Prove that each of the following problems is NP-hard.

1. Given an undirected graph *G*, does *G* contain a simple path that visits all but 374 vertices?

**Solution:** We prove this problem is NP-hard by a reduction from the undirected Hamiltonian path problem. Given an arbitrary graph G, let H be the graph obtained from G by adding 374 isolated vertices. Call a path in H almost-Hamiltonian if it visits all but 374 vertices. I claim that G contains a Hamiltonian path if and only if H contains an almost-Hamiltonian path.

- ⇒ Suppose *G* has a Hamiltonian path *P*. Then *P* is an almost-Hamiltonian path in *H*, because it misses only the 374 isolated vertices.
- $\Leftarrow$  Suppose *H* has an almost-Hamiltonian path *P*. This path must miss all 374 isolated vertices in *H*, and therefore must visit every vertex in *G*. Every edge in *H*, and therefore every edge in *P*, is also na edge in *G*. We conclude that *P* is a Hamiltonian path in *G*.

Given G, we can easily build H in polynomial time by brute force.

2. Given an undirected graph *G*, does *G* have a spanning tree in which every node has degree at most 374?

**Solution:** We prove this problem is NP-hard by a reduction from the undirected Hamiltonian path problem. Given an arbitrary graph G, let H be the graph obtained by attaching a fan of 372 edges to every vertex of G. Call a spanning tree of H **almost-Hamiltonian** if it has maximum degree 374. I claim that G contains a Hamiltonian path if and only if H contains an almost-Hamiltonian spanning tree.

- ⇒ Suppose *G* has a Hamiltonian path *P*. Let *T* be the spanning tree of *H* obtained by adding every fan edge in *H* to *P*. Every vertex *v* of *H* is either a leaf of *T* or a vertex of *P*. If  $v \in P$ , then deg<sub>*P*</sub>(v) ≤ 2, and therefore deg<sub>*H*</sub>(v) = deg<sub>*P*</sub>(v) + 372 ≤ 374. We conclude that *H* is an almost-Hamiltonian spanning tree.
- ⇐ Suppose *H* has an almost-Hamiltonian spanning tree *T*. The leaves of *T* are precisely the vertices of *H* with degree 1; these are also precisely the vertices of *H* that are not vertices of *G*. Let *P* be the subtree of *T* obtained by deleting every leaf of *T*. Observe that *P* is a spanning tree of *G*, and for every vertex  $v \in P$ , we have  $\deg_P(v) = \deg_T(v) 372 \le 2$ . We conclude that *P* is a Hamiltonian path in *G*.

Given *G*, we can easily build *H* in polynomial time by brute force.

3. Given an undirected graph *G*, does *G* have a spanning tree with at most 374 leaves?

**Solution:** We prove this problem is NP-hard by a reduction from the undirected Hamiltonian path problem.<sup>1</sup> Given an arbitrary graph G, let H be the graph obtained from G by adding the following vertices and edges:

- First we add a vertex *z* with edges to every other vertex in *z*.
- Then we add 373 vertices  $\ell_1, \ldots, \ell_{373}$ , each with edges to *t* and nothing else.

Call a spanning tree of *H* **almost-Hamiltonian** if it has at most 374 leaves. I claim that *G* contains a Hamiltonian path if and only if *H* contains an almost-Hamiltonian spanning tree.

- ⇒ Suppose *G* has a Hamiltonian path *P*. Suppose *P* starts at vertex *s* and ends at vertex *t*. Let *T* be subgraph of *H* obtained by adding the edge tz and all possible edges  $z\ell_i$ . Then *T* is a spanning tree of *H* with exactly 374 leaves, namely *s* and all 373 new vertices  $\ell_i$ .
- $\Leftarrow$  Suppose *H* has an almost-Hamiltonian spanning tree *T*. Every node  $\ell_i$  is a leaf of *T*, so *T* must consist of the 373 edges  $z\ell_i$  and a simple path from *z* to some vertex *s* of *G*. Let *t* be the only neighbor of *z* in *T* that is not a leaf  $\ell_i$ , and let *P* be the unique path in *T* from *s* to *t*. This path visits every vertex of *G*; in other words, *P* is a Hamiltonian path in *G*.

