

On the extremal graphs for degenerate subsets, dynamic monopolies, and partial incentives

S. Ehard D. Rautenbach

Institut für Optimierung und Operations Research, Universität Ulm, Ulm, Germany,
{stefan.ehard, dieter.rautenbach}@uni-ulm.de

Abstract

The famous lower bound $\alpha(G) \geq \sum_{u \in V(G)} \frac{1}{d_G(u)+1}$ on the independence number $\alpha(G)$ of a graph G due to Caro and Wei is known to be tight if and only if the components of G are cliques, and has been generalized several times in the context of large degenerate subsets and small dynamic monopolies. We characterize the extremal graphs for a generalization due to Ackerman, Ben-Zwi, and Wolfowitz. Furthermore, we give a simple proof of a related bound concerning partial incentives due to Cordasco, Gargano, Rescigno, and Vaccaro, and also characterize the corresponding extremal graphs.

Keywords: independent set; degenerate set; dynamic monopoly; target set; partial incentives

1 Introduction

We consider finite, simple, and undirected graphs, and use standard terminology. Throughout this paper, let G be a graph, and let $c : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and $\kappa : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ be two functions with $0 \leq \kappa(u) \leq d_G(u)$ for every vertex u of G , where $V(G)$ denotes the vertex set of G , and $d_G(u)$ denotes the degree of a vertex u in G . For a set I of vertices of G , let the c -weight of I be $c(I) = \sum_{u \in I} c(u)$. The set I is κ -degenerate in G if there is a linear ordering u_1, \dots, u_k of the vertices in I such that u_i has at most $\kappa(u_i)$ neighbors in $\{u_j : j \in [i-1]\}$ for every $i \in [k]$, where $[n]$ denotes the set of positive integers at most n for every integer n . Note that a set of vertices of G is *independent* exactly if it is 0-degenerate. Therefore, if $\alpha(G, c, \kappa)$ denotes the maximum c -weight of a κ -degenerate set of vertices of G , then $\alpha(G, 1, 0)$ is the well-known *independence number* $\alpha(G)$ of G .

For every graph G , Caro [5] and Wei [12] showed

$$\alpha(G) = \alpha(G, 1, 0) \geq \sum_{u \in V(G)} \frac{1}{d_G(u) + 1}. \quad (1)$$

For a fixed non-negative integer d , Alon, Kahn, and Seymour [2] extended (1) by showing

$$\alpha(G, 1, d) \geq \sum_{u \in V(G)} \frac{\min\{d_G(u), d\} + 1}{d_G(u) + 1}. \quad (2)$$

The dual notion of a degenerate set of vertices is the notion of a dynamic monopoly or target set [1, 6, 9]. More precisely, given G and κ as above, if the function $\tau : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ is such that $d_G(u) = \tau(u) + \kappa(u)$ for every vertex u of G , then a set I of vertices of G is κ -degenerate in G if and only if $V(G) \setminus I$ is a *dynamic monopoly* or *target set* in G with *threshold function* τ . This duality generalizes the well-known duality between independent sets and vertex covers. Using this duality, the following generalization of (1) and (2) is an equivalent formulation of a result due to Ackerman, Ben-Zwi, and Wolfowitz [1] (cf. also Reichman [9]).

$$\alpha(G, 1, \kappa) \geq \sum_{u \in V(G)} \frac{\kappa(u) + 1}{d_G(u) + 1}. \quad (3)$$

Cordasco, Gargano, Rescigno, and Vaccaro [4] gave an algorithmic proof of the following weighted extension of (3).

$$\alpha(G, c, \kappa) \geq \sum_{u \in V(G)} \frac{c(u)(\kappa(u) + 1)}{d_G(u) + 1}. \quad (4)$$

The simple probabilistic proofs [3] known for (1) and (3) also work for (4). In fact, if u_1, \dots, u_n is a linear ordering of the vertices of G chosen uniformly at random, then

$$I = \left\{ u_i : i \in [n] \text{ and } \left| N_G(u_i) \cap \{u_j : j \in [i-1]\} \right| \leq \kappa(u_i) \right\}$$

is κ -degenerate, and the right hand side of (4) equals $\mathbb{E}[c(I)]$, that is, the first moment method implies (4).

