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Abstract

In this paper we study the relationship between the degree sequence of a graph and its matching number. First, we prove that whether a degree sequence can be extended with a new degree δ is equivalent to the existence of a realization of the original degree sequence with a matching of size δ/2 that covers the largest δ degrees. Second, we estimate the minimum size of both the maximal and the maximum matching, as determined by the degree sequence, for any realization. Furthermore, we also estimate the maximum value of the matching number over all possible realizations for the degree sequence. Along this line we answer a question raised by Biedl, Demaine et al. (DOI:10.1016/j.disc.2004.05.003). These results are all closely connected to the recently introduced family of Degree Preserving Growth graph-dynamics (DOI:10.1038/s41567-021-01417-7).
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1 Introduction

A set of independent edges, or a graph matching is a fundamental notion in graph theory, with many practical applications, including in computer science, network control and computational chemistry. Recently, a novel mechanism for network evolution has been introduced (see [10] and [6]) under the name of degree-preserving network growth (DPG), a key element of which is the selection of independent edges, or matchings. The size of matchings in finite graphs is limited, with the largest size being called the graph’s matching number. It is well-known that there exists a polynomial-time algorithm for finding a maximum size (ν(G)) matching in a simple graph G (the “blossom” algorithm of Edmonds [18, Theorem 6.2.3]). However, the matching number is very difficult to estimate analytically, even on the basis of other commonly used graph parameters. For example, two graphs with the same degree sequence may have very different matching numbers (consider the disjoint union of 2k triangles and C_{6k}, i.e., ν = 2k vs. ν = 3k), even by orders of magnitude (see Section 6). Furthermore, local operations (such as manipulating one vertex and its neighbors) on the graph may change this number significantly, e.g.: in the complete bipartite graph K_{2,2k} (ν = 2) remove one of the vertices of degree 2k then
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connect the edges that were incident on it amongst themselves creating the friendship graph $F_k$ ($v = k$).

In the degree-preserving network growth (DPG) model (see [10], [6] and Section 2 below) the network grows in every step by the addition of a vertex in a way that does not change the degrees of any of the existing vertices in the graph, i.e., it respects their degrees, in contrast with previous models (such as the preferential attachment model for generating scale-free networks) where the existing nodes must increase their degrees, whenever a new node attaches to them. It was demonstrated [10] that the DPG process can generate most real-world networks (precisely, the exact graph), despite the problem itself being NP-hard, as shown in [6].

Motivated by the nature of the DPG mechanism used in real-world network modeling and the relative lack in the literature of matching number estimates based on the degree sequence as graph parameters, the goal of this paper is twofold. On the one hand is to study the maximal possible matching number among all the possible graphical realizations of a degree sequence, see Section 2. On the other hand, in Section 4 we study the size of maximal matchings of graphs with given degree sequences. We also answer a question raised by Biedl, Demaine et al. in [3] (see Theorem 4.4). Section 3 briefly describes the motivation for this research, the DPG process. Section 5 further improves on some of the results in Section 4 by focusing on maximum cardinality matchings. The two goals of this paper can be placed into the context of potentially or forcibly P-graphic properties, as described next.

Let $G$ be a simple graph with vertex set $V(G)$ and without isolated vertices. Let $P$ be an invariant graph theoretic property. A degree sequence $d$ is called potentially $P$-graphic if there exists a realization of $d$ which satisfies $P$. It is called forcibly $P$-graphic if each of its realizations satisfy $P$. For an early survey paper about these notions, see [16].

Consider a non-negative integer-valued function $f(v)$, defined on $V(G)$. A subgraph $F \subseteq G$ is an $f$-factor if $\deg_F(v) = f(v)$ for all $v \in V(G)$. When $f(v) = 0$, the isolated vertex does not belong to $F$. A 1-factor is a spanning subgraph with all degree one vertices and thus it forms a perfect matching in $G$. When the $f$-values vary between 0 and 1, then the $f$-factor is a (partial) matching or a $(0,1)$-factor. For simplicity we will use the slightly ambiguous notion of $\alpha$-matching for $(0,1)$-factors of $2\alpha$ 1’s in $f$.

For a given graph $G$, the existence of a 1-factor is fully determined by Tutte’s 1-Factor theorem (see [18, Theorem 6.2.3]). Deciding whether there exists an $f$-factor in $G$, in general, is also relatively easy: the problem is equivalent to finding a 1-factor in a graph derived from $G$ using Tutte-gadgets (see [18, Page 269]).

