

BINOMIAL INEQUALITIES OF CHROMATIC, FLOW, AND EHRHART POLYNOMIALS

MATTHIAS BECK AND EMERSON LEÓN

ABSTRACT. A famous and wide-open problem, going back to at least the early 1970's, concerns the classification of chromatic polynomials of graphs. Toward this classification problem, one may ask for necessary inequalities among the coefficients of a chromatic polynomial, and we contribute such inequalities when a chromatic polynomial $\chi_G(n) = \chi_0^* \binom{n+d}{d} + \chi_1^* \binom{n+d-1}{d} + \cdots + \chi_d^* \binom{n}{d}$ is written in terms of a binomial-coefficient basis. For example, we show that $\chi_{d-2}^* + \chi_{d-3}^* + \cdots + \chi_{d-j-1}^* \geq \chi_2^* + \chi_3^* + \cdots + \chi_{j+1}^*$, for $1 \leq j \leq \lfloor \frac{d}{2} \rfloor - 1$. A similar result holds for flow polynomials enumerating either modular or integral nowhere-zero flows of a graph. Our theorems follow from connections among chromatic, flow, order, and Ehrhart polynomials, and the fact that the latter satisfy a decomposition formula into symmetric polynomials due to Stapledon. Our results are related to recent work by Hersh–Swartz and Breuer–Dall, where similar inequalities were derived using algebraic-combinatorial methods.

1. INTRODUCTION

A famous and wide-open problem, going back to at least [30], concerns the classification of chromatic polynomials of graphs. As is well known, for a given graph G , the number $\chi_G(n)$ of proper colorings of G using n colors evaluates to a polynomial in n , and so a natural question is: which polynomials are chromatic?

Toward this classification problem, one may ask for necessary inequalities among the coefficients of a chromatic polynomial, and this paper gives one such set of inequalities. There are three natural bases for the space of polynomials of degree $\leq d$ when considering chromatic polynomials (of graphs with at most d vertices):

- the monomials $1, n, n^2, \dots, n^d$;
- the binomial coefficients $\binom{n}{d}, \binom{n}{d-1}, \dots, \binom{n}{0}$;
- the binomial coefficients $\binom{n+d}{d}, \binom{n+d-1}{d}, \dots, \binom{n}{d}$.

It is well known that the coefficients of any chromatic polynomial in the monomial basis alternate in sign (this can be proved, e.g., by deletion–contraction), and that the coefficients in both binomial-coefficient bases are nonnegative (in the first case, this follows from considering proper colorings that use exactly k colors, for $0 \leq k \leq d$, and this is closely connected to σ -polynomials [16]; in the second case, nonnegativity follows from Stanley's work on order polynomials [23] and the natural decomposition of a chromatic polynomial into order polynomial—see equation (15) below—; this was first spelled out in [18]).

Date: 21 November 2018.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 05C31; Secondary 05A15, 05C15, 05C21, 06A11, 52B20.

Key words and phrases. Chromatic polynomial, flow polynomial, classification, binomial coefficient, binomial transform, symmetric polynomial decomposition, lattice polytope, Ehrhart polynomial, h^* -polynomial, order polynomial.

An preliminary version of this paper appeared as an extended abstract in the conference proceedings for FPSAC 2017 (Formal Power Series and Combinatorics at Queen Mary University of London), published in *Séminaire Lotharingien Combinatoire*. We thank Tristram Bogart, Tricia Hersh, Florian Kohl, Julián Pulido, Alan Stapledon, and Tom Zaslavsky for many useful conversations and comments. Also thanks to the organizers of ECCO 2016 (Escuela Colombiana de Combinatoria 2016 in Medellín, Colombia) where this research collaboration started, and to Universidad de los Andes for their support.

We will work in the last basis and define the corresponding coefficients of the chromatic polynomial of a given graph G with d vertices via

$$\chi_G(n) = \chi_0^* \binom{n+d}{d} + \chi_1^* \binom{n+d-1}{d} + \cdots + \chi_d^* \binom{n}{d}.$$

We will collect these coefficients in the polynomial $\chi_G^*(z) := \chi_d^* z^d + \chi_{d-1}^* z^{d-1} + \cdots + \chi_0^*$ (which might not have degree d) and note that this polynomial appears in the generating function of $\chi_G(n)$, more precisely,

$$\sum_{n \geq 0} \chi_G(n) z^n = \frac{\chi_G^*(z)}{(1-z)^{d+1}}.$$

To the best of our knowledge, Linial [18] initiated the first study of the chromatic polynomial in the form of $\chi_G^*(z)$; see also [3, 8, 9, 28]. We think of the linear transformation going from $\chi_G(n)$ to $\chi_G^*(z)$ as a tool that is useful beyond chromatic polynomials (in fact, as we will see below, it is a standard tool in Ehrhart theory), and so we suggest to call $\chi_G^*(z)$ the *binomial transform* of $\chi_G(n)$.

Our first main result is as follows.

Theorem 1. *Let G be a graph on d vertices. Then there exist symmetric polynomials $a_G(z) = z^d a_G(\frac{1}{z})$ and $b_G(z) = z^{d-1} b_G(\frac{1}{z})$ with positive integer coefficients such that*

- (a) $\chi_G^*(z) = a_G(z) - b_G(z)$;
- (b) both constant terms a_0 and b_0 are equal to the number of acyclic orientations of G ;¹
- (c) the remaining coefficients of $a_G(z)$ and $b_G(z)$ satisfy $a_0 \leq a_1 \leq a_j$, where $1 \leq j \leq d-1$, and $b_0 \leq b_1 \leq b_j$, where $1 \leq j \leq d-2$.

