

# Truncated-degree-choosability of planar graphs

Yiting Jiang<sup>1\*</sup>    Huijuan Xu<sup>2</sup>    Xinbo Xu<sup>2</sup>    Xuding Zhu<sup>2†</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Institute of Mathematics, School of Mathematical Sciences, Nanjing Normal University

<sup>2</sup>School of Mathematical Sciences, Zhejiang Normal University

June 11, 2024

## Abstract

Assume  $G$  is a graph and  $k$  is a positive integer. Let  $f : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  be defined as  $f(v) = \min\{k, d_G(v)\}$ . If  $G$  is  $f$ -choosable, then we say  $G$  is  $k$ -truncated-degree-choosable. It was proved in [Zhou,Zhu,Zhu, Arc-weighted acyclic orientations and variations of degeneracy of graphs, arXiv:2308.15853] that there is a 3-connected non-complete planar graph that is not 7-truncated-degree-choosable, and every 3-connected non-complete planar graph is 16-truncated-degree-choosable. This paper improves the bounds, and proves that there is a 3-connected non-complete planar graph that is not 8-truncated-degree-choosable and every 3-connected non-complete planar graph is 12-truncated-degree-choosable.

**Keywords** Degree-choosable, Truncated-degree-choosable, Planar graphs

## 1 Introduction

A *list assignment*  $L$  for a graph  $G$  is a mapping that assigns a set  $L(v)$  of permissible colours to each vertex  $v$  of  $G$ . We denote by  $\mathbb{N}^G$  the set of mappings from  $V(G)$  to  $\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, \dots\}$ . For  $f \in \mathbb{N}^G$ , an  $f$ -list assignment is an assignment  $L$  with  $|L(v)| \geq f(v)$  for each vertex  $v$ . An  $L$ -colouring of  $G$  is a mapping  $\phi$  that assigns a colour  $\phi(v)$  from  $L(v)$  to each vertex  $v$ , such that  $\phi(u) \neq \phi(v)$  for every edge  $uv$  of  $G$ . We say  $G$  is  $f$ -choosable if  $G$  is  $L$ -colourable for any  $f$ -list assignment  $L$  of  $G$ . The *choice number*  $\text{ch}(G)$  of  $G$  is the minimum integer  $k$  such that  $G$  is  $k$ -choosable (i.e.,  $f$ -choosable for the constant mapping  $f \in \mathbb{N}^G$  defined as  $f(v) = k$  for all  $v$ ). The choice number is an important graph invariant that has been studied extensively in the literature (cf. [5]).

A graph  $G$  is called *degree-choosable* if it is  $f$ -choosable for the mapping  $f \in \mathbb{N}^G$  defined as  $f(v) = d_G(v)$  for  $v \in V(G)$ , where  $d_G(v)$  is the degree of vertex  $v$ . Degree-choosable graphs are characterized in [3] and [7]: A connected graph  $G$  is not degree-choosable if and only if  $G$  is a Gallai-tree, i.e., each block of  $G$  is either a complete graph or an odd cycle.

In this paper, we investigate a combination of  $k$ -choosability and degree-choosability, which is called  $k$ -truncated-degree-choosability (cf. [8]).

**Definition 1.** Assume  $G$  is a graph and  $k$  is a positive integer. Let  $f \in \mathbb{N}^G$  be defined as  $f(v) = \min\{k, d_G(v)\}$  for each vertex  $v \in V(G)$ . If  $G$  is  $f$ -choosable, then we say  $G$  is  $k$ -truncated-degree-choosable.

---

\*Grant numbers: NSFC 12301442, BK20230373, 23KJB110018.

†Grant numbers: NSFC 12371359, U20A2068.

Truncated-degree-choosability of graphs was first studied by Hutchinson [4]. Bruce Richter asked whether every 3-connected non-complete planar graph is 6-truncated-degree-choosable. Note that for any positive integer  $k$ , the complete bipartite graph  $K_{2,k^2}$  is planar and not  $k$ -truncated-degree-choosable. Also complete graphs are not degree-choosable. So for the study of  $k$ -truncated choosability of planar graphs, the restriction to 3-connected non-complete graphs is natural. Motivated by Richter's question, Hutchinson studied truncated-degree-choosability of outerplanar graphs. It was proved in [4] that if  $G \neq K_3$  is a 2-connected maximal outerplanar graphs (i.e., each inner face is a triangle), then  $G$  is 5-truncated-degree-choosable. If  $G$  is a 2-connected bipartite outerplanar graphs, then  $G$  is 4-truncated-degree-choosable. The results are sharp, as there are 2-connected maximal outerplanar graphs that are not 4-truncated-degree-choosable, and 2-connected bipartite outplanar graphs that are not 3-truncated-degree-choosable. Hutchinson's result is strengthened in [2], where it is shown that 2-connected outerplanar graphs other than odd cycles are 5-truncated-degree-DP-colourable, and hence 5-truncated-degree-choosable. This result is further strengthened in [6], where it is proved that 2-connected  $K_{2,4}$ -minor free graphs other than cycles and complete graphs are 5-truncated-degree-DP-colourable. Truncated-degree-choosability of graphs were also studied in [1]. Some families of graphs are shown to be  $k$ -truncated-degree-choosable, by putting restrictions on the distance between components of the subgraph induced by vertices of degree less than  $k$ .

Recently, Zhou, Zhu, and Zhu [8] answered Richter's question in negative and constructed a 3-connected non-complete planar graph that is not 7-truncated-degree-choosable. Then they proved that every 3-connected non-complete planar graph is  $ST^{(2)}$ -16-truncated-degree-degenerate, which implies that these graphs are 16-truncated-degree-choosable.

In this paper, we prove the following results.

**Theorem 1.** Every 3-connected non-complete planar graph is 12-truncated-degree-choosable.

**Theorem 2.** There is a 3-connected non-complete planar graph which is not 8-truncated-degree-choosable.

We remark that the result in [8] implies that 3-connected non-complete planar graphs are 16-truncated-degree-DP-paintable and 16-truncated-degree-AT. Our result takes advantage of the list assignment, and does not apply to DP-colouring, on-line list colouring and Alon-Tarsi orientation.

## 2 Some preliminaries

The following lemmas proved in [1] and [8] are needed in our proof. If  $G$  is a Gallai-tree, and  $L$  is a list assignment of  $G$  with  $|L(v)| \geq d_G(v)$  such that  $G$  is not  $L$ -colourable, then we say  $L$  is a *bad list assignment* for  $G$ .

**Lemma 1** ([1]). If  $G$  is a Gallai-tree, and  $L$  is a bad list assignment for  $G$ , then for each block  $B$  of  $G$  that is  $r$ -regular, there is a set  $C_B$  of  $r$  colours such that (i) if  $B$  and  $B'$  share a vertex, then  $C_B \cap C_{B'} = \emptyset$ , and (ii) for each vertex  $v$ ,  $L(v) = \cup_{v \in B} C_B$ .

Note that each block of a Gallai-tree is a regular graph. It follows from Lemma 1 that for a bad list assignment  $L$  of a Gallai-tree  $G$ ,  $|L(v)| = d_G(v)$  for each vertex  $v \in V(G)$ . One property of a bad list assignment  $L$  we shall use frequently is that if two vertices  $u, v$  are in a same block of  $G$  and none of them is a cut-vertex of  $G$ , then  $L(u) = L(v)$ .

Assume  $G$  is a simple plane graph. We denote by  $F(G)$  the set of faces of  $G$ . For each face  $\theta$  of  $G$ , let  $V(\theta)$  be the set of vertices on the boundary of  $\theta$ . Let  $\Theta(G)$  be the bipartite graph with partite sets  $V(G)$  and  $F(G)$ , where  $v\theta$  is an edge in  $\Theta(G)$  if and only if  $v \in V(\theta)$ .

Note that  $G$  need not be connected. Assume  $G$  has connected components  $G_1, G_2, \dots, G_k$ . For a face  $\theta$  of  $G$ , let  $J_\theta = \{i : V(\theta) \cap V(G_i) \neq \emptyset\}$ . For  $i \in J_\theta$ , let  $\theta_i$  be the face of  $G_i$  that contains  $\theta$ . Then  $\theta = \cap_{i \in J_\theta} \theta_i$  and  $V(\theta) = \cup_{i \in J_\theta} V(\theta_i)$ .

**Definition 2.** Let  $\theta^*$  be the infinite face of  $G$ , and  $v^*$  be an arbitrary vertex in  $V(\theta^*)$ . A spanning subgraph  $F$  of  $\Theta(G)$  is *very nice* with respect to  $(\theta^*, v^*)$  if the following hold:

- $d_F(v^*) = 1$  and  $d_F(v) \leq 2$  for  $v \in V(G) - \{v^*\}$ .
- $d_F(\theta^*) = d_{\Theta(G)}(\theta^*)$  and  $d_F(\theta) = d_{\Theta(G)}(\theta) - 2$  for each finite face  $\theta$  of  $G$ .
- If  $v_1, v_2 \in V(\theta) - N_F(\theta)$ , then  $v_1, v_2$  are contained in a cycle  $C$  of  $V(\theta)$ .

**Lemma 2** ([8]). For any simple plane graph  $G$ ,  $\Theta(G)$  has a very nice subgraph.

### 3 Proof of Theorem 1

We shall prove Theorem 1 by induction on the number of vertices of  $G$ . For that purpose, we need to conclude that certain induced subgraphs can be properly coloured. However, the induced subgraphs may not be 3-connected. To overcome this difficulty, we shall prove a stronger statement by induction.

Assume  $G$  is a connected plane graph, two vertices  $x, y$  of  $G$  are called *visible* to each other if  $x, y$  lie on the boundary of a same face of  $G$ , i.e.,  $G + xy$  is still a planar graph.

Assume  $V_1, V_2$  is a partition of  $V(G)$  such that each face of  $G[V_2]$  contains at most one connected component of  $G[V_1]$ . Assume  $G_1, G_2, \dots, G_k$  are the connected components of  $G[V_2]$ . For a connected component  $Q$  of  $G[V_1]$ , let  $\theta_Q$  be the face of  $G[V_2]$  that contains  $Q$ . Let  $J_Q = \{i : V(\theta_Q) \cap V(G_i) \neq \emptyset\}$ . For  $i \in J_Q$ , let  $\theta_{Q,i}$  be the face of  $G_i$  which contains  $Q$ . So  $\theta_Q = \cap_{i \in J_Q} \theta_{Q,i}$ . For a face  $\theta$  of  $G_i$ , we denote by  $\text{int}(\theta)$  the vertices of  $G$  contained in the interior of  $\theta$ .

