

5-choosability of graphs with 2 crossings

Victor Campos, Frédéric Havet

► **To cite this version:**

Victor Campos, Frédéric Havet. 5-choosability of graphs with 2 crossings. [Research Report] RR-7618, INRIA. 2011, pp.22. <inria-00593426>

HAL Id: inria-00593426

<https://hal.inria.fr/inria-00593426>

Submitted on 21 May 2011

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.



INSTITUT NATIONAL DE RECHERCHE EN INFORMATIQUE ET EN AUTOMATIQUE

5-choosability of graphs with 2 crossings

Victor Campos — Frédéric Havet

N° 7618

Mai 2011

Thème COM



*R*apport
de recherche

5-choosability of graphs with 2 crossings ^{*}

Victor Campos[†], Frédéric Havet[‡]

Thème COM — Systèmes communicants
Équipe-Projet Mascotte

Rapport de recherche n° 7618 — Mai 2011 — 19 pages

Abstract: We show that every graph with two crossings is 5-choosable. We also prove that every graph which can be made planar by removing one edge is 5-choosable.

Key-words: list colouring, choosability, crossing number

[†] Universidade Federal do Ceará, Departamento de Computação, Bloco 910, Campus do Pici, Fortaleza, Ceará, CEP 60455-760, Brasil. campos@lia.ufc.br; Partially supported by CNPq/Brazil.

[‡] Projet Mascotte, I3S(CNRS, UNSA) and INRIA, 2004 route des Lucioles, BP 93, 06902 Sophia-Antipolis Cedex, France. Frederic.Havet@inria.fr; Partially supported by the ANR Blanc International ANR-09-blanc-0373-01.

^{*} This work was partially supported by Equipe Associée EWIN.

5-choisissabilité des graphes ayant deux croisements

Résumé : Nous montrons que tout graphe ayant deux croisements est 5-choisissable. Nous prouvons également que tout graphe qui peut être rendu planaire par la suppression d'une arête est 5-choisissable.

Mots-clés : coloration sur listes, choisissabilité, nombre de croisements

1 Introduction

The crossing number of a graph G , denoted by $cr(G)$, is the minimum number of crossings in any drawing of G in the plane.

The Four Colour Theorem states that, if a graph has crossing number zero (i.e. is planar), then it is 4-colourable. Deleting one vertex per crossing, it follows that $\chi(G) \leq 4 + cr(G)$. So it is natural to ask for the smallest integer $f(k)$ such that every graph G with crossing number at most k is $f(k)$ -colourable? Settling a conjecture of Albertson [1], Schaefer [8] showed that $f(k) = O(k^{1/4})$. This upper bound is tight up to a constant factor since $\chi(K_n) = n$ and $cr(K_n) \leq \binom{|E(K_n)|}{2} = \binom{n}{2} \leq \frac{1}{8}n^4$.

The values of $f(k)$ are known for a number of small values of k . The Four Colour Theorem states $f(0) = 4$ and implies easily that $f(1) \leq 5$. Since $cr(K_5) = 1$, we have $f(1) = 5$. Oporowski and Zhao [7] showed that $f(2) = 5$. Since $cr(K_6) = 3$, we have $f(3) = 6$. Further, Albertson et al. [2] showed that $f(6) = 6$. Albertson then conjectured that if $\chi(G) = r$, then $cr(G) \leq cr(K_r)$. This conjecture was proved by Barát and Tóth [3] for $r \leq 16$.

A *list assignment* of a graph G is a function L that assigns to each vertex $v \in V(G)$ a list $L(v)$ of available colours. An *L -colouring* is a function $\varphi : V(G) \rightarrow \bigcup_v L(v)$ such that $\varphi(v) \in L(v)$ for every $v \in V(G)$ and $\varphi(u) \neq \varphi(v)$ whenever u and v are adjacent vertices of G . If G admits an L -colouring, then it is *L -colourable*. A graph G is *k -choosable* if it is L -colourable for every list assignment L such that $|L(v)| \geq k$ for all $v \in V(G)$. The *choose number* of G , denoted by $ch(G)$, is the minimum k such that G is k -choosable.

Similarly to the chromatic number, one may seek for bounds on the choose number of a graph with few crossings or with independent crossings. Thomassen's Five Colour Theorem [10] states that if a graph has crossing number zero (i.e. is planar) then it is 5-choosable. A natural question is to ask whether the chromatic number is bounded in terms of its crossing number. Erman et al. [5] observed that Thomassen's result can be extended to graphs with crossing number at most 1. Deleting one vertex per crossing yields $ch(G) \leq 4 + cr(G)$. Hence, what is the smallest integer $g(k)$ such that every graph G with crossing number at most k is $g(k)$ -choosable? Obviously, since $\chi(G) \leq ch(G)$, we have $f(k) \leq g(k)$.

In this paper, we extend Erman et al. result in two ways. We first show that every graph which can be made planar by the removal of an edge is 5-choosable (Theorem 3). We then prove that $g(2) = 5$. In other words, every graph with crossing number 2 is 5-choosable¹. This generalizes the result of Oporowski and Zhao [7] to list colouring.

2 Planar graphs plus an edge

In order to prove its Five Colour Theorem, Thomassen [10] showed a stronger result.

Definition 1. An *inner triangulation* is a plane graph such that every face of G is bounded by a triangle except its outer face which is bounded by a cycle.

Let G be a plane graph and x and y two consecutive vertices on its outer face F . A list assignment L of G is $\{x, y\}$ -suitable if

$$- |L(x)| \geq 1, |L(y)| \geq 2,$$

¹While writing this paper, we discovered that Dvořák et al. [4] independently proved this result. Their proof has some similarity to ours but is different. They prove by induction a stronger result, while we use the existence of a shortest path between the two crossings which satisfies some given properties.

- for every $v \in V(F) \setminus \{x, y\}$, $|L(v)| \geq 3$, and
- for every $v \in V(G) \setminus V(F)$, $|L(v)| \geq 5$.

A list assignment of G is *suitable* if it is $\{x, y\}$ -suitable for some vertices x and y on the outer face of G .

The following theorem is a straightforward generalization of Thomassen's five colour Theorem which holds for non-separable plane graphs.

Theorem 2 (Thomassen [10]). *If L is a suitable list assignment of a plane graph G then G is L -colourable.*

This result is the cornerstone of the following proof.

Theorem 3. *Let G be a graph. If G has an edge such that $G \setminus e$ is planar then $\text{ch}(G) \leq 5$.*

Proof. Let $e = uv$ be an edge of G such that $G \setminus e$ is planar. Let G' be a planar triangulation containing $G \setminus e$ as a subgraph. Without loss of generality, we may assume that u is on the outer triangle of G' . The graph $G' - u$ has an outer cycle C' whose vertices are the neighbours of u in G' .

Let L be a 5-list assignment of G . Let $\alpha, \beta \in L(u)$. Let L' be the list-assignment of $G' - u$ defined by $L'(w) = L(w) \setminus \{\alpha, \beta\}$ if $w \in V(C')$ and $L'(w) = L(w)$ otherwise. Then L' is suitable. So $G' - u$ admits an L' -colouring by Theorem 2. This colouring may be extended into an L -colouring of G by assigning to u a colour in $\{\alpha, \beta\}$ different from the colour of v .

Hence G is 5-choosable. □

3 Graphs with two crossings

3.1 Preliminaries

We first recall the celebrated characterization of planar graphs due to Kuratowski [6]. See also [9] for a nice proof.

Theorem 4 (Kuratowski [6]). *A graph is planar if and only if it contains no minor isomorphic to either K_5 or $K_{3,3}$.*

Let G be a plane graph and x, y and z three distinct vertices on the outer face F of G . A list assignment L of G is (x, y, z) -correct if

- $|L(x)| = 1 = |L(y)|$ and $L(x) \neq L(y)$,
- $|L(z)| \geq 3$,
- for every $v \in V(F) \setminus \{x, y, z\}$, $|L(v)| \geq 4$, and
- for every $v \in V(G) \setminus V(F)$, $|L(v)| \geq 5$.

If L is (x, y, z) -correct and $|L(z)| \geq 4$, we say that L is $\{x, y\}$ -correct.

Lemma 5. *Let G be an inner triangulation and x and y two distinct vertices on the outer face of G . If L is an (x, y, z) -correct list assignment of G then G is L -colourable.*

Proof. We prove the result by induction on the number of vertices, the result holding trivially when $|V(G)| = 3$.

Suppose first that F has a chord xt . Then xt lies in two unique cycles in $F \cup xt$, one C_1 containing y and the other C_2 . For $i = 1, 2$, let G_i denote the subgraph induced by the vertices lying on C_i or inside it. By the induction hypothesis, there exists an L -colouring ϕ_1 of G_1 . Let L_2 be the list assignment on G_2 defined by $L_2(t) = \{\phi_1(t)\}$ and $L_2(u) = L(u)$ if $u \in V(G_2) \setminus \{t\}$. Let $z' = z$ if $z \in V(C_2)$ and z' be any vertex of $V(C_2) \setminus \{x, t\}$ otherwise. Then L_2 is (x, t, z') -correct for G_2 so G_2 admits an L_2 -colouring ϕ_2 by induction hypothesis. The union of ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 is an L -colouring of G .

