An improved bound on Seymour's second neighborhood conjecture

Hao Huang * Fe

Fei Peng[†]

Abstract

Seymour's celebrated second neighborhood conjecture, now more than thirty years old, states that in every oriented digraph, there is a vertex usuch that the size of its second out-neighborhood $N^{++}(u)$ is at least as large as that of its first out-neighborhood $N^{+}(u)$. In this paper, we prove the existence of u for which $|N^{++}(u)| \ge 0.715538|N^{+}(u)|$. This result provides the first improvement to the best known constant factor in over two decades.

1 Introduction

An oriented digraph is a directed graph without digons or loops; that is, there are no vertices u, v for which the arcs (u, v) and (v, u) are both included. A tournament is an edge-maximal oriented digraph; that is, between every two distinct vertices u and v, exactly one of (u, v) and (v, u) is in the digraph. Given two vertices u and v, the positive distance from u to v, denoted by dist⁺(u, v), is the length of the shortest non-trivial directed walk starting from u and ending at v. We set dist⁺ $(u, v) = \infty$ if no such walk exists. Note that in an oriented digraph, dist⁺ $(u, u) \ge 3$.

Given a vertex u in an oriented digraph D, define

$$N^{+}(u) = \{ v \in V(D) : \text{dist}^{+}(u, v) = 1 \}, \quad d^{+}(u) = |N^{+}(u)|;$$

$$N^{++}(u) = \{ v \in V(D) : \text{dist}^{+}(u, v) = 2 \}, \quad d^{++}(u) = |N^{++}(u)|;$$

$$N^{+++}(u) = \{ v \in V(D) : \text{dist}^{+}(u, v) = 3 \}, \quad d^{+++}(u) = |N^{+++}(u)|.$$

As dist⁺ $(u, u) \ge 3$, the definitions of $N^+(u)$, $N^{++}(u)$, $d^+(u)$ and $d^{++}(u)$ remain unchanged regardless of whether we use the usual distance or the positive distance. However, it is now possible that $u \in N^{+++}(u)$. We denote $N^+(u)$, $N^{++}(u)$ and $N^{+++}(u)$ as the *first*, *second*, and *third neighborhood* of u, respectively. We also denote the vertices in $N^+(u)$ the *out-neighbors* of u, and $d^+(u)$

^{*}Department of Mathematics, National University of Singapore. Email: huang-hao@nus.edu.sg. Research supported in part by a start-up grant at NUS and an MOE Academic Research Fund (AcRF) Tier 1 grant.

[†]Department of Mathematics, National University of Singapore. Email: pfpf@u.nus.edu.

as the *out-degree* of u. For a fixed constant $\mu \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, we say that $u \in V(D)$ is a μ -Seymour vertex if $d^{++}(u) \geq \mu d^{+}(u)$.

In the early 1990s, Seymour posed the now-celebrated second neighborhood conjecture: in every digraph, there exists a vertex u such that the size of its second out-neighborhood $N^{++}(u)$ is at least as large as that of its first out-neighborhood $N^{+}(u)$. Using the above notations, the second neighborhood conjecture can be restated as follows:

Conjecture 1.1 (see [8]). Every oriented digraph has a 1-Seymour vertex.

A notable special case of Conjecture 1.1 asks if it holds for tournaments. This was known as *Dean's conjecture*, and was first verified by Fisher [11] based on Farkas' Lemma. Later, Havet and Thomassé [13] gave a very different proof using median orders. The second neighborhood conjecture has attracted a lot of attention over the years [1, 3, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22]. Despite various results on special cases and attempts to tackle the original form, Conjecture 1.1 remains open for general oriented digraphs. If the conjecture is true, the constant 1 is best possible, as demonstrated by the sparse powers, disjoint unions, and iterative blow-ups of directed cycles. One viable target is to find in a general oriented digraph a μ -Seymour vertex, for some $\mu < 1$. It is not hard to show that a vertex with minimum out-degree is always a $\frac{1}{2}$ -Seymour vertex. With some careful analysis, Chen, Shen and Yuster [5] proved that the constant factor $\frac{1}{2}$ can be improved.

Theorem 1.2 ([5], Theorem 6). Every oriented digraph has a λ -Seymour vertex, where $\lambda = 0.657298...$ is the unique real root of $2x^3 + x^2 - 1 = 0$.

At the end of their paper, they also claim that a better constant $\lambda' = 0.67815...$ can be achieved with similar methods. The main goal of this paper is to improve Theorem 1.2.

Theorem 1.3. Every oriented digraph has a γ -Seymour vertex, where $\gamma = 0.715538...$ is the unique real root of the equation $8x^5 + 4x^4 - 12x^3 - 7x^2 + 2x + 4 = 0$ in [0, 1].

