

# Hamiltonicity of edge-chromatic critical graphs

Yan Cao<sup>a</sup>, Guantao Chen<sup>a</sup>, Suyun Jiang<sup>b\*</sup>, Huiqing Liu<sup>c\*</sup>, Fuliang Lu<sup>d\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA 30303

<sup>b</sup> School of Mathematics, Shandong University, Jinan, Shandong 250100

<sup>c</sup> Hubei Key Laboratory of Applied Mathematics, Faculty of Mathematics and Statistic, Hubei University, Wuhan, Hubei 430062

<sup>d</sup> School of Mathematics and Statistics, Linyi University, Linyi, Shandong 276000

## Abstract

Given a graph  $G$ , denote by  $\Delta$  and  $\chi'$  the maximum degree and the chromatic index of  $G$ , respectively. A simple graph  $G$  is called *edge- $\Delta$ -critical* if  $\chi'(G) = \Delta + 1$  and  $\chi'(H) \leq \Delta$  for every proper subgraph  $H$  of  $G$ . We proved that every edge chromatic critical graph of order  $n$  with maximum degree at least  $\frac{2n}{3} + 12$  is Hamiltonian.

*Keywords:* edge- $k$ -coloring; edge-critical graphs; Hamiltonicity

## 1 Introduction

All graphs in this paper are simple graphs, that is, graphs with finite number of vertices without loops or parallel edges. Let  $G$  be a graph with maximum degree  $\Delta$  and minimum degree  $\delta(G)$ . Denote by  $V(G)$  and  $E(G)$  the vertex-set and edge-set of a graph  $G$ , respectively. An edge- $k$ -coloring of a graph  $G$  is a mapping  $\varphi : E(G) \rightarrow \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$  such that  $\varphi(e) \neq \varphi(f)$  for any two adjacent edges  $e$  and  $f$ . The codomain  $\{1, 2, \dots, k\}$  is called the color set of  $\varphi$ . Denote by  $\mathcal{C}^k(G)$  the set of all edge- $k$ -colorings of  $G$ . The chromatic index  $\chi'(G)$  is the least integer  $k \geq 0$  such that  $\mathcal{C}^k(G) \neq \emptyset$ . We call  $G$  *class I* if  $\chi'(G) = \Delta$ . Otherwise, Vizing [13] gives  $\chi'(G) = \Delta + 1$  and  $G$  is said to be of *class II*. An edge  $e$  is called *critical* if  $\chi'(G - e) < \chi'(G)$ , where  $G - e$  is the subgraph obtained from  $G$  by removing the edge  $e$ . A graph  $G$  is called *edge- $\Delta$ -critical* if  $\chi'(G) = \Delta + 1$  and  $\chi'(H) \leq \Delta$  holds for any proper subgraph  $H$  of  $G$ . Clearly, if  $G$  is edge- $\Delta$ -critical, then  $G$  is connected and  $\chi'(G - e) = \Delta$  for any  $e \in E(G)$ .

---

\*Partially supported by NSFC of China (Nos. 11671232, 11571096, 61373019, 11671186).

In 1965, Vizing [14] proposed the following conjecture about the structure of edge- $\Delta$ -critical graphs.

**Conjecture 1.** [Vizing [14]]. *Every edge- $\Delta$ -critical graph with chromatic index at least 3 contains a 2-factor.*

In 1968, Vizing [15] proposed a weaker conjecture on the independence number of edge- $\Delta$ -critical graphs as follows.

**Conjecture 2.** [Vizing [15]]. *For every edge- $\Delta$ -critical graph of order  $n$ ,  $\alpha(G) \leq \frac{n}{2}$ .*

Vizing's independence number conjecture was verified by Luo and Zhao [9] for edge- $\Delta$ -critical graphs of order  $n$  with  $\Delta \geq \frac{n}{2}$ , and by Grünewald and Steffen [6] for edge- $\Delta$ -critical graphs with many edges, including all overfull graphs.

Chen and Shan [5] verified Vizing's 2-factor conjecture for edge- $\Delta$ -critical graphs of order  $n$  with  $\Delta \geq \frac{n}{2}$ . Obviously, if a graph is Hamiltonian, then it contains a 2-factor. Luo and Zhao [10] proved that an edge- $\Delta$ -critical graph  $G$  of order  $n$  with  $\Delta \geq \frac{6n}{7}$  is Hamiltonian. Furthermore, Luo, Miao and Zhao [8] showed that an edge- $\Delta$ -critical graph  $G$  of order  $n$  with  $\Delta \geq \frac{4n}{5}$  is Hamiltonian. Recently, Chen, Chen and Zhao [3] showed that an edge- $\Delta$ -critical graph  $G$  of order  $n$  with  $\Delta \geq \frac{3n}{4}$  is Hamiltonian.

In this paper, we give the following result about the hamiltonicity of  $\Delta$ -critical graphs.

**Theorem 1.** *If  $G$  is an edge- $\Delta$ -critical graph of order  $n$  with  $\Delta \geq \frac{2n}{3} + 12$ , then  $G$  is Hamiltonian.*

It would be nice to know the minimum number  $\alpha$  ( $0 < \alpha < 1$ ) such that every edge- $\Delta$ -critical graph of order  $n$  with  $\Delta \geq \alpha n$  is Hamiltonian. Our main techniques applied to prove Theorem 1 are the following: (1) extending Woodall's Lemma ( $q = 2\Delta - d(x) - d(y) + 2$ , see Lemma 3) to an arbitrary  $q$  with  $q \leq \Delta - 10$  (see Lemma 4); (2) extending Woodall's Lemma (consider the neighbor of a vertex  $x$ , see Lemma 3) to Lemma 5 (consider the neighbor of two adjacent vertices).

We will give a few technic lemmas in Section 2 and give the proof of Theorem 1 in Section 3. Due to the length of the proofs of Lemmas 4 and 5, we will prove Lemmas 4 and 5 in Section 4. Let  $G$  be a graph and  $x$  be a vertex of  $G$ . Denote by  $N(x)$  and  $d(x)$  the neighborhood and degree of  $x$ , respectively. For any nonnegative integer  $k$ , we call a vertex  $x$  a  $k$ -vertex if  $d(x) = k$ , a ( $< k$ )-vertex if  $d(x) < k$ , and ( $> k$ )-vertex if  $d(x) > k$ . Correspondingly, we call a neighbor  $y$  of  $x$  a  $k$ -neighbor if  $d(y) = k$ , etc.. Denote by  $V_{\geq k}(G)$  the subset of  $V(G)$  of vertices with degree greater than or equal to  $k$ . Let  $k$  be a positive integer such that  $\mathcal{C}^k(G - e) \neq \emptyset$ ,  $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}^k(G - e)$  and  $v \in V(G)$ . Let

$\varphi(v) = \{\varphi(e) : e \text{ is incident with } v\}$  and  $\bar{\varphi}(v) = \{1, \dots, k\} \setminus \varphi(v)$ . We call  $\varphi(v)$  the set of colors seen by  $v$  and  $\bar{\varphi}(v)$  the set of colors missing at  $v$ . A set  $X \subseteq V(G)$  is called *elementary* with respect to  $\varphi$  if  $\bar{\varphi}(u) \cap \bar{\varphi}(v) = \emptyset$  for every two distinct vertices  $u, v \in X$ . For any color  $\alpha$ , let  $E_\alpha$  denote the set of edges assigned color  $\alpha$ . Clearly,  $E_\alpha$  is a matching of  $G$ . For any two colors  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , the components of induced by edges in  $E_\alpha \cup E_\beta$ , named  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -chains, are even cycles and paths with alternating color  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ . For a vertex  $v$  of  $G$ , we denote by  $P_v(\alpha, \beta, \varphi)$  the unique  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -chain that contains the vertex  $v$ . Let  $\varphi/P_v(\alpha, \beta, \varphi)$  denote the edge- $k$ -coloring obtain from  $\varphi$  by switching colors  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  on the edges on  $P_v(\alpha, \beta, \varphi)$ .

## 2 Lemmas

Let  $q$  be a positive number,  $G$  be an edge- $\Delta$ -critical graph and  $x \in V(G)$ . For each  $y \in N(x)$ , let  $\sigma_q(x, y) = |\{z \in N(y) \setminus \{x\} : d(z) \geq q\}|$ , the number of neighbors of  $y$  (except  $x$ ) with degree at least  $q$ . Vizing studied the case  $q = \Delta$  and obtained the following result.

**Lemma 1.** [Vizing's Adjacency Lemma [14]] *Let  $G$  be an edge- $\Delta$ -critical graph. Then  $\sigma_\Delta(x, y) \geq \Delta - d(x) + 1$  holds for every  $xy \in E(G)$ .*

Woodall [16] studied  $\sigma_q(x, y)$  for the case  $q = 2\Delta - d(x) - d(y) + 2$  and obtained the following two results. For convention, we let  $\sigma(x, y) = \sigma_q(x, y)$  when  $q = 2\Delta - d(x) - d(y) + 2$ .

**Lemma 2.** [Woodall [16]] *Let  $xy$  be an edge in an edge- $\Delta$ -critical graph  $G$ . Then there are at least  $\Delta - \sigma(x, y) \geq \Delta - d(y) + 1$  vertices  $z \in N(x) \setminus \{y\}$  such that  $\sigma(x, z) \geq 2\Delta - d(x) - \sigma(x, y)$ .*

Furthermore, Woodall defined the following two parameters.

$$p_{min}(x) := \min_{y \in N(x)} \sigma(x, y) - \Delta + d(x) - 1 \quad \text{and}$$

$$p(x) := \min \left\{ p_{min}(x), \left\lfloor \frac{d(x)}{2} \right\rfloor - 1 \right\}.$$

Clearly,  $p(x) < d(x)/2 - 1$ . As a corollary, the following lemma shows that there are about  $d(x)/2$  neighbors  $y$  of  $x$  such that  $\sigma(x, y)$  is at least  $\Delta/2$ .

**Lemma 3.** [Woodall [16]] *Every vertex  $x$  in an edge- $\Delta$ -critical graph has at least  $d(x) - p(x) - 1$  neighbors  $y$  for which  $\sigma(x, y) \geq \Delta - p(x) - 1$ .*

In our proof, we only need one neighbor  $y$  of  $x$  such that  $\sigma_q(x, y)$  is large. By allowing  $q$  to take various values, roughly speaking, we can count the number of edges more flexibility. The only drawback is that the lower bound  $\sigma_q(x, y)$  in Lemmas 4 and 5 are smaller, but not too much. It is much clearly in Lemmas 4 and 5.

**Lemma 4.** *Let  $xy$  be an edge in an edge- $\Delta$ -critical graph  $G$  and  $q$  a positive number. If  $d(x) < \frac{\Delta}{2}$  and  $q \leq \Delta - 10$ , then there exists a vertex  $z \in N(x) \setminus \{y\}$  such that*

$$\sigma_q(x, y) + \sigma_q(x, z) > 2\Delta - d(x) - \frac{6d(x)-8}{\Delta-q} - \frac{8(d(x)-2)}{(\Delta-q)^2}.$$

**Lemma 5.** *Let  $x_1x_2$  be an edge in an edge- $\Delta$ -critical graph  $G$  and  $q$  a positive number. If  $d(x_1) + d(x_2) < \frac{3}{2}\Delta$ ,  $q \leq \Delta - 10$  and  $\delta(G) \geq \frac{\Delta}{2}$ , then there exists a pair of vertices  $\{z, y\}$  with  $z \in N(x_1) \setminus \{x_2\}$  and  $y \in N(x_2) \setminus \{x_1, z\}$  such that  $\sigma_q(x_1, z) + \sigma_q(x_2, y) > 3\Delta - d(x_1) - d(x_2) - \frac{6(d(x_1)+d(x_2)-\Delta)-4}{\Delta-q} - \frac{8(d(x_1)+d(x_2)-\Delta-2)}{(\Delta-q)^2}$ .*

Our approaches are inspired by the recent development of Tashkinov tree technique for multigraphs. Let  $G$  be a multigraphs without loops,  $e_1 = y_0y_1 \in E(G)$  and  $\varphi \in C^k(G - e_1)$ . A Tashkinov tree  $T$  with respect to  $G, e, \varphi$  is an alternating sequence  $T = (y_0, e_1, y_1, \dots, e_p, y_p)$  with  $p \geq 1$  consisting of edges  $e_1, e_2, \dots, e_p$  and vertices  $y_0, y_1, \dots, y_p$  such that the following two conditions hold.

- The edges  $e_1, e_2, \dots, e_p$  are distinct and  $e_i = y_r y_i$  for each  $1 \leq i \leq p$ , where  $r < i$ ;
- For every edge  $e_i$  with  $2 \leq i \leq p$ , there is a vertex  $y_h$  with  $0 \leq h < i$  such that  $\varphi(e_i) \in \bar{\varphi}(y_h)$ .

Clearly, a Tashkinov tree is indeed a tree of  $G$ . Tashkinov [12] proved that if  $G$  is edge- $k$ -critical with  $k \geq \Delta + 1$ , then  $V(T)$  is elementary. In the above definition, if  $e_i = y_0 y_i$  for every  $i$ , i.e.,  $T$  is a star with  $y_0$  as the center, then  $T$  is a Vizing fan. The classic result of Vizing [11] show that for every Vizing fan  $T$  the set  $V(T)$  is elementary if  $G$  is edge- $k$ -critical for every  $k \geq \Delta$ , which includes edge- $\Delta$ -critical graphs. In the definition of Tashkinov tree, if  $e_i = y_{i-1} y_i$  for every  $i$ , i.e.,  $T$  is a path with end-vertices  $y_0$  and  $y_p$ , then  $T$  is a Kierstead path, which was introduced by Kierstead [7]. Kierstead proved that for every Kierstead path  $P$  the set  $V(P)$  is elementary if  $G$  is an edge- $k$ -critical with  $k \geq \Delta + 1$ . For simple graphs, following Kierstead's proof, Zhang [17] noticed the following Lemma.

