

Colorings of unrooted tree-based networks and related graphs

Mirko Wilde

Institute of Mathematics and Computer Science,
University of Greifswald, Germany
mirko.wilde@uni-greifswald.de

Mareike Fischer

Institute of Mathematics and Computer Science,
University of Greifswald, Germany
mareike.fischer@uni-greifswald.de
email@mareikefischer.de

December 5, 2025

Abstract

In mathematical phylogenetics, evolutionary relationships are often represented by trees and networks. The latter are typically used whenever the relationships cannot be adequately described by a tree, which happens when so-called reticulate evolutionary events happen, such as horizontal gene transfer or hybridization. But as such events are known to be relatively rare for most species, evolution is sometimes thought of as a process that can be represented by a tree with some additional edges, i.e., with a network that is still “somewhat treelike”. In this context, different versions of so-called tree-based networks have played a major role in recent phylogenetic literature. Yet, surprisingly little is known about their combinatorial and graph-theoretic properties. In our manuscript, we answer a recently published question concerning the colorability of a specific class of tree-based networks. In particular, we will investigate an even more general class of graphs and show their 3-colorability. This nicely links recent phylogenetic concepts with classical graph theory.

1 Introduction

Understanding evolutionary relationships and their structures plays an important role in many research areas, e.g., concerning disease outbreaks [15], tumors [16], and even languages [9]. Mathematical phylogenetics is concerned with reconstructing these relationships from data (like DNA, RNA, or proteins), representing them with the help of graphs and analyzing properties of the latter. Traditionally, trees were used to depict evolutionary relationships [17], but during the past two decades, biologists have become more and more interested in phylogenetic networks [12]. This is due to the fact that trees are unsuitable to represent reticulate evolutionary events like horizontal gene transfer or hybridization, which cause cycles in the underlying graph.

On the other hand, reticulate events are known to be relatively rare for most species [13], which is why networks with “too many cycles” are usually not of high interest. In fact, evolution is often assumed to be mainly tree-like with a few additional edges [7]. This point of view led to the introduction of so-called tree-based networks, which have since played a

big role in recent phylogenetic literature, and different types of tree-based networks have been distinguished. Basically, a tree-based phylogenetic network is simply a leaf-labelled connected graph which has a spanning tree with certain properties – and depending on these properties, different types of such networks can be distinguished. We will elaborate this further in the course of this manuscript.

Due to the increasing interest in tree-based networks, unsurprisingly, various attempts have been made to understand their mathematical properties. For instance, it is known that tree-basedness can be decided in polynomial time for rooted networks [7], while it is an NP-complete problem for unrooted networks [6]. Moreover, some first attempts have been made to use classical graph theory to characterize certain sub-classes of tree-based networks [3], as, for instance, so-called edge-based networks, which are closely linked to series-parallel graphs [3, 4].

Yet only little is known about the colorability of tree-based networks, i.e., the question how many colors are at least needed to color the vertices of the network such that no two adjacent vertices have the same color – which is the so-called chromatic number of a graph. This is surprising on two levels: first, graph coloring is a very well established research topic in graph theory with plenty of results concerning the chromatic number of certain classes of graphs [2]. For instance, it is well-known that every tree is bipartite and can therefore be colored with at most two colors [2]. Second, certain types of coloring also play an important role in phylogenetics, e.g., leaf colorings and their extensions to all vertices (see, e.g., [18]).¹ Therefore, it is surprising that not much is known about the colorability of certain types of tree-based networks. An exception is the manuscript by Hendriksen [11], which gives interesting insight into the colorability about certain types of tree-based networks. However, this manuscript left the important question open whether a specific kind of such networks is always 3-colorable:

Question 1 (adapted from Question 5.4, [11]). *Let N be a strongly tree-based network. It is true that $\chi(N) \leq 3$?*

Note that the formal definition of the concepts required to understand Question 1 will be introduced subsequently. However, answering this question affirmatively is the main aim of our manuscript. In order to do so, we will use standard techniques from graph theory, such as Zykov operations, which we formally define and explain in the course of our manuscript.

Note that a positive answer to Question 1 strengthens the close relationship between trees, which are known to be 2-colorable², and tree-based networks even more. However, as certain tree-based networks are known to be not 3-colorable [11], the answer to Question 1 is not obvious. Moreover, as there are strongly tree-based networks which are not 2-colorable, the bound suggested by Question 1 is tight. In our manuscript, we will answer Question 1 on the 3-colorability of a certain type of these networks affirmatively, thus linking these networks more closely to trees. However, our main result does not only cover the aspired tree-based networks, but an even broader class of graphs which can be regarded as a generalization thereof. In particular, our approach uses similar ideas as the Zykov algorithms (cf. [14], [19]), which are well-known in graph theory but, to the best of our knowledge, have not yet been applied in mathematical phylogenetics. Along the way, we

¹However, it has to be noted that colorings in phylogenetics typically have a different flavor than in graph theory as typically neighboring vertices are not forbidden to be in the same color – in fact, often the leaf colors are given and the inner vertices of a given tree shall be colored such that the number of change edges, i.e., edges incident with two different colors, is minimized.

²This is due to the fact that trees are trivial examples of so-called *bipartite* graphs (cf. [2, Proposition 1.6.1]), which can easily be seen to be 2-colorable (cf. [2, Chapter 5, p. 119]).

derive some results based on greedy procedures, such as a generalization of a result by Hendriksen as well as a more intuitive proof of another one of his results. However, while the greedy approach only leads to $\chi(N) \leq 4$, it does not appear to be sufficient to lower this bound to $\chi(N) \leq 3$. Instead, answering Question 1 requires the described machinery from graph theory.

Our manuscript is structured as follows: In Section 2, we state all required definitions and relevant preliminary results known from the literature. In Section 3, we present our own results. Finally, Section 4 discusses and summarizes our findings and gives an outlook on future research.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we present all relevant concepts and known results needed to derive our own results later on.

2.1 Definitions and notions

In this subsection, we specify the terminology and definitions used throughout the manuscript. In most of the cases, we follow the standard terminology of Diestel [2].

Basic concepts from graph theory

We assume a graph $G = (V, E)$ to be a pair with $E \subseteq \binom{V}{2}$. If $V' \subseteq V$, and $E' \subseteq \binom{V'}{2}$, then $H = (V', E')$ is called *subgraph* of G , and we write $H \subseteq G$. Special kinds of subgraphs are given by the following constructions: For $W \subseteq V$ we define $G[W] = (W, E_W)$ as the graph with vertex set W and edge set $E_W = \{e \in E : e \subseteq W\}$. For $v \in V$ we define $G - v$ as $G[V(G) \setminus \{v\}]$. For $e \in E(G)$ we define $G - e$ as the graph $(V, E \setminus \{e\})$.

If G is a graph, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $f : V(G) \rightarrow \{1, \dots, k\}$ is a function, we call f a k -*coloring* of G if $f(x) \neq f(y)$ for each $\{x, y\} \in E$. The *chromatic number* $\chi(G)$ of a given graph G is defined as the minimum $k \in \mathbb{N}$ for which a k -coloring of G exists.

If $v \in V(G)$, then let $\deg_G(v) = |\{e \in E(G) : v \in e\}|$. Then, $\deg_G(v)$ is called the *degree* of v in G . If $X, Y \subseteq V(G)$, then $E_G(X, Y) = \{\{x, y\} \in E(G) : x \in X, y \in Y\}$. If $X \subseteq V(G)$, then the *neighborhood* of X in G , denoted by $N_G(X)$, is defined as $N_G(X) = \{v \in V(G) \setminus X : \{v, x\} \in E_G \text{ for some } x \in X\}$. If $X = \{v\}$ for some $v \in V(G)$, for brevity, we often write $N_G(v)$ instead of $N_G(\{v\})$ to denote this set. By K_n we denote the *complete graph* on n vertices defined as the graph with vertex set $V = \{1, \dots, n\}$ and edge set $E = \binom{V}{2}$. In case that G is a graph and K_n is isomorphic to a subgraph H of G , we call H a *clique* of G of size n or shortly *clique*. By $K_{n,m}$ we denote the *complete bipartite graph* on n, m defined as the graph with vertex set $V = A \cup B$ such that $A \cap B = \emptyset$, $|A| = n$, $|B| = m$ and such that it has edge set $E = \{\{a, b\} : a \in A, b \in B\}$.

Let $P = v_1, \dots, v_k$ be a sequence of vertices in V for some $k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$. Assume that $\{v_i, v_{i+1}\} \in E$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}$. If each vertex is contained at most once in this sequence, then P is called a *path*. If $k \geq 3$, each vertex with the exception of v_1 is contained at most once in P and $v_1 = v_k$ is contained twice, then P is called a *cycle*. As usual we call a graph G *connected* if for any two vertices $u, v \in V(G)$ there exists a path u, \dots, v in G . A maximal connected subgraph of G is called a *connected component*. If H is a maximal connected subgraph of G such that $H - v$ is connected for each $v \in V(H)$, then H is called a *block*. A block H with $|V(H)| = 2$ is called a *bridge*. If $|V(H)| > 2$, then H is called a *non-trivial block*. Note that an edge $e \in E(G)$ is a bridge if and only if $G - e$ is disconnected and that each cycle is contained in some non-trivial block. Moreover, in each non-trivial

block H for each two edges $e_1, e_2 \in E(H)$ there is some cycle in H which contains both of them (cf. Lemma 3.1.3 in [2]). This fact implies that in each non-trivial block H for each two vertices $v_1, v_2 \in E(H)$, there is some cycle in H which contains both of them (as H is non-trivial, there are $e_1, e_2 \in E(H)$ with $e_1 \neq e_2$ such that $v_i \in e_i (i = 1, 2)$).

Finally, we want to introduce some concepts known as *Zykov operations* in the literature [14, 19].

Definition 1 (Zykov operations). *Suppose that x and y are non-adjacent vertices in a graph G . Then we define the graphs G'_{xy} and G''_{xy} as follows:*

- G'_{xy} is obtained from G by an addition, i.e., by adding an edge joining x and y .
- G''_{xy} is obtained from G by an identification, i.e., by replacing the vertices x and y by a single new vertex v_{xy} and each edge $\{x, z\}$ or $\{y, z\}$ by an edge $\{v_{xy}, z\}$ (cf. Figure 6). In order to avoid parallel edges, if both edges $\{x, z\}, \{y, z\}$ are in $E(G)$, then only one edge $\{v_{xy}, z\}$ is added.

Both operations are called Zykov operations.

As we will elaborate later on, Zykov operations are well-known tools in graph theory to determine the chromatic number of graphs, which is why they will also prove to be useful in order to tackle Question 1. However, we first need to turn our attention to some more definitions.

Concepts concerning tree-based phylogenetic networks

Next, we introduce some formal definitions from mathematical phylogenetics needed throughout this manuscript. We here mainly follow the definitions and terms as used in [5].³ We start with phylogenetic trees and networks.

Definition 2 (Phylogenetic trees and networks). *Let N be a simple connected graph and let V^1 be the set of all vertices in N with degree 1. We refer to V^1 as the leaves of N . We assume that no vertex in N has degree 2. Moreover, let the elements of V^1 be bijectively labelled by some label set X . Then, N is called an unrooted phylogenetic network (or shortly network) on X . Furthermore, we call the elements of X the leaves or taxa of N . Also, if N contains no cycles, we call it a phylogenetic tree.*

Next, we define tree-basedness.

Definition 3 (Tree-based networks). *Let N be a phylogenetic network on X . We say that N is tree-based if it has a spanning tree T with leaf set X .*

An example for a tree-based network is given by Figure 1 on the left. However, it is important to note that the existence of a spanning tree is guaranteed for all connected graphs [2], so in particular for all phylogenetic networks. And it is also guaranteed that all leaves of N are leaves in every spanning tree T of N . The crucial part Definition 3 is thus that N is tree-based if it has a spanning tree T that *only* has X as its leaf set.

Now, the following concept is the most important concept of our manuscript: strongly tree-based networks. However, note that these networks are simply called tree-based networks in Hendriksen's manuscript [11].

³Note that Hendriksen's definitions [11] vary slightly – e.g., the definition of tree-based networks used in [5] coincides with his definition of *loosely* tree-based networks. This existing conflict in the literature stems from different approaches to generalize the binary setting, in which all inner vertices have degree 2, to the non-binary setting. We decided to stick with the notions used in [5] and adapted Hendriksen's question and definitions accordingly.




Figure 1: Here N_1 is an example for a tree-based network which is not strongly tree-based. This can be easily seen by realizing that each spanning tree T of N_1 cannot cover *all* the edges of the K_4 -subgraph of N_1 (as this would cause cycles), but this would be necessary for strong tree-basedness, because all of the inner vertices have degree 4 in N_1 . On the other hand, considering the spanning tree with edges highlighted in bold in the depiction of N_2 , it can be verified that N_2 is strongly tree-based. Note that the same spanning tree can be used to verify that N_1 is tree-based, even if not strongly.

Definition 4 (Strongly tree-based networks). *Let N be a tree-based network on X . We call N strongly tree-based, if there exists a spanning tree T in N with leaf set X such that every edge in N between vertices of degree 4 or more is an edge in T and every vertex of degree 2 in T is a vertex of degree 3 in N .*

An example for a strongly tree-based network is given by Figure 1 on the right.

As we formally state later on, our main aim is to prove the 3-colorability of strongly tree-based networks. However, before we can do that, we need some new definitions to prove our results.

