

# Boxicity and Cubicity of Asteroidal Triple free graphs

Diptendu Bhowmick <sup>\*</sup>, L. Sunil Chandran <sup>\*\*</sup>

**Abstract.** An axis parallel  $d$ -dimensional box is the Cartesian product  $R_1 \times R_2 \times \cdots \times R_d$  where each  $R_i$  is a closed interval on the real line. The *boxicity* of a graph  $G$ , denoted as  $\text{box}(G)$ , is the minimum integer  $d$  such that  $G$  can be represented as the intersection graph of a collection of  $d$ -dimensional boxes. An axis parallel unit cube in  $d$ -dimensional space or a  $d$ -cube is defined as the Cartesian product  $R_1 \times R_2 \times \cdots \times R_d$  where each  $R_i$  is a closed interval on the real line of the form  $[a_i, a_i + 1]$ . The *cubicity* of  $G$ , denoted as  $\text{cub}(G)$ , is the minimum integer  $d$  such that  $G$  can be represented as the intersection graph of a collection of  $d$ -cubes.

An independent set of three vertices is called an asteroidal triple if between each pair in the triple there exists a path which avoids the neighbourhood of the third. A graph is said to be Asteroidal Triple free (AT-free for short) if it does not contain an asteroidal triple. The class of AT-free graphs is a reasonably large one, which properly contains the class of interval graphs, trapezoid graphs, permutation graphs, cocomparability graphs etc. Let  $S(m)$  denote a star graph on  $m + 1$  nodes. We define *claw number* of a graph  $G$  as the largest positive integer  $k$  such that  $S(k)$  is an induced subgraph of  $G$  and denote it as  $\psi(G)$ .

Let  $G$  be an AT-free graph with chromatic number  $\chi(G)$  and claw number  $\psi(G)$ . In this paper we will show that  $\text{box}(G) \leq \chi(G)$  and this bound is tight. We also show that  $\text{cub}(G) \leq \text{box}(G)(\lceil \log_2 \psi(G) \rceil + 2) \leq \chi(G)(\lceil \log_2 \psi(G) \rceil + 2)$ . If  $G$  is an AT-free graph having girth at least 5 then  $\text{box}(G) \leq 2$  and therefore  $\text{cub}(G) \leq 2 \lceil \log_2 \psi(G) \rceil + 4$ .

**Key words:** Boxicity, Cubicity, Chordal Dimension, Asteroidal Triple free Graph, Chromatic Number, Claw Number.

## 1 Introduction

Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a family of non-empty sets. An undirected graph  $G$  is the intersection graph of  $\mathcal{F}$  if there exists a one-one correspondence between the vertices of  $G$  and the sets in  $\mathcal{F}$  such that two vertices in  $G$  are adjacent if and only if the corresponding sets have non-empty intersection. If  $\mathcal{F}$  is a family of intervals on the real line, then  $G$  is called an *interval graph*. An interval graph  $G$  is said to be a *unit interval graph* if and only if there is some interval representation of  $G$  in which all the intervals are of the same length.

**Notations:** Let  $G(V, E)$  be a simple, finite, undirected graph on  $n$  vertices. The vertex set of  $G$  is denoted as  $V(G)$  and the edge set of  $G$  is denoted as  $E(G)$ . For any vertex

---

<sup>\*</sup> Computer Science and Automation Department, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore- 560012 Email: diptendubhowmick@gmail.com

<sup>\*\*</sup> Computer Science and Automation Department, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore- 560012 Email: sunil@csa.iisc.ernet.in

$v \in V(G)$  let  $N_G(v) = \{w \in V(G) \mid (v, w) \in E(G)\}$  be the set of neighbors of  $v$ . For each  $S \subseteq V(G)$  let  $G[S]$  denote the subgraph of  $G$  induced by the vertices in  $S$ . In this paper we shall use the notation  $G \setminus S$  to denote  $G[V \setminus S]$ . The *girth* of a graph is the length of a shortest cycle in the graph.

Let  $G'$  be a graph such that  $V(G') = V(G)$ . Then  $G'$  is a *super graph* of  $G$  if  $E(G) \subseteq E(G')$ . We define the *intersection* of two graphs as follows: if  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  are two graphs such that  $V(G_1) = V(G_2)$ , then the intersection of  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  denoted as  $G = G_1 \cap G_2$  is a graph with  $V(G) = V(G_1) = V(G_2)$  and  $E(G) = E(G_1) \cap E(G_2)$ .

### 1.1 Boxicity and Cubicity

A  $d$ -dimensional box is a Cartesian product  $R_1 \times R_2 \times \cdots \times R_d$  where each  $R_i$  is a closed interval of the form  $[a_i, b_i]$  on the real line. A  $k$ -box representation of a graph  $G$  is a mapping of the vertices of  $G$  to  $k$ -boxes such that two vertices in  $G$  are adjacent if and only if their corresponding  $k$ -boxes have a non-empty intersection. The *boxicity* of a graph  $G$ , denoted as  $\text{box}(G)$ , is the minimum integer  $k$  such that  $G$  can be represented as the intersection graph of  $k$ -dimensional boxes. Clearly, graphs with boxicity 1 are precisely the *interval graphs*.

A  $d$ -dimensional cube is a Cartesian product  $R_1 \times R_2 \times \cdots \times R_d$  where each  $R_i$  is a closed interval of the form  $[a_i, a_i + 1]$  on the real line. A  $k$ -cube representation of a graph  $G$  is a mapping of the vertices of  $G$  to  $k$ -cubes such that two vertices in  $G$  are adjacent if and only if their corresponding  $k$ -cubes have a non-empty intersection. The *cubicity* of  $G$  is the minimum integer  $k$  such that  $G$  has a  $k$ -cube representation. Clearly, graphs with cubicity 1 are precisely the *unit interval graphs*.

Let  $G$  be a graph. Let  $I_1, I_2, \dots, I_k$  be  $k$  interval (unit interval) graphs such that  $G = I_1 \cap I_2 \cap \cdots \cap I_k$ . Then  $I_1, I_2, \dots, I_k$  is called an *interval graph representation* (*unit interval graph representation*) of  $G$ . The following equivalence is well known.

**Lemma 1.** (Roberts[25]) *The minimum  $k$  such that there exists an interval graph representation (unit interval graph representation) of  $G$  using  $k$  interval graphs (unit interval graphs)  $I_1, I_2, \dots, I_k$  is the same as  $\text{box}(G)$  ( $\text{cub}(G)$ ).*

**Fact 1.** (Roberts [25]) *If  $G = G_1 \cap G_2 \cap \cdots \cap G_r$  then  $\text{cub}(G) \leq \sum_{i=1}^r \text{cub}(G_i)$ .*

The concept of boxicity and cubicity was introduced by F. S. Roberts [25] in 1969. Boxicity finds applications in fields such as ecology and operations research: It is used as a measure of the complexity of ecological [26] and social [20] networks and has applications in fleet maintenance [23]. Boxicity and cubicity has been investigated for various classes of graphs [14,27,28,8] and has been related with other parameters such as treewidth [9] and vertex cover [4]. Computing the boxicity of a graph was shown to be NP-hard by Cozzens [14]. This was later strengthened by Yannakakis [30], and finally by Kratochvíl

