STRONG BRANDT-THOMASSÉ THEOREMS

TOMASZ ŁUCZAK, JOANNA POLCYN, AND CHRISTIAN REIHER

ABSTRACT. Solving a long standing conjecture of Erdős and Simonovits, Brandt and Thomassé proved that the chromatic number of each triangle-free graph G such that $\delta(G) > |V(G)|/3$ is at most four. In fact, they showed the much stronger result that every maximal triangle-free graph G satisfying this minimum degree condition is a blow-up of either an Andrásfai or a Vega graph.

Here we establish the same structural conclusion on G under the weaker assumption that for $m \in \{2, 3, 4\}$ every sequence of 3m vertices has a subsequence of length m + 1with a common neighbour. In forthcoming work this will be used to solve an old problem of Andrásfai in Ramsey-Turán theory.

§1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Minimum degree conditions. One of the earliest results of modern graph theory is Mantel's theorem [14] from 1907 on the maximum number of edges in a triangle-free graph. The interest in the structure of dense triangle-free graphs has been revived in the early seventies. Andrásfai, Erdős, and Sós [2] observed that all triangle-free graphs G with nvertices and minimum degree $\delta(G) > 2n/5$ are bipartite. Moreover, Hajnal constructed a family of triangle-free graphs G with minimum degree (1/3 - o(1))|V(G)| and arbitrarily large chromatic number. Inspired by this example Erdős and Simonovits [7] conjectured in 1973 that every triangle-free graph G with n vertices and minimum degree $\delta(G) > n/3$ is three-colourable. In fact, at this time the only known maximal triangle-free graphs Gon n vertices with minimum degree $\delta(G) > n/3$ were blow-ups of Andrásfai graphs, which were introduced by Andrásfai [1] a few years earlier. For every positive integer k there is an Andrásfai graph Γ_k with vertex set $\mathbb{Z}/(3k-1)\mathbb{Z}$ and all edges ij such that $i-j \in \{k, k+1, \ldots, 2k-1\}$. Hence, we have $\Gamma_1 = K_2$, $\Gamma_2 = C_5$, and Figure 1.1 shows some further Andrásfai graphs. By a blow-up of a given graph G we mean another graph obtained by replacing each vertex of G by a non-empty independent set of vertices and each edge of G by the complete bipartite graph between the vertex classes corresponding to its end vertices.

²⁰¹⁰ Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary: 05C75, Secondary: 05C35, 05C07, 05C15.

Key words and phrases. Extremal graph theory, triangle-free, Ramsey-Turán theory.

The first author is partially supported by National Science Centre, Poland, grant 2022/47/B/ST1/01517.



FIGURE 1.1. The Andrásfai graphs Γ_3 , Γ_4 , Γ_5 , and Γ_6 .

Häggkvist [8] refuted the Erdős-Simonovits conjecture in the early eighties. His counterexample is a blow-up of a certain triangle-free graph Υ on eleven vertices with chromatic number four, often called the *Mycielski graph* [15] by Polish authors (see Figure 1.2a) or the *Grötzsch graph* by German authors (see Figure 1.2b). An appropriate choice of 'weights' indicated in Figure 1.2c leads to blow-ups $\hat{\Upsilon}$ on *n* vertices with $\delta(\hat{\Upsilon}) \ge 10n/29 > n/3$.

Later work of Chen, Jin, and Koh [6] showed that containing Υ is the only possible obstruction to satisfying the Erdős-Simonovits conjecture. More precisely, all $\{K_3, \Upsilon\}$ -free graphs G on n vertices with $\delta(G) > n/3$ are contained in blow-ups of Andrásfai graphs and, therefore, three-colourable.



FIGURE 1.2. Some relevant graphs.

Brandt and Pisanski [4], on the other hand, discovered that the Mycielski-Grötzsch graph starts a new sequence of four-chromatic triangle-free graphs, which they called Vega graphs; they have chromatic number four and admit (regular) blow-ups violating the Erdős-Simonovits conjecture. Following some further work on triangle-free graphs of large minimum degree (see, e.g., [10, 17]) Brandt and Thomassé then proved in an unpublished manuscript [5] that every maximal triangle-free graph G on n vertices with $\delta(G) > n/3$ is a blow-up of either an Andrásfai graph or a Vega graph. It follows that all such graphs are four-colourable, which establishes a relaxed version of the Erdős-Simonovits conjecture.

Given their importance, we would briefly like to describe Vega graphs here. For every integer $i \ge 2$ the graph Υ_i^{00} , shown in Figure 1.2d, consists of an inner Andrásfai graph Γ_i ,

an external hexagon $C_6 = avcubw$, and two outer vertices x, y joined to each other and to C_6 as in the picture. Moreover, the vertices of C_6 are connected to the vertices of Γ_i of the same colour (red, green, or blue). There are further Vega graphs Υ_i^{10} , Υ_i^{01} , and Υ_i^{11} obtained from Υ_i^{00} by deleting one or both of y and 2i - 1. For instance, $\Upsilon_2^{11} = \Upsilon_2^{00} - \{i, 3\}$ is isomorphic to the Mycielski-Grötzsch graph Υ (see Figure 4.3). A more detailed definition of Vega graphs will be given at the beginning of Section 4.

1.2. Existence of common neighbours. Our main result is similar to the Brandt-Thomassé theorem, but instead of a minimum degree hypothesis we shall use an assumption on the existence of common neighbours. The motivation for studying such problems is another conjecture on dense triangle-free graphs due to Andrásfai. In his already referenced article [1] he proposes to investigate the largest number ex(n, s) of edges that a triangle-free graph on n vertices can have if its independence number is at most s. So for $s \ge n/2$ we have $ex(n, s) = \lfloor n^2/4 \rfloor$ by Mantel's theorem. After proving that for $s \in (2n/5, n/2]$ certain blowups of Γ_2 are optimal, Andrásfai conjectured that for every s > n/3 the maximum ex(n, s)is achieved by an appropriate blow-up of some Andrásfai graph. His work is the first contribution to a branch of extremal graph theory nowadays called *Ramsey-Turán theory*. For some recent partial results on Andrásfai's conjecture we refer to [11–13]. An excellent survey by Sós and Simonovits [16] provides further background on Ramsey-Turán theory.

In a forthcoming article we plan to resolve Andrásfai's conjecture in the sense of establishing

$$ex(n,s) = \frac{1}{2}k(k-1)n^2 - k(3k-4)ns + \frac{1}{2}(3k-4)(3k-1)s^2$$
(1.1)

whenever $s \in (n/3, n/2]$ and $k = \lceil s/(3s-n) \rceil$. As explained in [11] there is always a blow-up of Γ_k achieving equality and for some values of k there are (perhaps unexpected) blow-ups of Vega graphs for which equality holds as well. There will be one step in the proof of (1.1), where we want to infer that some auxiliary graph \mathscr{F} admits a homomorphism into some 'well-behaved' graph, such as an Andrásfai or Vega graph. This graph \mathscr{F} is always triangle-free, but it can have vertices of small degree. Thus we need to prove a version of the Brandt-Thomassé theorem under an assumption which will turn out to hold in our intended application, and this is what we shall do here. The alternative hypothesis is of the following form.

Definition 1.1. A graph G has property \mathcal{D}_k for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ if for every $m \in [k]$ and every sequence $x_1, \ldots, x_{3m} \in V(G)$ of (not necessarily distinct) vertices of G there is a vertex $y \in V(G)$ such that

$$|\{i \in [3m] : x_i y \in E(G)\}| \ge m+1.$$

A simple counting argument discloses that every graph G on n vertices with $\delta(G) > n/3$ has the property \mathcal{D}_k for every $k \ge 1$. One advantage of these properties, however, is that they are preserved under taking blow-ups. That is, a graph G satisfies \mathcal{D}_k if and only if all its blow-ups do. Another feature of \mathcal{D}_k is that—in contrast to the minimum degree condition—it is a sensible property of infinite graphs. We offer some further remarks on this topic in the last section, but throughout the main body of this article we shall tacitly assume that our graphs are finite.

Theorem 1.2. A maximal triangle-free graph satisfies \mathcal{D}_4 if and only if it is a blow-up of either an Andrásfai or a Vega graph.

Therefore the class of blow-ups of Andrásfai and Vega graphs is definable by a single first order property of graphs, which seems somewhat surprising to us. Andrásfai and Vega graphs themselves are then definable as twin-free graphs in this class, which is another first-order property. Next, the difference between Andrásfai and Vega graphs is that the former are Υ -free, while the latter contain Υ . We thus arrive at the astonishing conclusion that both the class of Andrásfai graphs and the class of Vega graphs are definable by a first-order sentence in the language of graph theory.

The proof of Theorem 1.2 begins with a case distinction whether the given graph G is Υ -free or not. If it is, we look at a maximal Andrásfai subgraph Γ_k of G and show that Gis a blow-up of Γ_k . Similarly, if $\Upsilon \subseteq G$ we take a maximal Vega subgraph of G and argue that G is a blow-up thereof. It turns out that in the former case the property \mathcal{D}_3 rather than \mathcal{D}_4 suffices. As it reflects the historical progress made by Chen, Jin, Koh [6] and Brandt, Thomassé [5], we would like to state this fact separately.

Theorem 1.3. Let G be a maximal triangle-free graph.

- (a) If $\Upsilon \subseteq G$ and G satisfies \mathcal{D}_3 , then G is a blow-up of some Andrásfai graph.
- (b) If $\Upsilon \subseteq G$ and G satisfies \mathcal{D}_4 , then G is a blow-up of some Vega graph.

Finally it should be pointed out that many, but presumably not all, steps in the earlier works [5,6] use only \mathcal{D}_4 rather than the full force of $\delta(G) > n/3$. So there is some overlap between our proof and the arguments employed by Chen, Jin, and Koh [6], and by Brandt and Thomassé [5].

Organisation. In the next section we introduce the central concepts of our approach and provide a brief description of important intermediate steps. The proofs of the parts (a) and (b) of Theorem 1.3 will then be completed in Section 3 and Section 4, respectively. We conclude by mentioning an even stronger version of Theorem 1.3 and discussing some problems for further research in Section 5.

§2. Preliminaries

We follow standard graph theoretic notation. Given a graph G we denote its sets of vertices and edges by V(G) and E(G), respectively. For brevity we often write $xy \in E(G)$ instead of $\{x, y\} \in E(G)$. By N(v) we mean the neighbourhood of $v \in V(G)$. The graph obtained from G by removing a vertex v together with all incident edges is denoted by G - v. If H is a subgraph of G and $v \in V(G) \setminus V(H)$, then H + v refers to the graph

$$(V(H) \cup \{v\}, E(H) \cup \{vx \in E(G) : x \in V(H)\}).$$

Two vertices v, w are called *twins* if they have the same neighbourhood, i.e., N(v) = N(w). Since a maximal triangle-free graph G has property \mathcal{D}_k if and only if all its blow-ups have this property, it would suffice to prove our main result for twin-free graphs G. But in order to detect twins in the graphs G under consideration we shall work with the following slightly more general concept.

Definition 2.1. Let H be a subgraph of G. If $q \in V(H)$ and $q' \in V(G)$ satisfy

$$N(q) \cap V(H) = N(q') \cap V(H)$$
,

then q' is called an *H*-twin of q (see Figure 2.1a).

Notice that every $q \in V(H)$ is an *H*-twin of itself. Moreover, if $q' \notin V(H)$, then the graph H - q + q', which will be denoted by H(q') in the sequel, is isomorphic to *H*. Now we are ready to define a central concept of our approach.

Definition 2.2. Let F and G be two graphs.

(a) For an edge $e \in E(F)$ we say that G has the (F, e)-twin property if the following holds:

If H is a subgraph of G isomorphic to F, the edge $qz \in E(H)$ corresponds to e, and $q', z' \in V(G)$ are H-twins of q, z, then q'z' is an edge of G (see Figure 2.1b).

(b) If G has the (F, e)-twin property for every $e \in E(F)$, we say that G has the F-twin property.





(a) The vertex q' is an *H*-twin of q

(b) The graph G has the (F, e)-twin property

FIGURE 2.1. The concepts in Definitions 2.1 and 2.2.

Under some mild assumptions that will often be satisfied in what follows, the next lemma asserts that if we want to prove a vertex q' to be an *H*-twin of another vertex $q \in V(H)$, then we can temporarily replace some vertex $z \in V(H-q)$ by any of its *H*-twins z'.

Lemma 2.3. Suppose that F is a maximal triangle-free graph and G is a triangle-free graph possessing the F-twin property. Let H be a copy of F in G, let $z' \in V(G) \setminus V(H)$ be an H-twin of $z \in V(H)$, and set H' = H(z').

If a vertex q' is an H'-twin of $q \in V(H) \setminus \{z\}$, then it is an H-twin of q as well.

Proof. Knowing $N(q') \cap V(H') = N(q) \cap V(H')$ we want to show

$$N(q') \cap V(H) = N(q) \cap V(H).$$

So we only need to establish that z is adjacent to either both or none of q, q'.

Assume first that $qz \notin E(G)$. Since H is maximal triangle-free, there is a vertex $y \in V(H)$ with $yq, yz \in E(G)$ (see Figure 2.2a). Because q' is an H'-twin of q we obtain $yq' \in E(G)$ (see Figure 2.2b) and the hypothesis $K_3 \notin G$ yields indeed $q'z \notin E(G)$.