New definitions required to prove of our main result

Our goal is to answer Question 1 affirmatively. However, instead of considering only strongly tree-based networks, our proof considers the following more general concept:

Definition 5 (k -basis and k -representation). *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph such that $V = A \cup B$ with $A \cap B = \emptyset$.*

1. *Let $\mathbf{b} : A \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(B)$ some arbitrary function. Then, we define a new graph H by setting $V(H) = V$ and $E(H) = E \cup \{\{a, z\} : a \in A, z \in \mathbf{b}(a)\}$. We call H the graph defined by the quadruple (G, A, B, \mathbf{b}) and say that (G, A, B, \mathbf{b}) represents H .*
2. *Let H be a graph and let G, A, B and \mathbf{b} be such that (G, A, B, \mathbf{b}) represents H . If additionally the following three conditions hold, we say that G is a k -basis and \mathbf{b} is a k -representation (of H):*
 - (a) *Let Z be a non-trivial block in G . Then $A \cap V(Z) = \emptyset$.*
 - (b) *$\deg_G(a) \geq 2$ for each $a \in A$.*
 - (c) *$\deg_G(a) + |\mathbf{b}(a)| \leq k$ for each $a \in A$.*
3. *Let H be a graph such that there exists some (G, A, B, \mathbf{b}) representing H for which G is a k -basis. Then we say that H has a k -basis.*

Informally speaking, if (G, A, B, \mathbf{b}) represents H , then the vertices of H can be labelled A or B in such a way that G is a subgraph of H , and all edges of H that are not in G connect an A -vertex with a B -vertex. Note that this already has the flavor of considering a subgraph and adding some specific edges to derive the full graph – just as we want to derive a phylogenetic network N by taking a spanning tree and adding specific edges. However, in order to illustrate the somewhat technical Definition 5, in Figure 2 we give an example of a graph H represented by four pairs $(G_i, A_i, B_i, \mathbf{b}_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, 4$. Each pair $(G_i, A_i, B_i, \mathbf{b}_i)$ for $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ is chosen such that it violates exactly one of the conditions of Part 2 of Definition 5 for $k = 3$. This shows that the conditions are independent of each other. Only $(G_4, A_4, B_4, \mathbf{b}_4)$ fulfills all conditions for $k = 3$.

With regard to the inequality of Definition 5, Part 2, we note that this implies $\deg_H(a) \leq k$. However, there is no equivalence between Condition 2c and the inequality $\deg_H(a) \leq k$. As an example, consider for some $k \geq 2$ the graph $H = K_{1,k}$, which is the star graph with internal vertex v and leaf set $\{1, \dots, k\}$. Let $G = K_{1,k}$, $A = \{v\}$, $B = \{1, \dots, k\}$ and $\mathbf{b} : A \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(B)$, $\mathbf{b}(v) = B$. Then $K_{1,k}$ is represented by (G, A, B, \mathbf{b}) (in fact, both graphs equal $K_{1,k}$). Moreover, Conditions 2a and 2b are fulfilled and we have $\deg_H(v) = k$, but Condition 2c is violated, as $\deg_G(v) + |\mathbf{b}(v)| = k + |B| \geq k + 1$. Note that this example in particular shows that in part 1 of Definition 5, as $E(H)$ is a set rather than a multiset, it is possible that \mathbf{b} does not contribute additional edges that are not already contained in G .

Next, we turn our attention to known results relevant for our manuscript.

2.2 Prior results

In this section, we state results known from the literature that are important for the present manuscript. The most important such result is the following theorem, which shows that strongly tree-based networks can always be 4-colored.

Theorem 6 (adapted from Theorem 4.1 in [11]). *Let N be a strongly tree-based network. Then $\chi(N) \leq 4$.*

On the other hand, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there is a tree-based network with $\chi(N) \geq k$.

Note that the fact that strongly tree-based networks can always be 4-colored only leaves a very small gap concerning Question 1, which asks if a 3-coloring is always possible. This is due to the fact that it is known from the literature that trees with at least two vertices require always 2 colors [2] as they are bipartite. This easily leads to the following observation.

Observation 1. *There are strongly tree-based phylogenetic networks which are not 2-colorable.*

To verify that Observation 1 is correct, consider the network given by Figure 3. This network can be easily seen to be strongly tree-based. However, as it contains a triangle, the network cannot be 2-colorable. Thus, the affirmative answer we will give later on to Question 1 closes the gap (as we know 4 colors are always enough by Theorem 6, but 2 colors are not always enough as can be seen in Figure 3 – so the bound of 3 implied by our affirmative answer to Question 1 is tight). It also shows that strongly tree-based networks are even more closely related to trees than general tree-based networks.

Another result of [11] which we will refer to in our manuscript is the following theorem.

Theorem 7 (adapted from Theorem 4.3 in [11]). *If a strongly tree-based network N with leaf set X has the additional property that it contains a spanning tree T with leaf set X that contains all edges of N incident to vertices of degree at least 4, then $\chi(N) \leq 3$.*




Figure 2: Given is a graph H (top) such that each pair $(G_i, A_i, B_i, \mathfrak{b}_i)$ represents H for $i = 1, \dots, 4$ in the sense of Part 1 of Definition 5. In the corresponding figures, G_i is indicated by thick lines, and the edges represented by \mathfrak{b}_i are indicated by thin lines. Only $(G_4, A_4, B_4, \mathfrak{b}_4)$ is a 3-basis with 3-representation, because it fulfills all conditions of Part 2 of Definition 5 for $k = 3$. $(G_1, A_1, B_1, \mathfrak{b}_1)$ violates Condition 2a as there is a non-trivial block of G containing vertices of A (highlighted by the box). $(G_2, A_2, B_2, \mathfrak{b}_2)$ violates Condition 2b, because A contains a vertex of degree 1 (highlighted by the circle). Finally, $(G_3, A_3, B_3, \mathfrak{b}_3)$ violates Condition 2c for $k = 3$ as for the circled vertex $a \in A$ we have $\deg_G(a) + |\mathfrak{b}(a)| = 2 + 2 = 4 > 3$. However, $(G_3, A_3, B_3, \mathfrak{b}_3)$ implies that G_3 is a 4-basis of H with 4-representation \mathfrak{b}_3 .




Figure 3: [adapted from Figure 2(ii) in [11]] A strongly tree-based network together with the spanning tree defining this property. The edges in the spanning tree are highlighted with thicker lines, whereas the only network edge that is not contained in the spanning tree is drawn as a thinner line. Note that this network is not 2-colorable due to the triangle in the middle. Thus, the depicted 3-coloring with colors a , b and c is minimal.

Before we continue, we note that the specific strongly tree-based networks considered by the theorem are referred to as *strictly tree-based* by Hendriksen.

Next, we need to recall two more statements from the literature. The following lemma is very easy to prove and therefore mentioned in the literature as an exercise or obvious statement (cf. [1, V, Exercise 47] and [10, p. 141]).

Lemma 8. *Let $k \geq 2$ and let G be a graph. Then $\chi(G) \leq k$ if and only if $\chi(Z) \leq k$ for every block Z in G .*

As a corollary of this lemma, we directly obtain the following statement:

Corollary 9. *Let G be a graph such that each block contains at most k vertices. Then, we have $\chi(G) \leq k$.*

Before we can continue with our own results, we need to consider the following two lemmas, which are based on Zykov operations as introduced above. The idea here is merely that, by using these simple operations, one can obtain bounds on the chromatic number of a graph.

Lemma 10. *[[14], (2.1)] Let G be a graph with two non-adjacent vertices x, y . Then*

$$\chi(G) = \min\{\chi(G'_{xy}), \chi(G''_{xy})\}.$$

Before we can continue, we need the following definition.

Definition 11. *Let G be a graph, $k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$, x, y a pair of non-adjacent vertices and $f : V(G'_{xy}) \rightarrow \{1, \dots, k\}$ be some arbitrary function. Then we define $\widehat{f} : V(G) \rightarrow \{1, \dots, k\}$ in the following way:*

$$\widehat{f}(v) = \begin{cases} f(v) & v \in V(G) \setminus \{x, y\}, \\ f(v_{xy}) & v \in \{x, y\}. \end{cases}$$

Using this definition, we now state the following simple lemma, which provides a lower bound for the chromatic number of a graph G and which can easily be verified.

Lemma 12. *Let G be a graph, $k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$. Moreover, let x, y be a pair of non-adjacent vertices and $g : V(G) \rightarrow \{1, \dots, k\}$ be some arbitrary function.*

- If $g(x) \neq g(y)$, then g is a k -coloring of G if and only if g is a k -coloring of G'_{xy} .
- If $g(x) = g(y)$, then g is a k -coloring of G if and only if $g = \widehat{f}$ or a k -coloring $f : V(G''_{xy}) \rightarrow \{1, \dots, k\}$ of G''_{xy} .

We are now finally in the position to turn our attention to our own results.

3 Results

3.1 Greedy approaches

In this section, we reconsider Theorems 6 and 7 by Hendriksen [11]. Our first aim is to show that a greedy strategy similar to the one used by Hendriksen in the proof for Theorems 6 can be used to prove the following result, which is a lot more general.

Theorem 13. *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and let H be a graph which is represented by (G, A, B, \mathbf{b}) such that additionally Condition 2c of Definition 5 holds, i.e., such that $\deg_G(a) + |\mathbf{b}(a)| \leq k$ for each $a \in A$. Then, if additionally we have $\chi(G) \leq k + 1$, then we also have $\chi(H) \leq k + 1$.*

Proof. Let $f : V(G) \rightarrow \{1, \dots, k + 1\}$ be a coloring of G . We assume $A \neq \emptyset$ (otherwise the statement is trivial). Let $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_m\}$ be an enumeration of A . For each $i \in \{0, \dots, m\}$ we define H_i as the graph with vertex set $V(G)$ and edge set $E(G) \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^i \{\{a_j, b\} : b \in \mathbf{b}(a_j)\}$. Note that $H_0 = G$ and $H_m = H$.

We construct a sequence f_0, f_1, \dots, f_m beginning with $f_0 = f$ such that f_i is a coloring of H_i using at most $k + 1$ colors. Assume that f_i is already constructed for some $0 \leq i < m$. We show how to construct f_{i+1} . If f_i is a $k + 1$ -coloring of H_{i+1} , we simply set $f_{i+1} = f_i$. Otherwise, there are some edges violating the condition that f_i is a $k + 1$ -coloring of H_{i+1} . But such edges can only occur in $E(H_{i+1}) \setminus E(H_i) = \{\{a_{i+1}, b\} : b \in \mathbf{b}(a_{i+1})\}$. However, Condition 2c guarantees that $\deg_{H_{i+1}}(a_{i+1}) \leq k$. This implies $\{1, \dots, k + 1\} \setminus f_i(N_{H_{i+1}}(a_{i+1})) \neq \emptyset$. Hence, we can change the color of a_{i+1} such that we obtain a coloring f_{i+1} of H_{i+1} using at most $k + 1$ colors, which completes the proof. \square

Remark 14. *Before we continue, we note that the correctness of the first part of Theorem 6 is a direct consequence of Theorem 13. To see this, let $N = (V, E)$ be a strongly tree-based network and let T be the spanning tree whose existence is implied by Definition 4. Then, let $k = 3$, and construct sets A and B as follows: As long as there exists a vertex v that has degree 2 in T and has not been assigned a set yet, we note that v must be incident with an edge $e \in E(N) \setminus E(T)$ (as N contains no degree-2 vertices). If the other endpoint of e is also a degree-2 vertex of T and has not been assigned a set yet, we add one of the endpoints of e to set A and the other one to set B . If the other endpoint has degree 2 and already was assigned set A or B , we assign the remaining set to v . If, however, the other endpoint of e does not have degree 2 in T , we add v to set A . Ultimately, when no more such vertices exist, we add all possibly remaining vertices that have not been assigned a set yet to set B . Then, by Definition 4, all vertices $a \in A$ have degree $\deg_N(a) = 3$ (as A by construction only contains vertices that have degree 2 in T), implying that there exists precisely one edge $e_a = \{a, b_a\}$ in N (for some $b_a \in B$) incident to a that is not contained in T . For each $a \in A$, we set $\mathbf{b}(a) = \{b_a\}$. This way, we have $\deg_T(a) + |\mathbf{b}(a)| = 2 + 1 = 3 = k$. Moreover, as T is a tree, we have $\chi(T) \leq 2$ and thus obviously also $\chi(T) \leq 4 = k + 1$. At last we note that Definition 4 implies that each edge in $E(N) \setminus E(T)$ is incident with at least one degree-2 vertex in T , hence by our construction with exactly one vertex of A . Altogether, these observations show that N is represented by (T, A, B, \mathbf{b}) such that Condition 2c of*

Definition 5 holds and such that additionally $\chi(T) \leq k + 1 = 4$. Thus, Theorem 13 implies that N is 4-colorable.

Before we continue with our main results, we turn our attention to a special class of strongly tree-based networks, namely the ones considered in Theorem 7. The proof of this theorem given by Hendriksen [11] is somewhat technical – it uses an inductive argument concerning the so-called *level* of a network, which is a measure of how much a network deviates from being a tree. Motivated by the success of greedy coloring strategies to prove Theorem 6 and Theorem 13, we provide an alternative proof for Theorem 7 based on an even simpler greedy argument. This is possible due to the additional restrictions on the spanning tree T of N made by the theorem.

