

Bisections of graphs under degree constraints

Jie Ma*

Hehui Wu†

Abstract

In this paper, we investigate the problem of finding *bisections* (i.e., balanced bipartitions) in graphs. We prove the following two results for *all* graphs G :

- G has a bisection where each vertex v has at least $(1/4 - o(1))d_G(v)$ neighbors in its own part;
- G also has a bisection where each vertex v has at least $(1/4 - o(1))d_G(v)$ neighbors in the opposite part.

These results are asymptotically optimal up to a factor of $1/2$, aligning with what is expected from random constructions, and provide the first systematic understanding of bisections in general graphs under degree constraints. As a consequence, we establish for the first time the existence of a function $f(k)$ such that for any $k \geq 1$, every graph with minimum degree at least $f(k)$ admits a bisection where every vertex has at least k neighbors in its own part, as well as a bisection where every vertex has at least k neighbors in the opposite part.

Using a more general setting, we further show that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist $c_\varepsilon, c'_\varepsilon > 0$ such that any graph G with minimum degree at least $c_\varepsilon k$ (respectively, $c'_\varepsilon k$) admits a bisection satisfying:

- every vertex has at least k neighbors in its own part (respectively, in the opposite part), and
- at least $(1 - \varepsilon)|V(G)|$ vertices have at least k neighbors in the opposite part (respectively, in their own part).

These results extend and strengthen classical graph partitioning theorems of Erdős, Thomassen, and Kühn–Osthus, while additionally satisfying the bisection requirement.

1 Introduction

The problem of graph partitioning (i.e., partitioning vertex set of a graph into two or more parts) has been a central topic in combinatorics and theoretical computer science since the advent of modern graph theory in the last century. It has motivated a substantial body of research, spanning classical results in structural and extremal graph theory (see, e.g., [7, 8, 22]) to major advances in computational complexity and approximation algorithms for problems such as Max-Cut (see [11, 17]), among others. While traditional results in graph partitioning often optimize a single quantity (such as [7, 8, 11]), recent work increasingly focuses on partitioning under multiple simultaneous constraints.

*School of Mathematical Sciences, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui 230026, China, and Yau Mathematical Sciences Center, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China. Research supported by National Key Research and Development Program of China 2023YFA1010201 and National Natural Science Foundation of China grant 12125106. Email: jiema@ustc.edu.cn.

†Shanghai Center for Mathematical Sciences, Fudan University, Shanghai 200438, China. Research supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China grant 11931006, National Key Research and Development Program of China 2020YFA0713200, and the Shanghai Dawn Scholar Program grant 19SG01. Email: hhwu@fudan.edu.cn.

A natural problem is to partition graphs under *degree constraints*. In this direction, an early result by Erdős shows that every graph with minimum degree at least $2k - 1$ admits a bipartition such that

$$\text{every vertex has at least } k \text{ neighbors in the opposite part.} \quad (1)$$

Complementarily, Thomassen [27] established the existence of a function $f(k)$ such that every graph G with minimum degree at least $f(k)$ admits a bipartition $V(G) = A \cup B$ satisfying

$$\text{every vertex has at least } k \text{ neighbors in its own part,} \quad (2)$$

i.e., both induced subgraphs $G[A]$ and $G[B]$ have minimum degree at least k . This function $f(k)$ was improved by Hajnal [13] and was later determined to be $f(k) = 2k + 1$ by Stiebitz [26], resolving a conjecture of Thomassen [28]. A compelling question arises regarding whether both (1) and (2) can hold simultaneously for graphs with sufficiently large minimum degree. Kühn and Osthus [18] constructed examples showing this is impossible even when $k = 1$. Despite this limitation, they proved a remarkable compromise: there exists a function $g(k)$ such that every graph G with minimum degree at least $g(k)$ admits a bipartition $V(G) = A \cup B$ such that

$$(2) \text{ holds, and every vertex in } A \text{ has at least } k \text{ neighbors in } B. \quad (3)$$

The function $g(k)$ was recently improved to be a linear function in [23], answering a question from [18]. In a different direction, Kühn and Osthus [18] generalized Thomassen's result by further bounding the average degree of the cut across the bipartition from below: every graph G with minimum degree at least $2^{32}k$ admits a bipartition $V(G) = A \cup B$ such that

$$(2) \text{ holds, and the bipartite subgraph } (A, B)_G \text{ has average degree at least } k.^1 \quad (4)$$

The results in (3) and (4) reveal novel aspects of graph partitioning, which also lead to important applications in structural graph theory (see [18]).

Another natural problem that has garnered considerable attention in recent decades is graph partitioning with *part-size constraints*. A canonical and notable example is the search for a *bisection* in graphs G , that is, a bipartition $V(G) = A \cup B$ satisfying $||A| - |B|| \leq 1$. Extensive research has been conducted on finding bisections with various properties; see the surveys [4, 25] and references [6, 9, 14, 15, 19–21, 29], most of which focus on bounding the number of edges (or arcs in digraphs) either between the two parts or within each part. A prominent conjecture of Bollobás and Scott [4] (see its Conjecture 8) in this area states that every graph G has a bisection satisfying

$$\text{every vertex } v \text{ has at least } \frac{d_G(v)}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \text{ neighbors in its opposite part.} \quad (5)$$

This original statement fails for an infinite family of graphs, as shown in [16], but its equally important weaker version, which replaces the additive constant $-\frac{1}{2}$ with $O(1)$ in (5), remains widely open. In [3], Ban and Linial investigated several partitioning problems for regular graphs and proposed a related conjecture (see Conjecture 1 in [3]), asserting that every bridgeless cubic graph, except for the Petersen graph, has a bisection such that every vertex has at least two neighbors in its opposite part. Another longstanding conjecture of Füredi, which also appears in Green's 100 open problem list [12], states that with high probability, the Erdős-Rényi random graph $G(n, 1/2)$ has a bisection in which all but $o(n)$

¹In addition, the sizes of the parts A and B are at least $|V(G)|/2^{18}$; see Theorem 5 in [18].

vertices have at least half of their neighbors in the opposite part. This was recently proved by Ferber, Kwan, Narayanan, Sah, and Sawhney [10], who also showed that with high probability, $G(n, 1/2)$ has a bisection in which all but $o(n)$ vertices have at least half of their neighbors in their own part. More recently, further strengthening and advances related to this conjecture on bisections in random graphs were achieved by Dandi, Gamarnik, and Zdeborová [5], Minzer, Sah, and Sawhney [24], as well as Anastos, Cooley, Kang, and Kwan [2].

In this paper, we investigate bisections in general graphs under degree constraints. We develop a unified approach that extends to multi-partitions with arbitrary part-size constraints. Our results also reveal new partitioning phenomena that both generalize and strengthen the classical theorems of Erdős, Thomassen, and Kühn and Osthus discussed above.

1.1 Bisections in general settings

We first present our main results on bisections in the most general settings. The following two results hold for all graphs.

Theorem 1. *Every graph G has a bisection such that every vertex v has at least*

$$\frac{d_G(v)}{4} - o(d_G(v)) \quad \text{neighbors in its own part.}$$

Theorem 2. *Every graph G has a bisection such that every vertex v has at least*

$$\frac{d_G(v)}{4} - o(d_G(v)) \quad \text{neighbors in its opposite part.}$$

From the perspective of random bisections, we observe that these results are asymptotically optimal up to a factor of $1/2$. These are the first results concerning bisections in general graphs where the degree of every vertex satisfies a constant fraction of its total degree. As a consequence, we establish the existence of the following function $f(k)$, which provides the bisection analogs of (1) and (2).

Corollary 3. *There exists a function $f(k) = O(k)$ such that every graph with minimum degree at least $f(k)$ admits a bisection where every vertex has at least k neighbors in its own part, as well as a bisection where every vertex has at least k neighbors in the opposite part.*

1.2 Partitions with internal degree constraints

Next, we consider partitioning graphs with high minimum degree by imposing *internal degree constraints*, that is, by restricting the degrees of vertices within their own parts. The following theorem (derived from a more technical setting - Theorem 14) guarantees the existence of a specific tripartition under part-size and internal degree constraints.

Theorem 4. *Let c, ε be constants satisfying $0 \leq c < 1$ and $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1 - c$. For all $k \geq k_0(c, \varepsilon)$, every graph G with minimum degree at least $\left(\frac{4}{1-c} + \varepsilon\right)k$ admits a tripartition $V(G) = A \cup B \cup C$ such that*

- (1). $\left(\frac{1-c-\varepsilon}{2}\right)n \leq |A|, |B| \leq \left(\frac{1-c}{2}\right)n$,
- (2). $d_A(x) \geq k$ holds for every vertex $x \in A$,
- (3). $d_B(y) \geq k$ holds for every vertex $y \in B$, and

(4). both $d_A(z) \geq 2k$ and $d_B(z) \geq 2k$ hold for every vertex $z \in C$,

Using this theorem, we can immediately derive corresponding results on bisections. In the coming corollary, we apply Theorem 4 with $1 - c = O(\varepsilon)$ and distribute the vertices of C arbitrarily between A and B to form a bisection.

Corollary 5. *For any positive constant ε , there exists a constant $c_\varepsilon > 0$ such that the following holds. For any $k \geq 1$, every graph G with minimum degree at least $c_\varepsilon \cdot k$ admits a bisection such that*

(i). *every vertex has at least k neighbors in its own part, and*

(ii). *at least $(1 - \varepsilon)|V(G)|$ vertices in G have at least k neighbors in the opposite part.*

We previously noted that it is impossible to ensure that all vertices satisfy both (1) and (2) simultaneously, even for graphs G with arbitrarily large minimum degree (as shown by counterexamples in [18]). However, this corollary indicates that a slightly weaker statement holds true: there exists a bisection in G such that all vertices satisfy (2), while all but $o(|V(G)|)$ vertices satisfy (1). Additionally, we observe that condition (ii) automatically provides a lower bound on the average degree of the bipartite subgraph induced by the bisection. Thus, this corollary directly extends the result (4) of Kühn and Osthus [18].

In the next corollary, we establish explicit linear constants for the minimum degree conditions that guarantee bisections with desired internal degrees as well as average degree of the cut. In particular, this provides quantitative improvements to the aforementioned result of Kühn and Osthus [18].

Corollary 6. *For any positive constant ε , the following holds for all integers $k \geq k_0(\varepsilon)$. Every graph G with minimum degree at least $(4 + \varepsilon)k$ admits a bisection $V(G) = A \cup B$ such that both $G[A]$ and $G[B]$ have minimum degree at least k . Moreover, if the minimum degree of G is at least $(\frac{16}{3} + \varepsilon)k$, then in addition to the above, the bipartite subgraph $(A, B)_G$ has average degree at least k .*

1.3 Partitions with external degree constraints

Now we consider partitioning graphs with high minimum degree by imposing *external degree constraints*, meaning we restrict the degrees of vertices within their opposite parts. The following is the main result of this subsection.

