

Bounding the chromatic number of dense digraphs by arc neighborhoods

Felix Klingelhoef^{*}Alantha Newman^{*}

April 9, 2024

Abstract

The chromatic number of a directed graph is the minimum number of induced acyclic subdigraphs that cover its vertex set, and accordingly, the chromatic number of a tournament is the minimum number of transitive subtournaments that cover its vertex set. The neighborhood of an arc uv in a tournament T is the set of vertices that form a directed triangle with arc uv . We show that if the neighborhood of every arc in a tournament has bounded chromatic number, then the whole tournament has bounded chromatic number. This holds more generally for oriented graphs with bounded independence number, and we extend our proof from tournaments to this class of dense digraphs. As an application, we prove the equivalence of a conjecture of El-Zahar and Erdős and a recent conjecture of Nguyen, Scott and Seymour relating the structure of graphs and tournaments with high chromatic number.

1 Introduction

The chromatic number of a graph is the minimum integer k required to partition its vertex set into k independent sets. The chromatic number of a tournament (and more generally, a directed graph) is the minimum integer k required to partition its vertex set into k acyclic sets. Exploring the similarities and differences between the two notions is a well-studied area [EH89, APS01].

For example, if a graph has a large clique, it must have high chromatic number. However, the converse is far from true. In fact, a graph can be triangle-free, implying that the neighborhood of each vertex is an independent set, and yet still have high chromatic number [Des54]. In [BCC⁺13], it was conjectured that this phenomenon does not occur in tournaments. Specifically, [BCC⁺13] conjectured that in a tournament T , if each vertex $v \in V(T)$ has an out-neighborhood $N^+(v)$ that induces a subtournament $T[N^+(v)]$ with bounded chromatic number, then T itself should have bounded chromatic number. This was proved by [HLTW19] with the following theorem.

Theorem 1.1 ([HLTW19]). *There is a function f such that if for all $v \in V(T)$, $\vec{\chi}(T[N^+(v)]) \leq t$, then $\vec{\chi}(T) \leq f(t)$.*

^{*}Laboratoire G-SCOP (CNRS, Univ. Grenoble Alpes), Grenoble, France. Supported in part by ANR project DAGDigDec (ANR-21-CE48-0012). `firstname.lastname@grenoble-inp.fr`

We say a tournament T has vertex set $V(T)$ and arc set $A(T)$. For an arc $e = uv \in A(T)$, we define the *neighborhood of arc e* to contain all vertices w in $V(T)$ such that w forms a directed triangle with uv . Formally, we define $N(e) = N^+(v) \cap N^-(u)$. A stronger theorem, analogous to Theorem 1.1, but with vertex out-neighborhoods replaced by arc neighborhoods, is the following.

Theorem 1.2. *There is a function f such that for any tournament T , if for all $e \in A(T)$, $\bar{\chi}(T[N(e)]) \leq t$, then $\bar{\chi}(T) \leq f(t)$.*

This theorem is a special case of 13.3 in [NSS23]. We give a different proof, obtained independently, which we subsequently extend to prove our main theorem. Notice that the assumption that $\bar{\chi}(T[N^+(v)]) \leq t$ for every vertex $v \in V(T)$ is stronger than the assumption that $\bar{\chi}(T[N(e)]) \leq t$ for every arc $e \in A(T)$. However, our proof of Theorem 1.2 uses a theorem from [HLTW19], which they used to prove Theorem 1.1. Thus, we do not give a new proof of Theorem 1.1. We say a tournament T is *t -arc-bounded* if for every arc $e \in A(T)$, $\bar{\chi}(T[N(e)]) \leq t$. We can now restate Theorem 1.2 as follows.

Theorem 1.3. *There is a function f such that for every t -arc-bounded tournament T , we have $\bar{\chi}(T) \leq f(t)$.*

We prove Theorem 1.3 in Section 2, where in addition to the aforementioned theorem of [HLTW19], we use ideas from [KN23], originally developed to design efficient algorithms for coloring tournaments. In Section 3, we extend our proof of Theorem 1.3 to oriented graphs with bounded independence number and prove our main theorem. For the sake of simplicity, we often refer to oriented graphs as digraphs, but in this paper, a digraph never contains a directed 2-cycle or “digon”. Recall that the *independence number* of a digraph is the maximum size of a vertex set that contains no arcs. We say a digraph D has vertex set $V(D)$ and arc set $A(D)$. As we did for tournaments, for an arc $e = uv$, we define $N(e) = N^+(v) \cap N^-(u)$.

Theorem 1.4. *There is a function dense such that for any digraph D with independence number α , if $\bar{\chi}(D[N(e)]) \leq t$ for every arc $e \in A(D)$, then $\bar{\chi}(D) \leq \text{dense}(t, \alpha)$.*

As an application of Theorem 1.4, we prove the equivalence of two conjectures, one on graphs with high chromatic number and one on tournaments with high chromatic number. The first one, concerning graphs, was originally posed by [EE85] in the form of an open problem, which asks if the following conjecture is true.

Conjecture 1.5 ([EE85]). *For all integers $t, c \geq 1$, there exists $d \geq 1$, such that if a graph G satisfies $\chi(G) \geq d$, and has no clique with t vertices (i.e., $\omega(G) < t$), then there are subsets $A, B \subseteq V(G)$ with $\chi(G[A]), \chi(G[B]) \geq c$, such that there are no edges between A and B .*

The second conjecture, concerning tournaments, was recently stated by [NSS24].

Conjecture 1.6 ([NSS24]). *For all $c \geq 0$, there exists $d \geq 0$ such that if T is a tournament with $\bar{\chi}(T) \geq d$, there are two sets $A, B \subseteq V(T)$ such that $\bar{\chi}(T[A]), \bar{\chi}(T[B]) \geq c$ and all arcs between A and B go from vertices of A to vertices of B .*

[NSS23] show that Conjecture 1.6 implies Conjecture 1.5. They explore the possibility of the converse being true, but they do not prove it and write that Conjecture 1.6 seems to be strictly stronger than Conjecture 1.5. In Section 4, we prove that Conjecture 1.5 does in fact imply Conjecture 1.6, showing that the two conjectures are equivalent.

2 Arc local-to-global for tournaments

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.3. Since our goal is to color a tournament T , we can assume that T is strongly connected; otherwise T can be partitioned into strongly connected parts, and each one can be colored separately. A *dominating set* (respectively, *absorbing set*) in T is a set of vertices $S \subset V$ such that for every $v \in V \setminus S$, there is a $u \in S$ such that uv (respectively, vu) is an arc in T . By *domination number*, we mean the minimum size of a dominating set. We will use the following theorem from [HLTW19].

