

Orientations of graphs with at most one directed path between every pair of vertices

Barbora Dohnalová ^{*} Jiří Kalvoda ^{*} Gaurav Kucheriya ^{*†} Sophie Spirkl [‡]

Abstract

Given a graph G , we say that an orientation D of G is a *KT orientation* if, for all $u, v \in V(D)$, there is at most one directed path (in any direction) between u and v . Graphs that admit such orientations have been used by Kierstead and Trotter (1992), Carbonero, Hompe, Moore, and Spirkl (2023), Brianiński, Davies, and Walczak (2024), and Girão, Illingworth, Powierski, Savery, Scott, Tamitegami, and Tan (2024) to construct graphs with large chromatic number and small clique number that served as counterexamples to various conjectures.

Motivated by this, we consider which graphs admit KT orientations (named after Kierstead and Trotter). In particular, we construct a graph family with small independence number (sub-linear in the number of vertices) which admits a KT orientation. We show that the problem of determining whether a given graph admits a KT orientation is NP-complete, even if we restrict ourselves to planar graphs. Finally, we provide an algorithm to decide if a graph with maximum degree at most 3 admits a KT orientation, whereas, for graphs with maximum degree 4, the problem remains NP-complete.

1 Introduction

All graphs in this paper are simple and finite. Let G be a graph and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. A k -colouring of G is a function $f : V(G) \rightarrow \{1, \dots, k\}$ such that $f(u) \neq f(v)$ for all $uv \in E(G)$. If a k -colouring of G exists, we say that G is k -colourable. For a graph G , let $\chi(G)$ denote its *chromatic number*, the minimum number of colors required so that G is $\chi(G)$ -colorable, and let $\omega(G)$ denote its *clique number*. A family \mathcal{G} of graphs is χ -bounded (see [10]) if there exists a function f such that $\chi(H) \leq f(\omega(H))$ for all $G \in \mathcal{G}$ and each induced subgraph H of G . We refer the reader to [17] for a survey of χ -boundedness.

Several counterexamples related to χ -boundedness are based on a similar idea: We start with a directed graph D with the property that for all $u, v \in V(D)$, there is at most one directed path with u and v as its ends (we call such a digraph a *KT orientation*). Then, we fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and

^{*}Department of Applied Mathematics, Charles University, Prague, Czechia, Email: bdohnalova@matfyz.cz, jirkalvoda@kam.mff.cuni.cz, gaurav@kam.mff.cuni.cz. Supported by European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No. 823748.

[†]Supported by GAČR grant 22-19073S, SVV-2023-260699.

[‡]Department of Combinatorics and Optimization, University of Waterloo, Canada Email: sspirkl@uwaterloo.ca. We acknowledge the support of the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC), [funding reference number RGPIN-2020-03912]. Cette recherche a été financée par le Conseil de recherches en sciences naturelles et en génie du Canada (CRSNG), [numéro de référence RGPIN-2020-03912]. This project was funded in part by the Government of Ontario.

$S \subseteq \{1, \dots, k-1\}$; we construct $D(k, S)$ by adding an edge from u to v if there is a directed path from u to v in D , and its length is congruent, modulo k , to a number in S . The first example of this, due to Kierstead and Trotter [11], shows that graphs that admit an orientation with no induced monotone four-vertex path (that is, a P_4 with the orientation $\rightarrow\rightarrow\rightarrow$) are not χ -bounded. Similar ideas were subsequently used [4, 6, 9] to construct counterexamples to long-standing questions on χ -boundedness.

This motivates the following definition: We say that a graph G admits a *KT orientation* if there is an orientation D of G which is a KT orientation. We formally define this in Section 2 along with some preliminary observations and results.

What can we say about graphs that admit KT orientations? Admitting a KT orientation suggests that the underlying graph is “sparse” in some sense; however, in Section 3, we show that there are graphs without linear-sized independent sets that admit a KT orientation using a variation of twincut graphs from [3]. Next, we turn our attention to graphs that do not admit a KT orientation. Prior to this work, all known examples of such graphs contained cycles of length at most five [15]. Sadhukhan [15] conjectured that there are graphs with large girth that do not admit KT orientations. In Section 4, we settle this conjecture by constructing graphs of arbitrarily large girth with no KT orientation.

One of the applications of directed graphs that admit KT orientations relates to the Routing and Wavelength Assignment (RWA) problem in optical networks (see [14]). It aims to find routes and their associated wavelengths to satisfy a set of traffic requests while minimizing the number of wavelengths used. This problem is NP-hard in general, so it is usually split into two distinct problems: first step is to find routes for the requests and then for the second step, take these routes as input to solve the wavelength assignment problem. In [2], Bermond, Cosnard, and Pérennes study the RWA problem for digraphs that are KT orientations; in this case, the routing is forced and thus the only problem to solve is the wavelength assignment one.

In [2], Bermond, Cosnard, and Pérennes introduced the notion of good edge-labeling of a graph. A *labeling* of a graph $G = (V, E)$ is a function $\phi : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. The labeling is *good* if the labels are distinct and for any ordered pair of vertices (x, y) , there is at most one path from x to y with increasing labels. In [1], Araujo, Cohen, Giroire, and Havet show that deciding whether a graph has a good edge-labeling is NP-hard. Since admitting good edge-labeling is similar admitting a KT orientation, [2] conjectured that deciding whether a given graph has a KT orientation is NP-hard. In Section 5, we prove this result. Furthermore, we also show that this problem is NP-complete, even when restricted to the following graph families: planar graphs, graphs with maximum degree at most four, and graphs of large girth. On the other hand, Section 6 contains a polynomial-time algorithm for determining whether a graph with maximum degree at most 3 admits a KT orientation.

2 Preliminaries

We begin with some definitions.

Definition 2.1. *Let G be a graph and let K be an orientation on G . We say that K is a KT orientation on G if for all vertices u, v of G , there is at most one directed path (in any direction) between u and v . We say that G admits a KT orientation if there is at least one orientation of G which is a KT orientation.*

In particular, we note that a KT orientation is necessarily acyclic.



Figure 1: Left: A KT orientation of C_4 . Right: Not a KT orientation of C_4 as there are two directed paths (in red and blue, respectively) between a pair of vertices.

Observation 2.2. *Every k -colourable graph of girth at least $2k - 1$ admits a KT orientation. In particular, every bipartite graph admits a KT orientation.*

Proof. Let G be a graph with a k -colouring $f : V(G) \rightarrow \{1, \dots, k\}$. For every edge $uv \in E(G)$, we direct uv as $u \rightarrow v$ if and only if $f(u) < f(v)$. Let D be the resulting directed graph.

Suppose for a contradiction that D is not a KT orientation. Since f is strictly increasing along every directed path, it follows that D is acyclic and every directed path in D contains at most $k - 1$ edges. Therefore, if there are vertices u and v in D such that D contains two distinct directed paths from u to v , say P_1 and P_2 , then G contains an undirected cycle (using edges of P_1 and P_2) of length at most $2k - 2$, a contradiction. \square




Figure 2: A bipartite graph with a KT orientation.

For an orientation K , we denote by K^R the orientation obtained by reversing the direction of each edge of K . Next, we observe that the property of admitting a KT orientation is closed under this operation of reversing the orientation.

Observation 2.3. *Let G be a graph that admits a KT orientation K . Then K^R is also a KT orientation of G .*

It is easy to see that triangles do not admit a KT orientation; therefore, graphs which do admit a KT orientation are triangle-free.

Finally, we prove the following, which simplifies later proofs:

Lemma 2.4. *If D is a directed graph that is not a KT orientation, then there exist distinct $u, v \in V(D)$ such that there is an induced subgraph of D which is the union of two internally-disjoint directed paths between u and v .*

Proof. Since D is not a KT orientation, it follows that there exist distinct vertices $u, v \in V(D)$ such that D contains two distinct directed paths P and Q between u and v . Let us choose P, Q, u, v with this property, and subject to that, with the sum of lengths of P and Q as small as possible.

Now, if there is a vertex z which occurs both in the interior of P and the interior of Q , then D contains two distinct paths either between z and u or between z and v by taking the subpaths of P and Q from z to one of u or v . But this contradicts the choice of P and Q . It follows that P and Q are internally disjoint, as desired.

If one of P and Q is not induced, then there is an edge xy such that $x, y \in V(P)$ but $xy \notin E(P)$ and $xy \notin Q$. Now P, xy, x, y is a better choice than P, Q, u, v . Likewise, supposing that $x'y'$ is an edge between $V(P) \setminus \{u, v\}$ and $V(Q) \setminus \{u, v\}$, we can find a better choice of paths within either the union of the subpaths of P and Q from u to x' and u to y' , respectively, or the union of the subpaths of P and Q from v to x' and v to y' , respectively. This concludes the proof. \square

Lemma 2.4 has the following easy consequence:

Observation 2.5. *Let D, D' be KT orientations of graphs G, G' with disjoint vertex sets. Let $x \rightarrow y$ be an edge of D , and let $x' \rightarrow y'$ be an edge of D' . Then, taking the union of D and D' and identifying x with x' as well as y with y' results in a KT orientation.*

3 Graphs that admit KT orientations with no linear-size independent set

It was shown in [11] that Zykov graphs admit KT orientations. These graphs have linear-size independent sets and unbounded fractional chromatic number [7]. So a natural question to ask is if there are graphs with small independence number that admit KT orientations.

