



Improper choosability of graphs and maximum average degree

Frédéric Havet, Jean-Sébastien Sereni

► To cite this version:

Frédéric Havet, Jean-Sébastien Sereni. Improper choosability of graphs and maximum average degree. RR-5164, INRIA. 2004. inria-00071425

HAL Id: inria-00071425

<https://hal.inria.fr/inria-00071425>

Submitted on 23 May 2006

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Improper choosability of graphs and maximum average degree

Frédéric Havet — Jean-Sébastien Sereni

N° 5164

Mars 2004

THÈME 1



*Rapport
de recherche*

Improper choosability of graphs and maximum average degree

Frédéric Havet*, Jean-Sébastien Sereni †

Thème 1 — Réseaux et systèmes
Projet Mascotte

Rapport de recherche n° 5164 — Mars 2004 — 19 pages

Abstract: Improper choosability of planar graphs has been widely studied. In particular, Škrekovski investigated the smallest integer g_k such that every planar graph of girth at least g_k is k -improper 2-choosable. He proved [8] that $6 \leq g_1 \leq 9$; $5 \leq g_2 \leq 7$; $5 \leq g_3 \leq 6$ and $\forall k \geq 4, g_k = 5$. In this paper, we study the greatest real $M(k, l)$ such that every graph of maximum average degree less than $M(k, l)$ is k -improper l -choosable. We prove that for $l \geq 2$ then $M(k, l) \geq l + \frac{lk}{l+k}$. As a corollary, we deduce that $g_1 \leq 8$ and $g_2 \leq 6$. We also provide an upper bound for $M(k, l)$. This implies that for any fixed l , $M(k, l) \xrightarrow[k \rightarrow \infty]{} 2l$.

Key-words: improper colouring, choosability, maximum average degree, planar graph, girth

This work was partially supported by the european project CRESCCO

* havet@sophia.inria.fr

† sereni@sophia.inria.fr

Choisissabilité impropre et degré maximum moyen

Résumé : La choisissabilité impropre des graphes planaires a été beaucoup étudiée. En particulier, Škrekovski a étudié le plus petit entier g_k tel que tout graphe planaire de maille au moins g_k soit k -impropre 2-choisissable. Il a prouvé [8] les résultats suivants : $6 \leq g_1 \leq 9$; $5 \leq g_2 \leq 7$; $5 \leq g_3 \leq 6$ et $\forall k \geq 4, g_k = 5$. Dans cet article, nous introduisons le plus grand réel $M(k, l)$ tel que tout graphe de degré moyen maximum strictement inférieur à $M(k, l)$ soit k -impropre l -choisissable. Nous prouvons que $\forall l \geq 2, M(k, l) + \frac{lk}{l+k}$. Nous déduisons en corollaire que $g_1 \leq 8$ et $g_2 \leq 6$. Nous donnons également une borne supérieure pour $M(k, l)$ dont on déduit que, pour tout l fixé, $M(k, l) \xrightarrow[k \rightarrow +\infty]{} 2l$.

Mots-clés : coloration impropre, choisissabilité, degré moyen maximum, graphe planaire, maille

1 Introduction.

Let G be a graph. We note $V(G)$ its vertex set and $E(G)$ its edge set.

A *colouring* is an application from the vertex set into a set of colours S . If $|S| = l$ we call it l -colouring. Let c be a colouring of G . The *impropriety* of a vertex v in G under c , denoted by $im_G^c(v)$, is the number of neighbours u of v in G such that $c(u) = c(v)$. The *impropriety* of c in G is $im_G(c) = \max\{im_G^c(v) \mid v \in V(G)\}$. A colouring is k -improper if its impropriety is at most k and a graph is k -improper l -colourable if it admits a k -improper l -colouring. The k -improper chromatic number of G , denoted by $c_k(G)$, is the smallest integer l such that G is k -improper l -colourable. Note that 0-improper colouring is the usual notion of proper colouring, so the 0-improper chromatic number is exactly the chromatic number usually denoted $\chi(G)$.

One can analogously generalize the notion of *choosability*. A *list-assignment* of a graph G is an application L which assigns to each vertex $v \in V(G)$ a prescribed list of colours $L(v)$. L is an l -list-assignment provided each list is of size at least l . G is k -improper L -colourable if there exists a k -improper colouring c of G such that $\forall v \in V(G), v \in L(v)$. In this case, c is a k -improper L -colouring of G . G is k -improper l -choosable if it is k -improper L -colourable for every l -list-assignment L .

Colourings of planar graphs have been widely studied. In particular p_k and p_k^* , the smallest integers l such that every planar graph is k -improper l -colourable and k -improper l -choosable respectively, are known for almost all k . Indeed Thomassen showed in [9] that every planar graph is 5-choosable and there are planar graphs which are not 4-choosable [12] so $p_0^* = 5$. Every planar graph is 4-colourable [1, 2] and there are graphs which are not 1-improper 3-colourable, so $p_0 = p_1 = 4$. But we do not know the exact value of p_1^* which is either 4 or 5. However, it is conjectured that it is 4:

Conjecture 1 (Eaton and Hull [3], Škrekovski [6]) *Every planar graph is 1-improper 4-choosable.*

As shown independently by Eaton and Hull [3] and Škrekovski [6], every planar graph is 2-improper 3-choosable and for every k , there are planar graphs which are not k -improper 2-colourable. Hence $p_k = p_k^* = 3$ for any $k \geq 2$.

Moreover improper colourings of planar graphs have also been studied under some girth restrictions. The *girth* of graph is the smallest length of a cycle. The well-known theorem of Grötzsch [4, 11] states that every planar graph of girth at least 4 is 3-colourable. Voigt [13] showed a planar graph of girth 4 which is not 3-choosable and Thomassen [10] proved that every planar graph of girth at least 5 is 3-choosable. In [7], Škrekovski showed that every planar graph of girth at least 4 is 1-improper 3-choosable. In [8], Škrekovski investigated k -improper 2-choosability of planar graphs in relation with their girth. Denoting by g_k be the smallest integer such that every planar graph of girth at least g_k is k -improper 2-choosable, he proved that $6 \leq g_1 \leq 9$, $5 \leq g_2 \leq 7$, $5 \leq g_3 \leq 6$ and $\forall k \geq 4, g_k = 5$. Hence the only unknown values are g_1, g_2 and g_3 .

In this paper, we study the k -improper l -choosability of graphs in relation with their maximum average degree.