[19] who showed that deciding whether boxicity of a graph is at most 2 itself is NP-complete. Boxicity has been generalized in several ways like rectangle number [11], poset boxicity [29], grid dimension [3], circular dimension [16], boxicity of digraphs [10] etc. Recently Chandran et al. [7] showed that for any graph  $G$ ,  $\text{box}(G) \leq 2\chi(G^2)$  where  $G^2$  is the square of graph  $G$  and  $\chi(G)$  is the chromatic number of the graph. From this they inferred that  $\text{box}(G) \leq 2\Delta^2$ , where  $\Delta$  is the maximum degree of  $G$ . Very recently this result was improved by Esperet [15], who showed that  $\text{box}(G) \leq \Delta^2 + 2$ . Let  $n$  be the number of vertices in  $G$ . In [5] Chandran et al. have shown that for any graph  $G$ ,  $\text{box}(G) \leq \lceil (\Delta + 2) \log_2 n \rceil$ . In [6] they have shown that for any graph  $G$ ,  $\text{cub}(G) \leq \lceil 4(\Delta + 1) \log_2 n \rceil$ .

## 1.2 Chordal Graph and Chordal Dimension

An undirected graph is said to be *chordal* if every cycle of length four or more contains a chord i.e. an edge joining two nonconsecutive vertices in the cycle. The *chordal dimension* of a graph  $G$  denoted as  $\text{chord}(G)$ , is the minimum integer  $k$  such that  $G$  can be represented as the intersection graph of  $k$  chordal graphs. Scheinerman and Mckee [21] have shown that for any graph  $G$ ,  $\text{chord}(G) \leq \chi(G)$  and also  $\text{chord}(G) \leq \text{treewidth}(G)$  where  $\chi(G)$  is the chromatic number of  $G$ . Since any interval graph is a chordal graph we have the following observation:

**Observation 1.** *For any graph  $G$ ,  $\text{chord}(G) \leq \text{box}(G) \leq \text{cub}(G)$ .*

## 1.3 Claw Number

Let  $S(k)$  denote a star graph on  $k + 1$  vertices. (Note that  $S(k)$  is the complete bipartite graph  $K_{1,k}$ ). The *center* of a star is that vertex which is connected to all other vertices in the star. An induced  $S(3)$  in a graph is usually known as a *claw*.

**Definition 1.** *The claw number of a graph  $G$  is the largest positive integer  $k$  such that  $S(k)$  is an induced subgraph of  $G$  and is denoted as  $\psi(G)$ .*

Recently Adiga et al. [1] have given an almost tight bound for the cubicity of interval graphs in terms of its claw number.

**Theorem 1.** (Adiga et al. [1]) *If  $G$  is an interval graph with claw number  $\psi(G)$  then  $\lceil \log_2 \psi(G) \rceil \leq \text{cub}(G) \leq \lceil \log_2 \psi(G) \rceil + 2$ .*

## 1.4 AT-free graphs

An independent set of three vertices is called an *asteroidal triple* if between every pair of vertices there is a path which avoids the neighbourhood of the third. A graph is called *asteroidal triple free* (AT-free for short) if it does not contain an asteroidal triple.

They form a large class of graphs since they contain interval, permutation, trapezoid, cocomparability and many other graph classes. Corneil, Olariu and Stewart have studied many structural and algorithmic properties of AT-free graphs in [12,13].

A graph is called *claw-free AT-free graph* if it is AT-free and does not contain  $K_{1,3}$  (i.e.  $S(3)$ , the claw) as an induced subgraph. Kloks et al. [18] have given a characterization of claw-free AT-free graphs.

## 1.5 Our Results

In this paper we will show that

1. If  $G$  is an AT-free graph with chromatic number  $\chi(G)$  then  $\text{box}(G) \leq \chi(G)$  and this bound is tight.
2. If  $G$  is a claw-free AT-free graph with chromatic number  $\chi(G)$  then  $\text{box}(G) = \text{cub}(G) \leq \chi(G)$  and this bound is tight.
3. If  $G$  is an AT-free graph having girth at least 5 then  $\text{box}(G) \leq 2$  and this bound is tight. We also show that  $\text{cub}(G) \leq 2 \lceil \log_2 \psi(G) \rceil + 4$ .
4. If  $G$  is an AT-free graph with chromatic number  $\chi(G)$  and claw number  $\psi(G)$  then  $\text{cub}(G) \leq \text{box}(G)(\lceil \log_2 \psi(G) \rceil + 2) \leq \chi(G)(\lceil \log_2 \psi(G) \rceil + 2)$ .

### Remark on previous approach to boxicity and cubicity of AT-free graphs:

In [9] it has been shown that for any graph  $G$ ,  $\text{box}(G) \leq \text{treewidth}(G) + 2$ . It has also been shown that if  $G$  is an AT-free graph then  $\text{treewidth}(G) \leq 3\Delta - 2$ , hence  $\text{box}(G) \leq 3\Delta$  where  $\Delta$  is the maximum degree of  $G$ . But the result shown in this paper is much stronger. (Recall that  $\chi(G) \leq \Delta + 1$  for any graph, but in general  $\chi(G)$  can be much smaller.)

In [6] Chandran et al. have studied the relationship between cubicity and bandwidth of a graph. As a corollary they have also shown that if  $G$  is an AT-free graph then  $\text{cub}(G) \leq 3\Delta - 1$  since for AT-free graphs bandwidth is at most  $3\Delta - 2$ . Using the technique of [6], this upper bound cannot be improved much since  $\lceil \frac{\Delta}{2} \rceil$  is a lower bound for bandwidth of any graph. In this paper we show that for any AT-free graph  $G$ ,  $\text{cub}(G) \leq \text{box}(G)(\lceil \log_2 \psi(G) \rceil + 2) \leq \chi(G)(\lceil \log_2 \psi(G) \rceil + 2)$ . Clearly this result can be much stronger than that of [6] in some cases.

## 2 Upper bound on boxicity of AT-free graphs and cubicity of claw-free AT-free graphs

In this section we will show an upper bound on boxicity of AT-free graphs and cubicity of claw-free AT-free graphs. A *triangulation* of a graph  $G$  is a chordal graph  $H$  on the same vertex set that contains  $G$  as a subgraph i.e.  $V(G) = V(H)$  and  $E(G) \subseteq E(H)$ .  $H$  is said to be a *minimal triangulation* of  $G$  if there exists no other chordal graph  $H'$

on the same vertex set as  $G$  and  $H$  such that  $E(G) \subseteq E(H') \subset E(H)$ . Möhring studied minimal triangulation of AT-free graphs in [22]. Parra and Scheffler have shown relations between minimal separators of a graph and its minimal triangulations in [24].