Theorem 2.1 ([HLTW19]). *For every constant k , there exist constants K and ℓ such that every tournament T with domination number at least K has a subset of size ℓ that induces a tournament with chromatic number at least k .*

Following the notation in [AAC24], we define a (k, ℓ) -*cluster* to be a set of vertices S such that $\bar{\chi}(T[S]) \geq k$, $|S| \leq \ell$ and $T[S]$ is strongly connected. This notion is directly related to the previous theorem, which can be restated for our purposes as follows.

Corollary 2.2. *There exist functions K and ℓ such that for every integer $t \geq 1$, every tournament T contains either i) a dominating set and an absorbing set, each of size at most $K(t)$, or ii) a $(t, \ell(t))$ -cluster.*

Proof. Let t be a constant. By Theorem 2.1, there exist constants $K(t)$ and $\ell(t)$ such that one can find either a dominating set of size at most $K(t)$, or a subset of size $\ell(t)$ with chromatic number t . If this subset is not strongly connected, we can find a strongly connected subset with chromatic number t . Then take the tournament obtained by reversing all the arcs in T and repeat the previous argument. A dominating set in this tournament is an absorbing set in T , while a subset with high chromatic number would also have high chromatic number in T , as reversing all the arcs preserves the chromatic number. \square

Now let us fix a constant t . Using the function ℓ from Corollary 2.2, we define a *jewel* to be a $(t + 1, \ell(t + 1))$ -cluster. We will use the fact that in a t -arc-bounded tournament, for any arc e , the vertex set $N(e)$ does not contain a jewel.¹ We now present some useful tools for coloring t -arc-bounded tournaments.

2.1 Jewels and other tools for coloring t -arc-bounded tournaments

We begin with a decomposition lemma for tournaments.

Lemma 2.3. *Let T be a tournament, and let $P = (v_0, v_1, \dots, v_k)$ be a shortest path in T from v_0 to v_k with arcs $e_i = v_{i-1}v_i$ for $i : 1 \leq i \leq k$. Then we have the following properties.*

1. *Each vertex in $N^-(v_0) \cap N^+(v_k)$ belongs to $N(e_i)$ for some $i : 1 \leq i \leq k$.*
2. *If $k \geq 3$, then each vertex in $V(P)$ belongs to $N(e_i)$ for some $i : 1 \leq i \leq k$.*

¹We will redefine a jewel in Section 3, but it will have the same purpose.

3. If $k = 2$, then v_0 belongs to $N(e_2)$ and v_2 belongs to $N(e_1)$.

Proof. First consider a vertex v in $N^-(v_0) \cap N^+(v_k)$ and let i be the maximum index such that $v \in N^-(v_i)$. Some v_i must exist, since $v \in N^-(v_0)$. Then $v \in N(e_{i+1})$. Next, consider a vertex $v \in V(P)$. Notice that all arcs between vertices $V(P)$ that are not adjacent in P must go backward. It follows that $v_i \in N(e_{i+2})$ and $v_i \in N(e_{i-1})$. When $k \geq 3$, we can conclude that each v_i belongs to $N(e_j)$ for some j such that $1 \leq j \leq k$. When $k = 2$, the same argument applies, except now v_1 belongs neither to $N(e_1)$ nor to $N(e_2)$. \square

Lemma 2.4. *Let T be a t -arc-bounded tournament. Suppose that $P = (v_0, v_1, \dots, v_k)$ is a shortest path from v_0 to v_k , and let $S = (N^-(v_0) \cap N^+(v_k)) \cup V(P)$. Then $T[S]$ can be colored with at most $5t$ colors.*

Proof. If $k \geq 3$, then each vertex in S belongs to $N(e_i)$ for some $i : 1 \leq i \leq k$. For $i < j$, we say an arc from a vertex in $N(e_i)$ to a vertex in $N(e_j)$ is *forward* with *length* $j - i$. Observe that there are no arcs from $N(e_i)$ to $N(e_j)$ for $j \geq i + 5$, since this would give a shorter path from v_0 to v_k . Thus, we can color all the vertices in S using five color palettes of t colors each, using one color palette for each $N(e_i)$ assigned modulo 5. Since all forward arcs have length at most four, each cycle with vertices belonging to different $N(e_i)$'s has at least two different colors. Finally, if $k = 2$, then $T[S]$ can be colored with $2t + 1$ colors, and if $k = 1$, then $T[S]$ can be colored with $t + 2$ colors. \square

Lemma 2.4 can be used to prove the following two lemmas, which we will apply shortly to prove Theorem 1.3.

Lemma 2.5. *Let T be a t -arc-bounded tournament, containing two vertices u and v such that $\bar{\chi}(T[N^+(u)]) \leq g(t)$ and $\bar{\chi}(T[N^-(v)]) \leq g(t)$ for some function g . Then $\bar{\chi}(T) \leq 2 \cdot g(t) + 5t$.*

Proof. Since T is strongly connected, we can set $v_0 = u$ and $v_k = v$, find a shortest path from v_0 to v_k , and apply Lemma 2.4 to color the subtournament $T[S]$. Any remaining vertex belongs to at least one of the sets $N^+(v_0)$ and $N^-(v_k)$, which can each be colored with $g(t)$ colors. \square

If T has small dominating and absorbing sets, then the following lemma provides a bound on $\bar{\chi}(T)$.

Lemma 2.6. *Let T be a t -arc-bounded tournament. Suppose T has a dominating set $\gamma^+(T)$ and an absorbing set $\gamma^-(T)$. Then $\bar{\chi}(T) \leq 5t \cdot |\gamma^-(T)| \cdot |\gamma^+(T)|$.*

Proof. We may assume that T is strongly connected. Let $q = |\gamma^-(T)| \cdot |\gamma^+(T)|$. Let $\mathcal{P} = \{P_1, P_2, \dots, P_q\}$ be a set of $|\gamma^-(T)| \cdot |\gamma^+(T)|$ shortest paths from each $u \in \gamma^-(T)$ to each $w \in \gamma^+(T)$. Then for each $v \in V$, there is some path $P_j \in \mathcal{P}$ from some u to some w such that $v \in (N^-(u) \cap N^+(w)) \cup V(P_j)$. So we can apply Lemma 2.4, which implies the lemma. \square

To prove Theorem 1.3, we need one more lemma. First, we give some notation and a definition. For two disjoint vertex sets, $X, Y \subset V$, we say $X \Rightarrow Y$ if all arcs between X and Y go from X to Y . For a set $S \subset V$, we define the set $N^\pm(S)$ to be all vertices v in $V \setminus S$ such that there exist vertices $u, w \in S$ and arcs uv and vw in T .

