

Tournament transitivity of graphs

Kamal Santra*

Abstract

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph where V and E are the vertex and edge sets, respectively. For two disjoint subsets A and B of V , we say A *dominates* B if every vertex of B is adjacent to at least one vertex of A in G . A vertex partition $\pi = \{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_k\}$ of G is called a *transitive partition* of size k if V_i dominates V_j for all $1 \leq i < j \leq k$. A vertex partition $\pi = \{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_k\}$ of G is called a *tournament transitive partition* of size k if V_i dominates V_j for all $1 \leq i < j \leq k$ and V_j does not dominate V_i for $i < j$. The maximum integer k for which the above partition exists is called *tournament transitivity* of G , and it is denoted by $TTr(G)$. The MAXIMUM TOURNAMENT TRANSITIVITY PROBLEM is to find a tournament transitive partition of a given graph with the maximum number of parts. In this article, we study this variation of transitive partition from a structure and algorithmic point of view. We show that the decision version of this problem is NP-complete for chordal graphs (connected), perfect elimination bipartite graphs (disconnected) and doubly chordal graphs (disconnected). On the positive side, we prove that this problem can be solved in polynomial time for trees. Furthermore, we characterize Type-I BCG with equal transitivity and tournament transitivity and find some sufficient conditions under which the above two parameters are equal for a Type-II BCG. Finally, we show that for Type-III BCG, these two parameters are never equal.

Keywords. Tournament transitivity, NP-completeness, chordal graphs, Polynomial-time algorithm, trees, bipartite chain graphs.

1 Introduction

Partitioning a graph is one of the fundamental problems in graph theory. In the partitioning problem, the objective is to partition the vertex set (or edge set) into some parts with desired properties, such as independence, minimal edges across partite sets, etc. In literature, partitioning the vertex set into certain parts so that the partite sets follow particular domination relations among themselves has been studied [2, 7, 9, 10, 11, 15, 16, 18]. Let G be a graph with $V(G)$ as its vertex set and $E(G)$ as its edge set. When the context is clear, V and E are used instead of $V(G)$ and $E(G)$. The *neighbourhood* of a vertex $v \in V$ in a graph $G = (V, E)$ is the set of all adjacent vertices of v and is denoted by $N_G(v)$. The *degree* of a vertex v in G , denoted as $\deg_G(v)$, is the number of edges incident to v . A vertex v is said to *dominate* itself and all its neighbouring vertices. A *dominating set* of $G = (V, E)$ is a subset of vertices D such that every vertex $x \in V \setminus D$ has a neighbour $y \in D$, that is, x is dominated by some vertex y of D . For two disjoint subsets A and B of V , we say A *dominates* B if every vertex of B is adjacent to at least one vertex of A .

There has been a lot of research on graph partitioning problems based on a domination relationship between the different sets. Cockayne and Hedetniemi introduced the concept of *domatic partition* of a graph $G = (V, E)$ in 1977, in which the vertex set is partitioned into k parts, say $\pi = \{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_k\}$, such that each V_i is a dominating set of G [4]. The number representing the highest possible order of a domatic partition is called the *domatic number* of G , denoted by $d(G)$. Another similar type of partitioning problem is the *Grundy partition*. Christen and Selkow introduced a Grundy partition of a graph $G = (V, E)$ in 1979 [3]. In the Grundy partitioning problem, the vertex set is partitioned into k parts, say $\pi = \{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_k\}$, such that each V_i is an independent set and for all $1 \leq i < j \leq k$, V_i dominates V_j . The maximum order of such a partition is called the *Grundy number* of G , denoted by $\Gamma(G)$. In 2018, J. T. Hedetniemi and S. T. Hedetniemi [11] introduced a transitive partition as a generalization of the Grundy partition. A *transitive partition* of size k is defined as a partition of the vertex set into k parts, say $\pi = \{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_k\}$, such that for all $1 \leq i < j \leq k$, V_i dominates V_j . The maximum order of such a transitive partition is called the *transitivity* of G and is denoted by $Tr(G)$. Recently, in 2020, Haynes et al. generalized the idea of domatic partition as well as transitive partition

*Department of Mathematics, IIT Patna, India, email: kamal.1821ma04@iitp.ac.in, kamal.7.2013@gmail.com

and introduced the concept of *upper domatic partition* of a graph G , where the vertex set is partitioned into k parts, say $\pi = \{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_k\}$, such that for each i, j , with $1 \leq i < j \leq k$, either V_i dominates V_j or V_j dominates V_i or both [10]. The maximum order of such an upper domatic partition is called the *upper domatic number* of G , denoted by $D(G)$. All these problems, domatic number [2, 20, 21], Grundy number [5, 7, 12, 18, 19], transitivity [9, 11, 15, 16], upper domatic number [10, 17] have been extensively studied both from an algorithmic and structural point of view.

The concept of *tournament transitive partition* was introduced by Haynes et al. in 2019 [9] as an open problem. So far, no research has been done on this variation of transitivity. In this article, we study this variation of the transitivity problem from a structural and algorithmic point of view. For two disjoint subsets A and B , we say A *dominates* B if every vertex of B is adjacent to at least one vertex of A . A vertex partition $\pi = \{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_k\}$ of G is called a *tournament transitive partition* of size k if V_i dominates V_j and V_j does not dominate V_i for all $1 \leq i < j \leq k$. The maximum integer k for which the above partition exists is called *tournament transitivity* of G , and it is denoted by $TTr(G)$. A tournament transitive partition of order $TTr(G)$ is called a $TTr(G)$ -*partition*. The MAXIMUM TOURNAMENT TRANSITIVITY PROBLEM is to find a tournament transitive partition of a given graph with the maximum number of parts. Note that every tournament transitive partition is also a transitive partition. Therefore, for any graph G , $1 \leq TTr(G) \leq Tr(G) \leq n$. The MAXIMUM TOURNAMENT TRANSITIVITY PROBLEM and its corresponding decision version are defined as follows.

MAXIMUM TOURNAMENT TRANSITIVITY PROBLEM(MTTP)
Instance: A graph $G = (V, E)$
Solution: A tournament transitive partition of G with maximum size

MAXIMUM TOURNAMENT TRANSITIVITY DECISION PROBLEM(MTTDP)
Instance: A graph $G = (V, E)$, integer k
Question: Does G have a tournament transitive partition of order at least k ?

Note that the only tournament transitive partition for the graph K_n is $\{V\{K_n\}\}$. But on the other hand, according to [11], we know that $Tr(K_n) = n$. This distinction motivates us to investigate this new parameter. The other similarities and differences can be found in the properties of tournament transitivity section. The rest of the paper is organized as follows: Section 2 contains basic definitions and notations that are followed throughout the article. This section also discusses the properties of tournament transitivity of graphs. Section 3 shows that the MTTDP is NP-complete in chordal graphs (Connected), perfect elimination bipartite graphs (disconnected) and doubly chordal graphs (disconnected). In Section 4, we design a polynomial-time algorithm for solving MTTP in trees. Finally, Section 5 concludes the article.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Notation and definition

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph with V and E as its vertex and edge sets, respectively. A graph $H = (V', E')$ is said to be a *subgraph* of a graph $G = (V, E)$ if and only if $V' \subseteq V$ and $E' \subseteq E$. For a subset $S \subseteq V$, the *induced subgraph* on S of G is defined as the subgraph of G whose vertex set is S and edge set consists of all of the edges in E that have both endpoints in S , and it is denoted by $G[S]$. The *complement* of a graph $G = (V, E)$ is the graph $\bar{G} = (\bar{V}, \bar{E})$, such that $\bar{V} = V$ and $\bar{E} = \{uv | uv \notin E \text{ and } u \neq v\}$. The *open neighbourhood* of a vertex $x \in V$ is the set of vertices y adjacent to x , denoted by $N_G(x)$. The *closed neighborhood* of a vertex $x \in V$, denoted as $N_G[x]$, is defined by $N_G[x] = N_G(x) \cup \{x\}$. Let $S \subseteq V$, then we define $N_G(S) = \bigcup_{x \in S} N_G(x)$.

A subset of $S \subseteq V$ is said to be an *independent set* of G if every pair of vertices in S are non-adjacent. A subset of $K \subseteq V$ is said to be a *clique* of G if every pair of vertices in K are adjacent. The cardinality of a clique of maximum size is called *clique number* of G , and it is denoted by $\omega(G)$. A *path* of length $k - 1$ in a graph $G = (V, E)$, denoted by P_k , is a sequence of distinct vertices v_1, \dots, v_k such that $v_{i-1}v_i \in E$ for $2 \leq i \leq k$. Vertices v_1 and v_k are called the *end vertices* of P_k . For any two vertices y, z , we denoted a path starting with y and ending at z by yPz .

A graph is called *bipartite* if its vertex set can be partitioned into two independent sets. A *star* S_t is the complete bipartite graph $K_{1,t}$. An edge uv in a bipartite graph G is called *bisimplicial* if $N(u) \cup N(v)$ induces a biclique in G . For an edge ordering (e_1, e_2, \dots, e_k) , let S_i be the set of endpoints of $\{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_i\}$ and $S_0 = \emptyset$. An ordering (e_1, e_2, \dots, e_k) is a perfect edge elimination ordering for a bipartite graph $G = (V, E)$ if $G[V \setminus S_k]$ has no edges and each edge e_i is a bisimplicial edge in $G[V \setminus S_{i-1}]$. A graph G is a perfect elimination bipartite if and only if it admits a perfect edge elimination ordering [8].

A bipartite graph $G = (X \cup Y, E)$ is called a *bipartite chain graph* if there exists an ordering of vertices of X and Y , say $\sigma_X = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n_1})$ and $\sigma_Y = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_{n_2})$, such that $N(x_{n_1}) \subseteq N(x_{n_1-1}) \subseteq \dots \subseteq N(x_2) \subseteq N(x_1)$ and $N(y_{n_2}) \subseteq N(y_{n_2-1}) \subseteq \dots \subseteq N(y_2) \subseteq N(y_1)$. Such ordering of X and Y is called a *chain ordering*, and it can be computed in linear time [14]. Let G be a bipartite chain graph but not a complete bipartite graph. Also, let $\sigma_X = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n_1})$ and $\sigma_Y = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_{n_2})$ be the chain ordering of G and t be the maximum integer such that G contains a $K_{t,t}$ as an induced subgraph. A bipartite chain graph G is called (i) Type-I BCG if $x_{t+1}y_t \notin E(G)$ and $x_t y_{t+1} \notin E(G)$, (ii) Type-II BCG if either $x_{t+1}y_t \in E(G)$ or $x_t y_{t+1} \in E(G)$ not both, (iii) Type-III BCG if $x_{t+1}y_t \in E(G)$ and $x_t y_{t+1} \in E(G)$.

An edge between two non-consecutive vertices of a cycle is called a *chord*. If every cycle in G of length at least four has a chord, then G is called a *chordal graph*. A vertex $v \in V$ is called a *simplicial vertex* of G if $N_G[v]$ induces a clique in G . A *perfect elimination ordering (PEO)* of G is an ordering of the vertices, say $\sigma = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n)$, such that v_i is a simplicial vertex of $G_i = G[\{v_i, v_{i+1}, \dots, v_n\}]$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. Chordal graphs can be characterized by the existence of PEO; that is, a graph G is chordal if and only if G has a PEO [6]. A vertex $u \in N_G[v]$ is called a *maximum neighbour* of v in G if $N_G[w] \subseteq N_G[u]$ for every vertex $w \in N_G[v]$. A vertex v in G is called *doubly simplicial* if it is simplicial and has a maximum neighbour in G . An ordering $\delta = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n)$ of vertices of G is called a *doubly perfect elimination ordering (DPEO)* if v_i is a doubly simplicial vertex in $G_i = G[\{v_i, v_{i+1}, \dots, v_n\}]$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. A graph is doubly chordal if it admits a doubly perfect elimination ordering [1].

