H-kernels in *H*-colored digraphs without (ξ_1, ξ, ξ_2) -*H*-subdivisions of \overrightarrow{C}_3

Felipe Hernández-Lorenzana and Rocío Sánchez-López

Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México,

Círcuito Exterior s/n, Coyoacán, Ciudad Universitaria, 04510,

Ciudad de México, CDMX

Abstract

Let *H* be a digraph possibly with loops and *D* a digraph without loops with a coloring of its arcs $c : A(D) \rightarrow V(H)$ (*D* is said to be an *H*-colored digraph). A directed path *W* in *D* is said to be an *H*-path if and only if the consecutive colors encountered on *W* form a directed walk in *H*. A subset *N* of vertices of *D* is said to be an *H*-kernel if (1) for every pair of different vertices in *N* there is no *H*-path between them and (2) for every vertex u in $V(D)\setminus N$ there exists an *H*-path in *D* from u to *N*. Under this definition an *H*-kernel is a kernel whenever $A(H) = \emptyset$.

The color-class digraph $\mathscr{C}_{C}(D)$ of D is the digraph whose vertices are the colors represented in the arcs of D and $(i,j) \in A(\mathscr{C}_{C}(D))$ if and only if there exist two arcs, namely (u,v) and (v,w) in D, such that (u,v) has color i and (v,w) has color j. Since not every H-colored digraph has an H-kernel and $V(\mathscr{C}_{C}(D)) = V(H)$, the natural question is: what structural properties of $\mathscr{C}_{C}(D)$, with respect to the H-coloring, imply that D has an H-kernel? In this paper we investigate the problem of the existence of an H-kernel by means of a partition ξ of V(H) and a partition $\{\xi_1, \xi_2\}$ of ξ . We establish conditions on the directed cycles and the directed paths of the digraph D, with respect to the partition $\{\xi_1, \xi_2\}$. In particular we pay attention to some subestructures produced by the partitions ξ and $\{\xi_1, \xi_2\}$, namely (ξ_1, ξ, ξ_2) -H-subdivisions of $\overrightarrow{C_3}$ and (ξ_1, ξ, ξ_2) -H-subdivisions of $\overrightarrow{P_3}$. We give some examples which show that each hypothesis in the main result is tight.

Keywords: Kernel, Independent set, Absorbent set, H-kernel, kernel by properly colored paths

1 Introduction

For general concepts we refer the reader to [2]. For a digraph D, V(D) and A(D) will denote the sets of vertices and arcs of D, respectively. A directed walk is a sequence $W = (v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_n)$ such that $(v_i, v_{i+1}) \in A(D)$ for each i in $\{0, \ldots, n-1\}$. The number n is the length of the walk, denoted by l(W). A directed path is a directed walk (v_1, \ldots, v_n) such that $v_i \neq v_j$ for $i \neq j, \{i, j\} \subseteq \{0, \ldots, n\}$. The directed path (v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4) will be denoted by $\overrightarrow{P_3}$. A directed cycle is a directed walk (v_1, \ldots, v_n, v_1) such that $v_i \neq v_j$ for $i \neq j, \{i, j\}$ $\subseteq \{0, \ldots, n\}$. The directed cycle (v_1, v_2, v_3, v_1) will be denoted by $\overrightarrow{C_3}$. If D is an infinite digraph, an infinite outward path is an infinite sequence (v_1, v_2, \ldots) of different vertices of D such that $(v_i, v_{i+1}) \in A(D)$ for each i in \mathbb{N} . In this paper we are going to write walk, path, cycle instead of directed walk, directed path, directed cycle, respectively. A digraph D is acyclic if it has no cycle. The union of walks will be denoted with \cup . Let $W = (v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_n)$ be a walk and $\{v_i, v_j\} \subseteq V(W)$, with i < j. The $v_i v_j$ -walk $(v_i, v_{i+1}, \ldots, v_{j-1}, v_j)$ contained in W will be denoted by (v_i, W, v_j) .

For an arc (u,v) the first vertex u is its *tail* and the second vertex v is its *head*. For a vertex v, the *out-degree* is the number of arcs, except for loops, with tail v, which is denoted by $d^+(v)$.

For $S \subseteq V(D)$ the subdigraph of D induced by S, denoted by D[S], is the digraph such that V(D[S]) = S and $A(D[S]) = \{(u, v) \in A(D) : \{u, v\} \subseteq S\}$. For $A \subseteq A(D)$ the subdigraph of D induced by A, denoted by D[A], is the digraph such that $V(D[A]) = \{v : v \text{ is either the tail or the head of an arc <math>a$ for some a in $A\}$ and its arc set is A. We shall say that a subset S of V(D) is independent if D[S] has no arcs. A digraph D is a bipartite digraph if there exists a partition $\{V_1, V_2\}$ of V(D) such that $D[V_i]$ is an independent set for each i in $\{1, 2\}$. Let $R_1 = \{S : S \text{ is a subset of } V(D)\}$ and $R_2 = \{T : T \text{ is a subset of } V(D)\}$ two family sets; an R_1R_2 -arc is an arc (u, v) of D such that $u \in S$ for some S in R_1 and $v \in T$ for some T in R_2 . A pair of digraphs D and G are isomorphic if there exists a bijection $f : V(D) \to V(G)$ such that $(x,y) \in A(D)$ if and only if $(f(x), f(y)) \in A(G)$ (f will be called isomorphism). We will say that a digraph D is complete if for every pair of different vertices u and v in V(D) it holds that $\{(u, v), (v, u)\} \subseteq A(D)$. A digraph D is transitive whenever $\{(u, v), (v, w)\} \subseteq A(D)$ implies that $(u, w) \in A(D)$.

A digraph D is said to be *m*-colored if the arcs of D are colored with *m* colors. A chromatic class of D is the set of arcs of a same color. We say that a chromatic class C is transitive if D[C] is a transitive digraph. A path is called *monochromatic* if all of its arcs are colored alike. A path P is called *properly colored* if consecutive arcs in P have different color. A path is called *rainbow* if all arcs have distinct colors. For an arc (z_1, z_2) of D

we will denote by $c(z_1, z_2)$ its color.

Reachability is a topic widely studyed due to its applications. A number of variants of this concept have appeared in the last decades, for example, reachability by monochromatic paths, by rainbow paths, or by properly colored paths. For every notion of reachability, notions of independence and absorbency can be defined, and thus, a notion of kernel too.

In [15] Sands, Sauer and Woodrow prove that every digraph whose arcs are colored with two colors, which has no monochromatic infinite outward path, contains a set S of vertices such that, no two vertices of S are connected by a monochromatic directed path, and for every vertex x not in S there is a monochromatic directed path from x to a vertex in S. In [13] Linek and Sands generalize the notion of monochromatic path in the following way: let H be a digraph, possibly with loops, and D a digraph without loops; an H-arc coloring of Dis a function $c: A(D) \to V(H)$. D is said to be H-colored if D has an H-arc coloring. A path $W = (v_0, \ldots, v_n)$ in D is said to be an H-path if and only if $(c(v_0, v_1), \ldots, c(v_{n-1}, v_n))$ is a walk in H. In [1] Arpin and Linek show an extension of the concept of H-path and they define H-walk as a walk $W = (v_0, \ldots, v_n)$ such that $(c(v_0, v_1), \ldots, c(v_{n-1}, v_n))$ is a walk in H. We consider that an arc is an H-walk, that is, a singleton vertex is a walk in H. In [1] Arpin and Linek, in particular, make inroads in the classification of \mathscr{B}_3 (the class of all Hsuch that any multidigraph D arc-colored with the vertices of H has a set S of vertices such that (1) there is no H-walk between any two distinct vertices of S (S is H-independent by walks) and (2) for every x in $V(D) \setminus S$ there is an H-walk from x to some point of S (S is H-absorbent by walks). Let S be a subset of V(D), S is said to be H-kernel by walks if S is both H-absorbent by walks and H-independent by walks.

Since not every uv-H-walk contains a uv-H-path and the concatenation of two H-walks is an H-walk, in [6] Galeana-Sánchez and Delgado-Escalante introduce the concept of H-kernel in a digraph D as a subset S of V(D) which is both H-absorbent (for every x in $V(D) \setminus S$ there is an H-path from x to some point of S) and H-independent (there is no H-path between any two distinct vertices of S).

It follows from the definition of *H*-kernel that: when $A(H) = \emptyset$, an *H*-kernel is a *kernel*; when $A(H) = \{(u, u) : u \in V(H)\}$, an *H*-kernel is a *kernel by monochromatic paths* (mp-kernel); when *H* has no loops, an *H*-kernel is a *kernel by properly colored paths* (PCP-kernel) and when *H* has no cycles, an *H*-kernel is a *kernel by rainbow paths*. In each of these special cases for *H*, sufficient conditions have been established in order to guarantee the existence of *H*-kernels, see for example [3], [5], [12], [14], [15].

In [4] we find that it is NP-complete to recognize whether a digraph has a kernel. In [7] the authors prove that the problem of determining whether an H-colored digraph has a kernel by H-walks is in NP. In [3] we find that (1) it is NP-hard to recognize whether an arc-colored digraph has a PCP-kernel and (2) it is NP-hard to recognize whether an arc-colored digraph has a kernel by rainbow paths. Due to the difficulty of finding kernels, mp-kernels, alternating kernels and kernels by rainbow paths in arc-colored digraphs, sufficient conditions for the existence of each of these H-kernels in arc-colored digraphs have been obtained mainly by study special classes of digraphs.

An interesting digraph associated with an arc-colored digraph D is the *color-class digraph*, $\mathscr{C}_C(D)$, which is defined as the digraph whose vertices are the colors represented in the arcs of D and $(i, j) \in A(\mathscr{C}_C(D))$ if and only if there exist two arcs, namely (u,v) and (v,w) in D, such that (u,v) has color i and (v,w) has color j(notice that $\mathscr{C}_C(D)$ can have loops by definition). With this associated digraph, Galeana-Sánchez obtained an extension of Sands, Sauer and Woodrow's theorem in [10], for the finite case, as follows.

Theorem 1. [10] Let D be a finite m-colored digraph. If $\mathscr{C}_C(D)$ is a bipartite digraph, then D has an mp-kernel.

Notice that in [10] Galeana-Sánchez work with a partition of $V(\mathscr{C}_C(D))$ into two independent sets. Since an H-kernel is an mp-kernel whener $A(H) = \{(u, u) : u \in V(H)\}$, we can say that Galeana-Sánchez work with a partition of V(H) which holds a property with respect to the digraph $\mathscr{C}_C(D)$. In [8], [9] and [11] we also find that the authors work with a partitions of V(H) in order to guarantee the existence of mp-kernels.

The results in [8], [9], [10] and [11] motivate us to continue with the study of the existence of *H*-kernels by means of a partition of V(H). In this paper we work with a partition of V(H), say ξ , and with a partition $\{\xi_1, \xi_2\}$ of ξ which satisfy certain properties. In order to show those properties, we need more definitions.

