

THE LIST CHROMATIC NUMBER OF THE INTERSECTION OF TWO GENERALIZED PARTITION MATROIDS

HE GUO

ABSTRACT. A famous theorem of Galvin states that the list chromatic number of the intersection of two partition matroids equals its chromatic number. Király and Bérczi et. al. conjectured that this equality holds for any two matroids. We prove this conjecture and a conjecture by Aharoni–Berger for any two generalized partition matroids.

1. INTRODUCTION

An (*abstract*) *complex* \mathcal{C} is a finite set of finite sets which is closed under taking subsets, i.e., if $S \in \mathcal{C}$, then $T \in \mathcal{C}$ for every $T \subseteq S$. The set $V = \bigcup \mathcal{C}$ is called the *ground set* of \mathcal{C} . Each $S \in \mathcal{C}$ is called a *face* of \mathcal{C} . Given $U \subseteq V$, $\mathcal{C}[U] := \{S \subseteq U \mid S \in \mathcal{C}\}$ is called the *subcomplex of \mathcal{C} induced on U* .

A complex \mathcal{M} is a *matroid* if $\emptyset \in \mathcal{M}$, and for any $S, T \in \mathcal{M}$ with $|S| < |T|$, there exists $v \in T \setminus S$ such that $S \cup \{v\} \in \mathcal{M}$. A set $S \in \mathcal{M}$ is also called *independent* in \mathcal{M} (a term taken from the matroid of linearly independent sets in \mathbb{F}_p^n , it should not be confused with independent sets of vertices in a graph). For $A \subseteq V$, the set *spanned* by A in \mathcal{M} is

$$\text{span}_{\mathcal{M}}(A) := A \cup \{x \in V \setminus A : \{x\} \cup I \notin \mathcal{M} \text{ for some } I \in \mathcal{M}[A]\}.$$

The *expansion number* of \mathcal{M} is

$$\Delta(\mathcal{M}) := \max_{\emptyset \neq S \subseteq V} \frac{|\text{span}_{\mathcal{M}}(S)|}{|S|}.$$

In a *generalized partition matroid* \mathcal{M} the ground set is partitioned into sets P_1, \dots, P_a and positive integers p_1, \dots, p_a are given, such that $I \in \mathcal{M}$ if and only if $|I \cap P_i| \leq p_i$ for each $1 \leq i \leq a$. We call p_1, \dots, p_a the *constraints* of the parts P_1, \dots, P_a , respectively. If $p_1 = \dots = p_a = 1$, the matroid is plainly called a *partition matroid*.

For a complex \mathcal{C} , a *\mathcal{C} -respecting coloring* is a set of faces in \mathcal{C} whose union is $V(\mathcal{C})$. The *chromatic number* $\chi(\mathcal{C})$ of \mathcal{C} is the minimum number of faces in a \mathcal{C} -respecting coloring. For example, when $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{I}(G)$, the collection of independent sets in a graph G , $\chi(\mathcal{C})$ is the (classic) chromatic number of G . When $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{M}(G)$, the collection of all matchings in the graph G , $\chi(\mathcal{C})$ is the edge chromatic number of G .

Extending a theorem of Nash-Williams [13] for graph arboricity, Edmonds [6] proved the following result.

Theorem 1.1. *For a matroid \mathcal{M} ,*

$$\chi(\mathcal{M}) = \lceil \Delta(\mathcal{M}) \rceil.$$

Date: May 2024.

Faculty of Mathematics, Technion, Haifa 32000, Israel. Email: hguo@campus.technion.ac.il.

König's edge coloring theorem says that if \mathcal{M}_1 and \mathcal{M}_2 are partition matroids on the same ground set, then

$$\chi(\mathcal{M}_1 \cap \mathcal{M}_2) = \max(\chi(\mathcal{M}_1), \chi(\mathcal{M}_2)) = \max(\Delta(\mathcal{M}_1), \Delta(\mathcal{M}_2)).$$

In [3], Aharoni and Berger offered the following conjecture (see also [1]).

Conjecture 1.2. *For any two matroids \mathcal{M}_1 and \mathcal{M}_2 on the same ground set,*

$$\chi(\mathcal{M}_1 \cap \mathcal{M}_2) \leq \max(\chi(\mathcal{M}_1), \chi(\mathcal{M}_2) + 1).$$

In [1], using topology, it is proved that $\chi(\mathcal{M}_1 \cap \mathcal{M}_2) \leq 2 \max(\chi(\mathcal{M}_1), \chi(\mathcal{M}_2))$. By a refined topological method, the author and Berger [5] proved that $\chi(\mathcal{M}_1 \cap \mathcal{M}_2) \leq \chi_\ell(\mathcal{M}_1 \cap \mathcal{M}_2) \leq \chi(\mathcal{M}_1) + \chi(\mathcal{M}_2)$ (see the definition of χ_ℓ below).

Given a complex \mathcal{C} and lists $(L_v : v \in V(\mathcal{C}))$ of *permissible colors*, a *list coloring* with respect to these lists is a function $f : V \rightarrow \cup_{v \in V} L_v$ satisfying $f(v) \in L_v$ for every $v \in V$. It is said to be \mathcal{C} -*respecting* if $f^{-1}(c) \in \mathcal{C}$ for every color $c \in \cup_{v \in V} L_v$. The *list chromatic number* $\chi_\ell(\mathcal{C})$ is the minimal integer p such that any lists $(L_v : v \in V)$ satisfying $|L_v| = p$ for each $v \in V$ has a \mathcal{C} -respecting list coloring.