Alternative proof of Theorem 7. We consider N and T as stated in the theorem. Now we enumerate the vertices of T as follows: We start with a leaf and call it v_1 . We then take a vertex which is a neighbor of v_1 in T and assign it v_2 and so forth, until we reach another leaf. Thus, in this first step, we have enumerated a leaf-to-leaf path with v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, as long as there are still unnumbered vertices, we pick an unnumbered vertex which is adjacent in T to a numbered one (which must exist as T is connected), and continue the enumeration from there along a path to some unnumbered leaf.

Once all vertices are numbered, we can consider each edge of N as directed such that it points from the lower to the higher number. Now we consider a color set with three colors and go along our vertices according to our numbering. At every vertex, we assign one of the available colors that is not yet used in the neighborhood of the present vertex (but note that there might still be uncolored neighbors of this vertex). Clearly, if there is no vertex in N with in-degree larger than 2, there will always be one of the three colors still available. So this is precisely what we will show now.

First note that within T , except for vertex v_1 , which has in-degree 0 and out-degree 1 by construction, every vertex has in-degree 1. So if there was a vertex v with in-degree at least 3 in N , this would hence imply that there are at least two edges of $E(N) \setminus E(T)$ incident with v . We now show that this cannot be the case. To see this, first note that v cannot be a leaf: the leaf sets of T and N coincide by definition, and as T is connected, the unique edge leading to each leaf in N is also contained in T . Thus, no leaf is incident to an edge of N that is not in T . So v must be an inner node of T . Thus, it has a total degree of at least 2 in T . If it is also incident with two edges of N which are not contained in T , this shows $\deg_N(v) \geq 4$. However, by the assumptions made on N by the theorem, this would imply that *all* edges incident with v are contained in T , a contradiction to the assumption that v is incident with two edges of $E(N) \setminus E(T)$. This completes the proof. \square

Remark 15. *We note that Theorem 7 is directly implied by Corollary 18 which will be proved later.*

3.2 Main results

It is our main aim to answer Question 1 affirmatively. However, we will actually prove an even stronger result, namely the following theorem, which is the main result of our manuscript and which delivers a better bound than Theorem 13, albeit by presupposing more restrictive requirements. While Theorem 13 implies Hendriksen’s original result on strongly tree-based networks (cf. the first part of Theorem 6 and Remark 15), Theorem 16 will later on turn out to be the basis for answering Question 1 affirmatively.

Theorem 16. *Let $k \geq 2$ and let H be a graph with k -basis G such that $\chi(G) \leq k$. Then $\chi(H) \leq k$.*

In order to see that Theorem 16 provides the desired answer to Question 1, we need to make a connection between strongly tree-based networks and graphs with a k -basis. This is done by the following proposition.

Proposition 17. *Every strongly tree-based network has a 3-basis G with $\chi(G) \leq 2$.*

Note that Proposition 17 is actually slightly stronger than needed to fulfill the conditions of Theorem 16, as actually $\chi(G) \leq 3$ would be sufficient, but we actually will prove that we have $\chi(G) \leq 2$. Finally, from Theorem 16 together with Proposition 17 we then easily derive the following statement as a direct corollary, which answers Question 1 affirmatively:

Corollary 18. *Let N be a strongly tree-based network. Then $\chi(N) \leq 3$.*

So it remains to prove Theorem 16 and Proposition 17. However, before we do so, we first need to prove some preliminary statements that will be used later on.

3.3 Preliminary results needed to prove our main result

In this section, we prove some preliminary statements that will be used to prove our main result, which is Theorem 16. As a first step, we consider again Definition 5, which is highly technical. While its connection to strongly tree-based networks will be elaborated later, we can already state here that it will serve as a generalization of Definition 4. Loosely speaking, just as strongly tree-based networks can be thought of as trees with certain additional edges, Definition 5 allows us to think of general graphs as subgraphs with certain additional edges.

Next, we state two lemmas that will elucidate Condition 2a of Definition 5.

Lemma 19. *Let H be a graph which is represented by the pair (G, A, B, \mathbf{b}) such that Condition 2a of Definition 5 is fulfilled, i.e., such that $A \cap V(Z) = \emptyset$ for all non-trivial blocks Z of G . Let $v \in A$ and $e \in E(G)$ with $v \in e$. Then e is a bridge in G .*

Proof. Seeking a contradiction, let us assume that e is not a bridge. Then e is contained in some C which is a cycle in G . There is some non-trivial block Z of G containing C . Then $v \in e$ and $e \in C \subseteq Z$ imply $v \in Z$. But we have assumed $v \in A$, so this is in contradiction to Condition 2a. This shows that the assumption was wrong and thus completes the proof. \square

This lemma has the following immediate consequence:

Lemma 20. *Let H be a graph and let G , A , B and \mathbf{b} such that H is represented by (G, A, B, \mathbf{b}) and such that Condition 2a of Definition 5 is fulfilled, i.e., such that $A \cap V(Z) = \emptyset$ for all non-trivial blocks Z of G . Let C be a connected component of $G[B]$ and $v \in N_G(V(C))$. Then v is adjacent to exactly one vertex of C in G .*

Proof. Seeking a contradiction, let us assume there are two different vertices $v_1, v_2 \in C$ which are neighbors of v in G . As C is connected, there is a v_1 - v_2 -path P in C . Then P can be extended to P' via v_1vv_2 such that P' is a cycle in G which contains $\{v, v_1\}$ and $\{v, v_2\}$. But this contradicts Lemma 19 as $\{v, v_1\}$ and $\{v, v_2\}$ would not be bridges (as they are part of a cycle). This completes the proof. \square

So Condition 2a tells us that \mathbf{b} imposes on G a forest-like structure in the following sense: If we contract all connected components of $G[B]$ in G , then we obtain a forest F with a natural bijection between $E(F)$ and $E(G) \setminus E(G[B])$. This already gives a first hint

why Definition 5 may generalize tree-like structures as the one described in Definition 4. Note that Proposition 17 verifies this observation as it shows that every strongly tree-based network indeed has a 3-basis. We are now finally in the position to prove this assertion.

Proof of Proposition 17. Let N be a strongly tree-based network and let T be as required by Definition 4. As T is a tree, we have $\chi(T) \leq 2$. We now show that T is in fact a 3-basis for N , and we need to find a 3-representation $\mathbf{b} : A \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(B)$.

Let A' be the set of all vertices in T with degree 2. (Note that $A' = \emptyset$ is possible.) Definition 4 tells us that $\deg_N(v) = 3$ for each $v \in A'$, which implies for each such v the existence of exactly one edge $e_v \in E(N) \setminus E(T)$ with $v \in e_v$. Furthermore, we claim that every edge in $E(N) \setminus E(T)$ has the form e_v for at least one vertex $v \in A'$. To prove this claim we assume that there is some $e = \{x, y\} \in E(N) \setminus E(T)$ with $e \cap A' = \emptyset$. Then $2 \notin \{\deg_T(x), \deg_T(y)\}$. If $1 \in \{\deg_T(x), \deg_T(y)\}$, say $\deg_T(x) = 1$, then x is a leaf in T . As we have assumed T to be a tree as specified by Definition 4, we conclude that $x \in X$ and $\deg_N(x) = 1$. But this implies $e \in E(T)$, which is a contradiction to our assumption. On the other hand, if $\deg_T(x) \geq 3$ and $\deg_T(y) \geq 3$, then, considering $e = \{x, y\} \in E(N) \setminus E(T)$, we must have $\deg_N(x) \geq 4$ and $\deg_N(y) \geq 4$ (as N is connected), which is again a contradiction to Definition 4.

The above contradictions show that indeed every edge in $E(N) \setminus E(T)$ contains a vertex $v \in A'$. In particular, if $A' = \emptyset$, we must have $E(N) = E(T)$ and thus also $N = T$.

Next, we define A , B and \mathbf{b} , and we subsequently show that (T, A, B, \mathbf{b}) represents N . Now, in order to define \mathbf{b} , for each $e \in E(N) \setminus E(T)$ we fix one vertex $v_e \in A' \cap e$ (note that there might be two vertices to choose from). Set $A = \{v_e : e \in E(N) \setminus E(T)\}$, set $B = V(N) \setminus A$, and for every $v_e \in A$ set $\mathbf{b}(v_e) = e \setminus \{v_e\}$. Note that $A \subseteq A'$.

To prove that T , A , B and \mathbf{b} represent N , it suffices to show $\mathbf{b}(a) \subseteq B$ for each $a \in A$. Note that in particular, if $A' = \emptyset$, we also have $A = \emptyset$, so there is nothing to show. So now let $A \neq \emptyset$, and, seeking a contradiction, assume that $a = v_e$ for some $e \in E(N) \setminus E(T)$ and that $e = \{a, a'\}$ with $a' \in A$, i.e., $a' = v_f$ for some $f \in E(N) \setminus E(T)$. As $a' \in A \subseteq A'$, we know $\deg_T(a') = 2$. But a' is also an endpoint of e and f which are both in $E(N) \setminus E(T)$. This implies $\deg_N(a') \geq 2 + 2 = 4$ (as a' is incident with precisely two edges in T and with at least two edges in $N \setminus T$), which contradicts Definition 4, which states that $\deg_N(a') = 3$. Thus, we know that (T, A, B, \mathbf{b}) represents N .

Now it remains to show that T is a 3-basis for N . Therefore, we need to check the conditions of Definition 5.

As T is a tree, it does not contain any non-trivial block, so Condition 2a of Definition 5 holds trivially. As $A \subseteq A'$, it is true that $\deg_G(v) = 2$ for all $v \in A$, which shows that Condition 2b holds. Finally, we note that by definition we have $|\mathbf{b}(v)| = 1$ for all $v \in A$, so we have $\deg_T(v) + |\mathbf{b}(v)| = 2 + 1 = 3$ for all $v \in A$. This shows that T is a 3-basis for N with $\chi(T) \leq 2$, which completes the proof. \square

3.4 Proof of our main result

The main aim of this section is to prove Theorem 16. Note that if the set $A \subseteq V$ defining the k -basis G of H in the theorem is empty, we have $G = H$. In this case, the statement of the theorem is obvious (as clearly we have $\chi(G) = \chi(H)$ in this case). Therefore, the remainder of this paper will be devoted to a proof of Theorem 16 for the case $A \neq \emptyset$.

The main idea of the proof is as follows: For each graph H with k -basis G , k -representation \mathbf{b} as well as sets A and B as specified by Definition 5, we find a graph H^- with k -basis G^- and k -representation \mathbf{b}^- with $|A^-| < |A|$ such that $\chi(H^-) \leq k$ implies $\chi(H) \leq k$.




Figure 4: Two examples which illustrate the construction of $\mathfrak{b}^*(a)$ as formally defined in Equation (1). Each example consists of a pair H_i, H_i^* ($i = 1, 2$) such that H_i^* is obtained from H_i by the construction which is described in Lemma 21. H_i has 3-basis G_i and 3-representation \mathfrak{b}_i , H_i^* has 3-basis G_i^* and 3-representation \mathfrak{b}_i^* . The edges belonging to the respective 3-basis are depicted with thick lines in each graph, whereas the edges which are not contained in the 3-basis are thin. For example, H_2^* contains exactly one edge which is not contained in G_2^* , hence the graphical representation of H_2^* contains exactly one thin line. Note that the construction of G_i^* (for $i = 1, 2$) requires identifying vertices with identical colors and there is exactly one such pair in each example. Thus, here the modification effectively leads to the deletion of a single vertex in each example. Moreover, note that in the first example, we have $\mathfrak{b}_1^*(a) \neq \emptyset$. Indeed, as H_1^* is the graph represented by G_1^* and \mathfrak{b}_1^* , by Definition 5, we have $E(H_1^*) = E(G_1^*) \cup \{\{a, v\} : v \in \mathfrak{b}_1^*(a)\}$. But in this case, all edges of the form $\{a, v\}$ with $v \in \mathfrak{b}_1^*(a)$ (of which there is only one) are already contained in $E(G_1^*)$, hence $H_1^* = G_1^*$. On the other hand, as we have already noted H_2^* contains an additional edge with endpoint a which is not already contained in G_2^* . This is due to the fact that the additional edge is not connected with one of the vertices colored in G_2 by color 1 and in this example only vertices with color 1 are identified while the other vertices are de facto left unmodified (despite being formally replaced by other vertices).

Section 3.4.1 is concerned with the description of these reductions. Subsequently, Section 3.4.2 will show how to use these reductions to prove Theorem 16 inductively.

3.4.1 Reduction steps

In this section, we describe the reduction steps needed for our inductive proof of Theorem 16. The idea is based on Zykov operations as introduced earlier. These operations will be an elementary part of the more complex constructions which we describe in the following pages. Roughly speaking, the idea is that, given a graph as in Theorem 16, we can reduce this graph by using appropriate Zykov operations to a smaller graph of a similar structure.

We start with the following lemma, which describes a construction which shows that – given some graph H with k -basis G , k -representation $\mathfrak{b} : A \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(B)$ and $\chi(G) \leq k$ – some additional assumptions regarding the structure of $G[B]$ can be made. Later on, we will in particular use Lemma 21 to show that we can assume without loss of generality that each connected component of $G[B]$ is a clique with at most k elements.

