

Hoffman-London graphs: When paths minimize H -colorings among trees

David Galvin*
 University of Notre Dame
 dgalvin1@nd.edu

JD Nir
 Oakland University
 jdnir@oakland.edu

Phillip Marmorino†
 Purdue University
 pmarmorino@purdue.edu

Amanda Redlich
 University of Massachusetts Lowell
 amanda_redlich@uml.edu

Emily McMillon‡
 Rice University
 em72@rice.edu

January 1, 2026

Abstract

Given a graph G and a target graph H , an H -coloring of G is an adjacency-preserving vertex map from G to H . The number of H -colorings of G , $\text{hom}(G, H)$, has been studied for many classes of G and H . In particular, extremal questions of maximizing and minimizing $\text{hom}(G, H)$ have been considered when H is a clique or G is a tree.

In this paper, we develop a new technique using automorphisms of H to show that $\text{hom}(T, H)$ is minimized by paths as T varies over trees on a fixed number of vertices. We introduce the term *Hoffman-London* to refer to graphs that are minimal in this sense. In particular, we define an *automorphic similarity matrix* which is used to compute $\text{hom}(T, H)$ and give matrix conditions under which H is Hoffman-London.

We then apply this technique to identify several families of graphs that are Hoffman-London, including loop threshold graphs and some with applications in statistical physics (e.g. the Widom-Rowlinson model). By combining our approach with a few other observations, we fully characterize the minimizing trees for all graphs H on three or fewer vertices.

1 Introduction

Graph coloring is a well-known problem in which vertices of a graph are assigned a color with the restriction that adjacent vertices receive different colors. In this paper, we consider the related notion of H -colorings of a graph G in which vertices of G are labeled by vertices of H in such a way that adjacent vertices in G must be “colored” by adjacent vertices of H . Formally, given a simple, loopless graph $G = (V(G), E(G))$ and a target graph $H = (V(H), E(H))$ without multi-edges, but possibly containing loops, an H -coloring of G is a map $f : V(G) \rightarrow V(H)$ that preserves adjacency: whenever $u \sim_G v$ we must have $f(u) \sim_H f(v)$. Note that when $H = K_q$, the complete graph on q vertices, an H -coloring of G is an assignment of the vertices of G to one of q values with the only

*Galvin is in part supported by Simons Foundation Gift no. 854277 - Travel Support for Mathematicians.

†Marmorino is in part supported by NSF AGS-10002554.

‡McMillon is in part supported by NSF DMS-2303380.

restriction that adjacent vertices receive different labels—in other words, the proper q -colorings of G . In this sense, H -colorings are a generalization of proper vertex colorings, though, as we will see, H -colorings generalize several other common graph theoretic notions as well.

While we mainly focus on the framework of H -colorings, it should be noted that an H -coloring of G is just a graph homomorphism from G to H . Fittingly, we denote the set of all H -colorings of G by $\text{Hom}(G, H)$ and use $\text{hom}(G, H)$ to count the number of such colorings.

As mentioned, H -colorings encompass proper q -colorings by allowing H to be a complete graph. By setting $H = H_{\text{ind}}$, which is one looped vertex connected by an edge to an unlooped vertex, we see H -colorings of G also encode the *independent* (or *stable*) sets of G : any collection of vertices mapped to the unlooped vertex contains no internal edges. Lovász [32] investigated connections between H -colorings and graph limits, quasi-randomness, and property testing. In statistical physics, the language of H -coloring has been adopted to describe hard-constraint spin models; see e.g. [1, 2].

This article contributes to a broader investigation into an extremal enumeration question: for a given family of graphs \mathcal{G} and a target graph H , can we characterize those $G \in \mathcal{G}$ which maximize or minimize $\text{hom}(G, H)$? The origins of this question are attributed to Birkhoff’s work on the 4-color conjecture [3, 4] with more recent attention coming from questions of Wilf [42] and Linial [30] concerning which graph on n vertices and m edges admits the most proper q -colorings, which is to say maximizes $\text{hom}(G, K_q)$. For further results and conjectures, we direct the reader to the surveys [10, 45].

Here we consider the case where \mathcal{G} is a family of trees; in particular we consider the family of graphs $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{T}_n$, the set of all trees on n vertices. As in many such questions, the path graph P_n and star graph $S_n = K_{1, n-1}$ are natural candidates for extremal graphs. When $H = H_{\text{ind}}$, Prodinger and Tichy [34] proved that for each n , the number of independent sets among n vertex trees is maximized by stars and minimized by paths, confirming that for each $T_n \in \mathcal{T}_n$,

$$\text{hom}(P_n, H_{\text{ind}}) \leq \text{hom}(T_n, H_{\text{ind}}) \leq \text{hom}(S_n, H_{\text{ind}}). \quad (1)$$

The Hoffman-London inequality (see [25, 31, 39]) is equivalent to the statement that $\text{hom}(P_n, H) \leq \text{hom}(S_n, H)$ for *any* choice of H and n . Sidorenko [40] extended the Hoffman-London inequality to the following very general result:

Theorem 1.1 (Sidorenko [40]). *Fix H and $n \geq 1$. For any $T_n \in \mathcal{T}_n$,*

$$\text{hom}(T_n, H) \leq \text{hom}(S_n, H).$$

In other words, for any target graph H and order n , not only P_n , but every tree T_n admits at most as many H -colorings as S_n . Sidorenko’s result entirely resolves the maximization question for trees (and, it can be shown, connected graphs).

Given the result of Prodinger and Tichy, one might ask whether paths *minimize* the number of H -colorings; could one show a result analogous to Sidorenko’s that $\text{hom}(P_n, H) \leq \text{hom}(T_n, H)$ for all target graphs? Csikvári and Lin [6], following earlier work of Leontovich [29], dash such hopes by describing a target graph H and a tree E_7 on seven vertices in which $\text{hom}(E_7, H) < \text{hom}(P_7, H)$. They raise the following natural problem [6, Problem 6.2]:

Problem 1.2. Characterize those H for which $\text{hom}(P_n, H) \leq \text{hom}(T_n, H)$ holds for all n and all $T_n \in \mathcal{T}_n$.

Inspired by [25, 31], we introduce the following definitions:

Definition 1.3. We say a target graph H is *Hoffman-London* if for all $n \geq 1$,

$$\hom(P_n, H) = \min_{T_n \in \mathcal{T}_n} \hom(T_n, H) \quad (2)$$

If it holds that $\hom(P_n, H) < \hom(T_n, H)$ for all $T_n \in \mathcal{T}_n \setminus \{P_n\}$ and all $n \geq 1$, we say that H is *strongly Hoffman-London*.

We can thus restate Problem 1.2 as: Which target graphs H are Hoffman-London? To make progress on this problem, we develop criteria for identifying Hoffman-London and strongly Hoffman-London target graphs based on concepts introduced in a companion paper [19], which we restate here. Given a target graph H , possibly with loops, the *orbit partition* of H is the partition of $V(H)$ obtained by declaring a pair of vertices u, v to be equivalent if there is an automorphism that maps u to v . We say such vertices are *automorphically similar*. Denote the equivalence classes of the orbit partition, which we call *automorphic similarity classes*, by H^1, \dots, H^k , where k is the number of automorphism orbits of $V(H)$. We will show in Lemma 3.1 that for each $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $1 \leq j \leq k$, there is a constant $m_{i,j}$ counting the number of neighbors any $v \in H^i$ has in H^j , independent of the specific choice of v . The *automorphic similarity matrix* of H (relative to the specific ordering of the automorphic similarity classes) is the $k \times k$ matrix $M = M(H)$ whose (i, j) -entry is $m_{i,j}$.

We also make use of the following matrix property, which is related to the idea of stochastic domination.

Definition 1.4. A $k \times k$ matrix M with (i, j) -entry $m_{i,j}$ has the *increasing columns property* if any terminal segment of columns is non-decreasing: for each $1 \leq c \leq k$ and each $1 \leq i \leq k-1$,

$$\sum_{j=c}^k m_{i,j} \leq \sum_{j=c}^k m_{i+1,j}. \quad (3)$$

Our first contribution, captured by Theorem 1.5, is a test that can be applied to the automorphic similarity matrix of a graph H which, when it applies, proves that H is Hoffman-London.

Theorem 1.5. *Let H be a target graph, possibly with loops. Suppose there is an ordering of the automorphic similarity classes H^1, \dots, H^k of H such that the automorphic similarity matrix M has the increasing columns property. Then H is Hoffman-London.*

In certain cases, the reasoning behind Theorem 1.5 can be extended to show H is strongly Hoffman-London. For a graph G with designated vertex v , let $\text{Hom}_{v \rightarrow i}(G, H)$ denote the set of H -colorings of G in which v is mapped to some (arbitrary but specific) representative of H^i . We use $\hom_{v \rightarrow i}(G, H)$ for the number of such H -colorings. Although $\text{Hom}_{v \rightarrow i}(G, H)$ clearly depends on the choice of representative, in Lemma 3.2 we will show that $\hom_{v \rightarrow i}(G, H)$ does not.

Corollary 1.6. *Let H be a target graph that satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem 1.5. Suppose that for each $t \geq 2$, there exist two classes, $H^{a(t)}$ and $H^{b(t)}$, such that there is at least one H -coloring of P_t that sends one endvertex of P_t to a vertex in $H^{a(t)}$ and the other endvertex to a vertex in $H^{b(t)}$. Suppose further that for all $s \geq 2$, it holds that $\hom_{v \rightarrow b(t)}(P_s, H) > \hom_{v \rightarrow a(t)}(P_s, H)$, where v is one of the end vertices of P_s . Then H is strongly Hoffman-London.*

In Section 4 we apply Theorem 1.5 to prove (and in some cases, reprove known results) that several families of target graphs are Hoffman-London. These examples include vertex transitive

graphs to which looped dominating vertices are added (partially recovering a result of Engbers and the first author [15]), paths (partially recovering a result of Csikvari and Lin [7]) and fully looped paths, loop threshold graphs, blow-ups of fully looped stars, and families of graphs (including the Widom-Rowlinson model) originating from statistical physics. When possible, we also apply Corollary 1.6 to show that these graphs are strongly Hoffman-London.

2 Preliminary observations

In this section, we gather some observations about enumerating H -colorings of trees that will prove useful at various points throughout the paper. We also present a proof that complete bipartite graphs are Hoffman-London.

We begin with two observations pertaining to target graphs with more than one component. Both results follow immediately from the definition of H -coloring.

Observation 2.1. If H has components H_1, \dots, H_k , then for any connected graph G we have

$$\text{hom}(G, H) = \sum_{i=1}^k \text{hom}(G, H_i).$$

In particular, if it holds that $\text{hom}(P_n, H_i) \leq \text{hom}(T_n, H_i)$ for all i, n , and $T_n \in \mathcal{T}_n$, then it holds that $\text{hom}(P_n, H) \leq \text{hom}(T_n, H)$ for all n and $T_n \in \mathcal{T}_n$.

That is, the set of graphs that are Hoffman-London is closed under taking disjoint unions. The second observation follows from the first, but is useful on its own when considering graphs with isolated vertices.

Observation 2.2. If H has isolated vertices and H' is obtained from H by removing the isolated vertices, then for each G without isolated vertices we have $\text{hom}(G, H) = \text{hom}(G, H')$. In particular, this means that for the purpose of minimizing H -colorings of trees on two or more vertices, we can ignore isolated vertices.

We now make an observation about regular target graphs. Note that here and throughout this paper, the degree of a vertex v is the number of edges (including loops) that contain v —so loops contribute 1 to the degree, not 2, as is used elsewhere in the literature.

Observation 2.3. If H is regular, then all trees on n vertices admit the same number of H -colorings. Specifically, $\text{hom}(T, H) = |V(H)|d^{n-1}$, where d is the degree of each vertex in H .

It follows that regular graphs are, trivially, Hoffman-London. To see the validity of Observation 2.3, put an ordering v_1, \dots, v_n on the vertices of T satisfying that for each $i \geq 2$, v_i is adjacent to exactly one v_j , $j < i$. For example, start with an arbitrary vertex as v_1 , then list all the vertices at distance 1 from v_1 , in some arbitrary order, then move on to all the vertices at distance 2 from v_1 , and so on. When H -coloring the vertices of T in this order, there are $|V(H)|$ options for the color at v_1 , then d options for the color of each successive vertex.

Next, we refer to the notion of the tensor product of two graphs. For graphs H_1 and H_2 , the graph $H_1 \times H_2$ has vertex set $V(H_1) \times V(H_2)$, and pairs $(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2)$ are adjacent in $H_1 \times H_2$ if and only if $x_1x_2 \in E(H_1)$ and $y_1y_2 \in E(H_2)$; see Figure 1.




Figure 1: The tensor product $K_2 \times K_2$.

There is a strong connection between tensor products and H -colorings, namely that for any graphs G , H_1 , and H_2 we have

$$\hom(G, H_1 \times H_2) = \hom(G, H_1) \hom(G, H_2).$$

(see e.g. [32, Equation (5.30)]). From this fact we draw the following two conclusions:

Observation 2.4. If H_1, H_2 satisfy $\hom(P_n, H_i) \leq \hom(T_n, H_i)$ for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$, $n \geq 1$, and $T_n \in \mathcal{T}_n$, then

$$\hom(P_n, H_1 \times H_2) \leq \hom(T_n, H_1 \times H_2)$$

for all n and $T_n \in \mathcal{T}_n$.