From the definition of chordal dimension and boxicity we know that for any graph  $G$ ,  $\text{chord}(G) \leq \text{box}(G)$ . Now we will show that when  $G$  is an AT-free graph,  $\text{box}(G) \leq \text{chord}(G)$ . For this we need the following theorem:

**Theorem 2.** (Möhring [22]) *If  $G$  is an AT-free graph then every minimal triangulation of  $G$  is an interval graph.*

Let  $\text{chord}(G) = k$  and  $G = \bigcap_{i=1}^k G_i$  where  $G_i$  is a chordal graph for  $1 \leq i \leq k$ . It is easy to see that if we replace each  $G_i$  by another chordal graph  $G'_i$  such that  $V(G_i) = V(G'_i)$  and  $E(G) \subseteq E(G'_i) \subseteq E(G_i)$ , we still will have  $G = \bigcap_{i=1}^k G'_i$ . It follows that there exists  $G'_1, G'_2, \dots, G'_k$  such that  $G = \bigcap_{i=1}^k G'_i$  where each  $G'_i$  is a minimal triangulation of  $G$ . By Theorem 2,  $G'_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq k$  is an interval graph. It follows that  $\text{box}(G) \leq k = \text{chord}(G)$ . Thus we have the following Observation:

**Observation 2.** *If  $G$  is an AT-free graph then  $\text{chord}(G) = \text{box}(G)$ .*

Scheinerman and Mckee have shown the following upper bound on chordal dimension of a graph  $G$  in terms of its chromatic number  $\chi(G)$ .

**Theorem 3.** (Scheinerman and Mckee [21]) *For any graph  $G$  with chromatic number  $\chi(G)$ ,  $\text{chord}(G) \leq \chi(G)$ .*

Combining Observation 2 and Theorem 3 we get the following upper bound on boxicity of AT-free graphs:

**Theorem 4.** *If  $G$  is an AT-free graph with chromatic number  $\chi(G)$  then  $\text{box}(G) \leq \chi(G)$ .*

In general  $\chi(G) \leq d + 1$ , where  $d$  is the degeneracy of the graph. It follows that  $\text{box}(G) \leq d + 1$ . Though it is known [7] that  $\text{box}(G) \leq 2\chi(G^2)$  for any graph  $G$ ,  $\text{box}(G)$  need not always be less than equal to  $\chi(G)$ : For example it is shown in [4] that there exists bipartite graphs with boxicity  $\frac{n}{4}$ . It is also shown in [2] that almost all balanced bipartite graphs (with respect to a suitable probability distribution) have boxicity  $\Omega(\frac{n}{\log n})$ .

**Theorem 5.** (Parra and Scheffler [24]) *A graph  $G$  is claw-free AT-free if and only if every minimal triangulation of  $G$  is a unit interval graph.*

By a similar argument given for Observation 2, we get the following:

**Observation 3.** *If  $G$  is a claw-free AT-free graph then  $\text{chord}(G) = \text{cub}(G)$ .*

Thus if  $G$  is a claw-free AT-free graph we have  $\text{chord}(G) = \text{box}(G) = \text{cub}(G)$ . Combining Theorem 3 and Observation 3 we get the following upper bound on cubicity of claw-free AT-free graphs:

**Theorem 6.** *If  $G$  is a claw-free AT-free graph with chromatic number  $\chi(G)$  then  $\text{cub}(G) \leq \chi(G)$ .*

## 2.1 Tightness of Theorem 4 and Theorem 6

Let  $G$  be a complete  $k$ -partite graph on  $n$  vertices (We will assume that  $n$  is multiple of  $k$  and  $n > k$ ). It is easy to see that this is an AT-free graph. Since the chromatic number of this graph is  $k$ , we have  $\text{box}(G) \leq k$  by Theorem 4. But it was shown by Roberts [25] that  $\text{box}(G) = k$ . So the upper bound for boxicity given in Theorem 4 is tight for complete  $k$ -partite graphs.

Let  $G = \overline{(\frac{n}{2})K_2}$ , the complement of the perfect matching on  $n$  vertices (We will assume that  $n$  is even and  $n > 3$ ). It is easy to see that this is a claw-free AT-free graph. Since the chromatic number of this graph is  $\frac{n}{2}$ , we have  $\text{cub}(G) \leq \frac{n}{2}$  by Theorem 6. But it was shown by Roberts [25] that  $\text{cub}(G) = \frac{n}{2}$ . So the upper bound for cubicity given in Theorem 6 is tight for  $\overline{(\frac{n}{2})K_2}$ .

## 3 Upper bound on boxicity of AT-free graphs having girth at least 5

In this section we will show an upper bound on boxicity of AT-free graphs having girth at least 5. Let  $G$  be an AT-free graph having girth at least 5. Since an induced cycle of length at least 6 contains an AT,  $G$  is either acyclic or all induced cycles of  $G$  are of length exactly 5. Recall that diameter of a graph is the maximum of  $\text{distance}(u,v)$  over all pairs of vertices  $u, v \in V(G)$ . A set of vertices  $S$  of a graph  $G$  is said to be *dominating* if every vertex in  $V(G) \setminus S$  is adjacent to some vertex in  $S$ . A path joining vertices  $x$  and  $y$  is said to be a  $x$ - $y$  path. A pair of vertices  $x, y$  is said to be a *dominating pair* if all  $x$ - $y$  paths in  $G$  are dominating sets. Corneil, Olariu and Stewart have shown the following fundamental property of AT-free graphs:

**Theorem 7.** (Corneil et al.[12]) *Every connected AT-free graph contains a dominating pair.*

They have also proved the following theorem which we shall use to show the upper bound on boxicity:

**Theorem 8.** (Corneil et al.[12]) *In every connected AT-free graph there exists dominating pair  $x, y$  such that  $\text{distance}(x, y) = \text{diameter}(G)$ .*

Let  $x, y$  be a dominating pair in  $G$  and let  $P$  be a shortest  $x$ - $y$  path of length equal to the diameter of  $G$ . Let  $d$  be the diameter of  $G$  and  $V(P) = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_d\}$  where  $x = u_1$  and  $y = u_d$ . Let  $V(\overline{P}) = V(G) \setminus V(P)$ .

**Lemma 2.** *For each vertex  $v \in V(\overline{P})$ ,  $|N_G(v) \cap V(P)| = 1$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $x, y$  is a dominating pair and  $P$  is a  $x$ - $y$  path,  $V(P)$  is a dominating set. Hence for every vertex  $v \in V(\overline{P})$  we have  $|N_G(v) \cap V(P)| \geq 1$ . We will show that for each vertex  $v \in V(\overline{P})$ ,  $|N_G(v) \cap V(P)| \leq 1$ . If possible let  $w \in V(\overline{P})$  such that  $|N_G(w) \cap V(P)| \geq 2$ . Let  $u_i, u_j \in N_G(w) \cap V(P)$  be such that  $1 \leq i < j \leq d$  and for all  $k$ ,  $i < k < j$ ,  $u_k \notin N_G(w)$ . We consider the following cases

**Case 1:** *When  $j \leq i + 2$ .* If  $j = i + 1$  then  $u_i$ - $w$ - $u_j$ - $u_i$  forms an induced cycle of length 3 in  $G$ , a contradiction. Similarly if  $j = i + 2$  then  $u_i$ - $w$ - $u_j$ - $u_{j-1}$ - $u_i$  forms an induced cycle of length 4 in  $G$ , a contradiction.

