

Graph coloring

Michał Adamaszek ? ?

June 9, 2017

Contents

1	Preface	2
2	Temporary	3
2.1	Notation	3
2.2	Aha foo bar	3
2.3	Section	3
2.4	Including sage code	3
2.5	TODOs	4
2.6	Notation	4
3	Basic graph theory	5
4	Vertex coloring	6
5	Planar graphs	7
6	Chromatic polynomial	8
6.1	Definitions and simple properties	8
6.2	Deletion-contraction	10
7	Edge coloring	16
7.1	Definitions and examples	16
7.2	Basic properties	17
7.3	Hall's marriage theorem and applications	18
7.4	Edge coloring vs. the 4-color theorem.	19
7.5	Exercises	20
8	Chromatic number of Euclidean spaces	21
8.1	Chromatic number of Euclidean spaces	21
8.2	Compactness	21
8.3	Chromatic number of \mathbb{R}^2	22
8.4	Upper bound on $\chi(\mathbb{R}^d)$	23
8.5	Cube-like unit distance graphs in \mathbb{R}^d	23
8.6	Lower bound on $\chi(\mathbb{R}^d)$	25
8.7	Linear algebra in action	25
8.8	Exercises	27
9	Coloring and topology	28
9.1	Exercises	28
10	Exam problems	29
10.1	Problems	29
10.2	Hints	30

Chapter 1

Preface

These lecture notes come from a master-level course *Graph coloring*, taught by the first author at the Department of Mathematical Sciences of the University of Copenhagen in spring 2016.

Despite the name, this is not what one would call a comprehensive course in graph coloring. Instead, graph coloring problems serve only as a convenient excuse to familiarize the students, who may never have taken a more advanced combinatorics course, with interesting combinatorial techniques. The purpose is rather to give a taste of tools from linear algebra, calculus, combinatorics and geometry and demonstrate a few classical combinatorial theorems and their applications. It also has a bit of an experimental flavour and includes short programming exercises in Sage.

Each chapter ends with a series of exercises, preferably to be solved with the guidance of an instructor. The last chapter contains exam problems with short hints. This division does not imply a gradation of difficulty — some of the chapter exercises are quite challenging!

We are grateful for the contribution by the students who took notes during the course: Giorgia Laura Cassis, Hugrún Fjóla Hafsteinsdóttir, Rolf Jørgensen, Mathis Elmgaard Isaksen, Sokratis Theodoridis, Mortan Janusarson Thomsen, Kristoffer Holm Nielsen. Most of these notes are based on their writeup.

The LaTeX source of these lecture notes is available under the GNU GPL license from <http://github.com/aszek/chromatic>.

Chapter 2

Temporary

2.1 Notation

A graph is $G = (V, E)$ and it has $n = |V|$, $m = |E|$. If there are more graphs the next one is H . A coloring with c colors is a function $f : V \rightarrow \{1, \dots, c\} = C$. The chromatic number is χ . A bipartite graph has parts A, B , or X, Y .

2.2 Aha foo bar

This is just a testing ground for now.

Here is ade finition

Definition 2.1. *We say that a definition is a definition is*

$$\int_M d\omega = \int_{\partial M} \omega \tag{2.1}$$

On the other hand, here is a remark:

Remark 2.2. I would like the contents of a remark not to be italicised.

2.3 Section

It would be good to split each chapter into 2-4 sections.

2.4 Including sage code

We include SAGE source code like this:

```
def FunnyGraph(n):
    c = graphs.CompleteGraph(n)
    c.delete_edges(graphs.CycleGraph(n).edges())
    return graphs.MycielskiStep(c).join(graphs.WheelGraph(n+1))

G = FunnyGraph(99)
```

At the very end I will implement it using a pygmentize highlighter for python.

Figures can be drawn in tikz or whatever, or included from another file. In any case, it would be good to have every figure inside a figure environment with a label and caption.

2.5 TODOs

List of todos for MA:

- Remove this file
- Add pygmentize
- Expand and check bibliography

2.6 Notation

(This section is not temporary. In fact, it will become this whole chapter.)

G, H, \dots	graphs
$G = (V, E)$	vertices and edges of a graph
\overline{G}	graph complement
$N_G(x), N_G[x]$	open/close neighbourhood of x in G
$G[X]$	induced subgraph with vertex set X
$G[X, Y]$	induced bipartite subgraph on parts X, Y
$L(G)$	line graph of G
$G \setminus e$	edge removal
G/e	edge contraction
K_n	n -vertex complete graph
$K_{n,m}$	complete bipartite graph
C_n	n -vertex cycle
P_n	n -vertex path
Q_d	the d -dimensional cube graph
$M(G)$	the Mycielski construction on G
$\Delta(G)$	maximal vertex degree in G
$\delta(G)$	minimal vertex degree in G
$\omega(G)$	clique number
$\alpha(G)$	independence number
$\chi(G)$	chromatic number
$\chi_l(G)$	list chromatic number
$\chi'(G)$	edge chromatic number
$P_G(t), P(G, t)$	chromatic polynomial
$G(n, p)$	random graph $G(n, p)$
$G + H$	join of graphs
$G \sqcup H$	disjoint union of graphs
\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{Z}	real numbers, integers
x^n	n -th falling power, $x^n = x(x-1) \cdots (x-(n-1))$

Chapter 3

Basic graph theory

Roughly lex1.tex and lec2.tex without defining chromatic number.

Chapter 4

Vertex coloring

Define chromatic number and the `lec3.tex`, `lec4.tex`

Chapter 5

Planar graphs

Roughly lec5.tex, lec6.tex

Chapter 6

Chromatic polynomial

6.1 Definitions and simple properties

In the last chapter we discussed the 4-coloring problem for planar graphs. In the 1930s Birkhoff and Whitney had the idea that, instead of constructing one 4-colouring for a planar graph, one could instead find a formula for the *number* of 4-colourings, and then use algebraic, analytical or whatever other tools to somehow prove that the formula always returns a strictly positive answer. The plan didn't work; but it led to the notion of the chromatic polynomial.

Definition 6.1. For a graph G we define the chromatic function $P_G(t)$, $P(G, t)$ or $P(t)$, as

$$P_G(t) = \# \text{ of vertex colourings of } G \text{ with colours } \{1, \dots, t\} \\ = |\{c : V(G) \rightarrow \{1, \dots, t\} : c \text{ is a colouring}\}|$$

Note that the definition does not require that all the colors actually appear in the coloring, i.e. c need not be surjective.

Example 6.2. \circ If $G = \overline{K_n}$, $P_G(t) = t^n$.

\circ If $G = K_n$, $P_G(t) = t(t-1) \cdots (t-(n-1)) = t^{\underline{n}}$. (FIGURE)

\circ If $G = P_n$, $P_G(t) = t(t-1)^{n-1}$.

\circ If $G = \emptyset$, $P_G(t) = 1$.

\circ Consider cycles, for instance $G = C_5$. (FIGURE) The direct method ends up with a small complication: we didn't keep track of whether 1 and 4 are coloured differently. We will return to this example later.

\circ The chromatic number can now be redefined as $\chi(G) = \min\{k \in \mathbb{N} : P_G(k) > 0\}$.

\circ The 4-colour theorem is equivalent to the statement that $P_G(4) > 0$ for a planar graph G .

Let us now try to generalize some of those examples.

Lemma 6.3. If G is a tree with n vertices, then

$$P_G(t) = t(t-1)^{n-1}.$$

Proof. If G is a single vertex, then $P_G(t) = t$. Pick a leaf $x \in V(G)$. After $G \setminus x$ has been coloured we can pick the color for x in $t-1$ ways, so

$$P_G(t) = P_{G-x}(t)(t-1) = t(t-1)^{n-2}(t-1) = t(t-1)^{n-1}$$

by induction. □

Lemma 6.4. The chromatic polynomial of a disjoint union is $P(G \sqcup H, t) = P(G, t)P(H, t)$.

Proof. Any pair (colouring of G , colouring of H) gives a colouring of $G \sqcup H$. □

Next we show that the chromatic function is indeed a polynomial.

Proposition 6.5. *Let $\pi_i(G)$ be the number of ways to partition $V(G)$ into exactly i non-empty independent sets. For any graph G with $n > 0$ vertices*

$$P_G(t) = \sum_{i=0}^n \pi_i(G) t^i.$$

Proof. The choice of a colouring with colours from $\{1, \dots, t\}$ is the same as

- choosing the number i of colours that will actually be used,
- partitioning G into i independent sets; there are $\pi_i(G)$ ways to do this,
- colouring each part with a different colour; there are $t(t-1) \cdots (t-(i-1)) = t^i$ ways.

□

Example 6.6. Let $G = P_3$. (FIGURE)

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_1 &= 0 \\ \pi_2 &= 1, & 1-2-1 \\ \pi_3 &= 1, & 1-2-3 \\ \pi_{\geq 4} &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$P_{P_3}(t) = \pi_2 t^2 + \pi_3 t^3 = t(t-1) + t(t-1)(t-2) = t(t-1)^2$$

From now on we call $P_G(t)$ the *chromatic polynomial*. There are other ways to express $P_G(t)$ which also certify that the function is polynomial.

Proposition 6.7. *Suppose $G = (V, E)$ is a nonempty graph. Then*

$$P_G(t) = \sum_{F \subseteq E} (-1)^{|F|} t^{c(F)}$$

where $c(F)$ is the number of connected components of (V, F) .

Before the proof we quickly recall the Inclusion-Exclusion principle.

