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Abstract

It is shown that the difference between the chromatic number \(\chi\) and the fractional chromatic number \(\chi_f\) can be arbitrarily large in the class of uniquely colorable, vertex transitive graphs. For the lexicographic product \(G \circ H\) it is shown that \(\chi(G \circ H) \geq \chi_f(G) \chi_f(H)\). This bound has several consequences, in particular, it unifies and extends several known lower bounds. Lower bounds of Stahl (for general graphs) and of Bollobás and Thomason (for uniquely colorable graphs) are also proved in a simple, elementary way. © 2002 Elsevier Science B.V. All rights reserved.
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1. Introduction

A graph product is defined on the Cartesian product of the vertex sets of the factors, while its edges are determined by the edge sets of the factors. There are 256 such products. The four most important of them — the Cartesian, the direct, the strong, and the lexicographic one — are called the standard graph products and are defined below. For algebraic and other reasons for the selection of these four products to be the standard ones, see the book [10].

For graphs \(G\) and \(H\), let \(G \Box H\), \(G \times H\), \(G \boxtimes H\) and \(G \circ H\) be the Cartesian, the direct, the strong, and the lexicographic product of \(G\) and \(H\), respectively. The vertex
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set of any of these products is \( V(G) \times V(H) \). Vertices \((a,x)\) and \((b,y)\) are adjacent in \( G \Box H \) whenever \( ab \in E(G) \) and \( x = y \), or \( a = b \) and \( xy \in E(H) \); are adjacent in \( G \times H \) whenever \( ab \in E(G) \) and \( xy \in E(H) \); are adjacent in \( G \boxdot H \) whenever \( ab \in E(G) \) and \( x = y \), or \( a = b \) and \( xy \in E(H) \), or \( ab \in E(G) \) and \( xy \in E(H) \); are adjacent in \( G \circ H \) whenever \( ab \in E(G) \), or \( a = b \) and \( xy \in E(H) \). Another graph product that will be mentioned is the disjunctive product \( G \lor H \) (called the inclusive product in [4,15] and the Cartesian sum in [3]) in which vertices \((a,x)\) and \((b,y)\) are adjacent whenever \( ab \in E(G) \) or \( xy \in E(H) \).

For the Cartesian product Sabidussi [18] showed that for any graphs \( G \) and \( H \),
\[
\chi(G \square H) = \max\{\chi(G), \chi(H)\}.
\]
For the direct product it is easy to see that \( \chi(G \times H) \leq \min\{\chi(G), \chi(H)\} \). Hedetniemi [8] conjectured in 1966 that for any graphs \( G \) and \( H \),
\[
\chi(G \times H) = \min\{\chi(G), \chi(H)\}.
\]
Although the conjecture was widely approached, cf. recent survey [22], only special cases have been solved affirmatively. One of the reasons for the investigation of the chromatic number of the lexicographic product is its close relation to the fractional chromatic number, \( \chi_f \), cf. [19], and to the concept of the \( n \)th chromatic number, cf. [20, 21]. In addition, the chromatic number of lexicographic products form an important tool in the theory of approximation algorithms for the chromatic number of a graph [15], while in [4] the disjunctive product is used. For more results on the chromatic number of graph products see [12].

In Section 2 we show, using the graphs \((K_n \circ C_{2k+1}) \times K_{3n-1}\), that the difference between the chromatic number and the fractional chromatic number can be arbitrarily large in the class of uniquely colorable, vertex transitive graphs. Then we prove that for any graphs \( G \) and \( H \),
\[
\chi(G \circ H) \geq \chi_f(G) \chi_f(H) \]
and consider several consequences of this fact. In the final section we present two simple, elementary proofs of theorems of Stahl and of Bollobás and Thomason.

The graphs considered are finite and simple. As usually, \( \chi(G) \) denotes the chromatic number of \( G \) and \( \alpha(G) \) its independence number.

We will mostly consider the chromatic number of the lexicographic product. Clearly, for any graphs \( G \) and \( H \) we have \( \chi(G \circ H) \leq \chi(G) \chi(H) \). It is more difficult to obtain a good lower bound for \( \chi(G \circ H) \). In the rest we will extensively use the following fundamental result due to Geller and Stahl.

**Theorem 1** (Geller and Stahl [6]). If \( \chi(H) = n \), then for any graph \( G \),
\[
\chi(G \circ H) = \chi(G \circ K_n).
\]

A graph \( G \) is called uniquely \( n \)-colorable if any \( n \)-coloring of \( G \) determines the same partition of \( V(G) \) into color classes. We will apply the following result of Greenwell and Lovász.

**Theorem 2** (Greenwell and Lovász [7]). If \( G \) is a connected graph with \( \chi(G) > n \), then \( G \times K_n \) is uniquely \( n \)-colorable.

