Combinatorics, Probability and Computing (2007) 16, 173–191. © 2006 Cambridge University Press
doi:10.1017/S0963548306007851 First published online 14 August 2006 Printed in the United Kingdom

Edge Colouring with Delays

NOGA ALON[1†] and VERA ASODI[2‡]

[1]Department of Mathematics, Raymond and Beverly Sackler Faculty of Exact Sciences,
Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel
(e-mail: nogaa@post.tau.ac.il)

[2]Department of Computer Science, Raymond and Beverly Sackler Faculty of Exact Sciences,
Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel
(e-mail: veraa@post.tau.ac.il)

Received 30 November 2004; revised 7 November 2005

Consider the following communication problem, which leads to a new notion of edge colouring. The communication network is represented by a bipartite multigraph, where the nodes on one side are the transmitters and the nodes on the other side are the receivers. The edges correspond to messages, and every edge e is associated with an integer $c(e)$, corresponding to the time it takes the message to reach its destination. A proper k-edge-colouring with delays is a function f from the edges to $\{0, 1, \ldots, k-1\}$, such that, for every two edges e_1 and e_2 with the same transmitter, $f(e_1) \neq f(e_2)$, and for every two edges e_1 and e_2 with the same receiver, $f(e_1) + c(e_1) \not\equiv f(e_2) + c(e_2) \pmod{k}$. Ross, Bambos, Kumaran, Saniee and Widjaja [18] conjectured that there always exists a proper edge colouring with delays using $k = \Delta + o(\Delta)$ colours, where Δ is the maximum degree of the graph. Haxell, Wilfong and Winkler [11] conjectured that a stronger result holds: $k = \Delta + 1$ colours always suffice. We prove the weaker conjecture for simple bipartite graphs, using a probabilistic approach, and further show that the stronger conjecture holds for some multigraphs, applying algebraic tools.

1. Introduction

Motivated by the study of optical networks, Haxell, Wilfong and Winkler [11], Ross, Bambos, Kumaran, Saniee and Widjaja [18] and Widjaja, Saniee, Giles and Mitra [19] considered a communication network in which there are two groups of nodes: transmitters and receivers. Each transmitter has to send a set of messages, each of which should reach one

† Research supported in part by a USA–Israeli BSF grant, by the Israel Science Foundation and by the Hermann Minkowski Minerva Center for Geometry at Tel Aviv University.

‡ A preliminary version of this paper appeared in *RANDOM-APPROX 2004*, Vol. 3122 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, pp. 237–248.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548306007851 Published online by Cambridge University Press

receiver (more than one message per receiver is allowed). Each message has an associated *delay*, which is the time from the moment it is sent until it reaches its destination. The network is timed by a clock, so all times are integers. We wish to find a periodic set-up of message sending for all transmitters, such that in each cycle all messages of all transmitters are sent, where each transmitter sends at most one message and each receiver gets at most one message, at any given time unit. The objective is to find such a cycle of minimum length.

We can formalize this problem as follows: we represent the network by a bipartite multigraph $G = (V, E)$ with sides A and B, where the vertices of A are the transmitters and the vertices of B are the receivers. The edges correspond to the messages that are to be sent, and a function $c : E \to N$ associates each edge with its delay. The aim is to find the smallest number k for which there exists an edge colouring $f : E \to \{0, 1, \dots, k-1\}$, such that, for every two edges e_1 and e_2 that have a common vertex in A, $f(e_1) \neq f(e_2)$, and for every two edges e_1 and e_2 that have a common vertex in B, $f(e_1) + c(e_1) \not\equiv f(e_2) + c(e_2) \pmod{k}$.

The minimum number of colours is, clearly, at least Δ, where Δ is the maximum degree in G. Furthermore, there are simple examples in which $\Delta + 1$ colours are required, for example, any Δ-regular graph in which all delays but one are 0. Haxell, Wilfong and Winkler [11] made the following conjecture.

Conjecture 1.1. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a bipartite multigraph with sides A and B and with maximum degree Δ, and let $c : E \to N$ be a delay function. Then there is a colouring $f : E \to \{0, 1, \dots, \Delta\}$, such that, for every two edges e_1 and e_2 that have a common vertex in A, $f(e_1) \neq f(e_2)$, and for every two edges e_1 and e_2 that have a common vertex in B, $f(e_1) + c(e_1) \not\equiv f(e_2) + c(e_2) \pmod{(\Delta + 1)}$.*

This strengthens an earlier weaker conjecture of Ross, Bambos, Kumaran, Saniee and Widjaja [18] that asserts that the minimum number of colours needed is $\Delta + o(\Delta)$.

In this paper, we prove the weaker conjecture for simple graphs. That is, we prove that if G is a simple bipartite graph with maximum degree Δ, then $\Delta + o(\Delta)$ colours suffice. Our proof uses a random colouring procedure, following the result of Kahn [12] and its extensions and variants by Häggkvist and Janssen [8] and Molloy and Reed [14, 15] on list edge colouring.

Using algebraic techniques, based on [3, 7], we also show that the stronger conjecture, Conjecture 1.1, holds for some families of bipartite multigraphs such as all even length regular multi-cycles where the degree of regularity plus one is a prime. We further describe a generalization of the problem to non-bipartite multigraphs, and settle this general problem in a few special cases.

In Section 2 we prove the asymptotic result for simple bipartite graphs, and in Section 3 we present the algebraic proofs for some families of multigraphs. Section 4 contains some concluding remarks.

2. Simple bipartite graphs

In this section we show that if G is a simple bipartite graph with maximum degree Δ, then there is a colouring with the required properties using $(1 + o(1))\Delta$ colours.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548306007851 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Theorem 2.1. *For every $\epsilon > 0$ there is a $\Delta_0 = \Delta_0(\epsilon)$ such that the following holds. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a simple bipartite graph with sides A and B and with maximum degree $\Delta \geqslant \Delta_0$, and let $c : E \to N$ be a delay function. Then, for $k = \lceil (1+\epsilon)\Delta \rceil$, there is a colouring $f : E \to \{0, 1, \ldots, k-1\}$, such that, for every two edges e_1 and e_2 that have a common vertex in A, $f(e_1) \neq f(e_2)$, and for every two edges e_1 and e_2 that have a common vertex in B, $f(e_1) + c(e_1) \not\equiv f(e_2) + c(e_2) \pmod{k}$.*

As mentioned in the Introduction, the proof is based on the semi-random technique used in [12, 8, 14, 15]. This technique relies on the fact that the requirements for the colouring of distinct edges are nearly independent. It does not seem to extend to the case of multigraphs with high edge multiplicities, since in this case any colouring of a single edge forbids two colours for each parallel edge.

Throughout the section we omit all floor and ceiling signs, whenever these are not crucial. Throughout the paper we use the notation $\tilde{O}(x)$ to denote, as usual, $O(x(\log x)^{O(1)})$.

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a simple bipartite graph with sides A and B, and assume without loss of generality that G is Δ-regular. Let $c : E \to N$ be the delay function, and let $k = (1+\epsilon)\Delta$, where $\epsilon > 0$ is an arbitrarily small constant. We show that if Δ is sufficiently large, then there is a colouring with the desired properties using k colours.

We present a colouring procedure with three stages.

(1) Choose a small set of reserved colours for every edge.
(2) Iteratively colour the edges as follows. In each iteration, assign every uncoloured edge a random colour from the unreserved colours that are still available for it. An edge retains the colour assigned to it only if no adjacent edge is assigned a conflicting colour.
(3) Complete the colouring from the lists of reserved colours.

In the rest of this section we describe the details of each stage, and prove that, with positive probability, the procedure finds a colouring with the required properties.

2.1. Notation

To simplify the description of the procedure, we extend the function c by defining for all $e = (u, v) \in E$ with $u \in A$ and $v \in B$, $c(e, u) = 0$ and $c(e, v) = c(e)$. Now the colouring f should satisfy the condition that, for every two edges $e_1, e_2 \in E$ with a common vertex u, $f(e_1) + c(e_1, u) \neq f(e_2) + c(e_2, u)$, where all the operations on the colours are done modulo k.

During the iterative procedure, we denote by $L_e \subseteq \{0, 1, \ldots, k-1\}$ the set of all unreserved colours still available for e, for all $e \in E$. For all $v \in V$ let $L_v = \{c + c((u, v), v) \mid c \in L_{(u,v)}, (u, v) \in E\}$. For a set of colours C and a colour c, let $C - c = \{c' - c \mid c' \in C\}$. Clearly, $L_{(u,v)} \subseteq (L_u - c((u, v), u)) \cap (L_v - c((u, v), v))$, for all $(u, v) \in E$. Thus, every time a colour c is removed from a list L_v, then $c - c(e, v)$ is removed from the lists L_e, for all edges e incident with v.

