Sufficient conditions for matching extendability in terms of the Zeroth-order General Randić Index

Shuai Wang[1], Guifu Su[1] *

1. College of Mathematics and Physics,
Beijing University of Chemical Technology, Beijing, 100029, PR China

Abstract: Topological indices are important bridge between graph theory and chemical applications. The study of graph matching expandability has been an influential topic in recent research on graph structure. In this paper, we provide some sufficient conditions for a graph to be k-extendable graphs, n-factor-critical graphs and (n, k, d)-graphs and graphs with prefect matching in terms of a significant type of Topological index: the Zeroth-order General Randić Index ($\alpha \geq -1$ and $\alpha \neq 0$).

Key words: the Zeroth-order General Randić Index ; matching ; k-extendable graphs ; n-factor-critical graphs; (n, k, d)-graphs.

1 Introduction and Notation

The graphs we discuss in this paper are simple connected graphs, i.e., connected graphs that do not contain circles and parallel edges. Let $G = (V(G), E(G))$, where $V(G)$ is the set of vertices and $E(G)$ is the set of edges of G. For any vertex $x \in V(G)$, $d_G(x)$ denotes the degree of x within G.

A graph is bipartite if its vertex set can be partitioned into two subsets X and Y so that every edge has one end in X and the other in Y; such a partition (X, Y) is called a bipartition of the graph, and X and Y its parts. A bipartite graph is balanced if its two parts X and Y satisfied $|X| = |Y|$.

The complement of G , denoted by $\overline{G}$, is the graph with the vertex set $V(G)$ and whose edges are the pairs of nonadjacent vertices of G. The union of two graphs G and H, denoted by $G \cup H$, is the graph with the vertex set $V(G) \cup V(H)$ and edge set $E(G) \cup E(H)$. And the join of G and H (denoted by $G \cup H$) take the vertex $V(G) \cup V(H)$ and edge set $E(G) \cup E(H) \cup \{uv | u \in V(G), v \in V(H)\}$.

*Corresponding author: gfs@mail.buct.edu.cn (G. Su).

For $S \subset V(G)$, $G - S$ denote the graph induced by $V(G) - S$. For any two non-adjacent vertices x and y in G, let $G + e$ be the graph formed from G by adding a new edge $e = xy$.

The edge set $M \subseteq E(G)$ is a matching of G if there is no common endpoint on any 2 edges in M. A matching of k edges is called a k-matching. The matching M in G that covers exactly $|V(G)| - d$ (d is a non-negative integer) vertices is called the d-deficient matching of the graph G, which we also refer to the deficiency of M in G is d, denote $def(M) = d$. By definition, we can obtain that $2k + d = |V(G)|$ for any matching of G.

Suppose G is a connected graph with perfect matchings and G is k-extendable if every k-matching of G is contained in a perfect matching. A graph with perfect matching is equivalent to a 0-extandable graph. G is called maximal non-k-extendable if G is not k-extendable but $G + e$ is k-extendable for every $e \in E(\overline{G})$. A connected balanced bipartite graph G with a bipartition (X, Y) is maximal non-k-extendable bipartite if G is not k-extendable but $G + xy$ is k-extendable for any edge $xy \notin E(G)$ with $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$.

A closely related concept to k-extendable is that of k-factor-critical. G is said to be k-factor-critical if, for any subset $S \subseteq V(G)$ with n vertices, $G - S$ has a perfect matching. G is called maximal non-k-factor-critical if G is not k-factor-critical but $G + e$ is k-factor-critical for every missing edge $e \in E(\overline{G})$.

Let G be a graph and let n, k and d be non-negative integers such that $|V(G)| \geq n + 2k + d + 2$ and $|V(G)| - n - d$ is even. If on deleting any n vertices from G the remaining subgraph of G contains a k-matching and each k-matching in the subgraph can be extended to a d-deficient matching, then G is called an (n, k, d)-graph. This concept was proposed by Liu and Yu [3] as an extension to our usual discussion of k-expandability, n-factor criticality, and d-deficient matching. A graph G is called a maximal non-(n, k, d)-graph if G is not an (n, k, d)-graph but $G + e$ is an (n, k, d)-graph for every edge $e \in E(\overline{G})$.

Recently, the use of graph parameters to study matching parameters of graphs and problems related to matching extensibility have been studied. For example, Lin[11] used the number of edges of a graph to give a sufficient condition for a graph to have a perfect matching. Suil[12] used a new technique to give the same conclusion and utilized it to give a spectral radius condition for the existence of a perfect matching in a graph. Later, using similar methods, scholars have given various types of sufficient conditions for a graph to satisfy k-matching extensibility as well as k-factor-critical property, please see [8, 9, 15, 16] for details.

A mapping on a graph is called a graph invariant if it takes the same value for every isomorphic graph. In chemical graph theory, there are many graph invariants which are important in predicting the chemical properties of molecules, and we refer to these graph

invariants as topological indices.

The Zeroth-order General Randić Index is a index denoted by ${}^0R_\alpha$, is defined by the following equation:

$$ {}^0R_\alpha(G) = \sum_{v \in G} d_G(v)^\alpha (\alpha \in \mathbb{R} - \{0\}). $$

The ${}^0R_\alpha$ index was first raised in [7, 14], and the well-known indices $\mathbb{Z}(G)$ (the First Zagreb Index) and $\mathbb{F}(G)$ (the Forgetten Topological Index) correspond to the cases $\alpha = 2$ and 3.

This paper explores the sufficient conditions for k-factor-critical of a graph as well as k-extendable graph and (n, k, d)-graph, using the Zeroth-order General Randić Index as examples. In last section, we provide a new sufficiency conditions for the graph containing a perfect matching. This result generalizes the results of Lin and Suil in [11] and [12]. Some relevant extremal graph will also be shown in the text.

2 Preliminaries

A topological index (or more generally, a graph parameter) $\mathbb{T}(G)$ to each graph G , where $G \ncong K_n$, is said to be edge-increasing(denote by EI) if $\mathbb{T}(G + e) > \mathbb{T}(G)$ for every edge $e \in E(\overline{G})$. A topological index $\mathbb{T}(G)$ to each bipartite graph G, where $G \ncong K_{n,n}$, is said to be bipartite-edge-increasing (denote by BEI) if $\mathbb{T}(G + xy) > \mathbb{T}(G)$ for every edge $xy \notin E(G)$ with $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$. Similarly, we can define edge-decreasing (denote by ED) and bipartite-edge-decreasing (denote by BED) property. It can be verified that if $\mathbb{T}(G)$ is EI, it must be BEI and if $\mathbb{T}(G)$ is ED, it must be BED.

We denote $\mathscr{G}_{n,\mathscr{P}}$(resp. $\mathscr{G}_{n,\mathscr{P}^-}$) the graphs in order n and have (resp. not have) $\mathscr{P}$-property. We denote $\mathscr{B}_{n,\mathscr{P}}$(resp. $\mathscr{B}_{n,\mathscr{P}^-}$) the bipartite graphs in order n and have (resp. not have) $\mathscr{P}$-property.

Call a graph G has maximal non-$\mathscr{P}$-property if $G \in \mathscr{G}_{n,\mathscr{P}^-}$ but for $e \in E(\overline{G})$, $G + e \in \mathscr{G}_{n,\mathscr{P}}$. Accordingly, bipartite graph G is said to has maximal bipartite non-$\mathscr{P}$-property if $G \in \mathscr{B}_{n,\mathscr{P}^-}$ but for any edge $xy \notin E(G)$ with $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$, $G + xy \in \mathscr{B}_{n,\mathscr{P}}$.