2.2 Properties of tournament transitivity

In this subsection, we present some properties of tournament transitivity that motivate us to study this variation of transitivity. First, we show the following bounds for tournament transitivity.

Proposition 1. *For any graph G , $TTr(G) \leq \min\{Tr(G), Tr(\overline{G})\}$.*

Proof. Let $\pi = \{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_k\}$ be a TTr -partition of G . By the definition of tournament transitive partition, π is also a transitive partition of G . Thus, we can say that $TTr(G) \leq Tr(G)$. Now we show that π is also a transitive partition of \overline{G} . Since π is a tournament transitive partition, for $i < j$, V_i dominates V_j and V_j does not dominate V_i . Therefore, there exists a vertex $x \in V_i$ such that $xy \notin E(G)$ for all $y \in V_j$, and hence V_i dominates V_j in \overline{G} . Thus, π is also a transitive partition of \overline{G} . Therefore, $TTr(G) \leq Tr(\overline{G})$. Hence, for any graph G , $TTr(G) \leq \min\{Tr(G), Tr(\overline{G})\}$. \square

Next, we present two upper bounds: one in terms of the maximum and minimum degrees of a graph and the other in terms of the number of vertices.

Proposition 2. *For any graph G , $TTr(G) \leq \min\{\Delta(G) + 1, n - \delta(G)\}$, where n is the number of vertex and $\Delta(G), \delta(G)$ are maximum and minimum degree of G , respectively.*

Proof. From [9], we know that $Tr(G) \leq \Delta(G) + 1$, for any graph G . Also, from the Proposition 1, we have $TTr(G) \leq \min\{Tr(G), Tr(\overline{G})\}$. Therefore, $TTr(G) \leq \min\{\Delta(G) + 1, \Delta(\overline{G}) + 1\} = \min\{\Delta(G) + 1, n - \delta(G)\}$. \square

Proposition 3. *For any graph G , $1 \leq TTr(G) \leq \lfloor \frac{n+1}{2} \rfloor$, where n is the number of vertex of G .*

Proof. Taking all vertices in one set will produce a tournament transitive partition of size 1. So, $TTr(G) \geq 1$. Now, let $\pi = \{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_k\}$ be a TTr -partition of G . Consider $x \in V_k$. As π V_i dominates V_k in G for all $1 \leq i < k$, $deg_G(x) \geq k - 1$. Also, we know that V_k does not dominate V_j for all $1 \leq j < k$. Therefore, $deg_{\overline{G}}(x) \geq k - 1$. So, $deg_G(x) + deg_{\overline{G}}(x) \geq 2k - 1$, which implies $n - 1 \geq deg_G(x) + deg_{\overline{G}}(x) \geq 2k - 1$. Hence, $k = TTr(G) \leq \lfloor \frac{n+1}{2} \rfloor$. \square

Similarly, as transitivity, if we union any two sets of a tournament transitive partition of order k , we create a tournament transitive partition of order $k - 1$. Hence, we have a similar proposition as transitivity.

Proposition 4. If $\pi = \{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_k\}$ is a tournament transitive partition of a graph G , then for any two sets V_i and V_j in π , where $i < j$, the partition $\pi = \{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_{i-1}, V_i \cup V_j, V_{i+1}, \dots, V_{j-1}, V_{j+1}, \dots, V_k\}$ is a tournament transitive partition.

Given this, we have the following interpolation result.

Proposition 5. Let G be a graph and k be the order of a tournament transitive partition of G , then for every j , $1 \leq j \leq k$, G has a tournament transitive partition of order j .

Proposition 6. Let G be a connected graph and $TTr(G) = k$, $k \geq 3$. Then there exists a tournament transitive partition of G of size k , say $\pi = \{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_k\}$ of G , such that $|V_k| = 1$, $|V_{k-1}| = 2$. Moreover, $V_{k-1} = \{x, y\}$ and $V_k = \{z\}$ such that $xz \in E(G)$ and $yz \notin E(G)$.

Next, we find the tournament transitivity of complete graphs, paths, cycles and complete bipartite graphs.

Proposition 7. For the complete graph K_n of n vertices $TTr(K_n) = 1$.

Proof. The partition $\{V(K_n)\}$ is a tournament transitive partition of K_n of size 1. Moreover, from the Proposition 2, we have $TTr(G) \leq \min\{\Delta(K_n) + 1, n - \delta(K_n)\} = \min\{n, 1\} = 1$. Therefore, $TTr(K_n) = 1$. \square

Proposition 8. Let P_n be a path of n vertices, and then the tournament transitivity of P_n is given as follows:

$$TTr(P_n) = \begin{cases} 1 & n = 1, 2 \\ 2 & n = 3, 4 \\ 3 & n \geq 5 \end{cases}$$

Proof. For $n = 1, 2$, as P_1 and P_2 are K_1 and K_2 , respectively, from the Proposition 7, we have $TTr(P_n) = 1$ for $n = 1, 2$. Let us consider $n = 3, 4$. According to Proposition 3, we have $TTr(P_n) \leq 2$. Also, from the Figure 1, it is clear that $TTr(P_n) \geq 2$. Hence, $TTr(P_n) = 2$ for $n = 3, 4$.




Figure 1: Tournament transitive partition of P_n , $n \geq 3$

Assume $n = 5$. We show that $TTr(P_5) = 3$. From the Proposition 1, we have $TTr(P_5) \leq 3$. Let $\{v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4, v_5\}$ be the vertices of P_5 , where v_1, v_5 are its end vertices. Consider a vertex partition $\pi = \{V_1, V_2, V_3\}$ as follows: $V_1 = \{v_2, v_5\}$, $V_2 = \{v_1, v_3\}$, and $V_3 = \{v_4\}$ (see Figure 1). We show that π is a tournament transitive partition. Clearly, V_i dominates V_j , and V_j does not dominate V_i , for all $1 \leq i < j \leq 3$. Therefore, $TTr(P_5) = 3$. Finally, consider $n > 5$. Also, let $\{v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4, v_5, v_6, \dots, v_n\}$ be the path P_n . Consider a vertex partition $\pi = \{V_1, V_2, V_3\}$ as follows: $\{v_2, v_5\} \subseteq V_1$, $V_2 = \{v_1, v_3\}$, and $V_3 = \{v_4\}$ and all the other vertices in V_1 (see Figure 1). Similarly, we can show that $TTr(P_n) = 3$ for all $n > 5$. Hence, we have $TTr(P_n) = 3$, $n \geq 5$. \square

Proposition 9. Let C_n be a path of n vertices, and then the tournament transitivity of P_n is given as follows:

$$TTr(C_n) = \begin{cases} 1 & n = 3 \\ 2 & n = 4, 5 \\ 3 & n \geq 6 \end{cases}$$

Proof. Note that $TTr(C_n) \leq 3$, for all $n \geq 3$. We show that $TTr(C_5) = 2$; for the other cases, we can easily prove the statements. If possible, assume $TTr(C_5) = 3$ and $\{V_1, V_2, V_3\}$ be a tournament transitive partition of C_5 . Also, assume $C_5 = \{v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4, v_5\}$. Without loss of generality, assume $v_1 \in V_3$. As V_2, V_2 dominate V_3 , each of V_1, V_2 contains exactly one vertex from $\{v_2, v_5\}$. Again, V_3 does not dominate V_1, V_2 ; there exists a vertex from $\{v_3, v_4\}$ that must be in V_2 , and a vertex from $\{v_3, v_4\}$ must be in V_1 . In this situation, V_1 dominates V_2 , and V_2 dominates V_1 , a contradiction as π is a tournament transitive partition. Hence, $TTr(C_5) = 2$. \square

Proposition 10. For a complete bipartite graph $K_{m,n}$ with $m+n$ vertices $TTr(K_{m,n}) = 1$ if and only if $m = n = 1$.

Proof. First, we show that $TTr(K_{m,n}) = 2$ if either $m \neq 1$ or $n \neq 1$. Let the vertex set of $K_{m,n}$ be $V = X \cup Y$ such that $|X| = m, |Y| = n$ and $m \geq 2$. Consider a vertex partition $\pi = \{V_1, V_2\}$, where $V_1 = (X \setminus \{x\}) \cup Y, V_2 = \{x\}$ for some $x \in X$. Since $m \geq 2$, π is a tournament transitive partition of $K_{m,n}$ and hence $TTr(K_{m,n}) \geq 2$. To prove $TTr(K_{m,n}) = 2$, we show that $TTr(K_{m,n})$ cannot be more than 2. If possible, let $TTr(K_{m,n}) = k \geq 3$ and $\pi = \{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_k\}$ be a tournament transitive partition of $K_{m,n}$ of size k . We show that V_i , for $3 \leq i \leq k$, cannot contain any vertex from X or Y . If V_i contains a vertex, say x , from X , there must exist $y_1 \in V_1$ and $y_2 \in V_2$ such that $xy_1, xy_2 \in E(G)$. As G is a complete bipartite graph and V_i does not dominate V_1 and V_2 , there must be $x_1 \in V_1$ and $x_2 \in V_2$. So, V_1 and V_2 contains vertices from X and Y and hence V_1 dominates V_2 and V_2 dominates V_1 , which is a contradiction as π is a tournament transitive partition of $K_{m,n}$. On the other hand, assume V_i contains a vertex, say y from Y . Similarly, we can show a contradiction. Therefore, $TTr(K_{m,n}) = 2$, when $m \geq 2$. With similar arguments, we can show that $TTr(K_{m,n}) = 2$, when $n \geq 2$. Hence, $TTr(K_{m,n}) = 1$, if $m = 1$ and $n = 1$.

For the converse part, assume $m = 1$ and $n = 1$. Clearly, $K_{m,n}$ is a P_2 and from Proposition 7, we have $TTr(K_{m,n}) = 1$. \square

For the transitivity, if H is a subgraph of G , then $Tr(H) \leq Tr(G)$ [11]. But for tournament transitivity, this is not true. For example, let us consider $G = C_5$ and $H = P_5$. Clearly, H is a subgraph of G , and $TTr(C_5) = 2$ (by Proposition 9), $TTr(P_5) = 3$ (by Proposition 8). Another example is $G = K_4$ and $H = C_4$, where $TTr(K_4) = 1$ and $TTr(C_4) = 2$.

In the above examples, neither of the subgraphs is an induced one. However, the subgraph containment relation holds for tournament transitive partition if we consider an induced subgraph instead of a subgraph.

Proposition 11. If H is an induced subgraph of a graph G , then $TTr(H) \leq TTr(G)$.

Proof. Let $\pi = \{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_k\}$ be a TTr -transitive partition of H . Consider $\pi' = \{V'_1, V'_2, \dots, V'_k\}$ a vertex partition of G such that $V'_1 = (V(G) \setminus V(H)) \cup V_1$ and $V'_p = V_p$ for all $2 \leq p \leq k$. As H is an induced subgraph, V'_i dominates V'_j , but V'_j does not dominate V'_i in π' . So, π' is a tournament transitive partition of size k . Therefore, $k = TTr(H) \leq TTr(G)$. \square

For the case of transitivity, if G is a disconnected graph with connected component C_1, C_2, \dots, C_t , then $Tr(G) = \max\{Tr(C_i) | 1 \leq i \leq k\}$ [9]. But we show that for tournament transitivity, $TTr(G) \geq \max\{TTr(C_i) | 1 \leq i \leq k\}$ and the difference $TTr(G) - \max\{TTr(C_i) | 1 \leq i \leq k\}$ can be arbitrarily large. First, we prove that if G is a disjoint union of t ($\leq n$) number of complete graphs of n vertices, then $TTr(G) = t$.

Lemma 12. Let G be the disjoint union of t ($\leq n$) number of a complete graph of n vertices. Then $TTr(G) = t$.

