

The optimal χ -bound for (P_7, C_4, C_5) -free graphs

Shenwei Huang*

December 10, 2022

Abstract

In this paper, we give an optimal χ -binding function for the class of (P_7, C_4, C_5) -free graphs. We show that every (P_7, C_4, C_5) -free graph G has $\chi(G) \leq \lceil \frac{11}{9}\omega(G) \rceil$. To prove the result, we use a decomposition theorem obtained in [K. Cameron and S. Huang and I. Penev and V. Sivaraman, The class of (P_7, C_4, C_5) -free graphs: Decomposition, algorithms, and χ -boundedness, Journal of Graph Theory 93, 503–552, 2020] combined with careful inductive arguments and a nontrivial use of the König theorem for bipartite matching.

1 Introduction

All graphs in this paper are finite and simple. For general graph theory notation we follow [1]. A q -coloring of a graph G assigns a color from $\{1, \dots, q\}$ to each vertex of G such that adjacent vertices are assigned different colors. We say that a graph G is q -colorable if G admits a q -coloring. The *chromatic number* of a graph G , denoted by $\chi(G)$, is the minimum number q for which G is q -colorable. The *clique number* of G , denoted by $\omega(G)$, is the size of a largest clique in G . A graph G is *perfect* if $\chi(H) = \omega(H)$ for each induced subgraph H of G .

Let P_n , C_n and K_n denote the path, cycle and complete graph on n vertices, respectively. For a set \mathcal{H} of graphs, we say that G is \mathcal{H} -free if G contains no induced subgraph isomorphic to $H \in \mathcal{H}$. If $\mathcal{H} = \{H_1, \dots, H_p\}$, we simply write G is (H_1, \dots, H_p) -free instead. A graph class is *hereditary* if it is \mathcal{H} -free for some set \mathcal{H} of graphs. A hereditary graph class \mathcal{G} is χ -bounded if there is a function f such that $\chi(G) \leq f(\omega(G))$ for every $G \in \mathcal{G}$. The function f is called a χ -binding function for \mathcal{G} . If f can be chosen to be a polynomial function, then \mathcal{G} is called *polynomially χ -bounded*. It is easy to see that a necessary condition for the class of H -free graphs to be χ -bounded is that H is a forest. Gyárfás conjectured that this condition is also sufficient.

Conjecture 1 (Gyárfás [7]). *For every forest T , the class of T -free graphs is χ -bounded.*

*College of Computer Science, Nankai University, Tianjin 300350, China. Email: shenwei-huang@nankai.edu.cn. Supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (12171256).

Gyárfás [8] proved the conjecture for $T = P_t$: every P_t -free graph G has $\chi(G) \leq (t - 1)^{\omega(G)-1}$. Note that this χ -binding function is exponential in $\omega(G)$. Esperet asked whether every χ -bounded hereditary class is polynomially χ -bounded. Recently, this question was answered negatively by Briański, Davies and Walczak [3]. However, the question is still wide open for P_t -free graphs.

The answer is trivial for $t \leq 4$ (since P_4 -free graphs are perfect). For $t = 5$, there is a recent result by Scott, Seymour and Spirkl [11] that gives a quasi-polynomial bound. Apart from these, not much is known. Therefore, researchers started to investigate subclasses of P_t -free graphs. One interesting line is to consider P_t -free graphs without certain induced cycles. For instance, any (P_5, C_3) -free graph is 3-colorable (the bound is attained by C_5) [12], and any (P_5, C_4) -free graph has $\chi(G) \leq \lceil \frac{5}{4}\omega(G) \rceil$ (the equal-size blowups of C_5 shows that the bound is optimal) [5]. For $t = 6$, optimal bounds have been obtained for C_3 and C_4 as well [2, 9]. For $t \geq 7$, Gravier, Hoàng and Maffray [6] showed that every (P_t, C_3) -free graph G has $\chi(G) \leq t - 2$. However, it is not known whether this is optimal. Recently, Kathie et al. [4] showed that any (P_7, C_4, C_5) -free G has $\chi(G) \leq \frac{3}{2}\omega(G)$.

Our Contribution

In this paper, we give an optimal χ -bound for the class of (P_7, C_4, C_5) -free graphs. In particular, we prove the following theorem.

Theorem 1. *Let G be a (P_7, C_4, C_5) -free graph. Then $\chi(G) \leq \lceil \frac{11}{9}\omega(G) \rceil$.*

To prove the theorem, we use a decomposition theorem obtained in [4] combined with careful inductive arguments and a nontrivial use of the König theorem for bipartite matching. It is shown in [4] that for every positive integer k there is a (P_7, C_4, C_5) -free graph G_k such that $\omega(G_k) = 3k$ and $\chi(G_k) \geq \frac{11}{9}\omega(G_k)$. Therefore, our result gives an optimal bound.

2 Preliminaries

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph. The *neighborhood* of a vertex v is denoted by $N(v) = \{u \mid uv \in E\}$ and its degree by $d(v) = |N(v)|$. The *closed neighborhood* of v , denoted by $N[v]$, is $N(v) \cup \{v\}$. For a set $X \subseteq V$, we write $N(X) = \bigcup_{v \in X} N(v) \setminus X$. For $x \in V$ and $S \subseteq V$, we let $N_S(x)$ be the set of neighbors of x that are in S , that is, $N_S(x) = N_G(x) \cap S$. Define $d_S(v) = |N_S(v)|$. A vertex u is *universal* in G if $d_G(u) = |G| - 1$.

For $S \subseteq V$, the subgraph *induced* by S , is denoted by $G[S]$. The *complement* of G is the graph \overline{G} with vertex set V and edge set $\{uv \mid uv \notin E\}$. A clique $K \subseteq V$ is a *clique cutset* if $G - K$ has more connected components than G . A clique K is *maximal* if for any $v \notin K$, $K \cup \{v\}$ is not a clique. A subset is *stable* if no two vertices in the set are adjacent. A stable set S is *strong* if it intersects every maximum clique of G , i.e., $\omega(G - S) = \omega(G) - 1$.

For $X, Y \subseteq V$, we say that X is *complete* (resp. *anticomplete*) to Y if every vertex in X is adjacent (resp. non-adjacent) to every vertex in Y . Given a graph $G = (\{v_1, \dots, v_t\}, E(G))$ of order t and graphs H_1, \dots, H_t , we say that a *substitution of G using*




Figure 1: The emerald E .

H_1, \dots, H_t is the graph obtained from G by replacing v_i with a copy of H_i such that $V(H_i)$ and $V(H_j)$ are complete if $v_i v_j \in E(G)$, and anticomplete if $v_i v_j \notin E(G)$. A *blowup* of G is a substitution of G using complete graphs K_{s_1}, \dots, K_{s_t} of size $s_1, \dots, s_t \geq 0$, respectively. Note that in the definition of blowup we allow complete graphs of size 0, which is equivalent to the operation of removing the corresponding vertex. Therefore, any proper induced subgraph of G is a blowup of G under our definition. If $s_i \geq 1$ for each $1 \leq i \leq t$, we say the resulting graph is a *nonempty blowup* of G . If $s_1 = \dots = s_t = x$, we denote the resulting graph by $G[K_x]$ and call $G[K_x]$ an equal-size blowup of G .

3 The Main Result

In this section, we prove [Theorem 1](#). For that purpose, we need a decomposition theorem for (P_7, C_4, C_5) -free graphs. To state the decomposition theorem, we need to introduce two special graphs called the emerald and 7-bracelets. The *emerald* is a 11-vertex 4-regular graph shown in [Figure 1](#). We denote this graph by E .

We say that G is a *7-bracelet* if $V(G)$ can be partition into 7 nonempty cliques A_1, \dots, A_7 such that

- For each $1 \leq i \leq 7$, A_i is complete to $A_{i+1} \cup A_{i-1}$ and anticomplete to $A_{i+3} \cup A_{i-3}$;
- For $i \notin \{7, 1, 2\}$, A_{i+1} and A_{i-1} are anticomplete;
- A_1 can be partitioned into three (possibly empty) subsets A_1^0, A_1^+, A_1^- , A_i can be partitioned into two (possibly empty) subsets A_i^0, A_i^- for $i \in \{2, 3\}$ and A_i can be partitioned into two (possibly empty) subsets A_i^0, A_i^+ for $i \in \{6, 7\}$ such that

1. A_i^0 is anticomplete to $A_{i+2} \cup A_{i-2}$ for each $i \in \{6, 7, 1, 2, 3\}$;
2. A_1^+ is anticomplete to A_6 and A_1^- is anticomplete to A_3 ;
3. Every vertex in A_7^+ has a neighbor in A_2^- and every vertex in A_2^- has a neighbor in A_7^+ ;
4. Every vertex in A_1^+ has a neighbor in A_3^- and every vertex in A_3^- has a neighbor in A_1^+ , and every vertex in A_1^- has a neighbor in A_6^+ and every vertex in A_6^+ has a neighbor in A_1^- .




