

# On structural properties of trees with minimal atom-bond connectivity index II

December 22, 2014

**Darko Dimitrov**

*Hochschule für Technik und Wirtschaft Berlin,  
Wilhelminenhofstraße 75A, D-12459 Berlin, Germany  
E-mail: darko.dimitrov11@gmail.com*

## Abstract

The *atom-bond connectivity (ABC) index* is a degree-based graph topological index that found chemical applications. The problem of complete characterization of trees with minimal *ABC* index is still an open problem. In [14], it was shown that trees with minimal *ABC* index do not contain so-called *B<sub>k</sub>-branches*, with  $k \geq 5$ , and that they do not have more than four *B<sub>4</sub>-branches*. Our main results here reveal that the number of *B<sub>1</sub>* and *B<sub>2</sub>-branches* are also bounded from above by small fixed constants. Namely, we show that trees with minimal *ABC* index do not contain more than four *B<sub>1</sub>-branches* and more than eleven *B<sub>2</sub>-branches*.

## 1 Introduction

Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a simple undirected graph of order  $n = |V|$  and size  $m = |E|$ . For  $v \in V(G)$ , the degree of  $v$ , denoted by  $d(v)$ , is the number of edges incident to  $v$ . For an edge  $uv$  in  $G$ , let

$$f(d(u), d(v)) = \sqrt{\frac{d(u) + d(v) - 2}{d(u)d(v)}}. \quad (1)$$

Then, the *atom-bond connectivity (ABC) index* of  $G$  is defined as

$$\text{ABC}(G) = \sum_{uv \in E(G)} f(d(u), d(v)),$$

The *ABC* index was introduced in 1998 by Estrada, Torres, Rodríguez and Gutman [16], who showed that it can be a valuable predictive tool in the study of the heat of formation in

alikeness. Ten years later Estrada [15] elaborated a novel quantum-theory-like justification for this topological index. After that revelation, the interest of ABC-index has grown rapidly. Additionally, the physico-chemical applicability of the ABC index was confirmed and extended in several studies [4, 8, 12, 22, 26, 29, 38].

As a new and well motivated graph invariant, the ABC index has attracted a lot of interest in the last several years both in mathematical and chemical research communities and numerous results and structural properties of ABC index were established [5–7, 9–11, 14, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 25, 27, 31–33, 35–37].

The fact that adding an edge in a graph strictly increases its ABC index [10] (or equivalently that deleting an edge in a graph strictly decreases its ABC index [5]) has the following two immediate consequences.

**Corollary 1.1.** *Among all connected graphs with  $n$  vertices, the complete graph  $K_n$  has maximal value of ABC index.*

**Corollary 1.2.** *Among all connected graphs with  $n$  vertices, the graph with minimal ABC index is a tree.*

Although it is fairly easy to show that the star graph  $S_n$  is a tree with maximal ABC index [18], despite many attempts in the last years, it is still an open problem the characterization of trees with minimal ABC index (also refereed as minimal-ABC trees). The aim of this research is to make a step forward towards the full characterizations of minimal-ABC trees.

In the sequel, we present an additional notation that will be used in the rest of the paper. A tree is called a *rooted tree* if one vertex has been designated the *root*. In a rooted tree, the *parent* of a vertex is the vertex connected to it on the path to the root; every vertex except the root has a unique parent. A vertex is a parent of a subtree, if the subtree is attached to the vertex. A *child* of a vertex  $v$  is a vertex of which  $v$  is the parent. A vertex of degree one is a *pendant vertex*.


For the next two definitions, we adopt the notation from [24]. Let  $S_k = v_0 v_1 \dots v_k, v_{k+1}$ ,  $k \leq n-3$ , be a sequence of vertices of a graph  $G$  with  $d(v_0) > 2$  and  $d(v_i) = 2$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, k-1$ . If  $d(v_k) = 1$ , then  $S_k$  is a *pendant path* of length  $k+1$ . If  $d(v_k) > 2$ , then  $S_k$  is an *internal path* of length  $k$ .

In Section 2 we give an overview of already known structural properties of the minimal-ABC trees. In Sections 3 and 4 we present some results and bounds on the number of  $B_1$  and  $B_2$ -branches, respectively, that may occur in minimal-ABC trees. Conclusion and open problems are presented in Section 5.

## 2 Preliminaries and known structural properties of the minimal-ABC trees

A thorough overview of the known structural properties of the minimal-ABC trees was given in [24]. In addition to the results mentioned there, we present here also the recently obtained related results that we are aware of.

To determine the minimal-ABC tress of order less than 10 is a trivial task, and those trees are depicted in Figure 1. To simplify the exposition in the rest of the paper, we assume that the trees of interest are of order at least 10.



**Figure 1:** Minimal-ABC trees of order  $n$ ,  $4 \leq n \leq 9$ .

In [25], Gutman, Furtula and Ivanović obtained the following results.

**Theorem 2.1.** *The  $n$ -vertex tree with minimal ABC-index does not contain internal paths of any length  $k \geq 1$ .*

**Theorem 2.2.** *The  $n$ -vertex tree with minimal ABC-index does not contain pendant paths of length  $k \geq 4$ .*

An immediate, but important, consequence of Theorem 2.1 is the next corollary.

**Corollary 2.3.** *Let  $T$  be a tree with minimal ABC index. Then the subgraph induced by the vertices of  $T$  whose degrees are greater than two is also a tree.*

An improvement of Theorem 2.2 is the following result by Lin, Lin, Gao and Wu [31].

**Theorem 2.4.** *Each pendant vertex of an  $n$ -vertex tree with minimal ABC index belongs to a pendant path of length  $k$ ,  $2 \leq k \leq 3$ .*

**Theorem 2.5** ([25]). *The  $n$ -vertex tree with minimal ABC-index contains at most one pendant path of length 3.*

Before we state the next important result, we consider the following definition of a *greedy tree* provided by Wang in [34].

**Definition 2.1.** *Suppose the degrees of the non-leaf vertices are given, the greedy tree is achieved by the following ‘greedy algorithm’:*

1. *Label the vertex with the largest degree as  $v$  (the root).*
2. *Label the neighbors of  $v$  as  $v_1, v_2, \dots$ , assign the largest degree available to them such that  $d(v_1) \geq d(v_2) \geq \dots$*
3. *Label the neighbors of  $v_1$  (except  $v$ ) as  $v_{11}, v_{12}, \dots$  such that they take all the largest degrees available and that  $d(v_{11}) \geq d(v_{12}) \geq \dots$  then do the same for  $v_2, v_3, \dots$*

4. Repeat 3. for all newly labeled vertices, always starting with the neighbors of the labeled vertex with largest whose neighbors are not labeled yet.

The following result by Gan, Liu and You [21] characterizes the trees with minimal ABC index with prescribed degree sequences. The same result, using slightly different notation and approach, was obtained by Xing and Zhou [35].

**Theorem 2.6.** *Given the degree sequence, the greedy tree minimizes the ABC index.*

The next result was obtained in [24]. Alternatively it can be obtained as a corollary of Theorem 2.6.

**Theorem 2.7.** *If a minimal-ABC tree possesses three mutually adjacent vertices  $v_1, v_2, v_3$ , such that*

$$d(v_1) \geq d(v_2) \geq d(v_3),$$

*then  $v_3$  must not be adjacent to both  $v_1$  and  $v_2$ .*

**Theorem 2.8** ([14]). *A minimal-ABC tree does not contain a  $B_k$ -branch,  $k \geq 5$ .*

**Lemma 2.9** ([14]). *A minimal-ABC tree does not contain*

- (a) *a  $B_1$ -branch and a  $B_4$ -branch,*
- (b) *a  $B_2$ -branch and a  $B_4$ -branch,*

*that have a common parent vertex.*


**Theorem 2.10** ([14]). *A minimal-ABC tree does not contain more than four  $B_4$ -branches.*

To best of our knowledge, the above mentioned results seems to be the only proven properties of the minimal-ABC trees.

For complete characterization of the minimal-ABC trees, besides the theoretically proven properties, computer supported search can be of enormous help. Therefore, we would like to mention in the sequel few related results.

A first significant example of using computer search was done by Furtula, Gutman, Ivanović and Vukičević [19], where the trees with minimal ABC index of up to size of 31 were computed, and an initial conjecture of the general structure of the minimal-ABC trees was set. There, a brute-force approach of generating all trees of a given order, speeded up by using a distributed computing platform, was applied. The plausible structural computational model and its refined version presented there was based on the main assumption that the minimal ABC tree posses a single *central vertex*, or said with other words, it is based on the assumption that the vertices of a minimal ABC tree of degree  $\geq 3$  induce a star graph. This assumption was shattered by counterexamples presented in [1–3, 13]. In this context, it is worth to mention that for a special class of trees, so-called *Kragujevac trees*, that are comprised of a central vertex and  $B_k$ -branches,  $k \geq 1$  (see Figure 2 for an illustration), the minimal-ABC trees were fully characterized by Hosseini, Ahmadi and Gutman [28].

In [13] by considering only the degree sequences of trees and some known structural properties of the trees with minimal ABC index all trees with minimal ABC index of up to size of 300 were computed.



**Figure 2:**  $B_k$ -branches.

Recently, in [30], by slightly modified version of the approach in [13] all minimal-ABC tree of up to size of 350 were computed.

By Theorem 2.4 and Corollary 2.3, it follows that the minimal-ABC tree is comprised of a tree  $T$  to whose each pendant vertex a  $B_k$ -branch is attached. If  $T$  is just a single vertex, then the minimal-ABC trees are the same trees that are minimal with respect to Kragujevac trees. In this section, we present new results considering the types of  $B_k$ -branches that a minimal-ABC cannot contain.

Theorem 2.5 says that there is at most one pendant path of length  $k \geq 3$  in the tree with minimal ABC-index. It was already observed in [28] that the position of the path of length  $k \geq 3$  does not have an influence on the value of the ABC index. Therefore, we assume that it is attached to the vertex of degree 4, forming a  $B_3^*$ -branch (see Figure 2 for an illustration).

The next proposition is from [14] and will be used in the proofs in the main text here. The function  $f(x, y)$  is defined as in (1).

**Proposition 2.11.** *Let  $g(x, y) = -f(x, y) + f(x + \Delta x, y - \Delta y)$ , with real numbers  $x, y \geq 2$ ,  $\Delta x \geq 0$ ,  $0 \leq \Delta y < y$ . Then,  $g(x, y)$  increases in  $x$  and decreases in  $y$ .*

Due the symmetry of the function  $f(., .)$  Proposition 2.11 can be rewritten as follows.

**Proposition 2.12.** *Let  $g(x, y) = -f(x, y) + f(x - \Delta x, y + \Delta y)$ , with real numbers  $x, y \geq 2$ ,  $\Delta y \geq 0$ ,  $0 \leq \Delta x < x$ . Then,  $g(x, y)$  decreases in  $x$  and increases in  $y$ .*

A  $k$ -terminal vertex of a rooted tree is a vertex with degree  $k \geq 3$ , that is adjacent to a pendant path of length two or three. A  $k$ -terminal branch, referred as a  $T_k$ -branch, is a subtree induced by a  $(k + 1)$ -terminal vertex and all its (direct and indirect) children vertices. If the terminal vertex has at least one child with degree at least 3, then we say that the  $k$ -terminal branch is *proper*. Notice that  $B_k$ -branches are  $T_k$ -branches, but not proper  $T_k$ -branches, and the only proper  $T_k$ -branch in Figure 2 is the  $B_3^{**}$ -branch. If a tree is comprised only of one (proper)  $T_k$ -branch, then we call the tree a (proper)  $T_k$ -tree. Observe that Kragujevac trees are  $T_k$ -trees.

**Proposition 2.13.** *A minimal-ABC tree can contain at most one proper  $T_k$ -branch,  $k \geq 2$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $u$  and  $v$  be root vertices of two  $T_k$ -branches, and therefore terminal vertices, such that  $d(u) \geq d(v)$ . Since  $u$  is a root of  $T_k$ -branch, it has a child of degree 2. Due to Theorem 2.6 all direct children of  $v$  cannot have degree bigger than 2, which is a contradiction that  $v$  is a terminal vertex.  $\square$

All subtrees of a terminal vertex of a proper  $T_k$ -branch are  $B_l$ -branches. By Theorem 2.6, we have  $k \geq l$ .


### 3 Number of $B_1$ -branches

In this section we analyze the occurrence of the  $B_1$ -branches in a minimal-ABC tree and we give an upper bound on their number. Since the  $B_1$ -branches can occur only in the proper  $T_k$ -branches, we focus our investigation here to these type of branches.

**Lemma 3.1.** *A minimal-ABC tree does not contain a proper  $T_k$ -branch,  $k \geq 13$ , as a subtree. Moreover, a minimal-ABC tree cannot be a proper  $T_k$ -tree itself if  $k \geq 12$ .*

*Proof.* Denote by  $T$  a proper  $T_k$ -branch with a root vertex  $u$ . By Theorems 2.6, 2.8 and Lemma 2.9(a), it follows that  $T$  in addition to  $B_1$ -branches may contain only  $B_3$  and  $B_4$ -branches. Let  $v$  be a child of  $u$  with smallest degree larger than two.

First, we consider the case when  $T$  is a subtree of a minimal-ABC tree  $G$ . Assume that the number of  $B_1$ -branches contained in  $T$  is  $k_1 > 0$ , while the number of  $B_2$  and  $B_3$ -branches is  $k_2 > 0$ . It holds that  $k_1 + k_2 = k$ . Perform the transformation  $\mathcal{T}$  depicted in Figure 3. After this transformation the degree of the vertex  $u$  decreases by one, while the degree of the



**Figure 3:** Transformation  $\mathcal{T}$  from the proof of Lemma 3.1. Note that in this illustration all  $k_2$  children of  $u$  are of degree 4. As it is shown in the proof below, in that case the change of the ABC index is the largest.

vertex  $v$  increases by one. The degrees of the other vertices remain unchanged. The change of the ABC index is

$$\begin{aligned}
 & -f(d(u), d(v)) + f(d(u) - 1, d(v) + 1) + \sum_{i=1}^{d(u)-k_1-2} (-f(d(u), d(x_i)) + f(d(u) - 1, d(x_i))) \\
 & -f(d(u), d(w)) + f(d(u) - 1, d(w)),
 \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where  $x_i, i = 1, \dots, d(u) - k_1 - 2$  are children vertices of  $u$  different than  $v$ , with degrees 3 or 4, and  $w$  is a parent vertex of  $u$ . By Proposition 2.12 the expression  $-f(d(u), d(v)) + f(d(u) - 1, d(v) + 1)$  increases in  $d(v)$ , and therefore it is maximal for  $d(v) = 4$ . By the same proposition, the expressions  $-f(u, d(x_i)) + f(d(u) - 1, d(x_i))$  and  $-f(d(u), d(w)) + f(d(u) - 1, d(w))$  increase in  $x_i$  and  $w$ , respectively, and thus, the expressions are maximal for  $d(x_i) = 4, i = 1, \dots, d(u) - 3$ , and  $d(w) \rightarrow \infty$ . Hence, an upper bound on the expression (2) is

$$-f(d(u), 4) + f(d(u) - 1, 5) + (d(u) - k_1 - 2)(-f(d(u), 4) + f(d(u) - 1, 4))$$

$$+ \lim_{d(w) \rightarrow \infty} (-f(d(u), d(w)) + f(d(u) - 1, d(w))). \quad (3)$$

Since  $-f(u, 4) + f(d(u) - 1, 4)$  is positive for  $d(u) > 1$ , (3) is bounded from above, by

$$\begin{aligned} & -f(d(u), 4) + f(d(u) - 1, 5) + (d(u) - 3)(-f(d(u), 4) + f(d(u) - 1, 4)) \\ & + \lim_{d(w) \rightarrow \infty} (-f(d(u), d(w)) + f(d(u) - 1, d(w))). \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

The expressions  $-f(d(u), 4) + f(d(u) - 1, 5)$  and  $-f(d(u), d(w)) + f(d(u) - 1, d(w))$  decrease in  $d(u)$  by Proposition 2.12. Next we show that the expression  $(d(u) - 3)(-f(u, 4) + f(d(u) - 1, 4))$  also decreases in  $d(u)$ . The first derivative of  $(d(u) - 3)(-f(u, 4) + f(d(u) - 1, 4))$  after a simplification is

$$\frac{1}{2} \left( \sqrt{\frac{1+d(u)}{-1+d(u)}} - \sqrt{\frac{2+d(u)}{d(u)}} + \frac{1}{2}(d(u) - 3) \left( -\frac{2}{(-1+d(u))^2 \sqrt{\frac{1+d(u)}{-1+d(u)}}} + \frac{2}{d(u)^2 \sqrt{\frac{2+d(u)}{d(u)}}} \right) \right),$$

which is a negative function for positive values of  $d(u)$ . It follows that (4) decreases in  $d(u)$ . The smallest  $d(u)$  for which (4) is negative ( $\approx -0.0000943005$ ) is  $d(u) = 14$ . Therefore, we may conclude that for any  $k_1$ , also (3) and (2) are negative if  $d(u) \geq 14$ . Hence, the change of the ABC index (2), after applying the transformation  $\mathcal{T}$ , is negative, which is a contradiction to the assumption that  $T$  is a subtree of a tree with minimal-ABC index.