That is, the set of graphs that are Hoffman-London is closed under taking tensor products.

Observation 2.5. Let R be a regular graph of degree d with at least one edge. Then for any H and any $n \geq 1$, the trees T_n in \mathcal{T}_n that minimize $\hom(T_n, H)$ are the same as the trees T_n in \mathcal{T}_n that minimize $\hom(T_n, H \times R)$.

Observation 2.5 follows from Observation 2.4 and from the fact that $\hom(T_n, R) = |V(R)|d^{n-1}$ (see Observation 2.3) and is thus positive and independent of the specific choice of $T_n \in \mathcal{T}_n$.

Finally, we present a result whose justification is more involved. A bipartition $V(G) = X \cup Y$ of a graph is called *balanced* if the sizes are as equal as possible, i.e. $|X| = |Y|$ if $|V(G)|$ is even and $||X| - |Y|| = 1$ if $|V(G)|$ is odd.

Theorem 2.6. *Each complete bipartite graph $H = K_{a,b}$ is Hoffman-London. When $a \neq b$, $T_n \in \mathcal{T}_n$ minimizes $\hom(T_n, H)$ if and only if T_n has a balanced bipartition.*

Proof. If $a = b$, then H is a regular graph and Observation 2.3 tells us that every tree admits the same number of H -colorings. For the remainder of the proof we assume that $a \neq b$.

Any tree T_n on n vertices has a unique bipartition, say $V(T) = X \cup Y$, with $|X| = k$ and $|Y| = n - k$. Let A be the part of H containing a vertices and B be the part containing b vertices. Let $\varphi \in \text{Hom}(T_n, K_{a,b})$ and $x \in X$. Then, as T_n is connected, each vertex in X is adjacent to some vertex in Y and each vertex in Y is adjacent to some vertex in X , so if $\varphi(x) \in A$, we have $\varphi(X) \subseteq A$ and $\varphi(Y) \subseteq B$, and if $\varphi(x) \in B$, $\varphi(X) \subseteq B$ and $\varphi(Y) \subseteq A$. Furthermore, as H is complete bipartite, the image of x (and each other vertex in X) can be any vertex in the appropriate part, and similarly for the vertices of Y , so

$$\hom(T_n, K_{a,b}) = a^k b^{n-k} + a^{n-k} b^k =: f(k).$$

We have

$$f'(k) = \frac{\log(a) - \log(b)}{(ab)^k} (a^{2k}b^n - a^n b^{2k}).$$

As $a \neq b$, the only zero of f' occurs when $a^{n-2k} = b^{n-2k}$, which, for distinct positive integers, requires $n - 2k = 0$, or $k = \frac{n}{2}$. Noting

$$f''(k) = \frac{(\log(a) - \log(b))^2}{(ab)^k} (a^{2k}b^n + a^n b^{2k}) > 0,$$

we see $k = \frac{n}{2}$ is a minimum of f , and furthermore f is decreasing as k increases from 0 to $\frac{n}{2}$. Therefore

$$\min_{T \in \mathcal{T}_n} \text{hom}(T_n, H) \geq 2a^{n/2}b^{n/2}$$

when n is even. When n is odd, since k must be an integer,

$$\min_{T \in \mathcal{T}_n} \text{hom}(T_n, H) \geq a^{(n-1)/2}b^{(n+1)/2} + a^{(n+1)/2}b^{(n-1)/2}.$$

In both cases, P_n achieves the bound, as does any tree whose bipartition is balanced. If T is a tree whose bipartition is not balanced, $f(k)$ is strictly greater than the minimum value. \square

Csikvári and Lin [7] observed the case $a = 1$ of Theorem 2.6. The question of whether complete multipartite graphs with more than two parts are Hoffman-London remains open.

3 Proofs of Theorem 1.5 and Corollary 1.6

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.5, our primary condition for identifying Hoffman-London graphs H , and Corollary 1.6, our condition for identifying strongly Hoffman-London graphs. Recall from the introduction that if H is a target graph, possibly with loops, and u and v are vertices in H , we say u and v are *automorphically similar* if there is an automorphism of H that sends u to v . Automorphic similarity defines an equivalence relation on $V(H)$, and we call the equivalence classes of that relation the *automorphic similarity classes* of H . The resulting partition of the vertices is sometimes called the *orbit partition*. As discussed in [23, Section 9.3], the orbit partition is an *equitable partition*, which means that for any two (not necessarily distinct) automorphic similarity classes A and B , there is a constant $c(A, B)$ such $|N(v) \cap B| = c(A, B)$ for each $v \in A$. In other words, vertices in the same automorphic similarity class have the same number of neighbors in each other class. For completeness, and because the proof is brief and illustrative, we include the following lemma (which was first presented in [19]).

Lemma 3.1. *Let H be a graph, possibly with loops, and let H^1, \dots, H^k be the automorphic similarity classes of H . For any $1 \leq i \leq k$, any $u, v \in H^i$, and any $1 \leq j \leq k$,*

$$|N(u) \cap H^j| = |N(v) \cap H^j|.$$

Proof. Let φ be an automorphism of $V(H)$ that sends u to v . Then each $w \in N(u) \cap H^j$ is mapped to some w' . As $w \sim u$, we see $w' \sim v$, and as $w \in H^j$ and $\varphi(w) = w'$ we see w and w' are automorphically similar, so $w' \in H^j$ as well. We have shown $|N(u) \cap H^j| \leq |N(v) \cap H^j|$. Repeating the analysis with φ^{-1} , we see $|N(u) \cap H^j| \geq |N(v) \cap H^j|$ and so equality holds. \square

Using Lemma 3.1, given an ordering H^1, \dots, H^k of the automorphic similarity classes of H , we define $m_{i,j} = c(H^i, H^j)$ to be the number of neighbors that an arbitrary vertex in H^i has in H^j . We then define an *automorphic similarity matrix* of H to be a $k \times k$ matrix $M = M(H)$ whose (i,j) -entry is $m_{i,j}$, where we note that different orderings of the automorphic similarity classes of H may result in different automorphic similarity matrices.

As we will see in Lemma 3.3, the matrix M , together with the sizes of the automorphic similarity classes of H , contains all of the information necessary to count H -colorings of trees. This could also be accomplished using the adjacency matrix of H , but for highly symmetric target graphs the automorphic similarity matrix is much smaller than the adjacency matrix and is thus easier to analyze. First, though, we need the following result, also presented in [19].

Lemma 3.2. *Let H be a graph, possibly with loops, and let G be an arbitrary graph with distinguished vertex v . Suppose w and w' are automorphically similar vertices in H . Let \mathcal{G} be the set of H -colorings of G in which v is sent to w , and let \mathcal{G}' be the set of H -colorings of G in which v is sent to w' . Then $|\mathcal{G}| = |\mathcal{G}'|$.*

Proof. Let φ be an automorphism of H that sends w to w' , which exists as w and w' are automorphically similar. Then the function mapping f to $f \circ \varphi$ is a bijection mapping \mathcal{G} to \mathcal{G}' . \square

We now present another lemma which we will require in the proof of Theorem 1.5 but which we also feel is also of independent interest: a generalization to the setting of automorphic similarity classes and matrices of the tree-walk algorithm of Csikvári and Lin [6]. Recall that $\text{Hom}_{v \rightarrow i}(T, H)$ denotes the set of H -colorings of T in which v is mapped to some (arbitrary but specific) representative of H^i and that we set $\text{hom}_{v \rightarrow i}(T, H) = |\text{Hom}_{v \rightarrow i}(T, H)|$.

Lemma 3.3. *Let H be a target graph with automorphic similarity classes H^1, \dots, H^k and associated automorphic similarity matrix M . Let T be a tree with root v . Let $\mathbf{a}(H)$ be the row vector whose i^{th} entry is $|H^i|$ and define $\mathbf{h}(T, v)$ to be the column vector whose i^{th} entry is $\text{hom}_{v \rightarrow i}(T, H)$.*

Then $\text{hom}(T, H) = \mathbf{a}(H)\mathbf{h}(T, v)$, and $\mathbf{h}(T, v)$ can be explicitly computed from T , $\mathbf{a}(H)$, and M , via recursion on T .

Proof. To see that $\text{hom}(T, H) = \mathbf{a}(H)\mathbf{h}(T, v)$, partition $\text{Hom}(T, H)$ according to the color given to v . There are $|H^i|$ classes in this partition in which v is sent to some vertex in H^i , and by Lemma 3.2, each of these classes has size $\text{hom}_{v \rightarrow i}(T, H)$. Hence the total count of H -colorings is

$$\sum_{i=1}^k |H^i| \text{hom}_{v \rightarrow i}(T, H) = \mathbf{a}(H)\mathbf{h}(T, v).$$

To compute $\mathbf{h}(T, v)$, we proceed recursively. When T consists of a single vertex, necessarily v , we have that $\text{hom}_{v \rightarrow i}(T, H) = 1$ for any i , and so $\mathbf{h}(T, v)$ is the constant vector with all entries equal to 1.

When T has more than one vertex, we consider separately the cases $\deg(v) = 1$ and $\deg(v) \geq 2$. When $\deg(v) = 1$, let w be the neighbor of v . Then

$$\text{hom}_{v \rightarrow i}(T, H) = \sum_{j=1}^k m_{i,j} \text{hom}_{w \rightarrow j}(T - v, H).$$

Indeed, once we have colored v with the representative vertex from H^i , there are, for each j , $m_{i,j}$ choices for a color from H^j for w (as the representative vertex in H^i has $m_{i,j}$ neighbors in H^j for each j). For each of these $m_{i,j}$ choices, recalling that $\text{hom}_{w \rightarrow j}(T - v, H)$ is independent of the choice of representative from H^j due to Lemma 3.2, there are $\text{hom}_{w \rightarrow j}(T - v, H)$ ways to extend the coloring to the rest of T . More succinctly, we have

$$\mathbf{h}(T, v) = M\mathbf{h}(T - v, w) \quad (4)$$

where M is the automorphic similarity matrix of H .

When $\deg(v) = d \geq 2$, let w be any neighbor of v . Form tree T' by taking the component of $T - v$ that contains w and adding a new vertex $v' \sim w$. Form tree T'' by taking each component of $T - v$ that does not contain w (of which there is at least one, because v has degree at least two) and adding a new vertex v'' adjacent to each vertex that was adjacent to v in T . Note that by gluing v' to v'' we recover T . (See Figure 2.)




Figure 2: Deconstructing T into T' and T'' .

Then

$$\mathbf{h}(T, v) = \mathbf{h}(T', v') \odot \mathbf{h}(T'', v''),$$

where \odot represents the Hadamard product in which entries are multiplied term-wise. Indeed, to H -color T while sending v to H^i , we take any H -coloring of T' where v' is sent to H^i ($\text{hom}_{v' \rightarrow i}(T', H)$ many options) and independently any H -coloring of T'' where v'' is sent to H^i ($\text{hom}_{v'' \rightarrow i}(T'', H)$ many options). \square

We require an additional ingredient before proving Theorem 1.5. The KC ordering, introduced by Csikvári [5] (under the name *generalized tree shift*) as a generalization of an operation introduced by Kelmans [28], is a partial ordering of trees on n vertices. Let T be a tree, and let $v_\ell \neq v_r$ be two non-leaf vertices with the property that the unique v_ℓ to v_r path in T is a bare path, meaning that each of the internal vertices, if they exist, have degree two. Let P denote that path on $t \geq 2$ vertices.

Removing the edges and internal vertices (if any) of P from T leaves two components; call them L (the one with v_ℓ) and R (the one with v_r). We think of these as the “left” and “right” components. Denote by T^{KC} the tree built as follows: glue L and R together into a single tree by identifying the vertices v_ℓ and v_r ; let v be the vertex created by the identification. Then complete the construction of T^{KC} by appending a path with $t - 1$ new vertices to v ; denote by w the other end of the appended path. We say that T^{KC} is obtained from T by a *KC move*. Figure 3 illustrates this process. Note that T has at least one such a pair of non-leaf vertices v_ℓ, v_r exactly if T is not a star.




Figure 3: A demonstration of a KC move.

Csikvári [5, Remark 2.4] shows that the relation $S \leq T$ defined by T being obtainable from S by a sequence of KC moves defines, for each n , a partial order on \mathcal{T}_n (the *KC ordering*), with P_n the unique minimal element and S_n the unique maximal element.

The following lemma is necessary for the proof of Theorem 1.5. The proof that we give follows [27, Theorem 1.1, (a) \Rightarrow (c)]. We choose to present the full details because [27] only treats matrices whose row sums are 1.

Lemma 3.4. *Let M be a $k \times k$ non-negative matrix that has the increasing columns property, and let \mathbf{h} be a non-negative column vector of dimension k whose entries are non-decreasing. Then the entries of $M\mathbf{h}$ are non-negative and non-decreasing.*

Proof. Let S be the $k \times k$ matrix that has 1s on and below the main diagonal and 0s everywhere else. Note that S^{-1} has 1s down the main diagonal, -1 s down the first subdiagonal, and 0s everywhere else, which can be verified by computing SS^{-1} .

Observe that for a vector $\mathbf{v} = [v_1 \ v_2 \ \dots \ v_k]^T$, the entries of \mathbf{v} being non-negative and non-decreasing is equivalent to the entries of $S^{-1}\mathbf{v}$ being non-negative because the first entry of $S^{-1}\mathbf{v}$ is v_1 and for $i > 1$, the i^{th} entry is $v_i - v_{i-1}$.

