Non-degenerate colorings in the Brook’s Theorem

N. V. Gravin

Abstract

Let \(c \geq 2\) and \(p \geq c\) be two integers. We will call a proper coloring of the graph \(G\) a \((c,p)\)-nondegenerate, if for any vertex of \(G\) with degree at least \(p\) there are at least \(c\) vertices of different colors adjacent to it.

In our work we prove the following result, which generalizes Brook’s Theorem. Let \(D \geq 3\) and \(G\) be a graph without cliques on \(D + 1\) vertices and the degree of any vertex in this graph is not greater than \(D\). Then for every integer \(c \geq 2\) there is a proper \((c,p)\)-nondegenerate vertex \(D\)-coloring of \(G\), where \(p = (c^3 + 8c^2 + 19c + 6)(c + 1)\).

During the primary proof, some interesting corollaries are derived.
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Introduction

We follow the terminology and notations of the book [5] and consider finite and loopless graphs. As in [5], \(\delta(G)\) and \(\Delta(G)\) denote the minimal and the maximal degree of a graph \(G\) respectively. For a vertex \(v \in V(G)\) the neighborhood of \(v\) in \(G\) is \(N_G(v) = \{u \in V(G) : u\) is adjacent to \(v\) in \(G\}\}. Vertices in \(N_G(v)\) are called neighbors of \(v\). Also \(|S|\) denotes the cardinal number of a set \(S\).

For an integer \(k > 0\), let \(\mathbf{K} = \{1, 2, \ldots, k\}\). A proper \(k\)-coloring of a graph \(G\) is a map \(c : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbf{K}\) such that if \(u, v \in V(G)\) are adjacent vertices in \(G\), then \(c(u) \neq c(v)\). Let \(c\) is a proper \(k\)-coloring of \(G\) and a set \(V' \subseteq V(G)\), then by \(c(V')\) we denote a restriction of the map \(c\) to the set \(V'\), so we get a proper \(k\)-coloring of the induced graph \(G(V')\).

A proper vertex \(k\)-coloring is a proper conditional \((k,c)\)-coloring, if for any vertex of degree at least \(c\) there are at least \(c\) different colors in its neighborhood. This notion for \(c = 2\) appeared in the works [3] and [4] as a dynamic coloring. But results obtained there were not the Brook’s Theorem generalizations, because a number of colors in which graph was colored is bigger then it is in the Brook’s Theorem.

Further development of this theme can be found in the work [6] where the definition of a conditional coloring has been given for the first time. In this paper authors remarked that it would be interesting to know an analogous of Brook’s Theorem for conditional colorings. But the problem of finding such an analogous seems to be too hard in such formulation. Let us show the consideration, which lets one to think about changing the statement. If there is a vertex of degree \(c\) in the graph, then in any \((k,c)\)-coloring all its neighbors will be colored with different colors and it means that we can replace this vertex by \(c\)-hyperedge on its neighborhood. Repeating such transformations with a graph, we can obtain any graph with \(c\)-hyperedges and simple edges. So we can extend our results of just proper colorings on such graphs. But a graph with hyperedges is a complicated object for investigation concerning proper colorings. Even for \(c = 3\) one can easily construct
a big variety of graphs of the maximal degree $D$ (for sufficiently large $D$) which have no conditional $(D + 100, 3)$-coloring just by drawing the complete graph on a $D + 101$ vertices and changing some of its triangle subgraphs to 3-hyperedge in such a way that all vertices will have degree not greater than $D$. So it seems to us natural to change a little definition of the conditional coloring. The crucial consideration, which allowed us to get serious progress in this field, is that we demand another condition of non-degenerateness of a proper coloring. We will call this demand the $(c, p)$-nondegenerateness.

**Definition.** Let $c \geq 2$ and $p \geq c$ be positive integers. We call a vertex coloring of a graph $G$ $(c, p)$-nondegenerate if for any vertex, with degree at least $p$, there are at least $c$ vertices of different colors among all its neighbors.

So, speaking informally, we impose the requirement of nondegenerateness only to vertices of a large degree. But with such a weaker new requirement, we can state and prove stronger and more general theorem.

**Theorem 1.** Let $D \geq 3$ and $G$ be a graph without cliques on $D + 1$ vertices and $\Delta_G \leq D$. Then for every integer $c \geq 2$ there is a proper $(c, p)$-nondegenerate vertex $D$-coloring of $G$, where $p = (c^3 + 8c^2 + 19c + 6)(c + 1)$.

One of the main steps in the proof of the theorem 1 is the following theorem 2, which by itself appears to be an interesting result.

**Theorem 2.** Let $G$ be a graph with no cliques on $D + 1$ vertices with $\Delta_G \leq D$. And let $D = \sum_{i=1}^{c+1} \alpha_i$, where $\alpha_i \geq 2$ are integer numbers. Then in the set $\Xi$ of all colorings of $G$ with $c + 1$ colors there is a coloring $\xi$ such that:

1) $\Phi(\xi) = \min_{\psi \in \Xi} \Phi(\psi)$, where $\Phi = \sum_{i=1}^{c+1} \frac{f_i}{\alpha_i}$ and $f_i$ is a number of edges in $G$ connecting vertices of the $i$-th color.

2) For any $1 \leq i \leq c + 1$, there are no cliques on $\alpha_i + 1$ vertices of the $i$-th color in $\xi$.

In particular, there is a direct corollary from the theorem 2 which is similar to the result, obtained by L. Lovasz in the paper [2].

**Corollary.** Let $G$ be a graph with no cliques on $D + 1$ vertices with $\Delta_G \leq D$. And let $D = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \alpha_i$, where $\alpha_i \geq 2$ are integer numbers. Then the set $V(G)$ can be split into $k$ subsets $V_1, V_2, ..., V_k$ so that for any $i \in [1, k]$ there are no cliques on $\alpha_i + 1$ vertices in $G(V_i)$ and $\Delta_{G(V_i)} \leq \alpha_i$.

**Main theorem proof**

**Remark 1.** The $(c, p)$-nondegenerateness of a coloring is a rather strong condition even in a case of a bipartite graph (and coloring it with $p$ colors), since it is not easy to prove a statement analogous to the theorem 1. And if we want to get a $(c, p)$-nondegenerate proper $D$-coloring of a bipartite graph but do not bound the maximal degree of this graph, then the statement of theorem 1 doesn’t hold for $c = 2$ and every $p$.

**Contrary instance:**

We take a set $S_1$ consisting of $(p - 1)D + 1$ elements as the first part of $G$. As the second part of $G$, we take the set of all $p$-element samplings from $S_1$ and join every such sampling with all its elements in $S_1$ (see fig. 1). If we try to color $G$ with $D$ colors, then
by the Dirichlet principle in the set $S_1$ one can find $p$ vertices of the same color and this means that for correspondent $p$-element sampling in $S_2$ the $(2,p)$-nondegenerate condition does not hold.
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fig. 1.