As we already mentioned, the coefficients of $\chi_G^*(z)$ are nonnegative, and so we have the additional inequalities $a_j \geq b_j$ for $1 \leq j \leq d-1$.

We remark that the *existence* of the symmetric polynomials $a_G(z)$ and $b_G(z)$ satisfying (a) is not a deep fact—this boils down to an easy calculation—, the point is that they have *positive* coefficients. A consequence of (c) is the following set of inequalities among the χ^* -coefficients.

Corollary 2. *Let G be a graph on d vertices. Then for $2 \leq j \leq \lfloor \frac{d}{2} \rfloor$,*

$$\chi_{d-2}^* + \chi_{d-3}^* + \cdots + \chi_{d-j}^* \geq \chi_2^* + \chi_3^* + \cdots + \chi_j^*.$$

Naturally, these inequalities can be rephrased in terms of the coefficients of $\chi_G(n)$ in the monomial basis, and we give samples for graphs with $d \leq 7$ vertices in Table 1.

$d = 5$	$5c_1 + c_2 - 4c_3 - 5c_4 + 20 \geq 0$
$d = 6$	$-5c_1 + 5c_2 + 7c_3 - 19c_4 - 65c_5 + 245 \geq 0$
$d = 7$	$21c_1 - c_2 - 9c_3 + 11c_4 - 9c_5 - 301c_6 + 1071 \geq 0$
	$-7c_1 - 3c_2 + 8c_3 + 15c_4 - 52c_5 - 273c_6 + 1148 \geq 0$

TABLE 1. Relations among coefficients (monomial basis) of chromatic polynomials.

We also remark that, as we will see after proving Theorem 8 below, that the coefficients of $\chi_G^*(z)$ satisfy

$$(1) \quad \chi_{d-j}^* \leq \binom{\chi_{d-1}^* + j - 1}{j}.$$

¹ An orientations is *acyclic* if it does not contain any coherently oriented cycle.

Our second main contribution concerns a similar classification question for flow polynomials. Let A be an Abelian group. A *nowhere-zero A -flow* on a graph $G = (V, E)$ is a mapping $x : E \rightarrow A \setminus \{0\}$ such that for every node $v \in V$,

$$\sum_{h(e)=v} x(e) = \sum_{t(e)=v} x(e),$$

where $h(e)$ and $t(e)$ are respectively the head and tail of the edge e in an (arbitrary but fixed) orientation of G . (See, e.g., [14, 22] for background on nowhere-zero flows.) Tutte [29] proved in 1947 that the number $\phi_G(n)$ of nowhere-zero $\mathbb{Z}_n$ -flows on G is a polynomial in n . A more recent theorem of Kochol [15] says that the number $f_G(n)$ of nowhere-zero $\mathbb{Z}$ -flows on G whose images satisfy $|x(e)| < n$ is also a polynomial in n . (It is easy to see that both flow polynomials are independent of the chosen orientation.) While it has long been known that $\phi_G(n)$ and $f_G(n)$ have identical integer roots, they are rather different polynomials.

As with the chromatic polynomials, we will express $\phi_G(n)$ and $f_G(n)$ in a binomial-coefficient basis: $\binom{n+\xi-1}{\xi}, \binom{n+\xi-2}{\xi}, \dots, \binom{n-1}{\xi}$, where $\xi := |E| - |V| + \#(\text{components of } G)$ is the *cyclomatic number* of G , and define their binomial transforms via

$$\sum_{n \geq 1} \phi_G(n) z^n = \frac{\phi_G^*(z)}{(1-z)^{\xi+1}} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{n \geq 1} f_G(n) z^n = \frac{f_G^*(z)}{(1-z)^{\xi+1}}.$$

(Thus $\phi_G^*(z)$ and $f_G^*(z)$ have zero constant terms and degrees $\leq \xi + 1$. This slight shift compared to chromatic polynomials, and the resulting shift in the binomial-coefficient basis, comes from the nonzero constant terms of $\phi_G(z)$ and $f_G(z)$; note that a chromatic polynomial has zero constant term.)

The flow analogues to Theorem 1 and Corollary 2 are as follows.

Theorem 3. *Let G be a graph with cyclomatic number ξ . Then there exist symmetric polynomials $\alpha_G(z) = z^{\xi+1} \alpha_G(\frac{1}{z})$ and $\beta_G(z) = z^\xi \beta_G(\frac{1}{z})$ with positive integer coefficients such that*

- (a) $\phi_G^*(z) = \alpha_G(z) - \beta_G(z)$;
- (b) both constant terms α_0 and β_0 equal the number of in-degree sequences of totally cyclic orientations of G ;²
- (c) the remaining coefficients of $\alpha_G(z)$ and $\beta_G(z)$ satisfy $\alpha_0 \leq \alpha_1 \leq \alpha_j$, where $1 \leq j \leq \xi$, and $\beta_0 \leq \beta_1 \leq \beta_j$, where $1 \leq j \leq \xi - 1$.

