

k -colored kernels in semicomplete multipartite digraphs

Hortensia Galeana-Sánchez^a, Bernardo Llano^{b,*}, Juan José Montellano-Ballesteros^a

^aInstituto de Matemáticas, UNAM, Ciudad Universitaria, 04510, México, D. F.

^bDepartamento de Matemáticas, Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Iztapalapa, San Rafael Atlixco 186, Colonia Vicentina, 09340, México, D.F.

Abstract

An m -colored digraph D has k -colored kernel if there exists a subset K of its vertices such that for every vertex $v \notin K$ there exists an at most k -colored directed path from v to a vertex of K and for every $u, v \in K$ there does not exist an at most k -colored directed path between them. In this paper we prove that an m -colored semicomplete r -partite digraph D has a k -colored kernel provided that $r \geq 3$ and

- (i) $k \geq 4$,
- (ii) $k = 3$ and every \vec{C}_4 contained in D is at most 2-colored and, either every \vec{C}_5 contained in D is at most 3-colored or every $\vec{C}_3 \uparrow \vec{C}_3$ contained in D is at most 2-colored,
- (iii) $k = 2$ and every \vec{C}_3 and \vec{C}_4 contained in D is monochromatic.

If D is an m -colored semicomplete bipartite digraph and $k = 2$ (resp. $k = 3$) and every $\vec{C}_4 \uparrow \vec{C}_4$ contained in D is at most 2-colored (resp. 3-colored), then D has a 2-colored (resp. 3-colored) kernel. Using these and previous results, we obtain conditions for the existence of k -colored kernels in m -colored semicomplete r -partite digraphs for every $k \geq 2$ and $r \geq 2$.

Keywords:

m -colored digraph, k -colored kernel, semicomplete multipartite digraph
2000 MSC: 05C20

1. Introduction

Let m, j and k positive integers. A digraph D is said to be m -colored if the arcs of D are colored with m colors. Given $u, v \in V(D)$, a directed path from u to v of D , denoted by $u \rightsquigarrow v$, is j -colored if all its arcs use exactly j colors and it is represented by $u \rightsquigarrow_j v$. When $j = 1$, the directed path is said to be *monochromatic*. A nonempty set $S \subseteq V(D)$ is a k -colored *absorbent set* if for every vertex $u \in V(D) - S$ there exists $v \in S$ such that $u \rightsquigarrow_j v$ with $1 \leq j \leq k$. A nonempty set $S \subseteq V(D)$ is called a k -colored *independent set* if for every $u, v \in S$ there does not exist $u \rightsquigarrow_j v$ with $1 \leq j \leq k$. Let D be an m -colored digraph. A set $K \subseteq V(D)$ is called a k -colored *kernel* if K is a k -colored absorbent and independent set. This definition was introduced in [10], where the first basic results were proved. We observe that a 1-colored kernel is a kernel by monochromatic directed paths, a notion that has widely studied in the literature, see for instance [4], [5], [6], [8], [9], [11], [12] and [13].

An arc $(u, v) \in A(D)$ is *asymmetric* (resp. *symmetric*) if $(v, u) \notin A(D)$ (resp. $(v, u) \in A(D)$). We denote by \vec{C}_n the directed cycle of length n . A semicomplete r -partite digraph D with

*Corresponding author.

Email addresses: hgaleana@matem.unam.mx (Hortensia Galeana-Sánchez), llano@xanum.uam.mx (Bernardo Llano), juancho@matem.unam.mx (Juan José Montellano-Ballesteros)

$r \geq 2$ is an orientation of an r -partite complete graph in which symmetric arcs are allowed. A digraph D is called *3-quasi-transitive* if whenever distinct vertices $u_0, u_1, u_2, u_3 \in V(D)$ such that $u_0 \rightarrow u_1 \rightarrow u_2 \rightarrow u_3$ there exists at least $(u_0, u_3) \in A(D)$ or $(u_3, u_0) \in A(D)$. In particular, bipartite semicomplete digraphs are 3-quasi-transitive.

Let D' a subdigraph of an m -colored digraph D . We say that D' is *monochromatic* if every arc of D' is colored with the same color and D' is *at most k -colored* if the arcs of D' are colored with at most k colors. In this paper, we particularly use subdigraphs of semicomplete r -partite digraph which are at most 2- and 3-colored. We defined the digraphs $\vec{C}_3 \uparrow \vec{C}_3$ (resp. $\vec{C}_4 \uparrow\uparrow \vec{C}_4$) as two directed cycles \vec{C}_3 (resp. \vec{C}_4) joined by an arc (resp. by two consecutive arcs), see the next picture.




Figure 1: $\vec{C}_3 \uparrow \vec{C}_3$ and $\vec{C}_4 \uparrow\uparrow \vec{C}_4$, respectively.

The goal of this work is to complete the study of the existence of k -colored kernels in semicomplete r -partite digraphs for every $k \geq 2$. The problem for 1-colored kernels in bipartite tournaments was studied in [8]. In that paper, the authors proved that a if every \vec{C}_4 contained in an m -colored bipartite tournament T is monochromatic, then T has a 1-colored kernel. Let $r \geq 3$. In [9], it was proved that if every \vec{C}_3 and \vec{C}_4 contained in a r -partite tournament T is monochromatic then T has a 1-colored kernel. In [7] among other results, we showed that m -colored quasi-transitive and 3-quasi-transitive digraphs have a k -colored kernel for every $k \geq 3$ and $k \geq 4$, respectively. As a consequence, m -colored semicomplete bipartite digraphs have a k -colored kernel for every $k \geq 3$ and $k \geq 4$, respectively.

In this paper we prove that an m -colored semicomplete r -partite digraph D has a k -colored kernel provided that $r \geq 3$ and

- (i) $k \geq 4$,
- (ii) $k = 3$ and every \vec{C}_4 contained in D is at most 2-colored and, either every \vec{C}_5 contained in D is at most 3-colored or every $\vec{C}_3 \uparrow \vec{C}_3$ contained in D is at most 2-colored,
- (iii) $k = 2$ and every \vec{C}_3 and \vec{C}_4 contained in D is monochromatic.

If D is an m -colored semicomplete bipartite digraph and $k = 2$ (resp. $k = 3$) and every $\vec{C}_4 \uparrow\uparrow \vec{C}_4$ contained in D is at most 2-colored (resp. 3-colored), then D has a 2-colored (resp. 3-colored) kernel. Using these and previous results, we obtain conditions for the existence of k -colored kernels in m -colored semicomplete r -partite digraphs for every $k \geq 2$ and $r \geq 2$ (see Corollary 4.5). If we are restricted to the family of the m -colored multipartite tournaments, then we have conditions for the existence of k -colored kernels for every $k \geq 1$ and $r \geq 2$ using the main results of this paper and those obtained in [8] and [9] (see Corollary 4.6).

We finish this introduction including some simple definitions and a well-known result that will be useful in proving the main results.

Let D be a digraph and $x, y \in V(D)$. The *distance from x to y* , denoted by $d(x, y)$ is the minimum length (number of arcs) of a $x \rightsquigarrow y$.

Recall that a *kernel* K of D is an independent set of vertices so that for every $u \in V(D) \setminus K$ there exists $(u, v) \in A(D)$, where $v \in K$. We say that a digraph D is *kernel-perfect* if every nonempty induced subdigraph of D has a kernel.

Given an m -colored digraph D , we define the k -colored closure of D , denoted by $\mathfrak{C}_k(D)$, as the digraph such that $V(\mathfrak{C}_k(D)) = V(D)$ and

$$A(\mathfrak{C}_k(D)) = \{(u, v) : \exists u \rightsquigarrow_j v, 1 \leq j \leq k\}.$$

Remark 1.1. *Observe that every m -colored digraph D has a k -colored kernel if and only if $\mathfrak{C}_k(D)$ has a kernel.*

We will use the following theorem of P. Duchet [3].