In general, finding graphs that satisfy the maximal non-$\mathscr{P}$-property is a very arduous work. But for properties related to the matching extensibility of graphs, these graphs have been completely inscribed by Ananchuen et al.[1] and Bai et al.[2]. For details, please see the lemmas in the following sections.

The following lemma gives the relation between the increasing and decreasing properties of the index and the maximal non-$\mathscr{P}$-property.

Lemma 2.1. *(1)Let G be a graph (resp. bipartite graph) with a maximum EI $\mathbb{T}(G)$ among $\mathscr{G}_{n,\mathscr{P}}$-(resp. $\mathscr{B}_{n,\mathscr{P}}$-), then G must have a maximal non-$\mathscr{P}$-property (resp. maximal bipartite non-$\mathscr{P}$-property).*

(2)Let G be a graph (resp. bipartite graph) with a minimum ED $\mathbb{T}(G)$ among $\mathscr{G}_{n,\mathscr{P}}$-(resp. $\mathscr{B}_{n,\mathscr{P}}$-), then G must have a maximal non-$\mathscr{P}$-property (resp. maximal bipartite non-$\mathscr{P}$-property).

Proof. (1)Suppose G not have a maximal non-$\mathscr{P}$-property and be such that $\mathbb{T}(G)$ attain maximum. Then there exists an edge $e \in \overline{G}$ such that $G + e$ is still a non-$\mathscr{P}$ graph, it follows that $\mathbb{T}(G + e) - \mathbb{T}(G) > 0$, contradicting that $\mathbb{T}(G)$ attains maximum. A similar discussion can be made for the case where G is a bipartite graph. Here we omit the proof.

(2)Suppose G not have a maximal non-$\mathscr{P}$-property and be such that $\mathbb{T}(G)$ attain minimum. Then there exists an edge $e \in \overline{G}$ such that $G + e$ is still a non-$\mathscr{P}$ graph, it follows that $\mathbb{T}(G + e) - \mathbb{T}(G) < 0$, contradicting that $\mathbb{T}(G)$ attains minimum. A similar discussion can be made for the case where G is a bipartite graph. Here we omit the proof. □

Lemma 2.2. *(1)For $\alpha > 0$, ${}^0R_\alpha$ index is EI. In particular, ${}^0R_\alpha$ index is BEI.*

(2)For $\alpha < 0$, ${}^0R_\alpha$ index is ED. In particular, ${}^0R_\alpha$ index is DBI.

Proof. Let G be a graph and $e \in E(\overline{G})$, and two ends of e are v_1, v_2. It follows that

$$ {}^0R_\alpha(G + e) - {}^0R_\alpha(G) = (d(v_1) + 1)^\alpha + (d(v_2) + 1)^\alpha - d(v_1)^\alpha - d(v_2)^\alpha. $$

Clearly, if $\alpha > 0$, since $f(x) = x^\alpha$ is an increasing function when $x \geq 0$, then $(d(v_1) + 1)^\alpha > d(v_1)^\alpha$, $(d(v_2) + 1)^\alpha > d(v_2)^\alpha$. Hence ${}^0R_\alpha(G)$ is *EI*. It follows that $f(G + e) > f(G)$ holds.

If $\alpha < 0$, since $f(x) = x^\alpha$ is an decreasing function when $x \geq 0$, then $(d(v_1) + 1)^\alpha < d(v_1)^\alpha$, $(d(v_2) + 1)^\alpha < d(v_2)^\alpha$. Hence $f(x)$ is a *ED*. It follows that ${}^0R_\alpha(G + e) < {}^0R_\alpha(G)$ holds. □

In addition to the ${}^0R_\alpha$ index, there are many other graph parameters that satisfy similar properties, e.g., the spectral radius of a graph is EI (see [15]), while the spectral radius of the distance of a graph is ED (see [8]). For similar parameters, we should also be able to simplify the calculation using the above lemma.

3 Sufficient conditions for k-expandable bipartite graphs

We begin with the simplest case, discussing sufficient conditions for G to be k-expandable when G is a bipartite graph, and firstly we need the following result mentioned in [1].

Lemma 3.1. *([1]) Let G be a connected balanced bipartite graph on $2n$ vertices with a bipartition (X, Y) . For $0 \leq k \leq n-1$,G is maximal non-k-extendable bipartite if and only if there are subsets $S \subseteq X$, $T \subseteq Y$ with $|S| = s$ and $|T| = n - k - s + 1$ such that*

$$G \cong K_{n,n} - \{xy | x \in S, y \in T\}$$

for an integer s with $1 \leq s \leq n-1$ and $2 \leq k + s \leq n$.

Here is our main result:

Theorem 3.2. *Let G be a connected balanced bipartite graph on $2n(n \geq 3)$ vertices with a bipartition (X, Y) and $\alpha > 0$.*

(1)For $1 \leq k \leq n-1$, if

$$^0R_\alpha(G) \geq (n+k-1)n^\alpha + 2(k+1)^\alpha + (n-k-1)(n-2)^\alpha = \beta_1(n,k),$$

then G is k-extendable, unless $G \cong \{K_{n,n} - xy, x \in S, y \in T\}$ with $|S| = 1$ and $|T| = n - k$.

(2)For $k = 0$, if

$$^0R_\alpha(G) \geq (n-1)n^\alpha + (n-1)(n-2)^\alpha + 2 = \zeta_1(n,k),$$

then G contains a prefect matching, unless $G \cong \{K_{n,n} - xy, x \in S, y \in T\}$ with $|S| = 2$ and $|T| = n - 1$.

Proof. Suppose G is a non-k-expandable graph. By Lemma 2.1 and 2.2, since $^0R_\alpha(G)$ is *BEI*, in order to show the maximum of $^0R_\alpha(G)$, we need only discuss the cases if G is maximal non-k-expandable bipartite, and by Lemma 3.1 we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} ^0R_\alpha(G) &\leq (n-s)n^\alpha + s(k+s-1)^\alpha + (k+s-1)n^\alpha + (n-k-s+1)(n-s)^\alpha \\ &= s(k+s-1)^\alpha + (n+k-1)n^\alpha + (n-k-s+1)(n-s)^\alpha \end{aligned}$$

Set

$$\varphi_1(x) = x(k+x-1)^\alpha + (n+k-1)n^\alpha + (n-k-x+1)(n-x)^\alpha.$$

The interval of $\varphi_1(x)$ in the equation above is $[1, n-1] \cap [2-k, n-k]$, directly from the expression of $\varphi_1(x)$ we get:

$$\varphi_1'(x) = (k+x-1)^\alpha - (n-x)^\alpha - \alpha(n-x)^{\alpha-1}(n-k-x+1) + \alpha x(k+x-1)^{\alpha-1},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi_1''(x) &= 2\alpha(k+x-1)^{\alpha-1} + 2\alpha(n-x)^{\alpha-1} + \alpha(\alpha-1)(n-x)^{\alpha-2}(n-k-x+1) + \alpha(\alpha-1)x(k+x-1)^{\alpha-2} \\ &= \alpha(k+x-1)^{\alpha-2}\underbrace{[2k+(\alpha+1)x-2]}_{g_1(x)} + \alpha(n-x)^{\alpha-2}\underbrace{[2(n-x)+(\alpha-1)(n-k-x+1)]}_{g_2(x)}.\end{aligned}$$

We consider the following two possibilities:

Case 1. $k = 0$.

