Ex1.2.6 By $\varepsilon(G) = \varepsilon(G^c)$ and $\varepsilon(G) + \varepsilon(G^c) = \varepsilon(K_v)$.

Ex1.3.5 By Theorem 1 and $d_D^+(x) + d_G^-(x) = v - 1$ for any $x \in V(D)$.

Ex1.3.6 (a) By the equalities (1,3).

(b) By $d_D^+(x) + d_G^-(x) = v - 1$ for any $x \in V(D)$.

Ex1.4.2 A generalization of Example 1.4.2.

Ex1.4.4 By definition of the line graph.

Ex1.4.5 By definition of the Cartesian product.

Ex1.5.4 (c) By Example 1.4.1

Ex1.5.6 (a) There are two ways to prove it. The one way is to consider the number v_i of the component G_i and obtain

$$\epsilon(G) = \sum_{i=1}^{\omega} \epsilon(G_i) \le \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{\omega} v_i(v_i - 1) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{\omega} v_i^2 - \frac{1}{2} v \le \frac{1}{2} (v - \omega)(v - \omega + 1).$$

Another way is to consider G as a graph with edges as large as possible, and to prove that all components of G is trivial except one.

(b) By contradiction.

Ex1.5.7 The proof of (a) is similar to Ex1.5.6(a). To prove (b), define a function

$$f(\omega) = (v - \omega)(v - \omega + 1) + \frac{1}{2}(\omega - 1)(2v - \omega).$$

It is convex on the interval [2, v] for $v \ge 3$.

Ex1.6.3 There are some wrongs in this exercise. Should add that the condition " if G is strongly connected then" to (b) and delete "and Theorem 1.4" from (c).

The proof of (b). The faces that $v(G) = v(L(G)) = \varepsilon(G) = \varepsilon(L(G))$ and

$$\varepsilon = \sum_{x \in V(G)} d_G^+(x) d_G^-(x) \ge \sum_{x \in V(G)} 1 = \nu = \varepsilon,$$

implies $d_G^+(x) = d_G^-(x) = 1$ for any $x \in V(G)$.

Ex1.6.4 Similar to Example 1.6.4.

Ex1.6.6 There is flaw in this exercise. Should add that the condition " if G is an undirected graph" to (a).

Ex1.7.4 First prove that $v(T) \ge 2k+1$. Without loss of generality, assume $k = \delta^+$. By Theorem 1.1,

$$k \cdot v \le \sum_{x \in V(T)} d_T^+(x) = \sum_{x \in V(T)} d_T^-(x).$$

Thus,

$$2kv \le \sum_{x \in V(T)} [d_T^+(x) + d_T^-(x)] = \sum_{x \in V(T)} (v - 1) = v(v - 1),$$

which means that $v(T) \ge 2k + 1$ and the equality holds if and only if T is k-regular.

We now show that T contains a directed cycle of length $\geq 2k + 1$ by induction on $v \geq 2k + 1$. If v = 2k + 1, then T is k-regular and, hence, T is balanced. By the exercise 1.5.4 (c), T is strongly connected. By Theorem 1.5, T contains a directed cycle of length 2k + 1.

Now assume that the conclusion is true if $v = j \ge 2k + 1$ and let v = j + 1. If T is strongly connected, then T contains a directed cycle of length at least 2k + 1 by Theorem 1.5. Now assume that T is not strongly connected and let H be a strongly connected component of T with vertex-set S and $(S, \overline{S}) = \emptyset$. Then $\delta^+(H) \ge \delta^+(D)$, and so $\max\{\delta^+(H), \delta^-(H)\} \ge k$. Since H is a tournament, $|S| \ge 2k + 1$. By the induction hypothesis, H contains a directed cycle of length $\ge 2k + 1$.

(b) By Theorem 1.5, for any $k \ (3 \le k \le v)$, every vertex in T is contained in directed k-cycle. Let $x \in V(T)$ and C be a directed (v-1)-cycle containing x in T. Then, there is $y \in V(T) \setminus V(C)$ such that T - y is strongly connected.

On the other hand, let C' be a directed (v-1)-cycle containing y in T. Then there is $z \in V(T) \setminus V(C')$ such that T-z is strongly connected. Since $z \neq y$, the set $S = \{y, z\}$ is required.

(c) Let C be a directed k-cycle. Then T[C] is a strongly connected tournament. By Theorem 1.5, the assertion is true.

Ex1.7.6 Let $P = (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}, x_k)$ be a longest path in G. By contradiction. Assume $k < 2\delta$ and let

$$S = \{x_i : x_0 x_{i+1} \in E(G)\}, \quad T = \{x_i : x_k x_i \in E(G)\}.$$

Then, $|S| = d_G(x_0) \ge \delta$, $|T| = d_G(x_k) \ge \delta$ and $x_k \notin S \cup T$.

First prove that G contains a cycle of length k + 1. Since $x_k \notin S \cup T$, then $|S \cup T| \le k < 2\delta$, and so $S \cap T \neq \emptyset$. Let $x_i \in S \cap T$. Then $C = (x_0, x_1 \cdots, x_i, x_k, x_{k-1}, \cdots, x_{i+1}, x_0)$ is a cycle of length k + 1 in G.