However, the potentially and forcibly $f$-factor problems are not well-understood. The forcibly 1-factor graphic problem has been solved for a long time, see [3]. J. Petersen in 1891 proved that every even-degree regular graph contains a 2-factor, and thus such degree sequences are forcibly 2-factor graphic (see [18, Theorem 6.2.13]). In 2012 Bauer, Broersma et al. proved a necessary and sufficient condition for degree sequences to be forcibly 2-factor graphic (see [2]). However, the conditions are very complex. The potentially $f$-factor problems, in general, are not well studied, including the $(0,1)$-factor problems. In this paper we provide novel results on both the potentially and forcibly $(0,1)$-factor problems.

2 Potentially $(0,1)$-factor graphical degree sequences

A sequence $d$ of $n$ positive integers ($n$-sequence) is graphic, if there is a graph with a vertex labelling such that the degree sequence of the graph is $d$. Such a graph is called a realization of the graphic sequence $d$. A sequence of $n$ positive integers is arranged if $d_1 \geq d_2 \geq \ldots \geq d_n$.

Let us recall an algorithmic characterization of graphic sequences, introduced independently by Havel and Hakimi:
Theorem 2.1 (Havel, 1955 and Hakimi, 1962, see [13, Theorem 5.2.6.]). There exists a simple graph with degree sequence $d_1 > 0, d_2 \geq \ldots \geq d_n \geq 0$ if and only if the degree sequence $d' = d_2 - 1, \ldots, d_{d_1+1} - 1, d_{d_1+2}, \ldots, d_n$ is graphic.

Note, that the sequence $d'$ is not necessarily arranged.

Theorem 2.1 also provides a simple algorithm (the HH-algorithm) to generate an actual graph with the given degree sequence (if there is any). However, the HH-algorithm cannot construct all realizations of a graphic sequence (see, for example [11, Figure 1]). To be able to do so, further considerations are necessary, such as the star-constrained graphicality theorem based algorithm [11, Theorem 6].

Let us now consider an arranged graphic sequence $d$ and an even integer $\delta > 0$. We want to find necessary and sufficient conditions to ensure that the augmented sequence $D(\delta) = d \circ \delta = d_1, \ldots, d_n, \delta$ is graphic. To do that, we can just simply use Theorem 2.1 which provides the following statement.

Lemma 2.2. Given a graphic arranged sequence $d$ and a positive integer $\delta \leq n$, the augmented sequence $D(\delta) = d \circ \delta$ is graphic if and only if the sequence $d' := d_1 - 1, \ldots, d_\delta - 1, d_{\delta+1}, \ldots, d_n$ is also graphic. (Again, the last sequence is not necessarily arranged.)

Clearly, $\delta$ has to be even and $\delta \leq n$.

Definition 2.3. Given a graphic degree sequence $d$, let $\delta^*$ be the largest integer for which $d \circ \delta^*$ is graphic.

Note, (proven below) if $d \circ \delta$ is graphic, then for each even integer $0 < \delta' < \delta$ the sequence $d \circ \delta'$ is also graphic. Next we show that the graphicality of the augmented sequence is closely related to the existence of some matching in a certain realization of the graphic sequence.

Consider the integer sequence $k = (k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_n)$, where for all $i$ we have $k - 1 \leq k_i \leq k$ where $k$ is a natural number. The following theorem was conjectured by [8] (Generalized $k$-factor Conjecture), and was first proven by [12]:

Theorem 2.4 (Kundu, 1973). Let $d = (d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_n)$ and $(d_1 - k_1, d_2 - k_2, \ldots, d_n - k_n)$ be two graphic sequences. Then there exists a realization of $d$ which contains a $k$-factor.

In the language introduced earlier: it gives a condition for a degree sequence for being potentially $k$-factor graphic. Kundu’s theorem is part of a large literature on graph factors, intimately related to graph coloring and matching theory. Around the same time, Lovász independently gave a simple proof [13] for the case $k = (1, \ldots, 1)$.

As far as we know, the following application of Kundu’s theorem is new.

Theorem 2.5 (Weak extension condition). Given a graphic sequence $d$ and a positive even integer $\delta \leq n$, the sequence $D(\delta) = d \circ \delta$ is graphic if and only if the sequence $d$ has a realization with a matching of size $\delta/2$.

Proof. If a graph $G$ has a matching $M$ of size $\delta/2$, then we construct $G^+$ by pinching the edges of the matching $M$ onto a new vertex $v$: let $V(G^+) = V(G) \cup \{v\}$, and let

$$E(G^+) = E(G) - M + \{vu \mid u \in \cup M\}.$$ 

It is easy to see that the degree sequence of $G^+$ is $d(G) \circ \delta$.