Consider now the case when  $u$  is the root vertex of the tree with a minimal-ABC index. We have the same configuration and apply the same transformation as in Figure 3, with the only difference that  $u$  does not have a parent vertex. Hence, it holds that  $d(u) = k_1 + k_2$ . Now the change of the ABC index is

$$-f(d(u), d(v)) + f(d(u) - 1, d(v) + 1) + \sum_{i=1}^{d(u)-k_1-1} (-f(u, d(x_i)) + f(d(u) - 1, d(x_i))). \quad (5)$$

Similarly as above we obtain that (5) as most

$$-f(d(u), 4) + f(d(u) - 1, 5) + (d(u) - k_1 - 1)(-f(u, 4) + f(d(u) - 1, 4)), \quad (6)$$

and it decreases in  $d(u)$  and is maximal for  $k_1 = 1$ . The smallest  $d(u)$  for which (6) is negative ( $\approx -0.000580929$ ) is  $d(u) = 12$ . Thus, in this case we again obtain that after applying the transformation  $\mathcal{T}$ , the value of the ABC index decrease, which is a contradiction to the assumption that  $T$ ,  $k \geq 12$ , is a tree with minimal-ABC index.  $\square$

The next proposition is based on Lemma 3.1, and presents few configurations that cannot be contained in a minimal-ABC tree.

**Proposition 3.2.** *The proper  $T_k$ -branches depicted in Figure 4 cannot be subtrees of a minimal-ABC tree, and the proper  $T_k$ -branches depicted in Figure 5 cannot be minimal-ABC trees.*


*Proof.* First, consider the cases when  $T$  is a proper subtree of a minimal-ABC tree. For a given value of  $d(u) = d_g$ , the first derivative of (3) with respect to  $k_1$  is

$$-\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{1+d_g}{-1+d_g}} + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{2+d_g}{d_g}},$$

and it is negative for any positive  $d_g$ , from which follows that (3) decreases in  $k_1$  for any fixed value of  $d(u)$ . Thus, for  $d(u) \geq 14$  the smallest value of  $k_1$  for which (3) is negative is 1, and for  $d(u) = 13, 12, 11, 10, 9, 8$  the smallest values of  $k_1$  for which (3) is negative are 3, 4, 5, 6, 6, 6, respectively. Or expressed differently, (3) is negative for

$$\begin{aligned} k_1 + k_2 \geq 13 \quad \text{and} \quad k_1 \geq 1 & \quad (\text{the case } d(u) \geq 14); \\ k_1 + k_2 = 12 \quad \text{and} \quad k_1 \geq 3 & \quad (\text{the case } d(u) = 13); \\ k_1 + k_2 = 11 \quad \text{and} \quad k_1 \geq 4 & \quad (\text{the case } d(u) = 12); \\ k_1 + k_2 = 10 \quad \text{and} \quad k_1 \geq 5 & \quad (\text{the case } d(u) = 11); \\ k_1 + k_2 = 9 \quad \text{and} \quad k_1 \geq 6 & \quad (\text{the case } d(u) = 10); \\ k_1 + k_2 = 8 \quad \text{and} \quad k_1 \geq 6 & \quad (\text{the case } d(u) = 9); \\ k_1 + k_2 = 7 \quad \text{and} \quad k_1 \geq 6 & \quad (\text{the case } d(u) = 8). \end{aligned}$$

From the above constraints, one can conclude that for  $k_2 = 1, 2, 3, 4$ , the smallest value of  $k_1$  for which (3) is negative is 6. Similarly, (3) is negative, for  $k_2 = 5, 6$  and  $k_1 \geq 5$ , for  $k_2 = 7, 8$  and  $k_1 \geq 4$ , for  $k_2 = 9, 10$  and  $k_1 \geq 3$ , for  $k_2 = 11$  and  $k_1 \geq 2$ , and for  $k_2 \geq 12$  and  $k_1 \geq 1$ . From here, it follows that the subtrees depicted in Figure 4 cannot occur in a minimal-ABC tree.




**Figure 4:** Some subtrees that cannot occur in a minimal-ABC tree. The dashed lines indicates that the particular branch can be a  $B_3$  or a  $B_2$ -branch.

In the case when  $T$  is a minimal-ABC tree itself, we have obtained in Lemma 3.1 that there is no minimal-ABC tree that is  $B_{\geq 12}$ -branch. Analogously, as in the case when  $T$  is a subtree of a minimal-ABC tree, in this case we obtain that for  $d(u) = 11, 10, 9, 8, 7, 6$  the smallest



values of  $k_1$  for which (6) is negative are 2, 3, 4, 4, 5, 5, respectively, and an identical analysis as above show that the trees depicted in Figure 5 cannot be minimal-ABC trees.




**Figure 5:** Some trees that cannot be a minimal-ABC trees. The dashed lines indicates that the particular branch can be a  $B_3$  or a  $B_2$ -branch.

□

Next we present special cases of Lemma 3.1 and Proposition 3.2, with a relaxation that a proper  $T_k$ -branch contains only  $B_2$  and  $B_1$ -branches.

**Lemma 3.3.** *A minimal-ABC tree  $T$  does not contain a proper  $T_k$ -branch,  $k \geq 8$ , as a subtree, if the  $T_k$ -branch is comprised only of  $B_2$  and  $B_1$ -branches. Moreover, also in this case  $T$  cannot be a proper  $T_k$ -tree itself if  $k \geq 7$ .*

*Proof.* We proceed with the analog transformation (see Figure 6) and analysis as in Lemma 3.1. So, we omit most of the details that were mentioned in Lemma 3.1. After this transformation



**Figure 6:** Transformation  $\mathcal{T}$  from the proof of Lemma 3.3.

the degree of the vertex  $u$  decreases by one, while the degree of the vertex  $v$  increases by one. The degrees of other vertices remain unchanged. The change of the ABC index is at most

$$\begin{aligned}
 & -f(d(u), 3) + f(d(u) - 1, 4) + (d(u) - k_1 - 2)(-f(d(u), 3) + f(d(u) - 1, 3)) \\
 & + \lim_{d(w) \rightarrow \infty} (-f(d(u), d(w)) + f(d(u) - 1, d(w))).
 \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

and it is bounded from above by

$$\begin{aligned} & -f(d(u), 3) + f(d(u) - 1, 4) + (d(u) - 3)(-f(u, 3) + f(d(u) - 1, 3)) \\ & + \lim_{d(w) \rightarrow \infty} (-f(d(u), d(w)) + f(d(u) - 1, d(w))). \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

By the same arguments as in the proof of Lemma 3.1, it follows that the expressions  $-f(u, 3) + f(d(u) - 1, 3)$ ,  $(d(u) - 3)(-f(u, 3) + f(d(u) - 1, 3))$  and  $-f(d(u), d(w)) + f(d(u) - 1, d(w))$  decrease in  $d(u)$ . The smallest  $d(u)$  for which (8) is negative is  $d(u) = 9$ . Hence, for  $d(u) \geq 9$  or  $k \geq 8$ , the change of the ABC index, after applying the transformation  $\mathcal{T}$ , is negative, which is a contradiction to the assumption that  $T_k$  belongs to a tree with minimal-ABC index.

Consider now the case when  $u$  is the root vertex of the tree with a minimal-ABC index. We have the same configuration and apply the same transformation as in Figure 6, with the only difference that  $u$  does not have a parent vertex. Hence, it holds that  $d(u) = k_1 + k_2$ . Now the change of the ABC index is

$$\begin{aligned} & -f(d(u), d(v)) + f(d(u) - 1, d(v) + 1) + \sum_{i=1}^{d(u)-k_1-1} (-f(u, d(x_i)) + f(d(u) - 1, d(x_i))). \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Similarly as above, we obtain that (9) is as most

$$-f(d(u), 3) + f(d(u) - 1, 4) + (d(u) - k_1)(-f(u, 3) + f(d(u) - 1, 3)), \quad (10)$$

it decreases in  $d(u)$  and is maximal for  $k_1 = 1$ . The smallest  $d(u)$  for which (10) is negative is  $d(u) = 7$ . Thus, in this case we again obtain that after applying the transformation  $\mathcal{T}$ , the value of the ABC index decreases, which is a contradiction to the assumption that  $T_k$  is a tree with minimal-ABC index.  $\square$

**Proposition 3.4.** *The proper  $T_k$ -branches depicted in Figure 7 cannot be subtrees of a minimal-ABC tree, and the proper  $T_k$ -branches depicted in Figure 8 cannot be minimal-ABC trees.*

*Proof.* Since this proposition is a special case of Proposition 3.2, the derivation of their proofs are analogous. First, we consider the cases when  $T$  is a proper subtree of a minimal-ABC tree. For a given value of  $d(u) = d_g$ , the first derivative of (7) with respect to  $k_1$  is


$$\frac{\sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{d_g}} - \sqrt{\frac{d_g}{-1 + d_g}}}{\sqrt{3}},$$

and it is negative for any positive  $d_g$ , from which follows that (7) decreases in  $k_1$  for any fixed value of  $d(u)$ . Thus, for  $d(u) \geq 9$  the smallest value of  $k_1$  for which (7) is negative is 1, and for  $d(u) = 8, 7, 6$  the smallest values of  $k_1$  for which (7) is negative are 2, 4, 5, respectively. Or expressed differently, (7) is negative for

$$k_1 + k_2 \geq 8 \quad \text{and} \quad k_1 \geq 1 \quad (\text{the case } d(u) \geq 9);$$


$$\begin{aligned}
k_1 + k_2 = 7 \quad \text{and} \quad k_1 \geq 2 \quad & \text{(the case } d(u) = 8); \\
k_1 + k_2 = 6 \quad \text{and} \quad k_1 \geq 4 \quad & \text{(the case } d(u) = 7).
\end{aligned}$$

For  $d(u) = 6$ , i.e.,  $k_1 + k_2 = 5$ , (7) is negative if  $k_1 \geq 5$ . However, this is not a feasible combination, since  $k_2$  must be positive. From the above constraints, one can conclude that for  $k_2 = 1$ , the smallest value of  $k_1$  for which (7) is negative is 5. Similarly, (7) is negative, for  $k_2 = 2, 3$  and  $k_1 \geq 4$ , for  $k_2 = 4$  and  $k_1 \geq 3$ , for  $k_2 = 5, 6$  and  $k_1 \geq 2$ , and for  $k_2 \geq 7$  and  $k_1 \geq 1$ . From here, it follows that the subtrees depicted in Figure 7 cannot occur in a minimal-ABC tree.



**Figure 7:** Some subtrees that cannot occur in a minimal-ABC tree.

In the case when  $T$  is a minimal-ABC tree itself, we have obtained in Lemma 3.3 that there is no minimal-ABC tree that is a proper  $T_k$ -branch,  $k \geq 7$ . Analogously, as in the case when  $T$  is a subtree of a minimal-ABC tree, in this case we obtain that for  $d(u) = 6, 5$  the smallest values of  $k_1$  for which (10) is negative are 2, 3, respectively, and identical analysis as above shows that the trees depicted in Figure 8 cannot be minimal-ABC trees.



**Figure 8:** Some trees that are not minimal-ABC trees.

□


The following result is the main result in this section and it gives an upper bound on the number of  $B_1$ -branches in a minimal-ABC tree.

**Theorem 3.5.** *A minimal-ABC  $G$  tree can contain at most four  $B_1$ -branches. Moreover, if  $G$  is a  $T_k$ -branch itself, then it can contain at most three  $B_1$ -branches.*

*Proof.* Here we consider again two cases: when  $G$  has a  $T_k$ -branch as subtree or when  $G$  is a  $T_k$ -branch itself. Recall that by Theorem 2.8 and Lemma 2.9(a), a  $T_k$ -branch does not contains a  $B_4$ -branch.

**Case 1.**  $G$  has a  $T_k$ -branch as subtree.

Let  $G$  be a minimal-ABC tree that have more than three  $B_1$ -branches. If the  $T_k$ -branch contains only  $B_2$ -branches as its children, then by Proposition 3.4 (Figure 7(a)), it cannot contains more than 4  $B_1$ -branches. So we assume that the  $T_k$ -branch contains at least one  $B_3$ -branches. Observe, that by Proposition 3.2 (Figure 4(a)), it  $G$  cannot contain a  $T_k$ -branch with more than 5  $B_1$ -branches. In this case, we perform the transformation  $\mathcal{T}$  depicted in Figure 9. After this transformation the degree of the vertex  $u$  decreases by two, while the



**Figure 9:** Transformation  $\mathcal{T}_1$  from proof of Theorem 3.5, Case 1.

degree of the vertex  $v$  decreases by one. The degree of the vertex  $v_1$  increases by one, and degree of the vertex  $v_2$  increases by two. The degrees of other vertices remain unchanged. The change of the ABC index is

$$\begin{aligned}
 & -f(d(u), 4) + f(d(u) - 2, 3) + \sum_{i=1}^{d(u)-7} (-f(d(u), d(x_i)) + f(d(u) - 2, d(x_i))) \\
 & -f(4, 2) + f(d(u) - 2, 3) - f(2, 1) + f(d(u) - 2, 3)) - f(d(u), d(w)) + f(d(u) - 2, d(w)),
 \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

where  $x_i, i = 1, \dots, d(u) - 7$  are children vertices of  $u$  different than  $v$ , with degrees 3 or 4, and  $w$  is a parent vertex of  $u$ . By Proposition 2.12 the expressions  $-f(d(u), d(x_i)) + f(d(u) - 2, d(x_i))$  and  $-f(d(u), d(w)) + f(d(u) - 2, d(w))$  increase in  $x_i, i = 1, \dots, d(u) - 7$ , and  $d(w)$ , respectively. Thus, (11) is bounded from above by

$$\begin{aligned}
 & -f(d(u), 4) + f(d(u) - 2, 3) + (d(u) - 7)(-f(d(u), 4) + f(d(u) - 2, 4)) \\
 & -f(4, 2) + f(d(u) - 2, 3) - f(2, 1) + f(d(u) - 2, 3)) \\
 & \lim_{d(w) \rightarrow \infty} (-f(d(u), d(w)) + f(d(u) - 2, d(w))).
 \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

by Proposition 3.2 (Figure 4(a)), it follows that  $u$  may have at most 4 children of degree larger than 2. Thus,  $7 \leq d(u) \leq 10$ . For all 4 possible values of  $d(u)$ , (12) is largest for  $d(u) = 7$ , and its value is  $\approx -0.0145446$ . Thus, after applying the transformation from Figure 9 the ABC index decreases, which is in a contradiction that  $G$  is a minimal-ABC tree.

