

New Invariants for Partitioning a Graph into 2-connected Subgraphs

Michitaka Furuya*, Masaki Kashima†, Katsuhiro Ota‡

March 14, 2024

Abstract

Let G be a graph of order n . For an integer $k \geq 2$, a partition \mathcal{P} of $V(G)$ is called a k -proper partition of G if every $P \in \mathcal{P}$ induces a k -connected subgraph of G . This concept was introduced by Ferrara et al. [5], and Borozan et al. gave minimum degree conditions for the existence of a k -proper partition. In particular, when $k = 2$, they proved that if $\delta(G) \geq \sqrt{n}$, then G has a 2-proper partition \mathcal{P} with $|\mathcal{P}| \leq \frac{n-1}{\delta(G)}$. Later, Chen et al. [2] extended the result by giving a minimum degree sum condition for the existence of a 2-proper partition. In this paper, we introduce two new invariants of graphs $\sigma^*(G)$ and $\alpha^*(G)$, which are defined from degree sum of particular independent sets. Our result is that if $\sigma^*(G) \geq n$, then with some exceptions, G has a 2-proper partition \mathcal{P} with $|\mathcal{P}| \leq \alpha^*(G)$. We completely determine exceptional graphs. This result implies both of results by Borozan et al. [1] and by Chen et al. [2]. Moreover, we obtain a minimum degree product condition for the existence of a 2-proper partition as a corollary of our result.

Keywords 2-proper partition, degree sum, degree product, block-cut-vertex graph

1 Introduction

Throughout the paper, we only consider simple and finite graphs. For a graph G , $|G|$ denotes the order of G . For a graph G and a vertex $u \in V(G)$, $d_G(u)$ denotes the degree of u and $N_G(u)$ denotes the neighborhood of u . In addition, we use $N_G[u] = N_G(u) \cup \{u\}$ as the closed neighborhood of u . For a positive integer k , $[k]$ denotes the set of positive integers at most k . For a positive integer n , K_n denotes the complete graph of order n , and $K_{n,n}$ denotes the complete bipartite graph with two parts of size n . For the notation and terminology not defined in this paper, we refer the readers to Diestel [3].

1.1 Degree, degree sum and degree product

For a graph G , $\delta(G)$ denotes the minimum degree of G . When the minimum degree of G is large, G has many edges and is expected to contain many structures (such as Hamiltonian cycle). Thus there are

*College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, Kitasato University, 1-15-1 Kitasato, Minami-ku, Sagamihara 252-0373, Japan. e-mail: michitaka.furuya@gmail.com.

†School of Fundamental Science and Technology, Graduate School of Science and Technology, Keio University, 3-14-1 Hiyoshi, Kohoku-ku, Yokohama 223-8522, Japan. email: masaki.kashima10@gmail.com

‡Department of Mathematics, Keio University, 3-14-1 Hiyoshi, Kohoku-ku, Yokohama 223-8522, Japan. email: ohta@math.keio.ac.jp

many results which give a lower bound of the minimum degree for graphs to have a particular structure. One classical extended concepts of the minimum degree is the *minimum degree sum*, which is defined by $\sigma_2(G) = \min\{d_G(u) + d_G(v) \mid u, v \in V(G), u \neq v, uv \notin E(G)\}$. When a graph G is complete, we define $\sigma_2(G) = +\infty$. If a graph G satisfies $\delta(G) \geq a$, then it follows easily that $\sigma_2(G) \geq 2a$, so the minimum degree sum is a natural extension of the minimum degree. Recently, Furuya and Tsuchiya [6] introduced another extension of the minimum degree, the *minimum degree product*. The minimum degree product of a graph G is defined by $\pi_2(G) = \min\{d_G(u)d_G(v) \mid u, v \in V(G), u \neq v, uv \notin E(G)\}$. Again, we define $\pi_2(G) = +\infty$ when G is complete. By definitions, if a graph G satisfies $\delta(G) \geq a$, then G satisfies $\pi_2(G) \geq a^2$. This invariant is a natural extension of the minimum degree as well, but to our knowledge, there is no other result with minimum degree product condition than one by Furuya and Tsuchiya [6]. One reason for that is the following relation between the minimum degree sum and the minimum degree product; if $\pi_2(G) \geq a^2$, then $\sigma_2(G) \geq 2a$, which can be easily shown by the inequality of geometric and arithmetic means. For example, as an extension of Dirac's theorem [4] on hamiltonicity, we can show that if a graph G of order n satisfies $\pi_2(G) \geq \frac{n^2}{4}$, then G is hamiltonian. However, this is an easy corollary of Ore's theorem [8]. Hence, minimum degree product conditions should be considered only when there is a gap between the minimum degree sum condition and the double of the minimum degree condition for the problem. In this paper, we show that the minimum degree product condition works well for a problem of vertex partition. Also, we introduce a new invariant of graphs which is a further extension of the minimum degree product.

1.2 Partitioning a graph into highly connected subgraphs

For a positive integer k and a graph G , we say G is *k-connected* if $|G| > k$ and $G - S$ is connected for any $S \subseteq V(G)$ with $|S| < k$. Mader [7] proved that if G satisfies $|E(G)|/|G| \geq 2k$, then G has a k -connected subgraph. Motivated from this result, Ferrara et al. [5] introduced the concept of *k-proper partition*. (The name “ k -proper partition” was introduced later by Borozan et al. [1].) Let G be a graph and \mathcal{P} be a partition of $V(G)$. For an integer k at least 2, we say \mathcal{P} is a *k-proper partition* of G if every $P \in \mathcal{P}$ induces a k -connected subgraph of G . Ferrara et al. [5] showed the following result which gives a minimum degree condition for the existence of a k -proper partition.

Theorem 1 ([5]). Let G be a graph of order n , and k be an integer at least 2. If $\delta(G) \geq 2k\sqrt{n}$, then G has a k -proper partition \mathcal{P} with $|\mathcal{P}| \leq \frac{2kn}{\delta(G)}$.

Later, this minimum degree condition was improved by Borozan et al. [1], who proved the following theorem.

Theorem 2 ([1]). Let G be a graph of order n , and k be an integer at least 2. If $\delta(G) \geq \sqrt{c(k-1)n}$, then G has a k -proper partition \mathcal{P} with $|\mathcal{P}| \leq \frac{cn}{\delta(G)}$, where $c = \frac{2123}{180}$.

Their proof of Theorem 2 uses a known result of the edge density for a graph to have a k -connected subgraph. They conjectured that the constant c in Theorem 2 can be reduced to 1.

Conjecture 3 ([1]). Let G be a graph of order n , and k be an integer at least 2. If $\delta(G) \geq \sqrt{(k-1)n}$, then G has a k -proper partition \mathcal{P} with $|\mathcal{P}| \leq \frac{n-k+1}{\delta(G)-k+2}$.

If Conjecture 3 has a positive answer, then both of the lower bound of the minimum degree and the upper bound of $|\mathcal{P}|$ are sharp. In addition, they verified Conjecture 3 for the case $k = 2$.

Theorem 4 ([1]). Let G be a graph of order n . If $\delta(G) \geq \sqrt{n}$, then G has a 2-proper partition \mathcal{P} with $|\mathcal{P}| \leq \frac{n-1}{\delta(G)}$.

Their proof of Theorem 4 gives a method of constructing a 2-proper partition from the block decomposition of G . This idea is used in other results (including ours) to construct a 2-proper partition. Chen et al. [2] extended Theorem 4 to the result with a minimum degree sum condition as follows.

Theorem 5 ([2]). Let G be a non-complete graph of order n with minimum degree δ . If either $\delta \geq \sqrt{n}$, or $1 \leq \delta \leq \sqrt{n} - 1$ and $\sigma_2(G) \geq \frac{n}{\delta} + \delta - 1$, then G has a 2-proper partition \mathcal{P} with $|\mathcal{P}| \leq \frac{2(n-1)}{\sigma_2(G)}$.