Suppose now that x has exactly two neighbours u and v on F . Let $u, u_1, u_2, \dots, u_m, v$ be the neighbours of x in their natural cyclic order around x . As G is an inner triangulation, $uu_1u_2 \dots u_m, v = P$ is a path. Hence the graph $G - x$ has $F' = P \cup (F - x)$ as outer face.

Assume first that $z \notin \{u, v\}$. Then let L' be the list assignment on $G - x$ defined by $L'(w) = L(w) \setminus L(x)$ if $w \in N_G(x)$ and $L'(w) = L(w)$ otherwise. Clearly, $|L'(w)| \geq 3$ if $w \in F'$ and $|L'(w)| \geq 5$ otherwise. Hence, by Theorem 2, $G - x$ admits an L' -colouring. Colouring x with the colour of its list, we obtain an L -colouring of G .

Assume now that $z \in \{u, v\}$, say $z = u$. Let α be a colour of $L(z) \setminus (L(x) \cup L(y))$. Let L' be the list assignment on $G - x$ defined by $L'(z) = \{\alpha\}$, $L'(w) = L(w) \setminus L(x)$ if $w \in N_G(x) \setminus \{z\}$ and $L'(w) = L(w)$ otherwise. Clearly, L' is (y, z, v) -correct. Hence, by the induction hypothesis, $G - x$ admits an L' -colouring. Colouring x with the colour of its list, we obtain an L -colouring of G . \square

3.2 Nice, great and good paths

Let G be a graph and H an induced subgraph of G .

We denote by Z_H the set of vertices of G which are adjacent to at least 3 vertices of H . For every vertex v in $V(G)$, we denote by $N_H(v)$ the set of vertices of H adjacent to v , and we set $d_H(v) = |N_H(v)|$.

Let L be a list assignment of G . For any L -colouring ϕ of H , we denote by L_ϕ the list assignment of $G - H$ defined by $L_\phi(z) = L(z) \setminus \phi(N_H(z))$. A vertex $z \in V(G - H)$ is *safe* (with respect to ϕ), if $|L_\phi(z)| \geq 3$. An L -colouring of H is *safe* if all vertices of $z \in V(G - H)$ are safe. Observe that if L is a 5-list assignment, then for any L -colouring ϕ of H , every vertex z not in Z_H has at most two neighbours in H and therefore $|L_\phi(z)| \geq 3$. Hence ϕ is safe if and only if every vertex in Z_H is safe.

Let $P = v_1 \dots v_p$ be an induced path in G . For $2 \leq i \leq p - 1$, we denote by $[v_i]_P$, or simply $[v_i]$ if P is clear from the context, the set $\{v_{i-1}, v_i, v_{i+1}\}$. We say that a vertex z is adjacent to $[v_i]$ if it is adjacent to all vertices in the set $[v_i]$. Note that if z is adjacent to $[v_i]$ then z is not in P as P is induced.

Lemma 6. *Let $P = v_1 \dots v_p$ be an induced path in G , x a vertex such that $N_P(x) = [v_{i+1}]$, $1 \leq i \leq p - 1$, and ϕ a colouring of $P - v_i$. If $i = 1$ or $\phi(v_{i-1}) = \phi(v_{i+1})$, then one can extend ϕ to v_i such that x is safe.*

Proof. If $\{\phi(v_{i+1}), \phi(v_{i+2})\} \not\subset L(x)$, then assigning to v_i any colour distinct from $\phi(v_{i+1})$, we get a colouring of P such that x is safe. So we may assume that $\{\phi(v_{i+1}), \phi(v_{i+2})\} \subset L(x)$.

If $\phi(v_{i+2}) \in L(v_i)$, then setting $\phi(v_i) = \phi(v_{i+2})$, we have a colouring ϕ such that x is safe. If not, there is a colour α in $L(v_i) \setminus L(x)$. Necessarily, $\alpha \neq \phi(v_{i+1})$ and so one can colour v_i with α . Doing so, we obtain a colouring such that x is safe. \square

Let $P = v_1 \dots v_p$ be an induced path. It is a *nice path* in G if the following are true.

- (a) for every $z \in Z_P$, $N_P(z) = [v_i]$ for some $2 \leq i \leq p - 1$;

- (b) for every $2 \leq i \leq p-1$, there are at most two vertices adjacent to $[v_i]$ and, if there are two such vertices, then the number of vertices adjacent to $[v_{i-1}]$ or $[v_{i+1}]$ is at most 1.

It is a *great path* in G if it is nice and satisfies the following extra property.

- (c) for any $i < j$, if there are two vertices adjacent to $[v_i]$ and two vertices adjacent to $[v_j]$, then the number of vertices adjacent to $[v_{i+1}]$ or $[v_{j-1}]$ is at most 1.

A safe colouring of a path $P = v_1 \cdots v_p$ is α -safe if $\phi(v_1) = \alpha$.

Lemma 7. *If P is a great path and L is a 5-list assignment of G , then for any $\alpha \in L(v_1)$, there exists an α -safe L -colouring ϕ of P .*

Proof. We prove this result by induction on p , the number of vertices of P , the result holding trivially when $p \leq 2$.

Assume now that $p \geq 3$. Since P is great then every vertex of Z_p adjacent to v_1 is also adjacent to v_2 and there are at most two vertices of Z_p adjacent to $[v_2]$.

Set $\phi(v_1) = \alpha$.

1. If there is no vertex adjacent to $[v_2]$, then by induction, for any $\beta \in L(v_2) \setminus \{\alpha\}$, there is a β -safe L -colouring ϕ of $v_2 \cdots v_p$. Since $\phi(v_1) = \alpha$, ϕ is an α -safe L -colouring of P .
2. Assume now that there is a unique vertex z adjacent to $[v_2]$.

If $\alpha \notin L(z)$, then by Case 1, there is an α -safe L -colouring ϕ of P in $G - z$. It is also an α -safe L -colouring of P in G since z is safe as $\alpha \notin L(z)$. Hence we may assume that $\alpha \in L(z)$.

Assume there is a colour β in $L(v_2) \setminus \{\alpha\}$. By induction there is a β -safe L -colouring ϕ of $v_2 \cdots v_p$. Since $\phi(v_1) = \alpha$, we obtain an α -safe L -colouring of P because z is safe as $\beta \notin L(z)$. Hence we may assume that $L(v_2) = L(z)$. In particular, $\alpha \in L(v_2)$. Let γ be α if $\alpha \in L(v_3)$, and a colour in $L(v_3) \setminus L(v_2)$ otherwise. We set $\phi(v_3) = \gamma$. Observe that whatever colour is assigned to v_2 , the vertex z will be safe.

- 2.1. Assume that no vertex is adjacent to $[v_3]$. By induction hypothesis, there is a γ -safe L -colouring ϕ of $v_3 \cdots v_p$. Choosing $\phi(v_2)$ in $L(v_2) \setminus \{\alpha, \gamma\}$, we obtain an α -safe L -colouring of P .
- 2.2. Assume that exactly one vertex t is adjacent to $[v_3]$. By induction hypothesis, there is a γ -safe L -colouring ϕ of $v_3 \cdots v_p$. So far all the vertices except t will be safe. So we just need to choose $\phi(v_2)$ so that t is safe.

Observe that if $\{\gamma, \phi(v_4)\} \not\subset L(t)$, choosing any colour of $L(v_2) \setminus \{\alpha, \gamma\}$ will do the job. So we may assume that $\{\gamma, \phi(v_4)\} \subset L(t)$. If there is a colour $\beta \in L(v_2) \setminus (L(t) \cup \{\alpha\})$, then setting $L(v_2) = \beta$ will make t safe. So we may assume that $L(v_2) \setminus \{\alpha\} \subset L(t)$ and so $L(t) = L(v_2) \cup \{\gamma\} \setminus \{\alpha\}$. Thus $\phi(v_4) \in L(v_2) \setminus \{\alpha, \gamma\}$. Then setting $\phi(v_2) = \phi(v_4)$ makes t safe.

- 2.3. Assume that two vertices t_1 and t_2 are adjacent to $[v_3]$. Then no vertex is adjacent to $[v_4]$. Therefore, it suffices to prove that there is an α -safe L -colouring of $v_1 v_2 v_3 v_4$. Indeed, if we have such a colouring ϕ , then by induction, $v_4 \cdots v_p$ admits a $\phi(v_4)$ -safe L -colouring ϕ' . The union of these two colourings is an α -safe L -colouring of P .

If there exists $\beta \in L(v_4) \cap L(v_2) \setminus \{\alpha, \gamma\}$, then setting $\phi(v_2) = \phi(v_4) = \beta$, we obtain an α -safe L -colouring of $v_1 v_2 v_3 v_4$. Otherwise, $L(v_4) \setminus \{\gamma\}$ and $L(v_2) \setminus \{\alpha\}$ are disjoint. Hence one can choose β in $L(v_2) \setminus \{\alpha\}$ and δ in $L(v_4) \setminus \{\gamma\}$ so that $|\{\beta, \gamma, \delta\} \cap L(t_i)| \leq 2$ for $i = 1, 2$. Setting $\phi(v_2) = \beta$ and $\phi(v_4) = \delta$, we obtain an α -safe L -colouring of $v_1 v_2 v_3 v_4$.