**Lemma 6.** [Kierstead [7], Zhang [17]] *Let  $G$  be a graph with maximum degree  $\Delta$  and  $\chi'(G) = \Delta + 1$ . Let  $e_1 \in E(G)$  be a critical edge. If  $K = (y_0, e_1, y_1, \dots, y_{p-1}, e_p, y_p)$  is a*

*Kierstead path with respect to  $e_1$  and a coloring  $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}^\Delta(G - e_1)$  such that  $d(y_j) < \Delta$  for  $j = 2, \dots, p$ , then  $V(K)$  is elementary with respect to  $\varphi$ .*

Kostochka and Stiebitz considered elementary property of Kierstead paths with four vertices and showed the following Lemma.

**Lemma 7.** [Kostochka, Stiebitz [11]] *Let  $G$  be a graph with maximum degree  $\Delta$  and  $\chi'(G) = \Delta + 1$ . Let  $e_1 \in E(G)$  be a critical edge and  $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}^\Delta(G - e_1)$ . If  $K = (y_0, e_1, y_1, e_2, y_2, e_3, y_3)$  is a Kierstead path with respect to  $e_1$  and  $\varphi$ , then the following statements hold:*

1.  $\bar{\varphi}(y_0) \cap \bar{\varphi}(y_1) = \emptyset$ ;
2. if  $d(y_2) < \Delta$ , then  $V(K)$  is elementary with respect to  $\varphi$ ;
3. if  $d(y_1) < \Delta$ , then  $V(K)$  is elementary with respect to  $\varphi$ ;
4. if  $\Gamma = \bar{\varphi}(y_0) \cup \bar{\varphi}(y_1)$ , then  $|\bar{\varphi}(y_3) \cap \Gamma| \leq 1$ .

In the definition of Tashkinov tree  $T = (y_0, e_1, y_1, e_2, y_2, \dots, y_p)$ . We call  $T$  a *broom* if  $e_2 = y_1y_2$  and for each  $i \geq 3$ ,  $e_i = y_2y_i$ , i.e.,  $y_2$  is one of the end-vertices of  $e_i$  for each  $i \geq 3$ . Moreover, we call a broom  $T$  is a simple broom if  $\varphi(e_i) \in \bar{\varphi}(y_0) \cup \bar{\varphi}(y_1)$  for each  $i \geq 3$ , i.e.,  $(y_0, e_1, y_1, e_2, y_2, e_i, y_i)$  is a Kierstead path. Chen, Chen and Zhao considered the elementary property of simple brooms and gave the following Lemma.

**Lemma 8.** [Chen, Chen, Zhao [3]] *Let  $G$  be an edge- $\Delta$ -critical graph,  $e_1 = y_0y_1 \in E(G)$  and  $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}^\Delta(G - e_1)$  and  $B = \{y_0, e_1, y_1, e_2, y_2, \dots, e_p, y_p\}$  be a simple broom. If  $|\bar{\varphi}(y_0) \cup \bar{\varphi}(y_1)| \geq 4$  and  $\min\{d(y_1), d(y_2)\} < \Delta$ , then  $V(B)$  is elementary with respect to  $\varphi$ .*

Brandt and Veldman gave the following result about the circumference of a graph.

**Lemma 9.** [Brandt, Veldman [2]]. *Let  $G \neq K_{1, n-1}$  be a graph of order  $n$ . If  $d(x) + d(y) \geq n$  for any edge  $xy$  of  $G$ , then the circumference of  $G$  is  $n - \max\{|S| - |N(S)| + 1, 0\}$ , where  $S$  is an independent set of  $G$  with  $S \cup N(S) \neq V(G)$ .*

Using Lemma 9, Chen, Chen and Zhao showed the following Lemma.

**Lemma 10.** [Chen, Chen, Zhao [3]]. *Let  $G$  be an edge- $\Delta$ -critical graph of order  $n$ . If  $d(x) + d(y) \geq n$  for any edge  $xy$  of  $G$ , then  $G$  is Hamiltonian.*

The Bondy-Chvátal closure  $C(G)$  of a graph  $G$  with order  $n$  defined by Bondy and Chvátal [1] is the maximal graph obtained from  $G$  by consecutively adding the edges  $xy$  if the degree sum of  $x$  and  $y$  is at least  $n$ . They proved that  $C(G)$  is well-defined and  $C(G)$  is Hamiltonian if and only if  $G$  is Hamiltonian. Brandt and Veldman gave the following result about the circumference of a graph  $G$  and its closure  $C(G)$ .

**Lemma 11.** [Brandt, Veldman [2]]. *A graph  $G$  has the same circumference as its closure  $C(G)$ .*

**Lemma 12.** [Chen, Ellingham, Saito, Song [4]]. *Let  $G$  be a bipartite graph with partite sets  $X$  and  $Y$ . If for every  $S \subseteq X$ ,  $|N_G(S)| \geq \frac{3}{2}|S|$ , then  $G$  has a subgraph  $H$  covering  $X$  such that for every  $x \in X$ ,  $d_H(x) = 2$  and for every  $y \in Y$ ,  $d_H(y) \leq 2$ .*

**Lemma 13.** [Luo, Zhao [10]]. *An edge- $\Delta$ -critical graph with at most 10 vertices is Hamiltonian.*

### 3 Proof of Theorem 1

By Lemma 13, we can assume that  $n \geq 11$  and thus  $\Delta \geq 20$ . Suppose, on the contrary, there exists a non-Hamiltonian  $\Delta$ -critical graph  $G$  of order  $n$  with  $\Delta \geq \frac{2}{3}n + 12$ . If  $d(x) + d(y) \geq n$  for any edge  $xy \in E(G)$ , then by Lemma 10,  $G$  is Hamiltonian, a contradiction with the assumption. So there exists an edge of  $G$  with degree sum less than or equal to  $n - 1$ . We will show  $\delta(G) \geq \frac{\Delta}{2}$  with a sequence of claims.

**Claim 3.1.** *If  $\delta(G) < \frac{\Delta}{2}$ , then the followings hold:*

- a.  $|V_{\geq \Delta-18}(G)| \geq \frac{107}{162}\Delta$ ;
- b.  $|V_{\geq \Delta-18}(G)| \geq \frac{n}{2}$  provided  $\Delta \leq 100$ ;
- c.  $|V_{\geq (1-\frac{13}{81})\Delta}(G)| \geq \frac{n}{2}$  provided  $\Delta \geq 101$ .

*Proof.* Let  $x \in V(G)$  with  $d(x) = \delta(G)$ , and let  $q$  be a positive number with  $q \leq \Delta - 10$ . By Lemma 4, there exists a vertex  $y \in N(x)$  such that

$$\sigma_q(x, y) > \Delta - \frac{d(x)}{2} - \frac{3d(x) - 4}{\Delta - q} - \frac{4(d(x) - 2)}{(\Delta - q)^2}. \quad (1)$$

Plugging  $d(x) \leq \frac{\Delta-1}{2}$  and  $q = \Delta - 18$ , we get **a** by the following inequalities.

$$|V_{\geq \Delta-18}(G)| \geq \sigma_{\Delta-18}(x, y) > \frac{3\Delta + 1}{4} - \frac{3\Delta - 11}{36} - \frac{2\Delta - 10}{18^2} > \frac{107}{162}\Delta$$

When  $\Delta \leq 100$ , we have  $\frac{107}{162}\Delta > \frac{3}{4}(\Delta - 12) \geq \frac{n}{2}$  since  $\Delta \geq \frac{2}{3}n + 12$ . Thus **b** holds.

Suppose  $\Delta \geq 101$ . Let  $q = (1 - \frac{13}{81})\Delta$ . In this case  $q < \Delta - 10$ . By (1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|V_{\geq(1-\frac{13}{81})\Delta}(G)| &\geq \sigma_{(1-\frac{13}{81})\Delta}(x, y) \\
&> \frac{3\Delta + 1}{4} - \frac{81(3\Delta - 11)}{26\Delta} - 81^2 \frac{2\Delta - 10}{(13\Delta)^2} \\
&\geq \frac{n}{2} + 9 + \frac{1}{4} - \frac{243}{26} + \left(\frac{81 \times 11}{26\Delta} - \frac{81^2 \times 2}{13^2\Delta}\right) + \frac{81^2 \times 10}{13^2\Delta^2} \\
&> \frac{n}{2} - 0.0962 - \frac{43.376}{\Delta} + \frac{388.22}{\Delta^2} > \frac{n}{2} - 0.48761.
\end{aligned}$$

Since  $|V_{\geq(1-\frac{13}{81})\Delta}(G)|$  is an integer, we have  $|V_{\geq(1-\frac{13}{81})\Delta}(G)| \geq \frac{n}{2}$ . So we have **c**.  $\square$

**Claim 3.2.** *If  $\delta(G) \geq \frac{\Delta}{2}$ , then the followings hold:*

- a.  $|V_{\geq\Delta-18}(G)| \geq \frac{107}{162}\Delta$ ;
- b.  $|V_{\geq\Delta-18}(G)| \geq \frac{n}{2}$  provided  $\Delta \leq 100$ ;
- c.  $|V_{\geq(1-\frac{13}{81})\Delta}(G)| \geq \frac{n}{2}$  provided  $\Delta \geq 101$ .

*Proof.* Note that there exists an edge of  $G$  with degree sum less than or equal to  $n - 1$ . Let  $xy \in E(G)$  such that  $d(x) + d(y) \leq n - 1 < \frac{3}{2}\Delta$ . For any  $q \leq \Delta - 10$ , applying Lemma 5, there exists a pair of adjacent vertices  $\{u, v\}$ , where  $u \in \{x, y\}$  and  $v \notin \{x, y\}$ , such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_q(u, v) &> \frac{3\Delta - d(x) - d(y)}{2} - \frac{3(d(x) + d(y) - \Delta) - 2}{\Delta - q} - \frac{4(d(x) + d(y) - \Delta - 2)}{(\Delta - q)^2} \\
&> \frac{3\Delta - n + 1}{2} - \frac{3(n - \Delta) - 5}{\Delta - q} - \frac{4(n - \Delta - 3)}{(\Delta - q)^2}. \tag{2}
\end{aligned}$$

Plugging  $q = \Delta - 18$  and  $n \leq \frac{3}{2}(\Delta - 12)$  in (2), we get **a** by the following inequalities.

$$|V_{\geq\Delta-18}(G)| \geq \sigma_{\Delta-18}(u, v) > \frac{3\Delta + 38}{4} - \frac{3\Delta - 118}{36} - \frac{2\Delta - 84}{18^2} > \frac{107}{162}\Delta.$$

When  $\Delta \leq 100$ , we have  $\frac{107}{162}\Delta > \frac{3}{4}(\Delta - 12) \geq \frac{n}{2}$  since  $\Delta \geq \frac{2}{3}n + 12$ . Thus **b** holds.

Suppose  $\Delta \geq 101$ . Let  $q = (1 - \frac{13}{81})\Delta$ . In this case  $q < \Delta - 10$ . By (2), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|V_{\geq(1-\frac{13}{81})\Delta}(G)| \geq \sigma_{(1-\frac{13}{81})\Delta}(x, y) &> \frac{3\Delta + 38}{4} - 81 \frac{3\Delta - 118}{26\Delta} - 81^2 \frac{2\Delta - 84}{(13\Delta)^2} \\
&> \frac{n}{2} + 9 + \frac{38}{4} - \frac{243}{26} + \frac{49005}{13^2\Delta} + \frac{81^2 \times 84}{(13\Delta)^2} > \frac{n}{2}.
\end{aligned}$$

So we have **c**. □

Recall that  $C(G)$  is the closure obtained from  $G$  by consecutively adding edges between vertices whose degree sum greater than or equal to  $n$ . We have the following claim.

**Claim 3.3.** *In  $C(G)$ ,  $V_{\geq \frac{\Delta}{2}}(G)$  is a clique.*

*Proof.* Let  $u \in V(G)$  with  $d(u) \geq \frac{\Delta}{2}$ . For any vertex  $v \in V_{\geq \Delta-18}(G)$ , we have  $d(u)+d(v) \geq \frac{3\Delta}{2} - 18 \geq n$ , thus  $uv \in E(C(G))$ . It follows that  $d_{C(G)}(u) \geq |V_{\geq \Delta-18}(G)|$ . By Claims 3.1 and 3.2, we have  $d_{C(G)}(u) \geq \frac{107}{162}\Delta$ . If  $\Delta \leq 100$ , then  $d_{C(G)}(u) \geq \frac{n}{2}$ , thus  $V_{\geq \frac{\Delta}{2}}(G)$  is a clique of  $C(G)$ . Now we assume  $\Delta \geq 101$ . For any vertex  $w \in V_{\geq (1-\frac{13}{81})\Delta}(G)$ , we have

$$d_{C(G)}(u) + d_{C(G)}(w) \geq d_{C(G)}(u) + d(w) \geq \frac{107}{162}\Delta + (1 - \frac{13}{81})\Delta = \frac{3}{2}\Delta > n,$$

which implies that  $uw \in E(C(G))$  for any vertex  $w \in V_{\geq (1-\frac{13}{81})\Delta}(G)$ . Thus  $d_{C(G)}(u) \geq |V_{\geq (1-\frac{13}{81})\Delta}(G)|$ . By Claims 3.1.c and 3.2.c, we have  $d_{C(G)}(u) \geq \frac{n}{2}$ . Hence,  $V_{\geq \frac{\Delta}{2}}(G)$  is a clique of  $C(G)$ . □

**Claim 3.4.** *If  $\delta(G) < \frac{\Delta}{2}$ , then  $|N(X)| \geq 2|X|$  for any  $X \subseteq V_{< \frac{\Delta}{2}}(G)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $X$  be a subset of  $V_{< \frac{\Delta}{2}}(G)$ . Since  $G$  is edge- $\Delta$ -critical, each edge of  $G$  has degree sum greater than  $\Delta + 2$ . Thus  $X$  is an independent set of  $G$ , so  $X \cap N(X) = \emptyset$ . Let  $H$  be the bipartite graph induced by the edges with one end-vertex in  $X$  and the other in  $N(X)$ . Recall that  $p_{min}(x) := \min_{y \in N(x)} \sigma(x, y) - \Delta + d(x) - 1$  and  $p(x) := \min\{p_{min}(x), \lfloor \frac{d(x)}{2} \rfloor - 1\}$ . For each  $x \in X$ , let  $N_1(x) = \{y \in N(x) : \sigma(x, y) \geq \Delta - p(x) - 1\}$  and  $N_2(x) = N(x) \setminus N_1(x)$ .

