

# Sufficient conditions for a graph to have factors

Mikio Kano

Department of mathematics, Akashi Technological College  
Uozumi, Akashi 674, Japan

## Abstract

We present sufficient conditions for a graph to have an  $f$ -factor or a  $(g, f)$ -factor that contains given edges or does not contain any given edges, where  $g$ , and  $f$  be integer-valued functions defined on the vertices of the graph.

## 1 Introduction

We consider finite graphs which may have multiple edges but have no loops. All notation and definitions not given here can be found in [3] or [5].

Let  $G$  be a graph with vertex set  $V(G)$  and edge set  $E(G)$ . For a vertex  $v$  of a subgraph  $H$  of  $G$ , we denote by  $\deg_H(v)$  the degree of  $v$  in  $H$ . Let  $g$  and  $f$  be integer-valued functions defined on  $V(G)$ . Then an  $f$ -factor of  $G$  is a spanning subgraph  $F$  of  $G$  such that  $\deg_F(x) = f(x)$  for every vertex  $x$  of  $G$ . A spanning subgraph  $H$  of  $G$  satisfying  $g(x) \leq d_H(x) \leq f(x)$  for all  $x \in V(G)$  is called a  $(g, f)$ -factor of  $G$ . Then an  $f$ -factor and a  $(g, f)$ -factor with  $g \equiv f$  are the same.

Let  $r$  be a positive integer. Then an  $r$ -regular graph  $G$  satisfies  $d_G(x) = r$  for every  $x \in V(G)$ , and a spanning subgraph  $F$  is called an  $r$ -factor (an  $r$ -regular factor) if  $d_F(x) = r$  for all  $x \in V(F)$ .

A criterion for the existence of an  $f$ -factor was found by Tutte[11], and Lovász[10] gave a necessary and sufficient condition for a graph to have a  $(g, f)$ -factor. Simple sufficient conditions for a graph to have an  $f$ -factor and a  $(g, f)$ -factor are given in [8] and [9], and these conditions include edge-connectivity of a graph. In this paper, we give sufficient conditions for a graph to have an  $f$ -factor and a  $(g, f)$ -factor that contain given edges or do not contain given edges. For factors of graphs, the reader should refer to a survey [1].

## 2 Theorems

Let us first give some known results related to our theorems. In order to do so, we need some notation. By  $|X|$ , we denote the cardinality of a set  $X$ . For two disjoint subsets  $S$  and  $T$  of  $V(G)$ , we denote by  $e_G(S, T)$  the number of edges of  $G$  joining  $S$  to  $T$ . For a non-empty proper subset  $X$  of  $V(G)$ , we write  $\partial(X) = \partial_G(X) = e_G(X, V(G)/X)$ . When we deal with  $\partial(X)$ , we always assume  $\emptyset \neq X \neq V(G)$ . The order of  $G$  is  $|V(G)|$ . We use the following notation:

$$\sum (f(x); x \in X) = \sum_{x \in X} f(x) \quad \text{and} \quad \sum (f(x_i); 1 \leq i \leq n) = \sum_{i=1}^n f(x_i).$$

In the following propositions, let  $k, n$  and  $r$  denote positive integers.

**Proposition 1 (Bäbler[2])** . *Let  $G$  be a connected  $r$ -regular graph of even order and  $n \geq 2$ . Suppose  $\partial(X) \geq n$  for all  $X \subset V(G)$  with  $|X|$  odd. If  $r$  and  $k$  are odd and  $r/n \leq k$ , then  $G$  has a  $k$ -factor.*

**Proposition 2 (Gallai[6])** . *Let  $G$  be a connected  $r$ -regular graph. Suppose  $\partial(X) \geq n$  for all  $X \subset V(G)$  with  $|X|$  odd. Then*

(1) *If  $k$  is odd,  $|V(G)| \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$ , and  $r/n \leq k \leq r(n-1)/n$ , then  $G$  has a  $k$ -factor; and*

(2) *If  $k$  is even and  $2 \leq k \leq r(n-1)/n$ , then  $G$  has a  $k$ -factor.*

**Proposition 3 (Bermond and Las Vergnas[4])** . *Let  $G$  be a connected graph of even order, and  $k$  be an odd number. Suppose  $\partial(X) \geq r/k$  for all  $X \subset V(G)$  with  $|X|$  odd or  $\partial(X)$  odd. If  $1 \leq k \leq r/2$  and  $\sum (|d_G(x) - r|; x \in V(G)) < 2r/k$ , then  $G$  has a  $k$ -factor.*

