

A tight Q -index condition for a graph to be k -path-coverable involving minimum degree*

Tao Cheng^a, Lihua Feng^b, Yongtao Li^c, Weijun Liu^b

^a School of Mathematics and Statistics, Shandong Normal University
Jinan, Shandong, 250014, P.R. China.

^b School of Mathematics and Statistics, Central South University
New Campus, Changsha, Hunan, 410083, P.R. China.

^c School of Mathematics, Hunan University
Changsha, Hunan, 410082, P.R. China

April 26, 2020

Abstract

A graph G is k -path-coverable if its vertex set $V(G)$ can be covered by k or fewer vertex disjoint paths. In this paper, using the Q -index of a connected graph G , we present a tight sufficient condition for G with fixed minimum degree and large order to be k -path-coverable.

Key words: Q -index; minimum degree; k -path-coverable.

1 Introduction

We only consider simple connected graphs throughout paper. The notations we used are standard from [2]. Let G be a simple connected graph with vertex set $V(G)$ and edge set $E(G)$ such that $|V(G)| = n$ and $|E(G)| = e(G)$. We use $d(v)$ to denote the degree of a vertex v in G , and the minimum degree is $\delta(G) = \delta$. For two vertex-disjoint graphs G and H , $G \cup H$ is denoted to be the disjoint union of G and H , $G \vee H$ the join of G and H , which is obtained from $G \cup H$ by adding all possible edges between G and H . We use the symbol $i \sim j$ to denote the vertices i and j are adjacent, and $i \not\sim j$ otherwise.

The *adjacency matrix* of G is $A(G) = (a_{ij})_{n \times n}$ with $a_{ij} = 1$ if i and j are adjacent, and $a_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. The largest eigenvalue of $A(G)$, denoted by $\lambda(G)$, is called the *spectral radius* of G . The *diagonal matrix* of G is $D(G) = (d_{ii})_{n \times n}$ with diagonal entry $d_{ii} = d(i)$. The *signless Laplacian matrix* $Q(G)$ of G is $D(G) + A(G)$. The largest eigenvalue of $Q(G)$, denoted by $q(G)$, is called the Q -index (or the signless Laplacian spectral radius) of G .

For people that working on spectral graph theory, one of the most well-known problems is the Brualdi-Solheid problem [3]: Given a set \mathcal{G} of graphs, find a tight upper bound for the spectral radius in \mathcal{G} and characterize the extremal graphs. This problem is well

*This research was supported by NSFC (Nos. 11871479, 12071484), Hunan Provincial Natural Science Foundation (2020JJ4675, 2018JJ2479). E-mail addresses: taocheng@sdsu.edu.cn(Tao Cheng), fenglh@163.com(L. Feng), ytli0921@hnu.edu.cn(Y. Li), wjliu6210@126.com(W. Liu).

studied in the literature for many classes of graphs, such as graphs with given diameter [13], edge chromatic number [8], domination number [30]. For the Q -index counterpart of the above problem, Zhang [33] gave the Q -index of graphs with given degree sequence, Zhou [35] studied the Q -index and Hamiltonicity. Also, from both theoretical and practical viewpoint, the eigenvalues of graphs have been successfully used in many other disciplines, one may refer to [14, 17, 18, 32, 34].

Analogous to the Brualdi–Solheid problem, the following problem regarding the adjacency spectral radius was proposed in [26]: What is the maximum spectral radius of a graph G on n vertices without a subgraph isomorphic to a given graph F ? For this problem, Fiedler and Nikiforov [12] obtained tight sufficient conditions for graphs to be hamiltonian or traceable. This motivates further study for such question, see [10, 9, 12, 37, 21, 24, 25, 35, 22, 36, 28].

When the minimum degree is involved in contrast with the results in [12], using the adjacency spectral radius, Li and Ning [15] obtained

Theorem 1.1 [15] *Let $t \geq 1$, and G be a graph of order n with minimum degree $\delta(G) \geq t$. If $n \geq \max\{6t + 10, (t^2 + 7t + 8)/2\}$ and*

$$\lambda(G) \geq \lambda(K_t \vee (K_{n-2t-1} \cup (t+1)K_1)),$$

then G is traceable, unless $G = K_t \vee (K_{n-2t-1} \cup (t+1)K_1)$.

Theorem 1.1 is generalized by Nikiforov as

Theorem 1.2 [27] *Let $t \geq 1$ and G be a graph of order n . If $n \geq t^3 + t^2 + 2t + 5$, $\delta(G) \geq t$ and*

$$\lambda(G) \geq n - t - 2,$$

then G is traceable unless $G = K_{t+1} \cup K_{n-t-1}$ or $G = K_t \vee (K_{n-2t-1} \cup (t+1)K_1)$.

In this paper, we consider the k -path-coverable problem. A graph G is k -path-coverable if $V(G)$ can be covered by k or fewer vertex-disjoint paths. In particular, 1-path-coverable is the same as traceable. The disjoint path cover problem is strongly related to the well-known hamiltonian problem (one may refer to [16] for a survey), which is among the most fundamental ones in graph theory, and attracts much attention in theoretical computer science. However, this problem is NP-complete [29], therefore, finding their guaranteed sufficient conditions becomes an interesting work. In [19], such Ore-type condition is obtained.