Figure 2: Diagram for 7-bracelet. The thick line means the two sets are complete, no lines means anticompleteness, and the blue line means that the edges between the two sets are arbitrary subject to the constraint that the resulting graph is (P_7, C_4, C_5) -free graphs.

See Figure 2 for the diagram of a 7-bracelet.

Theorem 2 ([4]). *Let G be a (P_7, C_4, C_5) -free graph. Then G contains a clique cutset or a universal vertex, or is isomorphic to a nonempty blowup of the emerald (see Figure 1) or a 7-bracelet.*

It is well-known that clique cutsets and universal vertices preserve any χ -binding function. Therefore, it suffices to consider blowups of the emerald and 7-bracelets.

Theorem 3. *If G is a 7-bracelet, then $\chi(G) \leq \lceil \frac{7}{6}\omega(G) \rceil$.*

Theorem 4. *If G is a blowup of the emerald, then $\chi(G) \leq \lceil \frac{11}{9}\omega(G) \rceil$.*

Proof of Theorem 1 (assuming Theorem 3 and Theorem 4). We use induction on $|G|$. We may assume that G is connected, for otherwise we apply the inductive hypothesis on each

connected component. If G contains a clique cutset K that disconnects H_1 from H_2 , let $G_i = G[H_i \cup K]$ for $i = 1, 2$. Then the inductive hypothesis implies that $\chi(G_i) \leq \lceil \frac{11}{9} \omega(G_i) \rceil$ for $i = 1, 2$. Note that $\chi(G) = \max\{\chi(G_1), \chi(G_2)\}$ and so $\chi(G) \leq \lceil \frac{11}{9} \omega(G) \rceil$. If G contains a strong stable set S , then applying the inductive hypothesis to $G - S$ implies that $\chi(G - S) \leq \lceil \frac{11}{9} \omega(G - S) \rceil$. Since $\omega(G - S) \leq \omega(G) - 1$, it follows that $\chi(G) \leq \chi(G - S) + 1 \leq \lceil \frac{11}{9} \omega(G) \rceil$. So G has no clique cutsets or strong stable sets. In particular, G has no universal vertices. It follows then from [Theorem 2](#) that G is a blowup of the emerald or a 7-bracelet. Now the theorem follows from [Theorem 3](#) and [Theorem 4](#). \square

We prove [Theorem 3](#) and [Theorem 4](#) in the next two sections.

4 Color 7-bracelets

Let G be a 7-bracelet with notations introduced in [Figure 2](#). By the definition of 7-bracelet, $A_7^+ = \emptyset$ if and only if $A_2^- = \emptyset$, $A_6^+ = \emptyset$ if and only if $A_1^- = \emptyset$, $A_1^+ = \emptyset$ if and only if $A_3^- = \emptyset$. If $A_6^+ = A_3^- = \emptyset$, we call G a 7-bracelet with one uncertain pair.

For a graph G , let $\beta(G)$ and $\tau(G)$ be the maximum size of a matching and minimum size of a vertex cover, respectively. The following is a famous theorem due to König.

Lemma 1 (see for example [\[1\]](#)). *For any bipartite graph G , $\beta(G) = \tau(G)$.*

We first color 7-bracelets with one uncertain pair.

Lemma 2 (Equal-size 7-bracelet with one uncertain pair). *Let G be a 7-bracelet (A_1, \dots, A_7) such that*

- $|A_i| = x$ for each $1 \leq i \leq 7$, where x is a positive integer;
- $A_6^+ = A_3^- = \emptyset$;
- $\omega(G[A_7^+ \cup A_2^-]) \leq x$.

Then $\chi(G) \leq \lceil \frac{7}{6} \omega(G) \rceil$.

Proof. Since $A_6^+ = A_3^- = \emptyset$, $A_i = A_i^0$ for $i \in \{6, 1, 3\}$. Note that $\omega(G) = 2x$ since $\omega(G[A_7^+ \cup A_2^-]) \leq x$. We give a coloring of G using $\lceil \frac{7}{6} \omega(G) \rceil = \lceil \frac{7}{3} x \rceil$ colors. Consider the following coloring ϕ of G : color vertices in A_i using colors $(i-1)x + 1, (i-1)x + 2, \dots, (i-1)x + x$ for each i , where colors are taken modulo $\lceil \frac{7}{3} x \rceil$. Clearly, ϕ is a proper coloring of $G - F$, where F is the set of edges between A_7^+ and A_2^- .

It remains to show that it is possible to assign colors in $\phi(A_2)$ to the vertices of A_2 and assign colors in $\phi(A_7)$ to the vertices of A_7 in such a way that no edge between A_7^+ and A_2^- is monochromatic. If a color $c \in \phi(A_2) \cap \phi(A_7)$ is assigned to a vertex in A_2^0 , then it can be assigned to any vertex in A_7^+ . Similarly, if a color $c \in \phi(A_2) \cap \phi(A_7)$ is assigned to a vertex in A_7^0 , then it can be assigned to any vertex in A_2^- . However, if a color $c \in \phi(A_2) \cap \phi(A_7)$ is not assigned to a vertex in $A_2^0 \cup A_7^0$, it must be used on a non-edge between A_7^+ and A_2^- .

Let $t = |A_2^0| + |A_7^0|$. Then $G' := G[A_2^- \cup A_7^+]$ has order $2x - t$. Since $\omega(G') \leq x$, $\alpha(\overline{G'}) \leq x$. By König Theorem, $\beta(\overline{G'}) = \tau(\overline{G'})$. Since $\alpha(\overline{G'}) + \tau(\overline{G'}) \geq |G'|$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\beta(\overline{G'}) &\geq |G'| - \alpha(\overline{G'}) \\ &\geq x - t \\ &\geq |\phi(A_2) \cap \phi(A_7)| - t.\end{aligned}$$

Now consider the following assignment of colors to $A_2 \cup A_7$ from $\phi(A_2) \cup \phi(A_7)$.

- Color the vertices in $A_2^0 \cup A_7^0$ using colors in $\phi(A_2) \cap \phi(A_7)$;
- For each $c \in \phi(A_2) \cap \phi(A_7)$ not used on $A_2^0 \cup A_7^0$, assign c to a non-edge e_c between A_7^+ and A_2^- . Since $\beta(\overline{G'}) \geq |\phi(A_2) \cap \phi(A_7)| - t$, it is possible to choose e_c so that $e_c \cap e_{c'} = \emptyset$ for $c, c' \in \phi(A_2) \cap \phi(A_7)$ and $c \neq c'$.
- Color the remaining vertices in A_2 and A_7 in an arbitrary way.

It is routine to verify that this is a proper coloring of G . □

Lemma 3 (Equal-size 7-bracelet). *Let G be a 7-bracelet such that*

- $|A_i| = x$ for each $1 \leq i \leq 7$, where x is a positive integer;
- $\omega(G[A_6^+ \cup A_1^-]), \omega(G[A_1^+ \cup A_3^-]), \omega(G[A_7^+ \cup A_2^-]) \leq x$.

Then $\chi(G) \leq \lceil \frac{7}{6}\omega(G) \rceil$.

Proof. Note that $\omega(G) = 2x$ since $\omega(G[A_6^+ \cup A_1^-]), \omega(G[A_1^+ \cup A_3^-]), \omega(G[A_7^+ \cup A_2^-]) \leq x$. We give a coloring of G using $\lceil \frac{7}{6}\omega(G) \rceil = \lceil \frac{7}{3}x \rceil$ colors. Consider the following coloring ϕ of G : color vertices in A_i using colors $(i-1)x+1, (i-1)x+2, \dots, (i-1)x+x$ for each i , where colors are taken modulo $\lceil \frac{7x}{3} \rceil$. Let F_{61} (F_{13}) be the set of edges between A_6 (A_3) and A_1 . By Lemma 2, ϕ is a proper coloring of $G - (F_{61} \cup F_{13})$. It remains to show that it is possible to assign colors from $\phi(A_1), \phi(A_3), \phi(A_6)$ to vertices in A_1, A_3, A_6 respectively so that the resulting coloring is a proper coloring of G .

For clarity, we assume that $x = 3k$ for some $k \geq 1$ (and the cases that $x = 3k + 1$ or $x = 3k + 2$ are similar). Note that $\phi(A_1) = \{1, \dots, 3k\}$, $\phi(A_3) = \{6k + 1, \dots, 1, \dots, 2k\}$, $\phi(A_6) = \{k + 1, \dots, 4k\}$. Then $C := \phi(A_1) \cup \phi(A_3) \cup \phi(A_6)$ has size $5k$. Let

$$\begin{aligned}C_6 &= C \setminus (\phi(A_1) \cup \phi(A_3)); \\ C_{61} &= (\phi(A_1) \cap \phi(A_6)) \setminus \phi(A_3); \\ C_{613} &= \phi(A_1) \cap \phi(A_6) \cap \phi(A_3); \\ C_{13} &= (\phi(A_1) \cap \phi(A_3)) \setminus \phi(A_6); \\ C_3 &= C \setminus (\phi(A_1) \cup \phi(A_6)).\end{aligned}$$

Note that $C = C_6 \cup C_{61} \cup C_{613} \cup C_{13} \cup C_3$ and $|C_6| = |C_{61}| = |C_{613}| = |C_{13}| = |C_3| = k$.