If $L_v = [p]$ for every $v \in V$ then a \mathcal{C} -respecting list coloring is just a \mathcal{C} -respecting coloring by p colors. Therefore

$$\chi_\ell(\mathcal{C}) \geq \chi(\mathcal{C}).$$

As is well-known, $\chi_\ell(\mathcal{C})/\chi(\mathcal{C})$ can be arbitrarily large. For example, when \mathcal{C} is the collection of independent sets in the complete bipartite graph $K_{n,n}$, $\chi(\mathcal{C}) = 2$ and $\chi_\ell(\mathcal{C}) = \Theta(\log n)$ [7]. But, as shown by Seymour [15], in matroids $\chi_\ell = \chi$. In [2], answering a question by Király [10] and Bérczi, Schwarcz, and Yamaguchi [4], the author together with Aharoni, Berger, and Kotlar, proved that when \mathcal{C} is the intersection of k matroids on the same ground set, then

$$\chi_\ell(\mathcal{C}) \leq k\chi(\mathcal{C}).$$

Settling a conjecture of Dinitz, Galvin [9] proved a strengthening of König's edge coloring theorem:

Theorem 1.3. *For any two partition matroids \mathcal{M}_1 and \mathcal{M}_2 on the same ground set,*

$$\chi_\ell(\mathcal{M}_1 \cap \mathcal{M}_2) = \chi(\mathcal{M}_1 \cap \mathcal{M}_2).$$

Király [11] and Bérczi, Schwarcz, and Yamaguchi [4] conjectured that this is in fact true for the intersection of any pair of matroids.

Conjecture 1.4. *For any two matroids \mathcal{M}_1 and \mathcal{M}_2 on the same ground set,*

$$\chi_\ell(\mathcal{M}_1 \cap \mathcal{M}_2) = \chi(\mathcal{M}_1 \cap \mathcal{M}_2).$$

Király and Pap [12] proved the conjecture when \mathcal{M}_1 and \mathcal{M}_2 are both transversal matroids or both are of rank 2; or the ground set is the disjoint union of two arborescences having the same root, \mathcal{M}_1 is the graphic matroid and \mathcal{M}_2 is the partition matroid with the parts formed by the in-stars. We prove Conjecture 1.2 and Conjecture 1.4 when \mathcal{M}_1 and \mathcal{M}_2 are two generalized partition matroids.

Theorem 1.5. *For any two generalized partition matroids \mathcal{M}_1 and \mathcal{M}_2 on the same ground set,*

$$\chi_\ell(\mathcal{M}_1 \cap \mathcal{M}_2) = \chi(\mathcal{M}_1 \cap \mathcal{M}_2) = \max(\chi(\mathcal{M}_1), \chi(\mathcal{M}_2)).$$

2. A GRAPH TERMINOLOGY FORMULATION

A *graph* is a pair $G = (V, E)$, where V is a finite set and E is a family of unordered pairs from V . The elements of V are called the *vertices* and the elements of E are called *edges*. In the definition of graph we use the term “family” rather than “set”, to indicate that the same pair of vertices may occur several times in E . A pair occurring more than once in E is called a *multiple* edge. To emphasize this, sometimes we call a graph *multigraph* if it has multiple edges.

A graph is *bipartite* if its vertex set can be divided into two parts such that neither of the parts contains an edge of the graph.

Given a bipartite multigraph G and a function $b : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$, a *simple b -matching* is an edge subset F of G such that $\deg_F(v) := |\{e \in F \mid v \in e\}| \leq b_v$ for every $v \in V(G)$. When $b \equiv 1$, “simple b -matching” is just the familiar notion of “matching”.

Let \mathcal{M}_1 and \mathcal{M}_2 be generalized partition matroids on the same ground set U , where \mathcal{M}_1 has parts P_1, \dots, P_a with respective constraints p_1, \dots, p_a and \mathcal{M}_2 has parts Q_1, \dots, Q_b with respective constraints q_1, \dots, q_b . We construct a bipartite graph G whose two sides are $\{P_1, \dots, P_a\}$ and $\{Q_1, \dots, Q_b\}$, and each edge $e_u = \{P_i, Q_j\}$ corresponds to an element $u \in U$ such that $u \in P_i \cap Q_j$. Set $b(P_i) = p_i$ for each $1 \leq i \leq a$ and $b(Q_j) = q_j$ for each $1 \leq j \leq b$. Then a face in $\mathcal{M}_1 \cap \mathcal{M}_2$ corresponds to a simple b -matching in G .

For the other way around, given a bipartite multigraph G with two sides X and Y , and a function $b : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$, we can construct two generalized partition matroids \mathcal{M}_1 and \mathcal{M}_2 on ground set $E(G)$ such that the parts of \mathcal{M}_1 are $\Gamma(x) := (\{x, y\})_{\{x, y\} \in E(G)}$, i.e., the family of all edges incident with x , with constraint $b(x)$ for each $x \in X$, and the parts of \mathcal{M}_2 are $\Gamma(y) := (\{x, y\})_{\{x, y\} \in E(G)}$ with constraint $b(y)$ for each $y \in Y$. Then a simple b -matching in G is a face in $\mathcal{M}_1 \cap \mathcal{M}_2$, and vice versa.

Together with Lemma 3.1 in the next section, some immediate results of Theorem 1.5 are the following.

Corollary 2.1. *For a bipartite multigraph G and $b : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$, the minimal number of simple b -matchings whose union is $E(G)$ is $\lceil \max_{v \in V(G)} \frac{\deg_G(v)}{b(v)} \rceil$.*

Given a bipartite multigraph G and $b : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$, the *list b -edge chromatic number* is the minimum k such that for any lists $L = (L_e : e \in E(G))$ with $|L_e| = k$ for each $e \in E(G)$, there exists a choice function $f : E(G) \rightarrow \cup_{e \in E(G)} L_e$ such that $f(e) \in L_e$ for each $e \in E(G)$ and $f^{-1}(c)$ is a simple b -matching for each $c \in \cup_{e \in E(G)} L_e$.

