UNIVERSITY OF LJUBLJANA INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, PHYSICS AND MECHANICS DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS JADRANSKA 19, 1000 LJUBLJANA, SLOVENIA

Preprint series, Vol. 40 (2002), 817

# PLANAR GRAPH COLORINGS WITHOUT SHORT MONOCHROMATIC CYCLES

Tomáš Kaiser Riste Škrekovski

ISSN 1318-4865

March 11, 2002

Ljubljana, March 11, 2002

# Planar graph colorings without short monochromatic cycles

Tomáš Kaiser\*

Riste Škrekovski<sup>\*†</sup>

Department of Mathematics University of West Bohemia Univerzitní 8 306 14 Plzeň Czech Republic kaisert@kma.zcu.cz Department of Mathematics University of Ljubljana Jadranska 19 1111 Ljubljana Slovenia skreko@fmf.uni-lj.si

Institute of Theoretical Computer Science (ITI) Charles University Praha, Czech Republic

January 27, 2001

#### Abstract

It is well known that every planar graph G is 2-colorable in such a way that no 3-cycle of G is monochromatic. In this paper, we prove that G has a 2-coloring such that no cycle of length 3 or 4 is monochromatic. Equivalently, every cubic bridgeless planar graph G has a 2-factor which intersects every edge-cut of G of size 3 or 4. On the other hand, there are planar graphs with the property that any of their 2-colorings has a monochromatic cycle of length at most 5. In this sense, our result is best possible.

# 1 Introduction

Let G be a simple graph and  $k \geq 3$ . Let  $\mathcal{C}_{\leq k}(G)$  be the hypergraph on V(G) (the vertex set of G) whose edges are (the vertex sets of) cycles in G of length at most k. Similarly, let  $\mathcal{C}_{odd}(G)$  be the hypergraph on V(G) whose edges are the odd cycles of G. For the hypergraph of odd cycles, one has the following result:

<sup>\*</sup>The research was supported by project LN00A056 of the Czech Ministery of Education.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>†</sup>Supported in part by the Ministry of Science and Technology of Slovenia, Research Project Z1-3129.

### **Theorem 1.1** For every planar graph G, the hypergraph $\mathcal{C}_{odd}(G)$ is 2-colorable.

Stein [5] gave a straightforward argument to deduce the above claim from the Four Color Theorem (which was still a conjecture at the time). Color vertices of G properly by colors 1, 2, 3, and 4. Recolor the odd-colored vertices by black and the even-colored ones by white. It is easy to see that the new 2-coloring is proper for the hypergraph  $\mathcal{C}_{odd}(G)$ .

In particular, the above theorem implies that for a planar graph G, the hypergraph  $\mathcal{C}_{\leq 3}(G)$  is 2-colorable. A proof of Theorem 1.1, not based on the Four Color Theorem, is given in [5] for triangulations without separating 3-cycles (see the end of this section for the definition of a separating cycle). It uses the fact that a planar triangulation has a 2-coloring without monochromatic faces if and only if its dual has a 2-factor. This equivalence can be easily generalized to non-facial cycles.

Let us first review a few definitions. The edge set of a graph G is denoted by E(G). Recall that an *edge-cut* in G is a set  $A \subset E(G)$  such that G - A is disconnected and A is minimal with this property. Since we shall not be interested in vertex-cuts, we refer to edge-cuts simply as *cuts*. If the size of a cut is k, we also use the term *k-cut*. Similarly, we speak about *k-cycles* and *k-faces*. Vertices of degree k are referred to as *k-vertices*.

The dual of a planar graph G is denoted by  $G^*$ . We use the notation  $e^*$  to refer to the edge of  $G^*$  which corresponds to  $e \in E(G)$ . If  $A \subset E(G)$  is a set of edges, we let  $A^* = \{e^* : e \in A\}$ . Also if  $w \in V(G^*)$ , then  $w^*$  denotes the corresponding face of G.

