

PAINTABILITY OF r -CHROMATIC GRAPHS

PETER BRADSHAW AND JINGHAN A ZENG

ABSTRACT. The *paintability* of a graph is a coloring parameter defined in terms of an online list coloring game. In this paper we ask, what is the paintability of a graph G of maximum degree Δ and chromatic number r ? By considering the Alon-Tarsi number of G , we prove that the paintability of G is at most $\left(1 - \frac{1}{4r+1}\right)\Delta + 2$. We also consider the *DP-paintability* of G , which is defined in terms of an online DP-coloring game. By considering the *strict type-3 degeneracy* parameter recently introduced by Zhou, Zhu, and Zhu, we show that when r is fixed and Δ is sufficiently large, the DP-paintability of G is at most $\Delta - \Omega(\sqrt{\Delta \log \Delta})$.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Online list coloring and online DP-coloring. Given a graph G , a *list assignment* on G is a function $L : V(G) \rightarrow 2^{\mathbb{N}}$ that assigns a color set $L(v)$ to each vertex $v \in V(G)$. Given a function $f : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, a list assignment L which satisfies $|L(v)| = f(v)$ for all $v \in V(G)$ is called an *f-assignment*, and L is called a *k-assignment* if $|L(v)| = k$ for all $v \in V(G)$. Given a list assignment L on G , an *L-coloring* of G is a mapping $\phi : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that $\phi(u) \neq \phi(v)$ for each adjacent vertex pair $uv \in E(G)$ and such that $\phi(v) \in L(v)$ for each vertex $v \in V(G)$. We say that G is *L-colorable* if G has an L -coloring, and we say that G is *k-choosable* if G has an L -coloring for every k -assignment L . The problem of determining whether a graph G has an L -coloring for a given list assignment L , introduced independently by Vizing [16] and Erdős, Rubin, and Taylor [5], is called the *list coloring problem*. The minimum value k for which G is k -choosable is called the *choosability* of G and is denoted by $\text{ch}(G)$.

Given a graph G and a list assignment $L : V(G) \rightarrow 2^{\mathbb{N}}$, the problem of deciding whether G is L -colorable can be equivalently phrased as follows. Let H be a graph whose vertex set is obtained by taking a disjoint union of the lists $L(v)$ over $v \in V(G)$. Then, for each edge $uv \in E(G)$ and each common color $c \in L(u) \cap L(v)$, add an edge in H joining the vertex in $L(u)$ corresponding with the color c to the vertex in $L(v)$ corresponding with the color c . Then, an L -coloring of G is equivalent to an independent set in H that includes exactly one vertex from each set $L(v)$.

Dvořák and Postle [3] introduced a generalization of list coloring known as *correspondence coloring*, or *DP-coloring*. Kim, Kostochka, Li, and Zhu [10] further generalized DP-coloring with the following game. Given a graph G and a mapping $f : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, the *DP-f-painting game* is played with two players, Lister and Painter, as follows. Each vertex $v \in V(G)$ begins with $f(v)$ tokens, and each vertex of G begins the game unmarked. On each turn, Lister removes some number $g(v)$ of tokens (which may be zero) from each vertex $v \in V(G)$. Lister then generates a graph H and a function $L : V(G) \rightarrow 2^{V(H)}$ which obeys the following rules:

Peter Bradshaw received funding from NSF RTG grant DMS-1937241. Jinghan Zeng received funding from NSF grant DMS-1937241 through the ICLUE program of University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign.

- The sets $L(v)$ taken over $v \in V(G)$ form a partition of $V(H)$.
- For all $v \in V(G)$, $|L(v)| = g(v)$.
- If $a, b \in L(v)$ for some $v \in V(G)$, then a and b are adjacent in H .
- Given two distinct vertices $u, v \in V(G)$, if $a \in L(u)$ and $b \in L(v)$ are adjacent in H , then $uv \in E(G)$.
- If u and v are adjacent in G , then the edges in H between $L(u)$ and $L(v)$ form a (possibly empty) matching.

After Lister generates H and L , Painter responds by selecting an independent set I in H . For each $v \in V(G)$, if $L(v) \cap I$ is nonempty, then Painter marks the vertex v . The game ends when all vertices of G run out of tokens. We require that $g(v) \geq 1$ for some $v \in V(G)$ on each turn, so that the game ends in finite time. Painter wins if all vertices are marked at the end of the game; otherwise, Lister wins. A graph is *DP- f -paintable* if Painter has a winning strategy in the DP- f -painting game. We write $\chi_{DPP}(G)$ for the *DP-paintability* of G , which is the minimum integer k such that G is DP- f -paintable for the constant function $f(v) = k$.

If Lister chooses to remove exactly $f(v)$ tokens from each vertex $v \in V(G)$ on the first turn, so that the game only lasts one turn, then the question of whether Painter has a winning strategy is equivalent to the original DP-coloring problem of Dvořák and Postle. Furthermore, if Lister chooses to remove at most one token from each vertex on each turn, then the game is equivalent to the *online list coloring game*.

The online list coloring game, or *painting game*, has the following equivalent formulation, given independently by Schauz [13] and Zhu [18]. Given a graph G and a mapping $f : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, Lister and Painter play the *f -painting game* as follows. Each vertex $v \in V(G)$ begins with $f(v)$ tokens. On each turn i , Lister removes at most one token from each vertex of G and denotes by S_i the set of vertices from which a token has been removed on turn i . Then, Lister reveals the color i at each vertex of S_i , and Painter colors an independent subset of S_i with the color i . The game ends when all tokens have been removed from G . Painter wins the game if every vertex of G has been colored at the end of the game; otherwise, Lister wins. We say G is *f -paintable* if Painter has a winning strategy in the f -painting game. We write $\chi_P(G)$ for the *paintability* of G , which is the minimum integer k such that G is f -paintable for the constant function $f(v) = k$.

Throughout the f -painting game on a graph G , the $f(v)$ colors revealed at each vertex $v \in V(G)$ can be viewed as a color list $L(v)$, and hence Lister's strategy gives an f -assignment L on G . As Painter wins the f -painting game only if G is L -colorable, and as Painter is able to produce any list assignment L up to relabelling of colors, it follows that $\text{ch}(G) \leq \chi_P(G)$. Furthermore, as the f -painting game is a version of the DP- f -painting game in which Lister's strategy is restricted, it follows that $\chi_P(G) \leq \chi_{DPP}(G)$.

