

The extremal function for K_9^- minors

Martin Rolek*

Department of Mathematics

College of William & Mary

Williamsburg, VA 23185

March 26, 2018

Abstract

We prove the extremal function for K_9^- minors, where K_9^- denotes the complete graph K_9 with two edges removed. In particular, we show that any graph with n vertices and at least $6n - 20$ edges either contains a K_9^- minor or is isomorphic to a graph obtained from disjoint copies of K_8 and $K_{2,2,2,2}$ by identifying cliques of size 5.

We utilize computer assistance to prove one of our lemmas.

Keywords: extremal function, graph minor

1 Introduction

All graphs considered are simple and finite. We use $V(G)$, $|G|$, $E(G)$, $e(G)$, $\delta(G)$, $\Delta(G)$, and \overline{G} to denote the vertex set, number of vertices, edge set, number of edges, minimum degree, maximum degree, and complement of a graph G , respectively. Given $S, T \subseteq V(G)$,

*E-mail address: msrolek@wm.edu.

we denote by $e(S, T)$ the number of edges of G with one end in S and one end in T . We denote by $G[S]$ the subgraph of G induced by S , and by $G - S$ the subgraph $G[V(G) \setminus S]$ of G . If $S = \{x\}$, we simply write $G - x$ in the latter case. For $uv \in E(\overline{G})$, we denote by $G + uv$ the graph obtained from G by adding an edge joining u and v . The union (resp. intersection) of two graphs G and H , denoted $G \cup H$ (resp. $G \cap H$), is the graph with vertex set $V(G) \cup V(H)$ (resp. $V(G) \cap V(H)$) and edge set $E(G) \cup E(H)$ (resp. $E(G) \cap E(H)$). The join of two graphs G and H , denoted $G \vee H$, is the graph with vertex set $V(G) \cup V(H)$ and edge set $E(G) \cup E(H) \cup \{uv : u \in V(G), v \in V(H)\}$. If G contains H as a minor, we denote this by $G \geq H$. G/xy denotes the graph obtained from G by contracting the edge xy . A vertex x is complete to a set S if x is adjacent to every vertex of S . We use $d_G(x)$ to denote the degree of a vertex x in the graph G . Given a subgraph H of G , we define $N(H)$ to be the set of vertices of $V(G) \setminus V(H)$ with a neighbor in $V(H)$.

Given a graph property \mathcal{P} , the extremal function for \mathcal{P} determines the maximum number of edges a graph on n vertices may have while not satisfying property \mathcal{P} . Extremal graph theory began when Turán [22] determined the extremal function for K_t subgraphs. He further characterized all such graphs attaining this maximum number of edges, the well-known Turán graphs. Dirac [2] was the first to consider the natural extension to K_t minors. When considering K_t minors instead of K_t subgraphs, the problem is much more difficult to solve, and the extremal function is known only for $t \leq 9$. Dirac [2] showed for $t \leq 5$, and Mader [11] for $t \in \{6, 7\}$, that any graph on $n \geq t$ vertices with at least $(t-2)n - \binom{t-1}{2} + 1$ edges has a K_t minor. The case $t = 6$ was also independently shown by Györi [5].

For $t \geq 8$, there exist families of graphs with $(t-2)n - \binom{t-1}{2} + 1$ edges, but which do not contain a K_t minor. To describe these families, we define an (H_1, H_2, k) -cockade recursively as follows. Any graph isomorphic to either H_1 or H_2 is an (H_1, H_2, k) -cockade. Now given two (H_1, H_2, k) -cockades G_1 and G_2 , we let G be the graph obtained from G_1 and G_2 by identifying a clique of size k in G_1 with a clique of size k in G_2 . Then G is an (H_1, H_2, k) -

cockade, and every (H_1, H_2, k) -cockade can be constructed in this fashion. If H_1 is isomorphic to H_2 , we simply write (H_1, k) -cockade. Jørgensen [10] showed that any graph on $n \geq 8$ vertices with at least $6n - 20$ edges either has a K_8 minor or is a $(K_{2,2,2,2,2}, 5)$ -cockade, and Song and Thomas [19] showed any graph on $n \geq 9$ vertices with at least $7n - 27$ edges either has a K_9 minor or is a $(K_{1,2,2,2,2,2}, 6)$ -cockade, or is isomorphic to $K_{2,2,2,3,3}$, settling the cases $t = 8$ and $t = 9$, respectively. The extremal function for K_t minors remains open for $t \geq 10$. Note that in a certain sense there is only one minimal counterexample for the case $t = 8$, namely $K_{2,2,2,2,2}$, and two for the case $t = 9$, namely $K_{1,2,2,2,2,2}$ and $K_{2,2,2,3,3}$. As pointed out by Song [18], there are at least eight minimal counterexamples for the case $t = 10$, and Thomas and Zhu (see [20]) have conjectured that there are no further minimal counterexamples.

As a simplification, the extremal function for K_t^- minors has been investigated, where K_t^- is the complete graph on t vertices with one edge removed. For $t \in \{5, 6\}$, Dirac [2] showed that any graph on $n \geq t$ vertices with at least $\frac{1}{2}((2t - 5)n - (t - 3)(t - 1))$ edges either has a K_t^- minor or is a $(K_{t-1}, t - 3)$ -cockade. For larger values of t , there is more than one minimal counterexample. Jakobsen [8, 9] showed any graph on $n \geq 7$ vertices with at least $\frac{1}{2}(9n - 24)$ edges either has a K_7^- minor or is a $(K_6, K_{2,2,2,2}, 4)$ -cockade, and Song [17] showed any graph on $n \geq 8$ vertices with at least $\frac{1}{2}(11n - 35)$ edges either has a K_8^- minor or is a $(K_7, K_{1,2,2,2,2}, 5)$ -cockade. The extremal function for K_t^- minors remains open for $t \geq 9$.

In this paper, we will consider $K_t^=$ minors, where $K_t^=$ denotes the complete graph on t vertices with two edges removed. Note that there are two nonisomorphic graphs $K_t^=$, depending on whether the removed edges share a common end or not. Let $\mathcal{K}_t^=$ denote the family consisting of the two nonisomorphic graphs $K_t^=$. Throughout this paper, we will use the following conventions. We say a graph G has no $K_t^=$ minor if G does not contain K as a minor for any $K \in \mathcal{K}_t^=$, and we say that G has a $K_t^=$ minor if G contains K as a minor for some $K \in \mathcal{K}_t^=$. Dirac [2] proved the following for $t \in \{5, 6\}$, and Jakobsen [7, 8] proved the

cases $t \in \{7, 8\}$.

Theorem 1.1 (*Dirac [2], Jakobsen [7, 8]*) For $t \in \{5, \dots, 8\}$, if G is a graph with $|G| \geq t-1$ and at least $(t-3)n - \frac{1}{2}(t-1)(t-4)$ edges, then either $G \geq K_t^-$ or G is a $(K_{t-1}, t-4)$ -cockade.

Our main result is to extend Theorem 1.1 to the case $t = 9$ as follows.

Theorem 1.2 If G is a graph with $|G| \geq 8$ and at least $6|G| - 20$ edges, then either $G \geq K_9^-$ or G is a $(K_8, K_{2,2,2,2,2}, 5)$ -cockade.

Note that for this case there are now two minimal counterexamples to consider. In Section 2 we prove several results necessary for the proof of Theorem 1.2, which we present in Section 3.

Our primary motivation for studying the extremal functions for K_t , K_t^- , and K_t^- minors is their integral use in proving results related to Hadwiger's conjecture [6], which claims that every graph with no K_t minor is $(t-1)$ -colorable. Hadwiger's conjecture is easily true for $t \leq 3$. The case $t = 4$ was shown by both Hadwiger [6] and Dirac [3], and a short proof was given much later by Woodall [24]. For $t = 5$, Wagner [23] showed that Hadwiger's conjecture is equivalent to the Four Color Theorem, and for $t = 6$, Robertson, Seymour, and Thomas [12] showed the same. The conjecture remains open for $t \geq 7$, although there are some partial results as follows. Albar and Gonçalves [1] showed for $t \in \{7, 8\}$, and the present author and Song [15] for $t = 9$, that every graph with no K_t minor is $(2t-6)$ -colorable. An alternate proof for the cases $t \in \{7, 8\}$ is also provided in [15]. By noticing that known minimal counterexamples to the extremal function for K_t minors for $t \geq 7$ are all $(t-1)$ -colorable, the present author and Song [15] proved the first general result on coloring graphs with no K_t minor for all $t \geq 6$, provided a suitable conjecture holds as follows.

Conjecture 1.3 (*Rolek and Song [15]*) For every $t \geq 1$, every graph on n vertices with at least $(t-2)n - \binom{t-1}{2} + 1$ edges either has a K_t minor or is $(t-1)$ -colorable.

Theorem 1.4 (Rolek and Song [15]) *For $t \geq 6$, if Conjecture 1.3 is true, then every graph with no K_t minor is $(2t - 6)$ -colorable.*

The chromatic number of graphs without K_t^- minors and $K_t^=$ minors has also been investigated. Jakobsen [8, 9] showed for $t = 7$, and the present author and Song [15] for $t = 8$, that if G has no K_t^- minor, then G is $(2t - 7)$ -colorable, and if G has no $K_t^=$ minor, then G is $(2t - 8)$ -colorable. Most recently, the present author [13] has used Theorem 1.2 to show the following.

Theorem 1.5 (Rolek [13]) *If G has no $K_9^=$ minor, then G is 10-colorable.*

2 Preliminaries

We begin this section with four results on $(K_8, K_{2,2,2,2,2}, 5)$ -cockades which will be useful early in Section 3.

