

Proof Complexity and the Kneser-Lovász Theorem

Gabriel Istrate^{1,2} and Adrian Crăciun^{1,2}

¹ Dept. of Computer Science, West University of Timișoara, Timișoara, RO-300223, Romania.

² e-Austria Research Institute, Bd. V. Pârvan 4, cam. 045 B, Timișoara, RO-300223, Romania.

Corresponding author's email: gabrielistrate@acm.org

Abstract. We investigate the proof complexity of a class of propositional formulas expressing a combinatorial principle known as *the Kneser-Lovász Theorem*. This is a family of propositional tautologies, indexed by a nonnegative integer parameter k that generalizes the Pigeonhole Principle (obtained for $k = 1$). We show, for all fixed k , $2^{\Omega(n)}$ lower bounds on resolution complexity and exponential lower bounds for bounded depth Frege proofs. These results hold even for the more restricted class of formulas encoding Schrijver's strengthening of the Kneser-Lovász Theorem. On the other hand for the cases $k = 2, 3$ (for which combinatorial proofs of the Kneser-Lovász Theorem are known) we give polynomial size Frege ($k = 2$), respectively extended Frege ($k = 3$) proofs. The paper concludes with a brief announcement of the results (presented in subsequent work) on the complexity of the general case of the Kneser-Lovász theorem.

1 Introduction

One of the most interesting approaches in discrete mathematics is the use of topological methods to prove results having a purely combinatorial nature. The approach started with Lovász's proof [18] of a combinatorial statement raised as an open problem by Kneser in 1955 (see [16] for a historical account). A significant amount of work has resulted from this conjecture (to get a feel for the advances consult [20, 11]).

Methods from topological combinatorics raise interesting challenges from a complexity-theoretic point of view: they are non-constructive, often based on principles that appear to lack polynomial time algorithms (e.g. Sperner's Lemma and the Borsuk-Ulam Theorem [22]). The concepts involved (simplicial complexes, chains, chain maps) seem to require intrinsically exponential-size representations.

In this paper we raise the possibility of using statements from topological combinatorics as a source of interesting candidates for proof complexity. In particular we view the Kneser-Lovász theorem as a statement on the unsatisfiability of a certain class of propositional formulas, and investigate the complexity of proving their unsatisfiability.

We were initially motivated by the problem of separating the Frege and extended Frege proof systems. Various candidate formulas have been proposed (see [2] for a discussion). The question whether the non-elementary nature of mathematical proofs of Kneser's theorem translates into hardness and separation results in propositional complexity is a natural one to ask.

A slightly different perspective on this problem is the following: Matoušek obtained [19] a "purely combinatorial" proof of the Kneser-Lovász theorem, a proof that does not

explicitly mention any topological concept. While combinatorial, Matoušek’s proof is nonconstructive: the approach in [19] ”hides” in purely combinatorial terms the application of the so-called *Octahedral Tucker Lemma*, a discrete variant of the Borsuk-Ulam theorem. Searching for the object guaranteed to exist by this principle, though ”constructive” in theory [7] is likely to be intractable, as the associated search problem is likely to be complete for the class PPAD [21]³.

Thus another perspective on the main question we are interested in is **under what circumstances do cases of the Kneser-Lovász theorem have combinatorial proofs of polynomial size**. This depends, of course, on the proof system considered, making the question fit the ”bounded reverse mathematics” program of Cook and Nguyen [5]. A natural boundary seems to be the class of Frege proofs: for $k = 1$ the Kneser-Lovász theorem is equivalent to the pigeonhole principle (PHP) that has polynomial size TC^0 -Frege proofs, but exponential lower bounds in resolution [3] and bounded depth Frege. On the other hand **obtaining a similar upper bound** for the general case would be quite significant, as **it would seem to require completely bypassing the techniques from Algebraic Topology** starting instead from radically different principles.

Our contributions (and the outline of the paper) can be summarized as follows: In Section 3 we give a reduction between $Kneser_{k,n}$ and $Kneser_{k+1,n}$ for arbitrary $k \geq 1$. As an application we infer that existing lower bounds for PHP apply to formulas $Kneser_{k,n}$ for any fixed value of k . In Section 4 we investigate cases $k = 2, 3$ (when the Kneser-Lovász theorem has combinatorial proofs). We give Frege proofs (for $k = 2$) and extended Frege proofs (for $k = 3$), both having polynomial size.

As usual in the case of bounded reverse mathematics, our positive results could have been made uniform by stating them (more carefully) as expressibility results in certain logics: for instance our result for the case $k = 2$ of the Kneser-Lovász theorem could be strengthened to an expressibility result in logical theory VNC^1 [5]. We will not pursue this approach in the paper, deferring it to the journal version.

2 Preliminaries

Throughout this paper k will be a fixed constant greater or equal to 1. Given a set of integers A , we will denote by $\binom{A}{k}$ the set of cardinality k subsets of set A . We will write $\binom{n}{k}$ in the previous definition in case $A = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, for some $n \geq 1$. $A \subseteq [n]$ will be called *stable* if for no $1 \leq i \leq n$ both i and $i + 1 \pmod n$ are in A . Also denote by $A_{\leq k}$ (called ”firsts of A ”) the set of smallest (at most) k elements of A .

The Kneser-Lovász theorem informally states that if we color the size k subsets of set $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ with $n - 2k + 1$ colors, then two disjoint sets must have the same color. Formally:

Proposition 1. *Given $n \geq 2k \geq 1$ and a function $c : \binom{n}{k} \rightarrow [n - 2k + 1]$, there exist two disjoint sets A, B and a color $1 \leq l \leq n - 2k + 1$ with $c(A) = c(B) = l$.*

³ We thank Prof. Pálvölgyi for noting that while the Regular Tucker Lemma is indeed complete, the PPAD-completeness of the *Octahedral Tucker Lemma* is open.

An even stronger form was proved by Schrijver [24]: Proposition 1 is true if we limit the domain of c to all stable subsets of $[n]$ of cardinality k (we will denote this collection of such sets by $\binom{n}{k}_{stab}$):

Proposition 2. *Given $n \geq 2k \geq 1$ and a function $c : \binom{n}{k}_{stab} \rightarrow [n - 2k + 1]$, there exist two disjoint sets A, B and a color $1 \leq l \leq n - 2k + 1$ with $c(A) = c(B) = l$.*

The Kneser-Lovász Theorem can be seen as a statement about the chromatic number of a particular graph: define the graph $KG_{n,k}$ to consist of the subsets of cardinality k of $[n]$, connected by an edge when the corresponding sets are disjoint (Figure 2). Then the Kneser-Lovász Theorem is equivalent to $\chi(KG_{n,k}) \geq n - 2k + 2$ (in fact $\chi(KG_{n,k}) = n - 2k + 2$, since the upper bound is easy [20]).