**Case 2.**  $G$  is a  $T_k$ -branch itself.

Let  $G$  be a minimal-ABC tree that have more than four  $B_1$ -branches. If the  $T_k$ -branch contains only  $B_2$ -branches as its children, then by Proposition 3.4 (Figure 8(a)), it cannot contains more than 3  $B_1$ -branches. So we assume that the  $T_k$ -branch contains at least one  $B_3$ -branches. Observe, that by Proposition 3.2 (Figure 5(a)),  $G$  cannot contain a  $T_k$ -branch with more than 4  $B_1$ -branches. In this case, we perform the same transformation  $\mathcal{T}$  as in Figure 9 (the only difference in this case is that there is no vertex  $w$  -  $u$  is the root of the tree, and there are 4  $B_1$ -branches). After this transformation the degree of the vertex  $u$  decreases by two, while the degree of the vertex  $v$  decreases by one. The degree of the vertex  $v_1$  increases by one, and degree of the vertex  $v_2$  increases by two. The degrees of other vertices remain unchanged. The change of the ABC index is

$$\begin{aligned} & -f(d(u), 4) + f(d(u) - 2, 3) + \sum_{i=1}^{d(u)-5} (-f(d(u), d(x_i)) + f(d(u) - 2, d(x_i))) \\ & -f(4, 2) + f(d(u) - 2, 3) - f(2, 1) + f(d(u) - 2, 3), \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where  $x_i, i = 1, \dots, d(u) - 5$  are children vertices of  $u$  different than  $v$ , with degrees 3 or 4. By Proposition 2.12 the expressions  $-f(d(u), d(x_i)) + f(d(u) - 2, d(x_i))$  increase in  $x_i, i = 1, \dots, d(u) - 7$ . Thus, (13) is bounded from above by

$$\begin{aligned} & -f(d(u), 4) + f(d(u) - 2, 3) + (d(u) - 5)(-f(d(u), 4) + f(d(u) - 2, 4)) \\ & -f(4, 2) + f(d(u) - 2, 3) - f(2, 1) + f(d(u) - 2, 3). \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

by Proposition 3.2 (Figure 5(a)), it follows that  $u$  may have at most 3 children of degree larger than 2. Thus,  $5 \leq d(u) \leq 7$ . For all 3 possible values of  $d(u)$ , (14) is largest for  $d(u) = 5$ , and its value is  $\approx -0.00582154$ . Thus, after applying the above transformation the ABC index decreases, which is in a contradiction that  $G$  is a minimal-ABC tree.  $\square$

In the next section we analyze the  $B_2$ -branches and there occurrence in the minimal-ABC trees.

## 4 Number of $B_2$ -branches

First, we present two configurations that cannot occur as subtrees of a minimal-ABC tree. Their exclusion will be considered in the proofs of some of the results presented later in this section.


**Proposition 4.1.** *The tree depicted in Figure 10 (a) cannot be a subtree of a minimal-ABC tree.*

After applying the transformation  $\mathcal{T}$  from Figure 10, the change of the ABC index is

$$-f(d(w), 3) + f(d(w), 4) - f(3, 3) + f(3, 2) - f(3, 3) + f(4, 3). \quad (15)$$

By Theorem 2.6,  $d(w)$  cannot be smaller than the degrees of its children vertices. By Proposition 2.12,  $-f(d(w), 3) + f(d(w), 4)$  decreases in  $d(w)$ , and thus, it is maximal for  $d(w) = 3$ . Therefore, (15) is at most


$$-f(3, 3) + f(3, 4) - f(3, 3) + f(3, 2) - f(3, 3) + f(4, 3) < -0.0018988.$$



**Figure 10:** An illustration of the transformation  $\mathcal{T}$  from the proof of Proposition 4.1.

□

**Proposition 4.2.** *The tree depicted in Figure 11 (a) cannot be a subtree of a minimal-ABC tree.*



**Figure 11:** An illustration of the transformation  $\mathcal{T}_1$  from proof of Proposition 4.2.

*Proof.* The change of the ABC index after applying the transformation  $\mathcal{T}_1$  depicted in Figure 11, is


$$-f(d(w), 3) + f(d(w), 4) - f(3, 3) + f(4, 2). \quad (16)$$

Similarly as in the previous proposition, we conclude that the expression  $-f(d(w), 3) + f(d(w), 4)$  decreases in  $d(w)$  and it is maximal for  $d(w) = 3$ . A straightforward verification of (16) shows that it is negative for  $d(w) \geq 5$ . Next, we consider separately the cases  $d(w) = 3$  and  $d(w) = 4$ .

**Case 1.**  $d(w) = 3$ .

In this case, the vertex  $w$ , beside the child  $u$ , has one more child, denoted by  $v$ , which by Theorems 2.1, 2.6 and Proposition 2.13 has degree 3 (see Figure 12 (a) for an illustration). After applying the transformation  $\mathcal{T}_2$  depicted in Figure 12, the degree of the vertex  $w$  increases from 3 to 6, while the degrees of the vertices  $v$  and  $u$  decreases from 3 to 2 and 1, respectively. Thus, the total change of the ABC index of  $G$  is

$$\begin{aligned} & -f(d(w), 3) + f(d(w), 6) - f(3, 3) + f(6, 2) - f(3, 3) + f(2, 1) \\ & + 3(-f(3, 3) + f(6, 3)). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$




**Figure 12:** An illustration of the transformation  $\mathcal{T}_2$  from the proof of Proposition 4.2, the case  $d(w) = 3$ .

By Proposition 2.12,  $-f(d(z), 3) + f(d(z), 6)$  decreases in  $d(z)$ , and thus, (17) reaches its maximum of  $\approx -0.0913482$  for  $d(z) = 3$ .

If  $w$  is a root vertex of  $G$ , i.e.,  $z$  is a child of  $w$ , then,  $z$  for the same reasons as  $v$  must have degree 3, and thus, in this case, the change of the ABC index after applying the transformation  $\mathcal{T}_2$  is smaller than  $-0.091348$ .

**Case 2.**  $d(w) = 4$ .

Similarly as in the previous case, we may conclude that  $w$ , in addition to  $u$ , has two more children vertices  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  that by Theorems 2.1, 2.6 and Proposition 2.13 have degrees 3 or 4 (see Figure 13 (a) for an illustration). In this case we apply the transformation  $\mathcal{T}_3$  depicted



**Figure 13:** An illustration of the transformation  $\mathcal{T}_3$  from the proof of Proposition 4.2, the case  $d(w) = 4$ .

in Figure 13. After applying the transformation  $\mathcal{T}_3$  depicted in Figure 13, the degree of the vertex  $v_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , decreases from  $d(v_i)$  to 2 and 1, respectively. The degree of the vertex  $w$  increases from 4 to  $d(v_1) + d(v_2) + 1$ , while the rest of the vertices do not change their degrees. The total change of the ABC index of  $G$  is

$$\begin{aligned}
 & -f(d(z), 4) + f(d(z), d(v_1) + d(v_2) + 1) - f(4, d(v_1)) + f(2, 1) - f(4, d(v_2)) + f(3, 2) \\
 & -f(4, 3) + f(d(v_1) + d(v_2) + 1, 3) + (d(v_1) - 1)(-f(d(v_1), 3) + f(d(v_1) + d(v_2) + 1, 3)) \\
 & + (d(v_2) - 1)(-f(d(v_2), 3) + f(d(v_1) + d(v_2) + 1, 3))
 \end{aligned}$$

$$-f(3, 3) + f(d(v_1) + d(v_2) + 1, 3). \quad (18)$$

(Maybe explain each term?) Since  $d(v_1) + d(v_2) + 1 > 4$ , by Proposition 2.12, the expression  $-f(d(z), 4) + f(d(z), d(v_1) + d(v_2) + 1)$  decreases in  $z$ , and therefore it is maximal for  $d(z) = 4$ . Out of the four possible combinations of the values of  $d(v_1)$  and  $d(v_2)$  (recall that  $d(v_1)$  and  $d(v_2)$  can be either 3 or 4), (18) is maximal for  $d(x_1) = d(x_2) = 4$  and is  $\approx -0.186635$ .

If  $w$  is a root vertex of  $G$ , i.e.,  $z$  is a child of  $w$ , then,  $z$  for the same reasons as  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  must have degree 3 or 4. By Proposition 2.12, it follows that (18) reaches its maximum of  $\approx -0.16395$  for  $d(z) = 3$ .  $\square$

Next, we present an upper bound on the number of  $B_2$ -branches that may be attached to a vertex of a minimal-ABC tree.

**Lemma 4.3.** *A vertex  $w$  of a minimal-ABC tree  $G$  cannot be a parent of more than eleven  $B_2$ -branches. Moreover, if  $w$  is a root of  $G$ , then it cannot be a parent of more than ten  $B_2$ -branches.*

*Proof.* Let  $w$  has  $n_3$  children of degree at least 4,  $n_2$  children of degree 3 and  $n_1$  children of degree 2, where  $n_3 \geq 0$ ,  $n_2 > 11$  and  $n_1 \geq 0$ . By Theorem 2.6, it follows that a vertex of degree 3 can have a children of degree at most 3. Further, by Propositions 4.1 and 4.2, it follows that a vertex of degree 3 can be a parent only of  $B_2$ -branches, but only if it is a root vertex. Let  $v$  be a children of  $w$  with degree  $\geq 4$ . By Lemma 2.9,  $w$  cannot have simultaneously  $B_4$ -branches and  $B_2$ -branches as its children. By Theorems 2.6 and 2.8,  $v$  cannot be a root of  $B_{\geq 5}$ -branch. Thus, it follows that  $v$  is a parent of  $B_k$ -branches,  $1 \leq k \leq 2$ , or  $v$  is a root of a  $B_3$ -branch. Notice that, if  $v$  is not a root of a  $B_3$ -branch, then by Theorem 2.6, it follows that  $n_1 = 0$ .

We distinguish two cases regarding if  $w$  is the root vertex of a minimal-ABC tree or not. Further subcases that depend on the children of  $w$  are introduced.

**Case 1.**  $w$  is not the root vertex of a minimal-ABC tree.


**Subcase 1.1.**  $w$  is a parent only of  $B_k$ -branches,  $1 \leq k \leq 3$ .

In this case the structure of  $G$  is illustrated in Figure 14. After applying the transformation  $\mathcal{T}_{11}$  from the same figure, the degrees of the vertices  $v_i, i = 1, \dots, 5$ , increase by one, the degrees of  $w$  and  $y_1$  decrease by two, and the degree of  $x_1$  decreases by one. Thus, the change of the ABC index after applying the transformation  $\mathcal{T}$  is

$$\begin{aligned} & -f(d(z), d(w)) + f(d(z), d(w) - 2) + \sum_{i=1}^{n_3} (-f(d(u_i), d(w)) + f(d(u_i), d(w) - 2)) \\ & + 5(-f(3, d(w)) + f(4, d(w) - 2)) + (n_2 - 5)(-f(3, d(w)) + f(3, d(w) - 2)) \\ & -f(d(w), 3) + f(3, 2) - f(d(w), 3) + f(2, 1). \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

By Proposition 2.11,  $-f(d(z), d(w)) + f(d(z), d(w) - 2)$  increases in  $d(z)$  and it reaches its maximal values for  $d(z) \rightarrow \infty$ . By the same argument  $-f(d(u_i), d(w)) + f(d(u_i), d(w) - 2)$  is maximal for  $d(u_i) = 4$ . The expression  $-f(3, d(w)) + f(3, d(w) - 2)$  is positive for  $d(w) > 2$ . From  $d(w) = n_3 + n_2 + n_1 + 1$ , we have that  $n_2 - 5 = d(w) - n_3 - n_1 - 6$ . Thus  $(n_2 - 5)(-f(3, d(w)) + f(3, d(w) - 2)) = (d(w) - n_3 - n_1 - 6)(-f(3, d(w)) + f(3, d(w) - 2))$  is maximal for  $n_1 = 0$ , and then,  $d(w) = n_3 + n_2 + 1$ .





**Figure 14:** An illustration of the transformation  $\mathcal{T}_{11}$  from the proof of Lemma 4.3, Subcase 1.1.

Since  $-f(4, d(w)) + f(4, d(w) - 2) > -f(3, d(w)) + f(3, d(w) - 2)$ , the sum

$$\begin{aligned} & n_3(-f(4, d(w)) + f(4, d(w) - 2)) + (n_2 - 5)(-f(3, d(w)) + f(3, d(w) - 2)) \\ &= (d(w) - n_2 - 1)(-f(4, d(w)) + f(4, d(w) - 2)) + (n_2 - 5)(-f(3, d(w)) + f(3, d(w) - 2)) \end{aligned}$$

is maximal when  $n_2$  is minimal, i.e.,  $n_2 = 12$ . Considering all these, it follows that (19) is bound from above by

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{d(z) \rightarrow \infty} (-f(d(z), d(w)) + f(d(z), d(w) - 2)) + (d(w) - 13)(-f(4, d(w)) + f(4, d(w) - 2)) \\ & + 5(-f(3, d(w)) + f(4, d(w) - 2)) + 7(-f(3, d(w)) + f(3, d(w) - 2)) \\ & - f(d(w), 3) + f(3, 2) - f(d(w), 3) + f(2, 1). \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Next, consider the following functions that are comprised by components of (20):

$$g_1(d(w)) = 4(-f(3, d(w)) + f(4, d(w) - 2)) - f(d(w), 3) + f(3, 2) - f(d(w), 3) + f(2, 1),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} g_2(d(w)) &= (d(w) - 13)(-f(4, d(w)) + f(4, d(w) - 2)) + 7(-f(3, d(w)) + f(3, d(w) - 2)) \\ &\quad - f(3, d(w)) + f(4, d(w) - 2). \end{aligned}$$

After simplifying, we obtain that the first derivative of  $g_1(d(w))$  is

$$\frac{d g_1(d(w))}{d d(w)} = \frac{-2\sqrt{3} + d(w) \left( \sqrt{3} - 2\sqrt{\frac{d(w)+1}{d(w)-2}} \right)}{(d(w) - 2)d(w)^2 \sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{d(w)}}}.$$

For  $d(w) > 2$ , it is easy to verify that the nominator of the last expression is negative, while its denominator is positive. Thus  $d g_1(d(w))/d d(w)$  is negative, from which follows that  $g(d(w))$  is decreasing function in  $d(w)$ . The first derivative of  $g_2(d(w))$ , after a simplification is

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d g_2(d(w))}{d d(w)} = & \frac{1}{6} \left( -\frac{7\sqrt{6-3d(w)}}{\sqrt{1-d(w)}(-2+d(w))^2} + \frac{3\sqrt{-d(w)}}{(2-d(w))^{3/2}} + 3\sqrt{\frac{d(w)}{-2+d(w)}} \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{3}{d(w)\sqrt{\frac{2+d(w)}{d(w)}}} - 3\sqrt{\frac{2+d(w)}{d(w)}} + \frac{-\frac{39}{\sqrt{-2-d(w)}} + \frac{11\sqrt{3}}{\sqrt{-1-d(w)}} - \frac{27d(w)}{(2-d(w))^{3/2}}}{(-d(w))^{3/2}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

and it has no real roots, which means that it is either positive or negative. Since for  $d(w) = 13$ ,  $d g_2(d(w))/d d(w) = -0.00661647$ , it follows that  $g_2(d(w))$  decreases in  $d(w)$ , too.

By Proposition 2.11, the expression  $-f(d(z), d(w)) + f(d(z), d(w) - 2)$  also decreases in  $d(w)$ . We can conclude that (20), and therefore also (19) decrease in  $d(w)$ , and are maximal when  $d(w)$  is minimal, i.e.,  $d(w) = 13$  and their upper bound is

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{d(z) \rightarrow \infty} (-f(d(z), 13) + f(d(z), 11)) + 5(-f(3, 13) + f(4, 11)) + 7(-f(3, 13) + f(3, 11)) \\ & -f(13, 3) + f(3, 2) - f(13, 3) + f(2, 1) < -0.0107055. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that the above upper bound of  $-0.0107055$  is obtained when  $w$  does not have  $B_3$  and  $B_1$ -branches ( $n_3 = n_1 = 0$ ) as it immediate children. If  $w$  has in addition one  $B_3$ , i.e.,  $n_3 = 1$  and  $n_1 = 0$ , then (19) is negative for  $n_2 \geq 11$ , or with other words,  $w$  can have at most 10  $B_2$ -branches. If  $w$   $n_3 = 2$  and  $n_1 = 0$ , then (19) is negative for  $n_2 \geq 10$ , i.e.,  $w$  can have at most 9  $B_2$ -branches.