Chen et al. [2] did not assume the condition that G is non-complete. However, if G is complete, then $\sigma_2(G) = +\infty$, and so the upper bound of $|\mathcal{P}|$ is incorrect. Thus, to give a correct statement, we have added the condition. Note that Theorem 5 says nothing about a graph G with $\sqrt{|G|} - 1 < \delta(G) < \sqrt{|G|}$. In fact, there are infinitely many graphs G with the inequality (see the paragraph preceding Corollary 12 in Subsection 1.4). In addition, the assumption $\sigma_2(G) \geq \frac{n}{\delta} + \delta - 1$ is equivalent to the inequality $\delta(\sigma_2(G) - \delta) \geq n - \delta$, so it looks like an assumption on a kind of degree product. This observation and the fact that \sqrt{n} appears in the minimum degree condition in Theorem 4 lead us to the idea of considering minimum degree product conditions for the problem of 2-proper partition.

1.3 The minimum degree sum on large independent sets and the light independence number

To state our main result, we first introduce a new invariant $\sigma^*(G)$ as follows. For a graph G , let $\mathcal{I}(G)$ denote the family of independent sets of G . For each $I \in \mathcal{I}(G)$, let $\delta_G(I) = \min\{d_G(u) \mid u \in I\}$ and $w_G(I) = \sum_{u \in I} d_G(u)$. We say $I \in \mathcal{I}(G)$ is *large* if $|I| \geq \delta_G(I) + 1$. The *minimum degree sum on large independent sets* is defined by $\sigma^*(G) = \min\{w_G(I) \mid I \in \mathcal{I}(G), I \text{ is large}\}$. If there is no large independent set of G , then we define $\sigma^*(G) = +\infty$. Our main result, which we state in the next subsection, deals with the graphs with $\sigma^*(G) \geq |G|$. The next proposition describes the relations of the parameters $\sigma_2(G)$, $\pi_2(G)$ and $\sigma^*(G)$.

Proposition 6. Let G be a graph of order n with minimum degree δ . If $\delta \geq 1$ and $\sigma_2(G) \geq \frac{n}{\delta} + \delta - 1$, then $\pi_2(G) \geq n - \delta$. Furthermore, if $\pi_2(G) \geq n - \delta$, then $\sigma^*(G) \geq n$.

Proof. We first show the former statement. Suppose that $\delta \geq 1$ and $\sigma_2(G) \geq \frac{n}{\delta} + \delta - 1$. We may assume that $\pi_2(G) < +\infty$. Let u and v be non-adjacent vertices of G with $d_G(u)d_G(v) = \pi_2(G)$. We assume $d_G(u) \leq d_G(v)$ without loss of generality. If $d_G(u) \leq \frac{\sigma_2(G)}{2}$, then we have $\delta \leq d_G(u) \leq \frac{\sigma_2(G)}{2}$ and

$$d_G(u)d_G(v) \geq d_G(u)(\sigma_2(G) - d_G(u)) \geq \delta(\sigma_2(G) - \delta).$$

Otherwise,

$$d_G(u)d_G(v) > \left(\frac{\sigma_2(G)}{2}\right)^2 \geq \delta(\sigma_2(G) - \delta).$$

In either case, we have $\pi_2(G) = d_G(u)d_G(v) \geq \delta(\sigma_2(G) - \delta) \geq \delta\left(\frac{n}{\delta} - 1\right) = n - \delta$.

Next, we show the latter statement. Suppose that $\pi_2(G) \geq n - \delta$. We may assume that $\sigma^*(G) < +\infty$. Let I be a large independent set of G with $w_G(I) = \sigma^*(G)$, and let $u \in I$ be a vertex which

attains $\delta_G(I) = d_G(u)$. For the moment, suppose that $d_G(u) = 0$. Since $\sigma^*(G) \geq n > d_G(u)$, there exists a vertex $v \in I \setminus \{u\}$. Then $0 = d_G(u)d_G(v) \geq \pi_2(G) \geq n - \delta$, and so $\delta \geq n$, which is a contradiction. Thus $d_G(u) \geq 1$. As $d_G(u)d_G(v) \geq \pi_2(G) \geq n - \delta$ for each $v \in I \setminus \{u\}$, we have

$$\sigma^*(G) = w_G(I) = d_G(u) + \sum_{v \in I \setminus \{u\}} d_G(v) \geq d_G(u) + d_G(u) \frac{n - \delta}{d_G(u)} = d_G(u) + n - \delta \geq n,$$

as desired. \square

Next, we introduce another new invariant $\alpha^*(G)$. We say $I \in \mathcal{I}(G)$ is *light* if $w_G(I) \leq |G| - 1$. The *light independence number* of a graph G is defined by $\alpha^*(G) = \max\{|I| \mid I \in \mathcal{I}(G), I \text{ is light}\}$. For any graph G , we know that $\alpha^*(G) \geq 1$. By the definition, $\alpha^*(G)$ is at most the independence number $\alpha(G)$, and the gap $\alpha(G) - \alpha^*(G)$ can be arbitrarily large. For example, the complete bipartite graph $K_{n,n}$ satisfies $\alpha^*(K_{n,n}) = 1$ while $\alpha(K_{n,n}) = n$.

The next proposition gives a relation of $\alpha^*(G)$ and the number of parts of 2-proper partition \mathcal{P} in Theorem 5.

Proposition 7. For any non-complete graph G with $\delta(G) \geq 1$, $\alpha^*(G) \leq \frac{2(n-1)}{\sigma_2(G)}$.

Proof. Assume that G is non-complete and $\delta(G) \geq 1$. Since $\sigma_2(G) < 2(n-1)$, i.e., $\frac{2(n-1)}{\sigma_2(G)} > 1$, the statement holds when $\alpha^*(G) = 1$. Hence we assume $r := \alpha^*(G) \geq 2$. Let $I = \{u_0, u_1, \dots, u_{r-1}\}$ be a light independent set of G . Then we have

$$2(n-1) \geq 2w_G(I) = \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} (d_G(u_i) + d_G(u_{i+1})) \geq \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} \sigma_2(G) = r\sigma_2(G)$$

where $u_r = u_0$. Thus $\alpha^*(G) = r \leq \frac{2(n-1)}{\sigma_2(G)}$. \square

1.4 Main result

Using two invariants $\sigma^*(G)$ and $\alpha^*(G)$, we give a sufficient condition for the existence of a 2-proper partition with small number of parts.

Theorem 8. Let G be a graph of order n . If $\sigma^*(G) \geq n$, then either G has a 2-proper partition \mathcal{P} with $|\mathcal{P}| \leq \alpha^*(G)$, or G is isomorphic to a graph in $\{K_2, F_5\} \cup \mathcal{F}_{11} \cup \mathcal{F}_{12} \cup \mathcal{H}_n$, where the exceptional graphs are defined below.

We define exceptional graphs in Theorem 8 (Figures 1-4).

- A graph F_5 is defined by $V(F_5) = \{a\} \cup \{b_i \mid i \in [4]\}$ and $E(F_5) = \{ab_i \mid i \in [4]\} \cup \{b_1b_2, b_3, b_4\}$.
- Let F be a graph having the vertex set $V(F) = \{a, b_1, b_2\} \cup \{c_i \mid i \in [8]\}$ and the edge set $E(F) = \{ac_i \mid i \in [8]\} \cup \{b_1c_i \mid i \in [4]\} \cup \{b_2c_i \mid i \in [8] \setminus [4]\} \cup \{c_1c_2, c_3c_4, c_5c_6, c_7c_8\} \cup L$ where L is a subset of $\{ab_1, ab_2\}$. Let \mathcal{F}_{11} be the family of such graphs F . Note that \mathcal{F}_{11} consists of three graphs up to isomorphic.
- Let F be a graph having the vertex set $\{a, b_1, b_2\} \cup \{c_i \mid i \in [9]\}$ and the edge set $E(F) = \{ac_i \mid i \in [8]\} \cup \{b_1c_i \mid i \in [4]\} \cup \{b_2c_i \mid i \in [8] \setminus [4]\} \cup \{c_1c_2, c_3c_4, c_5c_6, c_7c_9, c_8c_9\} \cup L$ where L is a subset of $\{ab_1, ab_2, ac_9, b_2c_9\}$ with $L \cap \{ac_9, b_2c_9\} \neq \emptyset$. Let \mathcal{F}_{12} be the family of such graphs F . Note that \mathcal{F}_{12} consists of twelve graphs.