**Definition 3.** We say  $Q$  is *properly connected* to  $V_2$  if the following hold:

1. Every vertex in  $V(\theta_Q)$  is adjacent to some vertex of  $Q$ .
2. For each  $i \in J_Q$ , if  $\theta_{Q,i}$  is a finite face of  $G_i$ , then for each vertex  $v$  of  $Q$ , there are three paths contained in  $V(\theta_{Q,i}) \cup \text{int}(\theta_{Q,i})$  connecting  $V(\theta_{Q,i})$  and  $v$ , and these paths are vertex disjoint, except that they have the same end vertex  $v$ .

**Theorem 3.** Assume  $G$  is a connected plane graph, and  $V_1, V_2$  is a partition of  $V(G)$ ,  $V_2 \neq \emptyset$  and each face of  $G[V_2]$  contains at most one connected component of  $G[V_1]$ . Assume each connected component  $Q$  of  $G[V_1]$  is properly connected to  $V_2$ . Assume  $\theta^*$  is the infinite face of  $G[V_2]$  and  $v^* \in V(\theta^*)$ . If  $f : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  is defined as follows:

$$f(v) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } v = v^* \text{ and } v^* \text{ is not an isolated vertex in } G[V_2], \\ 12, & \text{if } v \in V_2 - \{v^*\} \text{ or } v = v^* \text{ is an isolated vertex in } G[V_2], \\ d_G(v), & \text{if } v \in V_1. \end{cases}$$

Then  $G$  is  $f$ -choosable.

**Proof of Theorem 1 (using Theorem 3)** Assume  $G$  is a counterexample to Theorem 1 with minimum number of vertices and subject to this, with maximum number of edges. Let  $V_1 = \{v \in V(G) : d_G(v) \leq 11\}$  and  $V_2 = V(G) - V_1$ . Let  $L$  be a list assignment of  $G$  such that  $|L(v)| = d_G(v)$  for  $v \in V_1$  and  $|L(v)| = 12$  for  $v \in V_2$ , and  $G$  is not  $L$ -colourable. Since  $G$  is 3-connected and not a complete graph,  $G$  is not a Gallai-tree, and hence  $G$  is degree-choosable. Therefore  $V_2 \neq \emptyset$ . Also any two vertices in  $V_2$  visible to each other are adjacent, for otherwise by adding an edge between two non-adjacent vertices in  $V_2$  that are visible to each other, the resulting graph is not  $L$ -colourable, and hence is a counterexample with more edges, contrary to the choice of  $G$ . Therefore each face of  $G[V_2]$  contains at most one connected component of  $G[V_1]$ , and for each connected component  $Q$  of  $G[V_1]$ , each vertex in  $V(\theta_Q)$  is adjacent to some vertex of  $Q$ .

Assume  $Q$  is a connected component  $Q$  of  $G[V_1]$ ,  $i \in J_Q$  and  $\theta_{Q,i}$  is a finite face of  $G_i$ , and  $v$  is a vertex of  $Q$ . Let  $u$  be a vertex of  $G$  that lies in the exterior of  $\theta_{Q,i}$  (or add such a vertex  $u$  adjacent to all vertices in  $V(\theta_{Q,i})$  if the exterior of  $\theta_{Q,i}$  is empty). Since  $G$  is 3-connected, there are three internally vertex disjoint paths connecting  $u$  and  $v$ . Each of these paths has a subpath contained in  $V(\theta_{Q,i}) \cup \text{int}(\theta_{Q,i})$  that connects  $V(\theta_{Q,i})$  and  $v$ . These paths are vertex disjoint, except that they have a common end vertex  $v$ . Hence  $Q$  is properly connected to  $V_2$ .

Let  $f \in \mathbb{N}^G$  be defined as in Theorem 3. As  $L$  is an  $f$ -list assignment of  $G$ , it follows from Theorem 3 that  $G$  is  $L$ -colourable, a contradiction.

**Proof of Theorem 3.** Assume Theorem 3 is not true, and  $G$  is a counterexample with minimum number of vertices. Let  $L$  be an  $f$ -list assignment of  $G$  such that  $G$  is not  $L$ -colourable.

For  $X, Y \subseteq V(G)$ , let

$$N_Y(X) = N_G(X) \cap Y.$$

**Definition 4.** Assume  $X$  is a subset of  $V(G)$  and  $\phi$  is an  $L$ -coloring of  $G[X]$ . Let  $L^\phi$  be the list assignment of  $G - X$  defined as

$$L^\phi(v) = L(v) - \{\phi(u) : u \in N_X(v)\}$$

for each vertex  $v \in V(G) - X$ .

**Definition 5.** Assume  $X \subseteq Y$  are subsets of  $V(G)$ ,  $\phi$  is an  $L$ -colouring of  $G[X]$  and  $\psi$  is an  $L$ -colouring of  $G[Y]$ . If  $\psi(v) = \phi(v)$  for each vertex  $v \in X$ , then we say  $\psi$  is an extension of  $\phi$  to  $Y$ .

Let  $F$  be a very nice subgraph of  $\Theta(G[V_2])$ .

**Definition 6.** Assume  $Q$  is a connected component of  $G[V_1]$  and  $u \in V(\theta_Q)$ . If  $u\theta_Q$  is an edge of  $F$ , then we say  $u \in V_2$  is a *protector* of  $Q$ . Otherwise,  $u$  is a *non-protector* of  $Q$ .

It follows from Lemma 2 that each  $u \in V_2$  is a protector of at most two connected components of  $G[V_1]$ ,  $v^*$  is a protector of  $\theta^*$  only, each connected component  $Q$  of  $G[V_1]$  has at most two non-protectors and  $\theta^*$  has no non-protector. Moreover, if  $w_1, w_2$  are two non-protectors of  $Q$ , then there is a cycle  $C_Q$  contained in  $V(\theta_Q)$  such that  $w_1, w_2 \in V(C_Q)$  and  $Q$  is contained in the interior of  $C_Q$ .

**Lemma 3.**  $G[V_2]$  is connected.

**Proof.** Assume  $G[V_2]$  is not connected, and  $B$  is a connected component of  $G[V_2]$  not containing the vertex  $v^*$ . Let  $\theta$  be the face of  $G[V_2] - V(B)$  containing  $B$ . Let  $H$  be the subgraph of  $G$

induced by vertices contained in  $\text{int}(\theta)$  and let  $G' = G - H$ . For  $i = 1, 2$ , let  $V_i' = V_i \cap V(G')$ . Then  $V_1', V_2'$  is a partition of  $V(G')$  and  $V_2' \neq \emptyset$ . Moreover, each connected component of  $G'[V_1']$  is properly connected to  $V_2'$  and  $v^* \in V(G')$ . By the minimality of  $G$ , there is an  $L$ -colouring  $\phi$  of  $G'$ .

For  $i = 1, 2$ , let  $V_i'' = V_i \cap V(H)$ . Then  $V_1'', V_2''$  is a partition of  $V(H)$ , and  $V_2'' \neq \emptyset$ . Each connected component of  $H[V_1'']$  is a connected component of  $G[V_1]$ , and is properly connected to  $V_2''$ . As

$$|L^\phi(v)| \geq \begin{cases} 12, & \text{if } v \in V_2'', \\ d_H(v), & \text{if } v \in V_1'', \end{cases}$$

by the minimality of  $G$ ,  $H$  has an  $L^\phi$ -colouring  $\psi$ . The union  $\phi \cup \psi$  is an  $L$ -colouring of  $G$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

**Definition 7.** A *leaf block* of a connected graph  $Q$  is a block  $B$  of  $Q$  which contains at most one cut-vertex of  $Q$ . If  $B$  contains one cut-vertex  $v$  of  $Q$ , then  $v$  is called the *root* of  $B$ . The other vertices of  $B$  are called *non-root* vertices. If  $Q$  is 2-connected, then  $Q$  itself is called a *leaf block* and all vertices of  $Q$  are non-root vertices. For a leaf-block  $B$  of  $Q$ , we denote by  $U_B$  the set of non-root vertices of  $B$ .

**Lemma 4.** Either  $|V_2| = 1$  or  $G[V_2]$  is 2-connected.

**Proof.** Assume  $|V_2| \geq 2$  and  $G[V_2]$  is not 2-connected. Let  $B$  be a leaf-block of  $G[V_2]$  such that  $v^* \notin U_B$ .

Assume  $U_B$  is contained in the face  $\theta$  of  $G[V_2] - U_B$ . If  $U_B$  is contained in the interior (respectively, exterior) of  $\theta$ , then let  $H$  be the subgraph of  $G$  induced by vertices contained in the interior (respectively, exterior) of  $\theta$ . By the minimality of  $G$ , there is an  $L$ -colouring  $\phi$  of  $G - V(H)$ .

Let  $H' = H \cup \{v'\}$ , where  $v'$  is the root of  $B$ . For  $i = 1, 2$ , let  $V_i' = V_i \cap V(H')$ . Then  $V_1', V_2'$  is a partition of  $V(H')$ , and  $V_2' \neq \emptyset$ . Moreover,  $v'$  is not an isolated vertex in  $H'[V_2']$ . It is easy to see that each connected component of  $H'[V_1']$  is properly connected to  $V_2'$ . As

$$|L^\phi(v)| \geq \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } v = v', \\ 12, & \text{if } v \in V_2', \\ d_H(v), & \text{if } v \in V_1', \end{cases}$$

by the minimality of  $G$ ,  $H$  has an  $L^\phi$ -colouring  $\psi$ . The union  $\phi \cup \psi$  is an  $L$ -colouring of  $G$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.** Each connected component  $Q$  of  $G[V_1]$  is a Gallai-tree. Moreover, the following hold:

- Each block of  $Q$  is either  $K_n$  for  $n \leq 3$  or is an odd cycle.
- For each non-cut vertex  $v$  of  $Q$ ,  $d_Q(v) \leq 2$  and  $v$  is adjacent to some vertex in  $V_2$ .

