

Minimum non-chromatic- λ -choosable graphs

Jialu Zhu* Xuding Zhu[†]

August 4, 2022

Abstract

For a multi-set $\lambda = \{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_q\}$ of positive integers, let $k_\lambda = \sum_{i=1}^q k_i$. A λ -list assignment of G is a list assignment L of G such that the colour set $\bigcup_{v \in V(G)} L(v)$ can be partitioned into the disjoint union $C_1 \cup C_2 \cup \dots \cup C_q$ of q sets so that for each i and each vertex v of G , $|L(v) \cap C_i| \geq k_i$. We say G is λ -choosable if G is L -colourable for any λ -list assignment L of G . The concept of λ -choosability puts k -colourability and k -choosability in the same framework: If $\lambda = \{k\}$, then λ -choosability is equivalent to k -choosability; if λ consists of k copies of 1, then λ -choosability is equivalent to k -colourability. If G is λ -choosable, then G is k_λ -colourable. On the other hand, there are k_λ -colourable graphs that are not λ -choosable, provided that λ contains an integer larger than 1. Let $\phi(\lambda)$ be the minimum number of vertices in a k_λ -colourable non- λ -choosable graph. This paper determines the value of $\phi(\lambda)$ for all λ .

Keywords: λ -list assignment, chromatic-choosable graph, non-chromatic- λ -choosable graph.

1 Introduction

A *proper colouring* of a graph G is a mapping $f : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that $f(u) \neq f(v)$ for any edge uv of $E(G)$. The *chromatic number* $\chi(G)$ of G is the minimum positive integer k such that G is k -colourable, i.e., there is a proper colouring f of G using colours from $\{1, 2, \dots, k\}$. The *choice number* $ch(G)$ of G is the minimum positive integer k such that G is k -choosable, i.e., if L is a list assignment which assigns to each vertex v a set $L(v) \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ of at least k integers as permissible colours, there is a proper colouring f of G such that $f(v) \in L(v)$ for each vertex v .

*Department of Mathematics, Zhejiang Normal University, Email: jialuzhu@zjnu.edu.cn,

[†]Department of Mathematics, Zhejiang Normal University, Email: xdzhu@zjnu.edu.cn, Grant Numbers: NSFC 11971438, U20A2068. ZJNSFC LD19A010001.

It follows from the definitions that $\chi(G) \leq ch(G)$ for any graph G , and it was shown in [3] that bipartite graphs can have arbitrarily large choice number. An interesting problem is for which graphs G , $\chi(G) = ch(G)$. Such graphs are called *chromatic-choosable*. Chromatic-choosable graphs have been studied extensively in the literature. There are a few challenging conjectures that assert certain families of graphs are chromatic-choosable. The most famous problem concerning this concept is perhaps the *list colouring conjecture*, which asserts that line graphs are chromatic-choosable [1]. Another problem concerning chromatic-choosable graphs that has attracted a lot of attention is the minimum order of a non-chromatic-choosable graph with given chromatic number. For a positive integer k , let

$$\phi(k) = \min\{n : \text{there exists a non-}k\text{-choosable } k\text{-chromatic } n\text{-vertex graph}\}.$$

Ohba [13] conjectured that $\phi(k) \geq 2k+2$. In other words, k -colourable graphs on at most $2k+1$ vertices are k -choosable. This conjecture was studied in many papers [7, 9, 11–17], and was finally confirmed by Noel, Reed and Wu [11]. This upper **lower** bound is tight if k is even, i.e., $\phi(k) = 2k+2$ when k is even. Noel [10] further conjectured that if k is odd, then k -colourable graphs on at most $2k+2$ vertices are also k -choosable. Recently, the authors of this paper confirmed Noel's conjecture [18], and determined the value of $\phi(k)$ for all k .

Theorem 1 For $k \geq 2$,

$$\phi(k) = \begin{cases} 2k+2, & \text{if } k \text{ is even,} \\ 2k+3, & \text{if } k \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

The concept of λ -choosability is a refinement of choosability introduced in [21]. Assume that $\lambda = \{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_q\}$ is a multi-set of positive integers. Let $k_\lambda = \sum_{i=1}^q k_i$ and $|\lambda| = q$. A λ -list assignment of G is a list assignment L such that the colour set $\bigcup_{v \in V(G)} L(v)$ can be partitioned into the disjoint union $C_1 \cup C_2 \cup \dots \cup C_q$ of q sets so that for each i and each vertex v of G , $|L(v) \cap C_i| \geq k_i$. Note that for each vertex v , $|L(v)| \geq \sum_{i=1}^q k_i = k_\lambda$. So a λ -list assignment L is a k_λ -list assignment with some restrictions on the set of possible lists. We say G is λ -choosable if G is L -colourable for any λ -list assignment L of G .

For a positive integer a , let $m_\lambda(a)$ be the multiplicity of a in λ . If $m_\lambda(a) = m$, then instead of writing m times the integer a , we may write $a \star m$. For example, $\lambda = \{1 \star k_1, 2 \star k_2, 3\}$ means that λ is a multi-set consisting of k_1 copies of 1, k_2 copies of 2 and one copy of 3. If $\lambda = \{k\}$, then λ -choosability is the same as k -choosability; if $\lambda = \{1 \star k\}$, then λ -choosability is equivalent to k -colourability. So the concept of λ -choosability puts k -choosability and k -colourability in the same framework.

