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Abstract

Let $G$ be a simple graph, and let $\Delta(G)$ and $\chi'(G)$ denote the maximum degree and chromatic index of $G$, respectively. Vizing proved that $\chi'(G) = \Delta(G)$ or $\Delta(G) + 1$. We say $G$ is $\Delta$-critical if $\chi'(G) = \Delta + 1$ and $\chi'(H) < \chi'(G)$ for every proper subgraph $H$ of $G$. In 1968, Vizing conjectured that if $G$ is a $\Delta$-critical graph, then $G$ has a 2-factor. Let $G$ be an $n$-vertex $\Delta$-critical graph. It was proved that if $\Delta(G) \geq n/2$, then $G$ has a 2-factor; and that if $\Delta(G) \geq 2n/3 + 12$, then $G$ has a hamiltonian cycle, and thus a 2-factor. It is well known that every 2-tough graph with at least three vertices has a 2-factor. We investigate the existence of a 2-factor in a $\Delta$-critical graph under “moderate” given toughness and maximum degree conditions. In particular, we show that if $G$ is an $n$-vertex $\Delta$-critical graph with toughness at least $3/2$ and with maximum degree at least $n/3$, then $G$ has a 2-factor. In addition, we develop new techniques in proving the existence of 2-factors in graphs.
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1 Introduction

In this paper, we consider only simple, undirected, and finite graphs. Let $G$ be a graph. The notation $\Delta$ is fixed for the maximum degree of $G$ throughout the paper. A $k$-vertex of $G$ is a vertex of degree exactly $k$ in $G$. Denote by $V_{\Delta}$ the set of $\Delta$-vertices in $G$, and by $\chi'(G)$ the chromatic index of $G$. The graph $G$ is called critical if $\chi'(G) > \Delta$ and $\chi'(H) < \chi'(G)$ for every proper subgraph $H$ of $G$. It is clear that if $G$ is critical then $G$
must be connected. In 1965, Vizing [15] showed that a graph of maximum degree $\Delta$ has chromatic index either $\Delta$ or $\Delta + 1$. If $\chi'(G) = \Delta$, then $G$ is said to be of class 1; otherwise, it is said to be of class 2. Holyer [8] showed that it is NP-complete to determine whether an arbitrary graph is of class 1. A critical graph $G$ is called $\Delta$-critical if $\chi'(G) = \Delta + 1$. So $\Delta$-critical graphs are class 2 graphs. Motivated by the classification problem, Vizing studied critical class 2 graphs, or $\Delta$-critical graphs, and made two well-known conjectures.

The first conjecture [16] is on the independence number $\alpha(G)$ of $G$, that is, the size of a maximum independent set in $G$.

**Conjecture 1** (Vizing’s Independence Number Conjecture). Let $G$ be a $\Delta$-critical graph of order $n$. Then $\alpha(G) \leq n/2$.

Furthermore, Vizing [14] conjectured that the following statement is true.

**Conjecture 2** (Vizing’s 2-Factor Conjecture). Let $G$ be a $\Delta$-critical graph. Then $G$ contains a 2-factor.

As each cycle $C$ satisfying $\alpha(C) \leq |V(C)|/2$, Conjecture 2 implies Conjecture 1.

For the Independence Number Conjecture, Brinkmann et al. [2], in 2000, proved that if $G$ is a critical graph, then $\alpha(G) < 2n/3$; and the upper bound is further improved when the maximum degree is between 3 and 10. Luo and Zhao [11], in 2008, by improving the result of Brinkmann et al., showed that if $G$ is an $n$-vertex $\Delta$-critical graph, then $\alpha(G) < (5\Delta - 6)n/(8\Delta - 6) < 5n/8$ if $\Delta \geq 6$. In 2009, Woodall [17] further improved the upper bound to $3n/5$. By restricting the problem to graphs with large maximum degrees, in 2006, Luo and Zhao [10] showed that Vizing’s Independence Number Conjecture is true if $\Delta(G) \geq n/2$.

Compared to the progresses on the first Conjecture, the progresses on Vizing’s 2-Factor Conjecture has been slow. In 2004, Grünwald and Steffen [7] established Vizing’s 2-Factor Conjecture for graphs with the deficiency $\sum_{v \in V(G)}(\Delta(G) - d_G(v))$ small; in particular, for overfull graphs (graphs of an odd order and with the deficiency $\sum_{v \in V(G)}(\Delta(G) - d_G(v)) < \Delta(G)$). In 2012, Luo and Zhao [12] proved that if $G$ is an $n$-vertex $\Delta$-critical graph with $\Delta \geq \frac{6n}{7}$, then $G$ contains a hamiltonian cycle, and thus a 2-factor with exactly one component. Continuing the investigation on the existence of a hamiltonian cycle in $\Delta$-critical graphs with “very large” maximum degrees, Luo and Zhao [9] in 2016 showed that an $n$-vertex $\Delta$-critical graph with $\Delta \geq \frac{2n}{3}$ is hamiltonian. The upper bound on $\Delta(G)$ assuring an $n$-vertex $\Delta$-critical graph to be hamiltonian, has been improved to $\frac{2n}{3} + 12$, respectively [3]. Just finding 2-factors, Chen and Shan [5] proved the following result.
Theorem 1.1 ([5]). Let $G$ be an $n$-vertex $\Delta$-critical graph. Then $G$ has a 2-factor if $\Delta \geq n/2$.

As a measure of graph connectivity and “resilience” under removal of vertices, graph toughness is a useful condition in finding factors in graphs. To be precise, we recall the definition of toughness below. The number of components of $G$ is denoted by $c(G)$. Let $t \geq 0$ be a real number. The graph is said to be $t$-tough if $|S| \geq t \cdot c(G - S)$ for each $S \subseteq V(G)$ with $c(G - S) \geq 2$. The toughness $\tau(G)$ is the largest real number $t$ for which $G$ is $t$-tough, or is $\infty$ if $G$ is complete. Enomoto et al. [6] proved the classic result below.

Theorem 1.2 (Enomoto et al. [6]). Every $k$-tough graph has a $k$-factor if $k|V(G)|$ is even and $|V(G)| \geq k + 1$.