The fractional chromatic number \( \chi_f(G) \) of \( G \) is defined as follows. Let \( \mathcal{F}(G) \) be the set of independent sets of a graph \( G \). A fractional coloring of \( G \) is a mapping
$f : \mathcal{I}(G) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that for each vertex $v$ of $G$ we have $\sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}, v \in I} f(I) \geq 1$. The weight $w(f)$ of the fractional coloring $f$ is defined as $w(f) = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}} f(I)$. Then $\chi_f(G)$ is the minimum of the weights of fractional colorings of $G$. Note that for any graph $G$, $\chi(G) \geq \chi_f(G)$. Gao and Zhu proved:

**Theorem 3** (Gao and Zhu [5]). For any graphs $G$ and $H$, $\chi_f(G \circ H) = \chi_f(G) \chi_f(H)$.

Analogous result for the disjunctive product is given in [4].

Finally, circulant graphs are defined as follows. Let $N$ be a set of nonzero elements of $\mathbb{Z}_k$ such that $N = -N$. The *circulant graph* $G(k; N)$ has vertices $0, 1, \ldots, k - 1$ and $i$ is adjacent to $j$ if and only if $i - j \in N$, where the arithmetic is done mod $k$. Note that circulant graphs are vertex transitive.

### 2. Products and fractional chromatic number

In this section we treat the interplay between the fractional chromatic number and graph products. We first use the direct product and the lexicographic one to show that the difference between the chromatic number and the fractional chromatic number can be arbitrarily large in the class of uniquely colorable, vertex transitive graphs. Then we observe that for any graphs $G$ and $H$ we have $\chi(G \circ H) \geq \chi_f(G) \chi(H)$. We list some consequences of this bound and demonstrate that it extends previously known lower bounds.

We begin with the following well-known lemma, cf. [10].

**Lemma 4.** For any graphs $G$ and $H$,

(i) $\chi(G \times H) \geq \max\{\chi(G) \mid V(H), \chi(H) \mid V(G)\}$, [11,17]
(ii) $\chi(G \circ H) = \chi(G) \chi(H)$ [6].

In a uniquely colorable, vertex transitive graph $G$, all color classes of the unique coloring are of the same size. This observation might give a feeling that the chromatic number and the fractional chromatic number coincide on such graphs. (This is clearly not the case for graphs that are only vertex transitive, for instance, $\chi(C_{2k+1}) = 3$ and $\chi_f(C_{2k+1}) = 2 + 1/k$.) However, we have the following:

**Theorem 5.** For any integer $n \geq 2$ there exists a uniquely colorable, vertex transitive graph $G$, such that $\chi(G) - \chi_f(G) > n - 2$.

**Proof.** Let $n \geq 2$ and let $k$ be an arbitrary integer $> n$. Set $G = (K_n \circ C_{2k+1}) \times K_{\frac{n-1}{2}}$.

The lexicographic product and the direct product of vertex transitive graphs is vertex transitive, cf. [10], hence so is $G$. From Theorem 1 we infer that $\chi(K_n \circ C_{2k+1}) = 3n$. Therefore, $G$ is uniquely colorable by Theorem 2.
It is well-known that Hedetniemi’s conjecture holds for complete graphs (see [2,22]), hence \(\chi(G) = 3n - 1\). Moreover, it is known (and easy to prove) that for a vertex transitive graph \(G\) we have \(\chi_f(G) = |V(G)|/\alpha(G)\). Since \(\alpha(G) \geq \alpha(K_n \circ C_{2k+1}) (3n-1)\) by Lemma 4(i), we find out, using Lemma 4(ii), that \(\alpha(G) \geq k(3n-1)\). Now, 
\[
\chi_f(G) \leq \frac{n(2k+1)(3n-1)}{k(3n-1)} = 2n + \frac{n}{k} < 2n + 1.
\]

Thus we conclude that \(\chi(G) - \chi_f(G) > 3n - 1 - (2n + 1) = n - 2\). \(\square\)

We now give a nonlinear lower bound for the chromatic number of the lexicographic product of graphs. Although its proof is quite short, it extends some previously known lower bounds.

**Theorem 6.** For any graphs \(G\) and \(H\), \(\chi(G \circ H) \geq \chi_f(G)\chi(H)\).

**Proof.** Let \(\chi(H) = n\). Then we have
\[
\chi(G \circ H) = \chi(G \circ K_n) \quad \text{(by Theorem 1)}
\]
\[
\geq \chi_f(G \circ K_n)
\]
\[
= \chi_f(G)\chi_f(K_n) \quad \text{(by Theorem 3)}
\]
\[
= \chi_f(G)n \quad \text{(as } K_n \text{ is vertex transitive)}
\]
\[
= \chi_f(G)\chi(H). \quad \square
\]

Consider the circulant graphs \(G_m = G(3m - 1, \{1, 4, \ldots, 3m - 2\})\). Then \(\chi(G_m \circ K_n) \geq \chi_f(G_m)n = ((3m - 1)/m)n\). Therefore \(\chi(G_m \circ K_n) \geq 3n - \lfloor n/m \rfloor\), which is the exact chromatic number of these graphs, cf. [13].

