

Multi-Colouring of Kneser Graphs: Notes on Stahl's Conjecture *

Jan van den Heuvel and Xinyi Xu

Department of Mathematics
London School of Economics & Political Science
Houghton Street, London WC2A 2AE, UK

j.van-den-heuvel@lse.ac.uk xinyi.xu97@gmail.com

9 July 2024

Abstract

If a graph is n -colourable, then it obviously is n' -colourable for any $n' \geq n$. But the situation is not so clear when we consider *multi-colourings* of graphs. A graph is (n, k) -colourable if we can assign each vertex a k -subset of $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ so that adjacent vertices receive disjoint subsets.

In this note we consider the following problem: if a graph is (n, k) -colourable, then for what pairs (n', k') is it also (n', k') -colourable? This question can be translated into a question regarding multi-colourings of Kneser graphs, for which Stahl formulated a conjecture in 1976. We present new results, strengthen existing results, and in particular present much simpler proofs of several known cases of the conjecture.

1 Introduction and Main Results

All graphs in this note are finite, undirected and without multiple edges or loops. All colourings we consider are vertex colourings. A *proper* colouring of a graph assigns a colour to each vertex such that adjacent vertices receive different colours. A graph G is n -colourable if n colours are enough for a proper colouring of G , and the *chromatic number* $\chi(G)$ is the smallest n for which G is n -colourable.

Multi-colouring generalises vertex colouring and itself has been the subject of extensive research; see e.g. [10, Chapter 3]. In a k -*multi-colouring of a graph*, each vertex receives a set of k colours, and such a colouring is *proper* if adjacent vertices receive disjoint colour sets. A graph G is (n, k) -colourable if there is a proper k -multi-colouring using k -subsets from $[n]$ ($= \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$). For a positive integer k , the k -*th multi-chromatic number* $\chi_k(G)$ is the smallest n such that G is (n, k) -colourable.

*The research in this publication was first published in the second author's PhD Thesis [13].

Note that if $k = 1$, then k -multi-colouring is just normal vertex colouring, and $\chi_1(G)$ is just the normal chromatic number $\chi(G)$.

In this note we consider the following question.

Question 1.1.

If a graph G is (n, k) -colourable, then for what pairs (n', k') are we guaranteed that G is also (n', k') -colourable?

Note that the corresponding question for standard n -colouring is trivial: if G is n -colourable, then it is n' -colourable for all $n' \geq n$. More precisely: if $\chi(G) = n$, then G is n' -colourable if and only if $n' \geq n$. Maybe somewhat surprisingly, the question for multi-colouring appears to be much more challenging, and in fact is mostly open.

Kneser graphs play a central role in the studies of multi-colouring. For $n \geq k \geq 1$, the *Kneser graph* $K(n, k)$ has as vertex set the collection of all k -subsets of $[n]$ (denoted by $\binom{[n]}{k}$), and there is an edge between two vertices if and only if the two k -sets are disjoint. We will usually assume $n \geq 2k$, as otherwise the Kneser graph is edgeless.

It is well known and easy to prove (see e.g. [10, Section 3.2]) that a graph G is (n, k) -colourable if and only if there is a homomorphism from G to $K(n, k)$. (A *homomorphism* from a graph G to a graph H is a mapping $\varphi : V(G) \rightarrow V(H)$ that preserves edges: if uv is an edge in G , then $\varphi(u)\varphi(v)$ is an edge in H .)

This means that the following questions are all equivalent to Question 1.1.

1. *Given n, k , for what n', k' is the Kneser graph $K(n, k)$ also (n', k') -colourable?*
2. *Given n, k , for what n', k' is there a homomorphism from $K(n, k)$ to $K(n', k')$?*
3. *Given n, k , for what n', k' do we have $n' \geq \chi_{k'}(K(n, k))$?*

The last question was studied by Stahl [11], who formulated the following conjecture.

Conjecture 1.2 (Stahl [11]).

Let n, k be integers, $n \geq 2k \geq 2$. Then for $k' = qk - r$, where q, r are integers with $q \geq 1$ and $0 \leq r \leq k - 1$, we have $\chi_{k'}(K(n, k)) = qn - 2r$.

The conjecture is known to hold for some special values of n, k, k' , but few general results are known. For instance, the conjecture is trivially true for $k = 1$ (since the Kneser graph $K(n, 1)$ is just the complete graph on n vertices). It is also true for $k' = 1$ by Lovász's proof [8] of the Kneser Conjecture: $\chi_1(K(n, k)) = \chi(K(n, k)) = n - 2(k - 1)$. (Though note that at the time [11] appeared the Kneser Conjecture was still open.)

In Stahl's original paper it was proved that the conjectured value is an upper bound, i.e. $(n, k, q, r$ as in Conjecture 1.2):

$$\chi_{qk-r}(K(n, k)) \leq qn - 2r. \tag{1}$$

In the next section we explain how this bound can be derived.

In a follow-up paper [12], Stahl proved the following general lower bound for $\chi_{k'}(K(n, k))$:

$$\chi_{qk-r}(K(n, k)) \geq qn - 2r - (k^2 - 3k + 4). \tag{2}$$

Stahl also proved the conjecture for some special values of n, k, k' .

Theorem 1.3.

- (a) For all k and k' , Conjecture 1.2 is true for the bipartite Kneser graphs $K(2k, k)$ and for the so-called odd graphs $K(2k + 1, k)$ (Stahl [11]).
- (b) For all n and k , Conjecture 1.2 is true for any k' that is an integer multiple of k ; in other words: $\chi_{qk}(K(n, k)) = qn$ (Stahl [11]).
- (c) For all n and k , Conjecture 1.2 is true for all $k' \leq k$; in other words: $\chi_{k-r}(K(n, k)) = n - 2r$ (Stahl [11]).
- (d) For all n and k' , Conjecture 1.2 is true for $k = 2$ and $k = 3$ (Stahl [12]).

Our first results are based on the following simple observation, which seems to have been missed in the research on Stahl's Conjecture.

The *independence number* $\alpha(G)$ of a graph G is the maximum size of an independent set in G . For any proper (n', k') -colouring of a graph G , each *colour class* (the set of vertices whose colour set contains a particular colour) is an independent set, hence contains at most $\alpha(G)$ vertices. Since each vertex appears in k' colour classes, we have $k' \cdot |V(G)| \leq n' \cdot \alpha(G)$. This means in particular that $\chi_{k'}(G) \geq \frac{k'|V(G)|}{\alpha(G)}$.

For Kneser graphs, by definition we have $|V(K(n, k))| = \binom{n}{k}$, while the celebrated Erdős-Ko-Rado Theorem [3] means that $\alpha(K(n, k)) = \binom{n-1}{k-1}$ for all $k \geq 1$ and $n \geq 2k$. Substituting those values in the lower bound for $\chi_{k'}(G)$ above immediately gives the following.

Observation 1.4.

Let n, k, k' be integers, $n \geq 2k \geq 2$, $k' \geq 1$. Then we have $\chi_{k'}(K(n, k)) \geq \frac{k' \binom{n}{k}}{\binom{n-1}{k-1}} = \frac{k'n}{k}$.

Note that by combining this observation with (1) we obtain a proof of Theorem 1.3 (b) that is much simpler than its proof in [11].

In addition, since $\chi_{k'}(K(n, k))$ is an integer, we immediately obtain the following result.

Theorem 1.5.

Let n, k be integers, $n \geq 2k \geq 2$. Then for $k' = qk - r$, where q, r are integers with $q \geq 1$ and $0 \leq r \leq k - 1$, we have $\chi_{k'}(K(n, k)) \geq \left\lceil \frac{k'n}{k} \right\rceil = qn - \left\lfloor \frac{rn}{k} \right\rfloor = qn - 2r - \left\lfloor \frac{r(n-2k)}{k} \right\rfloor$.

