

# Fractional factors and component factors in graphs with isolated toughness smaller than 1

Isaak H. Wolf \*

Department of Mathematics, Paderborn University, Warburger Str. 100, 33098 Paderborn, Germany.

isaak.wolf@uni-paderborn.de

## Abstract

Let  $G$  be a simple graph and let  $n, m$  be two integers with  $0 < m < n$ . We prove that  $iso(G - S) \leq \frac{n}{m}|S|$  for every  $S \subset V(G)$  if and only if  $G$  has a  $\{C_{2i+1}, T: 1 \leq i < \frac{m}{n-m}, T \in \mathcal{T}_{\frac{n}{m}}\}$ -factor, where  $iso(G - S)$  denotes the number of isolated vertices of  $G - S$  and  $\mathcal{T}_{\frac{n}{m}}$  is a special family of trees. Furthermore, we characterize the trees in  $\mathcal{T}_{\frac{n}{m}}$  in terms of their bipartition.

**Keywords:** component factors, factors, fractional factors, isolated toughness.

## 1 Introduction, notation and main result

We consider finite graphs that may have parallel edges but no loops. A graph without parallel edges is called *simple*. For a graph  $G$ , the vertex-set is denoted by  $V(G)$  and the edge-set by  $E(G)$ . Let  $X, Y \subseteq V(G)$  be two disjoint sets. The set of edges with one endvertex in  $X$  and one in  $Y$  is denoted by  $E_G(X, Y)$ . Let  $v \in V(G)$ . We write  $\partial_G(v)$  for  $E_G(\{v\}, V(G) \setminus \{v\})$ , and  $d_G(v)$  for  $|\partial_G(v)|$ . The indices will be omitted, if there is no harm of confusion. The graph induced by  $V(G) \setminus X$  is denoted by  $G - X$ . For  $E \subseteq E(G)$ , the graph obtained from  $G$  by deleting every edge in  $E$  is denoted by  $G - E$ ; for convenience we write  $G - e$  for  $G - E$  if  $E$  consists of a single edge  $e$ . Furthermore, we say that  $E$  induces a subgraph  $H$  of  $G$  if  $E(H) = E$  and  $V(H)$  contains all vertices of  $G$  that are incident with an edge of  $E$ .

The path with  $i$  vertices is denoted by  $P_i$ . The complete bipartite graph with partition sizes  $i, j$  (where  $i \leq j$ ) is denoted by  $K_{i,j}$ ; if  $i = 1$ , then  $K_{i,j}$  is a *star*. A *circuit* is a 2-regular connected graph;  $C_i$  denotes the circuit with  $i$  vertices. A connected graph without circuits is a *tree*. For a tree  $T$ , every vertex of degree 1 is a *leaf* of  $T$ ; the set of leaves of  $T$  is denoted by  $Leaf(T)$ . Moreover, every edge incident with a leaf is a *pendant edge* of  $T$ .

---

\*Funded by Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) - 445863039

If a subgraph of  $G$  is spanning, then it is a *factor* of  $G$ . Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a set of graphs. A factor  $F$  of  $G$  is a  $\mathcal{G}$ -factor, if every component of  $F$  is isomorphic to an element of  $\mathcal{G}$ . Let  $g_1, f_1 : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  and  $g_2, f_2 : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be functions with  $g_i(w) \leq f_i(w)$  for every  $w \in V(G)$  and every  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ . A factor  $F$  of  $G$  is a  $(g_1, f_1)$ -factor, if  $g_1(w) \leq d_F(w) \leq f_1(w)$  for every  $w \in V(G)$ . For a function  $h : E(G) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ , we define  $d^h(v) := \sum_{e \in \partial_G(v)} h(e)$ . If  $g_2(w) \leq d^h(w) \leq f_2(w)$  for every  $w \in V(G)$ , then  $h$  is a *fractional*  $(g_2, f_2)$ -factor of  $G$ . Additionally, if  $g_2(w) = a$  and  $f_2(w) = b$  for every  $w \in V(G)$ , then a fractional  $(g_2, f_2)$ -factor is called a *fractional*  $[a, b]$ -factor. The set of isolated vertices of  $G$  is denoted by  $Iso(G)$ ; we write  $iso(G)$  for  $|Iso(G)|$ .

The isolated toughness of a graph  $G$ , denoted by  $I(G)$ , was first introduced in [9] and is defined as follows:

$$I(G) = \min \left\{ \frac{|S|}{iso(G-S)} : S \subseteq V(G), iso(G-S) \geq 2 \right\}$$

if  $G$  is not a complete graph and  $I(G) = \infty$  otherwise. For  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , a graph  $G$  is *isolated  $t$ -tough* if  $I(G) \geq t$ . The isolated toughness is strongly related to the existence of fractional factors and specific component factors. Tutte [8] characterized isolated 1-tough graphs by the existence of component factors as follows.

**Theorem 1.1** (Tutte [8]). *Let  $G$  be a simple graph. Then,  $G$  has a  $\{K_{1,1}, C_i : i \geq 3\}$ -factor if and only if*

$$iso(G-S) \leq |S| \quad \text{for all } S \subset V(G).$$

This result was extended by Amahashi, Kano [2] and Las Vergnas [6] to isolated  $\frac{1}{n}$ -tough graphs.

**Theorem 1.2** (Amahashi, Kano [2], Las Vergnas [6]). *Let  $G$  be a simple graph and let  $n \geq 2$  be an integer. Then,  $G$  has a  $\{K_{1,i} : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ -factor if and only if*

$$iso(G-S) \leq n|S| \quad \text{for all } S \subset V(G).$$

Kano, Lu and Yu [5] asked for a general relation between isolated toughness and the existence of component factors.

