

# Realising every colour distribution sequence with a Gallai colouring

Jun Yan\*

## Abstract

An edge colouring of  $K_n$  with  $k$  colours is a Gallai  $k$ -colouring if it does not contain any rainbow triangle. Gyárfás, Pálvölgyi, Patkós and Wales proved that there exists a number  $g(k)$  such that  $n \geq g(k)$  if and only if for any colour distribution sequence  $(e_1, \dots, e_k)$  with  $\sum_{i=1}^k e_i = \binom{n}{2}$ , there exist a Gallai  $k$ -colouring of  $K_n$  with  $e_i$  edges having colour  $i$ . They also showed that  $\Omega(k) = g(k) = O(k^2)$  and posed the problem of determining the exact order of magnitude of  $g(k)$ . Feffer, Fu and Yan improved both bounds significantly by proving  $\Omega(k^{1.5}/\log k) = g(k) = O(k^{1.5})$ . We resolve this problem by showing  $g(k) = \Theta(k^{1.5}/(\log k)^{0.5})$ .

## 1 Introduction

An edge colouring (not necessarily proper) of the complete graph  $K_n$  using  $k$  colours is called a Gallai  $k$ -colouring if it contains no rainbow triangle, which is a triangle whose edges all have different colours. This concept first appeared in Gallai's work [3] on comparability graphs. It was formally introduced by Gyárfás and Simonyi [6], in which the following important structural decomposition theorem is proved.

**Theorem 1.1** ([6]). *Suppose we have a Gallai  $k$ -colouring of  $K_n$ . Then there exist at most two colours, which we call base colours, and a decomposition of  $K_n$  into  $m \geq 2$  vertex disjoint complete graphs  $K_{n_1}, \dots, K_{n_m}$ , such that for each  $1 \leq i < j \leq m$ , there exists a base colour with all edges between  $V(K_{n_i})$  and  $V(K_{n_j})$  having this colour.*

A more compact way of stating this theorem is that every Gallai  $k$ -colouring can be obtained by replacing the vertices of a 2-coloured complete graph with Gallai  $k$ -coloured complete graphs. It is easy to see that the converse is also true, in the sense that this construction always result in valid Gallai  $k$ -colourings. This shows that Gallai colourings are too some degree close to 2-colourings. In fact, Balogh and Li [1] showed that almost all Gallai  $k$ -colourings of  $K_n$  use only 2 colours. In [5], Gyárfás, Sárközy, Sebő, Selkow used this connection to show that 2-coloured Ramsey-type results for certain families of graphs, which are called Gallai-extendable, can be extended to Gallai colourings. More Ramsey-type problems for Gallai colourings are investigated in [5, 6, 7].

A new avenue of research was proposed by Gyárfás, Pálvölgyi, Patkós and Wales in [4]. They considered how the number of edges having each colour can be distributed in Gallai  $k$ -colourings. Several necessary or sufficient conditions were given, though a general characterisation seems difficult. However, they proved the following theorem, which says that as long as we have sufficiently many vertices, any colour distribution sequence can be realised as a Gallai colouring.

**Theorem 1.2** ([4]). *For every integer  $k \geq 2$ , there exists a (unique) integer  $g(k)$  such that  $n \geq g(k)$  if and only if for any colour distribution sequence  $(e_1, \dots, e_k)$  with  $\sum_{i=1}^k e_i = \binom{n}{2}$ , there exists a Gallai  $k$ -colouring of  $K_n$  with  $e_i$  edges having colour  $i$ .*

---

\*Supported by the Warwick Mathematics Institute Centre for Doctoral Training, and by funding from the UK EPSRC (Grant number: EP/W523793/1)

In [4], Gyárfás, Pálvölgyi, Patkós and Wales also gave the estimate  $2k - 2 \leq g(k) \leq 8k^2 + 1$ , and posed the problem of determining the exact order of magnitude of  $g(k)$ . The gap was closed considerably when Feffer, Fu and Yan proved the following almost matching bounds in [2].

**Theorem 1.3** ([2]). *Let  $\alpha < 1$  and  $\beta > 2\sqrt{3}$  be fixed. Then for all sufficiently large  $k$ , we have  $\frac{\alpha k^{1.5}}{\log k} \leq g(k) \leq \beta k^{1.5}$ .*

In this paper, we close the gap and show the exact order of magnitude of  $g(k)$  is  $\Theta\left(\frac{k^{1.5}}{(\log k)^{0.5}}\right)$  by proving the following pair of theorems.