**Case 2:** *When  $j \geq i + 3$ .* Let  $P_1$  denote the path  $u_1$ - $u_2$ - $\dots$ - $u_i$  and  $P_2$  denote the path  $u_j$ - $u_{j+1}$ - $\dots$ - $u_d$ . Clearly  $P_1 w P_2$  forms a  $x$ - $y$  path say  $P'$  in  $G$ . Now  $|V(P')| = i + 1 + (d - j + 1)$ . If  $j \geq i + 3$  then  $|V(P')| \leq d - 1$ . Recall that  $P$  is a shortest  $x$ - $y$  path. But  $P'$  is a shorter  $x$ - $y$  path than  $P$ , a contradiction.

Therefore for each vertex  $v \in V(\overline{P})$ ,  $|N_G(v) \cap V(P)| = 1$ . □

Let  $S_i = \{v \mid v \in V(\overline{P}) \text{ and } u_i \in N_G(v)\}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq d$ . From Lemma 2, it follows that  $S_1, S_2, \dots, S_d$  is a partition of the vertex set  $V(\overline{P})$ . In other words,

**Observation 4.** *Let  $u \in V(P)$  and  $v \in V(\overline{P})$ . Suppose  $u = u_i$  and  $v \in S_k$  where  $1 \leq i, k \leq d$ . Then  $(u, v) \notin E(G)$  if and only if  $i \neq k$ .*

**Lemma 3.** *Let  $v \in S_i$ .*

1.  $|N_G(v) \cap S_i| = 0$  where  $1 \leq i \leq d$ .
2.  $|N_G(v) \cap S_{i+1}| = 0$  where  $1 \leq i \leq d - 1$ .
3.  $|N_G(v) \cap S_{i+2}| \leq 1$  where  $1 \leq i \leq d - 2$ .
4.  $|N_G(v) \cap S_j| = 0$  where  $i + 3 \leq j \leq d$  and  $i \geq 1$ .

**Proof(1):** If possible let  $w \in S_i$  such that  $(v, w) \in E(G)$ . Now  $v$ - $u_i$ - $w$ - $v$  forms an induced cycle of length 3 in  $G$ , a contradiction.

**Proof(2):** If possible let  $w \in S_{i+1}$  such that  $(v, w) \in E(G)$ . Then  $u_i$ - $v$ - $w$ - $u_{i+1}$ - $u_i$  forms a cycle of length 4 in  $G$ , a contradiction.



**Proof(3):** If possible let  $u, w \in S_{i+2}$  such that  $(v, u) \in E(G)$  and  $(v, w) \in E(G)$ . Then  $v-w-u_{i+2}-u-v$  forms a cycle of length 4 in  $G$ , a contradiction.

**Proof(4):** If possible let  $w \in S_j$  such that  $(v, w) \in E(G)$ . Since  $(v, u_i) \in E(G)$  according to Lemma 2 we have  $(v, u_k) \notin E(G)$  for all  $k \neq i$ . Similarly since  $(w, u_j) \in E(G)$  we have  $(w, u_k) \notin E(G)$  for all  $k \neq j$ . Since  $j \geq i + 3$ ,  $u_i-v-w-u_j-u_{j-1}-u_{j-2}-\dots-u_i$  forms an induced cycle of length at least 6 in  $G$ . But  $G$  is an AT-free graph, a contradiction.

From Lemma 3 we have the following observation:

**Observation 5.** *If  $u, v \in V(\overline{P})$ ,  $u \in S_i$ ,  $v \in S_j$  and  $(u, v) \in E(G)$  then  $|j - i| = 2$ .*

**Lemma 4.** *Let  $u \in S_i$  and  $v \in S_{i+2}$  where  $1 \leq i \leq d - 2$ . If  $(u, v) \in E(G)$  then for any  $p \in S_i \setminus \{u\}$ ,  $q \in S_{i+2} \setminus \{v\}$  we have  $(p, q) \notin E(G)$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose not. Let  $p \in S_i \setminus \{u\}$  and  $q \in S_{i+2} \setminus \{v\}$  such that  $(p, q) \in E(G)$ . Since  $u, p \in S_i$ , according to Lemma 3 part (1),  $(u, p) \notin E(G)$ . Similarly  $(v, q) \notin E(G)$ . According to Lemma 2,  $(u, u_{i+2}) \notin E(G)$ ,  $(p, u_{i+2}) \notin E(G)$ ,  $(q, u_i) \notin E(G)$  and  $(v, u_i) \notin E(G)$ . Also we have  $(u, q) \notin E(G)$  and  $(v, p) \notin E(G)$  by Lemma 3 part (3). Moreover  $(u_i, u_{i+2}) \notin E(G)$  since  $P$  is a shortest  $x-y$  path. Therefore  $u-u_i-p-q-u_{i+2}-v-u$  forms an induced cycle of length 6 in  $G$  and hence  $\{u, p, u_{i+2}\}$  forms an AT in  $G$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

A vertex  $v \in V(\overline{P})$  is said to be *non-pendant* if  $N_G(v) \cap V(\overline{P}) \neq \emptyset$ . Note that if  $N_G(v) \cap V(\overline{P}) = \emptyset$  then  $v$  has to be a pendant vertex by Lemma 2.

**Lemma 5.**  *$S_i$  can contain at most 2 non-pendant vertices for  $1 \leq i \leq d$ .*

*Proof.* If  $v \in S_i$  is non-pendant then according to Observation 5, either  $N_G(v) \cap S_{i-2} \neq \emptyset$  or  $N_G(v) \cap S_{i+2} \neq \emptyset$ . By Lemma 3 part (3) and Lemma 4, at most one vertex in  $S_i$  can be connected to some vertex in  $S_{i+2}$ . Similarly at most one vertex in  $S_i$  can be connected to some vertex in  $S_{i-2}$ . Therefore  $S_i$  can contain at most 2 non-pendant vertices.  $\square$

**Observation 6.** *If  $S_i$  contains two non-pendant vertices say  $u, v$  then one of the following statements is true (by Lemma 3 part (3) and Lemma 4)*

1.  $N_G(u) \cap S_{i-2} = \emptyset$  and  $N_G(v) \cap S_{i+2} = \emptyset$ .
2.  $N_G(u) \cap S_{i+2} = \emptyset$  and  $N_G(v) \cap S_{i-2} = \emptyset$ .

### 3.1 Interval Graph Construction

We shall construct two interval graphs  $I_1$  and  $I_2$  such that  $G = I_1 \cap I_2$ . In the interval graph  $I_j$  where  $j = 1, 2$ , let  $l_j(u)$  and  $r_j(u)$  denote the left and right endpoint of the interval corresponding to vertex  $u \in V(G)$  respectively. Let  $S$  be the set of non-pendant



vertices in  $V(\overline{P})$ . To construct  $I_1$  we map each vertex  $v \in V(G)$  to an interval on the real line by the mapping:

$$\begin{aligned}
g_1(v) &= [i, i + 1] && \text{if } v \in V(P) \text{ and } v = u_i \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq d \\
&= [i + \frac{2j-1}{2n}, i + \frac{2j}{2n}] && \text{if } v \in S_i \setminus S, 1 \leq i \leq d \text{ and } 1 \leq j \leq |S_i| \\
&= [i - \frac{1}{2}, i + \frac{3}{2}] && \text{if } v \in S_i \cap S, N_G(v) \cap S_{i-2} \neq \emptyset \text{ and } N_G(v) \cap S_{i+2} \neq \emptyset \\
&= [i + 1, i + \frac{3}{2}] && \text{if } v \in S_i \cap S, N_G(v) \cap S_{i-2} = \emptyset \text{ and } N_G(v) \cap S_{i+2} \neq \emptyset \\
&= [i - \frac{1}{2}, i] && \text{if } v \in S_i \cap S, N_G(v) \cap S_{i-2} \neq \emptyset \text{ and } N_G(v) \cap S_{i+2} = \emptyset
\end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 6.**  $I_1$  is a supergraph of  $G$ .

