

ON TWO GENERALIZATIONS OF THE CACETTA-HÄGGKVIST CONJECTURE

RON AHARONI, ELI BERGER, MARIA CHUDNOVSKY, AND SHIRA ZERBIB

ABSTRACT. A famous conjecture of Caccetta and Häggkvist is that the girth $g(D)$ of a simple digraph on n vertices with minimal out-degree k is at most $\lceil \frac{n}{k} \rceil$. The first author suggested a stronger “rainbow” version: given n sets of edges, each of size k , in an undirected graph on n vertices, there exists a rainbow cycle of length at most $\lceil \frac{n}{k} \rceil$ (the CH conjecture is the case where the F_i are the outgoing stars at all vertices, with directions omitted). Here we consider another generalization:

(I) In any simple digraph D , $g(D) \leq \lceil \sum_{v \in V(D)} \frac{1}{\deg^+(v)} \rceil$.

The common generalization is:

(II) Any system $F_1, \dots, F_n$ of subsets of $E(K_n)$ has a rainbow cycle of size at most $\lceil \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{|F_i|} \rceil$.

We prove (II) when $|F_i| \leq 2$ for all i . We also prove (I) up to a factor of 2: $g(G) \leq 2 \sum_{v \in V(G)} \frac{1}{\deg^+(v)+1}$.

1. INTRODUCTION

The out-degree of a vertex v in a digraph is denoted by $\deg^+(v)$. A vertex with out-degree 0 is called a *sink*. A graph with no sinks is said to be *sink-less*. We write $\delta^+(G)$ for $\min_{v \in V(G)} \deg^+(v)$. The *girth* $g(G)$ of a graph G is the length of the shortest cycle. The girth of an acyclic graph is defined as ∞ . If G is directed, $g(G)$ is the length of the shortest directed cycle.

A famous conjecture of Caccetta and Häggkvist [2] is

Conjecture 1.1 (CHC). $g(G) \leq \lceil \frac{|V(G)|}{\delta^+(G)} \rceil$ for any simple digraph G .

Here are three forefront results. In all, G is a directed graph on n vertices:

- (1) [3] $g(G) \leq 2 \frac{n}{\delta^+(G)+1}$.
- (2) [8] $g(G) \leq \frac{n}{\delta^+(G)} + 73$ (solving the conjecture asymptotically).
- (3) [7] The CHC is true when $\delta^+(G) \leq \sqrt{n/2}$.

Ron Aharoni: Department of Mathematics, Technion, Israel and MIPT. ra@technion.ac.il. The research of R. Aharoni was supported in part by the Israel Science Foundation (ISF) grant no. 2023464 and the Discount Bank Chair at the Technion. This paper is part of a project that has received funding from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement no. 823748.

Eli Berger: Department of Mathematics, University of Haifa, Israel. berger@math.haifa.ac.il.

Maria Chudnovsky: Department of Mathematics, Princeton University, USA, mchudnov@math.princeton.edu. Supported by NSF DMS-EPSRC Grant DMS-2120644.

Shira Zerbib: Department of Mathematics, Iowa State University, USA. zerbib@iastate.edu. Supported by NSF grant DMS-1953929.

The authors were supported by US-Israel Binational Science Foundation (BSF) grant no. 2016077.

(4) [6] If $\delta^+(G) \geq 0.35n$ then $g(G) \leq 3$.

We suspect that a stronger statement is true:

Conjecture 1.2. *If G is a sink-less simple digraph then $g(G) \leq \lceil \sum_{v \in V(G)} \frac{1}{\deg^+(v)} \rceil$.*

Let $h(G)$ be the harmonic mean of the out-degrees of the vertices in G . The conjecture is then that $g(G) \leq \lceil \frac{n}{h(G)} \rceil$. Any acyclic graph can serve as an example showing that the harmonic mean cannot be replaced by the arithmetic mean. Adding a disjoint large cycle yields an example showing this, in which the girth is not infinity.

