

A lower bound on the number of edges in DP-critical graphs

Peter Bradshaw* Ilkyoo Choi† Alexandr Kostochka‡ Jingwei Xu§

September 4, 2024

Abstract

A graph G is k -critical (list k -critical, DP k -critical) if $\chi(G) = k$ ($\chi_\ell(G) = k$, $\chi_{\text{DP}}(G) = k$) and for every proper subgraph G' of G , $\chi(G') < k$ ($\chi_\ell(G') < k$, $\chi_{\text{DP}}(G') < k$). Let $f(n, k)$ ($f_\ell(n, k)$, $f_{\text{DP}}(n, k)$) denote the minimum number of edges in an n -vertex k -critical (list k -critical, DP k -critical) graph. Our main result is that if $k \geq 5$ and $n \geq k + 2$, then

$$f_{\text{DP}}(n, k) > \left(k - 1 + \left\lceil \frac{k^2 - 7}{2k - 7} \right\rceil^{-1} \right) \frac{n}{2}.$$

This is the first bound on $f_{\text{DP}}(n, k)$ that is asymptotically better than the well-known bound on $f(n, k)$ by Gallai from 1963. The result also yields a slightly better bound on $f_\ell(n, k)$ than the ones known before.

Mathematics Subject Classification: 05C07, 05C15, 05C35.

Keywords: Color-critical graphs, DP-coloring, sparse graphs.

1 Introduction

Let \mathbb{N} denote the set of positive integers. For a set X , let $\text{Pow}(X)$ denote the power set of a set X , and denote $\bigcup_{v \in X} f(v)$ by $f(X)$. A graph is simple if it has no parallel edges. Given a multigraph G , let $V(G)$ and $E(G)$ denote the vertex set and edge set, respectively, of G . Let G^- denote a multigraph obtained from G by removing any edge. Given a vertex $v \in V(G)$, the degree of v , denoted $d_G(v)$, is the number of edges incident with v . The neighborhood $N_G(v)$ of a vertex v is the set of vertices adjacent to v . Note that $|N_G(v)| \leq d_G(v)$, and equality holds if and only if v has no incident parallel edges. A vertex of degree d (at least d) is a d -vertex (d^+ -vertex). For vertex subsets S_1 and S_2 , let $E_G(S_1, S_2)$ denote the set of edges $xy \in E(G)$ where $x \in S_1$ and $y \in S_2$.

1.1 Known results on proper coloring

A (proper) k -coloring of a graph G is a mapping $g : V(G) \rightarrow \{1, \dots, k\}$ such that $g(u) \neq g(v)$ for each $uv \in E(G)$. The chromatic number of G , denoted $\chi(G)$, is the minimum positive integer k for

*University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign, Urbana, IL 61801, USA. E-mail: pb38@illinois.edu. Research is supported in part by NSF RTG grant DMS-1937241.

†Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, Yongin-si, Gyeonggi-do, Republic of Korea. E-mail: ilkyoo@hufs.ac.kr. Research is supported in part by the Hankuk University of Foreign Studies Research Fund.

‡University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign, Urbana, IL 61801, USA. E-mail: kostochk@illinois.edu. Research is supported in part by NSF Grant DMS-2153507 and by NSF RTG Grant DMS-1937241.

§University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign, Urbana, IL 61801, USA. E-mail: jx60@illinois.edu. Research is supported in part by Campus Research Board Award RB24000 of the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign.

which G has a proper k -coloring. A graph G is k -colorable if $\chi(G) \leq k$. For a positive integer k , a graph G is k -critical if $\chi(G) = k$, but every proper subgraph of G is $(k - 1)$ -colorable.

The notion of k -critical graphs was introduced and systematically studied by Dirac [6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12] as early as 1951. In particular, Dirac considered the minimum number $f(n, k)$ of edges in an n -vertex k -critical graph. With this notation, $f(k, k) = \binom{k}{2}$ and $f(k + 1, k)$ is not well defined. Already simplest bounds on $f(n, k)$ yield the Heawood Formula [25, (1.1)] that every graph G embeddable on an orientable surface S_γ of genus $\gamma \geq 1$ satisfies $\chi(G) \leq \lfloor c_\gamma \rfloor$, where $c_\gamma = \frac{7 + \sqrt{1 + 48\gamma}}{2}$. Dirac sharpened this result by showing that for $\gamma \geq 1$ every graph embeddable on S_γ with chromatic number $\lfloor c_\gamma \rfloor$ contains the complete graph with $\lfloor c_\gamma \rfloor$ vertices as a subgraph. For this result, he used the following lower bound on $f(n, k)$:

Theorem 1.1 (Dirac [11]). *If $k \geq 4$ and $n \geq k + 2$, then*

$$f(n, k) \geq (k - 1) \frac{n}{2} + \frac{k - 3}{2}. \quad (1)$$

Fifteen years later, Dirac [12] described the k -critical graphs for which the bound (1) is exact.

In his fundamental papers [15] and [16] from 1963, Gallai proved a series of important properties of color-critical graphs. Recall that a Gallai tree is a connected graph whose every block is a complete graph or an odd cycle. A Gallai forest is a graph where every connected component is a Gallai tree.

Theorem 1.2 (Gallai [16]). *Let $k \geq 4$, and let G be a k -critical graph. If B is the set of $(k - 1)$ -vertices in G , then $G[B]$ is a Gallai forest.*

Theorem 1.2 implies the following lower bound on $f(n, k)$:

Theorem 1.3 (Gallai [15]). *If $k \geq 4$ and $n \geq k + 2$, then*

$$f(n, k) \geq \left(k - 1 + \frac{k - 3}{k^2 - 3} \right) \frac{n}{2}. \quad (2)$$

For large n , this bound is much stronger than the bound in Theorem 1.1.

Krivelevich [21, 22] improved the lower bound on $f(n, k)$ in Theorem 1.3 to

$$f(n, k) \geq \left(k - 1 + \frac{k - 3}{k^2 - 2k - 1} \right) \frac{n}{2} \quad (3)$$

and demonstrated nice applications of his bound. Then Kostochka and Stiebitz [20] proved that for $k \geq 6$ and $n \geq k + 2$,

$$f(n, k) \geq \left(k - 1 + \frac{2(k - 3)}{k^2 + 6k - 9 - 6/(k - 2)} \right) \frac{n}{2}. \quad (4)$$

Note that the last term in the bound (4) is asymptotically (in k) twice larger than the one in (2). Then, Kostochka and Yancey [18] proved an asymptotically exact bound:

Theorem 1.4 (Kostochka and Yancey [18]). *If $k \geq 4$ and $n \geq k$, $n \neq k + 1$, then*

$$f(n, k) \geq \left(k - 1 + \frac{k - 3}{k - 1} \right) \frac{n}{2} - \frac{k(k - 3)}{2(k - 1)}. \quad (5)$$

In this bound, the last term in the coefficient of $\frac{n}{2}$ is asymptotically (in k) k times larger than the one in (2).

1.2 Known results on list coloring

List coloring was introduced independently by Vizing [26] and Erdős, Rubin, and Taylor [14]. A list assignment for a graph G is a function $L: V(G) \rightarrow \text{Pow}(Y)$, where Y is a set, whose elements are referred to as colors. For each $u \in V(G)$, the set $L(u)$ is called the list of u and its elements are said to be available for u . A proper coloring $f: V(G) \rightarrow Y$ is called an L -coloring if $f(u) \in L(u)$ for each $u \in V(G)$. A graph G with a list assignment L is said to be L -colorable if it admits an L -coloring. The list chromatic number $\chi_\ell(G)$ of G is the least positive integer k such that G is L -colorable whenever L is a list assignment for G with $|L(u)| \geq k$ for all $u \in V(G)$. If $L(u) = \{1, \dots, k\}$ for a positive integer k for all $u \in V(G)$, then G is L -colorable if and only if it is k -colorable; in this sense, list coloring generalizes proper coloring. In particular, $\chi_\ell(G) \geq \chi(G)$ for all graphs G .

The definition of critical graphs can be naturally extended to the list coloring setting. A graph G is list k -critical if $\chi_\ell(G) \geq k$, but $\chi_\ell(G') \leq k - 1$ for each proper subgraph G' of G . So, we can define $f_\ell(n, k)$ to be the minimum number of edges in an n -vertex list k -critical graph.

A list assignment L for a graph G is called a degree list assignment if $|L(u)| \geq d_G(u)$ for all $u \in V(G)$. A fundamental result of Borodin [3] and Erdős, Rubin, and Taylor [14] provides a complete characterization of all graphs that are not L -colorable with respect to some degree list assignment L . This result can be viewed as a generalization of Theorem 1.2.

Theorem 1.5 (Borodin [3]; Erdős, Rubin, and Taylor [14]). *Let G be a connected graph and L be a degree list assignment for G . If G is not L -colorable, then G is a Gallai tree; furthermore, $|L(u)| = d_G(u)$ for all $u \in V(G)$ and if $u, v \in V(G)$ are two adjacent non-cut vertices, then $L(u) = L(v)$.*

Exactly as Theorem 1.2 implies (2), Theorem 1.5 yields the same lower bound on $f_\ell(n, k)$. Kostochka and Stiebitz [20] improved (2) for $k \geq 9$: the last term in their bound is asymptotically (in k) 1.5 times larger than the one in (2). Then, in a series of papers by Kierstead and Rabern [17], Cranston and Rabern [5], and Rabern [23, 24], this bound was significantly improved and also extended to $4 \leq k \leq 8$. The main results by Rabern [23, 24] are as follows:

Theorem 1.6 (Rabern [23, 24]). *For $k \geq 4$ and $n \geq k + 2$,*

$$f_\ell(n, k) \geq \begin{cases} \left(k - 1 + \frac{(k-3)^2(2k-3)}{k^4 - 2k^3 - 11k^2 + 28k - 14} \right) \frac{n}{2} & \text{if } k \geq 7 \\ \left(5 + \frac{93}{766} \right) \frac{n}{2} & \text{if } k = 6 \\ \left(k - 1 + \frac{k-3}{k^2 - 2k + 2} \right) \frac{n}{2} & \text{if } k \in \{4, 5\} \end{cases}$$

In fact, the bounds were proved not only for $f_\ell(n, k)$ but also for the analogous parameter of online list coloring. The last term in Theorem 1.6 is asymptotically (in k) twice larger than the one in (2). Below is a table similar to ones in [5, 17, 23] with an added column of our results in this paper.

1.3 Known results on DP-coloring and our results

In this paper we focus on a generalization of list coloring that was recently introduced by Dvořák and Postle [13]; they called it correspondence coloring, and we call it DP-coloring for short. Dvořák

| k | k -critical | | list k -critical | | | | list and DP k -critical |
|-----|---------------|---------|--------------------|---------|---------|-------------|---------------------------|
| | Ga [15] | KY [18] | KS [20] | KR [17] | CR [5] | Ra [23, 24] | This paper |
| 4 | 3.0769 | 3.3333 | | | | 3.1000 | |
| 5 | 4.0909 | 4.5000 | | 4.0983 | 4.1000 | 4.1176 | 4.1666 |
| 6 | 5.0909 | 5.6000 | | 5.1052 | 5.1076 | 5.1214 | 5.1666 |
| 7 | 6.0869 | 6.6666 | | 6.1149 | 6.1192 | 6.1296 | 6.1666 |
| 8 | 7.0819 | 7.7142 | | 7.1127 | 7.1167 | 7.1260 | 7.1428 |
| 9 | 8.0769 | 8.7500 | 8.0838 | 8.1093 | 8.1130 | 8.1213 | 8.1428 |
| 10 | 9.0721 | 9.7777 | 9.0793 | 9.1054 | 9.1088 | 9.1162 | 9.1250 |
| 15 | 14.0540 | 14.8571 | 14.0610 | 14.0863 | 14.0884 | 14.0930 | 14.1000 |
| 20 | 19.0428 | 19.8947 | 19.0490 | 19.0718 | 19.0733 | 19.0762 | 19.0833 |

Table 1: Current lower bounds on the average degree of k -critical and list k -critical graphs. Best results for list k -critical graphs are highlighted.

and Postle invented DP-coloring in order to approach an open problem about list colorings of planar graphs with no cycles of certain lengths. This hints the usefulness of DP-coloring for graph coloring problems, in particular list coloring problems.