We wish to show that the entries of $M\mathbf{h}$ are non-negative and non-decreasing. This is implied by $S^{-1}M\mathbf{h}$ having non-negative entries, which is in turn implied by $(S^{-1}MS)(S^{-1}\mathbf{h})$ having non-negative entries. By assumption, the entries of \mathbf{h} are non-negative and non-decreasing, so the entries of $S^{-1}\mathbf{h}$ are non-negative. Therefore it suffices to show that $S^{-1}MS$ has non-negative entries.

Let $A = S^{-1}MS$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
 A_{i,j} &= \sum_{p=1}^k (S^{-1})_{i,p} \sum_{q=1}^k m_{p,q} S_{q,j} \\
 &= \sum_{p=1}^k (S^{-1})_{i,p} \sum_{q=1}^j m_{p,q} \\
 &= \sum_{q=1}^j m_{i,q} - \sum_{q=1}^{j-1} m_{i-1,q},
 \end{aligned}$$

where we adopt the convention that $m_{0,q} = 0$. Then

$$\sum_{q=1}^j m_{i,q} - \sum_{q=1}^j m_{i-1,q} \geq 0$$

follows from the increasing columns property. \square

We're now prepared to prove Theorem 1.5, which we restate here for convenience.

Theorem 1.5. *Let H be a target graph, possibly with loops. Suppose there is an ordering of the automorphic similarity classes H^1, \dots, H^k of H such that the automorphic similarity matrix M has the increasing columns property. Then H is Hoffman-London.*

Proof. We show that when H is a graph whose automorphic similarity classes can be ordered in such a way that the automorphic similarity matrix of H has the increasing columns property, applying a non-trivial KC move to a tree does not decrease the number of H -colorings of the tree. As the path is the minimum element of the KC ordering, it must therefore be among the minimizers of $\text{hom}(T_n, H)$.

We begin by establishing some notation. Let T be a non-star tree, let $v_\ell \neq v_r$ be two non-leaf vertices of T with the property that all of the internal vertices on the unique v_ℓ to v_r path have degree two, let there be t vertices in that internal path, and let T^{KC} be the tree obtained from T by applying a KC move at vertices v_ℓ and v_r . Suppose H has automorphic similarity classes H^1, \dots, H^k , labeled in such a way that the automorphic similarity matrix M has the increasing columns property. For $1 \leq i \leq k$, denote by \mathcal{L}_i the set of H -colorings of L in which v_ℓ is mapped to some specific (but arbitrarily chosen) vertex w_i of H^i , and let $\ell_i = |\mathcal{L}_i|$. Define \mathcal{R}_i and r_i analogously (with L replaced by R). Note that by Lemma 3.2, ℓ_i and r_i depend only on i and not on the specific choice of w_i . For $w, v \in V(H)$, denote by $\mathcal{P}^t(w, v)$ the set of H -colorings of any path x_1, \dots, x_t (where, recall, t is the number of vertices on the unique path in T between v_ℓ and v_r) in which x_1 is mapped to w and x_t is mapped to v , and let $p^t(w, v) = |\mathcal{P}^t(w, v)|$. Finally, for $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $1 \leq j \leq k$, let $\mathcal{P}_{i,j}^t = \bigcup_{w \in H^i, v \in H^j} \mathcal{P}^t(w, v)$ and let $p_{i,j}^t = |\mathcal{P}_{i,j}^t| = \sum_{w \in H^i, v \in H^j} p^t(w, v)$.

The idea at the core of this proof is that $\text{hom}(T, H)$ and $\text{hom}(T^{KC}, H)$ can both be expressed in terms of the ℓ_i , r_j , and $p_{i,j}^t$ s by partitioning the H -colorings according to, in the case of T , the automorphic similarity classes to which v_ℓ and v_r are mapped, and in the case of T^{KC} , the automorphic similarity classes to which v and w are mapped. In each case we get expressions that are sums of k^2 terms, and we show $\text{hom}(T^{KC}, H) \geq \text{hom}(T, H)$ by proving each term in the summation expression for $\text{hom}(T^{KC}, H) - \text{hom}(T, H)$ is non-negative.

When computing $\text{hom}(T, H)$, v_ℓ and v_r can take any pair of values, and those pairs of values then determine the values taken by the endvertices of P , which gives

$$\begin{aligned} \text{hom}(T, H) &= \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{w \in H^i} \sum_{v \in H^j} \ell_i r_j p^t(v, w) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^k \ell_i r_j p_{i,j}^t. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Note here that the count of H -colorings of T that send v_ℓ to some $w \in H^i$ and v_r to some $v \in H^j$ should, *a priori*, involve terms that depend on w and v , but by Lemma 3.2, these terms (ℓ_i and r_j , respectively) are independent of w and v .

In contrast, when computing $\text{hom}(T^{KC}, H)$, v_ℓ and v_r are forced to take a common value, which determines the values at one of the endvertices of P , and the value at the other endvertex is free, which means

$$\begin{aligned}\text{hom}(T^{KC}, H) &= \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{w \in H^i} \sum_{v \in H^j} \ell_i r_i p^t(w, v) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^k \ell_i r_i p_{i,j}^t.\end{aligned}\tag{6}$$

The term $\ell_i r_i p_{i,i}^t$ appears in both sums for each $1 \leq i \leq k$. Using symmetry to note $p_{i,j}^t = p_{j,i}^t$ for $1 \leq i < j \leq k$, we combine equations (5) and (6) to write

$$\begin{aligned}\text{hom}(T^{KC}, H) - \text{hom}(T, H) &= \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq k} (\ell_i r_i + \ell_j r_j - \ell_i r_j - \ell_j r_i) p_{i,j}^t \\ &= \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq k} (\ell_j - \ell_i)(r_j - r_i) p_{i,j}^t.\end{aligned}\tag{7}$$

Noting that trivially $p_{i,j}^t \geq 0$, we conclude that in order to prove $\text{hom}(T^{KC}, H) \geq \text{hom}(T, H)$ it suffices to show that for each i, j we have $(\ell_j - \ell_i)(r_j - r_i) \geq 0$.

Given any tree T and distinguished vertex v , recall that $\text{hom}_{v \rightarrow i}(T, H)$ denotes the number of H -colorings of T in which distinguished vertex v is mapped to some specific (but arbitrarily chosen) vertex w_i of H^i , where we again note that by Lemma 3.2, $\text{hom}_{v \rightarrow i}(T, H)$ depends only on i and not on the specific choice of w_i . As in the statement of Lemma 3.3, define $\mathbf{h}(T, v)$ to be the k -dimensional column vector whose i^{th} entry is $\text{hom}_{v \rightarrow i}(T, H)$. We now prove that our condition on the columns of M , the automorphic similarity matrix of H , ensures that $\mathbf{h}(T, v)$ is non-decreasing for any choice of T and v , so that in particular when $i < j$,

$$\ell_j = \text{hom}_{v_\ell \rightarrow j}(T, H) \geq \text{hom}_{v_\ell \rightarrow i}(T, H) = \ell_i,$$

and analogously $r_j \geq r_i$.

To see that $\mathbf{h}(T, v)$ is always non-decreasing, we use Lemmas 3.3 and 3.4. By the proof of Lemma 3.3, $\mathbf{h}(T, v)$ can be computed from the all-1s column vector by a sequence of steps that involve taking Hadamard products of vectors and pre-multiplying vectors by M . Combining the facts that the all-1s vector is non-negative and non-decreasing, that the Hadamard product of non-negative, non-decreasing vectors is both non-negative and non-decreasing, and that (by Lemma 3.4) pre-multiplying by M preserves the properties of being non-negative and non-decreasing, we see that $\mathbf{h}(T, v)$ is indeed non-negative and non-decreasing. Therefore, $\ell_j \geq \ell_i$ and $r_j \geq r_i$, so for each i and j , $(\ell_j - \ell_i)(r_j - r_i) \geq 0$ and we must have $\text{hom}(T^{KC}, H) \geq \text{hom}(T, H)$, as desired. \square

We now restate and prove Corollary 1.6, which gives conditions under which paths uniquely minimize $\text{hom}(T, H)$. The proof focuses on equation (7) in the special case where T is a path, and aims to show that at least one of the summands on the right-hand of equation (7) is (under certain circumstances) strictly positive. As an aside, we note that unlike traditional corollaries which follow directly from a theorem, we justify Corollary 1.6 using ideas from the proof of Theorem 1.5 rather than using the statement. Nonetheless, we use the term ‘‘corollary’’ to highlight the connection between the results.

Corollary 1.6. *Let H be a target graph that satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem 1.5. Suppose that for each $t \geq 2$, there exist two classes, $H^{a(t)}$ and $H^{b(t)}$, such that there is at least one H -coloring of P_t that sends one endvertex of P_t to a vertex in $H^{a(t)}$ and the other endvertex to a vertex in $H^{b(t)}$. Suppose further that for all $s \geq 2$, it holds that $\text{hom}_{v \rightarrow b(t)}(P_s, H) > \text{hom}_{v \rightarrow a(t)}(P_s, H)$, where v is one of the end vertices of P_s . Then H is strongly Hoffman-London.*

Proof. Let P_n^{KC} be obtained from P_n by a KC move. Suppose that the bare path involved in this move has t vertices. We have

$$\text{hom}(P_n^{KC}, H) - \text{hom}(P_n, H) = \sum_{i < j} (\ell_j - \ell_i)(r_j - r_i)p_{ij}^t \quad (8)$$

$$\geq (\ell_{b(t)} - \ell_{a(t)})(r_{b(t)} - r_{a(t)})p_{a(t), b(t)}^t. \quad (9)$$

Equation (8) is an instance of equation (7), while inequality (9) uses that $(\ell_j - \ell_i)(r_j - r_i)p_{ij}^t \geq 0$ for all i, j , which comes from the proof of Theorem 1.5.

Note that $p_{a(t), b(t)}^t$ counts the number of H -colorings of P_t that send one end vertex of P_t to something in $H^{a(t)}$ and the other end to something in $H^{b(t)}$; by hypothesis there is at least one such H -coloring, so $p_{a(t), b(t)}^t > 0$.

We have that $\ell_{b(t)} = \text{hom}_{v \rightarrow b(t)}(L, H)$ and $\ell_{a(t)} = \text{hom}_{v \rightarrow a(t)}(L, H)$. As L is a path, we have by hypothesis that $\ell_{b(t)} > \ell_{a(t)}$. Similarly, $r_{b(t)} > r_{a(t)}$. We conclude that

$$(\ell_{b(t)} - \ell_{a(t)})(r_{b(t)} - r_{a(t)})p_{a(t), b(t)}^t > 0.$$

It follows from inequality (9) that $\text{hom}(P_n^{KC}, H) - \text{hom}(P_n, H) > 0$, and so for any T_n obtained from P_n by a sequence of KC moves, $\text{hom}(P_n, H) < \text{hom}(P_n^{KC}, H) \leq \text{hom}(T_n, H)$. Since all trees on n vertices can be thus obtained, the result follows. \square

4 Applications of Theorem 1.5

One goal of this paper is to use Theorem 1.5 to contribute towards the resolution of Problem 1.2. Before we state our results in this direction, we summarize some pertinent results from the literature. We then show how Theorem 1.5 can reprove and sometimes strengthen some of these results, before moving on to establishing some new Hoffman-London families.

4.1 Two previous results on Hoffman-London graphs

In inequality (1), we saw that the path minimizes the number of independent sets among trees, i.e. that the target graph H_{ind} is Hoffman-London, where, recall, H_{ind} consists of two vertices joined by an edge with a loop at one vertex. Engbers and Galvin [15] gave a significant generalization of this result by showing that target graphs H formed by adding looped dominating vertices (looped vertices that are adjacent to all other vertices) to a regular graph are Hoffman-London, and they characterized the strongly Hoffman-London target graphs in this family.

Theorem 4.1 (Engbers, Galvin [15]). *If H is obtained from a regular graph by adding any number of looped dominating vertices, then H is Hoffman-London. If H is not regular (equivalently, if H is not a fully looped complete graph), then H is strongly Hoffman-London.*

A special case of Theorem 4.1—that H is strongly Hoffman-London when it is obtained from an empty (edgeless) graph by adding any non-zero number of looped dominating vertices, or equivalently when it is the join of empty graph and a fully looped complete graph—can also be easily derived from earlier work of Wingard [43, Theorem 5.1 and Theorem 5.2] on independent sets of fixed size in trees.

Csikvári and Lin [7] showed that paths and stars are Hoffman-London.

Theorem 4.2 (Csikvári, Lin [7]). *If H is either a path or a star (on any number of vertices), then for all n and all $T_n \in \mathcal{T}_n$ we have*

$$\hom(P_n, H) \leq \hom(T_n, H).$$

Note that Csikvári and Lin do not comment on when paths and stars are strongly Hoffman-London. We will address this question for paths in Section 4.3, specifically after the proof of Theorem 4.6. For stars, note that Theorem 2.6 shows that S_k is not strongly Hoffman-London for any k .

4.2 Target graphs with two automorphic similarity classes

In this section we specialize Theorem 1.5 to the case in which H has exactly two automorphic similarity classes and is not a regular graph. (Note that by Observation 2.3, if H is regular, then $\hom(T_n, H)$ is independent of T_n , so H is Hoffman-London but not strongly Hoffman-London.) Recall that automorphic similarity classes partition the vertex set, and so in this case all vertices of H are in either H^1 or H^2 . We have the following corollary of Theorem 1.5 and Corollary 1.6.