Suppose next that $qz \in E(G)$, which entails $qz' \in E(G)$, since z' is an H-twin of z (see Figure 2.2c). Due to $H' \cong H \cong F$ the F-twin property applies to the H'-twins q', z of q, z'. This shows that q'z is an edge of G, thereby completing the proof (see Figure 2.2d). \Box



FIGURE 2.2. The proof of Lemma 2.3.

Let us now explain our strategy for proving that a given graph is a blow-up of one of its subgraphs.

Lemma 2.4. Let G be a triangle-free graph and let Ω be a twin-free subgraph of G which is maximal triangle-free. If

- (i) G has the Ω -twin property
- (*ii*) and every vertex of G is an Ω -twin of some vertex of Ω ,

then G is a blow-up of Ω .

In practice, assertions verifying assumption (i) will be called *twin lemmata* and statements confirming (ii) will be referred to as *attachment lemmata*. Each of the two subsequent sections has its own twin lemma (cf. Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 4.28) and its own attachment lemma (cf. Lemma 3.4 and Lemma 4.29).

Proof of Lemma 2.4. Set $A_q = \{q' \in V(G) : q' \text{ is an } \Omega\text{-twin of } q\}$ for every $q \in V(\Omega)$. These sets are mutually disjoint, because we assumed Ω to be twin-free. So due to (ii) we have a partition

$$V(G) = \bigcup_{q \in V(\Omega)} A_q$$

and (*i*) informs us that whenever $qz \in E(\Omega)$ all A_q - A_z -edges are in E(G). Since Ω is maximal triangle-free, G can have no further edges.

§3. Andrásfai graphs

This entire section is devoted to the proof of part (a) of Theorem 1.3. Our first step simplifies the assumption $\Upsilon \not\subseteq G$. Since the Mycielski-Grötzsch graph Υ is maximal triangle-free, all its occurrences in triangle-free graphs must be induced. Together with the fact that Υ contains an induced hexagon this shows that triangle-free graphs containing Υ contain an induced hexagon as well. It turns out that this implication can be reversed for maximal triangle-free graphs with property \mathcal{D}_3 .

Lemma 3.1. Let G be a maximal triangle-free graph satisfying \mathcal{D}_3 . If G contains an induced hexagon, then it contains the Mycielski-Grötzsch graph as well.

Proof. Let $a_1 - b_3 - a_2 - b_1 - a_3 - b_2 - a_1$ be an induced hexagon. Its vertex set has only two independent subsets of size three, namely $\{a_1, a_2, a_3\}$ and $\{b_1, b_2, b_3\}$. So by \mathcal{D}_2 we may assume that there exists a common neighbour x of b_1, b_2 , and b_3 . Because G is a maximal triangle-free graph and $a_1b_1, a_2b_2, a_3b_3 \notin E(G)$, there are common neighbours c_i of a_i, b_i for i = 1, 2, 3 (see Figure 3.1a). Since G is triangle-free, the vertices x, c_1, c_2, c_3 are distinct.



FIGURE 3.1. The proof of Lemma 3.1.

By \mathcal{D}_3 there is a four-element subset T of $\{a_1, a_2, a_3, b_1, b_2, b_3, c_1, c_2, c_3\}$ possessing a common neighbour t. As T contains at most one vertex from each of the edges b_1c_1, b_2c_2, b_3c_3 , we may assume $a_1 \in T$. Similarly at least one of b_1, b_2, b_3 is in T. Together with the independence of T this yields $b_1 \in T$, whence $T = \{a_1, b_1, c_2, c_3\}$. Thus we can replace c_1 by t and this argument allows us to assume $c_1c_2, c_1c_3 \in E(G)$ (see Figure 3.1b).

Next we apply \mathcal{D}_2 to the hexagon $a_2 - c_2 - b_2 - a_3 - c_3 - b_3 - a_2$. Due to the symmetry between the indices 2 and 3 we can suppose, without loss of generality, that there exists a common neighbour q of a_2 , b_2 , c_3 (see Figure 3.1c). Altogether we have now found a copy of the Mycielski-Grötzsch graph Υ in G (see Figure 3.1d).

In the remainder of this section we do not need to appeal to \mathcal{D}_3 directly anymore. In other words, we shall obtain an explicit description of the class \mathfrak{A} of maximal triangle-free graphs on at least two vertices not containing an induced hexagon. As it will turn out, \mathfrak{A} is simply the class of blow-ups of Andrásfai graphs. Let us recall at this moment that for every positive integer k the Andrásfai graph Γ_k has vertex set $\mathbb{Z}/(3k-1)\mathbb{Z}$ and all edges ijsuch that $i - j \in \{k, k + 1, \ldots, 2k - 1\}$. As promised in Section 2 we shall establish a twin lemma and an attachment lemma.

An edge ij of the Andrásfai graph Γ_k is called *short* if $i - j = \pm k$ and *long* otherwise. So all edges of Γ_1 and Γ_2 are short and, up to symmetry, 04 is the only long edge of Γ_3 . For long edges the twin property requires no further assumptions.

Lemma 3.2. If e denotes a long edge of an Andrásfai graph Γ_k , then every $G \in \mathfrak{A}$ has the (Γ_k, e) -twin property.

Proof. We start with the special case k = 3, i.e., we show that every $G \in \mathfrak{A}$ has the $(\Gamma_3, 04)$ twin property. Assume contrariwise that $\Gamma_3 \subseteq G$ and that $0', 4' \in V(G)$ are non-adjacent Γ_3 -twins of $0, 4 \in V(\Gamma_3)$. Let r be a common neighbour of 0', 4' (see Figure 3.2a).



FIGURE 3.2. The (Γ_3, e) -twin property.

As the hexagon 0' - r - 4' - 7 - 2 - 5 - 0' cannot be induced, we have $2r \in E(G)$ (see Figure 3.2b). Similarly, the hexagon 0' - r - 4' - 1 - 6 - 3 - 0' discloses $6r \in E(G)$ (see Figure 3.2c). But now 26r is a triangle, which is absurd.

Next we generalise this to all long edges. By symmetry we may assume that the given long edge of Γ_k is of the form e = 0j, where k < j < 2k - 1. Figure 3.3a shows a copy of Γ_3 in Γ_k one of whose long edges corresponds to 0j. Thus the assertion follows from the special case treated earlier.

Lemma 3.3 (Twin lemma). Every Γ_{k+1} -free graph $G \in \mathfrak{A}$ has the Γ_k -twin property.



FIGURE 3.3. The Γ_k -twin property for long and short edges.

Proof. It remains to consider short edges. In fact, for reasons of symmetry, it suffices to show that G has the $(\Gamma_k, 0k)$ -twin property. Assume for the sake of contradiction that $\Gamma_k \subseteq G$ and that 0', k' are non-adjacent Γ_k -twins of 0, k, respectively. Let r be a common neighbour of 0', k'. Whenever 0 < j < k the hexagon

$$0' - r - k' - (j + 2k - 1) - j - (j + k) - 0'$$

shows $rj \in E(G)$ (for j = 1 this is illustrated in Figure 3.3b). So $\{0', 1, \ldots, k-1, k'\} \subseteq N(r)$ and $V(\Gamma_k) \cup \{0', k', r\}$ induces a copy of Γ_{k+1} in G, which is absurd (see Figure 3.3c). \Box

Lemma 3.4 (Attachment lemma). If $\Gamma_k \subseteq G \in \mathfrak{A}$ and G is Γ_{k+1} -free, then every $q \in V(G)$ is a Γ_k -twin of some vertex of Γ_k .

Proof. We begin with the following very special case.

Claim 3.5. If $j \in V(\Gamma_k)$, and $j + k, j - k \in N(q)$, then q is a Γ_k -twin of j.

Proof. By symmetry we can assume j = k, so that $0, 2k \in N(q)$. For every vertex $m \in [2k + 1, 3k - 2]$ the hexagon

$$q - 0 - (m - k) - m - (m + k) - 2k - q$$

shows $qm \in E(G)$ (see Figure 3.4a). So $N(k) \cap V(\Gamma_k) = \{2k, \ldots, 3k-2, 0\} \subseteq N(q) \cap V(\Gamma_k)$ and, since G is triangle-free, this holds with equality.

Let us proceed with a less special case.

Claim 3.6. If q has a neighbour in $V(\Gamma_k)$, then it is a Γ_k -twin of some vertex of Γ_k .

Proof. By symmetry we can suppose that $kq \in E(G)$ and $(k-1)q \notin E(G)$. Let z be a common neighbour of k-1 and q (see Figure 3.4b). The hexagon

$$z-q-k-0-(2k-1)-(k-1)-z$$



FIGURE 3.4. The proof of the attachment lemma.

shows that either q(2k-1) or z0 is an edge. In the first case Claim 3.5 entails that q is a Γ_k -twin of 0. In the second case Claim 3.5 implies that z is a Γ_k -twin of 2k - 1 and we can form $\Gamma'_k = \Gamma_k(z)$. Another application of Claim 3.5 reveals that q is a Γ'_k -twin of 0. Since G has the Γ_k -twin property, Lemma 2.3 tells us that q is also a Γ_k -twin of 0.

Proceeding with the general case we consider an arbitrary vertex $q \in V(G)$. Assuming $0q \notin E(G)$ we take a common neighbour z of q, 0. We already know that z is a Γ_k -twin of some $j \in V(\Gamma_k)$. Now q has a neighbour belonging to $\Gamma'_k = \Gamma_k(z)$ and, therefore q is a Γ'_k -twin of some $i \in V(\Gamma_k) \setminus \{j\}$. By Lemma 2.3 q is also a Γ_k -twin of i.

The main result of this section reads as follows.

Proposition 3.7. A maximal triangle-free graph on at least two vertices contains no induced hexagon if and only if it is a blow-up of some Andrásfai graph.

Proof. We will only require and prove the forward implication in the sequel, leaving the (almost obvious) reverse direction to the reader. Since the given graph G is maximal triangle-free and has at least two vertices, it needs to contain a copy of Γ_1 . Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ be maximal such that G has a subgraph isomorphic to Γ_k . By Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 3.4 the assumptions of Lemma 2.4 are satisfied for some $\Omega \cong \Gamma_k$. Thus G is a blow-up of Γ_k . \Box

It should be clear that Lemma 3.1 combined with Proposition 3.7 yields Theorem 1.3(a).

§4. Vega graphs

The goal of this section is to establish Theorem 1.3(b). We start by defining Vega graphs. For every $i \ge 2$ there is a Vega graph Υ_i^{00} shown in Figure 4.1. In the middle we see an Andrásfai graph Γ_i together with a three-colouring $V(\Gamma_i) = \Gamma_{\text{red}} \odot \Gamma_{\text{green}} \odot \Gamma_{\text{blue}}$ of its vertex set, where $\Gamma_{\text{red}} = \{0, \ldots, i-1\}$ is a set of red vertices, the set $\Gamma_{\text{green}} = \{i, \ldots, 2i-1\}$ is green, and $\Gamma_{\text{blue}} = \{2i, \ldots, 3i-2\}$ is blue. The vertices of the external hexagon $C_6 = avcubw$



FIGURE 4.1. The Vega graph Υ_i^{00} .

are connected to the vertices of the same colour of the inner Andrásfai graph, so that

 $\Gamma_{\text{red}} = \mathcal{N}(a) \cap \mathcal{N}(u), \qquad \Gamma_{\text{green}} = \mathcal{N}(b) \cap \mathcal{N}(v), \quad \text{ and } \quad \Gamma_{\text{blue}} = \mathcal{N}(c) \cap \mathcal{N}(w).$

Finally, there is an edge xy joined to the hexagon so that

$$\{a, b, c\} \subseteq \mathcal{N}(x)$$
 and $\{u, v, w\} \subseteq \mathcal{N}(y)$.

This completes the description of Υ_i^{00} .

For each $i \ge 2$ there are three further Vega graphs $\Upsilon_i^{10} = \Upsilon_i^{00} - y$, $\Upsilon_i^{01} = \Upsilon_i^{00} - (2i-1)$, and $\Upsilon_i^{11} = \Upsilon_i^{00} - \{y, 2i-1\}$. Thus for $\mu, \nu \in \{0, 1\}$ the vertex y belongs to $\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu}$ if and only if $\mu = 0$, while $\nu = 0$ indicates the presence of 2i - 1.

4.1. Automorphisms. We will write $\operatorname{Aut}(\Omega)$ for the automorphism group of a given graph Ω , i.e., for the group of adjacency preserving bijections $V(\Omega) \longrightarrow V(\Omega)$. The main reason why knowing automorphisms of Vega graphs will be helpful for us is that they often allow us to reduce the number of cases we need to consider. Moreover, they sometimes suggest non-obvious embeddings of smaller Vega graphs into larger ones, that are in turn useful when considering a maximal Vega subgraph of a given graph G we wish to analyse. In all cases, the lists of automorphisms we provide could be shown to be exhaustive, but there is no need for verifying this.