Let *H* be a digraph and *D* an *H*-colored digraph. We will say that *D* is *transitive by H-paths* if the existence of an *xy*-*H*-path and the existence of a *yz*-*H*-path in *D* imply that there exists an *xz*-*H*-path in *D*. Let (v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_n) be a walk in *D*; we say that there is an *H*-obstruction on v_i if $(c(v_{i-1}, v_i), c(v_i, v_{i+1})) \notin A(H)$ (if $v_0 = v_n$ we take indices modulo *n*). Let ξ be a partition of V(H) and $\{\xi_1, \xi_2\}$ a partition of ξ . D_i is the spanning subdigraph of *D* such that $A(D_i) = \{a \in A(D) : c(a) \in C \text{ for some } C \text{ in } \xi_i\}$ for every *i* in $\{1, 2\}$.

Let $W = (u_0, \ldots, u_l = v_0, \ldots, v_m = w_0, \ldots, w_n = u_0)$ be a cycle, we say that W is a (ξ_1, ξ, ξ_2) -H-subdivision of $\overrightarrow{C_3}$ if $T_1 = (u_0, W, u_l)$ is an H-path contained in D_1 , $T_2 = (v_0, W, v_m)$ is an H-path contained in D and $T_3 = (w_0, W, w_n)$ is an H-path contained in D_2 , where there are H-obstructions on u_0, v_0 and w_0 with respect to W.

Let $P = (u_0, \ldots, u_l = v_0, \ldots, v_m = w_0, \ldots, w_n)$ be a path, we say that P is a (ξ_1, ξ, ξ_2) -H-subdivision of $\overrightarrow{P_3}$ if $T_1 = (u_0, P, u_l)$ is an H-path contained in $D_1, T_2 = (v_0, P, v_m)$ is an H-path contained in D and $T_3 = (w_0, P, w_n)$

is an H-path contained in D_2 , where there are H-obstructions on v_0 and w_0 with respect to P.

The main result is the following:

Let *H* be a digraph possibly with loops and *D* an *H*-colored digraph without isolated vertices. Let $\xi = \{C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_k\}$ $(k \ge 2)$ be a partition of V(H) such that every *i* in $\{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$ holds that $G_i = D[\{a \in A(D) : c(a) \in C_i\}]$ is a subdigraph of *D* which is transitive by *H*-paths in *D*, suppose that $\{a \in A(D) : c(a) \in C_i\} \ne \emptyset$. Let $\{\xi_1, \xi_2\}$ be a partition of ξ . Suppose that

- 1. for every *i* in $\{1, 2\}$ and for every cycle γ contained in D_i there exists C_m in ξ_i such that γ is contained in G_m ,
- 2. for every *i* in $\{1, 2\}$ and for every *H*-walk *P* contained in D_i there exists $C_{m'}$ in ξ_i such that *P* is contained in $G_{m'}$,
- 3. if either there exists a $\xi_1\xi_2$ -arc or there exists a $\xi_2\xi_1$ -arc in $A(\mathscr{C}_C(D))$, say (a,b), then $(a,b) \notin A(H)$,
- 4. *D* does not contain a (ξ_1, ξ, ξ_2) -*H*-subdivision of $\overrightarrow{C_3}$,
- 5. if there exists a *ux*-path which is a (ξ_1, ξ, ξ_2) -*H*-subdivision of $\overrightarrow{P_3}$, for some subset $\{u, x\}$ of V(D), then there exists a *ux*-*H*-path in *D*.

Then D has an H-kernel.

We will see that Theorem 1 and the main result in [8] are direct consequences of the main result of this paper and we deduce some results that show the existence of kernels by properly colored paths and kernels by rainbow paths. We finish with some examples which show that each hypothesis in the main result is tight.

We need the following results.

Proposition 1 ([2]). Every acyclic digraph has a vertex v such that $d^+(v) = 0$.

Proposition 2. Every closed walk contains a cycle.

If every induced subdigraph of D has a kernel, D is said to be a *kernel perfect digraph*. Among the classical results on the theory of kernels we have the following theorem.

Theorem 2 ([14]). Every acyclic digraph has a kernel.

2 Previous results

Since every isolated vertex in D is in every H-kernel of D, in this paper we suppose that D has no isolated vertices.

From now on H is a finite digraph possibly with loops, D is a finite H-colored digraph without loops and $\xi = \{C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_k\}$ $(k \ge 2)$ is a partition of V(H) such that for every i in $\{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$ we have that $\{a \in A(D) : c(a) \in C_i\} \neq \emptyset$ and $G_i = D[\{a \in A(D) : c(a) \in C_i\}]$ is a subdigraph of D which is transitive by H-paths in D. Notice that $\{\{a \in A(D) : c(a) \in C_i\} : i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, k\}\}$ is a partition of A(D).

Lemma 1. Let H be a digraph, D an H-colored digraph, l in $\{1, 2, ..., k\}$ and $(x_0, x_1, ..., x_{n-1})$ a sequence of $n \ge 2$ vertices, different by pairs. If for each i in $\{1, 2, ..., n-1\}$ we have that there exists an $x_{i-1}x_i$ -H-path in G_l , then for each m in $\{1, 2, ..., n-1\}$ there exists an x_0x_m -H-path contained in G_l .

Proof. We proceed by induction on n.

If n = 2, then for the sequence (x_0, x_1) we have by hypothesis that there exists an x_0x_1 -H-path contained in G_l .

Suppose that if $(y_0, y_1, \ldots, y_{m-1})$ is a sequence of m vertices, with $2 \le m < n$, that satisfies the hypothesis of Lemma 1, then for every m' in $\{1, 2, \ldots, m-1\}$ there exists a $y_0y_{m'}$ -H-path contained in G_l .

Let $(x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_{n-1})$ be a sequence of n vertices, with $n \ge 3$, which satisfies the hypothesis of Lemma 1. It follows from the induction hypothesis on the sequence $(x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_{n-2})$ that for every m' in $\{1, 2, \ldots, n-2\}$ there exists an $x_0x_{m'}$ -H-path $T_{m'}$ which is contained in G_l . On the other hand, let T be an $x_{n-2}x_{n-1}$ -H-path which is contained in G_l (T there exists by hypothesis) and let T_{n-2} be the x_0x_{n-2} -H-path which is also contained in G_l . Since G_l is transitive by H-paths, we get that there exists an x_0x_{n-1} -H-path in G_l . Therefore, for every m' in $\{1, 2, \ldots, n-1\}$ there exists an $x_0x_{m'}$ -H-path contained in G_l .

Definition 1. Let H be a digraph, D an H-colored digraph and S a subset of V(D). We say that S is an H-semikernel if S satisfies the following:

1. S is an H-independent set in D.

2. For every z in $V(D) \setminus S$, if there exists a Sz-H-path in D, then there exists a zS-H-path in D.

Lemma 2. Let H be a digraph, D an H-colored digraph and r in $\{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$. Then

- 1. There exists no a sequence of vertices (x_0, x_1, x_2, \ldots) such that for every i in $\{0, 1, 2, \ldots\}$ there exists an $x_i x_{i+1}$ -H-path in G_r and there exists no an $x_{i+1} x_i$ -H-path in G_r .
- 2. There exists x_0 in $V(G_r)$ such that $\{x_0\}$ is an H-semikernel of G_r .
- *Proof.* 1. Proceeding by contradiction, suppose that there exists a sequence of vertices (x_0, x_1, \ldots) such that for every i in $\{0, 1, 2, \ldots\}$ there exists an $x_i x_{i+1}$ -H-path in G_r and there exists no an $x_{i+1} x_i$ -H-path in G_r . Since D is a finite digraph, we get that there exists a subset $\{i, j\}$ of $\{0, 1, 2, \ldots\}$, with i < j, such that $x_i = x_j$. Let $j_0 = \min\{j \in \mathbb{N} : x_j = x_i \text{ for some } i < j\}$ be and i_0 in $\{0, 1, \ldots, j_0 - 1\}$ such that $x_{i_0} = x_{j_0}$. Notice that it follows from the choice of j_0 that $(x_{i_0}, x_{i_0+1}, \ldots, x_{j_0-1})$ is a sequence of vertices, different by pairs. Suppose without loss of generality that $i_0 = 0$, $j_0 = n$, then $(x_0, x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{n-1})$ is a sequence of $n \ge 2$ vertices, different by pairs, such that for each i in $\{0, 1, \ldots, n-1\}$ we have that there exists an $x_i x_{i+1}$ -H-path in G_r and there exists no an $x_{i+1} x_i$ -H-path in G_r . For each i in $\{0, 1, \ldots, n-1\}$ let T_i be an $x_i x_{i+1}$ -H-path in G_r (indices modulo n), then we get from Lemma 1 that there exists an $x_0 x_{n-1}$ -H-path contained in G_r ; that is, there exists an $x_n x_{n-1}$ -H-path contained in G_r which is not possible.
 - 2. Proceeding by contradiction, suppose that for each x in $V(G_r)$, $\{x\}$ is not an H-semikernel of G_r ; that is, for every x in $V(G_r)$ there exists y in $V(G_r) \setminus \{x\}$ such that there exists an xy-H-path contained in G_r and there exists no a yx-H-path in G_r . Therefore, for every n in N we have that given x_n in $V(G_r)$ there exists x_{n+1} in $V(G_r) \setminus \{x_n\}$ such that there exists an $x_n x_{n+1}$ -H-path in G_r and there exists no an $x_{n+1}x_n$ -H-path in G_r which implies that (x_0, x_1, x_2, \ldots) is a sequence of vertices that contradicts (1).

Lemma 3. Let H be a digraph and D an H-colored digraph. Suppose that

1. For every cycle γ in D there exists i in $\{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ such that γ is contained in G_i .

2. For every H-walk P in D there exists j in $\{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$ such that P is contained in G_j .

If $S = (u_0, u_1, \ldots, u_{n-1})$ is a sequence of $n \geq 2$ vertices, different by pairs, such that for every i in $\{0, 1, \ldots, n-1\}$ there exists a $u_i u_{i+1}$ -H-path in D, say T_i , then there exists j in $\{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$ such that $\bigcup_{i=1}^{n-1} T_i$ is contained in G_i (indices modulo n).

Proof. We proceed by induction on n, the number of vertices in S.

If n = 2, then $T_0 \cup T_1$ is a closed walk which contains a cycle γ (by Proposition 2). It follows from hypothesis (1) that there exists j in $\{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$ such that γ is contained in G_j . On the other hand, let $\{i_0, i_1\}$ be a subset of $\{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$ such that T_0 is contained in G_{i_0} and T_1 is contained in G_{i_1} (by hypothesis (2)). Since γ contains arcs of T_0 and T_1 we get that $i_0 = j = i_1$ which implies that $T_0 \cup T_1$ is contained in G_j .

Suppose that if $S' = (u_0, u_1, \ldots, u_{l-1})$ is a sequence of l vertices, different by pairs, with $n-1 \ge l \ge 2$, such that for every i in $\{0, 1, \ldots, n-1\}$ there exists a $u_i u_{i+1}$ -H-path in D, say T'_i , then there exists j in $\{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$ such that $\bigcup_{i=1}^{l-1} T'_i$ is contained in G_j .

Let $S = (u_0, u_1, \ldots, u_{n-1})$ be a sequence of n vertices which satisfies the hypothesis of Lema 3. From hypothesis (2) we get that for every i in $\{0, 1, \ldots, n-1\}$ there exists i' in $\{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$ such that T_i is contained in $G_{i'}$.

Consider two cases:

Case 1. There exists i in $\{0, 1, ..., n-1\}$ such that u_i is not an H-obstruction in $\bigcup_{i=0}^{n-1} T_i$.

