

ARTICLE

WILEY

Polynomial bounds for chromatic number VII. Disjoint holes

Maria Chudnovsky¹  | Alex Scott²  | Paul Seymour¹  |
Sophie Spirkl³ 

¹Department of Mathematics, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey, USA

²Mathematical Institute, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

³Department of Combinatorics and Optimization, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada

Correspondence

Sophie Spirkl, Department of Combinatorics and Optimization, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario N2L3G1, Canada.

Email: sspirkl@uwaterloo.ca

Funding information

Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council, Grant/Award Number: EP/V007327/1; Air Force Office of Scientific Research, Grant/Award Numbers: A9550-19-1-0187, FA9550-22-1-0234; Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, Grant/Award Number: RGPIN-2020-03912; National Science Foundation, Grant/Award Numbers: DMS-2120644, DMS-2154169

Abstract

A *hole* in a graph G is an induced cycle of length at least four, and a k -*multihole* in G is the union of k pairwise disjoint and nonneighbouring holes. It is well known that if G does not contain any holes then its chromatic number is equal to its clique number. In this paper we show that, for any integer $k \geq 1$, if G does not contain a k -multihole, then its chromatic number is at most a polynomial function of its clique number. We show that the same result holds if we ask for all the holes to be odd or of length four; and if we ask for the holes to be longer than any fixed constant or of length four. This is part of a broader study of graph classes that are polynomially χ -bounded.

KEYWORDS

colouring, induced subgraph,

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

© 2023 The Authors. *Journal of Graph Theory* published by Wiley Periodicals LLC.

1 | INTRODUCTION

A function $\phi: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is a *binding function* for a graph G if $\chi(G) \leq \phi(\omega(G))$, where $\chi(G)$, $\omega(G)$ denote the chromatic number of G and the size of the largest clique of G , respectively. A class \mathcal{C} of graphs is *hereditary* if for every $G \in \mathcal{C}$, every graph isomorphic to an induced subgraph of G also belongs to \mathcal{C} . A hereditary class \mathcal{C} is χ -*bounded* if there is a function ϕ that is a binding function for each $G \in \mathcal{C}$, and if so, we call ϕ a *binding function* for the class; if there exists a polynomial binding function, we say that \mathcal{C} is *poly- χ -bounded* (see [12] for a survey on χ -bounded classes, and [9] on poly- χ -bounded classes). While many classes are known to be χ -bounded, the proofs frequently give quite fast-growing functions, and it is natural to ask whether this is necessary. A remarkable conjecture of Louis Esperet [6] asserted that every χ -bounded hereditary class is poly- χ -bounded. But this was recently disproved by Briński, Davies and Walczak [2]. So the question now is: Which hereditary classes are poly- χ -bounded?

A hereditary graph class is defined by excluding some induced subgraphs. A graph is *H-free* if it has no induced subgraph isomorphic to H , and $\{H_1, H_2\}$ -*free* means both H_1 -free and H_2 -free. There is a mass of results on χ -bounded classes where one of the excluded graphs is a forest, but in this paper we consider some classes where every excluded graph has a cycle. A *hole* is an induced cycle of length at least four, and *odd-hole-free* means containing no odd hole. A *four-hole* means a hole of length four. Let us say a *k-multihole* of a graph G is an induced subgraph with k components, each a cycle of length at least four. We denote the k -vertex path by P_k and the k -vertex cycle by C_k .

Graphs with no 1-multihole are chordal and hence perfect. The class of graphs with no k -multihole in which all the cycles have odd lengths is shown in [10] to be χ -bounded, but it contains the class of $\{P_5, C_5\}$ -free graphs, and we cannot yet prove it is poly- χ -bounded (see [16] for the best current bounds). If we replace “odd” by “long”, the same applies: It is shown in [11] that for every $\ell \geq 0$, the class of graphs with no k -multihole in which all the cycles have length at least ℓ is χ -bounded (and we cannot yet prove it is poly- χ -bounded, for the same reason). But we can if we permit cycles of length four to be components of the multiholes we are excluding. We will show:

1.1. *For each integer $k \geq 1$, let \mathcal{C} be the class of all graphs G with no k -multihole in which every component either has length four or odd length. Then \mathcal{C} is poly- χ -bounded.*

Incidentally, there is a similar-looking theorem due to Dvořák and Pekárek [5], the following:

1.2. *For each integer $k \geq 1$, let \mathcal{C} be the class of all graphs G with no induced subgraph that consists of k cycles of odd length. Then \mathcal{C} is poly- χ -bounded.*

But here the cycles of odd length may have length three, and this makes a huge difference. If we change “odd” to “long”, there is a result parallel to 1.1:

1.3. *For all integers $k \geq 1$ and $\ell \geq 4$, let \mathcal{C} be the class of all graphs G with no k -multihole in which every component either has length four or length at least ℓ . Then \mathcal{C} is poly- χ -bounded.*

This second one we can make stronger (we could not prove the corresponding strengthening of the first):

1.4. For all integers $k, s \geq 1$, and $\ell \geq 4$, let \mathcal{C} be the class of all graphs G such that no induced subgraph of G has exactly k components, each of which is either isomorphic to $K_{s,s}$ or a cycle of length at least ℓ . Then \mathcal{C} is poly- χ -bounded.

(In general, $K_{s,t}$ denotes the complete bipartite graph with parts of cardinality s and t .) Both these results derive from a theorem about $K_{s,s}$, which we will explain in Section 2.

2 | EXCLUDING A DISJOINT UNION, AND SELF-ISOLATION

If $A \subseteq V(G)$, $G[A]$ denotes the subgraph of G induced on A ; and we write $\chi(A)$ for $\chi(G[A])$ and $\omega(A)$ for $\omega(G[A])$. Two disjoint subsets of $V(G)$ are *anticomplete* if there are no edges between them, and *complete* if every vertex of the first subset is adjacent to every vertex of the second. A graph G *contains* a graph H if some induced subgraph of G is isomorphic to H , and such a subgraph is a *copy* of H . A function $\phi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is *nondecreasing* if $\phi(x) \leq \phi(y)$ for all $x, y \in \mathbb{N}$ with $x \leq y$.

Let us say a graph H is *self-isolating* if for every nondecreasing polynomial $\psi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, there is a polynomial $\phi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ with the following property. For every graph G with $\chi(G) > \phi(\omega(G))$, there exists $A \subseteq V(G)$ with $\chi(A) > \psi(\omega(A))$, such that either

- $G[A]$ is H -free, or
- G contains a copy H' of H such that $V(H')$ is disjoint from and anticomplete to A .