**Problem 1.3** (Problem 1 in [5], Problem 7.10 in [1]). *Let  $G$  be a simple graph and let  $n, m$  be two positive integers. If*

$$iso(G-S) \leq \frac{n}{m}|S| \quad \text{for all } \emptyset \neq S \subset V(G),$$

*what factor does  $G$  have?*

The same authors [10] gave an answer to Problem 1.3 when  $n$  is odd,  $n \geq 3$  and  $m = 2$ . Let  $\mathcal{T}(3)$  be the set of trees that can be obtained as follows (see [10] for a more detailed definition):

1. start with a tree  $T$  in which every vertex has degree 1 or 3,
2. insert a new vertex of degree 2 into every edge of  $T$ ,
3. add a new pendant edge to every leaf of  $T$ .

For every integer  $k \geq 2$ , let  $\mathcal{T}(2k+1)$  be the set of trees that can be obtained as follows (see [10] for a more detailed definition):

1. start with a tree  $T$  such that for every  $v \in V(T)$ 
  - $d_{T-Leaf(T)}(v) \in \{1, 3, \dots, 2k+1\}$ , and
  - $2|\{w: w \in Leaf(T) \cap N_T(v)\}| + d_{T-Leaf(T)}(v) \leq 2k+1$ ,
2. insert a new vertex of degree 2 into every edge of  $T - Leaf(T)$ ,
3. for every  $v \in T - Leaf(T)$  with  $d_{T-Leaf(T)}(v) = 2l+1 < 2k+1$ , add  $k-l - |\{w: w \in Leaf(T) \cap N_T(v)\}|$  new pendant edges to  $v$ .

**Theorem 1.4** (Kano, Lu, Yu [10]). *A simple graph  $G$  has a  $\{P_2, C_3, P_5, T: T \in \mathcal{T}(3)\}$ -factor if and only if*

$$iso(G - S) \leq \frac{3}{2}|S| \quad \text{for all } S \subset V(G).$$

**Theorem 1.5** (Kano, Lu, Yu [10]). *Let  $k \geq 2$  be an integer. A simple graph  $G$  has a  $\{K_{1,i}, T: 1 \leq i \leq k, T \in \mathcal{T}(2k+1)\}$ -factor if and only if*

$$iso(G - S) \leq \frac{2k+1}{2}|S| \quad \text{for all } S \subset V(G).$$

We extend these results and give an answer to Problem 1.3 when  $n > m$ . For every two integers  $n, m$  with  $0 < m < n$  let  $\mathcal{T}_{\frac{n}{m}}$  be the set of trees  $T$  such that

- $iso(T - S) \leq \frac{n}{m}|S|$  for all  $S \subset V(T)$ , and
- for every  $e \in E(T)$  there is a set  $S^* \subset V(T)$  with  $iso((T - e) - S^*) > \frac{n}{m}|S^*|$ .

The following theorem is the main result of this paper.

**Theorem 1.6.** *Let  $G$  be a simple graph and let  $n, m$  be integers with  $0 < m < n$ . Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- 1)  $iso(G - S) \leq \frac{n}{m}|S|$  for every  $S \subset V(G)$ .
- 2)  $G$  has a fractional  $[1, \frac{n}{m}]$ -factor.
- 3)  $G$  has a fractional  $[1, \frac{n}{m}]$ -factor with values in  $\{0, \frac{1}{m}, \dots, \frac{m-1}{m}, 1\}$ .

4)  $G$  has a  $\{C_{2i+1}, T: 1 \leq i < \frac{m}{n-m}, T \in \mathcal{T}_{\frac{n}{m}}\}$ -factor.

The paper is structured as follows. In Section 2 we give a relation between the isolated toughness and the existence of fractional factors, which proves the equivalence of 1), 2) and 3). In Section 3 we prove the equivalence of 1) and 4) by using fractional factors. In Section 4 we characterize the trees in  $\mathcal{T}_{\frac{n}{m}}$  and deduce further structural properties.

## 2 Isolated vertex conditions and fractional factors

There is a strong relation between the isolated toughness of a graph and the existence of fractional  $[1, \frac{n}{m}]$ -factors. When  $\frac{n}{m}$  is an integer, Ma, Wang and Li [7] obtained the following relation.

**Theorem 2.1** (Ma, Wang, Li [7]). *Let  $G$  be a simple graph and  $b > 1$  be an integer. Then*

$$iso(G - S) \leq b|S| \quad \text{for all } S \subset V(G)$$

*if and only if  $G$  has a fractional  $[1, b]$ -factor.*

As shown by Yu, Kano and Lu [10], similar results are true for isolated  $\frac{2}{n}$ -tough graphs, where  $n$  is an odd integer with  $n \geq 3$ .

**Theorem 2.2** (Kano, Lu, Yu [10]). *Let  $G$  be a simple graph and  $k \geq 1$  be an integer. Then*

$$iso(G - S) \leq \frac{2k+1}{2}|S| \quad \text{for all } S \subset V(G)$$

*if and only if  $G$  has a fractional  $[1, \frac{2k+1}{2}]$ -factor with values in  $\{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1\}$ .*

It turned out that their proof also works for isolated  $\frac{m}{n}$ -tough graphs, where  $n, m$  are arbitrary integers with  $0 < m < n$ . By substituting  $2k+1$  with  $n$  and  $2$  with  $m$  in the proof of Theorem 2.2 given in [10], this result can be extended as follows.

