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#### Abstract

In this paper, we consider the decomposition of multigraphs under minimum degree constraints and give a unified generalization of several results by various researchers. Let $G$ be a multigraph in which no quadrilaterals share edges with triangles and other quadrilaterals and let $\mu_{G}(v)=\max \left\{\mu_{G}(u, v): u \in V(G) \backslash\{v\}\right\}$, where $\mu_{G}(u, v)$ is the number of edges joining $u$ and $v$ in $G$. We show that for any two functions $a, b: V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \backslash\{0,1\}$, if $d_{G}(v) \geqslant a(v)+b(v)+2 \mu_{G}(v)-3$ for each $v \in V(G)$, then there is a partition $(X, Y)$ of $V(G)$ such that $d_{X}(x) \geqslant a(x)$ for each $x \in X$ and $d_{Y}(y) \geqslant b(y)$ for each $y \in Y$. This extends the related results due to Diwan, Liu-Xu and Ma-Yang on simple graphs to the multigraph setting. Mathematics Subject Classifications: 05C70, 05C07
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## 1 Introduction

All graphs considered in this paper are finite, undirected and may have multiple edges but no loops. Let $G$ be a graph. For a subset $X \subset V(G)$, let $G[X]$ be the subgraph of $G$ induced by $X$. For each $v \in V(G)$, denote $N_{X}(v)$ the set of neighbors of $v$ contained in $X$ and $d_{X}(v)$ the number of edges between $v$ and $X \backslash\{v\}$. When $X=V(G)$, we simplify $N_{V(G)}(v)$ and $d_{V(G)}(v)$ to $N_{G}(v)$ and $d_{G}(v)$, respectively. The multiplicity $\mu_{G}(u, v)$ of two different vertices $u$ and $v$ in $G$ is the number of edges joining $u$ and $v$, and the weight $\mu_{G}(v)$ of a vertex $v$ is defined as $\mu_{G}(v)=\max \left\{\mu_{G}(u, v): u \in V(G) \backslash\{v\}\right\}$. Call a graph $G$ simple if $\mu_{G}(v) \leqslant 1$ for each $v \in V(G)$. By a partition $(X, Y)$ of $V(G)$, we mean that $X, Y$ are two disjoint nonempty sets with $X \cup Y=V(G)$. For a set $\mathscr{H}$ of graphs, we say that a graph is $\mathscr{H}$-free if it contains no member of $\mathscr{H}$ as a subgraph. We also denote by $\mathbb{N}$ the set of nonnegative integers.

Many problems raised in graph theory concern graph partitioning and one popular direction of them is to partition graphs under minimum degree constraints. For a graph $G$ and two functions $a, b: V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, a partition $(X, Y)$ of $V(G)$ is called an $(a, b)$-feasible partition if $d_{X}(x) \geqslant a(x)$ for each $x \in X$ and $d_{Y}(y) \geqslant b(y)$ for each $y \in Y$. In 1996, Stiebitz [15] proved the following celebrated result for simple graphs, solving a conjecture due to Thomassen [16].

Theorem 1 (Stiebitz [15]). Let $G$ be a simple graph and $a, b: V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be two functions. If $d_{G}(x) \geqslant a(x)+b(x)+1$ for each $x \in V(G)$, then there is an $(a, b)$-feasible partition of $G$.

For special families of simple graphs, the minimum degree condition can be further sharpen (see $[4,6,7,8,11]$ ). In particular, for $s, t \geqslant 2$, Diwan [4] showed that every simple graph with neither triangles nor quadrilaterals and minimum degree at least $s+t-1$ can already force a partition $(X, Y)$ as above. Later, Liu and Xu [8] generalized this result by considering triangle-free simple graphs in which no two quadrilaterals share edges.

Theorem 2 (Liu and Xu [8]). Let $G$ be a triangle-free simple graph in which no two quadrilaterals share edges, and $a, b: V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \backslash\{0,1\}$ be two functions. If $d_{G}(x) \geqslant$ $a(x)+b(x)-1$ for each $x \in V(G)$, then $G$ admits an $(a, b)$-feasible partition.

Recently, Ma and Yang [11] obtained the following strengthening of Diwan's result.
Theorem 3 (Ma and Yang [11]). Let $G$ be a quadrilateral-free simple graph and $a, b$ : $V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \backslash\{0,1\}$ be two functions. If $d_{G}(x) \geqslant a(x)+b(x)-1$ for each $x \in V(G)$, then $G$ admits an $(a, b)$-feasible partition.

In 2017, Ban [1] proved a conclusion related to Theorem 1 on weighted simple graphs. Later, Schweser and Stiebitz [12] further studied this problem on graphs, and generalized the results of Stiebitz [15] and Liu and Xu [8] from simple graphs to graphs. Very recently, confirming two conjectures of Schweser and Stiebitz, Liu and Xu [9] obtained a graph version of Theorem 2.

Theorem 4 (Liu and $\mathrm{Xu}[9]$ ). Let $G$ be a triangle-free graph in which no two quadrilaterals share edges, and $a, b: V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \backslash\{0,1\}$ be two functions. If $d_{G}(x) \geqslant a(x)+b(x)+$ $2 \mu_{G}(x)-3$ for each $x \in V(G)$, then $G$ admits an $(a, b)$-feasible partition.

For related problems on graph partitioning under degree constraints or other variances, we refer readers to $[2,3,5,10,13,14]$. In this paper, we consider partitions of graphs and give a unified generalization of Theorems 2, 3 and 4 as well as the result of Diwan [4]. Precisely, we establish the following theorem.

Theorem 5. Let $G$ be a graph in which no quadrilaterals share edges with triangles and other quadrilaterals, and let $a, b: V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \backslash\{0,1\}$ be two functions. If $d_{G}(x) \geqslant$ $a(x)+b(x)+2 \mu_{G}(x)-3$ for each $x \in V(G)$, then $G$ admits an $(a, b)$-feasible partition.

Note that this is tight for cycles in the following two perspectives. Firstly, the ranges of the functions $a, b$ cannot be relaxed to the set of integers at least one by choosing the constant functions $a=b-1=1$. Secondly, one also cannot lower the degree condition further by choosing the constant functions $a=b=2$. We also mention that $G$ is actually $\left\{K_{4}^{-}, C_{5}^{+}, K_{2,3}, L_{3}\right\}$-free in Theorem 5 , where $K_{4}^{-}$is the graph obtained from $K_{4}$ by removing one edge, $C_{5}^{+}$is the graph obtained from $C_{5}$ by adding one edge between two nonadjacent vertices, and $L_{3}$ is the graph consisting of two quadrilaterals sharing exactly one common edge. Additionally, we use the condition that $G$ is $L_{3}$-free exactly once (see Claim 14) in our proof; however, this condition is necessary as shown by the graph constructed in [17].

## 2 Notations and Propositions

Let $G$ be a graph and $f: V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be a function. For a subset $X \subseteq V(G)$, we say that (i) $X$ is $f$-nice if $d_{X}(x) \geqslant f(x)+\mu_{G}(x)-1$ for each $x \in X$, (ii) $X$ is $f$-feasible if $d_{X}(x) \geqslant f(x)$ for each $x \in X$, (iii) $X$ is $f$-meager if for each nonempty subset $X^{\prime} \subseteq X$ there exists a vertex $x \in X^{\prime}$ such that $d_{X^{\prime}}(x) \leqslant f(x)+\mu_{G}(x)-1$, and (iv) $X$ is $f$ degenerate if for each nonempty subset $X^{\prime} \subseteq X$ there exists a vertex $x \in X^{\prime}$ such that $d_{X^{\prime}}(x) \leqslant f(x)$. We have the following propositions immediately from the definitions.