Note that the condition  $\sum (|d_G(x) - r|; x \in V(G)) < r/k$  in [4] can be replaced by  $\sum (|d_G(x) - r|; x \in V(G)) < 2r/k$  as above. It is obvious that the condition  $\partial(X) \geq n$  holds if  $G$  is  $n$ -edge-connected. For a vertex subset  $X$  of a graph  $G$ , we denote by  $G[X]$  the subgraph of  $G$  induced by  $X$ , and by  $G - X$  the subgraph of  $G$  obtained from  $G$  by deleting the vertices in  $X$  together with their incident edges. We now give our theorems; one is a result on  $f$ -factors and the other is a result on  $(g, f)$ -factors.

**Theorem 1** *Let  $G$  be a connected graph,  $\theta$  be a real number such that  $0 \leq \theta \leq 1$ ,  $A$  and  $B$  be disjoint subsets of  $E(G)$ , and  $f$  be an integer-valued function defined on  $V(G)$ . If the following four conditions hold, then  $G$  has an  $f$ -factor  $F$  such that  $E(F) \supset A$  and  $E(F) \cap B = \emptyset$ .*

- (1)  $\sum(f(x); x \in V(G)) \equiv 0(\text{mod } 2)$ .  
(2)  $\varepsilon = \sum(|f(x) - \theta d_G(x)|; x \in V(G)) + 2(1 - \theta)|A| + 2\theta|B| < 2$ .  
(3)  $\theta\partial(X) \geq 1$  for all  $X \subset V(G)$  such that  $G[X]$  is connected and

$$\sum(f(x); x \in X) \equiv 1(\text{mod } 2). \quad (2.1)$$

- (4)  $(1 - \theta)\partial(X) \geq 1$  for all  $X \subset V(G)$  such that  $G[X]$  is connected and

$$\sum(f(x); x \in X) + \partial(X) \equiv 1(\text{mod } 2). \quad (2.2)$$

Note that  $\emptyset \neq X \neq V(G)$  in (3) and (4) because we always assume so when we deal with  $\partial(X)$ . Furthermore, at least one of  $A$  and  $B$  must be an empty set by (2). We give some remarks on Theorem 1, which are useful for applications of Theorem 1.

**Lemma 1** *Let  $G$ ,  $f$  and  $X$  be the same as in Theorem 1. Then the following statements hold.*

- (1)  $\sum(d_G(x); x \in X) \equiv \partial(X)(\text{mod } 2)$ . (2.3)  
(2) If  $\{f(x)|x \in V(G)\}$  consists of even numbers, then (3) of Theorem 1 holds.  
(3) If both  $\{f(x)|x \in V(G)\}$  and  $\{d_G(x)|x \in V(G)\}$  consists of even numbers, then (3) and (4) of Theorem 1 hold.  
(4) If both  $\{f(x)|x \in V(G)\}$  and  $\{d_G(x)|x \in V(G)\}$  consists of odd numbers, then (4) of Theorem 1 holds.  
(5) If  $G$  is a regular graph and  $f(x) = K$  for all  $x \in V(G)$ , then (2.2) implies  $|X| \equiv 1(\text{mod } 2)$ .

**Proof.** (2.3) follows at once from  $\sum(d_G(x); x \in X) = 2|E(G[X])| + \partial(X)$ . We next prove (4). Since  $\{f(x)|x \in V(G)\}$  consists of odd numbers, we have by (2.2) that  $\sum\{f(x); x \in X\} + \partial(X) \equiv |X| + \partial(X) \equiv 1(\text{mod } 2)$ . On the other hand, we obtain  $\sum(d_G(x); x \in X) \equiv |X| \equiv \partial(X)(\text{mod } 2)$  by the assumption on  $\{d_G(x)|x \in V(G)\}$  and (2.3), a contradiction. Therefore there is no  $X$  satisfying (2.2), and thus (4) of Theorem 1 holds. Statements (2), (3) and (5) can be proved similarly.  $\square$

Before giving the other theorem, we show that the propositions mentioned previously can be obtained by making use of Theorem 1.