Fig. 1. Kneser graph $KG_{5,2}$ a.k.a. the Petersen graph. The Kneser-Lovász Theorem states that the chromatic number of this graph is 3. Schrijver's Theorem claims that a similar result holds for the interior star only.

We assume familiarity with the basics of proof complexity, as presented for instance in [12], in particular with resolution complexity (the size measure will be denoted by res). We will also need concepts of Frege and extended Frege (EF) proof systems together with methods and results in [3]. We will state our positive results using the sequent calculus system LK [12], a system p -equivalent to Frege proofs.

Definition 1. Let PHP_n^m be the formula $\bigwedge_{i=1}^m (\bigvee_{l=1}^n X_{i,l}) \vdash \bigvee_{i \neq j} [\bigvee_{l=1}^n (X_{i,l} \wedge X_{j,l})]$.

PHP_n^{n+1} has polynomial size Frege proofs [3]. An important ingredient of the proof is the representation of natural numbers as sequences of bits, with every bit being expressed as the truth value of a certain formula. We will use a similar strategy. In particular quantities such as $\binom{n}{2}$ will refer to the logical encoding of the binary expansion of integer $\frac{n \cdot (n-1)}{2}$. We will further identify statements such as " $A = B$ " or " $A \leq B$ " with the logical formulas expressing them. The approach of Buss uses *counting*, defining a set of families of formulas $Count_n$, such that $Count_n(Y_1, \dots, Y_n)$ yields the binary encoding of the number of variables $Y_1, \dots, Y_n$ that are *TRUE*. Such formulas

can be computed by polynomial size Frege proofs [3]. We will often drop the index n from notation if its value is self-evident. We will further need several simple intentional properties of function *Count* with respect to combinatorics. Formal arguments are deferred to the journal version.

Lemma 1. *Let $n \leq m$. and let $X_1, \dots, X_n, Y_1, \dots, Y_m$ be boolean variables . In LK one can give polynomial-size proofs of the following facts:*

1. $X_1 \wedge X_2 \wedge \dots \wedge X_n \vdash \text{Count}_n(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n) = n$,
2. $\vdash \text{Count}_{\binom{n}{2}}(X_1 \wedge X_2, \dots, X_i \wedge X_j, \dots, X_{n-1} \wedge X_n) = \binom{\text{Count}_n(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)}{2}$,
3. $\vdash \text{Count}_{n^2}((X_i \wedge \{i \neq j\})_{i,j=1}^n) = \text{Count}_n(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n) \cdot (n-1)$,
4. $(X_1 \leq Y_1), \dots, (X_n \leq Y_n) \vdash (\text{Count}_n((X_i)_{i=1}^n) \leq \text{Count}_m((Y_j)_{j=1}^m))$.

Finally a *variable substitution* in a formula will refer in this paper to substituting every variable by some other variable (not necessarily in a 1-1 manner).

2.1 Propositional formulation of the Kneser-Lovász Theorem

We define a variable $X_{A,l}$ for every set $A \in \binom{n}{k}$ of cardinality k , and partition class $P_l := c^{-1}(\{l\})$. $X_{A,l}$ is intended to be *TRUE* iff $A \in P_l$ and zero otherwise.

Definition 2. *Denote by*

- *Ant_{k,n} the formula $\bigwedge_{A \in \binom{n}{k}} (\bigvee_{l=1}^{n-2k+1} X_{A,l})$,*
- *Cons_{k,n} the formula $\bigvee_{\substack{A, B \in \binom{n}{k} \\ A \cap B = \emptyset}} (\bigvee_{l=1}^{n-2k+1} (X_{A,l} \wedge X_{B,l}))$,*
- *Onto_{k,n} the formula $\bigvee_{A \in \binom{n}{k}} (\bigvee_{\substack{l, s=1 \\ l \neq s}}^{n-2k+1} (\overline{X_{A,l}} \vee \overline{X_{A,s}}))$,*
- *Finally, denote by Kneser_{k,n} the formula $[Ant_{k,n} \vdash Cons_{k,n}]$. Kneser_{k,n} is (by [18]) a tautology with $(n-2k+1) \cdot \binom{n}{k}$ variable,*
- *We will also encode the onto version of the Kneser-Lovász Theorem. Indeed, denote by Kneser_{k,n}^{onto} the formula $[Ant_{k,n} \wedge Onto_{k,n} \vdash Cons_{k,n}]$.*

Note that formula $Kneser_{1,n}$ is essentially the Pigeonhole principle PHP_{n-1}^n .

3 Lower bounds: Resolution Complexity and bounded-depth Frege proofs

The following result provides a mapping between two different Kneser graphs showing that many lower bounds on the complexity of the pigeonhole principle apply directly to any family $(Kneser_{k,n})_n$:

Theorem 1. For all $k \geq 1, n \geq 3$, there exists a variable substitution Φ_k , $\Phi_k : \text{Var}(Kneser_{k+1,n}) \rightarrow \text{Var}(Kneser_{k,n-2})$ such that $\Phi_k(Kneser_{k+1,n})$ is a formula consisting precisely of the clauses of $Kneser_{k,n-2}$ (perhaps repeated and in a different order).

Proof. For simplicity we will use different notations for the variables of the two formulas: we assume that $\text{Var}(Kneser_{k+1,n}) = \{X_{A,i}\}$ and $\text{Var}(Kneser_{k,n-2}) = \{Y_{A,i}\}$, with obvious (different) ranges for i and A .

Let $A \in \binom{[n]}{k+1}$. For $1 \leq i \leq n - 2(k+1) + 1 = n - 2k - 1$ define $\Phi_k(X_{A,i})$ by:

- **Case 1:** $A_{\leq k} \subseteq [n-2]$: Define $\Phi_k(X_{A,i}) = Y_{A_{\leq k},i}$.
- **Case 2:** $A_{\leq k} \not\subseteq [n-2]$: In this case necessarily both $n-1$ and n are members of A . Let $A = P \cup \{n-1, n\}$, $|P| = k-1$. Let $\lambda = \max\{j : j \leq n-2, j \notin P\}$. Define $\Phi_k(X_{A,i}) = Y_{P \cup \{\lambda\},i}$.

