

# A Basic Elementary Extension of the Duchet-Meyniel Theorem

Anders Sune Pedersen<sup>a</sup> Bjarne Toft<sup>a,\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, University of Southern Denmark, DK-5230 Odense M, Denmark*

---

## Abstract

The Conjecture of Hadwiger implies that the Hadwiger number  $h$  times the independence number  $\alpha$  of a graph is at least the number of vertices  $n$  of the graph. In 1982 Duchet and Meyniel proved a weak version of the inequality, replacing the independence number  $\alpha$  by  $2\alpha - 1$ , that is,

$$(2\alpha - 1) \cdot h \geq n.$$

In 2005 Kawarabayashi, Plummer and the second author published an improvement of the theorem, replacing  $2\alpha - 1$  by  $2\alpha - 3/2$  when  $\alpha$  is at least 3. Since then a further improvement by Kawarabayashi and Song has been obtained, replacing  $2\alpha - 1$  by  $2\alpha - 2$  when  $\alpha$  is at least 3.

In this paper a basic elementary extension of the Theorem of Duchet and Meyniel is presented. This may be of help to avoid dealing with basic cases when looking for more substantial improvements. The main unsolved problem (due to Seymour) is to improve, even just slightly, the theorem of Duchet and Meyniel in the case when the independence number  $\alpha$  is equal to 2. The case  $\alpha = 2$  of Hadwiger's Conjecture was first pointed out by Mader as an interesting special case.

*Key words:* Complete minors, independence number, Hadwiger number

---

## 1 Introduction and Notation

The Hadwiger number  $h(G)$  of a graph  $G$  is the maximum  $k$  for which  $G$  has the complete graph  $K_k$  as a minor. In 1942 Hadwiger suggested that

---

\* Corresponding author.

*Email addresses:* `asp@imada.sdu.dk` (Anders Sune Pedersen),  
`btoft@imada.sdu.dk` (Bjarne Toft).

$h(G) \geq \chi(G)$ , where  $\chi(G)$  is the chromatic number of  $G$ . This conjecture of Hadwiger is still open.

In any colouring of  $G$  each colour is used at most  $\alpha(G)$  times, where  $\alpha(G)$  is the maximum number of independent vertices in  $G$ . Hence  $\chi(G) \cdot \alpha(G) \geq n$ , where  $n$  is the number of vertices of  $G$ . If Hadwiger's Conjecture is true, then  $h(G) \cdot \alpha(G) \geq n$ . This weaker form of Hadwiger's Conjecture is also unresolved. In 1982 the following result was obtained:

**Theorem 1 (The Theorem of Duchet and Meyniel [2])** *Let  $G$  be a graph on  $n$  vertices with independence number  $\alpha$  and Hadwiger number  $h$ . Then*

$$(2\alpha - 1) \cdot h \geq n.$$

It was observed by Maffray and Meyniel [5] that equality holds in  $(2\alpha - 1) \cdot h \geq n$  if and only if  $\alpha = 1$ , i.e. if and only if  $G$  is complete.

Around the same time, but independently from Duchet and Meyniel, Woodall [11] divided Hadwiger's Conjecture into subconjectures, one of which is  $h(G) \cdot \alpha(G) \geq n$ . In this connection Woodall proved a result very similar to the Theorem of Duchet and Meyniel:

**Theorem 2 (The Theorem of Woodall [11])** *Let  $G$  be a graph on  $n$  vertices with at least one edge and with independence number  $\alpha$  and Hadwiger number  $h$ . Then*

$$2\alpha \cdot (h - 1) \geq n.$$

The main purpose of this paper is to provide a common generalization of the Theorem of Duchet and Meyniel and the Theorem of Woodal, hoping in this way to cover general cases with a best possible result, thus being able to avoid consideration of these cases in future investigations.

All graphs considered in this paper are assumed to be simple and finite. The *clique number*  $\omega(G)$  of a graph  $G$  is the cardinality of a maximum clique of  $G$ , respectively. For any undefined concepts the reader may refer to [1]. Given some graph  $G$  and graph parameter  $\mu$  we may, for ease of notation, write  $\mu$  for the value  $\mu(G)$  when no confusion is possible.

## 2 The Main Theorem

The following theorem we call the basic elementary extension of the Duchet-Meyniel Theorem. The term basic refers to its coverage of general cases, and

the term elementary to the fact that the proof uses only induction and the original idea of Duchet and Meyniel [2].

**Theorem 3 (The Main Theorem)** *Let  $G$  be a graph on  $n$  vertices with at least one edge and at least one missing edge (i.e.  $G$  is neither edge-empty nor complete). Let  $\omega, \alpha$  and  $h$  denote the order of a largest complete subgraph of  $G$ , the size of a largest independent set of  $G$  and the Hadwiger number of  $G$ , respectively. Then*

$$(2\alpha - 1) \cdot (h - 1) + 3 \geq n + \omega, \quad (1)$$

where equality is obtained if and only if

(i)  $G$  is a non-empty forest with a perfect matching

or

(ii)  $G$  contains two disjoint  $K_{n/2}$ , possibly with some edges between them, such that  $h = n/2$ .

In the inequality of Duchet and Meyniel a 1 is thus subtracted from both factors  $2\alpha$  and  $h$  on the left hand side, diminishing it by  $2\alpha + h - 1$ , moreover 3 is added on the left hand side, whereas  $\omega$  is added to  $n$  on the right hand side. For the first case with equality we have  $\omega = h = 2$  and  $\alpha = n/2$ . For the second case with equality we have  $h = \omega = n/2$  and  $\alpha = 2$ .

The idea to replace  $n$  by  $n + \omega$  was first used in [6] and is due to M. Stiebitz.

**Corollary 4** *For  $\alpha \geq 3$  and  $\omega \geq 3$*

$$(2\alpha - 1) \cdot (h - 1) + 2 \geq n + \omega.$$

The proof of Theorem 3 is by induction and consists of many cases. Since the theorem does not hold for complete graphs nor for edge-empty graphs one needs to be careful when applying the induction hypothesis. This gives rise to the many cases. There is a considerable overlap between cases in the following proof, so maybe a shorter, more elegant proof can be designed. The main part of the proof of Theorem 3 is given in Section 6, while Sections 3, 4 and 5 settle the special cases  $h \in \{2, 3\}$ ,  $\alpha = 2$  and  $\omega = 2$ , respectively. First of all, we determine the values of the parameters  $\alpha$ ,  $\omega$  and  $h$  for the extremal graphs described in (i) and (ii) of Theorem 3.

