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#### 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 $W=\left(x_{0}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)$ is an open walk in $D$ and $i \in\{1, \ldots, n-1\}$, we say that there is an obstruction on $x_{i}$ whenever $\left(\operatorname{color}\left(x_{i-1}, x_{i}\right), \operatorname{color}\left(x_{i}, x_{i+1}\right)\right) \notin A(H)$.

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 $x \in V(D) \backslash S$ there exists an $x S$-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 $\mathscr{F}$ of $A(D)$ such that, for every $\{(u, v),(v, w)\} \subseteq A(D)$, $(\operatorname{color}(u, v), \operatorname{color}(v, w)) \in A(H)$ if and only if there exists $F$ in $\mathscr{F}$ such that $\{(u, v),(v, w)\} \subseteq F$. The $H$-class digraph relative to $\mathscr{F}$, denoted by $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$, is the digraph such that $V\left(C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)\right)=\mathscr{F}$, and $(F, G) \in A\left(C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)\right)$ if and only if there exist $(u, v) \in F$ and $(v, w) \in G$ with $\{u, v, w\} \subseteq V(D)$.

We will show sufficient conditions on $\mathscr{F}$ and $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$ 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 an obstruction-free vertex, then for every $k \geq 2, D$ has a ( $k, k-1, H$ )-kernel by walks. Despite the fact that finding $(k, l)$-kernels in arbitrary $H$-colored digraphs is an NP-complete problem, some hypothesis presented in this paper can be verified in polynomial time.
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## 1 Introduction.

Several practical and theoretical problems are related with the idea of convenient and inconvenient changes. For example, consider a group of participants, say $P$, and a set of imputations. We say that an imputation $z$ is superior to an imputation $x$ if there is an influence-group into $P$, say $S_{x z}$, that can convince a sufficient number of participants that imputation $z$ has more benefits for $P$ than $x$, and such change gives particular benefits to $S_{x z}$. It is worth to find a set of imputations that represents good choices for $P$.

A digraph $D$ can be defined as follows: the vertex set is the set of imputations, and $(x, z)$ is an arc in $D$ if and only if there exists an influence-group $S_{x z}$ that can convince enough participants in $P$ to choose imputation $z$ rather than $x$, and such choice gives a particular benefit to the members in $S_{x z}$. Notice that the existence of a path $\left(x_{0}, x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)$ in $D$ implies successive improvements for the participants. However, the change from $x_{1}$ to $x_{2}$ does not necessarily imply a particular benefit for $S_{x_{0} x_{1}}$, and conflicts of interest may arise that prevent the development of improvements for $P$.

Hence, we need to consider the possible conflict of interest that may arise through a chain of improvements. First, let $\rho$ be the arc-coloring in $D$ that assigns to an $\operatorname{arc}(x, z)$ the influence-group $S_{x z}$. Now consider a secondary digraph $H$ whose vertices are the different influence-groups represented in the arcs of $D$, and ( $G, G^{\prime}$ ) is an arc in $H$ whenever a benefit to $G^{\prime}$ implies a benefit to $G$. Notice that the arcs of the digraph $D$ are colored with the vertices of $H$, hence, $D$ is called an $H$-colored digraph. Given two consecutive arcs in $D$, say $(x, z)$ and $(z, w)$, we say that there is a convenient change of color in $z$ if and only if $(\rho(x, z), \rho(z, w)) \in A(H)$. In this case, the influence-groups $S_{x z}$ and $S_{z w}$ will not be in a conflict of interest, and the improvement from $x$ to $z$, and then $z$ to $w$ will be possible. In the same way, an inconvenient change of colors implies a conflict of interest between $S_{x z}$ and $S_{z w}$, and establish agreements between both groups will be necessary in order to achieve an improvement from $x$ to $w$.

In this sense, one may think that an imputation $z$ is more desirable than imputation $x$ if there exists an $x z$-walk in $D$ with no inconvenient changes of color. However, such kind of walks may not necessarily exist, and it is important to consider the number of inconvenient changes of color to reach $z$ from $x$. Given $k \geq 2$, and two different imputations $x$ and $z$, we will say that $z$ is more desirable than $x$ if there exists an $x z$-walk in $D$ with less than $k-1$ inconvenient changes of color. A $(k, H)$-kernel by walks in $D$ is a set of imputations such that: (i) for every $x \in S$, there is no $z \in S$ such that $z$ is more desirable than $x$, and (ii) for every $x \in V(D) \backslash S$, there exists $z \in S$ such that $z$ is more desirable than $x$. A $(k, H)$-kernel by walks in $D$ represents a good choice of imputations for $P$.

The formal notion of $(k, H)$-kernel was introduced in [18] and it is worth mentioning that the authors worked with paths, instead of walks, with at most certain number of inconvenient changes of color. Although there
exist certain classes of $H$-colored digraphs that have a $(k, H)$-kernel for certain values of $k$, it is known that determine if an arbitrary $H$-colored digraph has a $(k, H)$-kernel is an NP-complete problem. Hence, it is worth to find conditions that guarantee the existence of such kind of kernels. However, there are several parameters to consider in order to find $(k, H)$-kernels in arbitrary $H$-colored digraphs, as (i) the digraph $H$, (ii) the $H$-colored digraph, (iii) the coloring of the arcs of $D$, and (iv) the value of $k$. In [18] the authors worked by considering certain properties of the H -colored digraph.

In this paper we will present some sufficient conditions for the existence of a more general kind of kernels, namely $(k, l, H)$-kernels by walks, by considering two ideas: the $H$-colored digraph $D$ has a nice coloring on its arcs, and find $(k, l, H)$-kernels by walks in $D$ through the existence of $(k, l)$-kernels in an auxiliary digraph.

The way we will approach this problem is by means of certain kind of partitions of the arcs of an $H$-colored digraph, which will be called $H$-class partitions, and an auxiliary digraph, called the $H$-class digraph. The $H$-class partitions and the $H$-class digraph simplify the behavior of the arc-coloring in the $H$-colored digraph. Moreover, under certain conditions of such structures, we will be able to guarantee the existence of $(k, H)$-kernels in $H$-colored digraphs. For instance:

Theorem 1.1. (Theorem 5.5) If $D$ is an $H$-colored digraph and $\mathscr{F}$ is an $H$-class partition of $D$ such that every class in $\mathscr{F}$ induces a strongly connected digraph in $D$ and has an obstruction-free vertex in $D$, then for every $k \geq 2, D$ has a $(k, H)$-kernel by walks.

Theorem 1.2. (Theorem 5.3) Let $D$ be an $H$-colored digraph, $\mathscr{F}$ a walk-preservative $H$-class partition of $A(D)$ such that for every $F \in \mathscr{F}, D\langle F\rangle$ is unilateral and has no sinks. If $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$ 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.

Some hypothesis presented in this paper can be verified in polynomial time, and under the hypothesis presented in this paper, find a $(k, l, H)$-kernel is polynomial solvable. Moreover, we will show that some conditions are tight.

## 2 Definitions and previous results

For terminology and notation not defined here, we refer the reader to [3]. If $D=(V(D), A(D))$ 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 $F$ is a subset of arcs in $D$, we denote by $D\langle F\rangle$ the subdigraph arc-induced by $F$, that is $A(D\langle F\rangle)=F$ and $V(D\langle F\rangle)$ consist in those vertices of $D$ which are incident with at least one arc in $F$.

If $H$ is a digraph possibly with loops, a sink is a vertex $x$ such that $A^{+}(x) \subseteq\{(x, x)\}$. If $S_{1}$ is a subsets of $V(D)$, we denote by $N^{+}\left(S_{1}\right)$ 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 $W=\left(x_{0}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)$ is a walk (path), we say that $W$ is an $x_{0} x_{n}$-walk ( $x_{0} x_{n}$-path). The length of $W$ is the number $n$ and it is denoted by $l(W)$. If $T_{1}=\left(z_{0}, \ldots, z_{n}\right)$ and $T_{2}=\left(w_{0}, \ldots, w_{m}\right)$ are walks and $z_{n}=w_{0}$, we denote by $T_{1} \cup T_{2}$ the walk $\left(z_{0}, \ldots, z_{n}=w_{0}, \ldots, w_{m}\right)$. 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 $u v$-walk in $D$ is called an $S_{1} S_{2}$-walk whenever $u \in S_{1}$ and $v \in S_{2}$. If $S_{1}=\{x\}$ or $S_{2}=\{x\}$, then we write $x S_{2}$-walk or $S_{1} x$-walk, respectively. A digraph $D$ is unilateral if for every $\{u, v\} \subseteq V(D)$ there exists either a uv-path or a $v u$-path. A strongly connected digraph is a digraph such that for every $\{u, v\} \subseteq V(D)$, there exist a $u v$-path and a $v u$-path.

