in a necessarily noisy form. In a simple



**Figure 1:** Shown is a galled-tree explainable (GATEX) graph  $G$ . The modular decomposition tree (MDT) of  $G$  shows that  $G$  contains two prime modules, namely  $V(G)$  and  $M_1 = \{a, b, c, d, e\}$ . To keep the drawing simple, we have written all singleton modules  $\{x\}$  just by  $x$ . The respective quotient graphs  $H := G/\mathbb{M}_{\max}(G)$  and  $H' := G[M_1]/\mathbb{M}_{\max}(G[M_1])$  are shown in the upper part together with the respective galled-trees that explain them (directly below the respective graphs). One easily verifies that the 0/1-labeled galled-tree  $(N, t)$  that explains  $G$  is obtained from the MDT of  $G$ , by locally replacing all vertices in the MDT with label “prime (P)” by the respective cycles of the networks explaining  $H$  and  $H'$  and by rewiring the edges accordingly.

Note that  $H$  and  $H'$  are polar-cats and thus, primitive pseudo-cographs. In particular,  $H$  is a  $(M_3, H[M_1, M_2, M_3], H[f, M_3])$ -pseudo-cograph while  $H'$  is a  $(c, G[\{a, b, c\}], G[\{c, d, e\}])$  pseudo-cograph. Moreover,  $H'$  is well-proportioned, while  $H$  is not. Hence, there are further ways to write  $H$  as a  $(v, H_1, H_2)$ -pseudo-cograph. Consequently, there are further galled-trees that explain  $H$  (cf. Prop. 6.13 and Fig. 8 in [34]).

evolutionary scenario, such estimates are biologically feasible if one can find a tree that supports these estimates, i.e., the inferred relations can be explained by a 0/1-labeled tree [30, 32, 48, 48]. However, in practice, such estimates can often not be explained by any such tree since they violate the cograph property. There are two main reasons why such estimates are not cographs: (1) Noise in the data and measurement errors or (2) the history of the underlying genes is simply not a tree but a phylogenetic network. In fact, phylogenetic networks are a common framework to accommodate further events such as horizontal gene transfer or hybridization. Assuming Item (2) to be one of the main source of error, it makes sense, therefore, to ask if there is a 0/1-labeled phylogenetic network that can explain estimates of homology relations. A first attempt to answer this question is provided in [40], where the authors assumed to have, in addition to the orthology relation, information about the “behavior” of 3-elementary subsets of genes.

In a recent work [34], graphs  $G$  have been characterized that can be explained by 0/1-labeled networks that are obtained from the MDT of  $G$  by replacing the prime vertices by a simple 0/1-labeled cycle which leads to the concept of pseudo-cographs and, more general, galled-tree explainable (GATEX) graphs. It has been shown, that such graphs can be recognized and 0/1-labeled networks to explain these graphs can be constructed in linear time. In this contribution, we show that GATEX graphs are characterized by the absence of 25 induced forbidden subgraphs. This, in turn, allows us to show the rich connection of GATEX graphs to other graph classes. While  $P_4$ -reducible graphs form a proper subclass of GATEX graphs, all GATEX graphs are weakly-chordal, perfect graphs with perfect order, comparability and permutation graphs, as well as murky. Further connections to distance-hereditary graphs, interval and circular-arc graphs as well as Meyniel, very strongly-perfect and brittle graphs are established.

## 2 Preliminaries

**Graphs** We consider graphs  $G = (V, E)$  with vertex set  $V(G) := V \neq \emptyset$  and edge set  $E(G) := E$ . A graph  $G$  is *undirected* if  $E$  is a subset of the set of two-element subsets of  $V$  and  $G$  is *directed* if  $E \subseteq V \times V$ . Thus, edges  $e \in E$  in an undirected graph  $G$  are of the form  $e = \{x, y\}$  and in directed graphs of the form  $e = (x, y)$  with  $x, y \in V$  being distinct. An undirected graph is *connected* if, for every two vertices  $u, v \in V$ , there is a path connecting  $u$  and  $v$ . A directed graph is *connected* if its underlying undirected graph is connected. We write  $H \subseteq G$  if  $H$  is a subgraph of  $G$  and  $G[W]$  for the subgraph in  $G$  that is induced by some subset  $W \subseteq V$ . If  $H$  is an induced subgraph of  $G$ , we also write  $H \sqsubseteq G$ . Moreover  $G - v$  denotes the induced subgraph  $G[V \setminus \{v\}]$ . In addition, if  $H \sqsubseteq G$  and  $x \in V(G)$ , we define  $H + x := G[V(H) \cup \{x\}]$ .

From here on, we will call an undirected graph simply graph.

Complete graphs  $G = (V, E)$  are denoted by  $K_{|V|}$ , a path with  $n$  vertices by  $P_n$  and a cycle with  $n$  vertices by  $C_n$ . We sometimes write, for simplicity,  $x_1 - x_2 - \dots - x_n$  for a path  $P_n$  with vertices  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  and edges  $\{x_i, x_{i+1}\}$ ,  $1 \leq i < n$ . The join of two vertex-disjoint graphs  $H = (V, E)$  and  $H' = (V', E')$  is defined by  $H \otimes H' := (V \cup V', E \cup E' \cup \{\{x, y\} \mid x \in V, y \in V'\})$ , whereas their disjoint union is given by  $H \cup H' := (V \cup V', E \cup E')$ .

For later reference, we provide the following simple result. Although we assume that it is folklore, we provide a short proof for completeness.

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $\Pi$  be a graph property that is closed under isomorphism. Then, the following statements are equivalent.*

1.  $\Pi$  is heritable, i.e.,  $G$  satisfies  $\Pi$  if and only if every induced subgraph of  $G$  satisfied  $\Pi$ .
2. The class of graphs satisfying  $\Pi$  can be characterized in terms of a set  $\mathfrak{F}$  of forbidden subgraphs, i.e.,  $G$  satisfies  $\Pi$  if and only if  $G$  does not contain an induced subgraph  $H \simeq F \in \mathfrak{F}$ .

*Proof.* Suppose first that  $\Pi$  is heritable. Now put  $\mathfrak{F}$  as the set of all graphs that do not satisfy  $\Pi$ . Conversely, suppose that there is a set  $\mathfrak{F}$  of forbidden subgraphs that characterizes graphs that satisfy property  $\Pi$ . Since  $G$  does not contain any graph in  $\mathfrak{F}$  as an induced subgraph, none of the induced subgraphs of  $G$  can contain a graph in  $\mathfrak{F}$  as an induced subgraph. Consequently,  $\Pi$  is heritable.  $\square$

Although for every heritable property  $\Pi$  there is a set  $\mathfrak{F}$  of forbidden subgraphs that characterizes  $\Pi$ , this set  $\mathfrak{F}$  is not necessarily finite. For example, the property “ $G$  is acyclic” is heritable, but any set of forbidden subgraphs characterizing this property is of infinite size as it contains all cycles  $C_n$ ,  $n \geq 3$ .

A graph is  $\mathfrak{F}$ -free, if it does not contain any of the graphs in  $\mathfrak{F}$  as an induced subgraph. If  $G$  is  $\mathfrak{F}$ -free and  $\mathfrak{F} = \{F\}$  consists of just a single graph, we also say that  $G$  is  $F$ -free.

**Trees and Galled-trees** (Phylogenetic) trees and galled-trees are particular directed acyclic graphs (DAGs). To be more precise, a *galled-tree*  $N = (V, E)$  on  $X$  is a such that either

(N0)  $V = X = \{x\}$  and, thus,  $E = \emptyset$ .

or  $N$  satisfies the following three properties

(N1) There is a unique *root*  $\rho_N$  with indegree 0 and outdegree at least 2; and

(N2)  $x \in X$  if and only if  $x$  has outdegree 0 and indegree 1; and

(N3) Every vertex  $v \in V^0 := V \setminus X$  with  $v \neq \rho_N$  has

- (a) indegree 1 and outdegree at least 2 (*tree-vertex*) or
- (b) indegree 2 and outdegree at least 1 (*hybrid-vertex*).

If a galled-tree  $N = (V, E)$  does not contain hybrid-vertices, then  $N$  is a *tree*. The set  $L(N) = X$  is the *leaf set* of  $N$  and  $V^0$  the set of *inner* vertices. A graph is *biconnected* if it contains no vertex whose removal disconnects the graph. A *biconnected component* of a graph is a maximal biconnected subgraph. If such a biconnected component is not a single vertex or an edge, then it is called *non-trivial*. By definition, every non-trivial biconnected component in a galled-tree  $N$  forms an “undirected” cycle in  $N$  [3, 40] and is also known as *block* [14] or *gall* [15]. Hence, a cycle  $C$  of a galled-tree  $N$  is composed of two directed paths  $P^1$  and  $P^2$  in  $N$  with the same start-vertex  $\rho_C$  and end-vertex  $\eta_C$ , and whose vertices distinct from  $\rho_C$  and  $\eta_C$  are pairwise distinct. A cycle  $C \subseteq N$  is *weak* if either (i)  $P^1$  or  $P^2$  consist of  $\rho_C$  and  $\eta_C$  only or (ii) both  $P^1$  and  $P^2$  contain only one vertex distinct from  $\rho_C$  and  $\eta_C$ .

In [22], galled trees were introduced as phylogenetic networks in which all cycles are vertex disjoint. Here we consider a more general version, where cycles are allowed to share a cutvertex, see also [33] for more details.

If  $N = (V, E)$  is a galled-tree and  $(u, v) \in E$ , then the vertex  $v$  is a *child* of  $u$ . The set of children of a vertex  $u$  in  $N$  is denoted by  $\text{child}_N(u)$ .

A *caterpillar* is a tree  $T$  such that the subgraph induced by the inner vertices is a path with the root  $\rho_T$  at one end of this path and each inner vertex has exactly two children. A subset  $\{x, y\} \subseteq X$  is a *cherry* if the two leaves  $x$  and  $y$  are adjacent to the same vertex in  $T$ . In this case, we also say that  $x$ , resp.,  $y$  is *part of a cherry*. Note that a caterpillar on  $X$  with  $|X| \geq 2$  contains precisely two vertices that are part of a cherry.

A *caterpillar* is a tree  $T$  such that the subgraph induced by the inner vertices is a path with the root  $\rho_T$  at one end of this path and each inner vertex has exactly two children. A subset  $\{x, y\} \subseteq X$  is a *cherry* if the two leaves  $x$  and  $y$  are adjacent to the same vertex in  $T$ . In this case, we also say that  $x$ , resp.,  $y$  is *part of a cherry*. Note that a caterpillar on  $X$  with  $|X| \geq 2$  contains precisely two vertices that are part of a cherry.

**Labeled Galled-trees and Galled-Tree Explainable (GATEX) Graphs** We consider galled-trees  $N = (V, E)$  on  $X$  that are equipped with a (*vertex*-)labeling  $t$  i.e., a map  $t: V \rightarrow \{0, 1, \odot\}$  such that  $t(x) = \odot$  if and only if  $x \in X$ . Hence, every inner vertex  $v \in V^0$  must have some *binary* label  $t(v) \in \{0, 1\}$ . The labeling of the leaves  $x \in X$  with  $t(x) = \odot$  is just a technical subtlety to cover the special case  $V = X = \{x\}$ . A galled-tree  $N$  with such a “binary” labeling  $t$  is called *labeled* and denoted by  $(N, t)$ .

Let  $N = (V, E)$  be a galled-tree on  $X$ . A vertex  $u \in V$  is called an *ancestor* of  $v \in V$  and  $v$  a *descendant* of  $u$ , in symbols  $v \preceq_N u$ , if there is a directed path (possibly reduced to a single vertex) in  $N$  from  $u$  to  $v$ . We write  $v \prec_N u$  if  $v \preceq_N u$  and  $u \neq v$ . For a non-empty subset of leaves  $A \subseteq V$  of  $N$ , we define  $\text{lca}_N(A)$ , or a *lowest common ancestor* of  $A$ , to be a  $\preceq_N$ -minimal vertex of  $N$  that is an ancestor of every vertex in  $A$ . For simplicity we write  $\text{lca}_N(x, y)$  instead of  $\text{lca}_N(\{x, y\})$ . Note that in trees and galled-trees the  $\text{lca}_N$  is uniquely determined [33, 40]. This allows us to establish the following

**Definition 2.2.** Let  $(N, t)$  be a labeled galled-tree on  $X$ . We denote with  $\mathcal{G}(N, t) = (X, E)$  the graph with vertex set  $X$  and edges  $\{x, y\} \in E$  precisely if  $t(\text{lca}_N(x, y)) = 1$  and say that  $\mathcal{G}(N, t)$  is explained by  $(N, t)$ . A graph  $G = (X, E)$  is **Galled-Tree Explainable (GATEX)** if there is a labeled galled-tree  $(N, t)$  such that  $G \simeq \mathcal{G}(N, t)$ .

If  $G$  is explained by a labeled galled-tree  $(N, t)$  and one converts the vertex-labels by replacing every ‘1’ by ‘0’ and *vice versa*, one obtains a labeled galled-tree  $(N, \bar{t})$  that explains the complement  $\bar{G}$  of  $G$ . For later reference, we summarize the latter in

**Observation 2.3.**  $G$  is GATEX if and only if  $\bar{G}$  is GATEX.

Note that a galled tree is a special case of a *tree-child* network [3], that is, a network in which every inner vertex  $v$  has a child  $w$  that is a tree-vertex. In particular, if  $N = (V, E)$  is a galled tree with leaf set  $X$  and the set of hybrid-vertices  $H$ , then it holds that  $|H| \leq |X| - 1$  and  $|V| \leq 4|X| - 3$  by [3, Prop. 1] and the fact the every hybrid-vertex has indegree two. Hence, the information about the vertices and edges of GATEX graphs can be stored efficiently in  $O(|X|)$ -space.

**Modular Decomposition (MD)** A *module*  $M$  of a graph  $G = (X, E)$  is a subset  $M \subseteq V$  such that for all  $x, y \in M$  it holds that  $N_G(x) \setminus M = N_G(y) \setminus M$ , where  $N_G(x)$  is the set of all vertices of  $X$  that are adjacent to  $x$  in  $G$ . The singletons and  $X$  are the *trivial* modules of  $G$  and thus, the set  $\mathbb{M}(G)$  of all modules of  $G$  is not empty. A graph  $G$  is called *primitive* if it has at least four vertices and contains trivial modules only. The smallest primitive graph is the path  $P_4$  on four vertices.

