

# Improved linearly ordered colorings of hypergraphs via SDP rounding

Anand Louis<sup>\*</sup>  
Indian Institute of Science, Bengaluru  
anandl@iisc.ac.in

Alantha Newman  
CNRS and Université Grenoble Alpes  
alantha.newman@grenoble-inp.fr

Arka Ray<sup>†</sup>  
Indian Institute of Science, Bengaluru  
arkaray@iisc.ac.in

## Abstract

We consider the problem of *linearly ordered* (LO) coloring of hypergraphs. A hypergraph has an LO coloring if there is a vertex coloring, using a set of ordered colors, so that (i) no edge is monochromatic, and (ii) each edge has a unique maximum color. It is an open question as to whether or not a 2-LO colorable 3-uniform hypergraph can be LO colored with 3 colors in polynomial time. Nakajima and Zivný recently gave a polynomial-time algorithm to color such hypergraphs with  $\tilde{O}(n^{1/3})$  colors and asked if SDP methods can be used directly to obtain improved bounds. Our main result is to show how to use SDP-based rounding methods to produce an LO coloring with  $\tilde{O}(n^{1/5})$  colors for such hypergraphs. We first show that we can reduce the problem to cases with highly structured SDP solutions, which we call *balanced* hypergraphs. Then we show how to apply classic SDP-rounding tools in this case. We believe that the reduction to balanced hypergraphs is novel and could be of independent interest.

## 1 Introduction

Approximate graph coloring is a well-studied “promise” optimization problem. Given a simple graph  $G = (V, E)$  that is promised to be  $k$ -colorable, the goal is to find a coloring of  $G$  using the minimum number of colors. A (proper) *coloring* is an assignment of colors, which can be represented by positive integers, to the vertices of  $G$  so that for each edge  $ij$  in  $G$ , the vertices  $i$  and  $j$  are assigned different colors. The most popular case of this problem is when the input graph is promised to be 3-colorable. Even with this very strong promise, the gap between the upper and lower bounds are quite large: the number of colors used by the state-of-the-art algorithm is  $\tilde{O}(n^{0.19996})$  [KT17], while it is NP-hard to color a 3-colorable graph with 5 colors [BBKO21]. There is also super constant hardness conditioned on assumptions related to the Unique Games Conjecture [DMR06]. More generally, when we are promised that the graph  $G$  is  $k$ -colorable, it is NP-hard to color it using  $\binom{k}{\lfloor k/2 \rfloor} - 1$  colors [WZ20]. Regarding upper bounds, we note that almost all algorithms for coloring 3-colorable graphs use some combination of semidefinite programming (SDP) and combinatorial tools [KMS98, ACC06, KT17].

<sup>\*</sup>Supported in part by SERB Award CRG/2023/002896 and the Walmart Center for Tech Excellence at IISc (CSR Grant WMGT-23-0001).

<sup>†</sup>Supported in part by the Walmart Center for Tech Excellence at IISc (CSR Grant WMGT-23-0001).

Approximate hypergraph coloring is a natural generalization of the above problem to hypergraphs. Here, we want to assign each vertex a color such that there are no monochromatic edges, while using the minimum number of colors. In the case of hypergraph coloring, we know that for every pair of constants  $\ell \geq k \geq 2$ , it is NP-hard to  $\ell$ -color a  $k$ -colorable 3-uniform hypergraph [DRS05]. Even in the special case, when the 3-uniform hypergraph is promised to be 2-colorable, there is a large gap between the best algorithm, which uses at most  $\tilde{O}(n^{1/5})$  colors [KNS01, AKMR96, CF96] and the aforementioned (super constant) lower bound.

In this paper, we study a variant of the hypergraph coloring problem known as *linearly ordered coloring*, introduced in several different contexts by [KMS95, CT11, BBB21]. A linearly ordered (LO)  $k$ -coloring of an  $r$ -uniform hypergraph assigns an integer from  $\{1, \dots, k\}$  to every vertex so that, in each edge, the (multi)set of colors has a unique maximum. Recently, there has been a renewed interest in studying this problem. This is because this problem constitutes a gap in the understanding of the complexity of an important class of problems called *promise constraint satisfaction problems* (PCSPs). To elaborate, [FKOS19, BG21] classified the complexity of all (symmetric) PCSPs on the binary alphabet, showing that these problems are either polynomial-time solvable or NP-complete. Subsequently, [BBB21] gave a complete classification for PCSPs of the form: given a 2-colorable 3-uniform hypergraph, find a 3-coloring. Here, the notion of “coloring” can have several definitions. As highlighted by [BBB21], the only PCSP of this type whose complexity is unresolved is that of determining whether a 3-uniform hypergraph is 2-LO colorable or is not even 3-LO colorable. In contrast, it was recently shown that it is NP-complete to decide if a 3-uniform hypergraph is 3-LO colorable or not even 4-LO colorable [FNO<sup>+</sup>24].

The work [NZ22] addresses the corresponding optimization problem by giving an algorithm to compute a LO coloring using at most  $\tilde{O}(n^{1/3})$  colors for a 2-LO colorable 3-uniform hypergraph. [NZ22] leave open the question of finding an LO coloring for such a hypergraph using fewer colors. Moreover, they state that they do not know how to directly use SDP-based methods<sup>1</sup> and remark that SDP-based approaches seem less suited to LO colorings. In this paper, one of our main contribution is to show how to use SDP relaxations to give an improved bound for coloring such hypergraphs. Our main result improves this bound significantly by using at most  $\tilde{O}(n^{1/5})$  colors to LO color a 2-LO colorable 3-uniform hypergraph.

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $H$  be a 2-LO colorable 3-uniform hypergraph on  $n$  vertices. Then there exists a (randomized) polynomial-time algorithm that finds an LO coloring of  $H$  using  $\tilde{O}(n^{1/5})$  colors.*

The SDP relaxation that we use is similar to the natural SDP used in the case of 2-colorable 3-uniform hypergraphs [KNS01]. In fact, the upper bound on the number of colors used in Theorem 1 is the same as the upper bound given by [KNS01] to color 2-colorable 3-uniform hypergraphs. This might be a coincidence. While there is some similarity between our framework and that of [KNS01], this seems to be mainly due to the fact that on a high level, almost all promise graph colorings use the same general framework.

**General Framework for (Hyper)Graph Coloring.** Most algorithms for coloring graphs and hypergraphs proceed iteratively, producing a partial coloring of the remaining (uncolored) vertices at each step. This was formalized by [Blu94], following [Wig83]. The goal is to color a significant number of vertices with few colors in each step, ensuring that the number of iterations and therefore, the overall number of colors used, is small. Typically, in each step, the method used to color the vertices is chosen according to the degree of the graph (or hypergraph) induced on the remaining vertices. In particular, if the induced graph (or hypergraph) has a low degree, then most algorithms use an SDP-based method to find a large

<sup>1</sup>However, they do use [Hal00] which is an indirect use of SDP-based methods.

independent set, which can be assigned a single color [KMS98, BK97, ACC06]. The algorithm for LO-coloring presented in [NZ22], as well as ours, uses this general framework, except that in [NZ22], they did not use an SDP-based method directly, instead used [Hal00] to find a large independent set. The improved upper bound on the number of colors output by our algorithm comes from using an SDP and rounding methods tailored to LO coloring.

**Overview of our SDP-Based Approach.** As noted, we first solve a natural SDP relaxation for 2-LO coloring. Then our rounding proceeds in two steps. In the first step we look at the projection of the vectors to a particular special vector (the vector  $v_\phi$  in SDP 4) from the solution of the SDP, which signifies the color that is unique in all edges in the promised 2-LO coloring. For each of the three vertices in an edge, all three of the corresponding vectors can have a projection onto this special vector with roughly the same value (a *balanced* edge), or they can have very different values (an *unbalanced* edge). It is also possible to classify vertices into balanced and unbalanced (see Definition 5 for formal definitions) so that balanced edges contain only balanced vertices. We use a ‘combinatorial rounding’ to color all the unbalanced vertices with a small number of colors, leaving only a balanced (sub)hypergraph to be colored. Since this number of colors is much smaller than the bound stated in Theorem 1, this can be viewed as a reduction of the problem to the balanced case. To the best of our knowledge, nothing comparable to this rounding method is present in previous works and thus, this tool can be considered a major contribution of this paper. We note that [KNS01] showed that the vectors can be “bucketed” with respect to their projection onto a special vector, and used a simple argument to show that there is a large bucket on which they can focus. Our approach allows us to focus on a single bucket containing vectors with projection  $\approx -1/3$  with the special vector, which have useful geometric properties.

