

# Roman domination in graphs with minimum degree at least two and some forbidden cycles

S.M. Sheikholeslami<sup>1\*</sup>, M. Chellali<sup>2</sup>, R. Khoeilar<sup>1</sup>, H. Karami<sup>1</sup> and Z. Shao<sup>3</sup>,

<sup>1</sup>Department of Mathematics  
Azarbaijan Shahid Madani University  
Tabriz, I.R. Iran  
s.m.sheikholeslami@azaruniv.ac.ir  
khoeilar@azaruniv.ac.ir  
h.karami@azaruniv.ac.ir

<sup>2</sup>LAMDA-RO Laboratory, Department of Mathematics  
University of Blida  
B.P. 270, Blida, Algeria  
m.chellali@yahoo.com

<sup>3</sup>Institute of Computing Science and Technology  
Guangzhou University  
Guangzhou 510006, China  
zshao@gzhu.edu.cn

## Abstract

Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a graph of order  $n$  and let  $\gamma_R(G)$  and  $\partial(G)$  denote the Roman domination number and the differential of  $G$ , respectively. In this paper we prove that for any integer  $k \geq 0$ , if  $G$  is a graph of order  $n \geq 6k + 9$ , minimum degree  $\delta \geq 2$ , which does not contain any induced  $\{C_5, C_8, \dots, C_{3k+2}\}$ -cycles, then  $\gamma_R(G) \leq \frac{(4k+8)n}{6k+11}$ . This bound is an improvement of the bounds given in [E.W. Chambers, B. Kinnersley, N. Prince, and D.B. West, Extremal problems for Roman domination, SIAM J. Discrete Math. 23 (2009) 1575–1586] when  $k = 0$ , and [S. Bermudo, On the differential and Roman domination number of a graph with minimum degree two, Discrete Appl. Math. 232 (2017), 64–72] when  $k = 1$ . Moreover, using the Gallai-type result involving the Roman domination number and the differential of graphs established by Bermudo et al. stating that  $\gamma_R(G) + \partial(G) = n$ , we have  $\partial(G) \geq \frac{(2k+3)n}{6k+11}$ , thereby settling the conjecture of Bermudo posed in the second paper.

**Keyword:** Differential of a graph, Roman domination number.

**MSC 2010:** 05C69

## 1 Introduction

In this paper,  $G$  is a simple graph without isolated vertices, with vertex set  $V = V(G)$  and edge set  $E = E(G)$ . The *order*  $|V|$  of  $G$  is denoted by  $n = n(G)$ . For a vertex  $v \in V$ , the

---

\*Corresponding author

*open neighborhood* of  $v$  is the set  $N(v) = \{u \in V \mid uv \in E\}$ , the *closed neighborhood* of  $v$  is the set  $N[v] = N(v) \cup \{v\}$ , and the *degree* of  $v$  is  $\deg_G(v) = |N(v)|$ . Let  $u$  and  $v$  be two vertices in  $G$ . A *uv-path* is a path with endvertices  $u$  and  $v$ , and the *distance* between  $u$  and  $v$  is the length of a shortest *uv-path*. The *diameter* of  $G$ , denoted by  $\text{diam}(G)$ , is the maximum distance between vertices of  $G$ . We write  $P_n$  and  $C_n$  for the *path* and *cycle* of order  $n$ , respectively. Let  $A$  and  $B$  are two disjoint subgraphs (not necessarily induced) of a graph  $G$ . If there is an edge  $e$  having one endvertex in  $A$  and the other one in  $B$ , then  $A + B + e$  will denote the graph formed by  $A$  and  $B$  for which we add only the edge  $e$ . We also denote by  $G - A$  the subgraph of  $G$  induced by  $V(G) - V(A)$ .

For a set  $D$ , let  $B(D)$  be the set of vertices in  $V \setminus D$  that have a neighbor in  $D$ . The *differential* of a set  $D$  is defined in [16] as  $\partial(D) = |B(D)| - |D|$ , and the maximum value of  $\partial(D)$  for any subset  $D$  of  $V$  is the *differential* of  $G$ , denoted  $\partial(G)$ . Differential of graphs has been studied extensively in several papers, in particular [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 15]. In 2017, Bermudo [1] proved that for any graph  $G$  with order  $n \geq 15$ , minimum degree two and without any induced tailed 5-cycle graph of seven vertices or tailed 5-cycle graph of seven vertices together with a particular edge, it is satisfied  $\partial(G) \geq \frac{5n}{17}$ . Moreover, he posed the following conjecture.

**Conjecture 1** ([1]). *Let  $G$  be a graph of order  $n \geq 6k + 9$ , minimum degree  $\delta \geq 2$ , which does not contain any induced  $\{C_5, C_8, \dots, C_{3k+2}\}$ -cycles. Then  $\partial(G) \geq \frac{(2k+3)n}{6k+11}$ .*

A *Roman dominating function* (RDF) on a graph  $G$  is a function  $f : V(G) \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2\}$  such that every vertex  $u \in V(G)$  with  $f(u) = 0$  has a neighbor  $v$  with  $f(v) = 2$ . The *weight* of an RDF  $f$  is the value  $f(V(G)) = \sum_{u \in V(G)} f(u)$ , and the *Roman domination number*  $\gamma_R(G)$  is the minimum weight of an RDF on  $G$ . The Roman domination number of graphs was introduced in 2004 by Cockayne et al. in [14] and is now well-studied in graph theory. The literature on Roman domination and its variations has been surveyed and detailed in two book chapters and three surveys [9, 10, 11, 12, 13].

In [7], it has been shown that, if  $G$  is a graph of order  $n \geq 9$  and minimum degree  $\delta \geq 2$ , then  $\gamma_R(G) \leq \frac{8n}{11}$ . It was also shown in [1] that  $\gamma_R(G) \leq \frac{12n}{17}$  for any graph  $G$  with order  $n \geq 15$ , minimum degree two and without any induced tailed 5-cycle graph of seven vertices or tailed 5-cycle graph of seven vertices together with a particular edge.

In this paper, we improve the aforementioned known results by showing that if  $G$  is a graph satisfying the statement of Conjecture 1, then  $\gamma_R(G) \leq \frac{(4k+8)n}{6k+11}$ . Using the Gallai-type result involving the differential and the Roman domination number of graphs established by Bermudo, Fernau and Sigarreta [5] who proved that  $\gamma_R(G) + \partial(G) = n$ , our bound leads to  $\partial(G) \geq \frac{(2k+3)n}{6k+11}$  which settles Conjecture 1.

We close this section by recalling the exact values of the Roman domination number of paths and cycles given in [14], namely  $\gamma_R(P_n) = \gamma_R(C_n) = \lceil \frac{2n}{3} \rceil$ .

## 2 Some useful lemmas

We gather in this section some results that will be useful to us thereafter. For technical reasons, we will often consider three Roman dominating functions  $f_1, f_2$ , and  $f_3$  on a graph  $G$ , where we use  $\vec{f}$  to denote the 3-tuple  $(f_1, f_2, f_3)$ , and  $\vec{f}(v)$  for  $(f_1(v), f_2(v), f_3(v))$  for a vertex  $v$ . A vertex  $v$  is said to be  $\vec{f}$ -*strong* if  $f_j(v) = 2$  for some  $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ . Moreover, the weight of  $\vec{f}$  is  $\omega(\vec{f}) = \sum_{j=1}^3 \omega(f_j)$ . Clearly,  $\omega(f_j) \leq \omega(\vec{f})/3$  for some  $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ .

Also, if  $H$  is an induced subgraph of  $G$  and  $f$  an RDF on  $G$ , then we denote the restriction of  $f$  on  $H$  by  $f|_{V(H)}$  and let  $f(V(H)) = \omega(f, H)$ .

For integers  $m$  and  $\ell$  such that  $m \geq 3$  and  $\ell \geq 1$ , let  $C_{m,\ell}$  be the graph obtained from a cycle  $C_m = x_1x_2 \dots x_mx_1$  and a path  $P = y_1y_2 \dots y_\ell$  by adding the edge  $x_1y_1$ , with  $y_i \notin V(C_m)$  for all possible  $i$ . The graph  $C_{m,\ell}$  will be called a *tailed  $m$ -cycle graph* of order  $m + \ell$ . We call an *ear* of a cycle  $C$  in a graph  $G$ , to a path  $P$  in  $G - C$  whose endvertices are adjacent to some vertices in  $C$ .

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $G$  be a graph,  $u, v \in V(G)$  and  $\vec{f} = (f_1, f_2, f_3)$  be a 3-tuple of RDFs of  $G$  such that  $u$  and  $v$  are  $\vec{f}$ -strong. If  $H$  is a graph obtained from  $G$  by adding a path  $Q = y_1 \dots y_\ell$  and the edges  $uy_1, vy_\ell$ , then  $\vec{f}$  can be extended to a 3-tuple of RDFs  $\vec{g}$  of  $H$  such that  $\omega(\vec{g}, Q) \leq 2\ell$  and each vertex in  $V(Q) - \{y_1, y_\ell\}$  is  $\vec{g}$ -strong.*

**Proof.** By assumption,  $f_i(u) = 2$  and  $f_j(v) = 2$  for some  $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ . Let us consider the following two cases.

**Case 1.**  $i \neq j$ .

Assume, without loss of generality, that  $i = 1$  and  $j = 2$ . Consider the following situations.

**Subcase 1.1.**  $\ell \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ .

Define the functions  $g_1, g_2$  and  $g_3$  on  $V(H)$  as follows:  $g_1(z) = f_1(z)$  for all  $z \in V(G)$ ,  $g_1(y_{3i+3}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{\ell}{3} - 1$ , and  $g_1(z) = 0$  otherwise;  $g_2(z) = f_2(z)$  for all  $z \in V(G)$ ,  $g_2(y_{3i+1}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{\ell}{3} - 1$ , and  $g_2(z) = 0$  otherwise; and  $g_3(z) = f_3(z)$  for all  $z \in V(G)$ ,  $g_3(y_{3i+2}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{\ell}{3} - 1$ , and  $g_3(z) = 0$  otherwise.

**Subcase 1.2.**  $\ell \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ .

Define the functions  $g_1, g_2$  and  $g_3$  on  $V(H)$  as follows:  $g_1(z) = f_1(z)$  for all  $z \in V(G)$ ,  $g_1(y_{3i+3}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{\ell-4}{3}$ , and  $g_1(z) = 0$  otherwise;  $g_2(z) = f_2(z)$  for all  $z \in V(G)$ ,  $g_2(y_{3i+2}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{\ell-4}{3}$ , and  $g_2(z) = 0$  otherwise; and  $g_3(z) = f_3(z)$  for  $z \in V(G)$ ,  $g_3(y_{3i+1}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{\ell-1}{3}$ , and  $g_3(z) = 0$  otherwise.

**Subcase 1.3.**  $\ell \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ .

Define the functions  $g_1, g_2$  and  $g_3$  on  $V(H)$  as follows:  $g_1(z) = f_1(z)$  for all  $z \in V(G)$ ,  $g_1(y_{3i+3}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{\ell-5}{3}$ ,  $g_1(y_\ell) = 1$  and  $g_1(z) = 0$  otherwise;  $g_2(z) = f_2(z)$  for all  $z \in V(G)$ ,  $g_2(y_{3i+2}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{\ell-5}{3}$ ,  $g_2(y_{\ell-1}) = 1$  and  $g_2(z) = 0$  otherwise; and  $g_3(z) = f_3(z)$  for all  $z \in V(G)$ ,  $g_3(y_{3i+1}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{\ell-2}{3}$ , and  $g_3(z) = 0$  otherwise.

In either subcase,  $g_1, g_2, g_3$  are RDFs of  $H$  and thus  $g = (g_1, g_2, g_3)$  is a 3-tuple of RDFs of  $H$ . In addition,  $\omega(\vec{g}, Q) \leq 2\ell$  and each vertex of  $V(Q) - \{y_1, y_\ell\}$  is  $\vec{g}$ -strong.

**Case 2.**  $i = j$ .

Assume, without loss of generality, that  $i = j = 1$ . Consider again the following situations.

**Subcase 2.1.**  $\ell \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ .

Define the functions  $g_1, g_2$  and  $g_3$  on  $V(H)$  as follows:  $g_1(z) = f_1(z)$  for all  $z \in V(G)$ ,  $g_1(y_2) = 1$ ,  $g_1(y_{3i+4}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{\ell-6}{3}$ , and  $g_1(z) = 0$  otherwise;  $g_2(z) = f_2(z)$  for all  $z \in V(G)$ ,  $g_2(y_{3i+2}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{\ell}{3} - 1$ , and  $g_2(z) = 0$  otherwise;  $g_3(z) = f_3(z)$  for all  $z \in V(G)$ ,  $g_3(y_1) = 1$ ,  $g_3(y_{3i+3}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{\ell}{3} - 1$ , and  $g_3(z) = 0$  otherwise.

**Subcase 2.2.**  $\ell \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ .

Define the functions  $g_1, g_2$  and  $g_3$  on  $V(H)$  as follows:  $g_1(z) = f_1(z)$  for  $z \in V(G)$ ,  $g_1(y_2) = g_1(y_{\ell-1}) = 1$ ,  $g_1(y_{3i+4}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{\ell-7}{3}$ , and  $g_1(z) = 0$  otherwise;  $g_2(z) = f_2(z)$  for all  $z \in V(G)$ ,  $g_2(y_1) = 1$ ,  $g_2(y_{3i+3}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{\ell-4}{3}$ , and  $g_2(z) = 0$  otherwise;  $g_3(z) = f_3(z)$  for all  $z \in V(G)$ ,  $g_3(y_\ell) = 1$ ,  $g_3(y_{3i+2}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{\ell-4}{3}$ , and  $g_3(z) = 0$  otherwise.

**Subcase 2.3.**  $\ell \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ .

Define the functions  $g_1, g_2$  and  $g_3$  on  $V(H)$  as follows:  $g_1(z) = f_1(z)$  for all  $z \in V(G)$ ,  $g_1(y_{3i+3}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{\ell-5}{3}$  and  $g_1(z) = 0$  otherwise;  $g_2(z) = f_2(z)$  for all  $z \in V(G)$ ,  $g_2(y_{3i+1}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{\ell-2}{3}$ , and  $g_2(z) = 0$  otherwise;  $g_3(z) = f_3(z)$  for all  $z \in V(G)$ ,  $g_3(y_{3i+2}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{\ell-2}{3}$ , and  $g_3(z) = 0$  otherwise.

In either subcase,  $g_1, g_2, g_3$  are RDFs of  $H$  and thus  $g = (g_1, g_2, g_3)$  is a 3-tuple of RDFs of  $H$ . Moreover,  $\omega(\vec{g}, Q) \leq 2\ell$  and each vertex of  $V(Q) - \{y_1, y_\ell\}$  is  $\vec{g}$ -strong.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.** *Let  $G$  be a graph,  $u \in V(G)$  and  $\vec{f} = (f_1, f_2, f_3)$  a 3-tuple of RDFs of  $G$  such that  $u$  is  $\vec{f}$ -strong.*

1. *If  $H$  is obtained from  $G$  by adding a cycle  $C_{3p+1} = x_1x_2 \dots x_{3p+1}x_1$  ( $p \geq 1$ ) and the edge  $ux_1$ , then  $\vec{f}$  can be extended to a 3-tuple  $\vec{g}$  of RDFs of  $H$  such that  $\omega(\vec{g}, C_{3p+1}) \leq 2(3p+1)$  and each vertex in  $V(C_{3p+1}) - \{x_{3p+1}\}$  is  $\vec{g}$ -strong.*
2. *If  $H$  is obtained from  $G$  by adding a tailed cycle  $C_{3p+1,\ell}$  ( $p \geq 1$ ) and the edge  $uy_\ell$ , then  $\vec{f}$  can be extended to a 3-tuple  $\vec{g}$  of RDFs of  $H$  such that  $\omega(\vec{g}, C_{3p+1,\ell}) \leq 2(3p+1+\ell)$  and each vertex of  $V(C_{3p+1,\ell}) - \{x_{3p+1}\}$  is  $\vec{g}$ -strong.*
3. *If  $H$  is obtained from  $G$  by adding a cycle  $C_{3p+2} = x_1x_2 \dots x_{3p+2}x_1$  ( $p \geq 1$ ) and the edge  $ux_1$ , then  $\vec{f}$  can be extended to a 3-tuple  $\vec{g}$  of RDFs of  $H$  such that  $\omega(\vec{g}, C_{3p+2}) \leq 2(3p+2) + 1$  and each vertex of  $C_{3p+2}$ , is  $\vec{g}$ -strong.*
4. *If  $H$  is obtained from  $G$  by adding a tailed cycle  $C_{3p+2,\ell}$  ( $p \geq 1$ ) and the edge  $uy_\ell$ , then  $\vec{f}$  can be extended to a 3-tuple  $\vec{g}$  of RDFs of  $H$  such that  $\omega(\vec{g}, C_{3p+2,\ell}) \leq 2(3p+2+\ell) + 1$  and each vertex of  $C_{3p+2,\ell}$ , is  $\vec{g}$ -strong.*

**Proof.** Since  $u$  is  $\vec{f}$ -strong, let us assume, without loss of generality, that  $f_1(u) = 2$ .

1) Define the functions  $g_1, g_2$  and  $g_3$  on  $V(H)$  as follows:  $g_1(z) = f_1(z)$  for all  $z \in V(G)$ ,  $g_1(x_{3i+3}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq p-1$ , and  $g_1(z) = 0$  otherwise;  $g_2(z) = f_2(z)$  for all  $z \in V(G)$ ,  $g_2(x_{3p}) = 1$ ,  $g_2(x_{3i+1}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq p-1$ , and  $g_2(z) = 0$  otherwise;  $g_3(z) = f_3(z)$  for all  $z \in V(G)$ ,  $g_3(x_{3p+1}) = 1$ ,  $g_3(x_{3i+2}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq p-1$ , and  $g_3(z) = 0$  otherwise.

Clearly,  $g_1, g_2, g_3$  are RDFs of  $H$  and thus  $g = (g_1, g_2, g_3)$  is a 3-tuple of RDFs of  $H$ . In addition,  $\omega(\vec{g}, C_{3p+1}) \leq 2(3p+1)$  and each vertex of  $V(C_{3p+1}) - \{x_{3p+1}\}$  is  $\vec{g}$ -strong.

2) Consider the following cases.

**Case 1.**  $\ell \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ .

Define the functions  $g_1, g_2$  and  $g_3$  on  $V(H)$  as follows:  $g_1(z) = f_1(z)$  for all  $z \in V(G)$ ,  $g_1(x_{3i+3}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq p-1$ ,  $g_1(y_{3i+1}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{\ell}{3} - 1$ , and  $g_1(z) = 0$  otherwise;  $g_2(z) = f_2(z)$  for all  $z \in V(G)$ ,  $g_2(x_{3p}) = 1$ ,  $g_2(x_{3i+1}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq p-1$ ,  $g_2(y_{3i+3}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{\ell}{3} - 1$ , and  $g_2(z) = 0$  otherwise;  $g_3(z) = f_3(z)$  for all  $z \in V(G)$ ,  $g_3(x_{3p+1}) = 1$ ,  $g_3(x_{3i+2}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq p-1$ ,  $g_3(y_{3i+2}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{\ell}{3} - 1$ , and  $g_3(z) = 0$  otherwise.

**Case 2.**  $\ell \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ .

Define the functions  $g_1, g_2$  and  $g_3$  on  $V(H)$  as follows:  $g_1(z) = f_1(z)$  for all  $z \in V(G)$ ,  $g_1(x_{3p+1}) = 1$ ,  $g_1(x_{3i+2}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq p-1$ ,  $g_1(y_{3i+2}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{\ell-4}{3}$ , and  $g_1(z) = 0$  otherwise;  $g_2(z) = f_2(z)$  for all  $z \in V(G)$ ,  $g_2(x_{3p}) = 1$ ,  $g_2(x_{3i+1}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq p-1$ ,  $g_2(y_{3i+3}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{\ell-4}{3}$ , and  $g_2(z) = 0$  otherwise;  $g_3(z) = f_3(z)$  for all  $z \in V(G)$ ,  $g_3(x_{3i+3}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq p-1$ ,  $g_3(y_{3i+1}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{\ell-1}{3}$ , and  $g_3(z) = 0$  otherwise.

**Case 3.**  $\ell \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ .

Define the functions  $g_1, g_2$  and  $g_3$  on  $V(H)$  as follows:  $g_1(z) = f_1(z)$  for all  $z \in V(G)$ ,  $g_1(x_{3p}) = 1$ ,  $g_1(x_{3i+1}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq p-1$ ,  $g_1(y_{3i+3}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{\ell-5}{3}$ , and  $g_1(z) = 0$  otherwise;  $g_2(z) = f_2(z)$  for all  $z \in V(G)$ ,  $g_2(x_{3p+1}) = 1$ ,  $g_2(x_{3i+2}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq p-1$ ,  $g_2(y_{3i+2}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{\ell-2}{3}$ , and  $g_2(z) = 0$  otherwise;  $g_3(z) = f_3(z)$  for all  $z \in V(G)$ ,  $g_3(x_{3i+3}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq p-1$ ,  $g_3(y_{3i+1}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{\ell-2}{3}$ , and  $g_3(z) = 0$  otherwise.