**Proof of Proposition 1.** Set  $f(x) = k$  for all  $x \in V(G)$ ,  $A = B = \emptyset$ , and  $\theta = k/r$ . We show that the conditions in Theorem 1 hold. It is obvious that (1) and (2;  $\varepsilon = 0$ ) hold. Since  $k$  is odd, we have by (2.1) that  $|X| \equiv \sum(f(x); x \in X) \equiv 1(\text{mod } 2)$ , and thus  $\partial(X) \geq n$ . Hence

$\theta\partial(X) \geq (k/r)n \geq 1$ , and so (3) holds. It follows from (4) of Lemma 1 that (4) is true. Consequently  $G$  has a  $k$ -factor.  $\square$

**Proof of Proposition 2.** Set  $f(x) = k$  for all  $x \in V(G)$ ,  $A = B = \emptyset$ , and  $\theta = k/r$ . We prove that the conditions in Theorem 1 are satisfied. It is clear that (1) and (2;  $\varepsilon = 0$ ) hold. Suppose first  $k$  is odd. Then (2.1) implies  $|X| \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$ , and so  $\theta\partial(X) \geq (k/r)n \geq 1$  as  $\partial(X) \geq n$  and  $r/n \leq k$ . Hence (3) follows. By (5) of Lemma 1, (2.2) implies  $|X| \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$ . Thus  $(1 - \theta)\partial(X) \geq (1 - k/r)n \geq 1$  as  $k \leq r(n - 1)/n$ . Therefore (4) holds and we conclude that  $G$  has a  $k$ -factor. We next assume  $k$  is even. By (2) of Lemma 1, (3) holds. By (5) of Lemma 1, we have  $|X| \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$  and so  $(1 - \theta)\partial(X) \geq (1 - k/r)n \geq 1$  as  $k \leq r(n - 1)/n$ . Hence (4) follows, and thus  $G$  has a  $k$ -factor.  $\square$

**Proof of Proposition 3.** Set  $f(x) = k$  for all  $x \in V(G)$ ,  $A = B = \emptyset$ , and  $\theta = k/r$ . We show that the conditions in Theorem 1 hold. Since  $G$  is of even order, (1) holds. Since  $k$  is odd, we have  $|X| \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$  by (2.1), and so  $\theta\partial(X) \geq (k/r) \cdot (r/k) = 1$ . It is immediate that (2.2) implies that exactly one of  $|X|$  and  $\partial(X)$  is odd. Hence  $(1 - \theta)\partial(X) \geq (1 - k/r)(r/k) \geq 1$  as  $k \leq r/2$ . Moreover, (2) follows from  $\varepsilon = (k/r) \sum(|\deg_G(x) - r|; x \in V(G)) < (k/r) \cdot (2r/k) = 2$ . Consequently  $G$  has a  $k$ -factor.  $\square$

The other theorem is the following.

**Theorem 2** *Let  $G$  be a connected graph,  $\theta$  be a real number such that  $0 \leq \theta \leq 1$ ,  $A$  and  $B$  be disjoint subsets of  $E(G)$ , and  $g$  and  $f$  be integer-valued functions defined on  $V(G)$  satisfying  $g(x) \geq f(x)$  for all  $x \in V(G)$ . If the following four conditions hold, then  $G$  has a  $(g, f)$ -factor  $F$  such that  $A \subset E(F)$  and  $E(F) \cap B = \emptyset$ .*

- (1) *There exists at least one vertex  $v$  satisfying  $g(v) < f(v)$ .*
- (2)  $\varepsilon = \sum(\max\{0, g(x) - \theta d_G(x)\} + \max\{0, \theta d_G(x) - f(x)\}; x \in V(G)) + 2(1 - \theta)|A| + 2\theta|B| < 1$ .
- (3)  $\theta\partial(X) \geq 1$  for all  $X \subset V(G)$  such that  $G[X]$  is connected,  $g(x) = f(x)$  for all  $x \in X$  and  $\sum(f(x); x \in X) \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$ .
- (4)  $(1 - \theta)\partial(X) \geq 1$  for all  $X \subset V(G)$  such that  $G[X]$  is connected,  $g(x) = f(x)$  for all  $x \in X$  and  $\sum(f(x); x \in X) + \partial(X) \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$ .

We next give a corollary of Theorem 2.

