

TEL-AVIV UNIVERSITY  
RAYMOND AND BEVERLY SACKLER  
FACULTY OF EXACT SCIENCES

## Choice numbers of graphs

This work was submitted in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the Master's degree (M.Sc.) at  
Tel-Aviv University

School of Mathematical Sciences  
Department of Computer Science

Presented by  
Shai Gutner

This work was carried out under the supervision of  
Prof. Michael Tarsi

July 1992

*I am grateful to my advisor,  
Prof. Michael Tarsi, for his  
guidance and assistance  
throughout the work on this  
thesis.*

*I would like to thank  
Prof. Noga Alon for helpful  
discussions and comments.*

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>A solution to a problem of Erdős, Rubin and Taylor</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>An upper bound for the <math>k</math>th choice number</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Choice numbers and orientations</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Properties of <math>(2k : k)</math>-choosable graphs</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>The complexity of graph choosability</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>The strong choice number</b>	<b>27</b>

# 1 Introduction

A graph  $G = (V, E)$  is  $(a : b)$ -choosable if for every family of sets  $\{S(v) : v \in V\}$ , where  $|S(v)| = a$  for all  $v \in V$ , there are subsets  $C(v) \subseteq S(v)$ , where  $|C(v)| = b$  for all  $v \in V$ , and  $C(u) \cap C(v) = \emptyset$  for every two adjacent vertices  $u, v \in V$ . The  $k$ th choice number of  $G$ , denoted by  $ch_k(G)$ , is the minimum integer  $n$  so that  $G$  is  $(n : k)$ -choosable. A graph  $G = (V, E)$  is  $k$ -choosable if it is  $(k : 1)$ -choosable. The choice number of  $G$ , denoted by  $ch(G)$ , is equal to  $ch_1(G)$ .

The concept of  $(a : b)$ -choosability was defined and studied by Erdős, Rubin and Taylor in [8]. In the present paper we prove several results concerning  $(a : b)$ -choosability, a number of which generalize known results regarding choice numbers of graphs that appear in [4] and [2]. The following theorem examines the behavior of  $ch_k(G)$  when  $k$  is large.

**Theorem 1.1** *Let  $G$  be a graph. For every  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists an integer  $k_0$  such that  $ch_k(G) \leq k(\chi(G) + \epsilon)$  for every  $k \geq k_0$ .*

In [8] the authors ask the following question:

If  $G$  is  $(a : b)$ -choosable, and  $\frac{c}{d} > \frac{a}{b}$ , does it follow that  $G$  is  $(c : d)$ -choosable?

The following corollary gives a negative answer to this question.

**Corollary 1.2** *If  $l > m \geq 3$ , then there is a graph  $G$  which is  $(a : b)$ -choosable but not  $(c : d)$ -choosable where  $\frac{c}{d} = l$  and  $\frac{a}{b} = m$ .*

Let  $K_{m^*r}$  denote the complete  $r$ -partite graph with  $m$  vertices in each vertex class, and let  $K_{m_1, \dots, m_r}$  denote the complete  $r$ -partite graph with  $m_i$  vertices in the  $i$ th vertex class. It is shown in [2] that there exist two positive constants  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  such that for every  $m \geq 2$  and for every  $r \geq 2$ ,  $c_1 r \log m \leq ch(K_{m^*r}) \leq c_2 r \log m$ . The following theorem generalizes the upper bound.

**Theorem 1.3** *If  $r \geq 1$  and  $m_i \geq 2$  for every  $i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq r$ , then*

$$ch_k(K_{m_1, \dots, m_r}) \leq 948r(k + \log \frac{m_1 + \dots + m_r}{r}).$$

The following are two applications of this theorem.

**Corollary 1.4** *For every graph  $G$  and  $k \geq 1$*

$$ch_k(G) \leq 948\chi(G)(k + \log(\frac{|V|}{\chi(G)} + 1)).$$

The second corollary generalizes a result from [2] concerning the choice numbers of random graphs for the common model  $G_{n,p}$  (see, e.g., [7]), in which the graph is obtained by taking each pair of the  $n$  labeled vertices  $1, 2, \dots, n$  to be an edge, randomly and independently, with probability  $p$ .

**Corollary 1.5** *For every two constants  $k \geq 1$  and  $0 < p < 1$ , the probability that  $ch_k(G_{n,p}) \leq 475 \log(1/(1-p))n^{\frac{\log \log n}{\log n}}$  tends to 1 as  $n$  tends to infinity.*

A theorem which appears in [4] reveals the connection between the choice number of a graph  $G$  and its orientations. We present here a generalization of this theorem for a special case.

**Theorem 1.6** *Let  $D = (V, E)$  be a digraph and  $k \geq 1$ . For each  $v \in V$ , let  $S(v)$  be a set of size  $k(d_D^+(v) + 1)$ , where  $d_D^+(v)$  is the outdegree of  $v$ . If  $D$  contains no odd directed (simple) cycle, then there are subsets  $C(v) \subseteq S(v)$ , where  $|C(v)| = k$  for all  $v \in V$ , and  $C(u) \cap C(v) = \emptyset$  for every two adjacent vertices  $u, v \in V$ . There is a polynomial time algorithm in  $|V|$  and  $k$  which finds the subsets  $C(v)$ .*

**Corollary 1.7** *Let  $G$  be an undirected graph. If  $G$  has an orientation  $D$  which contains no odd directed (simple) cycle in which the maximum outdegree is  $d$ , then  $G$  is  $(k(d+1) : k)$ -choosable for every  $k \geq 1$ .*

**Corollary 1.8** *An even cycle is  $(2k : k)$ -choosable for every  $k \geq 1$ .*

The last corollary enables us to prove a generalization of a variant of Brooks Theorem which appears in [8].

**Corollary 1.9** *If a connected graph  $G$  is not  $K_n$ , and not an odd cycle, then  $ch_k(G) \leq k\Delta(G)$  for every  $k \geq 1$ , where  $\Delta(G)$  is the maximum degree of  $G$ .*

For a graph  $G = (V, E)$ , define  $M(G) = \max(|E(H)|/|V(H)|)$ , where  $H = (V(H), E(H))$  ranges over all subgraphs of  $G$ . The following two corollaries are generalizations of results which appear in [4].

**Corollary 1.10** *Every bipartite graph  $G$  is  $(k(\lceil M(G) \rceil + 1) : k)$ -choosable for all  $k \geq 1$ .*

**Corollary 1.11** *Every bipartite planar graph  $G$  is  $(3k : k)$ -choosable for all  $k \geq 1$ .*

The following are additional applications.

**Corollary 1.12** *If every induced subgraph of a graph  $G$  has a vertex of degree at most  $d$ , then  $G$  is  $(k(d+1) : k)$ -choosable for all  $k \geq 1$ .*

**Corollary 1.13** *If  $G$  is a triangulated graph, then  $ch_k(G) = k\chi(G) = k\omega(G)$  for every  $k \geq 1$ , where  $\omega(G)$  is the clique number of  $G$ .*

The list-chromatic conjecture asserts that for every graph  $G$ ,  $ch(L(G)) = \chi(L(G))$ , where  $L(G)$  is the line graph of  $G$ . The list-chromatic conjecture is easy to establish for trees, graphs of degree at most 2, and  $K_{2,m}$ . It has also been verified for snarks [11],  $K_{3,3}$ ,  $K_{4,4}$ ,  $K_{6,6}$  [4], and 2-connected cubic planar graphs. The following corollary shows that the list-chromatic conjecture is true for graphs which contain no  $C_n$  for every  $n \geq 4$ .

**Corollary 1.14** *If a graph  $G$  contains no  $C_n$  for every  $n \geq 4$ , then  $ch(L(G)) = \chi(L(G))$ .*

The *core* of a graph  $G$  is the graph obtained from  $G$  by deleting nodes of degree 1 successively until there are no nodes of degree 1. The graph  $\Theta_{a,b,c}$  consists of two distinguished nodes  $u$  and  $v$  together with three paths of lengths  $a, b$ , and  $c$ , which are node disjoint except that each path has  $u$  at one end, and  $v$  at the other end. The following theorem from [8] gives a characterization of the 2-choosable graph:

**Theorem 1.15** *A connected graph  $G$  is 2-choosable if, and only if, the core of  $G$  belongs to  $\{K_1, C_{2m+2}, \Theta_{2,2,2m} : m \geq 1\}$ .*

In [8] the authors ask the following question:

If  $G$  is  $(a : b)$ -choosable, does it follow that  $G$  is  $(am : bm)$ -choosable?

The following theorem gives a partial solution to this question by using theorem 1.15.

**Theorem 1.16** *If a graph  $G$  is 2-choosable, then  $G$  is also  $(4 : 2)$ -choosable.*

**Theorem 1.17** *Suppose that  $k$  and  $m$  are positive integers and that  $k$  is odd. If a graph  $G$  is  $(2mk : mk)$ -choosable, then  $G$  is also  $2m$ -choosable.*

A graph  $G = (V, E)$  is  $f$ -choosable for a function  $f : V \mapsto N$  if for every family of sets  $\{S(v) : v \in V\}$ , where  $|S(v)| = f(v)$  for all  $v \in V$ , there is a proper vertex-coloring of  $G$  assigning

to each vertex  $v \in V$  a color from  $S(v)$ . It is shown in [8] that the following problem is  $\Pi_2^p$ -complete:  
 ( for terminology see [10] )

**BIPARTITE GRAPH (2,3)-CHOOSABILITY (BG (2,3)-CH)**

INSTANCE: A bipartite graph  $G = (V, E)$  and a function  $f : V \mapsto \{2, 3\}$ .

QUESTION: Is  $G$   $f$ -choosable?

We consider the following decision problem:

**BIPARTITE GRAPH  $k$ -CHOOSABILITY (BG  $k$ -CH)**

INSTANCE: A bipartite graph  $G = (V, E)$ .

QUESTION: Is  $G$   $k$ -choosable?

It follows from theorem 1.15 that this problem is solvable in polynomial time for  $k = 2$ .

**Theorem 1.18** BIPARTITE GRAPH  $k$ -CHOOSABILITY is  $\Pi_2^p$ -complete for every constant  $k \geq 3$ .

A graph  $G = (V, E)$  is *strongly  $k$ -colorable* if every graph obtained from  $G$  by adding to it a union of vertex disjoint cliques of size at most  $k$  ( on the set  $V$  ) is  $k$ -colorable. An analogous definition of *strongly  $k$ -choosable* is made by replacing colorability with choosability. The *strong chromatic number* of a graph  $G$ , denoted by  $s\chi(G)$ , is the minimum  $k$  such that  $G$  is strongly  $k$ -colorable. Define  $s\chi(d) = \max(s\chi(G))$ , where  $G$  ranges over all graphs with maximum degree at most  $d$ . The definition of strongly  $k$ -colorable given in [1] is slightly different. It is claimed there that if  $G$  is strongly  $k$ -colorable, then it is strongly  $(k + 1)$ -colorable as well. However, it is not known how to prove this if we use the definition from [1].