The concept of kernel was introduced by von Neumann and Morgenstern in [24] 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, for 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 20 shows that every transitive digraph has a kernel.

A subset $S$ of vertices of $D$ is said to be a kernel by paths, if for every $x \in V(D) \backslash S$, there exists an $x S$-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). Moreover, such kind of kernels can be constructed by taking one arbitrary vertex in each terminal strong component of the digraph. The following lemma will be useful.

Lemma 2.1. If $D$ is a digraph with not 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 not 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 $y z$-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 $x z$-path in $D$ with $\{x, z\} \subseteq K$, contradicting the independence by paths of $K$. Therefore, $d_{D}^{-}(x) \neq 0$.

The concept of $(k, l)$-kernel was introduced by Borowiecki and Kwaśnik in [22] 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 $x \in V(D) \backslash S$ there exists an $x S$-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. Sufficient conditions for the existence of $k$-kernels have been proved, for example see [14], [15] and [21]. In [14] the authors proved the following theorem:

Theorem 2.2. 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.

As a consequence, we have the following lemma.
Lemma 2.3. 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 2.2 and the definition of $(k, l)$-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 colors). A subset $S$ of vertices of $D$ is a kernel by monochromatic paths (respectively, kernel by alternating walks) if for every $x \in V(D) \backslash S$ there exists a monochromatic $x S$-path (respectively an alternating $x S$-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 was introduced in [26]. Due to the difficulty of finding kernels by monochromatic paths in $m$-colored digraphs, in [12] was defined the color-class digraph of an $m$-colored digraph, denoted by $\mathscr{C}(D)$, as the digraph whose set of vertices are the colors represented in the arcs of $D$, and $\left(c_{1}, c_{2}\right)$ is an arc in $\mathscr{C}(D)$ 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 $c_{2}$. Several conditions on the color-class digraph guarantee the existence of a kernel by monochromatic paths.

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 $D^{\prime}$ of $D$ is an $H$-digraph, if for every two $\operatorname{arcs}(u, v)$ and $(v, w)$ in $D^{\prime}$ we have that $(\rho(u, v), \rho(v, w)) \in A(H)$.

An $H$-class partition of $A(D)$ is a partition of $A(D)$, say $\mathscr{F}$, 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 $\mathscr{F}$ such that $\{(u, v),(v, w)\} \subseteq F$. An $H$-class partition $\mathscr{F}$ is walk-preservative if for every $(F, G) \in A\left(C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)\right)$ and $z \in V(D\langle F\rangle)$, there exists a $z w$-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 $x \in V(D)$, we define $N_{\mathscr{F}}^{-}(x)=\{F \in \mathscr{F}:(u, x) \in F$ for some $u \in V(D)\}, N_{\mathscr{F}}^{+}(x)=\{F \in \mathscr{F}:(x, v) \in F$ for some $v \in V(D)\}$, and $N_{\mathscr{F}}(x)=N_{\mathscr{F}}^{+}(x) \cup N_{\mathscr{F}}^{-}(x)$.

If $\mathscr{F}$ is an $H$-class partition of $A(D)$, the $H$-class digraph relative to $\mathscr{F}$, denoted by $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$, is the digraph such that $V\left(C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)\right)=\mathscr{F}$, and $\left(F_{i}, F_{j}\right)$ is an arc in $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$, 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 $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$ can allow loops. Moreover, $\mathscr{C}(D)$ is a particular case of $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$ when $H$ has only loops, every vertex in $H$ has a loop and every class in $\mathscr{F}$ consist in those arcs colored alike.

If $W=\left(x_{0}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)$ is a walk in an $H$-colored digraph $D$, and $i \in\{0, \ldots, n-1\}$, we say that there is an obstruction on $x_{i}$ if and only if $\left(\rho\left(x_{i-1}, x_{i}\right), \rho\left(x_{i}, x_{i+1}\right)\right) \notin A(H)$ (indices are taken modulo $n$ if $\left.x_{0}=x_{n}\right)$. We denote by $O_{H}(W)$ the set $\left\{i \in\{1, \ldots, n-1\}\right.$ : there is an obstruction on $\left.x_{i}\right\}\left(O_{H}(W)=\{i \in\{0, \ldots, n-1\}\right.$ : there is an obstruction on $\left.x_{i}\right\}$ if $W$ is closed). A walk without obstructions is called $H$-walk. If $D$ is an $H$-colored digraph and $W$ is a walk in $D$, the $H$-length of $W$, denoted by $l_{H}(W)$, is defined as either $l_{H}(W)=\left|O_{H}(W)\right|+1$ if $W$ is open or $l_{H}(W)=\left|O_{H}(W)\right|$ otherwise. Notice that the usual length is a particular case of the $H$-length when $H$ has no arcs nor loops. The $H$-length was studied in 16 for closed walks and in 1 for open walks.

If $l \geq 1$, a subset $S$ of vertices of $D$ is an $(l, H)$-absorbent set by walks if for every vertex $v \in V(D) \backslash S$ there exists a $v S$-walk whose $H$-length is at most $l$. If $k \geq 2$, we say that $S$ is a $(k, H)$-independent set by walks if for every pair of different vertices in $S$, every 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 walks if it is both $(k, H)$-independent by walks and $(l, H)$-absorbent by walks. If $l=k-1$, a $(k, l, H)$-kernel by walks is called a $(k, H)$-kernel by walks. It is straightforward to see the following lemma.

Lemma 2.4. 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 $l \geq 1$.

It is worth mentioning that the concepts of $(k, l, H)$-kernel by paths (introduced in [18) 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.

Some kinds of kernels are particular cases of the $(k, l, H)$-kernels by walks in $H$-colored digraphs. For instance, if $S$ is a $(k, l, H)$-kernel by walks in an $H$-colored digraph, then: (i) $S$ is a kernel (von Neumann and Morgenstern [24]) if $k=2, l=1$ and $H$ has no arcs nor loops, (ii) $S$ is a ( $k, l$ )-kernel (Borowiecki and Kwaśnik in [22]) if $H$ is a digraph without arcs nor loops, (iii) $S$ is a kernel by monochromatic paths (Sands, Sauer and Woodrow [26]) if $k=2, l=1$ and $H$ is a looped digraph and those are the only arcs in $H$, and (vi) $S$ is an $H$-kernel (Arpin and Linek [2]) if $k=2$ and $l=1$.

Finally, the following lemma will be useful in what follows.
Lemma 2.5. 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 $D$.

## 3 First results

In this section we will show several technical lemmas and corollaries in order to simplify the proofs of the main results.

Lemma 3.1. Let $D$ be an $H$-colored digraph, $\mathscr{F}$ an $H$-class partition of $A(D)$ and $x \in V(D)$. The following assertions hold:
a) If $d^{-}(x) \neq 0$ and $d^{+}(x) \neq 0$, then for every $F_{1} \in N_{\mathscr{F}}^{-}(x)$ and $F_{2} \in N_{\mathscr{F}}^{+}(x)$, we have that $\left(F_{1}, F_{2}\right) \in A\left(C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)\right)$.
b) If $x$ is obstruction-free in $D$ and $d(x) \neq 0$, then there is a unique $F \in \mathscr{F}$ 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 $F \in \mathscr{F}$ such that $A(T) \subseteq F$.
d) If $u, v$ and $w$ are three different vertices in $D, T$ is a uv-walk, and $T^{\prime}$ is a vw-H-walk, then either $l_{H}(T \cup$ $\left.T^{\prime}\right)=l_{H}(T)$ or $l_{H}\left(T \cup T^{\prime}\right)=l_{H}(T)+1$.