A natural first attempt towards proving this would be the following: It is well-known that by replacing each vertex v by a number of non-adjacent copies of v (that is, vertices with the same neighborhood as v) proportional to the dual solution for the fractional chromatic number linear program, we obtain a graph G whose stability number equals $|V(G)|/f$, where f is the fractional chromatic number of G .

However, admitting a KT orientation is not closed under taking non-adjacent copies of a vertex (for example, take two non-adjacent copies of every vertex in a five-cycle), and therefore, we cannot leverage fractional chromatic number directly.

In this section, we create a sequence of graphs G_1, G_2, \dots , each of which admits a KT orientation, but their largest independent set is sub-linear and thus their fractional chromatic number is unbounded.

Definition 3.1. *Let us define a sequence F_1, F_2, \dots as follows.*

$$F_1 = 1$$

$$F_{k+1} = F_k + \frac{1}{F_k} \text{ for all } k \leq 1.$$

Writing $\alpha(G)$ for the size of a largest independent set in G , we will show that $\alpha(G_k) = |V(G_k)|/F_k$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

We note that the same recursive expression was used in [7, 12], where it was shown to be the fractional chromatic number of Zykov graphs and Mycielski graphs, respectively. In particular, as noted in [12], it is well known that $F_k/\sqrt{2k} \rightarrow 1$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

3.1 Construction

Since our construction is based on the construction of twincut graphs [3], we begin by describing the construction of twincut graphs. Let us denote the i -th twincut graph as G'_i and its number of vertices by n'_k . In each twincut graph, some of its vertices are called *branch vertices*, and we refer to the remaining vertices as *inner vertices*. The set of branch vertices forms an independent set.

Let G'_1 be a one-vertex graph (a branch vertex). We will construct G'_{k+1} from G'_k (for $k \geq 1$), as follows (see Figure 3). Fix an enumeration of $V(G'_k)$ as $x_1, \dots, x_{n'_k}$. First, we take the original G'_k and add to it a new copy of G'_k for each branch vertex v of G'_k , making sure that the original G'_k and all its copies are pairwise disjoint. Denote this graph by $G'_k(v)$. Then we replace each branch vertex v of G'_k by n'_k copies $v_1, \dots, v_{n'_k}$ of v . Finally, for each branch vertex v of G'_k and every $i \in \{1, \dots, n'_k\}$, we add an edge between v_i and the vertex corresponding to x_i in the copy $G'_k(v)$ of G'_k . The resulting graph is the graph G'_{k+1} . The set $\{v_i : v \text{ is a branch vertex of } G'_k, i \in \{1, \dots, n'_k\}\}$ is the set of branch vertices of G'_{k+1} , while the remaining vertices are inner vertices.




Figure 3: Construction of twincut graphs.

Let $d = (d_1, \dots)$ be a sequence of non-negative integers. Let us now describe the construction of d -copycut graphs G_1, G_2, \dots . Again, the vertices of each graph G_k are partitioned into *branch vertices* and *inner vertices*. Furthermore, G_k only depends on d_1, \dots, d_{k-1} .

As before, G_1 is a one-vertex graph (a branch vertex). For $k \geq 1$, we construct G_{k+1} as follows (see Figure 4). We denote the number of vertices of G_k by n_k . Let b_1, \dots, b_l be an enumeration of the branch vertices of G_k . We start by taking d_k pairwise disjoint copies of G_k , say $G_k^1, \dots, G_k^{d_k}$. Then, for each $r \in \{1, \dots, l\}$, we identify the d_k copies of the vertex b_r in $G_k^1, \dots, G_k^{d_k}$; denote the new vertex obtained by this identification as c_r . Let G_k^* denote the resulting graph, and let us call c_1, \dots, c_l its branch vertices. All the remaining vertices are inner vertices.

Now, we proceed as in the definition of twincut graphs. Fix an enumeration of $V(G_k)$ as x_1, \dots, x_{n_k} . First, we take the original G_k and add to it a new copy of G_k for each branch vertex v of G_k^* . Denote this graph by $G'_k(v)$. Then we duplicate each branch vertex v of G_k^* into n_k new vertices v_1, \dots, v_{n_k} . Finally, for each branch vertex v of G_k^* and every $i \in \{1, \dots, n_k\}$, we add an edge between v_i and the vertex x_i in the copy $G'_k(v)$ of G_k . The resulting graph is G_{k+1} . The set $\{v_i : v \text{ is a branch vertex of } G_k^*, i \in \{1, \dots, n_k\}\}$ is the set of branch vertices of G_{k+1} , while the remaining vertices are inner vertices.

Note that the construction is similar to blowing up non-branch vertices of G_k into d_i copies, but not exactly, and this small distinction ensures that the resulting graph admits a KT-orientation.




Figure 4: Construction of copycut graphs.

Theorem 3.2. *Let $d = (d_1, \dots)$ be a sequence of non-negative integers. For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the d -copycut graph G_k admits a KT orientation.*

Proof. We will prove by induction on k that every d -copycut graph G_k admits a KT orientation such that each branch vertex is a source (see Definition 5.6). Note that G_1, G_2 admit such KT orientations.

Let us now suppose that G_k admits a KT orientation, say D , such that all branch vertices are sources. Then, we define an orientation on G_k^* by orienting $G_k^1, \dots, G_k^{d_k}$ according to D , and preserving the orientation when identifying vertices. Next, for each branch vertex v of G_k^* , we orient $G_k(v)$ according to D , and when replacing v by copies v_1, \dots, v_{n_k} , we orient their incident edges according to the orientation of the corresponding edges of v ; since by our assumption, v is a source, it follows that v_1, \dots, v_{n_k} are sources. Finally, when adding edges between x_i and v_i , we orient the edge as $v_i \rightarrow x_i$, preserving that v_i is a source. Let us call the resulting orientation D' .

From this construction, it is immediate that all branch vertices of G_{k+1} are sources of D' . It remains to show that D' is a KT orientation.

Suppose for a contradiction that this is not the case. By Lemma 2.4, we may choose distinct $s, t \in V(G_{k+1})$ such that there are at least two distinct and internally disjoint paths P, P' between s and t . Since all branch vertices are sources, it follows that $V(P) \cup V(P')$ contains at most one branch vertex, namely s or t . If neither s nor t is a branch vertex of G_{k+1} , then P and P' are both contained in a copy of G_k oriented according to D , a contradiction as D is a KT orientation of G_k .

So we may assume that S is a branch vertex of G_{k+1} . There are two possibilities for t :

- If $t \in G_k^i$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, d_k\}$, then P and P' are both contained in G_k^i , which is oriented according to D , a contradiction.
- If $t \in G_k(v)$ for some branch vertex v of G_k^* , then all vertices of P, P' except for s are contained in $G_k(v)$. Moreover, since each branch vertex of G_{k+1} has at most one neighbour in $G_k(v)$, it follows that $s = v_i$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, n_k\}$. But as v_i has a unique neighbour in $G_k(v)$, namely x_i , it follows that both P and P' contain x_i , and so $x_i = t$ and $P = P'$, a contradiction.

This proves that D' is a KT orientation of G_{k+1} , as desired. \square

Theorem 3.3. *There exists a sequence $d = (d_1, \dots)$ such that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have that $\alpha(G_k) = |V(G_k)|/F_k$, where F_k is as in Definition 3.1.*

Proof. We define d_1, d_2, \dots iteratively, starting with $d_1 = 1$.

Now we may assume that d_1, \dots, d_{k-1} are defined, and therefore, G_1, \dots, G_k are defined. We let $d_k = |V(G_k)| - \alpha(G_k)$.

We will prove by induction that the statement of the theorem holds, and moreover, that the set of branch vertices is a maximum independent set in each G_k . This is true for $k = 1$ and $k = 2$ since $F_1 = 1$ and $F_2 = 2$.

Now let us assume that $k \geq 2$, and the statement holds for k ; we would like to show that it holds for $k + 1$. Let us write $\alpha_k = \alpha(G_k)$ and recall that $n_k = |V(G_k)|$. From the induction hypothesis, it follows that α_k is the number of branch vertices of G_k .

We compute:

$$\begin{aligned} n_{k+1} &= d_k(n_k - \alpha_k) + 2n_k\alpha_k \\ &= (n_k - \alpha_k)^2 + 2n_k\alpha_k \\ &= n_k^2 + \alpha_k^2. \end{aligned}$$

The number of branch vertices of G_{k+1} is $n_k\alpha_k$, and we have:

$$\begin{aligned} n_k\alpha_k F_{k+1} &= n_k\alpha_k \cdot (F_k + 1/F_k) \\ &= n_k\alpha_k \cdot (n_k/\alpha_k) + n_k\alpha_k \cdot (\alpha_k/n_k) \\ &= n_k^2 + \alpha_k^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, it suffices to prove that H_0 , the set of branch vertices of G_{k+1} , is a maximum independent set of G_{k+1} .