For a multigraph G , a (DP-)cover of G is a pair (H, L) , where H is a graph and $L: V(G) \rightarrow \text{Pow}(V(H))$ is a function such that

- The family $\{L(u) : u \in V(G)\}$ forms a partition of $V(H)$.
- For each $u \in V(G)$, $H[L(u)]$ is an independent set.
- For each $u, v \in V(G)$, if $|E_G(u, v)| = s$, then $E_H(L(u), L(v))$ is the union of s matchings (where each matching is not necessarily perfect and possibly empty).

We often refer to the vertices of H as colors. A multigraph G with a cover (H, L) has an (H, L) -coloring if H has an independent set containing exactly one vertex from $L(v)$ for each $v \in V(G)$. The DP chromatic number $\chi_{\text{DP}}(G)$ of a multigraph G is the least positive integer k such that G has an (H, L) -coloring whenever (H, L) is a cover of G with $|L(u)| \geq k$ for all $u \in V(G)$. Every list coloring problem can be represented as a DP-coloring problem. In particular, $\chi_{\text{DP}}(G) \geq \chi_{\ell}(G)$ for all multigraphs G .

We say a multigraph G is DP degree-colorable if G has an (H, L) -coloring whenever (H, L) is a cover of G with $|L(u)| \geq d_G(u)$ for all $u \in V(G)$.

A multigraph G is DP k -critical if $\chi_{\text{DP}}(G) = k$ and $\chi_{\text{DP}}(G') \leq k - 1$ for every proper subgraph G' of G . Let $f_{\text{DP}}(n, k)$ denote the minimum number of edges in an n -vertex DP k -critical (simple) graph.

For a simple graph G and a positive integer s , the multiple G^s of G is the multigraph obtained from G by replacing each edge $uv \in E(G)$ with s edges joining u and v . In particular, $G^1 = G$. A GDP-forest is a multigraph in which every block is isomorphic to either K_n^t or C_n^t for some n and t . (A double cycle is a graph C_n^2 .) A GDP-tree is a connected GDP-forest. Note that every Gallai tree is also a GDP-tree.

Theorems 1.2 and 1.5 extend to DP-coloring as follows.

Theorem 1.7 (Dvořák and Postle [13] for simple graphs; Bernshteyn, Kostochka, and Pron' [2] for multigraphs). *Suppose that G is a connected multigraph. Then G is not DP degree-colorable if and only if G is a GDP-tree.*

Analogous to how Theorems 1.2 and 1.5 imply lower bounds on $f(n, k)$ and $f_\ell(n, k)$, respectively, Theorem 1.7 yields that (2) holds also for $f_{\text{DP}}(n, k)$ when $n \geq k + 2$. Note that the bound (2) does not hold for DP-coloring of general multigraphs: for example, multiple of cycles C_n^k are $2k$ -regular and DP $(2k + 1)$ -critical.

Bernshteyn and Kostochka [1] proved that for $n \geq 2k$, Dirac's bound (1) holds also for $f_{\text{DP}}(n, k)$. The main result of this paper is a lower bound on $f_{\text{DP}}(n, k)$ that is asymptotically better than (2).

Theorem 1.8. *Let $k \geq 5$ and $\lambda = \left\lceil \frac{k^2 - 7}{2k - 7} \right\rceil$. If G is an n -vertex DP k -critical graph, then one of the following holds:*

1. $G = K_k$,
2. $k = 5$ and either $G = K_2^4$ or G is a double cycle, or
3. $|E(G)| \geq \left(k - 1 + \frac{1}{\lambda}\right) \frac{n}{2} + \frac{1}{\lambda}$.

Note that in Case 3 of Theorem 1.8, the average degree of G is greater than

$$k - 1 + \frac{1}{\lambda} = k - 1 + \left\lceil \frac{k^2 - 7}{2k - 7} \right\rceil^{-1}.$$

We do not know whether $f_\ell(n, k) \geq f_{\text{DP}}(n, k)$ for all n and k . However, our method for proving Theorem 1.8 also allows us to show the following bound on $f_\ell(n, k)$.

Corollary 1.9. *If $k \geq 5$, $\lambda = \left\lceil \frac{k^2 - 7}{2k - 7} \right\rceil$, and $n \geq k + 2$, then*

$$f_\ell(n, k) \geq \left(k - 1 + \frac{1}{\lambda}\right) \frac{n}{2} + \frac{1}{\lambda} \quad \text{and} \quad f_{\text{DP}}(n, k) \geq \left(k - 1 + \frac{1}{\lambda}\right) \frac{n}{2} + \frac{1}{\lambda}. \quad (6)$$

This is slightly better than the bound of Theorem 1.6 for $k \geq 5$, see the last column of Table 1. We do not know how to prove (6) without using DP-coloring. Thus, this is another example of usefulness of DP-coloring for proving results on list coloring. As it is, the proof of Theorem 1.8 does not work well for $k = 4$. In [4], we use a somewhat more elaborate technique to prove that for $n \geq 11$, $f_{\text{DP}}(n, 4) > \frac{8}{5}n$.

1.4 Outline of the proof and structure of the paper

The plan to prove Theorem 1.8 is as follows.

1. We want to prove by induction on n that if $G \neq K_k$ is an n -vertex DP k -critical graph with m edges, then $2m \geq \left(k - 1 + \frac{1}{\lambda}\right) n + \frac{2}{\lambda}$, which is equivalent to

$$(\lambda(k - 1) + 1)n - 2\lambda m \leq -2. \quad (7)$$

2. We wish to consider a smallest counterexample G to (7) and use the minimality of G to consider smaller graphs for which (7) holds. In doing so, we hope to infer some structural properties of G . For this, we use a weighted version of (7). If we assign $w(v) = \lambda(k - 1) + 1$ for each $v \in V(G)$ and $w(e) = 2\lambda$ for each $e \in E(G)$, then we can rewrite (7) as

$$\sum_{v \in V(G)} \left(w(v) - \sum_{e \in E(G): v \in e} \frac{w(e)}{2} \right) \leq -2. \quad (8)$$

Note that vertices of degree at most $k - 1$ contribute positive terms to the sum, while vertices of degree at least k contribute negative terms. Therefore, in order to prove the inequality, we plan to prove that the k^+ -vertices of G contribute enough to the sum in order to negate the positive terms from the vertices of degree at most $k - 1$.

3. Sometimes it is convenient to consider smaller graphs obtained from G in which some vertices have lists with fewer than $k - 1$ colors. For induction, it is also convenient to consider loopless multigraphs rather than just simple graphs. Therefore, we develop a more general and sophisticated model in which the weights of vertices with smaller list sizes are less than $\lambda(k - 1) + 1$ and the weights of multiple edges are greater than 2λ . In this new model, we still aim to prove (8).
4. In our new model, every positive term of (8) corresponds to a low vertex, that is, a vertex v for which the list size $h(v)$ is equal to the degree $d_G(v)$. We let \mathcal{B} be the set of low vertices in G , a minimum counterexample to our new model. We show that the induced subgraph $G[\mathcal{B}]$ is a GDP-forest.
5. Overall, roughly speaking, the proof of the weighted version of (8) has three parts:
- (a) We show that GDP-forests of maximum degree $k - 1$ and without $(k - 1)$ -regular and $(k - 2)$ -regular blocks do not have too many edges.
 - (b) We show that in a minimum counterexample G , $G[\mathcal{B}]$ has neither $(k - 1)$ -regular nor $(k - 2)$ -regular blocks.
 - (c) We use discharging to show that negative terms in (8) compensate for all positive ones, proving the inequality.

The structure of the paper is as follows. In Section 2, we introduce our model discussed above, which allows multiple edges and variable list sizes of the vertices. In Section 3 we discuss properties of GDP-forests. Properties of a minimum counterexample are shown in Section 4, and we finish the proof via the discharging method in Section 5.

2 The setup

We will prove a statement stronger than Theorem 1.8 in the setting of multigraphs with the language of potentials, and we will obtain Theorem 1.8 as a corollary.

Let G be a loopless multigraph, and let $h : V(G) \rightarrow \{0, \dots, k-1\}$ be a function. For each $v \in V(G)$ and $xy \in \binom{V(G)}{2}$, we define the potential $\rho_{G,h}(v)$ and $\rho_{G,h}(xy)$ to be as follows:

$$\rho_{G,h}(v) = \begin{cases} h(v)\lambda + 1 & \text{if } h(v) = k-1 \\ h(v)\lambda - 1 & \text{if } h(v) \in \{2, \dots, k-2\} \\ h(v)\lambda - 2 & \text{if } h(v) \in \{0, 1\}. \end{cases} \quad \rho_{G,h}(xy) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } xy \notin E(G) \\ 1 - (2\lambda + 1)|E_G(x, y)| & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In other words, if x and y are joined by a single edge in G , then $\rho_{G,h}(xy) = -2\lambda$, and each additional edge joining x and y adds $-(2\lambda + 1)$ to $\rho_{G,h}(xy)$.

Given a vertex subset $A \subseteq V(G)$, we define the potential of A as

$$\rho_{G,h}(A) = \sum_{x \in V(A)} \rho_{G,h}(x) + \sum_{xy \in \binom{A}{2}} \rho_{G,h}(xy).$$

When A consists of a single vertex v , we often write $\rho_h(v) = \rho_{G,h}(\{v\})$. We also write $\rho_h(G) = \rho_{G,h}(V(G))$. We often omit the subscripts G and h when they are clear from the context.

Given a graph G , let $h : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. A cover (H, L) of G is an h -cover of G if $|L(v)| \geq h(v)$ for each $v \in V(G)$. When $h \equiv t$ for some constant $t \in \mathbb{N}$, we call an h -cover simply a t -cover. We say that G is DP h -colorable if G has an (H, L) -coloring for every h -cover (H, L) of G . We say that G is (DP) h -minimal if G is not DP h -colorable, but every proper subgraph G' of G is DP $h|_{V(G')}$ -colorable. Given a vertex subset $A \subseteq V(G)$, we often write h for the restriction $h|_A$ when this does not cause confusion.

We now present our main result:

Theorem 2.1. *Let $k \geq 5$. Let G be a loopless multigraph and $h : V(G) \rightarrow \{0, \dots, k-1\}$. If G is h -minimal, then one of the following holds:*

1. $G = K_k$ and $h(v) = k-1$ for each $v \in V(G)$,
2. $k = 5$, either $G = K_2^4$ or G is a double cycle, and $h(v) = 4$ for each $v \in V(G)$, or
3. $\rho_h(G) \leq -2$.

Note that when G is a simple graph and $h(v) = k-1$ for each $v \in V(G)$, the statement $\rho_h(G) \leq -2$ is equivalent to the statement $|E(G)| \geq (k-1 + \frac{1}{\lambda})\frac{|V(G)|}{2} + \frac{1}{\lambda}$. Therefore, since K_2^4 and double cycles are not simple graphs, Theorem 2.1 implies Theorem 1.8.

A multigraph is exceptional if it is either a complete graph, or K_2^4 or a double cycle in the case that $k = 5$.

We end this section with some lemmas for the potential function. The following well-known lemma (c.f. [19, Fact 11]) shows that our potential function is submodular.

