Pacific Journal of Mathematics

RAMSEY THEORY AND CHROMATIC NUMBERS

Gary Theodore Chartrand and Albert David Polimeni

Vol. 55, No. 1 September 1974

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS
Vol. 55, No. 1, 1974

RAMSEY THEORY AND CHROMATIC NUMBERS

GARY CHARTRAND AND ALBERT D. POLIMENI

Let $\chi(G)$ denote the chromatic number of a graph G. For positive integers $n_1, n_2, \cdots, n_k$ $(k \geqq 1)$ the chromatic Ramsey number $\chi(n_1, n_2, \cdots, n_k)$ is defined as the least positive integer p such that for any factorization $K_p = \bigcup_{i=1}^{k} G_i$, $\chi(G_i) \geqq n_i$ for at least one $i, 1 \leqq i \leqq k$. It is shown that $\chi(n_1, n_2, \cdots, n_k) = 1 + \prod_{i=1}^{k} (n_i - 1)$. The vertex-arboricity $a(G)$ of a graph G is the fewest number of subsets into which the vertex set of G can be partitioned so that each subset induces an acyclic graph. For positive integers $n_1, n_2, \cdots, n_k$ $(k \geqq 1)$ the vertex-arboricity Ramsey number $a(n_1, n_2, \cdots, n_k)$ is defined as the least positive integer p such that for any factorization $K_p = \bigcup_{i=1}^{k} G_i$, $a(G_i) \geqq n_i$ for at least one $i, 1 \leqq i \leqq k$. It is shown that $a(n_1, n_2, \cdots, n_k) = 1 + 2k \prod_{i=1}^{k} (n_i - 1)$.

Introduction. The classical *Ramsey number* $r(m, n)$, for positive integers m and n, is the least positive integer p such that for any graph G of order p, either G contains the complete graph K_m of order m as a subgraph or the complement $\bar{G}$ of G contains K_n as a subgraph. More generally, for $k(\geqq 1)$ positive integers $n_1, n_2, \cdots, n_k$, the *Ramsey number* $r(n_1, n_2, \cdots, n_k)$ is defined as the least positive integer p such that for any *factorization* $K_p = G_1 \cup G_2 \cup \cdots \cup G_k$ (i.e., the G_i are spanning, pairwise edge-disjoint, possibly empty subgraphs of K_p such that the union of the edge sets of the G_i equals the edge set of K_p), G_i contains K_{n_i} as a subgraph for at least one $i, 1 \leqq i \leqq k$. It is known (see [5]) that all such Ramsey numbers exist; however, the actual values of $r(n_1, n_2, \cdots, n_k)$, $k \geqq 1$, are known in only seven cases (see [2, 3]) for which $\min \{n_1, n_2, \cdots, n_k\} \geqq 3$.

A *clique* in a graph G is a maximal complete subgraph of G. The *clique number* $\omega(G)$ is the maximum order among the cliques of G. The Ramsey number $r(n_1, n_2, \cdots, n_k)$ may be alternatively defined as the least positive integer p such that for any factorization $K_p = G_1 \cup G_2 \cup \cdots \cup G_k$, $\omega(G_i) \geqq n_i$ for at least one $i, 1 \leqq i \leqq k$.

The foregoing observation suggests the following definition. Let f be a graphical parameter, and let $n_1, n_2, \cdots, n_k$, $k \geqq 1$ be positive integers. The *f-Ramsey number* $f(n_1, n_2, \cdots, n_k)$ is the least positive integer p such that for any factorization $K_p = G_1 \cup G_2 \cup \cdots \cup G_k$, $f(G_i) \geqq n_i$ for at least one $i, 1 \leqq i \leqq k$. Hence, $\omega(n_1, n_2, \cdots, n_k) = r(n_1, n_2, \cdots, n_k)$, i.e., the ω-Ramsey number is the Ramsey number.

