

*Pacific  
Journal of  
Mathematics*

**GRAPH THINNESS: A LOWER BOUND AND COMPLEXITY**

YAROSLAV SHITOV

# GRAPH THINNESS: A LOWER BOUND AND COMPLEXITY

YAROSLAV SHITOV

The *thinness* of a simple graph  $G = (V, E)$  is the smallest integer  $k$  for which there exist a total order  $(V, <)$  and a partition of  $V$  into  $k$  classes  $(V_1, \dots, V_k)$  such that, for all  $u, v, w \in V$  with  $u < v < w$ , if  $u, v$  belong to the same class and  $\{u, w\} \in E$ , then  $\{v, w\} \in E$ . We prove:

- There are  $n$ -vertex graphs of thinness  $n - o(n)$ , which answers a question of Bonomo-Braberman, Gonzalez, Oliveira, Sampaio, and Szwarcfiter.
- The computation of thinness is NP-hard, which is a solution to a long-standing open problem posed by Mannino and Oriolo.

## 1. Introduction

The notion of a  $k$ -thin graph was introduced by Mannino, Oriolo, Ricci, Chandran [13; 14] and motivated by applications to frequency assignment problems. One particular result in [14] showed that the maximum weight stable set problem can be solved in polynomial time, provided that the input graph is given with the corresponding ordering and partition of its vertices, as in the definition of a  $k$ -thin graph, and where  $k$  should be bounded by a constant fixed in advance. We remark that  $G$  is 1-thin if and only if  $G$  is an interval graph, so the result of [14] came as a generalization of the earlier polynomial time solution for the maximum weight stable set problem on interval graphs [11; 12]. Nowadays, the polynomial time solutions, in cases when the inputs are restricted to the  $k$ -thin form with bounded  $k$ , are known for the maximum weight stable set [14], list matrix partition, rainbow domination [1], capacitated graph coloring [7], and several other problems [2; 5].

This article deals with the algorithmic problem corresponding to the notion of thinness. Here and in what follows, an ordered tuple  $(s_1, \dots, s_k)$  is said to be a *partition* of a set  $V$  if the sets  $s_1, \dots, s_k$  are pairwise disjoint and  $s_1 \cup \dots \cup s_k = V$ .

**Problem 1** (GRAPH THINNESS).

*Given:* A simple graph  $G = (V, E)$ , a positive integer  $k$ .

*Question:* Do there exist

- a total ordering  $<$  of the vertex set  $V$  and

---

MSC2020: 05C85, 68Q17.

Keywords: interval graph,  $k$ -thin graph, NP-completeness.

- a partition of  $V$  into  $k$  disjoint classes  $s = (s_1, \dots, s_k)$

such that, for all  $u, v, w \in V$  with

$$(1-1) \quad (u < v < w) \text{ AND } (\{u, w\} \in E) \text{ AND } (u, v \in s_i \text{ for some } i),$$

one always has  $\{v, w\} \in E$ ?

**Definition 2.** If  $(G, k)$  is a yes-instance in [Problem 1](#), then the graph  $G$  is called  $k$ -thin. The *thinness* of  $G$  is the smallest integer  $\tau$  for which  $G$  is  $\tau$ -thin.

The above mentioned algorithmic applications motivate the study of the computational complexity of  $k$ -thin graph recognition. As said above, the case  $k = 1$  corresponds to interval graphs, which can be detected in polynomial time [\[8\]](#). For general  $k$ , the question of the determination of the algorithmic complexity of detecting  $k$ -thin graphs was posed by Mannino and Oriolo [\[13\]](#) in 2002, and, until now, it remained open despite further extensive research [\[1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 6; 9; 10; 15\]](#). The aim of this paper is to prove [Theorems 3](#) and [5](#) below.

**Theorem 3.** *The problem GRAPH THINNESS is NP-complete.*

We refer the interested reader to [\[1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 6; 9; 10; 15\]](#) for further results and open problems regarding the complexities of fixed parameter versions of GRAPH THINNESS. In particular, is it hard to decide whether a given graph is 2-thin? Another question in [\[5\]](#) deals with the maximal value that can be taken by the thinness of a simple graph on  $n$  vertices, and the best known result was as follows.

**Proposition 4** (see [Lemma 16](#) in [\[1\]](#)). *For any positive integer  $k$ , there exists a simple graph with  $2k$  vertices and thinness  $k$ .*

Indeed, the construction in [\[1, Lemma 16\]](#) is also relevant in our paper, and we revisit it in [Definition 22](#) below. Here is the formulation of our second main result.

**Theorem 5.** *There exist simple graphs with  $n$  vertices and thinness  $n - o(n)$ .*

## 2. Preliminaries and overview

In what follows, the pair  $(s, <)$  as in [Problem 1](#) is to be called a *certificate* of the  $k$ -thinness of  $G$ , and, since the validity of such a certificate can be checked in polynomial time, [Problem 1](#) belongs to NP. Therefore, the remaining part of [Theorem 3](#) is the NP-hardness, and we prove it with the use of the following auxiliary problem.