Theorem 4. *Let G be a graph with cyclomatic number ξ . Then there exist symmetric polynomials $c_G(z) = z^{\xi+1} c_G(\frac{1}{z})$ and $d_G(z) = z^\xi d_G(\frac{1}{z})$ with positive integer coefficients such that*

- (a) $f_G^*(z) = c_G(z) - d_G(z)$;
- (b) both constant terms c_0 and d_0 equal the number of totally cyclic orientations of G ;
- (c) the remaining coefficients of $c_G(z)$ and $d_G(z)$ satisfy $c_0 \leq c_1 \leq c_j$, where $1 \leq j \leq \xi$, and $d_0 \leq d_1 \leq d_j$, where $1 \leq j \leq \xi - 1$.

Similar to the chromatic situation, it is known [5, 15] that the coefficients of both $\phi_G^*(z)$ and $f_G^*(z)$ are nonnegative, and so we have the additional inequalities $\alpha_j \geq \beta_j$ and $c_j \geq d_j$ for $1 \leq j \leq \xi$. And again in sync with the chromatic setting, parts (c) of Theorems 3 and 4 give the following concrete inequalities.

Corollary 5. *Let G be a graph with cyclomatic number ξ . Then for $1 \leq j \leq \lfloor \frac{\xi-1}{2} \rfloor$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{\xi-1}^* + \phi_{\xi-2}^* + \dots + \phi_{\xi-j}^* &\geq \phi_1^* + \phi_2^* + \dots + \phi_j^* \\ \phi_{\xi-1}^* + \phi_{\xi-2}^* + \dots + \phi_{\xi-j}^* &\geq \phi_2^* + \phi_3^* + \dots + \phi_{j+1}^* \\ f_{\xi-1}^* + f_{\xi-2}^* + \dots + f_{\xi-j}^* &\geq f_1^* + f_2^* + \dots + f_j^* \\ f_{\xi-1}^* + f_{\xi-2}^* + \dots + f_{\xi-j}^* &\geq f_2^* + f_3^* + \dots + f_{j+1}^*. \end{aligned}$$

² An orientations is *totally cyclic* if every edge belongs to a coherently oriented cycle.

We now give an idea why one might suspect decompositions of binomial transforms into symmetric positive polynomials such as in Theorems 1, 3, and 4, and we explain the setup of this paper. The starting point for our explorations are *Ehrhart polynomials of lattice polytopes*, which we discuss in Section 2. For this class of polynomials, Stapledon [27] (based on work of Betke–McMullen [2] and Payne [20]) proved a decomposition result similar in spirit to Theorems 1, 3, and 4.

While chromatic polynomials are not Ehrhart polynomials, they can be written as sums of *order polynomials* (by the afore-mentioned work of Stanley [23]), which we study in Section 4. Order polynomials, in turn, *are* Ehrhart polynomials in disguise, and so here is where we apply Stapledon’s results.

However, there are some complications: the decomposition of the binomial transform of an Ehrhart polynomial into symmetric polynomials depends on the degree of its binomial transform. But the degrees of the binomial transforms of the order polynomials that make up a given chromatic polynomial vary, and so we need a version of Stapledon’s theorem that is independent of the degree of the binomial transform (Theorem 6 below), which might be of independent interest. The same is true for our analogue of Theorem 1 for order polynomials (Theorem 8 below), from which Theorem 1 can then be easily deduced.

Theorems 3 and 4 follow in a similar fashion from writing the two kinds of flow polynomials as sums of Ehrhart polynomials (and then using Theorem 6), as we illustrate in Section 3. For integral flows, this geometric setup was introduced by Kochol [15], whereas for modular flows it is due to Breuer–Sanyal [5].

Our new inequalities are related to recent algebraic-combinatorial work of Hersh–Swartz [13] and Breuer–Dall [4]; in fact, Corollary 2 is implied by [13], and the first inequality in Corollary 5 follow from [4], as we explain in Section 5. However, our methods in this paper are quite different from those in [4, 13], and we see our main contribution in showing how Stapledon-type decompositions appear in graph polynomials; as a concrete consequence, at least the last three inequalities in Corollary 5 seem to be novel.

2. STAPLEDON DECOMPOSITIONS

Given a *lattice polytope* $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, i.e., the convex hull of finitely many points in $\mathbb{Z}^d$, Ehrhart’s celebrated theorem [7] says that the counting function

$$\text{ehr}_{\mathcal{P}}(n) := |n\mathcal{P} \cap \mathbb{Z}^d|$$

for $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ extends to a polynomial in n . (See, e.g., [1] for background on Ehrhart theory.) We will assume throughout that $\mathcal{P}$ is full dimensional, and so the degree of $\text{ehr}_{\mathcal{P}}(n)$ is d . An equivalent formulation of Ehrhart’s theorem is that the *Ehrhart series* $1 + \sum_{n \geq 1} \text{ehr}_{\mathcal{P}}(n)z^n$ evaluates to a rational function of the form $\frac{h_{\mathcal{P}}^*(z)}{(1-z)^{d+1}}$ for some polynomial $h_{\mathcal{P}}^*(z)$ of degree $s \leq d$, the h^* -polynomial of $\mathcal{P}$ —a name for the binomial transform of an Ehrhart polynomial that has become somewhat of a standard. The *Ehrhart–Macdonald reciprocity theorem* [19] gives the algebraic relation

$$(-1)^d \text{ehr}_{\mathcal{P}}(-n) = \text{ehr}_{\mathcal{P}^\circ}(z)$$

where $\mathcal{P}^\circ$ denotes the interior of $\mathcal{P}$. An equivalent version is

$$(2) \quad z^{d+1} h_{\mathcal{P}}^*\left(\frac{1}{z}\right) = h_{\mathcal{P}^\circ}^*(z)$$

where the h^* -polynomial of $\mathcal{P}^\circ$ is defined through $\sum_{n \geq 1} \text{ehr}_{\mathcal{P}^\circ}(n)z^n = \frac{h_{\mathcal{P}^\circ}^*(z)}{(1-z)^{d+1}}$.