Lemma 2.1 *Let G be a $(K_8, K_{2,2,2,2,2}, 5)$ -cockade, and let x and y be nonadjacent vertices in G . Then $G + xy \geq K_9^=$.*

Proof. We proceed by induction on $|G|$. It is easy to see that the statement holds if G is isomorphic to $K_{2,2,2,2,2}$. Hence we may assume that G is obtained from H_1 and H_2 by identifying a K_5 , where both H_1 and H_2 are $(K_8, K_{2,2,2,2,2}, 5)$ -cockades. If both $x, y \in V(H_i)$ for some $i \in \{1, 2\}$, then $G \geq K_9^=$ by induction. Thus we may assume that $x \in V(H_1) \setminus V(H_2)$ and $y \in V(H_2) \setminus V(H_1)$. If there exists $z \in V(H_1 \cap H_2)$ such that $xz \notin E(G)$, then by contracting the component of $H_2 - V(H_1 \cap H_2)$ containing y onto z and deleting all other components of $H_2 - V(H_1 \cap H_2)$, we see that $G \geq H_1 + xz$, and the resulting graph contains a $K_9^=$ minor by induction. Hence we may assume that x is complete to $V(H_1 \cap H_2)$, and similarly that y is complete to $V(H_1 \cap H_2)$. Since $G[(V(H_1 \cap H_2)) \cup \{x\}]$ is isomorphic to

K_6 , it follows that there is a K_8 -subgraph H' of H_1 such that $(V(H_1 \cap H_2)) \cup \{x\} \subseteq V(H')$. Then $G[V(H') \cup \{y\}]$ is a K_9^- -subgraph in $G + xy$. ■

From Lemma 2.1 we get the following.

Lemma 2.2 *If G' is a $(K_8, K_{2,2,2,2,2}, 5)$ -cockade, and G is the graph obtained from G' by adding a new vertex joined to at least six vertices of G' , then $G \geq K_9^-$.*

Proof. Let G and G' be as in the statement, and say $v \in V(G) \setminus V(G')$. If there exist $x, y \in N_G(v)$ such that $xy \notin E(G)$, then $G \geq G' + xy \geq K_9^-$ by Lemma 2.1. Hence $N_G(v)$ is complete, and so there exists a K_8 -subgraph H of G' such that $N_G(v) \subseteq V(H)$. But then $G[V(H) \cup \{v\}]$ is isomorphic to K_9^- . ■

Lemma 2.3 *Let G be a graph with $\delta(G) \geq 7$. Let $xy \in E(G)$ such that x and y have at least 5 common neighbors. If G/xy is a $(K_8, K_{2,2,2,2,2}, 5)$ -cockade, then $G \geq K_9^-$.*

Proof. We proceed by induction on $|G|$. The statement is easy to verify if G/xy is isomorphic to K_8 . Assume G/xy is isomorphic to $K_{2,2,2,2,2}$. Say $V(G/xy) = \{v_1, w_1, \dots, v_5, w_5\}$, where $v_i w_i \notin E(G/xy)$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, 5\}$, and w_5 is the vertex obtained by contracting the edge xy of G . We may assume by Pigeonhole that v_1, w_1, v_2, v_3 are common neighbors of x and y in G . If w_2 is also a common neighbor of x and y , then we may assume by symmetry that $xw_3, yw_4 \in E(G)$ since $\delta(G) \geq 7$ and each of w_3, w_4 must be adjacent to at least one of x, y . Now by contracting the edges $v_1 v_5$ and $w_3 w_4$, and noting that v_4 also must be adjacent to at least one of x, y , we see that $G \geq K_9^-$. Hence we may assume w_2 is not a common neighbor of x and y , and by symmetry neither is w_3 . Then v_4 , say, is a common neighbor of x and y . Now since $\delta(G) \geq 7$ and each of w_2, w_3, w_4 must be adjacent to at least one of x, y , we may assume that $xw_2, yw_3 \in E(G)$. By contracting the edges $v_1 v_5$ and $w_2 w_3$, we again see $G \geq K_9^-$.

Therefore we may assume that G/xy is a $(K_8, K_{2,2,2,2,2}, 5)$ -cockade obtained from H_1 and H_2 by identifying a K_5 , where both H_1 and H_2 are $(K_8, K_{2,2,2,2,2}, 5)$ -cockades. Say $v \in V(G/xy)$ is the vertex resulting from contracting the edge xy of G . Let $S = V(H_1 \cap H_2)$. Let H'_i be the subgraph of G induced by $(V(H_i) \setminus \{v\}) \cup \{x, y\}$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. If $v \in V(H_1) \setminus V(H_2)$, then every common neighbor of x and y in G belongs to $V(H'_1)$. Further, every vertex of S has at least 7 neighbors in $V(H'_1)$. Hence $G \geq K_9^-$ by induction applied to H'_1 . Thus $v \notin V(H_1) \setminus V(H_2)$ and similarly, $v \notin V(H_2) \setminus V(H_1)$. Therefore $v \in S$. Let Z denote the set of common neighbors of x and y in G . We may assume that $|Z \cap V(H_1)| \geq |Z \cap V(H_2)|$, and in particular that $Z \cap (V(H_1) \setminus V(H_2)) \neq \emptyset$ since $|Z| \geq 5$ and $|S \setminus \{v\}| = 4$. We may also assume that $d_{H'_1}(x) \geq d_{H'_1}(y)$. Let Z' be a set of neighbors of y in $H'_2 - x$ chosen maximal subject to $|Z'| \leq 4$ and then further such that $|Z \cap Z'|$ is maximum. Say $|Z'| = r$. Since G/xy is a $(K_8, K_{2,2,2,2,2}, 5)$ -cockade, it is 5-connected. Thus there exist r disjoint paths P_1, \dots, P_r in $G/xy - v$ with one end in Z' and the other end in $S \setminus \{v\}$. Then each path P_i is also a path in G . Let H^* be the graph obtained from G by contracting each path P_i onto its end in S and deleting all vertices of $V(H_2) \setminus V(H_1 \cup P_1 \cup \dots \cup P_r)$. Then by the choice of Z' , x and y have at least 5 common neighbors in H^* . Also, $H^* \geq H_1$. If $d_{H^*}(y) \geq 7$, then $\delta(H^*) \geq 7$, so $G \geq H^* \geq K_9^-$ by induction applied to H^* . Otherwise, $d_{H^*}(y) = 6$, y has only one neighbor in $V(H^*) \setminus S$, say $w \in Z$, and every vertex of $S \setminus \{v\}$ is a common neighbor of x and y . Since H_1 is a cockade and $H_1[S]$ is isomorphic to K_5 , some subgraph K of H_1 contains S , where K is either isomorphic to K_8 or $K_{2,2,2,2,2}$. Then there exists a path Q in H_1 with one end w and the other end in $V(K)$ such that Q avoids S , and Q has no internal vertices in $V(K)$ (possibly Q consists only of the vertex w). By contracting Q onto its end in $V(K)$, we may assume that y has one neighbor in $V(K) \setminus S$. Let K^* be the subgraph of H^* induced by $V(K) \cup \{x, y\} \setminus \{v\}$. Note that every vertex of $V(K)$ is adjacent to x , except the nonneighbor of v in K if K is isomorphic to $K_{2,2,2,2,2}$, because each such vertex is adjacent to at least one of x or y , and every neighbor of y in $V(K)$ is a common neighbor of x and

y . Hence, $K^* - y$ is isomorphic to K , that is $K^* - y$ is isomorphic to K_8 or $K_{2,2,2,2,2}$ and in particular is a $(K_8, K_{2,2,2,2,2}, 5)$ -cockade. Since y has six neighbors in $V(K^*)$, it follows from Lemma 2.2 that $G \geq K^* \geq K_9^-$. ■

It is easy to verify the following, so the details are omitted.

Lemma 2.4 *If G is a $(K_8, K_{2,2,2,2,2}, 5)$ -cockade, then $e(G) = 6|G| - 20$.*

Given a graph G and a set $T = \{v_1, \dots, v_4\} \subseteq V(G)$, we say that G has a K_4 minor rooted at T if, for $i \in \{1, \dots, 4\}$, G has disjoint subsets $T_i \subseteq V(G)$ such that $G[T_i]$ is connected, $T_i \cap T = \{v_i\}$, and there exist some vertices $u_i \in T_i$ and $u_j \in T_j$ such that $u_i u_j \in E(G)$ for all $j \in \{1, \dots, 4\}$ with $j \neq i$. The concept of rooted K_4 minors is an extension of earlier work by Seymour [16] and Thomassen [21] on 2-linked graphs. Robertson, Seymour, and Thomas utilized rooted K_4 minors in their proof of Hadwiger's conjecture for graphs with no K_6 minor [12], and the next result is a simplified restatement of (2.6) from that same paper. For a complete characterization of graphs with rooted K_4 minors, see Fabila-Monroy and Wood [4].