Consider an independent set H in G_{k+1} . Partition $V(G_{k+1})$ into $d_k + l$ sets: the first d_k sets are A_j consisting of the non-branch vertices of G_k^j for each j , the last l are the sets B_v consisting of the copies v_i of a branch vertex v of G_k^* together with the vertices of $G_k(v)$.

Firstly observe that $(H \cap A_j) \cup H_0$ must be independent in the copy G_k^j of G_k , therefore $|H \cap A_j| \leq \alpha(G_k) - |H_0|$. For $v \notin H_0$, $H \cap B_v$ is an independent set in $G_k(v)$ (another copy of G_k), so its size is at most $\alpha(G_k)$. Finally, for $v \in H_0$ we have $|H \cap B_v| \leq n_k$ as B_v induces a subgraph with $2n_k$ vertices containing a perfect matching. Here $l = \alpha(G_k)$. Summing all this, we have $|H| \leq d_k(l - |H_0|) + (l - |H_0|)l + |H_0|n_k = n_k l$, which is exactly the number of branch vertices in G_{k+1} . \square

4 Graphs with large girth and no KT orientation

In this section, we show that there are graphs with large girth and with no KT orientation.

We adapt a method of Duffus, Ginn, and Rödl [8]. For this, we need the following definitions.

Definition 4.1. Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$. An oriented k -uniform hypergraph H consists of a finite set $V(H)$ of vertices, and a set $E(H) \subseteq V(H)^k$ of edges, each of which is an ordered k -tuple of distinct vertices.

A cycle in a hypergraph is a sequence of pairwise distinct vertices and edges $v_1, e_1, v_2, e_2, \dots, v_l, e_l$ such that for all $i \in \{1, \dots, l-1\}$, the edge e_i contains v_i and v_{i+1} , and e_l contains v_l and v_1 .

Given a cycle in a hypergraph, its length is its number of vertices. The girth of a hypergraph is the length of a shortest cycle in it, or ∞ if no cycle exists.

Theorem 4.2 (Duffus, Ginn, Rödl [8], Lemma 3.3). *Let $l, k \geq 2$ be integers, and let $\delta > 0$. Let H be an oriented k -uniform hypergraph. Then there is an oriented k -uniform hypergraph H' with vertex set $V(H) \times X$ (for some set X) such that:*

- H' contains no cycle of length at most l ;
- Writing $X_v = \{(v, x) : x \in X\} \subseteq V(H) \times X$, we have that for every edge $e = (v_1, \dots, v_k) \in E(H)$, and for all sets $X'_{v_i} \subseteq X_{v_i}$ with $|X'_{v_i}| \geq \delta |X_{v_i}|$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, there exist x_1, \dots, x_k with $x_i \in X'_{v_i}$ such that $(x_1, \dots, x_k) \in E(H')$.

Theorem 4.3. *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then there is a graph with girth at least k which does not admit a KT orientation.*

Proof. Let H be the following oriented k -uniform hypergraph:

- $V(H) = \{v_1, \dots, v_k\}$;
- $E(H) = \{(v_{\pi(1)}, \dots, v_{\pi(k)}) : \pi \in S_k\}$, where S_k is the set of all permutations of $\{1, \dots, k\}$.

In other words, H is the complete oriented k -uniform hypergraph: every possible edge is present.

Let H' and X be as promised by Theorem 4.2 applied to H with $l = k$ and $\delta = 1/k$.

Let us define G as follows. We have $V(G) = V(H') = V(H) \times X$. For every edge (x_1, \dots, x_k) of H' , we add the following edges to G :

- $x_j x_{j+1}$ for all $j \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}$; and
- $x_1 x_k$.

We claim that G has girth k . (This follows from arguments in [8], but was not stated as a theorem.) Suppose not; and let C be a cycle in G of length less than k . Then not all edges of C were added due to the same edge e of H' . But now we can use C to obtain a cycle of length at most k in H' , a contradiction.

Now suppose for a contradiction that G admits a KT orientation D . Since every KT orientation is acyclic, it follows that there is a topological ordering q_1, \dots, q_m of $V(G)$ such that for every edge $q_i q_j$ of G with $i < j$, we have $q_i \rightarrow q_j$ in D .

For $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, we let $X_i = \{v_i\} \times X = \{(v_i, x) : x \in X\}$.

The following is again implicit in [8], where it is shown that in every ordering of the vertices of H' , there is some edge which appears in order.

We define a permutation π and sets X'_i for $i \in \{0, \dots, k-1\}$ by defining $\pi(1), \pi(2), \dots$ iteratively as follows: We define $j_0 = 0$. We assume that $\pi(1), \dots, \pi(i) \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ are defined and distinct. We also assume that j_i is defined, and that for each $l \in \{1, \dots, k\} \setminus \{\pi(1), \dots, \pi(i)\}$, we have $|\{q_{j_i+1}, \dots, q_m\} \cap X_l| \geq (k-i)|X|/k$. This conditions holds for $i = 0$ since $|X_l| = |X|$ for all $l \in \{1, \dots, k\}$.

Now, let $i \in \{0, \dots, k-1\}$ and let $S_i = \{\pi(1), \dots, \pi(i)\}$. Let j_{i+1} be minimum such that:

- $j_{i+1} \geq j_i + 1$; and
- there exists $l \in \{1, \dots, k\} \setminus S_i$ such that $|X_l \cap \{q_{j_{i+1}}, \dots, q_{j_{i+1}}\}| \geq |X|/k$.

Note that j_{i+1} is well-defined since $|S_i| = i$, and so $\{1, \dots, k\} \setminus S_i \neq \emptyset$, and $|X_l \cap \{q_{j_{i+1}}, \dots, q_m\}| \geq (k-i)|X|/k \geq (k-(k-1))|X|/k \geq |X|/k$.

Letting l be as in the definition of j_{i+1} , we set $\pi(i+1) = l$. We let $X'_l = |X_l \cap \{q_{j_{i+1}}, \dots, q_{j_{i+1}}\}|$. Then, since $\pi(i+1) \notin S_i$, it follows that $\pi(1), \dots, \pi(i+1) \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ are defined and distinct. Moreover, j_{i+1} is defined. In addition, for each $l' \in \{1, \dots, k\} \setminus (S_i \cup \{l\})$, we have that $|X_{l'} \cap \{q_{j_{i+1}}, \dots, q_{j_{i+1}}\}| \leq |X|/k$, and so

$$\begin{aligned} |\{q_{j_{i+1}+1}, \dots, q_m\} \cap X_{l'}| &= |\{q_{j_{i+1}}, \dots, q_m\} \cap X_{l'}| - |X_{l'} \cap \{q_{j_{i+1}}, \dots, q_{j_{i+1}}\}| \\ &\geq (k-i)|X|/k - |X|/k = (k-i-1)|X|/k, \end{aligned}$$

as desired.

We have defined sets X'_i for all $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ with the following properties:

- For all $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, $X'_i \subseteq X_i$ and $|X'_i| \geq |X|/k = |X_i|/k$;
- If $q_r \in X'_{\pi(i)}$ and $q_s \in X'_{\pi(j)}$ with $i < j$, then $r < s$.

In other words, in our topological ordering of D , the sets $X'_{\pi(1)}, X'_{\pi(2)}, \dots, X'_{\pi(k)}$ appear in this order.

Now, applying Theorem 4.2, and using that $(v_{\pi(1)}, \dots, v_{\pi(k)}) \in E(H)$, it follows that there is an edge $(x_1, \dots, x_k) \in E(H')$ such that $x_i \in X'_{\pi(i)}$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. But then, in the topological ordering of D , the vertices x_1, \dots, x_k appear in this order; and so, from our construction of G and the definition of a topological ordering, we obtain that $x_1 \rightarrow x_k$ and $x_1 \rightarrow x_2 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow x_k$ are two distinct directed paths from x_1 to x_k in D , a contradiction. This proves that D is not a KT orientation, which concludes the proof. \square

A similar argument to the proof of Theorem 4.3 establishes the stronger statement that for every vertex-ordered graph J , we can construct a graph G with the same girth as J such that every vertex-ordering of G contains an ordered induced copy of J .

5 NP-Completeness Results

In this section, we show that it is NP-complete to decide if a given graph admits a KT orientation. We first give a reduction for general graphs, and then show how to adapt this construction to certain restricted graph classes.

Lemma 5.1. *There is a polynomial-time algorithm which decides, for a given digraph D , whether D is a KT orientation or not.*

Proof. We first check whether D is acyclic, and output that D is not a KT orientation if D contains a directed cycle. Now we may assume that D is acyclic; and we may compute the number of directed paths between every pair of vertices (for example, via dynamic programming using a topological ordering). \square

In particular, it follows that the problem of deciding whether a given graph admits a KT orientation is in NP.