For all $v \in V$ and $c \in L_v$, denote by $T_{v,c}$ the set of all uncoloured edges e incident with v, for which the colour $c - c(e, v)$ is still available, that is,

$$T_{v,c} = \{e = (u, v) \in E \mid c - c(e, v) \in L_e \text{ and } e \text{ is uncoloured}\}.$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548306007851 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In the first stage we choose a set of reserved colours for every edge. We do it by choosing a set of reserved colours Reserve_v for all $v \in V$, and then by defining for every edge $e = (u,v) \in E$, $\text{Reserve}_e = (\text{Reserve}_u - c(e,u)) \cap (\text{Reserve}_v - c(e,v))$. During the iterative procedure, for all $v \in V$ and colour c, we denote by $R_{v,c}$ the set of all uncoloured edges $e = (u,v)$ incident with v, such that the colour $c - c(e,v) + c(e,u)$ is reserved for u, that is,

$$R_{v,c} = \{e = (u,v) \in E \mid c - c(e,v) + c(e,u) \in \text{Reserve}_u \text{ and } e \text{ is uncoloured}\}.$$

For all i, $e \in E$, $v \in V$ and colour c, let l_e^i, l_v^i, $t_{v,c}^i$ and $r_{v,c}^i$ denote the sizes of the sets L_e, L_v, $T_{v,c}$ and $R_{v,c}$, respectively, after i iterations. If after i iterations $c \notin L_v$ we define $t_{v,c}^i = 0$. For all the above, $i = 0$ refers to the time before the first iteration, but after the first stage of the procedure, in which the reserved colours are chosen.

2.2. Colouring scheme overview

We now describe the colouring procedure. Start by choosing a small set of reserved colours Reserve_v for all $v \in V$, and by defining for all $e = (u,v) \in E$, $\text{Reserve}_e = (\text{Reserve}_u - c(e,u)) \cap (\text{Reserve}_v - c(e,v))$. We would like these colours to be available for e at the final stage, and hence we remove from the initial set L_e of every edge $e = (u,v) \in E$, all the colours that conflict with the colours reserved for u and v. Therefore, for all $e = (u,v) \in E$, the initial set L_e is defined by $L_e = \{0,1,\dots,k-1\} \setminus ((\text{Reserve}_u - c(e,u)) \cup (\text{Reserve}_v - c(e,v)))$. We choose the reserved colours so that, for all $e \in E$, $l_e^0 \geqslant (1 + \frac{\epsilon}{2})\Delta$, but we also make sure that for all $e \in E$, $|\text{Reserve}_e| \geqslant \frac{\epsilon^2}{200}\Delta$, and for all $v \in V$ and colour c, $r_{v,c}^0 \leqslant \frac{\epsilon}{5}\Delta$, so the colouring can be completed at the final stage.

The second stage consists of a constant $t = t(\epsilon)$ number of iterations. In each iteration, we assign to each uncoloured edge $e \in E$ a colour c chosen randomly from L_e. If there is a conflict, *i.e.*, if there is an adjacent edge e' to which we assigned a colour c' such that $c + c(e,v) = c' + c(e',v)$, where v is the common vertex of e and e', we decolour e. If an edge $e = (u,v)$ retains the colour c it was assigned, then adjacent edges cannot be coloured with conflicting colours. Thus we remove $c + c(e,u)$ from L_u, $c + c(e,v)$ from L_v, and the corresponding colours from the lists $L_{e'}$ of the edges e' incident with u and v.

We start with $l_e^0 \geqslant (1 + \frac{\epsilon}{2})\Delta$, for all $e \in E$, $t_{v,c}^0 \leqslant \Delta$ and $r_{v,c}^0 \leqslant \frac{\epsilon}{5}\Delta$ for all $v \in V$ and colour c. We show that the sizes of the sets L_e and $T_{v,c}$ decrease at roughly the same rate, and hence, for every i, the sizes $t_{v,c}^i$ are slightly smaller than the sizes l_e^i.

The ith iteration is carried out as follows. We first remove colours from the sets L_e so that they all have the same size, which we denote by l_{i-1}. Now, for all uncoloured $e = (u,v) \in E$, assign e a colour c chosen randomly from L_e. The colour c is removed from e if an adjacent edge is assigned a conflicting colour, *i.e.*, if there is an edge e_1 incident with u that is assigned $c + c(e,u) - c(e_1,u)$, or an edge e_2 incident with v that is assigned $c + c(e,v) - c(e_2,v)$. Therefore, the probability that e retains c is

$$\left(1 - \frac{1}{l_{i-1}}\right)^{t_{u,c+c(e,u)}^{i-1} + t_{v,c+c(e,v)}^{i-1} - 2} \approx e^{-2}.$$

For every colour $c \in L_v$, the edges e incident with v that may retain $c - c(e,v)$ are the edges in $T_{v,c}$. For every $e \in T_{v,c}$, the probability that e is assigned the colour c and retains

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548306007851 Published online by Cambridge University Press

it is roughly $\frac{1}{l_{i-1}e^2}$. There is at most one edge $e \in T_{v,c}$ that retains $c - c(e,v)$. Therefore, these events are disjoint, and if one of them occurs we remove c from L_v. Hence, the probability that we remove c from L_v is roughly

$$\frac{t_{v,c}^{i-1}}{l_{i-1}e^2} \approx e^{-2}.$$

For an edge $e = (u,v)$ and a colour $c \in L_e$, we remove c from L_e if we remove $c + c(e,u)$ from L_u or $c + c(e,v)$ from L_v. If these events were independent, the probability that we do not remove c from L_e would have been roughly $(1 - e^{-2})^2$. We later show that although there is some dependence between those events, the probability that we do not remove c from L_e is still close to $(1 - e^{-2})^2$. Hence,

$$E[l_e^i] \approx (1 - e^{-2})^2 l_e^{i-1}.$$

For every $v \in V$ and $c \in L_v$, if $e = (u,v) \in T_{v,c}$, we remove e from $T_{v,c}$ if e retains the colour it is assigned, or if e can no longer be coloured with $c - c(e,v)$, since $c - c(e,v) + c(e,u)$ was removed from L_u. If these events were independent, the probability that e remains in $T_{v,c}$ would have been roughly $(1 - e^{-2})^2$, since the probability of each of these events is about e^{-2}. We show later that the dependence between the above events does not change this probability much. Therefore,

$$E[t_{v,c}^i] \approx (1 - e^{-2})^2 t_{v,c}^{i-1}.$$

As for the sets $R_{v,c}$, we remove an edge e from $R_{v,c}$ only if it retains the colour it was assigned. Therefore,

$$E[r_{v,c}^i] \approx (1 - e^{-2}) r_{v,c}^{i-1}.$$

We execute the iterative procedure for t iterations, where we choose t so that with positive probability $r_{v,c}^t \leqslant \frac{\epsilon^2}{3200}\Delta$ for all $v \in V$ and colour c. We later prove, using the local lemma (see, *e.g.*, [4, Chapter 5], or the results in [16, 17, 10]), that in this case the colouring can be completed with the reserved colours.

In the rest of this section we describe in detail the different stages of our scheme, and prove its correctness.

2.3. Choosing the reserved colours

We begin our colouring by choosing a set of colours Reserve_v for all $v \in V$. Then we define for all $e = (u,v) \in E$, $\text{Reserve}_e = (\text{Reserve}_u - c(e,u)) \cap (\text{Reserve}_v - c(e,v))$. We also initialize the sets L_v, L_e, $T_{v,c}$ and $R_{v,c}$ as follows. For all $v \in V$, $L_v = \{0,1,\ldots,k-1\} \setminus \text{Reserve}_v$. For all $e = (u,v) \in E$, $L_e = \{0,1,\ldots,k-1\} \setminus ((\text{Reserve}_u - c(e,u)) \cup (\text{Reserve}_v - c(e,v)))$. For all $v \in V$ and colour c, $R_{v,c} = \{e = (u,v) \in E \mid c - c(e,v) + c(e,u) \in \text{Reserve}_u\}$, and $T_{v,c} = \{e = (u,v) \in E \mid e \notin R_{v,c}\}$.

