

Indicated list colouring game on graphs

Yangyan Gu^{*} Yiting Jiang[†] Huan Zhou[‡] Jialu Zhu[§] Xuding Zhu[¶]

February 25, 2025

Abstract

Given a graph G and a list assignment L for G , the indicated L -colouring game on G is played by two players: Ann and Ben. In each round, Ann chooses an uncoloured vertex v , and Ben colours v with a colour from $L(v)$ that is not used by its coloured neighbours. If all vertices are coloured, then Ann wins the game. Otherwise after a finite number of rounds, there remains an uncoloured vertex v such that all colours in $L(v)$ have been used by its coloured neighbours, Ben wins. We say G is indicated L -colourable if Ann has a winning strategy for the indicated L -colouring game on G . For a mapping $g : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, we say G is indicated g -choosable if G is indicated L -colourable for every list assignment L with $|L(v)| \geq g(v)$ for each vertex v , and G is indicated degree-choosable if G is indicated g -choosable for $g(v) = d_G(v)$ (the degree of v). This paper proves that a graph G is not indicated degree-choosable if and only if G is an expanded Gallai-tree - a graph whose maximal connected induced subgraphs with no clique-cut are complete graphs or blow-ups of odd cycles, along with a technical condition (see Definition 7). This leads to a linear-time algorithm that determines if a graph is indicated degree-choosable. A connected graph G is called an IC-Brooks graph if its indicated chromatic number equals $\Delta(G) + 1$. Every IC-Brooks graph is a regular expanded Gallai-tree. We show that if $r \leq 3$, then every r -regular expanded Gallai-tree is an IC-Brooks graph. For $r \geq 4$, there are r -regular expanded Gallai-trees that are not IC-Brooks graphs. We give a characterization of IC-Brooks graphs, and present a linear-time algorithm that determines if a given graph of bounded maximum degree is an IC-Brooks graph.

1 Introduction

Assume G is a graph and L is a list assignment that assigns to each vertex v of G a set $L(v)$ of permissible colours. An L -colouring of G is a proper colouring ϕ of G with $\phi(v) \in L(v)$ for each vertex v . We say that G is L -colourable if there exists an L -colouring of G , and G is k -choosable if G is L -colourable for any list assignment L of G with $|L(v)| \geq k$ for each vertex v . More generally, for a function $g : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, we say G is g -choosable if G is L -colourable for every list assignment L with $|L(v)| \geq g(v)$ for all $v \in V(G)$. The *choice number* $ch(G)$ of G is the minimum k for which G is k -choosable.

^{*}School of Mathematical Sciences, Zhejiang Normal University, Email: yangyan@zjnu.edu.cn,

[†]Institute of Mathematics, School of Mathematical Sciences, Nanjing Normal University, Email: ytjiang@njnu.edu.cn, Grant number: NSFC 12301442, BK20230373, 23KJB110018.

[‡]Université Paris Cité, CNRS, IRIF, F-75006, Paris, France; School of Mathematical Sciences, Zhejiang Normal University, Email: huanzhou@zjnu.edu.cn, Grant number: ANR-18-IdEx-0001.

[§]School of Mathematical Sciences, Zhejiang Normal University, Email: jialuzhu@zjnu.edu.cn,

[¶]School of Mathematical Sciences, Zhejiang Normal University, Email: xdzhu@zjnu.edu.cn, Grant numbers: NSFC 12371359.

List colouring of graphs is a natural generalization of classical graph colouring, introduced independently by Erdős-Rubin-Taylor [7] and Vizing [25] in 1970's, and has been studied extensively in the literature.

In this paper, we study a game version of list colouring problem. Given a list assignment L of G , the *indicated L -colouring game* on G is played by two players: Ann and Ben. Initially, each vertex is uncoloured. In each round, Ann chooses an uncoloured vertex v and Ben assigns to v a colour $c \in L(v)$ that has not been assigned to any of its coloured neighbors. Ann wins the game if all vertices of G are coloured. Otherwise, after some round, there remains an uncoloured vertex v such that all colours in $L(v)$ have been assigned to neighbours of v , and rendering v uncolourable, and Ben wins. We say G is *indicated L -colourable* if Ann has a winning strategy for the indicated L -colouring game.

If $L(v) = \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ for all vertices v , then the indicated L -colouring game is called an *indicated k -colouring game* and G is *indicated k -colourable* if Ann has a winning strategy for the indicated k -colouring game. The *indicated chromatic number* of G is defined as

$$\chi_i(G) = \min\{k : G \text{ is indicated } k\text{-colourable}\}.$$

The concept of indicated k -colouring game and the parameter $\chi_i(G)$ was introduced by Grytczuk and first studied by Grzesik [19]. The list indicated colouring game was introduced in [11].

Definition 1. Assume G is a graph and $g : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is a mapping. We say G is *indicated g -choosable* if G is indicated L -colourable for any list assignment L of G for which $|L(v)| \geq g(v)$ for each vertex v . If $g(v) = k$ for every vertex v , then indicated g -choosable is also called *indicated k -choosable*. The *indicated choice number* of G , denoted by $ch_i(G)$, is the least integer k such that G is indicated k -choosable.

Definition 2. A *degree-list assignment* of G is a list assignment L with $|L(v)| \geq d_G(v)$ for each v . If $|L(v)| = d_G(v)$ for all v , L is a *tight degree-list assignment*. A graph G is *indicated degree-choosable* if it is indicated g -choosable for $g(v) = d_G(v)$.

Game version of many graph theory problems have been studied in the literature. By introducing an adversary in the process of getting a solution to a graph theory problem, it may help to reveal critical structural properties that are obstacles or essential to the existence of a solution.

A few graph colouring games are studied in the literature.

One graph colouring game was invented first by Bram [9], and re-invented by Bodlaender [2]. Given a graph G and a set C of colours. Two players, Alice and Bob, take turns to colour uncoloured vertices of G properly with colours from C . Alice's goal is to produce a proper colouring of the whole graph, and Bob's goal is the opposite. The *game chromatic number* of G is the minimum number of colours needed for Alice to have a winning strategy in the game. A benchmark problem is to determine the maximum game chromatic number of planar graphs. The current known upper and lower bounds are 17 and 7, respectively [13, 27].

Another graph colouring game is an online version of the list colouring of graphs, introduced by Schauz [24]. Given a graph with each vertex v be given a set of $g(v)$ tokens, the *g -painting game* is played by two players: Lister and Painter. In each round, Lister chooses a subset M of uncoloured vertices and removes one token from each vertex in M , and Painter colours an independent set I of G that is a subset of M . Painter wins if all vertices are coloured and Lister wins if some uncoloured vertex has no token left. We say G is *g -paintable* if Painter has a winning

strategy for the g -painting game. One challenging open problem is to determine the minimum number of vertices in a k -choosable but not k -paintable graph [20, 21, 28].

The Ramsey online game, introduced independently by Beck [1] and Kurek and Ruciński [14], is not directly related to vertex colouring of graphs. However, its definition is similar to that of indicated colouring of graphs, and this game, together with the game chromatic number of a graph, inspired Grytczuk to invent the indicated k -colouring game. The Ramsey online game has two players: Builder and Painter: Given a set of vertices. In each round, Builder presents an uncoloured edge, and Painter colours the edge by red or blue. Builder's goal is to force a monochromatic graph with certain property in a fewest number of steps (possibly with the restriction that the constructed graph belongs to a restricted family of graphs), and Painter's goal is the opposite. The game was studied a lot in the literature [5, 6, 8, 10, 12, 15], and results and ideas in the study of the Ramsey online game were used to improve the upper bound for some classical Ramsey numbers [6].

Compared to the graph colouring games above, indicated list colouring game considers more basic steps in the original procedure of list colouring. The action of colouring one vertex is split into two smaller steps: select one vertex, then colour it. Instead of optimizing the choice of colours, one optimizes at selecting vertices only. An adversary chooses the colour for the chosen vertex. The question in concern is how much this restriction affects the colourability.

A trivial upper bound $\chi(G) \leq \Delta(G) + 1$ for the chromatic number still holds for the indicated chromatic number: $\chi_i(G) \leq \Delta(G) + 1$. A classical result in chromatic graph theory is Brooks' Theorem, which states that this upper bound is tight for a connected graph G if and only if G is a complete graph or an odd cycle. This result was extended by Borodin [3] and Erdős, Rubin and Taylor [7], who proved that a connected graph G is not degree-choosable if and only if G is a Gallai-tree, i.e., each block of G is either a complete graph or an odd cycle.

In this paper, we are interested in the corresponding results in the setting of indicated colouring game and indicated list colouring game. Which graphs are indicated degree-choosable? What is the Brooks theorem with respect to the indicated chromatic number?

We call a graph G an *IC-Brooks graph* if $\chi_i(G) = \Delta(G) + 1$. We shall characterize indicated degree-choosable graphs and IC-Brooks graphs. The characterization of not degree-choosable graphs introduced the graph class of Gallai-trees, which arises in some other context as well. For the characterization of not indicated degree-choosable graphs, we define a graph class of expanded Gallai-trees. It is a more complex class of graphs, however, graphs in this class are still simple enough to be recognized in linear-time. The characterization of IC-Brooks graphs is a little complicated, however, it leads to a linear-time algorithm that determines if a given graph of bounded maximum degree is an IC-Brooks graph.

Definition 3. Assume G is a connected graph, L is a degree-list assignment of G . If G is not indicated L -colourable, then we say (G, L) is *infeasible*. Otherwise, we say (G, L) is *feasible*.

Note that if L is a list assignment of G , v is a vertex with $|L(v)| > d_G(v)$, then G is indicated L -colourable if and only if $G - v$ is indicated L -colourable. So if (G, L) is infeasible, then L is a tight degree-list assignment of G .

We prove that all infeasible pairs (G, L) can be constructed from (K_1, L_\emptyset) by three simple operations, where $L_\emptyset(v) = \emptyset$ for the unique vertex v of K_1 .

Using this result, we give a characterization of not indicated degree-choosable graphs. To state this characterization, we need some definitions.

For a graph G and a vertex v of G , $N_G(v)$ denotes the set of neighbours of v in G and $N_G[v] = N_G(v) \cup \{v\}$ is the close neighbourhood of v . For an induced subgraph H of G and

$v \in V(H)$, $N_H(v) = N_G(v) \cap V(H)$ and $N_H[v] = N_G[v] \cap V(H)$. For a subset X of $V(G)$, $N_G(X) = \cup_{v \in X} N_G(v)$ and $N_G[X] = \cup_{v \in X} N_G[v]$. For a positive integer n , $[n]$ denotes the set $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$.

Definition 4. Assume G is a graph and $p : V(G) \rightarrow \{1, 2, \dots\}$ is a mapping that assigns to each vertex of G a positive integer. We denote by $G[p]$ the graph obtained from G by blowing up each vertex v into a clique $K(v)$ of order $p(v)$. To be precise, $V(G[p]) = \cup_{v \in V(G)} \{v\} \times [p(v)]$ and for $i \in [p(u)], j \in [p(v)]$, $(u, i)(v, j) \in E(G[p])$ if and only if either $u = v$ and $i \neq j$ or $uv \in E(G)$. The graph $G[p]$ is called a *blow-up* of G .

Definition 5. A *clique cut* in a graph G is a clique K such that $G - V(K)$ is disconnected. A clique-cut K is *elementary* if for any $v \in V(K)$, there are two vertices $x, y \in V(G) - V(K)$ that are disconnected in $G - V(K)$ and connected in $G - (V(K) - \{v\})$. An *expanded block* of G is a maximal connected induced subgraph H of G such that H has no clique-cut. In particular, if G has no clique-cut, then G itself is an expanded block.

Definition 6. Assume G is a graph and $H = C[p]$ is an expanded block of G which is a blow up of an odd cycle C of length at least 5, where each vertex v of C is blow up into a clique $K(v)$ of size $p(v)$. If $uv \in E(C)$ and $K = K(u) \cup K(v)$ is an elementary clique-cut of G , then K is called a *root clique* of H .

