

Matheuristic Variants of DSATUR for the Vertex Coloring Problem

Federico Bruzzone,¹ PhD Candidate

Milan, Italy – 4 December 2025



¹ADAPT Lab – Università degli Studi di Milano,

Website: federicobruzzone.github.io,

Github: github.com/FedericoBruzzone,

Email: federico.bruzzone@unimi.it

Slides: TODO

Notation

- $G = (V, E)$ is an undirected graph with vertex set $V = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ and edge set E , and denote $I = \llbracket 1; n \rrbracket = [1; n] \cap \mathbb{Z}$.
- An edge $e = (v_i, v_j) \in E$ with $i < j$ links the underlying vertices (*for VCP there is no sense to consider loop/multiple edges*).
- For $i \in I$, δ_i denotes the set of neighbors of vertex v_i , and $d_i = |\delta_i| = |\{j \in I \mid \text{ngb}(v_i, v_j) = 1\}|$, where $\text{ngb}(v_i, v_j) = 1$ *iff* $(v_i, v_j) \in E$.²

²ngb stands for “neighbor”.

A k -coloring of G

- It is an assignment of colors to vertices such that no two adjacent vertices share the same color.
- **VCP** consists in finding a k -coloring of G using the minimum number of colors k (the *chromatic number* $\chi(G)$).
- A valid k -coloring (c) fulfills: $\forall i < j, (v_i, v_j) \in E \implies c_i \neq c_j$ where $c_* = \llbracket 1; k \rrbracket$ is the color of v_* .

A partial k -coloring of G

- If a vertex may not be colored, we set $c_i = -1$ s.t. $c_i \in \llbracket 1; k \rrbracket \cup \{-1\}$
- A partial k -coloring (c) is *feasible* if $\forall i < j, (v_i, v_j) \in E \implies c_i \neq c_j \vee c_i = c_j = -1$.
- Given v_i the **saturation table** S_i is the set of colors assigned to its colored neighbors: $S_i = \bigcup_{j \in \delta_i}^n \{c_j\} \setminus \{-1\}$, and $s_i = |S_i|$ is the **saturation degree**.
- A total order \succsim over V is defined as: $v_i \succsim v_j \iff s_i > s_j \vee (s_i = s_j \wedge d_i \geq d_j)$

Compact ILP Formulations³, feasible *iff* $\chi(G) \leq k$

$z_{i,c} \in \{0, 1\}$
indicates if
vertex v_i is
assigned color
 c .

$y_c \in \{0, 1\}$
indicates if
color c is used
in the coloring.

$$\min \sum_{c=1}^k y_c$$

$$s.t. \sum_{c=1}^k z_{i,c} = 1 \quad \forall i \in I$$

$$z_{i,c} + z_{j,c} \leq y_c \quad \forall (v_i, v_j) \in E, \\ \forall c \in \llbracket 1; k \rrbracket$$

The objective minimizes the
number of used colors.

The 1st set ensures that each
vertex is assigned exactly one
color.

The 2nd set ensures that
adjacent vertices do not share
the same color.

³Efficient formulations: extended column generation by Furini and Malaguti [1], and reduced formulation to MWSSP by Cornaz et al. [2].

Observations

- Having an upper bound of the chromatic number as the initial value k (or simply $k = |V|$) guarantees the optimality of the solution.
- The size of k strongly affects the performance of ILP solvers.
- Symmetries in the model (e.g., colors are permutable) enlarge the search space for Branch-and-Bound algorithms (the same solution can be represented in multiple ways)

Representative ILP Model⁴, asymmetric and easily to LP-relax

$$\begin{aligned}
 & x_{i,i'} \in \{0, 1\}, \\
 & \quad \forall i, i' \in V \text{ s.t. } i \leq i', \\
 & \quad \text{indicates if} \\
 & \text{vertices } v_i \text{ and } v_{i'} \text{ share the same color and} \\
 & \quad i \text{ is the minimum index of its color class.} \\
 & \min_z \sum_{i=1}^n x_{i,i} \\
 & \text{s.t. } \sum_{i' \leq i} x_{i',i} \geq 1 \quad \forall i \in I \\
 & \quad x_{j,i} + x_{j,i'} \leq x_{j,j} \quad \forall (v_i, v_{i'}) \in E, \\
 & \quad \quad \quad \forall j \leq i \leq i'
 \end{aligned}$$

The objective **counts** the number of representative vertices (i.e., used colors).

The 1st set ensures either $x_{i,i} = 1$ (i is **representative**) or i 's representative is a **previous** vertex $i' < i$ (all vertices must be colored).

The 2nd set expresses the color incompatibility between adjacent vertices and $x_{j,*} = 1 \implies x_{j,j} = 1$

⁴A vertex is representative of its color class if it has the minimum index among the vertices sharing the same color.