Proposition 6. If $\mu_{G}(x) \geqslant 1$ for each $x \in V(G)$, then each $f$-nice subset is also $f$-feasible and each $f$-degenerate subset is also $f$-meager.

Proposition 7. A subset of $V(G)$ does not contain any $f$-feasible subset if and only if it is $(f-1)$-degenerate.

For a graph $G$ and two functions $a, b: V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, a pair $(X, Y)$ of disjoint subsets of $V(G)$ is called an $(a, b)$-feasible pair if $X$ is $a$-feasible and $Y$ is $b$-feasible; if in addition $(X, Y)$ is a partition of $V(G)$, then we call it an $(a, b)$-feasible partition. Similarly, a partition $(X, Y)$ of $V(G)$ is called an $(a, b)$-meager partition if $X$ is $a$-meager and $Y$ is $b$-meager. The following proposition due to Schweser and Stiebitz [12] plays a vital role in our proof of Theorem 5 .

Proposition 8 (Schweser and Stiebitz [12]). Let $G$ be a graph without isolated vertices, and let $a, b: V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be two functions such that $d_{G}(x) \geqslant a(x)+b(x)+2 \mu_{G}(x)-3$ for each $x \in V(G)$. If $G$ has an $(a, b)$-feasible pair, then it admits an $(a, b)$-feasible partition.

Let $G$ be a graph and let $a, b: V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be two functions. For each partition $(A, B)$ of $V(G)$, we define the weight $\omega(A, B)$ of $(A, B)$ as

$$
\omega(A, B)=|E(G[A])|+|E(G[B])|+\sum_{u \in A} b(u)+\sum_{v \in B} a(v) .
$$

Then, for each $u \in A$ and $v \in B$, simple calculations show that

$$
\begin{gather*}
\omega(A \backslash\{u\}, B \cup\{u\})-\omega(A, B)=d_{B}(u)-d_{A}(u)+a(u)-b(u),  \tag{1}\\
\omega(A \cup\{v\}, B \backslash\{v\})-\omega(A, B)=d_{A}(v)-d_{B}(v)+b(v)-a(v) \tag{2}
\end{gather*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{align*}
& \omega(A \cup\{v\} \backslash\{u\}, B \cup\{u\} \backslash\{v\})-\omega(A, B) \\
= & d_{B}(u)-d_{A}(u)+a(u)-b(u)+d_{A}(v)-d_{B}(v)+b(v)-a(v)-2 \mu_{G}(u, v) . \tag{3}
\end{align*}
$$

## 3 Proof of Theorem 5

Throughout this section, let $G$ be a $\left\{K_{4}^{-}, C_{5}^{+}, K_{2,3}, L_{3}\right\}$-free graph and $a, b: V(G) \rightarrow$ $\mathbb{N} \backslash\{0,1\}$ be two functions such that $d_{G}(x) \geqslant a(x)+b(x)+2 \mu_{G}(x)-3$ for each $x \in V(G)$. Clearly, $d_{G}(x) \geqslant 1$ for each $x \in V(G)$. Thus, $\mu_{G}(x) \geqslant 1$ for each $x \in V(G)$. Since there is no danger of confusion, the reference to $G$ in the subscript of $\mu_{G}$ will be dropped in the following proof.

Suppose for a contradiction that $G$ contains no $(a, b)$-feasible partitions. It follows from Proposition 8 that there is no $(a, b)$-feasible pair in $G$. We may assume that

$$
\begin{equation*}
d_{G}(x)=a(x)+b(x)+2 \mu(x)-3 \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

for each $x \in V(G)$. Otherwise, we can increase $a, b$ to get functions $a^{\prime}, b^{\prime}$ such that $a^{\prime} \geqslant a$, $b^{\prime} \geqslant b$ and $d_{G}(x)=a^{\prime}(x)+b^{\prime}(x)+2 \mu(x)-3$ for each $x \in V(G)$. Clearly, the existence of an $\left(a^{\prime}, b^{\prime}\right)$-feasible partition would guarantee that of an $(a, b)$-feasible partition in $G$.

Claim 9. There exists an ( $a-1, b-1$ )-meager partition in $G$.
Proof. Observe that there is an $a$-nice proper subset of $V(G)$. Indeed, for a fixed $u \in V(G)$ and each $x \in V(G) \backslash\{u\}$, it follows from (4) that

$$
d_{V(G) \backslash\{u\}}(x)=d_{G}(x)-\mu(u, x) \geqslant a(x)+b(x)+\mu(x)-3 \geqslant a(x)+\mu(x)-1,
$$

meaning that $V(G) \backslash\{u\}$ is $a$-nice. Let $S$ be a minimum $a$-nice subset of $V(G)$ and $T=V(G) \backslash S$. Clearly, $|S| \geqslant 2$ and $T \neq \emptyset$. Note that $S$ is $a$-feasible by Proposition 6 .

Since $G$ has no $(a, b)$-feasible pair, $T$ contains no $b$-feasible subset. By Proposition 7, $T$ is ( $b-1$ )-degenerate, and thus is $(b-1)$-meager. Take $v \in S$ and it follows that $S \backslash\{v\}$ is ( $a-1$ )-meager by the minimality of $S$. Note that $d_{S}(v) \geqslant a(v)+\mu(v)-1$. This together with (4) yields that $d_{T \cup\{v\}}(v)=d_{T}(v) \leqslant b(v)+\mu(v)-2$. Thus, $T \cup\{v\}$ is $(b-1)$-meager. If not, then there is a $b$-nice subset $T^{\prime} \subseteq T \cup\{v\}$. Since $T$ is ( $b-1$ )-meager, we have $v \in T^{\prime}$ and $d_{T \cup\{v\}}(v) \geqslant d_{T^{\prime}}(v) \geqslant b(v)+\mu(v)-1$, a contradiction. Consequently, $(S \backslash\{v\}, T \cup\{v\})$ is an $(a-1, b-1)$-meager partition in $G$, as desired.

Let $\mathscr{P}$ be the family of all $(a-1, b-1)$-meager partitions $(A, B)$ satisfying that $\omega(A, B)$ is maximum. For any $(A, B) \in \mathscr{P}$, let $A^{-}=\left\{u \in A \mid d_{A}(u) \leqslant a(u)+\mu(u)-2\right\}$ and $B^{-}=\left\{v \in B \mid d_{B}(v) \leqslant b(v)+\mu(v)-2\right\}$. Note that both $A^{-}$and $B^{-}$are nonempty by the definition of $\mathscr{P}$. So for any $v \in B^{-}, d_{A}(v)=d_{G}(v)-d_{B}(v) \geqslant a(v)+\mu(v)-1$, implying $|A| \geqslant 2$. Similarly, $|B| \geqslant 2$.

