



HAL
open science

Digraph redicolouring

Nicolas Bousquet, Frédéric Havet, Nicolas Nisse, Lucas Picasarri-Arrieta,
Amadeus Reinald

► **To cite this version:**

Nicolas Bousquet, Frédéric Havet, Nicolas Nisse, Lucas Picasarri-Arrieta, Amadeus Reinald. Digraph redicolouring. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 2024, 116, pp.103876. 10.1016/j.ejc.2023.103876 . hal-04306893

HAL Id: hal-04306893

<https://hal.science/hal-04306893v1>

Submitted on 25 Nov 2023

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.

Digraph redicolouring ^{*}

N. Bousquet¹, F. Havet², N. Nisse², L. Picasarri-Arrieta², A. Reinald^{2,3}

¹ LIRIS, CNRS, Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1, Lyon, France
nicolas.bousquet@univ-lyon1.fr

² CNRS, Université Côte d’Azur, I3S, Inria, Sophia-Antipolis, France
{frederic.havet,nicolas.nisse,lucas.picasarri-arrieta}@inria.fr

³ LIRMM, CNRS, Université de Montpellier, Montpellier, France
amadeus.reinald@lirmm.fr

Abstract

In this work, we generalize several results on graph recolouring to digraphs.

Given two k -dicolourings of a digraph D , we prove that it is PSPACE-complete to decide whether we can transform one into the other by recolouring one vertex at each step while maintaining a dicolouring at any step even for $k = 2$ and for digraphs with maximum degree 5 or oriented planar graphs with maximum degree 6.

A digraph is said to be k -mixing if there exists a transformation between any pair of k -dicolourings. We show that every digraph D is k -mixing for all $k \geq \delta_{\min}^*(D) + 2$, generalizing a result due to Dyer et al. We also prove that every oriented graph \vec{G} is k -mixing for all $k \geq \delta_{\max}^*(\vec{G}) + 1$ and for all $k \geq \delta_{\text{avg}}^*(\vec{G}) + 1$. Here δ_{\min}^* , δ_{\max}^* , and δ_{avg}^* denote the min-degeneracy, the max-degeneracy, and the average-degeneracy respectively.

We pose as a conjecture that, for every digraph D , the dicolouring graph of D on $k \geq \delta_{\min}^*(D) + 2$ colours has diameter at most $O(|V(D)|^2)$. This is the analogue of Cereceda’s conjecture for digraphs. We generalize to digraphs two results supporting Cereceda’s conjecture. We first prove that the dicolouring graph of any digraph D on $k \geq 2\delta_{\min}^*(D) + 2$ colours has linear diameter, extending a result from Bousquet and Perarnau. We also prove that the analogue of Cereceda’s conjecture is true when $k \geq \frac{3}{2}(\delta_{\min}^*(D) + 1)$, which generalizes a result from Bousquet and Heinrich.

Restricted to the special case of oriented graphs, we prove that the dicolouring graph of any subcubic oriented graph on $k \geq 2$ colours is connected and has diameter at most $2n$. We conjecture that every non 2-mixing oriented graph has maximum average degree at least 4, and we provide some support for this conjecture by proving it on the special case of 2-freezable oriented graphs. More generally, we show that every k -freezable oriented graph on n vertices must contain at least $kn + k(k - 2)$ arcs, and we give a family of k -freezable oriented graphs that reach this bound. In the general case, we prove as a partial result that every non 2-mixing oriented graph has maximum average degree at least $\frac{7}{2}$.

Keywords: Digraphs, oriented graphs, graphs recolouring, reconfiguration, dicolouring

1 Introduction

1.1 Graph recolouring

We denote by $[k]$ the set $\{1, \dots, k\}$. Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, a k -colouring of G is a function $c : V \rightarrow [k]$ such that $c(x) \neq c(y)$ for every edge $xy \in E$. The *chromatic number* $\chi(G)$ is the smallest k such that G admits a k -colouring. For any $k \geq \chi(G)$, the k -colouring graph of G , denoted by $\mathcal{C}_k(G)$, is the graph whose vertices are the k -colourings of G and in which two k -colourings are adjacent if they differ on exactly one vertex. We identify a path between two given colourings in $\mathcal{C}_k(G)$ with a *sequence of recolourings*, that is, an ordered list of pairs composed of a vertex of G and a new colour for this vertex. If $\mathcal{C}_k(G)$ is connected, we say that G is k -mixing.

^{*}Research supported by research grant DIGRAPHS ANR-19-CE48-0013 and by the French government, through the EUR DS4H Investments in the Future project managed by the National Research Agency (ANR) with the reference number ANR-17-EURE-0004.

Given a graph G , one may ask for which values of k it is k -mixing, and when it is, how many steps are required at most to get from one colouring to another, i.e. what is the diameter of the $\mathcal{C}_k(G)$?

Determining if a graph is k -mixing has applications in statistical physics, where colourings represent states of the antiferromagnetic Potts model at temperature zero. The questions above were first addressed by researchers studying the Glauber dynamics for sampling k -colourings of a given graph. This is a Markov chain used to obtain efficient algorithms for approximately counting or almost uniformly sampling k -colourings of a graph, and the connectedness of the k -colouring graph is a necessary condition for such a Markov chain to be rapidly mixing. In graph theory, the study of recolouring has been rapidly developing in the last fifteen years, since the works of Cereceda, van den Heuvel and Johnson [7, 8]. We refer the reader to the PhD thesis of Bartier [1] for a complete overview on graph recolouring and to the surveys of van Heuvel [11] and Nishimura [14] for reconfiguration problems in general.

As described above, one of the main problems in recolouring is to decide whether a given graph is k -mixing.

IS k -MIXING

Input: A graph G

Question: Is G k -mixing?

Note that IS 2-MIXING is trivial since only edgeless graphs are 2-mixing. On the other hand, Cereceda [7] proved that IS 3-MIXING is coNP-complete. For higher values of k , the complexity of this problem is still open.

A related problem is that of recognizing when two given k -colourings of a graph G are in the same connected component of $\mathcal{C}_k(G)$. Formally, we have the following decision problem:

k -COLOURING-PATH

Input: A graph G along with two k -colourings α and β of G .

Question: Is there a path between α and β in $\mathcal{C}_k(G)$?

2-COLOURING PATH is trivial since only isolated vertices can be recoloured in a bipartite graph. Cereceda, van den Heuvel and Johnson [8] proved that 3-COLOURING PATH is polynomial-time solvable. Moreover the authors proved that the diameter of each component of $\mathcal{C}_k(G)$ is $O(n^2)$.

In contrast, for every $k \geq 4$, Bonsma and Cereceda [3] showed a family \mathcal{G}_k of graphs such that for every $G \in \mathcal{G}_k$ of order n , there exists two k -colourings whose distance in $\mathcal{C}_k(G)$ is finite and superpolynomial in n . They also proved that k -COLOURING PATH is PSPACE-complete for all $k \geq 4$ even restricted to bipartite graphs. However, the situation is different for degenerate graphs. The *degeneracy* of a graph G , denoted by $\delta^*(G)$, is the largest minimum degree of any subgraph of G . Bonsma and Cereceda [3] and Dyer et al. [9] independently proved the following.

Theorem 1 (Bonsma and Cereceda [3] ; Dyer et al. [9]). *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and G be a graph.*

If $k \geq \delta^(G) + 2$, then G is k -mixing.*

Cereceda [6] also conjectured the following.

Conjecture 2 (Cereceda [6]). *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and G be a graph.*

If $k \geq \delta^(G) + 2$, then the diameter of $\mathcal{C}_k(G)$ is at most $O(n^2)$.*

Cereceda [6] proved that this is true when $k \geq 2\delta^*(G) + 1$. This was improved recently by Bousquet and Heinrich [4], who showed the following.

Theorem 3 (Bousquet and Heinrich [4]). *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and G be a graph. Then $\mathcal{C}_k(G)$ has diameter at most:*

- Cn^2 if $k \geq \frac{3}{2}(\delta^*(G) + 1)$ (where C is a constant independent from k),
- $C_\varepsilon n^{\lceil \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \rceil}$ if $k \geq (1 + \varepsilon)(\delta^*(G) + 2)$ (where C_ε is a constant independent from k),
- $(Cn)^{d+1}$ for any $k \geq \delta^*(G) + 2$ (where C is a constant independent from k).

Bousquet and Perarnau [5] also proved the following.

Theorem 4 (Bousquet and Perarnau [5]). *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and G be a graph.*

If $k \geq 2\delta^(G) + 2$, then the diameter of $\mathcal{C}_k(G)$ is at most $(\delta^*(G) + 1)n$.*

Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and G be a graph that is not k -mixing. It follows from Theorem 1 that G contains a subgraph H with minimum degree at least $k - 1$. Thus G has maximum average degree at least $k - 1$. This bound is tight because the complete graph on k vertices is $(k - 1)$ -regular and is not k -mixing. Moreover, it is shown in [2] that this bound is tight even when we restrict to graphs of arbitrary large girth. The initial proof uses the probabilistic method. In Section 4, we give a new constructive proof of this result, based on an explicit construction of regular bipartite graphs from Lazebnik and Ustimenko [12].

1.2 Digraph redicolouring.

Let D be a digraph. A *digon* is a pair of arcs in opposite directions between the same vertices. An *oriented graph* is a digraph with no digon. The *bidirected graph* associated to a graph G , denoted by \overleftrightarrow{G} , is the digraph obtained from G , by replacing every edge by a digon. A *tournament* on k vertices is an orientation of the complete graph on k vertices. The *transitive tournament* on k vertices is the only acyclic tournament on k vertices.

In 1982, Neumann-Lara [13] introduced the notions of dicolouring and dichromatic number, which generalize the ones of colouring and chromatic number. A k -dicolouring of D is a function $c : V(D) \rightarrow \{1, \dots, k\}$ such that $c^{-1}(i)$ induces an acyclic subdigraph in D for each $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. The *dichromatic number* of D , denoted by $\bar{\chi}(D)$, is the smallest k such that D admits a k -dicolouring. There is a one-to-one correspondence between the k -colourings of a graph G and the k -dicolourings of the associated bidirected graph \overleftrightarrow{G} , and in particular $\chi(G) = \bar{\chi}(\overleftrightarrow{G})$. Hence every result on graph colourings can be seen as a result on dicolourings of bidirected graphs, and it is natural to study whether the result can be extended to all digraphs.

In this paper, we study digraph redicolouring, which is a generalization of graph recolouring. For any $k \geq \bar{\chi}(D)$, the k -dicolouring graph of D , denoted by $\mathcal{D}_k(D)$, is the graph whose vertices are the k -dicolourings of D and in which two k -dicolourings are adjacent if they differ on exactly one vertex. Observe that $\mathcal{C}_k(G) = \mathcal{D}_k(\overleftrightarrow{G})$ for any bidirected graph \overleftrightarrow{G} . A *redicolouring sequence* between two dicolourings is a path between these dicolourings in $\mathcal{D}_k(D)$. The digraph D is k -mixing if $\mathcal{D}_k(D)$ is connected, and k -freezable if $\mathcal{D}_k(D)$ contains an isolated vertex. A vertex v is *blocked* to its colour in a k -dicolouring α if, for every colour $c \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ different from $\alpha(v)$, recolouring v to c in α creates a monochromatic cycle. And we say that v is *frozen* in α if $\beta(v) = \alpha(v)$ for any k -dicolouring β in the same connected component of α in $\mathcal{D}_k(D)$.

In Section 2, we consider the directed analogues of IS k -MIXING and k -COLOURING PATH.

DIRECTED IS k -MIXING

Input: A digraph D .

Question: Is D k -mixing?

k -DICOLOURING PATH

Input: A digraph D along with two k -dicolourings α and β of D .

Question: Is there a path between α and β in $\mathcal{D}_k(D)$?

Note that IS k -MIXING and k -DICOLOURING PATH may be seen as the restrictions of DIRECTED IS k -MIXING and k -DICOLOURING PATH to bidirected graphs. Therefore hardness results transfer to those problems. It follows that DIRECTED IS 3-MIXING is coNP-hard and k -DICOLOURING PATH is PSPACE-complete for all $k \geq 4$. We strengthen these results in Section 2 by proving that 2-DICOLOURING PATH is PSPACE-complete, and that k -DICOLOURING PATH remains PSPACE-complete when restricted to some digraph classes:

Theorem 5. (i) For every $k \geq 2$, k -DICOLOURING PATH is PSPACE-complete on digraphs with maximum degree $2k + 1$.

(ii) For every $k \geq 2$, k -DICOLOURING PATH is PSPACE-complete on oriented graphs.

(iii) For every $2 \leq k \leq 4$, k -DICOLOURING PATH is PSPACE-complete on planar digraphs with maximum degree $2k + 2$.

(iv) 2-DICOLOURING PATH is PSPACE-complete on planar oriented graphs of degree at most 6.

In Section 3, we consider generalizations of Theorems 1, 3 and 4 to digraphs. There are several notions of degeneracy for digraphs. The *min-degeneracy* of D is $\delta_{\min}^*(D) = \max\{\min\{\delta^+(H), \delta^-(H)\} \mid H \text{ subdigraph of } D\}$. It is the smallest k such that every subdigraph H of D has a vertex v with $\min\{d_H^+(v), d_H^-(v)\} \leq k$. The *out-degeneracy* of D is $\delta_{\text{out}}^*(D) = \max\{\delta^+(H) \mid H \text{ subdigraph of } D\}$. It is the smallest k such that every subdigraph H of D has $\delta^+(H) \leq k$. The *max-degeneracy* of D , denoted by $\delta_{\max}^*(D)$, is the smallest k such that every subdigraph H of D has a vertex v with $\max\{d_H^+(v), d_H^-(v)\} \leq k$. The *average-degeneracy* of D , denoted by $\delta_{\text{avg}}^*(D)$, is the smallest k such that every subdigraph H of D has a vertex v with $\frac{1}{2}(d_H^+(v) + d_H^-(v)) \leq k$. (In that case k may be half-integral.) Note that if D is an oriented graph, then its average-degeneracy is half the degeneracy of its underlying graph.

By definition, we have $\delta_{\min}^*(D) \leq \delta_{\text{out}}^*(D) \leq \delta_{\max}^*(D)$ and $\delta_{\min}^*(D) \leq \delta_{\text{avg}}^*(D) \leq \delta_{\max}^*(D)$. If \overleftrightarrow{G} is a bidirected graph, then all directed versions of degeneracy above are equal to the degeneracy of the associated graph:

$$\delta^*(G) = \delta_{\min}^*(\overleftrightarrow{G}) = \delta_{\text{out}}^*(\overleftrightarrow{G}) = \delta_{\max}^*(\overleftrightarrow{G}) = \delta_{\text{avg}}^*(\overleftrightarrow{G}).$$

We show the following theorem, which extends Theorem 1 for min-degeneracy and thus also for out-, max- and average-degeneracy by the above inequalities.

Theorem 6. *Every digraph D is k -mixing for every $k \geq \delta_{\min}^*(D) + 2$.*

In the special case of oriented graphs, we improve the lower bounds on k by 1 in terms of the max-degeneracy and average-degeneracy.

Theorem 7. *Every oriented graph \vec{G} is k -mixing for all $k \geq \lceil \delta_{\text{avg}}^*(\vec{G}) \rceil + 1$.*

We also show that such an improvement cannot hold for out-degeneracy (and thus min-degeneracy) by exhibiting k -out-degenerate oriented graphs that are not $(k+1)$ -mixing (Proposition 18).

A natural question is then the generalization of Conjecture 2 to digraphs.

Conjecture 8. *Let D be a digraph on n vertices. If $k \geq \delta_{\min}^*(D) + 2$, then the diameter of $\mathcal{D}_k(D)$ is at most $O(n^2)$.*

As evidence towards this conjecture, we establish several results. We first prove the analogue of Theorem 4 for digraphs.

Theorem 9. *Let D be a digraph on n vertices and $k \geq 2\delta_{\min}^*(D) + 2$ be an integer. Then, the diameter of $\mathcal{D}_k(D)$ is at most $(\delta_{\min}^*(D) + 1)n$.*

We also generalize the first point of Theorem 3.

Theorem 10. *For a digraph D on n vertices, and $k \geq \frac{3}{2}(\delta_{\min}^*(D) + 1)$, the diameter of $\mathcal{D}_k(D)$ is at most Cn^2 where C is independent from k .*

We also consider oriented subcubic graphs. A *subcubic graph* is a graph with maximum degree at most 3. We prove that any orientation of such a graph is 2-mixing, and that its 2-dicolouring graph has linear diameter.