1.2. Alon-Tarsi number. Alon and Tarsi [1] introduced the following sufficient condition for showing that a graph is f -choosable for some function $f : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$. Given an oriented graph \vec{G} , a subgraph $\vec{H} \subseteq \vec{G}$ is *Eulerian* if $V(\vec{H}) = V(\vec{G})$ and each vertex $v \in V(\vec{H})$ satisfies $\deg_{\vec{H}}^+(v) = \deg_{\vec{H}}^-(v)$. We say that \vec{H} is *even* if $|E(\vec{H})|$ is even; otherwise, we say that \vec{H} is *odd*. We write $EE(\vec{G})$ for the number of even Eulerian subgraphs $\vec{H} \subseteq \vec{G}$, and we write $EO(\vec{G})$ for the number of odd Eulerian subgraphs of \vec{G} . Writing G for the undirected graph that underlies \vec{G} , we say that \vec{G} is an *Alon-Tarsi orientation* of G if $EE(\vec{G}) \neq EO(\vec{G})$. Given an

undirected graph G and a function $f : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, we say that G is f -Alon-Tarsi if G has an Alon-Tarsi orientation \vec{G} satisfying $\deg_{\vec{G}}^+(v) < f(v)$ for each $v \in V(G)$. Then, the *Alon-Tarsi number* of G , written $AT(G)$, is the minimum value k such that G is f -Alon Tarsi for the constant function $f : V(G) \rightarrow \{k\}$. Alon and Tarsi [1] proved that $\text{ch}(G) \leq AT(G)$ for every graph G . Schauz [14] later proved the even stronger inequality $\chi_P(G) \leq AT(G)$.

1.3. Strict type-3 and strict type-4 degeneracy. We now introduce several graph parameters related to degeneracy. We follow the notation of Zhou, Zhu, and Zhu [17].

All of the parameters of a graph G introduced in the previous subsections, namely $\text{ch}(G)$, $\chi_P(G)$, $\chi_{DPP}(G)$, and $AT(G)$, are bounded above by the *strict degeneracy* of a graph, written $sd(G)$ and defined as the minimum integer d for which G has an acyclic orientation in which each vertex $v \in V(G)$ has out-degree $\deg^+(v) < d$. The strict degeneracy of a graph is also called the *coloring number*, and it is equal to one plus the degeneracy of a graph. Recently, Zhou, Zhu, and Zhu [17] introduced four additional types of strict degeneracy with the aim of finding sharper upper bounds for the parameters introduced in the previous sections. In this paper we consider their strict degeneracy parameters of types 3 and 4.

The *strict type-3 degeneracy* and *strict type-4 degeneracy* of a graph G are defined using the following **DelSave** operation. The operation is defined in a restricted form in [2] and appears in the following general form in [7] and [17]:

Definition 1.1. Let G be a graph, and let $f : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be a positive-valued function. For a vertex $u \in V(G)$ and a subset $W \subseteq N(u)$, the operation $\text{DelSave}(G, f, u, W)$ outputs the graph $G' = G - u$ and the mapping $f' : V(G') \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ defined by

$$f'(v) = \begin{cases} f(v) - 1 & \text{if } v \in N(u) \setminus W \\ f(v) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We say that an application of the operation $\text{DelSave}(G, f, u, W)$ is *legal* if

- $f(u) > \sum_{w \in W} f(w)$, and
- $f'(v) \geq 1$ for all $v \in V(G')$.

We often say that when $\text{DelSave}(G, f, u, W)$ is applied, u *saves* each vertex in the set W . We say that the operation $\text{DelSave}(G, f, u, W)$ is *restricted* if $|W| \leq 1$, so that u saves at most one vertex.

Given a function $f : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, G is *strict type-3 f -degenerate* ($ST^{(3)}$ - f -degenerate) if whenever G is initially equipped with the function f , all vertices of G can be deleted through repeated applications of legal **DelSave** operations. We say that G is *strict type-4 f -degenerate* ($ST^{(4)}$ - f -degenerate) if whenever G is initially equipped with the function f , all vertices of G can be deleted through repeated applications of legal *restricted* **DelSave** operations. For $i \in \{3, 4\}$, the *strict type- i degeneracy* of G , written $sd^{(i)}(G)$, is the minimum integer k such that G is $ST^{(i)}$ - f -degenerate for the constant function $f(v) = k$. It is straightforward to show that $sd^{(3)}(G) \leq sd^{(4)}(G) \leq sd(G)$.

Bernshteyn and Lee [2] first investigated strict type-4 degeneracy using the closely related notion of *weak degeneracy*. They defined the weak degeneracy $\text{wd}(G)$ of a graph G as $\text{wd}(G) = sd^{(4)}(G) - 1$, and they showed that $\chi_{DPP}(G) \leq \text{wd}(G) + 1 = sd^{(4)}(G)$ for every graph G .

Zhou, Zhu, and Zhu [17] characterized the strict type-3 degeneracy of a graph in terms of *removal schemes*, which are defined as follows. If G is $ST^{(3)}$ - f -degenerate for a function

$f : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, then some sequence \mathcal{S} of legal **DelSave** operations removes all vertices of G . A sequence of legal **DelSave** operations on the graph G with the initial function f is called a (*legal*) *removal scheme* on (G, f) . (As we only consider legal **DelSave** operations in this paper, we often omit the word “legal.”) We say that a removal scheme \mathcal{S} is *complete* if the operations of \mathcal{S} remove all vertices of G . Given a removal scheme \mathcal{S} on (G, f) , we often define a function $\text{SAVE} : V(G) \rightarrow 2^{V(G)}$ such that $\text{SAVE}(u) = W$ for each vertex u removed by \mathcal{S} , where $W \subseteq N(u)$ is the set that appears in the **DelSave** operation in \mathcal{S} that removes u .

When we have a graph G and a function $f : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, we often imagine that each vertex $v \in V(G)$ has a stack of $f(v)$ tokens. Then, whenever we apply an operation $\text{DelSave}(G, f, u, W)$ to (G, f) , we imagine that the vertex u is removed from G , and then a single token is removed from each vertex $v \in N(u) \setminus W$. Then, G is $ST^{(3)}$ - f -degenerate if and only if all vertices of G can be removed by repeatedly applying **DelSave** operations in such a way that no vertex loses all of its tokens before being removed from G .

