

A 2-DISTANCE $(2\Delta + 7)$ -COLORING OF PLANAR GRAPHS

ZAKIR DENIZ

ABSTRACT. A vertex coloring of a graph G is called a 2-distance coloring if any two vertices at a distance at most 2 from each other receive different colors. Recently, Bousquet et al. (Discrete Mathematics, 346(4), 113288, 2023) proved that $2\Delta + 7$ colors are sufficient for the 2-distance coloring of planar graphs with maximum degree $\Delta \geq 9$. In this paper, we strengthen their result by removing the maximum degree constraint and show that all planar graphs admit a 2-distance $(2\Delta + 7)$ -coloring. This particularly improves the result of Van den Heuvel and McGuinness (Journal of Graph Theory, 42(2), 110-124, 2003).

1. INTRODUCTION

Among the numerous problems and concepts associated with graphs, coloring stands out as a fundamental and extensively studied topic. A vertex coloring of a graph involves assigning colors to its vertices to ensure that adjacent vertices have distinct colors. One particularly interesting variant of vertex coloring is 2-distance coloring, where any two vertices at a distance of two have distinct colors. Its motivation arises from the necessity in some real-life problems to assign different colors not only to adjacent vertices but also to those in close proximity [11, 14]. The concept of 2-distance coloring was first introduced in [9, 10], and it has received considerable attention due to the fact that certain problems, such as the Total Coloring Conjecture (see [4] for details), can be formulated as a 2-distance coloring of specific graphs. A comprehensive survey on 2-distance coloring and its related coloring concepts has been presented by Cranston [4].

The smallest number of colors for which graph G admits a 2-distance coloring is known as the 2-distance chromatic number $\chi_2(G)$ of G . In 1977, Wegner [17] proposed the following conjecture.

Conjecture 1.1. *For every planar graph G with maximum degree Δ , $\chi_2(G) \leq 7$ if $\Delta = 3$, $\chi_2(G) \leq \Delta + 5$ if $4 \leq \Delta \leq 7$, and $\chi_2(G) \leq \lfloor \frac{3\Delta}{2} \rfloor + 1$ if $\Delta \geq 8$.*

Wegner's Conjecture is one of the most popular problems in graph coloring, and it has remained open for many years, except for the case when $\Delta = 3$, which was solved by Thomassen [16] (independently by Hartke et al. [7]). For general planar graphs, Van den Heuvel and McGuinness [8] showed that $\chi_2(G) \leq 2\Delta + 25$, while the bound $\chi_2(G) \leq \lfloor \frac{5\Delta}{3} \rfloor + 78$ was proved by Molloy and Salavatipour [15]. On the other hand, some improved results are presented in [2, 3, 5, 6, 13] with a certain degree or girth restrictions. In particular, Bousquet et al. [1] recently showed that $\chi_2(G) \leq 2\Delta + 7$ if $\Delta \geq 9$, which significantly improves upon the work in [12].

In this paper, we strengthen the result of Bousquet et al. [1] by removing the maximum degree constraint and show that all planar graphs admit a 2-distance $(2\Delta + 7)$ -coloring, which particularly improves the best-known bound of $2\Delta + 25$ provided by Van den Heuvel and McGuinness [8].

Theorem 1.2. *For every planar graph G , we have $\chi_2(G) \leq 2\Delta + 7$.*

All graphs in this paper are assumed to be simple, and we refer to [18] for terminology and notation not defined here. When G is a graph, we use $V(G)$, $E(G)$, $F(G)$, and $\Delta(G)$ to denote the vertex, edge and face set, and the maximum degree of G , respectively. If there is no confusion in the context, we abbreviate $\Delta(G)$ to Δ . For a positive integer t , we denote by $[t]$ the set of integers between 1 and t . Given a planar graph G , we denote by $\ell(f)$ the length of a face f and by $d(v)$ the degree of a vertex v . A k -vertex is a vertex of degree k . A k^- -vertex is a vertex of degree at most k while a k^+ -vertex

Date: July 10, 2024.

Key words and phrases. Coloring, 2-distance coloring, girth, planar graph.

is a vertex of degree at least k . A k (k^- or k^+)-face is defined similarly. A vertex $u \in N(v)$ is called k -neighbour (resp. k^- -neighbour, k^+ -neighbour) of v if $d(u) = k$ (resp. $d(u) \leq k$, $d(u) \geq k$).

For a vertex $v \in V(G)$, we use $n_i(v)$ to denote the number of i -vertices adjacent to v . We denote by $d(u, v)$ the distance between u and v for a pair $u, v \in V(G)$. Also, we set $N_i(v) := \{u \in V(G) \mid 1 \leq d(u, v) \leq i\}$ for $i \geq 1$, so $N_1(v) = N(v)$ and let $d_2(v) = |N_2(v)|$. For $v \in V(G)$, we use $m_k(v)$ to denote the number of k -faces incident with v . A k -vertex v with $m_3(v) = d$ is called $k(d)$ -vertex. In particular, a k -vertex v is called $k(d^-)$ -vertex (resp. $k(d^+)$ -vertex) if $m_3(v) \leq d$ (resp. $m_3(v) \geq d$). Two faces f_1 and f_2 are said to be adjacent if they share a common edge.

2. THE PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

Let G be a minimal counterexample to Theorem 1.2 such that $|V(G)| + |E(G)|$ is minimum. Thus, G does not admit any 2-distance $(2\Delta + 7)$ -coloring, but any planar graph G' obtained from G with smaller $|V(G')| + |E(G')|$ admits a 2-distance $(2\Delta + 7)$ -coloring.

Clearly, G is a connected graph. Due to the results of Bousquet et al. [1] and Zou et al. [19] (also [5]), we only need to consider the case $6 \leq \Delta \leq 8$.

We call a graph H *proper* with respect to G if H is obtained from G by deleting some edges or vertices and adding some edges, ensuring that for every pair of vertices x_1 and x_2 in $V(G) \cap V(H)$ having distance at most 2 in G , they also have distance at most 2 in H . If f is a 2-distance coloring of such a graph H , then f can be extended to the whole graph G , provided that each of the remaining uncolored vertices has an available color.

For a given vertex v with $d(v) = k$, we assume that v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k are the neighbours of v in clockwise order throughout this section.

2.1. The case $\Delta = 6$.

Recall that G does not admit a 2-distance 19-coloring, but any planar graph G' obtained from G with a smaller $|V(G')| + |E(G')|$ admits a 2-distance 19-coloring.

Lemma 2.1. *We have $\delta(G) \geq 3$.*

Proof. If v is a vertex of degree at most 2, then $d_2(v) \leq 12$. Let G' be the graph obtained from $G - v$ by adding an edge between the vertices in $N(v)$. By minimality, the graph G' has a 2-distance coloring f with 19 colors. Notice that G' is proper with respect to G . Since $d_2(v) \leq 12$, we can color v with an available color, a contradiction. \square

Lemma 2.2. *Let v be a 3-vertex. Then $m_3(v) = 0$, $m_4(v) \leq 1$, and each neighbour of v is a $6(4^-)$ -vertex.*

Proof. Let v be a 3-vertex, and denote by v_1, v_2, v_3 the neighbours of v in clockwise order. Assume for a contradiction that v is incident to a 3-face, say $f_1 = v_1vv_2$. It is clear that $d_2(v) \leq 16$. If we set $G' = G - v + \{v_1v_3\}$, then G' would be proper with respect to G . By minimality, the graph G' has a 2-distance coloring with 19 colors. Since $d_2(v) \leq 16$, we can color v with an available color, a contradiction.

Suppose now that $m_4(v) \geq 2$, i.e., v is incident to two 4-faces, say $f_1 = v_1vv_2x$ and $f_2 = v_2vv_3y$. Clearly, we have $d_2(v) \leq 16$. If we set $G' = G - v + \{v_1v_3\}$, then G' would be proper with respect to G . Similarly as above, we get a contradiction.

Next we claim that each neighbour of v is a $6(4^-)$ -vertex. Note that v cannot have any $6(5^+)$ -neighbour since $m_3(v) = 0$. Moreover, v cannot have any 5^- -neighbour. Indeed, if v_1 is such a vertex, then we set $G' = G - v + \{v_1v_2, v_1v_3\}$. In such a case, $d_2(v) \leq 17$, and G' is proper with respect to G . Similarly as above, we get a contradiction. Thus, each neighbour of v is a $6(4^-)$ -vertex. \square

We now address some vertices having some special forms: If v is a $4(1)$ - or a $4(2)$ -vertex, then we call v as a *bad 4-vertex*. Similarly, if v is a $5(4)$ - or a $5(5)$ -vertex, then we call v as a *bad 5-vertex*.

Lemma 2.3. *If v is a 4-vertex, then $m_3(v) \leq 2$, and v has no $6(6)$ -neighbour.*

Proof. Let v be a 4-vertex, and denote by f_1, f_2, \dots, f_4 the faces incident to v . Assume for a contradiction that $m_3(v) \geq 3$. It follows that we have $f_i = v_i v v_{i+1}$ for $i \in [3]$. Clearly, $d_2(v) \leq 18$. If we set $G' = G - v + \{v_1 v_4\}$ (assuming $v_1 v_4 \notin E(G)$), then, by minimality, the graph G' has a 2-distance coloring with 19 colors. Observe that every vertex in $V(G)$, except v , is colored with the same color that appears on the same vertex in G' . Namely, G' is proper with respect to G . Since $d_2(v) \leq 18$, we assign v with an available color, a contradiction.

Suppose now that v has a 6(6)-neighbour. Without loss of generality, assume that v_2 is a 6(6)-vertex. In such a case, v must be incident to two adjacent 3-faces f_1, f_2 , say $f_1 = v_1 v v_2$ and $f_2 = v_2 v v_3$. Moreover, both $v_1 v_2$ and $v_2 v_3$ must be contained in two 3-faces. This implies that $d_2(v) \leq 18$. If we set $G' = G - v + \{v_2 v_4\}$, then G' would be proper with respect to G . By minimality, the graph G' has a 2-distance coloring with 19 colors. Since $d_2(v) \leq 18$, we assign v with an available color, a contradiction. \square

Lemma 2.4. *Let v be a 4(1)-vertex. If v has a 4-neighbour, then the other neighbours of v are different from 4- and 5(4)-vertices.*

Proof. Suppose that v has a 4-neighbour, say v_1 , and assume by contradiction that v has another neighbour consisting of 4- or 5(4)-vertices. In this case, we have $d_2(v) \leq 18$. If we set $G' = G - v + \{v_1 v_2, v_1 v_3, v_1 v_4\}$, then G' would be proper with respect to G . By minimality, the graph G' has a 2-distance coloring with 19 colors. Since $d_2(v) \leq 18$, we can color v with an available color, a contradiction. \square

Lemma 2.5. *Let v be a 4(1)-vertex. If $m_4(v) = r$ for $0 \leq r \leq 3$, then $n_6(v) \geq r + 1$.*

Proof. Let v be a 4(1)-vertex, and denote by f_1, f_2, \dots, f_4 the faces incident to v . Suppose that f_1 is a 3-face with $f_1 = v_1 v v_2$. Let $m_4(v) = r$ for $0 \leq r \leq 3$. Assume for a contradiction that $n_6(v) \leq r$. We then deduce that $d_2(v) \leq 18$, since v has $4 - r$ many 5^- -neighbours, and v is incident to r many 4-faces. This particularly implies that either v has two 5^- -neighbours or v is incident to three 4-faces.

If v has two 5^- -neighbours v_i, v_j such that $\{i, j\} \cap \{1, 2\} \neq \emptyset$, then we set $G' = G - v + \{v_k v_3, v_k v_4\}$ for $k \in \{i, j\} \cap \{1, 2\}$. If v has two 5^- -neighbours v_i, v_j with $i < j$ such that $\{i, j\} \cap \{1, 2\} = \emptyset$, then we set $G' = G - v + \{v_i v_j, v_i v_2, v_j v_1\}$. If v is incident to exactly three 4-faces, then we set $G' = G - v + \{v_2 v_3, v_1 v_4\}$. In each case, we observe that G' is proper with respect to G . By minimality, the graph G' has a 2-distance coloring with 19 colors. Since $d_2(v) \leq 18$, we can color v with an available color, a contradiction. \square

Lemma 2.6. *Let v be a 4(2)-vertex. Then $m_4(v) \leq 1$. In particular, if $m_4(v) = r$ for $0 \leq r \leq 1$, then $n_6(v) \geq r + 3$.*

Proof. Let v be a 4(2)-vertex, and denote by f_1, f_2, \dots, f_4 the faces incident to v . Suppose that f_1 and f_2 are 3-faces such that $f_1 = v_i v v_{i+1}$ and $f_2 = v_j v v_{j+1}$ with $i < j$ and $i, j \in [4]$ in a cyclic fashion. Assume for a contradiction that v is incident to two 4-faces. In this case, we have $d_2(v) \leq 18$. If f_1, f_2 are adjacent, then we set $G' = G - v + \{v_j v_k\}$ for $k \in N(v) \setminus \{v_i, v_j, v_{j+1}\}$. Else, we set $G' = G - v + \{v_i v_{j+1}, v_{i+1} v_j\}$. In both cases, G' is proper with respect to G . By minimality, the graph G' has a 2-distance coloring with 19 colors. Since $d_2(v) \leq 18$, we can color v with an available color, a contradiction.

On the other hand, if $m_4(v) = 0$ and $n_6(v) \leq 2$, then v has two 5^- -neighbours, and so $d_2(v) \leq 18$. Similarly, if $m_4(v) = 1$ and $n_6(v) \leq 3$, then v has a 5^- -neighbour, and so $d_2(v) \leq 18$, as $m_4(v) = 1$. By applying the same argument as above, we get a contradiction. \square

Lemma 2.7. *Let v be a 4(2)-vertex. Then, v has neither a 4-neighbour nor a bad 5-neighbour.*

Proof. Let v be a 4-vertex with $m_3(v) = 2$. Suppose first that one of v_i 's is a 4-vertex, say v_1 . Obviously, we have $d_2(v) \leq 18$, and let $G' = G - v + \{v_1 v_2, v_1 v_3, v_1 v_4\}$. By minimality, the graph G' has a 2-distance coloring f with 19 colors. Observe that G' is proper with respect to G . Since $d_2(v) \leq 18$, we can color v with an available color, a contradiction.

Suppose now that v has a bad 5-neighbour, say v_i . Then, there exists an edge $v_i v_j$ for $v_j \in N(v)$ such that $v_i v_j$ is contained in two 3-faces. It follows that we have $d_2(v) \leq 18$. If we set $G' =$

$G - v + \{v_i v_p, v_i v_t\}$ for $v_p, v_t \in N(v) \setminus \{v_i, v_j\}$, then G' would be proper with respect to G . Similarly as above, we get a contradiction. \square

Lemma 2.8. *Let v be a $5(4)$ -vertex. If v has a 4-neighbour, then the other neighbours of v are different from 4- and $5(4)$ -vertices.*

Proof. Let v be a $5(4)$ -vertex and denote by f_1, f_2, \dots, f_5 the faces incident to v such that $f_i = v_i v v_{i+1}$ for $i \in [4]$. Suppose that v has a 4-neighbour, and assume by contradiction that v has another neighbour consisting of 4- or $5(4)$ -vertices. We then deduce that $d_2(v) \leq 18$. If we set $G' = G - v + \{v_1 v_5\}$, then G' would be proper with respect to G . By minimality, the graph G' has a 2-distance coloring with 19 colors. Since $d_2(v) \leq 18$, we can color v with an available color, a contradiction. \square

The following is a direct consequence of Lemma 2.8, since a $5(4)$ -vertex cannot have both a 4-neighbour and a $5(4)$ -neighbour simultaneously.

Corollary 2.9. *If v is a $4(1)$ -vertex, then v has no two $5(4)$ -neighbours.*

Lemma 2.10. *Let v be a $5(4)$ -vertex.*

- (a) *If $m_4(v) = 0$, then v has two $6(5^-)$ -neighbours.*
- (b) *If $m_4(v) = 1$, then v has three $6(5^-)$ -neighbours.*

Proof. Let v be a $5(4)$ -vertex and denote by f_1, f_2, \dots, f_5 the faces incident to v such that $f_i = v_i v v_{i+1}$ for $i \in [4]$.

(a) Let $m_4(v) = 0$. Assume for a contradiction that v has at most one $6(5^-)$ -neighbour. In this case, v has four neighbours consisting of $6(6)$ - or 5^- -vertices, and so we have $d_2(v) \leq 18$. If we set $G' = G - v + \{v_1 v_5\}$, then G' is proper with respect to G . By minimality, the graph G' has a 2-distance coloring with 19 colors. Since $d_2(v) \leq 18$, we can color v with an available color, a contradiction.

(b) Let $m_4(v) = 1$. By contradiction, assume that v has at most two $6(5^-)$ -neighbours. In this case, v has three neighbours consisting of $6(6)$ - or 5^- -vertices, and so $d_2(v) \leq 18$. Similarly as above, we get a contradiction. \square

Proposition 2.11. *A $5(4)$ -vertex cannot have two non-adjacent $5(4)$ -neighbours.*

Proof. Let v be a $5(4)$ -vertex and denote by f_1, f_2, \dots, f_5 the faces incident to v such that $f_i = v_i v v_{i+1}$ for $i \in [4]$.

Assume that v has two $5(4)$ -neighbours v_i, v_j such that $|i - j| \geq 2$. Then $v_i v_{i-1}$ or $v_i v_{i+1}$ (in a cyclic ordering) is contained in two 3-faces. Moreover, $v_j v_{j-1}$ or $v_j v_{j+1}$ (in a cyclic ordering) is contained in two 3-faces. We then deduce that $d_2(v) \leq 18$. If we set $G' = G - v + \{v_1 v_5\}$, then G' would be proper with respect to G . By minimality, the graph G' has a 2-distance coloring with 19 colors. Since $d_2(v) \leq 18$, we can color v with an available color, a contradiction. \square

Lemma 2.12. *Let v be a $5(5)$ -vertex. Then v has neither 4-neighbour nor bad 5-neighbour nor $6(6)$ -neighbour. In particular, $n_5(v) \leq 1$.*

Proof. Let v be a $5(5)$ -vertex and denote by f_1, f_2, \dots, f_5 the 3-faces incident to v such that $f_i = v_i v v_{i+1}$ for $i \in [5]$ in a cyclic fashion.

Recall that G has no $4(3^+)$ -vertex by Lemma 2.3, also v cannot have any $4(1^-)$ -neighbour as $m_3(v) = 5$. Moreover, v cannot have any $4(2)$ -neighbour by Lemma 2.7. Consequently, we deduce that v has no 4-neighbour. On the other hand, if v has a bad 5-neighbour or a $6(6)$ -neighbour or two 5-neighbours, then we have $d_2(v) \leq 18$. When we set $G' = G - v$, the graph G' remains proper with respect to G . By minimality, the graph G' has a 2-distance coloring with 19 colors. Since $d_2(v) \leq 18$, we can color v with an available color, a contradiction. \square

The following is an easy consequence of Lemma 2.12.

Corollary 2.13. *If v is a $5(5)$ -vertex, then v has four $6(5^-)$ -neighbours.*

An edge uv is said to be *special* if v is a $5(5)$ -vertex, and uv is contained in two 3-faces f_1, f_2 such that each of those faces is adjacent to a 4^+ -face (see Figure 1). Recall that u is a 4^+ -vertex by Lemma 2.2.




FIGURE 1. A special edge uv with a $5(5)$ -vertex v and a 4^+ -vertex u .