**Problem 6** (GRAPH THINNESS WITH A GIVEN PARTITION).

*Given: A simple graph  $G=(V, E)$ , an integer  $k$ , a partition  $s = (s_1, \dots, s_k)$  of  $V$ .*

*Question: Does there exist a total ordering  $<$  of the set  $V$  such that, for all  $u, v, w \in V$  satisfying the conditions (1-1), one always has  $\{v, w\} \in E$ ?*

**Definition 7.** If  $(G, k, s)$  is a yes-instance in [Problem 6](#), then the partition  $s$  is said to *allow* a certificate of the  $k$ -thinness of  $G$ .

This problem has been considered earlier as the *ordering consistent with a given partition* in [\[1\]](#), and a review report suggests the *incompatibility graph coloring* as another possible name of this problem. Indeed, although there seems to be no standard terminology for the name of [Problem 6](#), its complexity is known.

**Theorem 8** (Bonomo, de Estrada [\[1\]](#)). *Problem 6 is NP-complete.*

Throughout our paper, all graphs are assumed to be simple. In the forthcoming [Section 3](#), we recall some relevant notation and prove several results needed in our discussion. In [Section 4](#), we present the polynomial reduction from GRAPH THINNESS WITH A GIVEN PARTITION to GRAPH THINNESS, and, in view of [Theorem 8](#), this implies the validity of [Theorem 3](#). In [Section 5](#), we switch to [Theorem 5](#) and discuss its motivation, and we prove this theorem with a probabilistic argument.

### 3. An auxiliary construction

We begin with two caveats on the use of some standard notation.

**Remark 9.** A *clique* of a graph  $G = (V, E)$  is a subset of  $V$  that induces a complete subgraph of  $G$ . In particular, for any  $u \in V$ , the sets  $\emptyset$  and  $\{u\}$  are cliques of  $G$ .


**Remark 10.** We write  $U \subseteq V$  for two sets  $U, V$  if every element of  $U$  is contained in  $V$ . In particular, we can write  $U \subseteq V$  even if  $U = V$ .

We proceed with several techniques needed in our reduction.

**Definition 11.** Assume  $G = (V, E)$  is a simple graph, and let  $U \subseteq V$ . We define  $\mathcal{B}(G, U)$  as the graph

- with the vertex set  $V \cup \{\alpha, \beta\}$ , where  $\alpha, \beta \notin V$  are new vertex labels,
- with all edges in  $E$ , and, apart from these, with an edge from  $\alpha$  to every vertex in  $V \setminus U$ , and with an edge from  $\beta$  to every vertex in  $V \setminus U$ .

Our next result may look similar to [Lemma 16](#) in [\[1\]](#), which essentially states that  $\text{thinness}(\mathcal{B}(G, \emptyset)) = \text{thinness}(G) + 1$  if  $G$  is not a clique.



**Figure 1.** An example of  $G$  and  $\mathcal{B}(G, \{3\})$  as in [Definition 11](#).

**Lemma 12.** *Let  $G, U$  be as in [Definition 11](#). Suppose that, for some integer  $k$ , a partition  $s = (s_1, \dots, s_k)$  allows a  $k$ -thinness certificate of  $\mathcal{B}(G, U)$ . Then for some*

- *label  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$  and*
- *subset  $C \subseteq V \setminus U$  that is a clique of  $G$ ,*

*one has  $s_i \subseteq U \cup C \cup \{\alpha, \beta\}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $<$  be an ordering of  $V \cup \{\alpha, \beta\}$  that is compatible with the partition  $s$ , so that  $(s, <)$  is a certificate of the  $k$ -thinness of  $\mathcal{B}(G, U)$ . Since the labels  $\alpha, \beta$  can be swapped without changing the graph  $\mathcal{B}(G, U)$ , we can assume without loss of generality that  $\alpha < \beta$ , and then we take a label  $i$  such that  $\alpha \in s_i$ .

Step 1. Let  $w \in V \setminus U$  be a vertex with  $w < \alpha$ . If  $w \in s_i$ , then we have

$$(3-1) \quad w < \alpha < \beta \text{ and } w, \alpha \in s_i.$$

However, [Definition 11](#) implies that  $w$  and  $\beta$  are adjacent in  $\mathcal{B}(G, U)$ , but at the same time  $\alpha, \beta$  are not adjacent. Therefore, we arrived at a contradiction with the fact that  $(s, <)$  is a  $k$ -thinness certificate, and hence we cannot have  $w \in s_i$ .

