

NAJI'S CHARACTERIZATION OF CIRCLE GRAPHS

JIM GEELEN AND EDWARD LEE

ABSTRACT. We present a simpler proof of Naji's characterization of circle graphs.

1. INTRODUCTION

A *circle graph* is the intersection graph of a finite set of chords on a circle. This class of graphs has surprising connections with planar graphs; De Fraysseix [3] showed that a bipartite graph is a circle graph if and only if it is the fundamental graph of a planar graph. By De Fraysseix's result any characterization of the class of circle graphs gives a characterization for the class of planar graphs.

Naji [6] gave the following beautiful characterization of the class of circle graphs by a system of linear equations over the two-element field \mathbb{F}_2 ; one attractive feature of this characterization is that it immediately gives an efficient algorithm for recognizing circle graphs.

Theorem 1.1 (Naji's Theorem). *A graph is a circle graph if and only if there exist values $\beta(u, v) \in \mathbb{F}_2$ for each distinct pair (u, v) of vertices such that*

- (1) $\beta(v, w) + \beta(w, v) = 1$ for each edge vw ,
- (2) $\beta(x, v) + \beta(x, w) = 0$ for each triple (x, v, w) of distinct vertices such that vw is an edge but xv and xw are not, and
- (3) $\beta(v, w) + \beta(w, v) + \beta(x, v) + \beta(x, w) = 1$ for each triple (x, v, w) of distinct vertices such that xv and xw are edges but vw is not.

The specialization of Naji's Theorem to bipartite graphs gives a characterization of planar graphs. In fact, more generally, it characterizes when a binary matroid is the cycle matroid of a planar graph. Geelen and Gerards [5] extended that specialization by characterizing when a binary matroid is graphic.

Date: May 29, 2019.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 05C62.

This research was partially supported by grants from the Office of Naval Research [N00014-10-1-0851] and NSERC [203110-2011] as well as an NSERC Canada Graduate Scholarship.

Naji’s original proof, which appears in his doctoral dissertation, is very long and was not published in a journal. Gasse [4] published a short proof of Naji’s Theorem, but it relies on Bouchet’s excluded-vertex minor characterization of the class of circle graphs [1] which is itself long and difficult. On the other hand, Geelen and Gerards gave a very short and intuitive proof of their characterization of graphic matroids. Motivated by that proof, Traldi [7] gave a shorter proof of Naji’s Theorem, but unlike the proof in [5], Traldi’s proof is not self-contained, relying on Bouchet’s analogue of Tutte’s Wheels Theorem for vertex-minors; see [2]. We give a self-contained proof based on the methods presented in [5].

2. OVERVIEW

We refer to the system of equations in Naji’s Theorem as the *Naji system* for the graph. For adjacent vertices v and w , we denote the equation $\beta(v, w) + \beta(w, v) = 1$ by $\text{NS}_1(v, w)$. For adjacent vertices v and w and a vertex x adjacent to neither v nor w , we denote the equation $\beta(x, v) + \beta(x, w) = 0$ by $\text{NS}_2(x, v, w)$. For distinct non-adjacent vertices v and w and a vertex x adjacent to both v and w , we denote the equation $\beta(v, w) + \beta(w, v) + \beta(x, v) + \beta(x, w) = 1$ by $\text{NS}_3(x, v, w)$.

A *chord diagram* is a drawing of a circle and some chords with disjoint ends. A *circle graph* is the intersection graph of the chords of some chord diagram; see Figure 1.




FIGURE 1. A Chord Diagram and its Circle Graph

We start by showing how to construct a solution to the Naji system when G is a circle graph. Let \mathcal{C} be a chord diagram for a circle graph $G = (V, E)$ and let $\vec{\mathcal{C}}$ be obtained from \mathcal{C} by giving each chord an orientation. For a pair (v, w) of distinct vertices of G we define $\beta_{\vec{\mathcal{C}}}(v, w) = 0$ if the head of the chord w is “to the right” of the chord v in $\vec{\mathcal{C}}$ (that is, we encounter the head of w when we travel clockwise from the head of v to the tail of v); see Figure 2. Otherwise, when the head of w is to the left of v , we define $\beta_{\vec{\mathcal{C}}}(v, w) = 1$. Note that, if u and v are




FIGURE 2. When $\beta(v, w) = 0$.

intersecting chords in $\vec{\mathcal{C}}$, then exactly one of u and v crosses the other from left to right; so $\beta_{\vec{\mathcal{C}}}$ satisfies $\text{NS}_1(u, v)$. Moreover, if x is a third chord that crosses neither u nor v , then the heads of u and v lie on the same side of x ; so $\beta_{\vec{\mathcal{C}}}$ satisfies $\text{NS}_2(x, u, v)$. Finally consider three distinct chords $x, u,$ and v where x intersects both u and v but u and v do not intersect. Note that the heads of u and v are on the same side of x if and only if exactly one of u and v is to the left of the other; thus

$$\beta_{\vec{\mathcal{C}}}(x, u) + \beta_{\vec{\mathcal{C}}}(x, v) = \beta_{\vec{\mathcal{C}}}(u, v) + \beta_{\vec{\mathcal{C}}}(v, u) + 1$$

and, hence, $\beta_{\vec{\mathcal{C}}}$ satisfies $\text{NS}_3(x, u, v)$.


