

Eigenvalue conditions implying edge-disjoint spanning trees and a forest with constraints

Jin Cai*, Bo Zhou†

School of Mathematical Sciences, South China Normal University
Guangzhou 510631, P.R. China

Abstract

Let G be a nontrivial graph with minimum degree δ and k an integer with $k \geq 2$. In the literature, there are eigenvalue conditions that imply G contains k edge-disjoint spanning trees. We give eigenvalue conditions that imply G contains k edge-disjoint spanning trees and another forest F with $|E(F)| > \frac{\delta-1}{\delta}(|V(G)| - 1)$, and if F is not a spanning tree, then F has a component with at least δ edges.

Keywords: edge-disjoint spanning trees, eigenvalues, fractional packing number, minimum degree

1 Introduction

In this paper, we consider finite, undirected and simple graphs. As usual, K_n denotes a complete graph of order n . For a connected graph G , let $\tau(G)$ be the maximum number of edge-disjoint spanning trees in G , which is also known as the spanning-tree packing number, see [9, 12, 13, 17]. By definition, $\tau(K_1) = \infty$, and $\tau(G) = 0$ if G is disconnected.

The eigenvalues of a graph are the eigenvalues of its adjacency matrix. Since the adjacency matrix of a graph is a real symmetric matrix, every eigenvalue of a graph is real. For a graph G of order n , let $\lambda_i(G)$ be the i -th largest eigenvalue of G with $i = 1, \dots, n$. $\lambda_1(G)$ is also known as the spectral radius of G .

Seymour proposed the following problem (in private communication to Cioabă) relating $\tau(G)$ and eigenvalues of G .

Problem 1.1. [3] *Let G be a nontrivial graph. Determine the relationship between $\tau(G)$ and eigenvalues of G .*

*Email: jincai@m.scnu.edu.cn

†Email: zhoubo@m.scnu.edu.cn

Motivated by Problem 1.1, Cioabă and Wong [3] established the first a few results on Problem 1.1. They proposed a conjecture: Let k be an integer with $k \geq 2$ and G be a d -regular graph with $d \geq 2k$. If $\lambda_2(G) \leq d - \frac{2k-1}{d+1}$, then $\tau(G) \geq k$. This was then generalized by Gu et al. [8] claiming that it holds for a graph G with minimum degree $d \geq 2k$, which was confirmed by Liu, Hong, Gu and Lai [14]. Further results may be found in [2] and references therein. We state two typical works.

For positive integers n and s and a nonnegative integer k with $n \geq s + k$, let $G \cong B_{n,s}^k$ be a graph obtained from disjoint K_s and K_{n-s} by adding k edges joining a vertex in K_s and k vertices in K_{n-s} . In particular, $B_{n,s}^0 = K_s \cup K_{n-s}$.

Theorem 1.1. [4] *Let k be an integer with $k \geq 2$, and let G be a connected graph with minimum degree $\delta \geq 2k$ and order $n \geq 2\delta + 3$. If $\lambda_1(G) \geq \lambda_1(B_{n,\delta+1}^{k-1})$, then $\tau(G) \geq k$ unless $G \cong B_{n,\delta+1}^{k-1}$.*

Generalizing sufficient eigenvalue conditions for a d -regular graph G with $\tau(G) \geq k$ in [3], Gu et al. [8] established the following theorem on graphs with fixed minimum degree.

Theorem 1.2. [8] *Let k be an integer with $k \geq 2$, and let G be a graph with minimum degree $\delta \geq 2k$. If*

$$\lambda_2(G) < \begin{cases} \delta - \frac{3}{\delta+1} & \text{if } k = 2, \\ \delta - \frac{5}{\delta+1} & \text{if } k = 3, \\ \delta - \frac{3k-1}{\delta+1} & \text{if } k \geq 4, \end{cases}$$

then $\tau(G) \geq k$.

To obtain these results, the Tree Packing Theorem due to Tutte [18] and Nash-Williams [15] over 60 years ago is needed. For a graph G we denote by $V(G)$ the vertex set and $E(G)$ the edge set. For vertex disjoint subset $X, Y \subset V(G)$, $E(X, Y)$ denotes the set of edges of G with one end vertex in X and the other end vertex in Y , and let $e(X, Y) = |E(X, Y)|$. For any partition \mathcal{P} of $V(G)$ of a nontrivial graph G , the size $|\mathcal{P}|$ of partition \mathcal{P} is the number parts. The fractional packing number $\nu_f(G)$ is defined by

$$\nu_f(G) = \min_{|\mathcal{P}| \geq 2} \frac{\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq |\mathcal{P}|} e(V_i, V_j)}{|\mathcal{P}| - 1}.$$

Theorem 1.3. [15, 18] [Tree Packing Theorem] *For a nontrivial graph G and a nonnegative integer k , $\tau(G) \geq k$ if and only if $\nu_f(G) \geq k$.*

Fan et al. [5] established an extension of Theorem 1.3 stating that for a graph G of order n , if $\nu_f(G) = k + \varepsilon$ with $0 \leq \varepsilon < 1$, then $\tau(G) \geq k$, and apart from k edge-disjoint spanning trees, there is another forest with at least $\varepsilon(n - 1)$ edges in G . Recently, Fang and Yang [6] gave a structural explanation for the fractional part ε .

For a nonnegative integer k and a positive integer d , a graph G is said to have property $P(k, d)$ if G satisfies the following three conditions:

- (a) $\tau(G) \geq k$,
- (b) apart from k edge-disjoint spanning trees, there is another forest F with $|E(F)| > \frac{d-1}{d}(|V(G)| - 1)$,
- (c) if F is not a spanning tree, then F has a component with at least d edges.

Note that any graph G with minimum degree $\delta \geq 1$ has property $P(0, \delta)$. This is obvious if G is connected. Suppose that G is a disconnected graph with order n and minimum degree $\delta \geq 1$. Then every component has at least $\delta + 1$ vertices, so it has at most $\frac{n}{\delta + 1}$ components. It follows that G has a spanning forest F such that $|E(F)| \geq n - \frac{n}{\delta + 1} > \frac{\delta - 1}{\delta}(n - 1)$. Evidently, each component of F has at least δ edges. Thus, G has property $P(0, \delta)$.

Theorem 1.4. [6] *For positive integers k and d , and a nontrivial graph G , if $\nu_f(G) > k + \frac{d-1}{d}$, then G has property $P(k, d)$.*

Motivated by the above works, we investigate the following problem.

Problem 1.2. *Let k be a positive integer, and let G be a nontrivial graph with minimum degree δ . What eigenvalue conditions imply that G has property $P(k, \delta)$?*

The main results are listed as below.

Theorem 1.5. *Let k be a positive integer, and let G be a graph with minimum degree $\delta \geq 2k + 2$ and order $n \geq 2\delta + 3$. If $\lambda_1(G) \geq \lambda_1(B_{n, \delta+1}^{k-1})$, then G has property $P(k, \delta)$ unless $G \cong B_{n, \delta+1}^{k-1}$.*

We remark that the lower bound $2k + 2$ on δ in Theorem 1.5 can not be lowered to $2k$ as in Theorem 1.1 or even $2k + 1$, generally. We give such examples.

