

An upper bound of 61 for the Ramsey number $R(3, 3, 3, 3)$

Milos Tatarevic
Impossible Research
milos.tatarevic@gmail.com

Abstract

We improve the upper bound on the classical Ramsey number $R(3, 3, 3, 3)$ from 62 to 61. The proof is based on a global incidence count, classifications of small neighborhoods and exhaustive SAT computations. We formalize the mathematical reductions in Lean and refute every resulting formula with two SAT solvers.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 05C55, 05D10.

1 Introduction

The Ramsey number $R(k_1, \dots, k_q)$ is the least integer n such that every q -coloring of the edges of K_n contains a monochromatic K_{k_i} in color i for some i . We call a coloring *good* if it has no monochromatic triangle. Fettes, Kramer and Radziszowski proved $R(3, 3, 3, 3) \leq 62$ [3]. As of 2026, the dynamic survey of small Ramsey numbers lists $51 \leq R(3, 3, 3, 3) \leq 62$ [8, Section 6.1.1]. We improve the upper bound by one.

Theorem 1.1. *Every four-coloring of the edges of K_{61} contains a monochromatic triangle. Consequently, $R(3, 3, 3, 3) \leq 61$.*

1.1 Proof roadmap

Suppose a good four-coloring of K_{61} exists, and choose a root r . Its four color neighborhoods $N_i(r)$, the vertices joined to r in color i , partition the other 60 vertices. For simplicity, we call the color neighborhoods of a vertex its *groups*. An edge of color i inside $N_i(r)$ would form a monochromatic triangle with r , so each group carries a good three-coloring and has at most 16 vertices, as $R(3, 3, 3) = 17$. Their deficits from 16 add up to 4, which leaves five *profiles*:

$$\begin{array}{lll} \text{A : (12, 16, 16, 16)} & \text{B : (13, 15, 16, 16)} & \text{C : (14, 14, 16, 16),} \\ \text{D : (14, 15, 15, 16)} & \text{E : (15, 15, 15, 15).} & \end{array}$$

Up to relabeling and permuting colors, a good three-coloring on 16 vertices is one of two templates, untwisted (U) and twisted (T), and on 15 vertices a template with one vertex removed. A group with 15 or 16 vertices we call *critical*. A template fixes the edges inside its group but not those between groups.

We say that a vertex u *sends a ticket* to v when the neighborhood of u in the color of uv is critical. This neighborhood contains v and crosses the three groups of v not containing u , so its

template constrains edges between these groups. We denote the numbers of tickets that v receives and sends by $H(v)$ and $w(v)$. Since a vertex sends tickets exactly along its critical colors, vertices of profiles A to E send 48, 47, 32, 46 and 60 tickets. Every ticket has one sender and one receiver, so

$$\sum_v H(v) = \sum_v w(v).$$

To prove Theorem 1.1, it would suffice to show that every vertex of profile A, B, C or D *falls short*, that is, receives fewer tickets than it sends. An E vertex has only 60 neighbors and sends 60 tickets, so it never receives more than it sends. The differences $w(v) - H(v)$ would then be nonnegative everywhere and positive outside E, while by double counting they sum to zero. Hence, every vertex would have profile E, and every color graph would be 15-regular on 61 vertices, which is impossible because $61 \cdot 15$ is odd.

In Section 3, we show that vertices of profiles A, B and D fall short, as they receive at most 47, 46 and 45 tickets. A root r that violates its bound receives at least 48, 47 or 46 tickets, but only 44 of its neighbors lie outside a given 16-vertex group. That group therefore contains at least four, three or two senders, and we choose one as the *mark* p . Its critical neighborhood in the color of rp contains r and misses the group of p . It meets the other three groups of r in *supports*. A support has at most five vertices, since its edges avoid two colors and $R(3, 3) = 6$. As the supports have 14 or 15 vertices together, each has four or five. The template of the marked neighborhood fixes the colors between them.

We enumerate the placements of the marked neighborhood up to symmetries using the actual neighborhoods. Every placement produces a SAT formula on all 61 vertices, with the edge colors fixed by the templates. SAT solvers refuted all 56,374 formulas. This way, we prove the three ticket bounds. Note that the bounds do not exclude roots of profiles A, B and D. We use them only through double counting.

For profile C, we could not prove the analogous bound $H \leq 31$, which would finish the proof. If a C vertex receives 32 tickets, they may all come from its two 16-vertex groups. The critical neighborhood of such a sender crosses the other 16-vertex group and the two unclassified 14-vertex groups, and leaves many edges free.

A ticket from a 14-vertex group is different. The critical neighborhood of its sender crosses both 16-vertex groups, and the same construction works with no template on either 14-vertex group. We call such a C root and its mark an *entrance*. In Section 4, we exclude all entrances with 346 cases.

Without an entrance, a C vertex receives tickets only from its two 16-vertex groups, so $H \leq 32 = w$. With the bounds at A, B, D and E, all differences $w - H$ are nonnegative, and double counting forces every vertex to *break even*, with $H = w$. Thus, profiles A, B and D do not occur. We call a coloring *perfectly balanced* if it has no entrance and every vertex breaks even. In such a coloring, every C vertex receives a ticket from each vertex of its two critical neighborhoods, and every E vertex from all 60 neighbors.

Therefore, if u sends v a ticket, then v sends one back. A degree count shows that the color graphs inside a critical neighborhood are connected, so all its vertices have the same critical colors. This rules out E, since an E vertex would have a 15-vertex neighborhood inside the two 16-vertex groups of a C vertex, with at most five in each. A second count shows that critical neighbors have the same critical pair. Any two vertices share a critical neighbor, as $32 + 32 > 61$, so all have the same two critical colors (Section 5.1).