If $|A_1^+| \leq k$, then color vertices in A_1^+ using colors from C_{61} . Since $C_{61} \cap \phi(A_3) = \emptyset$, A_3 can be colored in an arbitrary way. By Lemma 2, it is possible to assign colors from $\phi(A_1)$ and $\phi(A_6)$ to vertices in A_1 and A_6 such that vertices in A_1^+ are colored with colors

from C_{61} and the resulting coloring is a proper coloring of G . So $|A_1^+| > k$. By symmetry, $|A_1^-| > k$.

For every two vertices $x, y \in A_1^-$, $N_{A_6^+}(x) \subseteq N_{A_6^+}(y)$ or $N_{A_6^+}(y) \subseteq N_{A_6^+}(x)$, since G is C_4 -free. Let $A_1^{-\setminus} \subseteq A_1^-$ be a set of k vertices consisting of the largest k vertices of A_1^- (with respect to the neighborhood in A_6^+). Let $A_1^{+\setminus} \subseteq A_1^+$ be a set of k vertices consisting of the largest k vertices of A_1^+ (with respect to the neighborhood in A_3^-). Color $A_1^{-\setminus}$ using k colors in C_{13} and $A_1^{+\setminus}$ using k colors in C_{61} . We now consider two cases.

Case 1. $|R_1^-| \leq |A_6^0|$. In this case, color R_1^- using colors in C_{613} and these colors can also be used to color $|R_1^-|$ vertices in A_6^0 . Then color A_6^+ using the remaining colors in $\phi(A_6)$. It is easy to see that the coloring of A_6 and the coloring of A_1 are proper. Since in this coloring all colors used on A_1^- belong to $\phi(A_1) \cap \phi(A_3)$, it is possible to extend this coloring to a proper coloring of G by [Lemma 2](#).

Case 2. $|R_1^-| > |A_6^0|$. By symmetry, $|R_1^+| > |A_3^0|$. Since $|A_1^{-\setminus}|, |A_1^{+\setminus}| = k$ and $|A_1| = 3k$, $|R_1^-| + |R_1^+| + |A_1^0| = k$. So

$$|A_6^0| < |R_1^-| \leq k.$$

This implies that $|A_6^+| > 2k$ and so $|A_6^+| + |A_1^{-\setminus}| > 3k$. By symmetry, $|A_3^-| > 2k$ and $|A_3^-| + |A_1^{+\setminus}| > 3k$.

We claim that for each $r \in R_1^-$, r has a non-neighbor $f(r)$ in A_6^+ . Moreover, we can choose f to be injective. We prove this by induction on $|R_1^-|$. The base case is $|R_1^-| = \{r_1\}$. If r_1 is complete to A_6^+ , then $A_6^+ \cup A_1^{-\setminus} \cup \{r_1\}$ is a clique of size larger than $3k$ by the definition of $A_1^{-\setminus}$. This contradicts that $\omega(G[A_6^+, A_1^-]) \leq 3k$. So r_1 has a non-neighbor s_1 in A_6^+ . Now suppose that $|R_1^-| = i \geq 2$ and let r_j be the j th largest vertex in R_1^- for $1 \leq j \leq i$, and that we have found distinct non-neighbors s_1, \dots, s_{i-1} of r_1, \dots, r_{i-1} . If r_i is complete to $A_6^+ \setminus \{s_1, \dots, s_{i-1}\}$, then $(A_6^+ \setminus \{s_1, \dots, s_{i-1}\}) \cup \{r_1, \dots, r_i\} \cup A_1^{-\setminus}$ is a clique of $G[A_6^+ \cup A_1^-]$ of size larger than $3k$. This contradicts that $\omega(G[A_6^+ \cup A_1^-]) \leq 3k$. So r_i must have a non-neighbor $s_i \in A_6^+ \setminus \{s_1, \dots, s_{i-1}\}$. This proves the claim. By symmetry, for each $r \in R_1^+$, r has a non-neighbor $g(r)$ in A_3^- . Moreover, we can choose g to be injective.

Now we can have a desired coloring as follows.

- Color R_1^-, R_1^+, A_1^0 using the k colors in C_{613} in any way.
- For each color i assigned to some vertex $r \in R_1^-$, color a non-neighbor $f(r) \in A_6^+$ of r with i , and color the remaining vertices in A_6 in any way.
- For each color i assigned to some vertex $r \in R_1^+$, color a non-neighbor $g(r) \in A_3^-$ of r with i , and color the remaining vertices in A_3 in any way. \square

Now we are ready to prove [Theorem 3](#).

Proof of Theorem 3. Let G be a 7-bracelet (A_1, \dots, A_7) . We prove by induction on $|G|$. If G has a strong stable set S , we are done by applying the inductive hypothesis to $G - S$. So we assume that G has no strong stable set. Let K_{61} , K_{13} and K_{72} be any maximum clique of $G[A_6^+ \cup A_1^-]$, $G[A_1^+ \cup A_3^-]$, and $G[A_7^+ \cup A_2^-]$, respectively. Observe that the possible maximum cliques of G are $A_i \cup A_{i+1}$, $K_{61} \cup A_7$, $K_{13} \cup A_2$ or $K_{72} \cup A_1$. We claim that

$$A_i \cup A_{i+1} \text{ is a maximum clique of } G \text{ for each } i. \quad (1)$$

Since G is C_4 -free and each vertex in A_6^+ has a neighbor in A_1^- , there exists a vertex in A_1^- that is complete to A_6^+ . Let a_1^- be such a vertex. Note that a_1^- is universal in $G[A_6^+ \cup A_1^- \cup A_7]$ and so is in every maximum clique of $G[A_6^+ \cup A_1^- \cup A_7]$. The vertices $a_6^+, a_7^+, a_2^-, a_1^+, a_3^-$ can be defined similarly. If $A_i \cup A_{i+1}$ is not maximum, we can find a strong stable set S of G as follows, which is a contradiction. For $1 \leq i \leq 7$, let $a_i \in A_i$.

- If $A_4 \cup A_5$ is not a maximum clique, then $S = \{a_1, a_6^+, a_3^-\}$ is a desired set.
- If $A_5 \cup A_6$ is not a maximum clique, then $S = \{a_4, a_2^-, a_7^+\}$ is a desired set. The case $A_4 \cup A_3$ is symmetric.
- If $A_6 \cup A_7$ is not a maximum clique, then $S = \{a_5, a_3^-, a_1^-\}$ is a desired set. The case $A_2 \cup A_3$ is symmetric.
- If $A_1 \cup A_7$ is not a maximum clique, then $S = \{a_4, a_2^-, a_6^+\}$ is a desired set. The case $A_2 \cup A_1$ is symmetric.

This proves (1). Therefore, $|A_i| = x \geq 1$ for each $1 \leq i \leq 7$ and $\omega(G[A_6^+ \cup A_1^-]), \omega(G[A_1^+ \cup A_3^-]), \omega(G[A_7^+ \cup A_2^-]) \leq x$. It now follows from [Lemma 3](#) that $\chi(G) \leq \lceil \frac{7}{6}\omega(G) \rceil$. \square

5 Color Blowup of the Emerald

Let G be a blowup of the emerald. For each $i \in V(E)$ (see [Figure 1](#)), let L_i be the clique that substitutes the vertex i . Define $p(G) = \min_{1 \leq i \leq 11} |L_i|$. The overall strategy is to consider the blowups of a sequence of proper induced subgraphs (starting from C_7) of the emerald. We prove the bounds on the blowups of the larger induced subgraph using the results on blowups of the smaller induced subgraph as the base case for induction. In the end, we are able to show that the $\lceil \frac{11}{9}\omega(G) \rceil$ bound holds when $p(G) \leq 2$ ([Lemma 13](#)) and $p(G) \geq 3$ ([Lemma 15](#)), which together imply [Theorem 4](#).

We start with a famous lemma due to Lovász.

Lemma 4 ([\[10\]](#)). *Any blowup of a perfect graph is still a perfect graph.*

We now determine the chromatic number of equal-size blowups of C_7 .