A module  $M$  of  $G$  is *strong* if  $M$  does not overlap with any other module of  $G$ , that is,  $M \cap M' \in \{M, M', \emptyset\}$  for all modules  $M'$  of  $G$ . In particular, all trivial modules of  $G$  are strong. The set of strong modules  $\mathbb{M}_{\text{str}}(G) \subseteq \mathbb{M}(G)$  is uniquely determined [12, 35] and forms a hierarchy which gives rise to a unique tree representation  $\mathcal{T}_G$  of  $G$ , known as the *modular decomposition tree (MDT)* of  $G$ . The vertices of  $\mathcal{T}_G$  are (identified with) the elements of  $\mathbb{M}_{\text{str}}(G)$ . Adjacency in  $\mathcal{T}_G$  is defined by the maximal proper inclusion relation, that is, there is an edge  $(M', M)$  between  $M, M' \in \mathbb{M}_{\text{str}}(G)$  if and only if  $M \subsetneq M'$  and there is no  $M'' \in \mathbb{M}_{\text{str}}(G)$  such that  $M \subsetneq M'' \subsetneq M'$ . The root of  $\mathcal{T}_G$  is (identified with)  $X$  and every leaf is uniquely identified with a singleton  $\{v\}$ ,  $v \in X$ . In summary,  $\mathbb{M}_{\text{str}}(G) = \{L(\mathcal{T}_G(v)) \mid v \in V(\mathcal{T}_G)\}$ . Uniqueness and the hierarchical structure of  $\mathbb{M}_{\text{str}}(G)$  implies that there is a unique partition  $\mathbb{M}_{\text{max}}(G) = \{M_1, \dots, M_k\}$  of  $X$  into inclusion-maximal strong modules  $M_j \neq X$  of  $G$  [10, 11]. Since  $X \notin \mathbb{M}_{\text{max}}(G)$  the set  $\mathbb{M}_{\text{max}}(G)$  consists of  $k \geq 2$  strong modules, whenever  $|X| > 1$ .

Similar as for galled-trees, one can equip  $\mathcal{T}_G$  with a vertex-labeling  $t_G$  such that, for  $M \in \mathbb{M}_{\text{str}}(G) = V(\mathcal{T}_G)$ , we have  $t_G(M) = \odot$  if  $|M| = 1$ ;  $t_G(M) = 0$  if  $|M| > 1$  and  $G[M]$  is disconnected;  $t_G(M) = 0$  if  $|M| > 1$  and  $G[M]$  is connected but  $\bar{G}[M]$  is disconnected;  $t_G(M) = \text{prime}$  in all other cases. Strong modules of  $G$  are called *series*, *parallel* and *prime* if  $t_G(M) = 1$ ,  $t_G(M) = 0$  and  $t_G(M) = \text{prime}$ , respectively. Efficient linear algorithms to compute  $(\mathcal{T}_G, t)$  have been proposed e.g. in [7, 56, 65]. In this way, we obtain a labeled tree  $(\mathcal{T}_G, \tau_G)$  that, at least to some extent, “encodes” the structure of  $G$ . In particular,  $\tau_G(\text{lca}(x, y)) = 1$  implies  $\{x, y\} \in E(G)$  and  $\tau_G(\text{lca}(x, y)) = 0$  implies  $\{x, y\} \notin E(G)$ . The converse, however, is not satisfied in general, since  $\tau_G(\text{lca}(x, y)) = \text{prime}$  is possible.

Two disjoint modules  $M, M' \in \mathbb{M}(G)$  are *adjacent* (in  $G$ ) if each vertex of  $M$  is adjacent to all vertices of  $M'$ ; the modules are *non-adjacent* if none of the vertices of  $M$  is adjacent to a vertex of  $M'$ . By definition of modules, every two disjoint modules  $M, M' \in \mathbb{M}(G)$  are either adjacent or non-adjacent [10, Lemma 4.11]. One can therefore define the quotient graph  $G/\mathbb{M}_{\text{max}}(G)$  which has  $\mathbb{M}_{\text{max}}(G)$  as its vertex set and  $\{M_i, M_j\} \in E(G/\mathbb{M}_{\text{max}}(G))$  if and only if  $M_i$  and  $M_j$  are adjacent in  $G$ .

**Observation 2.4** ([23]). *The quotient graph  $G/\mathbb{M}_{\text{max}}(G)$  with  $\mathbb{M}_{\text{max}}(G) = \{M_1, \dots, M_k\}$  is isomorphic to any subgraph induced by a set  $W \subseteq V$  such that  $|M_i \cap W| = 1$  for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ .*

For later reference, we provide the following simple result.

**Lemma 2.5.** *Let  $H$  be an induced primitive subgraph of  $G$  and  $M \in \mathbb{M}_{\text{str}}(G)$  be a strong module that is inclusion-minimal w.r.t.  $V(H) \subseteq M$ . Then,  $M$  is prime and  $H$  is isomorphic to an induced subgraph of  $G[M]/\mathbb{M}_{\text{max}}(G[M])$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $H$  be an induced primitive subgraph of  $G$  and  $M \in \mathbb{M}_{\text{str}}(G)$  be a strong module that is inclusion-minimal w.r.t.  $V(H) \subseteq M$ . Assume, for contradiction, that  $M$  is not prime. W.l.o.g. assume that  $M$  is parallel (otherwise consider the complement  $\bar{G}$  of  $G$ ). Since  $M$  is inclusion-minimal w.r.t.  $V(H) \subseteq M$ , it follows that there are two vertices  $x, y \in V(H)$  such that  $x \in M'$  and  $y \in M''$  where  $M', M'' \in \mathbb{M}_{\text{max}}(G[M])$  are distinct. In this case, however,  $x$  and  $y$  must be in distinct connected components of  $H$ . Hence,  $H$  is disconnected and, therefore, not primitive; a contradiction.

We continue with showing that, for any two distinct vertices  $x, y \in V(H)$  we have  $x \in M'$  and  $y \in M''$  with  $M', M'' \in \mathbb{M}_{\text{max}}(G[M])$  being distinct. Assume, for contradiction, that  $x, y \in V(H)$  are distinct but  $x, y \in M' \in \mathbb{M}_{\text{max}}(G[M])$ . Since  $M$  is inclusion-minimal w.r.t.  $V(H) \subseteq M$ , it follows that there are a vertex  $z \in V(H)$  such that  $z \in M'' \in \mathbb{M}_{\text{max}}(G[M]) \setminus \{M'\}$ . Thus, we can partition  $V(H)$  into two non-empty sets  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  such that  $V_1$  contains all vertices of  $M' \cap V(H)$  and we put  $V_2 = V(H) \setminus V_1$ . By definition of modules, a vertex in  $V_2$  must be either adjacent to all or to none of the vertices in  $M'$  and, thus, in particular, the vertices in  $V_1$ . This and  $|V(H)| > |V_1| \geq 2$  implies that  $V_1$  is a non-trivial module of  $H$ ; a contradiction. In summary, for any two distinct vertices  $x, y \in V(H)$  we have  $x \in M'$  and  $y \in M''$  with  $M', M'' \in \mathbb{M}_{\text{max}}(G[M])$  being distinct. Hence, there is a subset  $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathbb{M}_{\text{max}}(G[M])$  of size  $|V(H)|$  such that there is a 1-to-1 correspondence between the vertices in  $|V(H)|$  and the modules in  $\mathcal{M}$  which together with Obs. 2.4 implies that  $H$  is isomorphic to an induced subgraph of  $G/\mathbb{M}_{\text{max}}(G)$ .  $\square$

In [61] the structure of primitive graphs (called indecomposable in [61]) has been studied. A graph  $G$  is *critical-primitive* if  $G - x$  is not primitive for all  $x \in V(G)$ .

**Proposition 2.6** ([61, Cor. 5.8]). *A graph  $G$  is critical-primitive if and only if  $G$  is isomorphic to the graph  $\mathcal{G}_r$  or its complement  $\bar{\mathcal{G}}_r$  where, for  $r \geq 2$ ,  $\mathcal{G}_r$  has vertex set  $\{a_1, \dots, a_r, b_1, \dots, b_r\}$  and  $\{a_i, b_j\}$  is an edge in  $\mathcal{G}_r$  precisely if  $i \geq j$ .*

### 3 Cographs, Pseudo-cographs and GATEX Graphs

*Cographs* are defined recursively [6]: the single vertex graph  $K_1$  is a cograph and the join  $H \otimes H'$  and disjoint union  $H \cup H'$  of two cographs  $H$  and  $H'$  is a cograph. In particular, cographs are precisely those graphs that are explained by their MDT  $(\mathcal{T}_G, t_G)$ . Many characterizations of cographs have been established in the last decades [6, 34, 62, 64] from which we summarize a few of them in the following

**Theorem 3.1.** *The following statements are equivalent.*

1.  $G$  is a cograph.
2. The complement  $\bar{G}$  of  $G$  is a cograph.
3. Every induced subgraph of  $G$  is a cograph.
4.  $G$  does not contain a path on four vertices as an induced subgraph.
5. The MDT  $(\mathcal{T}_G, t_G)$  of  $G$  does not contain vertices  $v$  such that  $t_G(v) = \text{prime}$ .
6.  $G$  can be explained by a labeled galled-tree  $(N, t)$  for which all cycles are weak. [34, Thm. 5.5]

Thus, cographs form a proper subclass of GATEX graphs.

A cograph is *caterpillar-explained* if its MDT is a caterpillar. We note in passing that caterpillar-explained cographs form a proper subclass of threshold graphs [5], i.e., graphs that can be obtained from a single vertex graph by repeatedly adding either an isolated vertex or a vertex that is adjacent to all pre-existing vertices.

A proper super-class of cographs are pseudo-cographs.

**Definition 3.2** (Pseudo-Cographs). *A graph  $G$  is a pseudo-cograph if  $|V(G)| \leq 2$  or if there are induced subgraphs  $G_1, G_2 \subseteq G$  and a vertex  $v \in V(G)$  such that*

(P1)  $V(G) = V(G_1) \cup V(G_2)$ ,  $V(G_1) \cap V(G_2) = \{v\}$ ,  $|V(G_1)| > 1$  and  $|V(G_2)| > 1$ ; and

(P2)  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  are cographs; and

(P3)  $G - v$  is either the join or the disjoint union of  $G_1 - v$  and  $G_2 - v$ .

In this case, we also say that  $G$  is a  $(v, G_1, G_2)$ -pseudo-cograph. A  $(v, G_1, G_2)$ -pseudo-cograph  $G$  is *slim* (resp., *fat*) if  $G - v$  is the disjoint union (resp., join) of  $G_1 - v$  and  $G_2 - v$ .

Note that the choice of  $G_1$ ,  $G_2$  and  $v$  may not be unique. In particular,  $G$  can be a slim  $(v, G_1, G_2)$ -pseudo-cograph and a fat  $(v', G'_1, G'_2)$ -pseudo-cograph for different choices of the triplets  $(v, G_1, G_2)$  and  $(v', G'_1, G'_2)$ . By way of example, consider a path  $G = 1 - 2 - 3 - 4$  on four vertices. Here,  $G$  is a fat  $(1, G_1, G_2)$ -pseudo-cograph for  $G_1 = G[\{1, 3\}]$  and  $G_2 = G[\{1, 2, 4\}]$  and a slim  $(2, G'_1, G'_2)$ -pseudo-cograph for  $G'_1 = G[\{1, 2\}]$  and  $G'_2 = G[\{2, 3, 4\}]$ .

By definition of pseudo-cographs and, in particular (P3), we easily derive

**Observation 3.3.** *If  $G$  is a  $(v, G_1, G_2)$ -pseudo-cograph, then  $G - v$  is a cograph and either  $G - v$  or its complement  $\bar{G} - v$  is disconnected.*

Several characterizations of and algorithmic results for pseudo-cographs have been established in [34] and are summarized in the following

**Theorem 3.4.** *The following statements are equivalent.*

1.  $G$  is a pseudo-cograph.
2. The complement  $\overline{G}$  of  $G$  is a pseudo-cograph.
3. Every induced subgraph of  $G$  is a pseudo-cograph.
4.  $|V(G)| \leq 2$  or  $G$  can be explained by a galled-tree  $(N, t)$  that contains precisely one cycle  $C$ , and  $C$  is such that  $\rho_C = \rho_N$  and  $\text{child}_N(\eta_C) = \{x\}$  for some  $x \in L(N)$ .  
Thus, pseudo-cographs form a proper subclass of GATEX graphs.

In particular,  $G$  is a  $(v, G_1, G_2)$ -pseudo-cograph if and only if  $\overline{G}$  is a  $(v, \overline{G}_1, \overline{G}_2)$ -pseudo-cograph. Moreover, Pseudo-cographs  $G = (V, E)$  can be recognized in  $O(|V| + |E|)$  time. In the affirmative case, one can determine a vertex  $v$  and subgraphs  $G_1, G_2 \subseteq G$  such that  $G$  is a  $(v, G_1, G_2)$ -pseudo-cograph and a labeled galled-tree that explains  $G$  in  $O(|V| + |E|)$  time.

Note that, by [34, Lemma 4.2], every cograph is a pseudo-cograph. A further subclass of pseudo-cographs are polar-cats.

**Definition 3.5** (Polar-Cat). A  $(v, G_1, G_2)$ -pseudo-cograph  $G$  is a polar-cat if  $G$  satisfies the following conditions:

- (C1)  $|V(G)| \geq 4$
- (C2) polarizing:  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  are both connected (resp., both disconnected) and  $G - v$  is the disjoint union (resp., join) of  $G_1 - v$  and  $G_2 - v$ .
- (C3) cat:  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  are caterpillar-explained such that  $v$  is part of a cherry in both caterpillars that explain  $G_1$ , resp.  $G_2$ .

In this case, we also say that  $G$  is a  $(v, G_1, G_2)$ -polar-cat. A  $(v, G_1, G_2)$ -polar-cat is well-proportioned if  $|V(G_1)| \geq 3$  and  $|V(G_2)| \geq 3$ , or  $|V(G_i)| = 2$  and  $|V(G_j)| \geq 5$  with  $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$  distinct.