So, if G is a circle graph, then the Naji system has a solution. To verify the converse we consider a solution β to the Naji system of a graph G . If $\vec{\mathcal{C}}$ is an oriented chord diagram for G and $\beta = \beta_{\vec{\mathcal{C}}}$ then we say that $\vec{\mathcal{C}}$ is an *oriented chord diagram for (G, β)* . We say that β is *chordal* if there is an oriented chord diagram for (G, β) . Unfortunately not all solutions to Naji systems are chordal; for example, both the complete graph K_4 and the Claw $K_{1,3}$, depicted in Figure 3, admit non-chordal solutions, as shown in the following two tables:

β	a	b	c	d
a		1	0	0
b	0		1	0
c	1	0		0
d	1	1	1	

β	x	a	b	c
x		1	1	1
a	0		0	1
b	0	1		0
c	0	0	1	

Note that, if β is chordal, then the restriction of β to any induced subgraph of G is also chordal. We will call an induced subgraph H of G an *obstruction* if the restriction of β to H is not chordal. We prove the following result in the next section; it shows that the Claw and K_4 are the minimal connected obstructions.

Lemma 2.1. *Let β be a solution to the Naji system for a graph G . If β is not chordal and G is connected, then there is an obstruction that is isomorphic to the Claw or to K_4 .*

FIGURE 3. Splits in K_4 and the Claw

We will use the terms K_4 -obstruction and *Claw-obstruction* to refer to obstructions isomorphic to K_4 and the Claw respectively.

A *split* in a graph G is a partition (X, Y) of $V(G)$ such that X and Y each have at least two vertices and the set of edges connecting X to Y induces a complete bipartite graph. Note that there are three ways to partition four vertices into pairs and each of these partitions is a split both in K_4 and in the Claw; see Figure 3. The hardest part of our proof is showing that splits in K_4 - or Claw-obstructions extend to splits in G ; see Section 4 for details.

Lemma 2.2. *Let β be a non-chordal solution to the Naji system for a graph G , let H be a K_4 -obstruction or a Claw-obstruction in G , and let (X, Y) be a split in H . Then there is a split (X', Y') in G such that $X \subseteq X'$ and $Y \subseteq Y'$.*

In our proof of Lemma 2.2 we consider K_4 -obstructions and Claw-obstructions independently, but readers familiar with the paper of Gasse [4] will observe that the two cases are in fact equivalent under local complementation.

Now we prove Naji's Theorem as a consequence of Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2.

Proof of Naji's Theorem. Consider a counter-example $G = (V, E)$ with $|V|$ minimum. Thus G is not a circle graph but there is a solution β to the Naji system for G . Since G is not a circle graph, β is not chordal. By minimality, G is connected. Then, by Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2, the graph G has a split (X, Y) . Let xy be an edge with $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$. Let G_1 and G_2 denote the subgraphs of G induced by $X \cup \{y\}$ and $Y \cup \{x\}$ respectively; see Figure 4.

Since G_1 and G_2 both have fewer vertices than G , by minimality, both G_1 and G_2 are circle graphs. By a well known folklore result printed by Bouchet in [2], we can construct a chord diagram for G by composing chord diagrams for G_1 and G_2 together as shown in Figure 5, contradicting the fact that G is not itself a circle graph. \square




FIGURE 4. G , G_1 , and G_2




FIGURE 5. Chord diagrams for G_1 , G_2 and G

3. FINDING THE OBSTRUCTIONS

The goal of this section is to prove Lemma 2.1. We need the following strengthening of the Naji equations of type (2).

Lemma 3.1. *Let β be a solution to the Naji system for a graph G and let x , u , and v be distinct vertices. If there is a path P from u to v and x is not adjacent to any vertex in P , then $\beta(x, u) = \beta(x, v)$.*

Proof. By possibly taking shortcuts, we may assume that the path P is an induced subgraph of G . Suppose that the vertices of P are (v_0, v_1, \dots, v_k) , in that order. For each $i \in \{0, \dots, k-1\}$, the equation $\text{NS}_2(x, v_i, v_{i+1})$ gives $\beta(x, v_i) = \beta(x, v_{i+1})$. Hence $\beta(x, u) = \beta(x, v)$, as required. \square

We start by describing an equivalence operation on solutions to the Naji system; this operation essentially corresponds to reorienting chords, but it also applies to non-chordal solutions.

