#### Near-colorings and Steinberg conjecture

André Raspaud

LaBRI Université Bordeaux I France

Department of Mathematics, Zhejiang Normal University, Jinhua, China October 13, 2011

## Proper k-coloring

#### Proper k-coloring

Let G be a graph and  $k \ (k \ge 1)$  an integer. A proper k-coloring of G is a mapping  $\phi : V(G) \longrightarrow \{1, \dots, k\}$  such that:

• for every edge xy,  $\phi(x) \neq \phi(y)$ 

In other words, a k-coloring of G is a partition  $V_1, V_2, \dots, V_k$  of V(G) such that  $V_i$  is an independent set for every *i*, i.e., the subgraph induced by  $V_i$  has maximum degree zero.

## d-improper k-coloring

Burr and Jacobson (1985), Cowen, Cowen, and Woodall (1986), Harary and Jones (1985).

#### d-improper k-coloring

Let G be a graph and k,  $d \ (k, d \ge 1)$  integers. A d-improper k-coloring of G is a mapping  $\psi : V(G) \longrightarrow \{1, \dots, k\}$  such that :

- ▶  $\forall i, 1 \leq i \leq k, G[i]$  has a maximum degree at most d
- G[i] is the subgraph induced by color *i*.

Every vertex v has at most d neighbors receiving the same color as v.

- a *d*-improper *k*-coloring :  $(d, \dots, d)$ -coloring
- $\blacktriangleright$  a (0,0,0,0)-coloring is a proper 4-coloring.
- ▶ a (2,2,2)-coloring is a 2-improper 3-coloring.

## d-improper k-coloring



#### Appel and Haken, 1977

• Every planar graph is (0, 0, 0, 0)-colorable.

#### Cowen, Cowen, and Woodall, 1986

▶ Every planar graph is 2-improperly 3-colorable, i.e. (2,2,2)-colorable.

#### Xu, 2009

Every plane graph with neither adjacent triangles nor 5-cycles is (1, 1, 1)-colorable.

#### Corollary

Every plane graph with neither 4-cycles nor 5-cycles is (1, 1, 1)-colorable.

#### Definition

A graph G is d-improper m-choosable, or simply  $(m, d)^*$ -choosable, if for every list assignment L, where  $|L(v)| \ge m$  for every  $v \in V(G)$ , there exists an L-colouring of G such that each vertex of G has at most d neighbours coloured with the same colour as itself.

#### Eaton and Hull (1999), Škrekovski (1999)

• Every planar graph is 2-improper 3-choosable:  $(3, 2)^*$ -choosable.

If a graph G is 2-improper 3-choosable then it is (2, 2, 2)-colorable.

Škrekovski proved that for every k, there are planar graphs which are not k-improper 2-colorable.

Cushing and Kierstead (2009)

Every planar graph is 1-improper 4-choosable  $((4, 1)^*$ -choosable).

#### Dong and Xu 2009

Let G be a plane graph without any cycles of length in  $\{4, 8\}$ , then G is  $(3, 1)^*$ -choosable.

#### Question (Xu and Zhang, 2007)

Is-it true that every planar graph without adjacent triangle is  $(3, 1)^*$ -choosable.

A weaker question: Is-it true that every planar graph without adjacent triangle is (1, 1, 1)-colorable?

Definition-Maximum average degree

$$\operatorname{Mad}(G) = max\left\{\frac{2 \cdot |E(H)|}{|V(H)|}, H \subseteq G\right\}.$$

Definition-Maximum average degree

$$\operatorname{Mad}(G) = max\left\{\frac{2 \cdot |E(H)|}{|V(H)|}, H \subseteq G\right\}.$$

In 1995, Jensen and Toft showed that there is a polynomial algorithm to comput Mad(G) for a given graph G.

T. R. Jensen and B. Toft, Choosability versus chromaticity, Geombinatorics 5(1995), 45-64.

if G is a planar graph with girth g, then  $Mad(G) < \frac{2g}{g-2}$ .

#### Havet and Sereni, 2006

▶ For every  $k \ge 0$ , every graph G with  $Mad(G) < \frac{4k+4}{k+2}$  is k-improperly 2-colorable (in fact k-improperly 2-choosable), i.e. (k, k)-colorable

- ▶  $k = 1 Mad(G) < \frac{8}{3}$ : (1,1)-colorable (planar, g = 8).
- ▶ k = 2 Mad(G) < 3 : (2, 2)-colorable (planar, g = 6).

A more general result:

#### Theorem (Havet and Sereni)

For every  $l \ge 2$  and every  $k \ge 0$ , all graphs of maximum average degree less than  $\frac{l(l+2k)}{l+k}$  are k-improper l-choosable.

it implies  $(k, \dots, k)$ -colorable.