Claim 10. For any $(A, B) \in \mathscr{P}, u \in A^{-}$and $v \in B^{-}$, we have $A \cup\{v\}$ is not (a-1)meager and every a-nice subset of $A \cup\{v\}$ contains $u$ and $v$; furthermore, $B \cup\{u\}$ is not ( $b-1$ )-meager and every $b$-nice subset of $B \cup\{u\}$ contains $u$ and $v$.

Proof. Note that $\omega(A \cup\{v\}, B \backslash\{v\})-\omega(A, B)=d_{G}(v)-2 d_{B}(v)+b(v)-a(v)$ by (2). This together with (4) and $d_{B}(v) \leqslant b(v)+\mu(v)-2$ implies that $\omega(A \cup\{v\}, B \backslash\{v\})-\omega(A, B) \geqslant 1$. Thus, $(A \cup\{v\}, B \backslash\{v\})$ cannot be an $(a-1, b-1)$-meager partition by the maximality of $\omega(A, B)$. Since $B \backslash\{v\}$ is ( $b-1$ )-meager, $A \cup\{v\}$ cannot be ( $a-1$ )-meager. Similarly, $B \cup\{u\}$ is not $(b-1)$-meager. Hence there exist an $a$-nice subset $A^{\prime} \subseteq A \cup\{v\}$ and a $b$-nice subset $B^{\prime} \subseteq B \cup\{u\}$. Since $A$ is $(a-1)$-meager and $B$ is $(b-1)$-meager, we have $v \in A^{\prime}$ and $u \in B^{\prime}$. Now, we prove that $u \in A^{\prime}$ and $v \in B^{\prime}$. If $u \notin A^{\prime}$ and $v \notin B^{\prime}$, then $\left(A^{\prime}, B^{\prime}\right)$ is an $(a, b)$-feasible pair by Proposition 6, a contradiction. Suppose by symmetry that $u \in A^{\prime}$ and $v \notin B^{\prime}$. Clearly, $B^{\prime} \subseteq(B \cup\{u\}) \backslash\{v\}$ and $d_{B \backslash\{v\}}(u)=d_{B \cup\{u\} \backslash\{v\}}(u) \geqslant$ $d_{B^{\prime}}(u) \geqslant b(u)+\mu(u)-1$. Thus, $d_{A^{\prime}}(u) \leqslant d_{A \cup\{v\}}(u)=d_{G}(u)-d_{B \backslash\{v\}}(u) \leqslant a(u)+\mu(u)-2$, a contradiction.

Let $A^{*} \subseteq A$ such that $A^{*} \cap A^{-} \neq \emptyset$. By Claim $10, B \cup A^{*}$ is not $(b-1)$-meager and there exists a $b$-nice subset of $B \cup A^{*}$, indicating that $A \backslash A^{*}$ is $(a-1)$-degenerate as $G$ has no $(a, b)$-feasible pair. Similarly, if $B^{*} \subseteq B$ such that $B^{*} \cap B^{-} \neq \emptyset$, then $B \backslash B^{*}$ is $(b-1)$-degenerate. We point out that Claim 10 will be also used in this form frequently.

Claim 11. For any $(A, B) \in \mathscr{P}$, every vertex in $A^{-}$is adjacent to every vertex in $B^{-}$.
Proof. Suppose that there exist $u \in A^{-}$and $v \in B^{-}$such that $\mu(u, v)=0$. By Claim 10 , there is an $a$-nice subset $A^{\prime} \subseteq A \cup\{v\}$ such that $u \in A^{\prime}$, implying that $d_{A^{\prime}}(u) \geqslant$ $a(u)+\mu(u)-1$. However, $d_{A^{\prime}}(u) \leqslant d_{A \cup\{v\}}(u)=d_{A}(u)+\mu(u, v) \leqslant a(u)+\mu(u)-2$, a contradiction.

Recall that both $A^{-}$and $B^{-}$are nonempty. By Claim 11, either $\left|A^{-}\right|=\left|B^{-}\right|=2$ or $\min \left\{\left|A^{-}\right|,\left|B^{-}\right|\right\}=1$ as $G$ is $K_{2,3}$-free.

Claim 12. For any $(A, B) \in \mathscr{P}$, we have $A \backslash A^{-} \neq \emptyset$ and $B \backslash B^{-} \neq \emptyset$.

Proof. For each $u \in A^{-}$, there exists a $b$-nice subset $B^{\prime} \subseteq B \cup\{u\}$ by Claim 10. It follows that $d_{B^{\prime}}(y) \geqslant b(y)+\mu(y)-1 \geqslant \mu(y)+1$ for each $y \in B^{\prime}$, implying $\left|N_{B^{\prime}}(y)\right| \geqslant 2$. If $\left|A^{-}\right|=\left|B^{-}\right|=2$, then we let $B^{-}=\left\{v_{1}, v_{2}\right\}$. Since $G$ is $K_{4}^{-}$-free, $v_{1} v_{2} \notin E(G)$ by Claim 11. Thus, $N_{B^{\prime}}\left(v_{1}\right)=N_{B^{\prime}}\left(v_{2}\right)=\{u\}$ providing that $B=B^{-}$. This leads to a contradiction as $v_{i} \in B^{\prime}$ for some $i=1,2$, implying $B \backslash B^{-} \neq \emptyset$. Similarly, $A \backslash A^{-} \neq \emptyset$. If $\min \left\{\left|A^{-}\right|,\left|B^{-}\right|\right\}=1$, then we assume that $A^{-}=\{u\}$. Clearly, $A \backslash A^{-} \neq \emptyset$ as $|A| \geqslant 2$. Since $A$ is $(a-1)$-meager, there exists $x \in A \backslash\{u\}$ such that $d_{A \backslash\{u\}}(x) \leqslant a(x)+\mu(x)-2$. Note that $d_{A \backslash\{u\}}(x)+\mu(u, x)=d_{A}(x) \geqslant a(x)+\mu(x)-1$. It follows that $\mu(u, x) \geqslant 1$ and $d_{A}(x) \leqslant a(x)+2 \mu(x)-2$, yielding that $u x \in E(G)$ and $d_{B}(x)=d_{G}(x)-d_{A}(x) \geqslant$ $b(x)-1 \geqslant 1$. Suppose that $B=B^{-}$and $z \in N_{B}(x)$. Choose $v=z$ in Claim 10, implying $z \in B^{\prime}$. Since $\left|N_{B^{\prime}}(z)\right| \geqslant 2$, there exists $z^{\prime} \in B^{-} \backslash\{z\}$ such that $z z^{\prime} \in E(G)$. By Claim 11, $\left\{u, x, z, z^{\prime}\right\}$ forms a $K_{4}^{-}$, a contradiction. Thus, $B \backslash B^{-} \neq \emptyset$.

For any $(A, B) \in \mathscr{P}$, let $D_{A}=\left\{u \in A \mid d_{A}(u) \leqslant a(u)-1\right\}$ and $D_{B}=\{v \in B \mid$ $\left.d_{B}(v) \leqslant b(v)-1\right\}$. Clearly, $D_{A} \subseteq A^{-}$and $D_{B} \subseteq B^{-}$.