**Theorem 1.19** *If  $G$  is strongly  $k$ -colorable, then it is strongly  $(k + 1)$ -colorable as well.*

We give a weaker version of this theorem for choosability.

**Theorem 1.20** *If  $G$  is strongly  $k$ -choosable, then it is strongly  $km$ -choosable as well.*

**Theorem 1.21** *Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a graph, and suppose that  $km$  divides  $|V|$ . If the choice number of any graph obtained from  $G$  by adding to it a union of vertex disjoint  $k$ -cliques (on the set  $V$ ) is  $k$ , then the choice number of any graph obtained from  $G$  by adding to it a union of vertex disjoint  $km$ -cliques is  $km$ .*

**Corollary 1.22** *Let  $n$  and  $k$  be positive integers, and let  $G$  be a  $(3k + 1)$ -regular graph on  $3kn$  vertices. Assume that  $G$  has a decomposition into a Hamiltonian circuit and  $n$  pairwise vertex disjoint  $3k$ -cliques. Then  $ch(G) = 3k$ .*

It is proved in [1] that there is a constant  $c$  such that for every  $d$ ,  $3\lfloor d/2 \rfloor < s\chi(d) \leq cd$ . The following theorem improves the lower bound.

**Theorem 1.23** *For every  $d \geq 1$ ,  $s\chi(d) \geq 2d$ .*

## 2 A solution to a problem of Erdős, Rubin and Taylor

In this section we prove an upper bound for the  $k$ th choice number of a graph when  $k$  is large and apply this bound to settle a problem raised in [8].

**Proof of Theorem 1.1** Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a graph and  $\epsilon > 0$ . Denote  $r = \chi(G)$ , and let  $V = V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_r$  be a partition of the vertices, such that each  $V_i$  is a stable set. For each  $v \in V$ , let  $S(v)$  be a set of  $\lfloor k(\chi(G) + \epsilon) \rfloor$  distinct colors. Let  $S = \cup_{v \in V} S(v)$  be the set of all colors. Put  $R = \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$  and let  $f : S \mapsto R$  be a random function, obtained by choosing, for each color  $c \in S$ , randomly and independently, the value of  $f(c)$  according to a uniform distribution on  $R$ . The colors  $c$  for which  $f(c) = i$  will be the ones to be used for coloring the vertices in  $V_i$ . To complete the proof, it thus suffices to show that with positive probability for every  $i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq r$ , and for every vertex  $v \in V_i$  there are at least  $k$  colors  $c \in S(v)$  so that  $f(c) = i$ .

Fix an  $i$  and a vertex  $v \in V_i$ , and define  $X = |S(v) \cap f^{-1}(i)|$ . The probability that there are less than  $k$  colors  $c \in S(v)$  so that  $f(c) = i$  is equal to  $Pr(X < k)$ . Since  $X$  is a random variable with distribution  $B(\lfloor k(r + \epsilon) \rfloor, 1/r)$ , by Chebyshev's inequality (see, e.g., [3])

$$Pr(X < k) \leq Pr(|X - \frac{\lfloor k(r + \epsilon) \rfloor}{r}| \geq \frac{\lfloor k\epsilon \rfloor}{r}) \leq \frac{\lfloor k(r + \epsilon) \rfloor \frac{1}{r} (1 - \frac{1}{r})}{(\frac{\lfloor k\epsilon \rfloor}{r})^2} = O(\frac{1}{k}).$$

It follows that there is an integer  $k_0$  such that  $P(X < k) < 1/|V|$  for every  $k \geq k_0$ . There are  $|V|$  possible choices of  $i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq r$  and  $v \in V_i$ , and hence, the probability that for some  $i$  and some  $v \in V_i$  there are less than  $k$  colors  $c \in S(v)$  so that  $f(c) = i$  is smaller than 1, completing the proof.  $\square$

Note that it is not true that for every graph  $G$  there exists an integer  $k_0$  such that  $ch_k(G) \leq k\chi(G)$  for every  $k \geq k_0$ . For example, take the graph  $G = K_{3,3}$  which has chromatic number 2.



The graph  $G$  is not 2-choosable and therefore by theorem 1.17 it is not  $(2k : k)$ -choosable for every  $k$  odd. This means that  $ch_k(G) > k\chi(G)$  for every  $k$  odd.

**Proof of Corollary 1.2** Suppose that  $l > m \geq 3$ , and let  $G$  be a graph such that  $ch(G) = l + 1$  and  $\chi(G) = m - 1$  ( it is proved in [13] that for every  $l \geq m \geq 2$  there is a graph  $G$ , where  $ch(G) = l$  and  $\chi(G) = m$  ). By theorem 1.1, for  $\epsilon = 1$  there exist an integer  $k$  such that  $G$  is  $(k(\chi(G) + 1) : k)$ -choosable. We have that  $G$  is  $(km : k)$ -choosable but not  $(l : 1)$ -choosable, as needed.  $\square$

### 3 An upper bound for the $k$ th choice number

In this section we establish an upper bound for  $ch_k(K_{m_1, \dots, m_r})$ , and use it to prove two consequences. The following lemma appears in [3].

**Lemma 3.1** *If  $X$  is a random variable with distribution  $B(n, p)$ ,  $0 < p \leq 1$ , and  $k < pn$  then*

$$Pr(X < k) < e^{-\frac{(np-k)^2}{2pn}}.$$

In the rest of this section we denote  $t = \frac{m_1 + \dots + m_r}{r}$ ,  $t_1 = \frac{m_1 + \dots + m_{r/2}}{r/2}$ , and  $t_2 = \frac{m_{r/2+1} + \dots + m_r}{r/2}$ . Notice that  $t = (t_1 + t_2)/2$ , and therefore  $\log t_1 t_2 \leq 2 \log t$ .

**Lemma 3.2** *If  $1 \leq r \leq t$ ,  $k \geq 1$ , and  $m_i \geq 2$  for every  $i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq r$ , then  $ch_k(K_{m_1, \dots, m_r}) \leq 4r(k + \log t)$ .*

**Proof** Let  $V_1, V_2, \dots, V_r$  be the vertex classes of  $K = K_{m_1, \dots, m_r}$ , where  $|V_i| = m_i$  for all  $i$ , and let  $V = V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_r$  be the set of all vertices of  $K$ . For each  $v \in V$ , let  $S(v)$  be a set of  $\lfloor 4r(k + \log t) \rfloor$  distinct colors. Put  $R = \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$  and let  $f : S \mapsto R$  be a random function, obtained by choosing, for each color  $c \in S$ , randomly and independently, the value of  $f(c)$  according to a uniform distribution on  $R$ . The colors  $c$  for which  $f(c) = i$  will be the ones to be used for coloring the vertices in  $V_i$ . To complete the proof it thus suffices to show that with positive probability for every  $i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq r$ , and every vertex  $v \in V_i$  there are at least  $k$  colors  $c \in S(v)$  so that  $f(c) = i$ .

Fix an  $i$  and a vertex  $v \in V_i$ , and define  $X = |S(v) \cap f^{-1}(i)|$ . The probability that there are less than  $k$  colors  $c \in S(v)$  so that  $f(c) = i$  is equal to  $Pr(X < k)$ . Since  $X$  is a random variable with distribution  $B(\lfloor 4r(k + \log t) \rfloor, 1/r)$ , by lemma 3.1

$$Pr(X < k) < e^{-\frac{(E(X)-k)^2}{2E(X)}} \leq e^{-\frac{(4(k+\log t)-1-k)^2}{8(k+\log t)}} < e^{-\frac{16(k+\log t)^2-8(k+1)(k+\log t)}{8(k+\log t)}} \leq e^{-2 \log t} = \frac{1}{t^2} \leq \frac{1}{rt},$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that  $r \leq t$ . There are  $rt$  possible choices of  $i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq r$  and  $v \in V_i$ , and hence, the probability that for some  $i$  and some  $v \in V_i$  there are less than  $k$  colors  $c \in S(v)$  so that  $f(c) = i$  is smaller than 1, completing the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.3** *Suppose that  $r$  is even,  $r > t$ ,  $k \geq 1$ ,  $d \geq 244$ , and  $m_i \geq 2$  for every  $i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq r$ . If  $ch_k(K_{m_1, \dots, m_{r/2}}) \leq d(1 - \frac{1}{5r^{1/3}})\frac{r}{2}(k + \log t_1)$  and  $ch_k(K_{m_{r/2+1}, \dots, m_r}) \leq d(1 - \frac{1}{5r^{1/3}})\frac{r}{2}(k + \log t_2)$ , then  $ch_k(K_{m_1, \dots, m_r}) \leq dr(k + \log t)$ .*

**Proof** Let  $V_1, V_2, \dots, V_r$  be the vertex classes of  $K = K_{m_1, \dots, m_r}$ , where  $|V_i| = m_i$  for all  $i$ , and let  $V = V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_r$  be the set of all vertices of  $K$ . For each  $v \in V$ , let  $S(v)$  be a set of  $\lfloor dr(k + \log t) \rfloor$  distinct colors. Define  $R = \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$ , and let  $S = \cup_{v \in V} S(v)$  be the set of all colors. Put  $R_1 = \{1, 2, \dots, r/2\}$  and  $R_2 = \{r/2 + 1, \dots, r\}$ . Let  $f : S \mapsto \{1, 2\}$  be a random function obtained by choosing, for each  $c \in S$  randomly and independently,  $f(c) \in \{1, 2\}$  where for all  $j \in \{1, 2\}$

$$Pr(f(c) = j) = \frac{k + \log t_j}{2k + \log t_1 t_2}.$$

The colors  $c$  for which  $f(c) = 1$  will be used for coloring the vertices in  $\cup_{i \in R_1} V_i$ , whereas the colors  $c$  for which  $f(c) = 2$  will be used for coloring the vertices in  $\cup_{i \in R_2} V_i$ .

For every vertex  $v \in V$ , define  $C(v) = S(v) \cap f^{-1}(1)$  if  $v$  belongs to  $\cup_{i \in R_1} V_i$ , and  $C(v) = S(v) \cap f^{-1}(2)$  if  $v$  belongs to  $\cup_{i \in R_2} V_i$ . Because of the assumptions of the lemma, it remains to show that with positive probability,

$$|C(v)| \geq d(1 - \frac{1}{5r^{1/3}})\frac{r}{2}(k + \log t_j) \tag{1}$$

for all  $j \in \{1, 2\}$  and  $v \in \cup_{i \in R_j} V_i$ .