**Remark 2.** Unfortunately our estimation $p(c) = (c^3 + 8c^2 + 19c + 6)(c + 1)$ gives rather large value for a small $c$. It is quite possible that using our proof method one can get a better estimation, but it is impossible to get an estimation asymptotically better than $c^4(1 + O(c^{-1}))$ using only our method.

**Theorem 1.** Let $D \geq 3$ and $G$ be a graph without cliques on $D + 1$ vertices and $\Delta_G \leq D$. Then for every integer $c \geq 2$ there is a proper $(c, p)$-nondegenerate vertex $D$-coloring of $G$, where $p = (c^3 + 8c^2 + 19c + 6)(c + 1)$.

**Statement 1.** Without loss of generality graph $G$ may be thought of as a graph containing no vertices of degree less than $p$.

*Proof.* The following operation can be done with $G$: take two copies of $G$ and join in this copies all pairs of similar vertices with degree less than $p$ (see fig. 2).
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fig. 2.

Obtained graph satisfies all the conditions of theorem 1. Also let us notice that if we get a $(c, p)$-nondegenerate proper $D$-coloring of the obtained graph then we get the same for an every copy of $G$. We repeat this operation while there is vertices of degree less than $p$. We repeat this operation a finite number of times because, by every execution of such operation, we increase the smallest degree of a graph.

\[
\square
\]

*Proof.* The proof of theorem 1 consists of two parts. In the first part we reduce our theorem to some lemma (see lemma 1). And in the second part we prove this lemma.
The first part.

Choose such a number \( \alpha_i \) for every \( i \in \{1, 2, ..., c+1\} \), that \( \alpha_i = \left\lceil \frac{D}{c+1} \right\rceil \) or \( \alpha_i = \left\lfloor \frac{D}{c+1} \right\rfloor \) and \( \sum_{i=1}^{c+1} \alpha_i = D \) (it is clear that we can choose such a set of \( \alpha_i \)). Consider for every coloring \( \xi \) with colors \( \{1, 2, ..., c+1\} \) a function \( \Phi(\xi) \) which is determined as follows: \( \Phi(\xi) := \sum_{i=1}^{c+1} f_i \alpha_i \), where \( f_i \) is a number of edges connecting vertices of the \( i \)-th color in the coloring \( \xi \). Then consider those colorings of the graph \( G \) with \( c+1 \) colors for which \( \Phi \) reaches its minimum. Denote such a set of colorings as \( G_c \). It is obvious that \( G_c \) is not empty. Then for any coloring \( \xi \) from the set \( G_c \) the following statements hold:

**Statement 2.** For every color \( i \in \{1, 2, ..., c+1\} \) in \( \xi \) and every \( i \)-th color vertex \( v \) of \( G \) a number of vertices adjacent to \( v \) of the \( i \)-th color does not exceed \( \alpha_i \).

**Proof.** Suppose the statement is false. Then from the condition that \( \sum_{j=1}^{c+1} \alpha_j = D \) there can be found a color \( j \) such that \( v \) is adjacent in the graph \( G \) to less than \( \alpha_j \) \( j \)-th color vertices. So by recoloring \( v \) with the color \( j \) we arrive at a contradiction.

**Statement 3.** If some vertex \( v \) of the \( i \)-th color in the coloring \( \xi \) of \( G \) is adjacent to exactly \( \alpha_i \) vertices of the \( i \)-th color then \( v \) is adjacent to exactly \( \alpha_j \) vertices of the \( j \)-th color for every color \( j \).

**Proof.** Assume the opposite to the statement 3 assertion. Then by condition that \( \sum_{k=1}^{c+1} \alpha_k = D \) there can be found a color \( j' \neq i \) such that \( v \) is adjacent in \( G \) to less than \( \alpha_{j'} \) vertices of the \( j' \)-th color. So by recoloring \( v \) with the color \( j' \) we arrive at a contradiction.

**Statement 4.** If the vertex \( v \) of the \( i \)-th color in the coloring \( \xi \) of the graph \( G \) is adjacent to at least one vertex of the \( i \)-th color then it is adjacent to at least one vertex of any other color.

**Proof.** Suggesting that statement fails we arrive at a contradiction with minimality of \( \Phi(\xi) \) by recoloring \( v \) with the color to which \( v \) is not adjacent.

We are going to prove now that there is a coloring in the coloring set \( G_c \) with no \( \alpha_i + 1 \) cliques in \( G \) of the \( i \)-th color. We will call such cliques the large cliques.

Due to the statement 2 there can not be bigger cliques of the \( i \)-th color in \( G \) for any coloring from \( G_c \).

For every coloring \( \xi \) in \( G_c \) denote as \( \phi(\xi) \) a number of large cliques in \( \xi \). Denote by \( \Omega \) the set of all colorings in \( G_c \) with the smallest number of the large cliques. Let \( \phi > 0 \) for all colorings in \( \Omega \).

Then using the statement 4 we get:

**Statement 5.** If we take a vertex \( v \) from some large clique in some coloring \( g_c \in \Omega \) and recolor this vertex with any other color then an obtained coloring \( g'_c \in G_c \) and \( \phi(g'_c) \leq \phi(g_c) \).
In statement 5 we took $\phi$ to be the minimal on colorings from $G_c$, so a number of large cliques shouldn’t change. And it means that a large clique should appear on vertices of the color with which we recolored $v$, besides we get $g'_c \in \Omega$.

**Statement 6.** Let coloring $\xi_1 \in \Omega$ and $\phi(\xi_1) > 0$. Let $C_1$ be a large clique of the $i$-th color. Consider the induced subgraph $G_{ij}$ of $G$ on all vertices of the $i$-th and $j$-th colors. Then connectivity component containing $C_1$ in the graph $G_{ij}$ constitute a complete graph on $\alpha_i + \alpha_j + 1$ vertices.

**Proof.** Recolor an arbitrary vertex $v_1 \in C_1$ with the color $j$. According to the statement 5 we get a new coloring $\xi_2 \in \Omega$. And $v_1$ should get in some large clique $C_2$ of the $j$-th color. Recolor some distinct from $v_1$ vertex $v_2$ in the clique $C_2$ with the color $i$. Again according to the statement 5 we get a new coloring $\xi_3 \in \Omega$ in which $v_2$ necessarily should get in some large clique $C_3$ of the $i$-th color. And so on: we recolor vertices in such a manner until we get the large clique a part of which we have already considered (see fig. 3, where four recolorings have been done and $\alpha_i = \alpha_j = 3$).

1.a) At the end we came back to a part of the clique $C_1$ and a number of recolorings is greater than two, i.e. the last coloring is $\xi_k$ where $k \geq 3$. Recolor in the coloring $\xi_1$ some another than $v_1$ vertex $v$ in the clique $C_1$ with $j$ color. According to the statement 5 we get a large clique containing $v_k$ and $v$ of the color $j$ and therefore the following holds: any vertex $v \in C_1$, where $v \neq v_1$, is adjacent to all vertices in $C_k$ except $v_{k-1}$.