**Theorem 2.3.** *Let  $G$  be a simple graph and let  $n, m$  be integers with  $0 < m < n$ . Then*

$$iso(G - S) \leq \frac{n}{m}|S| \quad \text{for all } S \subset V(G) \tag{1}$$

*if and only if  $G$  has a fractional  $[1, \frac{n}{m}]$ -factor with values in  $\{0, \frac{1}{m}, \dots, \frac{m-1}{m}, 1\}$ .*

For the sake of completeness, in the remainder of this section, we state the proof of [10] (with the substitutions mentioned above) and deduce the equivalence of statements 1), 2) and 3) of Theorem 1.6.

The main tool to prove Theorem 2.2 (respectively, Theorem 2.3) is provided by the next theorem. For a function  $f : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^+ \cup \{0\}$  and a set  $X \subseteq V(G)$ , set  $f(X) := \sum_{x \in X} f(x)$ .

**Theorem 2.4** (Anstee [3], Heinrich et al. [4]). *Let  $G$  be a graph and  $g, f : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^+ \cup \{0\}$  with  $0 \leq g(x) < f(x)$  for all  $x \in V(G)$ . Then  $G$  has a  $(g, f)$ -factor if and only if*

$$g(T) - d_{G-S}(T) \leq f(S) \text{ for all } S \subset V(G),$$

where  $T = \{v \in V(G) \setminus S : d_{G-S}(v) < g(v)\}$ .

*Proof of Theorem 2.3 (cf. Kano, Lu, Yu [10]).* Assume that  $G$  satisfies (1). Let  $G^*$  denote the graph obtained from  $G$  by replacing each edge  $e$  of  $G$  by  $m$  parallel edges  $e(1), \dots, e(m)$ . Then  $V(G^*) = V(G)$ , and  $d_{G^*}(v) = m \cdot d_G(v)$  for every  $v \in V(G^*)$ . Define two functions  $g, f : V(G^*) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^+ \cup \{0\}$  as

$$g(x) = m \quad \text{and} \quad f(x) = n \quad \text{for all } x \in V(G^*).$$

Then  $g < f$ , and for any  $S \subset V(G^*)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} T &= \{v \in V(G^*) \setminus S : d_{G^*-S}(v) < g(v) = m\} \\ &= \{v \in V(G^*) \setminus S : d_{G^*-S}(v) = 0\} \\ &= \text{Iso}(G - S). \end{aligned}$$

Thus it follows from the above equality and (1) that

$$\begin{aligned} g(T) - d_{G^*-S}(T) &= m \cdot \text{iso}(G - S) - 0 \\ &\leq n|S| = f(S). \end{aligned}$$

Hence by Theorem 2.4,  $G^*$  has a  $(g, f)$ -factor  $F$ . Now we construct a fractional  $[1, \frac{n}{m}]$ -factor  $h : E(G) \rightarrow \{0, \frac{1}{m}, \dots, \frac{m-1}{m}, 1\}$  as follows: for every edge  $e$  of  $G$ , define  $h(e) = \frac{k(e)}{m}$  where  $k(e)$  is the number of integers  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  with  $e(i) \in E(F)$ . It is easy to see that  $h$  is the desired fractional  $[1, \frac{n}{m}]$ -factor with values in  $\{0, \frac{1}{m}, \dots, \frac{m-1}{m}, 1\}$ .

Next assume that  $G$  has a fractional  $[1, \frac{n}{m}]$ -factor  $h$ . Let  $S \subset V(G)$ , and let  $F$  be the spanning subgraph of  $G$  induced by  $\{e \in E(G) : h(e) \neq 0\}$ . Clearly, the neighbours of each isolated vertex  $u$  of  $G - S$  are contained in  $S$  and  $d^h(u) \geq 1$ , thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{iso}(G - S) &\leq \sum_{e \in E_F(\text{Iso}(G-S), S)} h(e) \\ &\leq \sum_{x \in S} d^h(x) \leq \frac{n}{m}|S|. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $\text{iso}(G - S) \leq \frac{n}{m}|S|$ , i.e. (1) holds. □

The fact,  $h$  has values in  $\{0, \frac{1}{m}, \dots, \frac{m-1}{m}, 1\}$ , is not needed in the second part of the proof of Theorem 2.3. As a consequence, we obtain the following corollary:

**Corollary 2.5.** *Let  $G$  be a simple graph and let  $n, m$  be integers with  $0 < m < n$ . If  $G$  has a fractional  $[1, \frac{n}{m}]$ -factor, then  $G$  has a fractional  $[1, \frac{n}{m}]$ -factor with values in  $\{0, \frac{1}{m}, \dots, \frac{m-1}{m}, 1\}$ .*

Therefore, the equivalence of statements 1), 2) and 3) of Theorem 1.6 is proved.

### 3 Isolated vertex conditions and component factors

In this section we use Theorem 2.3 to prove the following equivalence, which completes the proof of Theorem 1.6:

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $G$  be a simple graph and let  $n, m$  be integers with  $0 < m < n$ . Then*

$$iso(G - S) \leq \frac{n}{m}|S| \quad \text{for all } S \subset V(G)$$

*if and only if  $G$  has a  $\{C_{2i+1}, T: 1 \leq i < \frac{m}{n-m}, T \in \mathcal{T}_{\frac{n}{m}}\}$ -factor.*

Observe that  $\frac{m}{n-m} \leq 1$  if and only if  $\frac{n}{m} \geq 2$ , and hence,  $\{C_{2i+1}, T: 1 \leq i < \frac{m}{n-m}, T \in \mathcal{T}_{\frac{n}{m}}\} = \mathcal{T}_{\frac{n}{m}}$  in this case.

For two positive integers  $n, m$ , we say a graph  $G$  satisfies the  $\frac{n}{m}$ -isolated-vertex-condition, if  $iso(G - S) \leq \frac{n}{m}|S|$  for all  $S \subset V(G)$ . To prove Theorem 3.1 we need the following observation.