Theorem 11. *Let \vec{G} be a subcubic oriented graph of order n . Then $\mathcal{D}_2(\vec{G})$ is connected and has diameter at most $2n$.*

This result is tight because there exists orientations of 4-regular graphs which are 2-freezable (see Figure 1). Since any digraph containing a digon is not 2-mixing, Theorem 11 directly implies the following:

Corollary 12. *A subcubic digraph D is 2-mixing if and only if D is an oriented graph.*

In Section 4, we turn our focus to the density of non-mixing graphs and digraphs. In a first part, we first consider undirected graphs. The *maximum average degree* of a graph G , denoted by $\text{Mad}(G)$, is defined by $\text{Mad}(G) = \max\left\{\frac{2|E(H)|}{|V(H)|} \mid H \text{ a non-empty subgraph of } G\right\}$. In the undirected case, one can easily deduce from




Figure 1: An orientation of a 4-regular oriented graph with a frozen 2-colouring.

Theorem 1 that any non k -mixing graph G contains a subgraph H with minimum degree at least $k - 1$. This bound is tight because the complete graph on k vertices is $(k - 1)$ -regular and is not k -mixing. Using probabilistic arguments, Bonamy, Bousquet and Perarnau [2] showed that this bound is tight even on graphs of arbitrary large girth (Recall that the *girth* of a graph is the length of its shortest cycle.). We provide a construction witnessing this fact in Theorem 22.

In a second part, we show that Theorem 22 cannot be generalized to digraphs. Given a digraph D , the *maximum average degree* of D is defined as $\max\{\frac{2|A(H)|}{|V(H)|} \mid H \text{ a non-empty subdigraph of } D\}$. The *digirth* of a digraph is the length of its shortest directed cycle if the digraph contains cycles, and $+\infty$ otherwise. In particular, oriented graphs are digraphs with digirth at least 3. It follows from Theorem 6 that every non k -mixing digraph D contains a subdigraph H with minimum out-degree and minimum in-degree at least $k - 1$. This shows that such a digraph D has maximum average degree at least $2k - 2$. This bound is tight because the bidirected complete digraph on k vertices is $2k - 2$ -regular and is not k -mixing. However, unlike the undirected case, this is not the case for digraphs with arbitrary large digirth. In fact, this is not even the case for oriented graphs, which are exactly the digraphs with digirth at least 3. We pose the following conjecture:

Conjecture 13. Any non 2-mixing oriented graph has maximum average degree at least 4.

We prove two results providing some support for this conjecture. Firstly, using the Discharging Method, we prove the conjecture in the special case of freezable oriented graphs.

Theorem 14. Let $\vec{G} = (V, A)$ be an oriented graph. If \vec{G} is 2-freezable, then $|A| \geq 2|V|$.

From this result, we derive the following lower bound on the density of k -freezable oriented graphs.

Corollary 15. Let $\vec{G} = (V, A)$ be an oriented graph. If \vec{G} is k -freezable, then $|A| \geq k|V| + k(k - 2)$.

We give a family of oriented graphs for which this bound is reached. Secondly, again with the Discharging Method, we show a statement weaker than Conjecture 13 with $7/2$ instead of 4.

Theorem 16. Let \vec{G} be an oriented graph. If \vec{G} is not 2-mixing, then $\text{Mad}(\vec{G}) \geq \frac{7}{2}$.

Finally, in Section 5, we conclude with some open problems.

2 Complexity of k -DICOLOURING PATH

In this section, we establish some hardness results for k -DICOLOURING PATH. We need some definitions.

Given a graph $G = (V, E)$ together with a mapping $\phi : V \rightarrow \{1, 2\}$, an orientation \vec{G} of G is *proper* if for any $v \in V$, $d_{\vec{G}}^-(v) \geq \phi(v)$. A *reorienting sequence* from \vec{G}_1 to \vec{G}_2 is a sequence of proper orientations $\vec{\Gamma}_1, \dots, \vec{\Gamma}_p$ of G such that $\vec{\Gamma}_1 = \vec{G}_1$, $\vec{\Gamma}_p = \vec{G}_2$, every $\vec{\Gamma}_i$ is proper and every $\vec{\Gamma}_{i+1}$ can be obtained from $\vec{\Gamma}_i$ by reversing exactly

one arc. The following problem has been shown to be PSPACE-complete in [10] by a reduction from Quantified Boolean Formulas.

PLANAR-CUBIC-NCL

Input: A cubic planar graph G , a mapping $\phi : V \rightarrow \{1, 2\}$, two proper orientations \vec{G}_1 and \vec{G}_2 of G .

Question: Is there a reorienting sequence from \vec{G}_1 to \vec{G}_2 ?

We will derive the hardness results for DICOLOURING PATH from a hardness result on its list colouring version. Let D be a digraph. A *list assignment* L is a function which associates a list of colours to every vertex v of D . An L -*dicolouring* of D is a dicolouring α of D such that $\alpha(v) \in L(v)$ for all vertex v . A k -*list assignment* is a list assignment L such that $L(v) \subseteq [k]$ for all vertex v . We denote by $\mathcal{D}(D, L)$ the redicolouring graph of the L -dicolourings of D . We call vertices v such that $|L(v)| = 1$ *forced vertices*. We will consider the following problem.

k -LIST DICOLOURING PATH

Input: A digraph D , a k -list assignment L , and two L -dicolourings α and β of D .

Question: Is there a path between α and β in $\mathcal{D}(D, L)$?

Let us start by proving the following result.

Theorem 17. 2-LIST DICOLOURING PATH is PSPACE-complete on digraphs D even when:

- forced vertices have degree at most 3 and,
- either all the vertices degree at most 5 or, the digraph D is planar and all the vertices have in and out-degree at most 3.

Proof. First note that 2-LIST DICOLOURING PATH is indeed in NPSpace. Given a digraph D and two dicolourings α and β of D together with a redicolouring sequence from α to β , we can easily check with a polynomial amount of space that each dicolouring is valid. Then, we get that k -LIST DICOLOURING PATH belongs to PSPACE thanks to Savitch's Theorem [15], which asserts that PSPACE = NPSpace.

We shall now give a polynomial reduction from PLANAR-CUBIC-NCL.

Let G be a planar cubic graph on n vertices x_1, \dots, x_n with a mapping $\phi : V(G) \rightarrow \{1, 2\}$. Let \vec{G}_1 and \vec{G}_2 be two proper orientations of G . From (G, ϕ) we construct the digraph D and the function L as follows (see Figure 2 for an illustration).

- For each vertex $x_i \in V(G)$, we create a *vertex-gadget* as follows.

We associate three vertices $x_{i,1}, x_{i,2}$ and $x_{i,3}$ in V_D so that each of these vertices is associated to exactly one edge of G incident to x_i , and each edge of G is associated to exactly two vertices of D . The function L assigns to each of these vertices the list $\{1, 2\}$.

We complete the vertex-gadget in two ways depending if $\phi(x_i) = 1$ or 2. If $\phi(x_i) = 1$, then we create a new vertex z_i in such a way that $(z_i, x_{i,1}, x_{i,2}, x_{i,3}, z_i)$ is a directed 4-cycle. We set $L(z_i) = \{2\}$.

If $\phi(x_i) = 2$, then we create three new vertices $z_{i,1}, z_{i,2}$, and $z_{i,3}$ in such a way that $(x_{i,1}, z_{i,1}, x_{i,2}, z_{i,2}, x_{i,3}, z_{i,3}, x_{i,1})$ is a directed 6-cycle, and we add the arcs $x_{i,1}z_{i,2}$, $x_{i,2}z_{i,3}$ and $x_{i,3}z_{i,1}$. The function L assigns the list $\{2\}$ to $z_{i,1}, z_{i,2}$, and $z_{i,3}$.

- For each edge $x_i x_j \in E(G)$, where $i < j$, we create a vertex a_{ij} and create the directed 3-cycle $(a_{ij}, x_{i,r}, x_{j,r'}, a_{ij})$. We set $L(a_{i,j}) = \{1\}$. This directed 3-cycle is the *edge-gadget* of $x_i x_j$.




Figure 2: An example of building D from G , where $\phi(x_i) = 1$, $\phi(x_j) = 2$, and $i < j$.

Note that the digraph D has degree at most 5 and that its forced vertices have degree at most 3.

For every proper orientation \vec{G} of G , we define the *dicolouring associated to \vec{G}* $\alpha_{\vec{G}}$ as follows.

- Forced vertices are assigned the colour of their list: vertices $z_i, z_{i,1}, z_{i,2}, z_{i,3}$ are coloured 2, and vertices a_{ij} are coloured 1.
- For each arc $x_i x_j \in A(\vec{G})$, we set $x_{i,r}$ to colour 2 and $x_{j,r'}$ to colour 1, where $x_{i,r}$ and $x_{j,r'}$ are the vertices of D corresponding to the edge $x_i x_j$ in G .

Claim 17.1: For every proper orientation \vec{G} of G and corresponding digraph D , the following hold.

(i) $\alpha_{\vec{G}}$ is an L -dicolouring of D .

(ii) Unless $d_{\vec{G}}^-(x_i) = \phi(x_i)$ in \vec{G} , changing the colour of $x_{i,r}$ from 1 to 2 still yields a valid L -dicolouring of D .

Proof of claim. Let us only show the first item, the second follows by similar arguments noting that $d_{\vec{G}}^-(x_i) > \phi(x_i)$ in this case. Note that by definition, $\alpha_{\vec{G}}$ satisfies the colouring constraints imposed by the list assignment L . Let us then show that $\alpha_{\vec{G}}$ is indeed an L -dicolouring. Assume, for a contradiction, that there is a monochromatic directed cycle C in $\alpha_{\vec{G}}$. For every edge-gadget, say corresponding to $x_i x_j$, the vertices $x_{i,r}, x_{j,r'}$ must be coloured differently. Therefore, all vertices of C must be contained in a single vertex-gadget of D . Let x_i be the vertex such that C is in the vertex-gadget of x_i . If $\phi(x_i) = 1$, then C must be $(z_i, x_{i,1}, x_{i,2}, x_{i,3}, z_i)$ and all its vertices should be coloured 2. This is a contradiction since $d_{\vec{G}}^-(x_i) \geq 1$ implies, by construction, that at least one of $x_{i,1}, x_{i,2}, x_{i,3}$ is coloured 1. If $\phi(x_i) = 2$, then C contains at least two vertices in $\{x_{i,1}, x_{i,2}, x_{i,3}\}$ and two vertices in $\{z_{i,1}, z_{i,2}, z_{i,3}\}$. Then, at least two vertices of $\{x_{i,1}, x_{i,2}, x_{i,3}\}$ are coloured 2 because vertices $z_{i,j}$ are. This is a contradiction since $d_{\vec{G}}^-(x_i) \geq 2$ implies, by construction, that at least two vertices of $x_{i,1}, x_{i,2}, x_{i,3}$ are coloured 1. \diamond

Let us take $\alpha_1 = \alpha_{\vec{G}_1}$ and $\alpha_2 = \alpha_{\vec{G}_2}$ to be the dicolourings obtained from the two proper orientations \vec{G}_1, \vec{G}_2 . We will now show that there exists a reorienting sequence in G from \vec{G}_1 to \vec{G}_2 if and only if there exists a redicolouring sequence in D from α_1 to α_2 .

Assume first that there is a reorienting sequence $\vec{\Gamma}_1, \dots, \vec{\Gamma}_p$ from \vec{G}_1 to \vec{G}_2 , and let us show how to build a corresponding redicolouring sequence. Consider any step s of the reorienting sequence, say when $\vec{\Gamma}_s$ is transformed into $\vec{\Gamma}_{s+1}$ by reversing an arc $x_i x_j$ into $x_j x_i$. We will exhibit a path from $\alpha_{\vec{\Gamma}_s}$ to $\alpha_{\vec{\Gamma}_{s+1}}$ in $\mathcal{D}(D, L)$. Consider vertices $x_{i,r}, x_{j,r'}$ in D , corresponding to the edge $x_i x_j$, and coloured 2 and 1 respectively in $\alpha_{\vec{\Gamma}_s}$. We first set the colour of $x_{j,r'}$ from 1 to 2. Since $a_{i,j}$ is forced to colour 1, the edge-gadget is not monochromatic at this point. Moreover since step s reorients arc $x_i x_j$ and still yields a proper orientation, $d_{\vec{\Gamma}_s}^-(x_j) = d_{\vec{\Gamma}_{s+1}}^-(x_j) + 1 \geq \phi(x_j) + 1$. The resulting colouring is an L -dicolouring by Claim 17.1 (ii). We then set the colour of $x_{i,r}$ from 2 to 1, yielding dicolouring $\alpha_{\vec{\Gamma}_{s+1}}$. Concatenating the redicolouring sequences obtained through the process above from steps $s = 1$ to $s = p$ yields a redicolouring sequence from α_1 to α_2 .

Conversely, assume that there is a redicolouring sequence $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_p$ from α_1 to α_2 . Observe that the only vertices of D that are possibly recoloured in a step of our sequence are those defined as $x_{i,k}$ for $i \in [n]$ and $k \in [3]$, since all others are forced. Now, at any step s of the redicolouring, for each edge $x_i x_j$ of G , at most one of the two corresponding vertices is coloured 1, because $a_{i,j}$ is forced to colour 1. This allows us to define an orientation $\vec{\Gamma}_s$ of G as follows. If the vertices $x_{i,r}, x_{j,r'} \in V(D)$, corresponding to the gadget of edge $x_i x_j$, are not coloured the same in γ_s , orientation $\vec{\Gamma}_s$ sets $x_i x_j$ to be directed from the vertex coloured 2 towards the vertex coloured 1. Otherwise, both vertices are coloured 2 in γ_s and we preserve the orientation of the corresponding edge given by $\vec{\Gamma}_{s-1}$. In the first and last dicolourings, α_1 and α_2 , for each edge $x_i x_j$ the corresponding vertices $x_{i,k}$ and $x_{j,k'}$ are coloured differently. Thus $\vec{\Gamma}_1 = \vec{G}_1$ and $\vec{\Gamma}_p = \vec{G}_2$. Therefore, $\vec{\Gamma}_1, \dots, \vec{\Gamma}_p$ is a sequence of orientations of G from \vec{G}_1 to \vec{G}_2 such that $\vec{\Gamma}_{s+1}$ is either obtained by reversing an arc of $\vec{\Gamma}_s$ (when one of the $x_{i,k}$ is recoloured to 1, and the edge $x_i x_j$ whose edge-gadget contains $x_{i,k}$ was not oriented towards x_i), or equal to $\vec{\Gamma}_s$ otherwise (and in particular when one of the $x_{i,k}$ is recoloured to 2). Moreover, at each step s , $\vec{\Gamma}_s$ is a proper orientation of G . Indeed, if $\phi(x_i) = 1$ (resp. $\phi(x_i) = 2$), then at least one vertex (resp. two vertices) of $\{x_{i,1}, x_{i,2}, x_{i,3}\}$ is coloured 1, and so x_i has in-degree at least 1 (resp. at least 2) in $\vec{\Gamma}_s$. Hence, taking the subsequence of $\vec{\Gamma}_1, \dots, \vec{\Gamma}_p$ that omits constant steps yields a reorienting sequence from \vec{G}_1 to \vec{G}_2 .

Since PLANAR-CUBIC-NCL is PSPACE-complete, at this point our reduction already yields the PSPACE-completeness of 2-LIST DICOLOURING PATH. By construction, forced vertices $z_{j,k}$ and $a_{i,j}$ have degree at most 3, and all other vertices have degree at most 5. This achieves the proof of the first case of the result.

Now, since the input instances are already planar, to get the PSPACE-completeness of 2-LIST DICOLOURING PATH on planar digraphs, it suffices to use planar vertex and edge gadgets. In our current reduction, the only gadget which is not planar is the vertex-gadget corresponding to $x_i \in V(G)$ such that $\phi(x_i) = 2$. We now consider the same reduction replacing the vertex-gadget for vertices such that $\phi(x_i) = 2$ with a planar one. For these vertices, the planar vertex-gadget is defined on the same set of vertices, i.e. $\{x_{i,1}, x_{i,2}, x_{i,3}, z_{i,1}, z_{i,2}, z_{i,3}\}$, but with the arcs of the directed 3-cycles $(z_{i,1}, x_{i,1}, x_{i,2}, z_{i,1})$, $(z_{i,3}, x_{i,1}, x_{i,3}, z_{i,3})$ and $(z_{i,2}, x_{i,2}, x_{i,3}, z_{i,2})$, as depicted in Figure 3. This replacement produces a planar digraph in which all forced vertices still have degree at most 3, and all vertices have maximum in- and out-degree at most 3. This completes the proof.