An even factor of a graph G is a spanning subgraph in which all degrees are even and non-zero. Thus, for instance, any 2-factor is an even factor. If there is no danger of confusion, we identify factors with their edge sets.

**Proposition 1.2** Let G be a planar graph with faces of size at most k. Then,  $C_{\leq k}(G)$  is 2-colorable if and only if the dual  $G^*$  of G has an even factor which intersects every cut of size at most k.

**Proof.** Let c be a 2-coloring of  $\mathcal{C}_{\leq k}(G)$ . Let  $\mathcal{C}^*$  be the set of edges  $e^*$  of  $G^*$  with the property that the endvertices of e are colored differently by c. Every vertex of  $G^*$  is incident with a positive even number of edges in  $\mathcal{C}^*$ . Thus  $\mathcal{C}^*$  is an even factor of  $G^*$ . Since a cut of  $G^*$  corresponds to a cycle in G of the same size (and vice versa), and since c has no monochromatic cycle of length at most k, it follows that  $\mathcal{C}^*$  intersects all cuts of size at most k in  $G^*$ .

To prove the other direction, we use an analogue of the argument from [5]. Let  $\mathcal{C}^*$  be an even factor in  $G^*$  which meets every cut of  $G^*$  of size at most k. As a subgraph of  $G^*$ ,  $\mathcal{C}^*$  is spanning and Eulerian. We can properly 2-color the faces of  $\mathcal{C}^*$ . This coloring induces a (possibly improper) 2-coloring of the faces of  $G^*$ , and

thus a 2-coloring of the vertices of G. Now, if G has a monochromatic cycle of length  $t \leq k$ , we obtain a *t*-cut in  $G^*$  which is disjoint from  $\mathcal{C}^*$ , a contradiction.

The well-known Petersen theorem asserts that every bridgeless cubic graph has a 2-factor. Schönberger [4] proved the following generalization.

**Theorem 1.3** Let G be a cubic bridgeless multigraph and let e, f be two edges of G. Then, G has a 2-factor which contains both e and f.

Observe that this is equivalent to the assertion that every edge of a bridgeless cubic graph is contained in a 1-factor (cf. [2], Chapter 4).

As noted in [5], D. Barnette has pointed out that Theorem 1.3 can be used to prove that the hypergraph  $\mathcal{C}_{\leq 3}(G)$  is 2-colorable for every planar graph G. A direct inductive proof of this fact was found by Král [3].

In this paper, we prove that for every planar graph G, the hypergraph  $\mathcal{C}_{\leq 4}(G)$  is 2-colorable. Equivalently, every bridgeless cubic graph G has a 2-factor which intersects every cut of G of size 3 or 4. However, there exist planar graphs for which  $\mathcal{C}_{\leq 5}(G)$  is not 2-colorable. It was noted in [5] that one such graph is the dual of the well-known non-hamiltonian planar cubic graph used by Tutte [6] to disprove Tait's Conjecture. In this sense, our result is best possible.

We conclude this section with a few more definitions. If C is a cycle of a plane graph G, then Int(C) is the subgraph of G consisting of all vertices and edges which belong to C or are contained inside it (with respect to the fixed embedding of G in the plane). The graph Out(C) is defined symmetrically. We say that a cycle C is *separating* if both Int(C) and Out(C) contain vertices not belonging to C.

## 2 Colorings and types

Let G be a plane graph. For a given face F of G, an F-type is any non-empty subset of E(F) of size 2. A type vector  $\tau$  for G is a mapping which assigns an F-type to each inner 4-face F of G. We denote this F-type by  $\tau(F)$ .

Let  $c: V(G) \to \{1, 2\}$  be a 2-coloring of a planar graph G. For brevity, any cycle of length at most 4 will be called *short*. If no short cycle of G is monochromatic, then c is a good coloring. Denote by D(c) the set of edges xy of G with  $c(x) \neq c(y)$ . A coloring c crosses an F-type T if  $D(c) \cap E(F) \neq T$  and  $D(c) \cap T \neq \emptyset$ . We say that c crosses a type vector  $\tau$  if for each inner 4-face F of G, the coloring c crosses  $\tau(F)$ . Saying that c crosses  $\tau$  at F, where F is a 4-face of G, means simply that ccrosses the F-type  $\tau(F)$ .