If  $G$  is a  $(v, G_1, G_2)$ -polar-cat and thus, a pseudo-cograph, Def. 3.2(P1) implies that  $|V(G_1)| \geq 2$  and  $|V(G_2)| \geq 2$ . This, in particular, implies

**Observation 3.6.** *Every polar-cat  $G$  with  $|V(G)| \geq 7$  is well-proportioned.*

Well-proportioned polar-cats  $G$  are of particular interest, since the galled-tree  $(N, t)$  that explains  $G$  is uniquely determined (cf. [34, Prop. 6.13]). We give now a mild extension of a characterization of polar-cats established in [34].

**Theorem 3.7.** *The following statements are equivalent.*

1.  $G$  is a polar-cat.
2.  $G$  is a primitive graph that can be explained by a labeled galled-tree.
3.  $G$  is a primitive pseudo-cograph.

Moreover, if  $G$  is a well-proportioned  $(v, G_1, G_2)$ -polar-cat, then  $v$  as well as  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  are uniquely determined, i.e., there is no other vertex  $w \neq v$  in  $G$  and no other subgraphs  $G'_1$  and  $G'_2$  than  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  such that  $G$  is a  $(w, G'_1, G'_2)$ -polar-cat.

Furthermore, polar-cats  $G = (V, E)$  can be recognized in  $O(|V| + |E|)$  time. In the affirmative case, one can determine a vertex  $v$  and subgraphs  $G_1, G_2 \subseteq G$  such that  $G$  is a  $(v, G_1, G_2)$ -polar-cat and a labeled galled-tree that explains  $G$  in  $O(|V| + |E|)$  time.

*Proof.* The equivalence between Condition (1) and (2) have been shown in [34, Thm. 6.9]. Suppose that (3)  $G$  is a primitive pseudo-cograph. By Thm. 3.4,  $G$  can be explained by a labeled galled-tree and Condition (2) follows. Finally, Condition (1) and its equivalent expression Condition (2) together with the definition of polar-cats imply that  $G$  is a primitive pseudo-cograph. The second statement is equivalent to [34, Thm. 6.12], and the last part is stated in [34, Thm. 9.3].  $\square$

A convenient characterization of the edges in primitive pseudo-cographs is provided by

**Proposition 3.8** ([34, Prop. 6.2]). *A graph  $G = (V, E)$  is a primitive pseudo-cograph if and only if  $|V| \geq 4$  and there exists a vertex  $v \in V$  and two ordered sets  $Y = \{y_1, \dots, y_{\ell-1}, y_\ell = v\}$  and  $Z = \{z_1, \dots, z_{m-1}, z_m = v\}$ ,  $\ell, m \geq 2$  such that  $Y \cap Z = \{v\}$ ,  $Y \cup Z = V$ , and one of the following conditions hold:*

- (a)  $G[Y]$  and  $G[Z]$  are connected and the edges of  $G$  are
  - (I)  $\{y_i, y_j\}$ , where  $1 \leq i < j \leq \ell$  and  $i$  is odd; and
  - (II)  $\{z_i, z_j\}$ , where  $1 \leq i < j \leq m$  and  $i$  is odd.

*In this case,  $G$  is a slim  $(v, G[Y], G[Z])$ -polar-cat.*

- (b)  $G[Y]$  and  $G[Z]$  are disconnected and the edges of  $G$  are
  - (I)  $\{y_i, y_j\}$ , where  $1 \leq i < j \leq \ell$  and  $i$  is even; and
  - (II)  $\{z_i, z_j\}$ , where  $1 \leq i < j \leq m$  and  $i$  is even; and
  - (III)  $\{y, z\}$  for all  $y \in Y \setminus \{v\}$  and  $z \in Z \setminus \{v\}$

*In this case,  $G$  is a fat  $(v, G[Y], G[Z])$ -polar-cat.*

As for general pseudo-cographs, the choice of  $G_1$ ,  $G_2$  and  $v$  may not be unique even for polar-cats (as example, consider again an induced  $P_4$ ). However, by Thm. 3.7, for all well-proportioned  $(v, G_1, G_2)$ -polar-cats,  $G_1$ ,  $G_2$  and  $v$  are uniquely determined. This and the fact that  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  are induced subgraphs implies that the sets  $Y$ ,  $Z$  and vertex  $v$  as specified in Prop. 3.8 are uniquely determined for well-proportioned polar-cats. Thm. 3.7, can be used to obtain a slightly rephrased and simplified version of Thm. 7.5 in [34].

**Theorem 3.9.** *A graph  $G$  is GATEX if and only if  $G[M]/\mathbb{M}_{\max}(G[M])$  is a (primitive) pseudo-cograph for all prime modules  $M$  of  $G$ .*

*Moreover, it can be verified in  $O(|V| + |E|)$  time if a given graph  $G = (V, E)$  is GATEX and, in the affirmative case, a labeled galled-tree  $(N, t)$  that explains  $G$  can be constructed within the same time complexity.*

The latter statement of Theorem 3.9 is equivalent to [34, Thm. 9.4]. In [34], the class of polar-cats has been denoted by  $\mathfrak{C}$  and the class of GATEX graphs by  $\mathfrak{C}^{prime}$ . The latter is due to Theorem 3.9 and Theorem 3.7 which imply that  $G[M]/\mathbb{M}_{\max}(G[M])$  is a polar-cat  $\mathfrak{C}$  for every prime module  $M$  of a GATEX graph  $G$ . Moreover, it has been shown in [34] that every labeled galled-tree  $(N, t)$  that explains  $G$  can be obtained from the MDT of  $G$  by replacing each vertex labeled as *prime* by a suitable choice of a single 0/1-labeled cycle. The latter is justified by [34, Prop. 3.8] which shows that for any labeled galled-tree  $(N, t)$  that explains  $G$  and that does not contain weak cycles, there is a 1-to-1 correspondence between the cycles in  $N$  and the prime modules of  $G$ . Suitable choices to replace respective prime modules  $M$  of  $G$  can be obtained as follows: Construct first  $H := G[M]/\mathbb{M}_{\max}(G[M])$ . Check if  $H$  is a polar-cat and determine a vertex  $v \in V(H_1)$  as well as induced subgraphs  $H_1, H_2 \sqsubseteq H$  such that  $H$  is a  $(v, H_1, H_2)$ -polar-cat. By Theorem 3.7, the latter task can be done in linear-time. By definition,  $H - v$  is either the join or the disjoint union of the cographs  $H_1 - v$  and  $H_2 - v$ . Note that the two cotrees  $(T_1, t_1)$  and  $(T_2, t_2)$  that explain  $H_1 - v$  and  $H_2 - v$ , respectively, must be caterpillars and  $v$  is part of a cherry in  $(T_1, t_1)$  as well as in  $(T_2, t_2)$ . To construct  $(N, t)$  that explains  $H$ , (1) add a root  $\rho_N$  and  $(T_1, t_1)$  and  $(T_2, t_2)$  to  $N$ , (2) add edges  $\{\rho_N, \rho_{T_1}\}$  and  $\{\rho_N, \rho_{T_2}\}$  and (3) identify  $v$  in  $(T_1, t_1)$  and  $(T_2, t_2)$  to obtain a vertex  $v'$  and (4) add an edge  $\{v', v\}$ . Finally keep the labels of all vertices in  $T_1$  and  $T_2$ , label  $v'$  arbitrarily and  $\rho_N$  by either “1” or “0” depending on whether  $H$  is fat or slim. Now replace the prime module  $M$  in  $G$  by the unique cycle in  $N$ ; see [34] for further details.

## 4 Forbidden Subgraph Characterization

In this section, we show that GATEX graphs are characterized by a set of 25 forbidden subgraphs. To this end, we first provide the following

**Lemma 4.1** ([34, Lemma 7.1]). *A graph  $G$  is GATEX if and only if every induced subgraph of  $G$  is GATEX.*

By Lemma 4.1, the property of a graph being galled-tree explainable is heritable and Lemma 2.1 implies that the class of GATEX graphs can be characterized by means of a not necessarily finite set of forbidden induced subgraphs. In the following, let  $\mathfrak{F}_{GT}$  denote the (currently unknown) set of minimal forbidden induced subgraphs that characterizes GATEX graphs. With *minimal* we mean that if  $F \in \mathfrak{F}_{GT}$ , then  $F$  is not GATEX, while  $F - x$  is GATEX for all  $x \in V(F)$ . In what follows, we will define the set  $\mathfrak{F}_{GT}$  in full detail. To this end, we provide first a new characterization of GATEX graphs.

**Theorem 4.2.**  *$G$  is GATEX if and only if all primitive induced subgraphs of  $G$  are pseudo-cographs.*

*Proof.* By contraposition, assume that  $G$  contains a primitive induced subgraph  $H = (W, E)$  that is not a pseudo-cograph and let  $M$  be an inclusion-minimal module that contains  $V(H)$ . By Lemma 2.5,  $M$  is prime and  $H$  is isomorphic to an induced subgraph of  $G[M]/\mathbb{M}_{\max}(G[M])$ . By Thm. 3.4, the property of being a pseudo-cograph is heritable. The latter arguments imply that  $G[M]/\mathbb{M}_{\max}(G[M])$  cannot be a pseudo-cograph. By Thm. 3.9,  $G$  is not GATEX. This establishes the *only-if* direction.

Assume now that all primitive induced subgraphs of  $G$  (if there are any) are pseudo-cographs. Note that if  $G$  does not contain prime modules at all, then Thm. 3.9 implies that  $G$  can be explained by a labeled galled tree. Hence, assume that  $G$  contains a prime module  $M$ . By Obs. 2.4,  $G[M]/\mathbb{M}_{\max}(G[M]) \simeq H$  where  $H$  is an induced subgraph of  $G$ . In particular,  $H$  is primitive. By assumption,  $H$  is a pseudo-cograph. Since the latter argument holds for all prime modules of  $G$ , Thm. 3.9 implies that  $G$  is GATEX. This establishes the *if* direction.  $\square$

The following lemma shows that the elements in  $\mathfrak{F}_{GT}$  are precisely the minimal primitive non-pseudo-cographs.

**Lemma 4.3.** *It holds that  $F \in \mathfrak{F}_{GT}$  if and only if  $F$  is primitive and not a pseudo-cograph and there is no  $F' \in \mathfrak{F}_{GT}$  such that  $|V(F')| < |V(F)|$  and  $F' \sqsubseteq F$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $F \in \mathfrak{F}_{GT}$ . By definition,  $F$  is not GATEX. However, since every pseudo-cograph is GATEX, it follows that  $F$  cannot be a pseudo-cograph. Assume now, for contradiction, that  $F$  is not primitive. Since  $F$  is not GATEX, Thm. 3.9 implies that there is a prime module  $M$  of  $F$  such that  $F[M]/\mathbb{M}_{\max}(F[M])$  is not a pseudo-cograph. By Obs. 2.4,  $F[M]/\mathbb{M}_{\max}(F[M])$  is isomorphic to an induced subgraph  $H$  of  $F$ . In particular,  $V(H)$  is a prime module of  $H$  and, since  $H$  is primitive but not a pseudo-cograph, Thm. 3.9 implies that  $H$  is not GATEX. This and the fact that  $\mathfrak{F}_{GT}$  characterizes GATEX graphs implies that there is an induced subgraph  $F' \in \mathfrak{F}_{GT}$  such that  $F' \sqsubseteq H$ . Note since  $F$  is not primitive but  $H \sqsubseteq F$  is, it follows that  $H \subsetneq F$ . Therefore,  $F' \sqsubseteq H \subsetneq F$  implies that  $F$  is not minimal and,

---

**Algorithm 1** Construct  $\tilde{\mathfrak{F}}_{\text{GT}}$ 

---

**Input:** The sets  $\mathfrak{G}_i$  of all graphs on  $i \in \{5, \dots, 8\}$  vertices

**Output:** Set  $\tilde{\mathfrak{F}}_{\text{GT}}$  of forbidden subgraphs on 5 to 8 vertices

```
1:  $\tilde{\mathfrak{F}}_{\text{GT}} \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
2: while  $i \leq 8$  do
3:   for all  $G \in \mathfrak{G}_i$  do
4:     forbidden=true
5:     if  $G$  is primitive and not a pseudo-cograph then ▷ Pseudo-cograph recognition with Alg. 2 in [34]
6:       for all  $H \in \tilde{\mathfrak{F}}_{\text{GT}}$  with  $|V(H)| < |V(G)|$  do
7:         if  $H \sqsubseteq G$  then
8:           forbidden=false
9:       if forbidden then
10:         $\tilde{\mathfrak{F}}_{\text{GT}} \leftarrow \tilde{\mathfrak{F}}_{\text{GT}} \cup \{G\}$ .
11:    $i \leftarrow i + 1$ 
12: return  $\tilde{\mathfrak{F}}_{\text{GT}}$ 
```

---

hence,  $F \notin \tilde{\mathfrak{F}}_{\text{GT}}$ ; a contradiction. In summary, all  $F \in \tilde{\mathfrak{F}}_{\text{GT}}$  are primitive and not pseudo-cographs. Assume now, for contradiction, that there is an  $F' \in \tilde{\mathfrak{F}}_{\text{GT}}$  such that  $|V(F')| < |V(F)|$  and  $F' \sqsubseteq F$ . By the latter arguments,  $F'$  is primitive and not a pseudo-cograph. In particular,  $F' \sqsubseteq F - x$  for some  $x \in V(F)$ . By Thm. 4.2,  $F - x$  is not GATEX; a contradiction to minimality of  $F$ .