Theorem 2.5 *(Robertson, Seymour, and Thomas [12]) If G is 4-connected and $T \subseteq V(G)$ with $|T| = 4$, then either G has a K_4 -minor rooted at T , or G is planar with $e(G) \leq 3|G| - 7$.*

Lemma 2.6 *Let G be a graph with $|G| \in \{7, \dots, 11\}$ and $\delta(G) \geq 6$. If G is not 4-connected, then G contains K_5 as a subgraph. If G is not 5-connected, then G contains K_5^- as a subgraph.*

Proof. The statement is clearly true if G is a complete graph, so we may assume that $|G| \in \{8, \dots, 11\}$. Let S be a minimum separating set in G , and let G_1, G_2 be proper subgraphs of G such that $G_1 \cup G_2 = G$ and $G_1 \cap G_2 = G[S]$. Since $\delta(G) \geq 6$, it follows that $|G_i| \geq 7$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Since $|G| = |G_1| + |G_2| - |S| \geq 14 - |S|$, we have $|S| \geq 5$ for $|G| \in \{8, 9\}$, and $|S| \geq 4$ for $|G| = 10$. Assume first that G is not 4-connected. Then

$|G| = 11$ and $|S| = 3$, so $|G_1| = 7$. Any vertex $u \in V(G_1) \setminus S$ is complete to $V(G_1) \setminus \{u\}$. Since $|G_1 - S| = 4$, the subgraph of G induced by $(V(G_1) \setminus S) \cup \{v\}$ for any $v \in S$ is isomorphic to K_5 . Now assume that G is 4-connected, but not 5-connected. Then $|G| \in \{10, 11\}$. At least one of G_1, G_2 , say G_1 , must satisfy $|G_1| = 7$. Any vertex $u \in V(G_1) \setminus S$ is complete to $V(G_1) \setminus \{u\}$. Since $|G_1 - S| \geq 3$, the subgraph of G induced by $(V(G_1) \setminus S) \cup \{v_1, v_2\}$ for any $v_1, v_2 \in S$ contains K_5^- as a subgraph. ■

Lemma 2.7 *Let G be a graph with $|G| \in \{7, \dots, 11\}$ and $\delta(G) \geq 6$. Then either G contains K_5 as a subgraph, or for any set $T \subseteq V(G)$ with $|T| = 5$ there exists $v \in T$ such that $G - v$ has a K_4 minor rooted at $T \setminus \{v\}$.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.6, if G is not 4-connected, then G contains K_5 as a subgraph and we are done. Thus we may assume G is 4-connected. Let $T \subseteq V(G)$ such that $|T| = 5$. Assume first that G is 5-connected, and let $v \in T$ be arbitrary. Then $G - v$ is a 4-connected graph on $|G| - 1$ vertices with $\delta(G) \geq 5$. Note that $e(G - v) \geq \lceil \frac{1}{2}(|G| - 1)\delta(G) \rceil \geq 3(|G| - 1) - 6$, and it follows from Theorem 2.5 that $G - v$ has a K_4 minor rooted at $T \setminus \{v\}$. Therefore we may assume G is not 5-connected, and so by Lemma 2.6 G contains K_5^- as a subgraph. In particular, G contains a K_4 subgraph H . Since G is 4-connected, there exist four disjoint paths P_1, P_2, P_3, P_4 with one end in $V(H)$, one end in T , and no internal vertices in $V(H) \cup T$. Let $v \in T$ be the unique vertex not met by any P_i . Then contracting each path P_i to a single vertex gives a K_4 minor rooted at T in $G - v$. ■

Lemma 2.8 *Let G be a graph with $|G| \in \{8, \dots, 11\}$ and $\delta(G) \geq 6$, and let $v_1, \dots, v_6 \in V(G)$ be distinct. If $v_1v_2 \notin E(G)$, then there exists some component C of $G - \{v_1, \dots, v_6\}$ such that either $\{v_1, v_2\} \subseteq N_G(C)$ or $\{v_3, \dots, v_6\} \subseteq N_G(C)$.*

Proof. Suppose for a contradiction that no such component exists. Put $T = \{v_1, \dots, v_6\}$.




Figure 2.1: The Petersen graph P .

Since $\delta(G) \geq 6$ and $|T| = 6$, every vertex of T has at least one neighbor in $V(G) \setminus T$. Thus it must be the case that $G - T$ is disconnected. Let C_1, C_2 be distinct components of $G - T$. Then for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, any vertex of C_i is adjacent to at most four vertices of T , and it follows that $|V(C_i)| \geq 3$ since $\delta(G) \geq 6$. But then $|G| \geq |T| + |C_1| + |C_2| \geq 12$, a contradiction. ■

The following lemma is proved by computer search. The details of this search can be found in [14].

Lemma 2.9 *If G is a graph with $|G| \in \{9, 10, 11\}$ and $\delta(G) \geq 6$, then either G contains $K_7^- \cup K_1$ as a minor, or G is isomorphic to one of the five graphs $\overline{C_5} \vee \overline{C_4}$, $\overline{C_9}$, $K_{3,3,3}$, $\overline{C_6} \vee \overline{K_3}$, or \overline{P} , where \overline{P} is the complement of the Petersen graph P . Furthermore, the graphs $\overline{C_5} \vee \overline{C_4}$ and $\overline{C_9}$ contain K_7^- as a minor, and the graphs $K_{3,3,3}$, $\overline{C_6} \vee \overline{K_3}$, and \overline{P} are all edge maximal with respect to not having a $K_7^- \cup K_1$ minor.*

The remaining results in this section will all be used in the proof of Theorem 1.2 to handle the counterexamples $K_{3,3,3}$, $\overline{C_6} \vee \overline{K_3}$, and \overline{P} of Lemma 2.9.

Lemma 2.10 *Let G be isomorphic to either $K_{3,3,3}$ or $\overline{C_6} \vee \overline{K_3}$. If e_1, e_2, e_3 are distinct missing edges of G such that e_1, e_2 share a common end, then $G + \{e_1, e_2, e_3\} \geq K_8^-$.*

Proof. Since e_1, e_2, e_3 are not independent, there exist $u, v \in V(G)$ such that $uv \in E(G)$ and u, v are both incident to two missing edges of $G + \{e_1, e_2, e_3\}$. By contracting uv we

obtain a K_8^- minor of $G + \{e_1, e_2, e_3\}$. ■

Lemma 2.11 *Let e_1, e_2, e_3 be three distinct missing edges of \overline{P} such that no vertex of \overline{P} is incident to every e_i . If either the e_i do not all belong to the same 5 vertex cycle in P or the e_i induce a 4 vertex path in P , then $\overline{P} + \{e_1, e_2, e_3\} \geq K_8^-$. Furthermore, the graph obtained from \overline{P} by adding any four missing edges contains K_8^- as a minor.*

Proof. Assume first that e_1, e_2, e_3 all belong to a 4 vertex path in P . Without loss of generality, $\{e_1, e_2, e_3\} = \{v_0v_1, v_1v_2, v_2v_3\}$, where the vertices of P are labeled as in Figure 2.1. By contracting the edges v_0v_6 and v_3v_7 , we see that $\overline{P} + \{v_0v_1, v_1v_2, v_2v_3\} \geq K_8^-$. So we may now assume that e_1, e_2, e_3 do not all belong to some 5 vertex cycle in P . If the edges e_i are pairwise disjoint, then without loss of generality, $\{e_1, e_2, e_3\}$ is one of the sets $\{v_0v_5, v_2v_3, v_6v_9\}$, $\{v_0v_1, v_2v_3, v_5v_8\}$, $\{v_0v_5, v_1v_2, v_3v_4\}$, or $\{v_0v_5, v_1v_6, v_3v_4\}$. In each case, it is straightforward to show that $\overline{P} + \{e_1, e_2, e_3\} \geq K_8^-$. So we may assume that two e_i are incident to the same vertex, say $\{e_1, e_2\} = \{v_0v_1, v_0v_4\}$. Then e_3 is either incident to v_5 or not, and by symmetry we may assume e_3 is either v_5v_7 or v_6v_8 . Both of these cases are also straightforward to verify. For the second part of the statement, it is easy to see that given any four missing edges of \overline{P} , some three of those edges satisfy the conditions of the first part of the statement. ■

Lemma 2.12 *Let $A_1, A_2 \subseteq V(\overline{P})$ such that $|A_1| \geq |A_2| \geq 7$. Then for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ there exist vertices $v_i \in A_i$ such that the graph obtained from \overline{P} by adding all missing edges incident to v_i in $\overline{P}[A_i]$ contains K_8^- as a minor.*

Proof. Let the vertices of P be as labeled in Figure 2.1. Since $|A_1| \geq 7$, there must exist two missing edges of $\overline{P}[A_1]$ which share a common end, say $\{v_0, v_1, v_4\} \subseteq A_1$. From Lemma 2.11, it follows that if $\overline{P}[A_2]$ contains any missing edge e other than $v_0v_1, v_0v_4, v_0v_5, v_2v_3$, or v_6v_9 ,

then we are done by adding all missing edges in $\overline{P}[A_1]$ incident to v_0 and all missing edges in $\overline{P}[A_2]$ incident to one end of e . Since $|A_2| \geq 7$, such an edge e must exist. ■

3 Proof of Theorem 1.2

Suppose that G is a minimum counterexample to Theorem 1.2, and put $n := |G|$. Then $e(G) \geq 6n - 20$, but G is not a $(K_8, K_{2,2,2,2,2}, 5)$ -cockade and $G \not\geq K_9^-$. We may suppose that $e(G) = 6n - 20$. It is easy to verify that $n \geq 11$.

(1) $\delta(G) \geq 7$.

Let $x \in V(G)$ such that $d_G(x) = \delta(G)$. Then $e(G - x) = 6n - 20 - \delta(G) = 6(n - 1) - 14 - \delta(G)$. If $e(G - x) > 6(n - 1) - 20$, then by the minimality of G and Lemma 2.4, $G - x \geq K_9^-$, a contradiction since $G \geq G - x$. If $e(G - x) = 6(n - 1) - 20$, then $d_G(x) = 6$, and since $G \not\geq K_9^-$, we see by the minimality of G that $G - x$ is a $(K_8, K_{2,2,2,2,2}, 5)$ -cockade. But then by Lemma 2.2, $G \geq K_9^-$, a contradiction. Hence, $e(G - x) < 6(n - 1) - 20$. It follows that $\delta(G) > 6$. ■

(2) $\delta(G[N(x)]) \geq 6$ for all $x \in V(G)$.

