

Multicolor Ramsey Number of Stars Versus a Path

Xuejun ZHANG¹, Xinmin HOU^{1,2,3,4,*}

1. School of Data Science, University of Science and Technology of China, Anhui 230026, P. R. China;
2. School of Mathematical Sciences, University of Science and Technology of China, Anhui 230026, P. R. China;
3. CAS Key Laboratory of Wu Wen-Tsun Mathematics, University of Science and Technology of China, Anhui 230026, P. R. China;
4. Hefei National Laboratory, University of Science and Technology of China, Anhui 230026, P. R. China

Abstract For given simple graphs H_1, H_2, \dots, H_c , the multicolor Ramsey number $R(H_1, H_2, \dots, H_c)$ is defined as the smallest positive integer n such that for an arbitrary edge-decomposition $\{G_i\}_{i=1}^c$ of the complete graph K_n , at least one G_i has a subgraph isomorphic to H_i . Let m, n_1, n_2, \dots, n_c be positive integers and $\Sigma = \sum_{i=1}^c (n_i - 1)$. Some bounds and exact values of $R(K_{1,n_1}, \dots, K_{1,n_c}, P_m)$ have been obtained in literature. Wang (Graphs Combin., 2020) conjectured that if $\Sigma \not\equiv 0 \pmod{m-1}$ and $\Sigma+1 \geq (m-3)^2$, then $R(K_{1,n_1}, \dots, K_{1,n_c}, P_m) = \Sigma+m-1$. In this note, we give a new lower bound and some exact values of $R(K_{1,n_1}, \dots, K_{1,n_c}, P_m)$ provided $m \leq \Sigma$, $\Sigma \equiv k \pmod{m-1}$, and $2 \leq k \leq m-2$. These results partially confirm Wang's conjecture.

Keywords Ramsey number; star; path

MR(2020) Subject Classification 05C55

1. Introduction

In this paper, all graphs are finite and simple. The vertex set, edge set, minimum degree, maximum degree, complement graph and edge chromatic number of a graph G are denoted by $V(G)$, $E(G)$, $\delta(G)$, $\Delta(G)$, \overline{G} and $\chi'(G)$, respectively. For $v \in V(G)$, we use $d_G(v)$ to denote the degree of v in G . We use kG to denote k vertex disjoint copies of G . An decomposition of a graph G is a set $\{G_1, G_2, \dots, G_c\}$ of edge-disjoint subgraphs of G such that $\bigcup_{i=1}^c G_i = G$. We use K_n^r to denote a complete n -partite graph with all partition classes having the same size r .

Let H_1, H_2, \dots, H_c be given simple graphs. The multicolor Ramsey number $R(H_1, H_2, \dots, H_c)$ is defined as the smallest positive integer n such that for an arbitrary edge-decomposition $\{G_i\}_{i=1}^c$ of the complete graph K_n , at least one G_i has a subgraph isomorphic to H_i .

Received September 9, 2023; Accepted January 6, 2024

Supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No.12071453), the National Key R and D Program of China (Grant No.2020YFA0713100) and the Innovation Program for Quantum Science and Technology (Grant No.2021ZD0302902).

* Corresponding author

E-mail address: tczjxwmz@mail.ustc.edu.cn (Xuejun ZHANG); xmhou@ustc.edu.cn (Xinmin HOU)

If $c \geq 3$, there are few known results about $R(H_1, H_2, \dots, H_c)$ for very special graphs. In this note, we focus on $R(K_{1,n_1}, K_{1,n_2}, \dots, K_{1,n_c}, P_m)$, where P_m is a path of order m . In the rest of this paper, let $\Sigma = \sum_{i=1}^c (n_i - 1)$. Some related results are listed here.

(a) ([1])

$$R(K_{1,n_1}, K_{1,n_2}, \dots, K_{1,n_c}) = \begin{cases} \Sigma + 1, & \text{if } \Sigma \text{ and at least one } n_i \text{ are even,} \\ \Sigma, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

(b) ([2]) $R(K_{1,n_1}, \dots, K_{1,n_c}, P_m) \leq m + \Sigma$. Moreover, if $\Sigma \equiv 0 \pmod{m - 1}$ and $m + \Sigma$ is odd, then

$$R(K_{1,n_1}, \dots, K_{1,n_c}, P_m) = \Sigma + m.$$

(c) ([3])

(c1) If $m \geq \Sigma + 1$, then $R(K_{1,n_1}, \dots, K_{1,n_c}, P_m) = \max\{m, 2\Sigma + 1\}$.