Figure 3: A planar vertex-gadget when $\phi(x_i) = 2$

□

The problem k -COLOURING PATH is known to be PSPACE-complete for every $k \geq 4$ in the undirected case [3]. Leveraging Theorem 17, we prove that this also holds for its dicolouring analogue for $k \geq 2$ colours, in both directed and oriented graphs.

Theorem 5. (i) For every $k \geq 2$, k -DICOLOURING PATH is PSPACE-complete on digraphs with maximum degree $2k + 1$.

(ii) For every $k \geq 2$, k -DICOLOURING PATH is PSPACE-complete on oriented graphs.

(iii) For every $2 \leq k \leq 4$, k -DICOLOURING PATH is PSPACE-complete on planar digraphs with maximum degree $2k + 2$.

(iv) 2-DICOLOURING PATH is PSPACE-complete on planar oriented graphs of degree at most 6.

Proof. (i) We give a reduction from 2-LIST DICOLOURING PATH on instances where forced vertices have degree at most 3 and the graph has maximum degree 5. The problem is PSPACE-complete by Theorem 17. Let $(D, L, \alpha_1, \alpha_2)$ be an instance of the problem, we construct an instance $(D', \alpha'_1, \alpha'_2)$ for k -DICOLOURING PATH as follows.

We build D' starting with $D' = D$. Then, for every vertex $v \in V(D)$, we let $\overleftrightarrow{K}_k^v$ be a bidirected complete graph on vertex set $\{z_i^v \mid i \in [k]\}$. We then add a digon between v and each z_i^v such that $i \notin L(v)$. We define dicolourings α'_1 and α'_2 on D' by extending dicolourings α_1 and α_2 as follows. All vertices of D' that were vertices of D are coloured the same, and we set z_i^v to colour i for all $v \in V(D)$ and all $i \in [k]$. Note that all the vertices of gadget $\overleftrightarrow{K}_k^v$ are then frozen in any k -dicolouring, letting us simulate in D' the list dicolouring constraints on D . An L -dicolouring path from α_1 to α_2 in D is then exactly a dicolouring path from α'_1 to α'_2 when restricted to vertices of D , achieving to show equivalence between the instances.

We will now show that the maximal degree of a vertex v in D' is $2k + 1$. If v belongs to some gadget $\overleftrightarrow{K}_k^v$, then its degree is at most $2(k - 1) + 2 = 2k$. Note that when $v \in V(D)$, v is of degree 2, 3 or 5 in D , and our reduction adds exactly $2k - |L(v)|$ arcs incident to v . If $|L(v)| = 2$, this yields $d_{D'}(v) \leq 5 + 2k - 4 = 2k + 1$. If $|L(v)| = 1$, we know by construction that $d_D(v) \leq 3$, yielding $d_{D'}(v) \leq 3 + 2k - 2 = 2k + 1$. This achieves the proof that D' has maximum degree at most $2k + 1$, concluding (i).

(ii) We give a reduction from k -DICOLOURING PATH to k -DICOLOURING PATH restricted to oriented graphs. Let (D, α_1, α_2) be an instance of k -DICOLOURING PATH, we will build an equivalent instance $(\vec{G}, \alpha'_1, \alpha'_2)$ where \vec{G} is an oriented graph. Take \vec{H} to be an arbitrary oriented graph with dichromatic number exactly k . We construct \vec{G} from D by replacing digons of D as follows. For each digon $[u, v]$ of D , create a copy \vec{H}_{uv} of \vec{H} , then replace $[u, v]$ by a single arc from u to v , and add the all arcs from v to \vec{H}_{uv} and all arcs from \vec{H}_{uv} to u . By construction, \vec{G} is an oriented graph.

In the following, we let c be a fixed k -dicolouring of \vec{H} . We show how to transform any k -dicolouring α of D to a k -dicolouring α' of \vec{G} , and vice versa. Given a k -dicolouring α for D , we define α' for \vec{G} by colouring each copy \vec{H}_{uv} of \vec{H} with c , and keeping the same colours as α on $V(D)$. Any monochromatic directed dycle in (\vec{G}, α') must contain a vertex of some \vec{H}_{uv} , as otherwise it would be a subdigraph of D and would already be monochromatic in (D, α) . Since c is a dicolouring of \vec{H} , the cycle must contain both u, v , but then u and v being coloured the same would yield a monochromatic digon in (D, α) , so α' is indeed a k -dicolouring of \vec{G} . Conversely, given any k -dicolouring α' of \vec{G} , we define α for D as the restriction of α' on $V(D)$. Similarly, if (D, α) were to contain a monochromatic directed dycle, any arc (u, v) of the cycle that is not present in \vec{G} may be replaced with (u, w, v) , taking $w \in \vec{H}_{uv}$ to be a vertex of the same colour as u and v (since $\chi(\vec{H}) = k$). This would yield a monochromatic directed dycle in (\vec{G}, α') , so α must be a k -dicolouring of D .

Now, we define the k -dicolourings α'_1, α'_2 on \vec{G} obtained from α_1, α_2 by the transformation above, and let our output instance be $(\vec{G}, \alpha'_1, \alpha'_2)$. If there is a redicolouring sequence from α_1 to α_2 in D , we perform the same recolouring steps in \vec{G} starting from α'_1 and yielding α'_2 . Since we only recolour vertices of $V(D)$, the last paragraph yields that this sequence is valid. Conversely, if there is a redicolouring sequence from α'_1 to α'_2 , its

restriction to $V(D)$ (omitting recolourings of vertices in subgraphs \vec{H}_{uv}) yields a valid sequence from α_1 to α_2 in D . This achieves the proof of the equivalence of the instances and proves (ii).

(iii) We give a reduction from 2-LIST DICOLOURING PATH where D is planar, forced vertices have degree at most 3 and D has in- and out-degree at most 3. The problem is PSPACE-complete by Theorem 17. Let $(D, L, \alpha_1, \alpha_2)$ be an instance of the problem. We make the same reduction as in the proof of (i) by ensuring that \vec{K}_k^v is embedded and coloured in such a way the (at most 3) forbidden colours of v lie on its external face. This allows us to keep a planar representation of D' which has maximum degree $2k + 2$. This proves (iii).

(iv) As in (iii), we give a reduction from 2-LIST DICOLOURING PATH where D is planar, forced vertices have degree at most 3 and every vertex has in- and out-degree at most 3. Since we are considering 2-dicolourings, vertices with a list of size 2 do not require a gadget to simulate forbidden colours. The main difference with case (iii) is that we cannot use a the bidirected complete graph \vec{K}_2^v to freeze a vertex v with list of size 1. To overcome this, we use the gadget depicted in Figure 4, where the colour of all vertices is frozen. Therefore, we simply have to attach such a gadget on each vertex with list size one, that is, those of the form $z_{i,r}$ or $a_{i,j}$. This can be done by creating a directed triangle including the vertex and two vertices of the gadget that are of the opposite colour as depicted in the figure.




Figure 4: How to freeze the vertex a in a planar oriented graph with two colours.

□

3 Connectivity and diameter of dicolouring graphs

3.1 Connectivity

We start by showing some easy bounds on the minimal number of colours, with respects to variants of degeneracy, ensuring that digraphs or oriented graphs are k -mixing. Bonsma and Cereceda [3] and Dyer et al. [9] independently proved that any (non-oriented) graph G is k -mixing for every $k \geq \delta^*(G) + 2$. Theorem 6, which we recall, generalizes this result for digraphs.

Theorem 6. *Every digraph D is k -mixing for every $k \geq \delta_{\min}^*(D) + 2$.*

Proof. The proof is an adaption of the proof of [9] for undirected graphs. We show the result by induction on the number of vertices of D , the result being obviously true for the digraph with one vertex. Let D be a digraph D on at least two vertices, $k \geq \delta_{\min}^*(D) + 2$ be an integer and α, β be two k -dicolourings of D . Let v be a vertex such that $\min\{d^+(v), d^-(v)\} \leq \delta_{\min}^*(D)$ and let $D' = D - v$. By induction, D' is k -mixing. Let α', β' be the

k -dicolourings of D' induced by α, β (i.e. for every $v \in V(D')$, $\alpha'(v) = \alpha(v)$ and $\beta'(v) = \beta(v)$). Since D' is k -mixing, there exists a redicolouring sequence $\alpha' = \gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_\ell = \beta'$ from α' to β' .

Let us prove that we can transform the redicolouring sequence from D' into a redicolouring sequence for D . Starting from α , we perform the same steps as in $\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_\ell$ as long as they produce dicolourings of D . If at some step i in the sequence it is not possible to recolour vertex v_i to c_i in D , it must be because v is currently coloured c_i and recolouring v_i to c_i would create a monochromatic directed cycle containing both. Assume that v has at most $k - 2$ out-neighbours (otherwise, v has at most $k - 2$ in-neighbours and the case is symmetrical). Now, we can choose c to be a colour different from c_i that is also different from that of the out-neighbours of v . Then, we recolour v to c , allowing us to recolour v_i to c_i and continue the sequence. \square

Theorem 7. *Every oriented graph \vec{G} is k -mixing for all $k \geq \lceil \delta_{\text{avg}}^*(\vec{G}) \rceil + 1$.*

Proof. We proceed by induction on the number of vertices of \vec{G} , the result being obviously true for the oriented graph with one vertex. Consider now an oriented graph \vec{G} on at least two vertices and $k \geq \lceil \delta_{\text{avg}}^*(\vec{G}) \rceil + 1$. Let v be a vertex such that $d^+(v) + d^-(v) \leq 2\delta_{\text{avg}}^*(\vec{G})$. By directional duality, we may assume $d^+(v) \leq d^-(v)$, then by assumption $d^+(v) \leq k - 1$. We let $\vec{G}' = \vec{G} - v$. Then, $\delta_{\text{avg}}^*(\vec{G}') \leq \delta_{\text{avg}}^*(\vec{G})$, and the induction hypothesis yields that \vec{G}' is k -mixing.

Let α and β two k -dicolourings of \vec{G} , and let α', β' be the k -dicolourings of \vec{G}' induced by α, β . Since \vec{G}' is k -mixing, there exists a sequence $\alpha' = \gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_\ell = \beta'$ of k -dicolourings of \vec{G}' such that γ_{i-1} and γ_i differ in the colour of exactly one vertex of \vec{G}' for $i \in [1, \ell]$. We denote this vertex by v_i . Now we consider the same recolouring steps to recolour \vec{G} , starting from α . If for some i it is not possible to recolour v_i to c_i , this must be because v is currently coloured c_i and recolouring v_i to c_i would create a monochromatic directed cycle. Note that such a cycle necessarily contains v , because γ_i is a dicolouring of G' .

- If $d^+(v) \leq k - 2$, then v can be recoloured to c , a colour different from c_i that does not appear on $N^+[v]$, allowing us to recolour v_i to c_i and proceed with the sequence.
- Otherwise $d^+(v) = k - 1$. Then since $k \geq \lceil \delta_{\text{avg}}^*(\vec{G}) \rceil + 1$, we get $d^-(v) \leq k - 1$, and then $d^-(v) = k - 1$ (since $d^+(v) \leq d^-(v)$). Since \vec{G} is an oriented graph, and recolouring v_i to c_i would create a monochromatic directed cycle, then v has at least one neighbour coloured c_i . Take w to be one of these neighbours. Then, if $w \in N^+(v)$ (resp. $w \in N^-(v)$), we can recolour v to a colour that does not appear in $N^+(v)$ (resp. $N^-(v)$), recolour v_i to c_i and continue the sequence.

\square

Note that $\delta_{\text{max}}^*(\vec{G}) \geq \lceil \delta_{\text{avg}}^*(\vec{G}) \rceil$ since $\delta_{\text{max}}^*(\vec{G})$ is an integer and $\delta_{\text{max}}^*(\vec{G}) \geq \delta_{\text{avg}}^*(\vec{G})$. Consequently, every oriented graph \vec{G} is k -mixing for all $k \geq \delta_{\text{max}}^*(\vec{G}) + 1$. A natural question is then whether this result can be extended to δ_{out}^* : is every oriented graph \vec{G} k -mixing for all $k \geq \delta_{\text{out}}^*(\vec{G}) + 1$? This does not hold for directed graphs, as witnessed by the bidirected clique, and the following also answers the question in the negative for oriented graphs.

Proposition 18. *For every positive integer k , there exist k -out-degenerate oriented graphs that are not $(k + 1)$ -mixing.*

Proof. Let \vec{B}_0 be the oriented graph with one vertex. For $k \geq 1$, we construct \vec{B}_k from \vec{B}_{k-1} as follows: take two disjoint copies \vec{B}_{k-1}^1 and \vec{B}_{k-1}^2 of \vec{B}_{k-1} and one vertex r ; add all arcs from r to \vec{B}_{k-1}^1 , all arcs from \vec{B}_{k-1}^1 to \vec{B}_{k-1}^2 and all arcs from \vec{B}_{k-1}^2 to r .

Claim 18.1: \vec{B}_k is k -out-degenerate and $\vec{\chi}(\vec{B}_k) = k + 1$.

Proof of claim. We prove the claim by induction on k , the result holding trivially for $k = 0$. Assume now that $k \geq 1$, and consider \vec{B}_k . By induction, there exist two $(k - 1)$ -out-degeneracy orderings σ_1 and σ_2 on \vec{B}_{k-1}^1 and

\vec{B}_{k-1}^2 , respectively. In \vec{B}_k , each vertex of $V(\vec{B}_{k-1}^2)$ has exactly one out-neighbour in $V \setminus V(\vec{B}_{k-1}^2)$, namely r . We may then remove the vertices of \vec{B}_{k-1}^2 following σ_2 , such that at each step the removed vertex has out-degree at most k . In the remaining graph, all out-neighbours of vertices in $V(\vec{B}_{k-1}^1)$ belong to $V(\vec{B}_{k-1}^1)$, allowing us to successively remove vertices of out-degree $k-1$ by following σ_1 . Combining these facts, $\sigma_2 \cdot \sigma_1 \cdot (r)$ yields a k -out-degeneracy ordering of \vec{B}_k . Hence \vec{B}_k is k -out-degenerate.

The graph \vec{B}_k is indeed $(k+1)$ -dicolourable since any dicolouring such that the restriction to \vec{B}_{k-1}^1 and \vec{B}_{k-1}^2 is a k -dicolouring and r is coloured with colour $k+1$ is a $(k+1)$ -dicolouring of \vec{B}_k . Now, assume for a contradiction that \vec{B}_k has a k -dicolouring α . Set $c = \alpha(r)$. By induction, $\vec{\chi}(\vec{B}_{k-1}) = k$, so there is a vertex x_1 of \vec{B}_{k-1}^1 and a vertex x_2 of \vec{B}_{k-1}^2 such that $\alpha(x_1) = \alpha(x_2) = c$. But then (r, x_1, x_2, r) is a monochromatic directed cycle, a contradiction. Thus $\vec{\chi}(\vec{B}_k) = k+1$. \diamond

Let k be a positive integer. Let \vec{G}_k be the oriented graph obtained from the transitive tournament TT_{k+1} on $k+1$ vertices, by adding, for each arc xy of TT_{k+1} , a copy \vec{B}_k^{xy} of \vec{B}_k , all arcs from y to \vec{B}_k^{xy} and all arcs from \vec{B}_k^{xy} to x . Let us prove that \vec{G}_k is k -out-degenerate and is not $(k+1)$ -mixing.