5.1 NP-Hardness in Arbitrary Graphs

In this subsection, we will prove Theorem 5.4 (below) using a reduction from the monotone not-all-equal 3-SAT problem [16] (also known as the 2-coloring of 3-uniform hypergraphs problem):

Definition 5.2. Monotone not-all-equal 3-SAT is the following problem:

- *Input:* Variables x_1, \dots, x_n and clauses C_1, \dots, C_m ; each clause consists of exactly three variables (no negations).
- *Output:* Yes if there is a truth assignment such that each variable x_1, \dots, x_n is set to either True or False, with the property that each clause contains at least one variable which is set to True and one variable which is set to False; and No otherwise.

Theorem 5.3 ([16]). *The monotone not-all-equal 3-SAT problem is NP-complete.*

We will use this to show:

Theorem 5.4. *Deciding whether a given graph admits a KT orientation is NP-hard.*

Before proving Theorem 5.4, we start with some definitions and lemmas.

Definition 5.5. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$. A k -ladder is a graph with vertex set $\{v_1, \dots, v_k, w_1, \dots, w_k\}$ and edge set

$$\{v_i w_i : i \in \{1, \dots, k\}\} \cup \{v_i v_{i+1} : i \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}\} \cup \{w_i w_{i+1} : i \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}\}.$$

In other words, the k -ladder graph is the $2 \times k$ grid.




Figure 5: A KT orientation of a 5-ladder.

Definition 5.6. A source in a digraph is a vertex with no in-neighbours; a sink in a digraph is a vertex with no out-neighbours.

Lemma 5.7. *There is exactly one KT orientation D of a k -ladder such that $v_1 \rightarrow w_1$ in D . Furthermore, the orientation D has the property that for $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, we have $v_i \rightarrow w_i$ in D if and only if i is odd. Also, each vertex of D is a source or a sink.*

Proof. We prove this by induction on k . The statement holds for $k = 1$, as v_1w_1 is the only edge of a 1-ladder.

Now, we first prove that every k -ladder has an orientation as desired, by taking the bipartition with $A = \{v_i : i \text{ odd}\} \cup \{w_i : i \text{ even}\}$ and $B = \{v_i : i \text{ even}\} \cup \{w_i : i \text{ odd}\}$. Then, as in Observation 2.2, we may obtain a KT orientation with the desired properties by directing every edge from A to B .

It is easy to verify that there are exactly two KT orientations of a four-cycle, shown in Figure 6.




Figure 6: Possible orientations of a four-cycle.

Now consider a KT orientation D of a k -ladder such that $v_1 \rightarrow w_1$. Then, by induction, we may assume that $v_{k-1} \rightarrow w_{k-1}$ if $k - 1$ is odd, and $w_{k-1} \rightarrow v_{k-1}$ if $k - 1$ is even. Since $v_{k-1}-v_k-w_k-w_{k-1}-v_{k-1}$ is a four-cycle, and since there are only two KT orientations of a four-cycle as shown in Figure 6, it follows that $v_k \rightarrow w_k$ if and only if k is odd. Note that this determines the orientations of all edges of the form $v_i v_{i+1}$ and $w_i w_{i+1}$. \square

We use the ladder to propagate information; more precisely, if we have two edges $e = vw$ and $f = v'w'$ in a graph, we may create a k -ladder with k odd and identify v with v_1 ; w with w_1 ; v' with v_k ; and w' with w_k to enforce that in every KT orientation, either both $v \rightarrow w$ and $v' \rightarrow w'$, or neither.

Let us now show how to create a clause gadget.

Lemma 5.8. *Let H be a five-cycle with vertices v_1, \dots, v_5 and edges $\{v_1v_2, v_2v_3, v_3v_4, v_4v_5, v_5v_1\}$. Then there is no KT orientation of H such that $v_1 \rightarrow v_2$, and $v_2 \rightarrow v_3$, and $v_5 \rightarrow v_4$. Likewise, there is no KT orientation such that $v_2 \rightarrow v_1$, and $v_3 \rightarrow v_2$, and $v_4 \rightarrow v_5$. However, every other choice of orientation of the edges v_1v_2, v_2v_3, v_4v_5 extends to a KT orientation of H .*

Proof. Let D be an orientation of H . Firstly, observe that an orientation of a cycle is KT if and only if it has at least 4 vertices that are sources or sinks. By Observation 2.3, we may (by versing all edges if necessary) assume that $v_1 \rightarrow v_2$ in D . Now assume that the vertex v_2 is neither a source nor a sink, that is $v_2 \rightarrow v_3$. Therefore all the remaining vertices have to be either sources or sinks in the KT orientation of H . However if $v_5 \rightarrow v_4$, then one of v_5 and v_1 is also not a sink, and the first claim of the lemma follows.

For the second claim, we again assume that $v_1 \rightarrow v_2$; we extend the orientations as follows:

- $v_2 \rightarrow v_3$ and $v_4 \rightarrow v_5$: Orient the remaining edges as $v_4 \rightarrow v_3$ and $v_1 \rightarrow v_5$.
- $v_3 \rightarrow v_2$ and $v_4 \rightarrow v_5$: Orient the remaining edges as $v_1 \rightarrow v_5$ and $v_3 \rightarrow v_4$.
- $v_3 \rightarrow v_2$ and $v_5 \rightarrow v_4$: Orient the remaining edges as $v_1 \rightarrow v_5$ and $v_3 \rightarrow v_4$.

Each of these is a KT orientation. \square

The following lemma makes it easier to show that a given orientation is a KT orientation.

Lemma 5.9. *Let D be a digraph, and let u be a source or a sink in D . Suppose further that every neighbour of u in D is a source or a sink in D . Then D is a KT orientation if and only if $D \setminus u$ is a KT orientation.*

Proof. Since KT orientations are monotone under taking subgraphs, it follows that if D is a KT orientation, then so is $D \setminus u$.

It remains to show the converse. By symmetry (using Observation 2.3), we may assume that u is a source, and consequently, all neighbours of u are sinks. Let P be a directed path of D which contains u . Then, since u is a source, it follows that u is the first vertex of P . Moreover, since every neighbour of u is a sink, it follows that P contains at most two vertices.

Now suppose that D is not a KT orientation, and let Q, Q' be two distinct directed paths between vertices $x, y \in V(D)$ which certify that D is not a KT orientation. If u is not a vertex of Q, Q' , then $D \setminus u$ is not a KT orientation as Q, Q' are paths in $D \setminus u$. Therefore, we may assume that $x = u$. By the previous paragraph, it follows that Q, Q' each contain at most two vertices, and therefore exactly two vertices, namely x and y . But now $Q = Q'$, a contradiction. This shows that if D is not a KT orientation, then $D \setminus u$ is not a KT orientation, finishing the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 5.4. Let x_1, \dots, x_n and C_1, \dots, C_m be an instance of monotone not-all-equal 3-SAT. For each variable x_i , we start by taking two distinct vertices y_i, z_i and add an edge $y_i z_i$. For each clause C_j , we add a copy of a five-cycle with vertex set $\{v_1^j, v_2^j, v_3^j, v_4^j, v_5^j\}$ and edge set $\{v_1^j v_2^j, v_2^j v_3^j, v_3^j v_4^j, v_4^j v_5^j, v_1^j v_5^j\}$. We also define i_1^j, i_2^j, i_3^j such that C_j contains variables $x_{i_1^j}, x_{i_2^j}, x_{i_3^j}$.

Then, for each clause $C_j = x_{i_1^j} \vee x_{i_2^j} \vee x_{i_3^j}$ and for each $l \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, we add a new 3-ladder with vertices $\{v_1, v_2, v_3, w_1, w_2, w_3\}$ and identify some of its vertices with the existing vertices as follows:

- v_1 is identified with $y_{i_1^j}$;
- w_1 is identified with $z_{i_1^j}$
- v_3 is identified with v_1^j if $l = 1$, with v_2^j if $l = 2$, and with v_5^j if $l = 3$;
- w_3 is identified with v_2^j if $l = 1$, with v_3^j if $l = 2$, and with v_4^j if $l = 3$.

Let us call the resulting graph G . Suppose first that G admits a KT orientation D . Let us define a truth assignment as follows: For $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, if $y_i \rightarrow z_i$ in D , we set x_i to True; otherwise, we set x_i to False. Suppose that there is a clause C_j with variables $x_{i_1^j}, x_{i_2^j}, x_{i_3^j}$ which are all set to True (the case in which they are all set to False is analogous). Then, using the 3-ladder gadgets and Lemma 5.7, we conclude that in D , we have $v_1^j \rightarrow v_2^j$ and $v_2^j \rightarrow v_3^j$, and $v_5^j \rightarrow v_4^j$. But now, by Lemma 5.8, the subgraph of D induced by $\{v_1^j, \dots, v_5^j\}$ is not a KT orientation, a contradiction. This proves that if G admits a KT orientation, then our instance of monotone not-all-equal 3-SAT is satisfiable.

It remains to show the converse, that is, we assume that a truth assignment of x_1, \dots, x_n satisfying the monotone not-all-equal 3-SAT instance is given, and we aim to produce a KT orientation of G .

For $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, we direct $y_i \rightarrow z_i$ if x_i is True, and $z_i \rightarrow y_i$ if x_i is False. For each 3-ladder gadget whose edge $v_1 w_1$ was identified with $y_i z_i$, we choose the unique orientation given by Lemma 5.7 which extends the orientation of the edge $y_i z_i$ we chose.