Lemma 2.2. *We can choose a set of colours* Reserve_v *for each vertex* v*, so that the following hold.*

(1) *For all* $e = (u,v) \in E$, $|(\text{Reserve}_u - c(e,u)) \cup (\text{Reserve}_v - c(e,v))| \leqslant \frac{\epsilon}{2}\Delta$.
(2) *For all* $e \in E$, $|\text{Reserve}_e| \geqslant \frac{\epsilon^2}{200}\Delta$.
(3) *For all* $v \in V$ *and colour* c, $r_{v,c}^0 \leqslant \frac{\epsilon}{5}\Delta$.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548306007851 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Proof. For every vertex v and colour c, we place c into Reserve_v independently with probability $p = \frac{\epsilon}{10}$. Then, for all $e = (u, v) \in E$,

$$E\left[|(\text{Reserve}_u - c(e,u)) \cup (\text{Reserve}_v - c(e,v))|\right] \leqslant 2pk = \frac{\epsilon}{5}(1+\epsilon)\Delta \leqslant \frac{\epsilon}{4}\Delta$$

(assuming $\epsilon \leqslant \frac{1}{4}$),

$$\begin{aligned} E\left[|\,\text{Reserve}_e\,|\right] &= E\left[|(\text{Reserve}_u - c(e,u)) \cap (\text{Reserve}_v - c(e,v))|\right] \\ &= p^2 k = \frac{\epsilon^2}{100}(1+\epsilon)\Delta > \frac{\epsilon^2}{100}\Delta, \end{aligned}$$

and for all $v \in V$ and colour c,

$$E[r^0_{v,c}] = p\Delta = \frac{\epsilon}{10}\Delta.$$

Let A_e be the event that e violates the first condition, B_e the event that e violates the second condition, and $C_{v,c}$ the event that v, c violate the third condition. The sizes of the above sets are distributed binomially, and hence, by the Chernoff bound, the probability of each of these events is much less than $e^{-\log^2 \Delta}$. Each event A_e or B_e is mutually independent of all other events except for the events $A_{e'}$ and $B_{e'}$ for the adjacent edges e' and for $e' = e$, and the events $C_{v,c}$ such that e is incident with v or a neighbour of v. There are fewer than 2Δ adjacent edges, 2Δ vertices v such that e is incident with v or a neighbour of v, and $O(\Delta)$ colours. Therefore, every A_e and B_e is mutually independent of all but $O(\Delta^2)$ of the other events. An event $C_{v,c}$ is mutually independent of all other events except for the events A_e and B_e for edges e incident with v or a neighbour of v, and the events $C_{v',c'}$ such that $v' = v$, v' is a neighbour of v, or v and v' share a common neighbour. There are $O(\Delta^2)$ edges incident with v or a neighbour of v, $O(\Delta^2)$ vertices v' such that $v' = v$, v' is a neighbour of v, or v and v' share a common neighbour, and $O(\Delta)$ colours. Therefore, every $C_{v,c}$ is mutually independent of all but $O(\Delta^3)$ of the other events. Hence, the result follows from the local lemma. □

2.4. The iterative procedure

In each iteration, we assign every edge e a colour c chosen randomly from L_e. We let e retain c only if it causes no conflicts, *i.e.*, no adjacent edge e' is assigned $c + c(e,u) - c(e',u)$, where u is the common vertex of e and e'. If an edge $e = (u,v)$ retains a colour c, we remove $c + c(e,u)$ from L_u and $c + c(e,v)$ from L_v. To simplify the proof, we remove some colours from some of the lists L_e at the beginning of each iteration, so that all the lists have the same size, and we sometimes remove colours from edges and from the lists L_v even when there is no conflict, in order to equalize all the probabilities. The details are explained below.

We show that the size of each L_e and of each $T_{v,c}$ decreases by a factor of approximately $(1 - e^{-2})^2$ in each iteration, and the size of each $R_{v,c}$ by a factor of approximately $1 - e^{-2}$. Each $T_{v,c}$ is initially slightly smaller than each L_e, and since these sizes decrease at approximately the same rate, the above holds at the beginning of every iteration.

Consider the ith iteration, and assume $l^{i-1}_e \geqslant l_{i-1}$ for all $e \in E$, and $t^{i-1}_{v,c} \leqslant l_{i-1}$ for all $v \in V$ and colour c. We first remove colours from some of the lists L_e so that they all

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548306007851 Published online by Cambridge University Press

have size exactly l_{i-1}. For each edge $e = (u, v)$ and colour $c \in L_e$, the probability that no adjacent edge is assigned a conflicting colour, if e is assigned c, *i.e.*, that no edge e_1 incident with u is assigned $c + c(e, u) - c(e_1, u)$, and that no edge e_2 incident with v is assigned $c + c(e, v) - c(e_2, v)$, is

$$P(e, c) = \left(1 - \frac{1}{l_{i-1}}\right)^{t^{i-1}_{u,c+c(e,u)} + t^{i-1}_{v,c+c(e,v)} - 2} \geqslant \left(1 - \frac{1}{l_{i-1}}\right)^{2l_{i-1}-2} > e^{-2}.$$

We now use an equalizing coin flip, so that if e is assigned c and no adjacent edge is assigned a conflicting colour, we still remove c from e with probability

$$Eq(e, c) = 1 - \frac{1}{e^2 P(e, c)} > 0.$$

This ensures that the probability that e retains c, conditional on e receiving c, is precisely

$$P(e, c)(1 - Eq(e, c)) = e^{-2}.$$

For every $v \in V$ and $c \in L_v$, there is at most one edge $e \in T_{v,c}$ that retains $c - c(e, v)$. Therefore, the events that e retains $c - c(e, v)$ for all $e \in T_{v,c}$ are pairwise disjoint, and hence the probability that we do not have to remove c from L_v, *i.e.*, the probability that no edge $e \in T_{v,c}$ retains $c - c(e, v)$, is

$$Q(v, c) = 1 - \frac{t^{i-1}_{v,c}}{l_{i-1} e^2} \geqslant 1 - e^{-2}.$$

If we do not have to remove c from L_v, we still remove it with probability

$$Vq(v, c) = 1 - \frac{1 - e^{-2}}{Q(v, c)}.$$

This ensures that the probability that c remains in L_v is precisely

$$Q(v, c)(1 - Vq(v, c)) = 1 - e^{-2}.$$

Lemma 2.3. *For every $v \in V$ and colour c, $E[r^i_{v,c}] = (1 - e^{-2}) r^{i-1}_{v,c}$.*

Proof. An edge is removed from $R_{v,c}$ if and only if it retains the colour it is assigned. This happens with probability e^{-2}. Therefore, $E[r^i_{v,c}] = (1 - e^{-2}) r^{i-1}_{v,c}$. □

Lemma 2.4. *For each $e \in E$, $E[l^i_e] \geqslant (1 - e^{-2})^2 l_{i-1}$.*

Proof. Let $e = (u, v) \in E$ and let $c \in L_e$ be a colour that was not removed at the first stage of the iteration, when the sizes of all lists were reduced to l_{i-1}. The colour c remains in L_e if and only if $c + c(e, u)$ remains in L_u and $c + c(e, v)$ remains in L_v. Let A_u be the event that no edge $e_1 \in T_{u,c+c(e,u)}$ retains $c + c(e, u) - c(e_1, u)$, and let A_v be the event that no edge $e_2 \in T_{v,c+c(e,v)}$ retains $c + c(e, v) - c(e_2, v)$, where we refer to the sets $T_{u,c+c(e,u)}$ and $T_{v,c+c(e,v)}$ at the beginning of the ith iteration. Thus, the probability that c remains in L_e is