(c2) If $m \leq \Sigma$, $\Sigma \equiv 0 \pmod{m - 1}$ and $m + \Sigma$ is even, then

$$R(K_{1,n_1}, \dots, K_{1,n_c}, P_m) = \begin{cases} \Sigma + m, & \text{if all } n_i \ (1 \leq i \leq c) \text{ are odd;} \\ \Sigma + m - 1, & \text{if some } n_i \text{ is even.} \end{cases}$$

(c3) If $m \leq \Sigma$ and $\Sigma \not\equiv 0 \pmod{m - 1}$, then

$$R(K_{1,n_1}, \dots, K_{1,n_c}, P_m) \leq \Sigma + m - 1.$$

Moreover, equality holds if $\Sigma \equiv 1 \pmod{m - 1}$.

(c4) If $m \leq \Sigma$, $\Sigma \equiv k \pmod{m - 1}$ and $2 \leq k \leq m - 2$, then

$$R(K_{1,n_1}, \dots, K_{1,n_c}, P_m) \geq \Sigma + k - 2.$$

In [3], the author also proposed the following conjecture.

Conjecture 1.1 ([3]) *If $\Sigma \not\equiv 0 \pmod{m - 1}$ and $\Sigma + 1 \geq (m - 3)^2$, then*

$$R(K_{1,n_1}, \dots, K_{1,n_c}, P_m) = \Sigma + m - 1.$$

In this paper, we continue the study of the Ramsey number of stars versus a path and give a new lower bound and some exact values of $R(K_{1,n_1}, \dots, K_{1,n_c}, P_m)$ when $m \leq \Sigma$, $\Sigma \equiv k \pmod{m - 1}$, and $2 \leq k \leq m - 2$. These results partially confirm Conjecture 1.1. The main result is as follows.

Theorem 1.2 *Let $m \leq \Sigma$, $\Sigma \equiv k \pmod{m - 1}$, $2 \leq k \leq m - 2$, and let $s = \frac{\Sigma - k}{m - 1}$. Then the following holds.*

(1) *If $s + k \geq m - 2$ and $m + \Sigma$ is even, then*

$$R(K_{1,n_1}, \dots, K_{1,n_c}, P_m) = \Sigma + m - 1.$$

(2) *If $\Sigma \equiv 0 \pmod{m - 2}$, $m + \Sigma$ is odd and n_1, \dots, n_c are odd, then*

$$R(K_{1,n_1}, \dots, K_{1,n_c}, P_m) = \Sigma + m - 1.$$

(3) *If $\Sigma \equiv 0 \pmod{m - 2}$, $m + \Sigma$ is odd, $\Sigma < (m - 2)^2$ and some n_i is even, then*

$$R(K_{1,n_1}, \dots, K_{1,n_c}, P_m) = \Sigma + m - 2.$$

$$(4) R(K_{1,n_1}, \dots, K_{1,n_c}, P_m) \geq \Sigma + \min\{s + k, m - 2\}.$$

The rest of this note is arranged as follows. We give some preliminaries in the next section. In Section 3, we prove Theorem 1.2.

2. Preliminaries

The following lemmas will be used in the proofs of this note. We first give some fundamental results in graph theory.

Lemma 2.1 ([4]) *Every graph has an even number of odd degree vertices.*

Lemma 2.2 ([4]) *For every simple graph G , $\chi'(G) \in \{\Delta(G), \Delta(G) + 1\}$.*

Let $p(G)$ be the order of a longest path of a graph G .

Lemma 2.3 ([5]) *Let G be a connected graph of order $n \geq 3$ with $\delta(G) = \delta$. Then $p(G) \geq \min\{2\delta + 1, n\}$.*

A graph G of order n is called overfull if $|E(G)| > \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor \Delta(G)$. Obviously, the order of an overfull graph must be odd.

Lemma 2.4 ([6]) *Let G be a complete multipartite graph. If G is not overfull, then $\chi'(G) = \Delta(G)$.*

Lemma 2.5 ([7]) *Let n_1, \dots, n_c be positive integers, $\Sigma = \sum_{i=1}^c (n_i - 1)$ and let H be a graph with $\chi'(H) \leq \Sigma$. Then H can be decomposed into edge-disjoint subgraphs H_1, H_2, \dots, H_c such that $\Delta(H_i) \leq n_i - 1$.*

Lemma 2.6 ([8]) *For odd n and even r , the complete multipartite graph K_n^r is the union of $\frac{n(r-1)-1}{2}$ edge-disjoint Hamilton cycles and a 1-factor. Otherwise, K_n^r is the union of $\frac{n(r-1)}{2}$ edge-disjoint Hamilton cycles.*

3. Proof of Theorem 1.2

In this section, we prove the main theorem.