In the other direction, if $G^+$ is a realization of $d \circ \delta$ where $d(v) = \delta$, then take $G = G^+ - v$ (delete the vertex $v$ and its incident edges). Since both $d$ and $d(G)$ are graphic degree sequences, Kundu’s theorem immediately implies that there is a realization of $d$ which contains a matching on the subgraph of $G^+$ induced by neighbors of $v$. \qed
In the following, we only allow values of 0 and 1 in \( k \). Let \( A(k) \) denote the support set of the sequence \( k \); these are the indices \( i \) from 1, \ldots, \( n \) for which \( k_i = 1 \). We introduce a partial ordering on \( A(k) \) by

\[(*) \quad A(k_1) \preceq A(k_2) \text{ if and only if the elements of } A(k_1) \text{ can be produced from the elements of } A(k_2) \text{ by left-shifting.}\]

The left-shift of a strictly increasing sequence \( S_2 \) is another strictly increasing sequence \( S_1 \) such that \( ∀ j : S_1(j) \leq S_2(j) \). In this definition, it is implicit that if \( A(k_1) \preceq A(k_2) \) then \( |A(k_1)| = |A(k_2)| \).

**Lemma 2.6.** Let \( \mathbf{d} \) be an arranged, positive, integer \( n \)-sequence. If sequence \( \mathbf{d} − \mathbf{k} \) is graphic, then so is the sequence \( \mathbf{d} − \mathbf{k}' \), for all \( \mathbf{k}' \) where \( A(\mathbf{k}') \preceq A(\mathbf{k}) \).

Note, we do not assume that \( \mathbf{d} \) is graphic.

**Proof.** By our assumption \( \mathbf{d} − \mathbf{k} \) is graphic. Let \( G \) be a realization. We construct a new graph \( G' \) by adding a new vertex \( u \) to \( G \) and connecting it to each \( v_i \) where \( i \in A(\mathbf{k}) \). The degree sequence of \( G' \) is \( \mathbf{D}([A(\mathbf{k})]) = \mathbf{d} \circ [A(\mathbf{k})] \). Since \( A(\mathbf{k}') \preceq A(\mathbf{k}) \), therefore

\[(**) \quad \text{there exists another graphic realization } G^* \text{ of } \mathbf{D}([A(\mathbf{k})]) \text{ where the neighbors of } u \text{ are those } v_i, \text{ for which } i \in A(\mathbf{k}').\]

This statement follows directly from [11 Lemma 4]. Finally, deleting \( u \) and its edges from \( G^* \), we obtain a graph \( G^+ \) whose degree sequence is \( \mathbf{d} − \mathbf{k}' \).

For the sake of completeness, here we give a version of Havel’s theorem, which also proves (**).

**Lemma 2.7.** Let \( \mathbf{d} \) be an arranged positive integer sequence, and let \( \mathbf{d} \circ \delta \) be graphic. Let \( G \) be a realization, where \( \deg(u) = \delta \). If \( uv_i \in E(G) \) and \( uv_j \notin E(G) \) for some \( j < i \), then there exists another realization \( G' \) of \( \mathbf{d} \circ \delta \) where \( uv_j \in E(G') \) and \( uv_i \notin E(G') \), but the rest of the neighborhood of \( u \) are not changed.

**Proof.** This is the main step in the original proof of Havel’s theorem. We leave the proof to the diligent reader.

The recursive application of this lemma clearly proves statement (**).

**Theorem 2.8.** The arranged degree sequence \( \mathbf{d} \) has a realization with a matching of size \( \mu \) if and only if the sequence \( d_1 − 1, \ldots, d_2μ − 1, d_{2μ + 1}, \ldots, d_n \) is graphic.

**Proof.** (⇒) Assume there is a realization \( G \) of \( \mathbf{d} \) which contains a \( \mu \)-matching. Delete this matching, obtaining a graph with degree sequence \( \mathbf{d} − \mathbf{k} \) where \( |A(\mathbf{k})| = 2\mu \). Since \( \mathbf{k}_0 \) with \( A(\mathbf{k}_0) = \{1, 2, \ldots, 2\mu\} \) is the minimal element in the poset of \( 2\mu \)-element \( \mathbf{k} \) sequences, Lemma 2.6 proves the statement.

(⇐) Since, by assumption, \( \mathbf{d} − \mathbf{k}_0 \) is graphic, Kundu’s Theorem [2.4] provides a realization with an \( \mu \)-matching.

Now Lemma 2.2 and Theorem 2.8 then lead immediately to a strengthening of Theorem 2.3.

**Theorem 2.9 (Strong extension condition).** Given a graphic sequence \( \mathbf{d} \) and a positive even integer \( \delta \leq n \), the sequence \( \mathbf{D}(\delta) = \mathbf{d} \circ \delta \) is graphic if and only if the sequence \( \mathbf{d} \) has a realization with a matching of size \( \delta/2 \) that covers the vertices with the largest \( \delta \) degrees.