Assume that $\lambda = \{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_q\}$ and $\lambda' = \{k'_1, k'_2, \dots, k'_p\}$. We say λ' is a *refinement* of λ if $p \geq q$ and there is a partition $I_1 \cup I_2 \cup \dots \cup I_q$ of $\{1, 2, \dots, p\}$ such that $\sum_{j \in I_t} k'_j = k_t$ for $t = 1, 2, \dots, q$. We say λ' is obtained from λ by increasing some parts if $p = q$ and $k_t \leq k'_t$ for $t = 1, 2, \dots, q$. We write $\lambda \leq \lambda'$ if λ' is a refinement of λ , and λ'' is obtained

from λ by increasing some parts. It follows from the definitions that if $\lambda \leq \lambda'$, then every λ -choosable graph is λ' -choosable. Conversely, it was proved in [21] that if $\lambda \not\leq \lambda'$, then there is a λ -choosable graph which is not λ' -choosable. In particular, λ -choosability implies k_λ -colourability, and if $\lambda \neq \{1 \star k_\lambda\}$, then there are k_λ -colourable graphs that are not λ -choosable.

All the partitions λ of a positive integer k are sandwiched between $\{k\}$ and $\{1 \star k\}$ in the above order. As observed above, $\{k\}$ -choosability is the same as k -choosability, and $\{1 \star k\}$ -choosability is equivalent to k -colourability. For other partitions λ of k , λ -choosability reveals a complex hierarchy of colourability of graphs sandwiched between k -colourability and k -choosability.

The framework of λ -choosability provides room to explore strengthenings of colourability and choosability results. For example, it was proved by Kermnitz and Voigt that there are planar graphs that are not $\{1, 1, 2\}$ -choosable [5]. This result strengthens Voigt's result that there are non-4-choosable planar graphs, and shows that the Four Colour Theorem is sharp in the sense of λ -choosability. This result is further generalized in [4], where it is shown that for $n \geq 5$, there are K_n -minor free graphs that are not $\{1 \star (n - 3), 2\}$ -choosable. This result shows the sharpness of Hadwiger's conjecture in the framework of λ -choosability. As another example, Kim and Park [6] showed that for any positive integer k , there are graphs G such that G^k is not chromatic-choosable. This result refutes a conjecture of Woodall and Kostochka [8]. A combination of a result in [6] and a result in [20] shows that there is a graph G , G^k is not $\{1 \star (\chi(G^k) - 2), 2\}$ -choosable.

The framework of λ -choosability also provides room to explore weakenings of difficult conjectures. For example, it is known that for any graph G , if $k_\lambda = \chi'(G)$ and each integer in λ is at most 2, then $L(G)$ is λ -choosable [21]. On the other hand, the following question remains open: *Is it true that for any graph G , the line graph $L(G)$ of G is $\{1 \star (\chi'(G) - 3), 3\}$ -choosable?*

In this paper, we are interested in minimum non-chromatic- λ -choosable graphs. Similar to the definition of $\phi(k)$, for a multi-set λ of positive integers, we define $\phi(\lambda)$ as follows:

Definition 1 *Assume λ is a multi-set of positive integers. Let*

$$\phi(\lambda) = \min\{n : \text{there exists a non-}\lambda\text{-choosable } k_\lambda\text{-chromatic } n\text{-vertex graph}\}.$$

If $\lambda = \{k\}$, then $\phi(\lambda) = \phi(k)$. We extend Theorem 1 and determine the value of $\phi(\lambda)$ for all λ .

If λ' is a refinement of λ , then $\lambda \leq \lambda'$ and $k_\lambda = k_{\lambda'}$. As every λ -choosable graph is λ' -choosable, we have $\phi(\lambda') \geq \phi(\lambda)$. In particular, as any multi-set λ is a refinement of $\{k_\lambda\}$, we conclude that

$$\phi(\lambda) \geq \phi(k_\lambda) = \begin{cases} 2k_\lambda + 2, & \text{if } k_\lambda \text{ is even,} \\ 2k_\lambda + 3, & \text{if } k_\lambda \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

If $\lambda = \{1 \star k\}$, then λ -choosable is equivalent to k -colourable. In this case, we set $\phi(\lambda) = \infty$. We call such a multi-set λ trivial. In the following, we only consider non-trivial multi-sets of positive integers.

For a non-trivial multi-sets λ of positive integers, it is natural that $\phi(\lambda)$ also highly depends on the number of 1's in λ . Let $m_\lambda(\text{odd})$ be the number of integers in λ that are odd. The following result was proved in [20].

Theorem 2 *For any non-trivial multi-set λ of positive integers,*

$$2k_\lambda + m_\lambda(1) + 2 \leq \phi(\lambda) \leq \min\{2k_\lambda + m_\lambda(\text{odd}) + 2, 2k_\lambda + 5m_\lambda(1) + 3\}.$$

In this paper, we determine the value of $\phi(\lambda)$ for all λ .

Theorem 3 *Assume λ is a non-trivial multi-set of positive integers. Then*

$$\phi(\lambda) = \min\{2k_\lambda + m_\lambda(\text{odd}) + 2, 2k_\lambda + 3m_\lambda(1) + 3\}.$$

If $m_\lambda(\text{odd}) = m_\lambda(1)$, then it follows from Theorem 2 that $\phi(\lambda) = 2k + m_\lambda(1) + 2$. In the following, we assume $m_\lambda(\text{odd}) > m_\lambda(1)$.