Proof. Let $G = K_n \cup K_n \cup \dots \cup K_n$ (t times). Let $\pi^j = \{V_1^j, V_2^j, \dots, V_t^j, V_{t+1}^j, \dots, V_n^j\}$ be a transitive partition of size n of the j -th component of G , and also we denote the j -th component of G as K_n^j . Let us consider $\pi = \{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_t\}$ be a vertex partition of G of size t as follows:

$$V_1 = \left(\bigcup_{j=1}^t (V_{t+1}^j \cup V_{t+2}^j \cup \dots \cup V_n^j) \right) \cup (V_1^1 \cup V_1^2 \cup \dots \cup V_1^{t-1} \cup (V_1^t \cup V_2^t \cup \dots \cup V_t^t)),$$

$$V_j = (V_j^1 \cup V_j^2 \cup \dots \cup V_j^{t-j} \cup (V_j^{t-j+1} \cup V_{j+1}^{t-j+1} \cup \dots \cup V_t^{t-j+1}))$$

for all $2 \leq j \leq t$ (See Figure 2 for reference).

Now we show that π is a tournament transitive partition of size t . Let us consider V_i and V_j , for $i < j$. Clearly, $V_i \supseteq (V_i^1 \cup V_i^2 \cup \dots \cup V_i^{t-i} \cup (V_i^{t-i+1} \cup V_{i+1}^{t-i+1} \cup \dots \cup V_t^{t-i+1}))$ and $V_j = (V_j^1 \cup V_j^2 \cup \dots \cup V_j^{t-j} \cup (V_j^{t-j+1} \cup V_{j+1}^{t-j+1} \cup \dots \cup V_t^{t-j+1}))$. Since π^p is a transitive partition of K_n^p , V_i^p dominates V_j^p for all $1 \leq p \leq t-j$. Again, as $i < j$, which implies $t-i \geq t-j+1$ and $V_i^{t-j+1} \subseteq V_i$. So, V_i^{t-j+1} dominates $(V_j^{t-j+1} \cup V_{j+1}^{t-j+1} \cup \dots \cup V_t^{t-j+1})$ as K_n^{t-j+1} is a complete graph. Therefore, V_i dominates V_j for all $1 \leq i < j \leq t$. However, V_j does not dominate V_i , as V_i contains vertices from K_n^{t-i} , whereas V_j does not contain any vertex from K_n^{t-i} . So, π is a tournament transitive partition of G , and hence $TTr(G) \geq t$.




Figure 2: (a) represents partitions π^j and (b) represents the partition π

To prove $TTr(G) = t$, we show that $TTr(G)$ cannot be more than t . If possible, let $TTr(G) = k \geq t + 1$. By the Proposition 5, we have a tournament transitive partition of G of size $t + 1$, say $\pi = \{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_{t+1}\}$. Without loss of generality, assume V_{t+1} contains a vertex from K_n^1 . As π is a tournament transitive partition, V_{t+1} does not dominate V_t , which implies there exists a vertex $x \in V_t$ and x does not belong to K_n^1 . Assume $x \in K_n^2$. Again, as V_t does not dominate V_{t-1} and $K_n^1 \cap V_{t-1}, K_n^2 \cap V_{t-1}$ are non-empty, there exists a vertex $y \in V_{t-1}$, and y must be a vertex that does not belong to $K_n^1 \cup K_n^2$. Assume $y \in K_n^3$. If we go like this, we end up with a situation where we need a vertex in V_1 that does not belong to $K_n^1 \cup K_n^2 \cup \dots \cup K_n^t$, a contradiction. As a result, π cannot be a tournament transitive partition of G , and hence $TTr(G) \leq t$. Therefore, $TTr(G) = t$. \square

Proposition 13. *Let G is a disconnected graph with connected component C_1, C_2, \dots, C_t , then $TTr(G) \geq \max\{Tr(C_i) | 1 \leq i \leq k\}$ and the difference $Tr(G) - \max\{Tr(C_i) | 1 \leq i \leq k\}$ can be arbitrarily large.*

Proof. Let C_i be the component such that $TTr(C_i) = \max\{TTr(C_i) | 1 \leq i \leq k\}$. Also, let $\pi = \{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_k\}$ be a TTr -partition of C_i . Now if we consider a vertex partition $\pi' = \{V'_1, V'_2, \dots, V'_k\}$, where $V'_1 = V_1 \cup_{p=1, p \neq i}^t V(C_p)$ and $V'_i = V_i$, for all $2 \leq i \leq k$. Clearly, π' is a tournament transitive partition of G of size k . Therefore, $TTr(G) \geq \max\{Tr(C_i) | 1 \leq i \leq k\}$.

Now let us consider G to be a graph, which is the disjoint union of $t(\leq n)$ number of complete graphs of n vertices. Then by the Lemma 12 and Proposition 7, we have $TTr(G) = t$ and $TTr(C_i) = 1$, for all i . Therefore, the difference $Tr(G) - \max\{Tr(C_i) | 1 \leq i \leq k\} = t - 1$ arbitrarily large for t . \square

Next, we characterize connected graphs G with $TTr(G) = 1$, and we give a necessary and sufficient condition for $TTr(G) \geq 2$.

Proposition 14. *For any connected graph G , $TTr(G) = 1$ if and only if $G = K_n$.*

Proof. From the Proposition 7, it is clear that $TTr(G) = 1$ if $G = K_n$. For the converse part, assume $TTr(G) = 1$ and G connected graph with $n \geq 3$. If G is not a complete graph, there exists $x, y \in V(G)$ such that $xy \notin E(G)$. Since G is connected, there exists a path connecting x and y with a length of at least 3. Taking $y \in V_2, x \in V_1$, and other vertices are in V_1 form a tournament transitive partition of size 2. As a result, G must be a complete graph K_n . \square

Proposition 15. *For any graph G , $TTr(G) \geq 2$ if and only if G contains P_3 as an induced subgraph.*

Proof. Let us assume G contains P_3 as an induced subgraph. Then from Proposition 8 and Proposition 11, we have $TTr(G) = 2$. Conversely, assume $TTr(G) \geq 2$. As V_1 dominates V_2 and V_2 does not dominate V_1 , also G is a connected graph, there must be an induced P_3 in G . \square

Remark 1. *From the definition of a tournament transitive partition, it is clear that it is also a transitive partition of G . But the difference $Tr(G) - TTr(G)$ can be arbitrarily large. From the Proposition 7, we have $TTr(K_n) = 1$ and from [9], we know that $Tr(K_n) = n$, hence the difference $Tr(K_n) - TTr(K_n) = n - 1$ is arbitrarily large for n . Moreover, we know that $Tr(K_{m,n}) = n + 1$, when $n < m$. But from Proposition*

10, we have $TTr(K_{m,n}) = 2$, when either $m \neq 1$ or $n \neq 1$. So, the difference $Tr(K_n) - TTr(K_n) = n - 1$ is arbitrarily large for n .

3 NP-Completeness of MTTDP

In this section, we present NP-completeness results for MAXIMUM TOURNAMENT TRANSITIVITY DECISION PROBLEM. Given a vertex partition $\pi = \{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_k\}$ of a graph, we can verify in polynomial time whether π is a tournament transitive partition of that graph or not. Hence, the MAXIMUM TOURNAMENT TRANSITIVITY DECISION PROBLEM (MTTDP) is in NP. To prove that this problem is NP-hard, we show a polynomial time reduction from the MAXIMUM TRANSITIVITY DECISION PROBLEM in general graphs, which is known to be NP-complete [13]. The reduction is as follows: given an instance of the MAXIMUM TRANSITIVITY DECISION PROBLEM, that is, a graph $G = (V, E)$ and an integer k , let us consider $3(\Delta(G) + 1)$ copies of G . Furthermore, we take another three vertices, say x, x' and x'' . Now we connect every vertices of first $\Delta(G) + 1$ copies of G to x , second $\Delta(G) + 1$ copies of G to x' and final $\Delta(G) + 1$ copies of G to x'' . Finally, add two edges xx' and $x'x''$. Clearly, the resultant graph $G' = (V', E')$ is a chordal graph if G is a chordal graph and having $(3n(\Delta(G) + 1) + 3)$ vertices and $(3m(\Delta(G) + 1) + 2)$ edges. The construction of G' is illustrated in Figure 3.




Figure 3: Construction of G' from G

Let \mathcal{G} be the disjoint union of $\Delta(G) + 1$ copies of G , and also we denote the i -th component of \mathcal{G} as G^i . Next, we prove that $Tr(G) = k$ if and only if $TTr(G) = k$, as shown in the following lemma.

Lemma 16. *Let \mathcal{G} be the disjoint union of $(\Delta(G) + 1)$ -copies of G , then $Tr(G) = k$ if and only if $TTr(\mathcal{G}) = k$.*

Proof. Let G be a graph with $Tr(G) = k$. Also, let $\mathcal{G} = G^1 \cup G^2 \cup \dots \cup G^t$, where each G^i is a graph G and $t = \Delta(G) + 1$. Let $\pi^j = \{V_1^j, V_2^j, \dots, V_k^j\}$ be a transitive partition of size k of the j -th component of \mathcal{G} . Let us consider $\pi = \{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_k\}$ be a vertex partition of \mathcal{G} of size k as follows:

$$V_1 = \left(\bigcup_{j=k+1}^t V(G^j) \right) \cup (V_1^1 \cup V_1^2 \cup \dots \cup V_1^{k-1} \cup (V_1^k \cup V_2^k \cup \dots \cup V_k^k)),$$

$$V_j = (V_j^1 \cup V_j^2 \cup \dots \cup V_j^{k-j} \cup (V_j^{k-j+1} \cup V_{j+1}^{k-j+1} \cup \dots \cup V_k^{k-j+1}))$$

for all $2 \leq j \leq k$.

Now we show that π is a tournament transitive partition of size k . Let us consider V_i and V_j for $i < j$. Clearly, $V_i \supseteq (V_i^1 \cup V_i^2 \cup \dots \cup V_i^{k-i} \cup (V_i^{k-i+1} \cup V_{i+1}^{k-i+1} \cup \dots \cup V_k^{k-i+1}))$ and $V_j = (V_j^1 \cup V_j^2 \cup \dots \cup V_j^{k-j} \cup (V_j^{k-j+1} \cup V_{j+1}^{k-j+1} \cup \dots \cup V_k^{k-j+1}))$. Since π^p is a transitive partition of G^p , V_i^p dominates V_j^p for all $1 \leq p \leq k - j$. Again, as $i < j$, which implies $k - i \geq k - j + 1$ and $V_i^{k-j+1} \subseteq V_i$. So, V_i^{k-j+1} dominates $(V_j^{k-j+1} \cup V_{j+1}^{k-j+1} \cup \dots \cup V_k^{k-j+1})$ as π^{k-j+1} is a transitive partition of G^{k-j+1} . Therefore, V_i dominates

V_j for all $1 \leq i < j \leq t$. However, V_j does not dominate V_i because V_i contains vertices from G^{k-i} , but V_j does not contain any vertex from G^{k-i} . So, π is a tournament transitive partition of \mathcal{G} , and hence $TTr(\mathcal{G}) \geq k$. To prove $TTr(\mathcal{G}) = k$, we show that $TTr(\mathcal{G})$ cannot be more than k . By the Proposition 1, we know that $TTr(\mathcal{G}) \leq Tr(\mathcal{G})$, and also from [9], we have $Tr(\mathcal{G}) = \max\{Tr(G^i), 1 \leq i \leq t\} = k$. Therefore, $TTr(\mathcal{G}) = k$.

Conversely, assume $TTr(\mathcal{G}) = k$. Then from [9] and by the Proposition 1, we have $k = TTr(\mathcal{G}) \leq Tr(\mathcal{G}) = \max\{Tr(G^i), 1 \leq i \leq t\} = Tr(G)$. Clearly, $Tr(G)$ cannot be more than k ; otherwise, $TTr(\mathcal{G})$ is more than k . Therefore, $Tr(G) = k$ if and only if $TTr(\mathcal{G}) = k$. \square

In the next claim, we show that G has a transitive partition of size k if and only if G' has a tournament transitive partition of size $k + 2$.