Definition 7. A connected graph G is an expanded Gallai-tree if each expanded block of G is either a complete graph or a blow-up of an odd cycle, and each expanded block that is a blow-up of an odd cycle of length at least 5 has at most one root-clique.

For an expanded Gallai-tree G , we denote by \mathcal{B}_G the set of expanded blocks that have a root clique. For $H \in \mathcal{B}_G$, let $\pi_G(H)$ be the root-clique of H in G . For each clique-cut K of G , let

$$\mathcal{B}_{G,K} = \{H \in \mathcal{B}_G : \pi_G(H) = K\}.$$

It follows from the definition that a blow-up of a Gallai-tree is an expanded Gallai-tree. However, not every expanded Gallai-tree is a blow-up of a Gallai-tree. See Fig. 5 for an example.

The following result characterizes graphs that are not indicated degree-choosable.

Theorem 1. A connected graph G is not indicated degree-choosable if and only if G is an expanded Gallai-tree.

By Theorem 1, an IC-Brooks graph is a regular expanded Gallai-tree. Theorem 4 in Section 8 gives a characterization of IC-Brooks graphs (some technical definitions are needed in the characterization). Using this characterization, we show that for $r \leq 3$, every r -regular expanded Gallai-tree is indeed an IC-Brooks graph. For $r \geq 4$, we give examples of r -regular expanded Gallai-trees that are not IC-Brooks graphs. The characterization (Theorem 4) may seem not very simple. However, it leads to a linear-time algorithm that determines if an r -regular expanded Gallai-tree is an IC-Brooks graph. We show that although not every regular expanded Gallai-tree is an IC-Brooks graph, every expanded Gallai-tree is an induced subgraph of an IC-Brooks graph. This shows that the structure of IC-Brooks graphs are complicated and we do not expect a very clean and simple characterization.

Our results have some other consequences. It was conjectured in [11] that all IC-Brooks graphs with $\Delta(G) = r$ contains K_{r+1}^- (complete graph K_{r+1} minus one edge) as a subgraph, and proved that the conjecture holds for graphs G with $\Delta(G) \leq 3$ [11]. It follows from our results that the conjecture fails when $\Delta(G) \geq 4$.

It was proved in [11] that every IC-Brooks graph has $\omega(G) \geq (\Delta(G) + 1)/2$. Our results imply an improvement of this bound: $\omega(G) \geq \frac{2}{3}(\Delta(G) + 1)$. This bound is tight. There are IC-Brooks graphs with $\omega(G) = \frac{2}{3}(\Delta(G) + 1)$.

The relation between the chromatic number and indicated chromatic number of graphs was studied in [19]. It was proved in [19] that for any positive integer n , there is a graph G with $\chi(G) \geq n$ and $\chi_i(G) = \frac{4}{3}\chi(G)$. Our results imply that there are graphs G with arbitrary large chromatic number for which $\chi_i(G) > (\frac{3}{2} - \epsilon)\chi(G)$ for any $\epsilon > 0$. It remains an open question whether $\chi_i(G) \leq C\chi(G)$ for some constant C .

2 Equivalent definition and some basic properties

This section proves some basic lemmas concerning indicated L -colourability of graphs. Lemma 1, whose proof is trivial and omitted, can be viewed as an alternate definition of indicated L -colourability, and will be the working definition in the remainder of the paper.

Definition 8. Assume G is a graph, L is a list assignment of G , X is a subset of $V(G)$, and ϕ is an L -colouring of $G[X]$. Then L^ϕ is the list assignment of $G - X$ defined as

$$L^\phi(v) = L(v) - \phi(N_G(v) \cap X),$$

for each vertex $v \in V(G) - X$. Here $\phi(A) = \{\phi(x) : x \in A\}$. If $X = \{v\}$ is a single vertex, $c \in L(v)$ and $\phi(v) = c$, then we denote L^ϕ by $L^{v \rightarrow c}$.

Lemma 1. Assume G is a graph and L is a list assignment of G . If G has a single vertex v , then G is indicated L -colourable if and only if $L(v) \neq \emptyset$. Assume $|V(G)| \geq 2$. Then the following are equivalent:

1. G is not indicated L -colourable.
2. For each vertex $v \in V(G)$, there is a colour $c \in L(v)$ such that $G - v$ is not indicated $L^{v \rightarrow c}$ -colourable.
3. For any subset X of G , there is an L -colouring ϕ of $G[X]$ such that $G - X$ is not indicated L^ϕ -colourable.

Corollary 1. Assume G is a graph, L is a list assignment of G and v is a vertex of G such that $L(v) = \{c\}$ consists of a single colour. Then G is not indicated L -colourable if and only if $G - v$ is not indicated $L^{v \rightarrow c}$ -colourable.

Lemma 2. Assume G is connected and L is a degree-list assignment of G . If (G, L) is infeasible, then L is tight.

Proof. Assume to the contrary that $|L(v)| > d_G(v)$. Order the vertices of G as v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n so that $v_n = v$ and each vertex v_i with $i < n$ has a neighbour v_j with $j > i$. It is obvious that choosing vertices in this order is a winning strategy for Ann. \square

Lemma 3. Assume (G, L) is an infeasible pair and v is a vertex of G . If $G - v$ is connected and not indicated $L^{v \rightarrow c}$ -colourable, then $c \in L(x)$ for all $x \in N_G(v)$.

Proof. It is easy to see that $L^{v \rightarrow c}$ is a degree-list assignment of $G - v$. If $c \notin L(x)$ for some $x \in N_G(v)$, then $L^{v \rightarrow c}$ is not tight. By Lemma 2, $G - v$ is indicated $L^{v \rightarrow c}$ -colourable, a contradiction. \square

Lemma 4. Assume (G, L) is an infeasible pair and v is a vertex of G . Then $L(v) \subseteq \cup_{u \in N(v)} L(u)$.

Proof. Assume to the contrary that $c \in L(v) \setminus \cup_{u \in N(v)} L(u)$. For any L -colouring ϕ of $G - v$, $c \in L^\phi(v)$. Then G is indicated L -colourable, a contradiction. \square

3 Three graph operations

Two vertices x and y of a graph G are *adjacent twins* if $N_G[x] = N_G[y]$.

Definition 9. Assume G is a graph, L is a degree-list assignment of G and v is a vertex of G .

1. For a colour $c \notin L(x)$ for any $x \in N_G[v]$, $D_{v,c}(G, L) = (G', L')$ is defined as follows:

G' is obtained from G by adding a vertex v' and adding edges $v'x$ for $x \in N_G[v]$, and L' is the list assignment of G' defined as

$$L'(x) = \begin{cases} L(x) \cup \{c\}, & \text{if } x \in N_G[v], \\ L(v) \cup \{c\}, & \text{if } x = v', \\ L(x), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We call the pair (G', L') obtained from (G, L) by *duplicating* v (see Fig. 1).

2. Assume $d_G(v) = 2$. $T_v(G, L) = (G', L')$ is the pair defined as follows:

G' is obtained from G by replacing v with a path $[v_1, v_2, v_3]$ and with each of v_1 and v_3 adjacent to one neighbor of v , and L' is a list assignment of G' defined as $L'(x) = L(x)$ for $x \in V(G) - \{v\}$ and $L'(v_i) = L(v)$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$.

We call the pair (G', L') obtained from (G, L) by *tripling the vertex* v (see Fig. 2).

Definition 10. Assume for $i = 1, 2$, G_i is a graph and L_i is a list assignment of G_i and v_i is a vertex of G_i such that $L_1(v_1) \cap L_2(v_2) = \emptyset$. Let G be obtained from the disjoint union of G_1 and G_2 by identifying v_1 and v_2 into a single vertex v^* . Let L be the list assignment of G defined as $L(v) = L_i(v)$ if $v \in V(G_i) - \{v_i\}$ and $L(v^*) = L_1(v_1) \cup L_2(v_2)$. Then we say (G, L) is the *vertex sum* of (G_1, L_1) and (G_2, L_2) with respect to vertices v_1, v_2 , and write $(G, L) = (G_1, L_1) \oplus_{(v_1, v_2)} (G_2, L_2)$ (see Fig. 3).

Lemma 5. If (G, L) is infeasible, $v \in V(G)$ and $c \notin \cup_{x \in N_G[v]} L(x)$, then $D_{(v,c)}(G, L)$ is infeasible.

Proof. Let $(G', L') = D_{(v,c)}(G, L)$. It is obvious that L' is a degree-list assignment of G' . We prove by induction on the number of vertices of G that G' is not indicated L' -colourable. By Lemma 1, it suffices to show that for any vertex x of G' , there is a colour $a \in L'(x)$ such that $G' - x$ is not indicated $L'^{x \rightarrow a}$ -colourable.

Assume x is a vertex of G . If $x \neq v, v'$, then there is a colour $a \in L(x)$ such that $(G - x, L^{x \rightarrow a})$ is infeasible. It is easy to verify that $(G' - x, L'^{x \rightarrow a}) = D_{(v,c)}(G - x, L^{x \rightarrow a})$. By induction hypothesis, $(G' - x, L'^{x \rightarrow a})$ is infeasible.

If $x = v$ or v' , then $(G' - x, L'^{x \rightarrow c}) = (G, L)$. Hence $(G' - x, L'^{x \rightarrow c})$ is infeasible. Therefore (G', L') is infeasible. \square

Lemma 6. If (G, L) is infeasible, $v \in V(G)$ and $d_G(v) = 2$, then $T_v(G, L)$ is infeasible.

Proof. Let $(G', L') = T_v(G, L)$. Again, it is obvious that L' is a degree-list assignment of G' , and it suffices to show that for any vertex x of G' , there is a colour $c \in L'(x)$ such that $(G' - x, L'^{x \rightarrow c})$ is infeasible.

Assume x is a vertex of G' . If $x \notin N_{G'}[v_1] \cup N_{G'}[v_3]$, then let $a \in L(x)$ be a colour such that $(G - x, L^{x \rightarrow a})$ is infeasible. Then $(G' - x, L'^{x \rightarrow a}) = T_v(G - x, L^{x \rightarrow a})$. Hence by induction hypothesis, $(G' - x, L'^{x \rightarrow a})$ is infeasible. If $x \neq v_2$ is adjacent to v_1 , then let $a \in L(x)$ be a colour such that $(G - x, L^{x \rightarrow a})$ is infeasible. By Lemma 3, $a \in L'(v_1) = L(v)$. By applying Corollary 1 to v_1, v_2 successively with respect to $(G - x, L^{x \rightarrow a})$, we obtain a pair $(G' - \{x, v_1, v_2\}, L'') = (G - x, L^{x \rightarrow a})$, which is infeasible. Hence $(G' - x, L'^{x \rightarrow a})$ is infeasible.

The case $x \neq v_2$ is adjacent to v_3 is symmetric.

It remains to show that for $x \in \{v_1, v_2, v_3\}$, there is a colour $c \in L(x)$ such that $(G' - x, L'^{x \rightarrow c})$ is infeasible.

Assume $L(v) = \{c_1, c_2\}$. By Lemma 1, we may assume that $(G - v, L^{v \rightarrow c_1})$ is infeasible.

If $x = v_2$, then by applying Corollary 1 to v_1 and v_3 with respect to $(G' - v_2, L'^{v_2 \rightarrow c_2})$, we obtain a pair $(G' - \{v_1, v_2, v_3\}, L'') = (G - v, L^{v \rightarrow c_1})$, which is infeasible. Hence $(G' - v_2, L'^{v_2 \rightarrow c_2})$ is infeasible.

If $x = v_1$, then by applying Corollary 1 to v_2, v_3 with respect to $(G' - v_1, L'^{v_1 \rightarrow c_1})$, and we obtain a pair $(G' - \{v_1, v_2, v_3\}, L'') = (G - v, L^{v \rightarrow c_1})$, which is infeasible. Hence $(G' - v_1, L'^{v_1 \rightarrow c_1})$ is infeasible.

The case $x = v_3$ is symmetric.

Therefore (G', L') is infeasible. \square

Lemma 7. If (G_i, L_i) is infeasible for $i = 1, 2$, $v_i \in V(G_i)$ and $L_1(v_1) \cap L_2(v_2) = \emptyset$, then $(G, L) = (G_1, L_1) \oplus_{(v_1, v_2)} (G_2, L_2)$ is infeasible.