*Proof.* Let  $(u, v) \in E(G)$ . We shall show that  $g_1(u) \cap g_1(v) \neq \emptyset$ . We consider the following cases:

**Case 1:** When either  $u \in V(P)$  or  $v \in V(P)$ . Without loss of generality we can assume that  $u \in V(P)$ . Let  $u = u_i$  where  $1 \leq i \leq d$ . If  $v \in V(P)$  then either  $v = u_{i-1}$  or  $v = u_{i+1}$ . Now if  $v = u_{i-1}$  then  $i \in g_1(u) \cap g_1(v)$ . On the other hand if  $v = u_{i+1}$  then  $i + 1 \in g_1(u) \cap g_1(v)$ . If  $v \in \overline{P}$  then according to Observation 4,  $v \in S_i$ . Now if  $v \in S_i \setminus S$  then  $i = l_1(u) < l_1(v) < r_1(u) = i + 1$  and hence  $g_1(u) \cap g_1(v) \neq \emptyset$ . If  $v \in S_i \cap S$  then we consider the following cases: If  $N_G(v) \cap S_{i-2} \neq \emptyset$  then  $i \in g_1(u) \cap g_1(v)$ . Otherwise if  $N_G(v) \cap S_{i+2} \neq \emptyset$  then  $i + 1 \in g_1(u) \cap g_1(v)$ .

**Case 2:** When  $u, v \in V(\overline{P})$ . By definition of non-pendant vertices  $u, v \in S$ . Let  $u \in S_i$ . According to Observation 5, either  $v \in S_{i-2}$  or  $v \in S_{i+2}$ . If  $v \in S_{i-2}$  then  $l_1(u) = r_1(v) = i - \frac{1}{2}$ . Otherwise if  $v \in S_{i+2}$  then  $r_1(u) = l_1(v) = i + \frac{3}{2}$ . In both cases we have  $g_1(u) \cap g_1(v) \neq \emptyset$ .  $\square$

To construct  $I_2$  we map each vertex  $v \in V(G)$  to an interval on the real line by the mapping:

$$\begin{aligned}
g_2(v) &= [1, 2] && \text{if } v \in V(P), v = u_i \text{ and } i \bmod 2 = 1 \\
&= [2, 3] && \text{if } v \in V(P), v = u_i \text{ and } i \bmod 2 = 0 \\
&= [\frac{5}{4}, \frac{7}{4}] && \text{if } v \in S_i \setminus S \text{ and } i \bmod 2 = 1 \\
&= [\frac{9}{4}, \frac{11}{4}] && \text{if } v \in S_i \setminus S \text{ and } i \bmod 2 = 0 \\
&= [0, 1] && \text{if } v \in S_i \cap S \text{ and } i \bmod 2 = 1 \\
&= [3, 4] && \text{if } v \in S_i \cap S \text{ and } i \bmod 2 = 0
\end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 7.**  $I_2$  is a supergraph of  $G$ .

*Proof.* Let  $(u, v) \in E(G)$ . We shall show that  $g_2(u) \cap g_2(v) \neq \emptyset$ . We consider the following cases:

**Case 1:** When either  $u \in V(P)$  or  $v \in V(P)$ . Without loss of generality we can assume that  $u \in V(P)$ . Let  $u = u_i$  where  $1 \leq i \leq d$ . If  $v \in V(P)$  then  $2 \in g_2(u) \cap g_2(v)$ . If  $v \in V(\overline{P})$  then according to Observation 4,  $v \in S_i$ . Now if  $v \in S_i \setminus S$  then  $l_2(u) < l_2(v) < r_2(v) < r_2(u)$  and hence  $g_2(u) \cap g_2(v) \neq \emptyset$ . If  $v \in S_i \cap S$  we consider the following cases: If  $i \bmod 2 = 1$  then  $l_2(u) = r_2(v) = 1$ . On the other hand if  $i \bmod 2 = 0$  then  $r_2(u) = l_2(v) = 3$ . In both cases we have  $g_2(u) \cap g_2(v) \neq \emptyset$ .

**Case 2:** When  $u, v \in V(\overline{P})$ . By definition of non-pendant vertices  $u, v \in S$ . Let  $u \in S_i$  and  $v \in S_j$  where  $1 \leq i, j \leq d$ . According to Observation 5,  $|i - j| = 2$  which implies that  $i = j \bmod 2$ . Hence  $g_2(u) = g_2(v)$  and thus  $g_2(u) \cap g_2(v) \neq \emptyset$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 8.** For any  $(u, v) \notin E(G)$  either  $(u, v) \notin E(I_1)$  or  $(u, v) \notin E(I_2)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $(u, v) \notin E(G)$ . We consider the following cases:

**Case 1:** When  $u, v \in V(P)$ . Let  $u = u_i$  and  $v = u_j$  where  $1 \leq i, j \leq d$ . Since  $(u, v) \notin E(G)$  we have  $|j - i| \geq 2$ . Therefore  $|l_1(u) - l_1(v)| \geq 2$ . Since in  $I_1$ , the intervals corresponding to vertices in  $V(P)$  are of length 1 we have  $g_1(u) \cap g_1(v) = \emptyset$  and hence  $(u, v) \notin E(I_1)$ .

**Case 2:** When  $u \in V(P)$  and  $v \in V(\overline{P})$ . Let  $u = u_i$  where  $1 \leq i \leq d$ . According to Observation 4,  $v \in S_k$  where  $k \neq i$ . Now if  $v \in S_k \setminus S$  then  $k < l_1(v) < r_1(v) < k + 1$ . Since  $g_1(u) = [i, i + 1]$  and  $i \neq k$  we have  $g_1(u) \cap g_1(v) = \emptyset$ . Hence  $(u, v) \notin E(I_1)$ .

When  $v \in S_k \cap S$  we consider the following cases:

**Subcase 2.1:** When  $|k - i| \geq 2$ . Now  $g_1(u) = [i, i + 1]$  and  $k - \frac{1}{2} \leq l_1(v) < r_1(v) \leq k + \frac{3}{2}$ . If  $i \leq k - 2$  then  $r_1(u) \leq k - 1 < k - \frac{1}{2} \leq l_1(v)$  and hence  $g_1(u) \cap g_1(v) = \emptyset$ . If  $i \geq k + 2$  then  $l_1(u) \geq k + 2 > k + \frac{3}{2} \geq r_1(v)$  and hence  $g_1(u) \cap g_1(v) = \emptyset$ . Therefore  $(u, v) \notin E(I_1)$ .

**Subcase 2.2:** When  $|k - i| \leq 1$ . Since  $k \neq i$  we have  $k \bmod 2 \neq i \bmod 2$ . If  $i \bmod 2 = 0$  then  $g_2(u) = [2, 3]$  and  $g_2(v) = [0, 1]$ . Hence  $g_2(u) \cap g_2(v) = \emptyset$ . If  $i \bmod 2 = 1$  then  $g_2(u) = [1, 2]$  and  $g_2(v) = [3, 4]$ . Hence  $g_2(u) \cap g_2(v) = \emptyset$ . In both cases we have  $(u, v) \notin E(I_2)$ .