(i) Let H_1 be the graph in Fig. 1. By a direct calculation, we have $5.1919 = \lambda_1(H_1) > \lambda_1(B_{11,5}^1) = 5.0561$. Note that $\delta(H_1) = 4 = 2 \times 2$, $\tau(H_1) = 2$, and apart from two edge-disjoint spanning trees (whose edges are displayed as bold and thin lines), there is another forest F (whose edges are displayed as dashed lines) with $8 = |E(F)| > \frac{3}{4} \times 10 = \frac{15}{2}$. However, F is not a spanning tree, and F has no component with at least 4 edges, so H_1 does not have property $P(2, 4)$.




Fig. 1: Graph H_1 .

(ii) Let H_2 be the graph obtained from $K_{16} \cup K_{17}$ by removing two independent edge uv, xy from K_{16} and adding edges uw, vw, xw, yw and three other edges connecting three

vertices of K_{16} to some vertex w of K_{17} . By a calculation, we have $16.1578 = \lambda_1(H_2) > \lambda_1(B_{33,16}^6) = 15.1645$. Note that $\delta(H_2) = 15 = 2 \times 7 + 1$ and that $\tau(H) \geq 7$. Apart from 7 edge-disjoint spanning trees, any forest has at most $13 + 16 = 29$ edges as there are only 13 edges left in K_{16} after removing two independent edges and the edges of 7 spanning trees. However, $29 < \frac{14}{15} \times 32 = \frac{448}{15}$, so H_2 does not have property $P(7, 15)$.

Theorem 1.6. *Let k be a positive integer, and let G be a graph with minimum degree $\delta \geq 2k + 2$. Suppose that*

$$\lambda_2(G) < \begin{cases} \delta - \frac{3k}{\delta+1} & \text{if } k = 1, 2, \\ \delta - \frac{8(k+1)}{3(\delta+1)} & \text{if } 3 \leq k \leq 7, \\ \delta - \frac{3k}{\delta+1} & \text{if } k \geq 8. \end{cases}$$

Then G has property $P(k, \delta)$.

To attain the conclusion Theorem 1.6, the lower bound $2k + 2$ on δ can not be lowered to $2k$ as in Theorem 1.2 or even $2k + 1$, generally.

(i) For $k \geq 1$, $\lambda_2(K_{2k+1}) = -1$, which is less than the bound in Theorem 1.6. Note that $\delta(K_{2k+1}) = 2k$ and $\tau(K_{2k+1}) = k$ [17]. However, apart from k edge-disjoint spanning trees, there are $k \leq 2k - 1$ edges, so K_{2k+1} does not have property $P(k, 2k)$.

(ii) Let H be the Petersen graph. Note that $\lambda_2(H) = 1 < 3 - \frac{3 \times 1}{3+1} = \frac{9}{4}$ and $\tau(H) = 1$. Apart from one spanning tree, there are 6 edges. But $6 = \frac{3-1}{3}(10-1)$, so H does not have property $P(1, 3)$. For $k \geq 2$, $\lambda_2(K_{2k+1, 2k+1}) = 0$, which is less than the bound of Theorem 1.6. Note that $\delta(K_{2k+1, 2k+1}) = 2k + 1$ and $\tau(K_{2k+1, 2k+1}) = k$ [17]. However, apart from k edge-disjoint spanning trees, there are $3k + 1$ edges. As $3k + 1 < \frac{2k}{2k+1}(4k + 1)$, $K_{2k+1, 2k+1}$ does not have property $P(k, 2k + 1)$.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we give lemmas that will be used. Theorems 1.5 and 1.6 are proved in Sections 3 and 4, respectively.

2 Preliminaries

Let G be a graph. For a vertex v of G , we denote by $d_G(v)$ the degree of v in G . We use $\bar{d}(G)$ for the average degree of G , and $\kappa'(G)$ for the edge connectivity of G . Denote by $G[S]$ the subgraph of G induced by S if $\emptyset \neq S \subseteq V(G)$, and $G - E_1$ the graph with vertex set $V(G)$ and edge set $E(G) \setminus E_1$ if $E_1 \subseteq E(G)$, and in particular, we write $G - f$ for $G - \{f\}$ when $f \in E(G)$. Given two graphs G and H , let $G \cup H$ denote the disjoint union of G and H .

If all the eigenvalues of an $n \times n$ matrix B are real, then we denote them by $\lambda_1(B), \dots, \lambda_n(B)$ with $\lambda_1(B) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n(B)$. For an n -vertex graph G , the adjacency matrix of G is the $n \times n$ matrix $A(G) = (a_{uv})_{u,v \in V(G)}$, where $a_{uv} = 1$ if $uv \in E(G)$ and $a_{uv} = 0$ otherwise. Evidently, $\lambda_i(G) = \lambda_i(A(G))$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Note that $\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i(G) = 0$.

The following sharp upper bound on the spectral radius was obtained by Hong et al. [11] and Nikiforov [16].

Lemma 2.1. *Let G be a graph on n vertices and m edges with minimum degree $\delta \geq 1$. Then*

$$\lambda_1(G) \leq \frac{\delta - 1}{2} + \sqrt{2m - n\delta + \frac{(\delta + 1)^2}{4}}.$$

By the well-known Perron-Frobenius theorem, we can easily deduce the following lemma.

Lemma 2.2. *If H is a subgraph of a connected graph G , then*

$$\lambda_1(H) \leq \lambda_1(G)$$

with equality if and only if $H \cong G$.

Consider two sequences of real numbers: $\eta_1 \geq \eta_2 \geq \dots \geq \eta_n$ and $\mu_1 \geq \mu_2 \geq \dots \geq \mu_m$ with $m < n$. The second sequence is said to interlace the first one whenever

$$\eta_i \geq \mu_i \geq \eta_{n-m+i} \text{ for } i = 1, 2, \dots, m.$$

Cioabă and Wong [3] derived the next useful lemma in plain text from the well-known Cauchy Interlacing Theorem, stating that for a real symmetric matrix A and a principal submatrix B of A , the eigenvalues of B interlace the eigenvalues of A , see [1, 7].

Lemma 2.3. [3] *Let S and T be disjoint subsets of $V(G)$ and $e(S, T) = 0$. Then*

$$\lambda_2(G) \geq \lambda_2(G[S \cup T]) \geq \min\{\lambda_1(G[S]), \lambda_1(G[T])\} \geq \min\{\bar{d}(G[S]), \bar{d}(G[T])\}.$$

Suppose that G is a graph and $V(G)$ is partitioned as $V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_m$. For $1 \leq i < j \leq m$, denote by A_{ij} the submatrix of $A(G)$ with rows corresponding to vertices in V_i and columns corresponding to vertices in V_j . The quotient matrix of $A(G)$ with respect to this partition is the matrix $B = (b_{ij})$, where $b_{ij} = \frac{1}{|V_i|} \sum_{u \in V_i} \sum_{v \in V_j} a_{uv}$.