Proof. a) If $F_{1} \in N_{\mathscr{F}}^{-}(x)$ and $F_{2} \in N_{\mathscr{F}}^{+}(x)$, then there exists $\{u, v\} \subseteq V(D)$ such that $(u, x) \in F_{1}$ and $(x, v) \in F_{2}$. It follows from the definition of $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$ that $\left(F_{1}, F_{2}\right) \in A\left(C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)\right)$.
b) Since $d(x) \neq 0$, then there exists $F \in \mathscr{F}$ such that $x \in V(D\langle F\rangle)$. On the other hand, since $x$ is obstructionfree, we have that $A(x) \subseteq F$, concluding that $F$ is unique.
c) If $T=\left(x_{0}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)$, then $\left(\rho\left(x_{i-1}, x_{i}\right), \rho\left(x_{i}, x_{i+1}\right)\right) \in A(H)$ for every $i \in\{0, \ldots, n-1\}$ (indices modulo $n$ if $x_{0}=x_{n}$ ). Hence, it follows from the definition of $H$-class partition that there is a unique $F \in \mathscr{F}$ such that $A(T) \subseteq F$.
d) Suppose that $T=\left(z_{0}=u, z_{1}, \ldots, z_{n}=v\right)$ and $T^{\prime}=\left(z_{n}=v, z_{n+1}, \ldots, z_{m}=w\right)$. It is straightforward to see that $O_{H}\left(T \cup T^{\prime}\right) \subseteq O_{H}(T) \cup\{n\}$ and $O_{H}(T) \subseteq O_{H}\left(T \cup T^{\prime}\right)$, which implies that either $l_{H}\left(T \cup T^{\prime}\right)=l_{H}(T)$ or $l_{H}\left(T \cup T^{\prime}\right)=l_{H}(T)+1$.

Lemma 3.2. Let $D$ be an $H$-colored digraph and $\mathscr{F}$ an $H$-class partition of $A(D)$. If $\mathcal{S}$ is an independent set in $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$, then $D\left\langle\cup_{F \in \mathcal{S}} F\right\rangle$ is an $H$-subdigraph of $D$.

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

The following lemmas will show some properties of the $H$-class partitions and the $H$-class digraph related to connectivity.

Lemma 3.3. Let $D$ be an $H$-colored digraph and $\mathscr{F}$ an $H$-class partition of $A(D)$. If $D$ is strongly connected, then $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$ is strongly connected.

Proof. Let $F$ and $F^{\prime}$ be different vertices in $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$, and $\left\{\left(x_{0}, x_{1}\right),\left(z_{0}, z_{1}\right)\right\} \subseteq A(D)$ such that $\left(x_{0}, x_{1}\right) \in F$ and $\left(z_{0}, z_{1}\right) \in F^{\prime}$. It follows from the fact that $D$ is strongly connected, that there exists an $x_{0} z_{1}$-walk in $D$, say $C=\left(w_{0}, \ldots, w_{n}\right)$, whose initial arc is $\left(x_{0}, x_{1}\right)$ and ending arc is $\left(z_{0}, z_{1}\right)$.

Since $\left(w_{0}, w_{1}\right) \in F,\left(w_{n-1}, w_{n}\right) \in F^{\prime}$, and $F \neq F^{\prime}$, we can conclude that $O_{H}(C) \neq \emptyset$ (Lemma 3.1) (c)). Let $O_{H}(C)=\left\{\alpha_{1}, \ldots, \alpha_{r}\right\}$ for some $r \geq 1$, and we can assume that $\alpha_{i} \leq \alpha_{i+1}$ whenever $i \in\{1, \ldots, r-1\}$. For every $i \in\{1, \ldots, r\}$, let $G_{i} \in \mathscr{F}$ such that $\left(w_{\alpha_{i}}, w_{\alpha_{i}}^{+}\right) \in G_{i}$. Notice that $P=\left(G_{1}, \ldots, G_{r}\right)$ is a walk in $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$, and $G_{r}=F^{\prime}$.

If $\alpha_{1}=0$, then $F=G_{1}$, which implies that $P$ is an $F F^{\prime}$-walk in $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$. If $\alpha_{1} \neq 0$, then $\left(F, G_{1}\right) \in$ $A\left(C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)\right)$, which implies that $\left(F, G_{1}\right) \cup P$ is an $F F^{\prime}$-walk in $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$. Hence, we conclude that $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$ is strongly connected.

Lemma 3.4. Let $D$ be an $H$-colored digraph, $\mathscr{F}$ an $H$-class partition of $A(D), \mathcal{S}$ a non-empty subset of $V\left(C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)\right)$ such that $D\langle F\rangle$ is unilateral for every $F \in \mathcal{S}, K$ a kernel by walks in $D\left\langle\cup_{F \in \mathcal{S}} F\right\rangle$, and $\{x, z\} \subseteq K$. If $x \in V\left(D\left\langle F_{1}\right\rangle\right)$ and $z \in V\left(D\left\langle F_{2}\right\rangle\right)$ for some $\left\{F_{1}, F_{2}\right\} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$, then $F_{1} \neq F_{2}$.

Proof. Proceeding by contradiction, suppose that $F_{1}=F_{2}$. Since $D\left\langle F_{1}\right\rangle$ is unilateral, then either there exists an $x z$-path in $D\left\langle F_{1}\right\rangle$ or there exists a $z x$-path in $D\left\langle F_{1}\right\rangle$, say $P$. It follows that $P$ is a path in $D\left\langle\cup_{F \in \mathcal{S}} F\right\rangle$ such that $\{x, z\} \subseteq K$, which contradicts the independence by paths of $K$. Therefore, $F_{1} \neq F_{2}$.

Lemma 3.5. Let $D$ be an $H$-colored digraph and $\mathscr{F}$ an $H$-class partition of $A(D)$ such that for every $F \in \mathscr{F}$, $D\langle F\rangle$ is strongly connected. The following assertions hold:
a) $\mathscr{F}$ is walk-preservative.
b) $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$ is a symmetric digraph.
c) If $\mathcal{S} \subseteq V\left(C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)\right)$ is an independent set in $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$ and $\left\{F_{1}, F_{2}\right\} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$, then $V\left(D\left\langle F_{1}\right\rangle\right) \cap V\left(D\left\langle F_{2}\right\rangle\right)=\emptyset$.

Proof. a) Let $(F, G) \in A\left(C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)\right)$ and $x \in V(D\langle F\rangle)$. It follows from the definition of $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$ 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 $x v$-walk in $D\langle F\rangle$, which implies that $\mathscr{F}$ is walk-preservative.
b) Let $\left(F_{1}, F_{2}\right) \in A\left(C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)\right)$. It follows from the definition of $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$ that there exists $\{u, v, z\} \subseteq V(D)$ such that $(u, v) \in F_{1}$ and $(v, z) \in F_{2}$. Since $(u, v) \in A\left(D\left\langle F_{1}\right\rangle\right)$, then $D\left\langle F_{1}\right\rangle$ is a nontrivial strongly connected digraph, which implies that there exists $u^{\prime} \in V\left(D\left\langle F_{1}\right\rangle\right)$ such that $\left(v, u^{\prime}\right) \in F_{1}$. In the same way, there exists $z^{\prime} \in V\left(D\left\langle F_{2}\right\rangle\right)$ such that $\left(z^{\prime}, v\right) \in F_{2}$. It follows from the definition of $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$ that $\left(F_{2}, F_{1}\right) \in A\left(C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)\right)$, concluding that $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$ is a symmetric digraph.
c) Proceeding by contradiction, suppose that $V\left(D\left\langle F_{1}\right\rangle\right) \cap V\left(D\left\langle F_{2}\right\rangle\right) \neq \emptyset$, and consider $x \in V\left(D\left\langle F_{1}\right\rangle\right) \cap$ $V\left(D\left\langle F_{2}\right\rangle\right)$. Since $D\left\langle F_{1}\right\rangle$ and $D\left\langle F_{2}\right\rangle$ are non-trivial strongly connected digraphs, then there exist $u \in V\left(D\left\langle F_{1}\right\rangle\right)$ and $z \in V\left(D\left\langle F_{2}\right\rangle\right)$ such that $(u, x) \in A\left(D\left\langle F_{1}\right\rangle\right)$ and $(x, z) \in A\left(D\left\langle F_{2}\right\rangle\right)$. It follows from the definition of $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$ that $\left(F_{1}, F_{2}\right) \in A\left(C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)\right)$, which is not possible since $\mathcal{S}$ is an independent set in $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$. Therefore, $V\left(D\left\langle F_{1}\right\rangle\right) \cap V\left(D\left\langle F_{2}\right\rangle\right)=\emptyset$.