A 4-cycle C of a planar graph G is *nice*, if for every 4-cycle C' of G either

(a) C' is a cycle of Int(C) or Out(C), or

(b) some edge of C is a diagonal of C'.

In order to prove our main theorem, we will first consider the following special case:

**Lemma 2.1** Let G be a plane graph isomorphic to  $K_{2,n}$   $(n \ge 2)$  with outer face O, and let  $\tau$  be a type vector of G. Then there exists an O-type T such that every good coloring of O which crosses T can be extended to a good coloring of G which crosses  $\tau$ .

**Proof.** Label the vertices of G in such a way that the two partites of G are  $\{x, y\}$  and  $\{a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n\}$ , and furthermore,  $O = xa_1ya_n$  and for each  $i = 1, \ldots, n-1$ , the 4-cycle  $xa_iya_{i+1}$  bounds a face  $F_i$  of G. We may assume that for each inner face  $F_i$  of G, the type  $\tau(F_i)$  contains the edge  $xa_i$  (otherwise, replace  $\tau(F_i)$  by its complement  $E(F_i) \setminus \tau(F_i)$ ). We may also restrict our attention to colorings of O assigning color 1 to x.

Note first that the coloring c of V(O) given by c(x) = c(y) = 1,  $c(a_1) = c(a_n) = 2$ can always be extended to a good coloring  $\tilde{c}$  of G which crosses  $\tau$ . Indeed, one can set  $\tilde{c}(a_i) = 2$  for all  $i \in \{2, \ldots, n-1\}$ . The coloring  $\tilde{c}$  is good, and since for each i,  $D(\tilde{c}) \supset E(F_i)$ , it follows that  $\tilde{c}$  crosses  $\tau$ . Also note that no matter which O-type Twill be chosen, the coloring  $\tilde{c}$  crosses T. At this point, we distinguish the following two cases.

### **Case 1.** For some $k, \tau(F_k) = \{xa_k, ya_k\}.$

In this case, we set  $T = \{xa_1, ya_1\}$ . Let c be a coloring of V(O) which crosses T. Necessarily  $c(x) \neq c(y)$ . It follows that no extension of c has a monochromatic cycle. We extend c to a coloring  $\tilde{c}$  by the following rule. First, color  $a_2, \ldots, a_k$ , one by one in the given order, in such a way that  $\tilde{c}$  crosses  $\tau$  at  $F_i$  for all i < k. This is always possible since of the two choices for  $\tilde{c}(a_{i+1})$ , at most one fails to produce a coloring which crosses  $\tau$  at  $F_i$ .

Similarly, color  $a_{n-1}, \ldots, a_{k+1}$  (in this order), making sure that  $\tilde{c}$  crosses  $\tau$  at  $F_i$ for all i > k. It remains to check the face  $F_k$ . The fact that  $c(x) \neq c(y)$  implies that exactly one of the edges  $xa_k, ya_k$  is in  $D(\tilde{c})$ . Since  $\tau(F_k) = \{xa_k, ya_k\}$ ,  $\tilde{c}$  necessarily crosses the  $F_k$ -type  $\tau(F_k)$ . Hence,  $\tilde{c}$  crosses  $\tau$  as desired.

### **Case 2.** For all i, $\tau(F_i)$ is different from $\{xa_i, ya_i\}$ .

Assume first that we wish to extend the coloring d of O given by  $d(x) = d(y) = d(a_1) = 1$  and  $d(a_n) = 2$ . Setting  $\tilde{d}(a_i) = 2$  for  $i = 2, \ldots, n-1$ , we clearly obtain a good coloring. Moreover, for  $i \ge 2$ ,  $E(F_i) \subset D(\tilde{d})$ ; thus to verify that  $\tilde{d}$  crosses  $\tau$ , it is sufficient to show that it crosses  $\tau$  at  $F_1$ . This is immediate from the fact that  $\tau(F_1) \neq \{xa_1, ya_1\}$ .