Claim 13. For any $(A, B) \in \mathscr{P}, u \in A^{-}$and $v \in B^{-}$, if either $u \in D_{A}$ or $v \in D_{B}$, then $(A \cup\{v\} \backslash\{u\}, B \cup\{u\} \backslash\{v\}) \in \mathscr{P}$. Moreover, if $u \in D_{A}$, then $\mu(u, v)=\mu(u), d_{A}(u)=$ $a(u)-1$ and $d_{B}(v)=b(v)+\mu(v)-2$; if $v \in D_{B}$, then $\mu(u, v)=\mu(v), d_{B}(v)=b(v)-1$ and $d_{A}(u)=a(u)+\mu(u)-2$.

Proof. Since every $a$-nice subset of $A \cup\{v\}$ contains $u$ by Claim $10, A \cup\{v\} \backslash\{u\}$ is (a-1)meager. Similarly, $B \cup\{u\} \backslash\{v\}$ is (b-1)-meager. Thus, $(A \cup\{v\} \backslash\{u\}, B \cup\{u\} \backslash\{v\})$ is an $(a-1, b-1)$-meager partition. By (3), $\omega(A \cup\{v\} \backslash\{u\}, B \cup\{u\} \backslash\{v\})-\omega(A, B)=$ $\left(d_{G}(u)-2 d_{A}(u)+a(u)-b(u)\right)+\left(d_{G}(v)-2 d_{B}(v)+b(v)-a(v)\right)-2 \mu(u, v)$. Suppose by symmetry that $u \in D_{A}$. Since $d_{A}(u) \leqslant a(u)-1$ and $d_{B}(v) \leqslant b(v)+\mu(v)-2$, by (4), we have
$\omega(A \cup\{v\} \backslash\{u\}, B \cup\{u\} \backslash\{v\})-\omega(A, B) \geqslant(2 \mu(u)-1)+1-2 \mu(u, v)=2(\mu(u)-\mu(u, v)) \geqslant 0$.
By the maximality of $\omega(A, B), \omega(A \cup\{v\} \backslash\{u\}, B \cup\{u\} \backslash\{v\})=\omega(A, B)$. Thus, $(A \cup\{v\} \backslash$ $\{u\}, B \cup\{u\} \backslash\{v\}) \in \mathscr{P}, \mu(u, v)=\mu(u), d_{A}(u)=a(u)-1$ and $d_{B}(v)=b(v)+\mu(v)-2$.

By Claim 13, $D_{A}=\left\{u \in A \mid d_{A}(u)=a(u)-1\right\}$ and $D_{B}=\left\{v \in B \mid d_{B}(v)=b(v)-1\right\} ;$ in addition, $d_{A}(u) \geqslant a(u)-1$ and $d_{B}(v) \geqslant b(v)-1$ for each $u \in A$ and $v \in B$.

Claim 14. For any $(A, B) \in \mathscr{P}$, we have $\min \left\{\left|A^{-}\right|,\left|B^{-}\right|\right\}=1$.
Proof. Suppose for a contradiction that $A^{-}=\left\{u_{1}, u_{2}\right\}$ and $B^{-}=\left\{v_{1}, v_{2}\right\}$. Since $G$ is $K_{4}^{-}$-free, $u_{1} u_{2}, v_{1} v_{2} \notin E(G)$ by Claim 11. Note that $A \cup B^{-}$is not $(a-1)$-meager by Claim 10. It follows that $B \backslash B^{-}$is ( $b-1$ )-degenerate as $G$ has no $(a, b)$-feasible pair and $B \backslash B^{-} \neq \emptyset$ by Claim 12. Thus, there exists $y \in B \backslash B^{-}$such that $d_{B \backslash B^{-}}(y) \leqslant b(y)-1$, implying $N_{B^{-}}(y) \neq \emptyset$ as $d_{B}(y) \geqslant b(y)+\mu(y)-1 \geqslant b(y)$. By Claim 11, $\left|N_{B^{-}}(y)\right|=1$ as $G$ is $K_{2,3}$-free, say $N_{B^{-}}(y)=\left\{v_{1}\right\}$. By symmetry, $A \backslash A^{-}$is ( $a-1$ )-degenerate and there exists $x_{1} \in A \backslash A^{-}$such that $d_{A \backslash A^{-}}\left(x_{1}\right) \leqslant a\left(x_{1}\right)-1$ and $\left|N_{A^{-}}\left(x_{1}\right)\right|=1$, say $N_{A^{-}}\left(x_{1}\right)=\left\{u_{1}\right\}$. Clearly, $d_{A \backslash\left\{u_{1}\right\}}\left(x_{1}\right)=d_{A \backslash A^{-}}\left(x_{1}\right) \leqslant a\left(x_{1}\right)-1$ and $d_{B \backslash\left\{v_{1}\right\}}(y)=d_{B \backslash B^{-}}(y) \leqslant b(y)-1$.

Since $G$ has no $(a, b)$-feasible partition, either $A$ is $(a-1)$-degenerate or $B$ is $(b-1)$ degenerate. We may assume that $A$ is $(a-1)$-degenerate. Thus, either $d_{A}\left(u_{1}\right) \leqslant a\left(u_{1}\right)-1$ or $d_{A}\left(u_{2}\right) \leqslant a\left(u_{2}\right)-1$. If $d_{A}\left(u_{1}\right) \leqslant a\left(u_{1}\right)-1$, then we set $u:=u_{1}$ and $x:=x_{1}$. If $d_{A}\left(u_{1}\right) \geqslant a\left(u_{1}\right)$, then $d_{A}\left(u_{2}\right) \leqslant a\left(u_{2}\right)-1$. Clearly, $A \backslash\left\{u_{2}\right\}$ is $(a-1)$-degenerate. Thus, there exists $x_{2} \in A \backslash\left\{u_{2}\right\}$ such that $d_{A \backslash\left\{u_{2}\right\}}\left(x_{2}\right) \leqslant a\left(x_{2}\right)-1$. Note that $d_{A \backslash\left\{u_{2}\right\}}\left(u_{1}\right)=$ $d_{A}\left(u_{1}\right) \geqslant a\left(u_{1}\right)$ as $u_{1} u_{2} \notin E(G)$. Thus, $x_{2} \neq u_{1}$ and $x_{2} \in A \backslash A^{-}$. Note also that $d_{A}\left(x_{2}\right) \geqslant$ $a\left(x_{2}\right)+\mu\left(x_{2}\right)-1 \geqslant a\left(x_{2}\right)$. This implies $u_{2} x_{2} \in E(G)$. Set $u:=u_{2}$ and $x:=x_{2}$. In both cases, we have $u x \in E(G), d_{A}(u) \leqslant a(u)-1$ and $d_{A \backslash\{u\}}(x) \leqslant a(x)-1$. Since $G$ is $C_{5}^{+}$-free, we have $x v_{1}, u y \notin E(G)$. By Claim $13,\left(A_{0}, B_{0}\right):=\left(A \cup\left\{v_{1}\right\} \backslash\{u\}, B \cup\{u\} \backslash\left\{v_{1}\right\}\right) \in \mathscr{P}$. Observe that $d_{A_{0}}(x)=d_{A \backslash\{u\}}(x) \leqslant a(x)-1$ and $d_{B_{0}}(y)=d_{B \backslash\left\{v_{1}\right\}}(y) \leqslant b(y)-1$. Thus, $x \in A_{0}^{-}$and $y \in B_{0}^{-}$, yielding $x y \in E(G)$ by Claim 11. It follows that $\left\{u_{1}, u_{2}, v_{1}, v_{2}, x, y\right\}$ contains an $L_{3}$, a contradiction.

