

{121, 112}

Upper bound

Always use $1 \rightarrow 1 \rightarrow 1 \rightarrow \dots$ for “larger” subtree and $1 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 1 \rightarrow 2 \dots$ for “smaller” subtree, so that the alternating paths $1 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 1 \rightarrow 2 \dots$ that you create can be as short as possible. E.g. if you have a long path with some short hairs, the long path would be $1 \rightarrow 1 \rightarrow 1 \rightarrow \dots$ and only the hairs would need color 2 in a coordinated manner.

Hence $O(\log n)$

Lower bound

It is clear that, in a general case, we cannot use only 1 of the 2 labels, so both labels will need to be used. Therefore, trivial solution where each node outputs the same label wouldn't work here.

It is rather easy to see that a deterministic setting there is no fast algorithm since, looking at a regular tree, at some level x , labels of the nodes at this level will **uniquely** determine labels of their parents \Rightarrow we have $\Omega(\log n)$.

We can argue that randomness does not help here. Let's assume the opposite. Then there is a node v somewhere in the middle of a large rooted tree G s.t. the output of v depends on the random bits in its constant neighbourhood C . In particular, the output of v is not completely determined by unique ids of nodes in C and the tree structure. Then, if we look at the set X of nodes s.t. they are at the distance of d from v and all nodes in X are descendants of v . Given that d is large enough, the number of label-2 nodes in X has to change whenever v changes its label. Thus, no matter what's the distribution of labels in set X , if their random bits are independent of the random bits of v , with probability $> p$ we will have a mismatch somewhere in the tree.

Hence $\Omega(\log n)$

Thus, we have $\Theta(\log n)$