# Chromatic Polynomial and Counting DP Colorings of a Graph

#### Hemanshu Kaul

#### Illinois Institute of Technology

www.math.iit.edu/~kaul

kaul@iit.edu

Joint work with Jeffrey Mudrock (College of Lake County)

# **Graph Coloring**

- Allocation of colors (limited resource) to vertices (entities) so that pairs of vertices with an edge (conflict) are given different colors.
- Color vertices so that any vertices with an edge between them must get different colors.
- Partition the set of all vertices into independent sets (edge-free sets/ "conflict-free" sets)
- Minimum number of colors needed for such a coloring is called the chromatic number χ(G) of the graph G.

# **Graph Coloring**

- Allocation of colors (limited resource) to vertices (entities) so that pairs of vertices with an edge (conflict) are given different colors.
- Color vertices so that any vertices with an edge between them must get different colors.
- Partition the set of all vertices into independent sets (edge-free sets/ "conflict-free" sets)
- Minimum number of colors needed for such a coloring is called the chromatic number χ(G) of the graph G.

# List Coloring

- List coloring was introduced independently by Vizing (1976) and Erdős, Rubin, and Taylor (1979), as a generalization of usual graph coloring.
- For graph *G* suppose each  $v \in V(G)$  is assigned a list, L(v), of colors. We refer to *L* as a list assignment. If all the lists associated with the list assignment *L* have size *k*, we say that *L* is a *k*-assignment.
- An L-coloring for G is a proper coloring, f, of G such that  $f(v) \in L(v)$  for all  $v \in V(G)$ .
- When an *L*-coloring for *G* exists, we say that *G* is L-colorable or L-choosable.

# List Coloring

- List coloring was introduced independently by Vizing (1976) and Erdős, Rubin, and Taylor (1979), as a generalization of usual graph coloring.
- For graph G suppose each v ∈ V(G) is assigned a list, L(v), of colors. We refer to L as a list assignment. If all the lists associated with the list assignment L have size k, we say that L is a k-assignment.
- An L-coloring for G is a proper coloring, f, of G such that  $f(v) \in L(v)$  for all  $v \in V(G)$ .
- When an *L*-coloring for *G* exists, we say that *G* is L-colorable or L-choosable.

# List Coloring

- List coloring was introduced independently by Vizing (1976) and Erdős, Rubin, and Taylor (1979), as a generalization of usual graph coloring.
- For graph G suppose each v ∈ V(G) is assigned a list, L(v), of colors. We refer to L as a list assignment. If all the lists associated with the list assignment L have size k, we say that L is a k-assignment.
- An L-coloring for G is a proper coloring, f, of G such that  $f(v) \in L(v)$  for all  $v \in V(G)$ .
- When an *L*-coloring for *G* exists, we say that *G* is L-colorable or L-choosable.

# List Chromatic Number

- The list chromatic number of a graph G, written *χ*<sub>ℓ</sub>(G), is the smallest k such that G is L-colorable whenever |L(v)| ≥ k for each v ∈ V(G).
- When χ<sub>ℓ</sub>(G) = k we say that G has list chromatic number k or that G is k-choosable.
- We immediately have that if χ(G) is the typical chromatic number of a graph G, then

 $\chi(\mathbf{G}) \leq \chi_{\ell}(\mathbf{G}).$ 

But we know the gap between  $\chi(G)$  and  $\chi_{\ell}(G)$  can be arbitrarily large:  $\chi_{\ell}(K_{k,t}) = k + 1$  when  $t \ge k^k$ .

# List Chromatic Number

- The list chromatic number of a graph G, written *χ*<sub>ℓ</sub>(G), is the smallest k such that G is L-colorable whenever |L(v)| ≥ k for each v ∈ V(G).
- When χ<sub>ℓ</sub>(G) = k we say that G has list chromatic number k or that G is k-choosable.
- We immediately have that if χ(G) is the typical chromatic number of a graph G, then

 $\chi(\mathbf{G}) \leq \chi_{\ell}(\mathbf{G}).$ 

But we know the gap between  $\chi(G)$  and  $\chi_{\ell}(G)$  can be arbitrarily large:  $\chi_{\ell}(K_{k,t}) = k + 1$  when  $t \ge k^k$ .

# List Chromatic Number

- The list chromatic number of a graph G, written *χ*<sub>ℓ</sub>(G), is the smallest k such that G is L-colorable whenever |L(v)| ≥ k for each v ∈ V(G).
- When χ<sub>ℓ</sub>(G) = k we say that G has list chromatic number k or that G is k-choosable.
- We immediately have that if χ(G) is the typical chromatic number of a graph G, then

 $\chi(G) \leq \chi_{\ell}(G).$ 

But we know the gap between  $\chi(G)$  and  $\chi_{\ell}(G)$  can be arbitrarily large:  $\chi_{\ell}(K_{k,t}) = k + 1$  when  $t \ge k^k$ .



# **DP-Coloring**

- In 2015, Dvořák and Postle introduced DP-coloring (they called it correspondence coloring) of graphs.
- Intuitively, DP-coloring considers the worst-case scenario of how many colors we need in the lists if we no longer can identify the names of the colors. Each vertex still gets a list of colors but identification of which colors are different can vary from edge to edge.
- A cover of G is a pair H = (L, H) consisting of a graph H and a function L : V(G) → P(V(H)) satisfying:

(1) the set  $\{L(u) : u \in V(G)\}$  is a partition of V(H); (2) for every  $u \in V(G)$ , the graph H[L(u)] is complete; (3) if  $E_H(L(u), L(v))$  is nonempty, then u = v or  $uv \in E(G)$ ; (4) if  $uv \in E(G)$ , then  $E_H(L(u), L(v))$  is a matching (the matching may be empty).