Theorem 1.2. *If every directed cycle of a digraph D has a symmetric arc, then D is kernel-perfect.*

The symbol \triangle will be used to denote the end of a claim or a subclaim. We follow [2] for the general terminology on digraphs.

2. Preliminary results

We set $r \geq 3$ for the rest of the paper. We denote by $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}, \dots$ the partite sets of a semicomplete multipartite digraph D .

Lemma 2.1. *Let D be an m -colored semicomplete r -partite digraph and $x, y \in V(D)$. If there exists $x \rightsquigarrow_k y$ with $k \geq 4$ and there does not exist $y \rightsquigarrow_{k'} x$ with $k' \leq 4$, then $d(x, y) \leq 2$.*

Proof. Suppose that $x \in \mathcal{A}$ and $y \in \mathcal{B}$. Since there does not exist $y \rightsquigarrow_{k'} x$, we have that $(x, y) \in A(D)$. So, we assume that $x, y \in \mathcal{A}$ and by contradiction, suppose that $d(x, y) \geq 3$. Consider the directed path of minimum length

$$x \longrightarrow x_1 \longrightarrow x_2 \longrightarrow \dots \longrightarrow x_t \longrightarrow y \quad (t \geq 2).$$

Therefore $x_1 \in \mathcal{B}$ (with $\mathcal{B} \neq \mathcal{A}$) and then $(y, x_1) \in A(D)$. If $x_2 \notin \mathcal{A}$, then $(x_2, x) \in A(D)$ (the arc (x, x_2) implies a shorter path from x to y). In this case, the directed path $y \longrightarrow x_1 \longrightarrow x_2 \longrightarrow x$ is a $y \rightsquigarrow_{k'} x$ with $k' \leq 3$, a contradiction (there does not exist $y \rightsquigarrow_{k'} x$ with $k' \leq 4$). Hence $x_2 \in \mathcal{A}$ and $t \geq 3$, since $x_t \notin \mathcal{A}$ and $(x_t, y) \in A(D)$. Recalling that $x_2 \in \mathcal{A}$, we get that $x_3 \notin \mathcal{A}$ and there exists $(x_3, x) \in A(D)$ (the arc (x, x_3) implies a shorter path from x to y). We obtain that the directed path

$$y \longrightarrow x_1 \longrightarrow x_2 \longrightarrow x_3 \longrightarrow x$$

is a $y \rightsquigarrow_{k'} x$ with $k' \leq 4$, a contradiction to the supposition of the lemma. \square

Lemma 2.2. *Let D be an m -colored semicomplete r -partite digraph, $k = 2$ (resp. $k = 3$) and $x, y \in V(D)$. If there exists $x \rightsquigarrow_k y$ and there does not exist $y \rightsquigarrow_{k'} x$ with $k' \leq 2$ (resp. $k' \leq 3$), then $d(x, y) \leq 4$.*

Proof. Suppose that $x \in \mathcal{A}$ and $y \in \mathcal{B}$. Since there does not exist $y \rightsquigarrow_{k'} x$, we have that $(x, y) \in A(D)$. So, we assume that $x, y \in \mathcal{A}$ and by contradiction, suppose that $d(x, y) \geq 5$. Consider the directed path of minimum length

$$x \longrightarrow x_1 \longrightarrow x_2 \longrightarrow \dots \longrightarrow x_t \longrightarrow y \quad (t \geq 4).$$

If $x_2 \notin \mathcal{A}$, then $(y, x_2) \in A(D)$ and $(x_2, x) \in A(D)$ (observe that $(x_2, y) \in A(D)$ or $(x, x_2) \in A(D)$ implies a shorter path from x to y). Therefore the directed path $y \longrightarrow x_2 \longrightarrow x$ is a $y \rightsquigarrow_{k'} x$ with $k' \leq 2$, a contradiction to the supposition of the lemma. Hence $x_2 \in \mathcal{A}$ and so $x_3 \notin \mathcal{A}$. In a similar way as done before, $(y, x_3) \in A(D)$ and $(x_3, x) \in A(D)$. It follows that the directed path $y \longrightarrow x_3 \longrightarrow x$ is a $y \rightsquigarrow_{k'} x$ with $k' \leq 2$, a contradiction to the supposition of the lemma. The proof for $k = 3$ follows analogously. \square

Lemma 2.3. *Let D be an m -colored semicomplete r -partite digraph such that every \vec{C}_4 contained in D is at most 2-colored, $k = 3$ and $x, y \in V(D)$. If there exists $x \rightsquigarrow_k y$ and there does not exist $y \rightsquigarrow_{k'} x$ with $k' \leq 3$, then $d(x, y) \leq 2$.*

Proof. Suppose that $x \in \mathcal{A}$ and $y \in \mathcal{B}$. Since there does not exist $y \rightsquigarrow_{k'} x$, we have that $(x, y) \in A(D)$. So, we assume that $x, y \in \mathcal{A}$. By Lemma 2.2, $d(x, y) \leq 4$. We consider two cases.

CASE 1. $d(x, y) = 3$. Let $x \rightarrow x_1 \rightarrow x_2 \rightarrow y$ be a directed path from x to y . Since $x_1, x_2 \notin \mathcal{A}$, we have that $(y, x_1), (x_2, x) \in A(D)$ and so $y \rightarrow x_1 \rightarrow x_2 \rightarrow x$ is a $y \rightsquigarrow_{k'} x$ with $k' \leq 3$, a contradiction to the supposition of the lemma.

CASE 2. $d(x, y) = 4$. Let $x \rightarrow x_1 \rightarrow x_2 \rightarrow x_3 \rightarrow y$ be a directed path from x to y . If $x_2 \notin \mathcal{A}$, then $(y, x_2), (x_2, x) \in A(D)$ and so $y \rightarrow x_2 \rightarrow x$ is a $y \rightsquigarrow_{k'} x$ with $k' \leq 2$, a contradiction to the supposition of the lemma. Hence $x_2 \in \mathcal{A}$. Notice that $x_1, x_3 \notin \mathcal{A}$ and then $(y, x_1), (x_3, x) \in A(D)$. So the directed path

$$y \rightarrow x_1 \rightarrow x_2 \rightarrow x_3 \rightarrow x$$

is a $y \rightsquigarrow_{k'} x$ with $k' = 4$ (that is, a heterochromatic directed path from y to x), otherwise there exists a $y \rightsquigarrow_{k'} x$ with $k' \leq 3$, a contradiction to the supposition of the lemma. Therefore $(y, x_1, x_2, x_3, y) \cong \vec{C}_4$ is at least 3-colored, a contradiction, every \vec{C}_4 of D is at most 2-colored. \square

Lemma 2.4. *Let D be an m -colored semicomplete r -partite digraph such that every \vec{C}_3 and \vec{C}_4 contained in D is monochromatic, $k = 2$ and $x, y \in V(D)$. If there exists $x \rightsquigarrow_k y$ and there does not exist $y \rightsquigarrow_{k'} x$ with $k' \leq 2$, then $d(x, y) \leq 2$.*

Proof. Suppose that $x \in \mathcal{A}$ and $y \in \mathcal{B}$. Since there does not exist $y \rightsquigarrow_{k'} x$, we have that $(x, y) \in A(D)$. So, we assume that $x, y \in \mathcal{A}$. By Lemma 2.2, $d(x, y) \leq 4$. We consider two cases.