**Observation 3.2.** *A simple graph  $G$  satisfies the  $\frac{n}{m}$ -isolated-vertex-condition, if and only if every component of  $G$  satisfies the  $\frac{n}{m}$ -isolated-vertex-condition.*

*Proof.* If  $G$  satisfies the  $\frac{n}{m}$ -isolated-vertex-condition and  $C$  is a component of  $G$ , then for every  $S \subset V(C)$  we have

$$iso(C - S) \leq iso(G - S) \leq \frac{n}{m}|S|$$

On the other hand, if  $G$  is a graph with components  $H_1, \dots, H_l$  and every component satisfies the  $\frac{n}{m}$ -isolated-vertex-condition, then for each  $S \subset V(G)$  we have

$$iso(G - S) = \sum_{i=1}^l iso(H_i - (S \cap V(H_i))) \leq \sum_{i=1}^l \frac{n}{m}|S \cap V(H_i)| = \frac{n}{m}|S|.$$

□

For a fractional  $[1, b]$ -factor  $h$  of a graph  $G$  and  $v \in V(G)$ , we call  $v$  a (+)-vertex if  $d^h(v) > 1$  and a (-)-vertex if  $d^h(v) = 1$ .

*Proof of Theorem 3.1.* First, assume that  $G$  has a  $\{C_{2i+1}, T: 1 \leq i < \frac{m}{n-m}, T \in \mathcal{T}_{\frac{n}{m}}\}$ -factor  $F$ . Let  $H_1, \dots, H_l$  be the components of  $F$ . Clearly, every component of  $F$  satisfies the  $\frac{n}{m}$ -isolated-vertex-condition and thus,  $F$  also does. For every  $S \subset V(G)$  each isolated vertex of  $G - S$  is also an isolated vertex of  $F - S$ , and thus  $iso(G - S) \leq iso(F - S) \leq \frac{n}{m}|S|$ .

Next, assume  $G$  satisfies  $iso(G - S) \leq \frac{n}{m}|S|$  for all  $S \subset V(G)$ . Let  $F$  be an inclusion-wise minimal factor of  $G$ , that also satisfies the  $\frac{n}{m}$ -isolated-vertex-condition. By Theorem 2.3,  $F$  has a fractional  $[1, \frac{n}{m}]$ -factor, whereas every spanning proper subgraph of  $F$  does not admit such a fractional factor. In particular, for every  $e \in E(F)$ , the graph  $F - e$  does not have a fractional  $[1, \frac{n}{m}]$ -factor. In conclusion, the following claim holds:

**Claim 1.**  $h(e) \neq 0$  for every  $e \in E(F)$  and every fractional  $[1, \frac{n}{m}]$ -factor  $h$  of  $F$ .

We now prove that  $F$  is the desired factor.

A closed trail of length  $k$  (of  $F$ ) is a sequence  $(v_0, e_0, v_1, e_1, \dots, e_{l-1}, v_l)$  of alternately vertices and edges of  $F$  with  $e_i = v_i v_{i+1}$  for all  $i < l$  and  $v_0 = v_l$ .


**Claim 2.**  $F$  does not contain a closed trail of an even length.

*Proof of Claim 2.* Suppose  $F$  contains a closed trail  $X$  of an even length. Let  $e$  be an arbitrary edge of  $X$ . Now fix a fractional  $[1, \frac{n}{m}]$ -factor  $h$  of  $F$  with values in  $\{0, \frac{1}{m}, \dots, \frac{m-1}{m}, 1\}$ , such that

(i)  $h(e)$  is as small as possible,

(ii) with respect to (i),  $\sum_{e' \in E(F)} h(e')$  is as small as possible.

Now suppose, there is an edge  $e' \in E(F)$  between two (+)-vertices. By Claim 1, the edge  $e'$  did not receive the value 0. Thus, reducing  $h(e')$  by  $\frac{1}{m}$  leads to a new fractional  $[1, \frac{n}{m}]$ -factor with a smaller sum, which contradicts the choice of  $h$ . Therefore, the set of (+)-vertices (with respect to  $h$ ) is stable in  $F$ . This implies, that an edge of  $F$  received the value 1 if and only if it is incident with a vertex of degree 1 in  $F$ . As a consequence,  $h(e') < 1$  for every edge  $e'$  of  $X$ . Now we modify the fractional factor  $h$  as follows: add  $\frac{1}{m}$  and  $-\frac{1}{m}$  alternately to the edges of  $X$  such that  $-\frac{1}{m}$  is added to  $e$  (see Figure 1).



**Figure 1:** The modifying of  $h$  if  $F$  contains a closed trail of an even length.

Since no edge of  $X$  had the value 0 or 1, this led to a new fractional  $[1, \frac{n}{m}]$ -factor  $h'$  of  $F$  with values in  $\{0, \frac{1}{m}, \dots, \frac{m-1}{m}, 1\}$ . This contradicts the choice of  $h$ , since  $h'(e) = h(e) - \frac{1}{m}$ . ■

As a consequence the following claims hold:

**Claim 3.**  $F$  does not contain an even circuit.

**Claim 4.**  $F$  does not contain two circuits that share an edge.

*Proof of Claim 4.* Suppose Claim 4 is false. Then  $F$  contains two circuits  $C, C'$  such that their common edges induce a path  $P$  in  $F$ . By Claim 3, the circuits  $C, C'$  are odd and thus the graph induced by  $E(C) \cup E(C') - E(P)$  is an even circuit. This contradicts Claim 3. ■