If true, Conjecture 1.2 would imply a characterization of the girth:

$$g(G) = \min_{S \subseteq V(G)} \left\lceil \frac{|S|}{h(G[S])} \right\rceil.$$

The inequality $g(G) \geq \min_{S \subseteq V(G)} \lceil \frac{|S|}{h(G[S])} \rceil$ follows from the fact that if S spans a directed cycle of minimal length, then the cycle is induced, so $h(G[S]) = 1$.

Let G be an undirected graph and let $F_1, \dots, F_m$ be sets of edges in G . We say that $R \subseteq E(G)$ is a (*partial*) *rainbow set* if it is the image of a choice function, namely if $R = \{e_{i_j} \mid j \in J\}$ where $i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_k$ and $e_{i_j} \in F_{i_j}$. The smallest size of a rainbow cycle is denoted by $rg(F_1, \dots, F_m)$.

The first author [1] suggested the following:

Conjecture 1.3. *Any family $F_1, \dots, F_n$ of sets of size k in an undirected graph G on n vertices has a rainbow cycle of size at most $\lceil \frac{n}{k} \rceil$.*

The CHC is equivalent to the case in which all F_i 's are stars, namely sets of edges sharing a vertex. Once we know Conjecture 1.3 for stars, the CHC follows by taking F_i to be the out-stars of the vertices, with directions omitted. For the other direction, if we know CHC, and stars F_i are given, we form a digraph by directing the edges of each star away from its apex (we may assume that the stars are disjoint, since otherwise the girth is 2).

Conjecture 1.3 is known when $|F_i| = 2$ for all $i \leq n$ [4]. In [5] it was shown that if $F_1, \dots, F_n$ are sets of size $10^{10}k$ of edges in K_n , then there exists a rainbow cycle of length at most $\lceil \frac{n}{k} \rceil$.

Conjectures 1.3 and 1.2 have a common generalization:

Conjecture 1.4. *Any system of subsets $F_1, \dots, F_n \subseteq E(K_n)$ has a rainbow cycle of size at most $\lceil \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{|F_i|} \rceil$.*

In Section 2 we prove Conjecture 1.2 for digraphs G with $\delta^+(G) \leq 2$.

Theorem 1.5. *If $\delta^+(G) \leq 2$ then $g(G) \leq \lceil \sum_{v \in V(G)} \frac{1}{\deg^+(v)} \rceil$.*

In Section 3 we prove Conjecture 1.4 when $|F_i| \leq 2$, thus generalizing both Theorem 1.5 and the result in [4]. (We keep the separate proof of Theorem 1.5 since it contains some extra information).

Theorem 1.6. *Any system of subsets $F_1, \dots, F_n \subseteq E(K_n)$ with $|F_i| \leq 2$ has a rainbow cycle of size at most $\lceil \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{|F_i|} \rceil$.*

In Section 4 we prove Conjecture 1.2 with the upper bound on the girth doubled.

Theorem 1.7. *In any directed graph G , $g(G) \leq 2 \sum_{v \in V(D)} \frac{1}{\deg^+(v)+1}$.*

2. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.5

In this section we prove Conjecture 1.2 when the out-degrees are at most 2. We may assume that the graph is sink-less. Let p be the number of vertices with out-degree 1. Then $\sum_{v \in V(G)} \frac{1}{\deg^+(v)} = \frac{n-p}{2} + p = \frac{n+p}{2}$. Thus the conjecture in this case follows from:

Theorem 2.1. *Let G be an n -vertex digraph with all out-degrees at least 1 and at most 2. Assume p vertices have out-degree 1. Then $g(G) \leq \lceil \frac{n+p}{2} \rceil$.*

Theorem 2.1 follows also from the result in Section 3, and again from a theorem of Shen [7]. The reasons for giving a third proof are (1) the proof includes a structural result on digraphs with out degrees at most 2 (Theorem 2.2) that is stronger than that in [7], and (2) this is a self-contained proof, whereas the proof in Section 2 uses the non-trivial result in [4].

