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Abstract


Let $H$ be a bipartite graph and let $G_n$ be the Mycielski graph with $\chi(G) = n$, $n \geq 4$. Then the chromatic number of the strong product of $G_n$ by $H$ is at most $2n - 2$. We use this result to show that there exist strong products of graphs in which a projection of a retract onto a factor is not a retract of the factor. We also show that in the Cartesian product of graphs $G$ and $H$, any triangles of $G$ transfer in $H$, whenever $G$ and $H$ are connected and $G$ is strongly-triangulated, weakly-triangulated or four-cycle free.

1. Introduction

The work of Sabidussi on graph products is well known. It is not so well known that Sabidussi was apparently the first person to explicitly suggest studying retractions of graphs (see [2, p. 550]). In this paper we continue the investigation of retracts of Cartesian and strong products of graphs in the sense of the papers [3, 5].

All graphs considered in this paper will be undirected, simple graphs, i.e., graphs without loops or multiple edges.

A subgraph $R$ of a graph $G$ is a retract of $G$ if there is an edge-preserving map $r: V(G) \to V(R)$ with $r(x) = x$, for all $x \in V(R)$. The map $r$ is called a retraction. If $R$ is a retract of $G$, then $R$ is an isometric subgraph of $G$, that is $d_G(x, y) = d_R(x, y)$ for all $x, y \in V(R)$, where $d_G(x, y)$ denotes the length of a shortest path in $G$ between $x$ and $y$.

* This work was done while the author was visiting the Montanuniversität Leoben, Austria. Supported by the Arge Alpen-Adria.
An *n*-colouring of a graph $G$ is a function $f$ from $V(G)$ onto \{1, 2, \ldots, n\} such that $[x, y] \in E(G)$ implies $f(x) \neq f(y)$. The smallest number $n$ for which an *n*-colouring exists is the *chromatic number* $\chi(G)$ of $G$. It is easy to see that if $R$ is a retract of $G$ then $\chi(R) = \chi(G)$.

The *Cartesian product* $G \square H$ of graphs $G$ and $H$ is the graph with vertex set $V(G) \times V(H)$ and $[(a, x), (b, y)] \in E(G \square H)$ whenever $[a, b] \in E(G)$ and $x = y$, or $a = b$ and $[x, y] \in E(H)$. The *strong product* $G \boxtimes H$ of graphs $G$ and $H$ is the graph with vertex set $V(G) \times V(H)$ and $[(a, x), (b, y)] \in E(G \boxtimes H)$ whenever $[a, b] \in E(G)$ and $x = y$, or $a = b$ and $[x, y] \in E(H)$, or $[a, b] \in E(G)$ and $[x, y] \in E(H)$. The notation was suggested by Nešetřil because $\Box$ looks like the Cartesian product of an edge with itself, $\boxtimes$ like the strong product.

Let $G \circ H$ be an arbitrary product of graphs $G$ and $H$. We shall denote the vertices of one factor by $a, b, c, \ldots$ and the vertices of the other factor by $x, y, z$. Let $R$ be a retract of $G \circ H$. For $x \in V(H)$ set $G_x = G \circ \{x\}$ and $R_x = G_x \cap R$. Analogously we define $H_x$ and $R_a$ for $a \in V(G)$. We call $G_x$ and $H_a$ a layer of $G$ and of $H$, respectively.

In Section 2 we construct examples of strong products of graphs where the projection of a retract on a factor is not a retract of the factor. These examples give some new insight into the internal structure of retracts of strong products. In Section 3 we show that in the Cartesian product of graphs $G$ and $H$, triangles of $G$ transfer in $H$, whenever $G$ and $H$ are connected and $G$ is strongly-triangulated, weakly-triangulated or four-cycle free.