Fix a  $j \in \{1, 2\}$  and a vertex  $v \in \cup_{i \in R_j} V_i$ , and define  $X = |C(v)|$ . The expectation of  $X$  is

$$\lfloor dr(k + \log t) \rfloor \frac{k + \log t_j}{2k + \log t_1 t_2} \geq (dr(k + \log t) - 1) \frac{k + \log t_j}{2k + 2 \log t} \geq d \frac{r}{2} (k + \log t_j) - 1 = T.$$

It follows from lemma 3.1 and the inequality  $E(X) \geq T$  that

$$Pr(X < T - T^{2/3}) < e^{-\frac{(E(X) - T + T^{2/3})^2}{2E(X)}} \leq e^{-\frac{1}{2}T^{1/3}} \leq e^{-\frac{1}{2}(d\frac{r}{2})^{1/3}}.$$

Since  $|\cup_{i \in R_j} V_i| \leq rt < r^2$ , the probability that  $|C(v)| < T - T^{2/3}$  holds for some  $v \in \cup_{i \in R_j} V_i$  is at most

$$r^2 \cdot e^{-\frac{1}{2}(d\frac{r}{2})^{1/3}} < 1/2,$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that  $d \geq 244$ . One can easily check that

$$T - T^{2/3} = T\left(1 - \frac{1}{T^{1/3}}\right) \geq d \frac{r}{2} (k + \log t_j) \left(1 - \frac{1}{5r^{1/3}}\right),$$

and therefore, with positive probability (1) holds for all  $j \in \{1, 2\}$  and  $v \in \cup_{i \in R_j} V_i$ .  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 1.3** Define for every  $r$  which is a power of 2

$$f(r) = \prod_{j=0}^{\log_2 r} \left(1 - \frac{1}{5 \cdot 2^{j/3}}\right) / \prod_{j=0}^2 \left(1 - \frac{1}{5 \cdot 2^{j/3}}\right).$$

We claim that for every  $r$  which is a power of 2

$$ch_k(K_{m_1, \dots, m_r}) \leq \frac{244r(k + \log t)}{f(r)}. \quad (2)$$

The proof is by induction on  $r$ .

**Case 1:**  $r \leq t$ .

The result follows from lemma 3.2 since

$$\frac{244}{f(r)} \geq 244 \prod_{j=1}^2 \left(1 - \frac{1}{5 \cdot 2^{j/3}}\right) > 4.$$

**Case 2:**  $r > t$ .

Notice that  $t \geq 2$ , and therefore  $r \geq 4$ . By the induction hypothesis

$$ch_k(K_{m_1, \dots, m_{r/2}}) \leq \frac{244\left(1 - \frac{1}{5r^{1/3}}\right) \frac{r}{2} (k + \log t_1)}{f(r)}$$

and

$$ch_k(K_{m_{r/2+1}, \dots, m_r}) \leq \frac{244\left(1 - \frac{1}{5r^{1/3}}\right) \frac{r}{2} (k + \log t_2)}{f(r)}.$$

Since  $r \geq 4$ , we have  $244/f(r) \geq 244$  and it follows from lemma 3.3 that (2) holds, as claimed.

It is easy to check that

$$\prod_{j=3}^{\log_2 r} \left(1 - \frac{1}{5 \cdot 2^{j/3}}\right) \geq 1 - \sum_{j=3}^{\log_2 r} \frac{1}{5 \cdot 2^{j/3}} \geq 1 - \frac{1}{10(1 - 2^{-1/3})},$$

and therefore  $244/f(r) \leq 474$ . It follows from (2) that for every  $r$  which is a power of 2

$$ch_k(K_{m_1, \dots, m_r}) \leq 474r(k + \log t). \quad (3)$$

Returning to the general case, assume that  $r \geq 1$ . Choose an integer  $r'$  which is a power of 2 and  $r < r' \leq 2r$ . By applying (3), we get

$$\begin{aligned} ch_k(K_{m_1, \dots, m_r}) &\leq ch_k(K_{m_1, \dots, m_r, \underbrace{2, \dots, 2}_{r'-r}}) \\ &\leq 474r'(k + \log \frac{m_1 + \dots + m_r + 2(r' - r)}{r'}) \leq 948r(k + \log \frac{m_1 + \dots + m_r}{r}), \end{aligned}$$

completing the proof.  $\square$

Denote  $K = K_{m, \underbrace{s, \dots, s}_r}$ , where  $m \geq 2$  and  $s \geq 2$ . Every induced subgraph of  $K$  has a vertex of degree at most  $rs$ , and therefore by corollary 1.10  $ch_k(K) \leq k(rs + 1)$  for all  $k \geq 1$ . Note that this upper bound for  $ch_k(K)$  does not depend of  $m$ , which means that a good lower bound for  $ch_k(K_{m_1, \dots, m_r})$  has a more complicated form than the upper bound given in theorem 1.3.

**Proof of Corollary 1.4** Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a graph and  $k \geq 1$ . Denote  $r = \chi(G)$ , and let  $V = V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_r$  be a partition of the vertices, such that each  $V_i$  is a stable set. Denote  $m_i = |V_i|$  for all  $i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq r$ . By theorem 1.1

$$ch_k(G) \leq ch_k(K_{m_1+1, \dots, m_r+1}) \leq 948r(k + \log \frac{m_1 + \dots + m_r + r}{r}) = 948\chi(G)(k + \log(\frac{|V|}{\chi(G)} + 1)),$$

as needed.  $\square$

**Proof of Corollary 1.5** As proved by Bollobás in [6], for a fixed probability  $p$ ,  $0 < p < 1$ , almost surely (i.e., with probability that tends to 1 as  $n$  tends to infinity), the random graph  $G_{n,p}$  has chromatic number

$$(\frac{1}{2} + o(1)) \log(1/(1-p)) \frac{n}{\log n}.$$

By corollary 1.4, for every  $\epsilon > 0$  almost surely

$$ch_k(G_{n,p}) \leq 948(\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon) \log(1/(1-p)) \frac{n}{\log n} (k + \log(\frac{3 \log n}{\log(1/(1-p))} + 1)).$$

The result follows since  $k$  and  $p$  are constants.  $\square$

Note that in the proof of the last corollary we have not used any knowledge concerning independent sets of  $G_{n,p}$ , as was done in [2] for the proof of the special case.

## 4 Choice numbers and orientations

Let  $D = (V, E)$  be a digraph. We denote the set of out-neighbors of  $v$  in  $D$  by  $N_D^+(v)$ . A set of vertices  $K \subseteq V$  is called a *kernel* of  $D$  if  $K$  is an independent set and  $N_D^+(v) \cap K \neq \emptyset$  for every vertex  $v \notin K$ . Richardson's theorem (see, e.g., [5]) states that any digraph with no odd directed cycle has a kernel.

**Proof of Theorem 1.6** Let  $D = (V, E)$  be a digraph which contains no odd directed (simple) cycle and  $k \geq 1$ . For each  $v \in V$ , let  $S(v)$  be a set of size  $k(d_D^+(v) + 1)$ . We claim that the following algorithm finds subsets  $C(v) \subseteq S(v)$ , where  $|C(v)| = k$  for all  $v \in V$ , and  $C(u) \cap C(v) = \emptyset$  for every two adjacent vertices  $u, v \in V$ .

1.  $S \leftarrow \cup_{v \in V} S(v)$ ,  $W \leftarrow V$  and for every  $v \in V$ ,  $C(v) \leftarrow \emptyset$ .
2. Choose a color  $c \in S \cap \cup_{v \in W} S(v)$  and put  $S \leftarrow S - \{c\}$ .
3. Let  $K$  be a kernel of the induced subgraph of  $D$  on the vertex set  $\{v \in W : c \in S(v)\}$ .
4.  $C(v) \leftarrow C(v) \cup \{c\}$  for all  $v \in K$ .
5.  $W \leftarrow W - \{v \in K : |C(v)| = k\}$ .
6. If  $W = \emptyset$ , stop. If not, go to step 2.

During the algorithm,  $W$  is equal to  $\{v \in V : |C(v)| < k\}$ , and  $S$  is the set of remaining colors. We first prove that in step 2,  $S \cap \cup_{v \in W} S(v) \neq \emptyset$ . When the algorithm reaches step 2, it is obvious that  $W \neq \emptyset$ . Suppose that  $w \in W$  in this step, and therefore  $|C(w)| < k$ . It follows easily from the definition of a kernel that every color from  $S(w)$ , which has been previously chosen in step 2, belongs either to  $C(w)$  or to  $\cup_{v \in N_D^+(w)} C(v)$ . Since

$$|C(w)| + \left| \bigcup_{v \in N_D^+(w)} C(v) \right| < k + k \cdot d_D^+(w) = |S(w)|,$$

not all the colors of  $S(w)$  have been used. This means that  $S \cap S(w) \neq \emptyset$ , as needed. It follows easily that the algorithm always terminates.

Upon termination of the algorithm,  $|C(v)| = k$  for all  $v \in V$ . In step 4 the same color is assigned to the vertices of a kernel which is an independent set, and therefore  $C(u) \cap C(v) = \emptyset$  for every two adjacent vertices  $u, v \in V$ . This proves the correctness of the algorithm.

In step 4, the operation  $C(v) \leftarrow C(v) \cup \{c\}$  is performed for at least one vertex. Upon termination  $|\cup_{v \in V} C(v)| \leq k|V|$ , which means that the algorithm performs at most  $k|V|$  iterations. There is a polynomial time algorithm for finding a kernel in a digraph with no odd directed cycle. Thus, the algorithm is of polynomial time complexity in  $|V|$  and  $k$ , completing the proof.  $\square$

**Proof of Corollary 1.7** This is an immediate consequence of theorem 1.6, since  $k(d_D^+(v) + 1) \leq k(d + 1)$  for every  $v \in V$ .  $\square$

**Proof of Corollary 1.8** The result follows from 1.7 by taking the cyclic orientation of the even cycle.  $\square$

The proof of corollary 1.9 is similar to the proof of the special case which appears in [8]. A graph  $G = (V, E)$  is *k-degree-choosable* if for every family of sets  $\{S(v) : v \in V\}$ , where  $|S(v)| = kd(v)$  for all  $v \in V$ , there are subsets  $C(v) \subseteq S(v)$ , where  $|C(v)| = k$  for all  $v \in V$ , and  $C(u) \cap C(v) = \emptyset$  for every two adjacent vertices  $u, v \in V$ .

