G k-connected $\Rightarrow \delta(G) = \min \text{degree} \ge k$

Converse?



Theorem (Mader) Every graph of minimum degree at least 4k has a *k*-connected subgraph.

Theorem (Mader) Every graph of minimum degree at least 4k has a *k*-connected subgraph.

Thoughts about a possible proof. Let n := |V(G)|

- 1. Replace minimum degree by average degree So $4k \le average \deg = \sum_{v} \deg(v)/n = 2|E(G)|/n$, which is the same as $|E(G)| \ge 2kn$
- 2. Let's try to prove that for some suitable c, β (*) $|E(G)| \ge ckn + \beta + 1 \Rightarrow G$ has *k*-connected subgraph.



Is it possible that for some values of c, β :

(#) If G is a counterexample, then so is G_1 or G_2 ?

If not, then $|E(G)| \ge ckn + \beta + 1$ and $|E(G_1)| \le ckn_1 + \beta$ and $|E(G_2)| \le ckn_2 + \beta$.

But these conditions could be contradictory

$$\begin{split} |E(G)| &\leq |E(G_1)| + |E(G_2)| \leq ckn_1 + \beta + ckn_2 + \beta \leq \\ &\leq ck(n+k) + 2\beta = ckn + \beta + ck^2 + \beta \leq ckn + \beta \end{split}$$
 if $ck^2 + \beta \leq 0.$

So if $ck^2 + \beta \le 0$, then above computation gives a contradiction, and hence proves (#).

If we pick $\beta \coloneqq -ck^2$, then we have an inductive proof of (*):

 $|E(G)| \ge ckn - ck^2 + 1 \Rightarrow G$ has k-connected subgraph.

But how about the base of the induction? n = k + 1? No way.

We should choose the base so that the edge bound will force the graph to be complete: $ckn - ck^2 + 1 \ge n^2/2$. Best chance for n = ck.

Thus we are trying to prove

(**) If $|V(G)| \ge ck$ and $|E(G)| \ge ckn - ck^2 + 1$, then *G* has a *k*-connected subgraph

Base case: If we choose suitable *c*, then there is no graph *G* with |V(G)| = ck and $|E(G)| \ge ckn - ck^2 + 1$: If |V(G)| = ck, then

$$(ck)^{2} - ck^{2} + 1 \le |E(G)| \le {\binom{ck}{2}} < \frac{1}{2}(ck)^{2}$$
$$\frac{1}{2}(ck)^{2} < ck^{2}$$
$$c < 2$$

If $c \ge 2$, then the graph does not exist.

Induction step: Same as before, except we need to show that $|V(G_i)| \ge ck$. That follows from

Lemma. If *G* is a minimum counterexample to (**), then $\delta(G) \ge ck$.

Proof. We have already shown that |V(G)| > ck.

If *v* has degree $\leq ck$, then

$$|E(G \setminus v)| \ge ckn - ck^2 + 1 - ck = ck(n-1) - ck^2 + 1 =$$
$$= ck(|V(G \setminus v)| - 1) - ck^2 + 1$$

 $\Rightarrow G \setminus v$ is a smaller counterexample.

Matching

A matching in *G* is a set $M \subseteq E(G)$ such that every vertex of *G* is incident with at most one edge of *M*.



M saturates $v \in V(G)$ or v is saturated by *M* if v is incident with an edge of *M*.

A matching is **perfect** if it saturates every vertex.

A maximum matching is a matching *M* in *G* such that there is no matching *M'* with |M'| > |M|.

A maximal matching is a matching *M* such that there is no matching *M'* with $M \subsetneq M'$.

An *M*-alternating path is a path P such that edges in M and edges not in M alternate along P.



An *M*-augmenting path is an *M*-alternating path *P* that starts and ends in an *M*-unsaturated vertex.



Let $M' \coloneqq M \Delta E(P)$. Then M' is a matching with |M'| > |M|.

Theorem. (Berge) A matching *M* in *G* is maximum if and only if there is no *M*-augmenting path.

Proof. \Rightarrow done

 \Leftarrow Assume *M* is not maximum. Let *M'* be a matching with |M'| > |M|. Look at the graph *H* with V(H) = V(G), $E(H) = M \triangle M'$.

Then $\Delta(H) \leq 2$. The components of *H* are:

- even cycles (same number of edges of M and M')
- paths

⇒ \exists component *P* of *H* that has more edges in *M'* than in *M*. That's an *M*-augmenting path. \Box