We name these two colors 0 and 1, and at a root r put $X = N_0(r)$ and $Y = N_1(r)$. For $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$, the opposite neighborhoods $N_1(x)$ and $N_0(y)$ have 16 vertices, so the part of each visible in $X \cup Y$ embeds into U or T with all colors preserved. These 32 embedding conditions share the 256 edges between X and Y .

For $x \in X$, five visible vertices lie in X and span a two-colored pentagon fixed by the template on X , and likewise for $y \in Y$. By enumeration, six tables with the pentagon at fixed positions cover all its placements in U and T . Each embedding then reduces to placing the other visible vertices in one of these tables. We write the 32 conditions into one formula on all 61 vertices, which also fixes the root partition and the templates on X and Y . Up to exchanging colors 0 and 1, three such formulas remain, for UU , UT and TT . All three are unsatisfiable, so no coloring is perfectly balanced (Sections 5.2 to 5.4).

In Section 6, we describe the computations and the formal verification, and Figure 1 shows the proof dependencies.




Figure 1: Proof dependencies. Double counting and the A, B, D bounds give Lemma 2.7, which leaves two cases, and excluding both proves the theorem. Tags mark the steps that rest on SAT exclusions or on a finite check of template embeddings, and the other steps are deductions.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Colorings, degrees and templates

To reach a contradiction, let c be a good four-coloring of K_{61} . We denote the color of an edge uv by $c(uv)$. The *color- i neighborhood* of a vertex v is $N_i(v) = \{u \neq v : c(uv) = i\}$, and $d_i(v) = |N_i(v)|$ is its *color- i degree*. We also call the four color neighborhoods of v its *groups*. We use $R(3, 3) = 6$ and $R(3, 3, 3) = 17$ [4]. A good two-coloring of K_5 consists of two complementary five-cycles.

An edge of color i inside $N_i(v)$ would form a color- i triangle with v , so $N_i(v)$ carries a good three-coloring. Since $R(3, 3, 3) = 17$ and the four degrees add up to 60, we have

$$12 \leq d_i(v) \leq 16, \quad \sum_{i=0}^3 d_i(v) = 60. \quad (1)$$

We call color i *critical* at v if $d_i(v) \geq 15$, and $N_i(v)$ is then a *critical neighborhood*.

Theorem 2.1 (Kalbfleisch and Stanton [6], and Heinrich [5]). *Up to relabeling the vertices and permuting the three colors, there are exactly two good three-colorings of K_{16} , the untwisted template U and the twisted template T . Up to the same operations, every good three-coloring of K_{15} is obtained from U or T by removing a vertex.*

We label the vertices of each template $0, \dots, 15$, calling them positions. We label U^- and T^- the colorings obtained by deleting position 15 from U and T . The exact colored adjacency matrices for all templates are supplied in our repository [9].

The *automorphisms* of a template are the permutations of its positions that preserve all edge colors. They form the groups $\text{Aut}(U)$ and $\text{Aut}(T)$.

Lemma 2.2. (a) *The groups $\text{Aut}(U)$ and $\text{Aut}(T)$ act transitively on the 16 positions.*

- (b) $|\text{Aut}(U)| = 160$ and $|\text{Aut}(T)| = 32$, so the stabilizer of a position has order 10 in $\text{Aut}(U)$ and order 2 in $\text{Aut}(T)$. The automorphisms of U^- and of T^- are exactly the automorphisms of U and of T that fix position 15.
- (c) Let τ be a permutation of the three colors and z a position. There is a permutation of the positions that fixes z and carries every edge of U of color j to an edge of color $\tau(j)$, for $j = 0, 1, 2$. The same holds for T .

Proof. We find the automorphisms of the four templates by backtracking. A position is mapped only to an unused position with the same color degrees, and only if its edge colors to the positions mapped so far agree. The resulting lists give (a) and (b). The same search, matching color j to color $\tau(j)$, finds a permutation realizing each τ [9].

For (c), if σ realizes τ (maps color- j edges to color- $\tau(j)$ edges), so does $\alpha \circ \sigma$ for every automorphism α , and by (a) some α has $\alpha(\sigma(z)) = z$. $\square$

When we place a template on $N_i(v)$, its colors 0, 1, 2 stand for the other three colors in increasing order. Theorem 2.1 and Lemma 2.2(c) let us fix this *palette* by relabeling the template vertices. When $d_i(v) = 15$, we take position 15 as the missing one and realize the palette by a permutation fixing it.

Thus, every critical $N_i(v)$ is a copy of U , T , U^- or T^- with this palette, and its *type* is U or T . The types stay distinct after deletion, since U^- and T^- have 10 and 2 automorphisms by Lemma 2.2(b). On a 16-vertex neighborhood, transitivity lets us put any vertex at position 15.

2.2 Profiles and tickets

The deficits $16 - d_i(v)$ are nonnegative and sum to 4, so the five partitions of 4 give the sorted degree profiles in Table 1.

Table 1: Root profiles and the number of tickets sent.

Profile	Sorted color degrees	Critical neighborhoods	$w(v)$
A	(12, 16, 16, 16)	3	48
B	(13, 15, 16, 16)	3	47
C	(14, 14, 16, 16)	2	32
D	(14, 15, 15, 16)	3	46
E	(15, 15, 15, 15)	4	60

Definition 2.3. A vertex u sends a ticket to $v \neq u$ when $d_{c(uv)}(u) \geq 15$. We denote the numbers of tickets that v receives and sends by $H(v)$ and $w(v)$. Thus

$$H(v) = |\{u \neq v : d_{c(uv)}(u) \geq 15\}|, \quad w(v) = \sum_{i: d_i(v) \geq 15} d_i(v).$$

A vertex *breaks even* if $H(v) = w(v)$ and *falls short* if $H(v) < w(v)$.