CASE 1. $d(x, y) = 3$. Let $x \rightarrow x_1 \rightarrow x_2 \rightarrow y$ be a directed path from x to y . Since $x_1, x_2 \notin \mathcal{A}$, we have that $(y, x_1), (x_2, x) \in A(D)$. Since $(y, x_1, x_2, y), (x, x_1, x_2, x) \cong \vec{C}_3$ are monochromatic, the directed path $y \rightarrow x_1 \rightarrow x_2 \rightarrow x$ is a monochromatic $y \rightsquigarrow x$, a contradiction to the supposition of the lemma.

CASE 2. $d(x, y) = 4$. Let $x \rightarrow x_1 \rightarrow x_2 \rightarrow x_3 \rightarrow y$ be a directed path from x to y . If $x_2 \notin \mathcal{A}$, then $(y, x_2), (x_2, x) \in A(D)$ and so $y \rightarrow x_2 \rightarrow x$ is a $y \rightsquigarrow_{k'} x$ with $k' \leq 2$, a contradiction to the supposition of the lemma. Hence $x_2 \in \mathcal{A}$. Notice that $x_1, x_3 \notin \mathcal{A}$ and then $(y, x_1), (x_3, x) \in A(D)$. Since $(y, x_1, x_2, x_3, y), (x, x_1, x_2, x_3, x) \cong \vec{C}_4$ are monochromatic, the directed path $y \rightarrow x_1 \rightarrow x_2 \rightarrow x_3 \rightarrow x$ is a monochromatic $y \rightsquigarrow x$, a contradiction to the supposition of the lemma. \square

Analogously, we can prove the following lemma in case of semicomplete bipartite digraphs.

Lemma 2.5. *Let D be an m -colored semicomplete bipartite digraph such that every $\vec{C}_4 \uparrow \vec{C}_4$ contained in D is at most k -colored, $k = 2$ (resp. $k = 3$) and $x, y \in V(D)$. If there exists $x \rightsquigarrow_k y$ and there does not exist $y \rightsquigarrow_{k'} x$ with $k' \leq 2$ (resp. $k' \leq 3$), then $d(x, y) \leq 2$.*

3. Flowers, cycles and closed walks in the k -colored closure of semicomplete r -partite digraphs

To begin with, we define the *flower* F_s with s petals as the digraph obtained by replacing every edge of the star $K_{1,s}$ by a symmetric arc. If every edge of the complete graph K_n is replaced by a symmetric arc, then the resulting digraph D on n vertices is symmetric semicomplete.

Remark 3.1. *Let D be an m -colored digraph isomorphic to a \vec{C}_3 or a flower F_s such that $s \geq 1$. Then $\mathfrak{C}_k(F_s)$ with $k \geq 2$ is a symmetric semicomplete digraph.*

This section is devoted to detail the common beginning of the proofs of Theorems 4.1 - 4.4 in the next section. The procedure is similar to that employed in the proof of Theorem 7 of [7]. We include it here to make this work self-contained. In every case, we apply Theorem 1.2 and Remark 1.1 to show that every directed cycle of the k -colored closure $\mathfrak{C}_k(D)$ of the corresponding digraph D has a symmetric arc and we proceed by contradiction.

First, we make a sketch of the following procedure in general terms. We suppose that there exists a directed cycle γ in $\mathfrak{C}_k(D)$ without symmetric arcs and using Lemmas 2.1, 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5 according to each specific case, we prove that every arc of γ corresponds to an arc or a directed path of length 2 in the original digraph D . At this point, we consider the closed walk δ , subdigraph of D , constructed by the concatenation of the already mentioned arcs or directed paths of length 2 and study its properties. In the next step, we define a closed subwalk ε of δ satisfying some prefixed properties. Then, we show that this subdigraph of δ exists and can be described in a neat form.

Formally, let D be an m -colored semicomplete r -partite digraph with $r \geq 2$. By contradiction, suppose that $\gamma = (u_0, u_1, \dots, u_p, u_0)$ is a cycle in $\mathfrak{C}_k(D)$ without any symmetric arc. Observe that if $p = 1$, then γ has a symmetric arc and we are done. So, assume that $p \geq 2$. Let x and y be two consecutive vertices of γ . Consider the following instances recalling that γ has no symmetric arcs:

- (a) $k \geq 4$. The conditions of Lemma 2.1 are satisfied and we conclude that $d(x, y) \leq 2$.
- (b) $k = 3$ and every \vec{C}_4 contained in D is at most 2-colored. The conditions of Lemma 2.3 are satisfied and we conclude that $d(x, y) \leq 2$.
- (c) $k = 2$ and every \vec{C}_3 and \vec{C}_4 contained in D is monochromatic. The conditions of Lemma 2.4 are satisfied and we conclude that $d(x, y) \leq 2$.
- (d) $r = 2$, $k = 2$ or 3 and every $\vec{C}_4 \uparrow\uparrow \vec{C}_4$ contained in D is at most k -colored. The conditions of Lemma 2.5 are satisfied and we conclude that $d(x, y) \leq 2$.

Therefore, in any case we can assume that every arc of γ corresponds to an arc or a directed path of length 2 in D . Let δ be the closed directed walk defined by the concatenation of the arcs and the directed paths of length 2 corresponding to the arcs of γ .

Remark 3.2. *There exist at least two consecutive vertices of γ in every directed walk of length at least 3 of δ .*

The following lemma settles two simple properties of δ .

Lemma 3.3. *Let δ be defined as before. Therefore*

- (i) δ contains a directed path of length at least 3 and
- (ii) there are neither \vec{C}_3 nor flowers F_s with $s \geq 2$ in δ .

Proof. For the first claim, suppose that every directed path of δ has length at most 2. Then, either δ contains a \vec{C}_3 or δ is isomorphic to a flower F_s with $s \geq 2$ and by Remarks 3.1 and 3.2, γ has a symmetric arc, a contradiction. For the second, observe that if δ contains \vec{C}_3 or a flower F_s with $s \geq 2$, then by Remark 3.2, two consecutive vertices u_i and u_{i+1} of γ (the subindices are taken modulo p) belong to the vertices of a \vec{C}_3 or a flower F_s , respectively. So, by Remark 3.1, there exists a symmetric arc between u_i and u_{i+1} of γ , which is a contradiction. \square

Let $\delta = (y_0, y_1, \dots, y_s)$.

Remark 3.4. (i) *If there exists a flower F_s in δ , then $s = 1$.*

(ii) *There are no consecutive vertices of γ in a flower.*

(iii) *If there exists a subdigraph $y_j \rightarrow y_{j+1} \rightarrow y_{j+2} \rightarrow y_{j+3} \rightarrow y_{j+4}$ of δ , where $y_{j+1} = y_{j+3}$ (that is, $y_{j+1} \leftrightarrow y_{j+2}$ is a flower), then $y_{j+2} \in V(\gamma)$.*

Notice that if $\delta = \gamma$, as we will see, the same argument of the proof will work even easier.

Observe that there exist $y_{i_0}, y_{i_1}, \dots, y_{i_p} \in V(\delta)$ such that $i_j < i_{j+1}$ and $u_l = y_{j_l}$, where $0 \leq l \leq p$.

We define $\varepsilon = (y_i, y_{i+1}, \dots, y_{i+l})$ of minimum length ($0 \leq i \leq s$ and the indices are taken modulo $s+1$) such that

- (i) $y_i = y_{i+l}$, $l \geq 3$,
- (ii) $y_i \neq y_t$ for $i+1 \leq t \leq i+l-1$,
- (iii) if $y_q = y_r$, then $r = q+2$ ($i+1 \leq q, r \leq i+l-1$),
- (iv) there exist $y_{i_1}, y_{i_2}, \dots, y_{i_{k+1}} \in V(\varepsilon)$ such that $y_{i_1} = u_j$, $y_{i_2} = u_{j+1}$, \dots , $y_{i_{k+1}} = u_{j+k}$ with $k \geq 1$, and
- (v) $y_{i+1} \neq y_{i+l-1}$.