### 2. A remark on the strong product

For the strong product $G \boxtimes H$ of connected graphs $G$ and $H$, it is shown in [3] that every retract $R$ of $G \boxtimes H$ is of the form $R = G' \boxtimes H'$, where $G'$ is an isometric subgraph of $G$ and $H'$ is an isometric subgraph of $H$. Furthermore, if both $G$ and $H$ are triangle-free then $G'$ and $H'$ are retracts of $G$ and $H$, respectively. It is also conjectured in [3] that every retract of strong products of a large class of graphs is a product of retracts of the factors.

The purpose of this section is to show that there exist graphs $G$ and $H$ such that $G' \boxtimes H'$ is a retract of $G \boxtimes H$ yet $G'$ is not a retract of $G$.

Let us denote by $G_3$ the five-cycle $C_5$ and construct the graphs $G_n$, $n \geq 3$, in the following way. Let $V(G_n) = \{a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n\}$. We construct the graph $G_{n+1}$ from $G_n$ by adding $p + 1$ new vertices $b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_p, b$. The vertex $b$ is joined to each vertex $b_i$ and the vertex $b_i$ is joined to every vertex to which $a_i$ is adjacent. The graphs $G_n$ were constructed by Mycielski [4]. They are triangle-free and, in addition, $\chi(G_n) = n$. The graph $G_4$ is also called the Grötzsch graph.

**Theorem 1.** Let $G_n$, $n \geq 4$, be the Mycielski graph and let $H$ be a bipartite graph. Then $\chi(G_n \boxtimes H) \leq 2n - 2$. 
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Proof. We first prove the theorem for the case when \( H \) is a single edge \( K_2 \). The proof is by induction on \( n \).

Colour one layer of \( G_4 \) in the product \( G_4 \times K_2 \) as shown in Fig. 1(a) and the other layer of \( G_4 \) as in Fig. 1(b). One can easily see that this is a 6-colouring of the product, hence \( \chi(G_4 \times K_2) \leq 6 \).

Suppose now that \( \chi(G_4 \times K_2) \leq 2n - 2 \), \( n \geq 4 \). Let \( V(G_{n+1}) = \{a_1, \ldots, a_p, b_1, \ldots, b_p, b\} \) and let \( V(K_2) = \{x, y\} \). Let \( g \) be a \((2n - 2)\)-colouring of the subgraph in \( G_{n+1} \times K_2 \) induced by the vertices \( \{a_1, \ldots, a_p\} \times \{x, y\} \). Extend \( g \) to a colouring \( f \) of \( G_{n+1} \times K_2 \) in the following way. For \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, p \) set \( f(b_i, x) = g(a_i, x) \) and \( f(b_i, y) = g(a_i, y) \). Finally set \( f(b, x) = 2n - 1 \) and \( f(b, y) = 2n \).

We claim that \( f \) is a \((2n)\)-colouring of \( G_{n+1} \times K_2 \). Note first that \( f(b_i, x) \neq f(b_j, y) \), \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, p \). If \( [(a_i, x), (b_j, x)] \in E(G_{n+1} \times K_2) \), \( i \neq j \), then \( [(a_i, x), (a_j, x)] \in E(G_{n+1} \times K_2) \) and hence \( f(a_i, x) = g(a_i, x) \neq g(a_j, x) = f(b_j, x) \). It follows that the layer \( (G_{n+1}, x) \) (and by symmetry, the layer \( (G_{n+1}, y) \)) is properly coloured. Assume next that \( [(a_i, x), (b_j, y)] \in E(G_{n+1} \times K_2) \), \( i \neq j \). But then \( [(a_i, x), (a_j, y)] \in E(G_{n+1} \times K_2) \), and with the same argument as above, \( f(a_i, x) \neq f(b_j, y) \). This proves the claim and the proof for the case \( K_2 \) is complete.