Theorem 7. *The conclusion of Theorem 4 remains valid when replacing conditions (2) and (3) with: $d_{(A,B)}(v) \geq k$ holds for every vertex $v \in A \cup B$.*

Using this, we can derive the following corollaries in a manner similar to the previous subsection concerning internal degree constraints.

Corollary 8. *For any positive constant ε , there exists a constant $c_\varepsilon > 0$ such that the following holds. For any $k \geq 1$, every graph G with minimum degree at least $c_\varepsilon \cdot k$ admits a bisection such that*

(i). *every vertex has at least k neighbors in the opposite part, and*

(ii). *at least $(1 - \varepsilon)|V(G)|$ vertices in G have at least k neighbors in their own part.*

This offers a complementary statement to Corollary 5: every graph G with large minimum degree has a bisection such that all vertices satisfy (1), while all but $o(|V(G)|)$ vertices satisfy (2).

Corollary 9. *For any positive constant ε , the following holds for all integers $k \geq k_0(\varepsilon)$. Every graph G with minimum degree at least $(4 + \varepsilon)k$ admits a bisection $V(G) = A \cup B$ such that the bipartite subgraph $(A, B)_G$ has minimum degree at least k .*

We suspect that both the $(4 + \varepsilon)k$ bounds in Corollaries 6 and 9 are within a factor of 2 of being optimal (see the discussion in Section 5).

The partition results with external degree constraints may appear analogous to those with internal constraints in Subsection 1.2. Indeed, as in the internal case, their proofs share the same two-stage framework: an initial random partitioning step followed by a deterministic refinement step. However, we emphasize that the deterministic refinement step requires substantially different approaches for these two settings. For readers interested in the technical details, we provide proof outlines before the main lemmas in Sections 3 and 4 (for internal and external degree constraints, respectively), where both the shared framework and the key differences are discussed.

Organization. The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we present the preliminaries, including definitions, probabilistic inequalities, and an important lemma for finding certain dense subgraphs that is crucial for both settings of degree constraints. In Section 3, we prove our main results on graph partitions and bisections with internal degree constraints. The analogous results for external degree constraints are established in Section 4. We conclude with a discussion of several remarks and open problems in the final section.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we gather and prepare all necessary preliminaries for the proofs that follow.

2.1 Basic notions

We adopt standard graph theory terminology. Let G be a finite simple graph. For each vertex $v \in V(G)$, its *neighborhood* $N_G(v)$ consists of all vertices adjacent to v , and its *degree* is $d_G(v) = |N_G(v)|$. For any subset $A \subseteq V(G)$, we write $d_A(v) = |N_G(v) \cap A|$ for the number of neighbors of v in A . For any integer $r \geq 2$, an r -*partition* of G is a partition $V(G) = V_1 \cup V_2 \cup \dots \cup V_r$ into r non-empty parts. When $r = 2$, we refer to this as a *bipartition*. Given a bipartition $V(G) = A \cup B$, the notation $(A, B)_G$ denotes both the edge cut (i.e., the set of all edges between A and B) and the corresponding bipartite subgraph of G . When it is clear from the context, we often omit the subscript G from the above notations. A *bisection* of G is a bipartition $V(G) = A \cup B$ satisfying $||A| - |B|| \leq 1$. For integers $n \geq \ell \geq 1$, we write $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and $\binom{[n]}{\ell} = \{F \subseteq [n] : |F| = \ell\}$.

2.2 Probabilistic inequalities

In this subsection, we collect several inequalities required for estimating graph-theoretic parameters during the initial random partitioning stage of our main results. First, we recall *Markov's inequality*.

Lemma 10 (see [1]). *Let X be a nonnegative random variable and $\lambda > 0$. Then $\mathbb{P}(X \geq \lambda) \leq \mathbb{E}[X]/\lambda$.*

We will also require the following *Chernoff bound* for binomial distributions. Let $\exp(x) = e^x$.

Lemma 11 (see [1]). *Let $p \in (0, 1)$ and $X \sim \text{Bin}(N, p)$. For any $\lambda > 0$, it holds that*

$$\mathbb{P}(|X - pN| > \lambda pN) \leq 2 \exp(-\lambda^2 pN/3).$$

The following inequality bounds a key quantitative measure in our analysis. Intuitively, it controls how many vertices and edges can be affected when “trouble” vertices - those exhibiting large degree deviations from the initial random bipartition - are relocated during subsequent deterministic operations. Recall the *gamma function* $\Gamma(t) = \int_0^{+\infty} x^{t-1} e^{-x} dx$.

Lemma 12. *For any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, there exists a constant $d_\varepsilon > 0$ such that*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{+\infty} i \cdot \exp(-d_\varepsilon^2 i^\varepsilon) \leq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{10^5}.$$

Proof. Fix $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. We show that it suffices to take $d_\varepsilon = 1000/(\varepsilon^2)$. The proof requires the following upper bound for the gamma function:

$$\Gamma(t) \leq 3t^{t-1/2} e^{-t} \leq 3t^t \text{ for } t \geq 2, \tag{6}$$

where the first inequality can be derived from Stirling’s formula. Using (6), we obtain

$$\sum_{i=1}^{+\infty} i \cdot \exp(-d_\varepsilon^2 i^\varepsilon) \leq \int_0^{+\infty} x \cdot \exp(-d_\varepsilon^2 x^\varepsilon) dx = \frac{\Gamma(2/\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon \cdot d_\varepsilon^{4/\varepsilon}} \leq \frac{3}{\varepsilon} \cdot \left(\frac{2}{d_\varepsilon^2 \varepsilon}\right)^{2/\varepsilon} \leq \frac{6}{d_\varepsilon^2 \varepsilon^2} \leq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{10^5},$$

where the equality is obtained by substituting $d_\varepsilon^2 x^\varepsilon$ as a new variable, the second last inequality uses the fact $2/\varepsilon \geq 1$, and the final inequality holds since $d_\varepsilon = 1000/(\varepsilon^2)$. This proves the lemma. \square

2.3 Key lemma for finding dense subgraphs

We now introduce a key lemma that guarantees the existence of an induced subgraph with all vertices satisfying the prescribed degree conditions in a general graph. At its core, this result generalizes the classical result that every graph with average degree at least $2d$ contains a non-empty induced subgraph of minimum degree at least d .² We emphasize that this lemma presents the decisive technical barrier that prevents improvements to the halfway bounds in our main theorems (Theorems 1 and 2).

Lemma 13. *Let H be a graph with a family $\{A_i\}_{i \in I}$ of disjoint vertex subsets,³ where I is a finite index set. For each $i \in I$, let $\eta_i > 0$ be a real number and let $a_i \geq 1$ be an integer. Define the subset*

$$A_i^+ = \{v \in A_i : d_H(v) \geq 2(1 + \eta_i)a_i\}.$$

and set $\eta = \min_{i \in I} \eta_i$. If

$$\left(1 + \frac{1}{\eta}\right) \sum_{i \in I} a_i |A_i \setminus A_i^+| < |V(H)|, \tag{7}$$

then there exists a non-empty induced subgraph $H' \subseteq H$ such that

- (a) $d_{H'}(v) \geq a_i$ for all $v \in V(H') \cap A_i$ and $i \in I$;

²It is worth noting that this bound is tight, as demonstrated by the complete bipartite graph $K_{d,n}$.

³Here, $\bigcup_{i \in I} A_i$ may not equal $V(H)$.

(b) $|V(H) \setminus V(H')| \leq \sum_{i \in I} a_i |A_i \setminus V(H')| \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{\eta}\right) \sum_{i \in I} a_i |A_i \setminus A_i^+|$, where $V(H) \setminus V(H') \subseteq \bigcup_{i \in I} A_i$.

Proof. We prove this using the following greedy algorithm. Initially, let $H_0 = H$. Suppose that H_k is well-defined for some $k \geq 0$. If there exist $i \in I$ and a vertex $v_k \in V(H_k) \cap A_i$ such that $d_{H_k}(v_k) < a_i$, then set $H_{k+1} = H_k - \{v_k\}$ and proceed to the next iteration; otherwise, terminate and output H_k as H' . We aim to show that this H' is the desired induced subgraph.

Assume that this algorithm terminates at $H' = H_t$. Let $U = V(H) \setminus V(H')$. So $U = \{v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{t-1}\}$. We now estimate the number T of edges deleted in this process. It is clear from the algorithm that

$$T = \sum_{k=0}^{t-1} d_{H_k}(v_k) < \sum_{i \in I} a_i |U \cap A_i| = \sum_{i \in I} a_i \cdot (|U \cap A_i^+| + |U \cap (A_i \setminus A_i^+)|).$$

On the other hand, we see that $T = e_H(U) + e_H(U, V(H'))$ is at least

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{v \in U} d_H(v) \geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in I} \sum_{v \in U \cap A_i^+} d_H(v) \geq \sum_{i \in I} (1 + \eta_i) a_i \cdot |U \cap A_i^+|.$$

Combining the above two inequalities, we have

$$\sum_{i \in I} (1 + \eta_i) a_i \cdot |U \cap A_i^+| \leq T \leq \sum_{i \in I} a_i \cdot (|U \cap A_i^+| + |U \cap (A_i \setminus A_i^+)|),$$

implying that

$$\sum_{i \in I} \eta_i a_i \cdot |U \cap A_i^+| \leq \sum_{i \in I} a_i \cdot |U \cap (A_i \setminus A_i^+)|.$$

Using this inequality, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in I} a_i \cdot |U \cap A_i| &= \sum_{i \in I} a_i \cdot |U \cap A_i^+| + \sum_{i \in I} a_i \cdot |U \cap (A_i \setminus A_i^+)| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\eta} \cdot \sum_{i \in I} \eta_i a_i \cdot |U \cap A_i^+| + \sum_{i \in I} a_i \cdot |U \cap (A_i \setminus A_i^+)| \\ &\leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{\eta}\right) \cdot \sum_{i \in I} a_i |U \cap (A_i \setminus A_i^+)| \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{\eta}\right) \cdot \sum_{i \in I} a_i |A_i \setminus A_i^+|. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $U \subseteq \bigcup_{i \in I} A_i$ and each a_i is a positive integer, so together with (7) we have

$$|V(H) \setminus V(H')| = |U| \leq \sum_{i \in I} a_i \cdot |U \cap A_i| = \sum_{i \in I} a_i \cdot |A_i \setminus V(H')| \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{\eta}\right) \cdot \sum_{i \in I} a_i |A_i \setminus A_i^+| < |V(H)|,$$

establishing item (b). This also shows that the algorithm must terminate at a non-empty subgraph H' . It is clear from the algorithm that item (a) holds. \square

3 Finding bisections with internal degree constraints

In this section, we prove our results on graph partitions with internal degree constraints. These are obtained from Theorem 14, a general result applicable to all graphs that establishes the existence of certain tripartitions with degree constraints. From a probabilistic perspective, Theorem 14 states that

for any $c \in (0, 1)$, every n -vertex graph G admits a tripartition $V(G) = A \cup B \cup C$ with approximately prescribed part sizes $(\frac{1-c}{2})n$, $(\frac{1-c}{2})n$, and cn , respectively, such that every vertex in A has at least roughly half of its expected neighbors within A , every vertex in B has at least roughly half of its expected neighbors within B , and every vertex in C has approximately the expected number of neighbors in both A and B . By appropriately redistributing the vertices of C between A and B , we can then derive the corresponding bisection results.

