

On (k, l, H) -kernels by walks and the H -class digraph

Hortensia Galeana-Sánchez and Miguel Tecpa-Galván

Abstract

Let H be a digraph possibly with loops and D a digraph without loops whose arcs are colored with the vertices of H (D is said to be an H -colored digraph). If $W = (x_0, \dots, x_n)$ is an open walk in D and $i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$, we say that there is an obstruction on x_i whenever $(color(x_{i-1}, x_i), color(x_i, x_{i+1})) \notin A(H)$.

A (k, l, H) -kernel by walks in an H -colored digraph D ($k \geq 2, l \geq 1$), is a subset S of vertices of D , such that, for every pair of different vertices in S , every walk between them has at least $k - 1$ obstructions, and for every $x \in V(D) \setminus S$ there exists an xS -walk with at most $l - 1$ obstructions. This concept generalizes the concepts of kernel, (k, l) -kernel, kernel by monochromatic paths, and kernel by H -walks. If D is an H -colored digraph, an H -class partition is a partition \mathcal{F} of $A(D)$ such that, for every $\{(u, v), (v, w)\} \subseteq A(D)$, $(color(u, v), color(v, w)) \in A(H)$ iff there exists F in \mathcal{F} such that $\{(u, v), (v, w)\} \subseteq F$. The H -class digraph relative to \mathcal{F} , denoted by $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$, is the digraph such that $V(C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)) = \mathcal{F}$, and $(F, G) \in A(C_{\mathcal{F}}(D))$ iff there exist $(u, v) \in F$ and $(v, w) \in G$ with $\{u, v, w\} \subseteq V(D)$.

We will show sufficient conditions on \mathcal{F} and $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$ to guarantee the existence of (k, l, H) -kernels by walks in H -colored digraphs, and we will show that some conditions are tight. For instance, we will show that if an H -colored digraph D has an H -class partition in which every class induces a strongly connected digraph, and has a obstruction-free vertex, then for every $k \geq 2$, D has a $(k, k - 1, H)$ -kernel by walks. Despite finding (k, l) -kernels is a NP -complete problem, some hypothesis presented in this paper can be verified in polynomial time.

(k, l) -kernel, H -colored digraph, H -kernel, (k, l, H) -kernel by walks.
MSC class: 05C15, 05C20, 05C69.

1 Introduction.

For terminology and notation not defined here, we refer the reader to [3]. If D is a digraph and $x \in V(D)$, we denote by $A^+(x)$ the set $\{(x, v) \in A(D) : v \in V(D)\}$, $A^-(x)$ the set $\{(u, x) \in A(D) : u \in V(D)\}$, and $A(x) = A^-(x) \cup A^+(x)$. If D is a digraph without loops, a *sink* is a vertex x such that $A^+(x) = \emptyset$. If H is a digraph possibly with loops, a *sink* is a vertex x such that $A^+(x) \subseteq \{(x, x)\}$. If S_1 and S_2 is a subsets of $V(D)$, we denote by $N^+(S_1)$ the *proper out-neighbor* of S_1 . In this paper we write walk, path and cycle, instead of directed walk, directed path, and directed cycle, respectively. If $W = (x_0, \dots, x_n)$ is a walk (path), we say that W is an x_0x_n -walk (x_0x_n -path). The *length* of W is the number n and it is denoted by $l(W)$. If $T_1 = (z_0, \dots, z_n)$ and $T_2 = (w_0, \dots, w_m)$ are walks and $z_n = w_0$, we denote by $T_1 \cup T_2$ the walk $(z_0, \dots, z_n = w_0, \dots, w_m)$. If x belongs to a walk W , we denote by x^+ (respectively x^-) the successor (respectively predecessor) of x in W .

If S_1 and S_2 are two disjoint subsets of $V(D)$, a uv -walk in D is called an S_1S_2 -walk whenever $u \in S_1$ and $v \in S_2$. If $S_1 = \{x\}$ or $S_2 = \{x\}$, then we write xS_2 -walk or S_1x -walk, respectively. For a nonempty subset $F \subseteq A(D)$ the *subdigraph arc-induced by F* is denoted by $D\langle F \rangle$.

The concept of *kernel* was introduced by von Neumann and Morgenstern in [23] as a subset S of vertices of a digraph D , such that for every pair of different vertices in S , there is no arc between them, and every vertex not in S has at least one out-neighbor in S . This concept has been deeply and widely studied by several authors due to a large amount of theoretical and practical applications, by example [7], [9], [10] and [11]. In [6] Chvátal showed that deciding if a digraph has a kernel is an NP-complete problem, and a classical result proved by König [19] shows that every transitive digraph has a kernel.

The concept of kernel has been generalized over the years. A subset S of vertices of D is said to be a *kernel by paths*, if for every $x \in V(D) \setminus S$, there exists an xS -path (that is, S is *absorbent by paths*) and, for every pair of different vertices $\{u, v\} \subseteq S$, there is no uv -path in D (that is, S is *independent by paths*). This concept was introduced by Berge in [5], and it is a well known result that every digraph has a kernel by paths [5] (see Corollary 2 on p. 311). The concept of (k, l) -kernel was introduced by Borowiecki and Kwaśnik in [21] as follows: If $k \geq 2$, a subset S of vertices of a digraph D is a *k-independent set*, if for every pair of different vertices in S , every walk between them has length at least k . If $l \geq 1$, we say that S is an *l-absorbent set* if for every $x \in V(D) \setminus S$ there exists an xS -walk with length at most l . If $k \geq 2$ and $l \geq 1$, a (k, l) -kernel is a subset of $V(D)$ which is k -independent and l -absorbent. If $l = k - 1$, the (k, l) -kernel is called a *k-kernel*. Notice that every 2-kernel is a kernel. Several sufficient conditions for the existence of k -kernels have been proved, as example see [14], [15] and [20]. In [14] the authors proved the following theorem:

Theorem 1.1. [14] *If D is a symmetric digraph, then D has a k -kernel for every $k \geq 2$. Moreover, every maximal k -independent set in D is a k -kernel.*

A digraph is *m-colored* if its arcs are colored with m colors. If D is an m -colored digraph, a path in D is called *monochromatic* (respectively, *alternating*) if all of its arcs are colored alike (respectively, consecutive arcs have different color). A subset S of vertices of D is a *kernel by monochromatic paths* (respectively, *kernel by alternating walks*) if for every $x \in V(D) \setminus S$ there exists a monochromatic xS -path (respectively an alternating xS -walk), and no two different vertices in S are connected by a monochromatic path (respectively, by an alternating walk). Notice that a digraph D has a kernel if and only if the m -colored digraph D , in which every two different arcs have different colors, has a kernel by monochromatic paths. The existence of kernels by monochromatic paths in m -colored digraphs was studied primarily by Sands, Sauer and Woodrow in [25]. It is worth mentioning that Galeana-Sánchez introduced the concept of kernel by monochromatic paths in [13]. Due to the difficulty of finding kernels by monochromatic paths in m -colored digraphs, in [12] Galeana-Sánchez studied the color changes in an m -colored digraph, in order to obtain conditions for the existence of kernels by monochromatic paths. As a consequence, she defined the *color-class digraph* of an m -colored digraph, denoted by $\mathcal{C}(D)$, as the digraph whose set of vertices are the colors represented in the arcs of D , and (c_1, c_2) is an arc in $\mathcal{C}(D)$ if and only if there exist two arcs of D , namely (u, v) and (v, w) , such that (u, v) has color c_1 and (v, w) has color c_2 .

Let H be a digraph possibly with loops, and D a digraph without loops whose arcs are colored with the vertices of H (D is said to be an H -colored digraph). For an arc (x, z) of D , we denote by $\rho(x, z)$ its color. A vertex $x \in V(D)$ is *obstruction-free in D* if $(\rho(a), \rho(b)) \in A(H)$ whenever $a \in A^-(x)$ and $b \in A^+(x)$. We say that a subdigraph D' of D is an *H -digraph*, if for every two arcs (u, v) and (v, w) in D' we have that $(\rho(u, v), \rho(v, w)) \in A(H)$. A directed walk (path) in D , say $W = (x_0, \dots, x_n)$, is an *H -walk* (*H -path*), whenever the consecutive colors encountered on W form a directed walk in H . In [22] Linek and Sands introduced the concept of H -walk and their work was later considered by several authors, as example, [2], [8], [16] and [24]. A subset S of vertices of D is *absorbent by H -paths* (*absorbent by H -walks*), if for every $x \in V(D) \setminus S$ there exists an xS - H -path (xS - H -walk); and S is said to be *independent by H -paths* (*independent by H -walks*), if for every pair of different vertices $\{u, v\} \subseteq S$, there is no uv - H -path (uv - H -walk) between them. A *kernel by H -paths*, or simply *H -kernel* (respectively *kernel by H -walks*), is a subset of vertices of D that is both absorbent by H -paths and independent by H -paths (respectively, absorbent by H -walks and independent by H -walks).