**Claim 5.**  $F$  does not contain two circuits that share a vertex.


*Proof of Claim 5.* Suppose  $F$  contains two circuits  $C, C'$  that share a vertex. By Claim 3,  $C, C'$  are odd circuits; by Claim 4,  $E(C) \cap E(C') = \emptyset$ . Hence, the edgeset  $E(C) \cup E(C')$  provides a closed trail of an even length, which contradicts Claim 2. ■

**Claim 6.**  $F$  does not contain two disjoint circuits that are connected by a path.

*Proof of Claim 6.* Suppose  $F$  contains two disjoint circuits  $C, C'$  that are connected by a path  $P$ . Let  $e$  be an arbitrary edge of  $P$ . Now fix a fractional  $[1, \frac{n}{m}]$ -factor  $h$  of  $F$  with values in  $\{0, \frac{1}{m}, \dots, \frac{m-1}{m}, 1\}$ , such that

- (i)  $h(e)$  is as small as possible,
- (ii) with respect to (i),  $\sum_{e' \in E(F)} h(e')$  is as small as possible.

Again, no two (+)-vertices are adjacent in  $F$ . This implies,  $h(e') < 1$  for all  $e' \in E(C) \cup E(C') \cup E(P)$ . Since  $C$  and  $C'$  are odd by Claim 3, both circuits contain adjacent (-)-vertices. In conclusion, there is a path  $P' = (v_1, \dots, v_l)$  such that  $E(P') \subset E(C) \cup E(C') \cup E(P)$ ,  $e \in E(P')$  and  $v_1, v_2$  are two (-)-vertices of  $C$  and  $v_{l-1}, v_l$  are two (-)-vertices of  $C'$ . Now, add  $\frac{1}{m}$  and  $-\frac{1}{m}$  alternately to the edges of  $P' - \{v_1v_2, v_{l-1}v_l\}$  such that  $-\frac{1}{m}$  is added to  $e$ . If  $v_2v_3$  or  $v_{l-2}v_{l-1}$  received  $-\frac{1}{m}$ , add  $\frac{1}{m}$  to  $v_1v_2$  or  $v_{l-1}v_l$ , respectively. An example is shown in Figure 2.



**Figure 2:** The modifying of  $h$  if  $F$  contains two disjoint circuits connected by a path. The solid edges are the edges of  $P'$ .

The resulting function  $h'$  has values in  $\{0, \frac{1}{m}, \dots, \frac{m-1}{m}, 1\}$ , since no edge of  $C, C'$  or  $P$  had the value 0 or 1 before. Furthermore, we have  $d^{h'}(v) \in \{d^h(v), d^h(v) + \frac{1}{m}\}$  for every  $v \in \{v_1, v_2, v_{l-1}, v_l\}$  and  $d^{h'}(w) = d^h(w)$  for every other vertex  $w$ . Since  $v_1, v_2, v_{l-1}$  and  $v_l$  are (-)-vertices (with respect to  $h$ ),  $h'$  is a fractional  $[1, \frac{n}{m}]$ -factor of  $F$  with values in  $\{0, \frac{1}{m}, \dots, \frac{m-1}{m}, 1\}$ . This contradicts the choice of  $h$ , since  $h'(e) = h(e) - \frac{1}{m}$ . ■

**Claim 7.** No component of  $F$  contains a circuit and a vertex of degree 1.

*Proof of Claim 7.* Suppose  $F$  contains a component with a circuit  $C$  and a vertex  $x$  with  $N_F(x) = \{y\}$ . Let  $z \in N_F(y) \setminus \{x\}$  be a vertex such that either the edge  $yz$  lies on a path from  $y$




to  $C$  or  $y, z \in V(C)$ . Now, fix a fractional  $[1, \frac{n}{m}]$ -factor  $h$  of  $F$  with values in  $\{0, \frac{1}{m}, \dots, \frac{m-1}{m}, 1\}$ , such that

(i)  $h(yz)$  is as small as possible,

(ii) with respect to (i),  $\sum_{e \in E(F)} h(e)$  is as small as possible.

Again, no two (+)-vertices are adjacent in  $F$ , which implies that  $C$  contains adjacent (-)-vertices. Furthermore, an edge received the value 1 if and only if it is incident with a vertex of degree 1, in particular  $h(xy) = 1$  and hence  $y$  is a (+)-vertex. In conclusion, there is a path  $P = (v_1, \dots, v_l)$  such that  $v_1 = y$ ,  $v_2 = z$  and  $v_{l-1}, v_l$  are two (-)-vertices of  $C$ . Now, add  $\frac{1}{m}$  and  $-\frac{1}{m}$  alternately to the edges of  $P - v_{l-1}v_l$  such that  $-\frac{1}{m}$  is added to  $yz$ . If  $v_{l-2}v_{l-1}$  received  $-\frac{1}{m}$ , add  $\frac{1}{m}$  to  $v_{l-1}v_l$  (see Figure 3).



**Figure 3:** The modifying of  $h$  if  $F$  contains a component with a circuit and a vertex of degree 1 in the cases (a)  $y \notin V(C)$  and (b)  $y \in V(C)$ . The solid edges are the edges of  $P$ .