Claim 17. *The graph G has a transitive partition of size k if and only if G' has a tournament transitive partition of size $k + 2$.*

Proof. Let G be a graph with a transitive partition of size k . Also, let \mathcal{G}_i be the disjoint union of i -th set of $(\Delta(G) + 1)$ copies of G , for all $1 \leq i \leq 3$. By the Lemma 16, we know that $TTr(\mathcal{G}_i) \geq k$, for all i . Now, if $\pi^i = \{V_1^i, V_2^i, \dots, V_k^i\}$ is a transitive partition of \mathcal{G}_i of size k , we can construct a vertex partition, say $\pi' = \{V'_1, V'_2, \dots, V'_{k+2}\}$ of G' , as follows: $V'_i = V_i^1 \cup V_i^2 \cup V_i^3$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $V'_{k+1} = \{x', x''\}, V'_{k+2} = \{x\}$. We show that π' is a tournament transitive partition of G' . For any pair of sets V'_i and V'_j with $1 \leq i < j \leq k$, V'_i dominates V'_j in G' as V_i^p dominates V_j^p in \mathcal{G}_p and V'_j does not dominate V'_i in G' as V_j^p does not dominate V_i^p in \mathcal{G}_p . Also, from the construction of G' , it is clear that V_i dominates V_j but V_j does not dominate V_i , for all $1 \leq i < j \leq k + 2$. Therefore, π' is a tournament transitive partition of G' of size $k + 2$.

Conversely, let $\pi = \{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_{k+2}\}$ be a tournament transitive partition of G' of size $k + 2$. So, $Tr(G') \geq k + 2$. Now consider the graph \mathcal{G}'_1 , where $V(\mathcal{G}'_1) = V(\mathcal{G}_1) \cup \{x\}$ and $E(\mathcal{G}'_1) = E(\mathcal{G}_1) \cup \{xy | y \in V(\mathcal{G}_1)\}$. From [11], we know that for a graph H and a vertex v , $Tr(H) - 1 \leq Tr(H - v) \leq Tr(H)$, and if H is a disjoint union of C_1, C_2, \dots, C_r , then $Tr(H) = \max\{Tr(C_i), 1 \leq i \leq r\}$. So, $Tr(G') - 1 \leq Tr(G' - x) = Tr(\mathcal{G}'_1)$, which implies $k + 1 \leq Tr(G') - 1 \leq Tr(\mathcal{G}'_1)$. Furthermore, $Tr(\mathcal{G}'_1) - 1 \leq Tr(\mathcal{G}'_1 - x) = Tr(G)$. Hence, $Tr(G) \geq k$, and G has a transitive partition of size k . \square

Therefore, we have the following main theorem for this section.

Theorem 18. *The MTTDP is NP-complete for chordal graphs (connected).*

Remark 2. *The MAXIMUM TRANSITIVITY DECISION PROBLEM is known to be NP-complete for the perfect elimination bipartite graphs [15] and doubly chordal graphs [16]. Therefore, from Lemma 16, we can say that MTTDP is NP-complete for perfect elimination bipartite graphs (disconnected) and doubly chordal graphs (disconnected).*

4 Tournament transitivity in trees

In this section, we design a polynomial-time algorithm for finding the tournament transitivity of a given tree T . To design the algorithm, we first prove that the tournament transitivity of a tree T can be either $Tr(T) - 1$ or $Tr(T)$, where $Tr(T)$ is the transitivity of T .

Lemma 19. *For a tree T , $Tr(T) - 1 \leq TTr(T) \leq Tr(T)$.*

Proof. According to the tournament transitive partition definition, for any graph G , $TTr(G) \leq Tr(G)$. Hence, for a tree T , we have $TTr(T) \leq Tr(T)$. Note that if $Tr(T) = 1$, by [11] T is a single vertex graph, and in that case, $TTr(T) = 1$. Again, when $Tr(T) = 2$, T is a star graph, according to [11]. Let T be a star S_t . According to Proposition 10, we know that $TTr(S_t) = 1$ if $t = 1$, otherwise $TTr(S_t) = 2$. Therefore, we assume that T is a tree such that $Tr(T) \geq 3$.

To prove that $TTr(G) \geq Tr(T) - 1$ for tree, let us consider $\pi = \{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_k\}$ be a transitive partition of T with size $Tr(T) \geq 3$. As $Tr(T) \geq 3$, from [9], we can modify the above transitive partition into another transitive partition, say, $\pi' = \{V'_1, V'_2, \dots, V'_k\}$, such that $|V'_k| = |V'_{k-1}| = 1$ and $|V'_{k-i}| \leq 2^{i-1}$ for all $2 \leq i \leq k - 2$. Since T is a tree, $|V'_k| = |V'_{k-1}| = 1$, $|V'_{k-i}| = 2^{i-1}$ for all $2 \leq i \leq k - 2$ and $|V'_1| \geq 2^{k-2}$. Let us consider V'_i and V'_j for $i < j \leq k - 1$. Let $x \in V'_i$ and $z \in V'_k$ such that $xz \in E(T)$. We show that x has no neighbour in V'_j . If possible, assume $y_j \in V'_j$ and $xy_j \in E(T)$. As $|V'_j| = 2^{k-j-1} = |(V'_{j+1} \cup V'_{j+2} \cup \dots \cup V'_k)|$ and T is a tree for y_j , there exists $y_{j+1} \in V'_{j+1}$ such that

$y_j y_{j+1} \in E(T)$. Similarly, for y_{j+1} we have $y_{j+2} \in V'_{j+2}$ such that $y_{j+1} y_{j+2} \in E(T)$. In this way, we end up with a cycle with the vertices from the set $\{x, y_j, y_{j+1}, \dots, y_{k-1}, z\}$, which is a contradiction as T is a tree. So, x has no neighbour in V'_j . Therefore, in π' , V'_j does not dominate V'_i for all $1 \leq i < j \leq k-1$. Now consider $\pi'' = \{V'_1 \cup V'_k, V'_2, \dots, V'_{k-1}\}$. Based on the above discussion, we can say that π'' is a tournament transitive partition of T with size $k-1$. Therefore, $TTr(G) \geq Tr(T) - 1$. Hence, for a T , $Tr(T) - 1 \leq TTr(T) \leq Tr(T)$. \square

Next, we characterize the trees with tournament transitivity equal to $Tr(T)$. We use a function, $TRANSITIVENUMBER(x, T)$, which takes a vertex x and a tree T and returns the transitive number of x in T . The transitive number of a vertex v in T is the maximum integer p such that $v \in V_p$ in a transitive partition $\pi = \{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_k\}$, where the maximum is taken over all transitive partitions of T . The transitive number of a vertex v in T is denoted by $t(v, T)$. The function $TRANSITIVENUMBER(x, T)$ is presented in [12], where the authors design an algorithm to find the Grundy number of a given tree. As we know that transitivity and Grundy number are the same for a tree [11], the algorithm in [12] also finds the transitivity of a tree. From the description in [12], it follows that $TRANSITIVENUMBER(x, T)$ correctly calculates the transitive number of x in T .

Let us consider two vertices $u, v \in V(T)$ and the path uPv as (u, v_a, \dots, v_b, v) . Additionally, we assume that the transitive number of u is $t(u, T) = t(u)$, and the transitive number of v is $t(v, T) = t(v)$. Let T^c denote the tree T rooted at c and $T^{[c, c']}$ denote the subtree rooted at c , which is obtained by deleting c' from T^c . Let us define the set X as the set of vertices required from the path $\{u, v_a, \dots, v_b, v\}$ such that $u \in V_{t(u)}$ for some transitive partition π of T . Clearly, $u \in X$ and the vertices of X are consecutive vertices from the path (u, v_a, \dots, v_b, v) . We calculate X iteratively by checking whether the transitive number of u is $t(u) - 1$ in the tree $T^{[u, v_a]}$ or not for all $v_a \in \{v_a, v_{a+1}, \dots, v_b, v\}$. Also, we define Y as the set of vertices required from $\{u, v_a, \dots, v_b, v\}$ to achieve the transitive number of v as $t(v)$ and calculate Y similarly. For a vertex $w \in X \cap Y$, we say that w agrees for u and v if there exist two transitive partitions of T (not necessarily distinct), say π_p and π_q , such that $u \in V_{t(u)}$ and $w \in V_t$ in π_p and $v \in V_{t(v)}$ and $w \in V_t$ in π_q , respectively. In other words, the index of the sets in which w belongs is the same in both π_p and π_q . In the following lemma, we characterize trees with equal transitivity and tournament transitivity.

Lemma 20. *Let T be a tree and $Tr(T) = k (\geq 3)$. Then $TTr(G) = Tr(T)$ if and only if there exist two vertices y, z of T such that the following conditions hold.*

- (a) *Transitive number of z in T is k , that is, $t(z, T) = k$.*
- (b) *$y \notin N_T(z)$.*
- (c) *Transitive number of y in T is at least $k-1$, that is, $t(y, T) \geq k-1$.*
- (d) *Either $X \cap Y = \phi$ or $X \cap Y \neq \phi$ and every vertex of $X \cap Y$ agrees for y and z .*

[Where X is the set of vertices required from the path yPz such that $y \in V_{k-1}$ for some transitive partition π of T and Y is the set of vertices required from the path yPz such that $z \in V_k$ for some transitive partition π of T . For a vertex $w \in X \cap Y$, we say that w agrees for y and z if there exist two transitive partitions of T (not necessarily distinct), say π_p and π_q , such that $y \in V_{k-1}$ and $w \in V_t$ in π_p and $z \in V_k$ and $w \in V_t$ in π_q , respectively. In other words, the index of the sets in which w belongs is the same in both π_p and π_q .]

Proof. First, assume that $TTr(T) = Tr(T) = k (\geq 3)$. By the Proposition 6, we have a tournament transitive partition of T of size k , say $\pi = \{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_k\}$, such that $|V_k| = 1$ and $|V_{k-1}| = 2$. Moreover, $V_{k-1} = \{x, y\}$ and $V_k = \{z\}$ such that $xz \in E(T)$ and $yz \notin E(T)$. Since π is also a transitive partition of T , by the definition of transitive number, we have $t(z, T) = k$ and $t(y, T) \geq k-1$. Also, by our choice, $y \notin N_T(z)$. Furthermore, π is a transitive partition such that $y \in V_{k-1}$ and $z \in V_k$. Now, from the definition of X and Y , we have either $X \cap Y = \phi$ or $X \cap Y \neq \phi$, and every vertex of $X \cap Y$ agrees for y and z . Therefore, we have two vertices, namely y and z , that satisfy the given conditions.

Conversely, assume there exist two vertices y, z of T such that the given conditions hold. From the conditions (a), (b), (c) and (d), we have a transitive partition of T , say, $\pi = \{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_{k-1}, V_k\}$ such that $V_k = \{z\}$ and $y \in V_{k-1}$. Now we show that $TTr(T) = Tr(T) = k$. Let V_i and V_j from π and $i < j \leq k-1$. Since V_i dominates V_k , there exists $x \in V_i$ such that $xz \in E(T)$. Now if x has no neighbour in V_j , then V_j does not dominate V_i . On the other hand, assume x has a neighbour in V_j , say y_j . If y_j is not used to dominate any sets from $\{V_{j+1}, V_{j+2}, \dots, V_k\}$, we modify the partition π into another

partition by moving y_j in V_1 . In this partition, V_j does not dominate V_i . Now consider the case when y_j is used to dominate a vertex from $\{V_{j+1}, V_{j+2}, \dots, V_k\}$, and let $y_s \in V_s$ such that $y_j y_s \in E(T)$. If V_s is V_k , then we have a cycle $\{x, y_j, y_s = z\}$, which is a contradiction as T is a tree. Therefore, we can assume V_s is not V_k .