The following lemma is a special case of Corollary 2.3 in [10], see also [1, 7].

Lemma 2.4. *For a graph G , if B is a quotient matrix of $A(G)$, then the eigenvalues of B interlace the eigenvalues of $A(G)$.*

We also need a lemma due to Gu et al. [8].

Lemma 2.5. [8] *Let G be a connected graph and $V(G) = V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_m$ be a partition of $V(G)$. Let B be the quotient matrix of $A(G)$ with respect to this partition. For $i = 1, \dots, m$, let \bar{d}_i be the average degree of vertices from U_i in G . Then*

$$\min_{1 \leq i \leq m} \{\bar{d}_i\} \leq \lambda_1(B) \leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} \{\bar{d}_i\}.$$

Lemma 2.6. *Let G be a graph with minimum degree $\delta \geq 1$. Let $\emptyset \neq U \subset V(G)$. If $e(U, V \setminus U) \leq \delta - 1$, then $|U| \geq \delta + 1$.*

Proof. If $|U| \leq \delta$, then

$$\delta|U| \leq \sum_{u \in U} d_G(u) \leq |U|(|U| - 1) + e(U, V \setminus U) \leq \delta(|U| - 1) + \delta - 1 = \delta|U| - 1,$$

a contradiction. □

3 Proof of Theorem 1.5

For positive integers n , k , and s with $n \geq s + k$ and $k \geq 2$, let $\mathcal{G}_{n,s}^k$ be the set of graphs obtained from $K_s \cup K_{n-s}$ by adding k edges between K_s and K_{n-s} . It is evident that $B_{n,s}^k \in \mathcal{G}_{n,s}^k$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let G be a disconnected graph on n vertices with minimum degree δ , where $n \geq 2\delta + 2$. Then $\lambda_1(G) \leq n - \delta - 2$ with equality of and only if $G \cong B_{n,\delta+1}^0$.*

Proof. Suppose that G is a disconnected graph on n vertices with minimum degree δ that maximizes the spectral radius. Then, for some component H of G ,

$$\lambda_1(H) = \lambda_1(G) \geq \lambda_1(K_{\delta+1} \cup K_{n-\delta-1}) = \max\{\delta, n - \delta - 2\} = n - \delta - 2.$$

So $|V(H)| \geq \lambda_1(H) + 1 \geq n - \delta - 1$. As the minimum degree of G is δ , G consists of two components, $|V(H)| = n - \delta - 1$, $G - V(H) \cong K_{\delta+1}$, and so we have by Lemma 2.2 that $H \cong K_{n-\delta-1}$. Thus $G \cong K_{\delta+1} \cup K_{n-\delta-1} = B_{n,\delta+1}^0$. \square

Lemma 3.2. *[4] Let $G \in \mathcal{G}_{n,\delta+1}^{k-1}$ where $k \geq 2$, $n \geq 2\delta + 3$, and $\delta \geq 2k$. Then $\lambda_1(G) \leq \lambda_1(B_{n,\delta+1}^{k-1})$ with equality of and only if $G \cong B_{n,\delta+1}^{k-1}$.*

Lemma 3.3. *[4] Let $G \in \mathcal{G}_{n,b}^{k-1}$ where $k \geq 2$, $n \geq 2b$, $b \geq \delta + 2$, and $\delta \geq 2k$. Then $\lambda_1(G) < \lambda_1(B_{n,\delta+1}^{k-1})$.*

Lemma 3.4. *For integers x, y and a with $x, y \geq a \geq 2$, $\binom{x}{2} + \binom{y}{2} \leq \binom{a}{2} + \binom{x+y-a}{2}$.*

Proof. It is equivalent to the trivial inequality $(x - a)(y - a) \geq 0$. \square

Lemma 3.5. *For positive integers a_1, \dots, a_p ,*

$$\sum_{i=1}^p \binom{a_i}{2} \leq \binom{\sum_{i=1}^p a_i - p + 1}{2}.$$

Proof. We prove the inequality by induction on p . It is trivial if $p = 1$. Suppose that $p \geq 2$, and that $\sum_{i=1}^{p-1} \binom{a_i}{2} \leq \binom{\sum_{i=1}^{p-1} a_i - (p-1) + 1}{2}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^p \binom{a_i}{2} &= \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} \binom{a_i}{2} + \binom{a_p}{2} \\ &\leq \binom{\sum_{i=1}^{p-1} a_i - (p-1) + 1}{2} + \binom{a_p}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $a = \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} a_i - (p-1) + 1$ and $b = a_p$. Then

$$\binom{a+b-1}{2} - \binom{a}{2} - \binom{b}{2} = (a-1)(b-1) \geq 0,$$

so $\binom{a}{2} + \binom{b}{2} \leq \binom{a+b-1}{2}$, implying that

$$\sum_{i=1}^p \binom{a_i}{2} \leq \binom{\sum_{i=1}^{p-1} a_i - (p-1) + 1 + a_p - 1}{2} = \binom{\sum_{i=1}^p a_i - p + 1}{2}.$$

Thus, the desired inequality follows. \square

Lemma 3.6. *Let $n \geq 2k+3$ and $k \geq 1$ be integers. Let G be a graph obtained by K_n deleting k edges. Then $\tau(G) \geq k+1$.*

Proof. Suppose that $\tau(G) < k+1$. By Theorem 1.3, there exists some partition $V(G) = V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_p$ of $V(G)$ with $2 \leq p \leq n$ such that

$$\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq p} e(V_i, V_j) \leq (k+1)(p-1) - 1.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} e(G) &= \sum_{i=1}^p e(G[V_i]) + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq p} e(V_i, V_j) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^p \binom{|V_i|}{2} + (k+1)(p-1) - 1. \end{aligned}$$

Now, by Lemma 3.5 and letting $f(p) = \frac{p^2}{2} - (n-k-\frac{1}{2})p + \frac{n(n+1)}{2} - k - 2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} e(G) &\leq \binom{n-p+1}{2} + (k+1)(p-1) - 1 \\ &= f(p). \end{aligned}$$

As $n \geq 2k+3$, we have $f(2) - f(n) = \frac{1}{2}n^2 - (k+\frac{5}{2})n + 2k+3 \geq \frac{1}{2}(2k+3)^2 - (k+\frac{5}{2})(2k+3) + 2k+3 = 0$, so $f(2) \geq f(n)$. As $n \geq 2k+3$ and $k \geq 1$, we have $2 < n-k-\frac{1}{2} < n$. As $2 \leq p \leq n$, we have $f(p) < \max\{f(2), f(n)\} = f(2) = \frac{n^2}{2} - \frac{3n}{2} + k + 1$. So $e(G) < \frac{n^2}{2} - \frac{3n}{2} + k + 1$. However, as $n \geq 2k+3$, we have

$$e(G) = \binom{n}{2} - k = \frac{n^2}{2} - \frac{n}{2} - k = \frac{n^2}{2} - \frac{3n}{2} + n - k > \frac{n^2}{2} - \frac{3n}{2} + k + 1,$$

a contradiction. \square

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.5.