We note that a complete removal scheme \mathcal{S} on (G, f) uniquely defines a linear order $<$ on $V(G)$, given by the order in which the vertices of G are deleted by the **DelSave** operations in \mathcal{S} . As discussed above, the complete removal scheme \mathcal{S} also uniquely defines a function $\text{SAVE} : V(G) \rightarrow 2^{V(G)}$ which maps each vertex $u \in V(G)$ to the subset $W \subseteq N(u)$ that u saves when it is deleted. We often identify a complete removal scheme \mathcal{S} with the pair $(<, \text{SAVE})$ with which \mathcal{S} uniquely corresponds.

For some graph classes, the strict type-4 degeneracy parameter gives the best possible upper bound for choosability. For instance, Han, Wang, Wu, Zhou, and Zhu [8] showed that if G is a planar graph of girth at least 5, then $sd^{(4)}(G) \leq 3$, generalizing the classical theorem of Thomassen [15] stating that planar graphs of girth at least 5 are 3-choosable.

For graphs of bounded chromatic number, Bernshteyn and Lee proved the following theorem.

Theorem 1.2 ([2]). *For each integer $r \geq 2$, there is an integer $d_0 = d_0(r) \geq 1$ and a real number $c = c(r) > 0$ such that if G is a graph of maximum degree $d \geq d_0$ satisfying $\chi(G) \leq r$, then*

$$sd^{(4)}(G) \leq d - c\sqrt{d}.$$

They also proved that every d -regular graph G on $n \geq 2$ vertices satisfies $sd^{(4)}(G) \geq d - \sqrt{2n} + 1$, which shows that Theorem 1.2 is tight in particular for dense regular bipartite graphs, up to the constant c .

A simple inductive argument shows that if G is $ST^{(3)}$ - f -degenerate, then G is L -colorable for every f -assignment L on G , implying that $\text{ch}(G) \leq sd^{(3)}(G)$. Using a more sophisticated argument, Zhou, Zhu, and Zhu [17] showed in fact that the strict type-3 degeneracy of a graph is an upper bound for its Alon-Tarsi number. They also showed that the strict type-3 degeneracy of a graph gives an upper bound for its DP-paintability. These facts give the following inequality chains:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ch}(G) &\leq \chi_P(G) \leq AT(G) \leq sd^{(3)}(G) \leq sd^{(4)}(G); \\ \text{ch}(G) &\leq \chi_P(G) \leq \chi_{DPP}(G) \leq sd^{(3)}(G) \leq sd^{(4)}(G). \end{aligned}$$

1.4. Our results. Theorem 1.2 shows that if G is an r -colorable graph of sufficiently large maximum degree d , then $\chi_P(G) \leq \chi_{DPP}(G) \leq d - \Omega(\sqrt{d})$. Based on current results, this

upper bound for $\chi_P(G)$ is best known for all $r \geq 3$, and this upper bound for $\chi_{DPP}(G)$ is the best known for all $r \geq 2$. In this paper, we improve both of these upper bounds.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $d \geq 0$ and $r \geq 2$ be integers. If G is a graph of maximum degree at most d satisfying $\chi(G) \leq r$, then*

$$\chi_P(G) \leq AT(G) \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{4r+1}\right) d + 2.$$

Theorem 1.4. *For each integer $r \geq 2$, there exists an integer $d_0 = d_0(r) \geq 1$ and a real number $c = c(r) > 0$ such that the following holds for all values $d \geq d_0$. If G is a graph of maximum degree at most d and chromatic number at most r , then*

$$\chi_{DPP}(G) \leq sd^{(3)}(G) \leq d - c\sqrt{d \log d}.$$

As Bernshteyn and Lee [2] show that Theorem 1.2 is best possible for dense bipartite graphs, Theorem 1.4 implies the existence of a family of graphs G for which the difference $sd^{(4)}(G) - sd^{(3)}(G)$ is arbitrarily large. Previously, even the existence of a single graph G for which $sd^{(4)}(G) > sd^{(3)}(G)$ was unknown.

Our paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we prove Theorem 1.3. Our proof uses a lemma of Esperet, Kang, and Thomassé [6] stating that a graph of bounded chromatic number has an induced bipartite subgraph with large minimum degree. Then, in Section 3, we prove Theorem 1.4. We first prove the result for bipartite graphs; then, we use the same lemma of Esperet, Kang, and Thomassé [6] described above to finish the proof for $r \geq 3$. We note that a similar approach gives an alternative (and perhaps simpler) proof of Theorem 1.2. We additionally show that Theorem 1.4 cannot be improved using strict type-3 degeneracy.

2. A BOUND FOR PAINTABILITY

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.3, which states that a graph G of maximum degree d and chromatic number at most r has Alon-Tarsi number at most $(1 - \frac{1}{4r+1})d + 2$. This result implies the same upper bound for the paintability of G and hence gives an asymptotic improvement to the bound on $\chi_P(G)$ implied by Theorem 1.2. The proof of Theorem 1.3 relies on the following lemma of Esperet, Kang, and Thomassé.

Lemma 2.1 ([6]). *If G is a graph of chromatic number r and minimum degree δ , then G has an induced bipartite subgraph with minimum degree at least $\frac{\delta}{2r}$.*

We also need the following folklore lemma.

Lemma 2.2. *Every graph G has an orientation such that each vertex $v \in V(G)$ satisfies*

$$\deg^-(v) \in \{\lfloor \deg(v)/2 \rfloor, \lceil \deg(v)/2 \rceil\}.$$

Proof. Consider the graph G' obtained from G by adding a vertex u adjacent to exactly those vertices $v \in V(G)$ for which $\deg_G(v)$ is odd. Then, G' is Eulerian and hence has an Eulerian orientation. This orientation satisfies the property stated in the lemma even after deleting u . \square

Proof of Theorem 1.3. We write $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{4r+1}$, and we observe that $\varepsilon = \frac{1-\varepsilon}{4r}$. We consider a graph G of maximum degree at most d satisfying $\chi(G) \leq r$, and we aim to show that $AT(G) \leq (1 - \varepsilon)d + 2$.

We induct on $|V(G)|$. We prove the stronger statement that each graph G of maximum degree at most d and chromatic number at most r has an orientation \vec{G} of maximum out-degree at most $(1 - \varepsilon)d + 1$ with no directed odd cycle. As every Eulerian subgraph of an oriented graph \vec{H} is an edge-disjoint union of directed cycles, every odd Eulerian subgraph of \vec{H} contains a directed odd cycle. Therefore, if \vec{G} has no directed odd cycle, then $EO(\vec{G}) = 0$. Then, as the edgeless subgraph of \vec{G} is Eulerian, $EE(\vec{G}) \geq 1 > EO(\vec{G})$, and hence $AT(G) \leq (1 - \varepsilon)d + 2$.