Lemma 21. *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}$ and let G be a connected graph with $\chi(G) \leq k$. Let H be a graph with k -basis G (and corresponding sets A, B as in Definition 5) and k -representation $\mathbf{b} : A \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(B)$. Let C be a connected component of $G[B]$. Then there is a graph H^* with k -basis G^* and k -representation $\mathbf{b}^* : A^* \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(B^*)$ and there exists a set $W^* \subseteq V(G^*)$ such that the following statements hold, where we define $C^* := G^*[W^*]$:*

- (i) $V(G^*) = (V(G) \setminus V(C)) \cup W^*$ and $W^* \cap V(C) = \emptyset$.
- (ii) $G[V(G) \setminus V(C)] = G^*[V(G^*) \setminus V(C^*)]$.
- (iii) C^* is a clique with at most k vertices.
- (iv) If G is connected, then G^* is also connected.
- (v) $A^* = A$, and for all $a \in A$ we have $\mathbf{b}(a) \setminus V(C) = \mathbf{b}^*(a) \setminus V(C^*)$.
- (vi) C^* is a connected component of $G^*[B^*]$.
- (vii) $\chi(H) \leq \chi(H^*)$.

Proof. We prove the statement by providing an explicit construction. Before we construct H^*, A^*, B^* and \mathbf{b}^* , we construct G^* and W^* . Then, we construct A^*, B^* and \mathbf{b}^* before explicitly stating H^* . This three step approach enables us to some of the statements first and to use them subsequently to prove the remaining statements.

- We start by explaining our construction of G^* and W^* . In the following, let $W = V(C)$. We consider some minimal r -coloring $g : W \rightarrow \{1, \dots, r\}$ of C , i.e. $r = \chi(C)$. Clearly, $r \leq \min(k, |W|)$ because $\chi(C) \leq \chi(G) \leq k$. From the minimality of r it follows that g is surjective (otherwise, we could delete the unused colors and proceed with a smaller value of r). Now we generate a graph G^* by repeating the following operation on G : Start with $G^* = G$ and $C^* = C$. As long as there is a color $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ that occurs several times in C^* , identify all vertices of color class $g^{-1}(i)$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ (which are non-adjacent) in C^* (i.e., apply the second Zykov operation defined in Definition 1), in order to derive the updated version of C^* and thus also the updated version of G^* . Note that by this process, the vertices of C in G are replaced by r new vertices corresponding to the color classes of g , resulting in graph G^* .

So we can assume that $V(G^*) = (V(G) \setminus V(C)) \cup \{g^{-1}(i) : i \in \{1, \dots, r\}\}$ such that each vertex in $V(G^*) \setminus V(G)$ is identical to a color class of g . Let $W^* = \{g^{-1}(i) : i \in \{1, \dots, r\}\} = V(G^*) \setminus V(G)$. By definition of r it is clear that W^* contains at most k elements.

- We can now already show that statement (i) of Lemma 21 holds for our choices of G^* and W^* . Recall that we have $V(G^*) = (V(G) \setminus V(C)) \cup W^*$, which shows the first part of (i). For the second part, recall that $W = V(C)$ and note that $W \cap W^* = \emptyset$ (as all vertices of W were removed to form the vertices of W^*). This completes the proof of Part (i).
- Part (ii) also holds for our choice of G^* and C^* as the Zykov operations we performed left $G[V(G) \setminus W] = G[V(G) \setminus V(C)]$ unchanged (we only changed vertices of W to form W^*). Thus, (ii) obviously holds, too.
- We now claim that W^* is a clique. Assume this is not the case. Then there exist $v, w \in C^*$ with $v = g^{-1}(i)$, $w = g^{-1}(j)$ and $i \neq j$ such that $\{v, w\} \notin E(C^*)$. As v and w

were constructed using Zykov operations by identifying all vertices in $g^{-1}(i)$ or $g^{-1}(j)$, respectively, it follows that $E_G(g^{-1}(i), g^{-1}(j)) = \emptyset$. But then there is a coloring $h : V(C) \rightarrow \{1, \dots, r\} \setminus \{j\}$ of C with $h^{-1}(m) = g^{-1}(m)$ for $m \in \{1, \dots, r\} \setminus \{i, j\}$ and $h^{-1}(i) = g^{-1}(i) \cup g^{-1}(j)$. As h employs only $r - 1$ colors, this is a contradiction to the minimality of g . Hence, W^* is a clique, which shows (iii).

- Now we are in position to prove (iv), i.e., we want to show that if G is connected, then G^* is also connected. We use a proof by contraposition, i.e., we show that if G^* is disconnected, then G must also be disconnected. By (iii) it follows that there is some connected component, say D_1 , of G^* which completely contains C^* . As G^* is assumed to be disconnected, there is another connected component, say D_2 , which is contained in $G^*[V(G^*) \setminus V(C^*)]$. By (ii) it follows that D_2 is contained in $G[V(G) \setminus V(C)]$ and that $E_G(V(G) \setminus (V(C) \cup V(D_2)), V(D_2)) = \emptyset$. Moreover, from $E_{G^*}(V(D_1), V(D_2)) = \emptyset$ and $C^* \subseteq D_1$ we conclude that $E_{G^*}(V(C^*), V(D_2)) = \emptyset$. Additionally, we recall that C^* has been obtained from C by identifying certain vertices of C . Hence, a vertex in $V(G) \setminus V(C)$ is contained in $N_G(V(C))$ if and only if it is contained in $N_{G^*}(V(C^*))$. Consequently, from $V(D_2) \subseteq V(G) \setminus V(C)$ and $E_{G^*}(V(C^*), V(D_2)) = \emptyset$, we infer $E_G(V(C), V(D_2)) = \emptyset$. Now, together with $E_G(V(G) \setminus (V(C) \cup V(D_2)), V(D_2)) = \emptyset$ and $E_G(V(C), V(D_2)) = \emptyset$, we conclude that $E_G(V(G) \setminus V(D_2), V(D_2)) = \emptyset$. This implies that G is disconnected, which completes the proof of (iv).
- We still need to construct H^* , A^* , B^* , and $\mathfrak{b}^* : A^* \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(B^*)$ in such a way that $(G^*, A^*, B^*, \mathfrak{b}^*)$ represents H^* , G^* is a k -basis G^* and $\mathfrak{b}^* : A^* \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(B^*)$ is a k -representation and such that additionally, statements (vi)- (vii) hold. We start with A^* , B^* , and \mathfrak{b}^* as follows (note that by Part 1 of Definition 5, this construction suffices in order to implicitly define a graph H^*):

- We begin with the definition of A^* and set $A^* := A$. As by assumption $\mathfrak{b} : A \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(B)$ is a k -representation, we have $A \cap B = \emptyset$. Using $W = V(C)$ and the fact that C is a connected component of $G[B]$, we conclude $A \cap W = \emptyset$. Hence, $A \subseteq V(G) \setminus W \subseteq V(G^*)$. In particular, $A^* = A$ then also implies $A^* \subseteq V(G^*)$.
- Next, we define $B^* := V(G^*) \setminus A^*$.
- Next, we define $\mathfrak{b}^* : A^* \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(B^*)$ as follows: Let $a \in A^*$ and define

$$\mathfrak{b}^*(a) := (\mathfrak{b}(a) \setminus W) \cup \{g^{-1}(i) : i \in g(\mathfrak{b}(a) \cap W)\}. \quad (1)$$

Note that the definition of \mathfrak{b}^* is illustrated by Figure 4. Note that this implies that for $\mathfrak{b}^*(a)$, we take $\mathfrak{b}(a)$ and first remove all vertices of W (as these are not in W^*), but then add those vertices of W^* that correspond to the color class of at least one of the vertices in $\mathfrak{b}(a) \cap W$.

- Note that the above definition of \mathfrak{b}^* immediately implies (v), as $\mathfrak{b}^*(a) \setminus W^* = \mathfrak{b}^*(a) \setminus \{g^{-1}(i) : i \in \{1, \dots, r\}\} = \mathfrak{b}(a) \setminus W$.
- We next want to show (vi), i.e., we want to show that $C^* = G^*[W^*]$ is a connected component of $G^*[B^*]$. In order to do so, from $A^* = A \subseteq V(G) \setminus W = V(G^*) \setminus W^*$, where the last equality holds because of (ii), and $B^* = V(G^*) \setminus A^*$, we conclude $W^* \subseteq B^*$. So for (vi), note that in order to show that $C^* = G^*[W^*]$ is a connected component of $G^*[B^*]$, it suffices to show $N_{G^*}(W^*) \subseteq A^*$. Also note that the Zykov operations used in the construction of G^* ensure that $N_G(W) = N_{G^*}(W^*)$. So from

$N_G(W) \subseteq A$ (as C is a connected component of $G[B]$), $N_G(W) = N_{G^*}(W^*)$ and $A^* = A$ together we conclude $N_{G^*}(W^*) \subseteq A^*$. Thus, (vi) holds.

- By Part 1 of Definition 5 the quadruple $(G^*, A^*, B^*, \mathfrak{b}^*)$ defines a graph H^* . Before we can show (vii) we have to show that \mathfrak{b}^* is indeed a k -representation of H^* .

1. At first we check Condition 2a of Definition 5, i.e., we check if $A^* \cap V(Z) = \emptyset$ for each non-trivial block Z in G^* . So let Z be such a block. We now consider several cases.

- If $V(Z) \cap W^* = \emptyset$, then we conclude with the help of (ii) that Z is a subgraph of G . In this case Z is contained in a non-trivial block of G . By assumption Condition 2a is true for (G, A, B, \mathfrak{b}) , implying $A \cap V(Z) = \emptyset$. This, together with $A^* = A$, implies $A^* \cap V(Z) = \emptyset$ as desired.
- Next, we consider the case that $V(Z) \subseteq W^*$. Note that this implies that Z is a subgraph of C^* . Then we conclude from (vi) that $V(Z) \subseteq B^*$, which again implies $A^* \cap V(Z) = \emptyset$ as desired.
- Last, we consider the case in which $V(Z) \cap W^* \neq \emptyset$ and $V(Z) \not\subseteq W^*$. Our aim is to show that this case cannot happen. Anyhow, in this case, Z contains at least one vertex of W^* and at least one vertex that is not contained in W^* . We now argue that, as Z is a non-trivial block and as $V(Z) \not\subseteq W^*$, this must imply that there must be at least two edges $e_1, e_2 \in E(Z)$ which are elements in $E_{G^*}(W^*, V(G^*) \setminus W^*)$ and which even belong to a cycle D of Z . To see this, first note that $E(Z) \cap E_{G^*}(W^*, V(G^*) \setminus W^*)$ cannot be empty as we have at least one vertex $z \in V(Z) \cap W^* \subseteq V(Z)$ and one vertex $z' \in V(G^*) \setminus W^* \subseteq V(Z)$ and as Z is connected, so there must be a path from z to z' containing an edge from $E(Z) \cap E_{G^*}(W^*, V(G^*) \setminus W^*)$. Now assume that $E(Z) \cap E_{G^*}(W^*, V(G^*) \setminus W^*)$ contains only one element, say e_1 . As Z is non-trivial, $E(Z)$ contains at least one more edge $f \neq e_1$ as well as a cycle D containing both e_1 and f . So this cycle D contains at least one element of W^* and at least one element of $V(G^*) \setminus W^*$ (as $e_1 \in E(D)$), which implies that in fact it must contain *two* edges connecting W^* and $V(G^*) \setminus W^*$, so there must be another such edge e_2 . Thus, the assumption was wrong, which is why we may conclude $|E(D) \cap E_{G^*}(W^*, V(G^*) \setminus W^*)| \geq 2$ as desired. We may assume that $e_i = \{v_i, w_i\}$ with $v_i \in W^*, w_i \notin W^*$ for $i = 1, 2$ (note that $v_1 = v_2$ is possible). Furthermore, we may assume that there is a segment D' of D such that w_1, w_2 are the endpoints of D' and D' is a subgraph of $G^*[V(G^*) \setminus W^*]$ (note that this segment is – of the two paths connecting w_1 and w_2 in D – the path *not* containing v_1 and v_2). By (ii), we conclude that D' is contained in $G[V(G) \setminus W]$. As v_1 and v_2 are obtained by the Zykov operations of contracting non-adjacent vertices from W , we conclude that there are some $v'_1, v'_2 \in V(C)$ with $e'_i = \{v'_i, w_i\} \in E_G(W, V(G) \setminus W)$ for $i = 1, 2$ (again, note that $v'_1 = v'_2$ is possible).

However, by assumption C is a connected component of $G[B]$, from which several conclusions can be drawn. First, as C is connected, there is a v'_1 - v'_2 -path P in C , from which – together with e'_1, e'_2 and D' – we obtain a cycle D'' in G which contains e'_1 and e'_2 . On the other hand, using Lemma 19, we conclude that e'_1, e'_2 are bridges in G , which is a contradiction, because e'_1, e'_2 are contained in a cycle in G . This contradiction shows that the last case cannot happen.

So we conclude that in all cases that can actually happen, we have $A^* \cap V(Z) = \emptyset$, which shows that Condition 2a is true for $(G^*, A^*, B^*, \mathfrak{b}^*)$.

2. In order to check the remaining Conditions 2b and 2c of Definition 5 for $(G^*, A^*, B^*, \mathfrak{b}^*)$, we have to show that we have $\deg_{G^*}(a) \geq 2$ and $\deg_{G^*}(a) + |\mathfrak{b}^*(a)| \leq k$ for all $a \in A^*$.