Figure 1: F_5

Figure 2: Graphs in \mathcal{F}_{11}

Figure 3: Graphs in \mathcal{F}_{12}

Figure 4: $H_{s,t}$

- Let s and t be two integers with $2 \leq s \leq t$. Let S_1 and S_2 be vertex disjoint complete graphs of order $s-1$ and $t-1$, respectively. Let $H_{s,t}$ be the graph obtained from S_1 and S_2 by adding four new vertices a, b, c_1 and c_2 and the edge set $\{ax, bx \mid x \in V(S_1) \cup V(S_2)\} \cup \{ab, ac_1, ac_2, c_1c_2\}$. Let $H_{s,t}^- = H_{s,t} - ab$. Note that $|H_{s,t}| = |H_{s,t}^-| = s + t + 2$. For an integer $n \geq 6$, let $\mathcal{H}_n = \{H_{s,t}, H_{s,t}^- \mid 2 \leq s \leq t, s + t + 2 = n\}$.

Now we give some remarks on Theorem 8.

Remark 9. The case $\sigma^*(G) = +\infty$ is allowed in Theorem 8.

Remark 10. If s and t are integers with $3 \leq s \leq t$ and $t \geq 4$, then both $H_{s,t}$ and $H_{s,t}^-$ have a 2-proper partition with 3 parts while $\alpha^*(H_{s,t}) = \alpha^*(H_{s,t}^-) = 2$. Other exceptional graphs have no 2-proper partition.

Using Propositions 6 and 7, we can show some corollaries to Theorem 8. For each even integer $n \geq 6$, we define \mathcal{H}_n^- by $\mathcal{H}_n^- = \{H_{s,s}, H_{s,s}^- \mid 2s + 2 = n\}$. Note that \mathcal{H}_n^- is a subset of \mathcal{H}_n . We obtain the minimum degree product condition for the existence of a 2-proper partition as a corollary of Theorem 8.

Corollary 11. Let G be a graph of order n with minimum degree δ . If $\pi_2(G) \geq n - \delta$, then either G has a 2-proper partition \mathcal{P} with $|\mathcal{P}| \leq \alpha^*(G)$, or $G \in \{K_2, F_5\} \cup \mathcal{F}_{11} \cup \mathcal{F}_{12} \cup \mathcal{H}_n^-$.

Proof. Let G be a graph of order n with the minimum degree δ . We assume that $\pi_2(G) \geq n - \delta$ and G is isomorphic to no graph in $\{K_2, F_5\} \cup \mathcal{F}_{11} \cup \mathcal{F}_{12} \cup \mathcal{H}_n^-$. If G is isomorphic to $H_{s,t}$ or $H_{s,t}^-$ for some integers s and t with $2 \leq s < t$, then we have $\delta = 2$ and $\pi_2(G) = 2s$, which implies $\pi_2(G) = 2s < s + t = n - 2 = n - \delta$, a contradiction. Hence G is isomorphic to no graph in $\{K_2, F_5\} \cup \mathcal{F}_{11} \cup \mathcal{F}_{12} \cup \mathcal{H}_n$. By Theorem 8 and Proposition 6, G has a 2-proper partition \mathcal{P} with $|\mathcal{P}| \leq \alpha^*(G)$. \square

For every even integer $n \geq 10$ and every $G \in \mathcal{H}_n^-$, we have $\frac{2(|G|-1)}{\sigma_2(G)} \geq 3$. This together with Remark 10 implies that if G is isomorphic to a graph in $\bigcup_{l \geq 5} \mathcal{H}_{2l}^-$, then there exists a 2-proper partition \mathcal{P} with $|\mathcal{P}| \leq \frac{2(n-1)}{\sigma_2(G)}$. Thus, by using Propositions 6, 7 and Corollary 11, we obtain the following result that is stronger than Theorem 5. (Note that if G is isomorphic to a graph in $\{F_5\} \cup \mathcal{F}_{11} \cup \mathcal{F}_{12} \cup \mathcal{H}_6^- \cup \mathcal{H}_8^-$, then $\sqrt{|G|} - 1 < \delta(G) < \sqrt{|G|}$.)

Corollary 12. Let G be a non-complete graph of order n with minimum degree $\delta \geq 1$. If $\sigma_2(G) \geq \frac{n}{\delta} + \delta - 1$, then either G has a 2-proper partition \mathcal{P} with $|\mathcal{P}| \leq \frac{2(n-1)}{\sigma_2(G)}$, or $G \in \{F_5\} \cup \mathcal{F}_{11} \cup \mathcal{F}_{12} \cup \mathcal{H}_6^- \cup \mathcal{H}_8^-$.

Now we introduce a relaxed concept of 2-proper partition as follows. Let G be a graph and $\mathcal{P} = \{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_r\}$ be a partition of $V(G)$. We say \mathcal{P} is an *almost 2-proper partition* of G if \mathcal{P} satisfies the following two conditions.

1. Either $G[V_1]$ is 2-connected, or $G[V_1]$ is isomorphic to K_2 .
2. For every $i \in \{2, 3, \dots, r\}$, $G[V_i]$ is 2-connected.

Every 2-proper partition of a graph G is an almost 2-proper partition of G as well. Furthermore, we can easily verify that all exceptional graphs G in Theorem 8 have also almost 2-proper partitions \mathcal{P} with $|\mathcal{P}| \leq \alpha^*(G)$. (Note that $H_{s,t}$ has an almost 2-proper partition $\{\{c_1, c_2\}, V(H_{s,t}) \setminus \{c_1, c_2\}\}$ for integers s and t with $2 \leq s \leq t$.) Thus we obtain the following result follows from Theorem 8.

Corollary 13. Let G be a graph of order n . If $\sigma^*(G) \geq n$, then G has an almost 2-proper partition \mathcal{P} with $|\mathcal{P}| \leq \alpha^*(G)$.

In Section 2, we give a proof of Theorem 8, and in Section 3, we give some graphs to show the sharpness of Theorem 8.

2 Proof of Theorem 8

2.1 Fundamental properties of σ^* and α^*

We can easily verify the following lemma for $\sigma^*(G)$. Note that the same property holds for the minimum degree, the minimum degree sum and the minimum degree product as well.

Lemma 14. Let G be a graph and G_1, G_2, \dots, G_k be the components of G . Then $\sigma^*(G) \leq \min\{\sigma^*(G_i) \mid i \in [k]\}$.

Proof. Fix $i \in [k]$ and we prove $\sigma^*(G) \leq \sigma^*(G_i)$. If $\sigma^*(G_i) = +\infty$, then we are done. Otherwise, let I be a large independent set of G_i with $w_{G_i}(I) = \sigma^*(G_i)$. Then I is an independent set of G as well, and I satisfies $|I| \geq \delta_{G_i}(I) + 1 = \delta_G(I) + 1$. Hence $\sigma^*(G) \leq w_G(I) = w_{G_i}(I) = \sigma^*(G_i)$. \square

For the light independence number $\alpha^*(G)$, we can easily verify the following useful properties.

Lemma 15. Let G be a graph, and G_1, G_2, \dots, G_k be the components of G . Then $\alpha^*(G) \geq \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha^*(G_i)$. As a result, if a graph G has k components, then $\alpha^*(G) \geq k$.

Proof. For each $i \in [k]$, let I_i be a light independent set of G_i with $|I_i| = \alpha^*(G_i)$. Then, $I = \bigcup_{i=1}^k I_i$ is an independent set of G with $w_G(I) = \sum_{i=1}^k w_{G_i}(I_i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^k (|G_i| - 1) \leq |G| - 1$. Hence $\alpha^*(G) \geq |I| = \sum_{i=1}^k |I_i| = \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha^*(G_i)$. \square

If $\alpha^*(G) \leq 1$, then either G is complete, or $d_G(u) + d_G(v) \geq |G|$ for every non-adjacent pair of vertices $u, v \in V(G)$, and hence G is hamiltonian by Ore's theorem [8]. Thus, the following lemma holds.