For the converse, assume that  $F$  is primitive and not a pseudo-cograph and that there is no  $F' \in \tilde{\mathfrak{F}}_{\text{GT}}$  such that  $|V(F')| < |V(F)|$  and  $F' \sqsubseteq F$ . Hence, for all  $x \in V(F)$ , it holds that  $F - x$  does not contain any of the graphs in  $\tilde{\mathfrak{F}}_{\text{GT}}$  as an induced subgraph. Since  $\tilde{\mathfrak{F}}_{\text{GT}}$  is the set of (minimal) forbidden induced subgraphs that characterizes GATEX graphs, it follows that  $F - x$  is GATEX for all  $x \in V(F)$ . By Thm. 4.2,  $F$  is not GATEX. By the latter arguments,  $F$  is minimal and thus,  $F \in \tilde{\mathfrak{F}}_{\text{GT}}$ .  $\square$

By Lemma 4.3, any forbidden subgraph  $F \in \tilde{\mathfrak{F}}_{\text{GT}}$  of GATEX graphs must be primitive. Hence,  $|V(F)| \geq 4$ . Since, however, an induced  $P_4$  is a pseudo-cograph and no other graph on four vertices is primitive, we can conclude that  $|V(F)| \geq 5$ . Furthermore, a  $(v, G_1, G_2)$ -pseudo-cograph  $G$  has, in particular, the property that  $v$  must be located on every induced  $P_4$ . By Lemma 4.3,  $F \in \tilde{\mathfrak{F}}_{\text{GT}}$  cannot be a pseudo-cograph. By the latter two arguments, a putative worst-case for the number of vertices of a forbidden subgraph in  $\tilde{\mathfrak{F}}_{\text{GT}}$  are graphs that contain two vertex-disjoint  $P_4$ s. The latter leads to the conjecture that  $|V(F)| \leq 8$ . We summarize the latter discussion into the following

**Conjecture.** For all  $F \in \tilde{\mathfrak{F}}_{\text{GT}}$ , we have  $5 \leq |V(F)| \leq 8$ .

To get evidence for this conjecture, we established Alg. 1 to compute all minimal forbidden subgraphs of size 5 to 8 which we downloaded from [57]. In total, we checked 13 580 graphs. Alg. 1 and the choice of graphs is based on the previous results. To be more precise, by the arguments above, it suffices to look for graphs on at least 5 vertices. By Lemma 4.3, a necessary condition for  $F$  being an element in  $\tilde{\mathfrak{F}}_{\text{GT}}$  is that  $F$  is primitive and not a pseudo-cograph (Alg. 1, Line (5)). To check if  $F$  is a minimal, we can apply Lemma 4.3 and verify if a formerly computed forbidden subgraph  $H$  with  $|V(H)| < |V(F)|$  (Alg. 1, Line (6)) is an induced subgraph of  $F$  (Alg. 1, Line (7)). If this is not the case,  $F$  adds a new forbidden subgraph  $\tilde{\mathfrak{F}}_{\text{GT}}$  (Alg. 1, Line (10)). This algorithm is written in Python and requires Python version 3.7 or higher and relies on the packages NetworkX and tralda [60]. It is hosted at GitHub (<https://github.com/marc-hellmuth/ForbiddenSubgraphs-GaTeX> [31]). The set  $\tilde{\mathfrak{F}}_{\text{GT}}$  of forbidden subgraphs computed with Alg. 1 is shown in Fig. 2 and we put, *from here on*,

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{F}}_{\text{GT}} := \{F_0, \dots, F_{24}\}.$$

So-far, we have constructed all elements of  $\tilde{\mathfrak{F}}_{\text{GT}}$  on 5 to 8 vertices. As we shall see later, these are indeed all elements of  $\tilde{\mathfrak{F}}_{\text{GT}}$ . We are aware of the fact, that the correctness of the computed graphs in  $\tilde{\mathfrak{F}}_{\text{GT}}$  relies on the correct implementation of Alg. 1. In order to make it as easy as possible for the reader to verify this implementation, Alg. 1 is implemented to be readable as easy as possible and, thus, mainly brute-force routines are used, although such a simplified algorithm goes hand in hand with a possibly lower runtime.


Since we have checked all graphs on 5 to 8 vertices, we obtain

**Observation 4.4.** The set  $\tilde{\mathfrak{F}}_{\text{GT}}$  of forbidden subgraphs is exhaustive for graphs up to 8 vertices. In other words, every primitive graph  $G$  that is not a pseudo-cograph and where  $|V(G)| \leq 8$  must contain at least one  $F \in \tilde{\mathfrak{F}}_{\text{GT}}$  as an induced subgraph.

In addition, we applied Alg. 1 to all 9 vertex graphs. As it turned out, all such graphs  $G$  that are not GATEX already contain one of the existing  $F \in \tilde{\mathfrak{F}}_{\text{GT}}$ . Consequently, there are no forbidden subgraphs with 9 vertices which gives further evidence to the aforestated conjecture. Closer inspection of the graphs in  $\tilde{\mathfrak{F}}_{\text{GT}}$  shows

**Observation 4.5.**  $F \in \tilde{\mathfrak{F}}_{\text{GT}}$  if and only if  $\bar{F} \in \tilde{\mathfrak{F}}_{\text{GT}}$  and, therefore,  $G$  is  $\tilde{\mathfrak{F}}_{\text{GT}}$ -free if and only if  $\bar{G}$  is  $\tilde{\mathfrak{F}}_{\text{GT}}$ -free





**Figure 2:** All graphs on 5 to 8 vertices that are primitive and not pseudo-cographs and for which every induced subgraph with fewer vertices is GATEX. Note,  $F_0$  is self-complementary. Every two graphs  $F_i$  and  $F_{i+1}$ ,  $i \in \{1, 3, 5, \dots, 23\}$  (represented in a common framebox) are complements of each other. According to Theorem 4.8, a graph  $G$  is GATEX if and only if  $G$  does not contain any of the graphs in  $\mathfrak{F}_{\text{GT}} = \{F_0, F_1, \dots, F_{24}\}$  as an induced subgraph.

Now consider the graph  $\mathcal{G}_r$  as specified in Prop. 2.6. If  $r \geq 3$  and thus,  $|V(\mathcal{G}_r)| \geq 6$ , then  $\mathcal{G}_r[\{a_1, a_2, a_3, b_1, b_2, b_3\}] \simeq F_7 \in \mathfrak{F}_{\text{GT}}$ . This implies together with Prop. 2.6

**Corollary 4.6.** *If  $G$  is critical-primitive and  $|V(G)| \geq 6$ , then  $G$  contains the forbidden subgraph  $F_7 \in \mathfrak{F}_{\text{GT}}$  or its complement  $F_8 \in \mathfrak{F}_{\text{GT}}$ .*

The next lemma is crucial for the forbidden subgraph characterization of graphs that can be explained by galled trees.

**Lemma 4.7.** *Every primitive graph that is not a pseudo-cograph is not  $\mathfrak{F}_{\text{GT}}$ -free.*

*Proof.* In essence, the proof is based on induction on the number of vertices. The base case is provided by the previously computed set  $\mathfrak{F}_{\text{GT}}$  that already contains all forbidden subgraphs on 5 to 8 vertices. The straightforward but tedious case-by-case analysis is given in the appendix.  $\square$

We are now in the position to provide a further novel characterization of GATEX graphs.

**Theorem 4.8.**  *$G$  is GATEX if and only if  $G$  is  $\mathfrak{F}_{\text{GT}}$ -free.*

*Proof.* The *only-if* direction readily follows from the fact that every induced subgraph of a GATEX graph  $G$  is GATEX as well (cf. Lemma 4.1). Since none of the graphs in  $\mathfrak{F}_{\text{GT}}$  are GATEX, it follows that  $G$  is  $\mathfrak{F}_{\text{GT}}$ -free.

By contraposition, assume that  $G$  is not GATEX. By Thm. 3.9,  $G$  contains a prime module  $M$  such that  $G[M]/\mathbb{M}_{\max}(G[M])$  is not a pseudo-cograph. Obs. 2.4 implies that there is an induced subgraph  $H \subseteq G$  such that  $H \simeq G[M]/\mathbb{M}_{\max}(G[M])$ . Note that  $H$  is primitive and, in particular, not a pseudo-cograph. This together with Lemma 4.7 implies that  $G$  is not  $\mathfrak{F}_{\text{GT}}$ -free.  $\square$

While the set  $\mathfrak{F}_{\text{GT}}$  characterizes GATEX graphs, pseudo-cographs are not characterized by  $\mathfrak{F}_{\text{GT}}$ . By way of example, consider the graph  $G$  that is the disjoint union of two induced  $P_4$ s. Since  $G$  is  $\mathfrak{F}_{\text{GT}}$ -free,  $G$  is GATEX. However,  $G$  is not a pseudo-cograph as, for all choices  $v \in V(G)$ , the graph  $G - v$  contains an induced  $P_4$  and is, therefore not a cograph (cf. Obs. 3.3). Hence, we leave it as an open problem to find a set of forbidden subgraphs that characterizes pseudo-cographs.

## 5 GATEX Graphs and Other Graph Classes

In this section, we show the rich connection of GATEX graphs to other graph classes.

We start with the following definitions. A *hole* is an induced cycle  $C_n$  on  $n \geq 5$  five vertices. The complement of a hole is an *anti-hole*. A graph is *weakly-chordal* if and only if it does not contain holes or anti-holes [27]. A graph  $G$  is *perfect*, if the chromatic number of every induced subgraph equals the size of the largest clique of that subgraph. As shown by [27], weakly-chordal graphs are perfect.

**Lemma 5.1.** *GATEX graphs are hole-free.*

*Proof.* By contraposition, assume that  $G$  contains an induced cycle  $C_\ell$  on  $\ell \geq 5$  vertices. Hence, if  $\ell = 5$  or  $\ell = 6$ , then  $G$  contains  $F_0$  or  $F_{13}$  as an induced subgraph and, otherwise, if  $\ell > 6$ , then  $G$  contains  $F_3$  as an induced subgraph. In all cases, Theorem 4.8 implies that  $G$  is not GATEX.  $\square$

**Theorem 5.2.** *GATEX graphs are weakly-chordal and thus, perfect.*

*Proof.* By Lemma 5.1, GATEX graphs are hole free. In addition, by Obs. 2.3, GATEX graphs are closed under complementation which immediately implies that  $G$  must be anti-hole free. By definition, GATEX graph are therefore weakly-chordal and thus, by [27], perfect.  $\square$

In all perfect graphs and thus, in all GATEX graphs, the graph coloring problem, maximum clique problem, and maximum independent set problem can all be solved in polynomial time [21].

A graph is *murky*, if the graph and its complement is hole- and  $P_6$ -free [28]. Theorem 4.8 and Lemma 5.1 imply

**Theorem 5.3.** *Every GATEX graph is murky.*

A directed graph  $G' = (V, E')$  is an *orientation* of a graph  $G = (V, E)$  if for all  $\{x, y\} \in E$ , either  $(x, y) \in E'$  or  $(y, x) \in E'$  (but not both) and for all  $(x, y) \in E'$ ,  $\{x, y\} \in E$  holds. An orientation  $G' = (V', E')$  of a graph  $G = (V, E)$  is *transitive* if  $(x, y), (y, z) \in E'$  implies  $(x, z) \in E'$  [13]. Graphs for which a transitive orientation exists are known as *comparability graphs*. In what follows, we show that GATEX graphs are comparability graphs. To this end, we start with

**Theorem 5.4.** *Every GATEX graph is a comparability graph.*

*Proof.* We start with showing that every primitive pseudo-cograph is a comparability graph. To this end, let  $G = (V, E)$  be a primitive pseudo-cograph.

Suppose first that  $G$  is slim. By Prop. 3.8, we can construct two ordered sets  $Y = \{y_1, \dots, y_{\ell-1}, y_\ell = v\}$  and  $Z = \{z_1, \dots, z_{m-1}, z_m = v\}$ ,  $\ell, m \geq 2$  such that  $Y \cap Z = \{v\}$ ,  $Y \cup Z = V$ ; and  $\{y_i, y_j\} \in E$  precisely if  $1 \leq i < j \leq \ell$  and  $i$  is odd; and  $\{z_i, z_j\} \in E$  precisely if  $1 \leq i < j \leq m$  and  $i$  is odd. Note that, since  $G$  is slim, there are no edges connecting vertices in  $Y \setminus \{v\}$  with vertices in  $Z \setminus \{v\}$ . We now define a directed graph  $G' = (V, E')$  by putting  $(y_i, y_j) \in E'$  for all  $\{y_i, y_j\} \in E$  and  $(z_i, z_j) \in E'$  for all  $\{z_i, z_j\} \in E$  where, in all cases,  $i < j$  and  $i$  is odd. Note, that  $v = y_\ell = y_m$  where  $\ell$  and  $m$  are the largest indices of the vertices in  $Y$  and  $Z$ , respectively. By definition, there are no arc  $(v, x)$  for all  $x \in Y \cup Z$  in  $G'$ .

Consider now two arcs  $(a, b)$  and  $(b, c)$  in  $G'$ . We show that  $(a, c) \in E'$ . We consider the following cases: (i) either  $a, b, c \in Y$  or  $a, b, c \in Z$  and (ii) at most two of  $a, b, c$  are contained in  $Y$  and at most two of  $a, b, c$  are contained in  $Z$ . Suppose first that  $a, b, c \in Y$  and let  $a = y_p, b = y_q$  and  $c = y_r$  and thus,  $p < q < r$  and  $p, q$  must be odd. Since  $p < r$  and  $p$  is odd, there is an edge  $\{y_p, y_r\} \in E$  and, by construction, an arc  $(y_p, y_r) \in E'$ . By similar arguments, the case  $a, b, c \in Z$  is shown. Consider now Case (ii). Since there are no arcs in  $G'$  connecting vertices in  $Y \setminus \{v\}$  with vertices in  $Z \setminus \{v\}$ , one of the vertices  $a, b$  and  $c$  must be the vertex  $v$ . Since,  $v = y_\ell = y_m$  where  $\ell$  and  $m$  are the largest indices of the vertices in  $Y$  and  $Z$ , respectively, there are no arcs  $(v, x)$  for all  $x \in Y \cup Z$  in  $G'$ . Therefore, only  $c = v$  is possible. Hence, if  $b \in Y$  then  $a \in Y$  which together with  $v \in Y$  implies  $a, b, c \in Y$ . Thus, this case cannot occur when we assume that at most two of  $a, b, c$  are contained in  $Y$ . By similar arguments, if  $b \in Z$ , then  $a, b, c \in Z$  and thus, this case cannot occur.

Therefore,  $G'$  is a transitive orientation of  $G$  in case that  $G$  is a slim primitive pseudo-cograph.

