

# Note on the $\chi$ -boundedness of graphs of bounded sim-width

Marcin Briański<sup>1</sup>, Ugo Giocanti<sup>1</sup>, Clément Legrand-Duchesne<sup>1</sup>,  
Piotr Micek<sup>1</sup>, Sang-il Oum<sup>2</sup>, and Bartosz Walczak<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Theoretical Computer Science Department, Jagiellonian  
University, Kraków, Poland

<sup>1</sup>Discrete Mathematics Group, Institute for Basic Science (IBS),  
Daejeon, South Korea

Email: marcin.brianski@gmail.com, ugo.giocanti@orange.fr,  
clement.legrand-duchesne@uj.edu.pl,  
piotr.micek@gmail.com, sangil@ibs.re.kr,  
bartosz.m.walczak@gmail.com

January 2025

## Abstract

We prove that the class of graphs of bounded sim-width is  $\chi$ -bounded.  
This answers an open problem proposed by Abrishami, Briański, Czyżewska,  
McCarty, Milanič, Rzażewski, and Walczak.

## 1 Introduction

All graphs in this paper are finite and simple. A class of graphs is *hereditary* if the class contains every induced subgraph of a graph in the class. A hereditary class  $\mathcal{C}$  of graphs is  $\chi$ -*bounded* if there is a function  $f$  such that  $\chi(G) \leq f(\omega(G))$  for every graph  $G$  in  $\mathcal{C}$ . Such a function  $f$  is called the  $\chi$ -*bounding function* of  $\mathcal{C}$ . If  $\mathcal{C}$  admits a polynomial  $\chi$ -bounding function, then  $\mathcal{C}$  is *polynomially  $\chi$ -bounded*.

The *sim-width* of a graph is a width parameter introduced by Kang, Kwon, Strømme, and Telle [10]. They showed that chordal graphs and co-comparability graphs have sim-width at most 1. It is known that every class of graphs of bounded tree-width, clique-width [5], mim-width [13], o-mim-width [2], tree-independence number [6], or induced matching tree-width [1] has bounded sim-width, see [1]. For many of these parameters, it was known that the class of graphs whose parameter is bounded is  $\chi$ -bounded. Here we summarize known  $\chi$ -boundedness results for those parameters, which result bounded sim-width.

- A class of graphs of tree-width at most  $k$  is  $\chi$ -bounded trivially, because their chromatic number is at most  $k + 1$ .

- A class of graphs of clique-width at most  $k$  is  $\chi$ -bounded, shown by Dvořák, Král' [8]. Later, Bonamy and Pilipczuk [3] showed that it is polynomially  $\chi$ -bounded.
- A class of graphs of tree-independence number at most  $k$  is  $\chi$ -bounded, because the tree-width of such a graph is bounded by a function of its clique number [7].
- A class of graphs of induced matching tree-width at most  $k$  is  $\chi$ -bounded, shown by Abrishami, Brianiński, Czyżewska, McCarty, Milanič, Rzażewski, and Walczak [1].

However, it was not known whether mim-width, o-mim-width, or sim-width have such a property.

What we prove is that all of these parameters have the property that having the bounded value implies  $\chi$ -boundedness. Here is our main theorem, answering the question of Abrishami, Brianiński, Czyżewska, McCarty, Milanič, Rzażewski, and Walczak [1] on sim-width.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Every class of graphs of bounded sim-width is  $\chi$ -bounded.*

Let us recall some definitions. A tree is *subcubic* if every node has degree at most 3. For a finite set  $V$ , let  $f : 2^V \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  be a symmetric function, that is  $f(A) = f(V \setminus A)$  for every subset  $A$  of  $V$ . A *branch-decomposition* of  $f$  is a pair  $(T, L)$  of a subcubic tree  $T$  and a bijection  $L$  from  $V$  to the set of all leaves of  $T$ . For a branch-decomposition  $(T, L)$  of  $f$ , every edge  $e$  of  $T$  defines a partition  $(A_e, B_e)$  of  $V$  induced by  $L^{-1}(C)$  for components  $C$  of  $T \setminus e$ . We define the  *$f$ -width* of  $e \in E(T)$  as  $f(A_e)$ . The  *$f$ -width* of a branch-decomposition  $(T, L)$  of  $f$  is the maximum  $f$ -width of edges of  $T$ . Then the  *$f$ -width* is defined as the minimum  $f$ -width of a branch-decomposition of  $f$ .

