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Abstract. In this paper we show that Linial’s Conjecture holds for two classes of split digraphs, namely the spider digraphs and the $k$-loose digraphs.

1. Introduction

The digraphs considered in this text do not contain loops or parallel arcs and by path we mean directed path. Let $D$ be a digraph. We denote by $V(P)$ the set of vertices of a path $P$. The size of a path $P$, denoted by $|P|$, is $|V(P)|$. We denote by $\lambda(D)$ the size of the longest path in $D$ and by $\alpha(D)$ the size of a maximum stable set. A path partition $\mathcal{P}$ of $D$ is a set of vertex-disjoint paths of $D$ that cover $V(P)$. We say that $\mathcal{P}$ is an optimal path partition if there is no path partition $\mathcal{P}'$ of $D$ such that $|\mathcal{P}'| < |\mathcal{P}|$. We denote by $\pi(D)$ the size of an optimal path partition of a digraph $D$.

Dilworth [Dilworth 1950] showed that for every transitive acyclic digraph $D$ we have $\pi(D) = \alpha(D)$. Note that this equality is not valid for any digraph; for example, if $D$ is a directed cycle with 5 vertices, then $\pi(D) = 1$ and $\alpha(D) = 2$. However, Gallai and Milgram [Gallai and Milgram 1960] have shown that $\pi(D) \leq \alpha(D)$ for every digraph $D$.

Greene and Kleitman [Greene and Kleitman 1976] proved a generalization of Dilworth’s Theorem described next. Let $k$ be a positive integer. The $k$-norm of a path partition $\mathcal{P}$, denoted by $|\mathcal{P}|_k$, is defined as $|\mathcal{P}|_k = \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \min\{|P|, k\}$. We say that $\mathcal{P}$ is a $k$-optimal path partition if there is no path partition $\mathcal{P}'$ such that $|\mathcal{P}'|_k < |\mathcal{P}|_k$. We denote by $\pi_k(D)$ the $k$-norm of a $k$-optimal path partition of $D$. A $k$-partial coloring $\mathcal{C}^k$ is a set of $k$ disjoint stable sets called color classes (empty color classes are allowed). The weight of a $k$-partial coloring $\mathcal{C}^k$, denoted by $||\mathcal{C}^k||$, is defined as $||\mathcal{C}^k|| = \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}^k} |C|$. We say that $\mathcal{C}^k$ is an optimal $k$-partial coloring if there is no $k$-partial coloring $\mathcal{B}^k$ such that $||\mathcal{B}^k|| > ||\mathcal{C}^k||$. We denote by $\alpha_k(D)$ the weight of an optimal $k$-partial coloring of $D$. Given these definitions, what Greene and Kleitman [Greene and Kleitman 1976] showed was that for every transitive acyclic digraph $D$, we have $\pi_k(D) = \alpha_k(D)$. Note that $\pi(D) = \pi_1(D)$ and $\alpha(D) = \alpha_1(D)$. Thus, Dilworth’s Theorem is a particular case of Greene-Kleitman’s Theorem in which $k = 1$.

As Gallai-Milgram’s Theorem extends Dilworth’s Theorem, it is a natural question whether Greene-Kleitman’s Theorem can be extended to digraphs in general. More precisely, is it true that for every digraph $D$ we have that $\pi_k(D) \leq \alpha_k(D)$? Linial [Linial 1981] conjectured that the answer for this question is positive.
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Linial’s Conjecture [Linial 1981]. Let $D$ be a digraph and $k$ be a positive integer. Then, $\pi_k(D) \leq \alpha_k(D)$.

Linial’s Conjecture remains open, but we know it holds for acyclic digraphs [Saks 1979], bipartite digraphs [Berge 1982], digraphs which contain a Hamiltonian path [Berge 1982], $k = 1$ [Linial 1978], $k = 2$ [Berger and Hartman 2008] and $k \geq \lambda(D) - 3$ [Herskovics 2013]. In this paper we give partial results on Linial’s Conjecture for split digraphs.

2. Split digraphs

Let $D$ be a digraph and let $X \subseteq V(D)$. We denote by $D[X]$ the subdigraph of $D$ induced by $X$. A digraph $D$ is a split digraph if there is a partition of $V(D)$ into two sets $X$ and $Y$, such that $D[X]$ is a tournament and $D[Y]$ is a stable set. We shall use the notation $D[X,Y]$ to indicate that $D$ is a split digraph with such partition $\{X,Y\}$.

