

# 2-distance $(\Delta + 2)$ -coloring of sparse graphs

Hoang La<sup>\*1</sup> and Mickael Montassier<sup>†1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>LIRMM, Université de Montpellier, CNRS, Montpellier, France

September 27, 2021

## Abstract

A 2-distance  $k$ -coloring of a graph is a proper  $k$ -coloring of the vertices where vertices at distance at most 2 cannot share the same color. We prove the existence of a 2-distance  $(\Delta + 2)$ -coloring for graphs with maximum average degree less than  $\frac{8}{3}$  (resp.  $\frac{14}{5}$ ) and maximum degree  $\Delta \geq 6$  (resp.  $\Delta \geq 10$ ). As a corollary, every planar graph with girth at least 8 (resp. 7) and maximum degree  $\Delta \geq 6$  (resp.  $\Delta \geq 10$ ) admits a 2-distance  $(\Delta + 2)$ -coloring.

## 1 Introduction

A  $k$ -coloring of the vertices of a graph  $G = (V, E)$  is a map  $\phi : V \rightarrow \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ . A  $k$ -coloring  $\phi$  is a *proper coloring*, if and only if, for all edge  $xy \in E$ ,  $\phi(x) \neq \phi(y)$ . In other words, no two adjacent vertices share the same color. The *chromatic number* of  $G$ , denoted by  $\chi(G)$ , is the smallest integer  $k$  such that  $G$  has a proper  $k$ -coloring. A generalization of  $k$ -coloring is  $k$ -list-coloring. A graph  $G$  is  *$L$ -list colorable* if for a given list assignment  $L = \{L(v) : v \in V(G)\}$  there is a proper coloring  $\phi$  of  $G$  such that for all  $v \in V(G)$ ,  $\phi(v) \in L(v)$ . If  $G$  is  $L$ -list colorable for every list assignment  $L$  with  $|L(v)| \geq k$  for all  $v \in V(G)$ , then  $G$  is said to be  *$k$ -choosable* or  *$k$ -list-colorable*. The *list chromatic number* of a graph  $G$  is the smallest integer  $k$  such that  $G$  is  $k$ -choosable. List coloring can be very different from usual coloring as there exist graphs with a small chromatic number and an arbitrarily large list chromatic number.

In 1969, Kramer and Kramer introduced the notion of 2-distance coloring [19, 20]. This notion generalizes the “proper” constraint (that does not allow two adjacent vertices to have the same color) in the following way: a *2-distance  $k$ -coloring* is such that no pair of vertices at distance at most 2 have the same color. The *2-distance chromatic number* of  $G$ , denoted by  $\chi^2(G)$ , is the smallest integer  $k$  such that  $G$  has a 2-distance  $k$ -coloring. Similarly to proper  $k$ -list-coloring, one can also define *2-distance  $k$ -list-coloring* and a *2-distance list chromatic number*.

For all  $v \in V$ , we denote  $d_G(v)$  the degree of  $v$  in  $G$  and by  $\Delta(G) = \max_{v \in V} d_G(v)$  the maximum degree of a graph  $G$ . For brevity, when it is clear from the context, we will use  $\Delta$  (resp.  $d(v)$ ) instead of  $\Delta(G)$  (resp.  $d_G(v)$ ). One can observe that, for any graph  $G$ ,  $\Delta + 1 \leq \chi^2(G) \leq \Delta^2 + 1$ . The lower bound is trivial since, in a 2-distance coloring, every neighbor of a vertex  $v$  with degree  $\Delta$ , and  $v$  itself must have a different color. As for the upper bound, a greedy algorithm shows that  $\chi^2(G) \leq \Delta^2 + 1$ . Moreover, that upper bound is tight for some graphs, for example, Moore graphs of type  $(\Delta, 2)$ , which are graphs where all vertices have degree  $\Delta$ , are at distance at most two from each other, and the total number of vertices is  $\Delta^2 + 1$ . See Figure 1.


By nature, 2-distance colorings and the 2-distance chromatic number of a graph depend a lot on the number of vertices in the neighborhood of every vertex. More precisely, the “sparser” a graph is, the lower its 2-distance chromatic number will be. One way to quantify the sparsity of a graph is through its maximum average degree. The *average degree*  $\text{ad}$  of a graph  $G = (V, E)$  is defined by  $\text{ad}(G) = \frac{2|E|}{|V|}$ . The *maximum average degree*  $\text{mad}(G)$  is the maximum, over all subgraphs  $H$  of  $G$ , of  $\text{ad}(H)$ . Another way to measure the sparsity is through the girth, i.e. the length of a shortest cycle. We denote  $g(G)$  the girth of  $G$ . Intuitively, the higher the girth of a graph is, the sparser it gets. These two measures can actually be linked directly in the case of planar graphs.

A graph is *planar* if one can draw its vertices with points on the plane, and edges with curves intersecting only at its endpoints. When  $G$  is a planar graph, Wegner conjectured in 1977 that  $\chi^2(G)$  becomes linear in  $\Delta(G)$ :


---

\*xuan-hoang.la@lirmm.fr


†mickael.montassier@lirmm.fr



(i) The Moore graph of type (2,2): the odd cycle  $C_5$ .



(ii) The Moore graph of type (3,2): the Petersen graph.




(iii) The Moore graph of type (7,2): the Hoffman-Singleton graph.

Figure 1. Examples of Moore graphs for which  $\chi^2 = \Delta^2 + 1$ .


**Conjecture 1** (Wegner [27]). *Let  $G$  be a planar graph with maximum degree  $\Delta$ . Then,*

$$\chi^2(G) \leq \begin{cases} 7, & \text{if } \Delta \leq 3, \\ \Delta + 5, & \text{if } 4 \leq \Delta \leq 7, \\ \lfloor \frac{3\Delta}{2} \rfloor + 1, & \text{if } \Delta \geq 8. \end{cases}$$

The upper bound for the case where  $\Delta \geq 8$  is tight (see Figure 2(i)). Recently, the case  $\Delta \leq 3$  was proved by Thomassen [26], and by Hartke *et al.* [16] independently. For  $\Delta \geq 8$ , Havet *et al.* [17] proved that the bound is  $\frac{3}{2}\Delta(1 + o(1))$ , where  $o(1)$  is as  $\Delta \rightarrow \infty$  (this bound holds for 2-distance list-colorings). Conjecture 1 is known to be true for some subfamilies of planar graphs, for example  $K_4$ -minor free graphs [25].



(i) A graph with girth 3 and  $\chi^2 = \lfloor \frac{3\Delta}{2} \rfloor + 1$ .