In either case,  $g_1, g_2, g_3$  are RDFs of  $H$  and thus  $\vec{g} = (g_1, g_2, g_3)$  is a 3-tuple of RDFs of  $H$ . In addition,  $\omega(\vec{g}, C_{3p+1, \ell}) \leq 2(3p+1+\ell)$  and each vertex of  $V(C_{3p+1, \ell}) - \{x_{3p+1}\}$  is  $\vec{g}$ -strong.

The proofs of the remaining items are similar and therefore omitted.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.** 1. Let  $C = v_1 v_2 \dots v_t v_1$  be a cycle on  $t \geq 4$  vertices with  $t \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ .

Then  $C$  has a 3-tuple of RDFs  $\vec{f} = (f_1, f_2, f_3)$  such that  $\omega(\vec{f}) \leq 2t+1$  and all vertices of  $C$  but  $v_t$  are  $\vec{f}$ -strong.

2. Let  $C = v_1 v_2 \dots v_t v_1$  be a cycle on  $t \geq 3$  vertices with  $t \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ . Then  $C$  has a 3-tuple of RDFs  $\vec{f} = (f_1, f_2, f_3)$  such that  $\omega(\vec{f}) \leq 2t$  and all vertices of  $C$  are  $\vec{f}$ -strong.

3. Let  $C_{m, \ell}$  be a tailed  $m$ -cycle with  $m \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$  and  $V(C_{m, \ell}) = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m, y_1, y_2, \dots, y_\ell\}$ , where the  $x_i$ 's induce a cycle  $C_m$  and the  $y_i$ 's induce a path  $P_\ell$ . Then  $G$  has a 3-tuple of RDFs  $\vec{f} = (f_1, f_2, f_3)$  such that  $\omega(\vec{f}) \leq 2(m+\ell)+1$  and all vertices of  $C_{m, \ell}$  but  $x_m$  are  $\vec{f}$ -strong.

**Proof.** 1) Define the functions  $f_1, f_2$  and  $f_3$  on  $V(C)$  as follows:  $f_1(v_{t-1}) = 1$ ,  $f_1(v_{3i+1}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{t-4}{3}$  and  $f_1(x) = 0$  otherwise;  $f_2(v_t) = 1$ ,  $f_2(v_{3i+2}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{t-4}{3}$  and  $f_2(x) = 0$  otherwise;  $f_3(v_1) = 1$ ,  $f_3(v_{3i+3}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{t-4}{3}$  and  $f_3(x) = 0$  otherwise. Clearly,  $f_1, f_2, f_3$  are RDFs of  $C$ . Hence  $\vec{f} = (f_1, f_2, f_3)$  is a 3-tuple of RDFs of  $C$ , with  $\omega(\vec{f}) \leq 2t+1$  and all vertices of  $C$  except  $v_t$  are  $\vec{f}$ -strong.

2) Define the functions  $f_1, f_2$  and  $f_3$  on  $V(C)$  as follows:  $f_1(v_{3i+1}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{t-3}{3}$  and  $f_1(x) = 0$  otherwise;  $f_2(v_{3i+2}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{t-3}{3}$  and  $f_2(x) = 0$  otherwise;  $f_3(v_{3i+3}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{t-3}{3}$  and  $f_3(x) = 0$  otherwise. Clearly,  $f_1, f_2, f_3$  are RDFs of  $C$ . Hence  $\vec{f} = (f_1, f_2, f_3)$  is a 3-tuple of RDFs of  $C$  with  $\omega(\vec{f}) \leq 2t$  and each vertex of  $C$  are  $\vec{f}$ -strong.

3) Define the functions  $f_1, f_2$  and  $f_3$  on  $V(C_{m, \ell})$ . For vertices on  $C_m$  as follows:  $f_1(x_{m-1}) = 1$ ,  $f_1(x_{3i+1}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{m-4}{3}$  and  $f_1(x) = 0$  otherwise;  $f_2(x_m) = 1$ ,  $f_2(x_{3i+2}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{m-4}{3}$  and  $f_2(x) = 0$  otherwise;  $f_3(x_{3i+3}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{m-4}{3}$  and  $f_3(x) = 0$  otherwise. Moreover, the  $f_i$ 's are defined for the vertices on  $P_\ell$  according to  $\ell$  as follows.

If  $\ell \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ , then  $f_1(y_{3i+3}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{\ell-3}{3}$  and  $f_1(x) = 0$  otherwise;  $f_2(y_{3i+2}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{\ell-3}{3}$  and  $f_2(x) = 0$  otherwise;  $f_3(y_\ell) = 1$ ,  $f_3(y_{3i+1}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{\ell-3}{3}$  and  $f_3(x) = 0$  otherwise.

If  $\ell \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ , then  $f_1(y_{3i+3}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{\ell-4}{3}$  and  $f_1(x) = 0$  otherwise;  $f_2(y_\ell) = 1$ ,  $f_2(y_{3i+2}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{\ell-4}{3}$  and  $f_2(x) = 0$  otherwise;  $f_3(y_{3i+1}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{\ell-1}{3}$  and  $f_3(x) = 0$  otherwise.

If  $\ell \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ , then  $f_1(y_\ell) = 1$ ,  $f_1(y_{3i+3}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{\ell-5}{3}$  and  $f_1(x) = 0$  otherwise;  $f_2(y_{3i+2}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{\ell-2}{3}$  and  $f_2(x) = 0$  otherwise;  $f_3(y_{3i+1}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{\ell-2}{3}$  and  $f_3(x) = 0$  otherwise.

Clearly, in either case  $f_1, f_2, f_3$  are RDFs of  $C_{m,\ell}$  and thus  $\vec{f} = (f_1, f_2, f_3)$  is a 3-tuple of RDFs of  $C_{m,\ell}$ . Also,  $\omega(\vec{f}) \leq 2(m+\ell) + 1$  and all vertices of  $C_{m,\ell}$  but  $x_m$  are  $\vec{f}$ -strong.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.** *Let  $C_i = x_1^i x_2^i \dots x_{n_i}^i x_1^i$  be a cycle of order  $n_i$ , for  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\}$ .*

1. *If  $n_1 \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$  and  $G$  is a graph obtained from  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  by identifying the vertices  $x_1^1$  and  $x_1^2$ , then  $G$  has a 3-tuple of RDFs  $\vec{f}$  such that  $\omega(\vec{f}) \leq 2n(G) + 1$ , and all vertices of  $V(G) - \{x_2^2, x_{n_2}^2\}$  are  $\vec{f}$ -strong.*
2. *If  $n_1 \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ ,  $n_2 \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$  and  $G$  is obtained from  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  by adding either the edge  $x_1^1 x_1^2$  or a path  $z_1 \dots z_{3k}$  ( $k \geq 1$ ) and the edges  $x_1^1 z_1$ ,  $x_1^2 z_{3k}$ , then  $G$  has a 3-tuple of RDFs  $\vec{f} = (f_1, f_2, f_3)$  such that  $\omega(\vec{f}) \leq 2n(G) + 1$  and each vertex of  $G$  but  $x_{n_2}^2$  is  $\vec{f}$ -strong.*
3. *If  $n_1 \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ ,  $n_2 \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$  and  $G$  is obtained from  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  by adding for  $k \geq 1$ , a path  $z_1 \dots z_{3k+1}$  and the edges  $x_1^1 z_1$ ,  $x_1^2 z_{3k+1}$ , then  $G$  has a 3-tuple of RDFs  $\vec{f}$  such that  $\omega(\vec{f}) \leq 2n(G) + 1$  and all vertices of  $G$  but  $x_{n_2}^2$  are  $\vec{f}$ -strong.*
4. *If  $n_1 \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ ,  $n_2 \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$  and  $G$  is obtained from  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  by adding for  $k \geq 1$  a path  $z_1 \dots z_{3k+2}$  and the edges  $x_1^1 z_1$ ,  $x_1^2 z_{3k+2}$ , then  $G$  has a 3-tuple of RDFs  $\vec{f}$  such that  $\omega(\vec{f}) \leq 2n(G) + 1$  and all vertices of  $G$  but  $x_{n_2}^2$  are  $\vec{f}$ -strong.*
5. *If  $n_i \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$  for  $i \in \{1, 2\}$  and  $G$  is obtained from  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  by adding either the edge  $x_1^1 x_1^2$  or a path  $z_1 \dots z_{3k}$  ( $k \geq 1$ ) and the edges  $x_1^1 z_1$ ,  $x_1^2 z_{3k}$ , then  $G$  has a 3-tuple of RDFs  $\vec{f}$  such that  $\omega(\vec{f}) \leq 2n(G) + 2$  and all vertices of  $G$  are  $\vec{f}$ -strong.*
6. *If  $n_i \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$  for  $i \in \{1, 2\}$  and  $G$  is obtained from  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  by adding a path  $z_1 \dots z_{3k+1}$  ( $k \geq 1$ ) and the edges  $x_1^1 z_1$ ,  $x_1^2 z_{3k+1}$ , then  $G$  has a 3-tuple of RDFs  $\vec{f}$  such that  $\omega(\vec{f}) \leq 2n(G) + 2$  and all vertices of  $G$  are  $\vec{f}$ -strong.*
7. *If  $n_i \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$  for  $i \in \{1, 2\}$  and  $G$  is obtained from  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  by adding a path  $z_1 \dots z_{3k+2}$  ( $k \geq 1$ ) and the edges  $x_1^1 z_1$ ,  $x_1^2 z_{3k+2}$ , then  $G$  has a 3-tuple of RDFs  $\vec{f}$  such that  $\omega(\vec{f}) \leq 2n(G) + 2$  and all vertices of  $G$  are  $\vec{f}$ -strong.*
8. *If  $n_1 \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ ,  $n_2 \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$  and  $G$  is obtained from  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  by adding either the edge  $x_1^1 x_1^2$  or a path  $z_1 \dots z_{3k}$  ( $k \geq 1$ ) and the edges  $x_1^1 z_1$ ,  $x_1^2 z_{3k}$ , then  $G$  has a 3-tuple of RDFs  $\vec{f}$  such that  $\omega(\vec{f}) \leq 2n(G) + 1$  and all vertices of  $G$  are  $\vec{f}$ -strong.*
9. *If  $n_1 \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ ,  $n_2 \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$  and  $G$  is obtained from  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  by adding a path  $z_1 \dots z_{3k+1}$  ( $k \geq 1$ ) and the edges  $x_1^1 z_1$ ,  $x_1^2 z_{3k+1}$ , then  $G$  has a 3-tuple of RDFs  $\vec{f}$  such that  $\omega(\vec{f}) \leq 2n(G) + 1$  and all vertices of  $G$  are  $\vec{f}$ -strong.*
10. *If  $n_1 \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ ,  $n_2 \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$  and  $G$  is obtained from  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  by adding a path  $z_1 \dots z_{3k+2}$  ( $k \geq 1$ ) and the edges  $x_1^1 z_1$ ,  $x_1^2 z_{3k+2}$ , then  $G$  has a 3-tuple of RDFs  $\vec{f}$  such that  $\omega(\vec{f}) \leq 2n(G) + 1$  and all vertices of  $G$  are  $\vec{f}$ -strong.*

11. If  $s \geq 3$ ,  $n_i \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$  for each  $i$  and  $G$  is obtained from  $C_1, \dots, C_s$  by adding a new vertex  $x$  and the edges  $xx_1^1, \dots, xx_1^s$ , then  $G$  has a 3-tuple of RDFs  $\vec{f}$  such that  $\omega(f, G) \leq 2n(G) - s + 4$  and the vertex  $x$  is  $\vec{f}$ -strong.

**Proof.**

1. Define the functions  $f_1, f_2$  and  $f_3$  on  $V(G)$  as follows. For vertices on  $C_1$ :  $f_1(x_{3i+1}^1) = f_2(x_{3i+2}^1) = 2$  for each  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{n_1-2}{3}$  and  $f_i(x) = 0$  otherwise, for  $i = 1, 2$ , and  $f_3(x_{3i+3}^1) = 2$  for each  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{n_1-5}{3}$ ,  $f_3(x_1^1) = 2$ , and  $f_3(x) = 0$  otherwise. Now for vertices on  $C_2$  but  $x_1^2$ :

If  $n_2 \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ , then let  $f_1(x_{3i+4}^2) = 2$  for each  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{n_2-6}{3}$  and  $f_1(x) = 0$  otherwise;  $f_2(x_{3i+3}^2) = 2$  for each  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{n_2-3}{3}$  and  $f_2(x) = 0$  otherwise;  $f_3(x_{3i+2}^2) = 2$  for each  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{n_2-3}{3}$  and  $f_3(x) = 0$  otherwise.

If  $n_2 \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ , then let  $f_1(x_{3i+4}^2) = 2$  for each  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{n_2-7}{3}$ ,  $f_1(x_{n_2-1}^2) = 1$  and  $f_1(x) = 0$  otherwise;  $f_2(x_{3i+3}^2) = 2$  for each  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{n_2-4}{3}$  and  $f_2(x) = 0$  otherwise;  $f_3(x_{n_2}^2) = 1$ ,  $f_3(x_{3i+2}^2) = 2$  for each  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{n_2-4}{3}$  and  $f_3(x) = 0$  otherwise.

If  $n_2 \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ , then let  $f_1(x_{3i+4}^2) = 2$  for each  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{n_2-5}{3}$  and  $f_1(x) = 0$  otherwise;  $f_2(x_{3i+3}^2) = 2$  for each  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{n_2-5}{3}$ ,  $f_2(x_{n_2}^2) = 1$  and  $f_2(x) = 0$  otherwise;  $f_3(x_3^2) = f_3(x_{n_2-1}^2) = 1$ ,  $f_3(x_{3i+5}^2) = 2$  for each  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{n_2-8}{3}$  and  $f_3(x) = 0$  otherwise.

In either case,  $f_1, f_2$  and  $f_3$  are RDFs of  $G$ . Hence  $\omega(\vec{f}) \leq 2n(G) + 1$ , and all vertices of  $V(G) - \{x_1^2, x_{n_2}^2\}$  are  $\vec{f}$ -strong.

2. Define the functions  $f_1, f_2$  and  $f_3$  on  $V(G)$  as follows:  $f_1(x_{3i+1}^1) = 2$  for each  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{n_1-2}{3}$ ,  $f_1(z_{3i+3}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq k-1$ ,  $f_1(x_{3i+3}^2) = 2$  for each  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{n_2-4}{3}$  and  $f_1(x) = 0$  otherwise;  $f_2(x_{3i+2}^1) = 2$  for each  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{n_1-2}{3}$ ,  $f_2(z_{3i+2}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq k-1$ ,  $f_2(x_{3i+2}^2) = 2$  for each  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{n_2-4}{3}$ ,  $f_2(x_{n_2}^2) = 1$  and  $f_2(x) = 0$  otherwise;  $f_3(x_{n_1}^1) = 1$ ,  $f_3(x_{3i+3}^1) = 2$  for each  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{n_1-5}{3}$ ,  $f_3(z_{3i+1}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq k-1$ ,  $f_3(x_{3i+1}^2) = 2$  for each  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{n_2-4}{3}$ ,  $f_3(x_{n_2-1}^2) = 2$  and  $f_3(x) = 0$  otherwise.

Clearly  $f_1, f_2$  and  $f_3$  are RDFs of  $G$ , and thus  $\vec{f} = (f_1, f_2, f_3)$  is a 3-tuple of RDFs of  $G$ . Moreover,  $\omega(\vec{f}) \leq 2n(G) + 1$  and each vertex of  $G$  but  $x_{n_2}^2$  is  $\vec{f}$ -strong.

3. Define the functions  $f_1, f_2$  and  $f_3$  on  $V(G)$  as follows:  $f_1(x_{3i+1}^1) = 2$  for each  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{n_1-2}{3}$ ,  $f_1(z_{3i+3}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq k-1$ ,  $f_1(x_{3i+2}^2) = 2$  for each  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{n_2-4}{3}$ ,  $f_1(x_{n_2}^2) = 1$  and  $f_1(x) = 0$  otherwise;  $f_2(x_{3i+2}^1) = 2$  for each  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{n_1-2}{3}$ ,  $f_2(z_{3i+2}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq k-1$ ,  $f_2(x_{3i+1}^2) = 2$  for each  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{n_2-4}{3}$ ,  $f_2(x_{n_2-1}^2) = 1$  and  $f_2(x) = 0$  otherwise;  $f_3(x_{n_1}^1) = 1$ ,  $f_3(x_{3i+3}^1) = 2$  for each  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{n_1-5}{3}$ ,  $f_3(z_{3i+1}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq k$ ,  $f_3(x_{3i+3}^2) = 2$  for each  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{n_2-4}{3}$  and  $f_3(x) = 0$  otherwise.

Clearly  $f_1, f_2$  and  $f_3$  are RDFs of  $G$  and thus  $\vec{f} = (f_1, f_2, f_3)$  is a 3-tuple of RDFs of  $G$ . Also,  $\omega(\vec{f}) \leq 2n(G) + 1$  and all vertices of  $G$  but  $x_{n_2}^2$  are  $\vec{f}$ -strong.

4. Define the functions  $f_1, f_2$  and  $f_3$  on  $V(G)$  as follows:  $f_1(x_{3i+1}^1) = 2$  for each  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{n_1-2}{3}$ ,  $f_1(z_{3i+3}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq k-1$ ,  $f_1(x_{3i+1}^2) = 2$  for each  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{n_2-4}{3}$ ,  $f_3(x_{n_2-1}^2) = 1$  and  $f_1(x) = 0$  otherwise;  $f_2(x_{3i+2}^1) = 2$  for each  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{n_1-2}{3}$ ,  $f_2(z_{3i+2}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq k$ ,  $f_2(x_{3i+3}^2) = 2$  for each  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{n_2-4}{3}$  and  $f_2(x) = 0$

otherwise;  $f_3(x_{n_1}^1) = 1$ ,  $f_3(x_{3i+3}^1) = 2$  for each  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{n_1-5}{3}$ ,  $f_3(z_{3i+1}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq k$ ,  $f_3(x_{3i+2}^2) = 2$  for each  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{n_2-4}{3}$ ,  $f_3(x_{n_2}^2) = 1$  and  $f_3(x) = 0$  otherwise.

Clearly  $f_1, f_2$  and  $f_3$  are RDFs of  $G$  and thus  $\vec{f} = (f_1, f_2, f_3)$  is a 3-tuple of RDFs of  $G$ . Also,  $\omega(\vec{f}) \leq 2n(G) + 1$  and each vertex of  $G$  but  $x_{n_2}^2$  is  $\vec{f}$ -strong.

5. Define the functions  $f_1, f_2$  and  $f_3$  on  $V(G)$  as follows:  $f_1(x_{3i+1}^1) = 2$  for each  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{n_1-2}{3}$ ,  $f_1(z_{3i+3}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq k-1$ ,  $f_1(x_{3i+3}^2) = 2$  for each  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{n_2-5}{3}$ ,  $f_1(x_{n_2}^2) = 1$  and  $f_1(x) = 0$  otherwise;  $f_2(x_{3i+2}^1) = 2$  for each  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{n_1-2}{3}$ ,  $f_2(z_{3i+2}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq k-1$ ,  $f_2(x_{3i+2}^2) = 2$  for each  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{n_2-2}{3}$  and  $f_2(x) = 0$  otherwise;  $f_3(x_{n_1}^1) = 1$ ,  $f_3(x_{3i+3}^1) = 2$  for each  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{n_1-5}{3}$ ,  $f_3(z_{3i+1}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq k-1$ ,  $f_3(x_{3i+1}^2) = 2$  for each  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{n_2-2}{3}$  and  $f_3(x) = 0$  otherwise.

Clearly  $f_1, f_2$  and  $f_3$  are RDFs of  $G$  and thus  $\vec{f} = (f_1, f_2, f_3)$  is a 3-tuple of RDFs of  $G$ . Further,  $\omega(\vec{f}) \leq 2n(G) + 2$  and all vertices of  $G$  are  $\vec{f}$ -strong.

6. The proof is similar to that of item (5).

7. The proof is similar to that of item (5).

8. Define the functions  $f_1, f_2$  and  $f_3$  on  $V(G)$  as follows:  $f_1(x_{3i+1}^1) = 2$  for each  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{n_1-2}{3}$ ,  $f_1(z_{3i+3}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq k-1$ ,  $f_1(x_{3i+3}^2) = 2$  for each  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{n_2-3}{3}$  and  $f_1(x) = 0$  otherwise;  $f_2(x_{3i+2}^1) = 2$  for each  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{n_1-2}{3}$ ,  $f_2(z_{3i+2}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq k-1$ ,  $f_2(x_{3i+2}^2) = 2$  for each  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{n_2-3}{3}$  and  $f_2(x) = 0$  otherwise;  $f_3(x_{n_1}^1) = 1$ ,  $f_3(x_{3i+3}^1) = 2$  for each  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{n_1-5}{3}$ ,  $f_3(z_{3i+1}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq k-1$ ,  $f_3(x_{3i+1}^2) = 2$  for each  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{n_2-3}{3}$  and  $f_3(x) = 0$  otherwise.

Then  $f_1, f_2$  and  $f_3$  are RDFs of  $G$  and thus  $\vec{f} = (f_1, f_2, f_3)$  is a 3-tuple of RDFs of  $G$  with the desired property.