Since G is connected, $v > 2\delta \ge k+1$, thus there are a vertex $x \in V(G) \setminus V(C)$ and a vertex in C, say $x_j \ (j \ne 0, k)$ such that $xx_j \in E(G)$. However, $C - x_i x_{i+1} + xx_j$ contains a longer path than P, a contradiction. Therefore, $k \ge 2\delta$.

Ex1.7.7 Let C be a shortest odd cycle of length n in G. Assume $n \ge 5$ and $n \ge 2k+1$. Let S = V(C). From the proof of Example 1.7.5, $|(S,\overline{S})| \le 2(v-n)$. Thus,

$$\delta(G) n \le \sum_{x \in S} d_G(x) \le 2\varepsilon(G[S]) + 2(v - n) = 2n + 2(v - n) = 2v,$$

from which a contradiction is deduced as follows: $\delta(G) \leq \lfloor \frac{2v}{2k+1} \rfloor$.

Ex1.9.7 (a) By contradiction. Let G be maximal counterexample, that is, G is a graph that satisfies the given conditions but G+xy contains a Hamilton cycle for any two

nonadjacent vertices $x \in X$, $y \in Y$, where $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$, $Y = \{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n\}$. Let $C = (x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2, \dots, x_n, y_n, x_1)$ be a Hamilton cycle in $G + x_1y_1$ and let

$$I = \{i : 2 \le i \le n, x_1 y_i \in E(G)\}.$$

Then $I = N_G(x_1)$ and $x_{i-1}y_1 \notin E(G)$ for any $i \in I$. Thus, $N_G(y_1) \subseteq X \setminus \{x_{i-1} : i \in I\}$, and so $d_G(y_1) \leq n - |I| = n - d_G(x_1)$, from which a contradiction is deduced as follows. $d_G(x_1) + d_G(y_1) \leq n$.

(b) From (a), it is sufficient to prove that $d_G(x) + d_G(y) > n$ for any two nonadjacent vertices $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$. By contradiction. Assume that there exist two nonadjacent vertices $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$ such that $d_G(x) + d_G(y) \leq n$. Since G is bipartite and |X| = |Y| = n, G can be viewed as a graph obtained from $K_{n,n}$ by deleting h edges. On the one hand,

$$h = n^{2} - \varepsilon(G) < n^{2} - (n^{2} - n + 1) = n - 1.$$

On the other hand, for $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$,

$$h \ge [n - d_G(x)] + [n - d_G(y)] - 1 = 2n - [d_G(x) + d_G(y)] - 1 \ge n - 1.$$

This is a contradiction.

Ex1.10.5 (d) Let $\mathbf{A}^* = \mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{X} = (x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_v)$ be any vector. Then

$$\mathbf{X}^{T}\mathbf{A}^{*}\mathbf{X} = \sum_{ij \in E(G)} (x_i - x_j)^2 \ge 0,$$

the equality holds $\iff \mathbf{X}^{T} = (1, 1, \dots, 1)$. Thus, \mathbf{A}^{*} semi-positive.

 (\Longrightarrow) By induction on $v \ge 1$. If v = 1, $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{O}$, $\mathbf{A}^* = \mathbf{O}$, and so, rank $\mathbf{A}^* = 0 = 1 - 1$. Assume the assertion holds for any connected graph of order less than $\langle v, \rangle$ and let G be a simple undirected graph of order $v, d_i = d_G(x_i)$ $(i = 1, 2, \dots, v)$. Choose a noncut-vertex of G (there are at least two such vertices by Example 1.5.3). Without loss of generality, let x_1 be such a vertex and $N_G(x_1) = \{x_2, x_3, \dots, x_d + 1\}$. There are two cases.

Case 1 $d_1 < v - 1$. In this case, **A** and the adjacency matrix of $G - x_1$ can be expressed as

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \mathbf{J}_{1,d_1} & \mathbf{O}_{1,v-d_1-1} \\ \mathbf{J}_{d_1,1} & \mathbf{A}_{11} & \mathbf{A}_{12} \\ \mathbf{O}_{v-d_1-1,1} & \mathbf{A}_{21} & \mathbf{A}_{22} \end{bmatrix}, \qquad \mathbf{A}_{v-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A}_{11} & \mathbf{A}_{12} \\ \mathbf{A}_{21} & \mathbf{A}_{22} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Define two diagonal matrices as follows.