For convenience, we denote

$$B(n, k, \delta) := K_\delta \vee (K_{n-2\delta-k} \cup \overline{K_{\delta+k}}).$$

In [24], by generalizing the results in Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2, Liu et. al. obtained the following sufficient by using the adjacency spectral radius.

Theorem 1.3 [24] *Let $k \geq 1$ and $\delta \geq 2$. If G is a connected graph on $n \geq \max\{\delta^2(\delta + k) + \delta + k + 5, 5k + 6\delta + 6\}$ vertices and minimum degree $\delta(G) \geq \delta$ such that*

$$\lambda(G) \geq n - \delta - k - 1,$$

then G is k -path-coverable unless $G = B(n, k, \delta)$.

In this paper, we will consider the Q -index version of Theorem 1.3. For the graph $B(n, k, \delta)$, let

$$X = \{v \in V(B(n, k, \delta)) : d(v) = k\}, \quad Y = \{v \in V(B(n, k, \delta)) : d(v) = n - 1\},$$

$$Z = \{v \in V(B(n, k, \delta)) : d(v) = n - k - \delta - 1\}.$$

We denote by E_1 the edge set of $E(R(n, k, \delta))$ whose endpoints are both from $Y \cup Z$. We define

$$\mathcal{B}_1(n, k, \delta) = \left\{ G \subseteq R(n, k, \delta) - E', \text{ where } E' \subset E_1 \text{ with } |E'| \leq \left\lfloor \frac{(\delta+k)\delta}{4} \right\rfloor \right\},$$

$$\mathcal{B}_2(n, k, \delta) = \left\{ G \subseteq R(n, k, \delta) - E', \text{ where } E' \subset E_1 \text{ with } |E'| = \left\lfloor \frac{(\delta+k)\delta}{4} \right\rfloor + 1 \right\}.$$

Here, the symbol $G \subseteq R(n, k, \delta) - E'$ means G is a subgraph of $R(n, k, \delta) - E'$.

The main result of this paper is

Theorem 1.4 *Let $k \geq 1$ and $\delta \geq 2$. If G is a connected graph on $n \geq (\delta^2 + k\delta + 7\delta + 6k + 9)(\delta^2 + k\delta + 1)$ vertices and minimum degree $\delta(G) \geq \delta$ such that*

$$q(G) \geq 2(n - \delta - k - 1),$$

then G is k -path-coverable unless $G \in \mathcal{B}_1(n, k, \delta)$.

2 Preliminary Results

We first present some basic notations and results. For $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)^T \neq 0$, according to the Rayleigh's principle, we have

$$q(G) = \max_x \frac{\langle Q(G)x, x \rangle}{\langle x, x \rangle} = \max_x \frac{x^T Q(G)x}{x^T x}.$$

By the definition of $Q(G)$, we have

$$\langle Q(G)x, x \rangle = \sum_{i \in V(G)} d(i)x_i^2 + 2 \sum_{i \sim j} x_i x_j = \sum_{i \sim j} (x_i + x_j)^2.$$

If h is the unit positive eigenvector of $q(G)$, then

$$Q(G)h = q(G)h.$$

If we take the i -th entry of both sides and rearranging terms, we get

$$(q(G) - d(i))h_i = \sum_{i \sim j} h_j. \quad (1)$$

Let $N(i)$ denote the neighbor of i , $N[i] = N(i) \cup \{i\}$. From the above, we have

Lemma 2.1 [21] *For any $i, j \in V(G)$, we have*

$$(q(G) - d(i))(h_i - h_j) = (d(i) - d(j))h_j + \sum_{k \in N(i) \setminus N(j)} h_k - \sum_{l \in N(j) \setminus N(i)} h_l. \quad (2)$$

We now present some graph notations we will use. The concept of stability was introduced by Bondy and Chvátal [1]. Let P be a property defined on all graphs of order n . Let k be a non-negative integer. The property P is said to be k -stable if whenever $G + uv$ has property P and

$$d_G(u) + d_G(v) \geq k,$$

where $uv \notin E(G)$, then G itself has property P . Among all the graphs H of order n such that $G \subseteq H$ and

$$d_H(u) + d_H(v) < k$$

for all $uv \notin E(H)$, there is a unique smallest one with respect to size. We shall call this graph the k -closure of G , and denote it by $\text{cl}_k(G)$. Obviously, $\text{cl}_k(G)$ can be obtained from G by recursive procedure which consists of joining non-adjacent vertices with degree-sum at least k . This concept plays a prominent role in any structural graph theory problems.

Lemma 2.2 [11] *Let G be a graph of order n . Then*

$$q(G) \leq \frac{2e(G)}{n-1} + n - 2.$$

Lemma 2.3 [1] *The property that “ G is k -path-coverable” is $(n-k)$ -stable.*

3 Proof of the Main Results

In order to prove our main result, we need the following stability result.