If $k = 0$, the interval of $\varphi(x)$ is $[2, n-1]$. It is convenient to check that

$$\varphi_1''(x) = \alpha(x-1)^{\alpha-2}[(\alpha+1)x-2] + \alpha(n-x)^{\alpha-2}[(\alpha+1)(n-x)+(\alpha-1)].$$

Note that $g_1(x) = (\alpha+1)x - 2 \geq 2(\alpha+1) - 2 = 2\alpha > 0$ and $g_2(x) = (\alpha+1)(n-x) + (\alpha-1) \geq (\alpha+1) + (\alpha-1) = 2\alpha > 0$, which yields that $\varphi_1''(x) > 0$. Hence $\varphi_1(x)$ is a is a convex function on the interval $[2, n-1]$. Thus, we have $\varphi_1(x) \leq max\{\varphi_1(2), \varphi_1(n-1)\}$.

It is routine to check that

$$\varphi_1(n-1) = \varphi_1(2) = (n-1)n^\alpha + (n-1)(n-2)^\alpha + 2.$$

So $\varphi_1(n-1) = \varphi_1(2)$ is the maximum of ${}^0R_\alpha(G)$. Hence we have ${}^0R_\alpha(G) \leq \varphi_1(2) = (n-2)n^\alpha + 2(k+1)^\alpha + (k+1)n^\alpha + (n-k-1)(n-2)^\alpha$. And if ${}^0R_\alpha(G) = \zeta_1(n,k)$ it could be verified that graphs corresponding to $\varphi_1(n-1)$ and $\varphi_1(2)$ are isomorphic, which yields that $G \cong \{K_{n,n} - xy, x \in S, y \in T\}$ with $|S| = 2$ and $|T| = n-1$, a contradiction. Hence G is 0-extendable, i.e, G attains a prefect matching.

Case 2. $1 \leq k \leq n-1$.

If $1 \leq k \leq n-1$, the interval of $\varphi(x)$ is $[1, n-k]$. It is convenient to check that $g_1(x) \geq (\alpha+1)x > 0$ and $g_2(x) = (\alpha+1)(n-x) + (\alpha-1)(-k+1) \geq (\alpha+1)k + (\alpha-1)(-k+1) = 2k + \alpha - 1 > 0$. Hence $\varphi_1''(x) > 0$, it follows that $\varphi_1(x)$ is a is a convex function on the interval $[1, n-k]$. Thus, we have $\varphi_1(x) \leq max\{\varphi_1(1), \varphi_1(n-k)\}$.

It is routine to check that

$$\varphi_1(n-k) = \varphi_1(1) = (n+k-1)n^\alpha + (n-k)(n-1)^\alpha + k^\alpha,$$

It is followed that both $\varphi_1(n-k)$ and $\varphi_1(1)$ are maximum of ${}^0R_\alpha(G)$. Hence we have ${}^0R_\alpha(G) \leq \varphi_1(1) = (n+k-1)n^\alpha + (n-k)(n-1)^\alpha + k^\alpha = \beta_1(n,k)$, and if ${}^0R_\alpha(G) = \beta_1(n,k)$ it could be verified that graphs corresponding to $\varphi_1(n-k)$ and $\varphi_1(1)$ are isomorphic, which yields that $G \cong \{K_{n,n} - xy, x \in S, y \in T\}$ with $|S| = 2$ and $|T| = n-1$, also a contradiction. Hence G is k-extendable. □

A similar proof would show the relevant conclusions if $-1 \leq \alpha < 0$ and $1 \leq k \leq n-1$:

Theorem 3.3. *Let G be a connected balanced bipartite graph on $2n(n \geq 3)$ vertices with a bipartition (X, Y) and $-1 < \alpha < 0$, $1 \leq k \leq n-1$, if*

$$^0R_\alpha(G) \leq (n+k-1)n^\alpha + 2(k+1)^\alpha + (n-k-1)(n-2)^\alpha = \beta_1(n,k),$$

then G is k-extendable, unless $G \cong \{K_{n,n} - xy, x \in S, y \in T\}$ with $|S| = 1$ and $|T| = n-k$.

Theorem 3.4. *Let G be a connected balanced bipartite graph on $2n(n \geq 3)$ vertices with a bipartition (X, Y) and $\alpha = -1$.*

(1)For $2 \leq k \leq n-1$, if $^0R_\alpha(G) \leq \beta_1(n,k)$, then G is k-extendable, unless $G \cong \{K_{n,n} - xy, x \in S, y \in T\}$ with $|S| = 1$ and $|T| = n-k$.

(2)For $k = 1$, if $^0R_\alpha(G) \leq 3$, then G is 1-extendable, unless G is maximal non-1-extendable bipartite.

4 Sufficiency conditions for k-expandable graph

This section continues from the previous section where we discuss relevant results for general connected graphs. Firstly, we show the following result.

Lemma 4.1. *([1]) Let G be a connected graph with a perfect matching on $2n$ vertices. For $1 \leq k \leq n-1$,G is maximal non-k-extendable if and only if*

$$G \cong K_{2k+s} \vee \bigcup_{i=1}^{s+2} K_{2t_i+1}$$

where s and t_i are non-negative integers with $0 \leq s \leq n-k-1$ and $\sum_{s+2}^{i=1} t_i = n-k-s-1$.

Before proving the theorem, we give a fundamental lemma for the extremum.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $\{n_i\}(1 \leq i \leq k, k > 1)$ be a non-negative sequence and and n_i are not all zeroes. If $l = \sum_{i=1}^k n_i$ is a constant number, and $g(x)$ is a differentiable strictly convex (resp. concave) function of $x \in [0, l]$. Then $f(n_1, n_2, \cdots, n_k) = \sum_{i=1}^k g(n_i)$ attaining the maximum (resp. minimum) if and only if $\{n_i\} = (l, \underbrace{0, 0, \cdots, 0}_{k-1})$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we set n_1 is the maximum of $\{n_i\}$. We use the adjustment method, now given any $\{n_i\} = (n_1, n_2, \cdots, n_k)$, we let n_1 increase by 1 and choose one of $n_i (i \neq 1)$ which is greater than 0 to decrease by 1. Now we have

$$\begin{aligned} & f(n_1+1, \cdots, n_i-1, \cdots, n_k) - f(n_1, \cdots, n_i, \cdots, n_k) \\ =\ & g(n_1+1) + g(n_i-1) - g(n_1) - g(n_i) \\ =\ & g'(\xi_1) - g'(\xi_2)(n_1 < \xi_1 < n_1+1, n_i - 1 < \xi_2 < n_i). \end{aligned}$$

Note that g is a differentiable strictly convex function in $[0, l]$, it follows that g' is a increasing function in $[0, l]$. Since $n_1 \geq n_i \geq 0$, we have $\xi_1 > \xi_2$. Consequently $f(n_1+1, \cdots, n_i-1, \cdots, n_k) > f(n_1, \cdots, n_i, \cdots, n_k)$ holds for any $n_i \geq 1 (1 < i \leq k)$.

From there we can keep adjusting using the inequality above, making f larger, until the adjustment ends when $\{n_i\} = (l, \underbrace{0, 0, \cdots, 0}_{k-1})$, f obtains its maximum value.

A similar discussion can be made for the case where $g(x)$ is a concave function. Here we omit the proof. □

Now, let us now derive the main Theorem:

Theorem 4.3. *Let G be a connected graph with a perfect matching on $2n (n \geq 2)$ vertices, $1 \leq k \leq n-1$ and $\alpha > 0$. If*

$$^0R_\alpha(G) \geq max\Big\{\beta_2(n,k), \zeta_2(n,k)\Big\},$$

where

$$\begin{cases} \beta_2(n,k) = (n+k-1)(2n-1)^\alpha + (n-k+1)(n+k-1)^\alpha; \\ \zeta_2(n,k) = 2k(2n-1)^\alpha + (2k)^\alpha + (2n-2k-1)(2n-2)^\alpha. \end{cases}$$

then G is k-expandable, unless $G \cong K_{n+k-1} \vee (n-k+1)K_1$ or $G \cong K_{2k} \vee (K_1 \cup K_{2n-2k-1})$.