In the second step we color the hypergraph containing the balanced edges. In this step, we produce (following [NZ22]) an “even” independent set or an “odd” independent set at each round. An *even independent set* is one which intersects each hyperedge two or zero times, while an *odd independent set* intersects each hyperedge one or zero times. To find an even independent set, we use the same approach used by [NZ22]. To find an odd independent set, we use a variant of the standard threshold rounding for a coloring SDP [Hal00, KNS01]. As in [KNS01] rather than use the vectors output by the SDP solution, we use a modified set of vectors, which have properties useful to obtain better bounds from the threshold rounding. Specifically, the set consists of the normalized projections of the vectors from the SDP solution onto the space orthogonal to the special vector; in the balanced case, the special vector seems to provide no information that is useful to construct a coloring. Combining all the colorings requires some technical care, since we need to always maintain an LO coloring, but it can be done and some of the work has already been done in [NZ22].

Finally, we remark that as claimed in [Bra22], [BG19, BG21] solve the following promise problem: Given a 2-LO colorable 3-uniform hypergraph, they show how to color it with 2 colors. Notice that the 2-coloring output is not an 2-LO coloring. We show that our approach gives a simple proof of this theorem, which can be found in Appendix B.

## 2 Tools for LO Coloring and Proof of the Main Theorem

In this section, we give an overview of our approach to color a 2-LO colorable 3-uniform hypergraph  $H = (V, E)$  with few colors. Following [NZ22], we assume that the input hypergraph  $H$  is a *linear hypergraph*, which is defined as follows.

**Definition 2.** A 3-uniform hypergraph is linear if every pair of edges intersects in at most one vertex.

This is not a restriction because we can construct an equivalent 3-uniform hypergraph.

**Proposition 3** (Proposition 3 in [NZ22]). *There is a polynomial-time algorithm that, if given an 2-LO colorable 3-uniform hypergraph  $H$ , constructs an 2-LO colorable linear 3-uniform hypergraph  $H'$  with no more vertices than  $H$  such that, if given an LO  $k$ -colouring of  $H'$ , one can compute in polynomial time an LO  $k$ -colouring of  $H$ .*

Given an 2-LO colorable 3-uniform hypergraph  $H = (V, E)$ , one can consider LO coloring it with  $\{-1, +1\}$ , with the natural ordering. Then we have  $x_a + x_b + x_c = -1$  for each edge  $\{a, b, c\} \in E$ , where  $x_a$  is the color assigned to vertex  $a \in V$ . Relaxing this constraint to a vector program we get [SDP 4](#).<sup>2</sup>

**SDP 4.**

$$v_a + v_b + v_c = -v_\emptyset \quad \forall \{a, b, c\} \in E, \quad (1)$$

$$\|v_a\|^2 = 1 \quad \forall a \in V \cup \{\emptyset\}. \quad (2)$$

For any  $a \in V$ , we now define  $\gamma_a \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \langle v_a, v_\emptyset \rangle$ . The values  $\{\gamma_a\}_{a \in V}$  might not be integral and could even be *perfectly balanced* (i.e.,  $\gamma_a = \gamma_b = \gamma_c = -\frac{1}{3}$  for an edge  $\{a, b, c\} \in E$ ). Hence, these values might not contain any information as to how the colors should be assigned to the vertices, and they might not even reveal information as to which vertex in an edge should receive the largest color. However, when all edges contain balanced vertices (i.e.,  $\gamma_v \approx -\frac{1}{3}$  for all vertices), threshold rounding will be used. Formally, we have the following definition.

**Definition 5.** For  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we say a vertex  $v \in V$  is  $\varepsilon$ -balanced if  $\gamma_v \in [-1/3 - \varepsilon, -1/3 + \varepsilon]$ .

For the rest of this paper, we fix  $\varepsilon = 1/n^{100}$ , where  $n$  is the number of vertices in the (fixed) hypergraph that we are trying to LO color. This is an abuse of notation, but simplifies our presentation. If a vertex is not  $\varepsilon$ -balanced, we say that it is *unbalanced*. If all vertices of a hypergraph  $H$  are  $\varepsilon$ -balanced, we say that  $H$  is an  $\varepsilon$ -balanced hypergraph.

We observe that there is a combinatorial method to color all unbalanced vertices using relatively few colors. This rounding method uses a bisection-like strategy on  $\{\gamma_a\}_{a \in V}$  to color the unbalanced vertices and outputs a *partial LO coloring*, which we define as follows.

**Definition 6.** A partial LO coloring of a 3-uniform hypergraph  $H = (V, E)$  is a coloring of a subset of vertices  $V_1 \subseteq V$  using the set of colors  $C$  such that for each edge  $e \in E$ , the set  $e \cap V_1$  has a unique maximum color from  $C$ .

The next lemma is proved in Section 3.

**Lemma 7.** Let  $H = (V, E)$  be a 2-LO colorable 3-uniform hypergraph and let  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Then there exists a polynomial-time algorithm that computes a partial LO coloring of  $H$  using  $O(\log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}))$  colors that colors all unbalanced vertices.

We remark that the previous lemma can be viewed as a reduction from LO coloring in 2-LO colorable 3-uniform hypergraphs to LO coloring in 2-LO colorable 3-uniform *balanced* hypergraphs. To formalize this, let  $V_U$  denote the vertices that are colored in a partial LO coloring produced via [Lemma 7](#). Let

<sup>2</sup>Observe that [SDP 4](#) can equivalently be written in terms of dot products using the following constraints:  
(i)  $\langle v_a + v_b + v_c + v_\emptyset, v_a + v_b + v_c + v_\emptyset \rangle = 0 \quad \forall \{a, b, c\} \in E$ , and (ii)  $\langle v_a, v_a \rangle = 1 \quad \forall a \in V \cup \{\emptyset\}$ .

$V_B = V \setminus V_U$ . Notice that  $V_B$  contains only  $\varepsilon$ -balanced vertices, while  $V_U$  contains all the unbalanced vertices but might also contain some  $\varepsilon$ -balanced vertices. Thus, the induced hypergraph  $H_B = (V_B, E(V_B))$  is a balanced hypergraph.<sup>3</sup> We now show that we can combine a partial LO coloring for  $H = (V, E)$  which colors  $V_U$  and an LO coloring for  $H_B = (V_B, E(V_B))$  to obtain an LO coloring of  $H$ .

**Proposition 8.** *Let  $H = (V_B \cup V_U, E)$  be a 2-LO colorable 3-uniform hypergraphs, let  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Let  $c_U$  be a partial LO coloring of  $H$  using colors from the set  $C_U$  that only assigns colors to  $V_U$  and let  $c_B$  be an LO coloring of  $H_B = (V_B, E(V_B))$  using colors from the set  $C_B$ . Then we can obtain an LO coloring of  $H$  using at most  $|C_U| + |C_B|$  colors.*

*Proof.* We assume that the colors in the set  $C_U$  are larger than the colors in the set  $C_B$ . We want to show that the given assignment of colors from  $C_U$  for vertex set  $V_U$  and  $C_B$  for vertex set  $V_B$  taken together forms a proper LO coloring of  $H$ .

Any edge  $e \in E$  with  $|e \cap V_B| = 3$  or  $|e \cap V_U| = 3$  has a unique maximum color by assumption since  $c_B$  is an LO coloring of  $H_B$  and  $c_U$  is a partial LO coloring of  $H$ . Suppose  $|e \cap V_U| = 2$ . Then, by definition of partial LO coloring, it has a unique maximum in  $C_U$  and will have a unique maximum in the output coloring. If  $|e \cap V_U| = 1$ , then  $e$  has a unique maximum color, because all colors in  $C_U$  are larger than the colors in  $C_B$ .  $\square$

Thus, if our goal is to LO color 2-LO colorable 3-uniform hypergraphs with a polynomial number of colors, we can focus on LO coloring *balanced* 2-LO colorable 3-uniform hypergraphs. The next corollary follows from [Lemma 7](#) and [Proposition 8](#).

**Corollary 9.** *Let  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ . Suppose we can LO color an  $\varepsilon$ -balanced 2-LO colorable 3-uniform hypergraph  $H$  with  $\tilde{O}(n^\alpha)$  colors. Then we can LO color a 2-LO colorable 3-uniform hypergraph with  $\tilde{O}(n^\alpha)$  colors.*

Now we can focus on balanced hypergraphs. We capitalize on the promised structure to prove the next lemma, in which we show that we can find an LO coloring for a balanced hypergraph, in particular for  $H_B = (V_B, E(V_B))$ .

**Lemma 10.** *Let  $H_B = (V_B, E_B)$  be an  $\varepsilon$ -balanced 2-LO colorable 3-uniform hypergraph. Then there exists a polynomial-time algorithm that computes an LO coloring using at most  $\tilde{O}(|V_B|^{1/5})$  colors.*

We recall our main theorem.

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $H$  be a 2-LO colorable 3-uniform hypergraph on  $n$  vertices. Then there exists a (randomized) polynomial-time algorithm that finds an LO coloring of  $H$  using  $\tilde{O}(n^{1/5})$  colors.*

The proof of [Theorem 1](#) follows from [Corollary 9](#) and [Lemma 10](#). It remains to prove [Lemma 10](#), which we discuss next.