Step 2. Now let  $w', w'' \in V \setminus U$  be two vertices such that

$$(3-2) \quad \alpha < w' < w'' \text{ and } w' \in s_i.$$

Also, by [Definition 11](#), the vertices  $\alpha, w''$  are adjacent in  $\mathcal{B}(G, U)$ , and, since  $(s, <)$  is a  $k$ -thinness certificate, we get  $\{w', w''\} \in E$ .

In Step 1, we showed that every vertex

$$(3-3) \quad w \in s_i \cap (V \setminus U)$$

should satisfy  $\alpha < w$ . Using Step 2, we see that, if there are two such vertices  $w', w''$ , then they should be adjacent in  $E$ . In other words, the set of all vertices  $w$  as in (3-3) should be a clique of  $G$ .  $\square$

Now we explain how to extend a  $k$ -thinness certificate of  $G$  to  $\mathcal{B}(G, U)$ .

**Lemma 13.** *Let  $G, U$  be as in [Definition 11](#). Suppose that, for some integer  $k$ , a partition  $s = (s_1, \dots, s_k)$  and ordering  $<$  certify the  $k$ -thinness of  $G$ , where*

$$(3-4) \quad s_1 = U.$$

*Also, we define  $\sigma_1 = s_1 \cup \{\alpha, \beta\}$  and extend the ordering  $<$  by adding the relations*

$$v < \alpha, v < \beta, \alpha < \beta$$

*for all  $v \in V$ . Then the partition  $s' = (\sigma_1, s_2, \dots, s_k)$  and the extended ordering  $<$  are a  $k$ -thinness certificate of  $\mathcal{B}(G, U)$ .*

*Proof.* In order to apply the definition of the  $k$ -thinness, we take  $u, v, w \in V \cup \{\alpha, \beta\}$  such that  $u < v < w$  and  $u, w$  are adjacent in  $\mathcal{B}(G, U)$ , and

$$(3-5) \quad u, v \text{ belong to the same class of the partition } s'.$$

We need to check that  $v, w$  are adjacent in  $\mathcal{B}(G, U)$ .

Step 1. If  $u, v, w \in V$ , the conclusion follows because the purported certificate of the  $k$ -thinness of  $\mathcal{B}(G, U)$  extends the initial certificate for  $G$ .

Step 2. If exactly one of the vertices  $u, v, w$  is in  $\{\alpha, \beta\}$ , then we assume without loss of generality that  $w = \beta$ . By [Definition 11](#), since  $\beta$  and  $u$  are adjacent, we get  $u \notin U$ , and, according to the condition (3-4), this implies  $u \notin s_1$ . Now we apply (3-5) to get  $v \notin s_1$ , and then we use (3-4) to get  $v \notin U$ , from which, by [Definition 11](#), we get a desired conclusion that  $v$  and  $\beta$  are adjacent in  $\mathcal{B}(G, U)$ .

Step 3. If both  $\alpha, \beta$  appear among  $u, v, w$ , then  $v = \alpha, w = \beta$ . Similarly to Step 2, we get  $u \notin s_1$  and hence  $u \notin \sigma_1$ . Since  $v = \alpha \in \sigma_1$  by the assumptions of the lemma, the condition (3-5) violates, so there is nothing to prove in Step 3.

Since Steps 1, 2, 3 cover all possibilities, the proof is complete. □

### 4. The reduction


The following is the main construction in our reduction.

**Definition 14.** Assume that  $G = (V, E)$  is a simple graph,  $k$  is a positive integer, and  $s = (s_1, \dots, s_k)$  is a partition of  $V$ . We define the graph  $\mathcal{G}(G, k, s)$  as

$$\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{B}(\dots \mathcal{B}(G, s_1), \dots), s_{k-1}), s_k),$$

that is, in other words,  $\mathcal{G}(G, k, s)$  is the  $k$ -fold application of the construction in [Definition 11](#), in which the  $i$ -th application is

$$(4-1) \quad \mathcal{G}_i := \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{G}_{i-1}, s_i),$$



**Figure 2.** An example of a cycle graph  $C$  with vertices  $\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$  and the graph  $\mathcal{G}(C, 2, (\{3, 4\}, \{1, 2\}))$  as in [Definition 14](#).

where  $\mathcal{G}_0 = G$ , and  $\mathcal{G}_{i-1}$  is the graph obtained at the  $(i - 1)$ -st iteration.

For yes-instances of [Problem 6](#), the desired outcome is straightforward.