Corollary 2.2. *Given a bipartite multigraph G and $b : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$, the list b -edge chromatic number is*

$$\left\lceil \max_{v \in V(G)} \frac{\deg_G(v)}{b(v)} \right\rceil.$$

3. THE CHROMATIC NUMBER

From the definitions there follows:

Lemma 3.1. *If \mathcal{M} is a generalized partition matroid with parts P_1, \dots, P_a and constraints p_1, \dots, p_a , then $\Delta(\mathcal{M}) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq a} \frac{|P_i|}{p_i}$.*

Proof. Suppose $X \subseteq V(\mathcal{M})$ satisfies

$$\frac{|span_{\mathcal{M}}(X)|}{|X|} = \Delta(\mathcal{M}) = \max_{\emptyset \neq S \subseteq V(\mathcal{M})} \frac{|span_{\mathcal{M}}(S)|}{|S|}.$$

By induction on the number d , it is easy to prove that for sequences of numbers $(y_\ell)_{1 \leq \ell \leq d}$ and $(x_\ell)_{1 \leq \ell \leq d}$, if $y_\ell \geq x_\ell > 0$ for each $1 \leq \ell \leq d$, then

$$\frac{\sum_{\ell=1}^d y_\ell}{\sum_{\ell=1}^d x_\ell} \leq \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq d} \frac{y_\ell}{x_\ell}.$$

And it is easy to prove that $span_{\mathcal{M}}(X)$ is equal to the disjoint union of $span_{\mathcal{M}}(X \cap P_i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq a$. Therefore

$$(1) \quad \frac{|span_{\mathcal{M}}(X)|}{|X|} = \frac{\sum_{1 \leq i \leq a: X \cap P_i \neq \emptyset} |span_{\mathcal{M}}(X \cap P_i)|}{\sum_{1 \leq i \leq a: X \cap P_i \neq \emptyset} |X \cap P_i|} \leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq a: X \cap P_i \neq \emptyset} \frac{|span_{\mathcal{M}}(X \cap P_i)|}{|X \cap P_i|}.$$

Since for $Y \subseteq P_i$,

$$span_{\mathcal{M}}(Y) = \begin{cases} Y & \text{if } |Y| < p_i, \\ P_i & \text{if } |Y| \geq p_i, \end{cases}$$

the maximum in (1) can be attained when $X \subseteq P_i$ and $|X| = p_i$ for some i , which completes the proof. \square

We first prove a formula for $\chi(\mathcal{M}_1 \cap \mathcal{M}_2)$:

Theorem 3.2. *Let \mathcal{M}_1 and \mathcal{M}_2 be two generalized partition matroids on the same ground set. Then*

$$\chi(\mathcal{M}_1 \cap \mathcal{M}_2) = \max(\chi(\mathcal{M}_1), \chi(\mathcal{M}_2)) = \max(\lceil \Delta(\mathcal{M}_1) \rceil, \lceil \Delta(\mathcal{M}_2) \rceil).$$

For the proof we need some definitions and notation.

A *directed graph (digraph)* is a pair $D = (V, A)$, where V is a finite set and A is a family of ordered pairs from V . The elements of V are called the *vertices* and the elements of A are called *directed edges*. The *direction* of $(u, v) \in A$ is from u to v . And we abbreviate (u, v) as uv in this note. Again, the term ‘‘family’’ is to indicate that the same pair of vertices may occur several times in A . A pair occurring more than once in A is called a *multiple* directed edge.

Notation 3.3. Given a digraph $D = (V, A)$ and $U \subseteq V$, let

$$\begin{aligned} \delta^{in}(U) &:= \{wu \in A \mid w \in V \setminus U, u \in U\}, \\ \delta^{out}(U) &:= \{uw \in A \mid u \in U, w \in V \setminus U\}. \end{aligned}$$

Notation 3.4. For a function $f : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $B \subseteq A$, let $f(B) := \sum_{a \in B} f(a)$.

Definition 3.5. A function $f : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ on the edge set of a digraph $D = (V, A)$ is a *circulation* if $f(\delta^{in}(\{v\})) = f(\delta^{out}(\{v\}))$ for every $v \in V$.

Theorem 3.6 (Hoffman’s circulation theorem (see, e.g., Theorem 11.2 in [14])). *Let $D = (V, A)$ be a digraph (allowing multiple directed edges) and let $d, c : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be functions satisfying $d \leq c$. Then there exists a circulation f satisfying $d \leq f \leq c$ if and only if*

$$(2) \quad d(\delta^{in}(U)) \leq c(\delta^{out}(U))$$

for each $U \subseteq V$. Moreover, if d and c are integral, then f can be chosen to be integral.

Proof of Theorem 3.2. The second equality in the conclusion of the theorem is by Theorem 1.1. It remains to prove the first one. We assume that \mathcal{M}_1 has parts P_1, \dots, P_a with respective constraints p_1, \dots, p_a and \mathcal{M}_2 has parts Q_1, \dots, Q_b with respective constraints q_1, \dots, q_b . Assume the ground set is V . Therefore $F \subseteq V$ is in $\mathcal{M}_1 \cap \mathcal{M}_2$ if and only if

$$|F \cap P_i| \leq p_i \quad \text{and} \quad |F \cap Q_j| \leq q_j$$

for every $1 \leq i \leq a$ and $1 \leq j \leq b$. By Lemma 3.1,

$$\Delta(\mathcal{M}_1) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq a} \frac{|P_i|}{p_i} \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta(\mathcal{M}_2) = \max_{1 \leq j \leq b} \frac{|Q_j|}{q_j}.$$

Let $C = \max(\chi(\mathcal{M}_1), \chi(\mathcal{M}_2)) = \max(\lceil \Delta(\mathcal{M}_1) \rceil, \lceil \Delta(\mathcal{M}_2) \rceil)$.

It is easy to see that $\chi(\mathcal{M}_1 \cap \mathcal{M}_2) \geq C$, since any $\mathcal{M}_1 \cap \mathcal{M}_2$ -respecting coloring is an \mathcal{M}_1 -respecting coloring and an \mathcal{M}_2 -respecting coloring.