Let $\vec{\mathcal{C}}_1$ be an oriented chord diagram for a circle graph G and let $\vec{\mathcal{C}}_2$ denote a second chord diagram obtained from $\vec{\mathcal{C}}_1$ by changing the orientation on a single chord c . For distinct vertices u and v we have

$\beta_{\vec{c}_1}(u, v) \neq \beta_{\vec{c}_2}(u, v)$ if and only if either $c = u$ or $c = v$ and uv is an edge.

Now consider an arbitrary graph G . For three vertices $c, u, v \in V$ with $u \neq v$ we define $\delta_c(u, v) = 1$ if either $c = u$ or $c = v$ and uv is an edge; otherwise we define $\delta_c(u, v) = 0$. The following result, due to Gasse [4], shows that the equivalence that we saw above on chordal solutions extends to arbitrary solutions of the Naji system; the proof can be verified by an easy case check.

Lemma 3.2. *If β be a solution to the Naji system of a graph G and c is a vertex of G , then $\beta + \delta_c$ is also a solution to the Naji system.*

We say that $\beta + \delta_c$ is obtained from β by *reorienting* c .

Let β be a solution to the Naji system for a graph $G = (V, E)$. Our goal is to find either a K_4 -obstruction or a Claw-obstruction in the case that β is not chordal.

For a set X of vertices, we let $\beta[X]$ denote the restriction of β to X . Suppose that $\beta[V - c]$ is chordal for some $c \in V$, and let $\vec{\mathcal{C}}$ be an oriented chord diagram for $(G - c, \beta[V - c])$. Consider trying to extend $\vec{\mathcal{C}}$ to an oriented chord diagram for (G, β) . For a vertex $v \in V - c$, if $\beta(v, c) = 0$, then we want to place the head of c to the right of v and if $\beta(v, c) = 1$ then we wish to place the head of c to the left of v .

Let $H(\beta, \vec{\mathcal{C}}, v)$ denote the open arc of the circle into which the head of c is required to be placed relative to v . Therefore the head of c is required to go into the intersection of the sets $H(\beta, \vec{\mathcal{C}}, v)$ where v ranges over all vertices in $V - c$; we denote this intersection by $H(\beta, \vec{\mathcal{C}})$.

To determine the position of the tail of c we simply reorient β at c ; thus we define

$$T(\beta, \vec{\mathcal{C}}, v) = H(\beta + \delta_c, \vec{\mathcal{C}}, v), \text{ and}$$

$$T(\beta, \vec{\mathcal{C}}) = H(\beta + \delta_c, \vec{\mathcal{C}}).$$

Lemma 3.3. *Let β be a solution for the Naji system of a graph $G = (V, E)$, let $c \in V$, and let $\vec{\mathcal{C}}$ be an oriented chord diagram for $(G - v, \beta[V - c])$. Now let $t \in T(\beta, \vec{\mathcal{C}})$, $h \in H(\beta, \vec{\mathcal{C}})$, and let $\vec{\mathcal{C}}_1$ denote the oriented chord diagram obtained from $\vec{\mathcal{C}}$ by adding c as an oriented chord with tail t and head h . Then $\vec{\mathcal{C}}_1$ is an oriented chord diagram for (G, β) .*

Proof. By construction $\beta_{\vec{c}_1} = \beta$, so it only remains to prove that $\vec{\mathcal{C}}_1$ is an oriented chord diagram for G . Consider a vertex $v \in V - c$. By definition $\delta_c(v, c) = 1$ if and only if $vc \in E$. So the chord v separates h from t if and only if $vc \in E$, as required. \square




FIGURE 6. Minimal covers

We are interested in the combinatorial properties of oriented chord diagrams as opposed to the specific topology; we can encode this combinatorial information by traversing the perimeter of the circle in a clockwise direction and recording for each end of a chord that we encounter both the name of the chord and whether that end is a head or a tail. We consider two oriented chord diagrams to be *equivalent* if they have the same such encodings.

Lemma 3.4. *Let β be a solution for the Naji system of a graph G . If β is chordal and G is connected, then, up to equivalence, there is a unique oriented chord diagram for (G, β) .*

Proof. We may assume that G has at least two vertices and, hence, that G has a vertex c such that $G - c$ is connected. Inductively we may assume that there is a unique oriented chord diagram \vec{C} for $(G - c, \beta[V(G - c)])$. Since β is chordal, there is an oriented chord diagram \vec{C}_1 of G respecting β ; let h and t denote the head and tail of c in \vec{C}_1 respectively. By uniqueness, we may assume that \vec{C}_1 contains \vec{C} . Hence,

$$t \in T(G - c, \beta[V(G - c)]) \text{ and } h \in H(G - c, \beta[V(G - c)]).$$

Claim 3.4.1. *$T(G - c, \beta[V(G - c)])$ and $H(G - c, \beta[V(G - c)])$ are both open arcs neither of which contains an end of any chord.*