**Theorem 1.4.** *There exists a constant  $\alpha > 0$  such that  $g(k) \geq \frac{\alpha k^{1.5}}{(\log k)^{0.5}}$  for all large  $k$ .*

**Theorem 1.5.** *There exists a constant  $\beta > 0$  such that  $g(k) \leq \frac{\beta k^{1.5}}{(\log k)^{0.5}}$  for all large  $k$ .*

The paper is organised as follows. In Section 2, we use a strengthened version of Theorem 1.1 to provide a stepwise decomposition framework that will be used throughout this paper to describe and analyse Gallai colourings. We also prove several preliminary results and sketch the proofs of the two main theorems. In Section 3, we prove Theorem 1.4 by explicitly constructing a colour distribution sequence that cannot be realised as a Gallai  $k$ -colouring. In Section 4, we prove Theorem 1.5 by describing a stepwise colouring process that will provide a Gallai  $k$ -colouring for any colour distribution sequence.

## 2 Preliminaries

### 2.1 Stepwise decomposition

As observed by Feffer, Fu and Yan in [2], Theorem 1.1 can be slightly strengthened as follows.

**Theorem 2.1** ([2]). *Suppose we have a Gallai  $k$ -colouring of  $K_n$ . Then there exist at most two colours, which we call base colours, and a decomposition of  $K_n$  into  $m \geq 2$  vertex disjoint complete graphs  $K_{n_1}, \dots, K_{n_m}$ , such that for each  $1 \leq i < j \leq m$ , there exists a base colour with all edges between  $V(K_{n_i})$  and  $V(K_{n_j})$  having this colour. Moreover, each base colour is used to colour at least  $n - 1$  edges between these smaller complete graphs.*

By repeated application of Theorem 2.1, we see that any Gallai  $k$ -colouring of  $K_n$  with colour distribution sequence  $(e_1, \dots, e_k)$  can be described or analysed in a stepwise process as follows. At the beginning of each step, there are some complete graphs  $K_{n_1}, \dots, K_{n_m}$  that remain to be coloured, and a colour sequence  $(e'_1, \dots, e'_k)$ , which means that we still need to colour  $e'_i$  edges with colour  $i$ . Therefore, we must have

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \binom{n_i}{2} = \sum_{i=1}^k e'_i.$$

By Theorem 2.1, there exists at most two base colours, each is used to colour at least  $n_1 - 1$  edges, and a decomposition of  $K_{n_1}$  into smaller complete graphs  $K_{x_1}, \dots, K_{x_r}$ , such that for any two of these smaller complete graphs, edges between them are all coloured with one of the base colours. Thus, at the end of this step, the complete graphs that remain to be coloured are  $K_{x_1}, \dots, K_{x_r}, K_{n_2}, \dots, K_{n_m}$ , and we have an updated colour sequence  $(e''_1, \dots, e''_k)$ . This process continues until all complete graphs remaining have size 1, at which point we have finished describing or analysing this Gallai  $k$ -colouring.

### 2.2 Lower bound sketch

The main idea for the lower bound proof comes from the following observation about the process described above. Suppose we have a Gallai  $k$ -colouring of  $K_n$  with colour distribution sequence  $(e_1, \dots, e_k)$ , where  $e_1 \geq \dots \geq e_\ell \geq b + 1 > e_{\ell+1} \geq \dots \geq e_k$ . Then colours  $\ell + 1, \dots, k$  will not be picked as base colours until we are decomposing a complete graph of size at most  $b + 1$ . Hence, there exists a sequence of decomposition steps that decompose  $K_n$  down to the

stage where each remaining complete graph has size at most  $b + 1$  using only colours  $1, \dots, \ell$  as base colours. We will prove that for certain sequences this is impossible by giving a lower bound on the number of edges that needed to be coloured with base colours in order to decompose down to this stage, and showing that the total number of edges that can be coloured with the first  $\ell$  colours is not large enough. This is essentially the same as the lower bound proof in [2], except with a better choice of colour sequence.

### 2.3 Upper bound sketch

To prove an upper bound on  $g(k)$ , we need to describe a valid Gallai  $k$ -colouring using the stepwise colouring process mentioned above for every possible colour distribution sequence. It turns out that in each step of the colouring process, it is enough to just decompose one of the remaining complete graph  $K_x$  into two complete graphs  $K_{x-t}$  and  $K_t$ , with  $t \ll k$ , and colour all  $t(x-t)$  edges between with a single base colour. For brevity, we describe this operation as using a colour to remove a  $K_t$  (or  $t$  vertices) from  $K_x$ . The following simple lemma says that we can always colour a complete graph stepwise down to size  $2k$  by removing one vertex each time.