Suppose without loss of generality that u_1 is not an H-obstruction in $\bigcup_{i=1}^{n-1} T_i$. Then $T_0 \cup T_1$ is a u_0u_2 -H-walk in D which implies that there exists m in $\{1, 2, ..., k\}$ such that $T_0 \cup T_1$ is contained in G_m (by hypothesis

(2)). Since G_m is transitive by H-paths and both T_0 and T_1 are contained in G_m it follows that there exists a u_0u_2 -H-path T in G_m . Consider the sequence $S' = (u_0, u_2, u_3, \ldots, u_{n-1})$, which is a sequence that satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 3 and so it follows from the induction hypothesis that there exists l in $\{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$ such that $T \cup T_2 \cup T_3 \cup \ldots \cup T_{n-1}$ is contained in G_l and since T is contained in G_m we have that m = l. Therefore, $\bigcup T_i$ is contained in G_m .

i=0

Case 2. For every *i* in $\{0, 1, ..., n-1\}$ we have that u_i is an *H*-obstruction in $\bigcup_{i=0}^{n-1} T_j$.

Consider two subcases.

Case 2.1. $(V(T_i) - \{u_{i+1}\}) \cap V(T_{i+1}) \neq \emptyset$ for some *i* in $\{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$.

Let v be a vertex in $(V(T_i) - \{u_{i+1}\}) \cap V(T_{i+1})$, then $(v, T_i, u_{i+1}) \cup (u_{i+1}, T_{i+1}, v)$ is a closed walk which contains a cycle γ (by Proposition 2). It follows from hypothesis (1) that there exists m in $\{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$ such that γ is contained in G_m and since γ contains arcs of both T_i and T_{i+1} it follows that T_i and T_{i+1} are contained in G_m ; that is, i' = m = (i+1)'. Because of that G_m is transitive by H-paths it follows that there exists a $u_i u_{i+2}$ -H-path T contained in G_m . Therefore, since $S' = (u_0, u_1, \dots, u_i, u_{i+2}, \dots, u_{n-1})$ is a sequence which holds the hypotheses of Lemma 3 we get from induction hypothesis that there exists l in $\{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$ such that
$$\begin{split} T_0 \cup T_1 \cup \ldots \cup T_{i-1} \cup T \cup T_{i+2} \cup \ldots \cup T_{n-1} \text{ is contained in } G_l. & \text{Since } T \text{ is contained in } G_m \text{ we get that } m = l. \\ & \text{Therefore, } \bigcup_{i=0}^{n-1} T_i \text{ is contained in } G_m. \\ & \text{Case } 2.2. & (V(T_i) - \{u_{i+1}\}) \cap V(T_{i+1}) = \emptyset \text{ for every } i \text{ in } \{0, 1, \ldots, n-1\}. \\ & \text{If } V(T_i) \cap V(T_j) = \emptyset \text{ for every subset } \{i, j\} \text{ of } \{1, 2, \ldots, k\} \text{ such that } |i-j| \ge 2, \text{ then } \bigcup_{i=0}^{n-1} T_i \text{ is a cycle and } I_j \text{ of } \{1, 2, \ldots, k\} \text{ such that } |i-j| \ge 2, \text{ then } \bigcup_{i=0}^{n-1} T_i \text{ is a cycle and } I_j \text{ of } \{1, 2, \ldots, k\} \text{ such that } |i-j| \ge 2, \text{ then } \bigcup_{i=0}^{n-1} T_i \text{ is a cycle and } I_j \text{ of } \{1, 2, \ldots, k\} \text{ such that } |i-j| \ge 2, \text{ then } \bigcup_{i=0}^{n-1} T_i \text{ of } I_j \text{ of } I_j$$

by hypothesis (1) we get that there exists m in $\{1, 2, ..., k\}$ such that $\bigcup_{i=0}^{n-1} T_i$ is contained in G_m . Suppose that $V(T_i) \cap V(T_j) \neq \emptyset$ for some subset $\{i, j\}$ of $\{1, 2, ..., k\}$ with $|i - j| \ge 2$. Assume without loss of generality that i < j and let v be a vertex in $V(T_i) \cap V(T_j)$.

If $v = u_i$, then consider the H-paths $T'_j = (u_j, T_j, v = u_i)$ and $T''_j = (v = u_i, T_j, u_{j+1})$ such that $T'_j \cup T''_j = T_j$. Since the sequences $S' = (u_i = v, u_{j+1}, u_{j+2}, \dots, u_{n-1}, u_0, u_1, \dots, u_{i-1})$ and $S'' = (u_i = v, u_{i+1}, u_{i+2}, \dots, u_{j-1}, u_j)$ hold the induction hypothesis we get that there exist r and s in $\{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ such that $T''_j \cup (\bigcup_{m=j+1}^{i-1} T_m) \cup (\bigcup_{m=0}^{i-1} T_m)$ is contained in G_r and $(\bigcup_{m=i}^{j-1} T_m) \cup T'_j$ is contained in G_s . Since $\{\{a \in A(D) : c(a) \in C_i\} : i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}\}$ is a partition of A(D) it follows that r = j' = s (recall that T_j is contained in $G_{j'}$). Therefore, $\bigcup_{i=1}^{n-1} T_m$ is contained in G_s . If $v = u_{i+1}$, then consider the *H*-paths $T'_j = (u_j, T_j, v = u_{i+1})$ and $T''_j = (v = u_{i+1}, T_j, u_{j+1})$ such that $T'_j \cup T''_j = T_j$. It follows from the induction hypothesis on the two sequences $S' = (u_{i+1} = v, u_{j+1}, u_{j+2}, \dots, u_{n-1}, u_0, u_1, \dots, u_i)$ and $S'' = (u_{i+1} = v, u_{i+2}, \dots, u_{j-1}, u_j)$ that there exist r and s in $\{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ such that $T''_j \cup (\bigcup_{m=i+1}^{n-1} T_m) \cup (\bigcup_{m=i+1}^$

 $(\bigcup_{m=0}^{i} T_m)$ is contained in G_r and $(\bigcup_{m=i+1}^{j-1} T_m) \cup T'_j$ is contained in G_s . Notice that r = j' = s which implies that $\bigcup^{n-1} T_m$ is contained in G_s .

 $\begin{array}{l} {}^{m=0} \\ If \ v = u_j, \ then \ we \ can \ consider \ the \ H-paths \ T'_i = (u_i, T_i, v = u_j) \ and \ T''_i = (v = u_j, T_i, u_{i+1}) \ (notice \ that \ T'_i \cup T''_i = T_i). \ Since \ the \ sequences \ S' = (u_j = v, u_{i+1}, u_{i+2}, \dots, u_{j-1}) \ and \ S'' = (u_j = v, u_{j+1}, \dots, u_{n-1}, u_0, u_1, \dots, u_i) \ due \ S''_i = (u_i = v, u_{i+1}, u_{i+2}, \dots, u_{j-1}) \ and \ S'' = (u_i = v, u_{j+1}, \dots, u_{n-1}, u_0, u_1, \dots, u_i) \ due \ S''_i = (u_i = v, u_{i+1}, u_{i+2}, \dots, u_{j-1}) \ due \ S''_i = (u_i = v, u_{j+1}, \dots, u_{n-1}, u_{n-1}$ hold the induction hypothesis we get that there exist r and s in $\{1, 2, ..., k\}$ such that $T''_i \cup (\bigcup_{m=i+1}^{j-1} T_m)$ is contained in G_r and $(\bigcup_{m=j}^{n-1} T_m) \cup (\bigcup_{m=0}^{i-1} T_m) \cup T'_i$ is contained in G_s . Because of that r = i' = s it follows that $\bigcup_{m=0}^{n-1} T_m$ is contained in G_s .

If $v = u_{j+1}$, then consider the *H*-paths $T'_i = (u_i, T_i, v = u_{j+1})$ and $T''_i = (v = u_{j+1}, T_i, u_{i+1})$ such that $T'_i \cup T''_i = T_i$. Since the sequences $S' = (u_{j+1} = v, u_{i+1}, u_{i+2}, \dots, u_j)$ and $S'' = (u_{j+1} = v, u_{j+2}, \dots, u_{n-1}, u_0, u_1, \dots, u_i)$ hold the induction hypothesis it follows that there exist r and s in $\{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ such that $T''_i \cup (\bigcup_{m=i+1}^j T_m)$ is contained in G_r and $(\bigcup_{m=j+1}^{n-1} T_m) \cup (\bigcup_{m=0}^{i-1} T_m) \cup T'_i$ is contained in G_s . Because of that r = i' = s we get that $\bigcup_{m=0}^{n-1} T_m$ is contained in G_s . is contained in G_s .

Suppose that $v \notin \{u_i, u_{i+1}, u_j, u_{j+1}\}$, then consider the *H*-paths $T'_i = (u_i, T_i, v)$, $T''_i = (v, T_i, u_{i+1})$, $T'_j = (u_j, T_j, v)$, $T''_j = (v, T_j, u_{j+1})$ such that $T'_i \cup T''_i = T_i$ and $T'_j \cup T''_j = T_j$. Since the sequences $S' = (v, u_{i+1}, u_{i+2}, \ldots, u_j)$ and $S'' = (v, u_{j+1}, u_{j+2}, \ldots, u_{n-1}, u_0, u_1, \ldots, u_i)$ hold the induction hypothesis we get that there exist rand s in $\{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$ such that $T''_i \cup (\bigcup_{m=i+1}^{j-1} T_m) \cup T'_j$ is contained in G_r and $T''_j \cup (\bigcup_{m=j+1}^{n-1} T_m) \cup (\bigcup_{m=0}^{i-1} T_m) \cup T'_i$ is contained in G_s . Since $\{\{a \in A(D) : c(a) \in C_i\} : i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, k\}\}$ is a partition of A(D) it follows that r = i' = j' = s (recall that T_j is contained in $G_{j'}$ and T_i is contained in $G_{i'}$) which implies that $\bigcup_{i=1}^{n-1} T_m$ is contained in G_s .

Therefore, we conclude from Cases 1 and 2 that there exists s in $\{1, 2, ..., k\}$ such that $\bigcup_{i=0}^{n-1} T_i$ is contained in G_s .

Lemma 4. Let H be a digraph and D an H-colored digraph. Suppose that

- 1. For every cycle γ in D there exists i in $\{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ such that γ is contained in G_i .
- 2. For every H-walk P in D there exists j in $\{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$ such that P is contained in G_j .

Then there exists no a sequence of vertices (x_0, x_1, x_2, \ldots) such that for every i in $\{0, 1, 2, \ldots\}$ there exists an $x_i x_{i+1}$ -H-path in D and there exists no an $x_{i+1} x_i$ -H-path in D.

Proof. Proceeding by contradiction, suppose that there exists a sequence of vertices (x_0, x_1, \ldots) such that for every i in $\{0, 1, 2, ...\}$ there exists an $x_i x_{i+1}$ -H-path in D and there exists no an $x_{i+1} x_i$ -H-path in D.