**Case 3:** When  $u, v \in V(\overline{P})$ . We consider the following cases:

**Subcase 3.1:** When  $u, v \in S$ . Let  $u \in S_i$  and  $v \in S_j$ . If  $i = j$  then according to Observation 6, either  $N_G(u) \cap S_{i-2} = \emptyset$  and  $N_G(v) \cap S_{i+2} = \emptyset$  OR  $N_G(v) \cap S_{i-2} = \emptyset$  and  $N_G(u) \cap S_{i+2} = \emptyset$ . If  $N_G(u) \cap S_{i-2} = \emptyset$  and  $N_G(v) \cap S_{i+2} = \emptyset$  then  $r_1(v) = i < i + 1 = l_1(u)$ . Hence  $g_1(u) \cap g_1(v) = \emptyset$ . If  $N_G(v) \cap S_{i-2} = \emptyset$  and  $N_G(u) \cap S_{i+2} = \emptyset$  then  $r_1(u) = i < i + 1 = l_1(v)$ . Hence  $g_1(u) \cap g_1(v) = \emptyset$ .

If  $i \neq j$  then we consider the following cases. Without loss of generality we can assume that  $j > i$ .

**Subcase 3.1.1:** When  $(j - i) \bmod 2 \neq 0$ . It is easy to see that  $g_2(u) \cap g_2(v) = \emptyset$ .

**Subcase 3.1.2:** When  $(j - i) \bmod 2 = 0$ . We consider the following cases:

**Subcase 3.1.2.1:** When  $j = i + 2$ . We will show that either  $N_G(u) \cap S_{i+2} = \emptyset$  or  $N_G(v) \cap S_i = \emptyset$ . If possible let  $N_G(u) \cap S_{i+2} \neq \emptyset$  and  $N_G(v) \cap S_i \neq \emptyset$ . Let  $p \in S_i$  and  $q \in S_{i+2}$  be such that  $(u, q) \in E(G)$  and  $(v, p) \in E(G)$ . Since  $(u, v) \notin E(G)$  we have  $u \neq p$  and  $v \neq q$ . But then we get a contradiction to Lemma 4. Therefore either  $N_G(u) \cap S_{i+2} = \emptyset$  or  $N_G(v) \cap S_i = \emptyset$ . If  $N_G(u) \cap S_{i+2} = \emptyset$  then  $r_1(u) = i < i + \frac{3}{2} = j - \frac{1}{2} \leq l_1(v)$ . Therefore  $g_1(u) \cap g_1(v) = \emptyset$ . On the other hand if  $N_G(v) \cap S_i = \emptyset$  then  $r_1(u) \leq i + \frac{3}{2} < j + 1 = l_1(v)$ . Therefore  $g_1(u) \cap g_1(v) = \emptyset$ .

**Subcase 3.1.2.2:** When  $j \geq i + 4$ . Then  $r_1(u) \leq i + \frac{3}{2} < (i + 4) - \frac{1}{2} \leq j - \frac{1}{2} \leq l_1(v)$ . Therefore  $g_1(u) \cap g_1(v) = \emptyset$ .

**Subcase 3.2:** When  $u \notin S$  and  $v \notin S$ . According to the construction of  $I_1$ , it is easy to see that  $\bigcup_{i=1}^d (S_i \setminus S)$  induces an independent set in  $I_1$ . Therefore  $g_1(u) \cap g_1(v) = \emptyset$ .

**Subcase 3.3:** When  $u \notin S$  and  $v \in S$ . In  $I_2$ ,  $g_2(v)$  is either  $[0, 1]$  or  $[3, 4]$  and  $g_2(u)$  is either  $[\frac{5}{4}, \frac{7}{4}]$  or  $[\frac{9}{4}, \frac{11}{4}]$ . In all the four possible cases it is easy to see that  $g_2(u) \cap g_2(v) = \emptyset$ . □

Combining Lemma 6,7 and 8 we have the following Theorem

**Theorem 9.** *If  $G$  is an AT-free graph having girth at least 5 then  $\text{box}(G) \leq 2$ .*

### 3.2 Tightness of Theorem 9

Let  $G$  be a cycle of length 5. It is easy to see that  $G$  is an AT-free graph having girth at least 5. According to Theorem 9,  $\text{box}(G) \leq 2$ . But clearly  $\text{box}(G) = 2$ , since  $G$  is not an interval graph. Therefore the upper bound given by Theorem 9 is tight.

## 4 Upper bound on cubicity of AT-free graphs

In this section we will show an upper bound on cubicity of AT-free graphs in terms of its boxicity and claw number. This in turn will give an upper bound in terms of chromatic number and claw number. Let  $G$  be an AT-free graph with chromatic number  $\chi(G)$  and claw number  $\psi(G)$ . We need some results shown by Parra and Scheffler [24].

For any graph  $G(V, E)$  and for a given pair of nonadjacent vertices  $a, b \in V$ , a subset  $S \subset V \setminus \{a, b\}$  is a *a-b vertex separator* (*a-b separator* for short) if when  $S$  is removed from  $G$ ,  $a$  and  $b$  belong to different connected components of  $G \setminus S$ .  $S$  is said to be a *minimal a-b separator* if no proper subset of  $S$  is an *a-b separator*. A separator  $S$  in  $G$  is said to be a *minimal separator* of  $G$  if there exists a pair of vertices  $a, b \in V(G)$  such

that  $S$  is a minimal  $a$ - $b$  separator. It is well-known that a graph is chordal if and only if all its minimal separators induce cliques [17].

Let  $S$  and  $T$  be two minimal separators of  $G$ .  $S$  is said to *cross*  $T$  if there are two components  $C, D$  of  $G \setminus T$  such that  $S$  intersects both  $C$  and  $D$ . Parra and Scheffler [24] have shown that if  $S$  crosses  $T$  then  $T$  crosses  $S$  also.  $S$  and  $T$  are said to be *parallel* if they do not cross each other. Let  $\mathcal{S}_G$  denote the set of minimal separators in  $G$ . For  $\mathcal{T} = \{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_k\} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_G$ , let  $G_{\mathcal{T}}$  denote the graph obtained by making each separator  $S_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq k$  a clique. The following Theorem is proved in [24].

**Theorem 10.** (Parra and Scheffler [24])

1. Let  $\mathcal{T} = \{S_1, \dots, S_k\}$  be a maximal set of pairwise parallel minimal separators in  $G$ . Then  $H = G_{\mathcal{T}}$  is a minimal triangulation of  $G$  and  $\mathcal{S}_H = \mathcal{T}$ .
2. Let  $H$  be a minimal triangulation of  $G$ . Then  $\mathcal{S}_H$  is a maximal set of pairwise parallel minimal separators in  $G$  and  $H = G_{\mathcal{S}_H}$ .

Let  $T$  be a minimal separator of  $G$ . A component  $C$  of  $G \setminus T$  is called a *full component* if every vertex in  $T$  is adjacent to some vertex in  $C$ . The following property of minimal separator is shown in [17].

