

THE EQUITABLE COLORINGS OF KNESER GRAPHS

Bor-Liang Chen and Kuo-Ching Huang

Dedicated to Professor Ko-Wei Lih on the occasion of his 60th birthday.

Abstract. An m -coloring of a graph G is a mapping $f : V(G) \rightarrow \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ such that $f(x) \neq f(y)$ for any two adjacent vertices x and y in G . The chromatic number $\chi(G)$ of G is the minimum number m such that G is m -colorable. An equitable m -coloring of a graph G is an m -coloring f such that any two color classes differ in size by at most one. The equitable chromatic number $\chi_{\leq}(G)$ of G is the minimum number m such that G is equitably m -colorable. The equitable chromatic threshold $\chi_{\leq}^*(G)$ of G is the minimum number m such that G is equitably r -colorable for all $r \geq m$. It is clear that $\chi(G) \leq \chi_{\leq}(G) \leq \chi_{\leq}^*(G)$. For $n \geq 2k + 1$, the Kneser graph $\text{KG}(n, k)$ has the vertex set consisting of all k -subsets of an n -set. Two distinct vertices are adjacent in $\text{KG}(n, k)$ if they have empty intersection as subsets. The Kneser graph $\text{KG}(2k + 1, k)$ is called the Odd graph, denoted by O_k . In this paper, we study the equitable colorings of Kneser graphs $\text{KG}(n, k)$. Mainly, we obtain that $\chi_{\leq}(\text{KG}(n, k)) \leq \chi_{\leq}^*(\text{KG}(n, k)) \leq n - k + 1$ and $\chi(O_k) = \chi_{\leq}(O_k) = \chi_{\leq}^*(O_k) = 3$. We also show that $\chi_{\leq}(\text{KG}(n, k)) = \chi_{\leq}^*(\text{KG}(n, k))$ for $k = 2$ or 3 and obtain their exact values.

1. INTRODUCTION

An m -coloring of a graph G is a mapping $f : V(G) \rightarrow \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ such that $f(x) \neq f(y)$ for any two adjacent vertices x and y in G . A color class $f^{-1}(i)$ under f is a subset of $V(G)$ in which every vertex is assigned the same color i . A graph G is m -colorable if it admits an m -coloring. The chromatic number $\chi(G)$ of G is the minimum number m such that G is m -colorable. The well-known Brooks' Theorem is stated as following.

Received January 9, 2008, Accepted March 11, 2008.

Communicated by Hung-Lin Fu.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification*: 05C15.

Key words and phrases: Equitable coloring, Equitable chromatic number, equitable chromatic threshold, Kneser graph, Odd graph, Intersection family.

Theorem 1. ([2]). *Suppose G is a graph different from a complete graph and an odd cycle. Then $\chi(G) \leq \Delta(G)$.*

An equitable m -coloring of a graph G is an m -coloring such that any two color classes differ in size by at most one. A graph G is equitably m -colorable if it admits an equitable m -coloring. The equitable chromatic number $\chi_=(G)$ of G is the minimum number m such that G is equitably m -colorable. One can also consider the minimum number m such that G is equitably r -colorable for all $r \geq m$. Such a number m is called the equitable chromatic threshold of G , denoted by $\chi_*(G)$. It is clear that $\chi(G) \leq \chi_=(G) \leq \chi_*(G)$. Since $\chi(G) \leq \chi_=(G)$, Meyer then posed the following conjecture which, if true, is stronger than the Brooks' Theorem.

Conjecture 1. ([15]). *Suppose G is a connected graph different from a complete graph and an odd cycle. Then $\chi_=(G) \leq \Delta(G)$.*

One well-known result of Hajnal and Szemerédi, when rephrased in terms of the equitable colorability, has already been shown as follows.

Theorem 2. ([6, 9]). *A graph G , not necessary connected, is equitably m -colorable if $m \geq \Delta(G) + 1$.*

Theorem 2 says that $\chi_=(G) \leq \chi_*(G) \leq \Delta(G) + 1$ for all graphs G . Since the graphs G that require at least $\Delta(G) + 1$ colors to color the vertices equitably are complete graphs and odd cycles, Chen, Lih and Wu put forth the following.

Conjecture 2. ([4]). *Equitable Δ -Coloring Conjecture.*

A connected graph G is equitably $\Delta(G)$ -colorable if and only if G is different from the complete graph K_n , the odd cycle C_{2n+1} and the complete bipartite graph $K_{2n+1,2n+1}$ for all $n \geq 1$.

They also verified this conjecture for a graph with $\Delta(G) \geq |V(G)|/2$ or $\Delta(G) \leq 3$. Yap and Zhang [18] obtained a finer bound when $|V(G)|/2 > \Delta(G) \geq (|V(G)|/3) + 1$. Moreover, some particular cases have been studied, such as trees [1, 3], bipartite graphs [13], d -degenerate graphs [11, 12] and planar graphs [10, 16, 17]. However, Conjecture 1 and Conjecture 2 are still open in general.

For $n \geq 2k + 1$, the Kneser graph $\text{KG}(n, k)$ has the vertex set consisting of all k -subsets of an n -set. Two distinct vertices are adjacent in $\text{KG}(n, k)$ if they have empty intersection as subsets. The Odd graph O_k is the Kneser graph $\text{KG}(2k+1, k)$. The chromatic number of $\text{KG}(n, k)$ was obtained by Lovász.

Theorem 3. ([14]). $\chi(\text{KG}(n, k)) = n - 2k + 2$.

In this paper, we study the equitable colorings of $KG(n, k)$. Since $KG(n, 1) = K_n$, it is easy to see that $\chi(KG(n, 1)) = \chi_=(KG(n, 1)) = \chi_*(KG(n, 1)) = n$. Throughout this paper, we assume $k \geq 2$. For convenience, we introduce some notation. For integers $i < j$, let $[i, j]$ be the set of all integers $i, i + 1, \dots, j$ and $[n] = [1, n]$. If X is a set, then the collection of all k -subsets of X is denoted by $\binom{X}{k}$. Hence, the vertex set $V(KG(n, k))$ is denoted by $\binom{[n]}{k}$ and $|V(KG(n, k))| = C(n, k) = \binom{n}{k}$. An i -flower \mathcal{F} of $\binom{X}{k}$ is a subcollection of $\binom{X}{k}$ in which all k -subsets have a common element i , i.e., $i \in \bigcap_{A \in \mathcal{F}} A$. It is clear that every i -flower is an independent set of $KG(n, k)$. An independent set \mathcal{F} of $KG(n, k)$ is also called an intersection family of $\binom{[n]}{k}$, i.e., $A \cap B \neq \emptyset$ for all A and B in \mathcal{F} . The independence number $\alpha(KG(n, k))$ of $KG(n, k)$ was obtained by Erdős, Ko and Rado.