3. Assume that two vertices z_1 and z_2 are adjacent to $[v_2]$.

We claim that it suffices to prove that there is an α -safe L -colouring of $v_1v_2v_3$.

Let j be the smallest index such that no vertex is adjacent to $[v_j]$. For the definition of j , consider there is no vertex adjacent to $[v_p]$ so that $j \leq p$. By the property (c) of great path, for all $3 \leq i < j$, there is exactly one vertex z_i adjacent to $[v_i]$. For $i = 3, \dots, j-1$, one after another, one can use Lemma 6 in the path $v_{i+1} \cdots v_1$ to extend ϕ to v_{i+1} , so that z_i is safe. Then applying induction on the path $v_j \cdots v_p$, we obtain an α -safe L -colouring. This proves the claim.

Let us now prove that an α -safe L -colouring of $v_1v_2v_3$ exists.

If $\alpha \notin L(z_i)$, then any α -safe L -colouring of $v_1v_2v_3$ in $G - z_i$ will be an α -safe L -colouring in G . By Case 2, one can find such a colouring in $G - z_i$, so we may assume that $\alpha \in L(z_i)$.

If there is a colour $\beta \in L(v_2) \setminus L(z_1)$, then set $\phi(v_2) = \beta$. By Lemma 6 in the path $v_3v_2v_1$, one can choose $\phi(v_3)$ in $L(v_3)$ to obtain an α -safe L -colouring of $v_1v_2v_3$. Hence we may assume that $L(z_1) = L(v_2)$. Similarly, we may assume that $L(z_2) = L(v_2)$. Therefore, any α -safe L -colouring of $v_1v_2v_3$ in $G - z_2$ will be an α -safe L -colouring in G . We can find such a colouring using Case 2.

□

We say that an induced path $P = v_1 \cdots v_p$ is *good path* if either P is great or $p \geq 4$ and there is a vertex $z \in Z_P$ adjacent to v_1 such that $\{v_1, v_4\} \subset N_P(z) \subseteq \{v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4\}$ satisfying the following conditions:

- P is a great path in $G \setminus v_1z$.
- if two vertices distinct from z are adjacent to $[v_2]$, then $N_P(z) = \{v_1, v_3, v_4\}$ and there is no vertex adjacent to $[v_3]$; and
- if two vertices distinct from z are adjacent to $[v_3]$, then $N_P(z) = \{v_1, v_2, v_4\}$ and there is no vertex adjacent to $[v_2]$.

Note that since P is induced, then z is not in P .

Lemma 8. *If $P = v_1 \cdots v_p$ is a good path and L is a 5-list assignment of G , then there exists a safe L -colouring of P .*

Proof. If P is great, then the result follows from Lemma 7. So we may assume that P is not great. Let z be the vertex of Z_P such that $\{v_1, v_4\} \subset N_P(z) \subseteq \{v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4\}$.

If there is a colour $\alpha \in L(v_1) \setminus L(z)$, then let $\phi(v_1) = \alpha$ and use Lemma 7 to colour $v_1 \cdots v_p$ in $G \setminus v_1z$. The obtained colouring ϕ is a safe L -colouring of P . For any $z' \in Z_P \setminus \{z\}$, we have $|L_\phi(z')| \geq 3$ because z' has the same neighbourhood in G and $G \setminus v_1z$. Now $|L_\phi(z)| \geq 3$ since $\alpha \notin L(z)$, so ϕ is safe. Henceforth, we assume that $L(v_1) = L(z)$.

1. Assume first that $N_P(z) = \{v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4\}$.

By the properties of a good path, at most one vertex z' different from z is adjacent to $[v_2]$.

1.1. Assume first that z is the unique vertex adjacent to $[v_3]$.

If there is a colour $\alpha \in L(z) \cap L(v_3)$, then set $\phi(v_1) = \phi(v_3) = \alpha$. By Lemma 7, one can extend ϕ to $v_3 \cdots v_p$ so that all vertices of Z_P but z are safe. Then by Lemma 6 applied to

$v_2 \cdots v_p$, one can choose $\phi(v_2) \in L(v_2)$ so that z is safe for $P - v_1$. Since $\phi(v_1) = \phi(v_3)$, then ϕ is a proper colouring and z is safe for P . Hence ϕ is a safe L -colouring of P . So we may assume that $L(z) \cap L(v_3) = \emptyset$.

If there exists $\beta \in L(v_2) \setminus L(z)$, then set $\phi(v_2) = \beta$. By Lemma 7, one can extend ϕ to $v_2 \cdots v_p$ so that all vertices of Z_P but z and z' are safe. Observe that necessarily z will be safe because $\phi(v_2) \notin L(z)$ and $\phi(v_3) \notin L(z)$. By Lemma 6, one can extend ϕ to v_1 so that z' is safe, thus getting a safe L -colouring of P . So we may assume that $L(v_2) = L(z)$.

We have $|L(v_2) \cup L(v_3)| = 10 \geq |L(z')|$. So we can find $\alpha \in L(v_2)$ and $\beta \in L(v_3)$ so that $|\{\alpha, \beta\} \cap L(z')| \leq 1$. Using Lemma 7 take a β -safe L -colouring ϕ of the path $v_3 v_4 \dots v_p$ and set $\phi(v_2) = \alpha$. If $\phi(v_4) \in L(z) \setminus \{\alpha\}$, then colour v_1 with $\phi(v_4)$, otherwise colour it with any colour distinct from α . This gives a safe L -colouring of P .

1.2 Assume now that a vertex $y \neq z$ is adjacent to $[v_3]$.

* Suppose that a vertex t is adjacent to $[v_4]$. Then z' does not exist.

If there is a colour $\alpha \in L(v_2) \setminus L(z)$, then using Lemma 7 take an α -safe L -colouring ϕ of $v_2 \cdots v_p$. If $\phi(v_3) \notin L(z)$, then z would be safe whatever colour we assign to v_1 , so there is a safe L -colouring of P . If $\phi(v_3) \in L(z)$, then setting $\phi(v_1) = \phi(v_3)$, we obtain a safe L -colouring of P . So we may assume that $L(v_2) = L(z)$.

If there is a colour α in $L(z) \cap L(v_4)$, then set $\phi(v_2) = \phi(v_4) = \alpha$. Then y will be safe. Extend ϕ to $v_4 \cdots v_p$ by Lemma 7. Then all the vertices are safe except t and z . By Lemma 6, one can choose $\phi(v_3)$ so that t is safe. If $\phi(v_3) \in L(z)$, then setting $\phi(v_1) = \phi(v_3)$, we get a safe L -colouring of P . If $\phi(v_3) \notin L(z)$, then whatever colour we assign to v_1 , we obtain a safe colouring of P . Hence we may assume that $L(z) \cap L(v_4) = \emptyset$. By Lemma 7, there is a safe L -colouring of P in $G \setminus z v_4$. This colouring is also a safe colouring of P in G , since $\phi(v_4)$ is not in $L(z)$.

* If no vertex is adjacent to $[v_4]$, then z' may exist. In this case, it is sufficient to prove that there exists a safe L -colouring of $v_1 v_2 v_3 v_4$. Indeed, if there is such a colouring ϕ , then by Lemma 7, it can be extended to a safe L -colouring of P .

Symmetrically to the way we proved the result when $L(v_1) \neq L(z)$, one can prove it when $L(v_4) \neq L(z)$. Hence we may assume that $L(v_4) = L(z)$.

Assume that there is a colour $\alpha \in L(v_2) \cap L(z)$. Set $\phi(v_2) = \phi(v_4) = \alpha$. If there is a colour $\beta \in L(v_3) \setminus L(z)$, then set $\phi(v_3) = \beta$ so that z will be safe and extend ϕ with Lemma 6 so that z' is safe to obtain a safe colouring of $v_1 v_2 v_3 v_4$ in G . If $L(v_3) = L(z)$, then assign to v_1 and v_3 a same colour in $L(z) \setminus \{\alpha\}$ to get a safe colouring of $v_1 v_2 v_3 v_4$. Hence we may assume that $L(v_2) \cap L(z) = \emptyset$. Symmetrically, we may assume that $L(v_3) \cap L(z) = \emptyset$. By Lemma 7, there exists a safe colouring ϕ of $v_1 v_2 v_3 v_4$ in $G - z$. It is also a safe colouring of $v_1 v_2 v_3 v_4$ in G because $\phi(v_2)$ and $\phi(v_3)$ cannot be in $L(z)$.

2. Assume now that $N_P(z) = \{v_1, v_3, v_4\}$.

If no vertex is adjacent to $[v_2]$, then using Lemma 7 take a safe L -colouring of $v_2 \dots v_p$. If $\phi(v_3) \in L(z)$, then set $\phi(v_1) = \phi(v_3)$. If not colour v_3 with any colour in $L(z) \setminus \{\phi(v_2)\}$. This gives a safe L -colouring of P . Hence we may assume that a vertex t is adjacent to $[v_2]$.

By the properties of a good path, we know that at most one vertex, say u , is adjacent to v_3 . If $L(v_3) \cap L(z)$ is empty, then any safe L -colouring of P given by Lemma 7 in $G \setminus z v_1$ would be a safe L -colouring of P . Hence we may assume that there is a colour α in $L(v_3) \cap L(z)$. Set $\phi(v_1) = \phi(v_3) = \alpha$ and apply Lemma 7 to $v_3 \dots v_p$. Then by Lemma 6, we can choose $\phi(v_2)$ so that the possible vertex u is safe. This gives a safe colouring of P .