(ii) A graph with girth 4 and  $\chi^2 = \lfloor \frac{3\Delta}{2} \rfloor - 1$ .

Figure 2. Graphs with  $\chi^2 \approx \frac{3}{2}\Delta$ .

Wegner's conjecture motivated extensive researches on 2-distance chromatic number of sparse graphs, either of planar graphs with high girth or of graphs with upper bounded maximum average degree which are directly linked due to Proposition 2.

**Proposition 2** (Folklore). *For every planar graph  $G$ ,  $(\text{mad}(G) - 2)(g(G) - 2) < 4$ .*

As a consequence, any theorem with an upper bound on  $\text{mad}(G)$  can be translated to a theorem with a lower bound on  $g(G)$  under the condition that  $G$  is planar. Many results have taken the following form: *every graph  $G$  of  $\text{mad}(G) < m_0$  and  $\Delta(G) \geq \Delta_0$  satisfies  $\chi^2(G) \leq \Delta(G) + c(m_0, \Delta_0)$  where  $c(m_0, \Delta_0)$  is a constant depending only on  $m_0$  and  $\Delta_0$ .* Due to Proposition 2, as a corollary, the same results on planar graphs of girth  $g \geq g_0(m_0)$  where  $g_0$  depends on  $m_0$  follow. Table 1 shows all known such results, up to our knowledge, on the 2-distance chromatic number of planar graphs with fixed girth, either proven directly for planar graphs with high girth or came as a corollary of a result on graphs with bounded maximum average degree.

$\chi^2(G)$	$\Delta + 1$	$\Delta + 2$	$\Delta + 3$	$\Delta + 4$	$\Delta + 5$	$\Delta + 6$	$\Delta + 7$	$\Delta + 8$
$g_0$								
3				$\Delta = 3$ [26, 16]				
4								
5		$\Delta \geq 10^7$ [1] <sup>2</sup>	$\Delta \geq 339$ [14]	$\Delta \geq 312$ [13]	$\Delta \geq 15$ [8] <sup>1</sup>	$\Delta \geq 12$ [7] <sup>2</sup>	$\Delta \neq 7, 8$ [13]	all $\Delta$ [12]
6		$\Delta \geq 17$ [3] <sup>5</sup>	$\Delta \geq 9$ [7] <sup>2</sup>		all $\Delta$ [9]			
7	$\Delta \geq 16$ [18] <sup>2</sup>	$\Delta \geq 10^4$	$\Delta \geq 6$ [21] <sup>4</sup>	$\Delta = 4$ [10] <sup>4</sup>				
8	$\Delta \geq 9$ [24] <sup>1</sup>	$\Delta \geq 6^3$	$\Delta \geq 4$ [21] <sup>4</sup>					
9	$\Delta \geq 7$ [23] <sup>5</sup>	$\Delta = 5$ [6] <sup>4</sup>	$\Delta = 3$ [11] <sup>2</sup>					
10	$\Delta \geq 6$ [18] <sup>2</sup>							
11		$\Delta = 4$ [10] <sup>4</sup>						
12	$\Delta = 5$ [18] <sup>2</sup>	$\Delta = 3$ [5] <sup>2</sup>						
13								
14	$\Delta \geq 4$ [2] <sup>5</sup>							
...								
21	$\Delta = 3$ [22]							

Table 1. The latest results with a coefficient 1 before  $\Delta$  in the upper bound of  $\chi^2$ .

For example, the result from line “7” and column “ $\Delta + 1$ ” from Table 1 reads as follows : “every planar graph  $G$  of girth at least 7 and of  $\Delta$  at least 16 satisfies  $\chi^2(G) \leq \Delta + 1$ ”. The crossed out cases in the first column correspond to the fact that, for  $g_0 \leq 6$ , there are planar graphs  $G$  with  $\chi^2(G) = \Delta + 2$  for arbitrarily large  $\Delta$  [4, 15]. The lack of results for  $g = 4$  is due to the fact that the graph in Figure 2(ii) has girth 4, and  $\chi^2 = \lfloor \frac{3\Delta}{2} \rfloor - 1$  for all  $\Delta$ .

We are interested in the case  $\chi^2(G) \leq \Delta + 2$ . In particular, we were looking for the smallest integer  $\Delta_0$  such that every graph with maximum degree  $\Delta \geq \Delta_0$  and  $\text{mad} < \frac{8}{3}$  (resp.  $\text{mad} < \frac{14}{5}$ ) can be 2-distance colored with  $\Delta + 2$  colors. That family contains planar graphs with  $\Delta \geq \Delta_0$  and girth at least 8 (resp. 7).

Our main results are the following:

**Theorem 3.** *If  $G$  is a graph with  $\text{mad}(G) \leq \frac{8}{3}$ , then  $G$  is 2-distance  $(\Delta(G) + 2)$ -colorable for  $\Delta(G) \geq 6$ .*

**Theorem 4.** *If  $G$  is a graph with  $\text{mad}(G) \leq \frac{14}{5}$ , then  $G$  is 2-distance  $(\Delta(G) + 2)$ -colorable for  $\Delta(G) \geq 10$ .*

For planar graphs, we obtain the following corollaries:

**Corollary 5.** *If  $G$  is a graph with  $g(G) \geq 8$ , then  $G$  is 2-distance  $(\Delta(G) + 2)$ -colorable for  $\Delta(G) \geq 6$ .*

**Corollary 6.** *If  $G$  is a graph with  $g(G) \geq 7$ , then  $G$  is 2-distance  $(\Delta(G) + 2)$ -colorable for  $\Delta(G) \geq 10$ .*

We will prove Theorems 3 and 4 respectively in Sections 2 and 3 using the same scheme.

## 2 Proof of Theorem 3

**Notations and drawing conventions.** For  $v \in V(G)$ , the 2-distance neighborhood of  $v$ , denoted  $N_G^*(v)$ , is the set of 2-distance neighbors of  $v$ , which are vertices at distance at most two from  $v$ , not including  $v$ . We also denote  $d_G^*(v) = |N_G^*(v)|$ . We will drop the subscript and the argument when it is clear from the context. Also for conciseness, from now on, when we say “to color” a vertex, it means to color such vertex differently from all of its colored neighbors at distance at most two. Similarly, any considered coloring will be a 2-distance coloring. We say that a vertex  $u$  “sees” a vertex  $v$  if  $v \in N_G^*(u)$ . We also say that  $u$  “sees a color”  $c$  if there exists  $v \in N_G^*(u)$  such that  $v$  is colored  $c$ .