Proof. Let v^* be the new vertex identified by v_1 and v_2 . We need to show that for any vertex v of G , there is a colour $c \in L(v)$ such that $(G - v, L^{v \rightarrow c})$ is infeasible. If $v = v^*$, then let $c \in L_1(v_1)$ be a colour such that $(G_1 - v_1, L_1^{v_1 \rightarrow c})$ is infeasible. Then $(G - v^*, L^{v^* \rightarrow c})$ is infeasible, as $(G_1 - v_1, L_1^{v_1 \rightarrow c})$ is a connected component of $(G - v^*, L^{v^* \rightarrow c})$.

Assume $v \neq v^*$. Without loss of generality, assume $v \in V(G_1)$. Let $c \in L_1(v)$ be a colour such that $(G_1 - v, L_1^{v \rightarrow c})$ is infeasible. Then $(G - v, L^{v \rightarrow c}) = (G_1 - v, L_1^{v \rightarrow c}) \oplus_{(v_1, v_2)} (G_2, L_2)$. By induction hypothesis, $(G - v, L^{v \rightarrow c})$ is infeasible. \square

4 Constructible infeasible pairs

Assume G and G' are graphs, L and L' are list assignment of G and G' , respectively. If $f : G \rightarrow G'$ is an isomorphism and $g : \bigcup_{v \in V(G)} L(v) \rightarrow \bigcup_{v \in V(G')} L'(v)$ is a bijection such that for each vertex v of G , $L'(f(v)) = \{g(c) : c \in L(v)\}$, then we say (G, L) and (G', L') are isomorphic. We do not distinguish (G, L) and (G', L') , unless otherwise specified explicitly.

Definition 11. Let \mathcal{W} be the minimum set of pairs (G, L) for which the following hold:

1. $(K_1, L_\emptyset) \in \mathcal{W}$, where $v \in V(K_1)$ and $L_\emptyset(v) = \emptyset$.
2. If $(G, L) \in \mathcal{W}$ and $v \in V(G)$, then $D_v(G, L) \in \mathcal{W}$.
3. If $(G, L) \in \mathcal{W}$, $v \in V(G)$ and $d_G(v) = 2$, then $T_v(G, L) \in \mathcal{W}$.
4. If for $i = 1, 2$, $(G_i, L_i) \in \mathcal{W}$, $v_i \in V(G_i)$ and $L_1(v_1) \cap L_2(v_2) = \emptyset$, then $(G_1, L_1) \oplus_{(v_1, v_2)} (G_2, L_2) \in \mathcal{W}$.




Fig. 1: Examples of constructible pairs: duplicating operation.




Fig. 2: Examples of constructible pairs: tripling operation.

In other words, \mathcal{W} is the smallest family of pairs (G, L) that contains (K_1, L_\emptyset) and is closed under the three operations defined in the previous section. From the results in the previous section it follows that all pairs $(G, L) \in \mathcal{W}$ are infeasible. We call pairs $(G, L) \in \mathcal{W}$ *constructible infeasible pairs*.

We shall show that the inverse is also true: all infeasible pairs are contained in \mathcal{W} . In this section, we prove some properties of pairs contained in \mathcal{W} .

First, we present some examples of pairs $(G, L) \in \mathcal{W}$. We denote by $\Theta_{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_k}$ the *generalized theta graph* consisting of k internally disjoint paths joining two vertices u and v , where the k paths are of lengths n_1, n_2, \dots, n_k , respectively. The two vertices u, v are called the *end vertices* of the generalized theta graph.

Example 1. The following are some examples of constructible infeasible pairs.

1. Starting from (K_1, L_\emptyset) , by duplicating $n-1$ times the vertex v , we obtain (K_n, L_{K_n}) , where L_{K_n} assigns to all vertices the same set of $n-1$ colours.
2. Starting from (K_3, L_{K_3}) , by repeatedly applying the tripling operation, we obtain $(C_{2n+1}, L_{C_{2n+1}})$, where C_{2n+1} is an odd cycle, and $L_{C_{2n+1}}$ assigns to all vertices the same set of 2 colors.
3. Using copies of complete graphs and odd cycles, applying vertex sum operations, we obtain (G, L) , where G is any Gallai-tree, and for each block B of G that is r -regular, C_B is a set of r colours, and $L(v) = \bigcup_B$ is a block of G containing v C_B .
4. Assume $K_{1,n}$ have vertices v, u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n , where v is the center, and u_i are the leaf vertices. Starting from $(K_{1,n}, L_{K_{1,n}})$, Duplicating the center v , we obtain $(\Theta_{1,2,\dots,2}, L_{\Theta_{1,2,\dots,2}})$. Then by applying a sequence of tripling operation to the degree 2 vertices of $\Theta_{1,2,\dots,2}$, we obtain $(\Theta_{1,2k_1,\dots,2k_n}, L_{\Theta_{1,2k_1,\dots,2k_n}})$.




Fig. 3: Examples of constructible pairs: vertex-sum operation.




Fig. 4: Construction of theta graphs




Fig. 5: Construction of a cubic IC-Brooks graph

- Starting with $(\Theta_{1,4,4}, L_{\Theta_{1,4,4}})$, and duplicating the vertices x_2 and y_2 , we obtain the pair $(G, L) \in \mathcal{W}$ as illustrated in Fig. 5.
- Starting from $(C_{6n+3}, L_{C_{6n+3}})$, by repeatedly duplicating each of the vertices of C_{6n+3} into a clique of size m , we obtain an infeasible pair $(G, L) \in \mathcal{W}$ as illustrated in Fig. 6.

It was conjectured in [11] that if $k \geq 3$ and G is a k -regular graph which does not contain K_{k+1}^- as an induced subgraph, then $\chi_i(G) \leq k$. The conjecture was verified for $k = 3$. However, the graph G constructed in (6) of Example 1 disproves this conjecture for $k \geq 4$. The graph G in that example is k -regular for $k = 3m - 1$. By choosing appropriate colours in the duplication process, the list L can be chosen so that $L(v)$ be the same set of k colours. So, the graph G is not indicated k -colourable, and hence $\chi_i(G) = 3m = k + 1$. Note that the clique size of G is $2m < k$, provided that $m \geq 2$.

In [19] it was proved that there are graphs G of an arbitrarily large chromatic number for which $\chi_i(G) = \frac{4}{3}\chi(G)$. The graphs G in (6) of Example 1, with $m = 3n + 1$, have $\chi(G) = 2m + 1$ and $\chi_i(G) = 3m$. So there are graphs G of an arbitrary large chromatic number for which $\chi_i(G) \approx \frac{3}{2}\chi(G)$. In [19] it was conjectured that $\chi_i(G) \leq 2\chi(G)$ for every graph G . This conjecture remains open.

Definition 12. Assume G is a graph and L is a degree-list assignment of G .

- If u, v are two vertices of G with $N_G[u] = N_G[v]$ and $L(u) = L(v)$, then we say $\{u, v\}$ is a pair of adjacent twins of (G, L) .
- If $[v_1, v_2, v_3]$ is a path in G with $d_G(v_1) = d_G(v_2) = d_G(v_3) = 2$ and $L(v_1) = L(v_2) = L(v_3)$, then we say (v_1, v_2, v_3) is a triple of 2-vertices in (G, L) .




Fig. 6: Example of constructible pairs: blow-up of an odd cycle

Definition 13. Assume G is a graph, C_1, C_2, \dots, C_k are odd cycles of length at least 5 that with a common edge uv , $d_G(w) = 2$ for $w \in \cup_{i=1}^k V(C_i) - \{u, v\}$, and $N_G(u) - \cup_{i=1}^k V(C_i) = N_G(v) - \cup_{i=1}^k V(C_i)$. Then we say u, v is a pair of adjacent pseudo-twins of index k . We say u, v is a pair of adjacent pseudo-twins if they are adjacent pseudo-twins of index k for some $k \geq 0$.

For example, the vertices u, v of the graph $(\Theta_{1,2,2,4,4}, L_{\Theta_{1,2,2,4,4}})$ in Fig. 4 are adjacent pseudo-twins of index 2. Note that u, v is a pair of adjacent pseudo-twins on index 0 means that u, v is a pair of adjacent twins.

Lemma 8. If $(G, L) \in \mathcal{W}$ and G is 2-connected, then G contains a pair of adjacent pseudo-twins.

Proof. Since G is 2-connected and $|V(G)| \geq 3$, no vertex-sum operation is applied after the last duplication operation. Assume the last duplication operation creates a pair of adjacent twins $\{u, v\}$. All the later operations applied in the process of constructing (G, L) (if any) are tripling operations. If $\{u, v\}$ is a pair of adjacent pseudo-twins in (G, L) , then after any tripling operation, $\{u, v\}$ remains a pair of adjacent pseudo-twins. If u, v have a common neighbour w which has degree 2, then the operation $T_w(G, L)$ increases by 1 the index of the pseudo-twins. \square

5 Some useful indicated degree-choosable

We shall prove in the next section that if (G, L) is infeasible, then $(G, L) \in \mathcal{W}$. Assume this is not true. Let (G, L) be a counterexample with $|V(G)|$ minimum. By Lemma 1, for any subset X of $V(G)$, there is an L -colouring ϕ of $G - X$ so that $(G[X], L^\phi)$ is infeasible. As L^ϕ is a degree-list assignment of $G[X]$, $G[X]$ is not indicated degree-choosable. I.e., any induced subgraph of G is not indicated degree-choosable. In this section, we prove some particular graphs are indicated degree-choosable, and hence cannot be an induced subgraph of G .

Lemma 9. Assume G is a cycle and L is a degree-list assignment of G . Then (G, L) is infeasible if and only if G is an odd cycle and all vertices v of G have the same list. In particular, even cycles are indicated degree-choosable.

Proof. Assume $C = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n)$ is a cycle, and L is a degree-list assignment of C and (C, L) is infeasible. First we prove that $L(v_i) = L(v_j)$ for all i, j .

Assume to the contrary that $L(v_1) = \{c_1, c_2\}$ and $L(v_2) \neq L(v_1)$.

By Lemma 3, we may assume that $C - v_1$ is not indicated $L^{v_1 \rightarrow c_2}$ -colourable. By repeatedly applying Corollary 1 and Lemma 3, we conclude that there is a sequence of colours c_3, c_4, \dots, c_n such that for $i = 2, 3, \dots, n$, $L(v_i) = \{c_i, c_{i+1}\}$ (hence $c_i \neq c_{i+1}$) and $c_{n+1} = c_1$.

Since $L(v_1) \neq L(v_2)$, we may assume that c_2 is the unique colour in $L(v_1) \cap L(v_2)$. Then by Lemma 3, $G - v_2$ is not $L^{v_2 \rightarrow c_2}$ -colourable. By Corollary 1, this implies that $c_2 \in L(v_n)$, and hence $L(v_n) = \{c_1, c_2\}$, i.e., $c_n = c_2$. This in turn implies that $c_1 \in L(v_{n-1})$ and hence $c_{n-1} = c_1$ and $L(v_{n-1}) = \{c_1, c_2\}$. Repeat this argument, we conclude that $L(v_i) = \{c_1, c_2\}$ for all i , a contradiction.

Assume $L(v_i) = \{c_1, c_2\}$ for all v_i . If C is an odd cycle, then G is not L -colourable and hence not indicated L -colourable. If C is an even cycle, then it follows easily from Corollary 1 that C is indicated L -colourable. \square

Lemma 10. Assume (G, L) is infeasible, $uv \in E(G)$ is contained in a cycle C and $d_G(u) = d_G(v) = 2$. Then $L(u) = L(v)$.

Proof. Let $A = V(G) - V(C)$. Then there is an L -colouring ϕ of A such that $(G - A, L^\phi)$ is infeasible. Thus $L(u) = L^\phi(u) = L^\phi(v) = L(v)$ by Lemma 9. \square

Lemma 11. Assume (G, L) is an infeasible pair, and v, v' are adjacent twins, i.e., $N_G[v] = N_G[v']$. Then (G, L) is obtained from an infeasible (G', L') by duplicating v , where $G' = G - v'$.