Now let us define the sim-width of a graph  $G$ . For a subset  $A$  of  $V(G)$ , let  $\text{sim}_G(A)$  be the maximum size of an induced matching  $M$  of  $G$  where every edge of  $M$  has exactly one end in  $A$ . The *sim-width* of a graph  $G$  is the  $\text{sim}_G$ -width.

## 2 Proof

For an integer  $n$ , we write  $[n]$  to denote the set of positive integers at most  $n$ .

Let  $M_n$  be the graph on  $[2n]$  with  $n$  edges, joining vertices of difference  $n$  in  $[2n]$ .

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $d$  be a positive integer. For every interval  $I$  with  $2d + 2 \leq |I \cap [6d + 6]| \leq 4d + 4$ ,  $M_{3d+3}$  has at least  $d + 1$  edges between  $I$  and  $[6d + 6] \setminus I$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $X = I \cap [6d + 6]$  and  $Y = [6d + 6] \setminus I$ . For  $i = 1, 2, \dots, 6$ , let  $B_i = \{(i - 1)d + j : j \in [d]\}$ .

If  $X \subseteq B_1 \cup B_2 \cup B_3$  or  $X \subseteq B_4 \cup B_5 \cup B_6$ , then we are done trivially because  $|X| \geq 2d + 2$ . Thus we may assume that  $X \cap (B_1 \cup B_2 \cup B_3) \neq \emptyset$  and  $X \cap (B_4 \cup B_5 \cup B_6) \neq \emptyset$ . By symmetry, we may assume that  $0 < |X \cap (B_1 \cup B_2 \cup B_3)| \leq |X \cap (B_4 \cup B_5 \cup B_6)|$ . Since  $|X| \leq 4d + 4$ , we have  $B_1 \cap X = \emptyset$ .

If  $B_4 \subseteq X$ , then we find  $d + 1$  edges between  $B_1$  and  $B_4$ , proving the lemma. Thus, we may assume that  $B_4 \not\subseteq X$  and therefore  $B_6 \cap X = \emptyset$ .

Since  $|X| \geq 2d + 2$  and  $B_4 \not\subseteq X$ , we deduce that  $B_3 \subseteq X$ . Thus, we find  $d + 1$  edges between  $B_3$  and  $B_6$ , proving the lemma.  $\square$

The following lemma is well known. For the completeness of the paper, we include the proof.

**Lemma 2.2.** *If  $T$  is a subcubic tree and  $S$  is a nonempty set consisting of leaves of  $T$ , then there exists an edge  $e$  of  $T$  such that each component of  $T \setminus e$  has at least  $\frac{1}{3}|S|$  of the vertices in  $S$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose not. We orient each edge  $e = uv$  of  $T$  towards  $v$  if the component of  $T \setminus e$  containing  $u$  has fewer than  $1/3$  of the vertices in  $S$ . Since  $T$  has fewer edges than vertices, there is a vertex  $x$  of  $T$  such that  $x$  has no incoming edges. This implies that  $S$  is a union of three sets  $S_1, S_2, S_3$  where each  $S_i$  has fewer than  $1/3$  of the vertices in  $S$ . This is a contradiction.  $\square$

**Theorem 2.3.** *Let  $d$  be a positive integer. If a graph  $G$  has sim-width at most  $d$ , then there exists an ordering  $\pi$  of its vertices such that  $M_{3d+3}$  is not an ordered induced subgraph of  $(G, \pi)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $(T, L)$  be the branch-decomposition of  $G$  certifying that the sim-width of  $G$  is at most  $d$ . Let us choose a root of  $T$  arbitrarily and choose  $\pi$  the ordering of vertices of  $G$  according to the ordering of the leaves in the depth-first search ordering of  $T$ .