Motivated by a scenario involving partial incentives, Cordasco et al. [4] consider — the equivalent dual of — the following problem for G and κ as above:

$$\beta(G, 1, \kappa) := \min \left\{ \iota(V(G)) : V(G) \text{ is } (\kappa + \iota)\text{-degenerate for } \iota : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \right\}, \quad (5)$$

that is, the minimum total pointwise increase $\iota(V(G)) = \sum_{u \in V(G)} \iota(u)$ of the function κ such that the entire vertex set of G becomes κ' -degenerate for the new function $\kappa' = \kappa + \iota$, or, equivalently, the empty set becomes a dynamic monopoly for the threshold function $d_G - \kappa'$. A natural weighted version of (5) is

$$\beta(G, c, \kappa) := \min \left\{ \sum_{u \in V(G)} c(u)\iota(u) : V(G) \text{ is } (\kappa + \iota)\text{-degenerate for } \iota : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \right\}. \quad (6)$$

For G and κ as above, Cordasco et al. [4] gave an involved algorithmic proof of the following inequality (cf. Theorem 6 in [4]).

$$\beta(G, 1, \kappa) \leq \sum_{u \in V(G)} \frac{(d_G(u) - \kappa(u))(d_G(u) - \kappa(u) + 1)}{2(d_G(u) + 1)}. \quad (7)$$

Our first contribution is a simple probabilistic proof of a weighted generalization of (7).

Theorem 1. *If G is a graph, and $c : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and $\kappa : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ are such that $0 \leq \kappa(u) \leq d_G(u)$ for every vertex u of G , then*

$$\beta(G, c, \kappa) \leq \sum_{u \in V(G)} \frac{c(u)(d_G(u) - \kappa(u))(d_G(u) - \kappa(u) + 1)}{2(d_G(u) + 1)}. \quad (8)$$

Proof. If u_1, \dots, u_n is a linear ordering of the vertices of G chosen uniformly at random, and

$$\iota(u_i) = \max \left\{ 0, \left| N_G(u_i) \cap \{u_j : j \in [i-1]\} \right| - \kappa(u_i) \right\},$$

then $\iota(u_i) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ for every $i \in [n]$, and $V(G)$ is κ' -degenerate for $\kappa' = \kappa + \iota$.

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\iota(u_i)] &= \sum_{\ell=0}^{d_G(u_i)} \mathbb{P} \left[\left| N_G(u_i) \cap \{u_j : j \in [i-1]\} \right| = \ell \right] \cdot \max \left\{ 0, \ell - \kappa(u_i) \right\} \\ &= \sum_{\ell=0}^{d_G(u_i)} \frac{1}{d_G(u_i) + 1} \cdot \max \left\{ 0, \ell - \kappa(u_i) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{\ell=1}^{d_G(u_i) - \kappa(u_i)} \frac{\ell}{d_G(u_i) + 1} \\
&= \frac{1}{d_G(u_i) + 1} \binom{d_G(u_i) - \kappa(u_i) + 1}{2},
\end{aligned}$$

we obtain, by linearity of expectation,

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta(G, c, \kappa) &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in [n]} c(u_i) \cdot \iota(u_i) \right] \\
&= \sum_{i \in [n]} c(u_i) \cdot \mathbb{E}[\iota(u_i)] \\
&\leq \sum_{i \in [n]} \frac{c(u_i)}{d_G(u_i) + 1} \binom{d_G(u_i) - \kappa(u_i) + 1}{2},
\end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. \square

As our main contribution we characterize the extremal graphs for (4) and (8). Our results generalize the well-known fact that (1) is achieved with equality if and only if G is the disjoint union of cliques.

2 Extremal graphs for (4) and (8)

While probabilistic arguments lead to simple and short proofs for (4) and (8), the extremal graphs can more easily be extracted from proofs mimicking greedy algorithms. Since (4) and (8) are both linear with respect to the components, it suffices to characterize the connected extremal graphs.

Theorem 2. *If G is a connected graph, and $c : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and $\kappa : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ are such that $0 \leq \kappa(u) \leq d_G(u)$ for every vertex u of G , then (4) holds with equality if and only if*

- (i) either $\kappa(u) = d_G(u)$ for every vertex u of G ,
- (ii) or G is a clique, and c and κ are constant on $V(G)$.

Proof. Let $f(G, c, \kappa)$ denote the right hand side of (4). Clearly, if (i) or (ii) hold, then (4) holds with equality. We call a triple (G, c, κ) *extremal* if $\alpha(G, c, \kappa) = f(G, c, \kappa)$. Now, let (G, c, κ) be extremal. Note that we do not yet assume that G is connected.