The resulting function is denoted by  $h'$ . For each edge  $e \in E(P)$  we have  $h(e) > 0$  by Claim 1 and  $h(e) < 1$  since  $P$  does not contain a vertex of degree 1 in  $F$ . In conclusion,  $h'$  has values in  $\{0, \frac{1}{m}, \dots, \frac{m-1}{m}, 1\}$ . Furthermore, we have  $d^{h'}(y) = d^h(y) - \frac{1}{m}$ ,  $d^{h'}(v) \in \{d^h(v), d^h(v) + \frac{1}{m}\}$  for every  $v \in \{v_{l-1}, v_l\}$  and  $d^{h'}(w) = d^h(w)$  for every other vertex  $w$ . Since  $y$  is a (+)-vertex and  $v_{l-1}, v_l$  are (-)-vertices (with respect to  $h$ ),  $h'$  is a fractional  $[1, \frac{n}{m}]$ -factor of  $F$  with values in  $\{0, \frac{1}{m}, \dots, \frac{m-1}{m}, 1\}$ . This contradicts the choice of  $h$ , since  $h'(yz) = h(yz) - \frac{1}{m}$ . ■

By Claims 3-7, each component of  $F$  is isomorphic to either an odd circuit or a tree.

**Claim 8.** If  $i$  is a positive integer and  $C$  is a component of  $F$  isomorphic to  $C_{2i+1}$ , then  $i < \frac{m}{n-m}$ .

*Proof of Claim 8.* By the choice of  $F$  and Observation 3.2, no proper subgraph of  $C$  satisfies the  $\frac{n}{m}$ -isolated-vertex-condition. In particular,  $P_{2i+1}$  does not satisfy the  $\frac{n}{m}$ -isolated-vertex-condition. Therefore,  $\frac{i+1}{i} > \frac{n}{m}$ , which is equivalent to  $i < \frac{m}{n-m}$ . ■

**Claim 9.** If  $T$  is a component of  $F$  that is isomorphic to a tree, then  $T \in \mathcal{T}_{\frac{n}{m}}$ .

*Proof of Claim 9.* By Observation 3.2,  $T$  satisfies the  $\frac{n}{m}$ -isolated-vertex-condition, whereas no proper subgraph of  $T$  satisfies this condition. Hence,  $T \in \mathcal{T}_{\frac{n}{m}}$ .  $\blacksquare$

In conclusion, every component of  $F$  is isomorphic to an element of  $\{C_{2i+1}, T: 1 \leq i < \frac{m}{n-m}, T \in \mathcal{T}_{\frac{n}{m}}\}$  and thus,  $F$  is the desired factor. This completes the proof of Theorem 3.1.  $\square$

## 4 Structural properties of the trees in $\mathcal{T}_{\frac{n}{m}}$

In this section, we characterize the trees in  $\mathcal{T}_{\frac{n}{m}}$  in terms of their bipartition.

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let  $n, m$  be integers with  $0 < m < n$  and let  $T$  be a tree with bipartition  $\{A, B\}$ , where  $0 < |B| \leq |A|$ . Then, the following statements are equivalent:*

- 1)  $T \in \mathcal{T}_{\frac{n}{m}}$ .
- 2) For every  $x \in B$ ,  $T$  has a fractional  $[1, \frac{n}{m}]$ -factor  $h$  with values in  $\{\frac{1}{m}, \dots, \frac{m-1}{m}, 1\}$  such that  $d^h(a) = 1$  for every  $a \in A$ ,  $d^h(b) = \frac{n}{m}$  for every  $b \in B \setminus \{x\}$  and  $d^h(x) = \frac{n}{m} + |A| - \frac{n}{m}|B|$ .
- 3)  $|A| \leq \frac{n}{m}|B|$  and for every  $e = xy \in E(T)$ :  $|V(T_e) \cap A| > \frac{n}{m}|V(T_e) \cap B|$ , where  $T_e$  is the component of  $T - e$  that contains the unique vertex in  $\{x, y\} \cap A$ .

*Proof.* 1)  $\Rightarrow$  2). For stars 2) trivially holds. Thus, we assume  $T$  is not a star and hence, there is an  $u \in \text{Leaf}(T - \text{Leaf}(T))$ . Recall that no fractional  $[1, \frac{n}{m}]$ -factor of  $T$  uses value 0. Let  $h$  be a fractional  $[1, \frac{n}{m}]$ -factor of  $T$  with values in  $\{\frac{1}{m}, \dots, \frac{m-1}{m}, 1\}$ , such that


(i)  $d^h(u)$  is as small as possible,

(ii) with respect to (i),  $\sum_{e \in E(T)} h(e)$  is as small as possible.

Observe that no two (+)-vertices are adjacent and as a consequence,  $h(e) = 1$  if and only if  $e$  is a pendant edge of  $T$ . Furthermore, every vertex adjacent to a leaf of  $T$  is a (+)-vertex since  $T$  is not isomorphic to  $K_2$ .

First, suppose  $T$  contains a path  $P = (u, v_1, \dots, v_l)$  in  $T$  such that  $v_{l-1}$  is a (-)-vertex and  $d^h(v_l) < \frac{n}{m}$ . Modify  $h$  as follows: add  $-\frac{1}{m}$  and  $\frac{1}{m}$  alternately to the edges of  $P - v_{l-1}v_l$  such that  $-\frac{1}{m}$  is added to  $uv_1$ . If  $v_{l-2}v_{l-1}$  received  $-\frac{1}{m}$ , add  $\frac{1}{m}$  to  $v_{l-1}v_l$ , see Figure 4.

Note that  $v_l$  is not a leaf, since it is adjacent to a (-)-vertex. Hence, no edge of  $P$  is a pendant edge of  $T$  and thus, every  $e \in E(P)$  satisfies  $h(e) < 1$ . In conclusion, the modification of  $h$ , denoted by  $h'$ , has values in  $\{0, \frac{1}{m}, \dots, \frac{m-1}{m}, 1\}$ . Moreover,  $h'$  is a fractional  $[1, \frac{n}{m}]$ -factor of  $T$  since  $d^{h'}(u) > 1$ ,  $d^{h'}(v_{l-1}) = 1$  and  $d^{h'}(v_l) < \frac{n}{m}$ . This contradicts the choice of  $h$ , since  $d^{h'}(u) = d^h(u) - \frac{1}{m}$ .