9. The proof is similar to that of item (8).

10. The proof is similar to that of item (8).

11. Define the function  $f_1$  by  $f_1(x) = 2$ ,  $f_1(x_{n_j}^j) = 1$  for each  $1 \leq j \leq s$ ,  $f_1(x_i^j) = 2$  for each  $j$  and each  $i \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ , and  $f_1(y) = 0$  otherwise, and set  $\vec{f} = (f_1, f_1, f_1)$ . Clearly  $f_1$  is an RDF of  $G$  and thus  $\vec{f} = (f_1, f_2, f_3)$  is a 3-tuple of RDFs of  $G$  such that  $\omega(\vec{f}) \leq 2n(G) - s + 4$  and the vertex  $x$  is  $\vec{f}$ -strong as desired.  $\square$

**Lemma 6.** *Let  $H$  be a graph obtained from a cycle  $C_{3p+2} = x_1x_2 \dots x_{3p+2}x_1$  and a path  $Q = y_1 \dots y_\ell$  where  $\ell \equiv 1$  or  $2 \pmod{3}$  by adding the edge  $y_1x_1$  and joining  $y_\ell$  to some vertices in  $V(C_{3p+2}) - \{x_1\}$  with the condition that:*

- (a) *if  $\ell \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$  and  $y_\ell x_j \in E(H)$ , then  $j \not\equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ ,*
- (b) *if  $\ell \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$  and  $y_\ell x_j \in E(H)$ , then  $j \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ .*

*Then there exists a 3-tuple  $\vec{g} = (g_1, g_2, g_3)$  of RDF of  $H$  such that  $\omega(\vec{g}, H) \leq 2n(H) + 1$  and each vertex of  $H$  but  $y_1, y_\ell$  is  $\vec{g}$ -strong.*



**Proof.** First let  $\ell \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$  and  $y_\ell x_j \in E(H)$ . Define the functions  $g_1, g_2$  and  $g_3$  on  $V(H)$  as follows, depending on whether  $j \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$  or  $j \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ .

If  $j \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ , then let  $g_1(x_{3i+1}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq p$ ,  $g_1(y_{3i+3}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{\ell-4}{3}$ , and  $g_1(z) = 0$  otherwise;  $g_2(x_{3i+2}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq p$ ,  $g_2(y_\ell) = 1$ ,  $g_2(y_{3i+2}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{\ell-4}{3}$ , and  $g_2(z) = 0$  otherwise;  $g_3(x_1) = 2$ ,  $g_3(x_{3i+3}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq p-1$ ,  $g_3(y_{3i+2}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{\ell-4}{3}$ , and  $g_1(z) = 0$  otherwise.

If  $j \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ , then let  $g_1(x_{3i+1}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq p$ ,  $g_1(y_{3i+3}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{\ell-4}{3}$ , and  $g_1(z) = 0$  otherwise;  $g_2(x_{3i+2}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq p$ ,  $g_2(y_\ell) = 1$ ,  $g_2(y_{3i+2}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{\ell-4}{3}$ , and  $g_2(z) = 0$  otherwise;  $g_3(x_1) = 2$ ,  $g_3(x_{3i+3}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq p-1$ ,  $g_3(y_{3i+3}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{\ell-4}{3}$ , and  $g_1(z) = 0$  otherwise.

Second, let  $\ell \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$  and  $y_\ell x_j \in E(H)$ , where  $j \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ . Define the functions  $g_1, g_2$  and  $g_3$  on  $V(H)$  as follows:  $g_1(x_p) = 1$ ,  $g_1(x_{3i+3}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq p-1$ ,  $g_1(y_{3i+1}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{\ell-2}{3}$ , and  $g_1(z) = 0$  otherwise;  $g_2(x_{3i+2}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq p$ ,  $g_2(y_{3i+2}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{\ell-5}{3}$ ,  $g_2(y_{\ell-1}) = 1$ , and  $g_2(z) = 0$  otherwise;  $g_3(x_{3i+1}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq p$ ,  $g_3(y_{3i+3}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{\ell-5}{3}$ ,  $g_3(y_\ell) = 1$ , and  $g_1(z) = 0$  otherwise.

Clearly,  $g_1, g_2, g_3$  are RDFs of  $H$  and thus  $\vec{g} = (g_1, g_2, g_3)$  is a 3-tuple of RDFs of  $H$  with the desired property.  $\square$

### 3 Partial answer to Conjecture 1

In this section, we give a positive answer to Conjecture 1 for some particular graphs. We start with the following two lemmas.

**Lemma 7.** Let  $k \geq 1$  be an integer and let  $G$  be a connected graph with  $\delta \geq 2$ , which does not contain neither any induced  $\{C_5, C_8, \dots, C_{3k+2}\}$ -cycles nor any cycle of length  $\equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ . Let  $C$  be a cycle of  $G$  with length  $\ell(C) \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ . Then

1. if  $C$  is induced in  $G$ , then  $\ell(C) \geq 3k + 5$ , and
2. if  $C$  is not induced in  $G$ , then  $\ell(C) \geq 6k + 8$ .

**Proof.** Item (1) is immediate since  $G$  does not contain any induced  $\{C_5, C_8, \dots, C_{3k+2}\}$ -cycles and  $\ell(C) \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ . To prove item (2), let  $C = v_1 v_2 \dots v_{3p+2} v_1$  be a cycle which is not induced in  $G$ . Hence  $C$  has a chord, say without loss of generality,  $v_1 v_i \in E(G)$ . Consider the two paths  $P = v_{i+1} v_{i+2} \dots v_{3p+2} v_1$  and  $Q = v_2 v_3 \dots v_i$ . Let  $n(P)$  and  $n(Q)$  denote the order of  $P$  and  $Q$ , respectively. Clearly  $n(P) + n(Q) = 3p + 2$ . Now, if  $n(P) \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ , then  $v_1 v_2 v_3 \dots v_i v_1$  is a cycle of length  $\equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ , contradicting the fact that  $G$  has no cycle of such length. Hence  $n(P) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ , and likewise  $n(Q) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ . Moreover, since  $n(P) + n(Q) = 3p + 2$ , we deduce that  $n(P) \not\equiv 2 \pmod{3}$  and  $n(Q) \not\equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ . Hence  $n(P) \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$  and  $n(Q) \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ . Consider the cycles  $C_1 = v_1 v_2 v_3 \dots v_i v_1$  and  $C_2 = v_1 v_i v_{i+1} \dots v_{3p+2} v_1$ . Then  $\ell(C_1) \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$  and  $\ell(C_2) \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ . If  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  are induced in  $G$ , then by item (1) we have  $i \geq 3k + 5$  and  $3p + 4 - i \geq 3k + 5$  and thus  $\ell(C) = 3p + 2 \geq 3k + 5 + i - 2 \geq 3k + 5 + 3k + 5 - 2 = 6k + 8$ . Hence we assume that  $C_1$  is not induced in  $G$ . By repeating the above process we can see that the subgraph  $G[V(C_1)]$  has an induced cycle of length  $\equiv 2 \pmod{3}$  and so  $|V(C_1)| = i \geq 3k + 5$ . If  $C_2$  is an induced cycle, then by item (1) we have  $3p + 4 - i \geq 3k + 5$  and so  $\ell(C) = 3p + 2 \geq 3k + 5 + i - 2 \geq 3k + 5 + 3k + 5 - 2 = 6k + 8$ . Now if  $C_2$  is not an induced cycle, then a similar argument as above shows that  $G[V(C_2)]$  has an induced cycle of length  $\equiv 2 \pmod{3}$  yielding also  $\ell(C) \geq 6k + 8$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 8.** *Let  $G$  be a connected graph with minimum degree  $\delta \geq 2$  and let  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  be two non-null subgraphs of  $G$  such that  $V(G) = V(G_1) \cup V(G_2)$ . Then one of the following holds:*

1.  $G_1$  has a path  $P = v_1 \dots v_t$  such that both  $v_1$  and  $v_t$  have neighbors in  $G_2$  and  $N_G(v_1) \cup N_G(v_t) \subseteq V(G_2) \cup V(P)$ .
2.  $G_1$  has a cycle  $C = v_1 v_2 \dots v_t v_1$  such that  $v_1$  has neighbors in  $G_2$  and  $N_G(v_t) \subseteq V(G_2) \cup V(C)$ .
3.  $G_1$  contains a tailed  $m$ -cycle, say  $C_{m,\ell}$ , such that  $y_\ell$  is adjacent to some vertex in  $G_2$  and  $N_G(x_2) \cup N_G(x_m) \subseteq V(G_2) \cup V(C_{m,\ell})$ .

**Proof.** Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be the family of all longest paths (not necessarily induced) in  $G_1$  such that at least one of their end-points has a neighbor in  $G_2$  and let  $Q = \{v \in V(G) \mid \text{there is a path } v_1, \dots, v_t (= v) \in \mathcal{P} \text{ such that } v_1 \text{ has a neighbor in } G_2\}$ . Choose a vertex  $v \in Q$  such that the length of its corresponding path  $P = v_1, \dots, v_t (= v) \in \mathcal{P}$  is as long as possible.

First let  $v$  be adjacent to some vertex in  $G_2$ . By the definition of set  $Q$ , we have  $v_1 \in Q$ , and from the choice of  $v$  we deduce that  $N_G(v_1) \cup N_G(v_t) \subseteq V(G_2) \cup V(P)$ . Hence item (1) holds. Suppose now  $v$  has no neighbor in  $G_2$ . It follows from the choice of  $v$  and the fact  $\delta \geq 2$  that  $v$  has at least two neighbors in  $V(P)$ . Let  $j$  be the smallest index such that  $vv_j \in E(G)$ . Now, if  $j = 1$ , that is  $v$  is adjacent to  $v_1$ , then clearly  $N_G(v_t) \subseteq V(P)$  and thus item (2) holds. Hence we assume that  $j \neq 1$ . Then  $v_1 \dots v_j \dots v_{t-1} vv_j$  is a tailed cycle contained in  $G_1$ . Observe that the path with endvertices  $v_1$  and  $v_{j+1}$  starting from  $v_1$  to  $v_j$  and then passing through  $v_t$  to  $v_{j+1}$  is also a longest path with same length as  $P$ . Since  $v = v_t$  has no neighbor in  $G_2$ , we may assume by analogy that  $v_{j+1}$  has no neighbor in  $G_2$  and thus all its neighbors are on  $P$  which forms a tailed cycle and thus item (3) holds.  $\square$

**Theorem 9.** *Let  $k \geq 1$  be an integer and let  $G$  be a connected graph of order  $n \geq 6k + 9$  and minimum degree at least 2 such that  $G$  has no cycle with length  $\equiv 0$  or  $2 \pmod{3}$ . Then  $\gamma_R(G) \leq \frac{(4k+8)n}{6k+11}$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $Q = z_1 z_2 \dots z_r$  be a longest path in  $G$ . If  $V(G) = V(Q)$ , then we have  $\gamma_R(G) \leq \frac{2n+1}{3} < \frac{(4k+8)n}{6k+11}$ . Hence, we assume that  $V(Q) \subsetneq V(G)$ . By the choice of  $Q$  we have  $N_G(z_1) \cup N_G(z_r) \subseteq V(Q)$ . Since  $\delta(G) \geq 2$ ,  $z_1$  is adjacent to some  $z_j$  with  $j \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ , because  $G$  has no cycle with length  $\equiv 0$  or  $2 \pmod{3}$ . Let  $G_2^0$  be the graph obtained from the path  $Q$  to which we add the edge  $z_1 z_j$  and let  $G_1^0$  be the graph induced by  $V(G) - V(G_2^0)$ . Observe that  $G_2^0$  is a tailed  $j$ -cycle  $C_{j,r-j}$ . By Lemma 4-(3),  $G_2^0$  has a 3-tuple of RDFs  $\vec{f} = (f_1, f_2, f_3)$  such that  $\omega(\vec{f}) \leq 2r + 1$  and all vertices of  $C_{j,r-j}$  but  $z_1$  are  $\vec{f}$ -strong. According to Lemma 8, we consider the following three possibilities.

- (a)  $G_1^0$  has a path  $P = v_1 \dots v_t$  such that  $v_1, v_t$  are adjacent to some vertices in  $V(G_2^0) - \{z_1, z_t\}$ , say  $u, v$  (possibly  $u = v$ ) and  $N_G(v_1) \cup N_G(v_t) \subseteq V(G_2^0) \cup V(P)$ .  
Let  $G_2^1$  be the graph obtained from  $G_2^0$  and the path  $P$  by adding the edges  $v_1 u, v_t v$ .  
By Lemma 2,  $\vec{f}$  can be extended to a 3-triple of RDFs  $\vec{g}$  of  $G_2^1$  such that  $\omega(\vec{g}, P) \leq 2n(P)$  and each vertex in  $V(P) - \{v_1, v_t\}$  is  $\vec{g}$ -strong. Note that  $\omega(\vec{g}) = \omega(\vec{f}) + \omega(\vec{g}, P) \leq 2n(G_2^1) + 1$ .

- (b)  $G_1^0$  has a cycle  $C = v_1, \dots, v_t v_1$  such that  $v_1$  is adjacent to a vertex in  $G_2^0$ , say  $u$ , and  $N_G(v_t) \subseteq V(G_2^0) \cup V(C)$ .  
Since  $G$  has no cycle of length  $\equiv 0$  or  $2 \pmod{3}$ , we have  $t \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ . Let  $G_2^1$  be the graph obtained from  $G_2^0$  and the cycle  $C$  by adding the edge  $v_1 u$ . By Lemma 3,  $\vec{f}$  can be extended to a 3-triple of RDFs  $\vec{g}$  of  $G_2^1$  such that  $\omega(g, C) \leq 2n(C)$  and each vertex in  $V(C) - \{v_t\}$  is  $\vec{g}$ -strong. In addition, it is clear that  $\omega(\vec{g}) \leq \omega(\vec{f}) + \omega(\vec{g}, C) \leq 2n(G_2^1) + 1$ .
- (c)  $G_1^0$  contains a tailed  $m$ -cycle  $C_{m,\ell}$ , such that  $y_\ell$  is adjacent to some vertex in  $G_2^0$ , say  $u$ , and  $N_G(x_2) \cup N_G(x_m) \subseteq V(G_2^0) \cup V(C_{m,\ell})$ .  
As above in (b), since  $G$  has no cycle of length  $\equiv 0$  or  $2 \pmod{3}$ , we have  $m \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ . Let  $G_2^1$  be the graph obtained from  $G_2^0$  and the tailed  $m$ -cycle  $C_{m,\ell}$  by adding the edge  $u y_\ell$ . By Lemma 3,  $\vec{f}$  can be extended to a 3-triple of RDFs  $\vec{g}$  of  $G_2^1$  such that  $\omega(\vec{g}, C_{m,\ell}) \leq 2n(C_{m,\ell})$  and each vertex of  $C_{m,\ell}$  but  $x_m$  is  $\vec{g}$ -strong. Therefore, we also have  $\omega(\vec{g}) \leq 2n(G_2^1) + 1$ .

Now, let  $G_1^1 = G - G_2^1$ . By repeating the above process, we obtain a 3-tuple of RDFs  $G$  that is  $\vec{h} = (h_1, h_2, h_3)$  such that  $\omega(\vec{h}) \leq 2n(G) + 1 \leq \frac{3n(4k+8)}{6k+8}$ . Therefore,  $\omega(h_j) \leq \frac{n(4k+8)}{6k+8}$  for some  $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ , and this completes the proof.  $\square$

**Theorem 10.** Let  $k \geq 1$  be an integer and let  $G$  be a connected graph of order  $n \geq 6k + 9$  with minimum degree at least 2 and having a cycle  $C$  with length  $\equiv 0 \pmod{3}$  such that any other cycle of  $G$  with length  $\equiv 0$  or  $2 \pmod{3}$  has at least a common vertex with  $C$ . Then  $\gamma_R(G) \leq \frac{(4k+8)n}{6k+11}$ .

**Proof.** Assume that the vertices of the cycle  $C$  with length  $\equiv 0 \pmod{3}$  are labelled by  $z_1 z_2 \dots z_r z_1$ . If  $V(G) = V(C)$ , then clearly  $\gamma_R(G) \leq \frac{2n}{3} < \frac{(4k+8)n}{6k+11}$ . Hence, we assume that  $V(C) \subsetneq V(G)$ . Let  $G_2^0 = C$  and let  $G_1^0$  be the graph induced by  $V(G) - V(G_2^0)$ . By Lemma 4,  $G_2^0$  has a 3-tuple of RDFs  $\vec{f} = (f_1, f_2, f_3)$  such that  $\omega(\vec{f}) \leq 2r$  and all vertices of  $C$  are  $\vec{f}$ -strong. Now, according to Lemma 8, we consider the following three possibilities.

- (a)  $G_1^0$  has a path  $P = v_1 \dots v_t$  such that  $v_1, v_t$  have neighbors in  $V(G_2)$ , say  $u, v$  (possibly  $u = v$ ), and  $N_G(v_1) \cup N_G(v_t) \subseteq V(G_2^0) \cup V(P)$ .  
Let  $G_2^1$  be the graph obtained from  $G_2^0$  and the path  $P$  by adding the edges  $v_1 u$  and  $v_t v$ . By Lemma 2,  $\vec{f}$  can be extended to a 3-triple of RDFs  $\vec{g}$  of  $G_2^1$  such that  $\omega(g, P) \leq 2n(P) = 2t$  and each vertex in  $V(P) - \{v_1, v_t\}$  is  $\vec{g}$ -strong. In this case, we have  $\omega(\vec{g}) = \omega(\vec{f}) + \omega(\vec{g}, P) \leq 2n(G_2^1)$ .
- (b)  $G_1^0$  has a cycle  $C' = v_1, \dots, v_t v_1$  such that  $v_1$  is adjacent to a vertex in  $G_2^0$ , say  $u$ , and  $N_G(v_t) \subseteq V(G_2^0) \cup V(C')$ .  
By assumption, we have  $t \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ . Let  $G_2^1$  be the graph obtained from  $G_2^0$  and the cycle  $C'$  by adding the edge  $v_1 u$ . By Lemma 3,  $\vec{f}$  can be extended to a 3-triple of RDFs  $\vec{g}$  of  $G_2^1$  such that  $\omega(\vec{g}, C') \leq 2n(C') = 2t$  and each vertex in  $V(C') - \{v_t\}$  is  $\vec{g}$ -strong. Moreover, we also obtain  $\omega(\vec{g}) \leq 2n(G_2^1)$ .
- (c)  $G_1^0$  contains a tailed  $m$ -cycle  $C_{m,\ell}$ , such that  $y_\ell$  is adjacent to some vertex in  $G_2^0$ , say  $u$ , and  $N_G(x_2) \cup N_G(x_m) \subseteq V(G_2^0) \cup V(C_{m,\ell})$ .  
As above,  $m \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ . Let  $G_2^1$  be the graph obtained from  $G_2^0$  and the tailed

$m$ -cycle  $C_{m,\ell}$  by adding the edge  $uy_\ell$ . By Lemmas 3,  $\vec{f}$  can be extended to a 3-triple of RDFs  $\vec{g}$  of  $G_2^1$  such that  $\omega(\vec{g}, C_{m,\ell}) \leq 2n(C_{m,\ell})$  and each vertex of  $C_{m,\ell}$  but  $x_m$  is  $\vec{g}$ -strong. In addition, we have  $\omega(\vec{g}) \leq 2n(G_2^1)$ .

Let  $G_1^1 = G - G_2^1$ . By repeating the above process, we obtain a 3-tuple of RDFs  $G$  that is  $\vec{h} = (h_1, h_2, h_3)$  such that  $\omega(\vec{h}) \leq 2n(G) + 1 \leq \frac{3n(4k+8)}{6k+8}$ . Therefore  $\omega(f_j) \leq \frac{n(4k+8)}{6k+8}$  for some  $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ , and this completes the proof.  $\square$

**Theorem 11.** Let  $k \geq 1$  be an integer and let  $G$  be a connected graph of order  $n \geq 6k + 9$  and minimum degree at least 2 which does not contain neither any induced  $\{C_5, C_8, \dots, C_{3k+2}\}$ -cycles nor any cycle of length  $\equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ , and every two distinct cycles of length  $\equiv 2 \pmod{3}$  (if any) have at least a common vertex. If  $G$  has a cycle  $C$  with length  $\equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ , then  $\gamma_R(G) \leq \frac{(4k+8)n}{6k+11}$ .

**Proof.** Let  $C = z_1 z_2 \dots z_p z_1$  be a cycle of length  $\equiv 2 \pmod{3}$  in  $G$  chosen first not induced, if it exists, otherwise it is of course induced. If  $V(G) = V(C)$ , then we have  $\gamma_R(G) \leq \frac{2n+2}{3} < \frac{(4k+8)n}{6k+11}$ . Hence, we can assume that  $V(C) \subsetneq V(G)$ .

First assume there is either a cycle  $C' = x_1 x_2 \dots x_m x_1$  such that  $x_1$  is adjacent to a vertex of  $C$ , say  $z_1$ , and  $N_G(x_m) \subseteq V(C) \cup V(C')$ , or a tailed  $m$ -cycle  $C_{m,\ell}$  in  $G$  such that  $y_\ell$  is adjacent to a vertex of  $C$ , say  $z_1$ , and  $N_G(x_m) \subseteq V(C) \cup V(C_{m,\ell})$ . By assumption  $m \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ . Let  $G_2^0 = C + C' + x_1 z_1$  or  $G_2^0 = C + C_{m,\ell} + y_\ell z_1$  (depending on which situation occurs, the first or the second one), and let  $G_1^0 = G - G_2^0$ . By Lemma 5,  $G_2^0$  has a 3-tuple of RDFs  $\vec{f} = (f_1, f_2, f_3)$  such that  $\omega(\vec{f}) \leq 2n(G_2^0) + 1$  and all vertices of  $G_2^0$  but  $x_m$  are  $\vec{f}$ -strong. Considering our assumption and Lemma 8, one of the following situations holds.

