

Polarity on H -split graphs*

F. Esteban Contreras-Mendoza^{†1} and César Hernández-Cruz^{‡1}

¹Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México,
Av. Universidad 3000, Circuito Exterior S/N, C.P. 04510, Ciudad
Universitaria, CDMX, México

Abstract

Given nonnegative integers, s and k , an (s, k) -polar partition of a graph G is a partition (A, B) of V_G such that $G[A]$ and $\overline{G[B]}$ are complete multipartite graphs with at most s and k parts, respectively. If s or k is replaced by ∞ , it means that there is no restriction on the number of parts of $G[A]$ or $\overline{G[B]}$, respectively. A graph admitting a $(1, 1)$ -polar partition is usually called a split graph.

In this work, we present some results related to (s, k) -polar partitions on two graph classes generalizing split graphs. Our main results include efficient algorithms to decide whether a graph on these classes admits an (s, k) -polar partition, as well as upper bounds for the order of minimal (s, k) -polar obstructions on such graph families for any s and k (even if s or k is ∞).

1 Introduction

All graphs in this work are finite and simple. In general we follow [1], although some notations can differ a little bit. We use $G + H$ and $G \oplus H$ to denote the disjoint union and the join of the graphs G and H , respectively. Congruently, we use nG to denote the disjoint union of n copies of a graph G . Two subsets U and W of the vertex set of a graph G are said to be *completely adjacent* if $uw \in E_G$ for every $u \in U$ and each $w \in W$, and they are *completely nonadjacent* if $uw \notin E_G$ for every $u \in U$ and each $w \in W$. For a family \mathcal{F} of graphs, we say that the graph G is \mathcal{F} -free if G does not have any graph in \mathcal{F} as an induced subgraph; if $\mathcal{F} = \{F\}$ we say that G is F -free instead of $\{F\}$ -free. A property of graphs is said to be *hereditary* if it is closed under induced subgraphs. A *minimal \mathcal{P} -obstruction* for a hereditary property \mathcal{P} of graphs is a graph that does not have the property \mathcal{P} , but such that every vertex-deleted subgraph does.

*The authors gratefully acknowledge support from grant DGAPA-PAPIIT IA101423

[†]esteban.contreras@ciencias.unam.mx

[‡]chc@ciencias.unam.mx

A (k, ℓ) -coloring of a graph G is a partition of V_G in k independent sets and ℓ cliques. A graph is said to be (k, ℓ) -colorable if its vertex set admits a (k, ℓ) -coloring. A $(k, 0)$ -coloring of G is called a (proper) k -coloring of G , and G is said to be k -colorable if it admits a k -coloring. The minimum integer k such that G admits a k -coloring is the *chromatic number* of G , and it is denoted by $\chi(G)$. The minimum integer ℓ for which G has a $(0, \ell)$ -coloring is denoted by $\theta(G)$, and it is called the *clique covering number* of G . A z -cocoloring of G is any (k, ℓ) -coloring of G such that $k + \ell = z$. We use $\chi^c(G)$ to denote the *cochromatic number* of G , which is the minimum integer z for which G admits a z -cocoloring. A graph G is said to be z -bicolorable if, for any integers k and ℓ such that $k + \ell = z$, G is (k, ℓ) -colorable. The *bichromatic number* of G , denoted $\chi^b(G)$, is the minimum integer z such that G is z -bicolorable. Notice that, for any graph G , $\chi^c(G) \leq \min\{\chi(G), \theta(G)\} \leq \max\{\chi(G), \theta(G)\} \leq \chi^b(G)$.

Given two nonnegative integers s and k , a partition (A, B) of the vertex set of a graph G is called an (s, k) -polar partition of G if A induces a complete s -partite graph and B induces the disjoint union of at most k complete graphs. An (s, k) -polar graph is a graph admitting an (s, k) -polar partition. If s , k , or both of them, are replaced by ∞ , it means that there is no restriction on the number of parts of $G[A]$, $\overline{G[B]}$, or both, respectively. A *polar partition* is an (∞, ∞) -polar partition. A *monopolar partition* (respectively, a *unipolar partition*) is a polar partition (A, B) such that A is an independent set (respectively, a clique). Naturally, graphs admitting polar, monopolar, or unipolar partitions are called polar, monopolar and unipolar graphs, respectively.

The problems of deciding whether an arbitrary graph is polar or monopolar are known to be NP-complete problems [5, 8]. In contrast, unipolar graphs have been shown to be recognizable in $O(n^3)$ -time [6, 7], and it was proven in [10] that (s, k) -polar graphs can be recognized in $O(|V|^{4+2\max\{s, k\}})$ -time.

It is known that, for any pair of nonnegative integers s and k , there is just a finite number of minimal (s, k) -polar obstructions [9]. In spite of this, complete list of minimal (s, k) -polar obstructions are known only for the cases $\min\{s, k\} = 0$ and $s = k = 1$. A graph is $(0, 1)$ -polar if and only if it is complete, so the only minimal $(0, 1)$ -polar obstruction is $\overline{K_2}$. For an integer k , $k \geq 2$, the $(0, k)$ -polar graphs are called a k -clusters, and they coincide with the $\{P_3, (k + 1)K_1\}$ -free graphs. The $(0, \infty)$ -polar graphs are simply called *clusters*, and they are the P_3 -free graphs. Analogous forbidden subgraph characterizations can be given for the case $k = 0$ by considering that the complement of an (s, k) -polar graph is a (k, s) -polar graph.

The $(1, 1)$ -polar graphs are usually called *split graphs*. The following marvelous characterizations of split graphs were provided by Foldes, Hammer, and Simeone.

Theorem 1 ([11, 12]). *Let G be a graph with vertex set $\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$ and degree sequence $d_1 \geq d_2 \geq \dots \geq d_n$, where d_i is the degree of vertex v_i . Set $p = \max\{i : d_i \geq i - 1\}$. The following conditions are equivalent:*

1. G is a split graph;

2. G is a $\{2K_2, C_4, C_5\}$ -free graph;

3. $\sum_{i=1}^p d_i = p(p-1) + \sum_{i=p+1}^n d_i$.

Additionally, if G is a split graph, then $(\{v_1, \dots, v_p\}, \{v_{p+1}, \dots, v_n\})$ is a split partition of G , $\omega(G) = \chi(G) = p$, and $\alpha(G) = \theta(G) = n - \min\{p, d_p\}$.

Note that, once the degree sequence of a graph G is known, computing the value of p , as well as verifying the condition in item 3, can be done in $O(|V|)$ -time, so split graphs are recognizable and a split partition can be found in linear time from their degree sequences.

Maffray and Preissmann [13] introduced the following generalization of split graphs. Given a fixed graph H , a graph G is said to be H -split if V_G admits a partition (C, S, I) such that C is a clique, I is an independent set, either $S = \emptyset$ or $G[S] \cong H$, C is completely adjacent to S , and I is completely nonadjacent to S . A partition (C, S, I) as described above is called an H -split partition of G . If $G = (C, S, I)$ is an H -split graph with $S \neq \emptyset$, we say that G is an *strict H -split graph*. Given a family of graphs \mathcal{H} , we say that G is \mathcal{H} -split if it is H -split for some $H \in \mathcal{H}$. The next theorem implies that, for a graph H whose degree sequence is uniquely realizable, the class of H -split graphs is recognizable and an H -split partition can be found in $O(|V|)$ -time from their degree sequences.

Theorem 2 ([13]). *Let $d_1^* \geq \dots \geq d_h^*$ be a realizable degree sequence and let \mathcal{H} be the class of all realizations of this sequence. Let G be a graph with degree sequence $d_1 \geq \dots \geq d_n$. If $q = \max\{i : d_i \geq i - 1 + h\} \cup \{0\}$, then G is an \mathcal{H} -split graph if and only if G is split or*

$$\sum_{i=1}^q d_i = q(q-1) + qh + \sum_{j=q+h+1}^n d_j$$

and $d_{q+i} = q + d_i^*$ for each $i \in \{1, \dots, h\}$. Additionally, if the condition on the degrees holds, then the sets $C = \{v_1, \dots, v_q\}$, $S = \{v_{q+1}, \dots, v_{q+h}\}$ and $I = \{v_{q+h+1}, \dots, v_n\}$ conform an \mathcal{H} -partition of G , the subgraph induced by S being isomorphic to some graph $H \in \mathcal{H}$. Moreover, if d^* is a uniquely realizable degree sequence, then $\omega(G) = q + \omega(H)$, $\chi(G) = q + \chi(H)$, $\alpha(G) = \alpha(H) + n - q - h$ and $\theta(G) = \theta(H) + n - q - h$.

Notice that H -split graphs conform a hereditary class of graphs if and only if either H is a split graph, in which case H -split graphs coincide with split graphs, or H is one of the three minimal split obstructions mentioned in Theorem 1, i.e., if $H \in \{2K_2, C_4, C_5\}$. The following observation will be frequently used in this work without any explicit mention.

Remark 3. *Let H be some of $2K_2, C_4$, or C_5 , and let $G = (C, S, I)$ be a strict H -split graph. Then, the only induced copy of H in G is $G[S]$ and the H -split partition of G is unique.*

The class of H -split graphs is self-complementary if and only if H is. From the above observations, it is not strange that the most studied H -split graphs

are the C_5 -split graphs which were named *pseudo-split graphs* in [13]. Naturally, a C_5 -split partition of a graph is also called a *pseudo-split partition* and, since pseudo-split graphs are strict if and only if they are perfect, strict pseudo-split graphs are called *imperfect*. Additionally to the characterization of pseudo-split graphs by their degree sequences provided by Theorem 2, Maffray and Preissmann [13] gave the complete list of minimal pseudo-split obstructions, namely $\{2K_2, C_4\}$. The following proposition summarize such characterizations to facilitate future references.

Theorem 4 ([13]). *Let G be a graph of order at least five with vertex set $\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$ and degree sequence $d_1 \geq d_2 \geq \dots \geq d_n$, where d_i is the degree of vertex v_i . Set $q = \max\{i : d_i \geq i + 4\} \cup \{0\}$. The following conditions are equivalent:*

1. G is an imperfect pseudo-split graph;
2. G is a $\{2K_2, C_4\}$ -free graph that has an induced C_5 ;
3. $\sum_{i=1}^q d_i = q(q+4) + \sum_{i=q+6}^n d_i$, and $d_j = q+2$ whenever $q+1 \leq j \leq q+5$.

Additionally, if G is an imperfect pseudo-split graph, then

$$(\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_q\}, \{v_{q+1}, v_{q+2}, v_{q+3}, v_{q+4}, v_{q+5}\}, \{v_{q+6}, v_{q+7}, \dots, v_n\})$$

is the pseudo-split partition of G , $\omega(G) = q+2$, $\chi(G) = q+3$, $\alpha(G) = n - q - 3$ and $\theta(G) = n - q - 2$.

In this work, we study (s, k) -polar partitions on pseudo-, $2K_2$ - and C_4 -split graphs. Polarity on pseudo-split graphs is treated in Section 2, where we provide finite lists of minimal obstructions for the main polar properties, and give linear-time algorithms to recognize such properties on pseudo-split graphs from their degree sequences; at the end of the section we study (k, ℓ) -colorings of pseudo-split graphs. Results about polarity in $2K_2$ -split graphs that are analogous to those given in Section 2 for pseudo-split graphs are developed in Section 3. We show that, among other differences, $2K_2$ -split graphs that are (s, k) -polar cannot be recognized from their degree sequence as pseudo-split (s, k) -polar graphs do, but they are still efficiently recognizable. Since C_4 -split graphs are the complements of $2K_2$ -split graphs, analogous results are deduced for these graphs. Finally, in Section 4 we pose some open problems and conjectures.

2 Polarity on pseudo-split graphs

As we have observed before, split graphs are precisely the $(1, 1)$ -polar graphs, so they trivially are polar, monopolar, unipolar, and (s, k) -polar for any positive integers s and k . In this section we study polarity on pseudo-split graphs. As our main results we give complete lists of pseudo-split minimal (s, k) -polar obstructions for the cases $\min\{s, k\} \leq 2$, $s = \infty$, and $k = \infty$, we prove tight upper bounds for the order of pseudo-split minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction,

and provide $O(|V|)$ -time algorithms to decide whether a pseudo-split graph is (s, k) -polar from its degree sequence.