**Figure 4:** The modifying of  $h$  if  $T$  contains a path  $P = (u, v_1, \dots, v_l)$  such that  $v_{l-1}$  is a  $(-)$ -vertex and  $d^h(v_l) < \frac{n}{m}$ . The solid edges belong to  $P$ .

The non-existence of such a path implies that the set of  $(-)$ -vertices is stable and every  $v \in V(T) \setminus \{u\}$  that is a  $(+)$ -vertex satisfies  $d^h(v) = \frac{n}{m}$ . The former implies that  $A$  consists of all  $(-)$ -vertices and  $B$  of all  $(+)$ -vertices. Hence,

$$|A| = \sum_{a \in A} d^h(a) = \sum_{b \in B} d^h(b) = \frac{n}{m}(|B| - 1) + d^h(u),$$

which implies  $d^h(u) = \frac{n}{m} + |A| - \frac{n}{m}|B|$ .

Now, let  $x$  be an arbitrary  $(+)$ -vertex, let  $P$  be the  $ux$ -path contained in  $T$  and let  $l = m \left( \frac{n}{m} - d^h(u) \right)$ . Note that  $|V(P)|$  is odd, since  $P$  consists of alternately  $(+)$ - and  $(-)$ -vertices. Set  $h_0 = h$  and for  $i \in \{1, \dots, l\}$  let  $h_i$  be the function obtained from  $h_{i-1}$  by alternately adding  $\frac{1}{m}$  and  $-\frac{1}{m}$  to the edges of  $P$  such that  $\frac{1}{m}$  is added to the edge of  $P$  incident with  $u$  (see Figure 5).



**Figure 5:** The modifying of  $h_{i-1}$  to obtain  $h_i$ . The solid edges belong to  $P$ .

We have  $d^{h_i}(u) = d^h(u) + \frac{l}{m} = \frac{n}{m}$  and  $d^{h_i}(x) = d^h(x) - \frac{l}{m} = \frac{n}{m} - \frac{l}{m} = d^h(u)$ . As a consequence,  $d^{h_i}(v) \in [1, \frac{n}{m}]$  for every  $i \in \{1, \dots, l\}$  and every  $v \in V(T)$ . Furthermore, for every  $i \in \{1, \dots, l\}$ , if  $h_{i-1}$  is a fractional  $[1, \frac{n}{m}]$ -factor that does not use value 0 nor 1 on  $P$ , then  $h_i$  is a fractional  $[1, \frac{n}{m}]$ -factor. Thus,  $h_i$  also does not use value 0 on  $P$ . Moreover, it also does not use value 1 on  $P$ , since every edge of  $P$  is incident with a  $(-)$ -vertex (with respect to  $h_i$ ) that is not a leaf of  $T$ . As a consequence, for every  $i \in \{1, \dots, l\}$ ,  $h_i$  only uses values  $\frac{1}{m}, \dots, \frac{m-1}{m}$  on  $P$  and therefore,  $h_l$  is the desired fractional factor.

2)  $\Rightarrow$  3) By Theorem 2.3,  $T$  satisfies the  $\frac{n}{m}$ -isolated-vertex-condition and hence  $|A| = iso(T - B) \leq \frac{n}{m}|B|$ . Let  $e = xy \in E(T)$ , where  $y \in A$ , and let  $h$  be a fractional  $[1, \frac{n}{m}]$ -factor of  $T$  with the properties stated in 2) (with prescribed vertex  $x$ ). Then,

$$|V(T_e) \cap A| = \sum_{v \in V(T_e) \cap A} d^h(v) = h(xy) + \sum_{w \in V(T_e) \cap B} d^h(w) = h(xy) + \frac{n}{m}|V(T_e) \cap B|,$$

which proves 3), since  $h(xy) > 0$ .

3)  $\Rightarrow$  1) For every  $e \in E(T)$ , statement 3) implies

$$iso((T - e) - (V(T_e) \cap B)) = |V(T_e) \cap A| > \frac{n}{m} |V(T_e) \cap B|.$$

Thus, by Theorem 2.3 it suffices to show that  $T$  has a fractional  $[1, \frac{n}{m}]$ -factor. For every  $e \in E(T)$  set

$$h(e) = |V(T_e) \cap A| - \frac{|A|}{|B|} |V(T_e) \cap B|.$$

For every  $e \in E(T)$ , statement 3) implies

$$h(e) = |V(T_e) \cap A| - \frac{|A|}{|B|} |V(T_e) \cap B| \geq |V(T_e) \cap A| - \frac{n}{m} |V(T_e) \cap B| > 0.$$

By the definition of  $h$ , for every  $a \in A$  and every  $b \in B$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} d^h(a) &= \sum_{e' \in \partial_T(a)} h(e') = (d_T(a) - 1)(|A| - 1) + d_T(a) - \frac{|A|}{|B|} (d_T(a) - 1)|B| \\ &= d_T(a)|A| - |A| + 1 - |A|(d_T(a) - 1) = 1 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$d^h(b) = \sum_{e' \in \partial_T(b)} h(e') = |A| - \frac{|A|}{|B|} (|B| - 1) = \frac{|A|}{|B|}.$$

Note that  $1 < \frac{|A|}{|B|} \leq \frac{n}{m}$ , since  $|A| > |B|$ . Furthermore, for every  $e = xy \in E(T)$ , where  $x \in B$ , the above calculations imply

$$h(e) = d^h(y) - \sum_{e' \in \partial_T(y) \setminus \{e\}} h(e') \leq 1.$$

In conclusion,  $h$  is a fractional  $[1, \frac{n}{m}]$ -factor of  $T$ , which proves  $T \in \mathcal{T}_{\frac{n}{m}}$ .  $\square$