(a)  $G_1^0$  has a path  $P = v_1, \dots, v_t$  such that  $v_1$  and  $v_t$  are adjacent to some vertices in  $V(G_2^0)$ , say  $u, v$  (possibly  $u = v$ ) and  $N_G(v_1) \cup N_G(v_t) \subseteq V(G_2^0) \cup V(P)$ . We note that  $x_m \notin \{u, v\}$ , since  $C'$  or  $C_{m,\ell}$  has been chosen so that  $x_m$  satisfies  $N_G(x_m) \subseteq V(C) \cup V(C_{m,\ell})$ . Hence  $u$  and  $v$  are  $\vec{f}$ -strong. Let  $G_2^1$  be the graph obtained from  $G_2^0$  and the path  $P$  by adding the edges  $v_1 u, v_t v$ . By Lemma 2,  $\vec{f}$  can be extended to a 3-triple  $\vec{g}$  such that  $\omega(\vec{g}) \leq 2n(G_2^1) + 1$  and all vertices of  $V(P) - \{v_1, v_t\}$  are  $\vec{g}$ -strong.

(b)  $G_1^0$  has a cycle  $C'' = v_1, \dots, v_t v_1$  such that  $v_1$  is adjacent to a vertex in  $G_2^0$ , say  $u$ , and  $N_G(v_t) \subseteq V(G_2^0) \cup V(C'')$ . A same argument as in item (a) shows that  $u \neq x_m$ , and thus  $u$  is  $\vec{f}$ -strong.

By assumption, we have  $t \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ . Let  $G_2^1$  be the graph obtained from  $G_2^0$  and the cycle  $C''$  by adding the edge  $v_1 u$ . By Lemma 3,  $\vec{f}$  can be extended to a 3-triple  $\vec{g}$  such that  $\omega(\vec{g}) \leq 2n(G_2^1) + 1$  and each vertex  $V(C'') - \{v_t\}$  is  $\vec{g}$ -strong.

(c)  $G_1^0$  contains a tailed  $m'$ -cycle  $C_{m',\ell'}$ , such that  $y_{\ell'}$  is adjacent to some vertex in  $G_2^0$ , say  $u$ , and  $N_G(x_2) \cup N_G(x_m) \subseteq V(G_2^0) \cup V(C_{m',\ell'})$ . Note that  $u \neq x_m$  and  $u$  is  $\vec{f}$ -strong. As above  $m' \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ . Let  $G_2^1$  be the graph obtained from  $G_2^0$  and the tailed cycle  $C_{m',\ell'}$  by adding the edge  $u y_{\ell'}$ . By Lemma 3,  $\vec{f}$  can be extended to a 3-triple  $\vec{g}$  such that  $\omega(\vec{g}) \leq 2n(G_2^1) + 1$  and all vertices of  $V(C_{m',\ell'}) - \{x_{m'}\}$  are  $\vec{g}$ -strong.

Let  $G_1^1 = G - G_2^1$ . By repeating the above process, we obtain a 3-tuple of RDFs  $\vec{g} = (g_1', g_2', g_3')$  such that  $\omega(\vec{g}) \leq 2n(G) + 1 \leq \frac{3n(4k+8)}{6k+8}$ . It follows that  $\omega(g_j') \leq \frac{n(4k+8)}{6k+8}$  for some  $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$  as desired.

Next we can assume that there is neither a cycle  $C' = (x_1 x_2 \dots x_m x_1)$  such that  $x_1$  is adjacent to a vertex in  $C$  and  $N_G(x_m) \subseteq V(C) \cup V(C')$ , nor a tailed  $m$ -cycle  $C_{m,\ell}$  with  $m \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$  in  $G$  such that  $y_\ell$  is adjacent to a vertex in  $C$  and  $N_G(x_m) \subseteq V(C) \cup V(C_{m,\ell})$ . Let  $H_2^0 = C$  and  $H_1^0 = G - H_2^0$ . It follows from Lemma 8 and the assumptions that  $H_1^0$  has a path  $P = v_1, \dots, v_t$  such that  $v_1, v_t$  are adjacent to some vertices in  $V(H_2^0)$ , say  $z_1, z_j$  (possibly  $j = 1$ ) and  $N_G(v_1) \cup N_G(v_t) \subseteq V(H_2^0) \cup V(P)$ . We consider the following cases.

**Case 1.**  $j = 1$ .

Let  $G_2^1$  be the graph obtained from  $H_2^0$  and the path  $P$  by adding the edges  $v_1 z_1, v_t z_1$  and let  $G_1^1 = G - G_2^1$ . By Lemma 5-(1),  $G_2^1$  has a triple  $\vec{f}$  of RDFs such that  $\omega(\vec{f}) \leq 2n(G_2^1) + 1$  and all vertices of  $G_2^1$  but  $v_1, v_t$  are  $\vec{f}$ -strong. If  $V(G) = V(G_2^1)$  (and hence  $G_1^1$  is empty), then the result follows. Hence, assume that  $V(G) \neq V(G_2^1)$ . By the assumptions and Lemma 8, we deduce that  $G_1^1$  has a path  $P' = v_1', \dots, v_{t'}'$  such that  $v_1', v_{t'}'$  are adjacent to some vertices in  $V(G_2^1)$ , say  $u, v$  (possibly  $u = v$ ) and  $N_G(v_1') \cup N_G(v_{t'}') \subseteq V(G_2^1) \cup V(P')$ . Let  $G_2^2$  be obtained from  $G_2^1$  and the path  $P'$  by adding the edges  $v_1' u, v_{t'}' v$  and let  $G_1^2 = G - G_2^2$ . Note that  $v_1, v_t \notin \{u, v\}$  and thus  $u, v$  are  $\vec{f}$ -strong. By Lemma 2,  $\vec{f}$  can be extended to a 3-triple  $\vec{g}$  such that  $\omega(\vec{g}) \leq 2n(G_2^2) + 1$  and all vertices of  $V(P') - \{v_1', v_{t'}'\}$  are  $\vec{g}$ -strong. By repeating the above process, we obtain a 3-tuple of RDFs  $\vec{g}^* = (g_1^*, g_2^*, g_3^*)$  such that  $\omega(\vec{g}^*) \leq 2n(G) + 1 \leq \frac{3n(4k+8)}{6k+8}$ . It follows that  $\omega(g_r^*) \leq \frac{n(4k+8)}{6k+8}$  for some  $r \in \{1, 2, 3\}$  as desired.

**Case 2.**  $j \neq 1$ .

We distinguish the following three subcases.

**Subcase 2.1.**  $t \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ .

Since  $G$  has no cycle of length  $\equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ , we have  $j \not\equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ . Let  $G_2^1$  be the graph obtained from  $H_2^0$  and the path  $P$  by adding the edges  $v_1 z_1, v_t z_j$  and let  $G_1^1 = G - G_2^1$ . By Lemma 6,  $G_2^1$  has a triple  $\vec{f}$  of RDFs such that  $\omega(\vec{f}) \leq 2n(G_2^1) + 1$  and all vertices of  $G_2^1$  but  $v_1, v_t$  are  $\vec{f}$ -strong. As in Case 1, we can obtain a 3-tuple of RDFs  $\vec{g}^* = (g_1^*, g_2^*, g_3^*)$  such that  $\omega(\vec{g}^*) \leq 2n(G) + 1 \leq \frac{3n(4k+8)}{6k+8}$  yielding the desired result.

**Subcase 2.2.**  $t \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ .

Observe that if  $j \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ , then  $z_1 v_1 \dots v_t z_j z_{j+1} \dots z_p z_1$  would be a cycle of length  $\equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ , a contradiction, and if  $j \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ , then  $z_1 v_1 \dots v_t z_j z_{j-1} \dots z_2 z_1$  would be a cycle of length  $\equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ , a contradiction again. Hence  $j \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ . Now, as in Subcase 2.1, we can get the result.

Considering Subcases 2.1 and 2.2, we may assume all ears of  $C$  in  $G_1^0$  have length  $\equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ .

**Subcase 2.3.**  $t \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ .

Considering the cycles generated by  $C + P + v_1 z_1 + v_t z_j$  and that fact that  $G$  has no cycle of length  $\equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ , we deduce that  $j \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ . Let  $C_1 = (z_1 z_2 \dots z_p z_1)$ ,  $C_2 = (z_1 v_1 v_2 \dots v_t z_j z_{j-1} \dots z_2 z_1)$  and  $C_3 = (z_1 v_1 v_2 \dots v_t z_j z_{j+1} \dots z_p z_1)$ . Clearly the cycles  $C_1, C_2, C_3$  are all of length  $\equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ .

Assume first that  $C_1$  is not an induced cycle in  $G$ . Then by Lemma 7 and considering the ear we have  $n(C_1 \cup C_2) \geq 6k + 11$ . Let  $G_2^0 = C_1 \cup C_2$  and  $G_1^0 = G - G_2^0$ . It is not hard to see that  $G_2^0$  has a 3-tuple  $\vec{f}$  of RDFs such that  $\omega(\vec{f}) \leq 2n(G_2^0) + 2$  and all

vertices of  $G_2^0$  but  $v_1, v_t$  are  $\vec{f}$ -strong. If  $V(G) = V(G_2^0)$ , then the result follows. Hence assume that  $V(G) \neq V(G_2^0)$ . By the assumptions and Lemma 8, we deduce that  $G_1^0$  has a path  $P' = v'_1, \dots, v'_t$  such that  $v'_1, v'_t$  are adjacent to some vertices in  $V(G_2^0)$ , say  $u, v$  (possibly  $u = v$ ) and  $N_G(v'_1) \cup N_G(v'_t) \subseteq V(G_2^0) \cup V(P')$ . Note that  $u, v \notin \{v_1, v_t\}$  since  $N_G(v_1) \cup N_G(v_t) \subseteq V(H_2^0) \cup V(P)$ . Thus  $u, v$  are  $\vec{f}$ -strong. Now, let  $G_2^1$  be the graph obtained from  $G_2^0$  and the path  $P'$  by adding the edges  $v'_1u, v'_tv$  and let  $G_1^1 = G - G_2^1$ . By Lemma 2,  $\vec{f}$  can be extended to a 3-triple  $\vec{g}$  such that  $\omega(\vec{g}) \leq 2n(G_2^0) + 1$  and all vertices of  $P'$  but  $v'_1, v'_t$  are  $\vec{g}$ -strong. By repeating above process, we obtain a 3-tuple of RDFs  $\vec{g}^* = (g_1^*, g_2^*, g_3^*)$  such that  $\omega(\vec{g}^*) \leq 2n(G) + 2 \leq \frac{3n(4k+8)}{6k+8}$ . It follows that  $\omega(\vec{g}_j^*) \leq \frac{n(4k+8)}{6k+8}$  for some  $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$  as desired.

Assume now that  $C_1$  is an induced cycle. By the choice of  $C$ , we may assume that  $G$  has no cycle of length  $\equiv 2 \pmod{3}$  which is not induced. Hence the cycle  $C_2$  is also induced. Let  $G_2^0 = C_1 \cup C_2$  and  $G_2^1 = G - G_2^0$ . There are the following two possibilities.

- $V(G) = V(G_2^0)$ .  
Suppose  $n(C_1) = 3t_1 + 2$  and  $t = 3t_2$ . Using the fact that  $n \geq 6k + 9$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} n &= n(C_1) + t \\ &= 3t_1 + 2 + 3t_2 \\ &\geq 3(2k + 3) \end{aligned}$$

implying that  $t_1 + t_2 \geq 2k + 3 - 2/3$ . Since  $t_1 + t_2$  is integer, we deduce that  $t_1 + t_2 \geq 2k + 3$ , and thus  $n \geq 6k + 11$ . Now, it is easy to see that  $\gamma_R(G) \leq \frac{2n+2}{3} \leq \frac{(4k+8)n}{6k+11}$ .

- $V(G_2^0) \subsetneq V(G)$ .

Clearly  $G_2^0$  has a triple  $\vec{f}^0$  of RDFs such that  $\omega(\vec{f}^0) \leq n(G_2^0) + 2$  and all vertices of  $G_2^0$  but  $v_1, v_t$  are  $\vec{f}^0$ -strong. By the assumptions and Lemma 8, we deduce that  $G_1^0$  has a path  $P_1 = v_1^1, \dots, v_{q_1}^1$  such that  $v_1^1, v_{q_1}^1$  are adjacent to some vertices in  $V(G_2^0)$ , say  $u, v$  (possibly  $u = v$ ) and  $N_G(v_1^1) \cup N_G(v_{q_1}^1) \subseteq V(G_2^0) \cup V(P_1)$ . Recall that  $u, v \in \{v_1, v_t\}$  and thus they are  $\vec{f}^0$ -strong. Moreover, since every cycle of  $G$  intersects  $C_1$ , we have  $V(C_1) \cap \{u, v\} \neq \emptyset$ . Hence vertices  $u, v$  may belong to  $C_1, C_2$  or  $C_3$ . Now, seeing Case 1 and Subcase 2.1 and 2.2, we may assume that  $q_1 \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ . Let  $q_1 = 3q_1'$  and let  $G_2^1$  be the graph obtained from  $G_2^0$  and the path  $P_1$  by adding the edges  $v_1^1u, v_{q_1}^1v$  and let  $G_1^1 = G - G_2^1$ . By Lemma 2,  $\vec{f}^0$  can be extended to a 3-triple  $\vec{f}^1$  of  $G_2^1$  such that  $\omega(\vec{f}^1) \leq 2n(G_2^0) + 2$  and all vertices of  $P_1$  but  $v_1^1, v_{q_1}^1$  are  $\vec{f}^1$ -strong. If  $V(G) = V(G_2^1)$ , then  $n = 3t_1 + 3t_2 + 3q_1' + 2$ . As above we can see that  $n \geq 6k + 11$ , implying that  $\gamma_R(G) \leq \frac{2n+2}{3} \leq \frac{(4k+8)n}{6k+11}$ . Hence assume that  $V(G_2^1) \subsetneq V(G)$ . By the assumptions and Lemma 8, we deduce that  $G_1^1$  has a path  $P_2 = v_1^2, \dots, v_{q_2}^2$  such that  $v_1^2, v_{q_2}^2$  are adjacent to some vertices in  $V(G_2^1)$ , say  $u', v'$  (possibly  $u' = v'$ ) and  $N_G(v_1^2) \cup N_G(v_{q_2}^2) \subseteq V(G_2^1) \cup V(P_2)$ . Since every cycle of  $G$  intersects  $C_1$ , we have  $V(C_1) \cap \{u', v'\} \neq \emptyset$ . On the other hand, we note that  $u', v'$  lies on a cycle of length  $\equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ . Seeing Case 1 and Subcase 2.1 and 2.2, we may assume that  $q_2 \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ . Let  $q_2 = 3q_2'$  and let  $G_2^2$  be the graph obtained from  $G_2^1$  and the path  $P_2$  by adding the edges  $v_1^2u', v_{q_2}^2v'$  and let  $G_1^2 = G - G_2^2$ . By Lemma 2,  $\vec{f}^1$  can be extended to a 3-triple  $\vec{f}^2$  such that  $\omega(\vec{f}^2) \leq 2n(G_2^1) + 2$  and all of  $P_2$  but  $v_1^2, v_{q_2}^2$  are  $\vec{f}^2$ -strong. If  $V(G) = V(G_2^2)$ , then  $n = 3t_1 + 3t_2 + 3q_1' + 3q_2' + 2$ . As above

we can see that  $n \geq 6k + 11$ , implying that  $\gamma_R(G) \leq \frac{2n+2}{3} \leq \frac{(4k+8)n}{6k+11}$ . Hence suppose that  $V(G_2^k) \subsetneq V(G)$ . By repeating the above process, we obtain a subgraph  $G_2^k$  with  $n(G_2^k) \geq 6k + 11$  and having a 3-tuple  $\vec{f}^k$  of RDFs such that  $\omega(\vec{f}^k) \leq 2n(G_2^k) + 2$  and all vertices of  $G_2^k$  with a neighbor outside of  $G_2^k$  are  $\vec{f}^k$ -strong. If  $V(G) = V(G_2^k)$ , then the result follows immediately. Otherwise, let  $G_1^k = G - V(G_2^k)$ . Now using Lemma 2 we can obtain extend  $G_2^k$  to a subgraph  $G_2^{k+1}$  by adding an ear in  $G_1^k$  and extend  $\vec{f}^k$  to a 3-tuple  $\vec{f}^{k+1}$  of RDFs such that  $\omega(\vec{f}^{k+1}) \leq 2n(G_2^{k+1}) + 2$  and all vertices of  $G_2^{k+1}$  with a neighbor outside of  $G_2^{k+1}$  are  $\vec{f}^{k+1}$ -strong. By repeating this process we obtain a 3-tuple  $\vec{g}$  of RDFs of  $G$  such that  $\omega(\vec{g}) \leq 2n(G) + 2$  and this leads to the result as above.  $\square$

## 4 Some more lemmas

Let  $\mathcal{F}_i$  be the family of all cycles of length  $\equiv i \pmod{3}$  with  $i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ . Let  $\mathcal{F}_{0,2}$  be the family of all connected graphs obtained from a cycle  $C$  of  $\mathcal{F}_0$  and a cycle  $C'$  of  $\mathcal{F}_2$  by joining a vertex  $x$  of  $C$  a vertex  $y$  of  $C'$  by either an edge  $xy$  or by a nontrivial path that we add so that one of the envertices of the path is attached to  $x$  and the other one to  $y$ ;  $\mathcal{F}_{2,2}$  be the family of all connected graphs obtained from two cycles in  $\mathcal{F}_2$  by adding an edge between them; and let  $\mathcal{F}_3$  be the family of all graphs  $G$  obtained from a graph  $G'$  in  $\mathcal{F}_{0,2}$  and a graph  $G''$  in  $\mathcal{F}_{2,2}$  by adding either an edge or a path joining a vertex of  $G'$  to a vertex of  $G''$  so that all vertices of the path become of degree two in  $G$ .

Let  $\mathcal{B}_{r,s}$  ( $r + s \geq 2$ ) be the family of connected graphs obtained from  $r$  tailed cycles  $C_{n_1, \ell_1}, \dots, C_{n_r, \ell_r}$  and  $s$  cycles  $C_{m_1}, \dots, C_{m_s}$ , where  $n_i \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$  and  $m_j \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$  for each  $i, j$ , by adding a new vertex  $z$  (which we call special vertex) and joining by edges  $z$  to the unique leaf of each graph  $C_{n_i, \ell_i}$  and to one vertex of each cycle  $C_{m_j}$ . Moreover, each of the  $s$  cycles will be called a *near cycle* of  $z$ . Let  $\mathcal{E} = \cup_{r,s \geq 0; r+s \geq 2} \mathcal{B}_{r,s}$ .

**Lemma 12.** Let  $G$  be a connected graph with at least two disjoint cycles and let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a family of pairwise disjoint cycles of length  $\equiv 0, 2 \pmod{3}$  in  $G$  with  $|\mathcal{F}| \geq 2$ . Then  $G$  has two disjoint subgraphs  $G_1$  (possibly null) and  $G_2$  such that  $V(G) = V(G_1) \cup V(G_2)$ ,  $G_1$  has no cycle of  $\mathcal{F}$  and each component of  $G_2$  is in  $\mathcal{F}_0 \cup \mathcal{F}_{0,2} \cup \mathcal{F}_{2,2} \cup \mathcal{E}$ .

**Proof.** The proof is by induction on the number of cycles in  $\mathcal{F}$ . First let  $|\mathcal{F}| = 2$  with  $\mathcal{F} = \{C_1, C_2\}$ . Since  $G$  is connected, let  $P$  be a shortest path joining a vertex of  $C_1$  to a vertex of  $C_2$ . If both  $C_1, C_2$  have length  $\equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ , then let  $G_2 = C_1 \cup C_2$  and if one of the two cycles has length  $\equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ , then let  $G_2 = C_1 + C_2 + P$ . Assume that  $G_1 = G - V(G_1)$ . Clearly  $G_1$  has no cycle of  $\mathcal{F}$  and each component of  $G_2$  belongs to  $\mathcal{F}_0 \cup \mathcal{F}_{0,2} \cup \mathcal{F}_{2,2} \cup \mathcal{E}$ , establishing the base case.