Proof of Theorem 1.5. Suppose that G is a graph for which Theorem 1.5 is not true. That is, G is a graph with minimum degree $\delta \geq 2k+2$ and order $n \geq 2\delta+3$ such that

$$\lambda_1(G) \geq \lambda_1(B_{n,\delta+1}^{k-1}) \quad (1)$$

but G does not have property $P(k, \delta)$ unless $G \cong B_{n, \delta+1}^{k-1}$.

By Theorem 1.4, $\nu_f(G) \leq k + \frac{\delta-1}{\delta}$, so there exists some partition \mathcal{P} of $V(G)$ into $p = |\mathcal{P}|$ subsets V_1, \dots, V_p with $p \geq 2$ such that

$$\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq p} e(V_i, V_j) \leq \left(k + \frac{\delta-1}{\delta}\right)(p-1) < (k+1)(p-1). \quad (2)$$

Case 1. $p = 2$.

From (2), we have $e(V_1, V_2) \leq k$. By Lemma 2.6, we have $|V_1|, |V_2| \geq \delta + 1$. Suppose that $e(V_1, V_2) \leq k - 1$. If $k = 1$, then we have by Lemma 3.1 that

$$\lambda_1(G) \leq n - \delta - 2 = \lambda_1(B_{n, \delta+1}^{k-1})$$

with equality if and only if $G \cong B_{n, \delta+1}^{k-1}$, contradicting the assumption. Suppose that $k \geq 2$. Assume that $|V_1| \leq |V_2|$. For the cases $|V_1| = \delta + 1$ and $|V_1| \geq \delta + 2$, we have by Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3, respectively, together with Lemma 2.2, that

$$\lambda_1(G) \leq \lambda_1(B_{n, \delta+1}^{k-1})$$

with equality if and only if $G \cong B_{n, \delta+1}^{k-1}$, contradicting the assumption again. This shows that $e(V_1, V_2) = k$.

Claim 3.1. $e(G[V_1]) + e(G[V_2]) < \binom{|V_1|}{2} + \binom{|V_2|}{2} - k$.

Proof. If $e(G[V_i]) < \binom{|V_i|}{2} - k$ for $i = 1$ or 2 , then $e(G[V_1]) + e(G[V_2]) < \binom{|V_1|}{2} + \binom{|V_2|}{2} - k$, as desired.

Suppose that $e(G[V_i]) \geq \binom{|V_i|}{2} - k$ for each $i = 1, 2$. For $i = 1, 2$, as $\delta \geq 2k + 2$ and $|V_i| \geq \delta + 1$, we have $|V_i| \geq 2k + 3$. By Lemma 3.6, $\tau(G[V_i]) \geq k + 1$ for $i = 1, 2$. A spanning tree of $G[V_1]$, a spanning tree of $G[V_2]$, and one edge from V_1 to V_2 form a spanning tree of G . Thus, $\tau(G) \geq k$. Apart from the k edge-disjoint spanning trees of G , there is a forest F of G consisting a spanning tree of $G[V_1]$ and a spanning tree of $G[V_2]$. As $n \geq 2\delta + 3$, we have

$$|E(F)| = |V_1| + |V_2| - 2 = n - 2 > \frac{\delta-1}{\delta}(n-1).$$

As $e(V_1, V_2) = k$, F is not a spanning tree. As $|V_i| \geq \delta + 1$ for $i = 1, 2$, each component of F has at least $\min\{|V_1|, |V_2|\} - 1 \geq \delta$ edges. So G has property $P(k, \delta)$, contradicting the assumption again. \square

By Claim 3.1, the fact that $e(V_1, V_2) = k$, and Lemma 3.4, we have

$$e(G) < \binom{|V_1|}{2} + \binom{|V_2|}{2} \leq \binom{\delta+1}{2} + \binom{n-\delta-1}{2}.$$

So, by Lemma 2.1, we have

$$\lambda_1(G) < \frac{\delta-1}{2} + \sqrt{2 \left(\binom{\delta+1}{2} + \binom{n-\delta-1}{2} \right) - n\delta + \frac{(\delta+1)^2}{4}}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{\delta - 1}{2} + \sqrt{\left(n - \frac{3}{2}\delta - \frac{3}{2}\right)^2} \\
&= n - \delta - 2.
\end{aligned}$$

Evidently, $K_{\delta+1} \cup K_{n-\delta-1}$ is a subgraph of $B_{n,\delta+1}^{k-1}$. From (1), we have Lemma 2.2 that

$$\lambda_1(G) \geq \lambda_1(B_{n,\delta+1}^{k-1}) \geq \lambda_1(K_{\delta+1} \cup K_{n-\delta-1}) = n - \delta - 2,$$

which is a contradiction.

Case 2. $p \geq 3$.

Claim 3.2. $e(G) < \binom{\delta+1}{2} + \binom{n-\delta-2}{2} + 2(k+1)$.

Proof. Let $r_i = e(V_i, V \setminus V_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, p$, it follows from (2) that

$$\sum_{i=1}^p r_i < 2(k+1)(p-1). \quad (3)$$

If there exists at most one part V_j with $1 \leq j \leq p$ such that $r_j \leq \delta - 1$, then $r_i \geq \delta$ for all i with $1 \leq i \leq p$ and $i \neq j$, so we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^p r_i \geq (p-1)\delta \geq 2(k+1)(p-1),$$

which contradicts (3). Thus, there exist two parts, say V_s, V_t such that $r_s, r_t \leq \delta - 1$. By Lemma 2.6, $|V_s|, |V_t| \geq \delta + 1$, so

$$p \leq n - |V_s| - |V_t| + 2 \leq n - 2\delta.$$

By Lemmas 3.5 and 3.4,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^p e(V_i) &\leq \binom{|V_t|}{2} + \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq t}}^p \binom{|V_i|}{2} \\
&\leq \binom{|V_t|}{2} + \binom{n - |V_t| - (p-1) + 1}{2} \\
&\leq \binom{\delta+1}{2} + \binom{n - (p + \delta - 1)}{2}.
\end{aligned}$$

From (2), we have

$$e(G) = \sum_{i=1}^p e(V_i) + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq p} e(V_i, V_j)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&< \binom{\delta+1}{2} + \binom{n-(p+\delta-1)}{2} + (k+1)(p-1) \\
&= \frac{1}{2}p^2 + (\delta+k-n+\frac{1}{2})p + \delta^2 - n\delta + \frac{1}{2}n^2 + \frac{1}{2}n - k - 1.
\end{aligned}$$