Assume, now that  $G'$  is a fat primitive pseudo-cograph. By Prop. 3.8, we can construct two ordered sets  $Y = \{y_1, \dots, y_{\ell-1}, y_\ell = v\}$  and  $Z = \{z_1, \dots, z_{m-1}, z_m = v\}$ ,  $\ell, m \geq 2$  such that  $Y \cap Z = \{v\}$ ,  $Y \cup Z = V$ ; and  $\{y_i, y_j\} \in E$  precisely if  $1 \leq i < j \leq \ell$  and  $i$  is even; and  $\{z_i, z_j\} \in E$  precisely if  $1 \leq i < j \leq m$  and  $i$  is even; and  $\{y, z\} \in E$  for all  $y \in Y \setminus \{v\}$  and  $z \in Z \setminus \{v\}$ . We now define a directed graph  $G' = (V, E')$  by putting  $(y_i, y_j) \in E'$  for all  $\{y_i, y_j\} \in E$  with  $i < j$  and  $i$  is even;  $(z_j, z_i) \in E'$  for all  $\{z_i, z_j\} \in E$  with  $i < j$  and  $i$  is even;  $(y, z) \in E'$  for all  $y \in Y \setminus \{v\}$  and  $z \in Z \setminus \{v\}$ . We emphasize that the “order” of the arcs  $(z_j, z_i) \in E'$  is opposite to the “order” chosen for slim pseudo-cographs. Note, that  $v = y_\ell = y_m$  where  $\ell$  and  $m$  are the largest indices of the vertices in  $Y$  and  $Z$ , respectively. By definition, there are no arc  $(v, y)$  for all  $y \in Y$ , no arc  $(z, v)$  for all  $z \in Z$  and no arc  $(z, y)$  for all  $y \in Y, z \in Z$  in  $G'$ .

Consider now two arcs  $(a, b)$  and  $(b, c)$  in  $G'$ . We show that  $(a, c) \in E'$ . We consider the following cases: (i') either  $a, b, c \in Y$  or  $a, b, c \in Z$  and (ii') at most two of  $a, b, c$  are contained in  $Y$  and at most two of  $a, b, c$  are contained in  $Z$ . The existence of the arc  $(a, c)$  in  $G'$  in Case (i') can be shown by similar arguments as used for Case (i) for slim pseudo-cographs. Hence, assume that Case (ii') holds.

Suppose first that  $v \in \{a, b, c\}$ . Assume that  $a = v$ . Since there are no arcs  $(v, y)$  for all  $y \in Y$  in  $G'$ , we have  $b \in Z$ . Since there is no arc  $(b, y)$  for all  $y \in Y \setminus \{v\}$  it follows that  $c \in Z$ . Thus,  $a, b, c \in Z$  which implies that this case cannot

occur when we assume that at most two of  $a, b, c$  are contained in  $Z$ . Assume that  $b = v$ . Since there is no arc  $(v, y)$  for all  $y \in Y$  and no arc  $(z, v)$  for all  $z \in Z$  in  $G'$ ,  $a \in Y \setminus \{v\}$  and  $c \in Z \setminus \{v\}$  must hold. By construction, the arc  $(a, c)$  exists in  $G'$ . Suppose now that  $c = v$ . By similar arguments as used for the case  $a = v$ , we can conclude that  $a, b, c \in Y$ ; a case that cannot occur when we assume that at most two of  $a, b, c$  are contained in  $Y$ .

Hence, suppose that  $v \notin \{a, b, c\}$ . If  $c \in Y$ , then  $(z, c) \notin E'$  for all  $z \in Z$  implies that  $b \in Y$  and, subsequently,  $a \in Y$ ; a case that cannot occur when we assume that at most two of  $a, b, c$  are contained in  $Y$ . Hence,  $c \in Z \setminus \{v\}$  must hold. By assumption, there are three cases we need to consider:  $a \in Z \setminus \{v\}$  and thus,  $b \notin Z \setminus \{v\}$ ;  $b \in Z \setminus \{v\}$  and thus,  $a \notin Z \setminus \{v\}$ ; and  $a, b \notin Z \setminus \{v\}$ . Since there are no arcs  $(z, y)$  for all  $y \in Y, z \in Z$  in  $G'$ , the case  $a \in Z \setminus \{v\}$  and, therefore,  $b \in Y \setminus \{v\}$  cannot occur. Hence, suppose that  $b \in Z \setminus \{v\}$  and thus,  $a \in Y \setminus \{v\}$ . By definition and since  $c \in Z \setminus \{v\}$ , the arc  $(a, c)$  exists in  $G'$ . Now assume that  $a, b \notin Z \setminus \{v\}$  and thus,  $a, b \in Y \setminus \{v\}$ . Again, since  $c \in Z \setminus \{v\}$ , the arc  $(a, c)$  exists in  $G'$ .

Therefore,  $G'$  is a transitive orientation of  $G$  in case that  $G$  is a fat primitive pseudo-cograph.

In summary, every primitive pseudo-cograph is a comparability graph. We note in passing that a primitive comparability graph and thus, a primitive pseudo-cograph, has only two transitive orientations, where one is obtained from the other by reversing the directions of all the edges [9, 56]

We continue with showing that every GATEX graph is a comparability graph. As argued in [63] and [56, Section 4], a graph is a comparability graph if  $G[M]/\mathbb{M}_{\max}(G[M])$  is a comparability graph for all prime modules  $M$  of  $G$ . Since for GATEX graphs, Theorem 3.9 implies that  $G[M]/\mathbb{M}_{\max}(G[M])$  is a primitive pseudo-cograph and thus, a comparability graph, it follows that every GATEX graph is a comparability graph.  $\square$

By Obs. 2.3, the complement  $\bar{G}$  of a GATEX graph  $G$  is GATEX. This and Thm. 5.4 imply

**Corollary 5.5.** *The complement of every GATEX graph is a comparability graph and thus, every GATEX graph is the complement of a comparability graph.*

A graph  $G = (V, E)$  is a *permutation graph* if there exists a labeling  $\ell$  of the vertices of  $G$  and a permutation  $\pi = (\pi(1), \dots, \pi(|V|))$  such that for all  $u, v \in V$  it holds that  $\{u, v\} \in E$  if and only if  $\ell(u) > \ell(v)$  and  $\pi^{-1}(\ell(u)) < \pi^{-1}(\ell(v))$  [59].

**Theorem 5.6.** *Every GATEX graph is a permutation graph.*

*Proof.* By Thm. 5.4 and Cor. 5.5, if  $G$  is GATEX, both  $G$  and  $\bar{G}$  are comparability graphs. By [59, Thm. 3],  $G$  is a permutation graph.  $\square$

A graph is *perfectly orderable* if there is an ordering of the vertices of  $G$  such that a greedy coloring algorithm with that ordering optimally colors every induced subgraph of the given graph. Such an ordering is called perfect.

**Theorem 5.7.** *GATEX graphs are perfectly orderable and this ordering can be found in linear-time.*

*Proof.* Let  $G$  be GATEX. By Thm. 5.4,  $G$  is a comparability graph and thus,  $G$  is transitive orientable. A transitive orientation of comparability graphs can be constructed in linear-time [55]. A topological ordering of a transitive orientation then yields a perfect order of  $G$  and can be constructed in linear-time, cf. [53, 54, 56].  $\square$

A graph  $G$  is *distance-hereditary*, if the distances in any connected induced subgraph of  $G$  are the same as they are in  $G$ . In general, GATEX graphs are not distance-hereditary (as an example consider the pseudo-cograph  $\bar{P}_5$ ). It has been shown in [26] (see also [8]) that a graph  $G$  is distance-hereditary if and only if  $G$  does not contain the *house*  $\bar{P}_5$ , the *gem*  $K_1 \otimes P_4$ , a *hole* and the *domino*  $F_{17} \in \mathfrak{F}_{GT}$  as an induced subgraph. By Thm. 4.8 and Lemma 5.1, GATEX graphs are  $F_{17}$ - and hole-free. We summarize the latter arguments into the following


**Proposition 5.8.** *Let  $G$  be a GATEX graph. Then,  $G$  is distance-hereditary if and only if  $G$  is house- and gem-free.*

The intersection graph of family  $\mathcal{S}$  of nonempty sets is obtained by representing each set in  $\mathcal{S}$  by a vertex and connecting two vertices by an edge if and only if their corresponding sets intersect. The intersection graph of a family of intervals on a linearly ordered set is called an *interval graph* [9, 50]. A *circular-arc graph* is the intersection graph of a set of arcs on the circle, see [51] for further details. Every interval graph is a circular-arc graph [51].

**Theorem 5.9.** *Every  $C_4$ -free GATEX graph is an interval graph and, thus a circular-arc graph.*

*Proof.* Suppose that  $G$  is a  $C_4$ -free GATEX graph. By Cor. 5.5,  $G$  is the complement of a comparability graph. By [20, Thm. 2],  $H$  is an interval graph if and only if  $H$  is  $C_4$ -free and  $H$  is the complement of a comparability graph. Hence,  $G$  is an interval graph and, by [51], a circular-arc graph.  $\square$

A graph  $G$  is *very strongly perfect* if for every induced subgraph  $H$  of  $G$ , every vertex of  $H$  belongs to a stable set of  $H$  meeting all maximal cliques in  $H$ , see [2] for further details. A *Meyniel* graph is a graph in which every odd cycle of length five or more has at least two chords, i.e., edges connecting non-consecutive vertices of the cycle [58]. It has been shown in [39] that a graph  $G$  is Meyniel if and only if  $G$  is very strongly perfect. An *odd-building*  $B_n$  is a graph isomorphic to an odd cycle  $C_n$  on  $n \geq 5$  vertices with just one chord where the chord makes a triangle with two consecutive edges on the cycle. As an example, a *house* is the odd-building  $B_5$ . As argued in [47], a graph is Meyniel if and only if the graph contains neither a hole on an odd number of vertices nor an odd-building as an induced subgraph. Moreover, a vertex  $x$  of a graph  $G$  is *soft* if  $x$  is either not a midpoint or not an endpoint of any  $P_4$  of  $G$ . A graph  $G$  is *brittle*, if each induced subgraph of  $G$  contains a soft vertex [2, 4].



**Figure 3:** The set  $\mathfrak{F}_{P_4\text{-sparse}}$  of forbidden subgraphs that characterizes  $P_4$ -sparse graphs [52, Fig. 3].

**Theorem 5.10.** *Every house-free GATEX graph is Meyniel, very strongly perfect and brittle.*

*Proof.* Suppose that  $G$  is a house-free GATEX graph. By Lemma 5.1,  $G$  is hole-free. Hence,  $G$  does, in particular, not contain a hole on an odd number of vertices. Suppose, for contradiction, that  $G$  is not Meyniel. By the latter argument and the arguments preceding the statement of this theorem,  $G$  must contain an odd building  $B_n$  as an induced subgraph. Since  $G$  is house-free, we have  $n \geq 7$ . It is easy to see that every odd building  $B_n$ ,  $n \geq 7$  contains an even cycle  $C_{n-1}$  on at least six vertices as an induced subgraph. Thus,  $G$  contains holes; a contradiction. Therefore,  $G$  is Meyniel. As shown in [39],  $G$  is Meyniel if and only if  $G$  is very strongly perfect. By [38], if a graph does not contain a hole, a domino  $F_{17} \in \mathfrak{F}_{GT}$  or a house as an induced subgraph, then this graph is brittle [38]. Since  $G$  is hole-free and house-free and, in addition GATEX, and thus  $F_{17} \not\subseteq G$ , we can conclude that  $G$  must be brittle.  $\square$

Several generalizations of cographs are obtained by bounding the number of  $P_4$ s in different ways. A graph  $G$  is  $P_4$ -reducible if every vertex belongs to at most one induced  $P_4$  of the graph [42]. A graph is  $P_4$ -sparse if every induced subgraph with exactly five vertices contains at most one induced  $P_4$  [2, 37].  $P_4$ -sparse graphs are characterized by the set of forbidden subgraph  $\mathfrak{F}_{P_4\text{-sparse}}$  as shown in Fig. 3 and, moreover,  $P_4$ -reducible graphs are precisely the  $P_4$ -sparse graph that do not contain  $F_5$  and  $F_6$  as an induced subgraph [2, 19, 44]. Closer inspection of the forbidden subgraphs in Fig. 3 and the forbidden subgraphs in  $\mathfrak{F}_{GT}$  shows that each  $F_i \in \mathfrak{F}_{GT} \setminus \{F_5, F_6\}$  contains at least one of the graphs in  $\mathfrak{F}_{P_4\text{-sparse}}$  as an induced subgraph. Consequently,  $P_4$ -sparse graphs cannot contain any of the graphs  $F_i \in \mathfrak{F}_{GT} \setminus \{F_5, F_6\}$  as an induced subgraph. In summary we obtain

**Theorem 5.11.** *Every  $\{F_5, F_6\}$ -free  $P_4$ -sparse graph or, equivalently, every  $P_4$ -reducible graph is GATEX.*

## 6 Concluding Remarks

In this contribution, we gave two novel characterizations of graphs that can be explained by labeled galled-trees (GATEX graphs) in terms of induced subgraphs. While Theorem 4.2 shows that a graph is GATEX precisely if all induced primitive subgraphs are pseudo-cographs, Theorem 4.8 provides a characterization in terms of the set  $\mathfrak{F}_{GT}$  of 25 forbidden induced subgraphs. These characterizations allowed us to show that GATEX graphs are closely related to many other graph classes such as  $P_4$ -sparse graphs, weakly-chordal graphs, perfect graphs with perfect order, comparability and permutation graphs, murky graphs as well as interval graphs, Meyniel graphs or very strongly-perfect and brittle graphs. The classes of graphs considered here is by-far not exhaustive and it would be of interest to investigate the connection of GATEX graphs to other graph classes as well.

A cluster  $C(v)$  in a galled-tree  $N$  is the set of all leaf-descendants of a vertex  $v$  and the clustering system  $\mathcal{C}(N)$  of  $N$  is the collection of all the clusters in  $N$ . Just recently, clustering systems of galled-trees have been characterized [33]. For cographs  $G$  there is a direct connection of the clusters in the cotree that explain  $G$  and the strong modules of  $G$  (cf. [35, Sec. 3.2]). In general, the modules of a GATEX graph  $G$  are not necessarily clusters of the galled-tree that explains  $G$ . Therefore, it is of interest, to understand in more detail, to what extent the clusters of a labeled galled-tree that explains  $G$  can be directly inferred from  $G$ . In addition, one may ask how the clustering systems of galled-trees are related to generalized notions of modules in the graph they explain, see e.g. [24, 25].

Generalizations of galled-trees to more “refined” labeled networks that can explain a given graph will be an interesting topic for future work to address the wide variety of different networks that can be found in phylogenomics [33, 41]. Such refinements may be defined in terms of additional labels to explain edge-colored graphs [1, 10, 11] or by resolving prime modules in the MDT by more “complicated” structures than simple cycles.

## Acknowledgments

We thank Nicolas Wieseke for stimulating discussions and comments that helped to significantly improve the established results. We also would like to thank the organizers of the 18. *Herbstseminar der Bioinformatik* hosted in Doubice, Czech Republic, where the main ideas of this paper were drafted.

