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Abstract

Consider the following Maker-Breaker type game played by Toucher and Isolator on the edges of a graph $G$ with first move given to Toucher. The aim of Isolator is to maximise the number of vertices which are not incident to any edges claimed by Toucher, and the aim of Toucher is to minimise this number. Let $u(G)$ be the number of isolated vertices when both players play optimally. Dowden, Kang, Mikalački and Stojaković proved that $\left\lceil \frac{n+2}{8} \right\rceil \leq u(T) \leq \left\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \right\rfloor$, where $T$ is a tree with $n$ vertices. The author also proved that $u(P_n) = \left\lfloor \frac{n+3}{5} \right\rfloor$ for all $n \geq 3$, where $P_n$ is a path with $n$ vertices.

The aim of this paper is to improve the lower bound to $u(T) \geq \left\lfloor \frac{n+3}{5} \right\rfloor$, which is sharp. Our result may be viewed as saying that paths are the 'best' for Isolator among trees with a given number of vertices.

1 Introduction

The following game, called ‘Toucher-Isolator’ game on a graph $G$, was introduced by Dowden, Kang, Mikalački and Stojaković [4]. The two players, Toucher and Isolator claim edges of $G$ alternately with Toucher having the first move. We say that a vertex is isolated if it is not incident to any of the edges claimed by Toucher at the end of the game. The aim of Toucher is to minimise the number of isolated vertices and the aim of Isolator is to maximise the number of isolated vertices. We set $u(G)$ to be the number of isolated vertices at the end of the game when both players play optimally. Hence this is a ‘quantitative’ Maker-Breaker type game.

Dowden, Kang, Mikalački and Stojaković gave bounds [4] for the size of $u(G)$ for general graphs, and they studied some particular examples. In particular, they focused on the case when $T$ is a tree and gave bounds for $u(T)$ in terms of the degree sequence of $T$. They also proved that if $T$ is a tree with $n$ vertices, then

$$\frac{n+2}{8} \leq u(T) \leq \frac{n-1}{2}. \tag{1}$$

If $T$ is a star with $n \geq 3$ vertices, it is easy to verify that $u(T) = \left\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \right\rfloor$ regardless of how Toucher and Isolator play the edges. Hence the upper bound in (1) is tight.

Let $P_n$ be the path with $n$ vertices. For paths, Dowden, Kang, Mikalački and Stojaković improved their general bound (1) to
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\[ \frac{3}{16} (n - 2) \leq u (P_n) \leq \frac{n + 1}{4}, \]

and they suggested that \( u (P_n) \) could asymptotically grow as \( \frac{n}{5} \). The author [6] verified this by proving an exact result which states that \( u (P_n) = \left\lfloor \frac{n + 3}{5} \right\rfloor \) for all \( n \geq 3 \).

The aim of this paper is to improve the lower bound in (1), and in particular we prove that paths are the 'best' for Isolator among the trees with \( n \) vertices.

**Theorem 1.** Let \( n \geq 3 \) and let \( T \) be a tree with \( n \) vertices. Then \( u (T) \geq \left\lfloor \frac{n + 3}{5} \right\rfloor \).

Indeed, since \( u (P_n) = \left\lfloor \frac{n + 3}{5} \right\rfloor \) for all \( n \geq 3 \), it follows that \( u (T) \geq u (P_n) \) for any \( T \) with \( n \) vertices. In general, it is easy to see that the lower bound is not uniquely attained by a path. Indeed, let \( S_n \) be a tree consisting of a path with \( n - 1 \) vertices together with a leaf joined to the second vertex on the path. It is easy to prove by following a similar argument that was used for paths in [6] that we also have \( u (S_n) = u (P_n) \).

The proof of Theorem 1 follows an approach that is similar to the proof of lower bound of \( u (P_n) \) in [6]. For general background on Maker-Breaker type games, see Beck [2]. There are many other papers dealing with achievement games on graphs, see e.g. [1, 3, 5].

We now outline the proof of Theorem 1 as it is rather lengthy. As in [6], the game naturally splits into two phases. At the early stages of the game it seems natural for Isolator to claim an edge whose endpoint is a leaf, as claiming such an edge instantly increases the score by one. Note that after claiming such an edge, the isolated leaf in a sense becomes 'useless' for the rest of the game, and hence it may be deleted (together with the edge that was occupied). Note that during the process the other endpoint of the edge may become a leaf. We say that the game is in the first phase as long as such an edge always exists, and once such edge no longer exists the game moves to the second phase. In particular, the game will not return to the first phase even though such an edge would become available later.

Suppose that at some point Isolator has no such move available. Let \( T_1 \) be the tree obtained as a result of the process, and let \( C_1 \) be the set of edges claimed by Toucher. Thus for every leaf \( v \in T_1 \) there exists an edge \( e \in C_1 \) whose endpoint \( v \) is. This is quite similar to the delayed game introduced in [6], in which Toucher is allowed to claim a certain number of edges at the start of the game and in which isolating endpoints, which naturally corresponds to leaves in our general case, do not increase the score.

However, before we can define a delayed game that is good enough for our purposes, the structure of \( T_1 \) and \( C_1 \) may need to be modified. Let \( v \) be a leaf in \( T_1 \) whose unique neighbour is \( w \). Similarly to leaves that are already isolated, the leaves that are already touched are quite useless for the rest of the game, so it would be tempting to just delete them. However, during the process we must make sure that we keep in mind that \( w \) is already touched, even though the edge \( vw \) is deleted during the process. Thus it will be convenient to declare a set \( X_1 \subseteq V (T_1) \) of 'additional' touched vertices at the start of the delayed game.

It turns out that such a simple deletion is fine whenever \( d_{T_1} (w) = 2 \), but when \( d_{T_1} (w) \geq 3 \) we need to modify the structure of \( T_1 \) in a slightly different way. In this case the modification is based on the observation that for a given edge \( e = vw \), if \( w \) is a touched vertex then \( e \) can be replaced with an edge \( vw' \) for any touched vertex \( w' \) without changing the game too much. By using this observation, we may restrict ourselves to those delayed games where \( X_1 \) is exactly the set of all leaves in \( T_1 \).
The plan of the paper is following. In Section 2 we define the notion that allows us to reduce the tree without changing the game too much, and we deal with the first phase of the case in which Isolator is claiming only leaves. In Section 3 we move on to analysing the specific delayed version of the game where leaves are not counted for isolated vertices, and Toucher is allowed to claim a certain number of edges at the start of the game. We then use these delayed games to deal with the second phase of the game.

2 The First phase of the game

We start by introducing the notion of the delayed game. Let \( T \) be a tree, let \( C \) and \( D \) be disjoint subsets of the edges of \( T \), and let \( X \) be a subset of the vertices of \( T \). Define the delayed game \( F(T, C, D, X, s) \) to be the Toucher-Isolator game played on the edges of \( T \), with the edges in \( C \) and \( D \) given to Toucher and Isolator respectively at the start of the game, and with both players claiming the edges in alternating turns with the first move given to the player specified by the parameter \( s \in \{i, t\} \). Define the score of this game to be the number of isolated vertices in \( V(T) \setminus X \) at the end of the game, and denote the score by \( \alpha(T, C, D, X, s) \).

For our purposes, we mostly focus on certain sub-classes of these games, and hence some of the parameters can be omitted as they will be clear from the context. First of all, we use \( F(T) \) to denote the ordinary Toucher-Isolator game on \( T \), that is \( F(T, \emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset, t) \), and similarly we use \( \alpha(T) \) to denote the score of \( F(T) \). However, apart from this special case, it is more convenient to choose Isolator to start the delayed version of the game, and hence \( s \) should be taken to be Isolator. Similarly \( C \) and \( D \) should be taken to be empty sets if they are omitted from the notation. We often either have \( X = \emptyset \) or \( X = L \), where \( L \) denotes the set of leaves in \( T \). Hence we use \( F(T, C, X) = F(T, C, \emptyset, X, i) \), \( F(T, C) = F(T, C, \emptyset, \emptyset, i) \) and \( F(T, C, L) = F(T, C, \emptyset, L, i) \) to simplify our notation.

Since some of the results used in the proof of Theorem 1 are proved by induction, it is convenient to introduce a suitable reduction operation that allows us to reduce the tree without increasing the score of the game. Our reduction operator is defined for the games of the form \( F(T, C, D, X, s) \), and in general \( s \) is taken to be Isolator.

First we need some notation. As usual, let \( E \) and \( V \) denote the set of edges and vertices in \( T \) respectively, and let \( C, D \) and \( X \) be defined as before. Let \( \hat{E} = E \setminus (C \cup D) \) be the set of edges that are not given to Toucher or Isolator at the start of the game, let \( I \) be the set of vertices in \( V \setminus X \) that are isolated by the edges in \( D \), and let \( O \) be the set of vertices in \( V \setminus X \) that are touched by an edge in \( C \). The vertices in \( O \) are called occupied and the vertices in \( O \cup X \) are called touched. Finally we set \( U = V \setminus (I \cup X \cup O) \), and the vertices in \( U \) are called unoccupied. Note that the set of vertices that are not yet isolated nor touched is \( U \), and hence \( U \) is exactly the set of those vertices that could be still isolated.

The definition of the reduction operation is quite tedious, but the ideas behind it are fairly simple, and we start by outlining these ideas. Suppose that \( v_1 \) and \( v_2 \) are two touched vertices and let \( e \) be an edge of the form \( uv_1 \) that is not in \( C \). Let \( T_1 \) be the graph obtained by replacing the edge \( uv_1 \) with \( uv_2 \) in \( T \), and suppose that \( T_1 \) is also a tree. This operation changes the structure of \( T \), but does not affect the game at all. First of all, note that the
process might only affect the vertices \( u, v_1 \) and \( v_2 \). Note that in both \( T \) and \( T_1 \) the vertices \( v_1 \) and \( v_2 \) are already touched and hence they are not affected during the process. Also only one edge with \( u \) as its endpoint is affected during the process and in both \( T \) and \( T_1 \) the other endpoint is touched. Note that it does not matter which particular vertex the other endpoint is, as long as in both cases the other endpoint is touched. Hence in fact the game is not affected at any vertex during the process. One can also perform similar operations to leaves that are endpoint of an edge in \( C \) and whose neighbour has degree at least 3.

Recall that \( \hat{E} = E \setminus (C \cup D) \). Let \( e \in \hat{E} \), and note that hence neither of the endpoints of \( e \) is in \( I \). Define the endpoint pattern of \( e \) to be \( P(e) \in \{1, 2, 3\} \), where \( P(e) = 1 \) if both endpoints of \( e \) are unoccupied, \( P(e) = 2 \) if one of the endpoints is occupied and the other is touched and \( P(e) = 3 \) if both endpoints are touched. Let \( T_1 \) and \( T_2 \) be trees with appropriate sets \( C_i, D_i \) and \( X_i \). We say that a function \( f : \hat{E} \to \hat{E} \) preserves the type of the endpoints if for every \( e \in \hat{E}_1 \), \( e \) and \( f(e) \) have the same endpoint pattern. Finally for a vertex \( v \in V(T) \) define \( \mathcal{E}(v) \) to be the collection of edges whose endpoint \( v \) is.