By symmetry, we conclude that any coloring of O which assigns the same color to x and y, and distinct colors to  $a_1$  and  $a_n$ , extends to a good coloring which crosses  $\tau$ .

To find other colorings with this property, let  $c_1$  be the coloring of  $\{x, y, a_1\}$ given by  $c_1(x) = c_1(a_1) = 1$ ,  $c_1(y) = 2$ . There is a unique extension  $\tilde{c}_1$  of  $c_1$  to Gwhich crosses  $\tau$ . To see this, extend  $c_1$  to  $a_2, \ldots, a_n$  in sequence and note that at each step, setting  $\tilde{c}_1(a_{i+1}) = \tilde{c}_1(a_i)$  if  $\tau(F_i) = \{xa_i, ya_{i+1}\}$ , and  $\tilde{c}_1(a_{i+1}) \neq \tilde{c}_1(a_i)$ otherwise, is the only choice for which  $\tilde{c}_1$  crosses  $\tau$  at  $F_i$ . The resulting coloring is the unique extension of  $c_1$ .

In particular, this implies that another good coloring  $\tilde{c}_2$  of G which crosses  $\tau$  can be obtained from  $\tilde{c}_1$  by changing its value on all the vertices  $a_i$ . In fact,  $\tilde{c}_2$  is the only other coloring of G which crosses  $\tau$  and agrees with  $\tilde{c}_1$  on x and y. It is easy to check that  $D(\tilde{c}_1)$  and  $D(\tilde{c}_2)$  intersect E(O) in non-empty disjoint subsets. Consequently,  $\tilde{c}_1$  crosses an O-type if and only if  $\tilde{c}_2$  does.

If  $\tilde{c}_1(a_n) = 1$ , then set  $T = \{xa_1, ya_n\}$ ; otherwise, set  $T = \{xa_1, xa_n\}$ . Observe that in both cases, the above discussion implies that T meets the requirement of the theorem.

We are now ready to prove our main result.

**Theorem 2.2** Let G be a (simple) plane graph with each face of size 3 or 4. Let O be the outer face of G and  $\tau$  be a type vector of G. Then,

- (a) If O is a triangle, then every good coloring of O can be extended to a good coloring of G which crosses  $\tau$ .
- (b) If O is a quadrangle, then there exists an O-type T such that every (good) coloring of O which crosses T can be extended to a good coloring of G which crosses  $\tau$ .

**Proof.** By contradiction. Let  $G, \tau$  be a counterexample with |V(G)| + |E(G)| minimum.

### Claim 1. G has no separating 3-cycles.

Suppose that the claim is false, i.e. G has a separating 3-cycle C. Since every inner 4-face of Int(C) or Out(C) is a face of G, it follows that  $\tau$  induces type vectors  $\tau_{int}$  and  $\tau_{out}$  in Int(C) and Out(C), respectively.

Assume first that O is of length 3. Let c be an arbitrary good coloring of O. Then, by the minimality, extend c to a good coloring of Out(C) which crosses  $\tau_{out}$ . Note that C is not monochromatic. Now, again by the minimality, we can extend c (or rather, its restriction to C) to a good coloring of Int(C) which crosses  $\tau_{int}$ . We claim that the resulting coloring of G is good. Certainly, no 4-cycle contained in  $\operatorname{Int}(C)$  or  $\operatorname{Out}(C)$  is monochromatic. All the other 4-cycles have a diagonal which is an edge of C. Consider the two triangles formed by this diagonal and the edges of the 4-cycle. Since one of the triangles is contained in  $\operatorname{Int}(C)$  (and the other one is contained in  $\operatorname{Out}(C)$ ), it follows that the 4-cycle cannot be monochromatic. So cis a good coloring of G which crosses  $\tau$ .