The next observation is basic to obtain $O(|V|)$ -time recognition algorithms for (s, k) -polarity on pseudo-split graphs; it follows directly from Theorem 4.

Remark 5. *Let $G = (C, S, I)$ be an imperfect pseudo-split graph, and let $c = |C|$ and $i = |I|$. If $u \in V_G$, then $u \in C$ if and only if $d(u) \geq c + 4$, $u \in S$ if and only if $d(u) = c + 2$, and $u \in I$ if and only if $d(u) \leq c$. Moreover, $d(u) = c + 4$ if and only if u is a vertex in C that is completely nonadjacent to I , and $d(u) = c$ if and only if u is a vertex in I that is completely adjacent to C .*

If $G = (C, S, I)$ is a pseudo-split graph and uv is an edge in $G[S]$, then $(C \cup S \setminus \{u, v\}, I \cup \{u, v\})$ is a polar partition of G . Hence, pseudo-split graphs are polar. In addition, since split graphs are precisely the $(1, 1)$ -polar graphs, for every pair of positive integers s and k , any pseudo-split minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction is necessarily imperfect. Moreover, since split graphs are monopolar and unipolar, every pseudo-split minimal monopolar (unipolar) obstruction is also imperfect. Considering above observations, it seems natural to ask about the polar partitions of C_5 . Notice that a 5-cycle admits only two essentially different polar partitions, which are depicted in Figure 1.



Figure 1: The only two polar partitions of a 5-cycle. Shaded vertices induce complete multipartite graphs, while white vertices induce clusters.

Observe that, if an imperfect pseudo-split graph $G = (C, S, I)$ has a polar partition (A, B) , then (A, B) must inherit either a $(1, 2)$ - or a $(2, 1)$ -polar partition to $G[S]$. In the first case, since $G[B]$ is a P_3 -free graph and C is completely adjacent to S , we have that $C \cap B$ must be an empty set, so $C \subseteq A$. Analogously, when $G[S]$ inherits a $(2, 1)$ -polar partition from (A, B) , we have that $I \subseteq B$, because I is completely nonadjacent to S and A induces a $\overline{P_3}$ -free graph. These observations are going to be used without any explicit mention in most of the proofs of this section.

2.1 Algorithms for polarity on pseudo-split graphs

In the following theorem we give a necessary and sufficient condition for a pseudo-split graph to be (s, ∞) -polar. Notice that such a condition can be verified in $O(|V|)$ -time from the degree sequence of a graph. Additionally, since the class of pseudo-split graphs is self-complementary, and a graph is (s, ∞) -polar if and only if its complement is (∞, s) -polar, we have that by a simple argument of complements an analogous characterization can be given for (∞, k) -polarity on pseudo-split graphs.

Theorem 6. *Let s be a nonnegative integer, and let G be an imperfect pseudo-split graph with pseudo-split partition (C, S, I) . Then, G is an (s, ∞) -polar graph if and only either $s > |C|$, or $|C| \geq s \geq 2$ and there are at least $|C| - s + 2$ vertices of G with degree exactly $|C| + 4$.*

Proof. Let us denote $|C|$ by c . Suppose that G is an (s, ∞) -polar graph, with polar partition (A, B) , such that $s \leq c$. Observe that, if the restriction of (A, B) to S is a $(1, 2)$ -polar partition, then $C \cap B = \emptyset$, or $G[B]$ has P_3 as an induced subgraph, but then $C \subseteq A$, which is impossible since $G[A]$ would have K_{c+1} as an induced subgraph and $s \leq c$. Thus, $G[S]$ is covered by a $(2, 1)$ -polar partition, so $s \geq 2$. Notice that $I \subseteq B$, otherwise $\overline{P_3}$ would be an induced subgraph of $G[A]$, which cannot occur.

Then, since A induces a complete s -partite graph, at most $s - 2$ vertices of C belong to A . It implies that there is a subset C' of $C \cap B$ with at least $c - s + 2$ vertices. Moreover, if there exist adjacent vertices $c \in C'$ and $i \in I$, then $G[B]$ would have P_3 as an induced subgraph, which is impossible, so C' is completely nonadjacent to I . Hence, by Remark 5, G has at least $c - s + 2$ vertices of degree $c + 4$.

For the converse implication, let A and B be a maximum independent set and a maximum clique in $G[S]$, respectively. If $s > c$, then $(C \cup A, I \cup S \setminus A)$ is an (s, ∞) -polar partition of G . Otherwise, we have that $c \geq s$ and there are at least $c - s + 2$ vertices of G with degree exactly $c + 4$. But then, if C' is the subset of C consisting of the vertices of degree $c + 4$, we have by Remark 5 that $((S \setminus B) \cup (C \setminus C'), I \cup C' \cup S \setminus B)$ is an (s, ∞) -polar partition of G . \square

Now, we present a necessary and sufficient condition for a pseudo-split graph to be (s, k) -polar. Once again, this condition can be verified in $O(|V|)$ -time from the degree sequence of a graph, so it implies that (s, k) -polarity can be efficiently decided on pseudo-split graphs.

Theorem 7. *Let G be an imperfect pseudo-split graph with pseudo-split partition (C, S, I) , and let c and i be the cardinalities of C and I , respectively. Let M_C be the number of vertices of G whose degree is exactly $c + 4$, and M_I be the number of vertices of G whose degree is exactly c . Let s and k be nonnegative integers such that $s + k \geq 1$. Then, G is an (s, k) -polar graph if and only if either*

1. $k \geq i + 1$ and $s \geq c - M_C + 2$, or
2. $s \geq c + 1$ and $k \geq i - M_I + 2$.

Proof. First, let us suppose that G admits an (s, k) -polar partition (A, B) . There are two possible cases, either $G[S]$ inherits a $(2, 1)$ -polar partition from (A, B) , or it inherits a $(1, 2)$ -polar partition (see Figure 1). We will show that in the first case, $k \geq i + 1$ and $s \geq c - M_C - 2$, while in the latter case $s \geq c + 1$ and $k \geq i - M_I + 2$.

Thus, suppose that $G[S]$ inherits a $(2, 1)$ -polar partition from (A, B) . Note that in such a case $I \subseteq B$, otherwise $G[A]$ would have $\overline{P_3}$ as an induced subgraph,

which is impossible. Moreover, since $G[B]$ is a P_3 -free graph, we have that every vertex $v \in C \cap B$ is completely nonadjacent to I , and then, by Remark 5, $|C \cap B| \leq M_C$. Thus, it occurs that

$$|C \cap A| = |C| - |C \cap B| \geq c - M_C,$$

where we conclude that $s \geq c - M_C + 2$. Furthermore, in this case $G[B]$ is a cluster with exactly $I + 1$ components, so $k \geq i + 1$. Hence, we have proved that, if $G[S]$ inherits a $(2, 1)$ -polar partition from (A, B) , then $k \geq i + 1$ and $s \geq c - M_C + 2$. It can be proved in a similar way that $s \geq c + 1$ and $k \geq i - M_I + 2$ whenever $G[S]$ inherits a $(1, 2)$ -polar partition from (A, B) .

Conversely, let assume that $k \geq i + 1$ and $s \geq c - M_C + 2$. By definition of M_C and Remark 5, there exists a subset C' of C of cardinality M_C that is completely nonadjacent to I . Let B_1 be a set of two adjacent vertices of $G[S]$, and let $A_1 = S \setminus B_1$. Then, we have that $(A_1 \cup C \setminus C', B_1 \cup I \cup C')$ is a $(c - M_C + 2, i + 1)$ -polar partition of G , so G is an (s, k) -polar graph, as we had to prove. The result follows analogously if we assume that $s \geq c + 1$ and $k \geq i - M_I + 2$, only taking a $(1, 2)$ -polar partition (A_1, B_1) of $G[S]$ instead of a $(2, 1)$ -polar partition. \square

Monopolarity and unipolarity also can be decided in $O(|V|)$ -time from the degree sequence of a pseudo-split graph, but that will be deduced as an immediate consequence of the forbidden subgraph characterizations that we present next.

Now, we present some results about pseudo-split minimal (s, k) -polar obstructions, which include tight upper bounds for the order of such graphs, as well as complete lists of minimal forbidden induced subgraphs for some values of s and k .

2.2 Pseudo-split minimal (s, k) -polar obstructions

Monopolar and unipolar pseudo-split graphs admit a very simple characterization by forbidden induced subgraphs which we summarize in the following proposition.

Theorem 8. *Let G be a pseudo-split graph. Then,*

1. G is a minimal monopolar obstruction if and only if $G \cong K_1 \oplus C_5$, and
2. G is a minimal unipolar obstruction if and only if $G \cong C_5$.

In consequence, the problems of deciding whether a pseudo-split graph is monopolar or unipolar are solvable in $O(|V|)$ -time from its degree sequence.

Proof. It is a routine to show that $K_1 \oplus C_5$ is a minimal monopolar obstruction. Moreover, if G has pseudo-split partition (C, S, I) , and G does not have $K_1 \oplus C_5$ as an induced subgraph, then either G is a split graph, or G is an imperfect pseudo-split graph with $C = \emptyset$. In the first case, G trivially is a monopolar

graph, while in the second case G is isomorphic to $nK_1 + C_5$ for some nonnegative integer n , and therefore, it is a monopolar graph. The proof of item 2 is similar and even simpler.

By item 1, a pseudo-split graph $G = (C, S, I)$ is monopolar if and only if either $S = \emptyset$ or $C = \emptyset$. Thus, it follows from Theorems 1 and 4 that deciding whether a pseudo-split graph is monopolar can be done in $O(|V|)$ -time from its degree sequence. Analogously, by item 2, a pseudo-split graph is unipolar if and only if it is split, so in this case the result follows from Theorem 1. \square

As we mentioned before, minimal (s, k) -polar obstructions on general graphs are known only for the cases $\min\{s, k\} = 0$, and $s = k = 1$, which correspond to clusters, complete multipartite graphs, and split graphs. In the following proposition we give complete lists of pseudo-split minimal (s, k) -polar obstructions for the case $s \in \{1, 2\}$, which can be extrapolated to case $k \in \{1, 2\}$ by simple arguments of complements. Before presenting such results, we introduce notation for some particular graphs.

For each positive integer s , let us denote by G_s^0 the imperfect pseudo-split graph whose (C, S, I) -partition satisfies that $|C| = s$, $I = 1$, and C is completely adjacent to I . We will also use G_s^1 to denote the graph obtained from G_s^0 by deleting one edge incident with the only vertex of I . Notice that, by Theorem 7, for any integers $s, k \geq 2$, the graphs G_s^0 and G_s^1 are minimal (s, k) -polar obstructions.

For positive integers s and k , with $k \geq s$, let $H_s^k = (C, S, I)$ be the imperfect pseudo-split graph such that $|C| = s - 1$, $|I| = k - 1$ and, for an injection $f: C \rightarrow I$, a vertex $v \in C$ is adjacent to a vertex $u \in I$ if and only if $u = f(v)$. It follows from Theorem 7 that H_s^k is a minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction provided $k \geq s \geq 2$.

Theorem 9. *Let k be an integer, $k \geq 2$. If G is a pseudo-split graph, then*

1. G is a minimal $(1, k)$ -polar obstruction if and only if $G \cong K_1 \oplus C_5$.
2. G is a minimal $(2, k)$ -polar obstruction if and only if G is isomorphic to some of $G_2^0, G_2^1, \overline{G_k^0}$ or H_1^k .

Proof. It is a routine to verify that $K_1 \oplus C_5$ is a minimal $(1, k)$ -polar obstruction. In addition, G is $K_1 \oplus C_5$ -free if and only if $S = \emptyset$ or $C = \emptyset$, but in both cases G is a $(1, 2)$ -polar graph, hence a $(1, k)$ -polar graph.

Previously, we observed that the graphs G_2^0, G_2^1 and H_2^k are all of them $(2, k)$ -polar obstructions. We also observed that G_k^0 is a minimal $(k, 2)$ -polar obstruction, so $\overline{G_k^0}$ is a minimal $(2, k)$ -polar obstruction.

Now, assume for having a contradiction that G is a minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction different to $G_2^0, G_2^1, \overline{G_k^0}$ and H_1^k . Let (C, S, I) be the pseudo-split partition of G , and let us denote by c and i the cardinalities of C and I , respectively. Notice that G is imperfect, otherwise it would be a $(1, 1)$ -polar graph, and hence a $(2, k)$ -polar graph. Also observe that, if either $i = 0$, or both $c \leq 1$ and $i \leq k - 1$, then G would admit a $(2, k)$ -polar partition, which is impossible.

