Токуо J. Матн. Vol. 20, No. 2, 1997

# **Neighborhood Conditions and** *k***-Factors**

Tadashi IIDA and Tsuyoshi NISHIMURA

Keio University and Shibaura Institute of Technology (Communicated by M. Maejima)

Abstract. Let k be an integer such that  $k \ge 2$ , and let G be a connected graph of order n such that  $n \ge 9k-1-4\sqrt{2(k-1)^2+2}$ , kn is even, and the minimum degree is at least k. We prove that if  $|N_G(u) \cup N_G(v)| \ge \frac{1}{2}(n+k-2)$  for each pair of nonadjacent vertices u, v of G, then G has a k-factor.

## 1. Introduction.

In this paper, we consider only finite undirected graphs without loops or multiple edges. Let G be a graph with vertex set V(G) and edge set E(G). For a vertex v of G, we write  $N_G(v)$  for the set of vertices of V(G) adjacent to v, and  $N_G[v]$  for  $N_G(v) \cup \{v\}$ . Further the degree of v,  $\deg_G(v)$ , is defined to be  $|N_G(v)|$ . In addition, we denote  $|N_G(u) \cup N_G(v)|$  by N(u, v). We define NC to be min N(u, v), where the minimum is taken over all pairs of nonadjacent vertices u, v. We use  $\delta(G)$  for the minimum degree. Let A and B be disjoint subsets of V(G). Then  $e_G(A, B)$  denotes the number of edges that join a vertex in A and a vertex in B. We let G - A denotes the subgraph of G obtained from G by deleting the vertices in A together with the edges incident with them. A spanning subgraph F of G is called a k-factor if  $\deg_F(v) = k$  for all  $v \in V(G)$ . If G and H are disjoint graphs, the union and the join are denoted by  $G \cup H$  and G + H, respectively. A vertex v is often identified with the set  $\{v\}$ . The definition of terms not defined here can be found in [1].

THEOREM 1.1. Let k be an integer such that  $k \ge 2$ , and let G be a connected graph of order n such that  $n \ge 9k - 1 - 4\sqrt{2(k-1)^2 + 2}$ , kn is even, and the minimum degree is at least k. If G satisfies  $NC \ge \frac{1}{2}(n+k-2)$ , then G has a k-factor.

The condition  $NC \ge \frac{1}{2}(n+k-2)$  is best possible, as can be seen from the following examples.

First assume that k is even. Let  $T = K_{k-1}$  with  $V(T) = \{a_1, \dots, a_{k-1}\}$ , and  $C_i = K_{k+2p}$  (p>0, i=1, 2) with  $V(C_i) = \{b_{i,1}, \dots, b_{i,k-1}, \dots, b_{i,k+2p}\}$ . Now we define a graph

Received February 29, 1996 Revised October 4, 1996 G as follows:

 $V(G) = V(T) \cup V(C_1) \cup V(C_2)$  and  $E(G) = E(T) \cup E(C_1) \cup E(C_2) \cup \{a_j b_{ij} | i = 1, 2 \text{ and } 1 \le j \le k-1\}$ . Then G is connected and  $\delta(G) \ge k$ . Also G has no k-factor, because  $\theta(\emptyset, T) = k \cdot 0 + 0 \cdot |T| - h_G(\emptyset, T) = -2$ , where  $\theta$  and  $h_G$  are as will be defined in the statement of Lemma 1.3 (note that  $k | C_i| + e_G(C_i, T) = k(k+2p) + k - 1 = k(k+2p+1) - 1 \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$ ). However, for  $u \in V(T)$  and  $v \in C_1$  or  $C_2$  with  $uv \notin E(G)$ , N(u, v) = (k-2) + (k+2p-1) + 1 = (n+k-3)/2, and for  $u \in C_1$  and  $v \in C_2$ ,  $N(u, v) \ge 2(k+2p-1) > (n+k-3)/2$ , and hence G satisfies  $NC \ge (n+k-3)/2$ .

Next assume that k is odd. Let p>0 be an integer. Let  $S=K_1$ ,  $T=K_k$ , and  $C_i = K_{k+2p}$  (i=1, 2), and define a graph G by

$$G = S + (T \cup C_1 \cup C_2) \, .$$

Then we have  $\theta(S, T) = k + (k-1-k) |T| - h_G(S, T) = -2$  because  $k |C_i| + e_G(C_i, T) = k(k+2p) + 0 \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$ . Also for  $u, v \in T \cup C_1 \cup C_2$  with  $uv \notin E(G)$ , we get  $N(u, v) \ge |S| + (|T| - 1) + (|C_2| - 1) = 2p + 2k - 1 = \frac{1}{2}(n+k-3)$  (since n = 3k + 4p + 1).