Suppose now that O is of length 4. By the minimality, there exists an O-type  $T_{\text{out}}$  such that every good coloring c of O which crosses  $T_{\text{out}}$  can be extended to a good coloring of Out(C) which crosses  $\tau_{\text{out}}$ . Afterwards, extend the coloring c of C to a good coloring of Int(C) which crosses  $\tau_{\text{int}}$ . Since, by the above, c is a good coloring of G which crosses  $\tau$ , just set  $T = T_{\text{out}}$  to establish this case.

#### **Claim 2.** G has no nice separating 4-cycles.

Assume that the claim is false and C is a nice separating 4-cycle. The fact that C is nice allows us to use induction, since every 4-cycle C' of G is contained either in Int(C) or in Out(C), or else some edge of C is a diagonal of C', in which case three vertices of C' form a triangle in Int(C). Denote by  $\tau_{int}$  the type vector induced by  $\tau$  on Int(C). By the minimality, there exists a C-type  $T_{int}$  which satisfies requirements of part (b) of this theorem for the graph Int(C) and the type vector  $\tau_{int}$ . Denote by  $\tau_{out}$  the type vector induced by  $\tau$  on Out(C) with the addition that  $\tau_{out}(C) = T_{int}$ .

We argue similarly as in Claim 1. Assume first that O is a triangle. Given a good coloring c of O, extend it first to Out(G). Since  $\tau_{out}(C) = T_{int}$ , it follows that c crosses  $T_{int}$ . By the minimality, we can extend the coloring induced by c on C to a good coloring of Int(C). We obtain a good coloring of G which crosses  $\tau$ .

Suppose now that O is a quadrangle. By the minimality, there exists an O-type  $T_{\text{out}}$  such that every good coloring c of O which crosses  $T_{\text{out}}$  can be extended to a good coloring of Out(C). As above, we extend c to Int(C) and obtain the required coloring of G. Finally, we set  $T = T_{\text{out}}$ .

#### **Claim 3.** G has no separating 4-cycles.

Assume  $C = x_1 x_2 x_3 x_4$  is a separating 4-cycle. By Claim 2, it follows that C is not nice. In other words, there exists a 4-cycle C' of G which is neither contained in Int(C) nor in Out(C) and no edge of C is a diagonal of C'. It is easy to observe that there are essentially two possibilities as shown in Fig. 1.

In case (a), an edge of C' is a diagonal of C, say  $x_1x_3$ . We may assume that  $C' = zyx_1x_3$  and z, y are both in Int(C) - C or Out(C) - C. As C is a separating 4-cycle, we infer that one of the 3-cycles  $x_1x_3x_2$ ,  $x_1x_3x_4$  is separating, which is a contradiction by Claim 1.

In case (b), C' has two vertices such that one is in Int(C) - C and the other one is in Out(C) - C. Without loss of generality we may assume that  $C' = zx_1yx_3$ . Consider a complete bipartite (plane) subgraph B of G such that one of its partites is



Figure 1: The two possibilities for C and C' in Claim 3.

 $B_1 = \{x_1, x_3\}$  and the size of the other partite  $B_2$  is as large as possible. Enumerate the vertices of  $B_2$  as  $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n$  in such a way that for each  $i \in \{1, \ldots, n-1\}$ , the 4-cycle  $F_i = x_3 a_i x_1 a_{i+1}$  is an inner face of B. Since  $x_2, x_4, y, z \in B_2$ , we have  $n \ge 4$ . Note that  $x_1 x_3$  is not an edge of G, for otherwise we would obtain a separating 3-cycle.