From the previous observation we have that either $c \geq 2$ and $i \geq 1$, or $c \leq 1$ and $i \geq k$.

Suppose that $c \geq 2$ and $i \geq 1$. Since G is a $\{G_2^0, G_2^1\}$ -free graph, we have that C is completely nonadjacent to I . Notice that $i \geq k$, otherwise G would be a $(2, k)$ -polar graph. But then, G has $\overline{G_k^0}$ as an induced subgraph, which is impossible. Thus, it must be the case that $c \leq 1$ and $i \geq k$. Since G is not a $(2, k)$ -polar graph, $c \geq 1$, so $c = 1$. Let v be the only vertex in C . If $|N(v) \cap I| \leq k - 2$, then G is a $(2, k)$ -polar graph, which is not possible, so that $|N(v) \cap I| \geq k - 1$, but then G contains an induced subgraph isomorphic to either $\overline{G_k^0}$ or H_1^k , contradicting that G is not isomorphic to these graphs. The contradiction arose from supposing the existence of a pseudo-split minimal $(2, k)$ -polar obstruction different to $G_2^0, G_2^1, \overline{G_k^0}$ and H_1^k , so it does not exist. \square

It is a simple observation that, for any nonnegative integer s , a graph G is a minimal (s, ∞) -polar obstruction if and only if there is a nonnegative integer k_0 such that, for any integer $k \geq k_0$, G is a minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction. Since monopolar graphs are by definition the $(1, \infty)$ -polar graphs, then item 1 of Theorem 8 can be deduced as a consequence of the previous observation and item 1 of Theorem 9. Similarly, the next corollary follows directly from the previous observation and item 2 of Theorem 9.

Corollary 10. *There are only two pseudo-split minimal $(2, \infty)$ -polar obstructions, namely G_2^0 and G_2^1 .*

It seems that there is not an easy way to describe the complete lists of pseudo-split minimal (s, k) -polar obstructions when s and k are arbitrary nonnegative integers, but, as we observed before, we know there is just a finite number of them, so it becomes natural to ask about the best possible upper bounds for their order. In the following propositions, we use Theorem 7 to give tight upper bounds for the order of pseudo-split minimal (s, k) - and (s, ∞) -polar obstructions. We start with the following technical observation.

Lemma 11. *Let $G = (C, S, I)$ be an imperfect pseudo-split graph, and let c and i be the cardinalities of C and I , respectively. Let s and k be nonnegative integers such that $s + k \geq 1$. The following assertions hold true.*

1. *If $c > s$, then G is not a minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction.*
2. *If $i > k$, then G is not a minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction.*

Proof. We only prove item 1 because the proof of item 2 is analogous. Notice that, if $c > s$ and $i \geq k$, it follows from Theorem 7 that, for every vertex $v \in C$, $G - v$ is not an (s, k) -polar graph, which clearly implies that G is not a minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction. Thus, we can assume that $i < k$.

Assume for obtaining a contradiction that G is a minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction. Observe that for every vertex v of C , $G - v$ has pseudo-split partition $(C \setminus \{v\}, S, I)$, and $|C \setminus \{v\}| = c - 1 \geq s$. Since G is a minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction, we have that, for every vertex v of G , $G - v$ admits an (s, k) -polar

partition. That is true in particular if $v \in C$. Then, we have from Remark 5, Theorem 7, and our previous observations that, for any vertex v of C , there are at least $c - s + 1$ vertices of $C \setminus \{v\}$ that are completely nonadjacent to I ; let C'_v be the set of these vertices.

Notice that no vertex v of C is completely nonadjacent to I , otherwise $C'_v \cup \{v\}$ would be a subset of C of cardinality at least $c - s + 2$ that is completely nonadjacent to I , but then, by Remark 5 and Theorem 7, G would be an (s, k) -polar graph, and we are assuming it is not. Thus, we conclude that each vertex of C is adjacent to at least one vertex of I .

Here is the desired contradiction. Let H be a graph obtained from G by removing any $c - s$ vertices of C . Thus, H is a proper induced subgraph of G with a pseudo-split partition (C^*, S, I) such that any vertex of C^* is adjacent to at least one vertex of I . But then, we have from Theorem 7 that H is not an (s, k) -polar graph, contradicting the minimality of G . \square

By itself, Lemma 11 implies that, for any nonnegative integers s and k , a pseudo-split minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction has order at most $s + k + 5$. Nevertheless, as we can corroborate in Theorem 9 and the observations that precede it, if $\min\{s, k\} \leq 2$, each minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction has order strictly lower than $s + k + 5$. In Lemma 12 and Theorem 13 we will prove that this is true for general values of s and k , and not only when $\min\{s, k\} \leq 2$.

Lemma 12. *Let s and k be integers, $s, k \geq 2$, and let $G = (C, S, I)$ be a pseudo-split minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction. Then, G is imperfect, $|C| \leq s$, $|I| \leq k$ and $|C| + |I| \leq s + k - 1$.*

Consequently, any pseudo-split minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction has order at most $s + k + 4$, and this bound is tight when $\min\{s, k\} = 2$.

Proof. As we noticed at the beginning of this chapter, split graphs are $(1, 1)$ -polar, hence (s, k) -polar, so G is an imperfect pseudo-split graph. Let $c = |C|$ and $i = |I|$. Observe that Lemma 11 implies that $s \geq c$ and $k \geq i$, so $|V_G| = |C| + |I| + |S| \leq s + k + 5$ and this bound is attained if and only if $c = s$ and $i = k$.

Assume for a contradiction that $c = s$ and $i = k$, so G has order $s + k + 5$. Let $v \in C$, and let us use C' to denote $C \setminus \{v\}$. Let (A, B) be an (s, k) -polar partition of $G - v$. Observe that $G[S]$ inherit a $(1, 2)$ -polar partition from (A, B) , otherwise $G[S]$ would inherit a $(2, 1)$ -polar partition, but then $I \subseteq B$ implying that B has an independent subset of size $k + 1$, which is impossible. Moreover, since $G[B]$ is $\{(k + 1)K_1, P_3\}$ -free, we have that $C' \subseteq A$ and there is at least one vertex u of I in the part A . Notice that u is completely adjacent to C' , because $G[A]$ does not have induced copies of $\overline{P_3}$.

Here we have the desired contradiction, because $G[C \cup S \cup \{u\}]$ is isomorphic to either G_s^0 or G_s^1 , depending on whether u is adjacent or not to v , but then G has an (s, k) -polar obstruction as a proper induced subgraph, contradicting the minimality of G . The contradiction arose from assuming that $|V_G| > s + k + 4$, so it is not the case. Notice that G_s^0 and G_s^1 attain the bound when $s = 2$, so the bound is tight. \square

Theorem 13. *Let s and k be integers, $s, k \geq 3$. Then, any pseudo-split minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction has order at most $s + k + 3$, and the bound is tight.*

Proof. Let G be an (s, k) -polar obstruction with pseudo-split partition (C, S, I) , and let c and i be the cardinalities of C and I , respectively. By Lemma 12, G is an imperfect pseudo-split graph with $c \leq s$, $i \leq k$ and, either $c \leq s - 1$ or $i \leq k - 1$. Notice that, if $c < s - 1$ or $i < k - 1$, then $|V_G| \leq s + k - 3$, so we are done. Thus we can assume that, either $c = s - 1$ or $i = k - 1$. Let us assume that $i = k - 1$, the case $c = s - 1$ is analogous.

To obtain a contradiction, let us suppose that G has at least $s + k + 4$ vertices, which implies by the previous observations that $c = s$. Let v be a vertex in C , and let (A, B) be an (s, k) -polar partition of $G - v$. We have two cases: either $G[S]$ inherits a $(1, 2)$ - or a $(2, 1)$ -polar partition from (A, B) .

In the first case, since $G[B]$ is $\{(k+1)K_1, P_3\}$ -free, we have that $C \setminus \{v\} \subseteq A$ and there exists a vertex $u \in I \cap A$. Moreover, $G[A]$ is a $\overline{P_3}$ -free graph, so u is completely adjacent to $C \setminus \{v\}$. But then, $G[C \cup S \cup \{u\}]$ is isomorphic to either G_s^0 or G_s^1 , so G properly contains an (s, k) -polar obstruction, which is impossible.

Hence, it must be the case that $G[S]$ inherits a $(2, 1)$ -polar partition (A', B') from (A, B) , in which case $I \subseteq B$ and there exists a vertex $u \in B \cap (C \setminus \{v\})$, so that u is completely non adjacent to I . Additionally, repeating the argument, but using u instead of v , we have that there exists a vertex $w \in B \cap (C \setminus \{u\})$, so that w is completely non adjacent to I . But then,

$$(A' \cup C \setminus \{u, w\}, B' \cup I \cup \{u, w\})$$

is an (s, k) -polar partition of G , a contradiction. The contradiction arose from supposing that $|V_G| \geq s + k + 4$, so it must be the case that G has at most $s + k + 3$ vertices.

To bound is tight since H_s^k is a pseudo-split minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction whenever $k \geq s \geq 3$, and \overline{H}_k^s is a pseudo-split minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction provided $s \geq k \geq 3$. \square

In contrast with minimal (s, k) -polar obstructions when s and k are integers, it is unknown whether the number of minimal (s, ∞) -polar obstructions is finite. In the following propositions we prove that, restricted to the class of pseudo-split graphs, minimal (s, ∞) -polar obstructions are, all of them, minimal $(s, s + 1)$ -minimal obstructions, implying that there is only a finite number of them. We start with some technical propositions.

Lemma 14. *Let s and k be positive integers, and let $G = (C, S, I)$ be an imperfect pseudo-split graph such that $|C| = s$ and $0 < |I| < k - 1$. For each vertex $v \in I$, let $C_v = \{w \in C : w \notin N(v)\}$ and let C'_v be the set of all vertices in C that are completely nonadjacent to $I \setminus \{v\}$. Then, G is a minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction if and only if for each $v \in I$, both $|C'_v| \geq 2$ and $|C_v \cap C'_v| \leq 1$.*

Proof. Suppose that G is a minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction. From the minimality of G we have that, for each vertex $v \in I$, $G - v$ is an (s, k) -polar graph.

Then, by Theorem 7, $|C'_v| \geq 2$. Moreover, from the same proposition we have that, if $|C_v \cap C'_v| \geq 2$ for some $v \in I$, then G is an (s, k) -polar graph, which is impossible. Then it must be the case that, for each vertex $v \in I$, $|C_v \cap C'_v| \leq 1$.

For the converse, assume that $|C'_v| \geq 2$ and $|C_v \cap C'_v| \leq 1$, for each $v \in I$. For any vertex $v \in C$, $G - v$ is a pseudo-split graph whose complete part has $s - 1$ vertices and whose independent part has at most $k - 2$ vertices, so it follows from Theorem 7 that $G - v$ admits an (s, k) -polar partition. For any vertex $v \in I$, the set C'_v has at least two vertices, so it also follows from Theorem 7 that $G - v$ is an (s, k) -polar graph. For any vertex $v \in S$, $G - v$ is a split graph, so $G - v$ is an (s, k) -polar graph. In summary, for every vertex v of G , $G - v$ is an (s, k) -polar graph. Furthermore, Theorem 7 implies that G is an (s, k) -polar graph if and only if there are at least two vertices of C that are completely nonadjacent to I . Nevertheless, if C' is any subset of C that is completely nonadjacent to I , then $C' \subseteq C_v \cap C'_v$ for any vertex $v \in I$, and therefore $|C'| \leq 1$. Hence, G is not an (s, k) -polar graph, and we conclude that G is a minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction. \square

For each integer $s \geq 2$, let $F_s = (C, S, I)$ be the imperfect pseudo-split graph such that $|C| = s$, $|I| = s - 1$ and, for an injection $f: I \rightarrow C$, a vertex $v \in I$ is adjacent to a vertex $u \in C$ if and only if $u = f(v)$. Notice that, from Theorem 7, we have that for any nonnegative integer k , F_s is not an (s, k) -polar graph. Moreover, F_s is a minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction if and only if $k > s$.