Fact 6.8. *Suppose A is a set, and A_1, \dots, A_k are subsets of A . For any $X \subseteq \{1, \dots, k\}$ define*

$$A_X = \bigcap_{i \in X} A_i$$

Then

$$\left| \bigcup_{i=1}^k A_i \right| = \sum_{X \subseteq \{1, \dots, k\}} (-1)^{|X|} |A_X|$$

Example 6.9. Assume we have some ambient set \mathcal{A} , with $A, B, C \subset \mathcal{A}$. (FIGURE) Then we have

$$|A \cup B \cup C| = |A| + |B| + |C| - |A \cap B| - |B \cap C| - |C \cap A| + |A \cap B \cap C|$$

$$|\overline{A \cup B \cup C}| = |\mathcal{A}| - |A| - |B| - |C| + |A \cap B| + |B \cap C| + |A \cap C| - |A \cap B \cap C|$$

Proof of Proposition 6.7. Define $A = \{g : V \rightarrow \{1, \dots, t\}\}$ (this is the set of all functions, not just colourings). For every $e = xy \in E$, let $A_e = \{g \in A : g(x) = g(y)\}$. Now for $F \subseteq E$, let $A_F = \bigcap_{e \in F} A_e$. Clearly $|A_F| = t^{c(F)}$, because $g \in A_F$ must be constant on every component of (V, F) . But then we're done, as

$$P_G(t) = \left| \bigcup_{e \in E} A_e \right| \stackrel{\text{Incl.-excl.}}{=} \sum_{F \subseteq E} (-1)^{|F|} |A_F|$$

□

This will help us understand some coefficients of the chromatic polynomial.

Notation 6.10. If $P(t)$ is a polynomial, we write $[t^k]P(t)$ for the coefficient of t^k in $P(t)$.

Lemma 6.11. If G is a graph with n vertices and m edges, then $P_G(t)$ is a polynomial of degree n , with

$$[t^n]P_G(t) = 1 \quad , \quad [t^{n-1}]P_G(t) = -m$$

Proof. By Proposition 6.7 we have $c(F) \leq n \Rightarrow \deg P_G \leq n$. Now then $c(F) = n$ if and only if $F = \emptyset$, which implies t^n appears exactly once in $P_G(t)$ with coefficient $(-1)^{|\emptyset|} = 1$. Also, $c(F) = n - 1$ if and only if $F = \{e\}$ is a single edge, which implies t^{n-1} appears with coefficient $(-1)^{-1}m = -m$. □

6.2 Deletion–contraction

Notation 6.12. For $e \in E(G)$ we write: $G - e$ for G with e removed, and G/e for G with e contracted. (FIGURE)

Proposition 6.13. (Deletion–contraction rule). If $e \in E(G)$, then

$$P_G(t) = P_{G-e}(t) - P_{G/e}(t)$$

Proof. Let $e = xy \in E(G)$.

$$\begin{aligned} P_{G-e}(t) &= \# \text{ colourings with } c(x) \neq c(y) + \# \text{ colourings with } c(x) = c(y) \\ &= P_G(t) + P_{G/e}(t) \end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 6.14. $|E(G - e)| = |E(G)| - 1$ and $|V(G/e)| = |V(G)| - 1$, so we could define $P_G(t)$ recursively

$$P_G(t) = \begin{cases} t^{|V(G)|} & \text{if } G \text{ has no edges} \\ P_{G-e}(t) - P_{G/e}(t) & \text{if } e \in E(G) \end{cases}$$

Example 6.15. G is a graph on 5 vertices, and we run the above. (FIGURE)

$$= t(t-1)^3 - 2t(t-1)^2(t-2)(t-2) + t(t-1)(t-2)$$

Example 6.16. $P(C_n, t) = P(P_n, t) - P(C_{n-1}, t)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} P(P_n, t) &= t(t-1)^{n-1} \\ P(C_3, t) &= t(t-1)(t-2) \end{aligned}$$

Now one can prove by induction that $P(C_n) = (t-1)^n + (-1)^n(t-1)$. In particular

$$P(C_n, 2) = 1 + (-1)^n = \begin{cases} 2, & 2 \mid n \\ 0, & 2 \nmid n \end{cases}$$

which agrees with what we know about $\chi(C_n)$.

The deletion-contraction rule has many interesting consequences.

=====

Proposition 6.17. *Let $G \neq \emptyset$ be a graph with n vertices, m edges and c connected components. The coefficients of $P_G(t)$ alternate in signs, i.e.*

$$P_G(t) = \sum_{i=0}^n (-1)^i c_i(G) t^{n-i}$$


where $c_i(G) \geq 0$. Moreover $c_i(G) = 0$ for $i > n - c$ and $c_{n-c}(G) \neq 0$.

Simply put:

$$P_G(t) = t^n - mt^{n-1} + c_2(G)t^{n-2} - \dots + (-1)^{n-c} c_{n-c}(G)t^c$$

the last term t^c is with t to the power of the number of connected components. Exercise: do a proof by induction.

Proof. Deleting keeps the sign, and contracting changes the sign.



Every branch of the deletion-contraction tree ends with some $\overline{K_i}$, $1 \leq i \leq n$. Every branch ending with $\overline{K_i}$ contributes

$$(-1)^{n-i} t^i$$

because the path from G to $\overline{K_i}$ contains $n - i$ contractions, i.e. $n - i$ sign changes. The proposition holds with

$$c_i(G) = \# \text{ of branches ending with } \overline{K_i}$$

and clearly $c_i(G) \geq 0$.

To prove that $c_i(G) = 0$ for $i > n - c$ note no branch of the tree ends with a graph on less than c vertices. Moreover, there is at least one branch with ends exactly with K_c (apply contractions all the time), so $c_{n-c}(G) > 0$. \square

In the next pages, G is always a graph, $V(G)$ its set of vertices and $E(G)$ its set of edges.

Lemma 6.18. *Let G, G_1, G_2 be graphs such that $G = G_1 \cup G_2$ and $G_1 \cap G_2 \simeq K_k$ for some $k \geq 0$. Then*

$$P_G(t) = \frac{1}{t^k} P_{G_1}(t) P_{G_2}(t).$$

(FIGURE)

Proof. Colour G_1 and colour G_2 . Since $G_1 \cap G_2 \simeq K_k$, $G_1 \cap G_2$ uses k different colours. It means that the colourings of G_1 and G_2 agree in $\frac{1}{P_{K_k}(t)}$ fraction of pairs. \square

Example 6.19. 1. $G = G_1 \sqcup G_2$ ($k = 0$), then

$$P_G(t) = P_{G_1}(t)P_{G_2}(t),$$

2. v is a leaf in G ($k = 1$), then

$$P_G(t) = \frac{1}{t}P_{K_2}(t)P_{G-v}(t) = \frac{1}{t}t(t-1)P_{G-v}(t) = (t-1)P_{G-v}(t),$$

(FIGURE)

3. $G = K_2 \square P_n = C_4 \cup K_2 \square P_{n-1}$ ($k = 2$), then

$$P_G(t) = \frac{1}{t(t-1)}P_{C_4}(t)P_{K_2 \square P_{n-1}}(t),$$

and we can use this method recursively. (FIGURE)

Let us summarize some facts. G is a graph with chromatic polynomial $P_G(t)$.

- $n = |V(G)| = \deg(P_G)$,
- $m = |E(G)| = -[t^{n-1}]P_G(t)$,
- The number of connected components is $= \max\{c : t^c \mid P_G(t)\}$,
- $\chi(G) = 1 + \max\{k : (t-k) \mid P_G(t)\} = 1 + \max\{k : t^k \mid P_G(t)\}$,
- The number of triangles is $= \binom{n}{2} - [t^{n-2}]P_G(t)$ (will be proved during the next exercise session),
- The coefficients of the polynomial are integers with alternating signs.

Remark 6.20. It is hard to computer $P_G(t)$, otherwise we could easily compute $\chi(G)$. It is also hard to recognize chromatic polynomials.

Theorem 6.21. (June Huh, 2010) Suppose G is connected with chromatic polynomial

$$P_G(t) = t^n - c_1 t^{n-1} + c_2 t^{n-2} - \dots + (-1)^{n-1} c_{n-1} t.$$

Then the sequence $(1, c_1, c_2, \dots, c_{n-1})$ is log-concave, which means

$$c_{i-1}c_{i+1} \leq c_i^2 \quad \text{for all } i.$$

In particular, it is unimodal, which means

$$1 \leq c_1 \leq c_2 \leq \dots \leq c_{k-1} \leq c_k \geq c_{k+1} \geq \dots \geq c_{n-1}, \quad \text{for some } k.$$

Proof. This theorem proves a conjecture of Read from 1968. We will not prove the theorem (the proof involves algebraic geometry and singularity theory). \square

1. Why the name *log-concave*?
2. Prove that a log-concave sequence of positive real numbers is unimodal.

Remark 6.22. We can prove $1 \leq c_1 \leq c_2 \leq \dots \leq c_{\lfloor \frac{1}{2}(n-1) \rfloor}$.

If G is a tree, then

$$P_G(t) = t(t-1)^{n-1} = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \binom{n-1}{i} (-1)^i t^{n-i} \cdot t = t^n - \binom{n-1}{1} t^{n-1} + \binom{n-1}{2} t^{n-2} - \dots.$$

The sequence $(1, c_1, c_2, \dots)$ is $(1, \binom{n-1}{1}, \binom{n-1}{2}, \dots)$, and it is increasing up to the middle term. Now suppose that G is connected, but not a tree. Then, by definition of a tree, there is an edge $e \in E(G)$ such that $G - e$ is still connected. For $i \leq \frac{1}{2}(n-1)$ we notice that

$$P_G(t) = P_{G-e}(t) - P_{G/e}(t) \implies c_{i-1}(G) = c_{i-1}(G-e) - (-c_{i-2}(G/e)) = c_{i-1}(G-e) + c_{i-2}(G/e).$$

We know $i \leq \frac{1}{2}(n-1)$ and $i-1 \leq \frac{1}{2}(n-2) = \frac{1}{2}(|V(G/e)| - 1)$, hence by induction

$$c_{i-1}(G) \leq c_i(G-e) + c_{i-1}(G/e) = c_i(G)$$

which ends the induction step.

What else does the chromatic polynomial count? And how?