If D is an H -colored digraph, an *H -class partition of $A(D)$* is a partition of $A(D)$, say \mathcal{F} , such that for every $\{(u, v), (v, w)\} \subseteq A(D)$, $(\rho(u, v), \rho(v, w)) \in A(H)$ if and only if there exists F in \mathcal{F} such that $\{(u, v), (v, w)\} \subseteq F$. If $x \in V(D)$, we define $N_{\mathcal{F}}^-(x) = \{F \in \mathcal{F} : (u, x) \in F \text{ for some } u \in V(D)\}$, $N_{\mathcal{F}}^+(x) = \{F \in \mathcal{F} : (x, v) \in F \text{ for some } v \in V(D)\}$, and $N_{\mathcal{F}}(x) = N_{\mathcal{F}}^+(x) \cup N_{\mathcal{F}}^-(x)$. If \mathcal{F} is an H -class partition of $A(D)$, the *H -class digraph relative to \mathcal{F}* , denoted by $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$, is the digraph such that $V(C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)) = \mathcal{F}$, and (F_i, F_j) is an arc in $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$, if and only if there exist $(u, v) \in F_i$ and $(v, w) \in F_j$ for some $\{u, v, w\} \subseteq V(D)$. Notice that $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$ can allow loops. Moreover, $\mathcal{C}(D)$ is a particular case of $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$ when H has only loops, every vertex in H has a loop and every class in \mathcal{F} consist in those arcs colored alike. An H -class partition \mathcal{F} is *walk-preservative* if for every $(F, G) \in A(C_{\mathcal{F}}(D))$ and $z \in V(D \langle F \rangle)$, there exists a zw -path in $D \langle F \rangle$ for some $w \in V(D \langle G \rangle)$. Notice that $w \in V(D \langle F \rangle) \cap V(D \langle G \rangle)$.

If $W = (x_0, \dots, x_n)$ is a walk in an H -colored digraph D and $i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$, we say that there is an *obstruction on x_i* iff $(\rho(x_{i-1}, x_i), \rho(x_i, x_{i+1})) \notin A(H)$ (indices are taken modulo n if $x_0 = x_n$). We denote by $O_H(W)$ the set $\{i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\} : \text{there is an obstruction on } x_i\}$. The *H -length of W* , denoted by $l_H(W)$, is defined as $l_H(W) = |O_H(W)| + 1$ if W is open, or $l_H(W) = |O_H(W)|$ otherwise. The H -length was primarily studied by Galeana-Sánchez and Sánchez-López in [16] for closed walks, and by Andenmatten, Galeana-Sánchez and Pach in [1] for open paths. Clearly, the usual length $l(W)$ coincides with the H -length $l_H(W)$, in the very particular case when $A(H) = \emptyset$. An open walk in an H -colored digraph is an H -walk if and only if it has H -length 1.

It is worth mentioning that in [1], the authors defined the H -length for H -colored graphs and H -colored digraphs. A particular kind of H -coloring in graphs was studied by Szeider in [26] and, as a consequence, in [1] was proved that under the assumption $P \neq NP$, finding uv -paths of minimum H -length in H -colored graphs (H -colored digraphs) has no polynomial solution (although there is a polynomial algorithm to find uv -paths of minimum H -length for some H [1]).

Let D be an H -colored digraph and S a subset of vertices of D . If $l \geq 1$, we say that S is an *(l, H) -absorbent set by paths* (respectively, *(l, H) -absorbent set by walks*), if for every vertex $v \in V(D) \setminus S$ there exists a vS -path (respectively, vS -walk) whose H -length is at most l . If $k \geq 2$, we say that S is a *(k, H) -independent set by paths* (respectively, *(k, H) -independent set by walks*), if for every pair of different vertices in S , every path (respectively, walk) between them has H -length at least k . If $k \geq 2$ and $l \geq 1$, we say that S is a *(k, l, H) -kernel by paths* (respectively, *(k, l, H) -kernel by walks*) if it is both (k, H) -independent by paths and (l, H) -absorbent by paths (respectively, (k, H) -independent by walks and (l, H) -absorbent by walks). If $l = k - 1$, a (k, l, H) -kernel by paths is called a *(k, H) -kernel by paths* (respectively, *(k, H) -kernel by walks*). It is straightforward to see that every kernel by H -paths (respectively, kernel by H -walks) is a $(2, H)$ -kernel by paths (respectively, $(2, H)$ -kernel by walks), and every (k, l) -kernel is a (k, l, H) -kernel by paths and a (k, l, H) -kernel by walks in D , if H has no arcs nor loops. Since finding (k, l) -kernels in digraphs is a NP -complete problem, finding

(k, l, H) -kernels in H -colored digraphs is a NP -complete problem.

On the other hand, the concepts of (k, l, H) -kernel by paths and (k, l, H) -kernel by walks are not equivalent. In [4], the authors showed an infinite family of digraphs with $(2, H)$ -kernel by walks and no $(2, H)$ -kernel by paths, and an infinite family of digraphs with $(2, H)$ -kernel by paths and no $(2, H)$ -kernel by walks.

In [18] the authors showed that, by applying conditions on $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$, it is possible to guarantee the existence of (k, H) -kernels by walks and (k, H) -kernels by paths in D . In the same spirit, in this paper we will show sufficient conditions on \mathcal{F} and $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$ in order to guarantee the existence of (k, l, H) -kernels by walks in H -colored digraphs, and we will show that some conditions are tight. Moreover, some hypothesis presented in this paper can be verified in polynomial time.

2 Preliminary results.

Lemma 2.1. *Let D be a symmetric digraph and $\{k, l\} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$. If $2 \leq k$ and $k - 1 \leq l$, then D has a (k, l) -kernel.*

Proof. It follows from Theorem 2.1 and the definition of (k, l) -kernel. \square

Lemma 2.2. *Let D be an H -colored digraph, \mathcal{F} an H -class partition of $A(D)$ and $x \in V(D)$. The following assertions holds:*

- a) *If $d^-(x) \neq 0$ and $d^+(x) \neq 0$, then for every $F_1 \in N_{\mathcal{F}}^-(x)$ and $F_2 \in N_{\mathcal{F}}^+(x)$, we have that $(F_1, F_2) \in A(C_{\mathcal{F}}(D))$.*
- b) *If x is obstruction-free in D and $d(x) \neq 0$, then there is a unique $F \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $x \in V(D \langle F \rangle)$.*
- c) *If T is a walk in D such that $O_H(T) = \emptyset$, then there is a unique $F \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $A(T) \subseteq F$.*
- d) *If u, v and w are three different vertices in D , T is a uv -walk, and T' is a vw - H -walk, then either $l_H(T \cup T') = l_H(T)$ or $l_H(T \cup T') = l_H(T) + 1$.*

Proof. a) If $F_1 \in N_{\mathcal{F}}^-(x)$ and $F_2 \in N_{\mathcal{F}}^+(x)$, then there exists $\{u, v\} \subseteq V(D)$ such that $(u, x) \in F_1$ and $(x, v) \in F_2$. It follows from definition of $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$ that $(F_1, F_2) \in A(C_{\mathcal{F}}(D))$.

b) Since $d(x) \neq 0$, then there exists $F \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $x \in V(D \langle F \rangle)$. On the other hand, since x is obstruction-free, we have that $A(x) \subseteq F$, concluding that F is unique.

c) If $T = (x_0, \dots, x_n)$, then $(\rho(x_{i-1}, x_i), \rho(x_i, x_{i+1})) \in A(H)$ for every $i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$ (indices modulo n if $x_0 = x_n$). Hence, it follows from definition of H -class partition that there is a unique $F \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $A(T) \subseteq F$.

d) Suppose that $T = (z_0 = u, z_1, \dots, z_n = v)$ and $T' = (z_n = v, z_{n+1}, \dots, z_m = w)$. It is straightforward to see that $O_H(T \cup T') \subseteq O_H(T) \cup \{n\}$ and $O_H(T) \subseteq O_H(T \cup T')$, which implies that either $l_H(T \cup T') = l_H(T)$ or $l_H(T \cup T') = l_H(T) + 1$. \square