When $|V(G)| = 1$, the empty orientation has maximum out-degree 0 and has no directed odd cycle; therefore, the statement holds.

Now, suppose that $|V(G)| \geq 2$, $\chi(G) \leq r$, and that G has maximum degree at most d . If G has degeneracy at most $(1 - \varepsilon)d + 1$, then we consider an acyclic orientation \vec{G} of $E(G)$ in which each vertex has out-degree at most $(1 - \varepsilon)d + 1$. Clearly, the orientation \vec{G} admits no directed odd cycle, so the statement holds. On the other hand, if the degeneracy of G is greater than $(1 - \varepsilon)d + 1$, then G has an induced subgraph H with minimum degree at least $\lfloor (1 - \varepsilon)d \rfloor + 2 > (1 - \varepsilon)d$. By Lemma 2.1, H in turn has an induced bipartite subgraph H' of minimum degree at least $\frac{(1 - \varepsilon)d}{2r}$. We orient $E(H')$ so that each vertex $v \in V(H')$ satisfies

$$\deg_{\vec{H}'}(v) \geq \left\lfloor \frac{(1 - \varepsilon)d}{4r} \right\rfloor > \frac{(1 - \varepsilon)d}{4r} - 1 = \varepsilon d - 1.$$

We also give the orientation uv to each edge $uv \in E(G)$ satisfying $u \in V(H')$ and $v \notin V(H')$. Finally, by the induction hypothesis, we give $G \setminus H'$ an orientation of maximum out-degree $(1 - \varepsilon)d + 1$ with no directed odd cycle. Hence, we obtain an orientation \vec{G} of $E(G)$.

We first check that \vec{G} has maximum out-degree at most $(1 - \varepsilon)d + 1$. Each vertex of $G \setminus H'$ has maximum out-degree at most $(1 - \varepsilon)d + 1$ by the induction hypothesis. Furthermore, each vertex $u \in V(H')$ has in-degree at least $\varepsilon d - 1$ and hence has out-degree at most $(1 - \varepsilon)d + 1$.

We next check that \vec{G} has no directed odd cycle. If C is a directed odd cycle in \vec{G} , then as every edge in the cut $[V(H'), V(G) \setminus V(H')]$ is directed away from H' , C has no edge in this cut. Furthermore, as H' is bipartite, C is not contained in $E(H')$, and hence C has no edge of H' . Finally, by the induction hypothesis, C is not contained in $E(G \setminus H')$. Thus, we conclude that a directed odd cycle C in fact does not appear in \vec{G} . Therefore, \vec{G} satisfies both of our desired properties, completing induction and the proof. \square

We note that unlike Theorems 1.2 and 1.4, for each fixed $r \geq 2$, the bound in Theorem 1.3 holds for all values d , not just those values d which are sufficiently large with respect to r . Hence, Theorem 1.3 applies even to graph classes in which the chromatic number grows with the maximum degree. For instance, if G is a triangle-free graph of maximum degree d , then $\chi(G) \leq (1 + o(1))\frac{d}{\log d}$ [12]. Hence, Theorem 1.3 implies that $\chi_P(G) \leq AT(G) \leq d - (\frac{1}{4} + o(1))\log d$. Similarly, if G has large maximum degree d and clique number $O(1)$, then $\chi(G) = O\left(\frac{d \log \log d}{\log d}\right)$ [9], and thus $\chi_P(G) \leq AT(G) \leq d - \Omega\left(\frac{\log d}{\log \log d}\right)$.

3. A BOUND FOR DP-PAINTABILITY

In this section, we prove that every graph of maximum degree d and bounded chromatic number satisfies $\chi_{DPP}(G) \leq sd^{(3)}(G) \leq d - \Omega(\sqrt{d \log d})$. We first prove the result for

bipartite graphs, and then we use Lemma 2.1 to extend our result to graphs of bounded chromatic number.

3.1. Bipartite graphs. We first consider bipartite graphs. We will need two probabilistic tools, namely the Lovász Local Lemma and the Chernoff bound.

Lemma 3.1 ([4]). *Let \mathcal{B} be a set of bad events. Suppose that each bad event $B \in \mathcal{B}$ occurs with probability at most p and that each $B \in \mathcal{B}$ is independent with all but at most D other events $B' \in \mathcal{B}$. If $pD < 1/e$, then with positive probability, no bad event in \mathcal{B} occurs.*

Lemma 3.2 ([11, Chapter 4]). *Let X_1, \dots, X_n be independent Bernoulli variables, and let $\Pr(X_i = 1) = p$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Let $X = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$, and let $\mu = pn$. Then, for $0 < \varepsilon < 1$,*

$$\Pr(|X - \mu| > \varepsilon\mu) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{1}{3}\varepsilon^2\mu\right).$$

We also need the following lemma, which appears in Bernshteyn and Lee [2] and easily follows from Hall's Marriage Theorem.

Lemma 3.3. *Let G be a bipartite graph with partite sets B and S . Suppose that each vertex $b \in B$ satisfies $\deg(b) \leq q_1$ and each vertex $s \in S$ satisfies $\deg(s) \geq q_2$. Let $t \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfy $tq_1 \leq q_2$. Then there exists a partial function $g : B \dashrightarrow S$ satisfying*

- For all $b \in B$, if $g(b)$ is defined, then $g(b) \in N(b)$;
- The preimage of every vertex $s \in S$ under g has cardinality exactly t .

Theorem 3.4. *For all constants $0 < \alpha \leq 1$, there exists an integer $d_0 \geq 1$ such that the following holds for all values $d \geq d_0$. Let G be a bipartite graph with maximum degree d and minimum degree at least αd , and let $f(v) = \deg(v) - \lfloor \frac{\alpha}{1000} \sqrt{d \log d} \rfloor$ for each vertex $v \in V(G)$. Then, G is $ST^{(3)}$ - f -degenerate.*

Proof. We often ignore floors and ceilings, as they do not affect our arguments. We imagine that each vertex $v \in V(G)$ initially receives $f(v)$ tokens, and we aim to construct a complete removal scheme for (G, f) .