**Lemma 5** *A graph  $G$  on  $n$  vertices has  $h = 2$  and  $\alpha = n/2$  if and only if  $G$  is a non-empty forest with a perfect matching.*

**PROOF.** Suppose that  $G$  is a graph on  $n$  vertices with  $h = 2$  and  $\alpha = n/2$ . Since  $h = 2$  excludes any cycles, it follows that  $G$  is a non-empty forest and, in

particular,  $G$  is bipartite. Moreover,  $\alpha = n/2$  implies that the bipartite graph has partition sets  $A$  and  $B$ , where  $|A| = |B| = n/2$ . If for every set  $S \subseteq A$ , the size of the neighbourhood  $N(S)$  is at least  $|S|$ , then it follows from Hall's theorem, that there is a matching of  $A$  into  $B$ , and, since  $|A| = |B| = n/2$ , such a matching is indeed a perfect matching. On the other hand, if there exists some set  $S \subseteq A$  with  $|N(S)| < |S|$ , then the set  $S \cup B \setminus N(S)$  is an independent set of  $G$  of size  $|S| + |B \setminus N(S)| = |S| + n/2 - |N(S)| > n/2$ , which contradicts the assumption  $\alpha = n/2$ .

Conversely, any non-empty forest with an edge has  $h = 2$  and is bipartite, hence  $\alpha \geq n/2$ . Since  $G$  has a perfect matching,  $\alpha \leq n/2$ . Thus, the reverse implication follows.

**Lemma 6** *A graph  $G$  on  $n$  vertices has  $h = \omega = n/2$  and  $\alpha = 2$  if and only if  $G$  consists of two disjoint  $K_{n/2}$ , possibly with some edges between them, such that  $h = n/2 \geq 1$ .*

**PROOF.** Suppose  $G$  is a graph on  $n$  vertices with  $h = \omega = n/2$  and  $\alpha = 2$ . Let  $K_\omega$  denote a complete  $n/2$ -subgraph of  $G$ . Now we just need to show that  $G - K_\omega$  is a complete  $n/2$ -graph. The graph  $G$  contains at least two vertices and  $\omega < n$ , since  $\alpha \geq 2$ . Hence there exists at least one vertex  $v \in G - K_\omega$ . If  $G - K_\omega$  consists of just a single vertex, then  $n = 2$ , and  $G$  has the desired structure. Hence we may assume that  $G - K_\omega$  contains at least two vertices.

Suppose that the vertices of  $V(G) \setminus V(K_\omega)$  can be partitioned into two non-empty sets  $X$  and  $Y$  such that there is no edge joining a vertex of  $X$  to a vertex of  $Y$ . Both the induced graphs  $G[X]$  and  $G[Y]$  must be complete, since otherwise we could find an independent set of cardinality 3. Let  $V_X$  denote the vertices  $z \in V(K_\omega)$  which are adjacent to every vertex of  $X$ , and let  $V_Y := V(K_\omega) \setminus V_X$ . Consider some vertex  $z \in V_Y$ . Since  $z \in V_Y$ , there must be some vertex  $x \in X$ , which is not adjacent to  $z$ , since otherwise  $z \in V_X$ . If  $z$  is not adjacent to some vertex of  $Y$ , say  $y$ , then  $\{x, y, z\}$  is an independent set in  $G$ , which contradicts  $\alpha = 2$ . Hence every vertex of  $V_Y$  must be adjacent to every vertex of  $Y$ . This shows that both  $G[V_X \cup X]$  and  $G[V_Y \cup Y]$  are complete graphs. The complete subgraphs  $G[V_X \cup X]$  and  $G[V_Y \cup Y]$  are disjoint and, together, they span  $G$ . Furthermore,  $\omega = n/2$ , and so we must have  $|V_X \cup X| = n/2$  and  $|V_Y \cup Y| = n/2$ . Hence  $G$  has the desired structure.

Now suppose that  $G - K_\omega$  is connected. The graph  $G - V(K_\omega)$  contains at least two vertices. Suppose that two vertices, say  $x$  and  $y$ , of  $G - K_\omega$  are non-adjacent. Any vertex  $z \in V(K_\omega)$  must be adjacent to  $x$  or  $y$ . Thus, since  $G - K_\omega$  is connected, contracting  $V(G) - V(K_\omega)$  in  $G$  into a single vertex results in a complete graph on  $1 + n/2$  vertices, which contradicts the assumption  $h = n/2$ .

This shows that  $G - K_\omega$  must be a complete graph on  $n/2$  vertices, and, again,  $G$  has the desired structure.

For the reverse implication, if  $G$  contains two disjoint complete  $n/2$ -graphs and  $h = n/2 \geq 1$ , then  $n/2 = h \geq \omega \geq n/2$ , implying that  $\omega = n/2$ . Moreover,  $\alpha \geq 2$ , since  $\omega < n$ , and  $\alpha \leq 2$  from the given structure of  $G$ . Thus,  $\alpha = 2$ . This proves the reverse implication, and so the proof is complete.

It is an unsolved problem if the graphs characterized in Lemma 6 may be recognized by a polynomial-time algorithm.

### 3 Graphs with $h = 2$ or $h = 3$

If  $G$  is a graph with  $h = 2$ , then  $G$  has no cycles and is a forest, and hence bipartite. Therefore  $\alpha \geq n/2$  and

$$(2\alpha - 1)(h - 1) + 3 \geq n + 2 = n + \omega,$$

where equality occurs if and only if  $\alpha = n/2$ , and so it follows from Lemma 5 that Theorem 3 holds for  $h = 2$ .

Suppose  $G$  is a graph with  $h = 3$ . If  $n = 3$ , then  $G \simeq K_3$  which is excluded by the assumptions of Theorem 3, so  $n \geq 4$ . According to Hadwiger's theorem [3]<sup>1</sup>, any 4-chromatic graph contains  $K_4$  as a minor, and so, since  $h = 3$ , it follows that  $G$  is 3-colourable. Therefore,  $\alpha \geq \lceil n/3 \rceil$  and

$$\begin{aligned} (2\alpha - 1)(h - 1) + 3 &\geq (2\lceil n/3 \rceil - 1)2 + 3 \\ &= 4\lceil n/3 \rceil + 1 \\ &\geq \lceil 4n/3 \rceil + 1 \\ &= n + \lceil n/3 \rceil + 1 \\ &\geq n + 3. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Equality occurs in (2) if and only if  $\omega = 3$ ,  $\alpha = \lceil n/3 \rceil = 2$  and  $4\lceil n/3 \rceil = \lceil 4n/3 \rceil$ . Now  $\lceil n/3 \rceil = 2$  implies  $n \in \{4, 5, 6\}$ , while  $4\lceil n/3 \rceil = \lceil 4n/3 \rceil$  implies that  $n$  is a multiple of three. Thus, equality occurs in (2) if and only if  $n = 6$ ,  $\omega = 3$  and  $\alpha = 2$ , in which case it follows from Lemma 6, that  $G$  contains two disjoint complete 3-graphs. This shows that Theorem 3 holds for  $h = 3$ .