Formula $Kneser_{k,n-2}$ has clauses of two types

- (a). Clauses of type $Y_{A,1} \vee Y_{A,2} \vee \dots \vee Y_{A,n-2k-1}$, with $A \in \binom{[n-2]}{k}$.
- (b). Clauses of type $\overline{Y_{A,i}} \vee \overline{Y_{B,i}}$ with $1 \leq i \leq n-2k-1$, $A, B \subseteq \binom{[n-2]}{k}$, $A \cap B = \emptyset$.

As Φ_k preserves the second index, every clause of type (a) of $Kneser_{k+1,n}$ maps via Φ_k to a clause of type (a) of $Kneser_{k,n-2}$. On the other hand every clause of type (a) is the image through Φ_k of some clause of $Kneser_{k,n+1}$, for instance of clause $X_{C,1} \vee X_{C,2} \vee \dots \vee X_{C,n-2k-1}$, where $C = A \cup \{n-1\}$.

As for clause $\overline{X_{A,i}} \vee \overline{X_{B,i}}$ of type (b), again we use the fact that Φ_k preserves the second index, and prove that the substituted variables correspond to disjoint subsets:

- **Case I:** A, B both fall in Case 1. of the definition of Φ_k .
Denote for simplicity $C = A_{\leq k}, D = B_{\leq k}$, hence $\Phi_k(\overline{X_{A,i}} \vee \overline{X_{B,i}}) = \overline{Y_{C,i}} \vee \overline{Y_{D,i}}$. It follows that C, D are disjoint (as $A \cap B = \emptyset$ and $C \subseteq A, D \subseteq B$). Note that the converse is also true: every clause $\overline{Y_{C,i}} \vee \overline{Y_{D,i}}$ is the image of clause $\overline{X_{A,i}} \vee \overline{X_{B,i}}$, with $A = C \cup \{n-1\}, B = D \cup \{n\}$.
- **Case II:** One of the sets, say A , falls under Case 2, the other one, B , falls under Case 1 (note that A and B cannot both fall under Case 2, as they would both contain $n-1, n$ and they would no longer be disjoint). In this case $C = P \cup \{\lambda\}, D = B_{\leq k}$. As $\{\lambda+1, \dots, n\} \subset A$ and $A \cap B = \emptyset$, $\lambda+1, \dots, n \notin B$. Therefore, even though it might be possible that $\lambda \in B$, certainly $\lambda \notin B_{\leq k}$ (since there are no elements in B larger than λ). Thus $C \cap D = (P \cup \{\lambda\}) \cap B_{\leq k} \subseteq A \cap B = \emptyset$.

□

The previous result can be applied k times to show the following two lower bounds:

Theorem 2. For any fixed $k \geq 1$ we have $\text{res}(Kneser_{n,k}) = 2^{\Omega(n)}$ (where the constant might depend on k).

Proof. The result follows from the following claim, similar to more powerful (less trivial) results of this type explicitly stated, e.g. in [1]:

Lemma 2. Let Φ be a propositional formula let $X \xrightarrow{\phi} Y$ be a variable substitution and let $\Xi = \Phi[X \xrightarrow{\phi} Y]$ be the resulting formula. Assume that $P = C_1, C_2, \dots, C_r$ is a resolution refutation of Φ and let $\phi(P) = \phi(C_1), \phi(C_2), \dots, \phi(C_r)$. Then $\phi(P)$ is a resolution refutation of Ξ . Consequently $\text{res}(\Xi) \leq \text{res}(\Phi)$. □

Similarly

Theorem 3. For any fixed $k \geq 1$ and arbitrary $d \geq 1$ there exists $\epsilon_d > 0$ such that the family $(Kneser_{n,k})$ has $\Omega(2^{n^{\epsilon_d}})$ depth- d Frege proofs

Proof. We employ the the corresponding bound for $PHP_{n-1}^n (= Kneser_{1,n})$ [13], [23]. □

3.1 Extension: lower bounds on the proof complexity of Schrijver's theorem

We can prove (stronger) bounds similar to those of Theorems 2 and 3 for Schrijver's formulas by noting that the following variant of Theorem 1 holds:

Theorem 4. For every $k \geq 1, n \geq 3$ there exists a variable substitution $\Phi_k, \Phi_k : \text{Var}(Sch_{k+1,n}) \rightarrow \text{Var}(Sch_{k,n-2})$ such that $\Phi_k(Sch_{k+1,n})$ is a formula consisting precisely of the clauses of $Sch_{k,n-2}$ (perhaps repeated and in a different order).

Proof. Substitution Φ_k is exactly the same as the one in the proof of Theorem 1. In this case we need to further argue three things:

- (1) If Φ_k maps $X_{A,i}$ onto $Y_{C,i}$ and A is stable then so is C .
 - (2) Every clause $Y_{C,1} \vee Y_{C,2} \vee \dots \vee Y_{C,n-2k-1}$ of $Sch_{k,n-2}$ is the image of a clause $X_{A,1} \vee X_{A,2} \vee \dots \vee X_{A,n-2k-1}$ with A stable.
 - (3) Every clause $\overline{Y_{C,i}} \vee \overline{Y_{D,i}}$ of $Sch_{k,n-2}$ is the image of a clause $\overline{X_{A,i}} \vee \overline{X_{B,i}}$ with A, B disjoint and stable.
- (1) If $A_{\leq k} \subseteq [n-2]$ then $C = A_{\leq k}$ satisfies the stability condition everywhere except perhaps at elements 1 and $n-2$. But if $1 \in C \subseteq A$ then $n \notin A$ (as A is stable). Similarly $n-1 \notin A$. This contradicts the fact that A must contain one of $n-1, n$. On the other hand it is not possible that A falls under Case 2, as it would have to contain successive elements $n-1, n$.
 - (2) Since C is stable, one of $1, n-2$ is **not** in C . Define A to consist of C together with the unique element in $n-1, n$ not forbidden by stability.
 - (3) Similarly to (2): given disjoint stable sets C, D in $[n-2]$ obtain A and B by adding the elements $n-1, n$ to C, D , one to each set, respecting the stability condition. This is possible as C and D are disjoint. For instance, if $n-2 \in C$ then $1 \notin C$, and we distribute n in C and $n-1$ in D .
-