Corollary 4.3. *Let H be a target graph that is not regular and that has two automorphic similarity classes, H^1 and H^2 , ordered so that the (common) degree of any vertex in H^1 is smaller than the (common) degree of any vertex in H^2 . If $m_{1,2} \leq m_{2,2}$, then H is Hoffman-London. If, further, there is a vertex in H that has a neighbor in H^1 and a neighbor in H^2 , then H is strongly Hoffman-London.*

Proof. To see that H is Hoffman-London, note that for any vertices $x \in H^1$ and $y \in H^2$ we have

$$\deg(x) = m_{1,1} + m_{1,2} < m_{2,1} + m_{2,2} = \deg(y). \quad (10)$$

Together with $m_{1,2} \leq m_{2,2}$, inequality (10) shows that the automorphic similarity matrix of H satisfies the increasing columns property and so is Hoffman-London by Theorem 1.5.

We now use Corollary 1.6 to establish that if H has a vertex that is adjacent to vertices in both H^1 and H^2 , then H is strongly Hoffman-London. Observe that for $0 < a \leq b$ we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} m_{1,1} & m_{1,2} \\ m_{2,1} & m_{2,2} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} a(m_{1,1} + m_{1,2}) + (b-a)m_{1,2} \\ a(m_{2,1} + m_{2,2}) + (b-a)m_{2,2} \end{bmatrix} := \begin{bmatrix} a' \\ b' \end{bmatrix}, \quad (11)$$

and our hypotheses that $m_{1,1} + m_{1,2} < m_{2,1} + m_{2,2}$ and $0 < a \leq b$ imply that $0 < a' < b'$. We use this fact to show that for all $s \geq 2$, we have $\hom_{v \rightarrow 1}(P_s, H) < \hom_{v \rightarrow 2}(P_s, H)$. As in the statement of Lemma 3.3, define $\mathbf{h}(T, v)$ to be the k -dimensional column vector whose i^{th} entry is $\hom_{v \rightarrow i}(T, H)$. When $s = 1$, the i^{th} entry of $\mathbf{h}(P_1, v)$ is $\hom_{v \rightarrow i}(P_1, H)$, the count of H -colorings of P_1 in which v is mapped to a representative of H^1 , so $\mathbf{h}(P_1, v) = [1 \ 1]^T$, where v is the unique

vertex of P_1 . Then for $s \geq 2$, we have $\mathbf{h}(P_s, v) = M\mathbf{h}(P_{s-1}, v)$, so by equation (11), we conclude $\hom_{v \rightarrow 1}(P_s, H) < \hom_{v \rightarrow 2}(P_s, H)$.

To apply Corollary 1.6 and conclude that H is strongly Hoffman-London, it remains to show that for all $t \geq 2$ there is an H -coloring of P_t that sends one end vertex to H_1 and the other to H_2 . Let $x \in H$ be the vertex in H that has a neighbor $y \in H^1$ and $z \in H^2$, noting that x, y , and z need not necessarily be distinct. Suppose $x \in H^1$. If t is even, then we can map the vertices of P_t alternately to x and z ; if t is odd, then we can map the first vertex of P_t to y , the second to x , and then proceed as in the even case. The argument for $x \in H^2$ follows analogously. \square

We can use Corollary 4.3 to recover a portion of Theorem 4.1. Specifically, Corollary 4.3 yields Theorem 4.1 in the case when looped dominating vertices are added to a vertex-transitive (and so necessarily regular) graph. Although the result below is weaker than Theorem 4.1, we include it as it makes our classification of target graphs on three vertices (see Section 5) self-contained.

Proof of special case of Theorem 4.1. Let H be obtained from a vertex transitive graph, say H_0 , by adding some number of looped dominating vertices. If either the number of looped dominating vertices added is zero or H_0 is a fully looped complete graph, then H is regular, and so by Observation 2.3 H is Hoffman-London but not strongly Hoffman-London. For the remainder of the proof, we assume that H_0 is regular but not a fully looped complete graph and at least one looped dominating vertex is added. Let A be the vertex set of H_0 and let B be the set of added looped dominating vertices. Let k be the degree of vertices in H_0 ; note $k < |A|$.

It is easy to check that H has two automorphic similarity classes, namely $H^1 = A$ and $H^2 = B$. Let x and y be arbitrary vertices in H^1 and H^2 , respectively. We have

$$\deg(x) = k + |B| < |A| + |B| = \deg(y)$$

and

$$m_{1,2} = |B| = m_{2,2}.$$

We apply Corollary 4.3 to conclude that H is Hoffman-London. Furthermore, because any vertex in H^2 is adjacent to itself and to all vertices in H^1 , Corollary 4.3 also shows that H is strongly Hoffman-London. \square

We note that Theorem 1.5 alone could not possibly imply the full strength of Theorem 4.1, which we demonstrate in Example 4.4.

Example 4.4. Consider the Folkman graph [16], a 4-regular graph on 20 vertices constructed from a K_5 by first subdividing each edge and then cloning each of the vertices of the original K_5 ; see Figure 4 where the vertices of the original K_5 are white and those from subdivided edges are black.

The Folkman graph is bipartite and has two automorphic similarity classes, specifically the two bipartition classes. By Theorem 4.1, adding a looped dominating vertex to the Folkman graph produces an H that is Hoffman-London. This H has three automorphic similarity classes: the two bipartition classes of the Folkman graph, each of size ten, which we call A and B , and the looped dominating vertex, which we call C . Vertices in A (respectively, B) have no neighbors in A (respectively, B), four neighbors in B (respectively, A), and one neighbor in C . The vertex in C has ten neighbors in A , ten in B and one in C . So if we set $A = H^1$, $B = H^2$ (or $A = H^2$, $B = H^1$)




Figure 4: The Folkman graph.

and $C = H^3$, the corresponding automorphic similarity matrix is

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 4 & 1 \\ 4 & 0 & 1 \\ 10 & 10 & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

which fails the increasing columns property of Theorem 1.5. Setting $C = H^1$ or $C = H^2$ also produces automorphic similarity matrices that fail the increasing columns property, meaning that Theorem 1.5 cannot be used to conclude that H is Hoffman-London.

As an example of the utility of Corollary 4.3 to obtain new families of Hoffman-London graphs, consider the family of constraint graphs $H(a, b, \ell)$, defined for $a, b \geq 1$ and $\ell \geq 0$. Start with a clique on b vertices. At each vertex v of the clique, append ℓ copies of a clique on a vertices, with v the only vertex in common to the ℓ appended cliques; see Figure 5. This family generalizes many well known families of graphs; for example, $H(2, 1, \ell)$ is the star graph, $H(2, 2, \ell)$ is the *balanced double star*—an edge with ℓ edges appended to each endpoint, and $H(3, 1, \ell)$ is the *fan graph*—a collection of triangles sharing a single common vertex. More generally, $H(a, 1, \ell)$ is a collection of ℓ cliques on a vertices each, all sharing a single common vertex; following standard notation from topology, we call this a *bouquet of ℓ a -cliques*.

For some choices of parameters, it is straightforward to verify whether $H(a, b, \ell)$ is Hoffman-London. In the cases $\ell = 0$, $\ell \geq 1$ and $a = 1$, or $\ell = 1$ and $b = 1$, we see $H(a, b, \ell)$ is just a complete graph, which is regular and so Hoffman-London but not strongly Hoffman-London. If $\ell \geq 2$, $a = 2$, and $b = 1$ then $H(a, b, \ell)$ is, as observed above, a star, and so is Hoffman-London by Theorem 4.2, although, as we saw in Theorem 2.6, it is not strongly Hoffman-London. For many other choices of parameters, we can use Corollary 4.3.

Corollary 4.5. *For all $a, b \geq 2$ and $\ell \geq 1$, the target graph $H(a, b, \ell)$ is strongly Hoffman-London.*

Proof. The graph $H(a, b, \ell)$ has two automorphic similarity classes: H^2 consisting of the b vertices of the initial clique and H^1 consisting of all $\ell(a-1)$ added vertices. We have $m_{1,2} = 1 \leq b-1 = m_{2,2}$, and if x is any vertex in H^1 and y any vertex in H^2 we have $\deg(x) = a-1 < b-1 + \ell(a-1) = \deg(y)$. We conclude that H is Hoffman-London by Corollary 4.3.




Figure 5: A visualization of the family of graphs $H(a, b, \ell)$.

Any vertex in H^2 is adjacent to at least one other vertex in H^2 and at least one vertex in H^1 , and so Corollary 4.3 also demonstrates that H is strongly Hoffman-London. \square

The graphs $H(a, b, \ell)$ that are not covered by Corollary 4.5 or the preceding discussion are those with $a \geq 3$, $b = 1$, and $\ell \geq 2$. In these cases, as mentioned above, H is a bouquet of ℓ a -cliques. Such target graphs have two automorphic similarity classes: one that includes only the central vertex and another that includes all other vertices. For this collection of target graphs, we cannot apply Theorem 1.5: if we choose the central vertex to be H^1 , then the associated automorphic similarity matrix has $\ell(a-1) > 1$ as its $(1, 2)$ -entry and 1 as its $(2, 2)$ -entry and fails the increasing columns property, while if we choose the central vertex to be H^2 then the associated automorphic similarity matrix has 1 as its $(1, 2)$ -entry and 0 as its $(2, 2)$ -entry, and so again fails the increasing columns property. It is unknown which graphs of this subfamily, if any, are Hoffman-London.

4.3 Paths and looped paths as target graphs

In this section, we consider paths and fully looped paths as target graphs. We begin by using Theorem 1.5 to recover part of Theorem 4.2, specifically the case when H is a path with an even number of vertices. We also strengthen this portion of Theorem 4.2 by using Corollary 1.6 to show that target graphs H in this case with at least four vertices are strongly Hoffman-London.

Theorem 4.6. *The path graph P_{2m} is Hoffman-London for all $m \geq 1$ and strongly Hoffman-London for all $m \geq 2$.*

Proof. Let $H = P_{2m}$ for some $m \geq 1$, specifically with vertices u_1, \dots, u_{2m} and edges $u_i u_{i+1}$ for $1 \leq i \leq 2m-1$. We claim that P_{2m} admits exactly two automorphisms: the identity and the

reversal map that sends u_i to u_{2m+1-i} for $i = 1, \dots, 2m$. To verify this claim, first note that an automorphism of P_{2m} must preserve degrees and thus leaves must be mapped to leaves. If u_1 is mapped to u_1 , then u_2 , the unique neighbor of u_1 , must be mapped to u_2 , u_3 must be mapped to u_3 , and so on, resulting in the identity map. If u_1 is instead mapped to u_{2m} , then u_2 must be mapped to u_{2m-1} , u_3 must be mapped to u_{2m-2} , and so on, giving resulting in the reversal map. It follows that P_{2m} has m automorphic similarity classes, each consisting of a pair of vertices $\{u_i, u_j\}$ such that $i + j = 2m + 1$.

Set $H^i = \{u_i, u_{2m+1-i}\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$. The automorphic similarity matrix of H with respect to this ordering of the automorphic similarity classes has the form

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

That is, it has 1s on the first subdiagonal, 1s on the first superdiagonal, a 1 in the (m, m) position, and 0s everywhere else. It is straightforward to check that all terminal sums of the i^{th} row are less than or equal to the corresponding terminal sums of the $(i + 1)^{\text{th}}$ row for all $i < m$, and so this matrix satisfies the increasing columns property, establishing that P_{2m} is Hoffman-London by Theorem 1.5.

We now turn to establishing that P_{2m} is strongly Hoffman-London for $m \geq 2$. We seek to apply Corollary 1.6. Towards this goal, we will show by induction on t that

$$\text{hom}_{v \rightarrow 1}(P_t, P_{2m}) < \text{hom}_{v \rightarrow 2}(P_t, P_{2m}) \leq \text{hom}_{v \rightarrow 3}(P_t, P_{2m}) \leq \cdots \leq \text{hom}_{v \rightarrow m}(P_t, P_{2m}), \quad (12)$$

where v is an endvertex of P_t .

When $t = 2$, inequality (12) holds because $\text{hom}_{v \rightarrow 1}(P_2, P_{2m}) = 1$ and $\text{hom}_{v \rightarrow i}(P_2, P_{2m}) = 2$ for $2 \leq i \leq m$. For $t > 2$, let v' be the unique neighbor of v in P_t . Using equation (4) from the proof of Lemma 3.3, we have the recurrence relations

$$\begin{aligned} \text{hom}_{v \rightarrow 1}(P_t, P_{2m}) &= \text{hom}_{v' \rightarrow 2}(P_{t-1}, P_{2m}), \\ \text{hom}_{v \rightarrow i}(P_t, P_{2m}) &= \text{hom}_{v' \rightarrow i-1}(P_{t-1}, P_{2m}) + \text{hom}_{v' \rightarrow i+1}(P_{t-1}, P_{2m}) \text{ when } 2 \leq i \leq m-1, \text{ and} \\ \text{hom}_{v \rightarrow m}(P_t, P_{2m}) &= \text{hom}_{v' \rightarrow m-1}(P_{t-1}, P_{2m}) + \text{hom}_{v' \rightarrow m}(P_{t-1}, P_{2m}). \end{aligned}$$

By induction, we have

$$\text{hom}_{v' \rightarrow 1}(P_{t-1}, P_{2m}) < \text{hom}_{v' \rightarrow 2}(P_{t-1}, P_{2m}) \leq \cdots \leq \text{hom}_{v' \rightarrow m}(P_{t-1}, P_{2m}). \quad (13)$$

When $m = 2$, we use the fact that $\text{hom}_{v' \rightarrow 1}(P_{t-1}, P_4) > 0$ to say

$$\begin{aligned} \text{hom}_{v \rightarrow 1}(P_t, P_4) &= \text{hom}_{v' \rightarrow 2}(P_{t-1}, P_4) \\ &< \text{hom}_{v' \rightarrow 1}(P_{t-1}, P_4) + \text{hom}_{v' \rightarrow 2}(P_{t-1}, P_4) \\ &= \text{hom}_{v \rightarrow 2}(P_t, P_4). \end{aligned}$$

which establishes inequality (12).