Draw the following conclusion:

Any vertex $u \in C_k$, where $u \neq v_{k-1}$, is adjacent to all vertices in $C_1$ except $v_1$.

Recolor in $\xi_1$ vertex $v \in C_1$, $v \neq v_1$ with the $j$-th color and then recolor some vertex $u \in C_k$ distinct from $v_{k-1}$ and $v_k$ with the $i$-th color (we can choose such a vertex $u$ because of $\alpha_i \geq 2$ and $\alpha_j \geq 2$). So we get a coloring $\xi' \in G_c$ with a smaller value of $\phi$ as $u$ is adjacent to all vertices in $C_1$ except $v_1$. The following figure 3 is called upon to illustrate process of recolorings for $k = 4$ and $\alpha_i = \alpha_j = 3$.

1.b) Point out that if it was only two recolorings and we came back to a part of the clique $C_1$ then the vertex $v_2$ is adjacent to all vertices in $C_1$ and so by recoloring in $\xi_1$ of
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any vertex in the large clique $C_1$ with the $j$-th color we will get by the statement a new large clique of the $j$-th color containing $C_2 \setminus \{v_1\}$. So $G(C_1 \cup C_2)$ is a complete graph. By arbitrary choice of the $v_1$ and $v_2$ and by the fact that $G(C_1 \cup C_2)$ is a $\alpha_i + \alpha_j + 1$ size clique it follows that vertices of the set $C_1 \cup C_2$ are not adjacent to the rest vertices of the $i$-th and $j$-th colors.

2) If we interrupted the process of recolorings on a clique $C_l$ where $l$ not necessary equals to 1 then by above reasoning it is clear that (we can assume that we start the process from $\xi_l$) $C_l \cup C_{l+1}$ constitute a clique in $G$. And so we get $l = 1$, because vertices from $C_l \cup C_{l+1}$ and the rest vertices of the $i$-th and $j$-th colors are not adjacent.

\[ \square \]

**Remark 3.** Note that at the statement proof we make essential use of $\alpha_i \geq 2$ and $\alpha_j \geq 2$. In other case we just could not choose a vertex distinct from all $v_i$.

**Statement 7.** In any coloring $g_c \in \Omega$ there are no large cliques.

**Proof.** There is a coloring $g_c \in \Omega$ with a large clique $C$ on vertices of the $i$-th color. Without loss of generality suppose that $i = 1$. Apply the statement to the first and the second colors. We get a complete graph containing $C$ on $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 1$ vertices of the first and the second colors. We can split in arbitrary way this complete graph into two parts of the first and the second colors with correspondent sizes $\alpha_1 + 1$ and $\alpha_2$ preserving remain coloring of the graph and an obtained coloring would also lay in $\Omega$. By the statement and above consideration applying to the first and the $i$-th color ($i \in [2, c + 1]$) it’s easy to show the presence of a complete subgraph of $G$ on $1 + \sum_{j=1}^{c+1} \alpha_j$ vertices, i.e. the complete subgraph on $D + 1$ vertices – contradiction with the condition of theorem.

\[ \square \]

**Remark 4.** In fact we have just now proved the theorem Also note that desired in the theorem coloring $\xi$ assign a partition of all vertices of the graph into required in the corollary sets.

**Remark 5.** Consider the particular coloring $g_c \in \Omega$. We have just shown that in $g_c$ there is no large clique. So using the Brook’s theorem for any color in $g_c$ we can get a proper $\alpha_c$-coloring of $i$-th color vertices, so as a result we can get a proper coloring of $G$ with $D$ colors ($\sum_{j=1}^{c+1} \alpha_i = D$). If a vertex in the coloring $g_c$ is adjacent to some vertex of its color, then by statement there should be at least $c + 1$ vertices of different colors in the neighborhood of such a vertex. In other words the main problem we have to solve is to satisfy the condition of $(c, p)$-nondegeneration for “singular” vertices, i.e. vertices not adjacent to its and some other colors in the coloring $g_c$. In fact, if $G$ is a bipartite graph then the theorem about $G$ proper $(c, p)$-nondegenerate coloring with $D$ colors would be none trivial fact. And a proof of the theorem for the case of a bipartite graph would show you a difficulty and specificity of the problem.

Consider a coloring $g_c \in \Omega$ and consider in it all vertices adjacent to less than $c - 1$ different colors. Denote a set of all such vertices by $\Upsilon$. Notice that every vertex $v \in \Upsilon$ has no adjacent to it vertices of the same as $v$ color in the coloring $g_c$ and there is another color such that $v$ is not adjacent to the vertices of this color. So we can change color of $v \in \Upsilon$ into another such that obtained coloring as before would be in $\Omega$. Moreover we can change color of any part of vertices from $\Upsilon$ of an $i$-th color so that obtained coloring will be in $\Omega$ (of course we could recolor this vertices with different colors). For every vertex
$v \in \Upsilon$ there can be found a color in $g_c$ such that $v$ is adjacent to at least $\lceil \frac{p_i}{c-1} \rceil$ vertices of this color. So we can divide $\Upsilon$ into $c+1$ sets $\theta_1, \theta_2, \ldots, \theta_{c+1}$, in such a way that every vertex from $\theta_i$ is adjacent to at least $\lceil \frac{p}{c-1} \rceil$ vertices of the $i$-th color.

Denote by $H_i$ for all $i \in [1, c+1]$ the induced subgraph of $G$ on the vertices of the $i$-th color in the coloring $g_c$.

**Statement 8.** For any vertex $v \in H_i$ the following inequality holds:

$$\left\lfloor d_{H_i}(v) + \frac{d_{G(\theta_i \cup \{v\})}(v)}{c+2} \right\rfloor \leq \alpha_i.$$  

**Proof.** Consider a set $E_v$ of all edges in the graph $G$ with one end at $v$. It’s obviously that $|E_v| \leq D$. Consider a set $E_1$ of all edges from $E_v$ which has the second end vertex distinct from $v$ not laying in $\theta_i$. Let from $v$ there lead less than $\frac{\alpha_j}{\alpha_i} d_{H_i}(v)$ edges of the set $E_1$ to a color $j$ distinct from $i$. Then we change the color of all vertices of the $j$-th color of the set $\theta_i \subseteq \Upsilon$ in such a way that an obtained coloring will be in $\Omega$. Clearly we recolored these vertices not with the color of $v$, so $d_{H_i}(v)$ doesn’t change in the obtained coloring. If we recolor $v$ in the new coloring with the $j$-th color then a magnitude less than $\frac{\alpha_j}{\alpha_i} d_{H_i}(v)$ is added to the value of $\Phi$, thus we find a coloring with a smaller value of $\Phi$ and so we arrive at a contradiction.
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So we can get the following lower bound on the number of edges coming from $v$:

$$|E_v| \geq d_{H_i}(v) + d_{G(\theta_i \cup \{v\})}(v) + \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{\alpha_j}{\alpha_i} d_{H_i}(v) = \sum_{j=1}^{c+1} \frac{\alpha_j}{\alpha_i} d_{H_i}(v) + d_{G(\theta_i \cup \{v\})}(v) = \frac{D}{\alpha_i} d_{H_i}(v) + d_{G(\theta_i \cup \{v\})}(v).$$