For all $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, it follows that the edges $v_1^j v_2^j, v_2^j v_3^j$ and $v_4^j v_5^j$ have received an orientation already (via the 3-ladder gadgets) and, since not all variables in C_j are assigned True, and not all are assigned False, it follows that this orientation can be extended to $v_3^j v_4^j$ and $v_1^j v_5^j$ using Lemma 5.8 in such a way that the restriction of our orientation to $\{v_1^j, \dots, v_5^j\}$ is a KT orientation.

Let us denote the resulting orientation of G as D . From the orientations of the 3-ladder gadgets as in Lemma 5.7, we conclude that for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, the vertices y_i, z_i and all their neighbours are sources or sinks. Therefore, by Lemma 5.9, it suffices to verify that $D' = D \setminus \{y_i, z_i : i \in \{1, \dots, n\}\}$ is a KT orientation.

Each component D'' of D' consists of 11 vertices, namely, for some $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, the vertices v_1^j, \dots, v_5^j , as well as two vertices from each of the three 3-ladder gadgets associated with C_j ; all six of these vertices are sources or sinks in D and hence in D'' . Now, the restriction D to the five-cycle on v_1^j, \dots, v_5^j is a KT orientation, and the restriction of D to each of its 3-ladder gadgets is a KT orientation. But D'' is obtained by identifying three edges of the five-cycle on v_1^j, \dots, v_5^j with four-cycles contained in ladder gadgets; so by Observation 2.5, D'' is a KT orientation. \square

We briefly mention the following:

Theorem 5.10. *Deciding if a given graph of maximum degree at most four admits a KT orientation is NP-complete.*

The proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 5.4, except that rather than identifying the edge $y_i z_i$ with several edges in different 3-ladder gadgets, we replace the edge $y_i z_i$ with a k -ladder for some sufficiently large k , and for each 3-ladder gadget that had one of its edges identified with $y_i z_i$, we instead identify the edge of the 3-ladder gadget with a different edge $v_j w_j$ of this k -ladder. All vertices in this construction have degree at most 3, except vertices v_2^j in clause gadgets, which have degree 4. We omit the details.

5.2 Planar Graphs

The main result of this subsection is the following:

Theorem 5.11. *Deciding if a given planar graph admits a KT orientation is NP-complete.*

We prove this by introducing a new gadget, the crossing gadget shown in Figures 7 and 8.

Lemma 5.12. *Every KT orientation of the graph in Figures 7 and 8 satisfies that either both a and a' are oriented from bottom to top or vice versa, and likewise either both b and b' are oriented from right to left or vice versa. Furthermore, every orientation of the edges a, a', b, b' such that both a and a' are oriented in the same direction, and both b and b' are oriented in the same direction, extends to a KT orientation of the gadget.*

Proof. Note that a and a' will always have the same orientation because there is a ladder gadget between them consisting of an even number of four-cycles. Now we will prove that b and b' also have the same orientation.




Figure 7: Crossing gadget.




Figure 8: Another orientation of the crossing gadget.




Figure 9: Attaching 3-ladder gadgets to variable gadgets in Theorem 5.11.

- If a is oriented from bottom to top and b is oriented from right to left (or both are reversed) as in Figure 7, then there is a directed path $y_3y_2y_1y_6$ (or directed in the opposite direction). So there is only one possible way to orient the rest of the six-cycle $y_1y_2y_3y_4y_5y_6$ as a KT orientation, namely orienting the remaining edges as $y_3 \rightarrow y_4$, $y_5 \rightarrow y_4$, and $y_5 \rightarrow y_6$. Since there is a series of four-cycles sharing edges from y_4y_5 , this determines the orientation of b' and implies that b' is oriented from right to left.
- If a is oriented from bottom to top and b is oriented from left to right (or both are reversed) as in Figure 8, we use the same observation as above for the six-cycle $x_1x_2x_3x_4x_5x_6$.

The second claim of the lemma follows from Figures 7 and 8 (possibly by reversing the orientations). \square

Proof of Theorem 5.11. We describe how to modify the proof of Theorem 5.4 using the crossing gadget. First, as in Theorem 5.10, we replace each edge y_iz_i in the construction of Theorem 5.4 with a k -ladder gadget, where k is at least the number of occurrences of the variable x_i in the monotone not-all-equal 3-SAT instance. For each 3-ladder gadget such that one of its edges was previously identified with y_iz_i , we instead identify it with an edge v_jv_{j+1} of the k -ladder. Note that the resulting graph is planar; see Figure 9.

The purpose of each 3-ladder gadget tape was to “copy” the orientation of an edge to another edge, but a longer ladder gadget would also serve this purpose. By replacing each 3-ladder gadget with a k -ladder gadget for some sufficiently large k , we can create a graph that can be embedded in the plane such that only ladder gadgets cross, and different crossings between ladder gadgets are at least some constant distance (in the graph) apart. Iteratively, using the gadgets in Figures 7 and 8, we remove crossings between ladder gadgets.

Let us denote the resulting graph as G . As in Theorem 5.4, using Lemma 5.7 and our observations about the crossing gadget mentioned above, it follows that if the given instance of monotone not-all-equal 3-SAT is not satisfiable, then G does not admit a KT orientation.

To prove the converse, let us assume that the given instance of monotone not-all-equal 3-SAT is satisfiable. We orient each variable gadget, as well as ladder gadgets and crossing gadgets, according to the values of the variables (Figures 7 and 8 demonstrate the orientations of the crossing gadget).

This gives an orientation to all edges except two edges per clause; these we orient by applying Lemma 5.8 to each clause gadget.

Again, we notice that after deleting every vertex which is a source or sink such that all its neighbours are also sources or sinks by Lemma 5.9, every component that remains contains at most 18 vertices (either 11 vertices from a clause gadget and its neighbours, or 18 vertices from one of the six-cycles x_1, \dots, x_6 or y_1, \dots, y_6 in a crossing gadget and its neighbours). As before, components containing a clause gadget are KT orientations.

It remains to consider components contained in a crossing gadget; but by inspection (or following the same line of reasoning as in Theorem 5.4), Figures 7 and 8 are KT orientations. This concludes the proof. \square

5.3 Graphs with Large Girth

In this subsection, we will show:

Theorem 5.13. *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Deciding whether a given graph has a KT orientation is NP-complete even when restricted to graphs of girth at least k .*

By Theorem 4.3 we know that there is a graph with girth k that admits no KT orientation. Let G be such a graph with the minimal number of edges. Now, let $e = uv \in E(G)$; and let $G^- = G \setminus e$. We construct a graph G^+ from G by subdividing the edge e by introducing one or two new vertices, as follows:

- Case 1: If there is a KT orientation D of G^- such that D contains no directed path between u and v , then we let G^+ be the graph obtained from G^- by adding a vertex x , setting $y = v$, and adding edges $a = ux$ and $b = vy$ (see Figure 10, left).
- Case 2: Otherwise, we let G^+ be the graph arising from G^- by adding vertices x and y as well as edges $a = ux$, $b = xy$ and $c = yv$ (see Figure 10, right).

Since G^+ is obtained from G by subdividing an edge, it follows that G^+ has girth at least k .




Figure 10: Construction of G^+ .

Lemma 5.14. *The graph G^+ admits a KT orientation such that x is a source and a KT orientation such that x is a sink. Furthermore, x has degree 2 in G^+ and x is either a source or a sink in every KT orientation of G^+ .*

Proof. We first claim that there is a KT orientation D of $G^+ \setminus x$ such that there is no directed path between u and y . This is immediate from the construction of G^+ in the first case, by definition, so we may assume that $v \neq y$. By the minimality of G , we know that G^- has a KT orientation D' . Since D' is acyclic, and as we can reverse D' , we may assume that D' contains no directed path from u to v . Now, orienting yv as $v \rightarrow y$, we obtain a KT orientation of $G^+ \setminus x$ with no directed path between u and y .

We fix a KT orientation D with no directed path between u and y . We extend D to the orientations D_1 and D_2 of G^+ by making x a source and a sink, respectively. Our goal is to show that either D_1 or D_2 is a KT orientation. Then, by reversing all its edges, we obtain another KT orientation of G^+ and thus proving the first statement of Lemma 5.14.

Let $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Then x is either a source or a sink in D_i , and so not in the interior of a directed path. Therefore, if D_i is not a KT orientation, then by Lemma 2.4, there is a vertex z_i such that D_i contains two distinct and internally disjoint directed paths between x and z_i ; let us call these paths Q_i^1 and Q_i^2 such that Q_i^1 contains y and Q_i^2 contains u . Since D contains no directed path between u and y , it follows that Q_i^1 does not contain u , and likewise, Q_i^2 does not contain y .

Thus, D contains two directed paths between z_1 and z_2 , namely the concatenation P^1 of Q_2^1 (from z_2 to y) and Q_1^1 (from y to z_1) and the concatenation P^2 of Q_2^2 (from z_2 to u) and Q_1^2 (from u to z_1). To see that these paths are distinct, note that P^1 contains y , but not u , and P^2 contains u , but not y . This is a contradiction, as D is a KT orientation. Thus we have proved the first statement of Lemma 5.14.