Definition 2.7. We define a jewel-chain of length p in a tournament to be an ordered set $X = (X_i)_{1 \leq i \leq p}$ such that each X_i induces a jewel, all X_i 's are disjoint, and $X_i \Rightarrow X_{i+1}$ for all i such that $1 \leq i \leq p - 1$.

For a jewel-chain X , we say that an arc uv is *forward* if $u \in X_i$ and $v \in X_j$ and $i < j$. If $j < i$, then uv is *backward*. Jewel-chains in t -arc-bounded tournaments are useful because they contain no backward arcs.

Observation 2.8. Let T be a t -arc-bounded tournament and let X be a jewel-chain in T . Then X contains no backward arcs.

Proof. Consider a backward arc $e = uv$, with $u \in X_j$ and $v \in X_i$ for $j > i$ such that $j - i$ is minimized. It must be the case that $j > i + 1$, since all arcs between X_i and X_{i+1} are forward by definition. Then $X_{i+1} \subseteq N(e)$, and since X_{i+1} has chromatic number at least $t + 1$, we have $\bar{\chi}(T[N(e)]) \geq t + 1$, which contradicts T being t -arc-bounded. Thus, all arcs with endpoints in distinct X_i 's must be forward. \square

Lemma 2.9. Let T be a t -arc-bounded tournament that contains a jewel. Then there exists a function g such that there are two vertices u, v such that $\bar{\chi}(T[N^+(u)]) \leq g(t)$, and $\bar{\chi}(T[N^-(v)]) \leq g(t)$.

Proof. Let X be a jewel-chain in T of maximum length, say p . Consider X_1 . Let Y be the set of vertices such that $Y \Rightarrow X_1$. Then Y does not contain a jewel (otherwise X would not have maximum length). By Corollary 2.2, Y must have a small dominating set and a small absorbing set, each of size at most $K(t + 1)$. So we can apply Lemma 2.6 to bound the chromatic number of Y by $5t \cdot (K(t + 1))^2$. Moreover, the set $N^\pm(X_1)$ has chromatic number at most $\ell(t + 1) \cdot t$, since X_1 contains a Hamilton cycle with at most $\ell(t + 1)$ arcs and each vertex in $N^\pm(X_1)$ belongs to $N(e)$ for some e in the Hamilton cycle. Finally, a vertex v in X_1 can have in-neighbors in X_1 itself, but this set has chromatic number at most $|X_1| \leq \ell(t + 1)$.

Set $g(t) = 2\ell(t + 1) \cdot t + 5t \cdot (K(t + 1))^2$. Then each vertex $u \in X_1$ has $\bar{\chi}(T[N^-(u)]) \leq g(t)$. By the same argument, each vertex $v \in X_p$ has $\bar{\chi}(T[N^+(v)]) \leq g(t)$. This proves Lemma 2.9. \square

2.2 Proof of Theorem 1.3

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.3.

Theorem 1.3. There is a function f such that for every t -arc-bounded tournament T , we have $\bar{\chi}(T) \leq f(t)$.

Proof. Let $f(t) = 2 \cdot g(t) + 5t$, where g is defined as in the end of the Proof of Lemma 2.9. If T does not contain a jewel, then by Corollary 2.2, it contains a dominating and an absorbing set each of size at most $K(t + 1)$. In this case, we can apply Lemma 2.6 to show that T can be colored with at most $5t \cdot (K(t + 1))^2$ colors. If T contains a jewel, then we can apply Lemma 2.9 and Lemma 2.5 to prove the theorem. \square

3 Arc local-to-global for dense digraphs

In this section, we extend Theorem 1.3 from tournaments to oriented graphs with bounded independence number. Since our goal is to color a digraph D , we can assume that D is strongly connected; otherwise D can be partitioned into strongly connected parts, and each one can be colored separately. An important tool for the proof is Theorem 3.1, which extends Theorem 2.1 from tournaments to digraphs with bounded independence number.² As the proof of Theorem 3.1 is very similar to the proof of Theorem 2.1 from [HLTW19], it is deferred to Appendix A. A (k, ℓ) -cluster in a digraph D is a set of vertices S in $V(D)$ such that $\vec{\chi}(D[S]) \geq k$, $|S| \leq \ell$ and $D[S]$ is strongly connected.

Theorem 3.1. *There exist functions K and ℓ such that for every pair of integers $k, \alpha \geq 1$, every digraph D with independence number α and dominating number at least $K(\alpha, k)$ contains a $(k, \ell(\alpha, k))$ -cluster.*

Corollary 3.2. *There exist functions K and ℓ such that for every pair of integers $k, \alpha \geq 1$, every digraph D with independence number α contains either i) a dominating and an absorbing set, each of size at most $K(\alpha, k)$, or ii) a $(k, \ell(\alpha, k))$ -cluster.*

Proof. Let k and α be constants, and D a digraph with independence number α . By Theorem 3.1, there exist constants $K(\alpha, k)$ and $\ell(\alpha, k)$ such that one can find either a dominating set of size at most $K(\alpha, k)$, or a subset of size $\ell(\alpha, k)$ with chromatic number at least k . Take the digraph obtained by reversing all the arcs in D and repeat the previous argument. A dominating set in this digraph is an absorbing set in D , while a subset with high chromatic number would also have high chromatic number in D , as reversing all the arcs preserves the chromatic number. \square

In a digraph $D = (V, A)$, there are some pairs of vertices that do not have arcs between them. A pair u, v is a *non-edge* in D if neither arc uv nor arc vu belongs to A . The proof of the next theorem involves adding arcs to a digraph D to obtain a tournament. Since there are two sets of arcs, A and B , we use, for example, $N_A^+(u)$ (rather than the more standard $N_D^+(u)$) and $N_B^+(u)$ to denote the set of vertices adjacent from u via arcs in A or arcs in B , respectively. We define $N_A^o(u)$ to be all vertices in V that form non-edges with u in D .³ The goal in this section is to prove our main theorem.

Theorem 1.4. *There is a function dense such that for any digraph D with independence number α , if $\vec{\chi}(D[N(e)]) \leq t$ for every arc $e \in A(D)$, then $\vec{\chi}(D) \leq \text{dense}(t, \alpha)$.*

Proof. We prove this theorem by induction on α . For the base case, Theorem 1.2 proves the statement for $\alpha = 1$, by setting $\text{dense}(t, 1) = f(t)$. For the induction hypothesis, we assume that for any digraph $D = (V, A)$ with independence number $\alpha - 1$, if for all $e \in A$, $\vec{\chi}(D[N(e)]) \leq t$, then $\vec{\chi}(D) \leq \text{dense}(t, \alpha - 1)$. Now our goal is to prove that for any digraph $D = (V, A)$ with independence number α , if for all $e \in A$, $\vec{\chi}(D[N(e)]) \leq t$, then $\vec{\chi}(D) \leq \text{dense}(t, \alpha)$.