Before stating the central result of this section, we introduce some necessary definitions. Throughout this section, let $c \in [0, 1)$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ be fixed constants. Let d_ε be the positive constant obtained from Lemma 12 with respect to ε . For every non-negative integer i , we define

$$\varphi_{c,\varepsilon}(i) = \left(\frac{1-c}{4}\right)i - \left(2d_\varepsilon \cdot i^{\frac{1}{2}(1+\varepsilon)} + \varepsilon \cdot i\right). \quad (8)$$

Since $\frac{1}{2}(1+\varepsilon) < 1$, we have $\varphi_{c,\varepsilon}(i) = (\frac{1-c}{4} - \varepsilon)i - o(i)$ as i tends to infinity. By treating ε as an arbitrarily small positive constant, we can express $\varphi_{c,\varepsilon}(i) \rightarrow (\frac{1-c}{4})i - o(i)$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Theorem 14. *Let c, ε be constants with $0 \leq c < 1$ and $0 < \varepsilon \leq \frac{1-c}{4}$. Then every graph G with $n \geq n_0(c, \varepsilon)$ vertices admits a tripartition $V(G) = A \cup B \cup C$ such that*

- (a). $(\frac{1-c-3\varepsilon}{2})n \leq |A|, |B| \leq (\frac{1-c-\varepsilon}{2})n$,⁴
- (b). $d_A(x) \geq \varphi_{c,\varepsilon}(d_G(x))$ for every vertex $x \in A$,
- (c). $d_B(y) \geq \varphi_{c,\varepsilon}(d_G(y))$ for every vertex $y \in B$, and
- (d). $d_A(z) \geq 2 \cdot \varphi_{c,\varepsilon}(d_G(z))$ and $d_B(z) \geq 2 \cdot \varphi_{c,\varepsilon}(d_G(z))$ for every vertex $z \in C$

The remainder of this section is organized as follows. In Subsection 3.1, we derive the internal degree results (including Theorems 1 and 4, and Corollaries 5 and 6) as consequences of Theorem 14. Subsection 3.2 provides the complete proof of Theorem 14.

3.1 Proof of Theorems 1 and 4, and Corollaries 5 and 6 via Theorem 14

Assuming the validation of Theorem 14, we now derive our internal degree results. First, we observe that Theorem 1 follows asymptotically from the special case $c = 0$ of Theorem 14.

Proof of Theorem 1. It suffices to prove the following statement: for arbitrarily small $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists an integer $i_0 := i_0(\varepsilon)$ such that every graph G has a bisection, where every vertex v with $d_G(v) \geq i_0$ has at least $(\frac{1}{4} - \varepsilon)d_G(v)$ neighbors in its own part.

Fix $c = 0$, and let $n_0(0, \varepsilon/2)$ be the constant from Theorem 14 (with parameters $c = 0$ and $\varepsilon/2$). Consider any graph G with at least i_0 vertices, where $i_0 \geq n_0(0, \varepsilon/2)$ is sufficiently large. Let V^i denote the set of vertices with degree i in G . From (8), we see that for all $i \geq i_0$, it holds

$$\varphi_{0,\varepsilon/2}(i) = \frac{i}{4} - \left(2d_{\varepsilon/2} \cdot i^{\frac{1}{2}(1+\varepsilon/2)} + (\varepsilon/2) \cdot i\right) \geq \left(\frac{1}{4} - \varepsilon\right)i.$$

Applying Theorem 14 with parameters $c = 0$ and $\varepsilon/2$, we obtain a tripartition $V(G) = A \cup B \cup C$ satisfying $|A| \leq \frac{n}{2}$, $|B| \leq \frac{n}{2}$, every vertex $x \in (A \cup B) \cap V^i$ has at least $\varphi_{0,\varepsilon/2}(i)$ neighbors in its own

⁴Clearly, we have $(c + \varepsilon)n \leq |C| \leq (c + 3\varepsilon)n$ here.

part, and moreover, every vertex $z \in C \cap V^i$ has at least $2\varphi_{0,\varepsilon/2}(i)$ neighbors in each of A and B . By distributing vertices of C between A and B appropriately, we can form a bisection $A' \cup B'$ of G such that every vertex v with $d_G(v) \geq i_0$ has at least $\varphi_{0,\varepsilon/2}(d_G(v)) \geq (\frac{1}{4} - \varepsilon) d_G(v)$ neighbors in its own part, completing the proof. \square

The proof of Theorem 4 is a direct consequence of Theorem 14, which provides the exact degree bounds for the tripartition construction.

Proof of Theorem 4. Fix constants $0 \leq c < 1$ and $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1 - c$. Set $\varepsilon' = (1 - c)^2\varepsilon/40$. Let G be a graph with $\delta(G) \geq \left(\frac{4}{1-c} + \varepsilon\right)k$, where $k \geq n_0(c, \varepsilon')$ is sufficiently large. Applying Theorem 14 with parameters c and ε' gives a tripartition $V(G) = A \cup B \cup C$ satisfying that

$$\left(\frac{1-c-\varepsilon}{2}\right)n \leq \left(\frac{1-c-3\varepsilon'}{2}\right)n \leq |A|, |B| \leq \left(\frac{1-c-\varepsilon'}{2}\right)n \leq \left(\frac{1-c}{2}\right)n,$$

every vertex $x \in A \cup B$ with degree i in G has at least

$$\varphi_{c,\varepsilon'}(i) \geq \left(\frac{1-c}{4} - 2\varepsilon'\right)i \geq \left(\frac{1-c}{4} - 2\varepsilon'\right) \cdot \left(\frac{4}{1-c} + \varepsilon\right)k = \left(1 + \left(\frac{1-c}{20} - 2\varepsilon'\right)\varepsilon\right) \cdot k \geq k$$

⁵neighbors in its own part, and moreover, every vertex $z \in C$ with degree i in G has at least $2\varphi_{c,\varepsilon'}(i) \geq 2k$ neighbors in both sets A and B . This completes the proof. \square

Now we can derive Corollaries 5 and 6 from Theorem 4 promptly.

Proof of Corollaries 5 and 6. First we consider Corollary 5. Fix $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. Set $c = 1 - \varepsilon$ and let $k_1(\varepsilon) = k_0(c, \varepsilon)$ be the constant obtained from Theorem 4. It suffices to prove the statement of Corollary 5 for sufficiently large integers $k \geq k_1(\varepsilon)$. Let G be a graph with minimum degree at least $c_\varepsilon \cdot k$, where $c_\varepsilon := \frac{4}{\varepsilon} + \varepsilon$. Using Theorem 4, there exists a tripartition $V(G) = A \cup B \cup C$ such that $|A|, |B| \leq \frac{\varepsilon n}{2}$, $|C| \geq (1 - \varepsilon)n$, every vertex in $A \cup B$ has at least k neighbors in its own part, and every vertex in C has at least $2k$ neighbors in both A and B . Distributing the vertices of C arbitrarily between A and B could yield a bisection $A' \cup B'$ such that every vertex has at least k neighbors in its own part, and every vertex from C has at least k neighbors in the opposite part. Since $|C| \geq (1 - \varepsilon)n$, at least $(1 - \varepsilon)n$ vertices satisfy condition (2), completing the proof of Corollary 5.

For Corollary 6, its first assertion follows easily from the $c = 0$ case of Theorem 4. To see the “moreover” part, we apply Theorem 4 with $c = \frac{1}{4}$. Let $k \geq k_0(\frac{1}{4}, \varepsilon)$ and let G be a graph with minimum degree at least $\left(\frac{16}{3} + \varepsilon\right)k$. Theorem 4 implies the existence of a tripartition $V(G) = A \cup B \cup C$ such that $|A|, |B| \leq \frac{3n}{8}$, $|C| \geq \frac{n}{4}$, every vertex in $A \cup B$ has at least k neighbors in its own part, and every vertex in C has at least $2k$ neighbors in the opposite part. Partition $C = C_1 \cup C_2$, with $|C_1| = \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - |A|$. Let $A' = A \cup C_1$ and $B' = B \cup C_2$. Then $A' \cup B'$ forms a bisection of G . It is evident that both $G[A']$ and $G[B']$ have minimum degree at least k , and the bipartite subgraph $(A', B')_G$ has at least $2k \cdot |C| \geq \frac{kn}{2}$ edges, i.e., it has average degree at least k . Hence, $A' \cup B'$ is the desired bisection. \square

⁵Here we use the facts that $i \geq \delta(G) \geq \left(\frac{4}{1-c} + \varepsilon\right)k$ and $\varepsilon' = (1 - c)^2\varepsilon/40$.

3.2 Proof of Theorem 14

Throughout this subsection, we adopt the following notation. Fix constants $c \in [0, 1)$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1-c}{4}]$. Let d_ε be the constant obtained from Lemma 12 (when applying it with ε). We can rewrite the expression for $\varphi_{c,\varepsilon}(i)$ from (8) as follows:

$$\varphi(i) := \varphi_{c,\varepsilon}(i) = \left(\frac{1-c}{4} - \frac{\mu_i}{2} \right) \cdot i, \quad \text{where } \mu_i = 4d_\varepsilon \cdot i^{\frac{1}{2}(\varepsilon-1)} + 2\varepsilon. \quad (9)$$

For brevity, we will treat $\varphi(i)$ as an integer throughout this subsection.⁶ Let G be an n -vertex graph, where $n \geq n_0(c, \varepsilon)$ is sufficiently large. Let V^i represent the set of all vertices of degree i in G .

For a subset $S \subseteq V(G)$, we say that a vertex $v \in V^i$ is **S -good** if

$$d_S(v) \geq 2(1 + \mu_i)\varphi(i). \quad (10)$$

We denote the set of all S -good vertices in V^i by V_S^i . Let I denote the set of all integers i with $\varphi(i) > 0$. For Theorem 14, it suffices to consider vertices in V^i with $i \in I$. This is because $\varphi(j) \leq 0$ for each $j \notin I$, and the degree condition in Theorem 14 trivially holds for these vertices in V^j .

We aim to establish the existence of a tripartition $V(G) = A \cup B \cup C$ that satisfies conditions (a)-(d) stated above. The construction of this tripartition unfolds in two major stages:

- An initial random partitioning step, which provides some essential yet lasting properties, and
- A deterministic refinement step, involving multiple rounds of local vertex relocations.

These two stages are addressed separately in the following two lemmas.