Stanley [24] proved that the coefficients of $h_{\mathcal{P}}^*(z)$ are nonnegative integers, and Stapledon [27] showed that there exist symmetric polynomials $a_{\mathcal{P}}(z) = z^d a_{\mathcal{P}}(\frac{1}{z})$ and $b_{\mathcal{P}}(z) = z^{s-1} b_{\mathcal{P}}(\frac{1}{z})$ with nonnegative integer coefficients such that

$$(3) \quad (1 + z + \cdots + z^{l-1}) h_{\mathcal{P}}^*(z) = a_{\mathcal{P}}(z) + z^l b_{\mathcal{P}}(z)$$

where $l := d + 1 - s$, the *codegree* of $h_{\mathcal{P}}^*(z)$. Furthermore, the coefficients of $a_{\mathcal{P}}(z)$ satisfy

$$(4) \quad 1 = a_0 \leq a_1 \leq a_j \quad \text{where } 1 \leq j \leq d - 1.$$

Again we remark that the *existence* of the symmetric polynomials $a_{\mathcal{P}}(z)$ and $b_{\mathcal{P}}(z)$ is not a deep fact—one easily computes, denoting the coefficients of $h_{\mathcal{P}}^*(z)$ by $h_0^*, h_1^*, \dots, h_d^*$,

$$(5) \quad a_j = h_0^* + h_1^* + \dots + h_j^* - h_d^* - h_{d-1}^* - \dots - h_{d-j+1}^*$$

$$(6) \quad b_j = -h_0^* - h_1^* - \dots - h_j^* + h_s^* + h_{s-1}^* + \dots + h_{s-j}^*$$

and so $a_{\mathcal{P}}(z)$ and $b_{\mathcal{P}}(z)$ are, in fact, unique. The nontrivial part of Stapledon's theorem is that $a_{\mathcal{P}}(z)$ and $b_{\mathcal{P}}(z)$ have *nonnegative* coefficients.

As mentioned in the introduction, we will need a version of (3) that is independent of s .

Theorem 6. *Let $\mathcal{P}$ be a d -dimensional lattice polytope. Then there exist symmetric polynomials $c_{\mathcal{P}}(z) = z^{d+1} c_{\mathcal{P}}(\frac{1}{z})$ and $a_{\mathcal{P}}(z) = z^d a_{\mathcal{P}}(\frac{1}{z})$ with positive integer coefficients such that*

$$h_{\mathcal{P}}^*(z) = c_{\mathcal{P}}(z) - z a_{\mathcal{P}}(z) \quad \text{and} \quad h_{\mathcal{P}^\circ}^*(z) = c_{\mathcal{P}}(z) - a_{\mathcal{P}}(z).$$

Furthermore, the coefficients of $a_{\mathcal{P}}(z)$ and $c_{\mathcal{P}}(z)$ satisfy $1 = a_0 \leq a_1 \leq a_j$, where $1 \leq j \leq d - 1$, and $1 = c_0 \leq c_1 \leq c_j$, where $1 \leq j \leq d$.

Our notation is not accidental: the polynomial $a_{\mathcal{P}}(z)$ in Theorem 6 coincides with that in (3). Just as in (3), the (unique) existence of $a_{\mathcal{P}}(z)$ and $c_{\mathcal{P}}(z)$ in these formulas is not a deep fact, the point is that the polynomials $a_{\mathcal{P}}(z)$ and $c_{\mathcal{P}}(z)$ have positive coefficients. In fact, we lose half of the nonnegativity properties encoded in (3), as $c_j = a_{j-1} + h_j^*$, and so the positivity of $c_{\mathcal{P}}(z)$ follows from that of $a_{\mathcal{P}}(z)$ and the nonnegativity of $h_{\mathcal{P}}^*(z)$.

Proof. Suppose $h_{\mathcal{P}}^*(z)$ has codegree l . Let $\mathcal{Q}$ be the pyramid over $\mathcal{P}$ given by

$$\mathcal{Q} := \text{conv}(\{\mathbf{0}\} \cup \{(\mathbf{v}, 1) : \mathbf{v} \text{ vertex of } \mathcal{P}\}) \subset \mathbb{R}^{d+1}.$$

It is well known (see, e.g., [1, Theorem 2.4]) that $h_{\mathcal{P}}^*(z) = h_{\mathcal{Q}}^*(z)$. The Stapledon decomposition (3) for $\mathcal{Q}$ takes on the form

$$(7) \quad (1 + z + \dots + z^l) h_{\mathcal{Q}}^*(z) = a_{\mathcal{Q}}(z) + z^{l+1} b_{\mathcal{Q}}(z).$$