Claim 1. *For every vertex u of G ,*

$$c(u) = \frac{c(u)(\kappa(u) + 1)}{d_G(u) + 1} + \sum_{v \in N_G(u)} \frac{c(v)(\kappa(v) + 1)}{d_G(v) + 1} - \sum_{v \in N_G(u)} \frac{c(v)\kappa(v)}{d_G(v)}.$$

Proof of Claim 1. Since, for every function $h : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\sum_{u \in V(G)} \sum_{v \in N_G(u)} h(v) = \sum_{u \in V(G)} h(u) d_G(u), \tag{9}$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{u \in V(G)} \left(-c(u) + \frac{c(u)(\kappa(u) + 1)}{d_G(u) + 1} + \sum_{v \in N_G(u)} \frac{c(v)(\kappa(v) + 1)}{d_G(v) + 1} - \sum_{v \in N_G(u)} \frac{c(v)\kappa(v)}{d_G(v)} \right) \\
&= \sum_{u \in V(G)} \left(-c(u) + \frac{c(u)(\kappa(u) + 1)}{d_G(u) + 1} + \sum_{v \in N_G(u)} \frac{c(v)(d_G(v) - \kappa(v))}{d_G(v)(d_G(v) + 1)} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{(9)}{=} \sum_{u \in V(G)} \underbrace{\left(-c(u) + \frac{c(u)(\kappa(u) + 1)}{d_G(u) + 1} + \frac{c(u)(d_G(u) - \kappa(u))}{(d_G(u) + 1)} \right)}_{=0} \\
& = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, if the statement of the claim does not hold, then there is a vertex u' of G with

$$c(u') > \frac{c(u')(\kappa(u') + 1)}{d_G(u') + 1} + \sum_{v \in N_G(u')} \frac{c(v)(\kappa(v) + 1)}{d_G(v) + 1} - \sum_{v \in N_G(u')} \frac{c(v)\kappa(v)}{d_G(v)}. \quad (10)$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned}
N' &= \{v \in N_G(u') : \kappa(v) = 0\}, \\
V' &= V(G) \setminus (\{u'\} \cup N'), \\
G' &= G[V'], \\
c' &= c|_{V'}, \text{ and} \\
\kappa' &: V' \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} : v \mapsto \begin{cases} \kappa(v) - 1 & , \text{ if } v \in V' \cap N_G(u'), \text{ and} \\ \kappa(v) & , \text{ if } v \in V' \setminus N_G(u'). \end{cases}
\end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Note that

$$\frac{c(v)\kappa(v)}{d_G(v)} = \begin{cases} \frac{c(v)(\kappa'(v)+1)}{d_{G'}(v)+1} & , \text{ if } v \in V' \cap N_G(u'), \text{ and} \\ 0 & , \text{ if } v \in N'. \end{cases}$$

By construction, $0 \leq \kappa'(u) \leq d_{G'}(u)$ for every vertex u of G' , and adding u' to a κ' -degenerate set of vertices of G' yields a κ -degenerate set of vertices of G . This implies the contradiction

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha(G, c, \kappa) &\geq \alpha(G', c', \kappa') + c(u') \\
&\stackrel{(4)}{\geq} f(G', c', \kappa') + c(u') \\
&\stackrel{(10)}{>} f(G', c', \kappa') + \frac{c(u')(\kappa(u') + 1)}{d_G(u') + 1} + \sum_{v \in N_G(u')} \frac{c(v)(\kappa(v) + 1)}{d_G(v) + 1} - \sum_{v \in N_G(u')} \frac{c(v)\kappa(v)}{d_G(v)} \\
&\geq f(G, c, \kappa),
\end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

which completes the proof of the claim.

Note that if the final inequality (12) in the above inequality chain holds with equality, then G contains no edges between N' and V' . In fact, if some vertex w in $V' \setminus N_G(u')$ has a neighbor in N' , then the contribution $\frac{c(v)(\kappa(v)+1)}{d_{G'}(v)+1}$ of v to $f(G', c', \kappa')$ is larger than its contribution $\frac{c(v)(\kappa(v)+1)}{d_G(v)+1}$ to $f(G, c, \kappa)$, and, if some vertex w in $V' \cap N_G(u')$ has a neighbor in N' , then the contribution $\frac{c(v)\kappa(v)}{d_{G'}(v)+1}$ of v to $f(G', c', \kappa')$ is larger than the subtracted term $\frac{c(v)\kappa(v)}{d_G(v)}$. \square

We say that a vertex u of G is *initial* if there is a κ -degenerate set I of c -weight $\alpha(G, c, \kappa)$ such that there is a linear ordering u_1, \dots, u_k of the vertices in I such that $u = u_1$, and u_i has at most $\kappa(u_i)$ neighbors in $\{u_j : j \in [i - 1]\}$ for every $i \in [k]$.