Theorem 4. ([5]). *Suppose \mathcal{F} is an intersection family of $\binom{[n]}{k}$. Then $|\mathcal{F}| \leq C(n-1, k-1)$. Moreover, the equality holds if and only if $\mathcal{F} = \{A \in \binom{[n]}{k} : i \in A\}$ for some $i \in [n]$.*

There are independent sets of $KG(n, k)$ which are not flowers. Denote by $\alpha_2(KG(n, k))$, or simply by $\alpha_2(n, k)$, the maximum size of independent sets \mathcal{H} of $KG(n, k)$ satisfying $\bigcap_{A \in \mathcal{H}} A = \emptyset$. The following result was obtained by Hilton and Milner.

Theorem 5. ([8]). *Suppose \mathcal{H} is an intersection family of $\binom{[n]}{k}$ with $\bigcap_{A \in \mathcal{H}} A = \emptyset$. Then $|\mathcal{H}| \leq C(n-1, k-1) - C(n-k-1, k-1) + 1$. Moreover, the equality holds if and only if $\mathcal{H} \cong \{A \in \binom{[n]}{3} : |A \cap [1, 3]| \geq 2\}$ or $\mathcal{H} \cong \{A \in \binom{[n]}{k} : 1 \in A, |A \cap [2, k+1]| \geq 1\} \cup \{[2, k+1]\}$.*

We also need the following to prove our main results.

Theorem 6. ([7]). *A bipartite graph $G = G(X, Y)$ with bipartition (X, Y) has a matching that saturates every vertex in X if and only if $|N(S)| \geq |S|$ for all $S \subseteq X$, where $N(S)$ denotes the set of neighbors of vertices in S .*

2. GENERAL BOUNDS

In this section, let $n \geq 2k + 1$. Since every flower of $\binom{[n]}{k}$ is an independent set of $KG(n, k)$, it is natural to partition flowers to form an equitable coloring of $KG(n, k)$. In this case, every k -subset of $[n]$ is in some flower. Hence, if f is an equitable m -coloring of $KG(n, k)$ such that every color class under f is

contained in some flower, then $m \geq n - k + 1$. Otherwise, suppose $m \leq n - k$ and each color class $f^{-1}(i)$ is contained in some t_i -flower for $1 \leq i \leq m$, respectively. Since $|[n] \setminus \{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_m\}| \geq n - m \geq k$, we may choose a k -subset $A \subseteq [n] \setminus \{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_m\}$. Since f is an equitable m -coloring, $A \in f^{-1}(i)$ for some i , i.e., $t_i \in A$. It is a contradiction. Hence, we have the following.

Lemma 7. *If f is an equitable m -coloring of $KG(n, k)$ such that every color class under f is contained in some flower of $\binom{[n]}{k}$, then $m \geq n - k + 1$.*

In what follows, we should show that $KG(n, k)$ is equitably m -colorable for all $m \geq n - k + 1$ by partitioning flowers of $\binom{[n]}{k}$ into m equitably independent sets. Precisely, letting $m = qn + r$, $0 \leq r < n$, we will partition $\binom{[n]}{k}$ into m subcollections $\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{V}_2, \dots, \mathcal{V}_m$ with $a_i = |\mathcal{V}_i| = \lceil (C(n, k) - i + 1)/m \rceil$, $1 \leq i \leq m$, such that \mathcal{V}_i is contained in a $\pi(i)$ -flower, where $\pi(i) = i \pmod n$ if $1 \leq i \leq qn$ and $\pi(i) = i + n - m$ if $qn + 1 \leq i \leq m$. The notation $i \pmod n$ denotes the residue of i modulo n taken in the set $[n]$. To do this, we construct a bipartite graph $G = G(X, Y)$ with bipartition (X, Y) , where X is the disjoint union of the sets $X_i = \{x_{i,j} : 1 \leq j \leq a_i\}$, $1 \leq i \leq m$, and $Y = \binom{[n]}{k}$. Two vertices $x_{i,j} \in X$ and $A \in Y$ are adjacent if and only if $\pi(i) \in A$. It is easy to see that $|X| = |Y| = \binom{[n]}{k}$. If G has a perfect matching $M = \{\{x_{i,j}, A_{i,j}\} : 1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq a_i\}$, letting $\mathcal{V}_i = \{A_{i,j} : 1 \leq j \leq a_i\}$, $1 \leq i \leq m$, then the partition $(\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{V}_2, \dots, \mathcal{V}_m)$ forms an equitable m -coloring of $KG(n, k)$. By Theorem 6, G has a perfect matching if $|N(S)| \geq |S|$ for all $S \subseteq X$. Hence, we need to show the inequality $|N(S)| \geq |S|$. Suppose $S \subseteq X$. Let $I(S) = \{\pi(j) : S \cap X_j \neq \emptyset\}$. Note that if $|I(S)| \geq n - k + 1$, then $N(S) = Y$ and $|N(S)| \geq |S|$. For $|I(S)| = i \leq n - k$, let $S_i = \bigcup_{\pi(j)=n-r+1}^{n-r+i} X_j$ if $i \leq r$ and $S_i = (\bigcup_{\pi(j)=n-r+1}^n X_j) \cup (\bigcup_{\pi(j)=1}^{i-r} X_j)$ if $i > r$. Then $|S| \leq |S_i|$. Moreover, the set $I(S_i) = \{\pi(j) : S_i \cap X_j \neq \emptyset\}$ has the same size as $I(S)$. It follows that $|N(S)| = |N(S_i)| = C(n, k) - C(n - i, k)$ and then $|N(S)| - |S| \geq |N(S_i)| - |S_i|$. The following lemmas are used to show the inequality $|N(S_i)| \geq |S_i|$ that implies $|N(S)| - |S| \geq 0$.