For the second statement, clearly x has degree 2 in G^+ . Now, suppose for a contradiction that D is a KT orientation of G^+ such that $u \rightarrow x$ and $x \rightarrow y$ in D (the reverse case is analogous). We again consider whether $v = y$ or not. If $v = y$, then we obtain a KT orientation of G by orienting edges as in D , and letting $u \rightarrow y$; but this contradicts the assumption that G does not admit a KT orientation.

If $v \neq y$, then we note that $D \setminus x$ has no directed path between u and v : On the contrary suppose that P is such a path. Then, if P is a path from u to v , it follows that:

- If $v \rightarrow y$ in D , then D contains two distinct directed paths from u to y , namely u, x, y and u, P, v, y , a contradiction.
- If $y \rightarrow v$ in D , then D contains two distinct directed paths from u to v , namely u, x, y, v and u, P, v , a contradiction.

Therefore, P is a path from v to u . Now,

- If $y \rightarrow v$ in D , then u, x, y, v, P, u is a directed cycle in D , a contradiction.
- If $v \rightarrow y$ in D , then D contains two distinct directed paths from v to y , namely v, y and v, P, u, x, y , and thus a contradiction.

This proves the second statement of Lemma 5.14. □

Lemma 5.14 allows us to create an analogue of the k -ladder, as follows (see Figure 11). We take copies G_1^+, \dots, G_l^+ of G^+ , denoting the copies of the vertices u, x, y in G_i^+ as u_i, x_i, y_i . Then, we identify the following sets of vertices:




Figure 11: The graph G^8 .

- $\{u_i, x_{i-1}, y_{i-2}\}$ for $i \in \{3, \dots, l\}$;
- $\{x_1, u_2\}$;
- $\{x_l, y_{l-1}\}$.

We denote the resulting graph by G^l . Note that G^l has girth at least k (since gluing together graphs along clique cutsets does not decrease girth). By Observation 2.5, it follows that G^l admits a KT orientation, and if l is even, then (using Lemma 5.14) in every KT orientation, one of the following is true:

- $y_{l-1} \rightarrow y_l$ and $u_1 \rightarrow u_2$; or
- $y_l \rightarrow y_{l-1}$ and $u_2 \rightarrow u_1$.

Next, we create an analogue of the clause gadgets in Theorem 5.4. We replace each five-cycle by a longer cycle, by subdividing the edge between v_1 and v_2 , creating a path P . Then, for every two consecutive edges of P , we add a copy of G^l that ensures that these two edges are oriented in the direction. It follows that P becomes a directed path in every KT orientation of the graph we create. By choosing l sufficiently large, we ensure that the resulting graph has large girth.

Proof of Theorem 5.13. Let I be an instance of monotone not-all-equal 3-SAT. Let H be the graph obtained by applying the construction from Theorem 5.4 to I , and then modifying it using G^l (for some sufficiently large l) instead of each 3-ladder gadget, as well as the modified clause gadgets

from the previous paragraph. Note that for every fixed k , we can arrange that H has girth at least k . From our construction and the correctness of the construction in Theorem 5.4, it immediately follows that if H admits a KT orientation, then I has a satisfying assignment. Conversely, suppose that I has a satisfying assignment. Let K be the orientation resulting from the valid truth assignment for I . We orient the input edges according to the assignment and the G^l gadgets between them and the clause gadgets in such a way that all the copies of G^+ are oriented according to a KT orientation, which is possible by the construction of H , the fact that I is satisfying, and the property from Lemma 5.14 of G^+ .

We now observe that in each KT orientation of a copy of G^+ , there is no directed path between its vertex u and its vertex y ; otherwise, along with its vertex x , we would have two distinct directed paths between two vertices of G^+ , a contradiction.

Therefore, a directed path which contains a vertex of a G^l , and not in the first or last three copies of G^+ within the G^l , has both its ends within the same copy of G^+ ; but each copy of G^+ is a KT orientation, a contradiction.

Supposing now that K contains two vertices x and y as well as two distinct directed paths P and Q between them. It follows from that neither P nor Q contains a vertex which is in a copy of G^l but not in the first or last three copies of G^+ within that copy of the gadget G^l . Let K' be the induced subgraph of G in which we remove all but the first and last three copies of G^+ within each G^l . Then x, y, P and Q are contained in K' . We apply Observation 2.5 to each component of K' , and find that either some copy of G^+ is not oriented according to a KT orientation (contrary to the definition of K), or one of the clause gadget cycles is not oriented according to a KT orientation (again contrary to the definition of K). This contradiction shows that K' is a KT orientation, contrary to the choice of P and Q . Therefore, K is a KT orientation. □

6 Graphs with Small Maximum Degree

Our main result in this section is the following:

Theorem 6.1. *There is a polynomial-time algorithm with the following specifications:*

- *Input: A graph G of maximum degree at most 3.*
- *Output: A KT orientation of G , or a determination that none exists.*

To prove Theorem 6.1, we need the following:

Theorem 6.2 (Brooks [5]). *Let G be a connected graph of maximum degree at most 3 such that $G \neq K_4$. Then G is 3-colourable.*

The proof of Theorem 6.2 given by Lovász in [13] yields a polynomial-time algorithm for finding such a colouring. Our main tool in proving Theorem 6.1 is a careful analysis of the four-cycles in the input graph, with the goal of applying the following lemma:

Lemma 6.3. *Let G be a triangle-free graph, and let f be a 3-colouring of G such that for every four-cycle C of G , we have $|f(V(C))| = 2$ (in other words, every four-cycle is 2-coloured). Then G admits a KT orientation, obtained by orienting each edge uv with $f(u) < f(v)$ as $u \rightarrow v$.*

Proof. We orient the edges of G as follows: for an edge uv , if $f(u) < f(v)$, we orient uv as $u \rightarrow v$, and otherwise, we orient it as $v \rightarrow u$. This orientation is acyclic, and moreover, every directed two-edge path contains a vertex of each of the three colours, and there is no directed path with more than three vertices. Suppose now that the resulting orientation, D , is not a KT orientation. Let $u, v \in V(D)$ with two distinct paths P and Q from u to v . Then, since G is triangle-free and D has no directed path with more than three vertices, it follows that each of P and Q has exactly three vertices. But then the four-cycle with vertex set $V(P) \cup V(Q)$ in G receives all three colours, contrary to our assumption about the colouring f . This concludes the proof. \square

Given a graph G , an edge $e \in E(G)$ is a *bridge* of G if $G \setminus e$ has more components than G does. The following is straightforward:

Lemma 6.4. *Let G be a graph and let e be a bridge of G . Then G admits a KT orientation if and only if every component of $G \setminus e$ does.*

We first analyze components of four-cycles:

Lemma 6.5. *Let G be a connected triangle-free graph of maximum degree 3. We define a hypergraph H as follows:*

- $V(H) = V(G)$;
- For every four-cycle in G , we add an edge containing its four vertices, to H .

Let C be a component of the hypergraph H containing at least one edge. Then the induced subgraph $G[V(C)]$ is one of the following graphs:

- A cube minus an edge, the graph on the left in Figure 13.
- A cube minus a vertex, the graph on the left and in the middle in Figure 14.
- A k -ladder, such as the graph on the left in Figure 15.
- A k -ladder with exactly one of v_1w_k and v_1v_k as an additional edge (where $v_1, \dots, v_k, w_1, \dots, w_k$ are as in Definition 5.5).
- $K_{2,3}$.
- $K_{3,3} - e$, the graph obtained from $K_{3,3}$ by removing an edge.
- A k -ladder with two additional edges, namely either $\{v_1v_k, w_1w_k\}$ or $\{v_1w_k, w_1v_k\}$ (where $v_1, \dots, v_k, w_1, \dots, w_k$ are as in Definition 5.5).
- A cube, the graph in Figure 12.




Figure 12: A cube.

- $K_{3,3}$.

Proof. Since G has maximum degree at most 3, we observe:

Observation 6.6. *Two distinct edges of H share either 0, 2 or 3 vertices. The corresponding four-cycles in G either have no vertices in common, or an edge in common, or a 2-edge path in common.*

Since, by assumption, H contains at least one edge, it follows that $G[V(C)]$ contains at least one four-cycle. Moreover, since G is connected and $V(C) \neq V(G)$, it follows that not all vertices of $G[V(C)]$ have degree 3.

If C has a single edge, then $G[V(C)]$ is a 2-ladder. If C has at least two edges, then there are two cases by Observation 6.6:

- Two edges of C share exactly two vertices; or
- Two edges of C share exactly three vertices.

Let us first consider the second case. Then $G[V(C)]$ contains $K_{2,3}$ as a subgraph, and since G is triangle-free, this is an induced subgraph. If C contains exactly these five vertices, then the fifth outcome of the lemma holds, and we are done.