Some more notations:

- A  $d$ -vertex ( $d^+$ -vertex,  $d^-$ -vertex) is a vertex of degree  $d$  (at least  $d$ , at most  $d$ ). A  $(d \leftrightarrow e)$ -vertex is a vertex of degree between  $d$  and  $e$  included.
- A  $k$ -path ( $k^+$ -path,  $k^-$ -path) is a path of length  $k + 1$  (at least  $k + 1$ , at most  $k + 1$ ) where the  $k$  internal vertices are 2-vertices. The endvertices of a  $k$ -path are  $3^+$ -vertices.
- A  $(k_1, k_2, \dots, k_d)$ -vertex is a  $d$ -vertex incident to  $d$  different paths, where the  $i^{\text{th}}$  path is a  $k_i$ -path for all  $1 \leq i \leq d$ .

<sup>1</sup>Corollaries of more general colorings of planar graphs.

<sup>2</sup>Corollaries of 2-distance list-colorings of planar graphs.

<sup>3</sup>Our results.

<sup>4</sup>Corollaries of 2-distance list-colorings of graphs with a bounded maximum average degree.

<sup>5</sup>Corollaries of 2-distance colorings of graphs with a bounded maximum average degree.

As a drawing convention for the rest of the figures, black vertices will have a fixed degree, which is represented, and white vertices may have a higher degree than what is drawn. Also, we will represent the lower bound on the number of available colors next to each not yet colored vertex in a subgraph  $H$  of  $G$  when  $G - H$  is colored.

Let  $G_1$  be a counterexample to Theorem 3 with the fewest number of vertices. Graph  $G_1$  has maximum degree  $\Delta \geq 6$  and  $\text{mad}(G) < \frac{8}{3}$ . The purpose of the proof is to prove that  $G_1$  cannot exist. In the following we will study the structural properties of  $G_1$ . We will then apply a discharging procedure.

## 2.1 Structural properties of $G_1$

**Lemma 7.** *Graph  $G_1$  is connected.*

*Proof.* Otherwise a component of  $G_1$  would be a smaller counterexample. □

**Lemma 8.** *The minimum degree of  $G_1$  is at least 2.*

*Proof.* By Lemma 7, the minimum degree is at least 1. If  $G_1$  contains a degree 1 vertex  $v$ , then we can simply remove  $v$  and 2-distance color the resulting graph, which is possible by minimality of  $G_1$ . Then, we add  $v$  back and color it (at most  $\Delta$  constraints and  $\Delta + 2$  colors). □

**Lemma 9.** *Graph  $G_1$  has no  $3^+$ -paths.*

*Proof.* Suppose  $G_1$  contains a  $3^+$ -path  $v_0v_1v_2v_3 \dots v_k$  with  $k \geq 4$ . We color  $H = G_1 - \{v_1, v_2, v_3\}$  by minimality of  $G_1$ , then we finish by coloring  $v_1, v_3$ , and  $v_2$  in this order, which is possible since they have at least respectively 2, 2, and  $\Delta \geq 6$  available colors left after the coloring of  $H$ . □

**Lemma 10.** *A 2-path has two distinct endvertices and both have degree  $\Delta$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose that  $G_1$  contains a 2-path  $v_0v_1v_2v_3$ .

If  $v_0 = v_3$ , then we color  $G_1 - \{v_1, v_2\}$  by minimality of  $G_1$  and extend the coloring to  $G_1$  by coloring greedily  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  who has 3 available colors each.

Now, suppose that  $v_0 \neq v_3$ , and that  $d(v_3) \leq \Delta - 1$ . We color  $G_1 - \{v_1, v_2\}$  by minimality of  $G_1$  and extend the coloring to  $G_1$  by coloring  $v_1$  then  $v_2$ , which is possible since they have respectively 1 and 2 available colors left. Thus,  $d(v_3) = \Delta$  and the same holds for  $d(v_0)$  by symmetry. □




Figure 3.

**Lemma 11.** *Graph  $G_1$  has no cycles consisting of 2-paths.*

*Proof.* Suppose that  $G_1$  contains a cycle consisting of  $k$  2-paths (see Figure 4). We remove all vertices  $v_{3i+1}$  and  $v_{3i+2}$  for  $0 \leq i \leq k-1$ . Consider a coloring of the resulting graph. It is then possible to color  $v_1, v_2, v_4, \dots, v_{3k-1}$  since each of them has at least two choices of colors (as  $d(v_0) = d(v_3) = \dots = d(v_{3(k-1)}) = \Delta$  due to Lemma 10) and by 2-choosability of even cycles. □





Figure 4. A cycle consisting of consecutive 2-paths.

**Lemma 12.** Consider a  $(1, 1, 1)$ -vertex  $u$ . The other endvertices of the 1-paths incident to  $u$  are all distinct and are  $\Delta$ -vertices.

*Proof.* Suppose there exists a  $(1, 1, 1)$ -vertex  $u$  with three 2-neighbors  $u_1$ ,  $u_2$ , and  $u_3$ . Let  $v_i$  be the other endvertex of  $uu_iv_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq 3$ .

First, suppose by contradiction that  $v_1 = v_2$  (and possibly  $= v_3$ ). We color  $G_1 - \{u, u_1, u_2, u_3\}$  by minimality of  $G_1$ . Then, we color  $u_3$ ,  $u_1$ ,  $u_2$ , and  $u$  in this order, which is possible since they have at least respectively 2, 3, 3, and  $\Delta \geq 6$  colors. So,  $v_1$ ,  $v_2$ , and  $v_3$  are all distinct.

Now, suppose w.l.o.g. that  $d(v_1) \leq \Delta - 1$  by contradiction. We color  $G_1 - \{u, u_1, u_2, u_3\}$  by minimality of  $G_1$ . Then, we color  $u_3$ ,  $u_2$ ,  $u_1$ , and  $u$  in this order. So,  $d(v_1) = d(v_2) = d(v_3) = \Delta$ .  $\square$



(i) A  $(1, 1, 1)$ -vertex that sees only two vertices at distance 2. (ii) A  $(1, 1, 1)$ -vertex that sees a  $(\Delta - 1)^-$ -vertex at distance 2.

Figure 5.

**Definition 13** ( $(1, 1, 1)$ -paths). We call  $v_0v_1v_2v_3v_4$  a  $(1, 1, 1)$ -path when  $v_0$  and  $v_4$  are  $\Delta$ -vertices,  $v_1$  and  $v_3$  are 2-vertices, and  $v_2$  is a  $(1, 1, 1)$ -vertex.