Double counting the tickets, once at the sender and once at the receiver, gives

$$\sum_v H(v) = \sum_v w(v). \quad (2)$$

2.3 The two branches

In Section 3, we prove the following bounds.

Proposition 2.4 (The A, B and D bounds). *In a good four-coloring of K_{61} , a vertex of profile A, B or D receives at most 47, 46 or 45 tickets, respectively.*

Since each bound is one below the number sent in Table 1, these vertices fall short. Section 3 gives no such bound for profile C, so the proof splits into two branches.

Definition 2.5 (Entrance). An *entrance* is a pair (r, p) such that r has profile C, p belongs to a 14-vertex neighborhood of r , and p sends r a ticket. We call r the *root* and p the *mark*.

Definition 2.6 (Perfect balance). A good coloring of K_{61} is *perfectly balanced* if it has no entrance and every vertex breaks even.

Lemma 2.7 (Entrance or perfect balance). *Assuming the bounds of Proposition 2.4, exactly one of the following holds:*

1. *An entrance exists.*
2. *The coloring is perfectly balanced. Only profiles C and E occur. Every C vertex receives tickets from exactly its 32 neighbors in critical colors, and every E vertex from all its 60 neighbors.*

Proof. Without an entrance, a C vertex receives tickets only from its two 16-vertex neighborhoods, so $H(v) \leq 32 = w(v)$. At an E vertex, $H(v) \leq 60 = w(v)$, and the bounds give $H(v) < w(v)$ at A, B and D. The differences $w(v) - H(v)$ are thus nonnegative, and (2) directly implies that they all vanish. Consequently, the coloring is perfectly balanced, no vertex has profile A, B or D, and every C or E vertex receives all the tickets listed in item 2. By definition, the items cannot both hold. $\square$

In Sections 4 and 5, we exclude the two branches.

Proposition 2.8 (No entrance). *No good four-coloring of K_{61} has an entrance.*

Proposition 2.9 (No perfect balance). *No good four-coloring of K_{61} is perfectly balanced.*

Proof of Theorem 1.1 from the three propositions. By Proposition 2.4 and Lemma 2.7, a good four-coloring of K_{61} has an entrance or is perfectly balanced. Propositions 2.8 and 2.9 exclude both. $\square$

2.4 Symmetries, formulas and coverage

A *symmetry* (σ, τ) consists of a vertex permutation σ and a global color permutation τ . It sends c to c' with $c'(\sigma(u)\sigma(v)) = \tau(c(uv))$ and preserves goodness, profiles and tickets. We extend permutations of vertex subsets by the identity.

Definition 2.10. A *marked case* κ is a finite list of signed edge facts on the vertices $0, \dots, 60$, each stating that an edge uv has, or does not have, a given color i . Its formula Φ_κ uses variables $x_{e,i}$ for the 1,830 edges e and four colors i . Besides the unit clauses for those facts, it contains

$$\begin{aligned}
 \bigvee_{i=0}^3 x_{e,i} & \quad \text{for each edge } e, \\
 \neg x_{e,i} \vee \neg x_{e,j} & \quad \text{for each edge } e \text{ and } i < j, \\
 \neg x_{uv,i} \vee \neg x_{uw,i} \vee \neg x_{vw,i} & \quad \text{for each triangle } uvw \text{ and color } i.
 \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

There are 7,320 variables and 156,770 shared clauses. Only the unit clauses depend on κ .

Lemma 2.11 (Encoding and coverage). *The satisfying assignments of Φ_κ correspond exactly to good four-colorings satisfying the facts of κ . A list of cases covers a class of good colorings if every coloring in that class satisfies one of its cases after some symmetry. If every formula in a cover is unsatisfiable, no coloring in the covered class exists.*

Proof. The first two clause families give each edge exactly one color, the third forbids monochromatic triangles, and the unit clauses impose exactly the listed facts. A coloring in the class would, after a symmetry, satisfy one of the cases and hence its formula. $\square$

3 Marked neighborhoods and the A, B and D bounds

Here and in Section 4, we place a sender's critical neighborhood across the receiver's groups.

3.1 A common construction

Let r be a root with groups $R_i = N_i(r)$ such that the *foreign groups* R_1 and R_2 carry placed critical templates. Suppose $p \in R_3$ sends r a ticket, that is, $d_3(p) \in \{15, 16\}$. We call p the *mark*, $S = N_3(p)$ the *brace* and $S_i = S \cap R_i$, for $i = 0, 1, 2$, the *supports* (Figure 2). We assume no template on R_0 and call it *free*. For fixed sizes of the root's groups, all cases use the same vertices for the root, the mark and the four groups.

Lemma 3.1. *The brace is $\{r\} \cup S_0 \cup S_1 \cup S_2$. Its ordered support sizes $(|S_0|, |S_1|, |S_2|)$ have one of the four shapes*

$$(4, 5, 5), \quad (5, 4, 5), \quad (5, 5, 4), \quad (5, 5, 5).$$

A five-support carries complementary five-cycles, and a four-support carries complementary paths.

