

Proper Rainbow Saturation Numbers for Cycles

Anastasia Halfpap Bernard Lidický Tomáš Masařík

University of Warsaw, Poland

EUROCOMB

Budapest 2025



F -saturated graphs

A graph G is F -saturated if it is:

- F -free (i.e., does not contain F as a subgraph),
- but for **any** $e \in \binom{V(G)}{2} \setminus E(G)$, the graph $G + e$ contains F .

F -saturated graphs

A graph G is F -saturated if it is:

- F -free (i.e., does not contain F as a subgraph),
- but for **any** $e \in \binom{V(G)}{2} \setminus E(G)$, the graph $G + e$ contains F .



F



Not F -Saturated



Not F -Saturated



F -Saturated

F -saturated graphs

A graph G is F -saturated if it is:

- F -free (i.e., does not contain F as a subgraph),
- but for **any** $e \in \binom{V(G)}{2} \setminus E(G)$, the graph $G + e$ contains F .



F



Not F -Saturated



Not F -Saturated



F -Saturated

In other words: F -saturated graphs are **edge-maximal F -free** graphs.

F -saturated graphs

A graph G is *F -saturated* if it is:

- *F -free* (i.e., does not contain F as a subgraph),
- but for **any** $e \in \binom{V(G)}{2} \setminus E(G)$, the graph $G + e$ contains F .



F



Not F -Saturated



Not F -Saturated



F -Saturated

In other words: F -saturated graphs are **edge-maximal F -free** graphs.

Question: given F and n , how sparse (or dense) can an n -vertex, F -saturated graph be?

Turán and Saturation Numbers

The *Turán number of F* is

$\text{ex}(n, F) =$ **maximum** number of edges in an n -vertex, F -saturated graph.

Turán and Saturation Numbers

The *Turán number of F* is

$\text{ex}(n, F) =$ **maximum** number of edges in an n -vertex, F -saturated graph.

while the *saturation number of F* is

$\text{sat}(n, F) =$ **minimum** number of edges in an n -vertex, F -saturated graph.

Turán and Saturation Numbers

The *Turán number of F* is

$\text{ex}(n, F) =$ **maximum** number of edges in an n -vertex, F -saturated graph.

while the *saturation number of F* is

$\text{sat}(n, F) =$ **minimum** number of edges in an n -vertex, F -saturated graph.

Classical problems with very extensive history.

Rainbow Saturation

An *edge-coloring* of G is an assignment of colors to edges.

Rainbow Saturation

An *edge-coloring* of G is an assignment of colors to edges.

Proper = any two edges that share a vertex get **different** colors

Rainbow = any two edges get **different** colors

Rainbow Saturation

An *edge-coloring* of G is an assignment of colors to edges.

Proper = any two edges that share a vertex get **different** colors

Rainbow = any two edges get **different** colors

One appealing variant is to ask Turán or saturation problems in an edge-colored setting.

Rainbow Saturation

An *edge-coloring* of G is an assignment of colors to edges.

Proper = any two edges that share a vertex get **different** colors

Rainbow = any two edges get **different** colors

One appealing variant is to ask Turán or saturation problems in an edge-colored setting.

Definition (Rainbow Saturation Number— Introduced by Barrus, Ferrara, Vandenbussche, Wenger 2017)

Given an integer t and a graph H . The t -rainbow saturation number is the **minimum number of edges** in a t -edge-colored graph G on n vertices such that G **does not contain a rainbow copy of H** , but adding to G a **new edge in any color** creates a **rainbow copy of H** .

Rainbow Saturation

An *edge-coloring* of G is an assignment of colors to edges.

Proper = any two edges that share a vertex get **different** colors

Rainbow = any two edges get **different** colors

One appealing variant is to ask Turán or saturation problems in an edge-colored setting.

Definition (Rainbow Saturation Number— Introduced by Barrus, Ferrara, Vandenbussche, Wenger 2017)

Given an integer t and a graph H . The t -rainbow saturation number is the **minimum number of edges** in a t -edge-colored graph G on n vertices such that G **does not contain a rainbow copy of H** , but adding to G a **new edge in any color** creates a **rainbow copy of H** .

Does not assume a setting of proper edge-colorings.

Proper Rainbow Saturation Number

Problem: Make properly edge-colored graphs G with no rainbow copy of F . How should our “edge maximality” condition look?

Proper Rainbow Saturation Number

Problem: Make properly edge-colored graphs G with no rainbow copy of F . How should our “edge maximality” condition look?