Proof. Suppose G is a non-k-expandable graph, then by Lemma 2.1, 2.2 and 4.1, it follows that:

$$^0R_\alpha(G) \leq {}^0R_\alpha\left(K_{2k+s} \vee \bigcup_{i=1}^{s+2} K_{2t_i+1}\right).$$

Analyzing the vertex degree of $K_{2k+s} \vee \bigcup_{i=1}^{s+2} K_{2t_i+1}$, each vertex degree in the cluster K_{2k+s} is $2n-1$, and each vertex degree in each clique K_{2t_i+1} is $2t_i + 2k + s$, it follows that

$$^0R_\alpha(G) \leq (2k+s)(2n-1)^\alpha + \sum_{i=1}^{s+2} (2t_i+1)(2t_i+2k+s)^\alpha.$$

Set $f(x) = (2x+1)(2x+2k+s)^{\alpha}, x \in [0, n-k-1]$, it is convenient to check that

$$f'(x) = 2(2x+2k+s)^{\alpha-1}\left[(2x+2k+s) + \alpha(2x+1)\right],$$

and

$$f''(x) = 4\alpha(2x+2k+s)^{\alpha-2}\left[2(2x+2k+s) + (\alpha-1)(2x+1)\right]$$

Since $\alpha > 0$ and $k \geq 1$, we have $2(2x+2k+s) + (\alpha-1)(2x+1) > 2(2x+2k+s) - (2x+1) = 2x+4k+2s-1 > 0$, all formulas on the right side of the above equation are greater than 0, it follows that $f''(x) > 0$. Hence, f is strictly convex on $[0, n-k-1]$. Using Lemma 4.2 we know that the maximum value is obtained only if $\{t_i\}$ takes values $(n-k-s-1, \underbrace{0, 0, \cdots, 0}_{s+1})$, which in turn leads

$$\begin{aligned} {}^{0}R_{\alpha}(G) &\leq (2k+s)(2n-1)^{\alpha} + (s+1)f(0) + f(n-k-s-1) \\ &= (2k+s)(2n-1)^{\alpha} + (s+1)(2k+s)^{\alpha} + (2n-2k-2s-1)(2n-s-2)^{\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

Set

$$\varphi_2(x) = (x+2k)(2n-1)^{\alpha} + (x+1)(x+2k)^{\alpha} + (2n-2k-2x-1)(2n-x-2)^{\alpha},$$

The interval of $\varphi_2(x)$ in the above equation is $[0, n-k-1]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_2''(x) &= 2\alpha(x+2k)^{\alpha-1} + 4\alpha(2n-x-2)^{\alpha-1} + \alpha(\alpha-1)(x+2k)^{\alpha-2}(x+1) \\ &\quad + \alpha(\alpha-1)(2n-x-2)^{\alpha-2}(2n-2k-2x-1) \\ &= \alpha(2n-x-2)^{\alpha-2}\Big(\underbrace{4(2n-x-2) + (\alpha-1)(2n-2k-2x-1)}_{g_1(x)}\Big) + \\ &\quad + \alpha(x+2k)^{\alpha-2}\Big(\underbrace{2(x+2k) + (\alpha-1)(x+1)}_{g_2(x)}\Big). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\alpha > 0, n \geq 2, k \geq 1$ and $0 \leq x \leq n-k-1$ we have $g_1(x) > 4(2n-x-2) - (2n-2k-2x-1) = 6n+2k-2x-7 \geq 6n+2k-2(n-k-1)-7 \geq 4n+4k-5 > 0$ and $g_2(x) > 2(x+2k) - (x+1) = x+4k-1 > 0$. This yields that $\varphi_2(x) > 0$. Hence $\varphi_2(x)$ is a convex function in $[0, n-k-1]$. It follows that

$${}^{0}R_{\alpha}(G) \leq max\{\varphi_2(0), \varphi_2(n-k-1)\} = max\Big\{\beta_2(n,k), \zeta_2(n,k)\Big\}.$$

Note that ${}^{0}R_{\alpha}(G) = max\Big\{\beta_2(n,k), \zeta_2(n,k)\Big\}$ if and only if ${}^{0}R_{\alpha}(G) = max\{\varphi_2(0), \varphi_2(n-k-1)\}$. If ${}^{0}R_{\alpha}(G) = \varphi_2(0)$, it follows that $s = 1$ and $\{t_i\} = (n-k-s-1, \underbrace{0, 0, \cdots, 0}_{s+1})$ which yields that

$G \cong K_{n+k-1} \vee (n-k+1)K_1$, this is a contradiction. If ${}^0R_\alpha(G) = \varphi_2(n-k-1)$, it follows that $s = n-k-1$ and $\{t_i\} = (n-k-s-1, \underbrace{0, 0, \cdots, 0}_{s+1})$, which yields that $G \cong K_{2k} \vee (K_1 \cup K_{2n-2k-1})$, this is also a contradiction. Hence, G is k-expandable, as desired. □

A similar proof would show the relevant conclusions if $-1 \leq \alpha < 0$:

Theorem 4.4. *Let G be a connected graph with a perfect matching on $2n (n \geq 2)$ vertices, $1 \leq k \leq n-1$ and $-1 \leq \alpha < 0$. If*

$$ {}^0R_\alpha(G) \leq min\Big\{\beta_2(n,k), \zeta_2(n,k)\Big\},$$

then G is k-expandable, unless $G \cong K_{n+k-1} \vee (n-k+1)K_1$ or $G \cong K_{2k} \vee (K_1 \cup K_{2n-2k-1})$.

5 Sufficiency conditions for k-factor-critical graphs

In this section we introduce sufficiency conditions for k-factor-critical graphs. By definition, it is easy to verify that all $2k$-factor-critical graphs must be k-extendable, but the converse is not necessarily true. However, for the maximal non-$2k$-factor-critical property, we have the following lemma:

Lemma 5.1. *([1]) Let G be a connected graph on p vertices and k a positive integer having the same parity with p. G is maximal non-k-factor-critical if and only if*

$$G \cong K_{k+s} \vee \bigcup_{i=1}^{s+2} K_{2t_i+1}$$

where s and t_i are non-negative integers with $0 \leq s \leq \frac{p-k}{2} - 1$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{s+2} t_i = \frac{p-k}{2} - s - 1$.

In conjunction with Lemma 3.1 along with Lemma 4.1, we have

Lemma 5.2. *([1]) Let G be a connected graph on $2n$ vertices with a perfect matching. For $1 \leq k \leq n-1$, G is maximal non-k-extendable if and only if G is maximal non-$2k$-factor-critical.*

By using Lemma 5.1, Lemma5.2 and a similar analysis as for Theorem 4.3, we can obtain the sufficient condition in terms of the zeroth-order general Randić index to determine whether a graph is k-factor-critical as follows.