Similarly, if y_s is not used to dominate sets from $\{V_{s+1}, V_{s+2}, \dots, V_k\}$, we can modify the partition π into another partition by moving y_j, y_s in V_1 . Note that, in the new partition, V_j does not dominate V_i . If we continue this process, we have a path $\{x, y_j, y_s, \dots, y_p\}$, and if $p \leq k - 2$, similarly as above, we have our required modified partition. Now, consider $y_p \in V_q$, where $q \leq k - 1$. If $q = k$, then this path $\{x, y_j, y_s, \dots, y_p\}$ becomes a cycle, which is a contradiction as T is a tree. Assume, $p = k - 1$. The vertex y_p is either y or not. If it is not y , then we have a modified partition where V_j does not dominate V_i for all $1 \leq i < j \leq k$, and hence $Tr(T) = TTr(T) = k$. Assume y_p is y , as V_{k-1} dominates V_k , for $z \in V_k$, we have $x' \in V_{k-1}$ such that $x'z \in E(T)$. Similarly for this x' we have $x'' \in V_i$ and a path $\{x'', y'_j, y'_s, \dots, y'_p\}$ such that $y'_j \in V_j$. Now, either we have a desired partition or y'_p is any vertex from V_q , $q \geq k - 1$. If $q = k$ we have a cycle $\{x', x'', y'_j, \dots, z\}$. Assume $q = k - 1$. If y'_p is x' , again we have a cycle; if y'_p is y , we have a cycle $\{z, x, y_j, \dots, y, \dots, y'_j, x'', x'\}$. In other cases, we have a desired partition such that V_j does not dominate V_i for all $1 \leq i < j \leq k$, and hence $TTr(T) = Tr(T) = k$. \square

4.1 Finding the set X and Y

In this subsection, we calculate the sets X and Y , which are defined as above. Now, we investigate those transitive partitions of T , where $u \in V_{i(u)}$, and show that for those transitive partitions, the vertices of X can be in some specific sets. To show this result, we need to understand how to find the transitive number of x in a rooted tree T^x , and when x achieves that transitive number, then to which sets the children of x belong. The following lemma shows that.

Lemma 21. *Let v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k be the children of x in a rooted tree T^x , and for each $1 \leq i \leq k$, l_i denotes the rooted transitive number of v_i in T^x with $l_1 \leq l_2 \leq \dots \leq l_k$. Let z be the largest integer such that there exists a subsequence of $\{l_i : 1 \leq i \leq k\}$, say $(l_{i_1} \leq l_{i_2} \leq \dots \leq l_{i_z})$ such that $l_{i_j} \geq j$, for all $1 \leq j \leq z$.*

(a) *In this case, the transitive number of x in T^x is $1 + z$.*

(b) (i) *For all $1 \leq j \leq z$, there exists a transitive partition $\pi = \{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_{1+z}\}$ such that $x \in V_{1+z}$ and v_{i_j} belongs to any of the sets from $V_j, V_{j+1}, \dots, V_{\min\{l_{i_j}, z\}}$.*

(ii) *If there exists a neighbour of x , say v , other than $\{v_{i_1}, v_{i_2}, \dots, v_{i_z}\}$, such that the rooted transitive number of v in T^x is at least j , then there exists a transitive partition $\pi = \{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_{1+z}\}$ such that $x \in V_{1+z}$ and v_{i_j} belongs to any of the sets from V_1, V_2, \dots, V_{j-1} . Otherwise, let r be the minimum index such that $l_{i_t} \geq t + 1$ for all $r \leq t \leq j - 1$. Then there exists a transitive partition $\pi = \{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_{1+z}\}$ such that $x \in V_{1+z}$ and v_{i_j} belongs to any of the sets from $V_r, V_{r+1}, \dots, V_{j-1}$ if and only if such r exists.*

Proof. (a) The proof is similar to the result used in [12], where authors designed an algorithm to calculate the Grundy number of a tree. We rephrase the statement in terms of transitivity.

(b)(i) Let us denote the subtree of T^x , rooted at y , as T_y^x . Since $l_{i_j} \geq j$, for all $1 \leq j \leq z$, there exists a transitive partition of $T_{v_{i_j}}^x$, say $\{V_1^j, V_2^j, \dots, V_j^j\}$ such that $v_{i_j} \in V_j^j$. Now let us consider a vertex partition of T^x , say $\{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_z, V_{1+z}\}$ as follows: $V_r = \bigcup_{s=r}^z V_r^s$ for all $1 \leq r \leq z$ and $V_{1+z} = \{x\}$. Clearly, the above partition is a transitive partition of T^x , such that $x \in V_{1+z}$ and v_{i_j} belongs to the set V_j . Now consider the vertex v_{i_j} and let $s \in \{j + 1, j + 2, \dots, \min\{l_{i_j}, z\}\}$. Since $l_{i_j} \geq s$, there exists a transitive partition of $T_{v_{i_j}}^x$, say $\{V_1^j, V_2^j, \dots, V_s^j\}$ such that $v_{i_j} \in V_s^j$. Also, since $l_{i_s} \geq s > j$, there exists a transitive partition of $T_{v_{i_s}}^x$, say $\{V_1^s, V_2^s, \dots, V_j^s\}$ such that $v_{i_s} \in V_j^s$. Similarly, as before, we can show that there exists a transitive partition $\pi = \{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_{1+z}\}$ such that $x \in V_{1+z}$ and v_{i_j} belongs to the set V_s . Therefore, we always have a transitive partition of T^x , say $\pi = \{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_{1+z}\}$ such that $x \in V_{1+z}$ and v_{i_j} belongs to any of the sets from $V_j, V_{j+1}, \dots, V_{\min\{l_{i_j}, z\}}$.

(b)(ii) Let v be a neighbour of x other than $\{v_{i_1}, v_{i_2}, \dots, v_{i_z}\}$, such that the rooted transitive number of v in T^x is at least j . In this case, let $s \in \{1, 2, \dots, j - 1\}$. Since $l_{i_j} \geq s$, there exists a transitive partition of $T_{v_{i_j}}^x$, say $\{V_1^j, V_2^j, \dots, V_s^j\}$ such that $v_{i_j} \in V_s^j$. Also, since the rooted transitive number of v in T^x is at least j , there exists a transitive partition of T_v^x , say $\{V_1^s, V_2^s, \dots, V_j^s\}$ such that $v \in V_j^s$. By taking the unions of the sets of these partitions as in (b)(i), we can construct a transitive partition of T^x , say $\pi = \{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_{1+z}\}$ such that $x \in V_{1+z}$ and v_{i_j} belongs to the set V_s .

Now assume there does not exist any neighbour of x other than $\{v_{i_1}, v_{i_2}, \dots, v_{i_z}\}$, having at least j as its rooted transitive number in T^x . In this case, let r be the minimum index such that $l_{i_t} \geq t + 1$ for all $r \leq t \leq j - 1$. For $1 \leq s \leq r - 1$ and $j + 1 \leq s \leq z$ as $l_{i_t} \geq t$, we know that there exists a transitive partition of $T_{v_{i_s}}^x$, say $\{V_1^s, V_2^s, \dots, V_s^s\}$ such that $v_{i_s} \in V_s^s$. Again, since $l_{i_t} \geq t + 1$ for all $r \leq t \leq j - 1$, we have a transitive partition of $T_{v_{i_t}}^x$, say $\{V_1^t, V_2^t, \dots, V_{t+1}^t\}$ such that $v_{i_t} \in V_{t+1}^t$, for all $r \leq t \leq j - 1$. As $l_{i_j} \geq j$, we have a transitive partition of $T_{v_{i_j}}^x$, say $\{V_1^j, V_2^j, \dots, V_r^j\}$ such that $v_{i_j} \in V_r^j$. By taking the unions of the sets of these partitions as in (b)(i), we can construct a transitive partition of T^x , say $\pi = \{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_{1+z}\}$ such that $x \in V_{1+z}$ and v_{i_j} belongs to the set V_r . Further, using similar arguments as in (b)(i), we can show that there exists a transitive partition $\pi = \{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_{1+z}\}$ such that $x \in V_{1+z}$ and v_{i_j} belongs to any of the sets from $V_{r+1}, V_{r+2}, \dots, V_{j-1}$.

Conversely, let no such r exist. In this case, we show that there does not exist any transitive partition $\pi = \{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_{1+z}\}$ such that $x \in V_{1+z}$ and v_{i_j} belongs to one of the sets from V_1, V_2, \dots, V_{j-1} . Let $\pi = \{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_{1+z}\}$ be a transitive such that $x \in V_{1+z}$ and v_{i_j} belongs to V_s , for some $1 \leq s \leq j - 1$. We know that $l_{i_1} \leq l_{i_2} \leq \dots \leq l_{i_z}$ and r do not exist. This implies that $l_{i_1} \leq l_{i_2} \leq \dots \leq l_{i_{j-1}} < j$. So, vertices of $\{v_{i_1}, v_{i_2}, \dots, v_{i_{j-1}}\}$ cannot belong to any of the sets $\{V_j, V_{j+1}, \dots, V_z\}$. As we assume that $v_{i_j} \in V_s$ for some $1 \leq s \leq j - 1$ and all the neighbours of x , other than $\{v_{i_1}, v_{i_2}, \dots, v_{i_z}\}$, have rooted transitive number less than j , the vertices $\{v_{i_{j+1}}, v_{i_{j+2}}, \dots, v_{i_z}\}$ are the only neighbours of x that can belong to the sets $\{V_j, V_{j+1}, \dots, V_z\}$. Clearly, there exists a set from $\{V_j, V_{j+1}, \dots, V_z\}$, which does not contain any children of x , which contradicts the fact that π is a transitive partition. Therefore, there does not exist any transitive partition $\pi = \{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_{1+z}\}$ such that $x \in V_{1+z}$ and v_{i_j} belongs to any of the sets from V_1, V_2, \dots, V_{j-1} . Hence, we have the lemma. \square

Based on the above lemma, we now show that in a transitive partition of T , if $u \in V_{t(u)}$, then the vertices of X can be in some specific sets. A similar result is true for Y as well.

Lemma 22. *Let u and v be two vertices of T and they are connected by the path (u, v_a, \dots, v_b, v) in T . Let $t(u, T) = t(u)$ and $t(v, T) = t(v)$. Further, let $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_\alpha\}$ be the set of consecutive vertices, starting with $x_1 = u$, from the path that is required to achieve the transitive number of u is $t(u)$. Similarly, let $Y = \{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_\beta\}$ be the set of consecutive vertices, starting with $y_1 = v$, from the path that is required to achieve the transitive number of v as k . Also, assume that π_p and π_q are two transitive partitions of T such that $u \in V_{t(u)}$ in π_p and $v \in V_{t(v)}$ in π_q , respectively. Then for all $2 \leq j \leq \alpha - 1$, x_j belongs to a unique set V_{p_j} in π_p , where $p_j = t(x_j, T^{[x_j, x_{j-1}]})$ and x_α belongs to a set of sets in π_p as described in Lemma 21(b). Similarly, for all $2 \leq j \leq \beta - 1$, y_j belongs to a unique set V_{q_j} in π_q , where $q_j = t(y_j, T^{[y_j, y_{j-1}]})$ and y_β belongs to a set of sets in π_q as described in Lemma 21(b).*

Proof. Let $x_j \in X$ for $2 \leq j \leq \alpha - 1$. The transitive number of x_j in $T^{[x_j, x_{j-1}]}$ is given by $t(x_j, T^{[x_j, x_{j-1}]})$. Note that, in π_p , to obtain the transitive number of u as $t(u)$, the vertex x_j must belong to V_{p_j} in π_p , where $p_j = t(x_j, T^{[x_j, x_{j-1}]})$ (see Figure 4). Because if x_j belongs to some V_r , where $r < p_j$, then x_{j+1} does not belong to X as we have transitive partition of $T^{[x_j, x_{j-1}]} \setminus \{x_{j+1}\}$ such that $x_j \in V_r$. For the vertex, x_α can be assigned from a set of sets in π_p , as described in Lemma 21(b). The proof for Y is similar. \square




Figure 4: Calculation of X and Y in the tree T

Based on the above two lemmas, we have Algorithm1 that describes the process of calculating the sets X and Y for two specific vertices y and z with $t(y, T) \geq k - 1$ and $t(z, T) = k$.

