

# Minimum vertex coloring on $\text{Graphs}(r,l)$

---

Matheus S. D'Andrea Alves, Uéverton dos Santos Souza

August 2017

Universidade Federal Fluminense

Introduction

The problem

Our approach

First results

The relation between list coloring and minimum coloring in  $\text{Graph}(r,l)$

Final results

Conclusion

## Introduction

---

# Who am I



Undergraduated student at:

- Universidade Federal Fluminense

Interested in:

- Graph theory
- Complexity analysis
- Software engineering

You can find me here:

- [github.com/MSDandrea](https://github.com/MSDandrea)
- [telegram.me/MSDandrea](https://telegram.me/MSDandrea)

## The problem

---

### **Graph( $r,l$ )**

Any graph in the class of graphs that can be partitionated in  $r$  independent sets and  $l$  cliques

### **Minimum vertex coloring**

A minimum vertex coloring is an assignment of a color among  $k$  colors to each vertex of a graph such that no edge connects two identically colored vertices and  $k$  is the smallest value to obtain a  $k$ -coloring

## THE QUESTION:

When does this problem begins to be NP-Complete?

And why?

## Our approach

---



Build a dichotomy to the problem, based on the  $r$  and  $l$  values.

Gather the results and search for a pattern in the problem behavior.

The starting point was the following:

- A null Graph (i.e. a  $\text{Graph}(0,0)$ ) is 0-colorable.
- 
- 
- 
-

The starting point was the following:

- A null Graph (i.e. a  $\text{Graph}(0,0)$ ) is 0-colorable.
- A empty Graph (i.e. a  $\text{Graph}(1,0)$ ) is 1-colorable.
- 
- 
-

The starting point was the following:

- A null Graph (i.e. a  $\text{Graph}(0,0)$ ) is 0-colorable.
- A empty Graph (i.e. a  $\text{Graph}(1,0)$ ) is 1-colorable.
- A bipartite Graph (i.e. a  $\text{Graph}(2,0)$ ) is 2-colorable.
- 
-

The starting point was the following:

- A null Graph (i.e. a  $\text{Graph}(0,0)$ ) is 0-colorable.
- A empty Graph (i.e. a  $\text{Graph}(1,0)$ ) is 1-colorable.
- A bipartite Graph (i.e. a  $\text{Graph}(2,0)$ ) is 2-colorable.
- A Complete Graph (i.e. a  $\text{Graph}(0,1)$ ) is  $k$ -colorable where  $k = \#V(G)$ .
-

The starting point was the following:

- A null Graph (i.e. a Graph(0,0)) is 0-colorable.
- A empty Graph (i.e. a Graph(1,0)) is 1-colorable.
- A bipartide Graph (i.e. a Graph(2,0)) is 2-colorable.
- A Complete Graph (i.e. a Graph(0,1)) is  $k$ -colorable where  $k = \#V(G)$ .
- A Split Graph (i.e. a Graph(1,1)) is  $k$ -colorable where  $k = \#V(C)$  such that  $C$  is the Maximal clique in  $G$ .

### Theorem

*Minimum vertex coloring of Graph(0,2) is Polynomial.*

### Proof.

A Graph(0,2) is a Graph that can be partitioned into 2 cliques, finding the maximal clique in this case is polynomial. Once we have the maximal clique, we know that the graph can be colored with  $k$  colors, such that  $K$  is the maximal clique cardinality. □

### Theorem

*Minimum vertex coloring of Graph(3,0) is Polynomial.*

### Proof.

Beacause we know that the Graph is a Graph(3,0) we known it can be colored at most with 3 colors. To find out if it can be colored with 2 or one color is polynomial, implying that minimum vertex coloring of Graph(3,0) is Polynomial. □



### Theorem

*Minimum vertex coloring of Graph(4,0) is NP-Complete.*

### Proof.

We know that the Graph is a Graph(4,0), therefore it can be colored at most with 4 colors. We need to discover if it can be colored with 3 colors; Note that the graph is a planar graph and 3-coloring in planar graphs are NP-complete, implying that minimum vertex coloring of Graph(4,0) is NP-Complete.  $\square$

## First results

---

# Partial Dichotomy

$r \backslash l$	0	1	2	3	4	...	n
0	$P$	$P$	$P$	?	?	...	?
1	$P$	$P$	?	?	?	...	?
2	$P$	?	?	?	?	...	?
3	$P$	?	?	?	?	...	?
4	$NP_C$	$NP_C$	$NP_C$	$NP_C$	$NP_C$	...	$NP_C$
$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\ddots$	$NP_C$
n	$NP_C$	$NP_C$	$NP_C$	$NP_C$	$NP_C$	...	$NP_C$