The special case of this result for perfect matchings was proved by Lovász and Plummer in [11 Theorem 10.3.3].
Lemma 2.10. Let \( \mathbf{d} \) be an arranged graphic sequence on \( n \) vertices and \( \delta \) be a positive even number. If the sequence \( \mathbf{D}(\delta) = \mathbf{d} \circ \delta \) is graphic, then the sequence \( \mathbf{D}(\delta') \) is also graphic for any even \( 0 < \delta' < \delta \).

Proof. This follows immediately from Theorem 2.8. Since sequence \( \mathbf{D}(\delta) \) is graphic, therefore the graphic sequence \( \mathbf{d} \) has a graphic realization with \( \delta/2 \) independent edges and thus it also has \( \delta'/2 \) independent edges. From Theorem 2.8 the statement then follows. \( \square \)

In view of Lemma 2.10 one can easily find the largest integer \( \delta^* \) for which \( \mathbf{D}(\delta^*) \) is graphic, by running a binary search on the interval \( \delta \in [2, [n/2]] \). However, here we would like to better characterize the value of \( \delta^* \), instead of just determining it numerically.

Definition 2.11. Denote by \( G(\mathbf{d}) \) the set of all labelled simple graph realizations of a graphic degree sequence \( \mathbf{d} \) and let

\[
\nu^s(\mathbf{d}) = \max_{G \in G(\mathbf{d})} \nu(G)
\]

(1)

denote the largest matching number among all of its realizations.

Corollary 2.12. Let \( \mathbf{d} \) be a graphic degree sequence. Then

\[
\delta^* = 2\nu^s(\mathbf{d}).
\]

(2)

Proof. The theorem follows immediately from Theorem 2.8. \( \square \)

Theorem 2.13 (Erdős-Gallai, see [18, Exercise 6.2.43.(c)] and [17]). An arranged degree sequence \( \mathbf{d} \) on \( n \) vertices is graphic if and only if

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{k} d_i \leq k(k - 1) + \sum_{i=k+1}^{n} \min\{d_i, k\}
\]

(3)

holds for any \( 1 \leq k \leq n \). The equivalence holds even if (3) is required only for those \( k \) that satisfy \( d_k > d_{k+1} \) with \( k \leq s \) and also at \( k = s \), where \( s = \max\{i : d_i \geq i\} \) (so \( d_{s+1} < s + 1 \)).

Definition 2.14. For any arranged degree sequence \( \mathbf{d} \), let

\[
t_{\mathbf{d}}(\delta) = \left| \left\{ i > \delta \mid d_i = d_\delta \right\} \right| - \left| \left\{ i \leq \delta \mid d_i = d_\delta \right\} \right|.
\]

Theorem 2.15. For any graphic (non-zero) arranged degree sequence \( \mathbf{d} \)

\[
\nu^s(\mathbf{d}) = \max \left\{ \mu \left| \sum_{i=1}^{k} d_i \leq k^2 + \sum_{i=k+1}^{n} \min\{d_i - I_{i \leq 2\mu}, k\} \forall 1 \leq k < \mu \text{ and} \right. \right.

\[
\left. \sum_{i=1}^{k} d_i - k + \left| \left\{ i > 2\mu \mid d_i = d_{2\mu} \right\} \right| \leq k(k - 1) + \sum_{i=k+1}^{n} \min\{d_i - I_{d_i=d_{2\mu}}, k\} \text{ for } k = 2\mu + t_{\mathbf{d}}(2\mu) \right\}
\]

(4)

where \( I_{i \leq 2\mu} = 1 \) if \( i \leq 2\mu \), otherwise \( I_{i \leq 2\mu} = 0 \).

Proof. By Theorem 2.8 it is sufficient to check the graphicality of the reduced degree sequence \( \mathbf{d}' = (d_1 - 1, \ldots, d_s - 1, d_{s+1}, \ldots, d_n) \), where \( \delta = 2\mu \). Let \( \mathbf{d}'' \) denote the arranged version of \( \mathbf{d}' \). Observe that if \( d_\delta > d_{\delta+1} \), then \( \mathbf{d}'' = \mathbf{d}' \). If \( d_\delta = d_{\delta+1} \), then \( d'_\delta = d''_{\delta+1} - 1 = 1 \) and \( \mathbf{d}'' \) can be obtained from \( \mathbf{d}' \) by transposing two contiguous blocks of degrees equal to \( d_\delta \) and \( d_{\delta+1} - 1 \), respectively. Consequently, in principle, there are at most three different indices \( k \) where \( d'_k > d''_{k+1} \) and \( d_k = d_{k+1} \).
The largest index \( k_1 \) such that \( d_{k_1} > d_\delta \) is a jump locus of \( d \), and the same holds for the largest index \( k_2 \) such that \( d_{k_2} = d_\delta \) \((k_1 \text{ and } k_2 \text{ may or may not remain a jump locus of } d^\delta)\). Thus if \( d_{k_1}'' > d_{k_1+1}'' \) and \( d_k'' = d_{k+1}'' \), then we must have \( k = \delta + t_d(\delta) \).