Theorem 5.3. *Let G be a connected graph on $p(p \geq 4)$ vertices, $k(1 \leq k \leq p-2)$ is a positive integer having the same parity with p. Let*

$$\begin{cases} \beta_3(p,k) = \left(\frac{p+k}{2} - 1\right)(p-1)^\alpha + \left(\frac{p-k}{2} + 1\right)\left(\frac{p+k}{2} - 1\right)^\alpha; \\ \zeta_3(p,k) = k(p-1)^\alpha + k^\alpha + (p-k-1)(p-2)^\alpha. \end{cases}$$

(1) If $\alpha > 0$ and

$$^0R_\alpha(G) \geq max\{\beta_3(p,k), \zeta_3(p,k)\},$$

or

(2) If $-1 \leq \alpha < 0$ and

$$^0R_\alpha(G) \leq min\{\beta_3(p,k), \zeta_3(p,k)\}.$$

Then G is k-factor-critical, unless $G \cong K_{\frac{p+k}{2}-1} \vee \left(\frac{p-k}{2} + 1\right)K_1$ or $G \cong K_k \vee (K_1 \cup K_{p-k-1})$.

6 Sufficiency conditions for (n,k,d)-graphs

In this section we use a similar method to give sufficient conditions for determining whether a graph is an (n,k,d)-graph. The following significant lemma is from Bai et al. in [2].

Lemma 6.1. *([2]) Let G be a connected graph of order p and and n,k,d be positive integers with $p+n+d \equiv 0 \pmod 2$.Then G is maximal non-(n,k,d)-graph if and only if*

$$G \cong K_{n+2k+s} \vee \bigcup_{i=1}^{s+d+2} K_{2t_i+1}$$

where s and t_i are non-negative integers with $0 \leq s \leq \frac{p-n-2k-d}{2} - 1$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{s+2} t_i = \frac{p-n-2k-d}{2} - s - 1$.

First of all, for the sake of simplicity, we let

$$l^\alpha(s) = (n+2k+s)(p-1)^\alpha + (s+d+1)(n+2k+s)^\alpha + (p-n-2k-d-2s-1)(p-d-s-2)^\alpha$$

for fixed $n,k,d \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ be a function on s.

Theorem 6.2. *Let G be a connected graph of order $p \geq n+2k+d+2$ and and n,k,d,α be positive integers with $p+n+d \equiv 0 \pmod 2$, and satisfy one of the following two conditions: (1)$\alpha \geq 1$; (2)$0 < \alpha < 1$ and $d \leq \frac{2n+4k}{1-\alpha} - 1$. If*

$$^0R_\alpha(G) \geq max\{\beta_4(p,n,k,d), \zeta_4(p,n,k,d)\},$$

where

$$\begin{cases}\beta_4(p,n,k,d) = l^\alpha\left(\frac{p-n-2k-d}{2}-1\right);\\ \zeta_4(p,n,k,d) = l^\alpha(0),\end{cases}$$

then G is a (n,k,d)-graph, unless $G \cong K_{\frac{p+n+2k-d}{2}-1} \vee \left(\frac{p-n-2k+d}{2}+1\right)K_1$ or $G \cong K_{n+2k} \vee ((d+1)K_1 \cup K_{p-n-2k-d-1})$.

Proof. Suppose G is a non-(n,k,d)-graph, by Lemma 2.1, we can know that for all non-(n,k,d)-graphs G such that ${}^0R_\alpha(G)$ obtains a maximum must be a maximal non-(n,k,d)-graph. Which yield that:

$$\begin{aligned}{}^0R_\alpha(G) &\le {}^0R_\alpha(K_{n+2k+s} \vee \bigcup_{i=1}^{s+d+2} K_{2t_i+1})\\ &= (n+2k+s)(p-1)^\alpha + \sum_{i=1}^{s+d+2}(2t_i+1)(2t_i+n+2k+s)^\alpha.\end{aligned}$$

Set $f(x) = (2x+1)(2x+n+2k+s)^\alpha, x \in \left[0, \frac{p-n-2k-d}{2}-s-1\right]$, it is convenient to check that $f''(x) > 0$. Hence, f is strictly convex on $\left[0, \frac{p-n-2k-d}{2}-s-1\right]$. By Lemma 4.2 we have $\{t_i\} = (\frac{1}{2}(p-n-2k-d)-s-1, \underbrace{0,0,\cdots,0}_{s+d+1})$, then it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}{}^0R_\alpha(G) &\le (n+2k+s)(p-1)^\alpha + (s+d+1)f(0) + f\left(\frac{p-n-2k-d}{2}-s-1\right)\\ &= (n+2k+s)(p-1)^\alpha + (s+d+1)(n+2k+s)^\alpha + (p-n-2k-d-2s-1)(p-d-s-2)^\alpha\\ &= l^\alpha(s).\end{aligned}$$

Let $\phi(x) = l^\alpha(x), x \in \left[0, \frac{p-n-2k-d}{2}-1\right]$. Taking the derivative for $\phi(x)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\phi'(x) = {}&(p-1)^\alpha - 2(p-d-x-2)^\alpha + (x+2k+n)^\alpha + \alpha(x+2k+n)^{\alpha-1}(x+d+1)\\ &+ \alpha(p-d-x-2)^{\alpha-1}(2s+d+2k+n-p+1),\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\phi''(x) &= 4\alpha(p-d-x-2)^{\alpha-1} + 2\alpha(x+2k+n)^{\alpha-1} + \alpha(\alpha-1)(x+2k+n)^{\alpha-2}(x+d+1)\\ &\quad + \alpha(\alpha-1)(p-d-x-2)^{\alpha-2}(p-d-2k-n-2x-1)\\ &= \alpha(p-d-x-2)^{\alpha-2}\Big(\underbrace{4(p-d-x-2)+(\alpha-1)(p-d-2k-n-2x-1)}_{g_1(x)}\Big)\\ &\quad + \alpha(x+2k+n)^{\alpha-2}\Big(\underbrace{2(x+2k+n)+(\alpha-1)(x+d+1)}_{g_2(x)}\Big).\end{aligned}$$

Note that $n, k, d \geq 1$, $p \geq n + 2k + d + 2x + 2$. If $\alpha \geq 1$, we can directly verify that $g_1(x) > 0$ and $g_2(x) > 0$. If $0 < \alpha < 1$ and $d \leq \frac{2n+4k}{1-\alpha} - 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} g_1(x) &> 4(p - d - x - 2) - (p - d - 2k - n - 2x - 1) \\ &= 3p + n + 2k - 3d - 2x - 7 \\ &\geq 3(n + 2k + d + 2x + 2) + n + 2k - 3d - 2x - 7 \\ &= 4n + 8k + 4x - 1 \\ &> 0, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$g_2(x) = (\alpha + 1)x + 2(2k + n) - (1 - \alpha)(d + 1) \geq 0.$$

This yields that $\phi''(x) > 0$ when $0 \leq x \leq \frac{p-n-2k-d}{2} - 1$. So $\phi(x)$ is also a convex function in $[0, \frac{p-n-2k-d}{2} - 1]$. Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} {}^0R_\alpha(G) &\leq max\left\{\phi(0), \phi\left(\frac{p - n - 2k - d}{2} - 1\right)\right\} \\ &= max\{\beta_4(p, n, k, d), \zeta_4(p, n, k, d)\} \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, ${}^0R_\alpha(G) = max\{\beta_4(p, n, k, d), \zeta_4(p, n, k, d)\}$ if and only if $G \cong K_{\frac{p+n+2k-d}{2}-1} \vee \left(\frac{p-n-2k+d}{2} + 1\right) K_1$ or $G \cong K_{n+2k} \vee ((d+1)K_1 \cup K_{p-n-2k-d-1})$, which is a contradiction. As desired, G is a (n, k, d)-graph.