Proposition 2.14. *Let v be a $5(5)$ -vertex, and let uw be an edge for $u, w \in N(v)$.*

- (a) *If uw is contained in two 3-faces, then all neighbours of v are $6(5^-)$ -vertices. In particular, for every vertex $z \in N(v) \setminus \{u, w\}$, the edge vz is a special edge.*
- (b) *If no edge in $G[N(v)]$ is contained in two 3-faces, then v has four $6(4^-)$ -neighbours, and each vv_i is a special edge for $v_i \in N(v)$.*

Proof. Let v be a $5(5)$ -vertex, and denote by f_1, f_2, \dots, f_5 the 3-faces incident to v such that $f_i = v_i v v_{i+1}$ for $i \in [5]$ in a cyclic fashion.

(a) Suppose first that there exists $v_i \in N(v)$ such that $v_i v_{i+1}$ is contained in two 3-faces. If v has a 5^- - or $6(6)$ -neighbours, then $d_2(v) \leq 18$. When we set $G' = G - v$, the graph G' remains proper with respect to G . By minimality, the graph G' has a 2-distance coloring with 19 colors. Since $d_2(v) \leq 18$, we can color v with an available color, a contradiction. Thus, all neighbours of v are $6(5^-)$ -vertices. In particular, if there also exists $v_j \in N(v) \setminus \{v_i, v_{i+1}\}$ such that $v_j v_{j-1}$ or $v_j v_{j+1}$ is contained in two 3-faces, then we have again $d_2(v) \leq 18$. Similarly as above, we get a contradiction. Therefore, for every vertex $v_j \in N(v) \setminus \{v_i, v_{i+1}\}$, the edge vv_j is a special edge.

(b) Suppose that no edge in $G[N(v)]$ is contained in two 3-faces. This implies that each vv_i is a special edge for $v_i \in N(v)$. So, the claim follows from Corollary 2.13. \square

Lemma 2.15. *Let v be a $6(5)$ -vertex. Then $n_4(v) \leq 3$. In particular,*

- (a) *if $n_4(v) = 3$, then v has no bad 5-neighbour,*
- (b) *if $n_4(v) = 2$, then v has at most two bad 5-neighbours,*
- (c) *if $n_4(v) = 2$ and v has two bad 5-neighbours, then v has two $6(4^-)$ -neighbours,*
- (d) *if $n_4(v) = 1$, then v has at most three bad 5-neighbours,*
- (e) *if $n_4(v) = 1$ and v has three bad 5-neighbours, then v has a $6(4^-)$ -neighbour,*
- (f) *if $n_4(v) = 0$, then v has at most four bad 5-neighbours,*
- (g) *if $n_4(v) = 0$, $m_4(v) = 1$ and v has four bad 5-neighbours, then v has two $6(4^-)$ -neighbours.*

Proof. Let v be a $6(5)$ -vertex, and denote by f_1, f_2, \dots, f_6 the faces incident to v such that $f_i = v_i v v_{i+1}$ for $i \in [5]$. Recall first that v has no 3-neighbour by Lemma 2.2.

We now claim that $n_4(v) \leq 3$. Otherwise, v has four 4-neighbours, and so $d_2(v) \leq 18$. By assumption, one of v_2, v_3, v_4 must be 4-vertex, say v_2 . If we set $G' = G - v + \{v_2 v_4, v_2 v_5, v_2 v_6\}$, then G' would be proper with respect to G . By minimality, the graph G' has a 2-distance coloring f with 19 colors. Since $d_2(v) \leq 18$, we can color v with an available color, a contradiction. Hence, $n_4(v) \leq 3$.

(a) Let $n_4(v) = 3$. By contradiction, assume that v has a bad 5-neighbour, say v_i . This forces that either $v_i v_{i-1}$ or $v_i v_{i+1}$ is contained in two 3-faces. In each case, we have $d_2(v) \leq 18$. By assumption, one of v_2, v_3, v_4, v_5 is a 4-vertex, say v_2 . Let $G' = G - v + \{v_2 v_4, v_2 v_5, v_2 v_6\}$. Clearly, G' is proper with respect to G . Similarly as above, we get a contradiction.

(b) Let $n_4(v) = 2$. Assume to the contrary that v has three bad 5-neighbours. This forces that there exist two distinct vertices $v_i, v_j \in N(v)$ such that $v_i v_{i+1}$ and $v_j v_{j+1}$ are contained in two 3-faces. It is clear that $d_2(v) \leq 17$. By assumption, v has two 4-neighbours. If one of v_2, v_3, v_4, v_5 is a 4-vertex, say v_2 , then we set $G' = G - v + \{v_2 v_4, v_2 v_5, v_2 v_6\}$, and so G' would be proper with respect to G . Otherwise, suppose that both v_1 and v_6 are 4-vertices. Consider a 5-neighbour of v , say v_2 , if we set $G' = G - v + \{v_1 v_6, v_2 v_4, v_2 v_6\}$, then G' would be proper with respect to G . Similarly as above, we get a contradiction.

(c) Let $n_4(v) = 2$, and suppose that v has two bad 5-neighbours, say v_i, v_j . This forces that either $v_i v_{i-1}$ or $v_i v_{i+1}$ is contained in two 3-faces. Moreover, if v_i and v_j are non-adjacent, then there exists another edge forming $v_j v_{j-1}$ or $v_j v_{j+1}$ such that it is contained in two 3-faces. We remark that if v has at most one $6(4^-)$ -neighbour, then the last neighbour of v other than v_i, v_j , 4-vertex and $6(4^-)$ -vertex would be either 5-vertex or a $6(5)$ -vertex or a $6(6)$ -vertex. In each case, we have $d_2(v) \leq 18$. By applying a similar process to (b), we get a contradiction.

(d) Let $n_4(v) = 1$. Assume that v has four bad 5-neighbours. This forces that there exist two distinct vertices $v_i, v_j \in N(v)$ with $|i - j| > 1$ such that $v_i v_{i+1}$ and $v_j v_{j+1}$ are contained in two 3-faces. Clearly we have $d_2(v) \leq 18$. By assumption, v has a 4-vertex. If one of v_2, v_3, v_4, v_5 is a 4-vertex, say v_2 , then we set $G' = G - v + \{v_2 v_4, v_2 v_5, v_2 v_6\}$, and so G' would be proper with respect to G . Otherwise, suppose that v_1 (or v_6) is a 4-vertex. Since v has four 5-neighbours, one of v_3, v_5 must be 5-vertex, say v_3 . Let $G' = G - v + \{v_1 v_6, v_3 v_1, v_3 v_5\}$. Clearly, G' is proper with respect to G . Similarly as above, we get a contradiction.

(e) Let $n_4(v) = 1$, and suppose that v has three bad 5-neighbours, say v_i, v_j, v_k . This forces that there exist two distinct vertices $v_p, v_q \in N(v)$ such that $v_p v_{p+1}$ and $v_q v_{q+1}$ are contained in two 3-faces. If v has no $6(4^-)$ -neighbour, then the last two neighbours of v other than v_i, v_j, v_k and 4-vertex consist of 5-, $6(5)$ - or $6(6)$ -vertices. In each case, we have $d_2(v) \leq 18$. Similar to (d), we get a contradiction.

(f) Let $n_4(v) = 0$. Assume to the contrary that v has five bad 5-neighbours. This forces that there exist three distinct vertices $v_i, v_j, v_t \in N(v)$ such that each of $v_i v_{i+1}, v_j v_{j+1}, v_t v_{t+1}$ is contained in two 3-faces. Clearly, we have $d_2(v) \leq 18$. Since v has five bad 5-neighbours, one of v_1, v_6 is a 5-vertex, say v_1 . Moreover, one of v_3, v_5 is a 5-vertex, say v_3 . Let $G' = G - v + \{v_1 v_6, v_3 v_1, v_3 v_5\}$. Clearly, G' is proper with respect to G . Similarly as above, we get a contradiction.

(g) Suppose that $n_4(v) = 0, m_4(v) = 1$, and v has four bad 5-neighbours. Since v has four bad 5-neighbours, there exist two distinct vertices $v_i, v_j \in N(v)$ with $|i - j| > 1$ such that $v_i v_{i+1}$ and $v_j v_{j+1}$ are contained in two 3-faces. By contradiction, assume that v has at most one $6(4^-)$ -neighbour. Then the sixth neighbour of v other than bad 5-vertex and $6(4^-)$ -vertex is either a $5(t)$ -vertex with $t \leq 3$ or a $6(5^+)$ -vertex. Clearly, we have $d_2(v) \leq 18$. Moreover, this particularly implies that either v has totally five 5-neighbours or there exist three distinct vertices $v_i, v_j, v_t \in N(v)$ such that each of $v_i v_{i+1}, v_j v_{j+1}, v_t v_{t+1}$ is contained in two 3-faces. If v has five 5-neighbours, then one of v_1, v_6 must be a 5-vertex, say v_1 . Also, one of v_3, v_5 must be a 5-vertex, say v_3 . Let $G' = G - v + \{v_1 v_6, v_3 v_1, v_3 v_5\}$. Clearly, G' is proper with respect to G . Similarly as above, we get a contradiction.

We now suppose that v has exactly four 5-neighbours. If v_1 (resp. v_6) is a 5-vertex, and one of v_3, v_5 (resp. v_2, v_4) is a 5-vertex, then we apply the same argument as above. Therefore, we may assume that v_1, v_6 are 6-vertices and v_2, v_3, v_4, v_5 are bad 5-vertices. In fact, v_2, v_3, v_4, v_5 must be $5(4)$ -vertices, since a $5(5)$ -vertex cannot have any bad 5-neighbour by Lemma 2.12. However, this yields a contradiction by Proposition 2.11. \square

We will now apply discharging to show that G does not exist. First, we assign to each vertex v a charge $\mu(v) = d(v) - 4$ and to each face f a charge $\mu(f) = \ell(f) - 4$. By Euler's formula, we have

$$\sum_{v \in V(G)} (d(v) - 4) + \sum_{f \in F(G)} (\ell(f) - 4) = -8.$$

We next present some rules and redistribute accordingly. Once the discharging finishes, we check the final charge $\mu^*(v)$ and $\mu^*(f)$. If $\mu^*(v) \geq 0$ and $\mu^*(f) \geq 0$, we get a contradiction that no such counterexample can exist.

Discharging Rules

We apply the following discharging rules.

R1: Every 3-face receives $\frac{1}{3}$ from each of its incident vertices.

R2: Let f be a 5^+ -face. Then,

- (a) f gives $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-vertices and bad 4-vertices,
- (b) f gives $\frac{1}{5}$ to each of its incident 5(4)-vertices,
- (c) f gives $\frac{1}{5}$ to each of its incident 6(5)-vertex u if $n_4(u) = 0$.

R3: Every $6(k)$ -vertex for $0 \leq k \leq 3$ gives $\frac{1}{6}$ to each of its neighbours.

R4: Let v be a 6(4)-vertex. Then,

- (a) v gives $\frac{1}{12}$ to each of its 4- and 6(5)-neighbours,
- (b) v gives $\frac{1}{9}$ to each of its 3- and 5(4)-neighbours,
- (c) v gives $\frac{1}{6}$ to each of its 5(5)-neighbour u if uv is a special edge,
- (d) v gives $\frac{1}{9}$ to each of its 5(5)-neighbour u if uv is not a special edge.

R5: Let v be a 6(5)-vertex. Then,

- (a) v gives $\frac{1}{12}$ to each of its bad 4-neighbours,
- (b) v gives $\frac{1}{9}$ to each of its bad 5-neighbours.

Checking $\mu^*(v), \mu^*(f) \geq 0$ for $v \in V(G), f \in F(G)$.

First we show that $\mu^*(f) \geq 0$ for each $f \in F(G)$. Given a face $f \in F(G)$, if f is a 3-face, then it receives $\frac{1}{3}$ from each of incident vertices by R1, and so $\mu^*(f) = -1 + 3 \times \frac{1}{3} = 0$. If f is a 4-face, then $\mu(f) = \mu^*(f) = 0$.

Let f be a 5-face. Suppose first that f is not incident to any 3-vertex. Note that if f is not incident to any bad 4-vertices, then $\mu^*(v) \geq 1 - 5 \times \frac{1}{5} = 0$ after f sends at most $\frac{1}{5}$ to each of its incident vertices by R2(b),(c). Therefore we further suppose that f is incident to at least one bad 4-vertex, let u be such a bad 4-vertex incident to f . Recall that u has no 6(6)-neighbour by Lemma 2.3. If u is a 4(1)-vertex, then it has at most one neighbour consisting of bad 4-vertex or 5(4)-vertex by Lemma 2.4 and Corollary 2.9. Besides, if u is a 4(2)-vertex, then the neighbours of u are different from 4- and 5(4)-vertices by Lemma 2.7. Consequently, if f is incident to three bad 4-vertices, then the other vertices incident to f are different from 4-, 5(4)- and 6(6)-vertices. Moreover, if f is incident to exactly two bad 4-vertices, then f is incident to at most one vertex consisting of 5(4)- or 6(6)-vertices. On the other hand, if f is incident to exactly one bad 4-vertex u , then u has no 6(6)-neighbour, and has at most one 5(4)-neighbour, so f is incident to at most three vertices consisting of 5(4)- or 6(6)-vertices. We then conclude that $\mu^*(f) \geq 0$, since the face f sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident bad 4-vertices by R2(a), $\frac{1}{5}$ to each of its incident 5(4)-vertices by R2(b) and $\frac{1}{5}$ to each of its incident 6(6)-vertices having no 4-neighbour by R2(c).

Now we suppose that f is incident to a 3-vertex. By Lemma 2.2, f can be incident to at most two 3-vertices. If f is incident to exactly one 3-vertex, say v_1 , then the neighbours of v_1 lying on f , denote by v_2, v_5 , are different from 5^- - and $6(5^+)$ -vertex by Lemma 2.2. Thus, $\mu^*(v) \geq 1 - 3 \times \frac{1}{3} = 0$ after f sends at most $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident vertices other than v_2, v_5 by R2. Next we assume that f is incident to exactly two 3-vertices, say v_1, v_3 , then all vertices incident to f other than v_1, v_3 are different from 5^- - and $6(5^+)$ -vertex by Lemma 2.2. Thus, $\mu^*(v) \geq 1 - 2 \times \frac{1}{3} > 0$ after f sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of v_1, v_3 by R2(a).

On the other hand, if f is a 6^+ -face, then we have $\mu^*(v) \geq \ell(f) - 4 - \ell(f) \times \frac{1}{3} \geq 0$ after v sends at most $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident vertices by R2.

We now pick a vertex $v \in V(G)$ with $d(v) = k$. By Lemma 2.1, we have $k \geq 3$.

(1). Let $k = 3$. By Lemma 2.2, $m_3(v) = 0$, $m_4(v) \leq 1$, and each neighbour of v is a $6(4^-)$ -vertex. Note that v is incident to at least two 5^+ -faces, and each of them gives $\frac{1}{3}$ to v by R2(a). On the

other hand, v is incident to three $6(4^-)$ -vertices, and each of them gives at least $\frac{1}{9}$ to v by R3 and R4(b). Thus, we have $\mu^*(v) \geq -1 + 2 \times \frac{1}{3} + 3 \times \frac{1}{9} \geq 0$.

(2). Let $k = 4$. By Lemma 2.3, v is incident to at most two 3-faces, in particular, v has no $6(6)$ -neighbour. Clearly, we have $\mu^*(v) \geq 0$ when v is not incident to any 3-face, since v does not give a charge to any vertex or face. We may therefore assume that $1 \leq m_3(v) \leq 2$; namely, v is a bad 4-vertex.

First suppose that $m_3(v) = 1$. Let $m_4(v) = r$ for $0 \leq r \leq 3$. By Lemma 2.5, $n_6(v) \geq r + 1$, i.e., v has at least $r + 1$ many $6(5^-)$ -neighbours, and each of them gives at least $\frac{1}{12}$ to v by R3, R4(a) and R5(a). On the other hand, v is incident to $3 - r$ many 5^+ -faces, and each of them gives $\frac{1}{3}$ to v by R2(a). Consequently, v receives totally $(3 - r) \times \frac{1}{3}$ from its incident 5^+ -faces, and totally $(r + 1) \times \frac{1}{12}$ from its 6-neighbours. Thus, $\mu^*(v) \geq (3 - r) \times \frac{1}{3} + (r + 1) \times \frac{1}{12} - \frac{1}{3} \geq 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to its incident 3-face by R1.

We now suppose that $m_3(v) = 2$, and let $m_4(v) = r$. Then, by Lemma 2.6, we have $0 \leq r \leq 1$ and $n_6(v) \geq r + 3$. Since v is not adjacent to any $6(6)$ -vertex, v has at least $r + 3$ many $6(5^-)$ -neighbours, and each of them gives at least $\frac{1}{12}$ to v by R3, R4(a) and R5(a). On the other hand, v is incident to $2 - r$ many 5^+ -faces, and each of them gives $\frac{1}{3}$ to v by R2(a). Consequently, v receives totally $(2 - r) \times \frac{1}{3}$ from its incident 5^+ -faces, and totally $(r + 3) \times \frac{1}{12}$ from its 6-neighbours. Thus, $\mu^*(v) \geq (2 - r) \times \frac{1}{3} + (r + 3) \times \frac{1}{12} - 2 \times \frac{1}{3} \geq 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1.

(3). Let $k = 5$. We first note that if $m_3(v) \leq 3$, then $\mu^*(v) \geq 1 - 3 \times \frac{1}{3} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1. Therefore, we may assume that $m_3(v) \geq 4$; namely, v is a bad 5-vertex.

Let $m_3(v) = 4$. If $m_4(v) = 0$, then v has at least two $6(5^-)$ -neighbours by Lemma 2.10(a), and v receives $\frac{1}{9}$ from each of its $6(5^-)$ -neighbours by R3, R4(b) and R5(b). Also, v receives $\frac{1}{5}$ from its incident 5^+ -face by R2(b). Thus, $\mu^*(v) \geq 1 + 2 \times \frac{1}{9} + \frac{1}{5} - 4 \times \frac{1}{3} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1. Suppose now that $m_4(v) = 1$. Then v has at least three $6(5^-)$ -neighbours by Lemma 2.10(b). It follows from applying R3, R4(b) and R5(b) that v receives at least $\frac{1}{9}$ from each of its $6(5^-)$ -neighbours. Thus, $\mu^*(v) \geq 1 + 3 \times \frac{1}{9} - 4 \times \frac{1}{3} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1.

Let $m_3(v) = 5$. Recall that v has no $6(6)$ -neighbour by Lemma 2.12. Suppose first that there exists $uw \in G[N(v)]$ such that uw is contained in two 3-faces. It then follows from Proposition 2.14(a) that all neighbours of v are $6(5^-)$ -vertices, and each vv_i for $v_i \in N(v) \setminus \{u, w\}$ is a special edge. This particularly implies that each $v_i \in N(v) \setminus \{u, w\}$ is a $6(4^-)$ -vertex. Then, v receives $\frac{1}{6}$ from each v_i for $i \in [3]$ by R3 and R4(c), and $\frac{1}{9}$ from each of u, w by R4(d) and R5(b). Thus, v totally receives at least $\frac{2}{3}$ from its 6-neighbours. Next we suppose that no edge $uw \in G[N(v)]$ is contained in two 3-faces. By Proposition 2.14(b), there exist four $6(4^-)$ -vertices $v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4 \in N(v)$ such that each vv_i is a special edge. Then, v receives $\frac{1}{6}$ from each v_i for $i \in [4]$ by R3 and R4(c). Clearly, v receives totally at least $\frac{2}{3}$ from its 6-neighbours. Hence, $\mu^*(v) \geq 1 + \frac{2}{3} - 5 \times \frac{1}{3} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1.

