Abstract

DP-coloring (also called correspondence coloring) is a generalization of list coloring introduced by Dvořák and Postle in 2015. In 2019, Bernshteyn, Kostochka, and Zhu introduced a fractional version of DP-coloring. They showed that unlike the fractional list chromatic number, the fractional DP-chromatic number of a graph $G$, denoted $\chi^*_\text{DP}(G)$, can be arbitrarily larger than $\chi^*(G)$, the graph’s fractional chromatic number. In this note we show that for any $n \geq 2$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$, there is a $t \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\chi^*_\text{DP}(K_{n,m}) \leq n + 1 - 1/t$, and we determine a lower bound on $\chi^*_\text{DP}(K_{2,m})$ for any $m \geq 3$. In studying fractional list coloring, Erdős, Rubin, Taylor asked: If $G$ is $(a,b)$-choosable and $c, d \in \mathbb{N}$ are such that $c/d > a/b$, must $G$ be $(c,d)$-choosable? It is known that the answer to this question is no, and we show that the answer to the analogue of this question in the context of fractional DP-coloring is also no. We also generalize a result of Alon, Tuza, and Voigt, and in the process, show that for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\chi^*_\text{DP}(C_{2k+1}) = \chi^*(C_{2k+1})$.
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1 Introduction

In this paper all graphs are nonempty, finite, simple graphs unless otherwise noted. Generally speaking we follow West [14] for terminology and notation. The set of natural numbers is $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, 3, \ldots\}$. Given a set $A$, $\mathcal{P}(A)$ is the power set of $A$. For $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we write $[m]$ for the set $\{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$. If $G$ is a graph and $S, U \subseteq V(G)$, we use $G[S]$ for the subgraph of $G$ induced by $S$, and we use $E_G(S, U)$ for the subset of $E(G)$ with one endpoint in $S$ and one endpoint in $U$. For $v \in V(G)$, we write $d_G(v)$ for the degree of vertex $v$ in the graph $G$, and we write $N_G(v)$ (resp. $N_G[v]$) for the neighborhood (resp. closed neighborhood) of vertex $v$ in the graph $G$. Also, for $S \subseteq V(G)$, we let $N_G(S) = \bigcup_{v \in S} N_G(v)$. A graph $G$ is $d$-degenerate if every subgraph of $G$ has a vertex of degree at most $d$. We use $K_{n,m}$ to denote complete bipartite graphs with partite sets of size $n$ and $m$.
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1.1 Fractional Coloring and Fractional Choosability

Before we focus on fractional DP-coloring, we briefly review some classic notions. Given a graph $G$, in the classic vertex coloring problem we wish to color the elements of $V(G)$ with colors from the set $[m]$ so that adjacent vertices receive different colors, a so-called proper $m$-coloring. We say $G$ is $m$-colorable when a proper $m$-coloring of $G$ exists. The chromatic number of $G$, denoted $\chi(G)$, is the smallest $k$ such that $G$ is $k$-colorable.

A set coloring of a graph $G$ is a function that assigns a set to each vertex of $G$ such that the sets assigned to adjacent vertices are disjoint. For $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$ with $a \geq b$, an $(a, b)$-coloring of graph $G$ is a set coloring, $f$, of $G$ such that the codomain of $f$ is the set of $b$-element subsets of $[a]$. We say that $G$ is $(a, b)$-colorable when an $(a, b)$-coloring of $G$ exists. So, saying $G$ is $a$-colorable is equivalent to saying that it is $(a, 1)$-colorable. The fractional chromatic number, $\chi^*(G)$, of $G$ is defined by $\chi^*(G) = \inf\{a/b : G$ is $(a, b)$-colorable$\}$. Since any graph $G$ is $(\chi(G), 1)$-colorable, we have that $\chi^*(G) \leq \chi(G)$. This inequality may however be strict; for example, when $r \geq 2$, $\chi^*(C_{2r+1}) = 2 + 1/r < 3 = \chi(C_{2r+1})$ (see [11]). It is also well known that the infimum in the definition of $\chi^*(G)$ is actually a minimum [11].

List coloring is a variation on classic vertex coloring that was introduced independently by Vizing [13] and Erdős, Rubin, and Taylor [6] in the 1970’s. In list coloring, we associate with graph $G$ a list assignment, $L$, that assigns to each vertex $v \in V(G)$ a list, $L(v)$, of available colors. Graph $G$ is said to be $L$-colorable if there exists a proper coloring $f$ of $G$ such that $f(v) \in L(v)$ for each $v \in V(G)$ (we refer to $f$ as a proper $L$-coloring of $G$). A list assignment $L$ is called a $k$-assignment for $G$ if $|L(v)| = k$ for each $v \in V(G)$. We say $G$ is $k$-choosable if $G$ is $L$-colorable whenever $L$ is a $k$-assignment for $G$. The list chromatic number of $G$, denoted $\chi_L(G)$, is the smallest $k$ for which $G$ is $k$-choosable. Since a $k$-assignment can assign the same $k$ colors to every vertex of a graph, $\chi(G) \leq \chi_L(G)$.