Definition 1 The maximal average degree of a graph G is:

$$\text{Mad}(G) := \max\left\{\frac{\sum_{v \in V(H)} d_H(v)}{|V(H)|}, H \text{ subgraph of } G\right\}.$$

The girth and the maximum average degree of a planar graph are related to each other:

Theorem 1 Let G be a planar graph of girth g .

$$\text{Mad}(G) < \frac{2g}{g-2}.$$

Proof. We recall the Euler's formula for a planar graph H : $|V(H)| - |E(H)| + |F(H)| = 2$ with $|F(H)|$ the number of faces of H . Note that every subgraph H of G has girth at least g , so $g|F(H)| \leq 2|E(H)|$. Thus $2g - g|V(H)| + g|E(H)| = g|F(H)| \leq 2|E(H)|$. Hence $\frac{2|E(H)|}{|V(H)|} \leq \frac{2g}{g-2} - \frac{4g}{(g-2)|V(H)|} < \frac{2g}{g-2}$ for every subgraph H of G . \square

Let $M(k, l)$ be the greatest real such that every graph of maximum average degree less than $M(k, l)$ is k -improper l -choosable. Obviously, $M(k_1, l) \leq M(k_2, l)$ if $k_1 \leq k_2$.

We have that $M(k, 1) = \frac{2k+2}{k+2}$ since a graph is k -improper 1-choosable if, and only if, it has maximum degree at most k .

In order to introduce our method which uses some discharging process, we first present it in Section 2 for improper 2-choosability: we prove that for every $k \geq 0$,

$$4 - \frac{4}{k+2} \leq M(k, 2) \leq 4 - \frac{2k+4}{k^2+2k+2}.$$

As a corollary, we obtain the following upper bounds for g_k which are better than Škrekovski's ones: $g_1 \leq 8$, $g_2 \leq 6$, $g_3 \leq 6$ and $\forall k \geq 4, g_k = 5$.

In Section 3 we extend the lower bound of Section 2 to any value of l : we prove that for every $l \geq 2$ and $k \geq 0$,

$$l + \frac{lk}{l+k} \leq M(k, l).$$

Last, we provide for any value of l and k a graph which is not k -improper l -choosable, and we deduce that $M(k, l) \xrightarrow[k \rightarrow \infty]{} 2l$.

2 Improper 2-choosability

2.1 Lower bound for $M(k, 2)$

In this subsection, we shall prove the following theorem:

Theorem 2 For all $k \geq 0$, all graphs of maximum average degree less than $\frac{4k+4}{k+2}$ are k -improper 2-choosable.

Note that if $k = 0$ the result holds trivially. Indeed a graph with maximum average degree less than 2 contains no cycle and so is a forest. Hence it is 2-choosable. Furthermore $M(0, 2) \leq 2$ since an odd cycle is not 2-colourable, so $M(0, 2) = 2$.

For bigger value of k , we will need the following preliminary definitions and results:

Definition 2 If $v \in V(G)$ then $d_G(v)$ denotes the degree of v in the graph G . For all positive integer d , a vertex of degree equals to (resp. at most, resp. at least) d is called a d -vertex (resp. $(\leq d)$ -vertex, resp. $(\geq d)$ -vertex). For $S \subseteq V(G)$ (resp. $E \subseteq E(G)$) we denote by $G - S$ (resp. $G - E$) the induced subgraph of G obtained by removing the vertices (resp. edges) of S (resp. E) from $V(G)$ (resp. $E(G)$). If $S = \{v\}$ and $E = \{uv\}$, we shall note $G - v = G - S$ and $G - uv = G - E$. The union (resp. intersection) of the graphs G_1 and G_2 is the graph $G = G_1 \cup G_2$ (resp. $G = G_1 \cap G_2$) such that $V(G) = V(G_1) \cup V(G_2)$ (resp. $V(G) = V(G_1) \cap V(G_2)$) and $E(G) = E(G_1) \cup E(G_2)$ (resp. $E(G) = E(G_1) \cap E(G_2)$).

A graph is said to be $(k, 2)$ -minimal if it is not k -improper 2-choosable but each of its proper subgraphs is.

Lemma 1 (Škrekovski [8]) *Let $k \geq 1$ and let G be a $(k, 2)$ -minimal graph. Then*

(i) $\delta \geq 2$.

(ii) Two $(\leq k + 1)$ -vertices are not adjacent.

Definition 3 Let D be a digraph. The outdegree (resp. indegree) of a vertex u in D is denoted by $d_D^+(u)$ (resp. $d_D^-(u)$). The degree of u is $d_D(u) = d_D^-(u) + d_D^+(u)$; it is the degree of u in the underlying undirected graph.

If u and v are two of its vertices, a (u, v) -dipath is a directed path from u to v .

An *arborescence* is an oriented tree in which every path is directed from a vertex called the *root*. Note that in an arborescence every vertex except the root has indegree 1. The leaves of the arborescence are the vertices of outdegree 0. A vertex which is neither a leaf nor the root is an *internal vertex*. A *quasi-arborescence* is a directed graph obtained from an arborescence by identifying some leaves.

Let u be a vertex of a digraph D . The *outsection* of u in D , denoted $A_D^+(u)$, is the set of vertices v such that there is a (u, v) -dipath in D .

Let G be a $(k, 2)$ -minimal graph. We partially orient G using the following process:

1. Orient each edge uv where v is a 2-vertex from u to v .
2. If $k \geq 3$, orient each edge uv where v is a 3-vertex from u to v .
3. While there is an unoriented edge uv where v an i -vertex with $2 + k \leq i < \frac{3k}{2} + 2$ and outdegree $i - 1$, we orient it from u to v .

The digraph D induced by the oriented edges is called a *discharging digraph* of G .

The following proposition, whose proof is left to the reader, follows immediately from the definition of a discharging digraph.

Proposition 1 *Let D be a discharging digraph of a $(k, 2)$ -minimal graph.*

- *D has no 2-circuit since two $(\leq k + 1)$ -vertices are not adjacent by Lemma 1 (ii). So it has no circuit at all.*
- *If $k \leq 2$, only vertices of degree 2 or $k + 2$ have indegree more than zero. If $k \leq 3$, only vertices of degree 2, 3 or $k + 2$ have indegree more than zero.*
- *Every 2-vertex has indegree exactly 2 in D and if $k \geq 3$, every 3-vertex has indegree exactly 3.*
- *For every vertex u , $A_D^+(u)$ is a quasi-arborescence whose leaves have degree 2 (resp. 2 or 3) in G if $k \leq 2$ (resp. $k \geq 3$). In particular, the indegree of the leaves in $A_D^+(u)$ is at most 2 (resp. 3).*

Definition 4 A quasi-arborescence is a $(k, 2)$ -quasi-arborescence if and only if:

- Every vertex has outdegree at most $\max\{2, 2k - 1\}$.
- Every leaf has indegree at most $\min\{k, 3\}$.