Since D is a finite digraph, we get that there exists a subset $\{i, j\}$ of $\{0, 1, 2, \ldots\}$, with i < j, such that $x_i = x_j$. Let $j_0 = \min\{j \in \mathbb{N} : x_j = x_i \text{ for some } i < j\}$ be and i_0 in $\{0, 1, \ldots, j_0 - 1\}$ such that $x_{i_0} = x_{j_0}$. Suppose without loss of generality that $i_0 = 0$, $j_0 = n$, then $(x_0, x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{n-1})$ is a sequence of $n \ge 2$ vertices, different by pairs, such that for each i in $\{0, 1, \ldots, n-1\}$ we have that there exists an $x_i x_{i+1}$ -H-path in D and there exists no an $x_{i+1}x_i$ -H-path in D. For each i in $\{0, 1, \ldots, n-1\}$ let T_i be an $x_i x_{i+1}$ -H-path in D (indices modulo n), then we get from Lemma 3 that there exists l in $\{1, \ldots, k\}$ such that $\bigcup_{m=0}^{n-1} T_m$ is contained in G_l , which implies that for each i in $\{0, 1, \ldots, n-1\}$ we have that T_i is contained in G_l . Therefore, $(x_0, x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{n-1}, x_n = x_0, x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{n-1}, \ldots)$ is a sequence of vertices that contradicts Lemma 2(1).

Lemma 5. Let H be a digraph and D an H-colored digraph. Suppose that

- 1. For every cycle γ in D there exists i in $\{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ such that γ is contained in G_i .
- 2. For every H-walk P in D there exists j in $\{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$ such that P is contained in G_j .

Then there exists x_0 in V(D) such that $\{x_0\}$ is an H-semikernel of D.

Proof. Proceeding by contradiction, suppose that for every x in V(D), $\{x\}$ is not an H-semikernel of D; that is, for every x in V(D) there exists y in $V(D) \setminus \{x\}$ such that there exists an xy-H-path in D and there exists no a yx-H-path in D. Therefore, for every n in \mathbb{N} we have that given x_n in V(D) there exists x_{n+1} in $V(D) \setminus \{x_n\}$ such that there exists an x_nx_{n+1} -H-path in D and there exists no an $x_{n+1}x_n$ -H-path in D which implies that (x_0, x_1, x_2, \ldots) is a sequence of vertices of D that contradicts Lemma 4.

Let *H* be a digraph and *D* an *H*-colored digraph. From now on $\{\xi_1, \xi_2\}$ will be a partition of ξ and for every *i* in $\{1, 2\}$ D_i will denote the spanning subdigraph of *D* such that $A(D_i) = \{a \in A(D) : c(a) \in C_j \text{ for some } C_j \text{ in } \xi_i\}$. Notice that for every *r* in $\{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$ G_r is a subdigraph of either D_1 or D_2 .

Let H be a digraph, D an H-colored digraph and S a subset of V(D). We will say that S is an H-semikernel modulo D_2 of D if

1. S is an H-independent set in D.

2. For z in $V(D) \setminus S$ if there exists a Sz-H-path contained in D_1 , then there exists a ZS-H-path in D.

Lemma 6. Let H be a digraph and D an H-colored digraph. Suppose that

- 1. For every i in $\{1,2\}$ and for every cycle γ contained in D_i there exists C_m in ξ_i such that γ is contained in G_m .
- 2. For every i in $\{1, 2\}$ and for every H-walk P contained in D_i there exists $C_{m'}$ in ξ_i such that P is contained in $G_{m'}$.

Then there exists x_0 in V(D) such that $\{x_0\}$ is an H-semikernel modulo D_2 of D.

Proof. If $\xi_1 = \{C_r\}$ for some r in $\{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$, then $A(G_r) = A(D_1)$ (by definition of D_1). Then, we get from Lemma 2 that there exists x_0 in $V(G_r)$ such that $\{x_0\}$ is an H-semikernel of G_r . Therefore, it follows from the definition of H-semikernel modulo D_2 that $\{x_0\}$ is an H-semikernel modulo D_2 of D.

Suppose that $|\xi_1| \ge 2$ and let H' be the digraph induced by $\bigcup_{C_m \in \xi_1} C_m$ in H, that is $H' = H[\bigcup_{C_m \in \xi_1} C_m]$.

Notice that D_1 is an H'-colored digraph and ξ_1 is a partition of V(H') such that for every C_i in ξ_1 it holds that $G_i = D_1[\{a \in A(D_1) : c(a) \in C_i\}] = D[\{a \in A(D) : c(a) \in C_i\}]$ is transitive by H'-paths in D_1 . Therefore, we get from hypotheses (1) and (2) and Lemma 5 that there exists x_0 in $V(D_1) = V(D)$ such that $\{x_0\}$ is an H-semikernel of D_1 . Thus, it follows from the definition of H-semikernel modulo D_2 that $\{x_0\}$ is an H-semikernel modulo D_2 of D.

Let $S = \{S \subseteq V(D) : S \text{ is a nonempty } H \text{-semikernel modulo } D_2 \text{ of } D\}.$

When $S \neq \emptyset$ we define the digraph D_S as follows: $V(D_S) = S$ and for S_1 and S_2 in S, with $S_1 \neq S_2$, we have that $(S_1, S_2) \in A(D_S)$ if and only if for every s_1 in S_1 there exists s_2 in S_2 such that either $s_1 = s_2$ or there exists a s_1s_2 -H-path contained in D_2 and there exists no a s_2s_1 -H-path contained in D.

Lemma 7. Let H be a digraph and D an H-colored digraph. Suppose that

- 1. For every i in $\{1,2\}$ and for every cycle γ contained in D_i there exists C_m in ξ_i such that γ is contained in G_m .
- 2. For every *i* in $\{1, 2\}$ and for every *H*-walk *P* contained in D_i there exists $C_{m'}$ in ξ_i such that *P* is contained in $G_{m'}$.

Then there exists the digraph $D_{\mathcal{S}}$ and it is is an acyclic digraph.

Proof. It follows from Lemma 6 that D has a nonempty H-semikernel modulo D_2 , which implies that $S \neq \emptyset$ and with this we can consider the digraph D_S .

Proceeding by contradiction, suppose that D_S contains a cycle, say $C = (S_0, S_1, \ldots, S_{n-1}, S_0)$, with $n \ge 2$. **Claim 1.** There exists i_0 in $\{0, 1, \ldots, n-1\}$ such that for some z in S_{i_0} we have that $z \notin S_{i_0+1}$ (indices modulo n).

Proceeding by contradiction, suppose that for each i in $\{0, 1, \ldots, n-1\}$ and for each z in S_i we have that $z \in S_{i+1}$, which implies that $S_0 \subseteq S_1 \subseteq S_2 \subseteq \ldots \subseteq S_{n-1} \subseteq S_0$ and therefore $S_i = S_j$ for every subset $\{i, j\}$ of $\{0, 1, \ldots, n-1\}$, with $i \neq j$, which contradicts that the length of C is at least two.

Claim 2. Let l_0 be an index in $\{0, 1, \ldots, n-1\}$. If for some z in S_{l_0} and for some w in S_{l_0+1} we have that there exists a zw-H-path in D, then there exists j_0 in $\{0, 1, \ldots, n-1\} \setminus \{l_0\}$ such that $w \in S_{j_0}$ and $w \notin S_{j_0+1}$ (indices modulo n).

Let z and w two vertices as in claim 2. Suppose without loss of generality that $l_0 = 0$. Observe that $w \notin S_n = S_0$ because there exists a zw-H-path in D, $\{z, w\} \subseteq S_0$ and S_0 is an H-independent set in D. Since $w \in S_1$, then we can consider $j_0 = \max\{i \in \{1, \ldots, n-1\} : w \in S_i\}$. Therefore, $w \in S_{j_0}$ and $w \notin S_{j_0+1}$ by choice of j_0 (indices modulo n).

It follows from Claim 1 that there exist i_0 in $\{0, 1, \ldots, n-1\}$ and t_0 in S_{i_0} such that $t_0 \notin S_{i_0+1}$. Since $(S_{i_0}, S_{i_0+1}) \in A(D_S)$ we get that there exists t_1 in S_{i_0+1} such that there is a t_0t_1 -H-path contained in D_2 and there is no a t_1t_0 -H-path contained in D. It follows from Claim 2 that there exists i_1 in $\{0, 1, \ldots, n-1\}$ such that $t_1 \in S_{i_1}$ and $t_1 \notin S_{i_1+1}$. Since $(S_{i_1}, S_{i_1+1}) \in A(D_S)$ we get that there exists t_2 in S_{i_1+1} such that there is a t_1t_2 -H-path contained in D_2 and there is no a t_2t_1 -H-path contained in D.

Once chosen t_0, t_1, \ldots, t_m we get from Claim 2 that there exists an index i_m in $\{0, 1, \ldots, n-1\}$ such that $t_m \in S_{i_m}$ and $t_m \notin S_{i_m+1}$. Since $(S_{i_m}, S_{i_m+1}) \in A(D_S)$ it follows that there exists t_{m+1} in S_{i_m+1} such that there is a $t_m t_{m+1}$ -H-path contained in D_2 and there is no a $t_{m+1}t_m$ -H-path contained in D. Thus, we obtain a sequence of vertices (t_0, t_1, t_2, \ldots) such that for every i in $\{0, 1, \ldots\}$ there exists a $t_i t_{i+1}$ -H-path contained in D_2 and there is no a $t_{i+1}t_i$ -H-path contained in D_2 and there is no a $t_{i+1}t_i$ -H-path in D, a contradiction with Lemma 4, when $|\xi_2| \geq 2$. If $|\xi_2| = 1$, suppose that $\xi_2 = \{C_r\}$, then $A(G_r) = A(D_2)$ and (t_0, t_1, t_2, \ldots) is a sequence of vertices of G_r such that for each i in $\{0, 1, \ldots\}$ there exists a $t_i t_{i+1}$ -H-path contained in G_r and there exists no a $t_{i+1}t_i$ -H-path in D, a contradiction with Lemma 2.

Therefore, $D_{\mathcal{S}}$ is an acyclic digraph.

Lemma 8. Let H be a digraph and D an H-colored digraph. Suppose that

1. For each i in $\{1,2\}$ and for each H-walk P contained in D_i there exists m' in $\{1,\ldots,k\}$ such that P is contained in $G_{m'}$.

2. If either there exists a $\xi_1\xi_2$ -arc or there exists a $\xi_2\xi_1$ -arc in $A(\mathscr{C}_C(D))$, say (a,b), then $(a,b) \notin A(H)$.

Then every H-walk of D is contained in either D_1 or in D_2 . Moreover, for each H-walk T of D there exists l in $\{1, \ldots, k\}$ such that T is contained in G_l .

Proof. Let $T = (v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_n)$ be an *H*-walk in *D*. Proceeding by contradiction, suppose that *T* is not contained in neither D_1 nor D_2 .

If $(v_0, v_1) \in A(D_1)$, then consider $j = \min\{i \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\} : (v_i, v_{i+1}) \in A(D_2)\}, \{i \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\} : (v_i, v_{i+1}) \in A(D_2)\} \neq \emptyset$ because T is not contained in D_1 . It follows from the choice of j that $(v_{j-1}, v_j) \in A(D_1)$, which implies that $(c(v_{j-1}, v_j), c(v_j, v_{j+1}))$ is a $\xi_1 \xi_2$ -arc in $A(\mathscr{C}_C(D))$. On the other hand, since T is an H-walk we get that $(c(v_{j-1}, v_j), c(v_j, v_{j+1})) \in A(H)$ which contradicts hypothesis (2).