²Theorem 1.1 was extended to digraphs with bounded independence number by [HLNT19], but they did not provide an extension of Theorem 2.1.

³We could have used $N_B^o(u)$ rather than $N_A^o(u)$ (since we never use $N_B^o(u)$), but we choose $N_A^o(u)$ for the sake of consistency.

Consider a digraph $D = (V, A)$ with independence number α . We construct a tournament $T = (V, A \cup B)$ where each arc in B is a non-edge in D . Recall that we use $N_A^+(u)$ to denote the set of vertices adjacent from u via arcs from A . Now we assign directions as follows. For each non-edge u, v in D , if $N_A^+(v) \cap N_A^-(u)$ and $N_A^+(u) \cap N_A^-(v)$ are both empty (i.e., contain no vertices) or are both non-empty, we direct the arc arbitrarily. Otherwise either $N_A^+(u) \cap N_A^-(v) = \emptyset$, and we direct the arc from v to u , or $N_A^+(v) \cap N_A^-(u) = \emptyset$ and we direct the arc from u to v . Thus, we have the following property for each arc uv in B : Either $N_A^+(v) \cap N_A^-(u)$ contains no vertices or $N_A^+(v) \cap N_A^-(u)$ and $N_A^+(u) \cap N_A^-(v)$ both contain at least one vertex.

Now our goal is to color the tournament T such that each color class induces an acyclic set of arcs from A . This will in turn bound the chromatic number of D . We use the notation $D[N_T(e)]$ to denote the subgraph of D (i.e., arcs from A) in the neighborhood of arc e in T .

Claim 1. $\forall e \in A \cup B, \bar{\chi}(D[N_T(e)]) \leq 3 \cdot \text{dense}(t, \alpha - 1) + 2t$.

Proof. Consider an arc $e = uv \in A$. We partition $N_T(e)$ into three subsets of vertices.

- (i) $S_1 = N_A^-(u) \cap N_A^+(v)$. By the condition of the theorem, $\bar{\chi}(D[S_1]) = \bar{\chi}(D[N_A(e)]) \leq t$.
- (ii) $S_2 = N_B^-(u)$. Then $D[S_2]$ has independence number at most $\alpha - 1$. Thus, by the induction hypothesis, $\bar{\chi}(D[S_2]) \leq \text{dense}(t, \alpha - 1)$.
- (iii) $S_3 = N_B^+(v)$. Then $D[S_3]$ has independence number at most $\alpha - 1$. Thus, by the induction hypothesis $\bar{\chi}(D[S_3]) \leq \text{dense}(t, \alpha - 1)$.

Therefore, for an arc $e \in A$, we have $\bar{\chi}(D[N_T(e)]) \leq 2 \cdot \text{dense}(t, \alpha - 1) + t$. Next, we consider an arc $e = uv \in B$. We partition $N_T(e)$ into three subsets of vertices.

- (i) $S_1 = N_A^-(u) \cap N_A^+(v)$. Then either S_1 is empty, in which case $\bar{\chi}(D[S_1]) = 0$, or S_1 is non-empty. In this case, take any vertex $w \in N_A^+(u) \cap N_A^-(v)$. Notice that $S_1 \subseteq N_A(uw) \cup N_A(vw) \cup N_A^o(w)$. By the condition of the theorem, $\bar{\chi}(D[N_A(uw)]) \leq t$ and $\bar{\chi}(D[N_A(vw)]) \leq t$. Finally, $N_A^o(w)$ has independence number at most $\alpha - 1$. Thus by the induction hypothesis, $\bar{\chi}(D[N_A^o(w)]) \leq \text{dense}(t, \alpha - 1)$. Therefore, $\bar{\chi}(D[S_1]) \leq 2t + \text{dense}(t, \alpha - 1)$.
- (ii) $S_2 = N_B^-(u)$. Then $D[S_2]$ has independence number at most $\alpha - 1$. Thus, by the induction hypothesis $\bar{\chi}(D[S_2]) \leq \text{dense}(t, \alpha - 1)$.
- (iii) $S_3 = N_B^+(v)$. Then $D[S_3]$ has independence number at most $\alpha - 1$. Thus, by the induction hypothesis $\bar{\chi}(D[S_3]) \leq \text{dense}(t, \alpha - 1)$.

Therefore, $\bar{\chi}(D[N_T(e)]) \leq 3 \cdot \text{dense}(t, \alpha - 1) + 2t$. ◇

Claim 2. For any pair of vertices u, v in V , $\bar{\chi}(D[N_T^-(u) \cap N_T^+(v)]) \leq 15 \cdot \text{dense}(t, \alpha - 1) + 10t$.

Proof. Recall that D , and therefore T , is strongly connected. For any pair of vertices u, v , take the shortest path $(e_i)_{1 \leq i \leq k}$ from u to v in T . Any vertex in $N_T^-(u) \cap N_T^+(v)$ must be in the neighborhood $N_T(e_i)$ of some arc e_i of the shortest path. An arc from a vertex in $N_T(e_i)$ to a vertex in $N_T(e_j)$ is *forward* if $i < j$ and *backward* if $j < i$. There can be no arc in A from a vertex in $N_T(e_i)$ to a

vertex in $N_T(e_j)$ for $j \geq i + 5$, or else there would be a shorter path from u to v . Thus, we can use five color palettes of $3 \cdot \text{dense}(t, \alpha - 1) + 2t$ colors each, and color $N_T(e_i)$ with the color palette $i \bmod 5$. By Claim 1, each neighborhood $N_T(e_i)$ does not contain a monochromatic directed cycle of arcs from A . Because all forward arcs from A between different neighborhoods are bicolored, this results in a coloring with no monochromatic directed cycle of arcs from A . In total, this coloring uses $15 \cdot \text{dense}(t, \alpha - 1) + 10t$ colors. \diamond

If we can find a pair of vertices u, v such that $\vec{\chi}(D[N_T^+(u) \cup N_T^-(v)])$ is small (i.e., bounded by a function of t and α), then we can use Claim 2 to bound $\vec{\chi}(D)$ and prove the theorem. To do this, we need a few more tools.

Claim 3. If the tournament $T = (V, A \cup B)$ has a dominating set $\gamma^+(T)$ and an absorbing set $\gamma^-(T)$, then $\vec{\chi}(D) \leq |\gamma^+(T)| \cdot |\gamma^-(T)| \cdot (15 \cdot \text{dense}(t, \alpha - 1) + 10t + 2)$.