## Appendix

*Proof of Lemma 4.7.* Let  $H$  be a primitive graph that is not a pseudo-cograph. Since  $H$  is primitive, we have  $|V(H)| \geq 4$ . We proceed now by induction on the number  $k$  of vertices of  $H$ . As base-cases, we have  $k \in \{4, 5, \dots, 8\}$  for which Obs. 4.4 implies that  $H$  must contain one of the forbidden subgraphs in  $\mathfrak{F}_{\text{GT}}$ . Let  $|V(H)| \geq 9$  and assume that all primitive graphs that are not pseudo-cographs and have less than  $|V(H)|$  vertices contain an  $F \in \mathfrak{F}_{\text{GT}}$  as an induced subgraph.

If  $H$  is critical-primitive, then Cor. 4.6 implies that  $H$  is not  $\mathfrak{F}_{\text{GT}}$ -free. Thus, assume that  $H$  is not critical-primitive. Therefore, there is a vertex  $x$  such that  $H' = H - x$  is primitive. Note that  $|V(H')| \geq 8$ .

If  $H'$  is not a pseudo-cograph it must, by induction hypothesis, contain a forbidden subgraph and so  $H$  is not  $\mathfrak{F}_{\text{GT}}$ -free.

Thus, assume that  $H'$  is a pseudo-cograph. Since  $H'$  is primitive, Thm. 3.7 implies that  $H'$  is a polar-cat. Moreover, since  $|V(H')| \geq 8$ ,  $H'$  must be well-proportioned, by Obs. 3.6. Hence, by Thm. 3.7,  $H'$  has a unique representation as a pseudo-cograph  $(v, H'_1, H'_2)$ . W.l.o.g. assume that  $H'$  is a slim pseudo-cograph (otherwise, take the complement of  $H'$ ; cf. Thm. 3.4). Since  $H'$  is a slim and primitive pseudo-cograph and  $H'_1, H'_2$  and  $v$  are uniquely determined, we can assume that  $H_Y := H[Y] = H'_1$  and  $H_Z := H[Z] = H'_2$  are induced subgraphs of  $H - x$  such that  $Y \cap Z = \{v\}$ ,  $Y \cup Z = V(H')$  and where the vertices in  $Y = \{y_1, \dots, y_{\ell-1}, y_\ell = v\}$  and  $Z = \{z_1, \dots, z_{m-1}, z_m = v\}$  are labeled according to Prop. 3.8 and thus, that the edges are of the form as specified in Prop. 3.8. By definition,  $H_Y$  and  $H_Z$  are cographs. By assumption,  $x$  is adjacent to  $1, 2, 3, \dots, |V(H')|$  vertices in  $H'$  where  $|V(H')| \geq 8$ . For better readability, we denote by  $\mathcal{N}(x)$  the set of the vertices of  $H'$  adjacent to  $x$  in  $G$ . We distinguish now the following exhaustive cases: (1)  $\mathcal{N}(x) \subseteq Y$  or  $\mathcal{N}(x) \subseteq Z$ , (2)  $\mathcal{N}(x) \not\subseteq Y$ ,  $\mathcal{N}(x) \not\subseteq Z$  and  $v \in \mathcal{N}(x)$  and (3)  $\mathcal{N}(x) \not\subseteq Y$ ,  $\mathcal{N}(x) \not\subseteq Z$  and  $v \notin \mathcal{N}(x)$ .

In what follows, we will make frequent use of Prop 3.8(a) and the additional argument that there are no edges between vertices in  $Y - \{v\}$  and  $Z - \{v\}$  in  $H'$  since  $H'$  is a slim pseudo-cograph without explicit reference.

*Case (1):  $\mathcal{N}(x) \subseteq Y$  or  $\mathcal{N}(x) \subseteq Z$ .*

Without loss of generality, we can assume that  $\mathcal{N}(x) \subseteq Y = \{y_1, \dots, y_\ell = v\}$  and thus,  $\mathcal{N}(x) \cap Z \in \{\emptyset, \{v\}\}$ . Note that  $H_Y + x$  cannot be a cograph. To see this, assume for contradiction that  $H_Y + x$  is a cograph. In this case, the fact that  $H'$  is a slim pseudo-cograph and that  $x$  is only adjacent to vertices in  $Y$  implies that  $H$  is a  $(v, H'_Y + x, H_Z)$ -pseudo-cograph; a contradiction. Hence,  $H_Y + x$  contains an induced  $P_4$ . Since  $H_Y$  is a cograph, this induced  $P_4$  must contain  $x$  and is, therefore, either of the form  $x - y_i - y_j - y_k$  or  $y_i - x - y_j - y_k$ .

- (i) Suppose first that  $H$  contains a  $P_4$  of the form  $x - y_i - y_j - y_k$ . In this case,  $j$  must be odd, since otherwise, both  $i$  and  $k$  must be odd in which case  $y_i$  and  $y_k$  are adjacent in  $H'$ , either because  $i < k$  or  $k < i$ . Since  $j$  is odd and  $y_j$  is adjacent to  $y_i$  and  $y_k$  it follows that  $j < i, k$ . We consider now the subcases to distinguish if  $v$  is contained in  $\mathcal{N}(x)$  or not.
  - (a) If  $v \in \mathcal{N}(x)$  and  $k$  is odd, then,  $i$  must be even and  $j < i < k$  holds. This and  $k \leq \ell$  implies that  $v = y_\ell \neq y_i, y_j$ . Moreover, since  $v \in \mathcal{N}(x)$  but  $x$  and  $y_k$  are not adjacent, we obtain  $v \neq y_k$ . In this case,  $\{x, v, y_i, y_j, y_k, z_1\}$  induces an  $F_9 \sqsubseteq H$ .
  - (b) If  $v \in \mathcal{N}(x)$  and  $k$  is even, then  $j < k \leq \ell$  and the fact that  $j$  is odd while  $k$  is even imply that  $v, y_j, y_k$  induce a path on three vertices in  $H$ . Consequently,  $H$  contains an induced  $P_4$   $x - v - y_j - y_k$ . If  $|Z| \geq 3$ , then  $\{x, v, y_j, y_k, z_1, z_2\}$  induces an  $F_1 \sqsubseteq H$ . Suppose now that  $|Z| = 2$ . In this case,  $|V(H')| \geq 8$  and  $Y \cap Z = \{v\}$  implies that  $|Y| \geq 7$ . Then there must exist a vertex  $y_r \in \mathcal{N}(x) \setminus \{v\}$  for some  $r < |Y|$  as, otherwise,  $\{x, z_1\}$  would be a module of  $H$ , contradicting primitivity of  $H$ . If  $y_2 \in \mathcal{N}(x)$ , then  $\{x, v, y_2, y_j, y_k, z_1\}$  induces an  $F_1 \sqsubseteq H$  if  $j > 1$  and an  $F_7 \sqsubseteq H$  if  $j = 1$ . If  $y_1 \in \mathcal{N}(x)$  and  $y_2 \notin \mathcal{N}(x)$ , then  $y_j \neq y_1$  (since  $y_j \notin \mathcal{N}(x)$ ) and  $\{x, v, y_1, y_2, y_j, y_k\}$  induces an  $F_{21} \sqsubseteq H$ . Suppose now that  $y_1, y_2 \notin \mathcal{N}(x)$ . In this case,  $v, y_1, y_2$  induce a path on three vertices in  $H$  and thus,  $H$  contains an induced  $P_4$   $x - v - y_1 - y_2$ . If there exists a vertex  $y_r \in \mathcal{N}(x)$  for some even  $r$ , then  $\{x, v, y_1, y_2, y_r, z_1\}$  induces an  $F_7 \sqsubseteq H$ . Otherwise, if  $y_3 \in \mathcal{N}(x)$ , then  $\{x, v, y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4, z_1\}$  induces an  $F_{19} \sqsubseteq H$ . If neither of the previous two cases hold then  $r \neq 3$  is odd. In particular,  $r \neq 1$  since  $y_1 \notin \mathcal{N}(x)$ . In this case,  $\{x, v, y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4, y_r, z_1\}$  induces an  $F_{23} \sqsubseteq H$ .
  - (c) If  $v \notin \mathcal{N}(x)$  and  $i$  is odd, then  $\{y_i, y_k\} \notin E(H')$  implies that  $k < i$  and  $k$  is even. This and together with  $j < i, k$  implies  $j < k < i$ . By similar arguments as in Case (i.a),  $v \neq y_i, y_j, y_k$ . In this case,  $\{x, v, y_i, y_j, y_k, z_1\}$  induces an  $F_5 \sqsubseteq H$ .
  - (d) If  $v \notin \mathcal{N}(x)$  and  $i$  is even, then  $j < i$ . By similar arguments as in Case (i.b),  $H$  contains an induced  $P_4$   $x - y_i - y_j - v$ . If  $|Z| \geq 3$ , then  $\{x, v, y_i, y_j, z_1, z_2\}$  induces an  $F_3 \sqsubseteq H$ . Suppose now that  $|Z| = 2$  and, therefore,  $|Y| \geq 7$ . In particular,  $Z = \{z_1, z_2 = v\}$ . Suppose first that  $y_1 \in \mathcal{N}(x)$ . Since  $y_j \notin \mathcal{N}(x)$ , we have  $y_1 \neq y_j$  and  $\{x, v, y_1, y_i, y_j, z_1\}$  induces an  $F_{10} \sqsubseteq H$ . If  $y_1 \notin \mathcal{N}(x)$ , then  $H$  contains an induced  $P_4$   $x - y_i - y_1 - v$ . In that case, if there exists an even  $r$  such that  $y_r \in \mathcal{N}(x)$ , then  $\{x, v, y_1, y_i, y_r, z_1\}$  induces an  $F_1 \sqsubseteq H$ . If otherwise,  $y_r \in \mathcal{N}(x)$  for all  $r$  even, then if  $y_3 \notin \mathcal{N}(x)$ ,  $\{x, v, y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4\}$  induces an  $F_{12} \sqsubseteq H$ , and if  $y_3 \in \mathcal{N}(x)$ ,  $\{x, v, y_1, y_3, y_4, z_1\}$  induces an  $F_{10} \sqsubseteq H$ .
- (ii) Suppose now that  $H$  contains a  $P_4$  of the form  $y_i - x - y_j - y_k$ . Assume first, for contradiction, that  $i$  is odd. In this case,  $i > j, k$  must hold, since  $y_i$  is neither adjacent to  $y_j$  nor to  $y_k$ . However, since  $y_j$  and  $y_k$  are adjacent, at least one of  $i$  and  $k$  must be odd which together with  $i > j, k$  implies that  $y_i$  is adjacent to  $y_j$  or  $y_k$ ; a contradiction. Hence,  $i$  must be even.

- (a) If  $v \in \mathcal{N}(x)$  and  $k$  is even, then  $j$  must be odd and  $i < j < k$ . The latter and  $k \leq \ell$  implies that  $v = y_\ell \neq y_i, y_j$ . Moreover,  $v \in \mathcal{N}(x)$  and  $y_k \notin \mathcal{N}(x)$  implies  $v \neq y_k$ . In this case,  $\{x, v, y_i, y_j, y_k, z_1\}$  induces an  $F_5 \sqsubseteq H$ .
- (b) If  $v \in \mathcal{N}(x)$  and  $k$  is odd, then  $i < k$ . As in case (ii.a),  $v \neq y_k$ . Since  $v = y_\ell$ , there is an induced  $P_4$   $y_i - x - v - y_k$ . If  $|Z| \geq 3$ , then  $\{x, v, y_i, y_k, z_1, z_2\}$  induces an  $F_1 \sqsubseteq H$ . Suppose now that  $|Z| = 2$  in which case  $|Y| \geq 7$  must hold. To recap,  $v = y_\ell \neq y_1$ . Note that  $1 \leq i < k$  implies that  $y_1 \neq y_k$  and, since  $i$  is even,  $y_1 \neq y_i$ . If  $y_1 \notin \mathcal{N}(x)$ , then  $\{x, v, y_1, y_i, y_k, z_1\}$  induces an  $F_9 \sqsubseteq H$ . If  $y_1 \in \mathcal{N}(x)$ ,  $y_2 \notin \mathcal{N}(x)$ , then  $y_2 \neq y_i, y_k$ , since  $y_i \in \mathcal{N}(x)$  and  $k$  is odd, and  $\{x, v, y_1, y_2, y_i, y_k, z_1\}$  induces an  $F_{21} \sqsubseteq H$ . If  $y_1, y_2 \in \mathcal{N}(x)$ , then there is, in particular, an induced  $P_4$   $y_2 - x - v - y_k$  in  $H$ . In this case, if  $y_3 \in \mathcal{N}(x)$ , then  $\{x, v, y_1, y_2, y_3, y_k, z_1\}$  induces an  $F_{22} \sqsubseteq H$ , and if  $y_3 \notin \mathcal{N}(x)$ , then  $\{x, v, y_2, y_3, y_4, z_1\}$  induces an  $F_7 \sqsubseteq H$  if  $y_4 \in \mathcal{N}(x)$ , and an  $F_1 \sqsubseteq H$  if  $y_4 \notin \mathcal{N}(x)$ .
- (c) If  $v \notin \mathcal{N}(x)$  and  $j$  is even, then  $k$  must be odd and, in particular,  $i < k < j$  and  $v \neq y_i, y_j, y_k$  holds by similar arguments as in Case (i.a). In this case,  $\{x, v, y_i, y_j, y_k, z_1\}$  induces an  $F_3 \sqsubseteq H$ .
- (d) If  $v \notin \mathcal{N}(x)$  and  $j$  is odd, then  $i < j$  and, in particular,  $j \neq 1$ . In this case, there is an induced  $P_4$   $y_i - x - y_j - v$  in  $H$ . Since  $j \neq 1$ , we have  $y_j \neq y_1$ . Moreover,  $v = y_\ell \neq y_1$  holds. Therefore,  $\{x, v, y_1, y_i, y_j, z_1\}$  induces an  $F_{16} \sqsubseteq H$  in case  $y_1 \notin \mathcal{N}(x)$ , and a  $F_{10} \sqsubseteq H$  in case  $y_1 \in \mathcal{N}(x)$ .