Combining the result in Theorem 1.1 and the result in Theorem 1.2 when restricted to 2-factors, one might wonder — can we get something in between, i.e., is it possible to find 2-factors in an $n$-vertex $\Delta$-critical graph $G$, under the condition that $\Delta(G) < n/2$ but $\Delta(G) \geq cn$ for some positive constant $c$, and $\tau(G) < 2$ but $\tau(G) \geq d$ for some positive constant $d$? Particularly, we prove the following result.

Theorem 1.3. Let $G$ be an $n$-vertex $\Delta$-critical graph. Then $G$ has a 2-factor if $\tau(G) \geq 3/2$ and $\Delta \geq n/3$.

The remaining of the paper is organized as follows: in Section 2, we recall some graph terminologies and present several lemmas; in Section 3, we recall Tutte’s 2-factor Theorem and develop techniques for showing the existence of 2-factors upon applying Tutte’s 2-factor Theorem; in the last section, we prove Theorem 1.3.

2 Notation and Lemmas

Let $G$ be a graph. For $x \in V(G)$ we denote by $d_G(x)$ the degree of $x$ in $G$. For disjoint subsets of vertices $S$ and $T$ in $G$, we denote by $E_G(S, T)$, the set of edges that has one end vertex in $S$ and the other in $T$, and let $e_G(S, T) = |E_G(S, T)|$. If $S = \{s\}$ is a singleton, we write $e_G(s, T)$ instead of $e_G(\{s\}, T)$. If $H \subseteq G$ is a subgraph of $G$, and $T \subseteq V(G)$ with $T \cap V(H) = \emptyset$, we write $E_G(H, T)$ and $e_G(H, T)$ for notational simplicity. A matching in $G$ is a set of independent edges. If $M$ is a matching of $G$, then let $V(M)$ denote the set of end vertices of the edges in $M$. For $X \subseteq V(G)$, $M$ is said to saturate $X$ if $X \subseteq V(M)$. If $G$ is a bipartite graph with partite sets $A$ and $B$, we denote $G$ by $G[A, B]$ to emphasize the two partite sets.
To prove Theorem 1.3, we present two lemmas below.

**Lemma 2.1** (Vizing’s Adjacency Lemma). Let \( G \) be a \( \Delta \)-critical graph. Then for any edge \( xy \in E(G) \), \( x \) is adjacent to at least \( \Delta - d_G(y) + 1 \) \( \Delta \)-vertices \( z \) with \( z \neq y \).

The following lemma is a generalization of a result in [10].

**Lemma 2.2.** Let \( G \) be a \( \Delta \)-critical graph and \( T \) be an independent set in \( G \). Let \( S = V(G) - T \), and let \( H = G - E(G[S]) \) be the bipartite graph with partite sets \( S \) and \( T \). For each \( x \in S \), let \( \sigma_x \) be the number of non \( \Delta \)-degree neighbors of \( x \) in \( S \). Assume that there are \( \delta_0 \) \( \Delta \)-vertices in \( T \). Then for each edge \( xy \in E(H) \) with \( x \in S \) and \( y \in T \), \( d_H(y) \geq d_H(x) + 1 - \delta_0 + \sigma_x \).

**Proof.** Let \( xy \in E(H) \) with \( x \in S \) and \( y \in T \). By Vizing’s Adjacency Lemma, \( x \) is adjacent to at least \( \Delta - d_G(y) + 1 \) \( \Delta \)-vertices in \( G \). As \( T \) has \( \delta_0 \) \( \Delta \)-vertices, we know \( x \) is adjacent to at least \( \Delta - d_G(y) + 1 - \delta_0 \) \( \Delta \)-vertices in \( S \). Let \( \sigma_x \) be the number of all non \( \Delta \)-degree neighbors of \( x \) in \( S \). Then, \( d_H(x) + \Delta - d_G(y) + 1 - \delta_0 + \sigma_x \leq d_G(x) \leq \Delta \). By noting that \( d_G(y) = d_H(y) \), the inequality implies that \( d_H(y) \geq d_H(x) + 1 - \delta_0 + \sigma_x \). \( \square \)

### 3 Tutte’s 2-factor Theorem and Biased Barriers

One of the main proof ingredients of Theorem 1.3 is to apply Tutte’s 2-factor Theorem under a new setting up that we develop in this section.

Let \( S \) and \( T \) be disjoint subsets of vertices of a graph \( G \). Let \( D \) be a component of \( G - (S \cup T) \). Then \( D \) is said to be an odd component (resp. even component) if \( e_G(D, T) \equiv 1 \) (mod 2) (resp. \( e_G(D, T) \equiv 0 \) (mod 2)). Let \( \mathcal{H}(S, T) \) be the set of odd components of \( G - (S \cup T) \) and let \( h(S, T) = |\mathcal{H}(S, T)| \). For \( y \in T \), let \( \mathcal{H}(y : S, T) = \{ D \in \mathcal{H}(S, T), e_G(y, D) > 0 \} \) and \( h(y : S, T) = |\mathcal{H}(y : S, T)| \). Note that \( e_G(y, V(G) - (S \cup T)) \geq h(y : S, T) \).

Let \( \delta(S, T) = 2|S| - 2|T| + \sum_{y \in T} d_{G-S}(y) - h(S, T) \). It is easy to see that \( \delta(S, T) \equiv 0 \) (mod 2) for every \( S, T \subseteq V(G) \) with \( S \cap T = \emptyset \). We use the following criterion for the existence of a 2-factor, which is a restricted form of Tutte’s \( f \)-factor Theorem.

**Lemma 3.1** (Tutte [13]). A graph \( G \) has a 2-factor if and only if \( \delta(S, T) \geq 0 \) for every \( S, T \subseteq V(G) \) with \( S \cap T = \emptyset \).

An ordered pair \((S, T)\) consists of disjoint subsets of vertices \( S \) and \( T \) in a graph \( G \) is called a barrier if \( \delta(S, T) \leq -2 \). By Lemma 3.1, if \( G \) does not have a 2-factor, then \( G \) has a barrier. We define a special barrier as below.
Definition 1. Let $G$ be a graph without a 2-factor. A barrier $(S, T)$ of $G$ is called a biased barrier if among all the barriers of $G$,

(1) $|S|$ is maximum; and

(2) subject to (1), $|T|$ is minimum.

Properties of a minimum barrier (a barrier such that $|S \cup T|$ is minimum among all the barriers of $G$) has been established, for example, in [1, 4]. A biased barrier has similar nice properties as given in the lemma below.