Definition 6.23. An orientation of G is a choice of direction for every edge. This gives a directed graph. If G has m edges, then it has 2^m possible orientations (which might also be isomorphic).

Definition 6.24. An orientation is acyclic if it has no closed directed walk. Let $a(G)$ be the number of acyclic orientations of G .

Theorem 6.25. (Stanley, 1973) If G has n vertices, then $a(G) = (-1)^n P_G(-1)$.

Example 6.26. • G is a tree with n vertices, then

$$a(G) = 2^{n-1} = (-1)^n (-1)(-1-1)^{n-1} = (-1)^n P_G(-1),$$

• G is a cycle on n vertices, then

$$\begin{aligned} a(G) &= 2^n - 2, \\ (-1)^n P_G(-1) &= (-1)^n [(-2)^n + (-1)^n (-2)] = (-1)^n [(-1)^n (2^n - 2)] = a(G), \end{aligned}$$

• $G = K_n$, then

$$(-1)^n P_G(-1) = (-1)^n (-1)^n = (-1)^n (-1)(-1-1)(-1-2) \cdots (-1-(n-1)) = (-1)^n (-1)^n n!.$$

An acyclic orientation is the same as ordering the vertices v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n (there are $n!$ possibilities to do this) and then choosing the orientation

$$v_i \longrightarrow v_j, \quad \text{whenever } i > j.$$

Proof. Take $e = xy \in E(G)$. Write $a^+(G-e)$, $a^-(G-e)$, $a^0(G-e)$ for the number of acyclic orientations of $G-e$ such that:

- There is a directed walk in $G-e$ from x to y (a^+),
- There is a directed walk in $G-e$ from y to x (a^-),
- There is no directed walk either way (a^0).

We prove a few claims about these quantities:

- $a(G-e) = a^+(G-e) + a^-(G-e) + a^0(G-e)$. An acyclic orientation in $G-e$ cannot have directed walks $x \longrightarrow y$ and $y \longrightarrow x$ at the same time. These three sets are therefore disjoint and they give all the possibilities.
- $a(G/e) = a^0(G-e)$. Take an orientation of $G-e$ with no walk $x \longrightarrow y$ or $y \longrightarrow x$. For any $z \in N_{G-e}(x) \cap N_{G-e}(y)$, the edges xz and yz have the same orientation (if not, there would be a walk $x \longrightarrow z \longrightarrow y$ or $y \longrightarrow z \longrightarrow x$), hence either

$$x \longrightarrow z \text{ and } y \longrightarrow z$$

or

$$z \longrightarrow x \text{ and } z \longrightarrow y.$$

The orientation of $G-e$ determines then an orientation of G/e (the edges xz and yz are compatible under the contraction). This orientation is also acyclic (a directed walk from xy to itself would imply a directed walk in $G-e$ from x or y to y or x). This also works vice versa.

The idea here was that

$$\text{Closed walks in } G/e = \text{Walks } x \longrightarrow y \text{ or } y \longrightarrow x \text{ in } G-e.$$

- $a(G) = a^+(G-e) + a^-(G-e) + 2a^0(G-e)$. For the first two terms there is only one way to extend the orientation of $G-e$ without closing a cycle in G . In the last case the edge xy can be oriented both ways, since we don't have a walk from x to y or from y to x .

By these three claims we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
a(G) &= a^+(G - e) + a^-(G - e) + 2a^0(G - e) = \\
&= a^+(G - e) + a^-(G - e) + a^0(G - e) + a^0(G - e) = \\
&= a(G - e) + a^0(G - e) = \\
&= a(G - e) + a(G/e)
\end{aligned}$$

We complete the proof by using induction:

- $G = K_1$, then $a(G) = 1 = (-1)^1 P_{K_1}(-1)$,
- Pick an edge $e \in E(G)$, then (by induction assumption)

$$\begin{aligned}
a(G) &= a(G - e) + a(G/e) = \\
&= (-1)^n P_{G-e}(-1) + (-1)^{n-1} P_{G/e}(-1) = \\
&= (-1)^n [P_{G-e}(-1) - P_{G/e}(-1)] = \\
&= (-1)^n P_G(-1)
\end{aligned}$$

□

Definition 6.27. $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ is a chromatic root if $P_G(\alpha) = 0$ for some graph G .

Observation 6.28. 1. Every natural number is a chromatic root,

2. For any G different from the empty graph, $P_G(0) = 0$,
3. For any G with at least one edge, $P_G(1) = 0$,
4. If α is a chromatic root, then so is $\alpha + 1$,

Proof. We proved in the exercise session that $P_{G+K_1}(\alpha + 1) = (\alpha + 1)P_G(\alpha)$,

□

5. The set of chromatic roots is countable (it is a subset of the algebraic numbers).

Proposition 6.29. There is no chromatic root in $(-\infty, 0) \cup (0, 1)$.

Proof. $\alpha < 0$ is not a root of $P_G(t)$, since the coefficients of the polynomial have alternating signs.

Take $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Because $P_{G \sqcup H}(t) = P_G(t)P_H(t)$, it suffices to prove that $P_G(\alpha) \neq 0$ for any connected graph. Apply the deletion-contraction rule to G , in such a way that all the intermediate graphs are connected. At each step, either G is a tree (and we stop splitting) or there is an edge $e \in E(G)$ such that $G - e$ is still connected.

A branch of this splitting process with i contractions

- ends with an $(n - i)$ -vertex tree,
- introduces a sign of $(-1)^i$,
- contributes $t(t - 1)^{n-i-1}$ to $P_G(t)$.

Define d_i as the number of branches ending with an $(n - i)$ -vertex tree, then

$$P_G(t) = \sum d_i (-1)^i t(t - 1)^{n-i-1},$$

and of course we have $d_i \geq 0$. Evaluate $P_G(\alpha)$ for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$:

$$\text{sgn}\{d_i (-1)^i \alpha (\alpha - 1)^{n-i-1}\} = (-1)^i \cdot 1 \cdot (-1)^{n-i-1} = (-1)^{n-1},$$

which means that all monomials in $P_G(\alpha)$ evaluate to positive or all evaluate to negative, hence $P_G(\alpha) \neq 0$ as $d_i > 0$ for at least one i . □

Remark 6.30. We used the deletion-contraction principle, but only until we reached trees (since we already know their chromatic polynomial).

Theorem 6.31. (Jackson, Thomassen) *There are no chromatic roots in $(-\infty, 0) \cup (0, 1) \cup (1, \frac{32}{27})$. Moreover, the constant $\frac{32}{27}$ is optimal.*

Theorem 6.32. (Sokal) *The chromatic roots are dense in \mathbb{C} .*

Theorem 6.33. (Birkhoff, Lewis) *If G is planar, then $P_G(t) > 0$ for all $t \in [5, \infty)$.*

Remark 6.34. Moreover, it is conjectured that if G is planar, then $P_G(t) > 0$ for all $t \in [4, \infty)$.

Chapter 7

Edge coloring

7.1 Definitions and examples

Until now we concentrated on coloring vertices of graphs. In this chapter we briefly address the concept of edge-coloring.

Definition 7.1. An edge-coloring of $G = (V, E)$ is a function $f : E \rightarrow C$ (for some set of colors C) such that if two edges e_1, e_2 have a common endpoint then $f(e_1) \neq f(e_2)$. The edge chromatic number (chromatic index) $\chi'(G)$ is the smallest k such that G has an edge-coloring with colors $\{1, \dots, k\}$.

[FIGURE]

Example 7.2 (Cycles). The n -cycle C_n can be edge-colored with 2 colors when n is even and requires 3 colors when n is odd, therefore

$$\chi'(C_n) = \begin{cases} 2 & 2|n \\ 3 & 2 \nmid n \end{cases}$$

Example 7.3 (Scheduling). Let G be a bipartite graph whose two parts are *Classes* and *Teachers*. There is an edge tc if teacher t is supposed to teach class c . How many time slots do we need to allocate to schedule all lessons?

[FIGURE]

The answer is $\chi'(G)$. Each color represents one time slot, and the edge-coloring condition guarantees that no teacher and no class is required to show up at two different events at the same time.

Example 7.4 (Complete graphs). As we all know a full soccer season in a league with $2k$ teams consists of $2k - 1$ rounds. Each team plays exactly once in each round, and each pair meets once. This is just the statement that

$$\chi'(K_{2k}) = 2k - 1.$$

Indeed, each color represents one week of the season, and the edges of a particular color determine the pairs of teams playing that week. We can of course make a more general statement about the edge-chromatic numbers of complete graphs:

$$\chi'(K_n) = \begin{cases} n - 1 & 2|n \\ n & 2 \nmid n \end{cases}$$

[FIGURE]

It is not hard to find a coloring. If $n = 2k - 1$ is odd, arrange the vertices into a regular n -gon. Choose a color class consisting of k parallel edges (one vertex is left out). This color class has n possible rotations. These rotations cover all edges of K_n . This is an edge-coloring with n colors, so $\chi'(K_n) \leq n$. For an upper bound, take any edge-coloring of K_n . The color class 1 must miss some vertex v . Since all edges incident to v require $n - 1$ colors, we get at least $1 + (n - 1) = n$ colors in total.

If $n = 2k$ is even arrange $n - 1$ vertices in a regular $(n - 1)$ -gon and place one vertex at the origin. Use $k - 1$ parallel edges and one edge from the origin to the vertex on the perimeter being left out. This

is one color class, and the $n - 1$ rotations of this class form a desired edge-coloring. The upper bound is obvious.

Lemma 7.5. $\chi'(G) \geq \Delta(G)$

Proof. We need at least $\Delta(G)$ colors just to color the edges incident to the vertex of maximum degree. \square

7.2 Basic properties

As with vertex-colorings, also edge-colorings can be expressed using other familiar language of graph theory. In fact edge-colorings can be seen as a special case of vertex-colorings.

Definition 7.6. A matching in G is a set of edges, no two of which have a common endpoint.