Proof. We now define a coloring C of D . For each pair of vertices $u \in \gamma^-(T), v \in \gamma^+(T)$, we can color the set $N_T^-(u) \cap N_T^+(v)$ using a different palette of $15 \cdot \text{dense}(t, \alpha - 1) + 10t$ colors by Claim 2. Each vertex w of $V \setminus (\gamma^-(T) \cup \gamma^+(T))$ can be colored this way; indeed for each such vertex w , there is some pair of vertices $u \in \gamma^-(T), v \in \gamma^+(T)$ such that $w \in N_T^-(u) \cap N_T^+(v)$. Moreover, each vertex in $\gamma^+(T) \cup \gamma^-(T)$ can be colored with its own color. If a vertex is assigned more than one color, simply use the first color it is given. This coloring uses a total of at most $|\gamma^+(T)| \cdot |\gamma^-(T)| \cdot (15 \cdot \text{dense}(t, \alpha - 1) + 10t) + |\gamma^+(T)| + |\gamma^-(T)| \leq |\gamma^+(T)| \cdot |\gamma^-(T)| \cdot (15 \cdot \text{dense}(t, \alpha - 1) + 10t + 2)$ colors. \diamond

Set $d = 3 \cdot \text{dense}(t, \alpha - 1) + 2t$. Notice that $T = (V, A \cup B)$ is not necessarily d -arc-bounded, since $\vec{\chi}(T[N_T(e)]) \geq \vec{\chi}(D[N_T(e)])$. We now modify the definition of a jewel (defined in the previous section) for our current setting: A *jewel* is a subset $J \subset V$ such that J is a $(d + 1, \ell(\alpha, d + 1))$ -cluster in D , so $\vec{\chi}(D[J]) \geq d + 1$ and $|J| \leq \ell(\alpha, d + 1)$.

Definition 3.3. We define a *jewel-chain* in T of length p to be an ordered set $X = (X_i)_{1 \leq i \leq p}$ such that each X_i induces a jewel in D (i.e., $D[X_i]$ is a jewel), all X_i 's are disjoint, and $X_i \Rightarrow X_{i+1}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq p - 1$ (i.e., X_i is complete to X_{i+1} in T).

As in the previous section, we say that for a jewel chain X , an arc uv is *forward* if $u \in X_i$ and $v \in X_j$ and $i < j$. If $j < i$, then arc uv is *backward*. The next claim is similar, but not identical, to Observation 2.8. The subtle difference stems from the fact that we care about the chromatic number of jewel with respect to D rather than T .

Claim 4. A jewel-chain X contains no backward arcs in T .

Proof. Consider a backward arc $e = uv$, with $u \in X_j$ and $v \in X_i$ for $j > i$ such that $j - i$ is minimized. It must be the case that $j > i + 1$, since all arcs between X_i and X_{i+1} are forward by definition. Then $X_{i+1} \subseteq N_T(e)$, and since $\vec{\chi}(D[N_T(e)]) \geq d + 1$, this contradicts Claim 1. Thus, all arcs with endpoints in distinct X_i 's must be forward. \diamond

Let X be a jewel-chain in T of maximum length, say p . Define Y to be the vertex set such that $Y \Rightarrow X_1$ in T . Then $D[Y]$ does not contain a jewel by assumption (otherwise, we could make the jewel-chain longer). By Corollary 3.2, since $D[Y]$ does not contain a $(d + 1, \ell(\alpha, d + 1))$ -cluster,

$D[Y]$ contains a dominating set and an absorbing set, each of size at most $K(d+1, \alpha)$. Notice that a dominating (absorbing) set in $D[Y]$ is also a dominating (absorbing) set in $T[Y]$. So we can apply Claim 3 to bound the chromatic number of $D[Y]$ by $(K(d+1, \alpha))^2 \cdot (15 \cdot \text{dense}(t, \alpha - 1) + 10t + 2)$.

Moreover, the set $N_T^\pm(X_1)$ has chromatic number at most $\bar{\chi}(D[N_T^\pm(X_1)]) \leq \ell(d+1, \alpha) \cdot d$. Finally, $v \in X_1$ can have in-neighbors in X_1 itself, but these can have chromatic number at most $|X_1| \leq \ell(d+1, \alpha)$.

So for each vertex $v \in X_1$, we have

$$\bar{\chi}(D[N_T^-(v)]) \leq (K(d+1, \alpha))^2 \cdot (15 \cdot \text{dense}(t, \alpha - 1) + 10t + 2) + \ell(d+1, \alpha) \cdot (d+1).$$

By the same argument, each vertex $u \in X_p$ has the same bound on $\bar{\chi}(D[N_T^+(u)])$. So we have

$$\bar{\chi}(D[N_T^+(u) \cup N_T^-(v)]) \leq 2((K(d+1, \alpha))^2 \cdot (15 \cdot \text{dense}(t, \alpha - 1) + 10t + 2) + \ell(d+1, \alpha) \cdot (d+1)).$$

By Claim 2, we have

$$\bar{\chi}[D] \leq 2((1 + (K(d+1, \alpha))^2) \cdot (15 \cdot \text{dense}(t, \alpha - 1) + 10t + 2) + \ell(d+1, \alpha) \cdot (d+1)).$$

Since $d = 3 \cdot \text{dense}(t, \alpha - 1) + 2t$, we can define the function dense as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dense}(t, \alpha) = & 2((1 + (K(3 \cdot \text{dense}(t, \alpha - 1) + 2t + 1, \alpha))^2) \cdot (15 \cdot \text{dense}(t, \alpha - 1) + 10t + 2) \\ & + \ell(3 \cdot \text{dense}(t, \alpha - 1) + 2t + 1, \alpha) \cdot (3 \cdot \text{dense}(t, \alpha - 1) + 2t + 1)). \end{aligned}$$

So we have $\bar{\chi}[D] \leq \text{dense}(t, \alpha)$, concluding the proof of the theorem. \square

4 Equivalence of Conjectures 1.5 and 1.6

[NSS23] show that Conjecture 1.6 implies Conjecture 1.5. In this section, we prove that Conjecture 1.5 implies Conjecture 1.6, showing they are equivalent. Our main tool is Theorem 1.4.

Let s be a function such that $s(x) \geq x^2 \cdot s(x-1) + x$ and let T be a tournament. Recall that a $(t, s(t))$ -cluster is a subset S of V of size $s(t)$ such that $\bar{\chi}(T[S]) \geq t$. For brevity, we use t -cluster to denote a $(t, s(t))$ -cluster in this section.