---

<sup>1</sup> Short proofs of Hadwiger's theorem were given by D. R. Woodall in [10] and M. Stiebitz in [8].

## 4 Graphs with $\alpha = 2$

The case  $\alpha = 2$  of the main theorem follows from Lemma 6 and the following result:

**Theorem 7** *Let  $G$  denote a graph on  $n$  vertices, and let  $\omega, \alpha$  and  $h$  denote the order of a largest complete subgraph of  $G$ , the size of a largest independent set of  $G$  and the Hadwiger number of  $G$ , respectively. Let  $\alpha = 2$ . Then*

$$3h \geq n + \omega, \quad (3)$$

where equality occurs if and only if  $h = \omega = n/2$ .

**PROOF.** Let  $K_\omega$  denote a maximum clique of  $G$ . Since  $\alpha = 2$ , of course  $n \geq 2$ . If  $n = 2$ , then  $G \simeq \overline{K_2}$ , and the theorem holds in this case. Suppose that  $n \geq 3$ . Then, clearly,  $h \geq 2$ , since  $\alpha = 2$ . If  $h = 2$ , then  $\alpha \geq n/2$ , and, since  $\alpha = 2$ , we obtain  $n \leq 4$ . In this case (3) holds with equality if and only if  $h = \omega = n/2$ . Considering  $n \in \{3, 4, 5, 6\}$  and  $h \geq 3$ , we obtain strict inequality in (3) unless  $n = 6$  and  $h = \omega = 3$ , in which case we obtain equality, as claimed. If  $\omega \geq n/2$ , then  $3h \geq 3\omega \geq n + \omega$ , where equality occurs if and only if  $h = \omega = n/2$ . Thus, we may assume  $n \geq 7$ ,  $\omega < n/2$  and that the statement of the theorem is true for any graph  $H$  of order  $< n$  and  $\alpha(H) = 2$ .

- (1) Suppose that  $G - K$  is disconnected for some complete subgraph  $K$  of  $G$  ( $K$  may even denote the empty graph). In this case, our assumption that  $\alpha = 2$  implies that  $G - K$  must consist of exactly two components and these components must be complete graphs, say  $K_a$  and  $K_b$ . For any vertices  $x \in V(K)$ ,  $y \in V(K_a)$  and  $z \in V(K_b)$ , the vertex  $x$  must be adjacent to at least one of  $y$  and  $z$ . Let  $A \subseteq V(K)$  consist of the vertices  $x \in V(K)$ , which are adjacent to every vertex of  $V(K_a)$ , and let  $B := V(K) - A$ . Now any vertex  $x \in B$  is not adjacent to every vertex of  $K_a$ , say  $x$  is not adjacent to  $y \in K_a$ . Since no set  $\{x, y, z\}$ , where  $z \in V(K_b)$ , is an independent set of  $G$ , it follows that  $x$  and  $z$  are adjacent. This shows that every vertex of  $B$  is adjacent to every vertex of  $K_b$ . Hence  $G[A \cup V(K_a)]$  and  $G[B \cup V(K_b)]$  are disjoint complete graphs, and, since they cover  $G$ , at least one of them must contain at least  $\lceil n/2 \rceil$  vertices, and so  $\omega \geq n/2$ , which contradicts our assumption  $\omega < n/2$ .
- (2) Suppose that  $G - K_\omega$  is connected. The graph  $G - K_\omega$  cannot be a complete graph, since, by the assumption  $\omega < n/2$ , this would imply  $n = \omega + n(G - K_\omega) \leq 2\omega < n$ . Since  $G - K_\omega$  is connected,  $G - K_\omega$  must contain an induced 3-path, say  $P_3 : xyz$ . Moreover,  $G - K_\omega$  has at least  $\lceil n/2 \rceil \geq 4$  vertices, since  $\omega < n/2$  and  $n \geq 7$ . The assumption  $\alpha = 2$  implies that any vertex of  $V(G) \setminus \{x, z\}$  is adjacent to  $x$  or  $z$ ; we say that  $P_3$  dominates  $G$ . Thus, any complete order  $k$  minor of  $G - P_3$  can, by contracting the two edges of

the 3-path  $P_3$ , be extended to a complete order  $k + 1$  minor of  $G$ . Define  $G' := G - P_3$  and let  $\alpha' := \alpha(G')$ ,  $n' := n(G')$ ,  $h' = h(G')$  and  $\omega' := \omega(G')$ . Thus, we have  $h' + 1 \leq h$  and  $\omega' = \omega$ . The graph  $G'$  cannot be complete, since it has more than  $\omega$  vertices. Hence we may apply the induction hypothesis to  $G'$ , and obtain

$$3h \geq 3(h' + 1) = 3h' + 3 \geq n' + \omega' + 3 = n + \omega, \quad (4)$$

which is the desired inequality. Equality in (4) implies  $h = h' + 1$  and, by induction,  $h' = \omega' = n'/2$ , and so  $\omega = (n - 3)/2$  and  $h = \omega + 1 = (n - 1)/2$ . Moreover,  $G' := G - P_3$  is of the exceptional type described in Lemma 6, in particular, it contains two disjoint complete  $\omega$ -graphs; let  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  denote the vertices of those two complete  $\omega$ -graphs.

If each vertex of  $V_1$  has a neighbour in  $V_2$ , then, by contracting the vertices of  $V_2$  and the vertices of  $V(P_3)$  into two distinct vertices, a complete  $(\omega + 2)$ -minor of  $G$  is obtained, which contradicts the assumption  $h = \omega + 1$ . This shows that, in  $G$ , at least one vertex of  $V_1$ , say  $x'$ , has no neighbour in  $V_2$ . Similarly, we may assume that some vertex  $z' \in V_2$  has no neighbours in  $V_2$ .

Since both  $G[V_1]$  and  $G[V_2]$  are maximum cliques in  $G$ , none of the vertices  $x, y$  and  $z$  are adjacent to every vertex of  $V_1$  or  $V_2$ . Let  $y_1 \in V_1$  and  $y_2 \in V_2$  denote non-neighbours of  $y$ .

Now, since  $\alpha = 2$ , the set  $\{y, y_1, z'\}$  is not independent, and so  $yyz' \in E(G)$ . Similar arguments show that each vertex of  $\{x, y, z\}$  is adjacent to both  $x'$  and  $z'$ . In particular,  $G[y, z, z'] \simeq K_3$  and  $\omega \geq 3$ .