Self-isolation is of interest in considering polynomial χ -boundedness for the class of H -free graphs, where H is a forest. Say a forest H is *good* if the class of H -free graphs is polynomially χ -bounded. It might be true that every forest is good (strengthening the Gyárfás-Sumner conjecture [7, 17] from χ -boundedness to polynomial χ -boundedness), but this has only been proved for a few simple kinds of tree H , and some (not all) of the forests that are disjoint unions of these trees. It is not known that if trees H_1, H_2 are good, then the disjoint union of H_1 and H_2 is good. For instance, trees of diameter three are good [15], but disjoint unions of them might not be as far as we know. But self-isolation helps here: if H_1 and H_2 are good forests, and one of them is self-isolating, then the disjoint union of H_1 and H_2 is good. Some good trees are known to be self-isolating (namely, stars and four-vertex paths), so we can happily take disjoint unions with them and preserve goodness.

Which graphs are self-isolating? We know very little at the moment: There are very few graphs that we know to have the property, and none that we know not to have the property. (Could it be that all graphs are self-isolating? Certainly, if we change the definition of self-isolating, replacing the polynomials ϕ, ψ by general functions, it is easy to show that all graphs have the property, by induction on $\omega(G)$.) A graph is self-isolating if all its components are self-isolating, but the only connected graphs that we know are self-isolating are complete graphs (proved below), paths of arbitrary length (proved in [4]), and complete bipartite graphs (proved in Section 3). The main result of [14] was that stars are self-isolating, so our result that

complete bipartite graphs are self-isolating generalizes this. The last takes up the main part of this paper, and is most of what we need to prove 1.1 and 1.4.

First, complete isolation:

2.1. Every complete graph is self-isolating.

Proof. (This proof was derived from a similar proof in [8]). Let $\psi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be a nondecreasing polynomial, and let H be a k -vertex complete graph. Let ϕ be the polynomial $\phi(x) = (x+1)^k \psi(x) + x$ for $x \in \mathbb{N}$. Now let G be a graph with chromatic number more than $\phi(\omega(G))$, and let K be a clique of G with cardinality $\omega(G)$. If $\omega(G) < k$, then the first bullet in the definition of self-isolating holds, so we assume that $\omega(G) \geq k$. For each $X \subseteq K$ with $|X| = k$, let A_X be the set of vertices in $V(G) \setminus K$ that are nonadjacent to every vertex in X ; and for every $Y \subseteq K$ with $|Y| = k-1$, let B_Y be the set of vertices in $V(G) \setminus K$ that are adjacent to every vertex in $K \setminus Y$. Thus $V(G) \setminus K$ is the union of the $\binom{\omega(G)}{k}$ sets A_X and the $\binom{\omega(G)}{k-1}$ sets B_Y ; and since

$$\binom{\omega(G)}{k} + \binom{\omega(G)}{k-1} = \binom{\omega(G)+1}{k} \leq (\omega(G)+1)^k,$$

and $\chi(G \setminus K) > (\omega(G)+1)^k \psi(\omega(G))$, one of the sets A_X or B_Y has chromatic number more than $\psi(\omega(G))$. If $\chi(A_X) > \psi(\omega(G))$ for some X , then $G[X]$ is a copy of H anticomplete to A_X , and since $\psi(\omega(G)) \geq \psi(\omega(A_X))$, the second bullet in the definition of self-isolating holds. If $\chi(B_Y) > \psi(\omega(G))$ for some Y , then since $|K \setminus Y| = \omega(G) - k + 1$ and B_Y is complete to $K \setminus Y$, it follows that $\omega(B_Y) < k$ and so $G[B_Y]$ is H -free, and the first bullet in the definition of self-isolating holds. This proves 2.1. \square

3 | COMPLETE BIPARTITE ISOLATION

We turn to the proof that

3.1. Every complete bipartite graph is self-isolating.

We will in fact prove something a little stronger. Let $\psi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be some nondecreasing function. An induced subgraph H of a graph G is ψ -*nondominating* if there exists a set $A \subseteq V(G)$ disjoint from and anticomplete to $V(H)$, with $\chi(A) \geq \psi(\omega(A))$. If $\psi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is a nondecreasing function and $q \geq 0$ is an integer, a (ψ, q) -*sprinkling* in a graph G is a pair (P, Q) of disjoint subsets of $V(G)$, such that

- $\chi(P) > \psi(\omega(P))$; and
- $\chi(Q) > \psi(\omega(Q)) + qr$, where r is the maximum over $v \in P$ of the chromatic number of the set of neighbours of v in Q .

(This is closely related to what was called a “ (ψ, q) -scattering” in [4].) We denote the number of vertices of a graph H by $|H|$. We will prove:

3.2. Let $s \geq 1$ and $q \geq 0$ be integers, and let $\psi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be a nondecreasing polynomial. Then there is a polynomial $\phi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ with the following property. For every graph G with $\chi(G) > \phi(\omega(G))$, either:

- there is a ψ -nondominating copy of $K_{s,s}$ in G , or
- there is a (ψ, q) -sprinkling in G .

Proof. (Proof of 3.1, assuming 3.2). Let $s, s' \geq 1$ be integers, where $s' \leq s$. We will show that $K_{s,s'}$ is self-isolating. (It is not enough to show this when $s = s'$, because we do not know that every induced subgraph of a self-isolating graph is self-isolating.) Let $\psi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be a nondecreasing polynomial, let $q = s + s'$, and let ϕ satisfy 3.2. Let G be a graph with $\chi(G) > \phi(\omega(G))$. We claim that either there is a ψ -nondominating copy of $K_{s,s'}$ in G , or there exists $A \subseteq V(G)$ with $\chi(A) > \psi(\omega(A))$ such that $G[A]$ is $K_{s,s'}$ -free. If there is a ψ -nondominating copy of $K_{s,s}$ in G , then there is also one of $K_{s,s'}$, so by 3.2, we may assume that there is a (ψ, q) -sprinkling (P, Q) in G . If $G[P]$ is $K_{s,s'}$ -free, the claim holds, so we assume that there is a copy H of $K_{s,s'}$ in $G[P]$. Thus $|H| = q$. Let r be the maximum over $v \in P$ of the chromatic number of the set of neighbours of v in Q . The set of vertices in Q with a neighbour in $V(H)$ has chromatic number at most $|H|r = qr$; and $\chi(Q) > \psi(\omega(Q)) + qr$ from the definition of a (ψ, q) -sprinkling. Consequently H is ψ -nondominating, and hence $K_{s,s'}$ is self-isolating. \square

To prove 3.2 we will need the following lemma:

3.3. For every graph G that is not a complete graph, there is a vertex v such that the set of vertices different from and nonadjacent to v has chromatic number at least $\chi(G)/\omega(G)$.