For $m \geq 3$, we first establish $\hom_{v \rightarrow 1}(P_t, P_{2m}) < \hom_{v \rightarrow 2}(P_t, P_{2m})$. By inequality (13), we see that $\hom_{v' \rightarrow 2}(P_{t-1}, P_{2m}) \leq \hom_{v' \rightarrow 3}(P_{t-1}, P_{2m})$. Then, again using $\hom_{v' \rightarrow 1}(P_{t-1}, P_{2m}) > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\hom_{v \rightarrow 1}(P_t, P_{2m}) &= \hom_{v' \rightarrow 2}(P_{t-1}, P_{2m}) \\ &\leq \hom_{v' \rightarrow 3}(P_{t-1}, P_{2m}) \\ &< \hom_{v' \rightarrow 1}(P_{t-1}, P_{2m}) + \hom_{v' \rightarrow 3}(P_{t-1}, P_{2m}) \\ &= \hom_{v \rightarrow 2}(P_t, P_{2m}).\end{aligned}$$

Next, we show $\hom_{v \rightarrow i}(P_t, P_{2m}) \leq \hom_{v \rightarrow i+1}(P_t, P_{2m})$ for $2 \leq i \leq m-2$ by using inequality (13) to say

$$\begin{aligned}\hom_{v \rightarrow i}(P_t, P_{2m}) &= \hom_{v' \rightarrow i-1}(P_{t-1}, P_{2m}) + \hom_{v' \rightarrow i+1}(P_{t-1}, P_{2m}) \\ &\leq \hom_{v' \rightarrow i}(P_{t-1}, P_{2m}) + \hom_{v' \rightarrow i+2}(P_{t-1}, P_{2m}) \\ &= \hom_{v \rightarrow i+1}(P_t, P_{2m}).\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we demonstrate $\hom_{v \rightarrow m-1}(P_t, P_{2m}) \leq \hom_{v \rightarrow m}(P_t, P_{2m})$ by once again using inequality (13):

$$\begin{aligned}\hom_{v \rightarrow m-1}(P_t, P_{2m}) &= \hom_{v' \rightarrow m-2}(P_{t-1}, P_{2m}) + \hom_{v' \rightarrow m}(P_{t-1}, P_{2m}) \\ &\leq \hom_{v' \rightarrow m-1}(P_{t-1}, P_{2m}) + \hom_{v' \rightarrow m}(P_{t-1}, P_{2m}) \\ &= \hom_{v \rightarrow m}(P_t, P_{2m}).\end{aligned}$$

which establishes inequality (12).

Finally, we use inequality (12) to show that P_{2m} is strongly Hoffman-London. We consider the cases $m = 2$ and $m > 2$ separately. For $m = 2$ and $t \geq 2$, set $a(t) = 1$ and $b(t) = 2$. From inequality (12), we have $\hom_{v \rightarrow a(t)}(P_s, P_4) < \hom_{v \rightarrow b(t)}(P_s, P_4)$ for all $s \geq 2$. To apply Corollary 1.6 to show that P_4 is strongly Hoffman-London, it remains to show that for all $t \geq 2$ there is a P_4 -coloring of P_t that sends one endvertex v of P_t to some vertex in H^1 and the other endvertex w to some vertex in H^2 . For t even, such a coloring is given by sending v to $u_1 \in H^1$, then sending the vertices of P_t alternatively to u_2 and u_1 , ending by sending w to $u_2 \in H^2$. For t odd, such a coloring is given by sending v to $u_1 \in H^1$, then sending the vertices of P_t alternatively to u_2 and u_1 except for w , which is sent to $u_3 \in H^2$ instead of u_1 .

For $m > 2$, set $a(t) = 1$ for $t \geq 2$, and set $b(t) = 2$ for even $t \geq 2$ and set $b(t) = 3$ for odd $t \geq 2$. From inequality (12), we again have $\hom_{v \rightarrow a(t)}(P_s, P_{2m}) < \hom_{v \rightarrow b(t)}(P_s, P_{2m})$ for all $s \geq 2$. To exhibit a coloring of P_t that sends v to a vertex in $H^{a(t)}$ and w to a vertex in $H^{b(t)}$, we proceed exactly as in the $m = 2$ case: send v to $u_1 \in H^1$ and proceed to alternate sending the vertices of P_t to u_2 and u_1 , ending by sending w to $u_2 \in H^2$ when t is even and deviating by sending w to $u_3 \in H^3$ instead of u_1 when t is odd. \square

Theorem 4.6 shows that P_ℓ is strongly Hoffman-London for all even $\ell \geq 4$, and Observation 2.3 establishes that P_2 is not strongly Hoffman-London, because all trees admit the same number of P_2 -colorings. What can be said of P_ℓ when ℓ is odd? As demonstrated in Theorem 2.6, P_3 is not strongly Hoffman-London but in a different manner than P_2 : trees with a balanced bipartition, including paths but not all trees, minimize $\hom(T_n, P_3)$. We know that paths are among the

minimizers of $\text{hom}(T_n, P_\ell)$ for odd ℓ due to Csikvári and Lin [7], but the precise set of trees that minimize the number of P_ℓ -colorings for odd $\ell \geq 5$ remains open.

The *fully looped path* P_n° is the graph on vertex set u_1, \dots, u_n with edges $u_i u_{i+1}$ for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ and $u_i u_i$ for each $1 \leq i \leq n$. Unlike for unlooped paths, for which we were only able to apply our techniques when the number of vertices is even, we can completely classify all fully looped paths.

Theorem 4.7. *The fully looped path P_n° is Hoffman-London for all $n \geq 1$ and strongly Hoffman-London for all $n \geq 3$.*

Proof. For $n = 1$ or 2 , P_n° is a fully looped complete graph and so Observation 2.3 tells us that P_n° is Hoffman-London but not strongly Hoffman-London. When $n = 3$, P_n° is an instance of a regular graph with a looped dominating vertex added, and so applying Theorem 4.1 establishes that P_n° is strongly Hoffman-London.

For $n \geq 4$, we start by considering n even, say $n = 2m$. Exactly as for P_{2m} , we find that the automorphic similarity classes of P_{2m}° are $H^i = \{v_i, v_{2m+1-i}\}$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, each of size 2, and the associated automorphic similarity matrix has the form

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 & 2 \end{bmatrix}$$

(i.e., it is the automorphic similarity matrix of P_{2m} modified by the addition of the identity matrix I_{2m}). It is straightforward to check that all terminal sums of the i^{th} row are less than or equal to the corresponding terminal sums of the $(i+1)^{\text{th}}$ row for all $i < m$, and so this matrix satisfies the increasing columns property and P_{2m}° is Hoffman-London.

For $n \geq 5$ and odd, say $n = 2m-1$, the automorphic similarity classes of P_{2m-1}° are $H^i = \{v_i, v_{2m-i}\}$, $i = 1, \dots, m-1$, each of size 2, and $H^m = \{v_m\}$ (of size 1). The structure of the corresponding automorphic similarity matrix is the same as in the even case, except that in the final row the 1 and 2 are flipped. That M satisfies the increasing columns condition follows almost exactly as it did in the even case.

We have established that P_n° is Hoffman-London for all n and strongly Hoffman-London for $n = 3$. To establish that P_n° is strongly Hoffman-London for $n \geq 4$, we will show that Corollary 1.6 can be applied. We first observe that for all $s \geq 2$ we have $\text{hom}_{v \rightarrow 1}(P_s, P_n^\circ) < \text{hom}_{v \rightarrow 2}(P_s, P_n^\circ)$, where v is one of the endvertices of P_s . We can see this via a non-surjective injection from $\text{Hom}_{v \rightarrow 1}(P_s, P_n^\circ)$ into $\text{Hom}_{v \rightarrow 2}(P_s, P_n^\circ)$. For concreteness, we take a fixed $x \in H^1$ (necessarily one of the endvertices of P_n°) to be the representative of H^1 that v is mapped to, and take its unique neighbor $x' \in H^2$ to be the representative of H^2 that v is mapped to. The injection is simple: given $f \in \text{Hom}_{v \rightarrow 1}(P_s, P_n^\circ)$ with $f(v) = x$, map f to f' by changing the value at v to x' . That $f' \in \text{Hom}_{v \rightarrow 2}(P_s, P_n^\circ)$ (i.e., that f' is actually a homomorphism) follows from the fact that f' maps v' (the unique neighbor of v in P_s) to a neighbor of x , so either x or x' , and both of these are neighbors of x' . To see that the injection is not a surjection, consider $f' \in \text{Hom}_{v \rightarrow 2}(P_s, P_n^\circ)$ that sends v to x' and all other vertices of P_s to x'' , the neighbor of x' in H^2 . There is no $f \in \text{Hom}_{v \rightarrow 1}(P_s, P_n^\circ)$ that maps onto f' via our injection, since x is not adjacent to x'' in P_n° .

We next observe that for all $t \geq 2$ there is a P_n° -coloring of P_t that sends one endvertex to a vertex in H^1 and the other to a vertex in H^2 —simply send one endvertex to x and all the others to x' . That P_n° ($n \geq 4$) is strongly Hoffman-London now follows from Corollary 1.6. \square

We end our discussion of paths with a quick corollary of Theorem 4.7 to the family of *ladder graphs*. The ladder graph L_n has vertices $u_1, \dots, u_n, v_1, \dots, v_n$ and edges $u_i u_{i+1}$ and $v_i v_{i+1}$, for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$, and $u_i v_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$.

Corollary 4.8. *For $n \geq 1$, the ladder graph L_n is Hoffman-London. For $n \geq 3$ it is strongly Hoffman-London.*

Proof. We have $L_n = P_n^\circ \times K_2$, so the proposition follows from Observation 2.5 and Theorem 4.7. \square

4.4 Loop threshold graphs

Here we define the family of loop threshold graphs and prove that they are Hoffman-London. Denote by K_1 the graph on one vertex with no edges, and by K_1° the graph on one vertex with a loop. The family of *loop threshold graphs* is the minimal (by inclusion) family of graphs that includes K_1 and K_1° , is closed under adding isolated vertices, and is closed under adding looped dominating vertices. Loop threshold graphs were introduced by Cutler and Radcliffe [13] where they were shown to be a natural family to consider in the context of H -coloring; one of the results of [13] is that if H is loop threshold, then among n -vertex m -edge graphs, there is a threshold graph that maximizes the number of H -colorings. For further work on loop threshold graphs, see also [11] (regarding H -coloring) and [21] (regarding enumeration).

The following characterization of loop threshold graphs is stated in [13], where the authors suggest adapting a proof from [8]. For completeness, we present the details here.

Lemma 4.9. *For a graph H on n vertices, possibly with loops, the following are equivalent.*

1. *H is loop threshold.*
2. *There is an ordering of the vertices of H , say v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n , with the property that*

$$N(v_1) \subseteq N(v_2) \subseteq \dots \subseteq N(v_n).$$

We refer to an ordering of vertices satisfying the second condition in Lemma 4.9 as a *nested neighborhood ordering*.

Proof. We begin by showing that if H is a loop threshold graph, then it admits a nested neighborhood ordering. Let \mathcal{O} be the family of graphs for which a nested neighborhood ordering exists. Trivially, $K_1, K_1^\circ \in \mathcal{O}$. Suppose now that $H \in \mathcal{O}$. Let v_1, \dots, v_n be a nested neighborhood ordering for H . If H' is obtained from H by adding an isolated vertex, u , then since $N_{H'}(u) = \emptyset$ we have that u, v_1, \dots, v_n is a nested neighborhood ordering for H' , so $H' \in \mathcal{O}$. If instead H' is obtained from H by adding a looped dominating vertex, u , then since $N_{H'}(u) = \{v_1, \dots, v_n, u\}$, we have that v_1, \dots, v_n, u is a nested neighborhood ordering for H' , so $H' \in \mathcal{O}$. It follows from the definition of the family of loop threshold graphs that all loop threshold graphs are in \mathcal{O} .

For the reverse implication, let H be a graph on n vertices that admits a nested neighborhood ordering v_1, \dots, v_n . We show by induction on n that H is loop threshold. When $n = 1$ this is clear, so we assume $n > 1$.

If $N(v_n) = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$, then v_n is a looped dominating vertex in H . Let H' be obtained from H by deleting v_n . We have that

$$N(v_1) \setminus \{v_n\} \subseteq N(v_2) \setminus \{v_n\} \subseteq \dots N(v_{n-1}) \setminus \{v_n\}$$

and so v_1, \dots, v_{n-1} is a nested neighborhood ordering for H' . By induction, H' is a loop threshold graph, so H , being obtained from H' by adding a looped dominating vertex, is also loop threshold.