We say that \( F(T_1, C_1, D_1, X_1, s) \) is a reduction of \( F(T_2, C_2, D_2, X_2, s) \) if \( D_1 = \emptyset \) and if there exist injections \( f_E : \hat{E}_1 \to \hat{E}_2 \) and \( f_V : U_1 \to U_2 \) so that \( f_E \) preserves the type of the endpoints and we have \( \mathcal{E}(f_V(v)) = f_E(\mathcal{E}(v)) \) for all \( v \in U_1 \), where \( f_E(A) = \bigcup_{a \in A} f_E(a) \) for \( A \subseteq \hat{E}_1 \). The first condition is intuitively clear and the second condition implies that the neighbourhood of an unoccupied vertex is preserved, which is crucial as we want isolating new vertices to be a similar process in both \( T_1 \) and \( T_2 \). For convenience, we just say that \( T_1 \) is a reduction of \( T_2 \) if \( F(T_1, C_1, D_1, X_1, s) \) is a reduction of \( F(T_2, C_2, D_2, X_2, s) \), as the other parameters are clear from the context.

In all of our applications, \( T_1 \) is obtained by deleting some vertices from \( T \) or by changing endpoints of several edges. If only deletion of vertices is used in the process, we usually take \( f_E \) and \( f_V \) to be the identity maps. For convenience, if \( f_E \) and \( f_V \) are taken to be the identity maps we simply say that \( T_1 \) is a reduction of \( T \) (without explicitly specifying that the maps are taken to be identity maps). If endpoints of some edges are changed, we often still take \( f_V \) to be the identity map and we take \( f_E(e) = e \) for most of the edges, apart from several exceptions involving the edges whose endpoints were changed. In such a case we specify the map \( f_E \) only on these exceptional edges, and for any unspecified \( v \in U_1 \) and \( e \in \hat{E}_1 \) one should take \( f_V(v) = v \) and \( f_E(e) = e \).

Our first aim is to prove that such reduction operation cannot increase the score, when the effect of those vertices that are isolated already is taken into account. This essentially follows by copying the strategy on \( T_1 \) to a strategy on \( T_2 \) by using the function \( f_E \).

**Lemma 2.** Let \( T_1 \) and \( T_2 \) be trees with appropriate sets \( C_i, D_i \) and \( X_i \) with \( D_1 = \emptyset \), and suppose that \( T_1 \) is a reduction of \( T_2 \). Let \( I_2 \) be the set of isolated vertices in \( T_2 \). Then \( \alpha(T_2, C_2, D_2, X_2, s) \geq |I_2| + \alpha(T_1, C_1, D_1, X_1, s) \).

**Proof.** Let \( S_1 \) be a strategy on \( T_1 \) which guarantees that Isolator can isolate at least \( \alpha(T_1, C_1, D_1, X_1, s) \) vertices. Consider the strategy \( S_2 \) on \( T_2 \) obtained as follows. If on her move Toucher claims an edge \( e \in \hat{E}_2 \) for which \( e \) is in the image of \( f_E \), then the edge \( f^{-1}_E(e) \) is assigned to Toucher on \( T_1 \). If she claims an edge \( e \in \hat{E}_2 \) that is not in the image of \( f_E \), then an arbitrary edge is assigned to Toucher on \( T_1 \). On a given turn, if Isolator claims an edge \( g \in \hat{E}_1 \) according to the strategy \( S_1 \), then on \( T_2 \) she claims the edge \( f_E(g) \). Once all the edges on \( T_1 \) are occupied, Isolator always plays an arbitrary edge on \( T_2 \) on her move.
By following this strategy, at the end of the game Isolator has isolated $\alpha (T_1, C_1, D_1, X_1, s)$ vertices on $T_1$. Since for all $v \in U_1$ we have $f_E (E (v)) = E (f_V (v))$, it follows that for each isolated vertex $v \in U_1$ the appropriate vertex $f_V (v)$ is also isolated, and all of these vertices are distinct as $f_V$ is an injection. In addition, all the vertices in $I_2$ are isolated as well by definition, and note that $I_2 \cap U_2 = \emptyset$. Hence it follows that $\alpha (T_2, C_2, D_2, X_2, s) \geq |I_2| + \alpha (T_1, C_1, D_1, X_1, s)$, as required. \qed

Recall that we start the game in the first phase, and after a given move of Toucher the game remains in the first phase if there exists an unoccupied vertex $v$ for which $E (v)$ contains exactly one edge that is not already claimed by Isolator. Otherwise the game moves to the second phase, and note that this transition always occurs after Toucher’s move. In particular, the game is in the first phase as long as Toucher can increase her score on every move by claiming a suitable edge - and it turns out that choosing an arbitrary edge among all such edges will work for Isolator.

Let $C$ and $D$ be the set of edges occupied by Toucher and Isolator when the game moves from the first phase to the second phase. Recall that for a tree $T$ we write $L$ for the set of leaves in $T$. Our first aim is to show that there exists a reduction $T'$ of $T$ with $D' = \emptyset$, $X' = L'$ and for which $|T'| - 3|C'| - 3|L'|$ is not too small. This is done in Lemma \textbf{3}. Note that the game on $T'$ is exactly the delayed game $F (T', C', L')$, as $X' = L'$, $D' = \emptyset$ and since Isolator has the first move in the second phase. Thus in order to analyse the second phase, we need a lower bound for $\alpha (T, C, L)$. In Lemma \textbf{4} we prove a lower bound for $\alpha (T, C, L)$ that depends on $|T'| - 3|C'| - 3|L'|$.

**Lemma 3.** Let $T$ be a tree with $n \geq 3$ vertices. Suppose that Isolator has the move, the game is in the first phase and let $Y$ be the set of those edges $v$ in $E$ that are not played yet for which Isolator can isolate a new vertex by claiming $v$ on this move.

Suppose that on each of her move Isolator claims an arbitrarily chosen edge from $Y$. Let $r$ be the number of edges Isolator claims during the first phase, and let $C$ and $D$ be the set of edges claimed by Toucher and Isolator at the end of the first phase. Then there exists a reduction $T'$ of the game $F (T, C, D)$ with $X' = L'$, $D' = \emptyset$ and $|T'| - 3|L'| - 3|C'| \geq |T| - 5r - 4$.

**Proof.** Let $C = \{e_1, \ldots, e_{r+1}\}$ and $D = \{f_1, \ldots, f_r\}$ be the set of edges claimed by Toucher and Isolator respectively at the end of the first phase, ordered in a way that $f_i$ is claimed before $f_j$ for $i < j$. Let $v_i$ be a vertex isolated by claiming the edge $f_i$.

We start by verifying that $T \setminus \{v_1, \ldots, v_i\}$ is a tree for all $i$ and that claiming $f_i$ cannot isolate both of its endpoints. Indeed, note that $v_1$ must be leaf, and since $n \geq 3$ it follows that no two leaves can be neighbours. Hence the claim is true when $i = 1$. If the claim is true for all $1 \leq j \leq i$ for some $i$, it follows that $T \setminus \{v_1, \ldots, v_i\}$ is a tree which does not contain any isolated vertices. Note that it also does not contain any edge claimed by Isolator on her first $i$ moves, as for every edge $f_1, \ldots, f_i$ at least one of the endpoints is deleted during the process. Thus $v_{i+1}$ must be a leaf in $T \setminus \{v_1, \ldots, v_i\}$, and note that the unique neighbour of $v_{i+1}$ cannot be a leaf. Indeed, this follows from the fact that $T \setminus \{v_1, \ldots, v_i\}$ contains an edge claimed by Toucher, and hence it contains at least 3 vertices. Thus both claims follow by induction.

\[5\]
Let $T'$ be the tree obtained by deleting the vertices $v_1, \ldots, v_r$, and note that $C \subseteq E(T')$ as none of the vertices $v_1, \ldots, v_r$ is touched. Hence it follows that $T'$ with $C' = C$, $D' = \emptyset$ and $X' = \emptyset$ is a reduction of $T$. Our aim is to construct a suitable sequence of reductions $T_0, \ldots, T_1$ for some $t$ with $T_0 = T'$ and so that $T_i$ satisfies $|T_i| - 3 |L_i| - 3 |C_i| \geq |T| - 5r - 4$. For each $i$ define $g_i = |T_i| - 3 |X_i| - 3 |C_i|.$

The sequence $T_0, \ldots, T_1$ is obtained as follows. First of all, we take $T_0 = T'$. Given $T_{i-1}$ together with appropriate sets satisfying $X_{i-1} \subseteq L_{i-1} \subseteq X_{i-1} \cup O_{i-1}$, we stop the process if $X_{i-1} = L_{i-1}$. Otherwise, there exists a leaf $v \in T_{i-1}$ with an unique neighbour $w$ satisfying $vw \in C_{i-1}$. Indeed, this follows by observing that $X_{i-1} \subseteq L_{i-1}$ and $L_{i-1} \setminus X_{i-1} \subseteq O_{i-1}$.

Given a leaf $v$ with $N(v) = \{w\}$ and $vw \in C_{i-1}$, we obtain $T_i$ as described by one of the cases below, and note that one of them always occurs given $v$ and $w$ satisfying these conditions. Note that by our earlier observation such a leaf $v$ certainly exists in $L_{i-1} \setminus X_{i-1}$, but such a leaf may exist even in $X_{i-1}$ in which case the reduction can be done as well. Hence we allow both cases $v \in X_{i-1}$ and $v \not\in X_{i-1}$. We will verify that in every case we have $g_i \geq g_{i-1} - 1$ and that the property $X_i \subseteq L_i \subseteq X_i \cup O_i$ is preserved.

Case 1. $w$ satisfies $d_{T_{i-1}}(w) = 2$.

Consider $T_i$ obtained by deleting the vertex $v$, and setting $C_i = C_{i-1} \setminus \{vw\}$, $D_i = \emptyset$ and $X_i = (X_{i-1} \setminus \{v\}) \cup \{w\}$. Note that $T_i$ is certainly a reduction of $T_{i-1}$ as $w$ is a touched vertex in both $T_{i-1}$ and $T_i$. We certainly have $|C_i| = |C_{i-1}| - 1$ and $|T_i| = |T_{i-1}| - 1$. Since we might have $v \not\in X_{i-1}$, it follows that $|X_i| \leq |X_{i-1}| + 1$. Hence we have $g_i \geq g_{i-1} - 1$, and it is easy to see that $X_i \subseteq L_i \subseteq X_i \cup O_i$.