4 The cases $k = 2$ and $k = 3$ of the Kneser-Lovász Theorem

Unlike the general case, for $k \in \{2, 3\}$ Kneser's conjecture has combinatorial proofs [25], [8]. This facts motivates the following theorem, similar to the one proved in [3] for the Pigeonhole Principle:

Theorem 5. *The following are true:*

- (a) *The class of formulas $Kneser_{2,n}^{onto}$ has polynomial size Frege proofs.*
- (b) *The class of formulas $Kneser_{3,n}^{onto}$ has polynomial size extended Frege proofs.*

Proof. Informally, the basis for the combinatorial proofs in [8], [25] of cases $k \in \{2, 3\}$ is the following claim, only valid for these values of k : any partition of $\binom{[n]}{k}$ into classes $P_1, P_2, \dots, P_{n-2k+1}$ contains at least one class P_j such that either $\bigcap_{A \in P_j} A \neq \emptyset$, or $A \cap B = \emptyset$ for some $A, B \in P_j$.

This claim could be used as the basis for the propositional simulation of the proofs from [25] and [8], respectively. This strategy only leads to *extended Frege*, rather than Frege proofs for $Kneser_{k,n}$. The reason is that we eliminate one element from $\{1, \dots, n\}$ and one class from the partition. Similar to the case of PHP in [3], doing so involves renaming, leading to extended Frege proofs.

For $k = 2$ we will bypass the problem above by giving a stronger, counting-based proof of $Kneser_{2,n}$. We will then explain why a similar strategy apparently does not work for $k = 3$ as well. In both situations, $k \in \{2, 3\}$ below we first present the mathematical argument, then discuss how to formalize it in (extended) Frege.

4.1 Case $k = 2$

Intuitively, the proof will employ the following strategy: we will partition the color classes of a $n - 2k + 1$ coloring into two parts: (a) classes whose member sets have one element in common, and there are at least four subsets, (b) all the other classes (we will show, in fact, that each such class has at most three elements).

The largest class of the first type has at most $n - 1$ elements. More generally, the first k largest such classes should have at most $n - 1 + n - 2 + \dots + n - k$ elements. The resulting upper bound is largest when $k = n - 3$ (i.e. there are no classes of the second type), but even then the upper bound is less than $\binom{n}{2}$, the number of sets to color with $n - 3$ colors.

Semantic proof. The result follows from the following sequence of claims:

Lemma 3. *Given any $(n - 3)$ -coloring c of $\binom{[n]}{2}$ and color $1 \leq l \leq n - 3$, at least one of the following alternatives is true:*

1. *there exist two disjoint sets $D, E \in c^{-1}(l)$.*
2. *$|c^{-1}(l)| \leq 3$.*
3. *there exists $x \in [n]$, $x \in \bigcap_{A \in c^{-1}(l)} A$.*

Proof. Assume that $D = \{a, b\} \in c^{-1}(l)$ and there is a set $E \in c^{-1}(l)$, $a \notin E$, then either $D \cap E = \emptyset$ or $E = \{b, c\}$, for some c . If $\bigcap_{A \in c^{-1}(l)} A = \emptyset$ then there exists another set F with $b \notin F$. F has to intersect both D and E , thus $F = \{a, c\}$. Hence $|c^{-1}(l)| \leq 3$. □

Define, for $r \geq 0$

$$p_r = |\{1 \leq \lambda \leq r : |c^{-1}(\lambda)| \geq 4 \text{ and } \bigcap_{A \in c^{-1}(\lambda)} A \neq \emptyset\}|,$$

$$s_r = |\{i \in [n] : \bigcap_{A \in c^{-1}(\lambda)} A = \{i\} \text{ for some } 1 \leq \lambda \leq r \text{ with } |c^{-1}(\lambda)| \geq 4\}|,$$

(call such an i counted by s_r *special*)

$$M_r = \sum_{i=1}^r |c^{-1}(i)|, \quad N_r = p_r(n-1) - \frac{p_r(p_r-1)}{2} + 3(r-p_r).$$

Lemma 4. *Sequences M_r, N_r are monotonically increasing.*

Proof. First $p_{r+1} - p_r \in \{0, 1\}$. Next $M_{r+1} - M_r = |c^{-1}(r+1)| \geq 0$. Finally, $N_{r+1} - N_r = 3$ if $p_{r+1} = p_r$, $N_{r+1} - N_r = (n-1) - p_r$ if $p_{r+1} - p_r = 1$. In this latter case $p_r = p_{r+1} - 1 \leq (n-3) - 1 = n-4$ hence $N_{r+1} - N_r \geq 3$. □

We now prove the following result:

Lemma 5. *For $1 \leq r \leq n-3$, $M_r \leq N_r$.*

Proof. First $s_r(n-1) - \frac{s_r(s_r-1)}{2} \leq p_r(n-1) - \frac{p_r(p_r-1)}{2}$. Indeed, the left hand side is

$$\begin{aligned} & s_r(n-1) - (0 + 1 + \dots + s_r - 1) = \\ & = (n-1) + (n-1-1) + (n-1-2) + \dots + (n-1-s_r+1) \\ & = (n-1) + (n-2) + \dots + (n-s_r) \end{aligned}$$

and similarly for the right-hand side. The desired inequality follows from the fact that $s_r \leq p_r$, valid since a special i may be counted for two different λ .

We prove the lemma by showing the stronger inequality

$$M_r \leq s_r(n-1) - \frac{s_r(s_r-1)}{2} + 3(r-p_r). \quad (1)$$

The first two terms of the right-hand side of (1) count sets $\{p, q\} \in \binom{[n]}{2}$ with at least one special element. Indeed $s_r(n-1)$ is the number of *pairs* (i, j) with $i \neq j$ and i special. This formula overcounts *sets* with at least one special element when j is special too (and set $\{i, j\}$ is counted for both pairs (i, j) and (j, i)). The number of such pairs is precisely $\frac{s_r(s_r-1)}{2}$.