For any $(A, B) \in \mathscr{P}$, define $A^{=}=\left\{x \in A \mid d_{A}(x)=a(x)+\mu(x)-1\right\}$ and $B^{=}=\{y \in$ $\left.B \mid d_{B}(y)=b(y)+\mu(y)-1\right\}$. A path $x u v y$ is called a special path with respect to $(A, B)$, if $u \in A^{-}, v \in B^{-}, x \in A^{=}$and $y \in B^{=}$.

Claim 15. For any special path xuvy with respect to $(A, B) \in \mathscr{P}$, if either $u \in D_{A}$ or $v \in D_{B}$, then either $v x \in E(G)$ or uy $\in E(G)$. Moreover, if $v x \in E(G)$, then $N_{A}=(u)=\{x\}$; if $u y \in E(G)$, then $N_{B}=(v)=\{y\}$.

Proof. Suppose that $v x, u y \notin E(G)$. We may assume by symmetry that $u \in D_{A}$. By Claim 13, $\left(A_{1}, B_{1}\right):=(A \cup\{v\} \backslash\{u\}, B \cup\{u\} \backslash\{v\}) \in \mathscr{P}, \mu(u, v)=\mu(u), d_{A}(u)=a(u)-1$ and $d_{B}(v)=b(v)+\mu(v)-2$. This together with $d_{A_{1}}(v)=d_{G}(v)-d_{B}(v)-\mu(u, v)$ and $d_{B_{1}}(u)=d_{G}(u)-d_{A}(u)-\mu(u, v)$ implies $v \in A_{1}^{-}$and $u \in B_{1}^{-}$. Since $x \in A^{=}$and $y \in B^{=}$, we have $d_{A_{1}}(x)=d_{A}(x)-\mu(u, x)=a(x)+\mu(x)-1-\mu(u, x)$ and $d_{B_{1}}(y)=d_{B}(y)-\mu(v, y)=$ $b(y)+\mu(y)-1-\mu(v, y)$, indicating $x \in A_{1}^{-}$and $y \in B_{1}^{-}$. This contradicts Claim 14.

Suppose that $v x \in E(G)$ and there exists $x^{\prime} \in N_{A}=(u) \backslash\{x\}$. Clearly, $x^{\prime} u v y$ forms another special path with respect to $(A, B)$. It follows that either $u y \in E(G)$ or $v x^{\prime} \in$ $E(G)$. In both cases, we can find a $K_{4}^{-}$, a contradiction. Similarly, if $u y \in E(G)$, then $N_{B}=(v)=\{y\}$.

Claim 16. For any $(A, B) \in \mathscr{P}$, let $u \in A^{-}$and $v \in B^{-}$. If $u \in D_{A}$ and $x \in N_{A}=(u)$ with $v x \notin E(G)$, then $(A \cup\{v\} \backslash\{x\}, B \cup\{x\} \backslash\{v\}) \in \mathscr{P}$; if $v \in D_{B}$ and $y \in N_{B}=(v)$ with $u y \notin E(G)$, then $(A \cup\{y\} \backslash\{u\}, B \cup\{u\} \backslash\{y\}) \in \mathscr{P}$.

Proof. Assume that $u \in D_{A}$ and $x \in N_{A}=(u)$ with $v x \notin E(G)$. We first show that $B \cup\{x\} \backslash\{v\}$ is $(b-1)$-meager. If not, then there is a $b$-nice subset $B^{\prime} \subseteq B \cup\{x\} \backslash$ $\{v\}$. This implies that $x \in B^{\prime}$ as $B$ is $(b-1)$-meager. Since $v x \notin E(G)$ and $x \in A^{=}$, $d_{B^{\prime}}(x) \leqslant d_{B \cup\{x\} \backslash\{v\}}(x)=d_{B}(x)=d_{G}(x)-d_{A}(x)=b(x)+\mu(x)-2$, contradicting with $x \in B^{\prime}$. Now, we prove that $A \cup\{v\} \backslash\{x\}$ is $(a-1)$-meager. Otherwise, there is an $a$-nice subset $A^{\prime} \subseteq A \cup\{v\} \backslash\{x\}$. Since $A$ is $(a-1)$-meager, we have $v \in A^{\prime}$ and $d_{A^{\prime}}(v) \geqslant a(v)+\mu(v)-1$. Note that $d_{B}(v)=b(v)+\mu(v)-2$ by Claim 13 as $u \in D_{A}$. It follows that $d_{A^{\prime}}(v) \leqslant d_{A \cup\{v\} \backslash\{x\}}(v)=d_{A}(v)=a(v)+\mu(v)-1$ as $v x \notin E(G)$. Thus, $d_{A^{\prime}}(v)=d_{A}(v)$, implying $u \in A^{\prime}$ as $u v \in E(G)$. The fact $d_{A^{\prime}}(u) \leqslant d_{A \cup\{v\} \backslash\{x\}}(u)=$
$d_{A}(u)+\mu(u, v)-\mu(u, x) \leqslant a(u)+\mu(u)-2$ also indicates that $u \notin A^{\prime}$, a contradiction. Therefore, $(A \cup\{v\} \backslash\{x\}, B \cup\{x\} \backslash\{v\})$ is an (a-1,b-1)-meager partition. With simple calculations, we have $\omega((A \cup\{v\} \backslash\{x\}, B \cup\{x\} \backslash\{v\}))=\omega(A, B)$ in view of (3) and (4). Thus, $(A \cup\{v\} \backslash\{x\}, B \cup\{x\} \backslash\{v\}) \in \mathscr{P}$. Similarly, if $v \in D_{B}$ and $y \in N_{B}=(v)$ with $u y \notin E(G)$, then $(A \cup\{y\} \backslash\{u\}, B \cup\{u\} \backslash\{y\}) \in \mathscr{P}$.

Fix a partition $(A, B) \in \mathscr{P}$. By Claim 14, we may assume by symmetry that

$$
A^{-}=\{u\} \text { and }\left|B^{-}\right| \geqslant\left|A^{-}\right| .
$$

By Claim 10, $B \cup\{u\}$ is not $(b-1)$-meager. Since $G$ has no $(a, b)$-feasible pair, $A \backslash\{u\}$ is (a-1)-degenerate, implying that there exists $x_{1} \in A \backslash\{u\}$ such that $d_{A \backslash\{u\}}\left(x_{1}\right) \leqslant a\left(x_{1}\right)-1$. Note that $d_{A}\left(x_{1}\right) \geqslant a\left(x_{1}\right)+\mu\left(x_{1}\right)-1$ as $x_{1} \in A \backslash A^{-}$and $d_{A \backslash\{u\}}\left(x_{1}\right)=d_{A}\left(x_{1}\right)-\mu\left(u, x_{1}\right)$. It follows that $\mu\left(u, x_{1}\right)=\mu\left(x_{1}\right), d_{A \backslash\{u\}}\left(x_{1}\right)=a\left(x_{1}\right)-1$ and $d_{A}\left(x_{1}\right)=a\left(x_{1}\right)+\mu\left(x_{1}\right)-1$. Hence,

$$
x_{1} \in N_{A}=(u) .
$$

Recall that either $A$ is $(a-1)$-degenerate or $B$ is $(b-1)$-degenerate. It follows that either $D_{A} \neq \emptyset$ or $D_{B} \neq \emptyset$. In what follows, we may assume that