Lemma 16. Let G be a connected graph. If G has a cut-vertex, then $\alpha^*(G) \geq 2$.

2.2 Proof of Theorem 8

Let \mathcal{F} be the set of exceptional graphs in Theorem 8. Suppose that the statement is false. Let G be a counterexample with the minimum order and let $n = |G|$. If $n = 1$, i.e., $G \simeq K_1$, then $\sigma^*(G) = 0 < n$, which is a contradiction. Thus $n \geq 2$. If G has a vertex u with degree at most 1, then there is a vertex $v \in V(G) \setminus N_G(u)$ since $G \not\simeq K_2$. However $I = \{u, v\}$ is a large independent set of G and $\sigma^*(G) \leq w_G(I) = d_G(u) + d_G(v) \leq 1 + (n - 2) < n$, a contradiction. Thus the minimum degree of G is at least 2.

Claim 1. G is connected.

Proof. Suppose that G is disconnected and let G_1, \dots, G_k be the components of G . First we show that G_i is not isomorphic to any exceptional graph for each $i \in [k]$. Suppose that G_i is isomorphic to a graph in \mathcal{F} for some $i \in [k]$. As $\delta(G) \geq 2$, G_i is isomorphic to a graph in $\mathcal{F} \setminus \{K_2\}$. Then we can take an independent set I_i of G_i such that $|I_i| = \delta_{G_i}(I_i) = \delta_G(I_i)$ and $w_G(I_i) = w_{G_i}(I_i) \leq |G_i|$. Let $u \in V(G) \setminus V(G_i)$ and $I = I_i \cup \{u\}$. Then $|I| = |I_i| + 1 = \delta_G(I_i) + 1 \geq \delta_G(I) + 1$, and hence I is a large independent set of G . This forces $\sigma^*(G) \leq w_G(I) = w_G(I_i) + d_G(u) \leq |G_i| + (n - |G_i| - 1) = n - 1$, a contradiction. Hence G_i is not isomorphic to any graph in \mathcal{F} for each $i \in [k]$. Since $\sigma^*(G_i) \geq \sigma^*(G) \geq n > |G_i|$ by Lemma 14, G_i has a 2-proper partition \mathcal{P}_i with $|\mathcal{P}_i| \leq \alpha^*(G_i)$. Then $\mathcal{P} = \bigcup_{i=1}^k \mathcal{P}_i$ is a 2-proper partition of G . By Lemma 15, \mathcal{P} satisfies $|\mathcal{P}| = \sum_{i=1}^k |\mathcal{P}_i| \leq \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha^*(G_i) \leq \alpha^*(G)$, a contradiction. \square

When G is 2-connected, $\{V(G)\}$ is a desired 2-proper partition. Hence G has a cut-vertex. Let \mathcal{B} be the family of blocks of G , and let U be the set of cut-vertices of G . The *block-cut-vertex graph* T of G is defined by $V(T) = \mathcal{B} \cup U$ and $E(T) = \{Bu \mid B \in \mathcal{B}, u \in U, u \in V(B)\}$. By the definition of T , the graph T is a tree and every leaf of T belongs to \mathcal{B} . A block $B \in \mathcal{B}$ which corresponds to a leaf of T is an *end-block* of G . Since $\delta(G) \geq 2$, every end-block of G has at least 3 vertices.

Claim 2. Every end-block $B \in \mathcal{B}$ has at least 4 vertices.

Proof. Suppose that B is an end-block of G and $|B| = 3$. As $\delta(G) \geq 2$, we have $B \simeq K_3$. Write $V(B) = \{u_1, u_2, u_3\}$ where u_3 is a cut-vertex of G . If $G - V(B)$ is 2-connected, then $\mathcal{P} = \{V(B), V(G) \setminus V(B)\}$ is a 2-proper partition of G and $|\mathcal{P}| = 2 \leq \alpha^*(G)$ by Lemma 16, a contradiction. Hence $G - V(B)$ is not 2-connected. Since $G \not\simeq F_5$, we have $G - V(B) \not\simeq K_2$. Now we define two subsets S_1 and S_2 of $V(G) \setminus V(B)$ as follows. If $G - V(B)$ is disconnected, let S_1 be the vertex set of a component of $G - V(B)$ and let $S_2 = V(G) \setminus (V(B) \cup S_1)$; if $G - V(B)$ is connected, let x be a cut-vertex of $G - V(B)$, and let $S_1, S_2 \subseteq V(G) \setminus V(B)$ such that $G[S_1]$ and $G[S_2]$ are distinct components of $G - (V(B) \cup \{x\})$. Let $v_i \in S_i$ for $i \in [2]$, and define $I = \{u_1, v_1, v_2\}$. Then $|I| = 3 = d_G(u_1) + 1 \geq \delta_G(I) + 1$, and hence I is a large independent set of G . It follows that $w_G(I) \geq \sigma^*(G) \geq n$, and so $d_G(v_1) + d_G(v_2) = w_G(I) - 2 \geq n - 2$. Note that $|N_{G-V(B)}[v_1] \cap N_{G-V(B)}[v_2]| \leq 1$, and the equality holds if and only if $G - V(B)$ is connected and $v_1x, v_2x \in E(G)$. Furthermore, for each $i \in [2]$, $|N_{G-V(B)}[v_i]| \geq d_G(v_i)$ and the equality holds if and only if $v_iu_3 \in E(G)$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} n - 2 = |G - \{u_1, u_2\}| &\geq |N_{G-V(B)}[v_1] \cup N_{G-V(B)}[v_2] \cup \{u_3\}| \\ &= |N_{G-V(B)}[v_1]| + |N_{G-V(B)}[v_2]| - |N_{G-V(B)}[v_1] \cap N_{G-V(B)}[v_2]| + 1 \\ &\geq d_G(v_1) + d_G(v_2). \end{aligned}$$

This forces $d_G(v_1) + d_G(v_2) = n - 2$, and all equalities hold in the above inequalities. As we mentioned above, $G - V(B)$ is connected, $v_1x, v_1u_3, v_2x, v_2u_3 \in E(G)$. Since $|G - \{u_1, u_2\}| = |N_{G-V(B)}[v_1] \cup$

$N_{G-V(B)}[v_2] \cup \{u_3\}$, we have $V(G) = V(B) \cup S_1 \cup S_2 \cup \{x\}$ and $S_i \subseteq N_G[v_i]$ for each $i \in [2]$. Since $v_i \in S_i$ is arbitrary, we conclude that both $S_1 \cup \{x\}$ and $S_2 \cup \{x\}$ are cliques of G and $S_1 \cup S_2 \subseteq N_G(u_3)$. By the symmetry of S_1 and S_2 , we may assume that $|S_1| \leq |S_2|$. Let $s = |S_1| + 1$ and $t = |S_2| + 1$. Then G is isomorphic to either $H_{s,t}$ or $H_{s,t}^-$ according to $u_3x \in E(G)$ or not. In particular, G is isomorphic to a graph in \mathcal{H}_n , which is a contradiction. \square

For each $B \in \mathcal{B}$, let $X_B = V(B) \setminus U$.

Claim 3. Let $B \in \mathcal{B}$ with $X_B \neq \emptyset$. If there is a vertex $u \in V(B) \setminus X_B$ for which no block of $B - u$ contains X_B , then $G - V(B)$ is isomorphic to a graph in $\mathcal{F} \setminus \{K_2\}$.