Proof. First we show that $L(v) = L(v')$. Otherwise, the restriction of L to $G - \{v, v'\}$ is a non-tight degree-list assignment of $G - \{v, v'\}$. Hence there is an L -colouring of $G - \{v, v'\}$. For any L -colouring ϕ of $G - \{v, v'\}$, L^ϕ is a degree-list assignment of $G[\{v, v'\}]$, which is either non-tight or $L^\phi(v) \neq L^\phi(v')$. In any case, $G[\{v, v'\}]$ is indicated L^ϕ -colourable, a contradiction.

Since G is not indicated L -colourable, there is a colour $c \in L(v')$ such that $G - v'$ is not indicated $L^{v' \rightarrow c}$ -colourable. Since L is a degree-list assignment of G , by Lemma 3, we know that $c \in L(x)$ for all $x \in N_G[v']$. Therefore $(G, L) = D_{v,c}(G - v', L^{v' \rightarrow c})$. \square

Corollary 2. If (G, L) is infeasible, and K is a clique in G and $N_G[u] = N_G[v]$ for all $u, v \in V(K)$. Then there is a set A of $|V(K)| - 1$ colours such that $A \subseteq L(x)$ for all $x \in N_G(v)$ for $v \in V(K)$.

Lemma 12. Assume that $(\Theta_{1,2k_1,2k_2}, L)$ is infeasible, then L is isomorphic to $L_{\Theta_{1,2k_1,2k_2}}$ defined in (4) Example 1. Consequently, $(\Theta_{1,2k_1,2k_2}, L) \in \mathcal{W}$.

Proof. Assume $\Theta_{1,2k_1,2k_2}$ consists of three paths P_1, P_2, P_3 connecting two vertices u and v , where for $i = 1, 2$, P_i has length $2k_i$, and P_3 is a single edge uv .

For $i = 1, 2$, let C_i be the odd cycle induced by the i th path and the edge uv . By Lemma 1, there exists an L -colouring ϕ_i of $G - C_i$ such that (C_i, L^{ϕ_i}) is infeasible. By Lemma 9, $L^{\phi_i}(x) = A_i$ for some 2-colour set A_i for all $x \in V(C_i)$. Note that $A_1 \neq A_2$, for otherwise, let x be the neighbour of v in P_2 , then $\phi_1(x) \in A_1$ and hence $L^{\phi_1}(v) \neq A_1$, a contradiction.

As $A_1 \cup A_2 \subseteq L(u)$ and $|L(u)| = 3$, we conclude that $|A_1 \cap A_2| = 1$, and $L(u) = L(v) = A_1 \cup A_2$. Hence L is isomorphic to $L_{\Theta_{1,2k_1,2k_2}}$. \square

Definition 14. Assume $k_1, k_2, k_3 \geq 2$, and the theta graph θ_{k_1, k_2, k_3} consists of paths $P_i = [u, v_{i,1}, v_{i,2}, \dots, v_{i,k_i-1}, w]$ connecting u and w , for $i = 1, 2, 3$. A graph H obtained from θ_{k_1, k_2, k_3} by adding some edges joining vertices of $V(P_1) \setminus \{u, w, v_{1,1}\}$ and $P_3 \setminus \{u, w\}$ is called a *theta-plus* graph. The two vertices u, w are the *end vertices* of the theta-plus graph.




Fig. 7: Theta-plus graphs, double chorded cycles and near odd-wheels

Lemma 13. Every theta-plus graph is indicated degree-choosable.

Proof. Assume H is a theta-plus graph, and let P_i ($i = 1, 2, 3$) be the paths defined in Definition 14. It follows from the definition that $d_H(v) = 2$ for $v \in V(P_2) \cup \{v_{1,1}\} - \{u, w\}$. Assume to the contrary that L is a degree-list assignment of H and (H, L) is infeasible.

Let $C_1 = P_1 \cup P_2$ and $C_2 = P_2 \cup P_3$. Note that C_1, C_2 are induced odd cycles in H . By Lemma 1, there exists an L -colouring ϕ of $G - V(C_1)$ such that (C_1, L^ϕ) is infeasible. As $d_G(v_{1,1}) = d_G(v_{2,1}) = 2$, $L(v_{1,1}) = L^\phi(v_{1,1}) = L^\phi(u) = L^\phi(v_{2,1}) = L(v_{2,1})$. Similarly, there exists

an L -colouring ψ of $G - V(C_2)$ such that (C_2, L^ψ) is infeasible. Then $L^\psi(u) = L^\psi(v_{2,1}) = L(v_{2,1})$. But $\psi(v_{1,1}) \in L(v_{1,1}) = L(v_{2,1})$. Hence $\psi(v_{1,1}) \in L^\psi(u)$, a contradiction. \square

Definition 15. Assume H is a graph that is obtained from a cycle $C = [v_1v_2 \dots v_l]$ by adding two chords $e_1 = v_iv_j$ and $e_2 = v_sv_t$, where $i < j \leq s < t$. Then we call H is a *double chorded cycle*.

Lemma 14. Any double chorded cycle is indicated degree-choosable.

Proof. Assume H is a double chorded cycle consisting of a cycle $C = [v_1v_2 \dots v_l]$ with two chords $e_1 = v_1v_r$ and $e_2 = v_sv_t$, where $3 \leq r \leq s \leq t - 2 \leq l - 2$.

Assume to the contrary that (H, L) is an infeasible pair.

For $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, l\}$, denote by $P^{i,j}$ the path $[v_i, v_{i+1}, \dots, v_j]$ in C (where indices are modulo l). There are three induced cycles C_1, C_2, C_3 in H , induced by $V(P^{1,r})$, $V(P^{r,s}) \cup V(P^{t,1})$ and $V(P^{s,t})$, respectively.

By Lemma 1, there exists an L -colouring ϕ of $P^{s+1,t-1}$ such that $(G - P^{s+1,t-1}, L^\phi)$ is infeasible. Note that $G - P^{s+1,t-1}$ is a theta graph. By Lemma 12, we may assume that $L(v) = L^\phi(v) = \{a, b\}$ for each $v \in V(C_1) \setminus \{v_1, v_r\}$, $L(v) = L^\phi(v) = \{a, c\}$ for each $v \in V(C_2) \setminus \{v_1, v_r, v_s, v_t\}$, $L(v_1) = L^\phi(v_1) = \{a, b, c\}$, $L^\phi(v_r) = \{a, b, c\} \subseteq L(v_r)$, and $L^\phi(v_t) = L^\phi(v_s) = \{a, c\} \subseteq L(v_t), L(v_s)$.

Similarly, there exists an L -colouring ψ of $P^{2,r-1}$ such that $(G - P^{2,r-1}, L^\psi)$ is infeasible. This implies that there is a set A of two colours, such that $|A \cap \{a, c\}| = 1$, $L(v) = L^\psi(v) = \{a, c\}$ for each $v \in V(C_2) \setminus \{v_1, v_r, v_s, v_t\}$, $L(v) = L^\psi(v) = A$ for each $v \in V(C_3) \setminus \{v_s, v_t\}$.

As $|A \cap \{a, c\}| = 1$, we may assume that $A = \{a, d\}$ or $A = \{c, d\}$, where d is either a new colour, or $d = b$. First we show that $A = \{a, d\}$. Assume to the contrary that $A = \{c, d\}$. Since H contains no even cycle, $P^{t,1}$ and $P^{r,s}$ have different parities. Assume $P^{t,1}$ has even length. By Lemma 1, there is an L -colouring ρ of $P^{t+1,l}$ such that $(H - P^{t+1,l}, L^\rho)$ is infeasible. As $P^{t,1}$ has even length, $\rho(v_i) = \rho(v_{t+1}) \in \{a, c\}$. Then either $L^\rho(v_1) \neq \{a, b\}$ or $L^\rho(v_t) \neq \{c, d\}$. It follows from Lemma 9 that $(H - P^{t+1,l}, L^\rho)$ is not infeasible, a contradiction.

If $r = s$, then $L(v_1) = \{a, b, c\}$ and $L(v_r) = \{a, b, c, d\}$ (a, b, c, d are distinct colours). By Lemma 1, there is an L -colouring τ of $P^{t,l}$ such that $(G - V(P^{t,l}), L^\tau)$ is infeasible. By Lemma 3, $\phi(v_t) \in L(v_{t+1}) \cap L(v_{t-1})$. Hence $\tau(v_t) = a$. Since C_2 is an odd cycle, this implies that $\tau(v_i) = a$. But then $L^\tau(v_1) = L(v_1) \setminus \{a\} \neq L^\tau(v)$ for $v \in C_1 \setminus \{v_1, v_r\}$, contrary to Lemma 9.

Assume $r < s$. Then $d(v_r) = d(v_s) = 3$ and $L(v_r) = L(v_1) = \{a, b, c\}$ and $L(v_s) = L(v_t) = \{a, c, d\}$.

By Lemma 1, there is an L -colouring ϕ_1 of $P^{r+1,s}$ such that $G - V(P^{r+1,s})$ is not indicated L^{ϕ_1} -colourable, and an L -colouring ϕ_2 of $P^{t,l}$ such that $G - V(P^{t,l})$ is not indicated L^{ϕ_2} -colourable. By Lemma 10,

$$L^{\phi_2}(v_1) = \{a, b\} = L^{\phi_1}(v_r). \quad (1)$$

This implies that $\phi_1(v_{r+1}) = \phi_2(v_l) = c$.

We claim that $\phi_1(v_s) = \phi_2(v_t) = a$. By Lemma 3, $\phi_1(v_s) \in L(v_{s+1}) = \{a, d\}$. If $r = s - 1$, $L^{\phi_1}(v_r) \neq \{a, b\}$, a contradiction. If $r < s - 1$, then by Lemma 3, $\phi_1(v_s) \in L(v_{s-1}) = \{a, c\}$. So $\phi_1(v_s) \in \{a, c\} \cap \{a, b\}$, and hence $\phi_1(v_s) = a$. By symmetry, $\phi_2(v_t) = a$.

Since paths $P^{r,s}$ and $P^{t,1}$ have different parities, and all vertices in $P^{r+1,s-1} \cup P^{t+1,l}$ have the same list $\{a, c\}$, this implies that $L^{\phi_2}(v_1) \neq L^{\phi_1}(v_r)$, in contrary to (1). \square

Note that in a double chorded cycle, the two chords need to be "non-crossing". For example, if G is obtained from an odd cycle by duplicating one vertex, then it is a cycle with two crossing

chords, i.e., two chords $e_1 = v_{i_1}v_{j_1}$ and $e_2 = v_{i_2}v_{j_2}$ such that $i_1 < i_2 < j_1 < j_2$. But G is not indicated degree-choosable.

Definition 16. Assume H is obtained from an odd cycle C of length at least 5 by adding a new vertex x adjacent to t vertices on C . If $t \geq 4$ or $t \in \{2, 3\}$ and the neighbours of x are not consecutive vertices of C , then we call H a near odd-wheel.

Lemma 15. Every near odd-wheel is indicated degree-choosable.

Proof. Assume (H, L) is infeasible, and H is a near odd-wheel, consisting an odd cycle C and a vertex x adjacent to t vertices v_1, v_2, \dots, v_t of C and the t vertices occurs in C in this clockwise cyclic order. Let $P_i = C[v_i, v_{i+1}]$ be paths in C from v_i to v_{i+1} in clockwise direction. If $t \geq 4$, then it is easy to check that the subgraph induced by $\cup_{1 \leq i \leq 3} V(P_i) \cup \{x\}$ is a double chorded cycle, and hence H is indicated degree-choosable.

If $t = 2$ or 3 , and v_i, v_{i+1} are not consecutive vertices of C , then G is a theta-plus graph with end vertices v_i and v_{i+1} , and hence H is indicated degree-choosable. \square

Corollary 3. If (G, L) is infeasible, then G does not contain any of the following graphs as an induced subgraph (see Fig. 7 for examples of such graphs):

1. An even cycle.
2. A theta-plus graph.
3. A double chorded cycle.
4. A near odd-wheel.

Lemma 16. If (G, L) is infeasible and G is obtained from an odd cycle $C = [v_1v_2 \dots v_{2k+1}]$ by adding a vertex v adjacent to two consecutive or three consecutive vertices of C , then $(G, L) \in \mathcal{W}$.