## 2.1 Coloring by Finding Independent Sets

In many graph coloring algorithms, we “make progress” by finding an independent set and coloring it with a new color [[Blu94](#), [KMS98](#), [BK97](#), [KNS01](#), [NZ22](#)]. When LO coloring a hypergraph, a similar idea may be

<sup>3</sup>Note that for a hypergraph  $H = (V, E)$  and  $S \subset V$ , we say  $H' = (S, E(S))$  contains the edges *induced* on  $S$ , meaning an edge belongs to  $H'$  if all of its vertices belong to  $S$ . In other words, an induced subhypergraph of a 3-uniform must also be 3-uniform (or empty). Notice that  $S$  can contain vertices that do not belong to any edge in  $E(S)$ . These vertices can receive any color in a valid LO coloring of  $H'$ .

used, but we need to consider certain types of independent sets. With the standard notion of independent set in a 3-uniform hypergraph, in which the independent set intersects each edge of the hypergraph most twice, it is not clear how to obtain a coloring in which each edge contains a unique maximum color. Thus, for a 3-uniform hypergraph  $H = (V, E)$ , following the approach of [NZ22], we consider the following two types of independent sets.<sup>4</sup>

**Odd Independent Set:** We call  $S \subseteq V$  an *odd independent set* if  $|S \cap e| \leq 1$  for each edge  $e \in E$ .

**Even Independent Set:** We call  $S \subseteq V$  an *even independent set* if  $|S \cap e| \in \{0, 2\}$  for each edge  $e \in E$ .

In Lemma 11, we show that we can make progress by coloring an odd independent set with a ‘large’ color or by coloring an even independent set with a ‘small’ color. This is formally stated in a proposition from [NZ22], which we state and prove here for the sake of completeness.

**Lemma 11** (Corollary of Proposition 5 in [NZ22]). *Let  $H = (V, E)$  be a hypergraph, let  $S_1 \subseteq V$  be an odd independent set and let  $S_2 \subseteq V$  be an even independent set. Let  $H_1 = (V_1, E_1)$ ,  $H_2 = (V_2, E_2)$  be the hypergraphs induced by  $V_1 = V \setminus S_1$  and  $V_2 = V \setminus S_2$ , respectively. Then,*

1. *An LO coloring of  $H_1$  using a set of colors  $C_1$  can be extended to an LO coloring of  $H$  by assigning a color  $c_1$  that is strictly larger than all the colors in  $C_1$  to the vertices in  $S_1$ .*
2. *Analogously, an LO coloring of  $H_2$  using a set of colors  $C_2$  can be extended to a LO coloring of  $H$  by assigning  $c_2$  to the vertices in  $S_2$  where  $c_2$  is strictly smaller than all the colors in  $C_2$ .*

*Proof.* In the proposed extension of the coloring from  $H_1$  to  $H$ , there is no edge  $e \in E_1$  where the maximum color in  $e$  occurs more than once in  $e$ ; otherwise, the promised coloring of  $H_1$  using  $C_1$  is not valid. Consider any edge  $\{u, v, w\} \in E \setminus E_1$ . By definition of  $S_1$ , we have  $|\{u, v, w\} \cap S_1| \leq 1$ . Note that  $|\{u, v, w\} \cap S_1| \neq 0$  as  $\{u, v, w\} \notin E_1$ . Therefore, we must have  $|\{u, v, w\} \cap S_1| = 1$ . Without loss of generality, assume that  $u \in S_1$  and  $v, w \notin S_1$ . Then, in the proposed coloring,  $c_1$  is only used for  $u$ , while  $v, w$  are colored using some color(s) from  $C_1$ . So,  $c_1$  is the largest color in  $\{u, v, w\}$  and occurs exactly once. Hence, for every edge, the corresponding (multi)set of colors has a unique maximum, and we conclude that the proposed coloring is a proper LO coloring of  $H$ .

Similarly, in the proposed extension of coloring from  $H_2$  to  $H$  there is no edge  $e \in E_2$  where the maximum color in  $e$  occurs more than once in  $e$ . Again, consider any edge  $\{u, v, w\} \in E \setminus E_2$ . In this case, we have  $|\{u, v, w\} \cap S_2| = 2$ . Without loss of generality, assume that  $u, v \in S_2$  and  $w \notin S_2$ . Then, in the proposed coloring,  $c_2$  is only used on  $u, v$ , while  $w$  is colored using some color  $c$  from  $C_2$ . So,  $c$  is the largest color in  $\{u, v, w\}$  and it occurs exactly once. Hence, for every edge, the corresponding (multi)set of color has a unique maximum, and the proposed coloring is therefore a proper LO coloring of  $H$ .  $\square$

The following proposition is essentially Lemma 1 in [Blu94] and follows in a straight-forward manner from Lemma 11.

**Proposition 12** (Proposition 5 in [NZ22]). *Let  $H = (V, E)$  be an  $\epsilon$ -balanced, 2-LO colorable 3-uniform linear hypergraph on  $m$  vertices. Suppose we can always find an odd independent set of size at least  $f(m)$  or an even independent set of size at least  $f(m)$  (where  $f$  is nearly-polynomial<sup>5</sup>), then there exists a polynomial-time algorithm that colors any  $\epsilon$ -balanced, 2-LO colorable 3-uniform linear hypergraph on  $n$  vertices with  $n/f(n)$  colors.*

<sup>4</sup>We remark that what [NZ22] refer to as an “independent set” is what we refer to here as an “odd independent set”.

<sup>5</sup>Definition 1 in [Blu94]. A function  $f(m) = m^\alpha \text{polylog} m$  for  $\alpha > 0$  is nearly-polynomial.



Following this standard notion of “making progress” from [Blu94], we simply need to show that we can find an even or an odd independent set of size at least  $f(m)$  in a 2-LO colorable 3-uniform  $\varepsilon$ -balanced hypergraph on  $m$  vertices. This will imply that we can color  $H_B$  with  $|V_B|/f(V_B)$  colors. We will show that we can set  $f(m) = \tilde{\Theta}(m^{4/5})$ , which will yield the bound in Lemma 10.

As is typical, our coloring algorithm makes progress using two different methods and chooses between the two methods depending on the degree. In the high-degree case, we use the method from [NZ22] to find a large even independent set. The method to find a large even independent from [NZ22] requires the input hypergraph to be a linear hypergraph, which, as discussed previously, we can assume by Proposition 3.

**Proposition 13** (Proposition 11 in [NZ22]). *Let  $H = (V, E)$  be a linear 2-LO colorable 3-uniform hypergraph and  $\Delta$  be such that  $|E| = \Omega(\Delta |V|)$ . Then there is a polynomial-time algorithm that finds a even independent set of size at least  $\Omega(\sqrt{|V|\Delta})$ .*

In the low-degree case, we show how to use an SDP based rounding method to find a large odd independent set. Here, we capitalize on the assumption that our input hypergraph is  $\varepsilon$ -balanced to obtain an improvement over the analogous lemma from [NZ22]. In Section 4, we prove Lemma 14.

**Lemma 14.** *Let  $H = (V, E)$  be a  $\frac{1}{|V|^{100}}$ -balanced 2-LO colorable 3-uniform hypergraph  $H = (V, E)$  with average degree at most  $\Delta$ . Then there exists a (randomized) polynomial-time algorithm to compute an odd independent set of size at least  $\Omega\left(\frac{|V|}{\Delta^{1/3}(\ln \Delta)^{3/2}}\right)$ .*

Finally, we are now ready to prove Lemma 10.

*Proof of Lemma 10.* We need to show that on a linear 2-LO-colorable 3-uniform  $\varepsilon$ -balanced hypergraph on  $m$  vertices, we can always find either an even independent set or an odd independent set of size at least  $f(m) = \tilde{\Omega}(m^{4/5})$ . By Lemma 11, this will imply we can color  $H_B$  with  $|V_B|/f(|V_B|)$  colors.

Take  $\Delta$  be a parameter (fixed later) so that we say we are in the high-degree regime if the average degree is higher than  $\Delta$ . Otherwise, we say that we are in the low-degree regime. In the high degree-regime, use Proposition 13 to find an even independent set  $S$  of size at least  $\Omega(\sqrt{m\Delta})$ . In the low-degree regime, we invoke Lemma 14 to find an odd independent set  $S$  of size at least  $\tilde{\Omega}(m/\Delta^{1/3})$ . Setting  $\Delta = m^{3/5}$  implies that the independent set we find has size at least  $m^{4/5}$ . Finally, by Proposition 12 we have the desired bound on the number of colors used.  $\square$

### 3 Combinatorial Rounding for Unbalanced Vertices

In this section, we prove Lemma 7. In other words, we show that for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , Algorithm 1 outputs a partial LO coloring using  $O(\log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}))$  colors so that all the unbalanced vertices are assigned a color.