The estimate in Theorem 1.5 is better than (2) if $n \leq k^2 + 2$.

We can obtain further results by using more detailed knowledge about independent sets in Kneser graphs. Erdős, Ko and Rado [3] proved that if $n \geq 2k + 1$, then the only independent sets of order $\binom{n-1}{k-1}$ in the Kneser graph $K(n, k)$ are the so-called *trivial* independent sets: those vertex sets whose vertices correspond to family of k -sets in $[n]$ that contain some fixed common element $i \in [n]$. Using that information about the structure of independent sets of order $\alpha(K(n, k))$, the following can be proved.

Theorem 1.6.

Let n, k be integers, $n \geq 2k + 1 \geq 3$. Then for all $k' \geq 1$ we have equality in Observation 1.4 if and only if k' is an integer multiple of k .

The statement that $\chi_{pk}(K(n, k)) = pn$ if and only if p is an integer is sometimes attributed to Stahl [11] (see, e.g., [5, Section 7.9] and [9]), but it is not explicitly stated in Stahl's paper. Stahl's result [11, Theorem 9] states that $K(n, k)$ has a *particular* (pn, pk) -colouring (called "efficient" in the paper) if and only if p is an integer. Nevertheless, its proof in essence proves the general result, as is made explicit in [5, Lemma 7.9.3] and its proof.

Surprisingly, by splitting the Kneser graph $K(n, k)$ into smaller subgraphs and using Theorem 1.5 for each of the subgraphs, sometimes it is possible to get a better bound than using the theorem directly.

Theorem 1.7.

Let n, k, r, q be integers, $n \geq 2k \geq 2$, $q \geq 1$ and $0 \leq r \leq k - 1$. Choose n_1, \dots, n_t such that $n = \sum_{i=1}^t n_i$ and $2k \leq n_i < 4k$ for all i . Then we have $\chi_{qk-r}(K(n, k)) \geq qn - \sum_{i=1}^t \left\lfloor \frac{n_i r}{k} \right\rfloor$.

We will prove this theorem in Subsection 3.1. And although the result is a fairly direct corollary of Theorem 1.5, it actually can give better bounds in many cases. For example, if $n = t(2k + 1)$, then Theorem 1.7 with $n_1 = \dots = n_t = 2k + 1$ gives $\chi_{qk-r}(K(n, k)) \geq qn - 2rt$, whilst Theorem 1.5 only gives $\chi_{qk-r}(K(n, k)) \geq qn - 2rt - \left\lfloor \frac{rt}{k} \right\rfloor$.

Observation 1.4 also almost immediately gives the following small improvement of the main result in Osztényi [9]; again with a much simpler and shorter proof. As before, details can be found in Subsection 3.1.

Theorem 1.8.

Let n, k, r be integers, $n \geq 2k + 1 \geq 3$ and $0 \leq r \leq \frac{k}{n - 2k}$. Then for all $q \geq 1$ we have $\chi_{qk-r}(K(n, k)) = qn - 2r$.

Our next result shows that for a fixed k only a finite number of values of $\chi_{k'}(K(n, k))$ need to be determined in order to conclude whether or not Stahl's Conjecture is true for that value of k and for all n and k' .

Theorem 1.9.

Let $k \geq 2$ be fixed. Then there exist $n_0(k)$ and $q_0(n, k)$ such that the following holds. If for all $2k \leq n \leq n_0(k)$ we know that $\chi_{qk-(k-1)}(K(n, k)) = qn - 2(k-1)$ for at least one $q \geq q_0(n, k)$, then we have $\chi_{qk-r}(K(n, k)) = qn - 2r$ for all $n \geq 2k$, $q \geq 1$ and $0 \leq r \leq k - 1$.

Possible functions $n_0(k)$ and $q_0(n, k)$ in Theorem 1.9 are given explicitly in Section 3. We use these expressions to show that we can take $n_0(k) \leq k^3 - k^2 + 2k - 2$ and $q_0(n, k) < 4^k(n - 2k)$ for all $n \geq 2k + 1 \geq 5$.

We could replace $q_0(n, k)$ by $q'_0(k) = \max\{q_0(n, k) \mid 2k \leq n \leq n_0(k)\}$ in the theorem, to remove the dependency of q_0 on n . We chose to keep $q_0(n, k)$, since for larger values of n we get better bounds for $q_0(n, k)$. For instance, if $n \geq k^2 + k - 1$, then we can show $q_0(n, k) < e(n - 2k)$.

Theorem 1.9 generalises some known results. Chvátal et al. [1] showed that for fixed k we only need to find $\chi_{k+1}(K(n, k))$ for finitely many n to decide if Stahl's Conjecture holds for $k' = k + 1$ for all n . And Stahl [11] proved that for fixed n, k and sufficiently large k' , the conjecture holds for k' if and only if it holds for $k' - k$. The proof of that latter result is non-constructive and does not give an explicit bound on the value of k' , and hence it can only give a version of Theorem 1.9 without a bound on the function $q_0(n, k)$.

Recall that Stahl's Conjecture was already proved by Stahl for $k = 2, 3$. For $k = 4$, our methods show that we only need to find $\chi_{4q-3}(K(n, 4))$ for $8 \leq n \leq 10$ and $q = 13$, and for $11 \leq n \leq 39$ and $q = 12$. (In fact, for larger n even smaller q are enough.) The cases $n = 8, 9$ follow from Theorem 1.3(a). The case $n = 10$ is solved in [7]. So the first open case is to determine whether or not $\chi_{45}(K(11, 4)) = 126$. Note that Stahl's bound (1) gives $\chi_{45}(K(11, 4)) \leq 126$, while our bounds in the next section show $\chi_{45}(K(11, 4)) \geq 124$.

The remainder of this paper is organised as follows. In the next section we discuss some of Stahl's work in more detail. The proofs of our results can be found in Section 3. Final observations and ideas for further research are discussed in Section 4.

2 Stahl's Work

In this section we describe some of the original ideas behind Stahl's Conjecture, as developed in [11, 12], since many of these ideas are important in the development of our arguments.

The following two results are essential in showing that the conjectured values of $\chi_{k'}(K(n, k))$ are indeed upper bounds.

Lemma 2.1 (Geller and Stahl [4]).

If a graph G is both (n_1, k_1) -colourable and (n_2, k_2) -colourable, then G is $(n_1 + n_2, k_1 + k_2)$ -colourable.

Lemma 2.2 (Stahl [11]).

For integers $n \geq 3$ and $k \geq 2$, there exists a homomorphism φ from $K(n, k)$ to $K(n - 2, k - 1)$.

The proof of Lemma 2.1 combines an (n_1, k_1) -colouring using colours from $[n_1] = \{1, \dots, n_1\}$ and an (n_2, k_2) -colouring using colours from $\{n_1 + 1, \dots, n_1 + n_2\}$.

The proof of Lemma 2.2 in [11] is more cumbersome than required, so we give a new proof here. First note that if $n < 2k$, then any mapping of vertices is a homomorphism, because both $K(n, k)$ and $K(n - 2, k - 1)$ are edgeless.

So we can assume $n \geq 2k$. For each k -subset $S \subseteq [n]$, let $\max S$ be the maximum element of S . Now for each k -subset S with $|S \cap \{n - 1, n\}| \leq 1$ we set $\varphi(S) = S \setminus \{\max S\}$. If $\{n - 1, n\} \subseteq S$, then let x be the largest integer in $[n] \setminus S$ and set $\varphi(S) = (S \setminus \{n - 1, n\}) \cup \{x\}$.