If  $w$  has in addition one  $B_1$ , i.e.,  $n_3 = 0$  and  $n_1 = 1$ , then (19) is negative for  $n_2 \geq 10$ , or with other words,  $w$  can have at most 9  $B_2$ -branches. If  $n_3 = 0$  and  $n_1 = 2$ , then (19) is negative for  $n_2 \geq 9$ , i.e.,  $w$  can have at most 8  $B_2$ -branches.

**Subcase 1.2.**  $w$  is a parent of one or more vertices that are not roots of  $B_k$ -branches,  $1 \leq k \leq 4$ .

This case is similar to the previous one, with the difference that  $w$  may have children with degree larger than 4. Denote by  $x$  a child of  $w$  with  $d(x) \geq 4$ . Since  $w$  has  $B_2$ -branches as children, by Theorem 2.6, it follows that the children of  $w$  are either  $B_2$  or  $B_1$ -branches. Due to Proposition 3.4, we may assume that  $d(x) \leq 8$ . If  $d(x) \geq 9$  we can apply the transformation from Lemma 3.3, obtaining  $d(x) \leq 8$ . If  $w$  has a child  $y$  of degree 3, where  $y$  is not a root of  $B_k$ -branches,  $1 \leq k \leq 2$ , then, by Propositions 4.1 and 4.2 and Theorem 2.6, it follows that  $y$  must be a root of a  $B_2$ -branch. Thus,  $4 \leq d(x) \leq 8$ . Also, in this case  $w$  does not have  $B_1$ -branches as children. Otherwise, if  $w$  does have  $B_1$ -branches as children, then by Theorem 2.6 a child of  $w$  cannot have a child of degree larger than 2, which is a contradiction to the main assumption of this subcase.

This subcase and the corresponding transformation that we apply are illustrated in Figure 15. Similarly as in previous case, here we obtain that the change of  $\text{ABC}(G)$  is

$$-f(d(z), d(w)) + f(d(z), d(w) - 2) + \sum_{i=1}^{d(w)-n_2-1} (-f(d(u_i), d(w)) + f(d(u_i), d(w) - 2))$$



**Figure 15:** An illustration of the transformation  $\mathcal{T}_{12}$  from the proof of Lemma 4.3, Subcase 1.2.

$$\begin{aligned}
 &+5(-f(3, d(w)) + f(4, d(w) - 2)) + (n_2 - 5)(-f(3, d(w)) + f(3, d(w) - 2)) \\
 &-f(d(w), 3) + f(3, 2) - f(d(w), 3) + f(2, 1).
 \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

By Proposition 2.11  $-f(d(u_i), d(w)) + f(d(u_i), d(w) - 2)$  increases with  $d(u_i)$ . Bearing in mind that  $4 \leq d(u_i) \leq 8$ , we obtain that (21) is maximal for  $d(u_i) = 8$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, d(w) - n_2 - 1$ . Applying same arguments as in Subcase 1.1., we also obtain that that (21) is maximal when  $d(w)$  is minimal, i.e,  $d(w) = 13$  ( $n_2 = 12$ ), and when  $d(z) \rightarrow \infty$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\lim_{d(z) \rightarrow \infty} (-f(d(z), 13) + f(d(z), 11)) + 5(-f(3, 13) + f(4, 11)) + 7(-f(3, 13) + f(3, 11)) \\
 &-f(13, 3) + f(3, 2) - f(13, 3) + f(2, 1) \approx -0.0107055
 \end{aligned}$$

is an upper bond on (21).

**Case 2.**  $w$  is the root vertex of a minimal-ABC tree.

**Subcase 2.1.**  $w$  is a parent only of vertices that are roots of  $B_k$ -branches,  $1 \leq k \leq 3$ .

If  $w$  is a root vertex of  $G$ , then the change of the ABC-index after applying the same transformation from Figure 14 is

$$\begin{aligned}
 &n_3(-f(4, d(w)) + f(4, d(w) - 2)) + 5(-f(3, d(w)) + f(4, d(w) - 2)) \\
 &+(n_2 - 5)(-f(3, d(w)) + f(3, d(w) - 2)) - f(d(w), 3) + f(3, 2) - f(d(w), 3) + f(2, 1).
 \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

where  $d(w) = n_1 + n_2 + n_3$ ,  $n_3 \geq 0$ ,  $n_2 > 10$  and  $n_1 \geq 0$ . Almost identical analysis as in the Subcase 1.1., shows that (22) decreases in  $d(w)$  and is maximal for  $n_1 = 0$  and  $n_3$  as large as

possible, which in this case is  $d(w) - n_2 = d(w) - 10$ . Thus, (22) is bounded from above by

$$(d(w) - 11)(-f(4, 11) + f(4, 9)) + 5(-f(3, 11) + f(4, 9)) + 7(-f(3, 11) + f(3, 9)) \\ - f(11, 3) + f(3, 2) - f(11, 3) + f(2, 1) < -0.00974369.$$

If  $w$  has in addition one  $B_3$ , i.e.,  $n_3 = 1$  and  $n_1 = 0$ , then (22) is negative for  $n_2 \geq 10$ , or with other words,  $w$  can have at most 9  $B_2$ -branches. If  $w$   $n_3 = 2$  and  $n_1 = 0$ , then (22) is negative for  $n_2 \geq 9$ , i.e.,  $w$  can have at most 8  $B_2$ -branches.

If  $w$  has in addition one  $B_1$ , i.e.,  $n_3 = 0$  and  $n_1 = 1$ , then (22) is negative for  $n_2 \geq 9$ , or with other words,  $w$  can have at most 8  $B_2$ -branches. If  $n_3 = 0$  and  $n_1 = 2$ , then (19) is negative for  $n_2 \geq 8$ , i.e.,  $w$  can have at most 7  $B_2$ -branches.

**Subcase 2.2.**  $w$  is a parent of one or more vertices that are not roots of  $B_k$ -branches,  $1 \leq k \leq 3$ .

Here we apply the same transformation as in Figure 15. Since  $w$  is a root vertex of  $G$ , the change of the ABC-index now is

$$(d(w) - n_2)(-f(13, d(w)) + f(13, d(w) - 2)) + 5(-f(3, d(w)) + f(4, d(w) - 2)) \\ + (n_2 - 5)(-f(3, d(w)) + f(3, d(w) - 2)) - f(d(w), 3) + f(3, 2) - f(d(w), 3) + f(2, 1). \quad (23)$$

where  $n_2 > 10$ . Almost identical analysis as in the Subcase 1.2., shows that (23) decreases in  $d(w)$ , and is maximal for  $d(w) = 11$  and when the children of  $w$  that are not roots of  $B_k$ -branches,  $1 \leq k \leq 4$ , have maximal degrees, which after Subcase 2.1 do not exceed 11. Thus, (23) is bounded from above by

$$(d(w) - 11)(-f(11, 11) + f(11, 9)) + 5(-f(3, 11) + f(4, 9)) + 7(-f(3, 11) + f(3, 9)) \\ - f(11, 3) + f(3, 2) - f(11, 3) + f(2, 1) < -0.00974369.$$

□


The following proposition follows from Lemma 4.3 and will be used in the proof of Theorem 4.8.

**Proposition 4.4.** *The trees depicted in Figure 16 are not minimal-ABC trees.*

*Proof.* Trees depicted in Figure 16 have the structure that belongs to Subcase 2.1 of Lemma 4.3 (actually, it is a special case of Subcase 2.1, since here we do not have  $B_1$ -branches). The change of the ABC-index after applying the transformation from Figure 16 is given in (22). Here it holds that  $d(w) = n_2 + n_3$ ,  $n_3 \geq 0$ ,  $7 \leq n_2 \leq 10$ . By substituting particular values for  $n_2$  and  $n_3$ , one can obtain that (22) is negative for  $n_2 = 10$  and  $n_3 > 0$ ;  $n_2 = 9$  and  $n_3 > 1$ ;  $n_2 = 8$  and  $n_3 > 3$ ;  $n_2 = 7$  and  $n_3 > 4$ .

Observe that trees in Figure 16 have less than 66 vertices. In [13] all minimal-ABC trees with up to 300 were computed, and no of them are in Figure 16. □

The next result is a specialized version of Lemma 4.3.




**Figure 16:** Trees with parameters  $n_2 = 10$  and  $n_3 > 0$ ,  $n_2 = 9$  and  $n_3 > 1$ ,  $n_2 = 8$  and  $n_3 > 3$ ,  $n_2 = 7$  and  $n_3 > 4$ , that are not minimal-ABC trees.

**Lemma 4.5.** *Let  $w$  be a vertex of a minimal-ABC tree  $G$  different than the root of  $G$ . If  $w$  has only  $B_2$ -branches as its children, then their number is at most 6.*

*Proof.* By Lemma 4.3,  $d(w) \leq 13$ . Since  $w$  is a parent of  $B_2$ -branches, by Theorem 2.6 it follows that  $z$  can not be a parent of a  $B_1$ -branch. Assume that  $w$  has more than 6  $B_2$ -branches as its children. We distinguish few cases with respect to  $d(w)$  and the degrees of the children vertices of  $z$ .

**Case 1.**  $d(w) = 8$ .

In this case we apply the transformation  $\mathcal{T}_1$  illustrated in Figure 17. After this transformation the degree of the vertex  $z$  increases by  $d(w) - 4$ , the degrees of five children vertices of  $w$  increase from 3 to 4, the degree of the vertex  $w$  decreases to 1, while two children vertices of  $w$  decrease their degrees from 3 to 2 and 1, respectively. After applying the transformation



**Figure 17:** An illustration of the transformation  $\mathcal{T}_1$  from the proof of Lemma 4.5, Case 1.

$\mathcal{T}_1$ , the change of the ABC index is bounded from above by

$$\begin{aligned}
 g(d(z), d(w)) &= -f(d(z), d(w)) + f(2, 1) + 5(-f(3, d(w)) + f(4, d(w) + d(z) - 4)) \\
 &\quad - f(3, d(w)) + f(4, 2) - f(3, d(w)) + f(2, 1) \\
 &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^{d(z)-2} (-f(x_i, d(w)) + f(x_i, d(w) + d(z) - 4)).
 \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 2.12  $-f(x_i, d(w)) + f(x_i, d(w) + d(z) - 4)$  decreases in  $x_i$ , i.e., it is maximal

for  $x_i = 3$ . This together with  $d(w) = 8$  gives us the following upper bound on  $g(d(z), d(w))$ :

$$\begin{aligned} g(d(z), 8) &= -f(d(z), 8) + f(2, 1) + 5(-f(3, 8) + f(4, d(z) + 4)) \\ &\quad -f(3, 8) + f(4, 2) - f(3, 8) + f(2, 1) \\ &\quad + (d(z) - 2)(-f(3, 8) + f(3, d(z) + 4)). \end{aligned}$$

The function  $g(d(z), 8)$  does not have local extremal points, and it is a decreasing function in  $d(z)$ . Thus,  $g(d(z), 8)$  is maximal when  $d(z)$  is smallest possible, i.e., when  $d(z) = d(w) = 8$ . Then  $g(8, 8) = -0.00136859$ , and therefore, the change of the ABC index after applying the transformation  $\mathcal{T}_1$  is negative. This is a contradiction to the assumption that  $G$  is a tree with minimal ABC index.

If  $z$  is the root vertex of  $G$  then the change of the ABC-index is bounded by


$$\begin{aligned} g_r(d(z), 8) &= -f(d(z), 8) + f(2, 1) + 5(-f(3, 8) + f(4, d(z) + 4)) \\ &\quad -f(3, 8) + f(4, 2) - f(3, 8) + f(2, 1) \\ &\quad + (d(z) - 1)(-f(3, 8) + f(3, d(z) + 4)), \end{aligned}$$

which is bounded from above by the negative function  $g(d(z), 8)$ .

**Case 2.**  $9 \leq d(w) \leq 13$ .

**Subcase 2.1.**  $z$  has at least three children of degree 3.

In this case we apply the transformation  $\mathcal{T}_{21}$  illustrated in Figure 18. After this transformation



**Figure 18:** An illustration of the transformation  $\mathcal{T}_{21}$  from the proof of Lemma 4.5, Subcase 2.1.

the degree of the vertex  $z$  increases by  $d(w) - 5$ , the degrees of five children vertices of  $w$  and three children vertices of  $z$  increase from 3 to 4, the degree of the vertex  $w$  decreases to 1, while three children vertices of  $w$  decrease their degrees from 3 to 2, 2 and 1, respectively. The rest of the vertices do not change their degrees. The change of the ABC index after applying  $\mathcal{T}_{21}$  is at most

$$\begin{aligned} &-f(d(z), d(w)) + f(2, 1) - f(3, d(w)) + f(2, 1) + 2(-f(3, d(w)) + f(4, 2)) \\ &+ 5(-f(3, d(w)) + f(4, d(w) + d(z) - 5)) + 3(-f(3, d(z)) + f(4, d(w) + d(z) - 5)) \\ &+ (d(w) - 9)(-f(3, d(w)) + f(3, d(w) + d(z) - 5)) \end{aligned}$$

$$+ \sum_{i=1}^{d(z)-5} (-f(x_i, d(w)) + f(x_i, d(w) + d(z) - 5)). \quad (24)$$

By Proposition 2.12  $-f(x_i, d(w)) + f(x_i, d(w) + d(z) - 4)$  decreases in  $x_i$ , i.e., it is maximal for  $x_i = 3$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} g(d(z), d(w)) &= -f(d(z), d(w)) + f(2, 1) - f(3, d(w)) + f(2, 1) + 2(-f(3, d(w)) + f(4, 2)) \\ &\quad + 5(-f(3, d(w)) + f(4, d(w) + d(z) - 5)) \\ &\quad + 3(-f(3, d(z)) + f(4, d(w) + d(z) - 5)) \\ &\quad + (d(w) - 9)(-f(3, d(w)) + f(3, d(w) + d(z) - 5)) \\ &\quad + (d(z) - 5)(-f(3, d(w)) + f(3, d(w) + d(z) - 5)), \end{aligned}$$

is an upper bound on (24). It can be verified that  $g(d(z), 9) \leq g(9, 9) \approx -0.0514586$ ,  $g(d(z), 10) \leq g(10, 10) \approx -0.0538142$ ,  $g(d(z), 11) \leq g(11, 11) \approx -0.0541005$ ,  $g(d(z), 12) \leq g(12, 12) \approx -0.0531217$ , and  $g(d(z), 13) \leq g(12, 13) \approx -0.0510972$ . Thus, the change of the ABC index after applying the transformation  $\mathcal{T}_{21}$  is negative.

If  $z$  is root vertex of  $G$  then the change of the ABC-index is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} g_r(d(z), d(w)) &= -f(d(z), d(w)) + f(2, 1) - f(3, d(w)) + f(2, 1) + 2(-f(3, d(w)) + f(4, 2)) \\ &\quad + 5(-f(3, d(w)) + f(4, d(w) + d(z) - 5)) \\ &\quad + 3(-f(3, d(z)) + f(4, d(w) + d(z) - 5)) \\ &\quad + (d(w) - 9)(-f(3, d(w)) + f(3, d(w) + d(z) - 5)) \\ &\quad + (d(z) - 4)(-f(3, d(w)) + f(3, d(w) + d(z) - 5)), \end{aligned}$$


which is bounded from above by the negative function  $g(d(z), d(w))$ .

**Subcase 2.2.**  $z$  has at most two children of degree 3.

We distinguish further two subcases with respect to  $d(w)$ .