Lemma 2.2. *If $U_1, U_2 \subseteq V(G)$, then $\rho_{G,h}(U_1 \cup U_2) + \rho_{G,h}(U_1 \cap U_2) \leq \rho_{G,h}(U_1) + \rho_{G,h}(U_2)$.*

Lemma 2.3. *Let F be a copy of K_k and let $h(v) = k-1$ for each $v \in V(F)$. For a proper induced subgraph F' of F^- , $\rho_h(F') \geq \rho_h(F^-) + (k-3)(\lambda-1) - 2$.*

Proof. The potential of a complete graph on j vertices is

$$j((k-1)\lambda + 1) - 2\lambda \binom{j}{2} = j\lambda k - j\lambda + j - \lambda j(j-1) = -\lambda j^2 + j(\lambda k + 1).$$

In order to minimize the potential of F' , we assume that F' is a complete graph. If $|V(F')| = j$, then $\rho_h(F') = -\lambda j^2 + j(\lambda k + 1)$. As a function of j , $\rho_h(F')$ is a concave quadratic function and hence is minimized at $j = 1$ or $j = k - 1$. Therefore,

$$\rho_h(F') \geq \min\{(k-1)\lambda + 1, (k-1)(\lambda + 1)\} = (k-1)\lambda + 1.$$

Therefore, $\rho_h(F') - \rho_h(F^-) \geq (k-1)\lambda + 1 - (k+2\lambda) = (k-3)(\lambda-1) - 2$. \square

Lemma 2.4. *Let $k = 5$, and let F be an exceptional multigraph such that $h(v) = 4$ for each $v \in V(F)$. Then $\rho_h(F) \in \{5, 0, -1\}$. Moreover, if A is a non-empty proper subset of $V(F^-)$, then $\rho_{F^-}(A) \geq \rho_h(F^-) + 8$.*

Proof. As $k = 5$, $\lambda = 6$, so, $(k-1)\lambda + 1 = 25$ and $2\lambda = 12$. If $F = K_5$, then $\rho_h(F) = 5(25) - 10(12) = 5$. If $F = K_2^4$, then $\rho_h(F) = 2(25) - 12 - 3(13) = -1$. If $F = C_n^2$, then $\rho_h(F) = 25n - 12n - 13n = 0$. Let A be a nonempty proper subset of $V(F^-)$. We consider the following cases. If $F = K_2^4$, then $\rho_h(F^-) = 12$, and $\rho_h(A) = 25$. If $F = K_5$, then $\rho_h(F^-) = 17$, and $\rho_{F^-}(A) \geq 25|A| - 12\binom{|A|}{2} \geq 25$. If F is a double cycle, then $\rho_h(F^-) = 13$ and $\rho_{F^-,h}(A) \geq 25|A| - (12+13)(|A|-1) = 25$. \square

3 Properties of GDP-forests

For a positive integer q , the q -blowup of a graph G is the graph obtained by replacing each $v \in V(G)$ with an independent set I_v of size q and replacing each edge $uv \in E(G)$ with a $K_{q,q}$ joining I_u and I_v .

Suppose that (H, L) is a DP-cover of a multigraph G . The q -blowup of (H, L) is a DP-cover of G^q obtained by replacing each vertex $u \in V(H)$ with an independent set I_u of size q , replacing each edge $uw \in E(H)$ with a $K_{q,q}$ joining I_u and I_w , and replacing each list $L(v)$ with the set $\bigcup_{u \in L(v)} I_u$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let G be a loopless multigraph and h be a function on $V(G)$. Let (H, L) be an h -cover of G .*

(a) *If $G = C_{2t}^q$ and $h(v) = 2q$ for all vertices v , then G has no (H, L) -coloring if and only if (H, L) is a q -blowup of a 2-cover (H', L') of C_{2t} where H' is isomorphic to C_{4t} .*

(b) *If $G = K_t^q$ and $h(v) = (t-1)q$ for all vertices v , then G has no (H, L) -coloring if and only if (H, L) is a q -blowup of a $(t-1)$ -cover (H', L') of K_t where H' is isomorphic to $t-1$ disjoint copies of K_t .*

(c) *If $G = C_{2t+1}^q$ and $h(v) = 2q$ for all vertices v , then G has no (H, L) -coloring if and only if (H, L) is a q -blowup of a 2-cover (H', L') of C_{2t+1} where H' is isomorphic to two disjoint copies of C_{2t+1} .*

Proof. In each case, the necessity direction is easy to check, so we prove sufficiency.

We first claim that in each case, H is d -regular, where d is the regularity of G . Indeed, suppose that H contains a vertex v with a color $c \in L(v)$ such that $d_H(c) < d$. Then, we assign c to v .

We write $G' = G - v$, and for each $w \in V(G')$, we write $L'(w)$ for the set of colors in $L(w)$ that are not adjacent to c . Then, for each $w \in V(G')$, $|L'(w)| \geq d_{G'}(w)$, and $|L'(w^*)| > d_{G'}(w^*)$ for at least one vertex $w^* \in V(G')$. Therefore, by degeneracy, G has an (H, L) -coloring that assigns c to v , a contradiction. Therefore, we assume that H is d -regular. In particular, for each adjacent pair $u, v \in V(G)$, $H[L(u) \cup L(v)]$ is a q -regular bipartite graph.

(a) First, we claim that (H, L) is a q -blowup of some 2-cover of C_{2t} . Consider two adjacent vertices $u, v \in V(G)$. By degeneracy, $G - \{u, v\}$ has an (H, L) -coloring f . For each $w \in \{u, v\}$, we write $L'(w)$ for the subset of $L(w)$ consisting of colors with no neighbor in f . Note that $|L'(w)| \geq q$ for each $w \in \{u, v\}$. If $H[L'(u) \cup L'(v)]$ is not a $K_{q,q}$, then f extends to u and v , a contradiction. Therefore, as $H[L(u) \cup L(v)]$ is q -regular, $H[L(u) \cup L(v)]$ consists of two disjoint copies of $K_{q,q}$.

Next, consider three consecutive vertices u, v, w in G . By our previous observation, $H[L(u) \cup L(v)]$ consists of two disjoint copies K_{uv} and K'_{uv} of $K_{q,q}$. Similarly, $H[L(v) \cup L(w)]$ consists of two disjoint copies K_{vw} and K'_{vw} of $K_{q,q}$. Without loss of generality, K_{uv} and K_{vw} intersect in at least one vertex of $L(v)$. Now, suppose that $|V(K_{uv}) \cap V(K_{vw})| < q$. Then, for each pair (K', K'') such that $K' \in \{K_{uv}, K'_{uv}\}$ and $K'' \in \{K_{vw}, K'_{vw}\}$, we have $|V(K') \cap V(K'')| \in \{1, \dots, q-1\}$. Let f be an (H, L) -coloring of $G - v$. By our observation above, $f(u)$ and $f(w)$ have a common neighbor in $L(v)$. Therefore, at least one color in $L(v)$ is adjacent to neither $f(u)$ nor $f(w)$, and hence f can be extended to v , a contradiction. Therefore, without loss of generality, $|V(K_{uv}) \cap V(K_{vw})| = q$, and $|V(K'_{uv}) \cap V(K'_{vw})| = q$. As this property holds for every consecutive triple u, v, w , it follows that (H, L) is a q -blowup of a 2-cover of C_{2t} .

Finally, up to isomorphism, there are only two 2-covers (H', L') of C_{2t} , namely one in which H' is isomorphic to two disjoint copies of C_{2t} and one in which H' is isomorphic to C_{4t} . It is easy to check that if H' is isomorphic to two disjoint copies of C_{2t} , then G admits an (H, L) -coloring. Therefore, H' is isomorphic to C_{4t} .

(b) Suppose that $G = K_t^q$, $h(v) = (t-1)q$ for all vertices v , and G has no (H, L) -coloring. We aim to show that (H, L) is a q -blowup of a $(t-1)$ -cover (H', L') of K_t where H' is isomorphic to $t-1$ disjoint copies of K_t .

We induct on t . If $t = 1$, then as $h(v) = 0$ for the single vertex $v \in V(G)$, H is the empty graph, which is 0 disjoint q -blowups of K_1 . Now, suppose that $t \geq 2$. Consider a vertex $v \in V(G)$, and write $G' = G - v$. For each color $c \in L(v)$ and vertex $w \in V(G')$, letting $L'(w)$ be the set of colors in $L(w)$ that are not adjacent to c , G' admits no $(H - L(v), L')$ -coloring. Therefore, by the induction hypothesis, $H[L'(V(G'))] - L(v)$ is isomorphic to $t-2$ disjoint q -blowups of K_{t-1} . Thus, by the regularity of H , $H - L(v)$ is isomorphic to $t-1$ disjoint q -blowups of K_{t-1} . We write A_1, \dots, A_{t-1} for these $t-1$ disjoint q -blowups of K_{t-1} that cover G' .

Now, by our observation above, each color $c \in L(v)$ is adjacent to a single component A_i , and furthermore, for each $w \in V(G')$, c has a neighbor in all vertices of $L(w) \cap V(A_i)$. Therefore, by the regularity of H , H is isomorphic to $t-1$ disjoint q -blowups of K_{t-1} , and the result follows.

(c) If $t = 1$, then we are in Case (b). If $t \geq 2$, then by following the same argument as in (a), (H, L) is a q -blowup of a 2-cover (H', L') of C_{2t+1} . It is easy to check that if H' is isomorphic to C_{4t+2} , then G has an (H, L) -coloring. Therefore, H' is isomorphic to two disjoint copies of C_{2t+1} . \square

For a multigraph F , let \tilde{F} denote the skeleton of F , i.e. the simple graph from which F is obtained by multiplying some edges. In other words, \tilde{F} is the simple graph on $V(F)$ in which u and v are adjacent if and only if $|E_F(u, v)| \geq 1$. For a vertex $v \in V(F)$, let $\tilde{d}(v)$ denote $d_{\tilde{F}}(v)$, the degree of

v in \tilde{F} , which is equal to $|N_F(v)|$.

For a multigraph F , let $m(F) := |E(F)| - |E(\tilde{F})|$. So, $2m(F) = \sum_{v \in V(F)} (d_F(v) - \tilde{d}_F(v))$.

Given a function $h : V(F) \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ with $h(v) \geq d_F(v)$ for each $v \in V(F)$, define $\sigma_h(F) := \sum_{v \in V(F)} (h(v) - d_F(v))$. For a positive integer j , let $V_j(F)$ and $V_j^-(F)$ denote the sets of vertices $v \in V(F)$ with $h(v) = j$ and $h(v) < j$, respectively, in F .

Lemma 3.2. *Let $k \geq 5$ and $\alpha = \frac{k-2}{2k-7}$. Suppose that T is a GDP-tree and $h : V(T) \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ satisfies*

- (i) $3 \leq h(v) \leq k-1$ for each $v \in V(T)$,
- (ii) $h(v) \geq d_T(v)$ for each $v \in V(T)$, and
- (iii) T has neither $(k-1)$ -regular nor $(k-2)$ -regular blocks.

Then

$$\Phi_k(T) := \alpha \sigma_h(T) + m(T) + |V_{k-1}^-(T)| - |V_{k-1}(T)| > 1 + \alpha. \quad (9)$$

Proof. We use induction on the number of blocks in T .

Suppose first that T has exactly one block. If T is a single vertex v , then $d_T(v) = 0$. So, if $h(v) \leq k-2$, then $V_{k-1}(T) = \emptyset$ and by (i), $\sigma_h(T) = h(v) - d_T(v) \geq 3$, implying that $\Phi_k(T) = \alpha(h(v) - d_T(v)) + 1 \geq 3\alpha + 1 > 1 + \alpha$. Otherwise, $|V_{k-1}(T)| = 1$ and

$$\Phi_k(T) = \alpha(h(v) - d_T(v)) - 1 = \alpha(k-1) - 1 = \alpha - 1 + \frac{(k-2)^2}{2k-7} > 1 + \alpha$$

for $k \geq 5$, again implying (9). Suppose T has two vertices, say v_1 and v_2 , and $j \geq 1$ edges, so $d_T(v_1) = d_T(v_2) = j$, $|V(T)| = 2$ and $m(T) = j-1$. By (i)–(iii), $j \leq k-3$. We can write $\Phi_k(T)$ in the form $\Phi_k(T) = \sum_{i=1}^2 \Phi'_k(v_i)$, where

$$\Phi'_k(v_i) = \alpha(h(v_i) - d_T(v_i)) + \frac{j-1}{2} + |V_{k-1}^-(T) \cap \{v_i\}| - |V_{k-1}(T) \cap \{v_i\}|.$$

For each $i \in \{1, 2\}$, if $h(v_i) = k-1$, then since $j \leq k-3$ and $k \geq 5$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi'_k(v_i) &= \alpha(k-1-j) + \frac{j-1}{2} + 0 - 1 = \alpha(k-1) - \frac{3}{2} - \frac{3j}{4k-14} \\ &\geq \alpha(k-1) - \frac{3}{2} - \frac{3k-9}{4k-14} = \frac{2k^2 - 15k + 34}{2(2k-7)} > 1. \end{aligned}$$

If $h(v_i) < k-1$, then

$$\Phi'_k(v_i) \geq \begin{cases} 0 + \frac{j-1}{2} + 1 - 0 \geq \frac{3}{2} & \text{if } j \geq 2 \\ \alpha(3-j) + 0 + 1 - 0 > 2 & \text{if } j = 1 \end{cases}$$

Thus in all cases, $\Phi_k(T) = \sum_{i=1}^2 \Phi'_k(v_i) > 2 \geq 1 + \alpha$, as claimed.