Theorem 3.6. If $D$ is an $H$-colored digraph such that for every vertex $x \in V(D)$, there exists an $x w$ - $H$-walk for some obstruction-free vertex $w$ in $D$, then $D$ has a kernel by $H$-walks.

Proof. First, we define the digraph $D^{\prime}$ whose vertex set consists of the obstruction-free vertices of $D$, and $(x, z) \in A\left(D^{\prime}\right)$ if and only if there exists an $x z$ - $H$-walk in $D$. Now, we will show that $D^{\prime}$ has a kernel, say $K$, by proving that $D^{\prime}$ 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 $D^{\prime}$ is a transitive digraph, consider $\{(u, v),(v, w)\} \subseteq A\left(D^{\prime}\right)$. It follows from the definition of $D^{\prime}$ that there exists a $u v$ - $H$-walk in $D$, say $W_{1}$, and a $v w$ - $H$-walk in $D$, say $W_{2}$. Since $v$ is an obstruction-free vertex in $D$, then we have that $W_{1} \cup W_{2}$ is a $u w$ - $H$-walk in $D$, which implies that $(u, w) \in A\left(D^{\prime}\right)$, concluding that $D^{\prime}$ is a transitive digraph.

Since $D^{\prime}$ is a transitive digraph, consider a kernel in $D^{\prime}$, say $K$. We will show that $K$ is a kernel by $H$-walks in $D$. It follows from the definition of $D^{\prime}$ and the fact that $K$ is an independent set in $D^{\prime}$, 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 $x \in V(D) \backslash K$. If $x$ is an obstruction-free vertex in $D$, then $x \in V\left(D^{\prime}\right)$ and, since $K$ is a kernel in $D^{\prime}$, there exists $w \in K$ such that $(x, w) \in A\left(D^{\prime}\right)$, which implies that there exists an $x w$ - $H$-walk in $D$. If $x \notin V\left(D^{\prime}\right)$, then by hypothesis, there exists $z \in V\left(D^{\prime}\right)$ and an $x z$ - $H$-walk in $D$, say $W_{1}$. If $z \in K$, then $W_{1}$ is an $x K$ - $H$-walk in $D$. If $z \notin K$, then there exists $w \in K$ such that $(z, w) \in A\left(D^{\prime}\right)$, which implies that there exists a $z w$ - $H$-walk in $D$, say $W_{2}$. Since $z$ is an obstruction-free vertex in $D$, then $W_{1} \cup W_{2}$ is an $x K$ - $H$-walk in $D$, concluding that $K$ is a kernel by $H$-walks in $D$.

Two simple but interesting corollaries of the previous result can be shown considering particular patterns.

Corollary 3.7. 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 3.6, it follows that $D$ has a kernel by $H$-walks, which is a kernel by monochromatic paths in $D$.

Corollary 3.8. If $D$ is an $m$-colored digraph such that for every vertex $x \in V(D)$, there exists an alternating $x w$-walk, for some vertex $w$ such that $A^{-}(w)$ and $A^{+}(w)$ have not 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 3.6, it follows that $D$ has a kernel by $H$-walks, which is a kernel by alternating walks in $D$.

The goal of the following lemma is to show the importance of the notion of a walk-preservative $H$-class partition. Such condition allows us to find $(l+1, H)$-absorbent sets by walks in an $H$-colored digraph through $l$-absorbent sets in the $H$-class digraph.

Proposition 3.9. Let $D$ be an $H$-colored digraph with not isolated vertices, $\mathscr{F}$ a walk-preservative $H$-class partition of $A(D)$, and $\mathcal{S}$ an independent and $l$-absorbent set in $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$ for some $l \geq 1$. If $K$ is a kernel by paths in $D\left\langle\cup_{F \in \mathcal{S}} F\right\rangle$, then $K$ is an $(l+1, H)$-absorbent set by walks in $D$.

Proof. Let $D^{\prime}=D\left\langle\cup_{F \in \mathcal{S}} F\right\rangle$ and $x_{0} \in V(D) \backslash K$. If $x_{0} \in V\left(D^{\prime}\right)$, since $K$ is a kernel by paths in $D^{\prime}$, there exists an $x_{0} K$-path in $D^{\prime}$, say $T$. It follows from Lemma 3.2 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 $x_{0} \notin V\left(D^{\prime}\right)$. By hypothesis, $x_{0}$ is not isolated, which implies that $x_{0} \in V\left(D\left\langle F_{0}\right\rangle\right)$ for some $F_{0} \in \mathscr{F}$. Notice that $F_{0} \notin \mathcal{S}$ because $x_{0} \notin V\left(D^{\prime}\right)$. Since $\mathcal{S}$ is an $l$-absorbent set in $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$, we can consider an $F_{0} F_{t}$-path with minimum length in $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$, say $T=\left(F_{0}, \ldots, F_{r}\right)$, where $F_{r} \in \mathcal{S}$. Notice that $r \leq l$.

Since $\mathscr{F}$ is walk-preservative, there exists $x_{\alpha_{1}} \in V\left(D\left\langle F_{0}\right\rangle\right) \cap V\left(D\left\langle F_{1}\right\rangle\right)$ such that there exists an $x_{0} x_{\alpha_{1}}$ path in $D\left\langle F_{0}\right\rangle$, say $T_{0}$, and, for every $i \in\{2, \ldots, r-1\}$, there exist $x_{\alpha_{i}} \in V\left(D\left\langle F_{i-1}\right\rangle\right) \cap V\left(D\left\langle F_{i}\right\rangle\right)$ and $x_{\alpha_{i+1}} \in V\left(D\left\langle F_{i}\right\rangle\right) \cap V\left(D\left\langle F_{i+1}\right\rangle\right)$, such that there exists an $x_{\alpha_{i}} x_{\alpha_{i+1}}$ - path in $D\left\langle F_{i}\right\rangle$, say $T_{i}$. Notice that $T_{i}$ is an $H$-path for every $i \in\{0, \ldots, r-1\}$, and $x_{\alpha_{r}} \in V\left(D^{\prime}\right)$. Moreover, since $C$ is a path in $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$, then $A\left(T_{i}\right) \cap A\left(T_{j}\right)=\emptyset$ whenever $i \neq j$.

Now we consider $C=\cup_{i=0}^{r-1} T_{i}$, and suppose that $C=\left(z_{1}, \ldots, z_{n}\right)$. Notice that $z_{n} \in V\left(D^{\prime}\right)$ (because $z_{n}=x_{\alpha_{r}}$ ).

Claim 1. $l_{H}(C) \leq l+1$.
For every $i \in\{0, \ldots, r-2\}$, let $U_{i}=\left\{l \in\{1, \ldots, n-1\}:\left(z_{l-1}, z_{l}\right) \in F_{i}\right\}$ be, and $L=\{i \in\{0, \ldots, r-2\}$ : $\left.U_{i} \neq \emptyset\right\}$. For every $i \in L$, define $\beta_{i}=\max U_{i}$.
We will show that $O_{H}(C) \subseteq\left\{\beta_{i}: i \in L\right\}$. If $m \in O_{H}(C)$, then it follows that $\left(\rho\left(z_{m-1}, z_{m}\right), \rho\left(z_{m}, z_{m+1}\right)\right) \notin$ $A(H)$. On the other hand, we have that $\left(z_{m-1}, z_{m}\right) \in A\left(T_{j}\right)$ for some $j \in\{0, \ldots, r-1\}$. Since $T_{j}$ is an $H$-path, then $\left(z_{m}, z_{m+1}\right) \notin A\left(T_{j}\right)$, which implies that $m=\max U_{j}$ and $j \leq r-2$. Hence, $m \in\left\{\beta_{i}: i \in L\right\}$. It follows that $O_{H}(C) \subseteq L$. Hence, $\left|O_{H}(C)\right| \leq|L|$, that is $\left|O_{H}(C)\right| \leq r-1$, and we can conclude that $l_{H}(C) \leq l$.