**Subcase 2.2.1.**  $d(w) = 9, 10, 11$ .

In this subcase we apply the transformation  $\mathcal{T}_{221}$  illustrated in Figure 19. After the transfor-



**Figure 19:** An illustration of the transformation  $\mathcal{T}_{221}$  from the proof of Lemma 4.5, Subcase 2.2.1.

mation  $\mathcal{T}_{221}$  the degree of the vertex  $z$  increases by  $d(w) - 5$ , the degrees of three children

vertices of  $w$  increase from 3 to 5, the degrees of two children vertices of  $w$  increase from 3 to 4, the degree of the vertex  $w$  decreases to 1, while three children vertices of  $w$ , decrease their degrees from 3 to 2, 2 and 1, respectively. The rest of the vertices do not change their degrees. The change of the ABC index after applying  $\mathcal{T}_{221}$  is at most

$$\begin{aligned}
& -f(d(z), d(w)) + f(2, 1)) - f(3, d(w)) + f(2, 1)) + 2(-f(3, d(w)) + f(4, 2)) \\
& + 3(-f(3, d(w)) + f(5, d(w) + d(z) - 5)) + 2(-f(3, d(w)) + f(4, d(w) + d(z) - 5)) \\
& + (d(w) - 9)(-f(3, d(w)) + f(3, d(w) + d(z) - 5)) \\
& + \sum_{i=1}^{d(z)-2} (-f(x_i, d(w)) + f(x_i, d(w) + d(z) - 5)). \tag{25}
\end{aligned}$$

Due to the same argument as in the previous cases,  $-f(x_i, d(w)) + f(x_i, d(w) + d(z) - 5)$  is maximal when  $x_i = 3$  is minimal. Since  $z$  may have at most two children of degree 2 and  $-f(x_i, d(w)) + f(x_i, d(w) + d(z) - 5)$  is strictly negative, then by setting  $x_i = 4$ , and considering only  $d(z) - 4$  children of  $z$  that they have degree at least 4 we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
g(d(z), d(w)) &= -f(d(z), d(w)) + f(2, 1)) - f(3, d(w)) + f(2, 1)) + 2(-f(3, d(w)) + f(4, 2)) \\
& + 3(-f(3, d(w)) + f(5, d(w) + d(z) - 5)) \\
& + 2(-f(3, d(w)) + f(4, d(w) + d(z) - 5)) \\
& + (d(w) - 9)(-f(3, d(w)) + f(3, d(w) + d(z) - 5)) \\
& + (d(z) - 4)(-f(4, d(w)) + f(4, d(w) + d(z) - 5))
\end{aligned}$$

is an upper bound on (25). It can be verified that  $g(d(z), d(w))$  is negative function for  $d(w) = 9, 10$ , and  $11$ , and  $g(d(z), 9) \leq g(9, 9) \approx -0.000496363$ ,  $g(d(z), 10) \leq g(10, 10) \approx -0.00763911$ , and  $g(d(z), 11) \leq \lim_{d(z) \rightarrow \infty} g(d(z), 11) \approx -0.00696979$ . Thus, also in this case, the change of the ABC index after applying the transformation  $\mathcal{T}_{221}$  is negative.

If  $z$  is root vertex of  $G$  then the change of the ABC-index is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
g_r(d(z), d(w)) &= -f(d(z), d(w)) + f(2, 1)) - f(3, d(w)) + f(2, 1)) + 2(-f(3, d(w)) + f(4, 2)) \\
& + 3(-f(3, d(w)) + f(5, d(w) + d(z) - 5)) \\
& + 2(-f(3, d(w)) + f(4, d(w) + d(z) - 5)) \\
& + (d(w) - 9)(-f(3, d(w)) + f(3, d(w) + d(z) - 5)) \\
& + (d(z) - 3)(-f(4, d(w)) + f(4, d(w) + d(z) - 5))
\end{aligned}$$


which is bounded from above by the negative function  $g(d(z), d(w))$ .

**Subcase 2.2.2.**  $d(w) = 12, 13$ .

Here we apply the transformation  $\mathcal{T}_{222}$  illustrated in Figure 20. After the transformation  $\mathcal{T}_{222}$  the degree of the vertex  $z$  increases by  $d(w) - 5$ , the degrees of eight children vertices of  $w$  increase from 3 to 4, the degree of the vertex  $w$  decreases to 1, while three children vertices of  $w$ , decrease their degrees from 3 to 2, 2 and 1, respectively. The rest of the vertices do not change their degrees. The change of the ABC index after applying  $\mathcal{T}_{222}$  is at most

$$-f(d(z), d(w)) + f(2, 1)) - f(3, d(w)) + f(2, 1)) + 2(-f(3, d(w)) + f(4, 2))$$





**Figure 20:** An illustration of the proof of Lemma 4.5, Subcase 2.2.2.

$$\begin{aligned}
& +8(-f(3, d(w)) + f(4, d(w) + d(z) - 5)) \\
& + (d(w) - 12)(-f(3, d(w)) + f(3, d(w) + d(z) - 5)) \\
& + \sum_{i=1}^{d(z)-2} (-f(x_i, d(w)) + f(x_i, d(w) + d(z) - 5)). \tag{26}
\end{aligned}$$

Applying the same argument as in the previous case, we obtain an upper bound on (26) by considering only  $d(z) - 4$  children of  $z$  that they have degree at least 4:

$$\begin{aligned}
g(d(z), d(w)) &= -f(d(z), d(w)) + f(2, 1) - f(3, d(w)) + f(2, 1) + 2(-f(3, d(w)) + f(4, 2)) \\
& + 8(-f(3, d(w)) + f(4, d(w) + d(z) - 5)) \\
& + (d(w) - 12)(-f(3, d(w)) + f(3, d(w) + d(z) - 5)) \\
& + (d(z) - 4)(-f(4, d(w)) + f(4, d(w) + d(z) - 5)).
\end{aligned}$$

It can be verified that  $g(d(z), d(w))$  is negative function for  $d(w) = 12$  and  $13$ , and  $g(d(z), 12) \leq \lim_{d(z) \rightarrow \infty} g(d(z), 12) \approx -0.0704253$ , and  $g(d(z), 13) \leq \lim_{d(z) \rightarrow \infty} g(d(z), 13) \approx -0.061309$ . Thus, also in this case, the change of the ABC index after applying the transformation  $\mathcal{T}_{222}$  is negative.

If  $z$  is root vertex of  $G$  then the change of the ABC-index is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
g(d(z), d(w)) &= -f(d(z), d(w)) + f(2, 1) - f(3, d(w)) + f(2, 1) + 2(-f(3, d(w)) + f(4, 2)) \\
& + 8(-f(3, d(w)) + f(4, d(w) + d(z) - 5)) \\
& + (d(w) - 12)(-f(3, d(w)) + f(3, d(w) + d(z) - 5)) \\
& + (d(z) - 3)(-f(4, d(w)) + f(4, d(w) + d(z) - 5)).
\end{aligned}$$


which is bounded from above by the negative function  $g(d(z), d(w))$ .

This concludes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

The following proposition will be used in the proof of Lemma 4.7, which is an improvement of Lemma 4.5.

**Proposition 4.6.** *Let  $T$  be a proper  $T_k$ -branch that contains more than 6  $B_2$ -branches. Then,  $T$  cannot be a proper subtree of a minimal-ABC tree or a minimal-ABC tree itself.*

*Proof.* Let  $u$  be the root vertex of  $T$ . From Theorems 2.6, 2.8, and Lemma 2.9(a), it follows that  $T$  does not contain  $B_k$ -branches,  $k \geq 4$ . Assume that the number of  $B_1$ -branches contained in  $T$  is  $k_1 > 0$ , the number of  $B_2$  is  $k_2 > 6$  and  $B_3$ -branches is  $k_3 \geq 0$ . It holds that  $k_1 + k_2 + k_3 = k$ . Perform the transformation  $\mathcal{T}$  depicted in Figure 21. After this



**Figure 21:** Transformation  $\mathcal{T}$  from Lemma 3.1. Note that in this illustration all  $k_2$  children of  $u$  are of degree 4. As it is shown in the proof below, in that case the change of the ABC index is the largest.

transformation the degree of the vertex  $u$  decreases by one, while the degree of the vertex  $v$  increases by one. The degrees of other vertices remain unchanged. The change of the ABC index is

$$\begin{aligned} & -f(d(u), 3) + f(d(u) - 1, 4) + (k_2 - 1)(-f(d(u), 3) + f(d(u) - 1, 3)) \\ & + (d(u) - k_2 - k_1 - 1)(-f(d(u), 4) + f(d(u) - 1, 4)) - f(d(u), d(w)) + f(d(u) - 1, d(w)), \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

By Proposition 2.12, the expression  $-f(d(u), d(w)) + f(d(u) - 1, d(w))$  increases in  $w$ , and thus, it is maximal when  $d(w) \rightarrow \infty$ . By the same proposition,  $-f(d(u), 4) + f(d(u) - 1, 4) > -f(d(u), 3) + f(d(u) - 1, 3)$ , and therefore, (27) is maximal when  $k_2$  is minimal, i.e.,  $k_2 = 7$ . Since  $-f(d(u), 4) + f(d(u) - 1, 4)$  is strictly positive for any  $d(u)$ , (27) is maximal when  $k_1$  minimal, i.e.,  $k_1 = 1$ . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} & -f(d(u), 3) + f(d(u) - 1, 4) + 6(-f(d(u), 3) + f(d(u) - 1, 3)) \\ & + (d(u) - 9)(-f(d(u), 4) + f(d(u) - 1, 4)) + \lim_{d(w) \rightarrow \infty} (-f(d(u), d(w)) + f(d(u) - 1, d(w))) \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

is an upper bound on (27). It can be verified that the expression (28) is negative for  $d(u) \geq 9$ , and reaches its maximum for of  $\approx -0.05141846$  for  $d(u) = 15$ . Hence, the change of the ABC index (27), after applying the transformation  $\mathcal{T}$ , is negative, which is a contradiction to the assumption that  $T$  is a subtree of a tree with minimal-ABC index.

Consider now the case when  $u$  is the root vertex of the tree with a minimal-ABC index. We have the same configuration and apply the same transformation as in Figure 3. Here, it holds that  $d(u) = k_1 + k_2 + k_3$ . Now the change of the ABC index is

$$-f(d(u), 3) + f(d(u) - 1, 4) + (k_2 - 1)(-f(d(u), 3) + f(d(u) - 1, 3))$$

$$+(d(u) - k_2 - k_1)(-f(d(u), 4) + f(d(u) - 1, 4)) - f(d(u), d(w)) + f(d(u) - 1, d(w)), \quad (29)$$

Similarly as above we obtain that (29) as most

$$\begin{aligned} & -f(d(u), 3) + f(d(u) - 1, 4) + 6(-f(d(u), 3) + f(d(u) - 1, 3)) \\ & + (d(u) - 8)(-f(d(u), 4) + f(d(u) - 1, 4)) + \lim_{d(w) \rightarrow \infty} (-f(d(u), d(w)) + f(d(u) - 1, d(w))). \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

and it is maximal for  $k_1 = 1$  and  $k_2 = 7$ . The expression (30), and therefore (29), is always negative, and its maximal value of  $\approx -0.048948$  is obtained for  $d(u) = 14$ . Thus, in this case we again obtain that after applying the transformation  $\mathcal{T}$ , the value of the ABC index decreases, which is a contradiction to the assumption that  $T$ ,  $k \geq 7$ , is a tree with minimal-ABC index.  $\square$


**Lemma 4.7.** *Let  $w$  be a vertex of a minimal-ABC tree  $G$  different than the root of  $G$ . Then,  $w$  is a parent of at most six  $B_2$ -branches.*

*Proof.* If  $w$  is a parent of a  $B_1$ -branch, then by Proposition 4.6,  $G$  contains at most 6  $B_1$ -branches, and the lemma holds. Thus, we assume that  $w$  does not have  $B_1$ -branches as children. Let  $n_2$  be the number of  $B_2$ -branches that are children of  $w$  and let  $n_3$  be the number of children vertices of  $w$  with degree at least 4. By Lemma 4.3,  $n_2 \leq 11$ . Assume that  $w$  has more than six  $B_2$ -branches. We consider three possible transformations  $\mathcal{T}_1$  and  $\mathcal{T}_2$ , illustrated in Figure 22. After applying  $\mathcal{T}_1$  the degree of the vertex  $z$  increases by  $d(w) - 4$ , the degrees of five children vertices of  $w$  increase from 3 to 4, the degree of the vertex  $w$  decreases to 1, while two children vertices of  $w$  decrease their degrees from 3 to 2 and 1, respectively. The rest of the vertices do not change their degrees. The change of the ABC index after applying  $\mathcal{T}_1$  is at most

$$\begin{aligned} & -f(d(z), d(w)) - f(3, d(w)) + f(2, 1) - f(3, d(w)) + f(4, 2) \\ & + 5(-f(3, d(w)) + f(4, d(z) + d(w) - 4)) + (n_2 - 7)(-f(3, d(w)) + f(3, d(z) + d(w) - 4)) \\ & + \sum_{i=1}^{n_3} (-f(x_i, d(w)) + f(x_i, d(z) + d(w) - 4)) \\ & + (d(z) - 2)(-f(4, d(w)) + f(4, d(z) + d(w) - 4)). \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

By Proposition 2.12  $-f(x_i, d(w)) + f(x_i, d(z) + d(w) - 4)$  decreases in  $x_i$ , i.e., it is maximal for  $x_i = 4$ . Together with  $d(w) = n_3 + n_2 + 1$  we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} f_1(d(z), d(w), n_2) &= -f(d(z), d(w)) + f(2, 1) - f(3, d(w)) + f(2, 1) - f(3, d(w)) + f(4, 2) \\ &+ 5(-f(3, d(w)) + f(4, d(z) + d(w) - 4)) \\ &+ (n_2 - 7)(-f(3, d(w)) + f(3, d(z) + d(w) - 4)) \\ &+ (d(w) - n_2 - 1)(-f(4, d(w)) + f(4, d(z) + d(w) - 4)) \\ &+ (d(z) - 2)(-f(4, d(w)) + f(4, d(z) + d(w) - 4)) \end{aligned}$$



**Figure 22:** Transformations  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  from the proof of Lemma 4.7.

is an upper bound on (31). Let consider the expression  $g(d(z), d(w)) = -f(d(z), d(w)) + f(2, 1) + (d(z) - 2)(-f(4, d(w)) + f(4, d(z) + d(w) - 4))$  comprised of the components of  $f_1(d(z), d(w), n_2)$ . The first derivative of  $g(d(z), d(w))$  with respect to  $d(z)$  is

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial g(d(z), d(w))}{\partial d(z)} &= \frac{1}{2} \left( -\sqrt{\frac{2+d(w)}{d(w)}} + \frac{-2+d(w)}{d(w)d(z)^2 \sqrt{\frac{-2+d(w)+d(z)}{d(w)d(z)}}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{-2+d(z)}{(-4+d(w)+d(z))^2 \sqrt{\frac{-2+d(w)+d(z)}{-4+d(w)+d(z)}}} + \sqrt{\frac{-2+d(w)+d(z)}{-4+d(w)+d(z)}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

For  $d(z) \geq d(w) \geq 9$ , we have that

$$\sqrt{\frac{2+d(w)}{d(w)}} > \sqrt{\frac{-2+d(w)+d(z)}{-4+d(w)+d(z)}}.$$

Next we show that

$$\frac{-2+d(w)}{d(w)d(z)^2 \sqrt{\frac{-2+d(w)+d(z)}{d(w)d(z)}}} < \frac{-2+d(z)}{(-4+d(w)+d(z))^2 \sqrt{\frac{-2+d(w)+d(z)}{-4+d(w)+d(z)}}}. \quad (32)$$

Indeed, from (32), it follows that

$$(-2 + d(w))^2(-4 + d(w) + d(z))^3 < (-2 + d(z))^2 d(w) d(z)^3, \quad \text{or}$$

$$(-4 + d(w) + d(z))^3 < d(w) d(z)^3, \quad \text{or}$$

$$(2d(z))^3 < d(w) d(z)^3,$$

which is satisfied since  $d(w) \geq 9$ . Thus,  $\partial g(d(z), d(w)) / \partial d(z) < 0$ . Because  $f(x, y)$  decreases in  $x$ , it follows that  $5(-f(3, d(w)) + f(4, d(z) + d(w) - 4))$ ,  $(n_2 - 7)(-f(3, d(w)) + f(3, d(z) + d(w) - 4))$ , and  $(d(w) - n_2 - 1)(-f(4, d(w)) + f(4, d(z) + d(w) - 4))$  decrease in  $d(z)$ . Thus,  $f_1(d(z), d(w), n_2)$  is maximal when  $d(z)$  is minimal, i.e.,  $d(z) = d(w)$ .