Proof. Let X be a maximum clique of G , and for each $x \in X$, let D_x be the set of vertices of G different from and nonadjacent to x . Since G is nonnull, it follows that $X \neq \emptyset$. But $V(G)$ is the union of the sets $D_x \cup \{x\}$ over $x \in X$, because of the maximality of X ; and so there exists $v \in X$ such that $\chi(D_v \cup \{v\}) \geq \chi(G)/\omega(G)$. Choose such a vertex v with $D_v \neq \emptyset$ if possible. If $D_v \neq \emptyset$, then $\chi(D_v \cup \{v\}) = \chi(D_v)$, since there are no edges between v and D_v , and so the theorem holds. Thus we may assume (for a contradiction) that $D_v = \emptyset$, and so $1 = \chi(D_v \cup \{v\}) \geq \chi(G)/\omega(G)$. Since $\chi(G)/\omega(G) \geq 1$, equality holds, and so $\chi(D_x \cup \{x\}) \geq \chi(G)/\omega(G)$ for every $x \in X$; and so $D_x = \emptyset$ for all $x \in X$, from the choice of v . Consequently $V(G) = X$, and G is a complete graph, a contradiction. This proves 3.3. \square

The proof of 3.2 will be by examining the largest “template” in G . Let us say that, for all integers $t, k, s \geq 1$, a (t, k, s) -template in G is a sequence (A_1, \dots, A_k) of pairwise disjoint subsets of $V(G)$, each of cardinality t , such that for $1 \leq i < j \leq k$, and for every stable set $S \subseteq A_j$ with $|S| = s$, every vertex in A_i has a neighbour in S . (Thus, this last condition is trivially satisfied if $t < s$.) The next result will enable us to find a $(t, 2, s)$ -template. If $v \in V(G)$, we denote the set of neighbours of a vertex v by $N(v)$ or $N_G(v)$.

3.4. Let $s, t \geq 1$ and $q \geq 0$ be integers, and let $\psi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be a nondecreasing polynomial. Let G be a graph with

$$\begin{aligned}\chi(G) &> \omega(G)^s((s+t^s)\psi(\omega(G)) + t) \\ \text{and} \\ \chi(G) &> q^s t + (2+q+q^2+\cdots+q^{s-1})\psi(\omega(G)) + 1.\end{aligned}$$

Then either

- there is a ψ -nondominating copy of $K_{s,s}$ in G , or
- there is a (ψ, q) -sprinkling in G , or
- G contains a $(t, 2, s)$ -template.

Proof. Define $p = \psi(\omega(G))$. For $0 \leq i \leq s$, define

$$\begin{aligned}m_i &= \omega(G)^{s-i}(t^s p + t) + (1 + \omega(G) + \cdots + \omega(G)^{s-i-1})p, \\ n_i &= q^{s-i}t + (1 + q + q^2 + \cdots + q^{s-i-1})p.\end{aligned}$$

Thus $m_s = t^s p + t$, and $m_i = \omega(G)m_{i+1} + p$ for $0 \leq i < s$; and $n_s = t$ and $n_i = qn_{i+1} + p$ for $0 \leq i < s$. By hypothesis, $\chi(G) > m_0$ and $\chi(G) > n_0 + p + 1$. We claim we may assume that:

(1) *There is a vertex v_1 such that $\chi(N(v_1)) > n_1$ and $\chi(M(v_1)) > m_1$, where $M(v_1) = V(G) \setminus (N(v_1) \cup \{v_1\})$.*

Let S be the set of all vertices v with $\chi(N(v)) \leq n_1$. If $\chi(S) > p$, choose a subset $P \subseteq S$ with $\chi(P) = p + 1$, and let $Q = V(G) \setminus P$. Then

$$\chi(Q) \geq \chi(G) - (p + 1) > n_0 = p + qn_1,$$

and so (P, Q) is a (ψ, q) -sprinkling. We therefore assume that $\chi(S) \leq p$. Let $R = V(G) \setminus S$. Thus

$$\chi(R) \geq \chi(G) - p > m_0 - p = \omega(G)m_1 \geq \omega(G),$$

and so R is not a clique. By 3.3, there exists $v_1 \in R$ such that the set of vertices in R different from and nonadjacent to v_1 has chromatic number at least $\chi(R)/\omega(G) > m_1$, and so $\chi(M(v_1)) > m_1$. This proves we may assume that (1) holds.

Choose a stable set $S \subseteq V(G)$ with $|S| \leq s$, maximal such that $\chi(N(S)) > n_{|S|}$ and $\chi(M(S)) > m_{|S|}$, where $N(S)$ denotes the set of all vertices in $V(G) \setminus S$ that are adjacent to every vertex in S , and $M(S)$ denotes the set of all vertices in $V(G) \setminus S$ that are nonadjacent to every vertex in S . From (1), $|S| \geq 1$. Now there are two cases, $|S| < s$ and $|S| = s$.

Suppose first that $|S| < s$. Let A be the set of all vertices $v \in M(S)$ such that the set of neighbours of v in $N(S)$ has chromatic number at most $n_{|S|+1}$. Since $\chi(N(S)) > n_{|S|} = qn_{|S|+1} + p$, we may assume that $\chi(A) \leq p$, because otherwise $(A, N(S))$ is a (ψ, q) -sprinkling. Hence

$$\chi(B) \geq \chi(M(S)) - p > m_{|S|} - p = \omega(G)m_{|S|+1},$$

where $B = M(S) \setminus A$. Since $m_{|S|+1} \geq 1$ (because $t \geq 1$), it follows that B is not a clique, and so from 3.3, there is a vertex $v \in B$ such that the set of vertices in B , different from and nonadjacent to v , has chromatic number at least $\chi(B)/\omega(G) > m_{|S|+1}$. But then adding v to S contradicts the maximality of S .

Now suppose that $|S| = s$. Since $\chi(N(S)) > n_s = t$, we may choose $T \subseteq N(S)$ with $|T| = t$. Let A be the set of vertices in $M(S)$ that have s nonneighbours in T that are pairwise nonadjacent, and let $B = M(S) \setminus A$. For each stable set $S' \subseteq T$ with $|S'| = s$, we may assume that the set of vertices in $M(S)$ with no neighbour in S' has chromatic number at most p , because otherwise $G[S \cup S']$ is a ψ -nondominating copy of $K_{s,s}$. The number of such sets S' is at most t^s , and so $\chi(A) \leq t^s p$. Hence

$$\chi(B) \geq \chi(M(S)) - t^s p > m_s - t^s p = t,$$

and so there exists $M \subseteq B$ with $|M| = t$. But then (M, T) is a $(t, 2, s)$ -template. This proves 3.4. \square

We also need the following version of Ramsey's theorem (proved for instance in [14]).

3.5. *For all integers $s \geq 1$ and $r \geq 2$, if a graph G has no stable subset of size s and no clique of size more than r , then $|V(G)| < r^s$.*

Now we use 3.4 to prove 3.2, which we restate in a strengthened form:

3.6. *Let $s \geq 1$ and $q \geq 0$ be integers, and let $\psi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be a nondecreasing polynomial. Let $\phi, \phi' : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be the polynomials defined by*

$$\begin{aligned} \phi'(x) &= x^s(s\psi(x) + (s+1)^s x^{s(s+1)}\psi(x) + (s+1)x^{s+1}) \\ &\quad + q^s(s+1)x^{s+1} + (2+q+q^2+\cdots+q^{s-1})\psi(x) + 2 \\ \text{and} \\ \phi(x) &= (s+1)^{2s}x^{2+2s(s+1)}\psi(x) + (s+1)^s x^{1+s(s+1)}\phi'(x) + (x+1)(s+1)x^{s+1} \end{aligned}$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{N}$. Let G be a graph with $\chi(G) > \phi(\omega(G))$. Then either:

- there is a ψ -nondominating copy of $K_{s,s}$ in G , or
- there is a (ψ, q) -sprinkling in G .