By definition $|E_v| \leq D$. So we get:

$$D \geq \frac{D}{\alpha_i} d_{H_i}(v) + d_{G(\theta_i \cup \{v\})}(v) \Rightarrow \alpha_i \geq d_{H_i}(v) + \frac{\alpha_i}{D} d_{G(\theta_i \cup \{v\})}(v).$$

Then by using the fact that $\alpha_i \geq \lceil \frac{D}{c+1} \rceil$ and $D \geq (c^3 + 8c^2 + 19c + 6)(c+1)$ we get

$$\frac{\alpha_i}{D} > \frac{1}{c+2}.$$ So we get

$$\alpha_i \geq d_{H_i}(v) + \frac{d_{G(\theta_i \cup \{v\})}(v)}{c+2}. \quad \square$$
The second part.

**Lemma 1.** Let there be given two nonempty sets $A$ and $B$ and a connected graph $H = (A \cup B, E)$. And let $G$ denotes the induced subgraph $H(B)$. Define $d_A(v), v \in B$ to be a number of edges coming from $v$ to the set $A$. Let the graph $H$ satisfy the following conditions:

1) every two vertices of $A$ are not joint with an edge;
2) the degree of every vertex from $A$ in the graph $H$ is at least $d$, where $d = q^3 + 2q^2 - q - 8$ and $q \geq 4$;
3) for any vertex $v \in B$, the following inequality holds:

$$d(v) + \lceil \frac{d_A(v)}{q} \rceil \leq d.$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

Then the graph $G$ could be properly colored with $d$ colors in such a way, that for any vertex $v \in A$ among all its neighbors in $B$ there are vertices of at least $q$ different colors.

**Remark 6.** $(c + 2)^3 + 2(c + 2)^2 - (c + 2) - 8 = c^3 + 8c^2 + 19c + 6$.

**Remark 7.** In the lemma [4], the set $B$ denotes $H_i$ from the first part, the set of vertices $A$ denotes $\theta_i$ from the first part. Also it makes no difference for us whether there are any edges between vertices in $\theta_i$. We only need to know to which vertices in $H_i$ vertices in $\theta_i$ are adjacent to, because we will color vertices only in $H_i$.

As $q$ in lemma [4] we denoted the value of $c + 2$ from the first part and as $d$ we denoted the value of $\alpha_i$. Via $H$ in the lemma [7] we denoted the graph $G(\theta_i \cup H_i) - E(G(\theta_i))$. By definition of the set $\theta_i$ from any vertex $v \in \theta_i$ there comes at least $c_7 \geq q^3 + 2q^2 - q - 8$ edges to the set $V(H_i)$.

We suppose in the lemma $[7]$ that the graph $H$ is connected (in other case it is sufficient to prove the lemma’s statement for every connectivity component). Furthermore we can assume that $\theta_i$ is not empty, otherwise we have just to prove the Brook’s Theorem because of we need to color properly graph $H_i$ with $\alpha_i$ colors, and we know that in $H_i$ there are no complete subgraphs on $\alpha_i + 1$ vertices (in $H_i$ there are no large cliques) and $d_{H_i} = \lceil d_H(v) + \frac{d_{G(\theta_i \cup H_i)(v)}}{c+2} \rceil \leq \alpha_i$. Thus, all the conditions of lemma $[1]$ are satisfied for the sets $B = V(H_i)$ and $A = \theta_i$.

Suppose the lemma $[7]$ has been already proven. Then, if we color for every $i$ the subgraph $H_i$ in the coloring $g_c$ of $G$ in a proper way with a new $\alpha_i$ colors such that every vertex from $\theta_i$ would be adjacent to vertices of at least $c$ different colors then we get a proper $D$-coloring of the whole graph $G$. At that time the vertices from the set $\Upsilon = \bigcup_{i=1}^{c+1} \theta_i$ would be adjacent to, at least, $c$ vertices of different colors. Moreover in accordance with the definition of $\Upsilon$ all the vertices from the set $V(G) \setminus \Upsilon$ would be adjacent to at least $c$ vertices of different colors. Thus, we reduce the theorem $[7]$ to the lemma $[7]$.

**Remark 8.** The second part is devoted to the proof of lemma $[7]$. So to avoid a misunderstanding for a coincidence of notations let us say that notations from the first part have no connection with notations from the second part.

**Remark 9.** In the assertion of the lemma $[7]$ it is possible to change $q$ to $q - 2$, but we will not do this for the sake of calculation convenience.

**Proof of the Lemma [7]** Suppose that assertion of the lemma $[7]$ fails. Then, consider the smallest for a number of vertices graph for which all the assumptions of the lemma $[7]$ holds but the statement of the lemma $[7]$ fails.
Definition 1. We will call a permissible the set $S_i \subseteq B$ if $S_i \subset N_H(v_i)$, where $v_i \in A$ and $|S_i| = q$. A set of all samplings of permissible sets for all $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, |A|\}$ we will denote by $\Lambda$.

The assertion of our lemma abides by the following fact:

Fact. For every vertex $v_i$ in $A$ we can choose a permissible set $S_i$ in such a way that if we add to the edges set $E(G)$ all complete graphs on sets $S_i$ where $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, |A|\}$ then it is possible to color vertices of the obtained graph $\tilde{G}$ properly with $d$ colors.

Remark 10. We will consider $\tilde{G}$ as a graph with multiedges.

Remark 11. So we get an equivalent statement of the lemma 1.

Remark 12. In the new formula, it is convenient to make some reduction with a graph as follows:

Let there be a vertex $\hat{v}$ of degree $d$ in a graph $\tilde{G}$, then it is possible to “delete” this vertex from the graph $\tilde{G}$ and prove a statement of the fact for the graph $\tilde{G} \setminus \hat{v}$.

Definition 2. We will say that $\hat{v}$ is recursively deleted from $\tilde{G}$ if there is a sequence of reductions described above with the last $\hat{v}$ reduction. We will call a graph $\tilde{G}$ to be a recursive one, if it reduces to the empty graph.

Remark 13. Let us explain why we call such a reduction as a recursion. The matter is that if a graph reduces to the empty one then we will color it just by recursion.

Actually we will prove the following stronger fact:

Instead of the statement that $\tilde{G}$ is properly colored with $d$ colors, we will prove that $\tilde{G}$ is a recursive with respect to coloring it with $d$ colors.