Theorem 2.1 will clearly follow from the following:

Theorem 2.2. *Let G be an n -vertex digraph with $1 \leq \delta^+(G) \leq 2$. Let p be the number of vertices having out-degree 1. Then there exist two directed cycles meeting in at most $p + 1$ vertices.*

Proof. By restricting attention to a terminal connected component (a sink in the directed tree of connected components) we may assume that G is strongly connected.

Claim 2.3. *We may assume that there exist vertices x, y of G satisfying the following:*

- (1) $\deg^-(x) \leq 2$
- (2) $yx \in E(G)$
- (3) y is a source in $G[N^-(x)]$
- (4) Either y has out-degree 1, or y lies on a directed cycle in $G \setminus \{x\}$.

Proof. Let x be a vertex of minimum in-degree. Since $\delta^+(G) \leq 2$, we have $\deg^-(x) \leq 2$.

Let D be a terminal component of $G \setminus \{x\}$. Since G is strongly connected, there exists an edge yx for some $y \in V(D)$.

Suppose that we can choose y to be a source in $G[N^-(x)]$. If $|D| > 1$, y is in a directed cycle in D . If $|D| = 1$, then $\deg^+(y) = 1$. In both cases the claim holds.

Thus we may assume that y cannot be chosen to be a source in $G[N^-(x)]$. Then x has in-degree 2, and so all in-degrees, and therefore all out-degrees in G are 2. It follows that $|D| > 1$, because an outneighbor of y that is different than x is in D . Let u be an inneighbor of x different from y . Since y is not a source in $G[N^-(x)]$, it follows that u is adjacent to y .

If x has exactly one inneighbor in D , there is exactly one edge from $G \setminus D$ to D and this edge is uy . Let P be a shortest path from x to D , then P is from x to u . Then $x - P - u - y - x$ is a cycle. Let C be a cycle through y in D , then $P + C$ have the required property.

Otherwise, $N^-(x) = \{y, u\} \subseteq D$, and since u, y are not sources in $N^-(x)$, both uy and yx are edges in G . Note that we may assume xy and xu are not edges in G , because otherwise we get two digons meeting at one vertex and the theorem is true.

If there exists a cycle in $G - \{u, y\}$ then together with the digon uy we get two cycles as in the theorem. Therefore $G - \{u, y\}$ is acyclic. Let z be a vertex with out-degree 0 in $G - \{u, y\}$. Then zu, zy are edges in G , and in particular $z \neq x$. Moreover, since all in-degrees are 2, no other vertex in $G - \{u, y\}$ is of out-degree 0.

Then $G - \{u, y, z, x\}$ is not empty (because x has out-degree 2) and all the out-degrees in $G - \{u, y, z\}$ are at least 1. So there is a cycle in $G - \{u, y, z\}$, and the theorem holds.

This proves the claim. $\square$

Let x, y be as in the claim. Let G' be obtained from G by deleting all out-edges of y except yx , and contracting yx . Then in G' all out-degrees are at least 1 (here we use the fact that no vertex has both x and y as out-neighbors, and so contracting x, y did not change the out-degrees). Let w be the contracted vertex.

Applying an induction hypothesis to Claim 2.2, there exist in G' two cycles C_1, C_2 as in the claim. By uncontracting the edge yx , we may assume $w \in C_1 \cap C_2$. Let p, q be the in-neighbors of w (namely sending an edge to w) in $C_1 + C_2$, and let s, t be the out-neighbors of w (namely receiving an edge to x) in $C_1 + C_2$ (possibly $p = q$ or $s = t$). Then s, t are out-neighbors of x . If one of p, q is an in-neighbor of x , can reroute one of C_1, C_2 such that x belongs to both new cycles and y belongs to at most one, so get two cycles in G that meet at most $|C_1 \cap C_2| \leq p + 1$ vertices. So we may assume p, q are in-neighbors of y (and not of x).