Lemma 3.1 *Let G be a graph of order $n \geq 8\delta + 6k + 7$, where $k \geq 1$. If $\delta(G) \geq \delta \geq 1$ and*

$$e(G) > \frac{1}{2}(n-k-\delta-1)(n-k-\delta-2) + (\delta+k+1)(\delta+1),$$

then G is k -path-coverable unless $G \subseteq B(n, k, \delta)$.

Proof. Let $G' = \text{cl}_{n-k}(G)$. If G' is k -path-coverable, then so is G by the $(n-k)$ -stability of k -path-coverable. We now assume that G' is not k -path-coverable, note that $\delta(G') \geq \delta(G) \geq \delta$ and $e(G') \geq e(G)$. Next, we show that

$$\omega(G') = n - \delta - k.$$

Let C be the vertex set of a maximum clique of G' , since every two vertices whose degree sum is at least $n-k$ are adjacent, then C contains all vertices whose degree is at least $(n-k)/2$. Let $H = G' - C$ and $t = |C|$.

Suppose first that $1 \leq t \leq (n+k)/3 + \delta + 4/3$, observe that $d_{G'}(v) \leq (n-k-1)/2$ for every $v \in V(H)$, if otherwise, we may assume $d_{G'}(v) > (n-k-1)/2$, because $d_{G'}(v)$ is a positive integer, then $d_{G'}(v) \geq (n-k-1)/2 + 1/2 = (n-k)/2$, so v is contained in C , a contradiction. Clearly, $d_C(v) \leq t-1$, so some tedious manipulation yields that

$$e(G') = e(G'[C]) + e(H) + e(V(H), C)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= e(G'[C]) + \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{v \in V(H)} d_{G'}(v) + \sum_{v \in V(H)} d_C(v) \right) \\
&\leq \binom{t}{2} + \frac{1}{2}(n-t) \left(\frac{n-k-1}{2} + t-1 \right) \\
&= \frac{n+k+1}{4}t + \frac{n(n-k-3)}{4} \\
&\leq \frac{n+k+1}{4} \left(\frac{n+k}{3} + \delta + \frac{4}{3} \right) + \frac{n(n-k-3)}{4} \\
&= \frac{1}{3}n^2 + \frac{3\delta-k-4}{12}n + (k+1)(3\delta-k+3) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2}(n-k-\delta-1)(n-k-\delta-2) + (\delta+1)(\delta+k+1),
\end{aligned}$$

which leads to a contradiction (The last inequality follows due to $n \geq 8\delta + 6k + 7$).

Suppose second that $(n+k)/3 + \delta + 4/3 < t \leq n - \delta - k - 1$, note that $d_{G'}(v) \leq n - k - t$ for every $v \in V(H)$, if otherwise, we assume $d_{G'}(v) \geq n - k - t + 1$, then v will be adjacent to every vertex in C . Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
e(G') &= e(G'[C]) + e(H) + e(V(H), C) \\
&\leq e(G'[C]) + \sum_{v \in V(H)} d_{G'}(v) \\
&\leq \binom{t}{2} + (n-t)(n-k-t) \\
&= \frac{3}{2}t^2 + (-2n+k-\frac{1}{2})t + n(n-k) \\
&\leq \frac{3}{2}(n-\delta-k-1)^2 + (-2n+k-\frac{1}{2})(n-\delta-k-1) + n(n-k) \\
&= \frac{1}{2}(n-k-\delta-1)(n-k-\delta-2) + (\delta+1)(\delta+k+1),
\end{aligned}$$

also a contradiction.

Finally, suppose that $t \geq n - \delta - k + 1$, since G' is not a clique, then $V(H)$ is not empty. Note that $d_{G'}(v) \geq \delta$ for every $v \in V(H)$ and $d_{G'}(u) \geq t - 1 \geq n - k - \delta$ for every $u \in C$, this means that every vertex of $V(H)$ is adjacent to every vertex of C , this contradicts the fact that C is a maximum clique. Consequently, we now infer that $\omega(G') = n - \delta - k$.

We call that a vertex in C is a *frontier* vertex if it has degree at least $n - \delta - k$ in G' , that is to say, it has at least one neighbour in H , and denote $F = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_s\}$ by the set of frontier vertices. Since $\omega(G') = n - \delta - k$, then $d_{G'}(v) \geq n - \delta - k - 1$ for every $v \in C$, we can see by the $(n-k)$ -stability that every vertex in H has degree exactly δ in G' , furthermore, every vertex in H is adjacent to every frontier vertex in G' , and then we have $1 \leq s \leq \delta$. Since C is a clique $K_{n-\delta-k}$, then we can choose a path P in $C - F$ with two end-vertices u_1 and u_s .

We assert that $s = \delta$.