(4). Let $k = 6$. Notice first that if $m_3(v) \leq 3$, then $\mu^*(v) \geq 2 - 3 \times \frac{1}{3} - 6 \times \frac{1}{6} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, and at most $\frac{1}{6}$ to each of its neighbours by R3. In addition, if $m_3(v) = 6$, then $\mu^*(v) \geq 2 - 6 \times \frac{1}{3} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1. Therefore we may assume that $4 \leq m_3(v) \leq 5$.

(4.1). Let $m_3(v) = 4$. Obviously, v has one of the three configurations depicted in Figure 2. Notice that v only gives charge to its incident 3-faces, and 4^- , $5(4^+)$ -, $6(5)$ -neighbours by R1, R4. We first note that if v has no $5(5)$ -neighbour v_i such that vv_i is a special edge, then v gives at most $\frac{1}{9}$ to each of its neighbours by R4(a),(b),(d), and so $\mu^*(v) \geq 2 - 6 \times \frac{1}{9} - 4 \times \frac{1}{3} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1. We may further assume that v has at least one $5(5)$ -neighbour v_i such that vv_i is a special edge. In fact, we will determine the final charge of v based on the number of $5(5)$ -neighbours v_i of v for which each edge vv_i is a special edge. It can be easily observed that v cannot have three $5(5)$ -neighbours by Lemma 2.12.




FIGURE 2. Three configurations of 6(4)-vertices.

Suppose first that v has two 5(5)-neighbours v_i and v_j such that both vv_i and vv_j are special edges. By Lemma 2.12, v_i and v_j are non-adjacent, so the configuration in Figure 2(b) is not possible for v . Moreover, v cannot have the form in Figure 2(c) as well, since vv_i and vv_j are special edges. Hence, we deduce that the neighbours of v can only form as depicted in Figure 2(a), where $v_i = v_2$ and $v_j = v_5$. By Lemmas 2.2 and 2.12, v_2 and v_5 cannot have a 4^- -neighbour, bad 5-neighbour and 6(6)-neighbour, so the other neighbours of v are $6(5^-)$ -vertices or $5(t)$ -vertices for $0 \leq t \leq 3$. Thus, v gives $\frac{1}{6}$ to each of v_2, v_5 by R4(c), and at most $\frac{1}{12}$ to each of the other neighbours of v by R4(a). Consequently, $\mu^*(v) \geq 2 - 2 \times \frac{1}{6} - 4 \times \frac{1}{12} - 4 \times \frac{1}{3} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1.

Now we suppose that v has exactly one 5(5)-neighbour v_i such that vv_i is a special edge. Then, similarly as above, we deduce that the neighbours of v can only form as depicted in Figure 2(a) where $v_i = v_2$ (or $v_i = v_5$). By Lemmas 2.2 and 2.12, v_2 cannot have a 4^- -neighbour, bad 5-neighbour and 6(6)-neighbour, so the neighbours of v_2 other than v are $6(5^-)$ -vertices or $5(t)$ -vertices for $0 \leq t \leq 3$. Thus, v gives $\frac{1}{6}$ to v_2 , at most $\frac{1}{12}$ to each of v_1, v_3 by R4(a), at most $\frac{1}{9}$ to v_5 by R4(a),(b),(d), and at most $\frac{1}{12}$ to each of v_4, v_6 by R4(a),(b),(d). Hence, $\mu^*(v) \geq 2 - \frac{1}{6} - 2 \times \frac{1}{12} - \frac{1}{9} - 2 \times \frac{1}{12} - 4 \times \frac{1}{3} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1.

(4.2). Let $m_3(v) = 5$. By Lemma 2.15, we have $n_4(v) \leq 3$.

Let $n_4(v) = 3$. Note that v has no bad 5-neighbours by Lemma 2.15(a). So, v only gives charge to its bad 4-neighbours and its incident 3-faces. Thus, $\mu^*(v) \geq 2 - 5 \times \frac{1}{3} - 3 \times \frac{1}{12} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, and $\frac{1}{12}$ to each of its bad 4-neighbours by R5(a).

Let $n_4(v) = 2$. By Lemma 2.15(b), v has at most two bad 5-neighbours. If v has such two neighbours, then the remaining neighbours of v are $6(4^-)$ -vertices by Lemma 2.15(c), i.e., v has two $6(4^-)$ -neighbours. In such a case, v gives $\frac{1}{12}$ to each of its bad 4-neighbours by R5(a), and $\frac{1}{9}$ to each of its bad 5-neighbours by R5(b). On the other hand, v receives at least $\frac{1}{12}$ from each of its $6(4^-)$ -neighbours by R3 and R4(a). Thus, $\mu^*(v) \geq 2 - 2 \times \frac{1}{12} - 2 \times \frac{1}{9} + 2 \times \frac{1}{12} - 5 \times \frac{1}{3} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1. Suppose now that v has at most one bad 5-neighbour. Then, v gives $\frac{1}{12}$ to each of its bad 4-neighbours by R5(a), and $\frac{1}{9}$ to its bad 5-neighbour R5(b) (if exists). Thus, $\mu^*(v) \geq 2 - 2 \times \frac{1}{12} - \frac{1}{9} - 5 \times \frac{1}{3} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1.

Let $n_4(v) = 1$. By Lemma 2.15(d), v has at most three bad 5-neighbours. If v has such three neighbours, then v would have a $6(4^-)$ -neighbour by Lemma 2.15(e), and so v receives at least $\frac{1}{12}$ from its $6(4^-)$ -neighbour by R3 and R4(a). On the other hand, v gives $\frac{1}{12}$ to its bad 4-neighbour by R5(a), and $\frac{1}{9}$ to each of its bad 5-neighbours by R5(b). Thus, $\mu^*(v) \geq 2 + \frac{1}{12} - \frac{1}{12} - 3 \times \frac{1}{9} - 5 \times \frac{1}{3} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1. Suppose now that v has at most two bad 5-vertices. Then, $\mu^*(v) \geq 2 - \frac{1}{12} - 2 \times \frac{1}{9} - 5 \times \frac{1}{3} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{12}$ to its bad 4-neighbour R5(a), $\frac{1}{9}$ to each of its bad 5-neighbours R5(b), and $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1.

Let $n_4(v) = 0$. Notice first that v has at most four bad 5-neighbours by Lemma 2.15(f). If v has at most three bad 5-neighbours, then v gives $\frac{1}{9}$ to each of its bad 5-neighbours by R5(b), and so $\mu^*(v) \geq 2 - 3 \times \frac{1}{9} - 5 \times \frac{1}{3} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1. Assume further that v has exactly four bad 5-neighbours. If $m_4(v) = 0$, i.e., v is incident to a 5^+ -face, then v receives

$\frac{1}{5}$ from its incident 5^+ -face by R2(c). Thus, $\mu^*(v) \geq 2 + \frac{1}{5} - 4 \times \frac{1}{9} - 5 \times \frac{1}{3} > 0$ after v gives $\frac{1}{9}$ to each of its bad 5-neighbours by R5(b), and $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1. If $m_4(v) = 1$, then v has two $6(4^-)$ -neighbours by Lemma 2.15(g), and so v receives at least $\frac{1}{12}$ from each of its $6(4^-)$ -neighbours by R3 and R4(a). Thus, $\mu^*(v) \geq 2 + 2 \times \frac{1}{12} - 4 \times \frac{1}{9} - 5 \times \frac{1}{3} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{9}$ to each of its bad 5-neighbours by R5(b), and $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1.

2.2. The case $\Delta = 7$.

Recall that G does not admit any 2-distance 21-coloring, but any planar graph G' obtained from G with smaller $|V(G')| + |E(G')|$ admits a 2-distance 21-coloring. We begin with some structural properties of G similar to the case when $\Delta = 6$.

The proof of Lemma 2.16 is omitted since it is similar to Lemma 2.1.

Lemma 2.16. *We have $\delta(G) \geq 3$.*

Lemma 2.17. *If v is a 3-vertex, then $m_3(v) = 0$, $m_4(v) \leq 1$ and each neighbour of v is a $7(5^-)$ -vertex.*

Proof. Let v be a 3-vertex. Assume for a contradiction that v is incident to a 3-face, say $f_1 = v_1vv_2$. It is clear that $d_2(v) \leq 19$. If we set $G' = G - v + \{v_1v_3\}$, then G' would be proper with respect to G . By minimality, the graph G' has a 2-distance coloring with 21 colors. Since $d_2(v) \leq 19$, we can color v with an available color, a contradiction.

Suppose now that $m_4(v) \geq 2$, i.e., v is incident to two 4-faces, say $f_1 = v_1vv_2x$ and $f_2 = v_2vv_3y$. Clearly, we have $d_2(v) \leq 19$. If we set $G' = G - v + \{v_1v_3\}$, then G' would be proper with respect to G . Similarly as above, we get a contradiction.

Next we claim that each neighbour of v is a $7(5^-)$ -vertex. Note that v cannot have any $7(6^+)$ -neighbour since $m_3(v) = 0$. Moreover, v cannot have any 6^- -neighbour. Indeed, if v_1 is such a vertex, then we set $G' = G - v + \{v_1v_2, v_1v_3\}$. In such a case, $d_2(v) \leq 20$, and G' is proper with respect to G . Similarly as above, we get a contradiction. Thus, each neighbour of v is a $7(5^-)$ -vertex. \square

Lemma 2.18. *If v is a 4-vertex, then $m_3(v) \leq 3$, i.e., G has no $4(4)$ -vertex.*

Proof. Let v be a 4-vertex. Assume that $m_3(v) = 4$, and so we have $d_2(v) \leq 20$. If we set $G' = G - v$, then G' is proper with respect to G . By minimality, the graph G' has a 2-distance coloring f with 21 colors. Since $d_2(v) \leq 20$, we can color v with an available color, a contradiction. \square

Let us define some vertices having special forms: If v is a $4(1^-)$, $4(2^-)$ or $4(3^-)$ -vertices, then we call v as a *bad 4-vertex*. Similarly, if v is a $5(4^-)$ or $5(5^-)$ -vertices, then we call v as a *bad 5-vertex*.

Lemma 2.19. *Let v be a 4-vertex.*

- (a) *v has no $5(5^-)$ -neighbour.*
- (b) *If $m_3(v) \geq 1$, then v has at most one 4-neighbour.*
- (c) *If $m_3(v) \geq 1$, and v has a 4-neighbour, then v cannot have any $5(4^-)$ -neighbour.*

Proof. (a) By contradiction, assume that v has a $5(5^-)$ -neighbour. In such a case, v should be either $4(2^-)$ -vertex or $4(3^-)$ -vertex, so we may assume that vv_2 is contained in two 3-faces. Observe that $d_2(v) \leq 20$. If we set $G' = G - v + \{v_2v_4\}$, then G' is proper with respect to G . By minimality, the graph G' has a 2-distance coloring f with 21 colors. Since $d_2(v) \leq 20$, we can color v with an available color, a contradiction.

(b) Let $m_3(v) \geq 1$. Suppose that v has two 4-neighbours, and let v_1 be one of those 4-vertices. In this case, we have $d_2(v) \leq 20$. If we set $G' = G - v + \{v_1v_2, v_1v_3, v_1v_4\}$, then G' is proper with respect to G . In a similar way as above, we get a contradiction.

(c) Let $m_3(v) \geq 1$. Assume that v has both a 4-neighbour and a $5(4^-)$ -neighbour. In this case, we have $d_2(v) \leq 20$. Similarly as above, we get a contradiction. \square

Lemma 2.20. *Let v be a $4(1^-)$ -vertex.*

- (a) If $m_4(v) = 2$, then v has a 7-neighbour. In particular, v has either a $7(5^-)$ -neighbour or two $7(6^-)$ -neighbours.
- (b) If $m_4(v) = 3$, then v has two $7(6^-)$ -neighbours.

Proof. Let v be a $4(1)$ -vertex, and denote by f_1, f_2, \dots, f_4 the faces incident to v such that $f_1 = v_1vv_2$.

(a) Let $m_4(v) = 2$. We first show that v has a 7-neighbour. Assume for a contradiction that all neighbours of v are 6^- -vertices. In such a case, we have $d_2(v) \leq 20$ since $m_4(v) = 2$. If we set $G' = G - v + \{v_2v_3, v_3v_4, v_1v_4\}$, then G' is proper with respect to G . By minimality, the graph G' has a 2-distance coloring f with 21 colors. Since $d_2(v) \leq 20$, we can color v with an available color, a contradiction.

Now we assume that v has no $7(5^-)$ -neighbour. Since v has no any $7(7)$ -neighbour as $m_3(v) = 1$, the vertex v is incident to a $7(6^-)$ -vertex, say v_i . Clearly we have $i = 1$ or $i = 2$, say $i = 1$. If the other neighbours of v are 6^- -vertices, then we have $d_2(v) \leq 20$. When we set $G' = G - v + \{v_2v_3, v_3v_4, v_1v_4\}$, the graph G' is proper with respect to G . Similarly as above, we get a contradiction. This infers that v has one more $7(6^-)$ -neighbour.

(b) Let $m_4(v) = 3$. We first show that v has two 7-neighbours. Assume for a contradiction that three neighbours of v are 6^- -vertices. In such a case, we have $d_2(v) \leq 20$ since $m_4(v) = 3$. If we set $G' = G - v + \{v_2v_3, v_1v_4\}$, then G' is proper with respect to G . By minimality, the graph G' has a 2-distance coloring f with 21 colors. Since $d_2(v) \leq 20$, we can color v with an available color, a contradiction. It then follows that v has two $7(6^-)$ -neighbours, since v cannot have any $7(7)$ -neighbour. \square

Lemma 2.21. *Let v be a $4(2)$ -vertex.*

- (a) If $m_4(v) = 0$, then v has either a $7(5^-)$ -neighbour and a $6(4^-)$ -neighbour or two $7(6^-)$ -neighbours.
- (b) If $m_4(v) = 1$, then v has either two $7(6^-)$ -neighbours and two $6(4^-)$ -neighbours or three $7(6^-)$ -neighbours.
- (c) If $m_4(v) = 2$, then v has either two $7(5^-)$ -neighbours and two $7(6^-)$ -neighbours or three $7(5^-)$ -neighbours.

Proof. Let v be a $4(2)$ -vertex, and denote by f_1, f_2, \dots, f_4 the faces incident to v such that $f_i = v_ivv_{i+1}$ and $f_j = v_jvv_{j+1}$ with $i < j$ are 3-faces (see Figure 3).

We remark that if $d_2(v) \leq 20$, then we set $G' = G - v + \{v_2v_4\}$ (when $i = 1, j = 2$) or $G' = G - v + \{v_2v_3, v_1v_4\}$ (when $i = 1, j = 3$), and so the graph G' remains proper with respect to G . By minimality, the graph G' has a 2-distance coloring f with 21 colors. Since $d_2(v) \leq 20$, we can color v with an available color, a contradiction. We therefore assume that $d_2(v) \geq 21$.

(a) Let $m_4(v) = 0$. Suppose first that v has a $7(7)$ -neighbour. If v has two 6^- -neighbours, then $d_2(v) \leq 20$, a contradiction. This infers that v has two $7(6^-)$ -neighbours. Now we assume that v has no $7(7)$ -neighbour. Clearly, v has at least one 7-neighbour, since otherwise, we have $d_2(v) \leq 20$ when all neighbours of v are 6^- -vertices, a contradiction. So, v has a $7(6^-)$ -neighbour, say v_r . Assume that v has exactly one $7(6^-)$ -neighbour, since otherwise, the claim holds. So, the other neighbours of v are 6^- -vertices. If v_r is a $7(6^-)$ -vertex or v has a $6(5^+)$ -neighbour, then we have again $d_2(v) \leq 20$, a contradiction. Thus, we conclude that v_r is a $7(5^-)$ -vertex, as well as v has a $6(4^-)$ -neighbour.



FIGURE 3. Two possible 3-faces $f_i = v_ivv_{i+1}$ and $f_j = v_jvv_{j+1}$ incident to a $4(2)$ -vertex.

(b) Let $m_4(v) = 1$. We first claim that v has at least two 7-neighbours. Indeed, if three neighbours of v are 6^- -vertices, then we have $d_2(v) \leq 20$ as $m_4(v) = 2$, a contradiction. Notice that v has at most one 7(7)-neighbour as $m_3(v) = 2$. We distinguish the remainder of the proof based on the number of edges $v_i v_{i+1}, v_j v_{j+1}$ contained in two 3-faces.

Suppose that both $v_i v_{i+1}$ and $v_j v_{j+1}$ are contained in two 3-faces. In this case, v cannot have a 6^- -neighbour, since otherwise, we have $d_2(v) \leq 20$, a contradiction. This infers that v has three 7(6^-)-neighbours.

Next we suppose that exactly one of the edges $v_i v_{i+1}, v_j v_{j+1}$ is contained in two 3-faces. In this case, v cannot have any 7(7)- and 6(6)-neighbours, i.e., v has two 7(6^-)-neighbours, say v_1, v_2 . Consider the vertices v_3, v_4 , if one of them is a 5^- -vertex or both are 6-vertices, then we have again $d_2(v) \leq 20$, a contradiction. Thus, one of v_3, v_4 is a 7(6^-)-vertex while the other is a 6^+ -vertex. This implies that v has one more 7(6^-)-neighbour, i.e., v has totally at least three 7(6^-)-neighbours.

Suppose now that none of the edges $v_i v_{i+1}, v_j v_{j+1}$ is contained in two 3-faces. In this way, v cannot have any 7(7)-, 7(6)-, 6(6)- and 6(5)-neighbours. So, v has two 7(5^-)-neighbours, say v_1, v_2 . Consider the vertices v_3, v_4 , if one of them is a 5^- -vertex, then the other must be 7(5^-)-vertex, since otherwise we have $d_2(v) \leq 20$, a contradiction. If none of v_3, v_4 is a 5^- -vertex, then we deduce that either one of v_3, v_4 is a 7(5^-)-vertex or both are 6(4^-)-vertices.

(c) Let $m_4(v) = 2$. Notice first that if v has two 6^- -neighbours or one 7(7)-neighbour or one 6(6)-neighbour, then we have $d_2(v) \leq 20$ since $m_4(v) = 2$, a contradiction. Therefore, we deduce that v has three 7(6^-)-neighbours. In fact, if v has three 7(6)-neighbours, then both $v_i v_{i+1}$ and $v_j v_{j+1}$ must be contained in two 3-faces, and so we have again $d_2(v) \leq 20$, a contradiction. Hence, v has two 7(6^-)-neighbours and one 7(5^-)-neighbours. Moreover, if v has two 7(6)-neighbours, the other neighbours of v must be 7(5^-)-vertices, since otherwise, we have $d_2(v) \leq 20$, a contradiction. Consequently, the claim holds. \square

Lemma 2.22. *Let v be a 4(3)-vertex.*

- (a) *If $m_4(v) = 0$, then v has either four 7(5^-)-neighbours or three 7(5^-)-neighbours and a 7(6)-neighbour or three 7(5^-)-neighbours and a 6(4^-)-neighbour or two 7(5^-)-neighbours and two 7(6)-neighbours.*
- (b) *If $m_4(v) = 1$, then all neighbours of v are 7(5^-)-vertices.*

Proof. Let v be a 4(3)-vertex, and denote by f_1, f_2, \dots, f_4 the faces incident to v such that $f_i = v_i v v_{i+1}$ for each $i \in [3]$ is a 3-face.

We first claim that at most one edge in $G[N(v)]$ is contained in two 3-faces. Indeed, if there exist such two edges, then we would have $d_2(v) \leq 20$. When we set $G' = G - v + \{v_1 v_4\}$, the graph G' remains proper with respect to G . By minimality, the graph G' has a 2-distance coloring f with 21 colors. Since $d_2(v) \leq 20$, we can color v with an available color, a contradiction. This particularly infers that v has neither 6(6)- nor 7(7)-neighbour. In a similar way, we deduce that v cannot have any 6(5)-neighbour, two 6(4^-)-neighbours, and three 7(6)-neighbours.