Otherwise there is v_i in H that is not in $N(v_n)$. Then v_i must be isolated: if there were v_j such that $v_i \sim v_j$, then $v_i \in N(v_j) \subseteq N(v_n)$. So we observe that for each j , $N(v_j) \setminus \{v_i\} = N(v_j)$, meaning if H' is obtained from H by deleting v_i , then H' admits the nested neighborhood ordering $v_1, \dots, v_{i-1}, v_{i+1}, \dots, v_n$. By induction, H' is a loop threshold graph, and as we obtain H by adding v_i , an isolated vertex, H is also loop threshold. \square

Using Lemma 4.9, we now prove that loop threshold graphs are Hoffman-London, and we characterize the strongly Hoffman-London loop threshold graphs.

Theorem 4.10. *Each loop threshold graph is Hoffman-London. Furthermore, if H is a loop threshold graph, then H is strongly Hoffman-London if and only after removing all isolated vertices from H , the resulting graph is neither empty nor a fully looped complete graph.*

Note that we consider a vertex v isolated if $N(v) \subseteq \{v\}$. In other words, a single vertex with a loop is still an isolated vertex.

Proof. Let H be a loop threshold graph. To establish the Hoffman-London property, we seek to apply Theorem 1.5. By Lemma 4.9, there is an ordering of the vertices of H , say v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n , with the property that

$$N(v_1) \subseteq N(v_2) \subseteq \dots \subseteq N(v_n).$$

Suppose $v_i \in H^a$ and $v_{i+1} \in H^b$ for some $a \neq b$. We claim $v_j \notin H^a$ for all $j > i$. Suppose otherwise: assume $v_i \in H^a$, $v_{i+1} \in H^b$, and $v_j \in H^a$ for some $j > i$. As v_a and v_j both belong to H^a , $|N(v_i)| = |N(v_j)|$, and as $i < j$, $N(v_i) \subseteq N(v_j)$, so $N(v_i) = N(v_j)$. Then

$$N(v_j) = N(v_i) \subseteq N(v_{i+1}) \subseteq N(v_j)$$

so $N(v_{i+1}) = N(v_i)$ as well. Thus the function on $V(H)$ that swaps v_i and v_{i+1} and fixes all other vertices is an automorphism of H , contradicting that $v_{i+1} \notin H^a$. We conclude that this ordering of the vertices induces an ordering of the automorphic similarity equivalence classes of H , say H^1, \dots, H^k , such that if $u \in H^i$ and $v \in H^j$ for $i < j$ then $N(u) \subseteq N(v)$. If we use this ordering of the automorphic similarity classes to define the automorphic similarity matrix M , we see that each column of M is non-decreasing: for any $1 \leq j \leq k$ and $1 \leq i \leq k-1$, $m_{i,j} \leq m_{i+1,j}$ because for any $u \in H^i$ and $v \in H^{i+1}$, $N(u) \subseteq N(v)$, so each $w \in H^j$ is adjacent to u only if it is adjacent to v . Sums of non-decreasing vectors are also non-decreasing, so this ordering of the automorphic similarity classes of H satisfies the hypothesis of Theorem 1.5. We conclude that H is Hoffman-London, as claimed.

We now turn to the characterization of loop threshold graphs that are strongly Hoffman-London. For $n \geq 2$, each vertex of any tree on n vertices is incident to an edge and cannot be mapped to an isolated vertex of H . (This is essentially the content of Observation 2.2). Thus if H is loop threshold and H' is the graph resulting from removing the isolated vertices from H , we have

$\hom(T_n, H) = \hom(T_n, H')$ for all $n \geq 2$. If H' is empty, then $\hom(T_n, H') = 0$ for all $T_n \in \mathcal{T}_n$. If H' is a fully looped complete graph, it is regular, so each $T_n \in \mathcal{T}_n$ admits the same number of H -colorings by Observation 2.3.

Now assume that upon deletion of all isolated vertices, H is non-empty and not a fully looped complete graph. Note that the resulting graph is also loop threshold: because only isolated vertices were removed, the neighborhoods of the remaining vertices are unchanged, so the resulting graph still admits a nested neighborhood ordering. Thus it suffices to assume H simply has no isolated vertices and is not a fully looped complete graph. To show that H is strongly Hoffman-London, we use Corollary 1.6.

We begin by showing that H has at least two automorphic similarity classes. If every vertex of H is looped, then H must have been constructed by adding looped dominating vertices at every step, contradicting that H is not a fully looped complete graph. Let u be a vertex of H without a loop. Because u was not removed, it is not isolated, so there is $v \sim u$. We claim that u comes before v in the nested neighborhood ordering of H ; if not, then $u \in N(v) \subseteq N(u)$, which contradicts our claim that u does not have a loop. By similar reasoning, v must have a loop: $v \in N(u) \subseteq N(v)$. Because u does not have a loop but v does, no automorphism of H can send u to v . We conclude H has at least two distinct automorphic similarity classes.

Now for each $t \geq 2$, let $a(t) = i$, where H^i is the class containing u , and let $b(t) = j$, where H^j is the class containing v . We first observe that there is an H -coloring of P_t that sends the first vertex of the path to some vertex in $H^{a(t)}$ and the last vertex of the path to some vertex in $H^{b(t)}$. Indeed, mapping the first vertex of P_t to u and all subsequent vertices to v yields such a coloring.

To apply Corollary 1.6 to conclude that H is strongly Hoffman-London, it remains to show that for each $t \geq 2$ and $s \geq 2$, $\hom_{w \rightarrow b(t)}(P_s, H) > \hom_{w \rightarrow a(t)}(P_s, H)$ where w is one of the endvertices of P_s . In what follows, when enumerating $\hom_{w \rightarrow a(t)}(P_s, H)$ (respectively, $\hom_{w \rightarrow b(t)}(P_s, H)$) we will take u (respectively, v) to be the specific vertex of $H^{a(t)}$ (respectively, $H^{b(t)}$) to which w is mapped in an H -coloring. There is a simple injection from $\hom_{w \rightarrow a(t)}(P_s, H)$ into $\hom_{w \rightarrow b(t)}(P_s, H)$: change the color at w from u to v . That this is a valid map comes from the fact that $N(u) \subseteq N(v)$. To see that this injection is not a bijection, and so $\hom_{w \rightarrow b(t)}(P_s, H) > \hom_{w \rightarrow a(t)}(P_s, H)$, consider the H -coloring of P_s that sends w to v , that sends the unique neighbor of w in P_s to u , and that sends all other vertices of P_s (if there are any) to v . This coloring is in $\hom_{w \rightarrow b(t)}(P_s, H)$, but, since there is not a loop at u in H , it is not the image of any coloring in $\hom_{w \rightarrow a(t)}(P_s, H)$. \square

We conclude our discussion of loop threshold graphs with an application of Theorem 4.10 to a family of target graphs that have arisen both in statistical physics and communications networks. For integer $C \geq 1$, define a *capacity C independent set* in a graph G to be a function $f : V(G) \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2, \dots, C\}$ satisfying $f(x) + f(y) \leq C$ for all $xy \in E(G)$. Standard independent sets are capacity 1 independent sets. This notion was introduced by Mazel and Suhov [33] as a statistical physics model of a random surface and was subsequently studied in [18, 35] in the context of multicast communications networks. Capacity C independent sets can be encoded as H -colorings by taking $H = H_C$ to be the graph on vertex set $\{0, 1, \dots, C\}$ with edge set $\{\{a, b\} : a + b \leq C\}$. The graph H_C admits a nested neighborhood ordering, namely $C, C-1, \dots, 1, 0$, since $N_{H_C}(i) = \{0, 1, \dots, C-i\}$, so by Lemma 4.9 H_C is loop threshold, and the following result is a corollary of Theorem 4.10.

Corollary 4.11. *For $C \geq 1$ and $n \geq 1$, if T_n is a tree on n vertices that is different from P_n , then P_n admits strictly fewer capacity C independent sets than T_n .*

4.5 Adding looped dominating vertices to a target graph

In this section we establish that the set of graphs H for which Theorem 1.5 is applicable is closed under adding looped dominating vertices and present an application that will be useful later.

Proposition 4.12. *Suppose that H is a target graph that has an automorphic similarity matrix satisfying the increasing columns property. Let \tilde{H} be obtained from H by adding some number of looped dominating vertices. Then \tilde{H} is Hoffman-London.*

Proof. We begin by considering the case where H does not have any looped dominating vertices. Let the automorphic similarity classes of H be H^1, \dots, H^k , presented in such an order that the associated automorphic similarity matrix M satisfies the increasing columns property. Then let \tilde{H} be obtained from H by adding b looped dominating vertices.

Any automorphism of \tilde{H} must be an extension of an automorphism of H obtained by permuting the looped dominating vertices of \tilde{H} , and so \tilde{H} has automorphic similarity classes $\tilde{H}^1, \dots, \tilde{H}^k, \tilde{H}^{k+1}$ where $\tilde{H}^i = H^i$ for $i \leq k$ and \tilde{H}^{k+1} is the set of b added looped dominating vertices. The associated automorphic similarity matrix \tilde{M} is obtained from M by adding a new row at the bottom whose j^{th} entry ($j = 1, \dots, k$) is $|H^j|$, and then adding a new column at the far left, all of whose entries are b . The last column of this matrix is constant and so non-decreasing.

For i and j with $1 \leq i \leq k-1$ and $1 \leq j \leq k$, the sum $\tilde{S}^{i,j}$ of the entries of row i of \tilde{M} starting from the j^{th} entry is b greater than $S^{i,j}$, the sum of the entries of row i of M starting from the j^{th} entry, and similarly $\tilde{S}^{i+1,j} = S^{i+1,j} + b$, so $\tilde{S}^{i,j} \leq \tilde{S}^{i+1,j}$ follows from $S^{i,j} \leq S^{i+1,j}$.

Finally, the (k, j) -entry ($1 \leq j \leq k$) of \tilde{M} , which counts the number of neighbors an element of H^k has in H^j , is trivially bounded above by $|H^j|$, which is the $(k+1, j)$ -entry of \tilde{M} ; this, together with the fact that the $(k, k+1)$ -th and $(k+1, k+1)$ -th entries of \tilde{M} agree, shows that $\tilde{S}^{k,j} \leq \tilde{S}^{k+1,j}$. We conclude that \tilde{M} has the increasing columns property and that \tilde{H} is Hoffman-London.

We now consider the case where H has some looped dominating vertices. The collection of looped dominating vertices in H forms an autmorphic similarity class. Moreover if the automorphic similarity classes of H are H^1, \dots, H^k , presented in such an order that the associated automorphic similarity matrix M satisfies the increasing columns property, then the class H^k must be the class consisting of all the looped dominating vertices. To see this, note that the increasing columns property applied to the sum of all k columns of M simply says $d_1 \leq d_2 \leq \dots \leq d_k$, where d_i is the common degree of the vertices in H^i . Looped dominating vertices have the maximum possible degree, namely $|H|$, and any vertex with degree $|H|$ is a looped dominating vertices. It follows that $d_k = |H|$ and that H^k consists of looped dominating vertices.

Now once again let \tilde{H} be obtained from H by adding b looped dominating vertices. The automorphic similarity classes of \tilde{H} are $\tilde{H}^1, \tilde{H}^2, \dots, \tilde{H}^k$, where $\tilde{H}^i = H^i$ for $i < k$ and \tilde{H}^k is the union of H^k and the b added looped dominating vertices. The associated automorphic similarity matrix \tilde{M} is obtained from M by adding b to every entry in the final column of M . In a similar manner to the previous case, it follows that \tilde{M} has the increasing columns property and that \tilde{H} is Hoffman-London. \square

Before presenting an application of Proposition 4.12, we discuss blow-ups of graphs.

Definition 4.13. Let H be a target graph on vertex set $\{v_0, v_1, \dots, v_k\}$ without multiple edges but perhaps with loops. Let $\mathbf{n} = (n_0, n_1, \dots, n_k)$ be a vector of positive integers. The *blow-up* of H by \mathbf{n} , denoted $H^\mathbf{n}$, has vertex set $\bigcup_{i=0}^k V_i$, where V_i is a set of size n_i and the V_i s are pairwise

disjoint. If $v_i \sim_H v_j$ (with either $i \neq j$ or $i = j$), then there is an edge in $H^{\mathbf{n}}$ between every $x \in V_i$ and $y \in V_j$, and there are no other edges.

In other words, $H^{\mathbf{n}}$ is obtained from H by “blowing up” each vertex of H to a cluster of vertices, replacing unlooped vertices with empty graphs, looped vertices with fully looped complete graphs, and edges with complete bipartite graphs. As an example, the join of an empty graph and a fully looped complete graph is a blow-up of H_{ind} , the target graph that encodes independent sets; see Figure 6.




Figure 6: An example of a blow-up with $\mathbf{n} = (3, 2)$ where the unlooped vertex of $H = H_{\text{ind}}$ is labeled v_0 and the looped vertex is labeled v_1 .

We now show, as a corollary of Proposition 4.12, that blow-ups of fully looped stars (stars augmented by putting a loop at every vertex) are Hoffman-London. We will present an application of this corollary, to the Widom-Rowlinson model from statistical physics, in Section 4.6.