If some vertex  $t \in V_1 \setminus \{x'\}$  is adjacent to  $y$ , then sets  $\{y, t, y_1\}$  and  $\{x, x', z\}$  both induce dominating 3-paths, and both are disjoint from  $V_2$ . Thus, by contracting  $\{y, t, y_1\}$  and  $\{x, x', z\}$  into two distinct vertices, a  $(\omega + 2)$ -minor is obtained, a contradiction. A similar argument shows that no vertex  $t \in V_2 \setminus \{z'\}$  is adjacent to  $y$ . Thus, we obtain  $N_G(y) = \{x, x', z, z'\}$ . The graph  $G'' := G - x - z - z'$  has at least two non-adjacent vertices, and so the induction hypothesis applies to  $G''$ . Since we are assuming  $G$  to be a graph for which equality is obtained in (7), it follows, exactly as in (4), that  $G''$  is a graph for which equality is obtained in (7), and so, by induction,  $G''$  contains two disjoint complete  $\omega$ -graphs. In particular,  $y$  has at least  $\omega - 1$  neighbours in  $G''$ . Thus, in  $G$ , the vertex  $y$  is adjacent to at least three vertices  $x, z, z' \in V(G) \setminus V(G'')$  and  $\omega - 1$  vertices of  $V(G'')$ , and so  $4 = \deg_G(y) \geq (\omega - 1) + 3$ , which implies  $\omega \leq 2$ , contradicting the fact that  $\omega \geq 3$ . This completes the proof.

## 5 Graphs with $\omega = 2$

The case  $\omega = 2$  of the main theorem follows from Lemma 5 and the following result:

**Theorem 8** *Let  $G$  be a graph on  $n$  vertices, and let  $\omega$ ,  $\alpha$  and  $h$  denote the order of a largest complete subgraph of  $G$ , the size of a largest independent set of  $G$  and the Hadwiger number of  $G$ , respectively. Let  $\omega = 2$ . Then*

$$(2\alpha - 1)(h - 1) + 1 \geq n, \quad (5)$$

where equality occurs if and only if  $h = 2$  and  $\alpha = n/2$ .

**PROOF.** Let  $G$  denote a graph of order  $n$  with at least one edge. If  $\alpha = n/2$  and  $h = \omega = 2$ , then equality holds in (5).

Now for the converse. If  $G$  is a complete graph, then  $G \simeq K_2$ ,  $h = 2$ ,  $\alpha = 1$  and we have equality in (5). Thus, we may assume  $\alpha \geq 2$ . It follows from Section 3 that the desired statement holds in the cases  $h \in \{2, 3\}$ . Thus, we assume  $h \geq 4$  and proceed by induction on the order of the graph  $G$  to obtain strict inequality in (8).

Suppose that  $G$  is disconnected, and let  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  be two non-empty subgraphs of  $G$  such that  $G_1 \cup G_2 = G$  and  $V(G_1) \cap V(G_2) = \emptyset$ . Let  $\alpha_i := \alpha(G_i)$ ,  $h_i := h(G_i)$  and  $n_i := n(G_i)$ . Then  $\alpha = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2$ ,  $n = n_1 + n_2$  and  $h = \max\{h_1, h_2\}$ . We may assume that  $h_1 = h \geq 4$ , and so the induction hypothesis is applicable to  $G_1$ :

$$(2\alpha_1 - 1)(h_1 - 1) + 1 \geq n_1. \quad (6)$$

Now there are two cases to consider depending on whether  $G_2$  is edge-empty or not. Firstly, if  $G_2$  is edge-empty, then  $\alpha_2 = n_2$  and, as the following computations show, we obtain strict inequality in (5).

$$\begin{aligned} (2\alpha - 1)(h - 1) + 1 &= (2\alpha_1 + 2n_2 - 1)(h - 1) + 1 \\ &\geq (2\alpha_1 - 1)(h_1 - 1) + 1 + 2n_2(h - 1) \\ &\geq n_1 + 6n_2 > n. \end{aligned}$$

Secondly, if  $G_2$  is not edge-empty, then the induction hypothesis also applies to  $G_2$ , and we obtain a bound on  $n_2$  similar to the one on  $n_1$  in (6). Then

$$\begin{aligned} (2\alpha - 1)(h - 1) + 1 &= (2(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2) - 1)(h - 1) + 1 \\ &= (2\alpha_1 - 1)(h_1 - 1) + 1 + (2\alpha_2)(h - 1) \\ &= (2\alpha_1 - 1)(h_1 - 1) + 1 + (2\alpha_2 - 1)(h - 1) + (h - 1) \\ &\geq (2\alpha_1 - 1)(h_1 - 1) + 1 + (2\alpha_2 - 1)(h_2 - 1) + 3 \\ &\geq n_1 + n_2 + 2 > n. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain strict inequality in (5). This completes the case where  $G$  is disconnected.



Now suppose that  $G$  is connected. Recall, that we are assuming  $\alpha \geq 2$ . Thus, the connectedness of  $G$ , implies that  $G$  contains at least one induced 3-path  $P_3 : xyz$ . Using the method of Duchet and Meyniel [2], we construct a connected dominating set  $D \subseteq V(G)$  of  $G$  with  $|D| = 3 + 2k$  and  $\alpha(G[D]) \geq 2 + k$  for some non-negative integer  $k$ . First, add the vertices  $x, y$  and  $z$  to  $D$ , so that  $|D| = 3$  and  $\alpha(G[D]) = 2$ . Obviously,  $G[D]$  is connected. If  $D$  dominates  $G$ , then we are done. Otherwise, since  $G$  is connected, there must be some vertex  $x_1$  at distance two from  $D$ . Let  $z_1$  denote a vertex adjacent to  $x_1$  and a vertex of  $D$ , and add both  $x_1$  and  $z_1$  to  $D$ . The induced subgraph  $G[D]$  remains connected, while  $|D| = 3 + 2$  and  $\alpha(G[D]) \geq 2 + 1$ . Continue in this manner, at each step adding to  $D$  a vertex  $x_i$  at distance two from  $D$  and vertex  $z_i$  connecting  $x_i$  and  $D$ , until we obtain a connected dominating set  $D$  with  $|D| = 3 + 2k$  and  $\alpha(G[D]) \geq 2 + k$  for some non-negative integer  $k$ . The process obviously terminates, since  $G$  is finite.

Let  $G' := G - D$ . Let  $\alpha' := \alpha(G')$ ,  $n' := n(G')$ ,  $h' = h(G')$  and  $\alpha_D = \alpha(G[D])$ . Clearly,  $\alpha' \leq \alpha$  and  $2 + k \leq \alpha_D \leq \alpha$ . Moreover,  $n' = n - 3 - 2k$ ,  $|D| = 3 + 2k \leq 3 + 2(\alpha - 2) = 2\alpha - 1$ , since  $2 + k \leq \alpha$ .