Suppose that an isomorphic copy of  $M_{3d+3}$  is an ordered induced subgraph of  $(G, \pi)$ . Let  $U$  be the set of vertices of the isomorphic copy of  $M_{3d+3}$  in  $(G, \pi)$ . Every edge  $e$  of  $T$  induces a partition  $(A_e, B_e)$  of  $V(G)$  such that  $T \setminus e$  splits its leaves into two sets, which induces a partition  $(A_e, B_e)$  of  $G$  by  $L$ . Since  $T$  is rooted, at least one of  $A_e$  or  $B_e$  is an interval of  $V(G)$  in  $\pi$ . By Lemma 2.2, there is an edge  $e$  of  $T$  such that both  $A_e$  and  $B_e$  contain at least  $\frac{1}{3}|U|$  vertices of  $U$ . By Lemma 2.1, there is a set  $M$  of at least  $d + 1$  edges between  $A_e$  and  $B_e$ . By the definition of  $M_{3d+3}$ , this  $M$  is an induced matching of  $G$  and therefore we found an induced matching of size  $d + 1$  for  $(A_e, B_e)$ , contradicting the assumption that  $(T, L)$  is a branch-decomposition of  $G$  certifying that the sim-width of  $G$  is at most  $d$ .  $\square$

Now we can deduce Theorem 1.1.

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.* Briński, Davies, and Wolczak [4] proved that the class of ordered graphs forbidding a fixed matching as an ordered induced subgraph is  $\chi$ -bounded. By Theorem 2.3, every graph of bounded sim-width admits an ordering of its vertices such that it does not contain a fixed matching as an ordered induced subgraph. This completes the proof.  $\square$

### 3 Discussions

Mim-width was introduced earlier by Vatschelle [13]. For a subset  $A$  of  $V(G)$ , let  $\text{mim}_G(A)$  be the maximum size of an induced matching  $M$  of a subgraph  $G'$  of  $G$  where the edges of  $G'$  are precisely all edges of  $G$  having exactly one end in  $A$ . And the *mim-width* of a graph  $G$ , denoted by  $\text{mimw}(G)$ , is  $\text{mim}_G$ -width.

Rank-width was introduced by Oum and Seymour [12]. The *cut-rank function* of a graph  $G$  is a function  $\rho_G$  on  $2^{V(G)}$  such that  $\rho_G(A)$  is the rank of an  $A \times (V(G) \setminus A)$  0-1 matrix over the binary field whose entry is 1 if and only if the vertices corresponding to its row and its column are adjacent in  $G$ . Then the

*rank-width* of a graph  $G$ , denoted by  $\text{rwd}(G)$ , is  $\rho_G$ -width. From the definition, it is clear that  $\text{sim}_G(A) \leq \text{mim}_G(A) \leq \rho_G(A)$  and therefore the

$$\text{simw}(G) \leq \text{mimw}(G) \leq \text{rwd}(G).$$

Thus, [Theorem 1.1](#) implies that every class of graphs of bounded min-width or bounded rank-width is  $\chi$ -bounded.

A graph  $G$  is perfect if  $\chi(H) = \omega(G)$  for every induced subgraph  $H$  of  $G$ . A classical theorem of Lovász [11] states that if a graph is perfect, then so is its complement. Note that a class of perfect graphs admits the identity function as its  $\chi$ -bounding function. So one may ask whether a class of the complements of graphs in a  $\chi$ -bounded class is also  $\chi$ -bounded. For rank-width, a class of the complement of graphs of bounded rank-width is also  $\chi$ -bounded, because  $\text{rwd}(\overline{G}) \leq \text{rwd}(G) + 1$ , which can be easily observed from the definition. Every graph of mim-width 1 is perfect [13, Corollary 3.7.4] and therefore the class of complements of graphs of mim-width at most 1 is perfect, thus  $\chi$ -bounded. However, it is not the case for mim-width and sim-width.