Let \( H \) be a bipartite graph with a vertex partition \( V(H) = V_1 \cup V_2 \). Let \( f \) be a \((2n - 2)\)-colouring of \( G_n \times K_2 \), let \( f_1 \) be the induced colouring of one layer of \( G_n \) and let \( f_2 \) be the induced colouring of the second layer. Colour the graph \( G_n \times H \) in the following way: for \( x \in V_1 \) colour the layer \( (G_n, x) \) with the colouring \( f_1 \) and for \( y \in V_2 \) colour the layer \( (G_n, y) \) with \( f_2 \). It is easy to see that we have obtained a \((2n - 2)\)-colouring of \( G_n \times H \), and the proof is complete. \( \square \)

Vesztergombi [6] showed that if both \( G \) and \( H \) have at least one edge then \( \chi(G \times H) \geq \max\{\chi(G), \chi(H)\} + 2 \). It follows from this fact and Theorem 1 that \( \chi(G_4 \times H) = 6 \), whenever \( H \) is a bipartite graph with at least one edge.

We now are ready for the following construction. Denote by \( H_n, n \geq 4 \), a graph which we get from a copy of the Mycielski graph \( G_n \) and the complete graph \( K_{n-1} \) by joining an arbitrary vertex of \( G_n \) with a vertex of \( K_{n-1} \). As \( \chi(K_{n-1} \times K_2) = \)
2n – 2 it is easy to see that there is a retraction from $V(H_n \boxtimes K_2)$ onto a subgraph $K_{n-1} \boxtimes K_2$. (Take any colour preserving map.) But as $\chi(G_n) = n$ there is no retraction $V(G_n) \rightarrow V(K_n-1)$. In fact, it is easy to see that graphs $H_n$ contain no proper retracts at all.

3. A remark on the Cartesian product

In [5], decomposition theorems for retracts of Cartesian products of graphs are derived for strongly-triangulated and weakly-triangulated graphs as well as for graphs without four-cycles.

The proofs make repeated use of the statement that 'triangles transfer'. The example in Fig. 2 (where the filled vertices induce a retract and a corresponding retraction is indicated with arrows) shows a counterexample to this statement. We prove however, that triangles transfer for strongly-triangulated graphs, weakly-triangulated graphs and graphs without four-cycles. This fills a gap in the proofs of Theorems 1 to 5 of [5].

A subgraph $S$ of a graph $G$ transfers in $H$ if, for every retract $R$ of $G \Box H$, $S \{x\} \subseteq R$ and $(u, y) \in V(R)$, where $a \in V(G)$ and $x, y \in V(H)$, we have $S \{a\} \subseteq R$.

A connected graph $G$ with $|V(G)| \geq 3$ is weakly-triangulated if each edge of $G$ is in a triangle. Call $G$ strongly-triangulated if every pair of vertices are joined by a sequence of triangles with consecutive ones sharing an edge.

**Proposition 1.** Let $G$ be a connected, weakly-triangulated graph and let $H$ be a connected graph. Then every triangle of $G$ transfers in $H$.

**Proof.** Let $R$ be a retract of $G \Box H$ and let $r : V(G \Box H) \rightarrow V(R)$ be a retraction. Let $T = \{a, b, c\}$ be a triangle in $G$ and suppose that $T \{x\}$ is contained in $R$ for some $x \in V(H)$. Assume that for some $y \in V(H)$, $R_y$ is non-empty, but $T \{y\}$ is not contained in $R$. As $H$ is connected we may suppose that $[x, y] \in E(H)$.

![Fig. 2. A triangle which does not transfer.](image)
Case 1: At least one of the vertices \((a, y), (b, y), (c, y)\) belongs to \(V(R)\).

We may assume that \((a, y) \in V(R)\). If \((b, y) \notin V(R)\) and \((c, y) \notin V(R)\) then \(r(b, y) = (a, x)\) and \(r(c, y) = (a, x)\), a contradiction. But if \((b, y) \in V(R)\) and \((c, y) \notin V(R)\) then \((c, y)\) must be mapped to both \((a, x)\) and \((b, x)\), which is again impossible.