**Table 1:** Partial dichotomy of the minimum coloring problem on  $\text{Graph}(r,l)$

**How to proceed?**

## The relation between list coloring and minimum coloring in $\text{Graph}(r,l)$

---

# The relation between list coloring and minimum coloring in $\text{Graph}(r,l)$

## Theorem

*Minimum vertex coloring is NP-Complete for  $\text{Graph}(r,l+1)$  if list coloring is NP-Complete for  $\text{Graph}(r,l)$*

# The relation between list coloring and minimum coloring in $\text{Graph}(r,l)$

## **Proof.**

The proof consists in showing that a solution for the list coloring problem in a  $\text{Graph}(r,l)$   $G$ , implies in a solution for the minimum color problem in a  $\text{Graph}(r,l+1)$   $H$ .

In order to do so, we need to show that:

- If a graph  $G(r,l)$  has a proper list coloring then  $H$  is  $k$ -colorable for  $k$ =total number of colors in the lists (1).
- If  $H$  is  $k$ -colorable then  $G$  has a proper list coloring (2).

## The relation between list coloring and minimum coloring in Graph(r,l)

(1):

Let  $G$  be a Graph(r,l) such that each vertex  $v \in V(G)$  has a color list; Each list has at least one color of the Set:  $C = \{c_1, c_2, c_3, \dots, c_k\}$ .

Let  $G$  be a **yes** instance for the list coloring problem, we build a clique  $K$ , where each vertex  $u \in V(K)$  represents a color of  $C$ .

Note that the clique  $K$  has exactly  $k$  vertices, thereafter, we can colorize  $K$  with only  $k$  colors, without becoming restrictive we can assume that the vertex  $u_i \in K$  will be colored with the color  $c_i$ .

Suppose  $H = G \cup K$ , and that for every vertex  $u_i \in V(K)$  and every vertex  $v_j \in V(G)$  add a edge  $E(u_i, v_j)$  in  $H$  iff  $c_i$  is not a color present on the list of  $v_j$ .

Using this construction, the coloring of  $K$  does not conflict with the color pattern solution found for  $G$ , implying in a minimum proper coloring of  $H$ .



(2):

Suppose that the graph  $H$  is a  $\text{Graph}(r,l+1)$  and has a  $k$ -coloring. Let  $K$  be the maximal clique in  $H$ . We know that  $k$  is the number of vertices in  $K$ .

Note that the removal of  $K$  from  $H$  (which become  $G$ ) does not affect its proper coloring, also note that the remaining vertex  $v \in V(G)$  can now be colored using the colors of their former neighbors in  $K$  in such a way that it does not affect its proper coloring.

In that way we show that, if  $H$  is  $k$ -colorable,  $G$  is a yes instance for the list coloring problem.  $\square$

With this result we can say that:

- Minimum proper coloring of  $\text{Graph}(1,2)$  is NP-Complete.  
NP-Completeness of list coloring of split graphs was demonstrated by Jensen et al. at *"Generalized coloring for tree-like graphs"*.
- Minimum proper coloring of  $\text{Graph}(2,1)$  is NP-Complete.  
NP-Completeness of list coloring of bipartite graphs was demonstrated by Fellows et al. at *"List Coloring and Precoloring Extension are  $W[1]$ -hard parameterized by treewidth"*.
- Minimum proper coloring of  $\text{Graph}(0,3)$  is NP-Complete.  
NP-Completeness of list coloring of  $\text{Graph}(0,2)$  graphs was demonstrated by Jensen et al. at *"Complexity results for the optimum cost chromatic partition problem"*.

## Final results

---

These results allow us to finish our dichotomy.

$r \backslash l$	0	1	2	3	4	...	n
0	$P$	$P$	$P$	$NP_C$	$NP_C$	...	$NP_C$
1	$P$	$P$	$NP_C$	$NP_C$	$NP_C$	...	$NP_C$
2	$P$	$NP_C$	$NP_C$	$NP_C$	$NP_C$	...	$NP_C$
3	$P$	$NP_C$	$NP_C$	$NP_C$	$NP_C$	...	$NP_C$
4	$NP_C$	$NP_C$	$NP_C$	$NP_C$	$NP_C$	...	$NP_C$
$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\ddots$	$NP_C$
n	$NP_C$	$NP_C$	$NP_C$	$NP_C$	$NP_C$	...	$NP_C$

**Table 2:** Dichotomy of the minimum coloring problem on  $\text{Graph}(r,l)$

## Conclusion

---

We were successful in answering our first question, and discovered an interesting relation between two coloring problems applied to the  $\text{Graph}(r,l)$  class.

Future works:

- Why the problem behaves that way?
- Does the Minimum vertex coloring problem have a parametrized solution for  $\text{Graph}(r,l)$ ?

**THANK YOU!**

**Questions?**