We now prove the first-stage lemma, which is obtained by modifying a random partition. Its property (1c), established through Lemma 12, serves as the most important foundation for the subsequent refinements. In a nutshell, all upcoming vertex relocation operations and their effects can be effectively controlled by the specific quantity defined in property (1c).

Lemma 15. *The graph G has a tripartition $V(G) = A \cup B \cup C$ such that the following hold:*

(1a). $\left(\frac{1-c}{2} - \frac{11}{10}\varepsilon\right)n \leq |A|, |B| \leq \left(\frac{1-c}{2} - \frac{9}{10}\varepsilon\right)n,$

(1b). *every vertex in C is both A -good and B -good, and*

(1c). $\sum_{i \geq 1} i \cdot |V^i \setminus (V_A^i \cap V_B^i)| \leq \frac{\varepsilon^2 n}{10^4}.$

Proof. Consider a random tripartition $V(G) = A \cup B \cup C$, where each vertex is independently placed in sets A, B and C with probabilities $\frac{1-c}{2} - \varepsilon, \frac{1-c}{2} - \varepsilon$ and $c + 2\varepsilon$, respectively.

Note that both $|A|$ and $|B|$ are distributed as $X = \text{Bin}(n, \frac{1-c}{2} - \varepsilon)$. Thus by Lemma 11 we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|X - \mathbb{E}[X]| > \frac{\varepsilon}{10}\mathbb{E}[X]\right) \leq 2e^{-\Omega(\varepsilon^2 n)} < \frac{1}{4}, \quad (11)$$

where the last inequality holds because $n \geq n_0(c, \varepsilon)$ is sufficiently large. Let

$$\lambda_i = \frac{4d_\varepsilon}{1-c} \cdot i^{\frac{1}{2}(\varepsilon-1)}.$$

⁶Observant readers will notice that rounding $\varphi(i)$ down to its floor will only affect the degree of each vertex by at most one, making this adjustment negligible for our results.

Then we see that

$$\left(\frac{1-c}{2} - \varepsilon\right) (1 - \lambda_i) i > \left(\frac{1-c}{2} - \frac{(1-c)\lambda_i}{2} - \varepsilon\right) i = \left(\frac{1-c}{2} - \frac{\mu_i}{2}\right) i > 2(1 + \mu_i)\varphi(i), \quad (12)$$

where the last inequality follows by (9) that $\varphi(i) = \left(\frac{1-c}{4} - \frac{\mu_i}{2}\right) i$. Recall the definition that $V_A^i \cap V_B^i$ denotes the set of vertices $v \in V^i$ satisfying $d_A(v) \geq 2(1 + \mu_i)\varphi(i)$ and $d_B(v) \geq 2(1 + \mu_i)\varphi(i)$. For every $v \in V^i$, both $d_A(v)$ and $d_B(v)$ are distributed as $Y = \text{Bin}(i, \frac{1-c}{2} - \varepsilon)$. Together with (12) and Lemma 11, this implies that the probability $p_i = \mathbb{P}(v \in V^i \setminus (V_A^i \cap V_B^i))$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} p_i &\leq 2 \cdot \mathbb{P}(Y < 2(1 + \mu_i)\varphi(i)) \leq 2 \cdot \mathbb{P}\left(Y < \left(\frac{1-c}{2} - \varepsilon\right) (1 - \lambda_i) i\right) = 2 \cdot \mathbb{P}(Y < (1 - \lambda_i)\mathbb{E}[Y]) \\ &\leq 4 \cdot \exp(-\lambda_i^2 \mathbb{E}[Y]/3) = 4 \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{16d_\varepsilon^2}{3(1-c)^2} \left(\frac{1-c}{2} - \varepsilon\right) i^\varepsilon\right) \leq 4 \cdot \exp(-d_\varepsilon^2 i^\varepsilon), \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where the last inequality holds because $\varepsilon \leq \frac{1-c}{4}$ and thus $\frac{16d_\varepsilon^2}{3(1-c)^2} \left(\frac{1-c}{2} - \varepsilon\right) \geq \frac{4d_\varepsilon^2}{3(1-c)} \geq d_\varepsilon^2$. Let

$$Z = \sum_{i \geq 1} i \cdot |V^i \setminus (V_A^i \cap V_B^i)|.$$

Using (13) and Lemma 12, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[Z] &= \sum_{i \geq 1} \sum_{v \in V^i} i \cdot \mathbb{P}(v \in V^i \setminus (V_A^i \cap V_B^i)) = \sum_{i \geq 1} i \cdot p_i \cdot |V^i| \\ &\leq \sum_{i \geq 1} i \cdot 4 \exp(-d_\varepsilon^2 i^\varepsilon) \cdot |V^i| \leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^{+\infty} i \cdot \exp(-d_\varepsilon^2 i^\varepsilon)\right) \cdot 4n \leq \frac{\varepsilon^2 n}{25000}. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

By Markov's inequality (Lemma 10), we have

$$\mathbb{P}(Z \geq 2 \cdot \mathbb{E}[Z]) \leq \frac{1}{2}. \quad (15)$$

Combining (11), (14), and (15), we conclude that there exists a tripartition $V(G) = A \cup B \cup C$ satisfying

$$\left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{10}\right) \left(\frac{1-c}{2} - \varepsilon\right) n \leq |A|, |B| \leq \left(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{10}\right) \left(\frac{1-c}{2} - \varepsilon\right) n \quad (16)$$

and

$$\sum_{i \geq 1} i \cdot |V^i \setminus (V_A^i \cap V_B^i)| = Z < 2 \cdot \mathbb{E}[Z] \leq \frac{\varepsilon^2 n}{10^4}. \quad (17)$$

Next, we move all vertices in $C \cap (\cup_{i \geq 1} V^i \setminus (V_A^i \cap V_B^i))$ to $A \cup B$, distributing these vertices in an arbitrary manner. We denote the resulting tripartition as $V(G) = A' \cup B' \cup C'$. We now claim $A' \cup B' \cup C'$ is the desired tripartition. It is important to observe that since $A \subseteq A'$, any vertex which is A -good is automatically A' -good. Thus we have $V_A^i \subseteq V_{A'}^i$ and similarly, $V_B^i \subseteq V_{B'}^i$. By (17), this implies that

$$\sum_{i \geq 1} i \cdot |V^i \setminus (V_{A'}^i \cap V_{B'}^i)| \leq \sum_{i \geq 1} i \cdot |V^i \setminus (V_A^i \cap V_B^i)| \leq \frac{\varepsilon^2 n}{10^4},$$

establishing property (1c) for the tripartition $A' \cup B' \cup C'$. Also, as there is no vertex of $V^i \setminus (V_A^i \cap V_B^i)$ belonging to C' , we obtain that $C' \cap V^i \subseteq V_A^i \cap V_B^i \subseteq V_{A'}^i \cap V_{B'}^i$, i.e., property (1b) holds for $A' \cup B' \cup C'$. Finally, using (17) again, the number of vertices moved out of C is

$$|C \cap (\cup_{i \geq 1} V^i \setminus (V_A^i \cap V_B^i))| \leq \sum_{i \geq 1} i \cdot |V^i \setminus (V_A^i \cap V_B^i)| < \frac{\varepsilon^2 n}{10^4}.$$

So evidently, $0 \leq |A'| - |A| \leq \varepsilon^2 n / 10^4$ and $0 \leq |B'| - |B| \leq \varepsilon^2 n / 10^4$. By (16), we can derive that

$$\left(\frac{1-c}{2} - \frac{21}{20} \varepsilon \right) n < |A|, |B| < \left(\frac{1-c}{2} - \frac{19}{20} \varepsilon \right) n.$$

Putting everything together, we see that property (1a) holds for the parts A' and B' . This finishes the proof of Lemma 15. \square

Next, we present our key technical lemma (Lemma 16) in this section. At a high level, it builds upon the tripartition $A \cup B \cup C$ from Lemma 15 to construct a modified tripartition $A' \cup B' \cup C'$ that both preserves properties (1a)-(1c) and ensures all vertices in A' satisfy condition (b) of Theorem 14, or equivalently property (2d) of this lemma. To complete the proof of Theorem 14, we will apply this lemma a second time to ensure that all vertices in a modified version of B' also satisfy condition (c) of Theorem 14, where property (2e) becomes crucial. The proof of this lemma employs a deterministic yet technically involved process, iteratively relocating vertices between parts through multiple carefully designed steps. While the full details are intricate, we hope this intuitive description may help readers navigate the forthcoming formal arguments.

Lemma 16. *Let $A \cup B \cup C$ be a tripartition of $V(G)$ such that every vertex in C is both A -good and B -good, and*

$$\sum_{i \geq 1} i \cdot |(A \cap V^i) \setminus V_A^i| \leq \frac{\varepsilon^2 n}{250}. \quad (18)$$

Then there exists a tripartition $A' \cup B' \cup C'$ of $V(G)$ such that the following hold:

(2a). $B \subseteq B'$ and $C' \subseteq C$,⁷

(2b). $|A| - \frac{\varepsilon n}{500} \leq |A'| \leq |A| + \frac{\varepsilon n}{500}$, $|B| \leq |B'| \leq |B| + \frac{\varepsilon n}{500}$ and $|C| - \frac{\varepsilon n}{500} \leq |C'| \leq |C|$,

(2c). every vertex in C' is both A' -good and B' -good,

(2d). every vertex $x \in A' \cap V^i$ satisfies $d_{A'}(x) \geq \varphi(i)$, and

(2e). every vertex in $B' \setminus B$ is B' -good. In particular, this shows that for each integer $i \geq 1$,

$$(B' \cap V^i) \setminus V_{B'}^i \subseteq (B \cap V^i) \setminus V_B^i. \quad (19)$$

Proof. Let $A \cup B \cup C$ be a tripartition of $V(G)$ given by the lemma. In what follows, beginning with $A \cup B \cup C$, we will define a sequence of operations that carefully relocate vertices. These operations will produce a series of tripartitions of G , each satisfying progressively stronger properties that bring

⁷One cannot establish a containment relationship between A and A' in this lemma.

us closer to the desired properties. Importantly, in each round, only a small fraction of vertices are affected. This ensures that the final tripartition retains a distribution very close to the original one.