Case 2: None of the vertices \((a, y), (b, y), (c, y)\) belong to \(V(R)\).

The layer \(R_y\) is non-empty, hence let \((d, y) \in V(R)\) be a vertex such that the distance in \(G\) between \(d\) and \(T\) is small as possible. Let \(P\) be a shortest path in \(R\) connecting a vertex of \(T \cup \{x\}\), say \((a, x)\), with \((d, y)\). The projection of \(P\) onto \(G\) is also a shortest \(a-d\) path. Because \(R\) is an isometric subgraph of \(G \sqcup H\), we have \(P = (a_0, x)(a_1, x) \cdots (a_{k-1}, x)(a_k, x)(a_{k+1}, y)\) with \(a_0 = a, a_k = d\) and \(k \geq 1\). Note that \((a_i, y) \notin V(R)\) for \(i = 0, 1, \ldots, k - 1\). Now \(r(a_{k-1}, y) = (a_k, x)\). Since \(G\) is weakly-triangulated, the edge \([a_{k-1}, a_k] \in E(G)\) is contained in a triangle \(T'\). Let \(e\) be the third vertex of \(T'\). Since \(r(T' \sqcup \{y\})\) is a triangle and two of the vertices of \(r(T' \sqcup \{y\})\) lie in the layer \(H_d\), it follows that \(r(e, y) = (d, z)\) for some \(z \in V(H)\). Clearly, \(z \neq x, y\). Hence \(T'' = \{x, y, z\}\) is a triangle in \(H\). Consider now \(\{d\} \sqcup T''\) and \(\{a_{k-1}\} \sqcup T''\). As \(\{d\} \sqcup T''\) belongs to \(R\) and \((a_{k-1}, x) \in V(R)\) we can use the argument of Case 1 to show that \((a_{k-1}, y) \in V(R)\), which contradicts the choice of \(d\). □

As not every strongly-triangulated graph is weakly-triangulated, we must also prove the following proposition.

**Proposition 2.** Let \(G\) be a strongly-triangulated graph and let \(H\) be a connected graph. Then every triangle of \(G\) transfers in \(H\).

**Proof.** Let \(R, r: V(G \sqcup H) \to V(R), T = \{a, b, c\}, x, y \in V(H)\) be defined as in Proposition 1. Suppose that \((T \sqcup \{y\}) \cap R = \emptyset\) and let \((d, y) \in V(R)\). As \(G\) is strongly-triangulated, there is a sequence of triangles in \(G_y, T_1, T_2, \ldots, T_n, n \geq 1\), such that \((d, y) \in T_1, (a, y) \in T_n, \) consecutive ones sharing an edge. Since \((d, y) \in V(R), r(T_i)\) lies completely in \(R_y\) or in \(R_d\). In the former case, every triangle \(r(T_i), i = 1, 2, \ldots, n\) lies in \(R_y\), hence \(r(a, y) \in R_y\). Since \((a, y)\) is not fixed by \(r, r(a, y)\) is not adjacent to \((a, x)\), a contradiction. Hence \(r(T_i)\) is contained in \(R_d\), for every \(i = 1, 2, \ldots, n\). Since \(r(a, y)\) is adjacent to \((a, x), \) it follows \(r(a, y) = (d, x)\). Consider now a sequence of triangles between \((d, y)\) and \((b, y)\). If \(r\) maps these triangles on \(R_d\), then since \(r(b, y)\) is adjacent to \((b, y)\), \(r(b, y) = (c, y), c \neq b\), which is also impossible. □

To prove that triangles transfer also for four-cycle free graphs, one can use the arguments in the last paragraph of the proof of Lemma 7 in [5]. Omitting details we thus state the following.
Proposition 3. Let $G$ be a connected graph without any four-cycle and let $H$ be a connected graph. Then every triangle of $G$ transfers in $H$.
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