To show that φ is a homomorphism from $K(n, k)$ to $K(n - 2, k - 1)$, we must show that if any two k -sets S_1, S_2 are adjacent in $K(n, k)$, hence are disjoint, then $\varphi(S_1)$ and $\varphi(S_2)$ are disjoint as well. This is obvious if both $|S_1 \cap \{n - 1, n\}| \leq 1$ and $|S_2 \cap \{n - 1, n\}| \leq 1$, since then $\varphi(S_1) \subseteq S_1$ and $\varphi(S_2) \subseteq S_2$, hence $\varphi(S_1) \cap \varphi(S_2) \subseteq S_1 \cap S_2 = \emptyset$. If for one of S_1, S_2 , say S_1 , we have $\{n - 1, n\} \subseteq S_1$, then for S_2 we must have $|S_2 \cap \{n - 1, n\}| = 0$. Since

$\max S_2 \notin S_1$, we have that the largest element x in $[n] \setminus S_1$ satisfies $x \geq \max S_2$. This means that $(S_1 \cup \{x\}) \cap (S_2 \setminus \{\max S_2\}) = \emptyset$, which guarantees that $\varphi(S_1)$ and $\varphi(S_2)$ are also disjoint in this case. \square

The existence of a homomorphism from $K(n, k)$ to $K(n-2, k-1)$ means that for any graph G , if G is (n, k) -colourable (i.e. there is a homomorphism from G to $K(n, k)$), then G is also $(n-2, k-1)$ -colourable (i.e. there is a homomorphism from G to $K(n-2, k-1)$). And hence for any graph G with at least one edge, we have $\chi_{k'-1}(G) \leq \chi_{k'}(G) - 2$. (For an edge-less graph G we have $\chi_{k'-1}(G) = k' - 1 = \chi_{k'}(G) - 1$ for all k' .)

Stahl's Conjecture states that $\chi_{qk-r}(K(n, k)) = qn - 2r$, for all $q \geq 1$ and $0 \leq r \leq k-1$. The two lemmas above can explain where this expression comes from. Firstly, by definition $K(n, k)$ is (n, k) -colourable. By using Lemma 2.1 $q \geq 1$ times, we find that $K(n, k)$ is (qn, qk) -colourable. (And then in fact Observation 1.4 shows that $\chi_{qk}(K(n, k)) = qn$.) Now applying Lemma 2.2 $r \geq 0$ times gives that $K(n, k)$ is $(qn - 2r, qk - r)$ -colourable. So we've proved the upper bound $\chi_{qk-r}(K(n, k)) \leq qn - 2r$ from (1).

Combining that $\chi_{qn}(K(n, k)) = qn$ and $\chi_{k'-1}(K(n, k)) \leq \chi_{k'}(K(n, k)) - 2$ for all k' , we can conclude that for any fixed q , if $\chi_{qk-(k-1)}(K(n, k)) = qn - 2(k-1)$, then $\chi_{qk-r}(K(n, k)) = qn - 2r$ for the same q and all $0 \leq r \leq k-1$. This means that in order to prove Stahl's Conjecture, it suffices to prove it for $r = k-1$. An immediate corollary of the Lovász-Kneser Theorem, $\chi_1(K(n, k)) = n - 2k + 2$, is that the conjecture is true for $q = 1$; see Theorem 1.3(c).

The observations in this section provide other ways to prove the lower bound $\chi_{qk-r}(K(n, k)) \leq qn - 2r$. For instance, we can use Lemma 2.1 to construct a $(qn - 2r, qk - r)$ -colouring of $K(n, k)$ by combining $q-1$ copies of an (n, k) -colouring and one copy of an $(n-2r, k-r)$ colouring. And in fact, in general there are many ways to obtain similar multi-colourings. For instance, if $k, q, r \geq 2$, we can take $q-2$ copies of an (n, k) -colouring, one copy of an $(n-2, k-1)$ -colouring and one copy of an $(n-2(r-1), k-(r-1))$ -colouring to get the same bound.

This multitude of possible $(n-2(r-1), k-(r-1))$ -colourings may be one of the reasons why Stahl's Conjecture is so difficult to prove. The proof of Theorem 1.6 shows that taking q copies of an (n, k) -colouring of $K(n, q)$ is in essence the only way to obtain an (qn, qk) -colouring of $K(n, q)$, which might explain why for that case we can prove the conjecture.

As already observed by Geller & Stahl [4], for any graph G we have $\chi_{k'}(G) = \chi(G \bullet K_{k'})$, where " \bullet " denotes the *lexicographic product* of two graphs: $V(G \bullet H) = V(G) \times V(H)$, and $(u_1, v_1)(u_2, v_2) \in E(G \bullet H)$ if and only if either $u_1 u_2 \in E(G)$, or $u_1 = u_2$ and $v_1 v_2 \in E(H)$. This allows us to translate the problem of finding multi-chromatic numbers to finding chromatic numbers. Since we also have that $|V(G \bullet K_{k'})| = k'|V(G)|$ and $\alpha(G \bullet K_{k'}) = \alpha(G)$, this gives an alternative proof of $\chi_{k'}(G) \geq \frac{k'|V(G)|}{\alpha(G)}$.

3 Proofs of Our Results

This section contains the proofs of the results from Section 1. Throughout this section we use k' and $qk-r$ interchangeably (i.e. $k' = qk-r$), where $q \geq 1$ and $0 \leq r \leq k-1$.

3.1 Proof and Discussion of Theorems 1.7 and 1.8

We first prove Theorem 1.8, which states that Stahl's Conjecture is true for $0 \leq r \leq \frac{k}{n-2k}$. Note that this result generalises the following known results.

(a) *Stahl's Conjecture is true if k' is a multiple of k , i.e. if $r = 0$ (Stahl [11]).*

(b) *Stahl's Conjecture is true if $2k < n < 3k$ and $0 \leq r < \frac{k}{n-2k}$ (Osztényi [9]).*

Theorem 1.8.

Let n, k, r be integers, $n \geq 2k + 1 \geq 3$ and $0 \leq r \leq \frac{k}{n-2k}$. Then for all $q \geq 1$ we have $\chi_{qk-r}(K(n, k)) = qn - 2r$.

Proof. If $0 \leq r < \frac{k}{n-2k}$, then $\left\lfloor \frac{r(n-2k)}{k} \right\rfloor = 0$, and hence Theorem 1.5 immediately shows that $\chi_{qk-r}(K(n, k)) \geq qn - 2r$. We then have $\chi_{qk-r}(K(n, k)) = qn - 2r$ by (1).

If $r = \frac{k}{n-2k}$ is an integer and $0 < r \leq k-1$, then $\frac{k'n}{k} = \frac{(qk-r)n}{k} = qn - \frac{n}{n-2k} = qn - 2r - 1$ is an integer. But as $qk-r$ is not a multiple of k , since $1 \leq r \leq k-1$, by Theorem 1.6 we have that $K(n, k)$ is not $(qn - 2r - 1, qk - r)$ -colourable. We can conclude that $\chi_{qk-r}(K(n, k)) = qn - 2r$ by (1). \square

The result in [9] mentioned above follows from the following lower bound in that paper, obtained after a long and quite elaborate proof.

Theorem 3.1 (Osztényi [9, Proposition 5]).

Let n, k, ℓ be integers, $k, \ell \geq 2$ and $\ell k < n < 2\ell k$. Then for all $q \geq 1$ and r , $0 \leq r \leq k-1$, we have $\chi_{qk-r}(K(n, k)) \geq qn - \ell r - c + 1$, where c is a positive integer satisfying $c > \frac{\ell r - 1}{\left\lceil \frac{\ell k}{n-\ell k} \right\rceil - 1}$.