Next let  $|\mathcal{F}| = 3$  and  $\mathcal{F} = \{C_1, C_2, C_3\}$ . Assume that  $C_i = x_1^i x_2^i \dots x_{n_i}^i x_1^i$  for  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ . If each cycle of  $\mathcal{F}$  has length  $\equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ , then let  $G_2 = C_1 \cup C_2 \cup C_3$  and  $G_1 = G - G_2$ . Clearly the result holds. Hence assume that one of the three cycles has length  $\equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ , say  $C_1$ . Let  $P$  be a shortest path joining a vertex of  $C_1$  to a vertex in  $C_2$  or  $C_3$ . Assume, without loss of generality, that  $P$  joins  $C_1$  and  $C_2$ , where  $P = (x_1^1 =) z_0 z_1 \dots z_k (= x_1^2)$ . If  $C_3$  has length  $\equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ , then by setting  $G_2 = (C_1 \cup C_2 \cup P) \cup C_3$  and  $G_1 = G - G_2$ , it is clear that the result holds. Hence we assume that  $C_3$  has length  $\equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ . Now, let

$Q = (x_1^3 =)y_0y_1\dots y_s$  be a shortest path joining a vertex of  $C_3$  to a vertex  $y_s$  belonging to  $V(C_1) \cup V(C_2) \cup V(P)$ . Assume that  $y_s \in V(P) - \{x_1^1, x_1^2\}$ , say  $y_s = z_m$ . If  $C_2$  has length  $\equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ , then by setting  $G_2 = (C_1 \cup C_3 \cup P') \cup C_2$ , with  $P' = (x_1^1 =)z_0z_1\dots z_m, y_{s-1}, \dots, y_0$ , and  $G_1 = G - G_2$ , we get the desired result. Hence we assume that  $C_2$  has length  $\equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ . In this case, the result holds by letting  $G_2 = C_1 \cup C_2 \cup C_3 \cup P \cup Q$  and  $G_1 = G - G_2$ . Finally, assume, without loss of generality, that  $y_s \in C_2$ , say  $y_s = x_j^2$  (possibly  $j = 1$ ). Let  $G_2 = C_1 P x_1^2 \dots x_j^2 Q C_3$  and  $G_1 = G - G_2$ . Note that  $G_2$  belongs to  $\mathcal{B}_{0,2} \cup \mathcal{B}_{1,1}$ , and clearly the desired result holds.

Assume now that  $|\mathcal{F}| \geq 4$ . If all cycles in  $\mathcal{F}$  have length  $\equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ , then the subgraphs  $G_2 = \cup_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{F}|} C_i$  and  $G_1 = G - G_2$  satisfy the conditions and the result holds. Hence we assume that one of the cycles in  $\mathcal{F}$ , say  $C_0$ , has length  $\equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ . Let  $\mathcal{F}' = \mathcal{F} - \{C_0\}$  and let  $G^1 = G - V(C_0)$ . We consider two cases.

**Case 1.**  $G^1$  is connected.

Then  $\mathcal{F}'$  is a family of disjoint cycles of length  $\equiv 0, 2 \pmod{3}$  in  $G^1$  with  $|\mathcal{F}'| \geq 2$ . By the induction hypothesis,  $G^1$  has two disjoint subgraphs  $G'_1$  (possibly null) and  $G'_2$  such that  $V(G^1) = V(G'_1) \cup V(G'_2)$ ,  $G'_1$  has no cycle of  $\mathcal{F}'$ , where each component of  $G'_2$  is in  $\mathcal{F}_0 \cup \mathcal{F}_{0,2} \cup \mathcal{F}_{2,2} \cup \mathcal{E}$ . Let  $H_1, \dots, H_p$  be the components of  $G'_2$ . Suppose without loss of generality that  $P := (x_1^0 =)v_0v_1\dots v_t$  is a shortest path between  $V(C_0)$  and  $V(G'_2)$  in  $G$  where  $v_t \in V(G'_2)$ . Without loss of generality, assume that  $v_t \in V(H_1)$ . If  $H_1 \in \mathcal{F}_0$ , then let  $H'_1 = H_1 + P + C_0$  and clearly the two subgraphs  $G_2 = H'_1 \cup H_2 \cup \dots \cup H_p$  and  $G_1 = G - V(G_2)$  satisfy the conditions and result follows. For the next, we can assume that  $H_1$  contains at least two cycles. We distinguish the following.

**Subcase 1.1.**  $H_1 \in \mathcal{F}_{2,2}$ .

Suppose  $H_1$  is obtained from two cycles  $C_1 = x_1^1 \dots x_{m_1}^1 x_1^1$  and  $C_2 = x_1^2 \dots x_{m_2}^2 x_1^2$  by adding a path  $Q = (x_1^1 =)z_0z_1\dots z_t(= x_1^2)$ . We further assume, without loss of generality, that  $v_t = x_j^2 \in V(C_2)$ . Let  $H'_1$  be the graph obtained from  $C_0 \cup C_1$  to which we add the path  $P x_{j-1}^2 \dots x_2^2 Q$ , in other words,  $H'_1$  is obtained from  $C_0 + P + H_1$  by removing vertices  $x_{j+1}^2, \dots, x_{m_2}^2$ . Note that  $H'_1$  belongs to either  $\mathcal{F}_{0,2}$  or  $\mathcal{B}_{0,2} \cup \mathcal{B}_{1,1}$ . Now let  $G''_2 = H'_1 \cup H_2 \cup \dots \cup H_p$  and  $G''_1 = G - G''_2$ . Then the subgraphs  $G''_2$  and  $G''_1$  satisfy the conditions and result follows.

**Subcase 1.2.**  $H_1 \in \mathcal{F}_{0,2}$ .

Using an argument similar to that described in the case  $|\mathcal{F}| = 3$ , we can obtain two subgraphs  $G''_2$  and  $G''_1$  satisfying the conditions and yielding the desired result.

**Subcase 1.3.**  $H_1 \in \mathcal{B}_{r,s}$  where  $r + s \geq 2$ .

Let  $z^*$  be the special vertex of  $H_1$ . If  $v_t = z^*$ , then  $H'_1 = H_1 + P + C_0$  is a subgraph belonging to  $\mathcal{E}$  and thus the subgraphs  $G_2 = H'_1 \cup H_2 \cup \dots \cup H_p$  and  $G_1 = G - V(G_2)$  satisfy the conditions and the result follows. Hence we assume that  $v_t \neq z^*$ . First let  $r + s = 2$ . Then  $H_1$  is obtained from two cycles  $C_1 = x_1^1 \dots x_{m_1}^1 x_1^1$  and  $C_2 = x_1^2 \dots x_{m_2}^2 x_1^2$  by adding a path  $Q = (x_1^1 =)z_0z_1\dots z_t(= x_1^2)$ , where  $t \geq 2$ . If  $v_t \in \{z_1, \dots, z_{t-1}\}$ , then let  $H'_1 = H_1 + C_0 + P$ . Clearly,  $H'_1 \in \mathcal{B}_{r,s}$  where  $r + s = 3$ , and thus the subgraphs  $G_2 = H'_1 \cup H_2 \cup \dots \cup H_p$  and  $G_1 = G - V(G_2)$  satisfy the conditions and the result yields. Now, suppose, without loss of generality, that  $v_t = x_j^2 \in V(C_2)$ . Let  $H_1$  be obtained  $C_0 \cup C_1$  to which we add the path  $P x_{j-1}^2 \dots x_2^2 Q$ , and set  $G''_2 = H'_1 \cup H_2 \cup \dots \cup H_p$  and  $G''_1 = G - G''_2$ . Clearly,  $G''_1$  and  $G''_2$  satisfy the condition and the desired result follows.

Now let  $r + s \geq 3$ . Assume that  $v_t$  belongs to one of the  $s + r$  cycles of  $H_1$ , say  $C'$ . Let  $H'_1 = C' + C_0 + P$  and  $H''_1$  be the graph obtained from  $H_1$  by deleting the vertices of  $V(C')$  and the path (if any) joining  $z^*$  to  $V(C')$  in  $H_1$ . Note that  $H'_1$  belongs to either



$\mathcal{F}_{2,2}$  or  $\mathcal{B}_{0,2} \cup \mathcal{B}_{1,1}$ . Now the subgraphs  $G_2 = H'_1 \cup H''_1 \cup H_2 \cup \dots \cup H_p$  and  $G_1 = G - V(G_2)$  satisfy the conditions and the desired result holds. Assume that  $v_t$  belongs to a path on a tailed cycle  $C_{m,\ell}$  of  $H_1$ , and let  $P'$  be the subpath between  $v_t$  and the cycle  $C'$  of  $C_{m,\ell}$ . Let  $H'_1 = C' + C_0 + P + P'$  and  $H''_1$  be the graph obtained from  $H_1$  by deleting the vertices of  $V(C_{m,\ell})$ . Note that  $H'_1$  belongs to either  $\mathcal{F}_{2,2}$  or  $\mathcal{B}_{0,2}$ . Now the subgraphs  $G_2 = H'_1 \cup H''_1 \cup H_2 \cup \dots \cup H_p$  and  $G_1 = G - V(G_2)$  satisfy the conditions and the desired result holds.

**Case 2.**  $G^1$  is disconnected.

Let  $M_1, \dots, M_t$  be the components of  $G^1$ . Assume first that a component  $M_i$  contains all cycles of  $\mathcal{F} - \{C_0\}$ , say  $M_1$ . Let  $K$  be the subgraph of  $G$  induced by  $V(C_0) \cup V(M_1)$ . Clearly  $K$  is connected. Using an argument similar to that described in Case 1 on  $K - C_0$ , we get the result. Henceforth, we may assume that no  $M_i$  contains all cycles of  $\mathcal{F} - \{C_0\}$  for each  $i$ . Now, assume that a component  $M_i$  contains at least two cycles of  $\mathcal{F}$ , say  $M_1$ . Let  $G^2 = G - V(M_1)$ . Clearly  $G^2$  is connected. Let  $\mathcal{F}_1 = \{C \mid C \in \mathcal{F} \text{ and } V(C) \subseteq V(M_1)\}$  and  $\mathcal{F}_2 = \mathcal{F} - \mathcal{F}_1$ . By the induction hypothesis,  $M_1$  has two subgraphs  $K^1, K^2$  such that  $K^1$  does not contain any cycle of  $\mathcal{F}_1$  and each component of  $K^2$  belongs to  $\mathcal{F}_0 \cup \mathcal{F}_{0,2} \cup \mathcal{F}_{2,2} \cup \mathcal{E}$ . Moreover,  $G^2$  has two subgraphs  $K'_1$  and  $K'_2$  such that  $K'_1$  does not contain any cycle of  $\mathcal{F}_2$  and each component of  $K'_2$  belongs to  $\mathcal{F}_0 \cup \mathcal{F}_{0,2} \cup \mathcal{F}_{2,2} \cup \mathcal{E}$ . Now the two subgraphs  $G_1 = K^1 \cup K'_1$  and  $G_2 = K^2 \cup K'_2$  satisfies the conditions yielding the desired result.

From now on, we can assume that each  $M_i$  contains at most one cycle of  $\mathcal{F}$ . Suppose that only the  $s$  first  $M_i$  contains exactly one cycle  $C_i$  of  $\mathcal{F}$ . Let  $C_i = x_1^i x_2^i \dots x_{n_i}^i x_1^i$  for  $0 \leq i \leq s$ . In addition, let  $P_i := (x_1^i =) w_0^i \dots w_{\ell_i}^i$  be a shortest nontrivial path (possibly of order two) between  $V(C_i)$  and  $V(C_0)$  in  $G$  for each  $1 \leq i \leq s$ , where  $w_{\ell_i}^i \in V(C_0)$ . If all cycles  $C_1, \dots, C_s$  have length  $\equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ , then the subgraphs  $G_2 = (C_1 + P_1 + C_0) \cup C_2 \cup \dots \cup C_s$  and  $G_1 = G - G_2$  satisfy the conditions and the result follows. Hence, we assume that some cycle  $C_i$  ( $i \geq 1$ ) has length  $\equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ . Note that the paths  $P_i$ 's minus their end-vertices belonging to  $V(C_0)$  are disjoint. If some  $C_i$  has length  $\equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ , say  $C_1$ , then let  $L = C_0 \cup (\cup_{i=2}^s C_i) \cup (\cup_{i=2}^s P_i)$ . By the induction hypothesis,  $L$  has two subgraphs  $L_1, L_2$  such that  $L_1$  has no cycle of  $\mathcal{F} - \{C_1\}$  and each component of  $L_2$  belongs to  $\mathcal{F}_0 \cup \mathcal{F}_{0,2} \cup \mathcal{F}_{2,2} \cup \mathcal{E}$ . Now  $G_2 = L_2 \cup C_1$  and  $G_1 = G - G_2$  satisfy the conditions and the result holds. Hence we can assume that all cycles  $C_1, \dots, C_s$  have length  $\equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ . Let  $L = C_0 \cup (\cup_{i=1}^s C_i) \cup (\cup_{i=1}^s P_i)$ . Let  $x_{i_1}^0, \dots, x_{i_t}^0$  be the vertices of  $C_0$  with degree at least three and assume, without loss of generality, that  $i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_t$ . Consider the following situations.

**Subcase 2.1.**  $t = 2$ .

If  $\deg(x_{i_1}^0), \deg(x_{i_2}^0) \geq 4$ , then let  $G_2$  be the graph obtained from  $L$  by deleting all vertices of  $V(C_0) - \{x_{i_1}^0, x_{i_2}^0\}$ . Otherwise, let  $G_2$  be the graph obtained from  $L$  by deleting either the edge  $x_{i_1}^0 x_{i_2}^0$  (if any) or all the vertices  $x_{i_1+1}, \dots, x_{i_2-1}$ . Then the subgraphs  $G_2$  and  $G_1 = G - G_2$  satisfies the conditions and the result holds.

**Subcase 2.2.**  $t = 3$ .

If  $\deg(x_{i_1}^0), \deg(x_{i_2}^0), \deg(x_{i_3}^0) \geq 4$ , then let  $G_2$  be the graph obtained from  $L$  by deleting all vertices of  $V(C_0) - \{x_{i_1}^0, x_{i_2}^0, x_{i_3}^0\}$ . If  $\deg(x_{i_1}^0) = \deg(x_{i_2}^0) = \deg(x_{i_3}^0) = 3$ , then let  $G_2$  be the graph obtained from  $L$  by deleting either the edge  $x_{i_2}^0 x_{i_3}^0$  (if any) or all the vertices of  $\{x_{i_2+1}, x_{i_2+2}, \dots, x_{i_3-1}^0\}$ . If, without loss of generality,  $\deg(x_{i_1}^0) = 3$  and  $\deg(x_{i_3}^0) \geq 4$ . Let  $G_2$  be the graph obtained from  $L$  by deleting either the edge  $x_{i_2}^0 x_{i_3}^0$  (if any) or all vertices between of  $x_{i_2}^0$  and  $x_{i_3}^0$  as well all vertices between  $x_{i_3}^0$  and  $x_{i_1}^0$  starting from  $x_{i_3+1}^0$ . In either situation, the subgraphs  $G_2$  and  $G_1 = G - G_2$  satisfies the conditions and the result follows.

**Subcase 2.3.**  $t \geq 4$ .

If  $\deg(x_{i_1}^0), \deg(x_{i_2}^0), \deg(x_{i_3}^0) \geq 4$ , then let  $G_2$  be the graph obtained from  $L$  by deleting all vertices of  $V(C_0) - \{x_{i_1}^0, x_{i_2}^0, \dots, x_{i_t}^0\}$ . If  $\deg(x_{i_1}^0) = \deg(x_{i_2}^0) = \dots = \deg(x_{i_t}^0) = 3$ , then let  $G_2$  be the graph obtained from  $L$  by deleting all vertices of  $\bigcup_{j=1}^{\lfloor t/2 \rfloor} \{x_{i_{2j+1}}^0, x_{i_{2j+2}}^0, \dots, x_{i_{2j+1-1}}^0\}$ . Assume without loss of generality that  $\deg(x_{i_1}^0) = 3$  and  $\deg(x_{i_t}^0) \geq 4$ . Let  $L^1$  be the component of  $L - \{x_{i_1-1}^0 x_{i_1}^0, x_{i_2}^0 x_{i_2+1}^0\}$  containing  $x_{i_1}^0$ , and let  $L^2$  be the component of  $L - \{x_{i_3-1}^0 x_{i_3}^0\}$  containing  $x_{i_3}^0$  if  $\deg(x_{i_3}^0) \geq 4$ , and be the component of  $L - \{x_{i_3}^0 x_{i_3-1}^0, x_{i_4}^0 x_{i_4+1}^0\}$  containing  $x_{i_3}^0$  if  $\deg(x_{i_3}^0) = 3$ . Repeating this process we obtain a sequence  $L^1, \dots, L^p$  of subgraphs  $L$  which contains all cycles of  $L$  but  $C_0$ . Now the subgraphs  $G_2 = \bigcup_{i=1}^p L^i$  and  $G_1 = G - G_2$  satisfies the conditions and the result follows.  $\square$

**Lemma 13.** *Let  $G$  be a connected graph with at least two disjoint cycles of length  $\equiv 0, 2 \pmod{3}$ , and let  $\mathcal{F}$  be the family of all cycles of  $G$  with length  $\equiv 0$  or  $2 \pmod{3}$ . Then there exists a maximal subfamily  $\mathcal{T}$  of pairwise disjoint cycles of  $\mathcal{F}$  with  $|\mathcal{T}| \geq 2$  and two disjoint subgraphs  $G_1$  (possibly null) and  $G_2$  of  $G$  such that  $V(G) = V(G_1) \cup V(G_2)$ ,  $G_1$  has no cycle of  $\mathcal{F}$  and each component of  $G_2$  belongs to  $\mathcal{F}_0 \cup \mathcal{F}_{0,2} \cup \mathcal{F}_{2,2} \cup \mathcal{E}$ .*

**Proof.** By Lemma 12, for any maximal subfamily  $\mathcal{T}$  of pairwise disjoint cycles of  $\mathcal{F}$  with  $|\mathcal{T}| \geq 2$ ,  $G$  has two disjoint subgraphs  $G_1^{\mathcal{T}}$  and  $G_2^{\mathcal{T}}$  such that  $V(G) = V(G_1^{\mathcal{T}}) \cup V(G_2^{\mathcal{T}})$ ,  $G_1^{\mathcal{T}}$  has no cycle of  $\mathcal{T}$  and each component of  $G_2^{\mathcal{T}}$  is in  $\mathcal{F}_0 \cup \mathcal{F}_{0,2} \cup \mathcal{F}_{2,2} \cup \mathcal{E}$ . Now, let  $c_{\mathcal{T}}$  denote the number of cycles of  $G_2^{\mathcal{T}}$ , and let  $s_{\mathcal{T}}$  be the sum of the lengths of paths between two cycles in the components of  $G_2^{\mathcal{T}}$  that belong to  $\mathcal{F}_{0,2} \cup \mathcal{F}_{2,2} \cup (\bigcup_{r,s \geq 0; r+s=2} B_{r,s})$ . Moreover, let

$$c_{\mathcal{F}} = \max\{c_{\mathcal{T}} \mid \mathcal{T} \text{ is a maximal subfamily of pairwise disjoint cycles of } \mathcal{F} \text{ with } |\mathcal{T}| \geq 2\}.$$

Choose a triple  $(\mathcal{T}, G_1^{\mathcal{T}}, G_2^{\mathcal{T}})$  such that: (i)  $c_{\mathcal{F}} = c_{\mathcal{T}}$ ; (ii) subject to (i):  $s_{\mathcal{T}}$  is maximized. Notice that  $G_2^{\mathcal{T}}$  may not contain all cycles of  $\mathcal{T}$ . We claim that the two disjoint subgraphs  $G_1^{\mathcal{T}}$  and  $G_2^{\mathcal{T}}$  chosen in this way yield the desired result.

It is clear that it suffices to show that  $G_1^{\mathcal{T}}$  has no cycle of  $\mathcal{F}$ . Hence, suppose to the contrary that  $G_1^{\mathcal{T}}$  contains at least one cycle of  $\mathcal{F}$ . Let  $G_2^1$  be obtained from  $G_2^{\mathcal{T}}$  by adding a maximum set of pairwise of cycles of  $\mathcal{F}$  with length  $\equiv 0 \pmod{3}$  belonging to  $G_1^{\mathcal{T}}$  and let  $G_1^1 = G - G_2^1$ . Note that if  $G_1^{\mathcal{T}}$  contains no cycle of  $\mathcal{F}$  with length  $\equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ , then  $G_2^1 = G_2^{\mathcal{T}}$ . Now, let  $\mathcal{T}_1^1$  be the family of all cycles of  $G_2^1$  that belong to  $\mathcal{F}$  and let  $\mathcal{T}^1$  be a maximal subfamily of  $\mathcal{F}$  such that  $\mathcal{T}_1^1 \subseteq \mathcal{T}^1$ . If  $G_1^1$  does not contain any cycle of  $\mathcal{F}$ , then the family  $\mathcal{T}^1$  and the subgraphs  $G_1^1$  and  $G_2^1$  satisfy the conditions which leads to a contradiction because of  $c_{\mathcal{T}^1} > c_{\mathcal{T}}$ . Hence we assume that  $G_1^1$  contains at least one cycle of  $\mathcal{F}$ .

