

Partition of Sparse Graphs into Two Forests with Bounded Degree

Matthew P. Yancey *

March 11, 2024

Abstract

Borodin and Kostochka proved that for $d_2 \geq 2d_1 + 2$ and a graph G where every subgraph H satisfies

$$e(H) < \left(2 - \frac{d_2 + 2}{(d_1 + 2)(d_2 + 1)}\right) n(H) + \frac{1}{d_2 + 1}$$

has a vertex partition $V(G) = V_1 \cup V_2$ such that $G[V_i]$ has maximum degree at most d_i for each i . We show that under the same conditions we can additionally conclude that each $G[V_i]$ is a forest.

1 Introduction

Let $\mathcal{G}^{(i)}$ denote a family of graphs. A $(\mathcal{G}^{(1)}, \mathcal{G}^{(2)}, \dots, \mathcal{G}^{(k)})$ -coloring of a graph G is a partition $V(G) = \cup_{i=1}^k V_i$ where $G[V_i] \in \mathcal{G}^{(i)}$ for each i . We primarily focus on three classes of graph families: Δ_t , which is graphs with vertex degrees bounded by t ; \mathcal{F} , which is the family of forests; and $F_i = \mathcal{F} \cap \Delta_i$. Observe that $\Delta_0 = F_0$ is the set of empty graphs, $\Delta_1 = F_1$ is the set of matchings, and F_2 is set of linear forests. A $(\Delta_{i_1}, \Delta_{i_2}, \dots, \Delta_{i_k})$ -coloring is called a defective coloring.

Appel and Haken [AH77, AHK77] proved that every planar graph has a $(\Delta_0, \Delta_0, \Delta_0, \Delta_0)$ -coloring in a result known as the Four Color Theorem. Cowen, Cowen, and Woodall [CCW86] proved that every planar graph has a $(\Delta_2, \Delta_2, \Delta_2)$ -coloring. This was improved independently by Poh [Poh90] and Goddard [God91] who showed that every planar graph has a

*Institute for Defense Analyses / Center for Computing Sciences (IDA / CCS), mpyance@super.net

(F_2, F_2, F_2) -coloring, answering a question of Broere and Mynhardt [BM85]. Outerplanar graphs are 2-degenerate, and therefore have a $(\Delta_0, \Delta_0, \Delta_0)$ -coloring. Akiyama, Era, Gervacio, and Watanabe [AEGW89] and Broere and Mynhardt [BM85] showed that outerplanar graphs have a (F_2, F_2) -coloring.

Lovász [Lov66] proved that graphs in $\Delta_{-1+\sum_{i=1}^k(d_i+1)}$ have $(\Delta_{d_1}, \Delta_{d_2}, \dots, \Delta_{d_k})$ -coloring. Borodin [Bor76] and independently Bollobás and Manvel [BM79] showed that every graph in Δ_{2t} that does not contain K_{2t+1} has a (F_2, F_2, \dots, F_2) -coloring (it has t distinct colors).

We are interested in sparsity conditions that imply a coloring exists. For a graph G , let $e(G) = |E(G)|$ and $n(G) = |V(G)|$. A graph G is (a, b) -sparse if for every subgraph $H \subseteq G$ we have $e(H) \leq an(H) - b$. It is (a, b) -strictly sparse when $e(H) < an(H) - b$ for each $H \subseteq G$. A graph is (a, b) -tight if $e(G) = an(G) - b$, while every proper subgraph of G is (a, b) -strictly sparse. One of the strongest known results about (Δ_j, Δ_k) -coloring comes from a sparsity condition. We say that a graph is $(\mathcal{G}^{(1)}, \mathcal{G}^{(2)})$ -critical if it does not have an $(\mathcal{G}^{(1)}, \mathcal{G}^{(2)})$ -coloring, but every proper subgraph does.

Theorem 1.1 (Borodin and Kostochka [BK14]). *Let $d_2 \geq 2d_1 + 2$. If G is $\left(2 - \frac{d_2+2}{(d_1+2)(d_2+1)}, \frac{-1}{d_2+1}\right)$ -strictly sparse graph, then it has a $(\Delta_{d_1}, \Delta_{d_2})$ -coloring. Moreover, there exists infinitely many $(\Delta_{d_1}, \Delta_{d_2})$ -critical graphs that are $\left(2 - \frac{d_2+2}{(d_1+2)(d_2+1)}, \frac{-1}{d_2+1}\right)$ -tight.*

Our main contribution is to show that the assumptions of Theorem 1.1 also imply a (F_{d_1}, F_{d_2}) -coloring. The inspiration for this project is that it is already known to be true in some special cases. Dross, Montassier, and Pinlou [DMP18] proved that a $\left(\frac{3}{2} - \frac{1}{2d_2}, 0\right)$ -strictly sparse graph has a (F_0, F_{d_2}) -coloring when $d_2 \geq 3$. Chen, Yu, and Wang [CYW18] improved this to $\left(\frac{3}{2} - \frac{1}{2(d_2+1)}, \frac{-1}{d_2+1}\right)$ -strictly sparse graphs having a (F_0, F_{d_2}) -coloring when $d_2 \geq 2$, which matches Borodin and Kostochka's formula when $d_1 = 0$. Chen, Raspaud, and Yu [CRY22] proved that a $(1.6, 0)$ -sparse graph has a (F_1, F_4) -coloring (observe that $\left(\frac{8}{5}, 0\right)$ -sparse is equivalent to Borodin and Kostochka's formula of $\left(\frac{8}{5}, \frac{-1}{5}\right)$ -strictly sparse for (Δ_1, Δ_4) -coloring).

Theorem 1.2. *Let $d_2 \geq 2d_1 + 2$. If G is a (F_{d_1}, F_{d_2}) -critical multigraph without loops, then*

$$e(G) \geq \left(2 - \frac{d_2 + 2}{(d_1 + 2)(d_2 + 1)}\right) n(G) + \frac{1}{d_2 + 1}.$$

Moreover, if G is a $\left(2 - \frac{d_2+2}{(d_1+2)(d_2+1)}, \frac{-1}{d_2+1}\right)$ -strictly sparse multigraph without loops, then a (F_{d_1}, F_{d_2}) -coloring of G can be found in polynomial time.

Let $g(G)$ denote the girth of G . It is well-known that planar graphs are $\left(\frac{g(G)}{g(G)-2}, 0\right)$ -strictly sparse. Let \widehat{G}_ℓ denote planar graphs with girth ℓ with no adjacent ℓ -cycles. A trivial

discharging argument reveals that graphs in \widehat{G}_ℓ are $(\frac{\ell(\ell+1)}{\ell^2-\ell-1}, 0)$ -strictly sparse. Huang, Huang, and Lv [HHL23] showed that planar graphs without cycles of length 4 to i are $(\frac{3i-3}{2(i-2)}, 0)$ -strictly sparse. These statements lead to quick corollaries in topological graph theory from results connecting sparsity to colorings.

For example, Dross, Montassier, and Pinlou [DMP18] showed that planar graph G has a (F_0, F_5) -coloring if $g(G) \geq 7$, a (F_0, F_3) -coloring if $g(G) \geq 8$, and (F_0, F_2) -coloring if $g(G) \geq 10$. Chen, Yu, and Wang [CYW18] improved this to a (F_0, F_4) -coloring if $g(G) \geq 7$ and a (F_0, F_2) -coloring if $g(G) \geq 8$. Chen, Raspaud, and Yu [CRY22] showed that if G has genus at most 1 and girth at least 6, then it has a (F_1, F_4) -coloring. It also follows quickly that if $G \in \widehat{G}_5$, then G has a (F_1, F_4) -coloring. Theorem 1.2 implies that such colorings can be found in polynomial time. We also establish similar corollaries.

Corollary 1.3. *Let G be a planar graph.*

- (A) *If $g(G) \geq 5$, then G has a (F_2, F_6) -coloring.*
- (B) *If $G \in \widehat{G}_4$, then G has a (F_5, F_{12}) -coloring.*
- (C) *If G has no cycles of length 4 to 11, then G has a (F_2, F_6) -coloring.*

Moreover, the above colorings can be found in polynomial time.

Choi and Raspaud [CR15] asked if planar graphs with girth 5 have (Δ_1, Δ_7) -colorings. As partial progress, Zhang, Chen, and Wang [ZCW17] proved that graphs in \widehat{G}_5 have (Δ_1, Δ_7) -colorings. This result is improved by the above discussion. Wang, Huang, and Finbow [WHF20] show that graphs in \widehat{G}_5 have (F_3, F_3) -colorings.

Dross, Montassier, and Pinlou [DMP17] showed that a planar graph with girth 4 has a (F_5, \mathcal{F}) -coloring. This was improved by Feghali and Šámal [Fv24] to a (F_3, \mathcal{F}) -coloring. Liu and Wang [LW22] showed that a planar graph with girth 4 and no chorded 6-cycle (which includes all graphs in \widehat{G}_4) has a (F_2, \mathcal{F}) -coloring. On the other hand, Montassier and Ochem [MO13] constructed for any finite d_1, d_2 a planar graph with girth 4 that has no $(\Delta_{d_1}, \Delta_{d_2})$ -coloring.

Cho, Choi, and Park [CCP21] showed that a planar graph without 4- or 5-cycles has a (F_3, F_4) -coloring, while asking if such a graph has a (F_2, F_{d_2}) -coloring for some finite d_2 .

There are three technical comments to be made about Theorem 1.2. First, the theorem considers multigraphs (we consider parallel edges to be cycles of length 2, and thus any parallel edge must have endpoints with distinct colors in a (F_{d_1}, F_{d_2}) -coloring). In similar situations (see [CY20] and [JKM⁺21, JKMX22] and [HPAR23]) the optimal sparsity conditions for a coloring depends on whether it is restricted to simple graphs, although that did not

happen here. Second, the polynomial-time algorithm is in contrast to results about similar colorings being NP-complete. For example, Montassier and Ochem [MO13] showed that it is NP-complete to determine whether a planar graph with girth 5 has a (Δ_1, Δ_3) -coloring. Moreover, polynomial-time algorithms have generated independent interest (for example, see [LRSS18] for an interest in algorithms to produce a (Δ_1, Δ_1) -coloring or Section 5.1 of [CDF⁺23] for (F_2, \dots, F_2) -coloring). Third, let us return to the fact that in Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 that the optimal sparsity condition for a (Δ_j, Δ_k) -coloring is the same as for a $(\Delta_j \cap \mathcal{F}, \Delta_k \cap \mathcal{F})$ -coloring. We informally describe this phenomenon as “acyclic is free in the sparsity context” for defective coloring. Cranston and the author [CY21] encountered this phenomenon previously for a different type of coloring. Which leads us to ask the informal question, for what other types of colorings is acyclic free in the sparsity context? This question is uninteresting for defective colorings, as the remaining cases where optimal sparsity conditions are known are (Δ_i, Δ_j) -coloring where $i, j \leq 1$ (see [BK11] and [BKY13]), and in such cases $\Delta_i = F_i, \Delta_j = F_j$. But the question is interesting for other types of colorings (for example, defective DP-coloring [JKM⁺21, JKMX22]).