**Proof.** If a connected component  $Q$  of  $G[V_1]$  is not a Gallai-tree, then by induction hypothesis,  $G - Q$  has a proper  $L$ -colouring  $\phi$ . As  $|L^\phi(v)| \geq d_Q(v)$  for each vertex  $v$  of  $Q$  and  $Q$  is not a Gallai-tree, then  $Q$  admits a proper  $L^\phi$ -colouring  $\psi$ . The union  $\phi \cup \psi$  is a proper  $L$ -colouring of  $G$ , a contradiction.

Assume  $Q$  is a connected component of  $G[V_1]$  and  $B$  is a block of  $Q$ . As  $Q$  is a Gallai-tree,  $B$  is either a complete graph or an odd cycle. If  $B$  is not an odd cycle and not  $K_n$  for  $n \leq 3$ ,

then  $B$  is a copy of  $K_4$ . Then  $B$  contains a triangle  $T$  so that one vertex of  $K_4$  is contained in the interior of  $T$ , and all the vertices in the interior of  $T$  is not adjacent to  $V_2$ . Let  $X$  be the set of vertices contained in the interior of  $T$ , and let  $\phi$  be a proper  $L$ -colouring of  $X$ . Then

$$|L^\phi(v)| \geq \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } v = v^*, \\ 12, & \text{if } v \in V_2, \\ d_{G-X}(v), & \text{if } v \in V_1 - X, \end{cases}$$

It is easy to see that  $Q - X$  is properly connected to  $V_2$ . By the minimality of  $G$ ,  $G - X$  has a proper  $L$ -colouring  $\psi$  and the union  $\phi \cup \psi$  is a proper  $L$ -colouring of  $G$ , a contradiction.

Assume  $v \in Q$  is a non-cut vertex of  $Q$ . Since each block of  $Q$  is an odd cycle or a complete graph of order at most 3,  $d_Q(v) \leq 2$ . Since  $Q$  is properly connected to  $V_2$ ,  $d_G(v) \geq 3$ . Hence  $v$  is adjacent to at least one vertex in  $V_2$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 1.** Assume  $Q$  is a connected component of  $G[V_1]$ . If  $\theta_Q$  is a finite face of  $G[V_2]$ , then  $\theta_Q = C_Q$  is a cycle, and for each leaf block  $B$  of  $Q$ , there are at least two vertices in  $C_Q$  adjacent to  $U_B$ .

**Proof.** As  $G[V_2]$  is 2-connected, the boundary of each face of  $G[V_2]$  is a cycle. So  $\theta_Q = C_Q$ . Let  $B$  be a leaf-block of  $Q$  and  $v \in U_B$ . As  $Q$  is properly connected to  $V_2$ , there are three paths connecting  $C_Q$  to  $v$ , and these paths are pairwise vertex disjoint paths except that they have the same end vertex  $v$ . At most one of the three paths contains the root vertex of  $B$ . Each of the other two paths contains an edge between  $C_Q$  and  $U_B$ . So there are at least two vertices in  $C_Q$  adjacent to  $U_B$ .  $\square$

**Definition 8.** A subset  $X$  of  $V(G)$  is *valid* if for each connected component  $Q$  of  $G[V_1]$ ,  $Q - X$  is connected, and for each vertex  $v \in X \cap V(Q)$ ,  $N_{V_2}(v) \subseteq X$ .

In the following proof process, we shall colour vertices of  $G$  one by one, and the set  $X$  of coloured vertices will always be a *valid* subset of  $V(G)$ . In other word, when we colour a vertex  $v$  of a connected component  $Q$  of  $G[V_1]$ , and  $X$  is the set of already coloured vertices, then  $v$  is not a cut-vertex of  $Q - X$  and  $v$  is not adjacent to any uncoloured vertex of  $V_2$ .

**Observation 1.** By following the above rules, if  $\phi$  is an  $L$ -colouring of  $G[X]$ , then for any connected component  $Q$  of  $G[V_1]$ , the following conditions hold:

1.  $Q - X$  is a connected component of  $G[V_1 - X]$ .
2. For any vertex  $v \in V(Q) - X$ ,  $|L^\phi(v)| \geq d_{G-X}(v)$ .
3. For any vertex  $v \in V_2 - X$ ,  $|L^\phi(v)| \geq 12 - |N_{V_2}(v) \cap X|$ .

**Definition 9.** Assume  $\phi$  is an  $L$ -colouring of  $G[X]$ , and  $Q$  is a connected component of  $G[V_1]$ . We say  $Q$  is *free* with respect to  $\phi$  if for any extension  $\psi$  of  $\phi$  to  $X \cup V_2$ ,  $Q - X$  is  $L^\psi$ -colourable.

Given an  $L$ -colouring  $\phi$  of  $G[X]$ , it is not easy to check whether  $Q$  is free with respect to  $\phi$ . The following are two easy sufficient conditions for  $Q$  to be free with respect to  $\phi$ .

**Lemma 6.** Assume  $\phi$  is an  $L$ -colouring of  $G[X]$  and  $Q$  is a connected component of  $G[V_1]$ . Then  $Q$  is free with respect to  $\phi$  if one of the following holds:

- (P1) There is a vertex  $v \in V(Q) - X$  for which  $|L^\phi(v)| > d_{G-X}(v)$ .

(P2) There are two non-cut vertices  $u, v$  of a same block of  $Q - X$  with  $L^\phi(u) \neq L^\phi(v)$  and  $N_{V_2-X}(u) = N_{V_2-X}(v)$ .

**Proof.** By Lemma 5,  $Q$  is a Gallai-tree and hence  $Q - X$  is also a Gallai-tree.

If there is a vertex  $v \in V(Q) - X$  for which  $|L^\phi(v)| > d_{Q-X}(v)$ , then for any extension  $\psi$  of  $\phi$  to  $X \cup V_2$ ,  $|L^\psi(v)| > d_{Q-X}(v)$ , because each time a neighbor of  $v$  in  $V_2$  is coloured, its degree in the subgraph induced by uncoloured vertices decreases by 1, and its list decreases by at most 1. Hence  $L^\psi|_{Q-X}$  is not a bad list assignment for  $Q - X$ , and  $Q - X$  is  $L^\psi$ -colourable.

Assume there are two non-cut vertices  $u, v$  of the same block of  $Q - X$  with  $L^\phi(u) \neq L^\phi(v)$  and  $N_{V_2-X}(u) = N_{V_2-X}(v)$ . Assume  $\psi$  is an extension of  $\phi$  to  $X \cup V_2$ . For any  $w \in V_2$  adjacent to  $u$  (hence also adjacent to  $v$ ), either  $\psi(w) \in L^\phi(u) \cap L^\phi(v)$ , and or  $\psi(w)$  is missing from one of  $L^\phi(u)$  and  $L^\phi(v)$ . If the later occurs, then one of the following holds:

- $|L^\psi(v)| > d_{Q-X}(v)$ .
- $|L^\psi(u)| > d_{Q-X}(u)$ .

If the later case never occur, then  $L^\psi(u) \neq L^\psi(v)$ . Hence  $L^\psi|_{Q-X}$  is not a bad list assignment for  $Q - X$ , and  $Q - X$  is  $L^\psi$ -colourable.  $\square$

Since  $G[V_2]$  is a planar graph and each planar with more than one vertex has at least two vertices of degree at most 5, there exists an ordering  $<$  of vertices in  $V_2$  such that  $v^*$  is the first vertex, and each vertex  $u \in V_2$  has at most 5 neighbors  $v$  with  $v < u$

We colour vertices of  $G$  one by one and use the following rules to choose the next vertex to be coloured. For  $i = 1, 2, \dots$ , let  $X_i$  be the set of the first  $i$  coloured vertices and let  $\phi_i$  be the  $L$ -colouring of  $G[X_i]$ . Initially,  $X_0 = \emptyset$ . Assume  $i \geq 0$ ,  $X_i$  and  $\phi_i$  are defined. We construct  $X_{i+1}$  and an extension  $\phi_{i+1}$  of  $\phi_i$  to  $X_{i+1}$  as follows:

(R1) If a non-free connected component  $Q$  has a vertex  $v \in Q - X_i$  which is not a cut-vertex of  $Q - X_i$ , and  $v$  is not adjacent to any vertex of  $V_2 - X_i$  and  $|Q - X_i| \geq 2$ , then let

$$X_{i+1} = X_i \cup \{v\}$$

and let  $\phi_{i+1}(v)$  be any colour in  $L^{\phi_i}(v)$ .

(R2) If (R1) does not apply, then let  $u$  be the smallest vertex in  $V_2 - X_i$  with respect to the order  $<$ , and let

$$X_{i+1} = X_i \cup \{u\}.$$

For each vertex  $u \in V_2$ , let  $i_u$  be the index such that

$$u \in X_{i_u} - X_{i_u-1}.$$

In other words,  $u$  is the  $i_u$ th coloured vertex.

The colour  $\phi_{i+1}(u)$  will be selected carefully. The main task of the remaining part of the proof is describing how to choose the colour for  $u$  in this case.

Note that when (R1) is applied to colour  $v \in Q - X_{i_u-1}$ , since  $|Q - X_{i_u-1}| \geq 2$ ,  $|L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v)| \geq d_{G-X_{i_u-1}}(v) \geq 1$ . So  $L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v) \neq \emptyset$ , and the required colour for  $v$  exists. Once a connected component  $Q$  of  $G[V_1]$  becomes free with respect to  $\phi_i$ , then it remains free with respect to  $\phi_j$  for  $j \geq i$ . In the following, if the partial colouring  $\phi_i$  is clear from the context, we simply say  $Q$  is free or non-free to mean that  $Q$  is free or non-free with respect to  $\phi_i$ .

We apply the above rules until all vertices of  $V_2$  are coloured. Our goal is to make each connected component  $Q$  of  $G[V_1]$  free when all vertices of  $V_2$  are coloured.

If this goal is achieved, then  $G$  has an  $L$ -colouring by the definition of free components. To complete the proof of Theorem 3, it remains to show that this goal can be achieved.

**Observation 2.** Assume  $u \in V_2$  and  $Q$  is a non-free connected component of  $G[V_1]$  and  $|Q - X_{i_u-1}| \geq 2$ . Then each non-cut vertex of  $Q - X_{i_u-1}$  is adjacent to some vertex in  $V(\theta_Q) - X_{i_u-1}$ .