First, we identify a large subset $A^* \subseteq A$ satisfying property (2d). Later, we will see that this subset A^* ensures that most vertices in A remain unchanged throughout subsequent operations. To construct A^* , we apply Lemma 13 to $H = G[A]$. Let I denote the set of all integers $1 \leq i \leq n$ with $\varphi(i) > 0$. Let $A_i := A \cap V^i$, $\eta_i := \mu_i$ and $a_i := \varphi(i)$ for each $i \in I$. By the definition of A_i^+ , we observe

$$A_i^+ = \{v \in A_i : d_H(v) \geq 2(1 + \eta_i)a_i\} = \{v \in A \cap V^i : d_A(v) \geq 2(1 + \mu_i)\varphi(i)\} = A \cap V_A^i.$$

Since $\eta = \min \eta_i \geq 2\varepsilon$ and $a_i = \varphi(i) \leq \frac{i}{4}$, it holds from (18) that

$$\Omega := \left(1 + \frac{1}{\eta}\right) \sum_{i \in I} a_i \cdot |A_i \setminus A_i^+| \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sum_{i \in I} \frac{i}{4} \cdot |(A \cap V^i) \setminus V_A^i| \leq \frac{\varepsilon n}{1000} < |A| = |V(H)|.$$

By Lemma 13, there is a subset A^* of A such that

$$d_{A^*}(x) \geq \varphi(i) \text{ for every } x \in A^* \cap V^i, \quad \text{and} \quad |A \setminus A^*| \leq \sum_{i \geq i_0} \varphi(i) \cdot |(A \cap V^i) \setminus A^*| \leq \Omega \leq \frac{\varepsilon n}{1000}. \quad (20)$$

Next, we implement a greedy algorithm that iteratively moves a small proportion of vertices from $A \cup C$ into B . The algorithm produces an intermediate tripartition $V(G) = A_1 \cup B_1 \cup C_1$ satisfying $A^* \subseteq A_1$. Initially, let $(A^0, B^0, C^0) = (A, B, C)$. Given that $A^k \cup B^k \cup C^k$ is defined, if there exists a vertex $v_k \in A^k \cap V^i$ for some $i \geq i_0$ satisfying

$$|N_G(v_k) \cap (A^k \cup C^k)| < \varphi(i), \quad (21)$$

then update $A^{k+1} \cup B^{k+1} \cup C^{k+1}$ by

$$A^{k+1} = A^k - \{v_k\}, \quad C^{k+1} = C^k \setminus N_G(v_k) \quad \text{and} \quad B^{k+1} = B^k \cup \{v_k\} \cup (N_G(v_k) \cap C^k);$$

otherwise, terminate this algorithm and return the current tripartition as $A_1 \cup B_1 \cup C_1$.

We analyze the properties of the tripartition $A_1 \cup B_1 \cup C_1$. By construction, for every iteration k we have the following nested containments: $A_1 \subseteq A^{k+1} \subseteq A^k \subseteq A$, $C_1 \subseteq C^{k+1} \subseteq C^k \subseteq C$, and $B \subseteq B^k \subseteq B^{k+1} \subseteq B_1$. Moreover, every vertex $x \in A_1 \cap V^i$ satisfies

$$|N_G(x) \cap (A_1 \cup C_1)| \geq \varphi(i). \quad (22)$$

From (20), we deduce $A^* \subseteq A_1 \subseteq A$ and

$$|A \setminus A_1| \leq |A \setminus A^*| \leq \frac{\varepsilon n}{1000}, \quad (23)$$

where $A \setminus A_1 = \{v_k : k \geq 0\}$. Since each $v_k \in V^i$ satisfies $|N_G(v_k) \cap C^k| < \varphi(i)$ (by (21)), we bound:

$$|C \setminus C_1| = \sum_k |N_G(v_k) \cap C^k| < \sum_{i \geq i_0} \varphi(i) \cdot |(A \setminus A_1) \cap V^i| \leq \sum_{i \geq i_0} \varphi(i) \cdot |(A \setminus A^*) \cap V^i| \leq \frac{\varepsilon n}{1000}, \quad (24)$$

where the last inequality follows from (20). Therefore,

$$|B_1 \setminus B| = |A \setminus A_1| + |C \setminus C_1| \leq \frac{\varepsilon n}{500}. \quad (25)$$

We claim that for every $k \geq 0$,

$$\text{each vertex in } C^k \text{ is both } A^k\text{-good and } B^k\text{-good.} \quad (26)$$

We prove this by induction on k . The base case $k = 0$ holds since every vertex in C is A -good and B -good by assumption. Now suppose (26) holds for some $k \geq 0$. Consider any vertex $x \in C^{k+1} = C^k \setminus N_G(v_k)$. Since $x \in C^{k+1} \subseteq C^k$, by induction x is B^k -good. Since $B^k \subseteq B^{k+1}$, this evidently implies that x is also B^{k+1} -good. Moreover, since x is not adjacent to v_k , crucially we have $d_{A^k}(x) = d_{A^{k+1}}(x)$, which implies that x remains A^{k+1} -good. This proves (26) and in particular, implies that

$$\text{each vertex in } C_1 \text{ is both } A_1\text{-good and } B_1\text{-good.} \quad (27)$$

We also claim that for every $k \geq 0$,

$$\text{each vertex in } B^{k+1} \setminus B^k \text{ is } B^k\text{-good.} \quad (28)$$

Note that $B^{k+1} \setminus B^k = \{v_k\} \cup (N_G(v_k) \cap C^k)$, so by (26) it is enough to show that v_k is B^k -good, i.e., $|N_G(v_k) \cap B^k| \geq 2(1 + \mu_i)\varphi(i)$ when $v_k \in V^i$. This can be verified by (21), using a routine calculation that $i - \varphi(i) \geq 2(1 + \mu_i)\varphi(i)$.⁸ Since B^k grows to B_1 as k increases, we derive from (28) that

$$\text{each vertex in } B_1 \setminus B \text{ is } B_1\text{-good.} \quad (29)$$

Let us point out that the tripartition $A_1 \cup B_1 \cup C_1$ satisfies all desired properties of Lemma 16, except for property (2d). To fix this, we move some vertices from C_1 into A_1 as follows. For every $x \in A_1 \cap V^i$, if $d_{A_1}(x) < \varphi(i)$, then in view of (22) there exists a subset R_x containing exactly $\varphi(i) - d_{A_1}(x)$ neighbors of x in C_1 ; otherwise $d_{A_1}(x) \geq \varphi(i)$, let $R_x = \emptyset$. Note that if $R_x \neq \emptyset$ for some $x \in A_1$, then $d_{A^*}(x) \leq d_{A_1}(x) < \varphi(i)$, which together with (20) imply that $x \in A_1 \setminus A^*$. We then move all vertices in the set

$$R := \cup_{x \in A_1} R_x = \cup_{x \in A_1 \setminus A^*} R_x \quad (30)$$

from C_1 into A_1 . This results in a new tripartition, denoted by $V(G) = A_2 \cup B_2 \cup C_2$, where

$$A_2 = A_1 \cup R, \quad B_2 = B_1, \quad \text{and } C_2 = C_1 \setminus R.$$

We now show $A_2 \cup B_2 \cup C_2$ is the desired tripartition for this lemma. Clearly, $B \subseteq B_1 = B_2$ and $C_2 \subseteq C_1 \subseteq C$, thus property (2a) holds. For every $x \in A_1 \cap V^i$, from the construction we see $d_{A_2}(x) \geq \varphi(i)$. By (27), every vertex in $R \subseteq C_1$ is A_1 -good. Therefore, every vertex $x \in A_2 \cap V^i$ satisfies that $d_{A_2}(x) \geq \varphi(i)$, establishing property (2d) for $A_2 \cup B_2 \cup C_2$. Since $A_1 \subseteq A_2$ and $B_1 = B_2$, every A_1 -good (or B_1 -good) vertex remains A_2 -good (or B_2 -good). Therefore (27) and (29) imply properties (2c) and (2e) for $A_2 \cup B_2 \cup C_2$, respectively. It remains to show property (2b) for $A_2 \cup B_2 \cup C_2$. To do so, we need to estimate the size of R . We can derive that

$$|R| \leq \sum_{x \in A_1 \setminus A^*} |R_x| \leq \sum_i \varphi(i) \cdot |(A \cap V^i) \setminus A^*| \leq \frac{\varepsilon n}{1000},$$

where the first inequality follows by (30), the second one follows by the fact $A_1 \subseteq A$ and by the construction that $|R_x| \leq \varphi(i)$ for each $x \in A_1 \cap V^i$, and the last one follows by (20). This upper bound on $|R|$, together with (23), (24), and (25), establishes property (2b) for the tripartition $A_2 \cup B_2 \cup C_2$, thereby completing the proof of Lemma 16. \square

⁸The inequality $i - \varphi(i) \geq 2(1 + \mu_i)\varphi(i)$ is equivalent to $1 \geq (3 + 2\mu_i) \left(\frac{1-\varepsilon}{4} - \frac{\mu_i}{2}\right)$, which is straightforward to verify.

We are ready to complete the proof of Theorem 14.

Proof of Theorem 14. Fix constants c, ε with $0 \leq c < 1$ and $0 < \varepsilon \leq \frac{1-c}{4}$. Let G be a graph with $n \geq n_0(c, \varepsilon)$ vertices. By Lemma 15, there exists a tripartition $V(G) = A \cup B \cup C$ such that $(\frac{1-c}{2} - \frac{11}{10}\varepsilon)n \leq |A|, |B| \leq (\frac{1-c}{2} - \frac{9}{10}\varepsilon)n$, every vertex in C is both A -good and B -good, and

$$\sum_{i \geq 1} i \cdot |V^i \setminus (V_A^i \cap V_B^i)| \leq \frac{\varepsilon^2 n}{10^4}.$$

Since $A \cap B = \emptyset$, this clearly implies that

$$\sum_{i \geq 1} i \cdot |(A \cap V^i) \setminus V_A^i| + \sum_{i \geq 1} i \cdot |(B \cap V^i) \setminus V_B^i| \leq \frac{\varepsilon^2 n}{10^4}. \quad (31)$$

So the tripartition $A \cup B \cup C$ satisfies all assumptions of Lemma 16. Using Lemma 16, there exists a tripartition $V(G) = A' \cup B' \cup C'$ satisfying properties (2a)-(2e). In particular, we can derive that $(\frac{1-c}{2} - \frac{6}{5}\varepsilon)n \leq |A'|, |B'| \leq (\frac{1-c}{2} - \frac{4}{5}\varepsilon)n$, every vertex in C' is A' -good and B' -good, and

$$\text{every } x \in A' \cap V^i \text{ satisfies } d_{A'}(x) \geq \varphi(i). \quad (32)$$

Moreover, using property (2e) and the above inequality (31), we can obtain that

$$\sum_{i \geq 1} i \cdot |(B' \cap V^i) \setminus V_{B'}^i| \leq \sum_{i \geq 1} i \cdot |(B \cap V^i) \setminus V_B^i| \leq \frac{\varepsilon^2 n}{10^4}.$$

By swapping the roles of A' and B' , we see that the tripartition $A' \cup B' \cup C'$ also satisfies the assumptions of Lemma 16. Applying Lemma 16 again (i.e., exchanging the roles of A' and B' here), we can find a new tripartition $V(G) = A'' \cup B'' \cup C''$ such that the following properties hold:

- (3a). $A' \subseteq A''$ and $C'' \subseteq C'$,
- (3b). $(\frac{1-c-3\varepsilon}{2})n \leq |A''|, |B''| \leq (\frac{1-c-\varepsilon}{2})n$,
- (3c). each vertex in C'' is both A'' -good and B'' -good,
- (3d). every vertex $x \in B'' \cap V^i$ satisfies $d_{B''}(x) \geq \varphi(i)$, and
- (3e). every vertex in $A'' \setminus A'$ is A'' -good.