We will show that the bound in Theorem 1.5 is already at least as good than this bound, by proving that we never have $qn - \ell r - c + 1 > qn - 2r - \left\lfloor \frac{r(n-2k)}{k} \right\rfloor$ for integers n, k, ℓ, c satisfying the conditions in Theorem 3.1. Since $\ell \geq 2$, it is more than enough to show that for $\ell k < n < 2\ell k$ there is no positive integer c such that $\frac{\ell r - 1}{\left\lceil \frac{\ell k}{n-\ell k} \right\rceil - 1} < c < \left\lfloor \frac{r(n-2k)}{k} \right\rfloor + 1$. For a contradiction, assume such a c exists for some n, k, r, ℓ . Then since c is an integer, we have

$$ck \leq r(n - \ell k). \quad (3)$$

Since $n < 2\ell k$ is equivalent to $n - \ell k \leq \ell k - 1$ for integers, we have $\left\lceil \frac{\ell k}{n - \ell k} \right\rceil - 1 \geq \left\lceil \frac{\ell k}{\ell k - 1} \right\rceil - 1 > 0$. Using this in $\frac{\ell r - 1}{\left\lceil \frac{\ell k}{n - \ell k} \right\rceil - 1} < c$ gives $c \left\lceil \frac{\ell k}{n - \ell k} \right\rceil - c > \ell r - 1$. We can rearrange this to $\left\lceil \frac{\ell k}{n - \ell k} \right\rceil > \frac{\ell r + c - 1}{c}$, and hence to $\left\lceil \frac{\ell k}{n - \ell k} \right\rceil \geq \frac{\ell r + c}{c} = \frac{\ell r}{c} + 1$. Since $\left\lceil \frac{\ell k}{n - \ell k} \right\rceil$ is an integer, we can conclude that $\frac{\ell k}{n - \ell k} > \frac{\ell r}{c}$, which gives $ck > r(n - \ell k)$, contradicting (3). \square

On the other hand, there are values of n, k, r for which Theorem 1.5 gives a better bound than Theorem 3.1. For instance if $n = 137$, $k = 56$ and $r = 31$, then Theorem 1.5 gives $\chi_{56q-31}(K(137, 56)) \geq 137q - 75$, whereas in Theorem 3.1 we need to take $\ell = 2$ and $c > 15.25$, which gives at best the bound $\chi_{56q-31}(K(137, 56)) \geq 137q - 77$. And for $n = 145$, $k = 30$ and $r = 17$, Theorem 1.5 gives $\chi_{30q-17}(K(145, 30)) \geq 145q - 82$, whereas in Theorem 3.1 we need to take $\ell = 3$ and $c > 50$, or $\ell = 4$ and $c > 16.75$, which gives at best the bound $\chi_{30q-17}(K(145, 30)) \geq 145q - 140$.

In the remainder of this subsection, we prove and discuss Theorem 1.7.

Theorem 1.7.

Let n, k, r, q be integers, $n \geq 2k \geq 2$, $q \geq 1$ and $0 \leq r \leq k - 1$. Choose n_1, \dots, n_t such that $n = \sum_{i=1}^t n_i$ and $2k \leq n_i < 4k$ for all i . Then we have $\chi_{qk-r}(K(n, k)) \geq qn - \sum_{i=1}^t \left\lfloor \frac{n_i r}{k} \right\rfloor$.

In fact, this theorem follows directly from the following more technical lemma.

Lemma 3.2.

Let k, r, q be integers, $n \geq 2k \geq 2$, $q \geq 1$ and $0 \leq r \leq k - 1$. Let n_1, \dots, n_t be positive integers such that $n = \sum_{i=1}^t n_i$, and let $I_1, I_2, I_3 \subseteq [t]$ be the sets of indices such that for $i \in I_1$ we have $n_i < k$, for $i \in I_2$ we have $k \leq n_i < 2k$, and for $i \in I_3$ we have $n_i \geq 2k$. Then we have $\chi_{qk-r}(K(n, k)) \geq |I_2| \cdot (qk - r) + \sum_{i \in I_3} \left(qn_i - \left\lfloor \frac{n_i r}{k} \right\rfloor \right)$.

The proof is based on the idea of partitioning $K(n, k)$ into suitable subgraphs by splitting the ground set $[n]$. Note that for any m with $k \leq m \leq n - k$, the subgraph of $K(n, k)$ induced by $\left\{ F \in \binom{[n]}{k} \mid F \subseteq [m] \right\}$ is isomorphic to $K(m, k)$, and the subgraph of $K(n, k)$ induced by $\left\{ F \in \binom{[n]}{k} \mid F \subseteq [m + 1, n] \right\}$ is isomorphic to $K(n - m, k)$. Moreover, since the vertices of these two subgraphs in $K(n, k)$ are disjoint subsets of $[n]$, there is a complete bipartite join between them in $K(n, k)$.

Setting $k' = qk - r$, these observations immediately give for $k \leq m \leq n - k$:

$$\chi_{k'}(K(n, k)) \geq \chi_{k'}(K(m, k)) + \chi_{k'}(K(n - m, k)).$$

Moreover, for $m < k$ or $m > n - k$ we have $\chi_{k'}(K(m, k)) = 0$, which means that the inequality above in fact holds for $0 \leq m \leq n$.

If $0 \leq n_i < k$, then $K(n_i, k)$ is empty, so $\chi_{qk-r}(K(n_i, k)) = 0$; while if $k \leq n_i < 2k$, then $K(n_i, k)$ has no edges, so $\chi_{qk-r}(K(n_i, k)) = qk - r$. Finally, for $n_i \geq 2k$ Theorem 1.5 gives $\chi_{qk-r}(K(n_i, k)) \geq qn_i - \left\lfloor \frac{n_i r}{k} \right\rfloor$. Combining it all we obtain

$$\chi_{qk-r}(K(n, k)) \geq \sum_{i=1}^t \chi_{qk-r}(K(n_i, k)) \geq |I_1| \cdot 0 + |I_2| \cdot (qk - r) + \sum_{i \in I_3} \left(qn_i - \left\lfloor \frac{n_i r}{k} \right\rfloor \right),$$

completing the proof of the lemma. □

Note that Lemma 3.2 allows for any value of the n_i 's, whereas Theorem 1.7 considers $2k \leq n_i < 4k$ only. To justify this restriction, we show that the best bound in the lemma with $n = n_1 + \dots + n_t$ can always be obtained by taking $2k \leq n_i < 4k$. First, if we have some n_i with $n_i < k$, then since we know $\chi_{qk-r}(K(n_i, k)) = 0$, adding this n_i to another n_j never will give a worse bound.

Next assume we have some n_i with $k \leq n_i < 2k$, but none with $n_i < k$. If there are two such n_i , say n_i and n_j , then it is easy to check that replacing them by $n_i + n_j$ (where $2k \leq n_i + n_j < 4k$) gives at least as good a bound. If there is only one n_i with $k \leq n_i < 2k$, then, since $n \geq 2k$, there must be an n_j with $n_j \geq 2k$. These two parts give $qk - r + qn_j - \lfloor \frac{n_j r}{k} \rfloor$ to the bound. Replacing them by $n_i + n_j$, where we have $2k \leq n_i + n_j$, replaces this contribution by $q(n_i + n_j) - \lfloor \frac{(n_i + n_j)r}{k} \rfloor$. We can estimate

$$\begin{aligned} q(n_i + n_j) - \lfloor \frac{(n_i + n_j)r}{k} \rfloor &\geq q(n_i + n_j) - \frac{(n_i + n_j)r}{k} \\ &> \frac{n_i}{k}(qk - r) + qn_j - \lfloor \frac{n_j r}{k} \rfloor - 1 \geq qk - r + qn_j - \lfloor \frac{n_j r}{k} \rfloor - 1. \end{aligned}$$

And since q, k, r, n_i, n_j are all integers, we can conclude that $q(n_i + n_j) - \lfloor \frac{(n_i + n_j)r}{k} \rfloor \geq qk - r + qn_j - \lfloor \frac{n_j r}{k} \rfloor$, justifying the replacement.

