

## Coloring digraphs by iterated antichains

SVATOPLUK POLJAK

*Abstract.* We show that the minimum chromatic number of a product of two  $n$ -chromatic graphs is either bounded by 9, or tends to infinity. The result is obtained by the study of coloring iterated adjoints of a digraph by iterated antichains of a poset.

*Keywords:* graph product, chromatic number, antichain

*Classification:* 05C15, 06A10

This note is motivated by a conjecture by Hedetniemi on the chromatic number of the product of two graphs. (The *product*  $G \times H$  of two unoriented graphs  $G$  and  $H$  is the graph on the vertex set  $V(G) \times V(H)$  and with the edges  $((u_1, u_2), (v_1, v_2))$  for  $u_1v_1 \in E(G_1)$  and  $u_2v_2 \in E(G_2)$ .) Hedetniemi [H] conjectured that

$$\chi(G \times H) = \min(\chi G, \chi H)$$

for any pair  $G$  and  $H$  of graphs. The conjecture is also sometimes called the *Lovász–Hedetniemi* conjecture. The inequality ‘ $\leq$ ’ in the conjecture is obvious, and it is also easy to see that the conjecture is valid for 1-, 2-, and 3-chromatic graphs. The validity for 4-chromatic graphs has been proved in [ES]. On the other hand, no lower bound on  $\chi(G \times H)$  is known. It is even not known whether the function  $f(n)$  defined by  $f(n) = \min\{\chi(G \times H) \mid \chi G = \chi H = n\}$  tends to infinity for  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . However, it has been proved in [PR] that if the function is bounded, then  $f(n) \leq 16$  for all  $n$ . The purpose of this note is to decrease the bound from 16 to 9.

A survey of other known results on Hedetniemi’s conjecture can be found in [DSW], and some further related results have been published in [HHMN]. A special case was proved also in [T].

The result here is obtained by extending the technique of coloring digraphs by antichains (see [HE] and [PR]) to coloring iterated adjoints of digraphs by iterated antichains.

Let  $L$  be a poset and let  $A(L)$  be the set of all (not necessarily maximal) antichains of  $L$ . We introduce a partial order on  $A(L)$  as follows. For  $a, a' \in A(L)$ , we write  $a < a'$ , if for every  $x \in a$  there is some  $y \in a'$  such that  $x < y$ . It is easy to check that if  $a < a'$  and  $a' < a$ , then  $a = a'$ , and  $a < a'$  and  $a' < a''$  give  $a < a''$ . For  $i > 0$ , we define  $A^i(L) = A(A^{i-1}(L))$ . (Note that our construction of a poset on antichains slightly differs from that of Dilworth [D], where only maximum sized antichains were considered.)

Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a digraph. We say that a mapping  $f$  from  $V$  to a poset  $L$  is a *homomorphism*, if  $f(u) < f(v)$  for every edge  $uv \in E$ .

The *adjoint*  $\delta G$  of a digraph  $G$  is the digraph whose vertex set is  $E(G)$ , and edges of  $\delta G$  are the pairs of consecutive edges of  $G$ , i.e.  $E(\delta G) = \{(uv, vw) \mid uv, vw \in E(G)\}$ . For  $i > 0$ , we define the  $i$ -th adjoint  $\delta^i G = \delta(\delta^{i-1} G)$ .

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $G$  be a digraph and  $L$  be a poset. Then there is a homomorphism  $f$  from  $G$  to  $A(L)$ , if and only if there is a homomorphism  $\phi$  from  $\delta G$  to  $L$ .*

PROOF: Let  $f$  be a homomorphism from  $G$  to  $A(L)$ . We define  $\phi$  as follows. Given  $e = uv \in V(\delta G)$ , where  $e$  is an edge of  $G$ , choose an arbitrary  $x \in f(u)$  for which  $\{x\} < f(v)$ , and set  $\phi(e) = x$ . (A suitable  $x$  must exist since  $f(u) < f(v)$ .) We check that the mapping  $\phi$  is a homomorphism from  $\delta G$  to  $L$ . Let  $ee' \in E(\delta G)$ , where  $e = uv$  and  $e' = vw$  are edges of  $G$ . We have  $\phi(e) < \phi(e')$  since  $\phi(e) \in f(u)$ ,  $\phi(e') \in f(v)$  and  $\{f(u)\} < f(v)$ .