Lemma 5 (Equal-size blowup of C_7). *For any integer $t \geq 1$, $\chi(C_7[K_t]) = \lceil \frac{7}{6}\omega(C_7[K_t]) \rceil$.*

Proof. Let $G = C_7[K_t]$ where $t \geq 1$. Note first that $\chi(G) \geq \lceil \frac{7t}{3} \rceil = \lceil \frac{7}{6}\omega(G) \rceil$. Next we show that $\chi(G) \leq \lceil \frac{7t}{3} \rceil$. Let L_i be the clique that substitutes the vertex $i \in V(C_7)$ for $1 \leq i \leq 7$. Consider the following coloring ϕ of G : color vertices in L_i using colors $(i-1)t+1, (i-1)t+2, \dots, (i-1)t+t$ for each i , where colors are taken modulo $\lceil \frac{7t}{3} \rceil$. It is routine to verify that ϕ is a proper coloring of G . \square

Lemma 6 (Blowup of $C_7 + v$). *If G is a blowup of $C_7 + v$ shown in [Figure 3](#), then $\chi(G) \leq \lceil \frac{7}{6}\omega(G) \rceil$.*

Proof. Let G be a blowup of $C_7 + v$ shown in [Figure 3](#). Suppose that L_u is the clique that substitutes the vertex $u \in V(C_7 + v)$. If $L_i = \emptyset$ for some $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, 7\}$, then G is




Figure 3: The graph $C_7 + v$.




Figure 4: The graph $C_7 + 2t$. The label outside a vertex u represents $|L_u|$.

perfect and $\chi(G) = \omega(G)$. Therefore, we may assume that $L_i \neq \emptyset$ for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, 7\}$. Hence, $t := \min_{1 \leq i \leq 7} |L_i| \geq 1$. For each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, 7\}$, let $L'_i \subseteq L_i$ be a set of size t . Denote by H the subgraph of G induced by $\bigcup_{i=1}^7 L'_i$. Note that $G - V(H)$ is perfect and $\omega(G - H) \leq \omega(G) - 2t$. It follows from [Lemma 5](#) that

$$\begin{aligned} \chi(G) &\leq \chi(G - H) + \chi(H) \\ &\leq (\omega(G) - 2t) + \lceil \frac{7}{3}t \rceil \\ &= \omega(G) + \lceil \frac{t}{3} \rceil. \end{aligned}$$

Since $t \leq \frac{\omega(G)}{2}$, $\chi(G) \leq \lceil \frac{7}{6}\omega(G) \rceil$. □

Lemma 7 (Blowup of $C_7 + 2t$). *If G is a blowup of $C_7 + 2t$ shown in [Figure 4](#), then $\chi(G) \leq \lceil \frac{7}{6}\omega(G) \rceil$.*

Proof. We prove by induction on $|G|$. Suppose that L_u is the clique that substitutes the vertex $u \in V(C_7 + 2t)$. If $L_u = \emptyset$ for some $u \in V(C_7 + 2t)$, then either G is perfect or G is a blowup of $C_7 + v$. Hence, we are done by [Lemma 6](#). Therefore, we may assume that $L_u \neq \emptyset$ for each $u \in V(C_7 + 2t)$. For every maximal clique K of $C_7 + 2t$, there is a stable set S_K such that S_K meets every maximal clique of $C_7 + 2t$ except K . This implies that if $\bigcup_{u \in K} L_u$ is not a maximum clique of G for some maximal clique K of $C_7 + 2t$, then




Figure 5: The graph $C_7 + 2f$.

$\omega(G - S_K) \leq \omega(G) - 1$. We are then done by applying the inductive hypothesis to $G - S_K$. Therefore, $\bigcup_{u \in K} L_u$ is a maximum clique of G for every maximal clique of $C_7 + 2t$. Hence, the sizes of L_u must be the ones shown in Figure 4, where x_1, x_2, x_3 are positive integers with $x_1 = x_2 + x_3$. Note that $\omega(G) = 2(x_2 + x_3)$.

For each clique L_u with $|L_u| = x_1$ or $|L_u| = x_2$, let $L'_u \subseteq L_u$ be a set of size x_2 . Denote by H the subgraph of G induced by the union of those L'_u . Since $x_1 = x_2 + x_3$, $H = C_7[K_{x_2}]$ and $G - H = C_7[K_{x_3}]$. It follows from Lemma 5 that,

$$\begin{aligned} \chi(G) &\leq \chi(H) + \chi(G - H) \\ &= \lceil \frac{7}{6}(2x_2) \rceil + \lceil \frac{7}{6}(2x_3) \rceil \\ &\leq \lceil \frac{7}{6}\omega(G) \rceil, \end{aligned}$$

unless $x_2, x_3 \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$. If $x_2 = x_3 = 1$, then it is easy to see that $\omega(G) = 4$ and $\chi(G) = 5 = \lceil \frac{7}{6}\omega(G) \rceil$. By symmetry, we now assume that $x_2 \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ and $x_2 \geq 4$. For each $u \in V(C_7 + 2v)$ with $|L_u| \in \{x_2, x_1\}$, let $L'_u \subseteq L_u$ of size 3. Denote by H the subgraph of G induced by those L'_u . Then $H = C_7[K_3]$ and $\omega(G - H) \leq \omega(G) - 6$. By the inductive hypothesis and Lemma 5,

$$\begin{aligned} \chi(G) &\leq \chi(G - H) + \chi(H) \\ &\leq \lceil \frac{7}{6}(\omega(G) - 6) \rceil + 7 \\ &\leq \lceil \frac{7}{6}\omega(G) \rceil. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. □

Lemma 8 (Blowup of $C_7 + 2f$). *If G is a blowup of $C_7 + 2f$ shown in Figure 5, then $\chi(G) \leq \lceil \frac{7}{6}\omega(G) \rceil$.*

Proof. Suppose that L_u is the clique that substitutes the vertex $u \in V(C_7 + 2f)$. Let $t = \min\{|L_1|, |L_{f_2}|, |L_{f_7}|\}$. If $t = 0$, then G is either perfect or a blowup of $C_7 + v$. We are done by Lemma 6. Therefore, we assume that $t \geq 1$. For each $u \in \{1, f_2, f_7\}$, let $L'_u \subseteq L_u$ be a set of size t . Let $G' = G[L'_1 \cup L'_{f_2} \cup L'_{f_7}]$. Note that $\omega(G - G') \leq \omega(G) - t$. Moreover,




Figure 6: The graph $E - 8$. The label outside a vertex u represents $|L_u|$.

$G - G'$ is either perfect or blowup of a $C_7 + v$. By Lemma 6, $\chi(G - G') \leq \lceil \frac{7}{6}(\omega(G) - t) \rceil$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \chi(G) &\leq \chi(G - G') + \chi(G') \\ &\leq \lceil \frac{7}{6}(\omega(G) - t) \rceil + t \\ &\leq \lceil \frac{7}{6}\omega(G) \rceil. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 9 (Blowup of emerald minus two vertices). *If G is a blowup of a proper induced subgraph of $H = E - 8$ shown in Figure 1, then $\chi(G) \leq \lceil \frac{7}{6}\omega(G) \rceil$.*

Proof. Note that there are five symmetric pairs $\{1, 2\}$, $\{3, 6\}$, $\{7, 9\}$, $\{10, 11\}$, $\{4, 5\}$ in H . Let G be a blowup of $H - v$ where v is a vertex in one of the five pairs.

- Observe that $H - 1$ and $H - 10$ are perfect. By Lemma 4, any blowup of $H - 1$ or $H - 10$ is perfect. If $v \in \{1, 2, 10, 11\}$, then $\chi(G) = \omega(G)$.

- Observe that $H - 5$ is isomorphic to $C_7 + v$ (see Figure 3). By Lemma 6, $\chi(G) \leq \lceil \frac{7}{6}\omega(G) \rceil$ if $v \in \{4, 5\}$.

- Observe that $H - 6$ is isomorphic to $C_7 + 2t$ (see Figure 4). By Lemma 7, $\chi(G) \leq \lceil \frac{7}{6}\omega(G) \rceil$ if $v \in \{3, 6\}$.

- Note that $H - 7$ is isomorphic to $C_7 + 2f$ shown in Figure 5. By Lemma 8, $\chi(G) \leq \lceil \frac{7}{6}\omega(G) \rceil$ if $v \in \{7, 9\}$. \square

Lemma 10 (Blowup of the emerald minus one vertex). *If G is a blowup of $E - 8$ shown in Figure 6, then $\chi(G) \leq \lceil \frac{7}{6}\omega(G) \rceil$.*

Proof. Let $H = E - 8$. We prove by induction on $|G|$. Suppose that L_u is the clique that substitutes the vertex $u \in V(H)$. If $L_u = \emptyset$ for some $u \in V(E - 8)$, then G is a blowup of a proper induced subgraph of H . It follows from Lemma 9 that $\chi(G) \leq \lceil \frac{7}{6}\omega(G) \rceil$. Therefore, we assume that $|L_u| \geq 1$ for each $u \in V(H)$. Note that for each maximal clique K of H ,

there exists a stable set S_K of H of size 3 such that S meets every maximal clique of H except K .