For the other direction, let N_1, \dots, N_C be a set of disjoint faces of $\mathcal{M}_1 \cap \mathcal{M}_2$ such that their union includes the maximum number of elements of V . If $N_1 \cup \dots \cup N_C = V$, we are done.

Suppose there exists $v \in V \setminus (N_1 \cup \dots \cup N_C)$. Then

$$v \in P_i \cap Q_j$$

for some $1 \leq i \leq a$ and $1 \leq j \leq b$. Since $C \cdot p_i \geq \Delta(\mathcal{M}_1) \cdot p_i > |P_i \setminus \{v\}|$ and $C \cdot q_j > |Q_j \setminus \{v\}|$, there exist $1 \leq \alpha \leq C$ and $1 \leq \beta \leq C$ such that

$$(3) \quad |N_\alpha \cap P_i| \leq p_i - 1 \quad \text{and} \quad |N_\beta \cap Q_j| \leq q_j - 1.$$

If $\alpha = \beta$, then $N_\alpha \cup \{v\} \in \mathcal{M}_1 \cap \mathcal{M}_2$, which together with other N_k 's includes one more elements of V than $N_1 \cup \dots \cup N_C$, a contradiction. Thus $\alpha \neq \beta$.

Furthermore,

$$(4) \quad |N_\beta \cap P_i| = p_i \quad \text{and} \quad |N_\alpha \cap Q_j| = q_j,$$

otherwise either $N_\beta \cup \{v\}$ or $N_\alpha \cup \{v\}$ is in $\mathcal{M}_1 \cap \mathcal{M}_2$, which together with other N_k 's includes one more elements of V than $N_1 \cup \dots \cup N_C$, a contradiction.

Without loss of generality, we may assume $\alpha = 1$ and $\beta = 2$. We construct a bipartite multigraph G as the following. Let

$$L := \{P_\ell \mid \text{there exists } u \in N_1 \cup N_2 \text{ such that } u \in P_\ell\},$$

$$R := \{Q_r \mid \text{there exists } u \in N_1 \cup N_2 \text{ such that } u \in Q_r\}$$

be the two parts of the vertex set of G . Especially $P_i \in L$ and $Q_j \in R$ by (4). Then let each edge e of the bipartite graph G between P_ℓ in L and Q_r in R represent an element $u \in N_1 \cup N_2$ such that $u \in P_\ell \cap Q_r$. So the number of edges between P_ℓ and Q_r is the number of $u \in N_1 \cup N_2$ such that $u \in P_\ell \cap Q_r$. Furthermore for $k = 1, 2$, each $P_\ell \in L$, and each $Q_r \in R$, we denote

$$(5) \quad \text{deg}_k(P_\ell) := |N_k \cap P_\ell| \quad \text{and} \quad \text{deg}_k(Q_r) := |N_k \cap Q_r|,$$

and for every $L' \subseteq L$ and $R' \subseteq R$, we denote $N_k(L', R')$ for the family of edges of G that are between L' and R' representing an element in N_k . We have

$$(6) \quad \text{deg}_k(P_\ell) \leq p_\ell \quad \text{and} \quad \text{deg}_k(Q_r) \leq q_r$$

for every $P_\ell \in L$ and $Q_r \in R$ and $k = 1, 2$.

Then based on G , we construct a digraph $D = (V(D), A)$ by directing the edges of G from the L -side to the R -side, and on each such directed edge e we set $d(e) = 0$ and $c(e) = 1$. (To avoid clutter, we use the same notation e for such edge in G and in D .) We add two new vertices s and t , and direct s to all vertices in L with

$$d(sP_\ell) = \deg_1(P_\ell) + \deg_2(P_\ell) - p_\ell \quad \text{and} \quad c(sP_\ell) = p_\ell,$$

and direct all vertices in R to t with

$$d(Q_r t) = \deg_1(Q_r) + \deg_2(Q_r) - q_r \quad \text{and} \quad c(Q_r t) = q_r.$$

And we direct t to s with $d(ts) = 0$ and $c(ts) = \infty$. Thus $V(D) = V(G) \cup \{s, t\}$. Then $N_1 \cup N_2$ induces a circulation f satisfying $d \leq f \leq c$ in the following way. For each edge e between L and R , we set

$$f(e) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if the element represented by } e \text{ is in } N_1, \\ 0 & \text{if the element represented by } e \text{ is in } N_2. \end{cases}$$

We set

$$f(sP_\ell) = \deg_1(P_\ell), \quad f(Q_r t) = \deg_1(Q_r), \quad \text{and} \quad f(ts) = |N_1|.$$

Then it can be verified that f is a circulation and satisfies $d \leq f \leq c$ by (6) and (5). Then by Theorem 3.6, the condition (2) holds for every vertex subset U of D .

Next based on D , we construct a digraph D' by adding one more directed edge e_v from P_i to Q_j representing v . Thus $V(D') = V(D)$ and $A' = A \cup \{e_v\}$. We set $d(e_v) = 0$ and $c(e_v) = 1$. We set

$$d(sP_i) = \deg_1(P_i) + \deg_2(P_i) + 1 - p_i,$$

$$d(Q_j t) = \deg_1(Q_j) + \deg_2(Q_j) + 1 - q_j,$$

and c, d on other edges are same as those of A . Note that in A' , by (6) and $\deg_1(P_i) \leq p_i - 1$ via assumption (3) and (5), we still have

$$d(sP_i) = \deg_1(P_i) + \deg_2(P_i) + 1 - p_i \leq p_i = c(sP_i).$$

Similarly $d(Q_j t) \leq c(Q_j t)$. Therefore $d \leq c$ for the integral d and c .