Proof. The root lies in S , and no vertex $v \neq p$ of R_3 does, since rpv would be a color-3 triangle. Edges inside S_i avoid colors i and 3, so $|S_i| \leq 5$ by $R(3, 3) = 6$. As the sizes add up to $|S| - 1 \in \{14, 15\}$, only the four shapes remain. By classification, S is a copy of U , T , U^- or T^- . In a good three-coloring of K_{16} , the three color degrees are at most five by $R(3, 3) = 6$ and add up to 15, so each is five. Hence, the color neighborhoods of r in U or T carry good two-colorings of K_5 , that is, complementary five-cycles. The supports are these sets, and deleting a position shrinks at most one of them to four vertices, which carry complementary paths. $\square$

The *reference coloring* of support i uses the two colors of $\{0, 1, 2\} \setminus \{i\}$. It puts the smaller one on the path $0, 1, 2, 3$ if $|S_i| = 4$, or on the cycle $0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 0$ if $|S_i| = 5$, and the larger on the other pairs. A *labeling* of S_i , or of any set colored like it, is a color-preserving bijection from the reference vertices onto it.

Definition 3.2. Let $a = (a_0, a_1, a_2)$ be a shape and $n = 1 + a_0 + a_1 + a_2$. Let $\rho \in \{U, T\}$ if $n = 16$, and $\rho \in \{U^-, T^-\}$ if $n = 15$. A *base vertex* of ρ , which stands for the root, is position 15 if $n = 16$, and any position with a_i neighbors of color i , for $i = 0, 1, 2$, if $n = 15$. For any labelings of the color- i neighbors of a base vertex by the reference coloring of support i , the colors between the three sets, read in label order, form a *word* of shape a . Its length is 65, or 75 for shape $(5, 5, 5)$.

Computation 3.3. *For each shape, these base vertices and labelings give exactly 600 distinct words, 100 from U or U^- and 500 from T or T^- .*




Figure 2: The construction for a C root and shape $(5, 5, 5)$. The white mark $p \in R_3$ sends r a ticket along a color-3 edge (arrow). Its shaded brace $S = N_3(p)$ contains r , avoids R_3 and meets the other groups in the supports. Here only S , R_1 and R_2 carry templates. We draw only some edges. The three gray edges between supports lie in the brace and are drawn without colors.

Every brace gives one of these words, for any labelings of its supports. By classification, we place a template on S with r at a base vertex, using transitivity when $|S| = 16$, and compose the support labelings with this placement.

We normalize the supports by symmetry. For $i = 1, 2$, we list the subsets of the template on R_i that admit the reference coloring of S_i . From each orbit under the automorphisms of the whole template, we keep one, with a fixed labeling. We place the free support S_0 on fixed vertices of R_0 , in reference order.

For fixed sizes of the root's groups and fixed template types, a *normalized configuration* is a selected pair of foreign supports with one of the 600 words of a matching shape. The automorphism group of the free reference path or cycle has order 2 or 10. With the set stabilizers of the foreign supports, it acts on these words, so we may keep only orbit representatives.

Each normalized configuration fixes:

1. all root edges;
2. the templates on R_1 and R_2 , and on R_3 when present;
3. the internal coloring of the brace and its exact membership as $N_3(p)$.

These specifications constrain one coloring, so they must agree on every shared edge.

For a symmetry (σ, τ) , the *pullback* of a fact $c'(uv) = i$ is the fact $c(\sigma^{-1}(u)\sigma^{-1}(v)) = \tau^{-1}(i)$, and likewise with $\neq$ for a negative fact. By the definition of a symmetry (Section 2.4), c' satisfies a fact exactly when c satisfies its pullback.

We call the list of cases left after these reductions a *retained case list*. It satisfies the *finite coverage condition* if each normalized configuration has a retained case and a symmetry that pulls every fact of the case back to a fact of the configuration. The same check justifies the reduction to orbit representatives and any exchange of equal-sized groups.

Lemma 3.4 (Marked-neighborhood cover). *For fixed sizes of the root's groups and placed template types, the normalized configurations cover every good coloring with a mark as above, and so does every retained case list that satisfies the finite coverage condition. Neither claim needs a template on R_3 .*

Proof. By Lemma 3.1, each support admits its reference coloring. Hence, for $i = 1, 2$, an automorphism of the whole template on R_i carries S_i to its chosen orbit representative. A reference labeling of S_0 , sent in order to the fixed free-support vertices, extends to a permutation of R_0 , as the complements have equal size. With the identity on r and R_3 , these maps form a permutation σ of all 61 vertices. It maps each group of the root to itself and acts by automorphisms on R_1 and R_2 , so it preserves the root-edge colors, the foreign templates and any template on R_3 . Let c' be the image of c under the symmetry (σ, id) .

Since σ fixes p , for every $v \neq p$ we have

$$c'(p\sigma(v)) = 3 \iff c(pv) = 3 \iff v \in S,$$

which implies that the brace of p in c' is $\sigma(S)$, the root with the selected supports. So c' satisfies the required brace membership. The reference coloring on the free support holds, since the labeling of S_0 preserves colors. As shown after Computation 3.3, the colors between the selected supports in c' , read in their fixed labelings, form one of the 600 words. With the selected supports, this word gives a normalized configuration whose facts all hold in c' .

Finally, each fact of the retained case pulls back to a fact of the configuration, which holds in c' . So the symmetry from the finite coverage condition carries c' to a good coloring that satisfies the retained case. $\square$

3.2 The A, B and D cases

Suppose a root violates its bound in Proposition 2.4. We name the colors so that $R_0, \dots, R_3$ have sizes (12, 16, 16, 16), (13, 15, 16, 16) or (14, 15, 15, 16). A global color permutation, followed by renormalizing the templates to the fixed palette, exchanges two groups of equal size. So we may order the template types by $U < T$ on all three 16-vertex groups for A, on R_2, R_3 for B and on R_1, R_2 for D. The root receives at least 48, 47 or 46 tickets, but only 44 of its neighbors lie outside a given 16-vertex group. Every 16-vertex group, including R_3 , therefore contains at least four, three or two senders. We choose one in R_3 as the mark p , place the template of R_3 with p at position 15 and apply Lemma 3.4.