Proof. Suppose that $X_B \neq \emptyset$ and no block of $B - u$ contains X_B for some $u \in V(B) \setminus X_B$. Then, there are distinct vertices $x_1, x_2 \in X_B$ such that $x_1x_2 \notin E(G)$ and $|N_{B-u}[x_1] \cap N_{B-u}[x_2]| \leq 1$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $d_G(x_1) \leq d_G(x_2)$. Considering these two vertices, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |B| &\geq |N_{B-u}[x_1] \cup N_{B-u}[x_2] \cup \{u\}| \geq |N_{B-u}[x_1]| + |N_{B-u}[x_2]| - 1 + 1 \\ &\geq d_G(x_1) + d_G(x_2) \geq 2d_G(x_1). \end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

Let $G' = G - V(B)$. Then $d_{G'}(v) \geq d_G(v) - 1$ for every $v \in V(G')$. We shall show that $\sigma^*(G') \geq |G'|$. Let $I' = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_t\}$ be any large independent set of G' . We may assume that $\delta_{G'}(I') = d_{G'}(u_1)$. Let $l = \min\{d_G(u_1), d_G(x_1)\}$. Since $t = |I'| \geq d_{G'}(u_1) + 1 \geq d_G(u_1) \geq l$, the set $I = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_l, x_1\}$ is well-defined. Since $|I| = l + 1 = \min\{d_G(u_1), d_G(x_1)\} + 1 \geq \delta_G(I) + 1$, I is a large independent set of G , and hence $w_G(I) \geq n$. Consequently, it follows from (2.1) that

$$\begin{aligned} w_{G'}(I') &= \sum_{i=1}^t d_{G'}(u_i) \geq \sum_{i=1}^l d_{G'}(u_i) \geq \sum_{i=1}^l (d_G(u_i) - 1) \geq w_G(I) - l - d_G(x_1) \\ &\geq w_G(I) - 2d_G(x_1) \\ &\geq n - |B| = |G'|, \end{aligned}$$

and we conclude that $\sigma^*(G') \geq |G'|$.

Suppose that G' is isomorphic to no graph in \mathcal{F} . Then G' has a 2-proper partition \mathcal{P}' with $|\mathcal{P}'| \leq \alpha^*(G')$. Since B is 2-connected, $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}' \cup \{V(B)\}$ is a 2-proper partition of G . We shall show that $|\mathcal{P}| \leq \alpha^*(G)$. Let $J' = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_r\}$ be a light independent set of G' with $r = \alpha^*(G')$. If $r \geq d_G(x_1)$, then $J_{x_1} := \{x_1, v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{d_G(x_1)}\}$ is a large independent set of G . Then by (2.1),

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^*(G) &\leq w_G(J_{x_1}) = d_G(x_1) + \sum_{i=1}^{d_G(x_1)} d_G(v_i) \leq d_G(x_1) + \sum_{i=1}^{d_G(x_1)} (d_{G'}(v_i) + 1) \\ &\leq d_G(x_1) + w_{G'}(J') + d_G(x_1) \\ &\leq |G'| - 1 + 2d_G(x_1) \leq n - 1, \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts the assumption of the theorem. Thus $r \leq d_G(x_1) - 1$. Let $J = J' \cup \{x_1\}$. Again by (2.1),

$$\begin{aligned} w_G(J) &= d_G(x_1) + \sum_{i=1}^r d_G(v_i) \leq d_G(x_1) + \sum_{i=1}^r (d_{G'}(v_i) + 1) = d_G(x_1) + w_{G'}(J') + r \\ &\leq |G'| - 1 + 2d_G(x_1) - 1 < n - 1, \end{aligned}$$

and in particular, J is a light independent set of G . Thus $\alpha^*(G) \geq |J| = r + 1 = \alpha^*(G') + 1$ and hence $|\mathcal{P}| = |\mathcal{P}'| + 1 \leq \alpha^*(G') + 1 \leq \alpha^*(G)$, which contradicts the fact that G is a counterexample of the theorem. Therefore, G' is isomorphic to a graph in \mathcal{F} . Moreover, Claim 2 implies that $G' \not\cong K_2$, and thus G' is isomorphic to a graph in $\mathcal{F} \setminus \{K_2\}$. \square

Claim 4. For every $B \in \mathcal{B}$ and every $u \in V(B) \setminus X_B$, X_B is contained in a block of $B - u$.

Proof. Let $B_1 \in \mathcal{B}$ and $u \in V(B_1) \setminus X_{B_1}$. Suppose that no block of $B_1 - u$ contains X_{B_1} , and let $B_1^- = B_1 - u$. By Claim 3, $G - V(B_1)$ is isomorphic to a graph in $\mathcal{F} \setminus \{K_2\}$. Since every graph in \mathcal{F} is connected, B_1 is an end-block of G , and so $X_{B_1} = V(B_1^-)$. This together with the assumption of the proof implies that B_1^- is not 2-connected. Now we prove the following subclaims.

Subclaim 4.1. If $G - V(B_1)$ is isomorphic to a graph in $\{F_5, H_{2,2}, H_{2,2}^-\}$, then u is adjacent to all vertices of $G - V(B_1)$ having degree 2.

Proof. We may assume that $G - V(B_1)$ belongs to $\mathcal{F} \setminus \{K_2\}$. (For example, if $G - V(B_1)$ is isomorphic to a graph in \mathcal{F}_{11} , then we may assume that $V(G - V(B_1)) = \{a_1, b_2, b_3, c_i \mid i \in [8]\}$.) Since B_1^- is not 2-connected, there is a vertex $v \in V(B_1^-)$ such that $d_G(v) \leq |B_1^-| - 2$.

Suppose that $G - V(B_1) \in \{F_5, H_{2,2}, H_{2,2}^-\}$. Then $|G - V(B_1)| \geq 5$. Suppose that there exists a vertex $x \in V(G) \setminus V(B_1)$ such that $d_{G-V(B_1)}(x) = 2$ and $xu \notin E(G)$. Then we can easily verify that there exists a vertex $y \in V(G) \setminus (V(B_1) \cup \{x\})$ such that $d_{G-V(B_1)}(y) = 2$ and $xy \notin E(G)$. Let $I = \{x, y, v\}$. Then I is a large independent set of G , and hence $\sigma^*(G) \leq w_G(I) = d_G(x) + d_G(y) + d_G(v) \leq 2 + 3 + (|B_1^-| - 2) \leq |G - V(B_1)| + |B_1^-| - 2 = n - 2$, which is a contradiction. Thus u is adjacent to all vertices of $G - V(B_1)$ having degree 2. \square

Subclaim 4.2. The graph $G - V(B_1^-)$ is a block of G .

Proof. We assume that $G - V(B_1)$ belongs to $\mathcal{F} \setminus \{K_2\}$, and let v be a vertex of B_1^- such that $d_G(v) \leq |B_1^-| - 2$. If $G - V(B_1) = F_5$, then it follows from Subclaim 4.1 that $G - V(B_1^-)$ is a block of G . Thus we may assume that $G - V(B_1) \in \mathcal{F} \setminus \{K_2, F_5\}$.

Case 1: $G - V(B_1) \in \mathcal{F}_{11} \cup \mathcal{F}_{12}$.

Suppose that $c_i u \notin E(G)$ for some $i \in [8]$. Then there exist two distinct indices j and k with $j, k \in [8] \setminus \{i\}$ such that $\{c_i, c_j, c_k\}$ is an independent set of G (for example, if $i = 1$, then $j = 3, k = 5$ are desired indices). Let $I = \{c_i, c_j, c_k, v\}$. Since $|I| = 4 = d_G(c_i) + 1 \geq \delta_G(I) + 1$, I is a large independent set of G , and hence $\sigma^*(G) \leq w_G(I) = d_G(c_i) + d_G(c_j) + d_G(c_k) + d_G(v) \leq 3 + 4 + 4 + (|B_1^-| - 2) \leq |G - V(B_1)| + |B_1^-| - 2 = n - 2$, which is a contradiction. Thus $\{c_i \mid i \in [8]\} \subseteq N_G(u)$, which implies that $G - V(B_1^-)$ is a block of G .

Case 2: $G - V(B_1) \in \mathcal{H}_l$, where $l = n - |B_1^-|$.