Our improvement comes from considering the third neighborhoods and introducing a new notion of a weighted out-degree minimizer, which we will elaborate on later. The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we show that the absence of γ -Seymour vertices implies the satisfiability of a certain quadratic constraint satisfaction problem (CSP). Section 3 establishes that this CSP is indeed unsatisfiable, and thus Theorem 1.3 follows immediately. The final section contains some concluding remarks and further discussions.

2 Reduction to a CSP

2.1 Small third neighborhoods

Throughout this paper, a digraph D is said to be a μ -counterexample if it has no μ -Seymour vertices. We call it an *edge-minimal* μ -counterexample if in addition

none of its proper subgraphs is a μ -counterexample. Our goal is to prove that γ -counterexamples cannot exist. We first show that in an edge-minimal μ -counterexample, not only are the second neighborhoods small compared to the first neighborhoods, but the third neighborhoods are also small compared to the second neighborhoods.

Lemma 2.1. If D is an edge-minimal μ -counterexample, then for all $u \in V(D)$, $d^{+++}(u) \leq \mu d^{++}(u) < \mu^2 d^+(u)$.

Lemma 2.1 is a special case of Lemma 4 of [21] letting $S = N^+(u)$. For completeness, we include a proof with a slight adjustment to the definition of a key term $N^+(A)$ for technical clarity, while following their proof idea.

Proof. The strict inequality is obvious, as otherwise u would be a μ -Seymour vertex. Thus, it suffices to show the first inequality.

For a set of vertices $A \subset V(D)$, let $N^+(A)$ be their out-neighbors outside A:

$$N^+(A) = \{ v \in V(D) \setminus A : \exists u \in A \text{ s.t. } (u, v) \in D \}.$$

Note that $N^+(N^+(u)) = N^{++}(u)$ and $N^+(N^{++}(u)) \setminus N^+(u) = N^{+++}(u)$. Let T be a maximal subset of $N^{++}(u)$ such that $\mu|T| \ge |N^+(T) \setminus N^+(u)|$. Note that this condition is always satisfied by the empty set. If $T = N^{++}(u)$, we have $\mu d^{++}(u) \ge d^{+++}(u)$, implying the first inequality. Otherwise, let $T' = N^{++}(u) \setminus T \neq \emptyset$.

We create a new digraph D' from D by removing the arcs from $N^+(u)$ to T'. Define the notions dist'⁺ (v_1, v_2) , $N'^+(v)$, $N'^{++}(v)$, $d'^+(v)$ and $d'^{++}(v)$ in the same way as in the introduction, but using D' as the underlying digraph. Since in D, every vertex in T' is reachable from $N^+(u)$, D' has strictly fewer edges than D, so it cannot be a μ -counterexample. Thus, it admits a μ -Seymour vertex v. Since v becomes μ -Seymour only after the edge removal, we have

$$N'^{+}(v) \subsetneq N^{+}(v), d^{++}(v) - d'^{++}(v) < \mu(d^{+}(v) - d'^{+}(v)).$$
(*)

The first line of (*) implies that $v \in N^+(u)$. Define

$$A = \{y \in N^+(v) : \operatorname{dist}'^+(v, y) \ge 3\} \subset T', B = \{y \in N^+(v) : \operatorname{dist}'^+(v, y) = 2\} \subset T', C = N^+(A \cup B) \setminus (N^+(u) \cup T \cup N^+(T)).$$

Note that $A \cup B = N^+(v) \setminus N'^+(v)$, which is nonempty by the first line of (*). Also, $C \subset N^{++}(v) \setminus N'^{++}(v)$ and $B = N'^{++}(v) \setminus N^{++}(v)$. Thus, by the second line of (*),

$$|C| - |B| \le |N^{++}(v)| - |N'^{++}(v)| < \mu(|N^{+}(v)| - |N'^{+}(v)|) = \mu(|A| + |B|).$$

Set $T_2 = T \cup A \cup B$. We claim that

$$(N^+(T_2) \setminus N^+(u)) \cup B \subset (N^+(T) \setminus N^+(u)) \cup C.$$

For all $y \in N^+(T_2) \setminus N^+(u)$, because it is in $N^+(T_2)$, it is either in $N^+(T)$ or in $N^+(A \cup B) \setminus (N^+(T) \cup T_2)$. In the first case, $y \in N^+(T) \setminus N^+(u)$; in the second case, $y \in C$. For all $y \in B$, note that $y \in N'^{++}(v)$ but $y \in T'$, implying that $y \in N^+(T)$ because in D', v cannot reach y in two steps without going through T. Since T' is disjoint from $N^+(u)$, we have that $y \in N^+(T) \setminus N^+(u)$. Since $B \subset T_2$ is disjoint from $N^+(T_2) \setminus N^+(u)$, we have

$$|N^{+}(T_{2}) \setminus N^{+}(u)| \leq |N^{+}(T) \setminus N^{+}(u)| + |C| - |B|$$

$$< \mu |T| + \mu (|A| + |B|)$$

$$= \mu |T_{2}|.$$

Since $A \cup B \neq \emptyset$, this contradicts with the maximality of T. Hence, it must be that the maximal T is $N^{++}(u)$, from which we get the desired inequalities.