If $s = 1$, then every vertex in H has degree $\delta - 1$ in H . According to Dirac's theorem, H has a path of order at least δ . First, we assume that H has a path P' of order $\delta + 1$,

and let x, x' be the two end-vertices of P' , then G' can be covered by one path $x'P'xu_1P$ and the rest $(k-1)$ vertices in H , so G' is k -path-coverable, a contradiction. We now assume that H has no paths of order more than δ , let P' be a path of order δ in H and $V(H - P') = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k\}$. Observe that x has no neighbour in $V(H - P')$ and $d_H(x) = \delta - 1$, which implies that $xx' \in E(H)$. Since H has no paths of order more than δ , then every vertex in $V(H - P')$ has no neighbour in P' , so $H - P'$ has an edge, say, v_1v_2 . Then G' can be covered by two paths $x'P'xu_1P, v_1v_2$ and the rest $(k-2)$ vertices in H , Also a contradiction.

If $2 \leq s \leq \delta - 1$, so every vertex in H has degree $\delta - s$ in H . By Dirac's theorem, H has a path of order at least $\delta - s + 1$. We first assume that H has a path P' of order $\delta - s + 2$ and $V(H - P') = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{s+k-2}\}$, then $v_1u_1v_2u_2 \cdots v_{s-1}u_{s-1}x'P'xu_sP$ is path of order $n - (k - 1)$, so G' is k -path-coverable, a contradiction. Now we assume that H has no paths of order more than $\delta - s + 1$, let P' be a path of order $\delta - s + 1$ in H and $V(H - P') = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{k+s-1}\}$. Observe that x has no neighbour in $V(H - P')$ and $d_H(x) = \delta - s$, which implies that $xx' \in E(H)$. Since H has no paths of order more than $\delta - s - 1$, then every vertex in $V(H - P')$ has no neighbour in P' , so $H - P'$ has an edge, say, v_1v_2 . Then $v_su_1v_1v_2u_2v_3u_3 \cdots v_{s-1}u_{s-1}x'P'xu_sP$ is a path of order $n - (k - 1)$, so G' is k -path-coverable, this also leads to a contradiction.

We have thus proved that $s = \delta$, as we claimed. Then H is an independent vertices $\overline{K_{\delta+k}}$, i.e., $G' = B(n, k, \delta)$, we have $G \subseteq B(n, k, \delta)$. The proof is now complete. ■

Lemma 3.2 For each graph $G \in \mathcal{B}_1(n, k, \delta)$, we have $q(G) \geq 2(n - k - \delta - 1)$.

Proof. Let $G \in \mathcal{B}_1(n, k, \delta)$. Note that $q(K_{n-k-\delta} \cup \overline{K_{\delta+k}}) = 2(n - k - \delta - 1)$, and we define a characteristic vector x , where $x_i = 1$ if $i \in Y \cup Z$ and $x_j = 0$ if $j \in X$. Obviously x is the eigenvector corresponding to $q(K_{n-k-\delta-1} \cup \overline{K_{\delta+k+1}})$. Then we get

$$\langle Q(G)x, x \rangle - \langle Q(K_{n-k-\delta} \cup \overline{K_{\delta+k}})x, x \rangle = \delta(\delta + k) - 4|E'| \geq 0.$$

By Rayleigh's principle, we have $q(G) \geq 2(n - k - \delta - 1)$. ■

Lemma 3.3 For each graph $G \in \mathcal{B}_2(n, k, \delta)$, we have $q(G) > 2(n - k - \delta - 1) - 1$.

Proof. Let x be the column vector defined in the proof of Lemma 3.2. We obtain that

$$\langle Q(G)x, x \rangle - \langle Q(K_{n-\delta-k} \cup \overline{K_{k+\delta}})x, x \rangle = \delta(\delta + k) - 4|E'| \geq -4.$$

Similarly, we have $q(G) \geq 2(n - k - \delta - 1) - \frac{4}{\|x\|^2} > 2(n - k - \delta - 1) - 1$. ■

Let G be a graph of $\mathcal{B}_2(n, k, \delta)$ with the largest signless Laplacian spectral radius, and furthermore we may assume that the induced graph $G[Y]$ contains the largest number of edges. Let h be the eigenvector corresponding to $q(G)$. We assume further that $\max_{i \in V(G)} h_i = 1$ by a rescaling.

Lemma 3.4 Assume $G \in \mathcal{B}_2(n, k, \delta)$. For each $i \in X$, we have $h_i \leq \frac{\delta}{q(G) - \delta}$.

Proof. Applying equation (1) at $i \in X$, we have

$$(q(G) - d(i))h_i = \sum_{j \in Y} h_j.$$

Since $d(i) = \delta$ and $\max_{i \in V(G)} h_i = 1$, we have $(q(G) - \delta)h_i \leq \delta$, the proof is completed. ■

Next, we divide Y, Z into two parts, respectively.

$$\begin{aligned} Y_1 &= \{i \in Y : d(i) = n - 1\}, & Y_2 &= \{i \in Y : d(i) \leq n - 2\}, \\ Z_1 &= \{i \in Z : d(i) = n - \delta - k - 1\}, & Z_2 &= \{i \in Z : d(i) \leq n - k - \delta - 2\}. \end{aligned}$$

Before proving Lemma 3.5, let us make clear the following truth: $Z_1 \neq \emptyset$ as $n \geq (\delta^2 + k\delta + 7\delta + 6k + 9)(\delta^2 + k\delta + 1)$. We already know the upper bound of h_i for each $i \in X$ and $\delta/(q(G) - \delta) < 1$ when $n > 2\delta + k + 3/2$. Therefore we get $\max_{i \in V(G)} h_i = \max_{i \in Y \cup Z} h_i$. To obtain the difference between $\max_{i \in V(G)} h_i$ and $\min_{i \in Y \cup Z} h_i$, we need to prove the following several results.