We shall show that no face  $F_i$  of B is a separating cycle in G. Assume the opposite. Claim 2 implies that  $F_i$  is not a nice 4-cycle. By the definition, there is a 4-cycle H which is contained neither in  $Int(F_i)$  nor in  $Out(F_i)$ . Once again, we have two possibilities as in Fig. 1. In case (a), since  $x_1x_3 \notin E(G)$ , it follows that  $a_i$  and  $a_{i+1}$  are adjacent. But then we obtain a separating 3-cycle in G. In case (b), either  $x_1, x_3 \in V(H)$ , or  $a_i, a_{i+1} \in V(H)$ . The former possibility is ruled out by the maximality of B. The latter one would contradict the planarity of G since H separates  $x_1$  from  $x_3$ , while they are known to have common neighbors other than those in V(H). We have shown that  $F_i$  cannot be separating in G. It follows that for each i, either  $a_i a_{i+1} \in E(G)$  or  $F_i$  is a 4-face of G. Note also that B is necessarily a spanning subgraph of G, i.e. V(B) = V(G).

If some 4-cycle in G is edge-disjoint from B, then all of its vertices must belong to  $B_2$ . The planarity of G implies easily that there are no other vertices in  $B_2$ , so that n = 4 and G must be the octahedron. Thus, O is triangular and G has no 4-faces. Fig. 2 exhibits a good coloring of the octahedron; by symmetry, any good coloring of the outer face extends to the whole graph. Henceforth, we assume that every 4-cycle of G intersects E(B).

Suppose first that O is a triangle, say  $O = x_3 a_1 a_n$ . Then observe that the 4-cycle  $C = x_3 a_1 x_1 a_n$  is nice (but not separating). We argue similarly as in Claim 2. By the minimality, there exists a C-type  $T_{\text{int}}$  such that any good coloring of C which crosses  $T_{\text{int}}$  can be extended to a good coloring of Int(C) which crosses  $\tau_{\text{int}} = \tau$ ). Finally, observe that for each good coloring c of O, one can choose a color  $c(x_1)$  so that  $D(c) \cap E(C)$  crosses  $T_{\text{int}}$ .

Assume now that O is a 4-face. Thus,  $O = x_1 a_1 x_3 a_n$ . If some  $a_i a_{i+1}$  is an edge



Figure 2: A good coloring of the octahedron.

of G then let  $G' = G - a_i a_{i+1}$  and let  $\tau'$  be the type vector for G' obtained from  $\tau$ by setting  $\tau(F_i) = \{x_1 a_i, x_1 a_{i+1}\}$ . By the minimality, there exists some O-type T' for the pair  $G', \tau'$ . Since a good coloring of G which crosses  $\tau$  is a good coloring of G' which crosses  $\tau'$ , just set T = T' to complete this case.

The remaining possibility is that no  $a_i a_{i+1}$  is an edge of G. In this case, G = B, and Claim 3 follows by Lemma 2.1.

By Claims 1 and 3, we may assume that no short cycle of G is separating. It follows that any 2-coloring of G without monochromatic faces is a good coloring of G. We use the following notation. Recall that for  $A \subset E(G)$ ,  $A^*$  is defined as the set of the corresponding edges in the dual. If F is an inner 4-face of G, we abbreviate  $(\tau(F))^*$  as  $\tau^*(F)$ . The vertex of  $G^*$  corresponding to the outer face of G is denoted by  $O^*$ .

We define the graph  $G_{\tau}^*$  as follows. Each 4-vertex  $w \neq O^*$  of  $G^*$  is split into two adjacent vertices  $w_1$ ,  $w_2$  of degree 3, such that  $w_1$  is adjacent to the two edges in  $\tau^*(F)$  (where  $F = w^*$  is the face of G corresponding to w), and  $w_2$  is adjacent to the remaining two edges in E(w). The process is illustrated in Fig. 3.



Figure 3: The splitting of 4-vertices x, y, where  $\tau^*(x^*) = \{xd, xy\}$  and  $\tau^*(y^*) = \{ya, yc\}$ .

The resulting graph  $G^*_{\tau}$  has at most one vertex of degree 4, namely the vertex  $O^*$ . Note that  $G^*_{\tau}$  need not be planar. We claim that it is bridgeless. To begin with, G is 2-connected, since it is simple with each face of size 3 or 4. It is well known that the dual of any 2-connected plane graph is 2-connected (or consists of 2 vertices and at least one edge). Furthermore, it is easily checked that the splitting of any vertex of degree 4, as above, does not introduce any cut-vertex. Since  $G^*_{\tau}$  arises by a series of such splittings, it must be 2-connected and hence bridgeless.