 $\mathbf{P}_1 = \text{diag}(d_2 - 1, \cdots, d_{d_1+1} - 1)\mathbf{I}_{d_1}$ $\mathbf{P}_2 = \text{diag}(d_{d_1+2}, \cdots, d_v)\mathbf{I}_{v-d_1-1}.$

By the induction hypothesis,

$$\mathbf{A}_{v-1}^{*} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{P}_{1} - \mathbf{A}_{11} & -\mathbf{A}_{12} \\ -\mathbf{A}_{21} & \mathbf{P}_{2} - \mathbf{A}_{22} \end{pmatrix}$$

has rank v - 2. Since \mathbf{A}^* is semi-positive, $\mathbf{P}_1 - \mathbf{A}_{22}$ is positive and $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{P}_2 - \mathbf{A}_{11} - \mathbf{A}_{12}\mathbf{P}_1^{-1}\mathbf{A}_{21}$ is semi-positive. Thus, $\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{I}_{d_1}$ is invertible. On the other hand, let

$$\mathbf{S} = \begin{pmatrix} \operatorname{diag}(d_2, \cdots, d_{d_1+1})\mathbf{I}_{d_1} - \mathbf{A}_{11} & -\mathbf{A}_{12} \\ -\mathbf{A}_{21} & \operatorname{diag}(d_{d_1+2}, \cdots, d_v)\mathbf{I}_{v-d_1-1} - \mathbf{A}_{22} \end{pmatrix},$$

the th-(v-1) sub-matrix of \mathbf{A}_{v}^{*} , its determinant det $\mathbf{S} = \det \mathbf{P}_{1} \cdot \det(\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{I}_{d_{1}}) \neq 0$, and $\mathbf{A}_{v}^{*} \cdot \mathbf{J}_{v,1} = \mathbf{O}_{v,1}$, that is, rank $(\mathbf{A}^{*}) = v - 1$.

Case 2 $d_1 = v - 1$. In this case,

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathbf{J}_{1,v-1} \\ \mathbf{J}_{v-1,1} & \mathbf{A}_{v-1} \end{pmatrix},$$

where \mathbf{A}_{v-1} is the adjacency matrix of $G - x_1$. diag $(d_2 - 1, \dots, d_{v-1}) - \mathbf{A}_{v-1}$ is semipositive and diag $(d_2, \dots, d_v) - \mathbf{A}_{v-1}$ is the th-(v-1) sub-matrix of \mathbf{A}^* , which is invertible. Since $\mathbf{A}^* \cdot \mathbf{J}_{v-1} = \mathbf{O}_{v,1}$, rank $(\mathbf{A}^*) = v - 1$.

(\Leftarrow) Assume rank (\mathbf{A}^*) = v - 1 and G is disconnected. Let $G_1, G_2, \dots, G_{\omega}$ be connected components of G with orders $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{\omega}$, respectively. Then

$$\mathbf{A}^* = \operatorname{diag}\left(\mathbf{A}_{v_1}^*, \mathbf{A}_{v_2}^*, \cdots, \mathbf{A}_{v_{\omega}}^*\right),$$

where $\mathbf{A}_{v_i}^*$ is the Laplace matrix of G_i $(i = 1, 2, \dots, \omega)$. Since G_i is connected, thus,

$$\operatorname{rank}\left(\mathbf{A}_{v_{i}}^{*}\right) = v_{i} - 1, \quad i = 1, 2, \cdots, \omega.$$

It follows that

$$v - 1 = \sum_{i=1}^{\omega} (v_i - 1) = v - \omega,$$

from which, $\omega = 1$, that is, G is connected.

Ex2.1.2 The assertion (c) can be proved structurally.

Ex2.1.3
$$v_1 = v_3 + 2v_4 + \dots + (\Delta - 2)v_{\Delta} + 2 = 2 + \sum_{i=3}^{\Delta} (i-2)v_i = 2 + \sum_{x \in U} (d_G(x) - 2).$$

Ex2.1.4 There are some wrongs in this exercise. It should be corrected as "Prove that if $\{X, Y\}$ is a bipartition of T with |X| = |Y| = k, then there are at least (k + 1) vertices of degree one in X." By induction on $k \ge 0$.

Ex2.1.15 Since any two spanning trees of X have the same number of edges, the symmetric difference of their edge sets is even, say 2m. To prove that T(X) is connected, it is sufficient to show that any two spanning trees of X, as two vertices, are connected in T(X). We can do this by induction on $m \ge 1$. If m = 1, then, by the definition of T(X), the two spanning trees are adjacent in T(X), and so are connected. Assume any two spanning trees of X are connected in T(X) if the symmetric difference of their edge sets is less than 2m.

Let T and T' be two spanning trees in X that the symmetric difference of their edge sets is 2m with $m \ge 2$. let $E_1 = E(T) \setminus E(T')$ and $E_2 = E(T') \setminus E(T)$. Then $|E_1| = |E_2| = m$. Since T' is a spanning tree of X, for an edge $e \in E_1$, T' + e contains only cycle, denoted by C_e . Since T' contains no cycle, there exists exactly one edge $e' \in E_2 \cap E(C_e)$ such that T'' = T' - e' + e is a spanning three of X. It is clear that the symmetric difference of E(T') and E(T'') is 2, and thus, they are adjacent in T(X). Also, the symmetric difference of E(T) and E(T'') is 2(m-1), and thus, by the induction hypothesis, they are connected in T(X). It follows that T and T' are connected in T(X).

Ex2.3.2 See Example 1.10.2.