Lemma 3.2. Let $G$ be a graph without a 2-factor, and let $(S, T)$ be a biased barrier of $G$. Then each of the following holds.

(1) The set $T$ is independent in $G$.

(2) If $D$ is an even component with respect to $(S, T)$, then $e_G(T, D) = 0$.

(3) If $D$ is an odd component with respect to $(S, T)$, then for any $y \in T$, $e_G(y, D) \leq 1$.

(4) If $D$ is an odd component with respect to $(S, T)$, then for any $x \in V(D)$, $e_G(x, T) \leq 1$.

Proof. Let $U = V(G) - (S \cup T)$ and $z \in T$ be a vertex. By the assumption that $(S, T)$ is a biased barrier, we know that $\delta(S, T - \{z\}) \geq 0$. So,

$$
0 \leq \delta(S, T - \{z\}) = 2|S| - 2|T| + 2 + \sum_{y \in T - \{z\}} d_{G-S}(y) - h(S, T - \{z\})
$$

$$
= 2|S| - 2|T| + 2 + \sum_{y \in T} d_{G-S}(y) - e_G(z, T - \{z\}) - e_G(z, U) - h(S, T - \{z\})
$$

$$
\leq 2|S| - 2|T| + 2 + \sum_{y \in T} d_{G-S}(y) - e_G(z, T - \{z\}) - e_G(z, U) - h(S, T) + h(z : S, T)
$$

$$
= \delta(S, T) + 2 - e_G(z, T - \{z\}) - e_G(z, U) + h(z : S, T)
$$

$$
\leq -e_G(z, T - \{z\}) - e_G(z, U) + h(z : S, T), \quad \text{since } \delta(S, T) \leq -2.
$$

This implies that

$$
e_G(z, T - \{z\}) + e_G(z, U) - h(z : S, T) \leq 0.
$$

Because $e_G(z, U) - h(z : S, T) \geq 0$ always holds, the above inequality particularly implies that

$$
e_G(z, T - \{z\}) = 0 \quad \text{for any } z \in T \quad \text{and} \quad e_G(z, U) - h(z : S, T) = 0.
$$

This proves statements (1)-(3).
To show (4), let $D$ be an odd component with respect to $(S, T)$ and let $x \in V(D)$ be any vertex. Then by the assumption that $|S|$ is maximum, we know that $\delta(S \cup \{x\}, T) \geq 0$. So,

\[
0 \leq \delta(S \cup \{x\}, T) = 2|S| - 2|T| + 2 + \sum_{y \in T} d_{G^{-}(S \cup \{x\})}(y) - h(S \cup \{x\}, T)
\]

\[
= 2|S| - 2|T| + 2 + \sum_{y \in T} d_{G^{-}}(y) - e_{G}(x, T) - h(S \cup \{x\}, T)
\]

\[
\leq 2|S| - 2|T| + 2 + \sum_{y \in T} d_{G^{-}}(y) - e_{G}(x, T) - (h(S, T) - 1)
\]

\[
= \delta(S, T) + 2 - e_{G}(x, T) + 1
\]

\[
\leq -e_{G}(x, T) + 1, \quad \text{since} \ \delta(S, T) \leq -2.
\]

Hence, $e_{G}(x, T) \leq 1$. \hfill \Box

Let $G$ be a graph without a 2-factor and let $(S, T)$ be a biased barrier of $G$. We call $(S, T)$ a good biased barrier of $G$ if $h(S, T)$ is smallest among all biased barriers of $G$.

**Lemma 3.3.** Let $G$ be a graph without a 2-factor, and let $(S, T)$ be a good biased barrier of $G$. For any $y \in T$, if $h(y : S, T) \geq 2$, then for any $D \in \mathcal{H}(y : S, T)$, $|V(D)| \geq 3$.

**Proof.** Let $D \in \mathcal{H}(y : S, T)$ be an odd component of $G - (S \cup T)$. By (4) of Lemma 3.2, $|V(D)| \geq 3$ if $e_{G}(D, T) \geq 3$. So we assume that $e_{G}(D, T) = 1$ and assume on the contrary that $|V(D)| \leq 2$. Let $x$ be the vertex in $D$ if $|V(D)| = 1$, and be a vertex in $D$ which is not adjacent to any vertex in $T$ if $|V(D)| = 2$. Let $z \in T$ be the vertex such that $e_{G}(D, z) = 1$, and let $T' = (T - \{z\}) \cup \{x\}$ and $U = V(G) - (S \cup T)$. Let $D_z$ be the component of $G - (S \cup T')$ which contains the vertex $z$. Then since $e_{G}(z, D') = 1$ for any $D' \in \mathcal{H}(z : S, T)$ by (3) of Lemma 3.2, we have that

\[
e_{G}(D_z, T) = \begin{cases} 
\sum_{D' \in \mathcal{H}(z : S, T) - \{D\}} (e_{G}(D', T) - 1) + e_{G}(x, z), & \text{if } |V(D)| = 1; \\
\sum_{D' \in \mathcal{H}(z : S, T)} (e_{G}(D', T) - 1) + e_{G}(x, V(D) - \{x\}), & \text{if } |V(D)| = 2.
\end{cases}
\]

Since $e_{G}(D', T)$ is odd for any $D' \in \mathcal{H}(z : S, T)$, and $e_{G}(x, z) = e_{G}(x, V(D) - \{x\}) = 1$, we know that $D_z \in \mathcal{H}(S, T')$ is an odd component of $G - (S \cup T')$. Hence, $h(S, T') = h(S, T) - h(y : S, T) + 1$. So

\[
\delta(S, T') = 2|S| - 2|T| + \sum_{y \in T'} d_{G^{-}}(y) - h(S, T')
\]

\[
= 2|S| - 2|T| + \sum_{y \in T} d_{G^{-}}(y) + e_{G}(x, V(D - x) \cup \{z\}) - e_{G}(z, U) - h(S, T) + h(z : S, T) - 1
\]

\[
= \delta(S, T) + e_{G}(x, V(D - x) \cup \{z\}) - e_{G}(z, U) + h(z : S, T) - 1
\]

\[
\leq \delta(S, T) \leq -2, \quad \text{since} \ e_{G}(x, V(D - x) \cup \{z\}) = 1, \text{and} \ e_{G}(z, U) \geq h(z : S, T).
\]

Thus, $(S, T')$ is a biased barrier. However, $h(S, T') = h(S, T) - h(y : S, T) + 1 \leq h(S, T) - 1$, showing a contradiction to the assumption that $(S, T)$ is a good biased barrier. \hfill \Box
4 Proof of Theorem 1.3

Let $G$ be an $n$-vertex $\Delta$-critical graph such that $\tau(G) \geq 3/2$ and $\Delta \geq n/3$. We show that $G$ has a 2-factor.