By construction of G^* , it is true that $\deg_{G^*}(x) = \deg_G(x)$ for each $x \in V(G^*) \setminus W^* = V(G) \setminus W$, which is simply a consequence of Lemma 20. In particular, this implies that $\deg_{G^*}(a) = \deg_G(a)$ is true for $a \in A^*$, because we know from (vi) that $A^* \subseteq V(G^*) \setminus W^*$. By Definition 5 and our assumption that \mathfrak{b} is a k -representation, we know that $\deg_G(a) \geq 2$ for $a \in A$. Additionally, by (v) we know $A = A^*$. Together these facts imply $\deg_{G^*}(a) \geq 2$ for $a \in A^*$, which is the first inequality.

Now we show the second inequality. By Condition 2c for (G, A, B, \mathfrak{b}) we know that $\deg_G(a) + |\mathfrak{b}(a)| \leq k$ for every $a \in A$. Furthermore, by (v), we know that $\mathfrak{b}(a) \setminus W = \mathfrak{b}^*(a) \setminus W^*$. As we have already shown that $\deg_{G^*}(a) = \deg_G(a)$, it only remains to show that $|\mathfrak{b}^*(a)| \leq |\mathfrak{b}(a)|$, and thus, by $|\mathfrak{b}^*(a)| = |\mathfrak{b}^*(a) \setminus W^*| + |\mathfrak{b}^*(a) \cap W^*|$ and $|\mathfrak{b}(a)| = |\mathfrak{b}(a) \setminus W| + |\mathfrak{b}(a) \cap W|$, we only need to show $|\mathfrak{b}^*(a) \cap W^*| \leq |\mathfrak{b}(a) \cap W|$. Using the definition of \mathfrak{b}^* , we conclude this inequality from $\mathfrak{b}^*(a) \cap W^* = \{g^{-1}(i) \in W^* : i \in g(\mathfrak{b}(a) \cap W)\} = \{g^{-1}(g(v)) \in W^* : v \in \mathfrak{b}(a) \cap W\}$ for $a \in A$.

In summary, we can conclude that \mathfrak{b}^* is indeed a k -representation. This, in turn, finally allows us to define H^* such that Conditions (i) - (vi) are fulfilled as shown above: Simply let H^* be the graph defined by $(G^*, A^*, B^*, \mathfrak{b}^*)$, i.e. $V(H^*) = V(G^*)$ and $E(H^*) = E(G^*) \cup \{(a, b) : a \in A^*, b \in \mathfrak{b}^*(a)\}$.

- It remains to show (vii), i.e., we need to prove that $\chi(H^*) \geq \chi(H)$. Let $l = \chi(H^*)$ and let $f^* : V(G^*) \rightarrow \{1, \dots, l\}$ be some l -coloring of H^* . Our aim now is to construct a function $f : V(G) \rightarrow \{1, \dots, l\}$ which is an l -coloring of H , which will prove the desired result.

We construct $f : V(G) \rightarrow \{1, \dots, l\}$ in the following way:

$$f(v) = \begin{cases} f^*(v) & \text{if } v \in V(G) \setminus V(C), \\ f^*(g^{-1}(i)) & \text{if } v \in g^{-1}(i). \end{cases}$$

It remains to show that f is an l -coloring of H . For $e = \{v, w\} \in E(H)$ we have to show $f(v) \neq f(w)$. We use a case distinction:

1. We first consider the case $e \subseteq V(G) \setminus W$. By (ii) and (v) we know $H[V(G) \setminus W] = H^*[V(G^*) \setminus W^*]$. This implies $e \in E(H^*)$. As f^* is a coloring of H^* , we have $f^*(v) \neq f^*(w)$. Then $f(v) \neq f(w)$ follows, because $f(v) = f^*(v)$ and $f(w) = f^*(w)$ by definition of f .
2. Next, we consider the case that $e \in E(G)$ and $v \in W$ and $w \in N_G(W)$. By construction of G^* , we know for all $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ that $\{w, g^{-1}(i)\} \in E(G^*)$ if and only if there is some $w' \in g^{-1}(i)$ such that $\{w, w'\} \in E(G)$. Hence the existence of $\{v, w\}$ in $E(G)$ implies $\{g^{-1}(j), w\} \in E(G^*)$ with $j = g(v)$. Now $f^*(w) \neq f^*(g^{-1}(j))$ (as f^* is a coloring) together with $f(w) = f^*(w)$ and $f(v) = f^*(g^{-1}(j))$ imply $f(v) \neq f(w)$. Note that the case in which $e \in E(G)$ and $w \in W$ and $v \in N_G(W)$ follows analogously.

3. Now, consider the case that $e \in E(G)$ and $e \subseteq V(C) = W$. In this case, we have $f(v) = f^*(g^{-1}(i))$ and $f(w) = f^*(g^{-1}(j))$ with $i = g(v)$ and $j = g(w)$. We note that $i \neq j$ as g is an r -coloring of C . By (ii) we know that $G^*[W^*]$ is a clique. So $\{g^{-1}(i), g^{-1}(j)\} \in E(G^*)$ and $f^*(g^{-1}(i)) \neq f^*(g^{-1}(j))$, from which $f(v) \neq f(w)$ follows.
4. The last case we need to consider is the case in which $e \in E(H) \setminus E(G)$. As H is represented by (G, A, B, \mathbf{b}) , this means that $e = \{v, w\}$ for some $v \in A$ and $w \in \mathbf{b}(v)$. As C is a connected component of $G[B]$, we conclude $A \subseteq V(G) \setminus W$ and thus $v \in V(G) \setminus W$. Note that we may assume without loss of generality that we are not in the first case (as this has already been covered), i.e., we may assume that $w \in W$. Now let $w^* = g^{-1}(g(w)) \in W^*$. Then $w^* \in \mathbf{b}^*(v)$ by definition of \mathbf{b}^* . This implies that $\{v, w^*\}$ is represented by \mathbf{b}^* and thus $\{v, w^*\} \in E(H^*)$. Hence $f^*(v) \neq f^*(w^*)$. Using the definition of f we conclude $f(v) = f^*(v)$ and $f(w) = f^*(w^*)$, and hence $f(v) \neq f(w)$ as desired.

Thus, f is an l -coloring of H , which shows that we indeed have $\chi(H) \leq \chi(H^*)$.

This shows that our construction of G^*, H^* and $\mathbf{b} : A^* \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(B^*)$ is such that the statements (i)-(vii) all hold and thus completes the proof. \square

Next, we will use Lemma 21 iteratively in order to derive the following result.

Proposition 22. *Let $k \geq 2$ and let G be a connected graph with $\chi(G) \leq k$. Let H be a graph with k -basis G and k -representation $\mathbf{b} : A \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(B)$. Then there exist H', G', A', B' and \mathbf{b}' such that H' is a graph with k -basis G' and k -representation $\mathbf{b}' : A' \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(B')$ having the following properties:*

- $A' = A$,
- $\chi(H) \leq \chi(H')$.
- Every connected component of $G'[B']$ is a clique with at most k vertices.
- If G is connected, then G' is also connected.

Proof. Let m denote the number of connected components of $G[B]$ and let C_1, \dots, C_m denote the corresponding connected components. The proof idea now is to construct sequences G_0, G_1, \dots, G_m and H_0, \dots, H_m with $G_0 = G$ and $H_0 = H$ such that for each $i \in \{0, \dots, m\}$ there is a k -representation $\mathbf{b}_i : A_i \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(B_i)$ representing H_i with k -basis G_i , and such that this sequence has the following property: For each $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, the graph $G_i[B_i]$ will have $C'_1, \dots, C'_i, C_{i+1}, \dots, C_m$ as connected components, where C'_i is a clique of size at most k . This way, in particular, $G_m[B_m]$ has the connected components C'_1, \dots, C'_m . Moreover, the sequence we construct will have the property that $\chi(H) \leq \chi(H_1) \leq \chi(H_2) \leq \dots \leq \chi(H_m)$. Finally, by setting $G' = G_m$, $H' = H_m$, $\mathbf{b}' = \mathbf{b}_m$, $A' = A_m$ and $B' = B_m$, we will derive the desired result.

Now we start our construction by setting $G_0 = G$, $H_0 = H$, $A_0 = A$, $B_0 = B$, and $\mathbf{b}_0 = \mathbf{b}$. For $i = 0, \dots, m-1$ we repeat the following: Each time G_i , H_i and $\mathbf{b}_i : A_i \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(B_i)$ are constructed for some $i < m$, we apply Lemma 21 to G_i , H_i , \mathbf{b}_i and the connected component C_{i+1} to derive G_{i+1} , H_{i+1} and $\mathbf{b}_{i+1} : A_{i+1} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(B_{i+1})$ as the result of this construction. By Property (i) of Lemma 21 we know that $V(G_{i+1}) = (V(G_i) \setminus V(C_{i+1})) \cup V(C'_{i+1})$, where – using Property (vi) – we may assume that C'_{i+1} is a connected component of $G_{i+1}[B_{i+1}]$. From Property (i) we also know $V(C_{i+1}) \cap V(C'_{i+1}) = \emptyset$, so it is clear then that C_{i+1} is not a connected component of $G_{i+1}[B_{i+1}]$.

To show that our construction has the desired properties we have to show that all other connected components of $G_i[B_i]$ are not changed by the construction of $G_{i+1}[B_{i+1}]$. By Property (ii) of Lemma 21 we know $G_i[V(G_i) \setminus V(C_{i+1})] = G_{i+1}[V(G_{i+1}) \setminus V(C'_{i+1})]$. As C_{i+1} is a connected component of $G_i[B_i]$ and C'_{i+1} is a connected component of $G_{i+1}[B_{i+1}]$, we conclude from this that $G_{i+1}[B_{i+1} \setminus V(C'_{i+1})] = G_i[B_i \setminus V(C_{i+1})]$. Here $G_i[B_i \setminus V(C_{i+1})]$ is the union of all connected components of $G_i[B_i]$ different from C_{i+1} and $G_{i+1}[B_{i+1} \setminus V(C'_{i+1})]$ is the union of all connected components of $G_{i+1}[B_{i+1}]$ different from C'_{i+1} . However, if both graphs are identical, their connected components are identical, too.

With the sequence H_1, \dots, H_m constructed as described above, we can apply Property (vii) of Lemma 21 to conclude $\chi(H) \leq \chi(H_1) \leq \chi(H_2) \leq \dots \leq \chi(H_m)$. We note that in each construction step we have replaced the connected component C_i with some C'_i which is by Property (iii) of Lemma 21 a clique with at most k vertices. Furthermore, from Property (v) we conclude $A = A_0 = A_1 = \dots = A_m$. Note that by Property (iv) if G is connected, then all elements in the series G_0, \dots, G_m are connected, too. Thus, with $G' = G_m$, $H' = H_m$, $\mathbf{b}' = \mathbf{b}_m$, $A' = A_m$ and $B' = B_m$ we get the desired result, which concludes the proof. \square

The preceding proposition allows us to simplify the task of proving Theorem 16. If H is a graph with k -basis G and $\chi(G) \leq k$, then we may, without loss of generality, assume that (G, A, B, \mathbf{b}) represents H in such a way that each connected component of $G[B]$ is a clique of size at most k . The usefulness of this assumption for the proof of the main result will become apparent in the following lemma. In this lemma certain assumptions are made, among them that each connected component of $G[B]$ contains at most k vertices and that at least one connected component of $G[B]$ is a clique. These assumptions are justified if, as guaranteed by Proposition 22, each connected component of $G[B]$ is in fact a clique with at most k vertices.

Lemma 23. *Let $k \geq 2$ and let H be a graph with k -basis G such that $\chi(G) \leq k$ and with k -representation $\mathbf{b} : A \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(B)$. Assume that each connected component of $G[B]$ has at most k elements and that C is a connected component of $G[B]$ which is a clique. Let $v \in N_G(V(C))$ and assume $\mathbf{b}(v) \subseteq V(C)$. Then, there is a graph H^- with k -basis G^- and k -representation $\mathbf{b}^- : A^- \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(B^-)$ with the following properties:*

- (i) $|A^-| < |A|$.
- (ii) Each block in G^- contains at most k elements.
- (iii) $\chi(H) \leq \chi(H^-)$.

Proof. We define $p := |V(C)| \leq k$ and prove the claims of the lemma in separate steps. The first step is to find a k -basis G^- and a k -representation $\mathbf{b}^- : A^- \rightarrow B^-$ and then to show Properties (i), (ii) and (iii) as stated in the lemma. We make a case distinction based on p .

1. First, consider the case $p < k$. In this case, we construct G^- by setting $V(G^-) = V(G)$ and $E(G^-) = E(G) \cup \{\{v, w\} : w \in \mathbf{b}(v)\}$. Moreover, we set $A^- = A \setminus \{v\}$, $B^- = B \cup \{v\}$ and $\mathbf{b}^- = \mathbf{b}|_{A^-}$. From these definitions it is clear that $\deg_{G^-}(x) \geq \deg_G(x)$ for all $x \in V(G)$. Together with $A^- \subseteq A$ and $\deg_G(a) \geq 2$ (by Condition 2b for (G, A, B, \mathbf{b})) for all $a \in A$ we conclude that $\deg_{G^-}(a) \geq 2$ for all $a \in A^-$ as well, which proves Condition 2b for $(G^-, A^-, B^-, \mathbf{b}^-)$.