Because the b_j coefficients, as visible in (6), depend only on s (and not on d), $b_{\mathcal{P}}(z) = b_{\mathcal{Q}}(z)$. Thus (3) and (7) yield

$$h_{\mathcal{P}}^*(z) = a_{\mathcal{Q}}(z) - z a_{\mathcal{P}}(z).$$

The analogous decomposition for $h_{\mathcal{P}^\circ}^*(z)$ now follows from (2), and the inequalities among the coefficients stem from (4). $\square$

Corollary 7. *Let $\mathcal{P}$ be a d -dimensional lattice polytope and denote the coefficients of $h_{\mathcal{P}}^*(z)$ by $h_0^*, h_1^*, \dots, h_d^*$. Then for $1 \leq j \leq \lfloor \frac{d}{2} \rfloor - 1$,*

$$(8) \quad h_{d-1}^* + h_{d-2}^* + \dots + h_{d-j}^* \leq h_2^* + h_3^* + \dots + h_{j+1}^*$$

$$(9) \quad h_d^* + h_{d-1}^* + \dots + h_{d-j+1}^* \leq h_2^* + h_3^* + \dots + h_{j+1}^*.$$

We remark that (8) was proved by Stapledon [27, Equation (6)], and one can think of (9) as stemming from the corresponding relations for the pyramid over $\mathcal{P}$.

Proof. We recursively compute from Theorem 6

$$c_0 = c_{d+1} = a_0 = a_d = h_0^*, \quad c_1 = c_d = h_1^* + h_0^*, \quad a_1 = a_{d-1} = h_1^* + h_0^* - h_d^*,$$

and for $2 \leq j \leq \lfloor \frac{d}{2} \rfloor$,

$$c_j = c_{d+1-j} = h_j^* + \cdots + h_0^* - h_d^* - \cdots - h_{d-j+2}^*, \quad a_j = a_{d-j} = h_j^* + \cdots + h_0^* - h_d^* - \cdots - h_{d-j+1}^*.$$

The inequalities $a_1 \leq a_j$ now yield (8), whereas $c_1 \leq c_j$ give (9). $\square$

3. FLOW POLYNOMIALS

Proof of Theorem 3. We use [5, Proposition 2.3], which expresses $\phi_G(n)$ as a sum of Ehrhart polynomials of certain open polytopes, all of which have dimension ξ . (Briefly, one replaces the flow equations over $\mathbb{Z}_n$ by a set of affine equations over $\mathbb{R}$, in which n now acts as a dilation parameter.) Thus $\phi_G^*(z)$ is a sum of Ehrhart h^* -polynomials. By [10] and [5, Corollary 2.9], the number of polytopes that contribute to $\phi_G^*(z)$ equals the number of in-degree sequences of totally cyclic orientations of G . Now use Theorem 6. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 4. As in the proof of [15, Theorem 1], we write

$$f_G(n) = \sum_{\Pi \in T(G)} p_{\Pi}(n)$$

where $T(G)$ is the set of all totally cyclic orientations of G , and $p_{\Pi}(n)$ counts the $\mathbb{Z}$ -flows on Π whose images satisfy $0 < x(e) < n$. As noted in [15], $p_{\Pi}(n)$ is the Ehrhart polynomial of an open polytope with dimension ξ , and so similar to our previous proof, $f_G^*(z)$ is a sum of Ehrhart h^* -polynomials. Now again use Theorem 6. $\square$

Corollary 5 now follows directly from Corollary 7.

4. ORDER AND CHROMATIC POLYNOMIALS

Given a finite poset $(\Pi, \preceq)$ with $|\Pi| = d$, the *order polynomial* $\Omega_{\Pi}^{\circ}(n)$ counts all strictly order-preserving maps from Π to $[n] := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, i.e.,

$$\Omega_{\Pi}^{\circ}(n) := |\{\varphi \in [n]^{\Pi} : a \prec b \implies \varphi(a) < \varphi(b)\}|.$$

Order polynomials first surfaced in [23]; we will encode them via

$$\sum_{n \geq 1} \Omega_{\Pi}^{\circ}(n) z^n = \frac{\Omega_{\Pi}^*(z)}{(1-z)^{d+1}}.$$

(See, e.g., [26] for background on posets and order polynomials.) Order polynomials are Ehrhart polynomials in disguise. We define the *order polytope* of Π as

$$\mathcal{O} := \{\varphi \in [0, 1]^{\Pi} : a \preceq b \implies \varphi(a) \leq \varphi(b)\}.$$

This much-studied subpolytope of the unit cube in $\mathbb{R}^{\Pi}$ was introduced in [25]. From its definition we deduce that

$$\Omega_{\Pi}^{\circ}(n) = \text{ehr}_{\mathcal{O}}(n+1).$$

This implies $\Omega_{\Pi}^*(z) = \frac{1}{z} h_{\mathcal{O}}^*(z)$ and so, with Theorem 6, we can assert the existence of symmetric polynomials $c_{\mathcal{O}}(z) = z^{d+1} c_{\mathcal{O}}(\frac{1}{z})$ and $a_{\mathcal{O}}(z) = z^d a_{\mathcal{O}}(\frac{1}{z})$ with positive integer coefficients such that

$$(10) \quad \Omega_{\Pi}^*(z) = \frac{1}{z} (c_{\mathcal{O}}(z) - a_{\mathcal{O}}(z)).$$

However, we can show something stronger.