Definition 4.1. *Define a t -heavy arc $e \in A(T)$ to be an arc such that $T[N(e)]$ contains a $(t-1)$ -cluster, and a t -light arc to be an arc that is not t -heavy.*

Let us prove a lemma that will allow us to restate Conjecture 1.6. The proof is reminiscent of the proof of 3.7 in [BCC⁺13] and essentially the same as the proof of Lemma 3.4 in [AAC24]. Let clust be a function such that $\text{clust}(x) = x \cdot 2^{s(2x)} + s(2x) + 1$.

Lemma 4.2. *For all $c \geq 0$, in any tournament T with $\bar{\chi}(T) \geq \text{clust}(c)$ that has a $2c$ -cluster, there are two sets $A, B \subseteq V(T)$ such that $\bar{\chi}(T[A]), \bar{\chi}(T[B]) \geq c$ and all arcs between A and B go from vertices of A to vertices of B .*

Proof. Let $C \subset V(T)$ be a $2c$ -cluster. By the definition of a cluster, $|C| \leq s(2c)$. So there are at most $2^{s(2c)}$ ways of partitioning C . Consider any vertex $v \in V(T) \setminus C$. Then $(N^+(v) \cap C, N^-(v) \cap C)$ forms a partition of C . Thus, we can partition $V(T) \setminus C$ into at most $2^{s(2c)}$ subsets $(S_i)_{1 \leq i \leq 2^{s(2c)}}$ such that all vertices in a subset S_i have the same in-neighborhood and out-neighborhood in C (i.e., each vertex in S_i partitions C in the same way). If every S_i can be colored with at most c colors, T can be colored with at most $c \cdot 2^{s(2c)} + s(2c)$ colors. Therefore, since $\bar{\chi}(T) \geq \text{clust}(c) = c \cdot 2^{s(2c)} + s(2c) + 1$ by the condition of the lemma, there must exist some subset S_i with $\bar{\chi}(T[S_i]) \geq c$. Consider the partition $(N^+(v) \cap C, N^-(v) \cap C)$ of C for a vertex $v \in S_i$. Either $\bar{\chi}(T[N^+(v) \cap C]) \geq c$ or $\bar{\chi}(T[N^-(v) \cap C]) \geq c$, since $\chi(C) \geq 2c$. By definition, S_i is complete to $N^+(v) \cap C$ and complete from $N^-(v) \cap C$. Thus by setting $A = N^-(v) \cap C$ and $B = S_i$ if $\bar{\chi}(T[N^-(v) \cap C]) \geq c$, and $A = S_i$, $B = N^+(v) \cap C$ if $\bar{\chi}(T[N^+(v) \cap C]) \geq c$, we have found A and B with A complete to B and $\bar{\chi}(T[A]), \bar{\chi}(T[B]) \geq c$. \square

Let us restate Conjectures 1.5 and 1.6.

Conjecture 4.3 (Restatement of Conjecture 1.5). *There exists a function ee such that for every pair of integers $t, c \geq 1$, if a graph G satisfies $\chi(G) \geq ee(t, c)$ and $\omega(G) < t$, then there are subsets $A, B \subseteq V(G)$ with $\chi(G[A]), \chi(G[B]) \geq c$, such that there are no edges between A and B .*

Conjecture 4.4. *There exists a function nss such that for every pair of integers $t, c \geq 1$, if a tournament T satisfies $\bar{\chi}(T) \geq nss(t, c)$ and T contains no t -cluster, then there are subsets $A, B \subseteq V(T)$ such that $\bar{\chi}(T[A]), \bar{\chi}(T[B]) \geq c$ and all arcs between A and B go from vertices in A to vertices in B .*

Conjecture 4.4 may seem weaker than Conjecture 1.6, but is in fact equivalent. This is a direct consequence of Lemma 4.2. Indeed, for any c , if a tournament T has no sets A and B with A complete to B and $\bar{\chi}(T[A]), \bar{\chi}(T[B]) \geq c$, then by the contrapositive of Lemma 4.2 it has no $2c$ -cluster or it has chromatic number less than $\text{clust}(c)$. Therefore, Conjecture 4.4 will imply that T has chromatic number strictly less than $d = \max(nss(2c, c), \text{clust}(c))$, which is some constant since c is fixed. This is exactly the contrapositive of Conjecture 1.6. We now state the contrapositive of Conjecture 4.4, which is also equivalent to Conjecture 1.6.

Conjecture 4.5 (Restatement of Conjecture 4.4). *There exists a function nss such that for every pair of integers $t, c \geq 1$, if a tournament T contains no t -cluster and T does not contain subsets $A, B \subseteq V(T)$ such that $\bar{\chi}(T[A]), \bar{\chi}(T[B]) \geq c$ with all arcs between A and B going from vertices in A to vertices in B , then $\bar{\chi}(T) \leq nss(t, c)$.*

Proof of Conjecture 4.5, assuming Conjecture 4.3. For $t = 2$, a tournament T with no 2-cluster does not contain a directed triangle and therefore has $\bar{\chi}(T) = 1$. Thus, we have $nss(2, c) = 1$. Now we assume that $nss(t-1, c)$ exists. We will prove that $nss(t, c)$ exists.

We consider a tournament T , which by assumption does not contain a t -cluster. Since t is now fixed for the rest of this proof, we simply use heavy and light in place of t -heavy and t -light. Let L be the set of light arcs and H the set of heavy arcs. Notice that every arc in T must be either in L or in H . Let $D_H = (V, H)$ and $D_L = (V, L)$ be digraphs containing the heavy and light arcs, respectively. Let $G_H = (V, H)$ denote the undirected graph of heavy edges and let $G_L = (V, L)$

denote the undirected graph of light edges. (Notice that we are abusing notation by using H and L to refer to both directed and undirected edge sets.)

Our first claim is that the graph G_H has no large clique, and consequently, the graph G_L has bounded independence number.

Claim 1. $\omega(G_H) \leq t - 1$.

Proof. Suppose that G_H contains a K_t (i.e., a clique on t vertices) and let S be the set obtained by including the t vertices of the clique in addition to the vertices in the $(t - 1)$ -cluster in the neighborhood of each arc corresponding to an edge in the clique. Then S has at most $t + t^2 \cdot s(t - 1)$ vertices. Moreover, $T[S]$ cannot be colored with $t - 1$ colors since every arc is heavy and the endpoints of a heavy arc cannot have the same color in any coloring using only $t - 1$ colors. Since S contains a clique, we have that $\chi(S) \geq t$. Thus, T contains a t -cluster, which is a contradiction. \diamond

Claim 2. $\alpha(G_L) \leq t - 1$.

Proof. L and H are complementary edge sets (i.e., every edge not in L belongs to H and vice versa). If G_L has an independent set of size t , then G_H would have a clique on those same t vertices, which would contradict Claim 1. \diamond

Claim 3. For every arc $e \in L$, $\vec{\chi}(T[N(e)]) \leq \text{nss}(t - 1, c)$.