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we cover technical preliminaries and establish notation. Sections 3, 4, and 5 are dedicated to proving the first half of Theorem 1.2. We use the potential method, which is a discharging proof enhanced with an extra tool called the “gap lemma.” The gap lemma is established in Section 3. The two classical phases of a discharging proof, the reducible configurations and the discharging rules, are presented in Sections 4 and 5, respectively. In Section 6 we prove the second half of Theorem 1.2—the polynomial algorithm—by reviewing the arguments made in Sections 3 and 4. Section 7 ends this paper with a discussion on whether the assumption $d_2 \geq 2d_1 + 2$ is sharp.

2 Technical Preliminaries

2.1 Notation

We use $N^m(u)$ to denote the multiset $\{x : e \in E(G), e = ux\}$ such that $d(u) = |N^m(u)|$ (‘m’ stands for multiplicity). Similarly we define the closed multi-neighborhood as $N^m[u] := \{u\} \cup N^m(u)$. For vertex set S , let $N^m(u) \cap S$ denote the multisubset of $N^m(u)$ formed from restricting it to elements in S . Let $N(u)$ denote the underlying set of $N^m(u)$. For subgraph H and vertex x , let $H + x$ denote the subgraph induced on $V(H) \cup \{x\}$ and $H - x$ denote the subgraph induced on $V(H) \setminus \{x\}$.

For $i \in \{1, 2\}$, let $W_i : V \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ denote two weight functions. A triple (G, W_1, W_2) is denoted as a *weighted graph*. We say that a partition $V = V_1 \cup V_2$ is a desired (d_1, d_2) -coloring if each $G[V_j]$ is a forest and for each $x \in V_j$ we have that $|N^m(x) \cap V_j| + W_j(x) \leq d_j$. If the values of d_1, d_2 are clear, then we simply call it a *desired coloring*. We say that (H, W'_1, W'_2)

is a *weighted subgraph* of (G, W_1, W_2) if H is a subgraph of G and $W'_j(u) \leq W_j(u)$ for all j, u . Moreover, it is an *induced weighted subgraph* if H is induced and $W'_i = W_i$ over $V(H)$. It should be clear that if (G, W_1, W_2) has a desired coloring, then so does every weighted subgraph. A graph is called *critical* if there is no desired coloring of it, but each proper weighted subgraph can be desirably colored.

This notation is similar to prior work. Chen, Yu, and Wang [CYW18] use a function s that is equivalent to our W_2 . Our notation (G, W_1, W_2) is implicitly equivalent to the notation by Chen, Raspaud, and Yu [CRY22] of $(G^* - P, ph, f)$, where P is the set of pendant hosts. The following notation of capacities is the same after translation by 1 as used by Kostochka, Xu, and Zhu [KXZ23].

Define $c_j(u) = d_j + 1 - W_j(u)$, which we will call the *capacity* of u for color j . The inequality for a desired coloring can be rewritten as $u \in V_j$ implies $|N^m[u] \cap V_j| \leq c_j(u)$. If u has zero (or less) capacity for color j , then a desired coloring has $u \in V_{3-j}$. Capacity and weight are redundant terminology, but having both will make reading our arguments easier. Weight is useful for understanding concepts like “subgraph;” while capacity provides a cleaner reference for when a desirable coloring does or does not exist. In particular, we will frequently discuss vertices with zero capacity and therefore their coloring is predetermined.

We use

$$\alpha = \frac{d_2 + 2}{(d_1 + 2)(d_2 + 1)} \quad \text{and} \quad \beta = \frac{1}{d_2 + 1}.$$

The theorem that we will prove in Sections 3, 4, and 5 is as follows. If $W_1(v) = W_2(v) = 0$, then we say v is *weightless*. The first half of Theorem 1.2 follows from Theorem 2.1 by making every vertex weightless.

Theorem 2.1. *Let d_1, d_2, W_1, W_2 be fixed with $d_2 \geq 2d_1 + 2$. If G is critical, then*

$$e(H) \geq \beta + \sum_{x \in V(H)} (\alpha c_1(x) + \beta(c_2(x) - 1)).$$

For a weighted graph (H, W_1, W_2) , we denote the *potential* of H as

$$\rho_{d_1, d_2}(H, W_1, W_2) = \sum_{x \in V} (\alpha c_1(x) + \beta(c_2(x) - 1)) - e(H).$$

When d_1, d_2, W_1, W_2 are clear from context, we will simply write $\rho(H)$ for the potential. Furthermore, if H is an induced weighted subgraph of G and G is clear from context, then we may simply write $\rho(V(H))$. Observe that if (H, W'_1, W'_2) is a weighted subgraph of (G, W_1, W_2) , then $\rho(H, W'_1, W'_2) \geq \rho(V(H))$ as decreasing the weight and removing edges only increases the potential. Theorem 2.1 is equivalent to $\rho(G) \leq -\beta$ for any critical G .

2.2 Arithmetic and Constructions

In the following we summarize arithmetic that will be repeated multiple times. For the reader's benefit we will reference Fact 2.2 at appropriate times, although we use Fact 2.2.2.e too frequently to refer to it each time.

Fact 2.2. *In the following, we assume that the capacity is nonnegative.*

1. As $d_1 \geq 0$ and $d_2 \geq 2$ we have that $\alpha \leq 2/3$ and $\beta \leq 1/3$ and so $\alpha + \beta \leq 1$.
2. The potential of a single vertex u for different capacities:
 - (a) If $c_1(u) = 1$ and $c_2(u) = 0$, then $\rho(\{u\}) = \alpha - \beta > 0$.
 - (b) If $c_1(u) = 0$ and $c_2(u) = 1$, then $\rho(\{u\}) = 0$.
 - (c) If $c_1(u) = 0$, then $\rho(\{u\}) \leq 1 - \beta$.
 - (d) If $c_2(u) = 0$, then $\rho(\{u\}) \leq 1 - \alpha$.
 - (e) For every vertex u , $\rho(\{u\}) \leq 2 - \alpha$.
3. If $c_1(u) = c_1(v)$ and $c_2(u) \geq c_2(v)$, then $\rho(\{u\}) - \rho(\{v\}) \leq 1$.
4. If $c_2(u) = c_2(v)$ and $c_1(u) \geq c_1(v)$, then $\rho(\{u\}) - \rho(\{v\}) \leq 1 - \alpha + \beta$.
5. Adding an unweighted vertex and two edges will change the potential an equal amount as incrementing W_1 by one for a single vertex.
6. As $\alpha = \beta \frac{d_2+2}{d_1+2}$, we have that $\alpha \geq 2\beta$ if and only if $d_2 \geq 2d_1 + 2$.
7. When $d_2 \geq 2d_1 + 2$ we have that increasing W_2 by one for two vertices changes the potential at most as adding an unweighted vertex and two edges.

The simplest critical graph is an isolated vertex with capacity 0 in both colors, which is sharp for Theorem 2.1. The sharp examples described by Borodin and Kostochka [BK14] in Theorem 1.1 are also critical weightless graphs, which proves the sharpness of Theorem 2.1. We will describe those examples in the language of Section 2.1, which will provide intuition for some arguments we make later. Borodin and Kostochka's examples are created by a construction with several steps, which we will break into two constructions.

For the first construction, let (G, W_1, W_2) be critical and sharp for Theorem 2.1 and contain a vertex v with $W_1(v) > 0$. A new sharp example can be constructed from G by decrementing $W_1(v)$ by one and appending a leaf v' to v such that $W_1(v') = c_2(v') = 0$. Borodin and Kostochka [BK14] use the phrase “peripheral (d_2, d_1) -host” for this construction, while Chen, Raspaud, and Yu [CRY22] call it a “pendant host.”

The second construction requires the following set up:

- Let $\{(G_i, W_{1,i}, W_{2,i})\}_{1 \leq i \leq \ell}$ with $\ell \leq d_1 + 2$ be a nonempty set of critical graphs that are sharp for Theorem 2.1.
- Suppose each $(G_i, W_{1,i}, W_{2,i})$ contains a vertex v_i with $W_2(v_i) > 0$.
- Let H be a K_{1,d_1+1} with each vertex unweighted and vertex set u_1, \dots, u_{d_1+2} .
- Let $y_1, y_2, \dots, y_{d_1+2}$ be a sequence of vertices, each chosen from $\{v_1, \dots, v_\ell\}$, such that each v_i is chosen at least once.

Under these circumstances, a new sharp critical graph can be constructed from $H \cup \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} G_i$ by adding edge $y_j u_j$ for each j and decrementing $W_2(v_i)$ by one for each i (regardless of how many neighbors in H it has). Borodin and Kostochka [BK14] use the term “flag” for H in the special case of this construction when $\ell = 1$. Chen, Yu, and Wang [CYW18] used the name “special triangles” for flags when $d_1 = 0$.

Any critical graph can be expanded into a weightless critical graph by repeatedly applying the first construction and then repeatedly adding flags. Moreover, if the original graph is sharp for Theorem 2.1, then the resulting weightless graph will be too.

There is a third construction that we can introduce. Let (G, W_1, W_2) be critical and sharp for Theorem 2.1. If $c_i(u) = 0$ for some vertex w and index i , then form a new sharp critical graph by reducing $W_i(u)$ to zero, appending a leaf u' to u , and giving u' capacities $c_i(u') = 1$, $c_{3-i}(u') = 0$. The proof to our gap lemma will be slightly different than in [BK14, CRY22], and this is because we will use this third construction to shorten our argument.

2.3 Opening Statements of the Proof

We assume d_1, d_2 are fixed integers such that $d_2 \geq 2d_1 + 2$. We say that weighted graph (H', W'_1, W'_2) is *smaller* than weighted graph (H, W_1, W_2) if it contains fewer edges. By way of contradiction, let G be a smallest counterexample to Theorem 2.1. That is, G is a critical graph with $\rho(G) > -\beta$ and any critical graph H with fewer edges than G satisfies $\rho(H) \leq -\beta$.

We make a couple of obvious statements about G , as they are true for any critical graph. We can assume G is connected. We can assume $c_j(w) \geq 0$ for all $w \in V$ and j . It should also be clear that $c_1(w) + c_2(w) \geq 1$ for all $w \in V$, as this is true for any critical graph with an edge. By simple case analysis, we can assume G contains at least two edges. The multiplicity of any edge in G is at most 2 (if it is at least two, then its endpoints have different colors in any desirable coloring).