Theorem 8. *Let Π be a poset on d elements. Then there exist symmetric polynomials $a_\Pi(z) = z^d a_\Pi(\frac{1}{z})$ and $b_\Pi(z) = z^{d-1} b_\Pi(\frac{1}{z})$ with positive integer coefficients such that*

- (a) $\Omega_\Pi^*(z) = a_\Pi(z) - b_\Pi(z)$;
- (b) *the coefficients of $a_\Pi(z)$ and $b_\Pi(z)$ satisfy $1 = a_0 \leq a_1 \leq a_j$, where $1 \leq j \leq d-1$, and $1 = b_0 \leq b_1 \leq b_j$, where $1 \leq j \leq d-2$.*

Before we prove Theorem 8, we need to introduce more machinery. A *triangulation* of a d -dimensional polytope $\mathcal{P}$ is a collection of simplices so that their union is $\mathcal{P}$ and the intersection of two simplices is a face of both. (See, e.g., [6] for background on triangulations.) A triangulation of $\mathcal{P}$ is *unimodular* if all simplices have integer vertices and (minimal) volume $\frac{1}{d!}$. A triangulation T comes with an *f-polynomial*

$$f_T(z) := \sum_{j=0}^{d+1} f_{j-1} z^j$$

where f_j counts the number of j -dimensional faces of T (and we set $f_{-1} = 1$ for the empty face). We further define the *h-polynomial* of T to be

$$h_T(z) := (1-z)^{d+1} f_T\left(\frac{z}{1-z}\right).$$

If $\mathcal{P}$ has a unimodular triangulation T , it is well known (see, e.g., [1, Chapter 10]) that the h^* -polynomial of $\mathcal{P}$ equals the h -polynomial of T .

Proof of Theorem 8. Let $\mu : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow H_0 := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : x_1 + x_2 + \cdots + x_d = 0\}$ be an orthogonal projection, and let L be the lattice in H_0 generated by $\mu(\mathbf{e}_1), \mu(\mathbf{e}_2), \dots, \mu(\mathbf{e}_{d-1})$, i.e., $L = \mu(\mathbb{Z}^d)$, and $\mu(\mathbf{e}_d) = -\mu(\mathbf{e}_1) - \cdots - \mu(\mathbf{e}_{d-1})$.

We claim that the order polytope $\mathcal{O}$ of Π and $\mu(\mathcal{O})$ have the same h^* -polynomial. To see this, consider the canonical unimodular triangulation T of $\mathcal{O}$, using the hyperplanes $x_j = x_k$. The image of each simplex $\Delta \in T$ under the projection μ is a unimodular simplex in H_0 (with respect to L), and the vertices $(0, \dots, 0)$ and $(1, \dots, 1)$ both get projected to the origin. This gives a unimodular triangulation T_μ of $\mu(\mathcal{O})$, and T is combinatorially a cone over T_μ ; in particular, the f -vectors of T and T_μ are related via

$$f_T(z) = f_{T_\mu}(z)(1+z).$$

Because both triangulations are unimodular,³

$$\begin{aligned} h_{\mathcal{O}}^*(z) &= h_T(z) = (1-z)^{d+1} f_T\left(\frac{z}{1-z}\right) = (1-z)^{d+1} \left(1 + \frac{z}{1-z}\right) f_{T_\mu}\left(\frac{z}{1-z}\right) \\ (11) \quad &= (1-z)^d f_{T_\mu}\left(\frac{z}{1-z}\right) = h_{T_\mu}(z) = h_{\mu(\mathcal{O})}^*(z). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, if $\mathcal{O}$ has codegree l , then the codegree of $\mu(\mathcal{O})$ is $l-1$, and so the Stapledon decomposition (3) for $\mu(\mathcal{O})$ takes on the form

$$(1 + z + \cdots + z^{l-2}) h_{\mu(\mathcal{O})}^*(z) = a_{\mu(\mathcal{O})}(z) + z^{l-1} b_{\mu(\mathcal{O})}(z).$$

As in our proof of Theorem 6, we have $b_{\mu(\mathcal{O})}(z) = b_{\mathcal{O}}(z)$, which together with (11) yields

$$h_{\mathcal{O}}^*(z) = a_{\mathcal{O}}(z) - z a_{\mu(\mathcal{O})}(z).$$

³ The equality (11) of $h_{\mathcal{O}}^*(z)$ and $h_{\mu(\mathcal{O})}^*(z)$ can be also seen by noticing that the triangulations T and T_μ are regular and therefore shellable, and they have the same h -polynomial. See, e.g., [11] why order polytopes are compressed, and therefore have regular unimodular triangulations, and also how these properties are preserved under the projection μ . We also note that projected order polytopes are examples of *alcoved polytopes* [17].