After applying  $\mathcal{T}_2$  the degrees of five children vertices of  $w$  increase from 3 to 4, the degree of the vertex  $w$  decreases by 2, while two children vertices of  $w$  decrease their degrees from 3 to 2 and 1, respectively. The rest of the vertices do not change their degrees. The change of the ABC index after applying  $\mathcal{T}_1$  is at most

$$\begin{aligned} & -f(d(z), d(w)) + f(d(z), d(w) - 2) - f(3, d(w)) + f(2, 1) - f(3, d(w)) + f(4, 2) \\ & + 5(-f(3, d(w)) + f(4, d(w) - 2)) + (n_2 - 7)(-f(3, d(w)) + f(3, d(w) - 2)) \\ & + \sum_{i=1}^{n_3} (-f(x_i, d(w)) + f(x_i, d(w) - 2)). \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

By Proposition 2.12  $-f(x_i, d(w)) + f(x_i, d(z) + d(w) - 4)$  increase in  $x_i$ . Because  $w$  has children of degree 3, by Theorems 2.4 and 2.6, it follows that  $x_i$  may have children of degree 3 or 2. Together with Lemma 3.3, we conclude that the maximal possible value of  $x_i$  is 8. Together with  $d(w) = n_3 + n_2 + 1$  we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} f_2(d(z), d(w), n_2) &= -f(d(z), d(w)) + f(d(z), d(w) - 2) \\ & - f(3, d(w)) + f(2, 1) - f(3, d(w)) + f(4, 2) \\ & + 5(-f(3, d(w)) + f(4, d(w) - 2)) \\ & + (n_2 - 7)(-f(3, d(w)) + f(3, d(w) - 2)) \\ & + (d(w) - n_2 - 1)(-f(8, d(w)) + f(8, d(w) - 2)) \end{aligned}$$

is an upper bound on (33). The expression  $-f(d(z), d(w))$ , and therefore also  $f_2(d(z), d(w), n_2)$ , increases in  $d(z)$ , and it is maximal  $d(z) \rightarrow \infty$ .

We distinguish three cases with respect to  $n_2$ .

**Case 1.**  $n_2 = 7$ .

It holds that  $f_1(d(z), d(w), 7) < f_1(d(w), d(w), 7) < 0$  for  $d(w) \leq 228$  and  $f_2(d(z), d(w), 7) < \lim_{d(z) \rightarrow \infty} f_2(d(z), d(w), 7) < 0$  for  $d(w) > 16$ . So, we apply  $\mathcal{T}_1$  for  $d(w) \leq 16$  and  $\mathcal{T}_2$  for  $d(w) > 16$ , and obtain trees with smaller ABC index than that of  $G$ , which is a contradiction to the claim of the lemma.

**Case 2.**  $n_2 = 8, 9, 10$ .

It holds that  $f_1(d(z), d(w), 8) < f_1(d(w), d(w), 8) < 0$  for  $d(w) \leq 225$ ,  $f_1(d(z), d(w), 9) < f_1(d(w), d(w), 9) < 0$  for  $d(w) \leq 221$  and  $f_1(d(z), d(w), 10) < f_1(d(w), d(w), 10) < 0$  for

$d(w) \leq 218$ . Also, we have  $f_2(d(z), d(w), 8) < \lim_{d(z) \rightarrow \infty} f_2(d(z), d(w), 8) < 0$  for  $d(w) > 15$ ,  $f_2(d(z), d(w), 9) < \lim_{d(z) \rightarrow \infty} f_2(d(z), d(w), 9) < 0$  for  $d(w) > 14$ , and  $f_2(d(z), d(w), 10) < \lim_{d(z) \rightarrow \infty} f_2(d(z), d(w), 10) < 0$  for  $d(w) > 12$ .

Here, we apply  $\mathcal{T}_1$  for  $d(w) \leq 15$  and  $\mathcal{T}_2$  for  $d(w) > 15$ , and obtain trees with smaller ABC index than that of  $G$ , which is a contradiction to the claim of the lemma.

**Case 3.**  $n_2 = 11$ .

Here for  $d(w) > 8$ , it holds that  $f_2(d(z), d(w), 11) < \lim_{d(z) \rightarrow \infty} f_2(d(z), d(w), 11) < 0$ , and thus obtain a tree with smaller ABC index than that of  $G$ , which is a contradiction to the claim of the lemma. This completes the proof.  $\square$

Next, we present the main result of this section.

**Theorem 4.8.** *A minimal-ABC tree does not contain more than eleven  $B_2$ -branches.*

*Proof.* First, consider the case when the  $B_2$ -branches have  $k \geq 3$  different parent vertices, denoted by  $w_1, w_2, \dots, w_{k-1}, w_k$ , such that,  $d(w_1) \geq d(w_2) \geq \dots \geq d(w_{k-1}) \geq d(w_k)$ . By Theorem 2.6 only  $w_1$  and  $w_k$  may have children that are not roots of  $B_2$ -branches:  $w_1$  may have in addition children vertices of degree  $\geq 3$ , while  $w_k$  may have in addition only children vertices of degree 2. Moreover, by Theorem 2.8 and Lemma 2.9, if  $w_k$  has a children of degree 2, then  $w_1$  in addition to  $B_2$ -branches may have only  $B_3$ -branches as its children. Note that  $w_2, w_3, \dots, w_{k-1}, w_k$  cannot be root vertices and by Lemma 4.7 they can be parents of at most 6  $B_2$ -branches.

We apply a transformation on the  $B_2$ -branches that are children of the  $w_1$  and  $w_{k-1}$  vertices. There are three distinct cases regarding the parent vertices of  $w_1$  and  $w_{k-1}$ , denoted by  $z_1$  and  $z_{k-1}$ :  $z_1 \neq z_{k-1}$ ,  $z_1 = z_{k-1}$  and  $z_{k-1} = w_1$ .


**Case 1.**  $z_1 \neq z_{k-1}$ .

Notice, that  $z_1$  and  $z_{k-1}$  may belong to different levels of  $G$ , but by Theorem 2.6, it follows that their distance to the root vertex of  $G$  may differ for at most 1. Let  $w_1$  be a parent of  $n_1$   $B_2$ -branches, and  $w_{k-1}$  be a parent of  $n_{k-1} = d(w_{k-1}) - 1$   $B_2$ -branches. By Theorem 2.1,  $z_{k-1}$  cannot have a child of degree 2. Also, by Proposition 4.1,  $w_{k-1}$  cannot have two  $B_2$ -branches as its children, thus it follows that it has at least 3  $B_2$ -branches as its children. With respect to the number of  $B_2$ -branches that are attached to  $w_{k-1}$ , we distinguish two further subcases.

**Subcase 1.1.**  $d(w_{k-1}) = 4$ .

In this case we apply the transformation  $\mathcal{T}_1$  illustrated in Figure 23. After applying  $\mathcal{T}_1$  the degree of the vertex  $w_1$  increases by 2, the degree of the vertex  $w_{k-1}$  decreases to 2, two children vertices of the vertex  $w_{k-1}$  increase their degrees from 3 to 4, while one child of  $w_{k-1}$  decreases its degree to 1. The rest of the vertices do not change their degrees. The change of the ABC index after applying  $\mathcal{T}_1$  is bounded from above by

$$\begin{aligned} & -f(d(z_{k-1}), 4) + f(d(z_{k-1}), 2) - f(4, 3) + f(2, 1)) \\ & + 2(-f(4, 3) + f(d(w_1) + 2, 4)) \\ & + n_1(-f(d(w_1), 3) + f(d(w_1) + 2, 3)) \\ & + \sum_{i=1}^{d(w_1)-n_1-1} (-f(d(w_1), x_i) + f(d(w_1) + 2, x_i)) \end{aligned}$$



**Figure 23:** An illustration of the transformations  $\mathcal{T}_1$  and  $\mathcal{T}_2$  from the proof of Theorem 4.8 (Case 1).  $\mathcal{T}_1$  is applied where  $n_{k-1} = 3$ , while for  $n_{k-1} = 4, 5$  and 6, we apply  $\mathcal{T}_2$ .

$$-f(d(z_1), d(w_1)) + f(d(z_1), d(w_1) + 2). \quad (34)$$

By Proposition 2.12  $-f(d(w_1), x_i) + f(d(w_1) + 2, x_i)$  decrease in  $x_i$ , so it is maximal for  $x_i = 4$ . The expression  $-f(d(z_{k-1}), 4) + f(d(z_{k-1}), 2)$  increases in  $d(z_{k-1})$ , so we obtain an upper bound on (34), if we set  $d(z_{k-1}) = d(z_1)$ . The expression

$$g_1(d(z_1), d(w_1)) = -f(d(z_1), 4) + f(d(z_1), 2) - f(d(z_1), d(w_1)) + f(d(z_1), d(w_1) + 2)$$

increases in  $d(z_1)$ , because its first derivative with respect to  $d(z_1)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial g_1(d(z_1), d(w_1))}{\partial d(z_1)} &= \frac{1}{4} \left( \frac{2}{d(z_1)^2 \sqrt{\frac{2+d(z_1)}{d(z_1)}}} + \frac{2(-2+d(w_1))}{d(w_1)d(z_1)^2 \sqrt{\frac{-2+d(w_1)+d(z_1)}{d(w_1)d(z_1)}}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{2d(w_1) \sqrt{\frac{d(w_1)+d(z_1)}{(2+d(w_1))d(z_1)}}}{d(w_1)d(z_1) + d(z_1)^2} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

is positive for  $d(z_1) \geq d(w_1) \geq 4$ . Thus,

$$\lim_{d(z_1) \rightarrow \infty} g(d(z_1), d(w_1), n_1) = \lim_{d(z_1) \rightarrow \infty} -f(d(z_1), 4) + f(d(z_1), 2) - f(4, 3) + f(2, 1))$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& +2(-f(4, 3) + f(d(w_1) + 2, 4)) \\
& +n_1(-f(d(w_1), 3) + f(d(w_1) + 2, 3)) \\
& +(d(w_1) - n_1 - 1)(-f(d(w_1), 4) + f(d(w_1) + 2, 4)) \\
& -f(d(z_1), d(w_1)) + f(d(z_1), d(w_1) + 2)
\end{aligned}$$

is an upper bound on (34). Considering the maximum of  $\lim_{d(z_1) \rightarrow \infty} g(d(z_1), d(w_1), n_1)$  for  $n_1 = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6$ , we show the  $\lim_{d(z_1) \rightarrow \infty} g(d(z_1), d(w_1), n_1)$  is always negative. Namely,

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{d(z_1) \rightarrow \infty} g(d(z_1), d(w_1), 1) &\leq \lim_{\substack{d(z_1) \rightarrow \infty \\ d(w_1) \rightarrow \infty}} g(d(z_1), d(w_1), 1) = -0.0222781, \\
\lim_{d(z_1) \rightarrow \infty} g(d(z_1), d(w_1), 2) &\leq \lim_{\substack{d(z_1) \rightarrow \infty \\ d(w_1) \rightarrow \infty}} g(d(z_1), d(w_1), 2) = -0.0222781, \\
\lim_{d(z_1) \rightarrow \infty} g(d(z_1), d(w_1), 3) &\leq \lim_{\substack{d(z_1) \rightarrow \infty \\ d(w_1) \rightarrow \infty}} g(d(z_1), d(w_1), 3) = -0.0222781, \\
\lim_{d(z_1) \rightarrow \infty} g(d(z_1), d(w_1), 4) &\leq \lim_{d(z_1) \rightarrow \infty} g(d(z_1), 5, 4) = -0.0186023, \\
\lim_{d(z_1) \rightarrow \infty} g(d(z_1), d(w_1), 5) &\leq \lim_{d(z_1) \rightarrow \infty} g(d(z_1), 6, 5) = -0.0151247, \quad \text{and} \\
\lim_{d(z_1) \rightarrow \infty} g(d(z_1), d(w_1), 6) &\leq \lim_{d(z_1) \rightarrow \infty} g(d(z_1), 7, 6) = -0.0131643.
\end{aligned}$$

From here follows that also the change of the ABC index (34) is negative.

**Subcase 1.2.**  $d(w_{k-1}) = 5, 6$  or  $7$ .

In this case, for  $n_1 = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6$ , we apply the transformation  $\mathcal{T}_2$  illustrated also in Figure 23. After applying  $\mathcal{T}_2$  the degree of the vertex  $w_1$  increases by  $d(w_{k-1}) - 3 = n_{k-1} - 2$ , the degree of the vertex  $w_{k-1}$  decreases to 4, two children vertices of the vertex  $w_{k-1}$  increase their degrees from 3 to 4, while two children vertices of  $w_{k-1}$  decrease their degrees to 2 and 1, respectively. The rest of the vertices do not change their degrees. The change of the ABC index after applying  $\mathcal{T}_2$  is bounded from above by

$$\begin{aligned}
& -f(d(z_{k-1}), d(w_{k-1})) + f(d(z_{k-1}), 4) - f(d(w_{k-1}), 3) + f(4, 2)) \\
& -f(d(w_{k-1}), 3) + f(2, 1)) + 2(-f(d(w_{k-1}), 3) + f(d(w_1) + n_{k-1} - 2, 4)) \\
& +n_1(-f(d(w_1), 3) + f(d(w_1) + n_{k-1} - 2, 3)) \\
& + \sum_{i=1}^{d(w_1)-n_1-1} (-f(d(w_1), x_i) + f(d(w_1) + n_{k-1} - 2, x_i)) \\
& +(n_{k-1} - 4)(-f(d(w_{k-1}), 3) + f(d(w_1) + n_{k-1} - 2, 3)) \\
& -f(d(z_1), d(w_1)) + f(d(z_1), d(w_1) + n_{k-1} - 2)). \tag{36}
\end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 2.12  $-f(d(w_1), x_i) + f(d(w_1) + 2, x_i)$  decrease in  $x_i$ , so it is maximal for  $x_i = 4$ .