Let (t_1, \dots, t_{k+1}) be the *acyclic ordering* of TT_{k+1} (such that there is no arc $t_i t_j$ with $i > j$), and let $\sigma_{i,j}$ be a k -out-degeneracy ordering of $\vec{B}_k^{t_i t_j}$ for all $1 \leq i < j \leq k+1$. We build a k -out-degeneracy ordering of \vec{G}_k by combining these orders as follows: $(t_1) \cdot \sigma_{1,2} \cdot \sigma_{1,3} \cdot \dots \cdot \sigma_{1,k+1} \cdot (t_2) \cdot \sigma_{2,3} \cdot \sigma_{2,4} \cdot \dots \cdot \sigma_{2,k+1} \cdot (t_3) \cdot \dots \cdot (t_k) \cdot \sigma_{k,k+1} \cdot (t_{k+1})$. Thus \vec{G}_k is k -out-degenerate.

We show that every $(k+1)$ -dicolouring α of \vec{G}_k is such that every vertex $v \in V(TT_{k+1})$ is frozen. Since any α' defined from α by a permutation of the colours is also a $(k+1)$ -dicolouring, the above being true yields that α' cannot be reached from α and implies that \vec{G}_k is not $(k+1)$ -mixing. Consider $v \in V(TT_{k+1})$, and assume there is a redicolouring sequence starting from α achieving to recolour v . We let β the dicolouring of \vec{G}_k right before v is recoloured in the sequence, and β' the dicolouring after recolouring v . It suffices to note that $\beta(v) \neq \beta(w)$ for any $w \in V(TT_{k+1}) \setminus v$. Indeed, since $\vec{\chi}(B_{vw}) = k+1$, there exists some $z \in V(B_{vw})$ coloured $\beta(v)$, and by construction $\beta(v) = \beta(w)$ would create a monochromatic directed cycle on vertices v, w, z . Then, since β' is obtained from β by recolouring v , there exists some $w \in V(TT_{k+1})$ coloured the same as v in β' , and the same argument yields a contradiction. \square

3.2 Diameter

In this section, we prove Theorems 9, 10 and 11.

Theorem 11. *Let \vec{G} be a subcubic oriented graph of order n . Then $\mathcal{D}_2(\vec{G})$ is connected and has diameter at most $2n$.*

Proof. Let α and β be any two 2-dicolourings of \vec{G} . Let $x = \text{diff}(\alpha, \beta) = |\{v \in V(\vec{G}) \mid \alpha(v) \neq \beta(v)\}|$. By induction on $x \geq 0$, let us show that there exists a path of length at most $2x$ from α to β in $\mathcal{D}_2(\vec{G})$. This clearly holds for $x = 0$ (i.e., $\alpha = \beta$). Assume $x > 0$ and the result holds for every $x' < x$.

Let $v \in V(\vec{G})$ such that $1 = \alpha(v) \neq \beta(v) = 2$ (v exists up to swapping the colours). If v can be directly recoloured with colour 2, then we recolour v with colour 2 and reach a new 2-dicolouring α' such that $\text{diff}(\alpha', \beta) = x-1$. Then, the result holds by induction.

Therefore, v cannot be directly recoloured with colour 2, i.e., there exists a directed cycle C containing v such that $\alpha(w) = 2$ for every $w \in V(C) \setminus \{v\}$. Moreover, there must be a vertex $u \in V(C) \setminus \{v\}$ such that $\beta(u) = 1$.

If u is not a neighbour of v , then u has two neighbours (those in C) coloured with 2 in α . Therefore, u can be recoloured 1 (it does not create any directed cycle of vertices coloured 1 since u has degree at most 3 in G) and we reach a new 2-dicolouring α' such that $\text{diff}(\alpha', \beta) = x-1$. Then, the result holds by induction. Hence, u is a neighbour of v in C .

Again, we may assume that u cannot be directly recoloured 1 (otherwise the result holds by induction) and so there exists a directed cycle C' such that $\alpha(w) = 1$ for every $w \in V(C') \setminus \{u\}$. Since u and v have degree at most

3 in \vec{G} , and because of the α -colours of vertices in C and C' , then $V(C') \cap V(C) = \{v, u\}$. Let h be the vertex of $V(C') \setminus \{u, v\}$ minimizing its distance to u and v in C' . Again, since \vec{G} is subcubic, h cannot be in any directed cycle C'' such that all vertices of C'' but h are coloured 2 by α . Hence, h can be recoloured with 2, then u can be recoloured 1, then v can be recoloured with 2 and h recoloured with 1, reaching a new 2-dicolouring α' such that $\text{diff}(\alpha', \beta) = x - 2$, and the result holds by induction. \square

Theorem 9. *Let D be a digraph on n vertices and $k \geq 2\delta_{\min}^*(D) + 2$ be an integer. Then, the diameter of $\mathcal{D}_k(D)$ is at most $(\delta_{\min}^*(D) + 1)n$.*

Proof. The proof is very similar to the proof of Bousquet and Perarnau [5] for undirected graphs. Let α and β be two k -dicolourings. Let us show by induction on the number of vertices that there exists a redicolouring sequence from α to β where every vertex is recoloured at most $\delta_{\min}^*(D) + 1$ times.

If $n = 1$ the result is obviously true. Let D be a digraph on $n + 1$ vertices, and let u be a vertex such that $\min\{d^+(u), d^-(u)\} \leq \delta_{\min}^*(D)$ and let $D' = D - u$. By directional duality, we may assume $d^+(u) \leq \delta_{\min}^*(D)$. We denote by α' and β' the dicolourings of D' induced by α and β . By induction and since $\delta_{\min}^*(D') \leq \delta_{\min}^*(D)$, there exists a redicolouring sequence from α' to β' such that each vertex is recoloured at most $\delta_{\min}^*(D) + 1$ times. Now we consider the same recolouring steps to recolour D , starting from α . If for some step i , it is not possible to recolour v_i to c_i , this must be because u is currently coloured c_i and recolouring v_i to c_i would create a monochromatic directed cycle. Since u has at most $\delta_{\min}^*(D)$ out-neighbours, and since $k \geq 2\delta_{\min}^*(D) + 2$, there are at least $\delta_{\min}^*(D) + 2$ colours that does not appear in the out-neighbourhood of u . We choose c among these colours so that c does not appear in the next $\delta_{\min}^*(D) + 1$ recolourings of $N^+(u)$.

Since u has at most $\delta_{\min}^*(D)$ out-neighbours and since each vertex in D' is recoloured at most $\delta_{\min}^*(D) + 1$ times, there are at most $\delta_{\min}^*(D)(\delta_{\min}^*(D) + 1)$ recolourings of an out-neighbour of u in this redicolouring sequence. Hence, in this new redicolouring sequence, u is recoloured at most $\delta_{\min}^*(D)$ times. We finally have to set u to its colour in β . Doing so u is recoloured at most $\delta_{\min}^*(D) + 1$ times. This concludes the proof. \square

The goal of the rest of this part is to prove the following theorem which generalizes a result of Bousquet and Heinrich [4] to digraphs.

Theorem 10. *For a digraph D on n vertices, and $k \geq \frac{3}{2}(\delta_{\min}^*(D) + 1)$, the diameter of $\mathcal{D}_k(D)$ is at most Cn^2 where C is independent from k .*

Given an undirected graph $G = (V, E)$, a list assignment L is a -feasible if, for some ordering v_1, \dots, v_n of V , $|L(v_i)| \geq |N(v) \cap \{v_{i+1}, \dots, v_n\}| + 1 + a$ for every $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Bousquet and Heinrich proved the following result appearing as the first and second items of Theorem 6 in in [4]:

Theorem 19 (Bousquet and Heinrich [4]). *Let G be a graph and $a \in \mathbb{N}$. Let L be an a -feasible list assignment and k be the total number of colours. Then $\mathcal{C}(G, L)$ has diameter at most:*

- (i) kn if $k \leq 2a$,
- (ii) Cn^2 if $k \leq 3a$ (where C a constant independent of k, a).

For a graph G and a list assignment L of G , we say that an L -colouring c avoids a set of colours S if for every vertex $v \in V(G)$, $c(v)$ does not belong to S . In order to prove Theorem 10, we deduce from Theorem 19 the following lemma:

Lemma 20. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be an undirected graph on n vertices, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ be the total number of colours, L be a $\lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil$ -feasible list assignment and α an L -colouring of G that avoids a set S of $\lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil$ colours. Then for any set of $\lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil$ colours S' , there is an L -colouring β of G that avoids S' and such that there is a recolouring sequence from α to β of length at most $\frac{4k+6}{3}n$.*

The proof of Lemma 20 comes from the proof of Lemma 8 in [4]. We give it for the sake of completeness.

Proof. Let S' be any set of $\lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil$ colours.

We start with G coloured by α . Let (v_1, \dots, v_n) be a degeneracy ordering of G . We consider each vertex from v_n to v_1 . For each vertex, if it possible we recolour it with a colour of S . We denote by η the obtained L -colouring. This is done in less than n steps. Observe that, for each colour $c \in S$ and each vertex v_i of G , at least one of the following holds:

- $\eta(v_i) \in S$,
- v_i has a neighbour in $\{v_{i+1}, \dots, v_n\}$ coloured c , or
- $c \notin L(v_i)$.

Let H be the subgraph of G induced by the vertices whose colour in η is not in S . We define L_H by $L_H(v) = L(v) \setminus S$ for every $v \in V(H)$. Using the previous observation, we get that for every vertex v_i of H , v has at least $|L(v) \cap S|$ neighbours in $\{v_{i+1}, \dots, v_n\} \setminus H$. This implies that L_H is a $\lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil$ -feasible list assignment of H with a total number of colours bounded by $\frac{2k}{3}$. By Theorem 19 (i), the diameter of $\mathcal{C}(H, L_H)$ is at most $\frac{2k}{3}n$. Note that every recolouring of H starting from η_H (the colouring η induced on H) gives a valid recolouring of G starting from η .

Consider the following preference ordering on the colours: an arbitrary ordering of $[k] \setminus (S \cup S')$, followed by an ordering of $S' \setminus S$, and finally the colours from S . Let γ be the L -colouring of G obtained by colouring G greedily from v_n to v_1 with this preference ordering. Since L is $\lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil$ -feasible, and $|S| = \lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil$, no vertex is coloured with a colour in S in γ . This implies that γ_H , the colouring γ induced on H , is an L_H -colouring of H . Thus there is a recolouring from η_H to γ_H of length at most $\frac{2k}{3}n$ steps. This gives a recolouring sequence in G . We can then recolour the vertices of $G - H$ to their target colour in γ in at most n steps. This shows that, in G , there is a recolouring sequence from α to γ of length at most $\frac{2k+3}{3}n$.

Now observe that, for each colour $c \in R = [k] \setminus (S \cup S')$ and each vertex v_i of G , at least one of the following must hold:

- $\gamma(v_i) \in R$,
- v_i has a neighbour in $\{v_{i+1}, \dots, v_n\}$ coloured c , or
- $c \notin L(v_i)$

Let Γ be the subgraph of G induced by all vertices coloured with a colour in S' by γ . Note that Γ is also the subgraph induced by all vertices coloured with a colour in $(S \cup S')$ by γ , because no vertex is coloured in S by γ . Let L_Γ be the list assignment defined by $L_\Gamma(v) = L(v) \cap (S \cup S')$ for all $v \in V(\Gamma)$. By the previous observation, L_Γ is $\lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil$ -feasible, and the total number of colours is $|S \cup S'| \leq 2 \lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil$. Thus by Theorem 19 (i), $\mathcal{C}(\Gamma, L_\Gamma)$ has diameter at most $2 \lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil n$. Let β_Γ be an L_Γ -colouring of Γ that avoids the colours of S' (such a colouring exists because $|S'| = \lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil$ and L_Γ is $\lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil$ -feasible) and γ_Γ the colouring γ induced on Γ .

There is a recolouring sequence of length at most $2 \lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil n$ from γ_Γ to β_Γ . This extends to a recolouring sequence in G from γ to β where β does not use any colour of S' .

The total number of steps to reach β from α is at most $\frac{2k}{3}n + n + 2 \lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil n$ which is bounded by $\frac{4k+6}{3}n$. This shows the result. \square

We are now able to prove Theorem 10.

Proof of Theorem 10. Let $D = (V, A)$ be a digraph on n vertices and $k \geq \frac{3}{2}(\delta_{\min}^*(D) + 1)$. Let (v_1, \dots, v_n) be a min-degeneracy-ordering of D , that is an ordering such that for each $i \in [n]$, v_i has at most $\delta_{\min}^*(D)$ out-neighbours or at most $\delta_{\min}^*(D)$ in-neighbours in $\{v_{i+1}, \dots, v_n\}$.

We define B a subset of A as follows: for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, if v_i has at most $\delta_{\min}^*(D)$ out-neighbours in $\{v_{i+1}, \dots, v_n\}$, we add all arcs of A from v_i to $\{v_{i+1}, \dots, v_n\}$ to B . Otherwise, we add all arcs of A from $\{v_{i+1}, \dots, v_n\}$ to v_i to B . Note that both digraphs (V, B) and $(V, A \setminus B)$ are acyclic.

Let H be (V, B) and G be the underlying graph of H . Note that, since $(V, A \setminus B)$ is acyclic, each colouring of G is a dicolouring of D , but a dicolouring of D is not necessarily a colouring of G .

By construction, G has degeneracy at most $\delta_{\min}^*(D)$. Using Theorem 3, we get that $\mathcal{C}_k(G)$ has diameter at most $C_0 n^2$ for some constant C_0 independent from k .

Set $\delta^* = \delta_{\min}^*(D) \geq \delta^*(G)$, $X_i = \{v_{i+1}, \dots, v_n\}$, and $H_i = G - X_i$ for all $i \in [n]$.

Let α be any dicolouring of D . Let L_i be the list assignment of H_i defined by

$$L_i(v_j) = [k] \setminus \{\alpha(v) \mid v \in N_G(v_j) \cap X_i\} \text{ for all } j \in [i].$$

Since k , the total number of colours, is at least $\frac{3}{2}(\delta^* + 1)$, for every $j \in [i]$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned} |L_i(v_j)| &\geq k - |N_G(v_j) \cap X_i| \\ &\geq \frac{k}{3} + \frac{2}{3} \frac{3}{2} (\delta^* + 1) - |N_G(v_j) \cap X_i| \\ &\geq |N_G(v_j) \cap \{v_{j+1}, \dots, v_i\}| + 1 + \frac{k}{3} \end{aligned}$$

Hence, since $|L_i(v_j)|$ is an integer, L_i is a $\lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil$ -feasible list assignment of H_i .

Remark 13. Let γ be a dicolouring of D and for some i , γ agrees with α on $\{v_{i+1}, \dots, v_n\}$ and γ_{H_i} is an L_i -colouring of H_i . Then any recolouring sequence starting from γ_{H_i} on H_i , valid for L_i , is a valid recolouring sequence in D . Assume this is not the case and at one step, we get to an L_i -colouring ζ of H_i but ζ_D contains a monochromatic directed cycle C , where $\zeta_D(v) = \zeta(v)$ when v belongs to H_i and $\zeta_D(v) = \gamma(v)$ otherwise. Let v_j be the vertex of C such that j is minimum. This vertex v_j has both an in-neighbour v_{j_1} and an out-neighbour v_{j_2} coloured $\zeta_D(v_j)$ such that $j_1, j_2 \geq j$. We know that either $v_{j_1} v_j$ or $v_j v_{j_2}$ belongs to G . Assume by symmetry that $v_{j_1} v_j$ belongs to G . Then either $j_1 \leq i$ and then $v_{j_1} v_j$ is a monochromatic edge in H_i or $j_1 \geq i + 1$ but then $\zeta(v_{j_1}) = \alpha(v_{j_1})$ does not belong to $L_i(v_j)$. In both cases, we get a contradiction.

Claim 10.1: Let γ_i be a dicolouring of D which induces an L_i -colouring of H_i avoiding at least $\lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil$ colours in H_i . There is a recolouring sequence of length at most $\frac{ck}{3}n$ from γ_i to a dicolouring $\gamma_{i+\lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil}$ which induces an $L_{i+\lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil}$ -colouring of $H_{i+\lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil}$ avoiding at least $\lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil$ colours in $H_{i+\lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil}$.

Proof of claim. Let S be a set of colours of size exactly $\lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil$ avoided by γ_i on H_i . For each vertex v_j in $\{v_{i+1}, \dots, v_{i+\lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil}\}$, we choose a colour c_j so that each of the following holds:

- c_j belongs to $L_j(v_j)$,
- c_j does not belong to $\{\alpha(u) \mid u \in N_G(v_j) \cap \{v_{j+1}, \dots, v_n\}\}$,
- for each $\ell \in \{i+1, \dots, j-1\}$, c_ℓ is different from c_j .