Ex2.3.3 The proofs of (a) and (b) are similar to Example 2.3.2. As (c), if G is not bipartite, then G contains an odd cycle. Let C be a shortest odd cycle. The determinant of the sub-matrix of M responding to the vertices and edges in C is equal to two, a contradiction. Conversely, by induction on $k \ge 1$, which is order of a sub-matrix of M. In the induction step, assume $P_{\ell+1}$ is a sub-matrix of M. If there is exactly one non-zero entry in some column, then it is easy to prove det $P_{\ell+1} = 0, \pm 1$. Assume there are exactly two non-zero entries in $P_{\ell+1}$ below. It is clear that det $P_{\ell+1} = 0$ since the sum of any column is two.

Ex2.3.6 For each vertex $y \neq x$, select one in-coming edge of y. Let T be the induced subgraph by these edges. Then T is an in-tree rooted at x, for T has v - 1 edges, contains no directed cycles, $d_T^-(x) = 0$, $d_T^-(y) = 1$ for any $y \neq x$ (see Exercise 2.1.1). Conversely, every in-tree rooted at x occurs in this way. Hence the number of such in-trees rooted at x is $\varsigma_x(G) = \prod_{y \in V \setminus \{x\}} d_G^-(y)$.

Ex3.1.4 Using the following three equalities:

 $3v - \varepsilon = 6,$ $v = v_3 + v_4 + v_5 + v_6 + v_7 + v_8 + \dots + v_{\Delta},$ $2\varepsilon = 3v_3 + 4v_4 + 5v_5 + 6v_6 + 7v_7 + 8v_8 + \dots + \Delta v_{\Delta}.$

Ex3.1.6 Using the following three equalities:

$$\begin{aligned} 3v &= \phi_1 + 2\phi_2 + 3\phi_3 + 4\phi_4 + 5\phi_5 + 6\phi_6 + 7\phi_7 + 8\phi_8 + \cdots, \\ 2\varepsilon &= \phi_1 + 2\phi_2 + 3\phi_3 + 4\phi_4 + 5\phi_5 + 6\phi_6 + 7\phi_7 + 8\phi_8 + \cdots, \\ \phi &= \phi_1 + \phi_2 + \phi_3 + \phi_4 + \phi_5 + \phi_6 + \phi_7 + \phi_8 + \cdots, \end{aligned}$$

and Euler's formula $v - \varepsilon + \phi = 2$.

Ex3.1.7 Without loss of generality, assume that G is a plane graph. By Theorem 3.2 and Euler's formula,

$$2\varepsilon(G) = \sum_{f \in F(G)} d_G(f) \ge g\phi = g(2 - v + \varepsilon) = -g(v - 2) + g\varepsilon.$$

Ex3.1.8 From $\varepsilon \leq 3v - 6$ and $\varepsilon(G) + \varepsilon(G^c) = \frac{1}{2}v(v-1)$, we have $\varepsilon(G^c) \geq \frac{1}{2}v(v-1) - 3(v-3) = \frac{1}{2}(v^2 - 7v + 12) > 3v - 6$ for $v \geq 11$.

Ex3.1.14 Without loss of generality, suppose that G is maximal and that $\{d_1, d_2, \dots, d_v\}$ is the degree-sequence of G. Then

$$\sum_{i=1}^{v} d_i = 2\varepsilon = 6n - 12.$$

Let

$$f(d_1, d_2, \cdots, d_v) = \sum_{i=1}^v d_i^2.$$

(a) For $3 \le d_i \le v - 1$ and $v \ge 4$,

$$f(d_1, d_2, \cdots, d_v) \leq f(3, 3, 4, 4, \cdots, 4, v - 1, v - 1)$$

= 18 + 16(v - 4) + 2(v - 1)² = 2(v + 3)² - 62.

(b) Note that $\delta \ge 4$ implies v > 5. For $4 \le d_i \le v - 1$ and v > 5,

$$f(d_1, d_2, \cdots, d_v) \leq f(4, 4, \cdots, 4, v - 2, v - 2) = 16(v - 2) + 2(v - 2)^2$$

= 2(v + 3)² - 4v - 42 < 2(v + 3)² - 62.

Ex3.2.3 Let $V(G) = \{x, y, z, x_4, x_5, \dots, x_v\}$. By Kuratowski's theorem, G contains no $K_{3,3}$. There exists at most two x_i , which all are adjacent to x, y, z. The number of edges between $\{x, y, z\}$ and $V \setminus \{x, y, z\}$ is at most $2 \cdot 3 + (n-5) \cdot 2 = 2n-4$. It follows that $d_G(x) + d_G(y) + d_G(z) \le 6 + (2n-4) = 2n+2$.

Ex4.1.2 (b) For any two distinct vertices $u, v \in S$, if $a = (u, v) \in E(G)$, then $\mathbf{f}^+(u)$ contains $\mathbf{f}(a)$ and $\mathbf{f}^-(v)$ contains $\mathbf{f}(a)$, that is, $\mathbf{f}(a)$ does not contribute to the sum. In other words, any edge a such that $\mathbf{f}(a)$ contributes to the sum has exactly one end-vertex in S.