Standard DSATUR Algorithm

Algorithm 1: Standard DSATUR algorithm

Input: $G = (V, E)$ a non-empty and non-oriented graph

Initialization:

define partial coloring c with $c_i := -1$ for all $i \in I$

define saturation table S with $S_i := \emptyset$ for all $i \in I$

initialize set $U := V$, and color $k := 0$

while $U \neq \emptyset$

find $u \in U$, a maximum of \succsim in U .

if $|S_u| = k$ **then** $k := k + 1$ // a new color is added

compute $c_i := \min S_u$ // assign color to u

 remove u from U

for all $i \in \delta_u \cap U$, $S_i = S_i \cup \{c_i\}$ // update saturation

end while

return color k and (c) a k -coloring of G

- DSATUR is an **adaptive greedy heuristic** proposed by Brélaz [3], which colors vertices iteratively.
- Selection of the uncolored vertex to color is given with order \succsim , maximizing first the saturation degree and secondly the degree.
- Coloring a new vertex updates saturation, the iteration order of vertices is thus adaptive.

DASTUR Matheuristic Variants⁵

⁵N. Dupin, “Matheuristic Variants of DSATUR for the Vertex Coloring Problem,” in *Metaheuristics 2024* [4]

Initialization

Defining an initial partial coloring and computing the saturation table for the uncolored vertices, **before** starting the main DSATUR iterations.

Variants:

1. maxDeg: color the vertex with the maximum degree — equivalent to standard DSATUR by definition of \succ , it would suffer from many ties;
2. col- n : consider n vertices having the maximum degree and color them solving a representative ILP model for the *induced* subgraph — more depth pre-processing, it tries to prevent erroneous decisions in the initial steps of DSATUR;
3. clq: find a maximum clique⁶ and color it with different colors — an exact pre-processing (not heuristic), it leads to a better initial saturation table S for the uncolored vertices;
4. clq-col- n : combine clq and col- n — best of both worlds.

⁶It is NP-hard, an heuristic can be used.

Local Optimization with Larger Neighborhoods

Let (c) be a partial k -coloring, where k is the number of colors used until now.

- $C = \{i \in I \mid c_i > 0\}$ is the set of colored vertices in (c) .
- $U \subset \{i \in I \mid c_i = -1\}$ is a subset of uncolored vertices in (c) .

We want to define an ILP formulation to **assign** a color to each vertex $u \in U$ while **preserving** the colors of vertices in C .

An **hybrid** formulation of **assignment**-based and **representative**-based formulations is used.

Matheuristic DSATUR Formulation

$$\min_z \sum_{u \in U} x_{u,u}$$

$$s.t. \quad z_{i,l} + z_{i',l} \leq 1$$

$$x_{u,i} + x_{u,i'} \leq x_{u,u}$$

$$\sum_{i' \in U: i' \leq i} x_{i',i} + \sum_{l \in K_u} z_{i,l} \geq 1 \quad \forall u \in U$$

$$\forall (v_i, v_{i'}) \in E_U,$$

$$\forall l \in \llbracket 1; k \rrbracket$$

$$\forall (v_i, v_{i'}) \in E_U,$$

$$\forall u \in U, u \leq i$$

$$\forall u \in U$$

- Binary variables $x_{u,u'}$ are defined only for $u \leq u' \in U$, when considering $E_U = \{(v_u, v_{u'})\}_{u < u' \in U} \subset E$.
- Binary variables $z_{u,l}$, to **assign previous colors**, are defined for $u \in U$ and $l \in \llbracket 1; k \rrbracket$ s.t. no neighbor u has color l in (c) – i.e., for all $u \in U$ and $l \in K_u$, where $K_u = \{l \in \llbracket 1; k \rrbracket \mid \forall i \in C, c_i = l \implies \text{ngb}(i, j) = 0\}$

Matheuristic DSATUR Formulation

$$\min_z \sum_{u \in U} x_{u,u}$$

$$s.t. \quad z_{i,l} + z_{i',l} \leq 1$$

$$x_{u,i} + x_{u,i'} \leq x_{u,u}$$

$$\sum_{i' \in U: i' \leq i} x_{i',i} + \sum_{l \in K_u} z_{i,l} \geq 1$$

$$\forall (v_i, v_{i'}) \in E_U,$$

$$\forall l \in \llbracket 1; k \rrbracket$$

$$\forall (v_i, v_{i'}) \in E_U,$$

$$\forall u \in U, u \leq i$$

$$\forall u \in U$$

- It is **assignment**-based for variables $z_{u,l}$, ensuring that vertices in U are assigned either a previous color l in K_u or share the color with another vertex in U .
- It is **representative**-based for variables $x_{i,i'}$, ensuring that vertices in U sharing the same color have a representative vertex with the minimum index.