(a) Let $m_4(v) = 0$. As earlier stated, v has at most one 6(4^-)-neighbours. In fact, if v has a 6(4^-)-neighbour, then v cannot have any 7(6)-neighbours, since otherwise, we have $d_2(v) \leq 20$, and similarly as above, we get a contradiction. This implies that the neighbours of v other than 6(4^-)-vertex are 7(5^-)-vertices. Suppose now that v has no 6(4^-)-neighbour. Since v has at most two 7(6)-neighbours, we have either four 7(5^-)-neighbours or three 7(5^-)-neighbours and a 7(6)-neighbour or two 7(5^-)-neighbours and two 7(6)-neighbours.

(b) Let $m_4(v) = 1$. If v has a 7(6^+)- or 6^- -neighbour, then $d_2(v) \leq 20$, and similarly as above, we get a contradiction. \square

Lemma 2.23. *Let v be a 5(4)-vertex.*

- (a) *v cannot have two 5(5)-neighbours.*
- (b) *If v has a 5(5)-neighbour, then v cannot be adjacent to a 4-vertex.*
- (c) *If v has a 7(6)-neighbour, then v cannot be adjacent to two 4-vertices.*
- (d) *If $m_4(v) = 0$, then v has two neighbours different from 5^- - and 6(6)-vertex.*

- (e) If $m_4(v) = 1$, then v has at least three 6^+ -neighbours different from $6(6)$ -vertex.
- (f) If $m_4(v) = 1$, and v has a $7(7)$ -neighbour, then v has at least four 6^+ -neighbours different from $6(6)$ -vertex.

Proof. Let v be a $5(4)$ -vertex, and denote by f_1, f_2, \dots, f_5 the faces incident to v such that $f_i = v_i v v_{i+1}$ for $i \in [4]$. Remark that if $d_2(v) \leq 20$, then we set $G' = G - v + \{v_4 v_5\}$, and so the graph G' remains proper with respect to G . By minimality, the graph G' has a 2-distance coloring f with 21 colors. Since $d_2(v) \leq 20$, we can color v with an available color, a contradiction. We therefore assume that $d_2(v) \geq 21$.

(a) If v has two $5(5)$ -neighbours, then there exist at least three edges in $G[N(v)]$ such that each of them is contained in two 3-faces, and so we have $d_2(v) \leq 20$, a contradiction.

(b) Suppose that v has both a $5(5)$ -neighbour and a 4-neighbour. Then we have again $d_2(v) \leq 20$, a contradiction.

(c) Assume that v has a $7(6)$ -neighbour as well as v is adjacent to two 4-vertices. Since v is adjacent to a $7(6)$ -vertex, at least one edge in $G[N(v)]$ is contained in two 3-faces. Thus, we have $d_2(v) \leq 20$, a contradiction.

(d) Let $m_4(v) = 0$. By contradiction, assume that v has at most one neighbour consisting of $6(5^-)$ - or 7-vertices, i.e., all neighbours of v but one consist of $6(6)$ - or 5^- -vertices. Notice that if v has a $6(6)$ -neighbour, then there exist two edges in $G[N(v)]$ such that each of them is contained in two 3-faces. It can be easily observed that v has no four $6(6)$ -neighbours. Consider all the other possibilities; v has either three $6(6)$ -neighbours or two $6(6)$ -neighbours and one 5^- -neighbour or one $6(6)$ -neighbour and two 5^- -neighbours or four 5^- -neighbours. In each case, we have $d_2(v) \leq 20$, a contradiction. Thus, v has two neighbours different from 5^- - and $6(6)$ -vertex.

(e) Let $m_4(v) = 1$. Assume that v has three neighbours x, y, z consisting of 5^- - or $6(6)$ -vertices. Recall that if v has a $6(6)$ -neighbour, then there exist two edges in $G[N(v)]$ such that each of them is contained in two 3-faces. Consider the possibilities; all x, y, z are 5^- -vertices; two of x, y, z are 5^- -vertices and one is $6(6)$ -vertex; one of x, y, z is a 5^- -vertex and the others are $6(6)$ -vertices; all x, y, z are $6(6)$ -vertices. In each case, we observe that $d_2(v) \leq 20$, a contradiction.

(f) Let $m_4(v) = 1$. Suppose that v has a $7(7)$ -neighbour. This implies that there exist two edges in $G[N(v)]$ such that each of them is contained in two 3-faces. In such a case, if v has two neighbours consisting of 5^- - or $6(6)$ -vertices, then we would have $d_2(v) \leq 20$, a contradiction. That is, v has at least four 6^+ -neighbours different from $6(6)$ -vertex. \square

Lemma 2.24. *Let v be a $5(5)$ -vertex.*

- (a) $n_4(v) = 0$ and $n_5(v) \leq 2$.
- (b) v cannot have two neighbours consisting of $5(4)$ -, $5(5)$ - or $6(6)$ -vertices. In particular, v has at least one 7-neighbour.
- (c) If v has four 6-neighbours, then v has also a $7(5^-)$ -neighbour.
- (d) If $n_5(v) = 0$, and v has both a $6(6)$ -neighbour and a $6(5^-)$ -neighbour, then v has three 7-neighbours; at least one of which is a $7(5^-)$ -vertex.
- (e) If $n_5(v) = 1$, then v has no $6(6)$ -neighbours, in particular, v has at most two 6-neighbours.
- (f) If $n_5(v) = 1$, and v has exactly one $6(5^-)$ -neighbour, then v has a $7(5^-)$ -neighbour.
- (g) If $n_5(v) = 1$, and v has exactly two $6(5^-)$ -neighbours, then v has two $7(5^-)$ -neighbours.
- (h) If $n_5(v) = 2$, then v has three $7(5^-)$ -neighbours.

Proof. Let v be a $5(5)$ -vertex, and denote by f_1, f_2, \dots, f_5 the 3-faces incident to v such that $f_i = v_i v v_{i+1}$ for $i \in [5]$ in a cyclic fashion. Remark that if $d_2(v) \leq 20$, then we set $G' = G - v$, and so the graph G' remains proper with respect to G . By minimality, the graph G' has a 2-distance coloring f with 21 colors. Since $d_2(v) \leq 20$, we can color v with an available color, a contradiction. We therefore assume that $d_2(v) \geq 21$.

(a) By Lemma 2.19(a), v has no 4^- -neighbours. Moreover, if v has three 5-neighbours, then we would have $d_2(v) \leq 19$, a contradiction.

(b) If v has two neighbours consisting of 5(4)-, 5(5)- or 6(6)-vertices, then $d_2(v) \leq 20$, a contradiction. Besides, if all neighbours of v are 6⁻-vertices, then we would have again $d_2(v) \leq 20$, a contradiction.

(c) Suppose that v has four 6-neighbours. By (b), the last neighbour of v must be 7-vertex, say v_1 . If v_1 is a 7(6⁺)-vertex, then there exists at least one edge in $G[N(v)]$ such that it is contained in two 3-faces, and so we have $d_2(v) \leq 20$, a contradiction. Thus, v_1 is a 7(5⁻)-vertex.

(d) Let $n_5(v) = 0$, and suppose that v has both a 6(6)-neighbour and a 6(5⁻)-neighbour. If v has at most two 7-neighbours, then we would have $d_2(v) \leq 20$, a contradiction. Moreover, at least one of those three 7-neighbours must be 7(5⁻), since otherwise there exist at least three edges in $G[N(v)]$ such that each of them is contained in two 3-faces, and so we have $d_2(v) \leq 20$, a contradiction.

(e) Let $n_5(v) = 1$. If v has a 6(6)-neighbour or three 6-neighbours, then we have $d_2(v) \leq 20$, a contradiction.

(f) Let $n_5(v) = 1$, and suppose that v has exactly one 6(5⁻)-neighbour. It follows from (e) that v has no 6(6)-neighbours, i.e., three neighbours of v are 7-vertices, where we recall that v has no 4-neighbour by (a). If all those 7-vertices are 7(6⁺)-vertices, then there exist at least two edges in $G[N(v)]$ such that each of them is contained in two 3-faces, and so we have $d_2(v) \leq 20$, a contradiction.

(g) Let $n_5(v) = 1$, and suppose that v has exactly two 6(5⁻)-neighbour, i.e., v has two 7-neighbours. If one of those 7-vertices is a 7(6⁺)-vertex, then there exists at least one edge in $G[N(v)]$ such that it is contained in two 3-faces, and so we have $d_2(v) \leq 20$, a contradiction. Thus, v has two 7(5⁻)-neighbours.

(h) Let $n_5(v) = 2$. If v has a 6- or 7(6⁺)-neighbours, then we have $d_2(v) \leq 20$, a contradiction. \square

Lemma 2.25. *Let v be a 6(5)-vertex. Then, v has at most four bad 5-neighbours. In particular, if $m_4(v) = 1$ and v has four bad 5-neighbour, then v has two 7(5⁻)-neighbours.*

Proof. Let v be a 6(5)-vertex, and denote by f_1, f_2, \dots, f_6 the faces incident to v such that $f_i = v_i v v_{i+1}$ for $i \in [5]$.

Assume for a contradiction that v has five bad 5-neighbours. This implies that there exist at least three edges in $G[N(v)]$ such that each of them is contained in two 3-faces, and so we have $d_2(v) \leq 19$. Since v has five bad 5-neighbours, one of v_1, v_6 is a 5-vertex, say v_1 . Also, one of v_3, v_5 is a 5-vertex, say v_3 . Let $G' = G - v + \{v_1 v_6, v_3 v_1, v_3 v_5\}$. Clearly, G' is proper with respect to G . By minimality, the graph G' has a 2-distance coloring f with 21 colors. Since $d_2(v) \leq 19$, we can color v with an available color, a contradiction.

Now we suppose that $m_4(v) = 1$, and v has four bad 5-neighbours. Since v has four 5(4⁺)-neighbours, there exist at least two edges in $G[N(v)]$ such that each of them is contained in two 3-faces. In this manner, if v has at most one 7(5⁻)-neighbour, then we would have $d_2(v) \leq 20$. We get a contradiction as above. \square

Let v be a 7-vertex and let x be a 4-neighbour of v . If v and x have two common neighbours, i.e., the edge vx is contained in two 3-faces, then x is called a *support vertex* of v .

A vertex v is said to be *poor* if it is a 4- or 5(5)-vertex. Recall that G has no 4(4)-vertices, and so poor vertices are 4(0)-, 4(1)-, 4(2)-, 4(3)- and 5(5)-vertices.

Lemma 2.26. *Let v be a 7-vertex.*

- (a) *If v has a support vertex, then $d_2(v) \geq 21$.*
- (b) *If $4 \leq m_3(v) \leq 5$, then v has at most six 4-neighbours.*
- (c) *If $m_3(v) = 5$ and $n_4(v) \leq 2$, then v has at most four poor neighbours.*
- (d) *If v is a 7(6)-vertex, then v has at most five poor neighbours.*
- (e) *If $n_4(v) = 3$, then v has at most two 5(5)-neighbours.*
- (f) *If $n_4(v) = 4$, then v has at most one 5(5)-neighbours.*
- (g) *If $m_3(v) = 5$, $n_4(v) = 4$, v has a support vertex, and v has both a 5(4)- and a 5(5)-neighbours, then v is adjacent to a 7-vertex.*

Proof. Let v be a 7-vertex, and denote by f_1, f_2, \dots, f_7 the faces incident to v .

(a) Suppose that v_1 is a support vertex of v . By definition, v_1 is a 4-vertex and it is adjacent to both v_2 and v_7 . Assume for a contradiction that $d_2(v) \leq 20$. When we set $G' = G - v + \{v_1v_3, v_1v_4, v_1v_5, v_1v_6\}$, the graph G' remains proper with respect to G . By minimality, the graph G' has a 2-distance coloring f with 21 colors. Since $d_2(v) \leq 20$, we can color v with an available color, a contradiction.

(b) Let $4 \leq m_3(v) \leq 5$. Assume for a contradiction that all neighbours of v are 4-vertices, and so we have $d_2(v) \geq 20$. In addition, at least one neighbour of v must be a support vertex due to $m_3(v) \geq 4$ and $n_4(v) = 7$. It then follows from (a) that we get a contradiction.

(c) By contradiction, assume that v has five poor neighbours. Note that a 5(5)-vertex is adjacent to at most one 5(5)-vertex by Lemma 2.24(b). Therefore v has at most three 5(5)-neighbours as $m_3(v) = 5$. Since $n_4(v) \leq 2$, and v has five poor neighbours, we then deduce that v has exactly three 5(5)-neighbours and two 4-neighbours. However, this is not possible since a 5(5)-vertex has no 4-neighbour by Lemma 2.24(a).

(d) Let v be a 7(6)-vertex. By Lemma 2.24(a),(b), a 5(5)-vertex has no 4-neighbour, also a 5(5)-vertex is adjacent to at most one bad 5-vertex. Moreover, a 4(1⁺)-vertex is adjacent to at most one 4-vertex by Lemma 2.19(b). Those facts imply that v cannot have six poor neighbours.

(e) Let $n_4(v) = 3$. By Lemma 2.24(a),(b), a 5(5)-vertex has no 4-neighbour, also a 5(5)-vertex is adjacent to at most one bad 5-vertex. Thus, one can infer that v has at most two 5(5)-neighbours.

(f) Similarly as (d), the claim holds.

(g) Suppose that $m_3(v) = 5$, $n_4(v) = 4$, v has a support vertex, and v has a 5(4)- and 5(5)-neighbour. If the last neighbour of v is a 6⁻-vertex, then we have $d_2(v) \leq 20$, a contradiction by (a). \square

We next apply discharging to show that G does not exist. We use the same initial charges as before, with the following discharging rules.

Discharging Rules

We apply the following discharging rules.

R1: Every 3-face receives $\frac{1}{3}$ from each of its incident vertices.

R2: Every 5⁺-face gives $\frac{1}{5}$ to each of its incident vertices.

R3: Every 6(3⁻)-vertex gives $\frac{1}{6}$ to each of its neighbours.

R4: Every 6(4)-vertex gives $\frac{1}{9}$ to each of its neighbours.

R5: Every 6(5)-vertex gives $\frac{1}{9}$ to each of its bad 5-neighbours.

R6: Every 7(3⁻)-vertex gives $\frac{2}{7}$ to each of its neighbours.

R7: Let v be a 7(4)- or 7(5)-vertices. Then,

- (a) v gives $\frac{1}{5}$ to each of its 3-neighbours,
- (b) v gives $\frac{1}{4}$ to each of its bad 4-neighbours,
- (c) v gives $\frac{2}{9}$ to each of its 5(5)-neighbours,
- (d) v gives $\frac{1}{9}$ to each of its 5(4)-neighbours,
- (e) v gives $\frac{1}{18}$ to each of its 6(5)-neighbours.

R8: Let v be a 7(6)-vertex. Then,

- (a) v gives $\frac{1}{6}$ to each of its 5(5)-neighbours,
- (b) v gives $\frac{1}{9}$ to each of its 5(4)-neighbours,
- (c) v gives $\frac{1}{6}$ to each of its bad 4-neighbours.

R9: Let v be a 7(7)-vertex. Then,

- (a) v gives $\frac{1}{6}$ to each of its 5(5)-neighbours,
- (b) v gives $\frac{1}{12}$ to each of its 5(4)-neighbours.

Checking $\mu^*(v), \mu^*(f) \geq 0$ for $v \in V(G), f \in F(G)$.

First we show that $\mu^*(f) \geq 0$ for each $f \in F(G)$. Given a face $f \in F(G)$, recall that the initial charge of a face f is $\mu(f) = \ell(f) - 4$. If f is a 3-face, then it receives $\frac{1}{3}$ from each of its incident vertices by R1, and so $\mu^*(f) \geq -1 + 3 \times \frac{1}{3} = 0$. If f is a 4-face, then $\mu(f) = \mu^*(f) = 0$. Let f be a 5^+ -face. By applying R2, f sends $\frac{1}{5}$ to each of its incident vertices. It then follows that $\mu^*(f) \geq 1 - 5 \times \frac{1}{5} = 0$. Consequently, $\mu^*(f) \geq 0$ for each $f \in F(G)$.

We now pick a vertex $v \in V(G)$ with $d(v) = k$. By Lemma 2.16, we have $k \geq 3$.

(1). Let $k = 3$. The initial charge of v is $\mu(v) = d(v) - 4 = -1$. By Lemma 2.17, $m_3(v) = 0$, $m_4(v) \leq 1$ and each neighbour of v is a $7(5^-)$ -vertex. This means that v is incident to at least two 5^+ -faces. It then follows that v receives $\frac{1}{5}$ from each of its incident 5^+ -faces by R2, and at least $\frac{1}{5}$ from each of its $7(5^-)$ -neighbours by R6 and R7(a). Hence, $\mu^*(v) \geq -1 + 2 \times \frac{1}{5} + 3 \times \frac{1}{5} = 0$.

(2). Let $k = 4$. The initial charge of v is $\mu(v) = d(v) - 4 = 0$. We have $m_3(v) \leq 3$ by Lemma 2.18. If $m_3(v) = 0$, then $\mu^*(v) \geq 0$ since v does not give a charge to its any incident faces. So we may assume that $1 \leq m_3(v) \leq 3$.

(2.1). Let $m_3(v) = 1$. If $m_4(v) \leq 1$, then v is incident to two 5^+ -faces, and by R2, v receives $\frac{1}{5}$ from each of those 5^+ -faces. Thus, $\mu^*(v) \geq 2 \times \frac{1}{5} - \frac{1}{3} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to its incident 3-face by R1. If $m_4(v) = 2$, then v has either a $7(5^-)$ -neighbour or two $7(6)$ -neighbours by Lemma 2.20(a). In both cases, v receives at least $\frac{1}{4} = \min\{\frac{1}{4}, 2 \times \frac{1}{6}\}$ from its 7-neighbours by applying R6-R8. On the other hand, v receives $\frac{1}{5}$ from its incident 5^+ -face by R2. Thus, $\mu^*(v) \geq \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{5} - \frac{1}{3} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to its incident 3-face by R1. If $m_4(v) = 3$, then v has two $7(6^-)$ -neighbours by Lemma 2.20(b). By applying R6-R8, v receives totally at least $\frac{1}{3}$ from its 7-neighbours. Thus, $\mu^*(v) \geq \frac{1}{3} - \frac{1}{3} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to its incident 3-face by R1.

(2.2). Let $m_3(v) = 2$. Since $0 \leq m_4(v) \leq 2$, we consider the following cases:

If $m_4(v) = 0$, then v has either a $7(5^-)$ -neighbour and a $6(4^-)$ -neighbour or two $7(6^-)$ -neighbours by Lemma 2.21(a). It follows that v receives totally at least $\frac{1}{3} = \min\{\frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{9}, 2 \times \frac{1}{6}\}$ from its 6^+ -neighbours by R3-R4 and R6-R8. In addition, v is incident to two 5^+ -faces, and by R2, v receives $\frac{1}{5}$ from each of those 5^+ -faces. Thus, $\mu^*(v) \geq \frac{1}{3} + 2 \times \frac{1}{5} - 2 \times \frac{1}{3} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1.

If $m_4(v) = 1$, then v has either two $7(6^-)$ -neighbours and two $6(4^-)$ -neighbours or three $7(6^-)$ -neighbours by Lemma 2.21(b). In both cases, v receives totally at least $\frac{1}{2} = \min\{2 \times \frac{1}{6} + 2 \times \frac{1}{9}, 3 \times \frac{1}{6}\}$ from its 6^+ -neighbours by R3-R4 and R6-R8. Also, v receives $\frac{1}{5}$ from its incident 5^+ -face by R2. Thus, $\mu^*(v) \geq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{5} - 2 \times \frac{1}{3} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1.