Let G have partite sets A and B . We define several constants, as follows. We write

$$\begin{aligned} c &= \frac{1}{2}\alpha \\ \beta &= \lfloor d^{1/100} \rfloor \\ \varepsilon &= d^{-1/8} \\ p_S &= \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{d}} \\ p_0 &= 1 - c \\ p_1 &= \frac{2}{3}c \\ p_m &= \frac{c}{(m+1)(m+2)} \text{ for } m \in \{2, \dots, \beta\}. \end{aligned}$$

We observe that for $m \in \{1, \dots, \beta\}$, $p_1 + \dots + p_m = c \left(1 - \frac{1}{m+2}\right)$, and $p_0 + p_1 + \dots + p_m = 1 - \frac{c}{m+2}$.

Claim 3.5. *There exists a subset $S \subseteq A$ and a partition $B = B_0 \cup B_1 \cup \dots \cup B_\beta \cup B^*$ satisfying the following properties:*

(1) *For each vertex $b \in B$,*

$$(1 - \varepsilon)p_S \deg(b) \leq |N(b) \cap S| \leq (1 + \varepsilon)p_S \deg(b);$$

(2) *For each $m \in \{0, \dots, \beta\}$ and each vertex $a \in A$,*

$$(1 - \varepsilon)p_m \deg(a) \leq |N(a) \cap B_m| \leq (1 + \varepsilon)p_m \deg(a);$$

Proof. We construct S by adding each vertex $a \in A$ to S independently with probability p_S . We construct our partition of B by placing each vertex $b \in B$ into a single part as follows:

- For each $m \in \{0, \dots, \beta\}$, b is placed in B_m with probability p_m ;
- b is placed in B^* with probability $1 - (p_0 + p_1 + \dots + p_\beta)$.

For each $a \in A$ and $m \in \{0, \dots, \beta\}$, let $X_{a,m}$ be the bad event that $|N(a) \cap B_m|$ is not in the interval specified in the claim. For each vertex $b \in B$, let Y_b be the bad event that $|N(b) \cap S|$ is not in the interval specified in the claim. We observe that if no bad event Y_b occurs, then (1) holds, and if for $m \in \{0, \dots, \beta\}$ no bad event $X_{a,m}$ occurs, then (2) holds. Therefore, to show that the partition described in the claim exists, it suffices to show that all bad events can be avoided with positive probability.

We use the Lovász Local Lemma (Lemma 3.1) to show that with positive probability, no bad event occurs. Using the Chernoff bound (Lemma 3.2), for $m \in \{0, \dots, \beta\}$ and $a \in A$, letting $\mu = p_m \deg(a)$ implies that

$$\Pr(X_{a,m}) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{1}{3}\varepsilon^2 \cdot p_m \deg(a)\right) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{1}{3}\varepsilon^2 \cdot \frac{c\alpha d}{(\beta+1)(\beta+2)}\right) < d^{-4}.$$

Similarly, given a vertex $b \in B$, letting $\mu = p_S \deg(b)$ in Lemma 3.2 implies that

$$\Pr(Y_b) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{1}{3}\varepsilon^2 \cdot p_S \deg(b)\right) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{1}{3}\varepsilon^2 \cdot \alpha \sqrt{d \log d}\right) < d^{-4}.$$

Now, we count the dependencies of our bad events. Consider a bad event Y_b . The event Y_b depends only on random choices made at neighbors of b ; therefore, Y_b is independent with all bad events except those events $Y_{b'}$ for which b and b' share a neighbor. The number of such b' is at most d^2 . Next, consider a bad event $X_{a,m}$. This bad event depends only on random choices made at neighbors of a . Therefore, $X_{a,m}$ is independent with all other bad events except for those bad events $X_{a',m'}$ for which a' and a share a neighbor. The number of choices for such a' is at most d^2 , and the number of possible values for m' is $\beta + 1$. Therefore, $X_{a,m}$ is independent with all but at most $d^2(\beta + 1) < d^3$ bad events.

We have seen that each bad event occurs with probability at most d^{-4} , and each bad event is independent with all but fewer than d^3 other bad events. Since $d^{-4}d^3 < 1/e$, the Lovász Local Lemma (Lemma 3.1) tells us that with positive probability, no bad event occurs. This completes the proof of the claim. \square

Next, we show that for each part B_m in our partition of B , there exists a certain matching-like structure between S and B_m .

Claim 3.6. *For each $m \in \{1, \dots, \beta\}$, there exists a spanning subgraph H_m of $G[S \cup B_m]$ and a constant $d_m = m \left\lceil \frac{cp_m}{p_S} \right\rceil$ such that $\deg_{H_m}(b) \leq m$ for each $b \in B_m$, and $d_{H_m}(s) = d_m$ for each $s \in S$.*

Proof. We construct H_m through repeated applications of Lemma 3.3. To do so, we prove the stronger claim that for each integer $0 \leq z \leq m$, there exists a spanning subgraph H^z of $G[S \cup B_m]$ so that $\deg_{H^z}(b) \leq z$ for each $b \in B_m$, and $\deg_{H^z}(s) = z \lceil \frac{cp_m}{p_S} \rceil$ for each $s \in S$.

The claim clearly holds for $z = 0$ by letting H_m have no edges. Now, suppose that $1 \leq z \leq m$ and a suitable subgraph H^{z-1} exists. By Claim 3.5, each vertex $b \in B_m$ has at most $q_1 = (1 + \varepsilon)p_S d$ neighbors in S , and each vertex $s \in S$ has at least

$$q_2 = (1 - \varepsilon)\alpha p_m d - (z - 1) \left\lceil \frac{cp_m}{p_S} \right\rceil$$

neighbors in B_m via the graph $G \setminus H^{z-1}$. Since $\frac{zp_m}{p_S} \leq \frac{mp_m}{p_S} < \sqrt{d}$ and $p_m d > d^{9/10}$, it follows that $\frac{q_2}{q_1} > \frac{\alpha p_m}{2p_S} = \frac{cp_m}{p_S}$. Therefore, by Lemma 3.3, we can find a star forest $F \subseteq G[S \cup B_m]$ whose edges are disjoint from $E(H^z)$ so that each vertex in S has degree exactly $\lceil \frac{cp_m}{p_S} \rceil$ in F , and each vertex in B_m has degree 1 or 0 in F . Then, we let $H^z = H^{z-1} \cup F$, and clearly H^z satisfies the required properties. This completes induction, and the proof of the claim is complete by setting $H_m = H^m$. \square

For $m \in \{1, \dots, \beta\}$, we define a graph H_m as described in Claim 3.6. We also define the graph H_0 to be the graph on the vertex set $B_0 \cup S$ with no edges. Finally, we define $H = H_0 \cup H_1 \cup \dots \cup H_\beta$. Now, we create a removal scheme $\mathcal{S} = (\langle, \text{SAVE})$ on G as follows. Iterating through $m = 0, 1, \dots, \beta$ in order, we delete the vertices $b \in B_m$ one at a time, each time letting $\text{SAVE}(b) = N_H(b)$. In other words, when we delete a vertex $b \in B_m$, we let b save the vertices in S which are adjacent to b via H_m .