Let $xy \in E(G)$ and put $d := |N(x) \cap N(y)|$. Then $e(G/xy) = 6n - 20 - (d + 1) = 6(n - 1) - 15 - d$. If $e(G/xy) > 6(n - 1) - 20$, then by Lemma 2.4 and the minimality of G , $G/xy \geq K_9^-$, a contradiction since $G \geq G/xy$. If $e(G/xy) = 6(n - 1) - 20$, then $d = 5$, and since $G \not\geq K_9^-$, we see by the minimality of G that G/xy is a $(K_8, K_{2,2,2,2,2}, 5)$ -cockade. But then by Lemma 2.3 and (1), $G \geq K_9^-$, a contradiction. Hence, $e(G/xy) < 6(n - 1) - 20$. It follows that $d > 5$. ■

We will utilize the following notation throughout the remainder of the proof. Let S be a minimal separating set in G , and let G_1 and G_2 be two subgraphs of G such that $G = G_1 \cup G_2$ and $G_1 \cap G_2 = G[S]$. It is an immediate consequence of (1) that

(3) $|G_i| \geq 8$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$.

(4) Neither G_1 nor G_2 is a $(K_8, K_{2,2,2,2,2}, 5)$ -cockade.

Suppose that G_1 , say, is a $(K_8, K_{2,2,2,2,2}, 5)$ -cockade. If $|S| \geq 6$, then by contracting any component of $G_2 - S$ to a single vertex, it follows from Lemma 2.2 that $G \geq K_9^-$, a contradiction. Hence $|S| \leq 5$, and it follows from Lemma 2.1 that $G[S]$ is complete. Then since $e(G_2) = e(G) - e(G_1) + e(G[S])$, from Lemma 2.4 we have $e(G_2) = (6n - 20) - (6|G_1| - 20) + \binom{|S|}{2} = 6|G_2| - 6|S| + \binom{|S|}{2}$. If $|S| \leq 4$, then $e(G_2) \geq 6|G_2| - 18$, and it follows from (3), Lemma 2.4, and the minimality of G that $G_2 \geq K_9^-$, a contradiction. Hence $|S| = 5$, and we have $e(G_2) = 6|G_2| - 20$. Since $G \not\geq K_9^-$, we see $G_2 \not\geq K_9^-$, and so by (3) and the minimality of G , G_2 is a $(K_8, K_{2,2,2,2,2}, 5)$ -cockade. However, since $G[S]$ is isomorphic to K_5 , it follows that G is also a $(K_8, K_{2,2,2,2,2}, 5)$ -cockade, a contradiction. \blacksquare

For $i \in \{1, 2\}$, let d_i be the maximum number of edges that can be added to G_{3-i} by contracting edges of G with at least one end in G_i . More precisely, let d_i be the largest integer such that G_i contains disjoint sets of vertices $V_1, V_2, \dots, V_{|S|}$ so that $G_i[V_j]$ is connected and $|S \cap V_j| = 1$ for $j \in \{1, \dots, |S|\}$, and such that the graph obtained from G_i by contracting V_1, V_2, \dots, V_p each to a single vertex and deleting $V(G) \setminus (\cup_j V_j)$ has $e(G[S]) + d_i$ edges. Let G_i^* be a graph obtained from G by contracting G_{3-i} onto S so that $G_i^* - S = G_i - S$ and $e(G_i^*) = e(G_i) + d_{3-i}$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$.

(5) For $i \in \{1, 2\}$, $e(G_i) \leq 6|G_i| - 20 - d_{3-i}$, with equality only if G_i^* is a $(K_8, K_{2,2,2,2,2}, 5)$ -cockade.

If, say, $e(G_1) > 6|G_1| - 20 - d_2$, then $e(G_1^*) > 6|G_1^*| - 20$, and so it follows from (3), Lemma 2.4, and the minimality of G that $G_1^* \geq K_9^-$, a contradiction. If $e(G_1) = 6|G_1| - 20 - d_2$, then $e(G_1^*) = 6|G_1^*| - 20$, and then since $G \not\geq K_9^-$, it now follows from the minimality of G that G_1^* is a $(K_8, K_{2,2,2,2,2}, 5)$ -cockade. \blacksquare

(6) $e(G) \leq 6n - 40 + 6|S| - d_1 - d_2 - e(G[S])$.

This follows from (5) and the fact that $e(G) = e(G_1) + e(G_2) - e(G[S])$. ■

(7) G is 5-connected.

Since $e(G) = 6n - 20$, it follows from (6) that $6|S| \geq 20 + d_1 + d_2 + e(G[S])$. Now since $e(G[S]) \geq \frac{1}{2}\delta(G[S])|S|$ and $d_i \geq |S| - \delta(G[S]) - 1$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, we see $4|S| \geq 18 + \frac{1}{2}\delta(G[S])(|S| - 4)$. Therefore $|S| \geq 5$. ■

(8) If $|S| \in \{5, 6\}$, then for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ there exists $x \in V(G_i) \setminus S$ with $d_G(x) \leq 11$.

Suppose to the contrary that $d_G(x) \geq 12$ for every vertex $x \in V(G_1) \setminus S$, say. Then $|G_1| \geq 13$ and $|G_1| - |S| \geq 7$. Then $2e(G_1) \geq 12(|G_1| - |S|) + e(V(G_1) \setminus S, S) + 2e(G[S])$. By (5), we also have $2e(G_1) \leq 12|G_1| - 40 - 2d_2$. Hence $e(V(G_1) \setminus S, S) \leq 12|S| - 40 - 2(d_2 + e(G[S]))$. Now there exists $y_1 \in V(G_2) \setminus S$. Since $|S| \leq 6$ and $d_G(y_1) \geq 7$ by (1), y_1 has a neighbor $y_2 \in V(G_2) \setminus S$. By (2), y_1 and y_2 have at least 6 common neighbors. Say $y_3, y_4, \dots, y_{|S|}$ are common neighbors of y_1 and y_2 in G . Note that $N(y_1) \subseteq V(G_2)$. Now there exist disjoint paths $P_1, \dots, P_{|S|}$ in G , each with one end in $\{y_1, \dots, y_{|S|}\}$, the other end in S , and all internal vertices in $G_2 - S$. By contracting each of these paths onto its end in S , it follows that $e(G[S]) + d_2 \geq 2(|S| - 2) + 1 = 2|S| - 3$. Thus $e(V(G_1) \setminus S, S) \leq 8|S| - 34$. Therefore $2e(G_1 - S) \geq 12(|G_1| - |S|) - e(V(G_1) \setminus S, S) \geq 12(|G_1| - |S|) - 8|S| + 34$, and so $e(G_1 - S) \geq 6(|G_1| - |S|) - 7$ since $|S| \in \{5, 6\}$. Since $e(G_1 - S) \leq \binom{|G_1| - |S|}{2}$, this implies $|G_1| - |S| \geq 12$. From the minimality of G and Lemma 2.4, we see $G_1 - S \geq K_9^-$, a contradiction. ■

(9) G is 6-connected.

Suppose not. By (7), there exists a minimal separating set S of G with $|S| = 5$. By (8), there exists $x \in V(G_1) \setminus S$ such that $d_G(x) \leq 11$. By (1), $d_G(x) \geq 7$, and by (2), $\delta(G[N(x)]) \geq 6$. If $G[N(x)]$ contains a subgraph H isomorphic to K_5 , then let P_1, \dots, P_5 be disjoint paths in G with one end in $V(H)$ and one end in S . Otherwise, let P_1, \dots, P_5 be disjoint paths with one end in $N(x)$, the other end in S , and no internal vertices in $N(x)$. Say $V(P_i) \cap N(x) = v_i$

for $i \in \{1, \dots, 5\}$. Then by Lemma 2.7 the end of some P_i in $N(x)$, say v_1 , is such that $G[N(x)] - v_1$ has a K_4 minor rooted at $\{v_2, v_3, v_4, v_5\}$. By additionally contracting the edge xv_1 if necessary, we may thus in both cases assume that the ends of P_1, \dots, P_5 in $N(x)$ belong to a K_5 subgraph of some minor of $G[N[x]]$. By now contracting each path P_i onto its end in S , it follows that $d_1 + e(G[S]) = 10$. Similarly, $d_2 + e(G[S]) = 10$, and so $d_1 = d_2$. Note that by (4) and (5), for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ we must have either $d_{3-i} \geq 1$ or $e(G_i) \leq 6|G_i| - 21 - d_{3-i}$. Then in either case, $6n - 20 = e(G) = e(G_1) + e(G_2) - e(G[S]) \leq 6n - 10 - \max\{1, d_1\} - (d_2 + e(G[S])) \leq 6n - 21$, a contradiction. ■

(10) *There is no minimal separating set S of G such that $G[S]$ is complete.*

Suppose such a separating set S exists. If $|S| \geq 7$, then by contracting any two components of $G - S$ to a single vertex each, we see $G \geq K_9^-$, a contradiction. Thus, by (9), $|S| = 6$. Since $G[S]$ is complete, we have $d_1 = d_2 = 0$. For $i \in \{1, 2\}$, since $G_i \not\geq K_9^-$ and G_i is not a $(K_8, K_{2,2,2,2,2}, 5)$ -cockade by (4), we have $e(G_i) \leq 6|G_i| - 21$ by (5). But then $6n - 20 = e(G) = e(G_1) + e(G_2) - e(G[S]) \leq (6|G_1| - 21) + (6|G_2| - 21) - 15 = 6n - 21$, a contradiction. ■

(11) $\delta(G) \geq 8$.

Suppose there exists $x \in V(G)$ such that $d_G(x) \leq 7$. By (1), $d_G(x) = 7$. By (2), $\delta(G[N(x)]) = 6$, and so $G[N(x)]$ is isomorphic to K_7 . But $N(x)$ is a separating set of G , and so contains some minimal separating set of G , contrary to (10). ■

(12) *There is no minimal separating set S of G such that $G[S \setminus \{x\}]$ is complete for some $x \in S$.*

Suppose there exists $x \in S$ such that $G[S \setminus \{x\}]$ is complete. Note that $|S| \geq 6$ by (9). If $|S| \geq 8$, then since $G[S \setminus \{x\}]$ contains K_7 as a subgraph, we can contract any two components of $G - S$ each to a single vertex to obtain a K_9^- minor, a contradiction. So $|S| \in \{6, 7\}$. By contracting any component of $G_i - S$ onto x , we see that $d_i + e(G[S]) = \binom{|S|}{2}$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$,

and in particular $d_1 = d_2 = |S| - \delta(G[S]) - 1 \geq 1$. Suppose, say, $e(G_1) \leq 6|G_1| - 21 - d_2$. Then $6n - 20 = e(G) = e(G_1) + e(G_2) - e(G[S]) \leq (6|G_1| - 21 - d_2) + (6|G_2| - 20 - d_1) - e(G[S]) \leq 6n - 21$, a contradiction.