Lemma 3.5. *There exists ε a closed subwalk of δ .*

Proof. Since δ is a closed walk, $p \geq 2$ and using Lemma 3.3(i), condition (i) is satisfied. For (ii), if there exists $t < l$ such that $y_i = y_{i+t}$, then, by the minimality of ε , $t = 2$ and $l - t = 2$ and therefore $(i+l) - (i+t) = 2$. By (i), we have that $y_i = y_{i+t} = y_{i+l}$ and so $l = 4$. We obtain that

$$y_{i+1} \longleftrightarrow y_i = y_{i+2} = y_{i+4} \longleftrightarrow y_{i+3},$$

which is a flower F_2 in δ , a contradiction to Lemma 3.3(ii). Condition (iii) follows from the minimality of ε and condition (iv) is immediate from the definition of δ and the fact that $l \geq 3$. If $y_{i+1} = y_{i+l-1}$, then by (iii), $l = 4$ and hence

$$y_{i+4} = y_i \longleftrightarrow y_{i+1} = y_{i+3} \longleftrightarrow y_{i+2}$$

which is a flower F_2 in δ , a contradiction to Lemma 3.3(ii). Condition (v) follows. \square

Since δ is not a flower itself by supposition, we can establish the structure of ε with precision.

Corollary 3.6. *The closed subwalk ε of δ is a directed cycle of length at least 3 with perhaps symmetric arcs attached to some vertices (maybe none) of the cycle for which the exterior endpoints are vertices of γ .*

An example of ε is depicted in [7].

For the sake of a clearer exposition of the forthcoming proofs in the next section, let us rename $\varepsilon = (y_0, y_1, \dots, y_l)$. By (v) of the definition of ε , we have that $y_1 \neq y_{l-1}$ and by (iv), there exist consecutive $u_0, u_1, \dots, u_k \in V(\gamma)$ in ε with $k \geq 1$. Notice that u_0 and u_k could not be consecutive vertices of γ and similarly, $(y_{l-1}, y_0) \in A(\varepsilon)$ could not be an arc of γ . Let $u_1 = y_i$ be the second vertex of γ from y_0 . Observe that $1 \leq i \leq 3$ by the definition of ε and either $u_0 = y_0$ ($1 \leq i \leq 2$) or $u_0 = y_1$ ($2 \leq i \leq 3$).

Let us suppose that there exists $(u_1, y_0) \in A(D)$, then

- (i) if $u_0 = y_0$, then $(u_1, u_0) \in A(D)$ and γ has a symmetric arc between u_0 and u_1 , a contradiction,
- (ii) if $u_0 = y_1$, then we have that $u_1 \longrightarrow y_0 \longrightarrow y_1 = u_0$ and we arrive at the contradiction of (i).

Therefore, without loss of generality we can assume that

$$(u_1, y_0) \notin A(D). \tag{\nabla}$$

4. Main theorems

First, we recall that by supposition $\gamma = (u_0, u_1, \dots, u_p, u_0)$ is a cycle in $\mathfrak{C}_k(D)$ without any symmetric arc and $\varepsilon = (y_0, y_1, \dots, y_l)$ is a closed subwalk of δ . The beginning of every proof of the following theorems are the arguments stated in Section 3.

Theorem 4.1. *Let D be an m -colored semicomplete r -partite digraph and $k \geq 4$. Then D has a k -colored kernel.*

Proof. In this case, we use instance (a) to assume that every arc of γ corresponds to an arc or a directed path of length 2 in D .

Claim. $(u_1, y_j) \in A(D)$ for some $l - 2 \leq j \leq l - 1$.

Proof of the claim. To prove the claim, suppose by contradiction that q is the maximum index such that $(u_1, y_q) \in A(D)$ with $q \leq l - 3$. Consider the directed path

$$u_1 \longrightarrow y_q \longrightarrow y_{q+1} \longrightarrow y_{q+2} \longrightarrow y_{q+3}$$

(observe that $q + 3 \leq l$). First, we will show that u_1 and y_{q+3} belong to the same part of D . If $(u_1, y_{q+3}) \in A(D)$, then $q + 3 = l$ because q is maximum and $y_{q+3} = y_0$, a contradiction to (∇) . If $(y_{q+3}, u_1) \in A(D)$, then we have the directed cycle $(u_1, y_q, y_{q+1}, y_{q+2}, y_{q+3}, u_1)$.

If $y_q = u_t$ for some $2 \leq t \leq p$, then either $y_{q+1} = u_{t+1}$ or $y_{q+2} = u_{t+1}$. Therefore there exists $u_{t+1} \rightsquigarrow_k u_t$ with $k \leq 4$, a contradiction, γ has a symmetric arc between u_t and u_{t+1} . Analogously, if $y_{q+1} = u_t$ and either $y_{q+2} = u_{t+1}$ or $y_{q+3} = u_{t+1}$, then we arrive to the same contradiction as before. Finally, if $y_{q+1} = u_0$, then there exists $u_1 \rightsquigarrow_k u_0$ with $k \leq 4$, a contradiction, γ has a symmetric arc between u_0 and u_1 . We conclude that $u_1, y_{q+3} \in \mathcal{A}$ (the same part of the semicomplete r -partite digraph D). As a consequence, $y_q, y_{q+2} \notin \mathcal{A}$ and there exists $(y_{q+2}, u_1) \in A(D)$ by the maximality of q .

We obtain the directed cycle $\vec{C}_4 \cong (y_q, y_{q+1}, y_{q+2}, u_1, y_q)$ in which there are no two consecutive vertices of γ , otherwise γ has a symmetric arc, a contradiction. Hence, $y_{q+1} = u_t$ and $y_{q+3} \in V(\gamma)$. Since there exists $u_1 \rightsquigarrow_k y_{q+3}$ with $k = 4$, we have that $y_{q+3} \neq u_0$, otherwise γ has a symmetric arc between u_0 and u_1 . Then $y_{q+3} = u_{t+1}$ and thus $q + 3 < l$ and we consider the extended directed path

$$u_1 \longrightarrow y_q \longrightarrow y_{q+1} = u_t \longrightarrow y_{q+2} \longrightarrow y_{q+3} = u_{t+1} \longrightarrow y_{q+4}.$$

Recall that $u_1, y_{q+3} \in \mathcal{A}$ and then $y_{q+4} \notin \mathcal{A}$. By the maximality of q and since $(u_1, y_0) \notin A(D)$, there exists $(y_{q+4}, u_1) \in A(D)$. We obtain the directed path

$$u_{t+1} = y_{q+3} \longrightarrow y_{q+4} \longrightarrow u_1 \longrightarrow y_q \longrightarrow y_{q+1} = u_t,$$

a contradiction, there exists a symmetric arc between u_t and u_{t+1} in γ . The claim is proved. \triangle

We conclude the proof of the theorem applying the Claim. In the worst case, we have that $q = l - 2$ and $y_1 = u_0$. We obtain the directed cycle

$$\vec{C}_4 \cong (u_1, y_q = y_{l-2}, y_{l-1}, y_0, y_1 = u_0, u_1)$$

and there exists $u_1 \rightsquigarrow_k u_0$ with $k = 4$, a contradiction, γ has a symmetric arc between u_0 and u_1 . In any other case, there exists $u_1 \rightsquigarrow_k u_0$ with $k \leq 4$ and it yields the same contradiction as before. \square

Theorem 4.2. *Let D be an m -colored semicomplete r -partite digraph and $k = 3$. If every \vec{C}_4 contained in D is at most 2-colored and, either every \vec{C}_5 contained in D is at most 3-colored or every $\vec{C}_3 \uparrow \vec{C}_3$ contained in D is at most 2-colored, then D has a 3-colored kernel.*

Proof. In this case, we use instance (b) to assume that every arc of γ corresponds to an arc or a directed path of length 2 in D .