2 The $m_\lambda(1) = 0$ case

This section proves that if $m_\lambda(1) = 0$ and $m_\lambda(\text{odd}) > 0$, then $\phi(\lambda) = 2k_\lambda + 3$. Assume that $k_\lambda = k$. By Theorem 2,

$$2k + 2 \leq \phi(\lambda) \leq 2k + 3.$$

We need to show that $\phi(\lambda) \neq 2k + 2$, i.e., any graph G with $\chi(G) \leq k$ and $|V(G)| \leq 2k + 2$ is λ -choosable.

If $|V(G)| \leq 2k + 1$, then it follows from Ohba's conjecture (which was confirmed in [11]) that G is k -choosable, and hence λ -choosable. Assume $|V(G)| = 2k + 2$. As $\chi(G) \leq k$ and adding edges to a non- λ -choosable graph results in a non- λ -choosable graph, it suffices to consider the case that G is a complete k -partite graph. The following result was proved in [19].

Theorem 4 *Assume G is a complete k -partite graph with $|V(G)| = 2k + 2$. Then G is k -choosable, unless k is even and $G = K_{4,2\star(k-1)}$ or $G = K_{3\star(k/2+1),1\star(k/2-1)}$.*

Thus we may assume that k is even and $G = K_{4,2\star(k-1)}$ or $G = K_{3\star(k/2+1),1\star(k/2-1)}$. We say a k -list assignment L of G is *bad* if G is not L -colourable. It remains to show that any λ -list assignment of G is not bad.

All bad assignments for $K_{4,2\star(k-1)}$ and $K_{3\star(k/2+1),1\star(k/2-1)}$ are characterized in [2] and [19], respectively.

Theorem 5 *Assume $G = K_{4,2\star(k-1)}$ or $G = K_{3\star(k/2+1),1\star(k/2-1)}$, and L is a bad k -list assignment of G . Let $C = \bigcup_{v \in V(G)} L(v)$.*

1. If $G = K_{3^*(k/2+1), 1^*(k/2-1)}$ and the partite sets of G are $P_i = \{v_{i,1}, v_{i,2}, v_{i,3}\}$ for $1 \leq i \leq k/2 + 1$ and $P_i = \{v_{i,1}\}$ for $k/2 + 2 \leq i \leq k$, then $|C| = 3k/2$ and for each partite set P_i where $1 \leq i \leq k/2 + 1$ of $K_{3^*(k/2+1), 1^*(k/2-1)}$, each colour in C is contained in two of the lists $L(v_{i,1}), L(v_{i,2}), L(v_{i,3})$.
2. If $G = K_{4, 2^*(k-1)}$, and the partite sets of G are $P_1 = \{u_1, v_1, x_1, y_1\}$ and $P_i = \{u_i, v_i\}$ for $2 \leq i \leq k$, then
 - C can be partitioned into A and B with $|A| = |B| = k$, where A can be further partitioned into A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4 such that $|A_1| = |A_2|$, $|A_3| = |A_4|$, and B can be further partitioned into B_1, B_2 with $|B_1| = |B_2|$.
 - $L(u_1) = A_1 \cup A_3 \cup B_1$, $L(v_1) = A_1 \cup A_4 \cup B_2$, $L(x_1) = A_2 \cup A_4 \cup B_1$, $L(y_1) = A_2 \cup A_3 \cup B_2$.
 - $L(u_i) = A$, $L(v_i) = B$ for $2 \leq i \leq k$.

Assume that $\lambda = \{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_q\}$. Assume to the contrary that a λ -list assignment L of G is bad. Let $C = \bigcup_{v \in V(G)} L(v)$. By definition, C can be partitioned into the disjoint union $C_1 \cup C_2 \cup \dots \cup C_q$ of q sets, and for each i and each vertex v of G , $|L(v) \cap C_i| = k_i$.

If $G = K_{3^*(k/2+1), 1^*(k/2-1)}$, then by Theorem 5, each color $c \in C$ is contained in two of the lists $L(v_{1,1}), L(v_{1,2}), L(v_{1,3})$, where $P = \{v_{1,1}, v_{1,2}, v_{1,3}\}$ is a partite set of G of size 3. This implies that $|C_i| = 3k_i/2$, and hence k_i is even for all i , contrary to the assumption that $m_\lambda(\text{odd}) > 0$.

Assume $G = K_{4, 2^*(k-1)}$. Let $A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4, B_1, B_2$ and A, B be the sets of colours as in Theorem 5. By the definition of λ -list assignment, we know that $|A \cap C_i| = |L(u_j) \cap C_i| = |L(v_j) \cap C_i| = |B \cap C_i| = k_i$ for each $1 \leq i \leq q$. Assume that

$$|A_1 \cap C_i| = a_{1i}, \quad |A_2 \cap C_i| = a_{2i}, \quad |A_3 \cap C_i| = a_{3i}, \quad |A_4 \cap C_i| = a_{4i},$$

for $1 \leq i \leq q$, and

$$|B_1 \cap C_i| = b_{1i}, \quad |B_2 \cap C_i| = b_{2i}.$$

By Theorem 5,

$$\begin{cases} a_{1i} + a_{3i} + b_{1i} = k_i, \\ a_{1i} + a_{4i} + b_{2i} = k_i, \\ a_{2i} + a_{4i} + b_{1i} = k_i, \\ a_{2i} + a_{3i} + b_{2i} = k_i, \end{cases}$$

It follows that $a_{1i} + a_{3i} = a_{2i} + a_{4i}$ and $a_{1i} + a_{4i} = a_{2i} + a_{3i}$. This implies that

$$a_{1i} + a_{2i} + a_{3i} + a_{4i} = |A \cap C_i| = k_i \equiv 0 \pmod{2},$$

contrary to the assumption that $m_\lambda(\text{odd}) > 0$. This completes the proof for the case $m_\lambda(1) = 0$.