# **DP-Coloring**

- In 2015, Dvořák and Postle introduced DP-coloring (they called it correspondence coloring) of graphs.
- Intuitively, DP-coloring considers the worst-case scenario of how many colors we need in the lists if we no longer can identify the names of the colors. Each vertex still gets a list of colors but identification of which colors are different can vary from edge to edge.
- A cover of G is a pair H = (L, H) consisting of a graph H and a function L : V(G) → P(V(H)) satisfying:

(1) the set { $L(u) : u \in V(G)$ } is a partition of V(H); (2) for every  $u \in V(G)$ , the graph H[L(u)] is complete; (3) if  $E_H(L(u), L(v))$  is nonempty, then u = v or  $uv \in E(G)$ ; (4) if  $uv \in E(G)$ , then  $E_H(L(u), L(v))$  is a matching (the matching may be empty).

# (DP-) Cover of a Graph

 A cover of G is a pair H = (L, H) consisting of a graph H and a function L : V(G) → P(V(H)) satisfying:

(1) the set { $L(u) : u \in V(G)$ } is a partition of V(H); (2) for every  $u \in V(G)$ , the graph H[L(u)] is complete; (3) if  $E_H(L(u), L(v))$  is nonempty, then u = v or  $uv \in E(G)$ ; (4) if  $uv \in E(G)$ , then  $E_H(L(u), L(v))$  is a matching (the matching may be empty).

#### • Intuition:

Blow up each vertex u in G into a clique of size |L(u)|; Add a matching (possibly empty) between any two such cliques for vertices u and v if uv is an edge in G.

# (DP-) Cover of a Graph

#### • Intuition:

Blow up each vertex u in G into a clique of size |L(u)|; Add a matching (possibly empty) between any two such cliques for vertices u and v if uv is an edge in G.

- A cover  $\mathcal{H} = (L, H)$  is called *m*-fold if |L(u)| = m for all *u*.
- Two 2-fold covers of C<sub>4</sub>:



# DP-Chromatic Number of a Graph

- Given H = (L, H), a cover of G, an H-coloring of G is an independent set in H of size |V(G)|.
- The DP-chromatic number of a graph G, χ<sub>DP</sub>(G), is the smallest m such that G admits an H-coloring for every m-fold cover H of G.

•  $\chi_{DP}(C_4) > 2 = \chi_{\ell}(C_4)$ :

# DP-Chromatic Number of a Graph

- Given H = (L, H), a cover of G, an H-coloring of G is an independent set in H of size |V(G)|.
- The DP-chromatic number of a graph G, χ<sub>DP</sub>(G), is the smallest m such that G admits an H-coloring for every m-fold cover H of G.

•  $\chi_{DP}(C_4) > 2 = \chi_{\ell}(C_4)$ :

# DP-Chromatic Number of a Graph

- Given H = (L, H), a cover of G, an H-coloring of G is an independent set in H of size |V(G)|.
- The DP-chromatic number of a graph G, χ<sub>DP</sub>(G), is the smallest m such that G admits an H-coloring for every m-fold cover H of G.

• 
$$\chi_{DP}(C_4) > 2 = \chi_{\ell}(C_4)$$
:



# **DP-Coloring and List Coloring**

Given an *m*-assignment, *L*, for a graph *G*, it is easy to construct an *m*-fold cover *H* of *G* such that:
 *G* has an *H*-coloring if and only if *G* has a proper



•  $\chi(G) \leq \chi_{\ell}(G) \leq \chi_{DP}(G)$ .

- The chromatic polynomial of *G*, *P*(*G*, *m*) equals the number of proper colorings of *G* with colors [*m*].
- P(G, L) be the number of proper L-colorings of G.
  The list color function P<sub>l</sub>(G, m) is the minimum value of P(G, L) over all possible m-assignments L for G.
- In general,  $P_{\ell}(G, m) \leq P(G, m)$ .
- $P(K_{2,4},2) = 2$ , and yet  $P_{\ell}(K_{2,4},2) = 0$ . •  $P_{\ell}(K_{3,26},3) \le 3^8 2^{12} < 3^1 2^{26} \le P(K_{3,26},3)$ .

- The chromatic polynomial of *G*, *P*(*G*, *m*) equals the number of proper colorings of *G* with colors [*m*].
- P(G, L) be the number of proper L-colorings of G. The list color function P<sub>ℓ</sub>(G, m) is the minimum value of P(G, L) over all possible m-assignments L for G.
- In general,  $P_{\ell}(G, m) \leq P(G, m)$ .
- $P(K_{2,4},2) = 2$ , and yet  $P_{\ell}(K_{2,4},2) = 0$ .
- $P_{\ell}(K_{3,26},3) \le 3^8 2^{12} < 3^1 2^{26} \le P(K_{3,26},3).$

- The chromatic polynomial of *G*, *P*(*G*, *m*) equals the number of proper colorings of *G* with colors [*m*].
- P(G, L) be the number of proper L-colorings of G. The list color function P<sub>ℓ</sub>(G, m) is the minimum value of P(G, L) over all possible m-assignments L for G.
- In general,  $P_{\ell}(G, m) \leq P(G, m)$ .

• 
$$P(K_{2,4},2) = 2$$
, and yet  $P_{\ell}(K_{2,4},2) = 0$ .

•  $P_{\ell}(K_{3,26},3) \leq 3^8 2^{12} < 3^1 2^{26} \leq P(K_{3,26},3).$ 

•  $P_{\ell}(G, m) \leq P(G, m)$ . And for some  $G, P_{\ell}(G, m) < P(G, m)$ 

•  $P_{\ell}(G, m)$  need not be a polynomial.

Theorem (Wang, Qian, Yan (2017); improving Thomassen (2009), Donner (1992)) For any connected graph G with t edges,  $P_{\ell}(G,m) = P(G,m)$  for  $m > \frac{t-1}{\ln(1+\sqrt{2})} \approx 1.135(t-1)$ .