Lemma 15. *Let s and k be integers, $s, k \geq 3$, and let $G = (C, S, I)$ be a pseudo-split minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction such that $|C| = s$. Then, $|I| \leq s - 1$. In addition, if $|I| = s - 1$, then $s < k$ and $G \cong F_s$.*

Proof. Let $c = |C|$ and $i = |I|$. For each $v \in I$, $G - v$ has an (s, k) -polar partition (A, B) . Moreover, since $c = s$, $G[S]$ inherits a $(2, 1)$ -polar partition from (A, B) , so we have that $I \subseteq B$. Additionally, at least two vertices of C belong to B , and any vertex in $C \cap B$ is completely nonadjacent to $I \setminus \{v\}$.

Observe that, if two vertices in $C \cap B$ are nonadjacent to v , then G would have an (s, k) -polar partition, but this is not the case. Hence, for each vertex $v \in I$, there is a vertex $u \in C$ whose only neighbor in I is v . Therefore, if $i \geq s$, G properly contains the (s, k) -polar obstruction F_s , contradicting the minimality of G . Thus, we conclude that $i \leq s - 1$.

Finally, if $i = s - 1$, G contains the (s, k) -polar obstruction F_s . But G is a minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction, so $G \cong F_s$, and then F_s is a minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction, which implies that $k > s$. \square

Lemma 16. *Let s and k be integers, $k > s \geq 3$, and let G be a graph with pseudo-split partition (C, S, I) .*

1. *If G is a minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction such that $|C| = s$, then G is a minimal (s, k') -polar obstruction for each integer $k' \geq k$.*

Particularly, if G is a minimal $(s, s + 1)$ -polar obstruction with $|C| = s$, then it is a minimal (s, ∞) -polar obstruction.

2. If G is a minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction such that $|C| = s$, then G is a minimal $(s, s + 1)$ -polar obstruction.

Consequently, if G is a minimal (s, ∞) -polar obstruction, then it is a minimal $(s, s + 1)$ -polar obstruction with $|C| = s$.

In consequence, G is a minimal (s, ∞) -polar obstruction if and only if G is an $(s, s + 1)$ -polar obstruction with $|C| = s$.

Proof. Let k' be an integer, $k' \geq k$, and suppose that G is a minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction such that $|C| = s$. Thus, we have from Lemma 15 that, either $|I| < s - 1$, or $k > s$ and $G \cong F_s$. In the latter case the result follows because F_s is a minimal (s, k') -polar obstruction. Otherwise, we have that $|I| < s - 1 < k - 1$ and, by Lemma 14 and the observation that precede it, G is a minimal (s, k') -polar obstruction. The assertion follows easily from here.

To prove item 2, assume again that G is a minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction such that $|C| = s$. Thus, since $s + 1 \leq k$, it is clear that G is not an $(s, s + 1)$ -polar graph. Let v be a vertex of G . Clearly, if $v \in S$, then $G - v$ is a split graph, hence a $(s, s + 1)$ -polar graph. Additionally, we have from Lemma 15 that $|I| \leq s - 1$, so it follows from Theorem 7 that $G - v$ is $(s, s + 1)$ -polar whenever $v \in C$. Notice that, from Theorem 13, we have that $|I| < k - 1$. Thus, it follows from Lemma 14 and Theorem 7 that, if $v \in I$, then $G - v$ also is an $(s, s + 1)$ -polar graph. Therefore, G is not an $(s, s + 1)$ -polar graph but any vertex deleted subgraph of G is, so we have that G is a minimal $(s, s + 1)$ -polar obstruction. The assertion follows easily from here.

The last statement is an immediate consequence of items 1 and 2. \square

Corollary 17. *Let s be an integer, $s \geq 3$. Any pseudo-split minimal (s, ∞) -polar obstruction has order at most $2s + 4$, and the bound is tight. In consequence, there are finitely many minimal (s, ∞) -polar obstructions.*

Proof. Let G be a pseudo-split minimal (s, ∞) -polar obstruction. We have from Lemma 16 that G is a minimal $(s, s + 1)$ -polar obstruction so, by Theorem 13, the order of G is at most $2s + 4$. The bound is tight because F_s is a pseudo-split minimal (s, ∞) -polar obstruction with $2s + 4$ vertices. \square

2.3 Colorings of pseudo-split graphs

Brandstädt [2, 3, 4] introduced the (k, ℓ) -colorings in the 1990s, when he proved that the problem of deciding whether a graph admits a (k, ℓ) -coloring is polynomial time solvable if $k, \ell \leq 2$, and NP-complete otherwise.

In this brief section we study some coloring parameters of pseudo-split graphs, including (k, ℓ) -colorings, co-chromatic number, and bi-chromatic number.

Lemma 18. *Let G be a pseudo-split graph, and let k be an integer, $k \geq 2$. Then, G is k -colorable if and only if G is a $(K_{k+1}, C_5 \oplus K_{k-2})$ -free graph.*

Proof. It is easy to verify that both, K_{k+1} and $C_5 \oplus K_{k-2}$, are not k -colorable graphs. Thus, since being k -colorable is a hereditary property, it follows that any k -colorable graph is $(K_{k+1}, C_5 \oplus K_{k-2})$ -free.

Conversely, suppose that G is a $(K_{k+1}, C_5 \oplus K_{k-2})$ -free pseudo-split graph, and let (C, S, I) be a pseudo-split partition of G . Since split graphs are perfect, if $S = \emptyset$, then G is a K_{k+1} -free perfect graph, hence a k -colorable graph. Otherwise, G is an imperfect pseudo-split graph such that $|C| \leq k - 3$, or G would have $C_5 \oplus K_{k-2}$ as an induced subgraph; in this case a proper k -coloring of G could be obtained assign colors $1, \dots, k - 3$ to the vertices of C , coloring S in a proper way with colors $k - 2, k - 1$ and k , and assigning color k to every vertex of I . \square

Theorem 19. *Let G be an imperfect pseudo-split graph with pseudo-split partition (C, S, I) , and let k and ℓ be nonnegative integers. The following statements hold true.*

1. G is a $(k, 0)$ -graph if and only if $|C| \leq k - 3$;
2. G is a $(0, \ell)$ -graph if and only if $|I| \leq \ell - 3$;
3. G is not a $(1, 1)$ -graph;
4. If k and ℓ are positive integers, and $k + \ell \geq 3$, then G is a (k, ℓ) -graph.

Particularly, $\chi(G) = |C| + 3$ and $\theta(G) = |I| + 3$.

Proof. It follows from Lemma 18 that, for any integer $k \geq 2$, an imperfect pseudo-split graph is k -colorable if and only if it is a $C_5 \oplus K_{k-2}$ -free graph. Thus, G is a $(k, 0)$ -graph if and only if $|C| < k - 2$.

The second item follows from the first one since a graph G is $(0, \ell)$ -colorable if and only if \overline{G} is $(\ell, 0)$ -colorable, and the complement of an imperfect pseudo-split graph is also an imperfect pseudo-split graph. Item 3 is due to G has an induced C_5 , and C_5 is not a $(1, 1)$ -graph.

Notice that for the last item it is enough to prove that G is a $(1, 2)$ -graph, but this is trivially true since, for any $(1, 2)$ -coloring (A, B) of $G[S]$, $(A \cup I, B \cup C)$ is a $(1, 2)$ -coloring of G . The last statement is a direct consequence of the first two items, although it is also a direct consequence of Theorem 4. \square

Corollary 20. *If G is an imperfect pseudo-split graph, then $\chi^c(G) = 3$.*

Proof. As we proved in Theorem 19, G is a $(1, 2)$ -colorable graph, hence a 3-cocolorable graph. Thus $\chi^c(G) \geq 3$. In addition, C_5 is an induced subgraph of G , but it is not a 2-cocolorable graph, so $\chi^c(G) > 2$, and the result follows. \square

Lemma 21. *Let z be a positive integer, and let $\mathcal{F}^b(z)$ be the set of minimal z -bicolorable obstructions. Then,*

$$\mathcal{F}^b(z) \subseteq \bigcup_{i=0}^z \mathcal{F}(i, z - i),$$

where $\mathcal{F}(k, \ell)$ stands for the set of minimal (k, ℓ) -obstructions.

Proof. Notice that a graph H is a minimal z -bicolorable obstruction if and only if there exists an integer i with $0 \leq i \leq z$, such that H contains a graph $F_i \in \mathcal{F}(i, z-i)$ as an induced subgraph and, for any vertex v of H and every integer $j \in \{0, \dots, z\}$, $H - v$ does not contain any graph of $\mathcal{F}(j, z-j)$ as an induced subgraph. Particularly, for some integer $i \in \{0, \dots, z\}$, H is not an $(i, z-i)$ -graph, but every vertex-deleted subgraph of H is, so H is a minimal $(i, z-i)$ -obstruction. \square

Theorem 22. *Let z be a positive integer, and let k and ℓ be nonnegative integers. Let $\mathcal{F}_{ps}^b(z)$ be the set of pseudo-split minimal z -bicolorable obstructions, and let $\mathcal{F}_{ps}(k, \ell)$ be the set of pseudo-split minimal (k, ℓ) -obstructions. Then,*

$$\mathcal{F}_{ps}^b(1) = \{K_2, \overline{K_2}\}, \quad \mathcal{F}_{ps}^b(2) = \{K_3, C_5, \overline{K_3}\},$$

and for any integer z with $z \geq 3$,

$$\mathcal{F}_{ps}^b(z) = \{K_{z+1}, C_5 \oplus K_{z-2}, \overline{K_{z+1}}, C_5 + \overline{K_{z-2}}\}.$$

Proof. It follows from Theorem 19 that $\mathcal{F}_{ps}(1, 0) = \{K_2\}$, $\mathcal{F}_{ps}(1, 1) = \{C_5\}$, and $\mathcal{F}_{ps}(k, 0) = \{K_{k+1}, C_5 \oplus K_{k-2}\}$ for any integer $k \geq 2$. In addition, it also follows from Theorem 19 that, for any positive integers k and ℓ with $k + \ell \geq 3$, $\mathcal{F}_{ps}(k, \ell) = \emptyset$.

Then, since $H \in \mathcal{F}_{ps}(k, \ell)$ if and only if $\overline{H} \in \mathcal{F}_{ps}(\ell, k)$, we have from Lemma 21 and the observations in the above paragraph that, for any positive integer z ,

$$\mathcal{F}_{ps}^b(z) = \bigcup_{i=0}^z \mathcal{F}_{ps}(i, z-i),$$

where the result follows. \square

Corollary 23. *Let G be an imperfect pseudo-split graph with pseudo-split partition (C, S, I) . Then $\chi^b(G) = \max\{|C| + 3, |I| + 3\} = \max\{\chi(G), \theta(G)\}$. Particularly, G is not a 2-bicolorable graph.*

Corollary 24. *Chromatic and bichromatic numbers can be determined on imperfect pseudo-split graphs in $O(|V|)$ -time from their degree sequences. Additionally, the cochromatic number of imperfect pseudo-split graphs can be determined in constant time.*

Proof. From Theorem 4, we have that $\chi(G)$ and $\theta(G)$ can be computed in $O(|V|)$ -time from the degree sequence of an imperfect pseudo-split graph. Then, we have from Corollary 23 that also the cochromatic number of imperfect pseudo-split graphs can be computed in $O(|V|)$ -time. The last part of the statement follows from Corollary 20. \square

3 $2K_2$ - and C_4 -split graphs

Theorem 2 provide us of a characterization of $2K_2$ -split graphs based on their degree sequences. Next, we characterize $2K_2$ -split graphs by their forbidden induced subgraphs.

Theorem 25. *A graph G is a $2K_2$ -split graph if and only if G has not induced subgraphs isomorphic to the graphs depicted in Figure 2.*




Figure 2: Minimal $2K_2$ -split obstructions.

Proof. It is a routine job to check that any graph in Figure 2 is a minimal $2K_2$ -split obstruction. To prove the necessary condition, let G be a graph without induced subgraphs isomorphic to the graphs in Figure 2. If G is $2K_2$ -free, then G is a split graph, and hence a $2K_2$ -split graph, so let us assume that G has an induced copy of $2K_2$ with vertex set S . Notice that any vertex in $V_G \setminus S$ is either completely adjacent to S or completely nonadjacent to it, or G would have some of the forbidden induced subgraphs.

Since G is a $3K_2$ -free graph, any two vertices $u, v \in V_G \setminus S$ that are completely nonadjacent to S must be nonadjacent to each other. In addition, if there exist two nonadjacent vertices $u, v \in V_G \setminus S$ that are completely adjacent to S , then G has an induced C_4 , which is impossible.