Given an $a$-assignment, $L$, for graph $G$ and $b \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $a \geq b$, we say that $f$ is an $(L, b)$-coloring of $G$ if $f$ is a set coloring of $G$ such that for each each $v \in V(G)$, $f(v) \subseteq L(v)$ with $|f(v)| = b$. We say that $G$ is $(L, b)$-colorable when an $(L, b)$-coloring of $G$ exists. Also, for $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$ with $a \geq b$ graph $G$ is $(a, b)$-choosable if $G$ is $(L, b)$-colorable whenever $L$ is an $a$-assignment for $G$. The fractional list chromatic number, $\chi_L^*(G)$, of $G$ is defined by $\chi_L^*(G) = \inf\{a/b : G$ is $(a, b)$-choosable$\}$. It is clear that if a graph is $(a, b)$-choosable, then it is $(a, b)$-colorable. So, $\chi^*(G) \leq \chi_L^*(G)$. In 1997, Alon, Tuza, and Voigt [1] famously proved that for any graph $G$, $\chi_L^*(G) = \chi^*(G)$. Moreover, they showed that for any graph $G$, there is an $M \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $G$ is $(M, M/\chi^*(G))$-choosable. So, the infimum in the definition of $\chi_L^*(G)$ is also actually a minimum.

In their 1979 paper Erdős et al. [6] asked: If $G$ is $(a, b)$-choosable and $c, d \in \mathbb{N}$ are such that $c/d > a/b$, must $G$ be $(c, d)$-choosable? A negative answer to this question is given in [8]. Erdős et. al. also asked: If $G$ is $(a, b)$-choosable, does it follow that $G$ is $(at, bt)$-choosable for each $t \in \mathbb{N}$? Tuza and Voigt [12] showed that the answer to this question is yes when $a = 2$ and $b = 1$. However, in general, a negative answer to this question was recently given in [H].

In this note we will consider the fractional DP-coloring analogues of both of these questions.\footnote{For each $a \geq 4$, a graph that is $(a, 1)$-choosable but not $(2a, 2)$-choosable is constructed.}
1.2 Fractional DP-coloring

In 2015, Dvořák and Postle [5] introduced DP-coloring (they called it correspondence coloring) in order to prove that every planar graph without cycles of lengths 4 to 8 is 3-choosable. Intuitively, DP-coloring is a generalization of list coloring where each vertex in the graph still gets a list of colors but identification of which colors are different can vary from edge to edge. Following [2], we now give the formal definition. Suppose $G$ is a graph. A cover of $G$ is a pair $\mathcal{H} = (L, H)$ consisting of a graph $H$ and a function $L : V(G) \to \mathcal{P}(V(H))$ satisfying the following four requirements:

1. the sets $\{L(u) : u \in V(G)\}$ form a partition of $V(H)$;
2. for every $u \in V(G)$, the graph $H[L(u)]$ is complete;
3. if $E_H(L(u), L(v))$ is nonempty, then $u = v$ or $uv \in E(G)$;
4. if $uv \in E(G)$, then $E_H(L(u), L(v))$ is a matching (the matching may be empty).

Suppose $\mathcal{H} = (L, H)$ is a cover of $G$. We say $\mathcal{H}$ is $m$-fold if $|L(u)| = m$ for each $u \in V(G)$. An $\mathcal{H}$-coloring of $G$ is an independent set in $H$ of size $|V(G)|$. Clearly, an independent set $I \subseteq V(H)$ is an $\mathcal{H}$-coloring of $G$ if and only if $|I \cap L(u)| = 1$ for each $u \in V(G)$. The DP-chromatic number of a graph $G$, $\chi_{DP}(G)$, is the smallest $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $G$ admits an $\mathcal{H}$-coloring for every $m$-fold cover $\mathcal{H}$ of $G$.

Given an $m$-assignment, $L$, for a graph $G$, it is easy to construct an $m$-fold cover $\mathcal{H}$ of $G$ such that $G$ has an $\mathcal{H}$-coloring if and only if $G$ has a proper $L$-coloring (see [2]). It follows that $\chi_G(G) \leq \chi_{DP}(G)$. This inequality may be strict since it is easy to prove that $\chi_{DP}(C_n) = 3$ whenever $n \geq 3$, but the list chromatic number of any even cycle is 2 (see [2] and [6]).

It is now natural to define fractional DP-coloring. Given a cover $\mathcal{H} = (L, H)$ of a graph $G$, we refer to the edges of $H$ connecting distinct parts of the partition $\{L(v) : v \in V(G)\}$ as cross-edges. A subset $S \subseteq V(H)$ is quasi-independent if $H[S]$ contains no cross-edges.

Suppose $\mathcal{H} = (L, H)$ is an $a$-fold cover of $G$ and $b \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $a \geq b$. Then, $G$ is $(\mathcal{H}, b)$-colorable if there is a quasi-independent set $S \subseteq V(H)$ such that $|S \cap L(v)| \geq b$ for each $v \in V(G)$. We refer to $S$ as an $(\mathcal{H}, b)$-coloring of $G$. For $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$ and $a \geq b$, we say graph $G$ is $(a, b)$-DP-colorable if for any $a$-fold cover of $G$, $\mathcal{H}$, $G$ is $(\mathcal{H}, b)$-colorable. The fractional DP-chromatic number, $\chi_{DP}(G)$, of $G$ is defined by

$$\chi_{DP}^*(G) = \inf\{a/b : G \text{ is } (a, b)\text{-DP-colorable}\}.$$

It is easy to prove that if $G$ is $(a, b)$-DP-colorable, then $G$ is $(a, b)$-choosable. Also, any graph $G$ must be $(\chi_{DP}(G), 1)$-DP-colorable. So, combining the facts we know, we have:

$$\chi^*_G = \chi^*_G(G) \leq \chi_{DP}^*(G) \leq \chi_{DP}(G).$$

Both of the inequalities above can be strict. Furthermore, we know that $\chi^*_G(G) \leq \chi_G(G) \leq \chi_{DP}(G)$, and we will see below that it is possible for the list chromatic number of a graph to be either smaller ($K_{2,3}$ by Theorem 1 below) or larger (odd cycles by Theorem 2 below) than the fractional DP-chromatic number of the graph.