Theorem (Kostochka, Sidorenko (1990); K., Mudrock (2021))

1)  $P_{\ell}(G,m) = P(G,m)$  for all m, if G is chordal. 2)  $P_{\ell}(C_n,m) = P(C_n,m) = (m-1)^n + (-1)^n(m-1)$  for all m. 3)  $P_{\ell}(C_n \lor K_k,m) = P(C_n \lor K_k,m)$  for all m.

•  $P_{\ell}(G, m) \leq P(G, m)$ . And for some  $G, P_{\ell}(G, m) < P(G, m)$ 

•  $P_{\ell}(G, m)$  need not be a polynomial.

Theorem (Wang, Qian, Yan (2017); improving Thomassen (2009), Donner (1992)) For any connected graph G with t edges,  $P_{\ell}(G,m) = P(G,m)$  for  $m > \frac{t-1}{\ln(1+\sqrt{2})} \approx 1.135(t-1)$ .

Theorem (Kostochka, Sidorenko (1990); K., Mudrock (2021))

1)  $P_{\ell}(G, m) = P(G, m)$  for all m, if G is chordal. 2)  $P_{\ell}(C_n, m) = P(C_n, m) = (m - 1)^n + (-1)^n (m - 1)$  for all m. 3)  $P_{\ell}(C_n \lor K_k, m) = P(C_n \lor K_k, m)$  for all m.

- For  $\mathcal{H} = (L, H)$ , a cover of graph *G*, we say  $P_{DP}(G, \mathcal{H})$  be the number of  $\mathcal{H}$ -colorings of *G*.
- The DP color function, P<sub>DP</sub>(G, m), is the minimum value of P<sub>DP</sub>(G, H) where the minimum is taken over all possible *m*-fold covers H of G.
- $P(C_4, 2) = P_{\ell}(C_4, 2) = 2$ , and yet  $P_{DP}(C_4, 2) = 0$ .
- In general,  $P_{DP}(G, m) \leq P_{\ell}(G, m) \leq P(G, m)$ .

- For H = (L, H), a cover of graph G, we say P<sub>DP</sub>(G, H) be the number of H-colorings of G.
- The DP color function, P<sub>DP</sub>(G, m), is the minimum value of P<sub>DP</sub>(G, H) where the minimum is taken over all possible *m*-fold covers H of G.

•  $P(C_4, 2) = P_{\ell}(C_4, 2) = 2$ , and yet  $P_{DP}(C_4, 2) = 0$ .

• In general,  $P_{DP}(G, m) \leq P_{\ell}(G, m) \leq P(G, m)$ .

- For H = (L, H), a cover of graph G, we say P<sub>DP</sub>(G, H) be the number of H-colorings of G.
- The DP color function, P<sub>DP</sub>(G, m), is the minimum value of P<sub>DP</sub>(G, H) where the minimum is taken over all possible *m*-fold covers H of G.

• 
$$P(C_4, 2) = P_{\ell}(C_4, 2) = 2$$
, and yet  $P_{DP}(C_4, 2) = 0$ .

• In general,  $P_{DP}(G, m) \leq P_{\ell}(G, m) \leq P(G, m)$ .

- For  $\mathcal{H} = (L, H)$ , a cover of graph *G*, we say  $P_{DP}(G, \mathcal{H})$  be the number of  $\mathcal{H}$ -colorings of *G*.
- The DP color function, P<sub>DP</sub>(G, m), is the minimum value of P<sub>DP</sub>(G, H) where the minimum is taken over all possible *m*-fold covers H of G.

• 
$$P(C_4, 2) = P_{\ell}(C_4, 2) = 2$$
, and yet  $P_{DP}(C_4, 2) = 0$ .

• In general,  $P_{DP}(G, m) \leq P_{\ell}(G, m) \leq P(G, m)$ .

# A Natural Question

#### We know:

### Theorem (Wang, Qian, Yan (2017)) For any connected graph G with t edges, $P_{\ell}(G,m) = P(G,m)$ for $m > \frac{t-1}{\ln(1+\sqrt{2})} \approx 1.135(t-1)$ .

 For every graph G, does P<sub>DP</sub>(G, m) = P(G, m) for sufficiently large m?

## A Natural Question

#### We know:

Theorem (Wang, Qian, Yan (2017)) For any connected graph *G* with *t* edges,  $P_{\ell}(G,m) = P(G,m)$  for  $m > \frac{t-1}{\ln(1+\sqrt{2})} \approx 1.135(t-1)$ .

 For every graph G, does P<sub>DP</sub>(G, m) = P(G, m) for sufficiently large m?

# DP Color Function is different

#### Theorem (K., Mudrock (2021))

If G is a graph with girth that is even, then there is an N such that  $P_{DP}(G, m) < P(G, m)$  whenever  $m \ge N$ .

Furthermore, for any integer  $g \ge 3$  there exists a graph M with girth g and an N such that  $P_{DP}(M, m) < P(M, m)$  whenever  $m \ge N$ .

Theorem (K., Mudrock (2021)) If G is a graph with girth that is even, then there is an N such that  $P_{DP}(G, m) < P(G, m)$  whenever  $m \ge N$ .

Proposition (K., Mudrock (2021))  $P_{DP}(G,m) \leq \frac{m^n(m-1)^{|E(G)|}}{m^{|E(G)|}}$  for all m.

Lemma (from Whitney's Broken Circuit Theorem (1932)) *G* be a connected graph on *n* vertices and *s* edges with girth *g*. Suppose  $P(G, m) = \sum_{i=0}^{n} (-1)^{i} a_{i} m^{n-i}$ . Then, for i = 0, 1, ..., g - 2  $a_{i} = {s \choose i}$  and  $a_{g-1} = {s \choose g-1} - t$ , where *t* is the number of cycles of length *g* contained in *G*.