Now M_r sums up cardinalities of color classes 1 to r . For those λ 's in $[r]$ such that $|c^{-1}(\lambda)| \geq 4$ and all sets in the color class intersect at a special i , all these sets contain

a special value, hence they are also counted by the right-hand side of (1). The difference is made by the remaining λ 's (there are $r - p_r$ of them). By Lemma 3 they add at most $3(r - p_r)$ sets to M_r , establishing the desired result. $\square$

Lemma 6. *We have $N_{n-3} \leq \binom{n}{2} - 3$.*

Proof. $N_{n-3} = (n-1) + (n-2) + \dots + (n - p_{n-3}) + 3(n-3 - p_{n-3})$. But $3(n-3 - p_{n-3}) \leq 3 + 4 + \dots + (n - p_{n-3} - 1)$ hence

$$N_{n-3} \leq 3 + 4 + \dots + (n-1) = n(n-1)/2 - 1 - 2 = \binom{n}{2} - 3.$$

$\square$

Now Theorem (5) (a) follows by setting $r = n - 3$. The right-hand side is $\binom{n}{2} - 3$. But there are $M_{n-3} = \binom{n}{2}$ sets to cover. $\square$

Propositional simulation. Now we start translating the above proof into sequent calculus LK. We will sketch the nontrivial steps of the translation. Tedious but straightforward computations shows that all these steps amount to polynomial length proofs.

Lemma 3 can be polynomially simulated as follows:

Lemma 7. *For $n \geq 5$ and $1 \leq l \leq n - 3$ define the propositional formula $Int_{n,l}[(X_{S,l})_{S \in \binom{[n]}{2}}]$ to be*

$$\bigvee_{\substack{D, E \in \binom{[n]}{2} \\ D \cap E = \emptyset}} (X_{D,l} \wedge X_{E,l}) \vee [Count((X_{S,l})_{S \in \binom{[n]}{2}}) \leq 3] \vee \bigvee_{i \in [n]} \left(\bigwedge_{i \notin S} \overline{X_{S,l}} \right).$$

Here *Count* are Buss's counting formulas. Then for every $1 \leq l \leq n - 3$ formula $Ant_{n,2} \vdash Int_{n,l}$ has proofs of polynomial length in sequent calculus LK.

Proof. We will apply the following trivial

Lemma 8. *Let A, B, C, D be four distinct subsets of cardinality 2 of $[n]$. Then at least one of the following alternatives holds:*

- *At least two sets among A, B, C, D are disjoint.*
- *$|A \cup B \cup C \cup D| = 5$ and $|A \cap B \cap C \cap D| = 1$.*

The lemma will be used "at the meta level", that is it will not be codified propositionally, but simply used to argue for the correctness of the proof.

Define (only for notational convenience, not as part of the Frege proof) shorthand

$$Z_{A,B,C,D}^l := X_{A,l} \wedge X_{B,l} \wedge X_{C,l} \wedge X_{D,l}.$$

Now for any $1 \leq l \leq n - 3$,

$$Ant_{2,n}, \neg[Count((X_{S,l})_{S \in \binom{[n]}{2}}) \leq 3] \vdash \bigvee_{\substack{A, \dots, D \\ \text{distinct}}} (Z_{A,B,C,D}^l).$$

On the other hand, when $|A \cap B \cap C \cap D| = \emptyset$ two of these sets must be disjoint,

$$\text{hence for such sets } Z_{A,B,C,D}^l \vdash \bigvee_{\substack{E,F \in \{A,\dots,D\} \\ E \cap F = \emptyset}} (X_{E,l} \wedge X_{F,l}).$$

As for any $n \geq 5$ any two disjoint sets in $\binom{n}{2}$ are part of a 4-tuple of sets in $\binom{n}{2}$

$$\bigvee_{\substack{E,F \in \{A,B,C,D\} \\ E \cap F = \emptyset}} (X_{E,l} \wedge X_{F,l}) \vdash \bigvee_{\substack{E,F \in \binom{n}{2} \\ E \cap F = \emptyset}} (X_{E,l} \wedge X_{F,l}), \text{ hence}$$

$$Ant_{n,2}, \neg[Count(X_{A,l}) \leq 3] \vdash \bigvee_{\substack{E,F \in \{A,\dots,D\} \\ E \cap F = \emptyset}} (X_{E,l} \wedge X_{F,l}) \vee \bigvee_{\substack{A,B,C,D \subseteq [n] \\ |A \cap B \cap C \cap D| = 1}} Z_{A,B,C,D}^l. \quad (2)$$

Now we rewrite

$$\bigvee_{\substack{A,B,C,D \subseteq [n] \\ |A \cap B \cap C \cap D| = 1}} Z_{A,B,C,D}^l = \bigvee_{i \in [n]} \left(\bigvee_{A \cap B \cap C \cap D = \{i\}} Z_{A,B,C,D}^l \right).$$

Fix an arbitrary 4-tuple (A, B, C, D) , $A \cap B \cap C \cap D = \{i\}$. For any $H \in \binom{n}{2}$, $H \not\ni i$ one of the sets A, B, C, D is disjoint from H . Hence by modus ponens (cut) with $E = H$ and $F \in \{A, B, C, D\}$ with $H \cap F = \emptyset$

$$Ant_{2,n}, Z_{A,B,C,D}^l, \bigwedge_{\substack{E,F \in \binom{n}{2} \\ E \cap F = \emptyset}} (\overline{X_{E,l}} \vee \overline{X_{F,l}}) \vdash \overline{X_{H,l}}$$

By repeatedly introducing ANDs in the conclusion, then OR in the antecedent

$$Ant_{2,n}, \bigvee_{\substack{A,B,C,D \subseteq [n] \\ A \cap B \cap C \cap D = \{i\}}} Z_{A,B,C,D}^l, \bigwedge_{\substack{E,F \in \binom{n}{2} \\ E \cap F = \emptyset}} (\overline{X_{E,l}} \vee \overline{X_{F,l}}) \vdash \bigwedge_{\substack{H \in \binom{n}{2} \\ H \not\ni i}} \overline{X_{H,l}}.$$

By repeated introduction of ORs in both the antecedent and the conclusion

$$Ant_{2,n}, \bigvee_{i \in [n]} \left(\bigvee_{\substack{A,B,C,D \subseteq [n] \\ A \cap B \cap C \cap D = \{i\}}} Z_{A,B,C,D}^l \right), \bigwedge_{\substack{E,F \in \binom{n}{2} \\ E \cap F = \emptyset}} (\overline{X_{E,l}} \vee \overline{X_{F,l}}) \vdash \bigvee_{i \in [n]} \left(\bigwedge_{\substack{H \in \binom{n}{2} \\ H \not\ni i}} \overline{X_{H,l}} \right).$$

Taking into account (2) and moving the third antecedent on the right-hand side we get the proof of Lemma 7. $\square$

Definition 3. Define for $i \in [n]$, $l \in [n-3]$ formula

$$Special_{i,l}((X_{S,l})_{S \in \binom{[n]}{2}}) \equiv [(Count((X_{S,l})_{S \in \binom{[n]}{2}}) \geq 4)] \wedge [(\bigwedge_{\substack{B \in \binom{[n]}{2} \\ B \not\ni i}} \overline{X_{B,l}})].$$

For $r \in [n-3]$ let q_r be the number of indices $i \in [n]$ such that there is a color l , $1 \leq l \leq r$ with $Special_{i,l}((X_{S,l})_{S \in \binom{[n]}{2}}) = TRUE$.