Let s and t be integers such that $2 \leq s \leq t$, $l = s + t + 2$ and $G - V(B_1) \in \{H_{s,t}, H_{s,t}^-\}$. By the definition of $H_{s,t}$ and $H_{s,t}^-$, $V(G) \setminus V(B_1) = V(S_1) \cup V(S_2) \cup \{a, b, c_1, c_2\}$. Suppose that $c_i u \notin E(G)$ for some $i \in [2]$. Let $I = \{c_i, b, v\}$. Since $|I| = 3 = d_G(c_i) + 1 \geq \delta_G(I) + 1$, I is a large independent set of G , and hence $\sigma^*(G) \leq w_G(I) \leq 2 + (s + t) + (|B_1^-| - 2) = |G - V(B_1)| + |B_1^-| - 2 = n - 2$, which is a contradiction. Thus $\{c_1, c_2\} \subseteq N_G(u)$.

Suppose that $(V(S_1) \cup V(S_2)) \cap N_G(u) = \emptyset$. Let $I' = \{c_1, x_1, x_2, v\}$, where x_j is a vertex in $V(S_j)$ for each $j \in [2]$. Since $|I'| = 4 = d_G(c_1) + 1 \geq \delta_G(I') + 1$, I' is a large independent set of G , and hence $\sigma^*(G) \leq w_G(I') = d_G(c_1) + d_G(x_1) + d_G(x_2) + d_G(v) \leq 3 + s + t + (|B_1^-| - 2) = (|G - V(B_1)| + 1) + |B_1^-| - 2 =$

$n - 1$, which is a contradiction. Thus $(V(S_1) \cup V(S_2)) \cap N_G(u) \neq \emptyset$, which implies that $G - V(B_1^-)$ is a block of G . \square

Let $B_2 = G - V(B_1^-) \in \mathcal{B}$ and $B_2^- = B_2 - u (= G - V(B_1))$. Since B_2^- is isomorphic to a graph in $\mathcal{F} \setminus \{K_2\}$, B_2^- is not 2-connected. It follows from Subclaim 4.2 that B_2 is an end-block of G , and hence, $X_{B_2} = V(B_2) \setminus \{u\}$. This implies that no block of $B_2 - u$ contains X_{B_2} . Applying Claim 3 with $B = B_2$, we have $G - V(B_2) (= B_1^-)$ is isomorphic to a graph in $\mathcal{F} \setminus \{K_2\}$. In particular, the roles of B_1 and B_2 are symmetric. Furthermore, by exchanging the role of B_1 and B_2 , the following subclaim holds.

Subclaim 4.3. If $G - V(B_2) (= B_1^-)$ is isomorphic to a graph in $\{F_5, H_{2,2}, H_{2,2}^-\}$, then u is adjacent to all vertices of $G - V(B_2)$ having degree 2.

We may assume that $|B_1^-| \leq |B_2^-|$.

Subclaim 4.4. If B_1^- is isomorphic to F_5 , then B_2^- is isomorphic to a graph in $\mathcal{F} \setminus \{K_2, F_5, H_{2,2}, H_{2,2}^-\}$.

Proof. If B_1^- is isomorphic to F_5 and B_2^- is isomorphic to a graph in $\{F_5, H_{2,2}, H_{2,2}^-\}$, then by Subclaims 4.1 and 4.3, G is isomorphic to a graph in $\mathcal{F}_{11} \cup \mathcal{F}_{12}$, which is a contradiction. \square

Subclaim 4.5. If B_1^- is isomorphic to a graph in $\{H_{2,2}, H_{2,2}^-\}$, then B_2^- is isomorphic to a graph in $\mathcal{F} \setminus \{K_2, F_5, H_{2,2}, H_{2,2}^-\}$.

Proof. Assume that B_1^- is isomorphic to a graph in $\{H_{2,2}, H_{2,2}^-\}$. Since $6 = |B_1^-| \leq |B_2^-|$, $B_2^- \not\cong F_5$. Suppose that B_2^- is isomorphic to a graph in $\{H_{2,2}, H_{2,2}^-\}$. Then for $i \in [2]$, there exist two non-adjacent vertices $x_1^{(i)}$ and $x_2^{(i)}$ of B_i^- with $d_{B_i^-}(x_1^{(i)}) = d_{B_i^-}(x_2^{(i)}) = 2$. Let $I = \{x_j^{(i)} \mid i \in [2], j \in [2]\}$. Note that $d_G(x_j^{(i)}) \leq d_{B_i^-}(x_j^{(i)}) + 1 = 3$. Then I is a large independent set of G , and hence $\sigma^*(G) \leq w_G(I) = \sum_{i \in [2], j \in [2]} d_G(x_j^{(i)}) \leq 4 \cdot 3 < 13 = n$, which is a contradiction. \square

Since $|B_1^-| \leq |B_2^-|$, it follows from Subclaims 4.4 and 4.5 that B_2^- is isomorphic to a graph in $\mathcal{F} \setminus \{K_2, F_5, H_{2,2}, H_{2,2}^-\}$. Now we define an independent set I_2 of B_2^- as follows. If B_2^- is isomorphic to a graph in $\mathcal{F}_{11} \cup \mathcal{F}_{12}$, let I_2 be the set of vertices of B_2^- corresponding to c_1 and c_3 ; if B_2^- is isomorphic to a graph in $\{H_{s,t}, H_{s,t}^-\}$ for some s and t with $2 \leq s \leq t$, let I_2 be the set of vertices of B_2^- corresponding to c_1 and a vertex in $V(S_1)$. In the former case, we have $w_{B_2^-}(I_2) = 6 < |B_2^-| - 3$; in the latter case, since $t \geq 3$, $w_{B_2^-}(I_2) = s + 2 \leq s + t - 1 = |B_2^-| - 3$. In either case, we obtain $w_{B_2^-}(I_2) \leq |B_2^-| - 3$.

Next we define the independent set I_1 of B_1^- as follows. If $B_1^- \cong F_5$, let I_1 be the set of vertices corresponding to b_1 and b_3 ; if B_1^- is isomorphic to a graph in $\mathcal{F}_{11} \cup \mathcal{F}_{12}$, let I_1 be the vertices corresponding to c_1, c_3 and c_5 ; if B_1^- is isomorphic to a graph in $\{H_{s,t}, H_{s,t}^-\}$ for some s and t with $2 \leq s \leq t$, let I_1 be the vertices corresponding to b and c_1 . Then we have $|I_1| = \delta_{B_1^-}(I_1)$ and $w_{B_1^-}(I_1) \leq |B_1^-| - |I_1| + 1$.

Let $\tilde{I} = I_1 \cup I_2$. Since $|\tilde{I}| = |I_1| + 2 \geq (\delta_{B_1^-}(I_1) + 1) + 1 \geq \delta_G(I_1) + 1 \geq \delta_G(\tilde{I}) + 1$, \tilde{I} is a large independent set of G , and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^*(G) &\leq w_G(\tilde{I}) = w_G(I_1) + w_G(I_2) \leq w_{B_1^-}(I_1) + |I_1| + w_{B_2^-}(I_2) + |I_2| \\ &\leq (|B_1^-| - |I_1| + 1) + |I_1| + (|B_2^-| - 3) + 2 = n - 1, \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. \square

Let $X = \bigcup_{B \in \mathcal{B}} X_B$.

Claim 5. For every $u \in V(G)$, $N_G(u) \cap X \neq \emptyset$. In particular, for every $B \in \mathcal{B}$, if $X_B \neq \emptyset$, then $|X_B| \geq 2$.

Proof. Let $u \in V(G)$. Suppose that $N_G(u) \cap X = \emptyset$. Write $N_G(u) = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_r\}$. For each $i \in [r]$, let D_i be a component of $G - v_i$ which does not contain u . Then

$$V(D_i) \cap V(D_j) = \emptyset \text{ for all } i, j \in [r] \text{ with } i \neq j \quad (2.2)$$

Let y_i be a vertex of D_i for each $i \in [r]$. Then we have $|D_i| \geq d_G(y_i)$. Let $I = \{u, y_1, y_2, \dots, y_r\}$. The condition (2.2) implies I is a large independent set of G , and hence $w_G(I) \geq n$. Again, by (2.2), we have

$$|G| \geq |N_G[u]| + \sum_{i=1}^r |D_i| \geq (d_G(u) + 1) + \sum_{i=1}^r d_G(y_i) = w_G(I) + 1 \geq n + 1,$$

which is a contradiction. \square

Fix an end-block B_0 of G . We regard the block-cut-vertex graph T of G as a rooted tree with the root B_0 . For each $B \in \mathcal{B} \setminus \{B_0\}$, let u_B be the parent of B in T . By Claim 4, for each $B \in \mathcal{B} \setminus \{B_0\}$ with $X_B \neq \emptyset$, there is a block A_B of $B - u_B$ that contains X_B .