Lemma 2.3. *If D is a digraph with no isolated vertices and K is a kernel by paths in D , then for every $x \in K$, $d_D^-(x) \neq 0$.*

Proof. Proceeding by contradiction, suppose that there exists $x \in K$ such that $d_D^-(x) = 0$. Since D has no isolated vertices, then there exists $y \in V(D)$ such that $(x, y) \in A(D)$, which implies that $y \notin K$. Hence, there exists a yz -path in D , say P , such that $z \in K$. Since $d_D^-(x) = 0$, we have that $z \neq x$, which implies that $(x, y) \cup P$ is an xz -path in D with $\{x, z\} \subseteq K$, contradicting the independence by paths of K . Therefore, $d_D^-(x) \neq 0$. \square

Lemma 2.4. *Let D be an H -colored digraph and \mathcal{F} an H -class partition of $A(D)$. If \mathcal{S} is a nonempty subset of \mathcal{F} and K is a kernel by paths in $D \langle \cup_{F \in \mathcal{S}} F \rangle$, then for every $x \in K$, $N_{\mathcal{F}}^-(x) \cap \mathcal{S} \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. Let K be a kernel by paths in $D' = D \langle \cup_{F \in \mathcal{S}} F \rangle$ and $x \in K$. By Lemma 2.3 we have that $d_{D'}^-(x) \neq 0$. Hence, there exists $z \in V(D')$ such that $(z, x) \in A(D')$. It follows from definition of D' that $(z, x) \in F$ for some $F \in \mathcal{S}$, which implies that $F \in N_{\mathcal{F}}^-(x) \cap \mathcal{S}$. Hence, $N_{\mathcal{F}}^-(x) \cap \mathcal{S} \neq \emptyset$. \square

Lemma 2.5. *Let D be an H -colored digraph and \mathcal{F} an H -class partition of $A(D)$. If \mathcal{S} is an independent set in $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$, then $D \langle \cup_{F \in \mathcal{S}} F \rangle$ is an H -subdigraph of D .*

Proof. Let $D' = D \langle \cup_{F \in \mathcal{S}} F \rangle$ and $\{(u, v), (v, x)\} \subseteq A(D')$. We will prove that $(\rho(u, v), \rho(v, x)) \in A(H)$. By definition of D' , there exists $\{F, G\} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ such that $(u, v) \in F$ and $(v, x) \in G$. Hence, we have that $(F, G) \in A(C_{\mathcal{F}}(D))$. Since \mathcal{S} is an independent set in $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$, then $F = G$, which implies that $\{(u, v), (v, x)\} \subseteq F$. It follows from the fact that \mathcal{F} is an H -class partition of $A(D)$ that $(\rho(u, v), \rho(v, x)) \in A(H)$. Therefore, D' is an H -subdigraph of D . \square

Lemma 2.6. *Let D be an H -colored digraph and \mathcal{F} an H -class partition of $A(D)$. If D is strongly connected, then $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$ is strongly connected.*

Proof. Let F and F' be different vertices in $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$, and $\{(x_0, x_1), (z_0, z_1)\} \subseteq A(D)$ such that $(x_0, x_1) \in F$ and $(z_0, z_1) \in F'$. It follows from the fact that D is strongly connected, that there exists an x_0z_1 -walk in D , say $C = (w_0, \dots, w_n)$, whose initial arc is (x_0, x_1) and ending arc is (z_0, z_1) .

Since $(w_0, w_1) \in F$, $(w_{n-1}, w_n) \in F'$, and $F \neq F'$, we can conclude that $O_H(C) \neq \emptyset$ (Lemma 2.2) (c). Let $O_H(C) = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r\}$ for some $r \geq 1$, and we can assume that $\alpha_i \leq \alpha_{i+1}$ whenever $i \in \{1, \dots, r-1\}$. For every $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, let $G_i \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $(w_{\alpha_i}, w_{\alpha_i}^+) \in G_i$. Notice that $P = (G_1, \dots, G_r)$ is a walk in $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$, and $G_r = F'$.

If $\alpha_1 = 0$, then $F = G_1$, which implies that P is an FF' -walk in $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$. If $\alpha_1 \neq 0$, then $(F, G_1) \in A(C_{\mathcal{F}}(D))$, which implies that $(F, G_1) \cup P$ is an FF' -walk in $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$. Hence, we conclude that $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$ is strongly connected. \square

Corollary 2.7. *Let D be a strongly connected H -colored digraph and \mathcal{F} a non-trivial H -class partition of $A(D)$. If \mathcal{S} is an independent set in $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$, then $N_{C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)}^+(\mathcal{S}) \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. Since $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$ is non-trivial and strongly connected (Lemma 2.6), then $\mathcal{S} \neq V(C_{\mathcal{F}}(D))$. As $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$ is strongly connected, there exists an arc from \mathcal{S} to $V(C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)) \setminus \mathcal{S}$, which implies that $N_{C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)}^+(\mathcal{S}) \neq \emptyset$. \square

Lemma 2.8. *Let D be an H -colored digraph, \mathcal{F} an H -class partition of $A(D)$, \mathcal{S} a non-empty subset of $V(C_{\mathcal{F}}(D))$ such that $D\langle F \rangle$ is unilateral for every $F \in \mathcal{S}$, K a kernel by walks in $D\langle \cup_{F \in \mathcal{S}} F \rangle$, and $\{x, z\} \subseteq K$. If $x \in V(D\langle F_1 \rangle)$ and $z \in V(D\langle F_2 \rangle)$ for some $\{F_1, F_2\} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$, then $F_1 \neq F_2$.*

Proof. Proceeding by contradiction, suppose that $F_1 = F_2$. Since $D\langle F_1 \rangle$ is unilateral, then either there exists an xz -path in $D\langle F_1 \rangle$ or there exists a zx -path in $D\langle F_1 \rangle$, say P . It follows that P is a path in $D\langle \cup_{F \in \mathcal{S}} F \rangle$ such that $\{x, z\} \subseteq K$, which contradicts the independence by paths of K . Therefore, $F_1 \neq F_2$. \square

Lemma 2.9. *Let D be an H -colored digraph and \mathcal{F} an H -class partition of $A(D)$ such that for every $F \in \mathcal{F}$, $D\langle F \rangle$ is strongly connected. The following assertions holds:*

a) \mathcal{F} is walk-preservative.

b) $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$ is a symmetric digraph.

c) If $\mathcal{S} \subseteq V(C_{\mathcal{F}}(D))$ is an independent set in $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$ and $\{F_1, F_2\} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$, then $V(D\langle F_1 \rangle) \cap V(D\langle F_2 \rangle) = \emptyset$.

Proof. a) Let $(F, G) \in A(C_{\mathcal{F}}(D))$ and $x \in V(D\langle F \rangle)$. It follows from definition of $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$ that there exists $\{u, v, z\} \subseteq V(D)$ such that $(u, v) \in F$ and $(v, z) \in G$. Notice that $v \in V(D\langle F \rangle) \cap V(D\langle G \rangle)$. Since $D\langle F \rangle$ is strongly connected, then there exists an xv -walk in $D\langle F \rangle$, which implies that \mathcal{F} is walk-preservative.

b) Let $(F_1, F_2) \in A(C_{\mathcal{F}}(D))$. It follows from definition of $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$ that there exists $\{u, v, z\} \subseteq V(D)$ such that $(u, v) \in F_1$ and $(v, z) \in F_2$. Since $(u, v) \in A(D\langle F_1 \rangle)$, then $D\langle F_1 \rangle$ is a nontrivial strongly connected digraph, which implies that there exists $u' \in V(D\langle F_1 \rangle)$ such that $(v, u') \in F_1$. In the same way, there exists $z' \in V(D\langle F_2 \rangle)$ such that $(z', v) \in F_2$. It follows from definition of $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$ that $(F_2, F_1) \in A(C_{\mathcal{F}}(D))$, concluding that $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$ is a symmetric digraph.