Lemma 2 *Let $k \geq 2$. Let Q be a $(k, 2)$ -quasi-arborescence rooted at u and L a 2-list-assignment of Q . Then any L -colouring of the leaves can be extended in a k -improper L -colouring of D such that u has improperty at most $k - 1$.*

Proof. By induction on the number of vertices of Q , the result being trivially true if $|V(Q)| = 1$.

Suppose now that $|V(Q)| > 1$ and the result holds for smaller k -quasi-arborescences. Let v_1, \dots, v_s be the outneighbours of u in Q . Note that $Q - u$ is the union of s $(k, 2)$ -quasi-arborescences Q_i , $1 \leq i \leq s$ rooted at v_i that are disjoint except possibly on their leaves.

Let c be an L -colouring of the leaves of Q . Then by induction it can be extended in a k -improper L -colouring of each of the Q_i so that $im(v_i) \leq k - 1$. Since a leaf of Q has indegree at most $\min\{k, 3\}$ and $im_Q(x) = im_{Q_i}(x)$ for every vertex of Q_i which is not a leaf, then the union of these colourings is a k -improper L -colouring of Q such that $im(v_i) \leq k - 1$.

Now, one of the two colours of $L(u)$, say α , is assigned to at most $k - 1$ neighbours of u since $s \leq 2k - 1$. Thus setting $c(u) = \alpha$, we obtain the desired colouring. \square

Obviously, the above result cannot be extended for $k = 1$ because it is hopeless to extend every L -colouring of the leaves in a colouring such that the root has improperty 0. However, one can prove the following weaker result:

Lemma 3 *Let Q be a $(1, 2)$ -quasi-arborescence rooted at u , L a 2-list-assignment of Q with $L(u) = \{\alpha, \beta\}$ and c an L -colouring of S the set of leaves of Q with indegree 1. One the following holds:*

- (i) c may be extended in a 1-improper L -colouring of Q such that $im(u) = 0$;
- (ii) c may be extended in two different 1-improper L -colourings of Q , one such that $c(u) = \alpha$ and one such that $c(u) = \beta$.

Proof. We proceed by induction on the number of vertices of Q . Let v_1 and v_2 be two outneighbours of u in Q . $Q - u$ is the union of two $(1, 2)$ -quasi-arborescences Q_1 and Q_2 , rooted at v_1 and v_2 respectively, that are disjoint except possibly on their leaves. Let S' be the set of leaves in $Q_1 \cap Q_2$ and $L(u) = \{\alpha, \beta\}$. We L -colour the leaves of Q_i that have indegree 1 in Q_i . By induction, each of the Q_i satisfies (i) or (ii).

If at least one of the Q_i satisfies (ii), then one can extend c to $Q_1 \cup Q_2$ such that $\{c(v_1), c(v_2)\} \neq L(u)$, say $\alpha \notin \{c(v_1), c(v_2)\}$. Moreover for any vertex x not in $V(Q_i) \setminus S'$, $im_Q(x) = im_{Q_i}(x) \leq 1$. If a vertex $s' \in S'$ has property 2 then its two neighbours are coloured the same. So recolouring s' with the colour of $L(s') \setminus \{c(s')\}$, we get a 1-improper L -colouring of $Q_1 \cup Q_2$. Hence setting $c(u) = \alpha$, we get a 1-improper L -colouring of Q such that $im(u) = 0$. Thus Q satisfies (i).

Suppose now Q_1 and Q_2 both satisfy (i). Then, possibly with recolouring of vertices of S' as before, one can extend c into a 1-improper L -colouring of $Q_1 \cup Q_2$ such that $im(v_1) = im(v_2) = 0$. If $\{c(v_1), c(v_2)\} \neq L(u)$, say $\alpha \notin \{c(v_1), c(v_2)\}$ then setting $c(u) = \alpha$, we get a 1-improper L -colouring of Q such that $im(u) = 0$. Thus Q satisfies (i). If not then assigning to u the colours α and β , we get the two 1-improper L -colourings of Q satisfying (ii). \square

Lemma 4 *Let $k \geq 3$. Let D be a discharging digraph of a $(k, 2)$ -minimal graph G .*

- (i) *Every i -vertex with $4 \leq i \leq k + 1$ has outdegree zero.*
- (ii) *Every i -vertex with $2 + k \leq i \leq 2k + 1$ has outdegree less than i .*

Proof.

- (i) Suppose, for a contradiction, that v is a vertex contradicting the assertion and let u be an outneighbour of v . Note that u is a $(\frac{3k}{2} + 2)$ -vertex by definition of a discharging digraph.

Let L be a 2-list-assignment of G . Let S be the set of leaves of $A_D^+(u)$. By minimality, let c be a k -improper L -colouring of $G - A_D^+(u)$.

$A_D^+(u)$ is a $(k, 2)$ -quasi-arborescence: since it is dominated by v in D , u has outdegree less than $\frac{3k}{2} + 1$ and so at most $2k - 1$. Thus by Lemma 2, we can extend c to $G - vu$ so that $im(u) \leq k - 1$. Since the leaves have degree at most $3 \leq k$, the impropriety of the leaves is at most $3 \leq k$. So we obtain a k -improper L -colouring of $G - uv$.

If $c(u) \neq c(v)$ or $im_{G-uv}(v) \leq k - 1$ then c is a k -improper L -colouring of G . Otherwise all the $k + 1$ neighbours of v are coloured the same so recolouring v with its other allowed colour yields a k -improper L -colouring of G .

Hence G is k -improper 2-choosable which is a contradiction.

(ii) Suppose, for a contradiction, that v is an i -vertex contradicting the assertion.

Let L be 2-list-assignment of G and c a k -improper L -colouring of $G - v$. There is a colour of $L(v)$, say α , that is assigned to at most k neighbours of v . Let v_1, \dots, v_s be these neighbours.

Let $G' = G - \bigcup_{j=1}^s A_D^+(v_j)$. And set $c' = c$ for every vertex of G' and every leaf of the $A_D^+(v_j)$. By Lemma 2 applied to each $A_D^+(v_j)$ (which are disjoint except possibly on their leaves), we can extend c' into a k -improper L -colouring of $G - v$ such that $im(v_j) \leq k - 1$ for $1 \leq j \leq s$. Now by definition of c' , the only neighbours of v that may be assigned α by c' are those of $\{v_1, \dots, v_s\}$. Hence setting $c'(v) = \alpha$, the L -colouring c' is k -improper.

Hence G is k -improper 2-choosable which is a contradiction. \square

Analogously, one can prove the following lemma when $k = 2$.