This is a very important concept in graph theory. Equivalently, a matching in G is a 1-regular subgraph of G .

Proposition 7.7. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph.

- If f is an edge-coloring of G then every color class $f^{-1}(c)$ is a matching.
- An edge-coloring with k colors is the same as a partition of E into k matchings.
- For any two colors $c_1, c_2 \in C$, $c_1 \neq c_2$, the edge set $f^{-1}(c_1) \cup f^{-1}(c_2)$ is a disjoint union of cycles and paths.

Proof. The first two parts are clear. For the last one, note that in $f^{-1}(c_1) \cup f^{-1}(c_2)$ every vertex is of degree at most 2. \square

Definition 7.8. Let $G = (V, E)$. The line graph $L(G)$ has vertex set E , and e_1, e_2 are adjacent in $L(G)$ if they share a common vertex in G .

Example 7.9. The line graph simply keeps track of the incidence relation between the edges of G .
[FIGURE]

All the entries in the following glossary should now be completely obvious. It translates edge-coloring notions into their vertex-coloring counterparts.

Edges of G	Vertices of $L(G)$
edge in G	vertex of $L(G)$
matching in G	independent set in $L(G)$
edge-coloring of G	vertex coloring of $L(G)$
$\chi'(G)$	$\chi(L(G))$

We have $\omega(L(G)) \geq \Delta(G)$ because all edges incident to a fixed vertex v induce a clique in $L(G)$. That implies $\chi'(G) = \chi(L(G)) \geq \omega(L(G)) \geq \Delta(G)$ which we already knew. Moreover $\Delta(L(G)) = \max_{uv \in E(G)} (\deg_G(u) + \deg_G(v) - 2) \leq 2\Delta(G) - 2$, so $\chi'(G) = \chi(L(G)) \leq \Delta(L(G)) + 1 \leq 2\Delta(G) - 1$. Altogether this shows

$$\Delta(G) \leq \chi'(G) \leq 2\Delta(G) - 1.$$

In fact the situation is much “better”, in that the uncertainty interval for $\chi'(G)$ is as short as possible without being trivial. There are only two possibilities for $\chi'(G)$!

Theorem 7.10. (Vizing '64) For any graph G we have

$$\Delta(G) \leq \chi'(G) \leq \Delta(G) + 1.$$

Remark 7.11. In some older literature graphs with $\chi'(G) = \Delta(G)$ are called “Class 1” and those with $\chi'(G) = \Delta(G) + 1$ are called “Class 2”. (Un?)surprisingly it is still NP-hard to recognize if $\chi'(G) = \Delta(G)$ or $\chi'(G) = \Delta(G) + 1$, even for graphs with $\Delta(G) = 3$.

In the next section we will prove that bipartite graphs are Class 1. The main tool is one of the most classical results in combinatorics — Hall’s marriage theorem, which we discuss next.

7.3 Hall's marriage theorem and applications

Here is a version of the question commonly known as *Hall's marriage problem*, first studied by Hall in the 1930s. We have a number of boys and girls, and each girl fancies some of the boys. We want to pair them up so that each girl is in a couple with a boy she fancies. Under what conditions is such a pairing possible?¹

There are obvious necessary conditions that must be met for this to work. For example, each girl must fancy at least one boy. Of course this is not enough, because two girls might desire only one and the same boy. We can avoid this situation with a more general necessary condition: every set of k different girls must altogether like at least k different boys, for each $k \geq 1$. Hall's marriage theorem states that this necessary condition is also sufficient. Here it is in the language of bipartite graphs.

Theorem 7.12. (Hall 1935) Suppose G is a bipartite graph with parts $V(G) = A \cup B$, such that for every $X \subseteq A$ we have:

$$|\bigcup_{x \in X} N_G(x)| \geq |X|.$$

Then G has a matching of size $|A|$.

Proof. Write $N_G(X) = \bigcup_{x \in X} N_G(x)$ and let $n = |A|$. The proof is by induction on n . If $n = 0$ there is clearly nothing to do. Otherwise we split the proof into two cases.

- Suppose that for any $\emptyset \neq X \subsetneq A$, $|N_G(X)| \geq |X| + 1$, so the inequality always holds with a surplus. Take any $a \in A$, $b \in N_G(a)$, match them, and use the inductive assumption in the graph $G' = G[A - a, B - b]$. This is possible because for any $X' \subseteq A - a$ we have $|N_{G'}(X')| \geq |N_G(X')| - 1 \geq (|X'| + 1) - 1 = |X'|$.
- Now suppose there is a set $\emptyset \neq X \subsetneq A$ with $|N_G(X)| = |X|$. Then by induction we find appropriate matchings in $G' = G[X, N_G(X)]$ and $G'' = G[A - X, B - N_G(X)]$ and join them to form a matching in G . The only nontrivial fact to be checked is that G'' satisfies the inductive assumption. Pick any $Y \subseteq A - X$. Then

$$|Y| + |X| = |Y \cup X| \leq |N_G(Y \cup X)| = |N_G(X)| + |N_G(Y) \cap (B - N_G(X))| = |X| + |N_G(Y) \cap (B - N_G(X))|.$$

It follows that $|Y| \leq |N_G(Y) \cap (B - N_G(X))| = |N_{G''}(Y)|$ as required.

[FIGURES]

□

The marriage theorem has many interesting applications, especially to regular configurations, often combined with a counting argument as below.

Example 7.13. Split the standard 52 card deck into 13 piles of 4 cards each. Regardless of the splitting we can choose 1 card from each pile, so that we have one card of each rank: $A, 2, 3, \dots, K$.

To see this, construct a bipartite graph G where the two parts are R (ranks) and P (piles). There is an edge $rp \in E(G)$ if pile p contains a card of rank r . A matching in G with 13 edges determines a bijection $P \longleftrightarrow R$. All we need to do is find such a matching with Hall's theorem.

[FIGURE]

Take any subset $X \subseteq R$ of ranks. This subset represents $4 \cdot |X|$ actual cards. Since each pile has size 4, these $4|X|$ cards must occupy at least $|X|$ piles. But that means that the ranks in X are adjacent to at least $|X|$ piles in P in total, which is exactly the statement $|N_G(X)| \geq |X|$.

Note that in the above example cards of one rank (say all aces) can be distributed to less than 4 piles, so it would be more convenient to represent the situation with a *multigraph*, where multiple edges between vertices are allowed.

[FIGURE]

This is the only part of these notes where we use the concept of a multigraph. Without going into too much formalism let us just note that the multiple edges adjacent to a vertex all contribute to its

¹As dictated by the political correctness of the 21st century, we ignore the preferences of the boys and we let some of the boys to leave without a girl.

degree, so in the example above each vertex in R has degree 13 and each vertex in P has degree 4 (in the multigraph sense).

Repeating a very similar argument yields the next theorem.

Theorem 7.14. *If $G = (V, E)$ is a d -regular bipartite multigraph, then $\chi'(G) = d$.*

Proof. Denote by $V = A \cup B$ the parts of the bipartition. Then $|A| = |B| = n$, because $d \cdot |A| = |E| = d \cdot |B|$.

We prove the theorem by induction. If $d = 1$ then G itself is a matching, so we are done. Let $d \geq 2$. We will first use Hall's theorem to show the existence of a matching of size n in G . Take any $X \subseteq A$ and let e_X be the number of edges in $G[X, N_G(X)]$. Then $d \cdot |X| = e_X \leq d \cdot |N_G(X)|$, so $|X| \leq |N_G(X)|$. From Hall's theorem, we get a matching M of size n in G . Since $G - M$ is a $(d - 1)$ -regular multigraph, by induction $\chi'(G) \leq 1 + (d - 1) = d$. \square

Remark 7.15. If G is a bipartite multigraph with both parts of size n then a matching of size n is called a *perfect matching*.

We can now prove that all bipartite graphs are of Class 1.

Theorem 7.16. (König) *If $G = (V, E)$ is a bipartite multigraph, then $\chi'(G) = \Delta(G)$.*

Proof. Let $V = A \cup B$ be the two parts. We can assume $|A| = |B| = n$. (If not, then add extra isolated vertices to the smaller part). Write $\Delta := \Delta(G)$. If A has a vertex v of degree less than Δ , then $|E| < \Delta n$, therefore also B has some vertex of degree less than Δ , call it u . In this case add a new edge uv to the multigraph. Repeat this process until the graph is Δ -regular. By Theorem 7.14 we get that the expanded graph (and even more so its original subgraph) is Δ -edge-colorable. \square

7.4 Edge coloring vs. the 4-color theorem.

With every planar triangulation (that is, a planar graph embedded so that all faces are triangles), we can associate a dual planar graph. This classical construction has tremendous applications in the theory of planar graphs. (In fact the dual graph can be defined for any planar graph, not necessarily a triangulation, but we will not require that generality).

[FIGURE]

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a planar graph together with a planar embedding such that every face (including the unbounded one) is a triangle. We denote the set of faces of the embedding by $F(G)$.

Definition 7.17. *The dual graph G^* of G is defined by the conditions: $V(G^*) = F(G)$ and $f_1 f_2 \in E(G^*)$ if f_1, f_2 are two faces of G that share a common edge.*

It is helpful to represent each vertex of G^* as a point inside the corresponding face.

[FIGURE]

Observation 7.18. *By construction G^* has the following properties:*

- G^* is 3-regular. (Since every face has 3 neighbours along common edge.)
- $|E(G^*)| = |E(G)|$. (The bijection is determined by the “crossing” relation.)
- G^* is planar.
- Every face of G^* contains exactly one vertex of G .
- $|V(G^*)| = |F(G)|$, $|E(G^*)| = |E(G)|$, $|F(G^*)| = |V(G)|$.

We introduced this concept because of a beautiful relation between vertex 4-colorings of G and edge 3-colorings of its dual G^* . This was, in fact, what Tait showed in his incomplete proof of the 4-colour theorem in 1878.