3. Assume that $N_P(z) = \{v_1, v_2, v_4\}$.

Suppose no vertex is adjacent to $[v_2]$. By Lemma 7, there is a safe L -colouring of $v_2 \dots v_p$. Set $\phi(v_1) = \phi(v_4)$ if $\phi(v_4) \in L(z) \setminus \{\phi(v_2)\}$, and let $\phi(v_1)$ be any colour of $L(v_1) \setminus \{\phi(v_2)\}$ otherwise. Doing so z is safe and so ϕ is a safe L -colouring of P . Hence we may assume that a vertex u is adjacent to $[v_2]$. By definition of good path, it is the unique vertex adjacent to $[v_2]$.

Suppose that there exists a colour β in $L(v_2) \setminus L(z)$. By Lemma 7, there is a safe colouring ϕ of $v_2 \dots v_p$ such that $\phi(v_2) = \beta$. By Lemma 6, it can be extended to v_1 so that u is safe. This yields a safe L -colouring of P . Hence we may assume that $L(v_2) = L(z)$.

If $L(v_4) \cap L(z) = \emptyset$, then in every colouring of P , the vertex z will be safe. Hence any safe colouring of P in $G - z$, (there is one by Lemma 7) is a safe L -colouring of P in G . So we may assume that there exists a colour $\alpha \in L(v_4) \cap L(z)$.

Assume that at most one vertex s is adjacent to $[v_4]$. Set $\phi(v_2) = \phi(v_4) = \alpha$ so that z and all the vertices adjacent to $[v_3]$ will be safe. By Lemma 7, there is an α -safe colouring of $v_4 \dots v_p$. Now by Lemma 6, one can extend ϕ to v_3 so that s (if it exists) is safe, and then again by Lemma 6 extend it to v_1 so that u is safe. This gives a safe L -colouring of P . So we may assume that two vertices s and s' are adjacent to $[v_4]$.

Assume that there is a vertex t adjacent to $[v_3]$, then there is no vertex adjacent to $[v_5]$. Hence it suffices to find a safe L -colouring of $v_1 v_2 v_3 v_4 v_5$. Indeed, if we have such a colouring ϕ , then using Lemma 7, one can extend it to a safe L -colouring of P . Set $\phi(v_2) = \phi(v_4) = \alpha$. Doing so t and z will be safe. If α or some colour $\beta \in L(v_5) \setminus \{\alpha\}$ is not contained in one of lists $L(s)$ and $L(s')$, say $L(s')$. Then colouring v_5 with β , if it exists, or any other colour otherwise, the vertex s' will also be safe. By Lemma 6, one can colour v_3 so that s is safe. By Lemma 6, one can then colour v_1 to obtain a colouring for which u is safe. This L -colouring of $v_1 v_2 v_3 v_4 v_5$ is safe. Hence, we may assume that $L(s) = L(s') = L(v_5)$. Colour v_5 with any colour in $L(v_5) \setminus \{\alpha\}$. Using Lemma 6, colour v_3 so that s is safe. Then s' will be also safe because $L(s) = L(s')$. Again by Lemma 6, colour v_1 so that u is safe to obtain a safe colouring of $v_1 v_2 v_3 v_4 v_5$.

Assume finally that no vertex is adjacent to $[v_3]$. By Lemma 7, there is a safe L -colouring ϕ of $v_3 \dots v_p$. If $\phi(v_4) \notin L(z)$, then assign to v_2 any colour in $L(v_2) \setminus \{\phi(v_3)\}$. If not, then set $\phi(v_2) = \phi(v_4)$. (This is possible since $L(v_2) = L(z)$.) Then z will be safe. By Lemma 6, colour v_1 so that u is safe to obtain a safe L -colouring of P .

□

3.3 Main theorem

A drawing of G is *nice* if two edges intersect at most once. It is well known that every graph with crossing number k has a nice drawing with at most k crossings. (See [5] for example.) In this paper, we will only consider nice drawings. Thus a crossing is uniquely defined by the pair of edges it belongs to. Henceforth, we will confound a crossing with this set of two edges. The *cluster* of a crossing C is the set of endvertices of its two edges and is denoted $V(C)$.

Theorem 9. *Let G be a graph having a drawing in the plane with two crossings. Then $\text{ch}(G) \leq 5$.*

Proof. By considering a counter-example G with the minimum number of vertices. Let L be a 5-list assignment of G such that G is not L -colourable.

Let C_1 and C_2 be the two crossings. By Theorem 3, C_1 and C_2 have no edge in common. Set $C_i = \{v_i w_i, t_i u_i\}$. Free to add edges and to redraw them along the crossing, we may assume that $v_i u_i$, $u_i w_i$, $w_i t_i$ and $t_i v_i$ are edges and that the 4-cycle $v_i u_i w_i t_i$ has no vertex inside but the two edges of C_i . In addition, we assume that $u_1 v_1 t_1 w_1$ appear in clockwise order around the crossing point of C_1 and that $u_2 v_2 t_2 w_2$ appear in counter-clockwise order around the crossing point of C_2 . Free to add edges, we may also assume that $G \setminus \{v_1 w_1, v_2 w_2\}$ is a triangulation of the plane. In the rest of the proof, for convenience, we will refer to this fact by writing that G is *triangulated*.

Claim 9.1. *Every vertex of G has degree at least 5.*

Proof. Suppose not. Then G has a vertex x of degree at most 4. By minimality of G , $G - x$ has an L -colouring ϕ . Now assigning to x a colour in $L(x) \setminus \phi(N(x))$ we obtain an L -colouring of G , a contradiction. \square

A cycle is *separating* if none of its edges is crossed and both its interior and exterior contain at least one vertex. A cycle is *nicey separating* if it is separating and its interior or its exterior has no crossing.

Claim 9.2. *G has no nicey separating triangle.*

Proof. Assume, by way of contradiction, that a triangle $T = x_1 x_2 x_3$ is nicey separating. Let G_1 (resp. G_2) be the subgraph of G induced by the vertices on T or outside T (resp. inside T). Without loss of generality, we may assume that G_2 is a plane graph.

By minimality of G , G_1 has an L -colouring ϕ_1 . Let L_2 be the list assignment of G_2 defined by $L_2(x_1) = \{\phi_1(x_1)\}$, $L_2(x_2) = \{\phi_1(x_1), \phi_1(x_2)\}$, $L_2(x_3) = \{\phi_1(x_1), \phi_1(x_2), \phi_1(x_3)\}$, and $L_2(x) = L(x)$ for every vertex inside T . Then L_2 is a suitable list assignment of G_2 , so by Theorem 2, G_2 admits an L_2 -colouring ϕ_2 . Observe that necessarily $\phi_2(x_i) = \phi_1(x_i)$. Hence the union of ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 is an L -colouring of G , a contradiction. \square

Claim 9.3. *Let $C = abcd$ be a 4-cycle with no crossing inside it. If a and c have no common neighbour inside C then C has no vertex in its interior.*

Proof. Assume by way of contradiction that the set S of vertices inside C is not empty.

Then ac is not an edge otherwise one of the triangles abc and acd would be nicey separating. Since G is triangulated, the neighbours of a (resp. c) inside C plus b and d (in cyclic order around a (resp. c)) form a (b, d) -path P_a (resp. P_c). The paths P_a and P_c are internally disjoint because a and c have no common neighbour inside C . Hence $P_a \cup P_c$ is a cycle C' . Furthermore C' is the outerface of $G' = G \langle S \cup \{b, d\} \rangle$.

By minimality of G , $G_1 = (G - S) \cup bd$ admits an L -colouring ϕ . Let L' be the list-colouring of G' defined by $L'(b) = \{\phi(b)\}$, $L'(d) = \{\phi(d)\}$, $L'(x) = L(x) \setminus \{\phi(a)\}$ if x is an internal vertex of P_a , $L'(x) = L(x) \setminus \{\phi(c)\}$ if x is an internal vertex of P_c , and $L'(x) = L(x)$ if $x \in V(G' - C')$. Then L' is a $\{b, d\}$ -correct list assignment of G' . Hence, by Lemma 5, G' admits an L' -colouring ϕ' . The union of ϕ and ϕ' is an L -colouring of G , a contradiction. \square

Claim 9.4. *G has no nicey separating 4-cycle.*

Proof. Suppose not. Then there exists a nicey separating 4-cycle $abcd$. Let $b = z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{p+1} = d$ be the common neighbours of a and c in clockwise order around a . By Claim 9.3, we have $p \geq 2$. Each of the 4-cycles $az_i cz_{i+1}$, $1 \leq i \leq p$ has empty interior by Claim 9.3. So z_2 has degree at most 4. This contradicts Claim 9.1. \square

A path P is *friendly* if there are two adjacent vertices x and y such that $|N_P(x)| \leq 4$, $|N_P(y)| \leq 3$ and P is good in $G - \{x, y\}$. A path P *meets* a crossing if it contains at least one endvertex of each of the two crossed edges. A *magic path* is a friendly path meeting both crossings.

Claim 9.5. G has no magic path Q .