**Lemma 15.** *If  $(G, k, s)$  is a yes-instance of [Problem 6](#), then  $\mathcal{G}(G, k, s)$  is  $k$ -thin.*

*Proof.* Let  $\alpha_i, \beta_i$  be the vertices added to the graph at the  $i$ -th application of [Definition 11](#). Then, for every  $t \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ , the partition

$$(4-2) \quad (s_1 \cup \{\alpha_1, \beta_1\}, \dots, s_t \cup \{\alpha_t, \beta_t\}, s_{t+1}, \dots, s_k)$$

allows a  $k$ -thinness certificate of  $\mathcal{G}_t$  because, in fact, for  $t = 0$ , this is true as  $(G, k, s)$  is a yes-instance, and, for  $t > 0$ , this follows from [Lemma 13](#) by the induction. In particular, the  $t = k$  version of (4-2) certifies the  $k$ -thinness of  $\mathcal{G}_k = \mathcal{G}(G, k, s)$ .  $\square$

A converse direction of [Lemma 15](#) requires some further work.

**Definition 16.** If  $G_1 = (V_1, E_1)$ ,  $G_2 = (V_2, E_2)$  are simple graphs with  $V_1 \cap V_2 = \emptyset$ , then we define  $G_1 \oplus G_2$  as the graph  $(V_1 \cup V_2, E_1 \cup E_2)$ .

**Definition 17.** If  $s = (s_1, \dots, s_k)$  is a partition of a set  $S$ , and  $P$  is a subset of  $S$ , then the partition  $(s_1 \cap P, \dots, s_k \cap P)$  is called the *restriction* of  $s$  on  $P$ .

**Lemma 18.** *Let  $G^1, \dots, G^{k+1}$  be nonempty simple graphs. We consider the graph*

$$G = G^1 \oplus \dots \oplus G^{k+1}$$

*and a partition  $s = (s_1, \dots, s_k)$  of the vertex set of  $G$ . If, for every  $q \in \{1, \dots, k+1\}$ ,*

(N1) *the graph  $G^q$  is not  $(k - 1)$ -thin,*

(N2) *the triple  $(G^q, k, \psi^q)$  is a no-instance for [Problem 6](#), where  $\psi^q$  is the restriction of  $s$  on the vertex set of  $G^q$ ,*

*then the graph  $\mathcal{G}(G, k, s)$  is not  $k$ -thin.*

*Proof.* We argue by contradiction, so we assume that  $\mathcal{G}(G, k, s)$  is  $k$ -thin. Therefore, some partition  $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k)$  allows a  $k$ -thinness certificate of  $\mathcal{G}(G, k, s)$ , and then, for all  $t \in \{0, \dots, k\}$  and  $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ , we define

$$\sigma_{jt} := \sigma_j \cap V_t,$$

where  $V_t$  is the vertex set of the graph  $\mathcal{G}_t$  as in [Definition 14](#). Since the  $k$ -thinness certificates remain valid at the restrictions to induced subgraphs, the partition

$$(\sigma_{1t}, \dots, \sigma_{kt})$$

certifies the  $k$ -thinness of  $\mathcal{G}_t$ . We recall that  $\mathcal{G}_t = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{G}_{t-1}, s_t)$  by the condition (4-1), and an application of [Lemma 12](#) to this graph  $\mathcal{G}_t$  allows us to find a clique  $\mathcal{C}_t$  in  $\mathcal{G}_{t-1}$  such that the set  $V_t \setminus (s_t \cup \mathcal{C}_t)$  lies in the union of at most  $(k - 1)$  classes in

$(\sigma_{1t}, \dots, \sigma_{kt})$ . A restriction of the latter statement to the vertices of  $G$  gives us a clique  $C_t$  of  $G$  and an index  $r_t$  such that

$$(4-3) \quad V \setminus (s_t \cup C_t) \text{ is a subset of } V \setminus \sigma_{0r_t}$$

for all  $t \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ . Since we had  $G = G^1 \oplus \dots \oplus G^{k+1}$  by the initial assumption, there exists an index  $q \in \{1, \dots, k+1\}$  for which

$$(4-4) \quad G^q \text{ does not intersect } C_1 \cup \dots \cup C_k.$$

Now we take the partition  $\psi^q = (\psi_{q1}, \dots, \psi_{qk})$  as in (N2), that is,  $\psi^q$  is the restriction of  $s$  on the vertex set  $U^q$  of  $G^q$ , which means that we have

$$(4-5) \quad \psi_{qj} = s_j \cap U^q$$

for all  $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ . Also, we define another partition  $\tau = (\tau_1, \dots, \tau_k)$  of  $U^q$  as the restriction of  $\sigma$ , that is, we get

$$(4-6) \quad \tau_j = \sigma_{0j} \cap U^q$$

for all  $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ . Now we use the conditions (4-5) and (4-6) to restrict the formula (4-3) to the set  $U^q$ . In view of (4-4), we get that