For each  $x \in X$  and  $y \in N(x)$ . By Lemma 3,  $x$  has at least  $d(x) - p(x) - 1$  neighbors  $y$  for which  $\sigma(x, y) \geq \Delta - p(x) - 1$ . Thus  $|N_1(x)| \geq d(x) - p(x) - 1$ . Since  $2\Delta - d(x) - d(y) + 2 > \frac{\Delta}{2}$ , we have  $\sigma(x, y) \leq \sigma_{\frac{\Delta}{2}}(x, y)$ . Thus for each  $y \in N_1(x)$  we have

$$d_H(y) \leq d(y) - \sigma(x, y) \leq d(y) - (\Delta - p(x) - 1) \leq p(x) + 1,$$

and for each  $y \in N(x)$  we have

$$d_H(y) \leq d(y) - \sigma(x, y) \leq d(y) - (\Delta - d(x) + p(x) + 1) \leq d(x) - p(x) - 1.$$



For each edge  $xy \in E(H)$  with  $x \in X$  and  $y \in N(X)$ , we define  $M(x, y) = \frac{1}{d_H(y)}$ . Then we have

$$\sum_{xy \in E(H)} M(x, y) = \sum_{y \in N(X)} \sum_{x \in N(y)} \frac{1}{d_H(y)} = \sum_{y \in N(X)} 1 = |N(X)|.$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{xy \in E(H)} M(x, y) &= \sum_{x \in X} \sum_{y \in N(x)} \frac{1}{d_H(y)} = \sum_{x \in X} \left( \sum_{y \in N_1(x)} \frac{1}{d_H(y)} + \sum_{y \in N_2(x)} \frac{1}{d_H(y)} \right) \\ &\geq \sum_{x \in X} \left( \frac{d(x) - p(x) - 1}{p(x) + 1} + \frac{p(x) + 1}{d(x) - p(x) - 1} \right) \geq \sum_{x \in X} 2 = 2|X|. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore  $|N(X)| \geq 2|X|$ . □

**Claim 3.5.**  $\delta(G) \geq \frac{\Delta}{2}$ .

*Proof.* Suppose, on the contrary,  $\delta(G) < \frac{\Delta}{2}$ . By Claim 3.4, we have  $|N(X)| \geq 2|X|$  for any  $X \subseteq V_{< \frac{\Delta}{2}}(G)$ . Thus by Lemma 12,  $G$  has a subgraph  $H$  covering  $V_{< \frac{\Delta}{2}}(G)$  such that for every  $x \in V_{< \frac{\Delta}{2}}(G)$ ,  $d_H(x) = 2$  and for every  $y \in V_{\geq \frac{\Delta}{2}}(G)$ ,  $d_H(y) \leq 2$ . That is, there exist some vertex-disjoint paths  $P_1, \dots, P_s$  covering  $V_{< \frac{\Delta}{2}}(G)$  such that the end-vertices of  $P_i$  belong to  $V_{\geq \frac{\Delta}{2}}(G)$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq s$ . Therefore, we can insert each vertex of  $V_{< \frac{\Delta}{2}}$  into the subgraph induced by  $V_{\geq \frac{\Delta}{2}}(G)$ . By Claim 3.3,  $V_{\geq \frac{\Delta}{2}}(G)$  is a clique of  $C(G)$ . Thus  $C(G)$  is Hamiltonian. So by Lemma 11,  $G$  is Hamiltonian, a contradiction. □

Now we complete the proof of our main theorem. By Claims 3.3 and 3.5,  $V(G)$  is a clique of  $C(G)$ . So  $C(G)$  is Hamiltonian, and by Lemma 11,  $G$  is Hamiltonian, giving a contradiction.

## 4 Proofs of Lemmas 4 and 5

### 4.1 Proof of Lemma 4

**Lemma 4.** Let  $xy$  be an edge in an edge- $\Delta$ -critical graph  $G$  and  $q$  a positive number. If  $d(x) < \frac{\Delta}{2}$  and  $q \leq \Delta - 10$ , then there exists a vertex  $z \in N(x) \setminus \{y\}$  such that  $\sigma_q(x, y) + \sigma_q(x, z) > 2\Delta - d(x) - \frac{6d(x)-8}{\Delta-q} - \frac{8(d(x)-2)}{(\Delta-q)^2}$ .

*Proof.* Let graph  $G$ , edge  $xy \in E(G)$  and  $q$  be defined in Lemma 4. A neighbor  $z \in N(x) \setminus \{y\}$  is called *feasible* if there exists a coloring  $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}^\Delta(G - xy)$  such that  $\varphi(xz) \in \bar{\varphi}(y)$ , and such a coloring  $\varphi$  is called a  *$z$ -feasible coloring*. Denote by  $\mathcal{C}_z$  the set of all  $z$ -feasible colorings. For each  $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_z$ , let

$$\begin{aligned} Z(\varphi) &= \{v \in N(z) \setminus \{x\} : \varphi(vz) \in \bar{\varphi}(x) \cup \bar{\varphi}(y)\}, \\ C_z(\varphi) &= \{\varphi(vz) : v \in Z(\varphi) \text{ and } d(v) < q\}, \\ Y(\varphi) &= \{v \in N(y) \setminus \{x\} : \varphi(vy) \in \bar{\varphi}(x) \cup \bar{\varphi}(z)\}, \text{ and} \\ C_y(\varphi) &= \{\varphi(vy) : v \in Y(\varphi) \text{ and } d(v) < q\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $Z(\varphi)$  and  $Y(\varphi)$  are vertex sets while  $C_z(\varphi)$  and  $C_y(\varphi)$  are color sets. For each color  $k \in \varphi(z)$ , let  $z_k$  be the unique vertex in  $N(z)$  such that  $\varphi(zz_k) = k$ . Similarly, we define  $y_k$  for each  $k \in \varphi(y)$ . Let  $T_0(\varphi) = \{k \in \varphi(x) \cap \varphi(y) \cap \varphi(z) : d(y_k) < q \text{ and } d(z_k) < q\}$ .

Since  $G$  is edge- $\Delta$ -critical,  $\{x, y, z\}$  is elementary with respect to  $\varphi$ . So  $\bar{\varphi}(x)$ ,  $\bar{\varphi}(y)$ ,  $\bar{\varphi}(z)$  and  $\varphi(x) \cap \varphi(y) \cap \varphi(z)$  are mutually exclusive, and

$$\bar{\varphi}(x) \cup \bar{\varphi}(y) \cup \bar{\varphi}(z) \cup (\varphi(x) \cap \varphi(y) \cap \varphi(z)) = \{1, 2, \dots, \Delta\}.$$

Recall that  $\sigma_q(x, y)$  and  $\sigma_q(x, z)$  are number of vertices with degree  $\geq q$  in  $N(y) \setminus \{x\}$  and  $N(z) \setminus \{x\}$ , respectively. So, the following inequalities hold.

$$\begin{aligned} &\sigma_q(x, y) + \sigma_q(x, z) \\ &\geq |Y(\varphi)| - |C_y(\varphi)| + |Z(\varphi)| - |C_z(\varphi)| + |\varphi(x) \cap \varphi(y) \cap \varphi(z)| - |T_0(\varphi)| \\ &= |\bar{\varphi}(x) \cup \bar{\varphi}(z)| + |\bar{\varphi}(x) \cup \bar{\varphi}(y)| - 1 + |\varphi(x) \cap \varphi(y) \cap \varphi(z)| \\ &\quad - |C_y(\varphi)| - |C_z(\varphi)| - |T_0(\varphi)| \\ &= \Delta + |\bar{\varphi}(x)| - |C_y(\varphi)| - |C_z(\varphi)| - |T_0(\varphi)| - 1 \\ &= 2\Delta - d(x) - |C_y(\varphi)| - |C_z(\varphi)| - |T_0(\varphi)| \end{aligned}$$

So, Lemma 4 follows the two statements below.

- I. For any  $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_z$ ,  $|C_z(\varphi)| < \frac{d(x)-2}{\Delta-q}$  and  $|C_y(\varphi)| < \frac{d(x)-2}{\Delta-q}$ ;
- II. there exists a  $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_z$  such that  $|T_0(\varphi)| \leq \frac{4d(x)-4}{\Delta-q} + \frac{8(d(x)-2)}{(\Delta-q)^2}$ .

For every  $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_z$ , let  $\varphi^d \in \mathcal{C}^\Delta(G - xz)$  obtained from  $\varphi$  by assigning  $\varphi^d(xy) = \varphi(xz)$  and keeping all colors on other edges unchange. Clearly,  $\varphi^d$  is a  $y$ -feasible coloring and

$Z(\varphi^d) = Z(\varphi)$ ,  $Y(\varphi^d) = Y(\varphi)$ ,  $C_z(\varphi^d) = C_z(\varphi)$  and  $C_y(\varphi^d) = C_y(\varphi)$ . We call  $\varphi^d$  the *dual coloring* of  $\varphi$ . Considering dual colorings, we see that some properties for vertex  $z$  is also held for vertex  $y$ .

Let  $z \in N(x) \setminus \{y\}$  be a feasible vertex and  $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_z$ . By the definition of  $Z(\varphi)$ ,  $G[\{x, y, z\} \cup Z(\varphi)]$  contains a simple broom. Since  $d(x) < \frac{\Delta}{2}$  and  $\frac{\Delta}{2} \geq 1$ , we have  $|\bar{\varphi}(x) \cup \bar{\varphi}(y)| \geq 4$ . Thus by Lemma 8 the set  $\{x, y, z\} \cup Z(\varphi)$  is elementary with respect to  $\varphi$ . Counting the number of missing colors of vertices in the set  $\{x, y, z\} \cup Z(\varphi)$ , we obtain  $(\Delta - q)|C_z(\varphi)| + |\bar{\varphi}(x)| + |\bar{\varphi}(y)| + |\bar{\varphi}(z)| < \sum_{v \in \{x, y, z\} \cup Z(\varphi)} |\bar{\varphi}(v)| \leq \Delta$ , which implies that  $|C_z(\varphi)| < \frac{d(x)-2}{\Delta-q}$ . By considering its dual  $\varphi^d$ , we have  $|C_y(\varphi)| = |C_y(\varphi^d)| < \frac{d(x)-2}{\Delta-q}$ . Hence, **I** holds.

The proof of **II** is much more complicated and will be placed in a separated section. A coloring  $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_z$  is called *optimal* if over all feasible colorings the followings hold:

1.  $|C_z(\varphi)| + |C_y(\varphi)|$  is maximum;
2. subject to 1,  $|C_z(\varphi) \cap C_y(\varphi)|$  is minimum.

#### 4.1.1 Proof of II.

Suppose, on the contrary,  $|T_0(\varphi)| > \frac{4d(x)-4}{\Delta-q} + \frac{8(d(x)-2)}{(\Delta-q)^2}$  for every  $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_z$ . Let  $T_0(\varphi) = \{k_1, \dots, k_{|T_0(\varphi)|}\}$  and  $V_{T_0(\varphi)} = \{z_{k_i} \in N(z) : k_i \in T_0(\varphi)\} \cup \{y_{k_i} \in N(y) : k_i \in T_0(\varphi)\}$ . Let  $\varphi$  be an optimal feasible coloring and assume, without loss of generality,  $\varphi(xz) = 1$ . Let  $Z = Z(\varphi)$ ,  $Y = Y(\varphi)$ ,  $C_z = C_z(\varphi)$ ,  $C_y = C_y(\varphi)$  and  $T_0 = T_0(\varphi)$  if the coloring  $\varphi$  is clearly referred. Let  $R = C_z \cup C_y$ .

**Claim A.** For each  $i \in \bar{\varphi}(x) \setminus R$  and  $k \in T_0$ , we have  $P_x(i, k, \varphi)$  contains both  $y$  and  $z$ .