For the special case where k=2, we have the following theorem, in which all conditions are best (for example,  $K_2 + (3K_2)$  does not have a 2-factor).

THEOREM 1.2. Let G be a connected graph of order  $n \ge 9$  such that the minimum degree is at least 2. If  $NC \ge n/2$ , then G has a 2-factor.

We conclude this introductory section by stating a criterion for the existence of a k-factor.

LEMMA 1.3 (Tutte). A graph G has a k-factor if and only if

$$\theta(S, T) := k |S| + \sum_{v \in T} \deg_{G-S}(v) - k |T| - h_G(S, T) \ge 0$$

for any disjoint subsets S, T of V(G), where  $h_G(S, T)$  denotes the number of connected components C of  $G - (S \cup T)$  such that  $k | C | + e_G(C, T) \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$ . Furthermore, whether G has a k-factor or not, we have  $\theta(S, T) \equiv k | V(G) | \pmod{2}$  for any disjoint subsets S and T of V(G).

## 2. Proof of Theorem 1.1.

First we state some numerical results which are often applied in the proof of Theorem 1.1.

LEMMA 2.1. Let  $n, s, t, m_1, m_2$ , and  $w_0$  be nonnegative integers. Also, suppose that  $m_i \ge 3$  (i = 1, 2) and  $(m_1 + m_2)w_0 \le 2(n - s - t)$ . Then the following hold.

(i) If  $w_0 \ge 4$ , then  $m_1 + m_2 + s + t - 2 \le \frac{1}{2}(n + s + t - 3w_0 + 8)$ .

(ii) If  $w_0 \ge 5$ , then  $m_1 + m_2 + s + t - 2 \le \frac{1}{5}(2n + 3s + 3t - 6w_0 + 20)$ .

LEMMA 2.2.

$$9k-1-4\sqrt{2(k-1)^2+2} \begin{cases} >3k+5, & \text{for } k \ge 4 \\ >3k+4, & \text{for } k=3 \\ =3k+3, & \text{for } k=2. \end{cases}$$

Let k, n, G be as in Theorem 1.1, and suppose that G has no k-factor. We aim at deducing a contradiction. By Lemma 1.3, we have  $\theta(S, T) \leq -2$  for some disjoint subsets S and T of V(G). We have  $S \cup T \neq \emptyset$  because  $\theta(\emptyset, \emptyset) = 0$ . We choose such subsets S and T so that  $|S \cup T|$  is as large as possible. Then we have the following lemma.

LEMMA 2.3 ([7]). We have  $\deg_{G-S}(u) \ge k+1$  and  $e_G(u, T) \le k-1$  for all vertices  $u \in G - (S \cup T)$ . Further we have  $|C| \ge 3$  for all components C of  $G - (S \cup T)$ .

For convenience, we set  $U:=G-(S \cup T)$  and let  $C_1, \dots, C_w$  be the components C of U, labelled so that  $|C_1| \leq \dots \leq |C_w|$ , where w denotes the number of components of U. We also let s = |S|, t = |T| and  $m_i = |C_i|$ . Since  $w \geq h_G(S, T)$ , it follows from the inequality  $\theta(S, T) \leq -2$  that

$$w \ge ks + \sum_{v \in T} \deg_{G-S}(v) - kt + 2.$$
(1)

Further, by Lemma 2.3, we also have

$$n - s - t \ge 3w \,. \tag{2}$$

Case 1.  $T = \emptyset$ . Since t = 0, (1) becomes

$$w \ge ks + 2 . \tag{3}$$

From (2) and (3), we obtain  $n-s \ge 3w \ge 3(ks+2)$ . Therefore we have  $s \le (n-6)/(3k+1)$ . By (3),  $w \ge 2$ . Also we have

$$m_1 + m_2 \le \frac{2(n-s)}{w} \le \frac{2(n-s)}{ks+2}$$
 (by (3)).

For  $y_i \in V(C_i)$  (i=1, 2),  $N(y_1, y_2) \le m_1 + m_2 - 2 + s$ . When s=1,

$$N(y_1, y_2) \le \frac{2(n-1)}{k+2} - 2 + 1 < \frac{1}{2}n$$
.