Claim 6. Let $B \in \mathcal{B} \setminus \{B_0\}$ with $X_B \neq \emptyset$. If $u \in V(B) \setminus (V(A_B) \cup \{u_B\})$, then $N_G(u) \cap (X \setminus X_B) \neq \emptyset$.

Proof. Let B be a block in $\mathcal{B} \setminus \{B_0\}$ and let $u \in V(B) \setminus (V(A_B) \cup \{u_B\})$. Write $N_G(u) = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_r\}$. Suppose that $N_G(u) \cap (X \setminus X_B) = \emptyset$. By Claim 5, we have $N_G(u) \cap X_B \neq \emptyset$. Since $u \notin V(A_B)$ and $X_B \subseteq V(A_B)$, we have $|N_G(u) \cap X_B| = 1$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $v_r \in X_B$ and $v_i \notin X$ for all $i \in [r-1]$. By Claim 5, there is a vertex $x \in X_B \setminus \{v_r\}$. Since $u \notin V(A_B)$, we have

$$|N_G(u) \cap N_G(x)| \leq |\{u_B, v_r\}| = 2. \quad (2.3)$$

Fix $i \in [r-1]$. Let D_i be a component of $G - v_i$ which does not contain u . Since B is a block of G , $B - v_i$ is a connected graph containing u if $v_i \in V(B)$. This leads to $V(D_i) \cap V(B) = \emptyset$. Let $y_i \in V(D_i)$ be a vertex. Then we have

$$|D_i| \geq |N_G[y_i] \setminus \{v_i\}| \geq d_G(y_i). \quad (2.4)$$

Let $I = \{u, x, y_1, y_2, \dots, y_{r-1}\}$. Then I is a large independent set of G , and hence $w_G(I) \geq n$. Recall that $V(D_i) \cap V(B) = \emptyset$ for all $i \in [r-1]$. Hence by (2.3) and (2.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} n = |G| &\geq |N_G[u] \cup N_G[x]| + \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} |D_i| \geq |N_G[u]| + |N_G[x]| - 2 + \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} d_G(y_i) \\ &= d_G(u) + d_G(x) + \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} d_G(y_i) \\ &= w_G(I) \geq n. \end{aligned}$$

This together with (2.4) forces $y_i v_i \in E(G)$ and $V(D_i) = N_G[y_i] \setminus \{v_i\}$ for each $i \in [r-1]$. Since $y_i \in V(D_i)$ is arbitrary, $V(D_i) \cup \{v_i\}$ is a clique of G . Furthermore, $V(G)$ is the disjoint union of $V(B)$, $N_G(u) \setminus V(B)$ and $\bigcup_{i=1}^{r-1} V(D_i)$. For each $i \in [r-1]$, we define V_i as $V_i = V(D_i) \cup \{v_i\}$ if $v_i \notin V(B)$, and $V_i = V(D_i)$ otherwise. By Claim 2, $|V_i| \geq 3$ for each $i \in [r-1]$. In addition, since $w_G(I \setminus \{x\}) < w_G(I) = n$, $I \setminus \{x\}$ is a light independent set of G , and hence $\alpha^*(G) \geq |I \setminus \{x\}| = r$. Combining these, we obtain a 2-proper partition $\mathcal{P} := \{V(B), V_2, V_3, \dots, V_r\}$ of G with $|\mathcal{P}| = r \leq \alpha^*(G)$, a contradiction. \square

Claim 7. For every $B \in \mathcal{B} \setminus \{B_0\}$ with $X_B \neq \emptyset$, A_B has at least 3 vertices. In particular, A_B is 2-connected.

Proof. If $B \in \mathcal{B} \setminus \{B_0\}$ is an end-block of G , then $|A_B| = |B - u_B| \geq 3$ by Claims 2 and 4. Suppose that $B \in \mathcal{B} \setminus \{B_0\}$ is not an end-block, $X_B \neq \emptyset$ and $|A_B| \leq 2$. By Claim 5, we know that $V(A_B) = X_B$ and $|A_B| = 2$. Write $X_B = \{x_1, x_2\}$. Since A_B is a connected graph, we have $x_1 x_2 \in E(G)$. Since B is not an end-block of G , one of x_1 and x_2 , say x_1 , is adjacent to a vertex $v_1 \in V(B) \setminus (X_B \cup \{u_B\})$. Write $N_G(x_2) = \{x_1, v_2, v_3, \dots, v_r\}$ where $r = d_G(x_2)$. Since $v_1 \notin V(A_B)$, v_1 is not adjacent to x_2 . For each $i \in [r]$, let D_i be a component of $G - v_i$ which does not contain x_2 , and let $y_i \in V(D_i)$. Then we have $|D_i| \geq d_G(y_i)$. Since $V(D_i) \cap V(B) = \emptyset$ for every $i \in [r]$ and $V(D_i) \cap V(D_j) = \emptyset$ for all distinct $i, j \in [r]$, $I = \{x_2, y_1, y_2, \dots, y_r\}$ is a large independent set of G . Hence

$$|G| \geq |N_G[x_2]| + \sum_{i=1}^r |D_i| \geq (d_G(x_2) + 1) + \sum_{i=1}^r d_G(y_i) = w_G(I) + 1 \geq n + 1,$$

which is a contradiction. \square

For each $B \in \mathcal{B}$, let $G(B)$ be a subgraph of G induced by the vertices of B and its descendant blocks with respect to T . In addition, for each $B \in \mathcal{B}$, let $\mathcal{B}(B) = \{B' \in \mathcal{B} \mid B' \subseteq G(B)\}$ and let $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(B) = \{B' \in \mathcal{B}(B) \mid X_{B'} \neq \emptyset\}$.

Claim 8. Let $B \in \mathcal{B} \setminus \{B_0\}$. Then $G(B) - u_B$ has a 2-proper partition \mathcal{P}_B^- with $|\mathcal{P}_B^-| = |\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(B)|$. Furthermore, if $X_B \neq \emptyset$, then $G(B)$ has a 2-proper partition \mathcal{P}_B with $|\mathcal{P}_B| = |\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(B)|$.

Proof. The proof goes by induction on the height h of the block-cut-vertex graph of $G(B)$ with the root B . When $h = 0$, B is an end-block of G , so $G(B) = B$, $X_B = V(B) \setminus \{u_B\} \neq \emptyset$ and $|\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(B)| = 1$. By Claim 4, $\{X_B\}$ is a desired 2-proper partition of $G(B) - u_B$, and $\{V(B)\}$ is a desired 2-proper partition of $G(B)$. Hence we assume $h \geq 1$, i.e., B has a child in T . For each $x \in V(B) \setminus (X_B \cup \{u_B\})$, let $\mathcal{C}(x)$ be the family of blocks in $\mathcal{B} \setminus \{B\}$ containing x , and let $\mathcal{C}(B) = \bigcup_{x \in V(B) \setminus (X_B \cup \{u_B\})} \mathcal{C}(x)$.

By the induction hypothesis, the statements of the claim hold for every $B' \in \mathcal{C}(B)$. For each block $B' \in \mathcal{C}(B)$, let $\mathcal{P}_{B'}^-$ be a 2-proper partition of $G(B') - u_{B'}$ with $|\mathcal{P}_{B'}^-| = |\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(B')|$. In addition, for each block $B' \in \mathcal{C}(B)$ with $X_{B'} \neq \emptyset$, let $\mathcal{P}_{B'}$ be a 2-proper partition of $G(B')$ with $|\mathcal{P}_{B'}| = |\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(B')|$.