*Proof.* We first show that  $z \in V(P_x(i, k, \varphi))$ . Otherwise,  $P_z(i, k, \varphi)$  is disjoint with  $P_x(i, k, \varphi)$ . Let  $\varphi' = \varphi / P_z(i, k, \varphi)$ . Since  $i, k \neq 1$ ,  $\varphi'$  is also feasible. Since colors in  $R$  are unchanged and  $d(z_k) < q$ , we have  $C_z(\varphi') = C_z \cup \{i\}$  and  $C_y(\varphi') \supseteq C_y$ , giving a contradiction to the maximality of  $|C_y| + |C_z|$ . By considering the dual  $\varphi^d$ , we can verify that  $y \in V(P_x(i, k, \varphi))$ .  $\square$

**Claim B.** If there exist three vertices  $u_1, u_2, u_3 \in V_{T_0}$  and two colors  $\alpha \in \varphi(x) \cup R, \beta \in \bar{\varphi}(x) \setminus R$  such that  $\alpha \in \bar{\varphi}(u_1) \cap \bar{\varphi}(u_2) \cap \bar{\varphi}(u_3)$  and  $\beta \in \varphi(u_1) \cap \varphi(u_2) \cap \varphi(u_3)$ , then there exists a vertex  $u \in \{u_1, u_2, u_3\}$  and an optimal feasible coloring  $\varphi' = \varphi / P_u(\alpha, \beta, \varphi)$  such that  $\beta \in \bar{\varphi}'(u)$ .

*Proof.* We first consider the case of  $\alpha \in \varphi(x) \setminus R$ . Since  $\alpha \in \bar{\varphi}(u_1) \cap \bar{\varphi}(u_2) \cap \bar{\varphi}(u_3)$ , we may assume  $P_x(\alpha, \beta, \varphi)$  is disjoint with  $P_{u_1}(\alpha, \beta, \varphi)$ . Let  $\varphi_1 = \varphi / P_{u_1}(\alpha, \beta, \varphi)$ . We claim

that  $\varphi_1$  is still feasible. It is easy to see that  $\varphi_1$  is feasible when  $\alpha \neq 1$ . Now we suppose  $\alpha = 1$ . In this case,  $P_x(\alpha, \beta, \varphi) = P_y(\alpha, \beta, \varphi)$ . Then  $z \in P_x(\alpha, \beta, \varphi)$  as  $\varphi(xz) = 1$ . Thus  $\varphi_1$  is feasible. Since  $\alpha, \beta \notin R$ , we have  $C_y(\varphi_1) = C_y$  and  $C_z(\varphi_1) = C_z$ . So,  $\varphi_1$  is also optimal and  $\beta \in \bar{\varphi}_1(u_1)$ .

We now suppose  $\alpha \in R$ . By the definition of  $R$ , there exists a vertex  $v \in \{x, y, z\}$  such that  $\alpha \in \bar{\varphi}(v)$ . Clearly,  $P_v(\alpha, \beta, \varphi) = P_x(\alpha, \beta, \varphi)$  when  $v = x$ . We claim that  $P_v(\alpha, \beta, \varphi) = P_x(\alpha, \beta, \varphi)$  when  $v \in \{y, z\}$ . Otherwise, if  $v = y$  then  $\varphi/P_x(\alpha, \beta, \varphi)$  would lead a  $\Delta$ -coloring of  $G$  and if  $v = z$  then  $\varphi^d/P_x(\alpha, \beta, \varphi)$  would lead a  $\Delta$ -coloring of  $G$ , giving a contradiction in either case. Thus  $V(P_x(\alpha, \beta, \varphi)) \cap \{u_1, u_2, u_3\} = \emptyset$ . Let  $w$  be a vertex of  $\{y, z\}$  such that  $\alpha \in C_w$ . We may assume  $P_{u_1}(\alpha, \beta, \varphi)$  is disjoint with  $P_w(\alpha, \beta, \varphi)$ . If  $\alpha \notin C_z \cap C_y$ , then  $\varphi_1 = \varphi/P_{u_1}(\alpha, \beta, \varphi)$  is the required coloring such that  $\beta \in \bar{\varphi}_1(u_1)$ . Now we suppose that  $\alpha \in C_z \cap C_y$ . Thus  $\alpha \in \bar{\varphi}(x)$ . We claim that  $P_z(\alpha, \beta, \varphi) = P_y(\alpha, \beta, \varphi)$ . For otherwise, let  $\varphi_1 = \varphi/P_z(\alpha, \beta, \varphi)$ , we have  $\varphi_1(x) = \varphi(x)$ ,  $C_z(\varphi_1) = (C_z \cup \{\beta\}) \setminus \{\alpha\}$  and  $C_y(\varphi_1) = C_y$ , which implies that  $|C_z(\varphi_1)| + |C_y(\varphi_1)| = |C_z| + |C_y|$  and  $|C_z(\varphi_1) \cap C_y(\varphi_1)| = |C_z \cap C_y| - 1$ , which leads a contradiction to the minimality of  $|C_z \cap C_y|$ . Thus  $\varphi_1 = \varphi/P_{u_1}(\alpha, \beta, \varphi)$  is feasible,  $C_y(\varphi_1) = C_y$  and  $C_z(\varphi_1) = C_z$ . So  $\varphi_1$  is also optimal and  $\beta \in \bar{\varphi}_1(u_1)$ .  $\square$

Recall that we have assumed  $|T_0| \geq \frac{4d(x)-4}{\Delta-q} + \frac{8(d(x)-2)}{(\Delta-q)^2}$ . Let  $T = \{k_1, \dots, k_{|T|}\}$  be a subset of  $T_0$  with  $|T| = \lfloor \frac{4d(x)-4}{\Delta-q} + \frac{8(d(x)-2)}{(\Delta-q)^2} \rfloor + 1$ . Let

$$\begin{aligned} V_T &= \{z_{k_1}, z_{k_2}, \dots, z_{k_{|T|}}\} \cup \{y_{k_1}, y_{k_2}, \dots, y_{k_{|T|}}\}, \\ W(\varphi) &= \{u \in V_T : \bar{\varphi}(u) \subseteq \varphi(x) \cup R\}, \\ M(\varphi) &= V_T - W(\varphi) = \{u \in V_T : \bar{\varphi}(u) \cap (\bar{\varphi}(x) \setminus R) \neq \emptyset\}, \\ E_T &= \{zz_{k_1}, zz_{k_2}, \dots, zz_{k_{|T|}}, yy_{k_1}, yy_{k_2}, \dots, yy_{k_{|T|}}\}, \\ E_W(\varphi) &= \{e \in E_T : e \text{ is incident to a vertex in } W(\varphi)\}, \text{ and} \\ E_M(\varphi) &= E_T - E_W(\varphi) = \{e \in E_T : e \text{ is incident to a vertex in } M(\varphi)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $W = W(\varphi)$ ,  $M = M(\varphi)$ ,  $E_W = E_W(\varphi)$  and  $E_M = E_M(\varphi)$  if the coloring  $\varphi$  is clearly referred.

We assume that  $|E_M|$  is maximum over all optimal feasible colorings  $\varphi$  and all subsets of  $T_0$  with order  $|T|$ . For each  $v \in M$ , pick a color  $\alpha_v \in \bar{\varphi}(v) \cap (\bar{\varphi}(x) \setminus R)$ . Let  $C_M = \{\alpha_v : v \in M\}$ . Clearly,  $|C_M| \leq |M|$ . Note that  $\{z_{k_1}, z_{k_2}, \dots, z_{k_{|T|}}\} \cap \{y_{k_1}, y_{k_2}, \dots, y_{k_{|T|}}\}$  may be not empty, we have  $\frac{|E_W|}{2} \leq |W| \leq |E_W|$  and  $\frac{|E_M|}{2} \leq |M| \leq |E_M|$ .

Since  $|T| = \lfloor \frac{4d(x)-4}{\Delta-q} + \frac{8(d(x)-2)}{(\Delta-q)^2} \rfloor + 1$ , by **I**, we have

$$(\Delta - q) \left\lceil \frac{|T|}{2} \right\rceil \geq 2d(x) - 2 + \frac{4(d(x) - 2)}{\Delta - q} > 2|\varphi(x) \cup R|. \quad (3)$$

Since  $d(x) < \frac{\Delta}{2}$  and  $q \leq \Delta - 10$ , by **I**, we have  $|\bar{\varphi}(x) \setminus R| > \Delta - d(x) + 1 - 2(\frac{d(x)-2}{\Delta-q}) > \frac{2\Delta+7}{5}$ . and  $|T| + \frac{2|\varphi(x) \cup R|}{\Delta-q-1} < \frac{\Delta-2}{5} + \frac{\Delta-4}{25} + \frac{6\Delta-14}{45} + 1 = \frac{84\Delta+29}{225}$ . Since  $\frac{2\Delta+7}{5} > \frac{84\Delta+29}{225}$ , the following inequality holds.

$$|\bar{\varphi}(x) \setminus R| > |T| + \frac{2|\varphi(x) \cup R|}{\Delta - q - 1} \quad (4)$$

**Claim C.** Suppose there is no color  $k \in T$  such that there are three distinct colors  $i, j, l \in \bar{\varphi}(x) \setminus R$  with  $i \in \bar{\varphi}(z_k)$  and  $j, l \in \bar{\varphi}(y_k)$ . Then there exists an optimal feasible coloring such that  $|E_M| \geq |T| + \frac{2|\varphi(x) \cup R|}{\Delta-q-1}$ .

*Proof.* Suppose, on the contrary,  $|E_M| < |T| + \frac{2|\varphi(x) \cup R|}{\Delta-q-1}$ . Since  $|C_M| \leq |E_M|$ , by (4), there exists a color  $\beta \in \bar{\varphi}(x) \setminus (R \cup C_M)$ . Clearly,  $\beta \in \varphi(u)$  for each  $u \in W$ .

First we claim that  $|E_M| \geq |T| + 1$ . If not, then  $|E_M| \leq |T|$  and  $|E_W| \geq |T|$  since  $|E_M| + |E_W| = 2|T|$ . Thus by (3) we have  $\sum_{v \in W} |\bar{\varphi}(v)| > (\Delta - q) \left\lceil \frac{|T|}{2} \right\rceil > 2|\varphi(x) \cup R|$ . By the definition of  $W$ ,  $\bar{\varphi}(v) \subseteq \varphi(x) \cup R$  for every  $v \in W$ , by the Pigeonhole Principle, there exists three vertices  $u_1, u_2, u_3 \in W$  and a color  $\alpha \in \varphi(x) \cup R$  such that  $\alpha \in \bar{\varphi}(u_1) \cap \bar{\varphi}(u_2) \cap \bar{\varphi}(u_3)$ . We note that  $\beta \in \varphi(u_1) \cap \varphi(u_2) \cap \varphi(u_3)$  since  $u_1, u_2, u_3 \in W$ . Applying Claim B with  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , there exists a vertex  $u \in \{u_1, u_2, u_3\}$  and an optimal feasible coloring  $\varphi' = \varphi/P_u(\alpha, \beta, \varphi)$  such that  $\beta \in \bar{\varphi}'(u)$ . Since  $u \in W$  and  $\beta \notin C_M$ , we have  $|E_M(\varphi')| > |E_M|$ , a contradiction to the maximality of  $|E_M|$ .

We may assume that  $|E_M| = |T| + p$ , thus  $|E_W| = |T| - p$ . Since  $|E_M| = |T| + p$ , there exists a  $p$ -element set  $Y_1 = \{y_k : k \in T \text{ and } z_k, y_k \in M\}$ . For each  $y_k \in Y_1$ , by Claim A, we have  $(\bar{\varphi}(x) \setminus R) \cap \bar{\varphi}(y_k) \cap \bar{\varphi}(z_k) = \emptyset$ . Since there do not exist color  $k \in T$  such that there exist  $i, j, l \in \bar{\varphi}(x) \setminus R$  with  $i \in \bar{\varphi}(z_k)$ ,  $j, l \in \bar{\varphi}(y_k)$ , we have  $|(\bar{\varphi}(x) \setminus R) \cap \bar{\varphi}(y_k)| = 1$  for each  $y_k \in Y_1$ . Thus by (3) we have  $\sum_{v \in W \cup Y_1} |\bar{\varphi}(v) \cap (\varphi(x) \cup R)| > (\Delta - q) \left\lceil \frac{|T|-p}{2} \right\rceil + (\Delta - q - 1)p \geq (\Delta - q) \left\lceil \frac{|T|}{2} \right\rceil + (\frac{\Delta-q}{2} - 1)p > 2|\varphi(x) \cup R|$ . Hence there exist three vertices  $u_1, u_2, u_3 \in W \cup Y_1$  and a color  $\alpha \in \varphi(x) \cup R$  such that  $\alpha \in \bar{\varphi}(u_1) \cap \bar{\varphi}(u_2) \cap \bar{\varphi}(u_3)$ . Since  $\beta \notin C_M$  and  $|(\bar{\varphi}(x) \setminus R) \cap \bar{\varphi}(y_k)| = 1$  for each  $y_k \in Y_1$ , we have  $\beta \in \varphi(u_1) \cap \varphi(u_2) \cap \varphi(u_3)$ . Applying Claim B, there exists a vertex  $u \in \{u_1, u_2, u_3\}$  and an optimal feasible coloring  $\varphi' = \varphi/P_u(\alpha, \beta, \varphi)$

such that  $\beta \in \bar{\varphi}'(u)$ . Thus  $u \in M(\varphi')$ . If  $u \in W$ , then  $|E_M(\varphi')| > |E_M|$ , a contradiction. Thus  $u \in Y_1$ . We may assume that  $u = y_{k_a}$ . So there exist three colors  $i, j, \beta \in \bar{\varphi}'(x) \setminus R$  such that  $i \in \bar{\varphi}'(z_{k_a}), j, \beta \in \bar{\varphi}'(y_{k_a})$ , giving a contradiction. Thus Claim C holds.  $\square$

**Claim D.** There exists a color  $k \in T$  and three distinct colors  $i, j, l \in \bar{\varphi}(x) \setminus R$  such that  $i \in \bar{\varphi}(z_k), j, l \in \bar{\varphi}(y_k)$ .