**Lemma 2.2.** *Suppose at some stage of the colouring process, one of the complete graph that needs to be coloured has size at least  $x \geq 2k$ , then it is always possible to decompose it into  $K_{x-1}$  and  $K_1$ , and colour all  $x-1$  edges between with the same colour.*

*Proof.* Suppose the complete graphs remaining at this stage have sizes  $x = x_1, \dots, x_m$ , and  $e'_i$  remaining edges need to be coloured with colour  $i$ . From the discussion above, we have

$$\sum_{i \in [k]} e'_i = \sum_{i \in [m]} \binom{x_i}{2} \geq \binom{x}{2}.$$

So there exists  $i \in [k]$  such that  $e'_i \geq \frac{1}{k} \binom{x}{2} \geq x-1$ . Hence, we can use colour  $i$  as the base colour, decompose  $K_x$  into  $K_{x-1}$  and  $K_1$ , and colour the  $x-1$  edges between with colour  $i$ .  $\square$

When the size of the complete graph goes below  $2k$ , the above argument breaks down. However, the following lemma shows that we can still find a Gallai  $k$ -colouring of  $K_{2k}$  provided that we have some cushion to work with. A weaker version of this lemma is proved by Feffer, Fu and Yan in [2] using more sophisticated methods, but we present a much simpler proof here.

**Lemma 2.3.** *If  $e_1, \dots, e_k$  are non-negative integers such that  $\sum_{i=1}^k e_i \geq \binom{2k}{2} + \frac{1}{2}k^2$ , then there is a Gallai  $k$ -colouring of  $K_{2k}$  with at most  $e_i$  edges of colour  $i$  for all  $i \in [k]$ .*

*Proof.* For each  $2 \leq t \leq 2k$ , we show that it is always possible to decompose  $K_t$  into  $K_{t-1}$  and  $K_1$ , and colour all  $t-1$  edges between them with one of the colours. This would provide a Gallai  $k$ -colouring of  $K_{2k}$  as required. Indeed, suppose we have successfully performed decomposition steps by removing one vertex at a time, until the largest complete graph remaining have size  $K_t$  for some  $2 \leq t \leq 2k$ . Suppose we can still colour  $e'_i$  edges with colour  $i$ . Since we have coloured  $\sum_{j=t}^{2k-1} j = \frac{1}{2}(2k+t-1)(2k-t)$  edges in this process, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^k e'_i &= \sum_{i=1}^k e_i - \frac{1}{2}(2k+t-1)(2k-t) \\ &\geq \binom{2k}{2} + \frac{1}{2}k^2 - \frac{1}{2}(2k+t-1)(2k-t) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}k^2 + \frac{1}{2}(t^2 - t). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, there exists a colour  $i$  with  $e'_i \geq \frac{1}{2}k + \frac{1}{2k}(t^2 - t) \geq t-1$ . So we can decompose  $K_t$  into  $K_{t-1}$  and  $K_1$  and colour all  $t-1$  edges between with colour  $i$ .  $\square$

The cushion we need to apply Lemma 2.3 will come from the other yet to be coloured small complete graphs. Suppose the other uncoloured complete graphs have sizes  $c_1, \dots, c_m$  when the size of the largest complete graph is decreased to  $2k$ . Suppose also that at this point we need to colour  $e'_i$  edges with colour  $i$ . Then we must have

$$\sum_{i=1}^k e'_i = \binom{2k}{2} + \sum_{i=1}^m \binom{c_i}{2}.$$

Hence, the cushion we have available is  $\sum_{i=1}^m \binom{c_i}{2}$ . Therefore, it is not enough to just use Lemma 2.2 to remove a single vertex each time, as  $K_1$  does not provide any cushion. Instead, we will need to remove some collection  $\mathcal{C} = \{K_{c_1}, \dots, K_{c_m}\}$  of small complete graphs of size larger than 1, with  $\sum_{i=1}^m \binom{c_i}{2} \geq \frac{1}{2}k^2$ , so that they provide enough cushions for us to colour  $K_{2k}$  using Lemma 2.3.