c) Proceeding by contradiction, suppose that $V(D\langle F_1 \rangle) \cap V(D\langle F_2 \rangle) \neq \emptyset$, and consider $x \in V(D\langle F_1 \rangle) \cap V(D\langle F_2 \rangle)$. Since $D\langle F_1 \rangle$ and $D\langle F_2 \rangle$ are non-trivial strongly connected digraphs, then there exist $u \in V(D\langle F_1 \rangle)$ and $z \in V(D\langle F_2 \rangle)$ such that $(u, x) \in A(D\langle F_1 \rangle)$ and $(x, z) \in A(D\langle F_2 \rangle)$. It follows from definition of $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$ that $(F_1, F_2) \in A(C_{\mathcal{F}}(D))$, which is not possible since \mathcal{S} is an independent set in $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$. Therefore, $V(D\langle F_1 \rangle) \cap V(D\langle F_2 \rangle) = \emptyset$. \square

Proposition 2.10. *Let D be an H -colored digraph and \mathcal{F} a non-trivial walk-preservative H -class partition of $A(D)$ such that $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$ has no sinks. If \mathcal{S} is an independent set in $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$, then there exists a kernel by paths in $D\langle \cup_{F \in \mathcal{S}} F \rangle$, say N , such that $N \subseteq V(D\langle \cup_{G \in N^+(\mathcal{S})} G \rangle)$.*

Proof. We will denote by D_1 the digraph $D\langle \cup_{F \in \mathcal{S}} F \rangle$. Since $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$ has no sinks, then $N^+(\mathcal{S}) \neq \emptyset$. Hence, denote by D_2 the digraph $D\langle \cup_{G \in N^+(\mathcal{S})} G \rangle$. Let N be a kernel by paths in D_1 intersecting $V(D_2)$ the most possible, that is, for every kernel by paths in D_1 , say N' , we have that

$$|N \setminus V(D_2)| \leq |N' \setminus V(D_2)| \quad (1)$$

Notice that possibly $N \cap V(D_2) = \emptyset$. We claim that $N \setminus V(D_2) = \emptyset$. Proceeding by contradiction, suppose that there exists $x_0 \in N \setminus V(D_2)$. Since $x_0 \in V(D_1)$, it follows from definition of D_1 that there exists $F \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $x_0 \in V(D\langle F \rangle)$. By hypothesis, $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$ has no sinks, which implies that there exists $G \in V(C_{\mathcal{F}}(D))$ such that $F \neq G$ and $(F, G) \in A(C_{\mathcal{F}}(D))$. It follows from the fact that \mathcal{F} is a walk-preservative H -class

partition that there exists an x_0z -path in $D\langle F \rangle$, say C , for some $z \in V(D\langle G \rangle)$. Notice that C is a path in D_1 , $z \in V(D_1) \cap V(D_2)$, and $z \neq x_0$. Moreover, since N is independent by paths in D_1 , then $z \notin N$. We will prove the following claims in order to get a contradiction.

Claim 1. There exists a zx_0 -path in D_1 .

Since $z \notin N$, there exists a zy -path in D_1 for some $y \in N$, say P' . It follows that $C \cup P'$ is an x_0y -walk in D_1 such that $x_0 \in N$ and $y \in N$, which implies that $x_0 = y$, concluding that P' is a zx_0 -path in D_1 .

Claim 2. $(N \setminus \{x_0\}) \cup \{z\}$ is a kernel by paths in D_1 .

In order to show that $N' = (N \setminus \{x_0\}) \cup \{z\}$ is an absorbent set by paths in D_1 , consider $u \in V(D_1) \setminus N'$. If $u = x_0$, then C is an x_0N' -path in D_1 . If $u \neq x_0$, then $u \in V(D_1) \setminus N$. It follows from the fact that N is an absorbent set by paths in D_1 that there exists a uv -path in D_1 , say P , for some $v \in N$. If $v \neq x_0$, then P is a uN' -path in D_1 . If $v = x_0$, then $P \cup C$ is a uN' -walk in D_1 , concluding that N' is an absorbent set by paths in D_1 .

Now we will show that N' is an independent set by paths in D_1 . Proceeding by contradiction, suppose that there exists a uv -path in D_1 , say T , where $\{u, v\} \subseteq N'$. Since N is an independent set by paths in D_1 , then $z \in \{u, v\}$. If $z = u$, it follows that $C \cup T$ is an x_0v -walk in D_1 , which contradicts the independence by paths of N . If $v = z$, by Claim 1 there exists a zx_0 -path in D_1 , say P , which implies that $T \cup P$ is a ux_0 -walk in D_1 , contradicting the independence by paths of N . Therefore, N' is an independent set by paths in D_1 , and the claim holds.

Notice that $|N' \setminus V(D_2)| = |N \setminus V(D_2)| - 1$, which is not possible by (1). Therefore, $N \setminus V(D_2) = \emptyset$, concluding that $N \subseteq V(D_2)$. \square

Proposition 2.11. *Let D be an H -colored digraph with no isolated vertices, \mathcal{F} a walk-preservative H -class partition of $A(D)$, and \mathcal{S} an independent and l -absorbent set in $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$ for some $l \geq 1$. If K is a kernel by paths in $D\langle \cup_{F \in \mathcal{S}} F \rangle$, then K is an $(l+1, H)$ -absorbent set by walks in D .*

Proof. Let $D' = D\langle \cup_{F \in \mathcal{S}} F \rangle$ and $x_0 \in V(D) \setminus K$. If $x_0 \in V(D')$, since K is a kernel by paths in D' , there exists an x_0K -path in D' , say T . It follows from Lemma 2.5 that T is an H -path. Hence, $l_H(T) = 1$, which implies that $l_H(T) \leq l+1$.

Now we will assume that $x_0 \notin V(D')$. By hypothesis, x_0 is not isolated, which implies that $x_0 \in V(D\langle F_0 \rangle)$ for some $F_0 \in \mathcal{F}$. Notice that $F_0 \notin \mathcal{S}$ because $x_0 \notin V(D')$. Since \mathcal{S} is an l -absorbent set in $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$, we can consider an F_0F_t -path with minimum length in $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$, say $T = (F_0, \dots, F_r)$, where $F_r \in \mathcal{S}$. Notice that $r \leq l$.

Since \mathcal{F} is walk-preservative, there exists $x_{\alpha_1} \in V(D\langle F_0 \rangle) \cap V(D\langle F_1 \rangle)$ such that there exists an $x_0x_{\alpha_1}$ -path in $D\langle F_0 \rangle$, say T_0 , and, for every $i \in \{2, \dots, r-1\}$, there exist $x_{\alpha_i} \in V(D\langle F_{i-1} \rangle) \cap V(D\langle F_i \rangle)$ and $x_{\alpha_{i+1}} \in V(D\langle F_i \rangle) \cap V(D\langle F_{i+1} \rangle)$, such that there exists an $x_{\alpha_i}x_{\alpha_{i+1}}$ -path in $D\langle F_i \rangle$, say T_i . Notice that T_i is an H -path for every $i \in \{0, \dots, r-1\}$, and $x_{\alpha_r} \in V(D')$. Moreover, since C is a path in $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$, then $A(T_i) \cap A(T_j) = \emptyset$ whenever $i \neq j$.

Now we consider $C = \cup_{i=0}^{r-1} T_i$, and suppose that $C = (z_1, \dots, z_n)$. Notice that $z_n \in V(D')$ (because $z_n = x_{\alpha_r}$).

Claim 1. $l_H(C) \leq l+1$.

For every $i \in \{0, \dots, r-2\}$, let $U_i = \{l \in \{1, \dots, n-1\} : (z_{l-1}, z_l) \in F_i\}$ be, and $L = \{i \in \{0, \dots, r-2\} : U_i \neq \emptyset\}$. For every $i \in L$, define $\beta_i = \max U_i$.

We will show that $O_H(C) \subseteq \{\beta_i : i \in L\}$. If $m \in O_H(C)$, then it follows that $(\rho(z_{m-1}, z_m), \rho(z_m, z_{m+1})) \notin A(H)$. On the other hand, we have that $(z_{m-1}, z_m) \in A(T_j)$ for some $j \in \{0, \dots, r-1\}$. Since T_j is an H -path, then $(z_m, z_{m+1}) \notin A(T_j)$, which implies that $m = \max U_j$ and $j \leq r-2$. Hence, $m \in \{\beta_i : i \in L\}$. It follows that $O_H(C) \subseteq L$. Hence, $|O_H(C)| \leq |L|$, that is $|O_H(C)| \leq r-1$, and we can conclude that $l_H(C) \leq l$.

If $z_n \in K$, then by Claim 1 we have that C is a x_0K -path with $l_H(C) \leq l+1$. If $z_t \notin K$, since $z_n \in V(D')$, and K is an absorbent set by paths in D' , then there exists a z_nK -path in D' , say T_r . Hence, $C' = C \cup T_r$ is an x_0K -walk in D , and by Lemma 2.2, $l_H(C') \leq l_H(C) + 1$, which implies that $l_H(C') \leq l+1$.