3 The $m_\lambda(1) \geq 1$ case

In the remainder of the paper, assume that $k_\lambda = k$, $m_\lambda(1) = a \geq 1$ and $m_\lambda(\text{odd}) - m_\lambda(1) = c \geq 1$. We need to show that $\phi(\lambda) = \min\{2k + a + c + 2, 2k + 3a + 3\}$. First, we prove the upper bound, i.e.,

$$\phi(\lambda) \leq \min\{2k + a + c + 2, 2k + 3a + 3\}.$$

By Theorem 2, $\phi(\lambda) \leq 2k + a + c + 2$. It remains to show that $\phi(\lambda) \leq 2k + 3a + 3$. Observe that $k_\lambda = k$, $m_\lambda(1) = a$ and $m_\lambda(\text{odd}) = a + c$ implies that $\{1 \star a, 2 \star (k - a - 3c)/2, 3 \star c\}$ is a refinement of λ . Hence it suffices to prove the following lemma.

Lemma 6 *Assume $\lambda = \{1 \star a, 2 \star b, 3 \star c\}$ and $k = a + 2b + 3c$ (and hence $m_\lambda(1) = a$, $m_\lambda(\text{odd}) = a + c$ and $k_\lambda = k$). Then there exists a k -chromatic graph G with $|V(G)| = 2k + 3a + 3$ which is not λ -choosable.*

Proof. Let $G = K_{5 \star (a+1), 2 \star (k-a-1)}$ be the complete k -partite graph with $a + 1$ partite sets of size 5, and $k - a - 1$ partite sets of size 2.

- The $a + 1$ partite sets of size 5 are $U_i = \{u_{i,1}, u_{i,2}, u_{i,3}, u_{i,4}, u_{i,5}\}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, a + 1$.
- The $k - a - 1$ partite sets of size 2 are $V_j = \{v_{j,1}, v_{j,2}\}$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, k - a - 1$.

Then G is a k -chromatic graph with $|V(G)| = 2k + 3a + 3$. We will show that G is not λ -choosable.

- For $i = 1, 2, \dots, c$, let $S_i = \{s_{i,1}, s_{i,2}, \dots, s_{i,6}\}$ be pairwise disjoint sets of size 6.
- For $i = 1, 2, \dots, b$, let $T_i = \{t_{i,1}, t_{i,2}, t_{i,3}, t_{i,4}\}$ be pairwise disjoint sets of size 4.
- Let E be a set of a colours, and the sets E, S_i, T_i are pairwise disjoint.

Let

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &= \bigcup_{i=1}^c \{s_{i,1}, s_{i,3}, s_{i,5}\}, & A_2 &= \bigcup_{i=1}^c \{s_{i,1}, s_{i,3}, s_{i,6}\}, & A_3 &= \bigcup_{i=1}^c \{s_{i,1}, s_{i,2}, s_{i,4}\}, & A_4 &= \bigcup_{i=1}^c \{s_{i,2}, s_{i,3}, s_{i,4}\}, \\ A_5 &= \bigcup_{i=1}^c \{s_{i,2}, s_{i,5}, s_{i,6}\}, & A_6 &= \bigcup_{i=1}^c \{s_{i,1}, s_{i,2}, s_{i,3}\}, & A_7 &= \bigcup_{i=1}^c \{s_{i,4}, s_{i,5}, s_{i,6}\}, \\ B_1 &= \bigcup_{i=1}^b \{t_{i,2}, t_{i,3}\}, & B_2 &= \bigcup_{i=1}^b \{t_{i,2}, t_{i,4}\}, & B_3 &= \bigcup_{i=1}^b \{t_{i,1}, t_{i,2}\}, & B_4 &= \bigcup_{i=1}^b \{t_{i,1}, t_{i,3}\}, \\ B_5 &= \bigcup_{i=1}^b \{t_{i,1}, t_{i,4}\}, & B_6 &= \bigcup_{i=1}^b \{t_{i,1}, t_{i,2}\}, & B_7 &= \bigcup_{i=1}^b \{t_{i,3}, t_{i,4}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let L be the λ -list assignment of G defined as follows:

$$L(v) = \begin{cases} A_j \cup B_j \cup E, & \text{if } v = u_{i,j}, 1 \leq i \leq a + 1, 1 \leq j \leq 5, \\ A_{j+5} \cup B_{j+5} \cup E, & \text{if } v = v_{i,j}, 1 \leq i \leq k - a - 1, 1 \leq j \leq 2, \end{cases}$$

The colour set $C = \bigcup_{v \in V(G)} L(v)$ is partitioned into subsets

$$\bigcup_{c \in E} \{c\} \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^b T_i \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^c S_i.$$

For each vertex v of G ,

- $|L(v) \cap \{c\}| = 1$ for $c \in E$,
- $|L(v) \cap T_i| = 2$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, b$,
- $|L(v) \cap S_i| = 3$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, c$.

So L is a λ -list assignment.

Now we show that G is not L -colourable. Assume to the contrary that G has a proper L -colouring φ .