In this section we shall prove an approximation to Linial’s Conjecture for split digraphs, i. e., that $\pi_k(D) \leq \alpha_k(D) + 1$ for every split digraph $D$, as stated in Theorem 1. For that, we need Rédei’s Theorem and Lemmas 1 and 2 below.

Rédei’s Theorem [Rédei 1934]. Every tournament contains a Hamiltonian path.

Lemma 1. Let $D[X,Y]$ be a split digraph. Then, $\pi_k(D) \leq |Y| + \min\{|X|,k\}$.

Proof. By Rédei’s Theorem, the tournament $D[X]$ contains a path $P$ such that $V(P) = X$. Let $\mathcal{P} = \{P\} \cup \{(y) : y \in Y\}$. Clearly, $\mathcal{P}$ is a path partition of $D$ for which $|\mathcal{P}|_k = \min\{|X|,k\} + |Y|$. Therefore, $\pi_k(D) \leq |\mathcal{P}|_k = \min\{|X|,k\} + |Y|$. ■

Lemma 2. Let $D[X,Y]$ be a split digraph. Then, $\alpha_k(D) \geq |Y| + \min\{|X|,k-1\}$. Moreover, when $|X| < k$, we have that $\alpha_k(D) = |V(D)|$.

Proof. First, suppose that $|X| \leq k-1$. Let $\mathcal{C}^k = \{Y\} \cup \{\{x\} : x \in X\}$. Note that $\mathcal{C}^k$ is a $k$-partial coloring of $D$ with $||\mathcal{C}^k|| = |V(D)|$. Therefore, $\alpha_k(D) = ||\mathcal{C}^k|| = |Y| + |X| = |Y| + \min\{|X|,k-1\}$ and the result follows. We may assume that $|X| \geq k$. Let $\mathcal{C}^k = \{Y\} \cup \{\{x\} : x \in S\}$, where $S \subseteq X$ such that $|S| = k-1$. Clearly, $\mathcal{C}^k$ is a $k$-partial coloring for which $||\mathcal{C}^k|| = |Y| + k-1$. Therefore, $\alpha_k(D) \geq ||\mathcal{C}^k|| = |Y| + k - 1 = |Y| + \min\{|X|,k-1\}$. ■

Theorem 1. Let $D[X,Y]$ be a split digraph. Then, $\pi_k(D) \leq \alpha_k(D) + 1$.

Proof. The result follows immediately from Lemmas 1 and 2. ■

In Section 2.1 we introduce $k$-loose digraphs and show that Linial’s Conjecture holds for them and in Section 2.2 we show that it holds for spider digraphs [Hoàng 1985].

2.1. $k$-loose digraphs

A split digraph $D[X,Y]$ is $k$-loose if either $|X| < k$ or there is a $S \subseteq X$ such that $|S| = k$ and no vertex $y \in Y$ is adjacent to every vertex in $S$. A split digraph $D[X,Y]$ that is not $k$-loose is called $k$-tight. We show in this section that Linial’s Conjecture holds for every $k$-loose digraph (Theorem 2) and for split digraphs such that $|X| \leq k$ (Theorem 3). For that, we need Lemmas 3 and 4 below.

Lemma 3. Let $D[X,Y]$ be a split digraph. Then, $D$ is $k$-loose if and only if $\alpha_k(D) \geq |Y| + \min\{|X|,k\}$.
**Theorem 2.** Let $D[X,Y]$ be a $k$-loose split digraph. Then, $\pi_k(D) \leq \alpha_k(D)$.

**Proof.** By Lemma 3, $\alpha_k(D) \geq |Y| + \min\{|X|, k\}$. On the other hand, by Lemma 1 $\pi_k(D) \leq |Y| + \min\{|X|, k\}$ and the result follows. ■

**Theorem 3.** Let $D[X,Y]$ be a split digraph such that $|X| \leq k$. Then, $\pi_k(D) \leq \alpha_k(D)$.

**Proof.** If $D$ is $k$-loose, then the result follows by Theorem 2. So, we may assume that $D$ is not $k$-loose. Hence, $|X| = k$ and there exists a vertex $y \in Y$ which is adjacent to every vertex of $X$. Therefore, $D[X \cup \{y\}]$ is a tournament and by Rédei’s Theorem it has a Hamiltonian path $P$ such that $|P| = |X| + 1$. As $P$ is a path in $D$ as well, we conclude that $\lambda(D) \geq |X| + 1$ and the result follows by Lemma 4. ■