Let X be the vertex set of an induced $K_{2,3}$ in $G[V(C)]$, and let x_1, x_2 be the vertices of degree 3 in $G[X]$, and let y_1, y_2, y_3 be the vertices of degree 2 in $G[X]$. Then, since C is connected and by Observation 6.6, C contains an edge e such that $|e \cap X| \in \{2, 3\}$. Since $N_G(x_1) = N_G(x_2) = \{y_1, y_2, y_3\}$ and the maximum degree of G is 3, it follows that $G[e]$ contains two edges in $G[X]$, and so $|e \cap X| = 3$. We conclude that e contains a vertex x_3 adjacent to at least two of y_1, y_2, y_3 . If x_3 is adjacent to all of y_1, y_2, y_3 , then $G = K_{3,3}$ and $G[V(C)] = K_{3,3}$, and the last outcome holds. Therefore, and by symmetry, we may assume that y_1, y_2 are adjacent to x_3 , and y_3 is non-adjacent to x_3 . It follows that $G[V(C)]$ contains $K_{3,3} - e$ as an induced subgraph (see Figure 16). If $V(C) = X \cup \{x_3\}$, then $G[V(C)]$ is isomorphic to $K_{3,3} - e$, as desired. Otherwise, since y_3 and x_3 are the only vertices in $X \cup \{x_3\}$ who may have a neighbour outside of $X \cup \{x_3\}$ in G , it follows that there is a four-cycle in G containing y_3 and x_3 . Since y_3, x_3 are non-adjacent, it follows that they have at least two common neighbours. Since the neighbours of y_3, x_3 in X are not common neighbours of y_3 and x_3 , it follows that y_3, x_3 have degree at least four. This is a contradiction, and concludes the analysis of the second case.

Now we may assume that no two edges of C share three vertices. If C has exactly two edges, then $G[V(C)]$ is a 3-ladder, and the lemma holds.

It follows that C has at least three edges. Since C is connected, there is an edge of C that shares 2 vertices with 2 different edges. Since G has maximum degree at most 3, there are two possible configurations for a four-cycle sharing two vertices with two other four-cycles: a cube minus a vertex, as depicted in Figure 14 (left) and the 4-ladder which is shown in Figure 15 (left).

Let us first consider the case that $G[V(C)]$ contains a cube minus a vertex (and note that since G has maximum degree 3 and is triangle-free, it follows that this is an induced subgraph). Let X be the vertex set of a cube minus a vertex in $G[V(C)]$. If $V(C) = X$, then we are done. Otherwise, let x_1, x_2, x_3 be the three vertices of degree 2 in $G[X]$. If there is a vertex in G adjacent to all

of x_1, x_2, x_3 , then G (and therefore $G[V(C)]$) is a cube, and the second-to-last outcome holds, as desired. Now we may assume that no vertex in G is adjacent to all of x_1, x_2, x_3 . Since C contains an edge e such that $|e \cap X| \in \{2, 3\}$, it follows that two of x_1, x_2, x_3 , say x_1 and x_2 , have a common neighbour, say y , in $G \setminus X$ (and so e is the four-cycle consisting of x_1, y, x_2 and the common neighbour of x_1 and x_2 in $G[X]$).

Now $G[X \cup \{y\}]$ is isomorphic to a cube minus an edge (see Figure 13). Moreover, the only vertices of $X \cup \{y\}$ which may have a neighbour (in G) outside of $X \cup \{y\}$ are x_3 and y . Since paths from x_3 to y with interior in X have length at least three, and x_3 is non-adjacent to y , it follows that no four-cycle in G contains both x_3 and y , and so every four-cycle in G which contains a vertex in $X \cup \{y\}$ is contained in $X \cup \{y\}$. Therefore, $V(C) = X \cup \{y\}$, and the statement of the lemma holds.

Now we may assume that $G[V(C)]$ contains a 4-ladder, and does not contain a cube minus a vertex. Let k be maximum such that $G[V(C)]$ contains a k -ladder, and let $v_1, \dots, v_k, w_1, \dots, w_k$ denote the vertex set of a k -ladder in $G[V(C)]$, with the notation as in Definition 5.5.

Suppose first that $V(C) \neq X$. Then, some four-cycle Q in G shares an edge with $G[X]$, but such that $V(Q) \not\subseteq X$. Since G has maximum degree 3, it follows that Q contains $v_1 w_1$ or $v_k w_k$, and by symmetry, we may assume the former. If Q contains no other vertex of X , then $X \cup V(Q)$ contains a $(k+1)$ -ladder, contrary to the choice of X . Therefore, and since $V(Q) \not\subseteq X$, it follows that Q contains exactly one of v_k, w_k ; by symmetry, we may assume the former. But now v_k has degree at least four: two neighbours in Q , along with w_k and v_{k-1} . This is a contradiction, proving $X = V(C)$.

If $G[X]$ is an induced k -ladder, then the statement holds. Since G has maximum degree 3, the possible only additional edges in $G[X]$ are $v_1 w_k, v_1 v_k, w_1 v_k, w_1 w_k$. If exactly one of these edges is present, then (possibly switching the roles of v_i and w_i for all i) the fourth outcome holds. Therefore, exactly two of these edges are present (using that G has maximum degree 3). But now every vertex in $G[X]$ has degree 3, and so $V(C) = V(G)$, and the third-to-last outcome holds. This concludes the proof. \square

Let us briefly describe our proof strategy. We start with the following:

Observation 6.7. *Let G, H be as in Lemma 6.5. Let C be a component of H . If one of the last three outcomes holds for C , then H has exactly one component C (and so $V(C) = V(G)$).*

Proof. This follows immediately by observing that every vertex in $G[V(C)]$ has degree 3. \square

Next, let's prove that we can disregard cases in which H has only a small number of components. For that, we need the following:

Observation 6.8. *Let G, H be as in Lemma 6.5. Let C be a component of H . Then the subgraph of G induced by the vertex set of C , $G[V(C)]$, has at most eight KT orientations, and we can compute all KT orientations of $G[V(C)]$ in polynomial time (or decide that none exists).*

Proof. Note that a four-cycle has exactly two KT orientations. Each of the outcomes of Lemma 6.5 therefore has at most eight KT orientations (orienting one edge in a four-cycle forces the orientations of other edges in four-cycles, and then we have at most two additional edges for which to choose an

orientation). By Lemma 5.1, we can decide in polynomial time which, if any, of these up to eight orientations are KT orientations, and output them. \square

We point out that “eight” can be improved to “four,” since in the cases with two additional edges, all edges are in four-cycles.

Using Observation 6.8, if H has few components, we can check for a KT orientation via brute-force. Otherwise, we will replace each component of H by one or two vertices, 3-colour the resulting graph, and then undo the replacement to obtain a 3-colouring of G such that every four-cycle is two-coloured, as Lemma 6.3 requires. There is one exception to this: It does not work for additional edges (those is the fourth and seventh bullet point of Lemma 6.5). We will show that orienting them arbitrarily after applying the above strategy to the rest of the graph is sufficient. In particular, our result implies that if G is connected and H has at least five components, then G admits a KT orientation.

The following cases formalizes which “additional edges” require special treatment. Let G be a connected triangle-free graph, and let H be as in Lemma 6.5. We say that an edge $e \in E(G)$ is *exceptional* if there is a component C of H such that $G[V(C)]$ is a k -ladder with exactly one additional edge, which is not in a four-cycle, and, denoting the vertices of the k -ladder as $v_1, \dots, v_k, w_1, \dots, w_k$ as in Definition 5.5, one of the following holds:

- k is odd and $e = v_1v_k$; or
- k is even and $e = v_1w_k$.

See Figure 18 for an example.

Observation 6.9. *Let G, H be as in Lemma 6.5. Suppose that H has at least two components. Let G^* be obtained from G by removing all exceptional edges. Then, for each component C of H , the graph $G^*[V(C)]$ is bipartite and connected.*

Proof. This is immediate from Lemma 6.5 and Observation 6.7. \square

Finally, from Lemma 6.5, the following is immediate:

Observation 6.10. *Let G, H be as in Lemma 6.5. Let $v \in V(G)$. Then at least one of the following holds:*

- v is not incident to an exceptional edge; or
- all neighbours of v in G are in the same component in H as v is.

We are now ready to prove the main result of this section.

Proof of Theorem 6.1. We may assume that G is triangle-free; if not, we output that G does not admit KT orientation. By considering each component of G separately, we may assume that G is connected. By Lemma 6.4, we may further assume that G does not contain any bridge, and so G is 2-edge-connected.

Let H be as in Lemma 6.5. If H has at most four components, then G contains at most 8 edges that do not have both ends within the same component of H (using that for each component C of H , at most four edges of G have exactly one end in $V(C)$ by Lemma 6.5). Using Observation 6.8, we compute a list of all possible KT orientations for $G[V(C)]$ for each component C of H , and for each choice of a KT orientation of each component of H , we try all orientations of the remaining at most 8 edges. This leads to at most $8^4 \cdot 2^8$ orientations in total; then, by Lemma 5.1, we check if any of them are KT orientations, and return the result.

