

An Approximate Version of the Strong Nine Dragon Tree Conjecture

Sebastian Mies* and Benjamin Moore†

Abstract

We prove the Strong Nine Dragon Tree Conjecture is true if we replace the edge bound with $d + \lceil k \lfloor \frac{d-1}{k+1} \rfloor (\frac{d}{k+1} - \frac{1}{2} \lceil \frac{d}{k+1} \rceil) \rceil \leq d + \frac{k}{2} \cdot (\frac{d}{k+1})^2$. More precisely: let G be a graph, let d and k be positive integers and $\gamma(G) = \max_{H \subseteq G, v(H) \geq 2} \frac{e(H)}{v(H)-1}$. If $\gamma(G) \leq k + \frac{d}{d+k+1}$, then there is a partition of $E(G)$ into $k+1$ forests, where in one forest every connected component has at most $d + \lceil k \lfloor \frac{d-1}{k+1} \rfloor (\frac{d}{k+1} - \frac{1}{2} \lceil \frac{d}{k+1} \rceil) \rceil$ edges.

1 Introduction

In this paper all graphs may contain parallel edges but are not allowed to contain loops. This is a paper on graph decompositions. Throughout, $E(G)$ and $V(G)$ denote the edge set and vertex set of a graph G , and we use the notation $e(G) = |E(G)|$ and $v(G) = |V(G)|$. A *decomposition* of a graph G is a partition of $E(G)$ into subgraphs. Naturally, we are interested in cases where we can partition $E(G)$ into few subgraphs, each of which are simple. An obvious candidate for a “simple” graph is a forest. Nash-Williams characterized exactly when a graph decomposes into k forests. To state his theorem, we need a definition.

Definition 1.1. *Given a graph G , we let the fractional arboricity of a graph, denoted $\gamma(G)$, be:*

$$\gamma(G) = \max_{H \subseteq G, v(H) \geq 2} \frac{e(H)}{v(H)-1}.$$

Theorem 1 (Nash-Williams’ Theorem [12]). *A graph G decomposes into k forests if and only if $\gamma(G) \leq k$.*

This is an extremely pretty theorem, however it fails to capture some of the information obtained in the parameter γ . In particular, γ may be non-integral, and if for example, $k \geq 1$, and $\gamma(G) = k + \varepsilon$ for $\varepsilon > 0$ but small, one might imagine strengthening the decomposition, because intuitively, one only barely needs $k+1$ forests, essentially k forests suffice. There are many possible ways one might try - but for this paper we will try to gain structure on one single forest. We are not the first to do this; at this point in time, there is a large body of literature on theorems of this type. The most relevant for this paper is the Nine Dragon Tree Theorem, which was proven by Jiang and Yang [6], after a large amount of effort by other authors (see for example, [1, 7, 11, 13]).

Theorem 2 (Nine Dragon Tree Theorem [6]). *Let G be a graph, and let d, k be positive integers. Every graph with $\gamma(G) \leq k + \frac{d}{d+k+1}$ decomposes into $k+1$ forests such that one of them has maximum degree d .*

*Institute of Computer Science, Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz, email: smies@students.uni-mainz.de

†Institute of Science and Technology Austria, email: Benjamin.Moore@ist.ac.at. Benjamin Moore is supported by ERC Starting Grant “RANDSTRUCT” No. 101076777 and appreciates the gracious support.

It was shown in [11] that the Nine Dragon Tree Theorem is sharp, in the following sense:

Theorem 3 ([11]). *For any positive integers k and d there are arbitrarily large graphs G and a set $S \subseteq E(G)$ of $d + 1$ edges such that $\gamma(G - S) = k + \frac{d}{d+k+1}$ and G does not decompose into $k + 1$ forests where one of the forests has maximum degree d .*

Despite this, the authors of [11] conjectured a massive strengthening:

Conjecture 1.2 (Strong Nine Dragon Tree Conjecture, [11]). *Let G be a graph and let d and k be positive integers. If $\gamma(G) \leq k + \frac{d}{d+k+1}$, then there is a partition into $k + 1$ forests, where in one forest every connected component has at most d edges.*

The conjecture is known to be true when $d \leq k + 1$ [9], and recently it was shown to be true when $d \leq 2(k + 1)$ [8]. All other cases are open. Before this paper, the best evidence towards the conjecture was that an analogous conjecture for pseudoforests (i.e. graphs which have at most one cycle in each connected component) was shown to be true (and in fact much more) in a series of work [3, 5, 10]. There is also a digraph version [4] and a matroidal version [2] of the Nine Dragon Tree Conjecture. In an effort to keep the introduction short, we refer the reader to [8] for a very thorough exposition of the history of the Strong Nine Dragon Tree Conjecture and its variants, as well as applications of the theorem.

Let $f(k, d)$ be a function such that every graph with fractional arboricity at most $k + \frac{d}{d+k+1}$ decomposes into $k + 1$ forests such that one of the forests has every connected component containing at most $f(k, d)$ edges. The Strong Nine Dragon Tree Conjecture says that we can take $f(k, d) = d$. Until now, it was not known if $f(k, d)$ exists for all k, d . We show that $f(k, d)$ exists.

Theorem 4. *Let G be a graph and let d and k be positive integers. If $\gamma(G) \leq k + \frac{d}{d+k+1}$, then there is a partition into $k + 1$ forests, where in one forest every connected component has at most $d + \lceil k \lfloor \frac{d-1}{k+1} \rceil (\frac{d}{k+1} - \frac{1}{2} \lceil \frac{d}{k+1} \rceil) \rceil$ edges.*

As a remark, we note that almost two years ago, Daqing Yang announced a similar result with Yaqin Zhang and Chenbo Zhu in a conference (ICCM 2022). After submission of this as a preprint, we learned that their result has also been submitted, but we have not seen it.

We now briefly describe how we prove Theorem 4. In Section 2, we describe how we pick our counterexample. For those who have read the papers on the Strong Nine Dragon Tree Conjecture, it follows the same set up as usual. We fix positive integers k and d , and we argue that a vertex-minimal counterexample to Theorem 4 for our choice of k and d decomposes into $k + 1$ forests where k of them are spanning trees. Let F be the forest which is not spanning (which exists, otherwise the fractional arboricity is too large). We pick our decomposition such that we minimize the number and sizes of large components in F (i.e. those with more than $d' := d + \lceil k \lfloor \frac{d-1}{k+1} \rceil (\frac{d}{k+1} - \frac{1}{2} \lceil \frac{d}{k+1} \rceil) \rceil$ edges). We then define a subgraph, which we call the exploration subgraph, from some component R^* of F which is too large, to be the graph we focus on for the paper. We order the components of F in a tree-like structure with R^* being the root. The goal now is to push edges away from R^* such that there is enough room to split R^* into smaller components getting the decomposition closer to satisfy the theorem. If there are no possibilities for such operations anymore, we can prove that the density of the exploration subgraph is too large and thus, the fractional arboricity of G is also too large, causing a contradiction.

To do this, we first review the special paths lemma (Lemma 3.2) in Section 3, which was proven in [6]: note that a parent and a child component are always linked by an edge of a spanning tree. If we add this edge to F and the resulting component is not too large, we can take away another edge from a component that is closer to the root in exchange (i.e. we move it to one of the spanning trees).

With this in hand, to prove that the exploration subgraph has too large fractional arboricity, it suffices to show that each component of F has few small children. We do this in Section 5. This is where the advancement lies. Prior to this paper, it has not been clear how to ensure any constant number (assuming k and d are fixed) of small children if $d > 2(k + 1)$. We proceed similar to the approach in [9]: in most cases it is possible to exchange the spanning-tree edge between a (relatively large) parent K and a (small) child component with an edge of K . This splits K into two parts and one of the parts is linked with the small child. If we are lucky, the two new components are smaller than K , which might already mean progress. But in the worst case the joined component could be too large. But if K has many small children and we do many of these exchanges in a row such that every part of K is linked with at most one small child, then we can guarantee that none of the new components has more edges than K initially had. After we achieved this, we might need to perform a special path augmentation at a spanning-tree edge to another remaining small child: for very technical reasons the tree structure of the components could have been jumbled up by the previous operations, which the special path augmentation makes up for. If there are at least $\lceil \frac{d}{k+1} \rceil + 1$ small children connected to K with edges of the same spanning tree, this augmentation technique succeeds. In [9] the authors implemented this approach for $d \leq 2(k + 1)$, where 3 children have to be considered, and achieved the same edge bound as this paper does, however, using a slightly lengthier argument. Finding a general rule with which edge of K a spanning-tree edge to a small child is exchanged and in which order the spanning-tree edges should be exchanged is the main achievement of this paper. Note that for $d \leq k + 1$ the edge bound is d and thus best possible. We note that the argument in this paper does not prove the Strong Nine Dragon Tree Conjecture when $k + 1 < d \leq 2(d + 1)$, which was shown in [8]. The argument in [8] required a reconfiguration argument on components which need not be small in certain cases, and a more complicated counting argument to obtain the optimal bound.

After it has been accomplished that K has at most $\lceil \frac{d}{k+1} \rceil$ small children generated from a single spanning tree, it is a routine check to argue that the density of the exploration subgraph is too large.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we set up all definitions needed to define the counterexample. In Section 3, we review the special paths algorithm, and prove small components do not have small children. In Section 4, we prove the root component has no small children, and also introduce a useful exchange operation. In Section 5, we show each component has only few small children. In Section 6, we perform the density calculation and finish the proof.