For D, we also use the exchange of R_1 with R_2 and color 1 with color 2. We then restore the template of R_3 by a permutation of positions fixing position 15 and realizing the color exchange. Relabeling the reference path or cycle of the free support restores its coloring. When the two foreign types agree, the exchange identifies the shapes (5, 4, 5) and (5, 5, 4). For foreign types TT and shapes (4, 5, 5) and (5, 5, 5), we also order the orbits of the two five-vertex foreign supports. If the two orbits coincide, we make no further exchange reduction. Table 2 lists the retained cases for Lemma 3.4.

Computation 3.5. *For every A, B and D family in Table 2, the retained list satisfies the finite coverage condition. The lists contain 360 A cases, 5,096 B cases and 50,918 D cases, 56,374 in total.*

Each case gives a formula as in Definition 2.10. The case lists, symmetry witnesses and formula comparisons accompany the computations of Section 6.

Computation 3.6 (The A/B/D exclusions). *All 56,374 A/B/D case formulas are unsatisfiable. Kissat 4.0.4 [1] and CaDiCaL 3.0.1 [7], both with default options, refuted each of them.*

Proof of Proposition 2.4. A vertex violating one of the bounds gives a mark as above. Lemma 3.4 and Computation 3.5 directly imply that, after a symmetry, the coloring satisfies a case of Table 2. By Lemma 2.11, its edge colors satisfy the formula of that case, which contradicts Computation 3.6. $\square$

Table 2: Retained A/B/D cases, with the foreign types of R_1, R_2 . Counts are per listed marked type, so a row with marked types U,T counts twice. A dash means the exchange of the foreign groups covers shape (5, 5, 4) through shape (5, 4, 5).

Profile	Foreign	Marked	(4, 5, 5)	(5, 4, 5)	(5, 5, 4)	(5, 5, 5)	Total
A	UU	U,T	4	4	4	2	14
A	UT	T	16	16	20	4	56
A	TT	T	76	92	92	16	276
B	UU	U,T	36	40	36	10	122
B	UT	T	168	184	204	36	592
B	TU	U,T	168	220	168	36	592
B	TT	T	828	1,084	996	168	3,076
D	UU	U,T	189	408	–	82	679
D	UT	U,T	1,824	1,992	2,388	372	6,576
D	TT	U,T	5,256	11,892	–	1,056	18,204

4 Excluding C entrances

Let (r, p) be an entrance (Definition 2.5). We name the colors so that p lies in R_3 and the groups $R_0, \dots, R_3$ have sizes (14, 16, 16, 14). The ticket from p to r means $d_3(p) \in \{15, 16\}$, so the construction of Section 3.1 applies with templates on R_1, R_2 and none on R_0, R_3 .

If necessary, we exchange colors 1 and 2, and with them R_1 and R_2 , to order the foreign types as UU, UT or TT. The actions on supports and words involve only the two foreign templates and the free support. Every vertex v of R_0 outside S_0 has $c(pv) \neq 3$, so enlarging R_0 from 12 to 14 vertices leaves these actions unchanged. Thus, they are the actions of the A row of Table 2 with the same foreign types. We keep all four shapes and list the cases in Table 3.

Table 3: Retained C entrance cases. A shape lists $|S_0|, |S_1|, |S_2|$, with S_0 the free support.

Foreign types	(4, 5, 5)	(5, 4, 5)	(5, 5, 4)	(5, 5, 5)	Total
UU	4	4	4	2	14
UT	16	16	20	4	56
TT	76	92	92	16	276
Total	96	112	116	22	346

Proposition 4.1. *Every good coloring with an entrance satisfies, after a symmetry, all facts of one of these 346 cases.*

Proof. The entrance gives a mark as in Lemma 3.4, which needs no template on R_3 . We normalize the two foreign templates and order their types as above. The actions of the A rows fix the mark and preserve both foreign templates. With these actions, the cases of Table 3 satisfy the finite coverage condition for every shape and type pair, so Lemma 3.4 applies. $\square$

Computation 4.2 (The C entrance exclusions). *All 346 case formulas of Table 3 are unsatisfiable. Kissat and CaDiCaL, run as in Computation 3.6, refuted each of them.*

Proof of Proposition 2.8. By Proposition 4.1, a good coloring with an entrance satisfies, after a symmetry, a case of Table 3. By Lemma 2.11, its edge colors satisfy the formula of that case, contradicting Computation 4.2. $\square$

5 Excluding perfect balance

To prove Proposition 2.9, we first show that perfect balance gives every vertex degree 16 in the same two colors, and then exclude this degree vector.

5.1 A common degree vector

Suppose c is perfectly balanced. By Proposition 2.4 and Lemma 2.7(2), only profiles C and E occur, and a C vertex receives tickets exactly from its two 16-vertex neighborhoods.