Lemma 3.5 *Assume $G \in \mathcal{B}_2(n, k, \delta)$ as defined above.*

- (1) *If $Y_2 \neq \emptyset$, then $h_i > h_j$ for all $i \in Z_1$ and $j \in Y_2$.*
- (2) *If $Z_2 \neq \emptyset$, then $h_i > h_j$ for all $i \in Z_1$ and $j \in Z_2$.*
- (3) *If $Y_1 \neq \emptyset$, then $h_i > h_j$ for any $i \in Y_1$ and $j \in Z_1$.*

Proof. (1) By contradiction, we assume that there are some $i \in Z_1$ and $j \in Y_2$ satisfying $h_i \leq h_j$. Let $k \in Y$ and $jk \in E(G)$, define a new graph $G' \in \mathcal{B}_2(n, k, \delta)$ by removing an edge ik and adding a new edge jk . Since

$$\langle Q(G')h, h \rangle - \langle Q(G)h, h \rangle = (h_j - h_i)(h_i + h_j + 2h_k) \geq 0,$$

we get $q(G') \geq q(G)$ and the induced graph $G'[Y]$ has more edges than $G[Y]$, which contradicts the choice of G . The proposition is proved.

(2) By Lemma 2.1, for each $i \in Z_1$ and $j \in Z_2$, we have

$$(q(G) - d(i))(h_i - h_j) = (d(i) - d(j))h_j + \sum_{k \in N(i) \setminus N(j)} h_k - \sum_{l \in N(j) \setminus N(i)} h_l.$$

We notice that $N(j) \setminus \{i\} \subset N(i) \setminus \{j\}$, equivalently,

$$(q(G) - d(i) + 1)(h_i - h_j) = (d(i) - d(j))h_j + \sum_{k \in N(i) \setminus N[j]} h_k.$$

Note that $d(i) > d(j)$, the proof is completed.

(3) If $Y_1 \neq \emptyset$. For each $i \in Y_1$ and $j \in Z_1$, by Lemma 2.1, we have

$$(q(G) - d(i))(h_i - h_j) = (d(i) - d(j))h_j + \sum_{k \in N(i) \setminus N(j)} h_k - \sum_{l \in N(j) \setminus N(i)} h_l.$$

Note that $N(j) \setminus \{i\} \subset N(i) \setminus \{j\}$, rearranging the last equation, we obtain

$$(q(G) - d(i) + 1)(h_i - h_j) = (d(i) - d(j))h_j + \sum_{k \in N(i) \setminus N[j]} h_k. \quad (3)$$

Since $d(i) > d(j)$, the proof is completed. ■

The key step for proving Lemma 3.7 is to show Lemma 3.6.

Lemma 3.6 *Assume $G \in \mathcal{B}_2(n, k, \delta)$ as defined above. We have*

$$\max_{i \in V(G)} h_i - \min_{j \in Y \cup Z} h_j < \frac{(\delta + k)(\delta + 4) + 4}{2(q(G) - n + 1)}.$$

Proof. We distinguish it into two cases.

Case 1: $Y_1 \neq \emptyset$. Notice that $\max_{i \in V(G)} h_i$ is attained by vertices from Y_1 by the above analysis. Hence $d(i) = n - 1$, i.e., the vertex i is adjacent to all other vertices in G .

Subcase 1.1: If $j \in Y_2$, we have $N(i) \setminus N[j] = \{k : k \in Y \cup Z \text{ and } k \not\approx j\}$. Thus we have $d(i) - d(j) \leq \left\lfloor \frac{(\delta+k)\delta}{4} \right\rfloor + 1$ and $|N(i) \setminus N[j]| \leq \left\lfloor \frac{(\delta+k)\delta}{4} \right\rfloor + 1$. Note that $N(j) \setminus \{i\} \subset N(i) \setminus \{j\}$, applying (4), we get

$$(q(G) - d(i) + 1)(h_i - h_j) = (d(i) - d(j))h_j + \sum_{k \in N(i) \setminus N[j]} h_k \leq \frac{(\delta + k)\delta}{2} + 2.$$

Since $i \in Y_1$, then

$$h_i - h_j \leq \frac{\frac{(\delta+k)\delta}{2} + 2}{q(G) - (n-1) + 1} = \frac{(\delta + k)\delta + 4}{2(q(G) - n + 2)} < \frac{(\delta + k)(\delta + 4) + 4}{2(q(G) - n + 1)}.$$