Theorem 7.19 (Tait 1878). *Suppose G is a planar triangulation. TFAE:*

a) G is vertex 4-colorable.

b) G^* is edge 3-colorable.

Proof. a) \Rightarrow b). Take a 4-coloring $c : V(G) \rightarrow \{00, 01, 10, 11\}$. We will construct an edge coloring of G^* as follows: if e^* is the dual edge of an edge $e = xy$, then we set

$$f(e^*) = c(x) \oplus c(y),$$

where \oplus denotes XOR — coordinate bitwise exclusive OR.

[FIGURE]

Let's check that f is an edge 3-coloring.

- $f(e^*) \neq 00$ because $c(x) \neq c(y)$, therefore $\text{im}(f) \subseteq \{01, 10, 11\}$.
- Take $e_1^*, e_2^* \in E(G^*)$ sharing a common vertex in G^* as in the figure. We must have $e_1 = xy$ and $e_2 = yz$ for some triangle xyz in G . Then $f(e_1^*) \oplus f(e_2^*) = c(x) \oplus c(y) \oplus c(y) \oplus c(z) = c(x) \oplus c(z) \neq 00$, because $c(x) \neq c(z)$.

[FIGURE]

b) \Rightarrow a). Start with an edge 3-coloring $f : E(G^*) \rightarrow \{1, 2, 3\}$. Since G^* is 3-regular, every color appears at every vertex of G^* . For $i = 1, 2$ let $H_i \subseteq G^*$ be the subgraph spanned by the edge set $f^{-1}(i) \cup f^{-1}(3)$.

[FIGURE]

Each H_i is 2-regular, hence it is a union of cycles. Construct a coloring $c : V(G) \rightarrow \{00, 01, 10, 11\}$ using the following definition. For a vertex $v \in V(G)$ and for $i = 1, 2$, the i -th bit of $c(v)$ is

the parity of the number of cycles in H_i which contain v inside

[FIGURE-EXAMPLE]

Note that each $H - i$ is just a simple polygon in \mathbb{R}^2 and v is inside a polygon if a generic ray from v intersects the polygon an odd number of times. With this observation we can prove that c is a vertex-coloring of G . Take an edge $e = uv \in E(G)$. We want to show $c(u) \neq c(v)$.

[FIGURE]

W.l.o.g. suppose that $f(e^*) = 1$. Then the dual edge e^* , which belongs to some cycle C of H_1 , intuitively “separates” u and v . More precisely, counting the intersections between generic rays from u and v with H_1 we prove the following two claims:

- v and u are on the opposite sides of C ,
- for any other cycle of H_1 , both u, v are inside or both u, v are outside that cycle.

As a consequence $c(v)$ and $c(u)$ differ at position $i = 1$. The proof when $f(e^*) = 2$ and $f(e^*) = 3$ is similar. That shows c is a vertex coloring. \square

7.5 Exercises

1. Prove: if G is connected and $L(G)$ is isomorphic to G then G is a cycle.
2. Suppose that G has n vertices and m edges. Show that $\chi'(G) \geq m/\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$. Use it to show that the 5-vertex graph below is of Class 2, and to reprove that $\chi'(K_{2k-1}) = 2k - 1$. [FIGURE]
3. We observed that $\omega(L(G)) \geq \Delta(G)$. Find an exact formula for $\omega(L(G))$.
4. Suppose G is r -regular with an odd number of vertices. Prove that r is even and that $\chi'(G) = r + 1$.
5. Find the edge-chromatic number of the Petersen graph.

Chapter 8

Chromatic number of Euclidean spaces

8.1 Chromatic number of Euclidean spaces

In this chapter we are going to work with infinite graphs. Let $d(x, y) = \sqrt{\sum_i (x_i - y_i)^2}$ denote the Euclidean distance.

Definition 8.1. $\chi(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is the minimal number of colors required to color all points in \mathbb{R}^d so that if $d(x, y) = 1$ then x, y have different colors.

Definition 8.2. For $X \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ define a graph U_X (U for “unit”) with vertex set X and edges

$$x_1 x_2 \in E(U_X) \text{ iff } d(x_1, x_2) = 1.$$

Of course this definition is chosen so that $\chi(\mathbb{R}^d) = \chi(U_{\mathbb{R}^d})$

Example 8.3. $U_{\mathbb{R}}$ is a union of infinitely many (uncountably many) bi-infinite paths. As a consequence $\chi(U_{\mathbb{R}}) = \chi(\mathbb{R}) = 2$.

Remark 8.4. All invariants $\omega, \chi, \alpha, \Delta, \dots$ we defined in previous lectures make sense for infinite graphs, except that they might be equal to ∞ . Inequalities such as $\omega(G) \leq \chi(G)$ and $H \subset G \Rightarrow \chi(H) \leq \chi(G)$ etc. still hold.

8.2 Compactness

Here is a question we should probably address before seriously considering the chromatic number of infinite graphs: how does the chromatic number of G relate to those of its finite subgraphs?

Theorem 8.5. Suppose G is a graph (which may be infinite). If every finite subgraph of G can be colored with k colors, then G can be colored with k colors.

Proof. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph and let X be the set of all functions $f: V \rightarrow \{1, \dots, k\}$, i.e. $X = \prod_{v \in V} \{1, \dots, k\} = \{1, \dots, k\}^V$. View $\{1, \dots, k\}$ as a discrete topological space and equip X with the product topology. $\{1, \dots, k\}$ is finite, so it is compact. By Tychonoff's theorem X is compact. For any $F \subset E$ let $X_F \subset X$ be defined as those $f: V \rightarrow \{1, \dots, k\}$ which are proper colorings of (V, F) .

- $X_{\{e\}}$ is closed in X since

$$X_{\{e\}} = \bigcup_{i \neq j} \{f \in X : f(u) = i, f(v) = j, e = uv\}$$

is a finite union of closed sets.

- $X_{F_1} \cap X_{F_2} = X_{F_1 \cup F_2}$.

- For any $F \subset E$, X_F is closed since $X_F = \bigcap_{e \in F} X_{\{e\}}$, is an intersection of closed sets, hence closed.

Now: Take the family $\mathcal{F} = \{X_F\}_{F \text{ finite}, F \subset E}$. All sets in \mathcal{F} are closed, and all intersections of finitely many from \mathcal{F} are non-empty (second claim: $X_{F_1} \cap \dots \cap X_{F_n} = X_{F_1 \cup \dots \cup F_n} \neq \emptyset$ because $(V, F_1 \cup \dots \cup F_n)$ is finite, hence k -colorable) Then the intersection of all sets in \mathcal{F} is non-empty (by compactness of X). $f \in \bigcap_{\substack{F \subset E \\ |F| < \infty}} X_F$ is a proper coloring on *every* edge of G . \square

8.3 Chromatic number of \mathbb{R}^2

Let us now discuss colorings of the unit graph $U_{\mathbb{R}^2}$ of the plane. Here is an easy upper bound.

Lemma 8.6. $\chi(\mathbb{R}^2) \leq 9$.

Proof. Take the 3×3 -square where the length of the diagonal in each of the 9 parts is 0.99. Color every such square with 9 colors (choose any color on the common edges). Use this square to tile the plane. Now take two points x, y of the same color. Then

- either x, y are in the same small square and so $d(x, y) \leq 0.99$, or
- x, y are in two different big squares and $d(x, y) \geq 2 \cdot 0.99 \cdot 1/\sqrt{2} > 1$

so $d(x, y) \neq 1$. \square

Next we prove the state-of-the-art bounds $4 \leq \chi(\mathbb{R}^2) \leq 7$.

Proposition 8.7. $\chi(\mathbb{R}^2) \leq 7$.

Proof. Consider a covering of \mathbb{R}^2 with squares of diagonal 1 (that is, of side $1/\sqrt{2}$):

[FIGURE]

Use the colors as indicated, remembering to color the interior of the square, its top-right corner, the top edge without the top-left corner and the right edge without the bottom-right corner. \square

Remark 8.8. Another coloring uses a covering by hexagons. Each small hexagon should have diameter 0.99:

[FIGURE]

Proposition 8.9. $\chi(\mathbb{R}^2) \geq 4$.

Proof. Suppose, on the contrary, that $c : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \{1, 2, 3\}$ is a coloring of $U_{\mathbb{R}^2}$ with 3 colors. I claim that

$$d(x, y) = \sqrt{3} \implies c(x) = c(y).$$

Indeed, if $d(x, y) = \sqrt{3}$ then there are points z, t with $d(x, z) = d(y, z) = d(x, t) = d(y, t) = d(z, t) = 1$, because x, y are the “opposite” vertices of two equilateral triangles joined at one base. Since $c(x), c(z), c(t)$ are all different and so are $c(y), c(z), c(t)$, we conclude $c(x) = c(y)$.

It means that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$, all points on the circle centered at x of radius $\sqrt{3}$ have the same color. But on that circle we can find two points in distance 1, contradiction. \square

Remark 8.10. The proof above can be turned into a construction of a finite subgraph H of $U_{\mathbb{R}^2}$ with $\chi(H) = 4$. It is called the Moser graph, left. Another graph with this property is the Golomb graph, right.

[FIGURE], [FIGURE]

Remark 8.11. Surprising as it may sound, the bounds $4 \leq \chi(\mathbb{R}^2) \leq 7$ are all that we know in general about $\chi(\mathbb{R}^2)$.

We can now move on to higher dimensions, where the gaps in our knowledge are even bigger. For example, it is only known that

$$6 \leq \chi(\mathbb{R}^3) \leq 15.$$

However, the rate of growth of $\chi(\mathbb{R}^d)$ as $d \rightarrow \infty$ is generally understood to be exponential.

Theorem 8.12. *There are constants $1 < c_1 < c_2$ such that for all d :*

$$c_1^d \leq \chi(\mathbb{R}^d) \leq c_2^d.$$

The current best are $c_1 \approx 1.23$ and $c_2 = 3 + \varepsilon$. We are not going to prove the theorem with the optimal constants, but we are going to show some weaker exponential upper and lower bounds. There will be some especially nice mathematics involved in the lower bounds, in particular!