Lemma 8. *Suppose $m = qn + r$, where $q \geq 1$ and $0 < r < n$. Let S_i be defined as above. Then $|S_i| \leq \frac{2i}{n+i}C(n, k)$.*

Proof. For $1 \leq j \leq n$, let $W_j = \bigcup_{\pi(t)=j, t \leq qn} X_t$. Then $|W_{j+1}| \leq |W_j| \leq |W_{j+1}| + 1$, $|X_{qn+t}| \leq |W_{n-r+t}|$ and $|W_j| \leq |W_{n-r+t}| + |X_{qn+t}|$ for $1 \leq j \leq n$ and $1 \leq t \leq r$. If $i \leq r$, then $|S_i| = \sum_{j=1}^i (|W_{n-r+j}| + |X_{qn+j}|) \leq 2 \sum_{j=1}^i |W_{n-r+j}| \leq 2i|W_{n-r+1}|$,

or $\frac{|S_i|}{2i} \leq |W_{n-r+1}|$. On the other hand, $C(n, k) - |S_i| = \sum_{j=1}^{n-r} |W_j| + \sum_{j=i+1}^n (|W_{n-r+j}| + |X_{qn+j}|) \geq (n-i)|W_{n-r}|$, or $\frac{C(n, k) - |S_i|}{n-i} \geq |W_{n-r}|$. Hence, $\frac{|S_i|}{2i} \leq |W_{n-r+1}| \leq |W_{n-r}| \leq \frac{C(n, k) - |S_i|}{n-i}$. It follows that $\frac{|S_i|}{2i} \leq \frac{|S_i| + C(n, k) - |S_i|}{2i + n - i} = \frac{C(n, k)}{n + i}$.

If $i > r$, then $|S_i| = \sum_{j=1}^{i-r} |W_j| + \sum_{j=1}^r (|W_{n-r+j}| + |X_{qn+j}|) \leq (i-r)(|W_{n-r+1}| + |X_{qn+1}|) + r(|W_{n-r+1}| + |X_{qn+1}|) \leq 2i|W_{n-r+1}|$, or $\frac{|S_i|}{2i} \leq |W_{n-r+1}|$. On the other hand, $C(n, k) - |S_i| = \sum_{j=i-r+1}^{n-r} |W_j| \geq (n-i)|W_{n-r}|$, or $\frac{C(n, k) - |S_i|}{n-i} \geq |W_{n-r}|$. Hence, $\frac{|S_i|}{2i} \leq |W_{n-r+1}| \leq |W_{n-r}| \leq \frac{C(n, k) - |S_i|}{n-i}$. It follows that $\frac{|S_i|}{2i} \leq \frac{|S_i| + C(n, k) - |S_i|}{2i + n - i} = \frac{C(n, k)}{n + i}$.

Therefore, $|S_i| \leq \frac{2i}{n+i}C(n, k)$ as desired. ■

Lemma 9. *Suppose that $k \leq n - i$.*

- (1) $C(n, k - 1) \geq C(n - i, k - 1) + ik$ for $k \geq 3$.
- (2) $C(n, k) - C(n - i, k) \geq \frac{2i}{n+i}C(n, k)$ for $k \geq 2$.

Proof.

- (1) By direct computation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} C(n, k - 1) &= C(n - 1, k - 1) + C(n - 1, k - 2) \\ &= C(n - i, k - 1) + C(n - i, k - 2) + C(n - i + 1, k - 2) \\ &\quad + \dots + C(n - 1, k - 2) \\ &\geq C(n - i, k - 1) + iC(k, 1) \\ &= C(n - i, k - 1) + ik. \end{aligned}$$

- (2) By direct computation, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{C(n, k)}{C(n - i, k)} &= \frac{n(n - 1) \cdots (n - k + 1)}{(n - i)(n - i - 1) \cdots (n - i - k + 1)} \\
 &= \left(1 + \frac{i}{n - i}\right) \left(1 + \frac{i}{n - i - 1}\right) \cdots \left(1 + \frac{i}{n - i - k + 1}\right) \\
 &> \left(1 + \frac{i}{n - i}\right)^k \\
 &\geq \left(1 + \frac{i}{n - i}\right)^2 \\
 &> \left(1 + \frac{2i}{n - i}\right) \\
 &= \frac{n + i}{n - i}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $C(n, k) - C(n - i, k) \geq \frac{2i}{n + i}C(n, k)$ as desired. ■

Now, we are ready to show our main results.

Lemma 10. *Suppose that $n - k + 1 \leq m \leq n$. Then $KG(n, k)$ is equitably m -colorable.*

Proof. Let the bipartite graph $G = G(X, Y)$, S and S_i be defined as before. It suffices to show that $|N(S_i)| - |S_i| \geq 0$ for $i \leq n - k$. First, we consider $k = 2$. Then $m = n - 1$ or n and $i \leq n - 2$. If $i = n - 2$, then $|S_i| = |X| - |X_m|$ for $m = n - 1$ or $|S_i| = |X| - |X_{m-1}| - |X_m|$ for $m = n$. Hence, $|N(S_i)| - |S_i| \geq C(n, 2) - 1 - \left(C(n, 2) - \left\lfloor \frac{C(n, 2)}{n - 1} \right\rfloor\right) = \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor - 1 > 0$. If $i \leq n - 3$, then $|N(S_i)| - |S_i| \geq C(n, 2) - C(n - i, 2) - i \left\lfloor \frac{C(n, 2)}{m} \right\rfloor - i \geq C(n, 2) - C(n - i, 2) - i \left\lfloor \frac{C(n, 2)}{n - 1} \right\rfloor - i \geq \frac{i}{2}(n - i - 3) \geq 0$.

Suppose $k \geq 3$. Then, $|S_i| = \sum_{j=1}^i \left\lceil \frac{C(n, k) - j + 1}{m} \right\rceil \leq i \left(\frac{C(n, k)}{n - k + 1} + 1 \right)$.

By Lemma 9(1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 |N(S)| - |S| &\geq |N(S_i)| - |S_i| \\
 &\geq \frac{n - k + 1 - i}{k} (C(n, k - 1) - C(n - i, k - 1)) - i \\
 &\geq \frac{n - k + 1 - i}{k} ik - i \\
 &= (n - k - i)i \geq 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we complete the proof. ■

Lemma 11. *Suppose that $m > n$. Then $\text{KG}(n, k)$ is equitably m -colorable.*

Proof. First, consider $m = qn$, $q \geq 1$. By Lemma 10, $\binom{[n]}{k}$ can be partitioned equitably into n subcollections $\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{X}_2, \dots, \mathcal{X}_n$, where each \mathcal{X}_i is an i -flower. For each $i \geq 1$, we can partition \mathcal{X}_i into q equitable subcollections $\mathcal{X}_{i,1}, \mathcal{X}_{i,2}, \dots, \mathcal{X}_{i,q}$. Hence the collection $\{\mathcal{X}_{i,j} : 1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq q\}$ forms an equitable m -coloring of $\text{KG}(n, k)$.

Now, suppose m is not divisible by n . Let the bipartite graph $G = G(X, Y)$, S and S_i be defined as before. It suffices to show that $|N(S_i)| - |S_i| \geq 0$ for $i \leq n - k$. By Lemma 8 and Lemma 9(2), $|N(S_i)| - |S_i| \geq C(n, k) - C(n - i, k) - \frac{2i}{n + i}C(n, k) \geq 0$.

Therefore, we complete the proof. ■

Combining Lemma 10 and Lemma 11, the following is easy to see.