Subcase 1.2: If $j \in Z_1$, we have $N(i) \setminus N[j] = X$ and $N(j) \setminus N[i] = \emptyset$. Then $|N(i) \setminus N[j]| = \delta + k + 1$. Meanwhile, note that $d(i) - d(j) = \delta + k + 1$. So

$$\begin{aligned} (q(G) - d(i) + 1)(h_i - h_j) &= (d(i) - d(j))h_j + \sum_{k \in N(i) \setminus N[j]} h_k - \sum_{l \in X} h_l \\ &\leq (d(i) - d(j))h_j + \sum_{k \in N(i) \setminus N[j]} h_k \\ &\leq \delta + k + \delta + k. \\ &= 2(\delta + k). \end{aligned}$$

Since $i \in Y_1$, we easily have

$$h_i - h_j < \frac{2(\delta + k)}{q(G) - (n-1) + 1} = \frac{4(\delta + k)}{2(q(G) - n + 2)} < \frac{(\delta + k)(\delta + 4) + 4}{2(q(G) - n + 1)}.$$

Subcase 1.3: If $j \in Z_2$, we have $N(i) \setminus N[j] = \{k : k \in X \cup Y \cup Z \text{ and } k \not\approx j\}$, and $N(j) \setminus N[i] = \emptyset$. Thus we have $|N(i) \setminus N[j]| \leq \delta + k + \left\lfloor \frac{(\delta+k)\delta}{4} \right\rfloor + 1$. Then, note that $d(i) - d(j) \leq \left\lfloor \frac{(\delta+k)\delta}{4} \right\rfloor + 1 + \delta + k$. Therefore, we get

$$(q(G) - d(i) + 1)(h_i - h_j) = (d(i) - d(j))x_j + \sum_{k \in N(i) \setminus N[j]} x_k - \sum_{l \in X} x_l$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq (d(i) - d(j))x_j + \sum_{k \in N(i) \setminus N[j]} x_k \\
&\leq \frac{(\delta + k)\delta}{2} + 2(\delta + k) + 2. \\
&= \frac{(\delta + k)(\delta + 4)}{2} + 2.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $i \in Y_1$, we easily have

$$h_i - h_j \leq \frac{\frac{(\delta+k)(\delta+4)}{2} + 2}{q(G) - (n-1) + 1} = \frac{(\delta+k)(\delta+4) + 4}{2(q(G) - n + 2)} < \frac{(\delta+k)(\delta+4) + 4}{2(q(G) - n + 1)}.$$

Case 2: $Y_1 = \emptyset$. Notice that $\max_{i \in V(G)} h_i$ is attained by vertices from Z_1 . And for each $i \in Z_1$, $d(i) = n - \delta + k - 1$, hence the vertex i is adjacent to all other vertices in $Y \cup Z$.

Subcase 2.1: If $j \in Z_2$, we have $N(i) \setminus N[j] = \{k : k \in Y \cup Z \text{ and } k \approx j\}$. Thus we get $d(i) - d(j) \leq \lfloor \frac{(\delta+k)\delta}{4} \rfloor + 1$ and $|N(i) \setminus N[j]| \leq \lfloor \frac{(\delta+k)\delta}{4} \rfloor + 1$. Note that $N(j) \setminus \{i\} \subset N(i) \setminus \{j\}$, applying (4), we get

$$(q(G) - d(i) + 1)(h_i - h_j) = (d(i) - d(j))h_j + \sum_{k \in N(i) \setminus N[j]} h_k \leq \frac{(\delta + k)\delta}{2} + 2.$$

Since $i \in Z_1$, we easily have

$$h_i - h_j \leq \frac{\frac{(\delta+k)\delta}{2} + 2}{q(G) - (n - \delta - k - 1) + 1} = \frac{(\delta + k)\delta + 4}{2(q(G) - n + \delta + k + 2)} < \frac{(\delta + k)(\delta + 4) + 4}{2(q(G) - n + 1)}.$$

Subcase 1.2: If $j \in Y_2$, we have $N(i) \setminus N[j] = \{k : k \in Y \cup Z \text{ and } k \approx j\}$, and $N(j) \setminus N[i] = X$. Thus we have $|N(i) \setminus N[j]| \leq \lfloor \frac{(\delta+k)\delta}{4} \rfloor + 1$. We also observe that $|d(i) - d(j)| \leq \lfloor \frac{(\delta+k)\delta}{4} \rfloor + \delta + k + 1$. Similarly, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
(q(G) - d(i) + 1)(h_i - h_j) &= (d(i) - d(j))h_j + \sum_{k \in N(i) \setminus N[j]} h_k - \sum_{l \in X} h_l \\
&\leq (d(i) - d(j))x_j + \sum_{k \in N(i) \setminus N[j]} x_k \\
&\leq \frac{(\delta + k)\delta}{2} + \delta + k + 1 + 1. \\
&= \frac{(\delta + k)(\delta + 2)}{2} + 2.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $i \in Z_1$, we easily have

$$h_i - h_j \leq \frac{\frac{(\delta+k)(\delta+2)}{2} + 2}{q(G) - (n - \delta - k - 2) + 1} = \frac{(\delta + k)(\delta + 2) + 4}{2(q(G) - n + \delta + k + 2)} < \frac{(\delta + k)(\delta + 4) + 4}{2(q(G) - n + 1)}.$$

The proof is completed. ■

In order to prove Theorem 1.4, we also need another lemma.