This completes the proof of Theorem 6.2. □

A similar proof would show the relevant conclusions if $-1 \leq \alpha < 0$:

Theorem 6.3. *Let G be a connected graph of order $p \geq n + 2k + d + 2$ and and n, k, d, α be positive integers with $p + n + d \equiv 0$ (mod 2) , $-1 \leq \alpha < 0$ and $d \leq \frac{2n+4k}{1-\alpha} - 1$. If*

$${}^0R_\alpha(G) \leq min\{\beta_4(p, n, k, d), \zeta_4(p, n, k, d)\},$$

then G is a (n, k, d)-graph, unless $G \cong K_{\frac{p+n+2k-d}{2}-1} \vee \left(\frac{p-n-2k+d}{2} + 1\right) K_1$ or $G \cong K_{n+2k} \vee ((d + 1)K_1 \cup K_{p-n-2k-d-1})$.

We now use the First Zagreb Index to give a further sufficient condition for the graph G to be an (n, k, d)-graph. Firstly, let

$$p_1 = \frac{1}{3}(8d + 2k + n + 8 + \sqrt{37d^2 + 56dk + 28dn + 44d + 16k^2 + 16kn + 32k + 4n^2 + 16n + 16}).$$

The main result is the following:

Theorem 6.4. *Let G be a connected graph of order p and n,k,d be positive integers with $p+n+d \equiv 0$ (mod 2) and $p \geq n+2k+d+2$.*

(1)For $d+2k+n+2 \leq p < p_1$, if $Z(G) \geq l^2\left(\frac{p-n-2k-d}{2}-1\right)$, then G is a (n,k,d)-graph, unless $G \cong K_{\frac{p+n+2k-d}{2}-1} \vee \left(\frac{p-n-2k+d}{2}+1\right)K_1$;

(2)For $p > p_1$, if $Z \geq l^2(0)$, then G is a (n,k,d)-graph, unless $G \cong K_{n+2k} \vee ((d+1)K_1 \cup K_{p-n-2k-d-1})$.

(3)For $p = p_1$, if $Z \geq l^2(0) = l^2\left(\frac{p_1-n-2k-d}{2}-1\right)$, then G is a (n,k,d)-graph, unless $G \cong K_{n+2k} \vee ((d+1)K_1 \cup K_{p_1-n-2k-d-1})$ or $G \cong K_{\frac{p_1+n+2k-d}{2}-1} \vee \left(\frac{p_1-n-2k+d}{2}+1\right)K_1$.

Proof. Let G be a non-(n,k,d)-graphs. Then by Theorem 6.2, we obtain that:

$$Z(G) = {}^0R_2(G) \leq max\left\{l^2\left(\frac{p-n-2k-d}{2}-1\right), l^2(0)\right\}.$$

Further, we now compare $l^2(0)$ and $l^2\left(\frac{p-n-2k-d}{2}-1\right)$ with p as the variable, if $p = n+2k+d+2$, $l^2\left(\frac{p-n-2k-d}{2}-1\right)$ is also $l^2(0)$ and if $p > n+2k+d+2$, we let $f(p) = \frac{l^2\left(\frac{p-n-2k-d}{2}-1\right)-l^2(0)}{p-n-2k-d-2}$, then

$$f(p) = \frac{1}{8}\Big(-3p^2 + (16d+4k+2n+16)p - 9d^2 + 8dk + 4dn - 28d + 4k^2 + 4kn + n^2 - 16\Big),$$

which is a quadratic equation with an opening in the downward direction with respect to p, and since

$$\lim_{p \to d+2k+n+2} f(p) = d+2k+n+4dk+2dn+\frac{d^2+1}{2} > 0,$$

$f(p)$ has only a single root in $(d+2k+n+2, +\infty)$. Now we let the largest root of $f(p)$ be p_1, then

$$p_1 = \frac{1}{3}(8d+2k+n+8+\sqrt{37d^2+56dk+28dn+44d+16k^2+16kn+32k+4n^2+16n+16}).$$

We can conclude that if $p \in (d+2k+n+2, p_1)$, $f(p) > 0$; if $p \in (p_1, +\infty)$, $f(p) < 0$. Hence, if $d+2k+n+2 \leq p < p_1$ the maximum of ${}^0R_\alpha(G)$ is $l^2\left(\frac{p-n-2k-d}{2}-1\right)$; if $p > p_1$ the maximum of ${}^0R_\alpha(G)$ is $l^2(0)$.

Hence we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} Z(G) &\leq max\left\{l^2(0), l^2\left(\frac{p-n-2k-d}{2}-1\right)\right\} \\ &= \begin{cases} l^2\left(\frac{p-n-2k-d}{2}-1\right), & d+2k+n+2 \leq p < p_1; \\ l^2(0), & p > p_1. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, ${}^0R_\alpha(G) = max\left\{l^2(0), l^2\left(\frac{p-n-2k-d}{2}-1\right)\right\}$ if and only if

$$G \cong \begin{cases} K_{\frac{p+n+2k-d}{2}-1} \vee \left(\frac{p-n-2k+d}{2}+1\right)K_1, & d+2k+n+2 \leq p < p_1; \\ K_{n+2k} \vee \Big((d+1)K_1 \cup K_{p-n-2k-d-1}\Big), & p > p_1. \end{cases}$$

This is a contradiction.

If p_1 is an integer and $p = p_1$, then we have $Z(G) = I^2(0) = I^2\left(\frac{p_1-n-2k-d}{2} - 1\right)$ which yields that $G \cong K_{n+2k} \vee ((d+1)K_1 \cup K_{p_1-n-2k-d-1})$ or $G \cong K_{\frac{p_1+n+2k-d}{2}-1} \vee \left(\frac{p_1-n-2k+d}{2} + 1\right)K_1$. This is also a contradiction.

Hence, G is a (n,k,d)-graph, as desired. This complete the proof of Theorem 6.3. □

7 Sufficient conditions with the edge sum for matching extensions

In the previous sections, we discussed several topological indices from which sufficient conditions for some matching parameters are given. At the end we discuss the case $\alpha = 1$ in ${}^0R_\alpha(G)$, when the index represented by the function is the sum of the degrees of all vertices in the graph, and by the handshake theorem we have $|E(G)| = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{v\in G} d(v)$. Therefore, we can also consider the number of edges of the graph as a special kind of topological index.

Corollary 7.1. *Let G be a connected graph on $p(p \geq 7)$ vertices and $k(1 \leq k \leq p-2)$ a positive integer having the same parity with p, if*

$$|E(G)| \geq p^2 + \left(\frac{k}{2} - 3\right)p + \left(\frac{5k}{2} + 2\right) = e_2(p,k),$$

then G is k-factor-critical, unless $G \cong K_k \vee (K_{p-k-1} \cup K_1)$ or $G \cong K_{p-3} \vee (3K_1)$.

Proof. Let G is a non-k-factor-critical graph. Set $e_2(p,k) = \left|E\Big(K_k \vee (K_1 \cup K_{p-k-1})\Big)\right|$, and $e_2'(p,k) = \left|E\Big(K_{\frac{p+k}{2}-1} \vee (\frac{p-k}{2} + 1)K_1\Big)\right|$. Let $\psi_1(p) = e_2'(p,k) - e_2(p,k)$. A direct calculation yields that

$$\psi_1(p) = -\frac{p^2}{8} + \left(\frac{k}{4} + \frac{3}{4}\right)p - \left(\frac{k^2}{8} + \frac{3k}{4} + 1\right).$$

The roots of $\psi_1(p) = 0$ are $p_1 = k+2$, $p_2 = k+4$. Since $k \leq p-2$ and p, k are positive integers and have the same parity. We consider the following three possibilities:

Case 1. $k = p-2$.

It is not difficult to check that $\psi_1(p) = 0$, hence $e_2(p,k) = e_2'(p,k)$, and the graph corresponding the $e_2(p,k)$ and $e_2'(p,k)$ are all isomorphic to $K_k \vee (K_{p-k-1} \cup K_1) \cong K_{p-2} \vee (2K_1)$.