Hence by (5), we have $e(G_i) = 6|G_i| - 20 - d_{3-i}$, and G_i^* is a $(K_8, K_{2,2,2,2,2}, 5)$ -cockade for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Now $6n - 20 = e(G) = e(G_1) + e(G_2) - e(G[S]) = (6|G_1| - 20 - d_2) + (6|G_2| - 20 - d_1) - e(G[S]) = 6n - 19 - d_1$. Thus we must have $d_1 = d_2 = 1$, and so $G[S]$ is isomorphic to $K_{|S|}^-$. Since $G_i^*[S]$ contains a K_6 subgraph, there must exist some K_8 subgraph H_i of G_i^* such that $S \subseteq V(H_i)$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Then $G[V(H_i)]$ is isomorphic to K_8^- . Thus $G[V(H_1 \cup H_2)]$ is not a $(K_8, K_{2,2,2,2,2}, 5)$ -cockade, but is a graph on $16 - |S|$ vertices with $6(16 - |S|) - 20$ edges. Since $n \geq 11 > 16 - |S|$, $G[V(H_1 \cup H_2)]$ contains a K_9^- minor by the minimality of G , a contradiction. \blacksquare

$$(13) \delta(G) \geq 9.$$

Suppose there exists $x \in V(G)$ such that $d_G(x) \leq 8$. By (11), $d_G(x) = 8$. Since $\delta(G[N(x)]) \geq 6$ by (2), it follows that $G[N(x)]$ is isomorphic to $K_8 - M$, where M is a matching of $N(x)$. If $|M| \leq 2$, then $G[N(x)]$ contains K_9^- as a subgraph, a contradiction. Suppose $|M| = 3$. Let C be a component of $G - N[x]$. Since G is 6-connected by (9), $N(C)$ contains both ends of some missing edge e of $G[N(x)]$. By contracting C onto one end of e , we see that $G \geq K_9^-$, a contradiction. Hence $|M| = 4$. That is, $G[N(x)]$ is isomorphic to $K_{2,2,2,2}$. Say $N(x) = \{v_1, w_1, \dots, v_4, w_4\}$, where $v_i w_i \notin E(G)$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, 4\}$.

$$(13.1) \ G - N[x] \text{ is connected.}$$

If not, let C_1, C_2 be distinct components of $G - N[x]$. Since G is 6-connected by (9), $N(C_1)$ and $N(C_2)$ each contain at least two nonadjacent pairs of vertices of $N(x)$. Thus it is possible to pick distinct pairs from each of $N(C_1)$ and $N(C_2)$, say $v_i, w_i \in N(C_i)$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. By contracting C_i onto v_i for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ we see $G \geq K_9^-$, a contradiction. \blacksquare

$$(13.2) \ \text{No vertex of } G - N[x] \text{ is adjacent to a pair of nonadjacent vertices of } N(x).$$

Suppose to the contrary that there exists $z \in V(G) \setminus N[x]$ such that z is adjacent to, say, v_1 and w_1 . Let C be a component of $G - N[x] - z$. If $N(C)$ contains some pair of nonadjacent vertices of $N(x)$ distinct from v_1, w_1 , say $v_2, w_2 \in N(C)$, then by contracting C onto v_2 and contracting the edge v_1z , we see $G \geq K_9^-$, a contradiction. Hence $N(C)$ can contain no nonadjacent pair of vertices of $N(x)$ other than v_1, w_1 . It follows that $|N(C) \cap N(x)| \leq 5$. Since G is 6-connected by (9), we conclude $|N(C) \cap N(x)| = 5$, and $\{v_1, w_1, z\} \subseteq N(C)$. Without loss of generality, $N(C) = \{v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4, z, w_1\}$. Since $N(C)$ is a minimal separating set of G , we may put $S = N(C)$. Note that $G[\{v_1, w_1, v_2, v_3, v_4\}]$ is isomorphic to K_5^- , so $e(G[S]) \geq 11$. By (8), there exists $y \in V(G) \setminus S$ such that $d_G(y) \leq 11$. Since G is 6-connected by (9), there exist disjoint paths P_1, \dots, P_6 with one end in $N(y)$, the other end in S , and no internal vertices in $N(y) \cup S$. Say u_i is the end of P_i in $N(y)$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, 6\}$, v_i is the end of P_i in S for $i \in \{1, \dots, 4\}$, and P_5, P_6 have ends z, w_1 in S , respectively. If $u_1u_6 \in E(G)$, then by contracting each path P_i onto its end in S and additionally contracting the edge yu_5 , we see $e(G[S]) + d_2 = 15$. Otherwise, by Lemma 2.8 there exists some component C' of $G[N(y)] - \{u_1, \dots, u_6\}$ such that either $\{u_1, u_6\} \subseteq N(C')$ or $\{u_2, \dots, u_5\} \subseteq N(C')$. By contracting C' onto u_1 and contracting yu_5 in the former case, or contracting C' onto u_5 and contracting yu_1 in the latter case, and then contracting each path P_i onto its end in S we again see $e(G[S]) + d_2 = 15$. By symmetry, $e(G[S]) + d_1 = 15$ as well. By (12), $d_i \geq 2$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Thus by (6), we see $6n - 20 = e(G) \leq 6n - 40 + 36 - (e(G[S]) + d_2) - d_1 \leq 6n - 21$, a contradiction. ■

(13.3) *Every vertex of $N(x)$ has at least three neighbors in $G - N[x]$.*

Since $\delta(G) \geq 8$ by (11), there exists $z \in V(G) \setminus N[x]$ such that $zv_1 \in E(G)$, say. By (2), z and v_1 have at least six common neighbors. By (13.2), at most three of these common neighbors can belong to $N(x)$, and (13.3) follows. ■

(13.4) *$G - N[x]$ is 2-connected.*

By (13.1), suppose to the contrary that z is a cut-vertex of $G - N[x]$. If C_1 and C_2 are components of $G - N[x] - z$ with, say, $v_i, w_i \in N(C_i)$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, then by contracting each C_i onto v_i we see $G \geq K_9^-$, a contradiction. Since G is 6-connected by (9), it follows that every component C of $G - N[x] - z$ satisfies $|N(C) \cap N(x)| = 5$, with v_1 and w_1 , say, in $N(C)$, and at most one of v_i or w_i in $N(C)$ for $i \in \{2, 3, 4\}$. Without loss of generality, assume C_1 is a component of $G - N[x] - z$ with $\{v_2, v_3, v_4\} \subseteq N(C)$. Consider the three edges $e_1 = v_2w_3$, $e_2 = v_3w_2$, and $e_3 = w_2w_3$. Then for $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, by (2) the ends of e_i have at least six common neighbors, only five of which belong to $N[x]$, and so there exists $y_i \in V(G) \setminus N[x]$ adjacent to both ends of e_i . By (13.2), y_1, y_2, y_3 are distinct, and in particular at most one $y_i = z$. As $w_2, w_3 \notin N(C_1)$, $y_i \notin V(C_1)$ for $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Furthermore, if two of y_1, y_2, y_3 belong to the same component C_2 of $G - N[x] - z$, then C_2 is a component with $v_2, w_2 \in N(C_2)$, say, contrary to the above. Thus there exist at least two components C_2 and C_3 of $G - N[x] - z$ distinct from C_1 . Without loss of generality, we may assume $w_2 \in N(C_2)$. Now by contracting C_1 and C_2 onto z , contracting C_3 onto v_1 , and contracting the edge v_2z , we see $G \geq K_9^-$, a contradiction. \blacksquare

We now consider the graph $H = G - \{x, v_3, w_3, v_4, w_4\}$. We claim that H is 4-connected. Suppose Q is a minimum separating set of at most three vertices in H . By (13.4), we have $|Q| \geq 2$ and $|Q \cap N(x)| \leq 1$. If $|Q \cap N(x)| = 1$, then by symmetry we may assume $w_2 \in Q$. Since $H[\{v_1, w_1, v_2\}]$ is connected, v_1, w_1 , and v_2 all belong to the same component C of $H - Q$. If $w_2 \notin Q$, then w_2 also belongs to C , and in this case we assume that Q and w_2 are chosen so that $|Q \cap N(w_2)|$ is maximal. We next claim that there exist v'_1 and w'_1 in $V(G) \setminus (N[x] \cup Q)$ adjacent to v_1 and w_1 , respectively. If not, then by (13.2) and (13.3), it must be the case that w_1 , say, has exactly three neighbors z_1, z_2, z_3 in $G - N[x]$, and $Q = \{z_1, z_2, z_3\}$. Now $w_2 \notin Q$, so by our choice of Q and w_2 , it follows that w_2 is complete to Q . Since $v_2w_1 \in E(G)$, v_2 and w_1 have at least one common neighbor in $G - N[x]$ by (2). This common neighbor must be one of z_1, z_2, z_3 , say z_1 , but then z_1 is adjacent to v_2 and w_2 ,

contradicting (13.2). Thus the claim is proved, and there exist $v'_1, w'_1 \in V(G) \setminus (N[x] \cup Q)$ such that $v_1 v'_1, w_1 w'_1 \in E(G)$. Now we have $v'_1, w'_1 \in V(C)$. By (13.4), there exist two internally disjoint v'_1, w'_1 -paths in $G - N[x]$. Since $|Q| \leq 3$, at least one of these paths must be contained entirely within $G[V(C) \cup Q]$. Note that since $G \not\geq K_9^-$, there must then be no v_i, w_i -path in $G[V(C') \cup \{v_i, w_i\}]$ for $i \in \{3, 4\}$, where C' is any component of $H - Q$ distinct from C . Hence at most one of v_i, w_i has a neighbor in C' for $i \in \{3, 4\}$. It follows that C' is separated from x by Q and at most two vertices of $N(x)$. But since $|Q| \leq 3$, this contradicts that G is 6-connected by (9). This proves the claim that H is 4-connected.