From Theorem 2.13 it follows that \( d'' \) (and \( d' \)) is graphic if and only if each of the following inequalities hold, whenever \( k = n, \delta + t_d(\delta) \) or \( d_k > d_{k+1} \):

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{k} d_i - k \leq k(k-1) + \sum_{i=k+1}^{\delta} \min\{d_i, k\} + \sum_{i=\delta+1}^{n} \min\{d_i, k\} \quad \text{if } 1 \leq k < \delta \quad (5)
\]

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{k} d_i - k \leq k(k-1) + \sum_{i=k+1}^{n} \min\{d_i, k\} \quad \text{if } \delta \leq k \leq n \quad (6)
\]

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{k} d_i - k + |\{i > \delta \mid d_i = d_\delta\}| \leq k(k-1) + \sum_{i=k+1}^{n} \min\{d_i - I_{d_i=d_\delta}, k\} \quad \text{if } k = \delta + t_d(\delta) \quad (7)
\]

Equations (5) and (6) need not be checked for every \( k < \delta \) and \( k \geq \delta \), respectively, but the inequalities hold even for non-arranged degree sequences. Suppose from now on, that \( k \neq \delta + t_d(\delta) \) and \( d_k > d_{k+1} \). Equation (6) automatically follows from the graphicity of \( d \). Thus the reduced degree sequence \( d'' \) is graphic if and only if eqs. (5) and (7) are satisfied. Inequality (5) follows from the graphicity of \( d \) if

\[
k \geq |\{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid k+1 \leq i \leq \delta \text{ and } d_i \leq k\}|.
\]

In particular, if \( k \geq \frac{1}{2}\delta = \mu \), then eq. (5) is automatically satisfied, which leads to eq. (4). \( \square \)

## 3 Degree-preserving network growth model

There is a surprising and important consequence of this series of statements, especially of Theorem 2.8 for the recently introduced degree-preserving network growth (DPG) model family (see [6] or [10]).

The DPG dynamics can be described as follows: let \( G \) be a simple graph with degree sequence \( d \). In a general step, a new node \( u \) joins the graph by removing a \( \mu \)-element matching of \( G \) followed by connecting \( u \) to the end nodes of the \( \mu \) removed edges. The degree of the newly inserted node is \( \delta = 2\mu \). Note, this step does not join two nodes that are non-adjacent, furthermore, the degrees of nodes in \( G \) are not changed. Thus, the degree sequence of the newly generated network is \( d \circ \delta \). This operation is called a degree-preserving growth step (DP-step for short). The degree-preserving growth process iteratively repeats DP-steps, starting with an arbitrarily chosen graph; the resulting process is what we generally refer to as DPG dynamics.

Thus the DPG model preserves the degrees of already inserted nodes, which can be useful: for example, to construct chemical compounds (where the valency, the number of chemical connections an atom can make, is fixed; however, the number of atoms is not fixed) [10]. Another example is the class of networks in which (some of the) existing nodes cannot accept additional connections, because their connectivity is saturated (e.g., social networks).

The DPG process can produce many types of graph families. For example, it can generate a close to random, ever growing sequence of regular networks (without fixing the size of the network before starting the process). Note, one could make the observation that in this process, each step needs a new matching, which might strongly restrict the degree of the next incoming node, so the fact that this is possible for regular graphs is not immediately obvious. However, Theorem 2.8 shows that if the new vertex has degree \( \delta \), that is the new degree sequence is supposed to be \( d \circ \delta \), then it is graphic if and only if there is a realization of \( d \) with a size \( \delta/2 \).
matching. So the DPG process does not seem to be too restricted, in general. (The several available, useful growth models within this family show the same.) Moreover, for most graphs, including random graphs [7], the matching numbers tend to be large ($O(n)$), where $n$ is the number of vertices) and thus this, in general, is not a very restricting constraint, see Ref. [10].

4 Forcibly $(0, 1)$-factor graphic degree sequences

In this section we are looking for conditions on the degree sequence $d$ which make it forcibly $\alpha$-matching graphic (i.e., each realization of $d$ should contain an $\alpha$-matching). We will use the notation $m(G) = |E(G)|$ for the number of edges in $G$ and $\Delta(G)$ for the maximum degree in $G$. When $G$ is known from the context then we may use only $m$ or $\Delta$.

Definition 4.1. For any matching $M$ in a graph $G(V, E)$, let $V_M \subseteq V$ denote the set of matched vertices and let $U_M$ be the set of unmatched vertices.

Clearly, $V_M \cup U_M = V$. Note that $|V_M| = 2|M|$. A matching is maximal if it is not a proper subset of another matching. A matching is maximum if it has the greatest cardinality among all matchings in $G$. We will use the notation $\nu(G)$ for this maximum cardinality, which is called the matching number of $G$.