However, we also need to make sure that after colouring  $K_{2k}$ , we can find Gallai colourings for the small complete graphs in  $\mathcal{C}$  as well. We solve this by using an absorption-type argument. At the beginning we remove another set  $\mathcal{R}$  of small complete graphs, which we call reservoirs.  $\mathcal{R}$  has the property that after using the cushions provided by  $\mathcal{C}$  to colour  $K_{2k}$ , the edges within  $\mathcal{R}$  provide enough cushions for us to colour first the complete graphs in  $\mathcal{C}$ , then those in  $\mathcal{R}$  itself as well. This idea is already present implicitly in the upper bound proof in [2] but with  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{R}$  being the same set, which turns out to be less than optimal.

We conclude this section by proving the following lemma, which allow us to repeatedly remove complete graphs of a certain size. This is what we will use to create the cushion set  $\mathcal{C}$  and build the reservoir set  $\mathcal{R}$ .

**Lemma 2.4.** *Let  $n, m, t, k \geq 1$  and  $e_1, \dots, e_k \geq 0$  be integers satisfying  $n > tm$  and  $\sum_{i=1}^k e_i > tn(m+k)$ . Suppose we may colour  $e_i$  edge with colour  $i$ , then we can perform  $m$  consecutive decomposition steps on  $K_n$ , where in each step we remove a  $K_t$  using one of the  $k$  colours.*

*Proof.* For each  $j \in [m]$ , in step  $j$ , we need to remove a  $K_t$  from  $K_{n-(j-1)t}$ , and colour the  $t(n-jt)$  edges between them using one of the  $k$  colours. Since  $t(n-jt) \leq tn$ , colour  $i$  can be used to remove a  $K_t$  at least  $\lfloor \frac{e_i}{tn} \rfloor$  times for each  $i \in [k]$ . Since

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \left\lfloor \frac{e_i}{tn} \right\rfloor \geq \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{e_i}{tn} - k > m + k - k = m,$$

it is possible to perform  $m$  such steps. □

### 3 Lower Bound Proof

*Proof of Theorem 1.4.* The proof consists of 3 steps.

#### Step 1: Construct the sequence

Consider the colour distribution sequence  $(e_1, \dots, e_k)$  on  $n$  vertices given by  $e_1 = \dots = e_c = a + 1$ ,  $e_{c+1} = \dots = e_{\lceil \frac{k}{2} \rceil} = a$  and  $e_{\lceil \frac{k}{2} \rceil + 1} = \dots = e_k = b$ , where

$$\alpha = \frac{1}{10}, \quad n = \left\lfloor \frac{\alpha k^{1.5}}{(\log k)^{0.5}} \right\rfloor, \quad b = \left\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \right\rfloor, \quad a = \left\lfloor \frac{\binom{n}{2} - b \lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor}{\lceil \frac{k}{2} \rceil} \right\rfloor, \quad c = \binom{n}{2} - b \left\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \right\rfloor - a \left\lceil \frac{k}{2} \right\rceil.$$

It is easy to verify that  $\sum_{i=1}^k e_i = \binom{n}{2}$ . We will show that for sufficiently large  $k$  this colour distribution sequence cannot be realised as a Gallai  $k$ -colouring of  $K_n$ .

Suppose for a contradiction that it can, then by repeated applications of Theorem 2.1 we can decompose  $K_n$  down to the stage where all components have size at most  $b + 1$  using only the first  $\lceil \frac{k}{2} \rceil$  colours as base colours. Suppose part of the decomposition proceeds as  $K_{x_0} \rightarrow K_{x_1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow K_{x_\ell}$ , where  $n = x_0 > x_1 > \dots > x_{\ell-1} \geq b + 2 > x_\ell$ , and  $K_{x_i}$  is the largest

complete graph in the decomposition of  $K_{x_{i-1}}$  for all  $i \in [\ell]$ .

**Step 2: Lower bound on the number of edges coloured with base colours**

Let  $t_i = x_{i-1} - x_i$  for all  $i \in [\ell]$ . We claim that  $t_i \leq \frac{4(a+1)}{x_{i-1}}$  for all  $i \in [\ell]$ . Indeed, suppose  $K_{x_{i-1}}$  is decomposed into complete graphs of sizes  $x_i$  and  $y_1, \dots, y_m$ , with  $\sum_{j=1}^m y_j = t_i$ . There are

$$\sum_{j=1}^m y_j x_i + \sum_{1 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq m} y_{j_1} y_{j_2} \geq t_i x_i = t_i (x_{i-1} - t_i)$$

edges between the complete graphs  $K_{x_i}, K_{y_1}, \dots, K_{y_m}$ , all of which need to be coloured with a base colour. However, the at most 2 base colours together can be used to colour at most  $2(a+1)$  available edges. Hence, we have  $t_i^2 - x_{i-1} t_i + 2(a+1) \geq 0$ , which implies

$$t_i \leq \frac{1}{2} \left( x_{i-1} - \sqrt{x_{i-1}^2 - 8(a+1)} \right) = \frac{4(a+1)}{x_{i-1} + \sqrt{x_{i-1}^2 - 8(a+1)}} \leq \frac{4(a+1)}{x_{i-1}}.$$