If $z_{n} \in K$, then by Claim 1 we have that $C$ is an $x_{0} K$-path with $l_{H}(C) \leq l+1$. If $z_{t} \notin K$, since $z_{n} \in V\left(D^{\prime}\right)$, and $K$ is an absorbent set by paths in $D^{\prime}$, then there exists a $z_{n} K$-path in $D^{\prime}$, say $T_{r}$. Hence, $C^{\prime}=C \cup T_{r}$ is an $x_{0} K$-walk in $D$, and by Lemma 3.1, $l_{H}\left(C^{\prime}\right) \leq l_{H}(C)+1$, which implies that $l_{H}\left(C^{\prime}\right) \leq l+1$.

Therefore, $K$ is an $(l+1, H)$-absorbent set by walks in $D$.
Notice that conclusion of Proposition 3.9 is 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 shown in Figure 1, and for every $i \in\{1, \ldots, 6\}$ let $F_{i}=\left\{e \in A(D): \rho(e)=c_{i}\right\}$. Clearly, $\mathscr{F}=\left\{F_{i}: i \in\{1, \ldots, 6\}\right\}$ is a walk-preservative $H$-class partition of $A(D)$. Notice that $\mathcal{S}=\left\{F_{6}\right\}$ is a 3 -absorbent set in $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$. On the other hand, it is straightforward to see that $K=\left\{x_{4}\right\}$ is a kernel by paths in $D\left\langle F_{6}\right\rangle$ which is not an $(r, H)$-absorbent by walks in $D$ for every $r \in\{1,2,3\}$.

On the other hand, if $D$ is an $H$-colored digraph and $\mathscr{F}$ is an $H$-class partition which is not walk-preservative, then Proposition 3.9 is not necessarily true. Consider the $H$-colored digraph shown in Figure 2. For every $i \in\{1, \ldots, 5\}$ let $F_{i}=\left\{e \in A(D): \rho(e)=c_{i}\right\}$. It is straightforward to see that $\mathscr{F}=\left\{F_{i}: i \in\{1, \ldots, 5\}\right\}$ is an $H$-class partition of $A(D)$. Notice that $\left(F_{2}, F_{3}\right)$ is an arc of $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$ such that $x_{3} \in V\left(D\left\langle F_{2}\right\rangle\right)$, and there is no $x_{3} w$-walk in $D\left\langle F_{2}\right\rangle$ with $w \in V\left(D\left\langle F_{3}\right\rangle\right)$, that is, $\mathscr{F}$ is not a walk-preservative $H$-class partition of $A(D)$. On
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the other hand, $\mathcal{S}=\left\{F_{5}\right\}$ is a 4-absorbent set in $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$ but no kernel by paths in $D\left\langle F_{5}\right\rangle$ is a (5,H)-absorbent set by walks in $D$.

Given an $H$-colored digraph $D$, a walk-preservative $H$-class partition of $A(D)$, say $\mathscr{F}$, and an $l$-absorbent an independent set in $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$, it follows from Proposition 3.9 that every kernel by paths in $D\left\langle\cup_{F \in N} F\right\rangle$, say $K$, is an $(l+1, H)$-absorbent set by walks in $D$. Remark that find kernels by paths in arbitrary digraphs can be solved in polynomial time.

Lemma 3.10. Let $D$ be an $H$-colored digraph and $\mathscr{F}$ an $H$-class partition of $A(D)$. If $\mathcal{S}$ is a nonempty subset of $\mathscr{F}$ and $K$ is a kernel by paths in $D\left\langle\cup_{F \in \mathcal{S}} F\right\rangle$, then for every $x \in K, N_{\mathscr{F}}^{-}(x) \cap \mathcal{S} \neq \emptyset$.

Proof. Let $K$ be a kernel by paths in $D^{\prime}=D\left\langle\cup_{F \in \mathcal{S}} F\right\rangle$ and $x \in K$. By Lemma 2.1 we have that $d_{D^{\prime}}^{-}(x) \neq 0$. Hence, there exists $z \in V\left(D^{\prime}\right)$ such that $(z, x) \in A\left(D^{\prime}\right)$. It follows from the definition of $D^{\prime}$ that $(z, x) \in F$ for some $F \in \mathcal{S}$, which implies that $F \in N_{\mathscr{F}}^{-}(x) \cap \mathcal{S}$. Hence, $N_{\mathscr{F}}^{-}(x) \cap \mathcal{S} \neq \emptyset$.

Proposition 3.11. Let $D$ be an $H$-colored digraph and $\mathscr{F}$ a non-trivial walk-preservative $H$-class partition of $A(D)$ such that $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$ has no sinks. If $\mathcal{S}$ is an independent set in $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$, then there exists a kernel by paths in $D\left\langle\cup_{F \in \mathcal{S}} F\right\rangle$, say $N$, such that $N \subseteq V\left(D\left\langle\cup_{G \in N^{+}(\mathcal{S})} G\right\rangle\right)$.

Proof. We will denote by $D_{1}$ the digraph $D\left\langle\cup_{F \in \mathcal{S}} F\right\rangle$. Since $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$ has no sinks, then $N^{+}(\mathcal{S}) \neq \emptyset$. Hence, denote by $D_{2}$ the digraph $D\left\langle\cup_{G \in N^{+}(\mathcal{S})} G\right\rangle$. Let $N$ be a kernel by paths in $D_{1}$ intersecting $V\left(D_{2}\right)$ the most possible, that is, for every kernel by paths in $D_{1}$, say $N^{\prime}$, we have that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|N \backslash V\left(D_{2}\right)\right| \leq\left|N^{\prime} \backslash V\left(D_{2}\right)\right| \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Notice that possibly $N \cap V\left(D_{2}\right)=\emptyset$. We claim that $N \backslash V\left(D_{2}\right)=\emptyset$. Proceeding by contradiction, suppose that there exists $x_{0} \in N \backslash V\left(D_{2}\right)$. Since $x_{0} \in V\left(D_{1}\right)$, it follows from the definition of $D_{1}$ that there exists $F \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $x_{0} \in V(D\langle F\rangle)$. By hypothesis, $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$ has no sinks, which implies that there exists $G \in V\left(C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)\right)$ such that $F \neq G$ and $(F, G) \in A\left(C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)\right)$. It follows from the fact that $\mathscr{F}$ is a walk-preservative $H$-class partition that there exists an $x_{0} z$-path in $D\langle F\rangle$, say $C$, for some $z \in V(D\langle G\rangle)$. Notice that $C$ is a path in $D_{1}$, $z \in V\left(D_{1}\right) \cap V\left(D_{2}\right)$, 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 $z x_{0}$-path in $D_{1}$.
Since $z \notin N$, there exists a $z y$-path in $D_{1}$ for some $y \in N$, say $P^{\prime}$. It follows that $C \cup P^{\prime}$ is an $x_{0} y$-walk in $D_{1}$ such that $x_{0} \in N$ and $y \in N$, which implies that $x_{0}=y$, concluding that $P^{\prime}$ is a $z x_{0}$-path in $D_{1}$.

Claim 2. $\left(N \backslash\left\{x_{0}\right\}\right) \cup\{z\}$ is a kernel by paths in $D_{1}$.
In order to show that $N^{\prime}=\left(N \backslash\left\{x_{0}\right\}\right) \cup\{z\}$ is an absorbent set by paths in $D_{1}$, consider $u \in V\left(D_{1}\right) \backslash N^{\prime}$. If $u=x_{0}$, then $C$ is an $x_{0} N^{\prime}$-path in $D_{1}$. If $u \neq x_{0}$, then $u \in V\left(D_{1}\right) \backslash N$. It follows from the fact that $N$ is an absorbent set by paths in $D_{1}$ that there exists a $u v$-path in $D_{1}$, say $P$, for some $v \in N$. If $v \neq x_{0}$, then $P$ is a $u N^{\prime}$-path in $D_{1}$. If $v=x_{0}$, then $P \cup C$ is a $u N^{\prime}$-walk in $D_{1}$, concluding that $N^{\prime}$ is an absorbent set by paths in $D_{1}$.
Now we will show that $N^{\prime}$ is an independent set by paths in $D_{1}$. Proceeding by contradiction, suppose that there exists a $u v$-path in $D_{1}$, say $T$, where $\{u, v\} \subseteq N^{\prime}$. 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 $x_{0} v$-walk in $D_{1}$, which contradicts the independence by paths of $N$. If $v=z$, by Claim 1 there exists a $z x_{0}$-path in $D_{1}$, say $P$, which implies that $T \cup P$ is a $u x_{0}$-walk in $D_{1}$, contradicting the independence by paths of $N$. Therefore, $N^{\prime}$ is an independent set by paths in $D_{1}$, and the claim holds.