Corollary 4.14. *Let S_{t+1}° be the fully looped star on $t+1$ vertices v_0, v_1, \dots, v_t , with v_0 the center of the star. Let $\mathbf{n} = (n_0, n_1, \dots, n_t)$ be any vector of positive integers. The blow-up of S_{t+1}° by \mathbf{n} is Hoffman-London.*

Proof. We start by considering the graph $H(n_1, \dots, n_t)$, which is the disjoint union of t fully looped complete graphs $K_1^{\circ}, \dots, K_t^{\circ}$ on n_1, \dots, n_t vertices, respectively. Let S_1, \dots, S_k be the partition of $\{1, \dots, t\}$ induced by the equivalence relation $i \equiv j$ if and only if $n_i = n_j$, and let $s_i = \sum_{j \in S_i} n_j$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $s_1 \leq s_2 \leq \dots \leq s_k$. For example, if $(n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5, n_6) = (3, 10, 4, 3, 10, 10)$, then we would take $S_1 = \{3\}$ with $s_1 = 4$, $S_2 = \{1, 4\}$ with $s_2 = 3 + 3 = 6$ and $S_3 = \{2, 5, 6\}$ with $s_3 = 10 + 10 + 10 = 30$. The automorphic similarity classes of H are $H^i = \bigcup_{j \in S_i} V(K^j)$ and the corresponding automorphic similarity matrix is $\text{diag}\{s_1, \dots, s_k\}$. By our choice of ordering on the s_i , this satisfies the increasing columns property.

It follows from Theorem 1.5 that $H(n_1, \dots, n_t)$ is Hoffman-London, and therefore it follows from Proposition 4.12 that the graph $H(n_0, n_1, \dots, n_t)$ obtained from $H(n_1, \dots, n_t)$ by adding n_0 looped dominating vertices is also Hoffman-London. But $H(n_0, n_1, \dots, n_t)$ is exactly the blow-up of S_{t+1}° by \mathbf{n} , and this observation completes the proof. \square

4.6 Connection to statistical physics

In this section we briefly discuss a connection between graph homomorphisms and statistical physics models, and we use some of our results to derive consequences for the partition functions of some of these models. For more thorough (though still accessible) treatments of the connection, see e.g. [1, 2, 24].

One goal of statistical physics is to understand the global behavior of models that are defined by local rules. In a *hard constraint spin model*, space is modeled by a graph G . The vertices of G represent sites that are occupied by at most one particle per site. Each particle has a certain spin, from among some specified collection of possible spins. The edges of G encode pairs of sites that are close enough that the particles at those sites interact. The interaction rule in a hard constraint model is that only certain pairs of spins are allowed to appear on adjacent sites. This can be encoded by a graph H whose vertices are the possible spins, with an edge between two vertices exactly when the corresponding spins are allowed to appear on adjacent sites. A valid configuration of spins on the vertices of G is thus exactly an H -coloring of G . Note that in this context it is very natural to allow H to have loops—a loop at vertex $v \in V(H)$ encodes the fact that two particles on adjacent sites of G are allowed to both have spin v .

Typically, a hard-constraint spin model, with constraint graph H on vertex set $\{v_0, \dots, v_k\}$, comes with a vector of positive activities $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k)$ which (informally) measure how frequently particles of each spin typically occur. Here λ_i is the activity associated with v_i . The weight of a configuration, or equivalently the weight of an H -coloring $f : V(G) \rightarrow V(H)$, is given by

$$w^{(H, \boldsymbol{\lambda})}(f) = \prod_{v \in V(G)} \lambda_{f(v)} = \prod_{i=0}^k \lambda_i^{|f^{-1}(v_i)|} \quad (14)$$

where note that $f^{-1}(v_i)$ is the set of vertices in G that are mapped to v_i by f . The *partition function* of the model is the sum

$$Z^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(G, H) = \sum_{f \in \text{Hom}(G, H)} w^{(H, \boldsymbol{\lambda})}(f).$$

The partition function is the normalizing constant used to turn the assignment of weights into an assignment of probabilities, making the model stochastic. The partition function encodes significant information about the model.

We present three specific examples; these are the three for which we later present results.

Example 4.15. The *hard-core* or *lattice gas model* is a model of the occupation of space by atoms that have non-zero volume, with a “hard core” around their boundary, meaning that if an atom sits at a site, no other atom can sit at any nearby site. Dating back at least to the investigations of Gaunt and Fisher and of Runnels [22, 36], this model can be represented using two spins, v_{out} representing “unoccupied” and v_{in} representing “occupied,” with the occupation rule being that unoccupied sites can be adjacent to each other, unoccupied sites can be adjacent to occupied sites, and occupied sites cannot be adjacent to each other. Since possible collections of occupied sites in this model correspond exactly with the collection of independent sets in G , the hard-core model can be encoded using the target graph H_{ind} , where v_{out} is the looped vertex of H_{ind} and v_{in} is the unlooped vertex. Traditionally, the activity associated with v_{out} in this model is 1 and the activity associated with v_{in} is some $\lambda > 0$. If λ is small, then the model favors sparser configurations of occupied vertices, while if λ is large, then it favors denser configurations. If $\lambda = 1$, then the model gives all configurations equal weight. See Figure 7 for an example.

Example 4.16. The *Widom-Rowlinson model* is a model of the occupation of space by k mutually repulsive particles. This model was introduced by Widom and Rowlinson [41] as a model of liquid-vapor phase transition. There are $k + 1$ spins, v_0 through v_k . Empty space is represented by v_0 ,




Figure 7: The constraint graph encoding the hard-core model (left) and a hard-core configuration on a tree (right). If v_{out} has activity 1 and v_{in} has activity λ , then the weight of the illustrated configuration is λ^4 .

and the remaining spins are used to represent k different particles. A site occupied by a particle of type i can be adjacent to empty space or to other particles of type i , but not to particles of type j for any $j \neq i$. Empty space comes with no restriction. A valid configuration of particles is thus modeled by an H -coloring of G where H is the fully looped star on vertex set $\{v_0, \dots, v_k\}$ with v_0 as the central vertex. A vertex of G being mapped to v_0 represents “unoccupied” and being mapped to v_i represents “occupied by a particle of type i .” Traditionally, the activity associated with v_0 in this model is 1 and for each $i > 0$ the activity associated with v_i is some $\lambda_i > 0$. See Figure 8 for an example with two particles, denoted red and blue.




Figure 8: The constraint graph encoding the Widom-Rowlinson model (left) and a Widom-Rowlinson configuration on a tree (right). If v_0 has activity 1, v_R has activity λ_R , and v_B has activity λ_B , then the weight of the illustrated configuration is $\lambda_R^3 \lambda_B^4$.

Example 4.17. The *capacity C independent set* or *capacity C multicast model* was introduced in Section 4.4. Recall that configurations in this model are encoded as H -colorings by taking $H = H_C$ to be the graph on vertex set $\{0, 1, \dots, C\}$ with edge set $\{\{a, b\} : a + b \leq C\}$. At $C = 1$, H_C reduces to the hard-core model of Example 4.15. Traditionally, in this model the activity assigned to vertex i is λ^i for some $\lambda > 0$. See Figure 9 for an example.

The problem of maximizing or minimizing the partition function of a weighted hard-constraint spin model with constraint graph H is very closely related to enumeration of $H^{\mathbf{n}}$ -colorings, as we shall now see. Consider a weighted hard-constraint spin model on a graph G with H on vertex set




Figure 9: The constraint graph encoding the capacity 3 independent set model (left) and a capacity 3 independent set on a tree (right). If spin i has activity λ^i , then the configuration has weight λ^{12} .

$\{v_0, v_1, \dots, v_k\}$ encoding the constraints on the spins. Let $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k)$ be an assignment of positive rational activities to the spins. Let integer M be such that $M\lambda_i = n_i \in \mathbb{N}$ for each i . For any H -coloring $f : V(G) \rightarrow V(H)$ we have, from equation (14),

$$M^n w^{(H, \boldsymbol{\lambda})}(f) = \prod_{i=0}^k n_i^{|f^{-1}(v_i)|}$$

where n is the number of vertices of G . Summing over all $f \in \text{Hom}(G, H)$ and recalling the definition of the blow-up graph, we get

$$M^n Z^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(G, H) = \text{hom}(G, H^{\mathbf{n}}). \quad (15)$$

This idea leads to the following lemma.

Lemma 4.18. *Let H be an arbitrary graph on vertex set $\{v_0, v_1, \dots, v_k\}$, perhaps with loops but without multiple edges. If G_1 and G_2 are graphs on the same number of vertices with the property that $\text{hom}(G_1, H^{\mathbf{n}}) \leq \text{hom}(G_2, H^{\mathbf{n}})$ for every vector \mathbf{n} of positive integers of length $k+1$, then for every assignment of real positive (not necessarily rational) activities $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ to the vertices of H , we have $Z^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(G_1, H) \leq Z^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(G_2, H)$.*

Proof. When the λ_i s are all rational, the result follows directly from equation (15). If $(\lambda_i)_{i=0}^k$ is not a rational $(k+1)$ -tuple, we can consider a sequence of rational $(k+1)$ -tuples that converge to $(\lambda_i)_{i=0}^k$. The validity of Lemma 4.18, together with the continuity of $Z^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(G, H)$, allows us to conclude that $Z^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(G_1, H) \leq Z^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(G_2, H)$ in this case. \square

The question of which graphs in various families maximize and minimize the partition function of various hard-constraint models has a well-developed literature; see e.g. [9, 12, 38] for the Widom-Rowlinson model, [26, 44, 14] for the hard-core model, and [11, 12, 13, 20, 17, 37] for general models.

We can use Lemma 4.18 to draw conclusions about the hard-core model, the Widom-Rowlinson model, and the capacity C independent set model on trees.

Theorem 4.19. *Let $n \geq 1$ be arbitrary and let $T_n \in \mathcal{T}_n$.*

(a) *For the hard-core model with $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (1, \lambda)$ for arbitrary $\lambda > 0$, we have*

$$Z^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(P_n, H_{\text{ind}}) \leq Z^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(T_n, H_{\text{ind}}) \leq Z^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(S_n, H_{\text{ind}}).$$

(b) For the k -state Widom-Rowlinson model with $\lambda = (1, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k)$ for arbitrary $\lambda_i > 0$, we have

$$Z^\lambda(P_n, H_{\text{WR}(k)}) \leq Z^\lambda(T_n, H_{\text{WR}(k)}) \leq Z^\lambda(S_n, H_{\text{WR}(k)}).$$

(c) For the capacity C independent set model with $\lambda = (1, \lambda, \dots, \lambda^C)$ for arbitrary $\lambda > 0$, we have

$$Z^\lambda(P_n, H_C) \leq Z^\lambda(T_n, H_C) \leq Z^\lambda(S_n, H_C).$$

Proof. All three upper bounds follow from Theorem 1.1 and Lemma 4.18. For the lower bounds, it suffices to establish that arbitrary positive integer blow-ups of H_{ind} , $H_{\text{WR}(k)}$, and H_C are Hoffman-London, and then appeal to Lemma 4.18. For H_{ind} and H_C , we use that arbitrary blow-ups of loop threshold graphs are still loop threshold and appeal to Theorem 4.10, and we use Corollary 4.14 for $H_{\text{WR}(k)}$. \square

5 Classification of target graphs with at most three vertices

There are twenty-eight graphs (with or without loops, not necessarily connected) on three or fewer vertices. These are shown in Figure 10. For each H on this list, each n , and each $T_n \in \mathcal{T}_n$, it holds that $\text{hom}(P_n, H) \leq \text{hom}(T_n, H)$. The collection of results we have presented thus far establish this fact, and also allow us, for each H , to completely specify which other $T_n \in \mathcal{T}_n$, if any, also minimize the count of H -colorings. As $\text{hom}(T_1, H) = |V(H)|$ for every H , we confine attention to trees on $n \geq 2$ vertices.

We begin with those cases in which each tree on $n \geq 2$ vertices admits the same number of H -colorings, using Observation 2.2 without additional mention to discuss sets of target graphs that behave identically. For unions of isolated vertices, namely H_1 , H_3 , and H_9 , there are no H -colorings of any such tree. We apply Observation 2.3 to those H whose non-isolated components are regular to find our trees have unique H_2 -, H_4 -, and H_{10} -colorings, two H_6 - and H_{13} -colorings, 2^n H_8 - and H_{17} -colorings, 3^n H_{28} -colorings, and finally $3 \cdot 2^{n-1}$ H_{23} - and H_{25} -colorings. Then we use Observation 2.1 to consider target graphs with regular components to see each of these trees have two H_5 -colorings, two H_{11} -colorings, three H_{12} -colorings, three H_{14} -colorings, and $2^n + 1$ H_{18} -colorings.

Because H_{19} is a complete bipartite graph with unequal parts, Theorem 2.6 tells us the trees minimizing $\text{hom}(T_n, H_{19})$ are precisely those with a balanced bipartition.

Theorem 4.1 demonstrates that regular graphs to which looped dominating vertices are added are strongly Hoffman-London, including H_7 , H_{21} , H_{24} , and H_{26} . Furthermore, H_{15} is strongly Hoffman-London due to Theorem 4.1 and Observation 2.2 and H_{16} is strongly Hoffman-London due to Theorem 4.1 and Observation 2.1.