2.2 CSP from a μ -counterexample

We show that for all μ , the existence of a μ -counterexample implies the satisfiability of a specific CSP. In the next section, we will see that this CSP is unsatisfiable when μ is set to the constant γ from Theorem 1.3. The proof presented in [5] can also be interpreted in this way. The CSP we discuss below is stronger, so the phase transition occurs at a larger μ . The key factor contributing to this improvement is that after choosing the first vertex u to be the out-degree minimizer, instead of invoking the induction hypothesis in $N^+(u)$ to obtain the second vertex v, we choose our second vertex to be a "weighted out-degree minimizer" in $N^+(u)$. That is, we choose in $N^+(u)$ a vertex that minimizes the weighted out-degree, giving a higher weight to the out-neighbors in $N^+(u)$. This modification, together with Lemma 2.1, provides the desired strengthening of the CSP. The value of the weighting factor w will not be chosen until Section 3, so our next result works for all $w \geq 1$.

Lemma 2.2. If for some $\mu \ge 0$ there exists a μ -counterexample, then for all constants $w \ge 1$, the following CSP is satisfiable:

$$x_{11}, x_{12}, x_{13}, x_{14}, x_{21}, x_{22}, x_{23}, x_{24}, x_{32}, x_{33}, x_{34} \in \mathbb{R}$$

subject to

 $\mu(x_{11} + x_{12} + x_{13} + x_{14}) > x_{21} + x_{22} + x_{23} + x_{24}, \tag{1}$

$$\mu^{2}(x_{11} + x_{12} + x_{13} + x_{14}) > x_{32} + x_{33} + x_{34}, \tag{2}$$

$$\mu(x_{11} + x_{21}) > x_{12} + x_{22} + x_{32}, \tag{3}$$

$$x_{21} \ge x_{12} + x_{13} + x_{14}, \tag{4}$$

$$x_{14}, x_{24}, x_{34}, x_{23} \ge 0, \tag{5}$$

$$x_{11} > 0, \quad x_{13}, x_{22}, x_{32}, x_{33}, x_{12} + x_{13}, x_{12} + x_{22} \ge 0,$$
 (6)

 $F > 0, \tag{7}$

$$F = x_{21}(x_{32} - x_{11} - x_{13}) + x_{22}(x_{32} + x_{23} + x_{33}) + x_{23}x_{12} - x_{14}(x_{12} + x_{21} + x_{22}) + \frac{(x_{21} + x_{22})^2}{2} - \frac{wx_{11}^2 + x_{12}^2}{2} + (w - 1)x_{11}x_{12}.$$

)

Proof. Take an edge-minimal μ -counterexample, D. Using the constant w as a weighting factor, we will select two vertices from D in the following way: first let $u \in V(D)$ be a vertex with minimum out-degree: i.e., $d^+(y) \ge d^+(u)$ for all $y \in V(D)$. Then, let $X_1 = N^+(u)$ and $X_2 = N^{++}(u)$. Note that $X_1 \neq \emptyset$ as otherwise $d^+(u) = 0$, making $u = \mu$ -Seymour vertex. Among those vertices in X_1 , let v be a vertex that minimizes the quantity $wd_{X_1}^+(v) + d_{X_2}^+(v)$, where $d_A^+(v) = |N^+(v) \cap A|$ denotes the number of out-neighbors of v in A. We remark that $d_{X_1}^+(v) + d_{X_2}^+(v) = d^+(v)$ because $N^+(v) \subset X_1 \cup X_2$, and that v is the weighted out-degree minimizer we mentioned at the beginning of this subsection. For $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, define the following pair-wise disjoint subsets of vertices based on their positive distances from u and v:

$$X_{ij} = \{y \in V(D) : dist^+(u, y) = i \text{ and } dist^+(v, y) = j\}.$$

For $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, we also set

where

$$X_{i4} = \{ y \in V(D) : dist^+(u, y) = i \text{ and } dist^+(v, y) \ge 4 \}.$$

Hence, the sets $\{X_{ij}\}_{i \in \{1,2,3\}, j \in \{1,2,3,4\}}$ partition $N^+(u) \cup N^{++}(u) \cup N^{+++}(u)$. Note that since $(u, v) \in D$, $X_{31} = \emptyset$. For every other X_{ij} we defined, let $x_{ij} = |X_{ij}| \in \mathbb{R}$. We claim that this assignment solves the CSP. Note that

$$d^{+}(u) = |X_{1}| = x_{11} + x_{12} + x_{13} + x_{14},$$

$$d^{++}(u) = |X_{2}| = x_{21} + x_{22} + x_{23} + x_{24},$$

$$d^{+++}(u) = x_{32} + x_{33} + x_{34},$$

$$d^{+}(v) = x_{11} + x_{21},$$

$$d^{++}(v) = x_{12} + x_{22} + x_{32}.$$

Thus, the constraints (1) and (2) follow from Lemma 2.1, and (3) follows from the fact that v is not a μ -Seymour vertex. Since u minimizes the out-degree, we have $d^+(v) \ge d^+(u)$, implying the constraint (4). Observe that x_{11} is strictly positive because otherwise, $N^+(v) \subset N^{++}(u)$ and u would be a 1-Seymour vertex: $d^{++}(u) \ge d^+(v) \ge d^+(u)$. The rest of the constraints (5) and (6) follow from the nonnegativity of the x_{ij} variables. Thus, it remains to show that the constraint (7) holds.