# $(d_1, d_2, \cdots, d_k)$ -coloring

## $(d_1, d_2, \cdots, d_k)$ -coloring

A graph G is  $(d_1, d_2, \dots, d_k)$ -colorable if and only if:

▶ it exists a partition of V:  $V = V_1 \cup V_2 \cup \cdots \cup V_k$  such that  $\forall i \in [1, k], \Delta(G[V_i]) \leq d_i$ 



# $(d_1, d_2, \cdots, d_k)$ -coloring



## (1, 0)-colorable

Theorem (Glebov and Zambalaeva, 2007)

Every planar graph is (1, 0)-colorable if  $g(G) \ge 16$ .

#### Theorem (Borodin and Ivanova, 2009)

Every graph is (1,0)-colorable if  $Mad(G) < \frac{7}{3}$ 

This implies: A planar graph is (1, 0)-colorable if  $g(G) \ge 14$ 

# New technique first introduced by Borodin, Ivanova and Kostochka in 2006.

Let G = (V, E) be a minimum counterexample to the theorem.

• 
$$\delta(G) \ge 2$$
 and G is connected.

$$\sum_{\substack{v \in V \\ |V|}} \frac{\sum_{v \in V} d(v)}{|V|} = \frac{2|E|}{|V|} < \frac{7}{3} \Longrightarrow 3\sum_{v \in V} d(v) < 7|V|$$
$$\Longrightarrow \sum_{v \in V} (6d(v) - 14) < 0$$

- We give a charge  $\forall v \in V \ \mu(v) = 6d(v) 14$  $d(v) = 2 \Longrightarrow \mu(v) = -2, \ d(v) = 3 \Longrightarrow \mu(v) = 4 \text{ etc.}$
- ▶ The total charge is negative, we will redistribute the charges in such a way that the total charge will be non negative. The sum of charges does not change, this is a CONTRADICTION.

Let G = (V, E) be a minimum counterexample to the theorem.

#### Lemme

G does not contain no 2-vertex adjacent to two 2-vertices.



#### Lemme

G does not contain a (2, 2, 2)-vertex.





- 2-vertex  $\Longrightarrow \mu^*(v) = 0$
- (2,2,1)-vertex  $\Longrightarrow \mu^*(v) = -1$
- (2, 1, 1)-vertex  $\Longrightarrow \mu^*(v) = 0$
- (1,1,1)-vertex  $\Longrightarrow \mu^*(v) = 1$

#### Feeding Area

A maximal subgraph consisting of (2, 2, 1)-,(2, 1, 1),-(1, 1, 1)-vertices mutually accessible from each other along 1-paths, and of those 2-vertices adjacent to vertices of FA only.





#### Soft component

A feeding area FA such that all edges from FA to  $G \setminus FA$  belongs to 2-paths



#### Soft component

A feeding area FA such that all edges from FA to  $G \setminus FA$  belongs to 2-paths



#### Lemma

G has no soft component.

A tough vertex is a 3-vertex incident with at least one 0-path. No soft component implies:

#### Corollary

For each feeding area FA, there exists a xz 1-path such that  $x \in FA$  and  $z \notin FA$  where z is tough or  $d(z) \ge 4$ 

#### The key Lemma

Let  $n_{221}$  be the number of (2, 2, 1)-vertices in a feeding area FA,  $n_{111}$  be the number of (1, 1, 1)-vertices of FA, b be the number of 1-path going from FA to tough or  $\geq$  4-vertices. Then  $n_{221} \leq n_{111} + b$ 

#### Rules of discharging

- R1 Every 2-vertex that belong to a 1-path gets 1 from its ends, each 2-vertex that belongs to a 2-path gets charge 2 from the neighbor vertex of degree greater than 2.
- R2 Each (2, 2, 1)-vertex gets 1 from its feeding area, each feeding area gets 1 from each of its (1, 1, 1)-vertex and along each 1-path that goes to a tough vertex or a  $\geq$  4-vertex.

▶ After applying R1 and R2, the new charge of a 2-vertex v is µ<sup>\*</sup>(v) = 0. By the Key lemma the total charge of each feeding area is non negative. Each tough vertex has also a nonnegative charge.

If d(v) ≥ 4. v gives at most 2 along each incident edge by R1 and R2, then:

$$\mu^*(v) \ge 6d(v) - 14 - 2d(v) = 4d(v) - 14 > 0$$

The total charge is non negative: a contradiction.

## Improvement

## Theorem (Borodin and Kostochka, 2010)

Every graph G with  $Mad(G) \leq \frac{12}{5}$  is (1,0)-colorable and the restriction on Mad(G) is sharp.