Proof. Assume G is obtained from C by adding a vertex v adjacent to v_1, v_2, v_3 , and (G, L) is infeasible. By Lemma 1, there is a colour $c \in L(v)$ such that $(G - v, L^{v \rightarrow c})$ is infeasible. By Lemma 9, we may assume that $L^{v \rightarrow c}(v_i) = \{a, b\}$ for all v_i . By Lemma 3, $L(v_1) = L(v_2) = L(v_3) = \{a, b, c\}$. By symmetry, we also have $L(v) = \{a, b, c\}$. Hence $(G, L) \in \mathcal{W}$. The case v is adjacent to two consecutive vertices of C is proved similarly. \square

Corollary 4. If (G, L) is infeasible and $G - v$ is an odd cycle for some vertex v with $d_G(v) \geq 2$, then $(G, L) \in \mathcal{W}$.

6 All infeasible pairs are constructible

This section proves the following theorem, which shows that all infeasible pairs are constructible.

Theorem 2. A pair (G, L) is infeasible if and only if $(G, L) \in \mathcal{W}$.

Proof. We have already shown that if $(G, L) \in \mathcal{W}$, then (G, L) is infeasible. It remains to show that the converse is true.

Assume the converse is not true, and (G, L) is a counterexample with $|V(G)|$ minimum. It follows from Lemma 10, Lemma 11 that G has no adjacent twins, no triple of 2-vertices. Hence G has no adjacent pseudo-twins. It is also obvious that $G \neq K_2$. Hence $|V(G)| \geq 3$.

We shall derive a sequence of properties of G , that lead to a final contradiction.

Lemma 17. G is 2-connected.

Proof. Assume to the contrary that G has a cut-vertex v . Let G_1, G_2 be two connected induced subgraphs of G such that $V(G_1) \cap V(G_2) = \{v\}$ and $V(G_1) \cup V(G_2) = V(G)$. We choose v so that G_1 has no cut-vertex.

By Lemma 1, for $i = 1, 2$, there is an L -colouring ϕ_i of $G - G_i$ such that (G_i, L^{ϕ_i}) is infeasible. Let $L_i = L^{\phi_i}$.

By the minimality of (G, L) , we know that $(G_i, L_i) \in \mathcal{W}$. Since G_1 has no cut vertex, we conclude that either G_1 has a pair of adjacent twins $u_1 u_2$ with $L_1(u_1) = L_1(u_2)$, or G_1 has an induced path $[u_1, u_2, u_3]$ with $d_{G_1}(u_i) = 2$ and $L_1(u_i) = A$ for a set A of 2 colours.

Assume first that $u_1 u_2$ is a pair of adjacent twins in G_1 with $L_1(u_1) = L_1(u_2)$. Since G has no adjacent twins, $v \in \{u_1, u_2\}$, say $v = u_2$.

By Lemma 1, there is a colour $c \in L(u_1)$ such that $(G - u_1, L^{u_1 \rightarrow c})$ is infeasible. Now v is a cut-vertex of $G - u_1$ or G_1 contains exactly one edge $u_1 u_2$. Hence $(G - u_1, L^{u_1 \rightarrow c}) \in \mathcal{W}$. Thus there are list assignments L'_1 of $G_1 - u_1$ and L'_2 of G_2 such that $(G_1 - u_1, L'_1)$ and (G_2, L'_2) are infeasible (and hence in \mathcal{W}) and $(G - u_1, L^{u_1 \rightarrow c}) = (G_1 - u_1, L'_1) \oplus_{u_2, v} (G_2, L'_2)$. Note that if G_1 contains exactly one edge $u_1 u_2$, then $(G_1 - u_1, L'_1) = (\{u_2\}, L_\emptyset)$ and $L'_2 = L_2$, that is, we consider $(G - u_1, L^{u_1 \rightarrow c})$ as the vertex sum of $(\{u_2\}, L_\emptyset)$ and (G_2, L_2) . Then $D_{u_2, c}(G_1 - u_1, L'_1) \in \mathcal{W}$ and it is easy to check that $(G, L) = D_{u_2, c}(G_1 - u_1, L'_1) \oplus_{u_2, v} (G_2, L'_2)$. Hence $(G, L) \in \mathcal{W}$, a contradiction.

Next we assume that G_1 has an induced path $[u_1, u_2, u_3]$ with $d_{G_1}(u_i) = 2$ and $L_1(u_i) = A$ for a set A of 2 colours. Since G has no such path, we know that $v \in \{u_1, u_2, u_3\}$. Let C be an induced cycle in G_1 containing $u_1 u_2 u_3$. By Lemma 1, C is an odd cycle and there is an L -colouring θ of $X = V(G_1) - V(C)$ such that $(G - X, L^\theta)$ is infeasible. By Lemma 9, all vertices $u \in V(C) - \{v\}$ have $L^\theta(u) = A$. By Lemma 1 again, there is an L^θ -colouring ψ of $V(C) - \{v\}$ such that $(G - X - (V(C) - \{v\}), L^\psi)$ is infeasible. Note that $L^\psi(v) = L(v) - A$, and $L^\psi = L_2$. Therefore $(G, L) = (G_1, L_1) \oplus_{u_i, v} (G_2, L_2)$. So $(G, L) \in \mathcal{W}$, a contradiction. This completes the proof of Lemma 17. \square

Lemma 18. Assume G is 2-connected and X is a subset of vertices that induces a connected subgraph. If any two vertices in $N_G(X) - X$ are contained in a cycle in $G - X$, then $G - X$ is 2-connected.

Proof. Assume to the contrary that any two vertices in $N_G(X) - X$ are contained in a cycle in $G - X$ and $G - X$ is not 2-connected. Let v be a cut-vertex that separates $G - X$ into two subgraphs G_1 and G_2 (i.e., $V(G_1) \cap V(G_2) = \{v\}$). Since any two vertices in $N_G(X) - X$ are contained in a cycle in $G - X$, we conclude that $N_G(X) - X$ are contained in $V(G_i)$ for some $i = 1, 2$. Then v is also a cut-vertex of G , a contradiction. \square

The converse of Lemma 18 is obviously true: If $G - X$ is 2-connected, then any two vertices in $N_G(X) - X$ are contained in a cycle in $G - X$. But we shall not need this.

An *open ear* in a graph G is a path connecting two distinct vertices of degree at least 3 and whose interior vertices (if any) are degree 2 vertices. An open ear is *proper* if it contains at least one interior vertex. It was proved by Whitney [26] that if G is 2-connected and G is not a cycle, then G has an open ear whose deletion results in a 2-connected graph. Given an ear P , we denote by $I(P)$ the set of interior vertices of P and $Z(P)$ the set of the two end vertices of P , and let $V(P) = Z(P) \cup I(P)$.

Lemma 19. If G is 2-connected and G is not a cycle, then G has a vertex v such that $G - v$ is 2-connected or a proper ear P such that $G - I(P)$ is 2-connected.

Proof. The proof is by induction on the number of edges in G . If G is 2-connected and $|E(G)| \leq 4$ then G is a cycle, there is nothing to prove.

Assume G is 2-connected with $|E(G)| \geq 5$, G is not a cycle and the lemma holds for graphs with less edges. By the ear-decomposition theorem, G has either a proper ear P such that $G - I(P)$ is 2-connected, or G has an edge $e = uv$ such that $G - e$ is 2-connected. In the former case, we are done. In the later case, let $G' = G - e$. If G' is a cycle, then the end vertices of e are connected by two proper ears P_1, P_2 , and $G - I(P_1)$ is a cycle, and we are done. Assume G' is not a cycle. By induction hypothesis, G' has a vertex x such that $G' - x$ is 2-connected or a proper ear P such that $G' - I(P)$ is 2-connected. In the former case, $G - x$ is 2-connected and we are done. In the later case, we may assume that $|I(P)| \geq 2$. If $u, v \notin I(P)$, then P is a proper ear in G and we are done.

By symmetry, assume $v \in I(P)$. If $u \in V(P)$, then the part of P connecting v and u is a proper ear P' of G . Let C be the cycle in G induced by $V(P')$. Let C' be any cycle containing v and a vertex $w \notin V(C)$. Then either C' or $C\Delta C'$ is a cycle in $G - I(P')$ containing $Z(P')$, where $C\Delta C'$ denotes the symmetric difference of C and C' . By Lemma 18, $G - I(P')$ is 2-connected and we are done.

Assume $u \notin V(P)$. Then G has a proper ear P' contained in P with $v \in Z(P')$. Assume $Z(P) = \{v', v''\}$ and $Z(P') = \{v', v\}$. If $G - I(P')$ is 2-connected, then we are done. Assume that $G - I(P')$ has a cut-vertex w . Since $G' - I(P)$ is 2-connected, $G - I(P) - w$ is a connected subgraph of $G - I(P') - w$ containing v' . Let Q be the connected component of $G - I(P') - w$ containing $G - I(P) - w$. If $w \in I(P)$, then Q contains both v and v'' . Hence Q contains all vertices of $G - I(P') - w$, a contradiction. Assume $w \notin I(P)$. If $u \neq w$, then u is also contained in Q and hence Q contains edge $e = uv$ and therefore all vertices of $G - I(P') - w$, a contradiction. So $u = w \notin I(P)$. As $u \notin V(P)$, we conclude that $w \neq v''$. Thus v'' is contained in Q and this implies that $V(P) - I(P') \subseteq Q$ and hence Q contains all vertices of $G - I(P') - w$, a contradiction. \square

For the remainder of the proof of Theorem 2, we consider two cases.

Case 1 G has a proper ear P such that $G - I(P)$ is 2-connected.

Since G has no triple of 2-vertices, $I(P)$ has either one vertex w_1 or two adjacent vertices w_1, w_2 . By the minimality of (G, L) and Lemma 8, $G' = G - I(P)$ contains a pair of adjacent pseudo-twins $\{u, v\}$ of index k for some $k \geq 0$. It is easy to verify that G' is not a cycle, and hence $d_{G'}(u) = d_{G'}(v) \geq 3$.

Assume first that $k \geq 1$ and $C = [v, u, v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{2m+1}]$ has length at least 5, and $d_{G'}(v_i) = 2$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, 2m + 1$. As $d_{G'}(u) = d_{G'}(v) \geq 3$, edge uv is contained in at least one other odd cycle C' (which might be a triangle). Since G contains no triple of 2-vertices, some v_i is adjacent to $I(P)$. Note that $|N_G(I(P)) - I(P)| = 2$. Assume $|N_G(I(P)) \cap V(C)| = 2$. If the two vertices in $N_G(I(P)) \cap V(C)$ are two consecutive vertices of C , then the subgraph of G induced by $I(P) \cup V(C) \cup V(C')$ is a double chorded cycle, see Fig. 8(a). If the two vertices x, y in $N_G(I(P)) \cap V(C)$ are non-consecutive vertices of C , then the subgraph of G induced by $I(P) \cup V(C)$ is a theta-plus graph with end vertices x and y , see Fig. 8(b).

Assume $N_G(I(P)) \cap V(C)$ contains exactly one vertex v_i . Without loss of generality, assume that $i \neq 1$ (hence v_i is not adjacent to u). Note that every vertex of $V(C) - \{v_i, u, v\}$ has degree 2 in G and hence is not adjacent to any vertex not in C . Let P' be a shortest path in $G - v_i$




Fig. 8: A pair of pseudo-twins $\{u, v\}$ of index k in $G - I(P)$, where $k \geq 1$




Fig. 9: A pair of twins $\{u, v\}$ in $G - I(P)$

connecting $I(P)$ to $\{u, v\}$. Let y be the vertex of P' adjacent to $\{u, v\}$. If y is adjacent to u , then the subgraph of G induced by $I(P) \cup V(P') \cup V(C)$ is a theta-plus graph with end vertices v_i and u , see Fig. 8(c). Assume y is adjacent to v but not u . By the definition of pseudo-twins, y is contained in another odd cycle C' in $G - I(P)$ of length at least 5 containing edge uv . Then the subgraph of G induced by $I(P) \cup V(P') \cup V(C) \cap V(C')$ contains three induced paths of lengths at least 2 connecting v_i and u , two of them are the two paths in C , and the third one go through P' and part of C' . These three paths induces a theta-plus graph with end vertices v_i and u , see Fig. 8(d).