For $A, B \subset V(D)$, define $e(A, B) = |\{(a, b) \in D : a \in A, b \in B\}|$. Let $Y = X_{11} \cup X_{12} \cup X_{21} \cup X_{22}$. We will count, in two ways, the quantity e(Y, V(D)). We first give a lower bound on e(Y, V(D)). Note that for all $y \in V(D)$,

 $d^+(y) \ge d^+(u)$. Applying this bound to each vertex in $X_{12} \cup X_{21} \cup X_{22}$, we have

$$e(X_{12} \cup X_{21} \cup X_{22}, V(D)) \ge (x_{12} + x_{21} + x_{22})|X_1|.$$

For each vertex $y \in X_{11}$, we instead use the fact that y failed to beat v when we chose the weighted out-degree minimizer inside X_1 . That is,

$$wd_{X_1}^+(y) + d_{X_2}^+(y) \ge wd_{X_1}^+(v) + d_{X_2}^+(v) = wx_{11} + x_{21}$$

It follows that $d^+(y) \ge wx_{11} + x_{21} - (w-1)d^+_{X_1}(y)$. Summing over all $y \in X_{11}$, we have

$$e(X_{11}, V(D)) \ge (wx_{11} + x_{21})x_{11} - (w - 1)e(X_{11}, X_1)$$

= $(wx_{11} + x_{21})x_{11} - (w - 1)e(X_{11}, X_{11} \cup X_{12})$
 $\ge (wx_{11} + x_{21})x_{11} - (w - 1)(x_{11}^2/2 + x_{11}x_{12}),$

where the last line follows from the fact that $e(X_{11}, X_{11}) \leq {\binom{|X_{11}|}{2}} \leq x_{11}^2/2$ and the assumption $w \geq 1$. Hence,

$$e(Y, V(D)) \ge (x_{12} + x_{21} + x_{22})|X_1| + (wx_{11} + x_{21})x_{11} - (w - 1)(x_{11}^2/2 + x_{11}x_{12})$$

Next, we give an upper bound on e(Y, V(D)). Note that $Y \supset X_{11} \neq \emptyset$. Using $\binom{a}{2} < a^2/2$ for all a > 0, we have

$$e(Y,Y) \le \binom{|Y|}{2} < \frac{|Y|^2}{2} = \frac{(x_{11} + x_{12} + x_{21} + x_{22})^2}{2}.$$

The number of arcs from Y to $V(D) \setminus Y$ can be estimated as follows.

- $e(X_{11}, V(D) \setminus Y) = 0$, since all out-neighbors of vertices in X_{11} lie in Y.
- $e(X_{21}, V(D) \setminus Y) \leq x_{21}x_{32}$, since all out-neighbors of vertices in X_{21} lie in $Y \cup X_{32}$.
- $e(X_{12}, V(D) \setminus Y) \leq x_{12}(x_{13} + x_{23})$, since all out-neighbors of vertices in X_{12} lie in $Y \cup X_{13} \cup X_{23}$.
- $e(X_{22}, V(D) \setminus Y) \le x_{22}(x_{32} + x_{13} + x_{23} + x_{33})$, since all out-neighbors of vertices in X_{22} lie in $Y \cup X_{32} \cup X_{13} \cup X_{23} \cup X_{33}$.

Hence,

$$e(Y, V(D)) < \frac{(x_{11} + x_{12} + x_{21} + x_{22})^2}{2} + x_{21}x_{32} + x_{12}(x_{13} + x_{23}) + x_{22}(x_{32} + x_{13} + x_{23} + x_{33}).$$

Together with the lower bound and rearranging some terms, we have F > 0. \Box

2.3 Adjustments

Now we claim that, given an assignment of the variables that solves the CSP in Lemma 2.2, we can tweak their values so that they satisfy a slightly different CSP. This will help us reduce the number of independent variables. We will need a narrower range for w, but it will still contain the value we eventually choose in Section 3.

Lemma 2.3. For all $\mu \ge 0$ and $w \in (1, 1 + \mu^2)$, if the CSP in Lemma 2.2 is satisfiable, then the following CSP is also satisfiable. Here, the quantity F is defined in the same way as in Lemma 2.2.