If there exists a K_4 minor of H rooted at $\{v_1, w_1, v_2, w_2\}$, then $G \geq K_9^-$, a contradiction. Thus $e(H) \leq 3|H| - 7 = 3(n - 5) - 7$ by Theorem 2.5. For $i \in \{3, 4\}$, v_i and w_i have no common neighbor in $G - N[x]$ by (13.2), so they together have at most $|G| - |N[x]| = n - 9$ neighbors in $G - N[x]$. Furthermore, the vertices v_3, w_3, v_4, w_4 are together incident with 20 edges of $G[N(x)]$. Therefore $6n - 20 = e(G) \leq d_G(x) + 20 + 2(n - 9) + e(H) \leq 8 + 20 + 2(n - 9) + 3(n - 5) - 7 = 5n - 12$. It follows that $n \leq 8$, a contradiction which completes the proof of (13). ■

(14) *Suppose $x \in V(G)$ with $d_G(x) \in \{9, 10, 11\}$, and let $M \subseteq N(x)$ be the vertices of $N(x)$ which are not complete to all other vertices of $N(x)$. Then there is no component C of $G - N[x]$ such that $N(C') \cap M \subseteq N(C)$ for all components C' of $G - N[x]$.*

Suppose to the contrary that such a component C exists. Among all vertices x with $d_G(x) \in \{9, 10, 11\}$ for which such a component C exists, choose x to be of minimum degree. Note that $N(C') \cap M \neq \emptyset$ for all components C' of $G - N[x]$ by (10). Suppose for a contradiction that $M \setminus N(C) \neq \emptyset$, and choose $y \in M \setminus N(C)$ to be of minimum degree among all vertices in $M \setminus N(C)$. Then $d_G(y) < d_G(x)$ since y has no neighbor outside $N[x]$ by the existence of C . Now let K be the component of $G - N[y]$ containing C . We claim that $N(x) \setminus N[y] \not\subseteq V(K)$. So suppose instead that $N(x) \setminus N[y] \subseteq V(K)$. Let C' be any component of $G - N[x]$ distinct from C . Note that such a component C' exists since

otherwise K is the only component of $G - N[y]$, contrary to our choice of x and C . Let K' be the component of $G - N[y]$ containing C' . We may assume C' is chosen such that $K' \neq K$, since otherwise K is the only component of $G - N[y]$, again a contradiction. Then $V(K') \cap (N(x) \setminus N[y]) = \emptyset$, since $N(x) \setminus N[y] \subseteq V(K)$. Hence $N(K') = N(C') \subseteq N(y)$. Thus we have that $N(C') \cap M \subseteq N(C) \cap N(y)$. Therefore $N(K') \cap M_y \subseteq N(K)$, where M_y is the set of vertices of $N(y)$ not complete to all other vertices of $N(y)$. Noticing that $M_y \subseteq M$ and that the component K' was essentially arbitrary (every component K' of $G - N[y]$ corresponds with some component C' of $G - N[x]$), we see that the existence of y and K contradicts the choice of x and C . Therefore $N(x) \setminus N[y] \not\subseteq V(K)$, as claimed.

Hence there exists some component H of $G[N(x) \setminus N[y]]$ with $V(H) \cap N(C) = \emptyset$. We must have $d_G(z) \geq d_G(y)$ for all $z \in V(H)$ by the choice of y . If $|H| = 1$, then it follows that $d_G(z) = d_G(y)$ and $N(z) = N(y)$. But then H is a component of $G - N[y]$ contradicting the choice of x and C . Thus $|H| \geq 2$. On the other hand, $|H| \leq d_G(x) - d_G(y) \leq 11 - 9 = 2$, and so $|H| = 2$, $d_G(x) = 11$, and $d_G(y) = 9$. By (2) applied to y , we see that $G[N(y) \cap N(x)]$ has minimum degree at least 5. Then the edges of $G[N(x)]$ are the edges of $N(x) \cap N(y)$, edges incident with y , and edges incident with $V(H)$. Therefore, $e(G[N(x)]) \geq \frac{5}{2}(d_G(y) - 1) + (d_G(y) - 1) + (2(d_G(y) - 1) - 1) = 43 > 5d_G(x) - 14$. By Theorem 1.1, we see that $G[N(x)] \geq K_8^-$, and therefore $G[N[x]] \geq K_9^-$, a contradiction. This proves that $M \setminus N(C) = \emptyset$, that is $M \subseteq N(C)$.

If $G[N(x)] \geq K_7^- \cup K_1$, then let $y \in N(x)$ such that $G[N(x) \setminus \{y\}] \geq K_7^-$. If $y \notin N(C)$, then y is complete to $N(x) \setminus \{y\}$, and so $G[N(x)] \geq K_8^-$ and $G[N[x]] \geq K_9^-$, a contradiction. Hence $y \in N(C)$ and every nonneighbor of y in $N(x)$ also belongs to $N(C)$ since $M \subseteq N(C)$. Now by contracting C onto y , we again find, along with x , a K_9^- minor in G , a contradiction. Hence by Lemma 2.9, $G[N(x)]$ is isomorphic to one of the five graphs $\overline{C}_5 \vee \overline{C}_4$, \overline{C}_9 , $K_{3,3,3}$, $\overline{C}_6 \vee \overline{K}_3$, or \overline{P} , where \overline{P} is the complement of the Petersen graph. Suppose $G[N(x)]$ is isomorphic to one of $\overline{C}_5 \vee \overline{C}_4$ or \overline{C}_9 . In both cases, $G[N(x)] \geq K_7^-$ and $N(x) = M \subseteq N(C)$, so

by contracting C to a single vertex we obtain, along with x , a K_9^- minor of G , a contradiction. Thus we may suppose $G[N(x)]$ is isomorphic to one of $K_{3,3,3}$, $\overline{C_6} \vee \overline{K_3}$, or \overline{P} . Note that by Lemma 2.9, these three graphs are edge-maximal subject to not having a $K_7^- \cup K_1$ minor. We first show the following.

(14.1) $G - N[x]$ is connected.

Suppose C' is a component of $G - N[x]$ distinct from C . By (10), $N(C')$ contains both ends of some missing edge e of $G[N(x)]$, and we contract C' onto one end of e . Then $G[N(x)] + e \geq K_7^- \cup K_1$. Now let $y \in N(x)$ such that $G[N(x) \setminus \{y\}] + e \geq K_7^-$. By contracting C onto y , we see $G \geq K_9^-$. ■

(14.2) $G[N(x)]$ is not isomorphic to either $K_{3,3,3}$ or $\overline{C_6} \vee \overline{K_3}$.

Say $N(x) = \{v_1, \dots, v_9\}$ where $\{v_1, v_2, v_3\}$ is an independent set and either $\{v_4, v_5, v_6\}$ and $\{v_7, v_8, v_9\}$ are independent sets if $G[N(x)]$ is isomorphic to $K_{3,3,3}$ or $\{v_4, \dots, v_9\}$ are the vertices of a C_6 in $\overline{G[N(x)]}$ written in cyclic order if $G[N(x)]$ is isomorphic to $\overline{C_6} \vee \overline{K_3}$. We claim that $G - N[x]$ is 3-connected. Suppose to the contrary that Q is a minimum cut set of $G - N[x]$ with $|Q| \leq 2$. By (14.1), $|Q| \geq 1$. Let C_1 be any component of $G - (N[x] \cup Q)$, and let $C_2 := G - (N[x] \cup V(C_1))$. Then C_2 is connected. Suppose that some vertex $v_i \in N(x)$ has no neighbor in $V(C_2)$. By (2), any neighbor of v_i in $N(x)$ must have at least 2 neighbors in $V(C_1)$, that is, $\{v_j \in N(x) : v_i v_j \in E(G)\} \subseteq N(C_1)$. In particular, there exist disjoint sets $T_1, T_2 \subseteq N(C_1)$ such that $|T_k| = 3$ and $G[T_k]$ contains at least two missing edges of $G[N(x)]$ for $k \in \{1, 2\}$. Now since C_2 contains at least one component of $G - (N[x] \cup Q)$, it follows by (9) that $|N(C_2) \cap N(x)| \geq 4$. If $G[N(C_2)]$ contains some missing edge e of $G[N(x)]$, then some T_k , say T_1 , does not contain both ends of e . We contract C_2 onto one end of e , and we contract C_1 onto a vertex in T_1 incident to two missing edges of $G[N(x)]$, and from Lemma 2.10 we see, along with x , that $G \geq K_9^-$, a contradiction. If $G[N(C_2)]$ does not contain a missing edge of $G[N(x)]$, then it must be the case that $G[N(x)]$ is isomorphic to $\overline{C_6} \vee \overline{K_3}$, $|Q| = 2$, and $N(C_2) \cap N(x) = \{v_3, v_4, v_6, v_8\}$,

say. Then there exist distinct $w_1, w_2 \in V(C_1)$ such that $w_1v_1, w_2v_2 \in E(G)$, and disjoint paths P_1, P_2 in $G - N[x]$ where P_i has one end w_i and one end in Q . Furthermore, since C_1 is connected there exists a path P_3 in C_1 with one end in P_1 , the other end in P_2 , and no internal vertices in $P_1 \cup P_2$. Now by contracting C_2 onto v_3 , contracting the paths $P_i \cup w_iv_i$ onto v_i for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, and contracting P_3 to a single edge, we see $G \geq K_9^-$ by Lemma 2.10, a contradiction. Therefore we may assume that every vertex of $N(x)$ has some neighbor in $V(C_2)$. But now $|N(C_1) \cap N(x)| \geq 4$, and the same argument as above with the roles of C_1 and C_2 switched will give a contradiction. This establishes that $G - N[x]$ is 3-connected.