Since $A' \subseteq A''$ (from property (3a)), we can derive from (32) and property (3e) that

$$\text{every vertex } x \in A'' \cap V^i \text{ satisfies } d_{A''}(x) \geq \varphi(i).$$

Using this, along with properties (3b) through (3d), we conclude that the obtained tripartition $V(G) = A'' \cup B'' \cup C''$ satisfies all conditions of Theorem 14, thereby completing the proof. \square

4 Finding bisections with external degree constraints

The main result of this section, Theorem 17, establishes graph tripartitions satisfying external degree constraints. It serves as the natural external-degree analogue of Theorem 14 (which concerns internal degree constraints). From a probabilistic perspective, Theorem 17 asserts that for any $c \in [0, 1)$, every n -vertex graph G admits a tripartition $V(G) = A \cup B \cup C$ with approximately prescribed part sizes $(\frac{1-c}{2})n$, $(\frac{1-c}{2})n$, and cn , respectively, such that every vertex in $A \cup B$ has at least roughly half of its expected neighbors in the other part, and every vertex in C has approximately the expected number of neighbors in both A and B . As an immediate consequence, by suitably redistributing vertices from C to A and B , we obtain corresponding results for bisections with external degree constraints.

For disjoint subsets A and B of $V(G)$, we note that (A, B) denotes the induced bipartite subgraph of G with parts A and B . Given constants $c \in [0, 1)$ and sufficiently small $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, we introduce the following function (which is a slightly different from the one in (8)):

$$\psi_{c,\varepsilon}(i) = \left(\frac{1-c}{4}\right)i - \left(2d_{c,\varepsilon} \cdot i^{\frac{1}{2}(1+\varepsilon)} + \varepsilon \cdot i\right), \quad (33)$$

where $d_{c,\varepsilon} > 0$ is a constant⁹ such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{+\infty} i \cdot \exp(-d_{c,\varepsilon}^2 i^\varepsilon) \leq \frac{(1-c)\varepsilon^2}{10^5}. \quad (34)$$

Notably, we have $\psi_{c,\varepsilon}(i) \rightarrow (\frac{1-c}{4})i - o(i)$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. The formal statement is as follows.

Theorem 17. *Let c, ε be constants with $0 \leq c < 1$ and $0 < \varepsilon \leq \frac{1-c}{10}$. Then every graph G with $n \geq n_0(c, \varepsilon)$ vertices admits a tripartition $V(G) = A \cup B \cup C$ such that*

- (a). $(\frac{1-c-3\varepsilon}{2})n \leq |A|, |B| \leq (\frac{1-c-\varepsilon}{2})n$,
- (b). $d_{(A,B)}(v) \geq \psi_{c,\varepsilon}(d_G(v))$ for every vertex $v \in A \cup B$,
- (c). $d_A(v) \geq 2 \cdot \psi_{c,\varepsilon}(d_G(v))$ and $d_B(v) \geq 2 \cdot \psi_{c,\varepsilon}(d_G(v))$ for every vertex $v \in C$

The proofs of Theorems 2 and 7, along with Corollaries 8 and 9, follow exactly the same arguments presented in Subsection 3.1, with Theorem 14 replaced by Theorem 17. We therefore omit these nearly identical proofs.

The proof of Theorem 17 follows the same two-stage framework as Theorem 14, consisting of an initial random partitioning step and a deterministic refinement step. The first step remains nearly identical, though it requires a modified version of Lemma 15. The second step, however, requires substantially different strategies for relocating vertices between parts. It is important to emphasize that both proofs rely on the same foundational fact that all vertex relocation operations and their effects are effectively controlled by the quantity defined in property (1c) of Lemma 15 (or Lemma 18).

4.1 Proof of Theorem 17

Throughout the rest of this section, we fix constants $c \in [0, 1)$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1-c}{10}]$. We have an equivalent expression for $\psi(i) := \psi_{c,\varepsilon}(i)$ as follows

$$\psi(i) = \left(\frac{1-c}{4} - \frac{\mu_i}{2}\right) \cdot i, \quad \text{where } \mu_i = 4d_{c,\varepsilon} \cdot i^{\frac{1}{2}(\varepsilon-1)} + 2\varepsilon. \quad (35)$$

⁹By the proof of Lemma 12, the constant $d_{c,\varepsilon}$ can be chosen as $1000/(\sqrt{1-c} \cdot \varepsilon^2)$.

Let G be a graph with n vertices, where $n \geq n_0(c, \varepsilon)$ is sufficiently large. Let V^i be the set of all vertices of degree i in G . Let I denote the set of all integers i with $\psi(i) > 0$. As we observed earlier, it suffices to consider vertices $v \in V^i$ with $i \in I$; we say such vertices are *active*.

We need a modified version of Lemma 15. A crucial technical requirement arises later in the deterministic refinement step, where we need $i = O(\psi(i))$ (see the upcoming (45)), which does not hold for small values of i . This obstacle necessitates replacing $\psi(i)$ with the following modified function

$$\psi^*(i) = \max \left\{ \psi(i), \left(\frac{1-c}{8} \right) i \right\} \text{ for all } i \in I. \quad (36)$$

This modification leads to a revised definition of “ S -goodness” for subsets S of $V(G)$, along with corresponding adjustments to Lemma 15. To be precise, for each $i \in I$, we define

$$\lambda_i = \frac{4d_{c,\varepsilon}}{1-c} \cdot i^{\frac{1}{2}(\varepsilon-1)} \quad \text{and} \quad \eta_i = \begin{cases} \mu_i & \text{if } \psi(i) \geq \left(\frac{1-c}{8} \right) i \\ 4\varepsilon\lambda_i/(1-c) & \text{if } \psi(i) < \left(\frac{1-c}{8} \right) i \end{cases} \quad (37)$$

In this section, for a subset $S \subseteq V(G)$, we say an active vertex $x \in V^i$ is **S -good** if

$$d_S(x) \geq 2(1 + \eta_i) \cdot \psi^*(i) = \begin{cases} 2(1 + \mu_i) \cdot \psi(i) & \text{if } \psi(i) \geq \left(\frac{1-c}{8} \right) i \\ ((1-c)/4 + \varepsilon\lambda_i) \cdot i & \text{if } \psi(i) < \left(\frac{1-c}{8} \right) i. \end{cases} \quad (38)$$

For $i \in I$, we denote the set of all S -good vertices in V^i by V_S^i .

The following lemma presents a modified version of Lemma 15. We provide a sketch of the proof.

Lemma 18. *The graph G has a tripartition $V(G) = X \cup Y \cup Z$ such that the following hold:*

- (a) $(\frac{1-c}{2} - \frac{11}{10}\varepsilon)n \leq |X|, |Y| \leq (\frac{1-c}{2} - \frac{9}{10}\varepsilon)n$,
- (b) every active vertex in Z is both X -good and Y -good, and
- (c) $\sum_{i \in I} i \cdot |V^i \setminus (V_X^i \cap V_Y^i)| \leq \frac{(1-c)\varepsilon^2 n}{10^4}$.

Proof. Consider a random tripartition $V(G) = X \cup Y \cup Z$, where each vertex is independently placed in X , Y , and Z with probabilities $\frac{1-c}{2} - \varepsilon$, $\frac{1-c}{2} - \varepsilon$, and $c + 2\varepsilon$, respectively.

Consider the probability $p_i = \mathbb{P}(v \in V^i \setminus (V_X^i \cap V_Y^i))$. It suffices to consider all $i \in I$, for which $\psi(i) > 0$ and thus $\mu_i < \frac{1-c}{2}$. We claim that

$$p_i \leq \exp(-d_{c,\varepsilon}^2 i^\varepsilon) \quad \text{holds for all } i \in I.$$

For $i \in I$ with $\psi(i) \geq \left(\frac{1-c}{8} \right) i$, we observe that the S -goodness here is identical to that of Section 3, hence through the same arguments of (12) and (13), we can derive the conclusion that $p_i \leq \exp(-d_{c,\varepsilon}^2 i^\varepsilon)$.

It remains to consider integers $i \in I$ satisfying $\psi(i) < \left(\frac{1-c}{8} \right) i$. This case requires separate treatment, which we address below. Note that $(1-c)\lambda_i + 2\varepsilon = \mu_i < \frac{1-c}{2}$. So we have

$$\left(\frac{1-c}{2} - \varepsilon \right) (1 - \lambda_i) = \frac{1-c}{2} - \frac{(1-c)\lambda_i + 2\varepsilon}{2} + \varepsilon\lambda_i \geq \frac{1-c}{4} + \varepsilon\lambda_i. \quad (39)$$

For any $v \in V^i$, both $d_X(v)$ and $d_Y(v)$ are distributed as $W = \text{Bin}(i, \frac{1-c}{2} - \varepsilon)$. By (38) and (39),

$$\begin{aligned} p_i &\leq 2 \cdot \mathbb{P}(W < ((1-c)/4 + \varepsilon\lambda_i) \cdot i) \leq 2 \cdot \mathbb{P}\left(W < \left(\frac{1-c}{2} - \varepsilon\right) (1 - \lambda_i)i\right) \\ &= 2 \cdot \mathbb{P}(W < (1 - \lambda_i)\mathbb{E}[W]) \leq 4 \cdot \exp(-\lambda_i^2\mathbb{E}[W]/3) \leq 4 \cdot \exp(-d_{c,\varepsilon}^2 i^\varepsilon), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows by the same proof as in (13). This proves the above claim.

Now we consider

$$P = \sum_{i \in I} i \cdot |V^i \setminus (V_X^i \cap V_Y^i)|.$$

Using the above claim and (34), we derive that its expectation satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}[P] \leq \left(\sum_{i \in I} i \cdot \exp(-d_{c,\varepsilon}^2 i^\varepsilon) \right) \cdot 4n \leq \frac{(1-c)\varepsilon^2 n}{25000}.$$

Now, by following the same arguments as in the remainder of the proof of Lemma 15, we obtain the desired tripartition. We emphasize that, for our purposes, it suffices to consider only the active vertices; that is why property (c) sums only over $i \in I$. \square

With the initial tripartition prepared in Lemma 18, we now present the proof of Theorem 17.