If T has more than two vertices, then T is a multiple of a cycle or a complete graph. In particular, T is j -regular for some $1 \leq j \leq k-3$. Similarly to above, we can write $\Phi_k(T) = m(T) + \sum_{v \in V(T)} \Phi_k(v)$, where

$$\Phi_k(v) = \alpha(h(v) - d_T(v)) + |V_{k-1}^-(T) \cap \{v\}| - |V_{k-1}(T) \cap \{v\}|.$$

For every $v \in V_{k-1}^-(T)$, $\Phi_k(v) \geq 0 + 1 - 0 = 1$. If $j \leq k - 4$, then for every $v \in V_{k-1}(T)$,

$$\Phi_k(v) = \alpha(k - 1 - j) + 0 - 1 \geq 3\alpha - 1 \quad (10)$$

In this case, $\Phi_k(T) \geq |V(T)| \geq 3 \cdot \min\{1, 3\alpha - 1\} > 1 + \alpha$, and we are done. Thus, we suppose $j = k - 3$. Then instead of (10), we get

$$\Phi_k(v) = \alpha(k - 1 - j) + 0 - 1 = 2\alpha - 1 = \frac{3}{2k - 7} > 0. \quad (11)$$

So if $|V_{k-1}^-(T)| + m(T) \geq 2$, then $\Phi_k(T) > 2 > 1 + \alpha$, as claimed. Otherwise, G is a simple $(k - 3)$ -regular graph and $|V_{k-1}^-(T)| \leq 1$. It follows that $G = K_{k-2}$ and by (11),

$$\Phi_k(T) \geq (k - 2)(2\alpha - 1) = (k - 2)\frac{3}{2k - 7} = 3\alpha > 1 + \alpha.$$

This proves the base of induction.

Now, let $b \geq 1$, and suppose that the lemma holds for GDP-trees with at most b blocks, and that T has $b + 1 \geq 2$ blocks. Let R be a root block in T , and let B be a peripheral block, that is, a block in T whose distance from R in the block cut tree of T is maximum. Choose B so that the cut vertex u in B has the minimum number of neighbors in B . Let $s = |V(B)| - 1$.

Let $T' = T - (V(B) - u)$. Then T' is a GDP-tree satisfying (i)–(iii) and has fewer blocks than T . So, by induction, $\Phi_k(T') > 1 + \alpha$. Since T is a GDP-tree, B is j -regular for some $1 \leq j \leq k - 3$. In particular, $d_T(u) - d_{T'}(u) = j$, and the multiplicity of every existing edge in B is the same, say q . Suppose first that $s = 1$, so that $V(B) = \{u, v\}$. If $v \in V_{k-1}^-(T)$, then $\Phi_k(T) \geq \Phi_k(T') - \alpha j + (j - 1) + 1 - 0 \geq \Phi_k(T')$. If $v \in V_{k-1}(T)$, then since $j \leq k - 3$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_k(T) - \Phi_k(T') &= -\alpha j + (j - 1) - 1 + \alpha(k - 1 - j) = j(1 - 2\alpha) - 2 + \alpha(k - 1) \\ &\geq (k - 3)(1 - 2\alpha) - 2 + \alpha(k - 1) = -\frac{3(k - 3)}{2k - 7} - 2 + \frac{(k - 1)(k - 2)}{2k - 7} = \frac{k^2 - 10k + 25}{2k - 7} \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, suppose $s \geq 2$. Then

$$\tilde{B} \text{ is } t\text{-regular for some } t \geq 2, \text{ and } j = qt \geq 2q. \quad (12)$$

For each $v \in (V(B) - u) \cap V_{k-1}(T)$, v contributes $\alpha(k - 1 - j) + 0 - 1$ to $\Phi_k(v)$, and for each $v \in (V(B) - u) \cap V_{k-1}^-(T)$, v contributes at least 1 to $\Phi_k(v)$. For two adjacent vertices $x, y \in V(B)$, the q edges in $E_B(x, y)$ contribute $q - 1$ to $\Phi_k(T) - \Phi_k(T')$ due to the increase in $m(T)$. Moreover, for each neighbor $x \in V(B)$ of u , the q edges in $E_G(u, x)$ contribute an additional $-\alpha q$ to $\Phi_k(T) - \Phi_k(T')$ due to the decrease in $h(u) - d_T(u)$. Note that $s \geq \frac{j}{q}$, and B has at least $(s + 1)q$ edges, so $m(B) \geq (s + 1)(q - 1)$.

If $j \leq k - 4$, then by (12), $k \geq 4 + j \geq 4 + t \geq 6$. In this case, each vertex $v \in V(B) - u$ contributes at least $\min\{\alpha(k - 1 - j) - 1, 1\} \geq \min\{3\alpha - 1, 1\} \geq \alpha$ to $\Phi_k(T)$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_k(T) - \Phi_k(T') &\geq s\alpha + (s + 1)(q - 1) - \frac{j}{q}(q\alpha) = \alpha(s - j) + (s + 1)(q - 1) \\ &\geq \alpha(s - j) + j - s + q - 1 = (j - s)(1 - \alpha) + q - 1 \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

since the third expression is nonnegative when $s \geq j$, and the last expression is nonnegative when $j \geq s$.

Otherwise, $j = k - 3$, so each vertex $v \in V(B) - u$ contributes at least $\min\{\alpha(k - 1 - j) - 1, 1\} = \min\{2\alpha - 1, 1\} = 2\alpha - 1$ to $\Phi_k(T)$. If $q \geq 2$, then $j = qt \geq 4$. Then, by (12), $k = 3 + j \geq 7$. If $s = 2$, then B is a 3-cycle, so j is even and $m(B) = \frac{3j}{2} - 3 \geq j - 1$ since $j \geq 4$. If $s \geq 3$, then $m(B) = \frac{j-t}{2}(s+1) \geq \frac{j}{4}(3+1) = j$. Hence, $m(B) \geq j - 1$.

So, $m(B) - \alpha(d_T(u) - d_{T'}(u)) \geq j - 1 - \alpha j = (j - 1)(1 - \alpha) - \alpha$. Therefore, since $s \geq 2$ and $j \geq 3$,

$$\Phi_k(T) - \Phi_k(T') \geq (j - 1)(1 - \alpha) - \alpha + s(2\alpha - 1) \geq 2(1 - \alpha) - \alpha + 4\alpha - 2 = \alpha > 0.$$

The remaining possibility is that $j = k - 3$ and $q = 1$, which means that $B = K_{k-2}$. Then $d_{T'}(u) = d_T(u) - j \leq 2$, so write $N_{T'}(u) = \{u_1, u_2\}$ (possibly, $u_2 = u_1$).

We say a tree T_0 is good if T_0 is a GDP-tree satisfying (i)–(iii) with fewer blocks than T and $V(T_0) \subseteq V(T) - (V(B) - u)$. By induction, $\Phi_k(T_0) > 1 + \alpha$. In the remainder of the proof, we will demonstrate $\Phi_k(T) - \Phi_k(T_0) \geq 0$, which proves the lemma. We will often use the fact that

- (*) Each $v \in (V(B) - u) \cap V_{k-1}^-(T)$ contributes 1 to $|V_{k-1}^-(T) \cap \{v\}|$, and
each $v \in (V(B) - u) \cap V_{k-1}(T)$ contributes $2\alpha - 1$ to $\alpha(h(v) - d_T(v)) - |V_{k-1}(T) \cap \{v\}|$,

so the vertices in $V(B) - u$ collectively contribute at least $(k - 3) \min\{1, 2\alpha - 1\} = (k - 3)(2\alpha - 1)$ to $\Phi_k(T)$.

Write $T'' = T' - u$ and observe that T'' is a good tree. Since B is peripheral, u_1 and u_2 are in the same block, say B_0 . Hence, B_0 is either a K_2 or a cycle.

Case 1: Assume $u_1 = u_2$, so $N_{T'}(u) = \{u_1\}$. Note that u contributes no less than -1 to $\Phi_k(T)$.

If $d_T(u) = k - 2$, then $h(u_1) - d(u_1)$ decreases exactly by 1. Together with (*),

$$\Phi_k(T) - \Phi_k(T'') \geq -\alpha - 1 + (k - 3)(2\alpha - 1) = \alpha(2k - 7) - (k - 2) = 0.$$

If $d_T(u) = k - 1$, then $m(B_0) = 1$ and $d_T(u_1) - d_{T''}(u_1) = 2$. Together with (*),

$$\Phi_k(T) - \Phi_k(T'') \geq -2\alpha + 1 - 1 + (k - 3)(2\alpha - 1) = \alpha(2k - 8) - (k - 3) = \frac{k - 5}{2k - 7} \geq 0.$$

For the remaining cases, assume $u_1 \neq u_2$, so $d_T(u) = k - 1$. As B is chosen so that the cut vertex of B has minimum degree in B over all cut vertices of peripheral blocks of T , B_0 is not peripheral, and thus T has at least three blocks.

Case 2.1: $|V(B_0)| \geq 4$, so B_0 is a cycle of length at least 4, and $u_1 u_2$ is not an edge. Obtain T_1 from T'' by adding the edge $u_1 u_2$, so T_1 is a good tree. Then u contributes -1 to $\Phi_k(T) - \Phi_k(T_1)$. Together with (*),

$$\Phi_k(T) - \Phi_k(T_1) \geq -1 + (k - 3)(2\alpha - 1) = \alpha(2k - 6) - (k - 2) > 0.$$

Case 2.2: $|V(B_0)| = 3$ and $d_T(u_1) = 2$. Obtain T_2 from T'' by deleting u_1 , so that T_2 is a good tree. Then $d_T(u_2) - d_{T_2}(u_2) = 2$, and u_1 contributes to $\Phi_k(T) - \Phi_k(T_2)$ either $\alpha(k - 1 - 2) - 1$

(when $h(u_1) = k - 1$) or at least 1 (when $h(u_1) \leq k - 2$). As in Case 2.1, u contributes -1 to $\Phi_k(T) - \Phi_k(T_2)$. Together with (*),

$$\Phi_k(T) - \Phi_k(T_2) \geq -2\alpha + (3\alpha - 1) - 1 + (k - 3)(2\alpha - 1) = \alpha(2k - 5) - (k - 1) = \frac{3}{2k - 7} > 0.$$

By the symmetry between u_1 and u_2 , the last case is as follows.

Case 2.3: $|V(B_0)| = 3$ and both u_1 and u_2 are cut vertices. For $i \in \{1, 2\}$, let B_i be a block of T containing u_i and distinct from B_0 . Since B is peripheral, at least one of B_1, B_2 also is peripheral, say B_1 . Then by the choice of B , B_1 is $(k - 3)$ -regular, and so by the previous cases, $B_1 = K_{k-2}$. In this case, $T_3 = T - V(B) - V(B_1)$ is a good tree. Then $d_T(u_2) - d_{T_3}(u_2) = 2$, and each of u, u_1 contributes -1 to $\Phi_k(T) - \Phi_k(T_2)$. Together with (*) for both B and B_1 ,

$$\Phi_k(T) - \Phi_k(T_3) \geq -2\alpha - 2 + 2(k - 3)(2\alpha - 1) = 2\alpha(2k - 7) - 2(k - 2) = 0.$$

This proves the lemma. □

4 Properties of a minimum counterexample G

For the rest of the paper, we fix a counterexample G , which is a loopless multigraph with a function $h : V(G) \rightarrow \{0, \dots, k - 1\}$, to Theorem 2.1 with minimum $|V(G)|$. We also fix an h -cover (H, L) of G such that G does not have an (H, L) -coloring. For every $uv \in E(G)$, we assume $E_H(L(u), L(v))$ is the union of $|E_G(u, v)|$ maximal matchings. We write $L(v) = \{1_v, \dots, t_v\}$, where $t = |L(v)|$.

4.1 General observations

We make some observations about our minimum counterexample G and the potentials of its subgraphs.

Observation 4.1. G has no vertex v for which $h(v) = 0$.

Proof. If $V(G) = \{v\}$, then $\rho_h(G) = \rho_h(v) = -2$, so G is not a counterexample. If $|V(G)| \geq 2$, then $G[\{v\}]$ is a proper subgraph of G that is not DP h -colorable, contradicting the assumption that G is h -minimal. □

Observation 4.2. For each induced subgraph $X \subseteq G$, X is not DP $(h - d_G + d_X)$ -colorable.