A graph G is *(properly) rainbow F -saturated* if

- G has a proper edge-coloring with no rainbow copy of F ;
- If we add any edge e , then $G + e$ cannot be properly edge-colored while avoiding a rainbow F .

Proper Rainbow Saturation Number

Problem: Make **properly edge-colored** graphs G with **no rainbow copy** of F . How should our “edge maximality” condition look?

A graph G is *(properly) rainbow F -saturated* if

- G has a **proper edge-coloring** with **no rainbow copy of F** ;
- If we add any edge e , then $G + e$ **cannot** be properly edge-colored while avoiding a rainbow F .




$$F = P_3$$



Bad



Good



Good

Largest Cases

The **maximum number of edges** in an n -vertex, properly rainbow F -saturated graph is the *rainbow Turán number* $\text{ex}^*(n, F)$.

Introduced by: **Keevash, Mubayi, Sudakov, and Verstraëte 2007**

Largest Cases


The **maximum number of edges** in an n -vertex, properly rainbow F -saturated graph is the *rainbow Turán number* $\text{ex}^*(n, F)$.

Introduced by: **Keevash, Mubayi, Sudakov, and Verstraëte 2007**

Example:



$$F = P_3$$



$$\text{ex}^*(n, P_3) \approx \frac{3n}{2}$$

Comparison: $\text{ex}(n, P_3) \approx n$.

Smallest Cases

The **minimum number of edges** in an n -vertex, properly rainbow F -saturated graph is the *(proper) rainbow saturation number* $\text{sat}^*(n, F)$.


Introduced by: **Bushaw, Johnston, and Rombach 2022**

Smallest Cases



The **minimum number of edges** in an n -vertex, properly rainbow F -saturated graph is the *(proper) rainbow saturation number* $\text{sat}^*(n, F)$.

Introduced by: **Bushaw, Johnston, and Rombach 2022**

Example:



$$F = P_3$$



$$\text{sat}^*(n, P_3) \approx \frac{4n}{5}$$

Comparison: $\text{sat}(n, P_3) \approx \frac{n}{2}$.

Known Values of $\text{sat}^*(n, F)$

Finding $\text{sat}^*(n, F)$ seems hard for most choices of F . But some exact results are known!

Known Values of $\text{sat}^*(n, F)$

Finding $\text{sat}^*(n, F)$ seems hard for most choices of F . But some exact results are known!

Theorem (Bushaw-Johnston-Rombach, 2022)

For all n ,

$$\text{sat}^*(n, P_3) = \frac{4n}{5} + O(1).$$

Known Values of $\text{sat}^*(n, F)$

Finding $\text{sat}^*(n, F)$ seems hard for most choices of F . But some exact results are known!

Theorem (Bushaw-Johnston-Rombach, 2022)

For all n ,

$$\text{sat}^*(n, P_3) = \frac{4n}{5} + O(1).$$

Very rough proof idea: disjoint copies of $K_{1,4}$ gives the upper bound. For the lower bound, what components of a rainbow saturated graph could be sparser than $K_{1,4}$?

Known Values of $\text{sat}^*(n, F)$

Theorem (HLM 2025)

For all n ,


$$\text{sat}^*(n, C_4) \leq \frac{11n}{6} + O(1).$$

Moreover, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, if $n \geq n_0$ and G is an n -vertex, properly rainbow C_4 -saturated graph, then G has more than $\left(\frac{11}{6} - \varepsilon\right)n$ edges.


Previously known: Bushaw, Johnston, and Rombach bounded

$$n \leq \text{sat}^*(n, C_4) \leq 2n - 2.$$

Determining $\text{sat}^*(n, C_4)$: A Construction



Determining $\text{sat}^*(n, C_4)$: A Construction



To scale up this construction: Take a universal u adjacent to copies of $S_{2,2,1}$.

Number of edges: $n - 1$ edges ending at u . For the rest, sets of 6 vertices yield 5 edges each. Total is $\approx \frac{11n}{6}$.

Lemma

Let G be a graph and $v \in V(G)$. If there exists a proper edge-coloring of G which is rainbow C_4 -free, then the subgraph of G induced on $N(v)$ **does not contain** the following subgraphs:


- 1 A copy of K_3 with pendant edges from two vertices;
- 2 C_4 ;
- 3 A copy of C_k with a pendant edge, for any $k \geq 5$;
- 4 The double star $D_{2,2}$, or any subdivision thereof.