## Improvement

#### Theorem (Borodin and Kostochka, 2010)

Every graph G with  $Mad(G) \leq \frac{12}{5}$  is (1,0)-colorable and the restriction on Mad(G) is sharp.



## Steinberg Conjecture

#### Conjecture (Steinberg, 1976)

Every planar graph without 4 and 5-cycles is 3-colorable ((0,0,0)-colorable)

Erdős' relaxation '91: Determine the smallest value of k, if it exists, such that every planar graph without cycles of length from 4 to k is 3-colorable.

- ▶  $k \leq 11$  Abbott and Zhou ('91)
- ▶  $k \leq 10$  Borodin ('96)
- ▶  $k \leq 9$  Borodin ('96) and Sanders and Zhao ('95)
- ▶  $k \leq 8$  Salavatipour (2002)
- ▶  $k \leq 7$  Borodin et al. (2005)

Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be the family of planar graphs without cycles of length 4 and 5. Can we prove that every graph in  $\mathcal{F}$  is:

▶ (1,0,0)-colorable?

Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be the family of planar graphs without cycles of length 4 and 5. Can we prove that every graph in  $\mathcal{F}$  is:

- ▶ (1,0,0)-colorable?
- ▶ (1, 1, 0)-colorable?

Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be the family of planar graphs without cycles of length 4 and 5. Can we prove that every graph in  $\mathcal{F}$  is:

- ▶ (1,0,0)-colorable?
- ▶ (1, 1, 0)-colorable?
- ▶ (1,1,1)-colorable (Xu, 2009)

By Euler's Formula :

$$|V| - |E| + |F| = 2$$

and

$$\sum_{v \in V} d(v) = 2|E| = \sum_{f \in F} r(f)$$

, and

$$\omega(v) = 2d(v) - 6 \text{ and } \omega(f) = r(f) - 6.$$

we have:

$$\sum_{v \in V} \omega(v) + \sum_{f \in F} \omega(f) = -12 < 0.$$
  
If  $r(f) = 3$  then  $\omega(f) = -3$ 

Let G be a minimum counterexample.

- 1.  $\delta(G) \geq 3$
- 2. no two 3-vertices adjacent
- 3. no 3-vertex adjacent to two adjacent 4-vertices

Discharging rules:

Rule 1 v s.t. d(v) = 4 gives 1 to an incidente 3-face. Rule 2 a 5<sup>+</sup>-vertex gives 2 to an incidente 3-face.

Remember : a 3-face needs 3.

#### **Final balance**

We have to feed the 3-face.

- ▶ (3,4,5<sup>+</sup>)-face gets 2+1=3
- ▶ (3,5<sup>+</sup>,5<sup>+</sup>)-face gets 2+2=4
- ▶ (4<sup>+</sup>, 4<sup>+</sup>, 4<sup>+</sup>)-face gets at least 1+1+1=3

We have after discharging  $\omega^*(f) \ge 0$  for any face of G

#### **Final balance**

Le v be a vertex of G,

- if v is a 3-vertex, v gives nothing then in this case  $\omega^*(v) = \omega(v) = 0$
- ▶ if v is a 4-vertex, v can be incident to at most 2 3-faces. Hence  $\omega^*(v) \ge 2-2=0$
- ► if v is a 5<sup>+</sup>-vertex, it can be incident to at most  $\lfloor \frac{d(v)}{2} \rfloor$  3-faces. Hence:  $\omega^*(v) \ge 2d(v) - 6 - 2\lfloor \frac{d(v)}{2} \rfloor \ge 0$  $0 \le \sum_{v \in V} \omega^*(v) + \sum_{f \in F} \omega^*(f) = \sum_{v \in V} \omega(v) + \sum_{f \in F} \omega(f) = -12 < 0.$

#### A CONTRADICTION.

#### **Final balance**

Le v be a vertex of G,

- if v is a 3-vertex, v gives nothing then in this case  $\omega^*(v) = \omega(v) = 0$
- ▶ if v is a 4-vertex, v can be incident to at most 2 3-faces. Hence  $\omega^*(v) \ge 2 2 = 0$
- ► if v is a 5<sup>+</sup>-vertex, it can be incident to at most  $\lfloor \frac{d(v)}{2} \rfloor$  3-faces. Hence:  $\omega^*(v) \ge 2d(v) - 6 - 2\lfloor \frac{d(v)}{2} \rfloor \ge 0$  $0 \le \sum_{v \in V} \omega^*(v) + \sum_{f \in F} \omega^*(f) = \sum_{v \in V} \omega(v) + \sum_{f \in F} \omega(f) = -12 < 0.$

#### A CONTRADICTION.

Remark

We proved that any  $G \in \mathcal{F}$  is  $(3, 1)^*$ -choosable.

Steinberg Conjecture

(2, 0, 0)-colorable?