**Proof.** If  $v$  is a non-cut vertex of  $Q - X_{i_u-1}$  which is not adjacent to any vertex in  $V(\theta_Q) - X_{i_u-1}$ , then (R1) can be applied to colour  $v$ , in contrary to the definition of  $i_u$ .  $\square$

**Definition 10.** Assume  $Q$  is a connected component of  $G[V_1]$  and  $u \in V_2$  is a protector of  $Q$ . Let

$$S_{u,Q}^* = \{c \in L_{i_u-1}(u) : \exists \text{ an extension } \psi \text{ of } \phi_{i_u-1} \text{ to } X_{i_u-1} \cup V_2 \text{ such that} \\ \psi(u) = c \text{ and } L^\psi|_{Q-X_{i_u-1}} \text{ is a bad list assignment for } Q - X_{i_u-1}\}.$$

If  $|S_{u,Q}^*| \leq 3$ , then we say  $u$  is a *savior* of  $Q$ .

Note that if  $Q$  is free with respect to  $\phi_{i_u-1}$ , then  $S_{u,Q}^* = \emptyset$  and hence  $u$  is a savior for  $Q$ .

To prove that  $u$  is a savior for  $Q$ , it suffices to present a set  $S_{u,Q}$  of colours such that  $S_{u,Q}^* \subseteq S_{u,Q}$  and  $|S_{u,Q}| \leq 3$ . In other words, the set  $S_{u,Q}$  has the following property

Property (S): *for any extension  $\psi$  of  $\phi_{i_u-1}$  to  $X_{i_u-1} \cup V_2$  for which  $\psi(u) \notin S_{u,Q}$ ,  $\psi|_{Q-X_{i_u-1}}$  is not bad for  $Q - X_{i_u-1}$ .*

In the following, for each savior  $u$  of a connected component  $Q$  of  $G[V_1]$ , a set  $S_{u,Q}$  with Property (S) is given. We call  $S_{u,Q}$  the *colour cost set* for  $u$  to be a savior of  $Q$ .

Let

$$\mathcal{Q}_u = \{Q : Q \text{ is a connected component of } G[V_1] \text{ and } u \text{ is a savior of } Q\}.$$

Since  $u$  is the protector of at most two connected components  $Q$  of  $G[V_1]$ ,  $|\mathcal{Q}_u| \leq 2$ .

Now we can finish the description of the colouring process by specifying the colour  $\phi_{i_u}(u)$  for  $u \in V_2$ :  $\phi_{i_u}(u)$  is any colour  $c$  such that

$$c \in L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(u) - \cup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_u} S_{u,Q}.$$

Note that  $\cup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_u} S_{u,Q}$  might be an empty set. In this case,  $c$  is any colour in  $L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(u)$ .

It follows from the colouring rules that  $L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(u) = L(u) - \{\phi_{i_u-1}(u') : u' \in V_2, u' < u\}$ .

Hence

$$|L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(u)| = |L(u)| - |\{\phi_{i_u-1}(u') : u' \in V_2, u' < u\}| \geq 12 - 5 = 7.$$

As  $|\mathcal{Q}_u| \leq 2$  and  $|S_{u,Q}| \leq 3$  for each  $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_u$ , we conclude that

$$L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(u) - \cup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_u} S_{u,Q} \neq \emptyset,$$

and hence the required colour  $c$  exists.

**Lemma 7.** Each connected component  $Q$  of  $G[V_1]$  has a savior.

Assume Lemma 7 is true. We use the colouring strategy described above. When all vertices of  $V_2$  are coloured, for any connected component  $Q$  of  $G[V_1]$ ,  $Q$  is free. Let  $X$  be the set of coloured vertices and  $\phi$  be the partial colouring of  $X$ . Then  $Q - X$  has a proper  $L^\phi$ -colouring. Therefore  $G$  has a proper  $L$ -colouring.

So it remains to prove the Lemma 7.



## 4 Proof of Lemma 7

Assume Lemma 7 is not true and  $Q$  is a connected component of  $G[V_1]$  which has no savior. In particular, for any vertex  $u \in V_2$ ,  $|L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v)| = d_{G-X_{i_u-1}}(v)$  for each vertex  $v \in Q - X_{i_u-1}$ .

**Definition 11.** Assume  $u \leq w$  are vertices in  $V(\theta_Q)$  ( $u$  and  $w$  are not necessarily distinct). We say  $w$  is *confined by  $u$  to colour  $c$*  if for any extension  $\psi$  of  $\phi_{i_u-1}$  to  $X_{i_u-1} \cup V_2$  with  $\psi(w) \neq c$ ,  $L^\psi|_{Q-X_{i_u-1}}$  is not bad for  $Q - X_{i_u-1}$ . We may simply say  $w$  is confined by  $u$ , if colour  $c$  is clear from the context or is not important.

Since  $u \leq w$ , at step  $i_u - 1$ ,  $u$  and  $w$  are both uncoloured yet. If  $w$  is confined by  $u$  to colour  $c$ , then at the step  $u$  is to be coloured, we may treat  $w$  as coloured with colour  $c$  (although  $w$  is not coloured yet). Note that if  $w$  is confined by  $u$  to colour  $c$ , and  $u \leq u' \leq w$ , then  $w$  is confined by  $u'$  to colour  $c$  as well. In particular, if there is a vertex  $u$  such that  $w$  is confined by  $u$  to colour  $c$ , then  $w$  is confined to colour  $c$  by itself.

**Lemma 8.** Assume  $w$  is confined by  $u$  to colour  $c$ . Then the following hold:

1. For any  $v \in N_{Q-X_{i_u-1}}(w)$ ,  $c \in L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v)$ .
2.  $w$  is not a protector of  $Q$ .

**Proof.** (1) If  $v \in N_{Q-X_{i_u-1}}(w)$  and  $c \notin L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v)$ , then for any extension  $\psi$  of  $\phi_{i_u-1}$  to  $X_{i_u-1} \cup V_2$ , either  $\psi(w) \neq c$ , or  $\psi(w) = c \notin L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v)$  and hence  $|L^\psi(v)| > d_{Q-X_{i_u-1}}(v)$ . In any case,  $Q - X_{i_u-1}$  is  $L^\psi$ -colourable. So  $Q$  is free at step  $i_u - 1$ , a contradiction.

(2) If  $w$  is a protector of  $Q$  which is confined by  $u$  to colour  $c$ , then  $w$  is a savior of  $Q$  with cost colour set  $S_{w,Q} = \{c\}$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

**Lemma 9.** Assume  $u \leq w \in V(\theta_Q)$ ,  $v, v'$  are non-cut vertices of a same block of  $Q - X_{i_u-1}$ . If  $N_{V_2-X_{i_u-1}}(v) = N_{V_2-X_{i_u-1}}(v') \cup \{w\}$  and  $c \in L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v) - L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v')$ , then  $w$  is confined by  $u$  to colour  $c$ . Consequently  $w$  is not a protector of  $Q$ .

**Proof.** If  $\psi$  is an extension of  $\phi_{i_u-1}$  to  $X_{i_u-1} \cup V_2$ , and  $\psi(w) \neq c$ , then either  $c \in L^\psi(v) - L^\psi(v')$  and hence  $L^\psi(v) \neq L^\psi(v')$ , or  $v$  and  $v'$  has a common neighbor  $u'$  in  $V_2 - X_{i_u-1}$  which is coloured by  $c \notin L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v')$  and hence  $|L^\psi(v')| > d_{Q-X_{i_u-1}}(v')$ . In any case, it follows from lemma 6 that  $Q - X_{i_u-1}$  is  $L^\psi$ -colourable. So  $w$  is confined by  $u$  to colour  $c$ . By Lemma 8,  $w$  is not a protector of  $Q$ .  $\square$

Assume  $u$  is a protector of  $Q$ . Let

$$F_u = \{w \in V_2 : w \text{ is a non-protector of } Q, w \text{ is confined by } u\}.$$

**Lemma 10.** Assume  $u$  is a protector of  $Q$ . If  $w, w' \in F_u$ , and  $w, w'$  are confined to a same colour  $c$ , then  $N_{Q-X_{i_u-1}}(w) \cap N_{Q-X_{i_u-1}}(w') = \emptyset$ .

**Proof.** If  $w, w'$  are confined to a same colour  $c$ , and  $v \in N_{Q-X_{i_u-1}}(w) \cap N_{Q-X_{i_u-1}}(w')$ , then for any extension  $\psi$  of  $\phi_{i_u-1}$  to  $X_{i_u-1} \cup V_2$ , either  $\psi(w) \neq c$  or  $\psi(w') \neq c$  or  $|L^\psi(v)| > d_{Q-X_{i_u-1}}(v)$ . In any case,  $Q - X_{i_u-1}$  is  $L^\psi$ -colourable. So  $Q$  is free, a contradiction.  $\square$

**Lemma 11.** Assume  $u$  is a protector of  $Q$  and  $v \in N_{Q-X_{i_u-1}}(u)$ . Then  $d_{G-X_{i_u-1}-F_u}(v) \geq 4$ .

**Proof.** Assume to the contrary that  $d_{G-X_{i_u-1}-F_u}(v) \leq 3$ . For  $w_i \in F_u$ , assume  $w_i$  is confined by  $u$  to colour  $c_i$ . Let

$$S_{u,Q} = L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v) - \{c_i : w_i \in F_u \text{ and } v \in N_{Q-X_{i_u-1}}(w_i)\}.$$

By Lemma 8,  $\{c_i : w_i \in F_u, v \in N_{Q-X_{i_u-1}}(w_i)\} \subseteq L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v)$ . By Lemma 10,  $|\{c_i : w_i \in F_u, v \in N_{Q-X_{i_u-1}}(w_i)\}| = |\{w_i \in F_u : v \in N_{Q-X_{i_u-1}}(w_i)\}|$ . As  $|L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v)| = d_{G-X_{i_u-1}}(v)$ , then  $|S_{u,Q}| = d_{G-X_{i_u-1}-F_u}(v) \leq 3$ . Let  $\psi$  be an extension of  $\phi_{i_u-1}$  to  $X_{i_u-1} \cup V_2$  with  $\psi(u) \notin S_{u,Q}$ . If  $\psi(w_i) \neq c_i$  for some  $w_i \in F_u$ , then  $Q - X_{i_u-1}$  is  $L^\psi$ -colourable.