Now we may assume that H has at least five components. Let G^* be the graph obtained from G by removing exceptional edges. We now construct a graph H , iteratively, as follows. For every component C of H with $|V(C)| > 1$, the graph $G^*[V(C)]$ has a unique bipartition (by Observation 6.9), say (A_C, B_C) . We replace $V(C)$ by two vertices a_C and b_C such that:

- $a_C b_C$ is an edge;
- a_C is adjacent to all neighbours of A_C outside of C ;
- b_C is adjacent to all neighbours of B_C outside of C ;
- if the only neighbour of a_C is b_C , delete a_C ; and
- if the only neighbour of b_C is a_C , delete b_C .

Denote the resulting graph by G' .

Next, we will examine all outcomes of Lemma 6.5, and check that all vertices of G' have degree at most 3. Let C be a component of H . The following, using Observation 6.7, are the possibilities for $G^*[V(C)]$:

- A cube minus an edge, the graph on the left in Figure 13. Both a_C and b_C have degree at most two.




Figure 13: The cube minus an edge, plus possible edges to the remainder of the graph (left), and the replacement a_C and b_C (right).

- A cube minus a vertex, the graph shown both on the left and in the middle in Figure 14 (the graph is shown twice to highlight similarities and differences with other cases). Note that one of a_C, b_C has no neighbours outside C and hence will be deleted; the remaining vertex has degree at most three, since there are at most three edges with exactly one end in $V(C)$.




Figure 14: The cube minus a vertex, plus possible edges to the remainder of the graph (left and middle), and the replacement (right); note that one of a_C, b_C was deleted.

- A k -ladder, such as the graph on the left in Figure 15. Both a_C and b_C have degree at most three.




Figure 15: A 4-ladder, plus possible edges to the remainder of the graph (left), and the replacement a_C and b_C (right).

- $K_{3,3} - e$, the graph on the left in Figure 16. Both a_C and b_C have degree at most two.




Figure 16: $K_{3,3} - e$, plus possible edges to the remainder of the graph (left), and the replacement a_C and b_C (right)

- $K_{2,3}$, the graph on the left in Figure 17. Note that one of a_C, b_C has no neighbours outside C and hence will be deleted; the remaining vertex has degree at most three.




Figure 17: $K_{2,3}$, plus possible edges to the remainder of the graph (left), and the replacement (right); note that one of a_C, b_C was deleted.

Therefore, the graph G' has maximum degree 3, and by construction, G' is connected. Moreover,

the number of vertices of G' is at least the number of components of H , and so $|V(G')| > 4$. By Theorem 6.2, we conclude that G' has a 3-colouring, say f .

Then, G^* has a 3-colouring f' arising from f , by extending the colouring as shown in Figures 13–17, that is, for every component C , we proceed as follows:

- If a_C was deleted, restore a_C and assign to it a colour distinct from that of b_C ;
- If b_C was deleted, restore b_C and assign to it a colour distinct from that of a_C ;
- Assign the colour of a_C to every vertex in A_C , and the colour of b_C to every vertex in B_C .

By construction, every four-cycle in G^* is coloured with two colours by f' .

Let D be the KT orientation of G^* arising from Lemma 6.3. It remains to find a suitable orientation for the exceptional edges; we orient them arbitrarily and claim that this yields a KT orientation D' of G .

Suppose not; then there exist vertices u and v in G with two internally disjoint paths P and Q between them. The union of P and Q is a cycle S in G such that the orientations of edges of S change at most twice along S ; in other words, at most two vertices of S are sources or sinks with respect to the set of edges of S . Since D is a KT orientation of G , it follows that S contains an exceptional edge e . Let C be the component of H containing the ends of e ; then $G^*[V(C)]$ is a k -ladder. If $V(S) \subseteq C$, then, since e is not contained in a four-cycle of G , it follows that S contains at least three vertices which are sources or sinks (in C and hence in S), and so at least three direction changes, as desired.

It follows that S is not contained in C , and so S contains exactly two edges with one end in C and the other in $V(G) \setminus C$, say e' and e'' ; note that there are exactly two such edges. If e' and e'' share an end, say v , it follows that $v \notin V(C)$. Now, either $V(G) = \{v\} \cup V(C)$ (and so H has at most two components, a case we already covered), or v has degree 3 and is incident with an edge $j \neq e', e''$; but now j is a bridge in G (with one component of $G \setminus e$ being $G[\{v\} \cup V(C)]$), again a contradiction. Therefore, e' and e'' are disjoint.

Let $e = yz$. By Observation 6.10, it follows that e', e'' and e are pairwise disjoint. Let x be the end of e' in C , and let w be the end of e'' in $V(C)$. See Figure 18.




Figure 18: An exceptional edge yz for a 4-ladder. Note that 4 is the smallest k such that a k -ladder can have an exceptional edge.

Since y, z are sources or sinks in D , it follows that one of y and z is a source or sink in D' . Therefore, a direction change of S occurs at one of y and z .

Moreover, by Observation 6.10, it follows that none of the vertices contained in e' and e'' are incident with exceptional edges. Since at least one end of e' is not coloured 2, and at least one end of e'' is not coloured 2, it follows that one end of e' and one end of e'' is a source or a sink in D' . Consequently, S contains at least three vertices which are sources or sinks (namely, one end of each of the three disjoint edges e, e', e''). This shows that S has more than two direction changes, contrary to our assumption. So D is a KT orientation. \square

7 Acknowledgement

We would like to thank the organisers of the DIMACS REU 2023 for providing the wonderful opportunity to work on this project during the summer. We would also like to express our gratitude to Gábor Tardos for providing invaluable feedback to improve the overall presentation.

References

- [1] Júlio Araújo, Nathann Cohen, Frédéric Giroire, and Frédéric Havet. “Good edge-labelling of graphs”. In: *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 160.18 (2012), pp. 2502–2513.
- [2] Jean-Claude Bermond, Michel Cosnard, and Stéphane Pérennes. “Directed acyclic graphs with the unique dipath property”. In: *Theoretical Computer Science* 504 (2013), pp. 5–11.
- [3] Édouard Bonnet, Romain Bourneuf, Julien Duron, Colin Geniet, Stéphan Thomassé, and Nicolas Trotignon. “A tamed family of triangle-free graphs with unbounded chromatic number”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.04296* (2023). URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.04296>.

- [4] Marcin Briański, James Davies, and Bartosz Walczak. “Separating polynomial χ -boundedness from χ -boundedness”. In: *Combinatorica* 44.1 (2024), pp. 1–8.
- [5] R. L. Brooks. “On colouring the nodes of a network”. In: *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society* 37.2 (1941), pp. 194–197. DOI: 10.1017/S030500410002168X.
- [6] Alvaro Carbonero, Patrick Hompe, Benjamin Moore, and Sophie Spirkl. “A counterexample to a conjecture about triangle-free induced subgraphs of graphs with large chromatic number”. In: *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B* 158 (Jan. 2023), pp. 63–69. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016%2Fj.jctb.2022.09.001>.
- [7] Pierre Charbit and Jean Sébastien Sereni. “The fractional chromatic number of Zykov products of graphs”. In: *Applied Mathematics Letters* 24.4 (2011), pp. 432–437. ISSN: 0893-9659. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0893965910003915>.
- [8] Dwight Duffus, Mark Ginn, and Vojtěch Rödl. “On the computational complexity of ordered subgraph recognition”. In: *Random Structures & Algorithms* 7.3 (1995), pp. 223–268.
- [9] António Girão, Freddie Illingworth, Emil Powierski, Michael Savery, Alex Scott, Youri Tamitegama, and Jane Tan. “Induced subgraphs of induced subgraphs of large chromatic number”. In: *Combinatorica* 44 (2024), pp. 37–62. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00493-023-00061-4>.
- [10] András Gyárfás. *Problems from the world surrounding perfect graphs*. 177. MTA Számítástechnikai és Automatizálási Kutató Intézet, 1985.
- [11] Hal A. Kierstead and William T. Trotter. “Colorful induced subgraphs”. In: *Discrete Mathematics* 101.1 (1992), pp. 165–169. ISSN: 0012-365X. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0012365X9290600K>.
- [12] Michael Larsen, James Propp, and Daniel Ullman. “The fractional chromatic number of Mycielski’s graphs”. In: *Journal of Graph Theory* 19.3 (1995), pp. 411–416.
- [13] László Lovász. “Three short proofs in graph theory”. In: *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B* 19.3 (1975), pp. 269–271.
- [14] Biswanath Mukherjee. *Optical communication networks*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill, July 1997.
- [15] Arpan Sadhukhan. *Shift Graphs, Chromatic Number and Acyclic One-Path Orientations*. 2024. arXiv: 2308.14010 [math.CO].
- [16] Thomas J. Schaefer. “The Complexity of Satisfiability Problems”. In: *Proceedings of the Tenth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*. STOC ’78. San Diego, California, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 1978, pp. 216–226. ISBN: 9781450374378. DOI: 10.1145/800133.804350. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/800133.804350>.
- [17] Alex Scott and Paul Seymour. “A survey of χ -boundedness”. In: *Journal of Graph Theory* 95.3 (2020), pp. 473–504. URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/jgt.22601>.