Furthermore, it can easily be seen that if $\deg_{G^-}(x) > \deg_G(x)$, then $x \in \{v\} \cup \mathbf{b}(v)$ (this is a direct consequence of the definition of $E(G^-)$). However, our definition of

B^- implies $\{v\} \cup \mathfrak{b}(v) \subseteq B^-$, so we necessarily have $\deg_{G^-}(a) = \deg_G(a)$ for all $a \in A^-$. Moreover, the definition of \mathfrak{b}^- implies $\mathfrak{b}^-(a) = \mathfrak{b}(a)$ for each $a \in A^-$. Together, both equations imply Condition 2c as $\deg_{G^-}(a) + |\mathfrak{b}^-(a)| = \deg_G(a) + |\mathfrak{b}(a)| \leq k$ for all $a \in A^-$, where the latter inequality stems from the fact that (G, A, B, \mathfrak{b}) represents H .

It remains to check Condition 2a. Let Z be a non-trivial block in G^- . We have to show that $A^- \cap V(Z) = \emptyset$. If $v \notin V(Z)$, then Z is contained in a non-trivial block in G (as $G - v = G^- - v$) and $A^- \subseteq A$ implies $A^- \cap V(Z) \subseteq A \cap V(Z) = \emptyset$, which completes the case $v \notin V(Z)$.

Now we assume $v \in V(Z)$. Let $W = V(C) \cup \{v\}$. We now consider two subcases. First, assume $V(Z) \subseteq W$. As C is a connected component of $G[B]$ and by the definition of B^- , we conclude $W \subseteq B^-$. So as $V(Z) \subseteq W$, we clearly have $V(Z) \cap A^- = \emptyset$, which completes the proof of this case.

So let us consider the remaining case in which we have $v \in V(Z)$ and thus $v \in V(Z) \cap W$ as well as $V(Z) \not\subseteq W$. We will show that this situation leads to a contradiction. So there exists some $w \in V(Z) \setminus W$. Then, as Z is a non-trivial block with $v, w \in V(Z)$, there exists a cycle D with $v, w \in V(D)$. Moreover, note that D contains at least two different edges $e_1, e_2 \in E_{G^-}(W, V(G^-) \setminus W)$. This is as above due to the fact that $v \in W$ and $w \notin W$ and $v, w \in V(D)$.

We now claim that $e_1, e_2 \in E(G)$. Otherwise, if for example $e_1 \in E(G^-) \setminus E(G)$, then the definition of G^- implies that $e_1 = \{v, w\}$ with $w \in \mathfrak{b}(v)$. But we have assumed $\mathfrak{b}(v) \subseteq V(C)$, which then implies $w \in \mathfrak{b}(v) \subseteq V(C) \subseteq W$, contradicting $w \notin W$. So this shows that the assumption was wrong and $e_1 \in E(G)$ (and the same holds analogously for e_2).

Next, we claim that both e_1 and e_2 are bridges in G . Since exactly one endpoint of each of these edges lies in $W = V(C) \cup \{v\}$, for each e_i ($i = 1, 2$), we have two possibilities: Either $e_i \in E_G(V(C), V(G) \setminus V(C))$ or $v \in e_i$. Using Lemma 19, we then conclude that e_i is a bridge in both cases.

Let $e_i = \{x_i, y_i\}$ such that $x_i \in W$ and $y_i \notin W$. Let D' be the segment of D with endpoints y_1, y_2 such that $x_1, x_2 \notin V(D')$. It may happen that $|E_{G^-}(W, V(G^-) \setminus W)| > 2$, but if we choose e_1, e_2 carefully we can nevertheless assume that D' is contained in $G^-[V(G^-) \setminus W]$. As D' is contained in $D - v$, it is also contained in $G - v$ (as $G^- - v = G - v$). On the other hand, $G[W]$ is connected and therefore contains an x_1 - x_2 -path P . Let D'' be the cycle composed of D', e_1, e_2, P . Then, D'' is a cycle in G which contains e_1, e_2 , which contradicts the fact that e_1, e_2 are bridges as shown above. This contradiction shows that we must indeed have $V(Z) \subseteq W$ and thus completes the proof of Condition 2a.

Now that we have shown all three conditions of Definition 5 for $(G^-, A^-, B^-, \mathfrak{b}^-)$, we finally want to show the remaining assertions of Lemma 23.

The definition of $A^- = A \setminus \{v\}$ implies $|A^-| < |A|$, which is (i). In order to show (ii), let Z be a non-trivial block of G^- . In case $v \notin V(Z)$, we know that Z is contained in a non-trivial block in G (as $G^- - v = G - v$). By Condition 2a for (G, A, B, \mathfrak{b}) , we conclude that Z is contained in $G[B]$. As Z is a connected subgraph of $G[B]$, it is contained in a connected component of $G[B]$. We have assumed that each connected component in $G[B]$ contains at most k vertices, so we conclude that (ii) holds in this case. If, however, we have $v \in V(Z)$, then, as shown above (in the course of the proof

of Condition 2a), we have $V(Z) \subseteq W$. However, $|W| = |V(C)| + 1 = p + 1 \leq k$, because we have assumed $p < k$. Hence (ii) holds in this case, too.

Finally, we define H^- to be the graph defined by $(G^-, A^-, B^-, \mathbf{b}^-)$. In order to show $\chi(H) \leq \chi(H')$, we first show that $E(H) = E(H^-)$:

$$\begin{aligned} E(H^-) &= E(G^-) \cup \{\{x, y\} : x \in A^-, y \in \mathbf{b}^-(x)\} \\ &= (E(G) \cup \{\{v, w\} : w \in \mathbf{b}(v)\}) \cup \{\{x, y\} : x \in A^-, y \in \mathbf{b}^-(x)\} \\ &= E(G) \cup \{\{x, y\} : x \in A^- \cup \{v\}, y \in \mathbf{b}(x)\} \\ &= E(G) \cup \{\{x, y\} : x \in A, y \in \mathbf{b}(x)\} \\ &= E(H). \end{aligned}$$

Obviously, this implies $H = H^-$ and thus $\chi(H) = \chi(H^-)$, which implies (iii) as desired. This completes the proof of Lemma 23 for the case $p < k$.

2. Next, before we can consider the case $p = k$, we need to prove the following inequality, which we will use subsequently to prove the desired assertions:

$$|N_H(v) \cap V(C)| \leq k - 1. \quad (2)$$

Note that by Condition 2b of Definition 5, we have $\deg_G(v) \geq 2$. Moreover, we also have $\deg_H(v) \leq k$ and thus $|N_H(v)| \leq k$ by Condition 2c. Now, the first inequality implies that there are at least two vertices adjacent to v in G . Therefore, by Lemma 20, at least one vertex adjacent to v in G is *not* in C . Then, due to the second inequality, at most $k - 1$ vertices in $V(C)$ are adjacent to v in H . This implies (2).

3. Now, we consider the case $p = k$. Due to Inequality (2), there is some $w \in V(C)$ such that v and w are *not* adjacent. Hence we can construct G^- in this case by applying the Zykov operation of identifying v and w to G (cf. Figure 5 for an example). We subsequently denote by w' the new vertex of G^- , which results from identifying v and w .

Next we construct $\mathbf{b}^- : A^- \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(B^-)$. Set $A^- := A \setminus \{v\}$, $B^- := V(G^-) \setminus A^-$. For the definition of \mathbf{b}^- consider some $a \in A^-$. If $w \notin \mathbf{b}(a)$, then set $\mathbf{b}^-(a) := \mathbf{b}(a)$. Otherwise set $\mathbf{b}^-(a) := (\mathbf{b}(a) \setminus \{w\}) \cup \{w'\}$. Note that in the following, to simplify the notation, we will denote the set $V(C) \cup \{v\}$ by W and $(V(C) \setminus \{w\}) \cup \{w'\}$ by W' .

We need to check that $(G^-, A^-, B^-, \mathbf{b}^-)$ fulfills the conditions of Definition 5, Part 2. First, we consider Condition 2a. Let Z be a non-trivial block in G^- . We consider different cases. If $w' \notin V(Z)$, then Z is contained in a non-trivial block in G (as $G^- - w' = G - v - w$). In this case, Condition 2a for (G, A, B, \mathbf{b}) implies $V(Z) \cap A = \emptyset$ and thus also $V(Z) \cap A^- = \emptyset$ as desired (as $A^- \subseteq A$ by definition of A^-).

On the other hand, if $w' \in V(Z)$, we first show that $V(Z) \subseteq W'$. Suppose this is not the case. Then, Z contains a cycle D in G^- such that D contains at least two edges $e_1, e_2 \in E_{G^-}(W', V(G^-) \setminus W')$. We can assume that $e_i = \{x_i, y_i\}$ such that $x_i \in W'$ and $y_i \notin W'$ for $i = 1, 2$. Furthermore, like in the first part of the proof, we can assume that e_1, e_2 are chosen such that there is a segment D' of D with endpoints y_1, y_2 and D' is contained in $G^-[V(G^-) \setminus W^-]$. Now for each e_i there are two possibilities: Either e_i is in $E(G)$ or it resulted from the identification of v with w . In each case e_i corresponds to some edge e'_i in $E_G(W, V(G) \setminus W)$. Using an analogous argument as in the first case of the proof, as $G[V(G) \setminus W] = G^-[V(G^-) \setminus W^-]$ and $G[W]$ is connected, we can conclude the existence of a cycle D'' in G containing e'_1, e'_2 . But

by Lemma 19, e'_1 and e'_2 are bridges, which shows that they cannot be contained in a cycle. This contradiction proves that indeed we must have $V(Z) \subseteq W'$. This, together with $W' \subseteq B^-$, shows that Condition 2a holds in this case, too.

Now let $a \in A^-$. For the remaining conditions of Definition 5 we have to show that the following inequalities are fulfilled:

- $\deg_{G^-}(a) \geq 2$.
- $\deg_{G^-}(a) + |\mathfrak{b}^-(a)| \leq k$.

For the first inequality we note that according to the first step of the construction of G^- we have $G[V(G) \setminus W] = G^-[V(G^-) \setminus W']$ and thus $\deg_{G[V(G) \setminus W]}(a) = \deg_{G^-[V(G^-) \setminus W']}(a)$ for $a \in A^- \subseteq V(G) \setminus W$. Now we claim that $|E_G(a, W)| = |E_{G^-}(a, W')|$ for each $a \in A^-$. As G^- is obtained from G by identifying v with w , this claim is equivalent to the statement that there is no $a \in A$ which is adjacent in G to both, v and w . To see that such an a cannot exist, assume the contrary: if there was such an $a \in A$, then by Lemma 19 both $\{a, v\}$ and $\{a, w\}$ would be bridges in G . As $G[W]$ is connected, there is a v - w -path in $G[W]$, which together with v, a, w forms a cycle. This, however, is impossible as $\{a, v\}$ and $\{a, w\}$ are bridges. This contradiction shows that indeed we have $|E_G(a, W)| = |E_{G^-}(a, W')|$. Altogether we therefore conclude $\deg_{G^-}(a) = \deg_{G^-[V(G^-) \setminus W']}(a) + |E_{G^-}(a, W')| = \deg_{G[V(G) \setminus W]}(a) + |E_G(a, W)| = \deg_G(a)$. In particular, this shows that by $\deg_G(a) \geq 2$, which is Condition 2b for (G, A, B, \mathfrak{b}) , we also have $\deg_{G^-}(a) \geq 2$ as desired.

For the second inequality, recall that the definition of \mathfrak{b}^- is based on a case distinction. If $w \notin \mathfrak{b}(a)$, then we have $\mathfrak{b}^-(a) = \mathfrak{b}(a)$. As we have just seen that $\deg_{G^-}(a) = \deg_G(a)$, it is clear that $\deg_{G^-}(a) + |\mathfrak{b}^-(a)| = \deg_G(a) + |\mathfrak{b}(a)| \leq k$, where the last inequality stems from Condition 2c for (G, A, B, \mathfrak{b}) . Otherwise, if $w \in \mathfrak{b}(a)$, we have $\mathfrak{b}^-(a) = (\mathfrak{b}(a) \setminus \{w\}) \cup \{w'\}$, which implies $|\mathfrak{b}^-(a)| = |\mathfrak{b}(a)|$. Again together with $\deg_{G^-}(x) = \deg_G(x)$, we derive the second inequality.

So in summary, so far we have shown that $\mathfrak{b}^- : A^- \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(B^-)$ is a k -representation with k -basis G^- . Let H^- be the graph defined by $(G^-, A^-, B^-, \mathfrak{b}^-)$. So it remains to show the Properties (i) - (iii) of Lemma 23. Note that our definition of A^- implies that $|A^-| < |A|$, so (i) is fulfilled. In order to prove (ii), let Z be a non-trivial block in G^- . Then either $w' \notin V(Z)$, in which case Z is contained in a non-trivial block in G (as $G^- - w' = G - w - v$). Using Condition 2a of Definition 5 for (G, A, B, \mathfrak{b}) , we conclude $V(Z) \subseteq G[B]$. As by assumption of Lemma 23 each connected component of $G[B]$ contains at most k elements, (ii) follows easily in this case. Otherwise, if we have $w' \in V(Z)$, we have $V(Z) \subseteq W'$, as shown above (in the part of the proof where we showed that Condition 2a holds). As $|W'| = k$, (ii) follows in this case, too.

The last property we need to show is $\chi(H) \leq \chi(H^-)$. Let $f' : V(H^-) \rightarrow \{1, \dots, l\}$ be an l -coloring of H^- for some $l \in \mathbb{N}$. Our aim now is to use f' to construct an l -coloring of H , which will complete the proof (using the special case $l = \chi(H^-)$).