Finally, assume we have some $n_i \geq 4k$. Then we can take $n_i = n_{i'} + n_{i''}$ with $n_{i'}, n_{i''} \geq 2k$. Since $\lfloor \frac{n_{i'} r}{k} \rfloor + \lfloor \frac{n_{i''} r}{k} \rfloor \leq \lfloor \frac{(n_{i'} + n_{i''})r}{k} \rfloor$, we find that splitting $n_i \geq 4k$ always gives at least as good a bound.

For many values of n and k there will be multiple ways to write $n = n_1 + \dots + n_t$ for $2k \leq n_i < 4k$. Although intuitive one would expect that smaller values of n_i give better bounds because of the rounding in the term $\lfloor \frac{n_i r}{k} \rfloor$, this does not in general give the best bound. For instance, if $n = 76$, $k = 7$ and $r = 4$ (and q can be anything), the choice $n_1 = n_2 = n_3 = n_4 = 15$ and $n_5 = 16$, gives the bound $\chi_{7q-4}(K(76, 7)) \geq 76q - 41$. But if we take $n_1 = n_2 = n_3 = n_4 = 19$, we get $\chi_{7q-4}(K(76, 7)) \geq 76q - 40$.

Another intuitive idea is that the best bounds are obtained if the n_i are similar in size (so they give roughly the same term $\lfloor \frac{n_i r}{k} \rfloor$). Also that idea appeared to be wrong. For instance, if $n = 79$, $k = 10$ and $r = 6$ (again q can be anything), the best bound is found by taking $n_1 = 23$ and $n_2 = n_3 = 28$, or by taking $n_1 = n_2 = 23$ and $n_3 = 33$.

We did quite extensive computations of bounds that can be obtained using Theorem 1.7, but weren't able to discover a pattern for what would be the optimal choice of the n_i 's for different values of n, k, r .

3.2 Proof and Discussion of Theorem 1.9

Theorem 1.9 is a corollary of the following two results.

Lemma 3.3.

For all $k \geq 2$ and $n \geq 2k + 1$ there exist $q_0(n, k)$, such that if $q \geq q_0(n, k) + 1$, then we have $\chi_{qk-r}(K(n, k)) \geq n + \chi_{(q-1)k-r}(K(n, k))$ for all $0 \leq r \leq k - 1$.

Lemma 3.4.

For all $k \geq 2$ there exists $n_0(k) \leq k^3 - k^2 + 2k - 2$, such that if $n \geq n_0(k) + 1$, then we have $\chi_{qk-r}(K(n, k)) \geq q + \chi_{qk-r}(K(n-1, k))$ for all $q \geq 1$ and $0 \leq r \leq k-1$.

We first show how these lemmas provide Theorem 1.9.

Theorem 1.9.

Let $k \geq 2$ be fixed. Then there exist $n_0(k)$ and $q_0(n, k)$ such that the following holds. If for all $2k \leq n \leq n_0(k)$ we know that $\chi_{qk-(k-1)}(K(n, k)) = qn - 2(k-1)$ for at least one $q \geq q_0(n, k)$, then we have $\chi_{qk-r}(K(n, k)) = qn - 2r$ for all $n \geq 2k$, $q \geq 1$ and $0 \leq r \leq k-1$.

Proof. Fix $k \geq 2$. Since Stahl's conjecture holds for $n = 2k$, we can assume $n \geq 2k + 1$. Let $n_0(k)$ be the integer as in Lemma 3.4. So if $n \geq n_0(k) + 1$, then for all $0 \leq r \leq k-1$ we have

$$\chi_{qk-r}(K(n, k)) \geq q + \chi_{qk-r}(K(n-1, k)). \quad (4)$$

For each $n \geq 2k + 1$, let $q_0(n, k)$ be the integer as in Lemma 3.3. So if $q \geq q_0(n, k) + 1$, then for all $0 \leq r \leq k-1$ we have

$$\chi_{qk-r}(K(n, k)) \geq n + \chi_{(q-1)k-r}(K(n, k)). \quad (5)$$

Next note that for all $n \geq 2k$ and $q' \geq 2$ we have

$$\chi_{q'k-r}(K(n, k)) \leq n + \chi_{(q'-1)k-r}(K(n, k)), \quad (6)$$

since combining a $(\chi_{(q'-1)k-r}(K(n, k)), (q'-1)k-r)$ -colouring and a (n, k) -colouring of $K(n, k)$ produces a $(q'k-r)$ -multi-colouring.

Assume the conditions in Theorem 1.9 hold. I.e. for each $2k \leq n \leq n_0(k)$ there is a $q_n \geq q_0(n, k)$ such that $\chi_{q_n k-(k-1)}(K(n, k)) = q_n n - 2(k-1)$. Then we immediately have $\chi_{q_n k-r}(K(n, k)) = q_n n - 2r$ for all $0 \leq r \leq k-1$, since for any non-empty graph G we have $\chi_{k'+1}(G) \geq \chi_{k'}(G) + 2$ (by Lemma 2.2), and $\chi_{q_n k}(K(n, k)) = q_n n$. Combining this with (1), (5), and (6), gives $\chi_{qk-r}(K(n, k)) = qn - 2r$ for all $2k \leq n \leq n_0(k)$, $q \geq 1$ and $0 \leq r \leq k-1$.

In particular we have that $\chi_{qk-r}(K(n, k)) = qn - 2r$ for $n = n_0(k)$ and all $q \geq 1$ and $0 \leq r \leq k-1$. Combining this with (1) and (4) gives $\chi_{qk-r}(K(n, k)) = qn - 2r$ for all $n \geq n_0(k)$, $q \geq 1$ and $0 \leq r \leq k-1$, completing the proof. \square

Essential in the proofs of Lemmas 3.3 and 3.4 is some more detailed information about large independent sets in Kneser graphs. Recall that for all $n \geq 2k$ the independence number of the Kneser graph $K(n, k)$ is $\alpha(K(n, k)) = \binom{n-1}{k-1}$ [3], and for $n \geq 2k+1$ equality only occurs for *trivial* independent sets: vertex sets whose vertices are k -sets in $[n]$ that contain some fixed common element $i \in [n]$. We say that such an independent set is *centred at i* .

Hilton and Milner [6] showed that if $n \geq 2k + 1$ and an independent set in the Kneser graph $K(n, k)$ is not trivial, then it has order at most $\binom{n-1}{k-1} - \binom{n-k-1}{k-1} + 1$. This 'second best' bound is significantly smaller than the Erdős-Ko-Rado bound, which means that for large n and q , many of the colours used in a 'good' $(qk-r)$ -multi-colouring of $K(n, k)$ must induce trivial independent sets. In the remainder, we use $\alpha^*(K(n, k)) = \binom{n-1}{k-1} - \binom{n-k-1}{k-1} + 1$ for the Hilton-Milner bound.

Proof of Lemma 3.3. Fix some $k \geq 2$, $n \geq 2k + 1$ and $0 \leq r \leq k - 1$. Take $q \geq q_0(n, k) + 1$, where $q_0(n, k)$ is a function that we will specify later. Fix a proper $(x, qk - r)$ -colouring C of $K(n, k)$ for some $x \leq qn - 2r$ (which we know exists by (1)). We will show this means there also exists a proper $(x - n, (q - 1)k - r)$ -colouring of $K(n, k)$.