Return to the lemma’s proof and more specifically to the proof of the stronger fact. Denote as $S$ the set of vertices from $B$ which are adjacent to at least one vertex in $A$.

Prove that for the graph $H$ the strengthened fact holds in assumption that $H$ is the minimal for number of vertices graph for which the statement of the lemma 1 fails. Thus, we will arrive at a contradiction and so we will prove the lemma 1.

Definition 3. Define for any vertex $v$ from the set $B$ the magnitude

$$L(v) := d_G(v) + \frac{d_A(v)}{q+1}.$$ 

Remark 14. Notice that if we choose a sampling $S_i$ at random (independently for any vertex $v_i$, where all possible variants of the set $S_i$ are equiprobable), then the distribution average of a variate of the degree in the graph $\tilde{G}$ for any vertex from the set $S$ is not greater than $d_G(v) + d_A(v)(q-1)\frac{q}{q^2+2q-8}$, i.e. the degree is not greater than $L(v)$ (since $q \geq 4$ then $q^3 + 2q^2 - q - 8 > q(q^2 - 1)$) and by the third condition of lemma 1 would be less than $d$. Thus, at the average the degree of every vertex in $\tilde{G}$ is less than $d$. And this gives us hope that the graph $\tilde{G}$ turns out to be a recursive one, i.e. if we successively delete vertices from the $\tilde{G}$ with degree less than $d$ then we arrive to the empty graph.

For a lemma’s proof completion, we only need to choose successfully a sampling of $S_i$, i.e. to choose it in such a way that $\tilde{G}$ become a recursive graph.
**Definition 4.** By the change of some permissible sets $S_{i_1}, S_{i_2}, ..., S_{i_z}$ in a sampling $\lambda \in \Lambda$ to some other permissible sets $S'_{i_1}, ..., S'_{i_z}$ we denote a substitution of $\lambda$ for a $\lambda' \in \Lambda$, where $\lambda'$ differs from $\lambda$ only by that the all permissible sets $S_{i_1}, ..., S_{i_z}$ in $\lambda$ are substituted by the other permissible sets $S'_{i_1}, ..., S'_{i_z}$. The sets $S'_{i_1}, ..., S'_{i_z}$ we will call the result of the change of sets $S_{i_1}, S_{i_2}, ..., S_{i_z}$.

Denote as $R$ the set $B \setminus S$. The degree of any vertex in $R$ may be thought of as $d$ because by the condition of lemma the degree of any vertex of $B$ in the graph $G$ is less or equal than $d$ and if degree of a vertex is less than $d$, then it is possible to delete recursively this vertex in $G$ for any permissible sampling.

**Statement 9.** Let there be given a graph $F$ such that $V(F) = S_1 \cup S_2$ and $S_1 \cap S_2 = \emptyset$, the degree of any vertex of $S_2$ in the graph $F$ is less or equal than $D$ and in $F$ there is such a vertex $v \in S_1$ that the graph $F(S_2 \cup \{v\})$ is connected, $d_F(v) < D$ and the vertex $v$ is adjacent to all the other vertices in $S_1$. Let the graph $F(S_1)$ be properly colored with $D$ colors. Then it is possible to extend such a vertex coloring of $F(S_1)$ to the proper $D$-coloring of $F$.

![fig. 5.](image)

**Proof.** Throw out from the graph $F$ the vertex $v$, then we get a new graph $F'$. The set $S_1 \setminus \{v\}$ has already been properly colored with $D$ colors. One by one we recursively color properly with $D$ colors all the vertices in $S_2$, since $F(S_2 \cup \{v\})$ is a connected graph and the degree in the graph $F$ of any vertex in $S_2$ is less or equal than $D$. Carry the obtained proper $D$-coloring of $F'$ to $F$ and then color $v$ with some color distinct from all the colors of vertices in $N_F(v)$ (it is possible to do so since $d_F(v) < D$), as a result we get a proper $D$-coloring of the graph $F$, but at that time we could probably change the initial color of vertex $v$ in the given coloring of $S_1$. Let us notice that all vertices in the set $S_1 \setminus \{v\}$ are colored with the colors different from the color of $v$ in the initial coloring of $S_1$, as initial coloring of $S_1$ was proper for the graph $F(S_1)$ and vertex $v$ is adjacent to all the other vertices in $S_1$, moreover all the colors of vertices in $S_1 \setminus \{v\}$ differ from the color of $v$ in the obtained proper $D$-coloring of $F$. And now if the vertex $v$ changed its color in the obtained coloring in comparison with the given coloring of $S_1$ then we trade places of the current color of $v$ with the color of $v$ in the initial coloring. Thus, we get a proper $D$-coloring of $F$, but now equal on the set $S_1$ to the initial coloring.

**Definition 5.** By the regular change of the sets $S_i$ of a sampling $\nu \in \Lambda$ with respect to a set $S'$, we will call such a change of the sets $S_i$, where $i \in [1, |A|]$, to the sets $S'_i$, $i \in [1, |A|]$, that for all $i \in [1, |A|]$ the set $S_i \cap S'$ contains the set $S'_i \cap S'$. If there exists $i \in [1, |A|]$ such that $|S_i \cap S'|$ greater than $|S'_i \cap S'|$ then such a regular change we will call the non-degenerate change.
Remark 15. A Regular change with respect to some set is a regular change with respect to any subset of this set, but at that time the non-degeneracy not necessarily preserves.

Statement 10. Let there is a sampling of permissible sets \( \eta = \{S_1, S_2, ..., S_{|A|}\} \) of the graph \( H \) — the smallest for the number of vertices graph which is contrary instance for the lemma 2 and let there are such sets \( S' \subseteq S, R' \subseteq R \) that the all vertices in \( B \setminus (S' \cup R') \) are recursively deleted from the graph \( \bar{G} \), for all \( u \in R' \) \( d_{\bar{G}(S' \cup R')}(u) = d \) and for all \( u \in R' \) \( d_{\bar{G}(S' \cup R')}(u) = d \).

Let \( \bar{H}' := \bar{G}(S' \cup R') \) and

\[
\sum_{u \in \bar{H}'} d_{\bar{H}'}(u) > \sum_{u \in \bar{H}'} L(u). \tag{2}
\]

Then it is possible to make a regular non-degenerate change of sets \( S_i \) with respect to the set \( S' \cup R' \) so that all the set \( B \setminus (S' \cup R') \) as before could be recursively deleted out the graph \( \bar{G}' \) obtained from \( \bar{G} \) as a result of this change.

Proof. We will prove this statement by induction on the set \( B \setminus (S' \cup R') \) size.

The basis: the case when \( |B \setminus (S' \cup R')| = 0 \) obviously could not take place since by virtue of remark 14 the condition (2) doesn’t hold.

The inductive step: let the statement holds for all numbers less than \( k \), then let us prove that it holds for the \( k \).

Let \( Z := B \setminus (S' \cup R') \).

Consider those sets \( S' \) and \( R' \) such that \( |Z| = k \) and the assertion of the statement fails.