$$\Pr(A_u \cap A_v)[1 - Vq(u, c + c(e, u))][1 - Vq(v, c + c(e, v))].$$

To calculate $\Pr(A_u \cap A_v)$, we use the fact that

$$\Pr(A_u \cap A_v) = 1 - \Pr(\bar{A}_u) - \Pr(\bar{A}_v) + \Pr(\bar{A}_u \cap \bar{A}_v).$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548306007851 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Clearly, $\Pr(\bar{A}_u) = \frac{t^{i-1}_{u,c+c(e,u)}}{l_{i-1}e^2}$, and $\Pr(\bar{A}_v) = \frac{t^{i-1}_{v,c+c(e,v)}}{l_{i-1}e^2}$. Let $e_1 = (u,x) \in T_{u,c+c(e,u)} \setminus \{e\}$ and $e_2 = (v,y) \in T_{v,c+c(e,v)} \setminus \{e\}$, and let B_{e_1,e_2} be the event that e_1 retains $c + c(e,u) - c(e_1,u)$ and e_2 retains $c + c(e,v) - c(e_2,v)$. This event occurs if and only if e_1 is assigned $c + c(e,u) - c(e_1,u)$, e_2 is assigned $c + c(e,v) - c(e_2,v)$, no adjacent edge is assigned a conflicting colour, and these colours are not removed from e_1 and e_2 by the equalizing coin flips. Denote $W = T_{u,c+c(e,u)}$, $X = T_{v,c+c(e,v)}$ $Y = T_{x,c+c(e,u)-c(e_1,u)+c(e_1,x)}$ and $Z = T_{y,c+c(e,v)-c(e_2,v)+c(e_2,y)}$. Note that the only edges that might be assigned conflicting colours are the edges of $(W \cup X \cup Y \cup Z) \setminus \{e_1,e_2\}$. Note also that $W \cap Y = \{e_1\}$, $X \cap Z = \{e_2\}$, $W \cap X = \{e\}$, and there might be an edge in $Y \cap Z$. All other intersections refer to vertices from the same side, and hence they are empty. If there is an edge in $Y \cap Z$, then this is the only edge for which there might be two conflicting colours. For all other edges of $(W \cup X \cup Y \cup Z) \setminus \{e_1,e_2\}$ there is one conflicting colour. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr(B_{e_1,e_2}) &\geqslant \frac{1}{l_{i-1}^2}\left(1-\frac{2}{l_{i-1}}\right)^{|Y\cap Z|}\left(1-\frac{1}{l_{i-1}}\right)^{|((W\cup X\cup Y\cup Z)\setminus\{e_1,e_2\})\setminus(Y\cap Z)|} \\
&\quad \cdot [1-Eq(e_1,c+c(e,u)-c(e_1,u))][1-Eq(e_2,c+c(e,v)-c(e_2,v))] \\
&\geqslant \frac{1}{l_{i-1}^2}\left(1-\frac{2}{l_{i-1}}\right)\left(1-\frac{1}{l_{i-1}}\right)^{|((W\cup X\cup Y\cup Z)\setminus\{e_1,e_2\})|-2} \\
&\quad \cdot [1-Eq(e_1,c+c(e,u)-c(e_1,u))][1-Eq(e_2,c+c(e,v)-c(e_2,v))] \\
&= \frac{1}{l_{i-1}^2}\left(1-\frac{2}{l_{i-1}}\right)\left(1-\frac{1}{l_{i-1}}\right)^{|W|+|X|+|Y|+|Z|-7} \\
&\quad \cdot [1-Eq(e_1,c+c(e,u)-c(e_1,u))][1-Eq(e_2,c+c(e,v)-c(e_2,v))].
\end{aligned}$$

If Δ is sufficiently large then $l_{i-1} \geqslant 3$ and hence $(1-\frac{2}{l_{i-1}})(1-\frac{1}{l_{i-1}})^3 \geqslant 1$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr(B_{e_1,e_2}) &\geqslant \frac{1}{l_{i-1}^2}\left(1-\frac{1}{l_{i-1}}\right)^{|W|+|X|+|Y|+|Z|-4} \\
&\quad \cdot [1-Eq(e_1,c+c(e,u)-c(e_1,u))][1-Eq(e_2,c+c(e,v)-c(e_2,v))] \\
&= \frac{1}{l_{i-1}^2}\left(1-\frac{1}{l_{i-1}}\right)^{|W|+|Y|-2}\left(1-\frac{1}{l_{i-1}}\right)^{|X|+|Z|-2} \\
&\quad \cdot [1-Eq(e_1,c+c(e,u)-c(e_1,u))][1-Eq(e_2,c+c(e,v)-c(e_2,v))] \\
&= \frac{1}{l_{i-1}^2}P(e_1,c+c(e,u)-c(e_1,u))P(e_2,c+c(e,v)-c(e_2,v))) \\
&\quad \cdot [1-Eq(e_1,c+c(e,u)-c(e_1,u))][1-Eq(e_2,c+c(e,v)-c(e_2,v))] \\
&= \frac{1}{l_{i-1}^2e^4}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let B_e be the event that e retains c. Then

$$\Pr(B_e) = \frac{1}{l_{i-1}e^2}.$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548306007851 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The events B_e and B_{e_1,e_2} for all $e_1 \in T_{u,c+c(e,u)} \setminus \{e\}$ and $e_2 \in T_{v,c+c(e,v)} \setminus \{e\}$ are pairwise disjoint. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr(\bar{A}_u \cap \bar{A}_v) &= \sum_{e_1,e_2} \Pr(B_{e_1,e_2}) + \Pr(B_e) \\
&\geqslant \frac{(t^{i-1}_{u,c+c(e,u)} - 1)(t^{i-1}_{v,c+c(e,v)} - 1)}{l^2_{i-1}e^4} + \frac{1}{l_{i-1}e^2} \\
&= \frac{t^{i-1}_{u,c+c(e,u)}t^{i-1}_{v,c+c(e,v)} - t^{i-1}_{u,c+c(e,u)} - t^{i-1}_{v,c+c(e,v)} + 1 + l_{i-1}e^2}{l^2_{i-1}e^4} \\
&\geqslant \frac{t^{i-1}_{u,c+c(e,u)}t^{i-1}_{v,c+c(e,v)} - 2l_{i-1} + 1 + l_{i-1}e^2}{l^2_{i-1}e^4} \\
&\geqslant \frac{t^{i-1}_{u,c+c(e,u)}t^{i-1}_{v,c+c(e,v)}}{l^2_{i-1}e^4},
\end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr(A_u \cap A_v) &= 1 - \Pr(\bar{A}_u) - \Pr(\bar{A}_v) + \Pr(\bar{A}_u \cap \bar{A}_v) \\
&\geqslant 1 - \frac{t^{i-1}_{u,c+c(e,u)}}{l_{i-1}e^2} - \frac{t^{i-1}_{v,c+c(e,v)}}{l_{i-1}e^2} + \frac{t^{i-1}_{u,c+c(e,u)}t^{i-1}_{v,c+c(e,v)}}{l^2_{i-1}e^4} \\
&= \left(1 - \frac{t^{i-1}_{u,c+c(e,u)}}{l_{i-1}e^2}\right)\left(1 - \frac{t^{i-1}_{v,c+c(e,v)}}{l_{i-1}e^2}\right) \\
&= Q(u, c + c(e,u))Q(v, c + c(e,v)).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, the probability that c remains in L_e is

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Pr(A_u \cap A_v)[1 - Vq(u, c + c(e,u))][1 - Vq(v, c + c(e,v))] \\
&\quad \geqslant Q(u, c + c(e,u))Q(v, c + c(e,v))[1 - Vq(u, c + c(e,u))][1 - Vq(v, c + c(e,v))] \\
&\quad = \left(1 - e^{-2}\right)^2,
\end{aligned}$$

and hence $E[l^i_e] \geqslant (1 - e^{-2})^2 l_{i-1}$. □

Lemma 2.5. *For every $v \in V$ and colour $c \in L_v$, $E[t^i_{v,c}] \leqslant (1 - e^{-2})^2 t^{i-1}_{v,c} + e^{-2}$.*

Proof. For all $v \in V$ and colour c, denote by $T'_{v,c}$ the set of all edges $e = (u,v) \in E$ for which, at the end of the ith iteration, e is uncoloured and $c - c(e,v) + c(e,u) \in L_u$. Note that for all $v \in V$ and colour c, $t^i_{v,c} \leqslant |T'_{v,c}|$, since, if at the end of the ith iteration $c \notin L_v$, then $t^i_{v,c} = 0$; and if $c \in L_v$ then, for all $e = (u,v) \in T_{v,c}$, e is still uncoloured and $c - c(e,v) \in L_e$; hence $c - c(e,v) + c(e,u) \in L_u$, and therefore $e \in T'_{v,c}$.

Let $e = (u,v)$ be an edge that belongs to $T_{v,c}$ at the beginning of the ith iteration, and let $\hat{c} = c - c(e,v) + c(e,u)$. Let R be the event that e does not retain the colour it is assigned, and let S be the event that no edge e' that belongs to $T_{u,\hat{c}}$ at the beginning of the ith iteration retains $\hat{c} - c(e',u)$. As $e \in T'_{v,c}$ if and only if R and S both hold and $\hat{c}$ is not removed from L_u by the equalizing coin flip, we have

$$\Pr(e \in T'_{v,c}) = \Pr(R \cap S)[1 - Vq(u, \hat{c})].$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548306007851 Published online by Cambridge University Press

To calculate $\Pr(R \cap S)$ we use the fact that $\Pr(R \cap S) = \Pr(R) - \Pr(\bar{S}) + \Pr(\bar{R} \cap \bar{S})$. As we have already shown, $\Pr(R) = 1 - e^{-2}$, and $\Pr(\bar{S}) = \frac{t_{u,\hat{c}}^{i-1}}{l_{i-1}e^2}$.