Remark 1. Semantically we have $q_r = s_r$ (in q_r we do not require that the intersection of all sets $B \in \binom{[n]}{2} \cap c^{-1}(l)$ have cardinality *exactly one*, but that is true if $Count((X_{S,l})_{S \in \binom{[n]}{2}}) \geq 4$)

Given $r \leq n-3$ we can compute, using a Frege proof, the binary representation of q_r . as $q_r = Count(\{i \in [n] \mid \bigvee_{l=1}^r Special_{i,l}\})$. Now define for $0 \leq r \leq n-3$

$$\begin{aligned} M_r &= |\{A \in \binom{[n]}{2} : \bigvee_{1 \leq l \leq r} X_{A,l}\}| \text{ (semantically } = \sum_{i=1}^r |c^{-1}(i)|), \\ M_r^{(1)} &= |\{A \in \binom{[n]}{2} : \bigvee_{1 \leq l \leq r} (X_{A,l} \wedge [Count(X_{S,l}) \leq 3])\}|, \\ M_r^{(2)} &= |\{A \in \binom{[n]}{2} : \bigvee_{1 \leq l \leq r} (X_{A,l} \wedge [Count((X_{S,l})_{S \in \binom{[n]}{2}}) \geq 4])\}|, \\ Q_r^{(1)} &= |\{l \mid (1 \leq l \leq r) \wedge [Count(X_{S,l}) \leq 3]\}|. \end{aligned}$$

One can easily prove in LK the following

Lemma 9. $Ant_{2,n} \wedge Onto_{2,n} \vdash [M_r = M_r^{(1)} + M_r^{(2)}]$.

Lemma 10. One can compute in LK the binary expansions of $M_r^{(1)}$, $Q_r^{(1)}$ and prove that $Ant_{2,n} \wedge Onto_{2,n} \vdash [M_r^{(1)} \leq 3 \cdot Q_r^{(1)}]$.

Proof. For the first part we use Buss's counting approach. For the second, define

$$W_l = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } Count(X_{S,l}) \leq 3, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad \text{and } Y_l = \begin{cases} Count(X_{S,l}) & \text{if } Count(X_{S,l}) \leq 3, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then (one can readily prove in LK that) $Y_l \leq 3W_l$. Summing up we get $M_r^{(1)} \leq 3Q_r^{(1)}$. The proof (using the fact that the cardinal of a union of disjoint sets is the sum of cardinals of individual subsets) can easily be simulated in LK. $\square$

Definition 4. Let

$$P_r^{(2)} = |\{A \in \binom{[n]}{2} : \bigvee_{1 \leq l \leq r} X_{A,l} \wedge [(\bigwedge_{B \not\ni First(A)} \overline{X_{B,l}}) \oplus (\bigwedge_{B \not\ni Second(A)} \overline{X_{B,l}})]\}|,$$

where

- $First(A)$ is the smallest element in A , $Second(A)$ is the largest.
- $P \oplus Q$ in the above expression is a shorthand for $(P \wedge \overline{Q}) \vee (Q \wedge \overline{P})$. Since there are $O(n^2)$ sets B to consider, the size of the formula after expanding to CNF is $O(n^4)$.

Lemma 11. *One can prove in LK that*

$$Ant_{2,n} \wedge Onto_{2,n} \wedge \neg Cons_{2,n} \vdash [M_r^{(2)} \leq P_r^{(2)}].$$

Proof. The inequality follows in the following way: From Lemma 7

$Ant_{2,n} \vdash Int_{n,l}$, hence

$$Ant_{2,n} \wedge \neg Cons_{2,n} \wedge X_{A,l} \wedge [Count((X_{S,l})_{S \in \binom{[n]}{2}}) \geq 4] \vdash \bigvee_{i \in [n]} Special_{i,l}.$$

Now assume $X_{A,l} \wedge [Count((X_{S,l})_{S \in \binom{[n]}{2}}) \geq 4]$. For $i \neq First(A), Second(A)$ set A is among the B 's in the conjunction defining $Special_{i,l}$, so all these formulas evaluate to *FALSE*. Furthermore, if $X_{A,l}$ and $Count((X_{S,l})_{S \in \binom{[n]}{2}}) \geq 4$ then exactly one of the two remaining terms, $\bigwedge_{B \not\ni First(A)} \overline{X_{B,l}}$ and $\bigwedge_{B \not\ni Second(A)} \overline{X_{B,l}}$ also simplifies to *FALSE*. Indeed, there is a set $B \neq A$ with $X_{B,l}$. B does not contain one of $First(A), Second(A)$, hence $\overline{X_{B,l}}$ appears in exactly one of the corresponding conjunctions, making it *FALSE*.

Hence every set A counted by $M_r^{(2)}$ is among those counted by $P_r^{(2)}$ and, by $Onto_{2,n}$, only in one such set. □

$$\text{Define } U_r = |\{A \in \binom{[n]}{2} : (\bigvee_{\lambda=1}^r Special_{First(A),\lambda}) \wedge (\bigvee_{\nu=1}^r Special_{Second(A),\nu})\}|.$$

Lemma 12. *We have (and can prove in polynomial size in LK)*

$$Ant_{n,2} \vdash [U_r = |\{(i,j) : i < j \in [n] \text{ and } (\bigvee_{\lambda=1}^r Special_{i,\lambda}) \wedge (\bigvee_{\nu=1}^r Special_{j,\nu})\}| = \binom{q_r}{2}].$$

Proof. The first equality amounts to no more than semantic reinterpretation. The last equality follows from Lemma 1 (2). □

Lemma 13. $Ant_{2,n} \wedge Onto_{2,n} \vdash [U_r + P_r^{(2)} \leq q_r \cdot (n-1)]$ has poly-size LK proofs.