*Proof.* We first note that if there exist  $i, j \in \bar{\varphi}(x) \setminus R$  such that  $i \in \bar{\varphi}(z_k)$  and  $j \in \bar{\varphi}(y_k)$ , then  $i \neq j$ ; for otherwise, by Claim A, the path  $P_x(i, k, \varphi)$  contains three endvertices  $x, z_k$  and  $y_k$ , a contradiction.

Suppose that Claim D does not hold. By Claim C, we have  $|E_M| \geq |T| + \frac{2|\varphi(x) \cup R|}{\Delta - q - 1}$ . So there exists a  $\lceil \frac{2|\varphi(x) \cup R|}{\Delta - q - 1} \rceil$ -element set  $Y_1 = \{y_k : k \in T \text{ and } z_k, y_k \in M\}$  such that  $|\bar{\varphi}(y_k) \cap (\bar{\varphi}(x) \setminus R)| = 1$  for each  $y_k \in Y_1$ . Then we have  $\sum_{v \in Y_1} |\bar{\varphi}(v) \cap (\varphi(x) \cup R)| > (\Delta - q - 1)|Y_1| = 2|\varphi(x) \cup R|$ . Thus there exist three vertices  $u_1, u_2, u_3 \in Y_1$  and a color  $\alpha \in \varphi(x) \cup R$  such that  $\alpha \in \bar{\varphi}(u_1) \cap \bar{\varphi}(u_2) \cap \bar{\varphi}(u_3)$ . For each  $y_k \in Y_1$ , pick a color  $\alpha_{k1} \in \bar{\varphi}(y_k) \cap (\bar{\varphi}(x) \setminus R)$  and  $\alpha_{k2} \in \bar{\varphi}(z_k) \cap (\bar{\varphi}(x) \setminus R)$ . Let  $C'_M = \{\alpha_{kj} : y_k \in Y_1 \text{ and } 1 \leq j \leq 2\}$ . Clearly,  $|C'_M| = 2|Y_1|$ . By (4), we have  $|\bar{\varphi}(x) \setminus R| > |C'_M|$ , thus there exists a color  $\beta \in \bar{\varphi}(x) \setminus (R \cup C'_M)$  such that  $\beta \in \varphi(y_k)$  for all  $y_k \in Y_1$ . So  $\beta \in \varphi(u_1) \cap \varphi(u_2) \cap \varphi(u_3)$ .

Applying Claim B with colors  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , there exists a vertex  $u \in \{u_1, u_2, u_3\}$  and an optimal feasible coloring  $\varphi' = \varphi / P_u(\alpha, \beta, \varphi)$  such that  $\beta \in \bar{\varphi}'(u)$ . Then  $u \in M(\varphi')$ . Since  $\beta \notin C'_M$ , there exists a color  $k_a \in T$  with  $u = y_{k_a}$  and colors  $i, j, \beta \in \bar{\varphi}'(x) \setminus R$  such that  $i \in \bar{\varphi}'(z_{k_a}), j, \beta \in \bar{\varphi}'(y_{k_a})$ , giving a contradiction.  $\square$

Let  $k, i, j, l$  be as stated in Claim D. Note that  $P_x(l, 1, \varphi)$  and  $P_y(l, 1, \varphi)$  are same and are disjoint from  $P_{y_k}(l, 1, \varphi)$ . If  $l \neq 1$ , we consider coloring  $\varphi / P_{y_k}(l, 1, \varphi)$ , and rename it as  $\varphi$ . So we may assume  $1 \in \bar{\varphi}(y_k)$ .

By Claim A, the paths  $P_x(i, k, \varphi)$  and  $P_x(j, k, \varphi)$  both contain  $y, z$ . Since  $\varphi(yy_k) = \varphi(zz_k) = k$ , these two paths also contain  $y_k, z_k$ . Since  $i \in \bar{\varphi}(z_k)$ , we have  $x$  and  $z_k$  are the two endvertices of  $P_x(i, k, \varphi)$ . So,  $i \in \varphi(y) \cap \varphi(z) \cap \varphi(y_k)$ . Similarly, we have  $j \in \varphi(y) \cap \varphi(z) \cap \varphi(z_k)$ . We now consider the following sequence of colorings of  $G - xy$ .

Let  $\varphi_1$  be obtained from  $\varphi$  by assigning  $\varphi_1(yy_k) = 1$ . Since 1 is missing at both  $y$  and  $y_k$ ,  $\varphi_1$  is an edge- $\Delta$ -coloring of  $G - xy$ . Now  $k$  is missing at  $y$  and  $y_k$ ,  $i$  is still missing at  $z_k$ . Since  $G$  is not  $\Delta$ -colorable,  $P_x(i, k, \varphi_1) = P_y(i, k, \varphi_1)$ ; otherwise  $\varphi_1 / P_y(i, k, \varphi_1)$  can be extended to an edge- $\Delta$ -coloring of  $G$  giving a contradiction. Furthermore,  $z_k, y_k \notin V(P_x(i, k, \varphi_1))$  since either  $i$  or  $k$  is missing at these two vertices, which in turn shows that  $z \notin V(P_x(i, k, \varphi_1))$  since  $\varphi_1(zz_k) = k$ .

Let  $\varphi_2 = \varphi_1/P_x(i, k, \varphi_1)$ . We have  $k \in \bar{\varphi}_2(x)$ ,  $i \in \bar{\varphi}_2(y) \cap \bar{\varphi}_2(z_k)$  and  $j \in \bar{\varphi}_2(x) \cap \bar{\varphi}_2(y_k)$ . Since  $G$  is not edge- $\Delta$ -colorable,  $P_x(i, j, \varphi_2) = P_y(i, j, \varphi_2)$  which contains neither  $y_k$  nor  $z_k$ .

Let  $\varphi_3 = \varphi_2/P_x(i, j, \varphi_2)$ . Then  $k \in \bar{\varphi}_3(x)$  and  $j \in \bar{\varphi}_3(y) \cap \bar{\varphi}_3(y_k)$ .

Let  $\varphi_4$  be obtained from  $\varphi_3$  by recoloring  $yy_k$  by  $j$ . Then  $1 \in \bar{\varphi}_4(y)$ ,  $\varphi_4(xz) = 1$ ,  $k \in \bar{\varphi}_4(x)$ ,  $\varphi_4(zz_k) = k$ . Since  $\varphi_4(xz) = 1 \in \bar{\varphi}_4(y)$ ,  $\varphi_4$  is  $z$ -feasible. Since  $i, j, k \notin R = C_y \cup C_z$ , the colors in  $R$  are unchanged during this sequence of re-colorings, so  $C_y(\varphi_4) \supseteq C_y$  and  $C_z(\varphi_4) \supseteq C_z$ . Since  $\varphi_4(zz_k) = k \in \bar{\varphi}_4(x)$  and  $d(z_k) < q$ , we have  $k \in C_z(\varphi_4)$ . So,  $C_z(\varphi_4) \supseteq C_z \cup \{k\}$ . Therefore,  $|C_y(\varphi_4)| + |C_z(\varphi_4)| \geq |C_y| + |C_z| + 1$ , giving a contradiction. So **II** holds.  $\square$

## 4.2 Proof of Lemma 5

The proof of Lemma 5 follows similar structure of the proof of Lemma 4. Nevertheless the difference is big enough. For this reason, we give it.

**Lemma 5.** Let  $x_1x_2$  be an edge in an edge- $\Delta$ -critical graph  $G$  and  $q$  a positive number. If  $d(x_1) + d(x_2) < \frac{3}{2}\Delta$ ,  $q \leq \Delta - 10$  and  $\delta(G) \geq \frac{\Delta}{2}$ , then there exists a pair of vertices  $\{z, y\}$  with  $z \in N(x_1) \setminus \{x_2\}$  and  $y \in N(x_2) \setminus \{x_1, z\}$  such that  $\sigma_q(x_1, z) + \sigma_q(x_2, y) > 3\Delta - d(x_1) - d(x_2) - \frac{6(d(x_1)+d(x_2)-\Delta)-4}{\Delta-q} - \frac{8(d(x_1)+d(x_2)-\Delta-2)}{(\Delta-q)^2}$ .

*Proof.* Let graph  $G$ , edge  $x_1x_2 \in E(G)$ ,  $q$  and  $\delta(G)$  be defined in Lemma 5. A pair of vertices  $\{z, y\}$  with  $z \in N(x_1) \setminus \{x_2\}$  and  $y \in N(x_2) \setminus \{x_1, z\}$  is called *feasible* if there exists a coloring  $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}^\Delta(G - x_1x_2)$  such that  $\varphi(x_1z) \in \bar{\varphi}(x_2)$  and  $\varphi(x_2y) \in \bar{\varphi}(x_1)$ , and such a coloring  $\varphi$  is called a *zy-feasible coloring*. Denote by  $\mathcal{C}_{zy}$  the set of all *zy-feasible* colorings. For each  $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_{zy}$ , let

$$\begin{aligned} Z(\varphi) &= \{v \in N(z) \setminus \{x_1\} : \varphi(vz) \in \bar{\varphi}(x_1) \cup \bar{\varphi}(x_2) \cup \bar{\varphi}(y)\}, \\ C_z(\varphi) &= \{\varphi(vz) : v \in Z(\varphi) \text{ and } d(v) < q\}, \\ Y(\varphi) &= \{v \in N(y) \setminus \{x_2\} : \varphi(vy) \in \bar{\varphi}(x_1) \cup \bar{\varphi}(x_2) \cup \bar{\varphi}(z)\}, \text{ and} \\ C_y(\varphi) &= \{\varphi(vy) : v \in Y(\varphi) \text{ and } d(v) < q\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $Z(\varphi)$  and  $Y(\varphi)$  are vertex sets while  $C_z(\varphi)$  and  $C_y(\varphi)$  are color sets. For each color  $k \in \varphi(z)$ , let  $z_k \in N(z)$  such that  $\varphi(zz_k) = k$ . Similarly, we define  $y_k$  for each  $k \in \varphi(y)$ . Let  $T_0(\varphi) = \{k \in \varphi(x_1) \cap \varphi(x_2) \cap \varphi(y) \cap \varphi(z) : d(y_k) < q \text{ and } d(z_k) < q\}$ .

Since  $d(x_1) + d(x_2) < \frac{3}{2}\Delta$  and  $\delta(G) \geq \frac{\Delta}{2}$ , we have  $d(x_1) < \Delta$  and  $d(x_2) < \Delta$ . We assume that  $\varphi(x_1z) = 1$  and  $\varphi(x_2y) = 2$ .

First, we claim that  $\bar{\varphi}(x_1)$ ,  $\bar{\varphi}(x_2)$ ,  $\bar{\varphi}(y)$ ,  $\bar{\varphi}(z)$  and  $\varphi(x_1) \cap \varphi(x_2) \cap \varphi(y) \cap \varphi(z)$  are mutually exclusive. Let  $\varphi_1$  be obtained from  $\varphi$  by uncoloring  $x_1z$  and coloring  $x_1x_2$  with the color 1, then  $\{z, x_1, x_2, y\}$  forms a Kierstead path with respect to  $\varphi_1$ . By Lemma 7,  $\{z, x_1, x_2, y\}$  is elementary with respect to  $\varphi_1$  as  $d(x_1) < \Delta$ . It follows that  $\bar{\varphi}_1(y) \cap \bar{\varphi}_1(z) = \emptyset$ , that is,  $\bar{\varphi}(y) \cap (\bar{\varphi}(z) \cup \{1\}) = \emptyset$ . Hence,  $\bar{\varphi}(y) \cap \bar{\varphi}(z) = \emptyset$ . Since  $G$  is edge- $\Delta$ -critical,  $\{x_1, x_2, z\}$  and  $\{x_1, x_2, y\}$  are both elementary with respect to  $\varphi$ . The claim holds and

$$\bar{\varphi}(x_1) \cup \bar{\varphi}(x_2) \cup \bar{\varphi}(y) \cup \bar{\varphi}(z) \cup (\varphi(x_1) \cap \varphi(x_2) \cap \varphi(y) \cap \varphi(z)) = \{1, 2, \dots, \Delta\}.$$

Recall that  $\sigma_q(x_2, y)$  and  $\sigma_q(x_1, z)$  are number of vertices with degree  $\geq q$  in  $N(y) \setminus \{x_2\}$  and  $N(z) \setminus \{x_1\}$ , respectively. So, the following inequalities hold.

$$\begin{aligned} & \sigma_q(x_2, y) + \sigma_q(x_1, z) \\ \geq & |Y(\varphi)| - |C_y(\varphi)| + |Z(\varphi)| - |C_z(\varphi)| + |\varphi(x_1) \cap \varphi(x_2) \cap \varphi(y) \cap \varphi(z)| - |T_0(\varphi)| \\ = & |\bar{\varphi}(x_1) \cup \bar{\varphi}(x_2) \cup \bar{\varphi}(z)| - 1 + |\bar{\varphi}(x_1) \cup \bar{\varphi}(x_2) \cup \bar{\varphi}(y)| - 1 \\ & + |\varphi(x_1) \cap \varphi(x_2) \cap \varphi(y) \cap \varphi(z)| - |C_y(\varphi)| - |C_z(\varphi)| - |T_0(\varphi)| \\ = & \Delta + |\bar{\varphi}(x_1)| + |\bar{\varphi}(x_2)| - |C_y(\varphi)| - |C_z(\varphi)| - |T_0(\varphi)| - 2 \\ = & 3\Delta - d(x_1) - d(x_2) - |C_y(\varphi)| - |C_z(\varphi)| - |T_0(\varphi)| \end{aligned}$$

So, Lemma 5 follows the two statements below.