In [3] the following result is proven.²

²Equivalently, one could require $|S \cap L(v)| = b$ for each $v \in V(G)$.
Theorem 7. Let $G$ be a connected graph. Then, $\chi^*_{DP}(G) \leq 2$ if and only if $G$ contains no odd cycles and at most one even cycle. Furthermore, if $G$ contains no odd cycles and exactly one even cycle, then $\chi^*_{DP}(G) = 2$ even though 2 is not contained in the set $\{a/b : G$ is $(a, b)$-$DP$-colorable$\}$.

So, unlike the fractional chromatic number and fractional list chromatic number, the infimum in the definition of the fractional DP-chromatic number is not a minimum. In [3] it is also shown that if $G$ is a graph of maximum average degree $d \geq 4$, then $\chi^*_{DP}(G) \geq d/(2 \ln d)$. Since bipartite graphs have fractional chromatic number (and hence fractional list chromatic number) 2 and there exist bipartite graphs with arbitrarily high average degree, we see $\chi^*_{DP}(G)$ and $\chi^*(G)$ can be arbitrarily far apart and $\chi^*_{DP}(G)$ can not be bounded above by a function of $\chi^*(G)$.

1.3 Outline of Results and Open Questions

We now present an outline of the results of this note while also mentioning some open questions. We begin by studying the fractional DP-chromatic number of odd cycles. In 1997, Alon, Tuza, and Voigt showed that $C_{2r+1}$ is $(2r+1, r)$-choosable (cf. Proposition 5.1 in [1]). We generalize this result by showing the following.

Theorem 2. $C_{2r+1}$ is $(2r+1, r)$-$DP$-colorable. Consequently, $\chi^*_{DP}(C_{2r+1}) = 2 + 1/r$.

Notice that by Theorem 2 we see it is possible for the list chromatic number of a graph to be larger than its fractional DP-chromatic number since $\chi^*_{DP}(C_{2r+1}) < \chi^*(C_{2r+1}) = 3$. The other possibility is shown by Theorem 1 below.

It is natural to ask analogues of the two questions posed about $(a, b)$-choosability in [6].

Question 3. If $G$ is $(a, b)$-$DP$-colorable and $c, d \in \mathbb{N}$ are such that $c/d > a/b$, must $G$ be $(c, d)$-$DP$-colorable?

Question 4. If $G$ is $(a, b)$-$DP$-colorable, does it follow that $G$ is $(at, bt)$-$DP$-colorable for each $t \in \mathbb{N}$?

Question 4 is open. In this note we prove the answer to Question 3 is no by proving the following results.

Theorem 5. There exists $a, b, k, t \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $k > a/b$, $K_{k,t}$ is not $(k, 1)$-$DP$-colorable, and $K_{k,t}$ is $(a, b)$-$DP$-colorable.

Proposition 6. For each $k \geq 149$, there exists a $k$-degenerate bipartite graph, $G$, and $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$ such that: $k > a/b$, $G$ is not $(k, 1)$-$DP$-colorable, and $G$ is $(a, b)$-$DP$-colorable

Finally, we study the fractional DP-chromatic number of complete bipartite graphs.

Theorem 7. Suppose $n \geq 2$, $t \in \mathbb{N}$, $G = K_{n,m}$, and

$$m < \frac{(n+1)(n+1)^{n} \prod_{i=0}^{n-2} (n-i)!}{(n+1) nt - 1} \prod_{i=1}^{n-2} (n-i)!} = n \prod_{i=0}^{n-2} (nt - i)!/(nt - 1)! = n \prod_{i=0}^{n-2} \prod_{j=0}^{t-1} \frac{nt + j}{(n-i)t - j}.$$ 

Then, $G$ is $((n+1)t - 1, t)$-$DP$-colorable. Consequently, $\chi^*_{DP}(G) \leq n + 1 - 1/t$. 

For example, letting \( n = t = 2 \) in the Theorem 7 inequality, it is easy to see that
\[ 3 < 2(4/4)(5/3). \]
So, \( \chi_{DP}(K_{2,3}) \leq 2.5 \). Similarly letting \( n = 2 \) and \( t = 5 \), we see that
\[ 15 < 2(10/10)(11/9)(12/8)(13/7)(14/6). \]
So, \( \chi_{DP}(K_{2,15}) \leq 2.8 \). From Theorem 7 it is easy to deduce the following Corollary.

**Corollary 8.** For \( n \geq 2 \) and \( m \in \mathbb{N} \), there is a \( t \in \mathbb{N} \) such that
\[ \chi_{DP}(K_{n,m}) \leq n + 1 - 1/t. \]

It follows from Theorem 1 that for each \( m \in \mathbb{N} \), \( \chi_{DP}(K_{1,m}) = 2 \) since \( K_{1,m} \) has at least one edge. It is now important to mention a result from [3].