Let y be the number of *non-trivial* colour classes in C (the colour classes that are not a subset of $\{F \in \binom{[n]}{k} \mid i \in F\}$ for some $i \in [n]$). Hence there are $x - y$ *trivial* colour classes. By counting the appearance of each vertex in all colour classes, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (qk - r) \binom{n}{k} &\leq (x - y)\alpha(K(n, k)) + y\alpha^*(K(n, k)) \\ &\leq (qn - 2r - y) \binom{n-1}{k-1} + y \left(\binom{n-1}{k-1} - \binom{n-k-1}{k-1} + 1 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $(qk - r) \binom{n}{k} = \left(qn - \frac{rn}{k} \right) \binom{n-1}{k-1}$, this gives

$$y \leq \frac{\left(\frac{rn}{k} - 2r \right) \binom{n-1}{k-1}}{\binom{n-k-1}{k-1} - 1} = \frac{r(n-2k) \binom{n-1}{k-1}}{k \left(\binom{n-k-1}{k-1} - 1 \right)}. \quad (7)$$

We claim that if $q \geq q_0(n, k) + 1$, where

$$q_0(n, k) := \left\lfloor \frac{(k-1)(n-2k+1)}{n-k} + \frac{(k-1)(n-2k)(n-1) \left(\binom{n-2}{k-1} - \binom{n-k-1}{k-1} \right)}{k(n-k) \left(\binom{n-k-1}{k-1} - 1 \right)} \right\rfloor, \quad (8)$$

then for all $i \in [n]$ there is a *trivial* colour class in C that is *centred* at i . For a contradiction, assume that there is no colour class centred at i^* for some $i^* \in [n]$, i.e. none of the colour classes in C is a subset of $\mathcal{F} = \left\{ F \in \binom{[n]}{k} \mid i^* \in F \right\}$. Then each trivial colour class contains at most $\binom{n-2}{k-2}$ vertices in \mathcal{F} , and each non-trivial colour class contains at most $\binom{n-1}{k-1} - \binom{n-k-1}{k-1}$ vertices in \mathcal{F} . Counting the appearance of each vertex in \mathcal{F} in all colour classes, we find

$$\begin{aligned} (qk - r)|\mathcal{F}| &\leq (x - y) \binom{n-2}{k-2} + y \left(\binom{n-1}{k-1} - \binom{n-k-1}{k-1} \right) \\ &\leq (qn - 2r) \binom{n-2}{k-2} + y \left(\binom{n-1}{k-1} - \binom{n-2}{k-2} - \binom{n-k-1}{k-1} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $(qn - r)|\mathcal{F}| = (qn - r) \binom{n-1}{k-1} = \frac{(qk - r)(n-1)}{k-1} \binom{n-2}{k-2}$ and $\binom{n-1}{k-1} - \binom{n-2}{k-2} = \binom{n-2}{k-1}$, this gives

$$y \left(\binom{n-2}{k-1} - \binom{n-k-1}{k-1} \right) \geq \frac{q(n-k) - r(n-2k+1)}{k-1} \binom{n-2}{k-2}. \quad (9)$$

Combining (7) and (9), we obtain

$$\frac{r(n-2k)\binom{n-1}{k-1}\left(\binom{n-2}{k-1}-\binom{n-k-1}{k-1}\right)}{k\left(\binom{n-k-1}{k-1}-1\right)} \geq \frac{q(n-k)-r(n-2k+1)}{k-1}\binom{n-2}{k-2}.$$

We can rearrange this to

$$q \leq \frac{r(n-2k+1)}{n-k} + \frac{r(n-2k)(n-1)\left(\binom{n-2}{k-1}-\binom{n-k-1}{k-1}\right)}{k(n-k)\left(\binom{n-k-1}{k-1}-1\right)}.$$

Since $r \leq k-1$, the right-hand side of this inequality is smaller than $q_0(n, k) + 1$ as defined in (8), a contradiction.

So we can assume that for all $i \in [n]$ there is a trivial colour class in C that is centred at i . By removing one such trivial colour class centred at i for each $i \in [n]$, we remove n colour classes in total and at most k colours for each vertex. This gives a proper $(x-n, (q-1)k-r)$ -colouring of $K(n, k)$, thus proving $\chi_{(q-1)k-r}(K(n, k)) \leq \chi_{qk-r}(K(n, k)) - n$. \square

We need the following technical result for the proof of Lemma 3.4.

Lemma 3.5.

For all $k \geq 2$, if $n_0(k) := k^3 - k^2 + 2k - 2$ then for $n \geq n_0(k) + 1$ we have $\frac{\alpha^*(K(n, k))}{\alpha(K(n, k))} < \frac{n}{k(n-2k+2)}$.

Proof. We can write

$$\frac{\alpha^*(K(n, k))}{\alpha(K(n, k))} = \frac{\binom{n-1}{k-1} - \binom{n-k-1}{k-1} + 1}{\binom{n-1}{k-1}} = 1 - \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{n-k-i}{n-i} + \frac{1}{\binom{n-1}{k-1}}.$$

$$\text{We first estimate } -\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{n-k-i}{n-i} = -\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \left(1 - \frac{k}{n-i}\right) \leq -\left(1 - \frac{k}{n-k+1}\right)^{k-1}.$$

Next, it is straightforward to check that if $k = 2$, then we have $\frac{1}{\binom{n-1}{k-1}} = \frac{1}{n-1} < \frac{1}{n-2} = \frac{2k-2}{k(n-2k+2)}$ for all $n \geq 3$. For $k \geq 2$ and $n \geq 2k+1$, we can estimate by induction on k :

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\binom{n-1}{(k+1)-1}} &= \frac{1}{\frac{n-k}{k}\binom{n-1}{k-1}} < \frac{k}{n-k} \cdot \frac{2k-2}{k(n-2k+2)} \\ &= \frac{(2k-2)(k+1)(n-2k)}{2k(n-k)(n-2k+2)} \cdot \frac{2(k+1)-2}{(k+1)(n-2(k+1)+2)} \\ &< \frac{2(k+1)-2}{(k+1)(n-2(k+1)+2)}. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that $\frac{1}{\binom{n-1}{k-1}} < \frac{2k-2}{k(n-2k+2)}$ for all $n \geq 2k+1 \geq 5$.

All in all, this means that it suffices to find $n_0(k) \geq 2k + 1$ such that for all $n \geq n_0(k) + 1$ we have

$$1 - \left(1 - \frac{k}{n - k + 1}\right)^{k-1} + \frac{2k - 2}{k(n - 2k + 2)} \leq \frac{n}{k(n - 2k + 2)}.$$

This inequality is equivalent to $\left(1 - \frac{k}{n - k + 1}\right)^{k-1} \geq 1 - \frac{1}{k}$, hence to

$$(k - 1) \ln\left(1 - \frac{k}{n - k + 1}\right) \geq \ln\left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right).$$

Now we use the standard inequalities $1 - \frac{1}{x} \leq \ln(x) \leq x - 1$ to obtain that it is enough to guarantee $(k - 1) \cdot \frac{-k}{n - 2k + 1} \geq \frac{-1}{k}$. This holds for $n \geq k^3 - k^2 + 2k - 1$, completing the proof. \square

Note that for specific values of k we can get better bounds on $n_0(k)$. For instance, computations show that for $k = 4$ the conclusion of the lemma already holds for $n \geq 39$ (whereas $n_0(4) + 1 = 55$).

Now we are ready to prove Lemma 3.4.

Proof of Lemma 3.4. Take $k \geq 2$ and $n \geq n_0(k) + 1$, with $n_0(k)$ as in Lemma 3.5 (hence definitely $n \geq 2k + 1$), and assume there exists a proper $(x, qk - r)$ -colouring of $K(n, k)$ for some $x \leq qn - 2r$. We will prove there is a proper $(x - q, qk - r)$ -colouring of $K(n - 1, k)$, which shows $\chi_{qk-r}(K(n - 1, k)) \leq \chi_{qk-r}(K(n, k)) - q$.