$x_{11}, x_{12}, x_{13}, x_{14}, x_{21}, x_{22}, x_{23}, x_{24}, x_{32}, x_{33}, x_{34} \in \mathbb{R}$ subject to

- $\mu(x_{11} + x_{12} + x_{13} + x_{14}) = x_{21} + x_{22} + x_{23} + x_{24}, \qquad (1=)$
 - $\mu^2(x_{11} + x_{12} + x_{13} + x_{14}) = x_{32} + x_{33} + x_{34}, \qquad (2=)$

$$\mu(x_{11} + x_{21}) = x_{12} + x_{22} + x_{32}, \qquad (3=)$$

 $x_{21} \ge x_{12} + x_{13} + x_{14}, \tag{4}$

$$x_{14}, x_{24}, x_{34}, x_{23} = 0, (5=)$$

 $x_{11} > 0, \quad x_{13}, x_{22}, x_{32}, x_{33}, x_{12} + x_{13}, x_{12} + x_{22} \ge 0,$ (6)

 $F > 0. \tag{7}$

Proof. Take an assignment of the variables $\{x_{ij}\}$ that satisfies the CSP in Lemma 2.2. We will perform a multi-step procedure to turn it into a solution of the desired CSP.

- 1. Increase the variable x_{13} by x_{14} , and set x_{14} , x_{24} and x_{34} to 0. Note that doing so will preserve $x_{13} + x_{14}$ and increase F by a nonnegative amount $(x_{12} + x_{22})x_{14}$. It follows that after this step, the variables will still satisfy the constraints (1)–(7), while we can additionally assume that $x_{14} = x_{24} = x_{34} = 0$.
- 2. Increase the values of x_{23} and x_{33} , until the constraints (1=) and (2=) are satisfied. Since F is an increasing function w.r.t x_{23} and x_{33} , doing so will preserve the constraints (3)-(7). Thus, after this step the variables will satisfy the constraints (1=), (2=), (3)-(7), as well as $x_{14} = x_{24} = x_{34} = 0$.
- 3. Greedily increase the values of x_{13} and x_{22} , and decrease the values of x_{12} and x_{23} , all at the same rate. That is, we increase x_{13} and x_{22} and decrease x_{12} and x_{23} by some small value δ all at once, and continue doing so as much as the constraints allow. Note that doing this will preserve the constraints (1=), (2=), (3), (4) and (6). The amount that the quantity F changes by is a function of δ . Because F is a quadratic form in the variables, this function has the form $a\delta + b\delta^2$. Since the step size δ can be made arbitrarily small, to see that F increases it suffices to show that a, the total differential along the direction of change, stays strictly positive:

$$a = \frac{\partial F}{\partial x_{13}} + \frac{\partial F}{\partial x_{22}} - \frac{\partial F}{\partial x_{12}} - \frac{\partial F}{\partial x_{23}}$$

= $-(w - 1)x_{11} + x_{32} + x_{33}$
> $-\mu^2 x_{11} + x_{32} + x_{33}$ $(x_{11} > 0, w - 1 < \mu^2)$
 $\geq -\mu^2 (x_{11} + x_{12} + x_{13}) + x_{32} + x_{33}$ $(x_{12} + x_{13} \ge 0)$
= $0.$ $((2=) \text{ and } x_{14} = x_{34} = 0)$

Thus, the constraint (7) is also preserved. With only the constraint (5) holding against us, we will stop precisely when $x_{23} = 0$. Hence, after this step, the variables will satisfy the constraints (1=), (2=), (3), (4), (5=), (6) and (7).

- 4. The goal of this step is to satisfy the constraint (3=) while preserving (1=), (2=), (4), (5=), (6) and (7).
 - (a) Greedily decrease x_{21} and increase x_{22} at the same rate. Note that doing this will preserve the constraints (1=), (2=), (5=) and (6), and only increase the value of F:

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial x_{22}} - \frac{\partial F}{\partial x_{21}} = x_{11} + x_{13} + x_{23} + x_{33} \ge x_{11} > 0.$$

Thus, either we will satisfy (3=) before violating (4), or we are forced to stop because the constraint (4) is at equality:

$$x_{21} - x_{12} - x_{13} - x_{14} = 0. (4=)$$

In the former case we terminate; otherwise we proceed to the next substep.

(b) Greedily increase x_{12} and decrease x_{13} at the same rate. Doing so will preserve the constraints (1=), (2=), (4=) and (5=), and only increase the value of F:

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial x_{12}} - \frac{\partial F}{\partial x_{13}} = (w-1)x_{11} + x_{21} - x_{12} - x_{14} + x_{23} \ge (w-1)x_{11} > 0.$$

The first inequality above follows from (4=), (5=) and $x_{13} \ge 0$. Thus, either we will satisfy (3=) before violating (6), or we are forced to stop because $x_{13} = 0$. Actually the latter would not occur earlier, since when $x_{13} = 0$, the strict inequality in constraint (3) is violated:

$$\mu(x_{11} + x_{21}) = \mu(x_{11} + x_{12} + x_{13} + x_{14})$$
 (by (4=))
= $x_{21} + x_{22} + x_{23} + x_{24}$ (by (1=))

$$= x_{12} + x_{13} + x_{22}$$
 (by (4=) and (5=))

$$\leq x_{12} + x_{22} + x_{32}.$$
 $(x_{13} = 0 \leq x_{22})$

Hence, we will always satisfy (3=) before violating (6).