The object of this paper is to investigate f-Ramsey numbers for two graphical parameters f, namely chromatic number and vertex-arboricity.

Chromatic Ramsey numbers. The *chromatic number* $\chi(G)$ of a graph G is the fewest number of colors which may be assigned to the vertices of G so that adjacent vertices are assigned different colors. For positive integers $n_1, n_2, \cdots, n_k$, the *chromatic Ramsey number* $\chi(n_1, n_2, \cdots, n_k)$ is the least positive integer p such that for any factorization $K_p = G_1 \cup G_2 \cup \cdots G_k$, $\chi(G_i) \geqq n_i$ for some i, $1 \leqq i \leqq k$. The existence of the numbers $\chi(n_1, n_2, \cdots, n_k)$ is guaranteed by the fact that $\chi(n_1, n_2, \cdots, n_k) \leqq r(n_1, n_2, \cdots, n_k)$. We are now prepared to present a formula for $\chi(n_1, n_2, \cdots, n_k)$. We begin with a lemma.

LEMMA. *If* $G = G_1 \cup G_2 \cup \cdots \cup G_k$, *then*

$$\chi(G) \leqq \sum_{i=1}^{k} \chi(G_i) .$$

Proof. For $i = 1, 2, \cdots, k$, let a $\chi(G_i)$-coloring be given for G_i. We assign to a vertex v of G the color $(c_1, c_2, \cdots, c_k)$, where c_i is the color assigned to v in G_i. This produces a coloring of G using at most $\prod_{i=1}^{k} \chi(G_i)$ colors; hence, $\chi(G) \leqq \prod_{i=1}^{k} \chi(G_i)$.

THEOREM 1. *For positive integers* $n_1, n_2, \cdots, n_k$,

$$\chi(n_1, n_2, \cdots, n_k) = 1 + \prod_{i=1}^{k} (n_i - 1) .$$

Proof. The result is immediate if $n_i = 1$ for some i; hence, we assume that $n_i \geqq 2$ for all i, $1 \leqq i \leqq k$. First, we verify that

$$\chi(n_1, n_2, \cdots, n_k) \leqq 1 + \prod_{i=1}^{k} (n_i - 1) .$$

Let $p = 1 + \prod_{i=1}^{k} (n_i - 1)$, and assume there exists a factorization $K_p = G_1 \cup G_2 \cup \cdots \cup G_k$ such that $\chi(G_i) \leqq n_i - 1$ for each $i = 1, 2, \cdots, k$. Then by the Lemma, it follows that

$$1 + \prod_{i=1}^{k} (n_i - 1) = \chi(K_p) \leqq \prod_{i=1}^{k} \chi(G_i) \leqq \prod_{i=1}^{k} (n_i - 1) ,$$

which produces a contradiction. Thus, in any factorization $K_p = G_1 \cup G_2 \cup \cdots \cup G_k$ for $p = 1 + \prod_{i=1}^{k} (n_i - 1)$, we have $\chi(G_i) \geqq n_i$ for at least one i, $1 \leqq i \leqq k$.

In order to show that

$$\chi(n_1, n_2, \cdots, n_k) \geqq 1 + \prod_{i=1}^{k} (n_i - 1) ,$$

we exhibit a factorization $K_{N_k} = G_1 \cup G_2 \cup \cdots \cup G_k$, where $N_k =$

$\prod_{i=1}^{k}(n_i - 1)$ and $\chi(G_i) \leqq n_i - 1$ for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, k$. The factorization is accomplished by employing induction on k. For $k = 1$, we simply observe that $\chi(K_{N_1}) = \chi(K_{n_1-1}) = n_1 - 1$. Assume there exists a factorization $K_{N_{k-1}} = H_1 \cup H_2 \cup \cdots \cup H_{k-1}$ such that $\chi(H_i) \leqq n_i - 1$ for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, k - 1$. Let F denote $n_k - 1$ (pairwise disjoint) copies of $K_{N_{k-1}}$ and define G_k by $G_k = \bar{F}$. Thus, $\bar{G}_k$ contains $n_k - 1$ pairwise disjoint copies of H_i for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, k - 1$, which we denote by G_i. Hence, $K_{N_k} = G_1 \cup G_2 \cup \cdots \cup G_k$, where $\chi(G_i) \leqq n_i - 1$ for each i, $1 \leqq i \leqq k$, which produces the desired result.