Proof of claim. It suffices to prove the claim for $H(G - c, \beta[V(G - c)])$. Since $H(G - c, \beta[V(G - c)])$ is the intersection of finitely many open arcs it is an open set with finitely many components. Since, for each $v \in V(G - c)$, the arc $H(G - c, \beta[V(G - c)], v)$ does not contain an end of v , the set $H(G - c, \beta[V(G - c)])$ does not contain the end of a chord. Let A be a maximal closed arc disjoint from $H(G - c, \beta[V(G - c)])$ and let C denote the set of chords in \vec{C} having an end in A . Since the ends of A are ends of chords, the set C is non-empty. Moreover, for each chord $v \in C$, since the arc $H(G - c, \beta[V(G - c)], v)$ contains $H(G - c, \beta[V(G - c)])$, both ends of v are contained in A . Then, since $G - c$ is connected, $H(G - c, \beta[V(G - c)])$ consists of a single arc. \square

Now, to prove the uniqueness of $\vec{\mathcal{C}}_1$, it remains to prove that $T(G - c, \beta[V(G - c)]) \neq H(G - c, \beta[V(G - c)])$. Since G is connected, there is a neighbour v of c . Note that $\delta_{\vec{\mathcal{C}}}(v, c) = 1$, so $T(G - c, \beta[V(G - c)], v)$ is disjoint from $H(G - c, \beta[V(G - c)], v)$ and, hence,

$$T(G - c, \beta[V(G - c)]) \neq H(G - c, \beta[V(G - c)])$$

as required. \square

If we cannot extend $\vec{\mathcal{C}}$ to an oriented chord diagram of (G, β) then, by Lemma 3.3, one of $T(\beta, \vec{\mathcal{C}})$ and $H(\beta, \vec{\mathcal{C}})$ is empty; by possibly reorienting β at c we may assume that $H(\beta, \vec{\mathcal{C}}) = \emptyset$. For a subset $X \subseteq V - c$ we let $H(\vec{\mathcal{C}}, \beta, X)$ denote the intersection of the arcs $H(\vec{\mathcal{C}}, \beta, v)$ taken over all $v \in X$. Consider a minimal subset X of $V - c$ such that $H(\beta, \vec{\mathcal{C}}, X)$ is empty.

Note that a collection of arcs has empty intersection if and only if the union of their complements covers the circle. Figure 6 show some minimal configurations of arcs that cover the circle; the following result shows that this list of examples is exhaustive. In this result \mathbb{Z}_k denotes the set of integers modulo k .

Lemma 3.5. *Let \mathcal{A} be a finite collection of closed arcs of a circle whose union covers the circle. Then there is a sequence (A_1, \dots, A_k) of arcs in \mathcal{A} such that (A_1, \dots, A_k) covers the circle and such that, for each $i \in \mathbb{Z}_k$, the arc A_i has a non-empty intersection with the arcs A_{i-1} and A_{i+1} but is disjoint from all other arcs.*

Proof. We may assume that \mathcal{A} is a minimal cover. Consider the set P of points on the circle that are in exactly one arc of \mathcal{A} . Now P partitions into a finite collection (P_1, \dots, P_k) of open arcs, which we number according to their order around the circle. For each $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, we let A_i denote the arc containing P_i . By the minimality of \mathcal{A} , the arcs A_1, \dots, A_k are distinct and $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, \dots, A_k\}$. By construction, for each $i \in \mathbb{Z}_k$, the arc A_i has a non-empty intersection with the arcs A_{i-1} and A_{i+1} but is disjoint from all other arcs. \square

We are now ready to prove Lemma 2.1, which states that if β is a solution is a non-chordal solution of the Naji system of a graph G , then there is an obstruction that is isomorphic to the Claw or K_4 .

Proof of Lemma 2.1. We may assume that no proper induced subgraph of G is both connected and an obstruction. Let c be a vertex of G such that $G - c$ is connected, and let $\vec{\mathcal{C}}$ be an oriented chord diagram for $(G - c, \beta[V(G - c)])$.

Case 1: *There are distinct vertices u and v of $G - c$ such that either $H(\vec{\mathcal{C}}, \beta, \{u, v\})$ or $T(\vec{\mathcal{C}}, \beta, \{u, v\})$ is empty.*

We may assume that $H(\vec{\mathcal{C}}, \beta, \{u, v\})$ is empty. By possibly reorienting $\vec{\mathcal{C}}$ and β on vertices in $V(G - c)$, we may assume that, for each vertex $w \in V(G - c)$, the arc $H(\vec{\mathcal{C}}, \beta, w)$ is to the right of w and hence that $\beta(v, c) = \beta(u, c) = 0$. Let $P = (v_0, v_1, \dots, v_k)$ be a shortest path from c to $\{u, v\}$ in G ; by symmetry, we may assume that $v_k = u$. Note that $\beta(v, c) = 0$ and, since the arcs to the right of u and v are disjoint, we have $\beta(v, u) = 1$. Then, by Lemma 3.1, the vertex v must have a neighbour in P . Since P is a shortest path from c to $\{u, v\}$, it must be the case that v is adjacent to v_{k-1} . Now we consider three cases $k = 1$, $k > 2$, and $k = 2$.