Proof. Let (H, L) be an h -cover of G for which G admits no (H, L) -coloring. As G is h -minimal, $G - V(X)$ has an (H, L) -coloring f . Now, let H' be the restriction of H to $L(V(X))$, and for each $x \in V(X)$, let $L'(x) \subseteq L(x)$ consist of the colors in $L(x)$ that are not adjacent to a color of f . As G has no (H, L) -coloring, f cannot be extended to X ; therefore, X has no (H', L') -coloring. As $|L'(x)| \geq h(x) - d_G(x) + d_X(x)$ for each $x \in V(X)$, X is not DP $(h - d_G + d_X)$ -colorable. □

Observation 4.3. For each vertex $v \in V(G)$, $h(v) \leq d(v)$.

Proof. We let $X = G[v]$. By Observation 4.2, X is not DP $(h - d_G + d_X)$ -colorable. This implies that $h(v) - d_G(v) + d_X(v) = h(v) - d(v) \leq 0$, completing the proof. □

We say that a vertex $v \in V(G)$ is low if $h(v) = d(v)$.

Lemma 4.4. *If $U \subseteq V(G)$ is a set of low vertices, then each block of $G[U]$ is isomorphic to K_t^s or C_t^s , for some t and s .*

Proof. Suppose that $G[U]$ contains a block B that is isomorphic to neither K_t^s nor C_t^s . Let (H, L) be an h -cover of G for which G has no (H, L) -coloring. As G is h -minimal, $G - V(B)$ has an (H, L) -coloring f . Now, for each $v \in V(B)$, let $L'(v) \subseteq L(v)$ consist of the colors in $L(v)$ with no neighbor in f . Each $v \in V(B)$ is low, so $|L'(v)| \geq d_B(v)$. Then, B has an (H, L') -coloring by Theorem 1.7, and thus G is (H, L) -colorable, a contradiction. \square

Lemma 4.5. *For each $j \geq 1$, if $S \subsetneq V(G)$ satisfies $|E_G(S, \overline{S})| \geq j$, then $\rho_{G,h}(S) \geq j(\lambda - 2) + 1$.*

Proof. Suppose that the lemma is false, and let j be the smallest value for which the lemma does not hold. Then, G has a set $S \subsetneq V(G)$ for which $\rho_{G,h}(S) \leq j(\lambda - 2)$ and $|E_G(S, \overline{S})| \geq j$. We choose S to be a counterexample to the lemma with largest size.

Let $G' = G - S$. For each vertex $v \in V(G')$, let $h'(v) = \max\{0, h(v) - d_G(v) + d_{G'}(v)\} = \max\{0, h(v) - |E_G(v, S)|\}$. By Observation 4.2, G' is not DP h' -colorable. Therefore, there exists $U \subseteq V(G')$ for which $G'[U]$ has a spanning h' -minimal subgraph. As G is h -minimal, it follows that (G, h) and (G', h') do not agree on U ; therefore, U contains a neighbor u of S . As $h'(u) < k - 1$, $\rho_{G',h'}(U) \leq -2$.

Now, consider the set $S' := U \cup S$, and write $\ell = |E_G(S, U)|$. As U contains a neighbor of S , $\ell \geq 1$. As $\rho_h(v) - \rho_{h'}(v) \leq (\lambda + 2)|E_G(v, S)|$ for each $v \in U$, $\rho_{G,h}(U) \leq -2 + \ell(\lambda + 2)$. We have

$$\rho_{G,h}(S') \leq \rho_{G,h}(U) + \rho_{G,h}(S) - 2\lambda\ell \leq -2 + \ell(\lambda + 2) - \ell(2\lambda) + \rho_{G,h}(S) = -2 - \ell(\lambda - 2) + \rho_{G,h}(S). \quad (13)$$

Now, suppose $j = 1$. Then, $\rho_{G,h}(S) \leq \lambda - 2$, so

$$\rho_{G,h}(S') \leq -2 - \ell(\lambda - 2) + \lambda - 2 = -2 + (1 - \ell)(\lambda - 2) \leq -2.$$

Thus, it follows from the maximality of S that $S' = V(G)$. Therefore, $\rho_h(G) \leq -2$, and G is not a counterexample to Theorem 2.1, a contradiction. This completes the case that $j = 1$.

Next, suppose that $j \geq 2$. Then, as $\rho_{G,h}(S) \leq j(\lambda - 2)$, (13) implies that

$$\rho_{G,h}(S') \leq -2 - \ell(\lambda - 2) + j(\lambda - 2) = -2 + (j - \ell)(\lambda - 2). \quad (14)$$

If $S' = V(G)$, then (14) implies that $\rho_h(G) \leq -2$, and G is not a counterexample to Theorem 2.1. Otherwise, $|E_G(S', \overline{S}')| \geq 1$, so the $j = 1$ case implies that $\rho_{G,h}(S') \geq \lambda - 1$. In both cases by (14), $\ell < j$, so that there is at least one edge in $E_G(S, V(G') \setminus U)$.

Now, since $|E_G(S, U)| = \ell$ and $|E_G(S, \overline{S})| \geq j$, it follows that $|E_G(S', \overline{S}')| \geq |E_G(S, V(G') \setminus U)| \geq j - \ell$. As $1 \leq j - \ell \leq j - 1$, the minimality of j tells us that $\rho_{G,h}(S') > (j - \ell)(\lambda - 2)$, contradicting (14). \square

We can make several observations from Lemma 4.5.

Observation 4.6. *Each vertex subset $U \subseteq V(G)$ satisfies $\rho_h(U) \geq -1$.*

Proof. If $1 \leq |U| \leq |V(G)| - 1$, then $\rho_h(U) \geq \lambda - 1$ by Lemma 4.5. If $|U| = |V(G)|$, then $\rho_h(U) = \rho_h(G) \geq -1$ by our assumption that G is a counterexample to Theorem 2.1. \square

Observation 4.7. For every nonempty proper subset $S \subsetneq V(G)$, $\rho_G(S) \geq \lambda - 1$.

Proof. As $S \subsetneq V(G)$ and G is connected, $|E_G(S, \bar{S})| \geq 1$, so the statement follows by setting $j = 1$ in Lemma 4.5. \square

Lemma 4.8. If G has a nonempty proper subset $S \subsetneq V(G)$ for which $|E_G(S, \bar{S})| = 1$, then $\rho_{G,h}(S) \in \{\lambda - 1, \lambda\}$.

Proof. Suppose that $E_G(S, \bar{S}) = \{x_0 y_0\}$, where $x_0 \in S$ and $y_0 \in \bar{S}$. If we define $h' : V(S) \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ so that $h'(x_0) = h(x_0) - 1$ and $h'(v) = h(v)$ for each $v \in S \setminus \{x_0\}$, Observation 4.2 implies that $G[S]$ is not h' -colorable, and hence S has a subset X for which $G[X]$ has a spanning h' -minimal subgraph. As G is h -minimal, h and h' do not agree on X , so $x_0 \in X$. As $h'(x_0) < k - 1$, $\rho_{G,h'}(X) \leq -2$. As $\rho_h(x_0) - \rho_{h'}(x_0) \leq \lambda + 2$, we have $\rho_{G,h}(X) \leq \rho_{G,h'}(X) + (\lambda + 2) \leq -2 + (\lambda + 2) = \lambda$. By a symmetric argument, \bar{S} has a vertex subset Y containing y_0 for which $\rho_{G,h}(Y) \leq \lambda$.

Now, $\rho_{G,h}(X \cup Y) \leq \lambda + \lambda - 2\lambda = 0$. Therefore, Observation 4.7 implies that $V(G) = X \cup Y$, further implying $X = S$ and $\rho_{G,h}(S) \leq \lambda$. As Observation 4.7 implies that $\rho_{G,h}(S) \geq \lambda - 1$, the proof is complete. \square

Lemma 4.9. G has no vertex v satisfying $h(v) = 1$.

Proof. If $h(v) = 1$, then $\rho_h(v) = \lambda - 2$, contradicting Observation 4.7. \square

Lemma 4.10. If $h(v) \in \{2, \dots, \frac{\lambda-1}{2}\}$, then v is low.

Proof. We have $\rho_h(v) = h(v)\lambda - 1 \leq \lceil \frac{h(v)\lambda-1}{\lambda-2} \rceil (\lambda - 2)$. Then, Lemma 4.5 implies that $d(v) \leq \lceil \frac{h(v)\lambda-1}{\lambda-2} \rceil - 1 = h(v) + \lceil \frac{2h(v)-1}{\lambda-2} \rceil - 1 = h(v)$. \square

Lemma 4.11. G has no vertex v satisfying $h(v) = 2$.

Proof. Suppose that $v \in V(G)$ satisfies $h(v) = 2$. By Lemma 4.10, $d(v) = 2$. Suppose first that v is joined to a neighbor w by a pair of parallel edges. Then, $N(v) = \{w\}$.

Now, let $G' = G - v$. Choose a color $c \in L(v)$, and obtain H' from H by deleting $L(v) \cup N_H(c)$. We may assume without loss of generality that $|L(w) \cap N_H(c)| \geq 2$. Let $L'(w) = L(w) \cap V(H')$, and let $L'(x) = L(x)$ for each $x \in V(G') - w$. If G' has an (H', L') -coloring f' , then we can extend it to G by letting $f'(v) = c$. So assume G' has no (H', L') -coloring. Then there exists a subset $U' \subseteq V(G')$ for which $G'[U']$ has a spanning h' -minimal subgraph. As G is h -minimal and $U' \subsetneq V(G)$, it follows that h' and h do not agree on some vertex of U' ; therefore, $w \in U'$. As $h'(w) < k - 1$, it follows from the minimality of G that $\rho_{G',h'}(U') \leq -2$, so that $\rho_{G,h}(U') \leq -2 + \lambda + (\lambda + 2) = 2\lambda$. Then,

$$\rho_{G,h}(U' + v) \leq 2\lambda - (4\lambda + 1) + (2\lambda - 1) = -2,$$

contradicting Observation 4.6.

Otherwise, suppose $N(v) = \{w, u\}$, where $u \neq w$. By Lemma 4.9, $|L(u)| \geq 2$ and $|L(w)| \geq 2$. We may assume that $\{1_v 1_u, 2_v 2_u, 1_v 1_w, 2_v 2_w\} \subseteq E(H)$.

Obtain G' from $G - v$ by adding an edge uw . Also, let (H', L) be an h -cover of G' obtained by deleting $L(v)$ and then adding the matching $\{1_u 2_w, 2_u 1_w\}$. (Here, we consider h restricted to $V(G')$.) If G' has an (H', L) -coloring f , then we can extend f to v , because if $f(u)$ forbids the color i_v for v , then (due to our new edge uw) $f(w)$ does not forbid the color $(3 - i)_v$ for v . Thus, G' has an h -minimal subgraph G'' containing u and w . Let $U' = V(G'')$.

As $|V(G')| < |V(G)|$, it follows from our induction hypothesis that $\rho_{G',h}(U') \leq -2$ or G'' is a copy of K_k . If $\rho_{G',h}(U') \leq -2$, then $G[U' \cup \{v\}]$ is constructed by deleting an edge uw from G' , adding a vertex v with $h(v) = 2$, and adding two edges vu and vw ; hence,

$$\rho_{G,h}(U' \cup \{v\}) \leq -2 + (2\lambda - 1) - 2(2\lambda) + (2\lambda + 1) = -2,$$

contradicting Observation 4.6. Therefore, G'' is a copy of K_k , and $h(x) = k - 1$ for each $x \in U'$.

Then, writing $U = U' \cup \{v\}$,

$$\rho_{G,h}(U) = k + (2\lambda - 1) - 2(2\lambda) + 2\lambda = k - 1.$$

For $k \geq 5$,

$$2\lambda - 3 = 2 \left\lceil \frac{k^2 - 7}{2k - 7} \right\rceil - 3 \geq \frac{2k^2 - 14}{2k - 7} - 3 = k - 1 + \frac{3k}{2k - 7} > k - 1,$$

so by Lemma 4.5, $j := |E_G(U, \overline{U})| \leq 1$.