**Lemma 4.1** *If a graph  $G = (V, E)$  is connected, and  $G$  has a connected induced subgraph  $H = (V', E')$  which is k-degree-choosable, then  $G$  is k-degree-choosable.*

**Proof** For each  $v \in V$ , let  $S(v)$  be a set of size  $kd(v)$ . The proof is by induction on  $|V|$ . In case  $|V| = |V'|$  there is nothing to prove. Assuming that  $|V| > |V'|$ , let  $v$  be a vertex of  $G$  which is at maximal distance from  $H$ . This guarantees that  $G - v$  is connected. Choose any subset  $C(v) \subseteq S(v)$  such that  $|C(v)| = k$ , and remove the colors of  $C(v)$  from all the vertices adjacent to  $v$ . The choice can be completed by applying the induction hypothesis on  $G - v$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 4.2** *If  $c \geq 2$ , then  $\Theta_{a,b,c}$  is k-degree-choosable for every  $k \geq 1$ .*

**Proof** Suppose that  $\Theta_{a,b,c}$  has vertex set  $V = \{u, v, x_1, \dots, x_{a-1}, y_1, \dots, y_{b-1}, z_1, \dots, z_{c-1}\}$  and contains the three paths  $u - x_1 - \dots - x_{a-1} - v$ ,  $u - y_1 - \dots - y_{b-1} - v$ , and  $u - z_1 - \dots - z_{c-1} - v$ . For each  $w \in V$ , let  $S(w)$  be a set of size  $kd(w)$ . For the vertex  $u$  we choose a subset  $C(u) \subseteq S(u) - S(z_1)$  of size  $k$ . For each node according to the sequence  $x_1, \dots, x_{a-1}, y_1, \dots, y_{b-1}, v, z_{c-1}, \dots, z_1$  we choose a subset of  $k$  colors that were not chosen in adjacent earlier nodes.  $\square$

For the proof of corollary 1.9, we shall need the following lemma which appears in [8].

**Lemma 4.3** *If there is no node which disconnects  $G$ , then  $G$  is an odd cycle, or  $G = K_n$ , or  $G$  contains, as a node induced subgraph, an even cycle without chord or with only one chord.*

**Proof of Corollary 1.9** Suppose that a connected graph  $G$  is not  $K_n$ , and not an odd cycle. If  $G$  is not a regular graph, then every induced subgraph of  $G$  has a vertex of degree at most  $\Delta(G) - 1$ , and by corollary 1.12  $ch_k(G) \leq k\Delta(G)$  for all  $k \geq 1$ . If  $G$  is a regular graph, then there is a part of  $G$  not disconnected by a node, which is neither an odd cycle nor a complete graph. It follows from lemma 4.3 that  $G$  contains, as a node induced subgraph, an even cycle or a particular kind of  $\Theta_{a,b,c}$  graph. We know from corollary 1.8 and lemma 4.2 that both an even cycle and  $\Theta_{a,b,c}$  are  $k$ -degree-choosable for every  $k \geq 1$ . The result follows from lemma 4.1.  $\square$

**Proof of Corollary 1.10** It is proved in [4] that a graph  $G = (V, E)$  has an orientation  $D$  in which every outdegree is at most  $d$  if and only if  $M(G) \leq d$ . Therefore, there is an orientation  $D$  of  $G$  in which the maximum outdegree is at most  $\lceil M(G) \rceil$ . Since  $D$  contains no odd directed cycles, the result follows from corollary 1.7.  $\square$

**Proof of Corollary 1.11**  $M(G) \leq 2$ , since any bipartite (simple) graph on  $r$  vertices contains at most  $2r - 2$  edges. The result follows from corollary 1.10.  $\square$

**Proof of Corollary 1.12** We claim that if every induced subgraph of a graph  $G = (V, E)$  has a vertex of degree at most  $d$ , then  $G$  has an acyclic orientation in which the maximum outdegree is  $d$ . The proof is by induction on  $|V|$ . If  $|V| = 1$ , the result is trivial. If  $|V| > 1$ , let  $v$  be a vertex of  $G$  with degree at most  $d$ . By the induction hypothesis,  $G - v$  has an acyclic orientation in which the maximum outdegree is  $d$ . We complete this orientation of  $G - v$  by orienting every edge incident to  $v$  from  $v$  to its appropriate neighbor and obtain the desired orientation of  $G$ , as claimed. The result follows from corollary 1.7.  $\square$

An undirected graph  $G$  is called *triangulated* if  $G$  does not contain an induced subgraph isomorphic to  $C_n$  for  $n \geq 4$ . Being triangulated is a hereditary property inherited by all the induced subgraphs of  $G$ . A vertex  $v$  of  $G$  is called *simplicial* if its adjacency set  $Adj(v)$  induces a complete subgraph of  $G$ . It is proved in [12] that every triangulated graph has a simplicial vertex.

**Proof of Corollary 1.13** Suppose that  $G$  is a triangulated graph, and let  $H$  be an induced subgraph of  $G$ . Since  $H$  is triangulated, it has a simplicial vertex  $v$ . The set of vertices  $\{v\} \cup Adj_H(v)$  induces a complete subgraph of  $H$ , and therefore  $v$  has degree at most  $\omega(G) - 1$  in  $H$ . It follows from corollary 1.10 that  $ch_k(G) \leq k\omega(G)$  for every  $k \geq 1$ . For every graph  $G$  and  $k \geq 1$ ,  $ch_k(G) \geq k\omega(G)$  and hence  $ch_k(G) = k\omega(G)$  for every  $k \geq 1$ . Since  $G$  is triangulated, it is also perfect, which means that  $\chi(G) = \omega(G)$ , as needed.  $\square$

**Proof of Corollary 1.14** It is easy to see that  $L(G)$  is triangulated if and only if  $G$  contains no  $C_n$  for every  $n \geq 4$ . The result follows from corollary 1.13.  $\square$

The validity of the list-chromatic conjecture for graphs of class 2 with maximum degree 3 (and in particular for snarks) follows easily from corollary 1.9. Suppose that  $G$  is a graph of class 2 with  $\Delta(G) = 3$ . Let  $C$  be a connected component of  $L(G)$ . If  $C$  is not a complete graph, and not an odd cycle, then  $ch(C) \leq \Delta(C) \leq \Delta(L(G)) \leq 4$ . If  $C$  is a complete graph or an odd cycle, then it is easy to see that  $\Delta(C) \leq 2$ , and therefore by corollary 1.10  $ch(C) \leq \Delta(C) + 1 \leq 3$ . It follows that  $ch(L(G)) \leq 4$ . Since  $G$  is a graph of class 2,  $ch(L(G)) \geq \chi(L(G)) = \Delta(G) + 1 = 4$ , and hence,  $ch(L(G)) = \chi(L(G)) = 4$ .

## 5 Properties of $(2k : k)$ -choosable graphs

Let  $A$  and  $B$  be sets of size 4. We denote  $p(A, B) = \{(C, D) : C \subseteq A, D \subseteq B, |C| = |D| = 2\}$ . Suppose that  $S \subseteq p(A_1, B_1)$  and that  $T \subseteq p(A_2, B_2)$ . We say that  $S$  and  $T$  are isomorphic if there exist two bijections  $f : A_1 \mapsto A_2$  and  $g : B_1 \mapsto B_2$  so that  $(C, D) \in S$  iff  $(f(C), g(D)) \in T$  for every  $C \subseteq A$  and  $D \subseteq B$ , where  $|C| = |D| = 2$ .

Let  $A$  and  $B$  be sets of size 4, and suppose that  $S \subseteq p(A, B)$ . Suppose that  $H_1, \dots, H_6$  are all the subsets of  $A$  of size 2. For each  $i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq 6$ , we denote  $c(H_i) = \{G : (H_i, G) \in S\}$  and  $d_i = |c(H_i)|$ . The sequence  $(d_1, \dots, d_6)$  is called the degree sequence of  $S$ . We say that  $S$  is special if it has the following properties:

1. Its degree sequence is  $(6, 5, 5, 3, 3, 1)$ .
2. If  $H$  and  $G$  are the two subsets of  $A$  for which  $|c(H)| = |c(G)| = 3$ , then  $|H \cap G| = 1$ . Denote  $H = \{1, 2\}$ ,  $G = \{1, 3\}$ , and  $A = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ .
3.  $c(H) = c(G)$ .
4.  $c(H)$  has either the form  $\{\{5, 6\}, \{5, 7\}, \{5, 8\}\}$  or the form  $\{\{5, 6\}, \{5, 7\}, \{6, 7\}\}$ .
5. Either  $|c(\{2, 3\})| = 1$  and  $|c(\{1, 4\})| = 6$ , or  $|c(\{2, 3\})| = 6$  and  $|c(\{1, 4\})| = 1$ .

We say that  $S$  has property  $P_1$  iff  $comp(H)$  has the form  $\{\{5, 6\}, \{5, 7\}, \{5, 8\}\}$  and that it has property  $P_2$  iff  $|comp(\{2, 3\})| = 1$ .



Suppose that  $K_{2,2}$  has vertex set  $V = X \cup Y$ , where  $X = \{x_1, x_2\}$ ,  $Y = \{y_1, y_2\}$ , and it has exactly the edges  $\{x_i, y_j\}$ . For each  $v \in V$ , let  $S(v)$  be a set of size 4. By  $C(v)$  we denote a subset of  $S(v)$  of size 2. We say that  $C(x_1)$  and  $C(x_2)$  are compatible if there exist two subsets  $C(y_1)$  and  $C(y_2)$ , so that  $C(u) \cap C(v) = \emptyset$  for every two adjacent vertices  $u, v \in V$ . A subset  $C(x_1) \subseteq S(x_1)$  is called bad if  $C(x_1)$  is not compatible with any  $C(x_2)$ . An analogous definition is made for  $C(x_2)$ . We say that a family of sets  $\{S(v) : v \in V\}$  is defected if there exist two bad subsets  $C(x_1)$  and  $C(x_2)$ . We denote by  $incomp(x_1, x_2)$  the set of incompatible pairs  $(C(x_1), C(x_2))$ .

**Lemma 5.1** *If the family of sets  $\{S(v) : v \in V\}$  is defected and  $C(x_1)$  is bad, then both  $S(y_1)$  and  $S(y_2)$  intersect  $C(x_1)$  and at least one of them contains  $C(x_1)$ .*

**Proof** Suppose that neither  $S(y_1)$  nor  $S(y_2)$  contain  $C(x_1)$ . Remove the colors of  $C(x_1)$  from  $S(y_1)$  and  $S(y_2)$ . Now both  $S(y_1)$  and  $S(y_2)$  have size at least 3. We can assume the worst case, in which both  $S(y_1)$  and  $S(y_2)$  are subsets of  $S(x_2)$ , and therefore  $|S(y_1) \cap S(y_2)| \geq 2$ . Let  $C$  be a subset of  $S(y_1) \cap S(y_2)$  of size 2. Choose a subset  $C(x_2) \subseteq S(x_2) - C$ . We have that  $C(x_1)$  and  $C(x_2)$  are compatible in contrast to the fact that  $C(x_1)$  is bad. This proves that at least one of  $S(y_1)$  and  $S(y_2)$  contains  $C(x_1)$ .