First suppose that $k = 1$. Summing equations $\text{NS}_1(c, u)$, $\text{NS}_1(c, v)$, and $\text{NS}_3(c, u, v)$ gives $\beta(u, c) + \beta(v, c) + \beta(u, v) + \beta(v, u) = 1$, which is a contradiction since $\beta(u, c) = \beta(v, c) = 0$ and $\beta(u, v) = \beta(v, u) = 1$.

Now suppose that $k > 2$. The head of v_1 is either to the left of u or the left of v ; by symmetry we may assume that it is to the left of u . Then $\beta(u, c) \neq \beta(u, v_1)$, contrary to $\text{NS}_2(u, c, v_1)$.

Finally suppose that $k = 2$. Let $H = G[\{c, u, v, v_1\}]$; note that H is isomorphic to the Claw. Moreover, since $H - c$ is connected and $H(\vec{\mathcal{C}}, \beta, V(H - c)) = \emptyset$, it follows from Lemma 3.4 that H is an obstruction, as required.

Case 2: *For any two distinct vertices u and v of $G - c$, both $H(\vec{\mathcal{C}}, \beta, \{u, v\})$ and $T(\vec{\mathcal{C}}, \beta, \{u, v\})$ are nonempty.*

Since β is not chordal, either $H(\vec{\mathcal{C}}, \beta)$ or $T(\vec{\mathcal{C}}, \beta)$ is empty. By possibly reorienting β at c , we may assume that $H(\beta, \vec{\mathcal{C}}) = \emptyset$. By possibly reorienting $\vec{\mathcal{C}}$ and β on vertices in $V(G - c)$, we may assume that, for each vertex $v \in V(G - c)$, the arc $H(\vec{\mathcal{C}}, \beta, v)$ is to the right of v and hence that $\beta(v, c) = 0$. Now, by Lemma 3.5, if X is a minimal subset of $V(G - c)$ such that $H(\beta, \vec{\mathcal{C}}, X) = \emptyset$, then $G[X]$ is an induced cycle. Let C be an induced cycle in $G - c$ with $H(\beta, \vec{\mathcal{C}}, V(C)) = \emptyset$. Let the vertices of C be (v_1, \dots, v_k) in that cyclic order. Among all such choices of C , if possible, we will take C containing a neighbour of c .

Claim 3.6. *The vertex c is either adjacent to every vertex in C or adjacent to no vertex in C .*

Proof of claim. Suppose not, then, up to symmetry, we may assume that c is adjacent to v_1 but not v_2 . Choose $j \in \{2, \dots, k\}$ maximum such that c is adjacent to none of $\{v_2, \dots, v_j\}$. Note that v_1 is adjacent

to v_2 and c but $cv_2 \notin E$. Moreover, $\beta(v_1, v_2) = 0$, $\beta(v_2, v_1) = 1$, and $\beta(v_2, c) = 0$. Therefore, by $\text{NS}_3(v_1, v_2, c)$, we have $\beta(c, v_2) = 0$. Similarly we have $\beta(c, v_{j-1}) = 1$. In particular $\beta(c, v_1) \neq \beta(c, v_{j-1})$, contradicting Lemma 3.1. \square

Claim 3.7. *If c is adjacent to every vertex in C , then G has a K_4 -obstruction.*

Proof of claim. First consider the case that C has three vertices. Then $G[V(C) \cup \{c\}]$ is isomorphic to K_4 . Moreover, it follows from Lemma 3.4 that $G[V(C) \cup \{c\}]$ is an obstruction, as required. Hence we may assume that C has at least four vertices. Let $\beta' = \beta + \delta_c$. Note that $\beta'(v_i, c) = 1$ for each vertex v_i of C . In particular, this implies that $T(\mathcal{C}, \beta, v_1)$ and $T(\mathcal{C}, \beta, v_3)$ are disjoint, contrary to the hypotheses of this case. \square

Henceforth we may assume that c has no neighbours in C . Note that in this case $\delta_c(v_i, c) = 0$ for each $i \in \mathbb{Z}_k$ and hence $T(\vec{\mathcal{C}}, \beta) = \emptyset$. Therefore we are free to reorient β at c , however, when we reorient β at c we should also reorient the chords adjacent to c so that we keep the property that, for each $v \in V - c$, the arc $H(\vec{\mathcal{C}}, \beta, v)$ lies to the right of v .