We start with three automorphisms of order two that exist for all $i \ge 2$ and appropriate values of μ , ν . First, for both indices $\nu \in \{0, 1\}$ the composition σ of the four transpositions

 $x \longleftrightarrow y$, $a \longleftrightarrow u$, $b \longleftrightarrow v$, $c \longleftrightarrow w$

is an automorphism of $\Upsilon_i^{0\nu}.$

Second, $\Upsilon_i^{\mu 0}$ has an automorphism τ_0 exchanging the colours red and green. More precisely, τ_0 is the composition of the transpositions

$$a \longleftrightarrow b$$
, $u \longleftrightarrow v$

with the reflection $j \mapsto 2i - 1 - j$ of the inner Andrásfai graph.

Similarly, $\Upsilon_i^{\mu 1}$ has an automorphism τ_1 exchanging blue and green, namely the composition of

$$b \longleftrightarrow c, \qquad v \longleftrightarrow w$$

with the reflection $j \mapsto i - 1 - j$ of $\Gamma_i - (2i - 1)$.

It could be shown that for $i \ge 3$ these automorphisms generate the entire automorphism group, i.e., that

$$\operatorname{Aut}(\Upsilon_{i}^{\mu\nu}) = \begin{cases} \{1, \sigma, \tau_{0}, \sigma\tau_{0}\} & \text{if } (\mu, \nu) = (0, 0) \\ \{1, \sigma, \tau_{1}, \sigma\tau_{1}\} & \text{if } (\mu, \nu) = (0, 1) \\ \{1, \tau_{0}\} & \text{if } (\mu, \nu) = (1, 0) \\ \{1, \tau_{1}\} & \text{if } (\mu, \nu) = (1, 1), \end{cases}$$

but we do not need this knowledge in the sequel.

What will be important, however, is that for i = 2 and $(\mu, \nu) \neq (0, 1)$ there are further 'sporadic' automorphisms. We begin their discussion with an alternative way of drawing Υ_2^{00} : Start with Γ_3 , add simultaneously four twins as indicated in Figure 4.2a, and join them to a new vertex.



FIGURE 4.2. Three pictures of Υ_2^{00} .

The dihedral group \mathbb{D}_4 acts in the usual way by rotations and reflections on the "imaginary square" c1w2. This yields a faithful action of \mathbb{D}_4 on Υ_2^{00} with fixed point 4 and, in fact, it could be proved that

$$\operatorname{Aut}(\Upsilon_2^{00}) \cong \mathbb{D}_4$$
.

We shall occasionally use the reflection ρ about the line av. So explicitly ρ is the composition of the five transpositions

 $c \longleftrightarrow 2, \qquad u \longleftrightarrow b, \qquad 1 \longleftrightarrow w, \qquad x \longleftrightarrow 0, \qquad 3 \longleftrightarrow y$

(see Figure 4.19). As ρ exchanges 3 and y, it establishes an exceptional isomorphism between Υ_2^{01} and Υ_2^{10} . More generally we shall always regard ρ as an isomorphism from $\Upsilon_2^{\mu\nu}$ to $\Upsilon_2^{\nu\mu}$. The graph Υ_2^{01} has only the four standard automorphisms mentioned earlier. Finally, Υ_2^{11} is isomorphic to the Mycielski-Grötzsch graph (see Figure 4.3) and its automorphism group can be shown to be the symmetry group \mathbb{D}_5 of the "imaginary pentagon" 01wxv.



FIGURE 4.3. The isomorphism $\Upsilon_2^{11} \cong \Upsilon$.

Let us conclude this subsection by showing that we cannot obtain Υ_i^{11} from Υ_i^{00} by deleting an edge.

Lemma 4.1. If $i \ge 2$ and $q, z \in V(\Upsilon_i^{00})$ satisfy $\Upsilon_i^{00} - \{q, z\} \cong \Upsilon_i^{11}$, then $qz \notin E(\Upsilon_i^{00})$.

Proof. Assume contrariwise that for some edge qz of Υ_i^{00} the graphs $\Upsilon_i^{00} - \{q, z\}$ and Υ_i^{11} are isomorphic. We label the vertices of Υ_i^{00} as in Figure 4.1. Recall that in Υ_i^{11} any two non-adjacent vertices have a common neighbour. Since u is the only common neighbour of c and 0, this proves that if q = u, then $z \in \{c, 0\}$. But u is also the only common neighbour of y and 1 and, therefore, q = u would imply $z \in \{y, 1\}$ as well. Altogether the case q = u is impossible. By σ - and τ_0 -symmetry this argument actually shows

$$q, z \notin \{ \boldsymbol{a}, \boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{v} \} \,. \tag{4.1}$$

We indicate degrees of vertices in Υ_i^{00} by $d(\cdot)$. Because of

$$|E(\Upsilon_i^{00})| - |E(\Upsilon_i^{11})| = d(y) + d(2i - 1) = 4 + (i + 2) = i + 6$$

and $qz \in E(\Upsilon_i^{00})$ we have

$$d(q) + d(z) = i + 7.$$
 (4.2)

As Υ_i^{00} has the degree table

$$\frac{t \in \{a, b, u, v\}}{\mathrm{d}(t) = i+3} \quad \frac{\Gamma_i \cup \{c, w\}}{i+2} \quad \frac{\{x, y\}}{4},$$

it follows from (4.1) and (4.2) that i = 3 and $q, z \in \Gamma_i \cup \{c, w\}$. It is not difficult to see, however, that if two adjacent vertices belonging to this set are deleted from Υ_i^{00} , then an even number of the vertices a, b, u, v keeps the degree i + 3. The graph Υ_i^{11} , on the other hand, has exactly one such vertex (namely, the vertex which would be called a in the standard labelling of Υ_i^{11}). This contradiction concludes the proof. 4.2. Properties of maximal triangle-free graphs satisfying \mathcal{D}_4 . Let \mathfrak{D}_4 be the class of maximal triangle-free graphs satisfying \mathcal{D}_4 . In this subsection we present two lemmata on subgraphs of such graphs. The first of them concerns the *cube*, that is the graph remaining from $K_{4,4}$ after the deletion of a perfect matching. Brandt [3] proved that maximal trianglefree graphs G with $\delta(G) > |V(G)|/3$ contain no induced cubes. His argument goes through under the weaker assumption $G \in \mathfrak{D}_4$ and for the sake of completeness we would like to provide full details.

Lemma 4.2 (Cube lemma). No graph in \mathfrak{D}_4 contains an induced cube.

Proof. Assume contrariwise that some $G \in \mathfrak{D}_4$ has eight vertices

$$a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4, b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4$$

such that $a_i b_j \in E(G)$ whenever $i, j \in [4]$ are distinct, whilst $a_i b_i \notin E(G)$ for all $i \in [4]$.



FIGURE 4.4. The proof of the cube lemma.

Because G has diameter two, there exist vertices $c_i \in N(a_i) \cap N(b_i)$ for all $i \in [4]$ (see Figure 4.4a). By \mathcal{D}_4 there is a five-element set $T \subseteq \{a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4, b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4, c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4\}$ possessing a common neighbour t. Since T contains at most one vertex from each of the edges $b_i c_i$, we may assume $a_4 \in T$. Similarly we obtain $b_4 \in T$ and thus $T = \{a_4, b_4, c_1, c_2, c_3\}$. So c_4 can be replaced by t (see Figure 4.4b) and, without loss of generality, we may assume

$$c_1c_4, c_2c_4, c_3c_4 \in E(G).$$
(4.3)

Next we apply \mathcal{D}_3 to the nine vertices a_1 , a_2 , a_3 , b_1 , b_2 , b_3 , c_1 , c_2 , c_3 , thereby finding a vertex s which is, without loss of generality, adjacent to a_2 , b_2 , c_1 , c_3 (see Figure 4.4c). Replacing c_2 by s we change (4.3) to the more 'symmetric' configuration

$$c_1c_2, c_2c_3, c_3c_4, c_4c_1 \in E(G)$$
.

But now the largest independent set among the twelve vertices a_i, b_i, c_i with $i \in [4]$ has size four, contrary to \mathcal{D}_4 .

In the sequel, whenever we apply the above lemma, we write

$$(Q) \quad \frac{a_1}{b_1} \begin{array}{c|c} a_2 & a_3 & a_4 \\ \hline b_1 & b_2 & b_3 & b_4 \end{array}$$

to denote the cube Q with vertices a_i , b_i and $E(Q) = \{a_i b_j : i \neq j \text{ and } i, j \in [4]\}$. Notice that if Q appears as a non-induced subgraph of some triangle-free graph G, then one of the edges $a_i b_i$ needs to be present in G.

We shall now take a closer look at the graph N displayed in Figure 4.5, which we have already encountered in the proofs of Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 4.2. It will be convenient to read the indices 0, 1, 2 in N modulo 3. As we have seen in earlier proofs, if N is a subgraph of some graph G satisfying \mathcal{D}_3 , then one of the three sets $\{a_i, b_i, c_{i+1}, c_{i+2}\}$ needs to have a common neighbour. It turns out that for $G \in \mathfrak{D}_4$ much more is true.



FIGURE 4.5. The graph N.

Lemma 4.3. If N is a subgraph of some $G \in \mathfrak{D}_4$, then for every $i \in \mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z}$ either $c_{i-1}c_{i+1}$ is an edge of G or there is a common neighbour of a_i , b_i , c_{i-1} , c_{i+1} .

Proof. The only independent sets of size four in N are

 $\{a_0, b_0, c_1, c_2\}, \quad \{a_1, b_1, c_0, c_2\}, \quad \text{and} \quad \{a_2, b_2, c_0, c_1\}.$

For every $i \in \mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z}$ let X_i be the set of common neighbours of a_i , b_i , c_{i-1} , c_{i+1} . As G satisfies \mathcal{D}_3 , the sets X_0 , X_1 , and X_2 cannot be empty simultaneously and thus we can assume $X_0 \neq \emptyset$. For reasons of symmetry we only need to prove that if $c_0c_2 \notin E(G)$, then $X_1 \neq \emptyset$. To this end we consider a common neighbour y of c_0 , c_2 (see Figure 4.6a).



FIGURE 4.6. The proof of Lemma 4.3.

Working with the hexagon $b_0a_1b_2a_0b_1a_2$ and the path c_0yc_2 (see Figure 4.6b) we see that the graph $N + y - c_1$ has only three independent sets of size four, namely

 $\{a_1, b_1, c_0, c_2\}, \qquad \{a_0, a_1, a_2, y\}, \qquad \{b_0, b_1, b_2, y\}.$

If the first of them has a neighbour we are done, so due to \mathcal{D}_3 and *a*-*b*-symmetry we can assume that there is a common neighbour z of $\{a_0, a_1, a_2, y\}$. Together with an arbitrary vertex $x_0 \in X_0$ we can now build the configuration shown in Figure 4.6c.

Let us now look at the set A consisting of the nine vertices belonging to the pentagon $P = b_2 a_1 b_0 a_2 c_2$ and the two edges $e_1 = y c_0$, $e_2 = c_1 b_1$ (see Figure 4.6c). By \mathcal{D}_3 there is an independent set $U \subseteq A$ of size four possessing a common neighbour q. Clearly, U contains two vertices from P and one vertex from each of the edges e_1, e_2 .

If $\{b_0, a_2\} \cap U = \emptyset$, then only the possibility $U = \{c_2, a_1, c_0, b_1\}$ remains, and we reach $q \in X_1$, as required. Now assume for the sake of contradiction that either b_0 or a_2 is in U. Both cases can be treated analogously and we only display the argument for $a_2 \in U$. Now we have $\{a_2, c_1, b_2\} \subseteq U$ and the largest independent set among the twelve vertices

$$y, c_0, q, c_1, b_2, z, b_0, c_2, a_0, a_1, a_2, x_0$$

has size four (see Figure 4.6d), contrary to \mathcal{D}_4 .

When using Lemma 4.3 in the sequel, we will sometimes draw the configuration at hand as in Figure 4.7. The dashed orange non-edge forces the existence of a green vertex together with four green edges.



FIGURE 4.7. Applications of Lemma 4.3.

4.3. Grötzsch subgraphs. In this subsection we label the vertices of the Mycielski-Grötzsch graph Υ as shown in Figure 4.8a. So the eleven vertices are called a_i , b_i , c with indices $i \in \mathbb{Z}/5\mathbb{Z}$, and the twenty edges of Υ are all pairs of the form $a_i c$, $a_i b_{i\pm 2}$, or $b_i b_{i+2}$.

The results that follow deal with graphs G such that $\Upsilon \subseteq G \in \mathfrak{D}_4$. Here are some questions motivating them.

- Which subsets of $V(\Upsilon)$ have common neighbours?
- How far can we go in the direction of proving the Υ-twin property?

At first sight some of the ensuing statements may seem very weak. This is because we do not 'know' at the present level of generality how the given copy of Υ 'sits' in the Vega graph of which G is a blow-up, so that there is still a large number of possibilities. For the very same reason, however, the results obtained here turn out to be very flexible later, when we study the scenario $\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu} \subseteq G \in \mathfrak{D}_4$. The fact that $\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu}$ can contain 'many' copies of Υ then means that results on Υ tend to be applicable in several distinct ways.

Lemma 4.4 (Beautiful lemma). If $i \in \mathbb{Z}/5\mathbb{Z}$, $\Upsilon \subseteq G \in \mathfrak{D}_4$, and $q \in V(G)$ is adjacent to a_{i-1} , a_{i+1} , then $a_i q \in E(G)$.