Theorem (K., Mudrock (2021)) If G is a graph with girth that is even, then there is an N such that  $P_{DP}(G, m) < P(G, m)$  whenever  $m \ge N$ .

Proposition (K., Mudrock (2021))  $P_{DP}(G, m) \leq \frac{m^n(m-1)^{|E(G)|}}{m^{|E(G)|}}$  for all m.

Lemma (from Whitney's Broken Circuit Theorem (1932)) *G* be a connected graph on *n* vertices and *s* edges with girth *g*. Suppose  $P(G,m) = \sum_{i=0}^{n} (-1)^{i} a_{i} m^{n-i}$ . Then, for i = 0, 1, ..., g - 2  $a_{i} = {s \choose i}$  and  $a_{g-1} = {s \choose g-1} - t$ , where *t* is the number of cycles of length *g* contained in *G*.

Theorem (K., Mudrock (2021)) If G is a graph with girth that is even, then there is an N such that  $P_{DP}(G, m) < P(G, m)$  whenever  $m \ge N$ .

Proposition (K., Mudrock (2021))  $P_{DP}(G, m) \leq \frac{m^n(m-1)^{|E(G)|}}{m^{|E(G)|}}$  for all m.

Lemma (from Whitney's Broken Circuit Theorem (1932)) *G* be a connected graph on *n* vertices and *s* edges with girth *g*. Suppose  $P(G, m) = \sum_{i=0}^{n} (-1)^{i} a_{i} m^{n-i}$ . Then, for i = 0, 1, ..., g - 2  $a_{i} = {s \choose i}$  and  $a_{g-1} = {s \choose g-1} - t$ , where *t* is the number of cycles of length *g* contained in *G*.

# Siderenko's Conjecture for DP-coloring

Proposition (K., Mudrock (2021))  $P_{DP}(G, m) \leq \frac{m^n(m-1)^{|E(G)|}}{m^{|E(G)|}}$  for all m.

 This upper bound is the same as the lower bound on P(G, m) when G is bipartite, as claimed by the well-known Sidorenko's conjecture on counting homomorphisms from bipartite graphs.

Corollary (K., Mudrock (2021)) For any connected graph G,  $P_{DP}(G,m) = \frac{m^{|V(G)|}(m-1)^{|\mathcal{E}(G)|}}{m^{|\mathcal{E}(G)|}}$  for all m if and only if G is a tree.

# Siderenko's Conjecture for DP-coloring

Proposition (K., Mudrock (2021))  $P_{DP}(G, m) \leq \frac{m^n(m-1)^{|E(G)|}}{m^{|E(G)|}}$  for all m.

 This upper bound is the same as the lower bound on P(G, m) when G is bipartite, as claimed by the well-known Sidorenko's conjecture on counting homomorphisms from bipartite graphs.

Corollary (K., Mudrock (2021)) For any connected graph G,  $P_{DP}(G,m) = \frac{m^{|V(G)|}(m-1)^{|\mathcal{E}(G)|}}{m^{|\mathcal{E}(G)|}}$  for all *m* if and only if G is a tree.

Proposition (K., Mudrock (2021))  $P_{DP}(G, m) \leq \frac{m^n(m-1)^{|E(G)|}}{m^{|E(G)|}}$  for all m.

- Form an *m*-fold cover, (*L*, *H*), of *G* by the following (partially random) process.
- Create cliques of order *m* in *H* corresponding to each vertex. Then, uniformly at random choose a perfect matching between any two cliques corresponding to a pair of adjacent vertices in *G*.
- There are  $m^n$  ways to select one vertex from each clique. If u and v are in two different cliques connected by a matching, the probability that u and v are not adjacent in His: 1 - 1/m.
- The expression above is the expected number of (*L*, *H*)-colorings of *G*.

Proposition (K., Mudrock (2021))  $P_{DP}(G, m) \leq \frac{m^n(m-1)^{|E(G)|}}{m^{|E(G)|}}$  for all m.

- Form an *m*-fold cover, (*L*, *H*), of *G* by the following (partially random) process.
- Create cliques of order *m* in *H* corresponding to each vertex. Then, uniformly at random choose a perfect matching between any two cliques corresponding to a pair of adjacent vertices in *G*.
- There are  $m^n$  ways to select one vertex from each clique. If u and v are in two different cliques connected by a matching, the probability that u and v are not adjacent in His: 1 - 1/m.
- The expression above is the expected number of (*L*, *H*)-colorings of *G*.

Proposition (K., Mudrock (2021))  $P_{DP}(G, m) \leq \frac{m^n(m-1)^{|E(G)|}}{m^{|E(G)|}}$  for all m.

- Form an *m*-fold cover, (*L*, *H*), of *G* by the following (partially random) process.
- Create cliques of order *m* in *H* corresponding to each vertex. Then, uniformly at random choose a perfect matching between any two cliques corresponding to a pair of adjacent vertices in *G*.
- There are  $m^n$  ways to select one vertex from each clique. If u and v are in two different cliques connected by a matching, the probability that u and v are not adjacent in His: 1 - 1/m.
- The expression above is the expected number of (*L*, *H*)-colorings of *G*.

Proposition (K., Mudrock (2021))  $P_{DP}(G,m) \leq \frac{m^n(m-1)^{|E(G)|}}{m^{|E(G)|}}$  for all m.

- Form an *m*-fold cover, (*L*, *H*), of *G* by the following (partially random) process.
- Create cliques of order *m* in *H* corresponding to each vertex. Then, uniformly at random choose a perfect matching between any two cliques corresponding to a pair of adjacent vertices in *G*.
- There are  $m^n$  ways to select one vertex from each clique. If u and v are in two different cliques connected by a matching, the probability that u and v are not adjacent in His: 1 - 1/m.
- The expression above is the expected number of (*L*, *H*)-colorings of *G*.