**Theorem 9 ([3]).** If \( G \) is a \( d \)-degenerate bipartite graph, then
\[ \chi_{DP}(G) \leq (1 + o(1))d/\ln(d) \]
as \( d \to \infty \).

Since \( K_{n,m} \) is \( n \)-degenerate when \( n \leq m \), we see that in light of Theorem 9 the result of Theorem 7 is only interesting for small values of \( n \). One interesting open question involves analyzing how good the bound obtained in Theorem 7 is for small values of \( n \).

**Question 10.** Does there exist an \( n \geq 2 \) so that: for every \( \epsilon > 0 \), there is an \( m \in \mathbb{N} \) such that
\[ n + 1 - \epsilon \leq \chi_{DP}(K_{n,m}). \]

For example, we suspect that \( \chi_{DP}(K_{2,m}) \) can be arbitrarily close to 3 provided that \( m \) is sufficiently large. In studying \( \chi_{DP}(K_{2,m}) \), we obtained the following result which provides a lower bound.

**Theorem 11.** Suppose \( G = K_{2,m} \) where \( m \geq 3 \). Suppose \( d \in (0,0.125) \) is chosen so that
\[ \frac{(d + 2)^{2/m}(d + 1)^{d+1}(1 - d)^{d-1}}{(d + 2)(d^{2d})} < 1. \]

Then, \( 2 + d \leq \chi_{DP}(G) \).

For example, notice that when \( m = 15 \) and \( d = 0.0959 \), the inequality in the hypothesis is satisfied. So, by Theorems 7 and 11 we have that \( 2.0959 \leq \chi_{DP}(K_{2,15}) \leq 2.8 \). Since we suspect a positive answer to Question 10 for \( n = 2 \), we think that the lower bound provided by Theorem 11 can be improved by quite a bit for large values of \( m \). Notice that Theorem 11 implies that \( 2.025 \leq \chi_{DP}(K_{2,3}) \) which means it is possible for a graph to have a fractional DP-chromatic number that is larger than its list chromatic number since
\[ 2 = \chi_{l}(K_{2,3}) < \chi_{DP}(K_{2,3}). \]

### 2 Proofs of Results

#### 2.1 Odd Cycles

We now prove Theorem 2.

**Proof.** Suppose that the vertices of \( G \) in cyclic order are: \( v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_{2r+1} \). Suppose that \( \mathcal{H} = (L, H) \) is an arbitrary \( (2r + 1) \)-fold cover of \( G \). We must show that there is an \((\mathcal{H}, r)\)-coloring of \( G \). We may assume that \( E_H(L(u), L(v)) \) is a perfect matching whenever \( uv \in E(G) \) since adding additional cross-edges to \( H \) only makes it harder to find an \((\mathcal{H}, r)\)-coloring.
Now, let $H^*$ be the graph with vertex set $\bigcup_{i=1}^{2r+1} L(v_i)$ and edge set $\bigcup_{uv \in E(G)} E_H(L(u), L(v))$. Clearly, $H^*$ is a 2-regular graph. This means that $H^*$ can be decomposed into vertex disjoint cycles: $B_1, B_2, \ldots, B_p$. The size of each of these cycles is a multiple of $2r + 1$. Let us suppose that $B_1, \ldots, B_l$ are even cycles and $B_{l+1}, \ldots, B_p$ are odd cycles (Note: we allow $l = 0$ since it is possible that none of the cycles in our decomposition are even. We also know the number of odd cycles in our decomposition must be odd since $|E(H^*)| = (2r + 1)^2$). Clearly, $1 \leq p \leq 2r + 1$, and $|L(v_i) \cap V(B_j)| \geq 1$ for each $i \in [2r + 1]$ and $j \in [p]$.

Let $H^{**}$ be the graph obtained from $H$ as follows: for each $j \in [p]$ we delete a vertex $d_j \in L(v_j) \cap V(B_j)$. We let $L'(v_j) = L(v_j) \setminus \{d_j\}$ for each $j \in [p]$ and $L'(v_i) = L(v_i)$ for each $t > p$. So, $H^{**}$ consists of $p$ vertex disjoint paths, and for each $j \in [p]$, let $P_j = B_j - \{d_j\}$. Note that if $1 < j < 2r + 1$, the endpoints of $P_j$ are in $L'(v_{j-1})$ and $L'(v_{j+1})$. Also for each $j \in [p]$, $|V(P_j)| = (2r + 1)k_j + 2r$ where $k_j$ is a nonnegative integer that is odd when $j \leq l$ and even when $j > l$. It is easy to see:

$$|V(H^{**})| = (2r + 1)^2 - p = \sum_{j=1}^{p}((2r + 1)k_j + 2r) = 2rp + (2r + 1)\sum_{j=1}^{p}k_j.$$  

Thus, $\sum_{j=1}^{p}k_j = 2r + 1 - p$. Now, we name the vertices of each path of $H^{**}$. Specifically, for $j \in [p]$ let the vertices of $P_j$ (in order) be: $a^j_1, a^j_2, \ldots, a^j_{(2r+1)k_j+2r}$ so that $a^j_1 \in L'(v_{j+1})$ if $j < 2r + 1$ and $a^j_1 \in L'(v_1)$ if $j = 2r + 1$. We call a vertex $a^j_m \in V(H^{**})$ odd if $m$ is odd. Let $S$ consist of all the odd vertices in $H^{**}$. Clearly, $S$ is a quasi-independent set of $H$. We claim that $|S \cap L'(v_i)| \geq r$ for each $i \in [2r + 1]$.