Case (2): Case (1) does not hold and  $v \in \mathcal{N}(x)$ . In this case, we have  $\mathcal{N}(x) \cap Y \neq \emptyset$  and  $\mathcal{N}(x) \cap Z \neq \emptyset$  since  $x$  is adjacent to at least one vertex in  $Y$  or  $Z$  and since Case (1) does not hold.

- (i) Suppose first that one of  $|Z| = 2$  or  $|Y| = 2$  holds. W.l.o.g. assume that  $|Y| = 2$  in which case  $|Z| \geq 7$  must hold. Moreover, since  $Y = \{y_1, y_2 = v = z_m\}$ , we must have  $y_1 \in \mathcal{N}(x)$  as, otherwise,  $\mathcal{N}(x) \subseteq Z$  and we are in the situation of Case (1).
  - (a) Suppose that  $z_1 \in \mathcal{N}(x)$ . Note, that  $\mathcal{N}(x) \setminus \{v, x\} \neq \mathcal{N}(v) \setminus \{x, v\}$  must hold as, otherwise,  $\{x, v\}$  would be a non-trivial module of  $H$ , contradicting the primitivity of  $H$ . Since  $\mathcal{N}(v) \setminus \{x, v\} = \{y_1\} \cup \{z_i \mid 1 \leq i < \ell, i \text{ odd}\}$  and  $y_1 \in \mathcal{N}(x) \setminus \{v, x\}$  and  $v = z_m \notin \mathcal{N}(x) \setminus \{v, x\}$ , there must be a vertex  $z_i \in \mathcal{N}(x)$  for some even  $i < \ell$  or a vertex  $z_i \notin \mathcal{N}(x)$  for some odd  $i < \ell$ . In particular, such a  $z_i$  satisfies  $z_i \neq v$ . Let  $i$  be the smallest index among all indices in  $\{1, \dots, m-1\}$  that satisfy  $i$  is even and  $z_i \in \mathcal{N}(x)$ , or  $i$  is odd and  $z_i \notin \mathcal{N}(x)$ . Assume first that  $i$  is odd. In this case,  $z_1 \in \mathcal{N}(x)$  implies  $i \geq 3$ . If  $i = 3$ , then  $\{x, v, y_1, z_1, z_3, z_4\}$  induces an  $F_8 \sqsubseteq H$  in case  $z_4 \notin \mathcal{N}(x)$ , and an  $F_2 \sqsubseteq H$  in case  $z_4 \in \mathcal{N}(x)$ . If  $i > 3$  and thus,  $z_2 \notin \mathcal{N}(x)$  and  $z_3 \in \mathcal{N}(x)$ , then  $\{x, v, y_1, z_1, z_2, z_3, z_i\}$  induces an  $F_{22} \sqsubseteq H$ . Assume now that  $i$  is even. In this case,  $z_i \in \mathcal{N}(x)$ . If  $i > 2$ , then  $z_3 \in \mathcal{N}(x)$  by choice of  $i$ , and  $\{x, v, y_1, z_1, z_2, z_3, z_i\}$  induces an  $F_{22} \sqsubseteq H$ . If  $i = 2$ , then let  $j \geq 3$  be the smallest index such that  $z_j \notin \mathcal{N}(x)$ . Note that such an element  $j$  must exist, otherwise,  $\mathcal{N}(x) = V(H')$  and  $V(H')$  would be a non-trivial module of  $H$ ; contradicting primitivity of  $H$ . If  $j$  is odd, then  $\{x, v, y_1, z_1, z_2, z_j\}$  induces a  $F_6 \sqsubseteq H$ . If  $j$  is even, then  $j > 3$  holds, so  $z_3 \in \mathcal{N}(x)$  and  $\{x, v, y_1, z_1, z_2, z_3, z_j\}$  induces a  $F_{20} \sqsubseteq H$ .
  - (b) Suppose that  $z_1 \notin \mathcal{N}(x)$ . Since  $y_1, v \in \mathcal{N}(x)$  and  $v = z_m = y_2$ , there must be an index  $i \in \{1, \dots, \ell-1\}$  such that  $z_i \in \mathcal{N}(x)$  as, otherwise,  $\mathcal{N}(x) \subseteq Y$  and we are in the situation of Case (1). Let  $i$  be the smallest index in  $\{1, \dots, \ell-1\}$  for which  $z_i \in \mathcal{N}(x)$  holds. Note,  $z_i \neq v$ . If  $i$  is odd, then  $z_2 \notin \mathcal{N}(x)$ , and  $\{x, v, y_1, z_1, z_2, z_i\}$  induces an  $F_{10} \sqsubseteq H$ . If  $i$  is even and  $i > 2$ , then  $z_2 \notin \mathcal{N}(x)$ , and  $\{x, v, y_1, z_1, z_2, z_i\}$  induces an  $F_{11} \sqsubseteq H$ . Assume now that  $i = 2$ . If there exists a  $j \geq 3$  such that  $z_j \notin \mathcal{N}(x)$ , then  $z_j \neq v$  and  $\{x, v, y_1, z_1, z_2, z_j\}$  induces an  $F_{15} \sqsubseteq H$  if  $j$  is odd, and an  $F_{11} \sqsubseteq H$  if  $j$  is even. Finally, if  $z_j \in \mathcal{N}(x)$  for all  $j \geq 2$ , then  $\{x, v, y_1, z_1, z_3, z_4\}$  induces an  $F_2 \sqsubseteq H$ .
- (ii) Suppose now that  $|Y|, |Z| \geq 3$ . Put  $S = \{v, y_1, y_2, z_1, z_2\}$ . Since  $v \in \mathcal{N}(x)$ , we consider now the  $2^4 = 16$  possible cases that  $S \cap \mathcal{N}(x)$  may satisfy.
  - (a) Case  $S \cap \mathcal{N}(x) = \{v\}$ . Then  $S \cup \{x\}$  induces an  $F_1 \sqsubseteq H$ .
  - (b) Case  $S \cap \mathcal{N}(x) = \{v, y_1\}$  or  $S \cap \mathcal{N}(x) = \{v, z_1\}$ .  
W.l.o.g. assume that  $S \cap \mathcal{N}(x) = \{v, y_1\}$ . In this case, there must be an index  $i$ ,  $3 \leq i \leq |Z| - 1$  such that  $z_i \in \mathcal{N}(x)$ , since otherwise, we have  $\mathcal{N}(x) \subseteq Y$  and we are in the situation of Case (1). In this case,  $\{x, v, y_1, z_1, z_2, z_i\}$  induces an  $F_{11} \sqsubseteq H$  if  $i$  is even, and an  $F_{10} \sqsubseteq H$  if  $i$  is odd.
  - (c) Case  $S \cap \mathcal{N}(x) = \{v, y_2\}$  or  $S \cap \mathcal{N}(x) = \{v, z_2\}$ .  
W.l.o.g. assume that  $S \cap \mathcal{N}(x) = \{v, y_2\}$ . In this case, there must be an index  $i$ ,  $3 \leq i \leq |Z| - 1$  such that  $z_i \in \mathcal{N}(x)$ , since otherwise, we have  $\mathcal{N}(x) \subseteq Y$  and we are in the situation of Case (1). In this case,  $\{x, v, y_1, y_2, z_1, z_i\}$  induces an  $F_{17} \sqsubseteq H$  if  $i$  is even, and an  $F_{12} \sqsubseteq H$  if  $i$  is odd.
  - (d) Case  $S \cap \mathcal{N}(x) = \{v, y_2, z_2\}$ , then  $S \cup \{x\}$  induces an  $F_{17} \sqsubseteq H$ .
  - (e) Case  $S \cap \mathcal{N}(x) = \{v, y_1, z_2\}$  or  $S \cap \mathcal{N}(x) = \{v, y_2, z_1\}$ , then  $S \cup \{x\}$  induces an  $F_{16} \sqsubseteq H$ .
  - (f) Case  $S \cap \mathcal{N}(x) = \{v, y_1, y_2\}$  or  $S \cap \mathcal{N}(x) = \{v, z_1, z_2\}$ .  
W.l.o.g. assume that  $S \cap \mathcal{N}(x) = \{v, y_1, y_2\}$ . In this case, there must be an index  $i$ ,  $3 \leq i \leq |Z| - 1$  such that  $z_i \in \mathcal{N}(x)$ , since otherwise, we have  $\mathcal{N}(x) \subseteq Y$  and we are in the situation of case (1). In this case,  $\{x, v, y_1, z_1, z_2, z_i\}$  induces an  $F_{11} \sqsubseteq H$  if  $i$  is even, and an  $F_{10} \sqsubseteq H$  if  $i$  is odd.

(g) Case  $S \cap \mathcal{N}(x) = \{v, y_1, z_1\}$ .

Since  $\{x, v\}$  cannot form a module in  $H$ , we can reuse the arguments as in Case (2.i.a) and conclude that there must be a vertex  $z_i \in \mathcal{N}(x)$  for some even  $i < m$  or a vertex  $y_i \in \mathcal{N}(x)$  for some even  $i < \ell$  or a vertex  $z_i \notin \mathcal{N}(x)$  for some odd  $i < m$  or  $y_i \notin \mathcal{N}(x)$  for some odd  $i < \ell$ . If  $y_i \in \mathcal{N}(x)$  and  $i < \ell$  is even or if  $y_i \notin \mathcal{N}(x)$  and  $i < \ell$  is odd, then  $\{x, v, y_1, y_i, z_1, z_2\}$  induces an  $F_{10} \sqsubseteq H$ . By similar arguments, one finds an  $F_{10} \sqsubseteq H$  in case  $z_i \in \mathcal{N}(x)$  and  $i < m$  even or  $z_i \notin \mathcal{N}(x)$  and  $i < m$  odd.

(h) Case  $S \cap \mathcal{N}(x) = \{v, y_1, y_2, z_2\}$  or  $S \cap \mathcal{N}(x) = \{y_2, z_1, z_2\}$ . Then,  $S \cup \{x\}$  induces an  $F_{12} \sqsubseteq H$ .

(i) Case  $S \cap \mathcal{N}(x) = \{v, y_1, y_2, z_1\}$  or  $S \cap \mathcal{N}(x) = \{v, y_1, z_1, z_2\}$ . Then,  $S \cup \{x\}$  induces an  $F_{10} \sqsubseteq H$ .

(j) Case  $S \cap \mathcal{N}(x) = S$ .

If  $\mathcal{N}(x) = V(H) \setminus \{x\} = V(H')$ , then  $\mathcal{N}(x)$  would form a non-trivial module in  $H$ , which is not possible since  $H$  is primitive. Hence, there must be at least one vertex  $w \in V(H')$  such that  $w \notin \mathcal{N}(x)$ . Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $w = y_i$  for some  $3 \leq i \leq |Y| - 1$ . Then,  $\{x, v, y_1, y_i, z_1, z_2\}$  induces an  $F_{10} \sqsubseteq H$  if  $i$  is even, and an  $F_8 \sqsubseteq H$  if  $i$  is odd.

Case (3): Case (1) does not hold and  $v \notin \mathcal{N}(x)$ .

(i) Suppose first that one of  $|Z| = 2$  or  $|Y| = 2$  holds. W.l.o.g. assume that  $|Y| = 2$ . In this case,  $|Z| \geq 7$  must hold. As argued in Case (2.i), we have  $y_1 \in \mathcal{N}(x)$ . Note that  $v = y_2 = z_m$ .

(a) If  $z_1 \in \mathcal{N}(x)$ , we have to distinguish between three cases. Suppose first that  $z_3 \notin \mathcal{N}(x)$ . In this case,  $\{x, v, y_1, z_1, z_2, z_3\}$  induces an  $F_{15} \sqsubseteq H$  if  $z_2 \in \mathcal{N}(x)$ , and a  $F_9 \sqsubseteq H$  if  $z_2 \notin \mathcal{N}(x)$ . Thus, assume that  $z_3 \in \mathcal{N}(x)$ . If  $z_2 \in \mathcal{N}(x)$ , then  $\{x, v, y_1, z_2, z_3, z_4\}$  induces an  $F_9 \sqsubseteq H$  if  $z_4 \in \mathcal{N}(x)$ , and a  $F_7 \sqsubseteq H$  if  $z_4 \notin \mathcal{N}(x)$ . Suppose that  $z_2 \notin \mathcal{N}(x)$ . Since  $\{x, v\}$  cannot form a module in  $H'$  and, in addition,  $v = z_m \notin \mathcal{N}(x)$  and  $y_1, z_1, z_3 \in \mathcal{N}(x) \cap \mathcal{N}(v)$ , there must be a vertex  $z_i$  with  $i \in \{4, 5, \dots, m-1\}$  such that  $z_i \notin \mathcal{N}(v)$  but  $z_i \in \mathcal{N}(x)$  or  $z_i \in \mathcal{N}(v)$  but  $z_i \notin \mathcal{N}(x)$ . In either case,  $\{x, v, y_1, z_1, z_2, z_i\}$  induces an  $F_9 \sqsubseteq H$ .

(b) If  $z_1 \notin \mathcal{N}(x)$ , then there exists a vertex  $z_i \in \mathcal{N}(x)$  for some  $i \in \{2, \dots, m-1\}$ , otherwise we are again in situation of Case (1). If there exists such an even index  $i$  with  $z_i \in \mathcal{N}(x)$ , then  $\{x, v, y_1, z_1, z_i\}$  induces an  $F_0 \sqsubseteq H$ . If otherwise,  $z_j \notin \mathcal{N}(x)$  for all  $j$  even, then  $z_2 \notin \mathcal{N}(x)$  and there is an odd index  $i$  with  $z_i \in \mathcal{N}(x)$  and  $z_i \neq v$ . In this case,  $\{x, v, y_1, z_1, z_2, z_i\}$  induces an  $F_{16} \sqsubseteq H$ .

(ii) Suppose now that  $|Y|, |Z| \geq 3$ .

(a) Suppose that  $y_1, z_1 \in \mathcal{N}(x)$ . In this case,  $\{x, v, y_1, y_2, z_1, z_2\}$  induces an  $F_{15} \sqsubseteq H$  if  $y_2, z_2 \in \mathcal{N}(x)$ , and an  $F_{11} \sqsubseteq H$  if exactly one of  $y_2, z_2$  is in  $\mathcal{N}(x)$ . Assume now that  $y_2, z_2 \notin \mathcal{N}(x)$ . Similar as in Case (2.i.a) we can conclude that there must be a vertex  $z_i \in \mathcal{N}(x)$  for some even  $i < m$  or a vertex  $y_i \in \mathcal{N}(x)$  for some even  $i < \ell$  or a vertex  $z_i \notin \mathcal{N}(x)$  for some odd  $i < m$  or  $y_i \notin \mathcal{N}(x)$  for some odd  $i < \ell$ . If there is an odd index  $i$  and  $y_i \notin \mathcal{N}(x)$ , or an even index  $i$  and  $y_i \in \mathcal{N}(x)$ , then  $\{x, v, y_1, y_i, z_1, z_2\}$  induces an  $F_{11} \sqsubseteq H$ . By similar reasoning, there is an induced  $F_{11}$  in the case for such an index  $i$  and vertex  $z_i$ .