Vertex-arboricity Ramsey numbers. The *vertex-arboricity* $a(G)$ of a graph G is the minimum number of subsets into which the vertex set of G may be partitioned so that each subset induces an acyclic subgraph. As with the chromatic number, the vertex-arboricity may be considered a coloring number since $a(G)$ is the least number of colors which may be assigned to the vertices of G so that no cycle of G has all of its vertices assigned the same color.

Our next result will establish a formula for the *vertex-arboricity Ramsey number* $a(n_1, n_2, \cdots, n_k)$, defined as the least positive integer p such that for every factorization $K_p = G_1 \cup G_2 \cup \cdots \cup G_k$, $a(G_i) \geqq n_i$ for some i, $1 \leqq i \leqq k$. Since $a(K_n) = \{n/2\}$, it follows that $a(n_1, n_2, \cdots, n_k) \leqq r(2n_1 - 1, 2n_2 - 1, \cdots, 2n_k - 1)$. In the proof of the following result, we shall make use of the *(edge) arboricity* $a_1(G)$ of a graph, which is the minimum number of subsets into which the edge set of G may be partitioned so that the subgraph induced by each subset is acyclic. It is known (see [1, 4]) that $a_1(K_n) = \{n/2\}$.

THEOREM 2. *For positive integers* $n_1, n_2, \cdots, n_k$,

$$a(n_1, n_2, \cdots, n_k) = 1 + 2k \prod_{i=1}^{k} (n_i - 1) .$$

Proof. In order to show that

$$a(n_1, n_2, \cdots, n_k) \leqq 1 + 2k \prod_{i=1}^{k} (n_i - 1) ,$$

we let $p = 1 + 2k \prod_{i=1}^{k}(n_i - 1)$ and assume there exists a factorization $K_p = G_1 \cup G_2 \cup \cdots \cup G_k$ such that $a(G_i) \leqq n_i - 1$ for each $i = 1, 2, \cdots, k$. For each $i = 1, 2, \cdots, k$, there is a partition $\{U_{i,1}, U_{i,2}, \cdots, U_{i,n_i-1}\}$ of the vertex set $V(G_i)$ of G_i such that the subgraph $\langle U_{i,j} \rangle$ of G_i induced by $U_{i,j}$ is acyclic, $j = 1, 2, \cdots, n_i - 1$. At least one of the sets $U_{1,1}, U_{1,2}, \cdots, U_{1,n_1-1}$, say U_{1,m_1}, contains at least $1 + 2k \prod_{i=2}^{k}(n_i - 1)$ vertices. Thus, at least one of the sets $U_{2,1}, U_{2,2}, \cdots,$

U_{2,n_2-1}, say U_{2,m_2}, contains at least $1 + 2k\prod_{i=3}^{k}(n_i - 1)$ vertices of U_{1,m_1}. Proceeding inductively, we arrive at subsets $U_{1,m_1}, U_{2,m_2}, \cdots, U_{k,m_k}$ such that $\bigcap_{i=1}^{t} U_{i,m_i}$ contains at least $1 + 2k\prod_{i=t+1}^{k}(n_i - 1)$ vertices, $1 \leqq t \leqq k-1$. In particular, $\bigcap_{i=1}^{k} U_{i,m_i}$, contains a set U having $1 + 2k$ vertices. For each $i = 1, 2, \cdots, k$, $\langle U \rangle$ is an acyclic subgraph of the graph $\langle U_{i,m_i} \rangle$. This implies that $a_1(K_{1+2k}) \leqq k$, which is contradictory. Therefore, $a(G_i) \geqq n_i$ for at least one i, $1 \leqq i \leqq k$.