Let $C'_1 = C_1 \setminus w + \{x, y\}$ and $C'_2 = C_2 \setminus w + \{x, y\}$. Then C'_1, C'_2 are directed cycles in G , and $|C'_1 \cap C'_2| = |C_1 \cap C_2| + 1$.

If y has out-degree 1 in G , then the number of vertices of degree 1 in G is larger than in G' , and so $|C_1 \cap C_2| \leq (p - 1) + 1$ and C'_1, C'_2 work. So we may assume y has out-degree 2 in G , and so by the choice of x there is a directed cycle C_3 in $G \setminus \{x\}$ with $y \in C_3$. Let P be a directed path in C_3 from y to $C'_1 + C'_2$, say P is from y to v and $v \in C'_2$. Now C'_1 and $y - P - v - (C'_2 \setminus (x - v)) - y$ are two directed cycles that meet in at most $|C'_1 \cap C'_2| - 1 = |C_1 \cap C_2| \leq p + 1$ vertices as required. $\square$

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.6

Similarly to the case of Theorem 1.5, the theorem follows from:

Theorem 3.1. *Let G be a undirected n -vertex graph and let $F_1, \dots, F_n$ be sets of edges in G such that $1 \leq |F_i| \leq 2$. Assume p sets are of size 1. Then G contains a rainbow cycle of length at most $\lceil \frac{n+p}{2} \rceil$.*

Proof. We may assume that the sets F_i are disjoint, or else there is a rainbow cycle of length 2. The case where all the F_i 's are of size 2 was proved in [4]. Thus we may assume $|F_1| = 1$, and let $F_1 = \{e\}$. We will think of the the edges in F_i as colored by the color i .

We construct a subgraph H of G recursively as follows. Let $H_0 = \{e\}$. At each step i , H_i is obtained by adding to H_{i-1} a vertex $x_i \notin V(H_{i-1})$ and two edges $x_i a_i, x_i b_i \notin E(H_{i-1})$ such that $a_i, b_i \in V(H_{i-1})$ and $x_i a_i, x_i b_i$ are colored by the same color j_i . We stop at step $i = t$ when there are no such two edges to add, and we let $H = H_t$.

For two vertices $u, v \in V(G)$ let $\text{dist}_r(u, v)$ denote the *rainbow distance* of u, v , that is, the minimum length (number of edges) of a rainbow path connecting u

and v . For a subgraph G' of G let the *rainbow diameter* of G' be defined as $rd(G') = \min_{u,v \in V(G')} \text{dist}_r(u, v)$.

Claim 3.2. $rd(H_i) \leq \frac{i}{2} + 1$, and if i is even there exists at most one pair of vertices $u_i, v_i \in V(H_i)$ such that $\text{dist}_r(u_i, v_i) = \frac{i}{2} + 1$ (so for any other pair of vertices $u, v \in V(H_i)$, $\text{dist}_r(u, v) \leq \frac{i}{2}$).

Proof of the claim. If $i \in \{0, 1\}$ the claim is trivial. We proceed by induction on i .

Suppose first that $i + 1$ is odd. By the induction hypothesis, there exists at most one pair of vertices $u_i, v_i \in V(H_i)$ such that $\text{dist}_r(u_i, v_i) \leq \frac{i}{2} + 1$ and for any other pair of vertices $u, v \in V(H_i)$, $\text{dist}_r(u, v) \leq \frac{i}{2}$. We have to show that for every $y, z \in V(H_{i+1})$, $\text{dist}_r(y, z) \leq \lfloor \frac{i+1}{2} + 1 \rfloor = \frac{i}{2} + 1$. If $y, z \in V(H_i)$ we are done. Suppose $z = x_{i+1}$. If $y \notin \{u_i, v_i\}$ there is a rainbow path from a_{i+1} to y of length at most $\frac{i}{2}$ and thus there is a rainbow path from x_{i+1} to y of length at most $\frac{i}{2} + 1$. If $y \in \{u_i, v_i\}$, say $y = u_i$, then either $a_{i+1} \neq v_i$ or $b_{i+1} \neq v_i$. In both cases there exists a rainbow path from x_{i+1} to y , through a_{i+1} or b_{i+1} respectively, of length at most $\frac{i}{2} + 1$.