Let v be a neighbour of c . Since $\beta[V(G - c)]$ is chordal, by NS_1 v is also a neighbour of C . For each $i \in \mathbb{Z}_k$ we let A_i denote the arc $H(\vec{\mathcal{C}}, \beta, V(C) - \{v_i\})$. These arcs are disjoint and $k \geq 3$, so one of these arcs, say A_i , lies either entirely to the right of v or entirely to the left of v . By possibly reorienting β at c and at each of its neighbours, we may assume that A_i lies to the left of v . Thus $H(\vec{\mathcal{C}}, \beta, (V(C) - \{v_i\}) \cup \{v\})$ is empty. Then, by Lemma 3.4, there is an induced cycle C' in $G[(V(C) - \{v_i\}) \cup \{v\}]$ such that $H(\vec{\mathcal{C}}, \beta, V(C'))$ is empty. Note that $v \in V(C')$ and that this contradicts our initial choice of C . \square

4. INDUCING A SPLIT

In this section we complete the proof of Naji's Theorem by proving Lemma 2.2, showing that any split in either a K_4 -obstruction or in a Claw obstruction will extend to a split in the original graph.

Let (X_0, Y_0) be a split in an induced subgraph H of G . We say that (X_0, Y_0) *induces a split* in G if there is a split (X, Y) in G with $X_0 \subseteq X$ and $Y_0 \subseteq Y$.

We will start with Claw-obstructions, which are a little easier to deal with; this proof is similar to that of Lemma 4.1 in [5].

Lemma 4.1. *Let β be a solution to the Naji system for a graph G and let H be a Claw-obstruction in G . Then each split in H induces a split in G .*

Proof. Consider an induced claw $G[\{x, a, b, c\}]$ in G where x is the vertex of degree 3. Summing $\text{NS}_3(x, a, b)$, $\text{NS}_3(x, b, c)$, and $\text{NS}_3(x, c, a)$ gives

$$(\beta(a, b) + \beta(a, c)) + (\beta(b, a) + \beta(b, c)) + (\beta(c, a) + \beta(c, b)) = 1.$$

Therefore either one or three of $\beta(a, b) + \beta(a, c)$, $\beta(b, a) + \beta(b, c)$, and $\beta(c, a) + \beta(c, b)$ is equal to 1. Given three pairwise non-intersecting chords a' , b' , and c' in an oriented chord diagram $\vec{\mathcal{C}}$, we have $\beta_{\vec{\mathcal{C}}}(a', b') + \beta_{\vec{\mathcal{C}}}(a', c') = 1$ if and only if a' separates b' from c' . However, if a' separates b' from c' then neither b' nor c' separate the other two chords. Therefore, if $\beta(a, b) + \beta(a, c) = 1$, $\beta(b, a) + \beta(b, c) = 1$, and $\beta(c, a) + \beta(c, b) = 1$, then $G[\{x, a, b, c\}]$ is an obstruction. It is left to the reader to verify that $\beta[\{x, a, b, c\}]$ is chordal when exactly one of $\beta(a, b) + \beta(a, c)$, $\beta(b, a) + \beta(b, c)$, and $\beta(c, a) + \beta(c, b)$ is equal to 1.

We denote the set of neighbours of a vertex v by $N(v)$. We first prove the following two claims, analogous to Claims 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 in [5].

Claim 4.1.1. *Let $G[\{x, a, b, c\}]$ be a Claw-obstruction where x is the vertex of degree three and let $X = N(a) \cap N(b) \cap N(c)$. Then a , b and, c are in distinct components of $G - X$.*

Proof. Suppose otherwise and let P be a shortest path in $G - X$ connecting two of a , b , and c . By symmetry we may assume that P contains a and b . Since $G[\{x, a, b, c\}]$ is a Claw-obstruction, we have $\beta(c, a) \neq \beta(c, b)$. Then, by Lemma 3.1, the vertex c must have a neighbour, say z , in P . However, by the minimality of P , both za and zb must be edges in P . But then $z \in X$, which is not possible for vertices of P . \square

Suppose that $V(H) = \{x, a, b, c\}$ where x is the vertex of degree three in H and let $X = N(a) \cap N(b) \cap N(c)$. Let X_a (respectively X_b and X_c) denote the set of vertices that are in the same component of $G - X$ as a (respectively b and c).

Claim 4.1.2. *If $d \in X_a \cup X_b \cup X_c$ is a vertex with a neighbour in X , then X is contained in $N(d)$.*

Proof. Up to symmetry we may assume that $d \in X_c$. Let $x' \in X$ be a neighbour of d . Note that $G[\{x', a, b, d\}]$ is a Claw. By Claim 4.1.1, the vertex a is not in the same component of $G - X$ as c . Hence, by Lemma 3.1, we have $\beta(a, c) = \beta(a, d)$. By a symmetric argument $\beta(b, c) = \beta(b, d)$. Since H is a Claw-obstruction, $\beta(a, b) + \beta(a, c) = 1$ and $\beta(b, a) + \beta(b, c) = 1$. So $\beta(a, b) + \beta(a, d) = 1$ and $\beta(b, a) + \beta(b, d) = 1$, and, hence, $G[\{x', a, b, d\}]$ is a Claw-obstruction. Then, by Claim 4.1.1, it must be the case that $X \subseteq N(d)$, as required. \square

Now consider a split (A, B) in H ; up to symmetry we may assume that $A = \{a, b\}$ and $B = \{x, c\}$. Let $A' = X_a \cup X_b$ and $B' = V(G) - A'$. Note that $A \subseteq A'$, $B \subseteq B'$, and, by Claim 4.1.2, (A', B') is a split in G . \square

We now complete the proof of Lemma 2.2 by showing that splits in K_4 -obstructions induce splits in the full graph.