Since $G$ is 3/2-tough, $\Delta(G) \geq \delta(G) \geq 3$. Assume to the contrary that $G$ does not have a 2-factor. Then by Tutte’s 2-factor Theorem (Lemma 3.1), $G$ has a barrier. Let $(S, T)$ be a good biased barrier of $G$. Let $U = V(G) - (S \cup T)$ and let $H_k$ be the set of components $D$ of $G - (S \cup T)$ with $e_G(D, T) = k$. Then we have $H = \bigcup_{k \geq 0} H_{2k+1}$. For any $y \in T$, let

$$H(y) = \{ D \in H \mid e_G(y, D) = 1 \},$$

$$H_1(y) = \{ D \in H_1 \mid e_G(y, D) = 1 \}.$$

It is clear that $H_1(y) \subseteq H(y)$. Note also that $H(y) = H(y : S, T)$. We use this notation $H(y)$ for simplicity since $S$ and $T$ are already fixed.

Claim 4.1. $|T| > |S| + \sum_{k \geq 1} k|H_{2k+1}|$.

Proof. Since $(S, T)$ is a barrier,

$$\delta(S, T) = 2|S| - 2|T| + \sum_{y \in T} d_{G-S}(y) - h(S, T)$$

$$= 2|S| - 2|T| + \sum_{y \in T} d_{G-S}(y) - \sum_{k \geq 0} |H_{2k+1}| < 0.$$

By Lemma 3.2 (1) and (2),

$$\sum_{y \in T} d_{G-S}(y) = \sum_{y \in T} e_G(y, U) = e_G(T, U) = \sum_{k \geq 0} (2k + 1)|H_{2k+1}|.$$

Therefore, we have

$$0 > 2|S| - 2|T| + \sum_{k \geq 0} (2k + 1)|H_{2k+1}| - \sum_{k \geq 0} |H_{2k+1}|,$$

which yields $|T| > |S| + \sum_{k \geq 1} k|H_{2k+1}|$. 

We perform the following operations to $G$.

(1) Remove all even components, and remove all components in $H_1$.

(2) Remove all edges in $G[S]$. 
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(3) For a component \( D \in \mathcal{H}_{2k+1} \) with \( k \geq 1 \) introduce a set of \( k \) independent vertices \( U^D = \{ u^D_1, u^D_2, \ldots, u^D_k \} \) and replace \( D \) with \( U^D \). By Lemma 3.2 (3), \( |N_G(D) \cap T| = e_G(T, D) = 2k + 1 \). Let \( N_G(D) \cap T = \{ v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_{2k} \} \). Add two new edges \( u^D_i v_{2i-1} \) and \( u^D_i v_{2i} \) for each \( i \) with \( 1 \leq i \leq k \). Moreover, add one extra edge \( u^D_1 v_0 \).

Let \( H \) be the resulting graph, and let

\[
U^H = \bigcup_{k \geq 1} \left( \bigcup_{D \in \mathcal{H}_{2k+1}} U^D \right), \quad X = S \cup U^H.
\]

By the construction, the graph \( H \) satisfies the following properties.

1. \( H \) is a bipartite graph with partite sets \( X \) and \( T \),
2. \( |U^H| = \sum_{k \geq 1} k|\mathcal{H}_{2k+1}|, \quad |X| = |S| + |U^H| = |S| + \sum_{k \geq 1} k|\mathcal{H}_{2k+1}|, \) and
3. For each \( k \geq 1 \) and each \( D \in \mathcal{H}_{2k+1} \), \( d_H(u^D_i) = 3 \) and \( d_H(u^D_i) = 2 \) for each \( i \) with \( 2 \leq i \leq k \).

We will show that there is a matching in \( H \) which saturates \( T \), which gives that \( |X| = |S| + \sum_{k \geq 1} k|\mathcal{H}_{2k+1}| \geq |T| \), giving a contradiction to Claim 4.1.

For notation simplicity, for a set \( \mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{H} \), let

\[
V(\mathcal{D}) = \bigcup_{D \in \mathcal{D}} V(D).
\]

Claim 4.2. \( |S| < |U^H| \).

Proof. Assume on the contrary that \( |S| \geq |U^H| = \sum_{k \geq 1} k|\mathcal{H}_{2k+1}| \). We may assume that \( |U^H| \geq 1 \). For otherwise, since there is no edge between even component of \( G - (S \cup T) \) and \( T \), and each component in \( \mathcal{H}_1 \) is connected to a single vertex in \( T \), \( c(G - S) \geq |T| \). This implies that \( \tau(G) \leq \frac{|S|}{|T|} < 1 \), giving a contradiction.

For each \( D \in \mathcal{H}_{2k+1} \) with \( k \geq 1 \), let \( W_D \) be a set of any \( 2k \) vertices in \( D \) such that for each \( x \in W_D \), \( e_G(x, T) = 1 \). Thus, \( D - W_D \) is only connected to a single vertex in \( T \). Let

\[
W = S \cup \left( \bigcup_{D \in \mathcal{H}_{2k+1}, k \geq 1} W_D \right).
\]
Since $T$ is an independent set in $G$, and each component in $G - (T \cup W)$ is connected to $S$ or only a single vertex in $T$, we have that $c(G - W) \geq |T|$. So

$$\tau(G) \leq \frac{|W|}{|T|} \leq \frac{|S| + \sum_{k \geq 1} 2k|H_{2k+1}|}{|S| + |U^H| + 1} \leq \frac{\sum_{k \geq 1} k|H_{2k+1}| + \sum_{k \geq 1} 2k|H_{2k+1}|}{\sum_{k \geq 1} k|H_{2k+1}| + \sum_{k \geq 1} 2k|H_{2k+1}| + 1} \leq \frac{3}{2},$$

showing a contradiction to the assumption that $\tau(G) \geq 3/2$.