$$U^q \setminus \psi_{qt} \text{ is a subset of } U^q \setminus \tau_{r_t}$$

for all  $t \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ , and hence

$$(4-7) \quad \tau_{r_t} \text{ is a subset of } \psi_{qt}$$

for all  $t \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ . If  $t \rightarrow r_t$  is a permutation, then (4-7) implies  $\tau_{r_t} = \psi_{qt}$  for all  $t$ , which shows that  $\tau$  is a permutation of  $\psi^q$ , and hence  $\psi^q$  allows a  $k$ -thinness certificate of  $G^q$ . This contradicts to the condition (N2), and hence, in fact, the mapping  $t \rightarrow r_t$  cannot be injective. Therefore, there exists a label  $h$  such that

$$h = r_{t_1} = r_{t_2} \text{ for some } t_1 \neq t_2,$$

and then  $\tau_h$  is a subset of both  $\psi_{qt_1}$  and  $\psi_{qt_2}$ . Since  $\psi^q$  is a partition, this implies that  $\tau_h$  is an empty set, so the graph  $G^q$  admits a  $k$ -thinness certificate in which the empty set appears in the corresponding partition of the vertices. This means that  $G^q$  is  $(k-1)$ -thin, so we obtain a contradiction to (N1) and complete the proof.  $\square$

We need to generalize the notation from [Definition 16](#).

**Definition 19.** Let  $V_1, V_2$  be disjoint sets. For some  $k$ , let  $s^1 = (s_{11}, \dots, s_{1k})$ ,  $s^2 = (s_{21}, \dots, s_{2k})$  be partitions of  $V_1, V_2$ , respectively. Then we define

$$s^1 \oplus s^2 = (s_{11} \cup s_{21}, \dots, s_{1k} \cup s_{2k}).$$

**Definition 20.** Let  $V_1, V_2$  be disjoint sets, and let  $<_1$  and  $<_2$  be total orderings on  $V_1, V_2$ , respectively. Then a total ordering  $<$  on  $V_1 \cup V_2$  is denoted  $<_1 \oplus <_2$  if

- $<_1$  is contained in  $<$ ,
- $<_2$  is contained in  $<$ ,
- one has  $v_1 < v_2$ , for all  $v_1 \in V_1, v_2 \in V_2$ .

**Observation 21.** Assume  $G_1 = (V_1, E_1), G_2 = (V_2, E_2)$  be simple graphs with disjoint vertex sets. Let  $k$  be an integer, and assume that

- $<_1$  is a total ordering of  $V_1$ ,
- $<_2$  is a total ordering of  $V_2$ ,
- $s^1$  is a partition of  $V_1$  into  $k$  classes,
- $s^2$  is a partition of  $V_2$  into  $k$  classes,

then the following are equivalent:

- $(s^1 \oplus s^2, <_1 \oplus <_2)$  is a  $k$ -thinness certificate of  $G_1 \oplus G_2$ ,
- $(s^i, <_i)$  is a  $k$ -thinness certificate of  $G_i$  with both  $i = 1, 2$ .

Our further arguments require the graph that appears as an iterative application of the construction in [1, Lemma 16] (see also the discussion of [Proposition 4](#) above).

**Definition 22.** We consider the graph  $H_k$  with vertices  $\{\alpha_1, \beta_1, \dots, \alpha_k, \beta_k\}$  in which  $*_i$  and  $\star_j$  are adjacent if and only if  $i \neq j$ , for any  $*, \star$  in  $\{\alpha, \beta\}$ .

**Remark 23.** According to Lemma 16 in [1], the thinness of  $H_k$  equals  $k$ .

**Definition 24.** We write  $(\psi_k, <_k)$  for the  $k$ -thinness certificate of  $H_k$  defined by

- $\psi_k = (\{\alpha_1, \beta_1\}, \dots, \{\alpha_k, \beta_k\})$ ,
- $*_i < \star_j$  if  $i < j$  and  $*, \star \in \{\alpha, \beta\}$ ,
- $\alpha_i < \beta_i$ , for any  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ .

Now we are ready to proceed with the reduction. To this end, we recall that the  $\oplus$  construction is the one introduced in Definitions [16](#) and [19](#) above.

**Definition 25.** Let  $(G, k, s)$  be an instance of [Problem 6](#). We create  $k + 1$  copies each of  $G$  and  $H_k$ , labeling them  $G_1, \dots, G_{k+1}$  and  $H_{k1}, \dots, H_{kk+1}$ , so that the vertex sets of all these copies are pairwise disjoint. We define

$$\bar{G} = (G_1 \oplus H_{k1}) \oplus \dots \oplus (G_{k+1} \oplus H_{kk+1}),$$

and, assuming that  $s_j$  and  $\psi_{kj}$  denote the copies of the corresponding partitions of the vertex sets of  $G$  and  $H_k$ , we take  $\bar{s} = (s_1 \oplus \psi_{k1}) \oplus \dots \oplus (s_{k+1} \oplus \psi_{kk+1})$ , and then we define the graph  $\Gamma(G, k, s) := \mathcal{G}(\bar{G}, k, \bar{s})$ , where  $\mathcal{G}$  stands for the construction in [Definition 14](#).