Claim. $(u_1, y_j) \in A(D)$ for some $l - 2 \leq j \leq l - 1$.

Proof of the claim. To prove the claim, suppose by contradiction that q is the maximum index such that $(u_1, y_q) \in A(D)$ with $q \leq l - 3$. Consider the directed path

$$u_1 \longrightarrow y_q \longrightarrow y_{q+1} \longrightarrow y_{q+2}.$$

First, we will show that u_1 and y_{q+2} belong to the same part of D . Observe that $(u_1, y_{q+2}) \in A(D)$ is impossible by the choice of q and since $q+2 < l$. Therefore, we suppose that $(y_{q+2}, u_1) \in A(D)$. If there exist $u_t, u_{t+1} \in V(\gamma)$ (indices are taken modulo $p+1$), such that $u_t, u_{t+1} \in \{y_q, y_{q+1}, y_{q+2}\}$, then there exists $u_{t+1} \rightsquigarrow_k u_t$ with $k \leq 3$, a contradiction, γ has a symmetric arc between u_t and u_{t+1} . Hence $y_{q+1} = u_t$ and $y_q, y_{q+2} \notin V(\gamma)$. Since the directed cycle $\vec{C}_4 \cong (u_1, y_q, y_{q+1}, y_{q+2}, u_1)$ is at most 2-colored, the directed path

$$u_1 \longrightarrow y_q \longrightarrow y_{q+1} \longrightarrow y_{q+2} \longrightarrow y_{q+3}$$

is at most 3-colored and then $y_{q+3} \neq u_0$ and $y_{q+3} = u_{t+1}$ (in virtue of the definition of ε). Moreover, $q+3 < l$. Let us suppose that there exists an arc between y_{q+3} and u_1 . By the maximality of q , we have that $(y_{q+3}, u_1) \in A(D)$. Then

$$y_{q+3} = u_{t+1} \longrightarrow u_1 \longrightarrow y_q \longrightarrow y_{q+1} = u_t$$

is an at most 3-colored directed path, a contradiction, γ has a symmetric arc between u_t and u_{t+1} . In consequence, $u_1, y_{q+3} \in \mathcal{A}$ (a same part of D), $y_q \notin \mathcal{A}$ and there exists an arc between y_q and y_{q+3} .

If $(y_{q+3}, y_q) \in A(D)$, then the directed path

$$y_{q+3} = u_{t+1} \longrightarrow y_q \longrightarrow y_{q+1} = u_t$$

is an at most 3-colored directed path, a contradiction, γ has a symmetric arc between u_t and u_{t+1} . Thus, $(y_q, y_{q+3}) \in A(D)$ and let us consider the extended directed path

$$u_1 \longrightarrow y_q \longrightarrow y_{q+1} = u_t \longrightarrow y_{q+2} \longrightarrow y_{q+3} = u_{t+1} \longrightarrow y_{q+4},$$

where $q+4 \leq l$ and furthermore, $y_{q+4} \notin \mathcal{A}$. There exists the arc between u_1 and y_{q+4} . If $(u_1, y_{q+4}) \in A(D)$, then by the maximality of q , $y_{q+4} = y_l = y_0$ and we obtain a contradiction to the assumption (∇) . So, $(y_{q+4}, u_1) \in A(D)$.

Recalling that $(y_{q+3}, u_1), (y_q, y_{q+3}), (y_{q+4}, u_1) \in A(D)$, we have the directed cycles

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{C}_4 &\cong (u_1, y_q, y_{q+1} = u_t, y_{q+2}, u_1) \text{ and} \\ \vec{C}_4 &\cong (y_{q+3} = u_{t+1}, y_{q+4}, u_1, y_q, y_{q+3}) \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

which are at most 2-colored by the condition of the theorem. Then the directed path

$$u_{t+1} = y_{q+3} \longrightarrow y_{q+4} \longrightarrow u_1 \longrightarrow y_q \longrightarrow y_{q+1} = u_t$$

is at most 3-colored given that the directed cycles of (1) have the common arc (u_1, y_q) . We have a contradiction, γ has a symmetric arc between u_t and u_{t+1} . We conclude that $u_1, y_{q+2} \in \mathcal{A}$ (a same part of D).

As a consequence, $y_q, y_{q+1}, y_{q+3} \notin \mathcal{A}$. The maximality of q implies that $(y_{q+1}, u_1) \in A(D)$. If there exists $(u_1, y_{q+3}) \in A(D)$, then by the maximality of q , $y_{q+3} = y_l = y_0$, a contradiction to (∇) . So, there exists $(y_{q+3}, u_1) \in A(D)$.

If $(y_q, y_{q+2}) \in A(D)$, then there exists the directed cycle

$$\vec{C}_4 \cong (u_1, y_q, y_{q+2}, y_{q+3}, u_1)$$

which is at most 2-colored and therefore there exists $u_{t+1} \rightsquigarrow_k u_t$ where $k \leq 3$ and with $u_t, u_{t+1} \in \{y_q, y_{q+1}, y_{q+2}, y_{q+3}\}$, a contradiction, γ has a symmetric arc between u_t and u_{t+1} . Hence $(y_{q+2}, y_q) \in A(D)$. \triangle

In brief, we have that $(y_{q+1}, u_1), (y_{q+3}, u_1), (y_{q+2}, y_q) \in A(D)$ in the directed path

$$u_1 \longrightarrow y_q \longrightarrow y_{q+1} \longrightarrow y_{q+2} \longrightarrow y_{q+3}.$$

Observe that $u_t \in \{y_q, y_{q+1}\}$. If $y_{q+2} = u_{t+1}$, then $u_{t+1} = y_{q+2} \longrightarrow y_q \longrightarrow y_{q+1}$ is at most 3-colored, a contradiction, γ has a symmetric arc between u_t and u_{t+1} . We conclude that $y_{q+1} = u_t$ and either $y_{q+3} = u_{t+1}$ or $y_{q+3} = u_0$. If $y_{q+3} = u_{t+1}$, then

$$u_{t+1} = y_{q+3} \longrightarrow u_1 \longrightarrow y_q \longrightarrow y_{q+1}$$

is at most 3-colored, a contradiction, γ has a symmetric arc between u_t and u_{t+1} . Thus $y_{q+3} = u_0$.

By condition of the theorem, every \vec{C}_5 contained in D is at most 3-colored or every $\vec{C}_3 \uparrow \vec{C}_3$ contained in D is at most 2-colored. If every \vec{C}_5 is at most 3-colored, then

$$\vec{C}_5 \cong (u_1, y_q, y_{q+1}, y_{q+2}, y_{q+3} = u_0, u_1)$$

is at most 3-colored and consequently, there exists $u_1 \rightsquigarrow_k u_0$ at most 3-colored, a contradiction, γ has a symmetric arc between u_0 and u_1 .

If every $\vec{C}_3 \uparrow \vec{C}_3$ is at most 2-colored then the $\vec{C}_3 \uparrow \vec{C}_3$ induced by $\{u_1, y_q, y_{q+1}, y_{q+2}\}$ is at most 2-colored and there exists $u_1 \rightsquigarrow_k u_0$ at most 3-colored, a contradiction, γ has a symmetric arc between u_0 and u_1 .

The claim is proved. \triangle

To finish the proof of the theorem, we apply the Claim and consider two cases:

CASE 1. $(u_1, y_{l-1}) \in A(D)$. In this case the directed path $u_1 \longrightarrow y_{l-1} \longrightarrow y_0 \longrightarrow y_1$ is at most 3-colored and we know that $u_0 \in \{y_0, y_1\}$. We arrive to a similar contradiction as before, γ has a symmetric arc between u_0 and u_1 .