Case 2. $w$ satisfies $d_{T_{i-1}}(w) \geq 3$ and $|E(w) \cap C_{i-1}| \geq 2$.

Since $|E(w) \cap C_{i-1}| \geq 2$, it follows that there exists an edge $uw \in C_{i-1}$ with $u \not\in v$. Consider $T_i$ obtained by deleting the vertex $v$, and setting $C_i = C_{i-1} \setminus \{vw\}$, $D_i = \emptyset$ and $X_i = (X_{i-1} \setminus \{v\})$. As before, this is a reduction of $T_{i-1}$ as $w$ is touched in both $T_{i-1}$ and $T_i$ since $uw \in C_{i}$. Since $d_{T_{i-1}}(w) \geq 3$, it follows that $w$ is not a leaf in $T_{i}$, and hence we have $X_i \subseteq L_i \subseteq X_i \cup O_i$. It is easy to check that $g_i \geq g_{i-1} + 2$, as required.

Case 3. $w$ satisfies $d_{T_{i-1}}(w) \geq 3$ and $|E(w) \cap C_{i-1}| = 1$.

Let $N_{T_{i-1}}(w) \setminus \{v\} = \{v_1, \ldots, v_s\}$. Since $d_{T_{i-1}}(w) \geq 3$ it follows that $s \geq 2$, and since $|E(w) \cap C_{i-1}| = 1$ it follows that $vw_j \not\in C_{i-1}$ for all $j$. Consider $T_i$ obtained by replacing the edge $vw_1$ with $vv_1$, and by setting $C_i = C_{i-1}$, $D_i = \emptyset$ and $X_i = X_{i-1} \setminus \{v\}$. Since $vw \in E_{i-1}$ and $T_i$ is a tree, it follows that $T_i$ does not contain a cycle and is connected, and hence $T_i$ is also a tree. Again, $T_i$ is a reduction of $T_{i-1}$ by taking $f_E(vw_1) = vv_1$. Indeed, this follows from the fact that both $v$ and $w$ are touched vertices so mapping $vw_1$ to $vv_1$ satisfies the conditions of reduction.

Note that $L_i = L_{i-1} \setminus \{v\}$, as the only vertices whose degrees are affected are $v$ and $w$, and since $s \geq 2$ it follows that $w$ is not a leaf in $T_i$ It is easy to see that $|T_i| = |T_{i-1}|$, $|X_i| \leq |X_{i-1}|$, and $|C_i| = |C_{i-1}|$. Hence it follows that $g_i \geq g_{i-1}$, and it is also easy to see that $X_i \subseteq L_i \subseteq X_i \cup O_i$. 

6
Note that we still need to verify that any sequence of such operations will terminate in a finite time. In every application of Case 1 the number of vertices in $T_i$ decreases by 1, yet the size of $T_i$ remains unaffected in Cases 2 and 3. Thus Case 1 can be applied at most $|T_0|$ times. On the other hand, the number of leaves in $T_i$ decreases by 1 in every application of Cases 2 or 3, so the number of times Cases 2 or 3 can be applied consecutively without applying Case 1 is at most the number of vertices at that particular stage. Hence the total number of applications is at most $\sum_{i=1}^{|T_0|} i$, which proves that the process must terminate in a finite time.

Let $T_0, \ldots, T_t$ be the sequence of reductions obtained during the process, and let $a$ be the number of times Case 1 is applied. Since $g_i \geq g_{i-1} - 1$ whenever Case 1 is applied, $g_i \geq g_{i-1} + 2$ whenever Case 2 is applied and $g_i \geq g_{i-1}$ whenever Case 3 is applied, it follows that $g_t \geq g_0 - a$.

On the other hand, note that $|C_i| = |C_{i-1}|$ whenever Case 3 is applied, yet $|C_i| = |C_{i-1}| - 1$ whenever Case 1 or 2 is applied. Since $|C_i| \geq 0$ and $|C_0| = r + 1$, it follows that $a \leq r + 1$. Thus we must have $g_t \geq g_0 - (r + 1)$. Since $X_t = L_t$ and $X_0 = \emptyset$, this can be rewritten as

$$|T_t| - 3|L_t| - 3|C_t| \geq |T_0| - 3|C_0| - (r + 1).$$

Since $|T_0| = |T| - r$ and $|C_0| = r + 1$, it follows that

$$|T_t| - 3|L_t| - 3|C_t| \geq |T| - 5r - 4.$$

Since $T_t$ is a reduction of $T$, this completes the proof.

### 3 Delayed version of the game

Let $T_t$, $C_t$ and $L_t$ be given by Lemma 3 and let $r$ be the number of edges claimed by Isolator during the first phase of the game. Then Lemma 2 implies that $\alpha(T) \geq r + \alpha(T, C_t, L_t)$. Since $|T_t| - 3|L_t| - 3|C_t| \geq |T| - 5r - 4$, it suffices to prove that for all trees $T$ with $n$ vertices, $l$ leaves and for any set of edges $C \subseteq E$ we have $\alpha(T, C, L) \geq \left\lfloor \frac{n - 3l - 3|C| + 7}{5} \right\rfloor$.

In order to make our inductive proof work, we need to prove a slightly stronger statement. Recall that $O$ is the set of occupied vertices, and since $X = L$ it follows that $O$ is the set of those vertices of degree at least 2 which are endpoint of an edge in $C$. Our aim is to prove the following result.

**Lemma 4.** Let $T$ be a tree with $n$ vertices and $l$ leaves. Let $O$ be the set of occupied vertices of $T$ and let $C \subseteq E$. Then

$$\alpha(T, C, L) \geq \left\lfloor \frac{n - 3l - 3|C| + 7 + \sum_{v \in O} (d(v) - 2)}{5} \right\rfloor.$$  

In particular, it follows that $\alpha(T, C, L) \geq \left\lfloor \frac{n - 3l - 3|C| + 7}{5} \right\rfloor$.

The proof is an inductive proof, first on the size on $T$ and then on the number of leaves in $T$. However, for simplicity one could view it just as an inductive proof on the size of $T$. Given
a tree $T$ whose leaves are touched and with some edges claimed by Toucher at the start, our aim is to either find suitable edges for Isolator that can help to isolate some vertices, or find suitable substructures of the tree with many touched edges that could be removed without deleting too many vertices that could possibly be isolated. In either case the aim is to reduce the size of $T$ without reducing the lower bound for the score.

The structures we are in general looking for are neighbouring vertices of degree 1 or 2, as near such vertices $T$ behaves similarly to path. If no such substructures exists, it follows that vertices of degree 1 or 2 must be spread out. In particular, it follows that there must be vertices of higher degree, which in turn implies that $T$ has plenty of leaves. The aim of the next Lemma is to make this argument precise. As a consequence, it turns out that if no suitable substructure of $T$ exist, then the expression \[ \left\lfloor \frac{n-3|C|+7+\sum_{v\in O(d(v)-2)}}{5} \right\rfloor \] in (2) turns out to be at most 0, and hence the claim is certainly true.

Since there are several substructures we are considering in $T$, the proof splits into many cases and the proofs of some cases are rather long. This is due to the fact that for each substructure, the proof often splits into multiple sub-cases based on the structure of $T$ on vertices near the substructure. In general, the proofs are fairly easy within each case, and the same ideas are repeatedly in different cases. In a sense, the hardest idea is to come up with a suitable lower bound in (2) that is strong enough for an inductive argument.

**Lemma 5.** Let $T$ be a tree with $n \geq 3$ vertices in which there are no two adjacent vertices of degree 2 and no leaf adjacent to a vertex of degree 2. Then $T$ contains at least $\frac{n+5}{3}$ leaves.

**Proof.** Let $d_i$ be the number of vertices in $T$ of degree $i$. It is well-known that we have
\[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} id_i = 2(n-1) \quad (3) \]
and
\[ d_1 = 2 + \sum_{i=3}^{n} (i-2)d_i. \quad (4) \]

Let $X$ be the set of vertices in $T$ that have degree 1 or 2, and let $Y$ be the set of vertices in $T$ that have degree at least 3. Note that there are no edges inside $X$. Indeed, trivially no two leaves can be adjacent in any tree with at least 3 vertices, and by assumption no leaf is adjacent to a vertex of degree 2 and no two vertices of degree 2 are adjacent. Hence it follows that
\[ d_1 + 2d_2 = e(X,Y) \leq \sum_{y\in Y} d(y) = \sum_{i=3}^{n} id_i. \quad (5) \]
Combining (3) with (5), it follows that
\[ \sum_{i=3}^{n} id_i \geq n - 1. \]
Since $3(i-2) \geq i$ holds for all $i \geq 3$, it follows that
\[ \sum_{i=3}^{n} (i-2)d_i \geq \frac{1}{3} \sum_{i=3}^{n} id_i \geq \frac{n-1}{3}. \]
Thus from (4) it follows that \( d_1 \geq 2 + \frac{n - 5}{3} \), which completes the proof.

We are now ready to prove Lemma 4.

Proof of Lemma 4. The proof is by induction on \( n \), and for fixed \( n \) we also induct on the number of leaves. Let \( C = \{e_1, \ldots, e_k\} \) be the set of edges claimed by Toucher at the start of the game, and for convenience let \( l = |L| \) and \( k = |C| \) throughout the proof. We start by checking the base cases. For fixed \( n \), note that the claim follows if \( T \) is path by [6]. Hence for given \( n \), the base case for the induction on the number of leaves hold. Thus we may always assume that \( T \) is not a path.

Next we prove that the claim holds whenever \( n \leq 5 \). Since \( T \) is not a path, we must have \( l \geq 3 \). Note that we always have \( \sum_{v \in O} (d(v) - 2) \leq \sum_{v \in L} (d(v) - 2) = l - 2 \). Hence it follows that for \( n \leq 5 \) and \( l \geq 3 \) we have

\[
n + 7 - 3l - 3k + \sum_{v \in O} (d(v) - 2) \leq n + 5 - 2l \leq 4,
\]

which completes the proof as we always have \( \alpha(T, C, L) \geq 0 \). Thus from now on we may assume that \( T \) has at least 6 vertices and that \( T \) is not a path.

We split the proof into cases based on whether \( T \) contains suitable substructures. At the end we prove that if \( T \) contains none of these substructures, then we must have \( n - 3l - 3k + 7 + \sum_{v \in O} (d(v) - 2) < 5 \), in which case the claim follows as well.