In the case that $p = 1$, $P_1$ is a path of length $(2r + 1)^2 - 2$, and we have that for $i \in [2r + 1]$, $|S \cap V(P_1) \cap L'(v_i)| = r + 1$ when $i$ is even, and $|S \cap V(P_1) \cap L'(v_i)| = r$ when $i$ is odd. In the case that $p = 2r + 1$, each of $P_1, \ldots, P_{2r+1}$ is a path of length $2r - 1$, and we have that for $i \in [2r + 1]$, $|S \cap L'(v_i)| = r$.

So, we turn our attention to the case where $2 \leq p \leq 2r$. For each $j \in [l]$ notice that $P_j$ is a path with an odd number of vertices. So, when $j \in [l]$, $|S \cap V(P_j)| = (2r + 1)(k_j + 1)/2$. Moreover, since $G$ is an odd cycle, for each $j \in [l]$ and $i \in [2r + 1]$, we have that $|S \cap V(P_j) \cap L'(v_i)| = (k_j + 1)/2$.

Now, let $\mathcal{L} = \{l + 1, l + 3, \ldots, p - 2\}$ (Note: $\mathcal{L}$ is empty if $l + 1 > p - 2$ and $|\mathcal{L}| \leq r - 1$). For each $j \in \mathcal{L}$ we consider $P_j$ and $P_{j+1}$ together. Note $P_j$ and $P_{j+1}$ are paths with an even number of vertices. So, when $j \in \mathcal{L}$, $|S \cap (V(P_j) \cup V(P_{j+1}))| = (2r + 1)(k_j + k_{j+1})/2 + 2r$. Therefore, when $j \in \mathcal{L}$ and $i \in [2r + 1] - \{j\}$, $|S \cap (V(P_j) \cup V(P_{j+1})) \cap L'(v_i)| = (k_j + k_{j+1})/2$, and for each $j \in \mathcal{L}$, $|S \cap (V(P_j) \cup V(P_{j+1})) \cap L'(v_i)| = (k_j + k_{j+1})/2$ (since $a^j_1 \in L'(v_1)$ and $a^{j+1}_{(2r+1)k_{j+1}+2r} \in L'(v_j)$). Thus, for $i \in [2r + 1] - \mathcal{L}$, we have:

$$\left|\bigcup_{j=1}^{p-1} (V(P_j) \cap S \cap L'(v_i))\right| = \sum_{j=1}^{l} \frac{k_i + 1}{2} + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{L}} \frac{k_j + k_{j+1} + 2}{2}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} (k_i + 1)$$
\[ p - 1 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} k_i = p - 1 + 2r + 1 - p - k_p = r - \frac{k_p}{2}. \]

Similarly, for \( i \in \mathcal{L} \), we have:

\[ \left| \bigcup_{j=1}^{p-1} (V(P_j) \cap S \cap L'(v_i)) \right| = r - \frac{k_p}{2}. \]

It is easy to see that \( |S \cap V(P_p) \cap L'(v_i)| \geq k_p/2 \) for each \( i \in [2r+1] \). If \( |\mathcal{L}| \geq 1 \), notice that \( a_{(2r+1)k_p+2r}^p \in L'(v_{p-1}) \). So, when \( |\mathcal{L}| \geq 1 \), the last odd vertex in \( V(P_p) \) is in \( L'(v_{p-2}) \). So, we know that for each \( i \in \mathcal{L} \),

\[ |S \cap V(P_p) \cap L'(v_i)| = \frac{k_p}{2} + 1. \]

It follows that \( |S \cap L'(v_i)| \geq r \) for each \( i \in [2r+1] \) which implies that \( S \) is a \((\mathcal{H}, r)\)-coloring of \( G \).

2.2 Question 3

We show the answer to Question 3 is no by proving Theorem 5.

Theorem 5. There exists \( a, b, k, t \in \mathbb{N} \) such that \( k > a/b \), \( K_{k,t} \) is not \((k,1)\)-DP-colorable, and \( K_{k,t} \) is \((a, b)\)-DP-colorable.

We will need a result from [10].

Theorem 12 ([10]). If \( t \geq 1 + \left( \frac{k^2}{k!} \right)(\ln(k) + 1) \), then \( \chi_{DP}(K_{k,t}) = k + 1 \).

We are now ready to prove Theorem 5.

Proof. By Theorem 9 there is a \( k \in \mathbb{N} \) such that if \( G \) is a \( k \)-degenerate bipartite graph, then

\[ \chi_{DP}^*(G) \leq \frac{2k}{\ln(k)} < k. \]

Note that we can ensure the second inequality is satisfied by taking \( k > e^2 \). Now, let \( t = \lceil 1 + (k^2/k!)(\ln(k) + 1) \rceil \) and \( H = K_{k,t} \). By Theorem 12 we know that \( H \) is not \((k,1)\)-DP-colorable. Since \( H \) is a \( k \)-degenerate bipartite graph, we have that \( \chi_{DP}^*(H) < k \). This inequality implies that there are \( a, b \in \mathbb{N} \) such that \( a/b < k \) and \( H \) is \((a, b)\)-DP-colorable.