We can now give a lower bound on the number of edges coloured with base colours in this sequence of decomposition steps  $K_{x_0} \rightarrow K_{x_1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow K_{x_\ell}$ . This number is

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} t_i (x_{i-1} - t_i) &= \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \int_{x=x_i}^{x_{i-1}} (x_{i-1} - t_i) dx \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \int_{x=x_i}^{x_{i-1}} \left( x_{i-1} - \frac{4(a+1)}{x_{i-1}} \right) dx \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \int_{x=x_i}^{x_{i-1}} \left( x - \frac{4(a+1)}{x} \right) dx \\ &= \int_{x=x_\ell}^{x_0} \left( x - \frac{4(a+1)}{x} \right) dx \\ &\geq \int_{x=b+1}^n \left( x - \frac{4(a+1)}{x} \right) dx \\ &= \frac{n^2 - (b+1)^2}{2} - 4(a+1) \log \frac{n}{b+1} \\ &\geq \frac{n^2}{2} - \frac{2b^2}{3} - 4(a+1) \log \frac{n}{b}. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that only the first  $\lceil \frac{k}{2} \rceil$  colours can be used as base colours in the decomposition steps  $K_{x_0} \rightarrow K_{x_1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow K_{x_\ell}$ .

**Step 3: Not enough edges can be coloured with the first  $\lceil \frac{k}{2} \rceil$  colours**

The total number of edges that can be coloured with the first  $\lceil \frac{k}{2} \rceil$  colors is

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\lceil \frac{k}{2} \rceil} e_i = \binom{n}{2} - b \left\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \right\rfloor \leq \frac{n^2}{2} - b^2.$$

So we will have a contradiction if

$$\frac{n^2}{2} - \frac{2b^2}{3} - 4(a+1) \log \frac{n}{b} > \frac{n^2}{2} - b^2,$$

because there are too many edges in the decomposition steps  $K_{x_0} \rightarrow K_{x_1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow K_{x_\ell}$  that need to be coloured with the first  $\lceil \frac{k}{2} \rceil$  colours.

Note that for sufficiently large  $k$  we have

$$b^2 = \left\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \right\rfloor^2 \geq \left( \frac{k-1}{2} \right)^2 \geq \frac{k^2}{5},$$

$$4(a+1) \leq 5a \leq 5 \frac{\binom{n}{2}}{\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor} \leq \frac{5n^2}{k} \leq \frac{5\alpha^2 k^2}{\log k},$$

$$\log \frac{n}{b} \leq \log \left( \frac{\alpha k^{1.5}}{(\log k)^{0.5}} \frac{3}{k} \right) = \log \left( \frac{3\alpha k^{0.5}}{(\log k)^{0.5}} \right) = \frac{1}{2}(\log k - \log \log k) + \log(3\alpha) \leq \log k.$$

Putting these together and use  $\alpha = \frac{1}{10}$ , we get

$$\left( \frac{n^2}{2} - \frac{2b^2}{3} - 4(a+1) \log \frac{n}{b} \right) - \left( \frac{n^2}{2} - b^2 \right) = \frac{b^2}{3} - 4(a+1) \log \frac{n}{b} \geq \frac{k^2}{15} - \frac{k^2}{20} > 0,$$

as required. This proves that if  $k$  is sufficiently large, then  $(e_1, \dots, e_k)$  cannot be realised as a Gallai colouring, and hence  $g(k) \geq \frac{\alpha k^{1.5}}{(\log k)^{0.5}}$ .  $\square$

## 4 Upper Bound Proof

Recall that by saying using colour  $i$  to remove a  $K_t$  from  $K_n$ , we mean decomposing  $K_n$  into  $K_t$  and  $K_{n-t}$ , and colouring all  $t(n-t)$  edges between them with colour  $i$ .

*Proof of Theorem 1.5.* The proof again consists of 3 steps. Assume  $k$  is sufficiently large and set

$$\beta = 5000000, \quad n = \left\lfloor \frac{\beta k^{1.5}}{(\log k)^{0.5}} \right\rfloor.$$

Let  $(e_1, \dots, e_k)$  be any colour distribution sequence with  $e = \sum_{i=1}^k e_i = \binom{n}{2}$ .