Suppose that  $S(y_1) \cap C(x_1) = \emptyset$ . Choose a subset  $C(y_2) \subseteq S(y_2) - C(x_1)$  and a subset  $C(x_2) \subseteq S(x_2) - C(y_2)$ . We have that  $C(x_1)$  and  $C(x_2)$  are compatible in contrast to the fact that  $C(x_1)$  is bad. This proves that both  $S(y_1)$  and  $S(y_2)$  intersect  $C(x_1)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 5.2** *If the family of sets  $\{S(v) : v \in V\}$  is defected, then both  $S(x_1)$  and  $S(x_2)$  contain exactly one bad subset. Furthermore, at least one of the following is valid:*

1. *The set  $incomp(x_1, x_2)$  is special and has properties  $P_1$  and  $P_2$ .*
2.  *$incomp(x_1, x_2)$  has degree sequence  $(6, 5, 5, 3, 2, 2)$ .*
3.  *$|incomp(x_1, x_2)| = 21$ .*

**Proof** The set  $S(x_1)$  contains a bad subset, which we denote by  $C(x_1) = \{1, 2\}$ . Without loss of generality, we can assume by lemma 5.1 that  $C(x_1) \subseteq S(y_1)$  and that  $S(y_2)$  intersects  $C(x_1)$ . Denote  $S(y_1) = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ . Since  $C(x_1)$  is bad, we must have that  $|(S(y_1) \cap S(y_2)) - C(x_1)| < 2$ .

**Case 1:**  $C(x_1) \subseteq S(y_2)$  and  $|S(y_1) \cap S(y_2)| = 3$ .

Denote  $S(y_2) = \{1, 2, 3, 5\}$ . Since  $C(x_1)$  is bad, surely  $\{3, 4, 5\} \subseteq S(x_2)$ . The set  $S(x_2)$  contains a bad subset, which we denote by  $C(x_2)$ , and therefore  $\{1, 2\} \cap S(x_2) \neq \emptyset$ . We can assume, without loss of generality, that  $S(x_2) = \{1, 3, 4, 5\}$ . Since  $C(x_2)$  is bad and  $|S(y_1) \cap S(y_2)| = 3$ , we must have that  $C(x_2) \subseteq S(y_1) \cap S(y_2)$ . Hence,  $C(x_2) = \{1, 3\}$  and  $S(x_1) = \{1, 2, 4, 5\}$ . We have that

$$S(x_1) = \{1, 2, 4, 5\}, S(x_2) = \{1, 3, 4, 5\}, S(y_1) = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}, S(y_2) = \{1, 2, 3, 5\}.$$

The set  $\text{incomp}(x_1, x_2)$  is special and has properties  $P_1$  and  $P_2$ .

**Case 2:**  $C(x_1) \subseteq S(y_2)$  and  $|S(y_1) \cap S(y_2)| = 2$ .

Denote  $S(y_2) = \{1, 2, 5, 6\}$ . Since  $C(x_1)$  is bad, surely  $|S(x_2) \cap \{3, 4, 5, 6\}| \geq 3$ . Suppose without loss of generality that  $\{3, 4, 5\} \subseteq S(x_2)$ . The set  $S(x_2)$  contains a bad subset, which we denote by  $C(x_2)$ , and therefore  $\{1, 2\} \cap S(x_2) \neq \emptyset$ . We can assume, without loss of generality, that  $S(x_2) = \{1, 3, 4, 5\}$ . Since  $C(x_2)$  is bad and  $|S(y_1) \cap S(y_2)| = 2$ , we must have that  $C(x_2) \cap \{1, 2\} \neq \emptyset$ , and therefore  $1 \in C(x_2)$ . We can assume, without loss of generality, that  $C(x_2) = \{1, 3\}$ . Since  $C(x_2)$  is bad, we must have that  $4 \in S(x_1)$  and  $S(x_1) \cap \{5, 6\} \neq \emptyset$ . Suppose without loss of generality that  $S(x_1) = \{1, 2, 4, 5\}$ . This is a contradiction to the fact that  $C(x_2)$  is bad.

**Case 3:**  $|C(x_1) \cap S(y_2)| = 1$  and  $|S(y_1) \cap S(y_2)| = 2$ .

We can assume, without loss of generality, that  $1 \in S(y_2)$ . Denote  $S(y_2) = \{1, 3, 5, 6\}$ . Since  $C(x_1)$  is bad, surely  $S(x_2) = \{3, 4, 5, 6\}$ . The set  $S(x_2)$  contains a bad subset, which we denote by  $C(x_2)$ . Since  $C(x_2)$  is bad and  $|S(y_1) \cap S(y_2)| = 2$ , we must have that  $C(x_2) \cap \{1, 3\} \neq \emptyset$ , and therefore  $3 \in C(x_2)$ . If  $C(x_2) = \{3, 4\}$ , then we must have that  $S(x_1) = \{1, 2, 5, 6\}$ , so

$$S(x_1) = \{1, 2, 5, 6\}, S(x_2) = \{3, 4, 5, 6\}, S(y_1) = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}, S(y_2) = \{1, 3, 5, 6\}.$$

The set  $\text{incomp}(x_1, x_2)$  has degree sequence  $(6, 5, 5, 3, 2, 2)$ . Otherwise, suppose without loss of generality that  $C(x_2) = \{3, 5\}$ . We must have that  $S(x_1) = \{1, 2, 4, 6\}$ , so

$$S(x_1) = \{1, 2, 4, 6\}, S(x_2) = \{3, 4, 5, 6\}, S(y_1) = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}, S(y_2) = \{1, 3, 5, 6\}.$$

In this case  $|\text{incomp}(x_1, x_2)| = 21$ .

**Case 4:**  $|C(x_1) \cap S(y_2)| = 1$  and  $|S(y_1) \cap S(y_2)| = 1$ .

We can assume, without loss of generality, that  $1 \in S(y_2)$ . Denote  $S(y_2) = \{1, 5, 6, 7\}$ . Since  $C(x_1)$  is bad, we must have that  $S(x_2) \cap \{3, 4\} \neq \emptyset$  and  $|S(x_2) \cap \{5, 6, 7\}| \geq 2$ . Suppose without loss of

generality that  $\{3, 5, 6\} \subseteq S(x_2)$ . Since  $C(x_1)$  is bad, we must have that either  $S(x_2) = \{4, 3, 5, 6\}$  or  $S(x_2) = \{7, 3, 5, 6\}$ . It is easy to see that in both cases we have a contradiction to the fact that  $S(x_2)$  contains a bad subset.  $\square$

For every  $i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq m$ , let  $A_i$  be a sequence of 4 distinct elements. The sequence  $A_1, \dots, A_m$  is called valid if whenever  $c \in A_i \cap A_{i+1}$ , then  $c$  appears in the same position in both  $A_i$  and  $A_{i+1}$ . A valid sequence  $A_1, \dots, A_m$  is called legal if whenever  $c \in A_{i+1} - A_i$ , then  $c \notin A_j$  for every  $j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq i$ . By a subsequence of  $A_1, \dots, A_m$  we mean a sequence of the form  $A_i, A_{i+1}, \dots, A_j$ , where  $1 \leq i \leq j \leq m$ .

Let  $A_1, \dots, A_m$  be a valid sequence. The pair  $(A_i, A_{i+1})$  contains a change in the  $k$ th position if the elements which appear in the  $k$ th position of  $A_i$  and  $A_{i+1}$  are different. The sequence  $A_1, \dots, A_m$  contains a change in the  $k$ th position if there exists a pair  $(A_i, A_{i+1})$  which contains a change in the  $k$ th position.

Let  $A_1, \dots, A_m$  be a sequence. By  $C_i$  we denote a subset of  $A_i$  of size 2. We say that  $C_1$  and  $C_m$  are compatible if there exist subsets  $\{C_k : 1 < k < m\}$  so that  $C_p \cap C_{p+1} = \emptyset$  for every  $p$ ,  $1 \leq p < m$ . A subset  $C_1$  is called bad if  $C_1$  is not compatible with any  $C_m$ . A subset  $C_1$  is called good if  $C_1$  is compatible with every  $C_m$ . We denote by  $comp(C_1; A_1, \dots, A_m)$  the set which consists of all the subsets  $C_m$  which are compatible with  $C_1$ , and by  $comp(A_1, \dots, A_m)$  the set of all the compatible pairs  $(C_1, C_m)$ . By  $good(A_1, \dots, A_m)$  we denote the set which consists of all the good subsets that  $A_1$  contains.

**Lemma 5.3** *If the valid sequence  $D_1, \dots, D_r$  contains a change in at least 3 positions and there is no  $i$ ,  $1 < i < r - 1$ , for which  $D_i = D_{i+1}$ , then it contains a subsequence  $A_1, \dots, A_m$ , so that the sequence  $A_1$  contains at least one good subset. Furthermore, the sequence  $A_1, \dots, A_m$  has at least one of the following properties:*

1.  $|good(A_1, \dots, A_m)| \geq 3$ .
2.  $|comp(A_1, \dots, A_m)| > 23$ .
3. *The set  $comp(A_1, \dots, A_m)$  is special. If  $m$  is odd, then  $comp(A_1, \dots, A_m)$  has exactly one of the properties  $P_1$  and  $P_2$ . If  $m$  is even then  $comp(A_1, \dots, A_m)$  has either both or none of the properties  $P_1$  and  $P_2$ .*

**Proof** We consider the following cases.

**Case 1:** For some  $i$ ,  $|D_i \cap D_{i+1}| \leq 1$ .

In this case  $|good(D_i, D_{i+1})| \geq 3$ .

**Case 2:** For every  $j$ ,  $|D_j \cap D_{j+1}| \leq 2$ , and for some  $i$ ,  $|D_i \cap D_{i+1}| = 2$ .

Assume without loss of generality that the pair  $(D_i, D_{i+1})$  contains a change in the first and second positions. At least one of the pairs  $(D_{i-1}, D_i)$  and  $(D_i, D_{i+1})$  contains a change in some position. Suppose that the pair  $(D_{i-1}, D_i)$  contains a change in some position. The proof in case the pair  $(D_i, D_{i+1})$  contains a change in some position is similar. If the pair  $(D_{i-1}, D_i)$  contains a change in at least one of the first and second positions, then surely  $|good(D_{i-1}, D_i, D_{i+1})| \geq 3$ . If the only position in which the pair  $(D_{i-1}, D_i)$  contains a change is either the third or the fourth position, then  $comp(D_{i-1}, D_i, D_{i+1})$  is special, has property  $P_2$ , and does not have property  $P_1$ . If the pair  $(D_{i-1}, D_i)$  contains a change in the third and fourth positions, then  $|comp(D_{i-1}, D_i, D_{i+1})| = 27$ .