For every colour $c' \in L_e$ and edge $e' = (u, w)$ that belongs to $T_{u,\hat{c}}$ at the beginning of the ith iteration, let $Z_{c',e'}$ be the event that e retains c' and e' retains $\hat{c} - c(e', u)$. If $c' + c(e, u) \neq \hat{c}$ then $e' \neq e$, and $Z_{c',e'}$ occurs if and only if e is assigned c', e' is assigned $\hat{c} - c(e', u)$, no adjacent edge is assigned a conflicting colour and these colours are not removed from e and e' by the equalizing coin flips. Let $W = T_{v,c'+c(e,v)}$, $X = T_{u,c'+c(e,u)}$, $Y = T_{u,\hat{c}}$ and $Z = T_{w,\hat{c}-c(e',u)+c(e',w)}$. The only edges that might be assigned conflicting colours are the edges of $(W \cup X \cup Y \cup Z) \setminus \{e, e'\}$, and the only edges for which there are two conflicting colours are the edges of $X \cap Y$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr(Z_{c',e'}) &= \frac{1}{l_{i-1}^2}\left(1 - \frac{2}{l_{i-1}}\right)^{|(X\cap Y)\setminus\{e,e'\}|}\left(1 - \frac{1}{l_{i-1}}\right)^{|(X\setminus Y)|+|(Y\setminus X)\setminus\{e'\}|+|W\setminus\{e\}|+|Z\setminus\{e'\}|} \\
&\quad \cdot [1 - Eq(e, c')][1 - Eq(e', \hat{c} - c(e', u))] \\
&\leqslant \frac{1}{l_{i-1}^2}\left(1 - \frac{1}{l_{i-1}}\right)^{2|(X\cap Y)\setminus\{e,e'\}|+|(X\setminus Y)|+|(Y\setminus X)\setminus\{e'\}|+|W|+|Z|-2} \\
&\quad \cdot [1 - Eq(e, c')][1 - Eq(e', \hat{c} - c(e', u))] \\
&\leqslant \frac{1}{l_{i-1}^2}\left(1 - \frac{1}{l_{i-1}}\right)^{|W|+|X|+|Y|+|Z|-6} \\
&\quad \cdot [1 - Eq(e, c')][1 - Eq(e', \hat{c} - c(e', u))] \\
&= \frac{1}{l_{i-1}^2}\left(1 - \frac{1}{l_{i-1}}\right)^{-2}\left(1 - \frac{1}{l_{i-1}}\right)^{|W|+|X|-2}\left(1 - \frac{1}{l_{i-1}}\right)^{|Y|+|Z|-2} \\
&\quad \cdot [1 - Eq(e, c')][1 - Eq(e', \hat{c} - c(e', u))] \\
&= \frac{1}{(l_{i-1} - 1)^2} P(e, c') P(e', \hat{c} - c(e', u)) \\
&\quad \cdot [1 - Eq(e, c')][1 - Eq(e', \hat{c} - c(e', u))] \\
&= \frac{1}{(l_{i-1} - 1)^2 e^4}.
\end{aligned}$$

If $c' = \hat{c}$ then $e' = e$, and $Z_{c',e'}$ is the event that e retains $\hat{c}$, and its probability is $\frac{1}{l_{i-1}e^2}$. Thus,

$$\Pr(\bar{R} \cap \bar{S}) \leqslant \frac{(l_{i-1} - 1)(t_{u,\hat{c}}^{i-1} - 1)}{(l_{i-1} - 1)^2 e^4} + \frac{1}{l_{i-1}e^2} \leqslant \frac{t_{u,\hat{c}}^{i-1}}{l_{i-1}e^4} + \frac{1}{l_{i-1}e^2}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr(R \cap S) &= \Pr(R) - \Pr(\bar{S}) + \Pr(\bar{R} \cap \bar{S}) \\
&\leqslant 1 - \frac{1}{e^2} - \frac{t_{u,\hat{c}}^{i-1}}{l_{i-1}e^2} + \frac{t_{u,\hat{c}}^{i-1}}{l_{i-1}e^4} + \frac{1}{l_{i-1}e^2} \\
&= (1 - e^{-2})\left(1 - \frac{t_{u,\hat{c}}^{i-1}}{l_{i-1}e^2}\right) + \frac{1}{l_{i-1}e^2} \\
&= (1 - e^{-2})Q(u, \hat{c}) + \frac{1}{l_{i-1}e^2},
\end{aligned}$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548306007851 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and hence

$$\begin{aligned}\Pr(e \in T'_{v,c}) &= \Pr(R \cap S)[1 - Vq(u, \hat{c} + c(e,u))] \\ &\leqslant (1 - e^{-2})Q(u,\hat{c})[1 - Vq(u,\hat{c} + c(e,u))] + \frac{1}{l_{i-1}e^2} \\ &\leqslant (1 - e^{-2})^2 + \frac{1}{l_{i-1}e^2},\end{aligned}$$

and

$$E[t^i_{v,c}] \leqslant (1 - e^{-2})^2 t^{i-1}_{v,c} + \frac{t^{i-1}_{v,c}}{l_{i-1}e^2} \leqslant (1 - e^{-2})^2 t^{i-1}_{v,c} + e^{-2}. \qquad \square$$

In Lemmas 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5, we have shown that the expected size of every L_e and $T_{v,c}$ decreases in one iteration by a factor of approximately $(1 - e^{-2})^2$, and of every $R_{v,c}$ by a factor of approximately $1 - e^{-2}$. We wish to prove that with positive probability, the sizes of all these sets indeed decrease by approximately these factors. For this purpose we show that these values are highly concentrated. More precisely, we prove that there exists a constant $\beta > 0$, such that the following hold for all $1 \leqslant i \leqslant t$.

Lemma 2.6. *For each $e \in E$,*

$$\Pr\left(|l^i_e - E[l^i_e]| > \log\Delta\sqrt{l_{i-1}}\right) \leqslant e^{-\beta \log^2 \Delta},$$

where the probability is over the random choices of the ith iteration.

Lemma 2.7. *For each $v \in V$ and $c \in L_v$, if $t^{i-1}_{v,c} > \frac{l_{i-1}}{10}$ then*

$$\Pr\left(|t^i_{v,c} - E[t^i_{v,c}]| > \log\Delta\sqrt{l_{i-1}}\right) \leqslant e^{-\beta \log^2 \Delta},$$

where the probability is over the random choices of the ith iteration.

Lemma 2.8. *For each $v \in V$ and colour c, if $r^{i-1}_{v,c} > \frac{e^2}{3200}\Delta$ then*

$$\Pr\left(|r^i_{v,c} - E[r^i_{v,c}]| > \log\Delta\sqrt{r^i_{v,c}}\right) \leqslant e^{-\beta \log^2 \Delta},$$

where the probability is over the random choices of the ith iteration.

Proof of Lemma 2.8. We prove the lemma using Talagrand's inequality (see, *e.g.*, [15, p. 81]). Fix a vertex v and a colour c. $r^i_{v,c}$ is a function of mutually independent random variables: the colours assigned to the edges and the equalizing coin flips. In order to apply Talagrand's inequality, we have to show that there are constants b and d such that:

- changing the outcome of a single random choice changes $r^i_{v,c}$ by at most b,
- for all s, if $r^i_{v,c} \geqslant s$, then there is a set of at most ds random choices whose outcomes certify that.

We first show that changing the outcome of a single random choice changes $r^i_{v,c}$ by at most two. An edge is removed from $R_{v,c}$ only if it retains the colour it is assigned. Hence,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548306007851 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the only choices that can affect the value of $r^i_{v,c}$ are the colours assigned to edges, and the coin flips that determine whether a colour is removed from an edge.

Changing the colour of an edge incident with v changes $r^i_{v,c}$ by at most two. Indeed, suppose the colour assigned to an edge $e = (u, v)$ is changed from c_1 to c_2. The only edges incident with v that might get coloured or decoloured due to this change are edges e' that are assigned $c_1 + c(e, v) - c(e', v)$ or $c_2 + c(e, v) - c(e', v)$. There is at most one edge e_1 incident with v that retains $c_1 + c(e, v) - c(e_1, v)$, and at most one edge e_2 incident with v that retains $c_2 + c(e, v) - c(e_1, v)$. Therefore, at most two edges might get coloured or decoloured because of this change, and thus removed from or added to $R_{v,c}$.

Changing the colour of an edge that is not incident with v changes $r^i_{v,c}$ by at most one, since it has at most one adjacent edge that is incident with v, and this is the only edge incident with v that might be affected by this change.

Changing the outcome of a coin flip that determines whether a colour is removed from an edge also changes $r^i_{v,c}$ by at most one, since it only affects the corresponding edge.