Note that since $\delta(G) \geq 9$ by (13), every vertex of $N(x)$ has at least two neighbors in $G - N[x]$. If some vertex $z \in V(G) \setminus N[x]$ is adjacent to both ends of a missing edge e of $G[N(x)]$, then by contracting $G - N[x] - z$ onto a vertex of $N(x)$ incident to two missing edges of $G[N(x)]$ distinct from e , and then contracting z onto one end of e , we get a K_9^- minor by Lemma 2.10, a contradiction. Hence no vertex of $V(G) \setminus N[x]$ is adjacent to both ends of a missing edge of $G[N(x)]$. Thus we may select distinct $z_1, z_2, z_3 \in V(G) \setminus N[x]$ such that $v_iz_i \in E(G)$ for $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Since $G - N[x]$ is 3-connected, by an application of Menger's Theorem there exists a cycle in $G - N[x]$ containing all of z_1, z_2, z_3 . By contracting each of the three subpaths of the cycle between the z_i to a single edge, and then contracting each of the three edges v_iz_i , we again have $G \geq K_9^-$ by Lemma 2.10. This contradiction proves (14.2). ■

Hence we may assume $G[N(x)]$ is isomorphic to \overline{P} , and we label the vertices of $\overline{G[N(x)]}$ as in Figure 2.1.

(14.3) *No vertex of $G - N[x]$ is adjacent to both ends of a missing edge of $G[N(x)]$.*

Suppose there exists $z \in V(G) \setminus N[x]$ adjacent to both ends of some missing edge e of $G[N(x)]$, say $zv_0, zv_1 \in E(G)$. Note that every vertex of $N(x)$ has at least two neighbors in $G - N[x]$ since $\delta(G) \geq 9$ by (13). Thus if $G - N[x] - z$ is connected, then by contracting z onto v_0 and contracting $G - N[x] - z$ onto v_3 , say, we add four edges to $G[N(x)]$, and

it follows from Lemma 2.11 that $G \geq K_9^-$, a contradiction. So suppose $G - N[x] - z$ is disconnected. Since G is 6-connected by (9), we have $|N(C) \cap N(x)| \geq 5$ for all components C of $G - N[x] - z$, and so $N(C)$ contains both ends of at least two missing edges of $G[N(x)]$. Let C_1 be a component of $G - N[x] - z$, and suppose $e_1 \neq e$ is a missing edge of $G[N(x)]$ with both ends in $N(C_1)$. We consider three cases.

First, suppose e and e_1 belong to a 6-cycle, but not a 5-cycle of $\overline{G[N(x)]}$, say $e_1 = v_7v_9$. If $v_2 \in N(C_1)$, then by contracting C_1 onto v_7 and contracting zv_0 , we see $G \geq K_9^-$ by Lemma 2.11, a contradiction. Hence $v_2 \notin N(C_1)$, so there exists some component C_2 of $G - N[x] - z$ such that $v_2 \in N(C_2)$. Now since $|N(C_2) \cap N(x)| \geq 5$, there must exist some missing edge e_2 of $G[N(x)]$ with both ends in $N(C_2)$ such that e_2 is distinct from e and e_1 . By contracting C_2 onto one end of e_2 , C_1 onto v_7 , and z onto v_0 , we again see $G \geq K_9^-$ by Lemma 2.11, a contradiction.

Next, suppose e and e_1 share a common end, say $e_1 = v_1v_2$. If $v_3 \in N(C_1)$, then by contracting C_1 onto v_2 and contracting zv_0 , we see $G \geq K_9^-$ by Lemma 2.11, a contradiction. Thus there exists a component $C_2 \neq C_1$ of $G - N[x] - z$ such that $v_3 \in N(C_2)$. From Lemma 2.11, we may assume that $N(C_2)$ does not contain both ends of any missing edges of $G[N(x)]$ other than v_3v_4 , v_5v_7 , or v_1v_6 . This requires $N(C_2) \cap N(x) \subseteq \{v_1, v_3, v_4, v_5, v_6, v_7\}$. By relabelling if necessary, we may assume $v_3, v_4 \in N(C_2)$. By Lemma 2.11, we may assume that $N(C_1)$ does not contain both ends of any missing edges of $G[N(x)]$ other than e_1 or v_0v_1 . This requires $N(C_1) = \{v_0, v_1, v_2, v_8, v_9, z\}$. Let $S = N(C_1)$. Then S is a minimum separating set of G . Let G_1 and G_2 be as defined prior to (3), where we may assume $V(G_1) \setminus S = V(C_1)$. By contracting $V(C_2) \cup \{v_3, v_4\}$ onto z and contracting xv_1 , we see $e(G[S]) + d_2 = 15$. By contracting C_1 onto v_1 , we see $d_1 \geq 2$. Thus by (6), we have $6n - 20 = e(G) \leq 6n - 40 + 6 \cdot 6 - 2 - 15 = 6n - 21$, a contradiction.

Lastly, suppose e and e_1 are disjoint and belong to a 5-cycle of $G[N(x)]$, say $e_1 = v_2v_3$. If $v_7 \in N(C_1)$, then by contracting C_1 onto v_2 and contracting zv_0 , $G \geq K_9^-$ by Lemma 2.11, a

contradiction. Thus there exists a component $C_2 \neq C_1$ of $G - N[x] - z$ such that $v_7 \in N(C_2)$. If any of v_2, v_5 , or v_9 belongs to $N(C_2)$, it is now possible to contract C_1, C_2 , and z onto $N(x)$ such that $G \geq K_9^-$ by Lemma 2.11, a contradiction. So $N(C_2)$ contains at least four vertices of $\{v_0, v_1, v_3, v_4, v_6, v_8\}$. From Lemma 2.11, we may assume $N(C_2) \cap N(x) = \{v_0, v_1, v_4, v_7, v_8\}$. But now considering C_2 and the missing edge v_0v_4 of $G[N(x)]$ puts us in the previous case. ■

(14.4) $G - N[x]$ is 2-connected.

Suppose that z is a cut-vertex of $G - N[x]$. We will show that z must be adjacent to both ends of some missing edge of $G[N(x)]$, contrary to (14.3). Let C_1 be a component of $G - N[x] - z$, chosen such that $|N(C_1) \cap N(x)|$ is minimum among all components of $G - N[x] - z$. If $|N(C_1) \cap N(x)| \geq 7$, then it follows from Lemma 2.12 that for any component $C_2 \neq C_1$ of $G - N[x] - z$, we may contract C_1 and C_2 onto $N(x)$ so that $G \geq K_9^-$, a contradiction. Thus $|N(C_1) \cap N(x)| \leq 6$. Since G is 6-connected by (9), we have $|N(C_1) \cap N(x)| \geq 5$. Then $N(C_1)$ contains both ends of some missing edge of $G[N(x)]$, say $v_0, v_1 \in N(C_1)$. Let e be any missing edge of $G[N(x)]$ such that v_0v_1 and e are disjoint and belong to the same 5-cycle of $\overline{G[N(x)]}$, and suppose neither end of e belongs to $N(C_1)$. We may assume $e = v_2v_3$. Since $\delta(G) \geq 9$ by (13), v_2 and v_3 each have at least two neighbors in $G - N[x] - V(C_1)$. Let w_i be a neighbor of v_i in $G - N[x] - V(C_1)$ for $i \in \{2, 3\}$. We may assume $w_3 \neq z$. Furthermore, $w_2 \neq w_3$ by (14.3). Since $G - N[x] - V(C_1)$ is connected, there exists a path P_1 in $G - N[x] - V(C_1)$ with ends w_2, w_3 , and a path P_2 with one end z , the other end in $V(P_1)$, and no internal vertices in $V(P_1)$. Possibly, P_2 consists of only the vertex z . Now by contracting $P_1 \cup P_2$ to a single vertex, contracting the edge v_2w_2 , and contracting C_1 onto v_1 , we add the edges v_0v_1, v_1v_2, v_2v_3 to $G[N(x)]$, and it follows from Lemma 2.11 that $G \geq K_9^-$, a contradiction.