We first show that during this process, no vertex $a \in A$ loses all of its tokens. Indeed, by Claim 3.5, each vertex $a \in A$ has at most $(1 + \varepsilon)(p_0 + \dots + p_\beta) \deg(a) = (1 + \varepsilon)(1 - \frac{c}{\beta+2}) \deg(a)$ neighbors in $B_0 \cup \dots \cup B_\beta$. Thus, after deleting all vertices in $B_0 \cup \dots \cup B_\beta$, a has at least

$$f(a) - (1 + \varepsilon) \left(1 - \frac{c}{\beta + 2}\right) \deg(a) = \Omega(d^{0.99}) > 0$$

tokens remaining.

Next, we prove by induction on m that for each $0 \leq m \leq \beta$ and vertex $b \in B_m$, our definition of $\text{SAVE}(b)$ is legal. Recall that for each $b \in B_m$, $|\text{SAVE}(b)| \leq m$. Thus, when $m = 0$, each vertex $b \in B_0$ has a function $\text{SAVE}(b) = \emptyset$, which is clearly legal. Now, suppose that $1 \leq m \leq \beta$ and that $\text{SAVE}(b')$ is legally defined for each vertex $b' \in B_0 \cup \dots \cup B_{m-1}$. We observe that for each vertex $b \in B_m$,

$$\frac{f(b)}{cd/m} \geq \frac{\alpha d - \frac{\alpha}{1000} \sqrt{d \log d}}{cd/m} = 2m - \frac{m}{500} \sqrt{\frac{\log d}{d}} > m \geq |\text{SAVE}(b)|.$$

Thus, as long as each $s \in S$ has at most $\frac{cd}{m}$ tokens when our removal scheme reaches B_m , $\text{SAVE}(b)$ is legally defined for each vertex $b \in B_m$. Hence, we aim to show that after deleting $B_0 \cup \dots \cup B_{m-1}$, each vertex in S has at most $\frac{cd}{m}$ tokens. By Claim 3.5, each vertex $s \in S$ satisfies

$$|N(s) \cap (B_0 \cup \dots \cup B_{m-1})| \geq (1 - \varepsilon) \deg(s)(p_0 + \dots + p_{m-1}) = (1 - \varepsilon) \deg(s) \left(1 - \frac{c}{m+1}\right).$$

Furthermore, by the induction hypothesis, when our deletion scheme reaches B_m , each vertex $s \in S$ has been saved

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} i \left\lceil \frac{cp_i}{p_S} \right\rceil < m^2 + \frac{c}{p_S} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} p_i = m^2 + \frac{c}{p_S} \left(1 - \frac{1}{m+1}\right)$$

times. Therefore, when our deletion scheme reaches B_m , each vertex $s \in S$ has at most

$$\begin{aligned} & \deg(s) - (1 - \varepsilon) \deg(s) \left(1 - \frac{c}{m+1}\right) + m^2 + \frac{c}{p_S} \left(1 - \frac{1}{m+1}\right) \\ = & \frac{c \deg(s)}{m+1} + \varepsilon \deg(s) \left(1 - \frac{c}{m+1}\right) + m^2 + c \sqrt{\frac{d}{\log d}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{m+1}\right) \\ = & \frac{c \deg(s)}{m} - \frac{c \deg(s)}{m(m+1)} + O(\varepsilon d) \\ < & \frac{cd}{m} \end{aligned}$$

tokens. Hence, our functions $\text{SAVE}(b)$ are legal for all $b \in B_m$. This completes induction.

After deleting $B_0 \cup \dots \cup B_\beta$, we delete each vertex $a \in A \setminus S$, each time letting $\text{SAVE}(a) = \emptyset$. By Claim 3.5, each remaining vertex $b \in B^*$ has at least $(1 - \varepsilon)p_S \deg(b) > \lfloor \frac{\alpha}{1000} \sqrt{d \log d} \rfloor = \deg(b) - f(b)$ neighbors in S , so no vertex $b \in B^*$ runs out of tokens during this stage.

Next, we delete the vertices in B^* , defining $\text{SAVE}(b) = \emptyset$ for each $b \in B^*$. We argue that for each vertex $s \in S$, the number of tokens at s is more than $|N(s) \cap B^*|$, so that no vertex $s \in S$ loses all of its tokens. To prove this claim, we fix a vertex s , and we write $t(s)$ for the number of remaining tokens at s at this stage. We aim to show that $t(s) - |N(s) \cap B^*| > 0$. Since s has been saved exactly $\sum_{m=1}^{\beta} m \lceil \frac{cp_m}{p_S} \rceil$ times, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} t(s) - |N(s) \cap B^*| &= f(s) - |N(s) \cap (B_0 \cup \dots \cup B_\beta)| + \sum_{m=1}^{\beta} m \left\lceil \frac{cp_m}{p_S} \right\rceil - |N(s) \cap B^*| \\ &= f(s) - \deg(s) + \sum_{m=1}^{\beta} m \left\lceil \frac{cp_m}{p_S} \right\rceil \\ &= \sum_{m=1}^{\beta} m \left\lceil \frac{cp_m}{p_S} \right\rceil - \lfloor \frac{\alpha}{1000} \sqrt{d \log d} \rfloor \\ &\geq \frac{c}{p_S} \sum_{m=1}^{\beta} mp_m - \frac{\alpha}{1000} \sqrt{d \log d} \\ &> \frac{c}{3p_S} \sum_{m=1}^{\beta} \frac{1}{m+2} - \frac{\alpha}{1000} \sqrt{d \log d}. \end{aligned}$$

By roughly estimating the harmonic series,

$$\begin{aligned} t(s) - |N(s) \cap B^*| &> \frac{c}{400p_S} \log d - \frac{\alpha}{1000} \sqrt{d \log d} \\ &= \frac{1}{4000} \sqrt{d \log d} > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, after deleting every vertex in B^* , each vertex in the remaining vertex set S has at least one token.