- I. For any  $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_{zy}$ ,  $|C_z(\varphi)| < \frac{d(x_1)+d(x_2)-\Delta-2}{\Delta-q}$  and  $|C_y(\varphi)| < \frac{d(x_1)+d(x_2)-\Delta-2}{\Delta-q}$ ;
- II. there exists a  $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_{zy}$  such that  $|T_0(\varphi)| \leq \frac{4(d(x_1)+d(x_2)-\Delta)}{\Delta-q} + \frac{8(d(x_1)+d(x_2)-\Delta-2)}{(\Delta-q)^2}$ .

In the remainder of the proof, we let  $Z = Z(\varphi)$ ,  $Y = Y(\varphi)$ ,  $C_z = C_z(\varphi)$ ,  $C_y = C_y(\varphi)$  and  $T_0 = T_0(\varphi)$  if the coloring  $\varphi$  is clearly referred. Let  $R = C_z \cup C_y$  and  $R' = C_z \cup C_y \cup \{1, 2\}$ . A coloring  $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_{zy}$  is called *optimal* if over all feasible colorings the followings hold:

1.  $|C_z| + |C_y|$  is maximum;
2. subject to 1,  $|C_z \cap C_y|$  is minimum.

#### 4.2.1 Proof of I.

**Claim A1.** For every  $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_{zy}$ , the sets  $\{x_1, x_2, z\} \cup Z$  and  $\{x_1, x_2, y\} \cup Y$  are both elementary with respect to  $\varphi$ .

*Proof.* We first show that

$$\text{for any } v \in Z, \{x_1, x_2, z, v\} \text{ is elementary with respect to } \varphi. \quad (5)$$



This is clearly true if  $\varphi(vz) \in \bar{\varphi}(x_1) \cup \bar{\varphi}(x_2)$ . We now assume  $\varphi(vz) \in \bar{\varphi}(y)$ . Since  $\bar{\varphi}(y) \supseteq \{1, \varphi(vz)\}$ , we have  $d(y) < \Delta$ . Suppose  $\{x_1, x_2, z, v\}$  is not elementary, let  $\eta \in \bar{\varphi}(v) \cap (\bar{\varphi}(x_1) \cup \bar{\varphi}(x_2) \cup \bar{\varphi}(z))$ . We let  $\varphi(vz) = k$ . Note that  $\bar{\varphi}(x_1) \cap \bar{\varphi}(y) = \emptyset$ , we have  $k \in \varphi(x_1)$ .

First we consider the case  $\eta \in \bar{\varphi}(x_1)$ . Since  $\bar{\varphi}(x_1) \cap \bar{\varphi}(y) = \emptyset$ , we have  $\eta \in \varphi(y)$ . Thus  $P_{x_1}(\eta, k, \varphi) = P_y(\eta, k, \varphi)$ , for otherwise, let  $\varphi_1 = \varphi/P_{x_1}(\eta, k, \varphi)$ ,  $\{x_1, x_2, y\}$  is not elementary with respect to  $\varphi_1$  since  $k \in \bar{\varphi}_1(x_1) \cap \bar{\varphi}_1(y)$ , giving a contradiction. Let  $\varphi_1 = \varphi/P_{x_1}(\eta, k, \varphi)$ . Then  $k \in \bar{\varphi}_1(x)$  and  $\eta \in \bar{\varphi}_1(y)$ . Let  $\varphi_2$  be obtained from  $\varphi_1$  by uncoloring  $vz, zx_1$  and coloring  $zx_1, x_1x_2$  with color  $k, 1$ , respectively. Then  $\eta \in \bar{\varphi}_2(y)$ ,  $k, \eta \in \bar{\varphi}_2(v)$ ,  $1 \in \bar{\varphi}_2(z)$  and  $2 \in \bar{\varphi}_2(x_1)$ . So  $\{v, z, x_1, x_2, y\}$  forms a Kierstead path with respect to  $\varphi_2$ . Since  $x_1, x_2, y$  are  $(< \Delta)$ -vertices, by Lemma 6, the set  $\{v, z, x_1, x_2, y\}$  is elementary with respect to  $\varphi_2$ , this contradicts with the fact that  $\eta \in \bar{\varphi}_2(v) \cap \bar{\varphi}_2(y)$ .

Then suppose  $\eta \in \bar{\varphi}(x_2) \cup \bar{\varphi}(z)$  and  $\bar{\varphi}(v) \cap \bar{\varphi}(x_1) = \emptyset$ . Since  $d(x_1) < \Delta$ , there exists a color  $\delta \in \bar{\varphi}(x_1)$ . Clearly,  $\delta \in \varphi(v)$ . Since  $\{z, x_1, x_2\}$  is elementary with respect to  $\varphi$ , we have  $\delta \in \varphi(x_2) \cap \varphi(z)$ . Since  $v, x_1$  and one of  $\{x_2, z\}$  are endvertices of  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -chains, we claim that  $P_v(\delta, \eta, \varphi) \neq P_{x_1}(\delta, \eta, \varphi)$ . For otherwise,  $P_z(\delta, \eta, \varphi) \neq P_{x_1}(\delta, \eta, \varphi)$  or  $P_{x_2}(\delta, \eta, \varphi) \neq P_{x_1}(\delta, \eta, \varphi)$ , let  $\varphi_1 = \varphi/P_{x_1}(\delta, \eta, \varphi)$ , then  $\bar{\varphi}_1(x_1) \cap \bar{\varphi}_1(z) \neq \emptyset$  or  $\bar{\varphi}_1(x_1) \cap \bar{\varphi}_1(x_2) \neq \emptyset$ , this contradicts with the fact that  $\{x_1, x_2, z\}$  is elementary with respect to  $\varphi_1$ . Let  $\varphi_1 = \varphi/P_{x_1}(\eta, \delta, \varphi)$ . Then  $\eta \in \bar{\varphi}(x_1) \cap \bar{\varphi}(v)$ , a contradiction.

We now show that

$$\bar{\varphi}(v) \cap \bar{\varphi}(v') = \emptyset \text{ for each } v, v' \in Z. \quad (6)$$

If not, let  $\alpha \in \bar{\varphi}(v) \cap \bar{\varphi}(v')$ . Since  $d(x_1) < \Delta$ , we may assume that  $\beta \in \bar{\varphi}(x_1)$ . Then by (5),  $\beta \in \varphi(v) \cap \varphi(v')$  and  $\alpha \in \varphi(x_1)$ . Then there exists a vertex in  $\{v, v'\}$  not in the path  $P_{x_1}(\alpha, \beta, \varphi)$ . Let  $\varphi_1 = \varphi/P_{x_1}(\alpha, \beta, \varphi)$ . Then  $\alpha \in \bar{\varphi}(v) \cap \bar{\varphi}(x_1)$  or  $\alpha \in \bar{\varphi}(v') \cap \bar{\varphi}(x_1)$ , this contradicts with (5).

By (5) and (6), we have  $\{x_1, x_2, z\} \cup Z$  is elementary with respect to  $\varphi$ . By the symmetry of  $y$  and  $z$ , we have  $\{x_1, x_2, y\} \cup Y$  is elementary with respect to  $\varphi$ .  $\square$

By Claim A1,  $\{x_1, x_2, z\} \cup Z$  and  $\{x_1, x_2, y\} \cup Y$  are both elementary with respect to  $\varphi$ . Consequently, by the definitions of  $C_y$  and  $C_z$ , we have  $(\Delta - q)|C_z| + |\bar{\varphi}(x_1)| + |\bar{\varphi}(x_2)| + |\bar{\varphi}(z)| < \sum_{v \in \{x_1, x_2, z\} \cup Z} \bar{\varphi}(v) \leq \Delta$  and  $(\Delta - q)|C_y| + |\bar{\varphi}(x_1)| + |\bar{\varphi}(x_2)| + |\bar{\varphi}(y)| < \sum_{v \in \{x_1, x_2, y\} \cup Y} \bar{\varphi}(v) \leq \Delta$ . It follows that  $|C_z| < \frac{d(x_1) + d(x_2) - \Delta - 2}{\Delta - q}$  and  $|C_y| < \frac{d(x_1) + d(x_2) - \Delta - 2}{\Delta - q}$ . Hence, **I** holds.

### 4.2.2 Proof of II.

Suppose, on the contrary:  $|T_0| > \frac{4(d(x_1)+d(x_2)-\Delta)}{\Delta-q} + \frac{8(d(x_1)+d(x_2)-\Delta-2)}{(\Delta-q)^2}$  for every  $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_{zy}$ . Let  $T_0 = \{k_1, \dots, k_{|T_0|}\}$  and  $V_{T_0} = \{z_k \in N(z) : k \in T_0\} \cup \{y_k \in N(y) : k \in T_0\}$ . Let  $\varphi$  be an optimal feasible coloring.

**Claim B1.** For each  $i \in \bar{\varphi}(x_2) \setminus (R \cup \{1\})$  and  $k \in T$ ,  $P_{x_2}(i, k, \varphi)$  contains both  $y$  and  $z$ ; and for each  $i \in \bar{\varphi}(x_1) \setminus (R \cup \{2\})$  and  $k \in T$ ,  $P_{x_1}(i, k, \varphi)$  contains both  $y$  and  $z$ .

*Proof.* By symmetry, we only show the first part of statement. Let  $u \in \{y, z\}$  and  $v \in \{y, z\} \setminus \{u\}$ . Suppose  $u \notin V(P_{x_2}(i, k, \varphi))$ . Then  $P_u(i, k, \varphi)$  is disjoint with  $P_{x_2}(i, k, \varphi)$ . Let  $\varphi' = \varphi/P_u(i, k, \varphi)$ . Since  $i, k \neq 1, 2$ ,  $\varphi'$  is also feasible. Since colors in  $R$  are unchanged and  $d(u_k) < q$ , we have  $C_u(\varphi') = C_u \cup \{i\}$  and  $C_v(\varphi') \supseteq C_v$ , giving a contradiction to the maximality of  $|C_y| + |C_z|$ . Thus  $P_{x_2}(i, k, \varphi)$  contains both  $y$  and  $z$ .  $\square$

**Claim C1.** If there exist three vertices  $u_1, u_2, u_3 \in V_{T_0}$  and two colors  $\alpha \notin (\bar{\varphi}(x_1) \cup \bar{\varphi}(x_2)) \setminus R'$ ,  $\beta \in (\bar{\varphi}(x_1) \cup \bar{\varphi}(x_2)) \setminus R'$  with  $\alpha \in \bar{\varphi}(u_1) \cap \bar{\varphi}(u_2) \cap \bar{\varphi}(u_3)$  and  $\beta \in \varphi(u_1) \cap \varphi(u_2) \cap \varphi(u_3)$ , then there exists a vertex  $u \in \{u_1, u_2, u_3\}$  and an optimal feasible coloring  $\varphi' = \varphi/P_u(\alpha, \beta, \varphi)$  such that  $\beta \in \bar{\varphi}'(u)$ .

*Proof.* Since  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  are symmetric, we assume  $\beta \in \bar{\varphi}(x_1)$ . Note that  $\bar{\varphi}(x_1), \bar{\varphi}(x_2), \bar{\varphi}(y), \bar{\varphi}(z)$  are mutually exclusive, we have  $\beta \in \varphi(x_2) \cap \varphi(z) \cap \varphi(y)$ . Since  $\alpha \notin (\bar{\varphi}(x_1) \cup \bar{\varphi}(x_2)) \setminus R'$ , we have  $\alpha \in (\varphi(x_1) \cap \varphi(x_2)) \setminus R'$  or  $\alpha \in R'$ .

We first consider the case of  $\alpha \in (\varphi(x_1) \cap \varphi(x_2)) \setminus R'$ . Since  $\alpha \in \bar{\varphi}(u_1) \cap \bar{\varphi}(u_2) \cap \bar{\varphi}(u_3)$ , we may assume that  $P_{x_1}(\alpha, \beta, \varphi)$  is disjoint with  $P_{u_1}(\alpha, \beta, \varphi)$ . Let  $\varphi_1 = \varphi/P_{u_1}(\alpha, \beta, \varphi)$ . Since  $\alpha, \beta \notin R'$ ,  $\varphi_1$  is still feasible,  $C_y(\varphi_1) = C_y$  and  $C_z(\varphi_1) = C_z$ . So,  $\varphi_1$  is also optimal and  $\beta \in \bar{\varphi}_1(u_1)$ .