2 Defining the Counterexample

The goal of this section is to set up everything we need to define a minimal counterexample to Theorem 4. First we pin down some basic notation. For a path P with l vertices, we will write $P = [v_1, \dots, v_l]$ where $v_i v_{i+1}$ is an edge for all $i \in \{1, \dots, k - 1\}$. As we will also consider digraphs, we will use the notation (u, v) to be a directed edge from u to v , and we extend the above notation for paths to directed paths if directions are used. In a tree T with undirected edges let $P^T(x, y)$ denote the unique path in T from x to y . For a tree T which has its edges directed towards a root vertex r , and $x, y \in V(T)$ such that x is a descendant of y in T , we let $P^T(x, y)$ be the unique directed path from x to y in T .

For the rest of the paper we fix integers $k, d \in \mathbb{N}$ where $k, d \geq 1$. Furthermore, we let $\ell := \lfloor \frac{d-1}{k+1} \rfloor = \lceil \frac{d}{k+1} \rceil - 1$ and $d' := d + \lceil k \lfloor \frac{d-1}{k+1} \rfloor (\frac{d}{k+1} - \frac{1}{2} \lceil \frac{d}{k+1} \rceil) \rceil = d + \lceil k\ell (\frac{d}{k+1} - \frac{1}{2}(\ell + 1)) \rceil$. We will later learn why ℓ is an important number. The following fact will be useful throughout the paper:

Observation 2.1. $2\ell + 1 \leq d \leq d'$.

Proof. It is clear that $2\ell + 1 \leq d$ holds. For the second inequality, note if $\ell = 0$, we have $d = d'$. If $\ell \geq 1$, we have that $d > k + 1$ and thus, $\frac{1}{2} \lceil \frac{d}{k+1} \rceil < \frac{d}{k+1}$, which yields $d < d'$. \square

We always assume that we have a graph G which is a vertex-minimal counterexample to Theorem 4. The first observation we need is that G decomposes into k spanning trees and another forest. This fact follows from a minor tweak to the proof of Lemma 2.1 of [6]. Thus, we omit the proof.

Lemma 2.2 (Lemma 2.1 [6]). *Every graph G that is a vertex-minimal counterexample to Theorem 4 admits a decomposition into forests T_1, \dots, T_k, F such that T_1, \dots, T_k are spanning trees.*

Note that if G decomposes into k spanning trees and a forest F , it follows that F is disconnected, or otherwise, $\gamma(G) = k + 1$, a contradiction.

Given a decomposition of G , we will want to measure how close it is to satisfying Theorem 4. This is captured in the next definition:

Definition 2.3. *The residue function $\rho(F)$ of a forest F is defined as the tuple $(\rho_{v(G)-1}(F), \rho_{v(G)-2}(F), \dots, \rho_{d'+1}(F))$, where $\rho_i(F)$ is the number of components of F having i edges.*

We will want to compare residue function values of different forests using lexicographic ordering and are interested in the decomposition with one forest minimizing the residue function.

Notation 2.4. *Over all decompositions into k spanning trees and a forest F we choose one where F minimizes ρ with respect to lexicographic order. We call this minimum tuple ρ^* . This forest F has a component R^* containing at least $d' + 1$ edges.*

We will now choose a vertex from R^* which will function as a root for the k spanning trees of G . We pick r from “the center” of R^* , which is formalized in the following lemma.

Lemma 2.5. *The component R^* contains a vertex r such that for every edge $e \in E(R^*)$ that is incident to r we have that the component of r in $R^* - e$ has at least $\ell + 1$ edges.*

Proof. For every $v \in V(R^*)$ let $\beta(v) \in \mathbb{N}$ be the maximum number such that for every edge $e \in E(R^*)$ that is incident to v we have that the component of v in $R^* - e$ has at least $\beta(v)$ edges. Suppose towards a contradiction that the lemma is false. Let $r' \in V(R^*)$ such that $\beta(r')$ is maximized over all vertices. Thus $\beta(r') \leq \ell$. We will show that a neighbour of r' has strictly larger β . Let $r''r' \in E(R^*)$ such that the component of r' in $R^* - r''r'$ has exactly $\beta(r')$ edges. We show that $\beta(r'') > \beta(r')$. First, note that the component of r'' in $R^* - r''r'$ has at least

$$e(R^*) - (\beta(r') + 1) \geq d' + 1 - (\ell + 1) \geq \ell + 1 > \beta(r')$$

edges by Observation 2.1. Now, let $x \in V(R^*)$ such that $r''x \in E(R^*)$ and $x \neq r'$. Then the component of r'' in $R^* - r''x$ has at least $\beta(r'') + 1$ edges, contradicting our choice of r' . \square

We fix one choice of r with the properties described in Lemma 2.5 for the rest of the paper.

Definition 2.6. *We define \mathcal{F} to be the set of decompositions into forests (T_1, \dots, T_k, F) of G such that T_1, \dots, T_k are directed spanning trees of G where the arcs of T_1, \dots, T_k are directed towards r and F is an undirected forest containing the component R^* .*

We let $\mathcal{F}^ \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ be the set of decompositions $(T_1, \dots, T_k, F) \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $\rho(F) = \rho^*$.*

The next definition is simply to make it easier to talk about decompositions in \mathcal{F} .

Definition 2.7. Let $\mathcal{T} = (T_1, \dots, T_k, F) \in \mathcal{F}$. We say that the arcs of T_1, \dots, T_k are blue and the (undirected) edges of F are red. We define $E(\mathcal{T}) := E(T_1) \cup \dots \cup E(T_k) \cup E(F)$. Furthermore, we let $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{T}) := F$ and for any $b \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ we let $\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T}) := T_b$. For any induced subgraph H of $(V(G), E(\mathcal{T}))$ we call the connected components of $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{T})[V(H)]$ red components of H and let $e_r(H)$ denote the number of red edges of H .

Finally, we can define the critical subgraph which we will focus on for the rest of the paper:

Definition 2.8. Let $\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{F}$. The exploration subgraph $H_{\mathcal{T}}$ of \mathcal{T} is the subgraph of the mixed graph $(V(G), E(\mathcal{T}))$ that is induced by the vertex set consisting of all vertices v for which there is a sequence of vertices $r = x_1, \dots, x_l = v$ such that for all $1 \leq i < l$ we have that $(x_i, x_{i+1}) \in \bigcup_{b \in \{1, \dots, k\}} E(\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T}))$ or $x_i x_{i+1} \in E(\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{T}))$.

In the next lemma we show that the red subgraph of an exploration subgraph has a natural density bound.

Lemma 2.9.

$$\frac{e_r(H_{\mathcal{T}})}{v(H_{\mathcal{T}}) - 1} \leq \frac{d}{d + k + 1}.$$

Proof. We have that $H_{\mathcal{T}}$ has exactly $k(v(H_{\mathcal{T}}) - 1)$ blue arcs since each vertex $v \in V(H_{\mathcal{T}}) - r$ has exactly k blue outgoing arcs and r has no blue outgoing arc in $E(\mathcal{T})$. We conclude

$$k + \frac{d}{d + k + 1} \geq \gamma(G) \geq \frac{e(H_{\mathcal{T}})}{v(H_{\mathcal{T}}) - 1} \geq \frac{k(v(H_{\mathcal{T}}) - 1) + e_r(H_{\mathcal{T}})}{v(H_{\mathcal{T}}) - 1} = k + \frac{e_r(H_{\mathcal{T}})}{v(H_{\mathcal{T}}) - 1}.$$

□

We will want to focus on red components of $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{T}}$ with low edge density:

Definition 2.10. A red component K is small if $e(K) \leq \ell$.

Note that $e(K) \leq \ell$ if and only if $e(K) < \frac{d}{k+1}$, which yields the following observation.

Observation 2.11. A red component K is small if and only if $\frac{e(K)}{v(K)} < \frac{d}{d+k+1}$.

Now we turn our focus to the notion of legal orders, which is an ordering of the red components of an exploration subgraph that loosely tells us in what order we should augment the decomposition.

Definition 2.12. Let $\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{F}$ and let $\sigma = (R_1, \dots, R_t)$ be a sequence of all red components in $H_{\mathcal{T}}$. We say σ is a legal order for \mathcal{T} if $R_1 = R^*$, and further, for each $1 < j \leq t$, there is an $i_j < j$ such that there is a blue arc (x_j, y_j) with $x_j \in V(R_{i_j})$ and $y_j \in V(R_j)$.

It will be useful to compare legal orders, and we will again do so using lexicographic ordering.

Definition 2.13. Let $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}' \in \mathcal{F}$ and suppose that $\sigma = (R_1, \dots, R_t)$ and $\sigma' = (R'_1, \dots, R'_{t'})$ are legal orders for \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{T}' , respectively. We say σ is smaller than σ' , denoted $\sigma < \sigma'$, if $(e(R_1), \dots, e(R_t))$ is lexicographically smaller than $(e(R'_1), \dots, e(R'_{t'}))$. If $t \neq t'$, we extend the shorter sequence with zeros to make the orders comparable.

To make it easier to discuss legal orders, we introduce some more vocabulary:

Definition 2.14. Suppose $\sigma = (R_1, \dots, R_t)$ is a legal order for $\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{F}$. If $v \in V(R_j)$ we write $i_{\sigma}(v) := j$. For $U \subseteq V(H_{\mathcal{T}})$ we define $i_{\sigma}(U) := \min_{u \in U} i_{\sigma}(u)$ (in particular, $i_{\sigma}(\emptyset) = \infty$) and for any subgraph $H \subseteq H_{\mathcal{T}}$ we let $i_{\sigma}(H) := i_{\sigma}(V(H))$.