### 2.2. Spider digraphs

We denote by $\mathcal{N}(v)$ the set of vertices that are adjacent to $v \in V(D)$ (regardless the direction of the arcs). A split digraph $D[X,Y]$ is **spider** [Hoàng 1985] if (i) $|X| = |Y| \geq 2$; and (ii) there exists a bijective function $f : X \rightarrow Y$ such that either $\mathcal{N}(x) = \{f(x)\}$ for all $x \in X$ (in this case, we say that $D$ is a **thin** spider) or $\mathcal{N}(x) = Y \setminus f(x)$ for all $x \in X$ (in this case, we say that $D$ is a **thick** spider). Note that thin spider digraphs are $k$-loose, but thick spider digraphs are $k$-tight, as long as $|X| > k$. The following theorem shows that Linial’s Conjecture holds for spider digraphs.

**Theorem 4.** Let $D[X,Y]$ be a spider digraph. Then, $\pi_k(D) \leq \alpha_k(D)$.

**Proof.** Let $\ell = |X| = |Y|$. If $\ell \leq k$, then the result follows by Theorem 3. Thus, we may assume that $|X| > k$. Clearly, $\pi_k(D) \leq |V(D)|$ and we deduce that $\alpha_k < |V(D)|$. If $D$ is a thin spider digraph, whence $k$-loose, the result follows by Theorem 2. Therefore, we may assume that $D$ is a thick spider graph. Since $D[X]$ is a tournament, by Rédei’s Theorem, there exists a path $P$ such that $V(P) = X$. Let $P = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{\ell})$. Since $D$ is a thick spider digraph, there exists one single vertex $y_i \in Y$ that is not adjacent to $x_i$, for $i = 1, \ldots, \ell$. Note that if $\lambda(D) > |X|$, then the result follows by Lemma 4. So we may assume that $\lambda(D) \leq |X|$. 

\begin{align*}
\text{Lemma 4.} & \quad \text{Let } D = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_k\} \text{ be a } k\text{-partial coloring where } C_i = \{x_i\} \\
& \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, \ldots, k. \text{ For each } y \in Y \text{ choose some vertex } x_i \text{ not adjacent to } y \text{ (which exists by definition) and add } y \text{ in color class } C_i. \text{ The } k\text{-partial coloring } D \text{ thus obtained has weight } |Y| + k = |Y| + \min\{|X|, k\} \text{ as expected.}
\end{align*}

\text{Conversely, consider that } \alpha_k(D) \geq |Y| + \min\{|X|, k\}. \text{ If } |X| < k, \text{ then } D \text{ is } k\text{-loose by definition. So, we may assume that } |X| \geq k \text{ and, whence, } \alpha_k(D) \geq |Y| + k. \text{ We conclude that } D \text{ must have exactly } k \text{ vertices of } X, \text{ besides all } |Y| \text{ vertices from } Y. \text{ Let } S = \{x : x \in C_i \cap X \text{ for } i = 1, 2, \ldots, k\}. \text{ Since all vertices of } Y \text{ belong to } D, \text{ then there is no vertex in } Y \text{ which is adjacent to every vertex of } S. \text{ Therefore, } D \text{ is } k\text{-loose. ■}

\text{Theorem 3.} \quad \text{Let } D[X,Y] \text{ be a split digraph such that } |X| \leq k. \text{ Then, } \pi_k(D) \leq \alpha_k(D). \text{ Proof.} \quad \text{If } D \text{ is } k\text{-loose, then the result follows by Theorem 2. So, we may assume that } D \text{ is not } k\text{-loose. Hence, } |X| = k \text{ and there exists a vertex } y \in Y \text{ which is adjacent to every vertex of } X. \text{ Therefore, } D[X \cup \{y\}] \text{ is a tournament and by Rédei’s Theorem it has a Hamiltonian path } P \text{ such that } |P| = |X| + 1. \text{ As } P \text{ is a path in } D \text{ as well, we conclude that } \lambda(D) \geq |X| + 1 \text{ and the result follows by Lemma 4. ■}