Thus, after the adjustments, the variables will satisfy the constraints (1=), (2=), (3=), (4), (5=), (6) and (7). Hence, the desired CSP is satisfiable.

3 Proof of Theorem 1.3

We are ready to prove Theorem 1.3. Let $\gamma = 0.715538...$ be the unique real root of $8x^5 + 4x^4 - 12x^3 - 7x^2 + 2x + 4 = 0$ in the interval [0, 1]. By Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.3, Theorem 1.3 immediately follows from the next result.

Lemma 3.1. Letting $\mu = \gamma$ and $w = \gamma^2 + 2\gamma^3 \in (1, 1 + \gamma^2)$, the CSP in Lemma 2.3 is unsatisfiable.

Proof. Note that $\gamma^2 + 2\gamma^3 \approx 1.2447$ and $\gamma^2 \approx 0.5119$, so we have $w \in (1, 1 + \gamma^2)$. Take an assignment of the variables $\{x_{ij}\}$ that satisfies the CSP in Lemma 2.3. We set $\theta = 2 + 2\gamma - 4\gamma^3 \approx 1.9657$, and define four more variables:

$$y_1 = \frac{x_{32}}{\gamma\theta} - \frac{x_{12}}{\gamma}, \quad y_2 = \frac{x_{22}}{\gamma} - \frac{x_{33}}{\gamma^2}, \quad y_3 = \frac{x_{32}}{\gamma\theta}, \quad y_4 = \frac{x_{33}}{\gamma^2}.$$
 (8)

By the constraints (1=), (2=), (3=) and (5=) and the definitions in (8), all the x_{ij} variables are linear combinations of y_1 , y_2 , y_3 and y_4 :

$$\begin{aligned} x_{32} &= \gamma \theta y_3, \ x_{33} &= \gamma^2 y_4, \ x_{12} &= \gamma (y_3 - y_1), \ x_{22} &= \gamma (y_2 + y_4), \\ x_{14} &= x_{24} &= x_{34} &= x_{23} &= 0, \end{aligned} \tag{by (8)}$$

$$x_{21} = \frac{x_{32} + x_{33} + x_{34}}{\gamma} - x_{22} - x_{23} - x_{24} = \theta y_3 - \gamma y_2, \quad \text{(by (1=) and (2=))}$$

$$x_{11} = (x_{11} + x_{21}) + x_{22} + x_{23} + x_{24} - \frac{x_{32} + x_{33} + x_{34}}{\gamma}$$
 (by (1=) and (2=))

$$= \frac{x_{12} + x_{22} - x_{33}}{\gamma} + x_{22} + x_{23}$$
 (by (3=) and (5=))

$$= (1+\gamma)y_2 + y_3 + y_4 - y_1,$$

$$x_{13} = \frac{x_{21} + x_{22} + x_{23} + x_{24}}{\gamma} - x_{11} - x_{12} - x_{14}$$
(by (1=))

$$= (1+\gamma)(y_1 - y_2) + (\gamma^{-1}\theta - \gamma - 1)y_3.$$

By substitution, we have

$$F = \sum_{1 \le i \le j \le 4} c_{ij} y_i y_j,$$

where the coefficients are

$$\begin{aligned} c_{11} &= (w-1)\gamma - (w+\gamma^2)/2, \\ c_{12} &= \gamma^2 + (1+\gamma)(w-(w-1)\gamma), \\ c_{13} &= w+\gamma^2 - \gamma(2w-2+\theta), \\ c_{14} &= w - (w-1)\gamma, \\ c_{22} &= -w(1+\gamma)^2/2, \\ c_{23} &= \theta - \gamma^2 - (1+\gamma)(w-(w-1)\gamma), \\ c_{24} &= \gamma + \gamma^3 - w(1+\gamma), \\ c_{33} &= \gamma(w-1+\theta) + (\gamma - \gamma^{-1})\theta^2 + (\theta^2 - \gamma^2 - w)/2, \\ c_{34} &= (\gamma + \gamma^2 - 1)\theta - w + (w-1)\gamma, \\ c_{44} &= \gamma^3 + (\gamma^2 - w)/2. \end{aligned}$$