Ex4.1.4 See the proof of Theorem 4.1.

Ex4.2.3 (a) Note that the condition " $d_G^+(x) - d_G^-(y) = k$ " should be replaced by " $d_G^+(x) - d_G^-(x) = k$ ".

One of the ways is to use Exercise 1.8.3. directly. The other way is use Menger's theorem 4.2. In fact, let (S,\overline{S}) be a λ -cut of G. Then $\eta_G(x,y) = \lambda_G(x,y) = |(S,\overline{S}| \ge |(S,\overline{S})| - |(\overline{S},S)| = \sum_{u \in S} (d_G^+(u) - d_G^-(u)) = d_G^+(x) - d_G^-(x) = k.$

Ex4.2.4 The assertion can be proved structurally. Let $k = d_G(x) \leq d_G(y)$, $A = N_G(x) \cap N_G(y) = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_h\}$, $X = N_G(x) - A - \{y\} = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_a\}$, $X = N_G(y) - A - \{x\} = \{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_b\}$. Then $a \leq b$ and $k = h + a + \delta_{xy}$, where δ_{xy} is equal to one if x and y adjacent, equal to zero otherwise.

For each $u_i \in A$, $P_i = (x, u_i, y)$ is an xy-path of length two. $P_{\delta_{xy}} = xy$ if xy exists.

Since $d(G) \leq 2$, there are *a* edge disjoint $x_j y_j$ -paths Q_j $(j = 1, 2, \dots, a)$ of length at most two. Let $P_{h+j} = xx_j + Q_j + y_j y$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, a$. Thus, $P_1, P_2, \dots, P_{h+a+\delta_{xy}}$ are k edge disjoint xy-paths of length at most 4.

Ex4.2.5 Note that the condition " $k \ge 2$ " should be added to the exercise.

Let x and y be two vertices in G such that $d_G(x, y) = d(G)$. Since G is k-regular and $k \ge 2$, there exists $z \in N_G^-(y)$ different from x. Consider k(x, z)-paths P_1, P_2, \dots, P_k , one of them, say P_i , must use the vertex y, whose length $\varepsilon(P_i) \ge d_G(x, y) + 1 = d(G) + 1$.

Ex4.3.3 Reduce it to Example 4.3.2.

Ex4.3.10 Apply Menger's theorem (4.3) to the graph H obtained from by adding a new vertex y and k edges from x_i to y for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$.

Ex4.3.11 Without loss of generality, assume $k \ge 3$. Let S be a set of k vertices and C be a cycle that contain vertices in S as large as possible. Let $m = |V(C) \cap S|$. Then $m \ge 2$. Want to prove m = k by contradiction. Let x be a vertex in S not in C. Label the vertices in $S \cap V(C)$ as s_1, s_2, \dots, s_m in some given direction of C. By Exercise 4.3.10, there are m internally disjoint (x, s_i) -paths P_i $(i = 1, 2, \dots, m)$ in G. If m < k, then s_1, s_2, \dots, s_m partitions C into m sections, of which at least one contains no vertex in S except end-vertices. Assume (s_1, s_2) -section C' contains no vertex in S. Then, $C' \cup P_1 \cup P_2$ forms a cycle in G, which contains vertices in S is more than C does since $x \notin V(C)$, a contradiction.

Ex4.3.12 Let $x \in V(G)$ and let $B = \{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k\} \subseteq N_G^-(x)$. By exercise 4.3.10, there are k internally disjoint (x, y_i) -paths P_i $(i = 1, 2, \dots, k)$ in G. Thus, $v(P_i) \ge g =$

g(G) for each $i = 1, 2, \cdots, k$. It follows that

$$v = v(G) \ge k(g-1) + 1 \Longrightarrow g(G) = g \le \left\lfloor \frac{v+k-1}{k} \right\rfloor = \left\lceil \frac{v}{k} \right\rceil.$$

Ex4.3.13 Assume $\kappa(G) = k \ge 1$ and $d(G) \ge 3$. Let $x, y \in V(G)$ such that $d_G(x, y) = d(G)$. By Menger's theorem, $\zeta_G(x, y) \ge \kappa(G) = k \ge 1$ and $\zeta_G(y, x) \ge \kappa(G) = k \ge 1$. Let P_1, P_2, \dots, P_k be k internally disjoint (x, y)-paths in G. Then

$$d_G^+(x) - k \ge \delta^+(G) - k, \quad d_G^-(y) - k \ge \delta^-(G) - k.$$

Since $d(G) \ge 3$, $N_G^+(x) \cap N_G^-(y) = \emptyset$. It follows that

$$v \ge \sum_{i=1}^{k} (v(P_i) - 1) + 2 + \delta^+(G) - k + \delta^-(G) - k$$

$$\ge k(d-1) + 2 + \delta^+ + \delta^- - 2k = k(d-3) + \delta^+ + \delta^- + 2.$$