First we assume $X_B = \emptyset$. For each $x \in V(B) \setminus \{u_B\}$, there is a block $B_x \in \mathcal{C}(x)$ with $X_{B_x} \neq \emptyset$ by Claim 5. Then,

$$\mathcal{P}_B^- = \bigcup_{x \in V(B) \setminus \{u_B\}} \left(\mathcal{P}_{B_x} \cup \bigcup_{B' \in \mathcal{C}(x) \setminus \{B_x\}} \mathcal{P}_{B'}^- \right)$$

is a 2-proper partition of $G(B) - u_B$ with $|\mathcal{P}_B^-| = \sum_{B' \in \mathcal{C}(B)} |\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(B')| = |\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(B)|$.

Next we assume that $X_B \neq \emptyset$. Then B is 2-connected, and hence

$$\mathcal{P}_B = \{V(B)\} \cup \left(\bigcup_{B' \in \mathcal{C}(B)} \mathcal{P}_{B'}^- \right)$$

is a 2-proper partition of $G(B)$ with $|\mathcal{P}_B| = 1 + \sum_{B' \in \mathcal{C}(B)} |\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(B')| = |\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(B)|$, which proves the second statement of the claim. For each $x \in V(B) \setminus (V(A_B) \cup \{u_B\})$, there is a block $B_x \in \mathcal{C}(x)$ with $X_{B_x} \neq \emptyset$ by Claim 6. By Claim 7, A_B is 2-connected, and hence

$$\mathcal{P}_B^- = \{V(A_B)\} \cup \left(\bigcup_{x \in V(B) \setminus (V(A_B) \cup \{u_B\})} \mathcal{P}_{B_x} \right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{B' \in \mathcal{C}(B) \setminus \{B_x \mid x \in V(B) \setminus (V(A_B) \cup \{u_B\})\}} \mathcal{P}_{B'}^- \right)$$

is a 2-proper partition of $G(B) - u_B$ with $|\mathcal{P}_B^-| = 1 + \sum_{B' \in \mathcal{C}(B)} |\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(B')| = |\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(B)|$, which proves the first statement of the claim. \square

Claim 9. For every $B \in \mathcal{B}$, $|\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(B)| \leq \alpha^*(G(B))$.

Proof. Let $B \in \mathcal{B}$. For each $B' \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}(B)$, take a vertex $x_{B'} \in X_{B'}$. Let $I = \{x_{B'} \mid B' \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}(B)\}$. Then

$$w_{G(B)}(I) = \sum_{B' \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}(B)} d_G(x_{B'}) \leq \sum_{B' \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}(B)} (|B'| - 1) \leq \sum_{B' \in \mathcal{B}(B)} (|B'| - 1) = |G(B)| - 1.$$

This together with the definition of $X_{B'}$ implies that I is a light independent set of $G(B)$. Consequently, $\alpha^*(G(B)) \geq |I| = |\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(B)|$. \square

Recall that B_0 is an end-block of G . Let u_0 be the unique cut-vertex of G belonging to B_0 , and let \mathcal{B}_0 be the family of blocks in $\mathcal{B} \setminus \{B_0\}$ of G containing u_0 . For each $B \in \mathcal{B}_0$, let \mathcal{P}_B^- be as in Claim 8. Then $\mathcal{P}_0 := \{V(B_0)\} \cup (\bigcup_{B \in \mathcal{B}_0} \mathcal{P}_B^-)$ is a 2-proper partition of G . Since B_0 is an end-block of G , $X_{B_0} \neq \emptyset$. This together with Claim 9 leads to $|\mathcal{P}_0| = 1 + \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}_0} |\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(B)| = |\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(B_0)| \leq \alpha^*(G(B_0)) = \alpha^*(G)$, which is a contradiction. This completes the proof of Theorem 8.

3 Sharpness of Theorem 8

In this section, we construct graphs to show the sharpness of Theorem 8. For positive integers n and d with $d(d+1) + 1 < n$, let $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_d)$ be a tuple of integers such that $\sum_{i=1}^d t_i = n - 1$ and $\min\{t_i \mid i \in [d]\} \geq d + 1$. For each $i \in [d]$, let H_i be the complete graph of order t_i , and let v_i be a vertex of H_i . Take a new vertex u . Now we define two graphs $G_{\mathbf{t}}$ and $G'_{\mathbf{t}}$ as follows. A graph $G_{\mathbf{t}}$ is obtained from the disjoint union of H_1, H_2, \dots, H_d by adding u and edges uv_i for all $i \in [d]$. A graph $G'_{\mathbf{t}}$ is obtained from the disjoint union of H_1, H_2, \dots, H_d by adding u and all edges between u and $\bigcup_{i=1}^d V(H_i)$. By constructions, both $G_{\mathbf{t}}$ and $G'_{\mathbf{t}}$ have order n .

We show that $G_{\mathbf{t}}$ satisfies $\sigma^*(G_{\mathbf{t}}) = n - 1$ and has no 2-proper partition. Let I be any large independent set of $G_{\mathbf{t}}$. As $\delta(G_{\mathbf{t}}) = d$, I must have at least $d+1$ vertices, and thus $I = \{u, w_1, w_2, \dots, w_d\}$ where $w_i \in V(H_i) \setminus \{v_i\}$ for each $i \in [d]$. Thus we have $w_{G_{\mathbf{t}}}(I) = d_{G_{\mathbf{t}}}(u) + \sum_{i=1}^d d_{G_{\mathbf{t}}}(w_i) = d + \sum_{i=1}^d (t_i - 1) = n - 1$. Since I is arbitrary, it follows that $\sigma^*(G_{\mathbf{t}}) = n - 1$. Since no 2-connected subgraph of $G_{\mathbf{t}}$ contains u , $G_{\mathbf{t}}$ does not have a 2-proper partition. Hence $G_{\mathbf{t}}$ shows the sharpness of the lower bound of $\sigma^*(G)$ in Theorem 8.

Next, we show that $\sigma^*(G'_t) = +\infty$, $\alpha^*(G'_t) \leq d$ and every 2-proper partition of G'_t has at least d parts. Since $\delta(G'_t) \geq d$ and $\alpha(G'_t) = d$, we have $\sigma^*(G'_t) = +\infty$. We also have $\alpha^*(G'_t) \leq \alpha(G'_t) = d$. Let \mathcal{P} be a 2-proper partition of G'_t . For all distinct $i, j \in [d]$, $V(H_i)$ and $V(H_j)$ must be in distinct parts in \mathcal{P} . Thus \mathcal{P} has at least d parts. Hence G'_t shows the sharpness of the upper bound of $|\mathcal{P}|$ in Theorem 8.

Acknowledgement

This work was partially supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant number JP23K03204 (to M.F), JSPS KAKENHI Grant number JP22K03404 (to K.O), Keio University SPRING scholarship Grant number JPMJSP2123 (to M.K), and JST ERATO Grant Number JPMJER2301 (to M.K).

References

- [1] V. Borozan, M. Ferrara, S. Fujita, M. Furuya, Y. Manoussakis, Narayanan N, and D. Stolee, Partitioning a graph into a highly connected subgraphs, *J. Graph Theory* 82 (2016), no. 3, 322-333.
- [2] X. Chen, X. Guo, and X. Yang, 2-proper partition of a graph, *Graphs Combin.* 38 (2022), Paper No. 191, 11pp.
- [3] R. Diestel, Graph Theory. 5th ed., *Springer*, 2016.
- [4] G. A. Dirac, Some theorems on abstract graphs, *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc.* 2 (1952), 69-81.
- [5] M. Ferrara, C. Magnant, and P. Wenger, Condition for families of disjoint k -connected subgraphs in a graph, *Discrete Math.* 313 (2013), 760-764.
- [6] M. Furuya and S. Tsuchiya, New strategy on the existence of a spanning tree without small degree stems, arXiv:2303.03762.
- [7] W. Mader, Existenz n -fach zusammenhängender Teilgraphen in Graphen genügend grosser Kantendichte, *Abh. Math. Sem. Univ. Hamburg.* 37 (1972), 86-97.
- [8] O. Ore, Note of Hamilton circuits, *Amer. Math. Monthly* 67 (1960), 67.