In the first four cases we consider those situations in which \( C \) contains two edges that are 'close' to each others or an edge close to a leaf. In those cases we prove that a suitable part of the tree can be removed already before the start of the game in a way that the resulting tree is a reduction of the original tree and so that this reduction does not decrease the score. In particular, note that we have \( D = I = \emptyset \) in those cases. In the remaining two cases we consider situations when \( T \) contains sufficiently many neighbouring vertices of degree 2 which can be claimed by Isolator in order to increase the score.

Let us first focus on those cases in which we can simply reduce \( T \) before the game starts. Given a reduction \( T_1 \) of \( T \) with appropriate sets \( C_1, L_1 \) and \( D_1 \) satisfying \( D_1 = \emptyset \), for convenience we define \( d(k) = |C| - |C_1| \), \( d(l) = |L| - |L_1| \), \( d(n) = |T| - |T_1| \) and

\[
d(s) = \sum_{v \in O} (d_T(v) - 2) - \sum_{v \in O_1} (d_{T_1}(v) - 2).
\]

For \( v \in V(T) \), define

\[
d_s(v) = (d_T(v) - 2) \mathbf{1}\{v \in O\} - (d_{T_1}(v) - 2) \mathbf{1}\{v \in O_1\},
\]

where \( \mathbf{1}\) denotes the indicator function of an event, and note that \( d(s) = \sum_{v \in V \cup V_1} d_s(v) \).

Finally define \( D(T, T_1) = d(n) - 3d(l) - 3d(k) + d(s) \). Note that this also depends on the sets \( C \) and \( C_1 \), but the dependence will not be highlighted in the notation as these sets are clear from the context.

Let

\[
S(T) = \left\lfloor \frac{n - 3l - 3k + 7 + \sum_{v \in O} (d(v) - 2)}{5} \right\rfloor,
\]
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Figure 1: Construction of $T_1$. Red rigid edges are edges in $T$ which are replaced with red dotted edges.

and again note that $S$ also depends on $C$. If $d(n) > 0$, then the inductive hypothesis implies that $\alpha(T_1, C_1, L_1) \geq S(T_1)$. If we also had $D(T, T_1) \leq 0$, it would certainly follow that $S(T_1) \geq S(T)$. Since $T_1$ is a reduction of $T$, Lemma 2 implies that $\alpha(T_1, C_1, L_1) \geq \alpha(T, C, L)$. If we also had $D(T, T_1) \leq 0$, it would certainly follow that $S(T_1) \geq S(T)$, as required. Hence if $|T| > |T_1|$ it suffices to prove that $D(T, T_1) \leq 0$. We now move on to considering various substructures of $T$.

**Case 1.** $T$ contains an unoccupied vertex of degree 2 whose both neighbours are touched.

Since $n \geq 3$, it follows that either both of the vertices are occupied, or one of them is occupied and the other is a leaf. We start by reducing the first case to the second case.

Let $v$ be the unoccupied vertex of degree 2, and let $u$ and $w$ be the neighbours of $v$, and set $N(u) \setminus \{v\} = \{u_1, \ldots, u_r\}$. Since $u$ is occupied, it follows that there exists $j$ for which $uu_j \in C$. Let $a$ be a leaf in $T$ so that every path from $a$ to $u$ must go through $w$. Consider $T_1$ obtained by deleting all the edges with $u$ as an endpoint apart from the edge $uv$ and adding the edges $au_1, \ldots, au_r$, as illustrated in Figure 1. We also take $C_1$ to be the set containing all the edges in $C$ that do not have $u$ as an endpoint, and all the edges of the form $au_i$ for those $i$ with $uu_i \in C$.

It is easy to see that $T_1$ is a reduction of $T$ by taking $f_E(uu_i) = au_i$. Indeed, this follows from the fact that $a$ is touched in $T_1$ as $au_j \in C_1$. It is also easy to check that $d(k) = 0$ and $d(n) = 0$. We also have $L_1 = (L \setminus \{a\}) \cup \{u\}$, which implies that $d(l) = 0$. Note that $a$ and $u$ are the only vertices whose degrees are affected during the process. Since we have $d_s(a) = 1 - r$ and $d_s(u) = r - 1$, it follows that $d(s) = 0$. In particular, we have $S(T) = S(T_1)$, and thus by Lemma 2 it suffices to prove the claim for $T_1$.

Hence we may assume that $T$ contains an unoccupied vertex $v$ of degree 2 with neighbours $u$ and $w$ so that $u$ is a leaf and $w$ is occupied. Let $w_1$ be chosen such that $ww_1 \in C$. Since $T$ has at least 6 vertices, we must have $d(w) + d(w_1) \geq 4$. We start by considering the cases corresponding to $d(w) + d(w_1) = 4$, and it is easy to check that this occurs exactly when $(d(w), d(w_1)) \in \{(2, 2), (3, 1)\}$.
If \( d(w) = d(w_1) = 2 \), consider \( T_1 \) obtained by deleting the vertices \( u, v \) and \( w \), and take \( C_1 = C \setminus \{ww_1\} \). Since \( w_1 \) is a leaf in \( T_1 \), it follows that \( T_1 \) is a reduction of \( T \). Since \( L_1 = (L \setminus \{V\}) \cup \{w_1\} \), it follows that \( d(l) = 0 \). It is also easy to check that we have \( d(n) = 3 \), \( d(k) = 1 \) and \( d(s) = 0 \). Thus it follows that \( D(T, T_1) = 0 \), and since \( |T| > |T_1| \) the claim follows by induction.

If \( d(w) = 3 \) and \( d(w_1) = 1 \), let \( x \) be chosen such that \( N(w) = \{x, v, w_1\} \). Consider \( T_1 \) obtained by deleting the vertices \( u, v \) and \( w_1 \), and take \( C_1 = C \setminus \{ww_1\} \). Since \( N_T(w) = \{x, v, w_1\} \), it follows that \( w \) is a leaf in \( T_1 \), and hence \( T_1 \) is a reduction of \( T \). Note that we have \( L_1 = (L \setminus \{u, w_1\}) \cup \{w\} \) and that \( w \) is the only vertex whose degree is affected during the process. Thus it follows that \( d(n) = 3 \), \( d(l) = 1 \) and \( d(k) = 1 \), and since \( d_s(w) = 1 \) we also have \( d(s) = 1 \). Hence we have \( D(T, T_1) = -2 \), and since \( |T| > |T_1| \) the claim follows by induction.

Now suppose that \( d(w) + d(w_1) \geq 5 \). Let \( N(w_1) \setminus \{w\} = \{a_1, \ldots, a_c\} \) and \( N(w) \setminus \{v, w_1\} = \{a_{c+1}, \ldots, a_d\} \) where one of these sets might be empty. Note that \( d(w) + d(w_1) \geq 5 \) implies that \( d \geq 2 \). Consider \( T_1 \) obtained by deleting the vertices \( u \) and \( v \) and by taking \( E(T_1) \) to be the set of those edges in \( T \) that do not have \( w \) or \( w_1 \) as their endpoint together with the edges \( w w_1 \) and \( w a_i \) for \( 2 \leq i \leq d \). See Figure 2 for illustration when \( c = 0 \). Finally we take \( C_1 \) to be the set containing the edge \( w w_1 \), all the edges in \( C \) that do not have \( w \) or \( w_1 \) as an endpoint, and the unique edge in \( \{w a_i, w_1 a_i\} \cap E(T_1) \) for those \( i \) for which the one of \( w a_i \) or \( w_1 a_i \) that is an edge in \( T \) is also in \( C \). In particular, it follows that \( |C_1| = |C| \).

Note that \( T_1 \) is a reduction of \( T \) by taking \( f(wa_i) = a_i a_i \) for all \( 2 \leq i \leq c \) since both \( w \) and \( w_1 \) are touched in \( T \) and \( T_1 \). It is easy to check that we have \( d(n) = 2 \), \( d(l) \geq 1 \) and \( d(k) = 1 \). It is easy to see that the only vertices whose degrees are affected are \( w \) and \( w_1 \). We have \( d_s(w) = (d - c) - (d - 1) = 1 - c \) and \( d_s(w_1) = \max(c - 1, 0) - 0 \leq c \) as \( c \geq 0 \). Also note that \( u \) and \( v \) are the only deleted vertices, and we have \( d_s(v) = 0 \) and \( d_s(u) = 0 \). Hence it follows that \( d(s) \leq 1 \) and hence it follows that \( D(T, T_1) \leq 0 \). Since \( |T| > |T_1| \), the claim follows by induction. This completes the proof of Case 1.

**Case 2.** \( T \) contains an edge \( e \not\in C \) whose both endpoints are touched.

There are again two possibilities: either both endpoints of \( e \) are occupied or one of them is occupied and the other is a leaf. By using same argument as in Case 1 we may assume that
Hence we have $D$ such that one of the endpoints is occupied and the other is a leaf. Let $u$ and $v$ be the endpoints of $e$ such that $u$ is a leaf and $v$ is occupied, and let $w$ be chosen such that $vw \in C$. Again we split into cases based on the size of $d(v) + d(w)$, and since $T$ has at least 6 vertices it follows that $d(v) + d(w) \geq 4$, and again $d(v) + d(w) = 4$ implies that $(d(v), d(w)) \in \{(2, 2), (3, 1)\}$.

If $d(v) = d(w) = 2$, consider $T_1$ obtained by deleting the vertices $u$ and $v$, and take $C_1 = C \setminus \{vw\}$. Since $d_T(w) = 2$, it follows that $w$ is a leaf in $T_1$, and hence $T_1$ is a reduction of $T$. It is easy to check that we have $d(n) = 2$, $d(l) = 0$ and $d(k) = 1$. Since $w$ is the only vertex whose degree is affected during the process and $d_s(w) = 0$, it follows that $d(s) = 0$. Hence we have $D(T, T_1) = -1$, and since $|T| > |T_1|$ the claim follows by induction.

If $d(v) = 3$ and $d(w) = 1$, let $T_1$ be the tree obtained by deleting the vertices $u$ and $w$, and set $C_1 = C \setminus \{vw\}$. Since $v$ is a leaf in $T_1$ it follows that $T_1$ is a reduction of $T$. It is easy to check that $d(n) = 2$, $d(l) = 1$ and $d(k) = 1$. Note that $v$ is the only vertex whose degree is affected during the process, and since $d_s(v) = 1$ it follows that $d(s) = 1$. Hence we have $D(T, T_1) = -3$, and since $|T| > |T_1|$ the claim follows by induction.