We note that $c_{13} = c_{33} = c_{44} = 0$. The fact that $c_{13} = c_{44} = 0$ follows from the definitions of w and θ . Substituting in those definitions, we also have

$$c_{33} = \gamma^{-1}(\gamma - 1)(2\gamma^2 + 2\gamma + 1)(8\gamma^5 + 4\gamma^4 - 12\gamma^3 - 7\gamma^2 + 2\gamma + 4) = 0,$$

by the choice of γ . Now, set $\rho = 1 + \theta - \gamma^{-1}\theta \approx 0.2186$ and consider four more quantities, which are nonnegative by the constraints (4) and (6):

$$P_{1} = (y_{2} - y_{1} + \rho y_{3})(y_{2} + y_{4}) = \gamma^{-1}(x_{21} - x_{12} - x_{13} - x_{14})x_{22} \ge 0,$$

$$P_{2} = (\gamma^{-1}\theta y_{3} - y_{2})y_{4} = \gamma^{-3}x_{21}x_{33} \ge 0,$$

$$P_{3} = (y_{2} + y_{4})y_{3} = \gamma^{-2}\theta^{-1}x_{22}x_{32} \ge 0,$$

$$P_{4} = y_{3}y_{4} = \gamma^{-3}\theta^{-1}x_{32}x_{33} \ge 0.$$
(9)

An easier way to verify (9) is to start from the RHS and substitute the x_{ij} 's with linear combinations of y_1 , y_2 , y_3 and y_4 shown earlier. Observe that the P_i 's and F have now become quadratic forms in the variables y_1 , y_2 , y_3 and y_4 , all with coefficient zero on y_1y_3 , y_3^2 and y_4^2 . It turns out that one can linearly combine them to obtain a quadratic form in just the variables y_1 and y_2 , which we demonstrate below. In fact, such linear combination is unique up to a constant factor, although our proof will not rely on this.

$$F + c_{14}P_1 + (c_{14} + c_{24})P_2 - (c_{23} + \rho c_{14})P_3 + (c_{23} - c_{34} - \gamma^{-1}\theta(c_{14} + c_{24}))P_4$$

= $c_{11}y_1^2 + (c_{12} - c_{14})y_1y_2 + (c_{22} + c_{14})y_2^2.$ (10)

We claim that this leads to a contradiction. Note that in (10), all the P_i 's have positive coefficients:

$$c_{14} \approx 1.0696, \quad c_{14} + c_{24} \approx 0.0162, \quad -(c_{23} + \rho c_{14}) \approx 0.1475,$$

 $c_{23} - c_{34} - \gamma^{-1} \theta(c_{14} + c_{24}) \approx 0.1967,$

so it follows from (7) and (9) that the LHS of (10) must be strictly positive. However, the RHS of (10) is nonpositive, due to a negative leading coefficient and a negative discriminant:

$$c_{11} \approx -0.7033, \quad (c_{12} - c_{14})^2 - 4c_{11}(c_{22} + c_{14}) \approx -0.5120.$$

This is a contradiction. Hence, the CSP in Lemma 2.3 is unsatisfiable.

4 Concluding Remarks

One can show that the constant $\gamma = 0.715538...$ in Theorem 1.3 is optimal under the constraints employed in our analysis. However, better bounds are observed when more nuanced constraints are added. Note that in the proof of Lemma 2.2, we selected a global out-degree minimizer, u, and then a weighted out-degree minimizer v in $X_1 = N^+(u)$. Continuing this procedure, one can further select a weighted out-degree minimizer v_2 in X_{11} , and use the more refined vertex sets

 $X_{ijk} = \{ y \in V(D) : \text{dist}^+(u, y) = i, \text{ dist}^+(v, y) = j, \text{ dist}^+(v_2, y) = k \}.$

The analogous CSP then becomes unsatisfiable even when $\mu = 0.74530$, with optimally chosen weighting factors. This follows from the rigorous bounds computed by the Gurobi optimization software. However, we believe that turning it into a fully self-contained, human-checkable proof would be excessively laborious.

It is natural to ask if further improvements to Theorem 1.3, or even a proof of Conjecture 1.1 in full generality, can be obtained in a similar fashion: one chooses a sequence of vertices that altogether satisfies some extremal properties (in our case, u minimizes the out-degree, and v minimizes the weighted outdegree among those in $N^+(u)$), and derives a contradiction provided that all the vertices in the sequence violate the μ -Seymour condition. Alternatively, one might wonder if there is a theoretical limit to this approach. The median order proof [13] of Dean's conjecture can also be loosely placed under this framework.

Our main result also has connections with the *Caccetta–Häggkvist conjecture*, which we state below. We refer interested readers to the excellent survey [22].

Conjecture 4.1 ([4]). Every n-vertex oriented digraph with minimum outdegree at least r has a directed cycle with length at most $\lceil \frac{n}{r} \rceil$.

The case r = n/2 is trivial, but the next case r = n/3 is still open, as well as a weakening of that case known as the *Behzad–Chartrand–Wall conjecture*:

Conjecture 4.2 ([2]). Every n-vertex oriented digraph with minimum outdegree and minimum in-degree at least n/3 contains a directed triangle.