Let first  $H^1, \dots, H^r$  be the components of  $G_1^1$  which contains at least two disjoint cycles of  $\mathcal{F}$  (if any), and let  $\mathcal{F}^i$  be a maximal subfamily of pairwise disjoint cycles of  $\mathcal{F}$  that are in  $H^i$  with  $|\mathcal{F}^i| \geq 2$ , for each  $1 \leq i \leq r$ . By Lemma 12,  $H^i$  has two subgraphs  $H_1^i, H_2^i$  such that  $H_1^i$  has no cycles of  $\mathcal{F}^i$  and each component of  $H_2^i$  is in  $\mathcal{F}_0 \cup \mathcal{F}_{0,2} \cup \mathcal{F}_{2,2} \cup \mathcal{E}$ . Let  $G_2^2 = G_2^1 \cup (\bigcup_{i=1}^r H_2^i)$ , if  $r \geq 1$  and  $G_1^2 = G - G_2^2$ . Let  $\mathcal{T}_2^1$  be the family of all cycles of  $G_2^2$  that belong to  $\mathcal{F}$  and let  $\mathcal{T}^2$  be a maximal subfamily of  $\mathcal{F}$  such that  $\mathcal{T}_2^1 \subseteq \mathcal{T}^2$ . If  $G_1^2$  does not contain any cycle of  $\mathcal{F}$ , then the family  $\mathcal{T}^2$  and the subgraphs  $G_1^2$  and  $G_2^2$  satisfy the conditions which leads to a contradiction because  $c_{\mathcal{T}^2} > c_{\mathcal{T}}$ . Hence, we assume that  $G_1^2$  contains at least one cycle of  $\mathcal{F}$ . If  $G_1^2$  has a component with at least two disjoint cycles of  $\mathcal{F}$ , then we proceed as above.

Henceforth, we can assume that each component of  $G_1^2$  has at most one cycle of  $\mathcal{F}$ . Let  $C_0$  be a cycle of  $G_1^2$  belonging to  $\mathcal{F}$ . Clearly,  $C_0 = x_1^0 x_2^0 \dots x_{m_0}^0 x_1^0$  is connected to a

component of  $G_2^2$  by some path (possibly an edge). Let  $P = (x_1^0 =)v_0v_1 \dots v_t$  be a shortest path between  $V(C_0)$  and  $V(G_2^2)$ . Then  $v_t$  belongs to a component of  $G_2^2$ , say  $H_1$ . If  $H_1 \in \mathcal{F}_0$ , then let  $H_1' = H_1 + P + C_0$  and let  $G_2^3 = (G_2^2 - H_1) \cup H_1'$ . Hence, assume that  $H_1$  contains at least two cycles. We distinguish the following cases.

**Case 1.**  $H_1 \in \mathcal{F}_{2,2}$ .

Suppose  $H_1$  is obtained from two cycles  $C_1 = x_1^1 \dots x_{m_1}^1 x_1^1$  and  $C_2 = x_1^2 \dots x_{m_2}^2 x_1^2$  by adding an edge  $x_1^1 x_1^2$ . We further assume, without loss of generality, that  $v_t = x_j^2 \in V(C_2)$ . Let  $H_1'$  be the graph obtained from  $C_0 \cup C_1$  to which we add the path  $Px_{j-1}^2 \dots x_2^2 Q$ , in other words,  $H_1'$  is obtained from  $C_0 + P + H_1$  by removing vertices  $x_{j+1}^2, \dots, x_{m_2}^2$ . Note that  $H_1'$  belongs to either  $\mathcal{B}_{0,2} \cup \mathcal{B}_{1,1}$ . Now let  $G_2^3 = (G_2^2 - H_1) \cup H_1'$  which we will discuss further below.

**Case 2.**  $H_1 \in \mathcal{F}_{0,2}$ .

Suppose  $H_1$  is obtained from two cycles  $C_1 = x_1^1 \dots x_{m_1}^1 x_1^1$  and  $C_2 = x_1^2 \dots x_{m_2}^2 x_1^2$  by adding a path  $Q = (x_1^1 =)z_0z_1 \dots z_k(= x_1^2)$ . Suppose without loss of generality that  $m_1 \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$  and  $m_2 \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ . If  $v_t = z_j$  for some  $j$ , then let  $H_1'$  be obtained from  $C_0 \cup C_2$  to which we add the path  $Pz_j \dots z_k$ , and let  $G_2^3 = (G_2^2 - H_1) \cup (H_1' \cup C_1)$ . Suppose that  $v_t \in V(C_1) \cup V(C_2)$ . We further assume, without loss of generality, that  $v_t = x_j^2 \in V(C_2)$ . Let  $H_1'$  be the graph obtained from  $C_0 \cup C_1$  to which we add the path  $Px_{j-1}^2 \dots x_2^2 Q$ , in other words,  $H_1'$  is obtained from  $C_0 + P + H_1$  by removing vertices  $x_{j+1}^2, \dots, x_{m_2}^2$ . Note that  $H_1'$  belongs to either  $\mathcal{F}_{0,2}$  or  $\mathcal{B}_{0,2} \cup \mathcal{B}_{1,1}$ . Now let  $G_2^3 = (G_2^2 - H_1) \cup H_1'$  which we will discuss further below.

**Case 3.**  $H_1 \in \mathcal{B}_{r,s}$  where  $r + s \geq 2$ .

Let  $z^*$  be the special vertex of  $H_1$ . If  $v_t = z^*$ , then  $H_1' = H_1 + P + C_0$  is a subgraph belonging to  $\mathcal{E}$ . In this case, let  $G_2^3 = (G_2^2 - H_1) \cup H_1'$  which we will discuss further below. Hence we assume that  $v_t \neq z^*$ . First let  $r + s = 2$ . Then  $H_1$  is obtained from two cycles  $C_1 = x_1^1 \dots x_{m_1}^1 x_1^1$  and  $C_2 = x_1^2 \dots x_{m_2}^2 x_1^2$  by adding a path  $Q = (x_1^1 =)z_0z_1 \dots z_t(= x_1^2)$ , where  $t \geq 2$ . If  $v_t \in \{z_1, \dots, z_{t-1}\}$ , then let  $H_1' = H_1 + C_0 + P$  and  $G_2^3 = (G_2^2 - H_1) \cup H_1'$ . Now, suppose, without loss of generality, that  $v_t = x_j^2 \in V(C_2)$ . Let  $H_1$  be obtained from  $C_0 \cup C_1$  to which we add the path  $Px_{j-1}^2 \dots x_2^2 Q$ . Set  $G_2^3 = (G_2^2 - H_1) \cup H_1'$  which we will discuss further below.

Now let  $r + s \geq 3$ . Assume that  $v_t$  belongs to one of the  $s + r$  cycles of  $H_1$ , say  $C'$ . Let  $H_1' = C' + C_0 + P$  and  $H_1''$  be the graph obtained from  $H_1$  by deleting the vertices of  $V(C')$  and the path (if any) joining  $z^*$  to  $V(C')$  in  $H_1$ . Note that  $H_1'$  belongs to either  $\mathcal{F}_{0,2}$  or  $\mathcal{B}_{0,2} \cup \mathcal{B}_{1,1}$ . Now let  $G_2^3 = (G_2^2 - H_1) \cup H_1'$ . Assume that  $v_t$  belongs to a path on a tailed cycle  $C_{m,\ell}$  of  $H_1$ , and let  $P'$  be the subpath between  $v_t$  and the cycle  $C'$  of  $C_{m,\ell}$ . Let  $H_1' = C' + C_0 + P + P'$  and  $H_1''$  be the graph obtained from  $H_1$  by deleting the vertices of  $V(C_{m,\ell})$ . Note that  $H_1'$  belongs to either  $\mathcal{F}_{0,2}$  or  $\mathcal{B}_{0,2}$ . Suppose  $G_2^3 = (G_2^2 - H_1) \cup H_1' \cup H_1''$ . Obviously either the number of cycles of  $G_2^3$  is greater than the number of cycles of  $G_2^2$  or the sum of lengths of paths between two cycles of  $G_2^3$  that belong to  $\mathcal{F}_{0,2} \cup \mathcal{F}_{2,2} \cup (\cup_{r,s \geq 0; r+s=2} \mathcal{B}_{r,s})$  is greater than the corresponding sum of  $G_2^2$ . Let  $G_1^3 = G - G_2^3$ . Let  $\mathcal{T}_3^1$  be the family of all cycles of  $G_2^3$  which belongs to  $\mathcal{F}$  and let  $\mathcal{T}^3$  be a maximal subfamily of  $\mathcal{F}$  such that  $\mathcal{T}_3^1 \subseteq \mathcal{T}^3$ . If  $G_1^3$  does not contain any cycle of  $\mathcal{F}$ , then the family  $\mathcal{T}^3$  and the subgraphs  $G_1^3$  and  $G_2^3$  satisfy the conditions which leads to a contradiction because of either  $c_{\mathcal{T}^3} > c_{\mathcal{T}}$  or  $s_{\mathcal{T}^3} > s_{\mathcal{T}}$ . Hence we assume that  $G_1^3$  contains at least one cycle of  $\mathcal{F}$ . We repeat the above process. Since  $G$  is finite, this process will stop and we obtain a maximal subfamily  $\mathcal{T}'$  of pairwise disjoint cycles of  $\mathcal{F}$  with  $|\mathcal{T}'| \geq 2$  and two disjoint subgraphs  $G_1$  (possibly null),

$G_2$  of  $G$  such that  $V(G) = V(G_1) \cup V(G_2)$ ,  $G_1$  has no cycle of  $\mathcal{F}$  and each component of  $G_2$  belongs to  $\mathcal{F}_0 \cup \mathcal{F}_{0,2} \cup \mathcal{F}_{2,2} \cup \mathcal{E}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 14.** Let  $G$  be a connected graph with at least two disjoint cycles of length  $\equiv 0, 2 \pmod{3}$ , and let  $\mathcal{F}$  be the family of all cycles of  $G$  with length  $\equiv 0$  or  $2 \pmod{3}$ . Then there exists a maximal subfamily  $\mathcal{T}$  of pairwise disjoint cycles of  $\mathcal{F}$  with  $|\mathcal{T}| \geq 2$  and two disjoint subgraphs  $G_1$  (possibly null),  $G_2$  of  $G$  such that  $V(G) = V(G_1) \cup V(G_2)$ ,  $G_1$  has no cycle of  $\mathcal{F}$  and each component of  $G_2$  belongs to  $\mathcal{F}_0 \cup \mathcal{F}_{0,2} \cup \mathcal{F}_{2,2} \cup \mathcal{F}_3 \cup \mathcal{E}$ .

**Proof.** Let  $(\mathcal{T}, G_1, G_2)$  be the triple satisfying the conditions of Lemma 13. Hence  $G_1$  has no cycle of  $\mathcal{F}$  and each component of  $G_2$  belongs to  $\mathcal{F}_0 \cup \mathcal{F}_{0,2} \cup \mathcal{F}_{2,2} \cup \mathcal{E}$ . If there are no two components  $H_1 \in \mathcal{F}_{0,2}$ ,  $H_2 \in \mathcal{F}_{2,2}$  of  $G_2$  joined by a path  $P$  in  $G$  with all its vertices, except the end-vertices, belong to  $V(G_1)$ , then  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  are the desired subgraphs. Hence we assume that there are two components  $H_1 \in \mathcal{F}_{0,2}$  and  $H_2 \in \mathcal{F}_{2,2}$  of  $G_2$  joined by a path  $P$  in  $G$  with all its vertices, except the end-vertices, belong to  $V(G_1)$ . Let  $G'_2$  be the graph obtained from  $G_2$  by adding the path  $P$  and let  $G'_1 = G - G'_2$ . Clearly  $G'_1$  and  $G'_2$  satisfy the conditions and the result follows. We can repeat this process until we get two subgraphs  $G_1^*$  (possibly null) and  $G_2^*$  such that  $V(G) = V(G_1^*) \cup V(G_2^*)$ ,  $G_1^*$  has no cycle of  $\mathcal{F}$ , each component of  $G_2^*$  is in  $\mathcal{F}_0 \cup \mathcal{F}_{0,2} \cup \mathcal{F}_{2,2} \cup \mathcal{F}_3 \cup \mathcal{E}$  and such that no path in  $G$  like to the one described above joins two components  $H' \in \mathcal{F}_{0,2}$  and  $H'' \in \mathcal{F}_{2,2}$  of  $G_2^*$ .  $\square$

From now on, a graph in  $(\cup_{r+s \geq 2; s \leq 2} \mathcal{B}_{r,s}) \cup \mathcal{F}_3 \cup \mathcal{F}_{0,2} \cup \mathcal{F}_0$  will be called *strong*. Also, the special vertex of each graph in  $\mathcal{B}_{r,s}$  will be called a *strong vertex*.

**Lemma 15.** Let  $k \geq 1$  be an integer and let  $G$  be a graph of order  $n$  and minimum degree  $\delta \geq 2$ , which does not contain any induced  $\{C_5, C_8, \dots, C_{3k+2}\}$ -cycles. If  $G$  is strong, then  $G$  has a 3-tuple  $\vec{f}$  of RDFs such that  $\omega(\vec{f}) \leq \frac{(4k+8)3n}{6k+11}$  and all vertices of  $G$  are  $\vec{f}$ -strong.

**Proof.** Let  $G \in (\cup_{r+s \geq 2; s \leq 2} \mathcal{B}_{r,s}) \cup \mathcal{F}_3 \cup \mathcal{F}_{0,2} \cup \mathcal{F}_0$ . Assume first that  $G \in \mathcal{F}_0$ . Then  $\gamma_R(G) = \frac{2n}{3} < \frac{(4k+8)n}{6k+11}$ . Let  $G = x_1 x_2 \dots x_{3t} x_1$  and define for  $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$  the functions  $f_j$  on  $V(G)$  as follows:  $f_j(x_{3i+j}) = 2$  for  $0 \leq i \leq t-1$  and  $f_j(x) = 0$  otherwise. Clearly  $f_j$  is an  $\gamma_R(G)$ -function for each  $j \in \{0, 1, 2\}$  and the triple  $\vec{f} = (f_0, f_1, f_2)$  satisfies the desired result.

Assume now that  $G \in \mathcal{F}_{0,2}$ . Since  $G$  has no induced  $\{C_5, C_8, \dots, C_{3k+2}\}$ -cycles, we deduce that cycle of length  $\equiv 2 \pmod{3}$  in  $\mathcal{F}_{0,2}$  has order at least  $3k+5$ , and thus  $G$  has order at least  $3k+8$ . Now by Lemma 5,  $G$  has a 3-tuple  $\vec{f}$  of RDFs such that  $\omega(\vec{f}) \leq 2n+1$  and all vertices of  $G$  are  $\vec{f}$ -strong. A simple calculation shows that  $\omega(\vec{f}) \leq \frac{(4k+8)3n}{6k+11}$ .

Next assume that  $G \in \mathcal{F}_3$ . By definition,  $G$  is obtained from a graph  $G_1 \in \mathcal{F}_{0,2}$  and a graph in  $G_2 \in \mathcal{F}_{2,2}$  by adding either an edge  $vw$  or a path  $Q$  joining a vertex of  $G_1$  to a vertex of  $G_2$  so that all vertices of  $Q$  become of degree two in  $G$ . Let  $G_1$  be obtained from two cycles  $C_1 = x_1^1 x_2^1 \dots x_{n_1}^1 x_1^1 \in \mathcal{F}_0$  and  $C_2 = x_1^2 x_2^2 \dots x_{n_2}^2 x_1^2 \in \mathcal{F}_2$  by adding either the edge  $x_1^1 x_1^2$  or a path  $P$  between  $x_1^1$  and  $x_1^2$ . By Lemma 5 (items 8,9,10),  $G_1$  has a 3-tuple  $\vec{f} = (f_1, f_2, f_3)$  of RDFs such that  $\omega(\vec{f}, G_1) \leq 2n(G_1) + 1$  and all vertices of  $G_1$  are  $\vec{f}$ -strong. Moreover, let  $G_2$  be obtained from two cycles  $C_3 = x_1^3 x_2^3 \dots x_{n_1}^3 x_1^3 \in \mathcal{F}_2$  and  $C_4 = x_1^4 x_2^4 \dots x_{n_4}^4 x_1^4 \in \mathcal{F}_2$  by adding the edge  $x_1^3 x_1^4$ . Without loss of generality, we assume that the added edge  $uv$  or the path  $Q$  is between  $V(C_3)$  and  $V(G_1)$ . By sequentially applying Lemmas 3 (items 3,4) (once on  $uv$  or  $Q$  and  $C_3$ , and then on the resulting graph with  $C_4$ ),  $\vec{f}$  can be extended to a triple  $\vec{g}$  of RDFs of  $G$  such that  $\omega(\vec{g}, G_2) \leq 2n(G_2) + 2$

and each vertex of  $G_2$  is  $\vec{g}$ -strong. Since  $G$  has no induced  $\{C_5, C_8, \dots, C_{3k+2}\}$ -cycles, we deduce that order each cycle of length  $\equiv 2 \pmod{3}$  in  $G$  is at least  $3k+5$ . Using the fact that  $G$  has three cycles of length  $\equiv 2 \pmod{3}$  and one cycle of length  $\equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ , we have  $n(G) \geq 9k+18$ . Therefore  $\omega(\vec{g}) \leq 2n(G) + 3 \leq \frac{(4k+8)3n(G)}{6k+11}$ .

Using a similar argument we can show that for any graph  $G \in \cup_{r+s \geq 2; s \leq 2} \mathcal{B}_{r,s}$  the result is also true.  $\square$

**Lemma 16.** Let  $k \geq 1$  be an integer and let  $G$  be a graph of order  $n$ , minimum degree  $\delta \geq 2$ , which does not contain any induced  $\{C_5, C_8, \dots, C_{3k+2}\}$ -cycles. If  $G \in \mathcal{B}_{r,s}$  with  $s \geq 3$ , then  $G$  has a 3-tuple  $\vec{f}$  of RDFs such that  $\omega(\vec{f}) \leq \frac{(4k+8)3n}{6k+11}$  and the special vertex as well as all vertices on tailed cycles of  $G$  are  $\vec{f}$ -strong.

**Proof.** Suppose  $G$  be obtained from  $r \geq 0$  graphs  $C_{n_1, \ell_1}, \dots, C_{n_r, \ell_r}$  and  $s \geq 3$  cycles  $C_{m_1}, \dots, C_{m_s}$ , where  $n_i \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$  and  $m_j \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$  for each  $i, j$ , by adding a new vertex  $z$  (special vertex) attached to endvertices of the  $C_{n_i, \ell_i}$ 's and to one vertex of each cycle  $C_{m_j}$ . We first note that each of the  $r+s \geq 3$  cycles has order at least  $3k+5$ , and thus each tailed cycle contains at least  $(3k+5)+1$  vertices. Hence  $n(G) \geq (3k+5)(s+r) + r + 1$ . Now, if  $r=0$ , then the result follows from Lemmas 5-(11) and the previous fact. Hence assume that  $r \geq 1$ . Let  $H$  be obtained from  $G$  by deleting all vertices of  $C_{n_i, \ell_i}$ 's. By Lemma 5 (item 11),  $H$  has a triple  $\vec{f}$  such that  $\omega(\vec{f}) \leq 2n(H) - s + 4$  and  $z$  is  $\vec{f}$ -strong. Since  $n(H) \geq (3k+5)s + 1$ , we deduce that  $\omega(\vec{f}) \leq \frac{(4k+8)3n(H)}{6k+11}$ . Now, by applying repeatedly Lemma 3-(4) on  $C_{n_1, \ell_1}, \dots, C_{n_r, \ell_r}$ , we can extend  $\vec{f}$  to a triple  $\vec{g}$  of  $G$  such that  $\omega(\vec{g}, \cup_{i=1}^r C_{n_i, \ell_i}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^r (2n(C_{n_i, \ell_i}) + 1)$  and all newly added vertices are  $\vec{g}$ -strong. Therefore,  $\omega(\vec{g}) \leq 2n+r+4-s$ . Now by the previous fact on the order and the calculation, we can see that  $2n+r+4-s \leq \frac{(4k+8)3n}{6k+11}$ , which proves the result.  $\square$

**Lemma 17.** Let  $k \geq 1$  be an integer and let  $G \in \mathcal{F}_{2,2}$  be a graph of order  $n$ , minimum degree  $\delta \geq 2$ , which does not contain any induced  $\{C_5, C_8, \dots, C_{3k+2}\}$ -cycles. Then

1.  $G$  has a 3-tuple  $f$  of RDFs such that  $\vec{f} \leq 2n(G) + 1 \leq \frac{(4k+8)3n(G)}{(6k+11)}$ .
2. If  $H$  is a graph obtained from  $G$  and a cycle  $C_{3p+1} = x_1 \dots x_{3p+1} x_1$  by adding an edge between them, then  $H$  has a 3-tuple  $f$  of RDFs such that  $\omega(\vec{f}) \leq \frac{(4k+8)3n(G)}{(6k+11)}$  and all vertices of  $H$  but  $x_{3p+1}$  are  $\vec{f}$ -strong.
3. If  $H$  is a graph obtained from  $G$  and a tailed cycle  $C_{3p+1, \ell}$  with vertex set  $x_1, \dots, x_{3p+1}, y_1, \dots, y_\ell$  by joining  $y_\ell$  to a vertex of  $G$ , then  $H$  has a 3-tuple  $f$  of RDFs such that  $\omega(\vec{f}) \leq \frac{(4k+8)3n(G)}{(6k+11)}$  and all vertices of  $H$  but  $x_{3p+1}$  are  $\vec{f}$ -strong.