Case 1. There exists a maximal clique K of H such that $\bigcup_{u \in K} L_u$ is not a maximum clique of G . Then there exists a stable set S of G of size 3 such that $\omega(G - S) \leq \omega(G) - 1$. By the inductive hypothesis,

$$\begin{aligned}\chi(G) &\leq \chi(G - S) + 1 \\ &\leq \lceil \frac{7}{6}(\omega(G) - 1) \rceil + 1 \\ &\leq \lceil \frac{7}{6}\omega(G) \rceil.\end{aligned}$$

Case 2. For every maximal clique K of H , $\bigcup_{u \in K} L_u$ is a maximum clique of G . Then the sizes of L_u must be the ones shown in [Figure 6](#), where x_1, x_2, x_3 are positive integers and $x_1 = x_2 + x_3$. For each clique L_u with $|L_u| = x_1$ or $|L_u| = x_2$, let $L'_u \subseteq L_u$ be a set of size x_2 . Denote by G' the subgraph of G induced by the union of those L'_u . Since $x_1 = x_2 + x_3$, $G' = C_7[K_{x_2}]$ and $G - G' = C_7[K_{x_3}]$. Note that $\omega(G) = 2(x_2 + x_3)$. It follows from [Lemma 5](#) that,

$$\begin{aligned}\chi(G) &\leq \chi(G') + \chi(G - G') \\ &= \lceil \frac{7}{6}(2x_2) \rceil + \lceil \frac{7}{6}(2x_3) \rceil \\ &\leq \lceil \frac{7}{6}\omega(G) \rceil,\end{aligned}$$

unless $x_2, x_3 \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$. If $x_2 = x_3 = 1$, then it is easy to see that $\omega(G) = 4$ and $\chi(G) = 5 = \lceil \frac{7}{6}\omega(G) \rceil$. By symmetry, we now assume that $x_2 \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ and $x_2 \geq 4$. For each $u \in V(E - 8)$ with $|L_u| \in \{x_2, x_1\}$, let $L'_u \subseteq L_u$ of size 3. Denote by H the subgraph of G induced by those L'_u . Then $H = C_7[K_3]$ and $\omega(G - H) \leq \omega(G) - 6$. By the inductive hypothesis and [Lemma 5](#),

$$\begin{aligned}\chi(G) &\leq \chi(G - H) + \chi(H) \\ &\leq \lceil \frac{7}{6}(\omega(G) - 6) \rceil + 7 \\ &\leq \lceil \frac{7}{6}\omega(G) \rceil.\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. □

We need the following lemma to handle certain subgraphs of blowups of the emerald in the subsequent proof.

Lemma 11. *Let G_x be a nonempty blowup of the graph in [Figure 7](#), where L_i is the clique that substitutes the vertex $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, t_2, t_7\}$. Suppose that $x \geq 1$, $|L_7| + |L_{t_7}| = |L_2| + |L_{t_2}| = x + 2$ and $|L_{t_7}| + |L_{t_2}| \leq x + 2$. Then $\chi(G_x) \leq \lceil \frac{7}{6}(2x + 1) \rceil$.*

Proof. We prove by induction on x . It is routine to verify that the lemma is true for $1 \leq x \leq 6$. Now suppose that $x \geq 7$. Suppose that $|L_7|, |L_{t_2}| \geq 4$. For each $u \in \{1, t_2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7\}$,




Figure 7: The graph G_x , where $|L_7| + |L_{t_7}| = |L_2| + |L_{t_2}| = x + 2$ and $|L_{t_7}| + |L_{t_2}| \leq x + 2$.

let $L'_u \subseteq L_u$ be a set of size 3 and H be the union of those L'_u . Then $H = C_7[K_3]$ and $G - H$ is isomorphic to G_{x-3} . By induction and [Lemma 5](#),

$$\begin{aligned} \chi(G) &\leq \chi(H) + \chi(G - H) \\ &\leq \lceil \frac{7}{6}(2(x-3) + 1) \rceil + 7 \\ &= \lceil \frac{7}{6}(2x + 1) \rceil. \end{aligned}$$

So $|L_7| \leq 3$ or $|L_{t_2}| \leq 3$. If $|L_7| \leq 3$, then $|L_{t_7}| \geq x - 1$, $|L_{t_2}| \leq 3$ and $|L_2| \geq x - 1$. Since $x \geq 7$, $|L_{t_7}|, |L_2| \geq 6$ and the same argument applies. So $|L_{t_2}| \leq 3$. By symmetry, $|L_{t_7}| \leq 3$. This implies that $|L_2|, |L_7| \geq x - 1 \geq 6$. For $u = 1, 2, \dots, 7$, let $L'_u \subseteq L_u$ be a set of size 3 and H be the union of those L'_u . Then $H = C_7[K_3]$. Since $|L_{t_2}| + |L_{t_7}| \leq 6 \leq (x-3) + 2$, $G - H = G_{x-3}$. So we are done by applying the inductive hypothesis to $G - H$. \square

The next lemma gives a near optimal bound on the chromatic number of blowups G of the emerald with $p(G) \leq 2$.

Lemma 12. *If G is a blowup of the emerald with $p(G) \leq 2$, then $\chi(G) \leq \lceil \frac{7}{6}\omega(G) \rceil + 1$.*

Proof. We prove the lemma by induction on $|G|$. Suppose that L_i is the clique that substitutes the vertex $i \in V(E)$. We assume that $i \in L_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq 11$. Let $p = p(G)$. Since E is vertex-transitive, we may assume that $|L_8| = p$. If $p \leq 1$, then $\chi(G) \leq \lceil \frac{7}{6}\omega(G) \rceil + 1$ by [Lemma 10](#). So $p = 2$. If $G = E[K_2]$, then $\chi(G) = 8, \omega(G) = 6$ and $\chi(G) = \lceil \frac{7}{6}\omega(G) \rceil + 1$. Now assume that G is not $E[K_2]$ and the lemma holds for any blowup G' of the emerald such that $|G'| < |G|$ and $p(G') \leq 2$. In the following, we assume that G has no strong stable sets for otherwise we are done by the inductive hypothesis.

We say that a vertex $i \in V(E)$ is *minimum* if $|L_i| = p$. A triangle $\{i, j, k\}$ in the emerald is *maximum* if $|L_i| + |L_j| + |L_k| = \omega(G)$. Let $T(E)$ be the *triangle graph* of E whose vertices are all triangles of E and two triangles are adjacent in $T(E)$ if and only if they share an edge in E . Note that $T(E) = C_{11}$. The *distance* of two triangles in the emerald is their distance in $T(E)$. We proceed with a sequence of claims.

Claim 1. *If a triangle in the emerald is not maximum, then any triangle of distance 1 or 4 to that triangle is maximum.*

Proof of Claim 1. By symmetry, assume that $\{1, 2, 8\}$ is not maximum. If $\{1, 7, 8\}$ is not maximum, then $\{4, 6, 9\}$ is a strong stable set. If $\{5, 6, 11\}$ is not maximum, then $\{4, 7, 9\}$ is a strong stable set. In either case, it contradicts that G has no strong stable set. \square

For a vertex $i \in V(E)$, $N_E(i)$ induces a P_4 . The *middle triangle* of i is the triangle consisting of the middle edge of the P_4 and i . The other two triangles containing i are called *end triangles*.

Claim 2. *The middle triangle of a minimum vertex is maximum.*

Proof. Suppose that $T = \{1, 2, 8\}$ is not maximum. By Claim 1,

$$\text{triangles } \{1, 7, 8\}, \{2, 8, 9\}, \{5, 6, 11\}, \{3, 4, 10\} \text{ are maximum.}$$

This implies that $|L_6| = |L_3| = p$ and $\{1, 6, 7\}, \{2, 3, 9\}$ are maximum, which in turn implies that $|L_4| = |L_5| = p$ and $\{4, 5, 10\}, \{4, 5, 11\}$ are maximum. Therefore, $|L_{10}| = |L_{11}|$, $|L_1| \geq |L_{11}|$, and $|L_2| \geq |L_{10}|$. It follows that $|L_1| + |L_2| + |L_8| \geq |L_{10}| + |L_{11}| + p = \omega(G)$. This contradicts that T is not maximum. \square

Claim 3. *If both end triangles of a minimum vertex are not maximum, then $\chi(G) \leq \lceil \frac{7}{6}\omega(G) \rceil + 1$.*

Proof. By Claim 2, $T = \{1, 2, 8\}$ is maximum. Suppose that $\{1, 7, 8\}$ and $\{2, 8, 9\}$ are not maximum. By Claim 1, triangles $\{2, 3, 9\}, \{1, 6, 7\}, \{3, 9, 10\}, \{6, 7, 11\}, \{4, 5, 10\}, \{4, 5, 11\}$ are maximum. Therefore, $|L_1| = |L_2| = |L_4| = |L_5|$. Let $x = |L_1|$, $y = |L_4|$ and $z = |L_5|$. Note that $\omega(G) = 2x + 2$, $y + z = x + 2$ and G is the graph shown in Figure 8, where r, s are nonnegative integers.