Finally suppose that $d(v) + d(w) \geq 5$. Let $N(v) \setminus \{u, w\} = \{a_1, \ldots, a_s\}$ and $N(w) \setminus \{v\} = \{a_{s+1}, \ldots, a_d\}$ where one of these sets might be empty. Note that $d(v) + d(w) \geq 5$ implies that $d \geq 2$. Consider $T_1$ obtained by deleting the vertex $u$, and we take $E(T_1)$ to be the set of those edges in $T$ that do not have $v$ or $w$ as their endpoint together with $vw$, $va_1$ and $wa_i$ for $2 \leq i \leq d$. Let $C_1$ be the set containing the edge $vw$, all the edges in $C$ that do not have $v$ or $w$ as an endpoint, and the unique edge in $\{va_i, wa_i\} \cap E(T_1)$ for those $i$ for which the one of $va_i$ or $wa_i$ that is an edge in $T$ is also in $C$, and note that we have $|C_1| = |C|$. Since $v$ and $w$ are occupied in both $T$ and $T_1$, it follows that $T_1$ is a reduction of $T$ by taking $f_E(va_i) = wa_i$ for all $2 \leq i \leq c$ if $c \geq 1$, or by taking $f_E(wa_1) = va_1$ if $c = 0$.

Note that we have $d(n) = 1$, $d(l) \geq 1$ and $d(k) = 0$. Since $v$ and $w$ are the only vertices whose degrees are affected during the process, and since we have $d_s(v) = c$ and $d_s(w) = \max(d - c - 1, 0) - (d - 2) \leq 2 - c$, it follows that $d(s) \leq 2$. Hence we have $D(T, T_1) \leq 0$, and since $|T| > |T_1|$ the claim follows by induction. This completes the proof of Case 2.

Case 3. There exist an edge $e \in C$ whose endpoint is a leaf.

Let $u$ and $v$ be the endpoints of $e$ with $u$ being the leaf. First suppose that $d(v) = 2$, and let $w$ be the other neighbour of $v$. Let $T_1$ be obtained by deleting the vertex $u$, and take $C_1 = C \setminus \{vw\}$. Since $v$ is touched in both $T_1$ and $T$, it follows that $T_1$ is a reduction of $T$. It is easy to check that we have $d(n) = 1$, $d(l) = 0$, $d(k) = 1$ and $d(s) = 0$. Thus it follows that $D(T, T_1) = -2$, and since $|T| > |T_1|$ the claim follows by induction.

Now suppose that $d(v) \geq 3$, and let $N(v) \setminus \{u\} = \{v_1, \ldots, v_c\}$ where $c \geq 2$. Consider $T_1$ obtained by replacing the edge $vv_1$ with $vw$. It is easy to see that $T_1$ is a reduction of $T$ by taking $f_E(vv_1) = vw$, as $u$ and $v$ are touched vertices in $T_1$ and $T$. It is easy to check that $d(n) = 0$, $d(l) = 1$ and $d(k) = 0$. Note that $u$ and $v$ are the only vertices whose degrees are affected during the process, and we clearly have $d_s(v) = 1$ and $d_s(u) = 0$. Hence it follows that $d(s) = 1$, and thus $D(T, T_1) = -2 \leq 0$. Since the number of vertices remains the same and the number of leaves decreases by one, the claim follows by induction. This completes the proof of Case 3.

\[ \square \]
Figure 3: Construction of $T_1$. Red rigid edges are edges in $T$ which are replaced with red dotted edges.

Case 4. There exist distinct edges $e_i, e_j \in C$ that have a common endpoint.

Let $u$ be the common endpoint of $e_i$ and $e_j$, and let $v$ and $w$ be the other endpoints respectively. By Case 3 we may assume that neither of $v$ nor $w$ is a leaf. Let $N(u) \setminus \{v, w\} = \{u_1, \ldots, u_r\}$ with possibly $r = 0$. Consider $T_1$ obtained by removing the vertex $u$ together with all the edges that have $u$ as an endpoint, and by adding the edges $vw$ and $vu_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq r$ as in Figure 3, and note that $T_1$ is certainly a tree. Let $C_1$ be the set containing the edge $vw$, all the edges in $C$ that do not have $u$ as an endpoint and all the edges $vu_i$ for those $i$ for which $uu_i \in C$. Since both $u$ and $v$ are touched, it follows that $T_1$ is a reduction of $T$ by taking $f_E(uu_i) = vu_i$ for all $i$.

It is easy to check that $d(n) = 1$, $d(l) = 0$ and $d(k) = 1$. Note that the only vertices whose degrees are affected during the process are $v$ and $w$, and the vertex $u$ is also deleted. Since neither of $v$ nor $w$ is a leaf, it is easy to check that $d_s(u) = r$, $d_s(v) = (d_T(v) - 2) - (d_T(v) + r - 1 - 2) = 1 - r$ and $d_s(w) = 1$. In particular, it follows that $d(s) = 2$ and hence we have $D(T, T_1) = 0$. Since $|T| > |T_1|$, the claim follows by induction, and this completes the proof of Case 4. □

From now on we suppose that $T$ contains no configuration described in Cases 1-4, and hence the edges in $C$ are suitably 'isolated'. We now consider those cases when $T$ contain two adjacent vertices of degree 2 that are both unoccupied. In such a case the edges incident to the vertex of degree 2 could be suitable moves for Isolator. Our aim is to describe a sequence of moves for Isolator that allow her to increase the score in a way that the resulting tree (together with the new moves) has a reduction with sufficiently large score.

From now on we change our notation slightly: let $C'$ be the set of those edges claimed by Toucher at the start of the delayed game and let $O'$ be the set of occupied vertices at the start of the delayed game. Let $D$ be the set of those edges claimed by Isolator during the new moves, and let $\hat{C}$ be the set of edges claimed by Toucher during the new moves, and for convenience we write $\hat{C} = \{f_1, \ldots, f_D\}$. Finally we set $C = C' \cup \hat{C}$, and hence $C$ is the set of all edges claimed by Toucher at the end of the process, i.e. once the new moves have been played.

In all the cases we are about to consider, the edges in $D$ form a path in $T$ so that all the vertices on this path except the endpoints have degree 2 in $T$, and the endpoints have degree at least 3 or are touched at the end of the process. In particular, it follows that the number of vertices isolated during the process is exactly $|D| - 1$. Again our aim is to seek for a suitable reduction $T_1$ of $T$ for these choices of $C$, $D$ and
If optimal, playing the edges in to play arbitrary edges on her moves. Hence it follows that process of claiming new edges we fix a suitable strategy for Isolator, but we allow Toucher

d In particular, note that (and not for the set-up containing the new edges that are played. As before, we define follow that S splits into a number of sub-cases.

exists such an unoccupied vertex whose neighbour is touched, although this case

for clarity. Hence if T, T

We now focus on the unoccupied vertices of degree 2. First we consider a case when there

Let v be the unoccupied vertex of degree 2 and let v be the neighbour of v that is touched. Note that by using the same argument as in the Case 1 we may assume that v is a leaf. We start by constructing a sequence of vertices v, v,..., v as follows: given an unoccupied vertex v of degree 2 with v,v ∈ E, let v be chosen such that N (v) = {v,v}. Let m denote the index for which the process stops, i.e. m is the least positive integer for which v is touched or d (v) ≥ 3. Since v is an unoccupied vertex of degree 2, it follows that m ≥ 2.

We now split into our main cases which mostly depend on the value of m. For convenience, we say that a vertex v is initially touched if v is touched in the initial set-up of the board. That is, if v is unoccupied on the initial board but v is an endpoint of one of the move played by Toucher once the game has started, we do not consider v as an initially touched vertex and we say that v is initially untouched.

Case 5. There exists an unoccupied vertex of degree 2 whose neighbour is touched.

Let v be the unoccupied vertex of degree 2 and let v be the neighbour of v that is touched. Note that by using the same argument as in the Case 1 we may assume that v is a leaf. We start by constructing a sequence of vertices v, v,..., v as follows: given an unoccupied vertex v of degree 2 with v,v ∈ E, let v be chosen such that N (v) = {v,v}. Let m denote the index for which the process stops, i.e. m is the least positive integer for which v is touched or d (v) ≥ 3. Since v is an unoccupied vertex of degree 2, it follows that m ≥ 2.

We now split into our main cases which mostly depend on the value of m. For convenience, we say that a vertex v is initially touched if v is touched in the initial set-up of the board. That is, if v is unoccupied on the initial board but v is an endpoint of one of the move played by Toucher once the game has started, we do not consider v as an initially touched vertex and we say that v is initially untouched.

Case 5.1. m = 2.

By Case 1 it follows that v cannot be touched. Hence by the choice of m we must have d (v) ≥ 3. Suppose that Isolator claims the edge v,v on her first move. If Toucher claims the edge v,v on her first move, we stop. Otherwise Isolator claims the edge v,v on her second move, and we stop after Toucher’s second move.

First consider the case when Isolator managed to claim both of these edges, and consider T obtained by deleting the vertices v and v. Take C = C ∪ {f, f}, and recall that f and f are the edges claimed by Toucher on her two moves. It is easy to see that T is a
reduction of $T$, and we have $d(n) = 2$, $d(l) = 1$ and $d(k) = -2$. Note that $v_2$ is the only vertex whose degree is affected during the process, and $v_2$ is initially unoccupied. Hence we have $d(s) \leq 0$, as the additional two moves given to Toucher can only decrease the value of $d(s)$. Since $|D| = 2$, it follows that $D(T, T_1) = 5 \leq 5(|D| - 1)$, as required.

Now suppose that Toucher claimed the edge $v_0v_1$. Again consider $T_1$ obtained by deleting the vertices $v_0$ and $v_1$, but in this case we take $C_1 = C'$. It is easy to see that $T_1$ is a reduction of $T$, and similarly we have $d(n) = 2$, $d(l) = 1$, $d(k) = 0$ and $d(s) = 0$. Indeed, in this case we have $d(s) = 0$ as Toucher’s only additional move is claiming the edge $v_0v_1$. Since $|D| = 1$ it follows that $D(T, T_1) = -1 \leq 5(|D| - 1)$, as required.

**Case 5.2.** $m = 3$ and $v_3$ is initially touched.

Since $T$ has at least 6 vertices, it follows that $v_3$ cannot be a leaf, and hence it is occupied. Suppose that Isolator claims the edge $v_1v_2$ on her first move and one of the edges in $\{v_0v_1, v_2v_3\}$ on her second move. If Toucher has claimed the other one of these edges on one of her first two moves, the process stops after Toucher’s second move. Otherwise Isolator claims the other edge in $\{v_0v_1, v_2v_3\}$, and the process stops after Toucher’s third move. The rest of our analysis splits into cases based on the number of neighbours of $v_3$.

**Case 5.2.1.** $d(v_3) = 2$.

Let $v_4$ be chosen such that $d(v_3) = \{v_2, v_4\}$. Since $v_3$ is occupied, it follows that $v_3v_4 \in C$. We also need to split into cases based on the number of neighbours of $v_4$, and note that $v_4$ cannot be a leaf as $T$ has at least 6 vertices.