If $(v_0, v_1) \in A(D_2)$, then consider $j = \min\{i \in \{0, 1, \ldots, n-1\} : (v_i, v_{i+1}) \in A(D_1)\}$. We get from the choice of j that $(v_{j-1}, v_j) \in A(D_2)$, which implies that $(c(v_{j-1}, v_j), c(v_j, v_{j+1}))$ is a $\xi_2\xi_1$ -arc in $A(\mathscr{C}_C(D))$, a contradiction with hypothesis (2) because T is an H-walk.

Therefore, every *H*-walk of *D* is contained in either D_1 or in D_2 . On the other hand, it follows from hypothesis (1) that for each *H*-walk *T* of *D* there exists *l* in $\{1, \ldots, k\}$ such that *T* is contained in G_l .

Lemma 9. Let H be a digraph, D an H-colored digraph and $\{u, z, x, w\}$ a subset of V(D). Suppose that

- 1. For every i in $\{1,2\}$ and for every cycle γ contained in D_i there exists C_m in ξ_i such that γ is contained in G_m .
- 2. For every *i* in $\{1, 2\}$ and for every *H*-walk *P* contained in *D_i* there exists $C_{m'}$ in ξ_i such that *P* is contained in $G_{m'}$.
- 3. There exists a uz-H-path contained in D_1 , say α_1 , there exists a zw-H-path contained in D, say α_2 , and there exists a wx-H-path contained in D_2 , say α_3 , where there are H-obstructions on z and w with respect to $\alpha_1 \cup \alpha_2 \cup \alpha_3$ (u can be x).
- 4. If either there exists a $\xi_1\xi_2$ -arc or there exists a $\xi_2\xi_1$ -arc in $A(\mathscr{C}_C(D))$, say (a,b), then $(a,b) \notin A(H)$.

If there exist no uw-H-paths in D, there exist no zx-H-paths in D, there exist no zu-H-paths in D, then either there exists a ux-path which is a (ξ_1, ξ, ξ_2) -H-subdivision of $\overrightarrow{P_3}$ or there exists a (ξ_1, ξ, ξ_2) -H-subdivision of $\overrightarrow{C_3}$. *Proof.* Consider the following remarks which will be useful in the proof of Lemma 9. Remark 1.

- (1) $u \notin V(\alpha_2)$, otherwise (u, α_2, w) is a *uw-H*-path, a contradiction.
- (2) $z \notin V(\alpha_3)$, otherwise (z, α_3, x) is a *zx-H*-path, a contradiction.
- (3) $w \notin V(\alpha_1)$, otherwise (u, α_1, w) is a *uw-H*-path, a contradiction.
- (4) $x \notin V(\alpha_2)$, otherwise (z, α_2, x) is a zx-H-path, a contradiction.
- (5) If β_1 is an *ab-H*-walk contained in D_i and β_2 is a *bc-H*-walk contained in D_j , with $\{i, j\} \subseteq \{1, 2\}, i \neq j$, then there is an *H*-obstruction on *b*, with respect to $\beta_1 \cup \beta_2$, otherwise $\beta_1 \cup \beta_2$ is an *H*-walk which is no contained in either D_1 or in D_2 , a contradiction with Lemma 8.

Remark 2. u, z and w are three different vertices and $x \notin \{z, w\}$.

It follows from Remark 1.

By Lemma 8, we will consider two cases on α_2 .

Case 1. α_2 is contained in D_1 .

Claim 1. $V(\alpha_1) \cap V(\alpha_2) = \{z\}.$

Proceeding by contradiction, suppose that $((V(\alpha_1) \cap V(\alpha_2)) - \{z\}) \neq \emptyset$. Then $\alpha_1 \cup \alpha_2$ contains a cycle, say γ , which has arcs of both α_1 and α_2 . Since α_1 and α_2 are contained in D_1 we get that γ is contained in D_1 . On the other hand, it follows from hypothesis 1 that there exists j in $\{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$ such that γ is contained in G_j , which implies that α_1 and α_2 are contained in G_j . Since G_j is transitive by H-paths we get that there exists a *uw*-H-path contained in G_i , a contradiction with the fact that there exists no *uw*-H-path.

Subcase 1.1. $V(\alpha_2) \cap V(\alpha_3) = \{w\}.$

In this subcase we consider two subcases.

(1.1.) $V(\alpha_1) \cap V(\alpha_3) = \emptyset$.

Notice that by supposition of this subcase we get $u \neq x$. Then it follows from Claim 1, the supposition of the Subcase 1.1 and by hypothesis 3 that $\alpha_1 \cup \alpha_2 \cup \alpha_3$ is a *ux*-path which is a (ξ_1, ξ, ξ_2) -*H*-subdivision of $\overrightarrow{P_3}$.

(1.2) $V(\alpha_1) \cap V(\alpha_3) \neq \emptyset$.

Let y be the last vertex in α_1 which appears in α_3 . Notice that from Remark 1(2) and Remark 1(3) we get that $y \notin \{z, w\}$. Since (y, α_1, z) is contained in D_1 , α_2 is contained in D, (w, α_3, y) is contained in D_2 , by hypothesis 3 there exist H-obstructions on z and w, with respect to $(y, \alpha_1, z) \cup \alpha_2 \cup (w, \alpha_3, y)$, by Remark 1(5) there exists an H-obstruction on y, with respect to $(y, \alpha_1, z) \cup \alpha_2 \cup (w, \alpha_3, y)$, then it follows from Claim 1, the supposition of Subcase 1.1 and by choice of y that $(y, \alpha_1, z) \cup \alpha_2 \cup (w, \alpha_3, y)$ is a (ξ_1, ξ, ξ_2) -H-subdivision of $\overrightarrow{C_3}$.

Subcase 1.2. $(V(\alpha_2) \cap V(\alpha_3) - \{w\}) \neq \emptyset$.

In this subcase we consider two subcases.

(I.3) $V(\alpha_1) \cap V(\alpha_3) = \emptyset$.

Let y be the first vertex in α_2 which appears in α_3 . Notice that it follows from Remark 1(2) and Remark 1(4) that $y \notin \{z, x\}$; and by supposition $V(\alpha_1) \cap V(\alpha_3) = \emptyset$ we get that $u \neq x$. Since α_1 is contained in D_1 , (z, α_2, y) is contained in D, (y, α_3, x) is contained in D_2 , by hypothesis 3 there exists an H-obstruction on z, with respect to $\alpha_1 \cup (z, \alpha_2, y) \cup (y, \alpha_3, x)$, by Remark 1(5) there exists an H-obstruction on y, with respect to $\alpha_1 \cup (z, \alpha_2, y) \cup (y, \alpha_3, x)$, then it follows from Claim 1 and the choice of y that $\alpha_1 \cup (z, \alpha_2, y) \cup (y, \alpha_3, x)$ is an ux-path which is a (ξ_1, ξ, ξ_2) -H-subdivision of $\overrightarrow{P_3}$.

(I.4) $V(\alpha_1) \cap V(\alpha_3) \neq \emptyset$.

Let y be the first vertex in α_3 which appears in $\alpha_1 \cup \alpha_2$ and let e be the last vertex in α_3 which appears in $\alpha_1 \cup \alpha_2$.

If $y \in V(\alpha_1)$, then we get from Remark 1(2) and Remark 1(3) that $y \notin \{z, w\}$. Since (y, α_1, z) is contained in D_1 , α_2 is contained in D, (w, α_3, y) is contained in D_2 , by hypothesis 3 there exist H-obstructions on z and w, with respect to $(y, \alpha_1, z) \cup \alpha_2 \cup (w, \alpha_3, y)$, by Remark 1(5) there exists an H-obstruction on y, with respect to $(y, \alpha_1, z) \cup \alpha_2 \cup (w, \alpha_3, y)$, then $(y, \alpha_1, z) \cup \alpha_2 \cup (w, \alpha_3, y)$ is a (ξ_1, ξ, ξ_2) -H-subdivision of $\overrightarrow{C_3}$.

If $y \in V(\alpha_2)$ and $e \in V(\alpha_1)$, we get that $y \neq e$. Let *a* be the last vertex in α_3 which appears in α_2 (there exists *a* because $y \in V(\alpha_2)$), and let *b* be the first vertex in (a, α_3, x) which appears in α_1 , (there exists *b* because $e \in V(\alpha_1)$ and $e \in V((a, \alpha_3, x))$). Notice that it follows from the choice of *a*, Remark 1(1), Remark 1(2) and Remark 1(4) that $a \notin \{u, z, x\}$, also it follows from the choice of *b*, Remark 1(2) and Remark 1(3) that $b \notin \{z, w\}$. So, we get from Claim 1 and the fact $z \notin \{a, b\}$ that $a \neq b$. Since (b, α_1, z) is contained in $D_1, (z, \alpha_2, a)$ is contained in $D, (a, \alpha_3, b)$ is contained in D_2 , by hypothesis 3 there exists an *H*-obstruction on *z*, with respect to $(b, \alpha_1, z) \cup (z, \alpha_2, a) \cup (a, \alpha_3, b)$, then $(b, \alpha_1, z) \cup (z, \alpha_2, a) \cup (a, \alpha_3, b)$ is a (ξ_1, ξ, ξ_2) -*H*-subdivision of $\overrightarrow{C_3}$.

If $y \in V(\alpha_2)$ and $e \in V(\alpha_2)$, then it follows from Remark 1(2) and Remark 1(4) that $e \notin \{z, x\}$, which implies by choice of e that $V(\alpha_1) \cap V((e, \alpha_3, x)) = \emptyset$. Since α_1 is contained in D_1 , (z, α_2, e) is contained in D, (e, α_3, x) is contained in D_2 , by hypothesis 3 there exists an H-obstruction on z, by Remark 1(5) there exists an H-obstruction on e, then $\alpha_1 \cup (z, \alpha_2, e) \cup (e, \alpha_3, x)$ is a ux-path which is a (ξ_1, ξ, ξ_2) -H-subdivision of $\overrightarrow{P_3}$.

Case 2. α_2 is contained in D_2 .

Claim 2. $V(\alpha_2) \cap V(\alpha_3) = \{w\}.$

Proceeding by contradiction, suppose that $(V(\alpha_2) \cap V(\alpha_3) - \{w\}) \neq \emptyset$. Then $\alpha_2 \cup \alpha_3$ is a walk in D_2 which contains a cycle γ . By hypothesis 1 there exists C_i in ξ_2 , for some i in $\{1, \ldots, k\}$, such that γ is contained in G_i , that implies that $\alpha_2 \cup \alpha_3$ is contained in G_i (by hypothesis 2) and since G_i is transitive by H-paths then there exists a zx-H-path, a contradiction.

Subcase 2.1. $V(\alpha_1) \cap V(\alpha_2) = \{z\}.$

In this subcase consider the following subcases.

(2.1.) $V(\alpha_1) \cap V(\alpha_3) = \emptyset$.

Notice that $u \neq x$ because $V(\alpha_1) \cap V(\alpha_3) = \emptyset$. Then $\alpha_1 \cup \alpha_2 \cup \alpha_3$ is a *ux*-path which is a (ξ_1, ξ, ξ_2) -*H*-subdivision of $\overrightarrow{P_3}$, because by hypothesis 3 there exist *H*-obstructions on *z* and *w* with respect to $\alpha_1 \cup \alpha_2 \cup \alpha_3$. (2.2.) $V(\alpha_1) \cap V(\alpha_3) \neq \emptyset$.