If we follow the randomized construction given in the proof of Theorem 1.10 in [3], we can deduce Proposition 13.

Proposition 13. Suppose that \( d \geq 149 \). If \( G \) is a \( d \)-degenerate bipartite graph, then \( \chi_{DP}^*(G) \leq 5d/\ln(d) < d \).

Finally, notice that Theorem 12 and Proposition 13 immediately imply Proposition 6.
2.3 Complete Bipartite Graphs

From this point forward, when considering a copy of the complete bipartite graph $K_{n,m}$, we will always assume that the partite sets are $A = \{v_1, \ldots, v_n\}$ and $B = \{u_1, \ldots, u_m\}$. In order to prove Theorem 7 we need two definitions and two lemmas. Our first definition and lemma come from [9].

Suppose $G$ is a graph and $H = (L, H)$ is an $m$-fold cover of $G$. We say there is a natural bijection between the $H$-colorings of $G$ and the proper $m$-colorings of $G$ if for each $v \in V(G)$ it is possible to let $L(v) = \{(v, j) : j \in [m]\}$ so that whenever $uv \in E(G)$, $(u, j)$ and $(v, j)$ are adjacent in $H$ for each $j \in [m]$. This definition is motivated by the following Lemma.

Lemma 14 ([9]). Suppose that $T$ is a tree and $H = (L, H)$ is an $m$-fold cover of $T$ such that $m \geq 2$ and $E_H(L(u), L(v))$ is a perfect matching whenever $uv \in E(T)$. Then, there is a natural bijection between the $H$-colorings of $T$ and the proper $m$-colorings of $T$.

Suppose that $G = K_{n,m}$ and $H = (L, H)$ is an $a$-fold cover of $G$. Then, for each $v \in V(G)$, we may suppose that $L(v) = \{(v, l) : l \in [a]\}$. Now, fix some $t \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $t \leq a$. For each $i \in [n]$ let $A_i$ be the set of all $t$-element subsets of $L(v)$. For each $(A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_n) \in \prod_{i=1}^n A_i$ and each $j \in [m]$, let

$$L(A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_n)(u_j) = \left\{ v \in L(u_j) : \text{In } H, v \text{ is not adjacent to any vertex in } \bigcup_{i=1}^n A_i \right\}.$$ 

We say that $(A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_n) \in \prod_{i=1}^n A_i$ is bad for $u_j$ if $|L(A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_n)(u_j)| < t$. It is immediately clear that if $(A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_n) \in \prod_{i=1}^n A_i$ is not bad for any vertex in $\{u_1, \ldots, u_m\}$, then

$$S = \left( \bigcup_{i=1}^n A_i \right) \bigcup \left( \bigcup_{j=1}^m L(A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_n)(u_j) \right)$$

is an $(H, t)$-coloring of $G$. We now show that we can bound the number of bad elements $\prod_{i=1}^n A_i$.

Lemma 15. Suppose $n \geq 2$, $t \in \mathbb{N}$, $G = K_{n,1}$, and $H = (L, H)$ is an $((n + 1)t - 1)$-fold cover of $G$. Let $A_i$ be the set of all $t$-element subsets of $L(v_i)$ for $i \in [n]$. Then, the number of elements in $\prod_{i=1}^n A_i$ that are bad for $u_1$ is at most

$$\binom{(n + 1)t - 1}{nt} \prod_{i=0}^{n-2} \binom{(n - i)t}{t}.$$

Proof. We may assume that for each $uv \in E(G)$, $E_H(L(u), L(v))$ is a perfect matching since adding edges to $H$ can only increase the number of elements of $\prod_{i=1}^n A_i$ that are bad for $u_1$. Since $G$ is a tree, Lemma 13 implies there is a natural bijection between the $H$-colorings of $G$ and the proper $((n + 1)t - 1)$-colorings of $G$. So, we may assume that $L(v_i) = \{(v_i, j) : j \in [(n + 1)t - 1]\}$ for each $i \in [n]$ and $L(u_1) = \{(u_1, j) : j \in [(n + 1)t - 1]\}$ where $(v_i, j)$ is adjacent to $(u_1, j)$ in $H$ for each $i \in [n]$ and $j \in [(n + 1)t - 1]$.\footnote{\prod_{i=1}^n A_i denotes the Cartesian product of $n$ sets.}
For each \((A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_n) \in \prod_{i=1}^{n} A_i\), let \(P_{A_i} = \{j : (v_i, j) \in A_i\}\) for \(i \in [n]\). Let

\[
B = \left\{ (A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_n) \in \prod_{i=1}^{n} A_i : \left| \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} P_{A_i} \right| = nt \right\}.
\]

We claim that \((A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_n) \in \prod_{i=1}^{n} A_i\) is bad for \(u_1\) if and only if \((A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_n) \in B\).