Theorem (K., Mudrock (2021))

For any integer  $g \ge 3$  there exists a graph M with girth g and an N such that  $P_{DP}(M, m) < P(M, m)$  whenever  $m \ge N$ .

Proposition (K., Mudrock (2021)) Let G be a graph with  $e \in E(G)$ . If  $m \ge 2$  and  $P(G - \{e\}, m) < \frac{m}{m-1}P(G, m)$ , then  $P_{DP}(G, m) < P(G, m)$ .

Theorem (K., Mudrock (2021))

Let  $G_2$  be any graph and  $G_1 = C_{2k+2}$  with exactly two vertices and one edge in common, and denote  $G = G_1 \oplus G_2$ . Then,  $P_{DP}(G, m) < P(G, m)$  whenever  $m \ge \max\{2, \chi(G_2)\}$ .

Theorem (K., Mudrock (2021))

For any integer  $g \ge 3$  there exists a graph M with girth g and an N such that  $P_{DP}(M, m) < P(M, m)$  whenever  $m \ge N$ .

#### Proposition (K., Mudrock (2021))

Let G be a graph with  $e \in E(G)$ . If  $m \ge 2$  and  $P(G - \{e\}, m) < \frac{m}{m-1}P(G, m)$ , then  $P_{DP}(G, m) < P(G, m)$ .

#### Theorem (K., Mudrock (2021))

Let  $G_2$  be any graph and  $G_1 = C_{2k+2}$  with exactly two vertices and one edge in common, and denote  $G = G_1 \oplus G_2$ . Then,  $P_{DP}(G, m) < P(G, m)$  whenever  $m \ge \max\{2, \chi(G_2)\}$ .

### Second Natural Question

- For which graphs G does  $P_{DP}(G, m) = P(G, m)$  for all m?
- For which graphs *G* does there exist *N* such that  $P_{DP}(G, m) = P(G, m)$  for all  $m \ge N$ ?

Theorem (K., Mudrock (2021)) If G is chordal, then  $P_{DP}(G, m) = P(G, m)$  for every m.

• a straightforward application of perfect elimination ordering.

## Second Natural Question

- For which graphs G does  $P_{DP}(G, m) = P(G, m)$  for all m?
- For which graphs *G* does there exist *N* such that  $P_{DP}(G, m) = P(G, m)$  for all  $m \ge N$ ?

Theorem (K., Mudrock (2021)) If G is chordal, then  $P_{DP}(G, m) = P(G, m)$  for every m.

a straightforward application of perfect elimination ordering.

- Let *H* = (*L*, *H*) be an *m*-fold cover of *G*. We say that *H* has a canonical labeling if it is possible to name the vertices of *H* so that *L*(*u*) = {(*u*, *j*) : *j* ∈ [*m*]} and (*u*, *j*)(*v*, *j*) ∈ *E*(*H*) for each *j* ∈ [*m*] whenever *uv* ∈ *E*(*G*).
- When  $\mathcal{H}$  has a canonical labeling, *G* has an  $\mathcal{H}$ -coloring if and only if *G* has a proper *m*-coloring.
- Trees have a canonical labeling.
- Using canonical labeling, we can develop tools to handle graphs that are close to being a forest.

- Let *H* = (*L*, *H*) be an *m*-fold cover of *G*. We say that *H* has a canonical labeling if it is possible to name the vertices of *H* so that *L*(*u*) = {(*u*, *j*) : *j* ∈ [*m*]} and (*u*, *j*)(*v*, *j*) ∈ *E*(*H*) for each *j* ∈ [*m*] whenever *uv* ∈ *E*(*G*).
- When  $\mathcal{H}$  has a canonical labeling, *G* has an  $\mathcal{H}$ -coloring if and only if *G* has a proper *m*-coloring.
- Trees have a canonical labeling.
- Using canonical labeling, we can develop tools to handle graphs that are close to being a forest.

# • A sharp bound when <u>removing an edge</u> gives us a canonical labeling.

Lemma (K., Mudrock (2021)) Let  $\mathcal{H} = (L, H)$  be an m-fold cover of G with  $m \ge 2$ . Suppose  $e = uv \in E(G)$ . Let  $H' = H - E_H(L(u), L(v))$  so that  $\mathcal{H}' = (L, H')$  is an m-fold cover of  $G - \{e\}$ . If  $\mathcal{H}'$  has a canonical labeling, then  $P_{DP}(G, \mathcal{H}) \ge P(G - e, m) - \max \left\{ P(G - e, m) - P(G, m), \frac{P(G,m)}{m-1} \right\}$ Moreover, there exists an m-fold cover of G,  $\mathcal{H}^* = (L, H^*)$ , s.t.  $P_{DP}(G, \mathcal{H}^*) = P(G - e, m) - \max \left\{ P(G - e, m) - P(G, m), \frac{P(G,m)}{m-1} \right\}$ 

Next, a sharp bound when <u>removing an induced P<sub>3</sub></u>.

• A sharp bound when <u>removing an edge</u> gives us a canonical labeling.

Lemma (K., Mudrock (2021)) Let  $\mathcal{H} = (L, H)$  be an m-fold cover of G with  $m \ge 2$ . Suppose  $e = uv \in E(G)$ . Let  $H' = H - E_H(L(u), L(v))$  so that  $\mathcal{H}' = (L, H')$  is an m-fold cover of  $G - \{e\}$ . If  $\mathcal{H}'$  has a canonical labeling, then  $P_{DP}(G, \mathcal{H}) \ge P(G - e, m) - \max \left\{ P(G - e, m) - P(G, m), \frac{P(G,m)}{m-1} \right\}$ Moreover, there exists an m-fold cover of G,  $\mathcal{H}^* = (L, H^*)$ , s.t.  $P_{DP}(G, \mathcal{H}^*) = P(G - e, m) - \max \left\{ P(G - e, m) - P(G, m), \frac{P(G,m)}{m-1} \right\}$ .