Therefore, K is an $(l+1, H)$ -absorbent set by walks in D . \square

Notice that the conclusions in Proposition 2.11 are tight. We will show an example where K is not necessarily an (r, H) -absorbent set by walks in D for some $r \leq l+1$. Consider the H -colored digraph showed in Figure 1, and for every $i \in \{1, \dots, 6\}$ let $F_i = \{e \in A(D) : \rho(e) = c_i\}$. Clearly, $\mathcal{F} = \{F_i : i \in \{1, \dots, 6\}\}$ is a walk-preservative H -class partition of $A(D)$. Notice that $\mathcal{S} = \{F_6\}$ is a 3-absorbent set in $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$. On the other hand, it is straightforward to see that $K = \{x_4\}$ is a kernel by paths in $D\langle F_6 \rangle$ which is not an (r, H) -absorbent by walks in D for every $r \in \{1, 2, 3\}$.




Figure 1:

On the other hand, if D is an H -colored digraph and \mathcal{F} is an H -class partition which is not walk-preservative, then Proposition 2.11 is not necessarily true. Consider the H -colored digraph shown in Figure 2. For every $i \in \{1, \dots, 5\}$ let $F_i = \{e \in A(D) : \rho(e) = c_i\}$. It is straightforward to see that $\mathcal{F} = \{F_i : i \in \{1, \dots, 5\}\}$ is an H -class partition of $A(D)$. Notice that (F_2, F_3) is an arc of $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$ such that $x_3 \in V(D(F_2))$, and there is no x_3w -walk in $D(F_2)$ with $w \in V(D(F_3))$, that is, \mathcal{F} is not a walk-preservative H -class partition of $A(D)$. On the other hand, $\mathcal{S} = \{F_5\}$ is a 4-absorbent set in $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$ but no kernel by paths in $D(F_5)$ is a $(5, H)$ -absorbent set by walks in D .




Figure 2:

3 Main results.

The following lemmas will be useful.

Lemma 3.1. *Let D be a digraph with at least one arc, $W = \{x \in V(D) : d(x) = 0\}$, and $\{k, l\} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ such that $2 \leq k$ and $1 \leq l$. If K is a (k, l, H) -kernel by walks in $D - W$, then $K \cup W$ is a (k, l, H) -kernel by walks in D .*

Lemma 3.2. *If D is an H -digraph, then every kernel by paths in D is a (k, l, H) -kernel by walks in D for every $k \geq 2$ and $l \geq 1$.*

Proposition 3.3. *Let D be an H -colored digraph with no isolated vertices, \mathcal{F} a walk-preservative H -class partition of $A(D)$, and $\mathcal{S} \subseteq V(C_{\mathcal{F}}(D))$ an independent and l -absorbent set in $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$ for some $l \geq 1$. If $N^+(\mathcal{S}) = \emptyset$ and $k \geq 2$, then every kernel by paths in $D(\cup_{F \in \mathcal{S}} F)$ is a $(k, l + 1, H)$ -kernel by walks in D .*

Proof. Let K be a kernel by paths in $D' = D(\cup_{F \in \mathcal{S}} F)$. Since \mathcal{F} is walk preservative, it follows from Proposition 2.11 that K is an $(l + 1, H)$ -absorbent set by walks in D . Now, in order to prove that K is a (k, H) -independent set by walks in D for every $k \geq 2$, we will show that K is a path-independent set in D . Proceeding by contradiction, suppose that there exists an x_1x_n -path in D , say $T' = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$, such that $\{x_1, x_n\} \subseteq K$. Consider $F_0 \in N_{\mathcal{F}}^-(x_1) \cap \mathcal{S}$ (Lemma 2.4). Hence, there exists $x_0 \in V(D)$ such that $(x_0, x_1) \in F_0 \cap A^-(x_1)$, and let $T = (x_0, x_1) \cup T'$ be.

If $A(T) \subseteq F_0$, then $A(T') \subseteq F_0$, which implies that T' is an x_1x_n -path in D' , contradicting the fact that K is an independent set by paths in D' . Hence, $A(T) \not\subseteq F_0$. Let $t = \min\{i \in \{1, \dots, n - 1\} : (x_i, x_{i+1}) \notin F_0\}$. It

follows that $(x_{t-1}, x_t) \in F_0$, and $(x_t, x_{t+1}) \in G$ for some $G \in \mathcal{F}$ with $F \neq G$. Notice that $(F, G) \in A(C_{\mathcal{F}}(D))$ and, since \mathcal{S} is an independent set in $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$, then $G \notin \mathcal{S}$. Therefore, $G \in N^+(\mathcal{S})$ which contradicts the assumption that $N^+(\mathcal{S}) = \emptyset$. Hence, K is path-independent in D , which implies that K is a (k, H) -independent set by walks in D for every $k \geq 2$.

Therefore K is a $(k, l+1, H)$ -kernel by walks in D for every $k \geq 2$. \square

Corollary 3.4. *Let D be an H -colored digraph, \mathcal{F} a walk-preservative H -class partition of $A(D)$, and $\{k, l\} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ such that $k \geq 2$ and $l \geq 1$. If \mathcal{S} is a (k, l) -kernel in $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$ such that $N^+(\mathcal{S}) = \emptyset$, then D has a $(k, l+1, H)$ -kernel by walks.*

Proof. Let $W = \{x \in V(D) : d(x) = 0\}$ and K' a (k, l) -kernel in $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$ such that $N^+(\mathcal{S}) = \emptyset$. Since K' is an independent and l -absorbent set in $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$, it follows from Proposition 3.3 that $D - W$ has a (k, l, H) -kernel by walks, say K . By Lemma 3.1, we can conclude that $K \cup W$ is a (k, l, H) -kernel by walks in D . \square

Proposition 3.5. *Let D be an H -colored digraph, and \mathcal{F} a walk-preservative H -class partition of $A(D)$ such that $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$ has a (k, l) -kernel, say \mathcal{S} . If the following conditions holds:*

- a) $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$ has no sinks, and every cycle in $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$ is either a loop or has length at least k .
- b) For every $x \in V(D)$ such that $N_{\mathcal{F}}(x) \cap \mathcal{S} \neq \emptyset$ and $N_{\mathcal{F}}(x) \cap N^+(\mathcal{S}) \neq \emptyset$, we have that $N_{\mathcal{F}}^-(x) \subseteq \mathcal{S}$.

Then D has a $(k, l+1, H)$ -kernel by walks.

Proof. First, suppose that D has no isolated vertices. Let $D_1 = D \langle \cup_{F \in \mathcal{S}} F \rangle$. Since $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$ has no sinks and \mathcal{S} is an independent set in $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$, then $N^+(\mathcal{S}) \neq \emptyset$. Now, let $D_2 = D \langle \cup_{G \in N^+(\mathcal{S})} G \rangle$. By Proposition 2.10, we can consider a kernel by paths in D_1 , say K , such that $K \subseteq V(D_2)$. We will show that K is a $(k, l+1, H)$ -kernel by walks in D .

Since \mathcal{F} is walk-preservative, it follows from Proposition 2.11 that K is an $(l+1, H)$ -absorbent set by walks in D . It only remains to show that K is a (k, H) -independent set by walks in D . First, we will prove the following useful claim.

Claim 1. For every $x \in K$, $N_{\mathcal{F}}^-(x) \subseteq A(D_1)$.

If $x \in K$, then $x \in V(D_1) \cap V(D_2)$. Since $x \in V(D_1)$, it follows from definition of D_1 that there exists $F \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $A(x) \cap F \neq \emptyset$. Hence, $N_{\mathcal{F}}(x) \cap \mathcal{S} \neq \emptyset$. On the other hand, since $x \in V(D_2)$, an analogous proof will show that $N_{\mathcal{F}}(x) \cap N^+(\mathcal{S}) \neq \emptyset$. By hypothesis (b), we can conclude that $N_{\mathcal{F}}^-(x) \subseteq \mathcal{S}$.

In order to show that K is a (k, H) -independent set by walks in D , consider an $x_0 x_n$ -walk in D , say $T = (x_0, \dots, x_n)$, such that $\{x_0, x_n\} \subseteq K$.

Claim 2. $O_H(T) \neq \emptyset$.