For the purposes of tiebreaking how we pick legal orders, we introduce the next graph:

Definition 2.15. Let $\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{F}$ and let $\sigma = (R_1, \dots, R_t)$ be a legal order for \mathcal{T} . Compliant to Definition 2.12 we choose a blue arc (x_j, y_j) for all $1 < j \leq t$. There might be multiple possibilities for this, but we simply fix one choice for \mathcal{T} and σ . By removing all the blue arcs from $H_{\mathcal{T}}$ that are not in $\{(x_j, y_j) \mid 1 < j \leq t\}$, we obtain the auxiliary tree of \mathcal{T} and σ and denote it by $Aux(\mathcal{T}, \sigma)$. We always consider $Aux(\mathcal{T}, \sigma)$ to be rooted at r .

Note that in the blue spanning trees of decompositions of \mathcal{F} the arcs are directed towards r while in an auxiliary tree blue arcs are directed away from the root r .

With this, we are in position to define our counterexample. As already outlined, G is a vertex-minimal counterexample to Theorem 4. Further, we pick a legal order $\sigma^* = (R_1^*, \dots, R_{t^*}^*)$ for a decomposition $\mathcal{T}^* \in \mathcal{F}^*$ such that there is no legal order σ with $\sigma < \sigma^*$ for any $\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{F}^*$. We will use these notations for the minimal legal order and decomposition throughout the rest of the paper.

Additionally, we define a few terms for \mathcal{T}^* and σ^* .

Definition 2.16. Let $j \in \{2, \dots, t\}$ and let x_j, y_j and i_j be defined as they were fixed in Definitions 2.12 and 2.15. Let $w(K) := y_j$ and we call (x_j, y_j) the witnessing arc of K . Furthermore, we say that R_{i_j} is the parent of R_j . On the other hand, we call R_j a child of R_{i_j} (that is generated by (x_j, y_j)).

We now outline how we will show that the fractional arboricity of the counterexample graph is larger than $\frac{d}{d+k+1}$. In Lemma 3.6 we will show that the parent of a small red component is not small. In Lemma 5.10 we will bound the number and sizes of the small children of non-small components. Lemma 6.4 will show that this bound is enough such that on average the density of a parent component and all its small children is at least $\frac{d}{d+k+1}$. Finally, we will show that this leads to a contradiction to Lemma 2.9.

3 Small Components Do Not Have Small Children

In this section we consider the first method to find a smaller legal order or shrink a component with more than d' edges. This method from [6] roughly works the following way: if a blue arc e connecting two red components can be coloured red without increasing the residue function, then in certain cases we can find a red edge e' that can be coloured blue in exchange. In order to find this edge we need to look for a certain blue directed path that ends at e and starts at a vertex v_0 and v_0 has to be closer to R^* with respect to the legal order than the tail of e . First, we formalize the requirements for such a blue path:

Definition 3.1. Let $\sigma = (R_1, \dots, R_t)$ be a legal order for $\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{F}$. We call a blue directed path $P = [v_0, v_1, \dots, v_l] \subseteq \bigcup_{b \in \{1, \dots, k\}} \mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T})$ that is contained in $H_{\mathcal{T}}$ special with respect to \mathcal{T} , σ and (v_{l-1}, v_l) if v_{l-1} and v_l are in different components of $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{T})$, $i_{\sigma}(v_l) > i_{\sigma}(v_0)$ and furthermore, v_0 needs to be an ancestor of v_{l-1} in $Aux(\mathcal{T}, \sigma)$ if both of them are in the same component of $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{T})$. For two special paths $P = [v_0, v_1, \dots, v_l]$ and $P' = [v'_0, v'_1, \dots, v'_l]$ with respect to \mathcal{T} , σ and (v_{l-1}, v_l) we write $P \leq P'$ if $i_{\sigma}(v_0) < i_{\sigma}(v'_0)$, or if $i_{\sigma}(v_0) = i_{\sigma}(v'_0)$ and v_0 in $Aux(\mathcal{T}, \sigma)$ is an ancestor of v'_0 . We call a special path P with respect to \mathcal{T} , σ and (x, y) minimal if there is no special path $P' \neq P$ with respect to \mathcal{T} , σ and (x, y) such that $P' \leq P$.

Note that for every special path P' with respect to \mathcal{T} , σ and (x, y) there exists a minimal special path P with respect to \mathcal{T} , σ and (x, y) such that $P \leq P'$. Furthermore, note that if we have a minimal special path $P = [v_0, v_1, \dots, v_l]$ with respect to \mathcal{T} , σ and (v_{l-1}, v_l) , we have $v_0 \neq r$ because

r has no outgoing blue arc by construction. Therefore, v_0 has a parent vertex in $Aux(\mathcal{T}, \sigma)$, which we denote by v_{-1} . Note that the edge $v_{-1}v_0$ is red because of the minimality of P and since all blue arcs in $Aux(\mathcal{T}, \sigma)$ are directed away from r in the auxiliary tree.

The following lemma describes which modifications to the decomposition can be made if a minimal special path exists and how they change the legal order. An illustration of these modifications can be seen in Figure 1.

Lemma 3.2 (cf. Lemma 2.4 and Corollary 2.5 in [6]). *Let $\sigma = (R_1, \dots, R_t)$ be a legal order for $\mathcal{T} = (T_1, \dots, T_k, F) \in \mathcal{F}$. Furthermore, let $P = [v_0, v_1, \dots, v_l]$ be a minimal special path with respect to \mathcal{T} , σ and (v_{l-1}, v_l) . Let $i_0 := i_\sigma(v_0)$.*

Then there is a partition into forests $\mathcal{T}' = (T'_1, \dots, T'_k, F')$ of G such that T'_1, \dots, T'_k are spanning trees rooted at r whose arcs are directed to the respective parent vertex, forest F' exclusively consists of undirected edges and if R' denotes the component in F' containing r , we have that

1. $F' = (F + v_{l-1}v_l) - v_{-1}v_0$.
2. $(v_0, v_{-1}) \in \bigcup_{b=1}^k E(T'_b)$.
3. $\{(x, y) \in E(T'_b) \mid i_\sigma(x) < i_0\} = \{(x, y) \in E(T_b) \mid i_\sigma(x) < i_0\}$ for all $b \in \{1, \dots, k\}$.
4. $\bigcup_{b=1}^k \{uv \mid (u, v) \in E(T'_b)\} = \left(\left(\bigcup_{b=1}^k \{uv \mid (u, v) \in E(T_b)\} \right) - v_{l-1}v_l \right) + v_0v_{-1}$.
5. If $i_0 > 1$, then $R^* = R'$, $\mathcal{T}' \in \mathcal{F}$ and there exists a legal order $\sigma' = (R'_1, \dots, R'_t)$ for \mathcal{T}' with $R'_j = R_j$ for all $j < i_0$ and $e(R'_{i_0}) < e(R_{i_0})$, where R'_{i_0} is the component of v_{-1} in F' . Thus, $\sigma' < \sigma$.




Figure 1: An example of an augmentation of a minimal special path that consists of three segments of three different spanning trees. A blue dotted path is the unique path in its spanning tree between the two vertices when orientations are ignored. Note that the minimal special path can be chosen such that the dotted paths are edge-disjoint to the special path.

Since we want to find smaller orders than σ^* in some of the following proofs to arrive at a contradiction, it is desirable that the fifth point holds in an application of Lemma 3.2. In the event this is not the case, we can still gain more structure. We want to show this more formally with the next lemma:

Lemma 3.3. *If Lemma 3.2 is applicable such that $\rho(F + v_{l-1}v_l) = \rho^*$ holds, then $e(R_{i_0}) \leq d'$ and therefore $i_0 > 1$ such that 5. can be applied. Moreover, in this case we have $\mathcal{T}' \in \mathcal{F}^*$ for the partition obtained.*

Proof. We use the notation of Lemma 3.2. We have that R_{i_0} is split into two strictly smaller components in F' . If $\rho(F + xy) = \rho^*$ and $e(R_{i_0}) > d'$, then we had $\rho(F') < \rho^*$, a contradiction. \square

The case treated in Lemma 3.3 still yields a contradiction since 5. of Lemma 3.2 provides a smaller legal order than σ^* . This fact is captured in the following corollary.

Corollary 3.4. *Let $\sigma = (R_1, \dots, R_t)$ be a legal order for $\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{F}$. If there is a special path $P = [v_0, \dots, v_l]$ with respect to \mathcal{T} , σ and (v_{l-1}, v_l) such that $e(R_i) \leq e(R_i^*)$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, i_\sigma(v_0)\}$, then $\rho(\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{T}) + v_{l-1}v_l) > \rho^*$.*

Corollary 3.4 shows how we will make use of special paths later. After doing some exchanges between the forests of \mathcal{T}^* we will obtain a decomposition \mathcal{T} and a special path as described in the corollary, but we will also have that $\rho(\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{T}) + v_{l-1}v_l) = \rho^*$. Next we want to look at what consequences Lemma 3.2 has on the relation of child and parent components:

Lemma 3.5 (Corollary 2.5 from [6]).

Let C be a child of K that is generated by (x, y) . Then $e(K) + e(C) \geq d'$.