We now show that if $r^i_{v,c} \geqslant s$, then there is a set of at most $2s$ outcomes that certifies that. This set contains, for each of the s edges that remain in $R_{v,c}$, the colour assigned to this edge, and the conflicting edge or the coin flip that caused the removal of this colour. Thus, the lemma follows from Talagrand's inequality. □

Proof of Lemma 2.6. Let $e = (u, v) \in E$. For $w \in \{u, v\}$, we say that a colour c is assigned to or retained by w, if there is an edge e' incident with w that is assigned or retains $c + c(e, w) - c(e', w)$. Let X be the number of colours c that belong to L_e at the beginning of the ith iteration, were not removed from L_e at the first stage of the iteration, and for which u or v retains c. Note that such colours are removed from L_e, and that the only other reason for which colours are removed from L_e is the equalizing coin flips. For $0 \leqslant k \leqslant j \leqslant 2$, let $Y_{j,k}$ be the number of colours that are assigned to exactly j vertices among u and v, and removed from at least k of them. Similarly, let $X_{j,k}$ be the number of colours that are assigned to at least j vertices among u and v, and removed from at least k of them. Note that $Y_{2,k} = X_{2,k}$, and for $j < 2$, $Y_{j,k} = X_{j,k} - X_{j+1,k}$. Thus, $X = Y_{2,0} - Y_{2,2} + Y_{1,0} - Y_{1,1} = X_{2,0} - X_{2,2} + X_{1,0} - X_{2,0} - X_{1,1} + X_{2,1}$. We show, using Talagrand's inequality, that each $X_{j,k}$ is highly concentrated, and conclude that X is highly concentrated, as well.

By the same argument used in the proof of Lemma 2.8, changing the outcome of a single random choice changes the value of any $X_{j,k}$ by at most 2. In addition, if $X_{j,k} \geqslant s$ then there is a set of $s(j + k)$ outcomes which certifies that. This set contains, for every colour c among the s corresponding colours, j edges e' that are assigned $c + c(e, w) - c(e', w)$, where w is the common vertex of e and e', and k colours assigned to other edges or coin flips that cause the decolouring of k of the above edges.

It is easy to check that $E[X] = \Theta(\Delta)$ and $E[X_{j,k}] = O(\Delta)$ for all j and k. Hence, there is a constant α such that $E[X_{j,k}] \leqslant \alpha E[X]$ for all j and k. Therefore, by Talagrand's inequality,

$$\Pr\left(|X_{j,k} - E[X_{j,k}]| > \frac{\alpha}{6} \log \Delta \sqrt{E[X_{j,k}]}\right) < e^{-\gamma \log^2 \Delta}$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548306007851 Published online by Cambridge University Press

for some constant $\gamma > 0$, and thus

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Pr\Big(|X - E[X]| > \log\Delta\sqrt{E[X]}\Big) \\
&\quad\leqslant \Pr\Big(\exists j,k\ |X_{j,k} - E[X_{j,k}]| > \frac{1}{6}\log\Delta\sqrt{E[X]}\Big) \\
&\quad\leqslant \Pr\Big(\exists j,k\ |X_{j,k} - E[X_{j,k}]| > \frac{\alpha}{6}\log\Delta\sqrt{E[X_{j,k}]}\Big) \\
&\quad< 6e^{-\gamma\log^2\Delta}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let X' be the number of colours that were removed from L_e since the corresponding colours were removed from L_u or L_v by the equalizing coin flips. These coin flips are mutually independent, and hence X' is highly concentrated by the Chernoff bound. Since $l_e^i = l_{i-1} - (X + X')$, the lemma holds for an appropriate choice of the constants. □

Proof of Lemma 2.7. Let $A_{v,c}$ be the set of edges that belong to $T_{v,c}$ at the beginning of the ith iteration, and which do not retain the colours they are assigned. Let $B_{v,c}$ be the set of edges $e = (u,v) \in A_{v,c}$ for which there is an edge e' that belongs to $T_{u,c-c(e,v)+c(e,u)}$ at the beginning of the iteration and that retains $c - c(e,v) + c(e,u) - c(e',u)$. Let $C_{v,c}$ be the set of edges $e \in A_{v,c} \setminus B_{v,c}$ for which $c - c(e,v) + c(e,u)$ is removed from L_u by the equalizing coin flip. We show that $|A_{v,c}|$, $|B_{v,c}|$ and $|C_{v,c}|$ are highly concentrated, and hence $t_{v,c}^i = |A_{v,c}| - |B_{v,c}| - |C_{v,c}|$ is also highly concentrated.

The proof that $|A_{v,c}|$ is highly concentrated is identical to the proof of Lemma 2.8. We now prove that $|B_{v,c}|$ and $|C_{v,c}|$ are also highly concentrated.

Fix a vertex v and a colour c. Let $B_{v,c}^1$ be the set of edges $e = (u,v) \in A_{v,c}$ for which there is an edge e' that belongs to $T_{u,c-c(e,v)+c(e,u)}$ at the beginning of the iteration, and which is assigned $c - c(e,v) + c(e,u) - c(e',u)$. Let $B_{v,c}^2$ be the set of such edges for which the colour $c - c(e,v) + c(e,u) - c(e',u)$ is removed from e'. Then, $|B_{v,c}| = |B_{v,c}^1| - |B_{v,c}^2|$. We first show that changing the outcome of a single random choice changes the size of $B_{v,c}^1$ and $B_{v,c}^2$ by at most two. Clearly, the only choices that can affect the size of $B_{v,c}^1$ and $B_{v,c}^2$ are the colours assigned to edges, and the coin flips that determine whether a colour is removed from an edge.

Suppose we change the colour of an edge $e = (u,v)$ from c_1 to c_2. As we have shown, at most two edges might be added to or removed from $A_{v,c}$ because of this change. These edges might be added to or removed from $B_{v,c}^1$ and $B_{v,c}^2$ as well. The above change might also affect the edges of $T_{u,c-c(e,v)+c(e,u)}$, and the only edge which might be added to or removed from $B_{v,c}^1$ or $B_{v,c}^2$ because of that is e itself. However, if the size of $B_{v,c}^1$ or $B_{v,c}^2$ is changed by two, then e is in any case one of the edges being added or removed. Therefore, changing the colouring of e changes the size of $B_{v,c}^1$ and $B_{v,c}^2$ by at most two.

Changing the colour of an edge that is not incident with v can change the size of $B_{v,c}^1$ and $B_{v,c}^2$ by at most one, since it has at most one adjacent edge incident with v, and this is the only edge that might be affected by this change. Changing the outcome of a coin flip that determines whether a colour is removed from an edge can also change the size of $B_{v,c}^1$ and $B_{v,c}^2$ by at most one, since it affects only the corresponding edge, if it is incident

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548306007851 Published online by Cambridge University Press

with v, or its adjacent edge that is incident with v, if the corresponding edge is adjacent to an edge which is incident with v.

If $|B^1_{v,c}| \geqslant s$, then there is a set of $3s$ outcomes that certifies that, consisting of the $2s$ outcomes that certify that the edges of $B^1_{v,c}$ are in $A_{v,c}$, and for every edge e among those, an edge $e' \in T_{u,c-c(e,v)+c(e,u)}$ that is assigned $c - c(e,v) + c(e,u) - c(e',u)$. If $|B^2_{v,c}| \geqslant s$, then there is a set of $4s$ outcomes that certifies that, consisting of the $3s$ outcomes that certify that the edges of $B^2_{v,c}$ are in $B^1_{v,c}$, and for every e' as above, a conflicting edge or a coin flip that caused the removal of that colour from e'. Thus, by Talagrand's inequality, $|B^1_{v,c}|$ and $|B^2_{v,c}|$ are highly concentrated.

Clearly, the expected size of all the above sets is $\Theta(\Delta)$. Therefore, we can conclude that $|B_{v,c}| = |B^1_{v,c}| - |B^2_{v,c}|$ is highly concentrated, too, and so is the size of $A_{v,c} \setminus B_{v,c}$. As for $C_{v,c}$, the edges of $C_{v,c}$ are edges $e = (u,v) \in A_{v,c} \setminus B_{v,c}$ for which $c - c(e,v) + c(e,u)$ was removed from L_u by the equalizing coin flip. These coin flips are mutually independent, and therefore, by the Chernoff bound, the size of $C_{v,c}$ is highly concentrated. To complete the proof of the lemma, we combine all the above, as in the proof of Lemma 2.6. □

To complete the proof we apply the local lemma to each iteration, to show that, with positive probability, the size of every set is within a small error of the expected size.

Lemma 2.9. *With positive probability, the following hold after i iterations, for all $0 \leqslant i \leqslant t$:*

(1) *For all $e \in E$*

$$l^i_e \geqslant (1 - e^{-2})^{2i}\left(1 + \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right)\Delta - \tilde{O}(\sqrt{\Delta}).$$

(2) *For all $v \in V$ and colour c, if $c \in L_v$ after the ith iteration then*

$$t^i_{v,c} \leqslant (1 - e^{-2})^{2i}\Delta + \tilde{O}(\sqrt{\Delta}).$$

(3) *For all $v \in V$ and colour c*

$$r^i_{v,c} \leqslant (1 - e^{-2})^{i}\frac{\epsilon}{5}\Delta + \tilde{O}(\sqrt{\Delta}).$$

Proof. We prove the lemma by induction on i. Suppose the claim holds after $i-1$ iterations. Note that by the induction hypothesis, $t^{i-1}_{v,c} \leqslant l_{i-1}$. Thus, we can apply all the lemmas that were proved in this section. For all $v \in V$ and colour c, if $t^{i-1}_{v,c} \leqslant (1 - e^{-2})^{2i}\Delta$ or $r^{i-1}_{v,c} \leqslant (1 - e^{-2})^{i}\frac{\epsilon}{5}\Delta$ then the corresponding condition after i iterations trivially holds. Otherwise, we can apply Lemmas 2.7 and 2.8.