**Case 5.2.1.1.** $d(v_4) = 2$.

Let $T_1$ be the tree obtained deleting the vertices $v_0$, $v_1$, $v_2$ and $v_3$, and let $C_1$ be the set of those edges in $C$ that are not deleted during the process. Since $v_4$ is a leaf in $T_1$ and occupied in $T$, it follows that $T_1$ is a reduction of $T$.

First suppose that Isolator claimed all three edges in $\{v_0v_1, v_1v_2, v_2v_3\}$. Since $v_4$ is a leaf in $T_1$ and the edge $v_3v_4 \in C$ is deleted during the process, it is easy to check that $d(n) = 4$, $d(l) = 0$, $d(k) = -2$ and $d(s) \leq 0$, as the new edges claimed by Toucher cannot increase the value of $d(s)$. Hence it follows that $D(T, T_1) \leq 10 = 5(|D| - 1)$, which completes the proof of this case as $|T| > |T_1|$.

Now suppose that Isolator claimed only two such edges. Hence one of the edges in $\{v_0v_1, v_1v_2, v_2v_3\}$ must be claimed by Toucher, and this edge is deleted together with $v_3v_4 \in C$. Hence it is easy to check that $d(n) = 4$, $d(l) = 0$, $d(k) = 0$ and $d(s) \leq 0$, and thus $D(T, T_1) \leq 4 < 5(|D| - 1)$ which completes the proof of this case.

**Case 5.2.1.2.** $d(v_4) \geq 3$.

Let $N(v_4) \setminus \{v_3\} = \{u_1, \ldots, u_a\}$ where $a \geq 2$. Let $T_1$ be the tree obtained by deleting the vertices $v_0$, $v_1$ and $v_2$, and by replacing the edge $v_4u_1$ with $v_3u_1$. Let $C_1$ be the set of all edges in $C$ that are also edges in $T_1$, and if $v_4u_1 \in C$ the edge $v_3u_1$ is also added to $C_1$. 
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Hence it is easy to see that $T_1$ is a reduction of $T$ by taking $f(v_3u_1) = v_3u_1$. Note that the only vertices whose degrees are affected during the process are $v_3$ and $v_4$, and it is easy to check that $d_s(v_3) = 0$ and $d_s(v_4) = (a + 1 - 2) - (a - 2) = 1$. In particular, it follows that $d(s) \leq 1$, and we certainly also have $d(n) = 3$.

If Isolator claimed claimed all three edges, it follows that $d(l) = 1$ and $d(k) = -3$. Hence we have $D(T, T_1) \leq 10 = 5(|D| - 1)$, as required. If Isolator claimed only two such edges, it follows that $d(l) = 1$ and $d(k) = -1$. Hence we have $D(T, T_1) \leq 4 < 5(|D| - 1)$, which completes the proof of this case.

**Case 5.2.2.** $d(v_3) \geq 3$.

Let $T_1$ be the tree obtained by deleting the vertices $v_0$, $v_1$ and $v_2$, and note that $T_1$ is a reduction of $T$. Since $v_3$ is the only vertex whose degree is affected during the process and $d_s(v_3) = 1$, it follows that $d(s) \leq 1$. We also have $d(n) = 3$.

If Isolator claimed claimed all three edges, it follows that $d(l) = 1$ and $d(k) = -3$. Hence we have $D(T, T_1) = 10 \leq 5(|D| - 1)$, as required. If Isolator claimed only two such edges, it follows that $d(l) = 1$ and $d(k) = -1$. Hence we have $D(T, T_1) \leq 4 < 5(|D| - 1)$, which completes the proof of this case.

These sub-cases cover the case when $m = 3$ and $v_3$ is initially touched completely.

**Case 5.3.** $m = 3$ and $v_3$ is initially unoccupied.

Since $v_3$ is initially unoccupied and $m = 3$, it follows that $d(v_3) \geq 3$. Again, suppose that Isolator claims the edge $v_1v_2$ on her first move and one of the edges in $\{v_0v_1, v_2v_3\}$ on her second move. If Toucher has occupied the other one of these edges on her first two moves, then the process stops after the second move of Toucher. Otherwise Isolator claims the other one of these edges on her third move and the process tops after the third move of Toucher.

First suppose that Isolator claimed all three edges, and let $T_1$ be the tree obtained by deleting the vertices $v_0$, $v_1$ and $v_2$, and take $C_1 = C$. Then $T_1$ is a reduction of $T$, and the only vertex whose degree is affected during the process is $v_3$. Since $v_3 \notin O'$ it follows that $d(s) \leq 0$, and it is also easy to check that $d(n) = 3$, $d(l) = 1$ and $d(k) = -3$. Hence we have $D(T, T_1) \leq 9 < 5(|D| - 1)$, as required.

If Isolator claimed only the edges $v_1v_2$ and $v_2v_3$, we consider the same reduction $T_1$ as in the previous case, and we take $C_1$ to be those edges in $C$ that are also edges in $T_1$. Again, it is easy to see that $T_1$ is indeed a reduction of $T$ as the edge $v_2v_3$ is occupied by Isolator. It is also easy to check that $d(n) = 3$, $d(l) = 1$, $d(k) = -1$ and $d(s) \leq 0$, and hence we have $D(T, T_1) \leq 3 < 5(|D| - 1)$, as required.

Finally suppose that Isolator claimed only the edges $v_0v_1$ and $v_1v_2$, and hence Toucher has claimed the edge $v_2v_3$. Let $N(v_3) \setminus \{v_2\} = \{u_1, \ldots, u_a\}$ where $a \geq 2$. Consider $T_1$ obtained by deleting the vertices $v_0$ and $v_1$, and replacing the edge $v_3u_1$ with $v_2u_1$, and set $C_1$ to be the all edges in $C$ that are also in $T_1$, and if $v_3u_1 \in C$ then $v_2u_1$ is also added to $C_1$. Since both $v_2$ and $v_3$ are touched, it follows that $T_1$ is a reduction of $T$ by taking $f_E(v_3u_1) = v_2u_1$.

Note that $v_2$ and $v_3$ are the only vertices whose degrees are affected during the process. Since both of them are initially unoccupied, it follows that $d(s) \leq 0$. It is easy to check
that \( d(n) = 2 \), \( d(l) = 1 \) and \( d(k) = -2 \). Hence we have \( D(T, T_1) \leq 5 = 5(|D| - 1) \), which completes the proof of this case.

**Case 5.4.** \( m \geq 4 \).

Suppose that Isolator claims the edge \( v_2v_3 \) on her first move. Suppose that before a given move of Isolator the set of the edges claimed by Isolator is of the form \( \{v_iv_{i+1}, v_{i+1}v_{i+2}, \ldots, v_{j}v_{j+1}\} \) for some \( i \leq 2 \) and \( 2 \leq j \leq m - 1 \). If \( j < m - 1 \) and if the edge \( v_{j+1}v_{j+2} \) is still available, Isolator claims this edge on her move. Otherwise, if \( i \geq 1 \) and the edge \( v_{i-1}v_i \) is still available, Isolator claims this edge on her move. If neither of these conditions is satisfied, the process stops. In particular, the process always stops after Toucher’s move.

Let \( D = \{v_i v_{i+1}, \ldots, v_j v_{j+1}\} \) be the set of edges claimed by Isolator at the end of the process. In particular, we have \( |D| = j - i + 1 \) and hence the number of isolated vertices is \( j - i \), and the set of isolated vertices is \( \{v_{i+1}, \ldots, v_j\} \). Note that we always have \( i \leq 2 \), \( 2 \leq j \leq m - 1 \) and \( j - i \geq 1 \), as Toucher cannot claim both \( v_1v_2 \) and \( v_3v_4 \) on her first move.

We now split into cases, mostly based on the value of \( j \) but sometimes also based on whether \( v_m \) is touched or \( d(v_m) \geq 3 \).

**Case 5.4.1.** \( j \leq 2 \).

Since \( j \neq m - 1 \) at the end of the process, it follows that Toucher has claimed the edge \( v_{j+1}v_{j+2} \) on one of her moves. Let \( T_1 \) be the tree obtained by deleting the vertices \( v_0, \ldots, v_{j+1} \), and take \( C_1 \) to be the set of those edges in \( C \) that are also edges in \( T_1 \). Since \( j < m - 2 \), it follows that \( v_{j+2} \) is a leaf in \( T_1 \). Hence \( T_1 \) is a reduction of \( T \), and it is easy to see that \( d(n) = j + 2 \), \( d(l) = 0 \) and \( d(s) \leq 0 \).

First suppose that \( i \in \{1, 2\} \). Hence Toucher has claimed at least one of the edges in \( \{v_0v_1, v_1v_2\} \), and also note that the edge \( v_{j+1}v_{j+2} \) claimed by Toucher is deleted. Since Toucher has claimed exactly \( j - i + 1 \) edges outside \( C' \) as her new moves, it follows that \( d(k) \geq (i - j - 1) + 2 = 1 + i - j \). Hence we have \( D(T, T_1) \leq 4j - 3i - 1 \), and by using \( i \leq 2 \) and \( j - i \geq 1 \) it follows that \( 5(|D| - 1) - D(T, T_1) \geq j - 2i + 1 \geq 0 \), as required.

Now suppose that \( i = 0 \). In this case it follows that \( d(k) = -j \), as \( v_{j+1}v_{j+2} \) is the only deleted edge claimed by Toucher. Hence we have \( D(T, T_1) \leq 4j + 2 \), and since \( j \geq 2 \) it follows that \( D(T, T_1) \leq 5j = 5(|D| - 1) \). This completes the proof of this case.

**Case 5.4.2.** \( j = m - 2 \) and \( d(v_m) = 2 \).

Note that since \( d(v_m) = 2 \), it follows that \( v_m \) is initially touched by the definition of \( m \). Again, since \( j \neq m - 1 \) at the end of the process, it follows that Toucher has claimed the edge \( v_{m-1}v_m \) on one of her moves. Let \( T_1 \) be the tree obtained by deleting the vertices \( v_0, \ldots, v_{m-1} \), and take \( C_1 \) to be the set of those edges in \( C \) that are also edges in \( T_1 \). Since \( d(v_m) = 2 \), it follows that \( v_m \) is a leaf in \( T_1 \). Hence \( T_1 \) is a reduction of \( T \), and it is easy to check that \( d(n) = m \), \( d(l) = 0 \) and \( d(s) \leq 0 \).

If \( i \in \{1, 2\} \), it follows that \( d(k) \geq 1 + i - j = 3 + i - m \) by using the same argument as in Case 5.4.1. Hence we have \( D(T, T_1) \leq 4m - 3i - 9 \), and thus it follows that \( 5(|D| - 1) - D(T, T_1) \geq m - 2i - 1 \). Since \( j \geq i + 1 \) and \( i \leq 2 \) it follows that
Let \( m = j + 2 \geq i + 3 \geq 2i + 1 \), as required. If \( i = 0 \), it follows that \( d(k) = -j = 2 - m \). Hence we have \( D(T, T_1) \leq 4m - 6 \), and since \( m \geq 4 \) it follows that \( D(T, T_1) \leq 5(m - 2) = 5(|D| - 1) \), which completes the proof of this case.