$$
\begin{equation*}
D_{B} \neq \emptyset . \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Otherwise, let $D_{B}=\emptyset$. Clearly, $B$ is $b$-feasible and $A$ is $(a-1)$-degenerate. Thus, $D_{A}=\{u\}$. If $\left|B^{-}\right|=1$, then the case can be reduced to (5) by symmetry as $D_{A} \neq \emptyset$. Suppose that $\left|B^{-}\right| \geqslant 2$ and $v_{1}, v_{2} \in B^{-}$. Since $G$ is $K_{4}^{-}$-free, either $x_{1} v_{1} \notin E(G)$ or $x_{1} v_{2} \notin E(G)$ by Claim 11. By symmetry, assume that $x_{1} v_{1} \notin E(G)$. Clearly, $\left(A_{2}, B_{2}\right):=$ $\left(A \cup\left\{v_{1}\right\} \backslash\{u\}, B \cup\{u\} \backslash\left\{v_{1}\right\}\right) \in \mathscr{P}, \mu(u, v)=\mu(u)$ and $d_{B}(v)=b(v)+\mu(v)-2$ for each $v \in B^{-}$by Claim 13. It is easy to check that $v_{1} \in A_{2}^{-}, x_{1} \in D_{A_{2}} \subseteq A_{2}^{-}$and $u \in B_{2}^{-}$. Thus, $B_{2}^{-}=\{u\}$ by Claim 14. Again, this can be reduced to (5) as $\left|B_{2}^{-}\right|=1$ and $D_{A_{2}} \neq \emptyset$.

For each $v \in D_{B}$ and the fixed vertex $x_{1}$, let $A_{v}=A \cup\{v\} \backslash\left\{x_{1}\right\}$ and $B_{v}=B \cup\left\{x_{1}\right\} \backslash\{v\}$.
Claim 17. For each $v \in D_{B}$, if $x_{1} v \notin E(G)$, then (i) $\mu(v)=1$; (ii) $\left(A_{v}, B_{v}\right) \in \mathscr{P}$, $u \in A_{v}^{-}, v \in A_{v}^{-}$and $x_{1} \in B_{v}^{-}$.

Proof. (i) By Claim 13, $\left(A_{3}, B_{3}\right):=(A \cup\{v\} \backslash\{u\}, B \cup\{u\} \backslash\{v\}) \in \mathscr{P}, \mu(v)=\mu(u, v)$ and $d_{A}(u)=a(u)+\mu(u)-2$ as $v \in D_{B}$. Recall that $d_{A \backslash\{u\}}\left(x_{1}\right)=a\left(x_{1}\right)-1$. Thus, $d_{A_{3}}\left(x_{1}\right)=d_{A \backslash\{u\}}\left(x_{1}\right)=a\left(x_{1}\right)-1$ as $x_{1} v \notin E(G)$, yielding $x_{1} \in D_{A_{3}}$. Note that $d_{B_{3}}(u)=$ $d_{G}(u)-d_{A}(u)-\mu(u, v)=b(u)+\mu(u)-1-\mu(u, v)$. This implies $u \in B_{3}^{-}$as $\mu(u, v) \geqslant 1$. Applying Claim 13 with $\left(A_{3}, B_{3}\right) \in \mathscr{P}, x_{1} \in D_{A_{3}}$ and $u \in B_{3}^{-}$, we have $d_{B_{3}}(u)=$ $b(u)+\mu(u)-2$. It follows that $\mu(u, v)=1$, implying $\mu(v)=1$.
(ii) Recall that $d_{A}(u)=a(u)+\mu(u)-2$ and $\mu(u, v)=\mu(v)=1$. Since $v \in D_{B}$ and $x_{1} \in A^{=}$, we have $d_{A_{v}}(u)=d_{A}(u)+\mu(u, v)-\mu\left(u, x_{1}\right)=a(u)+\mu(u)-1-\mu\left(u, x_{1}\right)$, $d_{A_{v}}(v)=d_{G}(v)-d_{B}(v)=a(v)$ and $d_{B_{v}}\left(x_{1}\right)=d_{G}\left(x_{1}\right)-d_{A}\left(x_{1}\right)=b\left(x_{1}\right)+\mu\left(x_{1}\right)-2$. Now, we show that $B_{v}$ is $(b-1)$-meager. If not, then there exists a $b$-nice subset $B^{\prime} \subseteq B_{v}$. Since $B$ is $(b-1)$-meager, we have $x_{1} \in B^{\prime}$ and $d_{B_{v}}\left(x_{1}\right) \geqslant d_{B^{\prime}}\left(x_{1}\right) \geqslant b\left(x_{1}\right)+\mu\left(x_{1}\right)-1$, a contradiction. Next, we prove that $A_{v}$ is $(a-1)$-meager. Otherwise, there is an $a$-nice
subset $A^{\prime} \subseteq A_{v}$. Since $A$ is $(a-1)$-meager, we have $v \in A^{\prime}$ and $d_{A_{v}}(v) \geqslant d_{A^{\prime}}(v) \geqslant$ $a(v)+\mu(v)-1=a(v)$. This implies that $d_{A_{v}}(v)=d_{A^{\prime}}(v)$. Thus, $u \in A^{\prime}$ as $u v \in E(G)$. It follows that $d_{A_{v}}(u) \geqslant d_{A^{\prime}}(u) \geqslant a(u)+\mu(u)-1$, a contradiction. Therefore, $\left(A_{v}, B_{v}\right)$ is an ( $a-1, b-1$ )-meager partition. Simple calculations together with (3) and (4) show that $\omega\left(A_{v}, B_{v}\right)=\omega(A, B)$, implying $\left(A_{v}, B_{v}\right) \in \mathscr{P}$. Moreover, $u \in A_{v}^{-}, v \in A_{v}^{=}$and $x_{1} \in B_{v}^{-}$ by noting that $\mu\left(u, x_{1}\right) \geqslant 1$ and $\mu(v)=1$.

Now, we conclude that $D_{B}$ is an independent set. Otherwise, there is an edge $v v^{\prime}$ contained in $G\left[D_{B}\right]$. Since $G$ is $K_{4}^{-}$-free, we have $x_{1} v, x_{1} v^{\prime} \notin E(G)$. By Claim 17, $\mu(v)=1$ and $\left(A_{v}, B_{v}\right) \in \mathscr{P}$. It follows that $d_{B_{v}}\left(v^{\prime}\right)=d_{B}\left(v^{\prime}\right)-\mu\left(v, v^{\prime}\right)=b\left(v^{\prime}\right)-2$, contradicting Claim 13.

Note that $B \backslash D_{B}$ is ( $b-1$ )-degenerate by Claim 10 as $B \backslash D_{B} \neq \emptyset$ by Claim 12. Thus, there exists $y \in B \backslash D_{B}$ such that $d_{B \backslash D_{B}}(y) \leqslant b(y)-1$.