**Lemma 7.** *Let  $H = (V, E)$  be a 2-LO colorable 3-uniform hypergraph and let  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Then there exists a polynomial-time algorithm that computes a partial LO coloring of  $H$  using  $O(\log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}))$  colors that colors all unbalanced vertices.*

To prove this lemma, we give an algorithm, which given the value  $\{\gamma_v\}$  for each vertex  $v$  (from SDP 4), is then combinatorial. We also assume that the algorithm knows the value of  $\varepsilon$ , which is the parameter we use to define  $\varepsilon$ -balanced.

We will use the following observation.

**Observation 15.** *For any  $\{a, b, c\} \in E$ , we have  $\gamma_a + \gamma_b + \gamma_c = -1$ .*

---

**Algorithm 1** Combinatorial Rounding

---

Input: A 2-LO colorable 3-uniform hypergraph  $H = (V, E)$ ,  $\varepsilon > 0$ , the values  $\{\gamma_a\}$  for all  $a \in V$  and set  $C$  of linearly ordered colors.

Output: A partial LO coloring of all unbalanced vertices in  $V$ .

1. Set  $j := 0, \ell_0 := -1, u_0 := 1, I_0 := [\ell_0, u_0]$ .
  2. While  $I_j \not\subseteq [-1/3 - \varepsilon, -1/3 + \varepsilon]$  do:
    - (a) If  $j$  is even then set  $I_{j+1}$  to the lower half of  $I_j$ , if  $j$  is odd then set  $I_{j+1}$  to be the upper half of  $I_j$ . More precisely, set
$$\ell_{j+1} := \begin{cases} \frac{\ell_j + u_j}{2} & j \text{ is odd} \\ \ell_j & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad u_{j+1} := \begin{cases} \frac{\ell_j + u_j}{2} & j \text{ is even} \\ u_j & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$
and set  $I_{j+1} := [\ell_{j+1}, u_{j+1}]$ .
    - (b) Set  $S_{j+1} := \{a \in V \mid \gamma_a \in I_j \setminus I_{j+1}\}$  and color  $S_{j+1}$  using the largest unused color from  $C$ .
    - (c) Set  $j := j + 1$ .
- 

*Proof.* From constraint (1), we get  $\gamma_a + \gamma_b + \gamma_c = \langle v_a + v_b + v_c, v_\emptyset \rangle = \langle -v_\emptyset, v_\emptyset \rangle = -1$ . □

On a high level, the algorithm partitions the interval  $[-1, 1]$  and assigns colors to vertices depending on where their corresponding  $\gamma_a$  values fall in this interval. For example, in the first iteration of the algorithm, we set  $S_1$  to contain all vertices whose  $\gamma_a$  values fall into the interval  $(0, 1]$ . Notice that by [Observation 15](#), at most one vertex from an edge will qualify. Now, all remaining vertices have  $\gamma_a$  values in the interval  $[-1, 0]$ . Next, we consider all vertices whose  $\gamma_a$  values fall into the interval  $[-1, -1/2]$ . Again, an edge with all three values in  $[-1, 0]$  can not have more than one vertex with  $\gamma_a$  value in  $[-1, -1/2]$ , and so on. We now formally analyze the algorithm.

**Lemma 16.** For even  $j \geq 2$ , the interval  $[\ell_j, u_j]$  is

$$\left[ \frac{-(2^{j-1} - 2)/3 - 1}{2^{j-1}}, \frac{-(2^{j-1} - 2)/3}{2^{j-1}} \right].$$

For odd  $j \geq 1$ , the interval  $[\ell_j, u_j]$  is

$$\left[ \frac{-(2^{j-1} - 1)/3 - 1}{2^{j-1}}, \frac{-(2^{j-1} - 1)/3}{2^{j-1}} \right].$$

*Proof.* For  $j = 1$  the interval is  $[-1, 0]$  and  $j = 2$  the interval is  $[-1/2, 0]$ . For odd  $j$ , we have

$$\ell_{j+1} = \frac{\ell_j + u_j}{2} = \frac{-(2^{j-1} - 1)/3 - 1 - (2^{j-1} - 1)/3}{2^j} = \frac{-(2^j - 2)/3 - 1}{2^j},$$

and

$$u_{j+1} = \frac{-(2^{j-1} - 1)/3}{2^{j-1}} = \frac{-(2^j - 2)/3}{2^j}.$$

For even  $j$ , we have



$$u_{j+1} = \frac{\ell_j + u_j}{2} = \frac{-(2^{j-1}-2)/3-1-(2^{j-1}-2)/3}{2^j} = \frac{-(2^j-1)/3}{2^j},$$

and

$$\ell_{j+1} = \frac{-(2^{j-1}-2)/3-1}{2^{j-1}} = \frac{-(2^j-4)/3-2}{2^j} = \frac{(-2^j+1-3)/3}{2^j} = \frac{-(2^j-1)/3-1}{2^j}.$$

□

As a consequence of [Lemma 16](#), we immediately get a bound on the number of iterations in form of [Corollary 17](#).

**Corollary 17.** *For  $j \geq \log(\frac{4}{3\varepsilon})$ , we have  $I_j \subseteq [-1/3 - \varepsilon, -1/3 + \varepsilon]$ .*

*Proof.* By [Lemma 16](#) we have the following bounds on  $I_j$ . For even  $j \geq 2$ , the interval  $I_j = [\ell_j, u_j]$  is

$$\left[ -\frac{1}{3} - \frac{1}{3 \cdot 2^{j-1}}, -\frac{1}{3} + \frac{2}{3 \cdot 2^{j-1}} \right].$$

For odd  $j \geq 1$ , the interval  $I_j = [\ell_j, u_j]$  is

$$\left[ -\frac{1}{3} - \frac{2}{3 \cdot 2^{j-1}}, -\frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{3 \cdot 2^{j-1}} \right].$$

Setting  $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{3 \cdot 2^{j-2}} = \frac{4}{3 \cdot 2^j}$ , we have  $I_j \subseteq [-\frac{1}{3} - \varepsilon, -\frac{1}{3} + \varepsilon]$ . Thus,  $j = \log(\frac{4}{3\varepsilon})$ . □

In [Lemma 18](#) we show that in each iteration [Algorithm 1](#) colors an odd independent set. [Lemma 18](#) also follows from [Lemma 16](#).

**Lemma 18.** *For each  $j \geq 0$ , let  $H_j = (S_j, E_j)$  be a hypergraph with  $E_j = \{e \in E : e \subseteq V_j\}$ . Then for any  $j \geq 0$ , the set  $S_{j+1}$  is an odd independent set (i.e., we have  $|S_{j+1} \cap e| \leq 1$  for any  $e \in E_j$ ).*

*Proof.* Let  $\{a, b, c\} \in E_j$ . Suppose  $a, b \in S_{j+1}$ . If  $j$  is odd, then  $\gamma_a, \gamma_b \in [\ell_j, \ell_{j+1})$ . Therefore, we get  $\gamma_a + \gamma_b < 2\ell_{j+1}$ . This implies, by [Observation 15](#),  $\gamma_c > -1 - 2\ell_{j+1}$ . Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_c > -1 - 2\ell_{j+1} &= -1 - 2 \left( \frac{-(2^j-2)/3-1}{2^j} \right) = -1 + 2 \left( \frac{(2^j-2)/3+1}{2^j} \right) \\ &= \frac{-3 \cdot 2^j + 2(2^j-2) + 6}{3 \cdot 2^j} = \frac{-2^j + 2}{3 \cdot 2^j} = u_j, \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction since  $\gamma_c \in [\ell_j, u_j]$ .

Similarly, if  $j$  is even, then  $\gamma_a, \gamma_b \in (u_{j+1}, u_j]$  as  $a, b \in S_{j+1}$ . Therefore, we get  $\gamma_a + \gamma_b > 2u_{j+1}$ . This implies, by [Observation 15](#),  $\gamma_c < -1 - 2u_{j+1}$ . Therefore, we have

$$\gamma_c < -1 - 2u_{j+1} = \frac{-3 \cdot 2^j + 2 \cdot 2^j - 2}{3 \cdot 2^j} = \frac{-2^j - 2}{3 \cdot 2^j} = \ell_j,$$

which is again a contradiction to the fact that  $\gamma_c \in [\ell_j, u_j]$ . □

*Proof of Lemma 7.* By Corollary 17, Algorithm 1 runs for  $O(\log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}))$  iterations. In each iteration, it uses exactly one color, which yields the stated bound on the number of colors used. To show that the output coloring is a partial LO coloring, we apply Lemma 18, which states that each color corresponds to an odd independent set.