Proof. Suppose that neither of the two bullets of the theorem holds. Let $t = (s+1)\omega(G)^{s+1}$. Thus

$$\chi(G) > \omega(G)^2 t^{2s} \psi(\omega(G)) + \omega(G) t^s \phi'(\omega(G)) + (\omega(G) + 1)t.$$

We claim:

(1) *If $A \subseteq V(G)$ with $\chi(A) > \phi'(\omega(G))$ then $G[A]$ contains a $(t, 2, s)$ -template.*

Let $G' = G[A]$. Since $\chi(A) > \phi'(\omega(G))$ and ψ is nondecreasing, it follows that

$$\chi(G') > \omega(G')^s((s + t^s)\psi(\omega(G')) + t)$$

and

$$\chi(G') > q^s t + (2 + q + q^2 + \cdots + q^{s-1})\psi(\omega(G')) + 1.$$

By 3.4 applied to G' , either

- there is a ψ -nondominating copy of $K_{s,s}$ in G' (and hence in G), or
- there is a (ψ, q) -sprinkling in G' (and hence in G), or
- G' contains a $(t, 2, s)$ -template.

By assumption, neither of the first two bullets hold, so the third holds. This proves (1).

For $2 \leq k \leq \omega(G) + 1$, define $t_k = (s + 1)\omega(G)^{s+1} - s(k - 2)\omega(G)^s$. Thus $t_2 = t$, and $0 \leq t_k \leq t$ for $2 \leq k \leq \omega(G) + 1$. By (1) applied to G , there is a $(t_2, 2, s)$ -template in G . Choose an integer k with $2 \leq k \leq \omega(G) + 1$, maximum such that there is a (t_k, k, s) -template in G , and let (A_1, \dots, A_k) be such a template.

$$(2) \ k \leq \omega(G).$$

Suppose that $k = \omega(G) + 1$. Inductively for $i = 1, \dots, k$, suppose that vertices a_1, \dots, a_{i-1} are defined, and define a_i as follows. For $1 \leq h < i$, the nonneighbours of a_h in A_i do not include a stable set of cardinality s , from the definition of a (t_k, k, s) -template. Hence by 3.5 (taking $r = \omega(G)$), there are at most $\omega(G)^s$ vertices in A_i nonadjacent to a_h , and hence at most $\omega(G)^{s+1}$ vertices in A_i that are nonadjacent to at least one of a_1, \dots, a_{i-1} . Since

$$|A_i| = t_k \geq (s + 1)\omega(G)^{s+1} - s(\omega(G) - 1)\omega(G)^s > \omega(G)^{s+1},$$

some vertex $a_i \in A_i$ is adjacent to all of a_1, \dots, a_{i-1} . This completes the inductive definition. But then $\{a_1, \dots, a_{\omega(G)+1}\}$ is a clique in G , a contradiction. This proves (2).

Let $Z = V(G) \setminus (A_1 \cup \cdots \cup A_k)$. For $1 \leq i \leq k$, let \mathcal{S}_i be the set of all stable sets contained in A_i with cardinality s . For each $S \in \mathcal{S}_i$, let D_S be the set of vertices in Z with no neighbour in S , and let Y_i be the union of the sets D_S over $S \in \mathcal{S}_i$.

$$(3) \ |Z \setminus (Y_1 \cup \cdots \cup Y_k)| < t_{k+1}.$$

Suppose not, and choose $A \subseteq Z \setminus (Y_1 \cup \cdots \cup Y_k)$ with $|A| = t_{k+1}$. For $1 \leq i \leq k$, choose $B_i \subseteq A_i$ with $|B_i| = t_{k+1}$. Then $(A, B_1, B_2, \dots, B_k)$ is a $(t_{k+1}, k + 1, s)$ -template, contrary to the maximality of k . This proves (3).

For each $v \in Y_1 \cup \cdots \cup Y_k$, choose $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ minimum such that $v \in Y_i$, and choose $S \in \mathcal{S}_i$ such that $v \in D_S$. We call S the *home* of v .

(4) Let $1 \leq i \leq k$, and let $S \in \mathcal{S}_i$. The set of vertices in D_S with home S has chromatic number at most $\omega(G)t^s\psi(\omega(G)) + \phi'(\omega(G))$.

Let F be the set of vertices in D_S with home S . By 3.5, as in the proof of (2), for $i + 1 \leq j \leq k$ there are at most $s\omega(G)^s$ vertices in A_j with a nonneighbour in S , and since $|A_j| = t_k = t_{k+1} + s\omega(G)^s$, there exists $B_j \subseteq A_j$ with $|B_j| = t_{k+1}$ complete to S . For $1 \leq h < i$, choose $B_h \subseteq A_h$ with $|B_h| = t_{k+1}$ arbitrarily. Let F' be the set of vertices $v \in F$ such that v has no neighbour in S' for some $j \in \{i + 1, \dots, k\}$ and some $S' \in \mathcal{S}_j$ with $S' \subseteq B_j$. For $i + 1 \leq j \leq k$, and each $S' \in \mathcal{S}_j$ with $S' \subseteq B_j$, the chromatic number of the set of vertices in F with no neighbour in S' is at most $\psi(\omega(G))$, since the copy of $K_{s,s}$ induced on $S \cup S'$ is not ψ -nondominating; and so $\chi(F') \leq \omega(G)t^s\psi(\omega(G))$, since there are at most $\omega(G)t^s$ choices for the pair (j, S') . Let $F'' = F \setminus F'$. If $G[F'']$ contains a $(t, 2, s)$ -template, then it contains a $(t_{k+1}, 2, s)$ -template (C_1, C_2) say; and then

$$(C_1, C_2, B_1, \dots, B_{i-1}, B_{i+1}, \dots, B_k)$$

is a $(t_{k+1}, k + 1, s)$ -template in G , from the definition of a home, a contradiction. Thus $G[F'']$ contains no such template, and so $\chi(F'') \leq \phi'(\omega(G))$ by (1). Hence $\chi(F) \leq \omega(G)t^s\psi(\omega(G)) + \phi'(\omega(G))$. This proves (4).