**Theorem 26.** *An instance  $(G, k, s)$  of Problem 6 is a ‘yes’ if and only if the graph  $\Gamma(G, k, s) = \mathcal{G}(\bar{G}, k, \bar{s})$  is  $k$ -thin.*

*Proof.* If  $(G, k, s)$  is a yes-instance in Problem 6, then  $(\bar{G}, k, \bar{s})$  is also a yes-instance by Observation 21. In this case, the graph  $\Gamma(G, k, s)$  is  $k$ -thin by Lemma 15.

If  $(G, k, s)$  is a no-instance in Problem 6, then we apply Lemma 18 to the graph  $\bar{G}$ . Then the corresponding condition (N1) is true by Remark 23, and we get the validity of (N2) from Observation 21. Therefore, the assertion of Lemma 18 is applicable, and hence the graph  $\Gamma(G, k, s)$  is not  $k$ -thin. □

Theorem 26 gives a polynomial reduction to GRAPH THINNESS from Problem 6, which is known to be NP-complete [1]. This implies Theorem 3.

### 5. Graphs with large thinness

As said above, the notion of thinness is being extensively studied for almost two decades, but there are still many open questions on the behavior of this function and its relations to other graph invariants [1; 2; 5; 6; 13; 14]. One particular natural problem concerns the largest value of the thinness of an  $n$ -vertex graph.

**Problem 27** (Section 5 in [5]). *Is there an  $n$ -vertex graph  $G$  with thinness  $> n/2$ ?*

This section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 5, which gives an affirmative solution to Problem 27, and, in fact, this theorem determines the largest value of the thinness in the asymptotic sense. As we will see, our proof is probabilistic.

**Definition 28.** A graph  $G = (V, E)$  with  $|V| = 3m$  is called  $m$ -obstructive if one can enumerate its vertices as  $(u_1, \dots, u_m, v_1, \dots, v_m, w_1, \dots, w_m)$  so that, for every  $i$  and  $j$  in  $\{1, \dots, m\}$ , one has either  $\{u_i, w_j\} \notin E$  or  $\{v_i, w_j\} \in E$ .

**Lemma 29.** *If  $m, n$  are positive integers with  $m > 11 \ln n$ , then there exists a graph with  $n$  vertices which has no  $m$ -obstructive induced subgraphs.*

*Proof.* We consider the random graph  $G = (V, E)$  with  $|V| = n$  such that the edges of  $G$  appear independently with probability  $1/2$  each. For every fixed nonrepeating sequence  $\alpha = (u_1, \dots, u_m, v_1, \dots, v_m, w_1, \dots, w_m)$  of vertices in  $V$ , the probability that  $\alpha$  certifies the  $m$ -obstruction is  $(3/4)^{m^2}$  because there are  $m^2$  independent choices of  $(i, j)$  as in Definition 28, and each of the corresponding events  $\{u_i, w_j\} \notin E$  or  $\{v_i, w_j\} \in E$  happens with probability  $1/2$  (which implies that their union occurs with probability  $3/4$  by the independence). Since there are a total of at most  $n^{3m}$  ways to choose  $\alpha$ , the expected total number of all those choices of  $\alpha$  which give the  $m$ -obstruction certificates is at most

$$n^{3m} \cdot \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^{m^2} = \exp\left(3m \ln n - m^2 \ln \frac{4}{3}\right) < 1,$$

and hence some choices of  $G$  do not admit  $m$ -obstructions at all. □

Now we are ready to complete the proof of [Theorem 5](#).

**Theorem 30.** *For any positive integer  $n$ , there exists a graph with  $n$  vertices whose thinness is at least  $n - 72 \ln n$ .*

*Proof.* Using [Lemma 29](#), we take a graph  $G = (V, E)$  with  $|V| = n$  such that

$$(5-1) \quad G \text{ has no induced } m\text{-obstructive subgraphs with any } m > 11 \ln n.$$

We are going to complete the proof by showing that the thinness of  $G$  is at least  $n - 72 \ln n$  as desired. If this was not the case, there would exist an ordering  $(V, <)$  and a partition of  $V$  into at most  $n - 72 \ln n$  classes as in the definition of the thinness, and then, for some integer  $c$  satisfying

$$(5-2) \quad c \geq 72 \ln n / 3 = 24 \ln n,$$

we should be able to find  $c$  disjoint pairs in each of which both vertices are in the same class (the bound [\(5-2\)](#) follows because the worst case scenario is when every class has either 1 or 3 vertices). We enumerate these pairs as follows:

$$(u_1, v_1), \dots, (u_c, v_c) \text{ with } v_1 < v_2 < \dots < v_c \text{ and } u_i < v_i \text{ for all } i.$$