Next, a sharp bound when <u>removing an induced P<sub>3</sub></u>.

• A sharp bound when <u>removing an edge</u> gives us a canonical labeling.

Lemma (K., Mudrock (2021)) Let  $\mathcal{H} = (L, H)$  be an m-fold cover of G with  $m \ge 2$ . Suppose  $e = uv \in E(G)$ . Let  $H' = H - E_H(L(u), L(v))$  so that  $\mathcal{H}' = (L, H')$  is an m-fold cover of  $G - \{e\}$ . If  $\mathcal{H}'$  has a canonical labeling, then  $P_{DP}(G, \mathcal{H}) \ge P(G - e, m) - \max \left\{ P(G - e, m) - P(G, m), \frac{P(G,m)}{m-1} \right\}$ Moreover, there exists an m-fold cover of G,  $\mathcal{H}^* = (L, H^*)$ , s.t.  $P_{DP}(G, \mathcal{H}^*) = P(G - e, m) - \max \left\{ P(G - e, m) - P(G, m), \frac{P(G,m)}{m-1} \right\}$ .

Next, a sharp bound when <u>removing an induced P<sub>3</sub></u>.

#### Lemma (K., Mudrock (2021))

Let  $\mathcal{H} = (L, H)$  be an *m*-fold cover of *G* with  $m \ge 3$ . Let  $e_1, e_2$  be the edges of an induced path *P* of length two. Let  $G_0 = G - \{e_1, e_2\}, G_1 = G - e_1, G_2 = G - e_2$ , and  $G^*$  be the graph obtained by making *P* into  $K_3$ . Suppose  $\mathcal{H}'$ , the *m*-fold cover of  $G_0$  induced by  $\mathcal{H}$ , has a canonical labeling. Let

$$\begin{split} A_{1} &= P(G_{0},m) - P(G,m), A_{2} = P(G_{0},m) - P(G_{2},m) + \frac{1}{m-1}P(G,m), \\ A_{3} &= P(G_{0},m) - P(G_{1},m) + \frac{1}{m-1}P(G,m), \\ A_{4} &= \frac{1}{m-1}\left(P(G_{1},m) + P(G_{2},m) + P(G^{*},m) - P(G,m)\right), \text{ and} \\ A_{5} &= \frac{1}{m-1}\left(P(G_{1},m) + P(G_{2},m) - \frac{1}{m-2}P(G^{*},m)\right). \end{split}$$

Then,  $P_{DP}(G, \mathcal{H}) \ge P(G_0, m) - \max\{A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4, A_5\}$ . Moreover, there exists an m-fold cover of G that achieves equality

# **Unicyclic Graphs**

- A unicyclic graph is a connected graph containing exactly one cycle.
- If G is a unicyclic graph on n vertices that contains a cycle on t vertices, then
  P(G, m) = (m 1)<sup>n</sup> + (-1)<sup>t</sup>(m 1)<sup>n-t+1</sup>

Theorem (K., Mudrock (2021)) Suppose G is a unicyclic graph on n vertice

(1) If G contains a cycle on 2k + 1 vertices, then  $P_{DP}(G, m) = P(G, m)$  for all m.

(2) If G contains a cycle on 2k + 2 vertices, then  $P_{DP}(G,m) = (m-1)^n - (m-1)^{n-2k-2}$  for all  $m \ge 2$ .

# **Unicyclic Graphs**

- A unicyclic graph is a connected graph containing exactly one cycle.
- If G is a unicyclic graph on n vertices that contains a cycle on t vertices, then P(G, m) = (m−1)<sup>n</sup> + (−1)<sup>t</sup>(m−1)<sup>n−t+1</sup>

Theorem (K., Mudrock (2021))

Suppose G is a unicyclic graph on n vertices.

(1) If G contains a cycle on 2k + 1 vertices, then  $P_{DP}(G, m) = P(G, m)$  for all m.

(2) If G contains a cycle on 2k + 2 vertices, then  $P_{DP}(G, m) = (m - 1)^n - (m - 1)^{n-2k-2}$  for all  $m \ge 2$ .

# Theta Graphs

 A Generalized Theta graph Θ(*l*<sub>1</sub>,...,*l<sub>k</sub>*) consists of a pair of end vertices joined by *k* internally disjoint paths of lengths *l*<sub>1</sub>,...,*l<sub>k</sub>*. Θ(*l*<sub>1</sub>,*l*<sub>2</sub>,*l*<sub>3</sub>) is simply called a Theta graph.

• 
$$P(\Theta(l_1,\ldots,l_k),m) = \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{k}((m-1)^{l_i+1}+(-1)^{l_i+1}(m-1))}{(m(m-1))^{k-1}} + \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{k}((m-1)^{l_i}+(-1)^{l_i}(m-1))}{m^{k-1}}.$$

• Widely studied for many graph theoretic problems and are the main subject of two classical papers on the chromatic polynomial by Sokal, which include the celebrated result that the zeros of the chromatic polynomials of the Generalized Theta graphs are dense in the whole complex plane with the possible exception of the unit disc around the origin (by including the join of Generalized Theta graphs with  $K_2$  this extends to all of the complex plane).

# Theta Graphs

 A Generalized Theta graph Θ(*l*<sub>1</sub>,...,*l<sub>k</sub>*) consists of a pair of end vertices joined by *k* internally disjoint paths of lengths *l*<sub>1</sub>,...,*l<sub>k</sub>*. Θ(*l*<sub>1</sub>,*l*<sub>2</sub>,*l*<sub>3</sub>) is simply called a Theta graph.