Steinberg Conjecture

(2, 0, 0)-colorable?

Theorem (Chang, Havet, Montassier, R. 2011)

Every graph of  $\mathcal{F}$  is (2, 1, 0)-colorable.

(2,1,0)-colorability of  ${\cal F}$ 

By Euler's Formula :

$$|V| - |E| + |F| = 2$$
$$\sum_{v \in V} d(v) = 2|E| = \sum_{f \in F} r(f)$$

, and

and

$$\omega(v) = 2d(v) - 6$$
 and  $\omega(f) = r(f) - 6$ .

we have:

$$\sum_{v\in V}\omega(v)+\sum_{f\in F}\omega(f)=-12<0.$$

If 
$$r(f) = 3$$
 then  $\omega(f) = -3$ 

## (2,1,0)-colorability of ${\cal F}$

Reducible configurations for (2, 1, 0)-coloring. (C1) *G* contains no 2<sup>-</sup>-vertices.



## (2, 1, 0)-colorability of $\mathcal{F}$

The discharging rules are as follows:

- **R1.** Every 4-vertex gives  $\frac{1}{2}$  to each pendent 3-face.
- **R2.** Every  $5^+$ -vertex gives 1 to each pendent 3-face.
- R3. Every 4-vertex gives 1 to each incident 3-face.
- R4. Every non-light 5-vertex gives 2 to each incident poor (3, 5, 5)-face.
- **R5.** Every 5-vertex gives  $\frac{3}{2}$  to each incident non-poor (3, 5, 5)-face or (3, 4, 5)-face.
- R6. Every 5-vertex gives 1 to each other incident 3-face.
- **R7.** Every  $6^+$ -vertex gives 2 to each incident 3-face.

$$0 \leq \sum_{v \in V} \omega^*(v) + \sum_{f \in F} \omega^*(f) = \sum_{v \in V} \omega(v) + \sum_{f \in F} \omega(f) = -12 < 0.$$

Can we prove: Any planar graph G without  $C_4$  and  $C_5$  is :

(0, 0, 0)-colorable? Steinberg Conjecture.

Can we prove: Any planar graph G without  $C_4$  and  $C_5$  is :

 $(0,0,0)\text{-}\mathrm{colorable}?$  Steinberg Conjecture.

(1, 0, 0)-colorable?

Can we prove: Any planar graph G without  $C_4$  and  $C_5$  is :

(0, 0, 0)-colorable? Steinberg Conjecture.

(1, 0, 0)-colorable?

(1, 1, 0)-colorable?

Can we prove: Any planar graph G without  $C_4$  and  $C_5$  is :

(0, 0, 0)-colorable? Steinberg Conjecture.

(1, 0, 0)-colorable?

(1, 1, 0)-colorable?

(1, 1, 1)-colorable? Result of B. Xu

Can we prove: Any planar graph G without  $C_4$  and  $C_5$  is :

(0, 0, 0)-colorable? Steinberg Conjecture.

(1, 0, 0)-colorable?

(1, 1, 0)-colorable?

(1,1,1)-colorable? Result of B. Xu

(2, 0, 0)-colorable?

Can we prove: Any planar graph G without  $C_4$  and  $C_5$  is :

 $(0,0,0)\text{-}\mathrm{colorable}?$  Steinberg Conjecture.

(1, 0, 0)-colorable?

(1, 1, 0)-colorable?

(1,1,1)-colorable? Result of B. Xu

(2, 0, 0)-colorable?

(2, 1, 0)-colorable? Yes

Can we prove: Any planar graph G without  $C_4$  and  $C_5$  is :

(0, 0, 0)-colorable? Steinberg Conjecture. (1, 0, 0)-colorable? (1, 1, 0)-colorable? (1, 1, 1)-colorable? Result of B. Xu (2, 0, 0)-colorable? (2, 1, 0)-colorable? Yes (3, 0, 0)-colorable?

Can we prove: Any planar graph G without  $C_4$  and  $C_5$  is :

(0,0,0)-colorable? Steinberg Conjecture. (1, 0, 0)-colorable? (1, 1, 0)-colorable? (1,1,1)-colorable? Result of B. Xu (2, 0, 0)-colorable? (2, 1, 0)-colorable? Yes (3, 0, 0)-colorable? (4, 0, 0)-colorable?

Can we prove: Any planar graph G without  $C_4$  and  $C_5$  is :

(0,0,0)-colorable? Steinberg Conjecture. (1, 0, 0)-colorable? (1, 1, 0)-colorable? (1,1,1)-colorable? Result of B. Xu (2, 0, 0)-colorable? (2, 1, 0)-colorable? Yes (3, 0, 0)-colorable? (4, 0, 0)-colorable? YES

# Thank you for your attention!