Properties and Intuition Helping with the Upper-bound Analysis

Lemma

Let G be a graph and $v \in V(G)$. If there exists a proper edge-coloring of G which is rainbow C_4 -free, then the subgraph of G induced on $N(v)$ **does not contain** the following subgraphs:

- 1 A copy of K_3 with pendant edges from two vertices;
- 2 C_4 ;
- 3 A copy of C_k with a pendant edge, for any $k \geq 5$;
- 4 The double star $D_{2,2}$, or any subdivision thereof.




Properties and Intuition Helping with the Upper-bound Analysis

Lemma

Let G be a graph and $v \in V(G)$. If there exists a proper edge-coloring of G which is rainbow C_4 -free, then the subgraph of G induced on $N(v)$ **does not contain** the following subgraphs:

- 1 A copy of K_3 with pendant edges from two vertices;
- 2 C_4 ;
- 3 A copy of C_k with a pendant edge, for any $k \geq 5$;
- 4 The double star $D_{2,2}$, or any subdivision thereof.




Properties and Intuition Helping with the Upper-bound Analysis

Lemma

Let G be a graph and $v \in V(G)$. If there exists a proper edge-coloring of G which is rainbow C_4 -free, then the subgraph of G induced on $N(v)$ **does not contain** the following subgraphs:

- 1 A copy of K_3 with pendant edges from two vertices;
- 2 C_4 ;
- 3 A copy of C_k with a pendant edge, for any $k \geq 5$;
- 4 The double star $D_{2,2}$, or any subdivision thereof.




Properties and Intuition Helping with the Upper-bound Analysis

Lemma

Let G be a graph and $v \in V(G)$. If there exists a proper edge-coloring of G which is rainbow C_4 -free, then the subgraph of G induced on $N(v)$ **does not contain** the following subgraphs:

- 1 A copy of K_3 with pendant edges from two vertices;
- 2 C_4 ;
- 3 A copy of C_k with a pendant edge, for any $k \geq 5$;
- 4 The double star $D_{2,2}$, or any subdivision thereof.




Properties and Intuition Helping with the Upper-bound Analysis

Lemma

Let G be a graph and $v \in V(G)$. If there exists a proper edge-coloring of G which is rainbow C_4 -free, then the subgraph of G induced on $N(v)$ **does not contain** the following subgraphs:

- 1 A copy of K_3 with pendant edges from two vertices;
- 2 C_4 ;
- 3 A copy of C_k with a pendant edge, for any $k \geq 5$;
- 4 The double star $D_{2,2}$, or any subdivision thereof.




Properties and Intuition Helping with the Upper-bound Analysis

Lemma


Let G be a graph and $v \in V(G)$. If there exists a proper edge-coloring of G which is rainbow C_4 -free, then the subgraph of G induced on $N(v)$ **does not contain** the following subgraphs:

- 1 A copy of K_3 with pendant edges from two vertices;
- 2 C_4 ;
- 3 A copy of C_k with a pendant edge, for any $k \geq 5$;
- 4 The double star $D_{2,2}$, or any subdivision thereof.



Lower Bound Ideas


Suppose first we have a universal vertex u .



Look at the components in $G - \{u\}$. Go through the options for trees with fewer than 5 edges...

Lower Bound Ideas

Suppose first we have a universal vertex u .




Look at the components in $G - \{u\}$. Go through the options for trees with fewer than 5 edges...

So, if G has a universal vertex, we're pretty much done!

Lower Bound Ideas

Suppose first we have a universal vertex u .




Look at the components in $G - \{u\}$. Go through the options for trees with fewer than 5 edges...

So, if G has a universal vertex, we're pretty much done!

Problem: it is not at all clear that G has a universal vertex.

Dominating Sets


A **dominating set** in a graph G is a set D of vertices such that every vertex of $V(G) \setminus D$ is adjacent to something in D .



New Idea: A nice dominating set might work sort of like a universal vertex.

Dominating Set Wrinkles

A nice dominating set is harder to work with than a universal vertex:



Problems: **too-sparse components in $G - D$.**

If a component C of $G - D$ doesn't contribute the right edge density

A Core Set

If a component C of $G - D$ doesn't contribute the right edge density
we find a set $S \subseteq D$ of few (≤ 35) vertices with **all too-sparse components intersecting**
 $\bigcup_{v \in S} N(v)$ **nicely**.

If a component C of $G - D$ doesn't contribute the right edge density
we find a set $S \subseteq D$ of few (≤ 35) vertices with **all too-sparse components intersecting**
 $\bigcup_{v \in S} N(v)$ **nicely**.


$\rightsquigarrow$ **Conclusion:** constant number of too-sparse components!