Because of $|T| > |S| + |U^H|$ and $|U^H| > |S|$, we get the following Claim.

**Claim 4.3.** $|T| \geq 2|S| + 2$.

**Claim 4.4.** $T$ contains no $\Delta$-vertex of $G$.

**Proof.** Suppose on the contrary that there exists $z \in T$ such that $d_G(z) = \Delta$. We may assume that $|H(z)| \geq 2$. Otherwise, $e_G(z, S) \geq \Delta - 1$ and so $|S| \geq \Delta - 1$. Hence by Claims 4.2 and 4.3,

$$n \geq |S| + |T| + |U| \geq 3|S| + 2 + |U^H| \quad (|U| \geq |U^H| \text{ by Lemma 3.2 (4)}) \geq 4|S| + 3 \geq 4\Delta - 1 \geq 4n/3 - 1,$$

implying that $n \leq 3$. This gives a contradiction to the fact that $\Delta \geq 3$.

Hence, by Lemma 3.3, we have that

$$n \geq |S| + |T| + |U| \geq e_G(z, S) + 3|H(z)| + |T| \geq e_G(z, S) + 3|H(z)| + 2e_G(z, S) + 2 \quad (|T| \geq 2|S| + 2 \geq 2e_G(z, S) + 2) = 3(e_G(z, S) + |H(z)|) + 2 = 3\Delta + 2 \geq n + 2,$$

showing a contradiction. \qed

Let $D_1 \in \mathcal{H}$ be a component such that

$$|V(D_1)| = \max\{|V(D)| \mid D \in \mathcal{H}\},$$

and $D_2 \in \mathcal{H} - \{D_1\}$ such that

$$|V(D_2)| = \max\{|V(D)| \mid D \in \mathcal{H} - \{D_1\}\}.$$

**Claim 4.5.** Let $D \in \mathcal{H} - \{D_1, D_2\}$. Then $D$ contains no $\Delta$-vertex of $G$. Furthermore, if $D_1$ contains a $\Delta$-vertex of $G$, then $|V(D)| \leq |V(D_1)| - 1$; and if $D_2$ contains a $\Delta$-vertex of $G$, then $|V(D)| \leq |V(D_2)| - 2 \leq |V(D_1)| - 2$, and for any $x \in V(D)$, $d_G(x) \leq \Delta - 2$. 
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Proof. Note that by the choice of $D_1$ and $D_2$, $|V(D)| \leq |V(H)|/3$, recall here that $V(H)$ is the union of vertex sets of components in $H$. Since $|T| \geq 2|S| + 2$ by Claim 4.3, we have that $n \geq |S| + |T| + |V(H)| \geq 3|S| + 2 + |V(H)|$. Consequently, $|V(H)|/3 \leq (n - 2)/3 - |S|$. Thus, for any $x \in V(D)$,

$$d_G(x) \leq |V(D)| - 1 + 1 + |S| \leq |V(H)|/3 + |S| \leq (n - 2)/3 < \Delta.$$  

Suppose that $D_1$ contains a $\Delta$-vertex of $G$, and there exists $D \in H - \{D_1, D_2\}$ such that $|V(D)| = |V(D_1)|$. This implies that $|V(D_1)| = |V(D_2)| = |V(D)|$, so $|V(D_1)| \leq |V(H)|/3$. Then by exactly the same argument above, we have that for any $x \in V(D_1)$,

$$d_G(x) \leq |V(D)| - 1 + 1 + |S| \leq |V(H)|/3 + |S| \leq (n - 2)/3 < \Delta.$$  

Hence, $|V(D)| \leq |V(D_1)| - 1$.

Suppose now that $D_2$ contains a $\Delta$-vertex of $G$. Since $|V(D_1)| \geq |V(D_2)|$, we then have that $|V(D_i)| + |S| \geq \Delta$ for $i = 1, 2$. So for any $D \in H - \{D_1, D_2\}$,

$$n \geq |S| + |T| + |V(D_1)| + |V(D_2)| + |V(D)| \geq |S| + 2|S| + 2 + |V(D_1)| + |V(D_2)| + |V(D)|$$

$$\geq |S| + |V(D_1)| + |S| + |V(D_2)| + |S| + |V(D)| + 2.$$  

Because of $|V(D_i)| + |S| \geq \Delta$ for $i = 1, 2$, it follows that

$$|S| + |V(D)| \leq n - 2\Delta - 2 \leq n/3 - 2 \leq \Delta - 2.$$  

Consequently, $|V(D)| \leq |V(D_2)| - 2 \leq |V(D_1)| - 2$, and for any $x \in V(D)$, $d_G(x) \leq \Delta - 2$. \hfill $\square$

We introduce some further notation here. Let

$$T_1 = \{ y \in T \mid |H_1(y)| = 1 \}, \quad \text{and} \quad T_2 = \{ y \in T \mid |H_1(y)| \geq 2 \}.$$  

For each component $D \in H_1$, let $y_D \in T$ be the vertex such that $e_G(D, T) = e_G(D, y_D) = 1$. Let

$$H_{11} = \{ D \in H_1 \mid y_D \in T_1 \}, \quad \text{and} \quad H_{12} = \{ D \in H_1 \mid y_D \in T_2 \} (= H_1 - H_{11}).$$  

Claim 4.6. For each component $D \in H_{12}$, $|H(y_D)| \geq 2$. Consequently, $|V(D)| \geq 3$.

Proof. Since $D \in H_{12}$, we have that $|H(y_D)| \geq |H_1(y_D)| \geq 2$. The second part of the Claim is an application of Lemma 3.3. \hfill $\square$
Denote

\[m_1 = |H_{11}|, \quad m_2 = |H_{12}|, \quad \text{and} \quad m_3 = |H - H_1|,\]

\[S_1 = \{x \in S \mid x \text{ has a non } \Delta\text{-degree neighbor in } V(G) - T\}, \quad \text{and} \quad S_0 = S - S_1,\]

\[p_y = |H_1(y)| \quad \text{for any } y \in T.\]

Note that by the definition, if \(m_2 \neq 0\), then \(m_2 \geq 2\).