Claim 2. *Let u' be any vertex of G , and let N', V', G', c' , and κ' be as in (11).*

The vertex u' is initial, (G', c', κ') is extremal, and there are no edges between N' and V' .

Proof of Claim 2. Since adding u' to a κ' -degenerate set of vertices of G' yields a κ -degenerate set of vertices of G , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha(G, c, \kappa) &\geq \alpha(G', c', \kappa') + c(u') \\
&\stackrel{(4)}{\geq} f(G', c', \kappa') + c(u')
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\stackrel{\text{Claim 1}}{=} f(G', c', \kappa') + \frac{c(u')(\kappa(u') + 1)}{d_G(u') + 1} + \sum_{v \in N_G(u')} \frac{c(v)(\kappa(v) + 1)}{d_G(v) + 1} - \sum_{v \in N_G(u')} \frac{c(v)\kappa(v)}{d_G(v)} \\ &\geq f(G, c, \kappa). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\alpha(G, c, \kappa) = f(G, c, \kappa)$, equality holds throughout this inequality chain. Since $\alpha(G, c, \kappa) = \alpha(G', c', \kappa') + c(u')$, it follows that u' is initial. Since $\alpha(G', c', \kappa') = f(G', c', \kappa')$, it follows that (G', c', κ') is extremal. As noted at the end of the proof of Claim 1, equality in the last inequality of the above inequality chain implies that there are no edges between N' and V' . \square

Claim 3. *If G is connected, then there is some $f_0 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ with*

$$f_0 = \frac{c(u)(d_G(u) - \kappa(u))}{d_G(u)(d_G(u) + 1)} \quad (13)$$

for every vertex u of G .

Proof of Claim 3. If $h(u)$ denotes the right hand side of (13), then Claim 1 implies that $h(u) = \frac{1}{d_G(u)} \sum_{v \in N_G(u)} h(v)$ for every vertex u of G , that is, the h -value of every vertex equals the average h -value of its neighbors. Since G is connected, it follows that h is constant within $V(G)$. \square

We have shown Claims 1, 2, and 3 for every extremal triple (G, c, κ) . For the rest of the proof, we proceed by contradiction, and assume that the extremal triple (G, c, κ) is a counterexample to the statement of the theorem such that the order n of G is minimum. Trivially, we have $n \geq 2$. If $f_0 = 0$, then $c(u) > 0$ implies $\kappa(u) = d_G(u)$ for every vertex u of G , that is, (i) holds. By the choice of (G, c, κ) , we obtain $f_0 > 0$, which implies $\kappa(u) < d_G(u)$ for every vertex u of G . If $n = 2$, then this implies $\kappa(u) = 0$ for every vertex u of G , which, by (13), implies that c is constant, that is, (ii) holds. Hence, the choice of (G, c, κ) implies $n \geq 3$.

Claim 4. *G is a clique.*

Proof of Claim 4. Suppose, for a contradiction, that G is not a clique. This implies that G has a vertex u' such that $G - u'$ is connected, and u' is not universal, that is, $N_G(u') \neq V(G) \setminus \{u'\}$. Let N', V', G', c' , and κ' be as in (11). Since u' is not universal, and $N' \subseteq N_G(u')$, the set $V' \setminus N_G(u')$ contains a vertex v' , in particular, the set V' is not empty. Since G and $G - u'$ are connected, and, by Claim 2, there are no edges between N' and V' , we obtain that the set N' is empty, the graph G' equals $G - u'$, which is connected, and the set $V' \cap N_G(u')$ contains a vertex w' . By Claim 2, the triple (G', c', κ') is extremal, which, by Claim 3, implies the existence of some $f'_0 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ with

$$f'_0 = \frac{c(u')(d_{G'}(u') - \kappa'(u'))}{d_{G'}(u')(d_{G'}(u') + 1)} \quad (14)$$

for every vertex u of G' . Using the definition of G' and c' , we obtain the contradiction

$$\begin{aligned} f_0 - f'_0 &\stackrel{(13),(14)}{=} \frac{c(w')(d_G(w') - \kappa(w'))}{d_G(w')(d_G(w') + 1)} - \frac{c'(w')(d_{G'}(w') - \kappa'(w'))}{d_{G'}(w')(d_{G'}(w') + 1)} \\ &= \frac{c(w')(d_G(w') - \kappa(w'))}{d_G(w')(d_G(w') + 1)} - \frac{c(w')((d_G(w') - 1) - (\kappa(w') - 1))}{(d_G(w') - 1)d_G(w')} < 0 \text{ and} \\ f_0 - f'_0 &\stackrel{(13),(14)}{=} \frac{c(v')(d_G(v') - \kappa(v'))}{d_G(v')(d_G(v') + 1)} - \frac{c'(v')(d_{G'}(v') - \kappa'(v'))}{d_{G'}(v')(d_{G'}(v') + 1)} = 0, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of the claim. \square