Matheuristic DSATUR Formulation

$$\min_z \sum_{u \in U} x_{u,u}$$

$$s.t. \quad z_{i,l} + z_{i',l} \leq 1$$

$$x_{u,i} + x_{u,i'} \leq x_{u,u}$$

$$\sum_{i' \in U: i' \leq i} x_{i',i} + \sum_{l \in K_u} z_{i,l} \geq 1$$

$$\forall (v_i, v_{i'}) \in E_U,$$

$$\forall l \in \llbracket 1; k \rrbracket$$

$$\forall (v_i, v_{i'}) \in E_U,$$

$$\forall u \in U, u \leq i$$

$$\forall u \in U$$

- The 1st set ensures that adjacent vertices in U do not share the same **existing** color l .
- The 2nd set ensures that two adjacent vertices in U cannot share the same representative color.
- The 3rd set ensures, $\forall i \in U$, that either it receives a **previous** color l in K_u or it receives a **new** color represented by another vertex i' in U with $i' \leq i$.

Matheuristic DSATUR Algorithm

Algorithm 2: Matheuristic DSATUR variants

Input: $G = (V, E)$ a non-empty and non-oriented graph

Parameters:

- an initialization strategy \mathcal{S} (from Sect. 3.1) ;
- $o \in \mathbb{N}$, $o > 1$;
- $r \in \mathbb{N}$.

Initialization:

initialize colored set C , and color k with strategy \mathcal{S} .

initialize $W := V \setminus C$.

update partial coloring c and saturation table S with strategy \mathcal{S} .

while $W \neq \emptyset$

sort W with order \succsim .

define U_1 as the o first elements after sorting.

define U_2 as the elements of rank $o + 1$ and $\min(|W|, o + r)$ after sorting.

solve ILP (15) with C and $U = U_1 \cup U_2$.

$k := k + OPT$ where OPT is the optimal value of the last ILP.

if $o + r \leq |W|$ **then** $U_1 = U$ **end if**

set $W := W \setminus U_1$

assign colors c_u of the ILP for $u \in U_1$

end while

return color k and (c) a k -coloring of G

- \mathcal{S} for *initialization* induces k , C , S , c , and W .
- Simultaneously colors o vertices solving the **matheuristic DSATUR ILP** formulation (the standard DSATUR have $o = 1$ and $r = 0$).
- Having $r > 0$ ensures **more depth** in the local search and the possibility to **reoptimize** in later iterations (set $W := W \setminus U_1$).
- U_2 helps the ILP in having context when coloring **critical** vertices U_1 .⁷
- $o + r \geq W$ holds in the last iteration, and $U_1 = U = W$ ensures both termination ($W \setminus U_1 = \emptyset$) and efficiency (no useless re-optimization—i.e., recoloring r vertices).

⁷ $o + r$ should be fine-tuned according to the ILP solver capabilities and instance features.

Comparison of DSATUR matheuristics

	#colors	gap	#BKS	#worse	#better	Q1	Q2	Q3
maxDeg	3240	32.03 %	1	0	0	0	0	0
col-60	3251	32.48 %	1	19	16	-1	0	1
col-80	3250	32.44 %	2	20	16	-1	0	1
clq-col-80	3214	30.97 %	2	18	17	-1	0	1
clq	3209	30.77 %	4	13	19	-1	0	0
Best clq	3181	29.63 %	6	7	26	-1	0	0
Best clq+DSATUR	3174	29.34 %	6	0	26	-1	0	0
Best-DSATUR	3163	28.89 %	6	3	34	-2	-1	0
Best+DSATUR	3160	28.77 %	6	0	34	-2	-1	0
BKS	2454	0.00 %	53	0	52	-14	-5	-3

- Using a maximum clique to initialize saturation drastically reduces the number of colors needed from the very first steps, avoiding early errors inherent in the greedy version.
- While clq-col-n provides the best results in terms of solution quality (lower k), it requires higher initial computation time due to the exact resolution of subgraphs.

Comparison with Larger Local Optimization

Init satur	o	r	#colors	gap	#BKS	#worse	#better	Q1	Q2	Q3
maxDeg	1	0	3240	32.03 %	1	0	0	0	0	0
col-80	1	0	3250	32.44 %	2	20	16	-1	0	1
col-80	20	60	3181	29.63 %	6	12	30	-3	-1	0
col-80	40	40	3218	31.13 %	5	20	26	-2	0	1
col-80	80	0	3322	35.37 %	2	35	13	0	1	2
clq	1	0	3209	30.77 %	4	13	19	-1	0	0
clq	40	40	3155	28.57 %	10	9	32	-3	-1	0
Best Clq			3134	27.71 %	10	4	37	-3	-1	0
Best-DSATUR			3125	27.34 %	10	3	40	-3	-2	-1
Best+DSATUR			3122	27.22 %	10	0	40	-3	-2	-1
BKS			2454	0.00 %	53	0	52	-14	-5	-3

- Depth and Re-optimization: Using $r > 0$ allows coloring the most critical vertices (U_1) while maintaining vision over their neighbors (U_2), reducing the “threshold effects” typical of standard DSATUR ($o = 1, r = 0$).
- As $o + r$ increases, the algorithm approaches an exact solver, but computational time grows; the matheuristic finds an optimal balance for medium-sized instances.