Proof. Suppose for a contradiction that G has a magic path Q . Then there exists two adjacent vertices x and y such that $|N_Q(x)| \leq 4$, $|N_Q(y)| \leq 3$ and P is good in $G - \{x, y\}$. Lemma 8, there in a L -colouring ϕ of Q such that every vertex z of $(G - Q) - \{x, y\}$ satisfies $|L_\phi(z)| \geq 3$. Now $|L_\phi(x)| \geq 1$ and $|L_\phi(y)| \geq 2$, because $|N_Q(x)| \leq 4$ and $|N_Q(y)| \leq 3$. Since Q meets the two crossings, $G - Q$ is planar. Furthermore, $G - Q$ may be drawn in the plane such that all the vertices on the outer face are those of $N(Q)$. Hence L_ϕ is a suitable assignment of $G - Q$. Hence by Theorem 2, $G - Q$ is L_ϕ -colourable and so G is L -colourable, a contradiction. \square

In the remaining of the proof, we shall prove that G contains a magic path, thus getting a contradiction. Therefore, we consider *shortest* (C_1, C_2) -paths, that are paths joining C_1 and C_2 with the smallest number of edges. We first consider the cases when the distance between C_1 and C_2 is 0 or 1. We then deal with the general case when $\text{dist}(C_1, C_2) \geq 2$.

Claim 9.6. $\text{dist}(C_1, C_2) > 0$.

Proof. Assume for a contradiction that $\text{dist}(C_1, C_2) = 0$. Then, without loss of generality, $v_1 = v_2$. Note that $u_1 \neq u_2$ as otherwise the path $u_1 v_1$ would be magic, contradicting Claim 9.5. Similarly, we have $t_1 \neq t_2$.

Note that w_1 is not adjacent to u_2 for otherwise both the interior and exterior of $w_1 u_1 v_1 u_2$ would contain at least one neighbour of u_1 by Claim 9.1. Thus this 4-cycle would be nicely separating, a contradiction to Claim 9.4. Henceforth, by symmetry, w_1 is not adjacent to u_2 nor t_2 and w_2 is not adjacent to u_1 nor t_1 .

If u_1 is not adjacent to u_2 , then consider the induced path $Q = u_1 v_1 u_2$. Since w_1 and w_2 are not adjacent to u_2 and u_1 , respectively, then $\{w_1, w_2\} \cap Z_Q = \emptyset$. The vertices t_1 and t_2 cannot be both in Z_Q for otherwise $u_1 t_2$ and $u_2 t_1$ would cross. Furthermore, if z_1 and z_2 are distinct vertices in $Z_Q \setminus \{t_1, t_2\}$, then either $u_1 v_1 u_2 z_1$ nicely separates z_2 or $u_1 v_1 u_2 z_2$ nicely separates z_1 contradicting Claim 9.4. Thus, $|Z_Q| \leq 2$ and Q is magic contradicting Claim 9.5. Henceforth, u_1 is adjacent to u_2 , and, by a symmetrical argument, t_1 is adjacent to t_2 .

If u_1 is adjacent to t_2 , then both the interior and exterior of $u_1 u_2 w_2 t_2$ contain at least one neighbour of w_2 by Claim 9.1. Thus this 4-cycle would be nicely separating, a contradiction to Claim 9.4. Henceforth, u_1 is not adjacent to t_2 , and symmetrically t_1 is not adjacent to u_2 .

Therefore $Q = u_1 v_1 t_2$ is an induced path. Note that $Z_Q \subseteq N(v_1)$. The triangles $v_1 u_1 u_2$ and $v_1 t_1 t_2$ together with Claim 9.2 imply that $N(v_1) = \{u_1, u_2, t_1, t_2, w_1, w_2\}$. Since w_1 is not adjacent to t_2 and w_2 is not adjacent to u_1 , then $Z_Q = \{u_2, t_1\}$. Thus Q is magic contradicting Claim 9.5. \square

Claim 9.7. Let $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and x a vertex not in C_i . Then at most one vertex in $\{u_i, t_i\}$ is adjacent to x and at most one vertex in $\{v_i, w_i\}$ is adjacent to x .

Proof. Assume for a contradiction that x is adjacent to both u_i and t_i . Observe that the edges $u_i x$ and $t_i x$ are not crossed since $\text{dist}(C_1, C_2) \geq 1$. Then one of the two 4-cycles $u_i v_i t_i x$ and $u_i w_i t_i x$ is nicely separating. Thus the region bounded by this cycle has no vertex by Claim 9.4. Hence either $d(v_i) \leq 4$ or $d(w_i) \leq 4$. This contradicts Claim 9.1.

Similarly, one shows that at most one vertex in $\{v_i, w_i\}$ is adjacent to x . \square

Claim 9.8. $\text{dist}(C_1, C_2) > 1$.

Proof. Assume for a contradiction that $\text{dist}(C_1, C_2) = 1$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $v_1v_2 \in E(G)$.

Let us first show that without loss of generality, we may assume that u_1 is not adjacent to v_2 and u_2 is not adjacent to v_1 . By symmetry, if t_1 is not adjacent to v_2 and t_2 is not adjacent to v_1 , then we get the result by renaming swapping the names of u_i and t_i , $i = 1, 2$. Thus by symmetry and by Claim 9.7, if it not the case, then $u_1v_2 \in E(G)$ and $v_1t_2 \in E(G)$. Moreover w_1v_2 is not an edge by Claim 9.7. Hence renaming u_1, v_1, t_1, w_1 into v_1, t_1, w_1, u_1 respectively, we are in the desired configuration.

The vertices u_1 and u_2 are not adjacent, for otherwise the cycle $u_1v_1v_2u_2$ would be nicely separating since G is triangulated and u_1v_2 and u_2v_1 are not edges. So Q is an induced path.

A vertex of Z_Q is *goofy* if it is adjacent to u_1 and u_2 .

- Suppose first that there is a goofy vertex z' not in $C_1 \cup C_2$.

Without loss of generality, we may assume that z' is adjacent to u_1, v_1 and u_2 . If the crossing C_1 is inside $z'u_1v_1$, then consider the path $R = t_1v_1v_2u_2$. It is induced since $z'u_1v_1$ separates t_1 from v_2 and u_2 . Moreover all the neighbours of t_1 are inside $z'u_1v_1$, so they have at most two neighbours in R except for u_1 which is not adjacent to v_2 nor to u_2 . Hence the vertices of Z_R are all adjacent to $\{v_1, v_2, u_2\}$. Moreover $w_2 \notin Z_R$ because w_2v_1 is not an edge by Claim 9.7. Hence by planarity of $G - \{w_1, w_2\}$, there are at most two vertices adjacent to $\{v_1, v_2, u_2\}$. Thus R is magic, a contradiction.

Hence we may assume that C_1 is outside $z'u_1v_1$. The 4-cycle $z'v_1v_2u_2$ is not nicely separating by Claim 9.4, and G is triangulated. So $z'v_2 \in E(G)$ because v_1 is not adjacent to u_2 . So z' is adjacent to all vertices of Q .

Then there is no other vertex z'' in $Z_Q \setminus \{C_1 \cup C_2\}$, for otherwise one of the crossing C_i is inside u_iv_iz'' and as above, we obtain the contradiction that R is magic.

Now w_1u_2 is not an edge, for otherwise $w_1u_1z'u_2$ would be separating since $d(u_1) \geq 5$, a contradiction to Claim 9.4. Similarly, w_2u_1 is not an edge. Hence $Z_Q \subset \{z', t_1, t_2\}$. Now one of the edges t_1u_2 and t_2u_1 is not in $E(G)$, since otherwise they would cross. Without loss of generality, t_1 is not adjacent to u_2 . Then Q is good in $G - t_2$, and so Q is magic. This contradicts Claim 9.5.

- Suppose now that all the goofy vertices of Z_Q are in $C_1 \cup C_2$.

Suppose first that w_1 is in Z_Q , then w_1u_2 is an edge because w_1 is not adjacent to v_2 according to Claim 9.7. Thus t_2 and w_2 are not adjacent to u_1 . So $w_2 \notin Z_Q$ and $N_Q(t_2) \subset \{v_1, v_2, u_2\}$, so t_2 is not goofy. Moreover by planarity of $G - \{w_1, w_2\}$, there is at most two vertices adjacent to $\{v_1, v_2, u_2\}$. Furthermore, all the vertices distinct from t_1 and adjacent to $\{u_1, v_1, v_2\}$ are in the region bounded by $w_1v_1v_2u_2$ containing u_1 . Therefore there is at most one such vertex. Hence Q is good in $G - \{w_1, t_1\}$. Thus Q is magic and contradicts Claim 9.5.

Similarly, we get a contradiction if $w_2 \in Z_Q$. So $Z_Q \cap (C_1 \cup C_2) \subseteq \{t_1, t_2\}$. Then easily Q is good in $G - t_2$ and so Q is magic. This contradicts Claim 9.5.

□

Claim 9.9. *Some of the shortest (C_1, C_2) -paths is nice.*

Proof. Let $P = x_1x_2 \cdots x_p$ be any shortest (C_1, C_2) -path. Then no vertex in C_1 is adjacent to a vertex in $P - \{x_1, x_2\}$. Therefore, $V(C_1) \cap Z_P = \emptyset$. Similarly, we have $V(C_2) \cap Z_P = \emptyset$. Hence the graph G' induced by $V(P) \cup Z_P$ is planar as it contains exactly one vertex from each crossing.