We define $f : V(H) \rightarrow \{1, \dots, l\}$ in the following way:

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} f'(x) & \text{if } x \notin \{v, w\}, \\ f'(w') & \text{if } x \in \{v, w\}. \end{cases}$$

In order to prove that f is indeed an l -coloring, we consider some $e = \{x, y\} \in E(H)$. We need to show that $f(x) \neq f(y)$. We use a case distinction.

- (a) Suppose $e \in E(G)$. In this case, if $e \cap \{v, w\} = \emptyset$ we conclude $e \in E(G^-)$ (as $G - v - w = G^- - w'$). Thus, we have $f(x) = f'(x)$ and $f(y) = f'(y)$. Then $f'(x) \neq f'(y)$, as f' is a coloring. Hence, $f(x) \neq f(y)$.

The other possible subcase is that $e \cap \{v, w\} \neq \emptyset$. As v and w are non-adjacent, we conclude $e \neq \{v, w\}$. So we may assume without loss of generality that $x \in \{v, w\}$ and $y \notin \{v, w\}$. Since G^- was obtained from G by identifying v and w , we conclude $\{w', y\} \in E(G^-)$. Then $f(x) = f'(w')$ and $f(y) = f'(y)$. As f' is a coloring, we have $f'(w') \neq f'(y)$ and thus derive $f(x) \neq f(y)$ as desired.

- (b) Suppose $e \in E(H) \setminus E(G)$. Then e is represented by \mathbf{b} , and we can assume without loss of generality that $x \in A$ and $y \in \mathbf{b}(x)$. Now we consider two different cases:

- i. First, we consider the case $x = v$. Recall that Lemma 23 assumes $\mathbf{b}(v) \subseteq V(C)$. Hence $y \in V(C)$. As v and w are non-adjacent in H , we conclude $y \in W \setminus \{w\} \subseteq W'$. Since C is assumed to be a clique, we have $\{y, w\} \in E(G)$, and by identifying w with v , we obtain $\{y, w'\} \in E(G')$. Then $f(v) = f'(w')$ and $f(y) = f'(y)$. As f' is a coloring, we know that $f'(w') \neq f'(y)$ and thus conclude that $f(v) \neq f(y)$.
- ii. Now, consider the case $x \in A \setminus \{v\} = A^-$. In this case, we have $f(x) = f'(x)$. Our definition of \mathbf{b}^- together with $y \in \mathbf{b}(x)$ imply that either $y = w$ or $y \in \mathbf{b}^-(x)$. First, consider the case that $y \in \mathbf{b}^-(x)$. Then, we have $\{x, y\} \in E(H^-)$ and thus $f'(x) \neq f'(y)$, because f' is a coloring of H^- . We conclude $f(x) \neq f(y)$. On the other hand, if $y = w$, then $f(y) = f'(w')$, and by our definition of \mathbf{b}^- , it follows that $w' \in \mathbf{b}^-(x)$. In this case $\{x, w'\} \in E(H^-)$, and therefore we conclude that $f'(x) \neq f'(w')$ and thus also $f(x) \neq f(w)$.

This completes the proof. \square

There is another construction which will be needed for the proof of Theorem 16. This construction will subsequently be described in Lemma 26, and it requires the following lemma to help us with the construction of a new k -basis.

Lemma 24. *Let $k \geq 2$ and let G be a graph consisting of two connected components G_1 and G_2 . Let each block in G contain at most k vertices. Let $x_1 \in V(G_1)$ and $x_2 \in V(G_2)$. Let G_3 be the graph resulting from identifying x_1 and x_2 to form a new vertex x . Then each block in G_3 has at most k vertices.*

Before we prove the lemma, note that Figure 6 illustrates the construction of graph G_3 .

Proof of Lemma 24. We begin the proof by noting that from the construction of G_3 it directly follows that $G'_i = G_3[V(G_i) \setminus \{x_i\} \cup x]$ is isomorphic to G_i for $i = 1, 2$, and that $V(G'_1) \cap V(G'_2) = \{x\}$. Let Z be a block in G_3 . Without loss of generality we can assume that Z is non-trivial (because otherwise $|Z| \leq 2$, in which case there is nothing to show). We have to show that Z contains at most k vertices. Our proof strategy now is to show that Z is contained either in G'_1 or in G'_2 and thus must be isomorphic to a block contained in G . As all these blocks by assumption of the lemma contain at most k vertices, this will complete the proof.

Thus, it only remains to show that Z is contained either in G'_1 or in G'_2 . Assume this is not the case. Then, there is a cycle C contained in Z such that C contains at least one element of $V(G'_1) \setminus V(G'_2)$ and at least one element of $V(G'_2) \setminus V(G'_1)$. As $V(G'_1) \cap V(G'_2) = \{x\}$




Figure 5: This is an example with $k = 3$ for the procedure described in the proof of Lemma 23. We assume on the left side that the vertices w_1, w_2 and w_3 belong to B and constitute a connected component C of $G[B]$ (which is a clique as these vertices form a triangle). Furthermore, we assume that v is in A . We see that v is a neighbor of C and $\mathbf{b}(v) \subseteq V(C)$. In this case, $(G^-, A^-, B^-, \mathbf{b}^-)$ is obtained by identifying v and w_3 . In the figure, thick lines indicate which edges belong to the respective basis, and thin lines indicate which edges are represented by the respective function. The dotted line on the right side indicates an edge by which some vertex in B (which is connected with v in the left figure) ends up as a neighbor of w'_3 in the right figure after identifying it with v .

contains only one element (namely x), we conclude that C contains at least one edge connecting $V(G'_1) \setminus V(G'_2)$ with $V(G'_2) \setminus V(G'_1)$ which contradicts our construction of G_3 .

Together with the above considerations, this completes the proof. \square

Before we can turn our attention to the final lemma, we state the following remark, which is a direct consequence of Lemma 24 and its proof.

Remark 25. *In the situation assumed by Lemma 24, we can consider G_1 and G_2 as subgraphs of G_3 by identifying them with their isomorphic copies G'_1 and G'_2 which were considered in the proof of the lemma. Furthermore, the proof shows that each non-trivial block in G_3 is either a non-trivial block in G_1 or a non-trivial block in G_2 .*

Lemma 26. *Let $k \geq 2$ and let H be a graph with k -basis G with $\chi(G) \leq k$ and k -representation $\mathbf{b} : A \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(B)$. Assume that each block in $G[B]$ contains at most k vertices. Let C be a connected component of $G[B]$. Let D_1, \dots, D_l be the connected components of $G[V(G) \setminus V(C)]$. Let $v \in N_G(V(C)) \cap V(D_1)$ and assume $\mathbf{b}(v) \cap V(D_1) \neq \emptyset$. Then there is a graph H^- with k -basis G^- and k -representation $\mathbf{b}^- : A^- \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(B^-)$ with the following properties:*

- (i) $|A^-| < |A|$.
- (ii) Each block in G^- has at most k vertices.
- (iii) $\chi(H) \leq \max(\chi(H^-), k)$.




Figure 6: This is an example for the Zykov operation described in Definition 1 which is used in Lemma 24. Here, G_1 and G_2 are the two connected components of graph G . By identifying x_1 and x_2 , a new graph G_3 is obtained, which has exactly one new vertex that is not contained in G , namely x .

Proof. Note that v as stated in Lemma 26 must be contained in A , and recall that by Lemma 20, v has a unique neighbor x_1 in C , which implies the existence of edge $e = \{v, x_1\}$. Moreover, as Lemma 26 assumes $\mathbf{b}(v) \cap V(D_1) \neq \emptyset$, we can choose some $x_2 \in \mathbf{b}(v) \cap V(D_1)$.

We will subsequently construct $(G^-, A^-, B^-, \mathbf{b}^-)$ and then show all desired properties. At first we construct the k -basis G^- . As we conclude from Lemma 19 that e is a bridge, we observe that $G - e$ has two connected components, namely D_1 and $G_2 := G[V(H) \setminus V(D_1)]$. Now we apply Lemma 24 to $G - e$ with its subgraphs D_1 and G_2 as follows: We identify the vertices x_1 and x_2 as defined above to derive a new vertex x and to obtain graph G^- . By Lemma 24 we know that each block in G^- has at most k vertices. Note that this already shows Property (ii) of Lemma 26. We denote the vertex obtained by identifying x_1 with x_2 by x . Figure 7 shows an example for this construction.

Now we construct a k -representation $\mathbf{b}^- : A^- \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(B^-)$. Set $A^- := A \setminus \{v\}$ (which already shows $|A^-| < |A|$ as required by Condition (i) of the lemma). Moreover, set $B^- := (B \setminus \{x_1, x_2\}) \cup \{v, x\}$. For $a \in A^-$ set $\mathbf{b}^-(a) := (\mathbf{b}(a) \setminus \{x_1, x_2\}) \cup \{x\}$, if $\{x_1, x_2\} \cap \mathbf{b}(a) \neq \emptyset$, and $\mathbf{b}^-(a) := \mathbf{b}(a)$, else.

Now it remains to show that $(G^-, A^-, B^-, \mathbf{b}^-)$ fulfills the conditions of Definition 5 and Property (iii) as stated in the lemma.

For Condition 2a of Definition 5 we have to check that for each non-trivial block Z in G^- it is true that $A^- \cap V(Z) = \emptyset$. Therefore, recall that G^- was constructed using Lemma 24 by identifying some vertex of D_1 and some vertex of G_2 . By Remark 25 we know that G^- contains D_1 and G_2 as subgraphs. Furthermore, again by Remark 25, we know that Z is contained either in D_1 or in G_2 . Hence Z is contained in G . Using Condition 2a for (G, A, B, \mathbf{b}) we conclude that $V(Z) \cap A = \emptyset$ in G . With $A^- \subseteq A$ and $x \in B^-$ we derive $V(Z) \cap A^- = \emptyset$ in G^- as desired.

Now let $a \in A^-$. For the remaining conditions we have to show the following two inequalities:

- $\deg_{G^-}(a) \geq 2$,
- $\deg_{G^-}(a) + |\mathbf{b}^-(a)| \leq k$.

We start with considering $\deg_{G^-}(a) \geq 2$. If $a \in A^- \subseteq A$, we have $a \notin \{v, x_1, x_2\}$ (as $a \in V(G^-)$ but $x_1, x_2 \notin V(G^-)$, and as $v \in B^-$). Deleting e and identifying x_1 with x_2 leaves all degrees of vertices in $V(G) \setminus \{v, x_1, x_2\}$ unchanged (note that with the possible exception of v there is no vertex which is adjacent with both x_1 and x_2 in G , because otherwise e would not be a bridge). This implies $\deg_{G^-}(a) = \deg_G(a)$. From this and Condition 2b for (G, A, B, \mathbf{b}) we conclude that $\deg_{G^-}(a) \geq 2$, which completes the proof of the first inequality.

Next we want to show $\deg_{G^-}(a) + |\mathbf{b}^-(a)| \leq k$. We now already know $\deg_{G^-}(a) = \deg_G(a)$. Furthermore, our definition of \mathbf{b}^- implies $|\mathbf{b}^-(a)| \leq |\mathbf{b}(a)|$. Together, these observations together with Condition 2c for (G, A, B, \mathbf{b}) immediately imply desired inequality, so we indeed have $\deg_{G^-}(a) + |\mathbf{b}^-(a)| \leq k$.

So now it only remains to show $\chi(H) \leq \max(\chi(H^-), k)$. Let $f' : V(H^-) \rightarrow \{1, \dots, l\}$ be some l -coloring and let $r = \max\{l, k\}$. We now provide a construction of an r -coloring $f : V(H) \rightarrow \{1, \dots, r\}$, which will complete our proof (by applying this construction to the special case $l = \chi(H^-)$).

We start by constructing a partial coloring $\tilde{f} : V(H - v) \rightarrow \{1, \dots, l\}$ as follows:

$$\tilde{f}(y) = \begin{cases} f'(y) & \text{if } y \in V(H) \setminus \{v, x_1, x_2\}, \\ f'(x) & \text{if } y \in \{x_1, x_2\}. \end{cases}$$

We claim that $\tilde{f}(y) \neq \tilde{f}(z)$ for $e = \{y, z\} \in E(H - v)$. We prove this assertion by distinguishing two cases.

1. First consider the case in which we have $e \in E(G)$. We remember that G^- is obtained from $G - e$ by the Zykov operation of identifying x_1 and x_2 . Now, if we denote by g the restriction of f' to $G^- - v$ and with \widehat{g} the function obtained from g by the construction described in Lemma 12, we derive $\tilde{f} = \widehat{g}$. From Lemma 12 we can thus conclude that \tilde{f} is an l -coloring of $G^- - v$, because g as a restriction of f is an l -coloring of $G^- - v$. Together with $v \notin \{y, z\}$, this shows $\tilde{f}(y) \neq \tilde{f}(z)$.
2. Now consider the case in which $e \notin E(G)$, i.e., the case in which e is represented by \mathfrak{b} . Then we can assume without loss of generality that $y \in A$ and $z \in \mathfrak{b}$. As we have assumed $v \notin \{y, z\}$, we derive the stronger statement $y \in A^-$. Using the definition of \mathfrak{b}^- , we conclude the existence of some $\{y, z'\} \in E(H^-)$ such that $\{y, z'\}$ is represented by \mathfrak{b}^- . Note that $z' = z$ if $z \notin \{x_1, x_2\}$, else $z' = x$. In each case we have $\tilde{f}(z) = f'(z')$. Furthermore, $\tilde{f}(y) = f'(y)$, because $x_1, x_2 \in B$ and $y \in A$. Now we use the fact that f' is an l -coloring of H to derive the desired conclusion that $\tilde{f}(y) \neq \tilde{f}(z)$.