If  $\psi(w_i) = c_i$  for each  $w_i \in F_u$ , then as  $\psi(u) \notin S_{u,Q}$ ,  $|L^\psi(v)| > d_{Q-X_{i_u-1}}(v)$ , and hence  $L^\psi|_{Q-X_{i_u-1}}$  is not bad for  $Q - X_{i_u-1}$ . Therefore  $u$  is a savior for  $Q$  with cost colour set  $S_{u,Q}$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

**Lemma 12.**  $|V(G[V_2])| \geq 2$ .

**Proof.** Assume  $V(G[V_2]) = \{v^*\}$ , then  $|L(v^*)| = 12$  and there is only one face of  $G[V_2]$  and  $G[V_1]$  is connected.

By Lemma 5, each non-cut vertex of  $G[V_1]$  is adjacent to  $v^*$ . Assume  $B$  is a leaf block of  $G[V_1]$  and  $v \in U_B$ . Then by Lemma 5,  $d_B(v) \leq 2$  and thus  $d_G(v) \leq 3$ , in contrary to Lemma 11.  $\square$

**Lemma 13.**  $\theta_Q$  is a finite face of  $G[V_2]$ .

**Proof.** Assume  $\theta_Q$  is the infinite face of  $G[V_2]$  and  $v^* \in \theta_Q$ . Thus each vertex in  $\theta_Q$  is a protector of  $Q$ . Let  $u$  be the last proctor of  $Q$ . As  $v^*$  is the first vertex in the ordering, by Lemma 12,  $u \neq v^*$  and  $v^* \in X_{i_u-1}$ . By Observation 2, each non-cut vertex of  $Q - X_{i_u-1}$  is adjacent to  $u$ . Assume  $B$  is a leaf block of  $Q - X_{i_u-1}$  and  $v \in U_B$ . By Lemma 5,  $d_B(v) \leq 2$  and hence  $d_{G-X_{i_u-1}}(v) \leq 3$ , in contrary to Lemma 11.  $\square$

By Lemma 13 and Corollary 1, we conclude that  $\theta_Q = C_Q$  and for any block  $B$  of  $Q$ , there are three paths contained in  $V(\theta_Q) \cup V(Q)$  connecting  $V(\theta_Q)$  and  $V(B)$ , and these paths are pairwise vertex disjoint except that they may have the same end vertex in  $B$ .

Let  $w_1, w_2$  be the non-protectors of  $Q$ . Since there are three paths connecting  $V(\theta_Q)$  and  $Q$ , and these paths have the different end vertex in  $V(\theta_Q)$ , there is at least one protector of  $Q$  adjacent to a vertex in  $Q$ .

**Lemma 14.** Assume  $u$  is a protector of  $Q$ . Then  $|Q - X_{i_u-1}| \geq 2$ .

**Proof.** Assume  $Q - X_{i_u-1}$  consists of a single vertex for some protector  $u$  of  $Q$ . We may assume that  $u$  is the last protector of  $Q$ . Since  $Q$  has only two non-protectors, we have  $d_{G-X_{i_u-1}}(v) = d_{V_2-X_{i_u-1}}(v) \leq 3$ , which contradicts Lemma 11.  $\square$

**Lemma 15.** Assume  $u$  is a protector of  $Q$ . Then each non-cut vertex  $v$  of  $Q - X_{i_u-1}$  is adjacent to at least one non-protector of  $Q$ .

**Proof.** Assume  $v$  is a non-cut vertex of  $Q - X_{i_u-1}$  that is not adjacent to any non-protector of  $Q$ . By Observation 2,  $v$  is adjacent to some vertex of  $V_2 - X_{i_u-1}$ . Thus  $v$  is adjacent to a protector of  $Q$ . Let  $u$  be the last protector of  $Q$  which is adjacent to  $v$ . By Lemma 5,  $d_{Q-X_{i_u-1}}(v) \leq 2$ . Hence  $d_{G-X_{i_u-1}}(v) \leq 3$ , in contrary to Lemma 11.  $\square$

**Lemma 16.** If  $B$  is a leaf-block of  $Q$ , then  $w_1, w_2 \in N_{\theta_Q}(U_B)$ .

**Proof.** Assume to the contrary that  $w_2 \notin N_{\theta_Q}(U_B)$ . By Corollary 1,  $|N_{\theta_Q}(U_B)| \geq 2$ . Thus  $N_{\theta_Q}(U_B)$  contains a protector of  $Q$ . Let  $u$  be the last protector of  $Q$  that is adjacent to some vertex in  $U_B$ .

By Lemma 11,  $d_{G-X_{i_u-1}}(v) = |L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v)| \geq 4$  for each vertex  $v \in N_{Q-X_{i_u-1}}(u) \cap U_B$ .

Let  $v_1 \in N_{Q-X_{i_u-1}}(u) \cap U_B$ . As  $N_{V_2-X_{i_u-1}}(v_1) \subseteq \{u, w_1\}$ , it follows from Lemma 5,  $B-X_{i_u-1}$  is an odd cycle  $C = [v_1 v_2 \dots v_{2l+1}]$ . So  $d_{Q-X_{i_u-1}}(v_1) = 2$ ,  $d_{G-X_{i_u-1}}(v_1) = 4$ ,  $N_{V_2-X_{i_u-1}}(v_1) = \{u, w_1\}$ . As  $C$  contains at most one cut-vertex of  $Q - X_{i_u-1}$ , we may assume that  $v_2 \in U_B$ . By assumption,  $N_{V_2-X_{i_u-1}}(v_2) \subseteq \{u, w_1\}$ . By Lemma 15,  $v_2$  is adjacent to  $w_1$ .

If  $v_2$  is not adjacent to  $u$ , then  $N_{G-X_{i_u-1}}(v_2) = N_{G-X_{i_u-1}}(v_1) - \{u\}$ , and hence  $u$  is confined by itself to colour  $c \in L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_1) - L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_2)$ , in contrary to Lemma 9.

Assume  $v_2$  is also adjacent to  $u$ . Then  $Q - \{v_1, v_2\}$  is contained in the interior of the 4-cycle  $[uv_1 w_1 v_2]$ . If  $Q$  has another leaf-block  $B'$ , then  $|N_{\theta_Q}(U_{B'})| \leq 1$ , a contradiction to Corollary 1. Thus  $Q - X_{i_u-1}$  is an odd cycle. By Lemma 15,  $v_{2l+1}$  is adjacent to  $w_1$ . Thus  $v_{2l+1}$  is not adjacent to  $u$  (for otherwise  $G$  contains  $K_5$  as a minor). Hence  $N_{G-X_{i_u-1}}(v_{2l+1}) = N_{G-X_{i_u-1}}(v_1) - \{u\}$ , and hence  $u$  is confined by itself to colour  $c \in L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_1) - L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_{2l+1})$ , in contrary to Lemma 9.  $\square$

The following corollary follows from Lemma 16 and the planarity of  $G$ .

**Corollary 2.**  $Q$  has at most two leaf-blocks, and each protector  $u$  of  $Q$  in  $V(\theta_Q)$  is adjacent to non-root vertices of exactly one leaf block of  $Q$ .

**Proof.** If  $Q$  has three leaf-blocks, then  $Q$  contains  $K_{1,3}$  as a minor and by Lemma 16,  $Q \cup \{w_1, w_2\}$  contains  $K_{3,3}$  as a minor, a contradiction.

Assume  $Q$  has two leaf-blocks  $B$  and  $B'$ , and  $u$  is a protector of  $Q$  adjacent to both  $U_B$  and  $U_{B'}$ . By contracting the cycle  $\theta_Q$  into a triangle containing  $w_1, w_2, u$ , and contracting each of  $U_B$  and  $U_{B'}$  into a single vertex, we obtain a copy of  $K_5$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

It follows from Corollary 2 that the blocks of  $Q$  are ordered as  $B_1, B_2, \dots, B_k$  ( $k \geq 1$ ) such that  $B_1, B_k$  are leaf-blocks and for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$ ,  $B_i$  and  $B_{i+1}$  share a cut-vertex  $v_i$ , and  $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{k-1}$  are pairwise distinct.

In the remainder of this section, let  $u$  be the last protector of  $Q$ .

By Corollary 2, we may assume that  $N_Q(u) \subseteq U_{B_k}$ , and assume  $v_1 \in N_Q(u) \cap U_{B_k}$ .

**Lemma 17.**  $w_1, w_2 \notin X_{i_u-1}$  and hence  $N_Q(w_1) \cup N_Q(w_2) \cap X_{i_u-1} = \emptyset$ .

**Proof.** Assume  $w_2 \in X_{i_u-1}$ . By Lemma 5,  $d_{Q-X_{i_u-1}}(v_1) \leq 2$ . By Lemma 11,  $d_{G-X_{i_u-1}}(v_1) \geq 4$ . It follows that  $d_{Q-X_{i_u-1}}(v_1) = 2$ ,  $N_{V_2-X_{i_u-1}}(v_1) = \{u, w_1\}$ ,  $|L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_1)| = d_{G-X_{i_u-1}}(v_1) = 4$  and  $B_k - X_{i_u-1}$  is an odd cycle  $[v_1 v_2 \dots v_{2l+1}]$ .

Assume first that  $U_{B_k-X_{i_u-1}} - N_G(u) \neq \emptyset$ , say  $v' \in U_{B_k-X_{i_u-1}} - N_G(u)$ . By Lemma 15,  $N_{V_2-X_{i_u-1}}(v') = \{w_1\}$  and  $|L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v')| = d_{G-X_{i_u-1}}(v') = 3$ . Let  $c \in L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_1) - L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v')$ . If  $\psi$  is an extension of  $\phi_{i_u-1}$  to  $V_2 \cup X_{i_u-1}$  with  $\psi(u) \neq c$ , then  $L^\psi(v') \neq L^\psi(v_1)$  or  $|L^\psi(v')| > d_{Q-X_{i_u-1}}(v')$ . So  $Q - X_{i_u-1}$  is  $L^\psi$ -colourable. Therefore  $u$  is confined to colour  $c$  by itself, a contradiction to Lemma 9.