Any vertex not in P can be adjacent only to vertices of P at distance at most two from each other, otherwise there would be a (C_1, C_2) -path shorter than P . Thus, if $z \in Z_P$, then z has precisely three neighbours in P . Moreover, there exists an $i \in \{2, \dots, p-1\}$ such that $N_P(z) = [x_i]$.

If there are distinct vertices $z_1, z_2, z_3 \in Z_P$ such that $N_P(z_1) = N_P(z_2) = N_P(z_3) = [x_i]$ for some value of i , then the subgraph of G' induced by $\{z_1, z_2, z_3\} \cup \{x_{i-1}, x_i, x_{i+1}\}$ contains a $K_{3,3}$. By Kuratowski's Theorem, this contradicts the fact that G' is planar. Therefore, for every $2 \leq i \leq p-1$, there are at most two vertices in Z_P adjacent to $[x_i]$.

Let $z_1, z_2 \in Z_P$ be such that $N_P(z_1) = N_P(z_2) = [x_i]$. The edges of $H = G[\{z_1, z_2\} \cup [x_i]]$ separate the plane into five regions R_1, \dots, R_5 as follows. Let R_1 be the region bounded by $x_{i-1}x_i z_1$ not containing the vertex z_2 , R_2 be the region bounded by $x_i x_{i+1} z_1$ not containing the vertex z_2 , R_3 be the region bounded by $x_{i-1}x_i z_2$ not containing the vertex z_1 , R_4 be the region bounded by $x_i x_{i+1} z_2$ not containing the vertex z_1 and R_5 be the region bounded by $x_{i-1}z_1 x_{i+1} z_2$ not containing x_i (see Figure 1). Since $(V(C_1) \cup V(C_2)) \cap Z_P = \emptyset$ and P is a shortest (C_1, C_2) -path, then no edge in H is crossed.




Figure 1: Regions R_1, R_2, R_3, R_4 and R_5 .

Let J_P be the subset of $\{3, \dots, p-2\}$ such that for $j \in J_P$, there are two vertices in Z_P adjacent to $[x_j]$ and at least one vertex adjacent to $[x_{j-1}]$ and another adjacent to $[x_{j+1}]$. The path P is said to be *semi-nice* if $J_P = \emptyset$.

Let us first prove that some of the shortest (C_1, C_2) -paths is semi-nice.

Suppose for a contradiction that no shortest (C_1, C_2) -path is semi-nice. Let P be a shortest (C_1, C_2) -path that maximizes the smallest index i in J_P . Let $z_1, z_2 \in Z_P$ be such that $N_P(z_1) = N_P(z_2) = [x_i]$.

Let $z \in Z_P$ be a vertex adjacent to $[x_{i+1}]$. If C_2 is in R_5 , then so is x_{i+2} and we get a contradiction from the fact that either zx_i or zx_{i+2} must cross an edge of H . Since P defines a path between x_{i+1} and $V(C_2)$, then C_2 must be either in R_2 or in R_4 (say R_4). Similarly, C_1 is either in R_1 or in R_3 . The cycle $x_{i-1}x_i x_{i+1} z_2$ is not be a nicely separating cycle by Claim 9.4, so C_1 must be in R_1 .

Now, by Claim 9.2, R_2 and R_3 are empty, and, by Claim 9.4, there is no vertex in R_5 . Since P is a shortest path, $x_{i-1}x_{i+1}$ is not an edge and therefore z_1 is adjacent to z_2 as G is triangulated.

Now, consider the path P' obtained from P by replacing x_i with $x'_i = z_2$. Note that P' is also a shortest path and that both z_1 and x_i are adjacent to $[x'_i]$. Since no edge in H is crossed, for any $v \in V(G) \setminus (\{z_1, z_2\} \cup [x_i])$, if v is adjacent to x_{i-1} then it must be in R_1 and if v is adjacent to z_2 then it must be in R_4 . Therefore, there is no vertex in $Z_{P'}$ adjacent to $\{x_{i-2}, x_{i-1}, z_2\}$. This implies that if $j \in J_{P'}$, then either $j \leq i-3$ or $j \geq i+1$. Note that if $j \in J_{P'}$ and $j \leq i-3$, then $j \in J_P$. As i is the minimum of J_P , the minimum of $J_{P'}$ is at least $i+1$. This contradicts our choice of P .

Let K_P be the subset of $\{2, \dots, p-1\}$ such that for $k \in K_P$, there are two vertices in Z_P adjacent to $[x_k]$ and two vertices adjacent to $[x_{k+1}]$. Observe that a nice path P is a semi-nice path such that K_P is empty, that is a path such that J_P and K_P are empty.

Suppose, by way of contradiction, that every (C_1, C_2) -shortest path is not nice. Then consider the semi-nice (C_1, C_2) -shortest path that maximizes the minimum of K_P .

Let $z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4 \in Z_P$ be such that $N_P(z_1) = N_P(z_2) = [x_i]$ and $N_P(z_3) = N_P(z_4) = [x_{i+1}]$, where i is the smallest index in K_P . Recall that the edges of $H = G[\{z_1, z_2\} \cup [x_i]]$ separate the plane into the five above-described regions R_1, \dots, R_5 . Again, we can use z_3 or z_4 to prove that C_2 is either in R_2 or in R_4 (say R_4). Therefore, x_{i+2} is in R_4 which implies z_3 and z_4 are also in R_4 . Thus, z_1 is not adjacent to z_3 nor z_4 . Furthermore, z_2 cannot be adjacent to both z_3 and z_4 for otherwise we can obtain a K_5 in the subgraph of G' induced by $[x_{i+1}] \cup \{z_2, z_3, z_4\}$ by contracting the edge z_4x_{i+2} (see Figure 2). Thus, without loss of generality, suppose z_2 and z_3 are not adjacent.




Figure 2: K_5 minor of G' is obtained by contracting z_4x_{i+2} .

Consider the path P' obtained from P by replacing x_{i+1} with $x'_{i+1} = z_3$. Since no edge in H is crossed, for any $v \in V(G) \setminus (\{z_1, z_2\} \cup [x_i])$, if v is adjacent to x_{i-1} then it is not in R_4 , and if v is adjacent to z_3 then it must be in R_4 . Since neither z_1 nor z_2 are adjacent to z_3 and x_{i+1} is not adjacent to x_{i-1} , there is no vertex in $Z_{P'}$ adjacent to $\{x_{i-1}, x_i, z_3\}$. This implies that if $k \in K_{P'}$, then either $k \leq i-2$ or $k \geq i+1$. Note that if $k \in K_{P'}$ and $k \leq i-2$, then $k \in K_P$. This implies that the minimum

index in $K_{P'}$ is strictly greater than i . Hence by our choice of P , the path P' is not semi-nice, that is $J_{P'} \neq \emptyset$.

Observe that if $j \in J_{P'}$, then either $j \leq i-2$ or $j \geq i+2$. Note that if $j \in J_{P'}$ and either $j \leq i-2$ or $j \geq i+4$, then $j \in J_P$. Since J_P is empty, then $J_{P'} \subseteq \{i+2, i+3\}$. Let $z'_1, z'_2 \in Z_{P'}$ be such that $N_{P'}(z'_1) = N_{P'}(z'_2) = [x'_j]$, for some $j \in J_{P'}$ with $J_{P'} \subseteq \{i+2, i+3\}$. Note that for the two possible values of j , both z'_1 and z'_2 are adjacent to x_{i+3} . Since P is a shortest (C_1, C_2) -path, neither z_2 nor x_{i+1} are adjacent to x_{i+3} and therefore z'_1 and z'_2 are in R_4 . Let R'_1 be the region bounded by $x'_{j-1}x'_jz'_1$ not containing the vertex z'_2 and R'_3 be the region bounded by $x'_{j-1}x'_jz'_2$ not containing the vertex z'_1 . Both of these regions are contained in R_4 . With the same argument used above in the proof of existence of a semi-nice path, one shows that if $j \in J_{P'}$, then C_1 is either contained in R'_1 or in R'_3 . We get a contradiction as the path P from $V(C_1)$ to x_{i-1} crosses an edge of H . \square

Claim 9.10. *There exists an induced path $Q = x_0x_1 \cdots x_px_{p+1}$ with the following properties:*

- P_1 . $P = x_1 \cdots x_p$ is a shortest (C_1, C_2) -path and is a nice path;
- P_2 . $x_0 \in V(C_1)$ and $x_{p+1} \in V(C_2)$ but x_0x_1 and x_px_{p+1} are not crossed edges; and
- P_3 . there is at most one vertex in Z_Q adjacent to both vertices in $\{x_0, x_3\}$ and at most one vertex in Z_Q adjacent to both vertices in $\{x_{p-2}, x_{p+1}\}$.
- P_4 . for any $i < j$, if there are two vertices adjacent to $[v_i]$ and two vertices adjacent to $[v_j]$, then the number of vertices adjacent to $[v_{i+1}]$ or to $[v_{j-1}]$ is at most 1.