### Step 1: Build the reservoir

Set  $r = \left\lfloor \frac{\beta k^{0.5}}{30(\log k)^{0.5}} \right\rfloor$ . Since

$$\sum_{i \in [k]} e_i = e = \binom{n}{2} > \frac{\beta^2 k^3}{3 \log k} \geq 10krn > rn(k+k),$$

we may remove, one by one,  $k$  complete graphs of size  $r$  from  $K_n$  using Lemma 2.4. Let  $\mathcal{R}$  be this collection of  $k$  complete graphs of size  $r$ . Note that we have coloured at most  $krn \leq \frac{\beta^2 k^3}{30 \log k} < 0.1e$  edges in this process. For each  $i \in [k]$ , let  $\bar{e}_i$  be the number of remaining edges that need to have colour  $i$  after this process. Then we have  $\sum_{i \in [k]} \bar{e}_i \geq 0.9e$ .

### Step 2: Create cushions

Let  $I_1 = \left\{ i \in [k] \mid \bar{e}_i \geq \frac{\beta^2 k^{2.25}}{(\log k)^{1.25}} \right\}$ . Since  $|I_1| \frac{\beta^2 k^{2.25}}{(\log k)^{1.25}} \leq \sum_{i \in I_1} \bar{e}_i \leq e$ , it follows that  $|I_1| \leq \frac{1}{2} k^{0.75} (\log k)^{0.25}$ . We split into two cases.

**Case 1.**  $\sum_{i \in I_1} \bar{e}_i \geq 0.1e$ .

Set  $c = \left\lfloor \frac{k^{0.75}}{(\log k)^{0.75}} \right\rfloor$ . Since

$$\sum_{i \in I_1} \bar{e}_i \geq 0.1e \geq \frac{\beta^2 k^3}{30 \log k} \geq cn \cdot \frac{\beta k^{0.75} (\log k)^{0.25}}{30} > cn(\lceil k^{0.75} (\log k)^{0.25} \rceil + |I_1|),$$

we can use Lemma 2.4 to remove, one by one,  $\lceil k^{0.75}(\log k)^{0.25} \rceil$  complete graphs of size  $c$  using only the colours in  $I_1$ . Note that at most  $0.1e$  edges are coloured in this process. Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be this collection of  $\lceil k^{0.75}(\log k)^{0.25} \rceil$  complete graphs of size  $c$ . Observe that  $\mathcal{C}$  creates a cushion of

$$k^{0.75}(\log k)^{0.25} \binom{c}{2} \geq \frac{k^{2.25}}{3(\log k)^{1.25}} \gg k^2,$$

which is enough for us to apply Lemma 2.3 later on.

**Case 2.**  $\sum_{i \in I_1} \bar{e}_i < 0.1e$ .

Let  $I_2 = \left\{ i \in [k] \mid \bar{e}_i \leq \frac{\beta^2 k^2}{30 \log k} \right\}$ , then  $\sum_{i \in I_2} \bar{e}_i < \frac{\beta^2 k^3}{30 \log k} \leq 0.1e$ . Let  $I_3 = [k] \setminus (I_1 \cup I_2)$ . Without loss of generality, assume  $I_3 = [\ell]$ . Then  $\frac{\beta^2 k^2}{30 \log k} < \bar{e}_i < \frac{\beta^2 k^{2.25}}{(\log k)^{1.25}}$  for all  $i \in I_3 = [\ell]$  and  $\sum_{i \in [\ell]} \bar{e}_i = \sum_{i \in [k]} \bar{e}_i - \sum_{i \in I_1} \bar{e}_i - \sum_{i \in I_2} \bar{e}_i \geq 0.9e - 0.1e - 0.1e = 0.7e$ .

For each  $i \in I_1 \cup I_2$ , use colour  $i$  to remove one vertex at a time from the largest remaining complete graph until it is no longer possible. Then when we stop, for each  $i \in I_1 \cup I_2$ , the number  $e'_i$  of edges we still need to colour with colour  $i$  is at most  $n$ , because otherwise we could remove another vertex using this colour. Let  $x_0$  be the size of the largest remaining complete graph. At this point, we have a  $K_{x_0}$ ,  $k$  complete graphs of size  $r$  which are the reservoirs, and many  $K_1$ . Therefore, we have

$$\binom{x_0}{2} + k \binom{r}{2} = \sum_{i \in I_1 \cup I_2} e'_i + \sum_{i \in [\ell]} \bar{e}_i \geq \sum_{i \in [\ell]} \bar{e}_i \geq 0.7e.$$

Since  $k \binom{r}{2} \ll e$ , it follows that  $0.5x_0^2 \geq \binom{x_0}{2} \geq 0.66e \geq 0.32 \frac{\beta^2 k^3}{\log k}$ , and thus  $x_0 \geq \frac{4\beta k^{1.5}}{5(\log k)^{0.5}}$ .