Let $\psi(p) = \frac{1}{2}p^2 + (\delta+k-n+\frac{1}{2})p + \delta^2 - n\delta + \frac{1}{2}n^2 + \frac{1}{2}n - k - 1$. Since $p \leq n - 2\delta$ and $\delta \geq 2k + 2$, we have

$$-(\delta+k-n+\frac{1}{2}) > n-2\delta \geq p \geq 3,$$

so $\psi(p) \leq \psi(3)$. Hence Claim 3.2 follows. \square

By Claim 3.2, $e(G) < \binom{\delta+1}{2} + \binom{n-\delta-2}{2} + 2(k+1)$. By Lemma 2.1, and the facts that $n \geq 2\delta + 3$ and $\delta \geq 2k + 2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_1(G) &< \frac{\delta-1}{2} + \sqrt{2 \left(\binom{\delta+1}{2} + \binom{n-\delta-2}{2} + 2(k+1) \right) - n\delta + \frac{(\delta+1)^2}{4}} \\
&= \frac{\delta-1}{2} + \sqrt{n^2 - (3\delta+5)n + \frac{9}{4}\delta^2 + \frac{13}{2}\delta + 4k + \frac{41}{4}} \\
&= \frac{\delta-1}{2} + \sqrt{\left(n - \frac{3}{2}\delta - \frac{3}{2} \right)^2 - (2n - 2\delta - 4k - 8)} \\
&< \frac{\delta-1}{2} + \sqrt{\left(n - \frac{3}{2}\delta - \frac{3}{2} \right)^2} \\
&= n - \delta - 2.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly as above, we arrive at a contradiction. \square

4 Proof of Theorem 1.6

If G is a graph with minimum degree $\delta \geq 1$, and $\lambda_2(G) < \delta$, then G is connected. This fact is used frequently.

Lemma 4.1. [8] *Let k be a positive integer, and let G be a graph with minimum degree $\delta \geq k$. If $\lambda_2(G) < \delta - \frac{2(k-1)}{\delta+1}$, then $\kappa'(G) \geq k$.*

Proof of Theorem 1.6. Suppose that G is a graph for which Theorem 1.6 is not true. By Theorem 1.4, $\nu_f(G) \leq k + \frac{\delta-1}{\delta}$. So $V(G)$ can be partitioned into p parts V_1, \dots, V_p for some $p \geq 2$ such that

$$\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq p} e(V_i, V_j) \leq \left(k + \frac{\delta-1}{\delta} \right) (p-1) < (k+1)(p-1). \quad (4)$$

Let $r_i = e(V_i, V \setminus V_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, p$. Then

$$\sum_{i=1}^p r_i \leq 2(k+1)(p-1) - 1. \quad (5)$$

Assume that $r_1 \leq \dots \leq r_p$.

Claim 4.1. *If $\lambda_2(G) < \delta - \frac{2k+1}{\delta+1}$, then there exist no indices i and j with $1 \leq i, j \leq p$ and $i \neq j$ such that $e(V_i, V_j) = 0$ and $r_i, r_j \leq 2k+1$.*

Proof. Suppose that there exist some i, j with $1 \leq i, j \leq p$ and $i \neq j$ such that $e(V_i, V_j) = 0$ and $r_i, r_j \leq 2k+1$. As $\delta \geq 2k+2$, we have $r_i, r_j \leq \delta - 1$. By Lemma 2.6, we have $|V_i|, |V_j| \geq \delta + 1$. Then

$$\bar{d}(G[V_i]) \geq \frac{\delta|V_i| - r_i}{|V_i|} = \delta - \frac{r_i}{|V_i|} \geq \delta - \frac{2k+1}{\delta+1},$$

and similarly,

$$\bar{d}(G[V_j]) \geq \delta - \frac{2k+1}{\delta+1}.$$

By Lemma 2.3,

$$\lambda_2(G) \geq \delta - \frac{2k+1}{\delta+1},$$

contradicting $\lambda_2(G) < \delta - \frac{2k+1}{\delta+1}$. □

Claim 4.2. *If $\lambda_2(G) < \delta - \frac{2k+1}{\delta+1}$, then, for any i with $1 \leq i \leq p$,*

$$r_i \geq \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } k = 1, \\ 3 & \text{if } k = 2, \\ k+2 & \text{if } k \geq 3. \end{cases}$$

Proof. The case when $k = 1$ is trivial. Suppose that $k \geq 2$ and for some $i = 1, \dots, p$,

$$r_i < \begin{cases} 3 & \text{if } k = 2, \\ k+2 & \text{if } k \geq 3. \end{cases}$$

Then

$$\kappa'(G) \leq r_i < \begin{cases} 3 & \text{if } k = 2, \\ k+2 & \text{if } k \geq 3. \end{cases}$$

So we have by Lemma 4.1 that

$$\lambda_2(G) \geq \delta - \frac{2k-2}{\delta+1} > \begin{cases} \delta - \frac{3k}{\delta+1} & \text{if } 2 \leq k \leq 8, \\ \delta - \frac{8(k+1)}{3(\delta+1)} & \text{if } k \geq 8. \end{cases}$$

This is a contradiction. □

In the following, if $U \subset V(G)$, then we denote by \bar{d}' the average degree of vertices from U in G .

Claim 4.3. *Let r be a positive integer. If $V(G) = V_1 \cup U$ and $e(V_1, U) = r$, then*

$$\lambda_2(G) \geq \delta - \left(\frac{r}{|V_1|} + \frac{r}{|U|} \right).$$

Proof. The quotient matrix of $A(G)$ with respect to the partition $V(G) = V_1 \cup U$ is

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{d}_1 - \frac{r}{|V_1|} & \frac{r}{|V_1|} \\ \frac{r}{|U|} & \bar{d}' - \frac{r}{|U|} \end{pmatrix}.$$

By Lemma 2.4, $\lambda_2(G) \geq \lambda_2(B)$. By Lemma 2.5,

$$\bar{d}_1 + \bar{d}' - \lambda_1(B) \geq \min\{\bar{d}_1, \bar{d}'\} \geq \delta.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_2(G) &\geq \lambda_2(B) \\ &= \bar{d}_1 - \frac{r}{|V_1|} + \bar{d}' - \frac{r}{|U|} - \lambda_1(B) \\ &= \bar{d}_1 + \bar{d}' - \lambda_1(B) - \left(\frac{r}{|V_1|} + \frac{r}{|U|} \right) \\ &\geq \delta - \left(\frac{r}{|V_1|} + \frac{r}{|U|} \right). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Claim 4.4. *Let r, s, t be nonnegative integers. If $V(G) = V_1 \cup V_2 \cup U$, $e(V_1, V_2) = r$, $e(V_1, U) = s$ and $e(V_2, U) = t$, then*

$$\lambda_2(G) \geq \delta - \left(\frac{r+s}{2|V_1|} + \frac{r+t}{2|V_2|} + \frac{s+t}{2|U|} \right).$$

Proof. The quotient matrix of $A(G)$ with respect to the partition $V(G) = V_1 \cup V_2 \cup U$ is