Notice that $\left|N^{\prime} \backslash V\left(D_{2}\right)\right|=\left|N \backslash V\left(D_{2}\right)\right|-1$, which is not possible by (1). Therefore, $N \backslash V\left(D_{2}\right)=\emptyset$, concluding that $N \subseteq V\left(D_{2}\right)$.

Notice that the previous proof gives us a simple way to find the kernel by paths described in Proposition 3.11 First, let $D_{2}=D\left\langle\cup_{G \in N^{+}(\mathcal{S})} G\right\rangle$, and take an arbitrary kernel by walks in $D_{1}=D\left\langle\cup_{F \in \mathcal{S}} F\right\rangle$, say $N$. If $N \subseteq V\left(D_{2}\right)$, we are done. Otherwise, there exist $x_{0} \in N \backslash V\left(D_{2}\right), z \in V\left(D_{1}\right) \cap V\left(D_{2}\right)$ and a $x_{0} z$-path in $D_{1}$. Then, replace $N$ by $\left(N \backslash\left\{x_{0}\right\}\right) \cup\{z\}$. Repeat such procedure until $N \subseteq V\left(D_{2}\right)$.

## 4 Main results

In this section we will show some conditions that guarantee the existence of $(k, l, H)$-kernels by walks in $H$ colored digraphs by means of $(k, l)$-kernels in the $H$-class digraph.

Proposition 4.1. Let $D$ be an $H$-colored digraph, and $\mathscr{F}$ a walk-preservative $H$-class partition of $A(D)$ such that $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$ has a $(k, l)$-kernel, say $\mathcal{S}$. If the following conditions hold:
a) $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$ has no sinks, and every cycle in $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$ is either a loop or has length at least $k$.
b) For every $x \in V(D)$ such that $N_{\mathscr{F}}(x) \cap S \neq \emptyset$ and $N_{\mathscr{F}}(x) \cap N^{+}(\mathcal{S}) \neq \emptyset$, we have that $N_{\mathscr{F}}^{-}(x) \subseteq \mathcal{S}$.

Then $D$ has a $(k, l+1, H)$-kernel by walks.
Proof. First, suppose that $D$ has not isolated vertices. Let $D_{1}=D\left\langle\cup_{F \in \mathcal{S}} F\right\rangle$. Since $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$ has no sinks and $\mathcal{S}$ is an independent set in $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$, then $N^{+}(\mathcal{S}) \neq \emptyset$. Now, let $D_{2}=D\left\langle\cup_{G \in N^{+}(\mathcal{S})} G\right\rangle$. By Proposition 3.11 we can consider a kernel by paths in $D_{1}$, say $K$, such that $K \subseteq V\left(D_{2}\right)$. We will show that $K$ is a $(k, l+1, H)$-kernel by walks in $D$.

Since $\mathscr{F}$ is walk-preservative, it follows from Proposition 3.9 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 $x \in K, N_{\mathscr{F}}^{-}(x) \subseteq A\left(D_{1}\right)$.
If $x \in K$, then $x \in V\left(D_{1}\right) \cap V\left(D_{2}\right)$. Since $x \in V\left(D_{1}\right)$, it follows from the definition of $D_{1}$ that there exists $F \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $A(x) \cap F \neq \emptyset$. Hence, $N_{\mathscr{F}}(x) \cap \mathcal{S} \neq \emptyset$. On the other hand, since $x \in V\left(D_{2}\right)$, an analogous proof will show that $N_{\mathscr{F}}(x) \cap N^{+}(\mathcal{S}) \neq \emptyset$. By hypothesis (b), we can conclude that $N_{\mathscr{F}}^{-}(x) \subseteq \mathcal{S}$.

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 $T=\left(x_{0}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)$, such that $\left\{x_{0}, x_{n}\right\} \subseteq K$.

Claim 2. $O_{H}(T) \neq \emptyset$.
Proceeding by contradiction, suppose that $O_{H}(T)=\emptyset$. Hence, there exists $F^{\prime} \in \mathscr{F}$ such that $A(T) \subseteq F^{\prime}$, which implies that $\left(x_{n-1}, x_{n}\right) \in F^{\prime}$. It follows from Claim 1 that $F^{\prime} \in \mathcal{S}$. 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 $O_{H}(T)=\left\{\alpha_{i}: i \in\{1, \ldots, t\}\right\}$ where $t \geq 1$, and $\alpha_{i} \leq \alpha_{i+1}$ for every $i \in$ $\{1, \ldots, t-1\}$. On the other hand, for every $i \in\{1, \ldots, t\}$ consider $F_{i} \in \mathscr{F}$ such that $\left(x_{\alpha_{i}}, x_{\alpha_{i}}^{+}\right) \in F_{i}$, and $F_{0} \in \mathscr{F}$ such that $\left(x_{0}, x_{1}\right) \in F_{0}$. It follows from the definition of $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$ that $T^{\prime}=\left(F_{0}, F_{1}, \ldots, F_{t}\right)$ is a walk in $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$. Notice that $l_{H}(T)=l\left(T^{\prime}\right)+1$ 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 $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$, then $l\left(T^{\prime}\right) \geq k$, which implies that $l_{H}(T) \geq k$. If $F_{0}=F_{t}$, then $T^{\prime}$ is a closed walk in $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$ which is not a loop and, by hypothesis, $l\left(T^{\prime}\right) \geq k$. Hence, $l_{H}(T) \geq k$.
Case 2. $F_{0} \in V\left(C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)\right) \backslash \mathcal{S}$.
By Lemma 3.10, consider $F \in N_{\mathscr{F}}^{-}\left(x_{0}\right) \cap \mathcal{S}$. Since $F_{0} \notin \mathcal{S}$, then $F \neq F_{0}$. It follows from the definition of $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$ that $T^{\prime \prime}=\left(F, F_{0}\right) \cup T^{\prime}$ is a walk in $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$. Notice that $l_{H}(T)=l\left(T^{\prime \prime}\right)$. If $F \neq F_{t}$, as $\mathcal{S}$ is a $k$-independent set in $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$, we have that $l\left(T^{\prime \prime}\right) \geq k$, which implies that $l_{H}(T) \geq k$. If $F=F_{t}$, then $T^{\prime \prime}$ is a closed walk in $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$ which is not a loop and, by hypothesis, $l\left(T^{\prime \prime}\right) \geq k$. 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 2.5, we can conclude that $K \cup W$ is a $(k, l+1, H)$-kernel by walks in $D$.

Remark that, given an $H$-colored digraph that satisfies the hypothesis of proposition 4.1, every kernel by walks $K$ in $D\left\langle\cup_{F \in \mathcal{S}} F\right\rangle$ contained in $D\left\langle\cup_{G \in N^{+}(\mathcal{S})} G\right\rangle$ is a $(k, l+1, H)$-kernel by walks in $D$. Such kind of kernel by walks can be found in polynomial time, as we show previously.

Proposition 4.2. Let $D$ be an $H$-colored digraph with not isolated vertices, $\mathscr{F}$ a walk-preservative $H$-class partition of $A(D)$, and $\mathcal{S} \subseteq V\left(C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)\right)$ an independent and l-absorbent set in $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$ for some $l \geq 1$. If $N^{+}(\mathcal{S})=\emptyset$ and $k \geq 2$, then every kernel by paths in $D\left\langle\cup_{F \in \mathcal{S}} F\right\rangle$ is a $(k, l+1, H)$-kernel by walks in $D$.

Proof. Let $K$ be a kernel by paths in $D^{\prime}=D\left\langle\cup_{F \in \mathcal{S}} F\right\rangle$. Since $\mathscr{F}$ is walk preservative, it follows from Proposition 3.9 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 $x_{1} x_{n}$-path in $D$, say $T^{\prime}=\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)$, such that $\left\{x_{1}, x_{n}\right\} \subseteq K$. Consider $F_{0} \in N_{\mathscr{F}}^{-}\left(x_{1}\right) \cap \mathcal{S}$ (Lemma 3.10). Hence, there exists $x_{0} \in V(D)$ such that $\left(x_{0}, x_{1}\right) \in F_{0} \cap A^{-}\left(x_{1}\right)$, and let $T=\left(x_{0}, x_{1}\right) \cup T^{\prime}$ be.