Thus  $U_{B_k-X_{i_u-1}} \subseteq N_G(u)$ . As  $u$  has at most two neighbours in  $U_{B_k-X_{i_u-1}}$  (for otherwise  $u$  has a neighbour  $v_i$  with  $d_{G-X_{i_u-1}}(v_i) = 3$ , contrary to Lemma 11), we conclude that  $B_k - X_{i_u-1}$  is a triangle  $[v_1 v_2 v_3]$  and  $|U_{B_k-X_{i_u-1}}| = 2$ , say  $v_3$  is a cut-vertex of  $G$ , and  $v_1, v_2 \in N_G(u) \cap N_G(w_1)$ . This implies that  $Q$  has at least two blocks, i.e.,  $k \geq 2$ . But then  $Q - \{v_1, v_2\}$  is contained in the interior of the 4-cycle  $[w_1 v_1 u v_2]$ . Hence  $w_2$  is not adjacent to  $U_{B_1}$  in  $G$ , a contradiction to Lemma 16.  $\square$

By Lemma 5 and Lemma 15, each non-cut vertex  $v$  of  $Q$  is adjacent to at least one of  $w_1, w_2$ . As  $w_1, w_2 \notin X_{i_u-1}$ , we have  $V(Q) \cap X_{i_u-1} = \emptyset$  and  $Q - X_{i_u-1} = Q$ .

**Lemma 18.**  $Q$  has at least two blocks.

**Proof.** Assume to the contrary that  $Q$  has a single block.

If  $Q$  is a copy of  $K_2$  with vertices  $v_1, v_2$ , then  $d_Q(v_i) = 1$  and  $d_{G-X_{i_u-1}}(v_i) \leq 4$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . If  $d_{G-X_{i_u-1}}(v_1) = d_{G-X_{i_u-1}}(v_2) = 4$ , then  $\{u, w_1, w_2\} \subseteq N_{V_2}(v_1), N_{V_2}(v_2)$ . Together with  $V(\theta_Q)$ , we obtain  $K_5$  as a minor, a contradiction. Thus we may assume that  $d_{G-X_{i_u-1}}(v_2) \leq 3$ . Hence  $v_1$  is adjacent to  $u, w_1, w_2$ , and by Lemma 11,  $v_2$  is not adjacent to  $u$ . If  $L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_2) \not\subseteq L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_1)$ , then for any extension  $\psi$  of  $\phi_{i_u-1}$  to  $X_{i_u-1} \cup V_2$ , either  $|L^\psi(v_1)| > d_Q(v_1)$  or  $L^\psi(v_1) \neq L^\psi(v_2)$ , and hence  $Q$  is  $L^\psi$ -colourable. Thus we may assume that  $L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_2) \subseteq L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_1)$ . Let

$$S_{u,Q} = L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_1) - L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_2).$$

Then  $|S_{u,Q}| \leq 3$ . Let  $\psi$  be an extension of  $\phi_{i_u-1}$  to  $V_2 \cup X_{i_u-1}$  for which  $\psi(u) \notin S_{u,Q}$ . We shall show that  $Q$  is  $L^\psi$ -colourable, and hence  $u$  is a savior for  $Q$  with cost colour set  $S_{u,Q}$ .

Assume to the contrary that  $L^\psi|_Q$  is bad for  $Q$ . Note that  $|S_{u,Q}| = |L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_1)| - |L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_2)| = |\{w_1, w_2\} - N_G(v_2)| + 1$ . If  $w_i$  is adjacent to  $v_2$ , then  $\psi(w_i) \in L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_2)$ , for otherwise  $|L^\psi(v_2)| > d_Q(v_2)$ . Hence  $\psi(w_i) \notin S_{u,Q}$ . So  $S_{u,Q} - \{\psi(w_1), \psi(w_2)\} \neq \emptyset$ , which implies that  $L^\psi(v_1) \neq L^\psi(v_2)$ , a contradiction.

Assume  $Q$  is an odd cycle  $C = [v_1 v_2 \dots v_{2l+1}]$ . Note that for each vertex  $x \in \{u, w_1, w_2\}$ ,  $N_Q(x)$  is a subpath of  $C$ , and  $u$  has at most two neighbours in  $C$ , for otherwise  $u$  has a neighbour  $v_i$  with  $d_{G-X_{i_u-1}}(v_i) = 3$ , contrary to Lemma 11.

**Case 1**  $u$  has two neighbours in  $C$ .

Assume  $u$  is adjacent to  $v_1$  and  $v_2$ . By Lemma 15, for  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, 2l+1\}$ ,  $v_i$  is adjacent to at least one non-protector. On the other hand, at least one of  $v_1, v_2$  is adjacent to only one non-protector, for otherwise  $G$  contains a subdivision of  $K_5$ . By symmetry, we assume that  $N_{V_2-X_{i_u-1}}(v_2) = \{u, w_1\}$ . If  $N_{V_2-X_{i_u-1}}(v_3) = \{w_1\}$ , then by Lemma 9,  $u$  is confined by itself to colour  $c \in L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_2) - L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_3)$ , contrary to Lemma 8. If  $N_{V_2-X_{i_u-1}}(v_3) = \{w_2\}$ , then  $N_{V_2-X_{i_u-1}}(v_i) = \{w_2\}$  for  $i = 3, 4, \dots, 2l+1$  and  $N_{V_2-X_{i_u-1}}(v_1) = \{u, w_2\}$ . Again by Lemma 9,  $u$  is confined by itself to colour  $c \in L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_1) - L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_{2l+1})$ , contrary to Lemma 8. Thus  $N_{V_2-X_{i_u-1}}(v_3) = \{w_1, w_2\}$ . This implies that  $N_{V_2-X_{i_u-1}}(v_1) = \{u, w_2\}$ . By symmetry,  $N_{V_2-X_{i_u-1}}(v_{2l+1}) = \{w_1, w_2\}$ , and this implies that  $l = 1$ , i.e.,  $C = [v_1 v_2 v_3]$ .

If  $L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_1) = L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_2)$ , then for any extension  $\psi$  of  $\phi_{i_u-1}$  to  $X_{i_u-1} \cup V_2$ , either  $\psi(w_1) = \psi(w_2)$  and  $|L^\psi(v_3)| > d_Q(v_3)$ , or  $\psi(w_1) \neq \psi(w_2)$ , and hence  $L^\psi(v_1) \neq L^\psi(v_2)$ . In any case,  $Q$  is  $L^\psi$ -colourable, and  $u$  is a savior for  $Q$  with cost colour set  $S_{u,Q} = \emptyset$ .

If  $L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_1) \neq L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_2)$ , then let  $S_{u,Q} = L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_1) \cap L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_2)$ . Then  $|S_{u,Q}| \leq 3$ , and for any extension  $\psi$  of  $\phi_{i_u-1}$  to  $V_2 \cup X_{i_u-1}$  with  $\psi(u) \notin S_{u,Q}$ , either  $|L^\psi(v_1)| > d_Q(v_1)$  or  $|L^\psi(v_2)| > d_Q(v_2)$ . So  $Q$  is  $L^\psi$ -colourable, and  $u$  is a savior for  $Q$  with cost colour set  $S_{u,Q}$ .

**Case 2**  $u$  has only one neighbour in  $C$ .

Assume  $u$  is adjacent to  $v_1$ . If  $v_1$  is adjacent to both  $w_1$  and  $w_2$ , then there exists  $i \in \{2, 2l+1\}$  such that  $d_{G-X_{i_u-1}}(v_i) = 3$ . By symmetry, we may assume that  $N_{V_2-X_{i_u-1}}(v_2) = \{w_1\}$ . Let  $S_{u,Q}$  be a subset of  $L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_1) - L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_2)$  of size 2. For any extension  $\psi$  of  $\phi_{i_u-1}$  to  $X_{i_u-1} \cup V_2$  for which  $\psi(u) \notin S_{u,Q}$ , at least one of the following holds:

- $\psi(w_1) \notin L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_2)$  and hence  $|L^\psi(v_2)| > d_Q(v_2)$ .

- $\psi(w_1) \in L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_2)$  and hence  $L^\psi(v_1) \neq L^\psi(v_2)$ , because at least one of the two colours in  $S_{u,Q}$  is contained in  $L^\psi(v_1) - L^\psi(v_2)$ .

So  $Q$  is  $L^\psi$ -colourable, and  $u$  is a savior for  $Q$  with cost colour set  $S_{u,Q}$ .

Assume  $v_1$  is adjacent to only one of  $w_1, w_2$ . By symmetry, assume that  $N_{V_2-X_{i_u-1}}(v_1) = \{u, w_1\}$ .

If  $N_{V_2-X_{i_u-1}}(v_2) = \{w_1\}$ , then it follows from Lemma 9 that  $u$  is confined by itself to colour  $c \in L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_1) - L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_2)$ , a contradiction. If  $N_{V_2-X_{i_u-1}}(v_2) = \{w_1, w_2\}$ , then  $w_2$  is adjacent to  $v_2, v_3, \dots, v_{2l+1}$ , and  $N_{V_2-X_{i_u-1}}(v_{2l+1}) = \{w_2\}$ . It follows from Lemma 9 that  $w_1$  is confined by  $u$  to colour  $c \in L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_2) - L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_{2l+1})$ . But then  $d_{G-X_{i_u-1}-F_u}(v_1) = 3$ , contrary to Lemma 11.

So  $N_{V_2-X_{i_u-1}}(v_2) = \{w_2\}$ . By symmetry,  $N_{V_2-X_{i_u-1}}(v_{2l+1}) = \{w_2\}$ . Hence for  $i = 2, 3, \dots, 2l+1$ ,  $N_{V_2-X_{i_u-1}}(v_i) = \{w_2\}$ .

Assume  $w_1$  and  $w_2$  are adjacent. If  $L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_2) \subseteq L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_1)$ , then let  $S_{u,Q} = L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_2)$ . Let  $\psi$  be an extension of  $\phi_{i_u-1}$  to  $X_{i_u-1} \cup V_2$  for which  $\psi(u) \notin S_{u,Q}$ . Then since  $\psi(w_1) \neq \psi(w_2)$ , then either  $\psi(u) \in L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_1) - L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_2)$  and hence  $L^\psi(v_1) \neq L^\psi(v_2)$  or  $\psi(u) \notin L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_1)$  and hence  $|L^\psi(v_1)| > d_Q(v_1)$ . In any case,  $Q$  is  $L^\psi$ -colourable, and  $u$  is a savior for  $Q$  with cost colour set  $S_{u,Q}$ .