But then

$$\Omega_{\Pi}^*(z) = \frac{1}{z} h_{\mathcal{O}^\circ}^*(z) = z^d h_{\mathcal{O}}^*\left(\frac{1}{z}\right) = z^d a_{\mathcal{O}}\left(\frac{1}{z}\right) - z^{d-1} a_{\mu(\mathcal{O})}\left(\frac{1}{z}\right) = a_{\mathcal{O}}(z) - a_{\mu(\mathcal{O})}(z). \quad \square$$

The last equation in our proof reveals one more set of inequalities: namely, since order polytopes are compressed, they satisfy [12, Corollary 3.2], and so

$$(12) \quad \Omega_{d-j}^* = h_j^* \leq \binom{h_1^* + j - 1}{j} = \binom{\Omega_{d-1}^* + j - 1}{j}.$$

Corollary 9. *Let Π be a poset on d elements. Then the coefficients of $\Omega_{\Pi}^*(z)$ satisfy, for $2 \leq j \leq \lfloor \frac{d}{2} \rfloor$,*

$$\Omega_{d-2}^* + \Omega_{d-3}^* + \cdots + \Omega_{d-j}^* \geq \Omega_2^* + \Omega_3^* + \cdots + \Omega_j^*.$$

Proof. We compute recursively from Theorem 8 that $a_0 = a_d = \Omega_d^*$, $b_0 = b_{d-1} = \Omega_d^* - \Omega_0^*$,

$$a_1 = a_{d-1} = \Omega_d^* + \Omega_{d-1}^* - \Omega_0^*, \quad b_1 = b_{d-2} = \Omega_d^* + \Omega_{d-1}^* - \Omega_0^* - \Omega_1^*,$$

and for $2 \leq j \leq \lfloor \frac{d-1}{2} \rfloor$

$$a_j = a_{d-j} = \Omega_d^* + \cdots + \Omega_{d-j}^* - \Omega_0^* - \cdots - \Omega_{j-1}^*, \quad b_j = b_{d-j-1} = \Omega_d^* + \cdots + \Omega_{d-j}^* - \Omega_0^* - \cdots - \Omega_j^*.$$

The inequalities $a_1 \leq a_j$ and $b_1 \leq b_j$ now yield

$$(13) \quad \Omega_{d-2}^* + \Omega_{d-3}^* + \cdots + \Omega_{d-j-1}^* \geq \Omega_1^* + \Omega_2^* + \cdots + \Omega_j^*$$

$$(14) \quad \Omega_{d-2}^* + \Omega_{d-3}^* + \cdots + \Omega_{d-j-1}^* \geq \Omega_2^* + \Omega_3^* + \cdots + \Omega_{j+1}^*.$$

However, Ω_1^* equals the coefficient h_{d-1}^* of the accompanying order polytope. It is well known (see, e.g., [1, Chapter 4]) that $h_{\mathcal{P}}^*(z)$ has degree s if and only if $(d+1-s)\mathcal{P}$ is the first dilate of $\mathcal{P}$ that contains an interior lattice point. An order polytope $\mathcal{O}$ contains no interior lattice point, and $2\mathcal{O}$ does only for $\mathcal{O} = [0, 1]^d$, i.e., the underlying poset is an antichain. So unless we're in the latter case, $\Omega_1^* = 0$, and (14) implies (13).

Finally, if $\mathcal{O} = [0, 1]^d$ then $\Omega_{\Pi}^*(z)$ is a shifted version of an Eulerian polynomial, which is well known to be unimodal, and this implies $\Omega_{d-j}^* \geq \Omega_{d-j+1}^* = \Omega_j^*$ for $2 \leq j \leq \lfloor \frac{d-1}{2} \rfloor$. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1 and Corollary 2. Let $A(G)$ be the set of all acyclic orientations of G . Then the chromatic polynomial $\chi_G(n)$ of G decomposes naturally into order polynomials as

$$(15) \quad \chi_G(n) = \sum_{\Pi \in A(G)} \Omega_{\Pi}^{\circ}(n).$$

Here we identify an acyclic orientation Π with its corresponding poset. (In this language, it is quite natural to think of $\Omega_{\Pi}^{\circ}(n)$ as the chromatic polynomial of the digraph Π .) Because every $\Pi \in A(G)$ has d elements,

$$(16) \quad \chi_G^*(z) = \sum_{\Pi \in A(G)} \Omega_{\Pi}^*(z),$$

and so Theorem 1 follows from Theorem 8 and Corollary 2 from Corollary 9. $\square$

Equations (12) and (16) explain where (1) stem from.

5. RELATION TO PREVIOUS WORK

In this section, we explain the relation of our work to that of Hersh–Swartz [13] and Breuer–Dall [4]. In our language, Hersh and Swartz proved that

$$\chi_{d-j}^* \geq \chi_j^* \quad \text{for } 2 \leq j \leq \frac{d-1}{2},$$

and Breuer and Dall showed that

$$\phi_{\xi-j}^* \geq \phi_j^* \quad \text{for } 1 \leq j \leq \frac{d-1}{2}.$$

As mentioned in the introduction, the first set of inequalities implies Corollary 2, whereas the second set implies the first of the four inequalities in Corollary 5. It is unclear to us whether the remaining inequalities in Corollary 5 follow in a similar manner from the ideas in [4]. At any rate, the methods in [4, 13] are algebraic: one constructs a simplicial complex whose h -vector satisfies certain inequalities (stemming from a convex-ear decomposition) and is closely related to χ^*/ϕ^* (this relation involves Eulerian polynomials; the same is not true for f^* , which makes that situation different).