Assume next that $k = 0$, i.e., $\{u, v\}$ is a pair of adjacent twins. Let U be the set of common neighbours of u and v . As $d_{G'}(u) = d_{G'}(v) \geq 3$, $|U| \geq 2$. Since G contains no adjacent twins and no induced even cycles, exactly one of u, v is adjacent to a vertex of P , say $u \sim w_1$. Let P' be a shortest path in $G - u$ connecting w_1 and a vertex $z \in U$. Let y be the neighbour of z in P' . If z is not adjacent to a vertex $z' \in U$, then either y is adjacent to z' and $\{v, y, z, z'\}$ induces 4-cycle, see Fig. 9(a), or y is not adjacent to z' and $\{u, v, z, z'\} \cup V(P')$ induces a double chorded cycle, see Fig. 9(b). Thus z is adjacent to every vertex of U .

As $N_G(v) \subseteq N_G(u) \cap N_G(z)$, by Lemma 18, $G - v$ is 2-connected, see Fig. 9(c). If $G - v$ contains a triple of 2-vertices (v_1, v_2, v_3) , then since G contains no triple of 2-vertices, there is an index $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ such that v_i is adjacent to v . But v_i is adjacent to both u and z in $G - v$, and $d_{G-v}(u), d_{G-v}(z) \geq 3$, a contradiction. Thus $G - v$ contains no triple of 2-vertices. By Lemma 8, $G - v$ has a pair of adjacent twins t_1, t_2 , with $d_{G-v}(t_1) = d_{G-v}(t_2) \geq 3$. As G contains no adjacent twins, we may assume that v is adjacent to t_1 and not adjacent to t_2 . If $t_1 = u$, then $t_2 = w_1$, as w_1 is the only neighbor of u that is not adjacent to v . However, $d_G(w_1) = 2$, a contradiction. Thus $t_1 \neq u$, and hence $t_1 \sim u$. This implies that $t_2 \sim u$. Again as w_1 is the only neighbor of u that is not adjacent to v , we have $t_2 = w_1$, a contradiction.

Case 2 G has a vertex w such that $G - w$ is 2-connected.

We choose such a vertex w of smallest degree. We may assume that Case 1 does not apply. Hence $d_G(w) \geq 3$.

By Lemma 8, $G' = G - w$ contains a pair of adjacent pseudo-twins u, v of index k for some




Fig. 10: A pair of pseudo-twins $\{u, v\}$ of index k in $G - w$, where $k \geq 1$

$k \geq 0$. By Corollary 4, G' is not a cycle, and hence $d_{G'}(u) = d_{G'}(v) \geq 3$.

Claim 1. $k = 0$.

Proof. Assume to the contrary that $k \geq 1$. Then uv is contained in a cycle $C = [v, u, v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{2m+1}]$ of length at least 5, where $d_{G'}(v_i) = 2$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, 2m+1$. Similarly, it is obvious that $G - w$ is not a cycle and hence uv is contained in another odd cycle C' (which maybe a triangle).

Since G contains no triple of 2-vertices, some v_i is adjacent to w . Since G does not contain a near odd wheel, w has at most three neighbours in C , and if w has at least two neighbours in C , then the neighbours are consecutive vertices of C .

If w is adjacent to three consecutive vertices of C , with the middle vertex v' of degree 3 in G , then by Lemma 18, $G - v'$ is 2-connected. By the choice of w , $d_G(w) = d_G(v') = 3$. Then $\{w, v'\}$ is a pair of adjacent twins, see Fig. 10(a), a contradiction. Thus w is not adjacent to three consecutive vertices of C with the middle vertex v' of degree 3 in G .

Thus by symmetry, we may assume that v_1 is not adjacent to w , and hence $d_G(v_1) = 2$, and w is adjacent to v_{i_0} for some $2 \leq i_0 \leq 3$. Let P be the proper ear of G that contains v_1 . Since Case 1 does not apply, some $v' \in V(C)$ is a cut-vertex in $G - I(P)$. Note that v' separates u and v_{i_0} in $G - I(P)$. Thus w is not adjacent to u , and hence w is adjacent to at most two vertices of C (if w is adjacent to 3 vertices of C , then the three vertices are consecutive in C and the middle vertex has degree 3 in G).

Let C' be another induced cycle, maybe triangle, contained the edge uv . Since v' separates u and v_{i_0} in $G - I(P)$, then there is no edge between w and $V(C') - \{v\}$. If w is adjacent to two vertices of C , then these two vertices are consecutive in C , and hence the set $\{w\} \cup V(C) \cup V(C')$ induces a double chorded cycle, see Fig. 10(b). This is a contradiction. Thus w is adjacent to exactly one vertex v_{i_0} of C .

Let P' be a shortest path in $G - v_{i_0}$ connecting w to $\{u, v\}$. Let y be the vertex of P' adjacent to $\{u, v\}$. If y is adjacent to u (and possibly to v as well), then the subgraph of G induced by $V(P') \cup V(C)$ is a theta-plus graph with end vertices v_{i_0} and u , see Fig. 10(c). Assume y is adjacent to v but not to u . By the definition of pseudo-twins, y is contained in another odd cycle C' of length at least 5 containing edge uv , and wy is an edge. By the same argument above, w is adjacent to exactly one vertex y of C' . Then the subgraph of G induced by $V(P') \cup V(C) \cup V(C')$ is a theta-plus graph with end vertices v_{i_0} and u , see Fig. 10(d). This completes the proof of Claim 1. \square

By Claim 1, $\{u, v\}$ is a pair of adjacent twins. Let U be the set of common neighbours of u and v . As $d_{G'}(u) = d_{G'}(v) \geq 3$, $|U| \geq 2$. Since G contains no adjacent twins, exactly one of u, v is adjacent to w , say $u \sim w$.

Let P' be a shortest path in $G - u$ connecting w to a vertex $z \in U$. Let y be the neighbour of z in P' . If z is not adjacent to a vertex $z' \in U$, then either y is adjacent to z' and hence




Fig. 11: A pair of twins $\{u, v\}$ in $G - w$




Fig. 12: A pair of twins $\{t_1, t_2\}$ in $G - v$ or 2-connected graph $G - u$

$\{v, y, z, z'\}$ induces a 4-cycle, see Fig. 11(a), or y is not adjacent to z' and $\{u, v, z, z'\} \cup V(P')$ induces a double chorded cycle, see Fig. 11(b), a contradiction. Thus we may assume that z is adjacent to every vertex of U .

As $N_G(v) \subseteq N_G(u) \cap N_G(z)$, by Lemma 18, $G - v$ is 2-connected, see Fig. 11(c). If $G - v$ contains a triple of 2-vertices (v_1, v_2, v_3) , then since G contains no triple of 2-vertices, there is an index $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ such that v_i is adjacent to v . But v_i is adjacent to both u and z in $G - v$, and $d_{G-v}(u), d_{G-v}(z) \geq 3$, a contradiction. Thus $G - v$ contains no triple of 2-vertices.

By Lemma 8, $G - v$ has a pair of adjacent twins t_1, t_2 , with $d_{G-v}(t_1) = d_{G-v}(t_2) \geq 3$. As G contains no adjacent twins, we may assume that v is adjacent to t_1 and not adjacent to t_2 . As w is the only neighbor of u that is not adjacent to v , we conclude that $t_2 = w$, as either $t_1 \sim u$, or $t_1 = u$.

Assume $t_1 \in U$. If there is a common neighbour x of t_1 and w such that $x \notin U \cup \{u\}$, $\{t_1, w, u, v, x\}$ induces a double chorded cycle, see Fig. 12(a), a contradiction. Thus $N_G(w) \in U \cup \{u\}$. If there is a vertex z' in U such that $wz' \notin E(G)$, then $\{z', u, w, t_1, v\}$ induces a double chorded cycle, see Fig. 12(b), a contradiction. Hence $N_{G-v}(w) = U \cup \{u\} = N_{G-v}(t_1) = N_G(v)$ for both $t_1 \in U$ and $t_1 = u$. By Lemma 18, $G - u$ is 2-connected, see Fig. 12(c), and contains a pair of adjacent pseudo-twins t'_1, t'_2 of index k for some $k \geq 0$. It is easy to verify that $G - u$ contains no triple of 2-vertices. Hence $k = 0$ and t'_1, t'_2 is a pair of adjacent twins in $G - u$. As G contains no adjacent twins, we may assume that u is adjacent to t'_1 but not t'_2 . As $N_{G-u}(t'_2) = N_{G-u}(t'_1)$, we have $t'_2 \in N_G(v) - N_G(u)$, contrary to the fact that $N_{G-w}(u) = N_{G-w}(v)$.

This completes the proof of Theorem 2. \square

7 Expanded Gallai-trees

The three operations defined in Section 3 apply to pairs (G, L) . We may forget the list assignments, and consider the three operations as graph operations, and denote these operations by $D_v(G), T_v(G), G_1 \oplus_{(v_1, v_2)} G_2$, respectively.

As a consequence of Theorem 2, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 5. A graph G is not indicated degree-choosable if and only if one of the following holds:

1. $G = K_1$.
2. $G = G_1 \oplus_{(v_1, v_2)} G_2$, and each G_i is not indicated degree-choosable.
3. $G = D_v(G')$ and G' is not indicated degree-choosable.
4. $G = T_v(G')$ and G' is not indicated degree-choosable.

Recall that a connected graph G is an expanded Gallai-tree if each expanded block of G is a complete graph or a blow-up of an odd cycle of length at least 5, and each expanded block that is a blow up of an odd cycle of length at least 5 has at most one root-clique. Now we prove Theorem 1: A connected graph G is not indicated degree-choosable if and only if G is an expanded Gallai-tree.

Proof of Theorem 1 Assume G is not indicated degree-choosable. We prove by induction on the number of vertices of G that G is an expanded Gallai-tree. The case $|V(G)| = 1$ is trivial. Assume $|V(G)| \geq 2$. If $G = G_1 \oplus_{(v_1, v_2)} G_2$ and G_1, G_2 are not indicated degree-choosable, then each expanded block of G is an expanded block of G_1 or G_2 . By induction hypothesis, G_1, G_2 are expanded Gallai-trees. Hence each expanded block of G is a complete graph or a blow-up of an odd cycle, and $\mathcal{B}_G = \mathcal{B}_{G_1} \cup \mathcal{B}_{G_2}$, and $\pi_G(H) = \pi_{G_i}(H)$ if $H \in \mathcal{B}_{G_i}$.

Assume G is 2-connected.

If $G = D_v(G')$ and G' is not indicated degree-choosable, then by induction hypothesis, G' is an expanded Gallai-tree. If H is an expanded block of G , then either $v \notin V(H)$ and hence H is an expanded block of G' or $v \in V(H)$, then $H = D_v(H')$, where H' is an expanded block of G' . Also a clique-cut K of G is either a clique-cut of G' or $K = D_v(K')$, where K' is a clique-cut of G' . Therefore each expanded block of G is a complete graph or a blow-up of an odd cycle of length at least 5. Moreover, for $H \in \mathcal{B}_G$, either $H \in \mathcal{B}_{G'}$ and $\pi_G(H) = \pi_{G'}(H)$ or $H = D_v(H')$ for some $H' \in \mathcal{B}_{G'}$, and

$$\pi_G(H) = \begin{cases} D_v(\pi_{G'}(H')), & \text{if } v \in V(\pi_{G'}(H')), \\ \pi_{G'}(H'), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

If $G = T_v(G')$, then $d_{G'}(v) = 2$. Since G is 2-connected, so is G' and hence v is contained in an odd cycle C' , which is contained in an expanded block H' of G' . Then $H = T_v(H')$ is an expanded block of G . So again, each expanded block of G is a complete graph or a blow-up of an odd cycle. If v is contained in a triangle $C' = [vuw]$ and uw is a cliue-cut of G' , then $C = T_v(C') \in \mathcal{B}_G$ with $\pi_G(C) = \{u, w\}$.