Now, we need to show that any edge with at least one colored vertex will have a unique maximum color. Consider such an edge  $e = \{a, b, c\}$ . If only one vertex in  $e$  is colored, then we are done. First, assume exactly two vertices in  $e$  (say  $a, b$ ) were colored. Let  $a$  be colored in the  $j_a$ -th iteration and  $b$  be colored in the  $j_b$ -th iteration. Assume (without loss of generality) that  $j_a \geq j_b$ . Then, by Lemma 18 we have  $j_a \neq j_b$  (i.e.,  $j_a > j_b$ ). As the color used in the iteration  $j$  is the  $j$ -th largest color in  $C$  (by a simple induction) color assigned to  $a$  is strictly larger than the color assigned to  $b$ . Finally, if all the vertices,  $a, b, c$  were colored at iterations  $j_a \geq j_b \geq j_c$ , respectively. Then, again by the same arguments we have  $j_a > j_b$  and  $j_a > j_c$ , so the maximum color is assigned to only  $a$ .  $\square$

## 4 SDP Rounding for Balanced Hypergraphs

In this section we show that Algorithm 2 outputs an odd independent set in an  $\varepsilon$ -balanced 2-LO colorable 3-uniform hypergraph  $H_B = (V_B, E_B)$ . Thus, we will prove Lemma 14.

**Lemma 14.** *Let  $H = (V, E)$  be a  $\frac{1}{|V|^{100}}$ -balanced 2-LO colorable 3-uniform hypergraph  $H = (V, E)$  with average degree at most  $\Delta$ . Then there exists a (randomized) polynomial-time algorithm to compute an odd independent set of size at least  $\Omega\left(\frac{|V|}{\Delta^{1/3}(\ln \Delta)^{3/2}}\right)$ .*

Recall that we have a solution for the SDP 4. Let  $u_a$  be the unit vector along the component orthogonal to  $v_\phi$  (if the orthogonal component is zero, then we define  $u_a$  to be any arbitrarily chosen unit vector). Therefore,

$$u_a = \frac{v_a - \gamma_a v_\phi}{\|v_a - \gamma_a v_\phi\|} = \frac{v_a - \gamma_a v_\phi}{\sqrt{\|v_a\|^2 + \gamma_a^2 - 2\gamma_a \langle v_a, v_\phi \rangle}} = \frac{v_a - \gamma_a v_\phi}{\sqrt{1 - \gamma_a^2}}. \quad (3)$$

---

### Algorithm 2 Randomized Rounding

---

Input:  $H_B$  a  $\varepsilon$ -balanced 2-LO colorable 3-uniform hypergraph and a parameter  $\alpha$  (see Lemma 21 for values of  $\varepsilon$  and  $\alpha$  to be used).

Output: An odd independent set.

1. Let  $t$  be such that  $\alpha = \bar{\Phi}(t)$ .
2. Sample  $g \sim N(0, 1)^{|V_B|}$  and set  $S(t) := \{a \in V_B : \langle u_a, g \rangle \geq t\}$ .

$$3. \text{ Set } S'(t) := S(t) \setminus \left( \bigcup_{\substack{e \in E_B \\ |e \cap S(t)| \geq 2}} e \right).$$

4. Output  $S'(t)$ .
- 

In case of an edge  $\{a, b, c\}$  with perfectly balanced vertices (i.e., if we have  $\gamma_a = \gamma_b = \gamma_c = -1/3$ ), one can observe that the component orthogonal to  $v_\phi$  of the corresponding vectors sum to 0 (i.e., we have

$u_a + u_b + u_c = 0$ ). In [Lemma 19](#) we show a generalization of this observation for an  $\varepsilon$ -balanced hypergraph. Recall that in an  $\varepsilon$ -balanced hypergraph, we have  $\gamma_a \in [-1/3 - \varepsilon, -1/3 + \varepsilon]$  for each vertex. The proof of the next lemma can be found in [Appendix C](#).

**Lemma 19.** *Let  $\{a, b, c\}$  be an edge in an  $\varepsilon$ -balanced hypergraph  $H_B$ . Then  $\|u_a + u_b + u_c\|^2 \leq 18\varepsilon$ .*

When all the vertices in  $\{a, b, c\}$  are perfectly balanced then the event that both  $a$  and  $b$  belong to  $S(t)$  is equivalent to  $\langle u_c, g \rangle \leq -2t$  as  $u_a + u_b + u_c = 0$ . Therefore, we can use bounds on Gaussians to bound the probability of the aforementioned event. Again, [Lemma 20](#) generalizes this to  $\varepsilon$ -balanced vector for small enough  $\varepsilon$ .

**Lemma 20.** *Take  $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{|V_B|^{100}}$  and let  $a, b$  be adjacent vertices in  $H_B$ . Then*

$$\Pr[a \in S(t) \wedge b \in S(t)] \leq \bar{\Phi}(2t) + \frac{2}{|V_B|^{25}}.$$

*Proof.* Suppose  $e = \{a, b, c\}$  is an edge in  $H_B$  containing both  $a$  and  $b$ . If both  $a$  and  $b$  belong to  $S(t)$ , then  $\langle u_a, g \rangle \geq t$  and  $\langle u_b, g \rangle \geq t$ . Note that  $\|u_a + u_b + u_c\| \leq 3\sqrt{2\varepsilon}$  by [Lemma 19](#). If we additionally assume that  $\|g\| \leq |V_B|^{25}$  (this assumption is violated with low probability) we have

$$\begin{aligned} 3\sqrt{2\varepsilon}|V_B|^{25} &\geq \langle u_a + u_b + u_c, g \rangle && \text{(Cauchy-Schwarz)} \\ &= \langle u_a, g \rangle + \langle u_b, g \rangle + \langle u_c, g \rangle \\ &\geq 2t + \langle u_c, g \rangle && (\langle u_a, g \rangle \geq t \text{ and } \langle u_b, g \rangle \geq t) \end{aligned}$$

we get  $\langle u_c, g \rangle \leq -2t + 3\sqrt{2\varepsilon}|V_B|^{25}$ . Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[(\langle u_a, g \rangle \geq t) \wedge (\langle u_b, g \rangle \geq t) \wedge (\|g\| \leq |V_B|^{25})] &\leq \Pr[\langle u_c, g \rangle \leq -2t + 3\sqrt{2\varepsilon}|V_B|^{25} \wedge (\|g\| \leq |V_B|^{25})] \\ &\leq \Pr[\langle u_c, g \rangle \leq -2t + 3\sqrt{2\varepsilon}|V_B|^{25}] \\ &= \bar{\Phi}(2t - 3\sqrt{2\varepsilon}|V_B|^{25}) \\ &\leq \bar{\Phi}(2t) + \sqrt{\varepsilon}|V_B|^{25} && \text{(Fact 22)} \\ &\leq \bar{\Phi}(2t) + \frac{1}{|V_B|^{25}} && \left(\varepsilon = \frac{1}{|V_B|^{100}}\right) \end{aligned}$$

Now, in the following step we look at the case when the assumption  $\|g\| \leq |V_B|^{25}$  is violated.

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[(\langle u_a, g \rangle \geq t) \wedge (\langle u_b, g \rangle \geq t) \wedge (\|g\| > |V_B|^{25})] &\leq \Pr[\|g\| > |V_B|^{25}] \\ &\leq \Pr[\|g\|^2 > |V_B|^{50}] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{|V_B|^{49}} && (\mathbb{E}[\|g\|^2] = |V_B| \text{ and Markov bound}) \end{aligned}$$

Adding up the two disjoint cases we get the required bound.  $\square$

**Lemma 21.** *Let  $\Delta \geq 4$  be an upper bound on the average degree of a vertex in  $H_B$  (i.e.,  $|E_B| \leq \frac{\Delta|V_B|}{3}$ ). Take  $\alpha = \frac{1}{32} \frac{1}{\Delta^{\frac{1}{3}} (\ln \Delta)^{1/2}}$  and  $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{|V_B|^{100}}$ . Then, we have  $\mathbb{E}[|S'(t)|] \geq \frac{3}{4} \alpha |V_B|$ .*

*Proof.* To lower bound the expected size of  $S'(t)$  we lower bound the expected size of  $S(t)$  and upper bound the expected number of vertices participating in a bad edge (i.e., an edge  $e$  such that  $|e \cap S(t)| \geq 2$ ) separately.

First, we lower bound the size of  $|S(t)|$  as follows.

$$\mathbb{E}[|S(t)|] = \sum_{a \in V_B} \Pr[\langle u_a, g \rangle \geq t] = \alpha |V_B|.$$

Now, to get an upper bound we note that each bad edge can contribute at most 3 vertices in the total number of vertices participating in some bad edge. Formally, we have the following.