For all $e \in E$, let A_e be the event that l^i_e violates the first condition, and for all $v \in V$ and colour c, let $B_{v,c}$ and $C_{v,c}$ be the events that $t^i_{v,c}$ and $r^i_{v,c}$ violate the second and third conditions, respectively. By Lemmas 2.6, 2.7 and 2.8, the probability of each one of these events is less than $e^{-\beta \log^2 \Delta}$ for some constant β. Every event A_e is mutually independent of all other events except for those that correspond to the vertices incident with e and their neighbours, and to edges incident with these vertices. Thus, it is mutually independent of all but $O(\Delta^2)$ of the other events. Every event $B_{v,c}$ or $C_{v,c}$ is mutually independent of all other events except for those that correspond to the edges incident

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548306007851 Published online by Cambridge University Press

with v, to the vertices incident with them and to the neighbours of these vertices. Thus, it is mutually independent of all but $O(\Delta^3)$ of the other events. Thus, by the local lemma, all the conditions hold with positive probability.

To complete the proof of the lemma we have to bound the sizes of the initial sets L_e, $T_{v,c}$ and $R_{v,c}$. Clearly, the size of the initial set $T_{v,c}$ satisfies $t^0_{v,c} \leqslant \Delta$ for all $v \in V$ and colour c. As for the sets L_e and $R_{v,c}$, by Lemma 2.2 the sizes of these sets before the beginning of the iterative procedure satisfy that for all $e = (u,v) \in E$, $l^0_e = k - |(\text{Reserve}_u - c(e,u)) \cup (\text{Reserve}_v - c(e,v))| \geqslant k - \frac{\epsilon}{2}\Delta \geqslant \left(1 + \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right)\Delta$, and for all $v \in V$ and colour c, $r^0_{v,c} \leqslant \frac{\epsilon}{5}\Delta$, and the lemma follows. □

2.5. Completing the colouring

By Lemma 2.9, at the end of the iterative procedure we have for all $v \in V$ and colour c, $|R_{v,c}| \leqslant \frac{\epsilon^2}{3200}\Delta$. Since $|\text{Reserve}_e| \geqslant \frac{\epsilon^2}{200}\Delta$ for all $e \in E$, we can complete the colouring by the reserved colours, using the results in [4], [16], [17] or [10]. For the sake of completeness, we describe a short proof. Let $l = \frac{\epsilon^2}{200}\Delta$. If Δ is sufficiently large, then for every edge $e = (u,v)$ and colour c, at the end of the iterative procedure, $|R_{u,c+c(e,u)}| + |R_{v,c+c(e,v)}| \leqslant \frac{\epsilon}{1600}\Delta = \frac{l}{8}$. We now prove that we can complete the colouring. Assign any edge e a colour chosen uniformly from Reserve_e. For any two edges e_1 and e_2 whose common vertex is u, and colour c such that $c - c(e_1,u) \in \text{Reserve}_{e_1}$ and $c - c(e_2,u) \in \text{Reserve}_{e_2}$, let $A_{e_1,e_2,c}$ denote the event that e_1 was coloured in $c - c(e_1,u)$ and e_2 in $c - c(e_2,u)$. The probability of any of these events is at most $\frac{1}{l^2}$. $A_{e_1,e_2,c}$ is mutually independent of all other events but those that involve e_1 or e_2, and there are at most $\frac{l^2}{4}$ such events. Hence, the local lemma implies that the desired colouring exists.

3. Algebraic methods

In this section we prove Conjecture 1.1 for several families of graphs using algebraic methods. The relevance of results from additive number theory to this conjecture appears already in [11], where the authors apply the main result of Hall [9] to prove their conjecture for the multigraph with two vertices and d parallel edges between them. Here we consider several more complicated cases.

3.1. Even multi-cycles

Consider the case where the graph G is a d-regular multigraph whose underlying simple graph is a simple cycle of even length. We show that if $d+1$ is a prime then there exists a colouring with the required properties using $d+1$ colours.

In our proof, we use the following theorem proved in [3].

Theorem 3.1. (Combinatorial Nullstellensatz) *Let F be an arbitrary field, and let $P = P(x_1,\ldots,x_n)$ be a polynomial in $F[x_1,\ldots,x_n]$. Suppose that the degree of P is $\sum_{i=1}^n t_i$, where each t_i is a non-negative integer, and suppose the coefficient of $\prod_{i=1}^n x_i^{t_i}$ in P is nonzero. Then, if $S_1,\ldots,S_n$ are subsets of F with $|S_i| > t_i$, there are $s_1 \in S_1, s_2 \in S_2, \ldots, s_n \in S_n$ so that $P(s_1,\ldots,s_n) \neq 0$.*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548306007851 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a simple cycle of length $2n$, with, possibly, multiple edges. Let (A, B) be the bipartition of G, and denote the vertices of A by $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n$, and the vertices of B by $b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_n$, so that there are edges between a_i and b_i for all $1 \leqslant i \leqslant n$, between b_i and a_{i+1} for all $1 \leqslant i \leqslant n-1$, and between b_n and a_1. Since G is d regular, all the edges (a_i, b_i) have the same multiplicity s, and hence all the other edges have multiplicity $t = d - s$.

We now associate a polynomial P with the graph G. For every edge e, we have a variable x_e. For every two edges e_1 and e_2 which have a common vertex in A, we have a term $(x_{e_1} - x_{e_2})$, and for every two edges e_1 and e_2 which have a common vertex in B we have a term $(x_{e_1} + c(e_1) - x_{e_2} - c(e_2))$. Thus, the polynomial P is defined by

$$P = \left[\prod_{e_1 \cap e_2 \cap A \neq \emptyset} (x_{e_1} - x_{e_2}) \right] \left[\prod_{e_1 \cap e_2 \cap B \neq \emptyset} (x_{e_1} + c(e_1) - x_{e_2} - c(e_2)) \right].$$

Since the graph is d-regular, every edge has $d-1$ terms for each one of its vertices. Hence, the total degree of P is $nd(d-1)$.

Proposition 3.2. *If $d+1$ is a prime then the coefficient of the monomial $\prod_{e \in E} x_e^{d-1}$ in P is nonzero modulo $d+1$.* □

Proof. The monomial $\prod_{e \in E} x_e^{d-1}$ is of maximum degree, and thus its coefficient in P is equal to its coefficient in the polynomial

$$Q = \left[\prod_{e_1 \cap e_2 \cap A \neq \emptyset} (x_{e_1} - x_{e_2}) \right] \left[\prod_{e_1 \cap e_2 \cap B \neq \emptyset} (x_{e_1} - x_{e_2}) \right].$$

In [7] (see also [2]) it is shown that, for any d-regular planar multigraph, the absolute value of this coefficient is equal to the number of proper d-edge-colourings. Every d-edge-colouring of G is obtained by partitioning the colours into a subset of size s and a subset of size t, and for every two connected vertices, choosing a permutation of the appropriate set. Thus the number of edge colourings with d colours is $\binom{d}{s}(s!)^n(t!)^n = d!(s!)^{n-1}(t!)^{n-1}$, which is nonzero modulo $d+1$ since $d+1$ is a prime. □

Corollary 3.3. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be an even length d-regular multi-cycle, where $d+1$ is a prime. Let (A, B) be the bipartition of G, and let $c : E \to N$ be a delay function. Then, there is a colouring $f : E \to \{0, 1, \ldots, d\}$ such that if e_1 and e_2 have a common vertex in A then $f(e_1) \neq f(e_2)$, and if e_1 and e_2 have a common vertex in B then $f(e_1) + c(e_1) \not\equiv f(e_2) + c(e_2) \pmod{(d+1)}$.*

Proof. By Theorem 3.1, with $S_e = \{0, 1, \ldots, d\}$ and $t_e = d - 1$ for every $e \in E$, there is a function $f : E \to \{0, 1, \ldots, d\}$ such that the value of P, when every x_e is assigned the value $f(e)$, is nonzero modulo $d+1$. Thus, for every two edges e_1 and e_2 that have a common vertex in A, $f(e_1) \neq f(e_2)$ since we have a term $(x_{e_1} - x_{e_2})$ in P, and for every two edges e_1 and e_2 that have a common vertex in B, $f(e_1) + c(e_1) \not\equiv f(e_2) + c(e_2) \pmod{(d+1)}$ since we have a term $(x_{e_1} + c(e_1) - x_{e_2} - c(e_2))$ in P. □

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548306007851 Published online by Cambridge University Press

3.2. Multi-K_4

The problem can be generalized to non-bipartite multigraphs. In this case, we specify for every edge which endpoint is the transmitter and which is the receiver. Following the notation used in Section 2, for every edge $e = (u, v)$, where u is the transmitter and v is the receiver, we define $c(e, u) = 0$, and $c(e, v)$ to be the delay associated with e.