Note that this is possible because $L_j(v_j)$ is $\lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil$ -feasible. Now let S' be $\{c_{i+1}, \dots, c_{i+\lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil}\}$. Observe that $|S'| = \lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil$. By Lemma 20, there is, in H_i , a recolouring sequence of length at most $\frac{4k+6}{3}n$, valid for L_i , from γ_i to some γ'_i that avoids S' . This recolouring sequence extends to a recolouring sequence in D by Remark 13. In the obtained dicolouring, since γ'_i avoids S' on H_i , we can recolour successively v_j with c_j for all $i+1 \leq j \leq i+\lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil$. This does not create any monochromatic directed cycle by choice of c_j . Let η_i be the resulting dicolouring of D . Now we define \tilde{L}_i a list-assignment of H_i as follows:

$$\tilde{L}_i(v_j) = \{1, \dots, k\} \setminus \{\eta_i(v) \mid v \in N(v_j) \cap \{v_{i+1}, \dots, v_n\}\}$$

Using the same arguments as we did for L_i , we get that \tilde{L}_i is $\lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil$ -feasible for H_i . Note that η_i is an \tilde{L}_i -colouring of H_i that avoids S' . Let S'' be a set of $\lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil$ colours disjoint from S' . By Lemma 20, there is, in H_i , a recolouring sequence (valid for \tilde{L}_i) of length at most $\frac{4k+6}{3}n$ from η_i to some η'_i that avoids S'' . This recolouring sequence extends directly to a recolouring sequence in D . Since S' is disjoint from S'' , the obtained dicolouring is an $L_{i+\lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil}$ -colouring of $H_{i+\lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil}$ that avoids at least $\lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil$ colours in $H_{i+\lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil}$. Hence we get a recolouring sequence from γ_i to the desired $\gamma_{i+\lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil}$, in at most $\frac{8k+12}{3}n + \lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil$ steps. This proves Claim 10.1. \diamond

Note that $\gamma_{\lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil}$ can be reached from α in less than n steps: for all $j \in [\lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil]$, choose a colour c_j so that each of the following holds:

- c_j belongs to $L_j(v_j)$,
- c_j does not belong to $\{\alpha(u) \mid u \in N_G(v_j) \cap \{v_{j+1}, \dots, v_n\}\}$,
- for each $\ell \in [j-1]$, c_ℓ is different from c_j .

Now we can recolour successively $v_1, \dots, v_{\lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil}$ to their corresponding colour in $\{c_1, \dots, c_{\lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil}\}$. Then applying

Claim 10.1 iteratively at most $\left\lceil \frac{n}{\lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil} \right\rceil \leq \frac{3n}{k}$ times, there is a redicolouring sequence of length at most $n + \frac{3n}{k} \left(\frac{8k+6}{3}n + \frac{k}{3} \right)$ from α to a dicolouring of D that is also a colouring of G . Note that there exists a constant C_1 such that $n + \frac{3n}{k} \left(\frac{8k+6}{3}n + \frac{k}{3} \right) \leq C_1 n^2$.

Let α and β be two k -dicolourings of D . As proved above, there is a redicolouring sequence of length at most $C_1 n^2$ from α (resp. β) to a dicolouring α' (resp. β') of D that is also a colouring of G . Since $\mathcal{C}_k(G)$ has diameter at most $C_0 n^2$, there is a recolouring sequence of G of length at most $C_0 n^2$ from α' to β' , which is also a redicolouring sequence of D (since every colouring of G is a dicolouring of D). The union of those three sequences yields a redicolouring sequence from α to β of length at most $(2C_1 + C_0)n^2$. \square

4 Density of non 2-mixing oriented graphs

4.1 Density of non k -mixing undirected graphs

Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$. As observed in the introduction, every non k -mixing graph has maximum average degree at least $k-1$. This bound is tight because the complete graph on k vertices is $(k-1)$ -regular and is not k -mixing. Moreover, it is shown in [2] that this bound is tight even when we restrict to graphs of arbitrary large girth. The initial proof uses the probabilistic method. In this section, we give a new constructive proof of this result, based on an explicit construction of regular bipartite graphs from Lazebnik and Ustimenko in [12].

Theorem 22 (Bonamy, Bousquet and Perarnau, [2]). *For any $k, \ell \in \mathbb{N}^*$, there exists a $(k-1)$ -regular k -freezable graph $G_{k,\ell}$ with girth at least ℓ .*

We first make the following remark that we will use in the proof of Theorem 22:

Remark 23. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$, G be a $(k-1)$ -regular k -freezable graph and c be a frozen k -colouring of G , then all colour classes of c have the same size. This follows from the fact that, for every vertex v of G , $N[v]$ uses all colours in c . Thus, given two colours i, j of c , there must be a perfect matching in G between the vertices coloured i and the vertices coloured j . In particular, this implies that the number of vertices coloured i is the same as the number of vertices coloured j .

Proof of Theorem 22. Let us fix $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. We prove the statement by induction on k , the result holding trivially for $k=1$. Let $k > 1$ and assume that there exists a $(k-2)$ -regular $(k-1)$ -freezable graph $G_{k-1,\ell}$ with girth at least ℓ . Let c be a frozen k -colouring of $G_{k-1,\ell}$.

We denote by n the number of vertices of $G_{k-1,\ell}$. Consider H a n -regular bipartite graph with girth at least ℓ (such a graph exists by a construction from Lazebnik and Ustimenko [12]). Since H is bipartite, we can colour the edges of H with exactly n colours such that two adjacent edges receive different colours. By Remark 23, all colour classes of c have the same size. Thus there is an ordering (v_1, \dots, v_n) of $V(G_{k-1,\ell})$ such that for each $i \in [n-k+1]$, the vertices v_i, \dots, v_{i+k-1} have different colours by c .

We denote by (A, B) the bipartition of H . Let $G_{k,\ell}$ be the graph obtained from H as follows.

- For each $a \in A$, replace a by a copy G^a of $G_{k-1,\ell}$, and connect v_i^a (the vertex corresponding to v_i in G^a) to the edge coloured i that was incident to a .

- For each $b \in B$, replace b by an independent set $I^b = \{x_1^b, \dots, x_{\frac{n}{k}}^b\}$ of size $\frac{n}{k}$ (by Remark 23, $\frac{n}{k}$ is an integer). Connect x_i^b to the edges coloured $\{k(i-1)+1, \dots, ki\}$ that were incident to b .

Observe that $G_{k,\ell}$ is k -regular: every vertex in a G^a is adjacent to its $k-1$ neighbours in G^a and exactly one neighbour in one of the I^b ; every vertex in an I^b has exactly k neighbours by construction. Moreover, $G_{k,\ell}$ has girth at least ℓ . Indeed, assume, for a contradiction, that it contains a cycle C of length at most $\ell-1$. Then C cannot contain an edge of H , otherwise, contracting each copy of G^a would transform C into a cycle of length at most $\ell-1$ in H . Thus C must be contained in some G^a , which is a copy of $G_{k-1,\ell}$, which is impossible since $G_{k-1,\ell}$ has girth at least ℓ .

Let α be the $(k+1)$ -colouring of $G_{k,\ell}$ such that the restriction of α to each G^a corresponds to c , and $\alpha(x_i^b) = k+1$ for all $b \in B$ and $i \in [n/k]$. Let v be a vertex of G . If v belongs to some G^a , then since c is frozen in $G_{k-1,\ell}$, $N_{G^a}[v]$ contains all colours of $\{1, \dots, k\}$. Moreover, by construction, v has a neighbour in some I^b which is coloured $k+1$. If v is in some I^b , then v is coloured $k+1$ and by construction it has exactly one neighbour in each colour class. In both cases, $N[v] = \{1, \dots, k+1\}$. Thus no vertex can be recoloured and so α is a frozen colouring of $G_{k,\ell}$. \square

4.2 Density of non 2-mixing and 2-freezable oriented graphs

Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and D be a digraph that is not k -mixing. As observed in the introduction, Theorem 6 implies that $\text{Mad}(D) \geq 2k-2$. This bound is tight because the bidirected complete digraph on k vertices is $(2k-2)$ -regular and is not k -mixing. However, unlike the undirected case, this result does not extend to digraphs with larger digirth, even for $k=2$. While the above inequality states that every non 2-mixing digraph has maximum average degree at least 2, we conjecture that every non 2-mixing oriented graph has maximum average degree at least 4.

Conjecture 24. Any non 2-mixing oriented graph has maximum average degree at least 4.

Remark 25. If true, this conjecture would be tight since there exist 2-freezable oriented graphs with maximum average degree 4. Consider for example the oriented graph \vec{F}_n obtained from the disjoint union of two disjoint directed paths (u_1, \dots, u_n) and (v_1, \dots, v_n) by adding the set of arcs $\{u_i v_i \mid i \in [n]\} \cup \{v_{i+1} u_i \mid i \in [n-1]\} \cup \{v_1 u_2, u_n v_1, v_{n-1} u_n\}$ (see Figure 5 for an illustration). Let α be the 2-dicolouring of \vec{F}_n in which all the u_i are coloured 1 and all the v_i are coloured 2. One can easily check that $\text{Mad}(\vec{F}_n) = 4$ and α is a 2-frozen dicolouring of \vec{F}_n .




Figure 5: The 2-freezable oriented graph \vec{F}_n and a frozen 2-dicolouring.

We now prove two results supporting Conjecture 24. First we prove that Conjecture 24 holds with the stronger assumption that G is 2-freezable.

Theorem 14. Let $\vec{G} = (V, A)$ be an oriented graph. If \vec{G} is 2-freezable, then $|A| \geq 2|V|$.

Proof. Let $\vec{G} = (V, A)$ be a 2-freezable oriented graph, and c a frozen 2-dicolouring of \vec{G} . For a vertex $v \in V$, we say that a vertex $u \in V$ is *blocking* for v (in dicolouring c), if one of the following holds:

- u is an out-neighbour of v , $c(u) \neq c(v)$, and there exists a directed path (u, \dots, x, v) such that (u, \dots, x) is monochromatic, or
- u is an in-neighbour of v , $c(u) \neq c(v)$, and there exists a directed path (x, \dots, u, v) such that (x, \dots, u) is monochromatic.

We shall use a discharging argument. We set the initial charge of every vertex v to be $d(v) = d^+(v) + d^-(v)$. Observe that $d(v) \geq 2$ otherwise v can be recoloured in c . We then use the following discharging rule.

(R) every vertex receives 1 from each of its blocking neighbours.

Let $f(v)$ be the final charge of every vertex v . Let us show that $f(v) \geq 4$ for every $v \in V$.

Let $v \in V$. Let α be its colour and β the other colour. Since c is frozen, v admits at least one out-neighbour v^+ and one in-neighbour v^- coloured β that are blocking, and thus sending 1 to v by (R). Let us now examine the charge that v sends to others vertices. Let w be a vertex to which v sends charge. v is blocking for w , so $c(w) = \beta$. Moreover if w is an out-neighbour (resp. in-neighbour) of v , then v has an in-neighbour (resp. out-neighbour) coloured α . We are in one of the following cases.

- If v sends no charge, then $f(v) \geq d(v) + 2 \geq 4$.
- If v sends charge only to some out-neighbours, then it does not send to its in-neighbours. Since v has at least two in-neighbours (one blocking v and one coloured α), $f(v) \geq d(v) + 2 - (d(v) - 2) \geq 4$.
- If v sends charge only to some in-neighbours, symmetrically to above, $f(v) \geq 4$.
- If v sends charge only to both out-neighbours and in-neighbours, then its has both an in-neighbour and an out-neighbour coloured α to which it sends no charge. Hence $f(v) \geq d(v) + 2 - (d(v) - 2) \geq 4$.

In all cases, we have $f(v) \geq 4$. Consequently, $2|A| = \sum_{v \in V} d(v) = \sum_{v \in V} f(v) \geq 4|V|$. \square

We can deduce from Theorem 14 the following lower bound on the density of a k -freezable oriented graph.

Corollary 15. *Let $\vec{G} = (V, A)$ be an oriented graph. If \vec{G} is k -freezable, then $|A| \geq k|V| + k(k - 2)$.*

Proof. Suppose for a contradiction that there is a k -freezable oriented graph $\vec{G} = (V, A)$ such that $|A| < k|V| + k(k - 2)$. Without loss of generality, we may take \vec{G} having a minimum number of arcs among all such graphs. Let c be a frozen k -dicolouring of \vec{G} . For each $i, j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, let \vec{G}_i be the subdigraph of \vec{G} induced by the vertices coloured i in c , and let $\vec{G}_{i,j}$ be the subdigraph of \vec{G} induced by the vertices coloured i or j in c . We set $n_i = |V(\vec{G}_i)|$, $m_i = |A(\vec{G}_i)|$ and $m_{i,j} = |A(\vec{G}_{i,j})|$.

We first show that, for any $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, $m_i \leq n_i - 1$. Suppose not. Then, since \vec{G}_i is acyclic, it admits an acyclic ordering (x_1, \dots, x_{n_i}) . Now consider $\vec{G}' = (\vec{G} \setminus A(\vec{G}_i)) \cup \{x_j x_{j+1} \mid j \in [n_i - 1]\}$ with the same colouring c . Clearly $|A(\vec{G}')| < |A(\vec{G})|$. Let v be a vertex of \vec{G}' . If $v \in V(\vec{G}_i)$, then x is still blocked in (\vec{G}', c) because it is blocked in (\vec{G}, c) . Now, suppose $v \notin V(\vec{G}_i)$. For any colour j distinct from i and $c(v)$, it is impossible to recolour v with j because it was already impossible in \vec{G} . Now, in \vec{G} , it was impossible to recolour v to i , so there is a directed path in \vec{G}_i whose initial vertex x_k is an out-neighbour of v and whose terminal vertex x_ℓ is an in-neighbour of v . Since (x_1, \dots, x_{n_i}) is an acyclic ordering of \vec{G}_i , we have $k \leq \ell$. Thus (x_k, \dots, x_ℓ) is a directed path in \vec{G}' . Hence v cannot be recoloured to i in (\vec{G}', c) , meaning it is also blocked in (\vec{G}', c) . Since all vertices of (\vec{G}', c) are blocked, c is a frozen k -dicolouring of \vec{G}' , contradicting the minimality of \vec{G} .

We will now prove the result by bounding $S = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq k} m_{i,j}$. First, since c induces a 2-frozen dicolouring on $\vec{G}_{i,j}$, Theorem 14 yields $m_{i,j} \geq 2(n_i + n_j)$ for any $1 \leq i < j \leq k$. Thus,

$$S = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq k} m(\vec{G}_{i,j}) \geq 2 \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq k} (n_i + n_j) = 2n(k - 1).$$

Next, observe that $S = |A(\vec{G})| + \sum_{i=1}^k (k - 2)m_i$ because every monochromatic arc of D is counted exactly $(k - 1)$ times in S , and every other arc only once. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} S &= |A(\vec{G})| + (k - 2) \sum_{i=1}^k m_i \\ &< kn + k(k - 2) + (k - 2) \sum_{i=1}^k (n_i - 1) \\ &= 2n(k - 1). \end{aligned}$$

Putting the two inequalities together, we get $2n(k - 1) \leq S < 2n(k - 1)$, which is a contradiction. \square

Remark 26. The bound of Corollary 15 is tight: we can extend the construction of \vec{F}_n (defined in Remark 25) to k -freezable oriented graphs \vec{F}_n^k with exactly $k|V(\vec{F}_n^k)| + k(k-2)$ arcs. The oriented graph \vec{F}_n^k is constructed as follows. We start from k disjoint directed paths P_1, \dots, P_k of length n . For each $j \in [k]$, let $P_j = (v_1^j, \dots, v_n^j)$. For each pair $1 \leq j < \ell \leq k$, we add the set of arcs $\{v_i^j v_i^\ell \mid i \in [n]\} \cup \{v_{i+1}^\ell v_i^j \mid i \in [n-1]\} \cup \{v_1^\ell v_2^j, v_n^j v_1^\ell, v_{n-1}^\ell v_n^j\}$, so that the subdigraph induced by $V(P_j) \cup V(P_\ell)$ is isomorphic to \vec{F}_n . By construction, $|A(\vec{F}_n^k)| = k|V(\vec{F}_n^k)| + k(k-2)$.