Algorithm 1 CALCULATION_X_AND_Y

Input: The tree T and two vertices y and z with $t(y, T) \geq k - 1$ and $t(z, T) = k$

Output: Set X and Y corresponding y and z , respectively .

```
1: Let the path  $P = (v_{a_0} = y, v_a, \dots, v_b, z = v_{b_0})$ ;
2: Initially,  $X = \{y\}$  and  $Y = \{z\}$ ;
3: if  $t(y) = t(y, T) = k$  then
4:    $t(y, T^{[y, v_a]}) \geq k - 1$ ;
5:    $X = \{y\}$ ;
6: else
7:   for all  $r$  in  $\{v_a, v_{a+1}, \dots, v_b, z\}$  do
8:     if  $t(y, T^{[y, r]}) = k - 2$  then
9:        $X = X \cup \{r\}$ ;
10:    else
11:      Stop;
12:    end if
13:  end for
14: end if
15: for all  $s$  in  $\{v_b, v_{b-1}, \dots, v_a, y\}$  do
16:   if  $t(z, T^{[z, s]}) = k - 1$  then
17:      $Y = Y \cup \{s\}$ ;
18:   else
19:     Stop;
20:   end if
21: end for
22: Calculate the set(s) in  $\pi_p$  to which the vertices of  $X$  belong using to the Lemma 22;
23: Calculate the set(s) in  $\pi_q$  to which the vertices of  $Y$  belong using to the Lemma 22;
```

Based on Lemmas 19 and 20, we can design an algorithm for finding tournament transitivity of a given tree.

Algorithm 2 TOURNAMENT_TRANSITIVITY(T)

Input: A tree T

Output: Tournament transitivity of T , that is, $TTr(T)$

```
1: Let  $V = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n\}$  be the set of all vertices of  $T$ ;
2: for all  $u \in V$  do
3:   TRANSITIVENUMBER( $u, T$ ) ;
4: end for
5:  $S = \{(y, z) | y, z \in V \text{ and } y \notin N_T(z) \text{ and } t(y, T) \geq k - 1, t(z, T) = k\}$ 
6: if  $S \neq \phi$  then
7:   for all  $(y, z) \in S$  do
8:     Calculate the sets  $X$  and  $Y$  according to the Algorithm 1;
9:     if  $X \cap Y = \phi$  then
10:       $TTr(T) = Tr(T)$ ;
11:     else if  $X \cap Y \neq \phi$  and every vertex of  $X \cap Y$  agrees for  $y$  and  $z$  then
12:        $TTr(T) = Tr(T)$ ;
13:     else
14:        $TTr(T) = Tr(T) - 1$ ;
15:     end if
16:   end for
17: else
18:    $TTr(T) = Tr(T) - 1$ ;
19: end if
20: return ( $TTr(G)$ );
```

4.2 Running time of the algorithm

In this subsection, we analyse the running time of Algorithm 2 (TOURNAMENT_TRANSITIVITY(T)). In lines 2 – 4 of the algorithm, we have computed the transitive number of every vertex. According to the running time analysis of [12], it will take $O(n)$ to calculate the transitive number of every vertex. Moreover, for a fixed pair of vertices $\{y, z\}$, we can check whether it is in S or not in a constant time.

Now we analyse the running time of Algorithm 1 (CALCULATION_X_AND_Y) for a pair of vertices $\{y, z\}$ such that $y \notin N_T(z)$ and $t(y, T) \geq k - 1, t(z, T) = k$. While computing the set X , the checking in line 8 takes $\sum_{v \in T} (O(deg(v)))$ time. This implies that we can compute the set X in $k(\sum_{v \in T} O(deg(v)))$ time,

where k is the length of the path yPz . In the worst case, X in lines 3 – 14 can be computed in $O(n^2)$ time. Similarly, Y can be computed in $O(n^2)$ time. The process of computing X and Y also indicates the set(s) to which the vertices of X and Y belong. Therefore, lines 22 and 23 take constant time. So for all vertices from S , to calculate the sets X and Y , we need at most $n^2 * O(n^2) = O(n^4)$ time. As a result, we get that the running time of Algorithm 2 is $O(n) + O(n^4) = O(n^4)$. Hence, we have the following main theorem.

Theorem 23. *The MAXIMUM TOURNAMENT TRANSITIVITY PROBLEM can be solved in polynomial time for trees.*

5 Tournament transitivity in bipartite chain graphs

In this section, we characterize some bipartite chain graphs with equal tournament transitivity and transitivity. Let $G = (X \cup Y, E)$ be a bipartite chain graph also let $\sigma_X = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n_1})$ and $\sigma_Y = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_{n_2})$ be the chain ordering. We know from the Proposition 10, for complete bipartite graph $TTr(K_{m,n}) = 2$, if and only if either $m \neq 1$ or $n \neq 1$. Let us assume only bipartite chain graphs, which are not complete bipartite graphs. Now we find some bipartite chain graphs which are not a complete bipartite graph with equal tournament transitivity and transitivity. Assume t be the maximum integer such that G contains $K_{t,t}$ as an induced subgraph. It is known from [15], that $K_{t,t} = G[X_t \cup Y_t]$, where $X_t = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t\}$ and $Y_t = \{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_t\}$. Now in G , the edges $x_{t+1}y_t, x_t y_{t+1}$ may or may not be present. Based on this, a bipartite chain graph, which is not a complete bipartite graph, can be partitioned into three subclasses.

Definition 24. *Let $G = (X \cup Y, E)$ be a bipartite chain graph which is not a complete bipartite graph. Also, let $\sigma_X = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n_1})$ and $\sigma_Y = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_{n_2})$ be the chain ordering of G and t be the maximum integer such that G contains a $K_{t,t}$ as an induced subgraph. A bipartite chain graph G is called (i) Type-I BCG if $x_{t+1}y_t \notin E(G)$ and $x_t y_{t+1} \notin E(G)$, (ii) Type-II BCG if either $x_{t+1}y_t \in E(G)$ or $x_t y_{t+1} \in E(G)$ not both, (iii) Type-III BCG if $x_{t+1}y_t \in E(G)$ and $x_t y_{t+1} \in E(G)$.*

It is known from [15], that for a bipartite chain graph G , $Tr(G) = t + 1$, where t is the maximum integer such that G contains either $K_{t,t}$ or $K_{t,t} - \{e\}$ as an induced subgraph. Also, from the definition of tournament transitivity, we know that $TTr(G) \leq Tr(G)$ for a graph G . Next, we find the conditions for which the transitivity and tournament transitivity are the same for Type-I BCG and for some Type-II BCG graphs. Also, we show that for Type-III BCG, $TTr(G) < Tr(G)$ always.

5.1 Tournament transitivity of Type-I BCG

In this subsection, we find the condition under which $TTr(G) = Tr(G)$ for a Type-I BCG. For that, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 25. *Let G be a Type-I BCG with $\sigma_X = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n_1})$ and $\sigma_Y = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_{n_2})$ be the chain ordering of G . Then $TTr(G) = Tr(G) = t + 1$ if and only if there exist vertices $\{z_1, z_2, \dots, z_t\}$ from $\{x_{t+1}, x_{t+2}, \dots, x_{n_1}, y_{t+1}, y_{t+2}, \dots, y_{n_2}\}$ such that $|N(z_1)| = t - 1$ and $t - j + 1 \geq |N(z_j)| \geq t - j$ for all $2 \leq j \leq t$.*

Proof. First, assume that there exist vertices $\{z_1, z_2, \dots, z_t\}$ from $\{x_{t+1}, x_{t+2}, \dots, x_{n_1}, y_{t+1}, y_{t+2}, \dots, y_{n_2}\}$ such that $|N(z_1)| = t - 1$ and $t - j + 1 \geq |N(z_j)| \geq t - j$ for all $2 \leq j \leq t$. Consider a vertex partition $\pi = \{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_t, V_{t+1}\}$ of T as follows: $\{x_1, y_1, z_t\} \subseteq V_1$; for all $2 \leq i \leq t - 1$, we set $V_i = \{x_i, y_i, z_{t-i+1}\}$, $V_t = \{x_t, z_1\}$, and $V_{t+1} = \{y_t\}$. We put other vertices of G in V_1 . This partition π is illustrated in Figure 5.




Figure 5: The partition π of Type-I BCG G , where dotted edges are not present in G

We show that π is a tournament transitive partition of G with size $t + 1$. Since G is a Type-I BCG, the set $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t, y_1, \dots, y_t\}$ induces a complete bipartite graph $K_{t,t}$ in G . Let us consider V_i and V_j for $2 \leq i < j \leq t - 1$. From π , we have $V_i = \{x_i, y_i, z_{t-i+1}\}$ and $V_j = \{x_j, y_j, z_{t-j+1}\}$. As $j \geq |N(z_{t-j+1})| \geq j - 1$, which implies either $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{j-1}\} \subseteq N(z_{t-j+1})$ or $\{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_{j-1}\} \subseteq N(z_{t-j+1})$. So, either x_i is a neighbour of z_{t-j+1} or y_i is a neighbour of z_{t-j+1} . Furthermore, because G is a Type-I BCG, x_j is adjacent with y_i , and y_j is adjacent with x_i . Therefore, V_i dominates V_j . Moreover, as $i \geq |N(z_{t-i+1})| \geq i - 1$, which implies either $N(z_{t-i+1}) \subseteq \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_i\}$ or $N(z_{t-i+1}) \subseteq \{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_i\}$. Since Type-I BCG and $i < j$, V_j does not dominate V_i .

Now for V_{t-1} and V_t , clearly V_{t-1} dominates V_t but V_t does not dominate V_{t-1} as $t \geq |N(z_{t-j+1})| \geq t - 1$ and G is a Type-I BCG. Similarly, we can show that V_i dominates V_j but V_j does not dominate V_i for others $1 \leq i < j \leq k$. Hence, π is a tournament transitive partition of G of size $t + 1$. Therefore, $TTr(G) \geq t + 1$. As we already know from [15], for a bipartite chain graph G , $Tr(G) = t + 1$, where t is the maximum integer such that G contains either $K_{t,t}$ or $K_{t,t} - \{e\}$ as an induced subgraph. Since G is a Type-I BCG, G contains $K_{t,t}$ as an induced subgraph for maximum t . Hence, $Tr(G) = t + 1$. According to the definition of tournament transitivity, we know that $TTr(G) \leq Tr(G)$. Therefore, $TTr(G) = Tr(G) = t + 1$.

Conversely, assume $TTr(G) = Tr(G) = t + 1$. To show the existence of $\{z_1, z_2, \dots, z_t\}$ from $\{x_{t+1}, x_{t+2}, x_{n_1}, y_{t+1}, y_{t+2}, \dots, y_{n_2}\}$ such that $|N(z_1)| = t - 1$ and $t - j + 1 \geq |N(z_j)| \geq t - j$ for all $2 \leq j \leq t$, first we prove the following claim.

Claim 26. *Let $\pi = \{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_t, V_{t+1}\}$ be a tournament transitive partition of G of size $t + 1$ such that $|V_t| = 2$ and $|V_{t+1}| = 1$. Then one of the following conditions holds.*

- (a) *Each V_1, V_2, \dots, V_t contains exactly one vertex from $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t\}$ and each $V_1, V_2, \dots, V_{t-1}, V_{t+1}$ contains exactly one vertex from $\{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_t\}$.*
- (b) *Each V_1, V_2, \dots, V_t contains exactly one vertex from $\{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_t\}$, and each $V_1, V_2, \dots, V_{t-1}, V_{t+1}$ contains exactly one vertex from $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t\}$.*

Proof. According to Proposition 6, we always have a $TTr(G)$ -partition $\pi = \{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_t, V_{t+1}\}$ of G such that $|V_t| = 2$ and $|V_{t+1}| = 1$. Since G is a Type-I BCG, the degree of each vertices from $(X \setminus X_t) \cup (Y \setminus Y_t)$ is at most $t - 1$. Now, for any vertex $x \in V_{t+1}$, the degree of x must be at least t . Therefore, only vertices from $X_t \cup Y_t$ can be in V_{t+1} . Now we prove that if V_{t+1} contains a vertex from Y_t , π satisfy the condition (a), otherwise π satisfy the condition (b).