**Case 3:** For every  $j$ ,  $|D_j \cap D_{j+1}| \leq 1$ .

Let  $B_1, \dots, B_k$  be a subsequence of  $D_1, \dots, D_r$  which contains a change in at least 3 positions, but no proper subsequence of  $B_1, \dots, B_k$  has this property. This implies that the three pairs  $(B_1, B_2)$ ,  $(B_2, B_3)$  and  $(B_{k-1}, B_k)$  contain a change in three different positions. We can assume, without loss of generality, that the three pairs contain a change in the first, second and third positions respectively. Suppose that  $2 \leq i \leq k - 2$ , and consider the pair  $(B_i, B_{i+1})$ . If this pair contains a change in the first position, then the sequence  $B_2, \dots, B_m$  contains a change in at least 3 positions. If this pair contains a change in the third or fourth position, then the sequence  $B_1, \dots, B_{i+1}$  contains a change in at least 3 positions. Hence, the pair  $(B_i, B_{i+1})$  contains a change in the second position. If  $k = 4$  then the set  $comp(B_1, \dots, B_4)$  is special and does not have neither property  $P_1$  nor property  $P_2$ . If  $k > 4$  then  $|good(B_1, \dots, B_4)| = 3$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 5.4** *If the set  $comp(A_1, \dots, A_m)$  is special, then both the set  $comp(A_1, A_1, \dots, A_m)$  and the set  $comp(A_1, \dots, A_m, A_m)$  are special. The set  $comp(A_1, A_1, \dots, A_m)$  has property  $P_1$  iff the set  $comp(A_1, \dots, A_m)$  has property  $P_1$ . The set  $comp(A_1, A_1, \dots, A_m)$  has property  $P_2$  iff the set  $comp(A_1, \dots, A_m)$  does not have property  $P_2$ . The set  $comp(A_1, \dots, A_m, A_m)$  has property  $P_1$  iff the set  $comp(A_1, \dots, A_m)$  does not have property  $P_1$ . The set  $comp(A_1, \dots, A_m, A_m)$  has property  $P_2$  iff the set  $comp(A_1, \dots, A_m)$  has property  $P_2$ .*

**Lemma 5.5** *If  $A_1, A_2, A_2, A_3$  is a legal sequence, then*

$$\text{comp}(A_1, A_2, A_2, A_3) = \text{comp}(A_1, A_3).$$

**Proof** Let  $k_1, \dots, k_n$  be all the positions in which  $A_1, A_2, A_2, A_3$  does not contain a change. It is easy to verify that  $(C, D) \in \text{comp}(A_1, A_3)$  iff there is no  $i$  for which  $C$  contains the  $k_i$ th element of  $A_1$  and  $D$  contains the  $k_i$  element of  $A_3$ . The same property holds also for  $\text{comp}(A_1, A_2, A_2, A_3)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 5.6** *If  $A_i, \dots, A_j$  is a subsequence of  $A_1, \dots, A_m$ , then*

$$|\text{comp}(A_1, \dots, A_m)| \geq |\text{comp}(A_i, \dots, A_j)|.$$

**Proof** By induction on  $m$ . If  $m = j - i + 1$ , there is nothing to prove. Suppose that  $m > j - i + 1$ . Assume that  $i > 1$ . The proof in case  $j < m$  is similar. Hence,

$$|\text{comp}(A_1, \dots, A_m)| \geq |\text{comp}(A_2, A_2, \dots, A_m)| = |\text{comp}(A_2, \dots, A_m)| \geq |\text{comp}(A_i, \dots, A_j)|,$$

where the last inequality follows from the induction hypothesis.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.7** *If  $A_i, \dots, A_j$  is a subsequence of  $A_1, \dots, A_m$ , then*

$$|\text{good}(A_1, \dots, A_m)| \geq |\text{good}(A_i, \dots, A_j)|.$$

**Proof** Similar to the proof of lemma 5.6.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.8** *Suppose that  $i \geq 0$ , and denote by  $F$  the sequence  $A_{i+1}, \dots, A_m$  together with an additional  $A_{i+1}$  as the first element of the sequence in case  $i \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$ . If  $A_{i+1}, \dots, A_m$  is a subsequence of  $A_1, \dots, A_m$  and  $|\text{comp}(A_{i+1}, \dots, A_m)| = |\text{comp}(A_1, \dots, A_m)|$ , then  $\text{comp}(A_1, \dots, A_m)$  is isomorphic to  $\text{comp}(F)$ .*

**Proof** We can assume that  $A_1, \dots, A_m$  is a valid sequence. Suppose that  $i \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$ . The proof in case  $i \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$  is similar. Suppose that  $C_1 \subseteq A_1$ . Denote by  $T$  the subset of  $A_{i+1}$  that appears in the two positions in which  $C_1$  does not appear in  $A_1$ . Since  $A_1, \dots, A_{i+1}$  is a valid sequence, we have that  $C_1$  is compatible with  $T$ . Hence,

$$V = \text{comp}(C_1; A_1, \dots, A_m) \supseteq \text{comp}(T; A_{i+1}, \dots, A_m) = W.$$

Since  $|\text{comp}(A_{i+1}, \dots, A_m)| = |\text{comp}(A_1, \dots, A_m)|$ , we must have that  $V = W$ . It is easy to see now that  $\text{comp}(A_1, \dots, A_m)$  is isomorphic to  $\text{comp}(A_{i+1}, A_{i+1}, \dots, A_m)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 5.9** *Suppose that  $i, j \geq 0$ . Denote by  $F$  the sequence  $A_{i+1}, \dots, A_{m-j}$  together with an additional  $A_{i+1}$  as the first element of the sequence in case  $i \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$  and an additional  $A_{m-j}$  as the last element of the sequence in case  $j \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$ . If  $A_{i+1}, \dots, A_{m-j}$  is a subsequence of  $A_1, \dots, A_m$  and  $|\text{comp}(A_{i+1}, \dots, A_{m-j})| = |\text{comp}(A_1, \dots, A_m)|$ , then  $\text{comp}(A_{i+1}, \dots, A_{m-j})$  is isomorphic to  $\text{comp}(F)$ .*

**Proof** Apply lemma 5.8 twice.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.10** *Suppose that  $r$  is odd and that  $r \geq 3$ . If the valid sequence  $D_1, \dots, D_r$  contains a change in at least 3 positions, then the sequence  $D_1$  contains at least one good subset. Furthermore, at least one of the following is valid:*

1.  $|\text{good}(D_1, \dots, D_r)| \geq 3$ .
2.  $|\text{comp}(D_1, \dots, D_r)| > 23$ .
3. The set  $\text{comp}(D_1, \dots, D_m)$  is special and has exactly one of the properties  $P_1$  and  $P_2$ .

**Proof** We can assume, without loss of generality, that  $D_1, \dots, D_r$  is legal. Due to lemma 5.5, we can assume that there is no  $i$ ,  $1 < i < r - 1$ , for which  $D_i = D_{i+1}$ . It follows from lemma 5.3 that the sequence  $D_1, \dots, D_r$  contains a subsequence  $A_1, \dots, A_m$ , so that the sequence  $A_1$  contains at least one good subset. It follows from lemma 5.7 that  $|\text{good}(D_1, \dots, D_r)| \geq 1$ . According to lemma 5.3, we consider the following cases:

**Case 1:**  $|\text{good}(A_1, \dots, A_m)| \geq 3$ .

It follows from lemma 5.7 that  $|\text{good}(D_1, \dots, D_r)| \geq 3$ .

**Case 2:**  $|\text{comp}(A_1, \dots, A_m)| \geq 27$ .

It follows from lemma 5.6 that  $|\text{comp}(D_1, \dots, D_r)| > 23$ .

**Case 3:** The set  $\text{comp}(A_1, \dots, A_m)$  is special.

We know that if  $m$  is odd, then  $\text{comp}(A_1, \dots, A_m)$  has exactly one of the properties  $P_1$  and  $P_2$ . Furthermore, if  $m$  is even then  $\text{comp}(A_1, \dots, A_m)$  has either both or none of the properties  $P_1$  and  $P_2$ . If  $|\text{comp}(D_1, \dots, D_r)| > |\text{comp}(A_1, \dots, A_m)|$ , then  $|\text{comp}(D_1, \dots, D_m)| > 23$ . Suppose that  $|\text{comp}(D_1, \dots, D_r)| = |\text{comp}(A_1, \dots, A_m)|$ . It follows from lemma 5.9 that  $\text{comp}(D_1, \dots, D_r)$  is isomorphic to  $\text{comp}(F)$  for some sequence  $F$ . Since  $r$  is odd and using lemma 5.4, it is easy to see that  $\text{comp}(D_1, \dots, D_r)$  is special and has exactly one of the properties  $P_1$  and  $P_2$ .  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 1.16** It is easy to see that a graph  $G$  is  $(4 : 2)$ -choosable iff its core is  $(4 : 2)$ -choosable. Due to theorem 1.15, we need to prove that for every  $m \geq 1$ ,  $\Theta_{2,2,2m}$  is  $(4 : 2)$ -choosable. Suppose that  $m$  is odd and that  $m \geq 3$ . Assume that  $\Theta_{2,2,m-1}$  has vertex set  $V = \{u, v, z_1, \dots, z_m\}$  and contains the three paths  $z_1 - z_2 - \dots - z_m$ ,  $z_1 - u - z_m$ , and  $z_1 - v - z_m$ . For each  $w \in V$ , let  $S(w)$  be a set of size 4. We denote  $A_i = S(z_i)$  for every  $i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq m$ . We can assume that  $A_1, \dots, A_m$  is a valid sequence.

Suppose first that the sequence  $A_1, \dots, A_m$  contains a change in at most 2 positions. This means that there is a set  $C$  of size 2 so that  $C \subseteq A_i$  for every  $i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq m$ . From  $A_i$  when  $i$  is odd, choose the subset  $C$ . Complete the choice by choosing a subset of  $S(w) - C$  for every other vertex  $w$ .

Suppose next that the sequence  $A_1, \dots, A_m$  contains a change in at least 3 positions. The graph induced by the set of vertices  $\{z_1, z_m, u, v\} = W$  is isomorphic to  $K_{2,2}$ . Denote  $x_1 = z_1$ ,  $x_2 = z_m$ ,  $y_1 = u$ , and  $y_2 = v$ . We use the same terminology as before.

**Case 1:**  $\{S(w) : w \in W\}$  is not defected.

Suppose without loss of generality that  $S(z_1)$  contains no bad subset. It follows from lemma 5.10 that  $|good(A_1, \dots, A_m)| \geq 1$ , and therefore a choice is possible.

**Case 2:**  $\{S(w) : w \in W\}$  is defected.

According to lemma 5.10, we consider the following cases:

**Case 2a:**  $|good(A_1, \dots, A_m)| \geq 3$ .

It follows from lemma 5.2 that  $S(z_1)$  contains exactly one bad subset, and therefore a choice is possible.

**Case 2b:**  $|comp(D_1, \dots, D_r)| > 23$ .

It follows from lemma 5.2 that  $|incomp(z_1, z_m)| \leq 23$ , and therefore a choice is possible.

**Case 2c:** The set  $comp(D_1, \dots, D_m)$  is special.

We know that  $comp(D_1, \dots, D_m)$  has exactly one of the properties  $P_1$  and  $P_2$ . It is easy to see from lemma 5.2 that the set  $incomp(z_1, z_m)$  does not contain the set  $comp(D_1, \dots, D_m)$ , and therefore a choice is possible.  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 1.17** Suppose that  $G = (V, E)$  is  $(2mk : mk)$ -choosable for  $k$  odd. We prove that  $G$  is  $2m$ -choosable as well. For each  $v \in V$ , let  $S(v)$  be a set of size  $2m$ . With every color  $c$  we associate a set  $F(c)$  of size  $k$ , such that  $F(c) \cap F(d) = \emptyset$  if  $c \neq d$ . For every  $v \in V$ , we

define  $T(v) = \cup_{c \in S(v)} F(c)$ . Since  $G$  is  $(2mk : mk)$ -choosable, there are subsets  $C(v) \subseteq T(v)$ , where  $|C(v)| = mk$  for all  $v \in V$ , and  $C(u) \cap C(v) = \emptyset$  for every two adjacent vertices  $u, v \in V$ .