Lemma 5 *Let D be a discharging digraph of a $(2, 2)$ -minimal graph G .*

(i) *The outdegree of a 3-vertex is zero.*

(ii) *If v is an i -vertex with $i \in \{4; 5\}$ then its outdegree is less than i .*

Lemma 6 *Let D be a discharging of a $(1, 2)$ -minimal graph G . There is no 3-vertex with outdegree 3 in D .*

Proof. Suppose, for a contradiction, that v is a 3-vertex with outdegree 3. Let u be an outneighbour of v . Let $Q_1 = A_D^+(u)$, $Q_2 = A_{D-vu}^+(v)$, S be the set of leaves of $A_D^+(v)$ with indegree 1 in $A_D^+(v)$ and S' the set of leaves with indegree 2 in $A_D^+(v)$.

Let L be a 2-list-assignment of G . By minimality of G , let c be a 1-improper L -colouring of $G - A_D^+(v)$. Vertices not in S have no neighbour in $G - A_D^+(v)$ and every vertex of S has exactly one neighbour in $G - A_D^+(v)$. Extend c to $S \cup S'$ by assigning to each vertex of S a colour of its list not assigned to its neighbour in $G - A_D^+(v)$ and any colour of its list to a vertex of S' .

Now Q_1 and Q_2 satisfy either (i) or (ii) of Lemma 3. If one of them satisfies (ii), then possibly with recolouring of vertices of S' one can extend c into a 1-improper L -colouring of $G - vu$ such that $c(v) \neq c(u)$. Hence c is a 1-improper L -colouring of G .

If Q_1 and Q_2 satisfies both (i), then possibly with recolouring of vertices of S' one can extend c into a 1-improper L -colouring of $G - vu$ such that $im(v) = im(u) = 0$. Hence c is a 1-improper L -colouring of G .

So G is 1-improper 2-choosable which is a contradiction. \square

Proof of Theorem 2. Let G be a $(k, 2)$ -minimal graph and D a discharging digraph of G . We start with a charge $w(v) = d(v)$ on each vertex and we apply the following discharging rule: every vertex gives $\frac{k}{k+2}$ to each of its outneighbours.

Let us examine the new charge $w'(v)$ of a vertex v :

- If v is a 2-vertex, it has indegree 2 so its new charge is $w'(v) = 2 + \frac{2k}{k+2} = \frac{4k+4}{k+2}$.
- If v is a 3-vertex and $k \geq 3$, it has indegree 3 so its new charge is $w'(v) = 3 + 3 \times \frac{k}{k+2} = \frac{6k+6}{k+2} > \frac{4k+4}{k+2}$. If v is a 3-vertex and $k = 2$ then it has outdegree 0 by Lemma 5 and indegree 0 by construction so $w'(v) = 3$.
- If $4 \leq d(v) \leq k+1$, ($k \geq 3$), then by Lemma 4 (i), v has outdegree zero so its charge is $d(v) \geq 4 > \frac{4k+4}{k+2}$.
- If $k+2 \leq d(v) < \frac{3k}{2} + 2$ then either v has outdegree at most $d(v) - 2$ and so its new charge is at least $d(v) - (d(v) - 2) \times \frac{k}{k+2} = \frac{2d(v)}{k+2} + \frac{2k}{k+2} \geq 2 + \frac{2k}{k+2} = \frac{4k+4}{k+2}$, or by Lemmas 4, 5 and 6, it has outdegree $d(v) - 1$. In this case, by definition of a discharging digraph, v has indegree 1 so its new charge is:

$$d(v) - (d(v) - 1) \times \frac{k}{k+2} + \frac{k}{k+2} = d(v) - (d(v) - 2) \times \frac{k}{k+2} \geq \frac{4k+4}{k+2}.$$

- If $\frac{3k}{2} + 2 \leq d(v) \leq 2k+1$, ($k \geq 2$), then by Lemmas 4 and 5, v has outdegree at most $d(v) - 1$. So $w'(v) \geq d(v) - (d(v) - 1) \times \frac{k}{k+2} = \frac{2d(v)}{k+2} + \frac{k}{k+2} \geq \frac{3k+4+k}{k+2} = \frac{4k+4}{k+2}$.
- If $d(v) \geq 2k+2$, then $w'(v) \geq d(v)(1 - \frac{k}{k+2}) = \frac{2d(v)}{k+2} \geq \frac{4k+4}{k+2}$.

$$\text{Hence } Mad(G) \geq \frac{1}{|V|} \sum_{v \in V} d(v) = \frac{1}{|V|} \sum_{v \in V} w'(v) \geq \frac{4k+4}{k+2}. \quad \square$$

Corollary 1 *Let G be a planar graph of girth g .*

1. *If $g \geq 8$ then G is 1-improper 2-choosable, so $g_1 \leq 8$.*
2. *If $g \geq 6$ then G is 2-improper 2-choosable, so $g_3 \leq g_2 \leq 6$.*
3. *If $g \geq 5$ then G is 4-improper 2-choosable, so $g_k \leq 4$ for $k \geq 5$.*

2.2 Upper bound for $M(k, 2)$


Let us fix $k \geq 1$. In this section, we shall construct a family of graphs $(G_n^k)_{n \geq 1}$ such that for all $n \geq 1$:

- G_n^k is not k -improper 2-colourable.
- $Mad(G_n^k) = \frac{2n(4k^2 + 6k + 4) + 4k^2 + 6k + 2}{2n(k^2 + 2k + 2) + (k + 1)^2}$.

Hence we will deduce:

Theorem 3 For all $k \geq 1$, $M(k, 2) \leq \frac{4k^2 + 6k + 4}{k^2 + 2k + 2} = 4 - \frac{2k + 4}{k^2 + 2k + 2}$.

We denote by H_k the graph composed of two adjacent vertices u and v also connected by $k + 1$ disjoint paths of length 2. Take k copies of H_k and create the graph F_k by identifying the vertex v of each copy. Note that F_k has one vertex of degree $k(k + 2)$, k vertices of degree $k + 2$ and $k(k + 1)$ vertices of degree 2. Now we take $2n + 1$ copies of F_k and we join the vertices v of each copy creating a cycle of size $2n + 1$. At last we make a subdivision of all the edges of the cycle but one so as to obtain the graph G_n^k .



Lemma 7 G_n^k is not k -improper 2-colourable.

Proof. First remark that in any k -improper 2 colouring of H_k , v has improperity at least 1. Indeed v is a $(k + 2)$ vertex in H_k , so if it has improperity zero then its $k + 2$ neighbours are coloured the same, but this is impossible since u is a neighbour of v adjacent to the $k + 1$ remaining neighbours. Hence in any k -improper colouring of F_k , v has improperity k . So in order to colour the whole graph, we must properly colour the subdivided cycle with 2 colours, which is impossible. \square

Lemma 8 The maximum average degree of G_n^k is $M_n^k = \frac{(2n+1)(4k^2+6k+4)-2}{(2n+1)(k^2+2k+2)-1}$.