To see why this is so, note that if \((A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_n) \in B\), \(L(A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_n)(u_1)\) is obtained by deleting precisely \(nt\) elements from \(L(u_1)\) which immediately implies that \(|L(A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_n)(u_1)| = t - 1 < t\). Conversely, suppose that \((A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_n) \not\in B\). This implies that \(|\bigcup_{i=1}^{n} P_{A_i}| < nt\). Notice that \(L(A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_n)(u_1)\) is obtained by deleting precisely \(|\bigcup_{i=1}^{n} P_{A_i}|\) elements from \(L(u_1)\) which immediately implies that \(|L(A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_n)(u_1)| \geq t\). This means that \((A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_n)\) is not bad for \(u_1\).

The desired result follows since it is easy to see that \(|B| = \left(\begin{array}{c} (n+1)t-1 \\ nt \end{array}\right) \prod_{i=0}^{n-2} \left(\begin{array}{c} (n-i)t \\ t \end{array}\right)\). \(\square\)

We are now ready to prove Theorem \[7\].

**Proof.** Suppose \(H = (L, H)\) is an arbitrary \(((n+1)t-1)\)-fold cover of \(G\). Let \(A_i\) be the set of all \(t\)-element subsets of \(L(v_i)\) for \(i \in [n]\). For each \(j \in [m]\), let \(B_j\) consist of all the \(n\) elements of \(\prod_{i=1}^{n} A_i\) that are bad for \(u_j\). By Lemma \[13\] we know that \(|B_j| \leq \left(\begin{array}{c} (n+1)t-1 \\ nt \end{array}\right) \prod_{i=0}^{n-2} \left(\begin{array}{c} (n-i)t \\ t \end{array}\right)\).

We also have that the number of elements of \(\prod_{i=1}^{n} A_i\) that are bad for at least one vertex in \(\{u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_m\}\) is \(|\bigcup_{j=1}^{m} B_j|\). We calculate that:

\[
\left| \bigcup_{j=1}^{m} B_j \right| \leq m \left(\begin{array}{c} (n+1)t-1 \\ nt \end{array}\right) \prod_{i=0}^{n-2} \left(\begin{array}{c} (n-i)t \\ t \end{array}\right) < \left(\begin{array}{c} (n+1)t-1 \\ t \end{array}\right)^n = \left| \prod_{i=1}^{n} A_i \right|.
\]

Thus, there is an element of \(\prod_{i=1}^{n} A_i\) that is not bad for any vertex in \(\{u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_m\}\). It immediately follows that a \((H, t)\)-coloring of \(G\) exists. \(\square\)

Finally, Corollary \[8\] follows from Theorem \[7\] and the fact that for fixed \(n\),

\[
\lim_{t \to \infty} n \prod_{i=0}^{n-2} \prod_{j=0}^{t-1} \frac{nt+j}{(n-i)t-j} = \infty.
\]

For some concrete applications of Theorem \[7\] consider the complete bipartite graphs, \(K_{2,3}\) and \(K_{2,15}\). Letting \(n = t = 2\) in the Theorem \[7\] inequality, it is easy to see that \(3 < 2(4/4)(5/3)\). So, Theorem \[7\] implies \(\chi_{DP}(K_{2,3}) \leq 2.5\). Similarly letting \(n = 2\) and \(t = 5\), we see that \(15 < 2(10/10)(11/9)(12/8)(13/7)(14/6)\). So, \(\chi_{DP}(K_{2,15}) \leq 2.8\).

We will now use a probabilistic argument to prove Theorem \[11\].

**Proof.** Throughout this proof suppose \(m \in \mathbb{N}\) is fixed and \(m \geq 3\). Since \(G\) contains more than one even cycle we know that \(\chi_{DP}(G) > 2\) by Theorem \[11\]. Our goal for this proof is to show that \(\chi_{DP}(G) \geq 2 + d\). So, suppose that \(a\) and \(t\) are arbitrary natural numbers such that \(2 < a/t \leq 2 + d\). Also, let \(r = a/t\) and \(\delta = r - 2\) so that \(\delta \in (0, d]\). To prove the result, it is sufficient to show that \(G\) is not \((a, t)\)-DP-colorable.
We form an $a$-fold cover, $(L, H)$, of $G$ by the following (partially random) process. We begin by letting $L(v_i) = \{(v_i, l) : l \in [a]\}$ and $L(u_j) = \{(u_j, l) : l \in [a]\}$ for each $i \in [2]$ and $j \in [m]$. Let the graph $H$ have vertex set

$$(\bigcup_{i=1}^{2} L(v_i)) \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^{m} L(u_j).$$

Also, draw edges in $H$ so that $H[L(v)]$ is a clique for each $v \in V(G)$. Finally, for each $i \in [2]$ and $j \in [m]$, uniformly at random choose a perfect matching between $L(v_i)$ and $L(u_j)$ from the $a!$ possible perfect matchings. It is easy to see that $H = (L, H)$ is an $a$-fold cover of $G$.