**Proposition 3.1.**

- (a) *The class of the complements of graphs of sim-width at most 1 is not  $\chi$ -bounded.*
- (b) *The class of the complements of graphs of mim-width at most 2 is not  $\chi$ -bounded.*

*Proof.* The *girth* of a graph is the minimum length of a cycle. Erdős [9] showed that for every pair of integers  $k$  and  $g$ , there is a graph  $G$  such that  $\chi(G) \geq k$  and the girth of  $G$  is at least  $g$ .

Now, observe that if a graph  $G$  has no cycle of length 4, then  $\overline{G}$  has no induced matching of size 2 and so  $\overline{G}$  has sim-width at most 1. This proves (a).

For (b), note that if  $G$  has no cycle of length 6, then  $\text{mim}_{\overline{G}}(A) \leq 2$  for every  $A \subseteq V(G)$ , because the complement of the semi-induced matching of size 3 contains a cycle of length 6. Therefore if  $G$  has girth at least 7, then the mim-width of  $\overline{G}$  is at most 2. This proves (b).  $\square$

Here is a natural follow-up question for [Theorem 1.1](#).

**Question 3.2.** *Is every class of graphs of bounded sim-width polynomially  $\chi$ -bounded?*

If true, it would imply that every class of graphs of bounded induced matching tree-width or of bounded tree independence number is polynomially  $\chi$ -bounded, which are still open problems.

## References

- [1] Tara Abrishami, Marcin Briański, Jadwiga Czyżewska, Rose McCarty, Martin Milanič, Paweł Rzażewski, and Bartosz Walczak. Excluding a clique or a biclique in graphs of bounded induced matching treewidth. arXiv:2405.04617, 05 2024.

- [2] Benjamin Bergougnoux, Tuukka Korhonen, and Igor Razgon. New width parameters for independent set: One-sided-mim-width and neighbor-depth. 02 2023.
- [3] Marthe Bonamy and Michał Pilipczuk. Graphs of bounded cliquewidth are polynomially  $\chi$ -bounded. *Adv. Comb.*, pages Paper No. 8, 21, 2020.
- [4] Marcin Briański, James Davies, and Bartosz Walczak. In preparation.
- [5] Bruno Courcelle and Stephan Olariu. Upper bounds to the clique width of graphs. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 101(1-3):77–114, 2000.
- [6] Clément Dallard, Martin Milanič, and Kenny Štorgel. Treewidth versus clique number. II. Tree-independence number. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 164:404–442, 2024.
- [7] Clément Dallard, Martin Milanič, and Kenny Štorgel. Treewidth versus clique number. III. Tree-independence number of graphs with a forbidden structure. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 167:338–391, 2024.
- [8] Zdeněk Dvořák and Daniel Král'. Classes of graphs with small rank decompositions are  $\chi$ -bounded. *European J. Combin.*, 33(4):679–683, 2012.
- [9] Paul Erdős. Graph theory and probability. *Canad. J. Math.*, 11:34–38, 1959.
- [10] Dong Yeap Kang, O-joung Kwon, Torstein J. F. Strømme, and Jan Arne Telle. A width parameter useful for chordal and co-comparability graphs. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, 704:1–17, 2017.
- [11] László Lovász. Normal hypergraphs and the perfect graph conjecture. *Discrete Math.*, 2(3):253–267, 1972.
- [12] Sang-il Oum and Paul Seymour. Approximating clique-width and branch-width. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 96(4):514–528, 2006.
- [13] Martin Vatshelle. *New width parameters of graphs*. PhD thesis, University of Bergen, 2012.