When  $s \ge 2$ ,

$$N(y_1, y_2) \le \frac{2(n-1)}{2k+2} - 2 + \frac{n-6}{3k+1} < \frac{n}{3} - 2 + \frac{n}{7} < \frac{n}{2}$$

Thus in either case,  $N(y_1, y_2) < n/2$ , which contradicts the assumption that G satisfies  $NC \ge (n+k-2)/2$ .

We define  $h_1$  to be equal to the minimum of the degree in G-S of a vertex in T, and let  $x_1 \in \{v \in T \mid \deg_{G-S}(v) = h_1\}$ .

### TADASHI IIDA AND TSUYOSHI NISHIMURA

Case 2.  $T \neq \emptyset$  and  $h_1 \ge k+1$ . We set  $w_0 := ks + (h_1 - k)t + 2$ . Then we clearly have  $w \ge w_0$ .

Subcase 2.1.  $w_0 \ge 4$ . In this subcase  $t \ge 2$  or  $s \ge 1$ , or  $h_1 \ge k+2$ . Therefore for  $y_i \in V(C_i)$  (i=1, 2), we have

$$\begin{split} N(y_1, y_2) &\leq m_1 + m_2 + s + t - 2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}(n + s + t - 3w_0 + 8) \qquad \text{(by Lemma 2.1 (i))} \\ &= \frac{1}{2}[n + s + t - 3\{ks + (h_1 - k)t + 2\} + 8] \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\{n + (1 - 3k)s + (1 - 3h_1 + 3k)t + 2\} < \frac{1}{2}n \,. \end{split}$$

This is a contradiction.

Subcase 2.2.  $w_0=3$ . Note that in this subcase t=1 and s=0 and  $h_1=k+1$ . Since  $S \cup T = \{x_1\}$  and  $\deg_{G-S}(x_1)=k+1$  by the assumptions of this subcase, it follows from Lemma 2.3 and the connectedness of G that  $|V(C_i)| \ge k+2$  (i=1, 2, 3). Hence there is a vertex  $y_i$  in  $C_i$  (i=1, 2, 3) which is not adjacent to  $x_1 \in T$ . For these vertices, we have  $N(x_1, y_i) \le m_i - 1 + e_G(T, C_{i+1} \cup C_{i+2})$  (i=1, 2, 3) (we take  $C_4 = C_1$  and  $C_5 = C_2$ ). Therefore

$$\min N(x_1, y_i) \le \frac{1}{3} \sum_{i=1}^{3} N(x_1, y_i) \le \frac{1}{3} \sum_{i=1}^{3} m_i - 1 + \frac{2}{3} e_G(T, U)$$
$$\le \frac{1}{3} (n-1) - 1 + \frac{2}{3} (k+1) < \frac{1}{2} (n+k-2) \quad (\text{since } n > k+2) .$$

Case 3.  $0 \le h_1 \le k$  and  $T - N_T[x_1] = \emptyset$ . Since  $s \ge k - h_1$ , we have  $w \ge ks + (h_1 - k)t + 2 \ge (k - h_1)(k - t) + 2 \ge 2$  (note that  $t \le h_1 + 1$ ). We claim that  $C_i - N_G(x_1) \ne \emptyset$  for each  $1 \le i \le w$ . Let  $1 \le i \le w$ , and take  $u \in C_i$ . Then  $k + 1 \le \deg_{G-S}(u) \le |C_i| - 1 + |T|$  by Lemma 2.3. Hence by the assumptions of Case 3,  $|N_{G-S}(x_1)| = h_1 < k + 1 \le |C_i| - 1 + |T| = |C_i| + |N_T(x_1)|$ , which implies  $C_i - N_{G-S}(x_1) \ne \emptyset$ , as desired. Subcase 3.1.  $w \ge 3$ . We have  $n - s - t \ge 3w \ge 3\{ks + (h_1 - k)t + 2\}$ . Hence

$$n + (3k - 3h, -1)t - 6 > (3k + 1)s$$
 (4)

Let  $y_1$  be a vertex of  $C_1 - N_G(x_1)$ . From the hypotheses of the theorem and the assumption of this subcase, we obtain

$$\frac{n+k-2}{2} \le N(x_1, y_1) \le s+h_1 + |C_1| - 1 \le s+h_1 + \frac{n-s-t}{3} - 1$$