Let us show that there is a vertex \( v_i \in A \) and correspondent to it the set \( S_i \) such that it is possible to make a regular non-degenerate change of \( S_i \) in relation to \( S' \). If it is false then for any \( v_j \in A \) and correspondent to it the set \( S_j \) only two possibilities can occurred:

1) the set \( S_i \cap S' = \emptyset \) (see fig. 7);
2) the set \( N_{\bar{G}}(v_j) \setminus S' \subseteq S_i \) (see fig. 8).

fig. 6.
In both of these cases the number of edges added to the graph $G$ with two ends in $S'$ reaches its minimum. Thus, for every vertex $v \in S' \cup R'$ the following chain of inequalities take place: $d_{\tilde{H}'}(v) \leq E(d_{\tilde{H}'}(v)) \leq E(d_{G}(v)) \leq L(v)$, where by the $E(\cdot)$, we denote the average of distribution of a variate with the distribution specified in the remark. We know from the condition (2) that $\sum_{u \in H'} d_{\tilde{H}'}(u) > \sum_{u \in H'} L(u)$. So by a substitution of the inequality $d_{\tilde{H}'}(v) \leq L(v)$ in the previous inequality we get $\sum_{u \in \tilde{H}'} d_{\tilde{H}'}(u) > \sum_{u \in \tilde{H}'} d_{\tilde{H}'}(u)$ — a contradiction.

Hence, there is such a vertex $v_i \in A$, that a part of its neighborhood is contained in $Z$ but the set $S_i \cap S' \neq \phi$ and $S_i$ does not contain this part.

Consequently, we can consider such a vertex $v \in \bar{N}_G(v_i)$, that it does not lay neither in the set $S'$ nor in the set $S_i$, but some nonempty part of $S_i$ is contained in the set $S'$.

We know that $Z$ can be recursively deleted from $\tilde{G}$, so begin to recursively delete vertices from $Z$, but do it while it is possible to delete vertex distinct from $v$. At some moment we should stop this process. It means that we could not delete vertex except $v$ and so we have only $v, u_1, u_2, ..., u_l \in S, w_1, w_2, ..., w_m \in R$ vertices remained in $Z$.

Denote by $P$ the set of all remaining vertices in $Z$, and denote by $\tilde{I}$ induced subgraph $\tilde{G}(S' \cup R' \cup P)$ of $G$.

Let us notice that the degree in the graph $\tilde{I}$ for any $u_k$ vertex, where $k \in [1, l]$, or for any $w_j$, where $j \in [1, m]$, is at least $d$.

Let us notice also that the degree of $v$ in $\tilde{I}$ is less than $d$.

If the degree of $v$ is less than $d - q + 1$ in $\tilde{I}$, then let us make a change of $S_i$ to a set $S_i'$ in the following way: we take a vertex $x$ in $S_i$ which also is contained in the set $S' \cap S_i$ (those vertex necessarily turns up as $S' \cap S_i \neq \phi$), then $S_i' := \{(S_i \setminus \{x\}) \cup \{v\}\}$, the remaining sets of the sampling $\eta$ we do not change. Let us notice that the change described above is a regular and non-degenerate one in regard to $S'$ also it is clear that set $Z$ will be recursively deleted in the obtained graph (it is clear that we can recursively delete as earlier vertices from $Z \setminus P$ then we can recursively delete $v$, as it has degree less than $d$, because before the change it has degree less than $d - q + 1$ and after the change the degree became not greater than $d - 1$, and then we can recursively delete all remaining vertices from $Z$, since $Z$ has been recursively deleted from $\tilde{G}$ and we drew no new edges in the graph $\tilde{I}(V(\tilde{I}) \setminus \{v\})$). So in this case we have proved an inductive step.

Thus we get that the degree of $v$ is less than $d$ but at least $d - q + 1$ in $\tilde{I}$.

Let us prove that for the graph $\tilde{I}$ the following condition holds:

$$\sum_{u \in \tilde{I}} d_{\tilde{I}}(u) > \sum_{u \in \tilde{I}} L(u). \quad (2')$$
With the proof, we can make use of an induction assumption for the sets $S'_0$ and $R'_0$, where $S'_0 := (S' \cup R' \cup P) \cap S$ and $R'_0 := (S' \cup R' \cup P) \cap R$, i.e. we can make a regular non-degenerate change of $\eta$ in regard to $S'_0 \cup R'_0$, where $S'_0 := (S' \cup R' \cup P) \cap S$ and $R'_0 := (S' \cup R' \cup P) \cap R$, i.e. we can make a regular non-degenerate change of $\eta$ in regard to $S'_0 \cup R'_0$, also a composition of regular changes in regard to some a set is also the regular change in regard to this very set. Besides let us notice that in the graph obtained by this change all vertices from the set $B \setminus (S' \cup R')$ will be recursively deleted, as we can recursively delete at first the all vertices from $B \setminus (S' \cup R' \cup P)$ and then we can recursively delete as before all vertices from $P$ since by the change we do not add new edges to $P$.

So we will do such changes until either $S_i$ will be regularly changed in non-degenerate way in regard to $S' \cup R'$, or the degree of $v$ in the graph $\tilde{G}$ will become less than $d - q + 1$, or the degree of any vertex from $P \setminus \{v\}$ will become less than $d$. In the last case we can recursively delete some more vertices from $Z$ and for the smaller graph $\tilde{I}$ apply the same arguments. Here, it needs to be emphasized that some time or other we necessarily arrive at one of this cases else we will do an infinite number of non-degenerate regular changes in regard to the set $S' \cup R' \cup P$ and, hence, we will infinitely decrease a value of the sum $|I| = \sum_{i=1}^{\frac{|A|}{d}} |S_i \cap (S' \cup R' \cup P)|$.

Denote by $l'$ the number of edges coming to the vertex set $S'$ from $P$ in the graph $\tilde{G}$.

By the conditions of statement 10 that for all $u \in R' d_{\tilde{G}(S' \cup R')} (u) = d$ and for all $u \in R d_{\tilde{G}} (u) = d$, there are no edges between $P$ and $R'$.

So to end the proof of statement 10 we only need to prove, that for the graph $\tilde{I} = \tilde{G}(S' \cup R' \cup P)$ the inequality $(2')$ holds. Assume the contrary, then

$$\sum_{u \in \tilde{I}} L(u) \geq \sum_{u \in \tilde{I}} d_{\tilde{I}}(u) \geq \sum_{u \in \tilde{R'}} d_{\tilde{R'}}(u) + l' + \sum_{u \in P} d_{\tilde{I}}(u) > \sum_{u \in \tilde{R'}} L(u) + \sum_{u \in P} d_{\tilde{I}}(u) + l'.$$
So we get the following:

\[ \sum_{u \in P} L(u) > l' + \sum_{u \in P} d_i'(u)'. \]

Hence, we get the inequality:

\[ l' + \sum_{u \in P} d_i'(u) - L(u) < 0. \]  \hspace{1cm} (3)

Let us bound the magnitude \( d_i'(u_i) - L(u_i) \) for all \( i \in [1, l] \).