Finally, since only the vertices in the independent set S remain undeleted, we simply delete each vertex $s \in S$ and define $\text{SAVE}(s) = \emptyset$. Hence, we create a complete removal scheme $\mathcal{S} = (\prec, \text{SAVE})$ on (G, f) , and thus G is $ST^{(3)}$ - f -degenerate. \square

Theorem 3.4 has the following immediate corollary.

Corollary 3.7. *There exists a constant d_0 such that the following holds for all integers $d \geq d_0$. If G is a bipartite graph of maximum degree d , then*

$$sd^{(3)}(G) \leq d - \frac{1}{1000} \sqrt{d \log d}.$$

Proof. Let $\alpha = 1$, and then let d_0 be a sufficiently large value taken from Theorem 3.4. Suppose that G is a bipartite graph of maximum degree $d \geq d_0$. We let G' be a d -regular bipartite graph containing G . Then, by Theorem 3.4, $sd^{(3)}(G) \leq sd^{(3)}(G') \leq d - \frac{1}{1000} \sqrt{d \log d}$. \square

Next, we prove that $sd^{(3)}(K_{n,n}) > n - \Omega(\sqrt{n \log n})$. This shows that the term of order $\sqrt{d \log d}$ in Theorem 3.4 and Corollary 3.7 is best possible, up to the multiplicative constant. First, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 3.8. *Let G be a graph, and let $f : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be a function. If G is $ST^{(3)}$ - f -degenerate, then $\sum_{v \in V(G)} f(v) > |E(G)|$.*

Proof. Zhou, Zhu, and Zhu [17] showed that if G is $ST^{(3)}$ - f -degenerate, then G is f -Alon-Tarsi. Therefore, G has an orientation such that for each vertex $v \in V(G)$, $\deg^+(v) < f(v)$. Then,

$$|E(G)| = \sum_{v \in V(G)} \deg^+(v) < \sum_{v \in V(G)} f(v).$$

This completes the proof. \square

Theorem 3.9. $sd^{(3)}(K_{n,n}) > n - \sqrt{2n(\log n + 1)}$.

Proof. We write $k = sd^{(3)}(K_{n,n})$. We write A and B for the two color classes of our graph $K_{n,n}$. Since $K_{n,n}$ has an induced C_4 , [2, Theorem 1.6] implies that $k \leq sd^{(4)}(K_{n,n}) \leq n$. We write $\gamma = n - k$.

We imagine that each vertex v in our graph $K_{n,n}$ begins with a stack of $f(v) = k$ tokens, and we let $\mathcal{S} = (\prec, \text{SAVE})$ be a complete removal scheme for our graph $K_{n,n}$. Without loss of generality, our removal scheme deletes k vertices from A before deleting k vertices from B . We let $A_0 \subseteq A$ denote the set of k vertices in A which are deleted first in our removal scheme. When we consider a vertex v at a point partway throughout our removal scheme, we let $t(v)$ denote the number of tokens remaining at v .

We claim that $\sum_{a \in A_0} |\text{SAVE}(a)| < (k-1)(\log k + 1)$. We note that for $i \in \{0, \dots, k-1\}$, after the i th vertex of A_0 is deleted, each vertex $b \in B$ satisfies $t(b) \geq k - i$, and furthermore $t(a) \leq k$. Therefore, if a is the $(i+1)$ st deleted vertex of A_0 , then $|\text{SAVE}(a)|(k-i) < k$, implying that $|\text{SAVE}(a)| \leq \frac{k-1}{k-i}$. Therefore,

$$\sum_{a \in A_0} |\text{SAVE}(a)| \leq \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \frac{k-1}{k-i} = (k-1)H_k < (k-1)(\log k + 1),$$

where H_k is the k th harmonic number. A similar argument shows that if $B_0 \subseteq B$ is the set of vertices in B which have been deleted when the last vertex of A_0 is removed, then $\sum_{b \in B_0} |\text{SAVE}(b)| < (k-1)(\log k + 1)$.

We consider the point in our removal scheme immediately after the last vertex of A_0 is deleted. At this point, the remaining vertices of A form a set $A' = A \setminus A_0$ of exactly $n - k = \gamma$ vertices, and the remaining vertices of B form a set $B' = B \setminus B_0$ of $q > n - k = \gamma$ vertices. By Lemma 3.8, at this point in our removal scheme,

$$\sum_{v \in A' \cup B'} t(v) > q\gamma.$$

We observe that when a vertex $a \in A_0$ is deleted from $K_{n,n}$, the vertices in B' altogether lose $|B'| - |\text{SAVE}(a)| = q - |\text{SAVE}(a)|$ tokens. Similarly, when a vertex $b \in B_0$ is deleted, the vertices in A' altogether lose $|A'| - |\text{SAVE}(b)| = \gamma - |\text{SAVE}(b)|$ vertices. Hence, letting $\sigma = \sum_{v \in A_0 \cup B_0} |\text{SAVE}(v)|$, it follows that the number of tokens removed from $A' \cup B'$ while deleting $A_0 \cup B_0$ is equal to $kq + (n - q)\gamma - \sigma$. As we have shown that $\sigma < (2k - 2)(\log k + 1)$, it follows that the number of tokens removed from $A' \cup B'$ while deleting $A_0 \cup B_0$ satisfies

$$\sum_{v \in A' \cup B'} (f(v) - t(v)) > kq + (n - q)\gamma - (2k - 2)(\log k + 1).$$

As $\sum_{v \in A' \cup B'} f(v) = k(q + \gamma)$, we combine our two inequalities to obtain

$$k(q + \gamma) - q\gamma > kq + (n - q)\gamma - (2k - 2)(\log k + 1).$$

Simplifying this, we see that

$$\gamma(k - n) + (2k - 2)(\log k + 1) > 0,$$

or equivalently, $\gamma^2 < (2k - 2)(\log k + 1)$. As $k \leq n$, we know that $\gamma < \sqrt{(2n - 2)(\log n + 1)}$. In other words, $k > n - \sqrt{(2n - 2)(\log n + 1)}$, completing the proof. \square

3.2. r -chromatic graphs. Now that we have proven an upper bound for the strict type-3 degeneracy of bipartite graphs, we use Lemma 2.1 to establish a similar result for graphs of bounded chromatic number.