Proof. As it is easily seen, the maximum average degree of G is its average degree, which is:

$$\frac{(2n+1)[(1 \times k(k+2) + 2) + (k \times (k+2)) + (k(k+1) \times 2)] + (2n) \times 2}{(2n+1)(1+k+k(k+1)) + 2n} = M_n^k.$$

□

3 Improper l -choosability, $l \geq 2$

3.1 Lower bound for $M(k, l)$

In this subsection, we shall prove the following theorem:

Theorem 4 *For all $l \geq 2$ and all $k \geq 0$, all graphs of maximum average degree less than $\frac{l(l+2k)}{l+k}$ are k -improper l -choosable.*

The result of the theorem is trivial if $k = 0$ since a graph of maximum average degree less than l is $(l-1)$ -degenerate (i.e. each of its subgraph has a vertex of degree at most $l-1$). Hence it is l -choosable. For bigger values of k , we will need some preliminary results.

Definition 5 A graph is said to be (k, l) -minimal if it is not k -improper l -choosable but every of its proper subgraph is.

Lemma 9 *Let G be a graph, L a list-assignment and c an L -colouring. If a vertex v has improperity at least $d(v) - |L(v)| + 2$ under c , then there exists an L -colouring c' of G such that $c'(u) = c(u)$ if $u \neq v$ and $im_{c'}(v) = 0$.*

Proof. Let $c(v) = \alpha$. Then v has at most $d(v) - (d(v) - |L(v)| + 2) = |L(v)| - 2$ neighbours that are not coloured with α . Hence there exists a colour $\beta \in L(v)$ that does not colour any neighbour of v . So setting $c(v) = \beta$ we obtain the desired colouring. □

We now prove a generalization of Lemma 1.

Lemma 10 *Let $k \geq 1$ and let G be a (k, l) -minimal graph. Then:*

- (i) $\delta \geq l$.
- (ii) Two $(\leq l + k - 1)$ -vertices are not adjacent.

Proof.

- (i) Let L be an l -list-assignment and suppose v is a $(\leq l - 1)$ -vertex. By minimality let c be a k -improper L -colouring of $G - v$. As v has at most $l - 1$ neighbours in G , there exists a colour, say α , that is not assigned to any neighbour of v . Hence colouring v with α yields a k -improper L -colouring of G .

Hence G is k -improper l -choosable, a contradiction.

- (ii) Let L be an l -list-assignment and suppose, for a contradiction, that u and v are two neighbours of degree at most $l + k - 1$. By minimality, let c be a k -improper L -colouring of $G - \{uv\}$. Then c is an L -colouring of G such that each vertex has impropriety at most k , except possibly u and v which may have impropriety $k + 1$. But in this case we use Lemma 9 to recolour these vertices and obtain a k -improper L -colouring of G .

Hence G is k -improper l -choosable, a contradiction.

□

Definition 6 Let G be a (k, l) -minimal graph. We partially orient G using the following process:

1. Orient each edge uv where v is a $(\leq l + k - 1)$ -vertex from u to v .
2. While there is an i -vertex v with $l + k \leq i < l + k + \frac{k}{7}$ having outdegree exactly $i - l + 1$ and indegree 0, we orient one of its unoriented incident edges uv from u to v .

The digraph D induced by the oriented edges is called a *discharging digraph* of G .

The following remark follows from the definition of a discharging digraph.

Remark 1

- Only vertices of degree less than $l + k + \frac{k}{7}$ can have indegree more than zero.
- For $i \leq l + k - 1$, every i -vertex has indegree exactly i in D .

Definition 7 A quasi-arborescence rooted at u is a (k, l) -quasi-arborescence if and only if:

- Every vertex has outdegree at most $\max\{2, 2k - 1\}$.
- Every leaf has indegree at most $l + k - 1$

Now we generalize Lemmas 2 and 3.

Lemma 11 Let $k \geq 2$ and let Q be a (k, l) -quasi-arborescence rooted at u . Let L be a list-assignment of Q such that $|L(v)| \geq \max\{1, d_Q(v) - k + 1\}$ if v is a leaf and $|L(v)| \geq 2$ otherwise. We denote by S the set of leaves that have indegree at least $k + 1$ in Q (and hence a colour-list of size at least 2). Any L -colouring of the leaves extends in an L -colouring of Q such that:

- $im(u) \leq k - 1$.
- $\forall v \notin S, im(v) \leq k$.

Furthermore, possibly by recolouring some vertices of S , this L -colouring of G can be made k -improper.

Proof. By induction on the number of vertices of Q , the result being trivially true if $|V(Q)| = 1$.

Suppose now that $|V(Q)| > 1$ and the result holds for smaller (k, l) -quasi-arborescences. Let v_1, \dots, v_s be the outneighbours of u in Q . Note that $Q - u$ is the union of s (k, l) -quasi-arborescences Q_i rooted at v_i , $1 \leq i \leq s$, that are disjoint except possibly on their leaves. We start by L -colouring all the leaves of Q .

By induction we extend this colouring to an L -colouring of each of the Q_i such that $im(v_i) \leq k - 1$. Note that $im_Q(x) = im_{Q_i}(x) \leq k$ for every vertex of Q_i which is not a leaf and $im_Q(x) \leq k$ for each leaf not in S . One of the two colours of $L(u)$, say α , is assigned to at most $k - 1$ neighbours of u since $deg(u) \leq 2k - 1$. Hence setting $c(u) = \alpha$, we obtain the first desired colouring.

Now, we can recolour each leaf f of S with impropriety at least $k + 1$ using Lemma 9 since $d_Q(f) - |L(f)| + 2 \leq d_Q(f) - d_Q(f) + k - 1 + 2 = k + 1$. This concludes the proof. \square

The above result cannot be extended for $k = 1$. However one can prove the following:

Lemma 12 *Let Q be a $(1, l)$ -quasi-arborescence rooted at u , L be a list-assignment of Q such that $|L(v)| \geq 2$ if v is not a leaf, and $|L(v)| \geq d_Q(v)$ otherwise. We denote by S the set of leaves with indegree at least 2. Let c be an L -colouring of the leaves. One of the followings holds:*

- (i) c can be extended in an L -colouring of Q such that $im(u) = 0$ and $im(v) \leq 1$ if $v \notin S$;
- (ii) c can be extended in two different L -colourings of Q c_1 and c_2 such that $c_1(v) = c_2(v)$ if $v \neq u$ and $im^{c_i}(v) \leq 1$ if $v \notin S$.

Furthermore, possibly by recolouring vertices of S , all these L -colourings can be made 1-improper.

Moreover, if $|L(u)| \geq 3$ then (i) holds.