Proof. Suppose to the contrary that $e(K) + e(C) < d'$. Since $i_{\sigma^*}(y) > i_{\sigma^*}(x)$, we have that $[x, y]$ is a special path with respect to \mathcal{T}^* , σ^* and (x, y) . Furthermore, $\rho(\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{T}^*) + xy) = \rho^*$, but this contradicts Corollary 3.4. \square

Lemma 3.6. *Let K be a small red component of $H_{\mathcal{T}^*}$. Then K does not have small children and thus, every small red component of $H_{\mathcal{T}^*}$ has a parent component that is not small.*

Proof. Let C be a small red component of $H_{\mathcal{T}^*}$. If C does not have a parent component, then $C = R^*$, which is a contradiction since $e(R^*) \geq d' + 1 > \ell$ by Observation 2.11. Thus, let K be the parent of C . By Lemma 3.5, we have that $e(K) \geq d' - e(C) \geq d' - \ell \geq \ell + 1$ by Observation 2.11 and hence, K is not small. \square

4 R^* Does Not Have Small Children

In this section, we define a useful exchange operation and show how to reorient edges after the exchange to maintain the proper structure of the decomposition. This operation has already been used in previous Nine Dragon Tree papers, starting with [6]. We then use this exchange operation to show that R^* does not have small children. For this section we define $\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{F}$ together with a legal order σ of \mathcal{T} .

Definition 4.1. *Let $e \in E(\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T}))$ for some $b \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ and $e' \in E(\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{T}))$. If $(\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T}) - e) + e'$ is a spanning tree and $(F - e') + e$ is a forest (ignoring orientations), we say that e' can be exchanged with e , and say that $e \leftrightarrow e'$ holds in \mathcal{T} .*

The next lemma is obvious and we omit the proof, but it usefully characterizes when $e \leftrightarrow e'$. However, we refer the reader to Figure 2 for an illustration.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $u \in V(G) - r$, u' be the parent vertex of u in $\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T})$ for some $b \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ and $e = v_1v_2 \in E(\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{T}))$ such that $(\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{T}) + uu') - e$ does not contain a cycle. Then, the following are equivalent:*

- (a) $(u, u') \leftrightarrow e$ holds in \mathcal{T} .
- (b) The edge (u, u') lies in the unique cycle (ignoring orientations) of $\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T}) + e$.

(c) Up to relabelling v_1 as v_2 , v_1 is a descendant of u in $\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T})$ and v_2 is not.

Furthermore, if these conditions are met, then after exchanging (u, u') and e between $\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T})$ and $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{T})$, orienting e towards v_2 , removing the orientation of e and reorienting the path $P^{\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T})}(v_1, u)$, the resulting decomposition is again in \mathcal{F} , and we say we obtain the resulting decomposition from \mathcal{T} by performing $(u, u') \leftrightarrow e$.




Figure 2: An example where we have $(u_1, u'_1) \leftrightarrow v_1 v'_1$ and $(u_2, u'_2) \leftrightarrow v_2 v'_2$.

Lemma 4.3. *The component R^* does not have small children.*

Proof. Suppose to the contrary that R^* has a small child C generated by $(x, x') \in E(\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T}^*))$ for some $b \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. Let $P = [x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be the path from x to r in $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{T}^*)$. Let $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that x_i is the first vertex on P that is not a descendant of x in $\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T}^*)$. This vertex exists and $i > 1$ since x is a descendant of x in $\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T}^*)$ and r is not. We obtain \mathcal{T} from \mathcal{T}^* by performing $(x, x') \leftrightarrow x_{i-1} x_i$. By Lemma 4.2 we have that $\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{F}$. The component K_r of r in $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{T})$ contains at least $\ell + 1$ edges by the definition of r . For the component K_x of x in $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{T})$ we have

$$e(K_x) \leq e(R^*) - |\{x_{i-1} x_i\}| - e(K_r) + |\{x x'\}| + e(C) < e(R^*).$$

Since K_r is a proper subgraph of R^* , we have that $\rho(\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{T})) < \rho^*$, which is a contradiction. \square

5 Non-small Components Do Not Have Many Small Children

In this section we fix $b \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ and a non-small red component $K \neq R^*$ of $H_{\mathcal{T}^*}$. Our goal is to show that K has at most $\ell + 1$ small children generated by $\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T}^*)$. In fact, we will show a slightly stronger statement, which is Lemma 5.10. In order to show this, we combine the two strategies of the previous two sections. Let us give some intuition for the approach before delving into the technical details. First, we perform edge exchanges as defined in Definition 4.1. These exchanges will cut off a part of K and link it with a small child. After we have done this a sufficient number of times, every part will be linked to at most one child, which will guarantee us that no part will have more $e(K)$ edges. If the exchanges have not messed up the legal order before K , then we will have arranged that the component of $w(K)$ has less than $e(K)$ edges, which immediately gives us a smaller legal order than σ^* . If the legal order is jumbled by the exchanges, we will have arranged that there is an spanning-tree arc to a small child of K , which we have not exchanged and which is the end of a minimal special path whose start is so far back in the legal order where it is still equal to σ^* . If we augment this minimal special path we will retrieve a smaller legal order than σ^* as we

previously did. We will later call the second to last vertex of this path (which is in K and has an arc to a small child) a special vertex. More specifically, each intermediate decomposition will have a such a vertex, even if we are not aiming to perform a special path augmentation yet, that we call a special vertex (however, it might change after an exchange operation and pass its “special” properties to another vertex).

Another challenge lies in not accidentally reorienting generating edges while performing edge exchanges. Since a blue directed path ending at a “generating vertex” (i.e. a tail of a generating edge) is reoriented by the exchange operation introduced in Lemma 4.2, we aim to make an edge exchange with a generating vertex that does not have another generating vertex as a descendant. In Lemma 5.7 this vertex will be called x or it will be the special vertex v_* . However, for technical reasons we have to take another vertex (which will be called y) for the exchange, which also has the nice property of not reorienting generating edges. When we are forced to perform an edge exchange with v_* , we will arrange that after the exchange there is a blue path from v_* to another generating vertex, which will then meet all the criteria for being a special vertex in the resulting decomposition. When it comes to not reorienting generating edges, we will actually make an exception: during the phase of edge exchanges operations our goal is to decrease the size of the largest component that stems from K . In the worst case we can only split one edge from it (i.e. the edge that is exchanged with a generating edge). Thus, if we split off a generating vertex that is not v_* from the largest component together with at least another vertex, then we can allow ourselves to not consider this vertex for future operations, since more progress than expected has already been made, and thus, we may also reorient it. This is covered by 5) in the first subsection.

In the first subsection of this section we describe which properties intermediate decompositions before the minimal special path augmentation should have. Of course, these properties also hold for \mathcal{T}^* . In the second subsection we then fully describe and prove the augmentation steps we just encountered.

5.1 Definition of Valid Intermediate States

Notation 5.1. Fix a positive integer $\ell' \leq \ell$. By $X_{\ell'}(K)$ we denote the set of vertices x such that there is a small child of K having at most ℓ' edges that is generated by $(x, x') \in E(\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T}^*))$. If not described otherwise, x' denotes the parent of $x \in X_{\ell'}(K)$ in $\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T}^*)$. Let $\mathcal{C}(K)$ denote the set of small children of K . For $\ell' \in \{0, \dots, \ell\}$ let $\mathcal{C}_{\ell'}(K)$ denote the number of small children of K having at most ℓ' edges.

The following definition will help us describing which vertices may be reoriented by performing edge exchanges. This might not be clear straightaway, but we will give an intuition afterwards.

Definition 5.2. Let $\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{F}$ and $U \subseteq V(K)$. Furthermore, for $v \in V(G)$ let $\Delta(v)$ denote the set of descendants of v in $\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T})$. For every $u \in U$ let $T_u(U, \mathcal{T})$ be the subtree of $\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T})$ with root u and vertex set $\Delta(u) \setminus (\bigcup_{u' \in U \cap \Delta(u)} \Delta(u'))$. Let $\mathcal{I}_{\ell'}(K) := \min_{x \in X_{\ell'}(K)} i_{\sigma^*}(T_x(X_{\ell'}(K), \mathcal{T}^*))$.

Note that in Definition 5.2 we have that $V(T_u(U, \mathcal{T}))$ and $V(T_{u'}(U, \mathcal{T}))$ are disjoint for any distinct vertices $u, u' \in U$. Later, we will use this definition with $U \subseteq X_{\ell'}(K)$ and our setup will guarantee that when performing $(u, u') \leftrightarrow e$, where $u \in U$, then only blue arcs of $T_u(U, \mathcal{T})$ will be reoriented and in particular, no other “child-generating” arcs will be reoriented whose tails are in U .

Let $\ell' \in \{0, \dots, \ell\}$, $\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{F}$ and $a \in X_{\ell'}(K)$. In the rest of this subsection we enumerate nine conditions 1), . . . , 9) which all need to hold such that we may call (\mathcal{T}, a) a valid intermediate state for K and ℓ' . For better readability we will sometimes use the notation $\mathcal{T}_a := (\mathcal{T}, a)$.

Let $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T})$ be the set of components of $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{T})[V(K)]$ and for every $L \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T})$ let \bar{L} be the component of $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{T})$ containing L .

- 1) All components of $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{T}^*)$ that are not from $\mathcal{C}_{\ell'}(K) \cup \{K\}$ are also components of $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{T})$, $\bigcup_{C \in \mathcal{C}_{\ell'}(K)} E(C) \subseteq E(\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{T}))$ and the remaining edges of $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{T})$ form a subset of $E(K) \cup \bigcup_{x \in X_{\ell'}(K)} \{xx'\}$.
- 2a) If $\mathcal{I}_{\ell'}(K) < i_{\sigma^*}(K)$, then there is a legal order (R_1, \dots, R_t) for \mathcal{T} such that $R_i = R_i^*$ for all $i \in \{0, \dots, \mathcal{I}_{\ell'}(K)\}$.
- 2b) If $\mathcal{I}_{\ell'}(K) = i_{\sigma^*}(K)$, then there is a legal order (R_1, \dots, R_t) for \mathcal{T} such that $R_i = R_i^*$ for all $i \in \{0, \dots, i_{\sigma^*}(K) - 1\}$ and the witnessing arc of K also is a blue arc in the same orientation as in \mathcal{T}^* in $E(\mathcal{T})$.
- 3) $\min_{x \in X_{\ell'}(K)} i_{\sigma^*}(T_x(X_{\ell'}(K), \mathcal{T})) \geq \mathcal{I}_{\ell'}(K)$.
- 4) For all $L \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T})$, \bar{L} contains at most one edge of $\bigcup_{x \in X_{\ell'}(K)} \{xx'\}$.