Hence, if we set C the set of all vertices in $V_G \setminus S$ that are completely adjacent to S , and I the set of vertices in $V_G \setminus S$ that are completely nonadjacent to S , then (C, S, I) is a $2K_2$ -split partition of G . \square

In this section we study polarity on $2K_2$ -split graphs. Observe that a graph is $2K_2$ -split if and only if its complement is C_4 -split. Thus, since the complement of an (s, k) -polar graph is a (k, s) -polar graph, we have that by simple arguments of complements any result about (s, k) -polarity on $2K_2$ -split graphs is equivalent to a dual result on C_4 -split graphs. As the reader will notice, although some results are similar to those proved in Section 2 for pseudo-split graphs, there are also remarkable differences.

3.1 Polarity on $2K_2$ -split graphs

As in the case of pseudo-split graphs, any $2K_2$ -split graph is polar. Moreover, if $G = (C, S, I)$ is a $2K_2$ -split graph, then $(C, S \cup I)$ is a unipolar partition of G , so G is unipolar, and hence polar. Similarly, any C_4 -split graph $G = (C, S, I)$ has a unipolar partition, namely $(C \cup \{u, v\}, I \cup (S \setminus \{u, v\}))$, where u and v are two adjacent vertices of S . Thus, any C_4 -split graph is unipolar.

With the next simple propositions we completely characterize the $2K_2$ - and C_4 -split graphs that admit a $(1, k)$ -polar partition for any value of k . Observe that, from such results, it follows that $(1, k)$ -polarity (including monopolarity) can be checked in $O(|V|)$ -time from the degree sequence of any $2K_2$ - or C_4 -split graph. We start with an observation that is to $2K_2$ -split graphs as Remark 5 is to pseudo-split graphs.

Remark 26. *Let $G = (C, S, I)$ be a strict $2K_2$ -split graph, and let $c = |C|$ and $i = |I|$. If $u \in V_G$, then $u \in C$ if and only if $d(u) \geq c + 3$, $u \in S$ if and only if $d(u) = c + 1$, and $u \in I$ if and only if $d(u) \leq c$. Moreover, $d(u) = c + 3$ if and only if u is a vertex in C that is completely nonadjacent to I , and $d(u) = c$ if and only if u is a vertex in I that is completely adjacent to C .*

Theorem 27. *Let k be an integer, $k \geq 2$, and let $G = (C, S, I)$ be a $2K_2$ -split graph. The following sentences are equivalent.*

1. G is a $(1, k)$ -polar graph.
2. G is a $\{K_2 \oplus 2K_2, K_1 \oplus (2K_2 + \overline{K_{k-1}})\}$ -free graph.
3. If G is a strict $2K_2$ -split graph, then G has at most one vertex whose degree is at least $|C| + 3$ and, if $\Delta_G \geq |C| + 3$, then G has at most $k - 1$ vertices of degree $|C|$.

In consequence, the only $2K_2$ -split minimal monopolar obstruction is $K_2 \oplus 2K_2$, and G is monopolar if and only if it has at most one vertex whose degree is at least $|C| + 3$.

Proof. The equivalence between the second and the third item follows easily from Remark 26, so we only prove the equivalence between 1 and 2. It is a routine to prove that both, $K_2 \oplus 2K_2$ and $K_1 \oplus (2K_2 + (k - 1)K_1)$ are $2K_2$ -split minimal $(1, k)$ -polar obstructions. Hence, every $(1, k)$ -polar graph is a $\{K_2 \oplus 2K_2, K_1 \oplus (2K_2 + \overline{K_{k-1}})\}$ -free graph.

For the converse, let us assume that $G = (C, S, I)$ is a $2K_2$ -split minimal $(1, k)$ -polar obstruction; notice that $S \neq \emptyset$, or G would be a $(1, 1)$ -polar graph, and hence a $(1, k)$ -polar graph. Also, notice that G does not have isolated vertices, because if v was a vertex of degree zero in G , and (A, B) is a $(1, k)$ -polar partition of $G - v$, then $(A \cup \{v\}, B)$ would be a $(1, k)$ -polar partition of G , contradicting the election of G . Particularly, each vertex in I has a neighbor in C .

Now, if $|C| \geq 2$, then $K_2 \oplus 2K_2$ is an induced subgraph of G , so $G \cong K_2 \oplus 2K_2$. In addition, if $C = \emptyset$, then G clearly is a $(1, 2)$ -polar graph, and hence a

$(1, k)$ -polar graph, which is impossible. Thus, if $G \not\cong K_2 \oplus 2K_2$, $|C| = 1$. Additionally, if $|I| < k - 1$, then $(C, S \cup I)$ would be a $(1, k)$ -polar partition of G , but that is absurd, so it must be the case that $|I| \geq k - 1$, and it follows from the previous observations that G has $K_1 \oplus (2K_2 + (k - 1)K_1)$ as an induced subgraph, so $G \cong K_1 \oplus (2K_2 + (k - 1)K_1)$ by the minimality of G . Thus, the only minimal $(1, k)$ -polar obstructions that are $2K_2$ -split are precisely $K_2 \oplus 2K_2$ and $K_1 \oplus (2K_2 + \overline{K_{k-1}})$, implying that every $2K_2$ -split graph that does not contain an induced copy of such graphs is $(1, k)$ -polar. \square

Theorem 28. *Let k be an integer, $k \geq 2$, and let $G = (C, S, I)$ be a C_4 -split graph. The following sentences are equivalent.*

1. G is a $(1, k)$ -polar graph.
2. G is a $K_1 \oplus C_4$ -free graph.
3. If G is a strict C_4 -split graph, then $\Delta_G \leq 2$.

In consequence, the only C_4 -split minimal monopolar obstruction is $K_1 \oplus C_4$, and G is monopolar if and only if $\Delta_G \leq 2$.

Proof. We only prove the equivalence between 1 and 2. It is a routine to show that $C_4 \oplus K_1$ is a $(1, \infty)$ -polar obstruction such that any vertex-deleted subgraph is $(1, 2)$ -polar, so we have that $C_4 \oplus K_1$ is a minimal $(1, k)$ -polar obstruction for any integer $k \geq 2$.

Now, let $G = (C, S, I)$ be a C_4 -split graph. If $C = \emptyset$, for any two nonadjacent vertices $u, v \in S$, $(I \cup (S \setminus \{u, v\}), \{u, v\})$ is a $(1, 2)$ -polar partition of G , so G is $(1, k)$ -polar. Otherwise, we have that $|C| \geq 1$, so $C_4 \oplus K_1$ is an induced subgraph of G and G is not a $(1, k)$ -polar graph. \square

3.1.1 $2K_2$ -split minimal (s, k) -polar obstructions

In this section, we provide upper bounds for the order of minimal $2K_2$ -split minimal (s, k) -polar obstructions. We start with a complete characterization of $2K_2$ -split graphs that admit an (s, k) -polar partition.

Theorem 29. *Let s and k be integers, $s, k \geq 2$, and let $G = (C, S, I)$ be a strict $2K_2$ -split graph. Let c and i be the cardinalities of C and I , respectively. The following statements hold true.*

1. If $s \geq c$ and $k \geq i + 2$, then G is an (s, k) -polar graph.
2. If $s \geq c + 2$ and $k \geq i + 1$, then G is an (s, k) -polar graph.
3. If $s \leq c - 1$ and $k \leq i$, then G is not an (s, k) -polar graph.
4. If $s \leq c - 1$ and $k \geq i + 1$, then G is an (s, k) -polar graph if and only if there is a subset C' of C with at least $c - s + 2$ vertices that is completely nonadjacent to I .

5. If $s \geq c + 1$ and $k \leq i$, then G is an (s, k) -polar graph if and only if there exists a subset I' of I with at least $i - k + 2$ vertices that satisfies some of the following conditions:
 - (a) I' is completely adjacent to C .
 - (b) There exists a vertex $v \in C$ such that I' is completely adjacent to $C \setminus \{v\}$ and v is completely nonadjacent to I' .
6. If $s = c$ and $k \leq i$, then G is an (s, k) -polar graph if and only if there exists a subset I' of I with at least $i - k + 2$ vertices and a vertex $v \in C$ such that I' is completely adjacent to $C \setminus \{v\}$ and v is completely nonadjacent to I' .
7. If $s = c$ and $k = i + 1$, then G is an (s, k) -polar graph if and only if some of the following sentences is satisfied:
 - (a) there exists a subset C' of C with at least $c - s + 2$ vertices that is completely nonadjacent to I .
 - (b) there exists a nonempty subset I' of I and a vertex $v \in C$ such that I' is completely adjacent to $C \setminus \{v\}$ and v is completely nonadjacent to I' .
8. If $s = c + 1$ and $k = i + 1$, then G is an (s, k) -polar graph if and only if some of the following sentences is satisfied:
 - (a) there exists a nonempty subset C' of C that is completely nonadjacent to I .
 - (b) there exists a nonempty subset I' of I such that satisfies some of the following conditions:
 - i. I' is completely adjacent to C .
 - ii. There is a vertex $v \in C$ that is completely nonadjacent to I' and such that I' is completely adjacent to $C \setminus \{v\}$.

Proof. Let $S = \{u, v, x, y\}$ and assume that $uv, xy \in E_G$.

1. It is enough to notice that $(C, S \cup I)$ is a $(c, i + 2)$ -polar partition of G .
2. It is enough to notice that $(C \cup \{u, v\}, I \cup \{x, y\})$ is a $(c + 2, i + 1)$ -polar partition of G .
3. Assume for a contradiction that G admits an (s, k) -polar partition (A, B) . Notice that $C \not\subseteq A$, so $C \cap B \neq \emptyset$, in which case the vertices of one component of $G[S]$ are in A . Suppose without loss of generality that $u, v \in A$. Then $I \cup \{x, y\} \subseteq B$, but in such a case $G[B]$ has at least $i + 1$ components, a contradiction.

4. For the necessary condition it is enough to notice that $(\{u, v\} \cup C \setminus C', \{x, y\} \cup C' \cup I)$ is an $(s, i + 1)$ -polar partition of G . For the sufficient condition, let us assume that (A, B) is a polar partition of G . Since $s \leq c - 1$, $C \cap B \neq \emptyset$. Thus, we can assume without loss of generality that $\{u, v\} \in A$ and $\{x, y\} \in B$, and we have that $I \subseteq B$. Let $C' = C \cap B$. Hence, C' is completely nonadjacent to I and $|C'| \geq c - s + 2$, so the result follows.
5. For the necessary condition, notice that $(C \cup I', S \cup I \setminus I')$ is an $(c + 1, k)$ -polar partition of G . For the sufficient condition let (A, B) be an (s, k) -polar partition of G . Since $2K_2$ is not a complete multipartite graph, we have that $B \cap S \neq \emptyset$, which implies that $I \cap A \neq \emptyset$, and then both, $B \cap \{u, v\} \neq \emptyset$ and $B \cap \{x, y\} \neq \emptyset$. In consequence $C \subseteq A$. Set $I' = I \cap A$, and notice that, since $k \leq i$, then $|I'| \geq i - k + 2$. Moreover, since $G[A]$ is a complete s -partite graph and $I' \cup C \subseteq A$ we have that every vertex of I' is either completely adjacent to C or it is adjacent to any vertex of C except for a vertex v . In addition, if a vertex $w \in C$ is adjacent to a vertex $z \in I'$, then w is completely adjacent to I' . The statement easily follows from the above observations.
6. For the necessary condition, notice that $(C \cup I', S \cup I \setminus I')$ is a (c, k) -polar partition of G . For the sufficient condition let (A, B) be an (s, k) -polar partition of G . Since $2K_2$ is not a complete multipartite graph, $B \cap S \neq \emptyset$, which implies that $I \cap A \neq \emptyset$. But then, $B \cap \{u, v\} \neq \emptyset$ and $B \cap \{x, y\} \neq \emptyset$, implying that $C \subseteq A$. Set $I' = I \cap A$. Since $k \leq i$, $|I'| \geq i - k + 2$. Moreover, since $G[A]$ is a complete c -partite graph and $I' \cup C \subseteq A$ we have that every vertex of I' is adjacent to any vertex of C except for a vertex v . In addition, if a vertex $w \in C$ is adjacent to a vertex $z \in I'$, then w is completely adjacent to I' . The conclusion follows easily from here.
7. For the necessary condition we only have to notice that, in case of (a) occurs, $(\{u, v\} \cup C \setminus C', \{x, y\} \cup C' \cup I)$ is an (s, k) -polar partition of G while, if (b) occurs, then $(C \cup I', S \cup I \setminus I')$ is an (s, k) -polar partition of G . For the sufficient condition let (A, B) be an (s, k) -polar partition of G . If $A \cap S \neq \emptyset$, then $B \cap C \neq \emptyset$, which implies, without loss of generality, that $\{u, v\} \subseteq A$ and $\{x, y\} \subseteq B$, and therefore $I \subseteq B$. Then, if $C' = C \cap B$, we have that $|C'| \geq c - s + 2$ and C' is completely nonadjacent to I . Otherwise, if $A \cap S = \emptyset$, $S \subseteq B$, and therefore $C \subseteq A$. Notice that, since $k = i + 1$, $A \cap I \neq \emptyset$. Let $I' = A \cap I$. Since $C \cup I' \subseteq A$ and A induces a complete c -partite graph, there exist a vertex $v \in C$ such that I' is completely adjacent to $C \setminus \{v\}$ but v is completely nonadjacent to I' .
8. For the necessary condition, notice that in case that (a) occurs, $(\{u, v\} \cup C \setminus C', \{x, y\} \cup C' \cup I)$ is an (s, k) -polar partition of G while, if (b) occurs, then $(C \cup I', S \cup I \setminus I')$ is an (s, k) -polar partition of G . For the sufficient condition, let us consider an (s, k) -polar partition (A, B) of G . If $G[B \cap S]$