Assume now that $i + 2$ is even. By the induction hypothesis, there exists at most one pair $u_i, v_i \in V(H_i)$ such that $\text{dist}_r(u_i, v_i) \leq \frac{i}{2} + 1$ and any other pair of vertices in $V(H_i)$ is of rainbow distance at most $\frac{i}{2}$. We have to show that there exists at most one pair $u_{i+2}, v_{i+2} \in V(H_{i+2})$ such that $\text{dist}_r(u_{i+2}, v_{i+2}) \leq \frac{i}{2} + 2$ and any other pair of vertices in $V(H_{i+2})$ is of rainbow distance at most $\frac{i}{2} + 1$.

We split into two cases.

Case 1. $x_{i+1} \notin \{a_{i+2}, b_{i+2}\}$.

Choose $u_{i+2} = x_{i+1}, v_{i+2} = x_{i+2}$. We claim that $\text{dist}_r(u_{i+2}, v_{i+2}) \leq \frac{i}{2} + 2$. Indeed, by the induction hypothesis we can choose a vertex $u \in \{a_{i+1}, b_{i+1}\}$ and $v \in \{a_{i+2}, b_{i+2}\}$ such that $\text{dist}_r(u, v) \leq \frac{i}{2}$, and adding the edges $x_{i+1}u, x_{i+2}v$ we get a rainbow path between x_{i+1}, x_{i+2} of length at most $\frac{i}{2} + 2$. Let $u, v \in V(H_{i+2})$ such that $\{u, v\} \neq \{x_{i+1}, x_{i+2}\}$. Since $a_{i+1}, b_{i+1}, a_{i+2}, b_{i+2} \in V(H_i)$, we have $\text{dist}_r(u, v) \leq \frac{i}{2} + 1$ like in the odd case.

Case 2. $x_{i+1} = a_{i+2}$.

In this case, either $b_{i+2} \neq u_i$ or $b_{i+2} \neq v_i$. Assume WLOG $b_{i+2} \neq v_i$. Choose $u_{i+2} = x_{i+2}, v_{i+2} = v_i$. Then $\text{dist}_r(u_{i+2}, v_{i+2}) \leq \frac{i}{2} + 2$, and like before, $\text{dist}_r(u, v) \leq \frac{i}{2} + 1$ for any other pair of vertices u, v . $\square$

We proceed by induction on n . Contract H into a single vertex h to obtain a new graph G' (G' may have loops). Note that $n' := |V(G')| = n - t - 1$, the number of colors is $n - t - 1 = n'$ and the number of colors of size 1 is $p' = p - 1$. By induction there exists a rainbow cycle C in G' of size at most $\lceil \frac{n'+p'}{2} \rceil = \lceil \frac{n-t+p-2}{2} \rceil = \lceil \frac{n-t+p}{2} \rceil - 1$.

If C does not use the vertex h , we are done. Otherwise, uncontracting h we have that C is a path in G , with end vertices $u, v \in V(H)$. By the claim, there is a rainbow path P in H connecting u and v of size at most $\frac{t}{2} + 1$. Note that P uses colors not appearing in C . Thus $P + C$ is a rainbow cycle in G of size at most $\lceil \frac{n-t+p}{2} \rceil - 1 + \frac{t}{2} + 1 = \lceil \frac{n+p}{2} \rceil$. This completes the proof of the theorem. $\square$

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.7

For a digraph D let $\phi(D) = \sum_{v \in V(D)} \frac{1}{\deg^+(v)+1}$.

Theorem 4.1. *If D is sink-less, then $g(D) \leq 2\phi(D)$.*

Item (1) following Conjecture 1.1 is the case where all the out-degrees are equal. Any acyclic non-empty graph illustrates the necessity of the sink-less-ness condition in the theorem.