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \bigcup_{\substack{e \in E_B \\ |e \cap S(t)| \geq 2}} e \right| &\leq \sum_{\substack{e \in E_B \\ |e \cap S(t)| \geq 2}} |e| && \text{(Union Bound)} \\ &\leq 3 |\{e \in E_B \text{ s.t. } |e \cap S(t)| \geq 2\}| && (|e| = 3) \end{aligned}$$

Notice that for each bad edge  $\{a, b, c\}$  we must have either  $\{a, b\} \subseteq \{a, b, c\}$  or  $\{a, c\} \subseteq \{a, b, c\}$  or  $\{b, c\} \subseteq \{a, b, c\}$ , i.e., using union bound we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|\{e \in E_B \text{ s.t. } |e \cap S(t)| \geq 2\}|] &\leq \sum_{\{a, b, c\} \in E_B} \left( \Pr[a \in S(t) \wedge b \in S(t)] + \Pr[a \in S(t) \wedge c \in S(t)] + \Pr[c \in S(t) \wedge b \in S(t)] \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{e \in E_B} 3 \cdot \left( \bar{\Phi}(2t) + \frac{2}{|V_B|^{25}} \right) \\ &= 3|E_B| \cdot \bar{\Phi}(2t) + \frac{6|E_B|}{|V_B|^{25}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from [Lemma 20](#). Let us now upper bound the first term as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} 3|E_B| \bar{\Phi}(2t) &\leq \Delta |V_B| \cdot 512 \bar{\Phi}(t)^4 \cdot (\ln(1/\bar{\Phi}(t)))^{3/2} && \left( |E_B| \leq \frac{\Delta |V_B|}{3} \text{ and } \text{Corollary 26} \right) \\ &\leq \Delta |V_B| \cdot 512 \alpha^4 \cdot (\ln(1/\alpha))^{3/2} && (\bar{\Phi}(t) = \alpha) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{8} \alpha |V_B| \left( \frac{\ln(1/\alpha)}{4 \ln \Delta} \right)^{3/2} && \text{(Substituting } \alpha) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{8} \alpha |V_B| && (\Delta \geq 4) \end{aligned}$$

Note that in the first inequality above we could use [Corollary 26](#) as  $\Delta \geq 4$  implies  $t \geq 1$ . It is easy to show that  $\frac{6|E_B|}{|V_B|^{25}} \leq \frac{1}{8} \alpha |V_B|$ . Therefore, we get

$$\mathbb{E}[|\{e \in E_B \text{ s.t. } |e \cap S(t)| \geq 2\}|] \leq \frac{1}{4} \alpha |V_B|.$$

Thus, by combining the two bounds we get that

$$\mathbb{E}[|S'(t)|] = \mathbb{E}[|S(t)|] - \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \bigcup_{\substack{e \in E_B \\ |e \cap S(t)| \geq 2}} e \right| \right] \geq \left( 1 - \frac{1}{4} \right) \alpha |V_B| \geq \frac{3}{4} \alpha |V_B|.$$

□

*Proof of Lemma 14.* This follows from Lemma 21 and the proof is standard Markov bound followed by an amplification argument where you repeat Algorithm 2 polynomially many times and choose the best odd independent set among all repetitions. The probability of even the best odd independent set not being of the required size is then inverse exponential with respect number of iterations. We refer the reader to Section 13.2 of [WS11] for further reference.  $\square$

## 5 Conclusion

We have presented an improved bound on the number of colors needed to efficiently LO color a 2-LO colorable 3-uniform hypergraph. As noted in the introduction, the bound is essentially the same as the best-known upper bound to color a 2-colorable 3-uniform hypergraph. We wonder if this is a coincidence or if there is a formal reduction between the two problems. Given that we have shown that SDP-based rounding methods can indeed be applied to LO coloring, it is natural to ask what other tools used to color 3-colorable graphs can be applied to this problem. We also emphasize that one of our contributions is to give a reduction (Corollary 9) showing that we can focus on balanced hypergraphs, which have more (unexploited?) structure, in order to LO color 2-LO colorable 3-uniform hypergraphs.

## References

- [ACC06] Sanjeev Arora, Eden Chlamtac, and Moses Charikar. New approximation guarantee for chromatic number. In *Proceedings of the thirty-eighth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 215–224, 2006. 1, 3
- [AKMR96] Noga Alon, Pierre Kelsen, Sanjeev Mahajan, and Hariharan Ramesh. Coloring 2-colorable hypergraphs with a sublinear number of colors. *Nordic Journal of Computing*, 3:425–439, 1996. 2
- [BBB21] Libor Barto, Diego Battistelli, and Kevin M. Berg. Symmetric promise constraint satisfaction problems: Beyond the Boolean case. In *38th International Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science (STACS)*, volume 187 of *LIPIcs*, pages 10:1–10:16, 2021. 2
- [BBKO21] Libor Barto, Jakub Bulín, Andrei A. Krokhin, and Jakub Oprsal. Algebraic approach to promise constraint satisfaction. *Journal of the ACM*, 68(4):28:1–28:66, 2021. 1
- [BG19] Joshua Brakensiek and Venkatesan Guruswami. An algorithmic blend of LPs and ring equations for promise CSPs. In *Proceedings of the thirtieth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 436–455, 2019. 3
- [BG21] Joshua Brakensiek and Venkatesan Guruswami. Promise constraint satisfaction: Algebraic structure and a symmetric Boolean dichotomy. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 50(6):1663–1700, 2021. 2, 3
- [BK97] Avrim Blum and David R. Karger. An  $O(n^{3/14})$ -coloring algorithm for 3-colorable graphs. *Information Processing Letters*, 61(1):49–53, 1997. 3, 5
- [Blu94] Avrim Blum. New approximation algorithms for graph coloring. *Journal of the ACM*, 41(3):470–516, 1994. 2, 5, 6, 7

- [Bra22] Alex Brandts. *Promise constraint satisfaction problems*. PhD thesis, University of Oxford, 2022. [3](#)
- [CF96] Hui Chen and Alan Frieze. Coloring bipartite hypergraphs. In *International Conference on Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization (IPCO)*, pages 345–358, 1996. [2](#)
- [CT11] Panagiotis Cheilaris and Géza Tóth. Graph unique-maximum and conflict-free colorings. *Journal of Discrete Algorithms*, 9(3):241–251, 2011. [2](#)
- [DMR06] Irit Dinur, Elchanan Mossel, and Oded Regev. Conditional hardness for approximate coloring. In *Proceedings of the thirty-eighth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 344–353, 2006. [1](#)
- [DRS05] Irit Dinur, Oded Regev, and Clifford D. Smyth. The hardness of 3-uniform hypergraph coloring. *Combinatorica*, 25(5):519–535, 2005. [2](#)
- [FKOS19] Miron Ficak, Marcin Kozik, Miroslav Olsák, and Szymon Stankiewicz. Dichotomy for symmetric Boolean PCSPs. In *46th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP)*, volume 132 of *LIPIcs*, pages 57:1–57:12, 2019. [2](#)
- [FNO<sup>+</sup>24] Marek Filakovský, Tamio-Vesa Nakajima, Jakub Opršal, Gianluca Tasinato, and Uli Wagner. Hardness of linearly ordered 4-colouring of 3-colourable 3-uniform hypergraphs. In *41st International Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science, (STACS)*, volume 289 of *LIPIcs*, pages 34:1–34:19, 2024. [2](#)
- [Hal00] Magnús M. Halldórsson. Approximations of weighted independent set and hereditary subset problems. *J. Graph Algorithms Appl.*, 4(1):1–16, 2000. [2](#), [3](#)
- [KMS95] Meir Katchalski, William McCuaig, and Suzanne Seager. Ordered colourings. *Discrete Mathematics*, 1(142):141–154, 1995. [2](#)
- [KMS98] David R. Karger, Rajeev Motwani, and Madhu Sudan. Approximate graph coloring by semidefinite programming. *Journal of the ACM*, 45(2):246–265, 1998. [1](#), [3](#), [5](#)
- [KNS01] Michael Krivelevich, Ram Nathaniel, and Benny Sudakov. Approximating coloring and maximum independent sets in 3-uniform hypergraphs. *Journal of Algorithms*, 41(1):99–113, 2001. [2](#), [3](#), [5](#)
- [KT17] Ken-ichi Kawarabayashi and Mikkel Thorup. Coloring 3-colorable graphs with less than  $n^{1/5}$  colors. *Journal of the ACM*, 64(1):4:1–4:23, 2017. [1](#)
- [NZ22] Tamio-Vesa Nakajima and Stanislav Zivný. Linearly ordered colourings of hypergraphs. *ACM Trans. Comput. Theory*, 14(3-4):1–19, 2022. [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#)
- [Wig83] Avi Wigderson. Improving the performance guarantee for approximate graph coloring. *Journal of the ACM*, 30(4):729–735, 1983. [2](#)
- [WS11] David P. Williamson and David B. Shmoys. *The Design of Approximation Algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, 2011. [13](#)
- [WZ20] Marcin Wrochna and Stanislav Zivný. Improved hardness for  $H$ -colourings of  $G$ -colourable graphs. In *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, (SODA)*, pages 1426–1435, 2020. [1](#)



## A Properties of Gaussian

Let function  $\Phi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  be defined as  $\Phi(t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Pr_{g \sim N(0,1)} [g \leq t]$ , and let function  $\bar{\Phi} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  be defined as  $\bar{\Phi}(t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Pr_{g \sim N(0,1)} [g \geq t]$ .