Lemma 5.1 (Reciprocity). *In a perfectly balanced coloring, an edge's color is critical at one endpoint if and only if it is critical at the other.*

Proof. Suppose u sends a ticket to v along a color- i edge. If v is E, then $d_i(v) = 15$. If v is C, then u lies in one of its 16-vertex neighborhoods, so $d_i(v) = 16$. In both cases, v sends a ticket back. $\square$

Lemma 5.2 (Internal connectivity). *Every color graph in a good three-coloring of K_n , for $n \in \{15, 16\}$, is connected.*

Proof. Every color degree is at most five, since a color neighborhood carries a good two-coloring and $R(3, 3) = 6$. The three degrees add up to $n - 1$, so each is at least $n - 11 > 0$. Fix a color graph. Since it has no triangle, every component contains an edge whose ends have disjoint neighborhoods. Hence, each component has at least $2(n - 11)$ vertices, and two components would need $4(n - 11) > n$ vertices, which is impossible. $\square$

Lemma 5.3 (Homogeneity of critical neighborhoods). *In a perfectly balanced coloring, all vertices of a critical neighborhood have the same set of critical colors.*

Proof. Let $N_i(v)$ be critical. By reciprocity (Lemma 5.1), i is critical at every vertex of $N_i(v)$. For $j \neq i$, the color- j graph inside $N_i(v)$ is connected by Lemma 5.2. Again by reciprocity, j is critical at both ends of each such edge or at neither, hence at all of $N_i(v)$ or at none. $\square$

Lemma 5.4 (A common critical pair). *In a perfectly balanced coloring, one global color permutation makes every vertex have $d_0 = d_1 = 16$ and $d_2 = d_3 = 14$.*

Proof. Some vertex r is C, since otherwise every color graph would be 15-regular on 61 vertices, with odd degree sum. We name its critical colors 0 and 1, and put $X = N_0(r)$ and $Y = N_1(r)$.

By reciprocity along its edge to r , every E vertex e lies in $X \cup Y$, and by homogeneity its whole group, X or Y , is E. Every color degree inside a template is five (see the proof of Lemma 3.1), so e has five color-2 neighbors in its group, all of them E. As $d_2(e) = 15$, the neighborhood $N_2(e)$ is critical and contains these E vertices. By homogeneity, all of $N_2(e)$ is E and therefore lies in $X \cup Y$. Inside X , its edges avoid colors 0 and 2, and inside Y colors 1 and 2, leaving at most five vertices in each part. This gives $15 = |N_2(e)| \leq 10$, a contradiction, and every vertex is C.

Now take any root r , name its critical pair 0 and 1, and let $x \in X = N_0(r)$. By reciprocity, 0 is critical at x . Suppose the other critical color of x is $j \in \{2, 3\}$. Since $d_j(r) = 14$, reciprocity makes j noncritical at every vertex of $N_j(r)$. As j is critical at x , no color- j edge joins x to $N_j(r)$, and $c(xr) = 0$. The color- j neighbors of x are five vertices of X and at most five in each of the two remaining groups, where their edges avoid color j and the root color of that group. Hence, $d_j(x) \leq 5 + 5 + 5 = 15$, while a critical color of a C vertex has degree 16. So the pair at x is $\{0, 1\}$, and likewise on Y .

Since r was arbitrary, every vertex has the same critical pair as each of its 32 critical neighbors. Any two vertices share a critical neighbor, as $32 + 32 > 61$, so all pairs agree, and one global color permutation names this pair 0 and 1. $\square$

5.2 Visible opposite neighborhoods

From now on, we assume only the degree vector of Lemma 5.4. At a root r , we write

$$X = N_0(r), \quad Y = N_1(r), \quad P = N_2(r), \quad Q = N_3(r).$$

Lemma 5.5 (The guard). *Every $x \in X$ has five color-0 neighbors in Y , and every $y \in Y$ has five color-1 neighbors in X .*

Proof. The 16 color-0 neighbors of x are r and 15 vertices outside X . Inside each of Y , P and Q , their edges avoid color 0 and the root color of the group, so each group contains at most five of the 15, hence exactly five. For y , we exchange colors 0 and 1. $\square$

By Theorem 2.1 and Lemma 2.2(c), we may relabel the vertices of X and Y , without changing any edge color, so that they carry templates $V_X, V_Y \in \{U, T\}$ with palettes $(1, 2, 3)$ and $(0, 2, 3)$.

For $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$, we call

$$\Omega_x = (X \cup Y) \cap N_1(x), \quad \Omega_y = (X \cup Y) \cap N_0(y)$$

their *visible opposite neighborhoods*. Since $N_1(x)$ and $N_0(y)$ have 16 vertices, each is a copy of U or T . By restriction, the colored graphs on Ω_x and Ω_y embed, with all colors preserved, into U or T with palettes $(0, 2, 3)$ and $(1, 2, 3)$.

The templates on X and Y fix the parts $A_x = X \cap N_1(x)$ of Ω_x and $B_y = Y \cap N_0(y)$ of Ω_y . Both parts have five vertices (see the proof of Lemma 3.1). Their edges avoid colors 0 and 1, so they carry a color-2 pentagon and its color-3 complement. We call these five-sets the *anchors* and the other visible vertices *members*. A vertex $y \in Y$ is a member of Ω_x exactly when $c(xy) = 1$, and $x \in X$ is a member of Ω_y exactly when $c(xy) = 0$ (Figure 3). A visible neighborhood has at most 11 members, since its critical neighborhood has 16 vertices.




Figure 3: A cross edge $x_i y_j$ (orange) and the embedding conditions of Ω_{x_i} and Ω_{y_j} . In (a), it has color 1, so y_j is a member of Ω_{x_i} and takes a nonanchor position in a table of Section 5.3. In (b), it has color 0, so x_i is a member of Ω_{y_j} . All 32 conditions share this grid of 256 edges. Each entry decides membership in the conditions of its row and column and is an anchor entry in up to ten others. Box colors are not edge colors.