Lemma 4.2. *Let β be a solution to the Naji system for a graph G and let H be a K_4 -obstruction in G . Then each split in H induces a split in G .*

Proof. For an edge $e = uv$ of G the equation $\text{NS}_1(u, v)$ implies that exactly one of $\beta(u, v)$ and $\beta(v, u)$ is one. So we can construct an orientation \vec{G} of G such that v is the head of e if and only if $\beta(u, v) = 1$. Reorienting β at a vertex x has the effect of changing the orientations on all edges incident with x and leaving the other edge orientations as they were.

Consider a subgraph H_0 of G that is isomorphic to K_4 and let $x \in V(H_0)$. We can reorient β so that $H_0 - x$ is a directed cycle in \vec{G} and so that at least two of the three edges of H_0 incident with x have x as their tail. It is easy to verify that, if the third edge has x as head, then $\beta[V(H_0)]$ is chordal, while, if that edge has x as its tail, H_0 is an obstruction.

Consider a 4-cycle C in G . We refer to C as *odd* (respectively *even*) if we encounter an *odd* (respectively *even*) number of forward arcs when we traverse C in \vec{G} ; since C has an even number of edges it does not matter which direction we traverse C . It is now easy to verify that H_0 is an obstruction if and only if every 4-cycle in H_0 is odd.

Claim 4.2.1. *Let $H_0 = G[\{a, b, c, d\}]$ be a subgraph of G isomorphic to K_4 and let P be a path with distinct ends a and b in H_0 such that $V(P) \cap V(H_0) = \{a, b\}$ and $E(P) \cap E(H_0) = \emptyset$. If $P \cup H_0$ is an induced subgraph of G , then the 4-cycle (a, c, b, d, a) of G is even.*

Proof of claim. Suppose that the vertices of P are (v_0, v_1, \dots, v_k) , in that order, from a to b . First consider the case that $k = 2$. Adding the equations $\text{NS}_3(a, c, v_1)$, $\text{NS}_3(b, c, v_1)$, $\text{NS}_3(a, d, v_1)$, $\text{NS}_3(b, d, v_1)$, $\text{NS}_1(a, c)$, and $\text{NS}_1(b, d)$ gives $\beta(c, a) + \beta(a, d) + \beta(d, b) + \beta(b, c) = 0$, and hence the 4-cycle (a, c, b, d, a) of G is even. So we may assume that $k > 2$. By Lemma 3.1, we have $\beta(c, v_1) + \beta(c, v_{k-1}) = 0$ and $\beta(d, v_1) + \beta(d, v_{k-1}) = 0$. Now add these two equations together with the equations $\text{NS}_3(a, c, v_1)$, $\text{NS}_3(b, c, v_{k-1})$, $\text{NS}_3(a, d, v_1)$, $\text{NS}_3(b, d, v_{k-1})$, $\text{NS}_2(v_1, c, d)$, $\text{NS}_2(v_{k-1}, c, d)$, $\text{NS}_1(a, c)$, and $\text{NS}_1(b, d)$ to obtain $\beta(c, a) +$

$\beta(a, d) + \beta(d, b) + \beta(b, c) = 0$, and hence the 4-cycle (a, c, b, d, a) of G is even. \square

Claim 4.2.2. *Let $H_0 = G[\{a, b, c, d\}]$ be a K_4 -obstruction. If $a' \in V(G) - \{a, b, c, d\}$ is a vertex that is adjacent to $b, c,$ and d but not a , then $G[\{a', b, c, d\}]$ is a K_4 -obstruction.*

Proof of claim. Consider an arbitrary 4-cycle C of H_0 . Up to symmetry we may assume that C is (a, b, c, d, a) . Since H_0 is a K_4 -obstruction,

$$\beta(a, b) + \beta(b, c) + \beta(c, d) + \beta(d, a) = 1.$$

Adding the equations $\text{NS}_3(d, a, a')$, $\text{NS}_3(b, a, a')$, $\text{NS}_1(a, b)$, and $\text{NS}_1(a', b)$ to this equation gives

$$\beta(a', b) + \beta(b, c) + \beta(c, d) + \beta(d, a') = 1.$$

So each 4-cycle of $G[\{a', b, c, d\}]$ is odd, as required. \square

Choose maximal disjoint vertex-sets (X_a, X_b, X_c, X_d) such that

- (i) each set (X_a, X_b, X_c, X_d) contains a vertex of H , and
- (ii) for each $a \in X_a, b \in X_b, c \in X_c,$ and $d \in X_d$ the subgraph $G[\{a, b, c, d\}]$ is a K_4 -obstruction.