Theorem 12. *Suppose that $m \geq n - k + 1$. Then $\text{KG}(n, k)$ is equitably m -colorable, i.e., $\chi_{=}(\text{KG}(n, k)) \leq \chi_{=}^*(\text{KG}(n, k)) \leq n - k + 1$.*

Suppose $m \leq n - k$ and $\text{KG}(n, k)$ is equitably m -colorable. Let f be an equitable m -coloring of $\text{KG}(n, k)$. By Lemma 7, there is some color class $f^{-1}(i)$ which is contained in no flowers of $\binom{[n]}{k}$. Moreover, the particular $f^{-1}(i)$ must satisfy that $|f^{-1}(i)| \leq \alpha_2(n, k) = C(n - 1, k - 1) - C(n - k - 1, k - 1) + 1$. Using this fact, we have the following.

Lemma 13. *Suppose that $m \leq n - k$ and $\left\lfloor \frac{C(n, k)}{m} \right\rfloor > \alpha_2(n, k)$. Then $\text{KG}(n, k)$ is not equitably r -colorable for all $r \leq m$, i.e., $\chi_{=}^*(\text{KG}(n, k)) \geq \chi_{=}(\text{KG}(n, k)) \geq m + 1$.*

Proof. Suppose $\text{KG}(n, k)$ has an equitable r -coloring f for some $r \leq m$. Then there is some color class $f^{-1}(i)$ satisfying that $|f^{-1}(i)| \leq \alpha_2(n, k)$. Since f is an equitable r -coloring, $|f^{-1}(i)| \geq \left\lfloor \frac{C(n, k)}{m} \right\rfloor > \alpha_2(n, k)$ which is a contradiction. Hence, $\text{KG}(n, k)$ is not equitably r -colorable for all $r \leq m$ and then $\chi_{=}^*(\text{KG}(n, k)) \geq \chi_{=}(\text{KG}(n, k)) \geq m + 1$. ■

Theorem 14. *If $\left\lfloor \frac{C(n, k)}{n - k} \right\rfloor > \alpha_2(n, k)$. Then $\chi_{=}(\text{KG}(n, k)) = \chi_{=}^*(\text{KG}(n, k)) = n - k + 1$.*

Proof. It follows from Theorem 12 and Lemma 13. ■

3. CASES FOR $k = 2, 3$

By the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 10, the following is not difficult to see.

Lemma 15. *Suppose that $1 \leq t \leq m$. Then the collection $\binom{[m]}{t}$ can be partitioned equitably into m subcollections $\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2, \dots, \mathcal{F}_m$, such that each \mathcal{F}_i is an i -flower.*

By Lemma 13, Theorem 14 and Lemma 15, we can show that $\chi_{=}(\text{KG}(n, k)) = \chi_{=}^*(\text{KG}(n, k))$ for $k = 2$ or 3 and obtain their exact values.

Theorem 16. *For $n \geq 5$,*

$$\chi_{=}(\text{KG}(n, 2)) = \chi_{=}^*(\text{KG}(n, 2)) = \begin{cases} n - 1 & \text{if } n \geq 7, \\ n - 2 & \text{if } n = 5 \text{ or } 6. \end{cases}$$

Proof. By Theorem 3 and Theorem 12,

$$n - 2 = \chi(\text{KG}(n, 2)) \leq \chi_{=}(\text{KG}(n, 2)) \leq \chi_{=}^*(\text{KG}(n, 2)) \leq n - 1.$$

By direct computation, $\left\lfloor \frac{C(n, 2)}{n - 2} \right\rfloor > \alpha_2(n, 2) = 3$ if and only if $n \geq 7$. Hence, by Theorem 14, $\chi_{=}(\text{KG}(n, 2)) = \chi_{=}^*(\text{KG}(n, 2)) = n - 1$ if $n \geq 7$.

For convenience, we use ij to denote the 2-subset $\{i, j\}$. It is easy to see that the partition $(\{12, 13, 14, 15\}, \{23, 24, 25\}, \{34, 35, 45\})$ forms an equitable 3-coloring of $\text{KG}(5, 2)$ and the partition $(\{12, 14, 15, 16\}, \{23, 24, 25, 26\}, \{13, 34, 35, 36\}, \{45, 46, 56\})$ forms an equitable 4-coloring of $\text{KG}(6, 2)$. Hence, $\chi(\text{KG}(n, 2)) = \chi_{=}(\text{KG}(n, 2)) = \chi_{=}^*(\text{KG}(n, 2)) = n - 2$ if $5 \leq n \leq 6$. ■

Lemma 17. *For $7 \leq n \leq 15$, $\chi_{=}(\text{KG}(n, 3)) \leq \chi_{=}^*(\text{KG}(n, 3)) \leq n - 3$. Moreover, $\chi_{=}(\text{KG}(n, 3)) = \chi_{=}^*(\text{KG}(n, 3)) = n - 3$ if $14 \leq n \leq 15$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{H} = \{A \in \binom{[n]}{3} : |A \cap \{n-2, n-1, n\}| \geq 2\}$. Then $\binom{[n-3, n]}{3} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ and $|\mathcal{H}| = 3n - 8 \geq \left\lfloor \frac{C(n, 3)}{n - 3} \right\rfloor \geq 4$ for $n \leq 15$. Note that if $A \notin \mathcal{H}$, then

A is in some i -flower, $1 \leq i \leq n - 4$. Let $\mathcal{F} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n-4} (\{A \in \binom{[n]}{3} : i \in A\} \setminus \mathcal{H})$

and $\mathcal{G}_t = \{\{i, j, t\} : 1 \leq i < j \leq n - 4\}$ for $n - 3 \leq t \leq n$. Then $\mathcal{F} = \binom{[n-4]}{3} \cup (\bigcup_{t=n-3}^n \mathcal{G}_t)$. By Lemma 15, $\binom{[n-4]}{3}$ can be partitioned equitably into $n - 4$ subcollections $\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{X}_2, \dots, \mathcal{X}_{n-4}$ such that each \mathcal{X}_i is an i -flower. Since $\{A \setminus \{t\} : A \in \mathcal{G}_t\} = \binom{[n-4]}{2}$ for $n - 3 \leq t \leq n$, by Lemma 15, \mathcal{G}_t can be partitioned equitably into $n - 4$ subcollections $\mathcal{X}_{1,t}, \mathcal{X}_{2,t}, \dots, \mathcal{X}_{n-4,t}$ such that each $\mathcal{X}_{i,t}$ is an i -flower. By adjusting the sizes of \mathcal{X}_i and $\mathcal{X}_{i,t}$, \mathcal{F} can be partitioned equitably into $n - 4$ subcollections $\mathcal{V}_i = \mathcal{X}_i \cup (\bigcup_{t=n-3}^n \mathcal{X}_{i,t})$, $1 \leq i \leq n - 4$ such that each \mathcal{V}_i is an i -flower.