Suppose  $G'$  is edge-empty. Then  $\alpha' = n'$ , and we establish strict inequality in (5) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} (2\alpha - 1)(h - 1) + 1 &\geq (2\alpha - 1)3 + 1 \\ &\geq 6\alpha - 2 \\ &\geq \alpha' + 2\alpha + 3\alpha + 1 \\ &\geq n' + |D| + 3\alpha + 2 > n. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose that  $G'$  contains at least one edge. Then, by induction,

$$(2\alpha' - 1)(h' - 1) + 1 \geq n'. \quad (7)$$

Since  $G[D]$  is connected, and  $D$  dominates  $G$ ,  $D$  may be contracted to a single vertex, which dominates all other remaining vertices, i.e., the vertices of  $G'$ . This observation implies  $h \geq h' + 1$ . Using this fact and (7), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (2\alpha - 1)(h - 1) + 1 &\geq (2\alpha - 1)h' + 1 \\ &= (2\alpha' - 1)(h' - 1) + 1 + (2\alpha - 1) \\ &\geq n' + |D| = n. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Equality in (8) implies  $h = h' + 1$ ,  $\alpha' = \alpha$ ,  $2 + k = \alpha$  and equality in (7), which, by induction, implies  $h' = 2$ . Thus, equality in (8) is impossible, since, by assumption,  $h \geq 4$ . This completes the proof.

## 6 Proof of the Main Theorem

**PROOF.** Firstly, if  $G$  is a graph as described in (i) or (ii), then it follows from Lemma 5 and Lemma 6, that equality is obtained in (1).

We prove, by induction on the order of the graph, that the inequality (1) holds and that equality is attained only for graphs as described in (i) and (ii). The proof will be partitioned into several cases. Let  $h := h(G)$ ,  $\omega := \omega(G)$  and  $\alpha := \alpha(G)$ . Obviously, the parameters  $h, \omega$  and  $\alpha$  must all be at least two, since  $G$  is neither complete nor edge-empty. According to Section 3, the desired result holds for  $h \in \{2, 3\}$ . For  $\alpha = 2$  or  $\omega = 2$ , the desired result follows immediately from Theorem 7 and Theorem 8, respectively. Hence we may assume  $h \geq 4$ ,  $\alpha \geq 3$ ,  $\omega \geq 3$ , which implies  $(2\alpha - 1)(h - 1) + 3 \geq 18$ , hence the desired strict inequality holds when  $n + \omega \leq 17$ . Thus, the base for the induction is established, and we shall be assuming  $n + \omega \geq 18$ . We shall often find it convenient to introduce graphs denoted  $G'$ ,  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ ; unless otherwise stated, we define  $h' = h(G')$ ,  $\omega' := \omega(G')$ ,  $\alpha' := \alpha(G')$ ,  $n' := n(G')$  and define  $h_i, \omega_i, \alpha_i$  and  $n_i$  for  $i = 1, 2$  analogously.

*Case 1.* Suppose  $G$  is disconnected, and let  $G_1$  denote a component of  $G$  and let  $G_2 := G - G_1$ . Since  $G$  is not edge-empty, we may assume that  $G_1$  is not edge-empty. Observe that not both  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  are complete graphs, since that would imply  $\alpha = 2$ , which contradicts our assumption  $\alpha \geq 3$ .

*Case 1.a.* Suppose  $G_2$  is edge-empty and thus contains an isolated vertex  $x$ . Define  $G' := G - x$ . Obviously,  $\alpha' = \alpha - 1$ ,  $\omega' = \omega \geq 3$  and  $h' = h \geq 4$ . Thus, the induction hypothesis applies to the non-complete graph  $G'$ , and we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 (2\alpha - 1)(h - 1) + 3 &\geq (2 + 2\alpha' - 1)(h - 1) + 3 \\
 &= 2(h - 1) + (2\alpha' - 1)(h - 1) + 3 \\
 &\geq 2(h - 1) + n' + \omega' \\
 &\geq 6 + n - 1 + \omega > n + \omega,
 \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where we used the fact that  $h \geq 4$ . Hence we may assume that neither  $G_1$  nor  $G_2$  is edge-empty.

*Case 1.b.* Suppose that one of  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  is a complete graph, say  $G_1$ . Now, by assumption,  $G_2$  is neither edge-empty nor complete, and so the induction hypothesis implies

$$(2\alpha_2 - 1)(h_2 - 1) + 3 \geq n_2 + \omega_2. \tag{10}$$

Moreover,  $\alpha = \alpha_2 + 1$ ,  $h = \max\{h_1, h_2\} \geq n_1$  and  $\omega = \max\{\omega_1, \omega_2\}$ , which allows us to establish (1).

$$\begin{aligned}
(2\alpha - 1)(h - 1) + 3 &= (2 + 2\alpha_2 - 1)(h - 1) + 3 \\
&\geq 2(h - 1) + (2\alpha_2 - 1)(h_2 - 1) + 3 \\
&\geq 2(h - 1) + n_2 + \omega_2 \\
&= h + n_2 + h + \omega_2 - 2 \\
&\geq n_1 + n_2 + h + \omega_2 - 2 \geq n + \omega,
\end{aligned}$$

since  $h \geq \omega$  and  $\omega_2 \geq 2$ . Observe that equality in (1) implies  $h_2 = h = \omega$ ,  $\omega_2 = 2$  and equality in (10). Equality in (10) implies that  $G_2$  is as described in Lemma 5 or Lemma 6, and hence has  $h_2 = \omega_2$ . However,  $h_2 = \omega_2$  implies  $h = 2$ , which is impossible, since  $h \geq 4$ .

*Case 1.c.* Suppose that neither  $G_1$  nor  $G_2$  is edge-empty or complete. Now the induction hypothesis applies to both  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ . Obviously,  $\alpha = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2$  and  $\omega_1 + \omega_2 \geq \omega + 2$ . Using this and adding the inequalities (1) for  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ , we obtain the following inequality.

$$(2\alpha - 1)(h - 1) + 3 \geq n + \omega + h - 2 > n + \omega,$$

where we used the fact that  $h \geq 4$ .

*Case 2.* Suppose that  $G$  is connected and contains a complete subgraph  $K$  such that  $\alpha(G - K) < \alpha(G)$ . Let  $G' := G - K$ . Note that  $\alpha' = \alpha - 1 \geq 2$ , that is,  $G'$  is not a complete graph.