Proof. See the technical report version [10]. □

Corollary 1. *LK can efficiently prove formulas:*

- (1). $Ant_{2,n} \wedge Onto_{2,n} \wedge \neg Cons_{2,n} \vdash [M_r + U_r \leq q_r(n-1) + 3 \cdot Q_r^1]$,
- (2). $Ant_{2,n} \wedge Onto_{2,n} \vdash [M_{n-3} = \binom{n}{2}]$,
- (3). $Ant_{2,n} \wedge Onto_{2,n} \vdash [q_{n-3} \leq n-3]$,
- (4). $Ant_{2,n} \wedge Onto_{2,n} \vdash [q_{n-3}(n-1) + 3 \cdot Q_{n-3}^1 + \binom{n-3}{2} \leq (n-3) \cdot (n-1) + U_{n-3}]$.

Proof. See [10]. □

Now we can put everything together to prove Theorem 5 (a): by (1)

$$Ant_{2,n} \wedge Onto_{2,n} \wedge \neg Cons_{2,n} \vdash [M_{n-3} + U_{n-3} \leq q_{n-3}(n-1) + 3 \cdot Q_{n-3}^1].$$

Adding relation (4), taking into account (2) and simplifying by $U_{n-3} + 3Q_{n-3}^1$ we get

$$Ant_{n,2} \wedge Onto_{n,2} \wedge \neg Cons_{2,n} \vdash \binom{n}{2} + \binom{n-3}{2} \leq (n-1)(n-3),$$

or, equivalently

$$Ant_{n,2} \wedge Onto_{n,2} \wedge \neg Cons_{2,n} \vdash [2n^2 - 8n + 12 \leq 2n^2 - 8n + 6] \vdash \square$$

Moving $\neg Cons_{2,n}$ to the other side we get the desired result. □

4.2 Case $k = 3$:

An analog of Lemma 3 holds for $k = 3$ (see [10] for a proof that can be efficiently simulated in EF):

Lemma 14. [8] *For any $1 \leq \lambda \leq n-5$ at least one of the following is true:*

- $c^{-1}(\lambda)$ contains two disjoint sets
- $|c^{-1}(\lambda)| \leq 3n-8$, or
- there exists $x \in \cap_{A \in c^{-1}(\lambda)} A$.

Assuming this claim we settle the case $k = 3$. The argument we give is simpler than the argument in [8]. Full details are deferred to the journal version.

Lemma 15. [8] *Kneser's conjecture is true for $k = 3$.*

Proof. By induction. The base case $n = 7$ can be verified directly. Assume that one could give a coloring c of the Kneser graph $KG_{n,3}$ with $n-5$ colors. If there is a color λ with $x \in \cap_{A \in c^{-1}(\lambda)} A$ then one could eliminate both element x and color λ , obtaining a $n-6$ coloring of graph $KG_{n-1,3}$, thus contradicting the inductive hypothesis.

If no color class contains two disjoint sets then all of them satisfy $|c^{-1}(\lambda)| \leq 3n-8$. But then we would have $\binom{n}{3} \leq (n-5)(3n-8)$. This is false for $n \geq 7$. □

We could try to give a Frege proof of the case $k = 3$ based on counting principles, using the following strategy, similar to the one used in case $k = 2$:

1. Count, using a Frege proof, the number p_r of sets $c^{-1}(l)$, $1 \leq l \leq t$ such that $|c^{-1}(\lambda)| \geq 3n - 7$ (implicitly $\cap_{A \in c^{-1}(l)} A \neq \emptyset$).
2. Define $M_r^{(3)} = \sum_{i=1}^r |c^{-1}(i)|$ and

$$N_r^{(3)} = \binom{n-1}{2} + \binom{n-2}{2} + \dots + \binom{n-p_r}{2} + (n-5-p_r)(3n-7).$$

3. Show inductively that $M_r^{(3)} \leq N_r^{(3)}$.
4. Obtain a contradiction from $M_{n-5}^{(3)} = \binom{n}{3}$ and $N_{n-3}^{(3)} < \binom{n}{3}$.

Although some of this program can be carried through, **this approach does not seem to work**. The inequality that critically fails is the last one: when $k = 2$ we showed that $N_{n-3}^{(2)} < \binom{n}{2}$ as the maximum of the upper bound was obtained for $p_r = n - 3$. For $k = 3$, though, such a statement is not true. Indeed, since (a) we need to give upper bound estimates on the size of $n - 5$ color classes, and (b) $3n - 8$, the bound on the size of independent sets is growing with n , one cannot guarantee that $N_{n-3}^{(3)} < \binom{n}{3}$ for all possible values of p_r . For instance, if $p_r = n - 6$ (an event we cannot exclude) the resulting upper bound, $\binom{n-1}{2} + \binom{n-2}{2} + \dots + \binom{6}{2} + (3n-8) = \binom{n}{3} - 10 - 6 - 3 - 1 + (3n-7) = \binom{n}{3} + (3n-27)$ is not smaller than $\binom{n}{3}$ for $n \geq 10$. For this reason when $k = 3$ we will have to do with the *extended Frege* proof described above.

Lemma 14 can be efficiently simulated in EF (actually in Frege) via a straightforward but tedious adaptation of the argument in [8] (see [10]).

On the other hand it may still be possible (and we conjecture that this can be done) to obtain a Frege proof by a more refined version of the above counting approach. $\square$

5 Heads up: the general case of the Kneser-Lovász Theorem

In this section we briefly announce the other results on the proof complexity of the Kneser-Lovász Theorem presented in a companion paper [9]. Unlike the cases $k = 2, 3$, cases $k \geq 4$ apparently require proof systems more powerful than EF. Indeed, the general case of the Kneser-Lovász theorem follows by a combinatorial result known as the *octahedral Tucker lemma* [20]. The propositional counterpart of this implication is the existence of a variable substitution that transforms the propositional encoding of the octahedral Tucker lemma into the Kneser-Lovász formulae.