**Lemma 14.** Graph  $G_1$  has no cycles consisting of  $(1, 1, 1)$ -paths.

*Proof.* Suppose that  $G$  contains a cycle consisting of  $k$   $(1, 1, 1)$ -paths (see Figure 6). We remove all vertices  $v_{4i+1}, v_{4i+2}, v_{4i+3}$  for  $0 \leq i \leq k - 1$ . Consider a coloring of the resulting graph. We color  $v_1, v_3, v_5, \dots, v_{4k-1}$  since each of them has at least two choices of colors (as  $d(v_0) = d(v_4) = \dots = d(v_{4(k-1)}) = \Delta$  due to Lemma 12) and by 2-choosability of even cycles. Finally, it is easy to color greedily  $v_2, v_6, \dots, v_{4k-2}$  since they each have at most six forbidden colors.  $\square$




Figure 6. A cycle consisting of consecutive  $(1, 1, 1)$ -paths.

**Lemma 15.** *A  $(1, 1, 0)$ -vertex with a  $(3 \leftrightarrow \Delta - 3)$ -neighbor shares its 2-neighbors with  $\Delta$ -vertices.*

*Proof.* Suppose that there exists a  $(1, 1, 0)$ -vertex  $u$  with a  $(3 \leftrightarrow \Delta - 3)$ -neighbor. Let  $u_1$  and  $u_2$  be its 2-neighbors. Let  $v \neq u$  be the other neighbor of  $u_1$ . Suppose w.l.o.g. that  $d(v) \leq \Delta - 1$  by contradiction. We color  $G_1 - \{u, u_1, u_2\}$  by minimality of  $G_1$ . Then, we color  $u_2, u_1,$  and  $u$  in this order, which is possible since they have at least respectively 1, 2, and 3 colors as we have  $\Delta + 2$  colors.  $\square$




Figure 7. A  $(1, 1, 0)$ -vertex with a  $(3 \leftrightarrow \Delta - 3)$ -neighbor that shares a 2-neighbor with a  $(\Delta - 1)^-$ -vertex.

**Lemma 16.** *A  $\Delta$ -vertex  $u$  cannot be incident to a 2-path, a  $(1, 1, 1)$ -path, and  $\Delta - 2$  other  $1^+$ -paths  $uu_i v_i$  ( $1 \leq i \leq \Delta - 2$ ) where each  $v_i$  is a  $3^-$ -vertex.*

*Proof.* Let  $uu_{\Delta-1}v_{\Delta-1} \notin \{uu_i v_i | 1 \leq i \leq \Delta - 2\}$  be a 1-path where  $v_{\Delta-1}$  is a  $(1, 1, 1)$ -vertex. Let  $uu_{\Delta}u'_{\Delta}v_{\Delta}$  be a 2-path incident to  $u$  where  $uu_{\Delta}u'_{\Delta} \notin \{uu_i v_i | 1 \leq i \leq \Delta - 1\}$ . Observe that  $v_{\Delta-1} \notin \{v_i | 1 \leq i \leq \Delta - 2\}$  due to Lemma 12 and  $v_{\Delta} \notin \{v_i | 1 \leq i \leq \Delta - 2\}$  due to Lemma 10.

Let  $H = u \cup N_G(u) \cup \{u'_{\Delta}\}$ . We color  $G - H$  by minimality of  $G$  and we uncolor  $v_{\Delta-1}$ . Let  $L(x)$  be the list of remaining colors for a vertex  $x \in H \cup \{v_{\Delta-1}\}$ . Observe that  $|L(u)| \geq \Delta + 2 - (\Delta - 2) \geq 4$ ,  $|L(u'_{\Delta})| \geq 2$  (since  $d(v_{\Delta}) = \Delta$  by Lemma 10),  $|L(v_{\Delta-1})| \geq \Delta - 2 \geq 4$ ,  $|L(u_i)| \geq \Delta - 1$  (since  $d(v_i) \leq 3$ ) for  $1 \leq i \leq \Delta - 2$ ,  $|L(u_{\Delta-1})| \geq \Delta$ , and  $|L(u_{\Delta})| \geq \Delta + 1$ . We remove the extra colors from  $L(u'_{\Delta})$  so that  $|L(u'_{\Delta})| = 2$ . We color  $u$  with a color that is not in  $L(u'_{\Delta})$ , then  $u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{\Delta}, v_{\Delta-1}$ , and  $u'_{\Delta}$  in this order. Observe that when  $v_i = v_j$  for  $1 \leq i \leq j \leq \Delta - 2$ , then  $|L(u_i)| \geq \Delta$  and  $|L(u_j)| \geq \Delta$  so the order in our coloring still hold. Thus, we obtain a valid coloring of  $G$ , which is a contradiction.  $\square$




Figure 8. A  $\Delta$ -vertex incident to a 2-path, a  $(1, 1, 1)$ -path, and  $\Delta - 2$  other  $1^+$ -paths with 3-endvertices.

## 2.2 Discharging rules

**Definition 17** (2-path sponsors). *Consider the set of 2-paths in  $G$ . By Lemma 10, the endvertices of every 2-paths are  $\Delta$ -vertices and by Lemma 11, the graph induced by the edges of all the 2-paths of  $G$  is a forest  $\mathcal{F}$ . For each tree of  $\mathcal{F}$ , we choose one  $\Delta$ -vertex as an arbitrary root. Each 2-path is assigned a unique sponsor which is the  $\Delta$ -endvertex that is further away from the root. See Figure 9.*




Figure 9. The sponsor assignment in a tree consisting of 2-paths.

**Definition 18** ((1, 1, 1)-path sponsors). *Consider the set of (1, 1, 1)-paths in  $G$ . By Lemma 12, the endvertices of every (1, 1, 1)-paths are  $\Delta$ -vertices and by Lemma 14, the graph induced by the edges of all the (1, 1, 1)-paths of  $G$  is a forest  $\mathcal{F}$ . For each tree of  $\mathcal{F}$ , we choose one  $\Delta$ -vertex as an arbitrary root. Each (1, 1, 1)-vertex  $v$  is assigned two sponsors which are the  $\Delta$ -vertices that are grandsons of  $v$ . See Figure 10.*




Figure 10. The sponsor assignment in a tree consisting of (1, 1, 1)-paths.

Since we have  $\text{mad}(G_1) < \frac{8}{3}$ , we must have

$$\sum_{v \in V(G_1)} (3d(v) - 8) < 0 \quad (1)$$

We assign to each vertex  $v$  the charge  $\mu(v) = 3d(v) - 8$ . To prove the non-existence of  $G_1$ , we will redistribute the charges preserving their sum and obtaining a non-negative total charge, which will contradict Equation (1).