It is easy to see that the set $\{i, s, t\} \in \mathcal{H}$ for $1 \leq i \leq n - 4$ and $n - 2 \leq s < t \leq n$. For each pair (s, t) , remove the sets $\{i, s, t\}$ from \mathcal{H} and add them one by one into \mathcal{V}_i to obtain new \mathcal{V}'_i , respectively, and preserve the equality of sizes of \mathcal{V}'_i 's. Continuing this process, \mathcal{H} can be reduced to \mathcal{H}' such that $|\mathcal{H}'| = \lfloor \frac{C(n, 3)}{n - 3} \rfloor$. In this case, the \mathcal{V}'_i 's satisfy $||\mathcal{V}'_i| - |\mathcal{V}'_j|| \leq 1$. Hence, the partition $(\mathcal{V}'_1, \mathcal{V}'_2, \dots, \mathcal{V}'_{n-4}, \mathcal{H}')$ forms an equitable $(n - 3)$ -coloring of $\text{KG}(n, 3)$. Therefore, $\chi_-(\text{KG}(n, 3)) \leq \chi^*_-(\text{KG}(n, 3)) \leq n - 3$ for $7 \leq n \leq 15$.

Moreover, since $\lfloor \frac{C(n, 3)}{n - 4} \rfloor > \alpha_2(n, 3) = 3n - 8$ if and only if $n \geq 14$, by Lemma 13, $\chi^*_-(\text{KG}(n, 3)) \geq \chi_-(\text{KG}(n, 3)) \geq n - 3$ if $n \geq 14$. Therefore, $\chi_-(\text{KG}(n, 3)) = \chi^*_-(\text{KG}(n, 3)) = n - 3$ for $14 \leq n \leq 15$. ■

Lemma 18. For $7 \leq n \leq 13$, $\chi(\text{KG}(n, 3)) = \chi_-(\text{KG}(n, 3)) = \chi^*_-(\text{KG}(n, 3)) = n - 4$.

Proof. By Theorem 3 and Lemma 17,

$$n - 4 = \chi(\text{KG}(n, 3)) \leq \chi_-(\text{KG}(n, 3)) \leq \chi^*_-(\text{KG}(n, 3)) \leq n - 3.$$

It suffices to show that $\text{KG}(n, 3)$ is equitably $(n - 4)$ -colorable for $7 \leq n \leq 13$.

Let $\mathcal{H}_1 = \{A \in \binom{[n]}{3} : |A \cap \{n - 2, n - 1, n\}| \geq 2\}$ and $\mathcal{H}_2 = \{A \in \binom{[n]}{3} : |A \cap \{n - 5, n - 4, n - 3\}| \geq 2\}$. Then $|\mathcal{H}_1| = |\mathcal{H}_2| = 3n - 8 \geq \lfloor \frac{C(n, 3)}{n - 4} \rfloor \geq \frac{1}{2} \left| \binom{[n-5, n]}{3} \right| = \frac{C(6, 3)}{2} = 10$ for $7 \leq n \leq 13$. By the same argument as in Lemma 17, \mathcal{H}_1 and \mathcal{H}_2 can be reduced to \mathcal{H}'_1 and \mathcal{H}'_2 such that $|\mathcal{H}'_1| = \lfloor \frac{C(n, 3) - (n - 5) + 1}{n - 4} \rfloor$ and $|\mathcal{H}'_2| = \lfloor \frac{C(n, 3) - (n - 4) + 1}{n - 4} \rfloor$. Moreover, $\binom{[n]}{3} \setminus (\mathcal{H}'_1 \cup \mathcal{H}'_2)$ can be partitioned equitably into $n - 6$ subcollections $\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{V}_2, \dots, \mathcal{V}_{n-6}$ such that each \mathcal{V}_i is an i -flower and $|\mathcal{V}_i| = \lfloor \frac{C(n, 3) - i + 1}{n - 4} \rfloor$. Hence, $\text{KG}(n, 3)$ is

equitably $(n-4)$ -colorable. Therefore, $\chi(\text{KG}(n, 3)) = \chi_=(\text{KG}(n, 3)) = \chi_*(\text{KG}(n, 3)) = n-4$ for $7 \leq n \leq 13$. ■

Theorem 19. For $n \geq 7$,

$$\chi_=(\text{KG}(n, 3)) = \chi_*(\text{KG}(n, 3)) = \begin{cases} n-2 & \text{if } n \geq 16, \\ n-3 & \text{if } 14 \leq n \leq 15, \\ n-4 & \text{if } 7 \leq n \leq 13. \end{cases}$$

Proof. By Theorem 3 and Theorem 12,

$$n-4 = \chi(\text{KG}(n, 3)) \leq \chi_=(\text{KG}(n, 3)) \leq \chi_*(\text{KG}(n, 3)) \leq n-2.$$

Since $\left\lfloor \frac{C(n, 3)}{n-3} \right\rfloor > \alpha_2(n, 3) = 3n-8$ if and only if $n \geq 16$, by Theorem 14, $\chi_=(\text{KG}(n, 2)) = \chi_*(\text{KG}(n, 2)) = n-2$ if $n \geq 16$. The remaining two cases follow from Lemma 17 and Lemma 18. ■

4. THE ODD GRAPHS

Since $O_1 = K_3$, we have $\chi(O_1) = \chi_=(O_1) = \chi_*(O_1) = 3$. By Theorem 16 and Theorem 19, $\chi(O_k) = \chi_=(O_k) = \chi_*(O_k) = 3$ for $k = 2$ or 3 . Suppose $k \geq 4$.