**Case 5.4.3.** \( j = m - 2 \) and \( d(v_m) \geq 3 \).

Since \( j \neq m - 1 \), it again follows that Toucher must have claimed the edge \( v_{m-1}v_m \) on one of her moves. Let \( N(v_m) \setminus \{v_{m-1}\} = \{u_1, \ldots, u_a\} \) with \( a \geq 2 \). Consider \( T_1 \) obtained by removing the vertices \( v_0, \ldots, v_{m-2} \), and by replacing the edge \( v_m u_1 \) with \( v_{m-1} u_1 \). Let \( C \) be the set of those edges in \( C \) that are also edges in \( T_1 \), and if \( v_m u_1 \in C \) then \( v_{m-1} u_1 \) is also added to \( C \). It is easy to see that \( T_1 \) is a reduction of \( T \) by taking \( f(v_m u_1) = v_{m-1} u_1 \) since both \( v_{m-1} \) and \( v_m \) are touched.

If \( v_m \) is initially unoccupied, it is clear that \( d(s) \leq 0 \). Otherwise, we have \( d_s(v_m) = (a + 1 - 2) - (a - 2) = 1 \) and \( d_s(v_{m-1}) = 0 \). Hence it follows that \( d(s) \leq 1 \) in either case. We also certainly have \( d(n) = m - 1 \) and \( d(l) = 1 \).

If \( i \in \{1, 2\} \), it follows that Toucher has claimed at least one of the edges \( v_0 v_1 \) or \( v_1 v_2 \), and hence we have \( d(k) \geq i - j = i + 2 - m \). Thus it follows that \( D(T, T_1) \leq 4m - 3i - 9 \), and hence

\[
5(|D| - 1) - D(T, T_1) \geq 5(m - 2 - i) - (4m - 3i - 9) = m - 2i - 1.
\]

By using \( m = j + 2 \geq i + 3 \) and \( i \leq 2 \) it follows that \( D(T, T_1) \leq 5(|D| - 1) \), as required.

If \( i = 0 \), we have \( d(k) = -j - 1 = 1 - m \). Hence it follows that \( D(T, T_1) \leq 4m - 6 \). Since \( m \geq 4 \), we have \( D(T, T_1) \leq 5(m - 2) = 5(|D| - 1) \), which completes the proof of this case.

**Case 5.4.4.** \( j = m - 1 \) and \( d(v_m) \geq 3 \).

Let \( T_1 \) be the tree obtained by deleting the vertices \( v_0, \ldots, v_{m-1} \). Since Isolator has occupied all the edges \( v_i v_{i+1}, \ldots, v_{m-1} v_m \), it follows that \( T_1 \) is a reduction of \( T \) regardless whether \( v_m \) is touched or not. Since \( v_m \) is the only vertex whose degree is affected during the process and \( d_{T_1}(v_m) = d_T(v_m) - 1 \), it follows that \( d(s) \leq 1 \). We also have \( d(n) = m \) and \( d(l) = 1 \).

If \( i \in \{1, 2\} \), it follows that \( d(k) \geq i + 1 - m \). Hence we have \( D(T, T_1) \leq 4m - 3i - 5 \), and thus

\[
5(|D| - 1) - D(T, T_1) \geq 5(m - i - 1) - (4m - 3i - 5) = m - 2i.
\]

By using \( m \geq 4 \) and \( i \leq 2 \) it follows that \( D(T, T_1) \leq 5(|D| - 1) \), as required.

If \( i = 0 \), it follows that \( d(k) = -m \). Hence we have \( D(T, T_1) \leq 4m - 2 \), and since \( m \geq 4 \) it follows that \( D(T, T_1) \leq 5(m - 1) \leq 5(|D| - 1) \), which completes the proof of this case.

**Case 5.4.5.** \( j = m - 1 \) and \( d(v_m) \leq 2 \).

Since \( T \) is not a path, we must have \( d(v_m) = 2 \). Since \( d(v_m) = 2 \), the definition of \( m \) implies that \( v_m \) is touched. Hence let \( v_m+1 \) be chosen so that \( N(v_m) = \{v_{m-1}, v_{m+1}\} \).

Since \( v_m \) is touched and \( v_{m-1}v_m \notin C \), it follows that \( v_m v_{m+1} \in C \). We split into sub-cases
based on the degree of $v_{m+1}$. First of all, note that $v_{m+1}$ cannot be a leaf since $T$ is not a path.

**Case 5.4.5.1.** $d(v_{m+1}) = 2$.

Let $T_1$ be the tree obtained by deleting the vertices $v_0, \ldots, v_m$. Since $v_{m+1}$ is touched in $T$ and leaf in $T_1$, it is easy to see that $T_1$ is a reduction of $T$, and we have $d(n) = m + 1$, $d(l) = 0$ and $d(s) = 0$.

If $i \in \{1, 2\}$ it follows that $d(k) \geq -(j - i + 1) + 2 = i - m + 2$, as Toucher has at least two edges that are deleted during the process, namely $v_m v_{m+1}$ and one of $v_0 v_1$ or $v_1 v_2$. Hence we have $D(T, T_1) \leq 4m - 3i - 5$, and thus

$$5(|D| - 1) - D(T, T_1) \geq 5(m - i - 1) - (4m - 3i - 5) = m - 2i.$$ Again by using $m \geq 4$ and $i \leq 2$ it follows that $D(T, T_1) \leq 5(|D| - 1)$, as required.

If $i = 0$ it follows that $d(k) \geq -(j + 1) + 1 = 1 - m$, and thus we have $D(T, T_1) \leq 4m - 2$. Since $m \geq 4$, it follows that $D(T, T_1) \leq 5(m - 1) = 5(|D| - 1)$, which completes the proof of this case.

**Case 5.4.5.2.** $d(v_{m+1}) \geq 3$.

Let $N(v_{m+1}) \setminus \{v_m\} = \{u_1, \ldots, u_a\}$ where $a \geq 2$, and let $T_1$ be the tree obtained by deleting the vertices $v_0, \ldots, v_{m-1}$ and by replacing the edge $v_{m+1}u_1$ with $v_mu_1$. Let $C_1$ be the set of those edges in $C$ that are also edges in $T_1$, and if $v_{m+1}u_1 \in C$ then $v_mu_1$ is also added to $C_1$. Then $T_1$ is a reduction of $T$ by taking $f_E(v_{m+1}u_1) = v_mu_1$. It is easy to see that $d(n) = m$ and $d(l) = 1$. Note that $v_m$ and $v_{m+1}$ are the only vertices whose degrees are affected during the process. Since $d_s(v_{m+1}) \leq 1$ and $d_s(v_m) = 0$, it follows that $d(s) \leq 1$.

If $i \in \{1, 2\}$, it follows that $d(k) \geq -(j - i + 1) + 1 = i + 1 - m$. Hence we have $D(T, T_1) \leq 4m - 3i - 5$. Since $m \geq 4 \geq 2i$, it follows that

$$5(|D| - 1) - D(T, T_1) \geq 5(m - i - 1) - (4m - 3i - 5) = m - 2i \geq 0,$$
as required.

If $i = 0$ it follows that $d(k) = -m$, and hence we have $D(T, T_1) \leq 4m - 2$. Since $m \geq 4$, it follows that $D(T, T_1) \leq 5(m - 1) \leq 5(|D| - 1)$, which completes the proof of this case and the proof of Case 5.

Suppose that $T$ does not contain any configurations described in Cases 1-5, and let $v_0, \ldots, v_m$ be a maximal path of vertices in $T$ for which $v_i$ is an unoccupied vertex of degree 2 for all $1 \leq i \leq m - 1$, and for which we have $v_i \in N(v_{i-1})$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$. Since $T$ does not contain any configurations described in Cases 1-5, it follows that $v_0$ and $v_m$ are also unoccupied, and the maximality assumption implies that we must have $d(v_0) \geq 3$ and $d(v_m) \geq 3$. In our final case we suppose that there exists a such a path with $m \geq 3$.

**Case 6.** There exists $m \geq 3$ and unoccupied vertices $v_0, \ldots, v_m$ satisfying $v_i \in N(v_{i-1})$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$, $d(v_i) = 2$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m - 1$, $d(v_0) \geq 3$ and $d(v_m) \geq 3$. 
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Figure 4: Construction of $T_1$. Green edges are edges claimed by Toucher and they are deleted during the process and replaced with the red dotted edge.

Suppose that Isolator claims the edge $v_1v_2$ on her first move. Suppose that before a given move of Isolator the set of edges claimed by Isolator is of the form $\{v_i, v_{i+1}, v_{i+2}, \ldots, v_{j+1}\}$ for some $i \in \{0, 1\}$ and $j \leq m - 1$. If $j < m - 1$ and if the edge $v_{j+1}v_{j+2}$ is still available, Isolator claims this edge on her move. Otherwise, if $i = 1$ and the edge $v_0v_1$ is still available, Isolator claims this edge on her move. If neither of these conditions is satisfied, the process stops.

Let $\{v_i, v_{i+1}, \ldots, v_{j+1}\}$ be the set of edges claimed by Isolator at the end of such process. Note that again we have $|D| = j - i + 1$, and we also have $i \in \{0, 1\}$, $1 \leq j \leq m - 1$ and $j - i \geq 1$ since Toucher cannot claim both edges $v_0v_1$ and $v_2v_3$ on her first move. We again split into several cases based on the values of $i$ and $j$.

**Case 6.1.** $i = 0$ and $j = m - 1$.

Let $S$ be the graph obtained by deleting the vertices $v_1, \ldots, v_{m-1}$. It is easy to see that $S$ consists of two connected components both of which are trees. Let $a$ and $b$ be leaves chosen from distinct connected components, let $T_1$ be the tree obtained by adding the edge $ab$ to the graph $S$ as demonstrated in Figure 4, and set $C_1 = C \cup \{ab\}$. Note that the set of leaves in $T_1$ is exactly $L \setminus \{a, b\}$ since $d_{T_1}(v_0) \geq 3 - 1 = 2$ and $d_{T_1}(v_m) \geq 3 - 1 = 2$. Since $ab \in C_1$, it follows that $T_1$ is a reduction of $T$.

Since $v_0$ and $v_m$ are initially unoccupied, it is easy to see that $d(s) \leq 0$. Note that $d(k) = -m - 1$, as Toucher has claimed $m$ new edges and the edge $ab$ is assigned to Toucher. Finally it is clear that we have $d(n) = m - 1$ and $d(l) = 2$. Since $m \geq 3$, it follows that $D(T, T_1) \leq 4m - 4 \leq 5(m - 1) = 5(|D| - 1)$, which completes the proof of this case.