3 Gap Lemma

Lemma 3.1. *If (H, W'_1, W'_2) is a nonempty weighted subgraph of (G, W_1, W_2) with $e(H) < e(G)$, then $\rho(H, W'_1, W'_2) > \alpha - \beta$.*

Proof. Let (H, W'_1, W'_2) be a proper weighted subgraph of (G, W_1, W_2) that minimizes $\rho(H, W'_1, W'_2)$ among all those with at least one fewer edge than G . By way of contradiction, assume $\rho(H) \leq \alpha - \beta$. Reducing weight only increases potential, so we may assume that $W'_1 = W_1$ and $W'_2 = W_2$.

If $V(H) = V(G)$, then $\rho(H) \geq \rho(G) + 1 > -\beta + 1 > \alpha - \beta$. Therefore $V(H) \subsetneq V(G)$. As removing edges only increases potential, we may assume that H is an induced weighted subgraph.

Our argument now splits into two cases, although the arguments are similar in each. It will benefit the reader to observe now that the assumption of case 1 is not used until the last line of the argument.

Case 1: $\rho(H) \leq 0$. As G is critical, there is a desired coloring of H ; let $V(H) = V_1 \cup V_2$ be such a coloring. We construct a new weighted graph (G^*, W_1^*, W_2^*) as follows:

- (A) Let $G^* = G - V(H)$.
- (B) Let $W_i^* = W_i$, with the following exceptions:
- (C) If $u \notin V(H)$ and $N_G(u) \cap V_i \neq \emptyset$, then set $c_i^*(u) = 0$.

If there is a desired coloring of (G^*, W_1^*, W_2^*) , then unioning that coloring with the coloring of H would create a desired coloring of G , as by construction there is no monochromatic edge that bridges $V(H)$ and $G \setminus V(H)$. This contradicts the criticality of G , so there must be a critical subgraph $(\widehat{G}, \widehat{W}_1, \widehat{W}_2)$ of (G^*, W_1^*, W_2^*) . As it has fewer edges, \widehat{G} is smaller than G , and so by assumption $\rho(\widehat{G}, \widehat{W}_1, \widehat{W}_2) \leq -\beta$.

Let (\widehat{H}, W_1, W_2) be the weighted induced subgraph of (G, W_1, W_2) over the vertex set $V(H) \cup V(\widehat{G})$. As the potential function is linear, we can compute $\rho(\widehat{H}, W_1, W_2)$ as a sum of ‘contributions’ from four steps:

- (1) the sum of $\rho(H, W_1, W_2)$ and $\rho(\widehat{G}, \widehat{W}_1, \widehat{W}_2)$,
- (2) plus $\rho(V(\widehat{G}), W_1^*, W_2^*) - \rho(\widehat{G}, \widehat{W}_1, \widehat{W}_2)$,
- (3) plus $\rho(V(\widehat{G}), W_1, W_2) - \rho(V(\widehat{G}), W_1^*, W_2^*)$, which comes from the change in capacity in step (C) in the construction of G^* , and

(4) minus 1 for each edge with an endpoint in H and another endpoint in \widehat{G} .

Observe that as \widehat{G} is a weighted subgraph of G^* , the contribution of step (2) is nonpositive. By Fact 2.2.(3-4), each application of step (C) in the construction of G^* affects the potential by at most 1. By construction, there is an injection from each application of (C) on a vertex in $\rho(\widehat{G})$ to the edges with an endpoint in H and another endpoint in \widehat{G} . Thus the net overall contribution of steps (3) and (4) above is nonpositive. Therefore the overall potential is bounded by step (1) above and we have

$$\rho(\widehat{H}, W_1, W_2) \leq \rho(H, W_1, W_2) + \rho(\widehat{G}, \widehat{W}_1, \widehat{W}_2) \leq \rho(H, W_1, W_2) - \beta.$$

So the choice of H as minimizing potential among all proper subgraphs implies that $\widehat{H} = G$. But as $\rho(H) \leq 0$, this implies $\rho(G) \leq -\beta$, which contradicts the choice of G .

Case 2: $\rho(H) > 0$. This case follows similarly to case 1. The difference is that we increase the weight on a vertex in H to influence the desired coloring of H , which is then used to slightly modify the construction of G^* . In the following we carefully describe the new aspects of the argument, while quickly mentioning details that are unchanged from case 1.

Pick an arbitrary edge zx such that $z \in H$ and $x \notin H$. Let (H', W'_1, W'_2) be the weighted graph formed from H by increasing $W_2(z)$ by one. By choice of H , the assumption of this case implies that $\rho(H^*) > 0$ for all proper weighted subgraphs H^* of G . Therefore every weighted subgraph of H' has potential strictly larger than $-\beta$. By the minimality of G , this implies that H' does not contain a critical subgraph, and therefore H' has a desirable coloring. Let $V(H') = V'_1 \cup V'_2$ be such a coloring.

Case 2.A: $z \in V'_1$. This subcase proceeds exactly like case 1, except with a stronger analysis of the potential function at the end. Observe that the entire argument except the last line of case 1 still holds (including the conclusion that $\widehat{H} = G$), but

$$\rho(G) = \rho(\widehat{H}, W_1, W_2) \leq \rho(H) - \beta$$

is no longer a contradiction as we only get $\rho(G) \leq \alpha - 2\beta$. The key difference is that during the construction of G^* , when we set $c_1(x) = 0$ during step (C), we only modified the potential by at most $1 - \alpha + \beta$ by Fact 2.2.4, when we previously bounded it by 1. As we have $\widehat{H} = G$, we know $x \in \widehat{G}$, and therefore we can strengthen our bound on the potential by $\alpha - \beta$, recreating the contradiction as before.

Case 2.B: $z \in V'_2$. As $W'_2(z) = W_2(z) + 1$, we have that $W_2(z) + |N^m(z) \cap V'_2| \leq d_2 - 1$. We now have a slightly different approach to constructing G^* .

First, observe that $N^m(x) \cap V(H) = \{z\}$, because if x is in a second edge with an endpoint in H then

$$\rho(H + x) \leq \rho(H) + (2 - \alpha) - 2 \leq -\beta.$$

This either contradicts the minimality of $\rho(H)$ (if $H + x$ is a proper subgraph of G) or the choice $\rho(G) > -\beta$. Therefore step (C) in the construction of G^* is only applied at most once to x , and it is because of the edge zx . So we construct G^* the same way as in case 1, with the following exception: when we apply step (C) to x , instead of setting $c_2^*(x) = 0$, we instead set $W_2^*(x) = W_2(x) + 1$.

We repeat the claim that if G^* has a desirable coloring $V_1^* \cup V_2^*$, then unioning it with desirable coloring $V_1' \cup V_2'$ of H would lead to a desirable coloring of G , which is a contradiction. By construction, the only edge with exactly one endpoint in H that could have both endpoints in the same color class is zx . Since there is only one such edge, it can not be in a monochromatic cycle. Because $z \in V_2'$, if xz is monochromatic, then $x \in V_2^*$, and by construction $W_2(z) + |N^m(z) \cap V_2^*| \leq d_2 - 1$. This proves the claim.

So G^* has a critical subgraph \widehat{G} , and we repeat the argument from case 1 until the last line, where similar to case 2.A we use a stronger analysis of the potential function. This time we bound by β the affect of step (C) on x , and therefore we have $\rho(G) \leq (\alpha - \beta) - \beta - (1 - \beta) < -\beta$, recreating the contradiction from before. \square

Corollary 3.2. *If H is a weighted subgraph of G , then $\rho(H) > -\beta$.*

Proof. If H is empty, then $\rho(H) = 0$. If $V(H) = V(G)$, then $\rho(H) \geq \rho(G) > -\beta$. Otherwise $\rho(H) > \alpha - \beta$ by Lemma 3.1. \square

Corollary 3.3. *For each vertex u in G we have $c_1(u) + c_2(u) \geq 2$.*

The most common application of Lemma 3.1 is to say that proper subgraphs of G have desirable colorings, even if we increase the weights on a few vertices. We collect some of these arguments below.

Corollary 3.4. *Let (H, W_1', W_2') be a proper weighted subgraph of (G, W_1, W_2) with strictly fewer edges. There exists a desired coloring of (H, W_1'', W_2'') in any of the following two cases:*

- (I) $W_1' = W_1''$, $W_2' = W_2''$ except for vertex u and index i , where $W_i''(u) = W_i'(u) + 1$.
- (II) $W_1' = W_1''$, $W_2' = W_2''$ except there is a vertex $x \notin V(H)$ and vertex set $\{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_k\} \subseteq N(x) \cap V(H)$ where $W_{i_j}''(u_j) = W_{i_j}'(u_j) + 1$ for some sequence i_j and at least one of the following hold:
 - (A) $e(G) \geq e(H) + k + 1$,
 - (B) $i_j = 2$ for all j ,
 - (C) $\rho(\{x\}) \leq 2 - 2\alpha$, or
 - (D) $k \geq 3$ and $d_1 \geq 1$.

Proof. By way of contradiction, suppose that (H, W_1'', W_2'') has a critical weighted subgraph $(\widehat{H}, \widehat{W}_1, \widehat{W}_2)$. By the minimality of G we have that $\rho(\widehat{H}) \leq -\beta$. By Lemma 3.1, $\rho(V(\widehat{H}), W_1, W_2) > \alpha - \beta$. This combines to say that

$$\rho(V(\widehat{H}), W_1, W_2) - \rho(\widehat{H}, \widehat{W}_1, \widehat{W}_2) > (\alpha - \beta) - (-\beta) = \alpha.$$

Increasing one of the weights of a single vertex only changes the potential by at most α , and so this proves part (I).

Let $k' = |V(\widehat{H}) \cap \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}|$. By the above reasoning, we can assume $k' \geq 2$.

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(\widehat{H} + x, W_1, W_2) &\leq \rho(V(\widehat{H}), W_1, W_2) + \rho(\{x\}) - k' \\ &\leq (\rho(V(\widehat{H}), \widehat{W}_1, \widehat{W}_2) + k'\alpha) + (2 - \alpha) - k' \\ &\leq \alpha - \beta - (k' - 2)(1 - \alpha). \end{aligned}$$

As $\alpha < 1$, so $\rho(\widehat{H} + x) \leq \alpha - \beta$. By Lemma 3.1, $\widehat{H} + x = G$, which implies $k' = k$. We strengthen this inequality based on additional assumptions.