**Proof.** (1) is easy to show and so we prove only (2) and (3). Let  $G \in \mathcal{F}_{2,2}$  be formed from two cycles  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  by adding an edge between them, and let  $H$  be obtained from  $G$  and the cycle  $C_{3p+1}$  (resp. tailed cycle  $C_{3p+1, \ell}$ ) by adding an edge  $xy$  (resp.  $xy_\ell$ ), where without loss of generality  $x \in V(C_2)$ . Let  $K$  be the graph obtained from  $H$  by deleting all vertices of  $V(C_1)$ . By Lemma 5 (items 2,3 and 4),  $K$  has a 3-tuple  $\vec{g}$  of RDFs of  $K$  such that  $\omega(\vec{g}) \leq 2n(K) + 1$  and all vertices of  $K$  except  $x_{3p+1}$  are  $\vec{g}$ -strong. Now by Lemma 3, we can extend  $\vec{g}$  to a 3-tuple  $\vec{f}$  of RDFs of  $H$  such that  $\omega(\vec{f}) \leq 2n(H) + 2$  and all vertices of  $H$  except  $x_{3p+1}$  are  $\vec{g}$ -strong. By assumption we have  $n(H) \geq 6k+14$  and thus one can check that  $\omega(\vec{f}) \leq \frac{(4k+8)3n(H)}{6k+11}$ .  $\square$

## 5 Proof of Conjecture 1

Now we are ready to state our main result.

**Theorem 18.** Let  $G$  be a graph of order  $n \geq 6k + 9$ , minimum degree  $\delta \geq 2$ , which does not contain any induced  $\{C_5, C_8, \dots, C_{3k+2}\}$ -cycles. Then  $\gamma_R(G) \leq \frac{(4k+8)n}{6k+11}$ .

**Proof.** Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be the family of all cycles of  $G$  with length  $\equiv 0$  or  $2 \pmod{3}$ . If  $|\mathcal{F}| = 0$ , then the result follows from Theorem 9 and if  $|\mathcal{F}| \geq 1$  and  $\mathcal{F}$  contains a cycle which intersect any cycle of  $\mathcal{F}$ , then the result follows from Theorems 10 and 11. Henceforth, we assume that each cycle of  $\mathcal{F}$  belongs to a maximal subfamily  $\mathcal{T}$  of pairwise disjoint cycles of  $\mathcal{F}$  with  $|\mathcal{T}| \geq 2$ . Let  $(G_1^1, G_2^1), \dots, (G_1^m, G_2^m)$  be all pairs of subgraph such that  $V(G) = V(G_1^i) \cup V(G_2^i)$ ,  $G_1^i$  has no cycle of  $\mathcal{F}$  and each component of  $G_2^i$  belongs to  $\mathcal{F}_0 \cup \mathcal{F}_{0,2} \cup \mathcal{F}_{2,2} \cup \mathcal{F}_3 \cup \mathcal{E}$ . Let  $s_{(G_1^i, G_2^i)}$  be the sum of the lengths of paths between two cycles in the components of  $G_2^i$  that belong to  $\mathcal{F}_{0,2} \cup \mathcal{F}_{2,2} \cup (\cup_{r,s \geq 0; r+s=2} B_{r,s})$ . Among all pairs  $(G_1^i, G_2^i)$ , let  $(G_1, G_2)$  be one chosen so that:

- (C<sub>1</sub>) the number of strong components of  $G_2$  is maximized.
- (C<sub>2</sub>) subject to Condition (C<sub>1</sub>): the number of cycles of  $G_2$  belonging to  $\mathcal{F}$  is maximized.
- (C<sub>3</sub>) subject to Conditions (C<sub>1</sub>) and (C<sub>2</sub>): the number of components of  $G_2$  in  $\mathcal{F}_{2,2}$  is minimized.
- (C<sub>4</sub>) subject to Conditions (C<sub>1</sub>), (C<sub>2</sub>) and (C<sub>3</sub>):  $s_{(G_1, G_2)}$  is maximized.

We proceed with some further claims that are needed for our proof.

**Claim 1.** Let  $M$  be a component of  $G_2$  such that  $M \in \mathcal{F}_{2,2}$ . Then there is no path  $v_0 v_1 \dots v_{t+1}$  ( $t \geq 1$ ) in  $G$  such that  $v_0, v_{t+1} \in M$ ,  $v_1, \dots, v_t \in V(G_1)$  and  $v_0$  and  $v_{t+1}$  belong to different cycles of  $M$ .

**Proof of Claim 1.** Suppose, to the contrary, that there is path  $P = v_0 v_1 \dots v_{t+1}$  ( $t \geq 1$ ) in  $G$  such that  $v_0, v_{t+1} \in M$ ,  $v_1, \dots, v_t \in V(G_1)$  and  $v_0$  and  $v_{t+1}$  belong to different cycles of  $M$ . Let  $e^*$  be the edge joining the two cycles of  $M$  and let  $M'$  be obtained from  $M$  by deleting  $e^*$  and adding path  $P$ . Set  $G'_2 = (G_2 - M) \cup M'$  and  $G'_1 = G - G_2$ . Clearly  $V(G) = V(G'_1) \cup V(G'_2)$ ,  $G_1$  has no cycle of  $\mathcal{F}$  and each component of  $G'_2$  is in  $\mathcal{F}_0 \cup \mathcal{F}_{0,2} \cup \mathcal{F}_{2,2} \cup \mathcal{F}_3 \cup \mathcal{E}$ . But  $G'_2$  has one more strong component than  $G_2$ , contradicting our choice of  $(G_1, G_2)$ .  $\square$

**Claim 2.** For any two components  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  of  $G_2$  belonging to  $\mathcal{F}_{2,2}$ , there is no path  $v_0 v_1 \dots v_{t+1}$  ( $t \geq 1$ ) in  $G$  such that  $v_0 \in M_1$ ,  $v_{t+1} \in M_2$  and  $v_1, \dots, v_t \in V(G_1)$ .

**Proof of Claim 2.** Suppose, to the contrary, that for two components  $M_1, M_2$  of  $G_2$  belonging to  $\mathcal{F}_{2,2}$ , there is a path  $v_0 v_1 \dots v_{t+1}$  ( $t \geq 1$ ) in  $G_1$  such that  $v_0 \in M_1$  and  $v_{t+1} \in M_2$ . Suppose that  $M_1$  is obtained from two cycles  $C_1 = u_1^1 \dots u_{m_1}^1 u_1^1$  and  $C_2 = u_1^2 \dots u_{m_2}^2 u_1^2$  by adding the edge  $u_1^1 u_1^2$ , and let  $M_2$  be obtained from two cycles  $C_3 = u_1^3 \dots u_{m_3}^3 u_1^3$  and  $C_4 = u_1^4 \dots u_{m_4}^4 u_1^4$  by adding the edge  $u_1^3 u_1^4$ . Moreover, assume, without loss of generality, that  $v_0 = u_j^2 \in V(C_2)$  where  $j \geq m_2/2$  (by relabeling the vertices if necessary) and  $v_{t+1} = u_b^3 \in V(C_3)$  where  $b \geq m_3/2$  (by relabeling the vertices if necessary). Now, let  $M$  be the subgraph obtained from  $C_1$  and  $C_4$  by adding the path  $u_1^1 u_1^2 u_2^2 \dots u_j^2 v_1 v_2 \dots v_t u_b^3 u_{b-1}^3 \dots u_1^3 u_1^4$ . Set

$G'_2 = (G_2 - (M_1 \cup M_2)) \cup M$  and  $G'_1 = G - G'_2$ . If  $G'_1$  has no cycle of  $\mathcal{F}$ , then by considering the pair  $(G'_1, G'_2)$  we get one more strong component in  $G'_2$  than in  $G_2$ , contradicting our choice of  $(G_1, G_2)$ . Hence we assume that  $G'_1$  has some cycles of  $\mathcal{F}$ .

First let  $G'_1$  has exactly one cycle  $C$  of  $\mathcal{F}$ . If  $C$  has length  $\equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ , then as above we get a contradiction by considering the subgraphs  $G''_2 = G'_2 \cup C$  and  $G''_1 = G - G''_2$ . Hence suppose  $C$  has length  $\equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ . Since  $G_1$  has no cycle of  $\mathcal{F}$ , we may assume that  $C$  contains one of the vertices  $u_{j+1}^2, \dots, u_{m_2}^2$ . Let  $\ell \in \{j+1, \dots, m_2\}$  be the smallest index such that  $u_\ell^2 \in V(C)$ . Let  $M' = (M \cup C) + u_j^2 u_{j+1}^2 \dots u_\ell^2$ . Clearly  $M'$  is strong because it belongs to  $\mathcal{B}_{r,s}$ , with  $r+s \geq 3$  and  $s \leq 2$ . By considering the subgraphs  $G''_2 = (G_2 - (M_1 \cup M_2)) \cup M'$  and  $G''_1 = G - G''_2$ , the pair  $(G''_1, G''_2)$  leads to a contradiction on the choice of  $(G_1, G_2)$ .

Now let  $G'_1$  has at least two disjoint cycles  $C$  and  $C'$  of  $\mathcal{F}$ . Using an argument similar to that described in the proof of Lemma 13, we can obtain a pair  $(G''_1, G''_2)$  such that  $G''_1$  has no cycle of  $\mathcal{F}$  and each component of  $G''_2$  belongs to  $\mathcal{F}_0 \cup \mathcal{F}_{0,2} \cup \mathcal{F}_{2,2} \cup \mathcal{F}_3 \cup \mathcal{E}$ , where either  $G''_2$  has more strong components than  $G_2$  or the number of cycles of  $G''_2$  belonging to  $\mathcal{F}$  is greater than the number of cycles of  $G_2$  belonging to  $\mathcal{F}$  or  $s_{(G''_1, G''_2)} > s_{(G_1, G_2)}$ . In either case, we obtain a contradiction.  $\square$

Recall that a component of  $\mathcal{B}_{r,s}$  is not strong when  $s \geq 3$ .

**Claim 3.** Let  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  be two non-strong components of  $G_2$  such that  $M_1 \in \mathcal{F}_{2,2}$  and  $M_2 \in \mathcal{B}_{r,s}$ . Then there is no path  $v_0 v_1 \dots v_{t+1}$  ( $t \geq 1$ ) in  $G$  such that  $v_1, \dots, v_t \in V(G_1)$ ,  $v_0 \in M_1$ ,  $v_{t+1} \in M_2$  and  $v_{t+1}$  is not the special vertex of  $M_2$ .

**Proof of Claim 3.** Suppose, to the contrary, that there is a path  $v_0 v_1 \dots v_{t+1}$  ( $t \geq 1$ ) in  $G$  such that  $v_1, \dots, v_t \in V(G_1)$ ,  $v_0 \in M_1$ ,  $v_{t+1} \in M_2$  and  $v_{t+1}$  is not special vertex of  $M_2$ . Suppose  $M_1$  is obtained from two cycles  $C^1 = u_1^1 \dots u_{m_1}^1 u_1^1$  and  $C^2 = u_1^2 \dots u_{m_2}^2 u_1^2$  by adding the edge  $u_1^1 u_1^2$  and let  $M_2$  obtained from  $r \geq 0$  tailed-cycle  $C_{n_1, \ell_1}, \dots, C_{n_r, \ell_r}$  and  $s \geq 3$  cycles  $C_{m_1}, \dots, C_{m_s}$ , where  $n_i \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$  and  $m_j \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$  for each  $i, j$ , by adding a new vertex  $z$  (special vertex) and attaching  $z$  to the leaf of each tailed cycle  $C_{n_i, \ell_i}$  and to one vertex of each cycle  $C_{m_j}$ . Without loss of generality, that we may assume that  $v_1$  is adjacent to the vertex  $u_j^2 \in V(C_2)$  where  $j \geq m_2/2$  (by relabeling the vertices if necessary).

First let  $v_{t+1}$  belongs to a cycle  $C_{m_i} = w_1^i w_2^i \dots w_{m_i}^i w_1^i$  for some  $i$ . Without loss of generality, let  $i = 1$  and  $v_{t+1} = w_q^1$ . Let  $M'_2$  be obtained from  $M_2$  by deleting the vertices of  $C_{m_1}$ , and  $M'_1 = (C^1 \cup C_{m_1}) \cup u_1^1 u_1^2 u_2^2 \dots u_j^2 v_1 \dots v_t w_q^1$ . In this case, consider the subgraphs  $G_2^1 = (G_2 - (M_1 \cup M_2)) \cup (M'_1 \cup M'_2)$  and  $G_1^1 = G - G_2^1$  which we will be discussing later.

Now assume that  $v_{t+1}$  belongs to a tailed cycle  $C_{n_i, \ell_i}$  for some  $i$ , say  $i = 1$ . Let  $C = w_1^1 w_2^1 \dots w_{n_1}^1 w_1^1$  be the cycle of  $C_{n_1, \ell_1}$  and  $P = y_1^1 \dots y_{\ell_1}^1$  be the tail of  $C_{n_1, \ell_1}$  such that  $w_1^1 y_1^1 \in E(G)$ . Consider the two situations depending on whether  $v_{t+1}$  is on the cycle or the tail. If  $v_{t+1} \in V(C)$ , say  $v_{t+1} = w_q^1$ , then let  $M'_2$  be obtained from  $M_2$  by deleting the vertices of  $C_{n_1, \ell_1}$ , and  $M'_1 = (C^1 \cup C) \cup u_1^1 u_1^2 u_2^2 \dots u_j^2 v_1 \dots v_t w_q^1$ . In this case, consider the subgraphs  $G_2^1 = (G_2 - (M_1 \cup M_2)) \cup (M'_1 \cup M'_2)$  and  $G_1^1 = G - G_2^1$ . If  $v_{t+1} \in V(P)$ , say  $v_{t+1} = y_q^1$ , then let  $M'_2$  be obtained from  $M_2$  by deleting the vertices of  $C_{n_1, \ell_1}$ , and  $M'_1 = (C^1 \cup C) \cup u_1^1 u_1^2 u_2^2 \dots u_j^2 v_1 \dots v_t y_q^1 y_{q-1}^1 \dots y_1^1 w_1^1$ . In this case, consider the subgraphs  $G_2^1 = (G_2 - (M_1 \cup M_2)) \cup (M'_1 \cup M'_2)$  and  $G_1^1 = G - G_2^1$ .

Observe that in any situation, either the number of cycles of  $G_2^1$  belonging to  $\mathcal{F}$  is greater than the one of  $G_2$  that are in  $\mathcal{F}$  or  $s_{(G_1^1, G_2^1)} > s_{(G_1, G_2)}$ . Now, if  $G_1^1$  has no cycle of  $\mathcal{F}$ , then the pair  $(G_1^1, G_2^1)$  leads to a contradiction. Otherwise, by repeating above process we can obtain a pair  $(G'_1, G'_2)$  such that  $G'_1$  has no cycle of  $\mathcal{F}$  and each component of  $G'_2$  belongs

to  $\mathcal{F}_0 \cup \mathcal{F}_{0,2} \cup \mathcal{F}_{2,2} \cup \mathcal{F}_3 \cup \mathcal{E}$ , where either the number of strong components of  $G'_2$  is greater than the one of  $G_2$  or the number of cycles of  $G'_2$  that are in  $\mathcal{F}$  is greater than the number of cycles of  $G_2$  belonging to  $\mathcal{F}$  or  $s_{(G'_1, G'_2)} > s_{(G_1, G_2)}$ . In either case, we have a contradiction and the desired claim follows.  $\square$

**Claim 4.** If  $M \in \mathcal{B}_{r,s}$  is a non-strong component of  $G_2$  with a special vertex  $z$ , then there is no path  $v_0 v_1 \dots v_t v_{t+1}$  ( $t \geq 1$ ) in  $G$  such that  $v_1, \dots, v_t \in V(G_1)$ ,  $v_0, v_{t+1} \in V(M) - \{z\}$  and  $v_0, v_{t+1}$  belong to different near cycles of  $z$ .

**Proof of Claim 4.** Let  $M$  be obtained from  $r \geq 0$  tailed-cycle  $C_{n_1, \ell_1}, \dots, C_{n_r, \ell_r}$  and  $s \geq 3$  cycles  $C_{m_1}, \dots, C_{m_s}$ , where  $n_i \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$  and  $m_j \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$  for each  $i, j$ , by adding a new vertex  $z$  (special vertex) and attaching  $z$  to the leaf of each tailed cycle  $C_{n_i, \ell_i}$  and to one vertex of each cycle  $C_{m_j}$ . Moreover, let  $C_{m_i} = z_1^i z_2^i \dots z_{m_i}^i z_1^i$  for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, s\}$  and let  $V(C_{n_i, \ell_i}) = \{x_1^i, \dots, x_{n_i}^i, y_1^i, \dots, y_{\ell_i}^i\}$ , where  $x_1^i, \dots, x_{n_i}^i$  induce in order the cycle of  $C_{n_i, \ell_i}$  and  $y_1^i, \dots, y_{\ell_i}^i$  induce in order the tail of  $C_{n_i, \ell_i}$ .

Suppose, to the contrary, that there is a path  $P = v_0 v_1 \dots v_t v_{t+1}$  in  $G$  such that  $v_1, \dots, v_t \in V(G_1)$ ,  $v_0, v_{t+1} \in V(M) - \{z\}$  and  $v_0, v_{t+1}$  belong to different near cycles of  $z$ .

First let  $r + s = 3$ . Then  $r = 0$  and  $s = 3$ . Assume, without loss of generality, that  $v_0 = u_k^1$  and  $v_{t+1} = u_j^2$  where  $j \leq m_1/2$  and  $k \leq m_2/2$ . Let  $M'$  be obtained from  $C_1, C_3$  by adding the path  $P u_{j-1}^2 \dots u_1^2 z u_1^3$ . Note that if  $v_{t+1} = u_1^2$ , then the added path will be simply  $P z u_1^3$ . Consider the subgraph  $G'_2 = (G_2 - M) \cup M'$ . If  $G - G'_2$  has no cycle of  $\mathcal{F}$ , then the pair  $(G - G'_2, G'_2)$  provides a number of strong components in  $G'_2$  greater than the one of  $G_2$ , contradicting our choice of the pair  $(G_1, G_2)$ . Assume now that  $G - G'_2$  has exactly one cycle  $C$  of  $\mathcal{F}$ . Then  $V(C)$  meets at least a vertex of  $\{u_{j+1}^2, \dots, u_{m_2}^2\}$  and let  $p$  be the largest integer that  $u_p^2 \in V(C)$ . Let  $M''$  be obtained from  $M' \cup C$  by adding the path  $u_1^2 \dots u_p^2$ . Consider the subgraph  $G''_2 = (G_2 - M') \cup M''$ . Then, as above, the pair  $(G - G''_2, G''_2)$  leads to a contradiction. Hence we can assume that  $G - G'_2$  has at least two disjoint cycles of  $\mathcal{F}$ . Clearly each of these cycles meets at least a vertex of  $\{u_{j+1}^2, \dots, u_{m_2}^2\}$ . Consider the subgraph  $G'$  of  $G - G'_2$  induced by the vertices of these cycles and the vertices of  $\{u_{j+1}^2, \dots, u_{m_2}^2\}$ , and let  $K_1$  and  $K_2$  be two disjoint subgraphs of  $G'$  satisfying the conditions of Lemma 13. Then the pair  $(G'_2 \cup K_2, G - (G'_2 \cup K_2))$  leads to a contradiction because the number of strong components of  $G'_2 \cup K_2$  is greater than the number of strong components of  $G_2$ .

Now let  $r + s \geq 4$ , and assume that  $P$  connects two cycles  $C$  and  $C'$  of  $M$  that are at distance one from  $z$ . Let  $M'$  be obtained from  $M$  by deleting the vertices of  $C \cup C'$ , and let  $M'' = C + C' + P$ . Now, if we consider the subgraphs  $G''_2 = (G_2 - M) \cup (M' \cup M'')$  and  $G''_1 = G - G''_2$ , then one can see, as above, that the pair  $(G''_1, G''_2)$  leads to a contradiction.  $\square$

**Claim 5.** Let  $M_1, M_2 \in \mathcal{E}$  be two non-strong components of  $G_2$  and let  $z_i$  be the special vertex of  $M_i$ . Then there is no path  $P = v_0 v_1 \dots v_t v_{t+1}$  ( $t \geq 1$ ) in  $G$  such that  $v_1, \dots, v_t \in V(G_1)$ ,  $v_0$  belongs to a near cycle  $C_1$  of  $z_1$  and  $v_{t+1}$  belongs to near cycle  $C_2$  of  $z_2$ .