It remains to extend \tilde{f} to an r -coloring f of H . We note that v has neighbors x_1, x_2 with $\tilde{f}(x_1) = \tilde{f}(x_2)$. Moreover by Condition 2c, which holds for (G, A, B, \mathfrak{b}) representing H , we have $\deg_H(v) \leq k$. This implies that \tilde{f} uses at most $k - 1$ colors in the neighborhood of v . Hence we need at most k colors for an extension of \tilde{f} to a coloring of H . As we have shown that \tilde{f} is an l -coloring, we conclude that at most $r = \max\{k, l\}$ colors are needed to construct a coloring of H . This completes the proof. \square

3.4.2 Proof of Theorem 16

We are now finally in a position to prove our main theorem, which is Theorem 16. We have already seen that, given a graph H which is represented by a k -basis G and k -representation $\mathfrak{b} : A \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(B)$, under certain conditions we can use Lemma 23 or Lemma 26 to construct a graph H^- which is represented by a k -basis G^- and k -representation $\mathfrak{b}^- : A^- \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(B^-)$ such that $|A^-| < |A|$. Moreover if $\chi(H^-) \leq k$, then $\chi(H) \leq k$. We will use these insights in order to derive a proof of Theorem 16.

Proof of Theorem 16. Let H be a graph with k -basis G and k -representation $\mathfrak{b} : A \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(B)$ such that $\chi(G) \leq k$. We now prove the desired result by induction on $|A|$. For $A = \emptyset$ the statement is clearly true, because in this case $G = H$, and by assumption we have $\chi(G) \leq k$.

So now we assume $A \neq \emptyset$. Moreover, without loss of generality we can assume by Proposition 22 that each connected component of $G[B]$ is a clique of size at most k .

We want to find a connected component of $G[B]$ to which Lemma 23 or Lemma 26 can be applied. In the following, we will call a connected component C of $G[B]$ a *leaf component* if $|N_G(C)| \leq 1$. We now argue that for each connected component C' of G there is at least one leaf component C of $G[B]$ such that C is a subgraph of C' . To see this, contract every connected component D of $G[B]$ to a vertex v_D . Using Lemma 20, we can conclude that no edge from $E_G(A, B)$ is deleted during these contractions. Furthermore, by Lemma 19, each edge $e \in E(G)$ which is not contained in $G[B]$ is a bridge. Hence, through the contractions we get a forest F with a natural bijection between $E(F)$ and $E(G) \setminus E(G[B])$. Moreover, each connected component of F resulted from some connected component C' of G by contracting all edges in $E(C') \cap E(G[B])$, and every vertex in F is either in A or was obtained by contraction from some connected component of $G[B]$. Furthermore,




Figure 7: This is an example for the construction described in the proof of Lemma 26. We have $x_1, x_2 \in B$ and $v \in A$ in G . G^- is then obtained from G by identifying x_1 with x_2 to derive the new vertex x . In G^- , vertices x and v are both in B .

$A \subseteq V(F)$ and $\deg_F(a) = \deg_G(a) \geq 2$ for every $a \in A$. Therefore, if x is a leaf in F , then x was obtained by contraction from some connected component C of $G[B]$. But then C is a leaf component. This shows our claim. Additionally, we note that in the case that C is contained in some connected component C'' of G with $A \cap V(C'') \neq \emptyset$, we have $|N_G(C)| = 1$. So we can assume from now on that each connected component of G contains at least one leaf component as a subgraph.

Now, we consider two cases. Let us first consider the case that G is connected. In this case, let C be a leaf component of $G[B]$, then. As we have already excluded the case $A = \emptyset$, we can conclude from the previous remarks that $|N_G(C)| = 1$. Hence, $N_G(C) = \{v\}$ for some $v \in A$.

In this situation there is only one connected component D_1 of $G[V(G) \setminus V(C)]$, so we conclude that there are only two possibilities:

1. If we have $\mathbf{b}(v) \subseteq V(C)$, then Lemma 23 can be applied as each connected component of $G[B]$ is a clique with at most k elements.
2. If $\mathbf{b}(v) \cap V(D_1) \neq \emptyset$, then by Condition 2a of Definition 5 we know that each non-trivial block in G is contained in a connected component of $G[B]$. As by assumption each connected component of $G[B]$ has at most k vertices, this shows that the conditions of Lemma 26 are fulfilled.

In each case by application of Lemma 23 or Lemma 26, respectively, we obtain a graph H^- with k -basis G^- and k -representation $\mathbf{b}^- : A^- \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(B^-)$. Moreover, Lemma 23 and Lemma 26 tell us that in each case each block in G^- has at most k elements and $|A^-| < |A|$. By Corollary 9 we conclude that $\chi(G^-) \leq k$. As $|A^-| < |A|$ we can apply the induction hypothesis and conclude $\chi(H^-) \leq k$. Finally, from Lemma 23 and Lemma 26 we know that $\chi(H^-) \leq k$ implies $\chi(H) \leq k$, which completes the proof in this case.

It remains to consider the case in which G has more than one connected component. We show how this case can be reduced to the previous case. So let us assume that G has the connected components C_1, \dots, C_l with $l \geq 2$. We have already seen that each connected component C_i contains at least one leaf component. In particular, this implies that $V(C_i) \cap B \neq \emptyset$, so we can choose some $b_i \in V(C_i) \cap B$ for each $i \in \{1, \dots, l\}$.

In order to reduce this case to the previous case we construct $(G', A', B', \mathbf{b}')$ in the following way:

- G' is the graph with $V(G') = V(G)$ and $E(G') = E(G) \cup \{\{b_i, b_{i+1}\} : 1 \leq i \leq k-1\}$.
- $A' = A$, $B' = B$ and $\mathbf{b}'(a) = \mathbf{b}(a)$ for all $a \in A$.

Clearly, $(G', A', B', \mathbf{b}')$ represents some graph H' with $V(H') = V(H)$ and $E(H') = E(H) \cup \{\{b_i, b_{i+1}\} : 1 \leq i \leq k-1\}$. We claim that G' is a k -basis and \mathbf{b}' is a k -representation of H' .

All additional edges of $E(G') \setminus E(G)$ are elements of $\binom{B}{2}$. Hence, $\deg_G(a) = \deg_{G'}(a)$ for all $a \in A$. Moreover, $\mathbf{b}(a) = \mathbf{b}'(a)$ for all $a \in A$. This suffices to show Conditions 2b and 2c of Definition 5. In order to prove Condition 2a, we observe that each $\{b_i, b_{i+1}\} \in E(G') \setminus E(G)$ is a bridge: Indeed, $G' \setminus \{b_i, b_{i+1}\}$ is decomposed into the two connected components $\bigcup_{j=1}^i C_j$ and $\bigcup_{j=i+1}^l C_j$. Now, consider some non-trivial block Z in G' . As all elements of $E(G') \setminus E(G)$ are bridges, we conclude that $E(Z) \cap (E(G') \setminus E(G)) = \emptyset$, and hence Z is contained in G . Then, we conclude from Condition 2a for (G, A, B, \mathbf{b}) that $A \cap V(Z) = A' \cap V(Z) = \emptyset$.

Now we have constructed a k -basis G' of H' such that G' is connected. As H is a subgraph of H' , we know that $\chi(H) \leq \chi(H')$. As the additional edges in $E(G') \setminus E(G)$ are bridges, it is easy to conclude that $\chi(G') = \chi(G)$. For a successful reduction to

the first case, it remains to apply Proposition 22 to H' in order to ensure that each connected component of $G'[B']$ is a clique with at most k vertices. Note that Proposition 22 guarantees that G' is still connected after replacing all connected components of $G'[B']$ with cliques. This implies that we have successfully reduced the second case to the previous case, which finally completes the proof. \square

We already have mentioned that Theorem 16 together with Proposition 17 implies Corollary 18. Thus, this solves Question 1, which was the main motivation of our manuscript.

4 Discussion and outlook

Trees has chromatic number 2 and we have shown that strongly tree-based networks have chromatic number at most 3. There are many other graph properties which could be investigated for the comparison of trees and strongly tree-based networks or other restricted classes of tree-based networks. The possibilities are endless here. We will give here just two simple examples.

For example, if we denote by $\omega(G)$ the size of a largest clique in a graph G , it is easy to see that $\omega(T) = 2$ for each tree T with at least one edge. As $\omega(G) \leq \chi(G)$ is true for each graph G it is implied by Theorem 16 that $\omega(N) \leq 3$ for each strongly tree-based network N . On the other hand, it has been already noted by Hendriksen that general tree-based networks can have an arbitrarily large clique number (cf. Proof of Theorem 4.1. in [11]). So the clique number exhibits a similar pattern as the chromatic number: Both graph properties can be arbitrarily large for general tree-based networks and have a constant as an upper bound for strongly tree-based networks.

We are curious if this pattern can be observed for more graph properties. Consider for example the *list chromatic number*: Given a graph $G = (V, E)$ and a non-negative integer k we associate with each vertex v a list $L(v)$ of k colors. Then G is called *k -list-colorable* if for each such association there is some function $f : V(G) \rightarrow \bigcup_{v \in V} L(v)$ with $f(v) \in L(v)$ and $f(v) \neq f(w)$ for all $\{v, w\} \in E(G)$. The list chromatic number of G which is denoted by $ch(G)$ is then the smallest number k for which G is k -list-colorable. It is well-known that $ch(G) \geq \chi(G)$ [2] and that for each natural number k there is a complete bipartite graph G with $ch(G) > k$ [8]. Hence it is clear that the list chromatic number can be arbitrarily large for general tree-based networks. This immediately leads to the following question, which we leave open for future research.

Problem 1. *Is there a constant C such that $ch(N) < C$ for each strongly tree-based network?*

We are confident that the investigation of problems like this will deepen the links between classical graph theory and tree-based networks and thus lead to a more profound understanding of the latter.

Statements and declarations

Competing interests

The authors herewith certify that they have no affiliations with or involvement in any organization or entity with any financial (such as honoraria; educational grants; participation in speakers' bureaus; membership, employment, consultancies, stock ownership, or other equity interest; and expert testimony or patent-licensing arrangements) or non-financial

(such as personal or professional relationships, affiliations, knowledge or beliefs) interest in the subject matter discussed in this manuscript.

Data availability statement

Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no new data were created or analyzed in this study.

References

- [1] Béla Bollobás. *Modern Graph Theory*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer, New York, 1 edition, 1998.
- [2] Reinhard Diestel. *Graph Theory*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer, Heidelberg; New York, 5 edition, 2017.
- [3] Mareike Fischer, Michelle Galla, Lina Herbst, Yangjing Long, and Kristina Wicke. Classes of tree-based networks. *Visual Computing for Industry, Biomedicine, and Art*, 3:12, 2020.
- [4] Mareike Fischer, Tom Niklas Hamann, and Kristina Wicke. How far is my network from being edge-based? proximity measures for edge-basedness of unrooted phylogenetic networks. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 337:303–320, October 2023.
- [5] Mareike Fischer, Lina Herbst, Michelle Galla, Yangjing Long, and Kristina Wicke. Unrooted non-binary tree-based phylogenetic networks. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 294:10–30, 2021.
- [6] A Francis, K T Huber, and V Moulton. Tree-based unrooted phylogenetic networks. *Bull. Math. Biol.*, 80(2):404–416, February 2018.
- [7] Andrew R. Francis and Mike Steel. Which phylogenetic networks are merely trees with additional arcs? *Systematic Biology*, 64(5):768–777, 06 2015.
- [8] Sylvain Gravier. A hajós-like theorem for list coloring. *Discrete Mathematics*, 152(1):299–302, 1996.
- [9] Russell D. Gray, Simon J. Greenhill, and Quentin D. Atkinson. 285 phylogenetic models of language change. In *Cultural Evolution: Society, Technology, Language, and Religion*. The MIT Press, 11 2013.
- [10] Frank Harary. *Graph Theory*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Reading, Massachusetts, 1 edition, 1969.
- [11] Michael Hendriksen. Tree-based unrooted nonbinary phylogenetic networks. *Mathematical Biosciences*, 302:131–138, 2018.
- [12] Daniel H. Huson, Regula Rupp, and Celine Scornavacca. *Phylogenetic Networks: Concepts, Algorithms and Applications*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2010.
- [13] Simone Linz. *"Reticulation in evolution."*. PhD thesis, Heinrich-Heine-University, Düsseldorf, Germany, 2008.

- [14] Colin McDiarmid. Determining the chromatic number of a graph. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 8(1):1–14, 1979.
- [15] Giacomo Plazzotta, Christopher Kwan, Michael Boyd, and Caroline Colijn. Effects of memory on the shapes of simple outbreak trees. *Sci. Rep.*, 6(1):21159, February 2016.
- [16] Jacob G Scott, Philip K Maini, Alexander R A Anderson, and Alexander G Fletcher. Inferring tumor proliferative organization from phylogenetic tree measures in a computational model. *Syst. Biol.*, 69(4):623–637, July 2020.
- [17] Charles Semple and Mike Steel. *Phylogenetics*. Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and Its Applications. Oxford University Press, London, England, February 2003.
- [18] M.A. Steel. *"Distributions on Bicoloured Evolutionary Trees"*. PhD thesis, Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand, 1989.
- [19] A. A. Zykov. On some properties of linear complexes. *Matematicheskii Sbornik*, 66(2):163–188, 1949.