By the formula for α we have that $\alpha \leq 2/3$ and if $d_1 \geq 1$, then $\alpha < 0.5$. If we are in Case (II.A), then we missed an edge and the above bound becomes $\rho(\widehat{H} + x) \leq \alpha - \beta - 1 < -\beta$, which contradicts Corollary 3.2. If we are in Case (II.B), then the second line in the above inequality $k'\alpha$ can be replaced by $k'\beta$, and we get $\rho(\widehat{H} + x) \leq \beta - \alpha$. By Fact 2.2.6 we have $\beta - \alpha \leq -\beta$, which contradicts Corollary 3.2. If we are in Case (II.C), then the bound $\rho(\{u\}) \leq 2 - \alpha$ can be replaced by $2 - 2\alpha$, and so $\rho(\widehat{H} + x) \leq -\beta$, which contradicts Corollary 3.2. If we are in Case (II.D), then $\rho(\widehat{H} + x) \leq \alpha - \beta - (1 - \alpha) < -\beta$, which contradicts Corollary 3.2. \square

4 Reducible Configurations

We will use the following notation about a vertex u :

- u is i -slack if $c_i(u) \geq d(u) + 1$ or if $c_i(u) = d(u)$ and $c_{3-i}(u) \geq 1$;
- u is i -null if $c_i(u) = 0$; and
- u is i -constrained if it is not i -slack or i -null.

We say that a vertex is *doubly-constrained* if it is 1-constrained and 2-constrained. Observe that a vertex u is doubly-constrained if and only if $1 \leq c_i(u) < d(u)$ for each i . We say that

a vertex is *somehow-constrained* if it is 1-constrained or 2-constrained. We will use the term *three-two-two* to denote a vertex u with degree 3 and $c_i(u) \geq 2$ for each i . We will use the term *triple-three* to denote a vertex u with degree 3 and $c_i(u) \geq 3$ for each i .

We will give a quick outline of our reducible configurations that is more intuitive than rigorous (for the extent of this outline, ignore that a vertex can be both doubly-constrained and a three-two-two). In Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2 we will show that G has minimum degree 2, and vertices with degree 2 are doubly-constrained or i -null for some i . This is sufficient to prove the theorem if $d_1 = 0$. When $d_1 > 0$, any vertex with insufficient charge will be a three-two-two. We balance the charge of such vertices as follows. In Lemma 4.4 we will show that each three-two-two vertex has a doubly-constrained neighbor when $d_1 \geq 1$. In Lemma 4.5 we will show that if the vertex satisfies the stronger property of being triple-three, then it is adjacent to another vertex that is somehow-constrained.

Lemma 4.1. *For each vertex u , $|N(u)| \geq 2$.*

Proof. By way of contradiction, suppose there exists a vertex u such that $N^m(u) = \{x\}$ or $N^m(u) = \{x, x\}$. Let $H = G - u$. By criticality of G , H has a desirable coloring. If $c_1(u), c_2(u) \geq 1$, then the coloring can be extended to a desirable coloring of G by giving u the opposite color of x . This is a contradiction, so there exists an i such that u is i -null.

Suppose first that ux is a simple edge. By Corollary 3.3 we have $c_{3-i}(u) \geq 2$. By Corollary 3.4.I, there is a desirable coloring of weighted graph (H, W'_1, W'_2) where $W'_j = W_j$ except $W'_{3-i}(x) = W_{3-i}(x) + 1$. By construction, such a coloring extends to a desirable coloring of G , which is a contradiction.

So ux is a parallel edge. Let (H, W''_1, W''_2) be the weighted graph where $W''_j = W_j$, except $c''_{3-i}(x) = 0$. If $i = 1$, then by Fact 2.2.2.c and Fact 2.2.3 we have $\rho(\{u\}) \leq 1 - \beta$ and $\rho(\{x\}, W_1, W_2) - \rho(\{x\}, W''_1, W''_2) \leq 1$. If $i = 2$, then by Fact 2.2.2.d and Fact 2.2.4 we have $\rho(\{u\}) \leq 1 - \alpha$ and $\rho(\{x\}, W_1, W_2) - \rho(\{x\}, W''_1, W''_2) \leq 1 - \alpha + \beta$. So in either case we have $\rho(\{u\}) + \rho(H, W_1, W_2) - \rho(H, W''_1, W''_2) \leq 2 - \beta$.

We claim that (H, W''_1, W''_2) has a desirable coloring. By way of contradiction, suppose (H, W''_1, W''_2) contains a critical weighted subgraph $(\widehat{H}, \widehat{W}_1, \widehat{W}_2)$. As G does not contain a proper weighted subgraph that is critical, we have $c \in V(\widehat{H})$. By the minimality of G , we have $\rho(\widehat{H}, \widehat{W}_1, \widehat{W}_2) \leq -\beta$. As it is a subgraph, we have $\rho(G[V(\widehat{H})], W''_1, W''_2) \leq \rho(\widehat{H}, \widehat{W}_1, \widehat{W}_2)$. So we have

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(\widehat{H} + u, W_1, W_2) &\leq \rho(V(\widehat{H}), W''_1, W''_2) + \rho(\{u\}) + \rho(V(\widehat{H}), W_1, W_2) - \rho(V(\widehat{H}), W''_1, W''_2) - 2 \\ &\leq -\beta + (2 - \beta) - 2 < -\beta. \end{aligned}$$

This contradicts Corollary 3.2, which proves the claim. The desirable coloring of (H, W''_1, W''_2) clearly extends to a desirable coloring of (G, W_1, W_2) , contradicting the choice of G . \square

Lemma 4.2. *If $d(u) = 2$, then u is doubly-constrained or there exists an i such that u is i -null.*

Proof. Let $N(u) = \{x, y\}$. By Lemma 4.1 we have $x \neq y$. We have that $c_1(u) = c_2(u) = 1$ if and only if u is doubly-constrained. By way of contradiction, assume that $\max(c_1(u), c_2(u)) \geq 2$ and $\min(c_1(u), c_2(u)) \geq 1$. Let $H = G - u$.

Case 1: $c_2(u) \geq 2$ and $c_1(u) \geq 1$. By Corollary 3.4.II.B there is a desirable coloring $V'_1 \cup V'_2$ of the weighted graph (H, W'_1, W'_2) where $W'_j = W_j$ except $W'_2(x) = W_2(x) + 1$ and $W'_2(y) = W_2(y) + 1$. This desirable coloring can be extended to a desirable coloring of G by adding u to V'_1 if $\{x, y\} \subseteq V'_2$ and adding u to V'_2 otherwise. This contradicts the criticality of G .

Case 2: $c_1(u) \geq 2$ and $c_2(u) \geq 1$. As we are not in case 1, we may assume that $c_2(u) = 1$, and therefore by Fact 2.2.2.d $\rho(\{u\}) \leq 1 - \alpha + \beta$. As $\alpha + \beta \leq 1$ we have $\rho(\{u\}) \leq 2 - 2\alpha$. By Corollary 3.4.II.C there is a desirable coloring $V''_1 \cup V''_2$ of the weighted graph (H, W''_1, W''_2) where $W''_j = W_j$ except $W''_1(x) = W_1(x) + 1$ and $W''_1(y) = W_1(y) + 1$. This desirable coloring can be extended to a desirable coloring of G by adding u to V''_2 if $\{x, y\} \subseteq V''_1$ and adding u to V''_1 otherwise. This contradicts the criticality of G .

□

It is well-known that potential functions are submodular. To see this, let $A, B \subseteq V(G)$. Let $e(A \setminus B, B \setminus A)$ denote the number of edges with an endpoint in $A \setminus B$ and another endpoint in $B \setminus A$. By counting vertices and edges we have that

$$\rho(A \cup B) + \rho(A \cap B) = \rho(A) + \rho(B) - e(A \setminus B, B \setminus A) \leq \rho(A) + \rho(B).$$

In Lemma 4.3 we will use that our potential function satisfies the stronger property of subadditivity on proper weighted subgraphs of G . That is, if A or B is not all of $V(G)$, then $\rho(A \cap B) \geq 0$ (this is trivial if $A \cap B = \emptyset$, otherwise apply Lemma 3.1). Therefore if A or B is not all of $V(G)$ we have $\rho(A \cup B) \leq \rho(A) + \rho(B)$.

Lemma 4.3. *If u is a three-two-two, then it is not in a parallel edge.*

Proof. Let u be as in the statement of the lemma. Recall that means that $d(u) = 3$ and $c_1(u), c_2(u) \geq 2$. By way of contradiction, suppose $N^m(u) = \{v, x, x\}$. Let $H = G - u$.

Let (H, W_1^v, W_2^v) be the weighted graph constructed by setting $W_j^v = W_j$ except $W_1^v(v) = W_1(v) + 1$ and $W_2^v(v) = W_2(v) + 1$. There is no desirable coloring of (H, W_1^v, W_2^v) , as such a coloring could be extended to a desirable coloring of G by giving u the opposite color of x , which contradicts the choice of G . So (H, W_1^v, W_2^v) contains critical subgraph $(G_v, \widehat{W}_1^v, \widehat{W}_2^v)$. Let $S_v = V(G_v)$. As G does not contain a proper weighted subgraph that is critical, $v \in S_v$.

By the minimality of G , we have $\rho(G_v, \widehat{W}_1^v, \widehat{W}_2^v) \leq -\beta$. As it is a subgraph, $\rho(S_v, W_1^v, W_2^v) \leq \rho(G_v, \widehat{W}_1^v, \widehat{W}_2^v)$. So S_v is a vertex subset that contains v and has potential bounded by $\rho(S_v, W_1, W_2) \leq \rho(S_v, W_1^v, W_2^v) + \alpha + \beta \leq \alpha$.

Let (H, W_1^x, W_2^x) be the weighted graph constructed by setting $W_j^x = W_j$ except $c_1^x(x) = 0$ and $W_1^x(v) = W_1(v) + 1$. There is no desirable coloring of (H, W_1^x, W_2^x) , as such a coloring could be extended to a desirable coloring of G by giving u color 1, which contradicts the choice of G . So (H, W_1^x, W_2^x) contains critical subgraph $(G_x, \widehat{W}_1^x, \widehat{W}_2^x)$. Let $S_x = V(G_x)$. By the minimality of G , we have $\rho(G_x, \widehat{W}_1^x, \widehat{W}_2^x) \leq -\beta$. As it is a subgraph, $\rho(S_x, W_1^x, W_2^x) \leq \rho(G_x, \widehat{W}_1^x, \widehat{W}_2^x)$. By Fact 2.2.4, $\rho(\{x\}, W_1, W_2) - \rho(\{x\}, W_1^x, W_2^x) \leq 1 - \alpha + \beta$.