Longer Cycles



What about cycles on more than 4 edges?

While some ideas from our proof may help, longer cycles seem to behave differently. In particular, the “ $u + \text{trees}$ ” model is tough to extend.

We do offer a construction giving an upper bound of $\approx \frac{5n}{2}$ for $C_5 \dots$



... and a construction giving $\approx \frac{7n}{3}$ for C_6 !



Follow-up Developement Appearing in 2024

- **Paths.** $\text{sat}^*(n, P_\ell) = n + O(1)$ (tight up to an additive constant).
**Baker–Gomez–Leos–Halfpap–Heath–Martin–
Miller–Parker–Pungello–Schwieder–Veldt & Lane–Morrison**

Follow-up Developement Appearing in 2024

- **Paths.** $\text{sat}^*(n, P_\ell) = n + O(1)$ (tight up to an additive constant).
Baker–Gomez–Leos–Halfpap–Heath–Martin–Miller–Parker–Pungello–Schwieder–Veldt & Lane–Morrison
- **K_4 .** Asymptotically determined: $\text{sat}^*(n, K_4) = \frac{7}{2}n + o(n)$. **Baker–Gomez–Leos–Halfpap–Heath–Martin–Miller–Parker–Pungello–Schwieder–Veldt & Lane–Morrison**

Follow-up Developement Appearing in 2024

- **Paths.** $\text{sat}^*(n, P_\ell) = n + O(1)$ (tight up to an additive constant).
Baker–Gomez–Leos–Halfpap–Heath–Martin–Miller–Parker–Pungello–Schwieder–Veldt & Lane–Morrison
- **K_4 .** Asymptotically determined: $\text{sat}^*(n, K_4) = \frac{7}{2}n + o(n)$. **Baker–Gomez–Leos–Halfpap–Heath–Martin–Miller–Parker–Pungello–Schwieder–Veldt & Lane–Morrison**
- **General cycles.** New linear upper bounds for long cycles: for $k \geq 7$,

$$\text{sat}^*(n, C_k) \leq \frac{k-1}{2}n + O(1),$$

and a worse bound for C_8 of $5n - 12$.

Lane–Morrison

Follow-up Developement Appearing in 2024

- **Paths.** $\text{sat}^*(n, P_\ell) = n + O(1)$ (tight up to an additive constant).
Baker–Gomez–Leos–Halfpap–Heath–Martin–Miller–Parker–Pungello–Schwieder–Veldt & Lane–Morrison
- **K_4 .** Asymptotically determined: $\text{sat}^*(n, K_4) = \frac{7}{2}n + o(n)$. **Baker–Gomez–Leos–Halfpap–Heath–Martin–Miller–Parker–Pungello–Schwieder–Veldt & Lane–Morrison**
- **General cycles.** New linear upper bounds for long cycles: for $k \geq 7$,

$$\text{sat}^*(n, C_k) \leq \frac{k-1}{2}n + O(1),$$

and a worse bound for C_8 of $5n - 12$.

Lane–Morrison

- **Trees.** Broad asymptotic results: if $\text{diam}(T) \geq 5$, then $\text{sat}^*(n, T) \geq n - 1$ (tight for several infinite families, e.g., brooms), giving $\Theta(n)$ for all connected trees with large diameter.

Lane–Morrison

Cycles: Current Best Bounds Summary

- C_4 . $\text{sat}^*(n, C_4) = \frac{11}{6}n \pm o(n)$
- C_5 . $\text{sat}^*(n, C_5) \leq \lfloor \frac{5}{2}n \rfloor - 4$.
- C_6 . $\text{sat}^*(n, C_6) \leq \frac{7}{3}n + O(1)$.
- C_k **for** $k \geq 7$. $\text{sat}^*(n, C_k) \leq \frac{k-1}{2}n + O(1)$; **except** $\text{sat}^*(n, C_8) \leq 5n - 12$.

Open Questions

While we now know many more values of $\text{sat}^*(n, F)$ than we did a year ago, many natural graphs remain unresolved.

- C_ℓ , for $\ell > 4$?

Open Questions

While we now know many more values of $\text{sat}^*(n, F)$ than we did a year ago, many natural graphs remain unresolved.

- C_ℓ , for $\ell > 4$?

Some nice general questions are also open:

- Is $\text{sat}^*(n, F)$ **always larger than** $\text{sat}(n, F)$? In all known cases, this is true (and in fact, there is a multiplicative factor of difference between the two).

Thanks for your attention!
Questions?