Let c_k be the dicolouring of \vec{F}_n^k that the vertices of P_j with colour j for all $j \in [k]$. Since $V(P_j) \cup V(P_\ell)$ is isomorphic to \vec{F}_n , then every vertex of P_j cannot be recoloured with ℓ (and vice versa). Therefore c_k is a frozen k -dicolouring of \vec{F}_n^k .

Theorem 16. *Let \vec{G} be an oriented graph. If \vec{G} is not 2-mixing, then $\text{Mad}(\vec{G}) \geq \frac{7}{2}$.*

Proof. Let $\vec{G} = (V, A)$ be an oriented graph which is not 2-mixing, and take \vec{G} to be minimal for this property (every proper induced subdigraph \vec{H} of \vec{G} is 2-mixing). In order to get a contradiction, assume that $|A| < \frac{7}{4}|V|$. Let α and β be two 2-dicolourings of \vec{G} such that there is no redicolouring sequence from α to β . We will first prove some structural properties on \vec{G} , which we then leverage through a discharging strategy to show that $|A| \geq \frac{7}{4}|V|$.

Claim 16.1: \vec{G} has no source nor sink.

Proof of claim. Assume that \vec{G} contains a vertex s which is either a source or a sink. By minimality of \vec{G} , we know that $\vec{G}' = \vec{G} - s$ is 2-mixing. In particular, there is a redicolouring sequence $\gamma'_0, \dots, \gamma'_r$ where γ'_0 and γ'_r are the restrictions of α and β to \vec{G}' respectively.

For all $i \in [r]$, let γ_i be defined by $\gamma_i(s) = \alpha(s)$ and $\gamma_i(v) = \gamma'_i(v)$ for all $v \neq s$. Since s is either a source or a sink, γ_i is a 2-dicolouring of \vec{G} . If $\beta(s) = \alpha(s)$, then $\beta = \gamma_r$ and so $\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_r$ is a redicolouring sequence from α to β , a contradiction. Thus $\beta(s) \neq \alpha(s)$. Then setting $\gamma_{r+1} = \beta$, we have that $\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_r, \gamma_{r+1}$ is a redicolouring sequence from α to β , a contradiction. \diamond

Claim 16.2: $\delta(\vec{G}) = 3$.

Proof of claim. First note that if $\delta(\vec{G}) \geq 4$ then $|A| \geq 2|V|$, contradicting our assumption that $|A| < \frac{7}{4}|V|$. Therefore $\delta(\vec{G}) \leq 3$.

Assume now that \vec{G} contains a vertex u such that $d(u) \leq 2$. By Claim 16.1 we know that $d^+(u) = d^-(u) = 1$. Let \vec{G}' be $\vec{G} - u$. By minimality of \vec{G} , we know that \vec{G}' is 2-mixing. Let $\gamma'_0, \dots, \gamma'_r$ a redicolouring sequence in \vec{G}' where γ'_0 and γ'_r are the restrictions of α and β to \vec{G}' . Towards the contradiction, we exhibit a redicolouring sequence from α to β . To do so, we show, for any $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, r\}$, the existence of a 2-dicolouring γ_i of \vec{G} such that γ_i is the restriction of γ_i on \vec{G}' , and there is a redicolouring sequence from α to γ_i .

For $i = 0$, the result holds trivially with $\gamma_0 = \alpha$. Assume now that γ_{i-1} exists, and that there exists a redicolouring sequence reaching γ_{i-1} from α . Let x_i be the vertex such that $\gamma'_{i-1}(x_i) \neq \gamma'_i(x_i)$. Consider the operation of recolouring x_i by its opposite colour in γ_{i-1} . If this creates no monochromatic directed cycle, we let γ_i be the output dicolouring. Otherwise, this creates a monochromatic directed cycle containing u and its two neighbours u^- and u^+ . Since in γ'_{i-1} , the colour of x_i is different from that of u^-, u^+ , we may first recolour u and then x_i to obtain the desired γ_i . At the end of this process, we obtain a redicolouring sequence from α to a 2-dicolouring γ_r agreeing with β on $V(\vec{G}')$. If necessary, we may then recolour u to yield a redicolouring sequence from α to β , achieving to show the contradiction and yielding $\delta(\vec{G}) = 3$. \diamond

For every positive integer i , an i -vertex (resp. $(\geq i)$ -vertex) is a vertex of degree i (resp. at least i) in \vec{G} , and the set of i -vertices in \vec{G} is denoted V_i . Let u be a 3-vertex. By Claim 16.1, either $d^-(u) = 1$ or $d^+(u) = 1$. Then, the *lonely neighbour* of u is its unique in-neighbour if $d^-(u) = 1$ and its unique out-neighbour if $d^+(u) = 1$.

Claim 16.3: *Let u be a 3-vertex and v its lonely neighbour. There exists two 2-dicolourings ϕ and ψ that agree on $V(\vec{G}) \setminus \{u, v\}$ and such that there is no redicolouring sequence from ϕ to ψ .*

Proof of claim. Assume for a contradiction that for any pair ϕ, ψ of 2-dicolourings that agree on $V(\vec{G}) \setminus \{u, v\}$,

there is a redicolouring sequence from ϕ to ψ . Let $\vec{G}' = \vec{G} - u$, and α', β' be the restrictions of our initial dicolourings α, β to \vec{G}' . By minimality of \vec{G} , there is a redicolouring sequence $\alpha' = \gamma'_0, \dots, \gamma'_r = \beta'$ in \vec{G}' . In order to get a contradiction, we will extend the latter into a redicolouring sequence from α to β . As in Claim 16.2, for $i = 0$ to r , we show inductively that there exists a 2-dicolouring γ_i of \vec{G} such that γ'_i is the restriction of γ_i on \vec{G}' , and there is a redicolouring sequence from α to γ_i .

For $i = 0$ the result holds trivially with $\gamma_0 = \alpha$. Assume now that γ_{i-1} exists, and let $x_i \in V(\vec{G}')$ be the vertex recoloured at step i , such that $\gamma'_{i-1}(x_i) \neq \gamma'_i(x_i)$. We try to recolour x_i . If this creates no monochromatic directed cycle, then we have the desired γ_i . If it does, the fact that γ'_i is a dicolouring of \vec{G}' yields that any resulting monochromatic directed cycle must contain both u and its lonely neighbour v .

- If $\gamma_{i-1}(u) = \gamma_{i-1}(v)$, then x_i must be different from v . In this case, we can first recolour u and then x_i to obtain the desired γ_i from γ_{i-1} , which combined with the sequence from α to γ_{i-1} obtained by induction yields the redicolouring sequence from α to γ_i .
- Else, $\gamma_{i-1}(u) \neq \gamma_{i-1}(v)$ and if recolouring x_i creates a monochromatic directed cycle containing both u and v , it must be because $x_i = v$. Now, let γ_i be the 2-dicolouring that agrees with γ'_i on $V(\vec{G}')$ and such that $\gamma_i(u) \neq \gamma_{i-1}(u)$. Observe that γ_i is a 2-dicolouring since γ'_i is, v is the lonely neighbour of u , and now $\gamma_i(u) \neq \gamma_i(v)$. Since γ_i and γ_{i-1} agree on $V(\vec{G}) - \{u, v\}$, our assumption yields a redicolouring sequence from γ_{i-1} to γ_i . Then, our induction hypothesis yields a sequence from α to γ_{i-1} , which combined with the one above yields a sequence from α to γ_i .

Therefore, by induction, we obtain a redicolouring sequence from α to a 2-dicolouring γ_r which agrees with β on $V(\vec{G}')$. Then, either $\gamma_r = \beta$, or we may recolour u in γ_r to obtain β , which in any case yields a redicolouring sequence from α to β , a contradiction. \diamond

Claim 16.4: *Let u be a 3-vertex and v its lonely neighbour. Then $d^+(v) \geq 2$ and $d^-(v) \geq 2$.*

Proof of claim. By directional duality, we may assume $d^+(u) = 1$, such that uv is an arc of \vec{G} .

Let ϕ and ψ be two 2-dicolourings of \vec{G} given by Claim 16.3. That is, both dicolourings agree on $V(\vec{G}) \setminus \{u, v\}$, and there is no redicolouring sequence from ϕ to ψ . In particular, $\phi(u) \neq \psi(u)$ and $\phi(v) \neq \psi(v)$ for otherwise ϕ and ψ would differ on at most one vertex, and ϕ, ψ would yield trivial sequence from ϕ to ψ . Moreover $\phi(u) \neq \phi(v)$, for otherwise we may obtain ψ from ϕ through the sequence that first recolours u , then v . Finally, there must be two paths from v to u such that one is internally coloured $\phi(u)$, and the other is internally coloured $\phi(v)$, respectively, in both ϕ and ψ . Otherwise, either v , respectively u , could be recoloured in ϕ or ψ to get a 2-dicolouring in which u and v have the same colour allowing us to get a contradiction as above. This shows $d^+(v) \geq 2$.

Now, assume for the sake of contradiction that $d^-(v) = 1$, and let α, β be the 2-dicolourings witnessing that \vec{G} is non-mixing. Up to recolouring u or v in α or β if both vertices are coloured the same, we may assume $\alpha(u) \neq \alpha(v)$ and $\beta(u) \neq \beta(v)$. We first show that we can further assume $\alpha(u) = \beta(u)$ (and therefore $\alpha(v) = \beta(v)$). To do so, if $\alpha(u) \neq \beta(u)$, we build a redicolouring sequence from α to another 2-dicolouring $\tilde{\alpha}$ such that $\tilde{\alpha}(u) = \beta(u)$. Let t_1 and t_2 be the two in-neighbours of u . If $\alpha(t_1) = \alpha(t_2)$, then we can either recolour u then v if $\alpha(t_1) = \alpha(u)$, or recolour v then u if $\alpha(t_1) \neq \alpha(u)$, yielding the desired $\tilde{\alpha}$. Hence we may assume that $\alpha(t_1) \neq \alpha(t_2)$. Let $\vec{G}' = \vec{G} - \{u, v\}$ and α' be the restriction of α to \vec{G}' . Given a 2-dicolouring c of \vec{G} , we define its *mirror* \bar{c} as the 2-dicolouring of \vec{G} such that $c(v) \neq \bar{c}(v)$ for all $v \in V(\vec{G})$. By minimality of \vec{G} , there is a redicolouring sequence from α' to its mirror $\bar{\alpha}'$ in \vec{G}' . Since the colours of all vertices are swapped, there must be a 2-dicolouring γ' at some point in the sequence where $\gamma'(t_1) = \gamma'(t_2)$ (for instance the first time t_1 or t_2 is recoloured). We extend the sequence from α' to γ' into a redicolouring sequence from α to γ in \vec{G} , where u, v are constantly coloured $\alpha(u), \alpha(v)$ in both colourings, which is possible because $\alpha(u) \neq \alpha(v)$. Now, since $\gamma'(t_1) = \gamma'(t_2)$, we may exchange the colour of u and v as above to obtain the desired $\tilde{\alpha}$.

Since α can be obtained from $\tilde{\alpha}$ through a redicolouring sequence, we can redefine α to be $\tilde{\alpha}$. Now, $\alpha(u) = \beta(u) \neq \alpha(v) = \beta(v)$, and we claim there exists a redicolouring sequence from α to β . Indeed, let α' and β' be

the the restrictions of α and β to \vec{G}' . By minimality of \vec{G} , there is a redicolouring sequence from α' to β' . This sequence extends to \vec{G} by fixing the colour of u and v to $\alpha(u), \alpha(v)$, since $\alpha(u) \neq \alpha(v)$. This gives a contradiction, and yields $d^-(v) \geq 2$. \diamond

Claim 16.5: *Let u be a 3-vertex such that $|N(u) \cap V_3| = 2$ and v its lonely neighbour, then:*

- (i) $d(v) \geq 5$, and
- (ii) $d(v) = 5$ only if v is adjacent to two (≥ 4)-vertices.

Proof of claim. By directional duality, we may assume $d^+(u) = 1$. Let t_1 and t_2 be the in-neighbours of u . By Claim 16.4, we have $d(v) \geq 4$ so $N(u) \cap V_3 = \{t_1, t_2\}$. Let ϕ and ψ be two 2-dicolourings given by Claim 16.3.

Since t_1 and t_2 are 3-vertices, Claim 16.4 yields $d^-(t_1) = d^-(t_2) = 1$ because u cannot be their lonely neighbour. By Claim 16.3, neither u nor v can be recoloured in ϕ . Thus, for each $j \in [2]$, there is a directed (v, u) -path P_j whose internal vertices are all coloured j . Without loss of generality, we may assume that both u and t_1 are coloured 1, and both v and t_2 are coloured 2.

(i). Let us first show that t_1 is blocked in ϕ . Towards this, consider the sequence successively recolouring t_1, v, u and t_1 again. For this not to be a redicolouring sequence from ϕ to ψ , which would contradict our assumption, it must create a monochromatic directed cycle at one of the steps. Assume that t_1 is recolourable, that is, the first step of the sequence does not create a monochromatic directed cycle. Now, since both t_1, t_2 are coloured 2 at this point, v can also be recoloured. Indeed, any monochromatic directed cycle resulting from setting v to colour 1 would already be a monochromatic directed cycle in ψ . Then, u is coloured the same as its lonely neighbour v , allowing us to set the colour of u to 2, then to recolour t_1 and obtain ψ . Therefore, t_1 is blocked in ϕ . Then, we must have $P_1 = (v, t_1, u)$, otherwise the only in-neighbour of t_1 would be coloured 1, and there is a directed (t_1, v) -path P_3 with internal vertices coloured 2. In particular, the out-neighbour of t_1 distinct from u is coloured 2.

We now consider t_2 . The existence of P_2 ensures that t_2 has its unique in-neighbour coloured 2, therefore t_2 is not blocked to colour 2. Then, as in the last paragraph, we consider the sequence successively recolouring t_2, u, v and t_2 again. The only step after which \vec{G} may contain a monochromatic directed cycle is the one recolouring v . In that case, $P_2 = (v, t_2, u)$ and there is a directed (t_2, v) -path P_4 , in $\vec{G} - u$ with internal vertices coloured 1.

The existence of P_1, P_2, P_3 , and P_4 ensures that $d(v) \geq 5$ (see Figure 6), and completes the proof of (i).




Figure 6: A 3-vertex u and its lonely neighbour v in a dicolouring ϕ from which we cannot reach the dicolouring ψ swapping the colours of u and v via a redicolouring sequence. Vertices coloured 1 are shown in red, while vertices coloured 2 are shown in blue. Vertex t_1 must be blocked, yielding the existence of monochromatic path P_3 and the arc vt_1 . Vertex v must be blocked after recolouring t_2 , yielding P_4 and the arc vt_2 .

(ii) Assume $d(v) = 5$. Let y_1 (resp. y_2) be the in-neighbour of v in P_3 (resp. P_4). Recall also that, without loss of generality, we can take $\phi(u) = 1$ and $\phi(v) = 2$. We shall prove that y_1 and y_2 both have degree at least 4 in \vec{G} .

- Assume for a contradiction that $d(y_1) = 3$. If the in-neighbour of y_1 on P_3 is coloured 2, we can recolour y_1 to 1 without creating a monochromatic directed cycle coloured 1. If not, the in-neighbour must be t_1 , and since its lonely neighbour v is coloured 2, again letting us recolour y_1 without creating a monochromatic directed cycle. Having recoloured y_1 , the whole in-neighbourhood of v is now coloured 1, since v is a lonely

neighbour of t_1 , we can set t_1 to colour 2 without creating any monochromatic directed cycle. Next we can successively recolour v to 1 since its out-neighbours are coloured 2, then u to 2 since its lonely out-neighbour v is now coloured 2. Now if recolouring y_1 yields a monochromatic directed cycle C , it does not contain neither u nor t_1 because they are both coloured 2 and v is coloured 1. Then C must have already been a monochromatic directed cycle in ϕ , which is a contradiction. Hence we can recolour y_1 , and finally recolour t_1 to obtain a redicolouring sequence from ϕ to ψ , a contradiction.

- Assume for a contradiction that $d(y_2) = 3$. We start by recolouring t_2 to colour 1, and u to colour 2. Now we can recolour y_2 to colour 2 since $d(y_2) = 3$, the in-neighbour of y_2 in P_4 is coloured 1 and the out-neighbourhood of v is coloured 1. Then, we can recolour v to colour 1 because its in-neighbourhood is coloured 2. Next we can recolour t_2 to colour 2 since its in-neighbour v is coloured 1, and we can finally recolour y_2 to obtain a redicolouring sequence from ϕ to ψ , a contradiction. \diamond

From now on, for each (≥ 4) -vertex v , we let S_v be the set of 3-vertices x such that v is the lonely neighbour of x .