Proposition 4.2. For any maximal matching $M$ in graph $G$ with no isolated vertices we have:

(i)

$$\sum_{v \in V_M} d(v) \geq \sum_{u \in U_M} d(u) + 2|M|.$$  \tag{8}

(ii)

$$\sum_{v \in V_M} d(v) \geq m(G) + |M|.$$  \tag{9}

Proof. (i) The vertices in $U_M$ are clearly independent. Furthermore each edge incident with $u \in U_M$ must be incident with an $v \in V_M$. Finally $M$ is completely within $V_M$.

(ii) Follows immediately from (8) after adding to both sides $\sum_{v \in V_M} d(v)$ and observing that $\sum_{v \in V_M} d(v) + \sum_{v \in U_M} d(v) = \sum_{v \in V} d(v) = 2m(G)$.

We can now use this to obtain more concrete estimates by bounding the LHS of (9) from below. The simplest of these is:

Corollary 4.3 ([3]). For any maximal matching $M$ of a graph $G$:

$$|M| \geq \frac{m(G)}{2\Delta(G) - 1}.$$  \tag{10}

Proof. Follows immediately from (9) after noting that $2|M|\Delta \geq \sum_{v \in V_M} d(v)$.

This statement means that if a matching is smaller than the RHS of (10), then the matching can be greedily extended to a bigger one. We remark that this proof is different from the proof in Biedl et al. [3, Theorem 7]. The authors of that paper raised the following question (Section 5, Problem 2): “What can be said about the size of maximum matchings in graphs? Can we obtain a bound better than Equation (10)?” We offer an answer in the following theorem (and Theorem 5.4).
Theorem 4.4 (Maximality-bound). Let $G$ be a graph without isolated vertices and with the arranged degree sequence $d$. For any maximal matching $M$ in $G$, we have

$$|M| \geq k^* = \min \left\{ k \in \mathbb{N} \mid \sum_{i=1}^{2k} d_i - m(G) - k \geq 0 \right\}. \quad (11)$$

The degree sequence is forcibly $k^*$-matching graphic.

Proof. Let $r(k) = \sum_{i=1}^{2k} d_i - m(G) - k$. Since every $d_i \geq 1$ and the degree sequence $d$ is non-increasing, $r(k)$ is strictly monotone increasing. From Equation (9) it follows that for any maximal matching $M$ of size $k$, we have

$$r(k) \geq \sum_{v \in \bigcup M} d(v) - m(G) - |M| \geq 0. \quad (12)$$

In other words, if $r(k) < 0$, then there exists a matching of size at least $k+1$, which is equivalent to the statement. \qed

As we will see soon, this affirmatively answer the question of the authors of [3], since this result is stronger than the bound in Equation (10).

Before we evaluate the prediction strength of Theorem 4.4 we will mention some other known bounds. There are not many such results on the value $\nu(d)$ (without special structural requirements on $G$, like, e.g. being bipartite). We are aware of only two. The first one is based on Vizing’s seminal result on the chromatic index:

Theorem 4.5 (Vizing, 1964, see [18, p. 359]). For any simple graph $G$, the edge-chromatic number satisfies $\chi'(G) \leq \Delta(G) + 1$.

From this one can show the known result:

Corollary 4.6 (Vizing-bound).

$$\nu(G) \geq \frac{m(G)}{\Delta(G) + 1}. \quad (13)$$

This approximation can be close to the truth if the degree distribution is concentrated, but in case of diverse degrees this may be very far from being sharp. The Vizing-bound is better than Equation (10), but it only applies to maximum cardinality matchings, and not necessarily all maximal matchings.

We will use the notation

Definition 4.7. $t_G(q)$ for the number of nodes of $G$ whose degree does not exceed $q$.

Theorem 4.8 ([6, Theorem 4.4]). Let $G$ be a simple graph on $n$ nodes. Let

$$r(G) := \min \left\{ \ell \in \mathbb{Z}^+ : \max_{0 \leq q < \frac{n-\ell}{2}} (t_G(q) - q + 1) \leq \ell \right\}. \quad (14)$$

Then $G$ has a matching of size: $\left\lceil \frac{n-r(G)}{2} \right\rceil \leq \nu(G)$.

We will call this result Pósa-bound, since in [6] it was proved using Pósa’s seminal Hamiltonian cycle result [15]. However, this result was proved already, albeit in a slightly different form by Chvátal and Bondy in (see [13, Theorem 5.1]) (using, essentially, Chvátal’s Hamiltonian cycle theorem). Inequality (14) has proven to be very useful for several DPG dynamics (like linear DPG and MaxDPG) models. In a wide range of cases it provides much better estimations than the Vizing-bound eq. (13).