Ex5.1.1 Without loss of generality, assume G is connected. Clearly, $\alpha'(G) \leq \lfloor \frac{1}{2} \rfloor$. We now show $\alpha'(G) \leq \lfloor \frac{1}{1+\Delta} \rfloor$ by induction on $\varepsilon \geq 1$. Assume $\varepsilon(G) = k + 1 \geq 2$. If G contains a cycle C, then choose an edge e in C. By the induction hypothesis,

$$\alpha'(G) \geq \alpha'(G-e) \geq \frac{v}{\Delta(G-e)} \geq \frac{v}{1+\Delta(G)}$$

If G contains no cycle, then G is a tree. If G is a star, then the conclusion holds clearly. Assume G is not a star below. Thus, there is an edge e in C. Let G_1 and G_2 be two components of G - e, and let $v_i = v(G_i)$ for each i = 1, 2. By the induction hypothesis,

$$\alpha'(G) \ge \alpha'(G_1) + \alpha'(G_2) \ge \frac{v_1}{\Delta(G_1)} + \frac{v_2}{\Delta(G_2)} \ge \frac{v_1 + v_2}{1 + \Delta(G)} = \frac{v}{1 + \Delta(G)}$$

Ex5.1.3 Note that this exercise has an erratum, that is, $\frac{2}{3}v$ should be replaced by $\frac{2}{3}\varepsilon$.

Let G be a plane triangulation of order $v (\geq 4)$. By the exercise 4.3.8, G^* is a 3-regular 2-edge-connected simple graph. By Corollary 5.2.1, G^* has a perfect matching M^* . G is connected since G a plane triangulation. Thus, by the exercise 3.3.1, $(G^*)^* \cong G$, and so $(G^* - M^*)^*$ is isomorphic to some subgraph of G. By Euler's formula,

$$\varepsilon(G^* - M^*) = \varepsilon(G^*) - \frac{1}{2}v^* = \frac{3}{2}v^* - \frac{1}{2}v^* = v^* = \phi = 2 + \varepsilon - v$$

Since G is a plane triangulation, by Theorem 3.4, $\varepsilon = 3v - 6$, that is, $v = \frac{1}{3}\varepsilon + 2$. It follows that

$$\varepsilon(G^* - M^*) = 2 + \varepsilon - v = 2 + \varepsilon - \frac{1}{3}\varepsilon - 2 = \frac{2}{3}\varepsilon.$$

Note that $(G^* - M^*)^*$ is equivalent to a graph obtained from G removing some common edges in two triangles. Thus, $G^* - M^*$ contains only cycles of length four, hence is bipartite. Thus, G contains a bipartite subgraph with $\frac{2}{3}\varepsilon$ edges.

Ex5.1.6 By Tutte's theorem, $o(G - x) \leq 1$ for any $x \in V(G)$. If there is a vertex x such that o(G - x) = 0, then G has odd order, a contradiction.

Conversely, by induction on $v \ge 2$. Let G be a tree of order $v \ge 3$. Choose a vertex x of degree one in G. Since o(G - x) = 1, v is even. Let y be the unique neighbor of x. Since o(G - y) = 1, $\{x\}$ is the only odd component of G - y, and other components G_1, G_2, \dots, G_p are even. Then $o(G_i - z) = 1$ for any $z \in V(G_i)$ and each $i = 1, 2, \dots, p$ (Why?). By the induction hypothesis, G_i has perfect matching M_i for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, p$. Then $M = M_i \cup M_2 \cup \dots \cup M_p \cup \{xy\}$ is a perfect matching of G.

Ex5.1.10 By definitions of permanent $\mathbf{A} = (a_{ij})_{m \times n}$ and $Per(\mathbf{A})$,

$$\operatorname{Per}(\mathbf{A}) = \sum_{f \in F} a_{1f(1)} a_{2f(2)} \cdots a_{mf(m)},$$

where $F = \{f : f \text{ is an injective from } \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ to $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, and $|F| = n(n-1)\cdots(n-m+1)$. Let $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m\}$ and $Y = \{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_m\}$.

If $a_{1f(1)}a_{2f(2)}\cdots a_{mf(m)} \neq 0$, then $a_{1f(1)}a_{2f(2)}\cdots a_{mf(m)} \neq 0$ denotes that the set of edges

$$E_G(x_1, y_{f(1)}) \neq \emptyset, \ E_G(x_2, y_{f(2)}) \neq \emptyset, \cdots, E_G(x_m, y_{f(m)}) \neq \emptyset.$$

Thus, $a_{1f(1)}a_{2f(2)}\cdots a_{mf(m)}$ is the number of the matchings that saturate X and consist of edged in the set of edges

$$E_G(x_1, y_{f(1)}) \cup E_G(x_2, y_{f(2)}) \cup \cdots \cup E_G(x_m, y_{f(m)}).$$

It follows that the number of the matchings that saturate X is equal to $Per(\mathbf{A})$.

Ex5.2.5 (a) By Theorem 5.6, it is sufficient to show $\alpha(G) \leq \kappa(G)$. By contradiction, if $\alpha(G) > \kappa(G) = k$, then there is an independent set I such that |I| = k + 1. A contradiction can be deduce as follows. $|(\bar{I}, I)| \leq k^2 < k(k+1) = |(I, \bar{I})|$.