By the thinness, for any  $i \in \{1, \dots, c\}$ , it never occurs that

$$(5-3) \quad (\{u_i, x\} \in E) \text{ AND } (\{v_i, x\} \notin E) \text{ with } x \in \{v_{i+1}, \dots, v_c\}.$$

Now we define  $m = \lfloor c/2 \rfloor$  and note that the sequence

$$\alpha = (u_1, \dots, u_m, v_1, \dots, v_m, v_{m+1}, \dots, v_{2m})$$

induces an  $m$ -obstruction because the condition [\(5-3\)](#) never occurs. By [\(5-1\)](#), we get  $m \leq 11 \ln n$  and hence  $c \leq 22 \ln n + 1$ . A comparison to [\(5-2\)](#) implies  $24 \ln n \leq 22 \ln n + 1$ , which is a contradiction unless  $n = 1$ .  $\square$

In other words, our result proves  $\theta(n) > n - 72 \ln n$  whenever  $\theta(n)$  is the largest possible thinness of any graph with  $n$  vertices. A review report suggests a modification of our argument that implies  $\theta(n) > n - 48 \ln n$ , and, although our research does not immediately lead to any bound stronger than  $\theta(n) > n - O(\ln n)$ , a more detailed analysis can lead to further minor improvements in the coefficient of  $\ln n$ .

### Acknowledgement

I thank the reviewers for helpful comments.

## References

- [1] F. Bonomo and D. de Estrada, “On the thinness and proper thinness of a graph”, *Discrete Appl. Math.* **261** (2019), 78–92. [MR](#)
- [2] F. Bonomo-Braberman and G. A. Brito, “Intersection models and forbidden pattern characterizations for 2-thin and proper 2-thin graphs”, *Discrete Appl. Math.* **339** (2023), 53–77. [MR](#)
- [3] F. Bonomo-Braberman, F. S. Oliveira, M. S. Sampaio, Jr., and J. L. Szwarcfiter, “Reconhecimento de grafos fino [sic] de precedência”, in *Anais do III Encontro de Teoria da Computação*, SBC, 2019.
- [4] F. Bonomo-Braberman, F. S. Oliveira, M. S. Sampaio, Jr., and J. L. Szwarcfiter, “A complexidade do reconhecimento de grafos k-fino próprio de precedência”, in *Anais do V Encontro de Teoria da Computação*, SBC, 2020.
- [5] F. Bonomo-Braberman, C. L. Gonzalez, F. S. Oliveira, M. S. Sampaio, Jr., and J. L. Szwarcfiter, “Thinness of product graphs”, *Discrete Appl. Math.* **312** (2022), 52–71. [MR](#)
- [6] F. Bonomo-Braberman, F. S. Oliveira, M. S. Sampaio, Jr., and J. L. Szwarcfiter, “Precedence thinness in graphs”, *Discrete Appl. Math.* **323** (2022), 76–95. [MR](#)
- [7] F. Bonomo, S. Mattia, and G. Oriolo, “Bounded coloring of co-comparability graphs and the pickup and delivery tour combination problem”, *Theoret. Comput. Sci.* **412**:45 (2011), 6261–6268. [MR](#)
- [8] K. S. Booth and G. S. Lueker, “Testing for the consecutive ones property, interval graphs, and graph planarity using PQ-tree algorithms”, *J. Comput. System Sci.* **13**:3 (1976), 335–379. [MR](#)
- [9] G. A. Brito, *Sobre la thinness en un grafo*, Ph.D. thesis, Universidad de Buenos Aires, 2020.
- [10] D. de Estrada, *On the thinness and proper thinness of a graph*, Ph.D. thesis, Universidad de Buenos Aires, 2020.
- [11] U. I. Gupta, D. T. Lee, and J. Y.-T. Leung, “Efficient algorithms for interval graphs and circular-arc graphs”, *Networks* **12**:4 (1982), 459–467. [MR](#)
- [12] J. Y. Hsiao, C. Y. Tang, and R. S. Chang, “An efficient algorithm for finding a maximum weight 2-independent set on interval graphs”, *Inform. Process. Lett.* **43**:5 (1992), 229–235. [MR](#)
- [13] C. Mannino and G. Oriolo, “Solving stability problems on a superclass of interval graphs”, technical report 511, Centro Vito Volterra, 2002.
- [14] C. Mannino, G. Oriolo, F. Ricci, and S. Chandran, “The stable set problem and the thinness of a graph”, *Oper. Res. Lett.* **35**:1 (2007), 1–9. [MR](#)
- [15] M. S. Sampaio, Jr., F. S. Oliveira, and J. L. Szwarcfiter, “Sobre finura própria de grafos”, in *Anais do III Encontro de Teoria da Computação*, SBC, 2018.

Received February 5, 2025. Revised August 18, 2025.