Proof. By induction on the number of vertices, the result being obvious if $|V(Q)| = 1$.

$Q - u$ is the union of two $(1, l)$ -quasi-arborescences Q_1 and Q_2 rooted at v_1 and v_2 respectively. They are disjoint except possibly on their leaves. Let c be an L -colouring of the leaves of Q . By induction we extend c to Q_1 and Q_2 . Note that for each vertex v of $Q - S$ $im_Q(v) = im_{Q_i}(v) \leq 1$.

If at least one of the Q_i satisfies (ii), or if $|L(u)| \geq 3$, we can suppose that $\{c(v_1), c(v_2)\} \neq L(u)$ and hence we extend c into an L -colouring of Q fulfilling (i).

If both Q_1 and Q_2 satisfy (i), then either $c(v_1) = c(v_2)$ and hence setting $c(u) \in L(u) \setminus \{c(v_1)\}$ yields an L -colouring of Q that satisfies (i); or colouring u with two colours of its list gives the two desired colourings of (ii).

Now we can recolour with impropriety zero each leaf $f \in S$ that has impropriety at least 2 in Q using Lemma 9, since $d_Q(f) - |L(f)| + 2 \leq 2$. This concludes the proof. \square

Using these results, we can say more about the structure of a discharging digraph. The following lemma generalizes Proposition 1.

Lemma 13 *Let D be a discharging digraph of a (k, l) -minimal graph G .*

- (i) *Every vertex u with $l + k \leq d(u) \leq l + 2k - 1$ has outdegree at most $d(u) - l + 1$. In particular, D is acyclic.*
- (ii) *For every vertex u , $A_D^+(u)$ is a (k, l) -quasi-arborescence. In particular, the indegree of the leaves in $A_D^+(u)$ is at most $l + k - 1$.*

Proof. (ii) follows easily from (i). So, let us prove (i).

Let L be an l -list-assignment of G . First, D has no 2-circuit since two $(\leq l + k - 1)$ -vertices are not adjacent by Lemma 10. Note also that in order to create a circuit in D , it is necessary to create a vertex u of outdegree at least $d(u) - l + 2$. Now suppose, for a contradiction, that D contains a vertex u of outdegree at least $d(u) - l + 2$ and let D' be the digraph obtained just after having created the first such vertex u . Let $u \rightarrow v$ be the last edge that is oriented in D' . u has $d(u) - l + 2$ outneighbours (including v) while v has $d(v) - l + 1$ outneighbours. We distinguish two cases depending whether the orientation of uv creates a circuit (which is necessary the first), or not.

First Case: the orientation of uv creates a circuit C . Let w be the inneighbour of u in C . We define $Q_1 = A_{D'-wu}^+(v)$, $Q_2 = A_{D'-uw}^+(u)$ and $Q = Q_1 \cup Q_2$. Note that Q_1 and Q_2 are (k, l) -quasi-arborescences which are disjoint, except possibly on some leaves. In particular the outdegree in D' of every internal vertex x of Q is at most $d_G(x) - l + 1$. More precisely every internal vertex $x \neq w$ satisfies $d_{D'}^+(x) = d_G(x) - l + 1$ while $d_{D'}^+(w) = d_G(w) - l$ and for all every vertex v $d_{D'}^-(x) = 1$. Recall that $d_Q(w) = d^+(w) + d^-(w)$. Let F be the set of leaves in Q , S the set of leaves that have indegree at least $k + 1$ in Q and $\bar{S} = F \setminus S$. We define $\hat{Q} = Q - \bar{S}$. By minimality, let c be a k -improper L -colouring of $G' = G - \hat{Q}$. Let $f \in S$: if f has impropriety at least $k - d_Q(f) + 1$, then using Lemma 9 we recolour it with impropriety 0 since $d_{G'}(f) - |L(f)| + 2 = d_G(f) - d_Q(f) - l + 2 \leq l + k - 1 - d_Q(f) - l + 2 = k - d_Q(f) + 1$. Now, let L_1 be the following list-assignment of Q_1 :
 $L_1(x) = L(x) \setminus \{\alpha \mid \exists z \in N_{G-Q_1}(x), c(z) = \alpha\}$ if $x \notin \bar{S}$, and $L_1(x) = \{c(x)\}$ otherwise.
Note that if $x \neq w$ is an internal vertex then:

$$|L_1(x)| \geq l - (d_G(x) - d_{Q_1}(x)) = l - d_G(x) + d_G(x) - l + 1 + 1 = 2$$

and since $d^+(w) = d_G(w) - l$ but w is yet uncoloured:

$$|L_1(w)| \geq l - (d_G(w) - d_{Q_1}(w)) + 1 = l - d_G(w) + d_G(w) - l + 1 + 1 = 2.$$

For the root v , $d^-(v) = 0$ but u is uncoloured yet so:

$$|L_1(v)| \geq l - (d_G(v) - d_{Q_1}(v)) + 1 = l - d_G(v) + d_G(v) - l + 1 + 1 = 2,$$

and for a leaf $f \in S$:

$$|L_1(f)| \geq l - d_G(f) + d_Q(f) \geq l - (l + k - 1) + d_Q(f) = d_Q(f) - k + 1.$$

Thus we may apply Lemmas 11 and 12. To do so, we L_1 -colour all the leaves in Q .

Suppose first $k \geq 2$. By Lemma 11, we obtain an L_1 -colouring c_1 of Q_1 such that $im_{Q_1}^{c_1}(v) \leq k - 1$. Note that c_1 extends c into an L -colouring of $G - Q_2$ such that each vertex has impropriety at most k except possibly some vertices of S . Furthermore, $im_{G-Q_2}(v) \leq k - 1$. We define a list-assignment L_2 of Q_2 by $L_2(u) = L(u) \setminus \{\alpha \mid \exists z \neq v \in N_{G-Q_2}(u), c(z) = \alpha\}$, $L_2(x) = \{c(x)\}$ if x is a leaf and $L_2(x) = L(x) \setminus \{\alpha \mid \exists z \in N_{G-Q_2}(x), c(z) = \alpha\}$ otherwise. Note that we have $|L_2(u)| \geq 2$. We now apply Lemma 11 so as to get an L_2 -colouring of Q_2 and hence an L -colouring of G . Every vertex not in $S \cup \{u, v\}$ has impropriety at most k . If $x \in \{u, v\}$ then: $im_G(x) \leq im_{G-Q_2}(x) + 1 \leq k - 1 + 1 = k$ since there cannot be in $L_2(u)$ the colour of a neighbour of u in $G - (Q_2 - v)$. If $f \in S$ has impropriety at least $k + 1$, then we recolour it with impropriety 0 using Lemma 9 since $d_G(f) - |L(f)| + 2 \leq l + k - 1 - l + 2 = k + 1$. Thus we obtain a k -improper L -colouring of G .