Note that at most one component of $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T})$ has at least $\max\{d', e(K)\} - \ell'$ edges (or otherwise $e(K) \geq 2(\max\{d', e(K)\} - \ell') + 1 > \max\{d', e(K)\}$ by Observation 2.1). We denote this component by $K'(\mathcal{T})$ if it exists and otherwise we let $K'(\mathcal{T})$ be the subgraph of K not containing any vertices, denoted by \emptyset .

- 5) For all $x \in X_{\ell'}(K) \cap V(K'(\mathcal{T}))$, we have that $(x', x) \notin E(\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T}))$.

Let $S(\mathcal{T})$ be the set of vertices s such that $s \in X_{\ell'}(K) \cap V(K'(\mathcal{T}))$ and $(s, s') \in E(\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T}))$.

In the following we will define special vertices. They are linked to special paths in the following way: our augmentations will finally resolve in a valid intermediate state, which might have a special vertex v_* . If so, we will do a special path augmentation in the proof of Lemma 5.9 where the minimal special path ends with (v_*, v'_*) . By the definition of special vertices this minimal special path will start relatively close to R^* with respect to σ^* . As all our other changes on the decomposition will be later in the legal order, the special path augmentation will provide a smaller legal order than σ^* , which will be a contradiction.

Definition 5.3. Let $v_* \in X_{\ell'}(K)$ and define $\bar{S}_{v_*} := S(\mathcal{T}) + v_*$.

- If $\mathcal{I}_{\ell'}(K) < i_{\sigma^*}(K)$, we call $v_* \in X_{\ell'}(K)$ special for \mathcal{T} if $(v_*, v'_*) \in E(\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T}))$ and $i_{\sigma^*}(T_{v_*}(\bar{S}_{v_*}, \mathcal{T})) = \mathcal{I}_{\ell'}(K)$.
 - If $\mathcal{I}_{\ell'}(K) = i_{\sigma^*}(K)$, we call $v_* \in X_{\ell'}(K)$ special for \mathcal{T} if $(v_*, v'_*) \in E(\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T}))$ and $w(K) \in V(T_{v_*}(\bar{S}_{v_*}, \mathcal{T}))$.
- 6a) If there is a special vertex for \mathcal{T} , then a is a special vertex. In this case let $v_* := a$.
 - 6b) If there is no special vertex for \mathcal{T} , then $\mathcal{I}_{\ell'}(K) = i_{\sigma^*}(K)$ and $a = w(K)$.
 - 7) Let $L \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T})$ contain a . Then \bar{L} does not contain an edge of $\bigcup_{x \in X_{\ell'}(K)} \{xx'\}$ and thus, $\bar{L} = L$.

5.2 Augmenting Valid Intermediate States

In Lemma 5.7 we will show that we can perform an edge exchange that gives us a “better” valid intermediate state. Before we turn to this lemma, we will show that after any obvious edge exchange, 1), 2a), 2b) and 3) will still hold in the new decomposition.

Lemma 5.5. *Let $\ell \in \{0, \dots, \ell\}$, $(\mathcal{T}, a) \in \mathcal{F}_{K, \ell'}$ and $x \in \bar{S}(\mathcal{T}_a)$. Furthermore, let v be a descendant of x in $\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T})$ and v' not be a descendant of x such that $vv' \in E(K) \cap E(\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{T}))$. Then 1), 2a), 2b) and 3) hold for the decomposition \mathcal{T}' that can be obtained from \mathcal{T} by performing $(x, x') \leftrightarrow vv'$.*

Proof. It is clear that 1) holds for \mathcal{T}' . Now we prove 2a) and 2b) hold for \mathcal{T}' . First observe that as 3) holds for \mathcal{T}_a we have that $i_{\sigma^*}(P^{\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T})}(v, x)) \geq \mathcal{I}_{\ell'}(K)$. First, let $\mathcal{I}_{\ell'}(K) < i_{\sigma^*}(K)$. Then $i_{\sigma^*}(K \cup \bigcup_{C \in \mathcal{C}_{\ell'}(K)} C) > \mathcal{I}_{\ell'}(K)$ and thus, there is a legal order $(R'_1, \dots, R'_{\ell'})$ for \mathcal{T}' such that $R'_i = R_i = R_i^*$ for all $i \in \{0, \dots, \mathcal{I}_{\ell'}(K)\}$ and hence, 2a) holds for \mathcal{T}' .

If $\mathcal{I}_{\ell'}(K) = i_{\sigma^*}(K)$, then $i_{\sigma^*}(K \cup \bigcup_{C \in \mathcal{C}_{\ell'}(K)} C) \geq i_{\sigma^*}(K)$ and thus, the witnessing arc of K also exists in $E(\mathcal{T}')$ and there is a legal order $(R'_1, \dots, R'_{\ell'})$ for \mathcal{T}' such that $R'_i = R_i = R_i^*$ for all $i \in \{0, \dots, i_{\sigma^*}(K) - 1\}$. Hence, 2b) holds for \mathcal{T}' .

Finally, suppose 3) does not hold for \mathcal{T}' . Thus there is a vertex z with $i_{\sigma^*}(z) < \mathcal{I}_{\ell'}(K)$ that has path in $\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T}')$ to some vertex of $X_{\ell'}(K)$, but it does not have such a path in $\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T})$. Let (u, u') be the first arc on this path that is not in $\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T}')$. Then $u \in V(P^{\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T})}(v, x))$ and thus, z has a path to x in $\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T})$, which is a contradiction. \square

Lemma 5.6. *Let $\ell' \in \{0, \dots, \ell\}$ and $\mathcal{T}_a \in \mathcal{F}_{K, \ell'}$. Then $P^{\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T})}(u(\mathcal{T}_a), r)$ either does not contain a vertex of $\bar{S}(\mathcal{T}_a)$ or a is special and the first vertex on this path which is in $\bar{S}(\mathcal{T}_a)$ is a .*

Proof. The lemma trivially holds if $u(\mathcal{T}_a) = a$ is special. If $u(\mathcal{T}_a)$ extends $K'(\mathcal{T})$ in \mathcal{T} , then the lemma holds since 9) holds for \mathcal{T} . If $u(\mathcal{T}_a) = a = w(K)$ is not special, then $\mathcal{I}_{\ell'}(K) = i_{\sigma^*}(K)$ and there is no special vertex for \mathcal{T} by 6a). Thus, $w(K)$ is not a descendant of any vertex of $\bar{S}(\mathcal{T}_a)$. \square

Lemma 5.7. *Let $\ell' \in \{0, \dots, \ell\}$ and $\mathcal{T}_a \in \mathcal{F}_{K, \ell'}$ such that $\dot{S}(\mathcal{T}_a) \neq \emptyset$ and $K'(\mathcal{T}) \neq \emptyset$. Then there is a tuple $(\mathcal{T}', a') \in \mathcal{F}_{K, \ell'}$ such that $K'(\mathcal{T}') \subsetneq K'(\mathcal{T})$.*

Proof. If a is special for \mathcal{T} , then let $a =: v_*$. Consider the tree Q with vertex set $\bar{S}(\mathcal{T}_a) + r$ where two vertices v_1, v_2 are linked by an arc (v_1, v_2) whenever v_1 is a descendant of v_2 in $\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T})$. Observe that Q has at least two vertices which are not a since $\dot{S}(\mathcal{T}_a) \neq \emptyset$. Let Q be rooted at r such that every vertex has a directed path to r . If a is special for \mathcal{T} and the only non-root leaf in Q , then let x be the parent of a (in this case Q is a path from a to r). Otherwise let x be a non-root leaf of Q . Note that $x \notin \{u(\mathcal{T}_a), r\}$ and furthermore, if a is special we have $x \neq v_*$. Since 8) holds for \mathcal{T}_a , we have that $u(\mathcal{T}_a) \in K'(\mathcal{T})$, and as $x \in \dot{S}(\mathcal{T}_a)$, it follows that both x and $u(\mathcal{T}_a)$ are in $K'(\mathcal{T})$. Let $P^{K'(\mathcal{T})}(u(\mathcal{T}_a), x) = [v_1, \dots, v_n]$. For $i \in \{2, \dots, n\}$ let L_i and L'_i be the components of $K'(\mathcal{T}) - v_{i-1}v_i$ containing v_i and v_{i-1} , respectively. Note that the notations defined in the following are illustrated on the right side of Figure 4. Let i be minimal with the property that $P^{\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T})}(v_i, r)$ visits a vertex of $V(L_i) \cap \dot{S}(\mathcal{T}_a)$ before it reaches any vertex of $\{v_*, r\}$. Note that i exists since $x \in V(L_n) \cap \dot{S}(\mathcal{T}_a)$ and we have $v_i \neq u(\mathcal{T}_a)$ by Lemma 5.6 and thus, $i \geq 2$. Let $v := v_i$ and $v' := v_{i-1}$ and note that $P^{\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T})}(v', r)$ either does not contain a vertex of $\dot{S}(\mathcal{T}_a)$ or the first vertex on this path which is in $\bar{S}(\mathcal{T}_a)$ is v_* (if $i = 2$ and thus, $v' = u(\mathcal{T}_a)$, this is true by Lemma 5.6). Let $L := L_i$ and $L' := L'_i$. We split into cases depending on how many edges L' has.