Since \(G \circ H\) is a spanning subgraph of \(G \vee H\), we infer that \(\chi(G \vee H) \geq \chi(G \circ H)\). Thus Theorem 6 implies that \(\chi(G \vee H) \geq \chi_f(G)\chi(H)\). This observation can be used to shorten some of the arguments from [3]. Moreover, we have:

**Corollary 7.** For a graph \(G\), the following conditions are equivalent:

(i) \(\chi_f(G) = \chi(G)\),
(ii) \(\chi(G \vee H) = \chi(G)\chi(H)\), for all graphs \(H\),
(iii) \(\chi(G \circ H) = \chi(G)\chi(H)\), for all graphs \(H\).

**Proof.** The equivalence between (i) and (ii) is proved in [19]. Since
\[
\chi(G)\chi(H) \geq \chi(G \vee H) \geq \chi(G \circ H),
\]
we infer that (iii) implies (ii). Finally (i) implies (iii) by Theorem 6. \(\square\)
It is not difficult to verify (cf. [13]) that
\[ \chi_f(G) = \inf \{ \chi(G \circ K_n)/n \mid n = 1, 2, \ldots \}. \]
Using this fact, we have another proof of Theorem 6. Indeed, let \( \chi(H) = n \). Then \( \chi_f(G) \leq \chi(G \circ K_n)/\chi(H) \).

Let \( G^{(n)} = G \circ G \circ \cdots \circ G \) and \( G^{[n]} = G \vee G \vee \cdots \vee G \), \( n \) times. Hell and Roberts showed in [9] that
\[ \chi_f(G) = \inf_n \sqrt[n]{\chi(G^{[n]})} = \inf_n \sqrt[n]{\chi(G^{(n)})}. \]
They first proved \( \chi_f(G) = \inf_n \sqrt[n]{\chi(G^{[n]})} \) and then claimed the second equality by using the duality theorem of linear programming. Using Theorem 6 we give an elementary proof of the second equality, that is, without using the duality theorem of LP.

By Theorem 6 we have \( \chi(G^{(t)})/\chi(G^{(t-1)}) \geq \chi_f(G), \) for every \( t \geq 1 \). Hence
\[ \sqrt[n]{\frac{\chi(G)}{\chi(G^{(2)})} \frac{\chi(G^{(3)})}{\chi(G^{(2)})} \cdots \frac{\chi(G^{(n)})}{\chi(G^{(n-1)})}} \geq \chi_f(G), \quad n = 1, 2, 3, \ldots \]
Therefore, \( \inf_n \sqrt[n]{\chi(G^{(n)})} \geq \chi_f(G) = \inf_n \sqrt[n]{\chi(G^{[n]})} \), and so we conclude that \( \inf_n \sqrt[n]{\chi(G^{(n)})} = \inf_n \sqrt[n]{\chi(G^{[n]})} \).

Note that the above argument is parallel to the proof of Theorem 1.6.2 on p. 13 of the book [19].

In the next two corollaries we show that Theorem 6 extends some known lower bounds. We first state:

**Corollary 8** (Stahl [20]). Let \( G \) be a nonbipartite graph. Then for any graph \( H \),
\[ \chi(G \circ H) \geq 2\chi(H) + \left\lfloor \frac{\chi(H)}{k} \right\rfloor, \]
where \( 2k + 1 \) is the length of a shortest odd cycle of \( G \).

**Proof.** We first observe that it suffices to prove the result for \( G = C_{2k+1} \). As \( C_{2k+1} \) is vertex transitive, \( \chi_f(C_{2k+1}) = 2 + 1/k \). The result now follows by Theorem 6. \( \square \)

Corollary 8 has been generalized in [5] to the so-called circular chromatic number of graphs.

Lovász [16] has shown that for any graph \( G \) on \( n \) vertices
\[ \chi_f(G) \geq \frac{\chi(G)}{1 + \ln \chi(G)}. \]
Therefore we also have:

**Corollary 9** (Lovász [16]). For any graphs \( G \) and \( H \),
\[ \chi(G \circ H) \geq \frac{\chi(G)\chi(H)}{1 + \ln \chi(G)}. \]
To see that the lower bound of Theorem 6 is in general better than those of Corollaries 8 and 9 consider the Hamming graphs $H_n = K_n \Box K_n$, $n \geq 2$. Let $G_n = H_n \circ K_n$. Corollary 8 gives $\chi(G_n) \geq 3n$. Since $\chi(H_n) = n$, Corollary 9 implies that $\chi(G_n) \geq n^2/(1 + \ln n)$. Finally Theorem 6 asserts that $\chi(G_n) \geq n^2$.