is connected, then the vertex set of one of the connected components of $G[S]$ is completely contained in A , let us say, without loss of generality, that $\{u, v\} \subseteq A$. Observe that, in this case, $C \not\subseteq A$, so $C' = C \cap B$ is not empty. In addition, $I \cap A = \emptyset$, so $I \subseteq B$. Thus, since $G[B]$ is a P_3 -free graph, C' is completely nonadjacent to I , and we have the case (a) of the statement. Otherwise, $G[B]$ is disconnected, which implies that $C \cap B = \emptyset$ and $I \not\subseteq B$. Then, we have that $C \subseteq A$ and the set $I' = I \cap A$ is not empty. Hence, $C \cup I' \subseteq A$ and, since $G[A]$ is \overline{P}_3 -free, we have that either I' is completely adjacent to C , or there is a vertex $v \in C$ such that I' is completely adjacent to $C \setminus \{v\}$ and v is completely nonadjacent to I' , so item (b) of the statement follows. \square

The following propositions are consequences of Theorem 29. They are intended to prove an upper bound for the order of $2K_2$ -split minimal (s, k) -polar obstructions for arbitrary integers s and k .

Observe that, for a $2K_2$ -split graph $G = (C, S, I)$, if some of C, S or I is an empty set, then G is a 2-polar graph. Hence, for any integers s and k with $s, k \geq 2$, any $2K_2$ -split minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction $G = (C, S, I)$ is such that C, S and I are all of them nonempty sets. We will use this observation in the following proofs without any explicit mention.

The following proposition is a direct consequence of item 3 of Theorem 29.

Lemma 30. *Let s and k be integers, $s, k \geq 2$, and let $G = (C, S, I)$ be a strict $2K_2$ -split graph. The following assertions hold for $c = |C|$ and $i = |I|$.*

1. *If $c \geq s + 2$ and $i \geq k$, for each vertex $v \in C$, $G - v$ is not an (s, k) -polar graph, so G is not a minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction.*
2. *If $c \geq s + 1$ and $i \geq k + 1$, for each vertex $v \in I$, $G - v$ is not an (s, k) -polar graph, so G is not a minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction.*

Lemma 31. *Let s and k be integers, $s, k \geq 2$, and let $G = (C, S, I)$ be a $2K_2$ -split graph. If $|C| \geq s + 2$ and $|I| \leq k - 1$, then G is not a minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction.*

Proof. Let $c = |C|$ and $i = |I|$. Suppose for a contradiction that G is a minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction. Notice that, for each vertex $v \in C$, $(C \setminus \{v\}, S, I)$ is the $2K_2$ -split partition of $G - v$ and $|C \setminus \{v\}| = c - 1 \geq s + 1$.

Since G is a minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction, for each $v \in C$, the graph $G - v$ is an (s, k) -polar graph, which implies, by item 4 of Theorem 29, that there is a subset C'_v of $C \setminus \{v\}$ with at least $c - s + 1$ vertices that is completely nonadjacent to I . In addition, also by item 4 of Theorem 29, since G is not an (s, k) -polar graph, each vertex $v \in C$ is adjacent to at least one vertex in I .

Let H be a graph obtained from G by deleting $c - s - 1$ vertices of C . Then H has a $2K_2$ -split partition (C^*, S, I) , with $|C^*| = s + 1$. Notice that each $v \in C^* \subseteq C$ has at least one neighbor in I , which implies that the only subset

C' of C^* that is completely nonadjacent to I is the empty set. Thus, we have from item 4 of Theorem 29 that H is not an (s, k) -polar graph, but that is impossible since H is a proper induced subgraph of G , which is by assumption a minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction. \square

Next, we identify some particular minimal (s, k) -polar obstructions.

Remark 32. *Let s and k be integers, $s \geq 2$.*

1. *The strict $2K_2$ -split graph $G = (C, S, I)$ such that $|C| = s$, $|I| = 1$, and C is completely adjacent to I , is a minimal $(s, 2)$ -polar obstruction.*
2. *Let $k \geq 2$, and let $G = (C, S, I)$ be the strict $2K_2$ -split graph such that $|C| = s + 1$, $|I| = 1$, and for two vertices u and v in C , $C' = C \setminus \{u, v\}$ is completely adjacent to I , and $\{u, v\}$ is completely nonadjacent to I . Then, G is a minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction.*
3. *Let $k \geq 3$, and let $G = (C, S, I)$ be the strict $2K_2$ -split graph such that $|C| = s + 1$, $|I| = 1$, and for a vertex $u \in C$, $C' = C \setminus \{u\}$ is completely adjacent to I , and u is completely nonadjacent to I . Then, G is a minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction.*

Lemma 33. *Let s and k be integers, $s, k \geq 2$, and let $G = (C, S, I)$ be a $2K_2$ -split graph. If $|C| = s + 1$ and $|I| = k$, then G is not a minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction.*

Proof. Let $c = |C|$ and $i = |I|$. Assume for a contradiction that G is a minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction, and for a vertex $v \in C$, let $C' = C \setminus \{v\}$. Let (A, B) be an (s, k) -polar partition of $G - v$. Since $i = k$ and $2K_2$ is not a complete multipartite graph, we have that $A \cap I \neq \emptyset$, which implies that B is present in both components of $2K_2$, and therefore $C' \subseteq A$.

Let $u \in A \cap I$. Since $C' \subseteq A$ and $|C'| = s$, we have that there is a vertex $w \in C'$ such that $C' \setminus \{w\}$ is completely adjacent to u and $wu \notin E$. Now, since $i = k \geq 2$, we have that $G[C \cup S \cup \{v\}]$ is a proper induced subgraph of G that contains one of the minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction mentioned in Remark 32, a contradiction. \square

Lemma 34. *Let s and k be integers, $s, k \geq 2$, and let $G = (C, S, I)$ be a $2K_2$ -split graph. If $|C| = s$ and $|I| \geq 2k - 1$, then, G is not a minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction.*

Proof. Let $c = |C|$ and $i = |I|$. Assume for a contradiction that G is a minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction, and let $u \in I$. Then, $G - u$ is an (s, k) -polar graph and, by item 6 of Theorem 29, there is a subset I'_u of $I \setminus \{u\}$ with at least $i - k + 1$ vertices, and a vertex $v_u \in C$ such that, I'_u is completely adjacent to $C \setminus \{v_u\}$ and v_u is completely nonadjacent to I'_u . Now, let $x \in I'_u$. By the same argument of the paragraph above, there is a subset I'_x of $I \setminus \{x\}$ with at least $i - k + 1$ vertices, and a vertex $v_x \in C$ such that, I'_x is completely adjacent to $C \setminus \{v_x\}$ and v_x is completely nonadjacent to I'_x .

Observe that $2i - 2k + 2 \geq i + 1$, because $i \geq 2k - 1$. Thus, we have that $I'_x \cap I'_u \neq \emptyset$, otherwise

$$i = |I| \geq |I'_x \cup I'_u| \geq 2(i - k + 1) \geq i + 1,$$

which is absurd. Since $x \in I'_u \setminus I'_x$ and $I'_x \cap I'_u \neq \emptyset$, we have that $|I'_x \cup I'_u| \geq |I'_x| + 1 \geq i - k + 2$, $v_u = v_x$, $I'_x \cup I'_u$ is completely adjacent to $C \setminus \{v_u\}$, and v_u is completely nonadjacent to $I'_x \cup I'_u$. This is impossible, since item 6 of Theorem 29 implies that in such a case G is an (s, k) -polar graph, contradicting our initial assumption. \square

Lemma 35. *Let s and k be integers, $s, k \geq 2$, and let $G = (C, S, I)$ be a $2K_2$ -split graph. If $|C| \leq s - 1$ and $|I| \geq 2k - 1$, then G is not a minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction.*

Proof. Let $c = |C|$ and $i = |I|$. Assume for a contradiction that G is a minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction, and let $u \in I$. Then $G - u$ is an (s, k) -polar graph and, by item 5 of Theorem 29, there exists a subset I'_u of $I \setminus \{u\}$ with at least $i - k + 1$ vertices and a vertex $v_u \in C$ such that I'_u is completely adjacent to $C \setminus \{v_u\}$ and, v_u is either completely adjacent or completely nonadjacent to I'_u .

We claim that v_u is completely adjacent to I'_u , and we prove it by means of contradiction. Let $x \in I'_u$. Then $G - x$ is an (s, k) -polar graph and again, we have from item 5 of Theorem 29 that there exists a subset I'_x of $I \setminus \{x\}$ with at least $i - k + 1$ vertices and a vertex $v_x \in C$ such that I'_x is completely adjacent to $C \setminus \{v_x\}$ and, v_x is either completely adjacent or completely nonadjacent to I'_x .

Observe that, as it occurred in Lemma 34, since $i \geq 2k - 1$, there is a vertex $w \in I'_x \cap I'_u$. Since we are assuming v_u is completely nonadjacent to I'_u , we have that v_u is not adjacent to w , and due to $w \in I'_x$, we have that $v_u = v_x$. But then, $I'_u \cup I'_x$ is completely adjacent to $C \setminus v_u$ and v_u is completely nonadjacent to $I'_u \cup I'_x$. Moreover, since $x \notin I'_x$, the set $I'_u \cup I'_x$ has at least $i - k + 2$ vertices. But then, item 5 of Theorem 29 implies that G is an (s, k) -polar graph, a contradiction. The contradiction arose from assuming that v_u is completely nonadjacent to I'_u , so it must be the case that, for every vertex $u \in I$, there exists a subset I'_u of I with at least $i - k + 1$ vertices such that I'_u is completely adjacent to C .

But then, for any $x \in I'_u$ and any subset I'_x of $I \setminus \{x\}$ with $i - k + 1$ vertices such that I'_x is completely adjacent to C , we have that $I'_x \cup I'_u$ is a subset of I with at least $i - k + 2$ vertices that is completely adjacent to C , which implies by Theorem 29 that G is an (s, k) -polar graph, contradicting our initial assumption. \square

Now, we are ready to give an upper bound for the order of the $2K_2$ -split minimal (s, k) -polar obstructions.

Theorem 36. *Let s and k be integers, $s, k \geq 2$. Every $2K_2$ -split minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction has order at most $s + 2k + 2$.*

Proof. Let $G = (C, S, I)$ be a $2K_2$ -split minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction. It follows from Lemmas 30, 31 and 33 that, if $|C| \geq s + 1$, then $|V_G| \leq s + k + 4$. Additionally, we conclude from Lemmas 34 and 35 that $|V_G| \leq s + 2k + 2$ whenever $|C| \leq s$. Hence, we have that $|V_G| \leq \max\{s + k + 4, s + 2k + 2\}$. However, since $k \geq 2$, we have that $s + 2k + 2 \geq s + k + 4$, so the result follows. \square

We continue with a characterization for $2K_2$ -split (s, ∞) -polar graphs, and then with an upper bound for the order of $2K_2$ -split minimal (s, ∞) -minimal obstructions.