Proof. Due to symmetry we can assume i = 1, so that $a_0q, a_2q \in E(G)$ (see Figure 4.8b). Suppose $a_1q \notin E(G)$ and let z be a common neighbour of a_1, q . The graph $\Upsilon - a_3 + q + z$ can be drawn as in Figure 4.8c. Its only independent set of size 5 is $\{a_0, a_4, b_0, b_4, z\}$. If b'_2 denotes a common neighbour of this set guaranteed by \mathcal{D}_4 , then the graph $\Upsilon - b_2 - a_4 + b'_2 + q + z$ drawn in Figure 4.8d has no independent set of size five, which contradicts $G \in \mathfrak{D}_4$.



FIGURE 4.8. The proof of the beautiful lemma.

The Mycielski-Grötzsch graph has three kinds of edges. For those containing the central vertex c the twin property demands no additional assumptions.

Lemma 4.5. For every $i \in \mathbb{Z}/5\mathbb{Z}$ all graphs $G \in \mathfrak{D}_4$ have the (Υ, ca_i) -twin property.

Proof. Due to symmetry we can assume i = 1. Suppose $\Upsilon \subseteq G$ and that $a'_1, c' \in V(G)$ are Υ -twins of a_1, c . Since $a_0, a_2 \in \mathcal{N}(c')$, the beautiful lemma applied to $\Upsilon(a'_1)$ and c' instead of Υ and q yields $a'_1c' \in E(G)$.

For the other edges of Υ the twin property cannot be proved unconditionally. But the situation can be analysed satisfactorily as follows.

Lemma 4.6. Let $i \in \mathbb{Z}/5\mathbb{Z}$, $\varepsilon \in \{1, -1\}$, and $\Upsilon \subseteq G \in \mathfrak{D}_4$. If a'_i , $b'_{i+2\varepsilon}$ are non-adjacent Υ -twins of a_i , $b_{i+2\varepsilon}$, then there exists a common neighbour of $\{a'_i, a_{i+2\varepsilon}, b_{i+\varepsilon}, b'_{i+2\varepsilon}\}$.

Proof. By symmetry we can assume i = 0 and $\varepsilon = 1$. Let r be a common neighbour of a'_0 , b'_2 (see Figure 4.9a). Due to $a_2b_1 \notin E(G)$ our claim follows from Lemma 4.3 (see Figure 4.9b).

Lemma 4.7. If $i \in \mathbb{Z}/5\mathbb{Z}$, $\Upsilon \subseteq G \in \mathfrak{D}_4$, and b'_i , b'_{i+2} are non-adjacent Υ -twins of b_i , b_{i+2} , then there is a common neighbour of $\{b'_i, b_{i+1}, b'_{i+2}, c\}$.

Proof. It suffices to consider the case i = 0. If r denotes a common neighbour of b'_0 , b'_2 (see Figure 4.9c), then due to $b_1c \notin E(G)$ Lemma 4.3 leads to the desired vertex (see Figure 4.9d).



FIGURE 4.9. The proofs of Lemma 4.6 and Lemma 4.7.

The three foregoing lemmata will assist us later when proving the twin lemma for Vega graphs (cf. Lemma 4.28). In an attempt to facilitate later references we visualise the beautiful lemma and the two previous lemmata in Figure 4.10. The idea is that in Figure 4.10a the existence of the two blue edges leads to the green one. Moreover, in the Figures 4.10b and 4.10c the dashed orange non-edge forces the existence of the green vertex together with four green edges.



Lemma 4.8. Let $\Upsilon \subseteq G \in \mathfrak{D}_4$. If $u \in V(G)$ is adjacent to a_1 , a_4 and $v \in V(G)$ is adjacent to u, b_0 , then either $b_1v \in E(G)$, or $b_4v \in E(G)$, or v is adjacent to Υ -twins of b_1 and b_4 .



FIGURE 4.11. The proof of Lemma 4.8.

Proof. The beautiful lemma implies $a_0 u \in E(G)$ (see Figure 4.11a). Suppose that neither $b_1 v$ nor $b_4 v$ is an edge of G. Due to Lemma 4.3 there are common neighbours b'_1 and b'_4 of $\{a_4, b_3, b_4, v\}$ and $\{a_1, b_1, b_2, v\}$, respectively (see Figure 4.11b).

It remains to show $a_3b'_1, a_2b'_4 \in E(G)$, for then b'_1, b'_4 are the desired Υ -twins in N(v). Both statements follow from the beautiful lemma applied to appropriate copies of Υ , as indicated in the Figures 4.11c and 4.11d.

We proceed with a series of results that are drawn schematically in Figure 4.12. Again the blue vertices and edges and the orange dashed non-edges force the existence of green vertices and edges. The colour light-green indicates twins.



Corollary 4.9. Let $\Upsilon \subseteq G \in \mathfrak{D}_4$. If $q \in V(G)$ is adjacent to c, b_0 , then either q is an Υ -twin of a_2 , or it is an Υ -twin of a_3 , or it is adjacent to Υ -twins of b_1 and b_4 .

Proof. Apply Lemma 4.8 to u = c and v = q.

The maximal independent sets of Υ are the neighbourhoods of vertices and the five sets of the form $\{a_{i-1}, a_i, a_{i+1}, b_i\}$. It can happen that some of these sets have common neighbours in an ambient graph G belonging to \mathfrak{D}_4 . Given $i \in \mathbb{Z}/5\mathbb{Z}$ and $\Upsilon \subseteq G$ we shall write $\operatorname{Ext}(\Upsilon, a_i)$ for the set of common neighbours of $\{a_{i-1}, a_{i+1}, b_i\}$. More generally, if $\Omega \subseteq G$ is isomorphic to Υ and $a \in V(\Omega)$ has degree three in Ω , then $\operatorname{Ext}(\Omega, a)$ is defined analogously. The beautiful lemma implies $\operatorname{Ext}(\Omega, a) \subseteq \operatorname{N}(a)$. If $\operatorname{Ext}(\Omega, a) = \emptyset$, we say that a is reliable (with respect to Ω).

Lemma 4.10. If $\Upsilon \subseteq G \in \mathfrak{D}_4$ and $q \in V(G)$ is adjacent to a_1 , a_4 , then either q is an Υ -twin of c or $q \in Ext(\Upsilon, a_0)$.

Proof. The beautiful lemma tells us $qa_0 \in E(G)$. If $q \notin \text{Ext}(\Upsilon, a_0)$, then $qb_0 \notin E(G)$ and we can pick a common neighbour z of q, b_0 (see Figure 4.13a). Plugging u = q, v = z into Lemma 4.8 we learn that either $zb_1 \in E(G)$, or $zb_4 \in E(G)$, or z is adjacent to Υ -twins of both b_1 , b_4 . By symmetry we may assume that N(z) contains some Υ -twin b'_4 of b_4 . As we only need to show $a_2, a_3 \in N(q)$, it is permissible to replace Υ by $\Upsilon(b'_4)$ and, hence, we can even assume $b_4z \in E(G)$ (see Figure 4.13b).



FIGURE 4.13. The proof of Lemma 4.10.

Due to \mathcal{D}_4 the graph $\Upsilon - a_2 + q + z$ depicted in Figure 4.13c has an independent set T of size five possessing a common neighbour c'. Since T contains at most two vertices of the pentagon $B = b_0 b_2 b_4 b_1 b_3$ and at most one vertex from each of the edges qz, a_3c , at least one of a_0 , a_1 , a_4 needs to be in T. Thus c and q are not in T or, in other words, T is a subset of the ten-cycle $b_0 a_3 b_1 a_4 b_2 a_0 b_3 a_1 b_4 z$, whence $T = \{z, a_0, a_1, a_3, a_4\}$.

The beautiful lemma applied to $a_4, z \in N(q)$ and the graph $\Upsilon - c - a_2 + c' + z$ drawn in Figure 4.13d shows $a_3 \in N(q)$. A final application of the beautiful lemma to $a_1, a_3 \in N(q)$ and Υ gives $a_2 \in N(q)$, wherefore q is indeed an Υ -twin of c.

Lemma 4.11. If $\Upsilon \subseteq G \in \mathfrak{D}_4$ and $q \in V(G)$ is adjacent to a_0 , b_1 , but not to a_1 , then it is adjacent to b_0 and to some vertex in $\text{Ext}(\Upsilon, a_2)$.



FIGURE 4.14. The proof of Lemma 4.11.

Proof. Let z be a common neighbour of q, a_1 (see Figure 4.14a). In view of $b_2a_3 \notin E(G)$, Lemma 4.3 tells us that there is a common neighbour t of q, a_1 , b_2 , and a_3 (see Figure 4.14b). Clearly, t is in Ext(Υ , a_2). Due to $a_0, t \in N(q)$ the beautiful lemma applied to $\Upsilon - a_2 + t$ yields $b_0 \in N(q)$ (see Figure 4.14c).

Lemma 4.12. If $\Upsilon \subseteq G \in \mathfrak{D}_4$ and $a_0, b_1 \in \mathbb{N}(q)$, then either $q \in \operatorname{Ext}(\Upsilon, a_1)$, or $b_0q \in E(G)$, or q is adjacent to Υ -twins of a_2 , b_0 .



FIGURE 4.15. The proof of Lemma 4.12.

Proof. If $a_2q \in E(G)$, then $q \in \text{Ext}(\Upsilon, a_1)$ and we are done. So we may suppose $a_2, b_0 \notin N(q)$ and need to prove that N(q) contains Υ -twins of those two vertices. Due to Lemma 4.3 there are vertices b'_0 and a'_2 adjacent to $\{a_2, a_3, b_2, q\}$ and $\{b_0, b_4, c, q\}$, respectively (see Figures 4.15b and 4.15c). Obviously a'_2 is an Υ -twin of a_2 . Moreover, the cube

$$(Q) \quad \frac{q}{b_0} \quad \frac{b_3}{b_0} \quad \frac{b_2}{b_1} \quad \frac{a_3}{a_0}$$

drawn in Figure 4.15d yields $b'_0 b_3 \in E(G)$ and thus b'_0 is an Υ -twin of b_0 .

When applying one of the three previous lemmata it is often useful to know that certain vertices in the copy of Υ under consideration are reliable, as this could eliminate one of several possible outcomes. So far, however, we have no way of inferring reliability. The last two lemmata of this subsection change this situation.

Lemma 4.13. If $\Upsilon \subseteq G \in \mathfrak{D}_4$, then at least one of a_1 , a_2 , a_3 is reliable.



FIGURE 4.16. The proof of Lemma 4.13.

Proof. Assume contrariwise that there exist vertices $t_i \in \text{Ext}(\Upsilon, a_i)$ for $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Let us recall that this means $a_{i-1}, a_{i+1}, b_i \in \mathcal{N}(t_i)$. The beautiful lemma yields $t_2a_2 \in E(G)$ (see Figure 4.16a). Since G is triangle-free, $b_1, t_2 \in \mathcal{N}(a_3)$ implies $b_1t_2 \notin E(G)$. Together with Lemma 4.3 this ensures the existence of a common neighbour q of $\{a_0, b_1, t_2, t_3\}$ (see Figure 4.16b). But now the graph $\Upsilon - a_3 - b_0 + q + t_2 + t_3$ drawn in Figure 4.16c has no independent set of size five, which contradicts $G \in \mathfrak{D}_4$.

Lemma 4.14. Let $\Upsilon \subseteq G \in \mathfrak{D}_4$ and let a'_1 be an Υ -twin of a_1 . If $t'_2 \in \operatorname{Ext}(\Upsilon(a'_1), a_2)$ and there exists a common neighbour of a_1 , b_1 , t'_2 , then a_0 is reliable (with respect to Υ).



FIGURE 4.17. The proof of Lemma 4.14.

Proof. Let q be a common neighbour of $\{a_1, b_1, t'_2\}$ and assume for the sake of contradiction that there exists some $t_0 \in \text{Ext}(\Upsilon, a_0)$, so that $a_1, a_4, b_0 \in N(t_0)$ (see Figure 4.17a). Since the only independent set of size five in the graph $\Upsilon - a_0 - a_2 + a'_1 + t_0 + t'_2$ drawn in Figure 4.17b is $\{b_3, b_4, c, t_0, t'_2\}$, property \mathcal{D}_4 guarantees the existence of a common neighbour z of this set. But now the graph $\Upsilon - a_0 - a_2 - b_3 + t_0 + t'_2 + q + z$ drawn in Figure 4.17c has no independent set of size five, contrary to $G \in \mathfrak{D}_4$.

4.4. Independent sets. Let us now return to Vega graphs and study their independent subsets. An independent set $T \subseteq V(\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu})$ is said to be *small* if it intersects $\{x, y\}$ and two of the sets Γ_{red} , Γ_{green} , Γ_{blue} . So if $\mu = 1$, then all small sets contain x. We proceed with a classification of independent sets.

Lemma 4.15. If $T \subseteq V(\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu})$ is independent, then one of the following six cases occurs.