Case 1: $e(L') \leq \max\{d', e(K)\} - \ell' - 1$:

Let y be the first vertex on $P^{\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T})}(v, r)$ that is in $V(L) \cap \dot{S}(\mathcal{T}_a)$.

Subcase 1.1: v' is not a descendant of y in $\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T})$:

Note that v' is a neighbour of v in the red path from $u(\mathcal{T}_a)$ to v while, compliant to Notation 5.1,




Figure 4: \mathcal{T}_a (left side) and \mathcal{T}'_a (right side) in Subcase 1.1 in the proof of Lemma 5.7.

y' shall denote the parent of y in $\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T}^*)$. We obtain \mathcal{T}' from \mathcal{T} by performing $(y, y') \leftrightarrow vv'$ (which reorients $P^{\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T})}(v, y)$) and show that $\mathcal{T}'_a := (\mathcal{T}', a) \in \mathcal{F}_{K, \ell'}$ and \mathcal{T}'_a satisfies the lemma. Note that \mathcal{T}'_a is depicted on the left side of Figure 4.

Note that 1), 2a), 2b) and 3) hold for \mathcal{T}' by Lemma 5.5. Hence, we focus on the remaining conditions.

To see that 4) holds, first observe that since 4) holds for \mathcal{T} , we only need to check the condition on the components L and L' affected by the exchange. Observe if there is a vertex $z \in X_{\ell'}(K) \cap V(K'(\mathcal{T}))$ such that $zz' \in E(\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{T}))$, then $z = u(\mathcal{T}_a)$ since 4) holds for \mathcal{T} . Since $u(\mathcal{T}_a)$ is in L' and y is in L , we have that 4) also holds for \mathcal{T}' .

Note that either $K'(\mathcal{T}') = \emptyset$ or $K'(\mathcal{T}') = L$. As 5) holds for \mathcal{T} and since y is the only vertex of $X_{\ell'}(K) \cap V(L)$ contained in $P^{\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T})}(v, y)$, we have that 5) also holds for \mathcal{T}' . Thus, $\dot{S}(\mathcal{T}'_a) = (\dot{S}(\mathcal{T}_a) \cap V(L)) - y$ if $K'(\mathcal{T}') \neq \emptyset$.

Next, we want to show 6a) and suppose that $a = v_*$ is special for \mathcal{T} . Since $P^{\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T})}(v, y) \subseteq T_y(\dot{S}(\mathcal{T}_a), \mathcal{T})$ and the vertex set of the supergraph is disjoint from $V(T_{v_*}(\dot{S}(\mathcal{T}_a), \mathcal{T}))$, we have that $T_{v_*}(\dot{S}(\mathcal{T}_a), \mathcal{T}) \subseteq T_{v_*}(\dot{S}(\mathcal{T}'_a), \mathcal{T}')$. Thus, v_* is also special for \mathcal{T}' and 6a) holds for \mathcal{T}'_a .

Now we consider 6b). Suppose that $a = w(K)$ is not special for \mathcal{T} and thus, there is no special vertex for \mathcal{T} and $\mathcal{I}_{\ell'}(K) = i_{\sigma^*}(K)$. Then $P^{\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T})}(w(K), r)$ does not contain a vertex of $X_{\ell'}(K)$ and in particular, it does not contain x . As all tails of the arcs of $E(\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T}')) \setminus E(\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T}))$ are descendants of x , we have that $P^{\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T})}(w(K), r) \subseteq \mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T}')$. Thus, there is no special vertex for \mathcal{T}' . Hence, 6b) holds for \mathcal{T}'_a .

We show that $a \notin V(L)$ and thus, 7) holds for \mathcal{T}'_a : if $u(\mathcal{T}_a)$ extends $K'(\mathcal{T})$ in \mathcal{T} , then a is not contained in $K'(\mathcal{T})$ since 7) holds for \mathcal{T} . If, on the other hand, we have $u(\mathcal{T}_a) = a$, then $a \in V(L')$. Thus, 7) holds for \mathcal{T}'_a .

Note that if $\emptyset \neq K'(\mathcal{T}') = L$, then $u(\mathcal{T}'_a) = y$ extends L in \mathcal{T}' and thus, 8) holds for \mathcal{T}'_a . Furthermore, note that $P^{\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T}')} (y, r)$ contains (v, v') . By the definition of v and v' , we have that 9) holds for \mathcal{T}'_a .

Thus, $\mathcal{T}'_a \in \mathcal{F}_{K, \ell'}$ and furthermore, since $K'(\mathcal{T}') \in \{L, \emptyset\}$, we have that $K'(\mathcal{T}') \subseteq L \subseteq K'(\mathcal{T}) - vv'$, which completes the claim in this case.

Subcase 1.2: v' is a descendant of y in $\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T})$:

This case is depicted in Figure 5. In this case, it follows that $a = v_*$ is special for \mathcal{T} and $P^{\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T})}(v', y)$ contains v_* . Note that v is not a descendant of v_* in $\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T})$ or otherwise $\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T})$ contains a cycle. Thus, we may obtain \mathcal{T}' from \mathcal{T} by performing $(v_*, v'_*) \leftrightarrow v'v$ (which reorients $P^{\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T})}(v', v_*)$) and show that (\mathcal{T}', y) is a valid intermediate state for K and ℓ' and satisfies the lemma. Note that 1),




Figure 5: \mathcal{T}_a (left side) and \mathcal{T}'_y (right side) in Subcase 1.2 in the proof of Lemma 5.7

2a), 2b) and 3) hold for \mathcal{T}' by Lemma 5.5.

Now we prove 4) holds. As 7) holds for \mathcal{T}_a , we have that the component of v_* in $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{T}')$ contains exactly one edge of $\bigcup_{x \in X_{\ell'}(K)} \{xx'\}$, which is $v_*v'_*$, and thus, 4) holds for \mathcal{T}' .

Note that if $K'(\mathcal{T}') \neq \emptyset$, then $K'(\mathcal{T}') = L$. As 5) holds for \mathcal{T} and since v_* is the only vertex of $X_{\ell'}(K) \cap V(L)$ contained in $P^{\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T})}(v', v_*)$, we have that 5) also holds for \mathcal{T}' .

We have that $V(T_{v_*}(\bar{S}(\mathcal{T}_a), \mathcal{T})) \subseteq V(T_y(\bar{S}(\mathcal{T}'_y), \mathcal{T}'))$ since in $\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T}')$ there is a path from v_* to y going over (v', v) and this path does not contain any vertices of $\bar{S}(\mathcal{T}'_y) - y$. Thus, y is a special vertex for \mathcal{T}' and 6a) holds for \mathcal{T}'_y . As there is a special vertex for \mathcal{T}' , 6b) trivially holds for \mathcal{T}'_y .

Note that if $\overline{K'(\mathcal{T})}$ contains an edge of $\bigcup_{x \in X_{\ell'}(K)} \{xx'\}$, then $u(\mathcal{T}_a)$, which is in L' , extends $\mathcal{K}'(\mathcal{T})$ in \mathcal{T} . Since $y \in V(L)$, we have that 7) holds for \mathcal{T}'_y .

Using the same argument, we have that there is no vertex extending L in \mathcal{T}' , and thus, $u(\mathcal{T}'_y) = y \in V(L)$. Hence, 8) and 9) hold for \mathcal{T}'_y .

Thus, $\mathcal{T}'_y \in \mathcal{F}_{K, \ell'}$ and furthermore, since $K'(\mathcal{T}') \in \{L, \emptyset\}$, we have that $K'(\mathcal{T}') \subseteq L \subseteq K'(\mathcal{T}) - vv'$.

Case 2: $e(L') \geq \max\{d', e(K)\} - \ell'$:

Recall that $P^{K'(\mathcal{T})}(u(\mathcal{T}_a), x) = [v_1, \dots, v_n]$. Let $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ be maximal such that v_j is not a descendant of x in $\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T})$ or $P^{\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T})}(v_j, r)$ visits v_* and after that it visits x . Note that j exists and $i - 1 \leq j < n$. Let $\bar{v} := v_{j+1}$ and $\bar{v}' := v_j$. Furthermore, let M and M' be the components in $K'(\mathcal{T}) - \bar{v}\bar{v}'$ of x and $u(\mathcal{T}_a)$, respectively. Note that $e(M') \geq e(L')$. We note that the edge exchange operations in the following two subcases are similar to the ones in the Subcases 1.1 and 1.2.

Subcase 2.1: \bar{v}' is not a descendant of x in $\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T})$:

We obtain \mathcal{T}' from \mathcal{T} by performing $(x, x') \leftrightarrow \bar{v}\bar{v}'$ and show that (\mathcal{T}', a) is a valid intermediate state for K and ℓ' and satisfies the lemma.

Note that 1), 2a), 2b) and 3) hold for \mathcal{T}' by Lemma 5.5.

Since x is not in the component of $u(\mathcal{T}_a)$ in $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{T}')$, we have that 4) holds for \mathcal{T}' .

Note that $K'(\mathcal{T}') = M'$. As 5) holds for \mathcal{T} and since by the definition of x and \bar{v} we have that x is the only vertex of $X_{\ell'}(K) \cap V(M)$ contained in $P^{\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T})}(\bar{v}, x)$, we have that 5) also hold for \mathcal{T}' .

Analogously to Subcase 1.1 it can be proven that 6a) and 6b) hold for \mathcal{T}'_a .