CASE 2. $(u_1, y_{l-2}) \in A(D)$. Observe that $y_0 \neq u_0$ and $y_1 = u_0$, otherwise

$$u_1 \longrightarrow y_{l-2} \longrightarrow y_{l-1} \longrightarrow y_0 = u_0$$

is at most 3-colored, and we have the contradiction of Case 1 once more. So, we have the directed path

$$u_1 \longrightarrow y_{l-2} \longrightarrow y_{l-1} \longrightarrow y_0 \longrightarrow y_1 = u_0.$$

By assumption (∇) , the arc (y_0, u_1) could belong to $A(D)$. If that is the case, then the directed cycle

$$\vec{C}_4 \cong (u_1, y_{l-2}, y_{l-1}, y_0, u_1)$$

is at most 2-colored by the condition of the theorem and therefore, $u_1 \rightsquigarrow_k u_0$ at most 3-colored, a contradiction, γ has a symmetric arc between u_0 and u_1 . So, we suppose that $(y_0, u_1) \notin A(D)$. By (∇) , we have that $(u_1, y_0) \notin A(D)$ and then $u_1, y_0 \in \mathcal{A}$ and $u_0 = y_1 \notin \mathcal{A}$. Consequently, there exists an arc between $y_1 = u_0$ and u_1 . It is clear that $(u_0, u_1) \in A(D)$ (otherwise we have a contradiction).

If every \vec{C}_5 is at most 3-colored, then

$$\vec{C}_5 \cong (u_1, y_{l-2}, y_{l-1}, y_0, y_1 = u_0, u_1)$$

is at most 3-colored and we arrive to a similar contradiction as shown before. Hence, we can suppose that there exists a \vec{C}_5 at least 4-colored and thus we assume the condition that every $\vec{C}_3 \uparrow \vec{C}_3$ is at most 2-colored in D . Notice that $y_{l-1} \in \mathcal{B} \neq \mathcal{A}$ and then there exists an arc between y_{l-1} and u_1 . Since $l-2$ is the maximum index such that $(u_1, y_{l-2}) \in A(D)$, we have that $(y_{l-1}, u_1) \in A(D)$. Also $y_{l-2} \in \mathcal{C} \notin \{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}\}$ and then there exists an arc between y_0 and y_{l-2} . If $(y_0, y_{l-2}) \in A(D)$, then the $\vec{C}_3 \uparrow \vec{C}_3$ induced by $\{u_1, y_{l-2}, y_{l-1}, y_0\}$ is at most 2-colored. Hence there exists $u_1 \rightsquigarrow_k u_0$ at most 3-colored, a contradiction, γ has a symmetric arc between u_0 and u_1 . If $(y_{l-2}, y_0) \in A(D)$, then

$$u_1 \longrightarrow y_{l-2} \longrightarrow y_0 \longrightarrow y_1 = u_0$$

is at most 3-colored, a contradiction, γ has a symmetric arc between u_0 and u_1 .

The theorem is proved. \square

Theorem 4.3. *Let D be an m -colored semicomplete r -partite digraph and $k = 2$. If every \vec{C}_3 and \vec{C}_4 contained in D is monochromatic, then D has a 2-colored kernel.*

Proof. In this case, we use instance (c) to assume that every arc of γ corresponds to an arc or a directed path of length 2 in D .

Claim 1. $(u_1, y_j) \in A(D)$ for some $l-2 \leq j \leq l-1$.

Proof of the Claim 1. To prove the claim, suppose by contradiction that q is the maximum index such that $(u_1, y_q) \in A(D)$ with $q \leq l-3$. Without loss of generality, suppose that $u_1 \in \mathcal{A}$. We will need the following three subclaims.

Subclaim 1. $y_{q+1} \in V(\gamma)$.

Proof of the Subclaim 1. By contradiction, suppose that $y_{q+1} \notin V(\gamma)$ and consider the directed path

$$u_1 \longrightarrow y_q \longrightarrow y_{q+1} \longrightarrow y_{q+2}$$

($q+3 \leq l$). Then $y_q, y_{q+2} \in V(\gamma)$ and without loss of generality, we can suppose that $y_q = u_t$ and $y_{q+1} = u_{t+1}$ for some $2 \leq t \leq p-1$ and $u_{t+1} \neq u_0$ (otherwise there exists $u_1 \rightsquigarrow_k u_0$ with $k \leq 2$, a contradiction, γ has a symmetric arc between u_0 and u_1). Observe that if $y_{q+2} = u_{t+1} \notin \mathcal{A}$, then there exists an arc between u_1 and y_{q+2} . By the maximality of q , we have that $(y_{q+2}, u_1) \in A(D)$ and then u_t and u_{t+1} are contained in the monochromatic cycle $\vec{C}_4 \cong (u_1, y_q, y_{q+1}, y_{q+2}, u_1)$ (by hypothesis). So, there exists a monochromatic $u_{t+1} \rightsquigarrow u_t$, a contradiction, γ has a symmetric arc between u_t and u_{t+1} . Hence, $y_{q+2} = u_{t+1} \in \mathcal{A}$. We know that $y_q \notin \mathcal{A}$. Let us suppose that $y_q \in \mathcal{B} \neq \mathcal{A}$. There exists an arc between y_q and y_{q+2} . If $(y_{q+2}, y_q) = (u_{t+1}, u_t) \in A(D)$, then we arrive to the same contradiction as before. Therefore $(y_q, y_{q+2}) = (u_t, u_{t+1}) \in A(D)$. As a consequence y_{q+1} does not exist in ε by the definition of γ , a contradiction. \triangle

Subclaim 2. $y_{q+2} \notin V(\gamma)$.

Proof of the Subclaim 2. By contradiction, suppose that $y_{q+2} \in V(\gamma)$ and hence $y_{q+2} = u_{t+1}$ because $q+2 \leq l-1$. So we have the directed path

$$u_1 \longrightarrow y_q \longrightarrow y_{q+1} = u_t \longrightarrow y_{q+2} = u_{t+1}.$$

If $y_{q+2} = u_{t+1} \notin \mathcal{A}$, there exists the arc $(y_{q+2} = u_{t+1}, u_1) \in A(D)$ by the maximality of q . But then u_t and u_{t+1} are contained in a monochromatic cycle

$$\vec{C}_4 \cong (y_{q+2} = u_{t+1}, u_1, y_q, y_{q+1} = u_t, y_{q+2} = u_{t+1}),$$

a contradiction, there exists a monochromatic $u_{t+1} \rightsquigarrow u_t$ and a symmetric arc between u_t and u_{t+1} in γ . Therefore, $y_{q+2} = u_{t+1} \in \mathcal{A}$ and there exists an arc between y_q and $y_{q+2} = u_{t+1}$ (recall that $y_q \notin \mathcal{A}$). If $(y_{q+2} = u_{t+1}, y_q) \in A(D)$, then $(y_{q+1} = u_t, y_{q+2} = u_{t+1}, y_q, y_{q+1} = u_t)$

is a monochromatic \vec{C}_3 by hypothesis and there exists a monochromatic $u_{t+1} \rightsquigarrow u_t$ and we get the same contradiction. Hence $(y_q, y_{q+2} = u_{t+1}) \in A(D)$. Consider the extended directed path

$$u_1 \longrightarrow y_q \longrightarrow y_{q+1} = u_t \longrightarrow y_{q+2} = u_{t+1} \longrightarrow y_{q+3},$$

where $y_{q+3} \notin \mathcal{A}$ (since $y_{q+2} = u_{t+1} \in \mathcal{A}$). Then, there exists an arc between u_1 and y_{q+3} . If $(u_1, y_{q+3}) \in A(D)$, then $y_{q+3} = y_l = y_0$, a contradiction to (∇) . Thus, $(y_{q+3}, u_1) \in A(D)$. Recall that $(y_q, y_{q+2} = u_{t+1}) \in A(D)$. Hence,

$$\vec{C}_4 \cong (y_{q+2} = u_{t+1}, y_{q+3}, u_1, y_q, y_{q+2} = u_{t+1})$$

is monochromatic by hypothesis. So, there exists $u_{t+1} \rightsquigarrow_k u_t$ with $k \leq 2$, a contradiction, γ has a symmetric arc between u_t and u_{t+1} . \triangle

As a consequence of Subclaim 2, we have that $y_{q+3} \in V(\gamma)$.