We now suppose  $\alpha \in R \setminus \{1, 2\}$ . By the definition of  $R$ , there exists a vertex  $v \in \{x_1, x_2, y, z\}$  such that  $\alpha \in \bar{\varphi}(v)$ . It is easy to see that  $P_v(\alpha, \beta, \varphi) = P_{x_1}(\alpha, \beta, \varphi)$  when  $v = x_1$ . We claim that  $P_v(\alpha, \beta, \varphi) = P_{x_1}(\alpha, \beta, \varphi)$  when  $v \neq x_1$ . Otherwise, let  $\varphi_1 = \varphi/P_{x_1}(\alpha, \beta, \varphi)$ , then  $\alpha \in \bar{\varphi}_1(v) \cap \bar{\varphi}_1(x_1)$ , this contradicts that  $\{x_1, x_2, y\}$  and  $\{x_1, x_2, z\}$  both are elementary with respect to  $\varphi_1$ . Thus  $V(P_{x_1}(\alpha, \beta, \varphi)) \cap \{u_1, u_2, u_3\} = \emptyset$ . Let  $w$  be a vertex of  $\{y, z\}$  such that  $\alpha \in C_w$ . We may assume that  $P_{u_1}(\alpha, \beta, \varphi)$  is disjoint with  $P_w(\alpha, \beta, \varphi)$ . If  $\alpha \notin C_z \cap C_y$ , then  $\varphi_1 = \varphi/P_u(\alpha, \beta, \varphi)$  is the required coloring such that  $\beta \in \bar{\varphi}_1(u_1)$ . Now we suppose that  $\alpha \in C_z \cap C_y$ . Thus  $\alpha \in \bar{\varphi}(x_1) \cup \bar{\varphi}(x_2)$ . We claim that  $P_z(\alpha, \beta, \varphi) = P_y(\alpha, \beta, \varphi)$ . For otherwise, let  $\varphi_1 = \varphi/P_z(\alpha, \beta, \varphi)$ , we have  $\varphi_1(x_1) = \varphi(x_1)$ ,  $\varphi_1(x_2) = \varphi(x_2)$  or  $\varphi_1(x_1) = (\varphi(x_1) \cup \{\beta\}) \setminus \{\alpha\}$ ,  $\varphi_1(x_2) = (\varphi(x_2) \cup \{\alpha\}) \setminus \{\beta\}$ . Clearly,  $Z(\varphi_1) = Z$  and  $Y(\varphi_1) = Y$ . Thus  $C_z(\varphi_1) = (C_z \cup \{\beta\}) \setminus \{\alpha\}$  and  $C_y(\varphi_1) = C_y$ , which

implies that  $|C_z(\varphi_1)| + |C_y(\varphi_1)| = |C_z| + |C_y|$  and  $|C_z(\varphi_1) \cap C_y(\varphi_1)| = |C_z \cap C_y| - 1$ , which leads a contradiction to the minimality of  $|C_z \cap C_y|$ . Thus  $\varphi_1 = \varphi/P_{u_1}(\alpha, \beta, \varphi)$  is feasible,  $C_y(\varphi_1) = C_y$  and  $C_z(\varphi_1) = C_z$ . So  $\varphi_1$  is also optimal and  $\beta \in \bar{\varphi}_1(u_1)$ .

We finally suppose that  $\alpha \in \{1, 2\}$ . If  $\alpha = 1$ , then  $P_z(\alpha, \beta, \varphi) = P_{x_1}(\alpha, \beta, \varphi) = P_{x_2}(\alpha, \beta, \varphi)$ . It is easy to see that  $P_y(\alpha, \beta, \varphi)$  contains at most two vertices of  $\{u_1, u_2, u_3\}$ . Thus there still exists one vertex, say  $u_1$ , such that  $V(P_{u_1}(\alpha, \beta, \varphi)) \cap \{x_1, x_2, y, z\} = \emptyset$ . Let  $\varphi_1 = \varphi/P_{u_1}(\alpha, \beta, \varphi)$ . Thus  $\varphi_1$  is an optimal feasible coloring and  $\beta \in \bar{\varphi}_1(u_1)$ .

Then  $\alpha = 2$ . Clearly,  $\{x_1, x_2, y, z\} \subseteq V(P_{x_2}(1, 2, \varphi))$ . Interchange the colors 1 and 2 on all edges not in  $P_{x_2}(1, 2, \varphi)$  to produce a coloring  $\varphi_1$ . Then  $1 \notin \varphi_1(u_i)$  for each  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ . Since  $G$  is edge- $\Delta$ -critical, we have  $P_{x_1}(\beta, 1, \varphi_1) = P_{x_2}(\beta, 1, \varphi_1)$ . Since  $\varphi(zx_1) = 1$ , we have  $P_{x_2}(\beta, 1, \varphi_1)$  contains  $z$ . Note that  $P_y(1, \beta, \varphi_1)$  contains at most two vertices of  $\{u_1, u_2, u_3\}$ . Thus there still exists one vertex, say  $u_1$ , such that  $V(P_{u_1}(1, \beta, \varphi_1)) \cap \{x_1, x_2, y, z\} = \emptyset$ . Let  $\varphi_2 = \varphi_1/P_{u_1}(1, \beta, \varphi_1)$ . Thus  $\varphi_2$  is feasible and  $C_y(\varphi_2) = C_y$  and  $C_z(\varphi_2) = C_z$ . So  $\varphi_2$  is still optimal and  $\beta \in \bar{\varphi}_2(u_1)$ .  $\square$

Recall that  $|T_0| > \frac{4(d(x_1)+d(x_2)-\Delta)}{\Delta-q} + \frac{8(d(x_1)+d(x_2)-\Delta-2)}{(\Delta-q)^2}$ . Let  $T = \{k_1, \dots, k_{|T|}\}$  be a subset of  $T_0$  with  $|T| = \lfloor \frac{4(d(x_1)+d(x_2)-\Delta)}{\Delta-q} + \frac{8(d(x_1)+d(x_2)-\Delta-2)}{(\Delta-q)^2} \rfloor + 1$ . Let

$$\begin{aligned} V_T &= \{z_{k_1}, z_{k_2}, \dots, z_{k_{|T|}}\} \cup \{y_{k_1}, y_{k_2}, \dots, y_{k_{|T|}}\}, \\ W(\varphi) &= \{u \in V_T : \bar{\varphi}(u) \cap ((\bar{\varphi}(x_1) \cup \bar{\varphi}(x_2)) \setminus R') = \emptyset\}, \\ M(\varphi) &= V_T - W(\varphi) = \{u \in V_T : \bar{\varphi}(u) \cap ((\bar{\varphi}(x_1) \cup \bar{\varphi}(x_2)) \setminus R') \neq \emptyset\}, \\ E_T &= \{zz_{k_1}, zz_{k_2}, \dots, zz_{k_{|T|}}, yy_{k_1}, yy_{k_2}, \dots, yy_{k_{|T|}}\}, \\ E_W(\varphi) &= \{e \in E_T : e \text{ is incident to a vertex in } W(\varphi)\}, \text{ and} \\ E_M(\varphi) &= E_T - E_W(\varphi) = \{e \in E_T : e \text{ is incident to a vertex in } M(\varphi)\}. \end{aligned}$$

And let  $W = W(\varphi), M = M(\varphi), E_W = E_W(\varphi)$  and  $E_M = E_M(\varphi)$  if the coloring  $\varphi$  is clearly referred.

We assume that  $|E_M|$  is maximum over all optimal feasible colorings  $\varphi$  and all subsets of  $T_0$  with order  $|T|$ . For each  $v \in M$ , pick a color  $\alpha_v \in \bar{\varphi}(v) \cap ((\bar{\varphi}(x_1) \cup \bar{\varphi}(x_2)) \setminus R')$ . Let  $C_M = \{\alpha_v : v \in M\}$ . Clearly,  $|C_M| \leq |M|$ . Note that  $\{z_{k_1}, z_{k_2}, \dots, z_{k_{|T|}}\} \cap \{y_{k_1}, y_{k_2}, \dots, y_{k_{|T|}}\}$  may be not empty, we have  $\frac{|E_W|}{2} \leq |W| \leq |E_W|$  and  $\frac{|E_M|}{2} \leq |M| \leq |E_M|$ .

Since  $|T| = \lfloor \frac{4(d(x_1)+d(x_2)-\Delta)}{\Delta-q} + \frac{8(d(x_1)+d(x_2)-\Delta-2)}{(\Delta-q)^2} \rfloor + 1$ , by **I**, we have

$$(\Delta - q) \left\lceil \frac{|T|}{2} \right\rceil \geq 2(d(x_1) + d(x_2) - \Delta) + 2|R| \geq 2(\Delta - |(\bar{\varphi}(x_1) \cup \bar{\varphi}(x_2)) \setminus R'|). \quad (7)$$

Since  $d(x_1)+d(x_2) < \frac{3}{2}\Delta$  and  $d(x_1), d(x_2)$  are integers, we have  $d(x_1)+d(x_2) \leq \frac{3\Delta-1}{2}$ . Since  $q \leq \Delta - 10$ , by **I**, we have  $|((\bar{\varphi}(x_1) \cup \bar{\varphi}(x_2)) \setminus R')| > 2\Delta - d(x_1) - d(x_2) - \frac{2(d(x_1)+d(x_2)-\Delta-2)}{\Delta-q} \geq \frac{2\Delta}{5} + 1$  and  $|T| + \frac{2(\Delta-|(\bar{\varphi}(x_1) \cup \bar{\varphi}(x_2)) \setminus R'|)}{\Delta-q-1} \leq \frac{\Delta-1}{5} + \frac{\Delta-5}{25} + \frac{6\Delta-2}{45} + 1 < \frac{2\Delta}{5} + 1$ . So

$$|((\bar{\varphi}(x_1) \cup \bar{\varphi}(x_2)) \setminus R')| > |T| + \frac{2(\Delta - |(\bar{\varphi}(x_1) \cup \bar{\varphi}(x_2)) \setminus R'|)}{\Delta - q - 1}. \quad (8)$$

**Claim D1.** Suppose no color  $k \in T$  such that there exist three distinct colors  $i, j, l \in (\bar{\varphi}(x_1) \cup \bar{\varphi}(x_2)) \setminus R'$  with  $i \in \bar{\varphi}(z_k)$  and  $j, l \in \bar{\varphi}(y_k)$ . Then there exists an optimal feasible coloring such that  $|E_M| \geq |T| + \frac{2(\Delta-|(\bar{\varphi}(x_1) \cup \bar{\varphi}(x_2)) \setminus R'|)}{\Delta-q-1}$ .

*Proof.* On the contrary, suppose  $|E_M| < |T| + \frac{2(\Delta-|(\bar{\varphi}(x_1) \cup \bar{\varphi}(x_2)) \setminus R'|)}{\Delta-q-1}$ . Since  $|C_M| \leq |E_M|$ , by (8), there exists a color  $\beta \in (\bar{\varphi}(x_1) \cup \bar{\varphi}(x_2)) \setminus (R' \cup C_M)$ . Clearly,  $\beta \in \varphi(u)$  for each  $u \in W$ .

First we claim that  $|E_M| \geq |T| + 1$ . If not, then  $|E_M| \leq |T|$  and  $|E_W| \geq |T|$  since  $|E_M| + |E_W| = 2|T|$ . Thus by (7), we have  $\sum_{v \in W} |\bar{\varphi}(v)| > (\Delta - q) \left\lceil \frac{|T|}{2} \right\rceil > 2(\Delta - |(\bar{\varphi}(x_1) \cup \bar{\varphi}(x_2)) \setminus R'|)$ , which implies that there exist three vertices  $u_1, u_2, u_3 \in W$  and a color  $\alpha \notin (\bar{\varphi}(x_1) \cup \bar{\varphi}(x_2)) \setminus R'$  such that  $\alpha \in \bar{\varphi}(u_1) \cap \bar{\varphi}(u_2) \cap \bar{\varphi}(u_3)$ . We note that  $\beta \in \varphi(u_1) \cap \varphi(u_2) \cap \varphi(u_3)$  since  $u_1, u_2, u_3 \in W$ . Applying Claim C1 with colors  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , we find a vertex  $u \in \{u_1, u_2, u_3\}$  and an optimal feasible coloring  $\varphi' = \varphi/P_u(\alpha, \beta, \varphi)$  such that  $\beta \in \bar{\varphi}'(u)$ . Since  $u \in W$  and  $\beta \notin C_M$ , we have  $|E_M(\varphi')| > |E_M|$ , giving a contradiction to the maximality of  $|E_M|$ .

We may assume that  $|E_M| = |T| + p$ , thus  $|E_W| = |T| - p$ . Since  $|E_M| = |T| + p$ , there exists a  $p$ -element set  $Y_1 = \{y_k : k \in T \text{ and both } z_k \text{ and } y_k \in M\}$ . Since there does not exist colors  $k \in T$  such that there exist  $i, j, l \in (\bar{\varphi}(x_1) \cup \bar{\varphi}(x_2)) \setminus R'$  with  $i \in \bar{\varphi}(z_k)$ ,  $j, l \in \bar{\varphi}(y_k)$ , we have  $|((\bar{\varphi}(x_1) \cup \bar{\varphi}(x_2)) \setminus R') \cap \bar{\varphi}(y_k)| = 1$  for each  $y_k \in Y_1$  since  $\bar{\varphi}(y_k) \cap \bar{\varphi}(z_k) \cap ((\bar{\varphi}(x_1) \cup \bar{\varphi}(x_2)) \setminus R') = \emptyset$ . Thus by (7),  $\sum_{v \in W \cup Y_1} |\bar{\varphi}(v) \setminus ((\bar{\varphi}(x_1) \cup \bar{\varphi}(x_2)) \setminus R')| > (\Delta - q) \left\lceil \frac{|T|-p}{2} \right\rceil + (\Delta - q - 1)p \geq (\Delta - q) \left\lceil \frac{|T|}{2} \right\rceil + (\frac{\Delta-q}{2} - 1)p > 2(\Delta - |(\bar{\varphi}(x_1) \cup \bar{\varphi}(x_2)) \setminus R'|)$ . Hence there exist three vertices  $u_1, u_2, u_3 \in W \cup Y_1$  and a color  $\alpha \notin (\bar{\varphi}(x_1) \cup \bar{\varphi}(x_2)) \setminus R'$  such that  $\alpha \in \bar{\varphi}(u_1) \cap \bar{\varphi}(u_2) \cap \bar{\varphi}(u_3)$ . Since  $\beta \notin C_M$  and  $|((\bar{\varphi}(x_1) \cup \bar{\varphi}(x_2)) \setminus R') \cap \bar{\varphi}(y_k)| = 1$  for each  $y_k \in Y_1$ , we have  $\beta \in \varphi(u_1) \cap \varphi(u_2) \cap \varphi(u_3)$ . Thus by Claim C1, there exists a vertex  $u \in \{u_1, u_2, u_3\}$  and an optimal feasible coloring  $\varphi' = \varphi/P_u(\alpha, \beta, \varphi)$  such that  $\beta \in \bar{\varphi}'(u)$ . Thus  $u \in M(\varphi')$ . If  $u \in W$ , then  $|E_M(\varphi')| > |E_M|$ , a contradiction. Thus  $u \in Y_1$ . We may assume that  $u = y_{k_a}$ . So there exists three distinct colors  $i, j, \beta \in (\bar{\varphi}'(x_1) \cup \bar{\varphi}'(x_2)) \setminus R'$  such that  $i \in \bar{\varphi}'(z_{k_a})$ ,  $j, \beta \in \bar{\varphi}'(y_{k_a})$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

**Claim E1.** There exist a color  $k \in T$  and three distinct colors  $i, j, l \in (\bar{\varphi}(x_1) \cup \bar{\varphi}(x_2)) \setminus R'$  such that  $i \in \bar{\varphi}(z_k)$ ,  $j, l \in \bar{\varphi}(y_k)$ .