If $m_4(v) = 2$, then v has either two $7(5^-)$ -neighbours and two $7(6)$ -neighbours or three $7(5^-)$ -neighbours by Lemma 2.21(c). In both cases, v receives totally at least $\frac{3}{4} = \min\{2 \times \frac{1}{4} + 2 \times \frac{1}{6}, 3 \times \frac{1}{4}\}$ from its 7^+ -neighbours by R6-R8. Thus, $\mu^*(v) \geq \frac{3}{4} - 2 \times \frac{1}{3} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1.

(2.3). Let $m_3(v) = 3$. Suppose first that $m_4(v) = 0$. It then follows from Lemma 2.22(a) that then v has either four $7(5^-)$ -neighbours or three $7(5^-)$ -neighbours and a $7(6)$ -neighbour or three $7(5^-)$ -neighbours and a $6(4^-)$ -neighbour or two $7(5^-)$ -neighbours and two $7(6)$ -neighbours. In each case, v receives at least $\frac{5}{6} = \min\{4 \times \frac{1}{4}, 3 \times \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{6}, 3 \times \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{9}, 2 \times \frac{1}{4} + 2 \times \frac{1}{6}\}$ from its 6^+ -neighbours by R3-R8. In addition, v receives $\frac{1}{5}$ from its incident 5^+ -face by R2. Thus, $\mu^*(v) \geq \frac{5}{6} + \frac{1}{5} - 3 \times \frac{1}{3} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1. Now, we suppose that $m_4(v) = 1$. By Lemma 2.22(b), all neighbours of v are $7(5^-)$ -vertices, and so v receives totally $4 \times \frac{1}{4}$ from its $7(5^-)$ -neighbours by R6-R7. Thus, $\mu^*(v) \geq 4 \times \frac{1}{4} - 3 \times \frac{1}{3} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1.

(3). Let $k = 5$. The initial charge of v is $\mu(v) = d(v) - 4 = 1$. We distinguish three cases according to the number of 3-faces incident to v as follows.

(3.1). Let $m_3(v) \leq 3$. Obviously, $\mu^*(v) \geq 1 - 3 \times \frac{1}{3} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1.

(3.2). Let $m_3(v) = 4$. Suppose first that $m_4(v) = 0$. By Lemma 2.23(d), v has two neighbours different from 5^- - and $6(6)$ -vertices, i.e., v has two neighbours consisting of $6(5^-)$ - or 7-vertices. It follows that v receives totally at least $\frac{1}{6} = \min\{2 \times \frac{1}{9}, \frac{1}{9} + \frac{1}{12}, 2 \times \frac{1}{12}\}$ from its 6^+ -neighbours by R3-R9, and $\frac{1}{5}$ from its incident 5^+ -face by R2. Thus, $\mu^*(v) \geq 1 + \frac{1}{6} + \frac{1}{5} - 4 \times \frac{1}{3} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1.

Next we suppose that $m_4(v) = 1$. By Lemma 2.23(e), v has at least three 6^+ -neighbours different from $6(6)$ -vertex. If v has no $7(7)$ -neighbour, then v receives totally at least $3 \times \frac{1}{9}$ from its 6^+ -neighbours by R3-R8. If v has a $7(7)$ -neighbours, then v has four 6^+ -neighbours different from $6(6)$ -vertex by Lemma 2.23(f), and so v receives totally at least $4 \times \frac{1}{12}$ from its 6^+ -neighbours by R3-R9. Thus, $\mu^*(v) \geq 1 + \frac{1}{3} - 4 \times \frac{1}{3} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1.

(3.3). Let $m_3(v) = 5$. Note that v has no 4^- -neighbour, and v has at most two 5-neighbours by Lemma 2.24(a).

(3.3.1). Let $n_5(v) = 0$. By Lemma 2.24(b), v has at most one $6(6)$ -neighbour, i.e., v has at least four 6^+ -neighbours different from $6(6)$ -vertex. First, suppose that v has a $6(6)$ -neighbour. If v has no $6(5^-)$ -neighbour, then all the neighbours of v different from $6(6)$ -vertex are 7-vertices, and by applying R6-R9, v receives totally at least $4 \times \frac{1}{6}$ from its 7-neighbours. So, $\mu^*(v) \geq 1 + 4 \times \frac{1}{6} - 5 \times \frac{1}{3} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1. On the other hand, if v has a $6(5^-)$ -neighbour, then v has three 7-neighbours, at least one of which is a $7(5^-)$ -vertex by Lemma 2.24(d). Then v receives at least $\frac{1}{9}$ from its $6(5^-)$ -neighbour by R3-R5, at least $\frac{2}{9}$ from each of its $7(5^-)$ -neighbours by R6-R7, at least $\frac{1}{6}$ from each of its other 7-neighbours by R6-R9. So, v receives totally at least $\frac{1}{9} + \frac{2}{9} + 2 \times \frac{1}{6}$ from its 6^+ -neighbours. Thus, $\mu^*(v) \geq 1 + \frac{2}{3} - 5 \times \frac{1}{3} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1.

Suppose now that v has no $6(6)$ -neighbour. That is, all neighbours of v are 6^+ -vertices different from $6(6)$ -vertex. By Lemma 2.24(b), v has at least one 7-neighbour, say x . Note that if v has exactly four 6-neighbours, then x must be a $7(5^-)$ -vertex by Lemma 2.24(c). This means that v has either four 6-neighbours and one $7(5^-)$ -neighbour or at most three 6-neighbours and two 7-neighbours. In each case, v receives totally at least $\frac{2}{3} = \min\{4 \times \frac{1}{9} + \frac{2}{9}, 3 \times \frac{1}{9} + 2 \times \frac{1}{6}\}$ from its 6^+ -neighbours by R3-R9. Thus, $\mu^*(v) \geq 1 + \frac{2}{3} - 5 \times \frac{1}{3} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1.

(3.3.2). Let $n_5(v) = 1$. Notice that v has no $6(6)$ -neighbours by Lemma 2.24(e), i.e., all neighbours of v but one are 7- or $6(5^-)$ -vertices. Moreover, v has at most two $6(5^-)$ -neighbours by Lemma 2.24(e). We distinguish three cases according to the number of $6(5^-)$ -vertices adjacent to v as follows.

First suppose that v has no $6(5^-)$ -neighbour. So, v has four 7-neighbours, and by applying R6-R9, v receives totally at least $4 \times \frac{1}{6}$ from its 7-neighbours. So, $\mu^*(v) \geq 1 + 4 \times \frac{1}{6} - 5 \times \frac{1}{3} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1.

Suppose next that v has exactly one $6(5^-)$ -neighbour. Then v has three 7-neighbours, one of which is a $7(5^-)$ -vertex by Lemma 2.24(f). Thus, v receives totally at least $\frac{1}{9} + 2 \times \frac{1}{6} + \frac{2}{9}$ from its 6^+ -neighbours by R3-R9. Hence, $\mu^*(v) \geq 1 + \frac{2}{3} - 5 \times \frac{1}{3} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1.

Finally, suppose that v has exactly two $6(5^-)$ -neighbours. Then v has two $7(5^-)$ -neighbours by Lemma 2.24(g). So, v receives totally at least $2 \times \frac{1}{9} + 2 \times \frac{2}{9}$ from its 6^+ -neighbours by R3-R7. Hence, $\mu^*(v) \geq 1 + \frac{2}{3} - 5 \times \frac{1}{3} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1.

(3.3.3). Let $n_5(v) = 2$. Then v has three $7(5^-)$ -neighbours by Lemma 2.24(h), and so v receives $\frac{2}{9}$ from each of its $7(5^-)$ -neighbours by R6-R7. Thus, $\mu^*(v) \geq 1 + 3 \times \frac{2}{9} - 5 \times \frac{1}{3} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1.

(4). Let $k = 6$. The initial charge of v is $\mu(v) = d(v) - 4 = 2$. If $m_3(v) \leq 3$, then $\mu^*(v) \geq 2 - 3 \times \frac{1}{3} - 6 \times \frac{1}{6} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, and $\frac{1}{6}$ to each of its neighbours by R3. Similarly, if $m_3(v) = 4$, then $\mu^*(v) \geq 2 - 4 \times \frac{1}{3} - 6 \times \frac{1}{6} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$

to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, and $\frac{1}{9}$ to each of its neighbours by R4. On the other hand, if $m_3(v) = 6$, then $\mu^*(v) \geq 2 - 6 \times \frac{1}{3} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1. Therefore, we further assume that $m_3(v) = 5$. By Lemma 2.25, v has at most four bad 5-neighbours. Notice that if v has at most three bad 5-neighbours, then $\mu^*(v) \geq 2 - 5 \times \frac{1}{3} - 3 \times \frac{1}{9} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, and $\frac{1}{9}$ to each of its bad 5-neighbours by R5. Next we assume that v has exactly four bad 5-neighbours. If $m_4(v) = 0$, then v receives $\frac{1}{5}$ from its incident 5^+ -face by R2, and so $\mu^*(v) \geq 2 + \frac{1}{5} - 5 \times \frac{1}{3} - 4 \times \frac{1}{9} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-face by R1, and $\frac{1}{9}$ to each of its bad 5-neighbours by R5. If $m_4(v) = 1$, then v has two $7(5^-)$ -neighbours by Lemma 2.25, and so v receives at least $\frac{1}{18}$ from each of its $7(5^-)$ -neighbours by R6 and R7(e). Thus, $\mu^*(v) \geq 2 + 2 \times \frac{1}{18} - 5 \times \frac{1}{3} - 4 \times \frac{1}{9} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-face by R1, and $\frac{1}{9}$ to each of its bad 5-neighbours by R5.

(5). Let $k = 7$. The initial charge of v is $\mu(v) = d(v) - 4 = 3$. Notice first that if $m_3(v) \leq 3$, then we have $\mu^*(v) \geq 3 - 3 \times \frac{1}{3} - 7 \times \frac{2}{7} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, and $\frac{2}{7}$ to each of its neighbours by R6. Therefore, we may assume that $4 \leq m_3(v) \leq 7$.

(5.1). Let $m_3(v) = 4$. By Lemma 2.26(b), v has at most six 4-neighbours. If $n_4(v) \leq 4$, then v sends $\frac{1}{4}$ to each of its bad 4-neighbours by R7(b), and at most $\frac{2}{9}$ to each of its other neighbours by R7. Consequently, $\mu^*(v) \geq 3 - 4 \times \frac{1}{4} - 3 \times \frac{2}{9} - 4 \times \frac{1}{3} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1. Suppose now that $5 \leq n_4(v) \leq 6$. Clearly, v has no $5(5)$ -neighbour, since a 4 vertex is not adjacent to any $5(5)$ -vertex by Lemma 2.19(a). If v has a 3-neighbour x , then the edge xv is contained in at least one 5^+ -face by Lemma 2.17. So, v receives at least $\frac{1}{5}$ from its incident 5^+ -faces by R2. Thus $\mu^*(v) \geq 3 + \frac{1}{5} - 6 \times \frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{5} - 4 \times \frac{1}{3} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{4}$ to each of its bad 4-neighbours by R7(b), at most $\frac{1}{5}$ to each of its neighbours other than 4-vertex by R7, and $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1. On the other hand, if v has no 3-neighbour, then $\mu^*(v) \geq 3 - 6 \times \frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{7} - 4 \times \frac{1}{3} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{4}$ to each of its bad 4-neighbours by R7(b), at most $\frac{1}{9}$ to each of its neighbours other than 4-vertex by R7, and $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1.

(5.2). Let $m_3(v) = 5$. Notice that v has at most one 3-neighbour, since a 3-vertex does not incident to any 3-faces by Lemma 2.17. First we assume that v has a 3-neighbour x . In such a case, all 3-faces incident to f must have a consecutive ordering. Moreover, the edge xv is contained in at least one 5^+ -face by Lemma 2.17. So, v receives at least $\frac{1}{5}$ from its incident 5^+ -faces by R2. Observe first that if v has three 4-neighbours, then at least one of them must be support vertex of v . In such a case, we have $d_2(v) \geq 21$ by Lemma 2.26(a). This implies that v has at most four poor neighbours, and recall that a poor vertex receives at most $\frac{1}{4}$ from v by R7(b),(c). It then follows that $\mu^*(v) \geq 3 + \frac{1}{5} - 5 \times \frac{1}{3} - \frac{1}{5} - 4 \times \frac{1}{4} - 2 \times \frac{1}{9} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, $\frac{1}{5}$ to its 3-neighbour x by R7(a), at most $\frac{1}{4}$ to each of its poor neighbours by R7(b),(c), and at most $\frac{1}{9}$ to each of its other neighbours by R7(d),(e). We now suppose that v has at most two 4-neighbours. It then follows from Lemma 2.26(c) that v has at most four poor neighbours. Thus, similarly as above, we have $\mu^*(v) \geq 3 + \frac{1}{5} - 5 \times \frac{1}{3} - \frac{1}{5} - 2 \times \frac{1}{4} - 2 \times \frac{2}{9} - 2 \times \frac{1}{9} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, $\frac{1}{5}$ to its 3-neighbour x by R7(a), at most $\frac{1}{4}$ to each of its bad 4-neighbours by R7(b), $\frac{2}{9}$ to each of its $5(5)$ -neighbours by R7(c), and at most $\frac{1}{9}$ to each of its other neighbours by R7(d),(e).

We may further assume that v has no 3-neighbours. By Lemma 2.26(b), v has at most six 4-neighbours, i.e., $n_4(v) \leq 6$. On the other hand, recall that $m_3(v) = 5$. Therefore, if v has more than four 4-neighbours, then there exists $v_i \in N(v)$ such that vv_i is contained in two 3-faces, i.e., v_i is a support vertex. It follows from Lemma 2.26(a) that we have $d_2(v) \geq 21$ when v has a support vertex.

(5.2.1). Let $n_4(v) \leq 2$. Note that v has at most four poor neighbours by Lemma 2.26(c). Then $\mu^*(v) \geq 3 - 5 \times \frac{1}{3} - 2 \times \frac{1}{4} - 2 \times \frac{2}{9} - 3 \times \frac{1}{9} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, $\frac{1}{4}$ to each of its bad 4-neighbours by R7(b), $\frac{2}{9}$ to each of its $5(5)$ -neighbours by R7(c), at most $\frac{1}{9}$ to each of its other neighbours by R7(d),(e).

(5.2.2). Let $n_4(v) = 3$. Obviously, v has at most two 5(5)-neighbours by Lemma 2.26(e). Suppose first that v has exactly two 5(5)-neighbours x, y . Since a 4-vertex has no 5(5)-neighbours by Lemma 2.19(a), we deduce that x and y are adjacent. On the other hand, a 5(5)-vertex has at most one bad 5-neighbour by Lemma 2.24(b), i.e., a 5(5)-vertex cannot have both a 5(5)-neighbour and a 5(4)-neighbour simultaneously. This implies that the neighbours of v other than 4- and 5(5)-vertices are 5(3⁻)- or 6⁺-vertices. Thus we have $\mu^*(v) \geq 3 - 5 \times \frac{1}{3} - 3 \times \frac{1}{4} - 2 \times \frac{2}{9} - 2 \times \frac{1}{18} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, $\frac{1}{4}$ to each of its bad 4-neighbours by R7(b), $\frac{2}{9}$ to each of its 5(5)-neighbours by R7(c), at most $\frac{1}{18}$ to each of its other neighbours by R7(e). Suppose now that v has at most one 5(5)-neighbour. In such a case, we have again $\mu^*(v) \geq 3 - 5 \times \frac{1}{3} - 3 \times \frac{1}{4} - \frac{2}{9} - 3 \times \frac{1}{9} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, $\frac{1}{4}$ to each of its bad 4-neighbours by R7(b), $\frac{2}{9}$ to each of its 5(5)-neighbours by R7(c), at most $\frac{1}{9}$ to each of its other neighbours by R7(d)-(e).

(5.2.3). Let $n_4(v) = 4$. By Lemma 2.26(f), v has at most one 5(5)-neighbour. First, suppose that v has no 5(5)-neighbours, then $\mu^*(v) \geq 3 - 5 \times \frac{1}{3} - 4 \times \frac{1}{4} - 3 \times \frac{1}{9} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, $\frac{1}{4}$ to each of its bad 4-neighbours by R7(b), at most $\frac{1}{9}$ to each of its other neighbours by R7(d)-(e). We may further assume that v has exactly one 5(5)-neighbour, say v_1 . Denote by v_2 and v_7 the common neighbours of v and v_1 . Recall that each of v_2, v_7 is a 5⁺-vertex by Lemmas 2.17 and 2.19(a). Moreover, for $i \in \{2, 7\}$, if v_i is adjacent to a 4-vertex, then v_i is different from 5(4)-vertex by Lemma 2.23(b). Recall also that a 4(1⁺)-vertex is adjacent to at most one 4-vertex by Lemma 2.19(b).

Suppose first that v has a support vertex x . If v has no 5(4)-neighbour, then $\mu^*(v) \geq 3 - 5 \times \frac{1}{3} - 4 \times \frac{1}{4} - \frac{2}{9} - 2 \times \frac{1}{18} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, $\frac{1}{4}$ to each of its bad 4-neighbours by R7(b), $\frac{2}{9}$ to its 5(5)-neighbour by R7(c), at most $\frac{1}{18}$ to each of its other neighbours by R7(e). If v has a 5(4)-neighbour, then v has also a 7-neighbour by Lemma 2.26(g). Thus, $\mu^*(v) \geq 3 - 5 \times \frac{1}{3} - 4 \times \frac{1}{4} - \frac{2}{9} - \frac{1}{9} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, $\frac{1}{4}$ to each of its bad 4-neighbours by R7(b), $\frac{2}{9}$ to its 5(5)-neighbour by R7(c), $\frac{1}{9}$ to its 5(4)-neighbour by R7(d).

Next, suppose that v has no support vertex. This means that each 4-neighbour of v is incident to a 4⁺-face containing v . Obviously, v has one of the two configurations depicted in Figure 4, where v_i, v_j, v_k, v_ℓ are 4-vertices. By Lemma 2.19(a), a 4-vertex has no 5(5)-neighbours, so the configuration in Figure 4(a) is not possible for v . So the neighbours of v can only form as depicted in Figure 4(b). We then infer that v cannot have any 5(4)-neighbour by Lemma 2.23(b). Thus $\mu^*(v) \geq 3 - 5 \times \frac{1}{3} - 4 \times \frac{1}{4} - \frac{2}{9} - 2 \times \frac{1}{18} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, $\frac{1}{4}$ to each of its bad 4-neighbours by R7(b), $\frac{2}{9}$ to its 5(5)-neighbour by R7(c), at most $\frac{1}{18}$ to each of its other neighbours by R7(e).




FIGURE 4. Two possible configurations of a 7(5)-vertex v .

(5.2.4). Let $n_4(v) = 5$. Clearly, v has a support vertex, and so we have $d_2(v) \geq 21$ by Lemma 2.26(a). This particularly implies that v has no 5(5)-neighbours by Lemma 2.19(a). Also, v has at most one 5(4)-neighbour since $d_2(v) \geq 21$. Suppose first that v has a 5(4)-neighbour or two 6(5)-neighbours. Then we conclude that v is incident to two 5⁺-face since $d_2(v) \geq 21$. By applying R2, v receives $\frac{1}{5}$ from each of its incident 5⁺-faces. In such a case, we have $\mu^*(v) \geq 3 + 2 \times \frac{1}{5} -$

$5 \times \frac{1}{3} - 5 \times \frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{9} - \frac{1}{18} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, $\frac{1}{4}$ to each of its bad 4-neighbours by R7(b), $\frac{1}{9}$ to its 5(4)-neighbour by R7(d), $\frac{1}{18}$ to each of its 6(5)-neighbours by R7(e). Now we suppose that v has no 5(4)-neighbour, and v has at most one 6(5)-neighbour. Then $\mu^*(v) \geq 3 - 5 \times \frac{1}{3} - 5 \times \frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{18} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, $\frac{1}{4}$ to each of its bad 4-neighbours by R7(b), $\frac{1}{18}$ to its 6(5)-neighbour by R7(e).