Proof of Theorem 1.2 (1) By (c3), we have $R(K_{1,n_1}, \dots, K_{1,n_c}, P_m) \leq \Sigma + m - 1$. Thus we only need to prove $R(K_{1,n_1}, \dots, K_{1,n_c}, P_m) > \Sigma + m - 2$ in this case. Note that

$$\Sigma + m - 2 = s(m - 1) + k + m - 2 = (s - m + k + 2)(m - 1) + (m - k)(m - 2).$$

Consider a decomposition $K_{\Sigma+k-2} = G \cup \overline{G}$, where $\overline{G} = (s - m + k + 2)K_{m-1} \cup (m - k)K_{m-2}$. Obviously, \overline{G} contains no P_m . Since $\Sigma + m$ is even, G is not overfull. Note that G is a complete $(s + 2)$ -partite graph. By Lemma 2.4, we have $\chi'(G) = \Delta(G) = \Sigma$. By Lemma 2.5, G can be decomposed into edge-disjoint subgraphs G_1, \dots, G_c such that $\Delta(G_i) \leq n_i - 1$. Thus $R(K_{1,n_1}, \dots, K_{1,n_c}, P_m) > \Sigma + m - 2$. Therefore, we have

$$R(K_{1,n_1}, \dots, K_{1,n_c}, P_m) = \Sigma + m - 1.$$

(2) With the same reason as in (1), we only need to show $R(K_{1,n_1}, \dots, K_{1,n_c}, P_m) > \Sigma + m - 2$. As n_1, \dots, n_c are odd, $\Sigma = \sum_{i=1}^c (n_i - 1)$ is even. Since $\Sigma + m$ is odd, we have m is odd. Let $\Sigma = t(m - 2)$ for some positive integer t . Then $\Sigma + m - 2 = (t + 1)(m - 2)$. Consider the complete $(t + 1)$ -partite graph G on $\Sigma + m - 2$ vertices with all parts of the same size $m - 2$. By Lemma 2.6, G can be decomposed into $\frac{\Sigma}{2}$ edge-disjoint Hamilton cycles. For $1 \leq i \leq c$, let G_i be the union of $\frac{n_i - 1}{2}$ edge-disjoint Hamilton cycles. Then G_i is $(n_i - 1)$ -regular and thus it contains no K_{1,n_i} . Clearly, \overline{G} contains no P_m . Therefore,

$$R(K_{1,n_1}, \dots, K_{1,n_c}, P_m) = \Sigma + m - 1.$$

(3) Let $\Sigma = t(m - 2)$. For the lower bound, consider the complete $(t + 1)$ -partite graph G on $\Sigma + m - 3$ vertices with t parts of the same size $m - 2$ and one part of size $m - 3$. Since $\Sigma + m$ is odd, $\Sigma + m - 3$ is even. So G is not overfull. By Lemma 2.4, $\chi'(K) = \Sigma$. By Lemma 2.5, G can be decomposed into edge-disjoint subgraphs G_1, \dots, G_c such that $\Delta(G_i) \leq n_i - 1$. Clearly, the complement of G contains no P_m . Therefore, we have

$$R(K_{1,n_1}, \dots, K_{1,n_c}, P_m) \geq \Sigma + m - 2.$$

For the upper bound, we assume to the contrary that there is a decomposition $K_{\Sigma+m-2} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{c+1} G_i$ such that G_i contains no K_{1,n_i} ($1 \leq i \leq c$) and G_{c+1} contains no P_m . Then $\delta(G_{c+1}) \geq m - 3$ (otherwise, at least one G_i for $1 \leq i \leq c$ has $\delta(G_i) \geq n_i$, a contradiction to the assumption that G_i contains no K_{1,n_i}). Therefore, every component of G_{c+1} has at least $m - 2$ vertices. By Lemma 2.3, each component of G_{c+1} has at most $m - 1$ vertices. Since $\Sigma < (m - 2)^2$, we have $|V(G_{c+1})| = \Sigma + m - 2 < (m - 2)(m - 1)$. This forces that every component of G_{c+1} has exact $m - 2$ vertices. Since $\delta(G_{c+1}) \geq m - 3$, all components of G_{c+1} are complete graphs, i.e., $G_{c+1} = (t + 1)K_{m-2}$. Thus $d_{\bigcup_{i=1}^c G_i}(v) = \Sigma + m - 3 - d_{G_{c+1}}(v) = \Sigma = \sum_{i=1}^c (n_i - 1)$ for all $v \in V(K_{\Sigma+m-2})$. As each G_i contains no K_{1,n_i} , we have every G_i is an $(n_i - 1)$ -regular graph for $1 \leq i \leq c$. Note that $V(G_i) = \Sigma + m - 2$ is odd. Lemma 2.2 forces that all $n_i - 1$ are even. This contradicts the assumption that at least one n_i is even.