We show that $a \notin V(M)$ and thus, 7) holds for \mathcal{T}'_a : if $u(\mathcal{T}_a)$ extends M in \mathcal{T}' , then a is not contained in $K'(\mathcal{T})$ since 7) holds for \mathcal{T}_a . If, on the other hand, we have that $u(\mathcal{T}_a) = a$, then $a \in V(M')$. Thus, 7) holds for \mathcal{T}'_a .

Observe that 8) holds for \mathcal{T}'_a since $u(\mathcal{T}'_a) = u(\mathcal{T}_a) \in V(M')$.

Finally, suppose that 9) does not hold for \mathcal{T}'_a and let (z, z') be the first arc on $P^{\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T})}(u(\mathcal{T}_a), r)$ that

is not on $P^{\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T}')} (u(\mathcal{T}_a), r)$. Then (z, z') is in $P^{\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T}')} (\bar{v}, x)$. As 9) holds for \mathcal{T}_a , we have that $a = v_*$ is special for \mathcal{T} and $v_* \in V(P^{\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T}')} (u(\mathcal{T}_a), x))$. Since $v_* \notin V(P^{\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T}')} (\bar{v}, x))$, we have that v_* is in $P^{\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T}')} (u(\mathcal{T}_a), z) \subseteq \mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T}')$ and thus, 9) holds for \mathcal{T}'_a .

Thus, $\mathcal{T}'_a \in \mathcal{F}_{K, \ell'}$ and furthermore, $K'(\mathcal{T}') = M' \subseteq K'(\mathcal{T}) - \bar{v}\bar{v}'$.

Subcase 2.2: \bar{v}' is a descendant of x in $\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T})$:

Then $a = v_*$ is special for \mathcal{T} and $P^{\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T}')} (\bar{v}', x)$ contains v_* . Note that \bar{v} is not a descendant of v_* in $\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T})$ or otherwise $\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T})$ contains a cycle. Thus, we may obtain \mathcal{T}' from \mathcal{T} by performing $(v_*, v'_*) \leftrightarrow v'v$ and show that (\mathcal{T}', x) is a valid intermediate state for K and ℓ' and satisfies the lemma.

We have that 1), 2a), 2b) and 3) hold for \mathcal{T}' by Lemma 5.5.

As 7) holds for \mathcal{T}_a , we have that the component of v_* in $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{T}')$ contains exactly one edge of $\bigcup_{x \in X_{\ell'}(K)} \{xx'\}$, and thus, 4) holds for \mathcal{T}' .

Note that $K'(\mathcal{T}') = M'$. Since v_* is a descendant of x in $\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T})$, we have by the definition of x that there are no vertices of $\mathring{S}(\mathcal{T}_a)$ on $P^{\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T}')} (\bar{v}', v_*)$, the path that is reoriented in $\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T}')$. Thus, since 5) holds for \mathcal{T} , we have that 5) also holds for \mathcal{T}' .

We have that $V(T_{v_*}(\bar{S}(\mathcal{T}_a), \mathcal{T})) \subseteq V(T_x(\bar{S}(\mathcal{T}'_x), \mathcal{T}'))$ since in $\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T}')$ there is a path from v_* to x going over (\bar{v}', \bar{v}) and this path does not contain any vertices of $\mathring{S}(\mathcal{T}'_x) - x$. Thus, x is a special vertex for \mathcal{T}' and 6a) holds for \mathcal{T}'_x and furthermore, 6b) trivially holds for \mathcal{T}'_x .

Note that if $\overline{K'(\mathcal{T})}$ contains an edge of $\bigcup_{x \in X_{\ell'}(K)} \{xx'\}$, then $u(\mathcal{T}_a)$, which is in M' , extends $K'(\mathcal{T})$ in \mathcal{T} . Since $x \in V(M)$, we have that 7) holds for \mathcal{T}'_x .

Using the same argument, we have that there is no vertex extending M in \mathcal{T}' , and thus, $u(\mathcal{T}'_x) = x \in V(M)$. Hence, 8) and 9) hold for \mathcal{T}'_x .

Thus, $(\mathcal{T}', x) \in \mathcal{F}_{K, \ell'}$ and furthermore, $K'(\mathcal{T}') = M' \subseteq K'(\mathcal{T}) - \bar{v}\bar{v}'$. \square

Notation 5.8. In the following let $\alpha := \max\{d' - e(K), 0\}$.

Lemma 5.9. Let $\ell' \in \{0, \dots, \ell\}$. If $|\mathcal{C}_{\ell'}(K)| \geq \ell' - \alpha + 2$, then there is a tuple $(\mathcal{T}, a) \in \mathcal{F}_{K, \ell'}$ such that $K'(\mathcal{T}) = \emptyset$.

Proof. Recall that by Observation 5.4 we have that $\mathcal{F}_{K, \ell'} \neq \emptyset$. Suppose the lemma is not true and let $(\mathcal{T}, a) \in \mathcal{F}_{K, \ell'}$ such that $e(K'(\mathcal{T}))$ is minimal. By Lemma 5.7 we have that $\mathring{S}(\mathcal{T}_a) = \emptyset$. As 4) and 5) hold for \mathcal{T} we have that $X_{\ell'}(K) \cap V(K'(\mathcal{T})) \subseteq \{a, t\}$ where t is a vertex such that $tt' \in E(\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{T}))$. Since 7) holds for \mathcal{T}_a , we have that $|X_{\ell'}(K) \cap V(K'(\mathcal{T}))| \leq 1$. Thus, $|X_{\ell'}(K) \setminus V(K'(\mathcal{T}))| \geq \ell' - \alpha + 1$ and $e(K'(\mathcal{T})) \leq e(K) - (\ell' - \alpha + 1) \leq \max\{d', e(K)\} - \ell'$, which is a contradiction to the definition of $K'(\mathcal{T})$. \square

Note that the lower bound of $|\mathcal{C}_{\ell'}(K)|$ cannot easily be lowered. In the “worst case” the size of K' is only decreased by one edge in every exchange operation. An example for this can be seen in Figure 6.

Finally, we show that the decomposition \mathcal{T} from Lemma 5.9 either already contradicts the minimality of σ^* or there is a special path for \mathcal{T} that we can use to retrieve a decomposition having a smaller legal order than σ^* .

Lemma 5.10. For every $b \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ and $\ell' \in \{0, \dots, \ell\}$ the number of children of K generated by $\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T}^*)$ each having at most ℓ' edges is at most $\ell' - \alpha + 1$.

Proof. Let $\ell' \in \{0, \dots, \ell\}$ and suppose that K has $\ell' - \alpha + 2$ children, each having at most ℓ' edges. Thus, by Lemma 3.5 we have $e(K) \geq d' - \ell'$ and $\alpha \leq \ell'$. By Lemma 5.9 there is a tuple $(\mathcal{T}, a) \in \mathcal{F}_{K, \ell'}$ such that for every $L \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T})$ we have $e(L) \leq \max\{d', e(K)\} - \ell' - 1 < e(K)$. If a is special for \mathcal{T} , let $v_* := a$. Let $R' := \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{T}) + (v_*, v'_*)$ if a is special, and $R' := \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{T})$ otherwise.




Figure 6: An example where $\ell' = 2, \alpha = 0, |\mathcal{C}_2(K)| = 3$ showing the tightness of Lemma 5.9 when applying the augmentations of Lemma 5.7 starting with \mathcal{T}^* on the left and progressing to the right with every operation suggested by the proof of Lemma 5.7. Note that every vertex on the dotted red paths is supposed to have a path to $u(\mathcal{T}_{v_*}^*)$. After the two augmentations we have that $K'(\mathcal{T}') \neq \emptyset$ has $e(K) - 2$ edges.

Claim. $\rho(R') \leq \rho^*$

Proof. Let A be the set of components of R' that contain a vertex of K . Note that every component $\bar{L} \in A$ has $e(\bar{L}) \leq \max\{d', e(K)\}$ including the component of v_* (if a is special for \mathcal{T}) since 7) holds for \mathcal{T}_a . If $e(\bar{L}) \leq \max\{d', e(K) - 1\}$ for every $\bar{L} \in A$, we have that $\rho(R') \leq \rho^*$. Thus, suppose that there is an $\bar{L} \in A$ such that $e(\bar{L}) = e(K) > d'$. Then $|E(\bar{L}) \cap E(K)| \geq e(K) - \ell' - 1$ and thus, $|(E(K) \cap E(R')) \setminus E(\bar{L})| \leq \ell'$ since at least one edge of $E(K)$ is coloured blue in \mathcal{T} . Thus, for every $\bar{L}' \in A \setminus \{\bar{L}\}$ we have that $e(\bar{L}') \leq \ell' + (\ell' + 1) \leq d'$ by Observation 2.1 and the claim follows. (End of proof of the claim) ■

Suppose that $a = w(K)$ is not special for \mathcal{T} . Note that since 7) holds for \mathcal{T}_a , the component of $w(K)$ in $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{T})$ is contained in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T})$ and thus has less than $e(K)$ edges. Since 2b) holds for \mathcal{T} , there is a smaller legal order than σ^* for \mathcal{T} , which is a contradiction.

Thus, a is special for \mathcal{T} . Let σ be the legal order for \mathcal{T} mentioned in 2a). Note that there is a minimal special path $P := [v_0, \dots, v_\ell]$ with respect to \mathcal{T}, σ and (v_*, v'_*) such that $i_{\sigma^*}(v_0) \leq i_{\sigma^*}(T_{v_*}(\bar{S}(\mathcal{T}_a), \mathcal{T})) = \mathcal{I}_{\ell'}(K)$. If $\mathcal{I}_{\ell'}(K) = i_{\sigma^*}(K)$, then $P^{\mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{T})}(w(K), v_*)$ preceded by the witnessing arc is a special path and thus, we even have $i_{\sigma^*}(v_0) \leq \mathcal{I}_{\ell'}(K) - 1$ in this case. But this contradicts Corollary 3.4. □

6 Density Calculations

In this section we show that the density of a component K of $H_{\mathcal{T}^*}$ and its small children is on average at least $\frac{d}{d+k+1}$, which immediately enables us to prove Theorem 4. Before this we need a few technical lemmas which mostly amount to rearranging equations.