**Claim 4.7.** Let \(y \in T\) be a vertex. Then

\[|N_G(y) \cap S| \geq \begin{cases} |S_0| + m_1/3 + m_2 - 1, & \text{if } \emptyset \neq H(y) \not\subseteq \{D_1, D_2\}; \\
2, & \text{if } H(y) = \{D_1\} \text{ or } \{D_2\}; \\
1, & \text{if } H(y) = \{D_1, D_2\}. \end{cases}\]

Moreover, \(N_G(y) \cap S \neq \emptyset\).

**Proof.** Since \(G\) is 3/2-tough, \(\delta(G) \geq 3\). As \(d_G(y) = e_G(y, S) + e_G(y, V(H))\) and \(e_G(y, V(H)) = 1\) if \(y \in T_1\), so we get \(e_G(y, S) \geq 2\) if \(H(y) = \{D_1\} \text{ or } \{D_2\}\).

So assume that \(|H(y)| \geq 2\). If \(H(y) = \{D_1, D_2\}\), then \(|N_G(y) \cap S| \geq 1\) as \(\delta(G) \geq 3\).

Thus we assume that there exists \(D \in H(y) - \{D_1, D_2\}\). Let \(x_D\) be the neighbor of \(y\) in \(D\).

By Claim 4.5, \(x_D\) is not a \(\Delta\)-vertex of \(G\). Moreover, \(y\) is adjacent to at least \(\Delta - d_G(x_D) + 1\) \(\Delta\)-vertices of \(G\) by Vizing’s Adjacency Lemma.

Note that each component in \(H - H_1\) contains at least three vertices by Lemma 3.2 (4).

So

\[n \geq \begin{cases} |S| + |T| + |V(D_1)| + |V(D_2)| + |V(D)| + m_1 + 3(m_2 + m_3 - 3), & \text{if } D_1, D_2, D \\
|S| + |T| + |V(D_1)| + |V(D_2)| + |V(D)| + m_1 - 1 + 3(m_2 + m_3 - 2), & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases} \]

Thus, because \(|T| \geq 2|S| + 2\) by Lemma 4.3, and \(|U^H| \geq |S| + 1\) implying that \(m_3 \geq 1\), we get that

\[n \geq |S| + |T| + |V(D_1)| + |V(D_2)| + |V(D)| + m_1 + 3(m_2 + m_3 - 3) \]

\[\geq 3|S| + 2 + |V(D_1)| + |V(D_2)| + |V(D)| + m_1 + 3(m_2 - 2) \]

\[\geq \begin{cases} 3|S| + 3|V(D)| + m_1 + 3m_2, & \text{if } D_2 \text{ contains a } \Delta\text{-vertex;} \\
3|S| + 3|V(D)| + m_1 + 3m_2 - 3, & \text{if } D_1 \text{ contains a } \Delta\text{-vertex;} \\
3|S| + 3|V(D)| + m_1 + 3m_2 - 4, & \text{if neither } D_1 \text{ nor } D_2 \text{ contains a } \Delta\text{-vertex.} \end{cases} \]

The above bounds were obtained because of \(|V(D_1)| \geq |V(D_2)| \geq |V(D)|\) and Claim 4.5. Thus since no component in \(H - \{D_1, D_2\}\) containing a \(\Delta\)-vertex of \(G\) by Claim 4.5, we
have that
\[ |N_G(y) \cap S \cap V_{\Delta}| \geq \begin{cases} 
\Delta - d_G(x_D) - 1, & \text{if } D_2 \text{ contains a } \Delta\text{-vertex; } \\
\Delta - d_G(x_D), & \text{if } D_1 \text{ contains a } \Delta\text{-vertex but } D_2 \text{ has no } \Delta\text{-vertex; } \\
\Delta - d_G(x_D) + 1, & \text{if neither } D_1 \text{ nor } D_2 \text{ contains a } \Delta\text{-vertex. }
\end{cases} \]

Because \( x_D \) is not a \( \Delta\)-vertex of \( G \), by the definitions of \( S_0 \) and \( S_1 \), we have that \( N_G(x_D) \cap S = N_G(x_D) \cap S_1 \). So \( d_G(x_D) \leq |S_1| + |V(D)| \). Replacing \( \Delta \) by \( \frac{n}{3} \) in the above bounds on \( |N_G(y) \cap S| \), and combining the bounds on \( n \), we get that
\[ |N_G(y) \cap S| \geq \begin{cases} 
|S_0| + \frac{m_1}{3} + m_2 - 1, & \text{if } D_2 \text{ contains a } \Delta\text{-vertex; } \\
|S_0| + \frac{m_2}{3} + m_2 - 1, & \text{if } D_1 \text{ contains a } \Delta\text{-vertex but } D_2 \text{ has no } \Delta\text{-vertex; } \\
|S_0| + \frac{m_1}{3} + m_2 - \frac{1}{3}, & \text{if neither } D_1 \text{ nor } D_2 \text{ contains a } \Delta\text{-vertex.}
\end{cases} \]

For the second part of the statement, if \( \mathcal{H}(y) = \emptyset \), then \( N_G(y) = N_G(y) \cap S \). So assume that \( \mathcal{H}(y) \neq \emptyset \). By the first part of the statement, it easily follows that \( |N_G(y) \cap S| \geq 1 \) unless \( \mathcal{H}(y) \not\subseteq \{D_1, D_2\} \). Let \( D \in \mathcal{H}(y) - \{D_1, D_2\} \), and let \( x_D \) be the neighbor of \( y \) in \( D \). By Claim 4.5, \( x_D \) is not a \( \Delta\)-vertex of \( G \). Moreover, \( y \) is adjacent to at least \( \Delta - d_G(x_D) + 1 \) \( \Delta\)-vertices of \( G \) by Vizing’s Adjacency Lemma. Note that no component in \( \mathcal{H} - \{D_1, D_2\} \) contains a \( \Delta\)-vertex of \( G \) by Claim 4.5. If \( D_2 \) does not contain a \( \Delta\)-vertex of \( G \), then \( y \) is adjacent to at least \( \Delta - d_G(x_D) \geq 1 \) \( \Delta\)-vertices which are contained in \( S \). If \( D_2 \) contains a \( \Delta\)-vertex of \( G \), then by the second part of Claim 4.5, \( d_G(x_D) \leq \Delta - 2 \). So \( y \) is adjacent to at least \( \Delta - d_G(x_D) - 1 \geq 1 \) \( \Delta\)-vertices which are contained in \( S \).