We consider separately the cases of O being a triangle or a quadrangle, respectively. Assume first that O is triangular. In this case,  $G^*_{\tau}$  is cubic. Let c be a good coloring of O. Clearly,  $(D(c))^*$  consists of two edges of  $G^*$  incident with  $O^*$ . By Theorem 1.3, the corresponding pair of edges of  $G^*_{\tau}$  is contained in a 2-factor  $\mathcal{Q}$  of  $G^*_{\tau}$ .

Performing the obvious identification of  $E(G^*)$  with the corresponding subset of  $E(G^*_{\tau})$ , consider the set  $\mathcal{Q}' = \mathcal{Q} \cap E(G^*)$ . This is an even factor of  $G^*$ . As in the proof of Proposition 1.2,  $\mathcal{Q}'$  induces a 2-coloring  $c_{\mathcal{Q}}$  of G. It is necessarily a good coloring as it has no monochromatic faces ( $\mathcal{Q}$  is a 2-factor), while G has no separating short cycles. Furthermore, we claim that  $c_{\mathcal{Q}}$  crosses  $\tau$ . Consider an inner 4-face F of G. By the construction,  $\mathcal{Q}' \cap E(F^*)$  must be different from both  $\tau^*(F)$ and  $E(F^*) \setminus \tau^*(F)$ , for otherwise  $\mathcal{Q}$  would not cover one of the two vertices into which  $F^*$  was split. Hence  $c_{\mathcal{Q}}$  crosses  $\tau$  as claimed. This concludes the proof of the first subcase.

If O is a quadrangle, the situation is a little more complicated. We start by defining possible splittings of the single remaining 4-vertex  $O^*$  of  $G^*_{\tau}$ . Let S be a subset of  $E(O^*)$  of size 2. The graph  $G^*_{\tau,S}$  is obtained by replacing  $O^*$  by two new adjacent 3-vertices  $O^*_S, O^*_{-S}$ , making  $O^*_S$  incident with the two edges in S, and making  $O^*_{-S}$  incident with the remaining two edges in  $E(O^*)$ . Any  $G^*_{\tau,S}$  is a bridgeless cubic graph.

If there is some  $S \subset E(O^*)$  of size 2 such that one cannot find any even factor  $\mathcal{Q}$  of  $G^*_{\tau}$  with the property that  $\mathcal{Q} \cap E(O^*) = S$ , then set  $T = S^*$  (where T is as in the theorem). Otherwise, choose T to be an arbitrary O-type.

Assume that we are given a coloring c of O which crosses T. If D(c) = E(O), then the required even factor  $\mathcal{Q}$  of  $G^*_{\tau}$  is obtained by extending any pair  $S \subset E(O^*)$ to a 2-factor of  $G^*_{\tau,S}$  (by Theorem 1.3), and contracting the edge  $O^*_S O^*_{-S}$ . Since  $\mathcal{Q}$  obviously contains all of  $E(O^*)$ , the associated coloring  $c_{\mathcal{Q}}$  extends c. By the argument of the preceding case, it is good and crosses  $\tau$ .

It remains to discuss the possibility that D(c) is of size 2. If every pair  $S \subset E(O^*)$  can be obtained as the intersection of an even factor of  $G^*_{\tau}$  with  $E(O^*)$  (that is, if T was chosen arbitrarily), then we simply choose such an even factor  $\mathcal{Q}$  for  $S = D^*(c)$  and we are done.