(5.2.5). Let $n_4(v) = 6$. Clearly, v has a support vertex, and so we have $d_2(v) \geq 21$ by Lemma 2.26(a), which implies that v is incident to two 5⁺-faces. In addition, v has no 5(4)- and 5(5)-neighbours since $d_2(v) \geq 21$. By R2, v receives $\frac{1}{5}$ from each of its incident 5⁺-faces. Thus we have $\mu^*(v) \geq 3 + 2 \times \frac{1}{5} - 5 \times \frac{1}{3} - 6 \times \frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{18} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, $\frac{1}{4}$ to each of its bad 4-neighbours by R7(b), $\frac{1}{18}$ to its 6(5)-neighbour by R7(e).

(5.3). Let $m_3(v) = 6$. By Lemma 2.26(d), v has at most five poor neighbours. If v has at most four poor neighbours, then $\mu^*(v) \geq 3 - 6 \times \frac{1}{3} - 4 \times \frac{1}{6} - 3 \times \frac{1}{9} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, $\frac{1}{6}$ to each of its poor neighbours by R8(a),(c), $\frac{1}{9}$ to each of its 5(4)-neighbours by R8(b). Suppose further that v has exactly five poor neighbours. First, observe that v has no 4(0)-neighbours as $m_3(v) = 6$, i.e., all 4-neighbours of v are bad 4-vertices. Note that a 5(4)-neighbour of v is not adjacent to two poor vertices by Lemma 2.23(a),(b),(c). Moreover, a 4-vertex has no 5(5)-neighbours by Lemma 2.19(a). Furthermore, a bad 4-vertex has at most one 4-neighbour by Lemma 2.19(b). In addition, by Lemma 2.24(b), a 5(5)-vertex is adjacent to at most one 5(5)-vertex. All those facts imply that v has at most one 5(4)-neighbour. Hence, $\mu^*(v) \geq 3 - 6 \times \frac{1}{3} - 5 \times \frac{1}{6} - \frac{1}{9} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, $\frac{1}{6}$ to each of its poor neighbours by R8(a),(c), $\frac{1}{9}$ to its 5(4)-neighbour by R8(b).

(5.4). Let $m_3(v) = 7$. By Lemma 2.24(b), a 5(5)-vertex is adjacent to at most one 5(5)-vertex. So, we deduce that v has at most four 5(5)-neighbours. In particular, if v has four such neighbours, then v cannot have any 5(4)-neighbours by Lemmas 2.23(a) and 2.24(b). Thus $\mu^*(v) \geq 3 - 7 \times \frac{1}{3} - 4 \times \frac{1}{6} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1 and $\frac{1}{6}$ to each of its 5(5)-neighbours by R9(a). If v has three 5(5)-neighbours, then v has at most two 5(4)-neighbours, and so $\mu^*(v) \geq 3 - 7 \times \frac{1}{3} - 3 \times \frac{1}{6} - 2 \times \frac{1}{12} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-face by R1, $\frac{1}{6}$ to each of its 5(5)-neighbour by R9(a), and $\frac{1}{12}$ to each of its 5(4)-neighbours by R9(b). Suppose now that v has at most two 5(5)-neighbours. By Lemma 2.24(b), a 5(5)-vertex has at most one bad 5-neighbour. We then deduce that v has at most six bad 5-neighbours when v has at least one 5(5)-neighbour. Thus, $\mu^*(v) \geq 3 - 7 \times \frac{1}{3} - 2 \times \frac{1}{6} - 4 \times \frac{1}{12} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-face by R1, $\frac{1}{6}$ to each of its 5(5)-neighbour by R9(a), and $\frac{1}{12}$ to each of its 5(4)-neighbours by R9(b).

2.3. The case $\Delta = 8$.

Recall that G does not admit any 2-distance 23-coloring, but any planar graph G' obtained from G with smaller $|V(G')| + |E(G')|$ admits a 2-distance 23-coloring.

Starting with some structural properties of G , we address similar results as in the case $\Delta = 7$. The proof of the following lemma is omitted since it is similar to Lemma 2.1.

Lemma 2.27. *We have $\delta(G) \geq 3$.*

Lemma 2.28. *Let v be a 3-vertex. Then $m_3(v) = 0$ and $m_4(v) \leq 1$. In particular,*

- (a) *v has no 6⁻-neighbour,*
- (b) *if $m_4(v) = 0$, then v has two 8(6⁻)-neighbours,*
- (c) *if $m_4(v) = 1$, then v has three 8(6⁻)-neighbours.*

Proof. Let v be a 3-vertex. If v is incident to a 3-face, say $f_1 = v_1vv_2$, then we set $G' = G - v + \{v_1v_3\}$. If v is incident to two 4-faces, say $f_1 = v_1vv_2x$ and $f_2 = v_2vv_3y$, then we set $G' = G - v + \{v_1v_3\}$. If v is adjacent to a 6⁻-vertex, say v_1 , then we set $G' = G - v + \{v_1v_2, v_1v_3\}$. In each case, G' remains proper with respect to G as well as $d_2(v) \leq 22$. By minimality, the graph G' has a 2-distance coloring with 23 colors. Since $d_2(v) \leq 22$, we can color v with an available color, a contradiction.

This particularly implies that v cannot have two (resp. one) 7-neighbours when $m_4(v) = 0$ (resp. $m_4(v) = 1$). \square

Recall that a 3-vertex cannot have any 6^- -neighbour by Lemma 2.28(a). That is, a vertex of degree 4, 5, or 6 has no 3-neighbour. This fact will be assumed in the sequel.

Lemma 2.29. *Let v be a 4-vertex with $m_3(v) \geq 1$.*

- (a) *If $m_3(v) = 1$, then v has no $5(5)$ -neighbour. In particular, v has at most one 4-neighbour.*
- (b) *If $m_3(v) = 2$, then v has at most one neighbour consisting of 4- or 5-vertices.*
- (c) *If $m_3(v) \geq 3$, then v has neither a 4-neighbour nor a $5(4^+)$ -neighbour.*

Proof. Let v be a 4-vertex.

(a) Let $m_3(v) = 1$. Obviously, v cannot have any $5(5)$ -neighbour as $m_3(v) = 1$. Now, we assume that v has two 4-neighbours, and so $d_2(v) \leq 22$. If we set $G' = G - v + \{v_1v_2, v_1v_3, v_1v_4\}$ for a 4-neighbour v_1 of v , then G' is proper with respect to G . By minimality, the graph G' has a 2-distance coloring with 23 colors. Since $d_2(v) \leq 22$, we can color v with an available color, a contradiction.

(b) Let $m_3(v) = 2$. Suppose that v has two neighbours consisting of 4- or 5-vertices. So, $d_2(v) \leq 22$, and we get a contradiction as above.

(c) Let $m_3(v) \geq 3$. If v has a 4- or $5(4^+)$ -neighbour, then we have $d_2(v) \leq 22$. In a similar way as above, we get a contradiction. \square

Lemma 2.30. *Let v be a $4(1)$ -vertex. If $m_4(v) \geq 2$, then v has two 7^+ -neighbours.*

Proof. Let v be a $4(1)$ -vertex. As $m_3(v) = 1$, the vertex v is incident to a 3-face f_1 , say $f_1 = v_1vv_2$. Suppose that $m_4(v) \geq 2$. By contradiction, assume that v has at most one 7^+ -neighbour. This implies that at least one of v_1, v_2 is a 6^- -vertex, say v_1 . In particular, we have $d_2(v) \leq 22$. If we set $G' = G - v + \{v_1v_3, v_1v_4\}$, then G' is proper with respect to G . By minimality, the graph G' has a 2-distance coloring with 23 colors. Since $d_2(v) \leq 22$, we can color v with an available color, a contradiction. \square

Lemma 2.31. *Let v be a $4(2)$ -vertex.*

- (a) *If $m_4(v) = 0$, then v has two 7^+ -neighbours different from $7(7)$ - and $8(8)$ -vertices.*
- (b) *If $m_4(v) = 1$, then v has either two $8(7^-)$ - or three 7^+ -neighbours different from $7(7)$ - and $8(8)$ -vertices.*
- (c) *If $m_4(v) = 2$, then v has either one $8(7^-)$ - and three $7(6^-)$ -neighbours or two $8(7^-)$ - and one $7(6^-)$ -neighbours or three $8(7^-)$ -neighbours.*

Proof. Let v be a $4(2)$ -vertex, and denote by f_1, f_2, \dots, f_4 the faces incident to v such that $f_i = v_ivv_{i+1}$ and $f_j = v_jvv_{j+1}$ with $i < j$ are 3-faces. Notice first that if v has a $7(7)$ - or a $8(8)$ -neighbours, then there exist two edges in $G[N(v)]$ such that each of them is contained in two 3-faces.

(a) Let $m_4(v) = 0$. Assume for a contradiction that v has at most one 7^+ -neighbour different from $7(7)$ - and $8(8)$ -vertices, i.e., v has three neighbours consisting of 6^- -, $7(7)$ - or $8(8)$ -vertices. In such a case, we clearly have $d_2(v) \leq 22$. If we set $G' = G - v + \{v_2v_4\}$ (when $i = 1, j = 2$) or $G' = G - v + \{v_2v_3, v_1v_4\}$ (when $i = 1, j = 3$), then G' is proper with respect to G . By minimality, the graph G' has a 2-distance coloring with 23 colors. Since $d_2(v) \leq 22$, we can color v with an available color, a contradiction.

(b) Let $m_4(v) = 1$. Notice that v cannot have two neighbours consisting of $7(7)$ - or $8(8)$ -vertices as $m_3(v) = 2$. Suppose first that v has no $7(7)$ - and $8(8)$ -vertices. If v has either two 6^- - and one 7-neighbours or three 6^- -neighbours, then we would have $d_2(v) \leq 22$, and similarly as above, we get a contradiction. Thus, we conclude that v has either two $8(7^-)$ -neighbours or three 7^+ -neighbours. Now we suppose that v has a $7(7)$ - or $8(8)$ -neighbours. If v has two 6^- -neighbours, then we have $d_2(v) \leq 21$. Moreover, if v has both a 6^- -neighbour and a 7-neighbour different from $7(7)$ -vertex, then we have $d_2(v) \leq 22$. Similarly as above, we get a contradiction. Thus, the claim holds.

(c) Let $m_4(v) = 2$. We first show that v has at least one $8(7^-)$ -neighbours. Indeed, if all neighbours of v are 7^- - or $8(8)$ -vertices, then we have $d_2(v) \leq 22$ since $m_4(v) = 2$. In a similar way as above,

we get a contradiction. Therefore, v has at least one $8(7^-)$ -neighbours. If v has exactly one $8(7^-)$ -neighbours, and exactly two $7(6^-)$ -neighbours, or if v has exactly two $8(7^-)$ -neighbours, and no $7(6^-)$ -neighbours, then we have $d_2(v) \leq 22$. Similarly as above, we get again a contradiction. \square

Lemma 2.32. *Let v be a $4(3)$ -vertex.*

- (a) *If $m_4(v) = 0$, then v has either one $8(7^-)$ - and three $7(6^-)$ -neighbours or two $8(7^-)$ - and one $7(6^-)$ -neighbours or two $8(7^-)$ - and two $8(8)$ -neighbours or three $8(7^-)$ -neighbours.*
- (b) *If $m_4(v) = 1$, then v has either two $8(7^-)$ - and two $7(6^-)$ -neighbours or three $8(7^-)$ -neighbours.*

Proof. Let v be a $4(3)$ -vertex, and denote by f_1, f_2, \dots, f_4 the faces incident to v such that $f_i = v_i v v_{i+1}$ for each $i \in [3]$ is a 3-face.

(a) Let $m_4(v) = 0$. We first show that v has at least one $8(7^-)$ -neighbours. Indeed, if all neighbours of v are 7^- - or $8(8)$ -vertices, then we would have $d_2(v) \leq 22$. When we set $G' = G - v + \{v_1 v_4\}$, the graph G' remains proper with respect to G . By minimality, the graph G' has a 2-distance coloring with 23 colors. Since $d_2(v) \leq 22$, we can color v with an available color, a contradiction. Thus v has at least one $8(7^-)$ -neighbours. First suppose that v has exactly one $8(7^-)$ -neighbour. If v has no $7(6^-)$ -neighbours, then we have $d_2(v) \leq 22$. Moreover, if v has one $7(6^-)$ -neighbour, and two neighbours consisting of 6^- -, $7(7^-)$ - or $8(8)$ -vertices, then we would have $d_2(v) \leq 22$. Furthermore, if v has two $7(6^-)$ -neighbours and one neighbour consisting of 6^- -, $7(7^-)$ - or $8(8)$ -vertices, then we would have $d_2(v) \leq 22$. Similarly as above, we get a contradiction. We then conclude that v has three $7(6^-)$ -neighbours. Now, we suppose that v has exactly two $8(7^-)$ -neighbours. If v has no $7(6^-)$ -neighbour, then v is adjacent to two $8(8)$ -neighbours, since otherwise, we have $d_2(v) \leq 22$, and similarly as above, we get a contradiction. Thus, v has either one $7(6^-)$ -neighbours or two $8(8)$ -neighbours.

(b) Let $m_4(v) = 1$. If v has at most one $8(7^-)$ -neighbours, then we would have $d_2(v) \leq 22$, and similarly as above, we get a contradiction. Thus, v has at least two $8(7^-)$ -neighbours. Moreover, if v has two neighbours consisting of 6^- -, $7(7^-)$ - or $8(8)$ -vertices, then we would have $d_2(v) \leq 22$. Furthermore, if v has two $8(7^-)$ -neighbours, one $7(6^-)$ -neighbour, and one neighbour consisting of 6^- -, $7(7^-)$ - or $8(8)$ -vertices, then we have again $d_2(v) \leq 22$. Similarly as above, we get a contradiction. \square

Lemma 2.33. *Let v be a $4(4)$ -vertex. Then, v has either three $8(7^-)$ - and one $7(5^-)$ -neighbours or four $8(7^-)$ -neighbours.*

Proof. If v has a 6^- -, $7(6^+)$ - or $8(8)$ -neighbours, then we would have $d_2(v) \leq 22$. In addition, if v has two 7^- -neighbours, then we would have again $d_2(v) \leq 22$. When we set $G' = G - v$, the graph G' remains proper with respect to G . By minimality, the graph G' has a 2-distance coloring with 23 colors. Since $d_2(v) \leq 22$, we can color v with an available color, a contradiction. This implies that v has either three $8(7^-)$ - and one $7(5^-)$ -neighbours or four $8(7^-)$ -neighbours. \square

Lemma 2.34. *Let v be a 5 -vertex.*

- (a) *If v is a $5(5)$ -vertex, and adjacent to a $5(5)$ -vertex, then v has no 4 - and $5(4)$ -neighbours.*
- (b) *If v is a $5(5)$ -vertex, then v has at most one neighbour consisting of 4 - or $5(5)$ -vertices.*

Proof. (a) Suppose that v is a $5(5)$ -vertex adjacent to a $5(5)$ -vertex. If v is also adjacent to a 4 - or $5(4)$ -vertices, then we have $d_2(v) \leq 22$. When we set $G' = G - v$, the graph G' remains proper with respect to G . By minimality, the graph G' has a 2-distance coloring f with 23 colors. Since $d_2(v) \leq 22$, we can color v with an available color, a contradiction.

(b) Let v be a $5(5)$ -vertex. Suppose that v has two neighbours consisting of 4 - or $5(5)$ -vertices. If v has a $5(5)$ -neighbour, then we get a contradiction by (a). Else, if v has two 4 -neighbours, then we have $d_2(v) \leq 22$, and similarly as above, we get a contradiction. \square

Lemma 2.35. *Let v be a $5(4)$ -vertex.*

- (a) *If $m_4(v) = 0$, then v has two 6^+ -neighbours different from $6(6)$ -vertex.*
- (b) *If $m_4(v) = 1$, then v has three 6^+ -neighbours different from $6(6)$ -vertex.*

Proof. Let v be a $5(4)$ -vertex, and denote by f_1, f_2, \dots, f_5 the faces incident to v such that $f_i = v_i v v_{i+1}$ for $i \in [4]$.

(a) Let $m_4(v) = 0$. By contradiction, assume that v has at most one 6^+ -neighbour different from $6(6)$ -vertex, i.e., all neighbours of v but one consist of $6(6)$ - and 5^- -vertices. Notice that if v has a $6(6)$ -neighbour, then there exist two edges in $G[N(v)]$ such that each of them is contained in two 3-faces. It can be easily observed that v has no four $6(6)$ -neighbours. Consider all the other possibilities; v has either three $6(6)$ -neighbours or two $6(6)$ -neighbour and one 5^- -neighbours or one $6(6)$ -neighbour and two 5^- -neighbours or four 5^- -neighbours. In each case, we have $d_2(v) \leq 22$. When we set $G' = G - v + \{v_1 v_5\}$, the graph G' remains proper with respect to G . By minimality, the graph G' has a 2-distance coloring f with 23 colors. Since $d_2(v) \leq 22$, we can color v with an available color, a contradiction.

(b) Let $m_4(v) = 1$. Assume that v has three neighbours x, y, z consisting of 5^- - or $6(6)$ -vertices. Note that if v has a $6(6)$ -neighbour, then there exist two edges in $G[N(v)]$ such that each of them is contained in two 3-faces. Consider all the possibilities; all x, y, z are 5^- -vertices; two of x, y, z are 5^- -vertices and the last is $6(6)$ -vertex; one of x, y, z is a 5^- -vertex and the others are $6(6)$ -vertices; all x, y, z are $6(6)$ -vertices. In each case, we have $d_2(v) \leq 22$, and similarly as above, we get a contradiction. \square

Lemma 2.36. *Let v be a $5(5)$ -vertex.*

- (a) *If $n_4(v) = 1$, then v has three 7^+ -neighbours different from $7(7)$ -vertex.*
- (b) *If $n_4(v) = n_5(v) = 0$, then v has either three $8(7^-)$ -neighbours or four 6^+ -neighbours different from $6(6)$ -vertex such that two of which are 7^+ -vertices different from $7(7)$ -vertex.*
- (c) *If $n_4(v) = 0$ and $n_5(v) = 1$, then v has either three 7^+ -neighbours different from $7(7)$ -vertex or two $6(5^-)$ - and two 7^+ -neighbours different from $7(7)$ -vertex.*
- (d) *If $n_4(v) = 0$ and $n_5(v) = 2$, then v has three 7^+ -neighbours different from $7(7)$ -vertex.*

Proof. Let v be a $5(5)$ -vertex, and denote by f_1, f_2, \dots, f_5 the 3-faces incident to v such that $f_i = v_i v v_{i+1}$ for $i \in [5]$ in a cyclic fashion.

(a) Let $n_4(v) = 1$, and assume that v has at most two 7^+ -neighbours different from $7(7)$ -vertex, i.e., v has two neighbours consisting of 5^- , 6^- or $7(7)$ -vertices. It is clear that $d_2(v) \leq 22$. When we set $G' = G - v$, the graph G' remains proper with respect to G . By minimality, the graph G' has a 2-distance coloring f with 23 colors. Since $d_2(v) \leq 22$, we can color v with an available color, a contradiction.