**Theorem 11.** (Golumbic [17]) *A separator  $T$  in graph  $G$  is minimal if and only if there are at least two full components in  $G \setminus T$ .*

**Lemma 9.** *Let  $X$  be a minimal separator in a graph  $G$  and  $C, D$  be two full components in  $G \setminus X$ . Let  $x \in X$ ,  $c \in C$  and  $d \in D$ . Let  $Y$  be another minimal separator of  $G$  such that  $c \in Y$  and  $x, d \notin Y$ . If  $X$  is parallel to  $Y$  then  $x, d$  belongs to the same connected component in  $G \setminus Y$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose  $x$  and  $d$  lies in different connected components in  $G \setminus Y$ . Since  $D$  is a full component in  $G \setminus X$ , there exists a  $x$ - $d$  path say  $P$  in  $G[D \cup \{x\}]$ . Now according to assumption,  $x$  and  $d$  lie in different components in  $G \setminus Y$ . Therefore  $Y$  must contain at least one vertex from  $P$ . But since  $x \notin Y$  and all the vertices in  $P$  except  $x$  lie in  $D$  we have  $Y \cap D \neq \emptyset$ . Again  $c \in Y \cap C$  and therefore  $Y \cap C \neq \emptyset$ . Hence  $Y$  crosses  $X$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

**Lemma 10.** *If  $G$  is an AT-free graph and  $H$  is a minimal triangulation of  $G$  with claw number  $\psi(H)$  then  $\psi(H) \leq \psi(G)$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose  $\psi(H) > \psi(G)$  and  $\psi(H) = p$ . An edge  $(u, v) \in E(H)$  is said to be an old edge if  $(u, v) \in E(G)$  and is said to be a new edge otherwise. Among all the claws of maximum size in  $H$ , let  $U = \{s, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_p\}$  induce the one with maximum number of old edges in it. Let  $s$  be the center of the claw. Since  $\psi(H) > \psi(G)$  at least one of the edges in  $U$  has to be new. Without loss of generality let us assume that  $(s, x_1)$  is a

new edge. Let  $\mathcal{T} = \{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_k\}$  be the collection of minimal separators of  $H$ . From part (2) of Theorem 10,  $\mathcal{T}$  is a maximal set of pairwise parallel minimal separators of  $G$  and  $H = G_{\mathcal{T}}$ . In other words if  $(u, v) \in E(H) \setminus E(G)$  then there exists an  $S_j \in \mathcal{T}$  such that both  $u, v \in S_j$ . Thus the vertices  $s, x_1$  must belong to some minimal separator, say  $X \in \mathcal{T}$  of  $G$ . Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be the set of full components in  $G \setminus X$ . According to Theorem 11,  $|\mathcal{C}| \geq 2$ . We consider the following two cases:

**Case 1:** *There exists a full component  $C \in \mathcal{C}$  such that  $C \cap \{x_2, x_3, \dots, x_p\} = \emptyset$ .* Since  $C$  is a full component of  $G \setminus X$  and  $s \in X$  there is at least one vertex in  $C$ , say  $a$  such that  $(s, a) \in E(G)$ . Since  $E(G) \subseteq E(H)$  we have  $(s, a) \in E(H)$ . Note that  $(a, x_i) \notin E(G)$  for  $2 \leq i \leq p$  because  $C \cap \{s, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_p\} = \emptyset$  by assumption and  $x_i \notin X$  for  $2 \leq i \leq p$  since  $x_1 \in X$  and  $X$  induces a clique in  $H$ . Then it is easy to see that  $\{s, a, x_2, \dots, x_p\}$  forms a claw of size  $p$  in  $H$  having more old edges than in  $U$  since  $(s, x_1)$  is a new edge and  $(s, a)$  is an old edge. But by assumption  $U$  was a maximum sized claw having maximum number of old edges in it, a contradiction.

**Case 2:** *Every full component in  $\mathcal{C}$  contains at least one  $x_i$  where  $2 \leq i \leq p$ .* According to Theorem 11,  $|\mathcal{C}| \geq 2$  and hence there exists two full components  $C, D \in \mathcal{C}$ . Let  $x_i \in C$  and  $x_j \in D$  where  $2 \leq i < j \leq p$ . We will show that the triplet  $\{x_1, x_i, x_j\}$  forms an AT in  $G$ , leading to a contradiction. Since  $C$  is a full component of  $G \setminus X$ ,  $x_i \in C$  and  $x_1 \in X$  there exists a  $x_i$ - $x_1$  path in  $G[C \cup \{x_1\}]$  and this path does not intersect  $N_G(x_j)$  since  $x_j \in D$ . Similarly since  $D$  is a full component of  $G \setminus X$ ,  $x_j \in D$  and  $x_1 \in X$  there exists a  $x_j$ - $x_1$  path in  $G[D \cup \{x_1\}]$  which does not intersect  $N_G(x_i)$ . Now we want to show that there exists a  $x_i$ - $x_j$  path in  $G$  which does not intersect  $N_G(x_1)$ . For that we need the following claim:

**Claim:**

1. There exists a  $x_i$ - $s$  path in  $G$  that does not intersect  $N_G(x_1)$ .
2. There exists a  $x_j$ - $s$  path in  $G$  that does not intersect  $N_G(x_1)$ .

*Proof.* We prove only part (1) since the proof of part (2) is similar. Recall that  $(s, x_1)$  is a new edge by assumption. Since  $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_p\}$  induce an independent set in  $H$  and  $E(G) \subseteq E(H)$  they induce an independent set in  $G$  also. If  $(s, x_i) \in E(G)$  we have a  $x_i$ - $s$  path in  $G$  that does not intersect  $N_G(x_1)$  since  $(s, x_1) \notin E(G)$  and  $(x_1, x_i) \notin E(G)$ . Therefore we can assume that  $(s, x_i) \notin E(G)$ . Since  $(s, x_i)$  is a new edge by theorem 10 there should be a minimal separator  $Y \in \mathcal{T}$  such that  $s, x_i \in Y$ . Clearly  $X \neq Y$  since  $x_i \notin X$ . According to Theorem 10,  $X$  and  $Y$  are parallel and each separator in  $\mathcal{T}$  induces a clique in  $H$ . Since  $(x_i, x_1) \notin E(H)$ ,  $(x_i, x_j) \notin E(H)$  and  $x_i \in Y$  we have  $x_1 \notin Y$  and  $x_j \notin Y$ . Therefore according to Lemma 9,  $x_1$  and  $x_j$  must belong to the same connected

component say  $Q$  of  $G \setminus Y$ . Let  $Q'$  be a full component of  $G \setminus Y$  such that  $Q' \neq Q$ . Note that such a full component exists by Theorem 11. Now  $s$  and  $x_i$  must be connected in  $G$  to at least one vertex in  $Q'$  and therefore there is a  $x_i$ - $s$  path in  $G[Q' \cup \{x_i, s\}]$  which does not intersect  $N_G(x_1)$ .  $\square$

Since  $(s, x_1) \notin E(G)$  from the previous claim it is easy to see that there exists a  $x_i$ - $x_j$  path in  $G$  which does not intersect  $N_G(x_1)$ . Therefore  $\{x_1, x_i, x_j\}$  forms an asteroidal triple in  $G$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