YAROSLAV SHITOV  
MOSCOW, RUSSIA  
[yaroslav-shitov@yandex.ru](mailto:yaroslav-shitov@yandex.ru)

# PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

Founded in 1951 by E. F. Beckenbach (1906–1982) and F. Wolf (1904–1989)

[msp.org/pjm](http://msp.org/pjm)

## EDITORS

Don Blasius (Managing Editor)  
Department of Mathematics  
University of California  
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1555  
[blasius@math.ucla.edu](mailto:blasius@math.ucla.edu)

Matthias Aschenbrenner  
Fakultät für Mathematik  
Universität Wien  
Vienna, Austria  
[matthias.aschenbrenner@univie.ac.at](mailto:matthias.aschenbrenner@univie.ac.at)

Vyjayanthi Chari  
Department of Mathematics  
University of California  
Riverside, CA 92521-0135  
[chari@math.ucr.edu](mailto:chari@math.ucr.edu)

Atsushi Ichino  
Department of Mathematics  
Kyoto University  
Riverside, CA 92521-0135  
[atsushi.ichino@gmail.com](mailto:atsushi.ichino@gmail.com)

Robert Lipshitz  
Department of Mathematics  
University of Oregon  
Eugene, OR 97403  
[lipshitz@uoregon.edu](mailto:lipshitz@uoregon.edu)

Kefeng Liu  
School of Sciences  
Chongqing University of Technology  
Chongqing 400054, China  
[liu@math.ucla.edu](mailto:liu@math.ucla.edu)

Sucharit Sarkar  
Department of Mathematics  
University of California  
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1555  
[sucharit@math.ucla.edu](mailto:sucharit@math.ucla.edu)

Dimitri Shlyakhtenko  
Department of Mathematics  
University of California  
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1555  
[shlyakht@ipam.ucla.edu](mailto:shlyakht@ipam.ucla.edu)

Ruixiang Zhang  
Department of Mathematics  
University of California  
Berkeley, CA 94720-3840  
[ruixiang@berkeley.edu](mailto:ruixiang@berkeley.edu)

## PRODUCTION

Silvio Levy, Scientific Editor, [production@msp.org](mailto:production@msp.org)

---

See inside back cover or [msp.org/pjm](http://msp.org/pjm) for submission instructions.

---

The subscription price for 2025 is US \$677/year for the electronic version, and \$917/year for print and electronic. Subscriptions, requests for back issues and changes of subscriber address should be sent to Pacific Journal of Mathematics, P.O. Box 4163, Berkeley, CA 94704-0163, U.S.A. The Pacific Journal of Mathematics is indexed by *Mathematical Reviews*, *Zentralblatt MATH*, PASCAL CNRS Index, *Referativnyi Zhurnal*, *Current Mathematical Publications* and *Web of Knowledge (Science Citation Index)*.


---

The Pacific Journal of Mathematics (ISSN 1945-5844 electronic, 0030-8730 printed) at the University of California, c/o Department of Mathematics, 798 Evans Hall #3840, Berkeley, CA 94720-3840, is published twelve times a year. Periodical rate postage paid at Berkeley, CA 94704, and additional mailing offices. POSTMASTER: send address changes to Pacific Journal of Mathematics, P.O. Box 4163, Berkeley, CA 94704-0163.

---

PJM peer review and production are managed by EditFLOW® from Mathematical Sciences Publishers.

PUBLISHED BY

 **mathematical sciences publishers**  
nonprofit scientific publishing

<http://msp.org/>

© 2025 Mathematical Sciences Publishers

# PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

Volume 339    No. 2    December 2025

---

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Starting the study of outer length billiards  | 201 |
| LUCA BARACCO, OLGA BERNARDI and CORENTIN FIEROBE  |     |
| Mori dream spaces and $\mathbb{Q}$ -homology quadrics   | 223 |
| PAOLO CASCINI, FABRIZIO CATANESE, YIFAN CHEN and<br>JONGHAE KEUM                              |     |
| Five-dimensional minimal quadratic and bilinear forms over function fields of conics          | 243 |
| ADAM CHAPMAN and AHMED LAGHRIBI   |     |
| The Manakov equation of mixed type and its matrix generalization                              | 265 |
| QING DING, CHAOHAO YE and SHIPING ZHONG   |     |
| Mapping classes fixing an isotropic homology class of minimal genus 0 in rational 4-manifolds | 283 |
| SERAPHINA EUN BI LEE  |     |
| Lower bounds for fractional Orlicz-type eigenvalues   | 309 |
| ARIEL SALORT  |     |
| Graph thinness: a lower bound and complexity  | 333 |
| YAROSLAV SHITOV   |     |
| Classifying preaisles of derived categories of complete intersections                         | 345 |
| RYO TAKAHASHI   |     |