Since $\{2, 8, 9\}$ and $\{1, 7, 8\}$ are not maximum, $y - r, z - s \geq 3$. Hence, $y, z \geq 3$ and $x \geq 4$. Suppose first that $r \geq 3$. For each vertex $i \in \{1, 2, 4, 7, 9, 10, 11\}$, let $L'_i \subseteq L_i$ be a set of size 3. Note that $H := G[L'_1 \cup L'_2 \cup L'_4 \cup L'_7 \cup L'_9 \cup L'_{10} \cup L'_{11}]$ is isomorphic to $C_7[K_3]$. By Lemma 5, $\chi(H) = 7$. Since $r \geq 3$, $|L_6| + |L_5| + |L_{11}| \leq \omega(G) - 3$ and so $\omega(G - H) \leq \omega(G) - 6$. By the inductive hypothesis,

$$\begin{aligned} \chi(G) &\leq \chi(G - H) + \chi(H) \\ &\leq \lceil \frac{7}{6}(\omega(G) - 6) \rceil + 1 + 7 \\ &\leq \lceil \frac{7}{6}\omega(G) \rceil + 1. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $r \leq 2$. By symmetry, $s \leq 2$.

Suppose that $y + s < x - 2$. For each vertex $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 10, 11\}$, let $L'_i \subseteq L_i$ be a set of size 3. Note that $H := G[L'_1 \cup L'_2 \cup L'_3 \cup L'_5 \cup L'_7 \cup L'_{10} \cup L'_{11}]$ is isomorphic to $C_7[K_3]$. Since $y + s < x - 2$, $|L_2| + |L_8| + |L_9| \leq \omega(G) - 3$ and so $\omega(G - H) \leq \omega(G) - 6$. By the inductive hypothesis, $\chi(G) \leq \lceil \frac{7}{6}\omega(G) \rceil + 1$. Therefore, $y + s \geq x - 2$ and thus




Figure 8: A special emerald with parameters x, y, z, r, s . The label outside the vertex i represents the size of L_i .

$z - s = (x + 2) - (y + s) \leq 4$. It follows that $z - 4 \leq s \leq 2$, i.e., $z \leq 6$. By symmetry, $y \leq 6$ and so $x \leq 10$. We consider two cases depending on the parity of x .

Case 1. x is odd.

For $i \in \{1, 2\}$, let $L'_i \subseteq L_i$ be a set of size $t = \frac{x+1}{2}$ and let $v \in L_8$. Let

$$H = G[L_7 \cup L_6 \cup L_5 \cup L_4 \cup L_3 \cup L_9 \cup L'_1 \cup L'_2 \cup \{v\}].$$

Note that $G - H$ is a perfect graph with $\omega(G - H) = x$. If $\chi(H) \leq x + 2 + t$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \chi(G) &\leq (x + 2 + t) + x \\ &= \omega(G) + t \\ &= \frac{5}{4}\omega(G). \end{aligned}$$

Since $x \in \{5, 7, 9\}$, $\lceil \frac{5}{4}\omega(G) \rceil \leq \lceil \frac{7}{6}\omega(G) + 1 \rceil$ and we are done.

Therefore, it remains to show $\chi(H) \leq x + 2 + t$. Note that $\omega(H) = x + 2 + t$. We first show that

$$(z + r) + (y + s) \leq (x + 2) + (t - 1) = \omega(H) - 1. \quad (2)$$

Recall that $r, s \leq 2$. If $x = 9$, then $t = 5$ and (2) holds. If $x = 7$, then $t = 4$. If (2) does not hold, then $r = s = 2$. Since $y - r, z - s \geq 3$, it follows that $y, z \geq 5$ and so $y + z = 10$. This contradicts that $y + z = x + 2$. If $x = 5$, then $t = 3$. If (2) does not hold, then $r + s \geq 3$. It follows that $y + z \geq 6 + (r + s) > x + 2$. Therefore, (2) is proved.

Now we show

$$\text{There is a proper } \omega(H)\text{-coloring } \phi \text{ of } L'_1 \cup L'_2 \cup L_7 \cup L_9 \cup \{v\} \text{ with } \phi(L_7) \cap \phi(L_9) = \emptyset. \quad (3)$$

We consider three cases.

If $y + s, z + r \leq t$,

- color the clique $L'_1 \cup L'_2 \cup \{v\}$ using $|L'_1 \cup L'_2 \cup \{v\}| \leq \omega(H)$ colors;
- color L_7 using the colors in $\phi(L'_2)$ and color L_9 using the colors in $\phi(L'_1)$.

If $y + s \leq t, z + r \geq t$,

- color the clique $L'_1 \cup L_7 \cup \{v\}$ using $|L'_1 \cup L_7 \cup \{v\}| \leq \omega(H)$ colors;
- color L'_2 using the colors in $\phi(L_7)$ and color L_9 using the colors in $\phi(L'_1)$.

If $y + s, z + r \geq t$,

• color L_7 and L_9 with disjoint sets of colors. By (2), it is possible to choose a color from $\{1, 2, \dots, \omega(H)\}$ to color v ;

- color L'_1 using the colors in $\phi(L_9)$ and color L'_2 using the colors in $\phi(L_7)$.

In all cases, ϕ is the desired coloring and (3) is proved.

Let ϕ be a coloring of $L'_1 \cup L'_2 \cup L_7 \cup L_9 \cup \{v\}$ guaranteed by (3). We now extend ϕ to a coloring of H as follows.

• Color L_6 with colors from $\{1, \dots, \omega(H)\} \setminus (\phi(L'_1) \cup \phi(L_7))$ and color L_3 with colors from $\{1, \dots, \omega(H)\} \setminus (\phi(L'_2) \cup \phi(L_9))$.

- Color L_5 using $|L_5|$ colors from $\phi(L_7)$ and color L_4 using $|L_4|$ colors from $\phi(L_9)$.

Since $|L_7| \geq |L_5|$, $|L_9| \geq |L_4|$ and $\phi(L_7) \cap \phi(L_9)$ are disjoint, it follows that the above coloring is a proper $\omega(H)$ -coloring of H .

Case 2. x is even.

Case 2.1 $x \in \{4, 6\}$.

For $i \in \{1, 2\}$, let $L'_i \subseteq L_i$ be a set of size $t = \frac{x}{2} + 1$. Let

$$H = G[L_7 \cup L_6 \cup L_5 \cup L_4 \cup L_3 \cup L_9 \cup L'_1 \cup L'_2].$$

Note that $G - H$ is a perfect graph with $\omega(G - H) = x$. Moreover, H is a perfect graph with $\omega(H) = x + 2 + t$. Since $2x + 2 = \omega(G)$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \chi(G) &\leq (x + 2 + t) + x \\ &= \frac{5}{4}\omega(G) + \frac{1}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $x \in \{4, 6\}$, $\lfloor \frac{5}{4}\omega(G) + \frac{1}{2} \rfloor \leq \lceil \frac{7}{6}\omega(G) \rceil + 1$.

Case 2.2 $x \in \{8, 10\}$.

For $i \in \{1, 2\}$, let $L'_i \subseteq L_i$ be a set of size $t = \frac{x}{2}$. Let

$$H = G[L_7 \cup L_6 \cup L_5 \cup L_4 \cup L_3 \cup L_9 \cup L'_1 \cup L'_2 \cup L_8].$$

Note that $G - H$ is a perfect graph with $\omega(G - H) = x$. If $\chi(H) \leq x + 2 + t$,

$$\begin{aligned} \chi(G) &\leq (x + 2 + t) + x \\ &= \lceil \frac{7}{6}\omega(G) \rceil + 1. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, it remains to show that $\chi(H) \leq x + 2 + t$. Since $r, s \leq 2$ and $t = \frac{x}{2} \geq 4$, $(z + r) + (y + s) \leq \omega(H)$. Moreover, if $(z + r) + (y + s) \geq \omega(H) - 1$, then $r + s \geq 3$. Consequently, there is a proper $\omega(H)$ -coloring ϕ of $L'_1 \cup L'_2 \cup L_7 \cup L_8 \cup L_9$ such that $|\phi(L_7) \cap \phi(L_9)| \leq 2$, and if $|\phi(L_7) \cap \phi(L_9)| \geq 1$, then $r + s \geq 3$. Hence, it is easy to see that one can extend ϕ to a proper coloring of G by avoiding the colors in $\phi(L_7) \cap \phi(L_9)$ on $L_1 \cup L_2 \cup L_4 \cup L_5$. \square

Claim 4. *If an end triangle of a minimum vertex is not maximum, then $\chi(G) \leq \lceil \frac{7}{6}\omega(G) \rceil + 1$.*

Proof. Suppose that $\{2, 8, 9\}$ is not maximum. By [Claim 2](#) and [Claim 3](#), $\{1, 2, 8\}$ and $\{1, 7, 8\}$ are maximum. It follows that $|L_6| = 2$ and $\{1, 6, 7\}$ are maximum. By [Claim 2](#), $\{6, 7, 11\}$ are maximum. By [Claim 1](#), $\{2, 3, 9\}$ and $\{4, 5, 10\}$ are maximum. Since $|L_6| = \min$, $|L_4| + |L_5| + |L_{11}| \geq |L_6| + |L_5| + |L_{11}|$ and so $\{4, 5, 11\}$ is maximum by [Claim 1](#).