Next we give four toy examples to compare these three estimations for $\nu(G)$. Recall from the proof of Theorem 4.4 the following notation: let $r(k) = \sum_{i=1}^{2k} d_i - m(G) - k$ for an arranged degree sequence $d$. 
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Example 1. For \( \ell \)-regular graphic degree sequence \( d \) on \( n \) nodes, the Maximality-bound (Theorem \[4.4\]) yields

\[
\nu(G) \geq \frac{1}{2} \frac{\ell}{2\ell - 1} n, \tag{15}
\]

while the Vizing-bound (Corollary \[4.5\]) is almost sharp, since a “typical” (uniformly random) regular graph has \( \nu(G) = n/2 - O(\log n) \) with high probability \[1\].

Example 2. The (non-bipartite) half-graph is defined as follows for every even \( n \): let the set of vertices be the integers \( 1, \ldots, n \), and two distinct vertices \( i \) and \( j \) are joined by an edge \( ij \) if and only if \( i, j \leq n/2 \) or \( i + n/2 \leq j \). The Pósa-bound (Theorem \[4.8\]) gives the correct \( \nu = n/2 \), while the estimate given by the Vizing-bound is only \( \sim n/4 \), and the Maximality-bound is also not any better either (\( \sim 2/4 - \sqrt{2} \)).

Example 3. Next we consider the windmill graph \( Wd(t, \ell) \) where we have \( t \) copies of \( K_{\ell} \) cliques, sharing one central vertex. The special case \( \ell = 3 \): \( Wd(t, 3) \) is called friendship graph. Clearly, the matching number is \( \nu(Wd(t, 3)) = t = (n - 1)/2 \) (near perfect matching, with one unmatched vertex). The Maximality-bound implies that \( \nu(Wd(t, 3)) \geq \lceil n + 3 \rceil / 6 \). The Vizing- and Pósa-estimates are constants.

Example 4. For a general windmill graph \( Wd(t, \ell) \) the Vizing-bound yields \( \nu(Wd(t, \ell)) \geq \ell - 1 \), the Pósa-bound gives \( \nu \geq \ell \), and the Maximality-bound implies \( \nu \geq n/t + 1 \).

In Example 1, the Vizing-bound is a factor of 2 better than the Maximality-bound \( k^* \) in eq. (11). However, this is a worst case scenario, as the next lemma shows.

Lemma 4.9.

\[
\frac{1}{2} \frac{m}{\Delta + 1} < \frac{m}{2\Delta - 1} \leq k^*
\]

Proof.

\[
r \left( \left\lfloor \frac{m}{2\Delta - 1} \right\rfloor \right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{2 \left\lfloor \frac{m}{2\Delta - 1} \right\rfloor} \nu_i - m - \left\lfloor \frac{m}{2\Delta - 1} \right\rfloor \leq \frac{m}{2\Delta - 1} \cdot (\Delta - 1/2) - m \leq 0.
\]

If any of the inequalities is strict, then it follows from the definition that \( \frac{m}{2\Delta - 1} \leq k^* \). If every inequality holds with equality, then \( \frac{m}{2\Delta - 1} \) is an integer and \( r \left( \frac{m}{2\Delta - 1} - 1 \right) = 1 - 2\Delta < 0 \), which also implies the statement.

5 Further lower bounds on the size of matchings in term of the degree sequence

In the remaining part of this note, we will strengthen our maximality-bound for both maximal and maximum size matchings. Let us begin with maximal matchings.

5.1 Maximal matchings

In addition to eq. (11), a set of similar inequalities hold, that are almost the same as the inequalities found by Gale and Ryser, see [18 Exercise 5.2.21]. This leads to a slightly stronger, but a computationally heavier result than Theorem [4.4].
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Lemma 5.1. Let $M$ be a maximal matching in $G$ and let its degree sequence $d$ be arranged. Then
\[ \forall U \subseteq U_M \sum_{v \in V_M} \min\{d(v) - 1, |U|\} \geq \sum_{u \in U} d(u). \] (16)

Proof. Delete each edge within $V_M$, except $M$. In the derived graph $G'$ (where the new degrees $d'(v)$ in $V_M$ may be smaller than in $G$) we have a bipartite graph plus our matching $M$. Since $M$ is maximal, $U_M$ must induce an empty graph. Thus the set of edges incident on a vertex of $U$ must be also incident on $V_M$. The inequality system appears in the well-known Gale-Ryse theorem which fully describes the graphic bipartite degree sequences. \qed

We have the following result on the forcibly $k$-matching graphic problem.