If $j = 0$, then $U = V(G)$, every vertex of G is low, and G is not a GDP-tree. Therefore, G is DP h -colorable, a contradiction. If $j = 1$, then write x for the unique vertex of U with a neighbor outside of U . As $d(v) = 2$, $x \neq v$. If $x \notin \{u, w\}$, then each vertex $z \in U' \setminus \{x\}$ is low, and $G'[U' \setminus \{x\}]$ is a 2-connected graph that is not a GDP-tree. Hence, $G'[U' \setminus \{x\}]$ is DP $(h - d_G + d_{G'[U' \setminus \{x\}]})$ -colorable, contradicting Observation 4.2.

Otherwise, $x \in \{u, w\}$. We claim that $G[U]$ is DP $(h - d_G + d_{G[U]})$ -colorable. For each $z \in U$, we write $h'(z) = h(z) - d_G(z) + d_{G[U]}(z)$, and we observe that $h'(x) = k - 2 \geq 3$, and $h'(z) = h(z)$ for each $z \in U \setminus \{x\}$. Consider an h' -cover (H', L') of $G[U]$. We assign a color $c \in L'(x)$ to x with no neighbor in $L(v)$; this is possible, as $|L(v)| = h'(v) = 2 < |L'(x)|$. Afterward, each vertex $z \in U \setminus \{x\}$ has at least $d_{G[U \setminus \{x\}]}(z)$ colors in $L'(z)$ not adjacent to c . Furthermore, v has two colors in $L(v)$ not adjacent to c , while v has only one neighbor in $U \setminus \{x\}$. Hence, we can finish an (H', L') -coloring of $G[U]$ using degeneracy, contradicting Observation 4.2. \square

Corollary 4.12. *Every vertex v in G satisfies $h(v) \geq 3$.*

Proof. This follows from Lemmas 4.9 and 4.11. \square

Lemma 4.13. *Let $k \geq 5$. If G is 2-connected and $h(v) = k - 1$ for each $v \in V(G)$, then G is not $(k - 1)$ -regular.*

Proof. Suppose G is $(k - 1)$ -regular. As G is h -minimal, Theorem 1.7 implies that G is either $K_t^{\frac{k-1}{t-1}}$ for some $2 \leq t \leq k - 2$ (satisfying $(t - 1)|(k - 1)$) or $C_n^{(k-1)/2}$ for some $n \geq 3$ (provided k is odd). If G is $K_t^{\frac{k-1}{t-1}}$, then

$$\rho_h(G) = t((k - 1)\lambda + 1) - \binom{t}{2} \left(\frac{k - 1}{t - 1} \right) (2\lambda + 1) + \binom{t}{2} = \binom{t + 1}{2} - \frac{1}{2}t(k - 1) = \frac{1}{2}t(t - k + 2).$$

As a function of t , this expression is a convex quadratic and is maximized at $t = 2$. When $t = 2$ and $k \geq 6$, we have $\rho_h(G) = 2 - k + 2 \leq -2$. Similarly, if $k \geq 6$ and $G = C_n^{(k-1)/2}$ (so k is odd), then

$$\rho_h(G) = n((k-1)\lambda + 1) - n \left(\frac{k-1}{2} \right) (2\lambda + 1) + n = n \left(\frac{5}{2} - \frac{1}{2}k \right) \leq -3$$

for $k \geq 7$ and $n \geq 3$.

In both cases, $\rho_h(G) \leq -2$, so G is not a counterexample to Theorem 2.1, a contradiction.

So suppose $k = 5$. If $G = C_n^2$, then Part 2 of Theorem 2.1 holds. If $G = K_t^{\frac{5-1}{t-1}}$ for some $2 \leq t \leq 5-2$, then $t \in \{2, 3\}$. If $t = 2$, then G is isomorphic to K_2^4 . If $t = 3$, then G is isomorphic to C_3^2 . In all cases, Part 2 of Theorem 2.1 holds. \square

4.2 A special set S_0^* of vertices in G

An edge-block in a multigraph G is an inclusion maximal connected subgraph G' of G such that either $|V(G')| = 2$ or G' has no cut edges. In particular, every cut edge forms an edge-block, and each connected graph decomposes into edge-blocks.

Define a special subset $S_0^* \subseteq V(G)$ as follows. If G has no cut edges, then $S_0^* = V(G)$. Otherwise, we fix a smallest pendent edge-block B^* distinct from K_2 and let $S_0^* = V(B^*)$. By Lemma 4.9 and Observation 4.3, a cut edge cannot be a pendent edge-block, so S_0^* is well-defined.

If $B^* \subsetneq G$, then since B^* is pendent, there are $x_0^* \in S_0^*$ and $y_0^* \in V(G) - S_0^*$ such that $x_0^*y_0^*$ is the unique edge connecting B^* with the rest of G . Fix these B^* , S_0^* , x_0^* , y_0^* . By definition, B^* is 2-edge-connected.

We have the following lemma.

Lemma 4.14. *Suppose that $S_0^* \subsetneq V(G)$. For each $S \subseteq V(G)$ satisfying $\emptyset \subsetneq S \cap S_0^* \subsetneq S_0^*$, $\rho_{G,h}(S) \geq 2\lambda - 3$.*

Proof. Recall that $x_0^*y_0^*$ is the cut edge joining S_0^* and $\overline{S_0^*}$. First, suppose that $S \subsetneq S_0^*$. If $\rho_{G,h}(S) \leq 2\lambda - 4$, then by Lemma 4.5, $|E_G(S, \overline{S})| \leq 1$. Then, S and $\overline{S} \cap S_0^*$ are joined by at most one edge, contradicting the 2-edge-connectedness of B^* .

Next, suppose that S is not contained in S_0^* , so that $x_0^*, y_0^* \in S$. We write $G' = G - S_0^*$ and observe that $\rho_{G,h}(V(G')) \leq \lambda$ by Lemma 4.8. We make several claims.

First, we claim that $\rho_{G,h}(S \cap S_0^*) + \rho_{G,h}(V(G')) \geq 4\lambda - 3$. Indeed, as $S \cap S_0^*$ is joined to $S_0^* - S$ by at least two edges, Lemma 4.5 implies that

$$2\lambda - 3 \leq \rho_{G,h}(S \cup (V(G'))) \leq -2\lambda + \rho_{G,h}(S \cap S_0^*) + \rho_{G,h}(V(G')).$$

Rearranging, $\rho_{G,h}(S \cap S_0^*) + \rho_{G,h}(V(G')) \geq 4\lambda - 3$.

Next, we claim that $\rho_{G,h}(S \cap V(G')) \geq \rho_{G,h}(V(G'))$. Indeed, if $V(G') \subseteq S$, then the statement is clearly true. If $S \cap V(G') \subsetneq V(G')$, then as G' is connected, $E_G(S \cap V(G'), \overline{S \cap V(G')})$ contains $x_0^*y_0^*$ as well as at least one additional edge of G' . Therefore, by Lemma 4.5, $\rho_{G,h}(S \cap V(G')) \geq 2\lambda - 3 > \rho_{G,h}(V(G'))$.

Now, putting these claims together,

$$\rho_{G,h}(S) = -2\lambda + \rho_{G,h}(S \cap S_0^*) + \rho_{G,h}(S \cap V(G')) \geq -2\lambda + \rho_{G,h}(S \cap S_0^*) + \rho_{G,h}(V(G')) \geq 2\lambda - 3.$$

□

4.3 Subgraphs induced by low vertices in G

Let \mathcal{B} be the subgraph of G induced by low vertices in G and let \mathcal{B}_0 be the subgraph of \mathcal{B} induced by the vertices of \mathcal{B} in S_0^* . By Lemma 4.4, each block in \mathcal{B} is a multiple of either a complete graph or a cycle. In particular, each such block is regular. Given a $(k-2)$ -regular block $B \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ along with distinct vertices $u, u' \in N(B) \setminus V(B)$, we write $F(B, u, u')$ for the multigraph obtained from $G - V(B)$ by adding an edge uu' .

Lemma 4.15. *If B is a $(k-2)$ -regular block of \mathcal{B} , then the multigraph $F(B, u, u')$ is not DP h -colorable.*

Proof. As G is h -minimal, $G - V(B)$ has an (H, L) -coloring f that does not extend to all of G . For each $v \in V(B)$, we write $L_f(v)$ for the subset of $L(v)$ consisting of colors with no neighbor in f . We write $H' = H[L_f(V(B))]$. As $|L_f(v)| \geq k-2$ for each $v \in V(B)$ and B has no (H', L_f) -coloring, Lemma 3.1 implies that (H', L_f) is one of the blowup covers described in Lemma 3.1. In particular, H' is $(k-2)$ -regular. Thus, $H_f := H[L(V(B))] - V(H')$ is isomorphic to a subgraph of \tilde{B} .

Now, we consider two cases. First, suppose that every component of $H[L(V(B))]$ is isomorphic to H_f . Then, as at least one vertex $v \in V(B)$ satisfies $h(v) = k-1$ (namely the neighbor of u in B), it follows that $H[L(V(B))]$ is isomorphic to $k-1$ disjoint copies of H_f , each of which contains exactly one vertex from $L(v)$ for each $v \in V(B)$. Now, we construct an h -cover (H'', L) of $F(B, u, u')$ as follows. We begin with (H, L) , and we remove $L(V(B))$ from H . Then, we add a perfect matching between $L(u)$ and $L(u')$ so that $c \in L(u)$ and $c' \in L(u')$ are adjacent if and only if c and c' are adjacent to a common component of $H[L(V(B))]$. Then, if $G - V(B)$ has an (H'', L) -coloring f' , the colors $f'(u)$ and $f'(u')$ are adjacent to distinct components of $H[L(V(B))]$. Hence, there is no H_f -component in $H[L(V(B))]$ all of whose vertices are adjacent to f' ; therefore, by Lemma 3.1, f' can be extended to all of G . This contradicts the initial assumption that G is h -minimal, completing the first case.

By Lemma 3.1, the only other case to consider is that $H[L(V(B))]$ has a single component isomorphic to H_f . In this case, H' is a q -blowup of either a clique or a cycle, where $q \geq 2$ is the quotient of $k-2$ and the regularity of \tilde{B} . In particular, \tilde{B} has maximum degree less than $k-2$. Then, we construct an h -cover (H'', L) of $F(B, u, u')$ as follows. We begin with (H, L) , and we remove $L(V(B))$ from H . Then, we add a single edge to H'' joining $f(u)$ and $f(u')$.

Now, suppose that $F(B, u, u')$ has an (H'', L) -coloring f' . By construction, either $f'(u) \neq f(u)$ or $f'(u') \neq f(u')$. Therefore, some vertex of H_f has no neighbor in f' . For each $v \in V(B)$, we let $L''(v)$ be the set of colors $c \in L(v)$ for which c has no neighbor in f' . Then, $H[L''(V(B))]$ is not $(k-2)$ -regular, so by Lemma 3.1, the coloring f' extends to an (H, L) -coloring of G . This contradicts our initial assumption that G is h -minimal.

Therefore, $F(B, u, u')$ is not DP h -colorable. □

By Lemma 4.15, for each $(k-2)$ -regular subgraph $B \subseteq \mathcal{B}$, and any two distinct vertices $u, u' \in N(B) \setminus V(B)$, there is an h -minimal multigraph $G(B, u, u')$ contained in $F(B, u, u')$. As G is h -minimal, $G(B, u, u')$ is not a subgraph of G ; therefore, $G(B, u, u')$ contains u and u' .

Lemma 4.16. *If $S_0^* \neq V(G)$, then the vertex x_0^* is not in a $(k-2)$ -regular block of \mathcal{B} .*

Proof. Suppose x_0^* is in a $(k-2)$ -regular block B of \mathcal{B} . Since B is 2-connected, $y_0^* \notin V(B)$. If there exists a vertex $y_1^* \in N(V(B)) \setminus (V(B) \cup \{y_0^*\})$, let $G' = G(B, y_0^*, y_1^*)$. Recall that $y_0^*, y_1^* \in V(G')$. Since $y_0^*y_1^*$ is a cut edge in G' , it is not part of a K_k -subgraph of G' . Therefore, $\rho_{G',h}(V(G')) \leq -2$, and hence $\rho_{G,h}(V(G')) \leq 2\lambda - 2$. However, the multigraph $G[V(G')]$ is disconnected. As $G[S_0^*]$ is an edge-block of G , $|E_G(V(G') \cap S_0^*, S_0^* \setminus V(G'))| \geq 2$; therefore, by Lemma 4.5, $\rho_{G,h}(V(G') \cap S_0^*) \geq 2\lambda - 3$. Hence, $\rho_{G,h}(V(G') \setminus S_0^*) \leq (2\lambda - 2) - (2\lambda - 3) < \lambda - 1$, contradicting Observation 4.7.