Though the formalization of the octahedral Tucker lemma yields a formula of exponential size, the octahedral Tucker lemma admits [9] a (nonstandard) version leading to polynomial-size formulas that is sufficient to prove the Kneser-Lovász theorem. However, even this version seems to require exponentially long EF proofs. The reason is that we prove the Octahedral Tucker Lemma by reduction to a Tseitin-type statement, crucially, though, to one on a complete graph K_m of **exponential size** ($m = O(n! \cdot 2^n)$).

The (exponentially long) proofs of such statements can be generated implicitly [15]. However, not only the proof steps but the very *formulas* involved in the proof may have

exponential size and need to be generated implicitly. Implicit proofs with implicitly generated formulas have been previously considered in the literature [14]. We postpone the discussion of further technical details to [9].

6 Combinatorial Topology and benchmark generation

Our results naturally suggest using the family of tautologies $Kneser_{k,n}$ and, more generally, families of propositional formulas translating results in combinatorial topology [11], as benchmark generators. Indeed, we believe it is interesting to investigate solvability of such formulas in practice.

However, such a task runs into the issue that naively generated formulas of this type are quickly becoming large: for example, formula $Kneser_{4,9}$ has $\binom{9}{4} \cdot (9 - 2 \cdot 4 + 1) = 252$ variables. One can alleviate this problem to some extent by using the propositional translation of Schrijver's theorem instead. An even more promising approach (that however requires more investigations) is to use the generalization of the Kneser-Lovász theorem known as Dolnikov's theorem [20]. The interest of this combinatorial result is that it provides lower bounds on the chromatic number of so-called generalized Kneser graphs; moreover, *every* graph is a generalized Kneser graph. However, the lower bounds provided by Dolnikov's theorem (the 2-colorability defect of the associated hypergraph) are nonconstructive and not always tight, as it is the case for Kneser graphs. Expansion is one property that could limit the growth of the propositional translation of colorability statements for such graphs. Thus finding a family of expander graphs for which the bounds are effective and tight is an interesting research question.

7 Conclusions, open problems and acknowledgments

Our work raises several open questions:

1. Does $Kneser_{2,n}$ have polynomial size cutting plane proofs/OBDD with projection, as PHP does [6, 4]?
2. Does family $Kneser_{3,n}$ have polynomial size Frege proofs? We believe so.
3. Are $(Kneser_{k,n})$, $k \geq 4$, hard for Frege/EF proofs? Though proving such a result seems beyond current methods, we would not be surprised if they were.
4. There is a reasonably sophisticated literature dealing with extensions of the Kneser-Lovász Theorem (see e.g. [11]) or other results in combinatorial topology [20, 17]. Do they yield interesting results in bounded reverse mathematics?

Acknowledgement: This work has been supported by CNCS IDEI Grant PN-II-ID-PCE-2011-3-0981 "Structure and computational difficulty in combinatorial optimization: an interdisciplinary approach".

References

1. Ben-Sasson, E., Nordström, J.: Understanding space in proof complexity: Separations and trade-offs via substitutions. In: *Proceedings of the Second Symposium on Innovations in Computer Science*. pp. 401–416 (2011)
2. Bonnet, M., Buss, S., Pitassi, T.: Are there hard examples for Frege Systems? In: Clote, P., Rémel, J. (eds.) *Feasible Mathematics II*. pp. 30–56 (1995)
3. Buss, S.: Polynomial size proofs of the propositional pigeonhole principle. *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 52(4), 916–927 (1987)
4. Chén, W., Zhang, W.: A direct construction of polynomial-size OBDD proof of pigeon hole problem. *Information Processing Letters* 109(10), 472–477 (2009)
5. Cook, S., Nguyen, P.: *Logical foundations of proof complexity*. Cambridge University Press (2010)
6. Cook, W., Coullard, C., Turán, G.: On the complexity of cutting-plane proofs. *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 18(1), 25–38 (1987)
7. Freund, R., Todd, M.: A constructive proof of Tucker’s combinatorial lemma. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A* 30(3), 321–325 (1981)
8. Garey, M., Johnson, D.: The complexity of near-optimal graph coloring. *Journal of the ACM* 23(1), 43–49 (1976)
9. Istrate, G., Crăciun, A.: Proof complexity and the Lovász-Kneser theorem (II) (2014), manuscript in progress
10. Istrate, G., Crăciun, A.: Proof complexity and the kneser-lovász theorem. Tech. rep., arXiv.org Report 1402.4338 (2014)
11. Kozlov, D.: *Combinatorial Algebraic Topology*. Springer Verlag (2008)
12. Krajíček, J.: *Bounded Arithmetic, Propositional Logic and Complexity Theory*. Cambridge University Press (1995)
13. Krajíček, J., Pudlák, P., Woods, A.: Exponential lower bound to the size of bounded depth Frege proofs of the pigeonhole principle. *Random Structures and Algorithms* 7(1), 15–39 (1995)
14. Krajíček, J.: Diagonalization in proof complexity. *Fundamenta Mathematicae* 182, 181–192 (2004)
15. Krajíček, J.: Implicit proofs. *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 69(2), 387–397 (2004)
16. de Longueville, M.: 25 years proof of the Kneser conjecture: The advent of topological combinatorics. *EMS Newsletter* 53, 16–19 (2004)
17. de Longueville, M.: *A Course in Topological Combinatorics*. Springer (2012)
18. Lovász, L.: Kneser’s conjecture, chromatic number, and homotopy. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A* 25, 319–324 (1978)
19. Matoušek, J.: A combinatorial proof of Kneser’s conjecture. *Combinatorica* 24(1), 163–170 (2004)
20. Matoušek, J.: *Using the Borsuk-Ulam Theorem* (second edition). Springer Verlag (2008)
21. Pálvölgyi, D.: 2D-TUCKER is PPAD-complete. *Proceedings of the Workshop on Internet and Network Economics (WINE’09)* pp. 569–574 (2009)
22. Papadimitriou, C.H.: On the complexity of the parity argument and other inefficient proofs of existence. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences* 48(3), 498–532 (1994)
23. Pitassi, T., Beame, P., Impagliazzo, R.: Exponential lower bounds for the pigeonhole principle. *Computational complexity* 3(2), 97–140 (1993)
24. Schrijver, A.: Vertex-critical subgraphs of Kneser graphs. *Nieuw Arch. Wiskd., III. Ser.* 26, 454–461 (1978)
25. Stahl, S.: n -tuple colorings and associated graphs. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory B* 20(3), 185–203 (1976)