*Case 2.a.* Suppose  $G'$  is edge-empty, that is,  $\alpha' = n'$ . Then any complete subgraph of  $G$  consists of some vertices of  $K$  and at most one vertex of  $G'$ . If, for some vertex  $x \in V(G')$ , the induced graph  $G[V(K) \cup \{x\}]$  is complete, then any independent set of  $G$  contains at most  $n'$  vertices, which contradicts the assumption  $\alpha = n' + 1$ . This shows that  $\omega(G) = n(K)$ , and so  $n(K) \geq 3$ , which allows us to establish strict inequality in (1).

$$\begin{aligned}
(2\alpha - 1)(h - 1) + 3 &\geq (2(n' + 1) - 1)(n(K) - 1) + 3 \\
&= (2n' + 1)(n(K) - 1) + 3 \\
&= n'(n(K) - 1) + (n' + 1)(n(K) - 1) + 3 \\
&\geq 2(n(K) - 1) + (n' + 1)2 + 3 \\
&= 2n(K) + n' + n' + 3 > 2n(K) + n' = n + \omega.
\end{aligned}$$

*Case 2.b.* Suppose that  $G'$  contains at least one edge, that is,  $\omega' \geq 2$ . Since also  $\alpha' \geq 2$ , the induction hypothesis implies

$$(2\alpha' - 1) \cdot (h' - 1) + 3 \geq n' + \omega', \quad (11)$$

which we use in the following calculations.

$$\begin{aligned}
(2\alpha - 1)(h - 1) + 3 &\geq 2(h - 1) + (2\alpha' - 1)(h - 1) + 3 \\
&\geq 2(h - 1) + (2\alpha' - 1)(h' - 1) + 3 \\
&\geq 2(h - 1) + n' + \omega' & (12) \\
&= 2(h - 1) + n - n(K) + \omega' \\
&= n + h + (\omega' - 2) + (h - n(K)) \geq n + \omega,
\end{aligned}$$

where equality is obtained only if we have equality in (11),  $\omega' = 2$ ,  $h = n(K)$  and  $h = h' = \omega$ . Since  $h \geq 4$ , we find that also  $n(K) > \omega'$ . Equality in (11) implies that  $G'$  is as described in Lemma 5 or Lemma 6, and, in particular,  $h' = \omega'$ , which implies  $h = 2$ , contradicting the assumption  $h \geq 4$ .

*Case 3.* Suppose that  $G$  is connected and  $\alpha(G - F) = \alpha(G)$  for every complete subgraph  $F$  of  $G$ . Let  $K$  denote a complete subgraph of  $G$  of order  $\omega$ , and define  $G' := G - K$ . Furthermore, suppose that  $G'$  is disconnected. Note that  $\alpha' = \alpha \geq 3$ .

*Case 3.a* If  $G'$  is edge-empty, then  $n' = \alpha' = \alpha \geq 3$ . Moreover,  $n = n' + n(K)$ ,  $\omega = n(K) \geq 3$ , and so we obtain strict inequality in (1).

$$\begin{aligned}
(2\alpha - 1)(h - 1) + 3 &\geq (2n' - 1)(\omega - 1) + 3 \\
&= (2n - \omega - 1)(\omega - 1) + 3 \\
&= n(\omega - 1) + (n - \omega - 1)(\omega - 1) + 3 \\
&\geq 2n + (n - \omega - 1)(\omega - 1) + 3 \\
&> 2n > n + \omega.
\end{aligned}$$

*Case 3.b.* Suppose that  $G'$  contains at least one edge. Since  $G'$  is assumed to be disconnected,  $G'$  can be partitioned into two disjoint non-empty graphs  $H_1$  and  $H_2$  such that there is no edge in  $G'$  that connects a vertex of  $V(H_1)$  to a vertex of  $V(H_2)$ . Note that  $\alpha = \alpha(G') = \alpha(H_1) + \alpha(H_2)$ .

For every vertex  $x \in V(K)$ , if the induced subgraphs  $G[x \cup V(H_1)]$  and  $G[x \cup V(H_2)]$  have independent sets of size  $\alpha(H_1) + 1$  and  $\alpha(H_2) + 1$ , respectively, then these independent sets can be combined into an independent set of  $G$  of cardinality  $\alpha(H_1) + \alpha(H_2) + 1$ , which contradicts the fact that  $\alpha = \alpha(H_1) + \alpha(H_2)$ .

Obviously,  $\alpha(G[x \cup V(H_1)]) \geq \alpha(H_1)$  and  $\alpha(G[x \cup V(H_2)]) \geq \alpha(H_2)$ . If  $\alpha(G[x \cup V(H_1)]) = \alpha(H_1)$ , then we refer to  $x$  as a type 1 vertex, otherwise  $\alpha(G[x \cup V(H_2)]) = \alpha(H_2)$ , and we refer to  $x$  as a type 2 vertex. Let  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  denote the set of type 1 and type 2 vertices, respectively. Then  $T_1 \cup T_2 = V(K)$  and

$\alpha(G[T_i \cup V(H_i)]) = \alpha(H_i)$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . Define  $G_i := G[T_i \cup V(H_i)]$ . Observe that  $\alpha_i = \alpha(G_i) = \alpha(H_i)$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . Clearly, the graphs  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  are not both edge-empty, since  $H_1$  and  $H_2$  are not.

*Case 3.b.1.* Suppose that at least one of  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  is a complete graph, say  $G_1$  is a complete graph. Then  $K' := G_1$  is a complete subgraph of  $G$  for which  $\alpha(G - K') = \alpha_2 = \alpha - 1 < \alpha(G)$ , since  $G - K' = G_2$ . This contradicts the assumption that  $\alpha(G - F) = \alpha(G)$  for every complete subgraph  $F$  of  $G$ .

*Case 3.b.2.* Now suppose that one of  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  is edge-empty, while the other is neither complete nor edge-empty, say  $G_1$  is edge-empty, and  $G_2$  is neither complete nor edge-empty. This implies  $T_1 = \emptyset$ ,  $T_2 = V(K)$ ,  $h_1 = 1$ ,  $\alpha_1 = n_1$  and  $\omega_2 = \omega$ . Moreover, the induction hypothesis may be applied to  $G_2$ , that is,

$$(2\alpha_2 - 1)(h_2 - 1) + 3 \geq n_2 + \omega_2,$$

and so we obtain strict inequality in (1).

$$\begin{aligned} (2\alpha - 1)(h - 1) + 3 &\geq (2(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2) - 1)(h_2 - 1) + 3 \\ &\geq 2\alpha_1(h_2 - 1) + (2\alpha_2 - 1)(h_2 - 1) + 3 \\ &\geq 2\alpha_1(h_2 - 1) + n_2 + \omega_2 \\ &\geq 2n_1(h_2 - 1) + n_2 + \omega > n + \omega \end{aligned}$$

since  $n_1 + n_2 = n$ ,  $n_1 \geq 1$  and  $h_2 \geq \omega_2 = \omega \geq 2$ .