Therefore we have

$$n+2t+3k-6h_1 \le 4s$$
. (5)

From (4) and (5), we have  $(3k+1)(n+2t+3k-6h_1) \le 4n+4(3k-3h_1-1)t-24$ . Hence

## NEIGHBORHOOD CONDITIONS AND *k*-FACTORS

$$\begin{aligned} (k-1)n \leq (6k+2-4t)h_1 + (2k-2)t - k(3k+1) - 8 \\ \leq (6k+2-4t)k + (2k-2)t - k(3k+1) - 8 \\ = (-2k-2)t + 3k^2 + k - 8 \leq 3k^2 - k - 10. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we obtain the following inequality which, in view of Lemma 2.2, contradicts the assumption  $n \ge 9k - 1 - 4\sqrt{2(k-1)^2 + 2}$ :

$$n \le \frac{3k^2 - k - 10}{k - 1} = 3k + 2 - \frac{8}{k - 1} < 3k + 2.$$

Subcase 3.2. w=2. We divide the proof of this subcase further into two subcases. (i)  $h_1=k-1$ , t=k and s=1. Take  $y_1 \in C_1 - N_G(x_1)$ . Then

$$N(x_1, y_1) \le s + t - 1 + |C_1| - 1 \le k + \frac{n - (k+1)}{2} - 1 = \frac{1}{2}(n+k-3).$$

This is a contradiction.

(ii)  $h_1 = k$  and s = 0. For i = 1, 2, take  $y_i \in C_i - N_G(x_1)$ . Let  $p_i = |N_G(x_1) \cap C_i|$ (i = 1, 2). Then  $\deg_{G-S}(x_1) = p_1 + p_2 + t - 1 = k$ . Therefore, we have  $p_1 + p_2 = k + 1 - t$ . Moreover, we have  $|C_1| + |C_2| = n - t$ . Hence we get the following inequalities:

$$\begin{split} \min(N(x_1, y_i) : i = 1, 2) &\leq \frac{1}{2} (N(x_1, y_1) + N(x_1, y_2)) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} [|C_1| - 1 + (t - 1) + p_2 + |C_2| - 1 + (t - 1) + p_1] \\ &= \frac{n - t}{2} + t - 2 + \frac{1}{2} (k + 1 - t) = \frac{1}{2} (n + k - 3) \,. \end{split}$$

This is a contradiction. This concludes the discussion for the case  $T - N_T[x_1] = \emptyset$ .

We henceforce assume  $T - N_T[x_1] \neq \emptyset$ . We define  $h_2$  to be equal to the minimum of the degree in G - S of a vertex in  $T - N_T[x_1]$ , and let  $x_2 \in \{v \in T - N_T[x_1] | \deg_{G-S}(v) = h_2\}$ . Since  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  are nonadjacent,  $(n+k-2)/2 \le N(x_1, x_2) \le s+h_1+h_2$ , and hence

$$2s \ge n + k - 2(h_1 + h_2 + 1).$$
(6)

For convenience, we set  $p = |N_T[x_1]|$ .

Case 4.  $0 \le h_1 \le h_2 \le k-1$ . In this case, we have

$$(k-h_2)(n-s-t) \ge n-s-t \ge w \ge ks + (h_1-k)p + (h_2-k)(t-p) + 2$$
.

Since  $p \le h_1 + 1$ , this implies

$$(2k-h_2)s \le (k-h_2)n + (h_2-h_1)(h_1+1) - 2.$$
<sup>(7)</sup>

Consequently,

### TADASHI IIDA AND TSUYOSHI NISHIMURA

$$0 \le -h_2 n + 2(h_2 - h_1)(h_1 + 1) - 4 - k(2k - h_2) + 2(2k - h_2)(h_1 + h_2 + 1) \quad (by (6) and (7))$$
  
$$\le -4h_2^2 + (9k - n - 2)h_2 - (2k^2 - 4k + 4) \quad (since h_1 \le h_2 \le k - 1)$$
  
$$\le -4h_2^2 + 4\sqrt{2(k - 1)^2 + 2}h_2 - 2(k - 1)^2 - 2 \quad (since n > 9k - 2 - 4\sqrt{2(k - 1)^2 + 2})$$
  
$$= -4\left(h_2 - \sqrt{\frac{(k - 1)^2 + 1}{2}}\right)^2 \le 0.$$

Further we have strict inequality in the third inequality or in the last inequality according to whether  $h_2 \neq 0$  or  $h_2 = 0$ . This is a contradiction.