**Proposition 4 (Little, Grant and Hoton)** . *Let  $G$  be a  $2r$ -edge-connected  $2r$ -regular graph of odd order. Then for all any vertex  $v$  of  $G$ ,  $G - v$  has a 1-factor that contains no  $r - 1$  given edges.*

**Proof.** Define two functions  $g$  and  $f$  on  $V(G)$  by  $g(x) = f(x) = 1$  for all  $x \in V(G)/\{v\}$ ,  $g(v) = 0$  and  $f(v) = 1$ . Set  $\theta = 1/(2r)$ ,  $A = \emptyset$  and  $B \subset E(G)$  with  $|B| = r - 1$ . We prove that the conditions in Theorem 2 hold. (1) follows at once from  $g(v) < f(v)$ . Since  $\varepsilon = 2\theta|B| = (r - 1)/r < 1$ , (2) is satisfied. It follows from  $\partial(X) \geq 2r$  that  $\theta\partial(X) \geq 1$  and  $(1 - \theta)\partial(X) \geq 1$ . Thus (3) and (4) hold. Consequently,  $G$  has a  $(g, f)$ -factor  $F$  such that  $E(F) \cap B = \emptyset$ , and it is easy to see that  $d_F(v) = 0$ . Therefore  $F$  is a desired 1-factor of  $G - v$ .  $\square$

### 3 Proofs of theorems

The following lemma plays an important role.

**Lemma 2 (Lovász's  $(g, f)$ -factor theorem[10])** *Let  $G$  be a connected graph and  $g$  and  $f$  be integer-valued functions defined on  $V(G)$  such that  $0 \leq g(x) \leq f(x) \leq d_G(x)$  for all  $x \in V(G)$ . Then  $G$  has a  $(g, f)$ -factor if and only if*

$$\delta(S, T) = \sum(d_G(t) - g(t); t \in T) + \sum(f(s); s \in S) - e_G(S, T) - h(S, T) \geq 0$$

for all disjoint subsets  $S$  and  $T$  of  $V(G)$ , where  $h(S, T)$  is the number of components  $C$  of  $G - (S \cup T)$  such that  $g(x) = f(x)$  for all  $x \in V(C)$  and  $\sum(f(x); x \in V(C)) + e_G(T, V(C)) \equiv (\text{mod } 2)$ .

Note that we can find an elegant short proof of the lemma in [13]. A necessary and sufficient condition for a graph to have an  $f$ -factor, so called Tutte's  $f$ -factor theorem([11], [12]), is obtained from the above lemma by setting  $g \equiv f$ .

**Proof of Theorem 2.** Put  $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_p\}$  and  $B = \{b_1, \dots, b_q\}$ , where  $p = 0$  or  $q = 0$  if  $A = \emptyset$  or  $B = \emptyset$ . We first construct a new graph  $H$  from  $G$  by inserting new vertices  $v_i$  and  $w_j$  of degree 2 into edges  $a_i$  and  $b_j$ , respectively, where  $1 \leq i \leq p$  and  $1 \leq j \leq q$ . Then  $V(H) = V(G) \cup \{v_1, \dots, v_p\} \cup \{w_1, \dots, w_q\}$ . We define two new functions  $g'$  and  $f'$  on  $V(H)$  by

$$\begin{aligned} g'(x) &= g(x) \quad \text{and} \quad f'(x) = f(x) \quad \text{if } x \in V(G), \\ g'(x) &= f'(x) = 2 \quad \text{if } x \in \{v_1, \dots, v_p\}; \quad \text{and} \\ g'(x) &= f'(x) = 0 \quad \text{if } x \in \{w_1, \dots, w_q\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then it is obvious that  $G$  has a  $(g, f)$ -factor  $F$  satisfying  $A \subset E(F)$  and  $E(F) \cap B = \emptyset$  if and only if  $H$  has a  $(g', f')$ -factor. Thus it suffices to show that  $H$ ,  $g'$  and  $f'$  satisfy the conditions in Lemma 2.