If  $L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_2) \not\subseteq L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_1)$ , then  $|L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_1) - L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_2)| \geq 2$ . Let  $S_{u,Q}$  be a subset of  $L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_1) - L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_2)$  of size 2. For any extension  $\psi$  of  $\phi_{i_u-1}$  to  $X_{i_u-1} \cup V_2$  for which  $\psi(u) \notin S_{u,Q}$ , at least one of the colours in  $S_{u,Q}$  is contained in  $L^\psi(v_1) - L^\psi(v_2)$ . Hence  $L^\psi(v_1) \neq L^\psi(v_2)$  and  $Q$  is  $L^\psi$ -colourable. So  $u$  is a savior for  $Q$  with cost colour set  $S_{u,Q}$ .

Now we assume  $w_1$  and  $w_2$  are not adjacent. Then  $|\theta_Q| \geq 4$ , and  $\theta_Q$  contains another protector of  $Q$ . As there are three pairwise vertex disjoint paths connecting  $\theta_Q$  to  $v_2$  except that have the same end vertex  $v_2$ , at most one of the three paths contains  $w_2$  and at most one of the three paths contains  $w_1$ . Thus  $Q$  has a protector which is adjacent to  $v_2$ . By symmetry,  $Q$  has a protector which is adjacent to  $v_{2l+1}$ . Let  $w$  be the last protector of  $Q$  which is adjacent to  $v_2$  or  $v_{2l+1}$ . If  $w$  is adjacent to both  $v_2$  and  $v_{2l+1}$ , then  $V(Q) \cup V(\theta_Q)$  contains  $K_5$  as a minor, a contradiction. By symmetry, we assume that  $w$  is adjacent to  $v_2$ . Thus

$$N_{V_2-X_{i_u-1}}(v_{2l+1}) = N_{V_2-X_{i_u-1}}(v_2) - \{w\}.$$

This contradicts Lemma 9. □

It follows from Corollary 2 and Lemma 18 that  $k \geq 2$  and  $Q$  has exactly two leaf-blocks  $B_1$  and  $B_k$ . Recall that  $v_1 \in N_Q(u) \cap U_{B_k}$  and  $N_Q(u) \subseteq U_{B_k}$ . We complete the proof of Theorem 3 by considering two cases.

**Case 1**  $|L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_1)| = d_{G-X_{i_u-1}}(v_1) = 5$ .

Then  $B_k$  is an odd cycle  $C = [v_1 v_2 \dots v_{2l+1}]$  and  $N_{V_2-X_{i_u-1}}(v_1) = \{u, w_1, w_2\}$ . By symmetry, we may assume that  $v_2 \in U_{B_k}$ .

By the planarity of  $G$ ,  $v_2$  is adjacent to only one of  $u, w_1, w_2$ . By Lemma 11,  $v_2$  is not adjacent to  $u$ . By symmetry, assume  $N_{V_2-X_{i_u-1}}(v_2) = \{w_1\}$ . Then  $|L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_2)| = d_{G-X_{i_u-1}}(v_2) = 3$ . Let  $S_{u,Q}$  be a subset of  $L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_1) - L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_2)$  of size 2. For any extension  $\psi$  of  $\phi_{i_u-1}$  to  $X_{i_u-1} \cup V_2$  for which  $\psi(u) \notin S_{u,Q}$ , at least one of the following holds:

- $\psi(w_1) \notin L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_2)$  and hence  $|L^\psi(v_2)| > d_Q(v_2)$ .
- $\psi(w_1) \in L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_2)$  and hence  $L^\psi(v_1) \neq L^\psi(v_2)$ .

So  $Q$  is  $L^\psi$ -colourable, and  $u$  is a savior for  $Q$  with cost colour set  $S_{u,Q}$ .

**Case 2**  $|L^{\phi_{iu-1}}(v_1)| = d_{G-X_{i_{u-1}}}(v_1) = 4$ .

First we show that  $B_1$  has a non-root vertex  $v'_1$  with  $d_{G-X_{i_{u-1}}}(v'_1) = 3$ .

If  $B_1 = K_2$ , then  $B_1$  has a single non-root vertex  $v'_1$ . By Lemma 16,  $v'_1$  is adjacent to both  $w_1$  and  $w_2$ , and not adjacent to  $u$ . Hence  $d_{G-X_{i_{u-1}}}(v'_1) = 3$ .

If  $B_1$  is an odd cycle  $[v'_1 v'_2 \dots v'_{2t+1}]$ , then we may assume that  $v'_1, v'_2$  are non-root vertices of  $B_1$ , and at most one of  $v'_1, v'_2$  is adjacent to both  $w_1, w_2$  (for otherwise  $V(\theta_Q) \cup V(Q)$  contains  $K_5$  as a minor, a contradiction). Thus we may assume that  $|L^{\phi_{iu-1}}(v'_1)| = d_{G-X_{i_{u-1}}}(v'_1) = 3$ .

**Case 2(i)** For all the other non-root vertex  $v'$  of  $B_1$ ,  $L^{\phi_{iu-1}}(v') = L^{\phi_{iu-1}}(v'_1)$ .

Let  $c \in L^{\phi_{iu-1}}(v_1) - L^{\phi_{iu-1}}(v'_1)$ .

Let  $l$  be the largest index such that  $B_l$  has a vertex  $x$  such that  $c \notin L^{\phi_{iu-1}}(x)$ . Since  $c \notin L^{\phi_{iu-1}}(v'_1)$ , we know that  $l \geq 1$  is well-defined. Let

$$S_{u,Q} = \begin{cases} \{c\}, & \text{if } k-l \text{ is even,} \\ L^{\phi_{iu-1}}(v_1) - \{c\}, & \text{if } k-l \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

Assume  $\psi$  is an extension of  $\phi_{iu-1}$  to  $X_{i_{u-1}} \cup V_2$  such that  $\psi(u) \notin S_{u,Q}$ , and  $L^\psi|_Q$  is a bad list assignment for  $Q$ . By Lemma 1, for  $1 \leq i \leq q$ , there is a set  $C_i$  of colours such that for each vertex  $x$  of  $Q$ ,  $L^\psi(x) = \cup_{x \in B_i} C_i$  and  $C_i \cap C_{i+1} = \emptyset$ .

For  $i = 1, 2$ , we have  $\psi(w_i) \in L^{\phi_{iu-1}}(v'_1)$ , for otherwise since  $L^{\phi_{iu-1}}(v') = L^{\phi_{iu-1}}(v'_1)$  for all non-root vertex  $v'$  of  $B_1$ , and each  $w_i$  is adjacent to some non-root vertex of  $B_1$ , we conclude that there is a non-root vertex  $v'$  of  $B_1$  such that  $|L^\psi(v')| > d_Q(v')$ , in contrary to the assumption that  $L^\psi|_Q$  is a bad list assignment for  $Q$ . So  $\psi(w_i) \neq c$  for  $i = 1, 2$ .

Since  $w_1, w_2 \in N_G(U_{B_i})$  for  $i = 1, k$ , the subgraph of  $G$  induced by  $\{w_1, w_2\} \cup U_{B_1} \cup U_{B_q}$  contains a cycle  $C''$  such that  $Q - U_{B'_1} - U_{B'_q}$  are contained in the interior of  $C''$ , and  $u$  is contained in the exterior of  $C''$ . Thus  $u$  is not adjacent to any vertex in  $Q - U_{B'_1} - U_{B'_q}$ . So for any vertex  $x$  of  $Q - U_{B'_1} - U_{B'_q}$ ,

$$L^{\phi_{iu-1}}(x) - \{\psi(w_1), \psi(w_2)\} \subseteq L^\psi(x).$$

In particular,  $c \in L^\psi(x)$  if and only if  $c \in L^{\phi_{iu-1}}(x)$ .

As there is a vertex  $x \in B_l$  such that  $c \notin L^{\phi_{iu-1}}(x)$ , we know that  $c \notin C_l$ .

As  $c \in L^{\phi_{iu-1}}(x)$  for all  $x \in B_{l+1}$ , we know that  $c \in L^\psi(x)$  for all  $x \in B_{l+1}$ . This implies that  $c \in C_{l+1}$ . As  $C_{l+1} \cap C_{l+2} = \emptyset$ , we know that  $c \notin C_{l+2}$ . Now  $c \in L^\psi(x)$  for all  $x \in B_{l+3}$ . This implies that  $c \in C_{l+3}$ . Repeat this argument, we conclude that  $c \in C_{l+1}, C_{l+3}, \dots, C_{l+1+2t}, \dots$ . If  $k-l$  is odd, this implies that  $c \in C_k$ , and hence  $\psi(u) \neq c$ . Therefore  $\psi(u) \notin L^{\phi_{iu-1}}(v_1)$  and  $|L^\psi(v_1)| > d_Q(v_1)$ . So  $L^\psi|_Q$  is not a bad list assignment for  $Q$ , a contradiction.

If  $k-l$  is even, then  $c \notin C_l, C_{l+2}, \dots, C_k$ . But  $\psi(u) \notin S_{u,Q} = \{c\}, \psi(w_i) \neq c$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . Hence  $c \in L^\psi(v_1)$ , a contradiction.

**Case 2(ii)**  $L^{\phi_{iu-1}}(v'_1) \neq L^{\phi_{iu-1}}(v'_2)$  for  $v'_1, v'_2 \in U_{B_1}$ .

In this case  $B_1$  is an odd cycle  $C' = [v'_1 v'_2 \dots v'_{2t+1}]$ . Note that  $N_{V_2-X_{i_{u-1}}}(v'_1) \neq N_{V_2-X_{i_{u-1}}}(v'_2)$ , for otherwise for any extension  $\psi$  of  $\phi_{iu-1}$  to  $X_{i_{u-1}} \cup V_2$ , we have either  $L^\psi(v'_1) \neq L^\psi(v'_2)$  or  $|L^\psi(v'_i)| > d_Q(v'_i)$  for some  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ , and hence  $u$  is a savior of  $Q$  with cost colour set  $S_{u,Q} = \emptyset$ .