**Proof of Claim 5.** Suppose to the contrary that such a path  $P$  exists. Let  $M'_i$  be obtained from  $M_i$  by deleting the vertices of  $V(C_i)$  for each  $i \in \{1, 2\}$  and let  $M = (C_1 \cup C_2) + P$ . Consider the subgraphs  $G'_2 = (G_2 - (M_1 \cup M_2)) \cup (M'_1 \cup M'_2 \cup M)$  and  $G'_1 = G - G'_2$ . Since  $G'_2$  has more strong components than  $G_2$ , the pair  $(G'_1, G'_2)$  contradicts the choice of the pair  $(G_1, G_2)$ .  $\square$



Now, let  $K_0$  be the subgraph of  $G_2$  that consists of all non-strong components of  $G_2$  and let  $H_0$  be the subgraph of  $G_2$  that consists of all strong components of  $G_2$ . By Lemma 15, each component  $M$  of  $H_0$  has a 3-tuple  $\vec{f}_M$  of RDFs of  $M$  such that  $\omega(\vec{f}_M) \leq \frac{(4k+8)3n(M)}{6k+11}$  and all vertices of  $M$  are  $\vec{f}_M$ -strong. Therefore, by combining these 3-tuples we obtain a 3-tuple  $\vec{f}_0$  of RDFs of  $H_0$  such that  $\omega(\vec{f}_0) \leq \frac{(4k+8)3n(H_0)}{6k+11}$  and all vertices of  $H_0$  are  $\vec{f}_0$ -strong. Moreover, by Lemmas 16 and 17, each component  $M$  of  $K_0$  has a 3-tuple  $\vec{g}_M$  of RDFs of  $M$  such that  $\omega(\vec{g}_M) \leq \frac{(4k+8)3n(M)}{6k+11}$ , and if further  $M \in \mathcal{B}_{r,s}$  ( $s \geq 3$ ), then its special vertex as well as all all vertices on tailed cycle are  $\vec{g}_M$ -strong. Therefore, by combining these 3-tuples we obtain a 3-tuple  $\vec{g}_0$  of RDFs of  $K_0$  such that  $\omega(\vec{g}_0) \leq \frac{(4k+8)3n(K_0)}{6k+11}$  and all vertices of  $K_0$  are  $\vec{g}_0$ -strong except vertices on near cycles of some special vertex or vertices on the component in  $\mathcal{F}_{2,2}$ .

If there is a path  $P_1 = v_0v_1 \dots v_tv_{t+1}$  in  $G$  such that  $v_1, \dots, v_t \in V(G_1)$ ,  $N(v_1) \cup N(v_t) \subseteq V(H_0 \cup K_0) \cup V(P_1)$  and both  $v_0, v_{t+1}$  belong to a component  $M \in \mathcal{F}_{2,2}$  of  $K_0$ , then we deduce from Claim 1 that both of  $v_0, v_{t+1}$  belong to same cycle of  $M$ . Let  $M' = M + P$ . It follows from Lemma 5-(5) and Lemmas 2 and 7 that  $M'$  has a 3-tuple  $\vec{f}'$  of RDFs of  $M'$  such that  $\omega(\vec{f}') \leq 2n(M') + 2 \leq \frac{(4k+8)3n(M')}{6k+11}$  and all vertices of  $M'$  are  $\vec{f}'$ -strong except  $v_1$  and  $v_t$ . In this case, let  $K_0^1 = K_0 - M$ ,  $\vec{g}_0^1 = \vec{g}_0|_{K_0^1}$  (the restriction of  $\vec{g}_0$  on  $K_0^1$ ) and  $H_0^1 = H_0 \cup (M + P) = H_0 \cup M'$ . Let  $\vec{f}_0^1$  be a 3-tuple of RDFs obtained by combining the 3-tuples  $\vec{f}_0$  and  $\vec{f}'$ . Clearly all vertices of  $H_0^1$  which have a neighbor outside  $H_0^1 \cup K_0^1$  are  $\vec{f}_0^1$ -strong. By repeating this process we obtain two sequences of subgraphs  $K_0 \supseteq K_0^1 \supseteq \dots \supseteq K_0^d$  and  $H_0 \subseteq H_0^1 \subseteq \dots \subseteq H_0^d$  so that: (i) there is no path  $P = w_0w_1 \dots w_rw_{r+1}$  in  $G$  with  $w_1, \dots, w_r \in V(G_1) - (\cup_{i=1}^d V(P_i))$ ,  $N(w_1) \cup N(w_r) \subseteq V(H_0^d \cup K_0^d) \cup (\cup_{i=1}^d V(P_i))$  and both  $v_0, v_{t+1}$  belong to a component  $M \in \mathcal{F}_{2,2}$  of  $K_0^d$ , and (ii)  $H_0^d$  has a 3-tuple  $\vec{f}_0^d$  such that all its vertices which have a neighbor outside  $V(H_0^d \cup K_0^d)$  are  $\vec{f}_0^d$ -strong. Let  $H_1 = H_0^d$ ,  $K_1 = K_0^d$ ,  $\vec{g}_1 = \vec{g}_0^d|_{K_1}$  and  $\vec{f}_1 = \vec{f}_0^d$ . Observe that  $\omega(\vec{f}_1) \leq \frac{(4k+8)3n(H_1)}{6k+11}$  and  $\omega(\vec{g}_1) \leq \frac{(4k+8)3n(K_1)}{6k+11}$ . If  $V(G) = V(H_1 \cup K_1)$ , then by combining 3-tuple  $\vec{f}_1$  of  $H_1$  and 3-tuple  $\vec{g}_1$  of  $K_1$ , we get a 3-tuple  $\vec{h}$  of  $G$  such that  $\omega(\vec{h}) \leq \frac{(4k+8)3n(G)}{6k+11}$  which will prove the theorem. Hence assume that  $V(G) \neq V(H_1 \cup K_1)$ , and let  $G_2^1 = H_1 \cup K_1$  and  $G_1^1 = G - G_2^1$ .

If there is a path  $P_1 = v_0v_1 \dots v_tv_{t+1}$  in  $G$  such that  $v_0, v_{t+1} \in V(H_1)$ ,  $v_1, \dots, v_t \in V(G_1^1)$  and  $N(v_1) \cup N(v_t) \subseteq V(H_1) \cup V(P_1)$ , then let  $H_1^1 = H_1 + P$ . By Lemma 2, we can extend  $\vec{f}_1$  to a 3-tuple  $\vec{f}_1^1$  of RDFs of  $H_1^1$  such that  $\omega(\vec{f}_1^1) \leq \frac{(4k+8)3n(H_1^1)}{6k+11}$ , where all vertices of  $H_1^1$  but  $v_1$  and  $v_t$  are  $\vec{f}_1^1$ -strong. Now, if there is a path  $P_2 = z_0z_1 \dots z_mz_{m+1}$  ( $m \geq 1$ ) in  $G$  such that  $z_0, z_{m+1} \in V(H_1^1)$ ,  $z_1, \dots, z_m \in V(G_1^1) - V(P_1)$ ,  $N(z_1) \cup N(z_m) \subseteq V(H_1^1) \cup V(P_2)$ , then let  $H_1^2 = H_1^1 + P_2$ . By Lemma 2, we can extend  $\vec{f}_1^1$  to a 3-tuple  $\vec{f}_1^2$  of RDFs of  $H_1^2$  such that  $\omega(\vec{f}_1^2) \leq \frac{(4k+8)3n(H_1^2)}{6k+11}$  and all new vertices but  $z_1, z_m$  are  $\vec{f}_1^2$ -strong. By repeating this process we obtain a sequence of subgraphs  $H_1 \subseteq H_1^1 \subseteq \dots \subseteq H_1^q$  so that there is no path  $P = w_0w_1 \dots w_rw_{r+1}$  in  $G$  such that  $w_0, w_{r+1} \in V(H_1^q)$ ,  $w_1, \dots, w_r \in V(G_1^1) - (\cup_{i=1}^q V(P_i))$  and  $N(w_1) \cup N(w_r) \subseteq V(H_1^q) \cup V(P)$ . Moreover,  $H_1^q$  has a 3-tuple  $\vec{f}_1^q$  of RDFs of  $H_1^q$  such that  $\omega(\vec{f}_1^q) \leq \frac{(4k+8)3n(H_1^q)}{6k+11}$  and all vertices are  $\vec{f}_1^q$ -strong unless the vertices which have no neighbors outside of  $H_1^q \cup K_1$ . If  $V(G) = V(H_1^q \cup K_1)$ , then as above, by combining 3-tuple  $\vec{f}_1^q$  and 3-tuple  $\vec{g}_2 = \vec{g}_1$ , the result follows. Hence assume that  $V(G) \neq V(H_1^q \cup K_1)$ , and let  $H_2 = H_1^q$ ,  $\vec{f}_2 = \vec{f}_1^q$ ,  $K_2 = K_1$ ,  $\vec{g}_2 = \vec{g}_1$ ,  $G_2^2 = H_2 \cup K_2$  and  $G_1^2 = G - G_2^2$ . In the following

we will use Lemma 8 by applying its three items, one by one (in any order), starting with the subgraph  $G_1^2$  and obtaining each time (when the item occurs) a sequence of subgraphs. The last subgraph of the sequence will be used for the next item.

**Case 1.**  $G_1^2$  contains a tailed  $m$ -cycle  $C_{m,\ell}$  ( $m \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ ), with vertex set  $\{x_1, \dots, x_m, y_1, \dots, y_\ell\}$ , such that  $y_\ell$  is adjacent to some vertex  $x$  of  $G_2^2$  and  $N_G(x_m) \subseteq V(G_2^2) \cup V(C_{m,\ell})$ .

First assume that  $x \in V(H_2)$ . Then  $x$  is  $\vec{f}_2$ -strong. Let  $H_2^1$  be obtained from  $H_2$  by adding the tailed cycle  $C_{m,\ell}$  and the edge  $xy_\ell$ . By Lemma 3,  $\vec{f}_2$  can be extended to a 3-tuple  $\vec{f}_2^1$  or RDFs of  $H_2^1$  such that  $\omega(\vec{f}_2^1) \leq \frac{(4k+8)3n(H_2^1)}{6k+11}$  and all new vertices but  $x_m$  are  $\vec{f}_2^1$ -strong. Set also  $K_2^1 = K_2$  and  $\vec{g}_2^1 = \vec{g}_1$ .

Now assume that  $x$  belongs to a component  $M$  of  $K_2$  such that  $M \in \mathcal{F}_{2,2}$ . Let  $M'$  be obtained from  $M$  and  $C_{m,\ell}$  by adding the edge  $xy_\ell$ . By Lemma 5-(5) and Lemma 3, one can see that  $M'$  has a 3-tuple  $f_{M'}$  of RDFs such that  $\omega(\vec{f}_{M'}) \leq 2n(M') + 2 \leq \frac{(4k+8)3n(M')}{6k+11}$  and all of its vertices but  $x_m$  are  $\vec{f}_{M'}$ -strong. Let  $H_2^1 = H_2 \cup M'$ ,  $K_2^1 = K_2 - M$ ,  $\vec{g}_2^1$  be the restriction of  $g$  on  $K_2^1$  and 3-tuple  $\vec{f}_2^1$  is obtained from combining  $\vec{f}_{M'}$  and  $\vec{f}_2$ . Note that all vertices of  $H_2^1$  which have neighbor in  $G_1^2 - V(C_{m,\ell})$  are  $\vec{f}_2^1$ -strong.

Next assume that  $x$  belongs to a component  $M$  of  $K_2$  such that  $M \in \mathcal{B}_{r,s}$  ( $s \geq 3$ ) and  $x$  is  $\vec{g}$ -strong. Let  $M'$  be obtained from  $M$  and  $C_{m,\ell}$  by adding the edge  $xy_\ell$  and let  $H_2^1 = H_2$  and  $K_2^1 = (K_2 - M) \cup M'$ . By Lemma 3,  $\vec{g}_2$  can be extended to a 3-tuple  $\vec{g}_2^1$  of RDFs of  $K_2^1$  such that  $\omega(\vec{g}_2^1) \leq \frac{(4k+8)3n(K_2^1)}{6k+11}$  and all newly added vertices but  $x_m$  are  $\vec{g}_2^1$ -strong.

Finally, assume that  $x$  belongs to a component  $M$  of  $K_2$  such that  $M \in \mathcal{B}_{r,s}$  ( $s \geq 3$ ) and  $x$  is not  $\vec{g}$ -strong. Then  $x$  belongs to a near cycle  $C$  from the special vertex of  $M$ . Let  $M'$  be obtained from  $M$  by deleting the vertices of  $C$  and let  $M''$  be obtained from  $C$  and  $C_{m,\ell}$  by adding the edge  $xy_\ell$ . In this case, let  $H_2^1 = H_2 \cup M''$ ,  $K_2^1 = K_2 - V(C)$  and  $\vec{g}_2^1$  is the restriction of  $\vec{g}_2$  on  $K_2^1$ . By Lemma 5 (items 2,3,4),  $f_2$  can be extended to a 3-tuple of RDFs  $f_2^1$  of  $H_2^1$  such that  $\omega(\vec{f}_2^1) \leq \frac{(4k+8)3n(H_2^1)}{6k+11}$  and all newly added vertices but  $x_m$  are  $\vec{f}_2^1$ -strong.

By repeatedly applying the above argument we obtain two sequences of subgraphs  $H_2 \supseteq H_2^1 \supseteq \dots \supseteq H_2^{r_1}$  and  $K_2, K_2^1, \dots, K_2^{s_1}$  such that there is no tailed cycle  $C_{m,\ell}$  ( $m \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ ) in  $G - (H_2^{r_1} \cup K_2^{s_1})$  whose end-vertex is adjacent to a vertex of  $H_2^{r_1} \cup K_2^{s_1}$ . Let  $H_3 = H_2^{r_1}$ ,  $K_3 = K_2^{s_1}$ ,  $f_3$  be a 3-tuple of RDFs of  $H_3$  such that all vertices of  $H_3$  which have a neighbor outside  $H_3 \cup K_3$  are  $\vec{f}_3$ -strong, and  $g_3$  be a 3-tuple of RDFs of  $K_3$  such that all newly added vertices of  $K_3$  which have no neighbor outside  $H_3 \cup K_3$  are  $\vec{g}_3$ -strong. Let  $G_2^3 = H_3 \cup K_3$  and  $G_1^3 = G - G_2^3$ .

**Case 2.**  $G_1^3$  contains a cycle  $C_m = x_1x_2 \dots x_mx_1$  ( $m \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ ) such that  $N_G(x_m) \subseteq V(G_2^3) \cup V(C_m)$  and there is an edge  $x_1y$  with  $y \in V(G_2^3)$ . Applying an argument similar to that described in Case 1, we obtained subgraphs  $H_4$  and  $K_4$  such that  $H_3 \subseteq H_4$ , and a 3-tuple  $f_4$  of RDFs of  $H_4$  so that all vertices of  $H_4$  having a neighbor outside  $H_4 \cup K_4$  are  $\vec{f}_4$ -strong, and a 3-tuple  $\vec{g}_4$  of RDFs of  $K_4$  so that all newly added vertices of  $K_3$  that have a neighbor outside  $H_4 \cup K_4$  are  $\vec{g}_4$ -strong. Assume that  $G_2^4 = H_4 \cup K_4$  and  $G_1^4 = G - G_2^4$ .

Let  $\vec{h}$  be a 3-tuple defined on  $G_2^4$  obtained by combining  $\vec{f}_4$  and  $\vec{g}_4$ .

**Case 3.**  $G_1^4$  has a path  $P = v_0v_1, \dots, v_tv_{t+1}$  ( $t \geq 1$ ) such that  $v_0, v_{t+1} \in G_2^4$ ,  $v_1, \dots, v_t \in V(G_1^4)$  and  $N_G(v_1) \cup N_G(v_{t+1}) \subseteq V(G_2^4) \cup V(P)$ .

By Claims 1,2,3,4 and 5, at least one of the vertices  $v_0, v_{t+1}$  is  $\vec{h}$ -strong. First assume that

each of  $v_0$  and  $v_{t+1}$  is  $\vec{h}$ -strong. Let  $G_2^5 = G_2^4 + P$  and  $G_1^5 = G - G_2^5$ . By Lemma 2, we can extend  $\vec{h}$  to a 3-tuple  $\vec{h}^1$  of RDFs of  $G_2^5$  such that  $\omega(\vec{h}^1) \leq \frac{(4k+8)3n(G_2^5)}{6k+11}$  and all vertices of  $G_2^5$  which have neighbor in  $G_1^5$  are  $\vec{h}^1$ -strong. Assume now, without loss of generality, that  $v_0$  is  $\vec{h}$ -strong and  $v_{t+1}$  is not  $\vec{h}$ -strong. It follows that  $v_{t+1}$  is on a near cycle from a special vertex of a component of  $K_4$  or is in a component of  $K_4$  that belongs to  $\mathcal{F}_{2,2}$ . If  $v_{t+1}$  is on a near cycle  $C$  from a special vertex, then let  $G_2^5 = G_2^4 + P$ . By Lemma 3,  $h|_{G_2^4-C}$  can be extended to a 3-tuple  $\vec{h}^1$  of RDFs of  $G_2^5$  such that  $\omega(\vec{h}^1) \leq \frac{(4k+8)3n(G_2^5)}{6k+11}$  and all vertices of  $G_2^5$  which have neighbors in  $G_1^5 - V(P)$  are  $\vec{h}^1$ -strong. If  $v_{t+1}$  is in a component  $M$  of  $K_4$  belonging to  $\mathcal{F}_{2,2}$ , then let  $G_2^5 = G_2^4 + P$ . By applying Lemma 3 twice,  $h|_{G_2^4-M}$  can be extended to a 3-tuple  $\vec{h}^1$  of RDFs of  $G_2^5$  such that  $\omega(\vec{h}^1) \leq \frac{(4k+8)3n(G_2^5)}{6k+11}$  and all vertices of  $G_2^5$  which have neighbors in  $G_1^5 - V(P)$  are  $\vec{h}^1$ -strong.

By repeating this process we obtain a 3-tuple  $\vec{h}$  of RDFs  $G$  such that  $\omega(\vec{h}) \leq \frac{(4k+8)3n(G)}{6k+11}$ , implying that  $\gamma_R(G) \leq \frac{(4k+8)n(G)}{6k+11}$  as desired.  $\square$

Now, the next result settling Conjecture 1 is an immediate consequence of Theorem 18 and the Gallai-type result  $\gamma_R(G) + \partial(G) = n$  which is valid for every graph  $G$  of order  $n$ .

**Corollary 19.** Let  $G$  be a graph of order  $n \geq 6k + 9$ , minimum degree  $\delta \geq 2$ , which does not contain any induced  $\{C_5, C_8, \dots, C_{3k+2}\}$ -cycles. Then  $\partial(G) \geq \frac{(2k+3)n}{6k+11}$ .

## 6 Acknowledgment

This work was supported by the National Key R & D Program of China (Grant No. 2019YFA0706402) and the Natural Science Foundation of Guangdong Province under grant 2018A0303130115.

## References

- [1] S. Bermudo, *On the differential and Roman domination number of a graph with minimum degree two*, Discrete Appl. Math. **232** (2017), 64–72.
- [2] S. Bermudo and H. Fernau, *Lower bounds on the differential of a graph*, Discrete Math. **312** (2012), 3236–3250.
- [3] S. Bermudo and H. Fernau, *Computing the differential of a graph: hardness, approximability and exact algorithms*, Discrete Appl. Math. **165** (2014), 69–82.
- [4] S. Bermudo and H. Fernau, *Combinatorics for smaller kernels: the differential of a graph*, Theoret. Comput. Sci. **562** (2015), 330–345.
- [5] S. Bermudo, H. Fernau and J.M. Sigarreta, *The differential and the Roman domination number of a graph*, Appl. Anal. Discrete Math. **8** (2014), 155–171.
- [6] S. Bermudo, J.M. Rodríguez and J.M. Sigarreta, *On the differential in graphs*, Util. Math. **97** (2015), 257–270.

- [7] E.W. Chambers, B. Kinnersley, N. Prince, and D.B. West, Extremal problems for Roman domination, *SIAM J. Discrete Math.* **23** (2009), 1575–1586.
- [8] S. Bermudo, L. De la Torre, A.M. Martín-Caraballo and J.M. Sigarreta, *The differential of the strong product graphs*, *Int. J. Comput. Math.* **92** (2015), 1124–1134.
- [9] M. Chellali, N. Jafari Rad, S.M. Sheikholeslami and L. Volkmann, Roman domination in graphs, in: *Topics in Domination in Graphs*, (Eds), T.W. Haynes, S.T. Hedetniemi and M.A. Henning, Springer: Berlin/Heidelberg, Germany, 2020, pp. 365–409.
- [10] M. Chellali, N. Jafari Rad, S.M. Sheikholeslami and L. Volkmann, Varieties of Roman domination, in: *Structures of Domination in Graphs*, (Eds), T.W. Haynes, S.T. Hedetniemi and M.A. Henning, Springer: Berlin/Heidelberg, Germany, 2021, pp. 273–307.
- [11] M. Chellali, N. Jafari Rad, S.M. Sheikholeslami and L. Volkmann, *Varieties of Roman domination II*, *AKCE Int. J. Graphs Comb.*, **17** (2020), 966–984.
- [12] M. Chellali, N. Jafari Rad, S.M. Sheikholeslami and L. Volkmann, *The Roman domatic problem in graphs and digraphs: A survey*, *Discuss. Math. Graph Theory* (to appear).
- [13] M. Chellali, N. Jafari Rad, S.M. Sheikholeslami and L. Volkmann, *A survey on Roman domination parameters in directed graphs*, *J. Combin. Math. Combin. Comput.* (to appear).
- [14] E.J. Cockayne, P.A. Dreyer, S.M. Hedetniemi and S.T. Hedetniemi, *Roman domination in graphs*, *Discrete Math.* **278** (2004), 11–22.
- [15] R. Khoeilar, H. Karami, M. Chellali, S.M. Sheikholeslami and L. Volkmann, *A proof of a conjecture on the differential of a subcubic graph*, *Discrete Appl. Math.* **287** (2020), 27–39.
- [16] J.L. Mashburn, T.W. Haynes, S.M. Hedetniemi, S.T. Hedetniemi and P.J. Slater, *Differentials in graphs*, *Util. Math.* **69** (2006), 43–54.