Next, we consider the case  $d(w_{k-1}) = 5$  ( $n_{k-1} = 4$ ). The expression  $-f(d(z_{k-1}), 5) + f(d(z_{k-1}), 4)$  increases in  $d(z_{k-1})$ , so we obtain an upper bound on (36), if we set  $d(z_{k-1}) = d(z_1)$ . The expression

$$g_1(d(z_1), d(w_1)) = -f(d(z_1), 5) + f(d(z_1), 4) - f(d(z_1), d(w_1)) + f(d(z_1), d(w_1) + 2)$$



increases in  $d(z_1)$ , because its first derivative with respect to  $d(z_1)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial g_1(d(z_1), d(w_1))}{\partial d(z_1)} &= \frac{1}{10} \left( -\frac{5}{d(z_1)^2 \sqrt{\frac{2+d(z_1)}{d(z_1)}}} + \frac{3\sqrt{5}}{d(z_1)^2 \sqrt{\frac{3+d(z_1)}{d(z_1)}}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{5(-2+d(w_1))}{d(w_1)d(z_1)^2 \sqrt{\frac{-2+d(w_1)+d(z_1)}{d(w_1)d(z_1)}}} - \frac{5d(w_1)\sqrt{\frac{d(w_1)+d(z_1)}{(2+d(w_1))d(z_1)}}}{d(w_1)d(z_1) + d(z_1)^2} \right) \end{aligned}$$

is positive for  $d(z_1) \geq d(w_1) \geq 5$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{d(z_1) \rightarrow \infty} g(d(z_1), d(w_1), n_1) &= \lim_{d(z_1) \rightarrow \infty} -f(d(z_1), d(w_1)) + f(d(z_{k-1}), 4) - f(5, 3) + f(4, 2)) \\ &\quad -f(5, 3) + f(2, 1) + 2(-f(5, 3) + f(d(w_1) + 2, 4)) \\ &\quad + n_1(-f(d(w_1), 3) + f(d(w_1) + 2, 3)) \\ &\quad + (d(w_1) - n_1 - 1)(-f(d(w_1), 4) + f(d(w_1) + 2, 4)) \\ &\quad - f(d(z_1), d(w_1)) + f(d(z_1), d(w_1) + 2)). \end{aligned}$$

is an upper bound on (36). Considering the maximum of  $\lim_{d(z_1) \rightarrow \infty} g(d(z_1), d(w_1), n_1)$  for  $n_1 = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6$ , we show the  $\lim_{d(z_1) \rightarrow \infty} g(d(z_1), d(w_1), n_1)$  is always negative. Namely,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{d(z_1) \rightarrow \infty} g(d(z_1), d(w_1), 1) &\leq \lim_{\substack{d(z_1) \rightarrow \infty \\ d(w_1) \rightarrow \infty}} g(d(z_1), d(w_1), 1) = -0.0628222, \\ \lim_{d(z_1) \rightarrow \infty} g(d(z_1), d(w_1), 2) &\leq \lim_{\substack{d(z_1) \rightarrow \infty \\ d(w_1) \rightarrow \infty}} g(d(z_1), d(w_1), 2) = -0.0628222, \\ \lim_{d(z_1) \rightarrow \infty} g(d(z_1), d(w_1), 3) &\leq \lim_{\substack{d(z_1) \rightarrow \infty \\ d(w_1) \rightarrow \infty}} g(d(z_1), d(w_1), 3) = -0.0628222, \\ \lim_{d(z_1) \rightarrow \infty} g(d(z_1), d(w_1), 4) &\leq \lim_{d(z_1) \rightarrow \infty} g(d(z_1), 5, 4) = -0.0591464, \\ \lim_{d(z_1) \rightarrow \infty} g(d(z_1), d(w_1), 5) &\leq \lim_{d(z_1) \rightarrow \infty} g(d(z_1), 6, 5) = -0.0556687, \quad \text{and} \\ \lim_{d(z_1) \rightarrow \infty} g(d(z_1), d(w_1), 6) &\leq \lim_{d(z_1) \rightarrow \infty} g(d(z_1), 7, 6) = -0.0537084. \end{aligned}$$

From here follows that also the change of the ABC index (36) when  $d(w_{k-1}) = 5$  is negative. Analogous proofs, one can obtain for  $d(w_{k-1}) = 6, 7$ , so we omit them.

After the transformation  $\mathcal{T}_1$   $d(w_{k-1}) = 2$ , and after the transformation  $\mathcal{T}_2$   $d(w_{k-1}) = 4$ . Let  $z_k$  be the parent vertex of  $w_k$ . Notice that degree of  $w_k$  is at least 4. Now, we interchange the labels of the vertices  $w_{k-1}$  and  $w_k$ . Since,  $d(z_{k-1}) \geq d(z_k)$ , after this relabeling the ABC index does not increase. Thus, finally we have obtained a tree with smaller ABC index than  $G$  and with  $k - 1$  different parent vertices of the  $B_2$ -branches.

**Case 2.**  $z_1 = z_{k-1}$ .


In the previous case, the upper bound of the change of the ABC index of  $G$  was obtained for  $d(z_1) = d(z_{k-1}) (\rightarrow \infty)$ . Thus, applying here the same transformation from Case 1, we obtain the same upper bounds on the change of the ABC index, which are all negative.

**Case 3.**  $z_{k-1} = w_1$ .

Since  $z_{k-1}$  has at same time children of degree larger than 3 and also children that are roots of  $B_2$ -branches, by the Theorem 2.6, it follows that  $z_{k-1}$  must be also a parent vertex of  $w_k$ . Similarly, as in Case 1, regarding the degree of  $w_{k-1}$  we apply two transformations (illustrated in Figure 24): when  $w_{k-1} = 4$ , we apply the transformation  $\mathcal{T}_3$ , and when  $w_{k-1} = 5, 6, 7$ , we apply the transformation  $\mathcal{T}_4$ .

**Subcase 3.1.**  $d(w_{k-1}) = 4$ .

After applying  $\mathcal{T}_3$  the degree of the vertex  $w_1$  ( $z_{k-1}$ ) increases by  $d(w_{k-1}) - 2 = n_{k_1} - 1$ , the degree of the vertex  $w_{k-1}$  decreases to 2, two children vertices of the vertex  $w_{k-1}$  increase their degrees from 3 to 4, while one child of  $w$  decreases its degree to 1. The rest of the vertices do not change their degrees. The change of the ABC index after applying  $\mathcal{T}_1$  is bounded from



**Figure 24:** An illustration of the transformations  $\mathcal{T}_3$  and  $\mathcal{T}_4$  from the proof of Theorem 4.8 .

above by

$$\begin{aligned}
& -f(d(w_1), 4) + f(d(w_1), 2) - f(4, 3) + f(2, 1)) \\
& + 2(-f(4, 3) + f(d(w_1) + 2, 4)) \\
& + n_1(-f(d(w_1), 3) + f(d(w_1) + 2, 3)) \\
& + \sum_{i=1}^{d(w_1)-n_1-2} (-f(d(w_1), x_i) + f(d(w_1) + 2, x_i)) \\
& - f(d(z_1), d(w_1)) + f(d(z_1), d(w_1) + 2).
\end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

By Proposition 2.12  $-f(d(w_1), x_i) + f(d(w_1) + 2, x_i)$  decrease in  $x_i$ , so it is maximal for  $x_i = 4$ . By the same proposition the expression  $-f(d(z_1), d(w_1)) + f(d(z_1), d(w_1) + 2)$  decreases in  $d(z_1)$ , and its upper bound is  $-f(d(w_1), d(w_1)) + f(d(w_1), d(w_1) + 2)$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
g(d(w_1), n_1) &= -f(d(w_1), 4) + f(d(w_1), 2) - f(4, 3) + f(2, 1)) \\
&\quad + 2(-f(4, 3) + f(d(w_1) + 2, 4)) \\
&\quad + n_1(-f(d(w_1), 3) + f(d(w_1) + 2, 3)) \\
&\quad + (d(w_1) - n_1 - 2)(-f(d(w_1), 4) + f(d(w_1) + 2, 4)) \\
&\quad - f(d(w_1), d(w_1)) + f(d(w_1), d(w_1) + 2)
\end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

is an upper bound on (37). Considering the maximum of  $g(d(w_1), n_1)$  for  $n_1 = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6$ , we show the  $g(d(w_1), n_1)$  is always negative. Namely,

$$g(d(w_1), n_1) \leq \lim_{d(w_1) \rightarrow \infty} g(d(z_1), d(w_1), n_1) = -0.0222781,$$

for  $n_1 = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6$ . From here follows that also the change of the ABC index (37) is negative.

**Subcase 3.2.**  $d(w_{k-1}) = 5, 6$ , or  $7$ .

After applying  $\mathcal{T}_4$  the degree of the vertex  $w_1$  increases by  $d(w_{k-1}) - 3 = n_{k-1} - 2$ , the degree of the vertex  $w_{k-1}$  decreases to 4, two children vertices of the vertex  $w_{k-1}$  increase their degrees from 3 to 4, while two children vertices of  $w$  decreases their degrees to 2 and 1, respectively. The rest of the vertices do not change their degrees. The change of the ABC index after applying  $\mathcal{T}_4$  is bounded from above by

$$\begin{aligned}
&-f(d(w_1), d(w_{k-1})) + f(d(w_1), 4) - f(d(w_{k-1}), 3) + f(4, 2)) \\
&-f(d(w_{k-1}), 3) + f(2, 1)) + 2(-f(d(w_{k-1}), 3) + f(d(w_1) + n_{k-1} - 2, 4)) \\
&+ n_1(-f(d(w_1), 3) + f(d(w_1) + n_{k-1} - 2, 3)) \\
&+ \sum_{i=1}^{d(w_1) - n_1 - 2} (-f(d(w_1), x_i) + f(d(w_1) + n_{k-1} - 2, x_i)) \\
&+ (n_{k-1} - 4)(-f(d(w_{k-1}), 3) + f(d(w_1) + n_{k-1} - 2, 3)) \\
&- f(d(z_1), d(w_1)) + f(d(z_1), d(w_1) + n_{k-1} - 2)).
\end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

By Proposition 2.12  $-f(d(w_1), x_i) + f(d(w_1) + 2, x_i)$  decrease in  $x_i$ , so it is maximal for  $x_i = 4$ . By the same proposition the expression  $-f(d(z_1), d(w_1)) + f(d(z_1), d(w_1) + 2)$  decreases in  $d(z_1)$ , and its upper bound is  $-f(d(w_1), d(w_1)) + f(d(w_1), d(w_1) + 2)$ .

Next, we consider the case  $d(w_{k-1}) = 5$  ( $n_{k-1} = 4$ ). The expression  $-f(d(z_1), d(w_1)) + f(d(z_1), d(w_1) + n_{k-1} - 2)$  decreases in  $d(z_1)$ , so it is bounded from above by  $-f(d(w_1), d(w_1)) + f(d(w_1), d(w_1) + n_{k-1} - 2)$ . We obtain an upper bound on (39) by setting  $d(z_{k-1}) = d(z_1)$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
g(d(w_1), n_1) &= -f(d(w_1), 5) + f(d(z_{k-1}), 4) - f(5, 3) + f(4, 2)) \\
&\quad - f(5, 3) + f(2, 1)) + 2(-f(5, 3) + f(d(w_1) + 2, 4)) \\
&\quad + n_1(-f(d(w_1), 3) + f(d(w_1) + 2, 3))
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& +(d(w_1) - n_1 - 2)(-f(d(w_1), 4) + f(d(w_1) + 2, 4)) \\
& -f(d(w_1), d(w_1)) + f(d(w_1), d(w_1) + 2)).
\end{aligned}$$

is an upper bound on (39). Considering the maximum of  $\lim_{d(z_1) \rightarrow \infty} g(d(z_1), d(w_1), n_1)$  for  $n_1 = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6$ , we show the  $\lim_{d(z_1) \rightarrow \infty} g(d(z_1), d(w_1), n_1)$  is always negative. Namely,

$$\begin{aligned}
g(d(z_1), d(w_1), 1) &\leq g(5, 1) = -0.0515202, \\
g(d(z_1), d(w_1), 2) &\leq g(5, 2) = -0.0421011, \\
g(d(z_1), d(w_1), 3) &\leq g(5, 3) = -0.0326819, \\
g(d(z_1), d(w_1), 4) &\leq g(6, 4) = -0.0399417, \\
g(d(z_1), d(w_1), 5) &\leq g(7, 5) = -0.0442738, \quad \text{and} \\
g(d(z_1), d(w_1), 6) &\leq g(7, 6) = -0.0470986.
\end{aligned}$$

From here follows that also the change of the ABC index (39) when  $d(w_{k-1}) = 5$  is negative. Analogous proofs, one can obtain for  $d(w_{k-1}) = 6, 7$ , so we omit them.

After applying transformations  $\mathcal{T}_3$  and  $\mathcal{T}_4$   $d(w_{k-1}) = 4$ , we have obtained a tree with smaller ABC index than  $G$  and with  $k - 1$  different parent vertices of the  $B_2$ -branches.

We can repeatedly apply the transformations from the above three cases until we end with a tree whose all  $B_2$ -branches have at most two different parent vertices,  $w_1$  and  $w_2$ . Observe that vertex  $w_2$  and its children were not affected by the eventual prior modification from Cases 1, 2, and 3. Also notice that  $w_1$  after the above transformations may gain only new  $B_2$  and  $B_3$ -branches. Next, if the tree has more than 11  $B_2$ -branches, we proceed with further transformation obtaining a tree with smaller ABC index, with all of  $B_2$ -branches attached to only one vertex. Here we distinguish two main cases.

**Case A.**  $w_2$  does not have children of degree 2.

In this case we can apply one of the transformations from Cases 1, 2, and 3, after which only  $w_1$  will have  $B_2$ -branches as children. If there are more than 11  $B_2$ -branches, we can apply the transformation from Lemma 4.3, and obtain a tree with smaller ABC index and maximal 11  $B_2$ -branches.

**Case B.**  $w_2$  has a children of degree 2.

Let  $n_{22}$  and  $n_{21}$  be the number of  $B_2$  and  $B_1$ -branches, respectively, that are attached to  $w_2$ , and let  $n_{13}$  and  $n_{12}$  be the number of  $B_3$  and  $B_2$ -branches, respectively, that are attached to  $w_1$ .


**Subcase B.1.**  $w_1$  is parent of  $w_2$ .

We consider further two subcases regarding if  $w_1$  is the root vertex or not.

**Subcase B.1.1.**  $w_1$  is not a root vertex.

In this case, by Lemma 4.7,  $w_2$  cannot be a parent of more than 6  $B_2$ -branches. If  $w_1$  is a parent of more than 6  $B_2$ -branches, then we can apply the transformations from Lemma 4.7, and obtain that also  $w_1$  is not a parent of more than 6  $B_2$ -branches.

If  $n_{22} \leq 6$  and  $n_{12} \leq 5$ , or  $n_{22} \leq 5$  and  $n_{12} \leq 6$ , the theorem holds. If  $n_{22} = 6$  and  $n_{12} = 6$ , we apply the transformation  $\mathcal{T}_5$  illustrated in Figure 25. By Proposition 3.4, it follows that



**Figure 25:** An illustration of the transformation  $\mathcal{T}_5$  from the proof of Theorem 4.8, Subcase B.1.1.

$n_{21} = 0$  or  $n_{21} = 1$ . Since the case  $n_{21} = 0$  is resolved in Case A, we consider here that  $n_{21} = 1$ . In this case, after applying  $\mathcal{T}_5$  the degree of the vertex  $w_1$  increases by 4, the degree of the vertex  $w_2$  decreases to 1, one child vertex of  $w_2$  decreases its degree from 3 to 2, and four children vertices of  $w_1$  increase their degrees from 3 to 4. The rest of the vertices do not change their degrees. The change of the ABC index after applying  $\mathcal{T}_5$  is

$$\begin{aligned}
 & -f(d(z), d(w_1)) + f(d(z), d(w_1) + 4) - f(d(w_1), d(w_2)) + f(2, 1) - f(d(w_2), 3) + f(4, 2) \\
 & + (n_{22} - 1)(-f(d(w_2), 3) + f(d(w_1) + 4, 3)) + n_{13}(-f(d(w_1), 4) + f(d(w_1) + 4, 4)) \\
 & + 4(-f(d(w_1), 3) + f(d(w_1) + 4, 4)) + (n_{12} - 4)(-f(d(w_1), 3) + f(d(w_1) + 4, 3)).
 \end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

By Proposition 2.12  $-f(d(z), d(w_1)) + f(d(z), d(w_1) + 4)$  decrease in  $d(z)$ , so it is maximal for  $d(z) = d(w_1)$ . Together with  $d(w_1) = n_{13} + n_{12} + 2 = n_{13} + 8$ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
 g(n_{13}) &= -f(n_{13} + 8, n_{13} + 8) + f(n_{13} + 8, n_{13} + 12) \\
 & -f(n_{13} + 8, 8) + f(2, 1) - f(8, 3) + f(4, 2) \\
 & + 5(-f(8, 3) + f(n_{13} + 12, 3)) + n_{13}(-f(n_{13} + 8, 4) + f(n_{13} + 12, 4)) \\
 & + 4(-f(n_{13} + 8, 3) + f(n_{13} + 12, 4)) + 2(-f(n_{13} + 8, 3) + f(n_{13} + 12, 3)),
 \end{aligned}$$

is an upper bound on (40). The function  $g(n_{13})$  is maximal when  $n_{13} \rightarrow \infty$ , and  $\lim_{n_{13} \rightarrow \infty} g(n_{13}) = -0.0362243$ .

**Subcase B.1.2.**  $w_1$  is a root vertex.

Due to the fact that  $w_1$  and  $w_2$  are the only vertices that are parent to  $B_2$ -branches and by Theorems 2.6, 2.8 and Lemma 2.9, it follows that  $w_1$  beside  $B_2$ -branches, may have only  $B_3$ -branches as children. Notice that if  $n_{12} + n_{22} \leq 11$ , the theorem in this case holds, so we assume that  $n_{12} + n_{22} \geq 12$ , and we can apply the transformation  $\mathcal{T}_5$  from Figure 25. Since  $n_{22} \leq 6$ , we consider further the cases when  $12 - n_{22} \leq n_{12} \leq 11$ .