(b) Suppose that exactly one of  $y_1, z_1$  is in  $\mathcal{N}(x)$ . W.l.o.g. assume that  $y_1 \in \mathcal{N}(x)$  and, thus,  $z_1 \notin \mathcal{N}(x)$ . Then, there exists an index  $i$  with  $2 \leq i \leq |Z| - 1$  such that  $z_i \in \mathcal{N}(x)$ , otherwise we are in the situation of Case (1). If there exists such an even index  $i$ , then  $\{x, v, y_1, z_1, z_i\}$  induces an  $F_0 \sqsubseteq H$ . If otherwise,  $z_j \notin \mathcal{N}(x)$  for all  $j$  even, then  $z_2 \notin \mathcal{N}(x)$  and there is an odd index  $i \neq 1, |Z|$  with  $z_i \in \mathcal{N}(x)$ . In this case,  $\{x, v, y_1, z_1, z_2, z_i\}$  induces an  $F_{16} \sqsubseteq H$ .

(c) Suppose that  $y_1, z_1 \notin \mathcal{N}(x)$ . Then there must exist  $2 \leq i \leq |Y| - 1$  such that  $y_i \in \mathcal{N}(x)$ , otherwise we are in the situation of case (1). If there exists such an even index  $i$ , then  $\{x, v, y_1, y_i, z_1, z_2\}$  induces an  $F_3 \sqsubseteq H$  if  $z_2 \notin \mathcal{N}(x)$ , and an  $F_{13} \sqsubseteq H$  if  $z_2 \in \mathcal{N}(x)$ . If otherwise,  $y_j \notin \mathcal{N}(x)$  for all  $j$  even, then there exists an odd index  $i \neq 1$  such that  $y_i \in \mathcal{N}(x)$ , and  $\{x, v, y_1, y_2, y_i, z_1\}$  induces an  $F_5 \sqsubseteq H$ .

□

## References

- [1] Sebastian Böcker and Andreas W. M. Dress. Recovering symbolically dated, rooted trees from symbolic ultrametrics. *Adv. Math.*, 138:105–125, 1998.
- [2] Andreas Brandstädt, Van Bang Le, and Jeremy P Spinrad. *Graph Classes: A Survey*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, PA, USA, 1999.
- [3] G. Cardona, F. Rosselló, and G. Valiente. Comparison of tree-child phylogenetic networks. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Computational Biology and Bioinformatics*, 6:552–569, 2007.
- [4] V Chvátal. On the p4-structure of perfect graphs iii. partner decompositions. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 43(3):349–353, 1987.

- [5] Václav Chvátal and Peter L. Hammer. Aggregation of inequalities in integer programming. In P.L. Hammer, E.L. Johnson, B.H. Korte, and G.L. Nemhauser, editors, *Studies in Integer Programming*, volume 1 of *Annals of Discrete Mathematics*, pages 145–162. Elsevier, 1977.
- [6] D. G. Corneil, H. Lerchs, and L K Stewart Burlingham. Complement reducible graphs. *Discr. Appl. Math.*, 3:163–174, 1981.
- [7] Elias Dahlhaus, Jens Gustedt, and Ross M McConnell. Efficient and practical algorithms for sequential modular decomposition. *Journal of Algorithms*, 41(2):360 – 387, 2001.
- [8] Gabriele Di Stefano. Distance-hereditary comparability graphs. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 160(18):2669–2680, 2012. V Latin American Algorithms, Graphs, and Optimization Symposium — Gramado, Brazil, 2009.
- [9] Martin Charles Golumbic (Eds.). *Algorithmic Graph Theory and Perfect Graphs*. Annals of Discrete Mathematics 57. North Holland, 2 edition, 2004.
- [10] A Ehrenfeucht and G Rozenberg. Theory of 2-structures, part I: Clans, basic subclasses, and morphisms. *Theor. Comp. Sci.*, 70:277–303, 1990.
- [11] A Ehrenfeucht and G Rozenberg. Theory of 2-structures, part II: Representation through labeled tree families. *Theor. Comp. Sci.*, 70:305–342, 1990.
- [12] Andrzej Ehrenfeucht, Harold N. Gabow, Ross M. Mcconnell, and Stephen J. Sullivan. An  $O(n^2)$  Divide-and-Conquer Algorithm for the Prime Tree Decomposition of Two-Structures and Modular Decomposition of Graphs. *Journal of Algorithms*, 16(2):283–294, 1994.
- [13] Tibor Gallai. Transitiv orientierbare graphen. *Acta Mathematica Hungarica*, 18(1-2):25–66, 1967.
- [14] P. Gambette, V. Berry, and C. Paul. Quartets and unrooted phylogenetic networks. *Journal of Bioinformatics and Computational Biology*, 10(4):1250004.1–1250004.23, 2012.
- [15] Philippe Gambette, KT Huber, and Steven Kelk. On the challenge of reconstructing level-1 phylogenetic networks from triplets and clusters. *Journal of mathematical biology*, 74(7):1729–1751, 2017.
- [16] Yong Gao, Donovan R. Hare, and James Nastos. The cluster deletion problem for cographs. *Discrete Mathematics*, 313(23):2763–2771, 2013.
- [17] Manuela Geiß, John Anders, Peter F. Stadler, Nicolas Wieseke, and Marc Hellmuth. Reconstructing gene trees from Fitch’s xenology relation. *J. Math. Biol.*, 77:1459–1491, 2018.
- [18] Manuela Geiß, Marcos E González Laffitte, Alitzel López Sánchez, Dulce I Valdivia, Marc Hellmuth, Mari-bel Hernández Rosales, and Peter F Stadler. Best match graphs and reconciliation of gene trees with species trees. *Journal of mathematical biology*, 80(5):1459–1495, 2020.
- [19] Vassilis Giakoumakis and Jean-Marie Vanherpe. On extended p4-reducible and extended p4-sparse graphs. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 180(1):269–286, 1997.
- [20] P. C. Gilmore and A. J. Hoffman. A characterization of comparability graphs and of interval graphs. *Canadian Journal of Mathematics*, 16:539–548, 1964.
- [21] Martin Grötschel, László Lovász, and Alexander Schrijver. *Geometric algorithms and combinatorial optimization*, volume 2. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [22] Dan Gusfield, Satish Eddhu, and Charles Langley. Efficient reconstruction of phylogenetic networks with constrained recombination. In *CSB ’03: Proceedings of the IEEE Computer Society Conference on Bioinformatics*, pages 363–374, Washington DC, US, 2003. IEEE Computer Society.
- [23] M. Habib and C. Paul. A survey of the algorithmic aspects of modular decomposition. *Computer Science Review*, 4(1):41 – 59, 2010.
- [24] Michel Habib, Lalla Mouatadid, Éric Sopena, and Mengchuan Zou.  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -modules in graphs. *CoRR*, abs/2101.08881, 2021.
- [25] Michel Habib, Lalla Mouatadid, and Mengchuan Zou. Approximating modular decomposition is hard. In *Algorithms and Discrete Applied Mathematics*, pages 53–66, Cham, 2020. Springer International Publishing.
- [26] Peter L. Hammer and Frédéric Maffray. Completely separable graphs. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 27(1):85–99, 1990.



- [27] Ryan B Hayward. Weakly triangulated graphs. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 39(3):200–208, 1985.
- [28] Ryan B Hayward. Murky graphs. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 49(2):200–235, 1990.
- [29] M. Hellmuth, M. Hernandez-Rosales, K. T. Huber, V. Moulton, P. F. Stadler, and N. Wieseke. Orthology relations, symbolic ultrametrics, and cographs. *J. Math. Biology*, 66(1-2):399–420, 2013.
- [30] M. Hellmuth and N. Wieseke. *From Sequence Data Including Orthologs, Paralogs, and Xenologs to Gene and Species Trees*, chapter 21, pages 373–392. Springer, Cham, 2016.
- [31] Marc Hellmuth. <https://github.com/marc-hellmuth/ForbiddenSubgraphs-GaTeX> (accessed Nov 3, 2022).
- [32] Marc Hellmuth. Biologically feasible gene trees, reconciliation maps and informative triples. *Alg Mol Biol*, 12:23, 2017.
- [33] Marc Hellmuth, David Schaller, and Peter F. Stadler. Clustering systems of phylogenetic networks. *Theory in Biosciences*, 2022. (to appear) arXiv:2204.13466v1 [q-bio.PE].
- [34] Marc Hellmuth and Guillaume E. Scholz. From modular decomposition trees to level-1 networks: Pseudocographs, polar-cats and prime polar-cats. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 321:179–219, 2022.
- [35] Marc Hellmuth, Peter F. Stadler, and Nicolas Wieseke. The mathematics of xenology: Di-cographs, symbolic ultrametrics, 2-structures and tree-representable systems of binary relations. *Journal of Mathematical Biology*, 75(1):199–237, 2017.
- [36] Marc Hellmuth, Nicolas Wieseke, Marcus Lechner, Hans-Peter Lenhof, Martin Middendorf, and Peter F. Stadler. Phylogenomics with paralogs. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 112(7):2058–2063, 2015.
- [37] CT Hoàng. Perfect graphs (ph. d. thesis), 1985.
- [38] C. T. Hoàng and N. Khouzam. On brittle graphs. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 12(3):391–404, 1988.
- [39] C.T. Hoàng. On a conjecture of meyniel. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 42(3):302–312, 1987.
- [40] K. T. Huber and G. E. Scholz. Beyond representing orthology relations with trees. *Algorithmica*, 80(1):73–103, 2018.
- [41] Daniel H. Huson, Regula Rupp, and Celine Scornavacca. *Phylogenetic Networks: Concepts, Algorithms and Applications*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2010.
- [42] B. Jamison and S. Olariu. P4-reducible graphs, a class of uniquely tree-representable graphs. *Studies in Applied Mathematics*, 81(1):79–87, 1989.
- [43] B. Jamison and S. Olariu. On a unique tree representation for p4-extendible graphs. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 34(1):151–164, 1991.
- [44] B. Jamison and S. Olariu. A tree representation for p4-sparse graphs. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 35(2):115–129, 1992.
- [45] Beverly Jamison and Stephan Olariu. On the homogeneous decomposition of graphs. In Ernst W. Mayr, editor, *Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science*, pages 170–183, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1993. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [46] Beverly Jamison and Stephan Olariu. P-components and the homogeneous decomposition of graphs. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 8(3):448–463, 1995.
- [47] Dieter Kratsch, Jeremy P. Spinrad, and R. Sritharan. A new characterization of hh-free graphs. *Discrete Mathematics*, 308(20):4833–4835, 2008.
- [48] Manuel Lafond, Riccardo Dondi, and Nadia El-Mabrouk. The link between orthology relations and gene trees: a correction perspective. *Algorithms for Molecular Biology*, 11(1):1, 2016.
- [49] Manuel Lafond and Nadia El-Mabrouk. Orthology and paralogy constraints: satisfiability and consistency. *BMC Genomics*, 15(6):S12, 2014.
- [50] C. Lekkekerker and J. Boland. Representation of a finite graph by a set of intervals on the real line. *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, 51(1):45–64, 1962.

- [51] Min Chih Lin and Jayme L. Szwarcfiter. Characterizations and recognition of circular-arc graphs and subclasses: A survey. *Discrete Mathematics*, 309(18):5618–5635, 2009.
- [52] Yunlong Liu, Jianxin Wang, Jiong Guo, and Jianer Chen. Complexity and parameterized algorithms for cograph editing. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 461:45–54, 2012. 17th International Computing and Combinatorics Conference (COCOON 2011).
- [53] F. Maffray. *On the coloration of perfect graphs*, pages 65–84. Springer New York, New York, NY, 2003.
- [54] Ross M. McConnell and Jeremy P. Spinrad. Linear-time modular decomposition and efficient transitive orientation of comparability graphs. In *Proceedings of the Fifth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, SODA '94, page 536–545, USA, 1994. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics.
- [55] Ross M McConnell and Jeremy P Spinrad. Linear-time transitive orientation. In *Proceedings of the eighth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms*, pages 19–25, 1997.
- [56] Ross M. McConnell and Jeremy P. Spinrad. Modular decomposition and transitive orientation. *Discrete Mathematics*, 201(1-3):189 – 241, 1999.
- [57] B McKay. Graphs. <https://users.cecs.anu.edu.au/~bdm/data/graphs.html> (accessed Nov 3, 2022).
- [58] H. Meyniel. The graphs whose odd cycles have at least two chords. In C. Berge and V. Chvátal, editors, *Topics on Perfect Graphs*, volume 88 of *North-Holland Mathematics Studies*, pages 115–119. North-Holland, 1984.
- [59] A. Pnueli, A. Lempel, and S. Even. Transitive orientation of graphs and identification of permutation graphs. *Canadian Journal of Mathematics*, 23(1):160–175, 1971.
- [60] David Schaller, Marc Hellmuth, and Peter F. Stadler. A simpler linear-time algorithm for the common refinement of rooted phylogenetic trees on a common leaf set. *Alg. Mol. Biol.*, 16(1):23, 2021.
- [61] James H. Schmerl and William T. Trotter. Critically indecomposable partially ordered sets, graphs, tournaments and other binary relational structures. *Discrete Mathematics*, 113(1):191–205, 1993.
- [62] D Seinsche. On a property of the class of n-colorable graphs. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 16(2):191–193, 1974.
- [63] Jeremy Spinrad. On comparability and permutation graphs. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 14(3):658–670, 1985.
- [64] David P. Sumner. Dacey graphs. *Journal of the Australian Mathematical Society*, 18(4):492–502, 1974.
- [65] Marc Tedder, Derek Corneil, Michel Habib, and Christophe Paul. Simpler linear-time modular decomposition via recursive factorizing permutations. In *Automata, Languages and Programming*, volume 5125 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 634–645. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2008.