Conversely, let  $\phi$  be a homomorphism from  $\delta G$  to  $L$ . We define a homomorphism  $f$  as follows. Given  $u \in V(G)$ , let  $S(u) = \{\phi(uv) \mid uv \in E(G)\}$ . Since  $S(u)$  is not necessarily an antichain, we define  $f(u)$  as the set of the maximal elements of  $S(u)$ . It is straightforward to check that  $f(u) < f(v)$  for  $uv \in E(G)$ .  $\square$

The *chromatic number*  $\chi G$  of a digraph  $G$  is the chromatic number of the graph obtained from  $G$  after forgetting the orientation of the edges. Equivalently, it is the minimum  $k$  for which there is a homomorphism from  $G$  to  $D_k$ , where  $D_k$  denotes the *discrete poset* on  $k$  elements. A digraph  $G = (V, E)$  is said to be *symmetric*, if for every edge  $uv$  it contains also the reversed edge  $vu$ . For a poset  $L$ ,  $\alpha(L)$  denotes the size of the maximum antichain in  $L$ .

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $G$  be a symmetric digraph, and  $i$  a nonnegative positive integer. Then  $\chi(\delta^i G)$  is equal to the minimum  $k$  for which  $\chi G$  is less or equals  $\alpha(A^i(D_k))$ .*

PROOF: Let  $\chi(\delta^i G) = k$ . Then there is a homomorphism  $f$  from  $\delta^i G$  to  $D_k$ , and hence also a homomorphism  $\phi$  from  $G$  to  $A^i(D_k)$  by the repeated use of Lemma 1. Since  $G$  is symmetric,  $\phi(u)$  and  $\phi(v)$  are incomparable elements of  $A^i(D_k)$  for every edge  $uv$  of  $G$ . Let  $H$  be the complement of the comparability graph of  $A^i(D_k)$ . The existence of  $\phi$  implies that  $\chi(\delta^i G) \leq \chi H$ . Since  $H$  is a perfect graph,  $\chi H$  equals the size of the maximum clique of  $H$ , which is the size of the maximum antichain in  $A^i(D_k)$ . Hence the inequality  $\chi G \leq \alpha(A^i(D_k))$  is established.

Conversely, let  $\chi G \leq \alpha(A^i(D_k))$ . Then there is a homomorphism  $\phi$  from  $\delta^i G$  to  $A^i(D_k)$ . By a repeated use of Lemma 1, there is a homomorphism  $f$  from  $\delta^i G$  to  $D_k$ . Clearly,  $f$  is a coloring of  $\delta^i G$  since  $D_k$  is discrete. Hence  $\chi(\delta^i G) \leq k$ .  $\square$

We recall that  $D_k$  is a discrete poset. Then  $A(D_k)$  is the set of all subsets of  $\{1, 2, \dots, k\}$  ordered by inclusion, and  $A^2(D_k)$  is the set of the Sperner systems on the underlying  $k$ -element set.

**Lemma 3.** *We have  $\alpha(A^2(D_3)) = 4$ .*

PROOF: The following four sets  $\{\{1, 2\}\}$ ,  $\{\{2, 3\}\}$ ,  $\{\{1, 3\}\}$  and  $\{\{1\}, \{2\}, \{3\}\}$  form an antichain in  $A^2(D_3)$ . It is easy to check that it is an antichain of the maximum size.  $\square$

**Lemma 4** ([HE]). *We have  $\chi(\delta G) \geq \log_2 \chi G$ .*

The product  $G_1 \times G_2$  of two digraph  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  is the digraph with the vertex set  $V(G_1) \times V(G_2)$  and the edges  $((u_1, u_2), (v_1, v_2))$  for  $u_1 v_1 \in E(G_1)$  and  $u_2 v_2 \in E(G_2)$ .