Fix a vertex  $v \in V$ . Since  $k$  is odd, there is a color  $c \in S(v)$  for which  $|C(v) \cap F(c)| > k/2$ , so we define  $f(v) = c$ . In case  $u$  and  $v$  are adjacent vertices for which  $c \in S(u) \cap S(v)$ , it is not possible that both  $|C(u) \cap F(c)|$  and  $|C(v) \cap F(c)|$  are greater than  $k/2$ . This proves that  $f$  is a proper vertex-coloring of  $G$  assigning to each vertex  $v \in V$  a color in  $S(v)$ .  $\square$

## 6 The complexity of graph choosability

Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a graph. We denote by  $G'$  the graph obtained from  $G$  by adding a new vertex to  $G$ , and joining it to every vertex in  $V$ . Consider the following decision problem:

### GRAPH $k$ -COLORABILITY

INSTANCE: A graph  $G = (V, E)$ .

QUESTION: Is  $G$   $k$ -colorable?

The standard technique to show a polynomial transformation from GRAPH  $k$ -COLORABILITY to GRAPH  $(k + 1)$ -COLORABILITY is to use the fact that  $\chi(G') = \chi(G) + 1$  for every graph  $G$ . However, it is not true that  $ch(G') = ch(G) + 1$  for every graph  $G$ . To see that, we first prove that  $K'_{2,4}$  is 3-choosable.

Suppose that  $K'_{2,4}$  has vertex set  $V = \{v, x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4\}$ , and contains exactly the edges  $\{x_i, y_j\}$ ,  $\{v, x_i\}$ , and  $\{v, y_j\}$ . For each  $w \in V$ , let  $S(w)$  be a set of size 3.

**Case 1:** All the sets are the same.

A choice can be made since  $K'_{2,4}$  is 3-colorable.

**Case 2:** There is a set  $S(x_i)$  which is not equal to  $S(v)$ .

Without loss of generality, suppose that  $S(v) \neq S(x_1)$ . For the node  $v$ , choose a color  $c \in S(v) - S(x_1)$ , and remove  $c$  from the sets of the other vertices. We can assume that every set  $S(y_j)$  is of size 2 now.

Suppose first that  $S(x_1)$  and  $S(x_2)$  are disjoint. The number of different sets consisting of one color from each of the  $S(x_i)$  is at least 6, and therefore we can choose colors  $c_i \in S(x_i)$ , such that  $\{c_1, c_2\}$  does not appear as a set of  $S(y_j)$ . We complete the choice by choosing for every vertex  $y_j$



a color from  $S(y_j) - \{c_1, c_2\}$ . Suppose next that  $c \in S(x_1) \cap S(x_2)$ . For every vertex  $x_i$  we choose  $c$ , and for every vertex  $y_j$  we choose a color from  $S(y_j) - \{c\}$ .

**Case 3:** There is a set  $S(y_j)$  which is not equal to  $S(v)$ .

Without loss of generality, suppose that  $S(v) \neq S(y_1)$ . For the node  $v$ , choose a color  $c \in S(v) - S(y_1)$ , and remove  $c$  from the sets of the other vertices. Suppose first that  $S(x_1)$  and  $S(x_2)$  are disjoint. The number of different sets consisting of one color from each of the  $S(x_i)$  is at least 4, and since  $|S(y_1)| = 3$  we can choose colors  $c_i \in S(x_i)$ , such that  $S(y_j) - \{c_1, c_2\} \neq \emptyset$  for every vertex  $y_j$ . We can complete the choice as in case 2. In case  $S(x_1)$  and  $S(x_2)$  are not disjoint, we proceed as in case 2.

This completes the proof that  $K'_{2,4}$  is 3-choosable. It follows from theorem 1.15 and corollary 1.12 that  $ch(K_{2,4}) = 3$ , and therefore  $ch(K'_{2,4}) = ch(K_{2,4}) = 3$ . The following lemma exhibits a construction which increases the choice number of a graph in exactly 1.

**Lemma 6.1** *Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a graph. If  $H$  is the disjoint union of  $|V|$  copies of  $G$ , then  $ch(H') = ch(G) + 1$ .*

**Proof** Let  $H$  be the disjoint union of the graphs  $\{G_i : 1 \leq i \leq |V|\}$ , where each  $G_i$  is a copy of  $G$ . Suppose that  $H'$  is obtained from  $H$  by joining the new vertex  $v$  to all the vertices of  $H$ .

We claim that if  $G$  is  $k$ -choosable, then  $H'$  is  $(k + 1)$ -choosable. For each  $w \in V(H')$ , let  $S(w)$  be a set of size  $k + 1$ . Choose a color  $c \in S(v)$ , and remove  $c$  from the sets of the other vertices. We can complete the choice since  $G$  is  $k$ -choosable.

We now prove that if  $H'$  is  $k$ -choosable, then  $G$  is  $(k - 1)$ -choosable. It is easy to see that this is true when  $G$  is a complete graph. If  $G$  is not a complete graph, then by corollary 1.9  $ch(G) < |V|$ , and therefore  $ch(H') \leq |V|$ . Hence, we can assume that  $k \leq |V|$ . For each  $w \in V$ , let  $S(w)$  be a set of size  $k - 1$ , such that  $S(w) \cap \{1, 2, \dots, |V|\} = \emptyset$ . For every  $i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq |V|$ , on the vertices of the graph  $G_i$  we put the sets  $S(w)$  together with the additional color  $i$ . The vertex  $v$  is given the set  $\{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ . Let  $f$  be a proper vertex-coloring of  $H'$  assigning to each vertex a color from its set. Denote  $f(v) = i$ , then  $f$  restricted to  $G_i$  is a proper vertex-coloring of  $G$  assigning to each vertex  $w \in V$  a color in  $S(w)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 6.2 BIPARTITE GRAPH 3-CHOOSABILITY** *is  $\Pi_2^p$ -complete.*

**Proof** It is easy to see that **BG 3-CH**  $\in \Pi_2^p$ . We transform **BG (2, 3)-CH** to **BG 3-CH**. Let  $G = (V, E)$  and  $f : V \mapsto \{2, 3\}$  be an instance of **BG (2, 3)-CH**. We shall construct a bipartite graph  $W$  such that  $W$  is 3-choosable if and only if  $G$  is  $f$ -choosable.

Let  $H$  be the disjoint union of the graphs  $\{G_{i,j} : 1 \leq i, j \leq 3\}$ , where each  $G_{i,j}$  is a copy of  $G$ . Let  $(X, Y)$  be a bipartition of the bipartite graph  $H$ . The graph  $W$  is obtained from  $H$  by adding two new vertices  $u$  and  $v$ , joining  $u$  to every vertex  $w \in X$  for which  $f(w) = 2$ , and joining  $v$  to every vertex  $w \in Y$  for which  $f(w) = 2$ .

Since  $H$  is bipartite,  $W$  is also a bipartite graph. It is easy to see that if  $G$  is  $f$ -choosable, then  $W$  is 3-choosable. We now prove that if  $W$  is 3-choosable, then  $G$  is  $f$ -choosable. For every  $w \in V$ , let  $S(w)$  be a set of size  $f(w)$ , such that  $S(w) \cap \{1, 2, 3\} = \emptyset$ . For every  $i$  and  $j$ ,  $1 \leq i, j \leq 3$ , on the vertices of the graph  $G_{i,j}$  we put the sets  $S(w)$  with the vertices for which  $f$  is equal to 2 receiving another color as follows: to the vertices which belong to  $X$  we add the color  $i$ , whereas to the vertices which belong to  $Y$  we add the color  $j$ . The vertices  $u$  and  $v$  are both given the set  $\{1, 2, 3\}$ . Let  $f$  be a proper vertex-coloring of  $H'$  assigning to each vertex a color from its set. Denote  $f(u) = i$  and  $f(v) = j$ , then  $f$  restricted to  $G_{i,j}$  is a proper vertex-coloring of  $G$  assigning to each vertex  $w \in V$  a color in  $S(w)$ .  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 1.18** The proof is by induction on  $k$ . For  $k = 3$ , the result follows from lemma 6.2. Assuming that the result is true for  $k$ ,  $k \geq 3$ , we prove it is true for  $k + 1$ . It is easy to see that **BG (k + 1)-CH**  $\in \Pi_2^p$ . We transform **BG k-CH** to **BG (k + 1)-CH**. Let  $G = (V, E)$  be an instance of **BG k-CH**. We shall construct a bipartite graph  $W$  such that  $W$  is  $(k + 1)$ -choosable if and only if  $G$  is  $k$ -choosable.

Let  $H$  be the disjoint union of the graphs  $\{G_{i,j} : 1 \leq i, j \leq (k + 1)^2\}$ , where each  $G_{i,j}$  is a copy of  $G$ . Let  $(X, Y)$  be a bipartition of the bipartite graph  $H$ . The graph  $W$  is obtained from  $H$  by adding two new vertices  $u$  and  $v$ , joining  $u$  to every vertex of  $X$ , and joining  $v$  to every vertex of  $Y$ .

It is easy to see that if  $G$  is  $k$ -choosable, then  $W$  is  $(k + 1)$ -choosable. In a similar way to the proof of lemma 6.2, we can prove that if  $W$  is  $(k + 1)$ -choosable, then  $G$  is  $k$ -choosable.  $\square$

## 7 The strong choice number

Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a graph, and let  $V_1, \dots, V_r$  be pairwise disjoint subsets of  $V$ . We denote by  $[G, V_1, \dots, V_r]$  the graph obtained from  $G$  by adding to it the union of cliques induced by each  $V_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq r$ .

Suppose that  $G = (V, E)$  is a graph with maximum degree at most 1. We claim that  $G$  is strongly  $k$ -choosable for every  $k \geq 2$ . To see that, let  $V_1, \dots, V_r$  be pairwise disjoint subsets of  $V$ , each of size at most  $k$ . The graph  $[G, V_1, \dots, V_r]$  has maximum degree at most  $k$ , and therefore by corollary 1.9 it is  $k$ -choosable.