*Case 3.b.3.* Now suppose that neither  $G_1$  nor  $G_2$  is edge-empty or complete. We may assume  $h_1 = h \geq 4$ . Observe that  $n = n_1 + n_2$  and  $\omega_1 + \omega_2 \geq |T_1| + |T_2| = \omega$ . The induction hypothesis implies

$$(2\alpha_i - 1)(h_i - 1) + 3 \geq n_i + \omega_i \text{ for } i = 1, 2, \quad (13)$$

which is used in the following.

$$\begin{aligned} (2\alpha - 1)(h - 1) + 3 &= (2\alpha_1 + 2\alpha_2 - 1)(h - 1) + 3 \\ &\geq 2\alpha_1(h - 1) + (2\alpha_2 - 1)(h_2 - 1) + 3 \\ &= (2\alpha_1 - 1)(h - 1) + (h - 1) + (2\alpha_2 - 1)(h_2 - 1) + 3 \\ &\geq (2\alpha_1 - 1)(h_1 - 1) + 3 + (2\alpha_2 - 1)(h_2 - 1) + 3 \\ &\geq n_1 + \omega_1 + n_2 + \omega_2 \geq n + \omega. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, equality in (1) implies equality in (13), while both  $h = 4$  and  $h = h_1 = h_2$ . Now the induction hypothesis applied to  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  implies that both  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  are graphs of the type described by Lemma 6. By Lemma 6,  $\omega_i = h_i = n_i/2$  and  $\alpha_i = 2$ . Hence  $n_i = 8$  and  $\omega_i = 4$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . Now

$$4 = h \geq \omega \geq \max\{\omega_1, \omega_2\} = 4$$

and so  $\omega = 4$ . Also,  $n = n_1 + n_2 = 16$  and  $\alpha = \alpha' = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = 4$ . Substituting these values of the parameters into (1) we obtain the desired strict inequality.

*Case 4.* Suppose that  $G$  is connected and  $\alpha(G - F) = \alpha(G)$  for every complete subgraph  $F$  of  $G$ . Let  $K$  denote a complete subgraph of  $G$  of order  $\omega$ , and let  $G' := G - K$ . Finally, we consider the case where  $G'$  is connected.

Obviously,  $G'$  is not vertex-empty. Let  $x$  denote a vertex of  $G'$ . According to an argument of Duchet and Meyniel [2] (a similar argument was given in the proof of Theorem 8), there exists a set  $T \subseteq V(G')$  such that  $x \in T \subseteq V(G')$ ,  $|T| = 2\alpha_T - 1$ ,  $\alpha(G[T]) = \alpha_T$ ,  $T$  dominates  $G'$  and  $G[T]$  is connected. *Case 4.a.* Suppose that  $T$  dominates  $G$ . Contract  $T$ , in  $G$ , into one vertex  $t$  and denote the resulting graph  $G''$ , and  $J := G'' - t$ . The vertex  $t$  of  $G''$  dominates  $G''$ , and so  $h(G'') = h(J) + 1$ . Since  $K \subseteq J \subseteq G$ , of course  $\omega(J) = \omega$ , in particular,  $J$  is not edge-empty.

*Case 4.a.1.* Suppose  $T \subsetneq V(G')$ . If  $J$  were complete, then it would contain a clique of order at least  $\omega + 1$ , which is impossible, since  $J \subseteq G$ . Hence we may apply the induction hypothesis and obtain the following bound.

$$(2\alpha(J) - 1)(h(J) - 1) + 3 \geq n(J) + \omega(J). \quad (14)$$

Since  $h(G) \geq h(G'') \geq h(J) + 1$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (2\alpha - 1)(h - 1) + 3 &\geq (2\alpha - 1)h(J) + 3 \\ &\geq (2\alpha(J) - 1)(h(J) - 1) + (2\alpha - 1) + 3 \\ &\geq n(J) + \omega(J) + (2\alpha - 1) \\ &= n(J) + \omega(J) + |T| \\ &\geq n + \omega, \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where we used  $\omega(J) = \omega$ ,  $\alpha \geq \alpha_T$  and  $\alpha \geq \alpha(J)$ . Thus, the desired inequality is established. It follows from the inequalities of (15) that equality in (1) implies equality in (14),  $\alpha = \alpha_T = \alpha(J)$  and  $h(G) = h(G'') = h(J) + 1$ . If this is the case, then the induction hypothesis implies that  $J$  is either a graph as described in Lemma 5 or Lemma 6. If  $J$  were a graph as described in Lemma 5, then we would have  $h(J) = \omega(J) = \omega = 2$ , which contradicts the assumption  $\omega \geq 3$ . On the other hand, if  $J$  is a graph as described in Lemma 6, then, in particular,  $\alpha(J) = 2$ , which contradicts  $\alpha(J) = \alpha \geq 3$ . Hence, strict inequality in (1) is established.

*Case 4.a.2.* Suppose  $T = V(G')$ . By contracting the vertices of  $T$  into one vertex we find that  $G$  contains  $K_{\omega+1}$  as a minor, i.e.,  $h \geq \omega + 1$ . Thus, in order to establish strict inequality in (1) it suffices to show

$$\frac{n + \omega - 3}{2\alpha - 1} + 1 < \omega + 1.$$

In the following computations we use that fact that  $\alpha = \alpha(G') = \alpha_T$ ,  $|T| = 2\alpha_T - 1$  and therefore  $n = \omega + 2\alpha - 1$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{n + \omega - 3}{2\alpha - 1} + 1 &= \frac{2}{2\alpha - 1}\omega + \frac{2(2\alpha - 1) - 3}{2\alpha - 1} \\ &< \frac{2}{2\alpha - 1}\omega + 2 < \omega + 1, \end{aligned}$$

where the last strict inequality follows from the facts that  $\alpha \geq 3$  and  $\omega \geq 3$ .

*Case 4.b.* Finally, suppose that  $T$  does not dominate  $G$ . The set  $T$  still dominates  $G'$ , so  $T$  does not dominate  $K$ . In particular, there exists a vertex  $z \in V(K)$  such that  $\{z\} \cup S$  is an independent set of  $G$  for any  $\alpha_T$ -set. Thus,  $\alpha_T < \alpha$ . Since  $G$  is connected, there exists some vertex  $x \in V(G')$  adjacent to some vertex  $y \in V(K)$ . We may assume that  $T$  was constructed so as to contain  $x$ . Since  $T$  dominates  $G'$ , and  $y$  dominates  $K$ , the set  $\{y\} \cup T$  dominates all of  $G$ .