As G does not contain a critical proper weighted subgraph, S_x contains x or v . Moreover, by Corollary 3.4.I, S_x contains x . If S_x also contains v , then

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(G[S_x] + u, W_1, W_2) &\leq \rho(G_x, W_1^x, W_2^x) + \rho(\{x, v\}, W_1, W_2) - \rho(\{x, v\}, W_1^x, W_2^x) + \rho(\{u\}) - 3 \\ &\leq -\beta + (1 - \alpha + \beta) + (\alpha) + (2 - \alpha) - 3 \\ &\leq -\alpha < -\beta, \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts Corollary 3.2. So v is not in S_x and we have

$$\rho(S_x, W_1, W_2) \leq \rho(V(G_x), W_1^x, W_2^x) + 1 - \alpha + \beta \leq 1 - \alpha.$$

Since u is not in S_x or S_v , we apply subadditivity to say that $\rho(S_x \cup S_v) \leq \alpha + (1 - \alpha) = 1$. Therefore we have

$$\rho(G[S_x \cup S_v] + u, W_1, W_2) \leq 1 + (2 - \alpha) - 3 < -\beta,$$

which contradicts Corollary 3.2. □

Lemma 4.4. *If $d_1 \geq 1$ and u is a three-two-two, then there exists $v \in N(u)$ such that v is doubly-constrained.*

Proof. Let u be as in the statement of the lemma. Recall that means that $d(u) = 3$ and $c_1(u), c_2(u) \geq 2$. By Lemma 4.3 the neighbors of u are distinct. By way of contradiction, suppose that $N(u) = \{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$ and for each i there exists a color j_i such that x_i is j_i -null or j_i -slack. Let $H = G - u$. By Corollary 3.4.II.D, there is a desirable coloring $V_1' \cup V_2'$ of weighted graph (H, W_1', W_2') where $W_j' = W_j$ except $W_{3-j_i}'(x_i) = W_{3-j_i}(x_i) + 1$ for $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$.

Consider extending the desirable coloring of (H, W_1', W_2') to a coloring of G by giving u the color that appears the least on its neighbors, which we will call the ‘‘first attempt coloring.’’ We will show that if the first attempt coloring is not a desirable coloring, then (H, W_1', W_2') satisfies certain properties, and there exists a desirable coloring of G that we will call the ‘‘flipped coloring.’’

As $d(u) = 3$, in the first attempt coloring u is in at most one monochromatic edge and therefore not in a monochromatic cycle. Thus, the only way that the first attempt coloring is not a desirable coloring is if for some i, j we have $x_i \in V_j$ and $|N^m[x_i] \cap V_j| > c_j(x_i)$. Because (H, W'_1, W'_2) is a desirable coloring, by construction we have $j = j_i$ and ux_i is monochromatic. Moreover, the desirable coloring (H, W'_1, W'_2) with $x_i \in V_j$ implies that x_i is not j -null. By the assumptions of the case, this implies that x_i is j -slack.

As u is in at most one monochromatic edge, this implies that if such an (x_i, j) exist, then it is unique. By definition of j -slack and $|N^m[x_i] \cap V_j| > c_j(x_i)$, we have that $c_{3-j}(x_i) \geq 1$ and $N^m[x_i] \subseteq V_j$. We construct the flipped coloring from the first attempt coloring by removing x_i from V_j and adding it to V_{3-j} . By the above, x_i is no longer in any monochromatic edges. As i, j is the unique obstruction to the first attempt coloring being a desirable coloring, we conclude that the flipped coloring is a desirable coloring of G . This contradicts the choice of G . \square

Lemma 4.5. *If u is a triple-three with $N(u) = \{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$, then there exists $\{s, t\} \subset \{1, 2, 3\}$ such that x_s and x_t are somehow-constrained.*

Proof. The outline of this argument follows similarly to the proof of Lemma 4.3. However, the details are different and sometimes more complicated, including repeated use of flipped colorings.

Let u be as in the statement of the lemma. Recall that means that $d(u) = 3$ and $c_1(u), c_2(u) \geq 3$. By Lemma 4.3 the neighbors of u are distinct. Without loss of generality, by Lemma 4.4 we may assume that x_1 is doubly-constrained. By way of contradiction, let us assume that x_2 and x_3 are not somehow-constrained. Let $H = G - u$.

Let $(G_1, W_1^{(1)}, W_2^{(1)})$ be the weighted graph formed from H by setting $W_j^{(1)} = W_j$, except $W_j^{(1)}(x_1) = W_j(x_1) + 1$ for each j . We claim that G_1 contains a critical subgraph. By way of contradiction, suppose G_1 has a desirable coloring $V_1^{(1)} \cup V_2^{(1)}$. We extend the desirable coloring of G_1 to a “first attempt” coloring of G by giving u the color that appears the least on its neighbors. If the first attempt coloring is not a desirable coloring, then there exists an $x_i \in V_j^{(1)}$ such that $|N^m[x_i] \cap V_j^{(1)}| > c_j(x_i)$. Because it is a desirable coloring of G_1 , we must have that ux_i is the unique monochromatic edge containing u and $i \in \{2, 3\}$. So x_i is not j -null and by assumption x_i is not j -constrained, so $N^m[x_i] \subseteq V_j^{(1)}$, $c_j(x_i) = d(x_i)$, and therefore $c_{3-j}(x_i) > 0$. We construct the “flipped coloring” from the first attempt coloring by removing x_i from $V_j^{(1)}$ and adding it to $V_{3-j}^{(1)}$. The first attempt coloring or the flipped coloring is a desirable coloring of G , which contradicts the choice of G . This proves the claim.

Let $(\widehat{G}_1, \widehat{W}_1^{(1)}, \widehat{W}_2^{(1)})$ be a critical weighted subgraph of G_1 . Let $S_1 = V(\widehat{G}_1)$. By the minimality of G we have that $\rho(\widehat{G}_1) \leq -\beta$ and $x_1 \in S_1$. Therefore there exists a vertex set S_1 that contains x_1 and $\rho(S_1, W_1, W_2) \leq -\beta + \alpha + \beta = \alpha$.

Let $(G_{2,3}, W_1, W_2)$ be the weighted graph formed from H by adding edge x_2x_3 . We claim that $G_{2,3}$ contains a critical subgraph. By way of contradiction, suppose $G_{2,3}$ has a desirable coloring $V_1^{(2,3)} \cup V_2^{(2,3)}$. We extend the desirable coloring of $G_{2,3}$ to a “first attempt” coloring of G by giving u the opposite color of the one on x_1 . The first attempt coloring does not contain a monochromatic cycle, as any such cycle containing u would be a monochromatic cycle in $G_{2,3}$ using edge x_2x_3 . So, if the first attempt coloring is not a desirable coloring, then there exists an $x_i \in V_j^{(2,3)}$ such that $|N^m[x_i] \cap V_j^{(2,3)}| > c_j(x_i)$. Because it is a desirable coloring of $G_{2,3}$, x_i must be in strictly more monochromatic edges in G : so ux_i is a monochromatic edge and x_2x_3 is not a monochromatic edge. This implies that ux_{5-i} is not a monochromatic edge, and therefore i is unique. We create the “flipped coloring” from the first attempt coloring by removing x_i from $V_j^{(2,3)}$ and adding it to $V_{3-j}^{(2,3)}$. The first attempt coloring or the flipped coloring is a desirable coloring of G , which contradicts the choice of G . This proves the claim.

Let $(\widehat{G_{2,3}}, \widehat{W_1^{(2,3)}}, \widehat{W_2^{(2,3)}})$ be a critical weighted subgraph of $G_{2,3}$. Let $S_{2,3} = V(\widehat{G_{2,3}})$. By the minimality of G we have that $\rho(\widehat{G_{2,3}}) \leq -\beta$ and $\{x_2, x_3\} \subseteq S_{2,3}$. Therefore there exists a vertex set $S_{2,3}$ that contains $\{x_2, x_3\}$ and $\rho(S_{2,3}, W_1, W_2) \leq -\beta + 1$.

Since u is not in S_1 or $S_{2,3}$, we apply subadditivity to say that $\rho(S_1 \cup S_{2,3}) \leq \alpha + (1 - \beta)$. Therefore we have

$$\rho(G[S_1 \cup S_{2,3}] + u, W_1, W_2) \leq (\alpha + 1 - \beta) + (2 - \alpha) - 3 = -\beta,$$

which contradicts Corollary 3.2. □

5 Discharging

To each vertex u we assign a *charge*, $ch(u) = \rho(\{u\}) - d(u)/2$. By construction we have $\rho(G) = \sum_u ch(u)$. Our goal is to show $\sum_u ch(u) \leq -\beta$, which will prove the theorem by contradicting the choice of G .

Recall $\alpha = \frac{d_2+2}{(d_1+2)(d_2+1)}$, $\beta = \frac{1}{d_2+1}$, and $d_2 \geq 2d_1 + 2$. Therefore $\frac{1}{d_1+2} < \alpha \leq \frac{2}{2d_1+3}$ and $\beta \leq \frac{1}{2d_1+3}$. So we have

- For $d_1 = 0$ we have $\alpha = 0.5 + \beta/2$ and $\beta \leq 1/3$.
- For $d_1 = 1$ we have $\alpha \leq \frac{2}{5}$ and $\beta \leq \frac{1}{5}$.
- For $d_1 = 2$ we have $\alpha \leq \frac{2}{7}$ and $\beta \leq \frac{1}{7}$.
- For $d_1 = 3$ we have $\alpha \leq \frac{2}{9}$ and $\beta \leq \frac{1}{9}$.
- For $d_1 \geq 4$ we have $\alpha \leq \frac{2}{11}$ and $\beta \leq \frac{1}{11}$.

We define functions D, S over the whole numbers as follows:

- $D(0) = S(0) = 0$.
- $D(1) = D(2) = 0.5 - \alpha$ and $S(1) = S(2) = 0$.
- $D(3) = 0.5 - \alpha - \beta/5$ and $S(3) = \beta/5$.
- $D(d) = 0.5 - \alpha - \beta$ and $S(d) = \beta$ for $d \geq 4$.

By construction, for each k we have $D(k) + S(k) \geq 0.5 - \alpha$ and $D(k) \geq S(k)$. Moreover, $D(1) \geq S(1) + \beta/2$ and for $k \geq 2$ we have $D(k) \geq S(k) + \beta$.

We create a “final charge” function ch^* . The function ch^* is the outcome of modifying ch according to two discharging rules. In a discharging rule, the act of “vertex u gives charge x to neighbor w ” describes increasing $ch(u)$ by x and decreasing $ch(w)$ by x . In this way we have the property that $\sum_{u \in V(G)} ch(u) = \sum_{w \in V(G)} ch^*(w)$. The discharging rules are:

- R1 Each vertex that is doubly-constrained gives $D(d_1)$ charge to each neighbor that is three-two-two and not doubly-constrained.
- R2 Each vertex that is somehow-constrained but not doubly-constrained gives $S(d_1)$ charge to each neighbor that is triple-three.

As $0 = D(0) = S(0) = S(1) = S(2)$, we effectively only apply R1 when $d_1 \geq 1$ and apply R2 when $d_1 \geq 3$.

Our goal is to show that for every vertex u we have $ch^*(u) \leq 0$. Moreover, there exists two vertices y_1, y_2 such that $ch^*(y_j) \leq -\beta/2$ for each j , or there exists a vertex y such that $ch^*(y) \leq -\beta$. This will prove $\rho(G) = \sum_{w \in V(G)} ch^*(w) \leq -\beta$, which contradicts the choice of G and proves the theorem.