Lemma 37. *Let s be an integer, $s \geq 2$, and let $G = (C, S, I)$ be an strict $2K_2$ -split graph. Then, G is an (s, ∞) -polar graph if and only if either $s \geq |C|$ or there is a subset C' of C with at least $|C| - s + 2$ vertices that is completely nonadjacent to I .*

Proof. Let $c = |C|$ and $i = |I|$. Suppose that G has an (s, ∞) -polar partition (A, B) . If $c > s$, since $G[A]$ is K_{s+1} -free, then $C \not\subseteq A$, so $C' = C \cap B \neq \emptyset$. Moreover, $G[B]$ is P_3 -free and A induces a $\overline{P_3}$ -free graph, which implies, without loss of generality, that $\{u, v\} \in A$ and $\{x, y\} \in B$. Thus, $I \cap A = \emptyset$ because $G[A]$ is $\overline{P_3}$ -free, so $I \subseteq B$, and $|C'| \geq c - s + 2$ because A induces a K_{s+1} -free graph. Additionally, since $C' \cup I \subseteq B$, we have that C' is completely nonadjacent to I , and we are done.

For the converse implication, if $s \leq c$, then $(C, S \cup I)$ is an $(s, i + 2)$ -polar partition of G . Otherwise, there is a set C' of C with at least $c - s + 2$ vertices that is completely nonadjacent to I . In this case, $(\{u, v\} \cup C \setminus C', \{x, y\} \cup C' \cup I)$ is an $(s, i + 1)$ -polar partition of G , and the result follows. \square

For each integer $s \geq 2$, let $H_s = (C, S, I)$ be the strict $2K_2$ -split graph such that $|C| = s + 1$, $|I| = s - 1$, and for an injection $f: I \rightarrow C$, a vertex $v \in I$ is adjacent to a vertex $u \in C$ if and only if $f(v) = u$. Notice that, by Lemma 37, H_s is a minimal (s, ∞) -polar obstruction.

Theorem 38. *Let s be an integer, $s \geq 2$. Every $2K_2$ -split minimal (s, ∞) -polar obstruction has order at most $2s + 4$, and the bound is tight.*

Consequently, there is only a finite number of $2K_2$ -split minimal (s, ∞) -polar obstructions.

Proof. Let $G = (C, S, I)$ be a $2K_2$ -split minimal (s, ∞) -polar obstruction, and let c and i be the number of vertices in C and I , respectively. From Lemma 37, we have that $c > s$. In addition, since G is a minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction for some positive integer k , we have from Lemmas 30 and 31, that $c \leq s + 1$, so we conclude that $c = s + 1$.

By the minimality of G , we have from Lemma 37 that, for each $u \in I$, there is a subset C'_u of C , with at least three vertices, that is completely nonadjacent to $I \setminus \{u\}$. Additionally, since G does not admit an (s, k) -polar partition, Lemma 37 implies that at most two vertices of C are completely nonadjacent to I , so each vertex $u \in I$ is adjacent to at least one vertex of C'_u . Moreover, it follows from

the previous observations that, for each $u \in I$, there is at least one vertex in C'_u that is not in C'_v for any $v \in I \setminus \{u\}$. Therefore, $|\bigcup_{u \in I} C'_u| \geq i + 2$, so $c \geq i + 2$, and it follows that $|V_G| = |C| + |S| + |I| \leq 2s + 4$.

The bound is tight since H_s is a K_2 -split minimal (s, ∞) -polar obstruction of order $2s + 4$. \square

Unlike pseudo-split graphs, $2K_2$ -split graphs does not constitute a self-complementary class of graphs, so we cannot use simple arguments of complements to conclude results for (∞, k) -polarity from those of (s, ∞) -polarity on this class. Next, we provide an upper bound for the order of $2K_2$ -split minimal (∞, k) -minimal obstructions by proving similar results to Lemma 37 and Theorem 38 for (∞, k) -polarity on $2K_2$ -split graphs.

Lemma 39. *Let k be an integer, $k \geq 2$, and let $G = (C, S, I)$ be an strict $2K_2$ -split graph. Then, G is an (∞, k) -polar graph if and only if either $|I| \leq k - 1$ or there exists a subset I' of I with at least $|I| - k + 2$ vertices such that $G[C \cup I']$ is a complete multipartite graph.*

Proof. Let $c = |C|$ and $i = |I|$. Suppose that G has an (∞, k) -polar partition (A, B) . Since $G[S]$ is not a complete multipartite graph, we have that $S \not\subseteq A$, so $S \cap B \neq \emptyset$. From here, if $i \geq k$, then $I \not\subseteq A$ because $G[B]$ is $(k + 1)K_1$ -free, so $I' = I \cap A \neq \emptyset$. Hence, since $G[A]$ is a \overline{P}_3 -free graph, we have that $A \cap S$ is an independent set, so B intersects the vertex sets of both of the connected components of $G[S]$. But then, $C \cap B = \emptyset$, because B induces a P_3 -free graph. Therefore $C \cup I' \subseteq A$, and $C \cup I'$ induces a complete multipartite graph. Notice that, due to $G[B]$ is $(k + 1)K_1$ -free and B intersects the vertex sets of both components of $G[S]$, $|I'| \geq i - k + 2$.

For the converse implication, let S' be a maximum clique of $G[S]$. If $i \leq k - 1$, then $(C \cup S', I \cup S \setminus S')$ is an (∞, k) -polar partition of G . Otherwise, there is a subset I' of I with at least $i - k + 2$ vertices such that $G[C \cup I']$ is a complete multipartite graph, so in this case $(C \cup I', S \cup I \setminus I')$ is an (∞, k) -polar partition of G . \square

Theorem 40. *Let k be an integer, $k \geq 2$. Any $2K_2$ -split minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction has order at most $2 + 2k + 2^{2k-1}$. In consequence, there is only a finite number of $2K_2$ -split minimal (∞, k) -polar obstructions.*

Proof. Let $G = (C, S, I)$ be a $2K_2$ -split minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction, and let c and i be the number of vertices in C and I , respectively. From Lemma 39 we have that $i \geq k$. Moreover, since G is a minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction for some positive integer s , we have from Lemmas 30, 34 and 35, that $i \leq 2k - 2$.

By the minimality of G , for each vertex $x \in C$, $G - x = (C \setminus \{x\}, S, I)$ is an (∞, k) -polar graph with at least k vertices in its stable part, so it follows from Lemma 39 that there is a subset I'_x of I with at least $i - k + 2$ vertices such that $G[I'_x \cup C \setminus \{x\}]$ is a complete multipartite graph.

We claim that, for any two different vertices $u, v \in C$, if I'_v is a subset of I'_u , then the neighborhood of each vertex in I'_v is precisely $C \setminus \{u, v\}$. Notice

that this would imply that there are not three vertices $u, v, w \in I$ such that $I'_u = I'_v = I'_w$.

To prove our claim, suppose that u and v are vertices in C such that $I'_v \subseteq I'_u$. Since $G[I'_v \cup C \setminus \{v\}]$ is a complete multipartite graph we have two possibilities, either I'_v is completely adjacent to $C \setminus \{v\}$ or there is a vertex $w \in C \setminus \{v\}$ such that I'_v is completely adjacent to $C \setminus \{v, w\}$ and w is completely nonadjacent to I'_v . Notice that, regardless of the case, since $v \in C \setminus \{u\}$ and $G[I'_u \cup C \setminus \{u\}]$ is \overline{P}_3 , v is either completely adjacent or completely nonadjacent to I'_u , and therefore, v is either completely adjacent or completely nonadjacent to I'_v . But we have from the previous observation that, if I'_v is completely adjacent to $C \setminus \{v\}$, then $G[I'_v \cup C]$ is a complete multipartite graph, which implies by Lemma 39 that G is an (∞, k) -polar graph, contradicting the election of G .

Thus, I'_v is not completely adjacent to $C \setminus \{v\}$, so there is a vertex $w \in C \setminus \{v\}$ such that I'_v is completely adjacent to $C \setminus \{v, w\}$ and w is completely nonadjacent to I'_v . Observe that we have two cases depending on whether $w = u$. Since $G[I'_u \cup C \setminus \{u\}]$ is a complete multipartite graph and $I'_v \subseteq I'_u$, we have that $G[I'_v \cup C \setminus \{u\}]$ is also a complete multipartite graph. Then, if $w \neq u$, we have that v is adjacent to every vertex of I'_v , but this would imply that $G[I'_v \cup C]$ is a complete multipartite graph, and we previously noticed that this is impossible. Hence $w = u$ and, since $G[I'_v \cup C \setminus \{u\}]$ is a complete multipartite graph but $G[I'_v \cup C]$ is not, we have that v is completely nonadjacent to I'_v , and it follows that the neighborhood of each vertex in I'_v equals $C \setminus \{u, v\}$.

By our previous arguments, there are at least $\lceil c/2 \rceil$ vertices of $u \in C$ whose associated sets I'_u are pairwise different. Therefore, since $I'_u \subseteq I$, we have that $\lceil C/2 \rceil \leq |\mathcal{P}(I)| = 2^{|I|} \leq 2^{2k-2}$, from which we conclude that

$$|V_G| = |C| + |S| + |I| \leq 2 + 2k + 2^{2k-1}.$$

□

3.1.2 Algorithms for polarity on $2K_2$ -split graphs

We have observed before that $2K_2$ -split graphs are unipolar and co-unipolar, and hence polar graphs. Additionally, we proved that deciding monopolarity and co-monopolarity in $2K_2$ -split graphs can be done in linear time from its degree sequence. In this section we prove that the problems of deciding whether a $2K_2$ -split graph is (s, ∞) -, (∞, k) - or (s, k) -polar also can be efficiently solved.

We start proving that, for any positive integer s , the $2K_2$ -split graphs that admit an (s, ∞) -polar partition can be recognized in linear time from their degree sequence.

Theorem 41. *Let s be an integer, $s \geq 2$. The problem of deciding whether a $2K_2$ -split graph is (s, ∞) -polar is linear-time solvable from its degree sequence.*

Proof. Let $G = (C, S, I)$ be a $2K_2$ -split graph, and let c and i be the number of vertices in C and I , respectively. If $c \leq s$, then $(C, S \cup I)$ is an (s, ∞) -polar partition of G . Otherwise, we have from Lemma 37 that G is an (s, ∞) -polar

graph if and only if there exist at least $c - s + 2$ vertices of G whose degree is exactly $c + 3$. By Theorem 2, these verifications can be done in linear time from the degree sequence of G . \square

We do not know whether (∞, k) -polarity can be decided in linear time for $2K_2$ -split graphs, but in the next proposition we prove that this problem can be solved in polynomial time.

Theorem 42. *Let k be an integer, $k \geq 2$. The problem of deciding whether a $2K_2$ -split graph is (∞, k) -polar is solvable in quadratic time.*

Proof. Let $G = (C, S, I)$ be a $2K_2$ -split graph, and let c and i be the number of vertices in C and I , respectively. If $i \leq k - 1$ and $\{u, v\}$ is a maximum clique of $G[S]$, then $(C \cup \{u, v\}, I \cup S \setminus \{u, v\})$ is an (∞, k) -polar partition of G . Else, if the subset I' of all vertices of degree c in G has at least $i - k + 2$ elements, then $(C \cup I', S \cup I \setminus I')$ is an (∞, k) -polar partition of G . Hence, if $i \leq k - 1$ or there are at most $i - k + 2$ vertices of degree c in G , then G is an (∞, k) -polar graph. Now, let us assume that $i \geq k$ and there are at most $i - k + 1$ vertices of G whose degree is c .

For each vertex $v \in C$, let I_v^* be the set of all vertices whose neighborhood is $C \setminus \{v\}$. It follows from Lemma 39 that G is an (∞, k) -polar graph if and only if I_v^* has at least $i - k + 2$ vertices for some $v \in C$. The result follows since all the verifications can be performed in quadratic time. \square

As a consequence of Remark 5 and Theorem 7, deciding whether a pseudo-split graph admits an (s, k) -polar partition can be done in linear time from its degree sequence. In contrast, it cannot be decided in general whether a $2K_2$ -split graph is (s, k) -polar only from its degree sequence. For instance, in Figure 3 are depicted two strict $2K_2$ -split graphs with the same degree sequence such that the left one is $(5, 4)$ -polar but the right one is not. Despite of that, through the following propositions we prove that the problem of recognizing $2K_2$ -polar graphs that admit an (s, k) -polar partition is solvable in polynomial time.