Proof. By definition, the neighborhood of any light arc contains no $(t - 1)$ -cluster. Thus by the induction hypothesis it can be colored with $\text{nss}(t - 1, c)$ colors. \diamond

It follows immediately that the neighborhood of every arc in D_L has chromatic number at most $\text{nss}(t - 1, c)$. We can then use Theorem 1.4 to show that D_L can be colored with $\text{dense}(\text{nss}(t - 1, c))$ of colors.

Fix such a coloring of D_L . Each color induces a tournament that has a vertex ordering in which each backward arc belongs to H (since all monochromatic arcs with the same color from L form an acyclic digraph). Consider the subtournament T_i induced on vertices with the i^{th} color, let n denote the number of vertices in this subtournament and fix a vertex ordering $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ in which all arcs in D_L are forward. Let G_i be the undirected graph on this vertex set whose edge set corresponds to the backward arcs of T_i with respect to the fixed vertex ordering. Notice that G_i is a subgraph of G_H , which is K_t -free by Claim 1.

Now let us apply Conjecture 4.3 to the graph G_i . Let $c_2 = 2tc$. Either each G_i has chromatic number at most $d = \text{ee}(t, c_2)$ or G_i contains two sets S_1 and S_2 with $\chi(G[S_1]), \chi(G[S_2]) \geq c_2$ and with no edges in G_i between S_1 and S_2 . In the latter case, let a be the smallest index such that $\chi(G[\{v_1, \dots, v_a\} \cap S_1]) \geq tc$, and let b be the smallest index such that $\chi(G[\{v_1, \dots, v_b\} \cap S_2]) \geq tc$. Without loss of generality, assume that $a < b$. Now let $A' = \{v_1, \dots, v_a\} \cap S_1$ and $B' = \{v_{b+1}, \dots, v_n\} \cap S_2$. Observe that since S_1 and S_2 have no arcs between them in G_i , which corresponds to the backedge graph of T_i , then all arcs between A' and B' in T_i must go from A' to B' . Moreover, we have $\vec{\chi}(T_i[A']) \leq \chi(G_i[A']) \leq \omega(G_i[A'])\vec{\chi}(T_i[A'])$.⁴ Since $\chi(G_i[A']) \geq tc$

⁴This follows from 2.1 in [NSS23], which says that $\vec{\chi}(T) \leq \chi(G) \leq \omega(G)\vec{\chi}(T)$ for a backedge graph G of tournament T .

and $\omega(G_i[A']) \leq \omega(G_i) \leq t$, we have $\bar{\chi}(T_i[A']) \geq c$. Using the same argument, we also have $\bar{\chi}(T_i[B']) \geq c$. However, by assumption, such sets A' and B' do not exist in T . So we conclude that we are in the first case, in which $\bar{\chi}(T_i) \leq \chi(G_i) \leq ee(t, c_2)$.

Thus, we can color the subtournament induced by each color class of D_L with $ee(t, 2tc)$ colors, resulting in a coloring of T with $nss(t, c) = ee(t, 2tc) \cdot \text{dense}(nss(t - 1, c))$ colors. \square

Acknowledgements

We thank Pierre Aboulker and Pierre Charbit for helpful conversations and comments. We thank Paul Seymour for pointing out that Theorem 1.2 is a special case of 13.3 in [NSS23]. We thank the anonymous referees for their help improving the presentation.

References

- [AAC24] Pierre Aboulker, Guillaume Aubian, and Pierre Charbit. Heroes in oriented complete multipartite graphs. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 105(4):652–669, 2024.
- [APS01] Noga Alon, János Pach, and József Solymosi. Ramsey-type theorems with forbidden subgraphs. *Combinatorica*, 21(2):155–170, 2001.
- [BCC⁺13] Eli Berger, Krzysztof Choromanski, Maria Chudnovsky, Jacob Fox, Martin Loebl, Alex Scott, Paul Seymour, and Stéphan Thomassé. Tournaments and colouring. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 103(1):1–20, 2013.
- [Bon03] J. Adrian Bondy. Short proofs of classical theorems. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 44(3):159–165, 2003.
- [Des54] Blanche Descartes. k -chromatic graphs without triangles. *American Mathematical Monthly*, 61(5):352–353, 1954.
- [EE85] Mohamed El-Zahar and Paul Erdős. On the existence of two non-neighborly subgraphs in a graph. *Combinatorica*, 5:295–300, 1985.
- [EH89] Paul Erdős and András Hajnal. Ramsey-type theorems. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 25(1-2):37–52, 1989.
- [HLNT19] Ararat Harutyunyan, Tien-Nam Le, Alantha Newman, and Stéphan Thomassé. Coloring dense digraphs. *Combinatorica*, 39:1021–1053, 2019.
- [HLTW19] Ararat Harutyunyan, Tien-Nam Le, Stéphan Thomassé, and Hehui Wu. Coloring tournaments: From local to global. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 138:166–171, 2019.
- [KN23] Felix Klingelhofer and Alantha Newman. Coloring tournaments with few colors: Algorithms and complexity. In *Proceedings of 31st Annual European Symposium on Algorithms (ESA)*, 2023.

- [NSS23] Tung Nguyen, Alex Scott, and Paul Seymour. Some results and problems on tournament structure. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.02364*, 2023.
- [NSS24] Tung Nguyen, Alex Scott, and Paul Seymour. On a problem of El-Zahar and Erdős. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 165:211–222, 2024.

A Proof of Theorem 3.1

Let D be a digraph with independence number α , and let $X, Y \subseteq V(D)$. Then the following inequalities are straightforward.

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma(D[N^+[X]]) &\leq |X|, \\ \gamma(D[Y]) &\leq \gamma(D[X]) + \gamma(D[Y \setminus X]).\end{aligned}\tag{A.1}$$

Theorem 3.1. *There exist functions K and ℓ such that for every pair of integers $k, \alpha \geq 1$, every digraph D with independence number α and dominating number at least $K(\alpha, k)$ contains a $(k, \ell(\alpha, k))$ -cluster.*

Proof. Let $P(\alpha, k)$ denote the statement of the theorem for α and k . Our goal is to prove $P(\alpha, k)$ for all integers $\alpha, k \geq 1$. Let us assume that $P(\alpha - 1, k)$ holds for all $k \geq 1$. The base case for this is $P(1, k)$, which is proved in [HLTW19]. Now we fix α and we want to prove $P(\alpha, k)$, which we will do by induction on k . The base case for this is $P(\alpha, 1)$, which is true since any digraph with independence number α and domination number at least 1 contains at least one vertex, which serves as a $(1, 1)$ -cluster. To build intuition, we can also consider the next case, which is $P(\alpha, 2)$. This is true since any digraph with independence number α and domination number at least $\alpha + 1$ contains a directed cycle of length at most $\ell(\alpha, 2) \leq 2\alpha + 1$, and this cycle requires two colors.⁵ Now we assume $P(\alpha, k - 1)$ (as well as $P(\alpha - 1, k)$) and we want to prove $P(\alpha, k)$.