Given G, we can easily build H in polynomial time by brute force.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Are you noticing a pattern here?

4. Recall that a 5-coloring of a graph *G* is a function that assigns each vertex of *G* a "color" from the set {0, 1, 2, 3, 4}, such that for any edge *uv*, vertices *u* and *v* are assigned different "colors". A 5-coloring is *careful* if the colors assigned to adjacent vertices are not only distinct, but differ by more than 1 (mod 5). Prove that deciding whether a given graph has a careful 5-coloring is NP-hard.

**Solution:** We prove that careful 5-coloring is NP-hard by reduction from the standard 5COLOR problem.

Given a graph G, we construct a new graph H by replacing each edge in G with a path of length three. I claim that H has a careful 5-coloring if and only if G has a (not necessarily careful) 5-coloring.

- $\Leftarrow$  Suppose *G* has a 5-coloring. Consider a single edge uv in *G*, and suppose color(u) = a and color(v) = b. We color the path from *u* to *v* in *H* as follows:
  - If  $b = (a + 1) \mod 5$ , use colors  $(a, (a + 2) \mod 5, (a 1) \pmod{5}, b)$ .
  - If  $b = (a-1) \mod 5$ , use colors  $(a, (a-2) \mod 5, (a+1) \pmod{5}, b)$ .
  - Otherwise, use colors (*a*, *b*, *a*, *b*).

In particular, every vertex in *G* retains its color in *H*. The resulting 5-coloring of *H* is careful.

⇒ On the other hand, suppose *H* has a careful 5-coloring. Consider a path (u, x, y, v) in *H* corresponding to an arbitrary edge uv in *G*. There are exactly eight careful colorings of this path with color(u) = 0, namely: (0, 2, 0, 2), (0, 2, 0, 3), (0, 2, 4, 1), (0, 2, 4, 2), (0, 3, 0, 3), (0, 3, 0, 2), (0, 3, 1, 3), (0, 3, 1, 4). It follows immediately that  $color(u) \neq color(v)$ . Thus, if we color each vertex of *G* with its color in *H*, we obtain a valid 5-coloring of *G*.

Given *G*, we can clearly construct *H* in polynomial time.

5. Prove that the following problem is NP-hard: Given an undirected graph *G*, find *any* integer k > 374 such that *G* has a proper coloring with *k* colors but *G* does not have a proper coloring with k - 374 colors.

**Solution:** Let G' be the union of 374 copies of G, with additional edges between *every* vertex of each copy and *every* vertex in *every* other copy. Given G, we can easily build G' in polynomial time by brute force. Let  $\chi(G)$  and  $\chi(G')$  denote the minimum number of colors in any proper coloring of G, and define  $\chi(G')$  similarly.

- ⇒ Fix any coloring of *G* with  $\chi(G)$  colors. We can obtain a proper coloring of *G'* with  $374 \cdot \chi(G)$  colors, by using a distinct set of  $\chi(G)$  colors in each copy of *G*. Thus,  $\chi(G') \leq 374 \cdot \chi(G)$ .
- $\Leftarrow$  Now fix any coloring of G' with  $\chi(G')$  colors. Each copy of G in G' must use its own distinct set of colors, so at least one copy of G uses at most  $\lfloor \chi(G')/374 \rfloor$  colors. Thus,  $\chi(G) \leq \lfloor \chi(G')/374 \rfloor$ .

These two observations immediately imply that  $\chi(G') = 374 \cdot \chi(G)$ . It follows that if *k* is an integer such that  $k - 374 < \chi(G') \le k$ , then  $\chi(G) = \chi(G')/374 = \lceil k/374 \rceil$ . Thus, if we could compute such an integer *k* in polynomial time, we could compute  $\chi(G)$  in polynomial time. But computing  $\chi(G)$  is NP-hard!

- 6. A *bicoloring* of an undirected graph assigns each vertex a set of *two* colors. There are two types of bicoloring: In a *weak* bicoloring, the endpoints of each edge must use *different* sets of colors; however, these two sets may share one color. In a *strong* bicoloring, the endpoints of each edge must use *distinct* sets of colors; that is, they must use four colors altogether. Every strong bicoloring is also a weak bicoloring.
  - (a) Prove that finding the minimum number of colors in a weak bicoloring of a given graph is NP-hard.