If we can check that for such D', d, c , the condition (2) holds for every $U \subseteq V(D')$, then there exists an integral circulation g satisfying $d \leq g \leq c$. Especially, on the edges between L and R , g is zero-one. Then let M be the set of elements represented by the edges with g -value 1, and N be those of g -value 0. The condition that $g \leq c$ guarantees that $M \in \mathcal{M}_1 \cap \mathcal{M}_2$. On the other hand, for $\ell \neq i$,

$$\begin{aligned} |N \cap P_\ell| &= |N_1 \cap P_\ell| + |N_2 \cap P_\ell| - |M \cap P_\ell| \\ &\leq \deg_1(P_\ell) + \deg_2(P_\ell) - d(sP_\ell) = p_\ell \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |N \cap P_i| &= |N_1 \cap P_i| + |N_2 \cap P_i| + 1 - |M \cap P_i| \\ &\leq \deg_1(P_i) + \deg_2(P_i) + 1 - d(sP_i) \leq p_i. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, $|N \cap Q_r| \leq q_r$ for each r . Therefore $N \in \mathcal{M}_1 \cap \mathcal{M}_2$. But $M \cup N = N_1 \cup N_2 \cup \{v\}$, which together with other N_k 's including more elements of V than $N_1 \cup \dots \cup N_C$, a contradiction. Therefore we prove that $\chi(\mathcal{M}_1 \cap \mathcal{M}_2) = C$.

It remains to verify (2) for every vertex subset U of D' . Given $U \subseteq V(D')$, let

$$L_U = L \cap U \quad \text{and} \quad R_U = R \cap U.$$

We claim that it is enough to verify (2) when either U includes both s and t , or U includes neither. Indeed, suppose U includes t but not s , then $c(\delta^{out}(U)) \geq c(ts) = \infty$, in which case (2) holds. Suppose U includes s but not t , then the two directed edges sP_i and $Q_j t$ are not in $\delta^{in}(U)$, and these are the only two directed edges whose d -values increase in A' compared to those in A . And since the $c(\delta^{out}(U))$ is non-decreasing in A' compared to that in A , then the fact that the condition (2) holds for $U \subseteq V(D)$ implies that the condition (2) holds for such $U \subseteq V(D')$.

First, we consider the case that U includes exactly one vertex of $\{P_i, Q_j\}$.

If $Q_j \in U$ and $P_i \notin U$, then in either case, $s, t \in U$ or $s, t \notin U$, we have $sP_i, Q_j t \notin \delta^{in}(U)$. These are the only two edges whose d -values in A' increases compared to those in A , therefore the condition (2) holds for such U in D implies its validity in D' .

If $P_i \in U$ and $Q_j \notin U$, then when $s, t \in U$, $sP_i \notin \delta^{in}(U)$, $Q_j t \in \delta^{in}(U)$ and $e_v \in \delta^{out}(U)$, therefore comparing to the condition (2) for D , in D' , both $d(\delta^{in}(U))$ and $c(\delta^{out}(U))$ increase by one, which implies the condition (2) still holds for such U in D' . Similarly when $s, t \notin U$, $sP_i \in \delta^{in}(U)$, $Q_j t \notin \delta^{in}(U)$, and $e_v \in \delta^{out}(U)$, so both $d(\delta^{in}(U))$ and $c(\delta^{out}(U))$ increase by one in D' compared to that in D , therefore the condition (2) for such U in D' holds.

The final case is when U includes both P_i and Q_j , or none of them.

If $P_i, Q_j, s, t \in U$ or $P_i, Q_j, s, t \notin U$, none of the edges $sP_i, e_v, Q_j t$ is between U and $V(D') \setminus U$, then the condition (2) for such U in D' is same as that for D , which is true.

If $P_i, Q_j \in U$ and $s, t \notin U$. Then

$$d(\delta^{in}(U)) = \sum_{P_\ell \in L_U} d(sP_\ell)$$

as those edges between L and R have d -value zero, and

$$c(\delta^{out}(U)) = \sum_{e \in E(A): e \in L_U \times (R \setminus R_U)} c(e) + \sum_{Q_r \in R_U} c(Q_r t).$$

Therefore

$$d(\delta^{in}(U)) \leq c(\delta^{out}(U))$$

is equivalent to

$$(7) \quad \sum_{P_\ell \in L_U \setminus \{S_i\}} \left(\deg_1(P_\ell) + \deg_2(P_\ell) - p_\ell \right) + \left(\deg_1(P_i) + \deg_2(P_i) + 1 - p_i \right) \leq N_1(L_U, R \setminus R_U) + N_2(L_U, R \setminus R_U) + \sum_{Q_r \in R_U} q_r.$$

Because $N_1(L_U, R \setminus R_U) + N_2(L_U, R \setminus R_U) = \sum_{P_\ell \in L_U} \left(\deg_1(P_\ell) + \deg_2(P_\ell) \right) - N_1(L_U, R_U) - N_2(L_U, R_U)$, (7) is equivalent to

$$1 + N_1(L_U, R_U) + N_2(L_U, R_U) \leq \sum_{P_\ell \in L_U} p_\ell + \sum_{Q_r \in R_U} q_r,$$

which is true, since $N_2(L_U, R_U) \leq \sum_{Q_r \in R_U} q_r$, and $\deg_1(P_i) \leq p_i - 1$ by (3) and (5) so that $1 + N_1(L_U, R_U) \leq p_i + \sum_{P_\ell \in L_U \setminus \{P_i\}} p_\ell = \sum_{P_\ell \in L_U} p_\ell$.