Proof of Theorem 17. Fix constants $0 \leq c < 1$ and $0 < \varepsilon \leq \frac{1-c}{10}$. Let G be a graph G with $n \geq n_0(c, \varepsilon)$ vertices. Let $V(G) = X \cup Y \cup Z$ be the tripartition from Lemma 18 such that $(\frac{1-c}{2} - \frac{11}{10}\varepsilon)n \leq |X|, |Y| \leq (\frac{1-c}{2} + \frac{9}{10}\varepsilon)n$, every active vertex in Z is both X -good and Y -good, and

$$\sum_{i \in I} i \cdot |V^i \setminus (V_X^i \cap V_Y^i)| \leq \frac{(1-c)\varepsilon^2 n}{10^4}. \quad (40)$$

Recall the definition of η_i in (37). We claim that

$$\eta_i \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{5} \text{ for each } i \in I, \text{ and thus } \eta = \min_{i \in I} \eta_i \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{5}. \quad (41)$$

If $\eta_i = \mu_i$, then $\eta_i = 4d_{c,\varepsilon} \cdot i^{\frac{1}{2}(\varepsilon-1)} + 2\varepsilon \geq 2\varepsilon$. Now assume that $\psi(i) < (\frac{1-c}{8})i$ and $\eta_i = 4\varepsilon\lambda_i/(1-c)$. In this case, using (35) we see that $(1-c)\lambda_i + 2\varepsilon = \mu_i > \frac{1-c}{4}$. Since $\varepsilon \leq \frac{1-c}{10}$, this implies that $\lambda_i \geq \frac{1}{20}$ and thus $\eta_i = 4\varepsilon\lambda_i/(1-c) \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{5}$, proving this claim.

Let $H = (X, Y)_G$ be the induced bipartite subgraph of G with parts X and Y . We propose applying Lemma 13 to H by choosing $A_i := V^i \cap V(H)$, $a_i := \psi^*(i)$, and η_i as defined in (37), for all $i \in I$. Let A_i^+ be as defined in Lemma 13, that is,

$$A_i^+ = \{v \in A_i : d_H(v) \geq 2(1 + \eta_i)a_i\} = \{v \in A_i : d_H(v) \geq 2(1 + \eta_i)\psi^*(i)\}.$$

Using (38), we derive that

$$A_i^+ = (V_X^i \cap Y) \cup (V_Y^i \cap X) \supseteq V_X^i \cap V_Y^i \cap A_i.$$

Since every active vertex in Z is both X -good and Y -good, we see that for every $i \in I$,

$$A_i \setminus A_i^+ \subseteq A_i \setminus (V_X^i \cap V_Y^i) = V^i \setminus (V_X^i \cap V_Y^i).$$

This, combined with (40) and (41), implies that condition (7) of Lemma 13 is satisfied:

$$\left(1 + \frac{1}{\eta}\right) \cdot \sum_{i \in I} a_i \cdot |A_i \setminus A_i^+| \leq \frac{10}{\varepsilon} \cdot \sum_{i \in I} i \cdot |V^i \setminus (V_X^i \cap V_Y^i)| \leq \frac{(1-c)\varepsilon n}{1000} < |V(H)|. \quad (42)$$

Then Lemma 13 guarantees the existence of a non-empty bipartite subgraph H' of H with parts $X' \subseteq X$ and $Y' \subseteq Y$, satisfying that

$$d_{H'}(x) \geq a_i = \psi^*(i) \geq \psi(i) \text{ for every } x \in (X' \cup Y') \cap V^i, \quad (43)$$

and

$$|V(H \setminus H')| \leq \sum_{i \in I} a_i |A_i \setminus V(H')| \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{\eta}\right) \cdot \sum_{i \in I} a_i |A_i \setminus A_i^+| \leq \frac{(1-c)\varepsilon n}{1000}, \quad (44)$$

where $(X \setminus X') \cup (Y \setminus Y') = V(H \setminus H') \subseteq \cup_{i \in I} A_i$. Using the definition (36) of ψ^* , we see that

$$i \leq \frac{8\psi^*(i)}{1-c} = \frac{8a_i}{1-c} \text{ for each } i \in I.$$

This, together with (44), implies that

$$\sum_{i \in I} i \cdot |V(H \setminus H') \cap V^i| \leq \frac{8}{1-c} \cdot \sum_{i \in I} a_i |V(H \setminus H') \cap V^i| = \frac{8}{1-c} \cdot \sum_{i \in I} a_i |A_i \setminus V(H')| \leq \frac{\varepsilon n}{125}. \quad (45)$$

We further define a 4-partition $V(G) = X_1 \cup Y_1 \cup Z_1 \cup W_1$, where

$$X_1 = X', \quad Y_1 = Y', \quad W_1 = V(H \setminus H') \cup \left(\bigcup_{x \in V(H \setminus H')} (N_G(x) \cap Z) \right), \quad \text{and } Z_1 = Z \setminus W_1.$$

Then every $x \in Z_1$ satisfies that $N_G(x) \cap X \subseteq X_1$ and $N_G(x) \cap Y \subseteq Y_1$. So the fact that every active vertex in Z is X -good and Y -good directly implies that

$$\text{every active vertex in } Z_1 \text{ is } X_1\text{-good and } Y_1\text{-good.} \quad (46)$$

On the other hand, (44) and (45) show that

$$|W_1| \leq |V(H \setminus H')| + \sum_{i \in I} i \cdot |V(H \setminus H') \cap V^i| \leq \frac{\varepsilon n}{50}. \quad (47)$$

We claim that for every $i \in I$ and every vertex $x \in W_1 \cap V^i$,

$$|N_G(x) \cap (X_1 \cup Y_1 \cup W_1)| \geq 4\psi(i). \quad (48)$$

This is clear for every $x \in V(H \setminus H') \cap V^i$, as $|N_G(x) \cap (X_1 \cup Y_1 \cup W_1)| = d_G(x) = i \geq 4\psi(i)$. It remains to consider $x \in (W_1 \cap Z) \cap V^i$. Since every active vertex in Z is X -good and Y -good, we see that $|N_G(x) \cap (X_1 \cup Y_1 \cup W_1)| \geq d_{X \cup Y}(x) \geq 4(1 + \eta_i)a_i \geq 4a_i \geq 4\psi(i)$. This proves the claim.

We then apply a greedy algorithm, which iteratively moves some vertices of W_1 to $X_1 \cup Y_1$ as follows. Initially, let $X_2 := X_1, Y_2 := Y_1$ and $W_2 := W_1$. If there is a vertex $x \in W_2 \cap V^i$ with $d_{X_2}(x) \geq \psi(i)$, then update $W_2 := W_2 \setminus \{x\}, X_2 := X_2 \cup \{x\}$ and $Y_2 := Y_2 \cup \{x\}$; if there is a vertex $x \in W_2 \cap V^i$ with

$d_{Y_2}(x) \geq \psi(i)$, then update $W_2 := W_2 \setminus \{x\}$, $X_2 := X_2 \cup \{x\}$ and $Y_2 := Y_2$; otherwise, this algorithm terminates. When terminating, this results in a new 4-partition $V(G) = X_2 \cup Y_2 \cup Z_2 \cup W_2$ such that

$$X_1 \subseteq X_2, \quad Y_1 \subseteq Y_2, \quad Z_2 = Z_1, \quad W_2 \subseteq W_1,$$

and for every $x \in W_2 \cap V^i$, $d_{X_2}(x) < \psi(i)$ and $d_{Y_2}(x) < \psi(i)$. The last property, together with (48) and the fact that $X_2 \cup Y_2 \cup W_2 = X_1 \cup X_2 \cup W_1$, implies that for every $x \in W_2 \cap V^i$, it holds

$$d_{W_2}(x) \geq 2\psi(i).$$

Let (W^+, W^-) be a max-cut of $G[W_2]$. Then by a well-known property, for every $x \in W_2 \cap V^i$,

$$d_{(W^+, W^-)}(x) \geq \frac{d_{W_2}(x)}{2} \geq \psi(i). \quad (49)$$

The above greedy algorithm shows that every vertex $x \in (X_2 \setminus X_1) \cap V^i$ satisfies $d_{Y_2}(x) \geq \psi(i)$. Combining this with the fact $X' = X_1 \subseteq X_2$ and (43), we obtain

$$d_{Y_2}(v) \geq \psi(i) \text{ for every } v \in X_2 \cap V^i, \text{ and similarly, } d_{X_2}(v) \geq \psi(i) \text{ for every } v \in Y_2 \cap V^i. \quad (50)$$

Now we define a tripartition $V(G) = X_3 \cup Y_3 \cup Z_3$ satisfying that

$$X_3 = X_2 \cup W^+, \quad Y_3 = Y_2 \cup W^-, \quad \text{and} \quad Z_3 = Z_2 = Z_1.$$

We show this is the desired tripartition. Firstly, by (49) and (50), we see clearly that

$$d_{(X_3, Y_3)}(x) \geq \psi(i) \text{ holds for every } x \in (X_3 \cup Y_3) \cap V^i,$$

i.e., condition (b) of Theorem 17 holds. Secondly, since $X \setminus W_1 \subseteq X_1 \subseteq X_3 \subseteq X_1 \cup W_1 \subseteq X \cup W_1$, we can derive from (47) that

$$\left(\frac{1-c-3\varepsilon}{2} \right) n \leq |X| - |W_1| \leq |X_3| \leq |X| + |W_1| \leq \left(\frac{1-c-\varepsilon}{2} \right) n;$$

similarly, we have $\left(\frac{1-c-3\varepsilon}{2} \right) n \leq |Y_3| \leq \left(\frac{1-c-\varepsilon}{2} \right) n$. So condition (a) of Theorem 17 holds. Finally, since $X_1 \subseteq X_3, Y_1 \subseteq Y_3$ and $Z_3 = Z_1$, by (46) we can derive that every active vertex in Z_3 is both X_3 -good and Y_3 -good. Using (36) and (38), this shows that every active vertex $v \in Z_3 \cap V^i$ satisfies both $d_{X_3}(v) \geq 2 \cdot \psi(i)$ and $d_{Y_3}(v) \geq 2 \cdot \psi(i)$, so condition (c) of Theorem 17 holds, finishing the proof. \square

5 Concluding remarks and open problems

In this paper, we combine both probabilistic and deterministic arguments to prove several results on bisections in graphs under degree constraints. Our main results in general settings demonstrate that every graph G has a bisection where each vertex v has at least $d_G(v)/4 - o(d_G(v))$ neighbors in its own part, as well as a bisection where each vertex v has at least $d_G(v)/4 - o(d_G(v))$ neighbors in the opposite part. It would be extremely interesting to improve the aforementioned $1/4$ constants to $1/2$, as this would be optimal when considering random bisections. If this improvement holds true, it would also yield a weak version of the conjecture by Bollobás and Scott (Conjecture 8 in [4]) regarding bisections with external degree constraints.

Specifically, we would like to raise the following minimum-degree version of the question:

Question 19. *Is there a function $f(k) = 2k + o(k)$ such that every graph with minimum degree at least $f(k)$ has a bisection where each vertex has at least k neighbors in its own part, as well as a bisection where each vertex has at least k neighbors in the opposite part?*

We demonstrate in Corollaries 6 and 9 that both bounds of $4k + o(k)$ are sufficient. However, Lemma 13 presents a significant barrier, preventing us from improving these bounds beyond $4k + o(k)$ in either direction. Moreover, there are additional obstacles in our arguments. For the external degree direction, the calculation required in footnote 8 (i.e., one line above (29)) indicates that the best possible bound (aside from Lemma 13) that could be derived from our methods is at least $3k + o(k)$. In the internal degree direction, the analysis between (48) and (49) suggests that our proof cannot achieve a minimum degree bound lower than $4k + o(k)$ on a second occasion. To address Question 19, we believe that some novel ideas will be necessary.