Next we prove that if G is an expanded Gallai-tree, then G is not indicated degree-choosable, again by induction on the number of vertices. Assume that this is not true and G is a minimum counterexample. Then G is neither a complete graph nor an blow-up of an odd cycle.

If G has a pair of adjacent twins or a triple of 2-vertices, then $G = D_v(G')$ or $G = T_v(G')$. Each clique-cut K of G is either a clique-cut of G' or $v \in V(K)$ and G' has a clique-cut K' such that $K = D_v(K')$. Similarly, each expanded block H of G is either an expanded block of G' or $v \in V(H)$ and there is an expanded block H' of G' such that $H = D_v(H')$ or $H = T_v(H')$. Thus each expanded block of G' is a complete graph or a blow-up of an odd cycle. Moreover, $\pi_{G'}(H) = \pi_G(H)$ or is obtained from $\pi_G(H)$ by deleting the twin of v . Hence G' is an expanded




Fig. 13: A graph G with clique-cuts K and K' , with subgraphs H_K , $H_{K'}$, Q_K and $Q_{K'}$

Gallai-tree. By induction hypothesis, G' is not indicated degree-choosable. By Corollary 5, G is not indicated degree-choosable.

Assume G has no adjacent twins and no triple of 2-vertices. Then G has a cut-vertex and $G = G_1 \oplus_{(v_1, v_2)} G_2$, where each of G_1, G_2 is an expanded Gallai-tree. By induction hypothesis, each of G_1, G_2 is not indicated degree-choosable, and hence G is not indicated degree-choosable. \square

Corollary 6. There is a linear-time algorithm that determines if a graph G is indicated degree-choosable.

Proof. We may assume that G is a connected graph. We repeatedly apply the reverse of the duplicating operation, the tripling operation and vertex-sum operation, until no such reverse operations can be applied. If we reach a set of isolated vertices, then G is an expanded Gallai-tree and hence is not indicated degree-choosable. Otherwise, it is degree-choosable. It is obvious that this algorithm terminates in linear-time. \square

8 Brooks' Theorem for indicated colouring

Definition 17. Assume G is an expanded Gallai-tree. Assume K is a clique-cut of G and $H \in \mathcal{B}_{G,K}$. Let $Z_{H,K} = V(H) - V(K)$ and $Q_{H,K}$ be the subgraph of G induced by the union of K and the vertex set of the connected component of $G - V(K)$ containing $Z_{H,K}$.

If K is a clique-cut of G with $\mathcal{B}_{G,K} \neq \emptyset$, then let

$$H_K = G[\cup_{H \in \mathcal{B}_{G,K}} V(H)], Q_K = G[\cup_{H \in \mathcal{B}_{G,K}} Q_{H,K}].$$

See Fig. 13 for an example of a clique-cut K , and the graphs H_K and Q_K .

Note that for any $H \in \mathcal{B}_{G,K}$, $H \subseteq Q_{H,K}$ and equality $H = Q_{H,K}$ holds if and only if H does not contain any other clique cut of G .

Theorem 3. Assume G is an expanded Gallai-tree, and with $\Delta(G) \leq r$. Then the following are equivalent:

- (1) G has a degree-list assignment L such that (G, L) is infeasible and $L(v) \subseteq [r]$ for each vertex v .
- (2) For each clique-cut K with $\mathcal{B}_{G,K} \neq \emptyset$, there is degree-list assignment L_K for H_K such that (H_K, L_K) is infeasible, $L_K(v) \subseteq [r]$ for each vertex v , and $L_K(v) \subseteq [r - t_K]$ if $v \in V(K)$, where $t_K = |\cap_{v \in V(K)} N_G(v)|$.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2): Let L be a degree-list assignment of G such that (G, L) is infeasible and $L(v) \subseteq [r]$ for each vertex v . Assume K is a clique-cut of G with $\mathcal{B}_{G,K} \neq \emptyset$. By Lemma 1, there is an L -colouring ϕ of $G - V(H_K)$ such that (H_K, L^ϕ) is infeasible. Note that for any $x, y \in V(K)$, $N_G(x) - V(H_K) = N_G(y) - V(H_K) = \bigcap_{v \in V(K)} N_G(v)$. Let $X = \bigcap_{v \in V(K)} N_G(v)$. By definition $|X| = t_K$. By permutation of colours, we may assume that $[r] - \phi(X) = [r - t_K]$. Let $L_K = L^\phi$, we obtain the required degree-list assignment of G .

(2) \Rightarrow (1): If G has no clique-cut, or G has only one clique-cut K and $H_K = G$, then the condition and the conclusion are the same, and there is nothing to be proved. Thus we assume that G has a clique-cut K such that $H_K \neq G$.

Case 1 G has a clique-cut K such that $\mathcal{B}_{G,K} = \emptyset$.

Choose such a clique-cut K , and let \mathcal{A} be the set of expanded blocks H of G containing K . For each $H \in \mathcal{A}$, there is a degree-list assignment L_H of $Q_{H,K}$ such that $(Q_{H,K}, L_H)$ is infeasible and $L_H(v) \subseteq [r]$ for each vertex v . As vertices in K are adjacent twins in $Q_{H,K}$, by Lemma 11, there is a set C_H of $d_{Q_{H,K}}(v)$ colours (for $v \in V(K)$) such that $L_H(x) = C_H$ for all $x \in V(K)$. Let S be a subset of $V(K)$ of size $|V(K)| - 1$. By Lemma 1, there is a L_H -colouring ψ of S such that $(Q_{H,K} - S, L_H^\psi)$ is infeasible. Let $A_H = \psi(S)$, which is a set of $|V(K)| - 1$ colours contained in C_H . By a permutation of colours, we may assume that for any two distinct expanded blocks H, H' containing K , $C_H \cap C_{H'} = A_H = A_{H'}$. Let $L = \bigcup_{H \in \mathcal{A}} L_H$.

Now we show that (G, L) is infeasible. By Lemma 1, it suffices to find, for each vertex v of G a colour $c \in L(v)$ such that $(G - v, L^{v \rightarrow c})$ is infeasible.

1. If $v \in V(K)$, then let c be any colour in A_H defined above.
2. If $v \in V(G) - V(K)$, then $v \in Q_{H,K}$ for some expanded block H containing K . Let c be a colour in $L_H(v)$ such that $(Q_{H,K} - v, L_H^{v \rightarrow c})$ is infeasible.

It follows from induction hypothesis that $L^{v \rightarrow c}$ is a degree-list assignment of $G - v$ and $(G - v, L^{v \rightarrow c})$ is infeasible.

Case 2 $\mathcal{B}_{G,K} \neq \emptyset$ for each clique-cut K of G .

Let K be a clique-cut such that Q_K is minimal. Assume $H \in \mathcal{B}_{G,K}$. If H contains another clique-cut K' of G , then for any $H' \in \mathcal{B}_{G,K'}$, $H' - V(K') \subseteq V(Q_{H,K})$ and hence $Q_{H',K'} \subsetneq Q_{H,K}$. Hence $Q_{K'} \subsetneq Q_K$, contrary to the choice of K .

So for any $H \in \mathcal{B}_{G,K}$, H contains no other clique-cut of G , $Q_{H,K} = H$ and hence $Q_K = H_K$.

By our assumption, $G - V(H_K) \neq \emptyset$. By the induction hypothesis, there is a degree-list assignment L' of $G' = G - (V(H_K) - V(K))$ such that (G', L') is infeasible and $L'(v) \subseteq [r]$ for each vertex v of G' . Since vertices in K are adjacent twins in G' , there is a set C' of $d_{G'}(v)$ colours ($v \in V(K)$) such that $L'(x) = C'$ for all $x \in V(K)$.

Let S be a subset of $V(K)$ of size $|V(K)| - 1$. By Lemma 1, there is a L' -colouring ψ of S such that $(G' - S, L'^\psi)$ is infeasible. Let $A = \psi(S)$, which is a set of $|V(K)| - 1$ colours contained in C' . By a permutation of colours, we may assume that $[r] - (C' - A) = [r - t_K]$. By assumption, there is a degree-list assignment L_K of H_K such that (H_K, L_K) is infeasible, $L_K(v) \subseteq [r]$ for each vertex v of H_K and $L_K(v) \subseteq [r - t_K]$ for each vertex $v \in V(K)$. By Lemma 1, there is a L_K -colouring τ of S such that $(H_K - S, L_K^\tau)$ is infeasible. By a permutation of colours, we may assume that $\tau(S) = A$. Let $L = L' \cup L_K$. Then L is a degree-list assignment of G with $L(v) \subseteq [r]$ for each vertex v of G , and a similar argument as above shows that (G, L) is infeasible.

This completes the proof of Theorem 3. \square

Lemma 20. Assume H is a graph consisting of k odd cycles C_1, C_2, \dots, C_k sharing one edge uv . Let $p : V(H) \rightarrow \{1, 2, \dots\}$ and $G = H[p]$ is a blow-up of H in which each vertex x is blown up into a clique $K(x)$ of order $p(x)$. Let $K = K(u) \cup K(v)$. Let $r \geq s$ be positive integers such that $d_G(v) \leq r$ for each vertex v of G and $d_G(v) \leq s$ for $v \in V(K)$. Then the following are equivalent:

- (i) There is a degree-list assignment L of G such that (G, L) is infeasible, $L(v) \subseteq [r]$ for $v \in V(G)$ and $L(v) \subseteq [s]$ for $v \in V(K)$.
- (ii) There is a multifold coloring f of H^2 such that $|f(x)| = p(x) - 1$ and $f(x) \subseteq [r] - \{i, k + 1\}$ if $x \in V(C_i) - N_H[\{u, v\}]$, and $f(x) \subseteq [s] - \{1, 2, \dots, k + 1\}$ if $x \in N_H[\{u, v\}]$. Here H^2 is the graph obtained from H by adding edges connecting pairs of vertices of distance 2 in H .

Proof. Let L' be the degree list assignment of H defined as $L'(u) = L'(v) = \{1, 2, \dots, k + 1\}$, and $L'(x) = \{i, k + 1\}$ for $x \in V(C_i) - \{u, v\}$. Up to a permutation of colours, L' is the unique degree list assignment of H such that (H, L') is infeasible (see the example graph in Fig. 5). Thus the required L exists if and only if (G, L) can be obtained from (H, L') by a sequence of duplication operations. The order of the duplication is irrelevant. For each vertex x of H , it is duplicated $p(x) - 1$ times. Hence, a set Z_x of $p(x) - 1$ colors need to be chosen. These colours are added to the lists $L'(y)$ for all $y \in N_H[x]$. Hence if $x \in N_H[\{u, v\}]$, then $Z_x \subseteq [s] - L'(u)$. Otherwise, $Z_x \subseteq [r] - L'(x)$. Moreover, if xy is an edge or x, y have a common neighbor z , then $Z_x \cap Z_y = \emptyset$. Therefore $f(x) = Z_x$ is a multifold colouring of H^2 as stated in (ii). \square

Theorem 4 below is a consequence of Theorem 3 and Lemma 20, and characterizes IC-Brooks graphs.

Theorem 4. Assume G is an r -regular expanded Gallai-tree. Then G is an IC-Brooks graph if the following hold:

- For each is clique-cut K with $\mathcal{B}_{G,K} \neq \emptyset$, if $H_K = H[p]$, where H consists of a family of k odd cycles C_1, C_2, \dots, C_k sharing an edge uv , and $p : V(H) \rightarrow \{1, 2, \dots\}$, then there is a multifold colouring f of H_K^2 with $|f(x)| = p(x) - 1$ and $f(x) \subseteq [r] - \{i, k + 1\}$ for $x \in V(C_i) - N_H[\{u, v\}]$ and $f(x) \subseteq [r - t_K] - \{1, 2, \dots, k + 1\}$ for $x \in N_H[\{u, v\}]$, where $t_K = |\bigcap_{v \in V(K)} N_G(v)|$. \square

Assume r is a fixed integer and G is an r -regular expanded Gallai-tree. For each clique-cut K of G , if $\mathcal{B}_{G,K} \neq \emptyset$, then $H_K = H[p]$, where H consists of a family of k odd cycles C_1, C_2, \dots, C_k sharing an edge uv , and is a graph with tree-width at most $2r$. Hence there is a linear-time algorithm to determine if the multifold colouring f described in Theorem 4 exists. Thus we have the following corollary.