\text{Theorem 4.} \quad \text{Let } D[X,Y] \text{ be a spider digraph. Then, } \pi_k(D) \leq \alpha_k(D). \text{ Proof.} \quad \text{Let } \ell = |X| = |Y|. \text{ If } \ell \leq k, \text{ then the result follows by Theorem 3. Thus, we may assume that } |X| > k. \text{ Clearly, } \pi_k(D) \leq |V(D)| \text{ and we deduce that } \alpha_k < |V(D)|. \text{ If } D \text{ is a thin spider digraph, whence } k\text{-loose, the result follows by Theorem 2. Therefore, we may assume that } D \text{ is a thick spider graph. Since } D[X] \text{ is a tournament, by Rédei’s Theorem, there exists a path } P \text{ such that } V(P) = X. \text{ Let } P = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{\ell}). \text{ Since } D \text{ is a thick spider digraph, there exists one single vertex } y_i \in Y \text{ that is not adjacent to } x_i, \text{ for } i = 1, \ldots, \ell. \text{ Note that if } \lambda(D) > |X|, \text{ then the result follows by Lemma 4. So we may assume that } \lambda(D) \leq |X|. \text{ Therefore, } D \text{ is } k\text{-loose by definition. So, we may assume that } |X| \geq k \text{ and, whence, } \alpha_k(D) \geq |Y| + k. \text{ We conclude that } D \text{ must have exactly } k \text{ vertices of } X, \text{ besides all } |Y| \text{ vertices from } Y. \text{ Let } S = \{x : x \in C_i \cap X \text{ for } i = 1, 2, \ldots, k\}. \text{ Since all vertices of } Y \text{ belong to } D, \text{ then there is no vertex in } Y \text{ which is adjacent to every vertex of } S. \text{ Therefore, } D \text{ is } k\text{-loose. ■
Let $P_{x_i}$ denote the subpath $(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_i)$ and let $x_iP$ denote the subpath $(x_i, x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_i)$. We denote by $W \circ Q$ the concatenation of two paths $W$ and $Q$.

**Claim 1:** If $x_i \in X$, $y_j \in Y$ and $i < j$, then $(x_i, y_j) \in A(D)$.

We prove this claim by induction on $i$. If $i = 1$, assume by contradiction that $(y_j, x_1) \in A(D)$; then $P' = (y_j, x_1) \circ P$ is a path in $D$ such that $|P'| = |X| + 1$, a contradiction. Hence, $(x_1, y_j) \in A(D)$. Consider now $i > 1$. Recall that $y_j$ is adjacent to every vertex in $X - \{x_j\}$. Thus, $y_j$ is adjacent to every vertex of $V(P_{x_j})$. By induction hypothesis, we have $(x_{i-1}, y_j) \in A(D)$. Suppose by contradiction that $(y_j, x_i) \in A(D)$. Then, there is a path $P' = P_{x_{i-1}} \circ (x_{i-1}, y_j, x_i) \circ x_iP$ such that $|P'| = |X| + 1$, a contradiction. Therefore, $(x_i, y_j) \in A(D)$. This completes the proof of Claim 1.

**Claim 2:** If $x_i \in X$, $y_j \in Y$ and $j < i$, then $(y_j, x_i) \in A(D)$.

We omit the proof of Claim 2, as it is analogous to that of Claim 1.

We claim that both $P_0 = (x_1, y_2, x_3, y_4, \ldots)$ and $P_1 = (y_1, x_2, y_3, x_4, \ldots)$ are paths in $D$. By Claim 1 we have that $(x_i, y_{i+1}) \in A(D)$ for $i = 1, 3, \ldots$, and by Claim 2 we have that $(y_j, x_{j+1}) \in A(D)$ for $j = 2, 4, \ldots$. Hence $P_1$ is a path in $D$. The proof is analogous for $P_1$. Clearly, $P = \{P_0, P_1\}$ is a path partition of $D$. Moreover, $|P_0| = |P_1| = \ell$ and $|P_k| = 2 \min\{\ell, k\} = 2k$. Since $|X| > k$, we have that $\min\{\ell, k\} = k \leq |X| - 1 = |Y| - 1$. Thus, $|P_k| = 2k \leq k + |Y| - 1$. On the other hand, by Lemma 2, $\alpha_k(D) \geq |Y| + \min\{|X|, k - 1\} = |Y| + k - 1$. Therefore, $\pi_k(D) \leq |P_k| = 2k \leq |Y| + k - 1 \leq \alpha_k(D)$.

3. Conclusion

We showed that Linial’s Conjecture holds for $k$-loose digraphs and for some subclasses of $k$-tight digraphs, namely those with $|X| = k$ and the thick spider digraphs. It is easy to see that for $k$-tight digraphs, $\alpha_k(D) = |Y| + k - 1$. Therefore, it is clear that any approach to prove Linial’s Conjecture for $k$-tight digraphs must involve finding a path partition with $k$-norm less than or equal to $|Y| + k - 1$. We are currently working on this idea.
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