For $j = 1, 2$, let $X_j = \{v_{1,j}, v_{2,j}, \dots, v_{k-a-1,j}\}$. Each of X_1, X_2 induces a complete graph of order $k - a - 1$. Hence $|\varphi(X_j)| = k - a - 1$. Note that

$$\varphi(X_1) \subseteq A_6 \cup B_6 \cup E, \quad \varphi(X_2) \subseteq A_7 \cup B_7 \cup E.$$

For each partite set P of G , $\bigcap_{v \in P} L(v) = E$. Hence either $\varphi(P) = \{c\}$ for some colour $c \in E$, or $|\varphi(P)| \geq 2$. Therefore

$$|\varphi(G)| \geq a + 2(k - a) = 2k - a.$$

As $|\bigcup_{v \in V(G)} L(v)| = a + 4b + 6c = 2k - a$, this implies that for each partite set P of G ,

$$|\varphi(P)| = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \varphi(P) = c \in E \text{ for some } c \in E, \\ 2 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Note that if $|\varphi(P)| = 2$, then $\varphi(P) \cap E = \emptyset$.

Claim 7 *If U_i is a partite set of size 5 and $|\varphi(U_i)| = 2$, then $\varphi(U_i) \subseteq A_6 \cup B_6$.*

Proof. Assume $1 \leq i \leq a + 1$ and $|\varphi(U_i)| = 2$, say $\varphi(U_i) = \{c_1, c_2\}$. Then for any $1 \leq j \leq 5$, $L(u_{i,j}) \cap \{c_1, c_2\} \neq \emptyset$.

Assume first that $\{c_1, c_2\} \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^7 B_i$. If $t_{i,1} \notin \{c_1, c_2\}$ for any $1 \leq i \leq b$, then $L(u_{i,j}) \cap \{c_1, c_2\} = \emptyset$ for some $j \in \{3, 4, 5\}$, a contradiction. If $t_{i,2} \notin \{c_1, c_2\}$ for any $1 \leq i \leq b$, then $L(u_{i,j}) \cap \{c_1, c_2\} = \emptyset$ for some $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, a contradiction. Therefore $\{c_1, c_2\}$ contains $t_{i,1}$ for some $1 \leq i \leq b$ and $t_{i',2}$ for some $1 \leq i' \leq b$. So $\{c_1, c_2\} \subseteq B_6$.

Assume that $\{c_1, c_2\} \not\subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^7 B_i$, say $c_1 \in \bigcup_{i=1}^7 A_i$. Let $J(c_1) = \{j : c_1 \in L(u_{i,j})\}$. Then $c_2 \in \bigcap_{j \in [5] - J(c_1)} L(u_{i,j}) - E$.

If $c_1 = s_{j,4}$ for some j , then $J(c_1) = \{3, 4\}$ and $L(u_{i,1}) \cap L(u_{i,2}) \cap L(u_{i,5}) - E = \emptyset$, a contradiction.

If $c_1 = s_{j,5}$ for some j , then $J(c_1) = \{1, 5\}$ and $L(u_{i,2}) \cap L(u_{i,3}) \cap L(u_{i,4}) - E = \emptyset$, a contradiction.

If $c_1 = s_{j,6}$ for some j , then $J(c_1) = \{2, 5\}$ and $L(u_{i,1}) \cap L(u_{i,3}) \cap L(u_{i,4}) - E = \emptyset$, a contradiction.

So $c_1 \neq s_{j,4}, s_{j,5}, s_{j,6}$ for $1 \leq j \leq c$.

If $c_1 = s_{j,1}$ for some j , then $J(c_1) = \{1, 2, 3\}$, and $L(u_{i,4}) \cap L(u_{i,5}) - E = \bigcup_{i=1}^c \{s_{i,2}\} \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^b \{t_{i,1}\}$. Hence $\{c_1, c_2\} \subseteq \bigcup_{j=1}^c \{s_{j,1}, s_{j,2}\} \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^b \{t_{i,1}\}$.

If $c_1 = s_{j,2}$ for some j , then $J(c_1) = \{3, 4, 5\}$, and $L(u_{i,1}) \cap L(u_{i,2}) - E = \bigcup_{i=1}^c \{s_{i,1}, s_{i,3}\} \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^b \{t_{i,2}\}$. Hence $\{c_1, c_2\} \subseteq \bigcup_{j=1}^c \{s_{j,1}, s_{j,2}, s_{j,3}\} \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^b \{t_{i,2}\}$.

If $c_1 = s_{j,3}$ for some j , then $J(c_1) = \{1, 2, 4\}$, and $L(u_{i,3}) \cap L(u_{i,5}) - E = \bigcup_{i=1}^c \{s_{i,2}\} \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^b \{t_{i,1}\}$. Hence $\{c_1, c_2\} \subseteq \bigcup_{j=1}^c \{s_{j,2}, s_{j,3}\} \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^b \{t_{i,1}\}$.

In any case, $\varphi(U_i) = \{c_1, c_2\} \subseteq \bigcup_{j=1}^c \{s_{j,1}, s_{j,2}, s_{j,3}\} \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^b \{t_{i,1}, t_{i,2}\} = A_6 \cup B_6$. This completes the proof of the claim. \blacksquare

It follows from Claim 7 that

$$\varphi\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{a+1} U_i\right) \subseteq E \cup A_6 \cup B_6.$$

Hence

$$\varphi(X_1) \cup \varphi\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{a+1} U_i\right) \subseteq E \cup A_6 \cup B_6.$$

As $|E| = a$, $|\varphi(U_i)| = 2$ for some i . This implies that

$$k + 1 \leq |\varphi(X_1)| + |\varphi\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{a+1} U_i\right)| \leq |E \cup A_6 \cup B_6| = k,$$

a contradiction. \blacksquare

Next we prove the lower bound that $\phi(\lambda) \geq \min\{2k + 3a + 3, 2k + a + c + 2\}$.