The proof is finished. \( \square \)

If \( \{D_1, D_2\} \cap \mathcal{H}_1 \neq \emptyset \), say \( D_1 \in \mathcal{H}_1 \), then there exists a unique vertex \( y \in T \) such that \( e_G(y, D_1) = 1 \). We particulary name such a vertex \( y \) if also \( e_G(y, D_2) = 1 \).

If \( \{D_1, D_2\} \cap \mathcal{H}_1 \neq \emptyset \) and there exists \( y \in T \) such that \( \mathcal{H}(y) = \{D_1, D_2\} \), we denote \( y \) by \( y_\omega \).

**Claim 4.8.** Let \( y \in T \) be a vertex such that \( |\mathcal{H}(y)| \geq 2 \) and \( y \neq y_\omega \). Then \( d_G(y) \geq 4 \).

**Proof.** Assume on the contrary that \( d_G(y) = 3 \). Let \( D \in \mathcal{H}(y) - \{D_1, D_2\} \), and let \( x_D \) be the neighbor of \( y \) in \( D \). Then \( x_D \) is adjacent to at least \( \Delta - 3 + 1 \) \( \Delta\)-vertices of \( G \) by Vizing’s Adjacency Lemma. Since \( V(D) \) contains no \( \Delta\)-vertex of \( G \) by Claim 4.5, and \( T \) contains no \( \Delta\)-vertex of \( G \) by Claim 4.4, we conclude that \( |S| \geq |N_G(x_D) \cap S \cap V_{\Delta}| \geq \Delta - 2 \). Since each \( D \in \mathcal{H}_{2k+1} \) contains at least \( 2k + 1 \) vertices by Lemma 3.2 (4), \( |V(\mathcal{H})| \geq 2|U^{\mathcal{H}}| \). Thus
\[
\begin{align*}
n & \geq |S| + 2|U^{\mathcal{H}}| + |T| \geq |S| + 2(|S| + 1) + 2|S| + 2 \\
& \geq 5|S| + 4 \geq 5(\Delta - 2) + 4 \geq 5 \left( \frac{n}{3} - 2 \right) + 4 = \frac{5n}{3} - 6,
\end{align*}
\]
implying that $n \leq 9$.

By Claim 4.7, $N_G(y) \cap S \neq \emptyset$. Since $|\mathcal{H}(y)| \geq 2$, by Lemma 3.3, $|U| \geq |V(\mathcal{H}(y))| \geq 6$. Since $|S| \geq 1$, $|T| \geq 2|S| + 2 \geq 4$. Hence, $n \geq |S| + |T| + |U| \geq 1 + 4 + 6 \geq 11$, a contradiction.

\textbf{Claim 4.9.} Let $xy \in E(H)$ be an edge with $x \in X$ and $y \in T$. Then each of the following holds.

1. If $x \in S_0$, then $d_H(x) + p_y \geq d_H(x) + 1$.
2. If $x \in S_1$, then $d_H(x) + p_y \geq d_H(x) + 2$.
3. If $x \in U^H$ and $p_y = 0$, then $d_H(y) \geq d_H(x)$.
4. If $x \in U^H$, $p_y \geq 1$, and $y \neq y_o$, then $d_H(y) + p_y \geq d_H(x) + 1$.
5. If $x \in U^H$ and $y = y_o$, then $d_H(y) + p_y \geq d_H(x)$.

\textit{Proof.} Statements (1) and (2) follow from Lemma 2.2 by taking $\sigma_x = 0$ and 1, respectively. The statements (3) and (5) are clear, since $d_H(y) + p_y = d_G(y) \geq \delta(G) \geq 3$, and $d_H(x) \leq 3$ for any $x \in U^H$. Now we show statement (4). By the assumption that $x \in U^H$ and $p_y \geq 1$, we have that $|\mathcal{H}(y)| \geq 2$. Then the statement follows by Claim 4.8, since $d_H(y) + p_y = d_G(y) \geq 4$, while $d_H(x) \leq 3$. \hfill $\square$

\textbf{Claim 4.10.} $H$ has a matching which saturates $T$.

\textit{Proof.} Suppose on the contrary that $H$ has no matching saturating $T$. By Hall’s Theorem, there is a nonempty subset $B \subseteq T$ such that $|N_H(B)| < |B|$. Among all such subsets with this property, we choose $B$ with smallest cardinality. Let $A = N_H(B)$ and $H' = H[A \cup B]$. Then we claim that in $H'$, there is a matching which saturates $A$. Suppose this is not the case. By Hall’s Theorem again, there is a nonempty subset $A' \subseteq A$ such that $|N_{H'}(A')| < |A'|$. Since $A' \subseteq A = N_H(B) \neq \emptyset (T$ contains no isolated vertex of $H)$, $N_{H'}(A') \neq \emptyset$. Let $B' = B - N_H(A')$. As $|B| > |A| \geq |N_{H'}(A')| > 0$, $0 < |B'| < |B|$. On the other hand, we have $N_{H'}(B') = N_H(B') = A - A'$. However, $|B'| = |B| - |N_{H'}(A')| > |A| - |N_{H'}(A')| > |A| - |A'| = |A - A'| = |N_H(B')|$, showing a contradiction to the choice of $B$.

Let $M$ be a matching of $H' = H[A \cup B]$ which saturates $A$. We consider two cases below.

\textit{Case 1.} $B \cap T_2 \subseteq \{y_o\}$.
For any \( y \in B \) with \( y \neq y_\omega \), \( p_y \leq 1 \). Since \( |B| > |A| \), there exists \( y_0 \in B - V(M) \). Since \( p_{y_0} \leq 1 \) if \( y_0 \neq y_\omega \), we have that \( d_H(y_0) \geq 2 \) if \( y_0 \neq y_\omega \). Otherwise, \( d_H(y_0) \geq 1 \).

Assume first that \( y_\omega \notin V(M) \). So applying Claim 4.9, we have that

\[
e_G(A, B) \leq \sum_{x \in A, y \in B} d_H(x) 
= \sum_{x \in A, y \in B} d_H(y) + (d_H(y) + p_y - 1) + \sum_{x \in U \setminus y \in B, p_y = 0} d_H(y) 
< \sum_{x \in A, y \in B} d_H(y) + d_H(y_0) \leq e_G(A, B),
\]

showing a contradiction.