We will follow the proof of Theorem 5 from [HLTW19]. Let us first prove a useful claim. Recall that $N^o(v)$ is the set of vertices that form non-edges with v .

Claim 1. If D does not contain a $(k, \ell(\alpha - 1, k))$ -cluster, then for any vertex $v \in V(D)$,

$$\gamma(D[N^o(v)]) \leq K(\alpha - 1, k).$$

Proof. The digraph $D' = D[N^o(v)]$ has independence number $\alpha - 1$. By the inductive hypothesis on α , either D' has a $(k, \ell(\alpha - 1, k))$ -cluster or D' has domination number at most $K(\alpha - 1, k)$. Thus, $\gamma(D[N^o(v)]) \leq K(\alpha - 1, k)$. \diamond

Let $D = (V, E)$ be a digraph with independence number α such that $\gamma(D) \geq K(\alpha, k)$, and let B be a minimum dominating set of D . We will assume that D does not contain a $(k, \ell(\alpha - 1, k))$ -cluster, since otherwise, we would be done. Fix

$$K(\alpha, k) = k(K(\alpha - 1, k) + 1)(K(\alpha, k - 1) + \ell(\alpha, k - 1) \cdot (K(\alpha - 1, k) + 1) + 1) + K(\alpha, k - 1).$$

⁵This follows from the well-known classical theorem that an acyclic digraph has an independent dominating set. See [Bon03].

Consider a subset W of B , where

$$|W| = k(K(\alpha, k-1) + \ell(\alpha, k-1) \cdot (K(\alpha-1, k) + 1) + 1).$$

From (A.1) and Claim 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma(D[V \setminus (N^+[W] \cup N^o(W))]) &\geq \gamma(D) - \gamma(D[N^+[W]]) - \gamma(D[N^o(W)]) \\ &\geq \gamma(D) - |W| - |W|(K(\alpha-1, k) \\ &\geq K(\alpha, k) - |W|(K(\alpha-1, k) + 1) \\ &\geq K(\alpha, k-1). \end{aligned}$$

By applying the induction hypothesis, the digraph $D[V \setminus (N^+[W] \cup N^o(W))]$ contains a $(k-1, \ell(\alpha, k-1))$ -cluster. Call this vertex set A . Note that by construction, $A \cap W = \emptyset$ and A is complete towards W . Now consider a subset S of W where

$$|S| = K(\alpha, k-1) + \ell(\alpha, k-1) \cdot (K(\alpha-1, k) + 1) + 1.$$

We claim that

$$\gamma(D[N^+(S)]) \geq K(\alpha, k-1) + \ell(\alpha, k-1) \cdot (K(\alpha-1, k) + 1). \quad (\text{A.2})$$

If not, we can choose a dominating set S' of $N^+(S)$, where

$$|S'| \leq K(\alpha, k-1) + \ell(\alpha, k-1) \cdot (K(\alpha-1, k) + 1) - 1.$$

Note that x dominates S for any $x \in A$, and so $S' \cup \{x\}$ dominates $N^+[S]$. Hence $(B \setminus S) \cup S' \cup \{x\}$ would be a dominating set of D of size less than $|B|$ which contradicts the minimality of B . We therefore conclude that Inequality (A.2) holds.

Let $N' = N^+(S) \setminus (N^+(A) \cup N^o(A))$. From Claims A.1 and 1 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma(D[N']) &\geq \gamma(D[N^+(S)]) - \gamma(D[N^+(A)]) - \gamma(D[N^o(A)]) \\ &\geq K(\alpha, k-1) + \ell(\alpha, k-1) \cdot (K(\alpha-1, k) + 1) - |A|(K(\alpha-1, k) + 1) \\ &= K(\alpha, k-1). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by the induction hypothesis on k , there is a subset $A_s \subseteq N'$ that forms a $(k-1, \ell(\alpha, k-1))$ -cluster. By construction, $A_s \cap A = \emptyset$ and A_s is complete towards A .

We now construct our subdigraph of D with chromatic number at least k . We consider the set of vertices $A \cup W$ to which we add the collection A_s , for all subsets $S \subseteq W$ of size $K(\alpha, k-1) + \ell(\alpha, k-1) \cdot (K(\alpha-1, k) + 1) + 1$. Call A' this new vertex set and observe that its size is at most

$$|A'| \leq |A| + |W| + |A_s| \binom{|W|}{|S|}.$$

So we have

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(\alpha, k) &= \ell(\alpha, k-1) + k(K(\alpha, k-1) + \ell(\alpha, k-1) \cdot (K(\alpha-1, k) + 1) + 1) \\ &+ \ell(\alpha, k-1) \binom{k(K(\alpha, k-1) + \ell(\alpha, k-1) \cdot (K(\alpha-1, k) + 1) + 1)}{K(\alpha, k-1) + \ell(\alpha, k-1) \cdot (K(\alpha-1, k) + 1) + 1}. \end{aligned}$$

To conclude, it is sufficient to show that $\chi(A') \geq k$. Suppose not, and for contradiction, take a $(k-1)$ -coloring of A' . Since $|W| = k(K(\alpha, k-1) + \ell(\alpha, k-1) \cdot (K(\alpha-1, k) + 1) + 1)$ there is a monochromatic set S in W of size $K(\alpha, k-1) + \ell(\alpha, k-1) \cdot (K(\alpha-1, k) + 1) + 1$ (say, colored 1). Recall that A_S is complete to A , and A is complete to S , and note that since $\chi(A) \geq k-1$ and $\chi(A_S) \geq k-1$, both A and A_S have a vertex of each of the $k-1$ colors. Hence there are $u \in A$ and $w \in A_S$ colored 1. Since $A_S \subseteq N^+(S)$, there is $v \in S$ such that (v, w) is an arc of D . We then obtain the monochromatic triangle (u, v, w) of color 1, a contradiction. Thus, $\bar{\chi}(D[A']) \geq k$ implying that A' is a $(k, \ell(\alpha, k))$ -cluster in D completing the induction on k .

Since this induction proves the statement $P(\alpha, k)$ holds for any k , it proves the inductive hypothesis for α . Then, by induction on α we have proven that the theorem is true for any pair of integers α, k . \square