By definition of \( L(u) \) and by virtue of \( d_i'(u_i) \geq d \) we get that for all \( i \in [1, l] \) the following inequality holds: \( d_i'(u_i) - L(u_i) \geq d - d_\phi(u_i) - \frac{d_A(u_i)}{q+1} \). Using the inequality (1) we get:

\[
d_i'(u_i) - L(u_i) \geq d - d_\phi(u_i) - \frac{d_A(u_i)}{q+1} \geq d_\phi(u_i) + \left[ \frac{d_A(u_i)}{q} \right] - d_\phi(u_i) - \frac{d_A(u_i)}{q+1}. \] \hspace{1cm} (*)

Thus \( d_i'(u_i) - L(u_i) \geq \left[ \frac{d_A(u_i)}{q} \right] - \frac{d_A(u_i)}{q+1} \).

Also \( d_A(u_i) > 0 \) for all \( i \in [1, l] \), as \( u_i \in S \) for all \( i \in [1, l] \). Let us consider two following cases:

a) 0 < \( d_A(u_i) \leq q \);

b) \( d_A(u_i) \geq q + 1 \).

In both of these cases the following inequality holds:

\[
d_i'(u_i) - L(u_i) \geq \left[ \frac{d_A(u_i)}{q} \right] - \frac{d_A(u_i)}{q+1} \geq \frac{1}{q+1}. \] \hspace{1cm} (4)

Let \( q_1 := d_i'(v) - d + q \) then, as we have just showed it above, \( q_1 > 0 \). Let us notice that for the vertex \( v \) analogously to calculations (*) we can get the following inequality:

\[
d_i'(v) - L(v) \geq q_1 - q + \frac{1}{q+1}. \] \hspace{1cm} (5)

Since \( w_i \in R \), where \( i \in [1, m] \), \( d_G(w_i) = L(w_i) \), moreover we can not recursively delete any vertex from the set \( P \cap R \) in the graph \( \tilde{I} \). In addition using the statement 10 condition, that for any vertex \( u \in R \) \( d_G(u) = d \), we get \( d_i'(w_j) = d_G(w_j) = d \). And so for all \( i \in [1, m] \) the we have

\[ d = d_i'(w_i) = L(w_i). \] \hspace{1cm} (6)

It now follows from (4), (5), (6), (3) that:

\[ l' + l \frac{1}{q+1} - q + q_1 + \frac{1}{q+1} < 0. \]

Recall now that \( l \) is a number of vertices in the set \( (P \cap S) \setminus \{v\} \), i.e. the number of \( u_i \). We know that \( q_1 \geq 1 \). Then \( l'(q+1) + l < (q-1)(q+1) - 1 \), i.e.

\[ (q+1)l' + l \leq q^2 - 3. \] \hspace{1cm} (7)

From the inequality (7) we get two inequalities

\[ l \leq q^2 - 3 \] \hspace{1cm} (8)
and

\[ l' \leq q - 2. \]  

(9)

Denote by \( b_j \) (see fig. 10), where \( j \in [1, r] \), the all vertices from the set \( R \cap V(\bar{I}) \), which are adjacent to \( v \) (\( r \) can be equal to 0). Let us consider some cases.

1) \( r \geq q^2 - 3 \).

By \( C_v \) we denote the union of all connectivity components of the graph \( \bar{G}(R) \), which is minimal and contains all the vertices \( b_j \), where \( j \in [1, 2, ..., r] \). As we remark earlier, between sets \( P \) and \( R' \) there are no edges, so \( C_v \subseteq R \setminus R' \). By equality (6) we have \( d_I(w_j) = d \), where \( j \in [1, m] \). Thus, vertices from the set \( P \cap R \) and from the set \( Z \setminus P \) are not adjacent, and so \( C_v \subseteq \{w_1, w_2, ..., w_m\} \).

Consider, in the vertex set \( S \) of the graph \( \bar{G} \) all adjacent to \( C_v \) vertices and denote it by \( W \). It is clear by virtue of \( d_I(w_i) = d \) and \( d_G(w_i) = d \) that, firstly \( W \subseteq V(\bar{I}) \), secondly \( v \in W \), and thirdly for all vertices \( u \in C_v \) the equality \( d_{\bar{G}(W \cup C_v)}(u) = d \) holds.

1.1) \(|W| \geq q^2 - 1\).

Then \(|W \cap S'| = |W| - |W \cap P \cap S| \geq q^2 - 1 - (l + 1)\). It is clear that \( l' \geq |W \cap S'| \). Thus \( l' \geq q^2 - 2 - l \), i.e. \( l' + l \geq q^2 - 2 \). So we arrive at a contradiction with inequality (7).

Thus \(|W| \leq q^2 - 2\).

1.2) \(|W| \leq q^2 - 2\).

Let us draw in the graph \( H \) all the edges of the type \((u, v)\), where \( u \in W \) and \((u, v) \notin E(H)\), denote by \( \Theta \) the obtained graph. Let us verify all conditions of the lemma \[ \] for the graph \( \bar{H} := \Theta(V(H) \setminus C_v) \) and sets \( \bar{A} := A, \bar{B} := B \setminus C_v \) and value \( \bar{d} := d \).

Condition 1) is clear as \( A \) became the same.

Condition 2) is clear, since any vertex from \( C_v \) are not adjacent in \( H \) to any vertex from the set \( A \).
**Condition 3.** It is sufficient to verify inequality (1) only for vertices from the set \(B\), from which we draw any new edges, in other words we need to verify (1) only for the set \(W\). By definition \(\hat{\mathcal{G}} := \hat{H}(\hat{B})\). For any vertex \(u \in W\), \(u \neq v\) we added not more than one edge with the end at \(u\) but also we deleted at least one edge coming from \(u\) to the set \(C_v\) (\(W\) is by definition the set of all vertices from \(S\), which are adjacent with at least one vertex in \(C_v\)). Thus (1) remains true for all \(u \in W\), \(u \neq v\). The inequality (1) for \(v\) holds, as \(|W| \leq q^2 - 2\), so we drew from \(v\) not greater than \(q^2 - 3\) edges. On the other hand the set \(C_v\) by definition contains all the \(b_j\), where \(j \in [1, r]\), \(r \geq q^2 - 3\), so we deleted at least \(q^2 - 3\) edges with the end in \(v\).