We are now in a position to derive a final contradiction. Let u' be any vertex of G , and let N', V', G', c' , and κ' be as in (11). By Claim 2, there are no edges between N' and V' , which, by Claim 4, implies that either N' or V' is empty. If V' is empty, then κ is constant on $V(G) \setminus \{u'\}$. If N' is empty,

then $\kappa(u) < d_G(u)$ for every vertex u of G implies that $\kappa'(u) < d_{G'}(u)$ for every vertex u of G' . Since (G', c', κ') is extremal, the choice of (G, c, κ) implies that κ' is constant on V' . Since u' is adjacent to all vertices in V' , the definition of κ' implies that κ is constant on $V(G) \setminus \{u'\}$. Altogether, we obtain that κ is constant on $V(G) \setminus \{u'\}$ for every vertex u' of G . Since G has at least 3 vertices, this actually implies that κ is constant on $V(G)$. By (13), and Claim 4, it follows that also c is constant on $V(G)$, that is, (ii) holds. This final contradiction completes the proof. \square

The statement and the proof of the following result is quite similar to the statement and the proof of Theorem 2. There are nevertheless several small yet subtle and important differences, which we will point out during the proof.

Theorem 3. *If G is a connected graph, and $c : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and $\kappa : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ are such that $0 \leq \kappa(u) \leq d_G(u)$ for every vertex u of G , then (8) holds with equality if and only if*

- (i) either $\kappa(u) = d_G(u)$ for every vertex u of G ,
- (ii) or c is constant on $V(G)$, and $\kappa(u) = 0$ for every vertex u of G ,
- (iii) or G is a clique, c and κ are constant on $V(G)$, and $0 < \kappa < d_G$.

Proof. Let $g(G, c, \kappa)$ denote the right hand side of (8). If (i) holds, then $\beta(G, c, \kappa) = 0 = g(G, c, \kappa)$. If (ii) holds, and c_0 is the value of c on $V(G)$, then (8) implies

$$\beta(G, c, \kappa) \leq g(G, c, \kappa) = \sum_{i=1}^n c(u_i) \cdot \frac{d_G(u_i)}{2} = c_0 \cdot m,$$

where m denotes the number of edges of G . Furthermore, if $\iota : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ is such that $V(G)$ is κ' -degenerate for $\kappa' = \kappa + \iota$, and u_1, \dots, u_n is a linear ordering of the vertices of G such that u_i has at most $\kappa'(u_i)$ neighbors in $\{u_j : j \in [i-1]\}$ for every $i \in [n]$, then $\kappa(u_i) = 0$ implies $\iota(u_i) \geq |N_G(u_i) \cap \{u_j : j \in [i-1]\}|$ for every $i \in [n]$, and, hence,

$$\sum_{i=1}^n c(u_i) \cdot \iota(u_i) \geq c_0 \sum_{i=1}^n |N_G(u_i) \cap \{u_j : j \in [i-1]\}| = c_0 \cdot m.$$

Altogether, we obtain $\beta(G, c, \kappa) = m = g(G, c, \kappa)$. Finally, if (iii) holds, G has order n , $c(u) = c_0$ and $\kappa(u) = \kappa_0$ for every vertex u of G , then $\beta(G, c, \kappa) = c_0(1 + 2 + \dots + (n-1 - \kappa_0)) = g(G, c, \kappa)$. Hence, if (i), (ii), or (iii) hold, then (8) holds with equality. We call a triple (G, c, κ) *extremal* if $\beta(G, c, \kappa) = g(G, c, \kappa)$. Now, let (G, c, κ) be extremal. Note that we do not yet assume that G is connected.