Contract  $\{y\} \cup T$  into one vertex  $t_y$  and denote the resulting graph  $G''$ , and  $J := G'' - t_y$ . Now  $K - y \subseteq J$ , and so, since  $|V(K)| \geq 3$ ,  $J$  must contain at least one edge.

*Case 4.b.1* Suppose that  $J$  is not complete. Then the induction hypothesis applies to  $J$ , that is,

$$(2\alpha(J) - 1)(h(J) - 1) + 3 \geq n(J) + \omega(J). \quad (16)$$

Since the vertex  $t_y$  of  $G''$  dominates  $G''$ , any minor of  $J$  can be extended to include  $t_y$  in  $G''$ , i.e.,  $h(G'') \geq h(J) + 1$ . Since also  $h \geq h(G'')$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (2\alpha - 1)(h - 1) + 3 &\geq (2\alpha - 1)h(J) + 3 \\ &\geq (2\alpha - 1)(h(J) - 1) + (2\alpha - 1) + 3 \\ &\geq (2\alpha(J) - 1)(h(J) - 1) + (2\alpha - 1) + 3 \\ &\geq n(J) + \omega(J) + (2\alpha - 1) \\ &\geq (n - |T| - 1) + (\omega - 1) + (2\alpha - 1) \\ &\geq (n - |T| - 1) + (\omega - 1) + (|T| + 2) = n + \omega, \end{aligned}$$

where we used  $\omega(J) \geq \omega - 1$ ,  $n(J) = n - |T| - 1$ ,  $\alpha \geq \alpha(J)$  and  $2\alpha - 1 \geq |T| + 2$ . Now equality in (1) implies, in particular,  $h = h(G'') = h(J) + 1$ ,  $\alpha = \alpha(J)$  and equality in (16). By induction, equality in (16) implies that  $J$  is as described in Lemma 5 or Lemma 6, in particular,  $h(J) = 2$  or  $\alpha(J) = 2$ , which both are impossible, since  $\alpha(J) = \alpha \geq 3$  and  $h(J) = h - 1 \geq 3$ , by assumption. Thus, we obtain strict inequality in (1).

*Case 4.b.2* Suppose  $J$  is a complete graph. Recall that  $\alpha(T) < \alpha = \alpha(G')$ ,

and so  $V(G') \setminus V(T) \neq \emptyset$ . Since  $V(K) \setminus \{y\} \subseteq V(J)$  and  $V(G') \setminus V(T) \subseteq V(J)$ , it follows that  $V(G') \setminus V(T)$  must contain exactly one vertex, say  $q$ . Since  $\alpha_T < \alpha'$ , it follows that any  $\alpha'$ -set  $S$  in  $G'$  must contain the vertex  $q$ . Now  $S \setminus \{q\}$  is also an independent set in  $G[T]$ , and so  $\alpha_T = \alpha' - 1 = \alpha - 1$ . Thus, we obtain

$$n = n(K) + |T| + (n' - |T|) = \omega + (2\alpha_T - 1) + 1 = \omega + 2(\alpha - 1).$$

Now we are ready to establish the desired strict inequality.

$$\begin{aligned} (2\alpha - 1)(h - 1) + 3 &= (2\alpha - 1)(h - 2) + (2\alpha - 1) + 3 \\ &= (2\alpha - 1)(h - 2) + (n - \omega - 1) + 3 \\ &\geq 5(h - 2) + n - \omega + 2 \\ &= n + h + 4h - \omega - 8 \\ &\geq n + h + 3h - 8 > n + h \geq n + \omega, \end{aligned}$$

where the last strict inequality holds since  $h \geq 4$ . This completes the proof.

## 7 Concluding Remarks

The Duchet-Meyniel Theorem is open for further extensions and improvements, but these will require new ideas. Some such improvements have been obtained, for example by Wood [9], who proved that for  $h(G) = h \geq 5$  the following inequality holds:

$$(2\alpha - 1) \cdot (2h - 5) \geq 2n - 5.$$

The case  $h = 5$  follows from the deep result by Robertson, Seymour and Thomas [7] that any 6-chromatic graph has  $K_6$  as a minor, and this is the starting point of an induction proof.

The main problem in this area is to improve the original theorem of Duchet and Meyniel in the case when  $\alpha = 2$ . This problem was first raised by P. Seymour. The more general problem of Hadwiger's Conjecture for  $\alpha = 2$  was first pointed by W. Mader as a very interesting special case.

### *Acknowledgment*

The result of this paper was presented by the second author at the 6th Czech-Slovak Combinatorial Conference in Prague, July 2006. We wish to thank the organizers of the conference for a perfect arrangement. We also wish to



thank an anonymous referee of [4] for the original suggestion to obtain a basic elementary extension of the Duchet-Meyniel Theorem.

## References

- [1] J. A. Bondy and U. S. R. Murty. *Graph theory*, volume 244 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer, New York, 2008.
- [2] P. Duchet and H. Meyniel. On hadwiger’s number and the stability number. *Annals of Discrete Mathematics*, 13:71–74, 1982.
- [3] H. Hadwiger. Über eine Klassifikation der Streckenkomplexe. *Vierteljahresschr. Naturforsch. Ges. Zürich*, 88:133–142, 1943.
- [4] K. Kawarabayashi, M. Plummer, and B. Toft. Improvements of the theorem of Duchet and Meyniel on Hadwiger’s conjecture. *J. Combinatorial Theory B*, 95:152–167, 2005.
- [5] F. Maffray and H. Meyniel. On a relationship between Hadwiger and stability numbers. *Discrete Math.*, 64:39–42, 1987.
- [6] M. D. Plummer, M. Stiebitz, and B. Toft. On a special case of Hadwiger’s Conjecture. *Discuss. Math. Graph Theory*, 23:333–363, 2003.
- [7] N. Robertson, P. Seymour, and R. Thomas. Hadwiger’s Conjecture for  $K_6$ -free Graphs. *Combinatorica*, 13:279–361, 1993.
- [8] B. Toft. A survey of Hadwiger’s conjecture. *Congr. Numer.*, 115:249–283, 1996.
- [9] D. R. Wood. Independent sets in graphs with an excluded clique minor. *Discrete Math. Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 9(1):171–175, 2007.
- [10] D. R. Woodall. A short proof of a theorem of Dirac’s about Hadwiger’s conjecture. *J. Graph Theory*, 16(1):79–80, 1992.
- [11] D.R. Woodall. Subcontraction-Equivalence and Hadwiger’s Conjecture. *J. Graph Theory*, 11:197–204, 1987.