**Solution:** It suffices to prove that deciding whether a graph has a weak bicoloring with three colors is NP-hard, using the following trivial reduction from the standard 3COLOR problem.

Let G be an arbitrary undirected graph. I claim that G has a proper 3-coloring if and only if G has a weak bicoloring with 3 colors.

- Suppose *G* has a proper coloring using the colors red, green, and blue. We can obtain a weak bicoloring of *G* using only the colors cyan, magenta, and yellow by recoloring each red vertex with {magenta, yellow}, recoloring each blue vertex with {magenta, cyan}, and recoloring each green vertex with {yellow, cyan}.
- Suppose *G* has a weak bicoloring using the colors cyan, magenta, yellow. Then we can obtain a proper 3-coloring of *G* by defining red = {magenta, yellow}, defining blue = {magenta, cyan}, and defining green = {yellow, cyan}.

More generally, for any integer *k* and any graph *G*, every weak *k*-bicoloring of *G* is also a proper  $\binom{k}{2}$ -coloring of *G*, and vice versa.

(b) Prove that finding the minimum number of colors in a strong bicoloring of a given graph is NP-hard.

**Solution:** It suffices to prove that deciding whether a graph has a strong bicoloring with six colors is NP-hard, using the following reduction from the standard 3COLOR problem.

Let G be an arbitrary undirected graph. We build a new graph H from G as follows:

- For every vertex v in G, the graph H contains three vertices  $v_1$ ,  $v_2$ , and  $v_3$  and three edges  $v_1v_2$ ,  $v_2v_3$ , and  $v_3v_1$ .
- For every edge uv in G, the graph H contains three edges  $u_1v_1$ ,  $u_2v_2$ , and  $u_3v_3$ .

I claim that G has a proper 3-coloring if and only if H has a strong bicoloring with six colors. Without loss of generality, we can assume that G (and therefore H) is connected; otherwise, consider each component independently.

- ⇒ Suppose *G* has a proper 3-coloring with colors red, green, and blue. Then we define a strong bicoloring of *H* with colors 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 as follows:
  - For every red vertex v in G, let  $color(v_1) = \{1, 2\}$  and  $color(v_1) = \{3, 4\}$  and  $color(v_3) = \{5, 6\}$ .
  - For every blue vertex v in G, let  $color(v_1) = \{3,4\}$  and  $color(v_1) = \{5,6\}$  and  $color(v_3) = \{1,2\}$ .
  - For every green vertex v in G, let  $color(v_1) = \{5, 6\}$  and  $color(v_1) = \{1, 2\}$  and  $color(v_3) = \{3, 4\}$ .

Exhaustive case analysis confirms that every pair of adjacent vertices of H has disjoint color sets.

• Suppose *H* has a strong bicoloring with six colors. Fix an arbitrary vertex *v* in *G*, and without loss of generality, suppose  $color(v_1) = \{1, 2\}$  and  $color(v_1) = \{3, 4\}$  and  $color(v_3) = \{5, 6\}$ . Exhaustive case analysis implies that for any edge *uv*, each vertex  $u_i$  must be colored either  $\{1, 2\}$  or  $\{3, 4\}$  or  $\{5, 6\}$ . It follows by induction that *every* vertex in *H* must be colored either  $\{1, 2\}$  or  $\{3, 4\}$  or  $\{5, 6\}$ .

Now for each vertex w in G, color w red if  $color(w_1) = \{1, 2\}$ , blue if  $color(w_1) = \{3, 4\}$ , and green if  $color(w_1) = \{5, 6\}$ . This assignment of colors is a proper 3-coloring of G.

Given G, we can build H in polynomial time by brute force.

I believe that deciding whether a graph has a strong bicoloring with five colors is also NP-hard, but I don't have a proof yet. A graph has a strong bicoloring with four colors if and only if it is bipartite, and a strong bicoloring with two or three colors if and only if it has no edges.