Case 2. $k = p-4$.

In this case, it is routine to check that $\psi_1(p) = 0$, and the graph corresponding the $e_2(p,k)$ and $e_2'(p,k)$ are $G \cong K_k \vee (K_{p-k-1} \cup K_1)$ and $G \cong K_{\frac{p+k}{2}-1} \vee (\frac{p-k}{2} + 1)K_1 \cong K_{p-3} \vee (3K_1)$.

Case 3. $1 \leq k \leq p-6$.

Note that $\psi_1(p) < 0$ if $p > k-4$, it follows that $e_2(p,k) > e_2'(p,k)$ if $1 \leq k \leq p-6$, and the graph corresponding the $e_2(p,k)$ is $G \cong K_k \vee (K_{p-k-1} \cup K_1)$.

In summary, for $1 \leq k \leq p-2$, we have $e_2(p,k) \geq e_2'(p,k)$ with equality if and only if $k = p-2$ or $k = p-4$. And by Theorem 5.3, we have $|E(G)| \leq max\{e_2(p,k), e_2'(p,k)\} = e_2(p,k)$ with equality if and only if $G \cong K_k \vee (K_{p-k-1} \cup K_1)$ or $G \cong K_{p-3} \vee (3K_1)$. This is a contradiction. Hence G is k-extendable. □

Corollary 7.2. *Let G be a connected graph of order p and n, k, d be positive integers with $p+n+d \equiv 0$ (mod 2) and $p \geq n+2k+d+2$.*

(1)For $d+2k+n+2 \leq p < 5d+2k+n+4$, if

$$|E(G)| \geq \frac{p^2}{2} + \left(-d - \frac{3}{2}\right)p + \left(\frac{3d}{2} + 2k + n + 2dk + dn + \frac{d^2}{2} + 1\right) = e_{31}(n,k,d,p),$$

then G is a (n,k,d)-graph, unless $G \cong K_{\frac{p+n+2k-d}{2}-1} \vee \left(\frac{p-n-2k+d}{2} + 1\right)K_1$.

(2)For $p = 5d+2k+n+4$, if $|E(G)| = e_{31}(n,k,d,p)$ then G is a (n,k,d)-graph, unless $G \cong K_{n+2k} \vee ((d+1)K_1 \cup K_{4d+3})$ or $G \cong K_{n+2k+2d+1} \vee (3d+3)K_1$.

(3)For $p > 5d+2k+n+4$, if

$$|E(G)| \geq \frac{3p^2}{8} + \left(\frac{2k-d+n-3}{4}\right)p + \frac{(2k-d+n)(d-2k-n+2)}{8} = e_{32}(n,k,d,p),$$

then G is a (n,k,d)-graph, unless $G \cong K_{n+2k} \vee ((d+1)K_1 \cup K_{p-n-2k-d-1})$.

Proof. Let G be a p-vertex non-(n,k,d) graph. Then by Theorem 6.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |E(G)| &= \frac{1}{2}\sum_{v \in G} d(v) \\ &\leq max\left\{\frac{1}{2}l^1\left(\frac{p-n-2k-d}{2} - 1\right), \frac{1}{2}l^1(0)\right\} \\ &= max\left\{e_{31}(n,k,d,p), e_{32}(n,k,d,p)\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\psi_2(p) = e_{31}(n,k,d,p) - e_{32}(n,k,d,p)$. A direct calculation yields that

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_2(p) = -\frac{p^2}{8} + \left(\frac{3d}{4} + \frac{k}{2} + \frac{n}{4} + \frac{3}{4}\right)p - \\ \left(\frac{5d^2}{8} + \frac{3dk}{2} + \frac{3dn}{4} + \frac{7d}{4} + \frac{k^2}{2} + \frac{kn}{2} + \frac{3k}{2} + \frac{n^2}{8} + \frac{3n}{4} + 1\right). \end{aligned}$$

The roots of $\psi_2(p) = 0$ are $p_1 = d + 2k + n + 2$, $p_2 = 5d + 2k + n + 4 > p_1$.

To continue the proof, we need consider the following three cases:

Case 1. $p_1 \leq p < p_2$.

In this case, we have $\psi_2(p) \geq 0$. It follows that

$$|E(G)| \leq e_{31}(n,k,d,p) = \frac{p^2}{2} + \left(-d - \frac{3}{2}\right)p + \left(\frac{3d}{2} + 2k + n + 2dk + dn + \frac{d^2}{2} + 1\right),$$

which equality if and only if $G \cong K_{\frac{p+n+2k-d}{2}-1} \vee \left(\frac{p-n-2k+d}{2} + 1\right)K_1$. This is a contradiction. Hence G is a (n,k,d)-graph.

Case 2. $p > p_2$.

In this case, we have $\psi_2(p) \leq 0$. It follows that

$$|E(G)| \leq e_{32}(n,k,d,p) = \frac{3p^2}{8} + \left(\frac{2k - d + n - 3}{4}\right)p + \frac{(2k - d + n)(d - 2k - n + 2)}{8},$$

which equality if and only if $G \cong K_{n+2k} \vee ((d+1)K_1 \cup K_{p-n-2k-d-1})$. This is a contradiction. Hence G is a (n,k,d)-graph.

Case 3. $p = p_1$ or $p = p_2$.

In this case, $e_{31}(n,k,d,p) = e_{32}(n,k,d,p)$, are both the maximum. And it could be verified that if $p = p_1$, $K_{\frac{p+n+2k-d}{2}-1} \vee \left(\frac{p-n-2k+d}{2} + 1\right)K_1 \cong K_{n+2k} \vee (d+2)K_1 \cong K_{n+2k} \vee ((d+1)K_1 \cup K_{p-n-2k-d-1})$.

Hence, if $p = p_1$, then $|E(G)| \leq e_{31}(n,k,d,p)$ which equality if and only if $G \cong K_{\frac{p+n+2k-d}{2}-1} \vee \left(\frac{p-n-2k+d}{2} + 1\right)K_1$, which is a contradiction.

If $p = p_2$, then $|E(G)| \leq e_{31}(n,k,d,p) = e_{32}(n,k,d,p)$ which equality if and only if $G \cong K_{\frac{p+n+2k-d}{2}-1} \vee \left(\frac{p-n-2k+d}{2} + 1\right)K_1 \cong K_{n+2k+2d+1} \vee (3d+3)K_1$ or $G \cong K_{n+2k} \vee ((d+1)K_1 \cup K_{p-n-2k-d-1}) \cong K_{n+2k} \vee ((d+1)K_1 \cup K_{4d+3})$, which is also a contradiction. Hence G is a (n,k,d)-graph. □

Combining Lemma 5.2 and Corollary 7.1, we can introduce a sufficient condition for a graph to be a k-expandable graph:

Corollary 7.3. *Let G be a connected graph with a perfect matching on $2n (n \geq 4)$ vertices and $1 \leq k \leq n-1$, if*

$$|E(G)| \geq 4n^2 - 2(k+3)n + 5k + 2 = e_4(n,k),$$

then G is k-expandable, unless $G \cong K_{2k} \vee (K_{2n-2k-1} \cup K_1)$ or $G \cong K_{2n-3} \vee (3K_1)$.

8 Sufficiency conditions for the graph containing a perfect matching

In Section 2, we gave a sufficient condition for a connected balanced bipartite graph to contain a perfect matching. In this section, we explore this problem for general connected graphs. We call G is maximal non-PM-graph if G does not contains a perfect matching, but $G+e$ contains a perfect matching for every $e \in E(\overline{G})$.