The extremal examples for the second neighborhood conjecture we mentioned also show that Conjecture 4.2, if true, is sharp. Note that Conjecture 1.1 would imply Conjecture 4.2. In fact, by Proposition 5 of [5], our bound in Theorem 1.3 also yields the following bound on the Behzad–Chartrand–Wall conjecture:

Corollary 4.3. Every n-vertex oriented digraph with minimum out-degree and minimum in-degree at least $n/(2 + \gamma)$ contains a directed triangle, where $\gamma = 0.715538...$ is the same as in Theorem 1.3.

The resulting constant factor $1/(2+\gamma)$ is approximately 0.3683, which is not as good as the current record 0.3465 shown by Hladkỳ et al. [15]. However, it might be of independent interest to apply the ideas and tools we developed in this paper to study Conjecture 4.1 or Conjecture 4.2 directly.

References

 Jiangdong Ai, Stefanie Gerke, Gregory Gutin, Shujing Wang, Anders Yeo, and Yacong Zhou. On Seymour's and Sullivan's second neighbourhood conjectures. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 105(3):413–426, 2024.

- [2] Mehdi Behzad, Gary Chartrand, and Curtiss Wall. On minimal regular digraphs with given girth. Fundamenta Mathematicae, 69:227–231, 1970.
- [3] James Brantner, Greg Brockman, Bill Kay, and Emma Snively. Contributions to Seymour's second neighborhood conjecture. *Involve, a Journal of Mathematics*, 2(4):387–395, 2009.
- [4] Louis Caccetta and Roland Haggkvist. On minimal digraphs with given girth. Department of Combinatorics and Optimization, University of Waterloo, 1978.
- [5] Guantao Chen, Jian Shen, and Raphael Yuster. Second neighborhood via first neighborhood in digraphs. Ann Comb, 7:15–20, 06 2003.
- [6] Zachary Cohn, Anant Godbole, Elizabeth Wright Harkness, and Yiguang Zhang. The number of seymour vertices in random tournaments and digraphs. *Graphs and Combinatorics*, 32:1805–1816, 2016.
- [7] Suresh Dara, Mathew C Francis, Dalu Jacob, and N Narayanan. Extending some results on the second neighborhood conjecture. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 311:1–17, 2022.
- [8] Nathaniel Dean and Brenda J Latka. Squaring the tournament—an open problem. Congressus Numerantium, pages 73–80, 1995.
- [9] Alberto Espuny Díaz, António Girão, Bertille Granet, and Gal Kronenberg. Seymour's second neighbourhood conjecture: random graphs and reductions. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 2024.
- [10] Dror Fidler and Raphael Yuster. Remarks on the second neighborhood problem. Journal of Graph Theory, 55(3):208–220, 2007.
- [11] David C Fisher. Squaring a tournament: a proof of Dean's conjecture. Journal of Graph Theory, 23(1):43–48, 1996.
- [12] Salman Ghazal. Seymour's second neighborhood conjecture for tournaments missing a generalized star. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 71(1):89–94, 2012.
- [13] Frédéric Havet and Stéphan Thomassé. Median orders of tournaments: a tool for the second neighborhood problem and Sumner's conjecture. *Journal* of Graph Theory, 35(4):244–256, 2000.
- [14] César Hernández-Cruz and Hortensia Galeana-Sánchez. k-kernels in k-transitive and k-quasi-transitive digraphs. Discrete Mathematics, 312(16):2522–2530, 2012.
- [15] Jan Hladkỳ, Daniel Král', and Sergey Norin. Counting flags in triangle-free digraphs. Combinatorica, 37(1):49–76, 2017.

- [16] Yoshihiro Kaneko and Stephen C Locke. The minimum degree approach for Paul Seymour's distance 2 conjecture. *Congressus Numerantium*, pages 201–206, 2001.
- [17] Hao Liang and Jun-Ming Xu. On Seymour's second neighborhood conjecture of m-free digraphs. *Discrete Mathematics*, 340(8):1944–1949, 2017.
- [18] Jeck Lim. A generalisation of Seymour's second neighbourhood conjecture. arXiv preprint arxiv:2001.07242, 2020.
- [19] Anna Lladó. On the second neighborhood conjecture of Seymour for regular digraphs with almost optimal connectivity. *European Journal of Combina*torics, 34(8):1406–1410, 2013.
- [20] Dania Mezher and Moussa Daamouch. A note on the second neighborhood problem for k-anti-transitive and m-free digraphs. arXiv preprint arxiv:2405.17797, 2024.
- [21] Tyler Seacrest. Seymour's second neighborhood conjecture for subsets of vertices. arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.06293v3, 2018.
- [22] Blair Dowling Sullivan. A summary of results and problems related to the Caccetta-Häggkvist conjecture. arXiv preprint arXiv:math/0605646, 2006.