- (a) There is a vertex of $V(\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu})$ whose neighbourhood contains T;
- (b) $\mu = 1$ and $\{\mathbf{u}, v, w\} \subseteq T \subseteq \{\mathbf{u}, v, w, x\};$
- (c) $\nu = 1$ and $\{b, v, i-1\} \subseteq T \subseteq \{b, v\} \cup \Gamma_{\text{red}};$
- (d) $\{c, w, 0\} \subseteq T \subseteq \{c, w\} \cup \Gamma_{\text{red}};$
- (e) $\nu = 0$ and $\{c, w, 2i 1\} \subseteq T \subseteq \{c, w\} \cup \Gamma_{\text{green}};$
- (f) T is small.

Proof. A vertex $q \in V(\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu})$ is said to govern T if $T \subseteq N(q)$. Let Φ be the set of colours φ satisfying $T \cap \Gamma_{\varphi} \neq \emptyset$. It is easily seen that $|\Phi| = 3$ is impossible. If $|\Phi| = 2$ there is a vertex $j \in \Gamma_i$ such that $T \cap \Gamma_i \subseteq N(j)$ and either j governs T or T is small. We may henceforth suppose that $|\Phi| \leq 1$.

Next, let Ψ be the set of colours of the vertices in $T \cap C_6$. If $|\Psi| = 3$ and neither x nor y governs T, then (b) holds. If $|\Psi| = 2$, then $T \cap C_6$ consists of two vertices and the vertex

between them governs T. If $|\Psi| \leq 1$ and, moreover, $|T \cap C_6| \leq 1$, then there is a hexagonal vertex governing T. In all remaining cases $T \cap C_6$ is a pair of vertices of the same colour.

But if $\{a, u\} \subseteq T$, then one of 0, i - 1 governs T (depending on whether the vertices in $T \cap \Gamma_i$ are green or blue). Similarly, if $\{b, v\} \subseteq T$ and none of i, 2i - 2, 2i - 1 governs T, then (c) holds. Finally, if $\{c, w\} \subseteq T$ and none of 2i, 3i - 2 governs T, then (d) or (e)holds.

In the remainder of this subsection we study situations where $\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu} \subseteq G \in \mathfrak{D}_4$ and for some $q \in V(G)$ the set $N(q) \cap V(\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu})$ is in one of the cases (b) - (f). We begin with a couple of simple applications of the cube lemma.

Lemma 4.16. Let $\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu} \subseteq G \subseteq \mathfrak{D}_4$ and $q \in V(G)$.

- (a) If $u, v, w \in N(q)$, then $x \in N(q)$.
- (b) If $a, b, c \in N(q)$ and $\mu = 0$, then $y \in N(q)$.

Proof. Part (a) follows from the fact that the cube

$$(Q) \quad \frac{q \quad a \quad b \quad c}{x \quad u \quad v \quad w}$$

cannot be induced. By σ -symmetry part (b) holds as well.

Lemma 4.17. Suppose $\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu} \subseteq G \in \mathfrak{D}_4$ and that $q \in V(G)$ is adjacent to b, v.

- (a) If $j \in N(q) \cap \Gamma_{red}$, then $[0, j] \subseteq N(q)$.
- (b) If $j \in N(q) \cap \Gamma_{\text{blue}}$, then $[j, 3i 2] \subseteq N(q)$.

Proof. For the proof of part (a) we consider any $t \in [0, j)$ and look at the cube

$$(Q) \quad \frac{q \quad a \quad u \quad t+i}{t \quad b \quad v \quad j}$$

Since (Q) is not induced and $j(t+i) \notin E(G)$, we have indeed $qt \in E(G)$. Similarly, to prove part (b), we observe that for given $t \in (j, 3i - 2]$ the facts that the cube

$$(Q) \quad \frac{q \quad c \quad w \quad t-i}{t \quad b \quad v \quad j}$$

is not induced and $(t-i)j \notin E(G)$ yield the edge $qt \in E(G)$.

Corollary 4.18. If $\Upsilon_i^{\mu 1} \subseteq G \in \mathfrak{D}_4$ and some $q \in V(G)$ is adjacent either to b, v, i-1 or to c, w, 0, then G has a subgraph isomorphic to $\Upsilon_i^{\mu 0}$.

Proof. Because of the automorphism τ_1 it suffices to treat the case $b, v, i - 1 \in N(q)$ (recall that $\tau_1(c) = b, \tau_1(w) = v, \tau_1(0) = i - 1$). Lemma 4.17(*a*) yields $\Gamma_{\text{red}} \subseteq N(q)$ and, therefore, *q* can play the rôle of 2i - 1.

Lemma 4.19. Let $\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu} \subseteq G \in \mathfrak{D}_4$ and let $q \in V(G)$ be adjacent to c, w.

- (a) If $j \in N(q) \cap \Gamma_{red}$, then $[j, i-1] \subseteq N(q)$.
- (b) If $j \in N(q) \cap \Gamma_{\text{green}}$, then $[i, j] \subseteq N(q)$.

Proof. As in the proof of Lemma 4.17 we consider any vertices $t \in (j, i - 1]$, $s \in [i, j)$ and look at the cubes

$$(Q) \quad \frac{q \quad a \quad u \quad t-i}{t \quad c \quad w \quad j} \quad \text{and} \quad (Q) \quad \frac{q \quad b \quad v \quad s+i}{s \quad c \quad w \quad j} \quad,$$

respectively.

Lemma 4.20. Let $\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu} \subseteq G \in \mathfrak{D}_4$ and let $q \in V(G)$ be adjacent to a, u.

- (a) If $j \in N(q) \cap \Gamma_{\text{green}}$, then $[j, 2i 1 \nu] \subseteq N(q)$.
- (b) If $j \in \mathcal{N}(q) \cap \Gamma_{\text{blue}}$, then $[2i, j] \subseteq \mathcal{N}(q)$.

Proof. Arguing similarly again, we consider any vertices $t \in (j, 2i - 1 - \nu]$, $s \in [2i, j)$ and look at the cubes

$$(Q) \quad \frac{q \quad b \quad v \quad t-i}{t \quad a \quad u \quad j} \quad \text{and} \quad (Q) \quad \frac{q \quad c \quad w \quad s+i}{s \quad a \quad u \quad j} \quad ,$$

respectively.

Lemma 4.21. If $\Upsilon_i^{\mu_0} \subseteq G \in \mathfrak{D}_4$ and some vertex $q \in V(G)$ is adjacent to either c, w, 0 or to c, w, 2i - 1, then G contains a subgraph isomorphic to $\Upsilon_{i+1}^{\mu_1}$.



FIGURE 4.18. The proof of Lemma 4.21.

Proof. Since τ_0 fixes c, w and exchanges 0, 2i - 1, it suffices to treat the case $c, w, 0 \in N(q)$. Lemma 4.19(*a*) yields $\Gamma_{\text{red}} \subseteq N(q)$. By \mathcal{D}_2 applied to the hexagon v(2i - 1)bwqc (see Figure 4.18a) there exists a vertex z adjacent to either c, w, 2i - 1 or to b, v, q.

In the former case Lemma 4.19(b) yields $\Gamma_{\text{green}} \subseteq N(z)$ and the desired copy of $\Upsilon_{i+1}^{\mu 1}$ is shown, with the possible exception of y, in Figure 4.18b.

So we can henceforth assume $b, v, q \in N(z)$. Notice that qi cannot be an edge of G, since otherwise G contained the triangle q0i. Next, the cube

$$(Q) \quad \frac{z \quad c \quad w \quad i}{2i \quad b \quad v \quad q}$$

cannot be induced, whence $2i \in N(z)$. Now Lemma 4.17(b) tells us $\Gamma_{\text{blue}} \subseteq N(z)$ and it remains to look at Figure 4.18c.

Recall that an independent set $T \subseteq V(\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu})$ is said to be small and if it intersects $\{x, y\}$ and two of the three sets Γ_{red} , Γ_{green} , Γ_{blue} . Since T cannot intersect all three of them, there is a unique colour $\varphi \in \{\text{red}, \text{green}, \text{blue}\}$ such that $T \cap \Gamma_{\varphi} = \emptyset$; we call φ the colour of T. Due to σ -symmetry it usually suffices to consider small sets containing x.

Given a Vega graph $\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu}$ we write $\mathfrak{D}_4(\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu})$ for the class of graphs in \mathfrak{D}_4 that contain $\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu}$ but no larger Vega graph, i.e., no Vega graph $\Upsilon_{i'}^{\mu'\nu'}$ with more vertices than $\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu}$. Eventually we shall show shat if $\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu} \subseteq G \in \mathfrak{D}_4(\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu})$, then there is no $q \in V(G)$ such that $N(q) \cap V(\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu})$ is small. In the special case i = 2 this can often be inferred from earlier results using exceptional isomorphisms.

Lemma 4.22. If $\Upsilon_2^{\mu\nu} \subseteq G \in \mathfrak{D}_4(\Upsilon_2^{\mu\nu})$, $q \in V(G)$, and $T = \mathbb{N}(q) \cap V(\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu})$ is small, then $\mu = \nu = 0$ and T is red or green.

Proof. By σ -symmetry it suffices to consider the case $x \in T$. Suppose first that T is blue, whence $T \supseteq \{x, 1, 2\}$.



FIGURE 4.19. The isomorphism ρ .

Recall, that the exceptional isomorphism ρ introduced in §4.1 maps $\Upsilon_2^{\mu\nu}$ onto $\Upsilon_2^{\nu\mu}$ and the three vertices x, 1, 2 to 0, w, c (see Figure 4.19). In the sequel such situations will be written as

$$(\Upsilon_2^{\mu\nu}, \{x, 1, 2\}) \cong (\Upsilon_2^{\nu\mu}, \{0, w, c\})$$
 (via ϱ).

Depending on whether $\mu = 1$ or $\mu = 0$ we now get a contradiction to $G \in \mathfrak{D}_4(\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu})$ from Corollary 4.18 or Lemma 4.21.

Suppose next that T is red, which implies $\{x, 3, 4\} \subseteq T$ and, therefore, $\nu = 0$. If, in addition, $\mu = 1$, then

$$(\Upsilon_2^{10}, \{x, 3, 4\}) \cong (\Upsilon_2^{01}, \{0, y, 4\}) \qquad (\text{via } \rho)$$
$$\cong (\Upsilon_2^{01}, \{1, x, 2\}) \qquad (\text{via } \sigma \circ \tau_1)$$

reduces the current situation to the blue case, which has already been dealt with. Thus we have indeed $\mu = \nu = 0$. Finally, the case that T is green reduces to the earlier ones by τ_{ν} -symmetry.

By an *auxiliary path* in $\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu}$ we mean a path of length three in Γ_i whose first and last vertex have the same colour, also called the *colour of the path*. For instance, if j, j + 1 are consecutive vertices of the same colour φ , then

$$\pi_j = j - (j+i) - (j+2i) - (j+1)$$

is an auxiliary path whose colour is φ . So every Vega graph $\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu}$ possesses a red auxiliary path $\pi_0 = 0 - i - 2i - 1$. If $i \ge 3$ there is for every vertex of Γ_i an auxiliary path starting in that vertex and, in particular, there are auxiliary paths of all colours. Every auxiliary path π in $\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu}$ gives rise to a copy $\Upsilon(\pi)$ of the Mycielski-Grötzsch graph in $\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu}$ (see Figure 4.20).



FIGURE 4.20. A copy $\Upsilon(\pi)$ of the Mycielski-Grötzsch graph in $\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu}$.

One can learn a lot by applying the results from the previous subsection to graphs of the form $\Upsilon(\pi)$.

Lemma 4.23. If $\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu} \subseteq G \in \mathfrak{D}_4(\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu})$ and $q \in V(G)$, then $N(q) \cap V(\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu})$ is not small.

Proof. By σ - and τ_{ν} -symmetry it suffices to show that if N(q) contains x and a vertex from Γ_{green} , then it is disjoint to $\Gamma_{\text{red}} \cup \Gamma_{\text{blue}}$.

First case: $N(q) \cap [i, 2i - 2] \neq \emptyset$.

In the special case i = 2 this means $2 \in N(q)$. Since G is triangle-free, q cannot have a neighbour in Γ_{blue} and by Lemma 4.22 there are no neighbours of q in Γ_{red} either. Suppose next that $i \ge 3$, so that the interval [i, 2i - 2] consists of more than one vertex. Thus there exists a pair of consecutive vertices $\{m, m + 1\} \subseteq [i, 2i - 2]$ such that $N(q) \cap \{m, m + 1\} \neq \emptyset$. Working with the auxiliary path

$$\pi_m = m - (m+i) - (m-i+1) - (m+1)$$

we construct the graph $\Upsilon(\pi_m)$ (see Figure 4.21a). The blue vertex m + 1 + i is adjacent to m + 1, c, w and, therefore, m is unreliable in $\Upsilon(\pi_m)$. Similarly, the red vertex m - iexemplifies the unreliability of m + 1. Now Lemma 4.13 tells us that u and w are reliable. In particular, q is neither in $\operatorname{Ext}(\Upsilon(\pi_m), u)$ nor in $\operatorname{Ext}(\Upsilon(\pi_m), w)$ and Lemma 4.10 implies that q is an $\Upsilon(\pi_m)$ -twin of b. Thus q is adjacent to u, w and, consequently, to no vertex in $\Gamma_{\text{red}} \cup \Gamma_{\text{blue}}$.



FIGURE 4.21. The proof of Lemma 4.23.

Second case: We have $\nu = 0$ and $2i - 1 \in N(q)$.