Note that $H_{20} \times K_2 = P_6$. That $\text{hom}(P_n, H_{20}) \leq \text{hom}(T_n, H_{20})$ for all n and $T_n \in \mathcal{T}_n$ now follows from Observation 2.5 and Theorem 4.2, and that $\text{hom}(P_n, H_{20}) < \text{hom}(T_n, H_{20})$ for all n and $T_n \in \mathcal{T}_n$ different from P_n follows from Theorem 4.6. Finally, H_{22} and H_{27} are loop threshold and thus strongly Hoffman-London by Theorem 4.10.

For convenience, we summarize these results in Table 1. In cases where all trees on n vertices admit the same number of H -colorings, that number is given.

Figure 10: All target graphs on up to three vertices.

6 Open problems

We conclude with a few questions that remain open and which we find of interest.

In addition to Problem 1.2, Csikvári and Lin propose a weaker variant in which “all n ” is replaced by “all sufficiently large n .” To consider this version of the problem, we introduce the

Identifier	Minimizer	Identifier	Minimizer	Identifier	Minimizer
H_1	All trees (0)	H_{11}	All trees (2)	H_{20}	Paths
H_2	All trees (1)	H_{12}	All trees (3)	H_{21}	Paths
H_3	All trees (0)	H_{13}	All trees (2)	H_{22}	Paths
H_4	All trees (1)	H_{14}	All trees (3)	H_{23}	All trees ($3 \cdot 2^{n-1}$)
H_5	All trees (2)	H_{15}	Paths	H_{24}	Paths
H_6	All trees (2)	H_{16}	Paths	H_{25}	All trees ($3 \cdot 2^{n-1}$)
H_7	Paths	H_{17}	All trees (2^n)	H_{26}	Paths
H_8	All trees (2^n)	H_{18}	All trees ($2^n + 1$)	H_{27}	Paths
H_9	All trees (0)	H_{19}	Trees with balanced bipartitions	H_{28}	All trees (3^n)
H_{10}	All trees (1)				

Table 1: Classification of tree minimizers of $\text{hom}(T_n, H)$ for $n \geq 2$.

following terminology.

Definition 6.1. We say a target graph H is *eventually Hoffman-London* if for all sufficiently large n ,

$$\text{hom}(P_n, H) = \min_{T_n \in \mathcal{T}_n} \text{hom}(T_n, H).$$

If it holds that $\text{hom}(P_n, H) < \text{hom}(T_n, H)$ for all sufficiently large n and $T_n \in \mathcal{T}_n \setminus \{P_n\}$, we say that H *eventually strongly Hoffman-London*.

At present, no target graphs are known to be eventually Hoffman-London but not Hoffman-London (nor eventually strongly Hoffman-London but not strongly Hoffman-London). In other words, there are no known target graphs H for which there is a non-path tree T_n admitting fewer H -colorings than P_n for a specific n but for which the path minimizes $\text{hom}(T_n, H)$ when n is sufficiently large. To this end, we introduce the following problem.

Problem 6.2. Does there exist a target graph H and integers $\alpha < \beta$ such that

$$\text{hom}(P_\alpha, H) > \min_{T_\alpha \in \mathcal{T}_\alpha} \text{hom}(T_\alpha, H),$$

but

$$\text{hom}(P_n, H) = \min_{T_n \in \mathcal{T}_n} \text{hom}(T_n, H)$$

for each $n \geq \beta$?

Theorem 4.6 proves that paths on an even number of vertices other than P_2 are strongly Hoffman-London. As mentioned, Theorem 2.6 demonstrates that the case is more complicated for P_3 as the set of trees with minimal P_3 -colorings is neither just the path nor all trees. For paths with a larger odd number of vertices, the question remains open.

Problem 6.3. For $m \geq 2$, classify the $T \in \mathcal{T}_n$ that minimize $\text{hom}(T, P_{2m+1})$.

Theorem 2.6 shows that $K_{a,b}$ is Hoffman-London, but it remains open whether complete multipartite graphs H with more than two parts need be Hoffman-London.

Problem 6.4. Let $r \geq 3$ and H be a complete r -partite graph. Does it follow that H is Hoffman-London?

Note that K_{a_1, \dots, a_q} -colorings may be viewed as weighted q -colorings, so this question is equivalent to asking whether there exist weights such that some tree on n vertices has fewer weighted q -colorings than P_n .

As discussed in Section 4.2, we proved that each graph in the family of $H(a, b, \ell)$, in which each vertex of a b -clique is replaced with a bouquet of ℓ a -cliques, is Hoffman-London except in the case $a \geq 3, b = 1$, and $\ell \geq 2$.

Problem 6.5. For which values of $a \geq 3$ and $\ell \geq 2$, if any, is $H(a, 1, \ell)$ Hoffman-London?

Finally, we proved in Theorem 4.10 that loop threshold graphs are Hoffman-London. There are three closely related classes of graphs for which it would be interesting to prove an analogous result:

1. Threshold graphs: the graphs in the smallest family containing K_1 that is closed under adding isolated vertices and (unlooped) dominating vertices.
2. Quasi-loop threshold graphs: the graphs in the smallest family containing K_1 and K_1° that is closed under adding isolated vertices, adding looped dominating vertices, and taking disjoint unions.
3. Quasi-threshold graphs: the graphs in the smallest family containing K_1 that is closed under adding isolated vertices, adding (unlooped) dominating vertices, and taking disjoint unions.

There are threshold (and so quasi-threshold) graphs on four vertices that the methods and results discussed in this paper cannot handle, such as the triangle with a pendant edge. There are also quasi-loop threshold graphs on four vertices whose status remains open, including the graph obtained from the union of a loop and two isolated vertices by adding a dominating vertex.

Acknowledgments

This work was started at the workshop “Graph Theory: structural properties, labelings, and connections to applications” hosted by the American Institute of Mathematics (AIM), Pasadena CA, July 22–July 26, 2024. The authors thank AIM and the organizers of the workshop for facilitating their collaboration.

References

- [1] Graham R. Brightwell and Peter Winkler, Graph homomorphisms and phase transitions, *Journal of Combinatorial Theory Series B* **77** (1999), 415–435.
- [2] Graham R. Brightwell and Peter Winkler, Hard constraints and the Bethe lattice: adventures at the interface of combinatorics and statistical physics, *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Vol. III* (Beijing, 2002), 605–624. Higher Education Press, Beijing, 2002.

- [3] George D. Birkhoff, A Determinant Formula for the Number of Ways of Coloring a Map, *Annals of Mathematics* **14** (1912/1913), 42–46.
- [4] G. D. Birkhoff and D. C. Lewis, Chromatic Polynomials, *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* **60** (1946), 355–451.
- [5] Péter Csikvári, On a poset of trees, *Combinatorica* **30** (2010), 125–137.
- [6] Péter Csikvári and Zhicong Lin, Graph homomorphisms between trees, *Electronic Journal of Combinatorics* **21** (2014), article #P4.9.
- [7] Péter Csikvári and Zhicong Lin, Homomorphisms of trees into a path, *SIAM Journal of Discrete Mathematics* **29** (2015), 1406–1422.
- [8] Vacláv Chvátal and Peter L. Hammer, Aggregation of inequalities in integer programming, in *Studies in Integer Programming*, P. L. Hammer, E. L Johnson, B. H. Korte and G. L. Nemhauser editors, (Proceedings of the Workshop on Programming, Bonn, 1975), *Annals of Discrete Mathematics* **1** (1977), 145–162.
- [9] Emma Cohen, Will Perkins, and Prasad Tetali, On the Widom-Rowlinson occupancy fraction in regular graphs, *Combinatorics, Probability & Computing* **26** (2017), 183–194.
- [10] Jonathan Cutler, Coloring graphs with graphs: a survey, *Graph Theory Notes of New York* **63** (2012), 7–16.
- [11] Jonathan Cutler and Nicholas Kass, Homomorphisms into loop-threshold graphs, *Electronic Journal of Combinatorics* **27** (2020), Article Number P2.38.
- [12] Jonathan Cutler and A. J. Radcliffe, Extremal graphs for homomorphisms, *Journal of Graph Theory* **67** (2011), 261–284.
- [13] Jonathan Cutler and A. J. Radcliffe, Extremal Graphs for Homomorphisms II, *Journal of Graph Theory* **76** (2014), 42–59.
- [14] Ewan Davies, Matthew Jenssen, Will Perkins, and Barnaby Roberts, Independent sets, matchings, and occupancy fractions, *Journal of the London Mathematical Society* **96** (2017), 47–66.
- [15] John Engbers and David Galvin, Extremal H-colorings of trees and 2-connected graphs, *Journal of Combinatorial Theory Series B* **122** (2017), 800–814.
- [16] Jon Folkman, Regular Line-Symmetric Graphs, *Journal of Combinatorial Theory* **3** (1967), 215–232.
- [17] David Galvin, Bounding the partition function of spin systems, *Electronic Journal of Combinatorics* **13** (2006), #R72.
- [18] David Galvin, Fabio Martinelli, Kavita Ramanan, and Prasad Tetali, The multistate hard core model on a regular tree, *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics* **25** (2011), 894–915.
- [19] David Galvin, Emily McMillon, JD Nir, and Amanda Redlich, Long paths need not minimize H -colorings among trees, arXiv:2510.18770.

- [20] David Galvin and Prasad Tetali, On weighted graph homomorphisms, *Discrete Mathematics and Theoretical Computer Science* **63** (2004), 97–104.
- [21] David Galvin, Greyson Wesley, and Bailee Zacovic, Enumerating threshold graphs and some related graph classes, *Journal of Integer Sequences* **25** (2022), Article 22.2.7.
- [22] David S. Gaunt and Michael E. Fisher, Hard-Sphere Lattice Gases. I. Plane-Square Lattice, *Journal of Chemical Physics* **43** (1965), 2840–2863.
- [23] Chris Godsil and Gordon Royle, *Algebraic Graph Theory*, Springer, 2001.
- [24] P. de la Harpe and V. F. R. Jones, Graph Invariants Related to Statistical Mechanical Models: Examples and Problems, *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B* **57** (1993), 207–227.
- [25] A. J. Hoffman, Three observations on nonnegative matrices, *Journal of Research of the National Bureau of Standards* **71B** (1967), 39–41.
- [26] Jeff Kahn, An Entropy Approach to the Hard-Core Model on Bipartite Graphs, *Combinatorics, Probability & Computing* **10** (2001), 219–237.
- [27] Julian Keilson and Adri Kester, Monotone matrices and monotone Markov processes, *Stochastic Processes and their Applications* **5** (1977), 231–241.
- [28] A. K. Kelmans, On graphs with randomly deleted edges, *Acta Mathematica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* **37** (1981), 77–88.
- [29] A. M. Leontovich, The number of mappings of graphs, the ordering of graphs and the Muirhead theorem, *Problemy Peredachi Informatsii* **25** (1989), 91–104; translation in *Problems Inform. Transmission* **25** (1989), 154–165.
- [30] N. Linial, Legal colorings of graphs, *Combinatorica* **6** (1986), 49–54.
- [31] David London, Two inequalities in nonnegative symmetric matrices, *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* **16** (1966), 515–536.
- [32] László Lovász, Large Networks and Graph Limits, American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications volume 60, Providence, Rhode Island, 2012.
- [33] A. E. Mazel and Yu. M. Suhov, Random surfaces with two-sided constraints: an application of the theory of dominant ground states, *Journal of Statistical Physics* **64** (1991), 111–134.
- [34] Helmut Prodinger and Robert F. Tichy, Fibonacci numbers of graphs, *Fibonacci Quarterly* **20** (1982), 16–21.
- [35] Kavita Ramanan, Anrivan Sengupta, Ilze Ziedins, and Partha Mitra, Markov random field models of multicasting in tree networks, *Advances in Applied Probability* **34** (2002), 1–27.
- [36] L. K. Runnels, Hard-Square Lattice Gas, *Physical Review Letters* **15** (1965), 581–584.
- [37] Ashwin Sah, Mehtaab Sawhney, David Stoner, and Yufei Zhao, A reverse Sidorenko inequality, *Inventiones mathematicae* **221** (2020), 665–711.

- [38] Luke Sernau, Graph operations and upper bounds on graph homomorphism counts, *Journal of Graph Theory* **87** (2018), 149–163.
- [39] A. F. Sidorenko, Proof of London’s assumption on sums of elements of nonnegative matrices (in Russian), *Matematicheskie Zametki* **38** (1985), 376–377, 475; translation in Proof of London’s conjecture on sums of elements of positive matrices, *Mathematical notes of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR* **38** (1985), 716–717.
- [40] Alexander Sidorenko, A partially ordered set of functionals corresponding to graphs, *Discrete Mathematics* **131** (1994), 263–277.
- [41] B. Widom and J. S. Rowlinson, New Model for the Study of Liquid-Vapor Phase Transitions, *Journal of Chemical Physics* **52** (1970), 1670–1684.
- [42] Herbert S. Wilf, Backtrack: An $O(1)$ expected time algorithm for the graph coloring problem, *Information Processing Letters* **18** (1984), 119–121.
- [43] George Clifton Wingard, Properties and applications of the Fibonacci polynomial of a graph, Ph.D. thesis, University of Mississippi (1995).
- [44] Yufei Zhao, The Number of Independent Sets in a Regular Graph, *Combinatorics, Probability & Computing* **19** (2010), 315–320.
- [45] Yufei Zhao, Extremal regular graphs: independent sets and graph homomorphisms, *American Mathematical Monthly* **124** (2017), 827–843.