As we suppose \(H\) to be a minimal by the number of vertices graph for which the lemma \([\text{lemma}]\) doesn’t hold, then lemma \([\text{lemma}]\) holds for \(\hat{H}\) which has the smaller number of vertices. Then we can color properly the graph \(\hat{G}\) with \(d\) colors in such a way that for any vertex \(u \in A\) among its neighbors in \(\hat{B}\) there would be at least \(q\) different colors. Denote by \(\xi\) such a proper \(d\)-coloring. It is clear that all assumptions of statement \([\text{statement}]\) are satisfied for the graph \(\Phi := \Theta(W \cup C_v)\), sets \(S_1 := W\) and \(S_2 := C_v\) and vertex \(v\). Consider a proper \(d\)-coloring \(\xi(W)\) of the graph \(\Theta(W)\). By the statement \([\text{statement}]\) we can extend \(\xi(W)\) to a proper \(d\)-coloring \(\zeta\) of the graph \(\Theta(W \cup C_v)\). Let us notice that there are no edges in the graph \(\Theta\) between the vertex set \(C_v\) and the vertex set \(V(H) \setminus (W \cup C_v)\), so we can combine \(\xi\) and \(\zeta\) into one proper \(d\)-coloring of the graph \(\hat{G}\), also the condition, that for any vertex \(v \in A\) there are at least \(q\) vertices of different colors in its neighborhood, holds for this combined coloring. Thus we get a coloring of the graph \(H\) we had seeking for in the lemma \([\text{lemma}]\) so we arrive at a contradiction with assumption of the statement \([\text{statement}]\).

2) \(r \leq q^2 - 4\)

So from the vertex \(v\) in the graph \(\bar{I}\) it outcomes not more than \(q^2 - 4\) edges to the vertex set \(R \cap V(\bar{I})\). The degree of \(v\) in the graph \(\bar{I}\) is \(d - q + q_1\). So from the vertex \(v\) it comes at least \(d - q + q_1 - r - l'\) edges to the set \(\{u_1, u_2, ..., u_l\}\). Let us notice that if a vertex \(u \in S\) in the graph \(\bar{G}\) has an edge of multiplicity \(k\), then \(d_A(u) \geq k - 1\). We know that from \(v\), the outcome is at least \(q^3 + 2q^2 - q - 8 - q + q_1 - r - l'\) edges to the vertices \(u_1, u_2, ..., u_l\). Denote for all \(i \in [1, l]\) as \(d_i\) the multiplicity of the edge \((v, u_i)\) in the graph \(\bar{H}\). Thus we know that \(\sum_{i=1}^{l} d_i \geq q^3 + 2q^2 - 2q - 8 + q_1 - r - l'\). Then we get

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{l} d_A(u_i) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{l} (d_i - 1) \geq q^3 + 2q^2 - 2q - 8 + q_1 - r - l' - l. \tag{10}
\]

By substituting inequality (5) and equality (6) into inequality (3) we get

\[
l' - q + q_1 + \frac{1}{q + 1} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{l} d_f(u_i) - L(u_i) < 0. \tag{11}
\]

We know that \(d_f(u_i) - L(u_i) \geq d - d_G(u_i) - \frac{d_A(u_i)}{q+1}\) for all \(i \in [1, l]\). By applying inequality (1) we get \(d - d_G(u_i) - \frac{d_A(u_i)}{q+1} \geq \left[d_A(u_i) - \frac{1}{q(q+1)}\right] - \frac{d_A(u_i)}{q+1} \geq d_A(u_i) - \frac{1}{q(q+1)}\). Thus

\[
d_f(u_i) - L(u_i) \geq d_A(u_i) - \frac{1}{q(q+1)}. \tag{12}
\]

Substitute (12) into (11) we get:

\[
l' - q + q_1 + \frac{1}{q + 1} + \frac{1}{q(q+1)} \sum_{i=1}^{l} d_A(u_i) < 0. \tag{13}
\]
Substitute (10) into (13):

\[ l' - q + q_1 + \frac{1}{q + 1} + \frac{q^3 + 2q^2 - 2q - 8 + q_1 - r - l' - l}{q(q + 1)} < 0. \]

We know that \( l' \geq 0 \) and \( q_1 \geq 1 \). Hence we have

\[ l'(1 - \frac{1}{q(q + 1)}) - (q - 1) + \frac{1}{q + 1} + \frac{q^3 + 2q^2 - 2q - 8 + 1 - r - l}{q(q + 1)} < 0. \]

We also know that \( r \leq q^2 - 4 \) and by inequality (8) \( l \leq q^2 - 3 \). Then

\[ \frac{1}{q + 1} + \frac{q^3 + 2q^2 - 2q - 8 + 1 - (q^2 - 4) - (q^2 - 3) - (q^3 - q)}{q(q + 1)} < 0. \]

So we get \( \frac{1}{q + 1} - \frac{q}{q(q + 1)} < 0 \), i.e. we arrive at a contradiction.

Thus we proved inequality (2′) for the graph \( \tilde{I} \) and so we proved the statement 𝓁7.

Return to the lemma 𝓁7 proof. Let us begin for the given sampling of sets \( \lambda \in \Lambda \) to delete recursively vertices from \( \tilde{G} \) while it is possible. If graph \( \tilde{G} \) is not a recursive one, then a graph \( \tilde{G}(S' \cup R') \) will remain from \( \tilde{G} \), where \( S' \subseteq S, R' \subseteq R \) and \( S' \neq \emptyset \). Let us choose among all samplings from \( \Lambda \) such a sampling \( \lambda \) that the value of \( |S'| + |R'| \) achieves minimum on it. Let us check up all assumptions of the statement 𝓁7 for sets \( S' \) and \( R' \).

The unique non-trivial place in this check is to verify inequality (2).

Since we can not delete recursively from the graph \( \tilde{H} := \tilde{G}(S' \cup R') \) any vertex, then the degree of any vertex there is at least \( d \). So by inequality (1) \( L(u) = d_u(u) + \frac{d_{\Lambda}(u)}{q+1} \leq d \) for all \( u \in B \), at that \( L(u) < d \) for all vertices \( u \in S \). Since \( S' \neq \emptyset \) it is clear that

\[ \sum_{u \in \tilde{H}'} d_{\tilde{H}'}(u) = d|\tilde{H}'| > \sum_{u \in \tilde{H}'} L(u). \]

So we will apply the statement 𝓁7 to sets \( S' \) and \( R' \), while we get such a vertex such, that it degree in \( \tilde{H}' \) is less than \( d \) (let us notice that we wan't do an infinite number of regular non-degenerate changes in regard to the set \( S' \cup R' \), since by any such a change we decrease the value of \( \sum_{i=1}^{[A]} |S_i \cap S'| \)). Due to the statement 𝓁7 we can as before to delete recursively all vertices from \( B \) except \( S' \cup R' \), and then we can to delete recursively one extra vertex of degree less than \( d \) from the set \( S' \cup R' \). Thus we arrive at a contradiction with minimality of \( |S'| + |R'| \). Hence there is such a sampling of permissible sets that the graph \( \tilde{G} \) would be a recursive one. Thus we proved the lemma 𝓁7 and finally we proved the theorem 𝓁7 (see remark 𝓁7).
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