We first claim there are at least $(q - 1)n + 1$ trivial colour classes in the $(x, qk - r)$ -colouring of $K(n, k)$. If this is not the case, then there are at most $(q - 1)n$ colour classes that appear on more than $\alpha^*(K(n, k))$ vertices. Hence counting the total number of appearance of each vertex in all colour classes, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (qk - r) \binom{n}{k} &\leq (q - 1)n\alpha(K(n, k)) + (x - (q - 1)n)\alpha^*(K(n, k)) \\ &\leq (q - 1)n\alpha(K(n, k)) + (qn - 2r - (q - 1)n)\alpha^*(K(n, k)). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\binom{n}{k} = \frac{n}{k} \binom{n-1}{k-1} = \frac{n}{k} \alpha(K(n, k))$, we can rearrange this to

$$\frac{\alpha^*(K(n, k))}{\alpha(K(n, k))} \geq \frac{n(k - r)}{k(n - 2r)} = \frac{n}{2k} \left(1 - \frac{n - 2k}{n - 2r}\right) \geq \frac{n}{k(n - 2k + 2)},$$

where we use that $r \leq k - 1$.

This contradicts Lemma 3.5. Hence there are at least $(q - 1)n + 1$ trivial colour classes in the $(x, qk - r)$ -colouring, where each trivial colour class is a subset of $\left\{F \in \binom{[n]}{k} \mid i \in F\right\}$ for some $i \in [n]$. Therefore there is some $i^* \in [n]$ such that at least q trivial colour classes are subsets of $\left\{F \in \binom{[n]}{k} \mid i^* \in F\right\}$. Removing those q trivial colour classes, we obtain an $(x - q, qk - r)$ -colouring of $K(n - 1, k)$, as required. \square

As we already know that Stahl's Conjecture is true for $n = 2k$ and $n = 2k + 1$, Theorem 1.9 shows that for every k , at most $k^3 - k^2 - 3$ values of $\chi_{k'}(n, k)$ or $\chi_{k''}(n, k)$ need to be determined (one for each n , $2k + 2 \leq n \leq n_0(k)$) to prove the conjecture for that value of k and all n, q (or find a counterexample).

We next prove the upper bound of $q_0(n, k)$ mentioned in Section 1.

Proposition 3.6.

For all $n \geq 2k + 1$ we have $q_0(n, k) < 4^k(n - 2k)$.

Proof. We first estimate, using the definition of $q_0(n, k)$ in (8),

$$\begin{aligned}
q_0(n, k) &\leq \frac{(k-1)(n-2k+1)}{n-k} + \frac{(k-1)(n-2k)(n-1) \left(\binom{n-2}{k-1} - \binom{n-k-1}{k-1} \right)}{k(n-k) \left(\binom{n-k-1}{k-1} - 1 \right)} \\
&= \frac{(k-1)(n-2k)(n-1)}{k(n-k)} \left(\frac{\binom{n-2}{k-1} - 1}{\binom{n-k-1}{k-1} - 1} - 1 \right) + \frac{(k-1)(n-2k+1)}{n-k} \\
&= \frac{(k-1)(n-2k)(n-1)}{k(n-k)} \cdot \frac{\binom{n-2}{k-1} - 1}{\binom{n-k-1}{k-1} - 1} - \frac{(k-1)(n-2k-1)}{k} \\
&= \frac{(k-1)(n-2k)(n-1)}{k(n-k)} \left(\frac{\binom{n-2}{k-1}}{\binom{n-k-1}{k-1}} + \frac{1}{\binom{n-k-1}{k-1} - 1} \left(\frac{\binom{n-2}{k-1}}{\binom{n-k-1}{k-1}} - 1 \right) \right) \\
&\quad - \frac{(k-1)(n-2k-1)}{k} \\
&\leq \frac{(k-1)(n-2k)(n-1)}{k(n-k)} \left(\frac{\binom{n-2}{k-1}}{\binom{n-k-1}{k-1}} + \frac{\binom{n-2}{k-1}}{(k-1)\binom{n-k-1}{k-1}} - \frac{1}{k-1} \right) \\
&\quad - \frac{(k-1)(n-2k-1)}{k} \\
&= \frac{(n-2k)(n-1)}{(n-k)} \cdot \frac{\binom{n-2}{k-1}}{\binom{n-k-1}{k-1}} - (n-2k) + \frac{k-1}{n-k} \\
&= (n-2k) \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{n-i}{n-k-i} - (n-2k) + \frac{k-1}{n-k} \\
&< (n-2k) \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{n-i}{n-k-i}.
\end{aligned}$$

In the second inequality we used that $\binom{n-2}{k-1} \geq \binom{n-k-1}{k-1} \geq \binom{2k+1-k-1}{k-1} = k$.

We bound $\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{n-i}{n-k-i}$ by estimating its logarithm for $n \geq 2k + 1$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\ln \left(\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{n-i}{n-k-i} \right) &= \sum_{i=n-2k+1}^{n-k-1} \ln \left(1 + \frac{k}{i} \right) < \int_{n-2k}^{n-k-1} \ln \left(1 + \frac{k}{x} \right) dx \\
&= (n-1) \ln(n-1) + (n-2k) \ln(n-2k)
\end{aligned}$$

$$-(n-k-1)\ln(n-k-1) - (n-k)\ln(n-k).$$

We will estimate this by setting, for $x \geq 2k+1$:

$$f(x) := (x-1)\ln(x-1) + (x-2k)\ln(x-2k) - (x-k-1)\ln(x-k-1) - (x-k)\ln(x-k).$$

Then we have $f'(x) = (\ln(x-1) - \ln(x-k-1)) - (\ln(x-k) - \ln(x-2k))$. Now set $g(y) := \ln y - \ln(y-k)$, for $y \geq k+1$. It's straightforward to check that $g'(y) < 0$ for $y \geq k+1$. Hence $g(y)$ is strictly decreasing and so for $x \geq 2k+1$ we have $f'(x) = g(x-1) - g(x-k) < 0$. So also $f(x)$ is strictly decreasing; which means that $f(x) \leq f(2k+1)$ for all $x \geq 2k+1$. Using this we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \ln\left(\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{n-i}{n-k-i}\right) &< 2k\ln(2k) + \ln 1 - k\ln k - (k+1)\ln(k+1) \\ &= 2k\ln 2 - ((k+1)\ln(k+1) - k\ln k) < 2k\ln 2. \end{aligned}$$

We can conclude that $\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{n-i}{n-k-i} < e^{2k\ln 2} = 4^k$, which gives $q_0(n, k) < 4^k(n-2k)$. \square

Note that for specific values of n, k we can get better bounds on $q_0(n, k)$. For instance, if $k=4$ and $n \geq 11$, direct computation shows $q_0(n, 4) = 12$. Hence for each $n \geq 11$ it suffices to find $\chi_{12,4-(4-1)}(K(n, 4)) = \chi_{45}(K(n, 4))$ to decide Stahl's Conjecture for $k=4$ and those n .

For fixed k , larger n can give better bounds for the expression $\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{n-i}{n-k-i} = \prod_{i=n-2k+1}^{n-k-1} \frac{k+i}{i}$ that appears in the proof above, which in its turn gives smaller $q_0(n, k)$. For instance,

(a) if $n \geq ck - 1$ for some constant $c > 2$, then $\prod_{i=n-2k+1}^{n-k-1} \frac{k+i}{i} \leq \left(\frac{c-1}{c-2}\right)^{k-1}$, and hence

$$q_0(n, k) < (n-2k) \left(\frac{c-1}{c-2}\right)^{k-1};$$

(b) if $n \geq k^2 + k - 1$, then $\prod_{i=n-2k+1}^{n-k-1} \frac{k+i}{i} \leq \left(\frac{k}{k-1}\right)^{k-1} < e$, and hence $q_0(n, k) < e(n-2k)$;

(c) if $n \geq k^3 + k - 1$, then $\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{n-i}{n-k-i} \leq \left(\frac{k^2}{k^2-1}\right)^{k-1} < 1 + \frac{1}{k}$, and hence $q_0(n, k) < \frac{k+1}{k}(n-2k) - (n-2k) + \frac{k-1}{n-k} < \frac{n}{k}$.