Now every vertex in $Y_1 \cup \dots \cup Y_k$ has a home, and there are only at most $\omega(G)t^s$ choices of a home; so by (4),

$$\chi(Y_1 \cup \dots \cup Y_k) \leq \omega(G)^2 t^{2s} \psi(\omega(G)) + \omega(G)t^s \phi'(\omega(G)).$$

Hence by (3),

$$\begin{aligned} \chi(G) &\leq \omega(G)^2 t^{2s} \psi(\omega(G)) + \omega(G)t^s \phi'(\omega(G)) + |Z \setminus (Y_1 \cup \dots \cup Y_k)| + |A_1 \cup \dots \cup A_k| \\ &\leq \omega(G)^2 t^{2s} \psi(\omega(G)) + \omega(G)t^s \phi'(\omega(G)) + (\omega(G) + 1)t, \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction. This proves 3.6. \square

4 | ODD HOLES

Now we deduce 1.1. Let us say a hole in G is *special* if its length is either four or odd. We need a result proved in [10], the following:

4.1. *Let $x \in \mathbb{N}$, and let G be a graph such that $\chi(N(v)) \leq x$ for every vertex $v \in V(G)$. If C is a shortest odd hole in G , the set of vertices of G that belong to or have a neighbour in $V(C)$ has chromatic number at most $21x$.*

We deduce:

4.2. *Let $\psi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be some nondecreasing polynomial, let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and let G be a graph such that $\chi(N(v)) \leq n$ for every vertex $v \in V(G)$. If $\chi(G) > \max(\omega(G), 21n + \psi(\omega(G)))$ then G contains a ψ -nondominating special hole.*

Proof. Since $\chi(G) > \omega(G)$, G is not perfect, and so contains either a four-hole or an odd hole (by the strong perfect graph theorem [3], since odd antiholes of length at least seven

contain four-holes). Let C be either a four-hole, or a shortest odd hole of G . Let A be the set of vertices in $V(G) \setminus V(C)$ that have no neighbour in $V(C)$, and $B = V(G) \setminus A$. If C has length four then $\chi(B) \leq 4n$, and if C is a shortest odd hole of G , then $\chi(B) \leq 21n$ by 4.1. Consequently $\chi(A) > \psi(\omega(G)) \geq \psi(\omega(A))$, and so C is a ψ -nondominating special hole. This proves 4.2. \square

We also need:

4.3. *Let G be a graph containing no four-hole, let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $X \subseteq V(G)$ be the set of all $v \in V(G)$ with $\chi(N(v)) > n$. If $\chi(X) > \omega(G)$, then there exist disjoint sets $A, B \subseteq V(G)$, anticomplete, with $\chi(A), \chi(B) > n/2 - \omega(G)$.*

Proof. Let us say an edge xy of G is *rich* if $\chi(N(x) \setminus N(y)) > n/2 - \omega(G)$ and $\chi(N(y) \setminus N(x)) > n/2 - \omega(G)$. Since there is no four-hole, it is enough to prove that there is a rich edge.

Since $\chi(X) > \omega(G)$, the graph $G[X]$ is not perfect, and so contains a four-vertex induced path with vertices $v_1-v_2-v_3-v_4$ in order. Let

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &= N(v_1) \setminus (N(v_3) \cup N(v_4)), \\ A_2 &= N(v_2) \setminus (N(v_4) \cup (N(v_1) \cap N(v_3))), \\ A_3 &= N(v_3) \setminus (N(v_1) \cup (N(v_2) \cap N(v_4))) \quad \text{and} \\ A_4 &= N(v_4) \setminus (N(v_2) \cup N(v_1)). \end{aligned}$$

Since there is no four-hole, $N(v_1) \cap N(v_3)$ is a clique, and so is $N(v_1) \cap N(v_4)$, and therefore $\chi(A_1) > n - 2\omega(G)$. Since $N(v_2) \cap N(v_4)$ and $N(v_1) \cap N(v_3)$ are cliques, it also follows that $\chi(A_2) > n - 2\omega(G)$, and similarly $\chi(A_i) > n - 2\omega(G)$ for $1 \leq i \leq 4$.

Now v_2 is anticomplete to $A_1 \setminus A_2$, and v_1 is anticomplete to $A_2 \setminus A_1$, so if $\chi(A_1 \cap A_2) \leq n/2 - \omega(G)$, then $\chi(A_1 \setminus A_2) > n/2 - \omega(G)$ and $\chi(A_2 \setminus A_1) > n/2 - \omega(G)$, and so the edge v_1v_2 is rich.

Thus we may assume that $\chi(A_1 \cap A_2) > n/2 - \omega(G)$, and similarly $\chi(A_3 \cap A_4) > n/2 - \omega(G)$. But $A_1 \cap A_2 \subseteq N(v_2) \setminus N(v_3)$, and $A_3 \cap A_4 \subseteq N(v_3) \setminus N(v_2)$, and so the edge v_2v_3 is rich. This proves 4.3. \square

We put 4.2 and 4.3 together to prove the following:

4.4. *Let $\psi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be some nondecreasing polynomial. If G is a C_4 -free graph with*

$$\chi(G) > 85\omega(G) + 43\psi(\omega(G))$$

then G contains a ψ -nondominating odd hole.

Proof. Let G be a C_4 -free graph with $\chi(G) > 85\omega(G) + 43\psi(\omega(G))$. Define $n = 4\omega(G) + 2\psi(\omega(G))$.

Let A be the set of all vertices v of G such that $\chi(N(v)) \leq n$, and $B = V(G) \setminus A$. By 4.2 applied to $G[A]$, we may assume that

$$\chi(A) \leq \max(\omega(A), 21n + \psi(\omega(A))) = 21n + \psi(\omega(A)) \leq 84\omega(G) + 43\psi(\omega(G))$$

and so $\chi(B) \geq \chi(G) - \chi(A) > \omega(G)$. By 4.3 there exist disjoint sets $X, Y \subseteq V(G)$, anticomplete, with $\chi(X), \chi(Y) > n/2 - \omega(G) \geq \omega(G) + \psi(\omega(G))$. Since $\chi(X) > \omega(G) \geq \omega(X)$, $G[X]$ is not perfect and so contains a special hole C , and hence an odd hole since G has no four-holes. Since $V(C)$ is anticomplete to Y , and $\chi(Y) > \psi(\omega(G)) \geq \psi(\omega(Y))$, C is ψ -nondominating. This proves 4.4. \square

This in turn is used to prove:

4.5. *Let $\psi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be some nondecreasing polynomial. Then there is a nondecreasing polynomial $\phi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that if $\chi(G) > \phi(\omega(G))$ then G contains a ψ -nondominating special hole.*

Proof. Let $\psi'(x) = 85x + 43\psi(x)$ for $x \in \mathbb{N}$, and let ϕ satisfy 3.2 with ψ replaced by ψ' , taking $s = 2$ and $q = 4$. We will show that ϕ satisfies 4.5. Let G be a graph with $\chi(G) > \phi(\omega(G))$. By 3.2, either there is a ψ' -nondominating four-hole in G , or there is a $(\psi', 4)$ -sprinkling in G . In the first case, this four-hole is also ψ -nondominating, since $\psi(x) \leq \psi'(x)$ for $x \in \mathbb{N}$, so we assume the second case holds. Let (P, Q) be a $(\psi', 4)$ -sprinkling in G , and let r be the maximum chromatic number over $v \in P$ of the set of neighbours of v in Q . Thus $\chi(Q) > 4r + \psi'(\omega(Q))$, from the definition of a $(\psi', 4)$ -sprinkling. If $G[P]$ has a four-hole H , the set of vertices in Q with a neighbour in $V(H)$ has chromatic number at most $4r$, and so there is a subset of Q with chromatic number more than $\psi'(\omega(Q)) \geq \psi(\omega(Q))$ anticomplete to H , and so H is ψ -nondominating. Thus we may assume that $G[P]$ has no four-hole. By 4.4, $G[P]$, and hence G , contains a ψ -nondominating odd hole. This proves 4.5. \square