REFERENCES

1. Matthias Beck and Sinai Robins, *Computing the Continuous Discretely: Integer-point Enumeration in Polyhedra*, second ed., Undergraduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer, New York, 2015, electronically available at <http://math.sfsu.edu/beck/ccd.html>.
2. Ulrich Betke and Peter McMullen, *Lattice points in lattice polytopes*, Monatsh. Math. **99** (1985), no. 4, 253–265.
3. Francesco Brenti, *Expansions of chromatic polynomials and log-concavity*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **332** (1992), no. 2, 729–756.
4. Felix Breuer and Aaron Dall, *Bounds on the coefficients of tension and flow polynomials*, J. Algebraic Combin. **33** (2011), no. 3, 465–482, [arXiv:1004.3470](https://arxiv.org/abs/1004.3470).
5. Felix Breuer and Raman Sanyal, *Ehrhart theory, modular flow reciprocity, and the Tutte polynomial*, Math. Z. **270** (2012), no. 1–2, 1–18, [arXiv:0907.0845](https://arxiv.org/abs/0907.0845).
6. Jesús A. De Loera, Jörg Rambau, and Francisco Santos, *Triangulations*, Algorithms and Computation in Mathematics, vol. 25, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2010.
7. Eugène Ehrhart, *Sur les polyèdres rationnels homothétiques à n dimensions*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris **254** (1962), 616–618.
8. Emden R. Gansner and Kiem Phong Vo, *The chromatic generating function*, Linear and Multilinear Algebra **22** (1987), no. 1, 87–93.
9. Ira M. Gessel, *Acyclic orientations and chromatic generating functions*, Discrete Math. **232** (2001), no. 1–3, 119–130.
10. Emeric Gioan, *Enumerating degree sequences in digraphs and a cycle-cocycle reversing system*, European J. Combin. **28** (2007), no. 4, 1351–1366.
11. Christian Haase, Andreas Paffenholz, Lindsay C. Piechnik, and Francisco Santos, *Existence of unimodular triangulations—positive results*, Preprint ([arXiv:1405.1687](https://arxiv.org/abs/1405.1687)).
12. Gábor Hegedüs, *An upper bound theorem concerning lattice polytopes*, Studia Sci. Math. Hungar. **52** (2015), no. 3, 337–349.
13. Patricia Hersh and Ed Swartz, *Coloring complexes and arrangements*, J. Algebraic Combin. **27** (2008), no. 2, 205–214, [arXiv:math/0706.3657](https://arxiv.org/abs/math/0706.3657).
14. François Jaeger, *Nowhere-zero flow problems*, Lowell W. Beineke, Robin J. Wilson (Eds.), Selected topics in graph theory, vol. 3, Academic Press, San Diego, CA, 1988, pp. 71–95.
15. Martin Kochol, *Polynomials associated with nowhere-zero flows*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B **84** (2002), no. 2, 260–269.
16. Robert R. Korfhage, *σ -polynomials and graph coloring*, J. Combinatorial Theory Ser. B **24** (1978), no. 2, 137–153.
17. Thomas Lam and Alexander Postnikov, *Alcoved polytopes. I*, Discrete Comput. Geom. **38** (2007), no. 3, 453–478, [arXiv:math/0501246](https://arxiv.org/abs/math/0501246).
18. Nathan Linial, *Graph coloring and monotone functions on posets*, Discrete Math. **58** (1986), no. 1, 97–98.
19. Ian G. Macdonald, *Polynomials associated with finite cell-complexes*, J. London Math. Soc. (2) **4** (1971), 181–192.
20. Sam Payne, *Ehrhart series and lattice triangulations*, Discrete Comput. Geom. **40** (2008), no. 3, 365–376, [arXiv:math/0702052](https://arxiv.org/abs/math/0702052).
21. The Sage Developers, *Sagemath, the Sage Mathematics Software System (Version 7.3)*, 2016, <http://www.sagemath.org>.

22. Paul D. Seymour, *Nowhere-zero flows*, Handbook of combinatorics, Vol. 1, 2, Elsevier Sci. B. V., Amsterdam, 1995, Appendix: Colouring, stable sets and perfect graphs, pp. 289–299.
23. Richard P. Stanley, *A chromatic-like polynomial for ordered sets*, Proc. Second Chapel Hill Conf. on Combinatorial Mathematics and its Applications (Univ. North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C., 1970), Univ. North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C., 1970, pp. 421–427.
24. ———, *Decompositions of rational convex polytopes*, Ann. Discrete Math. **6** (1980), 333–342.
25. ———, *Two poset polytopes*, Discrete Comput. Geom. **1** (1986), no. 1, 9–23.
26. ———, *Enumerative Combinatorics. Volume 1*, second ed., Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 49, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012.
27. Alan Stapledon, *Inequalities and Ehrhart δ -vectors*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **361** (2009), no. 10, 5615–5626, [arXiv:math/0801.0873](https://arxiv.org/abs/math/0801.0873).
28. Ioan Tomescu, *Graphical Eulerian numbers and chromatic generating functions*, Discrete Math. **66** (1987), no. 3, 315–318.
29. William T. Tutte, *A ring in graph theory*, Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **43** (1947), 26–40.
30. Herbert S. Wilf, *Which polynomials are chromatic?*, Colloquio Internazionale sulle Teorie Combinatorie (Roma, 1973), Tomo I, Accad. Naz. Lincei, Rome, 1976, pp. 247–256.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94132, U.S.A.

E-mail address: mattbeck@sfsu.edu

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICAS, UNIVERSIDAD DE LOS ANDES, BOGOTÁ, COLOMBIA

E-mail address: emersonleon@gmail.com