**Theorem 12.** *If  $G$  is an AT-free graph then  $\text{cub}(G) \leq \text{box}(G)(\lceil \log_2 \psi(G) \rceil + 2) \leq \chi(G)(\lceil \log_2 \psi(G) \rceil + 2)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\text{box}(G) = k$  and  $I_1, I_2, \dots, I_k$  be interval graphs such that  $G = \bigcap_{j=1}^k I_j$ . It is easy to see that if we replace each  $I_j$  by a chordal graph  $I'_j$  such that  $V(I_j) = V(I'_j)$  and  $E(G) \subseteq E(I'_j) \subseteq E(I_j)$ , we still have  $G = \bigcap_{j=1}^k I'_j$ . It follows that there exists chordal graphs  $I'_1, I'_2, \dots, I'_k$  such that  $G = \bigcap_{j=1}^k I'_j$  where each  $I'_j$  is a minimal triangulation of  $G$ . But by Theorem 2 any minimal triangulation of an AT-free graph is an interval graph. It follows that  $I'_1, I'_2, \dots, I'_k$  are interval graphs. According to Lemma 10,  $\psi(I'_j) \leq \psi(G)$  for  $1 \leq j \leq k$ . Since  $G = \bigcap_{j=1}^k I'_j$  we have  $\text{cub}(G) \leq \sum_{j=1}^k \text{cub}(I'_j)$  according to Fact 1. By Theorem 1,  $\text{cub}(I'_j) \leq \lceil \log_2 \psi(I'_j) \rceil + 2$  and by Lemma 10,  $\text{cub}(I'_j) \leq \lceil \log_2 \psi(G) \rceil + 2$  for  $1 \leq j \leq k$ . It follows that  $\text{cub}(G) \leq k(\lceil \log_2 \psi(G) \rceil + 2) = \text{box}(G)(\lceil \log_2 \psi(G) \rceil + 2)$ . Therefore  $\text{cub}(G) \leq \text{box}(G)(\lceil \log_2 \psi(G) \rceil + 2)$ . By Theorem 4, we also have  $\text{cub}(G) \leq \chi(G)(\lceil \log_2 \psi(G) \rceil + 2)$ .  $\square$

From Theorem 9 and 12 we get the following:

**Corollary 1.** *If  $G$  is an AT-free graph having girth at least 5 then  $\text{cub}(G) \leq 2 \lceil \log_2 \psi(G) \rceil + 4$ .*

## References

1. A. Adiga, L. S. Chandran, Cubicity of interval graphs and the claw number, manuscript, <http://arxiv.org/abs/0903.1197>, an abstract to appear in eurocomb 2009.
2. A. Adiga, L. S. Chandran, N. Sivadasan, Lower bounds for boxicity, manuscript, <http://arxiv.org/abs/0806.3175>.
3. S. Bellantoni, I. B.-A. Hartman, T. Przytycka, S. Whitesides, Grid intersection graphs and boxicity, Disc. Math. 114 (1-3) (1993) 41–49.
4. L. Chandran, A. Das, C. D. Shah, Cubicity, boxicity and vertex cover., Disc. Math. 309 (8) (2009) 2488–2496.
5. L. Chandran, N. Sivadasan, Geometric representation of graphs in low dimension using axis parallel boxes., Algorithmica DOI 10.1007/s00453-008-9163-5.
6. L. S. Chandran, M. C. Francis, N. Sivadasan, Representing graphs as the intersection of axis-parallel cubes, Accepted in MCDES 2008 (Managing Complexity in Distributed World, Division of Electrical Sciences, IISc- The IISc Centenary Conference.).

7. L. S. Chandran, M. C. Francis, N. Sivadasan, Boxicity and maximum degree, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* 98 (2) (2008) 443–445.
8. L. S. Chandran, C. Mannino, G. Oriolo, On the cubicity of certain graphs, *Inf. Process. Lett.* 94 (3) (2005) 113–118.
9. L. S. Chandran, N. Sivadasan, Boxicity and treewidth, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* 97 (5) (2007) 733–744.
10. Y. W. Chang, D. B. West, Interval number and boxicity of digraphs, in: *Proceedings of the 8th International Graph Theory Conf.*, 1998.
11. Y. W. Chang, D. B. West, Rectangle number for hyper cubes and complete multipartite graphs, in: *29th SE conf. Comb., Graph Th. and Comp., Congr. Numer.* 132, 1998.
12. D. G. Corneil, S. Olariu, L. Stewart, Asteroidal triple-free graphs, *SIAM J. Discrete Math.* 10 (3) (1997) 399–430.
13. D. G. Corneil, S. Olariu, L. Stewart, Linear time algorithms for dominating pairs in asteroidal triple-free graphs, *SIAM J. Comput.* 28 (4) (1999) 1284–1297.
14. M. B. Cozzens, F. S. Roberts, Computing the boxicity of a graph by covering its complement by cointerval graphs, *Disc. Appl. Math.* 6 (1983) 217–228.
15. L. Esperet, Boxicity of graphs with bounded degree., *European Journal of Combinatorics* 30 (5) (2009) 1277–1280.
16. R. B. Feinberg, The circular dimension of a graph, *Disc. Math.* 25 (1) (1979) 27–31.
17. M. C. Golumbic, *Algorithmic Graph Theory and Perfect Graphs*, Academic Press, New York, 1980.
18. T. Kloks, D. Kratsch, H. Müller, Approximating the bandwidth for asteroidal triple-free graphs, *J. Algorithms* 32 (1) (1999) 41–57.
19. J. Kratochvil, A special planar satisfiability problem and a consequence of its NP-completeness, *Disc. Appl. Math.* 52 (1994) 233–252.
20. L.C.Freeman, Spheres, cubes and boxes: graph dimensionality and network structure., in: *Social Networks* 5, 1983.
21. T. A. McKee, E. R. Scheinerman, On the chordality of a graph, *Journal of graph theory* 17 (2) (1993) 221–232.
22. R. H. Möhring, Triangulating graphs without asteroidal triples, *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 64 (3) (1996) 281–287.
23. R. Opsut, F. Roberts, On the fleet maintainence, mobile radio frequency, task assignment, and traffic phasing problems in g., in: *The Theory and Applications of Graphs*, Wiley New York, 1981.
24. A. Parra, P. Scheffler, Characterizations and algorithmic applications of chordal graph embeddings, *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 79 (1-3) (1997) 171–188.
25. F. S. Roberts, *Recent Progresses in Combinatorics*, chap. On the boxicity and Cubicity of a graph, Academic Press, New York, 1969, pp. 301–310.
26. F. S. Roberts, *Discrete mathematical models with applications to Social, Biological and Environmental Problems.*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1976.
27. E. R. Scheinerman, Intersection classes and multiple intersection parameters, Ph.D. thesis, Princeton University (1984).
28. C. Thomassen, Interval representations of planar graphs, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* 40 (1986) 9–20.
29. W. T. Trotter, Jr., D. B. West, Poset boxicity of graphs, *Disc. Math.* 64 (1) (1987) 105–107.
30. M. Yannakakis, The complexity of the partial order dimension problem, *SIAM J. Alg. Disc. Math.* 3 (3) (1982) 351–358.