8.4 Upper bound on $\chi(\mathbb{R}^d)$

We start with an upper bound.

Theorem 8.13. *For sufficiently large d we have $\chi(\mathbb{R}^d) \leq 14^d$.*

Proof. We will tile \mathbb{R}^d with small cubes, and color each cube with one color, similarly to the 3×3 strategy used to show $\chi(\mathbb{R}^2) \leq 9$. As you can prove in one of the exercises, repetitive coloring may not work for $d \geq 4$. Instead, we will color the small cubes greedily.

For simplicity, suppose first that $d = 2k$. We need two prerequisites: the formula for the volume of the d -dimensional ball $B_d(x, r)$ with center x and radius r for $d = 2k$ is

$$\text{vol}(B_d(x, r)) = \frac{\pi^k}{k!} r^{2k}.$$

We will also need the inequality $k! \geq (k/e)^k$, or equivalently $k^k/k! \leq e^k$.

Divide \mathbb{R}^d into “small cubes” of size

$$0.99 \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \times 0.99 \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \times \cdots \times 0.99 \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}.$$

Each cube has diameter (main diagonal) $0.99 < 1$ and volume $0.99^d d^{-d/2} = 0.99^{2k} (2k)^{-k}$. Denote any such small cube by C .

Now we ask: how many small cubes are completely contained in any ball $B_d(x, 3)$ of radius 3? Comparing volumes gives that this number is *at most*

$$\frac{\text{vol}(B_d(x, 3))}{\text{vol}(C)} = \frac{3^{2k} \pi^k (2k)^k}{k! 0.99^{2k}} = \frac{k^k}{k!} \cdot \left(\frac{18\pi}{0.99^2} \right)^k \leq \left(\frac{18\pi e}{0.99^2} \right)^k < 163^k < 13^d.$$

Now order the (countably many) small cubes into a sequence C_1, C_2, \dots and let x_i be the center of C_i . We color each C_i according to the greedy rule: choose any color that is not used for cubes C_j , $j < i$ such that $C_j \subseteq B_d(x_i, 3)$. By the previous observation there are at most $13^d - 1$ cubes C_j we have to consider, and there always is a spare color so that the greedy algorithm will do with at most 13^d colors. (It does not matter which color we use on points common to more than one cube, for example we can color closed cubes and repaint anything that is already colored).

Now, two points inside one small cube are in distance at most $0.99 < 1$. Consider two points x, y with $d(x, y) = 1$ and let $x \in C_i$, $y \in C_j$, with $i > j$. By the triangle inequality we have that for any point $z \in C_j$

$$d(x_i, z) \leq d(x_i, x) + d(x, y) + d(y, z) \leq 0.99 + 1 + 0.99 < 3$$

so $C_j \subseteq B_d(x_i, 3)$. It means that the greedy algorithm used different colors for $x \in C_i$ and $y \in C_j$, and so we showed $\chi(\mathbb{R}^d) \leq 13^d$.

If d is odd and large enough then $\chi(\mathbb{R}^d) \leq \chi(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}) \leq 13^{d+1} < 14^d$ by what we already showed. \square

8.5 Cube-like unit distance graphs in \mathbb{R}^d

We would like to move on to lower bounds. Clearly, we have $\chi(\mathbb{R}^d) \geq \omega(U_{\mathbb{R}^d}) = d + 1$, but that is far from exponential.

Definition 8.14. *We say a finite graph G is a unit distance graph in \mathbb{R}^d if there is a set $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ with $|X| = |V(G)|$ for which G is isomorphic to U_X .*

Lemma 8.15. *If G is a unit distance graph in \mathbb{R}^d then $\chi(\mathbb{R}^d) \geq \chi(G)$.*

Proof. For X as in the definition, we have $U_X \subseteq U_{\mathbb{R}^d}$, so $\chi(\mathbb{R}^d) = \chi(U_{\mathbb{R}^d}) \geq \chi(U_X) = \chi(G)$. \square

Example 8.16. • The Moser and Golomb graphs are unit distance graphs in \mathbb{R}^2 .

- The d -cube graph Q_d is a unit distance graph in \mathbb{R}^d . However, $\chi(Q_d) = 2$, so it does not provide useful lower bounds.
- Take the vertices of the 3-cube Q_3 , but this time instead of the edges of the cube, take a graph formed by all the diagonals of the faces of the cube. There are 12 of them, each of length $\sqrt{2}$, so they form a unit distance graph in \mathbb{R}^3 (after rescaling by $1/\sqrt{2}$). We see that this graph is isomorphic to $K_4 \sqcup K_4$, so it yields $\chi(\mathbb{R}^3) \geq 4$. We knew that already, but it is better than with the standard cube.

Definition 8.17. *For $1 \leq u \leq d$ let $Q_d(u)$ be the graph whose vertices are all binary sequences of length d :*

$$V(Q_d(u)) = \{(x_1, \dots, x_d) : x_i \in \{0, 1\}\}$$

and two sequences are adjacent in $Q_d(u)$ if and only if they differ in exactly u positions.

Example 8.18. • $Q_d(1) = Q_d$.

- $Q_3(2) = K_4 \sqcup K_4$ is the graph from the previous example.
- $Q_d(d)$ is a disjoint union of 2^{d-1} copies of K_2 .

Lemma 8.19. *Each $Q_d(u)$ is a unit distance graph in \mathbb{R}^d .*

Proof. Every vertex of $Q_d(u)$ can be treated as a point in \mathbb{R}^d with the same coordinates. If (x_1, \dots, x_d) and (y_1, \dots, y_d) are sequences of 0s and 1s which differ in exactly u positions, then their Euclidean distance is \sqrt{u} . \square

The graphs $Q_d(u)$ give pretty good lower bounds on $\chi(\mathbb{R}^d)$ already for small d . Here are results which can be verified using Sage.

[CODE]

- $\chi(Q_5(2)) = 8$. Consequently, $\chi(\mathbb{R}^5) \geq 8$. The best known lower bound is 9.
- $\alpha(Q_{10}(4)) = 40$ (this will take about 20min in Sage). Consequently

$$\chi(\mathbb{R}^{10}) \geq \chi(Q_{10}(4)) \geq \frac{|V(Q_{10}(4))|}{\alpha(Q_{10}(4))} = \frac{2^{10}}{40} = 25.6,$$

that is $\chi(\mathbb{R}^d) \geq 26$. This is the best known bound!

In order to prove some lower bounds valid for all d we need to add a further complication to $Q_d(u)$.

Definition 8.20. *The graph $Q_d(u, s) \subseteq Q_d(u)$ is the subgraph of $Q_d(u)$ induced by the vertices with exactly s coordinates equal to 1. Precisely:*

$$V(Q_d(u, s)) = \{\bar{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_d) : x_i \in \{0, 1\}, \sum_{i=1}^d x_i = s\}$$

and \bar{x} and \bar{y} are adjacent in $Q_d(u, s)$ iff they differ in exactly u positions.

Example 8.21. $Q_3(2, 1)$ has vertex set $\{001, 010, 100\}$ and it is isomorphic to K_3 .

8.6 Lower bound on $\chi(\mathbb{R}^d)$

As in the computational examples above, it is usually easier to say something about the independence number α than directly about the chromatic number χ . Our main theorem, which we will prove in the next part of the lecture, is the following.

Theorem 8.22. *If p is a prime then*

$$\alpha(Q_d(2p, 2p-1)) \leq \binom{d}{0} + \binom{d}{1} + \cdots + \binom{d}{p-1}.$$

We will prove this theorem in a moment. Let us just note that the condition “ p is a prime” suggests that this fact is somewhat algebraic in nature. For now, let us see what this theorem buys us when it comes to chromatic numbers.

Theorem 8.23. *We have $\chi(\mathbb{R}^d) \geq 1.05^d$ for sufficiently large d .*

Proof. For any prime $p \leq d/2$ we have

$$\chi(\mathbb{R}^d) \geq \chi(Q_d(2p)) \geq \chi(Q_d(2p, 2p-1)) \geq \frac{|V(Q_d(2p, 2p-1))|}{\alpha(Q_d(2p, 2p-1))} \geq \frac{\binom{d}{2p-1}}{p \binom{d}{p-1}}$$

where in the last step we used the inequality of Theorem 8.22 and the observation $|V(Q_d(u, s))| = \binom{d}{s}$.

Intuitively, the last fraction will be maximized if the binomial coefficient $\binom{d}{2p-1}$ is close to the middle of the d -th row of the Pascal triangle, that is when $p \approx d/4$. Since we can only use p primes, we resort to a classical number-theoretic result of Czebyšev: every interval $[n, 2n]$ contains a prime. That allows us to choose a prime p such that $\frac{d}{8} \leq p \leq \frac{d}{4}$. By carefully cancelling common factors in the binomial coefficients we obtain:

$$\chi(\mathbb{R}^d) \geq \frac{1}{p} \cdot \frac{d-p+1}{2p-1} \cdot \frac{d-p}{2p-2} \cdots \frac{d-2p+2}{p}.$$

Under the condition $d \geq 4p$ each of the last p factors is $\geq \frac{3}{2}$, so:

$$\chi(\mathbb{R}^d) \geq \frac{1}{p} \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^p \geq \frac{4}{d} \left(\left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{8}}\right)^d \geq \frac{4}{d} \cdot 1.051^d \geq 1.05^d$$

where the last inequality holds for sufficiently large d . □

8.7 Linear algebra in action

Let us now review two combinatorial methods of proving inequalities like $A \leq B$, where A, B are some combinatorially defined quantities.

Method 1 — set comparison. If a set of size B contains a subset of size A then $A \leq B$.