(b) Let $n_4(v) = n_5(v) = 0$. Assume that v has at most two $8(7^-)$ -neighbours. If v has at most three 6^+ -neighbours different from $6(6)$ -vertex, then v has two $6(6)$ -neighbours as $n_4(v) = n_5(v) = 0$. In particular, v has a neighbour forming 7^- or $8(8)$ -vertices. In each case, we have $d_2(v) \leq 22$, and similarly as above, we get a contradiction. Thus, v has four 6^+ -neighbours different from $6(6)$ -vertex. If only one of those neighbours is a 7^+ -vertex different from $7(7)$ -vertex, then we again have $d_2(v) \leq 22$, and similarly as above, we get a contradiction.

(c) Let $n_4(v) = 0$ and $n_5(v) = 1$. If v has at most one 7^+ -neighbour different from $7(7)$ -vertex, then we have $d_2(v) \leq 22$, and similarly as above, we get a contradiction. Thus, v has at least two 7^+ -neighbours different from $7(7)$ -vertex. Suppose that v has exactly two 7^+ -neighbours different from $7(7)$ -vertex. If v has at most one $6(5^-)$ -neighbour, i.e., v has one 5^- -neighbour, at most one $6(5^-)$ and one neighbour consisting of $6(6)$ - or $7(7)$ -vertices, then we have again $d_2(v) \leq 22$. Similarly as above, we get a contradiction.

(d) Let $n_4(v) = 0$ and $n_5(v) = 2$. If v has at most two 7^+ -neighbours different from $7(7)$ -vertex, then we have $d_2(v) \leq 22$, and similarly as above, we get a contradiction. \square

Lemma 2.37. *Let v be a $6(5)$ -vertex. Then, v has at most four $5(4^+)$ -neighbours. In particular, if $m_4(v) = 1$ and v has four $5(4^+)$ -neighbours, then v has two $8(6^-)$ -neighbours.*

Proof. Let v be a $6(5)$ -vertex, and denote by f_1, f_2, \dots, f_6 the faces incident to v such that $f_i = v_i v v_{i+1}$ for $i \in [5]$.

Assume for a contradiction that v has five $5(4^+)$ -neighbours. This implies that there exist at least three edges in $G[N(v)]$ such that each of them is contained in two 3-faces, and so we have $d_2(v) \leq 20$. If we set $G' = G - v$, the graph G' is proper with respect to G . By minimality, the graph G' has a 2-distance coloring f with 23 colors. Since $d_2(v) \leq 20$, we can color v with an available color, a contradiction.

Now we suppose that $m_4(v) = 1$, and v has four $5(4^+)$ -neighbours. Since v has four $5(4^+)$ -neighbours, there exist at least two edges in $G[N(v)]$ such that each of them is contained in two 3-faces. If v has at most one $8(6^-)$ -neighbour, then we would have $d_2(v) \leq 22$. Similarly as above, we get a contradiction. \square

Let v be a 7^+ -vertex and let x be a 5^- -neighbour of v . If v and x have two common neighbours, i.e., the edge vx is contained in two 3-faces, then x is called a *support vertex* of v .

Lemma 2.38. *Let v be a 7^+ -vertex. If v has a support vertex, then $d_2(v) \geq 23$.*

Proof. Let v be a 7^+ -vertex. Suppose that v_1 is a support vertex of v . By definition, v_1 is a 5^- -vertex and it is adjacent to both v_2 and v_7 . By contradiction, assume that $d_2(v) \leq 22$. When we set $G' = G - v + \{v_1v_3, v_1v_4, v_1v_5, v_1v_6\}$, the graph G' remains proper with respect to G . By minimality, the graph G' has a 2-distance coloring f with 23 colors. Since $d_2(v) \leq 22$, we can color v with an available color, a contradiction. \square

We next apply discharging to show that G does not exist. We use the same initial charges as before, with the following discharging rules.

Discharging Rules

We apply the following discharging rules.

R1: Every 3-face receives $\frac{1}{3}$ from each of its incident vertices.

R2: Every 5^+ -face gives $\frac{1}{5}$ to each of its incident vertices.

R3: Every 3-vertex receives $\frac{1}{5}$ from each of its $8(6^-)$ -neighbour.

R4: Every $4(1)$ -vertex receives $\frac{1}{6}$ from each of its $7(6^-)$ - and $8(7^-)$ -neighbours.

R5: Let v be a $4(2)$ -vertex. Then,

- (a) v receives $\frac{1}{6}$ from each of its $7(6^-)$ -neighbours,
- (b) v receives $\frac{1}{4}$ from each of its $8(7^-)$ -neighbours.

R6: Let v be a $4(3)$ -vertex. Then,

- (a) v receives $\frac{1}{6}$ from each of its $7(6^-)$ -neighbours,
- (b) v receives $\frac{1}{3}$ from each of its $8(7^-)$ -neighbours,
- (c) v receives $\frac{1}{9}$ from each of its $8(8)$ -neighbours.

R7: Every $4(4)$ -vertex receives $\frac{1}{3}$ from each of its $7(5^-)$ - and $8(7^-)$ -neighbours.

R8: Every $5(4)$ -vertex receives $\frac{1}{9}$ from each of its 6^+ -neighbours different from $6(6)$ -vertex.

R9: Let v be a $5(5)$ -vertex. Then,

- (a) v receives $\frac{1}{9}$ from each of its $6(5^-)$ - and $7(7)$ -neighbours,
- (b) v receives $\frac{2}{9}$ from each of its $7(6^-)$ - and 8 -neighbours.

R10: Every $6(5)$ -vertex receives $\frac{1}{18}$ from each of its $8(6^-)$ -neighbours.

Checking $\mu^*(v), \mu^*(f) \geq 0$ for $v \in V(G), f \in F(G)$.

First we show that $\mu^*(f) \geq 0$ for each $f \in F(G)$. Given a face $f \in F(G)$, if f is a 3-face, then it receives $\frac{1}{3}$ from each of its incident vertices by R1, and so $\mu^*(f) \geq \ell(f) - 4 + 3 \times \frac{1}{3} = 0$. If f is a 4-face, then $\mu(f) = \mu^*(f) = 0$. Let f be a 5^+ -face. By applying R2, f sends $\frac{1}{5}$ to each of its incident vertices. It then follows that $\mu^*(f) \geq \ell(f) - 4 - 5 \times \frac{1}{5} \geq 0$. Consequently, $\mu^*(f) \geq 0$ for each $f \in F(G)$.

We now pick a vertex $v \in V(G)$ with $d(v) = k$. By Lemma 2.27, we have $k \geq 3$.

(1). Let $k = 3$. The initial charge of v is $\mu(v) = d(v) - 4 = -1$. By Lemma 2.28, $m_3(v) = 0$ and $m_4(v) \leq 1$. If $m_4(v) = 0$, then v is adjacent to two $8(6^-)$ -vertices by Lemma 2.28(b), and so $\mu^*(v) \geq -1 + 3 \times \frac{1}{5} + 2 \times \frac{1}{5} = 0$ after v receives $\frac{1}{5}$ from each of its incident 5^+ -faces by R2, and $\frac{1}{5}$ from each of its $8(6^-)$ -neighbours by R3. On the other hand, if $m_4(v) = 1$, then v is adjacent to three $8(6^-)$ -neighbours by Lemma 2.28(c), and so $\mu^*(v) \geq -1 + 2 \times \frac{1}{5} + 3 \times \frac{1}{5} = 0$ after v receives $\frac{1}{5}$ from each of its incident 5^+ -faces by R2, and $\frac{1}{5}$ from each of its $8(6^-)$ -neighbours by R3.

(2). Let $k = 4$. The initial charge of v is $\mu(v) = d(v) - 4 = 0$. If $m_3(v) = 0$, then $\mu^*(v) \geq 0$, since v does not give any charge to its incident faces. Therefore, we may assume that $1 \leq m_3(v) \leq 4$.

(2.1). Let $m_3(v) = 1$. If $m_4(v) \leq 1$, then v is incident to two 5^+ -faces, and by R2, v receives $\frac{1}{5}$ from each of those 5^+ -faces. Thus, $\mu^*(v) \geq 2 \times \frac{1}{5} - \frac{1}{3} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to its incident 3-face by R1. If $m_4(v) \geq 2$, then v has two 7^+ -neighbours by Lemma 2.30, which are clearly different from $7(7^-)$ - and $8(8^-)$ -vertices as $m_3(v) = 1$. It follows that v receives $\frac{1}{6}$ from each of its 7^+ -neighbours by R4. Thus, $\mu^*(v) \geq 2 \times \frac{1}{6} - \frac{1}{3} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to its incident 3-face by R1.

(2.2). Let $m_3(v) = 2$. Since $0 \leq m_4(v) \leq 2$, we consider the following cases:

If $m_4(v) = 0$, then v has two 7^+ -neighbours different from $7(7^-)$ - and $8(8^-)$ -vertices by Lemma 2.31(a). It follows that v receives totally at least $2 \times \frac{1}{6}$ from its 7^+ -neighbours by R5. In addition, v is incident to two 5^+ -faces, and by R2, v receives $\frac{1}{5}$ from each of those 5^+ -faces. Thus, $\mu^*(v) \geq 2 \times \frac{1}{6} + 2 \times \frac{1}{5} - 2 \times \frac{1}{3} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1.

If $m_4(v) = 1$, then v has either two $8(7^-)$ -neighbours or three 7^+ -neighbours different from $7(7^-)$ - and $8(8^-)$ -vertices by Lemma 2.31(b). In each case, v receives totally at least $\frac{1}{2}$ from its 7^+ -neighbours by R5. Also, v receives $\frac{1}{5}$ from its incident 5^+ -face by R2. Thus, $\mu^*(v) \geq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{5} - 2 \times \frac{1}{3} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1.

If $m_4(v) = 2$, then v has either one $8(7^-)$ - and three $7(6^-)$ -neighbours or two $8(7^-)$ - and one $7(6^-)$ -neighbours or three $8(7^-)$ -neighbours by Lemma 2.31(c). In each case, v receives totally at least $\frac{2}{3} = \min\{\frac{1}{4} + 3 \times \frac{1}{6}, 2 \times \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{6}, 3 \times \frac{1}{4}\}$ from its 7^+ -neighbours by R5. Thus, $\mu^*(v) \geq \frac{2}{3} - 2 \times \frac{1}{3} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1.

(2.3). Let $m_3(v) = 3$. Suppose first that $m_4(v) = 0$. It then follows from Lemma 2.32(a) that v has either one $8(7^-)$ - and three $7(6^-)$ -neighbours or two $8(7^-)$ - and one $7(6^-)$ -neighbours or two $8(7^-)$ - and two $8(8^-)$ -neighbours or three $8(7^-)$ -neighbours. In each case, v receives totally at least $\frac{5}{6} = \min\{\frac{1}{3} + 3 \times \frac{1}{6}, 2 \times \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{6}, 2 \times \frac{1}{3} + 2 \times \frac{1}{9}, 3 \times \frac{1}{3}\}$ from its 7^+ -neighbours by R6. In addition, v receives $\frac{1}{5}$ from its incident 5^+ -face by R2. Thus, $\mu^*(v) \geq \frac{5}{6} + \frac{1}{5} - 3 \times \frac{1}{3} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1. Now, we suppose that $m_4(v) = 1$. By Lemma 2.32(b), v has either two $8(7^-)$ - and two $7(6^-)$ -neighbours or three $8(7^-)$ -neighbours. In both cases, v receives totally at least $1 = \min\{2 \times \frac{1}{3} + 2 \times \frac{1}{6}, 3 \times \frac{1}{3}\}$ from its 7^+ -neighbours by R6. Thus, $\mu^*(v) \geq 1 - 3 \times \frac{1}{3} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1.

(2.4). Let $m_3(v) = 4$. By Lemma 2.33, v has either three $8(7^-)$ - and one $7(5^-)$ -neighbour or four $8(7^-)$ -neighbours. By applying R7, v receives $\frac{1}{3}$ from each of its 7^+ -neighbours. Thus, $\mu^*(v) \geq 4 \times \frac{1}{3} - 4 \times \frac{1}{3} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1.

(3). Let $k = 5$. The initial charge of v is $\mu(v) = d(v) - 4 = 1$. If $m_3(v) \leq 3$, then $\mu^*(v) \geq 1 - 3 \times \frac{1}{3} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1. Therefore, we may assume that $4 \leq m_3(v) \leq 5$.

(3.1). Let $m_3(v) = 4$. Suppose first that $m_4(v) = 0$. By Lemma 2.35(a), v has two 6^+ -neighbours different from $6(6)$ -vertex. It follows that v receives $\frac{1}{9}$ from each of its 6^+ -neighbours different from $6(6)$ -vertex by R8, and $\frac{1}{5}$ from its incident 5^+ -face by R2. Thus, $\mu^*(v) \geq 1 + 2 \times \frac{1}{9} + \frac{1}{5} - 4 \times \frac{1}{3} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1. Next we suppose that $m_4(v) = 1$. By Lemma 2.35(b), v has three 6^+ -neighbours different from $6(6)$ -vertex. So, v receives $\frac{1}{9}$ from each of its 6^+ -neighbours different from $6(6)$ -vertex by R8. Thus, $\mu^*(v) \geq 1 + 3 \times \frac{1}{9} - 4 \times \frac{1}{3} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1.

(3.2). Let $m_3(v) = 5$. We distinguish two subcases according to the number of 4-vertices adjacent to v as follows. Recall that $0 \leq n_4(v) \leq 1$ by Lemma 2.34(b).

(3.2.1). Let $n_4(v) = 0$. If $n_5(v) = 0$, then, by Lemma 2.36(b), v has either three $8(7^-)$ -neighbours or four 6^+ -neighbours different from $6(6)$ -vertex, two of which are 7^+ -vertices different from $7(7)$ -vertex. It follows from applying R9 that v receives totally at least $\frac{2}{3} = \min\{3 \times \frac{2}{9}, 2 \times \frac{1}{9} + 2 \times \frac{2}{9}\}$ from its 6^+ -neighbours. Thus, $\mu^*(v) \geq 1 + \frac{2}{3} - 5 \times \frac{1}{3} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1.

If $n_5(v) = 1$, then, by Lemma 2.36(c), v has either three 7^+ -neighbours different from $7(7)$ -vertex or two $6(5^-)$ - and two 7^+ -neighbours different from $7(7)$ -vertex. So, v receives totally at least $\frac{2}{3} = \min\{3 \times \frac{2}{9}, 2 \times \frac{1}{9} + 2 \times \frac{2}{9}\}$ from its 6^+ -neighbours by R9. Thus, $\mu^*(v) \geq 1 + \frac{2}{3} - 5 \times \frac{1}{3} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1.

If $n_5(v) = 2$, then v has three 7^+ -neighbours different from $7(7)$ -vertex by Lemma 2.36(d). By R9(b), v receives $\frac{2}{9}$ from each of its 7^+ -neighbours different from $7(7)$ -vertex. Thus, $\mu^*(v) \geq 1 + 3 \times \frac{2}{9} - 5 \times \frac{1}{3} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1.

(3.2.2). Let $n_4(v) = 1$. By Lemma 2.36(a), v has three 7^+ -neighbours different from $7(7)$ -vertex. It follows that v receives $\frac{2}{9}$ from each of its 7^+ -neighbours different from $7(7)$ -vertex by R9(b). So, $\mu^*(v) \geq 1 + 3 \times \frac{2}{9} - 5 \times \frac{1}{3} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1.

(4). Let $k = 6$. The initial charge of v is $\mu(v) = d(v) - 4 = 2$. If $m_3(v) \leq 4$, then $\mu^*(v) \geq 2 - 4 \times \frac{1}{3} - 6 \times \frac{1}{9} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, and $\frac{1}{9}$ to each of its $5(4^+)$ -neighbours by R8 and R9(a). On the other hand, if $m_3(v) = 6$, then $\mu^*(v) \geq 2 - 6 \times \frac{1}{3} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1. Therefore, we may assume that $m_3(v) = 5$. By Lemma 2.37, v has at most four $5(4^+)$ -neighbours. If v has at most three $5(4^+)$ -neighbours, then $\mu^*(v) \geq 2 - 5 \times \frac{1}{3} - 3 \times \frac{1}{9} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, and $\frac{1}{9}$ to each of its $5(4^+)$ -neighbours by R8 and R9(a). Next we assume that v has exactly four $5(4^+)$ -neighbours. If $m_4(v) = 0$, then v receives $\frac{1}{5}$ from its incident 5^+ -face by R2, and so $\mu^*(v) \geq 2 + \frac{1}{5} - 5 \times \frac{1}{3} - 4 \times \frac{1}{9} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, and $\frac{1}{9}$ to each of its $5(4^+)$ -neighbours by R8 and R9(a). If $m_4(v) = 1$, then v has two $8(6^-)$ -neighbours by Lemma 2.37, and so v receives $\frac{1}{18}$ from each of its $8(6^-)$ -neighbours by R10. Thus, $\mu^*(v) \geq 2 + 2 \times \frac{1}{18} - 5 \times \frac{1}{3} - 4 \times \frac{1}{9} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, and $\frac{1}{9}$ to each of its $5(4^+)$ -neighbours by R8 and R9(a).

(5). Let $k = 7$. The initial charge of v is $\mu(v) = d(v) - 4 = 3$. Notice first that if $m_3(v) \leq 3$, then we have $\mu^*(v) \geq 3 - 3 \times \frac{1}{3} - 2 \times \frac{1}{3} - 5 \times \frac{2}{9} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its $4(4)$ -neighbours by R7, and at most $\frac{2}{9}$ to each of its other neighbours by R4-R6 and R8-R9, where we note that v can have at most two $4(4)$ -neighbours due to $m_3(v) \leq 3$. Therefore, we may assume that $4 \leq m_3(v) \leq 7$.

(5.1). Let $m_3(v) = 4$. Observe that v can have at most two neighbours consisting of $4(4)$ - or $5(5)$ -vertices by Lemmas 2.29(c) and 2.34(b). If v has at most one $4(4)$ -neighbour, then $\mu^*(v) \geq 3 - 4 \times \frac{1}{3} - \frac{1}{3} - 6 \times \frac{2}{9} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, $\frac{1}{3}$ to its $4(4)$ -neighbour by R7, and at most $\frac{2}{9}$ to each of its other neighbours by R4-R6 and R8-R9. If v has exactly two $4(4)$ -neighbours, then v is not adjacent to any $5(5)$ -vertex as stated earlier, and so $\mu^*(v) \geq 3 - 4 \times \frac{1}{3} - 2 \times \frac{1}{3} - 5 \times \frac{1}{6} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its $4(4)$ -neighbours by R7, and at most $\frac{1}{6}$ to each of its other neighbours by R4-R6 and R8.