Proceeding by contradiction, suppose that $O_H(T) = \emptyset$. Hence, there exists $F' \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $A(T) \subseteq F'$, which implies that $(x_{n-1}, x_n) \in F'$. It follows from Claim 1 that $F' \in \mathcal{S}$. Hence, T is an $x_0 x_n$ -walk in D_1 , which contradicts the fact that K is an independent set by paths in D_1 . Therefore, $O_H(T) \neq \emptyset$ and the claim holds.

By Claim 2, suppose that $O_H(T) = \{\alpha_i : i \in \{1, \dots, t\}\}$ where $t \geq 1$, and $\alpha_i \leq \alpha_{i+1}$ for every $i \in \{1, \dots, t-1\}$. On the other hand, for every $i \in \{1, \dots, t\}$ consider $F_i \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $(x_{\alpha_i}, x_{\alpha_i}^+) \in F_i$, and $F_0 \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $(x_0, x_1) \in F_0$. It follows from definition of $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$ that $T' = (F_0, F_1, \dots, F_t)$ is a walk in $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$. Notice that $l_H(T) = l(T') + 1$ and, by Claim 1, $F_t \in \mathcal{S}$. Consider the following cases:

Case 1. $F_0 \in \mathcal{S}$.

If $F_0 \neq F_t$, as \mathcal{S} is a k -independent set in $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$, then $l(T') \geq k$, which implies that $l_H(T) \geq k$. If $F_0 = F_t$, then T' is a closed walk in $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$ which is not a loop and, by hypothesis, $l(T') \geq k$. Hence, $l_H(T) \geq k$.

Case 2. $F_0 \in V(C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)) \setminus \mathcal{S}$.

By Lemma 2.4, consider $F \in N_{\mathcal{F}}^-(x_0) \cap \mathcal{S}$. Since $F_0 \notin \mathcal{S}$, then $F \neq F_0$. It follows from definition of $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$ that $T'' = (F, F_0) \cup T'$ is a walk in $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$. Notice that $l_H(T) = l(T'')$. If $F \neq F_t$, as \mathcal{S} is a k -independent set in $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$, we have that $l(T'') \geq k$, which implies that $l_H(T) \geq k$. If $F = F_t$, then T'' is a closed walk in $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$ which is not a loop and, by hypothesis, $l(T'') \geq k$. Hence, $l_H(T) \geq k$.

It follows from Case 1 and Case 2 that K is a (k, H) -independent set by walks in D . Therefore, K is a $(k, l+1)$ -kernel by walks in D .

Now, suppose that $W = \{x \in V(D) : d(x) = 0\}$ is nonempty. By the previous proof, we have that $D - W$ has a $(k, l+1, H)$ -kernel by walks, say K . By Lemma 3.1, we can conclude that $K \cup W$ is a $(k, l+1, H)$ -kernel by walks in D . \square

As a consequence of Proposition 3.5, we have the following result for strongly connected digraphs.

Corollary 3.6. *Let D be a strongly connected H -colored digraph and \mathcal{F} a walk-preservative H -class partition of $A(D)$ such that $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$ has a (k, l) -kernel, say \mathcal{S} . If the following conditions holds:*

- a) *Every cycle in $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$ is either a loop or has length at least k .*
- b) *For every $x \in V(D)$ such that $N_{\mathcal{F}}(x) \cap \mathcal{S} \neq \emptyset$ and $N_{\mathcal{F}}(x) \cap N^+(\mathcal{S}) \neq \emptyset$, we have that $N_{\mathcal{F}}^-(x) \subseteq \mathcal{S}$.*

Then D has a $(k, l + 1, H)$ -kernel by walks.

Proof. If D is an H -digraph, it follows from Lemma 3.2 that for every $k \geq 2$ and $l \geq 1$, D has a (k, l, H) -kernel by walks. Hence, we may assume that D is not an H -digraph. It follows that $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$ is a non-trivial strongly connected digraph (Lemma 2.6), which implies that $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$ has no sinks. By Proposition 3.5 we have that D has a $(k, l + 1, H)$ -kernel by walks. \square

Proposition 3.7. *Let D be an H -colored digraph with no isolated vertices, \mathcal{F} a walk-preservative H -class partition of $A(D)$, and \mathcal{S} a (k, l) -kernel in $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$ such that $k \geq 3$ and $l \geq 1$. If for every $F \in \mathcal{S}$, $D\langle F \rangle$ is unilateral and has no sinks, then every kernel by paths in $D(\cup_{F \in \mathcal{S}} F)$ is a $(k - 1, l + 1, H)$ -kernel by walks in D .*

Proof. Let K be a kernel by paths in $D_1 = D(\cup_{F \in \mathcal{S}} F)$. Since \mathcal{F} is a walk-preservative H -class partition, it follows from Proposition 2.11 that K is an $(l + 1, H)$ -absorbent set by walks in D . It only remains to show that K is a $(k - 1, H)$ -independent set by walks in D . Consider a walk in D , say $C = (x_0, \dots, x_n)$, such that $\{x_0, x_n\} \subseteq K$.

Claim 1. $N_{\mathcal{F}}^-(x_0) \cap \mathcal{S} \neq \emptyset$ and $N_{\mathcal{F}}^+(x_n) \cap \mathcal{S} \neq \emptyset$.

Since $x_0 \in K$, it follows from Lemma 2.4 that $N_{\mathcal{F}}^-(x_0) \cap \mathcal{S} \neq \emptyset$. On the other hand, since $x_n \in V(D_1)$, then $x_n \in V(D\langle F \rangle)$ for some $F \in \mathcal{S}$. By hypothesis, $D\langle F \rangle$ has no sinks, which implies that $A^+(x_n) \cap F \neq \emptyset$. Hence $F \in N_{\mathcal{F}}^+(x_n)$, concluding that $F \in N_{\mathcal{F}}^+(x_n) \cap \mathcal{S}$, and the claim holds.

By Claim 1, consider $F' \in N_{\mathcal{F}}^-(x_0) \cap \mathcal{S}$ and $F'' \in N_{\mathcal{F}}^+(x_n) \cap \mathcal{S}$. It follows from Lemma 2.8 that $F' \neq F''$ (*).

Claim 2. $O_H(C) \neq \emptyset$.

Proceeding by contradiction, suppose that $O_H(C) = \emptyset$. Hence, there exists $F \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $A(C) \subseteq F$. By definition of $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$, we have that $\{(F', F), (F, F'')\} \subseteq A(C_{\mathcal{F}}(D))$. Since $\{F', F''\} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ and \mathcal{S} is an independent set in $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$, then $F \neq F'$ and $F \neq F''$. Hence, (F', F, F'') is an $F'F''$ -path in $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$, which is no possible since \mathcal{S} is a k -independent set with $k \geq 3$. Therefore, $O_H(C) \neq \emptyset$, and the claim holds.

By Claim 2, suppose that $O_H(C) = \{\alpha_i : i \in \{1, \dots, t\}\}$ where $t \geq 1$, and $\alpha_i \leq \alpha_{i+1}$ for every $i \in \{1, \dots, t-1\}$. For every $i \in \{1, \dots, t\}$, let $F_i \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $(x_{\alpha_i}, x_{\alpha_i}^+) \in F_i$, and $F_0 \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $(x_0, x_1) \in F_0$. Notice that $x_0 \in V(D\langle F_0 \rangle)$ and $x_n \in V(D\langle F_t \rangle)$. On the other hand, it follows from definition of $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$ that $C_0 = (F_0, F_1, \dots, F_t)$ is a walk in $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$. Consider the following cases:

Case 1. $F_0 \in \mathcal{S}$.

First, suppose that $F_t \in \mathcal{S}$. Notice that C_0 is a walk in $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$ such that $l_H(C) - 1 = l(C_0)$. On the other hand, we have that $\{F_0, F_t\} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$, $x_0 \in V(D\langle F_0 \rangle)$ and $x_n \in V(D\langle F_t \rangle)$, which implies that $F_0 \neq F_t$ (Lemma 2.8). Since \mathcal{S} is a k -independent set in $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$, we have that $l(C_0) \geq k$. We can conclude that $l_H(C) \geq k - 1$.

Now suppose that $F_t \notin \mathcal{S}$, and consider $C_1 = C_0 \cup (F_t, F'')$. Notice that C_1 is a walk in $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$ such that $l_H(C) = l(C_1)$. On the other hand, we have that $\{F_0, F''\} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$, $x_0 \in V(D\langle F_0 \rangle)$ and $x_n \in V(D\langle F'' \rangle)$, which implies that $F_0 \neq F''$ (Lemma 2.8). Since \mathcal{S} is a k -independent set in $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$, then $l(C_1) \geq k$. We can conclude that $l_H(C) \geq k - 1$.