Lemma 20. O_k is equitably 3-colorable.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{F}_1 = \{A : 1 \in A, 2 \notin A\}$, $\mathcal{F}_2 = \{A : 1 \notin A, 2 \in A\}$, $\mathcal{F}_{12} = \{A : 1 \in A, 2 \in A\}$ and $\mathcal{F}_3 = \{A : 1 \notin A, 2 \notin A\}$. Then $(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2, \mathcal{F}_{12}, \mathcal{F}_3)$ forms a partition (or 4-coloring) of O_k , $|\mathcal{F}_1| = |\mathcal{F}_2| = C(2k-1, k-1) = C(2k-1, k) = |\mathcal{F}_3|$, $|\mathcal{F}_{12}| = C(2k-1, k-2)$ and $C(2k+1, k) = 3C(2k-1, k-1) + C(2k-1, k-2)$. Let $a_i = \left\lfloor \frac{C(n, k) + i - 1}{3} \right\rfloor$, $i = 1, 2, 3$ and $t = \frac{1}{3}C(2k+1, k) - C(2k-1, k-1) = \frac{1}{3}C(2k-1, k-2)$. Consider the two collections $\mathcal{H}_1 = \{A \in \mathcal{F}_3 : 3 \in A, 4 \in A\}$ and $\mathcal{H}_2 = \{A \in \mathcal{F}_{12} : |A \cap [3, 4]| = 1\}$. By direct computation, $\frac{|\mathcal{H}_1|}{t} = \frac{3(k+1)k}{(2k-1)(2k-2)} > 1$ for $k \leq 8$ and $\frac{|\mathcal{H}_2|}{t} = \frac{3(k-2)(k+1)}{(2k-1)(k-1)} > 1$ for $k \geq 4$. For $4 \leq k \leq 8$, choose $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{H}_1$ with $|\mathcal{S}| = \lfloor t \rfloor = a_1 - C(2k-1, k-1)$ and $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{H}_2$ with $|\mathcal{T}| = a_2 - C(2k-1, k-1)$. Let $\mathcal{S}_1 = \{A \in \mathcal{F}_1 : [3, 2k+1] \setminus A \in \mathcal{S}\}$ and $\mathcal{S}_2 = \{A \in \mathcal{F}_2 : [3, 2k+1] \setminus A \in \mathcal{S}\}$. Then $|\mathcal{S}| = |\mathcal{S}_1| = |\mathcal{S}_2|$. Moreover, if $A \in \mathcal{F}_i$ where $i = 1, 2$, then $A \cap B \neq \emptyset$ for all $B \in \mathcal{F}_3$ except $B = [3, 2k+1] \setminus A$. Hence, $(\mathcal{F}_3 \setminus \mathcal{S}) \cup \mathcal{S}_1 \cup \mathcal{S}_2$, $(\mathcal{F}_2 \setminus \mathcal{S}_2) \cup \mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{T}$ and $(\mathcal{F}_1 \setminus \mathcal{S}_1) \cup (\mathcal{F}_{12} \setminus \mathcal{T})$ are

independent sets of sizes a_1, a_2 and a_3 , respectively. Thus, the partition $((\mathcal{F}_1 \setminus \mathcal{S}_1) \cup (\mathcal{F}_{12} \setminus \mathcal{T}), (\mathcal{F}_2 \setminus \mathcal{S}_2) \cup \mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{T}, (\mathcal{F}_3 \setminus \mathcal{S}) \cup \mathcal{S}_1 \cup \mathcal{S}_2)$ forms an equitable 3-coloring of O_k . Hence, O_k is equitably 3-colorable for $4 \leq k \leq 8$.

Now, suppose $k \geq 9$. Consider the two collections $\mathcal{H}_3 = \{A \in \mathcal{F}_3 : |A \cap [3, 5]| = 2\}$ and $\mathcal{H}_4 = \{A \in \mathcal{F}_{12} : |A \cap [3, 5]| \geq 2\}$. By direct computation, $\frac{|\mathcal{H}_3|}{t} = \frac{9(k+1)k}{2(2k-1)(2k-3)} > 1$ and $\frac{|\mathcal{H}_4|}{t} = \frac{12k^3 - 63k^2 + 87k - 18}{8k^3 - 24k^2 + 22k - 6} > 1$. Choose $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{H}_3$ with $|\mathcal{P}| = \lfloor t \rfloor = a_1 - C(2k-1, k-1)$ and $\mathcal{Q} \subseteq \mathcal{H}_4$ with $|\mathcal{Q}| = a_2 - C(2k-1, k-1)$. Let $\mathcal{P}_1 = \{A \in \mathcal{F}_1 : [3, 2k+1] \setminus A \in \mathcal{P}\}$ and $\mathcal{P}_2 = \{A \in \mathcal{F}_2 : [3, 2k+1] \setminus A \in \mathcal{P}\}$. Then $|\mathcal{P}| = |\mathcal{P}_1| = |\mathcal{P}_2|$. By the same argument as above, $(\mathcal{F}_3 \setminus \mathcal{P}) \cup \mathcal{P}_1 \cup \mathcal{P}_2, (\mathcal{F}_2 \setminus \mathcal{P}_2) \cup \mathcal{P} \cup \mathcal{Q}$ and $(\mathcal{F}_1 \setminus \mathcal{P}_1) \cup (\mathcal{F}_{12} \setminus \mathcal{Q})$ are independent sets of sizes a_1, a_2 and a_3 , respectively. Thus, the partition $((\mathcal{F}_1 \setminus \mathcal{P}_1) \cup (\mathcal{F}_{12} \setminus \mathcal{Q}), (\mathcal{F}_2 \setminus \mathcal{P}_2) \cup \mathcal{P} \cup \mathcal{Q}, (\mathcal{F}_3 \setminus \mathcal{P}) \cup \mathcal{P}_1 \cup \mathcal{P}_2)$ forms an equitable 3-coloring of O_k . Hence, O_k is equitably 3-colorable for $k \geq 9$. Therefore, we complete the proof. ■

Let $\mathcal{U} = \binom{[2k+1]}{k}$ and $\mathcal{X} = \binom{[4, 2k+1]}{k}$. For $1 \leq i \leq 3$, let $\mathcal{F}_i = \{A \in \mathcal{U} : i \in A\}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{i0} = \{A \in \mathcal{U} : |A \cap \{1, 2, 3\}| = i\}$. For $1 \leq i < j \leq 3$, let $\mathcal{F}_{ij} = \{A \in \mathcal{U} : A \cap \{1, 2, 3\} = \{i, j\}\}$. Let $\mathcal{F}_{123} = \{A \in \mathcal{U} : \{1, 2, 3\} \subseteq A\}$. Then $\mathcal{U} = (\bigcup_{i=1}^3 \mathcal{F}_{i0}) \cup (\bigcup_{1 \leq i < j \leq 3} \mathcal{F}_{ij}) \cup \mathcal{F}_{123} \cup \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}_i = \mathcal{F}_{i0} \cup \mathcal{F}_{is} \cup \mathcal{F}_{it} \cup \mathcal{F}_{123}, \{i, s, t\} = \{1, 2, 3\}, |\mathcal{X}| = C(2k-2, k), |\mathcal{F}_{i0}| = C(2k-2, k-1), |\mathcal{F}_{ij}| = C(2k-2, k-2)$ and $|\mathcal{F}_{123}| = C(2k-2, k-3)$. It is not difficult to see that $\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{F}_{i0}$ is an independent set. If A and B both are in \mathcal{F}_{i0} , then $|A \cap B| \geq 2$ except $(A \setminus \{i\}) \cup (B \setminus \{j\}) = [4, 2k+1]$. Hence, each \mathcal{F}_{i0} can be partitioned into \mathcal{S}_i and \mathcal{T}_i such that if $A \in \mathcal{S}_i$, then $([4, 2k+1] \setminus A) \cup \{i\} \in \mathcal{T}_i$. Moreover, we may assume that $\{A \setminus \{i\} : A \in \mathcal{S}_i\} = \{A \setminus \{j\} : A \in \mathcal{S}_j\}$ for $1 \leq i < j \leq 3$. Hence, $|\mathcal{S}_i| = |\mathcal{S}_j| = |\mathcal{T}_i| = |\mathcal{T}_j| = \frac{|\mathcal{F}_{i0}|}{2}$ and $\mathcal{S}_1 \cup \mathcal{S}_2 \cup \mathcal{S}_3 \cup \mathcal{X}$ is an independent set. By direct computation, we have the following.