Claim 18. For each $y \in B \backslash D_{B}$ satisfying $d_{B \backslash D_{B}}(y) \leqslant b(y)-1$, we have $\left|N_{D_{B}}(y)\right|=1$.
Proof. Note that $d_{B}(y)=d_{B \backslash D_{B}}(y)+d_{D_{B}}(y) \geqslant b(y)$ as $y \in B \backslash D_{B}$. It follows that $d_{D_{B}}(y) \geqslant 1$. This together with Claim 11 yields that $1 \leqslant\left|N_{D_{B}}(y)\right| \leqslant 2$ as $G$ is $K_{2,3^{-}}$ free. Suppose that $N_{D_{B}}(y)=\left\{v_{1}, v_{2}\right\}$ and $v_{1} v_{2} \notin E(G)$ as $D_{B}$ is independent. Clearly, $d_{B}(y)=d_{B \backslash D_{B}}(y)+d_{D_{B}}(y) \leqslant b(y)-1+\mu\left(v_{1}, y\right)+\mu\left(v_{2}, y\right)$. Since $G$ is $\left\{C_{5}^{+}, K_{2,3}\right\}$-free, $x_{1} v_{1}, x_{1} v_{2}, x_{1} y \notin E(G)$. By Claim 17, $\left(A_{v_{1}}, B_{v_{1}}\right) \in \mathscr{P}, u \in A_{v_{1}}^{-}$and $v_{1} \in A_{v_{1}}^{-}$. Note also that $v_{2} \in D_{B_{v_{1}}}$ as $d_{B_{v_{1}}}\left(v_{2}\right)=d_{B}\left(v_{2}\right)=b\left(v_{2}\right)-1$. Since $d_{B_{v_{1}}}(y)=d_{B}(y)-\mu\left(v_{1}, y\right) \leqslant$ $b(y)-1+\mu\left(v_{2}, y\right) \leqslant b(y)+\mu(y)-1$, we have either $y \in B_{v_{1}}^{-}$or $y \in B_{v_{1}}^{-}$. If $y \in B_{v_{1}}^{-}$, then $u y \in E(G)$ by Claim 11; if $y \in B_{v_{1}}^{=}$, then $v_{1} u v_{2} y$ forms a special path with respect to $\left(A_{v_{1}}, B_{v_{1}}\right)$, indicating that either $u y \in E(G)$ or $v_{1} v_{2} \in E(G)$ by Claim 15. In both cases, $\left\{u, v_{1}, v_{2}, y\right\}$ contains a $K_{4}^{-}$, a contradiction.

By Claim 18, we can fix such a vertex $y \in B \backslash D_{B}$ and assume that

$$
N_{D_{B}}(y)=\left\{v_{1}\right\}
$$

for some vertex $v_{1} \in D_{B}$. It follows that $d_{B}(y)=d_{B \backslash D_{B}}(y)+d_{D_{B}}(y) \leqslant b(y)-1+\mu\left(v_{1}, y\right) \leqslant$ $b(y)+\mu(y)-1$, thus either $y \in B^{-} \backslash D_{B}$ or $y \in B^{=}$. If $y \in B^{-} \backslash D_{B}$, then $u y \in E(G)$ by Claim 11. If $y \in B^{=}$, then $x_{1} u v_{1} y$ forms a special path with respect to $(A, B)$. Since $v_{1} \in D_{B}$, we have either $x_{1} v_{1} \in E(G)$ or $u y \in E(G)$ by Claim 15. Hence, we conclude

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { either } x_{1} v_{1} \in E(G) \text { or } u y \in E(G) \text {. } \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Claim 19. If $u y \in E(G)$, then $\mu\left(x_{1}\right)=1$; if $x_{1} v_{1} \in E(G)$, then $y \in B^{=}, \mu\left(v_{1}, y\right)=$ $\mu(y)=1, d_{B}(y)=b(y)$ and $d_{B \backslash D_{B}}(y)=b(y)-1$.

Proof. If $u y \in E(G)$, then $x_{1} v_{1}, x_{1} y \notin E(G)$ as $G$ is $K_{4}^{-}$-free. By Claim 17, $\left(A_{v_{1}}, B_{v_{1}}\right) \in$ $\mathscr{P}, u \in A_{v_{1}}^{-}$and $d_{A_{v_{1}}}(u)=a(u)+\mu(u)-1-\mu\left(u, x_{1}\right)$. Note that $y \in D_{B_{v_{1}}}$ as $d_{B_{v_{1}}}(y)=$ $d_{B \backslash D_{B}}(y) \leqslant b(y)-1$. It follows that $d_{A_{v_{1}}}(u)=a(u)+\mu(u)-2$ by Claim 13, implying $\mu\left(u, x_{1}\right)=1$. The desired result follows by noting that $\mu\left(x_{1}\right)=\mu\left(u, x_{1}\right)$.

If $x_{1} v_{1} \in E(G)$, then $u y, x_{1} y \notin E(G)$ as $G$ is $K_{4}^{-}$-free. Clearly, $y \in B^{=}, \mu(y)=\mu\left(v_{1}, y\right)$ and $d_{B \backslash D_{B}}(y)=b(y)-1$. By Claim 16, $\left(A_{4}, B_{4}\right):=(A \cup\{y\} \backslash\{u\}, B \cup\{u\} \backslash\{y\}) \in \mathscr{P}$. Note that $d_{A_{4}}\left(x_{1}\right)=d_{A \backslash\{u\}}\left(x_{1}\right)=a\left(x_{1}\right)-1$ and $d_{B_{4}}\left(v_{1}\right)=d_{B}\left(v_{1}\right)+\mu\left(u, v_{1}\right)-\mu\left(v_{1}, y\right) \leqslant$ $b\left(v_{1}\right)+\mu\left(v_{1}\right)-2$. Thus, $x_{1} \in D_{A_{4}}$ and $v_{1} \in B_{4}^{-}$. By Claim 13, $d_{B_{4}}\left(v_{1}\right)=b\left(v_{1}\right)+\mu\left(v_{1}\right)-2$, indicating $\mu\left(v_{1}, y\right)=1$. Thus, $\mu(y)=\mu\left(v_{1}, y\right)=1, d_{B}(y)=b(y)$ and $d_{B \backslash D_{B}}(y)=$ $b(y)-1$.

Now, we may further assume that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|D_{B}\right| \geqslant 2 \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Otherwise, $D_{B}=\left\{v_{1}\right\}$ as $v_{1} \in D_{B}$. If $u y \in E(G)$, then $u \in A_{v_{1}}^{-}$and $x_{1}, y \in D_{B_{v_{1}}}$ by Claim 17 and the proof of Claim 19. Thus, $A_{v_{1}}^{-}=\{u\}$ by Claim 14 and $\left|D_{B_{v_{1}}}\right| \geqslant 2$. If $x_{1} v_{1} \in E(G)$, then $v_{1} \in B_{4}^{-}$and $x_{1}, y \in D_{A_{4}}$ by the proof of Claim 19. Again, $B_{4}^{-}=\left\{v_{1}\right\}$ by Claim 14 and $\left|D_{A_{4}}\right| \geqslant 2$. Thus, we can reduce both cases to (7), as desired.