Let  $S$  and  $T$  be any disjoint subsets of  $V(H)$ . If  $S \cup T = \emptyset$ , then  $\delta(S, T) = \delta(\emptyset, \emptyset) = -h(\emptyset, \emptyset) = 0$  by (1) of Theorem 2. Hence we may assume  $S \cup T \neq \emptyset$ . Let  $C_1, \dots, C_r$  be the components of  $H - (S \cup T)$  which satisfy the conditions on  $h(S, T)$  in Lemma 2, where  $r = h(S, T)$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(S, T) &= (1 - \theta) \sum (d_H(t); t \in T) + \theta \sum (d_H(s); s \in S) \\ &\quad - \sum (g'(t) - \theta d_H(t); t \in T) - \sum (\theta d_H(s) - f'(s); s \in S) \\ &\quad - e_H(S, T) - r. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $g'(v) - \theta d_H(v_i) = 2(1 - \theta)$ ,  $g'(w_j) - \theta d_H(w_j) \leq 0$ ,  $\theta d_H(v_i) - f'(v_i) \leq 0$  and  $\theta d_H(w_j) - f'(w_j) = 2\theta$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum (g'(t) - \theta d_H(t); t \in T) - \sum (\theta d_H(s) - f'(s); s \in S) \\ &\leq \sum (\max\{0, g'(x) - \theta d_H(x)\} + \max\{0, \theta d_H(x) - f'(x)\}; x \in V(H)) \\ &= 2(1 - \theta)|A| + 2\theta|B| + \sum (\max\{0, g(x) - \theta d_H(x)\} \\ &\quad + \max\{0, \theta d_H(x) - f(x)\}; x \in V(G)) \\ &= \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(S, T) &\geq (1 - \theta) \{e_H(T, S) + \sum (e_H(T, V(C_i)); 1 \leq i \leq r)\} \\ &\quad + \theta \{e_H(S, T) + \sum (e_H(S, V(C_i)); 1 \leq i \leq r)\} - \varepsilon - e_H(S, T) - r \\ &= \sum ((1 - \theta)e_H(T, V(C_i)) + \theta e_H(S, V(C_i)) - 1; 1 \leq i \leq r) - \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\delta(S, T)$  is an integer,  $\delta(S, T) > -1$  implies  $\delta(S, T) \geq 0$ . Therefore, since  $\varepsilon < 1$ , it suffices to show that  $(1 - \theta)e_H(T, V(C_i)) + \theta e_H(S, V(C_i)) - 1 \geq 0$  for all  $i$ . For any  $C \in \{C_1, \dots, C_r\}$ , put

$$\Delta(C) = (1 - \theta)e_H(T, V(C)) + \theta e_H(S, V(C)) - 1.$$

If  $e_H(T, V(C)) \geq 1$  and  $e_H(S, V(C)) \geq 1$ , then  $\Delta \geq 0$ , and thus we may assume  $e_H(T, V(C)) = 0$  or  $e_H(S, V(C)) = 0$ . Suppose  $V(C) = \{v_i\}$  (or  $= \{w_j\}$ ). Then it follows from the conditions on  $C$  that  $\sum (f'(x); x \in V(C)) + e_H(T, V(C)) \equiv e_H(T, V(C)) \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$ . Hence  $e_H(T, V(C)) = 1$  and so  $e_H(S, V(C)) = 1$  a contradiction. Therefore,  $C$  contains at least one vertex of  $V(G)$ . We consider two cases.

Case 1.  $e_H(S, V(C)) = 0$ . We shall prove  $\Delta(C) = (1 - \theta)e_H(T, V(C)) - 1 \geq 0$ . We first show that we may assume  $T$  contains neither  $v_i$  nor  $w_j$

such that  $e_H(v_i, V(C)) = 2$  or  $e_H(w_j, V(C)) = 2$ . Suppose  $T$  contains such a vertex  $v_i$  (or  $w_j$ ). Let  $T_1 = T/\{v_i\}$  ( $= T/\{w_j\}$ ) and  $C_1 = H[V(C) \cup \{v_i\}]$  ( $= H[V(C) \cup \{w_j\}]$ ). Then  $e_H(T, V(C)) = e_H(T_1, V(C_1)) + 2$ , and so  $(1 - \theta)e_H(T_1, V(C_1)) \geq 1$  implies  $(1 - \theta)e_H(T, V(C)) \leq 1$ . Moreover,  $C = 1$  is a component of  $H - (S \cup T_1)$  which satisfied the same conditions as  $C$ , that is,  $g'(x) = f'(x)$  for all  $x \in V(C_1)$ ,  $\sum(f'; x \in V(C_1)) + e_H(T_1, V(C_1)) \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$ . Consequently, we may consider  $T_1$  instead of  $T$ , that is, we may assume  $T$  has neither  $v_i$  nor  $w_j$  with  $e_H(v_i, V(C)) = 2$  or  $e_H(w_j, V(C)) = 2$ .