Lemma 5.1. *If $d_1 = 0$, then for any vertex u we have $ch(u) \leq -\beta/2$.*

Proof. Let u be a vertex. By Lemma 4.1, $d(u) \geq 2$. If $d(u) \geq 3$, then $ch(u) \leq 2 - \alpha - 3/2 = -\beta/2$. By Lemma 4.2, if $d(u) = 2$, then one of the following three cases applies.

- $c_1(u) = c_2(u) = 1$, which implies $ch(u) = \alpha - 1 = (\beta - 1)/2$. Because $\beta \leq 1/3$, this implies $ch(u) \leq -\beta$.
- $c_1(u) = 0$, which by Fact 2.2.2.c implies $ch(u) \leq -\beta$.
- $c_2(u) = 0$, which by Fact 2.2.2.d implies $ch(u) \leq -\beta$.

□

Lemma 5.2. *If u is doubly constrained, then*

- if $d_1 = 1$, then $ch(u) \leq -d(u)(0.5 - \alpha) - \beta$,
- if $d_1 = 2$, then $ch(u) \leq -d(u)(0.5 - \alpha)$,
- if $d_1 = 3$ and $d(u) \neq 5$, then $ch(u) \leq -d(u)(0.5 - \alpha)$,
- if $d_1 = 3$ and $d(u) = 5$, then $ch(u) \leq -d(u)(0.5 - \alpha) + \beta$, and
- if $d_1 \geq 4$, then $ch(u) \leq -d(u)(0.5 - \alpha - \beta) - \beta$.

Proof. Because u is doubly constrained, we have that $c_1(u), c_2(u) \leq d(u) - 1$. Therefore

$$\rho(\{u\}) = \alpha c_1(x) + \beta(c_2(x) - 1) \leq (d(u) - 1)(\alpha + \beta) - \beta,$$

and so

$$ch(u) \leq -d(u)(0.5 - \alpha - \beta) - 2\beta - \alpha.$$

This proves the lemma when $d_1 \geq 4$.

Recall that $c_1(u) \leq d_1 + 1$. So we can get a refined estimate as

$$\rho(\{u\}) \leq \min\{d_1 + 1, d(u) - 1\}\alpha + (d(u) - 2)\beta.$$

This implies that

$$ch(u) \leq -d(u)(0.5 - \alpha) + (\min\{d_1 + 1, d(u) - 1\} - d(u))\alpha + (d(u) - 2)\beta.$$

As $\alpha \geq 2\beta$ we can simplify this inequality to

$$ch(u) \leq -d(u)(0.5 - \alpha) + (2 \min\{d_1 + 1, d(u) - 1\} - d(u) - 2)\beta.$$

Observe that $2 \min\{d_1 + 1, d(u) - 1\} - d(u) - 2 = d_1 - 2 - |d_1 + 2 - d(u)|$. Plugging that value in gives us

$$ch(u) \leq -d(u)(0.5 - \alpha) + (d_1 - 2)\beta,$$

with an additional β subtracted from the right hand side when $d_1 = 3$ and $d(u) \neq 5$. This proves the lemma. □

Corollary 5.3. *If u is doubly constrained, then $ch^*(u) \leq 0$. Moreover, if $d_1 = 1$, then $ch^*(u) \leq -\beta$.*

Lemma 5.4. *If u is somehow constrained and not three-two-two, then:*

- If $d_1 \in \{1, 2\}$, then $ch(u) \leq -\beta$.
- If $d_1 = 3$, then $ch(u) \leq -d(u)\beta/5 - \beta$.
- If $d_1 \geq 4$, then $ch(u) \leq -(d(u) + 1)\beta$.

Proof. Recall that every vertex has potential at most $2 - \alpha$, so

$$ch(u) \leq (2 - \alpha) - d(u)/2 \leq -(d(u) - 4)/2 - \alpha.$$

Observe that at $d(u) = 5$ with $\alpha \geq 2\beta$ this becomes $-1/2 - 2\beta$, which is low enough to prove the lemma. Since the slope—in respect to the degree of u —of the right hand side is -0.5 , which is far smaller than $-\beta$, this proves the lemma for all vertices with degree at least 5.

If $d(u) = 2$, then by Lemma 4.2 one of the following three cases applies.

- $c_1(u) = c_2(u) = 1$, which implies $ch(u) = \alpha - 1$.
- $c_1(u) = 0$ and $c_2(u) = 2$, which implies $ch(u) = \beta - 1$.
- $c_2(u) = 0$ and $c_1(u) = 2$, which implies $ch(u) = 2\alpha - \beta - 1$.

Therefore $ch(u) \leq 2\alpha - 1 - \beta$. Observe that

- For $d_1 \in \{1, 2\}$ we have $\alpha \leq \frac{2}{5}$, so $2\alpha - 1 < 0$.
- For $d_1 = 3$ we have $\alpha \leq \frac{2}{9}$ and $\beta \leq \frac{1}{9}$, so $2\alpha - 1 \leq -2\beta/5$.
- For $d_1 \geq 4$ we have $\alpha \leq \frac{2}{11}$ and $\beta \leq \frac{1}{11}$, so $2\alpha - 1 \leq -2\beta$.

Thus the lemma is proven when $d(u) = 2$.

If $d(u) = 3$ and u is not three-two-two, then $c_i(u) \leq 1$ for some i . If $i = 1$, then $\rho(\{u\}) \leq 1 + \alpha - \beta$, and if $i = 2$, then $\rho(\{u\}) \leq 1 - \alpha + \beta$. Therefore $ch(u) \leq -0.5 + \alpha - \beta$.

- If $d_1 \in \{1, 2\}$, then the lemma immediately follows from $\alpha \leq 0.5$.
- If $d_1 = 3$, then $ch(u) \leq -8\beta/5$.
- If $d_1 \geq 4$, then $ch(u) \leq \frac{-7}{22} - \beta < -4\beta$.

Thus the lemma is proven when $d(u) = 3$.

We now consider the final case where $d(u) = 4$. As $ch(u) \leq -(d(u) - 4)/2 - \alpha = -\alpha \leq -2\beta$, the lemma is proven for $d_1 \leq 3$. So suppose $d_1 \geq 4$. As u is somehow constrained, we have $c_i(u) \leq 3$ for some i . If $i = 1$, then $\rho(\{u\}) \leq 1 + 3\alpha - \beta$, and if $i = 2$, then $\rho(\{u\}) \leq 1 - \alpha + 3\beta$. Therefore $ch(u) \leq 3\alpha - \beta - 1$. As $\alpha \leq \frac{2}{11}$ and $\beta \leq \frac{1}{11}$, we have that $ch(u) < -5\beta$. \square

Corollary 5.5. *If $d_1 \geq 1$ and u is somehow-constrained, not three-two-two, and not doubly constrained, then $ch^*(u) \leq -\beta$.*

Lemma 5.6. *If u is not three-two-two or somehow-constrained, then $ch^*(u) \leq -\beta$.*

Proof. If u is not three-two-two or somehow-constrained, then u is not involved in either discharging rule and so $ch(u) = ch^*(u)$.

If u is not three-two-two, not somehow-constrained, and $d(u) = 3$, then u is i -null for some i . If $d(u) = 2$ and not somehow-constrained, then by Lemma 4.2 u is i -null for some i . If u is i -null and $d(u) \geq 2$, then by Fact 2.2.2 we have $ch(u) \leq -\beta$. So assume $d(u) \geq 4$, which implies $ch(u) \leq (2 - \alpha) - 2 \leq -\beta$. \square

Lemma 5.7. *If $d_1 \geq 1$, u is three-two-two, not triple-three, and not doubly-constrained, then $ch^*(u) \leq 0$. Moreover, if $d_1 \geq 2$, then $ch^*(u) \leq -\beta$.*

Proof. If u is three-two-two but not triple-three, then $d(u) = 3$ and there exists an i such that $c_i(u) = 2$. This implies that u is somehow-constrained. By Lemma 4.4, u has a neighbor that is doubly-constrained (which implies that it is not triple-three). So while applying the discharging rules, at least one neighbor will give $D(d_1)$ charge to u while u will give at most $2S(d_1)$ charge to its neighbors, and therefore

$$ch^*(u) \leq \rho(\{u\}) - 3/2 - D(d_1) + 2S(d_1).$$

If $d_1 \in \{1, 2\}$, then $D(d_1) = 0.5 - \alpha$ and $S(d_1) = 0$, so $ch^*(u) \leq (2 - \alpha) - 3/2 - (0.5 - \alpha) = 0$. This proves the lemma if $d_1 = 1$, so assume $d_1 \geq 2$.

Because $c_i(u) = 2$ we have that $W_i(u) = d_i - 1$, which is positive. So we have that $\rho(\{u\}) \leq (2 - \alpha) - \min\{\alpha(d_1 - 1), \beta(d_2 - 1)\}$. As $\alpha \geq 2\beta$ and $d_2 \geq 2d_1 + 2$, this bound becomes $\rho(\{u\}) \leq (2 - \alpha) - 2(d_1 - 1)\beta$. Plugging this into the above inequality creates

$$ch^*(u) \leq 1/2 - \alpha - 2(d_1 - 1)\beta - D(d_1) + 2S(d_1).$$

When $d_1 = 2$ this simplifies to $ch^*(u) \leq -2\beta$, so assume $d_1 \geq 3$.

Recall that $D(3) = 0.5 - \alpha - \beta/5$ and $S(3) = \beta/5$. So when $d_1 = 3$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} ch^*(u) &\leq 0.5 - \alpha - 4\beta - (0.5 - \alpha - \beta/5) + 2\beta/5 \\ &= -3.4\beta. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $D(d_1) = 0.5 - \alpha - \beta$ and $S(d_1) = \beta$ for $d_1 \geq 4$. So when $d_1 \geq 4$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} ch^*(u) &\leq 0.5 - \alpha - 6\beta - (0.5 - \alpha - \beta) + 2\beta \\ &= -3\beta. \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 5.8. *If $d_1 > 0$ and u is triple-three, then $ch^*(u) \leq 0$. Moreover, if u is adjacent to two doubly-constrained vertices and $d_1 \geq 2$, then $ch^*(u) \leq -\beta$.*

Proof. A triple-three vertex is not somehow-constrained. By Lemmas 4.4 and 4.5, there exists $\{w_1, w_2\} \subset N(u)$ such that w_1 is doubly-constrained and w_2 is somehow-constrained.

Suppose first that w_2 is not doubly-constrained. While applying the discharging rules, w_1 gives $D(d_1)$ charge to u and w_2 gives $S(d_1)$ charge to u . Recall that by construction, $S(d_1) + D(d_1) \geq 0.5 - \alpha$. Therefore $ch^*(u) \leq (2 - \alpha) - 1.5 - (0.5 - \alpha) = 0$.