$$(I1) \quad |\mathcal{X}| < \frac{|\mathcal{U}|}{m} < |\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{S}_i \cup \mathcal{S}_j| \text{ if } 4 \leq m \leq 7.$$

$$(I2) \quad \frac{1}{6}|\mathcal{U}| < |\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{S}_i| < \frac{2}{6}|\mathcal{U}| \leq |\mathcal{F}_i \setminus \mathcal{F}_{123}| \leq \frac{2}{5}|\mathcal{U}| \leq |\mathcal{F}_i|.$$

The inequalities (I1) and (I2) will be used to guarantee that there are $\mathcal{P}_i \subseteq \mathcal{S}_i$ (\mathcal{P}_i may be empty) for $1 \leq i \leq 3$ such that $|\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{P}_1 \cup \mathcal{P}_2 \cup \mathcal{P}_3| = \lfloor \frac{|\mathcal{U}|}{m} \rfloor$ for

$4 \leq m \leq 7$. Then we can partition $\bigcup_{i=1}^3 (\mathcal{F}_i \setminus \mathcal{P}_i)$ equitably into $m-1$ subcollections so that O_k is equitably m -colorable.

Theorem 21. $\chi(O_k) = \chi_=(O_k) = \chi_*(O_k) = 3$ for $k \geq 1$.

Proof. If $k = 1, 2$ or 3 , then we are done. Suppose $k \geq 4$. By Lemma 20, O_k is equitably 3-colorable. It suffices to show that O_k is equitably m -colorable for all $m \geq 4$.

For $m = 4$, by (I1), we may choose $\mathcal{P}_i \subseteq \mathcal{S}_i, 1 \leq i \leq 3$, such that $||\mathcal{P}_1| - |\mathcal{P}_2|| \leq 1$ and $|\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{P}_1 \cup \mathcal{P}_2 \cup \mathcal{P}_3| = \lfloor \frac{|\mathcal{U}|}{4} \rfloor$. Partition \mathcal{F}_{123} into three subcollections $\mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R}_2$ and \mathcal{R}_3 such that $||\mathcal{R}_i| - |\mathcal{R}_j|| \leq 1$ and $|(\mathcal{F}_{i0} \setminus \mathcal{S}_i) \cup \mathcal{F}_{i,i+1} \cup \mathcal{R}_i| = \lfloor \frac{|\mathcal{U}| - i + 1}{4} \rfloor$ for $1 \leq i \leq 3$. Note that $\mathcal{F}_{34} = \mathcal{F}_{13}$. Hence, O_k is equitably 4-colorable.

For $m = 5$, by (I1), we may choose $\mathcal{P}_i \subseteq \mathcal{S}_i, 2 \leq i \leq 3$, such that $||\mathcal{P}_2| - |\mathcal{P}_3|| \leq 1$ and $|\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{P}_2 \cup \mathcal{P}_3| = \lfloor \frac{|\mathcal{U}|}{5} \rfloor$. By (I2), we may choose $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{123}$ such that $(\mathcal{F}_1 \setminus \mathcal{F}_{123}) \cup \mathcal{R} = \mathcal{V}_1 \cup \mathcal{V}_2$ with $|\mathcal{V}_1| = \lfloor \frac{|\mathcal{U}| + 4}{5} \rfloor$ and $|\mathcal{V}_2| = \lfloor \frac{|\mathcal{U}| + 3}{5} \rfloor$. It can be done since $(\mathcal{F}_1 \setminus \mathcal{F}_{123}) \cup \mathcal{R}$ is a 1-flower. Partition $(\mathcal{F}_{123} \setminus \mathcal{R}) \cup \mathcal{F}_{23}$ into two subcollections \mathcal{R}_2 and \mathcal{R}_3 such that $||\mathcal{R}_2| - |\mathcal{R}_3|| \leq 1$ and $|(\mathcal{F}_{i0} \setminus \mathcal{P}_i) \cup \mathcal{R}_i| = \lfloor \frac{|\mathcal{U}| + i - 1}{5} \rfloor$ for $2 \leq i \leq 3$. Hence, O_k is equitably 5-colorable.

For $m = 6$, by (I2), we may choose $\mathcal{P}_3 \subseteq \mathcal{S}_3$ such that $|\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{P}_3| = \lfloor \frac{|\mathcal{U}|}{6} \rfloor$ and choose $\mathcal{Q}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{13}$ and $\mathcal{Q}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{23}$ such that $||\mathcal{Q}_1| - |\mathcal{Q}_2|| \leq 1$ and $|\mathcal{F}_3 \setminus (\mathcal{P}_3 \cup \mathcal{Q}_1 \cup \mathcal{Q}_2 \cup \mathcal{F}_{123})| = \lfloor \frac{|\mathcal{U}| + 1}{6} \rfloor$. Partition $\mathcal{F}_{12} \cup \mathcal{F}_{123}$ into two subcollections \mathcal{R}_1 and \mathcal{R}_2 such that $||\mathcal{R}_1| - |\mathcal{R}_2|| \leq 1$ and $||\mathcal{F}_{10} \cup \mathcal{Q}_1 \cup \mathcal{R}_1| - |\mathcal{F}_{20} \cup \mathcal{Q}_2 \cup \mathcal{R}_2|| \leq 1$. Since $\mathcal{F}_{i0} \cup \mathcal{Q}_i \cup \mathcal{R}_i$ is an i -flower, it can be partitioned into $\mathcal{V}_{i,1}$ and $\mathcal{V}_{i,2}$ such that $|\mathcal{V}_{i,j}| = \lfloor \frac{|\mathcal{U}| + 8 - 2i - j}{6} \rfloor$ for $1 \leq i \leq 2$ and $1 \leq j \leq 2$. Hence, O_k is equitably 6-colorable.