*Proof.* We first note that if there exist  $i, j \in (\bar{\varphi}(x_1) \cup \bar{\varphi}(x_2)) \setminus R'$  such that  $i \in \bar{\varphi}(z_k)$ ,  $j \in \bar{\varphi}(y_k)$ , then  $i \neq j$ ; for otherwise, by Claim B1, the path  $P_{x_2}(i, k, \varphi)$  or  $P_{x_1}(i, k, \varphi)$  contains three endvertices, a contradiction.

Suppose that Claim E1 does not hold. By Claim D1,  $|E_M| \geq |T| + \frac{2(\Delta - |(\bar{\varphi}(x_1) \cup \bar{\varphi}(x_2)) \setminus R'|)}{\Delta - q - 1}$ .

So there exists a  $\lceil \frac{2(\Delta - |(\bar{\varphi}(x_1) \cup \bar{\varphi}(x_2)) \setminus R'|)}{\Delta - q - 1} \rceil$ -elements set  $Y_1 = \{y_k : k \in T \text{ and both } z_k \text{ and } y_k \in M\}$  such that  $|((\bar{\varphi}(x_1) \cup \bar{\varphi}(x_2)) \setminus R') \cap \bar{\varphi}(y_k)| = 1$  for each  $y_k \in Y_1$ . Thus we have  $\sum_{v \in Y_1} |\bar{\varphi}(v) \setminus ((\bar{\varphi}(x_1) \cup \bar{\varphi}(x_2)) \setminus R')| > (\Delta - q - 1)|Y_1| = 2(\Delta - |(\bar{\varphi}(x_1) \cup \bar{\varphi}(x_2)) \setminus R'|)$ . Thus there exist three vertices  $u_1, u_2, u_3 \in Y_1$  and a color  $\alpha \notin (\bar{\varphi}(x_1) \cup \bar{\varphi}(x_2)) \setminus R'$  such that  $\alpha \in \bar{\varphi}(u_1) \cap \bar{\varphi}(u_2) \cap \bar{\varphi}(u_3)$ . For each  $y_k \in Y_1$ , pick a color  $\alpha_{k1} \in \bar{\varphi}(y_k) \cap (\bar{\varphi}(x_1) \cup \bar{\varphi}(x_2)) \setminus R'$  and  $\alpha_{k2} \in \bar{\varphi}(z_k) \cap (\bar{\varphi}(x_1) \cup \bar{\varphi}(x_2)) \setminus R'$ . Let  $C'_M = \{\alpha_{kj} : y_k \in Y_1 \text{ and } 1 \leq j \leq 2\}$ . Clearly,  $|C'_M| = 2|Y_1|$ . By (8), we have  $|(\bar{\varphi}(x_1) \cup \bar{\varphi}(x_2)) \setminus R'| > |C'_M|$ , thus there exists a color  $\beta \in (\bar{\varphi}(x_1) \cup \bar{\varphi}(x_2)) \setminus (R' \cup C'_M)$  such that  $\beta \in \varphi(y_k)$  for all  $y_k \in Y_1$ . So  $\beta \in \varphi(u_1) \cap \varphi(u_2) \cap \varphi(u_3)$ .

Applying Claim C1 with colors  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , we find a vertex  $u \in \{u_1, u_2, u_3\}$  and an optimal feasible coloring  $\varphi' = \varphi / P_u(\alpha, \beta, \varphi)$  such that  $\beta \in \bar{\varphi}'(u)$ . Then  $u \in M(\varphi')$ . Hence, there exists a color  $k_a \in T$  with  $u = y_{k_a}$  and colors  $i, j, \beta \in (\bar{\varphi}'(x_1) \cup \bar{\varphi}'(x_2)) \setminus R'$  such that  $i \in \bar{\varphi}'(z_{k_a})$ ,  $j, \beta \in \bar{\varphi}'(y_{k_a})$ , giving a contradiction.  $\square$

Let  $k, i, j, l$  be as stated in Claim E1 and assume  $d(x_2) \leq d(x_1)$ . First we claim that there is an optimal feasible coloring  $\varphi$  such that  $i, j, l \in \bar{\varphi}(x_2) \setminus (R \cup \{1\})$ . For otherwise, we may assume  $i \in \bar{\varphi}(x_1) \setminus (R \cup \{2\})$ . Since  $d(x_2) < \frac{3}{4}\Delta$ , there exists a color  $\delta \in \bar{\varphi}(x_2) \setminus (R \cup \{1\})$  such that  $\delta \notin \{j, l\}$ . Since  $G$  is edge- $\Delta$ -critical, we have  $P_{x_1}(i, \delta, \varphi) = P_{x_2}(i, \delta, \varphi)$ . Let  $\varphi_1 = \varphi / P_{x_1}(i, \delta, \varphi)$ . Then  $\varphi_1$  is feasible and  $i \in \bar{\varphi}_1(x_2) \setminus (R \cup \{1\})$ . Since  $R$  does not change,  $\varphi_1$  is still optimal. Since  $q \leq \Delta - 10$  and  $q$  is a positive number, we have  $\Delta \geq 11$ . Thus  $|\bar{\varphi}(x_2) \setminus (R \cup \{1\})| > \frac{1}{4}\Delta + 1 - \frac{\Delta-4}{10} - 1 \geq 2$ . So  $|\bar{\varphi}(x_2) \setminus (R \cup \{1\})| \geq 3$ . Using the same method above, we can find an optimal feasible coloring  $\varphi^*$  such that  $i, j, l \in \bar{\varphi}^*(x_2) \setminus (R \cup \{1\})$ .

Since  $\{x_1, x_2, y\}$  is elementary with respect to  $\varphi$  and  $i, j, l \in \bar{\varphi}(x_2)$ , we have  $i, j, l \in \varphi(x_1) \cap \varphi(y)$ . By Claim B1, we have  $P_{x_2}(i, k, \varphi), P_{x_2}(j, k, \varphi)$  both contain  $y_k$  and  $z_k$ , thus  $j \in \varphi(z_k)$  and  $i \in \varphi(y_k)$ . If  $2 \in \bar{\varphi}(y_k)$ , we let  $\varphi_1 = \varphi$ . Otherwise, we let  $\varphi_1$  be obtained from  $\varphi$  by interchange the color 2 and  $l$  on all edges not in  $P_{x_2}(2, l, \varphi)$ . Since  $G$  is edge- $\Delta$ -critical, we have  $P_{x_1}(2, l, \varphi) = P_{x_2}(2, l, \varphi)$ . Thus  $2 \in \bar{\varphi}_1(y_k)$ .

Let  $\varphi_2$  be the coloring obtained from  $\varphi_1$  by uncoloring  $x_2y$  and coloring  $x_1x_2$  with color 2. Then  $2 \in \bar{\varphi}_2(y)$ .

Let  $\varphi_3$  be obtained from  $\varphi_2$  by assigning  $\varphi_3(yy_k) = 2$ . Now  $k$  is missing both  $y$  and  $y_k$  and  $i$  is still missing at  $z_k$ . Since  $G$  is not  $\Delta$ -colorable,  $P_{x_2}(i, k, \varphi_3) = P_y(i, k, \varphi_3)$ ; otherwise,  $\varphi_3/P_y(i, k, \varphi_3)$  can be extended to an edge- $\Delta$ -coloring of  $G$ , giving a contradiction. Furthermore,  $z_k, y_k \notin P_{x_2}(i, k, \varphi_3)$  since either  $i$  or  $k$  is missing at these two vertices, which additionally shows that  $z \notin P_{x_2}(i, k, \varphi_3)$  since  $\varphi_3(zz_k) = k$ .

Let  $\varphi_4 = \varphi_3/P_{x_2}(i, k, \varphi_3)$ . We have  $k \in \bar{\varphi}_4(x_2), i \in \bar{\varphi}_4(y) \cap \bar{\varphi}_4(z_k)$  and  $j \in \bar{\varphi}_4(x_2) \cap \bar{\varphi}_4(y_k)$ . Since  $G$  is not edge- $\Delta$ -colorable,  $P_{x_2}(i, j, \varphi_4) = P_y(i, j, \varphi_4)$  which contains neither  $z_k$  nor  $y_k$ .

Let  $\varphi_5 = \varphi_4/P_{x_2}(i, j, \varphi_4)$ . Then  $k \in \bar{\varphi}_5(x_2)$  and  $j \in \bar{\varphi}_5(y) \cap \bar{\varphi}_5(y_k)$ .

Let  $\varphi_6$  be obtained from  $\varphi_5$  by recoloring  $yy_k$  with  $j$ . Then  $2 \in \bar{\varphi}_6(y)$ .

Let  $\varphi_7$  be the coloring obtained from  $\varphi_6$  by uncoloring  $x_1x_2$  and coloring  $x_2y$  with color 2. Then  $1, k \in \bar{\varphi}_7(x_2), 2 \in \bar{\varphi}_7(x_1), \varphi_7(x_1z) = 1, \varphi_7(x_2y) = 2$  and  $\varphi_7(zz_k) = k$ . Thus  $\varphi_7$  is feasible. Since  $i, j, l, k \notin R$ , the colors in  $R$  are unchanged during this sequence of re-colorings, so  $C_z(\varphi_7) \supseteq C_z$  and  $C_y(\varphi_7) \supseteq C_y$ . Since  $\varphi_7(zz_k) = k \in \bar{\varphi}_7(x)$  and  $d(z_k) < q$ , we have  $k = \varphi_7(zz_k) \in C_z(\varphi_7)$ . So,  $C_z(\varphi_7) \supseteq C_z \cup \{k\}$ . We therefore have  $|C_y(\varphi_7)| + |C_z(\varphi_7)| \geq |C_y| + |C_z| + 1$ , giving a contradiction. So **II** holds.  $\square$

## References

- [1] J. A. Bondy and U. S. R. Murty. Graph theory with applications. American Elsevier Publishing Co., Inc., New York, 1976.
- [2] S. Brandt and H. J. Veldman. Degree sums for edges and cycle lengths in graphs. *J. Graph Theory*, 25(4):253-256, 1997.
- [3] G. Chen, X. Chen, and Y. Zhao. Hamiltonianicity of edge chromatic critical graph. *Discrete Math.*, accepted.
- [4] G. Chen, M. N. Ellingham, A. Saito, and S. Shan. Spanning trails with maximum degree at most 4 in  $2K_2$ -free graphs. *Graphs Combin.*, 2017, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00373-017-1823-2>.
- [5] G. Chen and S. Shan. Vizings 2-factor conjecture involving large maximum degree. *J. Graph Theory*, 00:1-17, 2017.
- [6] S. Grnewald and E. Steffen. Independent sets and 2-factors in edge-chromatic- critical graphs. *J. Graph Theory*, 45(2):113-118, 2004.

- [7] H. A. Kierstead. On the chromatic index of multigraphs without large triangles. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 36(2):156-160, 1984.
- [8] R. Luo, Z. Miao, and Y. Zhao. Hamiltonian cycles in critical graphs with large maximum degree. *Graphs Combin.*, 32(5):2019-2028, 2016.
- [9] R. Luo and Y. Zhao. A note on Vizings independence number conjecture of edge chromatic critical graphs. *Discrete Math.*, 306(15):1788-1790, 2006.
- [10] R. Luo and Y. Zhao. A sufficient condition for edge chromatic critical graphs to be Hamiltonianan approach to Vizings 2-factor conjecture. *J. Graph Theory*, 73(4):469-482, 2013.
- [11] M. Stiebitz, D. Scheide, B. Toft, and L. M. Favrholt. *Graph edge-coloring: Vizings theorem and Goldbergs conjecture*. Wiley, 2012.
- [12] V. A. Tashkinov. On an algorithm for the edge coloring of multigraphs. *Diskretn. Anal. Issled. Oper. Ser. 1*, 7(3):72-85, 100, 2000.
- [13] V. G. Vizing. On an estimate of the chromatic class of a  $p$ -graph (in Russian). *Diskret. Analiz No.*, 3:25-30, 1964.
- [14] V. G. Vizing. Critical graphs with a given chromatic class (in Russian). *Diskret. Analiz No.*, 5:9-17, 1965.
- [15] V. G. Vizing. Some unsolved problems in graph theory (in Russian). *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk*, 23:117-134, 1968.
- [16] D. R. Woodall. The average degree of an edge-chromatic critical graph. II. *J. Graph Theory*, 56:194-218, 2007.
- [17] L. Zhang. Every planar graph with maximum degree 7 is of class 1. *Graphs Combin.*, 16(4):467-495, 2000.