**R0** (see Figure 11): Every  $3^+$ -vertex gives 1 to each 2-neighbor on an incident 1-path.

**R1** (see Figure 12): Let  $u$  be incident to a 2-path  $P = uu_1u_2v$ .

- (i) If  $u$  is not  $P$ 's sponsor, then  $u$  gives  $\frac{3}{2}$  to  $u_1$ .
- (ii) If  $u$  is  $P$ 's sponsor, then  $u$  gives 2 to  $u_1$  and  $\frac{1}{2}$  to  $u_2$ .

**R2** (see Figure 13): Every  $4^+$ -vertex gives 1 to each 3-neighbor.

**R3** (see Figure 14): Let  $uvw$  be a 1-path.

- (i) If  $u$  is a  $\Delta$ -vertex,  $w$  is a (1, 1, 1)-vertex, and  $u$  is  $w$ 's sponsor, then  $u$  gives 1 to  $w$ .
- (ii) If  $u$  is a  $\Delta$ -vertex and  $w$  is a (1, 1, 0)-vertex, then  $u$  gives  $\frac{1}{2}$  to  $w$ .




Figure 11. **R0**.




Figure 12. **R1**.





Figure 13. **R2**.





Figure 14. **R3**.

### 2.3 Verifying that charges on each vertex are non-negative

Let  $\mu^*$  be the assigned charges after the discharging procedure. In what follows, we prove that:

$$\forall u \in V(G_1), \mu^*(u) \geq 0.$$

Let  $u \in V(G_1)$ .

**Case 1:** If  $d(u) = 2$ , then recall that  $\mu(u) = 3 \cdot 2 - 8 = -2$ .

There are no  $3^+$ -paths due to Lemma 9 so  $u$  must lie on a 1-path or a 2-path.

If  $u$  is on a 1-path, then it has two  $3^+$ -neighbors which give it 1 each by **R0**. Thus,

$$\mu^*(u) = -2 + 2 \cdot 1 = 0.$$

If  $u$  is on a 2-path, then it either receives 2 from an adjacent sponsor by **R1(ii)**, or it receives  $\frac{3}{2} + \frac{1}{2} = 2$  from an adjacent non-sponsor  $\Delta$ -neighbor and a distance 2 sponsor respectively by **R1(i)** and **R1(ii)**. Thus,

$$\mu^*(u) = -2 + 2 = 0.$$

**Case 2:** If  $d(u) = 3$ , then recall that  $\mu(u) = 3 \cdot 3 - 8 = 1$ .

Observe that  $u$  only gives charge away by **R0** (charge 1 to each 2-neighbor).

If  $u$  is a  $(1, 1, 1)$ -vertex, then the other endvertices of the 1-paths incident to  $u$  are all  $\Delta$ -vertices due to Lemma 12. Moreover, by Definition 18,  $u$  has two sponsors which give it 1 each by **R3(i)**. Hence,

$$\mu^*(u) = 1 - 3 \cdot 1 + 2 \cdot 1 = 0.$$

If  $u$  is a  $(1, 1, 0)$ -vertex with a  $4^+$ -neighbor, then it receives 1 from its neighbor by **R2**. Thus,

$$\mu^*(u) = 1 - 2 \cdot 1 + 1 = 0.$$

If  $u$  is a  $(1, 1, 0)$ -vertex with a 3-neighbor ( $3 \leq \Delta - 3$  since  $\Delta \geq 6$ ), then it receives  $\frac{1}{2}$  by **R3(ii)** from each of the other endvertices of its incident 1-paths due to Lemma 15. Thus,

$$\mu^*(u) = 1 - 2 \cdot 1 + 2 \cdot \frac{1}{2} = 0.$$

If  $u$  is a  $(1^-, 0, 0)$ -vertex, then

$$\mu^*(u) \geq 1 - 1 = 0.$$

**Case 3:** If  $4 \leq d(u) \leq \Delta - 1$ , then  $u$  only gives away at most 1 to each neighbor by **R0** or **R2**. Thus,

$$\mu^*(u) \geq 3d(u) - 8 - d(u) \geq 2 \cdot 4 - 8 = 0.$$

**Case 4:** If  $d(u) = \Delta$ , then we distinguish the following cases.



- If  $u$  is neither a 2-path sponsor nor a  $(1, 1, 1)$ -path sponsor, then observe that  $u$  gives away at most  $\frac{3}{2}$  along an incident path by **R1**(i), a combination of **R0** and **R3**(i), or less by **R2**. So at worst,

$$\mu^*(u) \geq 3\Delta - 8 - \frac{3}{2}\Delta \geq \frac{3}{2} \cdot 6 - 8 = 1.$$

- If  $u$  is a 2-path sponsor but not a  $(1, 1, 1)$ -path sponsor, then  $u$  gives  $2 + \frac{1}{2} = \frac{5}{2}$  to its unique sponsored incident 2-path by **R1**(ii). For the other incident paths, it gives at most  $\frac{3}{2}$  like above. So,

$$\mu^*(u) \geq 3\Delta - 8 - \frac{5}{2} - \frac{3}{2}(\Delta - 1) \geq \frac{3}{2} \cdot 6 - 8 - \frac{5}{2} + \frac{3}{2} = 0.$$

- If  $u$  is a  $(1, 1, 1)$ -path sponsor but not a 2-path sponsor, then  $u$  gives  $1 + 1 = 2$  to the unique incident  $(1, 1, 1)$ -path containing its assigned  $(1, 1, 1)$ -vertex  $v$ : 1 to the 2-neighbor by **R0** and 1 to  $v$  by **R3**(i). Once again,  $u$  gives at most  $\frac{3}{2}$  to the other incident paths. So,

$$\mu^*(u) \geq 3\Delta - 8 - 2 - \frac{3}{2}(\Delta - 1) \geq \frac{3}{2} \cdot 6 - 8 - 2 + \frac{3}{2} = \frac{1}{2}.$$

- If  $u$  is both a 2-path sponsor and a  $(1, 1, 1)$ -path sponsor, then  $u$  gives  $\frac{5}{2}$  to its unique sponsored 2-path and 2 to its unique assigned  $(1, 1, 1)$ -vertex like above.

Now, let us consider the other  $\Delta - 2$  paths incident to  $u$ . Observe that when  $u$  gives  $\frac{3}{2}$  along an incident path either by **R1**(i) or by a combination of **R0** and **R3**(ii), that path must be a  $1^+$ -path where the vertex at distance 2 from  $u$  is a  $3^-$ -vertex. Due to Lemma 16,  $u$  never has to give  $\frac{3}{2}$  to each of the  $\Delta - 2$  paths. As a result, there exists one path to which  $u$  gives at most 1. So at worst,

$$\mu^*(u) \geq 3\Delta - 8 - \frac{5}{2} - 2 - 1 - \frac{3}{2}(\Delta - 3) \geq \frac{3}{2} \cdot 6 - 8 - \frac{5}{2} - 2 - 1 + \frac{9}{2} = 0.$$

We obtain a non-negative amount of charge on each vertex, which is impossible since the total amount of charge is negative. As such,  $G_1$  cannot exist. That concludes the proof of Theorem 3.