Suppose now that $V(B)$ has no neighbor in $V(G) \setminus (V(B) \cup \{y_0^*\})$. Then every vertex $u \in V(B) - x_0^*$ satisfies $h(u) = k - 2$. Let $b = |V(B)|$, so

$$\rho_{G,h}(V(B)) = -m(B) + (b-1)((k-2)\lambda - 1) + ((k-1)\lambda + 1) - 2\lambda b \left(\frac{k-2}{2} \right) = -m(B) + \lambda + 2 - b.$$

If $b \geq 4$, then $\rho_{G,h}(V(B)) \leq \lambda - 2$, contradicting Observation 4.7. Furthermore, if $2 \leq b \leq 3$, then $m(B) \geq 2$, so again $\rho_{G,h}(V(B)) \leq \lambda - 2$, contradicting Observation 4.7. \square

Lemma 4.17. *If $k \geq 5$, then \mathcal{B}_0 does not contain K_{k-1} formed by $(k-1)$ -vertices.*

Proof. Suppose there is a set $C = \{v_1, \dots, v_{k-1}\} \subseteq S_0^*$ consisting of low $(k-1)$ -vertices such that $B := G[C] = K_{k-1}$. For $i \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}$, let v'_i be the unique neighbor of v_i outside of C . Let $C' = \{v'_1, \dots, v'_{k-1}\}$, so that $v_i v'_i \in E(G)$ for each $i \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}$. Since G has no K_k , $|C'| \geq 2$. For distinct $s, t \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}$, write $G_{s,t} = G(B, v'_s, v'_t)$. We will simultaneously consider two cases: If $\rho_h(G_{s,t}) \leq -2$ for some distinct s, t or if $G_{s,t}$ is exceptional for every distinct pair s, t . Let $\varrho(C) = \min\{\rho_h(G_{s,t}) : s, t \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}\}$.

For $j \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}$, define the function

$$g(j) = \begin{cases} 2\lambda + 2j - 5 & \text{if } \rho_h(G_{s,t}) \leq -2 \text{ for some distinct } s, t \text{ (Case 1)} \\ \varrho(C) + 2\lambda + j - 1 & \text{if } G_{s,t} \text{ is exceptional for all distinct } s, t \text{ (Case 2)} \end{cases}$$

For $j \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}$, let $\pi(j)$ be the minimum of $\rho_{G,h}(P)$ over $P \subseteq V(G) \setminus C$ with $|N(P) \cap C| \geq j$. Let $P_j \subseteq V(G) \setminus C$ be such that $|N(P_j) \cap C| \geq j$ and $\rho_{G,h}(P_j) = \pi(j)$.

We will prove that $\pi(k-1) \leq g(k-1)$. For this, let j be the largest value for which $\rho_{G,h}(P_j) \leq g(j)$. If $j = k-1$, then we are done, so assume $j < k-1$. Then $j \geq 2$ since

$$\pi(2) = \rho_{G,h}(P_2) \leq \begin{cases} -2 + (2\lambda + 1) = 2\lambda - 1 = g(2). & \text{(Case 1)} \\ \varrho(C) + (2\lambda + 1) = g(2). & \text{(Case 2)} \end{cases}$$

Assume there are distinct $i, i' \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}$ such that $v'_i \in P_j$ and $v'_{i'} \notin P_j$. Since $V(G_{i,i'}) \cup P_j \supseteq P_j \cup \{v'_{i'}\}$, $V(G_{i,i'}) \cup P_j$ has at least $j+1$ neighbors in C . Thus, Lemma 2.2 implies that

$$\pi(j+1) \leq \rho_{G,h}(P_j \cup V(G_{i,i'})) \leq g(j) + \rho_{G,h}(V(G_{i,i'})) - \rho_{G,h}(P_j \cap V(G_{i,i'})). \quad (15)$$

In Case 2, by Lemma 2.4, $\pi(j+1) \leq g(j) - (k-3)(\lambda-1) + 2 < g(j+1)$, contradicting the maximality of j . In Case 1, $\rho_h(G_{i,i'}) \leq -2$, so as both P_j and $V(G_{i,i'})$ contain $v'_i \in S_0^*$, by Lemma 4.14, $\rho_{G,h}(P_j \cap V(G_{i,i'})) \geq 2\lambda - 3$. Thus, $\pi(j+1) \leq g(j) + (-2 + 2\lambda + 1) - (2\lambda - 3) = g(j) + 2 = g(j+1)$, again contradicting the maximality of j . Therefore, $C' \subseteq J_{k-1}$, so $\pi(k-1) \leq g(k-1)$.

Since $\rho_{G,h}(C) = (k-1)((k-1)\lambda + 1) - 2\lambda \binom{k-1}{2} = (\lambda+1)(k-1)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{G,h}(C \cup P_{C'}) &\leq \rho_{G,h}(C) + g(k-1) - 2\lambda(k-1) = (\lambda+1)(k-1) + g(k-1) - 2\lambda(k-1) = (1-\lambda)(k-1) + g(k-1) \\ &= \begin{cases} (1-\lambda)(k-1) + (2\lambda + 2(k-1) - 5) \leq -2. & \text{(Case 1)} \\ (1-\lambda)(k-1) + (\varrho(C) + 2\lambda + k - 1) \leq (1-\lambda)(k-1) + 2\lambda + 2k - 2 \leq -3. & \text{(Case 2: } k \geq 6) \\ (1-\lambda)(k-1) + (\varrho(C) + 2\lambda + k - 1) \leq (1-\lambda)(k-1) + 2\lambda + k - 1 \leq -4. & \text{(Case 2: } k = 5 \text{ and } \varrho(C) \leq 0) \\ (1-\lambda)(k-1) + (\varrho(C) + 2\lambda + k - 1) = (1-\lambda)(k-1) + 2\lambda + k + 4 = 1. & \text{(Case 2: } k = 5 \text{ and } \varrho(C) = 5) \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

This contradicts Observation 4.6 in all cases except when $k = 5$ and $\varrho(C) = 5$. Since $1 < \lambda - 1$ when $k = 5$, Observation 4.7 implies $C \cup P_{C'} = V(G)$. In particular, $G[P_{C'}]$ is K_5^- and $G[C']$ is K_4^- so $G_{s,t}$ is exceptional only for one pair s, t . Yet, this is impossible since we are in Case 2. \square

Lemma 4.18. \mathcal{B}_0 does not contain a $(k-2)$ -regular block.

Proof. Suppose that \mathcal{B}_0 contains $C = \{v_1, \dots, v_b\}$ such that $B := G[C]$ is a $(k-2)$ -regular block. Let M be the set of $(k-2)$ -vertices in C . For all $v_i \in C - M$, let v'_i be the unique neighbor of v_i outside of C . Since G is h -minimal, $G - C$ has an (H, L) -coloring f . We write H_f for the set of colors in H above B that are adjacent to f . For each $v_i \in C$, we write $L_f(v_i) = L(v_i) \setminus V(H_f)$. Since $|L_f(v)| = d_B(v)$ for each $v \in V(B)$ and B is not $(H[L_f(C)], L_f)$ -colorable, Theorem 1.7 implies that B is a multiple of either a cycle or a complete graph.

If B is isomorphic to K_{k-1} , then by Lemma 3.1, $H[L_f(C)]$ consists of $k-2$ copies of the graph K_{k-1} . In particular, $H[L_f(C)]$ is $(k-2)$ -regular. By Lemmas 4.17, M is nonempty, so H_f is a complete graph on at most $k-2$ vertices; in particular, H_f is not $(k-2)$ -regular.

If B is not isomorphic to K_{k-1} , then by Lemma 3.1, every component of $H[L_f(C)]$ is a $(k-2)$ -regular q -blowup of a cycle or a complete graph for some q . More precisely, writing t for the regularity of \tilde{B} , $q = \frac{k-2}{t}$. Therefore, H_f is a subgraph of \tilde{B} , and hence each vertex of H_f has degree at most $t < k-2$. In particular, H_f is not $(k-2)$ -regular.

As H_f is a component of $H[L_f(C)]$, which is not $(k-2)$ -regular,

$$\forall v_i \in C - M, \text{ the color } f(v'_i) \in L(v'_i) \text{ is adjacent to the unique color } \alpha_{v_i} \in L(v_i) \cap H_f. \quad (16)$$

If $M = C$, then

$$\rho_h(M) = -m(B) + b((k-2)\lambda - 1) - 2\lambda \frac{b(k-2)}{2} = -m(B) + b((k-2)\lambda - 1 - (k-2)\lambda) = -m(B) - b \leq -4,$$

contradicting Observation 4.6. So $M \neq C$.

Fix a vertex $v_i \in C - M$, let $G_i = G - C$, and let L_i differ from $L|_{V(G)-C}$ only in that $f(v'_i)$ is deleted from $L(v'_i)$. Correspondingly, h_i differs from h only in that $h_i(v'_i) = h(v'_i) - 1$. By (16), G_i is not $(H[L_i(V(G_i))], L_i)$ -colorable. So, there is an h_i -minimal subgraph G'_i of G_i , and it contains v'_i . Since $h_i(v'_i) \leq k-2$, $G'_i \neq K_{k-1}$, and $\rho_{G_i, h_i}(V(G'_i)) \leq -2$. Then $\rho_{G, h}(V(G'_i)) \leq -2 + (\lambda + 2) = \lambda$. So, by Lemma 4.5, there is a unique edge joining $V(G'_i)$ with $V(G) \setminus V(G'_i)$. Since $C \cap V(G'_i) = \emptyset$, this edge is $v_i v'_i$. Hence each edge connecting C with $V(G) - C$ is a cut edge. As B^* is 2-edge-connected, it follows that $x_0^* \in C$, contradicting Lemma 4.16. \square

5 Discharging

We will use the notions of $\sigma_h(F)$, $\tilde{d}(v)$, and $m(F)$ from Lemma 3.2. By Corollary 4.12, each vertex $v \in V(G)$ satisfies $h(v) \geq 3$.

We show that $\rho_h(G) \leq -2$, proving that G in fact is not a counterexample to Theorem 2.1. We use the following discharging procedure. We write $\alpha = \frac{k-2}{2k-7}$.

1. For each $v \in V(G)$, we give initial charge $\rho_h(v)$ to v . For each pair uv , where $u, v \in V(G)$ are joined by $s \geq 1$ edges, we give initial charge $-s(2\lambda + 1) + 1$ to the pair uv . For each non-adjacent pair $u, v \in V(G)$, the initial charge of uv is 0.
2. For each pair uv of adjacent vertices in G , if $s \geq 1$ edges connect u with v , the pair uv receives charge $(s(2\lambda + 1) - 1)/2$ from each of u and v .
3. Each non-low vertex $u \in S_0^*$ takes charge α along each edge e that joins u to a low vertex $v \in S_0^*$.

Now, we investigate the final charges of the vertices in G . For each $v \in V(G)$, we write $ch^*(v)$ for the final charge of v . We observe that the total charge in G is $\rho_h(G)$. Additionally, the final charge of each vertex pair is 0, so $\rho_h(G) = \sum_{v \in V(G)} ch^*(v)$. Finally, if $S_0^* \neq V(G)$, then the total charge in $G[\overline{S_0^*}]$ is at most $\rho_{G,h}(\overline{S_0^*}) - \lambda \leq 0$ by Lemma 4.8. Therefore,

$$\rho_h(G) = \sum_{v \in V(G)} ch^*(v) \leq \sum_{v \in S_0^*} ch^*(v). \quad (17)$$

For each $v \in S_0^*$, if $d(v) \geq 1 + h(v)$, then we consider several cases.