(b) The proof is similar to one of Theorem 5.7. Since $\alpha(G) = 1$ if and only if $G \cong K_v$, assume $\alpha(G) \ge 2$. Choose a longest cycle C in G. Suppose to the contrary that C is not a Hamilton cycle. Then, $V(G) \setminus V(C) \ne \emptyset$ and $T \subseteq V(C)$. Choose $x \in V(G) \setminus V(C)$ and let $T = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_s\}$ and occurs in C in this order. By the choice of C, any successive two vertices in $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_s\}$ are not adjacent in C, otherwise we can construct a longer cycle than C.

Specify C a direction to obtained a directed cycle \overrightarrow{C} . Let $Y = \{y_i : (x_i, y_i) \in E(\overrightarrow{C}), i = 1, 2, \dots, s\}$. Then $Y \cup \{x\}$ is an independent set of G and $\alpha(G) \ge |I| = s + 1 \ge |T| + 1$, contradicting to the hypothesis.

Ex5.2.6 The proof is similar to one of Theorem 5.7. Without loss of generality, assume $\alpha(G) \geq 2$. By contradiction, assume $\alpha \geq \delta(G) + 1$. Let *I* and *S* be a maximum independent set and a minimum separating set of *G*, respectively. Then, for any $x, y \in I$, we have $|N_G(x) \cup N_G(y)| \leq v - \alpha$, and

$$|N_G(x) \cap N_G(y)| = d_G(x) + d_G(y) - |N_G(x) \cup N_G(y)| \\ \ge 2\delta - (v - \alpha) \ge 3\delta - v + 1 \ge \kappa + 1 > |S|.$$

This implies that only one of all components of G - S, say G_1 , may contain vertices in I, that is, $I \subseteq V(G_1) \cup S$. Since $\alpha \geq 2\delta + 1$, there exists $x \in I \cap V(G_1)$. Choose a vertex z in other component, say G_2 , of G - S. Then

$$|N_G(x) \cup N_G(z)| \le v - 2 - |I \cap V(G_1)| + 1 = v - \alpha + |I \cap S| - 1.$$

Since $N_G(x) \cap N_G(z) \subseteq S \setminus I$, thus, $|N_G(x) \cap N_G(z)| \leq \kappa - |I \cap S|$. Thus, we should have that

$$2\delta \le d_G(x) + d_G(z) = v - \alpha + \kappa - 1 \le v + \kappa - \delta - 2.$$

From this we can deduce a contradiction as follows. $\delta \leq \frac{1}{3} (v + \kappa - 2) < \frac{1}{3} (v + \kappa)$.

Ex5.2.7 Note that this exercise has an erratum. The exercise is restated as follows. Let G be a loopless digraph. Prove that G contains an independent set I such that $d_G(I, y) \leq 2$ for any $y \in V(G) \setminus I$, where $d_G(I, y) = \min\{d_G(x, y) : x \in I\}$. By induction on $v \ge 1$. Assume the conclusion holds for any digraph with order less then v and let G be a digraph with order v. Arbitrarily choose $x \in V(G)$. Then by the induction hypothesis, in the subdigraph $G - (\{x\} \cup N_G^+(x))$, there is an independent set I' such that $d_G(I', y) \le 2$ for any $y \in V(G) \setminus I'$. If there is $u \in I'$ such that $x \in N_G^+(x)$, then $d_G(I', y) \le 2$ for any $y \in V(G) \setminus I'$ clearly. If there is no such a vertex in I', then xis not adjacent with any vertex in I'. Thus, $I = I' \cup \{x\}$ is an independent set required.

Ex6.1.4 Let $\chi(G) = k$. Then G has a k-coloring $\pi = (V_1, V_2, \cdots, V_k)$, where V_i is an independent set of G and, hence, $v_i = |V_i| \leq \alpha$ for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$.

(a) Since $v = v_1 + v_2 + \dots + v_k \le k \alpha$, $\chi(G) = k \ge \left\lceil \frac{v}{\alpha} \right\rceil$. Choose an independent set I such that $|I| = \alpha$. Then G - I is $(v - \alpha)$ -colorable clearly. Thus, $\chi(G) = k \leq v + 1 - \alpha$.

(b) Note that $(V_i, V_j) \neq \emptyset$ since $\chi(G) = k$. Thus, $\varepsilon \geq \frac{1}{2}k(k-1)$, which implies $k \le \frac{1}{2} + \sqrt{2\varepsilon + \frac{1}{4}} \; .$

Using Example 1.2.2 and Langrange's method of minimum multipliers, we have that

$$2\varepsilon \le \varepsilon(T_{k,v}) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} v_i(v - v_i) = v^2 - \sum_{i=1}^{k} v_i^2 \le v^2 - k\left(\frac{v}{k}\right)^2 = v^2 - \frac{v^2}{k}$$

This implies $k \ge \frac{v^2}{v^2 - 2\varepsilon}$.