### 3 Proof of Theorem 4

We will reuse similar notations to Section 2. Let  $G_2$  be a counterexample to Theorem 4 with the fewest number of vertices. Graph  $G_2$  has maximum degree  $\Delta \geq 10$  and  $\text{mad} < \frac{14}{5}$ . The purpose of the proof is to prove that  $G_2$  cannot exist.

#### 3.1 Structural properties of $G_2$

Observe that the proofs of Lemmas 7 to 12 and 14 to 16 only rely on the facts that we have a minimal counterexample, two more colors than the maximum degree, and that  $\Delta$  was large enough ( $\Delta(G_1) \geq 6$ ). All of these still hold for  $G_2$  ( $\Delta(G_2) \geq 10$ ). Thus, we also have the following.

**Lemma 19.** *Graph  $G_2$  is connected.*

**Lemma 20.** *The minimum degree of  $G_2$  is at least 2.*

**Lemma 21.** *Graph  $G_2$  has no  $3^+$ -paths.*

**Lemma 22.** *A 2-path has two distinct endvertices and both have degree  $\Delta$ .*

**Lemma 23.** *Graph  $G_2$  has no cycles consisting of 2-paths.*

**Lemma 24.** *Consider a  $(1, 1, 1)$ -vertex  $u$ . The other endvertices of the 1-paths incident to  $u$  are all distinct and are  $\Delta$ -vertices.*

**Lemma 25.** *Graph  $G_2$  has no cycles consisting of  $(1, 1, 1)$ -paths.*

**Lemma 26.** *A  $(1, 1, 0)$ -vertex with a  $(3 \leftrightarrow \Delta - 3)$ -neighbor shares its 2-neighbors with  $\Delta$ -vertices.*

**Lemma 27.** *A  $\Delta$ -vertex  $u$  cannot be incident to a 2-path, a  $(1, 1, 1)$ -path, and  $\Delta - 2$  other  $1^+$ -paths  $uu_i v_i$  ( $1 \leq i \leq \Delta - 2$ ) where each  $v_i$  is a  $3^-$ -vertex.*

We will show some more reducible configurations.

**Lemma 28.** *A  $(1, 0, 0)$ -vertex with two  $(3 \leftrightarrow 4)$ -neighbors shares its 2-neighbor with a  $\Delta$ -vertex.*

*Proof.* Suppose by contradiction that there exists a  $(1, 0, 0)$ -vertex  $u$  with two  $(3 \leftrightarrow 4)$ -neighbors  $u_1, u_2$ , and let  $uvw$  be the 1-path incident to  $u$ , where  $d(w) \leq \Delta - 1$ . We color  $G_2 - \{v\}$  by minimality of  $G_2$ , then we uncolor  $u$ . Since we have  $\Delta + 2 \geq 12$  colors and  $d^*(u) = d(u_1) + d(u_2) + 2 \leq 4 + 4 + 2 = 10$ , we can always color  $u$  last. Finally,  $v$  has at least one available color. Thus, we obtain a valid coloring of  $G_2$ , which is a contradiction.  $\square$




Figure 15. A  $(1, 0, 0)$ -vertex with two  $(3 \leftrightarrow 4)$ -neighbor that shares a 2-neighbor with a  $(\Delta - 1)^-$ -vertex.

**Lemma 29.** *Consider the four other endvertices of the 1-paths incident to a  $(1, 1, 1, 1)$ -vertex. At most one of them is a  $(\Delta - 2)^-$ -vertex.*

*Proof.* Suppose by contradiction that we have a  $(1, 1, 1, 1)$ -vertex  $u$  incident to four 1-paths  $uu_i v_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq 4$ , where  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  are  $(\Delta - 2)^-$ -vertices. We color  $G_2 - \{u, u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4\}$  by minimality of  $G_2$ . Then, it suffices to color  $u_3, u_4, u_1, u_2$ , and  $u$  in this order, which is possible since they have at least respectively 2, 2, 4, 4, and 8 available colors as we have  $\Delta + 2$  colors and  $\Delta \geq 10$ .  $\square$




Figure 16. A  $(1, 1, 1, 1)$ -vertex that sees two  $(\Delta - 2)^-$ -vertex at distance 2.

### 3.2 Discharging rules

Since we have  $\text{mad}(G_2) < \frac{14}{5}$ , we must have

$$\sum_{v \in V(G_2)} (5d(v) - 14) < 0 \quad (2)$$

We assign to each vertex  $v$  the charge  $\mu(v) = 5d(v) - 14$ . To prove the non-existence of  $G_2$ , we will redistribute the charges preserving their sum and obtaining a positive total charge, which will contradict Equation (2).

Observe that Definitions 17 and 18 also hold for  $G_2$  thanks to Lemmas 23 and 25.

We apply the following discharging rules:

**R0** (see Figure 17): Every  $3^+$ -vertex gives 2 to each 2-neighbor on an incident 1-path.

**R1** (see Figure 18): Let  $u$  be incident to a 2-path  $P = uu_1u_2v$ .

- (i) If  $u$  is not  $P$ 's sponsor, then  $u$  gives  $\frac{7}{2}$  to  $u_1$ .
- (ii) If  $u$  is  $P$ 's sponsor, then  $u$  gives 4 to  $u_1$  and  $\frac{1}{2}$  to  $u_2$ .

**R2** (see Figure 19):

- (i) Every  $(5 \leftrightarrow 7)$ -vertex gives 1 to each 3-neighbor.

(ii) Every  $8^+$ -vertex gives 3 to each 3-neighbor.

**R3** (see Figure 20): Let  $uvw$  be a 1-path.

- (i) If  $u$  is a  $\Delta$ -vertex,  $w$  is a  $(1, 1, 1)$ -vertex, and  $u$  is  $w$ 's sponsor, then  $u$  gives 2 to  $w$ .
- (ii) If  $u$  is a  $\Delta$ -vertex,  $w$  is a  $(1, 1, 1)$ -vertex, and  $u$  is not  $w$ 's sponsor, then  $u$  gives 1 to  $w$ .
- (iii) If  $u$  is a  $\Delta$ -vertex and  $w$  is a  $(1, 1^-, 0)$ -vertex, then  $u$  gives  $\frac{3}{2}$  to  $w$ .
- (iv) If  $u$  is a  $9^+$ -vertex and  $w$  is a 4-vertex, then  $u$  gives  $\frac{2}{3}$  to  $w$ .