Thus we may assume that there is no even factor of  $G^*_{\tau}$  whose intersection with

 $E(O^*)$  is  $T^*$ . Since c crosses T, the symmetric difference  $S = T^* \oplus D^*(c)$  is of size 2. Use Theorem 1.3 to find a 2-factor  $\mathcal{Q}'$  of  $G^*_{\tau,S}$  containing both  $O^*_S O^*_{-S}$  and the unique edge e in  $T^* \cap D^*(c)$ . Let  $\mathcal{Q}$  be the even factor of  $G^*_{\tau}$  obtained by contracting the edge  $O^*_S O^*_{-S}$ . Since  $O^*_S O^*_{-S} \in \mathcal{Q}'$ , the intersection  $I = \mathcal{Q} \cap E(O^*)$  has size 2. The remaining element of I cannot be the edge which is missing in both  $T^*$ and  $D^*(c)$ , for  $O^*_{-S}$  would have degree 3 in  $\mathcal{Q}'$ . Further, if I contained the edge in  $T^* \setminus \{e\}$ , we would get a contradiction with the way we chose T. We conclude that  $I = D^*(c)$ . But this implies that the coloring  $c_{\mathcal{Q}}$  associated to  $\mathcal{Q}$  extends c. The above arguments show that  $c_{\mathcal{Q}}$  has all the required properties. The proof of the theorem is complete.

From the last theorem, we immediately obtain the following result:

**Theorem 2.3** Any planar graph G has a 2-coloring in which no cycle of length at most 4 is monochromatic.

### 3 Remarks

Theorem 2.3 shows that the hypergraph  $\mathcal{C}_{\leq 4}(G)$  is 2-colorable for every planar graph G. Combining it with Proposition 1.2, we obtain the following result. (Note that the result cannot be extended to 2-cuts, as shown by the cubic bridgeless graph in Fig. 4 which has no 2-factor intersecting every 2-cut.)



Figure 4: A bridgeless cubic graph with no 2-factor meeting every 2-cut.

**Theorem 3.1** Any cubic bridgeless planar graph G has a 2-factor which intersects every edge-cut of size 3 or 4.

**Proof.** The dual  $G^*$  of G is a triangulation but it may not be a simple graph. Let  $H^*$  be the graph obtained by removing multiple edges of  $G^*$ . Note that  $H^*$  is a simple plane graph with each face of size 3 or 4. By Theorem 2.3,  $H^*$  has a 2-coloring c without monochromatic cycles of length 3 or 4. Observe that c has the same property as a coloring of G. As in the proof of Proposition 1.2, one can show that the properly colored edges of  $G^*$  induce a 2-factor in G which meets every edge-cut of size 3 or 4.

Our last remark concerns Theorem 1.1. Let G be a planar graph. Each of the color classes of a 2-coloring of  $C_{odd}(G)$  induces a bipartite subgraph in G, by which we easily construct a proper 4-coloring of G. Thus, Theorem 1.1 is equivalent to the Four Color Theorem. Going further, to get rid of planarity, one can define that an integer k-flow f of a directed graph G is no-odd-cut-zero (or shortly NOCZ) if there is no odd edge-cut such that f is zero on all of its edges. Using the concept of even spanning subgraphs introduced by Archdeacon [1], one can easily show that a graph admits a nowhere zero 2k-flow if and only it admits NOCZ k-flow. Thus, the 4-Flow Conjecture is equivalent to the claim that if a bridgeless graph does not contain the Petersen graph as a minor, then it admits a NOCZ 2-flow. This is a generalization of the equivalence between the Four Color Theorem and Theorem 1.1.

# References

- D. Archdeacon, Face colorings of embedded graphs, J. Graph Theory 8 (1984), 387–398.
- [2] D. A. Holton and J. Sheehan, *The Petersen Graph*, Australian Mathematical Society Lecture Series, vol. 7, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993.
- [3] D. Král, private communication, 2001.
- [4] T. Schönberger, Ein Beweis des Petersenchen Graphensatzes, Acta Litt. Sci. Szeged, 7 (1934), 51–57.
- [5] S. K. Stein, B-sets and planar graphs, Pacific J. Math. 37 (1971), 217–224.
- [6] W. T. Tutte, On hamiltonian circuits, J. London Math. Soc. 21 (1946), 98– 101.