Claim 1. *For every vertex u of G ,*

$$\begin{aligned} c(u)(d_G(u) - \kappa(u)) &= \frac{c(u)(d_G(u) - \kappa(u))(d_G(u) - \kappa(u) + 1)}{2(d_G(u) + 1)} \\ &+ \sum_{v \in N_G(u)} \frac{c(v)(d_G(v) - \kappa(v))(d_G(v) - \kappa(v) + 1)}{2(d_G(v) + 1)} \\ &- \sum_{v \in N_G(u)} \frac{c(v)(d_G(v) - \kappa(v) - 1)(d_G(v) - \kappa(v))}{2d_G(v)}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Claim 1. Arguing as in the proof of Claim 1 in the proof of Theorem 2, we obtain that the sum of the differences of the left hand side and the right hand side of the expression in the statement of the claim equals 0. Hence, if the statement of the claim does not hold, then there is a vertex u' of G with

$$c(u')(d_G(u') - \kappa(u')) < \frac{c(u')(d_G(u') - \kappa(u'))(d_G(u') - \kappa(u') + 1)}{2(d_G(u') + 1)}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \sum_{v \in N_G(u')} \frac{c(v)(d_G(v) - \kappa(v))(d_G(v) - \kappa(v) + 1)}{2(d_G(v) + 1)} \\
& - \sum_{v \in N_G(u')} \frac{c(v)(d_G(v) - \kappa(v) - 1)(d_G(v) - \kappa(v))}{2d_G(v)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned}
N' &= \{v \in N_G(u') : \kappa(v) = d_G(v)\}, \\
V' &= V(G) \setminus \{u'\}, \\
G' &= G[V'], \\
c' &= c|_{V'}, \text{ and} \\
\kappa' &: V' \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} : v \mapsto \begin{cases} \kappa(v) - 1 & , \text{ if } v \in N', \text{ and} \\ \kappa(v) & , \text{ if } v \in V' \setminus N'. \end{cases}
\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

Note that, unlike in the proof of Theorem 2, the vertices in N' still belong to G' . By construction, $0 \leq \kappa'(u) \leq d_{G'}(u)$ for every vertex u of G' . This implies the contradiction

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta(G, c, \kappa) &\leq \beta(G', c', \kappa') + c(u')(d_G(u') - \kappa(u')) \\
&\stackrel{(8)}{\leq} g(G', c', \kappa') + c(u')(d_G(u') - \kappa(u')) \\
&\stackrel{(15)}{<} g(G', c', \kappa') + \frac{c(u')(d_G(u') - \kappa(u'))(d_G(u') - \kappa(u') + 1)}{2(d_G(u') + 1)} \\
&\quad + \sum_{v \in N_G(u')} \frac{c(v)(d_G(v) - \kappa(v))(d_G(v) - \kappa(v) + 1)}{2(d_G(v) + 1)} \\
&\quad - \sum_{v \in N_G(u')} \frac{c(v)(d_G(v) - \kappa(v) - 1)(d_G(v) - \kappa(v))}{2d_G(v)} \\
&= g(G, c, \kappa),
\end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of the claim.

Unlike in the proof of Theorem 2, the final equality within the above inequality chain always holds with equality. In fact,

- a vertex w in $V' \setminus N_G(u')$ contributes exactly the same to $g(G', c', \kappa')$ and $g(G, c, \kappa)$,
- a vertex v in $N_G(u') \setminus N'$ contributes $\frac{c(v)(d_G(v) - \kappa(v))(d_G(v) - \kappa(v) + 1)}{2(d_G(v) + 1)}$ to $g(G, c, \kappa)$ and $\frac{c(v)(d_G(v) - \kappa(v) - 1)(d_G(v) - \kappa(v))}{2d_G(v)}$ to $g(G', c', \kappa')$, and,
- a vertex v in N' contributes $0 = \frac{c(v)(d_G(v) - \kappa(v))(d_G(v) - \kappa(v) + 1)}{2(d_G(v) + 1)}$ to $g(G, c, \kappa)$ and $0 = \frac{c(v)(d_G(v) - \kappa(v) - 1)(d_G(v) - \kappa(v))}{2d_G(v)}$ to $g(G', c', \kappa')$.

□

We say that a vertex u of G is *terminal* if there is a function $\iota : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that

- $\iota(V(G)) = \beta(G, c, \kappa)$,
- $V(G)$ is $(\kappa + \iota)$ -degenerate, and
- $d_G(u) \leq \kappa(u) + \iota(u)$.

Note that $\kappa(u) \leq d_G(u)$ and the optimality of ι imply that $\iota(u) = d_G(u) - \kappa(u)$.