If $P_i, Q_j \notin U$ and $s, t \in U$. Then the condition (2) is equivalent to

$$(8) \quad \begin{aligned} & \sum_{Q_r \in R \setminus R_U} \left(\deg_1(Q_r) + \deg_2(Q_r) - q_r \right) + 1 \\ & \leq \sum_{P_\ell \in L \setminus L_U} p_\ell + |N_1(L_U, R \setminus R_U)| + |N_2(L_U, R \setminus R_U)|. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} & |N_1(L_U, R \setminus R_U)| + |N_2(L_U, R \setminus R_U)| \\ & = \sum_{Q_r \in R \setminus R_U} \left(\deg_1(Q_r) + \deg_2(Q_r) \right) - |N_1(L \setminus L_U, R \setminus R_U)| - |N_2(L \setminus L_U, R \setminus R_U)|, \end{aligned}$$

(8) is equivalent to

$$1 + |N_1(L \setminus L_U, R \setminus R_U)| + |N_2(L \setminus L_U, R \setminus R_U)| \leq \sum_{P_\ell \in L \setminus L_U} p_\ell + \sum_{Q_r \in R \setminus R_U} q_r,$$

which is true, since $|N_1(L \setminus L_U, R \setminus R_U)| \leq \sum_{P_\ell \in L \setminus L_U} p_\ell$, and $\deg_2(Q_j) \leq q_j - 1$ by (3) and (5) implies $1 + |N_2(L \setminus L_U, R \setminus R_U)| \leq q_j + \sum_{Q_r \in (R \setminus R_U) \setminus \{Q_j\}} q_r = \sum_{Q_r \in R \setminus R_U} q_r$, similar as before. \square

4. THE LIST CHROMATIC NUMBER

Theorem 4.1. *Let \mathcal{M}_1 and \mathcal{M}_2 be two generalized partition matroids on the same ground set. Then*

$$\chi_\ell(\mathcal{M}_1 \cap \mathcal{M}_2) = \chi(\mathcal{M}_1 \cap \mathcal{M}_2).$$

The proof of Theorem 4.1 below combines the idea of Galvin's proof of Theorem 1.3 and a theorem of Fleiner on a matroidal version of the Gale–Shapley stable matching theorem.

To state the Fleiner's theorem, an *ordered matroid* $(\mathcal{M}, <)$ is a matroid \mathcal{M} together with a linear order $<$ on the ground set. A subset $D \subseteq V(\mathcal{M})$ *dominates* $v \in V(\mathcal{M})$ by \mathcal{M} if $v \in D$ or there exists $I \in \mathcal{M}[D]$ such that $\{v\} \cup I \notin \mathcal{M}$ and $u < v$ for every $u \in I$. Given two ordered matroids $(\mathcal{M}_1, <_1), (\mathcal{M}_2, <_2)$ on the same ground set V , a subset K of V is called a *kernel* if $K \in \mathcal{M}_1 \cap \mathcal{M}_2$ and K dominates each element $v \in V$ by \mathcal{M}_1 or by \mathcal{M}_2 .

Theorem 4.2 (Theorem 2 in [8]). *Any pair of ordered matroids on the same ground set has a kernel.*

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Let $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{M}_1 \cap \mathcal{M}_2$ and $V = V(\mathcal{C})$. We shall prove that if the sizes of the list of permissible colors for each $v \in V$ are $C := \chi(\mathcal{M}_1 \cap \mathcal{M}_2)$, then there exists an \mathcal{C} -respecting list coloring.

Suppose \mathcal{M}_1 has parts P_1, \dots, P_a with respective constraints p_1, \dots, p_a and \mathcal{M}_2 has parts Q_1, \dots, Q_b with constraints q_1, \dots, q_b . And $N_1, \dots, N_C \in \mathcal{C}$ are disjoint satisfying that $\cup_{k=1}^C N_k = V$.

Now we label the elements in V distinctly by numbers $1, \dots, |V|$ in the following way: for each $1 \leq k \leq C$, the elements in N_k are labeled by the numbers in

$$\left\{ \sum_{t=1}^{k-1} |N_t| + 1, \dots, \sum_{t=1}^k |N_t| \right\}$$

distinctly in an arbitrary way.

We fix one of such labeling, and we define the two linear orders $<_1, <_2$ on V according to the labeling: for two distinct $u, v \in V$, $u <_1 v$ if the number labeled to u is less than that of v ; $u <_2 v$ if the number labeled to u is greater than that of v .

For ease of notation, for any $v \in V$, we define $i(v)$ as the index i such that $v \in P_i$, $j(v)$ as the index j such that $v \in Q_j$, and $k(v)$ as the index k such that $v \in N_k$.

For any induced subcomplex \mathcal{D} of \mathcal{C} and $v \in V(\mathcal{D})$, we define

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_{\mathcal{D},1}(v) &:= \{z \in V(\mathcal{D}) \mid z \in P_{i(v)}, z <_1 v\}, \\ \Gamma_{\mathcal{D},2}(v) &:= \{z \in V(\mathcal{D}) \mid z \in Q_{j(v)}, z <_2 v\}.\end{aligned}$$

Claim 4.3. *Let $(\mathcal{M}_1, <_1)$, $(\mathcal{M}_2, <_2)$ and N_1, \dots, N_C be defined as the above. Given $U \subseteq V$, let $\mathcal{D} := \mathcal{M}_1[U] \cap \mathcal{M}_2[U]$. If for any $v \in U$, there exist integers $1 \leq t_{\mathcal{D}}(v) \leq T_{\mathcal{D}}(v)$ such that*

$$(9) \quad |\Gamma_{\mathcal{D},1}(v)| \leq (t_{\mathcal{D}}(v) - 1)p_{i(v)} + p_{i(v)} - 1,$$

$$(10) \quad |\Gamma_{\mathcal{D},2}(v)| \leq (T_{\mathcal{D}}(v) - t_{\mathcal{D}}(v))q_{j(v)} + q_{j(v)} - 1.$$

Then for any list L of permissible colors given to each element of U satisfying $|L_v| \geq T_{\mathcal{D}}(v)$ for each $v \in U$, there exists a \mathcal{D} -respecting list coloring.

Proof of the claim. We prove by double induction on $T_{\mathcal{D}}^* = \max_{u \in U} T_{\mathcal{D}}(u)$ and on the number of elements $v \in U$ such that $T_{\mathcal{D}}(v) = T_{\mathcal{D}}^*$.