• 
$$P(\Theta(l_1,\ldots,l_k),m) = \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{k}((m-1)^{l_i+1}+(-1)^{l_i+1}(m-1))}{(m(m-1))^{k-1}} + \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{k}((m-1)^{l_i}+(-1)^{l_i}(m-1))}{m^{k-1}}.$$

• Widely studied for many graph theoretic problems and are the main subject of two classical papers on the chromatic polynomial by Sokal, which include the celebrated result that the zeros of the chromatic polynomials of the Generalized Theta graphs are dense in the whole complex plane with the possible exception of the unit disc around the origin (by including the join of Generalized Theta graphs with  $K_2$  this extends to all of the complex plane).

# **Theta Graphs**

Extending results of K. and Mudrock (2021),

Theorem (Halberg, K., Liu, Mudrock, Shin, Thomason (2021+)) Let  $G = \Theta(l_1, l_2, l_3)$  and  $2 \le l_1 \le l_2 \le l_3$ .

(1) If the parity of  $I_1$  is different from both  $I_2$  and  $I_3$ , then  $P_{DP}(G,m) = P(G,m)$  for all m.

(2) If the parity of  $l_1$  is the same as  $l_2$  and different from  $l_3$ , then for  $m \ge 2$ :  $P_{DP}(G, m) = \frac{1}{m} \left[ (m-1)^{l_1+l_2+l_3} + (m-1)^{l_1} - (m-1)^{l_2+1} - (m-1)^{l_3} + (-1)^{l_3+1}(m-2) \right].$ 

(3) If the parity of  $l_1$  is the same as  $l_3$  and different from  $l_2$ , then for  $m \ge 2$ :  $P_{DP}(G, m) = \frac{1}{m} \left[ (m-1)^{l_1+l_2+l_3} + (m-1)^{l_1} - (m-1)^{l_3+1} - (m-1)^{l_2} + (-1)^{l_2+1}(m-2) \right].$ 

(4) If  $l_1$ ,  $l_2$  and  $l_3$  all have the same parity, then for  $m \ge 3$ :  $P_{DP}(G, m) = \frac{1}{m} \left[ (m-1)^{l_1+l_2+l_3} - (m-1)^{l_1} - (m-1)^{l_2} - (m-1)^{l_3} + 2(-1)^{l_1+l_2+l_3} \right].$ 

### **Two Fundamental Questions**

• For which graphs *G* does there exist *N* such that  $P_{DP}(G, m) = P(G, m)$  for all  $m \ge N$ ?

Given a graph G does there always exist an N ∈ N and a polynomial p(m) such that P<sub>DP</sub>(G, m) = p(m) whenever m ≥ N?

### **Two Fundamental Questions**

• For which graphs *G* does there exist *N* such that  $P_{DP}(G, m) = P(G, m)$  for all  $m \ge N$ ?

Given a graph G does there always exist an N ∈ N and a polynomial p(m) such that P<sub>DP</sub>(G, m) = p(m) whenever m ≥ N?

#### **Generalized Theta Graphs**

Theorem (Halberg, K., Liu, Mudrock, Shin, Thomason (2021+)) Let  $G = \Theta(l_1, \ldots, l_k)$  where  $k \ge 2$ ,  $l_1 \le \cdots \le l_k$ , and  $l_2 \ge 2$ .

(i) If there is a  $j \in \{2, ..., k\}$  such that  $I_1$  and  $I_j$  have the same parity, then there is an  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $P_{DP}(G, m) < P(G, m)$  for all  $m \ge N$ .

(ii) If  $I_1$  and  $I_j$  have different parity for each  $j \in \{2, ..., k\}$ , then there is an  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $P_{DP}(G, m) = P(G, m)$  for all  $m \ge N$ .

 Statement (i) does not answer the question of whether *P<sub>DP</sub>(G, m)* equals a polynomial for sufficiently large *m*. To answer that question, we study the DP color function of a class of graphs that contains all Generalized Theta graphs.

#### **Generalized Theta Graphs**

Theorem (Halberg, K., Liu, Mudrock, Shin, Thomason (2021+)) Let  $G = \Theta(l_1, \ldots, l_k)$  where  $k \ge 2$ ,  $l_1 \le \cdots \le l_k$ , and  $l_2 \ge 2$ .

(i) If there is a  $j \in \{2, ..., k\}$  such that  $I_1$  and  $I_j$  have the same parity, then there is an  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $P_{DP}(G, m) < P(G, m)$  for all  $m \ge N$ .

(ii) If  $I_1$  and  $I_j$  have different parity for each  $j \in \{2, ..., k\}$ , then there is an  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $P_{DP}(G, m) = P(G, m)$  for all  $m \ge N$ .

 Statement (i) does not answer the question of whether *P<sub>DP</sub>(G, m)* equals a polynomial for sufficiently large *m*. To answer that question, we study the DP color function of a class of graphs that contains all Generalized Theta graphs.

# Graphs with a Feedback Vertex Set of Order One

• A feedback vertex set of a graph is a subset of vertices whose removal makes the resulting induced subgraph acyclic. Clearly, a Generalized Theta graph has a feedback vertex set of size one.

Theorem (Halberg, K., Liu, Mudrock, Shin, Thomason (2021+)) Let *G* be a graph with a feedback vertex set of order one. Then there exists *N* and a polynomial p(m) such that  $P_{DP}(G, m) = p(m)$  for all  $m \ge N$ .

We consider a decomposition *G* into a star *G*<sub>1</sub> and a spanning forest *G*<sub>0</sub>, and then carefully count the number of *H*<sub>0</sub>-colorings of *G*<sub>0</sub> that are not *H*-colorings of *G*, where *H*<sub>0</sub> is the *m*-fold cover of *G*<sub>0</sub> induced by a given *m*-fold cover *H* of *G*.