The proof will be complete once we have verified that

$$a(n_1, n_2, \cdots, n_k) \geqq 1 + 2k\prod_{i=1}^{k}(n_i - 1) .$$

Let $r = \prod_{i=1}^{k}(n_i - 1)$. We shall exhibit a factorization $K_{2kr} = G_1 \cup G_2 \cup \cdots \cup G_k$ such that $a(G_i) \leqq n_i - 1$ for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, k$. We begin with r pairwise disjoint copies of K_{2k}, labeled $K_{2k}^1, K_{2k}^2, \cdots, K_{2k}^r$. Since $a_1(K_{2k}) = k$, it follows that $K_{2k} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{k} F_i$, where each F_i is an acyclic graph. We introduce the notation F_{il} to denote the F_i contained in K_{2k}^l, $l = 1, 2, \cdots, r$ and $i = 1, 2, \cdots, k$. With each of the r k-tuples $(c_1, c_2, \cdots, c_k)$, $c_j = 1, 2, \cdots, n_j - 1$ and $j = 1, 2, \cdots, k$, we identify a complete graph K_{2k}^l, $l = 1, 2, \cdots, r$, in such a way that the identification is one-to-one. Then, for each $i = 1, 2, \cdots, k$ and $l = 1, 2, \cdots, r$, we associate with F_{il} the k-tuple identified with K_{2k}^l. Define the graph G_i, $i = 1, 2, \cdots, k$, to consist of the graphs $F_{i1}, F_{i2}, \cdots, F_{ir}$; in addition, each vertex of F_{is} is adjacent to each vertex of F_{it}, $s, t = 1, 2, \cdots, r$, provided the ith coordinate is the first coordinate in which their associated k-tuples differ (otherwise, there are no edges between F_{is} and F_{it}). It is then seen that $K_{2kr} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{k} G_i$. For each $i = 1, 2, \cdots, k$, define $V_{i,j}$ to be the set of all vertices v such that v is a vertex of an F_{il} whose associated k-tuple $(c_1, c_2, \cdots, c_k)$ has $c_i = j$; $j = 1, 2, \cdots, n_i - 1$. Then $\{V_{i,1}, V_{i,2}, \cdots, V_{i,n_i-1}\}$ is a partition of $V(G_i)$ for which the subgraph $\langle V_{i,j} \rangle$ consists of $r/(n_i - 1)$ pairwise disjoint copies of F_i, $j = 1, 2, \cdots, n_i - 1$. Thus, $\langle V_{i,j} \rangle$ is an acyclic graph for each such j. Hence, $a(G_i) \leqq n_i - 1$, $i = 1, 2, \cdots, k$.

REFERENCES

1. L. W. Beineke, *Decompositions of complete graphs into forests*, Magyar Tud. Akad. Mat. Kutato Int. Kozl., **9** (1964), 589-594.

2. J. E. Graver and J. Yackel, *Some graph theoretic results associated with Ramsey's theorem*, J. Combinatorial Theory, **4** (1968), 125-175.

3. R. E. Greenwood and A. M. Gleason, *Combinatorial relations and chromatic graphs*, Canad. J. Math., **7** (1955), 1-7.

4. C. St. J. A. Nash-Williams, *Edge-disjoint spanning trees of finite graphs*, J. London Math. Soc., **36** (1961), 445-450.

5. F. P. Ramsey, *On a problem of formal logic*, Proc. London Math. Soc., **30** (1930), 264-286.

Received October 4, 1974. The second author's research was supported by the Research Foundation of the State of New York.

WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY
AND
SUNY, COLLEGE AT FREDONIA

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

Printed in Japan by Intarnational Academic Printing Co., Ltd., Tokyo, Japan

Pacific Journal of Mathematics

Vol. 55, No. 1 September, 1974