Note that if Stahl's Conjecture is false for some n, q, k, r , then Lemmas 3.3 and 3.4 immediately give an infinite number of counterexamples.

Corollary 3.7.

If for some n, q, k, r , $n \geq 2k+1 \geq 5$, $q \geq 1$, $0 \leq r \leq k-1$, we have $\chi_{qk-r}(K(n, k)) \leq qn - 2r - 1$, then for any r', q' with $r \leq r' \leq k-1$ and $q' \geq q + r' - r$ we have $\chi_{q'k-r'}(K(n, k)) \leq q'n - 2r' - 1$.

Csorba and Osztényi [2] showed that the topological lower bounds used by Lovász to prove the Kneser Conjecture cannot be used on their own to prove Stahl's Conjecture. They proved that for $k' \geq \binom{n}{k}$ that topological lower bound implies $\chi_{k'}(K(n, k)) \geq k' \left\lfloor \frac{n}{k} \right\rfloor$ only.

On the other hand, our bounds in (the proofs of) Lemmas 3.4 and 3.3 show that for large n compared to k , we only need to determine one $\chi_{k'}(K(n, k))$ with $k' = qk - (k - 1)$, where $q \leq q_0(n, k)$ can be quite small. Hence it might still be possible that topological methods similar to those Lovász used can prove Stahl's Conjecture for large enough n (depending on k).

4 Concluding Remarks

Our starting point for the research describe in this note was Question 1.1, which we felt was a quite natural question, and then discovered was equivalent to a conjecture made by Stahl in 1976. We consider as our main contribution the simple observation that allowed us to give short proofs for many of the known cases of Stahl's Conjecture; and in fact sometimes extend those cases.

On the other hand, we have no illusion that similar observations will be enough to prove the conjecture. For the most part it remains stubbornly open.

We want to end with a question about multi-colouring we felt was (almost) equally natural and where the equivalent question for normal colouring again is trivial. But in this case we can give the full answer for multi-colouring as well.

The question “for what n and n' can we guarantee that every n -colourable graph is also n' -colourable?” essentially asks for what pairs n, n' there is a homomorphism from K_n to $K_{n'}$. And the answer is obvious: “if and only if $n' \geq n$ ”. This means that the answer to the question “for what pairs n, n' is there both a homomorphism $K_n \rightarrow K_{n'}$ and a homomorphism $K_{n'} \rightarrow K_n$?” is even more straightforward: “if and only if $n = n'$ ”.

The similar questions for multi-colouring the situation don't seem so obvious. “For what pairs (n, k) and (n', k') is there a homomorphism from $K(n, k)$ to $K(n', k')$?” is Stahl's Conjecture; which remains widely open after 50 years. But we can answer the symmetric case: “for what pairs (n, k) and (n', k') is there both a homomorphism $K(n, k) \rightarrow K(n', k')$ and a homomorphism $K(n', k') \rightarrow K(n, k)$?”. To answer it we actually needed some knowledge about special cases of Stahl's Conjecture, as the proof below shows.

Theorem 4.1.

For all integers n, k , $n \geq 2k \geq 2$, we have that there is both a homomorphism $K(n, k) \rightarrow K(n', k')$ and a homomorphism $K(n', k') \rightarrow K(n, k)$ if and only if

- (1) $n = n'$ and $k = k'$, or
- (2) $n = 2k$ and $n' = 2k'$.

Proof. If $n = n'$ and $k = k'$, then clearly there are homomorphisms $K(n, k) \rightarrow K(n', k')$ and $K(n', k') \rightarrow K(n, k)$.

If $n = 2k$ and $n' = 2k'$, then both $K(n, k)$ and $K(n', k')$ are bipartite. We can easily map any bipartite graph to any graph with at least one edge, by mapping all vertices in one part of the bipartition to one endvertex of an edge, and all vertices in the other part to the other endvertex of that same edge.

For the reverse implication, assume that we have homomorphisms $K(n, k) \rightarrow K(n', k')$ and

$K(n', k') \rightarrow K(n, k)$. This means that $\chi_{k'}(K(n, k)) \leq n'$ and $\chi_k(K(n', k')) \leq n$. On the other hand, Observation 1.4 gives $\chi_{k'}(K(n, k)) \geq \frac{k'n}{k}$ and $\chi_k(K(n', k')) \geq \frac{kn'}{k'}$. So we have both $\frac{k'n}{k} \leq n'$ and $\frac{kn'}{k'} \leq n$. This leads to the equality $\frac{n'}{k'} = \frac{n}{k}$ and in particular gives that both $\chi_{k'}(K(n, k)) = \frac{k'n}{k}$ and $\chi_k(K(n', k')) = \frac{kn'}{k'}$. If conclusion (2) does not hold, we must have $\frac{n'}{k'} = \frac{n}{k} > 2$. We obtain $n' = \frac{k'n}{k} > 2k'$ and $n = \frac{kn'}{k'} > 2k$. Then Theorem 1.6 gives that k' is a multiple of k and k is a multiple of k' . That means $k = k'$, hence also $n = n'$, and so conclusion (1) holds. \square

References

- [1] V. Chvátal, M. R. Garey, and D. S. Johnson. Two results concerning multicoloring. *Ann. Discrete Math.*, 2:151–154, 1978.
- [2] P. Csorba and J. Osztényi. On the topological lower bound for the multichromatic number. *Discrete Math.*, 310(8):1334–1339, 2010. DOI: 10.1016/j.disc.2009.12.024.
- [3] P. Erdős, C. Ko, and R. Rado. Intersection theorems for systems of finite sets. *Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser. (2)*, 12:313–320, 1961. DOI: 10.1093/qmath/12.1.313.
- [4] D. Geller and S. Stahl. The chromatic number and other functions of the lexicographic product. *J. Combinatorial Theory Ser. B*, 19(1):87–95, 1975. DOI: 10.1016/0095-8956(75)90076-3.
- [5] C. Godsil and G. Royle. *Algebraic Graph Theory*, volume 207 of *Grad. Texts in Math.* Springer-Verlag, New York, 2001. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4613-0163-9.
- [6] A. Hilton and E. Milner. Some intersection theorems for systems of finite sets. *Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser. (2)*, 18:369–384, 1967. DOI: 10.1093/qmath/18.1.369.
- [7] J. Kincses, G. Makay, M. Maróti, J. Osztényi, and L. Zádori. A special case of the Stahl Conjecture. *European J. Combin.*, 34(2):502–511, 2013. DOI: 10.1016/j.ejc.2012.10.003.
- [8] L. Lovász. Kneser’s Conjecture, chromatic number, and homotopy. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 25(3):319–324, 1978. DOI: 10.1016/0097-3165(78)90022-5.
- [9] J. Osztényi. Proof of Stahl’s Conjecture in some new cases. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 285:113–118, 2020. DOI: 10.1016/j.dam.2020.04.025.
- [10] E. R. Scheinerman and D. H. Ullman. *Fractional Graph Theory. A Rational Approach to the Theory of Graphs*. Available free online at www.ams.jhu.edu/ers/fgt/, 2008.
- [11] S. Stahl. n -Tuple colorings and associated graphs. *J. Combinatorial Theory Ser. B*, 20(2):185–203, 1976. DOI: 10.1016/0095-8956(76)90010-1.
- [12] S. Stahl. The multichromatic numbers of some Kneser graphs. *Discrete Math.*, 185(1-3):287–291, 1998. DOI: 10.1016/S0012-365X(97)00211-2.
- [13] X. Xu. *Topics in Graph Colouring*. PhD thesis, London School of Economics & Political Science, 2023. Available online at etheses.lse.ac.uk/4554/.