Thus at least one end of every missing edge of $G[N(x)]$ disjoint from v_0v_1 and belonging to a 5-cycle of $\overline{G[N(x)]}$ with v_0v_1 must belong to $N(C_1)$. There are eight such missing edges

of $G[N(x)]$ which give the 8-cycle $v_2v_3v_4v_9v_6v_8v_5v_7$ of $\overline{G[N(x)]}$. Since $|N(C_1) \cap N(x)| \leq 6$, either $N(C_1) = \{z, v_0, v_1, v_2, v_4, v_5, v_6\}$ or $N(C_1) = \{z, v_0, v_1, v_3, v_7, v_8, v_9\}$. In either case, $N(C_1)$ is a minimal separating set of G , so we may put $S = N(C_1)$ and let G_1 and G_2 be as defined before (3), where $V(G_1) = V(C_1) \cup N(C_1)$. Let $G'_2 = G_2 - N[x]$. Suppose $\{v_2, v_4, v_5, v_6\} \subseteq N(C_1)$. Then by contracting $V(G'_2) \cup \{v_3, v_8\}$ onto z , and by contracting the edges v_0x , v_1v_7 , and v_2v_9 , we see $e(G[S]) + d_1 = 21$, and by contracting C_1 onto v_0 , we see $d_2 \geq 3$. But then by (6), $6n - 20 = e(G) \leq 6n - 22$, a contradiction. Thus $\{v_3, v_7, v_8, v_9\} \subseteq N(C_1)$. If z is not adjacent to any vertex of $N(C_1)$, then by contracting $G_i - S$ onto z , we see $d_{3-i} \geq 6$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. But then from (6), $e(G) \leq 6n - 22$, again a contradiction. So z has at least one neighbor in $N(C_1) \setminus \{z\}$. By symmetry, we may suppose $zv_0 \in E(G)$. Now by contracting $V(G'_2) \cup \{v_4, v_5\}$ onto z , and by contracting the edges xv_0 , v_2v_9 , and v_6v_7 , we see that $e(G[S]) + d_1 \geq 20$. Since $e(G) = 6n - 20$, it follows from (6) that $d_2 \leq 2$, that is z has at least four neighbors in $N(C_1) \setminus \{z\}$. But this requires z to be adjacent to both ends of some missing edge of $G[N(x)]$, contradicting (14.3). ■

By (2), v_0 and v_2 have at least two common neighbors $w_1, w_2 \in V(G) \setminus N[x]$. Similarly, v_1 and v_3 have at least two common neighbors $u_1, u_2 \in V(G) \setminus N[x]$. By (14.3), the vertices w_1, w_2, u_1, u_2 are distinct. By (14.4), there exist two disjoint paths P_1, P_2 with one end in $\{w_1, w_2\}$ and the other end in $\{u_1, u_2\}$, and all internal vertices in $G - N[x]$. By relabelling if necessary, we may assume P_i has ends w_i, u_i for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Furthermore, there exists a path Q with one end in $V(P_1)$, the other end in $V(P_2)$, and all internal vertices in $G - N[x]$. Now by contracting P_1 and P_2 each to a single vertex, contracting Q to a single edge, and contracting the edges v_1u_1 and v_2w_2 , we have added the edges v_0v_1, v_1v_2, v_2v_3 to $G[N(x)]$, and it follows from Lemma 2.11 that $G \geq K_9^-$, a contradiction. ■

(15) $G - N[x]$ is disconnected for any vertex $x \in V(G)$ with $d(x) \in \{9, 10, 11\}$.

Suppose there exists a vertex $x \in V(G)$ with $d(x) \in \{9, 10, 11\}$ for which $G - N[x]$

is not disconnected. By (14), it follows that $G - N[x]$ must be the empty graph, that is $N[x] = V(G)$. But then $G[N(x)]$ is a graph on at most 11 vertices with $\delta(G[N(x)]) \geq 8$, and so $e(G) \geq 4|G| > 5|G| - 14$. Thus $G[N(x)] \geq K_8^-$ by Theorem 1.1, a contradiction. ■

(16) *Let $x \in V(G)$ with $d(x) \in \{9, 10, 11\}$. Then there is no component C of $G - N[x]$ such that $d_G(y) \geq 12$ for every $y \in V(C)$.*

Suppose such a vertex x and component C exist. Let $G_1 = G - V(C)$ and $G_2 = G[V(C) \cup N(C)]$. Let d_1 be as defined before (5). From (5), $e(G_2) \leq 6|G_2| - 20 - d_1 = 6(|C| + |N(C)|) - 20 - d_1$. By contracting the edge xz , where $z \in N(C)$ has minimum degree d in $G[N(C)]$, we have $d_1 \geq |N(C)| - d - 1$, and hence $e(G_2) \leq 6|C| + 5|N(C)| - 19 + d$. Let $t = e(V(C), N(C))$. Then $e(G_2) = e(C) + t + e(G[N(C)])$. Since $2e(C) \geq 12|C| - t$ and $2e(G[N(C)]) \geq d|N(C)|$, we have $2e(G_2) \geq 12|C| + t + d|N(C)|$. Hence $12|C| + 10|N(C)| - 38 + 2d \geq 2e(G_2) \geq 12|C| + t + d|N(C)|$, which gives $-t \geq d(|N(C)| - 2) - 10|N(C)| + 38$. Note that $G[N(x)]$ has minimum degree at least 6 by (2), and so $G[N(C)]$ has minimum degree at least $6 - (d_G(x) - |N(C)|)$. Thus $d \geq |N(C)| + 6 - d_G(x) \geq |N(C)| - 5$. Furthermore, by (9) and (14), $6 \leq |N(C)| \leq d_G(x) - 1 \leq 10$. It follows that $d(|N(C)| - 2) - 10|N(C)| > (|N(C)| - 5)(|N(C)| - 2) - 10|N(C)| = |N(C)|^2 - 17|N(C)| + 10 \geq -62$. Therefore $-t \geq -24$. Since $2e(C) \geq 12|C| - t$, we get $e(C) \geq 6|C| - 12$. If $|C| \geq 9$, then by the minimality of G we have $C \geq K_9^-$, a contradiction. Therefore, $|C| < 9$. From the inequality $6|C| - 12 \leq e(C) \leq \binom{|C|}{2}$, it follows that $|C| \leq 2$. Since every vertex of C has degree at least 12 in G , and since $d_G(x) \leq 11$, it follows that $|C| = 2$ and $d_G(x) = 11$. But now C is a component with $N(C) = N(x)$, contradicting (14). ■

Now choose a vertex $x \in V(G)$ with $d(x) \in \{9, 10, 11\}$, such that $G - N[x]$ has a component C of minimum order. Then choose a vertex $y \in V(C)$ of least degree in G . By (13) and (16), we have $d_G(y) \in \{9, 10, 11\}$. Let K be the component of $G - N[y]$ containing x . We claim that $N(K)$ contains all vertices of $N(y)$ that are not complete to

all other vertices of $N(y)$. Suppose not, and let $z \in N(y)$ such that z has a nonneighbor in $N(y) \setminus \{z\}$ and $z \notin N(K)$. If $z \in N(x)$, then $z \in N(K)$, and so $z \notin N(x)$, and thus $z \in V(C)$. Therefore $d_G(z) \geq d_G(y)$ by the choice of y . Thus z has some neighbor $z' \in N(x) \cup V(C) \setminus N[y]$. Now if $z' \notin V(K)$, then the component of $G - N[y]$ containing z' would be a proper subgraph of C , contradicting our choice of x and C . Therefore $z' \in V(K)$, and thus $z \in N(K)$, a contradiction. Thus $N(K)$ does contain all vertices of $N(y)$ which are not complete to all other vertices of $N(y)$, but this contradicts (14). This contradiction completes the proof of Theorem 1.2. ■

Acknowledgment

Thank you to Zi-Xia Song for introducing me to this topic and for helpful guidance during the early stages of the project.

References

- [1] B. Albar and D. Gonçalves, On triangles in K_r -minor free graphs, *J. Graph Theory* 88 (2018) 154–173.
- [2] G. A. Dirac, Homomorphism theorems for graphs, *Math. Ann.* 153 (1964) 69–80.
- [3] G. A. Dirac, A property of 4-chromatic graphs and some remarks on critical graphs, *J. London Math. Soc.* 27 (1952) 85–92.
- [4] R. Fabila-Monroy and D. Wood, Rooted K_4 -minors, *Elec. J. Combin.* 20(2) (2013) #P64.
- [5] E. Györi, On the edge numbers of graphs with Hadwiger number 4 and 5, *Period. Math. Hung.* 13 (1982) 21–27.

- [6] H. Hadwiger, Über eine Klassifikation der Streckencomplexe, Vierteljschr. Naturforsch. Ges. Zürich. 88 (1943) 133–142.
- [7] I. T. Jakobsen, A homomorphism theorem with an application to the conjecture of Hadwiger, Studia Sci. Math. Hungar. 6 (1971) 151–160.
- [8] I. T. Jakobsen, On certain homomorphism properties of graphs I, Math. Scand. 31 (1972) 379–404.
- [9] I. T. Jakobsen, On certain homomorphism properties of graphs II, Math. Scand. 52 (1983) 229–261.
- [10] L. K. Jørgensen, Contractions to K_8 , J. Graph Theory. 18 (1994) 431–448.
- [11] W. Mader, Homomorphiesätze für Graphen, Math. Ann. 178 (1968) 154–168.
- [12] N. Robertson, P. Seymour, and R. Thomas, Hadwiger’s conjecture for K_6 -free graphs, Combinatorica. 13 (1993) 279–361.
- [13] M. Rolek, Graphs with no K_9^- minor are 10-colorable, in preparation.
- [14] M. Rolek, Computer search details: Extremal function for K_9^- minors, <https://msrolek.sites.wm.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/317/2018/04/K9Minus2ComputerSearchDetails.pdf>
- [15] M. Rolek and Z-X. Song, Coloring graphs with forbidden minors, J. Combin. Theory, Ser. B. 127 (2017) 14–31.
- [16] P. Seymour, Disjoint paths in graphs, Disc. Math. 29 (1980) 293–309.
- [17] Z-X. Song, The extremal function for K_8^- minors, J. Combin. Theory, Ser. B. 95 (2005) 300–317.
- [18] Z-X. Song, Extremal functions for contractions of graphs, Doctoral Dissertaton, Georgia Institute of Technology, (2004).

- [19] Z-X. Song and R. Thomas, The extremal function for K_9 minors, *J. Combin. Theory, Ser. B.* 96 (2006) 240–252.
- [20] R. Thomas and Y. Yoo, The extremal functions for triangle-free graphs with excluded minors, arXiv:1801.06887.
- [21] C. Thomassen, 2-linked graphs, *Eur. J. Combin.* 1 (1980) 371–378.
- [22] P. Turán, On an extremal problem in graph theory, *Matematikai és Fizikai Lapok.* 48 (1941) 436–452.
- [23] K. Wagner, Über eine Eigenschaft der ebenen Komplexe, *Math. Ann.* 114 (1937) 570–590.
- [24] D. R. Woodall, A Short Proof of a Theorem of Dirac’s About Hadwiger’s Conjecture, *J. Graph Theory.* 16 (1992) 79–80.