Theorem 5.2. The size of every maximal matching $M$ in any realization of an arranged degree sequence $d$ is at least
\[ |M| \geq \ell^* = \min \left\{ \ell \mid \sum_{i=1}^{2\ell} \min\{d_i - 1, k\} \geq \sum_{i=2\ell+1}^{2\ell+k} d_i, \forall k = 1, \ldots, n - 2\ell \right\}. \] (17)

Proof. The vertices covered by the matching must cover every edge, which implies (16). If $d(v) \leq d(u)$ for $v \in V_M, u \in U_M$, then we can swap them between $V_M$ and $U_M$ and the inequality will still hold. Thus, we have shown that $|M| \geq \ell^*$ must hold. \qed

For $r$-regular graphs $|M| \geq \ell^* = \max \left( \frac{r}{2}, \frac{r}{2r-1} \cdot \frac{n}{2} \right)$.

5.2 Maximum matchings

From now on, we will consider a maximum matching $M$.

Lemma 5.3. Let $M$ be maximum size matching in a graph $G$ with degree sequence $d$. Then
\[ \sum_{uv \in M} \max\{d(u) - 1, d(v) - 1\} + |\{uv \in M \mid d(u) = d(v) = 2\}| \geq \sum_{w \in U_M} d(w) \] (18)

Proof. For any $uv \in M$, if there exist two disjoint edges $e, f$ connecting $V_M$ to $U_M$ that both intersect $uv$, then we may take $M - uv + e + f$ to obtain a larger matching, contradicting to the maximality of $M$. Therefore if both $u$ and $v$ have neighbors in $U_M$, then there is exactly 1 such neighbor in $U_M$. In other words, the number of edges induced between $\{u, v\}$ and $U_M$ is
\[ e(G[\{u, v\}, U_M]) \leq \max \{d(u) - 1, \ d(v) - 1, \ \min\{2, d(u) + d(v) - 2\} \}. \] (19)

The max on the right hand side takes its value from the third argument exclusively only if $d(u) = d(v) = 2$. Summing eq. (19) over every $uv \in M$ we obtain eq. (18). \qed

Using eq. (18), we can strengthen Theorem 4.4 as follows:

Theorem 5.4 (Lower bound on the matching number). For any graph $G$ with arranged degree sequence $d$ we have
\[ \nu(G) \geq \min \left\{ k \geq 0 \mid \sum_{i=1}^{k} 2d_i + \sum_{i=k+1}^{2k} d_i \geq 2m(G) \right\}. \] (20)

\qed
Proof. Let $M$ be a maximum matching in $G$, and let $k = |M|$. Adding $\sum_{w \in V_M} d(w)$ to both sides of eq. (18) and performing usual algebraic manipulations we get:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} 2d_i + \sum_{i=k+1}^{2k} d_i \geq 2m(G).$$  \hspace{1cm} (21)

Equation (20) is not always better than the maximality-bound (eq. (11)). For example, for the friendship graph we have $k \geq (\ell + 2)/3$. However, for the general windmill-graph $Wd(t, \ell)$ we have

$$k \geq \frac{t(\ell - 2) + 2}{3} = \frac{n - t + 1}{3}$$

This is a factor of $\frac{4}{3}$ larger than the maximality-bound on the same degree sequence.

For the half-graph for an even $n$, we have

$$6kn - 5k^2 - 3k \geq n^2 \Rightarrow \min k \simeq \frac{n}{5}.$$  

Finally, for an $\ell$-regular graph $G$, we have $\nu(G) \geq \frac{\ell}{3}n$. The lower bound is sharp for disjoint union of triangles, and it is a factor of $\frac{4}{3}$ better than what we obtained from Theorem 4.4.

In comparison, [9, Theorem B] proves $\nu(G) \geq \frac{4\nu - 1}{9}$ for any connected 3-regular graph $G$ on $n$ vertices. Of course, for disconnected graphs, the matching number can be lower: for any 5-divisible $n$, we have $\nu(\frac{n}{5} \times K_5) = \frac{2n}{5}$.

6 An open problem: minimum maximum matching

We finish this paper with an open problem. A graph $G$ can have several maximal matchings. Let us denote the smallest size among the maximal matchings with $\bar{\nu}(G)$ and thus $\bar{\nu}(G) \leq |A| \leq \nu(G)$. In general, to determine the value $\bar{\nu}(G)$ is NP-hard, showed by [19]. The same is true for several restricted graph classes. Since $2\bar{\nu}(G) \geq \nu(G)$ therefore a 2-approximation is trivial. Furthermore Chlebík and Chlebíková showed that a $7/6$ approximation algorithm ([5]) for the value $\bar{\nu}(G)$ is also NP-hard. Let $\bar{\nu}(d)$ denote the minimum possible $\bar{\nu}(G)$ for all possible realizations of the graphic degree sequence $d$. A very interesting question is then whether $\bar{\nu}(d) = \ell^*(\text{see (17)})$.
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