Suppose now $k = 1$. Applying Lemma 12, we obtain an L_1 -colouring of $G - Q_2$ such that every vertex not in S has impropriety at most 1, and either v has impropriety 0 (*i*), or it has impropriety 1 and we can indifferently colour it with two colours of its list (*ii*). Note that if v has one neighbour distinct from u which is an internal vertex in Q_2 then $|L_1(v)| \geq 3$ so we may suppose that v fulfils (*i*). Defining L_2 as before, we can apply Lemma 12 to Q_2 so as to obtain an L_2 -colouring of Q_2 and hence an L -colouring of G such that u fulfils (*i*) or (*ii*). Now, every vertex not in $S \cup \{u, v\}$ has impropriety at most 1. If v satisfies (*i*), then either u also satisfies (*i*) or u satisfies (*ii*) but in this case we may suppose u and v are coloured differently so in all cases they have impropriety at most 1 in G . If v satisfies (*ii*), then the only neighbour of v in Q_2 is u . Hence we may safely suppose that u and v are coloured differently, so they have impropriety at most 1 in G .

Finally, we can recolour each leaf of S that has impropriety at least 2 by using Lemma 9 and thus we obtain a 1-improper L -colouring of G .

Hence G is k -improper l -choosable, a contradiction.

Second Case: there is no circuit in D' . Then $Q = A_{D'}^+(u)$ is a quasi-arborescence. Moreover each internal vertex v has outdegree at most (and hence exactly) $d(v) - l + 1$. Let v_1, \dots, v_s be the outneighbours of u , we define $Q_j = A_{D'}^+(v_j)$, $1 \leq j \leq s$. The Q_i are (k, l) -quasi-arborescences that are disjoint except possibly on their leaves. Let F be the set of leaves in Q , S the set of leaves with indegree at least $k + 1$ in Q and $\bar{S} = F \setminus S$. We define $\dot{Q} = Q - \bar{S}$. Let L be an l -list-assignment of G . By minimality, let c be a k -improper L -colouring of $G' = G - \dot{Q}$. Let f be a leaf in \bar{S} . If f has impropriety at least

$k - d_Q(f) + 1$, we recolour it with improperty 0 using Lemma 9 since: $d_{G'}(f) - |L(f)| + 2 \leq d_G(f) - d_Q(f) - l + 2 \leq l + k - 1 - d_Q(f) - l + 2 = k - d_Q(f) + 1$.

For each vertex $v \in Q$, we define $L'(v) = L(v) \setminus \{\alpha \mid \exists w \in N_G(v), c(w) = \alpha\}$ if $v \notin \bar{S}$ and $L'(v) = \{c(v)\}$ otherwise. Note that for an internal vertex v :

$$|L'(v)| \geq l - (d_G(v) - d_Q(v)) = l - d_G(v) + d_G(v) - l + 1 + 1 = 2.$$

For a leaf $f \in S$:

$$|L'(f)| \geq l - d_G(f) + d_Q(f) \geq l - (l + k - 1) + d_Q(f) = d_Q(f) - k + 1.$$

Suppose first $k \geq 2$. We L' -colour all the leaves, use Lemma 11 so as to extend it into an L' -colouring of each of the Q_i , and possibly with recolouring some leaves in S we get a k -improper L -colouring of $G - u$ such that $im(v_j) \leq k - 1$, $1 \leq j \leq s$.

Now $|L'(u)| \geq |L(u)| - d(u) + d_{D'}^+(u) = l - d(u) + d(u) - l + 2 \geq 2$. And u has $d^+(u) = d(u) - l + 2 \leq 2k + 1$ outneighbours in D' . Thus there is a colour of $L'(u)$, say α , that is assigned to at most k outneighbours of u . Thus setting $c(u) = \alpha$ yields a k -improper L -colouring of G by definition of L' .

Suppose now $k = 1$. We L' -colour all the leaves, use Lemma 12 so as to extend it in an L' -colouring of each of the Q_i , and possibly with recolouring some leaves in S we get a 1-improper L -colouring of $G - u$ such that for each v_j either $im(v_j) = 0$ or v_j can safely be recoloured with another colour of $L'(v_j)$.

The same calculation as above shows there exists a colour of $L'(u)$, say α , that is assigned to at most 1 neighbour of u , say v_i . We set $c(u) = \alpha$. If v_i satisfies the first condition, we have a 1-improper L -colouring of G . If v_i satisfies the second condition then we may suppose that $c(u) \neq c(v)$ and thus we also have a 1-improper L -colouring of G .

Hence G is k -improper L -choosable, a contradiction □

Proof of Theorem 4. Let G be a (k, l) -minimal graph and D a discharging digraph of G . We start with a charge $w(v) = d(v)$ on each vertex and we apply the following discharging rule: every vertex gives $\frac{k}{l+k}$ to each of its outneighbours.

Let us examine the new charge $w'(v)$ of a vertex v :

- If $d(v) \leq l + k - 1$ it has indegree $d(v)$ so its new charge is $w'(v) = d(v) + \frac{d(v)k}{l+k} \geq l + \frac{lk}{l+k}$.
- If $l + k \leq d(v) < l + k + \frac{k}{7}$ then either v has outdegree at most $d(v) - l$ and so its new charge is at least $d(v) - (d(v) - l) \times \frac{k}{l+k} = \frac{ld(v)}{l+k} + \frac{lk}{l+k} \geq l + \frac{lk}{l+k}$, or by Lemma 13, it has outdegree $d(v) - l + 1$. In this case, by definition of a discharging digraph, v has indegree 1 so its new charge is:

$$w'(v) = d(v) - (d(v) - l + 1) \times \frac{k}{l+k} + \frac{k}{l+k} = d(v) - (d(v) - l) \times \frac{k}{l+k} \geq l + \frac{k}{l+k}.$$


- If $l+k+\frac{k}{l} \leq d(v) \leq l+2k-1$, then by Lemma 13, v has outdegree at most $d(v)-l+1$. So $w'(v) \geq d(v) - (d(v) - l + 1) \times \frac{k}{l+k} = \frac{ld(v)}{l+k} + \frac{kl-k}{l+k} \geq \frac{l^2+2kl}{l+k} = l + \frac{kl}{l+k}$.
- If $d(v) \geq l+2k$, then $w'(v) \geq d(v)(1 - \frac{k}{l+k}) = \frac{ld(v)}{l+k} \geq \frac{l^2+2kl}{l+k} = l + \frac{kl}{l+k}$.