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{d}_1 - \frac{r+s}{|V_1|} & \frac{r}{|V_1|} & \frac{s}{|V_1|} \\ \frac{r}{|V_2|} & \bar{d}_2 - \frac{r+t}{|V_2|} & \frac{t}{|V_2|} \\ \frac{s}{|U|} & \frac{t}{|U|} & \bar{d}' - \frac{s+t}{|U|} \end{pmatrix}.$$

By Lemma 2.4, $\lambda_2(G) \geq \lambda_2(B)$ and $\lambda_3(G) \geq \lambda_3(B)$. By Lemma 2.5,

$$\bar{d}_1 + \bar{d}_2 + \bar{d}' - \lambda_1(B) \geq 2 \min\{\bar{d}_1, \bar{d}_2, \bar{d}'\} \geq 2\delta.$$

Thus,

$$2\lambda_2(G) \geq 2\lambda_2(B) \geq \lambda_2(B) + \lambda_3(B)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \bar{d}_1 - \frac{r+s}{|V_1|} + \bar{d}_2 - \frac{r+t}{|V_2|} + \bar{d}' - \frac{s+t}{|U|} - \lambda_1(B) \\
&= \bar{d}_1 + \bar{d}_2 + \bar{d}' - \lambda_1(B) - \left(\frac{r+s}{|V_1|} + \frac{r+t}{|V_2|} + \frac{s+t}{|U|} \right) \\
&\geq 2\delta - \left(\frac{r+s}{|V_1|} + \frac{r+t}{|V_2|} + \frac{s+t}{|U|} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\lambda_2(G) \geq \delta - \left(\frac{r+s}{2|V_1|} + \frac{r+t}{2|V_2|} + \frac{s+t}{2|U|} \right)$. □

Denote by x_ℓ the multiplicity of ℓ in the multiset $\{r_1, \dots, r_p\}$.

Case 1. $k = 1$.

By Claim 4.2, $r_1 \geq 1$. From (5), we have

$$x_1 + 2x_2 + 3x_3 + 4(p - (x_1 + x_2 + x_3)) \leq 4p - 5,$$

i.e., $3x_1 + 2x_2 + x_3 \geq 5$.

Case 1.1. $x_1 = 0$.

If $x_2 = 0$, then $x_3 \geq 5$, so $r_1 = \dots = r_5 = 3$ and $e(V_1, V_j) = 0$ for some $j = 2, \dots, 5$. However, by Claim 4.1, we have $e(V_1, V_j) \neq 0$ for any $j = 2, \dots, 5$, which is a contradiction.

If $x_2 = 1$, then $x_3 \geq 3$, so $r_1 = 2, r_2 = r_3 = r_4 = 3$ and $e(V_1, V_j) = 0$ for some $j = 2, 3, 4$. However, by Claim 4.1, we have $e(V_1, V_j) \neq 0$ for any $j = 2, 3, 4$, which is a contradiction.

Suppose that $x_2 \geq 2$. Then $r_1 = r_2 = 2$. Note that $x_3 \geq 1$ if $x_2 = 2$, so $r_3 \leq 3 \leq \delta - 1$. Let $U = V(G) \setminus (V_1 \cup V_2)$. By Claim 4.1, $e(V_1, V_2) = e(V_1, U) = e(V_2, U) = 1$. By Lemma 2.6, $|V_1| \geq \delta + 1$, $|V_2| \geq \delta + 1$ and $|U| \geq |V_3| \geq \delta + 1$. The quotient matrix of $A(G)$ with respect to the partition $V(G) = V_1 \cup V_2 \cup U$ is

$$B_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{d}_1 - \frac{2}{|V_1|} & \frac{1}{|V_1|} & \frac{1}{|V_1|} \\ \frac{1}{|V_2|} & \bar{d}_2 - \frac{2}{|V_2|} & \frac{1}{|V_2|} \\ \frac{1}{|U|} & \frac{1}{|U|} & \bar{d}' - \frac{2}{|U|} \end{pmatrix}.$$

By Claim 4.4,

$$\lambda_2(G) \geq \delta - \left(\frac{1}{|V_1|} + \frac{1}{|V_2|} + \frac{1}{|U|} \right) \geq \delta - \frac{3}{\delta + 1},$$

a contradiction.

Case 1.2. $x_1 \geq 1$.

If $x_1 = 1$, then $r_1 = 1$ and $r_2 \leq 3 \leq \delta - 1$, and if $x_1 \geq 2$, then $r_1 = r_2 = 1$. Let $U = V(G) \setminus V_1$. By Lemma 2.6, $|V_1| \geq \delta + 1$ and $|U| \geq |V_2| \geq \delta + 1$. The quotient matrix of $A(G)$ with respect to the partition $V(G) = V_1 \cup U$ is

$$B_2 = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{d}_1 - \frac{1}{|V_1|} & \frac{1}{|V_1|} \\ \frac{1}{|U|} & \bar{d}' - \frac{1}{|U|} \end{pmatrix}.$$

By Claim 4.3,

$$\lambda_2(G) \geq \delta - \left(\frac{1}{|V_1|} + \frac{1}{|U|} \right) \geq \delta - \frac{2}{\delta+1},$$

a contradiction.

Case 2. $k = 2$.

By Claim 4.2, $r_1 \geq 3$. From (5), we have

$$3x_3 + 4x_4 + 5x_5 + 6(p - (x_3 + x_4 + x_5)) \leq 6p - 7,$$

i.e., $3x_3 + 2x_4 + x_5 \geq 7$.

Case 2.1. $x_3 = 0$.

If $x_4 = 0$, then $x_5 \geq 7$, so $r_1 = \dots = r_7 = 5$, and $e(V_1, V_j) = 0$ for some $j = 2, \dots, 7$, contradicting Claim 4.1.

If $x_4 = 1$, then $x_5 \geq 5$, so $r_1 = 4$, $r_2 = \dots = r_6 = 5$, and $e(V_1, V_j) = 0$ for some $j = 2, \dots, 6$, contradicting Claim 4.1.

Suppose that $x_4 \geq 2$. Then $r_1 = r_2 = 4$. Note that $x_5 \geq 3$ if $x_4 = 2$, and $x_5 \geq 1$ if $x_4 = 3$. So $r_4 \leq 5 = 3k - 1 \leq \delta - 1$. Let $U = V(G) \setminus (V_1 \cup V_2)$. By Lemma 2.6, $|U| \geq |V_3| + |V_4| \geq 2(\delta + 1)$. Let $e(V_1, V_2) = y$. Since $r_1 = r_2 = 4$, we have $y \geq 1$ by Claim 4.1. The quotient matrix of $A(G)$ with respect to the partition $V(G) = V_1 \cup V_2 \cup U$ is

$$B_3 = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{d}_1 - \frac{4}{|V_1|} & \frac{y}{|V_1|} & \frac{4-y}{|V_1|} \\ \frac{y}{|V_2|} & \bar{d}_2 - \frac{4}{|V_2|} & \frac{4-y}{|V_2|} \\ \frac{4-y}{|U|} & \frac{4-y}{|U|} & \bar{d}' - \frac{8-2y}{|U|} \end{pmatrix}.$$

By Claim 4.4,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_2(G) &\geq \delta - \left(\frac{2}{|V_1|} + \frac{2}{|V_2|} + \frac{4-y}{|U|} \right) \\ &\geq \delta - \left(\frac{2}{\delta+1} + \frac{2}{\delta+1} + \frac{4-y}{2(\delta+1)} \right) \\ &= \delta - \frac{12-y}{2(\delta+1)} \\ &\geq \delta - \frac{11}{2(\delta+1)}, \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction.