Due to $\Gamma_{\text{red}} \subseteq N(2i-1)$ we only need to derive a contradiction from the assumption that there exists some blue $m \in N(q) \cap \Gamma_{\text{blue}}$. To this end we consider the green auxiliary path $\omega = i - m - (i-1) - (2i-1)$ (see Figure 4.21b) and the associated graph $\Upsilon(\omega)$. The vertices 0 and q witness that 2i - 1 and u are unreliable; so x is reliable by Lemma 4.13 or, in other words, $\mu = 1$. Now Lemma 4.22 tells us that $i \ge 3$.

Next we apply Lemma 4.14 for the green auxiliary path $\varpi = i - 2i - 1 - (2i - 1)$ to $\Upsilon(\varpi)$ with the labelling $a_0 = u$, $a_1 = 2i - 1$, $a_2 = i$, $b_1 = a$ and the additional vertices $a'_1 = i + 1$, $t'_2 = 2i + 1$. As 2 is a common neighbour of 2i - 1, 2i + 1, a, we infer that u is reliable. Together with $x, 2i - 1 \in N(q)$ and Lemma 4.10 this entails that q is an $\Upsilon(\varpi)$ -twin of b. But now qwm is a triangle in G, which is absurd.

Corollary 4.24. If $\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu} \subseteq G \in \mathfrak{D}_4(\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu})$ and π denotes an auxiliary path in $\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu}$ with colour φ , then those among $\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{v}, \boldsymbol{w}$ whose colour is not φ are reliable in $\Upsilon(\pi)$.

Proof. Otherwise there existed a vertex $q \in V(G)$ for which $N(q) \cap V(\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu})$ is small (see Figure 4.20), contrary to Lemma 4.23.

Summarising the work of this subsection, we can now establish a weak form of the attachment lemma with an inclusion as opposed to an equality.

Lemma 4.25. If $\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu} \subseteq G \in \mathfrak{D}_4(\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu})$, then for every $q \in V(G)$ there is some $z \in V(\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu})$ such that $N(q) \cap V(\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu}) \subseteq N(z) \cap V(\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu})$.

Proof. If no such vertex z exists, then $T = N(q) \cap V(\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu})$ satisfies one of the five statements (b) - (f) in Lemma 4.15. In case (b) Lemma 4.16(a) yields $T = \{u, v, w, x\}$, and q can play the rôle of y in a copy of $\Upsilon_i^{0\nu}$ in G, which is absurd. Similarly, Corollary 4.18, Lemma 4.21, and Lemma 4.23 exclude the remaining cases.

4.5. The twin lemma. The goal of this subsection is to prove the twin lemma for graphs in $\mathfrak{D}_4(\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu})$, which simply asserts that all these graphs have the $\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu}$ -twin property. Since Vega graphs have several different types of edges, the argument involves a case analysis. We begin with some edges, for which the twin property can be derived from the cube lemma alone.

Edges of a Vega graph $\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu}$ that connect two vertices of Γ_i are called Andrásfai edges. Such an edge jm is said to be long if $j - m \neq \pm i$. Moreover, for $\nu = 0$ the edge 0(2i - 1) is considered to be long as well. All other Andrásfai edges are *short*. As in the previous section, long edges are easier to handle than short ones.

Lemma 4.26. If e denotes a long Andrásfai edge of a Vega graph $\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu}$, then every graph $G \in \mathfrak{D}_4$ has the $(\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu}, e)$ -twin property. Moreover, if $\mu = 0$ the same holds for e = xy.

Proof. For the last statement we consider any $\Upsilon_i^{0\nu}$ -twins x' and y' of x and y, respectively. Since the cube

$$(Q) \quad \frac{x' \quad u \quad v \quad w}{y' \quad a \quad b \quad c}$$

cannot be induced, x'y' is indeed an edge of G.

Now let e = jm be a long Andrásfai edge. Suppose first that j is red and m is green. Due to $i < m - j \leq 2i - 1$ we have $j \neq i - 1$ and, hence, there is a green vertex j + i. Furthermore, m - i is red and $(j + i) - (m - i) = 2i - (m - j) \in [i - 1]$ shows $(m - i)(j + i) \notin E(G)$. So if j', m' are $\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu}$ -twins of j, m, then the cube

$$(Q) \quad \frac{j' \quad b \quad v \quad m-i}{m' \quad a \quad u \quad j+i}$$

leads to the desired edge $j'm' \in E(G)$.

Similarly, if j is green and m is blue, then $j \neq 2i - 1$ and $(m - i)(j + i) \notin E(G)$, so that we can work with the cube

$$(Q) \quad \frac{j' \quad c \quad w \quad m-i}{m' \quad b \quad v \quad j+i}$$

The remaining case, where e connects a red and a blue vertex, reduces to one of the previous two by τ_{ν} -symmetry.

We proceed with short Andrásfai edges.

Lemma 4.27. If e denotes a short Andrásfai edge of a Vega graph $\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu}$, then every graph $G \in \mathfrak{D}_4(\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu})$ has the $(\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu}, e)$ -twin property.

Proof. Suppose first that e connects a red vertex with a green vertex. Recalling that the edge 0(2i - 1) is regarded as being long, we can write e = j(j + i) for some $j \in [0, i - 1]$. We may further assume $j \neq i - 1$, because if the edge e = (i - 1)(2i - 1) exists, then τ_0 reflects it to 0i, which corresponds to j = 0.

Working with the red auxiliary path $\pi_j = j - (j+i) - (j+2i) - (j+1)$ we form the graph $\Upsilon(\pi_j)$ (see Figure 4.22a). If there are non-adjacent $\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu}$ -twins j', (j+i)' of j, j+i, then Lemma 4.6 applied to $\Upsilon(\pi_j)$ yields a common neighbour q of j', (j+i)', c, w (see Figure 4.10b). We colour j' red, (j+i)' green, q blue, and construct a copy of $\Upsilon_{i+1}^{\mu\nu}$ whose Andrásfai part is shown in Figure 4.22b, thereby obtaining a contradiction to $G \in \mathfrak{D}_4(\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu})$. The edges from q to [j+1, j+i-1] required here exist by Lemma 4.19 applied to $\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu}(j')$ and $\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu}((j+i)')$.



FIGURE 4.22. The proof of Lemma 4.27.

Next we consider the case that e connects a green vertex with a blue vertex and write e = (j + i)(j + 2i), where $j \in [0, i - 2]$. By Lemma 4.7 applied to $\Upsilon(\pi_j)$ there is a common neighbour q of (j + i)', (j + 2i)', a, u (see Figures 4.10c and 4.22a). We colour (j + i)' green, (j + 2i)' blue, q red and construct a copy of $\Upsilon_{i+1}^{\mu\nu}$ whose Andrásfai part is shown in Figure 4.22c. The required edges from q to [j + i + 1, j + 2i - 1] are obtained from Lemma 4.20. So as in the previous case we reach a contradiction to $G \in \mathfrak{D}_4(\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu})$.

Finally, the case that e connects a red vertex to a blue vertex reduces to the previous ones by τ_{ν} -symmetry.

Lemma 4.28 (Twin Lemma). Every $G \in \mathfrak{D}_4(\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu})$ has the $\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu}$ -twin property.

Proof. Let e be an edge of $\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu} \subseteq G \in \mathfrak{D}_4(\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu})$, for which we want to confirm the twin property. For the sake of contradiction we assume that there are non-adjacent twins of the end vertices of e, indicated in the usual way by primes. Owing to the two foregoing lemmata we have $e \cap \mathcal{C}_6 \neq \emptyset$. Moreover, by σ -symmetry we can suppose $y \notin e$, which means that one of the following two main cases occurs.

First case: e connects one of u, v, w to Γ .

By τ_{ν} -symmetry we may assume $u \in e$ or $w \in e$. If e = uj, there exists a red auxiliary path π one of whose end vertices is j. By Lemma 4.6 applied to $\Upsilon(\pi)$, there exists a vertex q adjacent to u', j', x, and an inner vertex of π (see Figures 4.10b and 4.20a). But this means that q has a small neighbourhood in $\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu}(j')$, contrary to Lemma 4.23.

If $i \ge 3$ the case e = wj, where $j \in \Gamma_{\text{blue}}$, is similar, because there exists a blue auxiliary path starting with j. Finally, i = 2 implies j = 4 and due to

$$(\Upsilon_2^{\mu\nu}, 4w) \cong (\Upsilon_2^{\nu\mu}, 41)$$
 (via ϱ)

(see Figure 4.19) this case reduces to Lemma 4.27.

Second case: $e \cap \{a, b, c\} \neq \emptyset$.

If $a \in e$ we just need to apply Lemma 4.5 to $\Upsilon(\pi)$ for an appropriate red auxiliary path π . Provided that $i \ge 3$ there exist auxiliary paths ending in all vertices and this argument generalises. Thus it remains to consider the case that i = 2 and $\{b, c\} \cap e \neq \emptyset$. Using our isomorphisms and automorphisms, every possibility can be shown to be equivalent to a case that has already been covered. Indeed, we have

$$(\Upsilon_2^{\mu\nu}, cx) \cong (\Upsilon_2^{\nu\mu}, 20), \quad (\Upsilon_2^{\mu\nu}, c4) \cong (\Upsilon_2^{\nu\mu}, 24), \quad (\Upsilon_2^{\mu\nu}, cv) \cong (\Upsilon_2^{\nu\mu}, 2v) \qquad (\text{via } \varrho)$$

(see Figure 4.19), so that only the cases e = cu and $b \in e$ remain. The edge e = 2b can be taken care of by τ_{ν} -symmetry, because

$$(\Upsilon_2^{\mu 0}, 2b) \cong (\Upsilon_2^{\mu 0}, \mathbf{1}a)$$
 and $(\Upsilon_2^{\mu 1}, 2b) \cong (\Upsilon_2^{\mu 1}, 4c)$.

Next, we have $(\Upsilon_2^{\mu\nu}, c\mathbf{u}) \cong (\Upsilon_2^{\nu\mu}, 2b)$ (via ϱ) and, finally, the other edges containing b are τ_{ν} -equivalent to certain edges containing \mathbf{a} or c.

4.6. The attachment lemma. In this subsection we establish the attachment lemma for graphs in $\mathfrak{D}_4(\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu})$, which allows us to complete the proof of Theorem 1.3(b).

Lemma 4.29 (Attachment Lemma). If $\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu} \subseteq G \in \mathfrak{D}_4(\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu})$, then every vertex $q \in V(G)$ is an $\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu}$ -twin of some vertex belonging to $\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu}$.

Proof. Instead of " $\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu}$ -twin" we will just write "twin" throughout the argument. We proceed with fourteen claims of the form that if a given vertex $q \in V(G)$ is adjacent to certain members of $V(\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu})$, then q is indeed a twin of some vertex of $\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu}$.

Claim 4.30. If q is adjacent to at least two vertices among u, v, w, then either it is a twin of one of a, b, c or $\mu = 0$ and q is a twin of y.

Proof. Suppose first that $v, w \in N(q)$. With an arbitrary red auxiliary path π we form the graph $\Upsilon(\pi)$ (see Figure 4.20a). The beautiful lemma yields $x \in N(q)$; so if $u \in N(q)$ holds as well, then q is a twin of y (and $\mu = 0$). Otherwise Lemma 4.10 shows that q is a $\Upsilon(\pi)$ -twin of a, which means that q is adjacent to the end vertices of π . As for every red vertex $j \in \Gamma_{\text{red}}$ there is an auxiliary red path starting in j, we conclude that if $uq \notin E(G)$, then $\Gamma_{\text{red}} \subseteq N(q)$, whence q is a twin of a. By τ_{ν} -symmetry the only other case we need to consider is that $u, v \in N(q)$ but $w \notin N(q)$. If $i \ge 3$ we can simply repeat the above argument with blue auxiliary paths, thereby learning that q is a twin of c.



FIGURE 4.23. The proof of Claim 4.30 and Claim 4.33.

If i = 2, however, only the red auxiliary path $\pi_0 = 0 - 2 - 4 - 1$ might be available. Corollary 4.24 guarantees that w is reliable with respect to $\Upsilon(\pi_0)$ (see Figure 4.23a). Thus Lemma 4.11 applied to this graph yields $x \in N(q)$ (see Figure 4.12c). Next Lemma 4.12 and $q \notin \text{Ext}(\Upsilon(\pi_0), x)$ imply that some $\Upsilon(\pi_0)$ -twin 4' of 4 is in N(q) (see Figure 4.12d). Due to i = 2 this vertex is actually a real twin of 4. Now q is a $\Upsilon_2^{\mu\nu}(4')$ -twin of c. By Lemma 2.3 it follows that q is a twin of c. In view of σ -symmetry, the previous claim implies the following.

Claim 4.31. If $\mu = 0$ and q is adjacent to at least two among a, b, c, then it is a twin of u, v, w, or x.

Without the assumption on μ we still have the following weaker assertion.

Claim 4.32. If q is adjacent to two vertices among a, b, c and to some vertex from Γ_i , then q is a twin of \mathbf{u} , v, or w.