Figure 3: Two $2K_2$ -split graphs with the same degree sequence such that the one on the left side is $(5, 4)$ -polar but the one on the right side is not.

Lemma 43. *Let $G = (S, K)$ be a split graph, and let k be a positive integer. Let S' be the set of all vertices in S which are completely nonadjacent to K . Then, G is a k -cluster if and only if the following sentences hold true.*

1. For each vertex $w \in S$, either $N(w) = \emptyset$ or $N(w) = K$.
2. $|S \setminus S'| \leq 1$.
3. If $K \neq \emptyset$, then $|S'| \leq k - 1$. Otherwise $|S'| \leq k$.

Consequently, it can be decided whether a split graph is a k -cluster in linear time from its degree sequence.

Proof. The proposition can be easily verified if $K = \emptyset$, so we will assume for the proof that $K \neq \emptyset$. Notice that $K \cup S \setminus S'$ induces a component of G and the other components of G are trivial graphs induced by the singletons $\{w\}$ such that $w \in S'$. In consequence, G has exactly $1 + |S'|$ components.

Assume that G is a k -cluster. Since G is P_3 -free, any vertex $w \in S$ is either completely adjacent or completely nonadjacent to K , and there is at most one vertex of S that is not an isolated vertex. Moreover, since $K \neq \emptyset$, it follows from our initial observation about the components that $|S'| \leq k - 1$. Therefore, if G is a k -cluster, the three listed conditions hold. The converse implication follows from the observations in the first paragraph of this proof and the third statement.

For the last part, suppose that G has degree sequence $d_1 \geq \dots \geq d_n$, and let $p = \max\{i \mid d_i \geq i - 1\}$. We have from Theorem 1 that $(S, K) = (\{v_{p+1}, \dots, v_n\}, \{v_1, \dots, v_p\})$ is a split partition of G such that K is a maximum clique. Then, we have from the characterization above that G is a k -cluster if and only if G has at most k components and S is completely nonadjacent to K . For the first condition, notice that G has at most k connected components if and only if either $p = 1$ and $n \leq k$ or $p > 1$ and $n - p \leq k - 1$, and this can be checked in linear time. The second condition is satisfied if and only if $d_1 = \dots = d_p = p - 1$, which also can be verified in linear time. \square

Lemma 44. *Let s and k be nonnegative integers such that $s + k \geq 1$. It can be decided whether a split graph is (s, k) -polar in linear time from its degree sequence.*

Proof. Let G be a split graph. Since split graphs are precisely the $(1, 1)$ -polar graphs, if s and k are both positive integers, then G is (s, k) -polar. Otherwise, $s = 0$ or $k = 0$, and this case follows from Lemma 43. \square

As we mentioned before, it is known that (s, k) -polar graphs can be recognized in polynomial time [9, 10]. Next, we present an alternative polynomial-time algorithm to recognize (s, k) -polar graphs on the class of $2K_2$ -split graphs.

Theorem 45. *Let s and k be nonnegative integers such that $s + k \geq 1$. Deciding whether a $2K_2$ -split graph is (s, k) -polar can be done in polynomial-time.*

Proof. Let $G = (C, S, I)$ be a $2K_2$ -split graph, and let c and i be the number of vertices in C and I , respectively. Let us denote by I^* the set of all vertices of G of degree $c - 1$ and, for each vertex v in C , let I_v^* be the set of all vertices $w \in I$ such that $N(w) = C \setminus \{v\}$.

From Lemma 44 we have the result for the case in which $S = \emptyset$, so we can assume that G is a strict $2K_2$ -split graph. In addition we have the following particular cases.

1. $2K_2$ is $(0, 2)$ - and $(2, 1)$ -polar but it is neither $(1, 1)$ - nor $(\infty, 0)$ -polar.
2. $K_1 \oplus 2K_2$ is $(1, 2)$ - and $(2, 1)$ -polar but it is not $(\infty, 0)$ -, $(0, \infty)$ -, or $(1, 1)$ -polar.
3. For $c \geq 2$, $K_c \oplus 2K_2$ is $(2, 1)$ -polar but it is neither $(1, \infty)$ - nor $(\infty, 0)$ -polar.
4. For $c \geq 1$, $iK_1 + 2K_2$ is $(0, i+2)$ - and $(1, 2)$ -polar but it is neither $(0, i+1)$ - nor $(\infty, 1)$ -polar.

These cases correspond to the conditions $C = \emptyset$ or $I = \emptyset$, that can be checked in linear time from the degree sequence of G from Theorem 2.

From the above observations, we can assume for the rest of the proof that the sets C, S and I are all of them nonempty. We consider the following particular cases.

- If $s, k \leq 1$, then G is not (s, k) -polar, because $2K_2 \leq G$.
- If $k = 0$, then G is not a (s, k) -polar, because $2K_2 \leq G$.
- If $s = 0$ and $k \geq 2$, then G is not (s, k) -polar, because $K_1 \oplus 2K_2 \leq G$.
- If $k = 1$ and $s \geq 2$, then G is not (s, k) -polar, because $2K_2 + K_1 \leq G$.
- If $s = 1$ and $k \geq 2$, we have from Theorem 27 that G is an (s, k) -polar graph if and only if $c = 1$ and $|\{w \in I : d(w) > 0\}| \leq k - 2$. This condition can be verified from the degree sequence of G in linear time.

Notice that, if none of the cases listed before occurs, then $s, k \geq 2$, so we can use the characterizations provided by Theorem 29. The following cases are based on the that characterizations.

1. If $c \leq s$ and $i \leq k - 2$, then G is an (s, k) -polar graph.
2. If $c \leq s - 2$ and $i \leq k - 1$, then G is an (s, k) -polar graph.
3. If $c \geq s + 1$ and $i \geq k$, then G is not an (s, k) -polar graph.
4. If $c > s$ and $i < k$, then G is an (s, k) -polar graph if and only if there exist at least $c - s + 2$ vertices whose degree is exactly $c + 3$. This condition can be verified from the degree sequence of G in linear time.
5. If $c < s$ and $i \geq k$. We can verify from the degree sequence of G if there exist at least $i - k + 2$ vertices of degree exactly c ; if such vertices exist G is an (s, k) -polar graph. Otherwise, if $|I^*| < i - k + 2$, G is not an (s, k) -polar graph, and if $|I^*| \geq i - k + 2$ we can check, for each vertex $v \in C$, whether the set I_v^* has at least $i - k + 2$ vertices; in this point G is an (s, k) -polar graph if and only if $|I_v^*| \geq i - k + 2$ for some $v \in C$. These verifications can be done in polynomial time.

6. If $c = s$ and $i \geq k$. If $|I^*| < i - k + 2$, G is not an (s, k) -polar graph. Otherwise, if $|I^*| \geq i - k + 2$, we can check for each vertex $v \in C$ whether the set I_v^* has at least $i - k + 2$ vertices; G is an (s, k) -polar graph if and only if $|I_v^*| \geq i - k + 2$ for some $v \in C$.
7. If $c = s$ and $i = k - 1$. If there exist at least two vertices of degree exactly $c + 3$, G is an (s, k) -polar graph. Otherwise, if $I^* = \emptyset$, G is not an (s, k) -polar graph, and if $I^* \neq \emptyset$, we can check for each vertex $v \in C$ whether the set I_v^* is empty; G is an (s, k) -polar graph if and only if $I_v^* \neq \emptyset$ for some $v \in C$.
8. If $c = s - 1$ and $i = k - 1$. First, if there exists a vertex of degree $c + 3$ or a vertex of degree c , G is an (s, k) -polar graph. Otherwise, if $I^* = \emptyset$, G is not an (s, k) -polar graph, and if $I^* \neq \emptyset$, we can check for each vertex $v \in C$ whether the set I_v^* is empty; G is an (s, k) -polar graph if and only if $I_v^* \neq \emptyset$ for some $v \in C$.

The result follows since all verifications can be performed in polynomial-time. \square

4 Concluding remarks

It is worth noticing that, unlike the upper bound for the order of $2K_2$ -split minimal (s, ∞) -polar obstructions provided in Theorem 38, which is linear on s , the bound given in Theorem 40 for the order of $2K_2$ -split minimal (∞, k) -polar obstructions is exponential on k . Moreover, we know that the first of these bounds is tight, but we cannot guarantee the same for the second one. We pose the following question.

Problem 46. *Can Lemmas 34 and 35 be improved by replacing the condition $|I| \geq 2k - 1$ for a stronger one like $|I| \geq k + c_0$, for a constant c_0 ?*

Notice that, from the proof used for Theorem 40, an affirmative answer to Problem 46 would imply an improvement of the bound provided in the mentioned theorem. Nevertheless, the next observation makes us think the answer to Problem 46 could be negative.

Remark 47. *For any integers s and k , $s, k \geq 2$, the strict $2K_2$ -split graph $G = (C, S, I)$ with $C = \{w\}$, $I = \{i_1, \dots, i_{2k-2}\}$, and such that $wi_j \in E$ if and only if $1 \leq j \leq k - 1$, is a minimal (s, k) -polar obstruction, and hence it is a minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction.*

We think that the next question can be answered in an affirmative way by imitating the proof of Theorem 38, which is very different than the one we used in Theorem 40.

Problem 48. *Is the order of the $2K_2$ -split minimal (∞, k) -polar obstructions upper bounded by a function linear on k ?*

Moreover, some initial explorations allow us to pose the following conjecture.

Conjecture 49. *Let k be an integer, $k \geq 3$, and let $G = (C, S, I)$ be a $2K_2$ -split minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction. Then $k \leq i \leq 2k - 2$ and $c \leq 2k - i - 1$, where c and i stands for the number of vertices in C and I , respectively.*

Notice that, if the previous conjecture is true, then the order of every $2K_2$ -split minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction does not exceed $2k + 3$. In addition, such a bound would be tight since the strict $2K_2$ -split graph with $C = \{c_1, \dots, c_{k-1}\}$, $I = \{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$ and such that, for each $j \in \{1, \dots, k - 1\}$, $N(c_j) \cap I = I \setminus \{i_j\}$, is a minimal (∞, k) -polar obstruction for every integer $k \geq 2$.

References

- [1] J.A. Bondy and U.S.R Murty, Graph Theory, Springer, Berlin, 2008.
- [2] A. Brandstädt, Corrigendum, Discrete Mathematics 186 (1998), 295.
- [3] A. Brandstädt, Partitions of graphs into one or two independent sets and cliques, Discrete Mathematics 152 (1996), 47–54.
- [4] A. Brandstädt, V. B. Le, and T. Szymczak, The complexity of some problems related to Graph 3-colorability, Discrete Applied Mathematics 89 (1998), 59–73.
- [5] A. A. Chernyak, and A. A. Chernyak, About recognizing (α, β) -classes of polar graphs, Discrete Math 62(2) (1986), 133–138.
- [6] R. Churchley, and J. Huang, Solving partition problems with colour-bipartitions, Graphs and Combinatorics 30 (2014), 353–364.
- [7] E. M. Eschen, and X. Wang, Algorithms for unipolar and generalized split graphs, Discrete Applied Mathematics 162 (2014), 195–201.
- [8] A. Farrugia, Vertex-partitioning into fixed additive induced-hereditary properties is NP-hard, The Electronic Journal of Combinatorics 11(R46) (2004), 1.
- [9] T. Feder, P. Hell, and W. Xie, Matrix partitions with finitely many obstructions, Electronic Notes in Discrete Mathematics 28 (2007), 371–378.
- [10] T. Feder, P. Hell, S. Klein, and R. Motwani, List partitions. SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics 16(3) (2003), 449–478.
- [11] S. Foldes and P. L. Hammer, Split graphs, in: Proc. 8th Sout-Eastern Conf. on Combinatorics, Graph Theory and Computing, 1977, 311–315.
- [12] P. L. Hammer and B. Simeone, The splittance of a graph, Combinatorica 1 (1981) 375–384.

- [13] F. Maffray and M. Preissmann, Linear recognition of pseudo-split graphs, *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 52 (1994) 307–312.