Case 2.2. $x_3 = 1$.

If $x_4 = 0$, then $x_5 \geq 4$, so $r_1 = 3$, $r_2 = r_3 = r_4 = 5$ and $e(V_1, V_j) = 0$ for some $j = 2, 3, 4$, contradicting Claim 4.1.

Suppose that $x_4 \geq 1$. Then $r_1 = 3$, $r_2 = 4$. Note that $x_5 \geq 2$ if $x_4 = 2$. So $r_3 \leq 5 = 3k - 3 \leq \delta - 1$. Let $U = V(G) \setminus (V_1 \cup V_2)$. By Lemma 2.6, $|U| \geq |V_3| \geq \delta + 1$. Let

$e(V_1, V_2) = y$. Since $r_1, r_2 \leq 4$, we have $y \geq 1$ by Claim 4.1. The quotient matrix of $A(G)$ with respect to the partition $V(G) = V_1 \cup V_2 \cup U$ is

$$B_3 = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{d}_1 - \frac{3}{|V_1|} & \frac{y}{|V_1|} & \frac{3-y}{|V_1|} \\ \frac{y}{|V_2|} & \bar{d}_2 - \frac{4}{|V_2|} & \frac{4-y}{|V_2|} \\ \frac{3-y}{|U|} & \frac{4-y}{|U|} & \bar{d}' - \frac{7-2y}{|U|} \end{pmatrix}.$$

By Claim 4.4,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_2(G) &\geq \delta - \left(\frac{3}{2|V_1|} + \frac{2}{|V_2|} + \frac{7-2y}{2|U|} \right) \\ &\geq \delta - \frac{7-y}{\delta+1} \\ &\geq \delta - \frac{6}{\delta+1}, \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction.

Case 2.3. $x_3 \geq 2$.

Note that $r_1 = r_2 = 3$ and that $2x_4 + x_5 \geq 1$ if $x_3 = 2$. So $r_3 \leq 5 = 3k - 1 \leq \delta - 1$. Let $U = V(G) \setminus (V_1 \cup V_2)$. By Lemma 2.6, $|U| \geq |V_3| \geq \delta + 1$. Let $e(V_1, V_2) = y$. Since $r_1 = r_2 = 3$, we have $y \geq 1$ by Claim 4.1. The quotient matrix of $A(G)$ with respect to the partition $V(G) = V_1 \cup V_2 \cup U$ is

$$B_4 = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{d}_1 - \frac{3}{|V_1|} & \frac{y}{|V_1|} & \frac{3-y}{|V_1|} \\ \frac{y}{|V_2|} & \bar{d}_2 - \frac{3}{|V_2|} & \frac{3-y}{|V_2|} \\ \frac{3-y}{|U|} & \frac{3-y}{|U|} & \bar{d}' - \frac{6-2y}{|U|} \end{pmatrix}.$$

By Claim 4.4,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_2(G) &\geq \delta - \left(\frac{3}{2|V_1|} + \frac{3}{2|V_2|} + \frac{3-y}{|U|} \right) \\ &\geq \delta - \frac{6-y}{\delta+1} \\ &\geq \delta - \frac{5}{\delta+1}, \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction.

Case 3. $k \geq 3$.

By Claim 4.2, $r_1 \geq k + 2$. From (5), we have

$$\sum_{j=k+2}^{2k+1} jx_j + 2(k+1) \left(p - \sum_{j=k+2}^{2k+1} x_j \right) \leq 2(k+1)(p-1) - 1.$$

That is,

$$\sum_{j=k+2}^{2k+1} (2k+2-j)x_j \geq 2k+3.$$

Let h be the smallest index among $k + 2, \dots, 2k + 1$ such that $x_h \neq 0$. Then

$$\sum_{j=h}^{2k+1} (2k + 2 - j)x_j \geq 2k + 3. \quad (6)$$

Since $h \geq k + 2$, we have $2k + 3 > 2(2k - h + 2)$.

Case 3.1. $x_h \geq 2$.

Since $2k + 3 > 2(2k - h + 2)$, there exists an integer $a \geq 3$ such that

$$(a - 1)(2k - h + 2) < 2k + 3 \leq a(2k - h + 2).$$

From the right inequality, we have $h \leq \frac{2(k+1)(a-1)-1}{a}$. From the left equality and (6), we have

$$(2k - h + 2) \sum_{j=h}^{2k+1} x_j \geq \sum_{j=k+2}^{2k+1} (2k + 2 - j)x_j \geq 2k + 3 > (a - 1)(2k - h + 2),$$

so $x_h + \dots + x_{2k+1} \geq a$. Let $U = V(G) \setminus (V_1 \cup V_2)$. Let $e(V_1, V_2) = y$. Since $r_1, r_2 \leq 2k + 1$, we have $y \geq 1$ by Claim 4.1. The quotient matrix of $A(G)$ with respect to the partition $V(G) = V_1 \cup V_2 \cup U$ is

$$B_5 = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{d}_1 - \frac{h}{|V_1|} & \frac{y}{|V_1|} & \frac{h-y}{|V_1|} \\ \frac{y}{|V_2|} & \bar{d}_2 - \frac{h}{|V_2|} & \frac{h-y}{|V_2|} \\ \frac{h-y}{|U|} & \frac{h-y}{|U|} & \bar{d}' - \frac{2(h-y)}{|U|} \end{pmatrix}.$$

By Claim 4.4,

$$\lambda_2(G) \geq \delta - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{h}{|V_1|} + \frac{h}{|V_2|} + \frac{2(h-y)}{|U|} \right).$$

Since $r_1 \leq \dots \leq r_a \leq 2k + 1 \leq \delta - 1$, we have by Lemma 2.6 that $|V_i| \geq \delta + 1$ for $i = 1, \dots, a$, so $|U| \geq |V_3| + \dots + |V_a| \geq (\delta + 1)(a - 2)$. Note also that $y \geq 1$, and $h \leq \frac{2(k+1)(a-1)-1}{a}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{h}{|V_1|} + \frac{h}{|V_2|} + \frac{2(h-y)}{|U|} \right) &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{h}{\delta+1} + \frac{h}{\delta+1} + \frac{2(h-y)}{(\delta+1)(a-2)} \right) \\ &= \frac{(a-1)h-y}{(\delta+1)(a-2)} \\ &= \frac{1}{\delta+1} \cdot \left(\frac{a-1}{a-2}h - \frac{y}{a-2} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\delta+1} \cdot \left(\frac{a-1}{a-2} \cdot \frac{2(k+1)(a-1)-1}{a} - \frac{1}{a-2} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\delta+1} \cdot \left(\frac{2(a-1)^2(k+1)}{a(a-2)} - \frac{2a-1}{a(a-2)} \right) \\ &< \frac{1}{\delta+1} \cdot \frac{2(a-1)^2(k+1)}{a(a-2)} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{\delta+1} \cdot 2 \left(1 + \frac{1}{a^2 - 2a} \right) (k+1) \\
&\leq \frac{8(k+1)}{3(\delta+1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\lambda_2(G) > \delta - \frac{8(k+1)}{3(\delta+1)},$$

which is a contradiction as if $k \geq 9$, then $\lambda_2(G) \geq \delta - \frac{8(k+1)}{3(\delta+1)} > \delta - \frac{3k}{\delta+1}$.