Proof. By Claim 9.9 there exists a shortest (C_1, C_2) -path $P = x_1 \cdots x_p$ which is nice. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $x_1 = v_1$ and $x_p = v_2$. According to Claim 9.7, we can choose vertices $x_0 \in \{u_1, t_1\}$ and $x_{p+1} \in \{u_2, t_2\}$ such that Q is induced. Therefore, we have at least one path satisfying properties P_1 and P_2 . We say that x_0 is a *valid endpoint* if there is at most one vertex in Z_Q adjacent to both vertices in $\{x_0, x_3\}$ and x_{p+1} is a *valid endpoint* if there is at most one vertex in Z_Q adjacent to both vertices in $\{x_{p-2}, x_{p+1}\}$.


Let Q be a path satisfying properties P_1 and P_2 which maximizes the number of valid endpoints of Q .

Let us first show that Q has only valid endpoints, and satisfies property P_4 . By contradiction, suppose that Q has an invalid endpoint. Without loss of generality, x_0 is invalid.

Let $z_1, z_2 \in Z_Q$ be two vertices adjacent to both vertices in $\{x_0, x_3\}$. Since P is a shortest (C_1, C_2) -path, no vertex of C_1 is adjacent to x_3 . Therefore, no edge of $x_0x_1x_2x_3z_1$ and $x_0x_1x_2x_3z_2$ is crossed. Let R_1 be the region bounded by $x_0x_1x_2x_3z_1$ that does not contain z_2 and R_2 be the region bounded by $x_0x_1x_2x_3z_2$ that does not contain z_1 . Since the edges bounding the regions R_1 and R_2 are not crossed, then the crossing C_1 is contained in one of the regions R_1 or R_2 (say R_1). Let \hat{x}_0 be the vertex of $\{u_1, t_1\} \setminus \{x_0\}$ (see Figure 3).

Assume first that \hat{x}_0 is not adjacent to x_2 . Let \hat{Q} be the path obtained from Q by replacing x_0 with \hat{x}_0 . Clearly the path \hat{Q} is induced and satisfies properties P_1 and P_2 . By definition of Q , \hat{x}_0 must be an invalid endpoint. Hence, there is a vertex \hat{z} in $Z_{\hat{Q}} \setminus \{z_1\}$ which is adjacent to \hat{x}_0 and x_3 . This vertex is necessarily inside R_1 because it is adjacent to x_0 . But then, by planarity, z_1 cannot be adjacent to x_1 and x_2 , a contradiction to $z_1 \in Z_Q$.

Assume now that \hat{x}_0 is adjacent to x_2 . Let Q' be the path obtained from Q by replacing x_0 with w_1 and x_1 with \hat{x}_0 . Note that Q' is induced as w_1 is not adjacent to x_2 by Claim 9.7.

Figure 3: Regions R_1 and R_2 and the vertex \hat{x}_0 .

Note that property P_2 is valid for Q' . The path $P' = \hat{x}_0 x_2 \cdots x_p$ is a (C_1, C_2) shortest path. Let us prove that P' is nice and so that P' satisfies property P_1 . If $p = 3$, then, since no vertex in the cluster of C_1 is adjacent to x_3 , at most two vertices are in $Z_{P'}$ for otherwise we would get a $K_{3,3}$ in $G - \{w_1, w_2\}$, which is impossible as this graph is planar. Thus P' is nice. Suppose now that $p \geq 4$. By planarity, z_1 is not adjacent to x_1 , so z_1 is adjacent to x_2 as $z_1 \in Z_Q$. In addition, $z_1 x_2$ is contained in R_1 . Thus, any vertex in $Z_{P'}$ adjacent to \hat{x}_0 must be in region R_1 and cannot be adjacent to x_3 . Hence no vertex is adjacent to $[x_2]_{P'}$ so, since P is a nice path, P' is also a nice path.

By definition of Q , w_1 must be an invalid endpoint of Q' . Hence, there is a vertex z' in $Z_{Q'} \setminus \{z_1\}$ which is adjacent to w_1 and x_3 . This vertex is necessarily inside R_1 because neither x_0 nor x_1 are adjacent to x_3 . But then, by planarity, z_1 cannot be adjacent to x_1 and x_2 , a contradiction to $z_1 \in Z_Q$.

Let us now prove that Q satisfies property P_4 . By contradiction, suppose Q does not. Let $z_1, z_2, z'_1, z'_2 \in Z_Q$ be such that both z_1 and z_2 are adjacent to $[x_i]$ and z'_1 and z'_2 are adjacent to $[x_j]$. Consider the regions R_1, \dots, R_5 related to z_1 and z_2 used in Figure 1. Consider the regions R'_1, \dots, R'_5 related to z'_1 and z'_2 used in Figure 1 for $i = j$.

Let $z \in Z_Q$ be adjacent to $[x_{i+1}]$. Note that we can have $\{z_1, z_2\} \cap \{u_1, t_1\} \neq \emptyset$ if $i = 1$. But since $\text{dist}(C_1, C_2) \geq 2$, the edges $z_1 x_{i+1}$ and $z_2 x_{i+1}$ are not crossed. Furthermore, since no vertex in the cluster of C_1 is adjacent to x_3 and no vertex in the cluster of C_2 is adjacent to x_1 (P is a shortest (C_1, C_2) -path), then z is not in the cluster of either crossing.

Therefore, since z is adjacent to both x_i and x_{i+2} , we must have that both z and x_3 are in R_2 or in R_4 (say R_2). This also implies that C_2 is in R_2 . Note also that, by our choice of x_0 , the edges $z_1 x_i$ and $z_2 x_i$ are not crossed. Therefore, C_1 is contained in $R_1 \cup R_3 \cup R_5$. With a symmetric argument, we have that C_1 is either in R'_1 or in R'_3 (say R_1). Since both z'_1 and z'_2 are also in R_2 , then $R'_1 \cup R'_3$ are contained in R_2 and we get a contradiction. \square

Let Q be a path given by Claim 9.10. Without loss of generality, suppose $x_1 = v_1$ and $x_p = v_2$. Note also that Claim 9.7 implies w_1 and w_2 are not in Z_Q and therefore $G[V(Q) \cup Z_Q]$ is planar.

Claim 9.11. $\text{dist}(C_1, C_2) = 2$ and there is a vertex adjacent to x_0 and x_4 .

Proof. Suppose not. Then no vertex in Z_Q is adjacent to vertices at distance at least four in Q . Observe that this is the case when $\text{dist}(C_1, C_2) \geq 3$, since $x_1 \dots x_p$ is a shortest (C_1, C_2) -path.

Since P is a nice and shortest (C_1, C_2) -path, then the only vertices in Z_Q adjacent to vertices at distance at least three in Q must be adjacent to both x_0 and x_3 or to both x_{p-2} and x_{p+1} . By the property P_3 of Claim 9.10, there is at most one vertex, say z , adjacent to x_0 and x_3 and at most one vertex, say z' , adjacent to x_{p-2} and x_{p+1} .

Let us make few observations.

- Obs. 1 If two vertices z_1 and z_2 distinct from z are adjacent to $[x_2]$, then no vertex is adjacent to $[x_1]$ and $N_Q(z) = \{x_0, x_1, x_3\}$. Indeed z must be in the region R_5 in Figure 1 because it is adjacent to x_0 and x_3 . By the planarity of $G[V(Q) \cup Z_Q]$ and since z is adjacent to x_0 , x_0 must also be in R_5 . Again by planarity, z is not adjacent to x_2 and, therefore, must be adjacent to x_1 as $z \in Z_Q$.
- Obs. 2 If two vertices z_1 and z_2 distinct from z are adjacent to $[x_1]$, then no vertex is adjacent to $[x_2]$ and $N_Q(z) = \{x_0, x_2, x_3\}$. This argument is symmetric to Observation 1.

Suppose that z exists.

If z' exists, by Observations 1 and 2 (and their analog for z') and the properties of Q from Claim 9.10, the path Q is good in $G - z'$ because it is great in $G - \{z, z'\}$. Hence Q is magic, a contradiction to Claim 9.5. Hence z' does not exist.

By Claim 9.7, w_2 is not adjacent to x_{p-1} and w_1 is not adjacent to x_p since $dist(C_1, C_2) \geq 2$. So, by planarity of $G - \{w_1, w_2\}$, at most two vertices are adjacent to $[x_p]$. Let y be a vertex adjacent to $[x_p]$. The path Q is not great in $G - \{y, z\}$, for otherwise it would be magic. Hence, according to the properties of Q and the above observations, there must be two vertices adjacent to $[x_p]$, two vertices adjacent to $[x_{p-1}]$ and one vertex adjacent to $[x_{p-2}]$. Let z_1 and z_2 be the two vertices adjacent to $[x_{p-1}]$ and $R_1 \dots R_5$ be the regions as in Figure 1 with $i = p - 1$. Since there is a vertex adjacent to $[x_{p-2}]$, then C_1 is in R_1 or R_3 , and C_2 is in R_2 or R_4 because a vertex is adjacent to $[x_p]$. But by Claim 9.4 the 4-cycle $z_1 x_p z_2 x_{p-2}$ is not nicely separating, so there is no vertex inside R_5 . Since G is triangulated, and $x_{p-2} x_p$ is not an edge because P is a shortest (C_1, C_2) -path, $z_1 z_2 \in E(G)$. Now the path Q is good in $G - \{z_1, z_2\}$ and so is magic. This contradicts Claim 9.5.