Case 5.  $0 \le h_1 \le k$  and  $k \le h_2 \le k+1$ . Subcase 5.1.  $k \ge 3$ . We have

$$n-s-2 \ge n-s-t \ge 3w \ge 3\{ks+(h_1-k)p+(h_2-k)(t-p)+2\}$$
.

Therefore, we get

$$(3k+1)s \le n-3(h_1-k)p-3(h_2-k)-8 \quad (\text{since } t \ge p+1) \\ \le n+3(k-h_1)(h_1+1)-3(h_2-k)-8 \quad (8)$$

(the second inequality follows from the assumption that  $k \ge h_1$  and the fact that  $p \le h_1 + 1$ ). From (6) and (8), we obtain

$$(3k+1){n+k-2(h_1+h_2+1)} \le 2n+6(k-h_1)(h_1+1)-6(h_2-k)-16$$
.

Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} (3k-1)n &\leq 2(3k+1)(h_1+h_2+1) - k(3k+1) + 6(k-h_1)(h_1+1) - 6(h_2-k) - 16 \\ &\leq 2(3k+1)(h_1+k+2) - k(3k+1) + 6(k-h_1)(h_1+1) - 22 \\ &\leq 2(3k+1)(2k+2) - 3k^2 - k - 22 = 9k^2 + 15k - 18. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we obtain  $n \le 3k + 5 - 12/(3k - 1)$ . This implies that

$$n \le \begin{cases} 3k+3 & (3 \le k \le 4) \\ 3k+4 & (k \ge 5) . \end{cases}$$

In view of Lemma 2.2, this contradicts the assumption  $n \ge 9k - 1 - 4\sqrt{2(k-1)^2 + 2}$ . Subcase 5.2. k=2. By (6), we have

$$n \le 2(s+h_1+h_2)$$
. (9)

Further, since  $t \ge p+1$ , we obtain the following inequalities:

$$n-s-(p+1) \ge 3w \ge 3\{ks+(h_1-k)p+(h_2-k)(t-p)+2\}$$
  
$$\ge 3\{ks+(h_1-k)p+(h_2-k)+2\}.$$

Since k = 2, this implies

#### NEIGHBORHOOD CONDITIONS AND k-FACTORS

$$n \ge 7s + (3h_1 - 5)p + 3h_2 + 1. \tag{10}$$

From (9) and (10), we have  $2(s+h_1+h_2) \ge 7s+(3h_1-5)p+3h_2+1$ . Therefore we have  $5s \le h_1-(3h_1-5)p-1$ . When  $0 \le h_1 \le k-1=1$ , from  $p \le h_1+1$ , we have  $5s \le h_1+(5-3h_1)(h_1+1)-1=4$ . Since s is a nonnegative integer, s=0. When  $h_1=k=2$ , we have  $5s \le 2-p-1 \le 0$  (because  $p \ge 1$ ). Therefore, we again have s=0. This implies that  $h_1=k=2$  and  $h_2=3$  because otherwise, by (9), we have  $n\le 8$ , which is against our assumption  $n\ge 9$ . But then from (9), we get  $n\le 10$ , and from (10), we get  $n\ge p+3h_2+1\ge 3h_2+2\ge 11$ . This is a contradiction.

Case 6.  $0 \le h_1 \le k$  and  $h_2 \ge k+2$ . In this case, we have

$$w \ge ks + (h_1 - k)p + (h_2 - k)(t - p) + 2$$
  
 
$$\ge (k - h_1)(k - p) + 2(t - p) + 2 \ge 4.$$

Now we set  $s=k-h_1+\varepsilon_1$ ,  $h_2=k+2+\varepsilon_2$ , and  $t=p+1+\varepsilon_3$ . Then the  $\varepsilon_i$  (i=1, 2, 3) are nonnegative integers. First assume at least one of the  $\varepsilon_i$  is a positive integer. Then we have  $w \ge 5$ . For  $y_i \in C_i$  (i=1, 2), we have

$$\frac{n+k-2}{2} \le N(y_1, y_2) \le m_1 + m_2 - 2 + s + t$$
  
$$\le \frac{1}{5} (2n+3s+3t-6w_1+20) \qquad \text{(by Lemma 2.1 (ii))},$$

where  $w_1$  stands for  $ks + (h_1 - k)p + (h_2 - k)(t - p) + 2$ . From the above inequalities, we obtain