(N1) If $d(v) \leq k - 1$, then $h(v) \leq k - 2$, so

$$ch^*(v) \leq (h(v)\lambda - 1) - d(v)\lambda + \alpha d(v) = \lambda(h(v) - d(v)) - 1 + \alpha d(v) \leq -\lambda - 1 + \alpha d(v) < -1.$$

(N2) If $d(v) = k$, then

$$ch^*(v) \leq ((k - 1)\lambda + 1) - k\lambda + \alpha k = -\lambda + 1 + \alpha k \leq 0.$$

(N3) If $d(v) \geq k + 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned} ch^*(v) &\leq ((k - 1)\lambda + 1) - d(v)\lambda + \alpha d(v) \\ &\leq ((k - 1)\lambda + 1) - (k + 1)\lambda + \alpha(k + 1) = (-\lambda + 1 + \alpha k) - \lambda + \alpha < -1. \end{aligned}$$

For each $v \in S_0^*$, if $d(v) = h(v) = j$ for some fixed $j \in \{3, \dots, k - 1\}$, then we consider two cases:

(L1) If $j \leq k - 2$, then

$$ch^*(v) \leq (j\lambda - 1) - j\lambda - \frac{d(v) - \tilde{d}(v)}{2} - \alpha(d_{B^*}(v) - d_{B_0}(v)) = -1 - \frac{d(v) - \tilde{d}(v)}{2} - \alpha(d_{B^*}(v) - d_{B_0}(v)).$$

(L2) If $j = k - 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned} ch^*(v) &\leq (k-1)\lambda + 1 - (k-1)\lambda - \frac{d(v) - \tilde{d}(v)}{2} - \alpha(d_{B^*}(v) - d_{\mathcal{B}_0}(v)) \\ &= 1 - \frac{d(v) - \tilde{d}(v)}{2} - \alpha d_{B^*}(v) + \alpha d_{\mathcal{B}_0}(v). \end{aligned}$$

We claim that \mathcal{B}_0 is nonempty. Indeed, suppose that \mathcal{B}_0 is empty. As $d(v) \geq 1 + h(v)$ for each $v \in S_0^*$ we have the following inequality instead of (N1)–(N3):

$$ch^*(v) \leq (h(v)\lambda + 1) - d(v)\lambda = (h(v) - d(v))\lambda + 1 \leq -\lambda + 1 < -2.$$

Then, by (17), $\rho_h(G) < -2|S_0^*| \leq -2$, so G is not a counterexample. Thus, we assume that $\mathcal{B}_0 \neq \emptyset$, or equivalently, that S_0^* contains at least one low vertex.

Lemma 5.1. *If B is a component of \mathcal{B}_0 , then $\sum_{v \in V(B)} ch^*(v) < -1$.*

Proof. We note that $d_{B^*}(v) = h(v)$ for $v \in V(B) \setminus \{x_0^*\}$, and $d_{B^*}(x_0^*) = h(x_0^*) - 1$ whenever $x_0^* \in V(\mathcal{B}_0)$. Hence, by (L1)–(L2),

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{v \in V(B)} ch^*(v) &\leq |V_{k-1}(B)| - |V_{k-1}^-(B)| - \sum_{v \in V(B)} \left(\frac{d(v) - \tilde{d}(v)}{2} \right) - \alpha \sum_{v \in V(B)} (h(v) - d_{\mathcal{B}_0}(v)) + \alpha \\ &= |V_{k-1}(B)| - |V_{k-1}^-(B)| - m(B) - \alpha \sigma_h(B) + \alpha = -\Phi_k(B) + \alpha. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the α term accounts for the possibility that $x_0^* \in V(B)$, in which case $-d_{B^*}(x_0^*) = -h(x_0^*) + 1$.

By Corollary 4.12, Condition (i) of Lemma 3.2 holds for $T = B$. Condition (ii) holds because the vertices in B are low. By Lemma 4.18, B has no $(k-2)$ -regular block. If B is $(k-1)$ -regular, then as B is low and G is connected, $G = B$, which contradicts Lemma 4.13. Therefore, Condition (iii) holds. So, by Lemma 3.2, $\sum_{v \in V(B)} ch^*(v) \leq -\Phi_k(B) + \alpha < -1$. \square

Now, by (N1)–(N3), the vertices of $S_0^* \setminus \mathcal{B}_0$ have total nonpositive charge. Therefore,

$$\rho_h(G) = \sum_{v \in V(G)} ch^*(v) \leq \sum_{v \in S_0^*} ch^*(v) \leq \sum_{v \in \mathcal{B}_0} ch^*(v).$$

As $\mathcal{B}_0 \neq \emptyset$, Lemma 5.1 implies that $\sum_{v \in \mathcal{B}_0} ch^*(v) < -1$. Therefore, $\rho_h(G) < -1$, and as $\rho_h(G)$ is integral, $\rho_h(G) \leq -2$. This completes the proof.

6 Bound for list coloring

We say that G is (H, L) -minimal if G has no (H, L) -coloring but every proper subgraph G' of G has an $(H[L(V(G'))], L|_{V(G')})$ -coloring.

Theorem 6.1. *Let $k \geq 5$, and let G be a multigraph with a function $h : V(G) \rightarrow \{0, \dots, k-1\}$. Suppose that G has no exceptional subgraph. If (H, L) is an h -cover of G and G is (H, L) -minimal, then $\rho_h(G) \leq -2$.*

Proof. Suppose for the sake of contradiction that $\rho_h(G) \geq -1$. As G is (H, L) -minimal, no vertex $v \in V(G)$ satisfies $h(v) = 0$. By Theorem 2.1, G is not h -minimal. Since G is not DP h -colorable, G has a proper subgraph G_0 that is h -minimal. Since G has no exceptional subgraph, Theorem 2.1 implies that $\rho_{G,h}(V(G_0)) \leq -2$. We let $G_1 \supseteq G_0$ be a maximal subgraph of G for which $\rho_{G,h}(V(G_1)) \leq -2$, and we observe that $V(G_1) \subsetneq V(G)$. By the (H, L) -minimality of G , G_1 has an (H, L) -coloring f .

Now, define $G' = G - V(G_1)$. We observe that for each $v \in V(G')$, if $|E_G(v, V(G_1))| = j$, then $h(v) \geq j + 1$. Indeed, if $j = 0$, then the inequality is clear. If $j \geq 1$ and $h(v) \leq j$, then $\rho_{G,h}(V(G_1) \cup \{v\}) \leq -2 + j\lambda + 1 - 2j\lambda < -2$, contradicting the maximality of G_1 .

For each vertex $v \in V(G')$, write $h'(v) = h(v) - |E_G(v, V(G_1))|$. By our previous observation, $h'(v) \geq 1$ for each $v \in V(G')$. Consider a vertex subset $U \subseteq V(G')$, and let $j = |E_G(U, V(G_1))|$. By the maximality of G_1 ,

$$-1 \leq \rho_{G,h}(V(G_1) \cup U) \leq -2 - 2j\lambda + \rho_{G,h}(U).$$

Rearranging, $\rho_{G,h}(U) \geq 1 + 2j\lambda$, which implies that $\rho_{G,h'}(U) \geq 1 + j(\lambda - 2)$. Thus, every subgraph G'' of G' satisfies $\rho_{h'}(G'') \geq 1$, and hence by Theorem 2.1, G' has no h' -critical subgraph. Therefore, G' is DP h' -colorable, and thus f can be extended to an (H, L) -coloring of G . This contradicts the original assumption that G is (H, L) -minimal, completing the proof. \square

Corollary 6.2. *If $k \geq 5$, $\lambda = \left\lceil \frac{k^2-7}{2k-7} \right\rceil$, and $n \geq k + 2$, then $f_\ell(n, k) \geq (k - 1 + \frac{1}{\lambda}) \frac{n}{2} + \frac{1}{\lambda}$.*

Proof. Let G be a list k -critical multigraph on $n \geq k + 2$ vertices and m edges. As G has no k -critical proper subgraph, G is K_k -free. Furthermore, as G is list k -critical, G has no parallel edges. Therefore, G has no exceptional subgraph. Let $L' : V(G) \rightarrow \text{Pow}(\mathbb{N})$ be a list assignment for which $|L'(v)| \geq k - 1$ for every $v \in V(G)$ and G has no L' -coloring.

Now, we construct a $(k - 1)$ -cover (H, L) of G for which the L' -coloring and the (H, L) -coloring problems on G are equivalent. As G has no L' -coloring and is list k -critical, it follows that G is (H, L) -minimal. Therefore, by Theorem 6.1, $\rho_h(G) = (k\lambda + 1)n - 2\lambda m \leq -2$. Rearranging, $m \geq (k - 1 + \frac{1}{\lambda}) \frac{n}{2} + \frac{1}{\lambda}$. \square

References

- [1] A. Bernshteyn and A. Kostochka. Sharp Dirac's theorem for DP-critical graphs. *J. Graph Theory*, 88(3):521–546, 2018.
- [2] A. Y. Bernshteyn, A. V. Kostochka, and S. P. Pron'. On DP-coloring of graphs and multigraphs. *Sibirsk. Mat. Zh.*, 58(1):36–47, 2017.
- [3] O. V. Borodin. Problems of coloring and of covering the vertex set of a graph by induced subgraphs (in Russian). Novosibirsk, 1979. Thesis (Ph.D.)–Novosibirsk State University.
- [4] P. Bradshaw, I. Choi, A. Kostochka, and J. Xu. A lower bound on the number of edges in DP-critical graphs. II. Four colors. 2024. In preparation.
- [5] D. W. Cranston and L. Rabern. Edge lower bounds for list critical graphs, via discharging. *Combinatorica*, 38(5):1045–1065, 2018.
- [6] G. A. Dirac. Note on the colouring of graphs. *Math. Z.*, 54:347–353, 1951.

- [7] G. A. Dirac. A property of 4-chromatic graphs and some remarks on critical graphs. J. London Math. Soc., 27:85–92, 1952.
- [8] G. A. Dirac. Some theorems on abstract graphs. Proc. London Math. Soc. (3), 2:69–81, 1952.
- [9] G. A. Dirac. The structure of k -chromatic graphs. Fund. Math., 40:42–55, 1953.
- [10] G. A. Dirac. Map colour theorems related to the Heawood colour formula. II. J. London Math. Soc., 32:436–455, 1957.
- [11] G. A. Dirac. A theorem of R. L. Brooks and a conjecture of H. Hadwiger. Proc. London Math. Soc. (3), 7:161–195, 1957.
- [12] G. A. Dirac. The number of edges in critical graphs. J. Reine Angew. Math., 268/269:150–164, 1974.
- [13] Z. Dvořák and L. Postle. Correspondence coloring and its application to list-coloring planar graphs without cycles of lengths 4 to 8. J. Combin. Theory Ser. B, 129:38–54, 2018.
- [14] P. Erdős, A. L. Rubin, and H. Taylor. Choosability in graphs. In Proceedings of the West Coast Conference on Combinatorics, Graph Theory and Computing (Humboldt State Univ., Arcata, Calif., 1979), volume XXVI of Congress. Numer., pages 125–157. Utilitas Math., Winnipeg, MB, 1980.
- [15] T. Gallai. Kritische Graphen. I. Magyar Tud. Akad. Mat. Kutató Int. Közl., 8:165–192, 1963.
- [16] T. Gallai. Kritische Graphen. II. Magyar Tud. Akad. Mat. Kutató Int. Közl., 8:373–395, 1963.
- [17] H. Kierstead and L. Rabern. Improved lower bounds on the number of edges in list critical and online list critical graphs. Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B, 140:147–170, 2020.
- [18] A. Kostochka and M. Yancey. Ore’s conjecture on color-critical graphs is almost true. J. Combin. Theory Ser. B, 109:73–101, 2014.
- [19] A. Kostochka and M. Yancey. A Brooks-type result for sparse critical graphs. Combinatorica, 38(4):887–934, 2018.
- [20] A. V. Kostochka and M. Stiebitz. A new lower bound on the number of edges in colour-critical graphs and hypergraphs. Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B, 87(2):374–402, 2003.
- [21] M. Krivelevich. On the minimal number of edges in color-critical graphs. Combinatorica, 17(3):401–426, 1997.
- [22] M. Krivelevich. An improved bound on the minimal number of edges in color-critical graphs. Electron. J. Combin., 5:Research Paper 4, 4, 1998.
- [23] L. Rabern. A better lower bound on average degree of 4-list-critical graphs. Electron. J. Combin., 23(3):Paper 3.37, 5, 2016.
- [24] L. Rabern. A better lower bound on the average degree of online k -list-critical graphs. Electron. J. Combin., 25(1):Paper No. 1.51, 15, 2018.
- [25] G. Ringel. Map color theorem, volume 209 of Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften. Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1974.
- [26] V. G. Vizing. Coloring the vertices of a graph in prescribed colors. Diskret. Analiz, (29):3–10, 101, 1976.