Now suppose that w_2 is doubly-constrained; this will prove the “moreover” part of the lemma. Recall that for $k \geq 2$ we have $D(k) \geq S(k) + \beta$. During discharging, u is given charge $2D(d_1)$ instead of $D(d_1) + S(d_1)$ as considered before, which proves the lemma. □

We are now ready to finish the proof to Theorem 2.1. The proof is immediate by Lemma 5.1 if $d_1 = 0$ as G contains at least two vertices, so assume $d_1 \geq 1$ for the rest of the section. Recall that triple-three is stronger than three-two-two and doubly-constrained is stronger than somehow-constrained. Every vertex u of G falls into one of these categories:

1. u is triple-three,
2. u is doubly-constrained,
3. u is three-two-two, but not triple-three or doubly-constrained,
4. u is somehow-constrained, but not three-two-two or doubly-constrained, or
5. u is not somehow-constrained or three-two-two.

By Corollaries 5.3 and 5.5 and Lemmas 5.6, 5.7, and 5.8, $ch^*(u) \leq 0$ for any vertex u . Moreover, by Corollary 5.5 and Lemma 5.6, $ch^*(u) \leq -\beta$ if u is not doubly-constrained or three-two-two. As $-\beta < \rho(G) = \sum_u ch^*(u)$ and G contains at least two vertices, this implies that each vertex u of G is category (1), (2), or (3).

If every vertex is category (1), (2), or (3), then by Lemma 4.4 there exists $w \in V(G)$ such that w is doubly-constrained. By Corollary 5.3 $ch^*(w) \leq -\beta$ if $d_1 = 1$, which is a contradiction, and so $d_1 \geq 2$.

By Lemma 5.7 and $d_1 \geq 2$, if u is category (3), then $ch^*(u) \leq -\beta$. So all vertices in u are doubly-constrained or triple-three. Vertices that are triple-three are not somehow-constrained. So if u is triple-three, then the two somehow-constrained neighbors of u found in Lemma 4.5 are doubly-constrained, and so by Lemma 5.8 $ch^*(u) \leq -\beta$. This contradicts the choice of G as $-\beta < \rho(G) = \sum_u ch^*(u) \leq -\beta$, and it proves Theorem 2.1.

6 Algorithm

Our proof to Theorem 2.1 is constructive, although it is not immediately clear that it leads to a polynomial-time algorithm. Central to the algorithm is a routine that will find a nontrivial proper subgraph that minimizes potential (we restrict to nonempty subgraphs because the gap lemma requires finding subgraphs H with $0 < \rho(H) < \alpha - \beta$, and the empty subgraph has potential 0). For this routine we apply Corollary 2.4 of [CY20] with $m_1 = m_2 = 1$. In some situations we merely want to confirm whether the assumptions of Theorem 2.1 hold (in other words, whether $\min_H \rho(H) > -\beta$), which can be done using $m_1 = m_2 = 0$.

Theorem 6.1 ([CY20]). *Let G be a weighted graph as described in Section 2.1. We can find a weighted subgraph that minimizes potential among those that are nonempty and non-spanning in $O(n^4 \log(n))$ time. We can find a weighted subgraph of G that minimizes potential in $O(n^2 \log(n))$ time.*

We will now prove the following theorem.

Theorem 6.2. *Let G be a weighted graph as described in Section 2.1. If $\rho(H) > -\beta$ for every weighted subgraph H of G , then a desirable coloring of G can be found in $O(n^5 \log(n))$ time.*

Proof. Our algorithm breaks into a series of cases. The cases directly follow the arguments of Section 4, which we refer to frequently. We can simplify some of the details for the algorithm, such as a smaller set of assumptions for using the “flipped coloring” in cases 6 and 7 below.

The argument presented in Section 5 implies that if G satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 6.1, then at least one of the cases will apply. The later cases assume that the earlier

cases did not apply. Our calculation of computational cost includes determining if a given case applies, and the cost to perform the ensuing operations if it does apply.

Let $n = |V(G)|$. As $\rho(G) > -\beta$ we have that $|E(G)| \leq O(n)$. We will construct $T : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that a desirable coloring of G can be found in $T(n)$ computations. We will show that $T(n_*) \leq Cn_*^4 \log(n_*) + \max_{n' < n_*} T(n')$ for some fixed constant C and arbitrary n_* , which implies the theorem.

Case 1: G is disconnected, an edge has multiplicity at least 3, $c_i(u) < 0$ for some vertex u , or $n \leq 3$. (This case parallels Section 2.3.) Removing edges until each has multiplicity at most 2 can be done in linear time. Decreasing the weight of each vertex until the capacities are nonnegative can be done in linear time. If $n \leq O(1)$, then the desirable coloring can be done in $O(1)$ time by trying all 2^n possibilities.

Finding the connected components can be done in linear time, and recursing on each connected component can be done in time $O(n) + \max_{k_1+k_2+\dots+k_\ell=n} \sum_i T(k_i)$. Because T is a convex function, this is maximized when $\ell = 1$, which is when G is connected.

Case 2: G contains a nonempty proper weighted subgraph H such that $\rho(H) \leq \alpha - \beta$. (This case parallels Lemma 3.1.) As in the proof to Lemma 3.1, such an H will be non-spanning. So we use Theorem 6.1 to find the H that minimizes potential. This is done in $O(n^4 \log(n))$ time. Let $n_H = |V(H)|$.

If $\rho(H) > 0$, then we increase W_2 on a vertex in H with a neighbor outside of H . By the proof to Lemma 3.1, H satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 6.2. Therefore we recurse on H to find a desirable coloring of H . This is done in $T(n_H)$ time.

We construct (G^*, W_1^*, W_2^*) as in the proof to Lemma 3.1. By the proof to Lemma 3.1, we have that G^* satisfies assumptions of Theorem 6.2. Therefore we recurse on G^* to find a desirable coloring of G^* . The coloring of H and the coloring of G^* combine to form a desirable coloring of G , finishing the algorithm. This is done in $O(n) + T(n - n_H)$ time.

The overall running time of this case is then $O(n^4 \log(n)) + \max_{n_H} T(n_H) + T(n - n_H)$. As T is convex, the maximization occurs when $n_H \leq O(1)$ or $n - n_H \leq O(1)$. As H is a non-spanning and nonempty, we have that $n_H < n$ and $n - n_H < n$. Therefore the overall running time of the algorithm in this case is $O(n^4 \log(n)) + T(n - 1)$.

Case 3: there exists a vertex u with $|N(u)| = 1$. (This case parallels Lemma 4.1.) Such a vertex can be found in $O(n)$ time. We recurse on G after removing u and modifying the weights on the neighbor of u if u is in a parallel edge or i -null for some i . By the proof to Lemma 4.1, the smaller graph satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 6.2, and we can find a desirable coloring of it by recursing. The coloring that is returned from the recursive call is easily extended to G . The running time of the algorithm in this case is $O(n) + T(n - 1)$.

Case 4: there exists a u with $d(u) = 2$, $\min(c_1(u), c_2(u)) \geq 1$, and $\max(c_1(u), c_2(u)) \geq 2$. (This case parallels Lemma 4.2.) Such a vertex can be found in $O(n)$ time. We recurse on G after removing u and modifying the weights on the neighbors of u as described in the proof to Lemma 4.2. By the proof to Lemma 4.2, the smaller graph satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 6.2, and we can find a desirable coloring of it by recursing. The coloring that is returned from the recursive call is easily extended to G . The running time of the algorithm in this case is $O(n) + T(n - 1)$.

Case 5: there exists a three-two-two u that is in a parallel edge. (This case parallels Lemma 4.3.) Let $N^m(u) = \{v, x, x\}$. Such a vertex can be found in $O(n)$ time. As in the proof to Lemma 4.3, we construct weighted graphs (H, W_1^v, W_2^v) and (H, W_1^x, W_2^x) in $O(n)$ time. By the proof to Lemma 4.3, at least one of (H, W_1^v, W_2^v) or (H, W_1^x, W_2^x) satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 6.2. We use Theorem 6.1 to determine in $O(n^2 \log(n))$ time which of the weighted graphs satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 6.2. We recurse on one of the weighted graphs that satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 6.2 (and *only* one, even if they both satisfy the assumptions), which will return a coloring that is easily extended to a desirable coloring of G . The running time of the algorithm in this case is $O(n^2 \log(n)) + T(n - 1)$.

Case 6: there exists a three-two-two u that has no doubly-constrained neighbor. (This case parallels Lemma 4.4.) Such a vertex can be found in $O(n)$ time. We construct and recurse to find a desirable coloring $V'_1 \cup V'_2$ of (H, W'_1, W'_2) as in the proof to Lemma 4.4. Let $N(u) = \{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$, and let j be such that $|V'_j \cap N(u)| \geq 2$. If the following conditions hold for some $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$

- $x_i \notin V'_j$,
- $c_j(x_i) > 0$,
- $N(x_i) \cap V'_j = \emptyset$,

then we remove x_i from V'_{3-j} and add it to V'_j . This adjustment can be done in $O(n)$ time (verifying whether the conditions hold takes $d(x_i)$ time, and $d(x_i) \leq O(n)$). By the proof to Lemma 4.4, the coloring then extends to a desirable coloring of G by adding u to V'_{3-j} . The running time of the algorithm in this case is $O(n) + T(n - 1)$.

Case 7: there exists a triple-three u with two neighbors that are not somehow-constrained. (This case parallels Lemma 4.5.) Such a vertex can be found in $O(n)$ time. As in the proof to Lemma 4.5, we construct weighted graphs $(G_1, W_1^{(1)}, W_2^{(1)})$ and $(G_{2,3}, W_1, W_2)$ in $O(n)$ time. By the proof to Lemma 4.5, at least one of $(G_1, W_1^{(1)}, W_2^{(1)})$ and $(G_{2,3}, W_1, W_2)$ satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 6.2. We use Theorem 6.1 to determine in $O(n^2 \log(n))$ time which of the weighted graphs satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 6.2. We recurse on one of the weighted graphs that satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 6.2 to produce a desirable

coloring $V'_1 \cup V'_2$. Let $N(u) = \{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$, and let j be such that $|V'_j \cap N(u)| \geq 2$. If the following conditions hold for some $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$

- $x_i \notin V'_j$,
- $c_j(x_i) > 0$,
- $N(x_i) \cap V'_j = \emptyset$,

then we remove x_i from V'_{3-j} and add it to V'_j . This adjustment can be done in $O(n)$ time (verifying whether the conditions hold takes $d(x_i)$ time, and $d(x_i) \leq O(n)$). By the proof to Lemma 4.5, the coloring then extends to a desirable coloring of G by adding u to V'_{3-j} . The running time of the algorithm in this case is $O(n^2 \log(n)) + T(n - 1)$.