Let y be the last vertex in α_1 which appears in α_3 . We get from Remark 1(2) and Remark 1(3) that $y \notin \{z, w\}$. Since (y, α_1, z) is contained in D_1 , α_2 is contained in D, (w, α_3, y) is contained in D_2 , by hypothesis 3 there exist H-obstructions on z and w, with respect to $(y, \alpha_1, z) \cup \alpha_2 \cup (w, \alpha_3, y)$, by Remark 1(5) there exists an H-obstruction on y, with respect to $(y, \alpha_1, z) \cup \alpha_2 \cup (w, \alpha_3, y)$, then it follows that $(y, \alpha_1, z) \cup \alpha_2 \cup (w, \alpha_3, y)$ is a (ξ_1, ξ, ξ_2) -H-subdivision of $\overrightarrow{C_3}$.

Subcase 2.2. $(V(\alpha_1) \cap V(\alpha_2) - \{z\}) \neq \emptyset$.

In this subcase consider the following subcases.

(2.3.) $(V(\alpha_1) \cap V(\alpha_3)) = \emptyset$.

Let y be the first vertex in α_1 which appears in α_2 . Notice that by the supposition in (2.3) we get $u \neq x$, by supposition of Subcase 2.2 we get $y \neq z$, by Remark 1(1) and Remark 1(3) we get $y \notin \{u, w\}$. Since (u, α_1, y) is contained in D_1 , (y, α_2, w) is contained in D, α_3 is contained in D_2 , there exists an *H*-obstruction on *w*, with respect to $(u, \alpha_1, y) \cup (y, \alpha_2, w) \cup \alpha_3$, and by Remark 1(5) there exists an *H*-obstruction on *y*, with respect to $(u, \alpha_1, y) \cup (y, \alpha_2, w) \cup \alpha_3$, then $(u, \alpha_1, y) \cup (y, \alpha_2, w) \cup \alpha_3$ is a *ux*-path which is a (ξ_1, ξ, ξ_2) -*H*-subdivision of $\overrightarrow{P_3}$.

(2.4.) $V(\alpha_1) \cap V(\alpha_3) \neq \emptyset$.

Let y be the last vertex in α_1 which is in α_3 . Notice that it follows from Remark 1(2) and Remark 1(3) that $y \notin \{z, w\}$. Let x' be the first vertex in (y, α_1, z) which appears in α_2 (notice that x' can be z). It follows from Remark 1(3) that $x' \neq w$, by Claim 2 and the fact $y \neq w$ we get $x' \neq y$. Since (y, α_1, x') is contained in D_1 , (x', α_2, w) is contained in $D, (w, \alpha_3, y)$ is contained in D_2 , by Remark 1(5) there exist H-obstructions on y and x', with respect to $(y, \alpha_1, x') \cup (x', \alpha_2, w) \cup (w, \alpha_3, y)$, and by hypothesis 3 there exists an H-obstruction on w, with respect to $(y, \alpha_1, x') \cup (x', \alpha_2, w) \cup (w, \alpha_3, y)$, then $(y, \alpha_1, x') \cup (x', \alpha_2, w) \cup (w, \alpha_3, y)$ is a (ξ_1, ξ, ξ_2) -H-subdivision of $\overrightarrow{C_3}$.

-	-	

3 Main result

Theorem 3. Let H be a digraph and D an H-colored digraph. Suppose that

- 1. For every i in $\{1,2\}$ and for every cycle γ contained in D_i there exists C_m in ξ_i such that γ is contained in G_m .
- 2. For every *i* in $\{1, 2\}$ and for every *H*-walk *P* contained in D_i there exists $C_{m'}$ in ξ_i such that *P* is contained in $G_{m'}$.
- 3. If either there exists a $\xi_1\xi_2$ -arc or there exists a $\xi_2\xi_1$ -arc in $A(\mathscr{C}_C(D))$, say (a,b), then $(a,b) \notin A(H)$.
- 4. D does not contain a (ξ_1, ξ, ξ_2) -H-subdivision of $\overrightarrow{C_3}$.
- 5. If there exists a ux-path which is a (ξ_1, ξ, ξ_2) -H-subdivision of $\overrightarrow{P_3}$, for some subset $\{u, x\}$ of V(D), then there exists a ux-H-path in D.

Then D has an H-kernel.

Proof. Since D_S is an acyclic digraph (by Lemma 7), then D_S contains a vertex S such that $d^+_{D_S}(S) = 0$ (by Proposition 1). We will prove that S is an H-kernel in D.

Since $S \in V(D_S)$, it follows that S is an H-independent set in D. Therefore, it remains to prove that S is an H-absorbent set in D.

Proceeding by contradiction, suppose that S is not an H-absorbent set in D. Let X be the set defined as $\{z \in V(D) \setminus S : \text{there exists no a } zS$ -H-path in D $\}$. Notice that by our supposition $X \neq \emptyset$.

Claim 1. There exists x_0 in X such that for every z in $X \setminus \{x_0\}$ if there exists an x_0z -H-path contained in D_1 , then there exists a zx_0 -H-path contained in D_1 .

Proceeding by contradiction, suppose that for every x in X there exists y in $X \setminus \{x\}$ such that there exists an xy-H-path contained in D_1 and there exists no a yx-H-path in D_1 .

Let x_0 be a vertex in X, then there exists x_1 in $X \setminus \{x_0\}$ such that there exists an x_0x_1 -H-path contained in D_1 and there exists no an x_1x_0 -H-path in D_1 . For x_1 there exists x_2 in $X \setminus \{x_1\}$ such that there exists an x_1x_2 -H-path contained in D_1 and there exists no an x_2x_1 -H-path contained in D_1 . With this procedure we obtain a sequence of vertices $(x_0, x_1, x_2, ...)$ such that for every i in $\{0, 1, ...\}$ there exists an x_ix_{i+1} -H-path contained in D_1 and there exists no an $x_{i+1}x_i$ -H-path contained in D_1 . On the other hand, notice that D_1 is an $H[\xi_1]$ -colored digraph. If $|\xi_1| \ge 2$ we get that ξ_1 is a partition of $V(H[\xi_1])$. Therefore, it follows from hypotheses 1 and 2 that D_1 is an $H[\xi_1]$ -colored digraph which satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 4, a contradiction with the existence of the sequence (x_0, x_1, x_2, \ldots) . If $|\xi_1| = 1$, say $\xi_1 = \{C_r\}$, then $A(D_1) = A(G_r)$, a contradiction with Lemma 2 and the existence of the sequence (x_0, x_1, x_2, \ldots) . Therefore, there exists x_0 in X such that for every z in $X \setminus \{x_0\}$ if there exists an x_0z -H-path contained in

 D_1 , then there exists a zx_0 -H-path contained in D_1 .

Let T be defined as $\{z \in S : \text{there exists no a } zx_0\text{-}H\text{-path in } D_2\}$.

We get from the definition of T that for every z in $S \setminus T$ there exists a zx_0 -H-path in D_2 .

Claim 2. $T \cup \{x_0\}$ is an *H*-independent set in *D*.

Since $T \subseteq S$ and S is an H-independent set in D, then T is an H-independent set in D. By definition of X we have that there exists no x_0T -H-path in D. By Lemma 8 we have that every H-walk of D is contained in either D_1 or D_2 , then it remains to prove that there exists no Tx_0 -H-path contained in D_1 and there exists no Tx_0 -H-path contained in D_2 . It follows from the fact S is an H-semikernel modulo D_2 , $T \subseteq S$ and the definition of X that there exists no Tx_0 -H-path in D_1 . By definition of T there exists no Tx_0 -H-path in D_2 . Therefore, $T \cup \{x_0\}$ is an H-independent set in D.

Claim 3. For every z in $V(D) \setminus (T \cup \{x_0\})$ if there exists a $(T \cup \{x_0\})z$ -H-path contained in D_1 , then there exists a $z(T \cup \{x_0\})-H$ -path in D.

Let z be in $V(D) \setminus (T \cup \{x_0\})$ such that there exists a $(T \cup \{x_0\})z$ -H-path contained in D_1 .

Proceeding by contradiction, suppose that there exists no an *H*-path from z to $T \cup \{x_0\}$ in *D*. Consider two cases.

Case 1. There exists a Tz-H-path contained in D_1 .

Let u be a vertex in T and α_1 an H-path such that α_1 is a uz-H-path contained in D_1 . Since $T \subseteq S$ and S is an H-semikernel modulo D_2 in D, then it follows that there exists w in S such that there is a zw-H-path contained in D, say α_2 , which implies that $z \notin S \cup X$. Since there is no an H-path from z to $T \cup \{x_0\}$ in D, we get that $w \in S \setminus T$. It follows from the definition of T that there exists a wx_0 -H-path in D_2 , say α_3 .

There exists an *H*-obstruction on *z*, with respect to $\alpha_1 \cup \alpha_2$, otherwise $\alpha_1 \cup \alpha_2$ is a *uw-H*-walk in *D* and by Lemma 8 there exists C_m in ξ_1 such that $\alpha_1 \cup \alpha_2$ is contained in G_m . Since G_m is transitive by *H*-paths we get that there exists a *uw-H*-path in G_m , a contradiction because *S* is an *H*-independent set in *D* and $\{u, w\} \subseteq S$.

There exists an *H*-obstruction on *w*, with respect to $\alpha_2 \cup \alpha_3$, otherwise $\alpha_2 \cup \alpha_3$ is a zx_0 -*H*-walk in *D* and by Lemma 8 we get that there exists C_m in ξ_2 such that $\alpha_2 \cup \alpha_3$ is contained in G_m . Since G_m is transitive by *H*-paths we get that there exists a zx_0 -*H*-path, a contradiction because we are supposing that there exists no a $z(T \cup \{x_0\})$ -*H*-path. Therefore, there exist *H*-obstructions on *z* and *w*, with respect to $\alpha_1 \cup \alpha_2 \cup \alpha_3$.

Notice that there exists no a uw-H-path in D because $\{u, w\} \subseteq S$ and S is an H-independent set in D. There exists no a zx_0 -H-path and there exists no a zu-H-path in D because there exists no $z(T \cup \{x_0\})$ -H-paths in D.

Therefore, since it holds the hypotheses of Lemma 9, we get from hypothesis 4 of Theorem 3 that there exists a ux_0 -path which is a (ξ_1, ξ, ξ_2) -H-subdivision of $\overrightarrow{P_3}$, which implies by hypothesis 5 that there exists a ux_0 -H-path in D, a contradiction because $T \cup \{x_0\}$ is an H-independent set in D and $\{u, x_0\} \subseteq (T \cup \{x_0\})$.

Case 2. There exists an x_0z -H-path contained in D_1 .

Let α_1 be an x_0z -*H*-path contained in D_1 . Since there exists no a $z(T \cup \{x_0\})$ -*H*-path in D, then it follows from the choice of x_0 that $z \notin X$; in addition, by definition of X we have that $z \notin S$. It follows from the definition of X that there exist w in S and an *H*-path, say α_2 , such that α_2 is a zS-*H*-path contained in D. Notice that $w \notin T$ because we are supposing that there exists no a $z(T \cup \{x_0\})$ -*H*-path in D. It follows from the definition of T that there exists a wx_0 -*H*-path contained in D_2 , say α_3 .