**Fact 22.** For any  $a \leq b$ , we have  $\bar{\Phi}(b) - \bar{\Phi}(a) = \Pr_{g \sim N(0,1)} [g \in [a, b]] \leq \frac{b-a}{\sqrt{2\pi}}$ .

*Proof.* The statement follows from the following computations.

$$\Pr[g \in [a, b]] = \int_a^b \frac{e^{-x^2/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} dx \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_a^b \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} e^{-y^2/2} dx = \frac{b-a}{\sqrt{2\pi}}.$$

□

**Fact 23** (Folklore). For every  $t > 0$ ,

$$\frac{t}{\sqrt{2\pi}(t^2 + 1)} e^{-\frac{1}{2}t^2} < \bar{\Phi}(t) < \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}t} e^{-\frac{1}{2}t^2}.$$

**Corollary 24** (Folklore). Fix  $t \geq 1$  and let  $\beta = \bar{\Phi}(t)$ . Then we have

$$\sqrt{2 \ln \frac{1}{\beta} - \ln \ln \frac{1}{\beta} - \ln 16\pi} \leq t \leq \sqrt{2 \ln \frac{1}{\beta} - \ln \ln \frac{1}{\beta}} \leq \sqrt{2 \ln \frac{1}{\beta}}.$$

In fact,  $t < \sqrt{2 \ln \frac{1}{\beta}}$  holds even if  $t \in (0, 1)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $t > 0$  (note here we allow  $t \in (0, 1)$ ) and let  $\beta = \bar{\Phi}(t)$ . By taking logarithm and multiplying by  $-2$ , the inequalities in [Fact 23](#) imply

$$2 \ln \left( \frac{1}{\beta} \right) > t^2 + 2 \ln \left( \sqrt{2\pi} t \right), \quad (4)$$

$$2 \ln \left( \frac{1}{\beta} \right) < t^2 + 2 \ln \left( \sqrt{2\pi} \left( \frac{t^2 + 1}{t} \right) \right). \quad (5)$$

We can now use (4) to get

$$2 \ln \left( \frac{1}{\beta} \right) > t^2 + 2 \ln \left( \sqrt{2\pi} t \right) \geq t^2.$$

Hence, we have  $t < \sqrt{2 \ln \frac{1}{\beta}}$  for any  $t > 0$ . Again, by multiplying by  $\frac{1}{2}$  and taking logarithms, the (4), (5) imply

$$\ln \ln \left( \frac{1}{\beta} \right) > \ln \left( t^2/2 + \ln \left( \sqrt{2\pi} t \right) \right), \quad (6)$$

$$\ln \ln \left( \frac{1}{\beta} \right) < \ln \left( t^2/2 + \ln \left( \sqrt{2\pi} \left( \frac{t^2 + 1}{t} \right) \right) \right). \quad (7)$$

From hereon we assume  $t \geq 1$ . (4) – (7) gives us

$$2 \ln \left( \frac{1}{\beta} \right) - \ln \ln \left( \frac{1}{\beta} \right) > t^2 + \ln \left( \frac{2\pi t^2}{t^2/2 + \ln \left( \sqrt{2\pi} \left( \frac{t^2 + 1}{t} \right) \right)} \right) = t^2 + \ln \left( \frac{4\pi t^2}{t^2 + 2 \ln \left( \sqrt{2\pi} \left( \frac{t^2 + 1}{t} \right) \right)} \right) \quad (8)$$

**Claim 25.**  $4\pi t^2 \geq t^2 + 2\ln\left(\sqrt{2\pi}\left(\frac{t^2+1}{t}\right)\right)$ .

*Proof.* Note that the above inequality is equivalent to  $\left(\frac{4\pi-1}{2}\right)t^2 \geq \ln\sqrt{2\pi} + \ln\left(t + \frac{1}{t}\right)$ . Indeed we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\ln\sqrt{2\pi} + \ln\left(t + \frac{1}{t}\right) &\leq \ln\sqrt{2\pi} + \ln(t+1) && (t \geq 1) \\
&\leq \ln\sqrt{2\pi} + t && (\ln(1+x) \leq x) \\
&\leq \ln\sqrt{2\pi} + t^2 && (t \geq 1) \\
&\leq \left(\frac{4\pi-3}{2}\right) + t^2 && \left(\frac{4\pi-3}{2} \geq \ln\sqrt{2\pi}\right) \\
&\leq \left(\frac{4\pi-1}{2}\right)t^2 && (t \geq 1)
\end{aligned}$$

□

Using this claim and (8) we get

$$t^2 \leq 2\ln\frac{1}{\beta} - \ln\ln\frac{1}{\beta}.$$

Hence, we have  $t \leq \sqrt{2\ln\frac{1}{\beta} - \ln\ln\frac{1}{\beta}}$ . For the remaining inequality, we again see that (5) – (6) gives us

$$\begin{aligned}
2\ln\frac{1}{\beta} - \ln\ln\frac{1}{\beta} &< t^2 + \ln\left(\frac{4\pi\left(t + \frac{1}{t}\right)}{t^2 + 2\ln(\sqrt{2\pi}t)}\right) \\
&\leq t^2 + \ln 4\pi + \ln\left(\frac{(t+1)^2}{t^2}\right) && (t \geq 1) \\
&\leq t^2 + \ln 4\pi + 2\ln\left(1 + \frac{1}{t}\right) \\
&\leq t^2 + \ln 4\pi + 2\ln 2 = t^2 + \ln 16\pi && (t \geq 1)
\end{aligned}$$

$\sqrt{2\ln\frac{1}{\beta} - \ln\ln\frac{1}{\beta}} - \ln 16\pi \leq t$  follows from the above inequality. Hence, we have all the required inequalities. □

**Corollary 26** (Folklore). *Fix  $t \geq 1$ . Then, we have*

$$\bar{\Phi}(2t) \leq 512 \left( \ln\left(\frac{1}{\bar{\Phi}(t)}\right) \right)^{3/2} \bar{\Phi}(t)^4.$$

*Proof.* For any  $t \geq 1$  and  $\delta \in (0, 1)$  the following holds.

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{\Phi}(2t) &\leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2\pi}t} e^{-2t^2} && \text{(Fact 23)} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2\pi}t} \cdot \frac{(2\pi)^2 (t^2 + 1)^4}{t^4} \cdot \bar{\Phi}(t)^4 && \left( \frac{t}{\sqrt{2\pi}(t^2 + 1)} e^{-\frac{1}{2}t^2} \leq \bar{\Phi}(t) \text{ by Fact 23} \right) \\
&= (2\pi)^{3/2} \frac{1}{2t} \left( t + \frac{1}{t} \right)^4 \bar{\Phi}(t)^4 \\
&\leq (2\pi)^{3/2} (2t)^3 \bar{\Phi}(t)^4 && (t \geq 1) \\
&\leq (4\sqrt{\pi})^3 \left( \ln \left( \frac{1}{\bar{\Phi}(t)} \right) \right)^3 \cdot \bar{\Phi}(t)^4 && \text{(by Corollary 24)} \\
&\leq 512 \left( \ln \left( \frac{1}{\bar{\Phi}(t)} \right) \right)^3 \bar{\Phi}(t)^4 && (\sqrt{\pi} \leq 2).
\end{aligned}$$

□

## B Coloring of 2-LO Colorable 3-Uniform Hypergraphs

In this section, we show how to color a 2-LO colorable 3-uniform hypergraph with 2 colors. For simplicity, we define *balanced* vertices to be those with  $\gamma_a = -1/3$ . It is straightforward to extend to the case of  $\varepsilon$ -balanced for small but (strictly) positive  $\varepsilon$ .

---

### Algorithm 3 2-Coloring Algorithm

---

Input: A solution to **SDP 4**.

Two-Sided Combinatorial Rounding

1. Set  $S_l := \{a \in V \mid \gamma_a < -\frac{1}{3}\}$ ,  $S_r := \{a \in V \mid \gamma_a > -\frac{1}{3}\}$ , and  $S_b := \{a \in V \mid \gamma_a = -\frac{1}{3}\}$ .
2. Color  $S_l$  using color 1 and  $S_r$  using color 2.

Two-Sided Hyperplane Rounding

3. Choose a uniformly random unit vector  $r$  over the sphere.
  4. Set  $H_r := \{a \in S_b \mid \langle r, u_a \rangle \geq 0\}$  and  $H_l := \{a \in S_b \mid \langle r, u_a \rangle < 0\}$ .
  5. Color  $H_l$  using 1 and  $H_r$  using 2.
- 

**Lemma 27.** Let  $S_l, S_r$  be as defined in **Algorithm 3**. Then, for any edge  $e \in E$ , we have  $S_l \cap e \neq \emptyset$  if and only if  $S_r \cap e \neq \emptyset$ .