Lemma 6.1. *Let $1 \leq n \leq \ell$. Then*

$$\frac{n + k \frac{(n-1)n}{2}}{n + k \frac{(n-1)n}{2} + kn} < \frac{d}{d + k + 1}.$$

Proof. We have:

$$\frac{n + k \frac{(n-1)n}{2}}{n + k \frac{(n-1)n}{2} + kn} = \frac{\frac{1}{k} + \frac{n-1}{2}}{\frac{1}{k} + \frac{n-1}{2} + 1} \leq \frac{\frac{n+n}{2}}{\frac{n+n}{2} + 1} \leq \frac{\ell}{\ell + 1} < \frac{d}{d + k + 1}.$$

Here, in the first equality we cancelled out n and k . In the second inequality we set $k = 1$, and use the fact that $n \geq 1$. The third inequality follows since $n \leq \ell$. The fourth inequality follows by similar reasoning to Observation 2.11. \square

Observation 6.2. *We have that*

$$d' \geq d \cdot \frac{k(\ell + 1) + 1}{k + 1} - \frac{k}{2}\ell(\ell + 1).$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} d' &= d + \left\lceil k\ell \left(\frac{d}{k+1} - \frac{1}{2}(\ell + 1) \right) \right\rceil \\ &= d + \left\lceil \frac{k\ell d}{k+1} \right\rceil - \frac{k}{2}\ell(\ell + 1) \\ &\geq d \cdot \frac{k(\ell + 1) + 1}{k + 1} - \frac{k}{2}\ell(\ell + 1). \end{aligned}$$

\square

Observation 6.3. *Let $a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ where $a_1 \geq a_2$, $b_1 > b_2 > 0$ and $\frac{a_1}{b_1} \geq \frac{a_2}{b_2}$. Then $\frac{a_1 - a_2}{b_1 - b_2} \geq \frac{a_1}{b_1}$.*

Lemma 6.4. *For every red component $K \neq R^*$ of $H_{\mathcal{T}^*}$ that is not small, we have that*

$$\frac{e(K) + \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}(K)} e(K)}{v(K) + \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}(K)} v(K)} \geq \frac{d}{d + k + 1}.$$

Proof. First, suppose that K does not have small children. Then $e(K) \geq \ell + 1$ by Lemma 3.5 and the lemma holds by Observation 2.11.

Thus, let K have a small child and suppose that the lemma is not true. In the following α is defined as in Notation 5.8. We enumerate some facts that we will use.

- a) For any $\ell' \in \{0, \dots, \ell\}$, K has at most $k(\ell' - \alpha + 1)$ small children each having at most ℓ' edges by Lemma 5.10.
- b) By Lemma 3.5 we have that every small child of K has at least α edges.
- c) Let $\ell' \in \{0, \dots, \ell\}$. Note that adding ℓ' to the nominator and $\ell' + 1$ to the denominator of a fraction that is smaller than $d/(d + k + 1)$ again results in a smaller fraction than $d/(d + k + 1)$ since $\ell'/(\ell + 1) < d/(d + k + 1)$.
- d) Note that for $1 < a < b$ we have that $\frac{a-1}{b-1} < \frac{a}{b}$. Thus, informally speaking, decreasing the size of a small child also decreases $\frac{e(K) + \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}(K)} e(K)}{v(K) + \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}(K)} v(K)}$.

Now, we prove the lemma. In the first “ \geq ” we use b), the (possibly repeated) usage of c) and d) while still being compliant with a).

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{d+k+1} &> \frac{e(K) + \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}(K)} e(K)}{v(K) + \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}(K)} v(K)} \\
&\geq \frac{e(K) + k \sum_{i=\alpha}^{\ell} i}{e(K) + 1 + k \sum_{i=\alpha}^{\ell} (i+1)} \\
&\geq \frac{d' - \alpha + k \sum_{i=\alpha}^{\ell} i}{d' - \alpha + 1 + k \sum_{i=\alpha}^{\ell} i + k(\ell+1) - k\alpha} \\
&\stackrel{\text{Obs. 6.2}}{\geq} \frac{d \cdot \frac{k(\ell+1)+1}{k+1} - (\alpha + k \sum_{i=0}^{\alpha-1} i)}{d \cdot \frac{k(\ell+1)+1}{k+1} + (k(\ell+1) + 1) - (\alpha + k \sum_{i=0}^{\alpha-1} i + k\alpha)} \\
&\stackrel{\text{Lemma 6.1, Obs. 6.3}}{\geq} \frac{d}{d+k+1},
\end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. \square

Now, we are able to prove Theorem 4.

Proof of Theorem 4. Let \mathcal{K} be the set of red components of $H_{\mathcal{T}^*}$ that are not small. By Lemma 3.6 we have that the set of red components of $H_{\mathcal{T}^*}$ is

$$\bigcup_{K \in \mathcal{K}} (\{K\} \cup \bigcup_{C \in \mathcal{C}(K)} \{C\}).$$

Note that in this representation every component is enumerated exactly once. Thus, by Lemma 4.3 we have that

$$\frac{e(R^*) + \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}(R^*)} e(C)}{v(R^*) + \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}(R^*)} v(C)} = \frac{e(R^*)}{e(R^*) + 1} > \frac{d'}{d'+1} > \frac{d}{d+k+1}.$$

By Lemma 6.4 we have that

$$\frac{e_r(H_{\mathcal{T}^*})}{v(H_{\mathcal{T}^*})} = \frac{\sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}} (e(K) + \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}(K)} e(C))}{\sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}} (v(K) + \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}(K)} v(C))} > \frac{d}{d+k+1},$$

which is a contradiction to Lemma 2.9. \square

References

- [1] Min Chen, Seog-Jin Kim, Alexandr V. Kostochka, Douglas B. West, and Xuding Zhu. “Decomposition of sparse graphs into forests: The Nine Dragon Tree Conjecture for $k \leq 2$.” In: *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B* 122 (2017), pp. 741–756. ISSN: 0095-8956. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jctb.2016.09.004>.
- [2] Genghua Fan, Hongbi Jiang, Ping Li, Douglas B. West, Daqing Yang, and Xuding Zhu. “Extensions of matroid covering and packing.” In: *European Journal of Combinatorics* 76 (2019), pp. 117–122. ISSN: 0195-6698. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejc.2018.09.010>. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0195669818301690>.

- [3] Genghua Fan, Yan Li, Ning Song, and Daqing Yang. “Decomposing a graph into pseudoforests with one having bounded degree.” In: *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B* 115 (2015), pp. 72–95. ISSN: 0095-8956. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jctb.2015.05.003>.
- [4] Hui Gao and Daqing Yang. “Digraph analogues for the Nine Dragon Tree Conjecture.” In: *Journal of Graph Theory* 102.3 (2022), pp. 521–534. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/jgt.22884>.
- [5] Logan Grout and Benjamin Moore. “The pseudoforest analogue for the Strong Nine Dragon Tree Conjecture is true.” In: *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B* 145 (2020), pp. 433–449. ISSN: 0095-8956. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jctb.2020.07.001>.
- [6] Hongbi Jiang and Daqing Yang. “Decomposing a Graph into Forests: The Nine Dragon Tree Conjecture is True.” In: *Combinatorica* (2017), pp. 1125–1137. DOI: [10.1007/s00493-016-3390-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00493-016-3390-1).
- [7] Seog-Jin Kim, Alexandr V. Kostochka, Douglas B. West, Hehui Wu, and Xuding Zhu. “Decomposition of Sparse Graphs into Forests and a Graph with Bounded Degree.” In: *Journal of Graph Theory* 74.4 (2013), pp. 369–391. DOI: [10.1002/jgt.21711](https://doi.org/10.1002/jgt.21711).
- [8] Sebastian Mies and Benjamin Moore. *The Strong Nine Dragon Tree Conjecture is True for $d \leq 2(k + 1)$* . 2024. arXiv: 2403.05178 [math.CO].
- [9] Sebastian Mies and Benjamin Moore. “The Strong Nine Dragon Tree Conjecture is true for $d \leq k + 1$.” In: *Combinatorica* (2023), pp. 1215–1239. DOI: [10.1007/s00493-023-00058-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00493-023-00058-z).
- [10] Sebastian Mies, Benjamin Moore, and Evelyne Smith Roberge. *Beyond the Pseudoforest Strong Nine Dragon Tree Theorem*. 2023. arXiv: 2310.00931 [math.CO].
- [11] Mickael Montassier, Patrice Ossona de Mendez, André Raspaud, and Xuding Zhu. “Decomposing a graph into forests.” In: *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B* 102.1 (2012), pp. 38–52. ISSN: 0095-8956. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jctb.2011.04.001>.
- [12] Crispin St. J. A. Nash-Williams. “Decomposition of Finite Graphs Into Forests.” In: *Journal of the London Mathematical Society* 39.1 (1964), p. 12. DOI: [10.1112/jlms/s1-39.1.12](https://doi.org/10.1112/jlms/s1-39.1.12).
- [13] Daqing Yang. “Decomposing a graph into forests and a matching.” In: *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B* 131 (2018), pp. 40–54. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jctb.2018.01.005>.