**Subcase B.1.2.1.**  $n_{12} = 6$ .

Here we apply the same transformation as in Subcase B.1.1. The only difference here is that there is  $w_1$  does not have a parent vertex, and therefore the expression  $-f(d(z), d(w_1)) +$

$f(d(z), d(w_1) + 4)$  is not included in (40), and  $d(w_1) = n_{13} + n_{12} + 1 = n_{13} + 7$ . Thus, the change of the ABC index in this case is bounded from above by

$$\begin{aligned} g(n_{13}) &= -f(n_{13} + 7, 8) + f(2, 1) - f(8, 3) + f(4, 2) \\ &\quad + 5(-f(8, 3) + f(n_{13} + 11, 3)) + n_{13}(-f(n_{13} + 7, 4) + f(n_{13} + 11, 4)) \\ &\quad + 4(-f(n_{13} + 7, 3) + f(n_{13} + 11, 4)) + 2(-f(n_{13} + 7, 3) + f(n_{13} + 11, 3)). \end{aligned}$$

The function  $g(n_{13})$  is negative for  $n_{13} \geq 0$ , it is maximal when  $n_{13} \rightarrow \infty$ , and  $\lim_{n_{13} \rightarrow \infty} g(n_{13}) = -0.0362242$ .

**Subcase B.1.2.2.**  $7 \leq n_{12} \leq 11$ .

After applying  $\mathcal{T}_5$ , the degree of the vertex  $w_1$  increases by  $n_{22} - 2$ , the degree of the vertex  $w_2$  decreases to 1, one child vertex of  $w_2$  decreases its degree from 3 to 2, and four children vertices of  $w_1$  increase their degrees from 3 to 4. The change of the ABC index is bounded from above by

$$\begin{aligned} &-f(d(w_1), d(w_2)) + f(2, 1) - f(d(w_2), 3) + f(4, 2) \\ &+ (n_{22} - 1)(-f(d(w_2), 3) + f(d(w_1) + n_{22} - 2, 3)) \\ &+ n_{13}(-f(d(w_1), 4) + f(d(w_1) + n_{22} - 2, 4)) \\ &+ n_{21}(-f(d(w_1), 3) + f(d(w_1) + n_{22} - 2, 4)) \\ &+ 3(-f(d(w_1), 3) + f(d(w_1) + n_{22} - 2, 4)) \\ &+ (n_{12} + n_{22} - n_{21} - 4)(-f(d(w_1), 3) + f(d(w_1) + n_{22} - 2, 3)). \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

Considering that  $d(w_1) = n_{13} + n_{12} + 1$  and  $d(w_2) = n_{22} + n_{21} + 1$ , we can write (41) as

$$\begin{aligned} g(n_{13}, n_{12}, n_{22}, n_{21}) &= -f(d(w_1), d(w_2)) + f(2, 1) - f(d(w_2), 3) + f(4, 2) \\ &\quad + (n_{22} - 1)(-f(d(w_2), 3) + f(d(w_1) + n_{22} - 2, 3)) \\ &\quad + n_{13}(-f(d(w_1), 4) + f(d(w_1) + n_{22} - 2, 4)) \\ &\quad + n_{21}(-f(d(w_1), 3) + f(d(w_1) + n_{22} - 2, 4)) \\ &\quad + 3(-f(d(w_1), 3) + f(d(w_1) + n_{22} - 2, 4)) \\ &\quad + (n_{12} + n_{22} - n_{21} - 4)(-f(d(w_1), 3) + f(d(w_1) + n_{22} - 2, 3)). \end{aligned}$$


By Propositions 3.4 and 4.4 we have additional constraints on  $n_{13}, n_{12}, n_{22}$ , and  $n_{21}$ . Namely, it holds that  $7 \leq n_{12} \leq 9$ ,  $0 \leq n_{13} \leq 4$ ,  $1 \leq n_{22} \leq 6$ , and  $1 \leq n_{21} \leq 4$ . Also, it holds that  $n_{12} + n_{13} \leq 11$  and  $n_{22} + n_{21} \leq 7$ . For all feasible values of the parameters  $n_{13}, n_{12}, n_{22}$ , and  $n_{21}$ , the function  $g(n_{13}, n_{12}, n_{22}, n_{21})$  obtain the maximal value of  $-0.0640574 = g(0, 9, 3, 1)$ .

Observe that with the above possible values of the parameters  $n_{22}, n_{21}, n_{13}$  and  $n_{12}$  the graph  $G$  has strictly less than 134 vertices. In [13] all minimal-ABC trees with up to 300 were computed, and no of them has the structure of  $G$ .

**Subcase B.2.**  $w_1$  is not parent of  $w_2$ .

If  $n_{12} > 6$  or  $n_{22} > 6$  we can apply transformations from Lemma 4.7, so that afterwards we obtain  $n_{12} \leq 6$  and  $n_{22} \leq 6$ . The theorem holds, if  $n_{22} \leq 6$  and  $n_{12} \leq 5$ , or  $n_{22} \leq 5$  and  $n_{12} \leq 6$ , the theorem holds. By Proposition 3.4, if  $n_{22} = 6$ ,  $w_2$  may have at most one  $B_1$ -branch as a child. If  $w_2$  does not have a  $B_1$ -branch as a child, we apply the transformations

from Case 1 of this proof, and the proof is completed. If  $w_2$  has one  $B_1$ -branch as a child, and  $n_{22} = 6$  and  $n_{12} = 6$ , then we proceed with the transformation  $\mathcal{T}_6$  illustrated in Figure 26. After applying  $\mathcal{T}_6$ , the degree of the vertex  $w_1$  increases by 4, the degree of the vertex  $w_2$



**Figure 26:** An illustration of the transformations  $\mathcal{T}_6$  from the proof of Theorem 4.8, Subcase B.2.

decreases from 8 to 4, two children vertices of  $w_2$  decrease their degrees from 3 to 2 and 1, respectively. The rest of the vertices do not change their degrees. Thus, the change of the ABC index is smaller than

$$\begin{aligned}
 & -f(8, d(z_2)) + f(4, d(z_2)) - f(8, 3) + f(2, 1) - f(8, 3) + f(4, 2) \\
 & + 3(-f(8, 3) + f(d(w_1) + 4, 4)) - f(d(w_1), 3) + f(d(w_1) + 4, 4)) \\
 & + 6(-f(d(w_1), 3) + f(d(w_1) + 4, 3)).
 \end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

By Proposition 2.12  $-f(8, d(z_2)) + f(4, d(z_2))$  is maximal for  $d(z_2) \rightarrow \infty$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
 g(d(w_1)) &= \lim_{d(z_2) \rightarrow \infty} (-f(8, d(z_2)) + f(4, d(z_2))) - f(8, 3) + f(2, 1) - f(8, 3) + f(4, 2) \\
 &+ 3(-f(8, 3) + f(d(w_1) + 4, 4)) - f(d(w_1), 3) + f(d(w_1) + 4, 4)) \\
 &+ 6(-f(d(w_1), 3) + f(d(w_1) + 4, 3)),
 \end{aligned}$$

is an upper bound on (42). The function  $g(d(w_1))$  obtains its maximum of  $-0.0154895$  for  $d(w_1) = 11$ . Observe that  $g(d(w_1))$  is independent on  $d(z_1)$ , so the proof holds for any value of  $d(z_1)$ , including the case  $z_1 = z_2$ .  $\square$

## 5 Conclusion

The main contributions of this work are the upper bounds on the number of  $B_1$  and  $B_2$ -branches in the minimal-ABC trees presented in Theorems 3.5 and 4.8, respectively. The theorems state that a minimal-ABC tree may have at most four  $B_1$ -branches and at most eleven  $B_2$ -branches. Moreover, it was shown that these two bounds are attained in special cases that cannot occur simultaneously. Based on the experimental results [13] and obtained (counter)examples of minimal-ABC trees [1, 13, 24], it is very likely that here presented upper bounds on  $B_1$  and  $B_2$ -branches are not sharp, although they are quite close to the conjectured sharp bounds below.

**Conjecture 5.1.** *A minimal-ABC tree can contain at most three  $B_1$ -branches.*

**Conjecture 5.2.** *A minimal-ABC tree can contain at most nine  $B_2$ -branches.*

However, Theorem 3.5 also states that if a minimal-ABC tree is a  $T_k$ -branch itself, then it can contain at most three  $B_1$ -branches. This is the best possible bound since the minimal-ABC trees with 14 and 19 vertices contain three  $B_1$ -branches [13, 25].

The results presented here, together with Theorems 2.8 and 2.10 from [14], show that beside a very small number of  $B_1$ ,  $B_2$  and  $B_4$ -branches, the minimal-ABC trees are comprised of  $B_3$ -branches and additional number of internal vertices. This goes in line with Conjecture 3.2. [1], which states that enough large minimal-ABC trees are comprised exclusively of  $B_3$ -branches and internal vertices.

## References

- [1] M. B. Ahmadi, D. Dimitrov, I. Gutman, S. A. Hosseini, *Disproving a conjecture on trees with minimal atom-bond connectivity index*, MATCH Commun. Math. Comput. Chem. **72** (2014) 685–698.
- [2] M. B. Ahmadi, S. A. Hosseini, P. Salehi Nowbandegani, *On trees with minimal atom bond connectivity index*, MATCH Commun. Math. Comput. Chem. **69** (2013) 559–563.
- [3] M. B. Ahmadi, S. A. Hosseini, M. Zarrinderakht, *On large trees with minimal atom–bond connectivity index*, MATCH Commun. Math. Comput. Chem. **69** (2013) 565–569.
- [4] M. B. Ahmadi, M. Sadeghimehr, *Atom bond connectivity index of an infinite class  $NS_1[n]$  of dendrimer nanostars*, Optoelectron. Adv. Mat. **4** (2010) 1040–1042.
- [5] J. Chen, X. Guo, *Extreme atom-bond connectivity index of graphs*, MATCH Commun. Math. Comput. Chem. **65** (2011) 713–722.
- [6] J. Chen, X. Guo, *The atom-bond connectivity index of chemical bicyclic graphs*, Appl. Math. J. Chinese Univ. **27** (2012) 243–252.
- [7] J. Chen, J. Liu, X. Guo, *Some upper bounds for the atom-bond connectivity index of graphs*, Appl. Math. Lett. **25** (2012) 1077–1081.
- [8] J. Chen, J. Liu, Q. Li, *The atom-bond connectivity index of catacondensed polyomino graphs*, Discrete Dyn. Nat. Soc. **2013** (2013) ID 598517.



- [9] K. C. Das, *Atom-bond connectivity index of graphs*, Discrete Appl. Math. **158** (2010) 1181–1188.
- [10] K. C. Das, I. Gutman, B. Furtula, *On atom-bond connectivity index*, Chem. Phys. Lett. **511** (2011) 452–454.
- [11] K. C. Das, I. Gutman, B. Furtula, *On atom-bond connectivity index*, Filomat **26** (2012) 733–738.
- [12] K. C. Das, N. Trinajstić, *Comparison between first geometric-arithmetic index and atom-bond connectivity index*, Chem. Phys. Lett. **497** (2010) 149–151.
- [13] D. Dimitrov, *Efficient computation of trees with minimal atom-bond connectivity index*, Appl. Math. Comput. **224** (2013) 663–670.
- [14] D. Dimitrov, *On structural properties of trees with minimal atom-bond connectivity index*, Discrete Appl. Math. **172** (2014) 28–44.
- [15] E. Estrada, *Atom-bond connectivity and the energetic of branched alkanes*, Chem. Phys. Lett. **463** (2008) 422–425.
- [16] E. Estrada, L. Torres, L. Rodríguez, I. Gutman, *An atom-bond connectivity index: Modelling the enthalpy of formation of alkanes*, Indian J. Chem. **37A** (1998) 849–855.
- [17] G. H. Fath-Tabar, B. Vaez-Zadeh, A. R. Ashrafi, A. Graovac, *Some inequalities for the atom-bond connectivity index of graph operations*, Discrete Appl. Math. **159** (2011) 1323–1330.
- [18] B. Furtula, A. Graovac, D. Vukičević, *Atom-bond connectivity index of trees*, Discrete Appl. Math. **157** (2009) 2828–2835.
- [19] B. Furtula, I. Gutman, M. Ivanović, D. Vukičević, *Computer search for trees with minimal ABC index*, Appl. Math. Comput. **219** (2012) 767–772.
- [20] L. Gan, H. Hou, B. Liu, *Some results on atom-bond connectivity index of graphs*, MATCH Commun. Math. Comput. Chem. **66** (2011) 669–680.
- [21] L. Gan, B. Liu, Z. You, *The ABC index of trees with given degree sequence*, MATCH Commun. Math. Comput. Chem. **68** (2012) 137–145.
- [22] A. Graovac, M. Ghorbani, *A new version of the atom-bond connectivity index*, Acta Chim. Slov. **57** (2010) 609–612.
- [23] I. Gutman, B. Furtula, *Trees with smallest atom-bond connectivity index*, MATCH Commun. Math. Comput. Chem. **68** (2012) 131–136.
- [24] I. Gutman, B. Furtula, M. B. Ahmadi, S. A. Hosseini, P. Salehi Nowbandegani, M. Zarrinderakht, *The ABC index conundrum*, Filomat **27** (2013) 1075–1083.
- [25] I. Gutman, B. Furtula, M. Ivanović, *Notes on trees with minimal atom-bond connectivity index*, MATCH Commun. Math. Comput. Chem. **67** (2012) 467–482.
- [26] I. Gutman, J. Tošović, S. Radenković, S. Marković, *On atom-bond connectivity index and its chemical applicability*, Indian J. Chem. **51A** (2012) 690–694.
- [27] I. Gutman, L. Zhong, K. Xu, *Relating the ABC and harmonic indices*, J. Serb. Chem. Soc. **79** (2014) 557–563.

- [28] S. A. Hosseini, M. B. Ahmadi, I. Gutman, *Kragujevac trees with minimal atom-bond connectivity index*, MATCH Commun. Math. Comput. Chem. **71** (2014) 5–20.
- [29] X. Ke, *Atom-bond connectivity index of benzenoid systems and fluoranthene congeners*, Polycycl. Aromat. Comp. **32** (2012) 27–35.
- [30] W. Lin, J. Chen, Q. Chen, T. Gao, X. Lin, B. Cai, *Fast computer search for trees with minimal ABC index based on tree degree sequences*, MATCH Commun. Math. Comput. Chem. **72** (2014) 699–708.
- [31] W. Lin, X. Lin, T. Gao, X. Wu, *Proving a conjecture of Gutman concerning trees with minimal ABC index*, MATCH Commun. Math. Comput. Chem. **69** (2013) 549–557.
- [32] J. L. Palacios, *A resistive upper bound for the ABC index*, MATCH Commun. Math. Comput. Chem. **72** (2014) 709–713.
- [33] T. S. Vassilev, L. J. Huntington, *On the minimum ABC index of chemical trees*, Appl. Math. **2** (2012) 8–16.
- [34] H. Wang, *Extremal trees with given degree sequence for the Randić index*, Discrete Math. **308** (2008) 3407–3411.
- [35] R. Xing, B. Zhou, *Extremal trees with fixed degree sequence for atom-bond connectivity index*, Filomat **26** (2012) 683–688.
- [36] R. Xing, B. Zhou, F. Dong, *On atom-bond connectivity index of connected graphs*, Discrete Appl. Math. **159** (2011) 1617–1630.
- [37] R. Xing, B. Zhou, Z. Du, *Further results on atom-bond connectivity index of trees*, Discrete Appl. Math. **158** (2011) 1536–1545.
- [38] J. Yang, F. Xia, H. Cheng, *The atom-bond connectivity index of benzenoid systems and phenylenes*, Int. Math. Forum **6** (2011) 2001–2005.