Now consider the following process. Sequentially for  $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ , suppose the size of the largest remaining complete graph is  $x_{i-1}$ . As long as  $x_{i-1} \geq \frac{2\sqrt{\beta} k^{1.25}}{(\log k)^{0.25}}$ , remove a maximum number  $t_i < \frac{1}{2}x_{i-1}$  of vertices using colour  $i$ . Let  $x_i = x_{i-1} - t_i$  be the number of vertices remaining and let  $e'_i = \bar{e}_i - t_i x_i$  be the number of edges we still need to colour with colour  $i$ . Since  $\bar{e}_i \leq \frac{\beta^2 k^{2.25}}{(\log k)^{1.25}} \ll \frac{1}{4}x_{i-1}^2$ , we must have  $t_i \ll \frac{1}{2}x_{i-1}$ . Then the maximality of  $t_i$  implies that  $t_i x_i \leq \bar{e}_i$  and  $(t_i + 1)(x_i - 1) > \bar{e}_i$ . It follows that

$$\frac{\bar{e}_i}{2x_i} \leq \frac{\bar{e}_i}{x_i - 1} - 1 \leq t_i \leq \frac{\bar{e}_i}{x_i},$$

and

$$e'_i = \bar{e}_i - t_i x_i < x_i - t_i - 1 < x_i \leq n.$$

If  $x_{i-1} < \frac{2\sqrt{\beta} k^{1.25}}{(\log k)^{0.25}}$ , then we stop. We claim that at the end of this process, the size of the largest remaining complete graph is less than  $\frac{2\sqrt{\beta} k^{1.25}}{(\log k)^{0.25}}$ .

Indeed, this follows trivially if the process stops because  $x_{i-1} < \frac{2\sqrt{\beta} k^{1.25}}{(\log k)^{0.25}}$  for some  $i \in [\ell]$ . If instead we performed the operation above for all  $i \in [\ell]$ , then the total number of edges that remain to be coloured is  $\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} e'_i \leq kn$ . This implies that the largest complete graph left to be coloured has size  $x_\ell < \frac{2\sqrt{\beta} k^{1.25}}{(\log k)^{0.25}}$ , as required, because otherwise  $\binom{x_\ell}{2} > kn \geq \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} e'_i$ . Hence if we let  $\ell' \leq \ell$  be the last index on which the operation is performed, then

$$2k \ll \frac{\sqrt{\beta} k^{1.25}}{(\log k)^{0.25}} \leq \frac{1}{2} x_{\ell'-1} \leq x_{\ell'} < \frac{2\sqrt{\beta} k^{1.25}}{(\log k)^{0.25}}.$$

It follows that for  $i \in [\ell']$ , we have

$$t_i \leq \frac{\bar{e}_i}{x_i} \leq \frac{\beta^2 k^{2.25}}{(\log k)^{1.25}} \frac{(\log k)^{0.25}}{\sqrt{\beta} k^{1.25}} \leq \frac{\beta^{1.5} k}{\log k} \ll k.$$

Moreover, if we let  $\mathcal{C}$  be this collection  $K_{t_1}, \dots, K_{t_{\ell'}}$  of small complete graphs we removed in this process, then the amount of cushions we gained with  $\mathcal{C}$  is at least

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^{\ell'} \binom{t_i}{2} &\geq \frac{1}{3} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell'} t_i^2 \geq \frac{1}{3} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell'} t_i \frac{e_i}{2x_i} \\
&\geq \frac{\beta^2 k^2}{180 \log k} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell'} \frac{t_i}{x_i} \\
&= \frac{\beta^2 k^2}{180 \log k} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell'} \int_{x=x_i}^{x_i-1} \frac{1}{x_i} dx \\
&\geq \frac{\beta^2 k^2}{180 \log k} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell'} \int_{x=x_i}^{x_i-1} \frac{1}{x} dx \\
&= \frac{\beta^2 k^2}{180 \log k} \int_{x=x_{\ell'}}^{x_0} \frac{1}{x} dx \\
&= \frac{\beta^2 k^2}{180 \log k} \log \frac{x_0}{x_{\ell'}} \\
&\geq \frac{\beta^2 k^2}{180 \log k} \log \left( \frac{4\beta k^{1.5}}{5(\log k)^{0.5}} \frac{(\log k)^{0.25}}{2\sqrt{\beta} k^{1.25}} \right) \\
&\geq \frac{\beta^2 k^2}{180 \log k} \log \frac{2\sqrt{\beta} k^{0.25}}{5(\log k)^{0.25}} \\
&\geq \frac{\beta^2 k^2}{720 \log k} (\log k - \log \log k) \gg k^2,
\end{aligned}$$

which is enough for us to apply Lemma 2.3.