□

7 An Open Question

As a graduate student, our first experience with the potential method was an attempt at improving the $d_2 \geq 2d_1 + 2$ assumption in Theorem 1.1, which is a question we continue to think about many years later. We use the assumption $d_2 \geq 2d_1 + 2$ in several places to prove Theorem 1.2—but not all of those arguments are needed to prove Theorem 1.1. The arguments in this paper can be used to create a proof of Theorem 1.1 where the only time $d_2 \geq 2d_1 + 2$ is used is in Fact 2.2.6, exclusively to prove Fact 2.2.7, exclusively to prove Corollary 3.4.II.B, exclusively to prove Lemma 4.2.

The constructions of sparse critical graphs in Section 2.2 do not depend on $d_2 \geq 2d_1 + 2$ (only $d_2 > d_1$), so an improvement to Theorem 1.1 would be sharp. However, we can show that such constructions are not sharp when $d_2 = d_1 + 1$, and therefore any such improvement to Theorem 1.1 would still require at least $d_2 \geq d_1 + 2$ as an assumption. We consider a new gadget that we name the *double-pennon*. It might be viewed as a generalization of the butterfly graph used by Borodin and Kostochka [BK11] for (Δ_0, Δ_1) -coloring, although it satisfies weaker properties.

A double-pennon is attached to u by

1. adding unweighted vertices x_*, x_1, \dots, x_{d_2} and edges x_*x_i, ux_i for each i and x_*u , and then
2. adding unweighted vertices y_*, y_1, \dots, y_{d_2} and edges y_*y_i, x_*y_i for each i and y_*x_* .

Adding a double-pennon adds $2(d_2 + 1)$ unweighted vertices and $4d_2 + 2$ edges. In Theorem 7.1 we will show that attaching a double-pennon to u has the same effect as decreasing each of $c_1(u)$ and $c_2(u)$ by one.

When $d_2 = d_1 + 1$, attaching a double-pennon to u can be interpreted as attaching a flag (as mentioned in Section 2.2) to u and then attaching a second flag to the center of the first flag. If $d_2 = d_1 + 1$, then adding a double-pennon changes the potential by of an entire graph by $2(d_1 + 2)(2 - \alpha) - (4d_1 + 6) = -2\beta$. As increasing each capacity of u by one increases the potential by $\alpha + \beta > 2\beta$, this implies that the double-pennon can be used to create sparser critical graphs when $d_2 = d_1 + 1$ than those constructed in Section 2.2.

Theorem 7.1. *Let $d_2 > d_1$ and $x_*, x_1, \dots, x_{d_2}, y_*, y_1, \dots, y_{d_2}$ be the vertex set of a double-pennon attached at u as described above in graph H . In any desirable coloring $V_1 \cup V_2$ of H , we have $\{x_*, x_1, \dots, x_{d_2}\} \cap V_i \neq \emptyset$ for each i .*

Proof. Let $V_1 \cup V_2$ be a desirable coloring of H . As $H[V_1]$ has maximum degree at most $d_1 < d_2$ and $H[\{x_*, x_1, \dots, x_{d_2}\}] \cong K_{1, d_2}$, it follows that $V_2 \cap \{x_*, x_1, \dots, x_{d_2}\} \neq \emptyset$. Symmetrically, there exists $\hat{y} \in V_2 \cap \{y_*, y_1, \dots, y_{d_2}\}$. Because $H[\{\hat{y}, x_*, x_1, \dots, x_{d_2}\}] \cong K_{1, d_2+1}$ and $H[V_2]$ has maximum degree at most d_2 , it follows that $V_1 \cap \{x_*, x_1, \dots, x_{d_2}\} \neq \emptyset$. \square

It is unknown if double-pennons are part of an optimal construction of sparse $(\Delta_{d_1}, \Delta_{d_1+1})$ -critical graph; even the optimal sparsity condition for (Δ_1, Δ_2) -coloring remains open. Kostochka, Xu, and Zhu [KXZ23] recently made progress on (Δ_1, Δ_3) -coloring, but this is still open as well. We would like to know if the constructions of Section 2.2 are optimal when $d_1 + 2 \leq d_2 \leq 2d_1 + 1$.

Question 7.2. *Does there exist a $(\Delta_{d_1}, \Delta_{d_2})$ -critical graph G with $d_1 + 2 \leq d_2$ and $\rho(G) > -\beta$?*

References

- [AEGW89] Jin Akiyama, Hiroshi Era, Severino V. Gervacio, and Mamoru Watanabe. Path chromatic numbers of graphs. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 13(5):571–573, 1989.
- [AH77] Kenneth Appel and Wolfgang Haken. Every planar map is four colorable. part i: Discharging. *Illinois Journal of Mathematics*, 21:429–490, 1977.
- [AHK77] K. Appel, W. Haken, and J. Koch. Every planar map is four colorable part ii: Reducibility1. *Illinois Journal of Mathematics*, 21(3):491 – 567, 1977.
- [BK11] O. Borodin and A. Kostochka. Vertex partitions of sparse graphs into an independent vertex set and subgraph of maximum degree at most one. *Siberian Mathematical Journal*, 52:796–801, 09 2011.

- [BK14] O.V. Borodin and A.V. Kostochka. Defective 2-colorings of sparse graphs. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 104:72–80, 2014.
- [BKY13] O.V. Borodin, A. Kostochka, and M. Yancey. On 1-improper 2-coloring of sparse graphs. *Discrete Mathematics*, 313(22):2638–2649, 2013.
- [BM79] Béla Bollobás and Bennet Manvel. Optimal vertex partitions. *Bulletin of the London Mathematical Society*, 11(2):113–116, 1979.
- [BM85] I. Broere and C. M. Mynhardt. Generalized colorings of outerplanar and planar graphs. *Graph theory with applications to algorithms and computer science*, pages 151–161, 1985.
- [Bor76] Oleg V. Borodin. On decomposition of graphs into degenerate subgraphs. *Diskretn. Anal. Novosibirsk*, 28:3–12, 1976. (in Russian).
- [CCP21] Eun-Kyung Cho, Ilkyoo Choi, and Boram Park. Partitioning planar graphs without 4-cycles and 5-cycles into bounded degree forests. *Discrete Mathematics*, 344(1):112172, 2021.
- [CCW86] L. J. Cowen, R. H. Cowen, and D. R. Woodall. Defective colorings of graphs in surfaces: Partitions into subgraphs of bounded valency. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 10(2):187–195, 1986.
- [CDF⁺23] Timothée Corsini, Quentin Deschamps, Carl Feghali, Daniel Gonçalves, H el ene Langlois, and Alexandre Talon. Partitioning into degenerate graphs in linear time. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 114:103771, 2023.
- [CR15] Ilkyoo Choi and Andr e Raspaud. Planar graphs with girth at least 5 are (3,5)-colorable. *Discrete Mathematics*, 338(4):661–667, 2015.
- [CRY22] Min Chen, Andr e Raspaud, and Weiqiang Yu. An (f_1, f_4) -partition of graphs with low genus and girth at least 6. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 99(2):186–206, 2022.
- [CY20] Daniel W. Cranston and Matthew P. Yancey. Sparse graphs are near-bipartite. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 34(3):1725–1768, 2020.
- [CY21] Daniel W. Cranston and Matthew P. Yancey. Vertex partitions into an independent set and a forest with each component small. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 35(3):1769–1791, 2021.
- [CYW18] Min Chen, Weiqiang Yu, and Weifan Wang. On the vertex partitions of sparse graphs into an independent vertex set and a forest with bounded maximum degree. *Applied Mathematics and Computation*, 326:117–123, 2018.

- [DMP17] François Dross, Mickael Montassier, and Alexandre Pinlou. Partitioning a triangle-free planar graph into a forest and a forest of bounded degree. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 66:81–94, 2017. Selected papers of EuroComb15.
- [DMP18] François Dross, Mickael Montassier, and Alexandre Pinlou. Partitioning sparse graphs into an independent set and a forest of bounded degree. *Electronic Journal of Combinatorics*, 25(1):P1.45, 2018.
- [Fv24] Carl Feghali and Robert Šámal. Decomposing a triangle-free planar graph into a forest and a subcubic forest. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 116, 2024.
- [God91] Wayne Goddard. Acyclic colorings of planar graphs. *Discrete Mathematics*, 91(1):91–94, 1991.
- [HHL23] Xiaojie Huang, Ziwen Huang, and Jian-Bo Lv. Partitioning planar graphs without 4-cycles and 6-cycles into a linear forest and a forest. *Graphs and Combinatorics*, 39(10), 2023.
- [HPAR23] Frédéric Havet, Lucas Picasarri-Arrieta, and Clément Rambaud. On the minimum number of arcs in 4-dicritical oriented graphs. In Daniël Paulusma and Bernard Ries, editors, *Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science*, pages 376–387, Cham, 2023. Springer Nature Switzerland.
- [JKM⁺21] Yifan Jing, Alexandr Kostochka, Fuhong Ma, Pongpat Sittitrai, and Jingwei Xu. Defective dp-colorings of sparse multigraphs. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 93:103267, 2021.
- [JKMX22] Yifan Jing, Alexandr Kostochka, Fuhong Ma, and Jingwei Xu. Defective dp-colorings of sparse simple graphs. *Discrete Mathematics*, 345(1):112637, 2022.
- [KXZ23] Alexandr Kostochka, Jingwei Xu, and Xuding Zhu. Sparse critical graphs for defective (1, 3)-coloring, 2023.
- [Lov66] L. Lovász. On decomposition of graphs. *Studia Sci. Math. Hungar.*, 1:237–238, 1966.
- [LRSS18] Carlos V. G. C. Lima, Dieter Rautenbach, Uéverton S. Souza, and Jayme L. Szwarcfiter. Bipartizing with a matching. In Donghyun Kim, R. N. Uma, and Alexander Zelikovsky, editors, *Combinatorial Optimization and Applications*, pages 198–213, Cham, 2018. Springer International Publishing.
- [LW22] Runrun Liu and Weifan Wang. A sufficient condition for a planar graph to be (f,f₂)-partitionable. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 318:61–68, 2022.
- [MO13] Mickaël Montassier and Pascal Ochem. Near-colorings: Non-colorable graphs and np-completeness. *Electron. J. Comb.*, 22:1, 2013.

- [Poh90] K. S. Poh. On the linear vertex-arboricity of a planar graph. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 14(1):73–75, 1990.
- [WHF20] Yang Wang, Danjun Huang, and Stephen Finbow. On the vertex partition of planar graphs into forests with bounded degree. *Applied Mathematics and Computation*, 374:125032, 2020.
- [ZCW17] Miao Zhang, Min Chen, and Yiqiao Wang. A sufficient condition for planar graphs with girth 5 to be $(1, 7)$ -colorable. *Journal of Combinatorial Optimization*, 33, 04 2017.