**Case 6.2.** $i = 0$ and $j < m - 1$.

Since $j < m - 1$, it follows that Toucher has claimed the edge $v_{j+1}v_{j+2}$ on one of her moves. Let $S$ be the graph obtained by deleting the vertices $v_1, \ldots, v_{j+1}$, and let $a$ be a leaf in the component of $S$ containing $v_0$. Consider the tree $T_1$ obtained by adding the edge $av_{j+2}$ to $S$, and define $C_1$ by setting $C_1 = (C \cup \{av_{j+2}\}) \setminus \{v_{j+1}v_{j+2}\}$. Note that $T_1$ is a reduction of $T$ as both $a$ and $v_{j+2}$ are touched vertices in both $T$ and $T_1$. Finally note that
Given $T_1(v_0) \geq 3 - 1 = 2$, and hence $v_0$ is not a leaf in $T_1$.  

Note that the only vertices whose degrees are affected during the process are $a$, $v_0$ and $v_{j+2}$. Note that $d_s(a) = 0$, and since $v_0, v_{j+2} \not\in O'$ it follows that $d(s) \leq 0$. It is easy to check that we also have $d(n) = j + 1$, $d(l) = 1$ and $d(k) = -(j + 1)$. Thus we have $D(T, T_1) \leq 4j + 1$, and since $j \geq 1$ it follows that $D(T, T_1) \leq 5j = 5(|D| - 1)$, which completes the proof of this case.

**Case 6.3.** $i = 1$ and $j = m - 1$.

Note that the case $(i, j) = (1, m - 1)$ is equivalent to the case $(i, j) = (0, m - 2)$, which is covered in the previous case.

**Case 6.4.** $i = 1$ and $j < m - 1$.

Since $i = 1$ and $j < m - 1$, it follows that Toucher has claimed the edges $v_0v_1$ and $v_{j+1}v_{j+2}$. Let $T_1$ be the tree obtained by deleting the vertices $v_1, \ldots, v_{j+1}$ and by adding the edge $v_0v_{j+2}$, and set $C_1 = (C \cup \{v_0v_{j+2}\}) \setminus \{v_0v_1, v_{j+1}v_{j+2}\}$. Note that $T_1$ is a reduction of $T$ as both $v_0$ and $v_{j+2}$ are touched before and after the reduction.

Note that the degree of any vertex that is not deleted is not affected during the process. Since $v_0 \in O' \setminus O_1$ and $d_{T_1}(v_0) = d_T(v_0) \geq 3$, it follows that $d_s(v_0) \leq -1$. Hence we must have $d(s) \leq -1$. Since the edges $v_0v_1$ and $v_{j+1}v_{j+2}$ claimed by Toucher are deleted in the process and the edge $v_0v_{j+2}$ is given to Toucher, it follows that $d(k) = 1 - j$, and it is easy to see that $d(n) = j + 1$ and $d(l) = 0$. Hence we have $D(T, T_1) \leq 4j - 3$. Since $j \geq i + 1 \geq 2$, it follows that $D(T, T_1) \leq 5(j - 1) = 5(|D| - 1)$, which completes the proof of Case 6. \[\square\]

Let $C = \{e_1, \ldots, e_k\}$ be the set of edges claimed by Toucher at the start of the game. Our aim is to prove that if $T$ together with this particular collection $C$ does not contain any of the configurations described in Cases 1-6, then it follows that $S(T) \leq 0$. For each $1 \leq i \leq k$ let $e_i = a_i b_i$ and let $d_i = d_T(a_i) + d_T(b_i) - 2$.

We say that a graph $T$ is a forest if every connected component of $T$ is a tree. We define a sequence of forests $T_0, \ldots, T_k$ and collections of edges $C_0, \ldots, C_k$ as follows. First of all, we set $T_0 = T$ and $C_0 = C = \{e_1, \ldots, e_k\}$, and at every stage we will have $C_i = \{e_{i+1}, \ldots, e_k\}$.

Given $T_i$ and $C_i$, let $X$ be the connected component of $T_i$ containing the edge $e_i$, and note that $X$ is a tree since $T_i$ is a forest. Let $Y$ be the forest consisting of $d_i$ trees obtained by removing the vertices $a_i$ and $b_i$ and the edge $a_i b_i$, and by adding one new vertex to each connected component $S$ of $Y$ joined by an edge to the vertex of $S$ that was neighbour of $a_i$ or $b_i$. Note that such a vertex always exists in each connected component, and such vertex is also unique since $X$ is a tree. Finally we set $T_{i+1}$ to be the union of $Y$ and all the components of $T_i$ apart from $X$. One stage of the process is illustrated in Figure 5.

Note that by Claims 2, 3 and 4 it follows that all $a_1, \ldots, a_k, b_1, \ldots, b_k$ are distinct vertices, none of them is a leaf in any $T_i$ and any two such vertices are neighbours if and only if they are $a_j$ and $b_j$ for some $j$. Also by Claim 1 it follows that every connected component in $T_k$ has at least 4 vertices.

Note that during the $i$th step of the process, the number of connected components increases by $d_i - 1$, as one connected component splits into $d_i$ connected components. Hence the number
Figure 5: Illustration of one stage of the process. The edge $uv \in C_i$ is deleted, and since $d_i = 3$ the connected component on left splits into 3 trees on right.

\[ D = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{k} (d_i - 1) = 1 - k + \sum_{i=1}^{k} d_i. \]  

(6)

Let $n_1, \ldots, n_D$ be the number of vertices in each connected component and let $l_1, \ldots, l_D$ be the number of leaves in each connected component. Note that on the $i^{th}$ stage the number of vertices increases by $d_i - 2$, as we delete the vertices $a_i$ and $b_i$ and add $d_i$ new vertices that are leaves. Hence we have

\[ \sum_{i=1}^{D} n_i = n + \sum_{i=1}^{k} (d_i - 2) = n - 2k + \sum_{i=1}^{k} d_i. \]  

(7)

Since none of the vertices $a_1, \ldots, a_k, b_1, \ldots, b_k$ is a leaf at any stage of the process before they are deleted, it follows that the number of leaves increases by $d_i$ on the $i^{th}$ stage. Hence we have

\[ \sum_{i=1}^{D} l_i = l + \sum_{i=1}^{k} d_i. \]  

(8)

Let $S$ be a connected component in $T_k$. Note that if $S$ contains a vertex of degree 2 whose neighbour is a leaf, then we can backtrack the process to find a vertex of degree 2 in $T$ whose neighbour is a touched vertex, which contradicts Case 5. Hence we may assume that no vertex of degree 2 in $S$ has a leaf as a neighbour.

If $S$ contains two vertices of degree 2 that are neighbours, it follows that there exists a path of vertices $v_0, \ldots, v_t$ in $S$ for some $t \geq 3$ with $d(v_0) \geq 3$, $d(v_{t+1}) \geq 3$ and $d(v_i) = 2$ for all $1 \leq i \leq t$. Since none of these is a leaf in $S$, it follows that these vertices also formed a path satisfying the same condition in $T$, and all of these vertices are unoccupied in $T$. This contradicts Case 6.

Hence in every connected component there is no vertex of degree 2 whose neighbour is a leaf or another vertex of degree 2. Since each connected component is a tree with at least 4
vertices, Lemma 5 implies that $3l_i \geq n_i + 5$. Adding these inequalities for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, D\}$, and using (5), (7) and (8) it follows that
\[3 \left( l + \sum_{i=1}^{k} d_i \right) \geq n - 2k + \sum_{i=1}^{k} d_i + 5 - 5k + 5 \sum_{i=1}^{k} d_i.\]
This can be rearranged to
\[3l + 3k \geq n + 5 + 3 \sum_{i=1}^{k} d_i - 4k. \tag{9}\]

Note that $O(T) = \{a_1, \ldots, a_k, b_1, \ldots, b_k\}$, and hence it follows that
\[\sum_{v \in O(T)} (d(v) - 2) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} (d(a_i) + d(b_i) - 4) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} (d_i - 2) = -2k + \sum_{i=1}^{k} d_i.\]
Hence (9) can be written as
\[3l + 3k \geq n + 5 + \sum_{v \in O(T)} (d(v) - 2) + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{k} d_i - 2k. \tag{10}\]

Since none of $a_i$ or $b_i$ is a leaf, it follows that $d_i = d(a_i) + d(b_i) - 2 \geq 2$. Hence we have $2 \sum_{i=1}^{k} d_i - 2k \geq 2k \geq 0$. In particular, (10) implies that
\[n + 7 - 3k - 3l + \sum_{v \in O(T)} (d(v) - 2) \leq 2,
\]
and thus we must have $S(T) \leq \left\lfloor \frac{2}{5} \right\rfloor = 0$. Hence the claim follows trivially as we always have $\alpha(T, C, L) \geq 0$. Since we always have $\sum_{v \in O(T)} (d(v) - 2) \geq 0$, the second part follows immediately. This completes the proof of Lemma 4.

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.

\textit{Proof of Theorem 1.} Let $T$ be a tree with $n \geq 3$ vertices. Suppose that during the first phase of the game Isolator follows the strategy specified in Lemma 3, and let $r$ be the number of edges claimed by her during the first phase of the game. Let $T'$, $C'$ and $X' = L'$ be given as in Lemma 3. Since $|I| = r$, it follows that $\alpha(T) \geq r + \alpha(T', C', L')$. Since the second phase is equivalent to the delayed game $F(T', C', L')$, Lemma 5 implies that
\[\alpha(T', C', L') \geq \left\lfloor \frac{|T'| - 3|C'| - 3|L'| + 7}{5} \right\rfloor.
\]
Since Lemma 3 guarantees that
\[|T'| - 3|C'| - 3|L'| \geq n - 5r - 4,
\]
it follows that
\[\alpha(T) \geq r + \left\lfloor \frac{n - 5r - 4 + 7}{5} \right\rfloor = \left\lfloor \frac{n + 3}{5} \right\rfloor,
\]
which completes the proof of Theorem 1.

23
There are many questions that are open concerning the value of $u(G)$ for general $G$. Dowden, Kang, Mikalački and Stojaković [4] gave bounds for $u(G)$ that depend on the degree sequence of the graph $G$. In particular, they concluded that if the minimum degree of $G$ is at least 4 then $u(G) = 0$. They also proved that there exists a 3-regular graph with $u(G) > 0$, and they proved that for all 3-regular graphs we have $u(G) \leq \frac{2}{5}$. It would be interesting to know what is the largest possible proportion of untouched vertices in a connected 3-regular graph.
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