Suppose first that $\{3, 9, 10\}$ is maximum. It follows that $|L_1| = |L_2| = |L_7| = |L_{10}| = |L_{11}|$. Let $x = |L_1|$. Note that $\omega(G) = 2x + 2$, $|L_4| + |L_5| = x + 2$ and $|L_3| + |L_9| = x + 2$. Then $G - (L_6 \cup L_8)$ is isomorphic to the graph G_x in [Figure 7](#). By [Lemma 11](#),

$$\begin{aligned} \chi(G) &\leq \lceil \frac{7}{6}(2x + 1) \rceil + 2 \\ &= \lceil \frac{7}{6}(\omega(G) - 1) \rceil + 2 \\ &\leq \lceil \frac{7}{6}\omega(G) \rceil + 1. \end{aligned}$$

Now suppose that $\{3, 9, 10\}$ is not maximum. By [Claim 3](#), 9 is not a minimum vertex and so $|L_9| \geq 3$. By [Claim 1](#), $\{3, 4, 10\}$ is maximum and so $|L_4| > |L_9| \geq 3$. This implies that $\{5, 6, 11\}$ is not maximum. Now $\{2, 4, 7\}$ is a strong stable set, a contradiction. \square

By [Claim 2](#) and [Claim 4](#), every triangle containing a minimum vertex is maximum. This implies that $G = E[K_2]$, a contradiction. \square

We now show that [Theorem 4](#) is true for blowups G of the emerald with $p(G) \leq 2$.

Lemma 13. *If G is a blowup of the emerald and $p(G) \leq 2$, then $\chi(G) \leq \lceil \frac{11}{9}\omega(G) \rceil$.*

Proof. By [Lemma 12](#), $\chi(G) \leq \lceil \frac{7}{6}\omega(G) \rceil + 1$. Note that $\lceil \frac{7}{6}\omega(G) \rceil + 1 \leq \lceil \frac{11}{9}\omega(G) \rceil$ unless $\omega(G) \in \{3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 13\}$. Next we show directly that $\chi(G) \leq \lceil \frac{11}{9}\omega(G) \rceil$ when $\omega(G) \in \{3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 13\}$. Moreover, $p(G) \geq 1$ by [Lemma 10](#).

Case 1. $\omega(G) = 3$. It follows that $G = E$ and $\chi(G) = 4 = \lceil \frac{11}{9}\omega(G) \rceil$.

Case 2. $\omega(G) = 4$. Let I be the set of vertices i such that $|L_i| = 2$. Since $1 \leq |L_i| \leq 2$ for each $i \in V(E)$, I is a stable set of E . For each $i \in I$, take a vertex $u_i \in L_i$ and let S be the union of those vertices. Note that $G - S = E$. It follows that $\chi(G) \leq 5 = \lceil \frac{11}{9}\omega(G) \rceil$.

Case 3. $\omega(G) \in \{7, 8\}$. Note that $\lceil \frac{11}{9}\omega(G) \rceil = \omega(G) + 2$. A vertex $i \in V(E)$ is said to be a t -vertex if $|L_i| = t$. Since each L_i is nonempty, G has no i -vertex for $i \geq \omega(G) - 1$. We now prove the following.

Claim 5. *If G has an i -vertex where $i \in \{\omega(G) - 4, \omega(G) - 3, \omega(G) - 2\}$, then $\chi(G) \leq \omega(G) + 2$.*

Proof. By symmetry, assume that $|L_8| = i \in \{\omega(G) - 4, \omega(G) - 3, \omega(G) - 2\}$. It follows that $|L_1| + |L_7| \leq 4$ and $|L_2| + |L_9| \leq 4$. Suppose first that $|L_1| = 1$. Take a vertex $u_i \in L_i$ for each $i \in \{1, 2, 7, 9\}$. Let $S = \{u_1, u_2, u_7, u_9\}$ and $G' = G - S$. Note that $d_{G'}(v) \leq \omega(G) - 1$ for each $v \in L_8$. Therefore, G' is $\omega(G)$ -colorable if and only if $G' - L_8$ is. Since $G' - L_8$ is perfect, $\chi(G' - L_8) = \omega(G' - L_8) \leq \omega(G)$. This implies that $\chi(G) \leq \chi(G') + 2 \leq \omega(G) + 2$.

Now suppose that $|L_1|, |L_2| \geq 2$. So $i = \omega(G) - 4$ and $|L_1| = |L_2| = 2$. If $|L_7| = |L_9| = 1$, then for every $v \in L_8$, $d_G(v) = \omega(G) + 1$. So G is $\omega(G) + 2$ -colorable if and only if $G - L_8$ is. By Lemma 10, $\chi(G - L_8) \leq \lceil \frac{7}{6}\omega(G) \rceil = \omega(G) + 2$ and thus $\chi(G) \leq \omega(G) + 2$. Therefore, we may assume that $|L_7| \geq 2$. Let $L'_7 \subseteq L_7$ be a set of size 2. Let $G' = G - (L_2 \cup L'_7)$. For every $v \in L_8$, $d_{G'}(v) \leq \omega(G) - 1$. Since $G' - L_8$ is perfect, $\chi(G') \leq \omega(G)$ and thus $\chi(G) \leq \omega(G) + 2$. \square

By Claim 5, we may assume that G has no i -vertex for $i \geq \omega(G) - 4$. If $\omega(G) = 7$, then $|L_i| \leq 2$ for every $i \in V(E)$ by Claim 5. This implies that $\omega(G) \leq 6$, a contradiction. So $\omega(G) = 8$. Since the lemma holds for any graph G' with $\omega(G') = 7$, We may assume that G has no strong stable set.

Claim 6. *If G has a 3-vertex, $\chi(G) \leq 10$.*

Proof. By symmetry, assume that $|L_8| = 3$. Since $\omega(G) = 8$, $|L_1| + |L_7| \leq 5$ and $|L_2| + |L_9| \leq 5$. Let $v \in L_8$. If $|N_G[v]| \leq 10$, we are done. So assume that $|N_G[v]| \geq 11$. By symmetry, $(|L_1| + |L_7|, |L_2| + |L_9|) \in \{(5, 5), (5, 4), (5, 3), (4, 4)\}$. Suppose first that $(|L_1| + |L_7|, |L_2| + |L_9|) \neq (5, 5)$. Note that $|N_G[v]| \leq 12$ for any $v \in L_8$. Similar to the proof of Claim 5, $|L_1|, |L_2| \geq 2$. If $|L_1| = |L_2| = 2$, then one of $|L_7|$ and $|L_9|$ is of size at least 2, say $|L_7|$. Then $G - (L_2 \cup L_7)$ is 8-colorable and so $\chi(G) \leq 10$. Now by symmetry $|L_1| = 3$ and $|L_2| = 2$. If $|L_7| \geq 2$, then $G - (L_2 \cup L_7)$ is 8-colorable and so $\chi(G) \leq 10$. So $|L_7| = 1$ and thus $|L_1| + |L_7| + |L_8| = 7 < \omega(G)$. Since G has no strong stable set, $\{1, 6, 7\}$ must be maximum and so $|L_6| = 4$, a contradiction.

Now assume that $|L_1| + |L_7| = 5$ and $|L_2| + |L_9| = 5$. Since G has no 4-vertex, no L_i is of size 1 for $i \in \{1, 2, 7, 9\}$. By symmetry, $(|L_7|, |L_1|, |L_2|, |L_9|) \in \{(2, 3, 2, 3), (3, 2, 2, 3)\}$. Suppose first that $(|L_7|, |L_1|, |L_2|, |L_9|) = (2, 3, 2, 3)$. Since 1 is a 3-vertex, $|L_6| = 3$. Suppose that $|L_3| = 2$. Since $|L_9| = 3$, it follows that $|L_{10}| = 3$. Since $\{2, 3, 9\}$ is not maximum, $\{4, 5, 11\}$ is maximum. It follows that $|L_4| = 3$. The fact that $\omega(G) = 8$ implies that $|L_{11}| = 3$ and $|L_5| = 2$. Let $S = L_2 \cup L_5 \cup L_7$. It is easy to see that $\chi(G - S) = 8$ (by modulo 8 coloring) and so $\chi(G) \leq 10$. Now suppose that $|L_3| = 3$. Since $|L_2| = 2$ and $|L_9| = 3$, $|L_{10}| = 2$ and $|L_4| = 3$. Moreover, $(|L_{11}|, |L_5|) \in \{(2, 3), (3, 2)\}$. In either case, it is easy to see $\chi(G) \leq 10$. So far we have proved that for every 3-vertex i , the neighbors of i must have sizes $(3, 2, 2, 3)$. It then implies that $|L_4| = 2$ and $|L_4| = 3$, a contradiction. \square

Now $|L_i| \leq 2$ for each $i \in V(E)$. This shows that $\omega(G) \leq 6$, a contradiction. This completes the proof for $\omega(G) = 8$.