Theorem 3.10. *For each integer $r \geq 2$, there exists an integer $d_0 = d_0(r) \geq 1$ and a real number $c = c(r) > 0$ such that the following holds for all values $d \geq d_0$. If G is a graph of maximum degree at most d and chromatic number at most r , then*

$$sd^{(3)}(G) \leq d - \lfloor c\sqrt{d \log d} \rfloor.$$

Proof. We show that the result holds when $c = \frac{1}{4000r}$ and d_0 is sufficiently large. In particular, we set $\alpha = \frac{1}{4r}$, and we show that when d_0 is chosen to be sufficiently large as in Theorem 3.4, the result holds for all $d \geq d_0$.

We aim to prove that if $f(v) = d - \lfloor c\sqrt{d \log d} \rfloor$ for each $v \in V(G)$, then (G, f) has a complete removal scheme. For this, we use induction on $|V(G)|$. If $|V(G)| = 1$, then as d_0 is sufficiently large, f is positive-valued on G , and hence (G, f) has a complete removal scheme.

Now, suppose that $|V(G)| \geq 2$. We assign $f(v) = d - \lfloor c\sqrt{d \log d} \rfloor$ tokens to each vertex $v \in V(G)$. If the degeneracy of G is less than $\frac{1}{2}d$, then $sd^{(3)}(G) \leq sd(G) \leq \frac{1}{2}d < d - \lfloor c\sqrt{d \log d} \rfloor$, so the result holds. Otherwise, as G has degeneracy at least $\frac{1}{2}d$, G has an induced subgraph

of minimum degree at least $\frac{1}{2}d$. Using Lemma 2.1, we take an induced bipartite subgraph H of G with minimum degree at least $\frac{d}{4r}$. Using the induction hypothesis, we let \mathcal{S}' be a complete removal scheme of $G \setminus H$.

Now, consider the graph H after carrying out the removal scheme \mathcal{S}' on G . We see that each vertex $v \in V(H)$ satisfies $\alpha d \leq \deg_H(v) \leq d$ and has at least $\deg_H(v) - \lfloor c\sqrt{d \log d} \rfloor = \deg_H(v) - \lfloor \frac{\alpha}{1000}\sqrt{d \log d} \rfloor$ remaining tokens. Therefore, by Theorem 3.4, there exists a complete removal scheme \mathcal{S} on H . We append \mathcal{S} to \mathcal{S}' to obtain a complete removal scheme for (G, f) . This completes induction and the proof. \square

We conclude this section by noting that a similar application of Lemma 2.1 allows for an alternative proof of Bernshteyn and Lee's [2] bound in Theorem 1.2, in which one first proves the result for bipartite graphs and then extends the bound to r -chromatic graphs using a similar proof to that of Theorem 3.10.

4. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We are grateful to Tao Wang for carefully reading an earlier draft of this paper and pointing out an error in our terminology, which has helped us greatly improve the writing quality.

REFERENCES

- [1] N. Alon and M. Tarsi. Colorings and orientations of graphs. *Combinatorica*, 12(2):125–134, 1992.
- [2] Anton Bernshteyn and Eugene Lee. Weak degeneracy of graphs. *J. Graph Theory*, 103(4):607–634, 2023.
- [3] Zdeněk Dvořák and Luke Postle. Correspondence coloring and its application to list-coloring planar graphs without cycles of lengths 4 to 8. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 129:38–54, 2018.
- [4] P. Erdős and L. Lovász. Problems and results on 3-chromatic hypergraphs and some related questions. In *Infinite and finite sets (Colloq., Keszthely, 1973; dedicated to P. Erdős on his 60th birthday)*, Vol. II, Colloq. Math. Soc. János Bolyai, Vol. 10, pages 609–627. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1975.
- [5] Paul Erdős, Arthur L. Rubin, and Herbert Taylor. Choosability in graphs. In *Proceedings of the West Coast Conference on Combinatorics, Graph Theory and Computing (Humboldt State Univ., Arcata, Calif., 1979)*, volume XXVI of *Congress. Numer.*, pages pp 125–157. Utilitas Math., Winnipeg, Man., 1980.
- [6] Louis Esperet, Ross J. Kang, and Stéphan Thomassé. Separation choosability and dense bipartite induced subgraphs. *Combin. Probab. Comput.*, 28(5):720–732, 2019.
- [7] Ming Han, Jingxiang He, and Xuding Zhu. Weak degeneracy of the square of line graphs, 2023.
- [8] Ming Han, Tao Wang, Jianglin Wu, Huan Zhou, and Xuding Zhu. Weak degeneracy of planar graphs and locally planar graphs. *Electron. J. Combin.*, 30(4):Paper No. 4.18, 17, 2023.
- [9] Anders Johansson. The choice number of sparse graphs. 1996.
- [10] Seog-Jin Kim, Alexandr Kostochka, Xuer Li, and Xuding Zhu. On-line DP-coloring of graphs. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 285:443–453, 2020.
- [11] Michael Mitzenmacher and Eli Upfal. *Probability and computing*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2005.
- [12] Michael Molloy. The list chromatic number of graphs with small clique number. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 134:264–284, 2019.
- [13] Uwe Schauz. Mr. Paint and Mrs. Correct. *Electron. J. Combin.*, 16(1):Research Paper 77, 18, 2009.
- [14] Uwe Schauz. Flexible color lists in Alon and Tarsi's theorem, and time scheduling with unreliable participants. *Electron. J. Combin.*, 17(1):Research Paper 13, 18, 2010.
- [15] Carsten Thomassen. 3-list-coloring planar graphs of girth 5. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 64(1):101–107, 1995.

- [16] V. G. Vizing. Coloring the vertices of a graph in prescribed colors. *Diskret. Analiz*, (29):3–10, 101, 1976.
- [17] Huan Zhou, Jialu Zhu, and Xuding Zhu. Arc weighted acyclic orientations and variations of degeneracy of graphs, 2024. arXiv:2308.15853, version 3.
- [18] Xuding Zhu. On-line list colouring of graphs. *Electron. J. Combin.*, 16(1):Research Paper 127, 16, 2009.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS URBANA-CHAMPAIGN
Email address: pb38@illinois.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS URBANA-CHAMPAIGN
Email address: jazeng2@illinois.edu