Assume now that \( y_\omega \in V(M) \). By the definition of \( y_\omega \), \( 1 \leq p_{y_\omega} \leq 2 \). If \( p_{y_\omega} = 2 \), then for any edge \( xy_\omega \in E(H), x \in S \) and so \( d_H(y_\omega) + p_{y_\omega} \geq d_H(x) + 1 \); and if \( p_{y_\omega} = 1 \), then for any edge \( xy_\omega \in E(H), d_H(y_\omega) + p_{y_\omega} \geq d_H(x) \). So for any edge \( xy_\omega \in E(H), d_H(x) \leq d_H(y_0) + 1 \). Then applying Claim 4.9, we have that

\[
e_G(A, B) \leq \sum_{x \in A, y \in B} d_H(x) 
= \sum_{x \in A, y \in B} d_H(y) + (d_H(y) + p_y - 1) + \left( \sum_{x \in U \setminus y \in B, p_y = 0} d_H(y) \right) + d_H(y_\omega) + 1
< \left( \sum_{x \in A, y \in B} d_H(y) \right) + d_H(y_0) \leq e_G(A, B),
\]

showing a contradiction again.

**Case 2.** \( (B \cap T_2) - \{y_\omega\} \neq \emptyset \).

For any \( y \in T_2, H_1(y) \subseteq H_{12} \). Since \( |H_1(y)| \geq 2 \) if \( y \in T_2 \), the assumption that \( (B \cap T_2) - \{y_\omega\} \neq \emptyset \) implies that \( m_2 \geq 2 \). Furthermore, if \( y_\omega \in T_2 \), then \( m_2 \geq 4 \).

Since \( |B| > |A| \), there exists \( y_0 \in B - V(M) \). Since \( N_H(y) \cap S \neq \emptyset \) for any \( y \in T \) by Claim 4.7, we have \( d_H(y_0) \geq 1 \). We claim that if \( y_\omega \) exists and \( y_0 \neq y_\omega \), then \( d_H(y_0) \geq 2 \). If \( |H(y_0)| \leq 1 \), then \( d_H(y_0) \geq d_G(y_0) - 1 \geq 2 \). So we assume that \( |H(y_0)| \geq 2 \). If \( y_\omega \) exists and \( y_0 \neq y_\omega \), then by Claim 4.7, \( d_H(y_0) \geq |N_H(y_0) \cap S| \geq |S_0| + m_1/3 + m_2 - 1 \geq m_1/3 + m_2 - 1 \). Note that if \( y_\omega \in T_2 \) then \( m_2 \geq 4 \), and if \( y_\omega \notin T_2 \), then by the definition of \( y_\omega \), \( m_1 \geq 1 \). Thus we have that \( d_H(y_0) \geq 2 \).

For any \( y \in T_2 - \{y_\omega\}, |N_H(y) \cap S| = |N_G(y) \cap S| \geq |S_0| + m_1/3 + m_2 - 1 \) by Claim 4.7.
Thus, $|A \cap S| \geq |S_0| + m_1/3 + m_2 - 1$. Let $A_0 = A \cap S$. Then since $m_2 \geq 2$, if $m_1 \leq 1$

$$2|A_0 - S_0| \geq 2m_1/3 + 2m_2 - 2 \geq m_1 + m_2 - 1/3,$$

(1)

and if $m_1 \geq 2$, then

$$|A_0 - S_0| \geq m_1/3 + m_2 - 1 \geq m_2 - 1/3.$$  

(2)

Assume first that $y_\omega \notin V(M)$. Applying Claim 4.9, we have that

$$e_G(A, B) \leq \sum_{xy \in M, x \in A, y \in B} d_H(x) \leq \sum_{xy \in M, x \in S_0} (d_H(y) + p_y - 1) + \sum_{xy \in M, x \in S_1} (d_H(y) + p_y - 2)$$

$$+ \sum_{xy \in M, x \in U^H, y \in B, p_y = 0} d_H(y) + \sum_{xy \in M, x \in U^H, y \in B, p_y \geq 1} (d_H(y) + p_y - 1)$$

$$\leq \begin{cases}
\left( \sum_{xy \in M, x \in A, y \in B} d_H(y) \right) + m_1 + m_2 - 2|A_0 - S_0| \\
\left( \sum_{xy \in M, x \in A, y \in B} d_H(y) \right) + m_2 - |A_0 - S_0| \\
\left( \sum_{xy \in M, x \in A, y \in B} d_H(y) \right) + 1/3 \\
\left( \sum_{xy \in M, x \in A, y \in B} d_H(y) \right) + d_H(y_0) \leq e_G(A, B),
\end{cases}$$

showing a contradiction.

Assume now that $y_\omega \in V(M)$. By the definition of $y_\omega$, $1 \leq p_{y_\omega} \leq 2$. If $p_{y_\omega} = 2$, then for any edge $xy_\omega \in E(H)$, $d_H(y_\omega) + p_{y_\omega} \geq d_H(x) + 1$; and if $p_{y_\omega} = 1$, then for any edge $xy_\omega \in E(H)$, $d_H(y_\omega) + p_{y_\omega} \geq d_H(x)$. So for any edge $xy_\omega \in E(H)$, $d_H(x) \leq d_H(y_\omega) + 1$. 
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Applying Claim 4.9, we have that

\[
e_G(A, B) \leq \sum_{x \in A, y \in B} d_H(x) \leq \sum_{x \in A, y \in B} (d_H(y) + p_y - 1) + \sum_{x \in S, y \neq y_\omega} (d_H(y) + p_y - 1) + d_H(y_\omega) + 1
\]

\[
\leq \begin{cases} 
\left( \sum_{x \in M} d_H(y) \right) + 1 + m_1 + m_2 - 2|A_0 - S_0| \\
\left( \sum_{x \in M} d_H(y) \right) + 1 + m_2 - |A_0 - S_0| 
\end{cases}
\]

\[
\leq \left( \sum_{x \in M} d_H(y) \right) + 1 + 1/3
\]

\[
\leq \left( \sum_{x \in M} d_H(y) \right) + d_H(y_0) \leq e_G(A, B), \quad (d_H(y_0) \geq 2 \text{ in this case})
\]

showing a contradiction again.

Claim 4.10 gives a contradiction to Claim 4.1. The proof of Theorem 1.3 is now complete.

\[\square\]
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