5.3 Finite template tables

A *table* is a relabeling of U or T onto positions $0, \dots, 15$ whose *anchor positions* $0, \dots, 4$ carry the reference pentagon, with template color 1 on 01, 12, 23, 34, 40 and color 2 on the other pairs. The other 11 positions are the *nonanchor positions*. An *ordered anchor* is a sequence of five vertices carrying this reference coloring.

In a template, each five-subset independent in color 0 carries complementary pentagons in colors 1 and 2. Its ten orders along the color-1 pentagon are ordered anchors, and every ordered anchor arises in this way, since it has no color-0 edge.

Computation 5.6 (The anchored table library). *Each of U and T has 16 five-subsets independent in color 0. Six representative tables, one from U and five from T, cover the resulting $2 \cdot 16 \cdot 10 = 320$ ordered anchors. For every ordered anchor, there is a bijection of the 16 positions that preserves all 120 edge colors and sends the ordered anchor, in order, to the anchor positions of its representative.*

We order each A_x and B_y along its color-2 pentagon, which has template color 1 in both palettes $(0, 2, 3)$ and $(1, 2, 3)$, so the library covers all ten such orders.

Proposition 5.7 (Exhaustive anchored tables). *Let G be a three-colored graph with an ordered anchor colored as above. Then G embeds in U or T if and only if we can assign its other vertices distinct nonanchor positions in one of the six tables, preserving the colors of all edges at these vertices.*

Proof. An embedding sends the ordered anchor to one of the 320 enumerated ones, and composing it with that anchor's bijection gives a table assignment. Conversely, a table assignment composed with the inverse bijection is a color-preserving embedding into U or T. $\square$

5.4 The three compatibility formulas

By Lemma 5.5, $N_0(x) \cap Y$ has five vertices. Its edges avoid colors 0 and 1, so it spans no edge of template color 0 in V_Y and is one of the 16 five-subsets of Computation 5.6. The same holds for $N_1(y) \cap X$ in V_X .

For each pair (V_X, V_Y) , the *compatibility formula* Ψ_{V_X, V_Y} has the edge variables and goodness clauses of Definition 2.10. Its unit clauses fix the 60 root edges and the 240 template edges in X and Y . For each $x \in X$, auxiliary variables encode the guard and the table criterion of Proposition 5.7 through three kinds of choices:

1. Sixteen guard selectors choose exactly one five-subset of V_Y independent in color 0. The chosen subset must equal $\{y \in Y : c(xy) = 0\}$.
2. Six table selectors choose exactly one of the six anchored tables.
3. For each $y \in Y$ and nonanchor position t , a position variable records whether y occupies t . A vertex receives exactly one position when $c(xy) = 1$ and none otherwise. Distinct members receive distinct positions. Every anchor-to-member color agrees with the selected table, read with palette $(0, 2, 3)$, and so does every member-to-member color, which V_Y fixes.

We impose the same conditions for every $y \in Y$, with X, Y and colors 0,1 exchanged, and write them as exactly-one and implication clauses. Each visible neighborhood has its own auxiliary variables, but all share the edge variables. The CNF files of the reproduction package share the table-independent constraints and add implied clauses on cross-edge colors and triangles (see Section 6).

Exchanging colors 0 and 1 everywhere, and with them X and Y , carries TU to UT and preserves the degree vector and all embedding requirements. So we need only UU, UT and TT. Each formula has 13,656 variables and 524,462 clauses.

Lemma 5.8 (From a coloring to a compatibility formula). *A good coloring with $d_0 = d_1 = 16$ and $d_2 = d_3 = 14$ everywhere gives a satisfying assignment to one of $\Psi_{U,U}$, $\Psi_{U,T}$ or $\Psi_{T,T}$.*

Proof. We normalize the root partition and the templates on X and Y , using the exchange above if necessary to obtain UU, UT or TT. We set $x_{e,i}$ true exactly when e has color i , so goodness and the fixed unit clauses hold.

For $x \in X$, we select $N_0(x) \cap Y$, one of the 16 independent five-subsets. Classification of $N_1(x)$ and Proposition 5.7 give a table and an injective placement of Ω_x that sends its ordered anchor to positions $0, \dots, 4$. We select that table and set a position variable true exactly when its vertex is a member placed at that position. This way, every member has one position and every nonmember none, and the placement preserves all anchor-to-member and member-to-member colors.

Similarly, we treat every $y \in Y$ with colors and groups exchanged. The auxiliary variables of different vertices are disjoint and every edge has one color, so all conditions hold at once. By goodness and the fixed templates, the implied cross-edge clauses also hold. $\square$

Computation 5.9 (Three compatibility exclusions). *The three formulas $\Psi_{U,U}$, $\Psi_{U,T}$ and $\Psi_{T,T}$ are unsatisfiable. Kissat and CaDiCaL, run as in Computation 3.6, refuted each of them. The six runs took 179 CPU seconds in total.*

Proposition 5.10. *No good four-coloring of K_{61} has $d_0 = d_1 = 16$ and $d_2 = d_3 = 14$ at every vertex.*

Proof. By Lemma 5.8, such a coloring would give a satisfying assignment to a formula excluded by Computation 5.9. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 2.9. By Lemma 5.4, a perfectly balanced coloring has, after a color permutation, the degree vector excluded by Proposition 5.10. $\square$

6 Computations and verification

We have reduced Theorem 1.1 to the unsatisfiability of 56,720 distinct marked-case formulas and three compatibility formulas, 56,723 in all. One generator writes them on the same edge variables of K_{61} . We ran Kissat [1] and CaDiCaL [7] on each with no time limit, and every run returned UNSAT.

For our computation, we used an Apple M4 Max with 128 GiB of memory and ran up to 12 solver processes at once. The 113,446 runs took approximately 677 CPU hours, where about 92% of the time was spent on the D cases (Table 4). These times exclude input generation, finite enumeration and Lean compilation.