We define  $g(n)$  as the minimum chromatic number of the product of two  $n$ -chromatic digraphs. It has been proved in [PR] that the function  $g$  is either bounded by 4, or tends to infinity. Here we present an improvement of that result.

**Theorem 5.** *The function  $g(n)$  is either bounded by 3, or tends to infinity.*

PROOF: Assume that the function  $g$  is bounded by a constant  $c$ , i.e. for all  $n$  sufficiently large, say  $n > n_0$ , we have  $g(n) = c$ . It has been proved in [PR] that  $c \leq 4$ . For a contradiction, assume that  $c = 4$ . Let  $n > 2^{2^{n_0}}$ , and  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  be a pair of  $n$ -chromatic digraphs for which  $\chi(G_1 \times G_2) = \chi H = 4$ , where  $H = G_1 \times G_2$ . Since  $\alpha A^2(D_3) = 4$  by Lemma 3, we have  $\chi(\delta^2 H) \leq 3$  by Theorem 2.

On the other hand, we have  $\chi(\delta^2 G_1), \chi(\delta^2 G_2) > n_0$  by Lemma 4, and hence  $\chi(\delta^2 G_1 \times \delta^2 G_2) \geq 4$  by our assumption on  $g$ . Since  $\delta^2 H = \delta^2(G_1 \times G_2) = \delta^2 G_1 \times \delta^2 G_2$  (the latter equality is easy to see, cf. Proposition 2.2 of [PR]), we get  $\chi(\delta^2 H) = 4$ , which is a contradiction.  $\square$

Let  $h(n) = \min\{\max(\chi(G_1 \times G_2), \chi(G_1 \times G_2^{-1})) \mid G_1 \text{ and } G_2 \text{ are digraphs with } \chi G_1 = \chi G_2 = n\}$ , where  $G_2^{-1}$  denotes the digraph obtained from  $G_2$  by reversing the edges. Quite analogously as above, it is possible to show that  $h(n)$  is either bounded by 3 or tends to infinity. However, it is not yet excluded that  $g(n)$  is bounded, while  $h(n)$  is not.

**Theorem 6.** *The minimum chromatic number of a product of two  $n$ -chromatic graphs is either bounded by 9, or tends to infinity.*

PROOF: Let  $f(n)$  be the minimum chromatic number of a product of two (undirected)  $n$ -chromatic graphs. The statement follows from the inequality  $h(n) \leq f(n) \leq h^2(n)$  established in the proof of Theorem 3.6 of [PR].  $\square$

I have been recently informed by V. Rödl that the possibility of improving the construction of [PR] was also observed by J. Schmerl.

#### REFERENCES

- [D] Dilworth R.P., *Some combinatorial problems on partially ordered sets*, Combinatorial Analysis, R. Bellman and M. Halls (eds.), Proc. Symp. Appl. Math., Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 1960, 85–90.
- [DSW] Duffus D., Sands B., Woodrow R., *On the chromatic number of the product of graphs*, J. Graph Theory **9** (1985), 487–495.
- [ES] El-Zahar M, Sauer N., *The chromatic number of the product of two four-chromatic graphs is four*, Combinatorica **5** (1985), 121–126.
- [H] Hedetniemi S., *Homomorphisms of graphs and automata*, University of Michigan Technical Report 03105–44–T, 1966.
- [HE] Harner C.C., Entringer R.C., *Arc coloring of digraphs*, J. Combinatorial Theory Ser. B **13** (1972), 219–225.
- [HHMN] Häggkvist R., Hell P., Miller D.J., Neumann Lara V., *On the multiplicative graphs and the product conjecture*, Combinatorica **8** (1988), 63–74.

- [PR] Poljak S., Rödl V., *On the arc chromatic number of a digraph*, J. Combinatorial Theory Ser. B **31** (1981), 190–198.
- [T] Turzík D., *A note on chromatic number of direct product of graphs*, Comment. Math. Univ. Carolinae **24** (1983), 461–463.

FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS AND PHYSICS, CHARLES UNIVERSITY, MALOSTRANSKÉ NÁM. 25,  
118 00 PRAGUE 1, CZECHOSLOVAKIA

(Received August 23, 1990)