Claim 2. *Let u' be any vertex of G , and let N' , V' , G' , c' , and κ' be as in (16). The vertex u' is terminal, and (G', c', κ') is extremal.*

Proof of Claim 2. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta(G, c, \kappa) &\leq \beta(G', c', \kappa') + c(u')(d_G(u') - \kappa(u')) \\
&\stackrel{(8)}{\leq} g(G', c', \kappa') + c(u')(d_G(u') - \kappa(u')) \\
&\stackrel{\text{Claim 1}}{=} g(G', c', \kappa') + \frac{c(u')(d_G(u') - \kappa(u'))(d_G(u') - \kappa(u') + 1)}{2(d_G(u') + 1)} \\
&\quad + \sum_{v \in N_G(u')} \frac{c(v)(d_G(v) - \kappa(v))(d_G(v) - \kappa(v) + 1)}{2(d_G(v) + 1)} \\
&\quad - \sum_{v \in N_G(u')} \frac{c(v)(d_G(v) - \kappa(v) - 1)(d_G(v) - \kappa(v))}{2d_G(v)} \\
&= g(G, c, \kappa),
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\beta(G, c, \kappa) = g(G, c, \kappa)$, equality holds throughout the above inequality chain. Since $\beta(G, c, \kappa) = \beta(G', c', \kappa') + c(u')(d_G(u') - \kappa(u'))$, it follows that u' is terminal. Since $\beta(G', c', \kappa') = g(G', c', \kappa')$, it follows that (G', c', κ') is extremal. \square

Claim 3. *If G is connected, then there is some $g_0 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ with*

$$g_0 = \frac{c(u)(d_G(u) - \kappa(u))(d_G(u) + \kappa(u) + 1)}{2d_G(u)(d_G(u) + 1)} \quad (17)$$

for every vertex u of G .

Proof of Claim 3. If $h(u)$ denotes the right hand side of (17), then Claim 1 implies that $h(u) = \frac{1}{d_G(u)} \sum_{v \in N_G(u)} h(v)$ for every vertex u of G , that is, the h -value of every vertex equals the average h -value of its neighbors. Since G is connected, it follows that h is constant within $V(G)$. \square

We have shown Claims 1, 2, and 3 for every extremal triple (G, c, κ) . For the rest of the proof, we proceed by contradiction, and assume that the extremal triple (G, c, κ) is a counterexample to the statement of the theorem such that the order n of G is minimum. Trivially, we have $n \geq 2$. If $g_0 = 0$, then $c(u) > 0$ implies $\kappa(u) = d_G(u)$ for every vertex u of G , that is, (i) holds. By the choice of (G, c, κ) , we obtain $g_0 > 0$, which implies $\kappa(u) < d_G(u)$ for every vertex u of G . Unlike in the proof of Theorem 2, this implies that, for any vertex u' of G , and N' , V' , and κ' as in (16), we have $N' = \emptyset$ and $\kappa'(u) = \kappa(u)$ for every vertex u in V' . Furthermore, if $n = 2$, then this implies $\kappa(u) = 0$ for every vertex u of G , which, by (17), implies that c is constant, that is, (iii) holds. Hence, the choice of (G, c, κ) implies $n \geq 3$.

In order to complete the proof using a similar approach as in the proof of Theorem 2, we first need to handle the situation corresponding to (ii), which leads to the following additional claim.

Claim 4. *$\kappa(u) > 0$ for every vertex u of G .*

Proof of Claim 4. Suppose, for a contradiction, that $\kappa(x') = 0$ for some vertex x' of G . Let u' be a vertex of G such that u' is distinct from x' , and $G - u'$ is connected. Let N' , V' , G' , c' , and κ' be as in (16). By Claim 2, the triple (G', c', κ') is extremal. Since G has at least 3 vertices, we obtain $d_{G'}(x') > 0$. Since $\kappa'(x') = 0$, the choice of (G, c, κ) implies that (G', c', κ') is as in (ii), that is, c' is constant on V' , and $\kappa'(u) = 0$ for every vertex u of G' . Let u'' be a vertex of G such that u'' is distinct from u' , and $G - u''$ is connected. Let N'' , V'' , G'' , c'' , and κ'' be defined analogously as in (16). Since G has at least 3 vertices, we have $\kappa''(x'') = 0$ for some vertex x'' of G'' . Arguing as above, we obtain that (G'', c'', κ'') is as in (ii), that is, c'' is constant on V'' , and $\kappa''(u) = 0$ for every vertex

u of G'' . Since $V(G) = V' \cup V''$, it follows that c is constant on $V(G)$, and $\kappa(u) = 0$ for every vertex u of G , that is, (ii) holds. This contradiction completes the proof of the claim. \square

Now, we can proceed similarly as in the proof of Theorem 2.

Claim 5. G is a clique.