Example 8.24. We will show that $\binom{n}{k} \leq 2^n$. The family of all subsets of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ has size 2^n , and it contains the family of all k -element subsets, the latter of size $\binom{n}{k}$. Our inequality follows.

That was an easy and completely standard argument. Our next method is also based on an elementary observation in linear algebra.

Method 2 — vector space comparison. If a vector space of dimension B contains A linearly independent vectors then $A \leq B$.

This may seem like an overkill, but it is actually a useful strategy in many otherwise complicated situations (like our Theorem 3). Here is an example of how the method works: the (rather classical) problem known as Odd-Town.

Example 8.25. n people participate in m clubs. Every club has an odd number of members, and every two clubs have an even number of common members. Prove that $m \leq n$.

First let's note that we may have $m = n$, for example when every person forms its own one-element club.

To solve the problem, encode the clubs C_1, \dots, C_m via "membership vectors" $\overline{c}_1, \dots, \overline{c}_m$ of length n , where

$$(\overline{c}_i)_j = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if person } j \text{ belongs to club } i, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

for $i = 1, \dots, m, j = 1, \dots, n$. If we write $\langle \overline{x}, \overline{y} \rangle = \sum_i x_i y_i$ for the standard inner product, then

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \overline{c}_i, \overline{c}_k \rangle &= \text{number of common members of } C_i \text{ and } C_k, \\ \langle \overline{c}_i, \overline{c}_i \rangle &= \text{number of members of } C_i. \end{aligned}$$

We will show that $\overline{c}_1, \dots, \overline{c}_m$ are linearly independent. Suppose, for a contradiction, that it is not true. Then we have a linear relation

$$\sum_i a_i \overline{c}_i = 0$$

where not all a_i are zero. Since the coordinates of \overline{c}_i are integers, we can assume that all $a_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and moreover $\gcd(a_1, \dots, a_m) = 1$. In particular, a_k is odd for some k . Now:

$$0 = \left\langle \sum_i a_i \overline{c}_i, \overline{c}_k \right\rangle = a_k \langle \overline{c}_k, \overline{c}_k \rangle + \sum_{i \neq k} a_i \langle \overline{c}_i, \overline{c}_k \rangle$$

which is a contradiction, because $a_k \langle \overline{c}_k, \overline{c}_k \rangle$ is odd, while all the other terms are even.

We showed that $\overline{c}_1, \dots, \overline{c}_m$ are linearly independent vectors in \mathbb{R}^n . It follows that $m \leq n$.

Very similar arguments will now appear in the proof Theorem 8.22.

Proof of Theorem 8.22. As always, we write $\langle \overline{x}, \overline{y} \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^d x_i y_i$. Let \overline{x} and \overline{y} be two different vertices of $Q_d(2p, 2p-1)$. Using the fact that both \overline{x} and \overline{y} have exactly $2p-1$ coordinates equal to 1, we easily get

$$|\{j : x_j \neq y_j\}| = 2(2p-1 - |\{j : x_j = y_j = 1\}|) = 2(2p-1 - \langle \overline{x}, \overline{y} \rangle),$$

hence

$$\langle \overline{x}, \overline{y} \rangle = 2p-1 - \frac{1}{2} |\{j : x_j \neq y_j\}|.$$

Now if \overline{x} and \overline{y} are adjacent in $Q_d(2p, 2p-1)$ then they differ in exactly $2p$ places, and we get $\langle \overline{x}, \overline{y} \rangle = 2p-1 - p = p-1$. Otherwise we get some other inner product between 0 and $2p-2$ (because $\overline{x} \neq \overline{y}$). The upshot is that

$$\langle \overline{x}, \overline{y} \rangle \begin{cases} = p-1 & \text{if } \overline{xy} \in E(Q_d(2p, 2p-1)), \\ \not\equiv p-1 \pmod{p} & \text{if } \overline{xy} \notin E(Q_d(2p, 2p-1)). \end{cases}$$

Moreover $\langle \overline{x}, \overline{x} \rangle = 2p-1$ for all \overline{x} .

Take any independent set I in $Q_d(2p, 2p-1)$. For any $\overline{x} \in I$ consider the function $f_{\overline{x}} : \{0, 1\}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined for $\overline{t} = (t_1, \dots, t_d)$ by the formula

$$f_{\overline{x}}(\overline{t}) = \langle \overline{x}, \overline{t} \rangle^{p-1}$$

(recall that $z^{p-1} = z(z-1) \cdots (z-(p-2))$ is the falling factorial). The functions $f_{\overline{x}}$ are naturally elements of the \mathbb{R} -vector space of all functions $\{0, 1\}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Let us check that the set $\{f_{\overline{x}}\}_{\overline{x} \in I}$ is linearly independent in that space. If not, then we would have a linear relation

$$\sum_{\overline{x} \in I} a_{\overline{x}} f_{\overline{x}} = 0$$

for $a_{\overline{x}}$ not all zero. As in the example before, we can assume that $a_{\overline{x}} \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\gcd(a_{\overline{x}}) = 1$. In particular, some $a_{\overline{x}_0}$ is not divisible by p . We have

$$0 = \sum_{\overline{x} \in I} a_{\overline{x}} f_{\overline{x}}(\overline{x}_0) = a_{\overline{x}_0} \langle \overline{x}_0, \overline{x}_0 \rangle^{p-1} + \sum_{I \ni \overline{x} \neq \overline{x}_0} a_{\overline{x}} \langle \overline{x}, \overline{x}_0 \rangle^{p-1}.$$

We have $\langle \overline{x_0}, \overline{x_0} \rangle^{p-1} = (2p-1)(2p-2) \cdots (p+1) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$. Here we use that p is a prime! Since I is an independent set, each $\langle \overline{x}, \overline{x_0} \rangle$ is different from $p-1 \pmod{p}$, hence one of the factors in the falling factorial formula for $\langle \overline{x}, \overline{x_0} \rangle^{p-1}$ is divisible by p . That is a contradiction, since all the terms in the formula above are now divisible by p except for the first one.

We would now like to know $\dim(\text{span}\{f_{\overline{x}}\}_{\overline{x} \in I})$. A more explicit representation of $f_{\overline{x}}$

$$f_{\overline{x}}(t_1, \dots, t_d) = \left(\sum x_i t_i \right) \left(\sum x_i t_i - 1 \right) \cdots \left(\sum x_i t_i - (p-2) \right)$$

reveals, after opening the brackets, that $f_{\overline{x}}$ is a linear combination of monomials of degree at most $p-1$ in the d variables t_1, \dots, t_d . Since $t_i \in \{0, 1\}$, we have $t_i^2 = t_i$, so $f_{\overline{x}}$ is in fact equal to a linear combination of square-free monomials of degree at most $p-1$ in d variables. The dimension of the vector space of such functions is $\binom{d}{0} + \cdots + \binom{d}{p-1}$, where $\binom{d}{i}$ is the number of square-free monomials of degree i (that is, products of i out of d variables).

To conclude, $\{f_{\overline{x}}\}_{\overline{x} \in I}$ is a set of linearly independent vectors in a vector space of dimension $\binom{d}{0} + \cdots + \binom{d}{p-1}$, which means that $|I| \leq \binom{d}{0} + \cdots + \binom{d}{p-1}$, as we wanted to prove. \square

Remark 8.26. The proof above is based on [Mat, Chapter 17].

8.8 Exercises

1. What is $\omega(U_{\mathbb{R}^2})$?
2. What is the length of the side in a d -dimensional cube whose main diagonal has length 1?
3. Recall our naive coloring of $U_{\mathbb{R}^2}$ by translates of a 9-colored 3×3 square, where each small square has diameter almost 1. Does the same strategy work in \mathbb{R}^3 and produce a coloring of $U_{\mathbb{R}^3}$ with 27 colors by translates of a 27-colored $3 \times 3 \times 3$ cube? What about \mathbb{R}^d ?
4. We say that two points A and B of the integer lattice \mathbb{Z}^2 *see each other* if the line segment AB contains no other point of \mathbb{Z}^2 . Find a 4-coloring of \mathbb{Z}^2 so that any two points which see each other have different colors. Hint: use colors 00, 01, 10, 11.
5. Show that the following are equivalent definitions of $Q_d(u)$:
 - The vertices are all vertices of Q_d . Two vertices are adjacent if their distance in Q_d is exactly u .
 - The vertices are all subsets of $\{1, \dots, d\}$. Two subsets A, B are adjacent if $|A \triangle B| = u$, where \triangle is the symmetric difference $A \triangle B = (A \cup B) \setminus (A \cap B)$.
 - The vertices are all integers in $\{0, \dots, 2^d - 1\}$. Two numbers x, y are adjacent if $x \oplus y$ has exactly u nonzero digits in base 2, where \oplus is bitwise XOR.
 - The vertices are the vertices of the cube $[0, 1]^d \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$. Two of them are adjacent if their Euclidean distance is \sqrt{u} .
6. If u is odd then show that $Q_d(u)$ is bipartite (hence $\chi(Q_d(u)) = 2$).
7. If u is even then show that $Q_d(u)$ has at least two connected components.
8. If $Q_d(u)$ has two components, we denote any of them by $Q'_d(u)$. Implement your favourite definition of $Q_d(u)$ in Sage and compute $\chi(Q'_5(2))$ and $\alpha(Q'_{10}(4))$ to prove the results mentioned in this chapter.

Chapter 9

Coloring and topology

9.1 Exercises

1. Can the directed graph formed in the proof of oriented Sperner's lemma really have cycles, or is it just a union of directed paths?
2. Prove that Sperner's lemma and Brouwer's fixed point theorem are equivalent in the following sense: Find a proof of the "classical" version of Sperner's lemma from Brouwer's theorem.

Hint: Construct a continuous map $f : \Delta \rightarrow \Delta$ by defining it on the vertices of the triangulation and extending linearly to the interiors of the edges and triangles of the triangulation. Arrange it so that any fixed point of f must lie inside a 3-colored triangle.