We want to show that with positive probability there is no $(\mathcal{H}, t)$-DP-coloring of $G$. For $i = 1, 2$, let $A_i$ be the set of $t$-element subsets of $L(v_i)$. We know we can find a $(\mathcal{H}, t)$-coloring of $G$ if $(A_1, A_2) \in A_1 \times A_2$ is not bad for each vertex in $\{u_j : j \in [m]\}$. Let $E_j$ be the event that $(A_1, A_2)$ is not bad for $u_j$. In order for $E_j$ to occur we need at least $3t - a$ of the vertices in $N_H(A_1) \cap L(u_j)$ to also be in $N_H(A_2) \cap L(u_j)$. So,

$$P[E_j] = \binom{a}{t}^{-1} \sum_{i=3t-a}^{t} \binom{t}{i} \binom{a-t}{t-i} = \binom{a}{t}^{-1} \sum_{i=3t-a}^{t} \binom{t}{i} \binom{a-t}{t-i}$$

$$= \binom{a}{t}^{-1} \sum_{i=0}^{a-2t} \binom{t}{i} \binom{a-t}{i}.$$ 

Since $r \leq 2.125 < 2.5$, it easily follows that $a - 2t < t/2$ and $a - 2t < (a-t)/2$. Using a well known bound on the partial sum of binomial coefficients (see [7]), we obtain:

$$P[E_j] = \binom{a}{t}^{-1} \sum_{i=0}^{a-2t} \binom{t}{i} \binom{a-t}{i}$$

$$\leq \binom{a}{t}^{-1} \left( \sum_{i=0}^{a-2t} \binom{t}{i} \right) \left( \sum_{i=0}^{a-2t} \binom{a-t}{i} \right)$$

$$\leq \binom{a}{t}^{-1} \frac{t}{a-2t} \frac{a-2t}{3t-a} \frac{a-t}{a-2t} \frac{a-2t}{a-t} t^{(a-t)}$$

$$= \binom{a}{t}^{-1} \left( \frac{r-1}{(r-2)^2} \right)^{t(r-2)} \left( \frac{1}{3-r} \right)^{t(3-r)} \left( r-1 \right)^t$$

$$= \binom{a}{t}^{-1} \left( \frac{\delta + 1}{\delta^2} \right)^{t\delta} \left( \frac{1}{1-\delta} \right)^{t(1-\delta)} \left( \delta + 1 \right)^t.$$ 

The probability $(A_1, A_2)$ is not bad for each vertex in $\{u_j : j \in [m]\}$ is then $(P[E_1])^m$. Since $|A_1 \times A_2| = \binom{a}{t}^2$, we can guarantee the existence of an $a$-fold cover, $\mathcal{H}^*$, for $G$ such that there is no $(\mathcal{H}^*, t)$-coloring of $G$ if

$$\binom{a}{t}^2 (P[E_1])^m < 1.$$
Using a well known bound on binomial coefficients, we compute
\[
\left(\frac{a}{t}\right)^2 \left(\frac{P[E_1]}{m}\right)^m \leq \left(\frac{a}{t}\right)^{2-m} \left(\frac{\delta + 1}{\delta^2}\right)^{mt\delta} \left(\frac{1}{1-\delta}\right)^{mt(1-\delta)} (\delta + 1)^{mt}
\]
\[
\leq \left(\frac{t}{a}\right)^{t(m-2)} \left(\frac{\delta + 1}{\delta^2}\right)^{mt\delta} \left(\frac{1}{1-\delta}\right)^{mt(1-\delta)} (\delta + 1)^{mt}
\]
\[
= \left[ \left(\frac{1}{r}\right)^{1-2/m} \left(\frac{\delta + 1}{\delta^2}\right)^{\delta} \left(\frac{1}{1-\delta}\right)^{(1-\delta)} \right]^{mt}
\]
\[
= \left[ \frac{(\delta + 2)^{2/m}(\delta + 1)^{\delta+1}(1-\delta)^{\delta-1}}{(\delta + 2)(\delta^{2\delta})} \right]^{mt} .
\]

Thus, to prove the desired it suffices to show that:
\[
\frac{(\delta + 2)^{2/m}(\delta + 1)^{\delta+1}(1-\delta)^{\delta-1}}{(\delta + 2)(\delta^{2\delta})} < 1.
\]

Consider the function \( f : (0, 1) \to (0, \infty) \) given by \( f(x) = \frac{(x+2)^{2/m}(x+1)^{x+1}(1-x)^{x-1}}{(x+2)(x^{2x})} \). It is easy to verify that \( f \) is increasing on \((0, 0.5)\). So, since \( 0 < \delta \leq d < 0.5 \),
\[
\frac{(\delta + 2)^{2/m}(\delta + 1)^{\delta+1}(1-\delta)^{\delta-1}}{(\delta + 2)(\delta^{2\delta})} = f(\delta) \leq f(d) = \frac{(d+2)^{2/m}(d+1)^{d+1}(1-d)^{d-1}}{(d+2)(d^{2d})} < 1
\]
as desired.

Notice that in our argument above the upper bound: \( \binom{a}{t}^{-1} \left( \sum_{i=0}^{a-2t} \binom{t}{i} \right) \left( \sum_{i=0}^{a-2t} \binom{a-t}{i} \right) \) used for \( \binom{a}{t}^{-1} \sum_{i=0}^{a-2t} \binom{t}{i} \binom{a-t}{i} \) is a fairly weak upper bound. So, our result may be able to be improved significantly with a better upper bound on \( \binom{a}{t}^{-1} \sum_{i=0}^{a-2t} \binom{t}{i} \binom{a-t}{i} \). For a concrete application of Theorem 11, notice that when \( m = 15 \) and \( d = 0.0959 \), the inequality in the hypothesis is satisfied. So, by Theorems 7 and 11 we have that \( 2.0959 \leq \chi_{DP}^*(K_{2,15}) \leq 2.8 \).
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