Assume to the contrary that $\phi(\lambda) < \min\{2k + a + c + 2, 2k + 3a + 3\}$ for some λ . We choose such a multi-set $\lambda = \{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_q\}$ with $|\lambda| = q$ minimum. Assume that $k_1 = k_2 = \dots = k_a = 1$ and $3 \leq k_{a+1} \leq k_{a+2} \leq \dots \leq k_{a+c}$ are the odd integers in λ .

Let $n = \min\{2k + a + c + 2, 2k + 3a + 3\}$. Then there is a k -chromatic graph G with $|V(G)| \leq n - 1$ which is not λ -choosable. We may assume that G is a complete k -partite graph with $|V(G)| = n - 1$ and with partite sets P_1, P_2, \dots, P_k such that $|P_1| \geq |P_2| \geq \dots \geq |P_k|$. For a positive integer i , let

$$I_i = \{j : |P_j| = i\}.$$

Note that $|P_1| \geq 3$ (as $|V(G)| > 2k$). If $c \leq 2a + 1$, then $n = 2k + a + c + 2$ and if $c \geq 2a + 2$, then $n = 2k + 3a + 3$.

Claim 8 $|P_1| \leq 4$, and if $c \leq 2a + 1$, then $|P_1| \leq c - 2a + 3$.

Proof. Let $G' = G - P_1$ and $L'(v) = L(v) - C_1$ for $v \in V(G')$. Then L' is a λ' -list assignment of G' , where $\lambda' = \lambda - \{1\}$. Note that $m_{\lambda'}(1) = a' = a - 1$, $m_{\lambda'}(\text{odd}) - m_{\lambda'}(1) = c' = c$ and $k' = k_{\lambda'} = k - 1$.

If $|P_1| \geq 5$, then $|V(G')| \leq |V(G)| - 5 = \min\{2k + a + c + 1 - 5, 2k + 3a + 2 - 5\} = \min\{2k' + a' + c' - 1, 2k' + 3a' + 2\}$. Hence G' is λ' -choosable and has a proper L' -colouring of G' , which extends to a proper L -colouring by colouring the vertices in P_1 by colours from C_1 , a contradiction. So $|P_1| \leq 4$.

If $c \leq 2a + 1$ and $|P_1| \geq c - 2a + 4$, then $|V(G')| = 2k + a + c + 1 - |P_1| \leq \min\{2k' + a' + c' + 1, 2k' + 3a' + 2\}$ (as $|P_1| \geq 3$). Hence G' is λ' -choosable, a contradiction. \blacksquare

Since $a \geq 1$, it follows from Claim 8 that $c \geq 2a \geq 2$, and if $c = 2$, then $a = 1$ and $|P_1| = 3$.

Definition 2 A 4-tuple (a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4) of integers is reducible if

$$0 \leq a_i \leq |I_i|, \sum_{i=1}^4 a_i = k_{a+1} \text{ and } 2k_{a+1} + 1 \leq \sum_{i=1}^4 ia_i \leq 2k_{a+1} + 2.$$

Claim 9 There is no reducible 4-tuple.

Proof. Assume to the contrary that (a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4) is a reducible 4-tuple. Let X be a subgraph of G consisting of a_i partite sets of G of size i for $1 \leq i \leq 4$, and let $G_1 = G[X]$. Then G_1 is a complete k_{a+1} -partite graph with $|V(G_1)| \leq 2k_{a+1} + 2$. By Theorem 4, G_1 is k_{a+1} -choosable, and hence there is a proper L -colouring ψ of G_1 using colours from C_{a+1} .

Let $\lambda' = \lambda - \{k_{a+1}\}$, $G' = G - X$, and $L'(v) = L(v) - C_{a+1}$ for each vertex v of G' . Then L' is a λ' -list assignment of G' . Note that $k' = k_{\lambda'} = k - k_{a+1}$, $a' = m_{\lambda'}(1) = a$ and $c' = m_{\lambda'}(\text{odd}) - m_{\lambda'}(1) = c - 1$, and G' is a complete k' -partite graph with $|V(G')| \leq |V(G)| - (2k_{a+1} + 1)$.

If $c \leq 2a + 1$, then $c' = c - 1 \leq 2a = 2a'$ and

$$|V(G')| \leq 2k + a + c + 1 - (2k_{a+1} + 1) = 2k' + a' + c' + 1.$$

If $c \geq 2a + 2$, then $c' = c - 1 \geq 2a + 1 = 2a' + 1$ and

$$|V(G')| \leq 2k + 3a + 2 - 2k_{a+1} - 1 = 2k' + 3a' + 1 \leq 2k' + a' + c'.$$

By the minimality of $|\lambda|$, G' is λ' -choosable. Let ϕ be an L' -colouring of G' . Then $\phi \cup \psi$ is a proper L -colouring of G , a contradiction. \blacksquare

If $|I_2| \geq k_{a+1} - 1$, then since $|I_3| + |I_4| \geq 1$, $(0, k_{a+1} - 1, 0, 1)$ or $(0, k_{a+1} - 1, 1, 0)$ is a reducible 4-tuple, contrary to Claim 9. So

$$|I_2| \leq k_{a+1} - 2. \tag{1}$$

Claim 10 If $c \geq 3$, then $|I_1| \geq \frac{2}{3}k_{a+1}$. If $c = 2$, then $|I_1| \geq (k_{a+1} - 1)/2$.