If $A(T) \subseteq F_{0}$, then $A\left(T^{\prime}\right) \subseteq F_{0}$, which implies that $T^{\prime}$ is an $x_{1} x_{n}$-path in $D^{\prime}$, contradicting the fact that $K$ is an independent set by paths in $D^{\prime}$. Hence, $A(T) \nsubseteq F_{0}$. Let $t=\min \left\{i \in\{1, \ldots, n-1\}:\left(x_{i}, x_{i+1}\right) \notin F_{0}\right\}$. It follows that $\left(x_{t-1}, x_{t}\right) \in F_{0}$, and $\left(x_{t}, x_{t+1}\right) \in G$ for some $G \in \mathscr{F}$ with $F \neq G$. Notice that $(F, G) \in A\left(C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)\right)$ and, since $\mathcal{S}$ is an independent set in $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$, 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 $k \geq 2$.
Proposition 4.3. Let $D$ be an $H$-colored digraph with not isolated vertices, $\mathscr{F}$ a walk-preservative $H$-class partition of $A(D)$, and $\mathcal{S}$ a $(k, l)$-kernel in $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$ 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 $D\left\langle\cup_{F \in \mathcal{S}} F\right\rangle$ is a $(k-1, l+1, H)$-kernel by walks in $D$.

Proof. Let $K$ be a kernel by paths in $D_{1}=D\left\langle\cup_{F \in \mathcal{S}} F\right\rangle$. Since $\mathscr{F}$ is a walk-preservative $H$-class partition, it follows from Proposition 3.9 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 $C=\left(x_{0}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)$, such that $\left\{x_{0}, x_{n}\right\} \subseteq K$.
Claim 1. $N_{\mathscr{F}}^{-}\left(x_{0}\right) \cap \mathcal{S} \neq \emptyset$ and $N_{\mathscr{F}}^{+}\left(x_{n}\right) \cap \mathcal{S} \neq \emptyset$.
Since $x_{0} \in K$, it follows from Lemma 3.10 that $N_{\mathscr{F}}^{-}\left(x_{0}\right) \cap \mathcal{S} \neq \emptyset$. On the other hand, since $x_{n} \in V\left(D_{1}\right)$, 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 $A^{+}\left(x_{n}\right) \cap F \neq \emptyset$. Hence $F \in N_{\mathscr{F}}^{+}\left(x_{n}\right)$, concluding that $F \in N_{\mathscr{F}}^{+}\left(x_{n}\right) \cap \mathcal{S}$, and the claim holds.
By Claim 1, consider $F^{\prime} \in N_{\mathscr{F}}^{-}\left(x_{0}\right) \cap \mathcal{S}$ and $F^{\prime \prime} \in N_{\mathscr{F}}^{+}\left(x_{n}\right) \cap \mathcal{S}$. It follows from Lemma 3.4 that $F^{\prime} \neq F^{\prime \prime}\left(^{*}\right)$.
Claim 2. $O_{H}(C) \neq \emptyset$.
Proceeding by contradiction, suppose that $O_{H}(C)=\emptyset$. Hence, there exists $F \in \mathscr{F}$ such that $A(C) \subseteq F$. By definition of $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$, we have that $\left\{\left(F^{\prime}, F\right),\left(F, F^{\prime \prime}\right)\right\} \subseteq A\left(C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)\right)$. Since $\left\{F^{\prime}, F^{\prime \prime}\right\} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{S}$ is an
independent set in $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$, then $F \neq F^{\prime}$ and $F \neq F^{\prime \prime}$. Hence, $\left(F^{\prime}, F, F^{\prime \prime}\right)$ is an $F^{\prime} F^{\prime \prime}$-path in $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$, which is not 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 $O_{H}(C)=\left\{\alpha_{i}: i \in\{1, \ldots, t\}\right\}$ where $t \geq 1$, and $\alpha_{i} \leq \alpha_{i+1}$ for every $i \in$ $\{1, \ldots, t-1\}$. For every $i \in\{1, \ldots, t\}$, let $F_{i} \in \mathscr{F}$ such that $\left(x_{\alpha_{i}}, x_{\alpha_{i}}^{+}\right) \in F_{i}$, and $F_{0} \in \mathscr{F}$ such that $\left(x_{0}, x_{1}\right) \in F_{0}$. Notice that $x_{0} \in V\left(D\left\langle F_{0}\right\rangle\right)$ and $x_{n} \in V\left(D\left\langle F_{t}\right\rangle\right)$. On the other hand, it follows from the definition of $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$ that $C_{0}=\left(F_{0}, F_{1}, \ldots, F_{t}\right)$ is a walk in $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$. 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 $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$ such that $l_{H}(C)-1=l\left(C_{0}\right)$. On the other hand, we have that $\left\{F_{0}, F_{t}\right\} \subseteq \mathcal{S}, x_{0} \in V\left(D\left\langle F_{0}\right\rangle\right)$ and $x_{n} \in V\left(D\left\langle F_{t}\right\rangle\right)$, which implies that $F_{0} \neq F_{t}$ (Lemma 3.4). Since $\mathcal{S}$ is a $k$-independent set in $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$, we have that $l\left(C_{0}\right) \geq k$. We can conclude that $l_{H}(C) \geq k-1$.
Now suppose that $F_{t} \notin \mathcal{S}$, and consider $C_{1}=C_{0} \cup\left(F_{t}, F^{\prime \prime}\right)$. Notice that $C_{1}$ is a walk in $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$ such that $l_{H}(C)=l\left(C_{1}\right)$. On the other hand, we have that $\left\{F_{0}, F^{\prime \prime}\right\} \subseteq \mathcal{S}, x_{0} \in V\left(D\left\langle F_{0}\right\rangle\right)$ and $x_{n} \in V\left(D\left\langle F^{\prime \prime}\right\rangle\right)$, which implies that $F_{0} \neq F^{\prime \prime}$ (Lemma 3.4). Since $\mathcal{S}$ is a $k$-independent set in $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$, then $l\left(C_{1}\right) \geq k$. We can conclude that $l_{H}(C) \geq k-1$.

Case 2. $F_{0} \in V\left(C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)\right) \backslash \mathcal{S}$.
First, suppose that $F_{t} \in \mathcal{S}$, and consider $C_{2}=\left(F^{\prime}, F_{0}\right) \cup C_{0}$. Notice that $C_{2}$ is a walk in $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$ such that $l_{H}(C)=l\left(C_{2}\right)$. On the other hand, we have that $\left\{F^{\prime}, F_{t}\right\} \subseteq \mathcal{S}, x_{0} \in V\left(D\left\langle F^{\prime}\right\rangle\right)$ and $x_{n} \in V\left(D\left\langle F_{t}\right\rangle\right)$, which implies that $F^{\prime} \neq F_{t}$ (Lemma 3.4). Since $\mathcal{S}$ is a $k$-independent set in $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$, then $l\left(C_{2}\right) \geq k$. We can conclude that $l_{H}(C) \geq k-1$.
Now suppose that $F_{t} \notin \mathcal{S}$, and consider $C_{3}=\left(F^{\prime}, F_{0}\right) \cup C_{0} \cup\left(F_{t}, F^{\prime \prime}\right)$. Notice that $C_{3}$ is a walk in $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$ such that $l_{H}(C)+1=l\left(C_{3}\right)$. On the other hand, by $\left(^{*}\right)$ we have that $F^{\prime} \neq F^{\prime \prime}$ and, since $\mathcal{S}$ is a $k$-independent set in $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$, then $l\left(C_{3}\right) \geq k$. 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 $D$.

Remark that, given an $H$-colored digraph that satisfies the hypothesis of proposition 4.2, every kernel by walks in $D\left\langle\cup_{F \in \mathcal{S}} F\right\rangle$ is a $(k, l+1, H)$-kernel by walks in $D$. In the same way, for every $H$-colored digraph that satisfies the hypothesis of proposition 4.3, every kernel by walks in $D\left\langle\cup_{F \in \mathcal{S}} F\right\rangle$ is a $(k-1, l+1, H)$-kernel by walks in $D$

Proposition 4.4. Let $D$ be an $H$-colored digraph, $\mathscr{F}$ an $H$-class partition of $A(D)$ and $\mathcal{S}$ a $(k, l)$-kernel of $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$ 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 an obstruction-free vertex in $D$, then $D$ has a $(k+1, l+1, H)$-kernel by walks.