Hence $Mad(G) \geq \frac{1}{|V|} \sum_{v \in V} d(v) = \frac{1}{|V|} \sum_{v \in V} w'(v) \geq l + \frac{kl}{l+k}$.

□

3.2 Upper bound for $M(k, l)$

In this section we shall construct for all $l \geq 2$ and all $k \geq 1$, a graph G_l^k which is not k -improper l -colourable. So its maximum average degree will give an upper bound for $M(k, l)$. To construct G_2^k , take $k+1$ copies of H_k (defined in Subsection 2.2) and identify their vertex v . We define G_l^k , $l \geq 3$, inductively. First we create the graph M_l^k by taking k copies of G_{l-1}^k and adding a vertex w which we join to every other vertices. Then we take $l-1$ copies M^1, \dots, M^{l-1} of M_l^k and we join all the vertices w_1, \dots, w_{l-1} (so that they form a complete graph of size $l-1$). Now, we add $k+2$ vertices z_0, z_1, \dots, z_{k+1} each joined to each of the $w_i, 1 \leq i \leq l-1$. Last we add the edges $z_0 z_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq k+1$.



Lemma 14 For all $l \geq 2$ and all $k \geq 1$, the graph G_l^k is not k -improper l -colourable.

Proof. The result is clear for G_2^k . Suppose the result is true for $l-1 \geq 2$ and let us prove it for G_l^k . First note that in any k -improper l -colouring of M^i , the vertex w_i has impropriety k . Indeed, w_i has a neighbour of its colour in each copy of G_{l-1}^k since otherwise G_{l-1}^k would be k -improper $(l-1)$ -colourable. Hence each of the $w_i, 1 \leq i \leq l-1$, cannot have any neighbour of its colour in $G_l^k - M^i$. In particular, as the subgraph induced by w_1, \dots, w_{l-1}

is complete, all the z_i , $0 \leq i \leq k+1$, must be coloured the same. But then w_0 must have improperity $k+1$. \square

Lemma 15 *The number of vertices of G_l^k is:*

$$n_l^k = 2l + (l+1)k + \sum_{i=2}^l \frac{(l-1)!}{(l-i)!} k^i.$$

In particular, it is a polynomial in k of degree l and dominant coefficient $(l-1)!$.

Proof. n_l^k satisfies: $n_2^k = k^2 + 3k + 3$ and $\forall l \geq 3, n_l^k = (k \times n_{l-1}^k + 1) \times (l-1) + k + 2$. \square

Let s_l^k denotes the sum of the degrees of the vertices in G_l^k . We have the following result:

Lemma 16 *s_l^k is a polynomial in k of degree l whose dominant coefficient is $2l!$.*

Proof. s_l^k satisfies: $s_2^k = 4k^2 + 10k + 6$ and $s_l^k = (l-1)(k \times s_{l-1}^k + 2k \times n_{l-1}^k + l + k) + (l+1)k + 2l$ if $l \geq 3$. Hence it is a polynomial in k of degree l . Furthermore, denoting by c_l^k its dominant coefficient, we have: $c_2^k = 4$ and $\forall l \geq 3, c_l^k = (l-1) \times c_{l-1}^k + 2k \times (l-1)!$. Thus $c_l^k = 2l!$. \square

Proposition 2 $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} Mad(G_l^k) = 2l$.

Proof. It is clear that the maximum average degree of G_l^k is its average degree. Then by Lemmas 15 and 16, we have:

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} Mad(G_l^k) = 2 \frac{l!}{(l-1)!} = 2l.$$

\square

Corollary 2 *For any fixed l , $\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} M(k, l) = 2l$.*

Proof. It follows from Theorem 4 and Proposition 2. \square

References

- [1] K. Appel and W. Haken, Every planar map is four colourable, Part I: Discharging, *Illinois J. Math.* **21** (1977), 429–490.
- [2] K. Appel, W. Haken and J. Koch Every planar map is four colourable, Part II: Reducibility, *Illinois J. Math.* **21** (1977), 491–567.

-
- [3] N. Eaton and T. Hull, Defective list colorings of planar graphs, *Bull. Inst. Combin. Appl.* **25** (1999), 79–87.
 - [4] H. Grötzsch, Ein Dreifarbensatz für dreikreisfreie Netze auf der Kugel, *Wiss. Z. Martin Luther Univ. Halle-Wittenberg, Math.-nat* **8** (1959), 109–120.
 - [5] K.-W. Lih, Z. Song, W. Wang and K. Zhang, A Note on List Improper Coloring Planar Graphs, *Appl. Math. Let.* **14** (2001), 269–273.
 - [6] R. Škrekovski, List improper colouring of planar graphs, *Comb. Prob. Comp.* **8** (1999), 293–299.
 - [7] R. Škrekovski, A Grötzsch-type theorem for list colourings with impropriety one, *Comb. Prob. Comp.* **8** (1999), 493–507.
 - [8] R. Škrekovski, List improper colorings of planar graphs with prescribed girth, *Discrete Math.* **214** (2000), 221–233.
 - [9] C. Thomassen, Every planar graph is 5-choosable, *J. Comb. Theory B* **62** (1994), 180–181.
 - [10] C. Thomassen, 3-list-coloring planar graph of girth 5, *J. Comb. Theory B* **64** (1995), 101–107.
 - [11] C. Thomassen, A short list color proof of Grötzsch’s theorem, *J. Comb. Theory B* **88** (2003), 189–192.
 - [12] M. Voigt, List colorings of planar graphs, *Discrete Math.* **120** (1993), 215–219.
 - [13] M. Voigt, A not 3-choosable graph without 3-cycles, *Discrete Math.* **146** (1995), 325–328.



Unité de recherche INRIA Sophia Antipolis
2004, route des Lucioles - BP 93 - 06902 Sophia Antipolis Cedex (France)

Unité de recherche INRIA Futurs : Parc Club Orsay Université - ZAC des Vignes
4, rue Jacques Monod - 91893 ORSAY Cedex (France)

Unité de recherche INRIA Lorraine : LORIA, Technopôle de Nancy-Brabois - Campus scientifique
615, rue du Jardin Botanique - BP 101 - 54602 Villers-lès-Nancy Cedex (France)

Unité de recherche INRIA Rennes : IRISA, Campus universitaire de Beaulieu - 35042 Rennes Cedex (France)

Unité de recherche INRIA Rhône-Alpes : 655, avenue de l'Europe - 38334 Montbonnot Saint-Ismier (France)

Unité de recherche INRIA Rocquencourt : Domaine de Voluceau - Rocquencourt - BP 105 - 78153 Le Chesnay Cedex (France)

Éditeur
INRIA - Domaine de Voluceau - Rocquencourt, BP 105 - 78153 Le Chesnay Cedex (France)
<http://www.inria.fr>
ISSN 0249-6399