Corollary 7. Let r be a fixed positive integer. Given an r -regular expanded Gallai-tree, there is a linear-time algorithm to determine if G is an IC-Brooks graph.

9 Regular expanded Gallai-trees and IC-Brooks graphs

In this section, we show that if $r \leq 3$, then every r -regular expanded Gallai-tree is an IC-Brooks graph. For $r \geq 4$, there are r -regular expanded Gallai-trees that are not IC-Brooks graphs. On the other hand, any expanded Gallai-tree is an induced subgraph of an IC-Brooks graphs.




Fig. 14: The regular expanded Gallai-tree for $r = 3k + 1$ and $r = 3k$

Theorem 5. If $r \leq 3$, and G is an expanded Gallai-tree with maximum degree at most r , then there is a degree-list assignment L of G such that (G, L) is infeasible and $L(v) \subseteq [r]$. In particular, every r -regular expanded Gallai-trees is an IC-Brooks graph.

Proof. The case $r \leq 2$ is trivial. Assume $r = 3$. By Theorem 3 and Lemma 20, it suffices to show that the required multifold colouring f of H exists, where H consists of at most two odd cycles sharing one edge. If H is an odd cycle, then since $H[p]$ has maximum degree at most 3, we have $p(v) \leq 2$ for each vertex v , and if $p(v) = 2$, then $p(x) = 1$ for each $x \in N_{H^2}(v)$. Thus the problem is to find a proper colouring of a graph consisting of isolated vertices with a single colour 3, which trivially exists.

If H consists of two odd cycles sharing one edge uv , then $p(x) = 1$ for all $x \in N_H[\{u, v\}]$. Similarly as above, the problem is to find a proper colouring of a graph consisting of isolated vertices with a single colour 3. \square

Proposition 1. For $r \geq 4$, the conclusion of Theorem 5 does not hold, and there is an r -regular expanded Gallai-tree that is not an IC-Brooks graph.

Proof. We denote by C_k the k -cycle with vertices v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k .

Assume $r \geq 4$. If $r = 3k + 1$, then let $G = C_5[p]$, where $p(v_i) = k + 1$ for $i = 1, 3, 4$ and $p(v_i) = k$ for $i = 2, 5$. It is easy to check that the multifold colouring described in Lemma 20 for this graph does not exist. Note that each vertex in G has degree r , except that vertices in $K(v_1)$ have degree $r - 1$. Take the union of a copy of K_{2k+1} and $2k + 1$ copies of G , and add edges connect the i th vertex of K_{2k+1} to the vertices in $K(v_1)$ in the i th copy of G . See Fig. 14(a). The resulting graph is an r -regular expanded Gallai-tree which is not an IC-Brooks graph.

If $r = 3k + 2$, then let $G = C_5[k + 1]$. Then G is an r -regular expanded Gallai-tree. A degree-list assignment L for G for which (G, L) be infeasible is equivalent to a k -fold colouring ϕ of K_5 using colours from $[r] - \{1, 2\}$. It is easy to check that such a colouring does not exist.

If $r = 3k$ and $k \geq 2$, then let $G = C_7[p]$, where $p(v_i) = k$ for $i = 1, 2, 4, 5, 7$ and $L(v_i) = k + 1$ for $i = 3, 6$. Then each vertex of G has degree r , except that the vertices in $K(v_1)$ have degree $r - 1$. A degree-list assignment of G for which (G, L) is infeasible and $L(x) \subseteq [r]$ is equivalent to an f -fold colouring of C_7^2 with $|f(x)| = p(x) - 1$ and $f(x) \subseteq [r] - \{1, 2\}$. It is again easy to check that there is no such colouring. Take 3 copies of G , add a vertex which is adjacent to 3 copies of $K(v_1)$. See Fig. 14(b). The resulting graph is an r -regular expanded Gallai-tree which is not an IC-Brooks graph. \square

Theorem 6. If G is an expanded Gallai-tree, then there is an IC-Brooks graph G' such that G is an induced subgraph of G' .

Proof. Assume G is not indicated degree-choosable, and L is a degree-list assignment of G such that (G, L) is infeasible. Let $r = 2k + 1$ be an odd integer such that $\cup_{v \in V(G)} L(v) \subseteq [r]$. Let H' be the expanded theta graph consisting of paths $P_1, P_2, P_3, \dots, P_r$ connecting two vertices u and v , where P_1 is a single edge, $P_2 = [u, w, v]$ has length 2, and $P_i = [u, w_{i,1}, w_{i,2}, w_{i,3}, v]$ has length 4 for $i = 3, 4, \dots, r$. Let H be obtained from H' by duplicating $w_{i,2}$ into an $(r - 1)$ -clique, for $i = 3, 4, \dots, r$. Then each vertex of H has degree r , except that w has degree 2. Let $A = \{a, b\}$ be any arbitrary 2-subset of $\{1, 2, \dots, r\}$, and let $L(x) = [r]$ for $x \in V(H) - \{w\}$ and $L(w) = A$. It is easy to verify that (H, L) is infeasible.

Take k copies of H , and one copy of K_2 with $V(K_2) = \{s, t\}$. Identify s and all the k copies of w in the k copies of H into a single vertex. Denote the resulting graph by Q . Then each vertex of Q has degree r , except that vertex t has degree 1. Let B be any 1-subset of $[r]$, and let $L'(x) = [r]$ for all vertices $x \in V(Q) - \{t\}$ and $L'(t) = B$. Again it is easy to verify that (Q, L') is infeasible.

Now for each vertex x of G , take $r - d_G(x)$ copies of Q , identify x with the $r - d_G(x)$ copies of t in the copies of Q . The resulting graph G' is r -regular, and it follows from the discussion above that G' is an IC-Brooks graph. \square

It was proved in [11] that every IC-Brooks graph G has $\omega(G) \geq \lceil \frac{\Delta(G)}{2} \rceil + 1$. The following result shows that G has $\omega(G) \geq \lceil \frac{2(\Delta(G)+1)}{3} \rceil$, and this upper bound on $\omega(G)$ is sharp.

Theorem 7. If G is an r -regular expanded Gallai-tree, then $\omega(G) \geq 2(r + 1)/3$. In particular, if G is an IC-Brooks graph, then $\omega(G) \geq \frac{2}{3}(\Delta(G) + 1)$.

Proof. Assume G is an r -regular expanded Gallai-tree. Let H be an expanded leaf block of G . If H is a complete graph, then we are done. Otherwise, $H = C[p]$ is a blow-up of an odd cycle C of length at least 5. Assume that the vertices of C are $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{2k+1}$ and $v_3, v_4, \dots, v_{2k+1}$ are not contained in any other expanded blocks. For G to be r -regular, we must have $p(v_i) = p(v_{i+3})$ for $i = 2, 3, \dots, 2k - 1$, and $r = p(v_2) + p(v_3) + p(v_4) - 1$ and $\omega(G) \geq \max\{p(v_2) + p(v_3), p(v_3) + p(v_4), p(v_4) + p(v_5)\} \geq \frac{2}{3}(r + 1)$. \square

By (6) of Example 1, the bound $\omega(G) \geq \frac{2}{3}(\Delta(G)+1)$ for Brooks graph for indicated chromatic number is tight.

References

- [1] J. Beck. *Achievement games and the probabilistic method*, in: *Combinatorics*. Paul Erdős is Eighty, Bolyai Soc. Math. Stud., vol. 1, (1993), 51-78.
- [2] H. L. Bodlaender. *On the complexity of some coloring games*. Internat. J. Found. Comput. Sci. 2 (1991) 133-147
- [3] O. V. Borodin. *Criterion of chromaticity of a degree prescription*. In IV All-Union Conf. on Theoretical Cybernetics (Novosibirsk), pages 127-128, 1977.
- [4] B. Brešar, M. Jakovac, and D. Štesl, *Indicated coloring game on Cartesian products of graphs*, Discrete Appl. Math. 289 (2021) 320-326.
- [5] D. Conlon. *On-line Ramsey numbers*. SIAM J. Discrete Math. 23(2009), 1954-1963.
- [6] D. Conlon, J. Fox and B. Sudakov. *Recent developments in graph Ramsey theory*. Surveys in combinatorics 2015, 49-118. London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., 424.

- [7] P. Erdos, A. L. Rubin, and H. Taylor. *Choosability in graphs*. Congr. Numer, 26(4):125–157, 1979.
- [8] E. Friedgut, Y. Kohayakawa, V. Rodl, A. Ruciński and P. Tetali. *Ramsey games against a one-armed bandit*. Combin. Probab. Comput. 12 (2003), no. 5-6, 515–545.
- [9] M. Gardner, *Mathematical games*. Scientific American (April, 1981) 23.
- [10] J. A. Grytczuk, M. Haluszczak and H. A. Kierstead. *On-line Ramsey theory*. Electron. J. Combin. 11 (2004), no. 1, Research Paper 60, 10 pp.
- [11] H. Kawabe, Y. Kobayashi, S. Kojima, K. Ozeki, *Brooks’ type theorem for indicated coloring game*, 2024. Manuscript.
- [12] H. A. Kierstead and G. Konjevod. *Coloring number and on-line Ramsey theory for graphs and hypergraphs*. Combinatorica 29 49–64.
- [13] H. A. Kierstead and W. T. Trotter. *Planar graph coloring with an uncooperative partner*. J. Graph Theory 18 (1994) 569–584.
- [14] A. Kurek and A. Ruciński. *Two variants of the size Ramsey number*. Discussiones Mathematicae Graph Theory 25 (2005), 141–149.
- [15] M. Marciniszyn, R. Spohel and A. Steger. *Online Ramsey games in random graphs*. Combin. Probab. Comput. 18 271–300.
- [16] M. Marciniszyn, R. Spohel and A. Steger. *Upper bounds for online Ramsey games in random graphs*. Combin. Probab. Comput. 18 259–270.
- [17] P. Francis, S.F. Raj, and M. Gokulnath, *On indicated coloring of lexicographic product of graphs*, Discrete Appl. Math. 319 (2022) 576–582.
- [18] P. Francis, S.F. Raj, and M. Gokulnath, *On indicated coloring of some classes of graphs*, Graphs Combin. 35 (2019) 1105–1127.
- [19] A. Grzesik, *Indicated coloring of graphs*, Discrete Math. 312 (2012) 3467–3472.
- [20] S.-J. Kim, Y. S. Kwon, D. D.-F. Liu, and X. Zhu. *On-line list colouring of complete multipartite graphs*. Electron. J. Combin., 19(1):P41, 2012.
- [21] J. Kozik, P. Micek, and X. Zhu. *Towards an on-line version of Ohbas conjecture*. Eur. J. Combin., 36:110–121, 2014.
- [22] R.P. Raj, S.F. Raj, H.P. Patil, *On indicated coloring of graphs*, Graphs Combin. 31 (2015) 2357–2367.
- [23] R.P. Raj, S.F. Raj, H.P. Patil. *On indicated chromatic number of graphs*, Graphs Combin. 33 (2017) 203–219.
- [24] U. Schauz. *Mr. Paint and Mrs. Correct*. Electron. J. Combin. 16 (2009), no. 1, Research Paper 77, 18 pp.
- [25] V. G. Vizing. *Coloring the vertices of a graph in prescribed colors*. Diskret. Analiz, 1976, no.29, Metody Diskret. Anal. v Teorii Kodov i Shem, 3–10, 101.

- [26] H. Whitney. *Non-separable and planar graphs*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society, 34 (2): 339–362.
- [27] X. Zhu. *Refined activation strategy for the marking game*. J. Combin. Theory Ser. B, 98 (2008), no. 1, 1–18.
- [28] X. Zhu. *On-line list colouring of graphs*. Electron. J. Combin., 16(1):R127, 2009.