*Proof.* Fix an edge  $\{a, b, c\} = e \in E$ . **Observation 15** states that  $\gamma_a + \gamma_b + \gamma_c = -1$ . Suppose that  $e \cap S_l \neq \emptyset$  and  $e \subseteq S_l \cup S_b$ . Then, we get  $\gamma_a + \gamma_b + \gamma_c < -1$ , a contradiction. Hence,  $e \cap S_l \neq \emptyset$  implies  $e \cap S_r \neq \emptyset$ . The proof of the converse is similar. □

**Lemma 28.** Let  $r$  be unit vector distributed uniformly over the sphere and let  $H_l$ , and  $H_r$  be defined as in **Algorithm 3**. Then, for any edge  $e \in E$ , we have  $|H_l \cap e| \leq 2$  and  $|H_r \cap e| \leq 2$  (with probability 1).

*Proof.* We can assume that  $H_r = \{a \in S_b \mid \langle r, u_a \rangle > 0\}$ , as this is true with probability 1. Fix any  $e \in E$ . Assume that  $\{a, b, c\} = e \subseteq S_b$ ; otherwise, we are done. Using [Lemma 19](#) with  $\varepsilon = 0$  we get  $\|u_a + u_b + u_c\|^2 = 0$ , which implies  $u_a + u_b + u_c = 0$ . Therefore, we have  $\langle r, u_a \rangle + \langle r, u_b \rangle + \langle r, u_c \rangle = 0$ . But, if  $e \subseteq H_l$ , then we have  $\langle r, u_a \rangle + \langle r, u_b \rangle + \langle r, u_c \rangle < 0$ , a contradiction. Similarly, if  $e \subseteq H_r$ , then we have a contradiction in form of  $\langle r, u_a \rangle + \langle r, u_b \rangle + \langle r, u_c \rangle > 0$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 29.** *There is a polynomial-time algorithm that, if given a 2-LO colorable 3-uniform hypergraph  $H$  with  $n$  vertices, finds an 2-coloring of  $H$ .*

*Proof.* Solve [SDP 4](#) and use [Algorithm 3](#). Consider any edge  $e = \{a, b, c\}$ . If  $e$  is not completely contained in  $S_b$ , then by [Lemma 27](#) we at least one vertex each from  $S_l$  and  $S_r$ ; hence,  $e$  is non-monochromatic. Otherwise,  $e$  is non-monochromatic by [Lemma 28](#).  $\square$

## C Omitted Proofs

### C.1 Proof of [Lemma 19](#)

Before we proceed to prove [Lemma 19](#) we need the following lemma.

**Lemma 30.** *Let  $\{a, b, c\} \in E$  and  $\gamma_a = -1/3 + \varepsilon_a$ ,  $\gamma_b = -1/3 + \varepsilon_b$ ,  $\gamma_c = -1/3 + \varepsilon_c$ . Then the following hold.*

1.  $\varepsilon_a + \varepsilon_b + \varepsilon_c = 0$ .
2.  $\langle v_a, v_b \rangle = -1/3 + \varepsilon_c$ ,  $\langle v_b, v_c \rangle = -1/3 + \varepsilon_a$ , and  $\langle v_c, v_a \rangle = -1/3 + \varepsilon_b$ .

*Proof.* Using [Observation 15](#) we get

$$-1/3 + \varepsilon_a - 1/3 + \varepsilon_b - 1/3 + \varepsilon_c = -1,$$

which implies  $\varepsilon_a + \varepsilon_b + \varepsilon_c = 0$ . Taking inner products with  $v_a, v_b, v_c$  on both sides of constraint (1) of [SDP 4](#) we get

$$1 + \langle v_a, v_b \rangle + \langle v_a, v_c \rangle = 1/3 - \varepsilon_a,$$

$$\langle v_b, v_a \rangle + 1 + \langle v_b, v_c \rangle = 1/3 - \varepsilon_b,$$

$$\langle v_c, v_a \rangle + \langle v_c, v_b \rangle + 1 = 1/3 - \varepsilon_c,$$

which imply

$$\langle v_a, v_b \rangle + \langle v_a, v_c \rangle = -(2/3 + \varepsilon_a), \tag{9}$$

$$\langle v_b, v_a \rangle + \langle v_b, v_c \rangle = -(2/3 + \varepsilon_b), \tag{10}$$

$$\langle v_c, v_a \rangle + \langle v_c, v_b \rangle = -(2/3 + \varepsilon_c). \tag{11}$$

(9)+(10)–(11) gives us

$$2 \langle v_a, v_b \rangle = -2/3 - \varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_b + \varepsilon_c.$$

Using [Item 1](#) of this lemma and dividing by 2 we get  $\langle v_a, v_b \rangle = -1/3 + \varepsilon_c$  as needed. Similarly, we get  $\langle v_a, v_c \rangle = -1/3 + \varepsilon_b$ ,  $\langle v_c, v_b \rangle = -1/3 + \varepsilon_a$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 19.* Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\langle u_a, u_b \rangle &= \left\langle \frac{v_a - \gamma_a v_\phi}{\sqrt{1 - \gamma_a^2}}, \frac{v_b - \gamma_b v_\phi}{\sqrt{1 - \gamma_b^2}} \right\rangle = \frac{\langle v_a, v_b \rangle - \gamma_a \langle v_\phi, v_b \rangle - \gamma_b \langle v_\phi, v_a \rangle + \gamma_a \gamma_b \langle v_\phi, v_\phi \rangle}{\sqrt{(1 - \gamma_a^2)(1 - \gamma_b^2)}} \\ &= \frac{\langle v_a, v_b \rangle - \gamma_a \gamma_b}{\sqrt{(1 - \gamma_a^2)(1 - \gamma_b^2)}}.\end{aligned}$$

First let us upper-bound the denominator in the above expression using  $\gamma_a, \gamma_b \in [-1/3 - \epsilon, -1/3 + \epsilon]$  as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}\sqrt{(1 - \gamma_a^2)(1 - \gamma_b^2)} &\leq \sqrt{(1 - (1/3 - \epsilon)^2)(1 - (1/3 - \epsilon)^2)} \\ &= \frac{8}{9} + \frac{2\epsilon}{3} - \epsilon^2 \\ &\leq \frac{8}{9} + \frac{2\epsilon}{3}.\end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{\sqrt{(1 - \gamma_a^2)(1 - \gamma_b^2)}} &\geq \frac{1}{\frac{8}{9}(1 + \frac{9\epsilon}{4})} \\ &\geq \frac{9}{8} \left( 1 - \frac{9\epsilon}{4} + \frac{(\frac{9\epsilon}{4})^2}{(1 + \frac{9\epsilon}{4})} \right) \\ &\geq \frac{9}{8} \left( 1 - \frac{9\epsilon}{4} \right).\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 30, we have  $\langle v_a, v_b \rangle \in [-1/3 - \epsilon, -1/3 + \epsilon]$ . So, we can also bound the numerator in the expression for  $\langle u_a, u_b \rangle$  by using the fact that  $\langle v_a, v_b \rangle, \gamma_a, \gamma_b \in [-1/3 - \epsilon, -1/3 + \epsilon]$  as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}\langle v_a, v_b \rangle - \gamma_a \gamma_b &\leq -\frac{1}{3} + \epsilon - \left( \frac{1}{3} - \epsilon \right)^2 \\ &= -\frac{4}{9} + \frac{5\epsilon}{3} - \epsilon^2 \\ &\leq -\frac{4}{9} + \frac{5\epsilon}{3}.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\langle u_a, u_b \rangle &\leq -\frac{4}{9} \left( 1 - \frac{15\epsilon}{4} \right) \cdot \frac{9}{8} \left( 1 - \frac{9\epsilon}{4} \right) \\ &\leq -\frac{1}{2} (1 - 6\epsilon).\end{aligned}$$

Finally, for the edge  $\{a, b, c\}$  we get

$$\begin{aligned}\|u_a + u_b + u_c\|^2 &= \|u_a\|^2 + \|u_b\|^2 + \|u_c\|^2 + 2\langle u_a, u_b \rangle + 2\langle u_b, u_c \rangle + 2\langle u_c, u_a \rangle \\ &= 3 + 2(\langle u_a, u_b \rangle + \langle u_b, u_c \rangle + \langle u_c, u_a \rangle) \\ &\leq 18\epsilon\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that  $\langle u_a, u_b \rangle$ ,  $\langle u_b, u_c \rangle$ , and  $\langle u_c, u_a \rangle$  are all at most  $-\frac{1}{2} + 3\epsilon$ .  $\square$