(5.2). Let $m_3(v) = 5$. By Lemmas 2.29(c) and 2.34(b), v has at most two $4(4)$ -neighbours. If v has no $4(4)$ -neighbour, then v is adjacent to at most three $5(5)$ -neighbour by Lemma 2.34(b), and so $\mu^*(v) \geq 3 - 5 \times \frac{1}{3} - 3 \times \frac{2}{9} - 4 \times \frac{1}{6} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, $\frac{2}{9}$ to each of its $5(5)$ -neighbours by R9(b), and at most $\frac{1}{6}$ to each of its other neighbours by R4-R6 and R8. If v has exactly one $4(4)$ -neighbour, then v is adjacent to at most two $5(5)$ -neighbours by Lemmas 2.29(c) and 2.34(b). Moreover, v has at least two neighbours v_i and v_j that are neither 4-vertices nor $5(4^+)$ -vertices by Lemma 2.29(c), since v has a $4(4)$ -neighbour. Clearly, neither v_i nor v_j receives any charge from v . Therefore, $\mu^*(v) \geq 3 - 5 \times \frac{1}{3} - \frac{1}{3} - 2 \times \frac{2}{9} - 2 \times \frac{1}{6} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of

its incident 3-faces by R1, $\frac{1}{3}$ to its 4(4)-neighbour by R7, $\frac{2}{9}$ to each of its 5(5)-neighbours by R9(b), and at most $\frac{1}{6}$ to each of its 4(1⁺)- and 5(4)-neighbours different from 4(4)-vertex by R4-R6 and R8. If v has exactly two 4(4)-neighbours, then v is not adjacent to any 5(5)-vertices by Lemma 2.29(c). Moreover, v has at least three neighbors $v_i, v_j,$ and v_k that are neither 4-vertices nor 5(4⁺)-vertices by Lemma 2.29(c), since v has two 4(4)-neighbours. Clearly, none of $v_i, v_j,$ or v_k receives any charge from v . Thus, $\mu^*(v) \geq 3 - 5 \times \frac{1}{3} - 2 \times \frac{1}{3} - 2 \times \frac{1}{6} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its 4(4)-neighbours by R7, and at most $\frac{1}{6}$ to each of its 4(1⁺)- and 5(4)-neighbours different from 4(4)-vertex by R4-R6 and R8.

(5.3). Let $m_3(v) = 6$. Notice first that if v has at most four neighbours forming 4- or 5-vertices, then we have $\mu^*(v) \geq 3 - 6 \times \frac{1}{3} - 4 \times \frac{2}{9} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, and at most $\frac{2}{9}$ to each of its 5⁻-neighbours by R4-R6 and R8-R9. Therefore we may further assume that v has at least five neighbours forming 4- or 5-vertices, which clearly infers that v has at least one support vertex. Thus we have $d_2(v) \geq 23$ by Lemma 2.38. On the other hand, by Lemma 2.29, we conclude that a 4(1⁺)-vertex has at most one 4-neighbour. In addition, a 5(5)-vertex has at most one neighbour consisting of 4- or 5(5)-vertices by Lemma 2.34(b). This implies that v has at most four 5(5)-neighbours, and at most five 4(1⁺)-vertices.

Suppose first that v has no 5(5)-neighbours. If v has at most four 4(1⁺)-neighbours, then $\mu^*(v) \geq 3 - 6 \times \frac{1}{3} - 4 \times \frac{1}{6} - 3 \times \frac{1}{9} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, $\frac{1}{6}$ to each of its 4(1⁺)-neighbours by R4-R6, and $\frac{1}{9}$ to each of its 5(4)-neighbours by R8. If v has five 4(1⁺)-neighbours, then v cannot have any 5(4)-neighbours as $d_2(v) \geq 23$. So, $\mu^*(v) \geq 3 - 6 \times \frac{1}{3} - 5 \times \frac{1}{6} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, and $\frac{1}{6}$ to each of its 4(1⁺)-neighbours by R4-R6.

Next we suppose that v has exactly one 5(5)-neighbour. Since $d_2(v) \geq 23$, we can say that v has at most four 4-neighbours. If v has at most two 4-neighbours, then $\mu^*(v) \geq 3 - 6 \times \frac{1}{3} - \frac{2}{9} - 2 \times \frac{1}{6} - 4 \times \frac{1}{9} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, $\frac{2}{9}$ to its 5(5)-neighbour by R9(b), $\frac{1}{6}$ to each of its 4(1⁺)-neighbours by R4-R6, and $\frac{1}{9}$ to each of its 5(4)-neighbours by R8. If v has at least three 4-neighbours, then v is adjacent to at most one 5(4)-vertices as $d_2(v) \geq 23$, and so $\mu^*(v) \geq 3 - 6 \times \frac{1}{3} - \frac{2}{9} - 4 \times \frac{1}{6} - \frac{1}{9} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, $\frac{2}{9}$ to each of its 5(5)-neighbours by R9(b), $\frac{1}{6}$ to each of its 4(1⁺)-neighbours by R4-R6, and $\frac{1}{9}$ to its 5(4)-neighbour by R8.

Suppose now that v has exactly two 5(5)-neighbours. Then we deduce that v has at most three neighbours consisting of 4- or 5(4)-vertices as $d_2(v) \geq 23$, and so $\mu^*(v) \geq 3 - 6 \times \frac{1}{3} - 2 \times \frac{2}{9} - 3 \times \frac{1}{6} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, $\frac{2}{9}$ to each of its 5(5)-neighbours by R9(b), at most $\frac{1}{6}$ to each of its 4(1⁺) and 5(4)-neighbours by R4-R6 and R8.

Suppose that v has exactly three 5(5)-neighbours. It follows that v has at most one 4-neighbour as $d_2(v) \geq 23$ together with Lemma 2.34(a). By the same reason, v has at most two neighbours consisting of 4- or 5(4)-vertices. Thus, we have $\mu^*(v) \geq 3 - 6 \times \frac{1}{3} - 3 \times \frac{2}{9} - \frac{1}{6} - \frac{1}{9} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, $\frac{2}{9}$ to each of its 5(5)-neighbours by R9(b), $\frac{1}{6}$ to each of its 4(1⁺)-neighbours by R4-R6, and $\frac{1}{9}$ to each of its 5(4)-neighbours by R8.

Finally, suppose that v has four 5(5)-neighbours. Then v has no 4- and 5(4)-neighbours by Lemma 2.34(a),(b), and so $\mu^*(v) \geq 3 - 6 \times \frac{1}{3} - 4 \times \frac{2}{9} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, $\frac{2}{9}$ to each of its 5(5)-neighbours by R9(b).

(5.4). Let $m_3(v) = 7$. By Lemma 2.38, we deduce that v has at most five 5(4⁺)-neighbours, and so $\mu^*(v) \geq 3 - 7 \times \frac{1}{3} - 5 \times \frac{1}{9} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-face by R1, $\frac{1}{9}$ to each of its 5(4⁺)-neighbour by R8-R9.

(6). Let $k = 8$. The initial charge of v is $\mu(v) = d(v) - 4 = 4$. Notice first that if $m_3(v) \leq 4$, then we have $\mu^*(v) \geq 4 - 4 \times \frac{1}{3} - 8 \times \frac{1}{3} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, and at most $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its neighbours by R3-R10. Therefore, we may assume that $5 \leq m_3(v) \leq 8$.

(6.1). Let $m_3(v) = 5$. By Lemma 2.29(c), a 4(3⁺)-vertex cannot be adjacent to any 4-vertex. It follows that v has at most five 4(3⁺)-neighbours. If v has at most four 4(3⁺)-neighbours, then

$\mu^*(v) \geq 4 - 5 \times \frac{1}{3} - 4 \times \frac{1}{3} - 4 \times \frac{1}{4} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its $4(3^+)$ -neighbours by R6(b), R7, and at most $\frac{1}{4}$ to each of its other neighbours by R3-R5 and R8-R10. If v has five $4(3^+)$ -neighbours, then v cannot have any 3-, $4(2^-)$ - or $5(4^+)$ -neighbour by Lemmas 2.28(a) and 2.29(c). Thus $\mu^*(v) \geq 4 - 5 \times \frac{1}{3} - 5 \times \frac{1}{3} - 3 \times \frac{1}{18} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its $4(3^+)$ -neighbours by R6(b) and R7, $\frac{1}{18}$ to each of its $6(5)$ -neighbours by R10.

(6.2). Let $m_3(v) = 6$. By Lemma 2.29(c), v has at most five $4(3^+)$ -neighbours. If v has five such neighbours, then v is not adjacent to any 3-, $4(2^-)$ - or $5(4^+)$ -vertex by Lemmas 2.28(a) and 2.29(c). Thus $\mu^*(v) \geq 4 - 6 \times \frac{1}{3} - 5 \times \frac{1}{3} - 3 \times \frac{1}{18} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its $4(3^+)$ -neighbours by R6(b) and R7, $\frac{1}{18}$ to each of its $6(5)$ -neighbours by R10. We may further assume that v has at most four $4(3^+)$ -neighbours.

Suppose first that v has no $4(3^+)$ -neighbour. Then $\mu^*(v) \geq 4 - 6 \times \frac{1}{3} - 8 \times \frac{1}{4} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, and at most $\frac{1}{4}$ to each of its neighbours by R3-R5 and R8-R10.

Next suppose that v has exactly one $4(3^+)$ -neighbour. It follows from Lemmas 2.28(a) and 2.29(c) that v has at most six neighbours consisting of 3-, $4(2^-)$ - or $5(4^+)$ -vertices. Thus $\mu^*(v) \geq 4 - 6 \times \frac{1}{3} - \frac{1}{3} - 6 \times \frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{18} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its $4(3^+)$ -neighbours by R6(b) and R7, at most $\frac{1}{4}$ to each of its 3-, $4(1^-)$, $4(2^-)$ - and $5(4^+)$ -neighbours by R3-R5 and R8-R9, $\frac{1}{18}$ to each of its $6(5)$ -neighbours by R10.

Suppose now that v has exactly two $4(3^+)$ -neighbours. In such a case, v has at most five neighbours consisting of 3-, $4(2^-)$ - or $5(4^+)$ -vertices by Lemmas 2.28(a) and 2.29(c). Thus $\mu^*(v) \geq 4 - 6 \times \frac{1}{3} - 2 \times \frac{1}{3} - 5 \times \frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{18} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its $4(3^+)$ -neighbours by R6(b) and R7, at most $\frac{1}{4}$ to each of its 3-, $4(1^-)$, $4(2^-)$ - and $5(4^+)$ -neighbours by R3-R5 and R8-R9, $\frac{1}{18}$ to each of its $6(5)$ -neighbours by R10.

Suppose that v has exactly three $4(3^+)$ -neighbours. In such a case, v can have at most three neighbours consisting of 3-, $4(2^-)$ - or $5(4^+)$ -vertices by Lemmas 2.28(a) and 2.29(c). Thus $\mu^*(v) \geq 4 - 6 \times \frac{1}{3} - 3 \times \frac{1}{3} - 3 \times \frac{1}{4} - 2 \times \frac{1}{18} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its $4(3^+)$ -neighbours by R6(b) and R7, at most $\frac{1}{4}$ to each of its 3-, $4(1^-)$, $4(2^-)$ - and $5(4^+)$ -neighbours by R3-R5 and R8-R9, $\frac{1}{18}$ to each of its $6(5)$ -neighbours by R10.

Finally suppose that v has exactly four $4(3^+)$ -neighbours. In such a case, v can have at most one neighbour consisting of 3-, $4(2^-)$ - or $5(4^+)$ -vertices by Lemmas 2.28(a) and 2.29(c). Thus $\mu^*(v) \geq 4 - 6 \times \frac{1}{3} - 4 \times \frac{1}{3} - \frac{1}{4} - 3 \times \frac{1}{18} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its $4(3^+)$ -neighbours by R6(b) and R7, and at most $\frac{1}{4}$ to its 3-, $4(1^-)$, $4(2^-)$ - and $5(4^+)$ -neighbours by R3-R5 and R8-R9, $\frac{1}{18}$ to each of its $6(5)$ -neighbours by R10.

(6.3). Let $m_3(v) = 7$. Notice first that if v has at most five 5^- -neighbours, then we have $\mu^*(v) \geq 4 - 7 \times \frac{1}{3} - 5 \times \frac{1}{3} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, and at most $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its 5^- -neighbours by R4-R9. Therefore we may assume that v has at least six 5^- -neighbours, which clearly infers that v has at least one support vertex. Thus we have $d_2(v) \geq 23$ by Lemma 2.38. Observe that v has at most six 4-neighbours as $d_2(v) \geq 23$. In particular, by Lemma 2.29(c), a $4(3^+)$ -vertex has no 4- and $5(4^+)$ -neighbours. So, we deduce that v has at most four $4(3^+)$ -neighbours. If v has four such neighbours, then v is not adjacent to any $4(2^-)$ - or $5(4^+)$ -vertices by Lemma 2.29(c). Thus $\mu^*(v) \geq 4 - 7 \times \frac{1}{3} - 4 \times \frac{1}{3} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its $4(3^+)$ -neighbours by R6(b) and R7. We may further assume that v has at most three $4(3^+)$ -neighbours.

Suppose first that v has no $4(3^+)$ -neighbour. Note that v has at most six neighbours consisting of $4(2^-)$ - or $5(5)$ -vertices as $d_2(v) \geq 23$. If v has six such neighbours, then v cannot be adjacent to any $5(4)$ -vertex as $d_2(v) \geq 23$, and so $\mu^*(v) \geq 4 - 7 \times \frac{1}{3} - 6 \times \frac{1}{4} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, at most $\frac{1}{4}$ to each of its $4(1^-)$, $4(2^-)$ - and $5(5)$ -neighbours by R4-R5 and R9(b). If v has at most five neighbours consisting of $4(2^-)$ - or $5(5)$ -vertices, then $\mu^*(v) \geq 4 - 7 \times \frac{1}{3} - 5 \times \frac{1}{4} - 3 \times \frac{1}{9} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, at most $\frac{1}{4}$ to each of its $4(1^-)$, $4(2^-)$ - and $5(5)$ -neighbours by R4-R5 and R9(b), $\frac{1}{9}$ to each of its $5(4)$ -neighbours by R8.

Next we suppose that v has exactly one $4(3^+)$ -neighbour. By Lemma 2.29(c), v has at least one neighbour different from 4- and $5(4^+)$ -vertices. On the other hand, a $4(t)$ -vertex with $1 \leq t \leq 2$ has at most one neighbour consisting of 4- or $5(5)$ -vertices by Lemma 2.29(a),(b). It then follows from Lemma 2.29(c) and Lemma 2.34(b) that v has at most four neighbours consisting of $4(1)$ -, $4(2)$ - or $5(5)$ -vertices. Thus $\mu^*(v) \geq 4 - 7 \times \frac{1}{3} - \frac{1}{3} - 4 \times \frac{1}{4} - 2 \times \frac{1}{9} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its $4(3^+)$ -neighbours by R6(b) and R7, at most $\frac{1}{4}$ to each of its $4(1)$ -, $4(2)$ - and $5(5)$ -neighbours by R4-R5 and R9(b), $\frac{1}{9}$ to each of its $5(4)$ -neighbours by R8.

Suppose that v has exactly two $4(3^+)$ -neighbours. By Lemma 2.29(c), a $4(3^+)$ -vertex has neither 4-neighbour nor $5(4^+)$ -neighbour. This means that v has at least two neighbours different from 4- and $5(4^+)$ -vertices. Thus $\mu^*(v) \geq 4 - 7 \times \frac{1}{3} - 2 \times \frac{1}{3} - 4 \times \frac{1}{4} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its $4(3^+)$ -neighbours by R6(b) and R7, and at most $\frac{1}{4}$ to each of its $4(1)$ -, $4(2)$ - and $5(4^+)$ -neighbours by R4-R5 and R8-R9.

Finally suppose that v has exactly three $4(3^+)$ -neighbours. It follows from Lemma 2.29(c) that v has at least three neighbours different from 4- and $5(4^+)$ -vertices. Thus $\mu^*(v) \geq 4 - 7 \times \frac{1}{3} - 3 \times \frac{1}{3} - 2 \times \frac{1}{4} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its $4(3^+)$ -neighbours by R6(b) and R7, at most $\frac{1}{4}$ to each of its $4(1)$ -, $4(2)$ - and $5(4^+)$ -neighbours by R4-R5 and R8-R9.

(6.4). Let $m_3(v) = 8$. By Lemma 2.34(b), v has at most five $5(5)$ -neighbours. If v has at most four such neighbours, then $\mu^*(v) \geq 4 - 8 \times \frac{1}{3} - 4 \times \frac{2}{9} - 4 \times \frac{1}{9} = 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, $\frac{2}{9}$ to each of its $5(5)$ -neighbours by R9(b), and at most $\frac{1}{9}$ to each of its $4(3)$ - and $5(4)$ -neighbours by R6(c) and R8. If v has five $5(5)$ -neighbours, then v has neither 4-neighbour nor $5(4)$ -neighbour by Lemma 2.34(a). Thus, $\mu^*(v) \geq 4 - 8 \times \frac{1}{3} - 5 \times \frac{2}{9} > 0$ after v sends $\frac{1}{3}$ to each of its incident 3-faces by R1, and $\frac{2}{9}$ to each of its $5(5)$ -neighbours by R9(b).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author extends their gratitude to Kengo Aoki for pointing out a significant error in a previous proof of Lemma 2.1.

REFERENCES

- [1] Bousquet, N., Deschamps, Q., de Meyer, L., and Pierron, T. *Improved square coloring of planar graphs*. Discrete Mathematics, 346(4), 113288, 2023.
- [2] Bousquet, N., Deschamps, Q., De Meyer, L., and Pierron, T. *Square coloring planar graphs with automatic discharging*. SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics, 38(1), 504-528, 2024.
- [3] Bu, Y., and Zhu, X. *An optimal square coloring of planar graphs*. Journal of Combinatorial Optimization, 24(4), 580-592, 2012.
- [4] Cranston, D. W. *Coloring, List Coloring, and Painting Squares of Graphs (and other related problems)*, The Electronic Journal of Combinatorics, **30**, 2, DS25, 2023.
- [5] Deniz, Z. *On 2-distance 16-coloring of planar graphs with maximum degree at most five*. arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.15899, 2023.
- [6] Deniz, Z. *Some results on 2-distance coloring of planar graphs with girth five*. Journal of Combinatorial Optimization, 47(4), 68, 2024.
- [7] Hartke, S. G., Jahanbekam, S. and Thomas, B. *The chromatic number of the square of subcubic planar graphs*. arXiv preprint arXiv:1604.06504, 2016.
- [8] Heuvel, J. van den, McGuinness, S. *Coloring of the square of planar graph*, Journal of Graph Theory, 42 110-124, 2003.
- [9] Kramer, F., and Kramer, H. *Ein Farbungsproblem der Knotenpunkte eines Graphen bezüglich der Distanz p*. Revue Roumaine de Mathematiques Pures et Appliquees, 14(2):1031-1038, 1969.
- [10] Kramer, F., and Kramer, H. *Un probleme de coloration des sommets d'un graphe*. Comptes Rendus Mathematique Academie des Sciences, Paris, 268:46-48, 1969.
- [11] Krumke, S.O., Marathe, M.V., and Ravi, S.S. *Models and approximation algorithms for channel assignment in radio networks*. Wireless Networks 7, 575-584, 2001.
- [12] Krzyzinski, M., Rzaszewski, P., and Tur, S. *Coloring squares of planar graphs with small maximum degree*. Discussiones Mathematicae Graph Theory, 2023.
- [13] Madaras, T. and Marcinova, A. *On the structural result on normal plane maps*. Discussiones Mathematicae Graph Theory 22.2, 293-303, 2002.

- [14] McCormick, S. T. *Optimal approximation of sparse Hessians and its equivalence to a graph coloring problem.* Mathematical Programming, 26(2), 153-171, 1983.
- [15] Molloy, M. and Salavatipour, M. R. *A bound on the chromatic number of the square of a planar graph,* Journal of Combinatorial Theory Series B, 94, 189-213, 2005.
- [16] Thomassen, C. *The square of a planar cubic graph is 7-colorable.* Journal of Combinatorial Theory Series B, 128:192-218, 2018.
- [17] Wegner, G. *Graphs with given diameter and a coloring problem.* Technical report, University of Dortmund, Germany, 1977.
- [18] West, D. B. *Introduction to Graph Theory (Vol. 2).* Upper Saddle River, Prentice hall, 2001.
- [19] Zou, J., Han, M., and Lai, H. J. *Square coloring of planar graphs with maximum degree at most five.* Discrete Applied Mathematics, 353, 4-11, 2024.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, DÜZCE UNIVERSITY, DÜZCE, 81620, TURKEY
Email address: zakirdeniz@duzce.edu.tr