Figure 17. **R0**.





Figure 18. **R1**.





Figure 19. **R2**.







Figure 20. **R3**.

### 3.3 Verifying that charges on each vertex are non-negative

Let  $\mu^*$  be the assigned charges after the discharging procedure. In what follows, we prove that:

$$\forall u \in V(G_2), \mu^*(u) \geq 0.$$

Let  $u \in V(G_2)$ .

**Case 1:** If  $d(u) = 2$ , then recall that  $\mu(u) = 5 \cdot 2 - 14 = -4$ .

Recall that there exists no  $3^+$ -path due to Lemma 21. So,  $u$  must lie on a 1-path or a 2-path.

If  $u$  is on a 1-path, then it has two  $3^+$ -neighbors which give it 2 each by **R0**. Thus,

$$\mu^*(u) = -4 + 2 \cdot 2 = 0.$$

If  $u$  is on a 2-path, then  $u$  receives 4 from an adjacent sponsor by **R1(ii)**, or it receives  $\frac{7}{2} + \frac{1}{2} = 4$  from an adjacent non-sponsor and a distance 2 sponsor respectively by **R1(i)** and **R1(ii)**. Thus,

$$\mu^*(u) = -4 + 4 = 0.$$

**Case 2:** If  $d(u) = 3$ , then recall that  $\mu(u) = 5 \cdot 3 - 14 = 1$ .

Observe that  $u$  only gives charge away by **R0** (charge 2 to each 2-neighbor).

If  $u$  is a  $(1, 1, 1)$ -vertex, then the other endvertices of the 1-paths incident to  $u$  are all  $\Delta$ -vertices due to Lemma 24. As a result,  $u$  receives 2 from each of its two sponsors and 1 from the non-sponsor  $\Delta$ -vertex by **R3(i)** and **R3(ii)**. Hence,

$$\mu^*(u) = 1 - 3 \cdot 2 + 2 \cdot 2 + 1 = 0.$$

If  $u$  is a  $(1, 1, 0)$ -vertex with a  $8^+$ -neighbor, then it receives 3 from its  $8^+$ -neighbor by **R2(ii)**. Thus,

$$\mu^*(u) = 1 - 2 \cdot 2 + 3 = 0.$$

If  $u$  is a  $(1, 1, 0)$ -vertex with an  $7^-$ -neighbor ( $7 \leq \Delta - 3$  since  $\Delta \geq 10$ ), then it receives  $\frac{3}{2}$  by **R3(iii)** from each of the other endvertices of its incident 1-paths due to Lemma 26. Thus,

$$\mu^*(u) = 1 - 2 \cdot 2 + 2 \cdot \frac{3}{2} = 0.$$

If  $u$  is a  $(1, 0, 0)$ -vertex with a  $5^+$ -neighbor, then it receives at least 1 from that neighbor by **R2**. Thus,

$$\mu^*(u) \geq 1 - 2 + 1 = 0.$$

If  $u$  is a  $(1, 0, 0)$ -vertex with two  $(3 \leftrightarrow 4)$ -neighbors, then it receives  $\frac{3}{2}$  by **R3(i)** from the other endvertex of its incident 1-path due to Lemma 28. So,

$$\mu^*(u) = 1 - 2 + \frac{3}{2} = \frac{1}{2}.$$

If  $u$  is a  $(0, 0, 0)$ -vertex, then

$$\mu^*(u) = \mu(u) = 1.$$

**Case 3:** If  $d(u) = 4$ , then recall that  $\mu(u) = 5 \cdot 4 - 14 = 6$ .

Observe that  $u$  only gives charge by **R0** (charge 2 to each 2-neighbor).

If  $u$  is a  $(1, 1, 1, 1)$ -vertex, then at least three of the four other endvertices of the 1-paths incident to  $u$  are  $(\Delta - 1)^+$ -vertices (which are  $9^+$ -vertices since  $\Delta \geq 10$ ) due to Lemma 29. As a result,  $u$  receives  $\frac{2}{3}$  from each of the  $9^+$ -endvertex by **R3(iv)**. Hence,

$$\mu^*(u) \geq 6 - 4 \cdot 2 + 3 \cdot \frac{2}{3} = 0.$$

If  $u$  is a  $(1^-, 1^-, 1^-, 0)$ -vertex, then

$$\mu^*(u) \geq 6 - 3 \cdot 2 = 0.$$

**Case 3:** If  $5 \leq d(u) \leq 7$ , then  $u$  can give 2 to each 2-neighbor by **R0** or 1 to each 3-neighbor by **R2(i)**. Thus, at worst we get

$$\mu^*(u) \geq 5d(u) - 14 - 2d(u) \geq 3 \cdot 5 - 14 = 1.$$

**Case 4:** If  $8 \leq d(u) \leq \Delta - 1$ , then  $u$  gives at most 3 along each incident path by **R2(ii)**. Thus, at worst we get

$$\mu^*(u) \geq 5d(u) - 14 - 3d(u) \geq 2 \cdot 8 - 14 = 2.$$

**Case 5:** If  $d(u) = \Delta$ , then we distinguish the following cases.

- If  $u$  is neither a 2-path sponsor nor a  $(1, 1, 1)$ -path sponsor, then observe that  $u$  gives away at most  $\frac{7}{2}$  along an incident path by **R1(i)** or a combination of **R0** and **R3(iii)**. So at worst,

$$\mu^*(u) \geq 5\Delta - 14 - \frac{7}{2}\Delta \geq \frac{3}{2} \cdot 10 - 14 = 1.$$

- If  $u$  is a 2-path sponsor but not a  $(1, 1, 1)$ -path sponsor, then  $u$  gives  $4 + \frac{1}{2} = \frac{9}{2}$  to its unique sponsored incident 2-path by **R1(ii)**. For the other incident paths, it gives at most  $\frac{7}{2}$  like above. So,

$$\mu^*(u) \geq 5\Delta - 14 - \frac{9}{2} - \frac{7}{2}(\Delta - 1) \geq \frac{3}{2} \cdot 10 - 14 - \frac{9}{2} + \frac{7}{2} = 0.$$

- If  $u$  is a  $(1, 1, 1)$ -path sponsor but not a 2-path sponsor, then  $u$  gives  $2 + 2 = 4$  to the unique incident  $(1, 1, 1)$ -path containing its assigned  $(1, 1, 1)$ -vertex  $v$ : 1 to the 2-neighbor by **R0** and 1 to  $v$  by **R3(i)**. Once again,  $u$  gives at most  $\frac{7}{2}$  to the other incident paths. So,

$$\mu^*(u) \geq 5\Delta - 14 - 4 - \frac{7}{2}(\Delta - 1) \geq \frac{3}{2} \cdot 10 - 14 - 4 + \frac{7}{2} = \frac{1}{2}.$$

- If  $u$  is both a 2-path sponsor and a  $(1, 1, 1)$ -path sponsor, then  $u$  gives  $\frac{9}{2}$  to its unique sponsored 2-path and 4 to its unique assigned  $(1, 1, 1)$ -vertex like above.