We can further generalize the problem as follows. Given a multigraph $G = (V, E)$, where every edge $e = (u, v) \in E$ is associated with two integers $c(e, u)$ and $c(e, v)$, we aim to find the smallest number k such that there is a colouring $f : E \to \{0, 1, \ldots, k-1\}$, satisfying the following. For every vertex v and every two edges $e_1 \neq e_2$ incident with v, $f(e_1) + c(e_1, v) \not\equiv f(e_2) + c(e_2, v) \pmod{k}$. In this case, $\Delta + 1$ colours do not always suffice, simply because $\chi'(G)$ may be as large as $\lfloor \frac{3}{2}\Delta \rfloor$, where $\chi'(G)$ is the edge chromatic number of G. The following conjecture seems plausible for this case.

Conjecture 3.4. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a multigraph, and suppose that every edge $e = (u, v) \in E$ is associated with two integers $c(e, u)$ and $c(e, v)$. Let $k = \chi'(G) + 1$. Then there exists a colouring $f : E \to \{0, 1, \ldots, k-1\}$ such that, for every vertex v and every two edges $e_1 \neq e_2$ incident with v, $f(e_1) + c(e_1, v) \not\equiv f(e_2) + c(e_2, v) \pmod{k}$.*

Proposition 3.5. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a d-regular multi-K_4, where every edge $e = (u, v) \in E$ is associated with two integers $c(e, u)$ and $c(e, v)$, and suppose $d + 1$ is a prime. Then there is a colouring $f : E \to \{0, 1, \ldots, d\}$, satisfying the condition that for every vertex v and every two edges $e_1 \neq e_2$ incident with v, $f(e_1) + c(e_1, v) \not\equiv f(e_2) + c(e_2, v) \pmod{(d+1)}$.* □

The proof is similar to the proof of the result for even cycles.

Proof. First, note that if G is d-regular, then every pair of non-adjacent edges of K_4 have the same multiplicity in G. Denote these multiplicities by a, b and c. We associate the following polynomial with G:

$$P = \prod_{v \in V} \prod_{e_1 \neq e_2 \in E \ : \ v \in e_1 \cap e_2} (x_{e_1} + c(e_1, v) - x_{e_2} - c(e_2, v)).$$

P is a polynomial in $2d$ variables, with total degree $2d(d-1)$. Hence, by Theorem 3.1, if the coefficient of $\prod_{e \in E} x_e^{d-1}$ is nonzero modulo $d + 1$, then there is a function $f : E \to \{0, 1, \ldots, d\}$, such that if every variable x_e is assigned $f(e)$ then the value of P is nonzero modulo $d + 1$, and therefore f satisfies the required properties.

The coefficient of $\prod_{e \in E} x_e^{d-1}$ in P is equal to its coefficient in

$$Q = \prod_{v \in V} \prod_{e_1 \neq e_2 \in E \ : \ v \in e_1 \cap e_2} (x_{e_1} - x_{e_2}),$$

which is, by [7], the number of proper d-edge-colourings of G. Such a colouring is obtained as follows. First, choose a permutation of the colours and colour the edges incident to a vertex u accordingly. Now for every pair of other vertices v and w, the set of colours that may be used to colour the edges between v and w is the same set used for the edges between u and the fourth vertex, and we only choose the permutation of this set.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548306007851 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Thus, the number of proper d-edge-colourings is $d!a!b!c! \not\equiv 0 \pmod{(d+1)}$, since $d+1$ is a prime. □

4. Concluding remarks

In Section 3 we proved Conjecture 1.1 for some graphs using algebraic techniques. This method can be used to prove the conjecture for several other graphs. However, it seems that in order to prove the conjecture for the general case, more ideas are needed. In the graphs for which we used Theorem 3.1, the theorem implies that there is a proper edge colouring with delays using $\Delta + 1$ colours, even if there is one forbidden colour for every edge.

In Section 2 we showed that the weaker conjecture holds for simple bipartite graphs. It would be interesting to extend this proof to multigraphs as well.

In the probabilistic proof presented in Section 2, we proved that $\Delta + o(\Delta)$ colours suffice, and did not make any effort to minimize the $o(\Delta)$ term. By modifying our proof slightly, we can show that $\Delta + \tilde{O}(\Delta^{2/3})$ colours suffice, and it seems plausible that a more careful analysis, following the discussion in [14], can even imply that $\Delta + \tilde{O}(\sqrt{\Delta})$ colours suffice.

The probabilistic proof can be extended to other variations of edge colouring. Instead of the delays, one can associate with every edge e and an endpoint v of e an injective function $g_{e,v}$ on the colours. Then, by our proof, there is an edge colouring f using $\Delta + o(\Delta)$ colours such that for every vertex v and any two edges $e_1 \neq e_2$ incident with v, $g_{e_1,v}(f(e_1)) \neq g_{e_2,v}(f(e_2))$.

The known results about the algorithmic version of the local lemma, initiated by Beck ([5], see also [1], [13] and [6]), can be combined with our probabilistic proof in Section 2 to design a polynomial time algorithm that solves the corresponding algorithmic problem. In contrast, the algebraic proofs of Section 3 supply no efficient procedures for the corresponding problems, and it will be interesting to find such algorithms.

References

[1] Alon, N. (1991) A parallel algorithmic version of the Local Lemma. *Random Struct. Alg.* **2** 367–378.
[2] Alon, N. (1993) Restricted colorings of graphs. In *Surveys in Combinatorics: Proc. 14th British Combinatorial Conference, London* (K. Walker, ed.), Vol. 187 of *Mathematical Society Lecture Notes Series*, Cambridge University Press, pp. 1–33.
[3] Alon, N. (1999) Combinatorial Nullstellensatz. *Combin. Probab. Comput.* **8** 7–29.
[4] Alon, N. and Spencer, J. H. (2000) *The Probabilistic Method*, 2nd edn, Wiley.
[5] Beck, J. (1991) An algorithmic approach to the Lovász Local Lemma. *Random Struct. Alg.* **2** 343–365.
[6] Czumaj, A. and Scheideler, C. (2000) Coloring nonuniform hypergraphs: A new algorithmic approach to the general Lovász Local Lemma. *Random Struct. Alg.* **17** 213–237.
[7] Ellingham, M. N. and Goddyn, L. (1996) List edge colourings of some 1-factorable multigraphs. *Combinatorica* **16** 343–352.
[8] Häggkvist, R. and Janssen, J. (1997) New bounds on the list chromatic index of the complete graph and other simple graphs. *Combin. Probab. Comput.* **6** 273–295.
[9] Hall, M. (1952) A combinatorial problem on abelian groups. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **3** 584–587.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548306007851 Published online by Cambridge University Press

[10] Haxell, P. E. (2001) A note on vertex list colouring. *Combin. Probab. Comput.* **10** 345–348.
[11] Haxell, P. E., Wilfong, G. T. and Winkler, P. Delay coloring and optical networks. To appear.
[12] Kahn, J. (1996) Asymptotically good list-colorings. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* **73** 1–59.
[13] Molloy, M. and Reed, B. (1998) Further algorithmic aspects of the Local Lemma. In *Proc. 30th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pp. 524–529.
[14] Molloy, M. and Reed, B. (2000) Near-optimal list colorings. *Random Struct. Alg.* **17** 376–402.
[15] Molloy, M. and Reed, B. (2001) *Graph Colouring and the Probabilistic Method*, Springer.
[16] Reed, B. (1999) The list colouring constants. *J. Graph Theory* **31** 149–153.
[17] Reed, B. and Sudakov, B. (2002) Asymptotically the list colouring constants are 1. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* **86** 27–37.
[18] Ross, K., Bambos, N., Kumaran, K., Saniee, I. and Widjaja, I. (2003) Scheduling bursts in time-domain wavelength interleaved networks. *IEEE JSAC OCN* **21** 1441–1451.
[19] Widjaja, I., Saniee, I., Giles, R. and Mitra, D. (2003) Light core and intelligent edge for a flexible, thin-layered and cost-effective optical transport network. *IEEE Optical Communications* **1**(2); *IEEE Communications Magazine* **45**(5) 31–36.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548306007851 Published online by Cambridge University Press