Case 3.2. $x_h = 1$.

From (6), we have

$$\sum_{j=h+1}^{2k+1} (2k+2-j)x_j \geq 2k+3 - (2k-h+2) = h+1 \geq k+3.$$

Let h' be the smallest index such that $x_{h'} > 0$ with $h' > h$. Then

$$\sum_{j=h'}^{2k+1} (2k+2-j)x_j \geq k+3.$$

Since $h' > h \geq k+2$, we have $2k-h'+2 < k < k+3$. Thus there exists an integer $a' \geq 2$ such that

$$(a'-1)(2k-h'+2) < k+3 \leq a'(2k-h'+2).$$

From the right inequality, we have $h' \leq \frac{(2a'-1)(k+1)-2}{a'}$. From the left inequality and $\sum_{j=h'}^{2k+1} (2k+2-j)x_j \geq k+3$, we have

$$x_{h'} + \cdots + x_{2k+1} \geq a',$$

and $r_1 \leq \cdots \leq r_{a'+1} \leq 2k+1 \leq \delta-1$. By Lemma 2.6, $|V_i| \geq \delta+1$ for any $i = 1, \dots, a'+1$. Let $U = V(G) \setminus (V_1 \cup V_2)$. By Lemma 2.6, $|U| \geq |V_3| + \cdots + |V_{a'+1}| \geq (\delta+1)(a'-1)$. Let $e(V_1, V_2) = y$. Since $r_1, r_2 \leq 2k+1$, we have $y \geq 1$ by Claim 4.1. The quotient matrix of $A(G)$ with respect to the partition $V(G) = V_1 \cup V_2 \cup U$ is

$$B_6 = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{d}_1 - \frac{h}{|V_1|} & \frac{y}{|V_1|} & \frac{h-y}{|V_1|} \\ \frac{y}{|V_2|} & \bar{d}_2 - \frac{h'}{|V_2|} & \frac{h'-y}{|V_2|} \\ \frac{h-y}{|U|} & \frac{h'-y}{|U|} & \bar{d}' - \frac{h+h'-2y}{|U|} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that $|V_1|, |V_2| \geq \delta+1$, $|U| \geq (\delta+1)(a'-1)$, $y \geq 1$, and $h < h' \leq \frac{(k+1)(2a'-1)-2}{a'}$. By Claim 4.4,

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_2(G) &\geq \delta - \left(\frac{h}{2|V_1|} + \frac{h'}{2|V_2|} + \frac{h+h'-2y}{2|U|} \right) \\
&\geq \delta - \frac{(a'-1)(h+h') + h+h'-2y}{2(a'-1)(\delta+1)}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\geq \delta - \frac{a'(h+h')-2}{2(a'-1)(\delta+1)} \\
&> \delta - \frac{a'h'-1}{(a'-1)(\delta+1)} \\
&\geq \delta - \frac{(2a'-1)(k+1)-3}{(a'-1)(\delta+1)} \\
&> \delta - \frac{3k}{\delta+1},
\end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction, as if $3 \leq k \leq 7$, then $\lambda_2(G) \geq \delta - \frac{3k}{\delta+1} \geq \delta - \frac{8(k+1)}{3(\delta+1)}$. \square

Acknowledgement. This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 12071158).

References

- [1] A.E. Brouwer, W.H. Haemers, Spectra of Graphs, Springer, New York, 2012.
- [2] S.M. Cioabă, A. Ostuni, D. Park, S. Potluri, T. Wakhare, W. Wong, Extremal graphs for a spectral inequality on edge-disjoint spanning trees, Electron. J. Combin. 29 (2022) 2.56.
- [3] S.M. Cioabă, W. Wong, Edge-disjoint spanning trees and eigenvalues of regular graphs, Linear Algebra Appl. 437 (2012) 630–647.
- [4] D. Fan, X. Gu, H. Lin, Spectral radius and edge-disjoint spanning trees, J. Graph Theory 104 (2022) 697–711.
- [5] G. Fan, H. Jiang, P. Li, D.B. West, D. Yang, X. Zhu, Extensions of matroid covering and packing, Eur. J. Combin. 76 (2019) 117–122.
- [6] X. Fang, D. Yang, An extension of Nash-Williams and Tutte’s theorem, J. Graph Theory 108 (2025) 361–367.
- [7] C. Godsil, G. Royle, Algebraic Graph Theory, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2013.
- [8] X. Gu, H.-J. Lai, P. Li, S. Yao, Edge-disjoint spanning trees, edge connectivity, and eigenvalues in graphs, J. Graph Theory 61 (2016) 16–29.
- [9] X. Gu, R. Liu, G. Yu, Spanning tree packing and 2-essential edge-connectivity, Discrete Math. 346 (2023) 113132.
- [10] W.H. Haemers, Interlacing eigenvalues and graphs, Linear Algebra Appl. 226 (1995) 593–616.

- [11] Y. Hong, J. Shu, K. Fang, A sharp upper bound of the spectral radius of graphs, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B.* 81 (2001) 177–183.
- [12] H.-J. Lai, J. Li, Packing spanning trees in highly essentially connected graphs, *Discrete Math.* 342 (2019) 1–9.
- [13] F. Lehner, On spanning tree packings of highly edge connected graphs, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* 105 (2014) 93–126.
- [14] Q. Liu, Y. Hong, X. Gu, H.-J. Lai, Note on edge-disjoint spanning trees and eigenvalues, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 458 (2014) 128–133.
- [15] C.St.J.A. Nash-Williams, Edge-disjoint spanning trees of finite graphs, *Lond. Math. Soc.* 36 (1961) 445–450.
- [16] V. Nikiforov, Some inequalities for the largest eigenvalue of a graph, *Combin. Probab. Comput.* 11 (2002) 179–189.
- [17] E.M. Palmer, On the spanning tree packing number of a graph: a survey, *Discrete Math.* 230 (2001) 13–21.
- [18] W.T. Tutte, On the problem of decomposing a graph into n factors, *Lond. Math. Soc.* 36 (1961) 221–230.