If one of the  $v'_1, v'_2$  is adjacent to both  $w_1$  and  $w_2$ , without loss of generality, we assume  $N_{V_2-X_{i_{u-1}}}(v'_2) = \{w_1, w_2\}$  and  $N_{V_2-X_{i_{u-1}}}(v'_1) = \{w_2\}$ . By Lemma 9,  $w_1$  is confined by  $u$  to colour  $c \in L^{\phi_{iu-1}}(v'_2) - L^{\phi_{iu-1}}(v'_1)$ .

If  $B_k$  has a non-root vertex  $v$  which is adjacent to  $u$  and  $w_1$ , then  $d_{G-X_{i_u-1}-F_u}(v) = 3$ , contrary to Lemma 11.

If each non-root vertex of  $B_k$  is not adjacent to both  $u$  and  $w_1$ , then  $B_k$  is an odd cycle  $[v_1 v_2 \dots v_{2l+1}]$ . Since  $v_1 \in N_Q(u) \cap U_{B_k}$ , we assume that  $N_{V_2-X_{i_u-1}}(v_1) = \{u, w_2\}$ . Since  $w_1, w_2 \in N_{V_2}(U_{B_k})$ , there exists a vertex  $v_i \in U_{B_k}$  such that  $N_{V_2-X_{i_u-1}}(v_i) = \{w_1\}$ . It follows from Lemma 8 that  $c \in L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_i)$ . Then let  $S_{u,Q}$  be a subset of  $L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_1) - (L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v_i) - \{c\})$  of size 2.

For any extension  $\psi$  of  $\phi_{i_u-1}$  to  $X_{i_u-1} \cup V_2$  for which  $\psi(u) \notin S_{u,Q}$ ,  $\psi(w_1) \neq c$  or  $\psi(w_1) = c$  but then at least one of the colours in  $S_{u,Q}$  is contained in  $L^\psi(v_1) - L^\psi(v_i)$  and hence  $L^\psi(v_1) \neq L^\psi(v_i)$ . In any case  $Q$  is  $L^\psi$ -colourable. So  $u$  is a savior for  $Q$  with cost colour set  $S_{u,Q}$ .

Assume each of  $v'_1$  and  $v'_2$  is adjacent to exactly one non-protector, say  $N_{V_2-X_{i_u-1}}(v'_1) = \{w_2\}$  and  $N_{V_2-X_{i_u-1}}(v'_2) = \{w_1\}$ . Assume  $\psi$  is an extension of  $\phi_{i_u-1}$  to  $X_{i_u-1} \cup V_i$  such that  $L^\psi|_Q$  is bad for  $Q$ . As  $L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v'_1) \neq L^{\phi_{i_u-1}}(v'_2)$  and  $L^\psi(v'_1) = L^\psi(v'_2)$ , we conclude that  $w_1$  is confined by  $u$  to the unique colour  $c_1 \in L^\psi(v'_1) - L^\psi(v'_2)$  and  $w_2$  is confined by  $u$  to the unique colour  $c_2 \in L^\psi(v'_2) - L^\psi(v'_1)$ . Thus  $w_1, w_2 \in F_u$ , and hence  $d_{G-X_{i_u-1}-F_u}(v_1) \leq 3$ , contrary to Lemma 11. This completes the proof of Lemma 7.  $\square$

## 5 Proof of Theorem 2

In this section, we present a 3-connected non-complete planar graph which is not 8-truncated-degree-choosable.




Fig. 1: The graph  $H$

Let  $H$  be the graph in Figure 1 and let  $L$  be the list assignment of  $H$  defined as follows:

- $L(x) = \{a\}$ ,  $L(y) = \{b\}$ ,

- $L(u_i) = L(v_i) = \{a, b, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$  for  $i = 1, 2$ ,
- $L(s_1) = L(t_1) = \{a, 1, 2, 3\}$ ,  $L(w_1) = \{a, 4, 5, 6\}$ ,
- $L(s_2) = L(t_2) = L(s_3) = L(t_3) = \{1, 2, 3\}$ ,  $L(w_2) = L(s_6) = L(t_6) = \{4, 5, 6\}$ ,
- $L(s_4) = L(t_4) = \{b, 1, 2, 3\}$ ,  $L(s_7) = L(t_7) = \{b, 4, 5, 6\}$ ,
- $L(s_5) = L(t_5) = \{b, 1, 2, 3, 7\}$ ,  $L(s_8) = L(t_8) = \{b, 4, 5, 6, 7\}$ .

First we show that  $H$  is not  $L$ -colourable. Assume to the contrary that there is an  $L$ -colouring  $\phi$  of  $H$ .

**Claim 1.**  $\phi(u_1) \in \{1, 2, 3\}$  or  $\phi(v_1) \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ .

**Proof.** Let  $H_1 = H[\{u_1, v_1, w_1, w_2\}]$ . Then  $\phi$  is an  $L_1$ -colouring of  $H_1$  where  $L_1(u_1) = L_1(v_1) = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$  and  $L_1(w_1) = L_1(w_2) = \{4, 5, 6\}$ . Assume  $\phi(u_1) \notin \{1, 2, 3\}$  and  $\phi(v_1) \notin \{1, 2, 3\}$ . Then  $\{\phi(u_1), \phi(v_1), \phi(w_1), \phi(w_2)\} \subseteq \{4, 5, 6\}$ . But  $\{u_1, v_1, w_1, w_2\}$  induces a copy of  $K_4$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

By symmetry, we assume that  $\phi(u_1) \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ .

**Observation 3.** Assume  $K$  is a copy of  $K_4$  with vertex set  $\{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4\}$ , and  $L'$  is a list-assignment of  $K$  such that  $L'(x_1) = L'(x_2) = L'(x_3) = \{a_1, a_2, a_3\}$  and  $L'(x_4) = \{a_1, a_2, a_3\} \cup B$  (where  $B$  is a non-empty colour set and  $B \cap \{a_1, a_2, a_3\} = \emptyset$ ). Then in each  $L'$ -colouring  $\varphi$  of  $K$ ,  $\varphi(x_4) \in B$ .

Let  $H_2 = H[u_1, u_2, s_1, s_2]$ . Then  $\phi$  is an  $L_2$ -colouring of  $H_2$  where  $L_2(u_1) = L_2(s_1) = L_2(s_2) = \{1, 2, 3\}$  and  $L_2(u_2) = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$ . By Observation 3,  $\phi(u_2) \in \{4, 5, 6\}$ .

Let  $H_3 = H[u_1, s_3, s_4, s_5]$ . Then  $\phi$  is an  $L_3$ -colouring of  $H_3$  where  $L_3(u_1) = L_3(s_3) = L_3(s_4) = \{1, 2, 3\}$  and  $L_3(s_5) = \{1, 2, 3, 7\}$ . By Observation 3,  $\phi(s_5) = 7$ .

Similarly, let  $H_4 = H[u_2, s_6, s_7, s_8]$ . Then  $\phi$  is an  $L_4$ -colouring of  $H_4$  where  $L_4(u_2) = L_4(s_6) = L_4(s_7) = \{4, 5, 6\}$  and  $L_4(s_8) = \{4, 5, 6, 7\}$ . By Observation 3,  $\phi(s_8) = 7$ .

Thus  $\phi(s_5) = \phi(s_8) = 7$ , but  $s_5 s_8$  is an edge in  $H$ , a contradiction. Hence  $H$  is not  $L$ -colourable.

Let  $G$  be a graph obtained from the disjoint union of 56 copies of  $H_i$  of  $H$  by identifying all copies of  $x$  into a single vertex (also named as  $x$ ) and all the copies of  $y$  into a single vertex (also named as  $y$ ), and adding the edges  $v_2^{(i)} u_2^{(i+1)}$  (where  $v_2^{(i)}$  and  $u_2^{(i)}$  are the copies of  $u_2$  and  $v_2$  in  $H_i$ ) for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, 55$ , and adding an edge connecting  $x$  and  $y$ . Then  $G$  is a non-complete 3-connected planar graph.

Let  $L(x) = L(y) = \{a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h\}$ . There are 56 possible  $L$ -colourings  $\phi$  of  $x$  and  $y$ . Each such a colouring  $\phi$  corresponds to one copy of  $H$ . We define the list assignment of the corresponding copy of  $H$  as  $L$  by replacing  $a$  with  $\phi(x)$  and replacing  $b$  with  $\phi(y)$ . It is easy to verify that  $L(v) = \min\{d(v), 8\}$  for any  $v \in V(G)$ . As every possible  $L$ -colouring of  $x$  and  $y$  cannot be extended to an  $L$ -colouring of some copy of  $H$ , we conclude that  $G$  is not  $L$ -colourable. Hence  $G$  is not 8-truncated-degree-choosable.

## References

- [1] D. W. Cranston, A. Pruchnewski, Z. Tuza and M. Voigt, List colorings of  $K_5$ -minor-free graphs with special list assignments, J. Graph Theory 71 (1) (2012) 18–30.



- [2] T. Dai, J. Hu, H. Li, and S. Maezawa. *On DP-colouring of outerplanar graphs*, Manuscript, 2023.
- [3] P. Erdős, A. L. Rubin and H. Taylor, Choosability in graphs, in: Proceedings of the West Coast Conference on Combinatorics, Graph Theory and Computing (Humboldt State Univ., Arcata, Calif., 1979), Congress. Numer., XXVI, Utilitas Math., Winnipeg, Man., 1980, pp. 125–157.
- [4] J. P. Hutchinson, On list-coloring outerplanar graphs, *J. Graph Theory* 59 (1) (2008) 59–74.
- [5] J. Kratochvíl, Z. Tuza and M. Voigt, New trends in the theory of graph colorings: choosability and list coloring, in: Contemporary trends in discrete mathematics (Štířín Castle, 1997), DIMACS Ser. Discrete Math. Theoret. Comput. Sci., vol. 49, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1999, pp. 183–197.
- [6] O.-H. S. Lo, C. Wang, H. Zhou and X. Zhu, DP-5-truncated-degree-colourability of  $K_{2,4}$ -minor free graphs, arXiv:2312.15962 .
- [7] V. G. Vizing, Coloring the vertices of a graph in prescribed colors, *Diskret. Analiz.* 29 (1976) 3–10.
- [8] H. Zhou, J. Zhu and X. Zhu, Arc-weighted acyclic orientations and variations of degeneracy of graphs, arXiv:2308.15853v3 .