Case 2. $F_0 \in V(C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)) \setminus \mathcal{S}$.

First, suppose that $F_t \in \mathcal{S}$, and consider $C_2 = (F', F_0) \cup C_0$. Notice that C_2 is a walk in $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$ such that $l_H(C) = l(C_2)$. On the other hand, we have that $\{F', F_t\} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$, $x_0 \in V(D\langle F' \rangle)$ and $x_n \in V(D\langle F_t \rangle)$, which implies that $F' \neq F_t$ (Lemma 2.8). Since \mathcal{S} is a k -independent set in $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$, then $l(C_2) \geq k$. We can conclude that $l_H(C) \geq k - 1$.

Now suppose that $F_t \notin \mathcal{S}$, and consider $C_3 = (F', F_0) \cup C_0 \cup (F_t, F'')$. Notice that C_3 is a walk in $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$ such that $l_H(C) + 1 = l(C_3)$. On the other hand, by (*) we have that $F' \neq F''$ and, since \mathcal{S} is a k -independent set in $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$, then $l(C_3) \geq k$. We can conclude that $l_H(C) \geq k - 1$.

It follows from the previous cases that K is a $(k-1, H)$ -independent set by walks in D . Therefore, K is a $(k-1, l+1)$ -kernel by walks in D . \square

Corollary 3.8. *Let D be an H -colored digraph, \mathcal{F} a walk-preservative H -class partition of $A(D)$ such that for every $F \in \mathcal{F}$, $D\langle F \rangle$ is unilateral and has no sinks. If $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$ has a (k, l) -kernel for some $k \geq 3$ and $l \geq 1$, then D has a $(k-1, l+1, H)$ -kernel by walks.*

Proof. First, suppose that D has no isolated vertices. If \mathcal{S} is a (k, l) -kernel in $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$ with $k \geq 3$ and $l \geq 1$, then by Proposition 3.7, every kernel by paths in $D(\cup_{F \in \mathcal{S}} F)$ is a $(k-1, l+1, H)$ -kernel by walks in D .

On the other hand, if $W = \{x \in V(D) : d(x) = 0\}$ is nonempty, then by the previous proof, we have that $D - W$ has a $(k-1, l+1, H)$ -kernel by walks, say K . By Lemma 3.1, we can conclude that $K \cup W$ is a $(k-1, l+1, H)$ -kernel by walks in D . \square

Corollary 3.9. *Let D be an H -colored digraph and \mathcal{F} an H -class partition of $A(D)$. If for every $F \in \mathcal{F}$ we have that $D\langle F \rangle$ is strongly connected, then for every $k \geq 2$ and $l \geq k+1$, D has a (k, l, H) -kernel by walks.*

Proof. First, suppose that D has no isolated vertices. Since $D\langle F \rangle$ is strongly connected for every $F \in \mathcal{F}$, we have that \mathcal{F} is walk-preservative (Lemma 2.9 (a)), and $D\langle F \rangle$ is unilateral and has no sinks for every $F \in \mathcal{F}$. On the other hand, by Lemma 2.9 (b), we have that $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$ is a symmetric digraph, which implies that $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$ has a $(k+1, l-1)$ -kernel for every $k+1 \geq 3$ and $l-1 \geq k$ (Lemma 2.1). Hence, by Corollary 3.8, we have that D has a (k, l, H) -kernel by walks for every $k \geq 2$ and $l \geq k+1$.

On the other hand, if $W = \{x \in V(D) : d(x) = 0\}$ is nonempty, then by the previous proof, we have that $D - W$ has a (k, l, H) -kernel by walks for every $k \geq 2$ and $l \geq k+1$. By Lemma 3.1, we can conclude that D has a (k, l, H) -kernel by walks for every $k \geq 2$ and $l \geq k+1$. \square

Proposition 3.10. *Let D be an H -colored digraph, \mathcal{F} an H -class partition of $A(D)$ and \mathcal{S} a (k, l) -kernel of $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$ for some $k \geq 3$ and $l \geq 1$. If for every $F \in \mathcal{S}$, $D\langle F \rangle$ is strongly connected and has a obstruction-free vertex in D , then D has a $(k+1, l+1, H)$ -kernel by walks.*

Proof. First, suppose that D has no isolated vertices. Let $\mathcal{S} = \{F_1, \dots, F_r\}$ for some $r \geq 1$, and for every $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, let $z_i \in V(D\langle F_i \rangle)$ such that z_i is obstruction-free in D . By Lemma 2.9 (c) we have that $z_i \neq z_j$ whenever $\{i, j\} \subseteq \{1, \dots, r\}$ and $i \neq j$.

Claim 1. $K = \{z_i : i \in \{1, \dots, r\}\}$ is a kernel by paths in $D_1 = D(\cup_{F \in \mathcal{S}} F)$.

In order to show that K is an absorbent set by paths in D_1 , consider $w \in V(D_1) \setminus K$. Since $w \in V(D_1)$, then there exists $j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ such that $w \in V(D\langle F_j \rangle)$. It follows from the fact that $D\langle F_j \rangle$ is strongly connected that there exists a wz_j -path in $D\langle F_j \rangle$, say P . Hence, P is a wK -path in D_1 , concluding that K is an absorbent set by paths in D_1 .

It only remains to show that K is a path-independent set in D_1 . It follows from Lemma 2.9 (c) that $V(D\langle F_i \rangle) \cap V(D\langle F_j \rangle) = \emptyset$ for every $\{i, j\} \subseteq \{1, \dots, r\}$ with $i \neq j$, which implies that there is no $z_i z_j$ -path in D_1 for every $\{i, j\} \subseteq \{1, \dots, r\}$ with $i \neq j$. Hence, K is a path-independent set in D_1 , and the claim holds.

Now, we will show that K is a $(k+1, l+1, H)$ -kernel by walks in D . In order to show that K is an $(l+1, H)$ -absorbent set by walks in D , notice that \mathcal{F} is a walk-preservative partition of $A(D)$ (Lemma 2.9 (a)), and, since K is a kernel by walks in D_1 , we can conclude from Proposition 2.11 that K is an $(l+1, H)$ -absorbent set by walks in D .

It only remains to show that K is a $(k+1, H)$ -independent set by walks in D . Consider $\{z_i, z_j\} \subseteq K$ with $i \neq j$, and a $z_i z_j$ -walk in D , say $C = (z_i = x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n = z_j)$.

Claim 2. $O_H(C) \neq \emptyset$.

Proceeding by contradiction, suppose that $O_H(C) = \emptyset$, which implies that there exists $F \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $A(C) \subseteq F$. Since z_i and z_j are obstruction-free in D , then $F = F_i$ and $F = F_j$ (Lemma 2.2 (b)), concluding that $F_i = F_j$, which is not possible since $F_i \neq F_j$. Hence, $O_H(C) \neq \emptyset$ and the claim holds.

By Claim 2, suppose that $O_H(C) = \{\alpha_i : i \in \{1, \dots, t\}\}$ where $t \geq 1$, and $\alpha_i \leq \alpha_{i+1}$ for every $i \in \{1, \dots, t-1\}$. For every $i \in \{1, \dots, t\}$, let $G_i \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $(x_{\alpha_i}, x_{\alpha_i}^+) \in G_i$, and $G_0 \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $(x_0, x_1) \in G_0$. It follows from definition of $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$ that $C' = (G_0, G_1, \dots, G_t)$ is a walk in $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$. Notice that $z_i \in V(D\langle G_0 \rangle)$, $z_j \in V(D\langle G_t \rangle)$, and $l_H(C) = l(C') + 1$. Since z_i and z_j are obstruction-free in D , then $F_i = G_0$ and $F_j = G_t$ (Lemma 2.2 (b)), which implies that $\{G_0, G_t\} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ and $G_0 \neq G_t$. Since \mathcal{S} is a k -independent set in $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$, then $l(C') \geq k$, which implies that $l_H(C) \geq k+1$. Hence, K is a $(k+1, H)$ -independent set by walks in D . Therefore, K is a $(k+1, l+1, H)$ -kernel by walks in D .