We deduce 1.1, which we restate:

4.6. *For each integer $k \geq 1$, let \mathcal{C} be the class of all graphs G with no k -multihole in which every component is special. Then \mathcal{C} is poly- χ -bounded.*

Proof. Let us say a k -multihole is *special* if each of its components is a special hole. We proceed by induction on k . The result is true when $k = 1$, because graphs containing no special hole are perfect; so we assume that $k \geq 2$, and there is a polynomial binding function $\psi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ for the class of all graphs with no special $(k - 1)$ -multihole \mathcal{C}_{k-1} (and we may assume ψ is nondecreasing). Let ϕ satisfy 4.5; we claim that ϕ is a binding function for the class of all graphs with no special k -multihole. Thus, let G be a graph with $\chi(G) > \phi(\omega(G))$; we must show that G contains a special k -multihole. By the choice of ϕ , G contains a ψ -nondominating special hole H say. Choose $A \subseteq V(G) \setminus V(H)$, anticomplete to $V(H)$, such that $\chi(A) > \psi(\omega(A))$. From the inductive hypothesis, $G[A]$ contains a special $(k - 1)$ -multihole, and so G contains a special k -multihole. This proves 4.6. \square

5 | LONG HOLES

In this section we will prove 1.4. The proof is similar to that of 1.1. Fix an integer $\ell \geq 4$, and we say a hole is *long* if its length is at least ℓ . Let $\tau(G)$ denote the largest integer t such that G contains $K_{t,t}$ as a subgraph. We need a result proved in [1] (see also [13]), the following:

5.1. *There exists an integer $c > 0$ such that $\chi(G) \leq \tau(G)^c + 1$ for every graph G with no long hole.*

We deduce:

5.2. *Let $s \in \mathbb{N}$; then the class of $K_{s,s}$ -free graphs with no long hole is poly- χ -bounded.*

Proof. Let $c \geq 1$ be as in 5.1, and let ϕ be the polynomial $\phi(x) = x^{cs}$ for $x \in \mathbb{N}$. Let G be a $K_{s,s}$ -free graph with no long hole. We will show that ϕ is a binding function for G . Suppose that $\tau(G) \geq \omega(G)^s$, and let A, B be disjoint subsets of $V(G)$, both of cardinality at least $\omega(G)^s$ and complete to each other. By 3.5, there exist stable sets $A' \subseteq A$ and $B' \subseteq B$ both of cardinality s ; but then $G[A' \cup B']$ is a copy of $K_{s,s}$, a contradiction. So $\tau(G) < \omega(G)^s$. By 5.1,

$$\chi(G) \leq (\omega(G)^s - 1)^c + 1 \leq \omega(G)^{cs} = \phi(\omega(G)),$$

and so ϕ is a binding function for G , and hence for the class of $K_{s,s}$ -free graphs with no long hole. This proves 5.2. \square

Next we need an analogue of 4.1, the following:

5.3. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and let G be a graph such that $\chi(N(v)) \leq n$ for every vertex $v \in V(G)$. If C is a shortest long hole in G , the set of vertices of G that belong to or have a neighbour in $V(C)$ has chromatic number at most $(\ell + 1)n$.*

Proof. Let C have vertices $c_1, c_2, \dots, c_k, c_1$ in order. Let P be the path $c_1, c_2, \dots, c_{\ell-3}$, and let Q be the path $C \setminus V(P)$.

(1) *If $v \in V(G) \setminus V(C)$ has no neighbour in $V(P)$, then all neighbours of v in $V(Q)$ belong to a three-vertex subpath of Q .*

Suppose not, and choose i, j minimum and maximum, respectively, such that $c_i, c_j \in V(Q)$ are neighbours of v . Thus $j - i \geq 3$, and so

$$c_1, c_2, \dots, c_i, v, c_j, c_{j+1}, \dots, c_k, c_1$$

is a long hole (because $j \geq \ell - 2$) that is shorter than C , a contradiction. This proves (1).

For $1 \leq i \leq k$, let A_i be the set of vertices in $V(G) \setminus V(C)$ that are adjacent to c_i and to none of c_1, \dots, c_{i-1} .

(2) *A_i is anticomplete to A_j for $\ell - 2 \leq i < j \leq k$ with $j - i \geq 4$.*

Suppose that $u \in A_i$ and $v \in A_j$ are adjacent. Choose $j' \geq j$ maximum such that $c_{j'}$ is adjacent to v ; thus $j' \geq j \geq i + 4$, and so by (1), u is nonadjacent to $c_{j'}, \dots, c_k$. Hence

$$c_1 - c_2 - \dots - c_i - u - v - c_{j'} - c_{j'+1} - \dots - c_k - c_1$$

is a long hole shorter than C , a contradiction. This proves (2).

For $t = 1, 2, 3, 4$ let I_t be the set of all integers $i \in \{\ell - 2, \dots, k\}$ such that $i - t$ is divisible by four. Thus I_1, I_2, I_3, I_4 form a partition of $\{\ell - 2, \dots, k\}$. Moreover, for all $t \in \{1, \dots, 4\}$, and all distinct $i, j \in I_t$, there is no edge between $A_i \cup \{c_{i+1}\}$ and $A_j \cup \{c_{j+1}\}$, by (1) and (2); and so $\bigcup_{i \in I_t} A_i \cup \{c_{i+1}\}$ has chromatic number at most n . Hence the set of all vertices in $V(G)$ that belong to or have a neighbour in $V(C)$ has chromatic number at most $(\ell + 1)n$, since those that belong to or have a neighbour in P have chromatic number at most $(\ell - 3)n$, and the others have chromatic number at most $4n$. This proves 5.3. \square

Now we need an analogue of 4.3, the following:

5.4. Let $s \in \mathbb{N}$, let G be a $K_{s,s}$ -free graph, with no long hole of length at most $2s\ell$. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $B \subseteq V(G)$ be the set of vertices v of G such that $\chi(N(v)) > n$. If $G[B]$ contains a long hole, then there exist disjoint sets $X, Y \subseteq B$, anticomplete, with $\chi(X), \chi(Y) > n - (2s\ell)^s \omega(G)^s$.