Put  $X = V(C) \cap V(G)$ . We show that  $g(x) = f(x)$  for all  $x \in X$ ,  $e_H(T, V(C)) = \partial_G(X)$ ,  $G[X]$  is connected, and  $\sum(f(x); x \in X) + \partial_G(X) \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$ , which implies  $\Delta(C) = (1 - \theta)\partial_G(X) - 1 \geq 0$  by (4) of Theorem 2. Since  $g'(u) = f'(u)$  for all  $u \in V(C)$ , it is trivial that  $g(x) = f(x)$  for all  $x \in X$ . It follows that  $\sum(f'(u); u \in V(C)) = \sum(f(x); x \in X) + \sum(f'(y); y \in V(C)/X) \equiv \sum(f(x); x \in X) \pmod{2}$  and  $e_H(T, V(C)) = \partial_H(V(C)) = \partial_G(X)$ . Then we have  $\sum(f(x); x \in X) + \partial_G \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$  by  $\sum(f'(u); u \in V(C)) + e_H(T, V(C)) \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$ . Moreover, it is immediate that  $G[X]$  is connected. Consequently,  $\Delta(C) \geq 0$  in this case.

Case 2.  $e_H(T, V(C)) = 0$ . By the same argument as in case 1, we may assume that  $S$  contains neither  $v_i$  nor  $w_j$  such that  $e_H(v_i, V(C)) = 2$  or  $e_H(w_j, V(C)) = 2$ . Let  $X = V(C) \cap V(G)$ . Then we can prove in the same way in the proof of case 1 that  $e_H(S, V(C)) = \partial_H(V(C)) = \partial_G(X)$ ,  $g(x) = f(x)$  for all  $x \in X$ ,  $G[X]$  is connected, and  $\sum(f(x); x \in X) \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$ . Consequently,  $\Delta(C) = \theta e_H(S, V(C)) = 1 = \theta \partial_G(X) - 1 \geq 0$  by (3) of Theorem 2, and we conclude that the proof of this theorem is complete.  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 1.** We first construct a new graph  $H$  and define a new function  $f'$  on  $V(H)$  as in the proof of Theorem 2. By Tutte's  $f$ -factor theorem, it suffices to prove that for any disjoint subsets  $S$  and  $T$  of  $V(H)$ ,

$$\delta(S, T) = \sum(d_H(t) - f'(t); t \in T) + \sum(f'(s); s \in S) - e_H(S, T) - h(S, T) \geq 0.$$

If  $S \cup T = \emptyset$ , then  $\delta(S, T) = -h(\emptyset, \emptyset) = 0$  by (1) of Theorem 1. If  $S \cup T \neq \emptyset$ , then we can show that  $\delta(S, T) \geq -\varepsilon$  by the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 2. On the other hand, we have  $\delta(S, T) \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$  since  $\delta(S, T) \equiv \sum(f'(x); x \in V(H)) \pmod{2}$  ([11, 12]) and  $\sum(f'(x); x \in V(H)) \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$  by (1) of Theorem 1. Therefore, if  $\varepsilon < 2$ , then  $\delta(S, T) \geq 0$ . Consequently,  $G$  has a desired  $f$ -factor.  $\square$

## References

- [1] Akiyama, J., Kano, M: Factors and factorizations of graphs-A survey. *J. Graph Theory* **9** (1985) 1–42.
- [2] F. Bäßler, Über die Zerlegung regulärer Streckenkomplexe ungerader Ordnung, *Comment. Math. Helverrici.* **10** (1938) 275–287.
- [3] M. Behzad, G. Chartrand, and L. Lesniak-Foster, *Graphs and digraphs. Prindle Weber and Schmidt, Massachusetts* (1979).
- [4] J.C. Berge, and M. Las Vergnas, Regular factors in nearly regular graphs, *Discrete Math* **50**, (1984) 9–13.
- [5] J.A. Bondy and U.S.R. MuGraph theory with applications (MacMillan Press, London, 1976)
- [6] T. Gallai, On factorisation of graphs, *Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar.*1(1950)133–153.
- [7] C.H.C. Little, D.D. Grant and D.A. Holton, On defecte  $d$ -matchings in graphs, *Discrete Math* **13**, (1975) 41–54.
- [8] M. Kano,  $[a, b]$ -factorization of a graph, *J. Graph. Theory*, **9** (1985) 129–146.
- [9] M. Kano, Graph factors with given properties, *Graph Theory Singapore, 1983, Springer Lecture Notes in Math. No. 1073*(1984)161–168.
- [10] L. Lovász, Subgraphs with prescribed valencies. *J. Comb. Theory* **9** (1970) 391–416.
- [11] Tutte, W.T., The factors of Graphs, *Canad. J. Math* **4** (1952) 314–328.
- [12] Tutte, W.T.C A short proof of the factor theorem for finite graphs, *Canad. J. Math* **6** (1954) 347–352.
- [13] Tutte, W.T.C Graphs factors, *Combinatorican* **1** (1981) 79–97.