When $T_{\mathcal{D}}^* = 1$, i.e., $T_{\mathcal{D}}(u) = t_{\mathcal{D}}(u) = 1$ for every $u \in U$, we have $U \in \mathcal{M}_1 \cap \mathcal{M}_2$: suppose not, then either there are $p_i + 1$ many elements of U in some P_i , in which case the maximum one in $<_1$ order, say v , has $|\Gamma_{\mathcal{D},1}(v)| \geq p_{i(v)}$, contradicting to the assumption that $|\Gamma_{\mathcal{D},1}(v)| \leq p_{i(v)} - 1$ in (9); or there are $q_j + 1$ many vertices of U in some Q_j , in which case the maximum one in $<_2$ order, say v , has $|\Gamma_{\mathcal{D},2}(v)| \geq q_{j(v)}$, a contradiction to (10). Then $U \in \mathcal{M}_1[U] \cap \mathcal{M}_2[U] = \mathcal{D}$ immediately implies that for any list L of permissible colors satisfying $|L_v| = 1$ for every $v \in U$, the only possible list coloring is \mathcal{D} -respecting.

Next, we turn to $T_{\mathcal{D}}^* > 1$. We take an element $v \in U$ such that $T_{\mathcal{D}}(v) = T_{\mathcal{D}}^*$ and take a color $c \in L_v$. Let $F_c := \{u \in U \mid c \in L_u\}$. Then by Theorem 4.2, there is a kernel $K \subseteq F_c$ for $(\mathcal{M}_1[F_c], <_1)$ and $(\mathcal{M}_2[F_c], <_2)$. We define the new list L' of permissible colors for each element of $U \setminus K$ as

$$(11) \quad L'_u = \begin{cases} L_u \setminus \{c\} & \text{if } u \in F_c \setminus K, \\ L_u & \text{if } u \in U \setminus F_c. \end{cases}$$

It is enough to verify that for every $u \in U \setminus K$, there exist integers

$$1 \leq t_{\mathcal{D}[U \setminus K]}(u) \leq T_{\mathcal{D}[U \setminus K]}(u)$$

such that

$$(12) \quad |\Gamma_{\mathcal{D}[U \setminus K],1}(u)| \leq (t_{\mathcal{D}[U \setminus K]}(u) - 1)p_{i(u)} + p_{i(u)} - 1,$$

$$(13) \quad |\Gamma_{\mathcal{D}[U \setminus K],2}(u)| \leq (T_{\mathcal{D}[U \setminus K]}(u) - t_{\mathcal{D}[U \setminus K]}(u))q_{j(u)} + q_{j(u)} - 1,$$

and

$$(14) \quad T_{\mathcal{D}[U \setminus K]}(u) = \begin{cases} T_{\mathcal{D}}(u) - 1 & \text{if } u \in F_c \setminus K, \\ T_{\mathcal{D}}(u) & \text{if } u \in U \setminus F_c. \end{cases}$$

Then combining (11) with the induction hypothesis (since $T_{\mathcal{D}[U \setminus K]}^* \leq T_{\mathcal{D}}^*$ and the number of elements $u \in U \setminus K$ such that $T_{\mathcal{D}[U \setminus K]}(u) = T_{\mathcal{D}}^*$ decreases by at least one compared to those in U), for L' , there exists a $\mathcal{D}[U \setminus K]$ -respecting list coloring for elements in $U \setminus K$, which together with coloring elements in K by color c forms a \mathcal{D} -respecting list coloring for elements in U . We are done.

Note that $U \setminus K = (U \setminus F_c) \cup (F_c \setminus K)$. For each $u \in U \setminus F_c$, since

$$|\Gamma_{\mathcal{D}[U \setminus K], \ell}(u)| \leq |\Gamma_{\mathcal{D}, \ell}(u)|$$

for $\ell = 1, 2$, setting $t_{\mathcal{D}[U \setminus K]}(u) := t_{\mathcal{D}}(u)$ and $T_{\mathcal{D}[U \setminus K]}(u) = T_{\mathcal{D}}(u)$ satisfies the requirements (12), (13), and (14).

For each $u \in F_c \setminus K$, by the construction K dominates u by $\mathcal{M}_1[F_c]$ or by $\mathcal{M}_2[F_c]$. If K dominates u by $\mathcal{M}_1[F_c]$, then there exists $I_1 \subseteq K$ and $I_1 \cup \{u\} \notin \mathcal{M}_1[F_c]$ and $z <_1 u$ for every $z \in I_1$. It means there exist $p_{i(u)}$ elements of $I_1 \subseteq K$ that are in the $P_{i(u)}$, and each of them is less than u in $<_1$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} |\Gamma_{\mathcal{D}[U \setminus K], 1}(u)| &\leq |\Gamma_{\mathcal{D}, 1}(u)| - p_{i(u)} \\ &\leq (t_{\mathcal{D}}(u) - 1)p_{i(u)} + p_{i(u)} - 1 - p_{i(u)} \\ &\leq ((t_{\mathcal{D}}(u) - 1) - 1)p_{i(u)} + p_{i(u)} - 1. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we can set $t_{\mathcal{D}[U \setminus K]}(u) := t_{\mathcal{D}}(u) - 1$, which is at least 1, since the above argument guarantees that $|\Gamma_{\mathcal{D}, 1}(u)| \geq p_{i(u)}$ and then $t_{\mathcal{D}}(u) > 1$. On the other hand, setting $T_{\mathcal{D}[U \setminus K]}(u) = T_{\mathcal{D}}(u) - 1$, which is at least $t_{\mathcal{D}[U \setminus K]}(u)$ since $T_{\mathcal{D}}(u) \geq t_{\mathcal{D}}(u)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\Gamma_{\mathcal{D}[U \setminus K], 2}(u)| &\leq |\Gamma_{\mathcal{D}, 2}(u)| \leq (T_{\mathcal{D}}(u) - t_{\mathcal{D}}(u))q_{j(u)} + q_{j(u)} - 1 \\ &= (T_{\mathcal{D}[U \setminus K]}(u) - t_{\mathcal{D}[U \setminus K]}(u))q_{j(u)} + q_{j(u)} - 1. \end{aligned}$$