Subclaim 3. $y_{q+3} \in \mathcal{A}$.

Proof of the Subclaim 3. By contradiction, suppose that $y_{q+3} \notin \mathcal{A}$. By Subclaim 1, we can suppose that $y_{q+1} = u_t \in V(\gamma)$. Consider the directed path

$$u_1 \longrightarrow y_q \longrightarrow y_{q+1} = u_t \longrightarrow y_{q+2} \longrightarrow y_{q+3}$$

Then there exists an arc between u_1 and y_{q+3} (recall that $u_1 \in \mathcal{A}$). By the maximality of q , we have that $(y_{q+3}, u_1) \in A(D)$. By Subclaim 2, $y_{q+2} \notin V(\gamma)$ and thus $y_{q+3} \in V(\gamma)$. We consider two cases:

CASE 1. $y_{q+2} \notin \mathcal{A}$. By the maximality of q , there exists $(y_{q+2}, u_1) \in A(D)$ and the directed cycle

$$\vec{C}_4 \cong (y_{q+2}, u_1, y_q, y_{q+1} = u_t, y_{q+2})$$

is monochromatic by hypothesis. If $y_{q+3} = u_0$, then there exists $u_1 \rightsquigarrow_k u_0$ with $k \leq 2$, a contradiction, γ has a symmetric arc between u_0 and u_1 . If $y_{q+3} = u_{t+1}$, then here exists $u_{t+1} \rightsquigarrow_k u_t$ with $k \leq 2$, a contradiction, γ has a symmetric arc between u_t and u_{t+1} .

CASE 2. $y_{q+2} \in \mathcal{A}$. Then $y_{q+1} \notin \mathcal{A}$ and since $y_q \in \mathcal{B}$ (see the proof of Subclaim 1), we have that $y_{q+1} \notin \mathcal{B}$. Without loss of generality, suppose that $y_{q+1} \in \mathcal{C}$. By the maximality of q , there exists $(y_{q+1}, u_1) \in A(D)$ and therefore the directed cycle

$$\vec{C}_3 \cong (u_1, y_q, y_{q+1} = u_t, u_1) \tag{2}$$

is monochromatic. On the other hand, there exists an arc between y_q and y_{q+2} . If $(y_{q+2}, y_q) \in A(D)$, then the directed cycle $\vec{C}_3 \cong (y_{q+2}, y_q, y_{q+1} = u_t, y_{q+2})$ is monochromatic and has the same color of the \vec{C}_3 of (2) because they share the arc $(y_q, y_{q+1} = u_t) \in A(D)$. If $y_{q+3} = u_0$, then there exists $u_1 \rightsquigarrow_k u_0$ with $k \leq 2$, a contradiction, γ has a symmetric arc between u_0 and u_1 . If $y_{q+3} = u_{t+1}$, then there exists $u_{t+1} \rightsquigarrow_k u_t$ with $k \leq 2$, a contradiction, γ has a symmetric arc between u_t and u_{t+1} . So, we conclude that there exists $(y_q, y_{q+2}) \in A(D)$. In this case, the directed cycle

$$\vec{C}_4 \cong (u_1, y_q, y_{q+2}, y_{q+3}, u_1)$$

is monochromatic and of the same color as the \vec{C}_3 of (2) because they share the arc $(u_1, y_q) \in A(D)$. Analogously, if $y_{q+3} = u_0$ or $y_{q+3} = u_{t+1}$, we arrive to the same contradiction, γ has a symmetric arc.

The subclaim follows. \triangle

Continuing with the proof of Claim 1, we have the following directed path

$$u_1 \longrightarrow y_q \longrightarrow y_{q+1} = u_t \longrightarrow y_{q+2} \longrightarrow y_{q+3},$$

where $u_1, y_{q+3} \in \mathcal{A}$, $y_q \in \mathcal{B}$, $y_{q+2} \notin \mathcal{A}$, $y_{q+2} \notin V(\gamma)$ and $y_{q+3} \in V(\gamma)$ using Subclaims 1-3. By the maximality of q , there exists $(y_{q+2}, u_1) \in A(D)$ creating the monochromatic directed cycle

$$\vec{C}_4 \cong (y_{q+2}, u_1, y_q, y_{q+1} = u_t, y_{q+2}). \quad (3)$$

Hence, there exists $u_1 \rightsquigarrow_k y_{q+3}$ with $k \leq 2$ and therefore, $y_{q+3} \neq u_0$ (otherwise, γ has a symmetric arc between u_0 and u_1) and then $y_{q+3} = u_{t+1}$ with $q+3 < l$. Consider the extended directed path

$$u_1 \longrightarrow y_q \longrightarrow y_{q+1} = u_t \longrightarrow y_{q+2} \longrightarrow y_{q+3} = u_{t+1} \longrightarrow y_{q+4},$$

where $y_{q+4} \notin \mathcal{A}$ (since $y_{q+3} \in \mathcal{A}$). Therefore there exists an arc between u_1 and y_{q+4} . If $(u_1, y_{q+4}) \in A(D)$, then by the maximality of q , we have that $y_{q+4} = y_0$, a contradiction to (∇) . So there exists $(y_{q+4}, u_1) \in A(D)$.

On the other hand, since $y_{q+3} = u_{t+1} \in \mathcal{A}$ and $y_q \in \mathcal{B}$, there exists an arc between y_q and y_{q+3} . If $(y_{q+3} = u_{t+1}, y_q) \in A(D)$, then u_t and u_{t+1} belong to the monochromatic

$$\vec{C}_4 \cong (y_q, y_{q+1} = u_t, y_{q+2}, y_{q+3} = u_{t+1}, y_q)$$

and thus there exists a monochromatic $u_{t+1} \rightsquigarrow u_t$, a contradiction, γ has a symmetric arc between u_t and u_{t+1} . Hence $(y_q, y_{q+3} = u_{t+1}) \in A(D)$ and we obtain the monochromatic directed cycle

$$\vec{C}_4 \cong (y_q, y_{q+3} = u_{t+1}, y_{q+4}, u_1, y_q)$$

of the same color of the \vec{C}_4 of (3) because they share the arc $(u_1, y_q) \in A(D)$. Thus, there exists the monochromatic $u_{t+1} = y_{q+3} \rightsquigarrow y_{q+1} = u_t$, a contradiction, γ has a symmetric arc between u_t and u_{t+1} .

Claim 1 is proved. △

Claim 2. $y_0 \in \mathcal{A}$.

Proof of Claim 2. By contradiction, let us suppose that $y_0 \notin \mathcal{A}$. Then there exists an arc between u_1 and y_0 . By (∇) , there exists $(y_0, u_1) \in A(D)$. So the directed cycle

$$\vec{C}_4 \cong (y_0, u_1, y_{l-2}, y_{l-1}, y_0) \text{ or } \vec{C}_3 \cong (y_0, u_1, y_{l-1}, y_0)$$

is monochromatic and hence there exists $u_1 \rightsquigarrow_k u_0$ with $k \leq 2$ (recall that $y_0 = u_0$ or $y_1 = u_0$). We arrive to a contradiction, γ has a symmetric arc between u_0 and u_1 , completing the proof of the claim. △

To finish the proof of the theorem, we consider two cases according to Claim 1.