Ex6.1.5 If G contains no odd cycle, then G is bipartite and, hence, $\chi(G) \leq 2$. Assume now G contains an odd cycle C. Then G - C contains no odd cycle. Thus, $\chi(G) \le \chi(C) + \chi(G - C) \le 3 + 2 = 5.$

Ex6.1.6 (\Rightarrow) Since G is k-critical, G is not an odd cycle. Also since G is not complete, $k \leq \Delta$ by Brooks' theorem. Choose $x \in V(G)$ such that $d_G(x) = \Delta$. By Corollary 6.1.1, $\delta \geq k - 1$, and so we have

$$2\varepsilon = \sum_{x \in V} d_G(x) = \Delta + \sum_{y \in V \setminus \{x\}} d_G(y) \ge \Delta + (v-1)\delta$$

$$\ge \Delta + (v-1)(k-1) = (\Delta - k) + v(k-1) + 1$$

$$\ge v(k-1) + 1.$$

 (\Leftarrow) Let G be a connected simple graph neither an odd cycle nor a complete graph, H be a $\chi(G)$ -critical subgraph of G.

Assume H is an odd cycle. Since G is not an odd cycle, $\chi(G) = \chi(H) = 3 \leq \Delta(G)$. Assume H is a complete graph. Since G is not a complete graph, $\chi(G) < \chi(G) + 1 \leq$ $\Delta(G).$

Assume H is neither an odd cycle nor a complete graph. Since $k \geq 4$, we have $v\Delta(G) \ge v\Delta(H) \ge 2\varepsilon(H) \ge v(\chi(G)-1)+1$, that is, $\Delta(G) \ge \chi(G)-1+\frac{1}{v}$, which implies $\chi(G) \leq \Delta(G)$.

Ex6.2.2 By contradiction. Suppose that $\chi(G) = \Delta$, and let $\pi' = (E_1, E_2, \cdots, E_\Delta)$ be a Δ -edge-coloring of G. Since $|E_i| \leq \alpha'(G)$ for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, \Delta$, by the condition (a), we have can deduce a contradiction as follows.

$$\Delta \alpha'(G) < \varepsilon = \sum_{i=1}^{\Delta} |E_i| \le \Delta \alpha'(G).$$

Also since $|E_i| \leq \lfloor \frac{v}{2} \rfloor$ for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, \Delta$, by the condition (b), we have can deduce a contradiction as follows.

$$\Delta\left\lfloor\frac{v}{2}\right\rfloor < \varepsilon = \sum_{i=1}^{\Delta} |E_i| \le \Delta\left\lfloor\frac{v}{2}\right\rfloor.$$

(c) Since G has odd order and is regular, we have $\varepsilon = \Delta \frac{v}{2} > \Delta \lfloor \frac{v}{2} \rfloor$. By (b), G belongs to class two.

(d) If G is odd order, the assertion holds by (b). We now assume G is even order. Let x be a cut-vertex of G. Then there are two subgraphs H and K such that $G = H \cup K$ and $V(H) \cap V(K) = \{x\}$. Without loss of generality, suppose that H has odd order h. Then $1 \leq d_H(x) \leq \Delta(G)$, and so

$$\varepsilon(H) = \frac{1}{2} \left((h-1)\Delta + d_H(x) \right) > \frac{1}{2} \left(h-1 \right) \Delta = \Delta \left\lfloor \frac{h}{2} \right\rfloor.$$

By (b), H belongs to class two, and so does G.

Ex6.2.5 By contradiction. Suppose that $\chi'(G) = k > \lfloor \frac{3}{2}\Delta \rfloor$. By removing sufficiently many edges from G (if necessary), we may assume that $\chi'(G - e) = k - 1$, for each edge e of G. It follows from Theorem 6.3 that $k \leq \Delta(G) + \mu(G)$, and so there must exist vertices x and y which are joined by at least $k - \Delta$ edges.

We now color all of the edges of G except one of the edges joining x and y; since $\chi'(G-e) = k-1$, this coloring can be done with k-1 colors. Now the number of colors missing from x or y (or both) can not exceed $(k-1) - (\mu - 1)$, which in turn can not exceed Δ , since $k \leq \Delta + \mu$. But the number of colors missing from x is at least $(k-1) - (\Delta - 1) = k - \Delta$, and similarly the number of colors missing from y is at least $(k-\Delta) - \Delta$. It follows that the number of colors missing from both x and y is at least $(2k-\Delta) - \Delta$, which is positive since $k > \lfloor \frac{3}{2} \Delta \rfloor$. By assigning one of these missing colors to the un-colored edge joining x and y, we have colored all of the edges of G using only k-1 colors. thereby contradicting the fact that $\chi'(G) = k$.

Ex6.2.6 Let *L* be the line of a simple graph *G*. By Exercise 6.2.3, $\chi'(G) = \chi(L)$. Since $\Delta(G) \geq 3$, *L* is nether an odd cycle nor a complete graph, and $\Delta(L) \leq 2\Delta(G) - 2$. Thus, By Brooks' theorem, $\chi'(G) = \chi(L) \leq \Delta(L) \leq 2\Delta(G) - 2$.