Proof. Arguing indirectly we assume that q is a counterexample. Let $\varphi \in \{\text{red}, \text{green}, \text{blue}\}$ be a colour satisfying $N(q) \cap \Gamma_{\varphi} \neq \emptyset$. Claim 4.31 tells us that $\mu = 1$, whence $\Gamma_{\varphi} \not \subseteq N(q)$. Consequently, there is a pair of consecutive vertices $\{j, j + 1\} \subseteq \Gamma_{\varphi}$ such that exactly one of j, j + 1 is in N(q).

Recall that

$$\pi_j = j - (j+i) - (j+2i) - (j+1)$$

is an auxiliary path of colour φ . By Lemma 4.11 applied to $\Upsilon(\pi_j)$ there is a neighbour of q in $\operatorname{Ext}(\Upsilon(\pi_j), s)$ for some $s \in \{u, v, w\}$ whose colour is not φ (see Figure 4.20). But this contradicts the fact that s is, by Corollary 4.24, reliable in $\Upsilon(\pi_j)$.

Here is a statement that can be viewed as an adaptation of Claim 3.5 to Vega graphs.

Claim 4.33. If $j \neq 0$, i and $j, j + i - 1 \in N(q)$, then q is a twin of j - i.

Proof. The condition $j \neq 0, i$ just means that j, j + i - 1 have distinct colours. So by τ_{ν} -symmetry we may assume that j is red or green. If j is red, we consider $\Upsilon(\pi_{j-1})$, where

$$\pi_{j-1} = (j-1) - (j+i-1) - (j+2i-1) - j$$

is a red auxiliary path (see Figure 4.23b). Assume for the sake of contradiction that $w \notin N(q)$. In view of Lemma 4.11 there exists some $y' \in N(q) \cap Ext(\Upsilon(\pi_{j-1}), x)$. As y' is adjacent to u, v, w, and x, we have $\mu = 0$ and y' is a twin of y. But now q has a small neighbourhood in $\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu}(y')$, which is absurd. This proves $w \in N(q)$.

Using the impossibility of small neighbourhoods again we obtain $x \notin N(q)$. Therefore Lemma 4.12 shows that some $\Upsilon(\pi_{j-1})$ -twin c' of c is in N(q). Claim 4.30 informs us that c'is, in fact, a real twin of c. So Lemma 4.19 applied to $\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu}(c')$ yields $[j, i-1] \subseteq N(q)$ and $[i, j + i - 1] \subseteq N(q)$. Altogether q is a $\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu}(c')$ -twin of j - i and by Lemma 2.3 we are done. The case that j is green is similar, the only difference being that now the path $\pi_{j-1} = (j-1) - (j+i-1) - (j-i) - j$ is green (see Figure 4.23c).

The next three claims analyse vertices adjacent to two opposite vertices of the external hexagon.

Claim 4.34. If $a, u \in N(q)$, then q is a twin of some vertex belonging to Γ_{red} .

Proof. Due to Lemma 4.20 it suffices to show the following statements.

- (1) For every $j \in [0, i-2]$, either j + i or j + 2i is in N(q).
- (2) If $\nu = 0$, then $2i 1 \in \mathcal{N}(q)$.

For the proof of (1) we apply Corollary 4.9 to $\Upsilon(\pi_j)$, where, as usual,

$$\pi_{j} = j - (j+i) - (j+2i) - (j+1)$$

(see Figures 4.12a and 4.24a). This shows that if $j + i, j + 2i \notin N(q)$, then there are $\Upsilon(\pi_j)$ -twins of j + i, j + 2i adjacent to q. But by Claim 4.33 these twins had to be real twins and the twin lemma would show that they are adjacent, thus creating a triangle with q.

To verify (2) we work with the green auxiliary path $\omega = i - 2i - (i - 1) - (2i - 1)$. In view of Lemma 4.25 no vertex is adjacent to c, w, 2i - 1 and thus i is reliable in $\Upsilon(\omega)$ (see Figure 4.24b). So Lemma 4.11 discloses that $(2i - 1) \notin N(q)$ is impossible.



FIGURE 4.24. The proofs of Claim 4.34 and Claim 4.35.

Claim 4.35. If $c, w \in N(q)$, then q is a twin of some vertex in Γ_{blue} .

Proof. Because of Lemma 4.19 it suffices to show that

- (1) for every $j \in [1, i-2]$, either j or j + i is in N(q);
- $(2) \ i-1 \in \mathcal{N}(q);$
- (3) and $i \in \mathcal{N}(q)$.

The argument establishing (1) is very similar to the previous proof but uses the blue auxiliary path

$$\pi_{2i+j-1} = (2i+j-1) - j - (i+j) - (2i+j)$$

instead (see Figure 4.24c); we omit the details.

For the remaining two statements we work with the red auxiliary path

$$\eta = 0 - i - 2i - (i - 1)$$

(see Figure 4.24d). Assume first that contrary to (2) we have $i - 1 \notin N(q)$. By Lemma 4.11 there exists some $z \in N(q) \cap Ext(\Upsilon(\omega), 0)$. Due to $b, v, i - 1 \in N(z)$ and Lemma 4.17(*a*) we have $\Gamma_{red} \subseteq N(z)$, wherefore z is a twin of 2i - 1 (and $\nu = 0$). But this means that q violates Lemma 4.25 with respect to $\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu}(z)$. Thereby (2) is proved.

Suppose next that $i \notin N(q)$ and observe that due to Lemma 4.25 the vertex i - 1 is reliable with respect to $\Upsilon(\eta)$. So Lemma 4.12 tells us that N(q) contains some $\Upsilon(\eta)$ -twins 0', i' of 0, i, respectively. By Lemma 4.20(a) 0' is actually a real twin of 0 and by the case j = 2i of Claim 4.33 i' is also real twin of i. Now the twin lemma discloses $0'i' \in E(G)$ and together with q this edge closes a triangle, which is absurd. This concludes the proof of (3).

Claim 4.36. If $b, v \in N(q)$, then q is a twin of some vertex in Γ_{green} .

Proof. By τ_{ν} -symmetry this follows from the two previous claims.

So far all our claims assume that at least two neighbours of q in $V(\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu})$ are given. This is not surprising, because all the results in §4.3 are of this form, and up to this point no other arguments have been utilised. Eventually we need to cover less restrictive cases of the attachment lemma as well. Accordingly, we shall use a hexagon argument in the claim after the next one, where we show that neighbours of x are twins of a, b, c, or y. Preparing ourselves for this task we establish an important special case first.

Claim 4.37. If q is adjacent to x and a vertex belonging to Γ_i , then it is a twin of a, b, or c.

Proof. If, for instance, $x, j \in N(q)$, where $j \in \Gamma_{red}$, we take a red auxiliary path π one of whose end vertices is j and apply Lemma 4.10 to $\Upsilon(\pi)$ (see Figure 4.20a). As q cannot have a small neighbourhood in $\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu}$, this yields $v, w \in N(q)$ and due to Claim 4.30 q is a twin of a. By τ_{ν} -symmetry the only other possibility we need to consider is that $j, x \in N(q)$ holds for some $j \in \Gamma_{blue}$. The case $i \geq 3$ is similar, because then there is a blue auxiliary path starting in j. Suppose, finally, that i = 2 and $4, x \in N(q)$. Since $\varrho(4) = 4$ and $\varrho(x) = 0$, the case j = 4 of Claim 4.33 now shows that q is a twin of $\varrho^{-1}(2)$, i.e., of c.

Claim 4.38. If $x \in N(q)$, then q is a twin of a, b, c, or y.

Proof. We first show that if $u \notin N(q)$, then q is a twin of a. To this end we take an arbitrary common neighbour z of q, u and form the hexagon shown in Figure 4.25a. Since G satisfies \mathcal{D}_2 , there is a common neighbour t of $\{q, a, u\}$ or $\{x, 0, z\}$.

If $q, a, u \in N(t)$, then Claim 4.34 informs us that t is a twin of some $j \in \Gamma_{red}$. Among the neighbours of q in $\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu}(t)$ there are x and the red vertex $t \in \Gamma_{red}$. Therefore, Claim 4.37 implies that q is a $\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu}(t)$ -twin of a and Lemma 2.3 reveals that q is a real twin of a as well.



FIGURE 4.25. Hexagon arguments.

Suppose next that $x, 0, z \in N(t)$. By Claim 4.37, t is a twin of a. For simplicity we may assume t = a. Now Claim 4.34 shows that z is a twin of some $j \in \Gamma_{\text{red}}$ and a final application of Claim 4.37 reveals that q is again a twin of a. Summarising the discussion so far, we have thereby completed the case $u \notin N(q)$.

A similar argument based on the hexagon in Figure 4.25b shows that if $w \notin N(q)$, then q is a twin of c. In the only remaining case, $u, w \in N(q)$, Claim 4.30 implies that q is a twin of b or y.

This has the following consequence.

Claim 4.39. If $\mu = 0$ and some twin y' of y is adjacent to q, then q is a twin of u, v, w, or x.

Proof. For y = y' this can be seen by applying the automorphism σ to the previous claim. By Lemma 2.3 the general case follows.

Our next major goal is an attachment lemma for neighbours of a (cf. Claim 4.41) and again we commence with a special case.

Claim 4.40. If $a \in N(q)$ and, moreover, $\{b, c\} \cap N(q) \neq \emptyset$, then q is a twin of v, w, or x.

Proof. We will only display the argument for the case $a, b \in N(q)$, the other case being similar. Using the red auxiliary path $\pi_0 = 0 - i - 2i - 1$ we form the graph $\Upsilon(\pi_0)$. By Corollary 4.9 there is a $\Upsilon(\pi_0)$ -twin of c or 2i adjacent to q.

Suppose first that $c' \in N(q)$ holds for some $\Upsilon(\pi_0)$ -twin c' of c. Claim 4.30 tells us that c' is a real twin of c and due to Lemma 4.16(b) q is a $\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu}(c')$ -twin of x. So by Lemma 2.3 q is a twin of x.

It remains to consider the case that some $\Upsilon(\pi_0)$ -twin (2i)' of 2i is adjacent to q. For j = 1Claim 4.33 shows that (2i)' is actually a real twin of 2i and, therefore, Claim 4.32 is applicable to $\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu}((2i)')$. Together with Lemma 2.3 we conclude that q is a twin of w. \Box **Claim 4.41.** If q is adjacent to a, then it is a twin of some vertex of $\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu}$.

Proof. If $u \in N(q)$ the desired conclusion can be drawn from Claim 4.34. Assuming $u \notin N(q)$ from now on we take a common neighbour z of q, u and form the hexagon shown in Figure 4.25c.

If there is a common neighbour t of q, u, w, then Claim 4.30 shows that t is a twin of b, or $\mu = 0$ and t is a twin of y. In the latter case we use Claim 4.39 and in the former case we appeal to Claim 4.40 and Lemma 2.3.

Since G satisfies \mathcal{D}_2 , it only remains to consider the case that some common neighbour t of a, b, z exists. By Claim 4.40, t is a twin of w or x. Due to Lemma 2.3 we can assume, for simplicity, that $t \in \{w, x\}$. Now the Claims 4.30 and 4.38 tell us that z is a twin of b, c or y. Finally, Claim 4.39 or Claim 4.40 and Lemma 2.3 complete the proof.

We also need a version of this claim with b or c instead of a, which we prepare as follows.

Claim 4.42. If q is adjacent to b and c, then it is a twin of u or x.

Proof. If $a \in N(q)$, then Claim 4.41 shows that q is a twin of x. Otherwise, we take a common neighbour z of a, q and deduce from Claim 4.41 that z is a twin of some vertex $t \in V(\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu})$ adjacent to a. Since neither qbz nor qcz is a triangle in G, we have $z \notin (N(b) \cup N(c))$. Consequently, t is non-adjacent to b and c and, altogether, only the possibility $t \in \Gamma_{red}$ remains. Now Claim 4.32 shows that q is a $\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu}(t)$ -twin of u and another application of Lemma 2.3 concludes the argument.

Next we can repeat the proof of Claim 4.41 with the hexagon in Figure 4.25d or 4.25e, thus obtaining the following statement.

Claim 4.43. If b or c is in N(q), then q is a twin of some vertex of $\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu}$.

Now the attachment lemma is clear. Given any $q \in V(G)$ we can either apply Claim 4.38 directly (if $qx \in E(G)$), or there is a common neighbour z of q and x, which then has to be a twin of a, b, c, or y. As usual, Lemma 2.3 allows us to assume that, actually, z is one of those four vertices. Depending on z we now use Claim 4.41, 4.43, or 4.39.

Let us end this section by pointing out that owing to the twin lemma (cf. Lemma 4.28) and the attachment lemma (cf. Lemma 4.29) Lemma 2.4 implies Theorem 1.3(b).

§5. Concluding remarks

5.1. Finite graphs. Whenever we appealed to the property \mathcal{D}_4 in the proof of Theorem 1.2, the list of 3m vertices x_1, \ldots, x_{3m} we specified had no independent subset $\{x_i : i \in I\}$ such that $|I| \ge m + 2$. Originally we thought that our intended application to Ramsey-Turán

theory, i.e., the proof of (1.1), required that we establish Theorem 1.2 with such 'restricted applications' of \mathcal{D}_4 only. While it turned out later that this extra caution could be avoided, we would still like to record the stronger statement for potential future references.

Let us say for a positive integer k that a graph G has the property \mathcal{Q}_k if for every $m \in [k]$ and every sequence x_1, \ldots, x_{3m} of vertices of G there is an index set $I \subseteq [3m]$ such that $U = \{x_i : i \in I\}$ is independent and either $|I| \ge m+2$, or |I| = m+1 and U has a common neighbour.