### Step 3: Colour the complete graphs

In both cases, the complete graphs left to be coloured at this point are a single large complete graph and those complete graphs in  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{R}$ . By Lemma 2.2, we can always decompose the remaining large complete graph down to size  $2k$  by removing one vertex at a time. Also, we showed above that in both cases the edges inside the complete graphs in  $\mathcal{C}$  create a cushion of at least  $\frac{1}{2}k^2$ , so we can find a Gallai colouring of the  $K_{2k}$  by Lemma 2.3.

It remains to colour the complete graphs in  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{R}$ . First we deal with those in  $\mathcal{C}$ . We colour them by removing one vertex at a time. In Case 1, each complete graph in  $\mathcal{C}$  has size  $c = \lfloor \frac{k^{0.75}}{(\log k)^{0.75}} \rfloor$ . In Case 2, the complete graphs in  $\mathcal{C}$  have sizes  $t_1, \dots, t_{\ell'}$ . Recall that  $t_i \leq \frac{\beta^{1.5} k}{\log k}$  for each  $i \in [\ell']$ . In both cases, at each step, since the  $k$  complete graphs of size  $r$  in  $\mathcal{R}$  have not been coloured, the number of edges yet to be coloured is at least  $k \binom{r}{2} \geq \frac{\beta^2 k^2}{2000 \log k}$ . Hence, there is always a colour that we can use to colour at least  $\lfloor \frac{\beta^2 k}{2000 \log k} \rfloor$  edges. Since  $\lfloor \frac{\beta^2 k}{2000 \log k} \rfloor$  is larger than both  $c$  and every  $t_i$ , we can use this colour to remove a single vertex from one of the complete graphs in  $\mathcal{C}$ . Because this is true at every step, we can repeat and colour all complete graphs in  $\mathcal{C}$ .

Finally, we colour the  $k$  complete graphs of size  $r$  in  $\mathcal{R}$  by removing a vertex from the largest remaining complete graph in each step. It follows that if the size of the largest remaining complete graph is  $2 \leq t \leq r$ , then the other  $k-1$  complete graphs all have size at least  $t-1$ . Hence the total number of uncoloured edges is at least  $(k-1) \binom{t-1}{2} + \binom{t}{2} \geq (k-1)(t-2) + (t-1) = k(t-2) + 1$ . So there is always one colour that we can use to colour at least  $t-1$  edges, which allows us to use it to remove a vertex from the complete graph of size  $t$ . Since this is true at every step, we can repeat and colour all complete graphs in  $\mathcal{R}$  as well. This completes a Gallai  $k$ -colouring of  $K_n$  with colour distribution sequence  $(e_1, \dots, e_k)$  and finishes the proof.  $\square$



## References

- [1] J. Balogh and L. Li. The typical structure of Gallai colorings and their extremal graphs, *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 33.4 (2019), 2416-2443.
- [2] J. Feffer, Y. Fu and J. Yan. Remarks on the distribution of colors in Gallai colorings, *Discrete Mathematics*, 343.10 (2020), 111996.
- [3] T. Gallai. Transitiv orientierbare Graphen, *Acta Mathematica Hungarica*, 18 (1967), 25-66.
- [4] A. Gyárfás, D. Pálvölgyi, B. Patkós and M. Wales. Distribution of colors in Gallai colorings, *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 86 (2020), 103087.
- [5] A. Gyárfás, G. N. Sárközy, A. Sebő and S. Selkow. Ramsey-type results for Gallai colorings, *Journal of Graph Theory*, 64.3 (2010), 233-243.
- [6] A. Gyárfás and G. Simonyi. Edge colorings of complete graphs without tricolored triangles, *Journal of Graph Theory*, 46.3 (2004), 211-216.
- [7] C. Magnant and I. Schiermeyer. Gallai-Ramsey number for  $K_5$ , *Journal of Graph Theory*, 101.3 (2022), 455-492.