Thank You!

Bibliography

- [1] F. Furini and E. Malaguti, “Exact weighted vertex coloring via branch-and-price,” *Discrete Optimization*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 130–136, 2012.
- [2] D. Cornaz, F. Furini, and E. Malaguti, “Solving vertex coloring problems as maximum weight stable set problems,” *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, vol. 217, pp. 151–162, 2017.
- [3] D. Brélaz, “New methods to color the vertices of a graph,” *Commun. ACM*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 251–256, Apr. 1979.
- [4] N. Dupin, “Matheuristic Variants of DSATUR for the Vertex Coloring Problem,” in *Metaheuristics*, M. Sevaux, A.-L. Olteanu, E. G. Pardo, A. Sifaleras, and S. Makboul, Eds., Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland, 2024, pp. 96–111.
- [5] M. A. Boschetti, A. N. Letchford, and V. Maniezzo, “Matheuristics: survey and synthesis,” *International Transactions in Operational Research*, vol. 30, no. 6, pp. 2840–2866, 2023.

- [6] N. Dupin and E.-G. Talbi, “Machine learning-guided dual heuristics and new lower bounds for the refueling and maintenance planning problem of nuclear power plants,” *Algorithms*, vol. 13, no. 8, p. 185, 2020.

Dual Bounds

DSATUR matheuristics allow to have both lower and upper bounds on $\chi(G)$ [5], [6].

- Any clique $Q \subset V$ provides a lower bound $|Q| \leq \chi(G)$ — finding a maximum clique Q^* sets a strong starting dual bound.
- Solving the LP relaxation of the hybrid ILP formulation provides a dual bound for the global VCP — this is valid as long as no heuristic reductions are applied to the original problem constraints.
- Intermediate dual bounds can be obtained by stopping the ILP solver before global optimality.
- Techniques like those in can be used to compute dual bounds on equivalent, smaller VCP sub-problems more efficiently.
- Larger values of $n = o + r$ in LP relaxations lead to more relevant selections of nodes and tighter dual bounds.

Comparison of Dual Bounds

	UB	LB	LB			$t(s)$	$\Delta t(s)$	$\Delta t(s)$
	BKS	BKLB	clq	$n = 125$	$n = 200$	clq	$n = 125$	$n = 200$
C2000.5	145	99	15	20	21	185	163	3600
C4000.5	259	107	17	21	22	252	99	3600
dsjc125.1	5	5	4	5	5	0.2	82	118
dsjc125.5	17	17	10	14	14	14	131	3600
dsjc125.9	44	44	34	43	44	33	1	1
dsjc250.1	8	7	4	6	5	0.7	186	3600
dsjc250.5	28	26	12	16	17	160	206	3600
dsjc250.9	72	71	41	56	70	53	1.5	105
dsjc500.1	12	9	5	5	5	5	4	3600
dsjc500.5	48	43	13	17	19	167	61	3450
dsjc500.9	126	123	51	65	79	50	0.4	274
dsjc1000.1	20	10	6	6	6	38	8.6	3600
dsjc1000.5	83	73	14	19	20	175	172.6	3600
dsjc1000.9	222	215	59	73	86	80	2.3	15
dsjr500.1c	85	85	76	77	79	47	3	11
dsjr500.5	122	122	114	122	122	5	0.6	10
flat300_26_0	26	26	11	15	16	167	217	3600
flat300_28_0	28	28	12	15	16	160	259	3600
flat1000_50_0	50	50	13	17	19	175	186	3600
flat1000_60_0	60	60	13	17	19	178	135	3600
flat1000_76_0	76	76	14	18	19	166	179	3600
latin_square	97	90	90	90	90	32	0.2	12
r1000.1c	98	96	87	88	88	143	73	9
r1000.5	234	234	213	214	220	81	8.5	19
Average						95	87	2033
TOTAL	1965	1716	928	1039	1101			

- Dual bounds obtained from local optimizations provide mathematical proof of the solution's quality, narrowing the gap between the number of colors used and the theoretical optimum.
- Even linear relaxations (LP) on small subsets of nodes ($n = o + r$) significantly improve the lower bound compared to searching for the maximum clique alone.