Let us assume $V_{t+1} = \{y_j\}$ for some $1 \leq j \leq t$. Since π is a tournament transitive partition of G , V_t must contain a vertex adjacent to y_j , and the degree of that vertex is at least t . So, for some $1 \leq i \leq t$, assume $x_i \in V_t$. Moreover, V_{t+1} does not dominate V_t , which implies that there exists a vertex in V_t that is not adjacent to y_j , and the degree of that vertex is at least $t - 1$. Let $v \in V_t$ other than x_i , then $v \in (X \setminus X_t) \cup Y$. If $v \in (X \setminus X_t)$, to dominate v , each V_1, V_2, \dots, V_{t-1} contains exactly one vertex from $\{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_{t-1}\}$, and the vertex y_j must be the vertex y_t . As $y_t \in V_{t+1}$ and $N(y_t) = X_t$, each

V_1, V_2, \dots, V_t contains exactly one vertex from $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t\}$. Therefore, in this case, the condition (a) holds. On the other hand, if $v \in (Y \setminus Y_t)$, we can similarly show the condition (a).

Finally, assume $v \in Y_t$. As V_{t-1} dominates V_t , for $v \in V_t$ there must exist a vertex from V_{t-1} , say u , such that v is adjacent to u and $|N(u) \setminus \{v, y_j\}| \geq t-2$. If $u \in (X \setminus X_t)$, then $|N(u) \setminus \{v, y_j\}| = |N(u)| - 2 \leq t-1-2 = t-3$, which implies u must be a vertex from X_t . Let us assume $u = x_r$ for some $1 \leq r \leq t$ and $r \neq i$. As we know, V_t does not dominate V_{t-1} , so there exists a vertex from V_{t-1} , say v' , such that v' is not adjacent to the vertices from $\{x_i, v\}$. Therefore, v' must be a vertex from $(X \setminus X_t) \cup (Y \setminus Y_t)$. Consider the case when $v' \in (X \setminus X_t)$. Since $v' \in V_{t-1}$, $|N(v') \setminus \{v, y_j\}| \geq t-2$. But $|N(v') \setminus \{v, y_j\}| = |N(v')| - 2 \leq t-1-2 = t-3$. So, v' cannot be a vertex from $(X \setminus X_t)$. Furthermore, for $v' \in (Y \setminus Y_t)$, $|N(v') \setminus \{x_r, x_i\}| \geq t-2$. But $|N(v') \setminus \{x_r, x_i\}| = |N(v')| - 2 \leq t-1-2 = t-3$. So, v' cannot be a vertex from $(Y \setminus Y_t)$. We have a contradiction, which implies that v cannot be in V_t . Hence, we have the claim. \square

From the Claim 26, we have either each V_1, V_2, \dots, V_t contains exactly one vertex from $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t\}$ and each $V_1, V_2, \dots, V_{t-1}, V_{t+1}$ contains exactly one vertex from $\{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_t\}$ or each V_1, V_2, \dots, V_t contains exactly one vertex from $\{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_t\}$ and each $V_1, V_2, \dots, V_{t-1}, V_{t+1}$ contains exactly one vertex from $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t\}$. Since G is a bipartite chain graph, without loss of generality assume $x_r, y_r \in V_r$ for all $1 \leq r \leq t-1$ and either $x_t \in V_t$ and $y_t \in V_{t+1}$ or $y_t \in V_t$ and $x_t \in V_{t+1}$.

Now we are ready to show the existence of $\{z_1, z_2, \dots, z_t\}$ vertices from $(X \setminus X_t) \cup (Y \setminus Y_t)$ such that $|N(z_1)| = t-1$ and $t-j+1 \geq |N(z_j)| \geq t-j$ for all $2 \leq j \leq t$. Since π is a tournament transitive partition, V_{t+1} does not dominate V_t . So, there must exist a vertex from $\{x_{t+1}, x_{t+2}, x_{n_1}, y_{t+1}, y_{t+2}, \dots, y_{n_2}\}$ that belongs to V_t and is not adjacent to either y_t or x_t , depending on whether $V_{t+1} = \{y_t\}$ or $V_{t+1} = \{x_t\}$. Let z_1 be such a vertex from $(X \setminus X_t) \cup (Y \setminus Y_t)$. As $z_1 \in V_t$, $|N(z_1)| \geq t-1$ and we know that $|N(z_1)| \leq t-1$, which implies $|N(z_1)| = t-1$. Let us consider V_j and V_{j+1} for some $1 \leq j \leq t-1$. Since V_{j+1} does not dominate V_j , there exists a vertex from $(X \setminus X_t) \cup (Y \setminus Y_t)$, say $z_{t-j+1} \in V_j$ such that $z_{t-j+1} \notin N(V_{j+1})$. As $z_{t-j+1} \in V_j$ and π is a tournament transitive partition of G , $|N(z_{t-j+1})| \geq j-1$. Moreover, $z_{t-j+1} \notin N(V_{j+1})$ and G is a bipartite chain graph, implies that $z_{t-j+1} \notin N(x_p)$ and $z_{t-j+1} \notin N(y_p)$, for all $j+1 \leq p \leq t$. So, $|N(z_{t-j+1})| \leq j$. Therefore, $j \geq |N(z_{t-j+1})| \geq j-1 = t-s+1 \geq |N(z_s)| \geq t-s$. Hence, we have $\{z_1, z_2, \dots, z_t\}$ from $\{x_{t+1}, x_{t+2}, x_{n_1}, y_{t+1}, y_{t+2}, \dots, y_{n_2}\}$ such that $|N(z_1)| = t-1$ and $t-s+1 \geq |N(z_s)| \geq t-s$ for all $2 \leq s \leq t$. \square

5.2 Tournament transitivity of Type-II BCG

In this subsection, we find a sufficient condition under which $TTr(G) = Tr(G)$ for Type-II BCG. Let G be a Type-II BCG with $\sigma_X = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n_1})$ and $\sigma_Y = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_{n_2})$ be the chain ordering of G and $x_t y_{t+1} \in E(G)$. Further, we divide a Type-II BCG into two subclasses, based on whether $x_{t+1} y_{t-1} \notin E(G)$ or $x_{t+1} y_{t-1} \in E(G)$. A Type-II BCG G is called (i) Type-II(a) BCG if $x_{t+1} y_{t-1} \notin E(G)$, (ii) Type-II(b) BCG if $x_{t+1} y_{t-1} \in E(G)$. The following theorems find a sufficient condition under which $TTr(G) = Tr(G)$ for a Type-II BCG.

Theorem 27. *Let G be a Type-II(a) BCG with $\sigma_X = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n_1})$ and $\sigma_Y = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_{n_2})$ be the chain ordering of G . Then $TTr(G) = Tr(G) = t+1$ if there exist vertices $\{z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{t-1}\}$ from $\{x_{t+1}, x_{t+2}, \dots, x_{n_1}, y_{t+2}, y_{t+3}, \dots, y_{n_2}\}$ such that $t-j \geq |N(z_j)| \geq t-j-1$ for all $1 \leq j \leq t-1$.*

Proof. Let us assume there exist vertices $\{z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{t-1}\}$ from $\{x_{t+1}, x_{t+2}, \dots, x_{n_1}, y_{t+2}, y_{t+3}, \dots, y_{n_2}\}$ such that $t-j \geq |N(z_j)| \geq t-j-1$ for all $1 \leq j \leq t-1$. As G is a Type-II(a) BCG, $x_t y_{t+1} \in E(G)$ and $x_{t+1} y_{t-1} \notin E(G)$. Consider a vertex partition $\pi = \{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_t, V_{t+1}\}$ of G as follows: $\{x_1, y_1, z_{t-1}\} \subseteq V_1$; for all $2 \leq i \leq t-1$, we set $V_i = \{x_i, y_i, z_{t-i}\}$, $V_t = \{x_t, y_t\}$, and $V_{t+1} = \{y_{t+1}\}$. We put the other vertices of G in V_1 . This partition π is illustrated in Figure 6.

We show that π is a tournament transitive partition of G with size $t+1$. Since G is a Type-II BCG, the set $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t, y_1, \dots, y_t\}$ induces a complete bipartite graph $K_{t,t}$ in G . Let us consider V_i and V_j for $2 \leq i < j \leq t-1$. From π , we have $V_i = \{x_i, y_i, z_{t-i}\}$ and $V_j = \{x_j, y_j, z_{t-j}\}$. As $j \geq |N(z_{t-j})| \geq j-1$, which implies either $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{j-1}\} \subseteq N(z_{t-j})$ or $\{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_{j-1}\} \subseteq N(z_{t-j})$. Since $i < j$, either x_i is a neighbour of z_{t-j} or y_i is a neighbour of z_{t-j} . Furthermore, because G is a Type-II BCG, x_j is adjacent with y_i , and y_j is adjacent with x_i . Therefore, V_i dominates V_j in π . Moreover, as $i \geq |N(z_{t-i})| \geq i-1$, which implies either $N(z_{t-i}) \subseteq \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_i\}$ or $N(z_{t-i}) \subseteq \{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_i\}$. Since Type-II BCG and $i < j$, V_j does not dominate V_i . Now for V_t and V_{t+1} , clearly V_t dominates V_{t+1} but V_{t+1} does not dominate V_t . Similarly, we can show that V_i dominates V_j but V_j does not dominate V_i for others $1 \leq i < j \leq k$. Hence, π is a tournament transitive partition of G of size $t+1$. Therefore, $TTr(G) \geq t+1$. As we already know from [15], for a bipartite chain graph G , $Tr(G) = t+1$, where t




Figure 6: The partition π of Type-II(a) BCG G , where dotted edges are not present in G

is the maximum integer such that G contains either $K_{t,t}$ or $K_{t,t} - \{e\}$ as an induced subgraph. Since G is a Type-II BCG, G contains $K_{t,t}$ as an induced subgraph for maximum t . Hence, $Tr(G) = t + 1$. According to the definition of tournament transitivity, we know that $TTr(G) \leq Tr(G)$. Therefore, $TTr(G) = Tr(G) = t + 1$. \square

For Type-II(b) BCG, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 28. *Let G be a Type-II(b) BCG with $\sigma_X = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n_1})$ and $\sigma_Y = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_{n_2})$ be the chain ordering of G . Then $TTr(G) = Tr(G) = t + 1$ if there exist vertices $\{z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{t-2}\}$ from $\{x_{t+2}, x_{t+3}, \dots, x_{n_1}, y_{t+2}, y_{t+3}, \dots, y_{n_2}\}$ such that $t - j - 1 \geq |N(z_j)| \geq t - j - 2$ for all $1 \leq j \leq t - 2$.*

Proof. Let us assume there exist vertices $\{z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{t-2}\}$ from $\{x_{t+2}, x_{t+3}, \dots, x_{n_1}, y_{t+2}, y_{t+3}, \dots, y_{n_2}\}$ such that $t - j - 1 \geq |N(z_j)| \geq t - j - 2$ for all $1 \leq j \leq t - 2$. As G is a Type-II(b) BCG, $x_t y_{t+1} \in E(G)$ and $x_{t+1} y_{t-1} \in E(G)$. Consider a vertex partition $\pi = \{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_t, V_{t+1}\}$ of G as follows: $\{x_1, y_1, z_{t-2}\} \subseteq V_1$; for all $2 \leq i \leq t - 2$, we set $V_i = \{x_i, y_i, z_{t-i-1}\}$, $V_{t-1} = \{x_{t-1}, y_{t-1}\}$, $V_t = \{x_t, x_{t+1}\}$, and $V_{t+1} = \{y_t\}$. We put the other vertices of G in V_1 . This partition π is illustrated in Figure ??.