On the other hand, if $W = \{x \in V(D) : d(x) = 0\}$ is nonempty, then by the previous proof, we have that $D - W$ has a $(k+1, l+1, H)$ -kernel by walks, say K . By Lemma 3.1, we can conclude that $K \cup W$ is a $(k+1, l+1, H)$ -kernel by walks in D . \square

Theorem 3.11. *If D is an H -colored digraph such that for every vertex $x \in V(D)$, there exists an xw - H -walk for some vertex obstruction-free w in D , then D has a kernel by H -walks.*

Proof. First, we define the digraph D' whose vertex set consists in the obstruction-free vertices of D , and $(x, z) \in A(D')$ if and only if there exists an xz - H -walk in D . Now, we will show that D' has a kernel, say K , by proving that D' is a transitive digraph. Then, a simple proof will show that K is a kernel by H -walks in D .

In order to show that D' is a transitive digraph, consider $\{(u, v), (v, w)\} \subseteq A(D')$. It follows from definition of D' that there exists a uv - H -walk in D , say W_1 , and a vw - H -walk in D , say W_2 . Since v is a obstruction-free vertex in D , then we have that $W_1 \cup W_2$ is a uw - H -walk in D , which implies that $(u, w) \in A(D')$, concluding that D' is a transitive digraph.

Since D' is a transitive digraph, consider a kernel in D' , say K . We will show that K is a kernel by H -walks in D . It follows from definition of D' and the fact that K is an independent set in D' , that K is an independent set by H -walks in D . It only remains to show that K is an absorbent set by H -walks in D .

Consider $x \in V(D) \setminus K$. If x is a obstruction-free vertex in D , then $x \in V(D')$ and, since K is a kernel in D' , there exists $w \in K$ such that $(x, w) \in A(D')$, which implies that there exists an xw - H -walk in D . If $x \notin V(D')$, then by hypothesis, there exists $z \in V(D')$ and an xz - H -walk in D , say W_1 . If $z \in K$, then W_1 is a xK - H -walk in D . If $z \notin K$, then there exists $w \in K$ such that $(z, w) \in A(D')$, which implies that there exists an zw - H -walk in D , say W_2 . Since z is a obstruction-free vertex in D , then $W_1 \cup W_2$ is an xK - H -walk in D , concluding that K is a kernel by H -walks in D . \square

Corollary 3.12. *If D is an m -colored digraph such that for every vertex $x \in V(D)$, there exists a monochromatic xw -walk with color c , for some vertex w such that every arc in $A(w)$ has color c , then D has a kernel by monochromatic paths.*

Proof. Consider the digraph H whose vertices are the colors represented in $A(D)$, and $A(H) = \{(c, c) : c \in V(H)\}$. Since D is an H -colored digraph satisfying the hypothesis on Lemma 3.11, it follows that D has a kernel by H -walks, which is a kernel by monochromatic paths in D . \square

Corollary 3.13. *If D is an m -colored digraph such that for every vertex $x \in V(D)$, there exists an alternating xw -walk, for some vertex w such that $A^-(w)$ and $A^+(w)$ have no colors in common, then D has a kernel by properly colored walks.*

Proof. Consider the digraph H whose vertices are the colors represented in $A(D)$, and $A(H) = \{(c, d) : \{c, d\} \subseteq V(H), c \neq d\}$. Since D is an H -colored digraph satisfying the hypothesis on Theorem 3.11, it follows that D has a kernel by H -walks, which is a kernel by alternating walks in D . \square

Theorem 3.14. *Let D be an H -colored digraph and \mathcal{F} an H -class partition of $A(D)$ such that for every $F \in \mathcal{F}$, $D\langle F \rangle$ is strongly connected and has a obstruction-free vertex in D . For every $k \geq 2$, D has a (k, H) -kernel by walks.*

Proof. Since $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$ is a symmetric digraph (Lemma 2.9 (b)), for every $k \geq 2$ we have that $C_{\mathcal{F}}(D)$ has a k -kernel (Theorem 1.1). By Theorem 3.10, D has a (k, H) -kernel by walks for every $k \geq 3$. On the other hand, it follows from Theorem 3.11 that D has a $(2, H)$ -kernel by walks, concluding that D has a (k, H) -kernel by walks for every $k \geq 2$. \square

Acknowledgments

Hortensia Galeana-Sánchez is supported by CONACYT FORDECYT-PRONACES/39570/2020 and UNAM-DGAPA-PAPIIT IN102320. Miguel Tecpa-Galván is supported by CONACYT-604315.

References

- [1] C. Andenmatten: H -distance, H - A -kernel and in-state splitting in H -colored graphs and digraphs. (Master Thesis supervised by H. Galeana-Sánchez and J. Pach), École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne, Switzerland, (2019).
- [2] P. Arpin, V. Linek: Reachability problems in edge-colored digraphs, *Discrete. Math.* 307, 2276-2289 (2007).
- [3] J. Bang-Jensen: G. Gutin Digraphs: Theory, Algorithms and Applications, Springer, Longdon, 2000.
- [4] G. Benítez-Bobadilla, H. Galeana-Sánchez, C. Hernández Cruz: Panchromatic patterns by paths, arXiv 1903.10031v1 <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1903.10031.pdf>, 24 Mar 2019

- [5] C. Berge: Graphs and Hypergraphs in: North-Holland Mathematical Library, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam (1985)
- [6] V. Chvátal: On the computational Complexity of Finding a kernel Report CRM300, Centre de Recherches Mathématiques, Université de Montréal (1973).
- [7] N. Creignou: The class of problems that are linearly equivalent to satisfiability or a uniform method for proving np-completeness, Theor. Comput. Sci., 145, 111-145 (1995).
- [8] P. Delgado-Escalante, H. Galeana-Sánchez: Restricted domination in arc-colored digraphs, AKCE Int. J. Comb. 1, 95-104 (2014).
- [9] Y. Dimopoulos, V. Magirou: A graph theoretic approach to default logic, Inform. Comput. 112, 239-256 (1994).
- [10] Y. Dimopoulos, A. Torres: Graph theoretical structures in logic programs and default theories, Theor. Comp. Sci. 170 (1-2), 209-244 (1996).
- [11] A.S. Fraenkel: Combinatorial game theory foundations applied to digraph kernels, Electron. J. Comb. 4 (2), (1997).
- [12] H. Galeana-Sánchez: Kernels by monochromatic paths and the color class digraph, Discuss. Math. Graph Theory 31, 273-281 (2011).
- [13] H. Galeana-Sánchez: Kernels in edge coloured digraphs, Discrete Math. 184, 87-99 (1998).
- [14] H. Galeana Sánchez, C. Hernández-Cruz: On the existence of (k, l) -kernels in infinite digraphs: a survey, Discuss. Math. 34, 431-466 (2014).
- [15] H. Galeana-Sánchez, C. Hernández-Cruz: k -kernels in generalizations of transitive digraphs, Discuss. Math. Graph Theory 31, 293-312 (2011).
- [16] H. Galeana-Sánchez, R. Sánchez-López: H -kernels and H -obstructions in H -colored digraphs, Discrete Math. 338, 2288-2294 (2015).
- [17] H. Galeana-Sánchez, R. Sánchez-López: Richardson's Theorem in H -coloured digraphs, Graphs and Combin. 32, 629-638 (2016).
- [18] H. Galeana-Sánchez, M. Tecpa-Galván: Some extensions for Richardson's theorem for (k, l, H) -kernels and (k, l, H) -kernels by walks in H -colored digraphs, *submitted*.
- [19] D. König: Theorie der endlichen undendlichen Graphen, Reprinted from Chelsea Publishing Company (1950).
- [20] M. Kwaśnik: On (k, l) -kernels, Graph Theory (Lagów, 1981) Lecture Notes in Math 1018, 114-121 (1983).
- [21] M. Kwaśnik: On (k, l) -kernels in graphs and their products (Ph.D. thesis supervised by M. Borowiecki), Technical University of Wrocław, Wrocław (1980).
- [22] V. Linek, B. Sands: A note on paths in edge-colored tournaments, Ars Combin. 44, 225-228 (1996).
- [23] J. von Neumann, O. Morgenstern: Theory of Games and Economic Behavior, Princeton University Press, Princeton (1944).
- [24] K. B. Reid: Monotone reachability in arc-colored tournaments, Congr. Numer. 146, 131-141 (2000).
- [25] B. Sands, N. Sauer, R. Woodrow: On monochromatic paths in edge coloured digraphs, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B33, 271-275 (1982).
- [26] S. Szeider: Finding paths in graphs avoiding forbidden transitions, Discrete Appl. Math. 126, 261-273 (2003).