To verify the computation, we used two methods. First, separate programs matched the solver inputs one to one with the formulas emitted by Lean. They compared the ordered signed facts, the numbers of variables, clauses and bytes, and the hash of the full DIMACS file. For the marked cases, the counts and hashes were derived from the unit clauses and the common base (3), which Lean emitted once. The compatibility formulas of Section 5.4 were emitted in full. Second, we checked the input file, solver binary, command, exit status and UNSAT output of every run.

The final theorem of our Lean 4 formalization [2, 10] is `UniformK61.WholeProof.ramsey61`. Its single premise is that these 56,723 formulas are unsatisfiable. Otherwise, it uses only the standard axioms `propext`, `Classical.choice` and `Quot.sound`. Lean checks the classification certificates, but not the SAT exclusions.

We formalize the degree profiles, the double counting of tickets, the template classification with its 55 CNF/LRAT certificate pairs and the marked-neighborhood covers, where the C cover assumes

Table 4: SAT runs, in CPU hours summed over processes. In a name such as D/TTU, the letters are the template types of R_1, R_2, R_3 .

Case family	Formulas	Kissat	CaDiCaL
A	360	0.31	1.71
B	5,096	7.45	41.21
D/UUU	679	1.92	3.25
D/UUT	679	2.01	6.47
D/UTU	6,576	20.04	40.03
D/UTT	6,576	20.67	45.89
D/TTU	18,204	65.23	168.26
D/TTT	18,204	66.15	184.43
C entrance	346	0.26	1.42
Perfect balance	3	0.02	0.03
Total	56,723	184.06	492.71

no template on a 14-vertex group. We also formalize the perfect-balance argument, the anchored tables and the passage from a coloring to a satisfying assignment in Lemmas 2.11 and 5.8, where the second assigns all auxiliary variables at once. With exhaustive finite checks and our proofs about symmetries and pullbacks, we establish the template automorphisms and palette maps, the 600 words of each shape and the orbits of supports and words. We also check the 320 bijections of Computation 5.6 and that every retained case list satisfies the finite coverage condition.

7 Data and AI assistance

The reproduction package [9] contains the Lean sources and manifests, the template data, finite tables, case lists and symmetry witnesses, the formula generator and the verification programs. Its executable instructions rebuild the Lean sources, regenerate and compare the inputs and rerun both solvers. It also records a completed build, every comparison and measurements for the verification steps of Section 6. For every solver run, it keeps the command, resource use and full output.

AI tools assisted extensively with the mathematics, counterexample analysis, implementation, experiments and formalization. GPT 5.6 in Codex (ultra mode) and Fable 5 in Claude Code (ultracode mode) contributed to the A/B/D reductions. GPT-6 Pro provided mathematical proposals and analysis and helped prepare and edit the manuscript. GPT-6 Astra in Codex (ultra mode) contributed the C reduction, its integration and the simplified compatibility argument. The author directed the research and computations and takes responsibility for the result, its exposition, computational artifacts, verification claims and any necessary corrections.

References

- [1] Armin Biere et al. The Kissat SAT solver. Software and documentation. Accessed September 25, 2026. URL: <https://github.com/arminbiere/kissat>.
- [2] Leonardo de Moura and Sebastian Ullrich. The Lean 4 theorem prover and programming language. In André Platzer and Geoff Sutcliffe, editors, *Automated Deduction—CADE 28*, volume 12699 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 625–635. Springer, 2021. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-79876-5_37.
- [3] Susan E. Fettes, Richard L. Kramer, and Stanisław P. Radziszowski. An upper bound of 62 on the classical Ramsey number $R(3, 3, 3)$. *Ars Combinatoria*, 72:41–63, 2004. URL: <https://combinatorialpress.com/article/ars/Volume%20072/volume-72-paper-5.pdf>.

- [4] R. E. Greenwood and A. M. Gleason. Combinatorial relations and chromatic graphs. *Canadian Journal of Mathematics*, 7:1–7, 1955. doi:10.4153/CJM-1955-001-4.
- [5] Katherine Heinrich. Proper colourings of K_{15} . *Journal of the Australian Mathematical Society, Series A*, 24(4):465–495, 1977. doi:10.1017/S1446788700020838.
- [6] J. G. Kalbfleisch and R. G. Stanton. On the maximal triangle-free edge-chromatic graphs in three colors. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory*, 5(1):9–20, 1968. doi:10.1016/S0021-9800(68)80024-9.
- [7] Florian Pollitt, Mathias Fleury, Katalin Fazekas, Nils Froleyks, André Schidler, Dominik Schreiber, and Armin Biere. CaDiCaL 3.0 (tool paper). In Alexey Ignatiev and Stefan Szeider, editors, *29th International Conference on Theory and Applications of Satisfiability Testing (SAT 2026)*, volume 377 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics*, pages 40:1–40:14. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2026. doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.SAT.2026.40.
- [8] Stanisław P. Radziszowski. Small Ramsey numbers. *The Electronic Journal of Combinatorics*, Dynamic Survey DS1.18, 2026. Revision 18, April 24, 2026. doi:10.37236/21.
- [9] Milos Tatarevic. An upper bound of 61 for $R(3, 3, 3, 3)$: proof sources and computational evidence. Source and evidence repository, 2026. URL: <https://github.com/milostatarevic/r3333-upper-bound>.
- [10] The mathlib Community. The Lean mathematical library. In *Proceedings of the 9th ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Certified Programs and Proofs*, pages 367–381. ACM, 2020. doi:10.1145/3372885.3373824.