For $m = 7$, by (I1), we may choose $\mathcal{P}_i \subseteq \mathcal{S}_i, 1 \leq i \leq 3$, such that $||\mathcal{P}_i| - |\mathcal{P}_j|| \leq 1$ and $|\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{P}_1 \cup \mathcal{P}_2 \cup \mathcal{P}_3| = \lfloor \frac{|\mathcal{U}|}{7} \rfloor$. Partition \mathcal{F}_{123} into three subcollections $\mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R}_2$ and \mathcal{R}_3 such that $||\mathcal{R}_i| - |\mathcal{R}_j|| \leq 1$ and $||(\mathcal{F}_{i0} \setminus \mathcal{P}_i) \cup \mathcal{F}_{i,i+1} \cup \mathcal{R}_i| - |(\mathcal{F}_{j0} \setminus \mathcal{P}_j) \cup \mathcal{F}_{j,j+1} \cup \mathcal{R}_j|| \leq 1$. Note that $\mathcal{F}_{34} = \mathcal{F}_{13}$. Since each $(\mathcal{F}_{i0} \setminus \mathcal{P}_i) \cup \mathcal{F}_{i,i+1} \cup \mathcal{R}_i$ is an i -flower, it can be partitioned into $\mathcal{V}_{i,1}$ and $\mathcal{V}_{i,2}$ such that $|\mathcal{V}_{i,j}| = \lfloor \frac{|\mathcal{U}| + 9 - 2i - j}{7} \rfloor$ for $1 \leq i \leq 3$ and $1 \leq j \leq 2$. Hence, O_k is equitably 7-colorable.

From the foregoing argument, there are $\mathcal{P}_i \subseteq \mathcal{F}_i$ such that $|\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{P}_1 \cup \mathcal{P}_2 \cup \mathcal{P}_3| = \lfloor \frac{|\mathcal{U}|}{m} \rfloor$ and $\mathcal{F}_i \setminus \mathcal{P}_i = \mathcal{V}_{i,1} \cup \mathcal{V}_{i,2}$ ($\mathcal{V}_{i,2}$ may be empty) with $|\mathcal{V}_{i,j}| = \lfloor \frac{|\mathcal{U}|}{m} \rfloor$ or $\lfloor \frac{|\mathcal{U}|}{m} \rfloor$

for $4 \leq m \leq 7$. Now, for $t \geq 1$, we can partition $\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{P}_1 \cup \mathcal{P}_2 \cup \mathcal{P}_3$ into $t + 1$ subcollections, partition $\mathcal{F}_i \setminus \mathcal{P}_i$ into $t + 1$ or $t + 2$ (if $\mathcal{V}_{i,2}$ is not empty) subcollections such that all of the subcollections are of size $\lfloor \frac{|\mathcal{U}|}{m + 4t} \rfloor$ or $\lceil \frac{|\mathcal{U}|}{m + 4t} \rceil$. Hence, O_k is equitably $(m + 4t)$ -colorable. Therefore, we complete the proof. ■

5. A CONJECTURE

In this paper, we have shown that $\chi_{=}(\text{KG}(n, k)) \leq \chi_{=}^*(\text{KG}(n, k)) \leq n - k + 1$ and $\chi(O_k) = \chi_{=} (O_k) = \chi_{=}^* (O_k) = 3$. We have also shown that $\chi_{=}(\text{KG}(n, k)) = \chi_{=}^*(\text{KG}(n, k))$ for $k = 2$ or 3 and obtained their exact values. We conclude this paper by posing the following conjecture.

Conjecture 3. $\chi_{=}(\text{KG}(n, k)) = \chi_{=}^*(\text{KG}(n, k))$ for $k \geq 2$.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors would like to thank Professor Ko-Wei Lih for his helpful comments to improve this paper. The authors also would like to thank referee for her/his many constructive suggestions.

REFERENCES

1. B. Bollobás and R. K. Guy, Equitable and proportional coloring of trees, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, **34** (1983), 177-186.
2. R. L. Brooks, On colouring the nodes of a network, *Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc.*, **37** (1941), 194-197.
3. B. L. Chen and K. W. Lih, Equitable coloring of trees, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, **61** (1994), 83-87.
4. B. L. Chen, K. W. Lih and P. L. Wu, Equitable coloring and the maximum degree, *European J. Combin.*, **15** (1994), 443-447.
5. P. Erdős, C. Ko and R. Rado, Intersection theorems for systems of the finite sets, *Quart. J. Math. Oxford (2)*, **12** (1961), 313-320.
6. A. Hajnal and E. Szemerédi, Proof of a conjecture of P. Erdős, in: *Combinatorial Theory and Its Applications*, (P. Erdős, A. Rényi, V. Sós, Eds), 601-623, North-Holland, London, 1970.
7. P. Hall, On representation of subsets, *J. London Math. Soc.*, **10** (1935), 26-30.
8. A. J. W. Hilton and E. C. Milner, Some intersection theorems for systems of finite sets, *Quart. J. Math. Oxford (2)*, **18** (1967), 369-384.

9. H. A. Kierstead and A. V. Kostochka, *A short proof of the Hajnal-Szemerédi theorem on equitable coloring*, to appear in *Combin. Probab. Comput.*
10. A. V. Kostochka, Equitable colorings of the outerplanar graphs, *Discrete Math.*, **258** (2002), 373-377.
11. A. V. Kostochka and K. Nakprasit, Equitable colourings of d -degenerate graphs, *Combin. Probab. Comput.*, **12** (2003), 53-60.
12. A. V. Kostochka, K. Nakprasit and S. V. Pemmaraju, On equitable coloring of d -degenerate graphs, *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, **19** (2005), 83-95.
13. K. W. Lih and P. L. Wu, On equitable coloring of bipartite graphs, *Discrete Math.*, **151** (1996), 155-160.
14. L. Lovász, Kneser's conjecture, chromatic number, and homotopy, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, **25** (1978), 319-324.
15. W. Meyer, Equitable coloring, *Amer. Math. Monthly*, **80** (1973), 920-922.
16. H. P. Yap and Y. Zhang, The equitable Δ -coloring holds for outplanar graphs, *Bull. Inst. Math. Acad. Sin.*, **5** (1997), 143-149.
17. H. P. Yap and Y. Zhang, Equitable colorings of planar graphs, *J. Combin. Math. Combin. Comput.*, **27** (1998), 97-105.
18. H. P. Yap and Y. Zhang, *On the equitable coloring of graphs*, manuscript, 1996.

Bor-Liang Chen
Department of Business Administration,
National Taichung Institute of Technology,
Taichung 40401,
Taiwan

Kuo-Ching Huang*
Department of Applied Mathematics,
Providence University,
Shalu 43301,
Taiwan