We note that both Corollaries 5 and 6 extend the result (4) of Kühn and Osthus [18], in addition to the bisection requirement. One may wonder if there is a bisection analog for another result (3) of Kühn and Osthus [18]. The answer is negative even for $k = 1$, as demonstrated by the following graphs first provided in [18]: for any $\ell \geq 2$ and sufficiently large n , let G be the bipartite graph with parts $X = [n]$ and $Y = \{v_F : F \in \binom{[n]}{\ell}\}$, where $i \in X$ and $v_F \in Y$ are adjacent if and only if $i \in F$. Note that the minimum degree of G is ℓ , which can be arbitrarily large. We now show that G has no bisection $A \cup B$ satisfying (3) even for $k = 1$. Suppose for a contradiction that $A \cup B$ is such a bisection, meaning every vertex has at least one neighbor in its own part and every vertex in A has at least one neighbor in B . Since $|Y|$ is much larger than $|X|$, we have $|A \cap Y| \geq |Y|/3 = \frac{1}{3} \binom{n}{\ell}$. If $|A \cap X| < \ell$, then $e(G[A]) < \ell \binom{n-1}{\ell-1} < \frac{1}{3} \binom{n}{\ell} \leq |A \cap Y|$, a contradiction. Thus, $|A \cap X| \geq \ell$. Let F be a subset of size ℓ in $A \cap X$. We observe that the vertex v_F has none of its neighbors in B . This leads to a final contradiction, regardless of which part v_F belongs to.

Our proofs can be extended to derive analogous results for multi-partitions with arbitrary part-size constraints. For internal degrees, based on the arguments in Section 3, we can prove the following:

Theorem 20. *For any $r \geq 2$ and given $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r \in (0, 1)$ with $\sum_{i=1}^r \alpha_i = 1$, every n -vertex graph G has an r -partition $V(G) = V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_r$ with $|V_i| = \alpha_i n$ such that every vertex v has at least $(\frac{\alpha_i}{2} + o(1)) d_G(v)$ neighbors in its own part.*

For external degrees, the analogous result is as follows:

Theorem 21. *For any $r \geq 2$ and given $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r \in (0, 1)$ with $\sum_{i=1}^r \alpha_i = 1$, every n -vertex graph G has an r -partition $V(G) = V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_r$ with $|V_i| = \alpha_i n$ such that every vertex $v \in V_i$ satisfies $d_{V(G) \setminus V_i}(v) \geq \frac{1}{2}(1 - \alpha_i + o(1)) \cdot d_G(v)$.*

The proof of Theorem 21 can be derived using similar arguments as those in Section 4, along with a property regarding a biased Max- r -Cut (see Lemma 23 in Appendix A), which is used in place of (49). In the case $r = 2$, this is equivalent to stating that for any constants $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in (0, 1)$ with $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = 1$, every n -vertex graph G has a bipartition $V(G) = V_1 \cup V_2$ with $|V_1| = \alpha_1 n$ and $|V_2| = \alpha_2 n$ such that for any $1 \leq i \neq j \leq 2$, every vertex $v \in V_i$ has at least $\frac{1}{2}(\alpha_j + o(1)) \cdot d_G(v)$ neighbors in V_j . It would be interesting to see if, for $r \geq 3$, one can strengthen the above result by requiring that for each $v \in V_i$ and for each $j \neq i$, we have $d_{V_j}(v) \geq \frac{1}{2}(\alpha_j + o(1)) \cdot d_G(v)$.

Thomassen [27] and Hajnal [13] proved an analogue of the result (2) for connectivity. That is, they established that for all integers $k \geq 1$, there exists a function $g(k)$ such that every $g(k)$ -connected

graph G has a bipartition $V(G) = A \cup B$, where both $G[A]$ and $G[B]$ are k -connected. We wonder if this result can be extended to bisections.

Question 22. *Is there a function $h(k)$ such that every $h(k)$ -connected graph G has a bisection $V(G) = A \cup B$, where both $G[A]$ and $G[B]$ are k -connected?*

Acknowledgements

The authors are indebted to Chang Shi and Zhiheng Zheng for their careful readings of a preliminary draft and for providing valuable comments that greatly improved the presentation.

References

- [1] N. Alon and J. Spencer, *The Probabilistic Method*, 4th Edition, Wiley (2015).
- [2] M. Anastos, O. Cooley, M. Kang and M. Kwan, Partitioning problems via random processes, *J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2)* 110 (2024), Paper No. e70010, 49 pp.
- [3] A. Ban and N. Linial, Internal partitions of regular graphs, *J. Graph Theory* 83 (2016), 5–18.
- [4] B. Bollobás and A. D. Scott, Problems and results on judicious partitions, Random structures and algorithms (Poznan, 2001), *Random Structures Algorithms* 21 (2002), 414–430.
- [5] Y. Dandi, D. Gamarnik and L. Zdeborová, Maximally-stable local optima in random graphs and spin glasses: phase transitions and universality, arXiv:2305.03591.
- [6] S. Das, A. Pokrovskiy and B. Sudakov, Isomorphic bisections of cubic graphs, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* 151 (2021), 465–481.
- [7] C. S. Edwards, Some extremal properties of bipartite graphs, *Canadian J. Math.* 25 (1973), 475–485.
- [8] C. S. Edwards, An improved lower bound for the number of edges in a largest bipartite subgraph, in *Proc. 2nd Czechoslovak Symposium on Graph Theory*, Prague (1975), 167–181.
- [9] G. Fan, J. Hou and X. Yu, Bisections of graphs without short cycles, *Combin. Probab. Comput.* 27 (2018), 44–59.
- [10] A. Ferber, M. Kwan, B. Narayanan, A. Sah and M. Sawhney, Friendly bisections of random graphs, *Comm. Amer. Math. Soc.* 2 (2022), 380–416.
- [11] M. X. Goemans and D. P. Williamson, Improved approximation algorithms for maximum cut and satisfiability problems using semidefinite programming. *Journal of the ACM*, 42(6) (1995), 1115–1145.
- [12] Ben Green, *100 Open Problems*, Available at <https://people.maths.ox.ac.uk/greenbj/papers/open-prob>
- [13] P. Hajnal, Partition of graphs with condition on the connectivity and minimum degree, *Combinatorica* 3 (1983), 95–99.

- [14] J. Hou and S. Wu, On bisections of graphs without complete bipartite graphs, *J. Graph Theory* 98 (2021), 630–641.
- [15] J. Hou, S. Wu and G. Yan, On bisections of directed graphs, *European J. Combin.* 63 (2017), 44–58.
- [16] Y. Ji, J. Ma, J. Yan and X. Yu, On problems about judicious bipartitions of graphs, *J. Combin. Theory, Ser. B* 139 (2019), 230–250.
- [17] R. M. Karp, Reducibility among combinatorial problems, in *Complexity of Computer Computations*, (R. Miller and J. Thatcher, eds) Plenum Press, New York, 1972, pp. 85–103.
- [18] D. Kühn and D. Osthus, Partitions of graphs with high minimum degree or connectivity, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* 88 (2003), 29–43.
- [19] C. Lee, P. Loh and B. Sudakov, Bisections of graphs, *J. Comb. Theory Ser. B* 103 (2013), 599–629.
- [20] J. Lin and Q. Zeng, Maximum bisections of graphs without short even cycles, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* 180 (2021), 105404.
- [21] G. Liu, J. Ma and C. Zu, Optimal bisections of directed graphs, *Random Structures Algorithms* 64(1) (2024), 138–153.
- [22] L. Lovász, On decomposition of graphs, *Studia Sci. Math. Hungar.* 1 (1966), 237–238.
- [23] J. Ma and H. Wu, Partitioning graphs with linear minimum degree, *Random Structures Algorithms* 65(3) (2024), 601–609.
- [24] D. Minzer, A. Sah and M. Sawhney, On perfectly friendly bisections of random graphs *Ann. Probab.* 52(6) (2024), 2281–2341.
- [25] A. Scott, Judicious partitions and related problems, in: Surveys in Combinatorics, in: *London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser.*, vol. 327, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2005, pp. 95–117.
- [26] M. Stiebitz, Decomposing graphs under degree constraints, *J. Graph Theory* 23 (1996), 321–324.
- [27] C. Thomassen, Graph decomposition with constraints on the connectivity and minimum degree, *J. Graph Theory* 7 (1983), 165–167.
- [28] C. Thomassen, Paths, circuits and subdivisions, in (L. W. Beineke and R. J. Wilson, Eds.), *Selected topics in graph theory III*, Academic Press, New York (1988), 97–133.
- [29] B. Xu and X. Yu, On judicious bisections of graphs, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* 106 (2014), 30–69.

A A lemma on biased Max- r -Cut in graphs

Lemma 23. *Given any $r \geq 2$ and $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r \in (0, 1)$ with $\sum_{i=1}^r \alpha_i = 1$, every graph G has an r -partition $V(G) = U_1 \cup U_2 \cup \dots \cup U_r$ such that for every $i \neq j$ and every $x \in U_i$, it holds that*

$$\frac{d_{U_i}(x)}{\alpha_i} \leq \frac{d_{U_j}(x)}{\alpha_j}.$$

In particular, this implies that $d_{V(G) \setminus U_i}(x) \geq (1 - \alpha_i) \cdot d_G(x)$.

Proof. Consider a nontrivial r -partition $V(G) = U_1 \cup \dots \cup U_r$, which minimizes the function

$$f(U_1, \dots, U_r) = \sum_{i=1}^r \frac{1}{\alpha_i} \cdot e(U_i).$$

Without loss of generality, consider a vertex $x \in U_1$. Let $d_j = d_{U_j}(x)$ for each j and let $d = d_G(x)$. If $U_1 = \{x\}$, then clearly $d_1/\alpha_1 = 0 \leq d_j/\alpha_j$. So we have $|U_1| \geq 2$. Then $f(U_1, \dots, U_r) \leq f(U_1 \setminus \{x\}, \dots, U_j \cup \{x\}, \dots, U_r)$ for every $j \neq 1$, implying that

$$\frac{e(U_1)}{\alpha_1} + \frac{e(U_j)}{\alpha_j} \leq \frac{e(U_1 \setminus \{x\})}{\alpha_1} + \frac{e(U_j \cup \{x\})}{\alpha_j}, \text{ and thus } \frac{d_1}{\alpha_1} \leq \frac{d_j}{\alpha_j},$$

as desired. That also is $\alpha_j d_1 \leq \alpha_1 d_j$ for all $j \in [r]$. Summing over all j , we have $d_1 \leq \alpha_1 d$. This proves that $d_{U_i}(x) \leq \alpha_i \cdot d_G(x)$ for every i and every $x \in U_i$, finishing the proof. \square