Claim 16.6: *Let v be a (≥ 4) -vertex, then $|S_v| \leq d(v) - 2$.*

Proof of claim. Assume for a contradiction that $|S_v| \geq d(v) - 1$. If $|S_v| = d(v) - 1$, we let w be the only neighbour of v which does not belong to S_v . By directional duality, we may assume that w is an out-neighbour of v . If $|S_v| = d(v)$, let w be any out-neighbour of v .

We shall find a redicolouring sequence from α to β . Without loss of generality, we may assume $\beta(v) = 1$. We first find a redicolouring sequence from α to a 2-dicolouring $\tilde{\alpha}$ such that $\tilde{\alpha}(v) = 1$. If $\alpha(v) = 1$, there is nothing to do. Assume now that $\alpha(v) = 2$. We distinguish two cases, depending on the colour of w .

- If $\alpha(w) = 1$, then we can set every vertex in $N^+(v)$ to colour 1 without creating any monochromatic directed cycle. Next we can set every vertex in $N^-(v)$ to colour 2. Finally we can recolour v to 1.
- If $\alpha(w) = 2$, then we set every vertex in $N^-(v)$ to colour 1. Next we set every vertex in $N^+(v)$ to colour 2. Finally we can recolour v to 1.

We now have a 2-dicolouring $\tilde{\alpha}$ such that $\tilde{\alpha}(v) = \beta(v) = 1$. First we set each vertex in S_v to colour 2. Then we consider $\vec{G}' = \vec{G} - (\{v\} \cup S_v)$. By the minimality of \vec{G} , there is a redicolouring sequence from $\tilde{\alpha}'$ to β' , the restrictions of $\tilde{\alpha}$ and β to \vec{G}' . This sequence extends directly to \vec{G} , since v is coloured 1 and every vertex in S_v is coloured 2. Finally we only have to set each vertex $x \in S_v$ to colour $\beta(x)$. This operation does not create any monochromatic directed cycle, because such a cycle C should be coloured 1 (since we only recolour some vertices of S_v to colour 1). But then, every vertex in C is also coloured 1 in β , a contradiction.

We finally get a redicolouring sequence from $\tilde{\alpha}$ to β . Since we described above a redicolouring sequence from α to $\tilde{\alpha}$, there is a redicolouring sequence from α to β , a contradiction. \diamond

Claim 16.7: *Let v be a 4-vertex. If $|S_v| = 0$, then $|N(v) \cap V_3| \leq 2$.*

Proof of claim. Assume for a contradiction that $|S_v| = 0$ and $|N(v) \cap V_3| \geq 3$. We consider $\vec{G}' = \vec{G} - (\{v\} \cup (N(v) \cap V_3))$. By minimality of \vec{G} , there is a redicolouring sequence $\gamma'_0, \dots, \gamma'_r$ where γ'_0 and γ'_r are the restrictions of α and β to \vec{G}' . In order to get a contradiction, we exhibit a redicolouring sequence from $\alpha = \gamma_0$ to $\beta = \gamma_r$ in \vec{G} as follows. For $i = 1$ to r , we show that there exists a 2-dicolouring γ_i of \vec{G} such that γ'_i is the restriction of γ_i on \vec{G}' , and there is a redicolouring sequence from γ_{i-1} to γ_i . The concatenation of these sequences will then yield the desired sequence between α and β .

Assume that for any $i \geq 1$, we have defined dicolouring γ_{i-1} such that γ'_{i-1} is the restriction of γ_i to \vec{G}' , let us and exhibit a redicolouring sequence from γ_{i-1} to some γ_i such that γ'_i is a restriction of γ_i to \vec{G}' . In \vec{G} , γ_{i-1} , we first recolour each vertex of $N(v) \cap V_3$ with the colour different from the one of its lonely neighbour to get a new 2-dicolouring $\tilde{\gamma}_{i-1}$ (possibly equal to γ_{i-1}). Note that γ'_{i-1} is still the restriction of $\tilde{\gamma}_{i-1}$ on \vec{G}' . Let x_i be the vertex recoloured between γ'_{i-1} and γ'_i .

If recolouring x_i in our current colouring $\tilde{\gamma}_{i-1}$ of \vec{G} creates no monochromatic directed cycle, we let γ_i be the resulting colouring. Then, we have defined a sequence from γ_{i-1} to $\tilde{\gamma}_{i-1}$ to γ_i , yielding the desired property. If the recolouring of x_i in $\tilde{\gamma}_{i-1}$ does yield a monochromatic directed cycle, the cycle must contain at least one vertex in $\{v\} \cup (N(v) \cap V_3)$. Moreover, it must always contain a 3-vertex x that is a neighbour of v , because when it contains v it must also contain two of its neighbours, and by assumption at most one is not a 3-vertex. Since in $\tilde{\gamma}_{i-1}$, x is coloured differently from its lonely neighbour, x_i must be the lonely neighbour of x . We may assume without loss of generality that x is an out-neighbour of v . Since all 3-vertices in $N(v)$, that is, all but one vertex in $N(v)$, are now coloured differently from their lonely neighbour, we can recolour v without creating any monochromatic directed cycle. Hence, up to this recolouring, we may assume that the two in-neighbours of x have the same colour. If this colour is the same as x , then we can recolour x and then recolour x_i , otherwise we can directly recolour x_i . In both cases, we let γ_i be the resulting colouring, which has been obtained by a redicolouring sequence from γ_{i-1} .

Concatenating the sequences $\gamma_{i-1}, \dots, \gamma_i$ for $i \in [r]$ yields a sequence from α to a dicolouring γ_r which agrees with β on $V(\vec{G}')$. To extend this into a redicolouring sequence to β , in γ_r we start by recolouring each vertex of $N(v) \cap V_3$ with the colour different from the one of its lonely neighbour. Then, if necessary, we can recolour v to $\beta(v)$ without creating any monochromatic directed cycle. Finally we recolour in any order the neighbours of v that need to be recoloured with their colour in β . If recolouring one of these vertices, say y , were to create a monochromatic directed cycle C , since β is a 2-dicolouring, C would have to contain both y and a neighbour of v coloured differently than in β . But these neighbours can only be other 3-vertices that we have not recoloured at this point, which are therefore coloured differently from their lonely neighbour, thus cannot be part of a monochromatic directed cycle. Hence, we have a redicolouring sequence from α to β , yielding the contradiction. \diamond

Claim 16.8: *Let v be a 4-vertex. If $|S_v| = 1$, then $|N(v) \cap V_3| \leq 2$.*

Proof of claim. Assume for a contradiction that $|S_v| = 1$ and $|N(v) \cap V_3| \geq 3$, and let u be the only vertex in S_v . By directional duality, we may assume that u is an in-neighbour of v . Note that by Claim 16.4, $d^-(v) = d^+(v) = 2$. This implies that v has at least one out-neighbour x in V_3 , and $d^+(x) = 1$ since $S_v = \{u\}$.

By Claim 16.3, there are two 2-dicolourings ϕ and ψ of \vec{G} that agree on $V(\vec{G}) \setminus \{u, v\}$ and such that there is no redicolouring sequence from ϕ to ψ . In this case, $\phi(u) \neq \phi(v)$ and both u and v are blocked in ϕ , for otherwise we could recolour them one after the other to yield ψ . Without loss of generality, let $\phi(u) = 1$ and $\phi(v) = 2$. For each $j \in [2]$ there is a (v, u) -path P_j whose internal vertices are all coloured j in ϕ . We now distinguish two cases, depending on whether x belongs to P_1 or P_2 .

- Assume first that x is the out-neighbour of v in P_1 . Then x can be recoloured since its only out-neighbour is coloured 1. After recolouring x , every out-neighbour of v is coloured 2, hence we can successively recolour v to 1 and u to 2. We finally can recolour x to 1, since this directly gives dicolouring ψ , yielding a redicolouring sequence from ϕ to ψ , a contradiction.
- Assume now that x is the out-neighbour of v in P_2 . Then, x can be recoloured since its only out-neighbour is either coloured 2 or it is u (and the only out-neighbour of u is coloured 2). After recolouring x , every out-neighbour of v has colour 1, and we can recolour u to colour 2. Now, recolouring v to colour 1 does not create any monochromatic directed cycle. Indeed, such a cycle C would necessarily contain x , otherwise C would already be monochromatic in ψ , and be coloured 1. Note that x has only one out-neighbour, which is necessarily coloured 2, because it is either internal to P_2 , or it is u , which is now coloured 2. We finally can recolour x , yielding a redicolouring sequence from ϕ to ψ , a contradiction.

\diamond

Claim 16.9: *Let v be a 4-vertex with $|S_v| = 2$. Set $S_v = \{u_1, u_2\}$ and $N(v) \setminus S_v = \{w_1, w_2\}$. Then each of the following holds:*

- (i) v has exactly one in-neighbour and one out-neighbour in S_v ;
- (ii) v has exactly one in-neighbour and one out-neighbour in $\{w_1, w_2\}$;

(iii) $d(w_1) \geq 4$ and $d(w_2) \geq 4$;

(iv) \vec{G} has a 2-dicolouring γ such that $\gamma(u_1) = \gamma(u_2) = 1$, $\gamma(v) = \gamma(w_1) = \gamma(w_2) = 2$ and there exists no redicolouring sequence from γ that recolours at least one vertex in $N[v]$.

Proof of claim. (i) By Claim 16.4, we have $d^+(v) = d^-(v) = 2$. Suppose (i) does not hold, and assume without loss of generality that both u_1 and u_2 are in-neighbours of v , so both w_1 and w_2 are out-neighbours of v . Towards a contradiction, we exhibit a redicolouring sequence from α to β .

Starting from α , we first show how to obtain a dicolouring where v is coloured $\beta(v)$. If $\alpha(v) = \beta(v)$, there is nothing to do. If $\alpha(v) \neq \beta(v)$, we distinguish three cases depending on the colours of $\alpha(w_1)$ and $\alpha(w_2)$:

- If $\alpha(w_1) = \alpha(w_2) = \alpha(v)$, then we can directly recolour v .
- If $\alpha(w_1) = \alpha(w_2) \neq \alpha(v)$, then we can set both u_1 and u_2 to $\alpha(v)$, and then recolour v with $\beta(v)$.
- We may thus assume $\alpha(w_1) \neq \alpha(w_2)$. Since $\alpha(v) \neq \beta(v)$, we first set u_1 and u_2 to colour $\beta(v)$, naming the resulting 2-dicolouring $\hat{\alpha}$. Then, we consider $\vec{G}' = \vec{G} - \{v, u_1, u_2\}$ and let $\hat{\alpha}'$ be the restriction of $\hat{\alpha}$ to \vec{G}' . By minimality of \vec{G} , \vec{G}' is 2-mixing. In particular, there is a redicolouring sequence from $\hat{\alpha}'$ to its mirror. Along this sequence, since we initially set $\hat{\alpha}'(w_1) \neq \hat{\alpha}'(w_2)$, there is a 2-dicolouring $\check{\alpha}'$ of \vec{G}' such that $\check{\alpha}'(w_1) = \check{\alpha}'(w_2)$. The redicolouring sequence from $\hat{\alpha}'$ to $\check{\alpha}'$ in \vec{G}' directly extends to a redicolouring sequence from $\hat{\alpha}$ to a 2-dicolouring $\check{\alpha}$ in \vec{G} . Indeed, in $\hat{\alpha}$, both u_1 and u_2 are coloured differently from their lonely neighbour v , and v has no other in-neighbours, thus applying the same sequence in $\hat{\alpha}$ does not create any monochromatic directed cycle. After this recolouring, we obtain dicolouring $\check{\alpha}$ such that $\check{\alpha}(w_1) = \check{\alpha}(w_2)$, allowing us to apply one of the first two items to recolour v .

We have shown that there is a (possibly empty) redicolouring sequence from α to a 2-dicolouring $\alpha^*(v)$ such that $\alpha^*(v) = \beta(v)$. We now start from α^* , set both u_1 and u_2 to $\bar{\beta}(v)$, and name the resulting 2-dicolouring $\tilde{\alpha}$. Consider $\vec{G}' = \vec{G} - \{v, u_1, u_2\}$ and $\tilde{\alpha}', \beta'$ the restrictions of $\tilde{\alpha}$ and β to \vec{G}' . By minimality of \vec{G} , there is a redicolouring sequence from $\tilde{\alpha}'$ to β' in \vec{G}' . This redicolouring sequence immediately extends to \vec{G} , by keeping $\tilde{\alpha}$ on v, u_1, u_2 , and we may only need to change the colour of u_1 and u_2 at the end. Therefore there is a redicolouring sequence from α to β , a contradiction. This proves (i).

(ii) follows directly from (i) by Claim 16.4.

(iv) By (i) and (ii), we may assume that u_1 and w_1 are the in-neighbours of v and u_2 and w_2 are the out-neighbours of v . Assume for the sake of contradiction that (iv) does not hold, that is:

(\star) for any 2-dicolouring c of \vec{G} , such that $c(u_1) = c(u_2)$ and $c(v) = c(w_1) = c(w_2)$ with $c(v) \neq c(u_1)$, there is a redicolouring sequence from c to a 2-dicolouring c' such that for at least one vertex x in $N[v]$, $c(x) \neq c'(x)$.

Assuming this, we will prove that there is a redicolouring sequence from α to β , which is a contradiction, showing the existence of γ .

First we show that there is a redicolouring sequence from α to some colouring $\tilde{\alpha}$, where $\tilde{\alpha}(w_1) \neq \tilde{\alpha}(w_2)$. If $\alpha(w_1) \neq \alpha(w_2)$, we let $\tilde{\alpha} = \alpha$, otherwise, $\alpha(w_1) = \alpha(w_2)$ and we distinguish two cases according to whether $\alpha(v) = \alpha(w_1)$ or not.

- Assume $\alpha(w_1) = \alpha(w_2) \neq \alpha(v)$. Starting from α , we first set both u_1 and u_2 to $\bar{\alpha}(v)$. Then, we consider $\vec{G}' = \vec{G} - \{u_1, u_2, v\}$, which must be 2-mixing by minimality of \vec{G} . In particular, there is a redicolouring sequence in \vec{G}' from α' , the restriction of α to \vec{G}' , to its mirror $\bar{\alpha}'$. Along this sequence, we let $\tilde{\alpha}'$ be the first colouring where w_1 and w_2 are coloured differently. The redicolouring sequence from α' to $\tilde{\alpha}'$ in \vec{G}' directly extends to a redicolouring sequence from α to $\tilde{\alpha}$ in \vec{G} . Indeed, we keep v coloured with $\alpha(v)$ and u_1 and u_2 with $\bar{\alpha}(v)$ throughout the sequence, which does not create any monochromatic directed cycle since v does not have any neighbour coloured $\alpha(v)$ until reaching $\tilde{\alpha}$, when it has exactly one.

- Assume $\alpha(w_1) = \alpha(w_2) = \alpha(v)$. Starting from α , we first set both u_1 and u_2 to $\bar{\alpha}(v)$. Now by (\star) there is a recolouring sequence from α to a 2-dicolouring $\hat{\alpha}$ where one vertex x in $N[v]$ has a different colour. If x is w_1 or w_2 , then we are done. If x is v , then we are done by the previous case. Finally if x is u_1 or u_2 , then v has three neighbours coloured $\alpha(v)$, hence v can be recoloured $\bar{\alpha}(v)$, and we are done by the previous case.

The same proof applies to β to yield a recolouring sequence from β to some 2-dicolouring $\tilde{\beta}$ such that $\tilde{\beta}(w_1) \neq \tilde{\beta}(w_2)$. It now suffices to exhibit a recolouring sequence from $\tilde{\alpha}$ to $\tilde{\beta}$.