Lemma 8.1. *([11], also in [4]) Let G be a connected graph of order $2n$ and $U = \{v|d(v) = 2n-1, v \in V(G)\}$. Then G is maximal non-PM-graph if and only if*

(1) $1 \leq |U| \leq n-1$;

(2)each component of $G-U$ are all odd cliques;

(3)the number of odd component $O(G-U) = |U|+2$.

From Lemma 8.1, we could immediately deduce a equivalent proposition:

Lemma 8.2. *Let G be a connected graph of order $2n(n \geq 2)$. Then G is maximal non-PM-graph if and only if .*

$$G \cong K_s \vee \bigcup_{i=1}^{s+2} K_{2t_i+1},$$

where s and t_i are non-negative integers with $1 \leq s \leq n-1$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{s+2} t_i = n-s-1$.

Theorem 8.3. *Let G be a connected graph of order $2n$ and $\alpha > 0$, if*

$$^0R_\alpha(G) \geq max\{\beta_5(n), \zeta_5(n)\},$$

where

$$\begin{cases} \beta_5(n) = (2n-1)^\alpha + (2n-3)(2n-4)^\alpha + 2; \\ \zeta_5(n) = (n-1)(2n-1)^\alpha + (n+1)(n-1)^\alpha. \end{cases}$$

then G contains a perfect matching, unless $G \cong K_{n-1} \vee (n+1)K_1$ or $G \cong K_1 \vee (2K_1 \cup K_{2n-3})$.

Proof. Suppose G is a non-PM-graph, then by Lemma 2.1, 2.2 and 8.2, it follows that:

$$\begin{aligned} ^0R_\alpha(G) &\leq {}^0R_\alpha\left(K_s \vee \bigcup_{i=1}^{s+2} K_{2t_i+1}\right) \\ &= s(2n-1)^\alpha + \sum_{i=1}^{s+2} (2t_i+1)(2t_i+s)^\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

Set $f(x) = (2x+1)(2x+s)^\alpha, x \in [0, n-1]$, it is convenient to check that $f''(x) = 4\alpha(2x+s)^{\alpha-1}[2(2x+s) + (\alpha-1)(2x+1)] > 0$. Hence, f is strictly convex on $[0, n-1]$. Using Lemma 4.2 we know

that the maximum value is obtained only if $\{t_i\}$ takes values $(n-s-1, \underbrace{0, 0, \cdots, 0}_{s+1})$, which in turn leads

$$^0R_\alpha(G) \leq s(2n-1)^\alpha + (s+1)s^\alpha + (2n-2s-1)(2n-s-2)^\alpha.$$

Set

$$\varphi_3(x) = x(2n-1)^\alpha + (x+1)x^\alpha + (2n-2x-1)(2n-x-2)^\alpha,$$

The interval of $\varphi_3(x)$ in the above equation is $[1, n-1]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi_3''(x) &= 2\alpha x^{\alpha-1} + 4\alpha(2n-x-2)^{\alpha-1} + \alpha(\alpha-1)x^{\alpha-2}(x+1) \\
&\quad + \alpha(\alpha-1)(2n-x-2)^{\alpha-2}(2n-2x-1) \\
&= \alpha(2n-x-2)^{\alpha-2}\Big(\underbrace{4(2n-x-2) + (\alpha-1)(2n-2x-1)}_{g_1(x)}\Big) + \\
&\quad + \alpha x^{\alpha-2}\Big(\underbrace{2x + (\alpha-1)(x+1)}_{g_2(x)}\Big).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\alpha > 0$, $n \geq 2$ and $1 \leq x \leq n-1$ we have $g_1(x) > 4(2n-x-2) - (2n-2x-1) = 6n-2x-7 \geq 6n-2(n-1)-7 = 4n-5 > 0$ and $g_2(x) > 2x-(x+1) = x-1 \geq 0$. This yields that $\varphi_2(x) > 0$. Hence $\varphi_3(x)$ is a convex function in $[1, n-1]$. It follows that

$$^0R_\alpha(G) \leq max\{\varphi_3(1), \varphi_3(n-1)\} = max\Big\{\beta_5(n), \zeta_5(n)\Big\}.$$

Note that $^0R_\alpha(G) = max\Big\{\beta_5(n), \zeta_5(n)\Big\}$ if and only if $^0R_\alpha(G) = max\{\varphi_3(1), \varphi_3(n-1)\}$, which yields that $G \cong K_{n-1} \vee (n+1)K_1$ or $G \cong K_1 \vee (2K_1 \cup K_{2n-3})$. This is a contradiction. Hence, G contains a perfect matching. □

Let $\alpha = 1$, the results follows:

Corollary 8.4. *([11, 12]) Let G be a connected graph of order $2n (n \geq 2)$, if*

$$|E(G)| > \begin{cases} (2n-3)(n-2)+2, & n = 2 \text{ or } n \geq 5; \\ 3n(n-1) & n = 3, 4. \end{cases}$$

then G contains a perfect matching.

Acknowledgments The authors thank my supervisor for his careful reading and valuable suggestions.

References

[1] N. Ananchuen, L. Caccetta , W. Ananchuen , A characterization of maximal non-k-factor-critical graphs, *Discrete Math.* **307(1)** ,(2007),108-114.

[2] B. Bai, H. Lu, Q. Yu, Generalization of matching extensions in graphs (III), *Discrete Appl. Math.* **159(8)**,(2011) ,727-732 .

[3] G. Liu, Q. Yu, Generalization of matching extensions in graphs, *Discrete Math.* **231(1-3)**, (2001),311-320.

[4] J. A. Bondy, U. S. R. Murty, Graph Theory, GTM 244, Springer, (2008).

[5] L.Lovasz ,M.D.Plummer, Matching Theory, *North-Holland mathematics studies*, Vol.121, Amsterdam ect.:North-Holland,(1986).

[6] Q. Yu, G. Liu, Graph Factors and Matching Extensions, Springer, (2010).

[7] X. Li , H. Zhao , Trees with the first three smallest and largest generalized topological indices, *MATCH Commun. Math. Comput. Chem.* **50**, (2004), 57-62.

[8] Zhang. Y , E. R. van Dam, Matching extension and distance spectral radius, *Liner Algebra Appl.* **674**, (2023), 244-255.

[9] D. Dan, H. Lin, Spectral conditions for k-extendability and k-factors of bipartite graphs, *preprint*, arXiv:2211.09304, 2022.

[10] W. Liu, M. Liu, L. Feng, Spectral conditions for graphs to be β-deficient involving minimum degree, *Linear Multilinear A* **66(4)**, (2018), 792–802.

[11] G. Lin, Maximal Simple Graph without Perfect Matching, *Journal of Lanzhou University* **4**, (1980), 6-16.

[12] O. Suil, Spectral radius and matchings in graphs, *Liner Algebra Appl.* **614**, (2021), 316–324.

[13] Y. Lin, W. Liu, L. Feng A survey on spectral conditions for some extremal graph problems, *preprint*, arXiv:2111.03309v2, 2022.

[14] X. Li, J. Zheng, A unified approach to the extremal trees for different indices, *MATCH Commun. Math. Comput. Chem.* **54 (1)**, (2005), 195-208

[15] S. Miao, S. Li, W. Wei, Matching extension and matching exclusion via the size or the spectral radius of graphs, *Discrete Appl. Math.* **347**, (2024) ,214-230 .

[16] Z. Lin, S. Li, X. Luo, G. Wang Some sufficient conditions for a graph with minimum degree to be k-factor-critical, *Discrete Appl. Math.* **348**, (2024) ,279-291 .