Note that, by the proof of 3)  $\Rightarrow$  1), every  $T \in \mathcal{T}_{\frac{n}{m}}$  has a fractional  $[1, \frac{n}{m}]$ -factor  $h$  such that  $d^h(a) = 1$  for every  $a \in A$  and  $d^h(b) = \frac{|A|}{|B|}$  for every  $b \in B$ . On the other hand, not every tree with such a factor belongs to  $\mathcal{T}_{\frac{n}{m}}$ . As the following corollary shows, Theorem 4.1 implies some structural properties of trees in  $\mathcal{T}_{\frac{n}{m}}$ .

**Corollary 4.2.** *Let  $n, m$  be integers with  $0 < m < n$  and let  $T \in \mathcal{T}_{\frac{n}{m}}$  be a tree with bipartition  $\{A, B\}$ , where  $0 < |B| \leq |A|$ . Then, the following holds*

- (i) either  $T \cong K_{1,1}$ , or  $Leaf(T) \subseteq A$ ,
- (ii)  $d_T(a) \leq m$  for every  $a \in A$ ,
- (iii)  $d_T(b) \leq n$  for every  $b \in B$ ,

(iv)  $d_T(x) = \lfloor \frac{n}{m} \rfloor + 1$  for every  $x \in \text{Leaf}(T - \text{Leaf}(T))$ ,

(v) if  $n \equiv 1 \pmod{m}$ , then either  $T$  is a star or  $|A| = \frac{n}{m}|B|$  and  $|V(T)|$  is a multiple of  $n+m$ .

*Proof.* For stars the statements are trivial. Thus, assume  $T$  is not a star and hence, there are two distinct vertices  $x_1, x_2 \in \text{Leaf}(T - \text{Leaf}(T))$ . Note that every vertex  $v \in \text{Leaf}(T - \text{Leaf}(T))$  belongs to  $B$ , since  $h(v) > 1$  for every fractional  $[1, \frac{n}{m}]$ -factor  $h$  of  $T$ . Consider two fractional  $[1, \frac{n}{m}]$ -factors  $h_1, h_2$  of  $T$  with the properties stated in statement 2) of Theorem 4.1 (with respect to  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ , respectively). The existence of  $h_1$  implies (i), (ii), (iii) and  $d(x) = \lfloor \frac{n}{m} \rfloor + 1$  for every  $x \in \text{Leaf}(T - \text{Leaf}(T)) \setminus \{x_1\}$ . By the existence of  $h_2$  we have  $d(x_1) = \lfloor \frac{n}{m} \rfloor + 1$ , which proves (iv). Furthermore, if  $n \equiv 1 \pmod{m}$ , then  $\frac{n}{m} = \lfloor \frac{n}{m} \rfloor + \frac{1}{m} \leq d^{h_1}(x_1) \leq \frac{n}{m}$ . Hence,  $\frac{n}{m} = d^{h_1}(x_1) = \frac{n}{m} + |A| - \frac{n}{m}|B|$ , i.e.  $|A| = \frac{n}{m}|B|$ . Moreover, we observe that  $\frac{|B|}{m}$  is an integer, since  $\frac{n-1}{m}$  is an integer and  $|A| = \frac{n}{m}|B| = \frac{n-1}{m}|B| + \frac{|B|}{m}$ . As a consequence,  $|V(G)| = |A| + |B| = \frac{n}{m}|B| + |B| = (n+m)\frac{|B|}{m}$ , which proves (v).  $\square$

By (i), (iii) and (iv), for every  $T \in \mathcal{T}_1^n$ , the set  $\text{Leaf}(T - \text{Leaf}(T))$  is empty, which is equivalent to  $T$  being a star. As a consequence,  $\mathcal{T}_1^n = \{K_{1,i} : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ , or equivalently, Theorem 1.2 holds.

## References

- [1] J. Akiyama and M. Kano. *Factors and factorizations of graphs: Proof techniques in factor theory*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1st edition, 2011.
- [2] A. Amahashi and M. Kano. On factors with given components. *Discrete Mathematics*, 42(1):1–6, 1982.
- [3] R. Anstee. Simplified existence theorems for  $(g, f)$ -factors. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 27(1):29–38, 1990.
- [4] K. Heinrich, P. Hell, D. Kirkpatrick, and G. Liu. A simple existence criterion for  $(g < f)$ -factors. *Discrete Mathematics*, 85:313–317, 1990.
- [5] M. Kano, H. Lu, and Q. Yu. Component factors with large components in graphs. *Applied Mathematics Letters*, 23(4):385–389, 2010.
- [6] M. Las Vergnas. An extension of Tutte’s 1-factor theorem. *Discrete Mathematics*, 23(3):241–255, 1978.
- [7] Y. Ma, A. Wang, and J. Li. Isolated toughness and fractional  $(g, f)$ -factors of graphs. *Ars Combinatoria*, 93:153–160, 2009.

- [8] W. T. Tutte. The 1-factors of oriented graphs. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 4(6):922–931, 1953.
- [9] J. Yang, Y. Ma, and G. Liu. Fractional  $(g, f)$ -factors in graphs. *Applied Mathematics, Series A (Chinese Edition)*, 16(4):385–390, 2001.
- [10] R. Yu, M. Kano, and H. Lu. Fractional factors, component factors and isolated vertex conditions in graphs. *Electronic Journal of Combinatorics*, 26:4, 2019.