3. Use Sperner's lemma to prove the following classical fact about rectangle dissections:

Suppose a rectangle is partitioned into smaller rectangles, and that each small rectangle has at least one side of integer length. Prove that the big rectangle also has at least one side of integer length.

Hint: Subdivide each small rectangle with one diagonal to get a triangulation of the big rectangle. Place everything in a coordinate system with one corner at $(0,0)$. Color each vertex $P = (x,y)$ with

- color 1 if $x \in \mathbb{Z}$,
- color 2 if $x \notin \mathbb{Z}$ and $y \in \mathbb{Z}$,
- color 3 if $x, y \notin \mathbb{Z}$.

Prove that there is no triangle with colors 1, 2, 3. Finally show that assuming both sides of the big rectangle are non-integers contradicts Sperner's lemma.

Chapter 10

Exam problems

10.1 Problems

The number of stars indicates the difficulty level.

1. (★) Find the chromatic number of the graph G defined below in Sage:

```
def FunnyGraph(n):  
    c = graphs.CompleteGraph(n)  
    c.delete_edges(graphs.CycleGraph(n).edges())  
    return graphs.MycielskiStep(c).join(graphs.WheelGraph(n+1))
```

```
G = FunnyGraph(99)
```

2. (★★) Consider the following algorithm for vertex coloring. Find the largest independent set of vertices, and color them with color 1. Remove those vertices, find the largest independent set in the remaining graph and color it with color 2, and so on until there are no more vertices left to color. Prove that there are infinitely many graphs G for which this algorithm will use more than $\chi(G)$ colors.
3. (★) Prove that $\max\{\chi(G), \chi(\overline{G})\} \geq \sqrt{|V(G)|}$ for any graph G .
4. (★★) Let G, H be two graphs. The *substitution of H into G* , denoted $G[H]$, is the graph obtained by replacing every vertex of G with a copy of H , and replacing every original edge of G with a complete bipartite graph between the corresponding copies of H . Formally $V(G[H]) = V(G) \times V(H)$ and $(u, v)(u', v') \in E(G[H])$ iff either $uu' \in E(G)$ or $u = u'$ and $vv' \in E(H)$. Sage calls this operation `G.lexicographic_product(H)`. Prove that

$$\omega(G)\chi(H) \leq \chi(G[H]) \leq \chi(G)\chi(H).$$

Find an example with $\chi(G[H]) < \chi(G)\chi(H)$.

5. (★★) Let $\gcd(a, b)$ denote the greatest common divisor of a and b . Let $n = 20162016$. Define G as the graph with vertex set $\{1, \dots, n\}$ where two numbers $1 \leq a < b \leq n$ are adjacent if and only if $\gcd(a, b) = 1$. Find the exact value of $\chi(G)$.
6. (★)
- Prove or disprove: if the only complex roots of $P_G(t)$ are 0 and 1 then G is a forest.
 - How many non-isomorphic graphs have chromatic polynomial $t^2(t-1)^8$?
 - Find all non-isomorphic graphs with chromatic polynomial $t(t-1)^3(t-2)$.

7. (★) A vertex coloring of G will be called *brilliant* if (1) every two adjacent vertices have different colors and (2) every two vertices which have a common neighbour also have different colors. Let $\chi_b(G)$ be the minimal number of colors required for a brilliant coloring of a simple graph G , and let $P_b(G, t)$ be the number of brilliant colorings of G with colors $\{1, \dots, t\}$.

Find all graphs G with $\chi_b(G) \leq 2$ and show that $P_b(G, t)$ is a polynomial in t for every graph G .

8. (★★★) Prove that $\chi_l(G) + \chi_l(\overline{G}) \leq |V(G)| + 1$ for any graph G , where χ_l is the list chromatic number.
9. (★★) (This is an experimental problem; formal proofs are not expected.) Let $g(n)$ be the expected number of colors used by the greedy algorithm to color a random graph from $G(n, \frac{1}{2})$.
- Compute and plot an experimental approximation of $g(n)$ for a sequence of reasonably large values of n , for example $n = 100, 200, \dots, 2000$.
 - Speculate about the asymptotic behaviour of $g(n)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. In particular, what do you think about $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{g(n)}{n / \log_2 n}$?
 - Find information about the expected value of $\chi(G)$ for $G \in G(n, \frac{1}{2})$. How well does the greedy algorithm perform?
10. (★★★) Let G be a nonempty graph. Simplify the expression

$$\sum_I P(G - I, -1)$$

where the sum runs over all independent sets I in G (including the empty one) and, as always, $G - X$ denotes the subgraph of G induced by the vertex set $V(G) - X$.

11. (★★★) A vertex v of a directed graph is called a *source* if all the edges incident to v are pointing out of v . Suppose G is a nonempty graph with n vertices. Prove that the number of acyclic orientations of G having exactly one source equals $n \cdot (-1)^{n-1} \cdot [t]P_G(t)$.
12. (★) Find the edge-chromatic number χ' of **FunnyGraph(99)** from Problem 1.
13. (★★) In the lectures we defined a family of graphs $Q_d(u, s)$, and we used the fact that they are unit distance graphs in \mathbb{R}^d .
- a) Show that each $Q_d(u, s)$ is in fact a unit distance graph in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} .
 - b) Use the graphs $Q_{10}(u, s)$ to prove $\chi(\mathbb{R}^9) \geq C$ for a constant C as large as you can.
14. (★★) The *supremum metric* (or ℓ_∞ metric) in \mathbb{R}^d , $d \geq 1$ is given by

$$d_\infty((x_1, \dots, x_d), (y_1, \dots, y_d)) = \max\{|x_1 - y_1|, \dots, |x_d - y_d|\}.$$

Find the smallest number of colors required to color \mathbb{R}^d so that any two points whose distance in the supremum metric equals 1 have different colors.

15. (★★) Let $P_{2 \times n} = P_2 \square P_n$ be the $2 \times n$ grid graph. Find the number of edge-colorings of $P_{2 \times n}$ with 3 colors. ($P_{2 \times n}$ is called `graphs.Grid2dGraph(2,n)` in Sage).

10.2 Hints

1. The graph is $M(K_n \setminus C_n) + C_n + K_1$ and so its chromatic number is $(1 + \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil) + (2 + (n \bmod 2)) + 1$ for $n > 3$.
2. Take two n -vertex stars and connect their central vertices with an edge.
3. $\chi(G)\chi(\overline{G}) \geq \chi(G)\alpha(G) \geq |V(G)|$.

4. For the lower bound G contains an $\omega(G)$ -fold join of copies of H . For the upper bound take a cartesian product of colorings of G and H . For the example take $G = C_5$, $H = K_2$.
5. Let $\pi(n)$ be the number of prime numbers up to n . The graph contains a clique of size $1 + \pi(n)$. There is also a coloring with $1 + \pi(n)$ colors: map each number to the smallest prime in its factorization.
6.
 - True, because each connected component has n_i vertices and $n_i - 1$ edges.
 - Count all forests with 10 vertices, 8 edges and 2 connected components.
 - Look among connected graphs with 5 vertices and 5 edges.
7. If $\chi_b(G) \leq 2$ then every connected component of G has at most two vertices. Let G^2 denote the graph where all pairs originally at distance 2 are given an edge. Then $P_b(G, t) = P(G^2, t)$.
8. Induction.
9. The expected value of the chromatic number of $G(n, \frac{1}{2})$ is $(1 + o(1)) \frac{n}{2^{\log_2 n}}$, while the expected number of colors used by the greedy algorithm is $(1 + o(1)) \frac{n}{\log_2 n}$. See [Kri02] for a nice introduction. It is hard to observe the asymptotics within the bounds of this problem, though.
10. Prove combinatorially the identity

$$P(G, t + 1) = \sum_I P(G - I, t).$$

11. Prove a deletion-contraction rule for $a(G, v_0)$ defined as the number of acyclic orientations in which the fixed vertex v_0 is the unique source.
12. Find the degree sequence. There is only one vertex of maximal degree.
13. All vertices lie in the same $(d - 1)$ -hyperplane in \mathbb{R}^d . We have $\alpha(Q_{10}(4, 5)) = 12$, so $\chi(\mathbb{R}^9) \geq \chi(Q_{10}(4, 5)) \geq \binom{10}{5}/12 = 21$. This proof comes from [KT15].
14. A coloring $c : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^d$ given by

$$c(x_1, \dots, x_d) = (\lfloor x_1 \rfloor \bmod 2, \dots, \lfloor x_d \rfloor \bmod 2)$$

uses 2^d colors and is optimal.

15. There are many ways to observe inductively that $c_n = 2c_{n-1} - 6$ for $n \geq 3$, where $c_n = P(L(P_{2 \times n}), 3)$.

Bibliography

- [BoMu] A. Bondy, B. Murty, Graph Theory, Graduate Texts in Mathematics 244, Springer–Verlag
- [Bol] B. Bollobas, Modern Graph Theory, Graduate Texts in Mathematics 184, Springer–Verlag
- [Dies] R. Diestel, Graph Theory, Graduate Texts in Mathematics 173, Springer–Verlag
- [KT15] M. Kahle, B. Taha, *New Lower Bounds for $\chi(\mathbb{R}^d)$* , Geombinatorics XXIV (3) 2015, 109–116, also <http://arxiv.org/abs/1409.1278>
- [Kri02] M. Krivelevich, *Coloring Random Graphs – an Algorithmic Perspective*, Mathematics and Computer Science II, 175–19, also www.math.tau.ac.il/~krivelev/col_rg.ps
- [Mat] J. Matoušek, *Thirty-three Miniatures: Mathematical and Algorithmic Applications of Linear Algebra*, The Student Mathematical Library 53, AMS, also <http://kam.mff.cuni.cz/~matousek/stml-53-matousek-1.pdf>
- [Soi] A. Soifer, *The Mathematical Coloring Book*, Springer–Verlag
- [West] D. West, *Introduction to Graph Theory*, Prentice Hall