Proof of Claim 5. Suppose, for a contradiction, that G is not a clique. This implies that G has a vertex u' such that $G' = G - u'$ is connected, and u' is not universal. Let N' , V' , G' , c' , and κ' be as in (16). Let v' be a non-neighbor of u' in V' . Since G is connected, the vertex u' has a neighbor w' in V' . By Claim 2, the triple (G', c', κ') is extremal, which, by Claim 3, implies the existence of some $g'_0 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ with

$$g'_0 = \frac{c(u)(d_{G'}(u) - \kappa(u))(d_{G'}(u) + \kappa(u) + 1)}{2d_{G'}(u)(d_{G'}(u) + 1)} \quad (18)$$

for every vertex u of G' . Now, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} g_0 - g'_0 &\stackrel{(17),(18)}{=} \frac{c(w')(d_G(w') - \kappa(w'))(d_G(w') + \kappa(w') + 1)}{2d_G(w')(d_G(w') + 1)} \\ &\quad - \frac{c(w')((d_G(w') - 1) - \kappa(w'))((d_G(w') + 1) + \kappa(w') + 1)}{2(d_G(w') - 1)d_G(w')} \\ &= \frac{c(w')\kappa(w')(\kappa(w') + 1)}{d_G(w')(d_G(w')^2 - 1)} \\ &\stackrel{\text{Claim 4}}{>} 0, \text{ and} \\ g_0 - g'_0 &\stackrel{(17),(18)}{=} \frac{c(v')(d_G(v') - \kappa(v'))(d_G(v') + \kappa(v') + 1)}{2d_G(v')(d_G(v') + 1)} \\ &\quad - \frac{c(v')(d_G(v') - \kappa(v'))(d_G(v') + \kappa(v') + 1)}{2d_G(v')(d_G(v') + 1)} \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

This contradiction completes the proof of the claim.

Note that we needed $\kappa(w') > 0$, that is, Claim 4, for that contradiction. \square

We are now in a position to derive a final contradiction. Let u' be any vertex of G , and let N' , V' , G' , c' , and κ' be as in (16). By Claims 2 and 5, G' is complete and (G', c', κ') is extremal. By the choice of (G, c, κ) , this implies that κ' is constant on V' ; regardless which of (i), (ii), or (iii) applies. By the definition of κ' , this implies that κ is constant on $V(G) \setminus \{u'\}$. Since u' was an arbitrary vertex of G , and G has at least 3 vertices, this implies that κ is constant on $V(G)$. Since $g_0 > 0$, Claim 3 implies that c is constant on $V(G)$, that is, (ii) holds. This final contradiction completes the proof. \square

3 Conclusion

There are versions of (4) and (8) that apply to functions c and κ , where c is allowed to assume values that are less or equal to 0, and κ is allowed to assume negative values. It seems not too difficult — yet slightly tedious — to extend Theorems 2 and 3 in order to incorporate these cases. In view of the extremal graphs, there are several natural additional assumptions that one may impose on G in order to improve (4) and (8). In view of similar research for the independence number, one may consider connectivity [8], triangle-freeness [11], or local irregularity [10] (cf. [7] for a corrected proof).

References

- [1] E. Ackerman, O. Ben-Zwi, and G. Wolfowitz, Combinatorial model and bounds for target set selection, *Theoretical Computer Science* 411 (2010) 4017-4022.
- [2] N. Alon, J. Kahn, and P. Seymour, Large induced degenerate subgraphs, *Graphs and Combinatorics* 3 (1987) 203-211.
- [3] N. Alon and J. Spencer, *The Probabilistic Method*, John Wiley and Sons, 2008.
- [4] G. Cordasco, L. Gargano, A.A. Rescigno, and U. Vaccaro, Optimizing Spread of Influence in Social Networks via Partial Incentives, *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* 9439 (2015) 119-134.
- [5] Y. Caro, New results on the independence number, Technical Report, Tel-Aviv University, 1979.
- [6] N. Chen, On the approximability of influence in social networks, *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics* 23 (2009) 1400-1415.
- [7] J. Harant and S. Mohr, On Selkow's Bound on the Independence Number of Graphs, arXiv:1705.03779
- [8] J. Harant and D. Rautenbach, Independence in Connected Graphs, *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 159 (2011) 79-86.
- [9] D. Reichman, New bounds for contagious sets, *Discrete Mathematics* 312 (2012) 1812-1814.
- [10] S.M. Selkow, A probabilistic lower bound on the independence number of graphs, *Discrete Mathematics*, 132 (1994) 363-365.
- [11] J.B. Shearer, A note on the independence number of triangle-free graphs. II, *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B* 53 (1991) 300-307.
- [12] V.K. Wei, A lower bound on the stability number of a simple graph, Technical memorandum, TM 81 - 11217 - 9, Bell laboratories, 1981.