Proof. Observe that $3(k - |I_2| - |I_1|) + 2|I_2| + |I_1| \leq |V(G)| = n - 1$ and $k \geq a + ck_{a+1}$. Therefore $|I_2| + 2|I_1| \geq 3k - n + 1$. If $c \leq 2a + 1$, then $n = 2k + a + c + 2$ and hence

$$2|I_1| \geq k - a - c - 1 - |I_2| \geq (a + ck_{a+1}) - a - c - 1 - (k_{a+1} - 2) = (c - 1)(k_{a+1} - 1).$$

If $c \geq 2a + 2$, then $n = 2k + 3a + 3$ and hence

$$2|I_1| \geq k - 3a - 2 - |I_2| \geq (c - 1)k_{a+1} - 2a \geq (c - 1)(k_{a+1} - 1).$$

If $c \geq 3$, then $|I_1| \geq k_{a+1} - 1 \geq \frac{2}{3}k_{a+1}$ as $k_{a+1} \geq 3$.

If $c = 2$, then $a = 1$ and $|P_1| = 3$ and $n = 2k + a + c + 2 = 2k + 5$. Hence

$$3|I_3| + 2|I_2| + |I_1| = n - 1 = 2k + 4 \text{ and } |I_3| + |I_2| + |I_1| = k.$$

Therefore $2|I_3| + |I_2| = k + 4$. As $|I_2| + 2|I_1| \geq k - a - c - 1 = k - 4$ and hence

$$2k = 2(|I_1| + |I_2| + |I_3|) = (2|I_3| + |I_2|) + (|I_2| + 2|I_1|) \geq (k + 4) + (k - 4) = 2k.$$

Therefore $k - 4 = |I_2| + 2|I_1| \leq k_{a+1} - 2 + 2|I_1|$. As $k \geq 1 + 2k_{a+1}$, we have $|I_1| \geq (k_{a+1} - 1)/2$. ■

Case 1: $|P_1| = 4$.

Let $b_1 = \frac{k_{a+1} - |I_2| - 1}{2}$. Note that $\lceil b_1 \rceil + |I_2| + \lceil b_1 \rceil + 1 = k_{a+1}$ and $\lceil b_1 \rceil + 2|I_2| + 3\lceil b_1 \rceil + 4 \times 1 = 2k_{a+1} + 2$ (or $2k_{a+1} + 1$) if $2b_1$ is even (or odd). As $c \geq 3$, by Calim 10, $|I_1| \geq \frac{2}{3}k_{a+1} \geq \lceil b_1 \rceil$.

If $|I_3| \geq \lceil b_1 \rceil$, then $(\lceil b_1 \rceil, |I_2|, \lceil b_1 \rceil, 1)$ is a reducible 4-tuple, contrary to Claim 9. Therefore,

$$|I_3| < \lfloor \frac{k_{a+1} - |I_2| - 1}{2} \rfloor. \quad (2)$$

Let $b_2 = \frac{k_{a+1} - |I_2| - 2|I_3| - 1}{3}$. Note that $|I_1| \geq \frac{2}{3}k_{a+1} \geq 2\lceil b_2 \rceil + |I_3|$.

If $|I_4| \geq \lceil b_2 \rceil + 1$, then it is straightforward to check that

- either $3b_2 \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$, and $(2b_2 + |I_3|, |I_2|, |I_3|, b_2 + 1)$ is a reducible 4-tuple,
- or $3b_2 \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$, and $(2\lceil b_2 \rceil + |I_3| - 1, |I_2|, |I_3|, \lceil b_2 \rceil + 1)$ is a reducible 4-tuple,
- or $3b_2 \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$, and $(2\lceil b_2 \rceil + |I_3|, |I_2| - 1, |I_3|, \lceil b_2 \rceil + 1)$ is a reducible 4-tuple,

a contradiction. Therefore,

$$|I_4| < \lceil b_2 \rceil + 1 = \lceil \frac{k_{a+1} - |I_2| - 2|I_3| - 1}{3} \rceil + 1. \quad (3)$$

It follows from (1), (2) and (3) that

$$\begin{aligned}
|V(G)| &= 4|I_4| + 3|I_3| + 2|I_2| + |I_1| \\
&\leq 4 \times \frac{k_{a+1} - |I_2| - 2|I_3| - 1}{3} + 4 + 3|I_3| + 2|I_2| + |I_1| \\
&\leq \frac{4}{3}k_{a+1} + \frac{2}{3}|I_2| + \frac{1}{3} \frac{k_{a+1} - |I_2| - 1}{2} + |I_1| + \frac{8}{3} \\
&\leq \frac{3}{2}k_{a+1} + \frac{1}{2}(k_{a+1} - 2) + |I_1| + \frac{5}{2} \\
&\leq 2k + \frac{1}{2}.
\end{aligned}$$

The last inequality holds because $k \geq \sum_{i=1}^c k_{a+i} \geq ck_{a+1} \geq 2k_{a+1}$ and $|I_1| \leq k - 1$. This contradicts to $|V(G)| = n - 1 \geq 2k + 1$.

Case 2: $|P_1| = 3$.