$$\begin{split} n &\leq 6s + 6t + 50 - 5k - 12\{ks + (h_2 - k)t + (h_1 - h_2)p + 2\} \\ &= -6(2k - 1)s + \{6 - 12(h_2 - k)\}t + 26 - 5k + 12(h_2 - h_1)p \\ &= -6(2k - 1)(k - h_1 + \varepsilon_1) + 6(-3 - 2\varepsilon_2)(p + 1 + \varepsilon_3) - 5k + 26 + 12(k + 2 + \varepsilon_2 - h_1)p \\ &\leq -6(2k - 1)(k - h_1 + \varepsilon_1) - 6(3 + 2\varepsilon_2)(\varepsilon_3 + 1) - 5k + 26 + \{12(k - h_1) + 6\}(h_1 + 1) \\ &\leq -6(2k - 1)\varepsilon_1 - 6(3 + 2\varepsilon_2)(\varepsilon_3 + 1) - 5k + 26 + 6(k + 1) \\ &= k + 14 - 6(2k - 1)\varepsilon_1 - 12\varepsilon_2\varepsilon_3 - 12\varepsilon_2 - 18\varepsilon_3 \leq k + 2 \;. \end{split}$$

This is a contradiction. Finally, assume  $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_2 = \varepsilon_3 = 0$ . Then we have  $w \ge (k - h_1)(k - p) + 4 \ge 4$ . For  $y_i \in C_i$  (i = 1, 2), we have

$$\frac{n+k-2}{2} \le N(y_1, y_2) \le m_1 + m_2 - 2 + s + t \le \frac{2}{4}(n-s-t) - 2 + s + t.$$

Hence, we have  $k-2 \le s+t-4=k-h_1+p+1-4$ , that is to say,  $p \ge h_1+1$ . Since  $p \le h_1+1$ , this implies  $p=h_1+1$ . So any vertex in  $C_1$  is independent of  $x_1$ . Hence if we let  $y_1 \in C_1$ , then we have

## TADASHI IIDA AND TSUYOSHI NISHIMURA

$$\frac{n+k-2}{2} \le N(x_1, y_1) \le s+t+|C_1|-1$$
  
$$\le \frac{1}{4}(n+3s+3t-4) \qquad (\text{since } |C_1| \le \frac{1}{4}(n-s-t)).$$

Consequently, we obtain  $2n+2k-4 \le n+3s+3t-4$ . Therefore,

$$n \le 3s + 3t - 2k = 3s + 3(p+1) - 2k = 3(k-h_1) + 3(h_1 - 2) - 2k$$
$$= k + 6 < 3k + 3 \qquad (since \ k \ge 2).$$

This is a contradiction, and this completes the proof of Theorem 1.1.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT. We would like to thank the referee for his detailed suggestions which substantially improved the presentation of this paper.

## References

- [1] G. CHARTRAND and L. LESNIAK, Graphs & Digraphs. Wadsworth (1986).
- Y. EGAWA and H. ENOMOTO, Sufficient conditions for the existence of k-factors, Recent Studies in Graph Theory (ed. V. Kulli), Vishwa (1989), 96–105.
- [3] T. IIDA, A neighborhood condition for the existence of k-factors, Proc. JSPS Workshop on Graph Theory and Combinatorics (1993), 21-35.
- [4] T. IIDA and T. NISHIMURA, An Ore-type condition for the existence of k-factors in graphs, Graphs Combin. 7 (1991), 353-361.
- [5] M. KANO and N. TOKUSHIGE, Binding numbers and f-factors of graphs, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B 54 (1992), 213-221.
- [6] P. KATERINIS, Minimum degree of a graphs and the existence of k-factors, Proc. Indian Acad. Sci. 94 (1985), 123–127.
- [7] P. KATERINIS and D. R. WOODALL, Binding numbers of graphs and the existence of k-factors, Quart. J. Math. 38 (1987), 221–228.
- [8] W. T. TUTTE, The factors of graphs, Canad. J. Math. 4 (1952), 314–328.

#### Present Addresses:

Tadashi Iida

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, FACULTY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, KEIO UNIVERSITY, HIYOSHI, KOHOKU-KU, YOKOHAMA, 223 JAPAN.

TSUYOSHI NISHIMURA

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SHIBAURA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, Fukasaku Ohmiya, 330 Japan.