Hence we may assume that z does not exist and by symmetry that z' does not exist. We get a contradiction similarly by considering a vertex w adjacent to $[x_1]$ in place of z . \square

Claim 9.12. *There is precisely one vertex $z \in Z_Q$ adjacent to both x_0 and x_4 .*

Proof. Observe that there are at most two vertices adjacent to x_0 and x_4 . Indeed such vertices cannot be in the crossings because $dist(C_1, C_2) = 2$. Thus if there were three such vertices, together with contracting the path $x_1 x_2 x_3$ we would get $K_{3,3}$ minor in $G - \{w_1, w_2\}$, a contradiction.

Suppose by contradiction that two distinct vertices $z_1, z_2 \in Z_Q$ adjacent to vertices x_0 and x_4 . The edges of Q are contained in the same region of the plane bounded by the cycle $x_0 z_1 x_4 z_2$. Therefore, both crossings are also in the region containing the edges of Q . By Claim 9.3, the region bounded by the cycle $x_0 z_1 x_4 z_2$ that does not contain the crossings has no vertex in its interior. Since G is triangulated, $z_1 z_2 \in E(G)$ as x_0 because x_4 are not adjacent as $dist(C_1, C_2) = 2$.

By the property P_3 of Claim 9.10, z_1 and z_2 cannot be both adjacent to the five vertices in Q . Therefore, without loss of generality, suppose $|N_Q(z_2)| \leq 4$. Let us prove that Q is great in $H = (G - z_2) \setminus \{z_1 x_0, z_1 x_4\}$.

- (i) If a vertex t in $G - \{z_1, z_2\}$ is adjacent to at least four vertices of Q , then without loss of generality it is adjacent to $\{x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3\}$ as it cannot be adjacent to x_0 and x_4 . Now by property P_3 , z_1 and z_2 are not adjacent to x_3 . Hence one of them (the one such that $x_0 x_1 x_2 x_3 x_4 z_i$ separates t from z_{3-i}) cannot be adjacent to any vertex of $\{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$, a contradiction to the fact that it is in Z_Q . Hence Q satisfies (a) in H .

- (ii) If two vertices t_1 and t_2 of H are adjacent to $[x_2]$, then necessarily $x_1t_1x_2t_2$ is a nicely separating, a contradiction to Claim 9.4. Hence there is at most one vertex of H adjacent to $[x_2]$. Thus Q satisfies (b) in H .
- (iii) If two vertices r_1 and r_2 of H are adjacent to $[x_1]$, then no vertex is adjacent to $[x_2]$. Indeed suppose for a contradiction that a vertex t is adjacent to $[v_2]$ none of $\{r_1, r_2, t\}$ is in $\{w_1, w_2\}$ by Claim 9.7 and because $\text{dist}(C_1, C_2) \geq 2$. Now contracting the path $tx_3x_4z_2$ into a vertex w , we obtain a $K_{3,3}$ with parts $\{r_1, r_2, w\}$ and $\{x_0, x_1, x_2\}$. This contradicts the planarity of G .
- Symmetrically, if two vertices of H are adjacent to $[x_3]$, then no vertex is adjacent to $[x_2]$. Therefore Q satisfies (c) in H .

It follows that Q is a good path in $H' = (G - z_2) \setminus z_1x_4$. Let ϕ be a safe L -colouring of Q in H' obtained by Lemma 8. Since Q meets the two crossings, $G - Q$ is planar. Furthermore, $G - Q$ can be drawn in the plane such that all vertices on the outer face are those in $N(Q)$. Every vertex of $Z_Q \setminus \{z_1, z_2\}$ is safe in H' and so in G , so $|L_\phi(v)| \geq 3$. In H' , z_1 is safe and in G , z_1 has one more neighbour in Q in G than H' , namely x_4 . Thus in G , $|L_\phi(z_1)| \geq 2$ because z_1 was safe in H' . Since z_2 has at most four neighbours in Q , we have $|L_\phi(z_2)| \geq 1$. Now z_1 is adjacent to z_2 , so L_ϕ is a $\{z_1, z_2\}$ -suitable assignment for $G - Q$. Hence by Theorem 2, $G - Q$ is L_ϕ -colourable and so G is L -colourable, a contradiction. \square


- Assume first that $|N_Q(z)| = 5$. Let $H = G \setminus \{zx_0, zx_4\}$. z is the unique vertex adjacent to x_0 and x_4 . Moreover by property P_3 z is the unique vertex adjacent to x_0 and x_3 and the unique one adjacent to x_1 and x_4 . Hence Q satisfies (a) in H . Moreover, for $1 \leq i \leq 3$, there is at most one vertex distinct from z adjacent to $[x_i]$ otherwise $G[V(Q) \cup Z_Q]$ would contain a $K_{3,3}$. Hence Q also satisfies (b) and (c) in H . Therefore Q is great in H . By Lemma 7, there exists a safe L -colouring ϕ of Q in H . Thus in G , every vertex in $Z_Q \setminus \{z\}$ satisfies $|L_\phi(v)| \geq 3$ while $|L_\phi(z)| \geq 1$. Hence L_ϕ is suitable for $G - Q$. Therefore, by Theorem 2, $G - Q$ is L_ϕ -colourable and so G is L -colourable, a contradiction.
- Assume now that $|N_Q(z)| \leq 4$.

Suppose that there are two distinct vertices $z_1, z_2 \in Z_Q$ with z_1 adjacent to x_0 and x_3 and z_2 adjacent to x_1 and x_4 . Let R_1 be the region bounded by the cycle $x_0x_1x_2x_3z_1$ not containing z_2 and R_2 be the region bounded by the cycle $x_1x_2x_3x_4z_2$ not containing z_1 (see Figure 4). Now, note that any vertex adjacent to both x_0 and x_4 is not in $R_1 \cup R_2$ and any vertex adjacent to x_2 must be in $R_1 \cup R_2$. Therefore, $z \in \{z_1, z_2\}$. Indeed if this was not true, then by property P_3 z is not adjacent to x_1 nor x_3 . Thus z must be adjacent to x_2 as it is in Z_Q . So z is inside $R_1 \cup R_2$, which contradicts the fact that it is adjacent to x_0 and x_4 .

Thus, at most one other vertex z' in $Z_Q \setminus \{z\}$ is adjacent to vertices at distance three in Q . By symmetry, we may assume that z' is adjacent to x_0 and x_3 . Hence all vertices in $Z_Q \setminus \{z, z'\}$ are adjacent to some $[x_i]$ for $1 \leq i \leq 3$. Similarly to (ii) and (iii) in Claim 9.12, one shows that Q also satisfies (a) and (b) in $(G - z) \setminus z'x_0$. Hence Q is a good path in $G - z$. Then Q is magic, a contradiction to Claim 9.5. \square

Acknowledgement

The authors would like to thank Claudia Linhares Sales for stimulating discussions.

Figure 4: Regions R_1 and R_2 .

References

- [1] M. O. Albertson. Chromatic Number, Independence Ratio, and Crossing Number. *Ars Mathematica Contemporanea* 1:1–6, 2008.
- [2] M. O. Albertson, M. Heenehan, A. McDonough, and J. Wise. Coloring graphs with given crossing patterns. *manuscript*.
- [3] J. Barát and G. Tóth. Towards the Albertson Conjecture. *Electronic Journal of Combinatorics* 17: R-73, 2010.
- [4] Z. Dvořák, B. Lidický, and R. Škrekovski. Graphs with two crossings are 5-choosable. (arXiv:1103.1801v1 [math.CO]).
- [5] R. Erman, F. Havet, B. Lidický, and O. Pangrac. 5-colouring graphs with 4 crossings. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.* 25(1):401–422, 2011.
- [6] C. Kuratowski. Sur le problème des courbes gauches en topologie. *Fund. Math.* 15: 271–283, 1930.
- [7] B. Oporowski and D. Zhao. Coloring graphs with crossing. *Discrete Mathematics* 309: 2948–2951, 2009.
- [8] M. Schaefer. *personal communication to M. O. Albertson*.
- [9] C. Thomassen. Kuratowski’s theorem. *J. Graph Theory* 5:225–241, 1981.
- [10] C. Thomassen. Every planar graph is 5-choosable. *J. Comb. Theory B* 62:180–181, 1994.



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

Centre de recherche INRIA Bordeaux – Sud Ouest : Domaine Universitaire - 351, cours de la Libération - 33405 Talence Cedex
Centre de recherche INRIA Grenoble – Rhône-Alpes : 655, avenue de l'Europe - 38334 Montbonnot Saint-Ismier
Centre de recherche INRIA Lille – Nord Europe : Parc Scientifique de la Haute Borne - 40, avenue Halley - 59650 Villeneuve d'Ascq
Centre de recherche INRIA Nancy – Grand Est : LORIA, Technopôle de Nancy-Brabois - Campus scientifique
615, rue du Jardin Botanique - BP 101 - 54602 Villers-lès-Nancy Cedex
Centre de recherche INRIA Paris – Rocquencourt : Domaine de Voluceau - Rocquencourt - BP 105 - 78153 Le Chesnay Cedex
Centre de recherche INRIA Rennes – Bretagne Atlantique : IRISA, Campus universitaire de Beaulieu - 35042 Rennes Cedex
Centre de recherche INRIA Saclay – Île-de-France : Parc Orsay Université - ZAC des Vignes : 4, rue Jacques Monod - 91893 Orsay Cedex

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