Let $b_3 = \frac{k_{a+1} - |I_2| - 1}{2}$. Note that $\lfloor b_3 \rfloor + |I_2| + (\lfloor b_3 \rfloor + 1) = k_{a+1}$ and $\lfloor b_3 \rfloor + 2|I_2| + 3(\lfloor b_3 \rfloor + 1) = 2k_{a+1} + 2$ (or $2k_{a+1} + 1$) if $2b_3$ is odd (or even).

By Claim 10, $|I_1| \geq \frac{1}{2}(k_{a+1} - 1) \geq b_3$.

If $|I_3| \geq \lfloor b_3 \rfloor + 1$, then $(\lfloor b_3 \rfloor, |I_2|, \lfloor b_3 \rfloor + 1, 0)$ is a reducible 4-tuple, contrary to Claim 9. Therefore,

$$|I_3| < \left\lceil \frac{k_{a+1} - |I_2| - 1}{2} \right\rceil + 1. \quad (4)$$

It follows from (1) and (4) that

$$\begin{aligned}
|V(G)| &\leq 3 \times \frac{k_{a+1} - |I_2| - 1}{2} + 3 + 2|I_2| + |I_1| \\
&\leq \frac{3}{2}k_{a+1} + \frac{1}{2}(k_{a+1} - 2) + |I_1| + \frac{3}{2} \\
&\leq 2k - \frac{1}{2}.
\end{aligned}$$

The last inequality holds because $k \geq \sum_{i=1}^c k_{a+i} \geq ck_{a+1} \geq 2k_{a+1}$ and $|I_1| \leq k - 1$. This contradicts to $|V(G)| = n - 1 \geq 2k + 1$.

This completes the proof of Theorem 3.

References

- [1] Béla Bollobás and Andrew Harris. List-colourings of graphs. *Graphs Combin.*, 1(2):115–127, 1985.
- [2] Hikoe Enomoto, Kyoji Ohba, Katsuhiko Ota, and Junko Sakamoto. Choice number of some complete multi-partite graphs. *Discrete Math.*, 244(1-3):55–66, 2002.

- [3] Paul Erdős, Arthur L. Rubin, and Herbert Taylor. Choosability in graphs. In *Proceedings of the West Coast Conference on Combinatorics, Graph Theory and Computing (Humboldt State Univ., Arcata, Calif., 1979)*, Congress. Numer., XXVI, pages 125–157. Utilitas Math., Winnipeg, Man., 1980.
- [4] Yangyan Gu, Yiting Jiang, David Wood, and Xuding Zhu. Refined list version of Hadwiger’s conjecture. In preparation.
- [5] Arnfried Kemnitz and Margit Voigt. A note on non-4-list colorable planar graphs. *Electron. J. Combin.*, 25(2):Paper 2.46, 5, 2018.
- [6] Seog-Jin Kim and Boram Park. Counterexamples to the list square coloring conjecture. *J. Graph Theory*, 78(4):239–247, 2015.
- [7] Alexandr V. Kostochka, Michael Stiebitz, and Douglas R. Woodall. Ohba’s conjecture for graphs with independence number five. *Discrete Math.*, 311(12):996–1005, 2011.
- [8] Alexandr V. Kostochka and Douglas R. Woodall. Choosability conjectures and multicircuits. *Discrete Math.*, 240(1-3):123–143, 2001.
- [9] Jakub Kozik, Piotr Micek, and Xuding Zhu. Towards an on-line version of *Ohba’s* conjecture. *European J. Combin.*, 36:110–121, 2014.
- [10] Jonathan A. Noel. Choosability of graphs with bounded order: Ohba’s conjecture and beyond. Master’s thesis, McGill University, 2013.
- [11] Jonathan A. Noel, Bruce A. Reed, and Hehui Wu. A proof of a conjecture of Ohba. *J. Graph Theory*, 79(2):86–102, 2015.
- [12] Jonathan A. Noel, Douglas B. West, Hehui Wu, and Xuding Zhu. Beyond Ohba’s conjecture: a bound on the choice number of k -chromatic graphs with n vertices. *European J. Combin.*, 43:295–305, 2015.
- [13] Kyoji Ohba. On chromatic-choosable graphs. *J. Graph Theory*, 40(2):130–135, 2002.
- [14] Kyoji Ohba. Choice number of complete multipartite graphs with part size at most three. *Ars Combin.*, 72:133–139, 2004.
- [15] Bruce Reed and Benny Sudakov. List colouring when the chromatic number is close to the order of the graph. *Combinatorica*, 25(1):117–123, 2005.
- [16] Yufa Shen, Wenjie He, Guoping Zheng, and Yanpo Li. Ohba’s conjecture is true for graphs with independence number at most three. *Appl. Math. Lett.*, 22(6):938–942, 2009.

- [17] Yufa Shen, Wenjie He, Guoping Zheng, Yanning Wang, and Lingmin Zhang. On choosability of some complete multipartite graphs and Ohba's conjecture. *Discrete Math.*, 308(1):136–143, 2008.
- [18] Jialu Zhu and Xuding Zhu. Bad list assignments for non- k -choosable k -chromatic graphs with $2k + 2$ -vertices. arXiv:2202.09756.
- [19] Jialu Zhu and Xuding Zhu. Minimum non-chromatic-choosable graphs with given chromatic number. arXiv:2201.02060.
- [20] Jialu Zhu and Xuding Zhu. Chromatic λ -choosable and λ -paintable graphs. *J. Graph Theory*, 98(4):642–652, 2021.
- [21] Xuding Zhu. A refinement of choosability of graphs. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 141:143–164, 2020.