Theorem 5.1. A maximal triangle-free graph satisfies Q_4 if and only if it is a blow-up of either an Andrásfai or a Vega graph.

Recall that by Lemma 4.2 the members of \mathfrak{D}_4 contain no induced cubes. We also found several other forbidden induced subgraphs for the class \mathfrak{D}_4 , such as the graph N depicted in Figure 4.5, but so far we did not complete our analysis of the situation.

Conjecture 5.2. There exists a finite family \mathscr{F} of graphs such that \mathfrak{D}_4 is the class of maximal triangle-free graphs with at least two vertices not possessing induced subgraphs in \mathscr{F} .

Let us point out that a somewhat similar result for the class \mathfrak{A} of maximal triangle-free, Υ -free graphs and the forbidden family $\{C_6\}$ is established in Section 3. Thus a solution of the above problem might lead to a different (albeit longer) proof of Theorem 1.2.

Another problem suggested by Theorem 1.2 is whether the assumption \mathcal{D}_4 is really necessary or whether a more elaborate argument would show that \mathcal{D}_3 suffices. It is probably not very difficult to rule this out, but we lacked the energy for doing so.

Conjecture 5.3. There is a finite maximal triangle-free graph G satisfying \mathcal{D}_3 but not \mathcal{D}_4 .

The last finitary problem we would like to mention is the well-known question to characterise the maximal triangle-free graphs G on n vertices satisfying $\delta(G) \ge n/3$. This family does not consist exclusively of blow-ups of Andrásfai and Vega graphs, since it contains, for instance, the Cayley graphs associated to

$$\mathbb{Z}/6k\mathbb{Z}$$
 and $\{\pm k, \pm (k+1), \dots, \pm (2k-1)\}.$

This graph contains the induced hexagon 0 - 2k - 3k - 4k - 5k - 0 but no vertex with three neighbours on this hexagon and, therefore, it violates \mathcal{D}_2 . Another graph interesting in this context is shown in Figure 5.1 (see also Figure 4.16c for a less symmetric drawing of the same graph). As all these additional examples are (n/3)-regular, one may wonder whether the following is true. Question 5.4. Let G be a maximal triangle-free graph on n vertices such that $\delta(G) \ge n/3$, but at least one vertex of G has degree larger than n/3. Does it follow that G is a blow-up of either an Andrásfai or a Vega graph?



FIGURE 5.1. A triangle-free graph G with v(G) = 12 and $\alpha(G) = 4$.

5.2. Infinite graphs. One may wonder whether results analogous to Theorem 1.3 hold for infinite graphs as well. Before we discuss this matter we present three examples of infinite maximal triangle-free graphs, which have the property \mathcal{D}_k for every $k \ge 1$.

I. The circular Andrásfai graph G_{ω} .

Let $\xi \in S^1 \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ be a complex number of modulus 1 which is not a root of unity. Consider the graph G_{ω} with vertex set $V = \{\xi^n \colon n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ in which two vertices are adjacent if their distance exceeds $\sqrt{3}$. Since V is dense in S^1 , the graph G_{ω} is maximal trianglefree. Moreover, for every sequence of 3m vertices from V there is an open arc $I \subseteq S^1$ of length $2\pi/3$ containing m + 1 of them. Consequently, G_{ω} satisfies \mathcal{D}_k for every $k \ge 1$.

II. Generalised Andrásfai graphs Γ_X .

Given a dense linear order (X, \leq) without minimal or maximal elements we define the generalised Andrásfai graph Γ_X to be the graph with vertex set

$$V(\Gamma_X) = \{ \mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{x}} \colon x \in X \} \cup \{ g_x \colon x \in X \} \cup \{ \mathbf{b}_{\mathbf{x}} \colon x \in X \}$$

and all edges

- $r_x g_x, g_x b_x$, where $x \in X$,
- as well as $r_x g_y$, $g_x b_y$, $b_x r_y$, where x < y.

It can easily be checked that Γ_X is maximal triangle-free and that if $x_1 < x_2 < \cdots < x_k$ are in X, then the vertices

$$\{r_{x_1}, r_{x_2}, \dots, r_{x_k}\} \cup \{g_{x_1}, g_{x_2}, \dots, g_{x_k}\} \cup \{b_{x_1}, \dots, b_{x_{k-1}}\}$$

span a copy of Γ_k in Γ_X . This fact immediately implies that G_X has the property \mathcal{D}_k for every $k \ge 1$.

III. Generalised Vega graphs $\Upsilon_X^{\mu 0}$.

Starting from the graph Γ_X defined in the previous example we can construct two generalised Vega graphs Υ_X^{00} and Υ_X^{10} . To this end we take an external hexagon *avcubw* and, as usual, we connect

- a, u to $\{r_x : x \in X\};$
- b, v to $\{g_x \colon x \in X\};$
- and c, w to $\{b_x : x \in X\}$.

Next, we join another vertex x to a, b, c, thereby obtaining Υ_X^{10} . Finally Υ_X^{00} has a further vertex y adjacent to u, v, w, and x.

As none of these graphs is a blow-up of a finite Andrásfai of Vega graph, the most naïve extension of Theorem 1.3 to infinite graphs is false.

Theorem 5.5. There exists an infinite maximal triangle-free graph satisfying \mathcal{D}_k for every $k \ge 1$ that fails to be a blow-up of any finite graph.

We are optimistic, however, that the following 'local version' of Theorem 1.3 holds for infinite graphs.

Conjecture 5.6. For every maximal triangle-free graph G with property \mathcal{D}_4 and every finite set of vertices $W \subseteq V(G)$ there exists a finite set U with $W \subseteq U \subseteq V(G)$ which spans a blow-up of either an Andrásfai or a Vega graph in G.

Notice that this is true for finite graphs, where one just needs to take U = V(G), and for the infinite graphs G_{ω} , Γ_X , $\Upsilon_X^{\mu 0}$ constructed above. Moreover, Conjecture 5.6 implies that the following statement holds for $\ell = 4$.

Conjecture 5.7. There exists a natural number ℓ such that each maximal triangle-free graph satisfying \mathcal{D}_{ℓ} has the property \mathcal{D}_k for every $k \ge 1$.

Next we would like to address the infinitary version of Conjecture 5.3. Let us recall that Henson [9] constructed a countable homogeneous triangle-free graph, which he denoted by U_3 . Its main property is that for all disjoint finite sets $A, B \subseteq V(U_3)$ such that A is independent in U_3 there is a vertex v adjacent to the vertices in A and non-adjacent to the vertices in B. In particular, U_3 is a maximal triangle-free graph containing all finite or countably infinite triangle-free graphs as induced subgraphs.

Theorem 5.8. Henson's graph U_3 satisfies \mathcal{D}_3 but not \mathcal{D}_4 .

Proof. It is a well known elementary Ramsey theoretic fact that for all $m \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ the partition relation $3m \longrightarrow (3, m + 1)$ asserting that triangle-free graphs on 3m vertices

contain independent sets of size m + 1 holds. Consequently, for every sequence x_1, \ldots, x_{3m} of vertices of U_3 there is a set $I \subseteq [3m]$ of size m + 1 such that $A = \{x_i : i \in I\}$ is independent. As all finite independent subsets of $V(U_3)$ have common neighbours, this proves that U_3 satisfies \mathcal{D}_3 .

On the other hand, as U_3 contains the graph depicted in Figure 5.1, it has twelve vertices no five of which possess a common neighbour. Thus U_3 does not have the property \mathcal{D}_4 . \Box

Finally, we would like to point out that there is an infinite minimum-degree version of the Brandt-Thomassé theorem. The result that follows concerns graphs on \mathbb{N} . Given such a graph G and a vertex $v \in V(G)$ we write

$$\underline{\operatorname{deg}}(v) = \liminf_{n \to \infty} \frac{|\{1, 2, \dots, n\} \cap \mathcal{N}(v)|}{n}$$

Theorem 5.9. Let G be a maximal triangle-free graph on \mathbb{N} . If $\inf\{\underline{\deg}(v): v \in \mathbb{N}\} > 1/3$, then G is a blow-up of either an Andrásfai or a Vega graph.

Proof. Choose $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\underline{\deg}(v) > 1/3 + \varepsilon$ holds for every $v \in \mathbb{N}$. Given any sequence x_1, \ldots, x_{3m} of vertices of G, there is some positive integer n such that for every $i \in [3m]$ we have $|\mathcal{N}(x_i) \cap [n]| \ge (1/3 + \varepsilon)n$. Now a counting argument leads to some $y \in [n]$ for which the set $I = \{i \in [3m] : x_i y \in E(G)\}$ has at least the size $m + 3m\varepsilon$. Consequently, G satisfies \mathcal{D}_k for every $k \ge 1$ and, in particular, G satisfies \mathcal{D}_4 .

The only moment in the proof of Theorem 1.3 employing the finiteness of G is that at the very end we choose a maximal Andrásfai or Vega graph contained in it. Thus it remains to show that there exists some constant C such that every Andrásfai or Vega subgraph of G has at most C vertices.

If for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$ there is a copy of Γ_{m+1} in G and $U = \{x_1, \ldots, x_{3m}\}$ contains 3m distinct vertices of this copy, then every independent subset of $I \subseteq U$ satisfies $|I| \leq \alpha(\Gamma_{m+1}) = m+1$ and, therefore, the conclusion of our first paragraph yields $m \leq (3\varepsilon)^{-1}$. This shows that the Andrásfai subgraphs of G are indeed bounded. For Vega graphs the argument is similar, using in addition that each $\Upsilon_i^{\mu\nu}$ has for $\kappa = 9i - (6 + \mu + \nu)$ a blow-up on $3\kappa - 1$ vertices with independence number κ (see [4] or [11]).

References

- B. Andrásfai, Über ein Extremalproblem der Graphentheorie, Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar. 13 (1962), 443–455. ↑1.1, 1.2
- [2] B. Andrásfai, P. Erdős, and V. T. Sós, On the connection between chromatic number, maximal clique and minimal degree of a graph, Discrete Math. 8 (1974), 205–218. ↑1.1
- [3] S. Brandt, A 4-colour problem for dense triangle-free graphs, Discrete Math. 251 (2002), no. 1-3, 33-46. ↑4.2

- [4] S. Brandt and T. Pisanski, Another infinite sequence of dense triangle-free graphs, Electronic Journal of Combinatorics (1998), # R43. ↑1.1, 5.2
- [5] S. Brandt and S. Thomassé, Dense triangle-free graphs are four-colorable: A solution to the Erdős-Simonovits problem. Available from Thomassé's webpage at http://perso.ens-lyon.fr/stephan. thomasse/. 11.1, 1.2, 1.2
- [6] C. C. Chen, G. P. Jin, and K. M. Koh, Triangle-free graphs with large degree, Combin. Probab. Comput. 6 (1997), no. 4, 381–396. [↑]1.1, 1.2, 1.2
- [7] P. Erdős and M. Simonovits, On a valence problem in extremal graph theory, Discrete Math. 5 (1973), 323–334. [↑]1.1
- [8] R. Häggkvist, Odd cycles of specified length in nonbipartite graphs., Graph theory (Cambridge, 1981), North-Holland Math. Stud., 62, 1982, pp. 89–99. ¹¹¹
- [9] C. W. Henson, A family of countable homogeneous graphs, Pacific J. Math. 38 (1971), 69–83. [↑]5.2
- T. Łuczak, On the structure of triangle-free graphs of large minimum degree, Combinatorica 26 (2006), no. 4, 489–493. ↑1.1
- [11] T. Łuczak, J. Polcyn, and Chr. Reiher, Andrásfai and Vega graphs in Ramsey-Turán theory, Journal of Graph Theory 98 (2021), no. 1, 57–80. [↑]1.2, 1.2, 5.2
- [12] _____, On the Ramsey-Turán density of triangles, Combinatorica 42 (2022), no. 1, 115–136. [↑]1.2
- [13] _____, The next case of Andrásfai's conjecture, Submitted, available at arXiv:2308.06070. ↑1.2
- [14] W. Mantel, Problem 28 (Solution by H. Gouwentak, W. Mantel, J. Teixeira de Mattes, F. Schuh and W. A. Wythoff), Wiskundige Opgaven 10 (1907), 60–61. [↑]1.1
- [15] J. Mycielski, Sur le coloriage des graphs, Colloq. Math. 3 (1955), 161–162 (French). ↑1.1
- [16] M. Simonovits and V. T. Sós, *Ramsey-Turán theory*, Discrete Math. 229 (2001), no. 1-3, 293–340.
 Combinatorics, graph theory, algorithms and applications. [↑]1.2
- [17] C. Thomassen, On the chromatic number of triangle-free graphs of large minimum degree, Combinatorica 22 (2002), no. 4, 591–596. [↑]1.1

Adam Mickiewicz University, Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science, Poznań, Poland

Email address: tomasz@amu.edu.pl

Adam Mickiewicz University, Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science, Poznań, Poland

Email address: joaska@amu.edu.pl

FACHBEREICH MATHEMATIK, UNIVERSITÄT HAMBURG, HAMBURG, GERMANY Email address: Christian.Reiher@uni-hamburg.de