There exists an *H*-obstruction on *z*, with respect to $\alpha_1 \cup \alpha_2$, otherwise $\alpha_1 \cup \alpha_2$ is an $x_0 w$ -*H*-walk in *D* and by Lemma 8 there exists C_m in ξ_1 such that $\alpha_1 \cup \alpha_2$ is contained in G_m . Since G_m is transitive by *H*-paths we get that there exists an $x_0 w$ -*H*-path in *D*, a contradiction with the definition of *X* because $w \in S$.

There exists an *H*-obstruction on *w*, with respect to $\alpha_2 \cup \alpha_3$, otherwise $\alpha_2 \cup \alpha_3$ is a zx_0 -*H*-walk in *D* and by Lemma 8 there exists C_m in ξ_2 such that $\alpha_2 \cup \alpha_3$ is contained in G_m . Since G_m is transitive by *H*-paths we have that there exists a zx_0 -*H*-path in *D*, a contradiction because we are supposing that there exists no a $z(T \cup \{x_0\})$ -*H*-path in *D*.

Denote x_0 by u. Notice that by definition of X we get that there exists no a uw-H-path in D. Since we are supposing that there exists no a $z(T \cup \{x_0\})$ -H-path in D it follows that there exists no a zu-H-path in D; that is, there exists no a zx_0 -H-path.

Since it holds the hypotheses of Lemma 9, we get from hypothesis 4 of Theorem 3 that there exists a ux_0 -path which is a (ξ_1, ξ, ξ_2) -H-subdivision of $\overrightarrow{P_3}$, which is not possible because $x_0 = u$.

Since we obtain a contradiction with cases 1 and 2, we conclude that there exists an *H*-path from z to $T \cup \{x_0\}$ in D.

It follows from Claims 1 and 2 that $T \cup \{x_0\}$ is an *H*-semikernel modulo D_2 in *D*, which implies that $T \cup \{x_0\} \in S = V(D_S)$.

Since $T \subseteq S$ and for every s in $S \setminus T$ there exists a sx_0 -H-path contained in D_2 and there exists no a x_0s -H-path contained in D. Then, $(S, T \cup \{x_0\}) \in A(D_S)$, a contradiction with $d_{D_S}^+(S) = 0$.

Therefore, S is an H-kernel in D.

4 Some consequences of Theorem 3

Corollary 1. Let D be a 3-transitive digraph, H_1 and H_2 two spanning subdigraphs of D such that $A(H_1) \cap A(H_2) = \emptyset$ and $A(H_1) \cup A(H_2) = A(D)$. Suppose that D has no $\overrightarrow{C_3}$ and for every i in $\{1, 2\}$ H_i is an acyclic digraph. Then D has a kernel.

Proof. It is easy to see that if $|A(H_i)| = \emptyset$ for some i in $\{1, 2\}$, then D has a kernel (because in this case by hypothesis D is an acyclic digraph and by Theorem 2). Therefore, suppose that $|A(H_i)| \ge 1$ for every i in $\{1, 2\}$ and |A(D)| = q.

Let H be a digraph with $V(H) = \{1, \ldots, q\}$, and $A(H) = \emptyset$. Let D' be the H-colored digraph obtained from D by assigning a different color to each arc of D.

Let $\xi = \{\{1\}, \ldots, \{q\}\}$ a partition of V(H) and $\{\xi_1 = \{\{i\} : a \text{ has color } i \text{ for some } a \text{ in } A(D_1)\}, \xi_2 = \{\{j\} : b \text{ has color } j \text{ for some } b \text{ in } A(D_2)\}\}$ a partition of ξ .

Notice that it follows from the definition of ξ and the definition of $\{\xi_1, \xi_2\}$ that for every i in $\{1, 2\}$ $D_i = H_i$. Consider the following claims.

Claim 1. For every *i* in $\{1, 2\}$ and for every cycle γ contained in D_i there exists C_m in ξ_i such that γ is contained in G_m .

This follows because H_i is acyclic.

Claim 2. For every *i* in $\{1,2\}$ and for every *H*-walk *P* contained in D_i there exists $C_{m'}$ in ξ_i such that *P* is contained in $G_{m'}$.

Since every *H*-path in D' has length at most one, then it follows from the definition of ξ and the definition of $\{\xi_1, \xi_2\}$ that Claim 2 holds.

Claim 3. If either there exists a $\xi_1\xi_2$ -arc or there exists a $\xi_2\xi_1$ -arc in $A(\mathscr{C}_C(D'))$, say (a, b), then $(a, b) \notin A(H)$. It follows from the fact $A(H) = \emptyset$.

Claim 4. D' does not contain a $(\underline{\xi}_1, \xi, \xi_2)$ -*H*-subdivision of \overrightarrow{C}_3 .

It follows from the fact D has no $\overrightarrow{C_3}$ and because every H-path in D' has length at most one.

Claim 5. If there exists a ux-path which is a (ξ_1, ξ, ξ_2) -*H*-subdivision of $\overrightarrow{P_3}$, for some subset $\{u, x\}$ of V(D), then there exists a ux-*H*-path in *D*.

Since D is a 3-transitive digraph, then Claim 5 holds.

Therefore, we get from Theorem 3 that D' has an *H*-kernel which is a kernel.

Proof of Theorem 1

Consider the partition $\xi = \{\{v\} : v \in V(H)\}$ of V(H) and the partition $\{\xi_1 = \{\{u\} : u \in X\}, \xi_2 = \{\{u\} : u \in Y\}\}$ of ξ which were given in Remark ??. Consider the following claims.

1. For every *i* in $\{1, 2\}$ and for every cycle γ contained in D_i there exists C_m in ξ_i such that γ is contained in G_m .

It follows from the fact $\{X, Y\}$ is a partition of $V(\mathscr{C}_C(D))$ into independent sets.

2. For every *i* in $\{1, 2\}$ and for every *H*-walk *P* contained in D_i there exists $C_{m'}$ in ξ_i such that *P* is contained in $G_{m'}$.

It follows from the fact $\{X, Y\}$ is a partition of $V(\mathscr{C}_C(D))$ into independent sets.

- 3. If either there exists a $\xi_1\xi_2$ -arc or there exists a $\xi_2\xi_1$ -arc in $A(\mathscr{C}_C(D))$, say (a,b), then $(a,b) \notin A(H)$. It follows from the fact $A(H) = \{(u,u) : u \in V(H)\}.$
- 4. D does not contain a (ξ_1, ξ, ξ_2) -H-subdivision of $\overrightarrow{C_3}$.

Proceeding by contradiction, suppose that $W = (u_0, \ldots, u_l = v_0, \ldots, v_m = w_0, \ldots, w_n = u_0)$ is a (ξ_1, ξ, ξ_2) -*H*-subdivision of $\overrightarrow{C_3}$. Since there are *H*-obstructions on u_0, v_0 and w_0 with respect to *W*, then the color of the monochromatic path $T_1 = (u_0, W, u_l)$ is different of the color of the monochromatic path $T_2 = (v_0, W, v_m)$ and the color of the monochromatic path T_2 is different of the color of the monochromatic path $T_3 = (w_0, W, w_n)$. Suppose that T_1 has color i, T_2 has color j and T_3 has color k. Since $i \neq j, (i,j) \in A(\mathscr{C}_C(D)), i \in X$ and X is an independent set in $\mathscr{C}_C(D)$, we get that $j \in Y$, which implies that $\{j, k\} \subseteq Y$, a contradiction because $k \neq j, (j,k) \in A(\mathscr{C}_C(D))$ and Y is an independent set in $\mathscr{C}_C(D)$.

5. If there exists a *ux*-path which is a (ξ_1, ξ, ξ_2) -*H*-subdivision of $\overrightarrow{P_3}$, for some subset $\{u, x\}$ of V(D), then there exists a *ux*-*H*-path in *D*.

The proof is similar that 4.

Therefore, we get from Theorem 3 that D has an H-kernel which is an mp-kernel.

Lemma 10. Let D be an m-colored digraph, $\{u, v, w\}$ a subset of V(D), with $u \neq v$ $u \neq w$ $w \neq v$, P_1 a uvpath in D and P_2 a vw-path in D. Suppose that every chromatic class is transitive. Then

1. if P_1 and P_2 are properly colored paths, then there exists a uw-properly colored path in D,

2. if $\mathscr{C}_C(D)$ has no cycles of length at least two, then every properly colored path is a rainbow path.

Proof. Suppose that $P_1 = (u = u_0, \ldots, u_n = v)$ and $P_2 = (v = v_0, \ldots, v_m = w)$ for some subset $\{n, m\}$ of \mathbb{N} .

1. Suppose that P_1 and P_2 are properly colored paths. Let u_{i_0} be the first vertex in P_1 that appears in P_2 ; there exists u_{i_0} because $v \in V(P_1) \cap V(P_2)$. If either $u_{i_0} = u$ or $u_{i_0} = w$, then clearly $(u_{i_0} = u, P_2, w)$ is a *uw*-properly colored path in D or $(u, P_1, u_{i_0} = w)$ is a *uw*-properly colored path in D, respectively; suppose that $u_{i_0} \neq u$ and $u_{i_0} \neq w$. Notice that (u, P_1, u_{i_0}) and $(u_{i_0} = u, P_2, w)$ are properly colored paths and by choice of u_{i_0} we have that $(u, P_1, u_{i_0}) \cup (u_{i_0} = v_j, P_2, w)$ is a path. If (u_{i_0-1}, u_{i_0}) and $(u_{i_0} = v_j, v_{j+1})$ have a different color, then $(u, P_1, u_{i_0}) \cup (u_{i_0} = v_j, P_2, w)$ is a *uw*-properly colored path in D; therefore suppose that (u_{i_0-1}, u_{i_0}) and $(u_{i_0} = v_j, v_{j+1})$ have the same color, say α . Since (u_{i_0-1}, u_{i_0}) and $(u_{i_0} = v_j, v_{j+1})$ are in the same chromatic class, then it follows from hypothesis that $(u_{i_0-1}, v_{j+1}) \in A(D)$ and this arc has color α . Therefore, $(u, P_1, u_{i_0-1}) \cup (u_{i_0-1}, v_{j+1}) \cup (v_{j+1}, P_2, w)$ is a *uw*-properly colored path in D.

2. Let $P_3 = (u = w_0, \ldots, w_k = w)$ be a properly colored path in D for some k in \mathbb{N} . We claim that P_3 is a rainbow path, otherwise there exist two arcs (w_i, w_{i+1}) and (w_j, w_{j+1}) in P_3 , with i+1 < j, such that these arcs have the same color, say α . Therefore, $(c(w_i, w_{i+1}) = \alpha, c(w_{i+1}, w_{i+2}), \ldots, c(w_j, w_{j+1}) = \alpha)$ is a closed walk in $\mathscr{C}_C(D)$ which contains a cycle (by Proposition 2), a contradiction.

Corollary 2. Let D be an m-colored digraph without isolated vertices. Suppose that every chromatic class is transitive. Then D has a PCP-kernel.

Proof. Let H be a complete digraph without loops such that $V(H) = \{i : (u,v) \text{ has color } i \text{ for some } (u,v) \text{ in } A(D)\}$. Notice that D is an H-colored digraph (by choice of H).