Lemma 3.7 *Let G be a graph of order $n \geq F(k, \delta)$ and minimum degree $\delta(G) \geq \delta \geq 1$. For each graph $G \in \mathcal{B}_2(n, k, \delta)$, we have $q(G) < 2(n - \delta - k - 1)$.*

Proof. We first assume $G \in \mathcal{B}_2(n, k, \delta)$ such that G has the largest signless Laplacian spectral radius and $G[Y]$ contains the largest number of edges. Let $q(G)$ be the largest eigenvalue of $Q(G)$ and h be the eigenvector corresponding to $q(G)$. Lemmas 3.4 and 3.6 together with $|E'| = \lfloor \frac{\delta(\delta+k)}{4} \rfloor \geq \frac{\delta(\delta+k)+1}{4}$ imply that

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle Q(G)h, h \rangle - \langle Q(\overline{K_{\delta+k}} \cup K_{n-\delta-k})h, h \rangle \\ &= \sum_{i \in X, j \in Y} (h_i + h_j)^2 - \sum_{i, j \in E'} (h_i + h_j)^2 \\ &\leq |X||Y| \left(\max_{i \in X} h_i + \max_{j \in Y} h_j \right)^2 - |E'| \left(2 \min_{j \in Y \cup Z} h_j \right)^2 \\ &\leq \delta(k + \delta) \left(1 + \frac{\delta}{q(G) - \delta} \right)^2 - [\delta(\delta + k) + 1] \left(1 - \frac{(\delta + k)(\delta + 4) + 4}{2(q(G) - n + 1)} \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since $q(G) > 2(n - \delta - k - 1) - 1$ by Lemma 3.3, then we can choose for our purpose that $n \geq (\delta^2 + k\delta + 7\delta + 6k + 9)(\delta^2 + k\delta + 1)$, to make sure the following holds.

$$\langle Q(G)h, h \rangle - \langle Q(\overline{K_{\delta+k}} \cup K_{n-\delta-k})h, h \rangle < 0.$$

According to Rayleigh's principle,

$$\frac{\langle Q(\overline{K_{\delta+k}} \cup K_{n-\delta-k})h, h \rangle}{\langle h, h \rangle} \leq q(\overline{K_{\delta+k}} \cup K_{n-\delta-k}) = 2(n - \delta - k - 1).$$

Therefore, we have $q(G) = \frac{\langle Q(G)h, h \rangle}{\langle h, h \rangle} < 2(n - \delta - k - 1)$. ■

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 1.4.

Proof. By Lemma 2.2, we have

$$2(n - \delta - k - 1) \leq q(G) \leq \frac{2e(G)}{n - 1} + n - 2.$$

We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} e(G) &\geq \frac{(n - 2\delta - 2k)(n - 1)}{2} \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(n - k - \delta - 1)(n - k - \delta - 2) + (\delta + 1)(k + \delta + 1) \\ &\quad + n - \frac{1}{2}(k + \delta + 1)(3\delta + k + 2) - 1 \\ &> \frac{1}{2}(n - k - \delta - 1)(n - k - \delta - 2) + (\delta + 1)(k + \delta + 1), \end{aligned}$$

the last inequality holds as $n \geq \frac{1}{2}(k + \delta + 1)(3\delta + k + 2) + 1$. By Lemma 3.1, G is k -path coverable unless $G \subseteq B(n, k, \delta)$. Together with Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 3.7, the result follows. ■