Since H is a K_4 -obstruction, every 4-cycle of H is odd, so such sets exist. Let $X = X_a \cup X_b \cup X_c \cup X_d$.

Claim 4.2.3. *For each $v \in V(G) - X$, either*

- *v is adjacent to vertices in at most one of the sets (X_a, X_b, X_c, X_d) ,*
or
- *v is adjacent to every vertex in X .*

Proof of Claim. Suppose otherwise that v has neighbours in at least two of the sets (X_a, X_b, X_c, X_d) , but that v is not adjacent to every vertex in X . By Claim 4.2.1, v cannot have exactly two neighbours in any K_4 -obstruction. It follows that v has neighbours in at least three of (X_a, X_b, X_c, X_d) . Now, up to symmetry we can choose elements $a \in X_a, b \in X_b, c \in X_c,$ and $d \in X_d$ such that v is adjacent to b and c but not a . By Claim 4.2.1, v is also adjacent to d . By changing our choice of $d \in X_d$ (respectively $b \in X_b$ and $c \in X_c$) and applying Claim 4.2.1, we have that v is adjacent to each vertex in X_d (respectively X_b and X_c). Now, for any $b' \in X_b, c' \in X_c$ and $d' \in X_d$, by Claim 4.2.2, we have that $G[\{a, b', c', d'\}]$ is a K_4 -obstruction. Thus $(X_a \cup \{a\}, X_b, X_c, X_d)$ satisfies (ii), but this contradicts the maximality of our collection (X_a, X_b, X_c, X_d) . \square

Let Y denote the set of all vertices in $V(G) - X$ that are adjacent to every vertex in X .

Claim 4.2.4. *Each component in $G - (X \cup Y)$ has neighbours in at most one of the sets (Y, X_a, X_b, X_c, X_d) .*

Proof of Claim. By Claims 4.2.1 and 4.2.3, no component of $G - (X \cup Y)$ has neighbours in two of the sets (X_a, X_b, X_c, X_d) . Suppose that there is a component of $G - (X \cup Y)$ with neighbours in both X and Y . Consider a shortest path $P = (v_0, v_1, \dots, v_k)$ such that v_0 has a neighbour in X and v_k has a neighbour in Y . Suppose that $a \in X$ is a neighbour of v_0 and $a' \in Y$ is a neighbour of v_k . By symmetry we may assume that $a \in X_a$. By the maximality of (X_a, X_b, X_c, X_d) , there exist $b \in X_b$, $c \in X_c$, and $d \in X_d$ such that $G[\{a', b, c, d\}]$ is not a K_4 -obstruction. By possibly reorienting β at b, c , and d we may assume that the edges ab, ac , and ad each have a as their head and by possibly reorienting β at a' we may assume that at least two of the edges $a'b, a'c$, and $a'd$ have a' as their head. Up to symmetry we may assume that a' is the head of both $a'b$ and $a'c$. Since $G[\{a, b, c, d\}]$ is a K_4 -obstruction but $G[\{a', b, c, d\}]$ is not, a' must be the tail of $a'd$. However, then the 4-cycle (a, b, a', d, a) is odd, contrary to Claim 4.2.1. \square

Now consider a split (A, B) in H ; up to symmetry we may assume that $A \subseteq X_a \cup X_b$ and $B \subseteq X_c \cup X_d$. Let A' denote the union of X_a, X_b , together with the set of all vertices in components of $G - (X \cup Y)$ that have a neighbour in $X_a \cup X_b$. Let $B' = V(G) - A'$. Note that $A \subseteq A', B \subseteq B'$, and, by Claim 4.2.4, (A', B') is a split in G . \square

5. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank the referees for their helpful comments.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Bouchet, Circle graph obstructions, *J. Combin. Theory, Ser. B*, 60 (1994), pp. 107-144.
- [2] A. Bouchet, Reducing prime graphs and recognizing circle graphs, *Combinatorica* 7 (1987), pp. 243-254.
- [3] H. de Fraysseix, Local complementation and interlacement graphs, *Discrete Math.* 33 (1981), pp. 29-35.
- [4] E. Gasse, A proof of a circle graph characterization, *Discrete Math.* 173 (1997), pp. 273-283.
- [5] J. Geelen, B. Gerards, Characterizing graphic matroids by a system of linear equations, *J. Comb. Theory, Ser. B*, 103 (2013), pp. 642-646.
- [6] W. Naji, *Graphes des cordes: une caractérisation et ses applications* (Thèse), Grenoble, 1985.

- [7] L. Traldi, Notes on a theorem of Naji, *Discrete Math.* 340 (2017), pp. 3217-3234.

E-mail address: jfgeelen@uwaterloo.ca

DEPARTMENT OF COMBINATORICS AND OPTIMIZATION, UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO, WATERLOO, ON, CANADA

E-mail address: e45lee@uwaterloo.ca

DEPARTMENT OF COMBINATORICS AND OPTIMIZATION, UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO, WATERLOO, ON, CANADA