If K dominates u by $\mathcal{M}_2[F_c]$, then there exists $I_2 \subseteq K$ and $I_2 \cup \{u\} \notin \mathcal{M}_2[F_c]$ and $z <_2 u$ for every $z \in I_2$. It means there exists $q_{j(u)}$ elements of $I_2 \subseteq K$ that are in the $Q_{j(u)}$, and each of them is less than u in $<_2$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} |\Gamma_{\mathcal{D}[U \setminus K], 2}(u)| &\leq |\Gamma_{\mathcal{D}, 2}(u)| - q_{j(u)} \\ &\leq (T_{\mathcal{D}}(u) - t_{\mathcal{D}}(u))q_{j(u)} + q_{j(u)} - 1 - q_{j(u)} \\ &\leq ((T_{\mathcal{D}}(u) - 1) - t_{\mathcal{D}}(u))q_{j(u)} + q_{j(u)} - 1. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we set $T_{\mathcal{D}[U \setminus K]}(u) = T_{\mathcal{D}}(u) - 1$ and $t_{\mathcal{D}[U \setminus K]}(u) = t_{\mathcal{D}}(u)$, and the above argument guarantees that $|\Gamma_{\mathcal{D}, 2}(u)| \geq q_{j(u)}$ and then $T_{\mathcal{D}}(u) - t_{\mathcal{D}}(u) \geq 1$ so that $1 \leq t_{\mathcal{D}[U \setminus K]}(u) \leq T_{\mathcal{D}[U \setminus K]}(u)$. On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} |\Gamma_{\mathcal{D}[U \setminus K], 1}(u)| &\leq |\Gamma_{\mathcal{D}, 1}(u)| \leq t_{\mathcal{D}}(u)p_{i(u)} + p_{i(u)} - 1 \\ &= t_{\mathcal{D}[U \setminus K]}(u)p_{i(u)} + p_{i(u)} - 1. \end{aligned}$$

In both cases $1 \leq t_{\mathcal{D}[U \setminus K]}(u) \leq T_{\mathcal{D}[U \setminus K]}(u)$ satisfy (12), (13), and (14), which completes the proof of the claim. \square

To complete the proof of the theorem, it is enough to verify for $U = V$ and for every $v \in V$, there exist integers $1 \leq t_{\mathcal{C}}(v) \leq T_{\mathcal{C}}(v) \leq C$ that satisfy (9)–(10).

For $v \in V$, by the setting of $<_1$, the elements of $\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}, 1}(v)$ have labels less than that of v , which means they are in $(\cup_{\ell=1}^{k(v)-1} N_{\ell} \cap P_{i(v)}) \cup (N_{k(v)} \cap P_{i(v)} \setminus \{v\})$. Since

$|N_\ell \cap P_i| \leq p_i$ for every ℓ , we have

$$|\Gamma_{\mathcal{C},1}(v)| \leq \sum_{\ell=1}^{k(v)-1} |N_\ell \cap P_{i(v)}| + |N_{k(v)} \cap P_{i(v)} \setminus \{v\}| \leq (k(v) - 1)p_{i(v)} + p_{i(v)} - 1.$$

And by our definition of $<_2$, elements in $\Gamma_{\mathcal{C},2}(v)$ have labels greater than that of v , therefore

$$|\Gamma_{\mathcal{C},2}(v)| \leq \sum_{\ell=k(v)+1}^C |N_\ell \cap Q_{j(v)}| + |N_{k(v)} \cap Q_{j(v)} \setminus \{v\}| \leq (C - k(v))q_{j(v)} + q_{j(v)} - 1.$$

Setting $t_{\mathcal{C}}(v) = k(v)$ and $T_{\mathcal{C}}(v) = C$, we verify the assumption (9) and (10) in Claim 4.3 and thus prove the theorem. \square

Acknowledgements. The author would like to thank Ron Aharoni for his helpful writing suggestions.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Aharoni and E. Berger. The intersection of a matroid and a simplicial complex. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **358** (2006), 4895–4917.
- [2] R. Aharoni, E. Berger, H. Guo, and D. Kotlar. Intersection of matroids. *In preparation*.
- [3] R. Aharoni, E. Berger, and R. Ziv. The edge covering number of the intersection of two matroids. *Discrete Math.* **312** (2012), 81–85.
- [4] K. Bérczi, T. Schwarcz, and Y. Yamaguchi. List coloring of two matroids through reduction to partition matroids. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.* **35** (2021), 2192–2209.
- [5] E. Berger and H. Guo. Coloring the intersection of two matroids. *In preparation*.
- [6] J. Edmonds. Minimum partition of a matroid into independent subsets. *J. Res. Nat. Bur. Standards Sect. B* **69** (1965), 67–72.
- [7] P. Erdos, A. L. Rubin, and H. Taylor. Choosability in graphs. *Congr. Numer.* **26** (1979), 125–157.
- [8] T. Fleiner. A matroid generalization of the stable matching polytope. In K. Aardal and B. Gerards, editors, *Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization*, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg (2001), 105–114.
- [9] F. Galvin. The list chromatic index of a bipartite multigraph. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* **63** (1995), 153–158.
- [10] T. Király. Egres open: Research forum of the egerváry research group. 2013.
- [11] T. Király. Open questions on matroids and list colouring. In *Midsummer Combinatorial Workshop* (2013), 36–38.
- [12] T. Király and J. Pap. On the list colouring of two matroids. *EGRES Quick Proof*, (2010-01), 2010.
- [13] C. S. A. Nash-Williams. Decomposition of finite graphs into forests. *J. London Math. Soc.* **s1-39** (1964), 12–12.
- [14] A. Schrijver. *Combinatorial optimization: polyhedra and efficiency*, **24**. Springer (2003).
- [15] P. Seymour. A note on list arboricity. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* **72** (1998), 150–151.