Consider $\vec{G}' = \vec{G} - \{v, u_1, u_2\}$, which is 2-mixing by minimality of \vec{G} , giving us a recolouring sequence $\tilde{\alpha}' = \eta'_0, \dots, \eta'_r = \tilde{\beta}'$, where $\tilde{\alpha}'$ and $\tilde{\beta}'$ are the restrictions of $\tilde{\alpha}$ and $\tilde{\beta}$ to \vec{G}' . We will extend this recolouring sequence to \vec{G} . To do so, for $i = 1$ to r , we show that there exists a 2-dicolouring η_i of \vec{G} such that η'_i is the restriction of η_i on \vec{G}' , and there is a recolouring sequence from η_{i-1} to η_i . To ensure that extending this sequence does not create any monochromatic directed cycle, we will maintain the property that $\{v, w_1, w_2\}$ is not monochromatic in each η_i .

We first set η_0 to $\tilde{\alpha}$. Since $\tilde{\alpha}(w_1) \neq \tilde{\alpha}(w_2)$, $\{v, w_1, w_2\}$ is not monochromatic in η_0 . Assume now that η_{i-1} exists, and let us define η_i . Let x_i be the vertex that is recoloured from η'_{i-1} to η'_i . Without loss of generality, say v is coloured 1 in η_{i-1} . We may assume that $\eta_{i-1}(u_1) = \eta_{i-1}(u_2) = 2$, otherwise we may recolour them. Then, if recolouring x_i does not break the invariant that $\{v, w_1, w_2\}$ is not monochromatic, we can recolour x_i without creating any monochromatic directed cycle and obtain the desired η_i . Indeed, a resulting monochromatic directed cycle cannot contain u_1 or u_2 , so it must contain v and therefore both w_1 and w_2 , which are coloured differently. If recolouring x_i breaks the invariant, x_i must belong to $\{w_1, w_2\}$. Assume then that $x_i = w_1$, and recolouring w_1 breaks the invariant. This implies that w_2 is currently coloured 1 and w_1 is going to be recoloured from colour 2 to colour 1. In this case, all in-neighbours of v are coloured 2, allowing us to first recolour u_2 without creating any monochromatic directed cycle. Now, all out-neighbours of v are coloured 1, letting us set v to colour 2. We finally can recolour w_1 to colour 1 and we get the desired η_i extending η'_i and preserving the invariant. The arguments hold symmetrically when the recoloured vertex x_i is w_2 .

Concatenating the resulting sequences $\eta_{i-1}, \dots, \eta_i$ for $i \in [1, r]$, we obtain a recolouring sequence from $\tilde{\alpha}$ to a 2-dicolouring β^* which agrees with $\tilde{\beta}$ on $V(\vec{G}')$. Moreover, $\{v, w_1, w_2\}$ is not monochromatic in β^* . We now turn to exhibiting a recolouring sequence from β^* to $\tilde{\beta}$. Let us assume, without loss of generality, that $\beta^*(v) = 1$. We may first set u_1 and u_2 to colour 2, as v is their lonely neighbour. We show how to recolour v to $\tilde{\beta}(v)$, when required, without affecting the colours of $V(\vec{G}')$. Note that $\tilde{\beta}(v)$ is a dicolouring, so any monochromatic directed cycle resulting from recolouring v must use one of u_1 or u_2 . We distinguish two cases according to $\beta^*(w_1) = \tilde{\beta}(w_1)$.

- If $\tilde{\beta}(w_1) = 1$, we know by assumption on $\tilde{\beta}$ that $\tilde{\beta}(w_2) = 2$. Now, all out-neighbours of v are coloured 2, letting us first recolour u_1 to 1. Then, all in-neighbours of v are coloured 1, letting us set v to colour 2.
- If $\tilde{\beta}(w_1) = 2$, we know by assumption that $\tilde{\beta}(w_2) = 1$. Symmetrically, all in-neighbours of v are coloured 2, letting us recolour u_2 to 1. Then, all out-neighbours of v are coloured 1, letting us recolour v to 2.

Finally, if necessary, we may recolour u_1 and u_2 . To do so, we may initially set u_1 and u_2 to the colour different from $\tilde{\beta}(v)$. Then, if only one of u_1, u_2 needs to be recoloured, this can be done since $\tilde{\beta}$ is a dicolouring. If both need to be recoloured, this can also be done in any order, as any resulting monochromatic directed cycle would also exist in $\tilde{\beta}$. This yields recolouring sequence from $\tilde{\alpha}$ to $\tilde{\beta}$, which together with the recolouring sequences from α to $\tilde{\alpha}$ and β to $\tilde{\beta}$ yields a recolouring sequence from α to β , a contradiction. This achieves to prove (iv) .

(iii) This is a consequence of (iv) , let us consider the dicolouring γ given by (iv) with $\gamma(u_1) = \gamma(u_2) = 1$ and $\gamma(v) = \gamma(w_1) = \gamma(w_2) = 2$. In γ , u_2 cannot be recoloured to 2, therefore there is a (u_2, w_1) -path with internal vertices coloured 2. If $d(w_1) = 3$, then w_1 could be recoloured 1 because its out-neighbour v is coloured 2 and one of its in-neighbours is either coloured 2 or is u_2 , whose unique in-neighbour v is coloured 2. This would contradict (iv) , hence $d(w_1) \geq 4$. We can show symmetrically that $d(w_2) \geq 4$, achieving to prove (iii) . \diamond

Claim 16.10: *If v is a 4-vertex, then $|N(v) \cap V_3| \leq 2$.*

Proof of claim. This is a direct consequence of Claims 16.6, 16.7, 16.8 and 16.9. \diamond

We shall now use the Discharging Method. The initial charge of each vertex x is $d(x)$, and we apply the following rules:

(R1) Each vertex x such that $d(x) = 3$ and $|N(x) \cap V_3| \geq 2$ receives $\frac{1}{2}$ charge from its lonely neighbour.

(R2) Each vertex x such that $d(x) = 3$ and $|N(x) \cap V_3| \leq 1$ receives $\frac{1}{4}$ from each of its (≥ 4)-neighbours.

Let us now show that the final charge $w^*(x)$ of a vertex x in \vec{G} is at least $\frac{7}{2}$, showing that $|A| \geq \frac{7}{4}|V|$, which contradicts the assumption $|A| < \frac{7}{4}|V|$.

- Assume $d(x) = 3$ and $|N(x) \cap V_3| \geq 2$, then x receives $\frac{1}{2}$ by (R1). Hence $w^*(x) = d(x) + \frac{1}{2} = \frac{7}{2}$.
- Assume $d(x) = 3$ and $|N(x) \cap V_3| \leq 1$, then x receives $\frac{1}{4}$ by (R2) at least twice. Hence $w^*(x) \geq d(x) + \frac{1}{2} = \frac{7}{2}$.
- Assume $d(x) = 4$. By Claim 16.5, x does not give any charge through (R1), and by Claim 16.10 it gives at most twice $\frac{1}{4}$ by (R2). Hence $w^*(x) \geq d(x) - 2 \cdot \frac{1}{4} = \frac{7}{2}$.
- Assume $d(x) = 5$. If x gives $\frac{1}{2}$ charge at least once by (R1), then by Claim 16.5, x has at least two neighbours that did not take any charge from x . Therefore $w^*(x) \geq d(x) - 3 \times \frac{1}{2} = \frac{7}{2}$.
If x does not give by (R1), then it gives at most $\frac{1}{4}$ to each of its neighbours. Thus $w^*(x) \geq d(x) - d(x) \times \frac{1}{4} = \frac{15}{4} > \frac{7}{2}$.
- Finally assume $d(x) \geq 6$. By Claim 16.6, x gives $\frac{1}{2}$ by (R1) to at most $d(x) - 2$ of its neighbours. Thus $w^*(x) \geq d(x) - \frac{1}{2}(d(x) - 2) - 2 \times \frac{1}{4} = \frac{d(x)}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \geq \frac{7}{2}$.

This completes the proof of Theorem 16. □

5 Further research

In this first paper, we established the first results on digraph redicolouring. This is obviously just the tip of the iceberg and many open questions arise. Forthwith, we detail a few of them.

In Section 2, we prove that k -DICOLOURING PATH is PSPACE-complete for all $k \geq 2$. But we did not prove any complexity result about DIRECTED IS k -MIXING.

Problem 17. What is the complexity of DIRECTED IS k -MIXING?

We believe that this is PSPACE-hard for all $k \geq 2$. To settle the complexity of DIRECTED IS k -MIXING, it could be helpful to settle the complexity of the following particular case of 2-DICOLOURING PATH. (Recall that the mirror of a 2-dicolouring α of D , is the 2-dicolouring $\bar{\alpha}$ of D such that $\alpha(v) \neq \bar{\alpha}(v)$ for all $v \in V(D)$.)

MIRROR-REACHABILITY

Input: A 2-dicolouring α of a digraph D .

Question: Is there a path between α and its mirror $\bar{\alpha}$ in $\mathcal{D}_2(D)$?

Problem 18. What is the complexity of MIRROR-REACHABILITY?

A particular case of non k -mixing digraphs are k -freezable digraphs. It would then be interesting to consider the complexity of the following problem.

DIRECTED IS k -FREEZABLE

Input: A k -dicolourable digraph D .

Question: Is D k -freezable?

Note that deciding whether a digraph is k -freezable is NP-complete in general since we can reduce easily from k -dicolourability for all $k \geq 2$. Indeed, for a digraph D , let D' be the digraph obtained from D by adding on

each vertex $v \in V(D)$ a complete bidirected graph K_k^v which contains v and $k - 1$ new vertices. Trivially, D' is k -dicolourable if and only if D is k -dicolourable, and every k -dicolouring of D' (if one exists) is necessarily frozen because of the complete bidirected graphs. Therefore D' is k -freezable if and only if D is k -dicolourable.

A related problem is the one of deciding whether a vertex is frozen in a given k -dicolouring α of a digraph D . Recall that a vertex v is frozen in α if $\beta(v) = \alpha(v)$ for any k -dicolouring β in the same connected component of α in $\mathcal{D}_k(D)$.

k -FROZEN VERTEX

Input: A digraph D , a k -dicolouring α of D , and a vertex v of D .

Question: Is v frozen in α ?

2-FROZEN VERTEX is PSPACE-complete. This comes from the following result from [10]: given a cubic graph G , a mapping $\phi : V(G) \rightarrow \{1, 2\}$, a proper orientation \vec{G} of G , and an edge xy of G , deciding whether there is a reorienting sequence from \vec{G} that reverse xy is PSPACE-complete. Hence, the same reduction as the one used for Theorem 5 also yields PSPACE-completeness of 2-FROZEN VERTEX.

One can then easily derive that k -FROZEN VERTEX is PSPACE-complete for any $k \geq 2$. Indeed, consider a (non-acyclic) digraph D_2 and a 2-dicolouring α_2 of D_2 . Let D_k be the digraph obtained the disjoint union of D_2 and bidirected complete graph $\overleftrightarrow{K}_{k-2}$ on $k - 2$ vertices y_1, \dots, y_{k-2} and adding a digon between any vertex of D_2 and any vertex of $\overleftrightarrow{K}_{k-2}$. Let α_k be the k -dicolouring of D_k defined by $\alpha_k(v) = \alpha_2(v)$ for all $v \in V(D_2)$ and $\alpha_k(y_i) = i + 2$ for every $i \in [k - 2]$. One can easily check that a vertex v in $V(D_2)$ is frozen in α_2 if and only if it is frozen in α_k .

For each of the above problems which are proved or conjectured to be PSPACE-complete, it is natural to determine the smallest possible classes of digraphs on which the problem remains PSPACE-complete. For example, in Theorem 5, we prove that it remains PSPACE-complete for oriented graphs in (ii) and planar oriented graphs with maximum degree at most 6 in (iv). This raises the following questions.

Problem 19. (a) What is the smallest D_k (resp. D_k^*) such that k -DICOLOURING PATH remains PSPACE-complete for oriented graphs (resp. planar oriented graphs) with maximum degree at most D_k (resp. D_k^*)?

(b) Does k -DICOLOURING PATH remain PSPACE-complete for digraphs with no directed cycles of length less than g , for any fixed g .

Regarding Problem 19 (a), Theorem 5 and Theorem 11 imply that $D_2 \in \{4, 5\}$. Thus the first question to address is the following.

Problem 20. What is the complexity of 2-DICOLOURING PATH restricted to digraphs with maximum degree at most 4?

In the opposite direction, it would be interesting to determine the largest possible classes of digraphs for which k -DICOLOURING PATH can be solved in polynomial time. For example, Corollary 12 implies that DIRECTED IS 2-MIXING is polynomial-time solvable for subcubic digraphs. This raises the following questions.

Problem 21. (a) What is the largest M_k such that DIRECTED IS k -MIXING is polynomial-time solvable for digraphs with maximum degree at most M_k ?

(b) What is the largest M_k^* such that DIRECTED IS k -FREEZABLE is polynomial-time solvable for digraphs with maximum degree at most M_k^* ?

A first step towards tackling Problem 21 (a) would be to determine whether Theorem 11 extends to digraphs with maximum degree k for every odd k .

Problem 22. Let $k = 2\ell + 1$ be an odd positive integer. Is every oriented graph with maximum degree k ($\ell + 1$)-mixing?

Corollary 15 directly implies that a planar oriented graph is not 3-freezable. It is then natural to ask whether a planar oriented graph is always 3-mixing.

Problem 23. Is every planar oriented graph 3-mixing?

In Sections 3 and 4, we established several conditions for a digraph to be k -mixing and sometimes some bounds on the diameter. It is then natural to ask whether the bound in the diameter is tight or not. For example, Theorem 6 states that every $(k - 2)$ -min-degenerate digraph D is k -mixing and following its proof one can show that the diameter of $\mathcal{D}_k(D)$ is at most 2^n with $n = |V(D)|$. But it is likely to be smaller, perhaps even polynomial in n .

Problem 24. What is the maximum diameter of $\mathcal{D}_k(D)$ over all $(k - 2)$ -min-degenerate digraphs D of order n ?

Another example is the diameter of $\mathcal{D}_2(\vec{G})$ for a subcubic oriented graph \vec{G} . By Theorem 11, it is at most $2n$. But, we do not know if this bound is tight.

Problem 25. What is the maximum diameter of $\mathcal{D}_2(\vec{G})$ over all subcubic oriented graphs \vec{G} of order n ?

References

- [1] Valentin Bartier. *Combinatorial and Algorithmic aspects of Reconfiguration*. PhD thesis, Université Grenoble Alpes, 2021.
- [2] Marthe Bonamy, Nicolas Bousquet, and Guillem Perarnau. Frozen colourings of bounded degree graphs. *Electronic Notes in Discrete Mathematics*, 68:167–172, 2018. Discrete Mathematics Days 2018.
- [3] Paul Bonsma and Luis Cereceda. Finding paths between graph colourings: PSPACE-completeness and super-polynomial distances. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 410(50):5215–5226, 2009. Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science (MFCS 2007).
- [4] Nicolas Bousquet and Marc Heinrich. A polynomial version of Cereceda’s conjecture. *CoRR*, abs/1903.05619, 2019.
- [5] Nicolas Bousquet and Guillem Perarnau. Fast recoloring of sparse graphs. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 52:1–11, 2016.
- [6] Luis Cereceda. *Mixing graph colourings*. PhD thesis, London School of Economics and Political Science, 2007.
- [7] Luis Cereceda, Jan Van den Heuvel, and Matthew Johnson. Mixing 3-colourings in bipartite graphs. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 30(7):1593–1606, 2009.
- [8] Luis Cereceda, Jan van den Heuvel, and Matthew Johnson. Finding paths between 3-colorings. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 67(1):69–82, 2011.
- [9] Martin Dyer, Abraham D. Flaxman, Alan M. Frieze, and Eric Vigoda. Randomly coloring sparse random graphs with fewer colors than the maximum degree. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 29(4):450–465, 2006.
- [10] Robert A. Hearn and Erik D. Demaine. PSPACE-completeness of sliding-block puzzles and other problems through the nondeterministic constraint logic model of computation. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 343(1-2):72–96, 2005.
- [11] Jan van den Heuvel. *The complexity of change*, page 127–160. London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series. Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- [12] Felix Lazebnik and Vasily A. Ustimenko. Explicit construction of graphs with an arbitrary large girth and of large size. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 60(1-3):275–284, 1995.
- [13] Victor Neumann-Lara. The dichromatic number of a digraph. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B.*, 33:265–270, 1982.
- [14] Naomi Nishimura. Introduction to reconfiguration. *Algorithms*, 11(4), 2018.
- [15] Walter J. Savitch. Relationships between nondeterministic and deterministic tape complexities. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 4(2):177–192, 1970.