To conclude the section we add that the inequality $\chi(G \circ H) \geq \chi(G)\chi_f(H)$ does not hold in general. For instance, $\chi(C_{2k+1} \circ K_n) = 2n + \lceil n/k \rceil$ while $\chi(C_{2k+1})\chi_f(K_n) = 3n$. This example is a nice illustration of the fact that the lexicographic product is not commutative.

3. Two simple and short proofs

In this section we present simple and elementary proofs of two further lower bounds. The main advantage of the presented proofs is that they are conceptually simpler than the existing ones.

The first result is due to Stahl [20], see also [14].

**Theorem 10** (Stahl [20]). If $G$ has at least one edge, then for any graph $H$,

$$\chi(G \circ H) \geq \chi(G) + 2\chi(H) - 2.$$  

**Proof.** By Theorem 1 it suffices to prove the bound for $H = K_n$. Let $V(K_n) = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, $\chi(G \circ K_n) = l$, and let $c$ be an $l$-coloring of $G \circ K_n$. Set

$$U = \{v \in V(G); c(v, i) \leq 2n \text{ for } i = 1, \ldots, n\}.$$  

Then $U$ can be partitioned into independent sets $U' = \{v \in U; c(v, i) = 1 \text{ for some } i\}$ and $U \setminus U'$. Hence $U$ induces a bipartite subgraph of $G$.

For a vertex $u \in V(G) \setminus U$ let $i_u$ be a vertex of $K_n$ such that $c(u, i_u) \geq 2n + 1$. Then the function $\phi : V(G) \setminus U \to \{2n + 1, \ldots, l\}$ given by $\phi(u) = c(u, i_u)$ is an $(l - 2n)$-coloring of $G \setminus U$. For if $uu' \in E(G)$ then $(u, i_u)$ and $(u', i_{u'})$ are adjacent in $G \circ K_n$ and hence $c(u, i_u) \neq c(u', i_{u'})$. We conclude that $\chi(G) \leq (l - 2n) + 2$.  

Bollobás and Thomason improved Theorem 10 for the case of uniquely colorable graphs:

**Theorem 11** (Bollobás and Thomason [1]). If $G$ is uniquely $m$-colorable graph, $m \geq 2$, then for any graph $H$ with at least one edge,

$$\chi(G \circ H) \geq \chi(G) + 2\chi(H) - 1.$$  

**Proof.** It suffices to consider the case $\chi(G) = m$ and $H = K_n$, $n \geq 2$. Let $V(K_n) = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$. Suppose on the contrary that $\chi(G \circ K_n) \leq \chi(G) + 2\chi(H) - 2$, and let $c$ be an $(m + 2n - 2)$-coloring of $G \circ K_n$. Let $U$, $U'$ and $\phi$ be defined as in the proof of
Theorem 10, where the vertices of $U'$ (resp. $U \setminus U'$) receive color 1 (resp. color 2). We claim that $c(u, i) \geq 2n + 1$ for any $u \in V(G) \setminus U$ and any $i \in V(K_n)$. Assume on the contrary that $c(u, i) \leq 2n$. We may without loss of generality assume that $c(u, i) = 1$ (for otherwise we can redefine $U'$ accordingly). But then we can recolor $u$ with color 1 and still have an $m$-coloring of $G$, which is not possible since $G$ is uniquely colorable.

Since $|\{c(u, k) : u \in V(G) \setminus U \text{ and } k \in V(K_n)\}| \leq (m + 2n - 2) - 2n = m - 2$, $|V(G) \setminus U| \geq m - 2$ and $n \geq 2$, there exist two distinct vertices $x, y \in V(G) \setminus U$ such that $c(x, i) = c(y, j)$ for some $i, j \in V(K_n)$. Then the function

$$
\phi(u) = \begin{cases}
  c(x, i), & u = x, \\
  c(y, j), & u = y, \\
  \phi(u) & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
$$

is an $m$-coloring of $G$. Now pick $r \in V(K_n) \setminus \{i\}$, then

$$
\phi'(u) = \begin{cases}
  c(x, r), & u = x, \\
  c(y, j), & u = y, \\
  \phi(u) & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
$$

is another $m$-coloring of $G$ different from $\phi$, since $c(x, r) \neq c(y, j) = c(x, i)$. \hfill\Box
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