Proof. First, suppose that $D$ has not isolated vertices. Let $\mathcal{S}=\left\{F_{1}, \ldots, F_{r}\right\}$ for some $r \geq 1$, and for every $i \in\{1, \ldots, r\}$, let $z_{i} \in V\left(D\left\langle F_{i}\right\rangle\right)$ such that $z_{i}$ is obstruction-free in $D$. By Lemma 3.5 (c) we have that $z_{i} \neq z_{j}$ whenever $\{i, j\} \subseteq\{1, \ldots, r\}$ and $i \neq j$.

Claim 1. $K=\left\{z_{i}: i \in\{1, \ldots, r\}\right\}$ is a kernel by paths in $D_{1}=D\left\langle\cup_{F \in \mathcal{S}} F\right\rangle$.
In order to show that $K$ is an absorbent set by paths in $D_{1}$, consider $w \in V\left(D_{1}\right) \backslash K$. Since $w \in V\left(D_{1}\right)$, then there exists $j \in\{1, \ldots, r\}$ such that $w \in V\left(D\left\langle F_{j}\right\rangle\right)$. It follows from the fact that $D\left\langle F_{j}\right\rangle$ is strongly connected that there exists a $w z_{j}$-path in $D\left\langle F_{j}\right\rangle$, say $P$. Hence, $P$ is a $w K$-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 3.5 (c) that $V\left(D\left\langle F_{i}\right\rangle\right) \cap V\left(D\left\langle F_{j}\right\rangle\right)=\emptyset$ for every $\{i, j\} \subseteq\{1, \ldots r\}$ with $i \neq j$, which implies that there is no $z_{i} z_{j}$-path in $D_{1}$ for every $\{i, j\} \subseteq\{1, \ldots r\}$ 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 $\mathscr{F}$ is a walk-preservative partition of $A(D)$ (Lemma 3.5 (a)), and, since $K$ is a kernel by walks in $D_{1}$, we can conclude from Proposition 3.9 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 $\left\{z_{i}, z_{j}\right\} \subseteq K$ with $i \neq j$, and a $z_{i} z_{j}$-walk in $D$, say $C=\left(z_{i}=x_{0}, x_{1} \ldots, x_{n}=z_{j}\right)$.

Claim 2. $O_{H}(C) \neq \emptyset$.
Proceeding by contradiction, suppose that $O_{H}(C)=\emptyset$, which implies that there exists $F \in \mathscr{F}$ 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 3.1 (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 $O_{H}(C)=\left\{\alpha_{i}: i \in\{1, \ldots, t\}\right\}$ where $t \geq 1$, and $\alpha_{i} \leq \alpha_{i+1}$ for every $i \in$ $\{1, \ldots, t-1\}$. For every $i \in\{1, \ldots, t\}$, let $G_{i} \in \mathscr{F}$ such that $\left(x_{\alpha_{i}}, x_{\alpha_{i}}^{+}\right) \in G_{i}$, and $G_{0} \in \mathscr{F}$ such that $\left(x_{0}, x_{1}\right) \in G_{0}$. It follows from the definition of $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$ that $C^{\prime}=\left(G_{0}, G_{1}, \ldots, G_{t}\right)$ is a walk in $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$. Notice that $z_{i} \in V\left(D\left\langle G_{0}\right\rangle\right), z_{j} \in V\left(D\left\langle G_{t}\right\rangle\right)$, and $l_{H}(C)=l\left(C^{\prime}\right)+1$. Since $z_{i}$ and $z_{j}$ are obstruction-free in $D$, then $F_{i}=G_{0}$ and $F_{j}=G_{t}$ (Lemma 3.1 (b)), which implies that $\left\{G_{0}, G_{t}\right\} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ and $G_{0} \neq G_{t}$. Since $\mathcal{S}$ is a $k$-independent set in $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$, then $l\left(C^{\prime}\right) \geq k$, 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 2.5, we can conclude that $K \cup W$ is a $(k+1, l+1, H)$-kernel by walks in $D$.

In the same spirit that in the previous results, given an $H$-colored digraph that satisfies the hypothesis of Proposition 4.4, it is easy to find a $(k+1, l+1, H)$-kernel by walks, by taking the obstruction-free vertex in $D\langle F\rangle$ for every $F \in \mathcal{S}$.

## 5 Some consequences

Finally, we present the following theorems which are direct consequences of the results presented in the previous section.

Theorem 5.1. Let $D$ be an $H$-colored digraph, $\mathscr{F}$ 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 $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$ 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 $\mathcal{S}$ a $(k, l)$-kernel in $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$ such that $N^{+}(\mathcal{S})=\emptyset$. Since $\mathcal{S}$ is an independent and $l$-absorbent set in $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$, it follows from Proposition 4.2 that $D-W$ has a $(k, l, H)$-kernel by walks, say $K$. By Lemma 2.5, we can conclude that $K \cup W$ is a $(k, l, H)$-kernel by walks in $D$.

Theorem 5.2. Let $D$ be a strongly connected $H$-colored digraph and $\mathscr{F}$ a walk-preservative $H$-class partition of $A(D)$ such that $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$ has a $(k, l)$-kernel, say $\mathcal{S}$. If the following conditions hold:
a) Every cycle in $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$ is either a loop or has length at least $k$.
b) For every $x \in V(D)$ such that $N_{\mathscr{F}}(x) \cap S \neq \emptyset$ and $N_{\mathscr{F}}(x) \cap N^{+}(\mathcal{S}) \neq \emptyset$, we have that $N_{\mathscr{F}}^{-}(x) \subseteq \mathcal{S}$.

Then $D$ has a $(k, l+1, H)$-kernel by walks.
Proof. If $D$ is an $H$-digraph, it follows from Lemma 2.4 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 $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$ is a non-trivial strongly connected digraph (Lemma 3.3), which implies that $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$ has no sinks. By Proposition 4.1 we have that $D$ has a $(k, l+1, H)$-kernel by walks.

Theorem 5.3. Let $D$ be an $H$-colored digraph, $\mathscr{F}$ a walk-preservative $H$-class partition of $A(D)$ such that for every $F \in \mathscr{F}, D\langle F\rangle$ is unilateral and has no sinks. If $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$ 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 not isolated vertices. If $\mathcal{S}$ is a $(k, l)$-kernel in $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$ with $k \geq 3$ and $l \geq 1$, then by Proposition 4.3, every kernel by paths in $D\left\langle\cup_{F \in \mathcal{S}} F\right\rangle$ 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 2.5 , we can conclude that $K \cup W$ is a $(k-1, l+1, H)$-kernel by walks in $D$.

Theorem 5.4. Let $D$ be an $H$-colored digraph and $\mathscr{F}$ an $H$-class partition of $A(D)$. If for every $F \in \mathscr{F}$ 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 not isolated vertices. Since $D\langle F\rangle$ is strongly connected for every $F \in \mathscr{F}$, we have that $\mathscr{F}$ is walk-preservative (Lemma 3.5 (a)), and $D\langle F\rangle$ is unilateral and has no sinks for every $F \in \mathscr{F}$. On the other hand, by Lemma 3.5 (b), we have that $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$ is a symmetric digraph, which implies that $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$ has a $(k+1, l-1)$-kernel for every $k+1 \geq 3$ and $l-1 \geq k$ (Lemma 2.3). Hence, by Corollary 5.3, 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 2.5, we can conclude that $D$ has a $(k, l, H)$-kernel by walks for every $k \geq 2$ and $l \geq k+1$.

Theorem 5.5. Let $D$ be an $H$-colored digraph and $\mathscr{F}$ an $H$-class partition of $A(D)$ such that for every $F \in \mathscr{F}$, $D\langle F\rangle$ 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 $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$ is a symmetric digraph (Lemma $3.5(\mathrm{~b})$ ), for every $k \geq 2$ we have that $C_{\mathscr{F}}(D)$ has a $k$-kernel (Theorem 2.2). By Theorem 4.4, $D$ has a $(k, H)$-kernel by walks for every $k \geq 3$. On the other hand, it follows from Theorem 3.6 that $D$ has a $(2, H)$-kernel by walks, concluding that $D$ has a $(k, H)$-kernel by walks for every $k \geq 2$.
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