Case 4. $\omega(G) \in \{9, 13\}$. Since the lemma holds for graphs with clique number $\in \{8, 12\}$, we may assume that G has no strong stable set. Similar to the proof of [Lemma 12](#), the following two claims hold.

Claim 7. *If a triangle in the emerald is not maximum, then any triangle of distance 1 or 4 to that triangle is maximum.*

Claim 8. *The middle triangle of a minimum vertex must be maximum.*

Now we prove the statements analogous to [Claim 3](#) and [Claim 4](#).

Claim 9. *If both end triangle of a minimum vertex are not maximum, then $\chi(G) \leq \lceil \frac{11}{9}\omega(G) \rceil$.*

Proof. Suppose that $|L_8| = p$. By [Claim 8](#), $T = \{1, 2, 8\}$ is maximum. Suppose that $\{1, 7, 8\}$ and $\{2, 8, 9\}$ are not maximum. By [Claim 7](#),

triangles $\{2, 3, 9\}, \{1, 6, 7\}, \{3, 9, 10\}, \{6, 7, 11\}, \{4, 5, 10\}, \{4, 5, 11\}$ are maximum.

Then L_1, L_2, L_4, L_5 have the same size, say x . Note that $\omega(G) = 2x + p$. Since $\omega(G)$ is odd, $p = 1$ and $x = \frac{\omega(G)-1}{2}$. Let $|L_4| = y$ and $|L_5| = z$. Then $y + z = x + 1$ and G is the graph shown in [Figure 8](#), where r, s are nonnegative integers. It is easy to show that $\chi(G) \leq 11$ if $\omega(G) = 9$ and $\chi(G) \leq 16$ if $\omega(G) = 13$. \square

Claim 10. *If one end triangle of a minimum vertex is not maximum, then $\chi(G) \leq \lceil \frac{11}{9}\omega(G) \rceil$.*

Proof. Suppose that 8 is a minimum vertex and $\{2, 8, 9\}$ is not maximum. By [Claim 8](#) and [Claim 9](#), $\{1, 2, 8\}$ and $\{1, 7, 8\}$ are maximum. It follows that $|L_6| = p$ and $\{1, 6, 7\}$ are maximum. By [Claim 8](#), $\{6, 7, 11\}$ are maximum. By [Claim 7](#), $\{2, 3, 9\}$ and $\{4, 5, 10\}$ are maximum. Since $|L_6| = p$, $|L_4| + |L_5| + |L_{11}| \geq |L_6| + |L_5| + |L_{11}|$. By [Claim 7](#), $\{4, 5, 11\}$ is maximum.

If $\{3, 9, 10\}$ is maximum, then $|L_1| = |L_2| = |L_{10}| = |L_{11}| = x$, $\omega(G) = 2x + p$, and so $p = 1$. Moreover, $|L_4| + |L_5| = x + 1$ and $|L_3| + |L_9| = x + 1$. Then $G - (L_6 \cup L_8)$ is isomorphic to a blowup of the graph in [Figure 9](#) with $x \in \{4, 6\}$. It is easy to verify that $\chi(G - (L_6 \cup L_8)) \leq \lceil \frac{11}{9}\omega(G) \rceil - 1$. So $\chi(G) \leq \lceil \frac{11}{9}\omega(G) \rceil$. Now $\{3, 9, 10\}$ is not maximum. By [Claim 9](#), $|L_9| > p$. By [Claim 7](#), $\{3, 4, 10\}$ is maximum and thus $|L_4| \geq |L_9| > p = |L_6|$. So $\{5, 6, 11\}$ is not maximum. Now $\{2, 4, 7\}$ is a strong stable set, a contradiction. \square

Now every triangle containing a minimum vertex is maximum. This implies that $G = E[K_p]$ and so $\omega(G) \leq 6$. This is a contradiction. This completes the proof of Case 4 and hence the lemma. \square

Lemma 14 (Equal-size blowup of the emerald). $\chi(E[K_3]) = 11$.

Proof. Let $G = E[K_3]$. Since $|G| = 33$ and $\alpha(G) = 3$, $\chi(G) \geq 11$. Next we show that $\chi(G) \leq 11$. Observe that an 11-coloring of G is equivalent to a set of 11 stable sets of size




Figure 9: A blowup of a 9-vertex graph, where $|L_i| = x$ for $i \in \{1, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$, $|L_7| + |L_{t_7}| = |L_2| + |L_{t_2}| = x + 1$ and $|L_{t_7}| + |L_{t_2}| \leq x + 1$.

3 such that each vertex of the emerald (see Figure 1) is contained in exactly three stable sets. It is routine to verify that the following is a desired set of 11 stable sets:

$$\begin{aligned} & \{1, 3, 5\}, \{2, 5, 7\}, \{4, 9, 11\}, \{1, 3, 11\}, \\ & \{3, 6, 8\}, \{6, 8, 10\}, \{2, 4, 6\}, \{4, 7, 9\}, \\ & \{1, 5, 9\}, \{2, 7, 10\}, \{8, 10, 11\}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. □

Now we show Theorem 4 for blowups G of the emerald with $p(G) \geq 3$.

Lemma 15. *If G is a blowup of the emerald with $p(G) \geq 3$, then $\chi(G) \leq \lceil \frac{11}{9}\omega(G) \rceil$.*

Proof. We prove by induction on $|G|$. The base case is $G = E[K_3]$ and the lemma holds. So we assume that the lemma holds for every blowup of the emerald G' with $p(G') \geq 3$ and $|G'| < |G|$. For each $u \in V(E)$, let $L'_u \subseteq L_u$ be a set of size 3 and $H = G[\bigcup_{u \in V(E)} L'_u]$. Then $H = E[K_3]$ and $G' := G - H$ is a blowup of the emerald. If $p(G') \leq 2$, then $\chi(G') \leq \lceil \frac{11}{9}\omega(G') \rceil$ by Lemma 13. If $p(G') \geq 3$, then $\chi(G') \leq \lceil \frac{11}{9}\omega(G') \rceil$ by the inductive hypothesis. Since $\omega(G') \leq \omega(G) - 9$, it follows from Lemma 14 that

$$\begin{aligned} \chi(G) & \leq \chi(G') + \chi(H) \\ & \leq \lceil \frac{11}{9}(\omega(G) - 9) \rceil + 11 \\ & = \lceil \frac{11}{9}\omega(G) \rceil. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. □

Finally, we are ready to prove Theorem 4.

Proof of Theorem 4. It follows directly from Lemma 13 and Lemma 15 □

References

- [1] J. A. Bondy and U. S. R. Murty. *Graph Theory*. Springer, 2008.
- [2] A. Brandstädt, T. Klembt, and S. Mahfud. P_6 - and triangle-free graphs revisited: structure and bounded clique-width. *Discrete Mathematics and Theoretical Computer Science*, 8:173–188, 2006.
- [3] M. Briański, J. Davies, and B. Walczak. Separating polynomial χ -boundedness from χ -boundedness. [arXiv:2201.08814v2](https://arxiv.org/abs/2201.08814) [math.CO], 2022.
- [4] K. Cameron, S. Huang, I. Penev, and V. Sivaraman. The class of (P_7, C_4, C_5) -free graphs: Decomposition, algorithms, and χ -boundedness. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 93:503–552, 2020.
- [5] S. A. Choudum, T. Karthick, and M. A. Shalu. Perfectly coloring and linearly χ -bound P_6 -free graphs. *J. Graph Theory*, 54:293–306, 2007.
- [6] S. Gravier, C. T. Hoàng, and F. Maffray. Coloring the hypergraph of maximal cliques of a graph with no long path. *Discrete Math.*, 272:285–290, 2003.
- [7] A. Gyárfás. On Ramsey covering numbers. *Coll. Math. Soc. János Bolyai*, 10:801–816, 1973.
- [8] A. Gyárfás. Problems from the world surrounding perfect graphs. *Zastosowania Matematyki*, XIX:413–441, 1987.
- [9] T. Karthick and F. Maffray. Square-free graphs with no six-vertex induced path. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 33:874–909, 2019.
- [10] L. Lovász. A characterization of perfect graphs. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 13:95–98, 1972.
- [11] A. Scott, P. Seymour, and S. Spirkl. Polynomial bounds for chromatic number. IV. a near-polynomial bound for excluding the five-vertex path. *Combinatorica*, to appear, 2022.
- [12] G. J. Woeginger and J. Sgall. The complexity of coloring graphs without long induced paths. *Acta Cybernetica*, 15:107–117, 2001.