Proof. We may assume that $G[B]$ has a hole of length more than $2s\ell$, and so contains an induced path P with $r = 2s\ell - 2$ vertices. Let the vertices of P be $p_1 - p_2 - \dots - p_r$ in order. For each stable subset $S \subseteq V(P)$ with $|S| = s$, let D_S be the set of vertices in $V(G) \setminus V(P)$ that are adjacent to every vertex in S . Since G is $K_{s,s}$ -free, it follows from 3.5 that $|D_S| \leq \omega(G)^s$. Let D be the set of vertices in $V(G) \setminus V(P)$ that have s pairwise nonadjacent neighbours in $V(P)$. Since there are at most $(2s\ell)^s$ choices of S , it follows that $\chi(D) \leq (2s\ell)^s \omega(G)^s$. Let $F = V(G) \setminus (V(P) \cup D)$.

(1) For each $v \in F$, if i, j are minimum and maximum such that v is adjacent to p_i, p_j , then $j - i \leq (s - 2)(\ell - 2) + 1$.

Let $v \in F$. Choose $t \geq 0$ maximum such that there exist $1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_t \leq r$ satisfying:

- i_1 is the least i such that v is adjacent to p_i ;
- v is adjacent to p_{i_k} for $1 \leq k \leq t$;
- $i_{k+1} \geq i_k + 2$ for $1 \leq k \leq t - 1$;
- v is nonadjacent to p_j for $1 \leq k \leq t - 1$ and for each $j \in \{i_k + 2, \dots, i_{k+1} - 1\}$.

Since $\{p_{i_1}, p_{i_2}, \dots, p_{i_t}\}$ is a stable set, and $v \in F$, it follows that $t < s$. Moreover, for $1 \leq k < t$, v is nonadjacent to each p_j for each $j \in \{i_k + 2, \dots, i_{k+1} - 1\}$; so one of

$$v - p_{i_k} - p_{i_k+1} - \dots - p_{i_{k+1}},$$

$$v - p_{i_{k+1}} - p_{i_{k+2}} - \dots - p_{i_{k+1}}$$

is an induced cycle. This cycle has length at most $2s\ell$, since P has only $r = 2s\ell - 2$ vertices; and so the cycle has length less than ℓ , since G has no long hole of length at most $2s\ell$. Consequently $i_{k+1} - i_k \leq \ell - 2$, and so $i_t - i_1 \leq (s - 2)(\ell - 2)$. From the maximality of t , v is nonadjacent to p_j for all $j \geq i_t + 2$. This proves (1).

Let X be the set of neighbours of p_1 in $V(G) \setminus D$, and let Y be the set of neighbours of p_r in $V(G) \setminus D$.

(2) X is disjoint from and anticomplete to Y .

Since $r - 1 > (s - 2)(\ell - 2) + 1$, (1) implies that $X \cap Y = \emptyset$. Suppose that $u \in X$ and $v \in Y$ are adjacent. Choose $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ maximum such that u is adjacent to p_i , and choose $j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ minimum such that v is adjacent to p_j . By (1), $i - 1 \leq (s - 2)(\ell - 2) + 1$, and $r - j \leq (s - 2)(\ell - 2) + 1$. Hence $i - 1 + r - j \leq 2((s - 2)(\ell - 2) + 1)$, and so

$$j - i \geq (r - 1) - 2((s - 2)(\ell - 2) + 1) = 4\ell + 4s - 13.$$

But then $u - p_i - p_{i+1} - \dots - p_j - v - u$ is a hole of length at least $4\ell + 4s - 10 \geq \ell$ and at most $2s\ell$, a contradiction. This proves (2).

But $\chi(N(p_1)) \geq n$, and so $\chi(X) \geq n - \chi(D) \geq n - (2s\ell)^s \omega(G)^s$, and the same for Y . This proves 5.4. \square

Next, combining 5.3 and 5.4, we have an analogue of 4.4:

5.5. Let $s \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $\psi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be some nondecreasing polynomial. There is a nondecreasing polynomial $\phi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ with the following property. If G is a $K_{s,s}$ -free graph with no long hole of length at most $2s\ell$, and no ψ -nondominating long hole, then $\chi(G) \leq \phi(\omega(G))$.

Proof. By 5.2, there is a nondecreasing polynomial $\theta : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ that is a binding function for the class of $K_{s,s}$ -free graphs with no long hole. Define ϕ by

$$\phi(x) = 2\theta(x) + \psi(x) + (\ell + 1)((2s\ell)^s x^s + \theta(x) + \psi(x)).$$

We claim that ϕ satisfies 5.5. Thus, let G be a $K_{s,s}$ -free graph with no long hole of length at most $2s\ell$, and no ψ -nondominating long hole. Let

$$n = (2s\ell)^s \omega(G)^s + \theta(\omega(G)) + \psi(\omega(G)).$$

Let A be the set of vertices $v \in V(G)$ such that $\chi(N(v)) \leq n$, and $B = V(G) \setminus A$.

(1) $\chi(A) \leq \theta(\omega(G)) + \psi(\omega(G)) + (\ell + 1)n$.

Suppose not. Then by 5.2, $G[A]$ has a long hole; let C be a shortest long hole of $G[A]$. By 5.3 applied to $G[A]$, the set of vertices of A that belong to or have a neighbour in $V(C)$ has chromatic number at most $(\ell + 1)n$, and so there is a subset of $A \setminus V(C)$ anticomplete to $V(C)$ with chromatic number more than $\chi(A) - (\ell + 1)n \geq \psi(\omega(G))$. Hence C is ψ -nondominating, a contradiction. This proves (1).

$$(2) \chi(B) \leq \theta(\omega(G)).$$

Suppose not. Then $G[B]$ has a long hole by 5.2. By 5.4, there exist disjoint sets $X, Y \subseteq B$, anticomplete, with $\chi(X), \chi(Y) > n - (2s\ell)^s \omega(G)^s$. Since $\chi(X) \geq \theta(\omega(G))$, $G[X]$ has a long hole, and it is ψ -nondominating since $\chi(Y) \geq \psi(\omega(G))$, a contradiction. This proves (2).

From (1) and (2), it follows that

$$\chi(G) \leq 2\theta(\omega(G)) + \psi(\omega(G)) + (\ell + 1)n.$$

This proves 5.5. □

This implies:

5.6. *Let $s \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $\psi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be some nondecreasing polynomial. Then there is a nondecreasing polynomial $\phi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that if $\chi(G) > \phi(\omega(G))$ then G contains either a ψ -nondominating copy of $K_{s,s}$, or a ψ -nondominating long hole.*

Proof. By 5.5, there is a nondecreasing polynomial $\psi' : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ with the following property. If G is a $K_{s,s}$ -free graph with no long hole of length at most $2s\ell$, and $\chi(G) > \psi'(\omega(G))$, then G contains a ψ -nondominating long hole.