# Graphs with a Feedback Vertex Set of Order One

• A feedback vertex set of a graph is a subset of vertices whose removal makes the resulting induced subgraph acyclic. Clearly, a Generalized Theta graph has a feedback vertex set of size one.

Theorem (Halberg, K., Liu, Mudrock, Shin, Thomason (2021+)) Let *G* be a graph with a feedback vertex set of order one. Then there exists *N* and a polynomial p(m) such that  $P_{DP}(G, m) = p(m)$  for all  $m \ge N$ .

We consider a decomposition *G* into a star *G*<sub>1</sub> and a spanning forest *G*<sub>0</sub>, and then carefully count the number of *H*<sub>0</sub>-colorings of *G*<sub>0</sub> that are not *H*-colorings of *G*, where *H*<sub>0</sub> is the *m*-fold cover of *G*<sub>0</sub> induced by a given *m*-fold cover *H* of *G*.

**Theorem (Halberg, K., Liu, Mudrock, Shin, Thomason (2021+))** Let *G* be a graph with a feedback vertex set of order one. Then there exists *N* and a polynomial p(m) s.t.  $P_{DP}(G, m) = p(m)$  for all  $m \ge N$ .

- There is no explicit formula for the polynomial p(m) but we know its three highest degree terms are the same as P(G, m).
- By extension of results of and answering a question of K. and Mudrock (2021),

Theorem (Mudrock, Thomason (2021+))

For any graph G,  $P(G, m) - P_{DP}(G, m) = O(m^{n-3})$  as  $m \to \infty$ .

**Theorem (Halberg, K., Liu, Mudrock, Shin, Thomason (2021+))** Let *G* be a graph with a feedback vertex set of order one. Then there exists *N* and a polynomial p(m) s.t.  $P_{DP}(G, m) = p(m)$  for all  $m \ge N$ .

- There is no explicit formula for the polynomial p(m) but we know its three highest degree terms are the same as P(G, m).
- By extension of results of and answering a question of K. and Mudrock (2021),

Theorem (Mudrock, Thomason (2021+))

For any graph G,  $P(G, m) - P_{DP}(G, m) = O(m^{n-3})$  as  $m \to \infty$ .

**Theorem (Halberg, K., Liu, Mudrock, Shin, Thomason (2021+))** Let *G* be a graph with a feedback vertex set of order one. Then there exists *N* and a polynomial p(m) s.t.  $P_{DP}(G, m) = p(m)$  for all  $m \ge N$ .

- The graphs above are a partial join of a vertex with a forest. What if we have a complete join?
- By extension of results of and answering a question of K. and Mudrock (2021),

#### **Theorem (Mudrock, Thomason (2021+))** There exists N s.t. $P_{DP}(K_1 \lor G, m) = P(K_1 \lor G, m)$ for $m \ge N$ .

• But, by our theorem for Generalized Theta Graphs, we know this conclusion (i.e., p(m) = P(G, m)) cannot hold for all graphs with a feedback vertex set of order one since the Theorem for graphs with a feedback vertex set of order one also applies to Generalized Theta graphs.

**Theorem (Halberg, K., Liu, Mudrock, Shin, Thomason (2021+))** Let *G* be a graph with a feedback vertex set of order one. Then there exists *N* and a polynomial p(m) s.t.  $P_{DP}(G, m) = p(m)$  for all  $m \ge N$ .

- The graphs above are a partial join of a vertex with a forest. What if we have a complete join?
- By extension of results of and answering a question of K. and Mudrock (2021),

#### Theorem (Mudrock, Thomason (2021+))

There exists N s.t.  $P_{DP}(K_1 \vee G, m) = P(K_1 \vee G, m)$  for  $m \ge N$ .

• But, by our theorem for Generalized Theta Graphs, we know this conclusion (i.e., p(m) = P(G, m)) cannot hold for all graphs with a feedback vertex set of order one since the Theorem for graphs with a feedback vertex set of order one also applies to Generalized Theta graphs.

# Thank You! Questions?

• For which graphs *G* does there exist *N* such that  $P_{DP}(G, m) = P(G, m)$  for all  $m \ge N$ ? In particular, also consider the situation when N = 1.

- Given a graph G does there always exist an N ∈ N and a polynomial p(m) such that P<sub>DP</sub>(G, m) = p(m) whenever m ≥ N?
- Study the <u>DP color function threshold of G</u>,  $\tau_{DP}(G)$ , the smallest  $N \ge \chi(G)$  such that  $P_{DP}(G, m) = P(G, m)$  whenever  $m \ge N$ .
- For a graph *G* such that  $P_{DP}(G, m_0) = P(G, m_0)$  for some  $m_0 \ge \chi(G)$ , is  $P_{DP}(G, m) = P(G, m)$  for all  $m \ge m_0$ ? The corresponding question for  $P_{\ell}(G, m)$ , the list color function is also open.

# Thank You!

#### **Questions?**

- For which graphs *G* does there exist *N* such that  $P_{DP}(G, m) = P(G, m)$  for all  $m \ge N$ ? In particular, also consider the situation when N = 1.
- Given a graph G does there always exist an N ∈ N and a polynomial p(m) such that P<sub>DP</sub>(G, m) = p(m) whenever m ≥ N?
- Study the <u>DP color function threshold of G</u>,  $\tau_{DP}(G)$ , the smallest  $N \ge \chi(G)$  such that  $P_{DP}(G, m) = P(G, m)$  whenever  $m \ge N$ .
- For a graph *G* such that  $P_{DP}(G, m_0) = P(G, m_0)$  for some  $m_0 \ge \chi(G)$ , is  $P_{DP}(G, m) = P(G, m)$  for all  $m \ge m_0$ ? The corresponding question for  $P_{\ell}(G, m)$ , the list color function, is also open.