CASE 1. $j = l - 2$. By Claim 2, $y_0 \in \mathcal{A}$ and then $y_{l-1} \notin \mathcal{A}$. So, there exists an arc between y_{l-1} and u_1 . By the maximality of j , there exists $(y_{l-1}, u_1) \in A(D)$. Hence the directed cycle

$$\vec{C}_3 \cong (u_1, y_{l-2}, y_{l-1}, u_1) \quad (4)$$

is monochromatic by hypothesis and then there exists $u_1 \rightsquigarrow_k y_0$ with $k \leq 2$. If $y_0 = u_0$, then we have a contradiction, γ has a symmetric arc between u_0 and u_1 . Therefore $y_1 = u_0$. On the other hand, there exists an arc between y_{l-2} and y_0 since $y_{l-2} \notin \mathcal{A}$ and $y_0 \in \mathcal{A}$. If $(y_0, y_{l-2}) \in A(D)$, then the directed cycle $\vec{C}_3 \cong (y_{l-1}, y_0, y_{l-2}, y_{l-1})$ is monochromatic and of the same color as the \vec{C}_3 of (4). Thus, there exists $u_1 \rightsquigarrow_k u_0$ with $k \leq 2$, particularly,

$$u_1 \longrightarrow y_{l-2} \longrightarrow y_{l-1} \longrightarrow y_0 \longrightarrow y_1 = u_0,$$

we have the same contradiction as previously. In consequence, $(y_{l-2}, y_0) \in A(D)$. In addition, since $y_0 \in \mathcal{A}$ and $y_1 = u_0 \notin \mathcal{A}$, there exists the arc $(u_0, u_1) \in A(D)$ (otherwise, $(u_1, u_0) \in A(D)$ yielding the same contradiction as before). Then the directed cycle

$$\vec{C}_4 \cong (y_1 = u_0, u_1, y_{l-2}, y_0, y_1 = u_0)$$

is monochromatic and there exists a monochromatic $u_1 \rightsquigarrow u_0$, the same contradiction once more.

CASE 2. $j = l - 1$. In this case, there exists the directed path $u_1 \rightarrow y_{l-1} \rightarrow y_0$. So, $y_0 \neq u_0$, otherwise we have a contradiction, γ has a symmetric arc between u_0 and u_1 . Hence $y_1 = u_0$ and since $y_0 \in \mathcal{A}$ by Claim 2, $y_1 = u_0 \notin \mathcal{A}$. Thus, there exists an arc between u_0 and u_1 which should be $(u_0, u_1) \in A(D)$ (if not, $(u_1, u_0) \in A(D)$ and we have a contradiction). Therefore the directed cycle

$$\vec{C}_4 \cong (y_1 = u_0, u_1, y_{l-1}, y_0, y_1 = u_0)$$

is monochromatic and there exists a monochromatic $u_1 \rightsquigarrow u_0$, the same contradiction once more.

This concludes the proof of the theorem. \square

In a very similar way as the proofs of the above theorems, we can show the following theorem for semicomplete bipartite digraphs.

Theorem 4.4. *Let D be an m -colored semicomplete bipartite digraph and $k = 2$ (resp. $k = 3$). If every $\vec{C}_4 \uparrow\uparrow \vec{C}_4$ contained in D is at most 2-colored (resp. 3-colored), then D has a 2-colored (resp. 3-colored) kernel.*

We summarize the known results on the existence of k -colored kernels for m -colored semicomplete multipartite digraphs and multipartite tournaments in the next two corollaries.

Corollary 4.5. *Let D be an m -colored semicomplete r -partite digraph and $r \geq 2$.*

- (i) *If $r \geq 3$, $k = 2$ and every \vec{C}_3 and \vec{C}_4 contained in D is monochromatic, then D has a 2-colored kernel (Theorem 4.3).*
- (ii) *If $r \geq 3$, $k = 3$ and every \vec{C}_4 contained in D is at most 2-colored and, either every \vec{C}_5 contained in D is at most 3-colored or every $\vec{C}_3 \uparrow \vec{C}_3$ contained in D is at most 2-colored, then D has a 3-colored kernel (Theorem 4.2).*
- (iii) *If $r \geq 2$ and $k \geq 4$, then D has a k -colored kernel (Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 14 of [7]).*
- (iv) *If $r = 2$, $k = 2$ (resp. $k = 3$) and every $\vec{C}_4 \uparrow\uparrow \vec{C}_4$ contained in D is at most 2-colored, then D has a 2-colored (resp. 3-colored) kernel (Theorem 4.4).*

Corollary 4.6. *Let D be an m -colored r -partite tournament with $r \geq 2$. Then the conclusions (i)–(iv) of Corollary 4.5 remain valid. Moreover,*

- (i) *if $r = 2$, $k = 1$ and every \vec{C}_4 contained in D is monochromatic, then D has a 1-colored kernel (Theorem 2.1 of [8]), and*
- (ii) *if $r \geq 3$, $k = 1$ and every \vec{C}_3 and \vec{C}_4 contained in D is monochromatic, then D has a 1-colored kernel (Theorem 3.3 of [9]).*

We conclude this paper with the following challenging conjecture. If it were true, the resulting theorem would be a fine generalization of Theorem 3.3 proved in [9].

Conjecture 4.7. *Let D be an m -colored semicomplete r -partite digraph with $r \geq 2$. If every \vec{C}_3 and \vec{C}_4 contained in D is monochromatic, then D has a 1-colored kernel.*

References

References

- [1] J. Bang-Jensen, The structure of strong arc-locally semicomplete digraphs, *Discrete Math.* 283 (2004), no. 1-3, 1-6.
- [2] J. Bang-Jensen and G. Gutin, *Digraphs: Theory, algorithms and applications*. Second edition. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag London, Ltd., London, 2009.
- [3] P. Duchet, Graphes noyau-parfaits. (French) *Combinatorics* 79 (Proc. Colloq., Univ. Montréal, Montreal, Que., 1979), Part II. *Ann. Discrete Math.* 9 (1980), 93–101.
- [4] H. Galeana-Sánchez, On monochromatic paths and monochromatic cycles in edge colored tournaments, *Discrete Math.* 156 (1996) 103-112.
- [5] H. Galeana-Sánchez, Kernels in edge-colored digraphs, *Discrete Math.* 184 (1998) 87-99.
- [6] H. Galeana-Sánchez, B. Llano, and J. J. Montellano-Ballesteros, Kernels by monochromatic paths in m -colored unions of quasi-transitive digraphs. *Discrete Appl. Math.* 158 (2010), no. 5, 461–466.
- [7] H. Galeana-Sánchez, B. Llano and J. J. Montellano-Ballesteros, k -colored kernels (submitted, arXiv:1201.2712).
- [8] H. Galeana-Sánchez and R. Rojas-Monroy, On monochromatic paths and monochromatic 4-cycles in bipartite tournaments, *Discrete Math.* 285 (2004), no. 1-3, 313-318.
- [9] H. Galeana-Sánchez and R. Rojas-Monroy, Monochromatic paths and monochromatic cycles in edge-colored k -partite tournaments, *Ars Combin.* 97A (2010) 351-365.
- [10] L. A. Martínez Chigo, Trayectorias monocromáticas en digráficas m -coloreadas (Monochromatic paths in m -colored digraphs), Bachelor Thesis tutored by J. J. Montellano-Ballesteros, UNAM, 2010.
- [11] B. Sands, N. Sauer and R. Woodrow, On monochromatic paths in edge-colored digraphs, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* 33 (1982) 271-275.
- [12] M. G. Shen, On monochromatic paths in m -colored tournaments, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* 45 (1988) 108-111.
- [13] I. Włoch, On kernels by monochromatic paths in the corona of digraphs, *Cent. Eur. J. Math.* 6 (2008), no. 4, 537–542.