Lemma 4.2. *In any digraph D there exists a vertex v for which $\phi(D - v) \leq \phi(D)$.*

Proof. The condition $\phi(D - v) \leq \phi(D)$ means that

$$(1) \quad \frac{1}{\deg^+(v) + 1} \geq \sum_{u \in N^-(v)} \frac{1}{\deg^+(u)} \frac{1}{\deg^+(u) + 1}$$

The expression on the right hand side is the average

This will follow if we show that the sums, over all vertices, of the two sides, are equal. On the left hand side the sum is, by definition, $\phi(D)$. On the right hand side, the number of times every vertex u appears is $\deg^+(u)$, and hence we get $\sum_{u \in V(D)} \frac{1}{\deg^+(u) + 1}$, which is again $\phi(D)$. $\square$

Lemma 4.3. *If D is a sink-less graph, then there exists a vertex v such that $\phi(D - v) \leq \phi(D)$ and $D - v$ is sink-less, or else D is the union of cycles.*

Proof. Let A be the set of vertices v satisfying (1). Assuming negation, for every $v \in A$ there exists $w \in V(D)$ such that $N^+(w) = \{v\}$. The w -term in the right hand side of (1) is then $\frac{1}{2}$, while the left hand side is at most $\frac{1}{2}$, and thus for the inequality to hold necessarily $N^-(v) = \{w\}$ and $\deg^+(v) = 1$. Namely, both in-degree and out-degree of v are 1. Thus, assuming negation of the lemma, for every $v \in A$ equality holds in (1). Other vertices satisfy a strict reverse inequality, so if $V(D) \setminus A \neq \emptyset$ then the sum over the right hand side of (1) would be less than the sum over the left hand side, a contradiction. This means that $A = V(D)$. But we have just shown that vertices in A have in-degree and out-degree 1. So, this condition holds for all vertices of D , meaning that D is the union of cycles, proving the lemma. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 4.1. By the lemma, we can remove vertices one by one, while keeping the graph sink-less and not increasing ϕ , until we reach a graph K that is the union of cycles. Since K is a subgraph of G , we have $g(G) \leq g(K)$. Since K is the union of cycles, $\phi(K) = \frac{1}{2}|V(K)| \geq \frac{1}{2}g(K)$.

Combining these, we get

$$g(G) \leq g(K) \leq 2\phi(K) \leq 2\phi(G),$$

as desired. $\square$

REFERENCES

- [1] , R. Aharoni, M. DeVos and R. Holzman, Rainbow triangles and the Caccetta-Häggkvist conjecture, J. Graph Theory **92**(2009), 347–360.
- [2] L. Caccetta, and R. Häggkvist, On minimal digraphs with given girth. Proceedings of the Ninth Southeastern Conference on Combinatorics, Graph Theory, and Computing (Florida Atlantic Univ., Boca Raton, Fla., 1978), pp. 181–187, Congress. Numer., XXI, Utilitas Math., Winnipeg, Man., 1978.
- [3] V. Chvatal and E. Szemerédi, Short cycles in directed graphs, J. Combin. Th., Ser. B, **35** (1983) 323–327.
- [4] M. Devos, M. Drescher, D. Funk, S. González Hermosillo de la Maza, K. Guo, T. Huynh, B. Mohar, Bojan and A. Montejano, Short rainbow cycles in graphs and matroids, J. Journal Graph Theory, **96**(2021), 192–202.

- [5] P. Hompe and S. Spirkl, Further approximations for Aharoni's rainbow generalization of the Caccetta-Häggkvist conjecture, arXiv:2105.03373.
- [6] J. N. Shen, Directed triangles in digraphs. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* **74** (1998), no. 2, 405–407.
- [7] J. N. Shen, On the girth of digraphs, *Discrete Mathematics* **211** (2000) 167–181.
- [8] J. N. Shen, On the Caccetta-Häggkvist conjecture, *Graphs Combin.* **18** (2002), 645–654.