**Proof of Theorem 1.19** Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a strongly  $k$ -colorable graph. Let  $V_1, \dots, V_r$  be pairwise disjoint subsets of  $V$ , each of size at most  $k + 1$ . Without loss of generality, we can assume that  $V_1, \dots, V_m$  are subsets of size exactly  $k + 1$ , and  $V_{m+1}, \dots, V_r$  are subsets of size less than  $k + 1$ . Let  $H$  be the graph  $[G, V_1, \dots, V_r]$ . To complete the proof, it suffices to show that  $H$  is  $(k + 1)$ -colorable. For every  $i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq m$ , we define  $W_i = V_i - \{c\}$  for an arbitrary element  $c \in V_i$ , whereas for every  $j$ ,  $m + 1 \leq j \leq r$ , we define  $W_j = V_j$ . Since  $[G, W_1, \dots, W_r]$  is  $k$ -colorable, there exists an independent set  $S$  of  $H$  which is composed of exactly one vertex from each  $V_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq m$ . For every  $i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq m$ , we define  $W_i = V_i - S$ , whereas for every  $j$ ,  $m + 1 \leq j \leq r$ , we define  $W_j = V_j$ . Since  $[G, W_1, \dots, W_r]$  is  $k$ -colorable, we can obtain a proper  $(k + 1)$ -vertex coloring of  $H$  by using  $k$  colors for  $V - S$  and another color for  $S$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 7.1** *Suppose that  $k, l \geq 1$ . If  $\mathcal{F}$  is a family of  $k + l$  sets of size  $k + l$ , then it is possible to partition  $\mathcal{F}$  into a family  $\mathcal{F}_1$  of  $k$  sets and a family  $\mathcal{F}_2$  of  $l$  sets, to choose for each set  $S \in \mathcal{F}_1$  a subset  $S' \subseteq S$  of size  $k$ , and to choose for each set  $T \in \mathcal{F}_2$  a subset  $T' \subseteq T$  of size  $l$ , so that  $S' \cap T' = \emptyset$  for every  $S \in \mathcal{F}_1$  and  $T \in \mathcal{F}_2$ .*

**Proof** Suppose that  $\mathcal{F} = \{C_1, \dots, C_{k+l}\}$ , and define  $C = \cup_{i=1}^{k+l} C_i$ . For every partition  $\pi$  of  $C$  into the two subsets  $A$  and  $B$ , we denote  $\mathcal{R}(\pi) = \{V \in \mathcal{F} : |V \cap A| > k\}$ ,  $\mathcal{L}(\pi) = \{V \in \mathcal{F} : |V \cap B| > l\}$ , and  $\mathcal{M}(\pi) = \{V \in \mathcal{F} : |V \cap A| = k \text{ and } |V \cap B| = l\}$ . We now start with the partition of  $C$  into the two subsets  $A = C$  and  $B = \emptyset$ , and start moving one element at a time from  $A$  to  $B$  until we obtain a partition  $\pi_1$  of  $C$  into the two subsets  $A$  and  $B$  and a partition  $\pi_2$  into the two subsets  $A' = A - \{c\}$  and  $B' = B \cup \{c\}$ , such that  $|\mathcal{R}(\pi_1)| > k$  and  $|\mathcal{R}(\pi_2)| \leq k$ . It is easy to that

$\mathcal{L}(\pi_2) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\pi_1) \cup \mathcal{M}(\pi_1)$ , and therefore  $|\mathcal{L}(\pi_2)| < l$ . We now partition  $\mathcal{M}(\pi_2)$  into two subsets  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$ , such that  $\mathcal{F}_1 = \mathcal{R}(\pi_2) \cup \mathcal{M}_1$  has size  $k$  and  $\mathcal{F}_2 = \mathcal{L}(\pi_2) \cup \mathcal{M}_2$  has size  $l$ . For every set  $S \in \mathcal{F}_1$  we choose a subset  $S' \subseteq S \cap A'$  of size  $k$ , whereas for every  $T \in \mathcal{F}_2$  we choose a subset  $T' \subseteq T \cap B'$  of size  $l$ . Since  $A'$  and  $B'$  are disjoint, we have that  $S' \cap T' = \emptyset$  for every  $S \in \mathcal{F}_1$  and  $T \in \mathcal{F}_2$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 7.2** *Suppose that  $k, m \geq 1$ . If  $\mathcal{F}$  is a family of  $km$  sets of size  $km$ , then it is possible to partition  $\mathcal{F}$  into the  $m$  subsets  $\mathcal{F}_1, \dots, \mathcal{F}_m$ , each of size  $k$ , and to choose for each set  $S \in \mathcal{F}$  a subset  $S' \subseteq S$  of size  $k$ , so that  $S' \cap T' = \emptyset$  for every  $i \neq j$ ,  $S \in \mathcal{F}_i$  and  $T \in \mathcal{F}_j$ .*

**Proof** By induction on  $m$ . For  $m = 1$  the result is trivial. Assuming that the result is true for  $m, m \geq 1$ , we prove it is true for  $m + 1$ . Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a family of  $k(m + 1)$  sets of size  $k(m + 1)$ . By lemma 7.1, it is possible to partition  $\mathcal{F}$  into a family  $\mathcal{F}_1$  of  $k$  sets and a family  $\mathcal{F}_2$  of  $km$  sets, to choose for each  $S \in \mathcal{F}_1$  a subset  $S' \subseteq S$  of size  $k$ , and to choose for each set  $T \in \mathcal{F}_2$  a subset  $T' \subseteq T$  of size  $km$ , so that  $S' \cap T' = \emptyset$  for every  $S \in \mathcal{F}_1$  and  $T \in \mathcal{F}_2$ . The proof is completed by applying the induction hypothesis on  $\mathcal{F}_2$ .  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 1.20** Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a strongly  $k$ -choosable graph. Let  $V_1, \dots, V_r$  be pairwise disjoint subsets of  $V$ , each of size at most  $km$ . Let  $H$  be the graph  $[G, V_1, \dots, V_r]$ . To complete the proof, it suffices to show that  $H$  is  $km$ -choosable. For each  $v \in V$ , let  $S(v)$  be a set of size  $km$ . By lemma 7.2, for every  $i, 1 \leq i \leq r$ , is it possible to partition  $V_i$  into the  $m$  subsets  $V_{i,1}, \dots, V_{i,m}$ , each of size at most  $k$ , and to choose for each vertex  $v \in V_i$  a subset  $C(v) \subseteq S(v)$  of size  $k$ , so that  $C(u) \cap C(v) = \emptyset$  for every  $p \neq q$ ,  $u \in V_{i,p}$  and  $v \in V_{i,q}$ . Since the graph  $[G, V_{1,1}, \dots, V_{r,m}]$  is  $k$ -choosable, we can obtain a proper vertex-coloring of  $H$  assigning to each vertex a color from its set.  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 1.21** Apply lemma 7.2 as in proof of theorem 1.20.  $\square$

**Proof of Corollary 1.22** It is proved in [9] that if  $G$  is a 4-regular graph on  $3n$  vertices and  $G$  has a decomposition into a Hamiltonian circuit and  $n$  pairwise vertex disjoint triangles, then  $ch(G) = 3$ . The result follows from theorem 1.21.  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 1.23** Since  $s\chi(1) = 2$ , we can assume that  $d > 1$ . Suppose first that  $d$  is even, and denote  $d = 2r$ . Construct a graph  $G$  with  $12r - 3$  vertices, partitioned into 8 classes, as follows. Let these classes be  $A, B_1, B_2, C_1, C_2, D_1, D_2, E$ , where  $|A| = |D_1| = |D_2| = 2r$ ,  $|B_1| = |B_2| = r$ ,

$|C_1| = |C_2| = r - 1$ , and  $|E| = 2r - 1$ . Each vertex in  $A$  is joined by edges to each member of  $B_1$  and each member of  $B_2$ . Each member of  $D_1$  is adjacent to each member of  $D_2$ . Consider the following partition of the set of vertices of  $G$  into three classes of cardinality  $4r - 1$  each:

$$V_1 = B_1 \cup C_1 \cup D_1, V_2 = B_2 \cup C_2 \cup D_2, V_3 = A \cup E.$$

We claim that  $H = [G, V_1, V_2, V_3]$  is not  $(4r - 1)$ -colorable. In a proper  $(4r - 1)$ -vertex coloring of  $H$ , every color used for coloring the vertices of  $A$  must appear on a vertex of  $C_1 \cup D_1$  and on a vertex of  $C_2 \cup D_2$ . Since  $|C_1 \cup C_2| < |A|$ , there is a color used for coloring the vertices of  $A$  which appears on both  $D_1$  and  $D_2$ . But this is impossible as each vertex in  $D_1$  is adjacent to each member of  $D_2$ . Thus  $s\chi(G) > 4r - 1$  and as the maximum degree in  $G$  is  $2r$ , this shows that  $s\chi(2r) \geq 4r$ .

Suppose next that  $d$  is odd, and denote  $d = 2r + 1$ . Construct a graph  $G$  with  $12r + 3$  vertices, partitioned into 8 classes, as follows. Let these classes be named as before, where  $|A| = |D_1| = |D_2| = 2r + 1$ ,  $|B_1| = r + 1$ ,  $|C_1| = r - 1$ ,  $|B_2| = |C_2| = r$ , and  $|E| = 2r$ . In the same manner we can prove that  $[G, V_1, V_2, V_3]$  is not  $(4r + 1)$ -colorable. Thus  $s\chi(G) > 4r + 1$  and as the maximum degree in  $G$  is  $2r + 1$ , this shows that  $s\chi(2r + 1) \geq 4r + 2$ , completing the proof.  $\square$

## References

- [1] N. Alon, *The strong chromatic number of a graph*, Random Structures and Algorithms 3 (1992), 1-7.
- [2] N. Alon, *Choice numbers of graphs; a probabilistic approach*, Combinatorics, Probability and Computing, in press.
- [3] N. Alon and J. H. Spencer, **The Probabilistic Method**, Wiley, 1991.
- [4] N. Alon and M. Tarsi, *Colorings and orientations of graphs*, Combinatorica, in press.
- [5] C. Berge, **Graphs and Hypergraphs**, Dunod, Paris, 1970.
- [6] B. Bollobás, *The chromatic number of random graphs*, Combinatorica 8 (1988), 49-55.
- [7] B. Bollobás, **Random Graphs**, Academic Press, 1985.

- [8] P. Erdős, A. L. Rubin and H. Taylor, *Choosability in graphs*, Proc. West Coast Conf. on Combinatorics, Graph Theory and Computing, Congressus Numerantium XXVI, 1979, 125-157.
- [9] H. Fleischner and M. Stiebitz, *A solution to a coloring problem of P. Erdős*, to appear.
- [10] M. R. Garey and D. S. Johnson, **Computers and Intractability, A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness**, W. H. Freeman and Company, New York, 1979.
- [11] A. J. Harris, *Problems and conjectures in extremal graph theory*, Ph.D. dissertation, Cambridge, 1985.
- [12] M. C. Golumbic, **Algorithmic Graph Theory and Perfect Graphs**, Academic Press, 1980.
- [13] V. G. Vizing, *Coloring the vertices of a graph in prescribed colors* (in Russian), Diskret. Analiz. No. 29, Metody Diskret. Anal. v. Teorii Kodov i Shem 101 (1976), 3-10.