Figure 7: The partition π of Type-II(b) BCG G , where dotted edges are not present in G

We show that π is a tournament transitive partition of G with size $t+1$. Since G is a Type-II BCG, the set $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t, y_1, \dots, y_t\}$ induces a complete bipartite graph $K_{t,t}$ in G . Let us consider V_i and V_j for $2 \leq i < j \leq t - 2$. From π , we have $V_i = \{x_i, y_i, z_{t-i-1}\}$ and $V_j = \{x_j, y_j, z_{t-j-1}\}$. As $j \geq |N(z_{t-j-1})| \geq j - 1$, which implies either $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{j-1}\} \subseteq N(z_{t-j-1})$ or $\{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_{j-1}\} \subseteq N(z_{t-j-1})$. Since $i < j$, either x_i is a neighbour of z_{t-j-1} or y_i is a neighbour of z_{t-j-1} . Furthermore, because G is a Type-II

BCG, x_j is adjacent with y_i , and y_j is adjacent with x_i . Therefore, V_i dominates V_j in π . Moreover, as $i \geq |N(z_{t-i-1})| \geq i-1$, which implies either $N(z_{t-i-1}) \subseteq \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_i\}$ or $N(z_{t-i-1}) \subseteq \{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_i\}$. Since Type-II BCG and $i < j$, V_j does not dominate V_i . Now for $t-1 \leq p < q \leq t+1$, as $x_{t+1}y_{t-1} \in E(G)$, clearly, V_p dominates V_q and V_q does not dominate V_p . Similarly, we can show that V_i dominates V_j but V_j does not dominate V_i for others $1 \leq i < j \leq k$. Hence, π is a tournament transitive partition of G of size $t+1$. Therefore, $TTr(G) \geq t+1$. As we already know from [15], for a bipartite chain graph G , $Tr(G) = t+1$, where t is the maximum integer such that G contains either $K_{t,t}$ or $K_{t,t} - \{e\}$ as an induced subgraph. Since G is a Type-II BCG, G contains $K_{t,t}$ as an induced subgraph for maximum t . Hence, $Tr(G) = t+1$. According to the definition of tournament transitivity, we know that $TTr(G) \leq Tr(G)$. Therefore, $TTr(G) = Tr(G) = t+1$. \square

5.3 Tournament transitivity of Type-III BCG

In this subsection, we show that $TTr(G) < Tr(G)$ for a Type-III BCG. For that, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 29. *Let G be a Type-III BCG. Then $TTr(G) < Tr(G)$.*

Proof. By the definition of Type-III BCG, G contains $K_{t,t}$ for maximum t and $x_{t+1}y_t, x_t y_{t+1} \in E(G)$. From [15], as G contains $K_{t+1,t+1} \setminus \{e\}$ for maximum t , we have $Tr(G) = t+2$. Now we show that $TTr(G)$ cannot be $t+2$. If possible assume $TTr(G) = t+2$ and let $\pi = \{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_t, V_{t+1}, V_{t+2}\}$ be a tournament transitive partition of G . By the Proposition 6 we can assume that $|V_{t+1}| = 2$ and $|V_{t+2}| = 1$.

Since G is a Type-III BCG, the degree of each vertices from $(X \setminus X_t) \cup (Y \setminus Y_t)$ is at most t . Now, for any vertex $u \in V_{t+2}$, u must have a degree of at least $t+1$. Therefore, only vertices from $X_t \cup Y_t$ can be in V_{t+2} (See Figure 8).




Figure 8: The partition π of Type-III BCG G , where dotted edges are not present in G

Let us assume $V_{t+2} = \{y_j\}$ for some $1 \leq j \leq t$. Since π is a tournament transitive partition of G , V_{t+1} must contain a vertex adjacent to y_j , and the degree of that vertex is at least $t+1$. So, for some $1 \leq i \leq t$, assume $x_i \in V_{t+1}$. Moreover, V_{t+2} does not dominate V_{t+1} , which implies that there exists a vertex in V_{t+1} that is not adjacent to y_j , and the degree of that vertex is at least t . Let $z \in V_{t+1}$ other than x_i , then $z \in (X \setminus X_t) \cup Y$.

If $z \in (X \setminus X_t)$, to dominate z , each V_1, V_2, \dots, V_t contains exactly one vertex from $\{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_t\}$, and the vertex y_j must be the vertex y_{t+1} . As $y_{t+1} \in V_{t+2}$ and $N(y_{t+1}) = X_t$, each V_1, V_2, \dots, V_{t+1} contains exactly one vertex from X_t . We have a contradiction as $|X_t| = t$, and we require $t+1$ vertices. Assume $z \in (Y \setminus Y_t)$. To dominate z , each V_1, V_2, \dots, V_t contains exactly one vertex from $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t\} \setminus \{x_i\}$. Again, we have contradiction as $|X_t| \setminus \{x_i\} = t-1$ and we required t vertices to dominate z .

Finally, assume $z \in Y_t$. As V_t dominates V_{t+1} , for $z \in V_{t+1}$ there must exist a vertex from V_t , say z' , such that z is adjacent to z' and $|N(z') \setminus \{z, y_j\}| \geq t-1$. If $z' \in (X \setminus X_t)$, then $|N(z') \setminus \{z, y_j\}| = |N(z')| - 2 \leq t-2 = t-2$, which implies z' must be a vertex from X_t . Let us assume $z' = x_r$ for some $1 \leq r \leq t$ and $r \neq i$. As we know, V_{t+1} does not dominate V_t , so there exists a vertex from

V_t , say z'' , such that z'' is not adjacent to the vertices from $\{x_i, z\}$. Therefore, z'' must be a vertex from $(X \setminus (X_t \cup \{x_{t+1}\})) \cup (Y \setminus (Y_t \cup \{y_{t+1}\}))$. Consider the case when $z'' \in (X \setminus (X_t \cup \{x_{t+1}\}))$. Since $z'' \in (X \setminus X_t \cup \{x_{t+1}\})$ and $z'' \in V_t$, we must have $|N(z'') \setminus \{z, y_j\}| \geq t - 1$. But $|N(z'') \setminus \{z, y_j\}| = |N(z'')| - 2 \leq t - 2$. So, z'' cannot be a vertex from $(X \setminus (X_t \cup \{x_{t+1}\}))$. Furthermore, for $z'' \in (Y \setminus (Y_t \cup \{y_{t+1}\}))$, $|N(z'') \setminus \{x_r, x_i\}| \geq t - 1$. But $|N(z'') \setminus \{x_r, x_i\}| = |N(z'')| - 2 \leq t - 2$. So, z'' cannot be a vertex from $(Y \setminus (Y_t \cup \{y_{t+1}\}))$. We have a contradiction, which implies that z cannot be in V_{t+1} . From the above discussion, we have if $TTr(G) = t + 2$, there does not exist any $z \in V_{t+1}$ such that z is not adjacent with $y \in V_{t+1} \cap Y_t$. Similarly, we can show that contradiction when $x \in V_{t+1} \cap X_t$. Hence, $TTr(G) < t + 2 = Tr(G)$. \square

6 Conclusion and future works

In this paper, we have studied the notion of tournament transitivity in graphs, which is a variation of transitivity. We have shown that the decision version of this problem is NP-complete for chordal graphs (connected), perfect elimination bipartite graphs (disconnected), and doubly chordal graphs (disconnected). On the positive side, we prove that this problem can be solved in polynomial time for trees. Furthermore, we have characterized Type-I BCG with equal transitivity and tournament transitivity and find some sufficient conditions under which the above two parameters are equal for a Type-II BCG. Finally, we have shown that for Type-III BCG, these two parameters are never equal.

This paper concludes by addressing some of the several unresolved problems in the study of tournament transitivity of a graph.

1. What is the necessary condition for a Type-II BCG with $TTr(G) = Tr(G)$?
2. We know from [15], in linear time we can solve the transitivity problem in bipartite chain graphs. Can we design an algorithm for tournament transitivity in a bipartite chain graph?
3. Characterize connected graphs with $TTr(G) = 2$ or $TTr(G) = 3$.
4. What is the necessary and sufficient condition for $TTr(G) \geq t$, for an integer t ?

It would be interesting to investigate the complexity status of this problem in other graph classes. Designing an approximation algorithm for this problem would be another challenging open problem.

References

- [1] A. Brandstädt, F. Dragan, V. Chepoi, and V. Voloshin. Dually chordal graphs. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 11(3):437–455, 1998.
- [2] G. J. Chang. The domatic number problem. *Discrete Mathematics*, 125(1-3):115–122, 1994.
- [3] C. A. Christen and S. M. Selkow. Some perfect coloring properties of graphs. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 27(1):49–59, 1979.
- [4] E. J. Cockayne and S. T. Hedetniemi. Towards a theory of domination in graphs. *Networks*, 7(3):247–261, 1977.
- [5] B. Effantin. A note on Grundy colorings of central graphs. *The Australasian Journal of Combinatorics*, 68(3):346–356, 2017.
- [6] D. Fulkerson and O. Gross. Incidence matrices and interval graphs. *Pacific journal of mathematics*, 15(3):835–855, 1965.
- [7] Z. Füredi, A. Gyárfás, G. N. Sárközy, and S. Selkow. Inequalities for the first-fit chromatic number. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 59(1):75–88, 2008.
- [8] M. C. Golumbic and C. F. Goss. Perfect elimination and chordal bipartite graphs. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 2(2):155–163, 1978.
- [9] T. W. Haynes, J. T. Hedetniemi, S. T. Hedetniemi, A. McRae, and N. Phillips. The transitivity of special graph classes. *Journal of Combinatorial Mathematics and Combinatorial Computing*, 110:181–204, 2019.

- [10] T. W. Haynes, J. T. Hedetniemi, S. T. Hedetniemi, A. McRae, and N. Phillips. The upper domatic number of a graph. *AKCE International Journal of Graphs and Combinatorics*, 17(1):139–148, 2020.
- [11] J. T. Hedetniemi and S. T. Hedetniemi. The transitivity of a graph. *Journal of Combinatorial Mathematics and Combinatorial Computing*, 104:75–91, 2018.
- [12] S. M. Hedetniemi, S. T. Hedetniemi, and T. Beyer. A linear algorithm for the grundy (coloring) number of a tree. *Congressus Numerantium*, 36:351–363, 1982.
- [13] S. M. Hedetniemi, S. T. Hedetniemi, A. A. McRae, D. Parks, and J. A. Telle. Iterated colorings of graphs. *Discrete Mathematics*, 278(1-3):81–108, 2004.
- [14] P. Heggenes and D. Kratsch. Linear-time certifying recognition algorithms and forbidden induced subgraphs. *Nordic Journal of Computing*, 14(1-2):87–108, 2007.
- [15] S. Paul and K. Santra. Transitivity on subclasses of bipartite graphs. *Journal of Combinatorial Optimization*, 45(1):1–16, 2023.
- [16] S. Paul and K. Santra. Transitivity on subclasses of chordal graphs. In *Algorithms and Discrete Applied Mathematics*, pages 391–402, Cham, 2023. Springer International Publishing.
- [17] L. Samuel and M. Joseph. New results on upper domatic number of graphs. *Communications in Combinatorics and Optimization*, 5(2):125–137, 2020.
- [18] M. Zaker. Grundy chromatic number of the complement of bipartite graphs. *The Australasian Journal of Combinatorics*, 31:325–330, 2005.
- [19] M. Zaker. Results on the grundy chromatic number of graphs. *Discrete Mathematics*, 306(23):3166–3173, 2006.
- [20] B. Zelinka. Domatically critical graphs. *Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal*, 30(3):486–489, 1980.
- [21] B. Zelinka. On k -domatic numbers of graphs. *Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal*, 33(2):309–313, 1983.