References

- [1] J.A. Bondy, V. Chvátal, *A method in graph theory*, Discrete Math. **15** (1976) 111–135.
- [2] J.A. Bondy, U.S.R. Murty, *Graph Theory with Applications*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1976.
- [3] R.A. Brualdi, E.S. Solheid, *On the spectral radius of complementary acyclic matrices of zeros and ones*, SIAM J. Alg. Disc. Meth. **7** (1986) 265–272.
- [4] L. Chen, J. Liu, Y. Shi, *Matching energy of unicyclic and bicyclic graphs with a given diameter*, Complexity **21**(2) (2015) 224–238.
- [5] V. Chvátal, *On Hamilton's ideals*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B **12** (1972) 163–168.
- [6] G. Chartrand, S. Kapoor, D. Lick, *n -Hamiltonian graphs*, J. Combin. Theory **9** (1970) 308–312.
- [7] L.H. Feng, P.L. Zhang, H. Liu, W. Liu, M. Liu, Y. Hu, *Spectral conditions for some graphical properties*, Linear Algebra Appl. **524** (2017) 182–198.
- [8] L.H. Feng, J. Cao, W. Liu, S. Ding, H. Liu, *The spectral radius of edge chromatic critical graphs*, Linear Algebra Appl. **492** (2016) 78–88.
- [9] L.H. Feng, P. Zhang, W. Liu, *Spectral radius and k -connectedness of graphs*, Monatsh. Math. **185** (2018) 651–661.
- [10] L.H. Feng, X. Zhu, W. Liu, *Wiener index, Harary index and graph properties*, Discrete Applied Math. **223** (2017) 72–83.
- [11] L.H. Feng, G.H. Yu, *On three conjectures involving the signless Laplacian spectral radius of graphs*, Publ. Inst. Math. (Beograd). **85** (2009) 35–38.
- [12] M. Fiedler, V. Nikiforov, *Spectral radius and Hamiltonicity of graphs*, Linear Algebra Appl. **432** (9) (2010) 2170–2173.
- [13] P. Hansen, D. Stevanović, *On bags and bugs*, Discrete Appl. Math. **156** (2008) 986–997.
- [14] B. Huo, X. Li, Y. Shi, *Complete solution to a conjecture on the maximal energy of unicyclic graphs*, European J. Combin. **32** (2011) 662–673.
- [15] B. Li, B. Ning, *Spectral analogues of Erdős' and Moon-Moser's theorems on Hamilton cycles*, Linear Multilinear Algebra **64**(11) (2016) 1152–1169.
- [16] H. Li, *Generalizations of Dirac's theorem in Hamiltonian graph theory—A survey*, Discrete Math. **313** (2013) 2034–2053.
- [17] J. Li, X. Li, Y. Shi, *On the maximal energy tree with two maximum degree vertices*, Linear Algebra Appl. **435** (2011) 2272–2284.
- [18] X. Li, Y. Shi, M. Wei, J. Li, *On a conjecture about tricyclic graphs with maximal energy*, MATCH Commun. Math. Comput. Chem. **72** (2014) 183–214.

- [19] J. Li, G. Steiner, *Partitioning a graph into vertex-disjoint paths*, Studia Sci. Math. Hungar. **42** (2005) 277–294.
- [20] X. Li, M. Wei, J. Li, Y. Shi, *On a conjecture about tricyclic graphs with maximal energy*, MATCH Commun. Math. Comput. Chem. **72** (2014) 183–214.
- [21] Y. Li, Y. Liu, X. Peng, *Signless Laplacian spectral radius and Hamiltonicity of graphs with large minimum degree*, Linear and Multilinear Algebra **66** (2018) 2011–2023.
- [22] R. Liu, W.C. Shiu, J. Xue, *Sufficient spectral conditions on Hamiltonian and traceable graphs*, Linear Algebra Appl. **467** (2015) 254–266.
- [23] W.J. Liu, M. Liu, L.H. Feng, *Spectral conditions for graphs to be β -deficient involving minimum degree*, Linear and Multilinear Algebra **66** (2018), 792–802.
- [24] W.J. Liu, M. Liu, P.L. Zhang, L.H. Feng, *Spectral conditions for graphs to be k -hamiltonian or k -path-coverable*, Discuss. Math. Graph Theory **40** (2020) 161–179.
- [25] M. Lu, H. Liu, F. Tian, *Spectral radius and Hamiltonian graphs*, Linear Algebra Appl. **437** (2012) 1670–1674.
- [26] V. Nikiforov, *The spectral radius of graphs without paths and cycles of specified length*, Linear Algebra Appl. **432** (2010) 2243–2256
- [27] V. Nikiforov, *Spectral radius and Hamiltonicity of graphs with large minimum degree*, Czech. Math. Journal **66** (141) (2016) 925–940.
- [28] B. Ning, J. Ge, *Spectral radius and Hamiltonian properties of graphs*, Linear Multilinear Algebra **63** (8) (2015) 1520–1530.
- [29] G. Steiner, *On the k -path partition of graphs*, Theoretical Computer Science 290 (2003) 2147–2155.
- [30] D. Stevanović, M. Aouchiche, P. Hansen, *On the spectral radius of graphs with a given domination number*, Linear Algebra Appl. **428** (2008) 1854–1864.
- [31] G.D. Yu , Y.Z. Fan, *Spectral conditions for a graph to be Hamilton-connected*, Applied Mechanics and Materials **336-338** (2013) 2329–2334.
- [32] M. Zhang, S.C. Li, *Extremal Halin graphs with respect to the signless Laplacian spectra*, Discrete Appl. Math. **213** (2016) 207–218.
- [33] X.-D. Zhang, *The signless Laplacian spectral radius of graphs with given degree sequence*, Discrete Appl. Math. **157** (2009) 2928–2937.
- [34] M. Zhang, S.C. Li, *Extremal cacti of given matching number with respect to the distance spectral radius*, Appl. Math. Comput. **291** (2016) 89–97.
- [35] B. Zhou, *Signless Laplacian spectral radius and Hamiltonicity*, Linear Algebra Appl. **432** (2010), 566–570.

- [36] Q. Zhou, L. Wang, *Some sufficient spectral conditions on Hamilton-connected and traceable graphs*, Linear Multilinear Algebra **65** (2017) 224–234.
- [37] Q.N. Zhou, L.G. Wang, Y. Lu, *Some sufficient conditions on k -connected graphs*, Applied Math. Comput. **325** (2018) 332–339