(4) If $s + k < m - 2$, let $n = \Sigma + s + k$, then

$$\begin{aligned} n - 1 &= \Sigma + s + k - 1 = s(m - 1) + k + s + k - 1 \\ &= (s - 1)(m - 2) + m - 3 + 2(s + k). \end{aligned}$$

Consider a complete $(s + 2)$ -partite graph K on $n - 1$ vertices with $s - 1$ parts of the same size $m - 2$, one part of size $m - 3$ and two parts of size $s + k$. By Lemma 2.2, $\chi'(K) \leq \Delta(K) + 1 = \Sigma$. By Lemma 2.5, K can be decomposed into edge-disjoint subgraphs G_1, \dots, G_c such that $\Delta(G_i) \leq n_i - 1$. Obviously, the complement of K contains no P_m . So $R(K_{1,n_1}, \dots, K_{1,n_c}, P_m) \geq \Sigma + s + k$. If $s + k > m - 2$, let $n = \Sigma + m - 2$, then

$$\begin{aligned} n - 1 &= \Sigma + m - 3 = s(m - 1) + k + m - 3 \\ &= (s - m + k + 1)(m - 1) + (m - k + 1)(m - 2). \end{aligned}$$

Consider a complete $(s + 2)$ -partite graph K on $n - 1$ vertices with $s - m + k + 1$ parts of the same size $m - 1$ and $m - k + 1$ parts of the same size $m - 2$. By Lemma 2.2, $\chi'(K) \leq \Delta(K) + 1 = \Sigma$. By

Lemma 2.5, K can be decomposed into edge-disjoint subgraphs G_1, \dots, G_c such that $\Delta(G_i) \leq n_i - 1$. Since the complement of K contains no P_m , we have $R(K_{1,n_1}, \dots, K_{1,n_c}, P_m) \geq \Sigma + m - 2$. If $s + k = m - 2$ and $m + \Sigma$ is even, then by (1), we have

$$R(K_{1,n_1}, \dots, K_{1,n_c}, P_m) = \Sigma + m - 1.$$

If $s + k = m - 2$ and $m + \Sigma$ is odd,

$$\Sigma = s(m - 1) + k = s(m - 2) + s + k = (s + 1)(m - 2) < (m - 2)^2.$$

By (2) and (3), we have

$$R(K_{1,n_1}, \dots, K_{1,n_c}, P_m) = \begin{cases} \Sigma + m - 1, & \text{if } n_i \ (1 \leq i \leq c) \text{ are odd;} \\ \Sigma + m - 2, & \text{if some } n_i \text{ is even.} \end{cases}$$

The proof of the theorem is completed. \square

4. Remarks

In this note, we confirm some special cases ((1) and (2) in Theorem 1.2) of Conjecture 1.1, and result (3) also supports the conjecture, but unfortunately, Conjecture 1.1 is still open.

Acknowledgements We thank the referees for their time and comments.

References

- [1] S. A. BURR, J. A. ROBERTS. *On Ramsey Numbers for Stars*. Utilitas Math., 1973, **4**: 217–220.
- [2] Kemin ZHANG, Shusheng ZHANG. *Some Tree-Stars Ramsey Numbers*. World Sci. Publ., River Edge, NJ, 1998.
- [3] Longqin WANG. *Some multi-color Ramsey numbers on stars versus path, cycle or wheel*. Graphs Combin., 2020, **36**(3): 515–524.
- [4] J. A. BONDY, U. S. R. MURTY. *Graph Theory with Applications*. American Elsevier Publishing Co., Inc., New York, 1976.
- [5] G. A. DIRAC. *Some theorems on abstract graphs*. Proc. London Math. Soc., 1952, **2**(3): 69–81.
- [6] D. G. HOFFMAN, C. A. RODGER. *The chromatic index of complete multipartite graphs*. J. Graph Theory, 1992, **16**(2): 159–163.
- [7] G. R. OMIDI, G. RAEISI, Z. RAHIMI. *Stars versus stripes Ramsey numbers*. European J. Combin., 2018, **67**: 268–274.
- [8] R. LASKAR, B. AUERBACH. *On decomposition of r -partite graphs into edge-disjoint Hamilton circuits*. Discrete Math., 1976, **14**(3): 265–268.
- [9] S. P. RADZISZOWSKI. *Small Ramsey Numbers*. The Electronic Journal of Combinatorics, 2012, **DS1**: Jan 15–2021.