Let D^* be a digraph such that D and D^* are isomorphic, with $V(D) \cap V(D^*) = \emptyset$, and let H^* be a digraph such that H and H^* are isomorphic, with $V(H) \cap V(H^*) = \emptyset$. Consider $f : V(D) \to V(D^*)$ and $g : V(H) \to V(H^*)$ two isomorphisms. Suppose that D^* is an H^* -colored digraph such that (u,v) has color i in D if and only if (f(u), f(v)) has color g(i) in D^* . It follows that D^* holds the same hypothesis as D.

Let $D' = D \cup D^*$ be. Notice that D' is an H'-colored digraph (with $V(H') = V(H) \cup V(H^*)$ and $A(H') = A(H) \cup A(H^*)$)

Consider the partition $\xi = \{C_1 = V(H), C_2 = V(H^*)\}$ of V(H') and the partition $\{\xi_1 = \{C_1\}, \xi_2 = C_2\}\}$ of ξ . It follows from the choice of ξ and $\{\xi_1, \xi_2\}$ that $A(D_1) = A(D)$ and $A(D_2) = A(D^*)$. Since every H'-path in D' is a properly colored path in D', we get from Lemma 10 (1) that $G_i = D'[\{a \in A(D') : \text{the color of the} arc a \text{ is in } C_i\}]$ is a subdigraph of D' which is transitive by H'-paths in D' for every i in $\{1, 2\}$. The following claims can be deduced from the definition of D' and its H'-coloring.

- 1. For every *i* in $\{1, 2\}$ and for every cycle γ contained in D_i there exists C_m in ξ_i such that γ is contained in G_m .
- 2. For every *i* in $\{1, 2\}$ and for every *H'*-walk *P* contained in D_i there exists $C_{m'}$ in ξ_i such that *P* is contained in $G_{m'}$.
- 3. If either there exists a $\xi_1\xi_2$ -arc or there exists a $\xi_2\xi_1$ -arc in $A(\mathscr{C}_C(D'))$, say (a, b), then $(a, b) \notin A(H')$.
- 4. D' does not contain a (ξ_1, ξ, ξ_2) -H'-subdivision of $\overrightarrow{C_3}$.
- 5. If there exists a ux-path which is a (ξ_1, ξ, ξ_2) -H'-subdivision of $\overrightarrow{P_3}$, for some subset $\{u, x\}$ of V(D'), then there exists a ux-H'-path in D'.

Therefore, we get from Theorem 3 that D' has an H'-kernel, say K. It follows from the construction of D' that $V(D) \cap K$ is an H-kernel of D, which is a PCP-kernel of D.

Corollary 3. Let D be an m-colored digraph without isolated vertices. Suppose that every chromatic class is transitive. If $\mathscr{C}_C(D)$ has no cycles of length at least two, then D has a kernel by rainbow paths.

Proof. Let N be a PCP-kernel of D (by Corollary 2). It follows from Lemma 10 (2) that N is a kernel by rainbow paths (recall that every rainbow path is a properly colored path). \Box

Recall that when $A(H) = \{(u,u) : u \in V(H)\}$, an *H*-path is a monochromatic path, an *H*-kernel is an mpkernel and *D* is said to be *m*-colored (where |V(H)| = m). Also in this case a (ξ_1, ξ, ξ_2) -*H*-subdivision of $\overrightarrow{C_3}$ is called (ξ_1, ξ, ξ_2) -subdivision of $\overrightarrow{C_3}$ and a (ξ_1, ξ, ξ_2) -*H*-subdivision of $\overrightarrow{P_3}$ is called (ξ_1, ξ, ξ_2) -subdivision of $\overrightarrow{P_3}$.

Corollary 4 ([8]). Let D be an m-colored digraph, C the set of colors of A(D), $\xi = \{C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_k\}$ $(k \ge 2)$ a partition of C, $\{\xi_1, \xi_2\}$ a partition of ξ . For every i in $\{1, 2\}$ D_i is the spanning subdigraph of D such that $A(D_i) = \{a \in A(D) : c(a) \in C \text{ for some } C \text{ in } \xi_i\}$. Suppose that

- 1. for every i in $\{1, \ldots, k\}$, $D[\{a \in A(D) : c(a) \in C_i\}]$ is transitive by monochromatic paths,
- 2. for every i in $\{1, 2\}$ and for every cycle γ contained in D_i there exists C_j in ξ_i such that $c(e) \in C_j$ for every e in $A(\gamma)$,

- 3. D does not contain a (ξ_1, ξ, ξ_2) -subdivision of $\overrightarrow{C_3}$,
- 4. if there exists a ux-path which is a (ξ_1, ξ, ξ_2) -subdivision of $\overrightarrow{P_3}$, for some subset $\{u, x\}$ of V(D), then there exists a ux-monochromatic path in D.

Then D has an mp-kernel.

The following examples show that each hypothesis in Theorem 3 is tight. We show digraphs H and D such that D is an H-colored digraph without H-kernel.

Remark 1. The condition "for every i in $\{1,2\}$ and for every cycle γ contained in D_i there exists C_m in ξ_i such that γ is contained in G_m " in Theorem 3 cannot be dropped as example in Figure 1 shows.



Figure 1: *D* is an *H*-colored digraph without *H*-kernel, $\xi = \{C_1 = \{1\}, C_2 = \{2\}, C_3 = \{3\}, C_4 = \{4\}, C_5 = \{5\}, C_6 = \{6\}\}$ is a partition of V(H) and $\{\xi_1 = \{\{1\}, \{3\}, \{5\}\}, \xi_2 = \{\{2\}, \{4\}, \{6\}\}\}$ is a partition of ξ . With these two partitions *D* holds the hypotheses 2, 3, 4 and 5 of Theorem 3 but *D* does not hold the hypothesis 1.

Remark 2. The condition "for every *i* in $\{1, 2\}$ and for every *H*-walk *P* contained in D_i there exists $C_{m'}$ in ξ_i such that *P* is contained in $G_{m'}$ " in Theorem 3 cannot be dropped as example in Figure 2 shows.



Figure 2: D is an H-colored digraph without H-kernel, $\xi = \{C_1 = \{1\}, C_2 = \{2\}, C_3 = \{3\}\}$ is a partition of V(H) and $\{\xi_1 = \{\{1\}, \{2\}\}, \xi_2 = \{\{3\}\}\}$ is a partition of ξ . With these two partitions D holds the hypotheses 1, 3, 4 and 5 of Theorem 3 but D does not hold hypothesis 2.

Remark 3. The condition "if either there exists a $\xi_1\xi_2$ -arc or there exists a $\xi_2\xi_1$ -arc in $A(\mathscr{C}_C(D))$, say (a, b), then $(a, b) \notin A(H)$ " in Theorem 3 cannot be dropped as example in Figure 3 shows.



Figure 3: *D* is an *H*-colored digraph without *H*-kernel, $\xi = \{C_1 = \{1\}, C_2 = \{2\}, C_3 = \{3\}, C_4 = \{4\}, C_5 = \{5\}, C_6 = \{6\}, C_7 = \{7\}\}$ is a partition of *V*(*H*) and $\{\xi_1 = \{\{1\}, \{3\}, \{5\}, \{7\}\}, \xi_2 = \{\{2\}, \{4\}, \{6\}\}\}$ is a partition of ξ . With these two partitions *D* holds the hypotheses 1, 2, 4 and 5 of Theorem 3 but *D* does not hold hypothesis 3.

Remark 4. The condition "D does not contain a (ξ_1, ξ, ξ_2) -H-subdivision of $\overrightarrow{C_3}$ " in Theorem 3 cannot be dropped as example in Figure 4 shows.



Figure 4: *D* is an *H*-colored digraph without *H*-kernel, $\xi = \{C_1 = \{1\}, C_2 = \{2\}, C_3 = \{3\}\}$ is a partition of V(H) and $\{\xi_1 = \{\{1\}, \{2\}\}, \xi_2 = \{\{3\}\}\}$ is a partition of ξ . With these two partitions *D* holds the hypotheses 1, 2, 3 and 5 of Theorem 3 but *D* does not hold the hypothesis 4.

Remark 5. The condition "if there exists a ux-path which is a (ξ_1, ξ, ξ_2) -H-subdivision of $\overrightarrow{P_3}$, for some subset $\{u, x\}$ of V(D), then there exists a ux-H-path in D" in Theorem 3 cannot be dropped as example in Figure 5 shows.



Figure 5: D is an H-colored digraph without H-kernel, $\xi = \{C_1 = \{1\}, C_2 = \{2\}, C_3 = \{3\}\}$ is a partition of V(H) and $\{\xi_1 = \{\{1\}, \{3\}\}, \xi_2 = \{\{2\}\}\}$ is a partition of ξ . With these two partitions D holds the hypotheses 1, 2, 3 and 4 of Theorem 3 but D does not hold the hypothesis 5.

References

- P. Arpin, V. Linek. Reachability problems in edge-colored digraphs. Discrete Math., 307(17-18): 2276–2289, 2007
- [2] J. Bang-Jensen, G. Gutin. Digraphs: Theory, Algorithms and Applications. Springer, London (2000)
- [3] Y. Bai, S. Fujita and S. Zhang. kernels by properly colored paths in arc-colored digraphs. *Discrete Math.*, 341(6): 1523–1533, 2018.
- [4] V. Chvátal. On the computational complexity of finding a kernel. Report CRM300, Centre de Recherches Mathématiques, Université de Montréal, 1973.
- [5] A. Contreras-Balbuena and R. Rojas-Monroy. H-Paths in 2-Colored Tournaments. Int. J. Contemp. Math. Sci., 10(5): 185–195, 2015.
- [6] P. Delgado-Escalante and H. Galeana-Sánchez. Restricted domination in arc-colored digraphs. AKCE Int. J. Comb., 11(1): 95–104, 2014.
- [7] H. Galeana-Sánchez and C. Hernández-Cruz. A dichotomy for the kernel by H-walks problem in digraphs. J. Graph Theory, 90(3): 213–226, 2019.
- [8] H. Galeana-Sánchez, R. Rojas-Monroy and E. Casas-Bautista. Cycles and transitivity by monochromatic paths in arc-coloured digraphs. AKCE Int. J. Comb., 12(2): 104–112, 2015.
- [9] H. Galeana-Sánchez, R. Rojas-Monroy and E. Casas-Bautista. γ-Cycles and transitivity by monochromatic paths in arc-coloured digraphs. *Discuss. Math Graph Theory*, 3(3): 493–507, 2013.
- [10] H. Galeana-Sánchez. kernels by monochromatic paths and the color-class digraph. Discuss. Math Graph Theory, 31(2): 273–281, 2011.
- [11] H. Galeana-Sánchez, Guadalupe Gaytán Gómez and R. Rojas-Monroy. Monochromatic cycles and monochromatic paths in arc-colored digraphs. *Discuss. Math Graph Theory*, 31(2): 283–292, 2011.
- [12] H. Galeana-Sánchez and R. Rojas-Monroy. Kernels in pretransitive digraphs. Discrete Math., 275(1-3): 129–136, 2004.
- [13] V. Linek, B. Sands. A note on paths in edge-colored tournaments. Ars Combin., 44: 225–228, 1996.
- [14] v. J. Neumann and O. Morgenstern. Theory of games and Economic Behavior. Princeton University Press, Princeton (1944).
- [15] B. Sands, N. Sauer and R. Woodrow. On monochromatic paths in edge coloured digraphs. J. Combin. Theory Ser. B, 33: 271–275, 1982.