Let ϕ satisfy 3.2 with ψ replaced by ψ' , taking $q = 2s\ell$. We claim that ϕ satisfies 5.6. Thus, let G be a graph with $\chi(G) > \phi(\omega(G))$. By 3.2, either there is a ψ' -nondominating copy of $K_{s,s}$ in G , or there is a $(\psi', 2s\ell)$ -sprinkling in G . In the first case, this copy of $K_{s,s}$ is also ψ -nondominating, since $\psi(x) \leq \psi'(x)$ for $x \in \mathbb{N}$, so we assume the second case holds. Let (P, Q) be a $(\psi', 2s\ell)$ -sprinkling in G , and let r be the maximum chromatic number over $v \in P$ of the set of neighbours of v in Q . Thus $\chi(Q) > 2s\ell r + \psi'(\omega(Q))$, from the definition of a $(\psi', 2s\ell)$ -sprinkling. If $G[P]$ contains H where H is either a copy of $K_{s,s}$ or a long hole of length at most $2s\ell$, the set of vertices in Q with a neighbour in $V(H)$ has chromatic number at most $|H|r \leq 2s\ell r$, and so there is a subset of Q with chromatic number more than $\psi'(\omega(Q)) \geq \psi(\omega(Q))$ anticomplete to H ; and therefore H is ψ -nondominating. Thus we may assume that $G[P]$ is $K_{s,s}$ -free and has no long hole of length at most $2s\ell$. By 5.5, $G[P]$, and hence G , contains a ψ -nondominating long hole. This proves 5.6. □

Finally, we prove 1.4, which we restate:

5.7. *For all integers $k, s \geq 1$ and $\ell \geq 4$, let \mathcal{C} be the class of all graphs G such that no induced subgraph of G has exactly k components, each of which is either a copy of $K_{s,s}$ or a cycle of length at least ℓ . Then \mathcal{C} is poly- χ -bounded.*

Proof. (The proof is just like that of 4.6). Let us say an induced subgraph H of a graph G is a k -object if it has exactly k components, and each is either a copy of $K_{s,s}$ or a cycle of length at least ℓ . Thus \mathcal{C}_k is the class of graphs with no k -object. We prove by induction on k that \mathcal{C}_k is poly- χ -bounded. The result is true when $k = 1$, by 5.2, so we assume that $k \geq 2$, and there is a polynomial binding function $\psi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ for \mathcal{C}_{k-1} (and we may assume ψ is nondecreasing). Let ϕ satisfy 5.6; we claim that ϕ is a binding function for \mathcal{C}_k . Thus, let G be a graph with $\chi(G) > \phi(\omega(G))$; we must show that G contains a k -object. By the choice of c , G contains a ψ -nondominating induced subgraph H , where H is either a copy of $K_{s,s}$ or a long hole. Choose

$A \subseteq V(G) \setminus V(H)$, anticomplete to $V(H)$, such that $\chi(A) > \psi(\omega(A))$. From the inductive hypothesis, $G[A]$ contains a $(k-1)$ -object, and so G contains a k -object. This proves 5.7. \square

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Chudnovsky: Supported by NSF grant DMS-2120644. Scott: Research supported by EPSRC grant EP/V007327/1. Seymour: Supported by AFOSR grants A9550-19-1-0187 and FA9550-22-1-0234, and NSF grant DMS-2154169. Spirk: We acknowledge the support of the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC), (funding reference number RGPIN-2020-03912). Cette recherche a été financée par le Conseil de recherches en sciences naturelles et en génie du Canada (CRSNG) (numéro de référence RGPIN-2020-03912).

ORCID

Maria Chudnovsky  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-8920-4944>

Alex Scott  <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-4489-5988>

Paul Seymour  <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-0067-4534>

Sophie Spirk  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2536-5618>

REFERENCES

1. M. Bonamy, N. Bousquet, M. Pilipczuk, P. Rzażewski, S. Thomassé, and B. Walczak, *Degeneracy of P_t -free and $C_{\geq t}$ -free graphs with no large complete bipartite subgraphs*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B. **152** (2022), 353–378.
2. M. Briański, J. Davies, and B. Walczak, *Separating polynomial χ -boundedness from χ -boundedness*, arXiv:2201.08814. preprint, 2022.
3. M. Chudnovsky, N. Robertson, P. Seymour, and R. Thomas, *The strong perfect graph theorem*, Ann. Math. **164** (2006), 51–229.
4. M. Chudnovsky, A. Scott, P. Seymour and S. Spirk, *Polynomial bounds for chromatic number. VI. Adding a four-vertex path*, European J. Combin. **110** (2023), 103710.
5. Z. Dvořák and J. Pekárek, *Induced odd cycle packing number, independent sets, and chromatic number*, J. Graph Theory. (2023), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jgt.22932>
6. L. Esperet, *Graph colorings, flows and perfect matchings*, Habilitation Thesis, Université Grenoble Alpes, 24, 2017. <https://tel.archives-ouvertes.fr/tel-01850463/document>
7. A. Gyárfás, *On Ramsey covering-numbers*, Infinite and Finite Sets, Vol. II (Colloq., Keszthely, 1973) (A. Hajnal, L. Lovász, and V. T. Sós, eds.), vol. **10**, Coll. Math. Soc. János Bolyai, pp. 801–816.
8. I. Schiermeyer, *On the chromatic number of $(P_3, \text{windmill})$ -free graphs*, Opuscula Math. **37** (2017), no. 4, 609–615.
9. I. Schiermeyer and B. Randerath, *Polynomial χ -binding functions and forbidden induced subgraphs: A survey*, Graphs Combin. **35** (2019), 1–31.
10. A. Scott and P. Seymour, *Induced subgraphs of graphs with large chromatic number. VII. Gyárfás' complementation conjecture*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B. **142** (2020), 43–55.
11. A. Scott and P. Seymour, *Induced subgraphs of graphs with large chromatic number. X. Holes of specific residue*, Combinatorica. **39** (2019), 1105–1132.
12. A. Scott and P. Seymour, *A survey of χ -boundedness*, J. Graph Theory. **95** (2020), 473–504.
13. A. Scott, P. Seymour, and S. Spirk, *Polynomial bounds for chromatic number. I. Excluding a biclique and an induced tree*, J. Graph Theory. **102** (2023), 458–471.
14. A. Scott, P. Seymour, and S. Spirk, *Polynomial bounds for chromatic number. II. Excluding a star forest*, J. Graph Theory. **101** (2022), 318–322.
15. A. Scott, P. Seymour, and S. Spirk, *Polynomial bounds for chromatic number. III. Excluding a double star*, J. Graph Theory. **101** (2022), 323–340.
16. A. Scott, P. Seymour, and S. Spirk, *Polynomial bounds for chromatic number. IV. A near-polynomial bound for excluding the five-vertex path*, Combinatorica, to appear, arXiv:2110.00278. preprint, 2021.

17. D. P. Sumner, *Subtrees of a graph and chromatic number*, The Theory and Applications of Graphs (G. Chartrand, ed.), John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1981, pp. 557–576.

How to cite this article: M. Chudnovsky, A. Scott, P. Seymour, and S. Spirkl, *Polynomial bounds for chromatic number VII. Disjoint holes*, J. Graph Theory. 2023;**104**:499–515. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jgt.22987>