Now, let us consider the other  $\Delta - 2$  paths incident to  $u$ . Observe that when  $u$  gives  $\frac{7}{2}$  along an incident path either by **R1(i)** or by a combination of **R0** and **R3(iii)**, that path must be a  $1^+$ -path where the vertex at distance 2 from  $u$  is a  $3^-$ -vertex. Due to Lemma 27,  $u$  never has to give  $\frac{7}{2}$  to each of the  $\Delta - 2$  paths. As a result, there exists one path to which  $u$  gives at most 3. So at worst,

$$\mu^*(u) \geq 5\Delta - 14 - \frac{9}{2} - 4 - 3 - \frac{7}{2}(\Delta - 3) \geq \frac{3}{2} \cdot 10 - 14 - \frac{9}{2} - 4 - 3 + \frac{21}{2} = 0.$$

We obtain a non-negative amount of charge on each vertex, which is impossible since the total amount of charge is negative. As such,  $G_2$  cannot exist. That concludes the proof of Theorem 4.

## Acknowledgements

This work was partially supported by the grant HOSIGRA funded by the French National Research Agency (ANR, Agence Nationale de la Recherche) under the contract number ANR-17-CE40-0022.

## References

- [1] M. Bonamy, D. Cranston, and L. Postle. Planar graphs of girth at least five are square  $(\Delta + 2)$ -choosable. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 134:218–238, 2019.
- [2] M. Bonamy, B. Lévêque, and A. Pinlou. 2-distance coloring of sparse graphs. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 77(3), 2014.
- [3] M. Bonamy, B. Lévêque, and A. Pinlou. Graphs with maximum degree  $\Delta \geq 17$  and maximum average degree less than 3 are list 2-distance  $(\Delta + 2)$ -colorable. *Discrete Mathematics*, 317:19–32, 2014.
- [4] O.V. Borodin, A.N. Glebov, A.O. Ivanova, T.K. Neutroeva, and V.A. Tashkinov. Sufficient conditions for the 2-distance  $(\Delta + 1)$ -colorability of plane graphs. *Sibirskie Elektronnyye Matematicheskie Izvestiya*, 1:129–141, 2004.
- [5] O.V. Borodin and A.O. Ivanova. List 2-facial 5-colorability of plane graphs with girth at least 12. *Discrete Mathematics*, 312:306–314, 2012.
- [6] Y. Bu, X. Lv, and X. Yan. The list 2-distance coloring of a graph with  $\Delta(G) = 5$ . *Discrete Mathematics, Algorithms and Applications*, 7(2):1550017, 2015.
- [7] Y. Bu and C. Shang. List 2-distance coloring of planar graphs without short cycles. *Discrete Mathematics, Algorithms and Applications*, 8(1):1650013, 2016.
- [8] Y. Bu and J. Zhu. *Channel Assignment with  $r$ -Dynamic Coloring: 12th International Conference, AAIM 2018, Dallas, TX, USA, December 3–4, 2018, Proceedings*, pages 36–48. 2018.
- [9] Y. Bu and X. Zhu. An optimal square coloring of planar graphs. *Journal of Combinatorial Optimization*, 24:580–592, 2012.
- [10] D. Cranston, R. Erman, and R. Škrekovski. Choosability of the square of a planar graph with maximum degree four. *Australian Journal of Combinatorics*, 59(1):86–97, 2014.
- [11] D. Cranston and S.-J. Kim. List-coloring the square of a subcubic graph. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 1:65–87, 2008.
- [12] W. Dong and W. Lin. An improved bound on 2-distance coloring plane graphs with girth 5. *Journal of Combinatorial Optimization*, 32(2):645–655, 2016.
- [13] W. Dong and W. Lin. On 2-distance coloring of plane graphs with girth 5. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 217:495–505, 2017.

- [14] W. Dong and B. Xu. 2-distance coloring of planar graphs with girth 5. *Journal of Combinatorial Optimization*, 34:1302–1322, 2017.
- [15] Z. Dvořák, D. Král, P. Nejedlý, and R. Škrekovski. Coloring squares of planar graphs with girth six. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 29(4):838–849, 2008.
- [16] S.G. Hartke, S. Jahanbekam, and B. Thomas. The chromatic number of the square of subcubic planar graphs. arXiv:1604.06504, 2018.
- [17] F. Havet, J. Van Den Heuvel, C. McDiarmid, and B. Reed. List colouring squares of planar graphs. arXiv:0807.3233, 2017.
- [18] A.O. Ivanova. List 2-distance  $(\Delta+1)$ -coloring of planar graphs with girth at least 7. *Journal of Applied and Industrial Mathematics*, 5(2):221–230, 2011.
- [19] F. Kramer and H. Kramer. Ein Färbungsproblem der Knotenpunkte eines Graphen bezüglich der Distanz  $p$ . *Revue Roumaine de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées*, 14(2):1031–1038, 1969.
- [20] F. Kramer and H. Kramer. Un problème de coloration des sommets d’un graphe. *Comptes Rendus Mathématique Académie des Sciences, Paris.*, 268:46–48, 1969.
- [21] H. La. 2-distance list  $(\Delta + 3)$ -coloring of sparse graphs. arXiv:2105.01684, 2021.
- [22] H. La and M. Montassier. 2-distance 4-coloring of planar subcubic graphs with girth at least 21. arXiv:2106.03587, 2021.
- [23] H. La and M. Montassier. 2-distance  $(\Delta + 1)$ -coloring of sparse graphs using the potential method. arXiv:2103.11687, 2021.
- [24] H. La, M. Montassier, A. Pinlou, and P. Valicov.  $r$ -hued  $(r + 1)$ -coloring of planar graphs with girth at least 8 for  $r \geq 9$ . *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 91, 2021.
- [25] K.-W. Lih, W.-F. Wang, and X. Zhu. Coloring the square of a  $K_4$ -minor free graph. *Discrete Mathematics*, 269(1):303 – 309, 2003.
- [26] C. Thomassen. The square of a planar cubic graph is 7-colorable. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 128:192–218, 2018.
- [27] G. Wegner. Graphs with given diameter and a coloring problem. *Technical report, University of Dortmund*, 1977.