Let $D=D_{B} \cup\{y\}$. It follows from (6) and (7) that $N_{D}(v)=\emptyset$ for each $v \in D_{B} \backslash\left\{v_{1}\right\}$ as $G$ is $\left\{K_{4}^{-}, C_{5}^{+}\right\}$-free and $D_{B}$ is independent. This implies that $d_{B \backslash D}(v)=d_{B}(v)=$ $b(v)-1 \geqslant 1$, i.e., $B \backslash D \neq \emptyset$. By Claim 10, $B \backslash D$ is $(b-1)$-degenerate. Thus, there exists $z \in B \backslash D$ such that $d_{B \backslash D}(z) \leqslant b(z)-1$. This together with $d_{B}(z) \geqslant b(z)$ gives that $N_{D}(z) \neq \emptyset$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
d_{B}(z)=d_{B \backslash D}(z)+d_{D}(z) \leqslant b(z)-1+\sum_{x \in N_{D}(z)} \mu(x, z) . \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

In what follows, we proceed our proof by considering $N_{D}(z)$ according to (6).
Case 1. $x_{1} v_{1} \in E(G)$. By Claim 19, we have $y \in B^{=}, \mu(y)=1, d_{B}(y)=b(y)$ and $d_{B \backslash D_{B}}(y)=b(y)-1$. We first establish the following easy but useful claim.
Claim 20. (i) There exists $w \in N_{A}=\left(x_{1}\right)$ such that $u w \notin E(G), \mu\left(x_{1}, w\right)=\mu(w)$ and $d_{A \backslash\left\{u, x_{1}\right\}}(w)=a(w)-1$. (ii) If there exists $y^{\prime} \in N_{B}=(y)$, then $v_{1} y^{\prime} \in E(G)$.
Proof. (i) Let $U=\left\{u, x_{1}\right\}$. Clearly, $A \backslash U \neq \emptyset$ as $d_{A \backslash U}\left(x_{1}\right)=d_{A \backslash\{u\}}\left(x_{1}\right)=a\left(x_{1}\right)-1 \geqslant 1$. By Claim 10, $A \backslash U$ is ( $a-1$ )-degenerate, implying that there exists $w \in A \backslash U$ such that $d_{A \backslash U}(w) \leqslant a(w)-1$. It follows that $d_{U}(w)=d_{A}(w)-d_{A \backslash U}(w) \geqslant a(w)+\mu(w)-1-$ $(a(w)-1)=\mu(w) \geqslant 1$, i.e., $N_{U}(w) \neq \emptyset$. Thus, $\left|N_{U}(w)\right|=1$ as $G$ is $K_{4}^{-}$-free, implying $d_{U}(w) \leqslant \mu(w)$. Then $d_{U}(w)=\mu(w), d_{A}(w)=a(w)+\mu(w)-1$ and $d_{A \backslash U}(w)=a(w)-1$. Since $w \in A^{=}$and $N_{A=}(u)=\left\{x_{1}\right\}$ by Claim 15, we have $u w \notin E(G), x_{1} w \in E(G)$ and $\mu\left(x_{1}, w\right)=\mu(w)$.
(ii) Suppose that $y^{\prime} \in N_{B}=(y)$ such that $v_{1} y^{\prime} \notin E(G)$. Since $G$ is $\left\{K_{4}^{-}, C_{5}^{+}\right\}$-free, we have $x_{1} y, u y, u y^{\prime} \notin E(G)$. By Claim 13, we have $\left(A_{5}, B_{5}\right):=\left(A \cup\left\{v_{1}\right\} \backslash\{u\}, B \cup\right.$ $\left.\{u\} \backslash\left\{v_{1}\right\}\right) \in \mathscr{P}$ together with the following formulas: (i) $d_{A_{5}}\left(v_{1}\right)=d_{A}\left(v_{1}\right)-\mu\left(u, v_{1}\right)=$ $a\left(v_{1}\right)+\mu\left(v_{1}\right)-2$; (ii) $d_{B_{5}}(u)=d_{B}(u)-\mu\left(u, v_{1}\right) \leqslant b(u)+\mu(u)-2$; (iii) $d_{A_{5}}\left(x_{1}\right)=$ $d_{A}\left(x_{1}\right)+\mu\left(v_{1}, x_{1}\right)-\mu\left(u, x_{1}\right) \leqslant a\left(x_{1}\right)+\mu\left(x_{1}\right)-1$; (iv) $d_{B_{5}}(y)=d_{B}(y)-\mu\left(v_{1}, y\right)=b(y)-1$; (v) $d_{B_{5}}\left(y^{\prime}\right)=d_{B}\left(y^{\prime}\right)=b\left(y^{\prime}\right)+\mu\left(y^{\prime}\right)-1$. It follows that $v_{1} \in A_{5}^{-}, u \in B_{5}^{-}, x_{1} \in A_{5}^{-} \cup A_{5}^{=}$, $y \in D_{B_{5}} \subseteq B_{5}^{-}$and $y^{\prime} \in B_{5}^{=}$. By Claim 14, $A_{5}^{-}=\left\{v_{1}\right\}$, implying $x_{1} \in A_{5}^{=}$. Thus, $x_{1} v_{1} y y^{\prime}$ forms a special path with respect to $\left(A_{5}, B_{5}\right)$. By Claim 15, either $x_{1} y \in E(G)$ or $v_{1} y^{\prime} \in E(G)$ as $y \in D_{B_{5}}$, a contradiction.

Now, we consider $N_{D}(z)$ and assert that $v_{1} \notin N_{D}(z)$. Otherwise, let $v_{1} z \in E(G)$. Clearly, $u w, u y, u z, w y, x_{1} y, w v_{1}, x_{1} z \notin E(G)$ and $N_{D_{B}}(z)=\left\{v_{1}\right\}$ as $G$ is $\left\{K_{4}^{-}, C_{5}^{+}\right\}$-free. We focus on the partition $\left(A_{4}, B_{4}\right)=(A \cup\{y\} \backslash\{u\}, B \cup\{u\} \backslash\{y\}) \in \mathscr{P}$ defined in the second part of the proof of Claim 19. Clearly, $x_{1}, y \in D_{A_{4}} \subseteq A_{4}^{-}, v_{1} \in B_{4}^{-}$and $w \in A_{4}^{=}$as $d_{A_{4}}(w)=d_{A}(w)=a(w)+\mu(w)-1$. Note that $d_{B_{4}}(z)=d_{B}(z)-\mu(y, z) \leqslant$ $b(z)-1+\sum_{x \in N_{D_{B}}(z)} \mu(x, z)$ by (8). It follows that $z \in B_{4}^{=}$as $N_{D_{B}}(z)=\left\{v_{1}\right\}$ and $z \notin B_{4}^{-}$ by Claim 14. Then $w x_{1} v_{1} z$ forms a special path with respect to $\left(A_{4}, B_{4}\right)$. By Claim 15, either $w v_{1} \in E(G)$ or $x_{1} z \in E(G)$ as $x_{1} \in D_{A_{4}}$, a contradiction. We further show that there exists $v \in D_{B} \backslash\left\{v_{1}\right\}$ such that $v \in N_{D}(z)$. Otherwise, $N_{D}(z)=\{y\}$. In view of (8), we know $z \in B^{-} \cup B^{=}$. If $z \in B^{-}$, then $\left\{u, v_{1}, x_{1}, y, z\right\}$ contains a $C_{5}^{+}$as $u z \in E(G)$ by Claim 11. Thus, $z \in N_{B}=(y)$, implying $v_{1} \in N_{D}(z)$ by Claim 20(ii), a contradiction.

Claim 21. $N_{D}(z)=\{v, y\}$ with $\mu(z)=1$ and $d_{B}(z)=b(z)+1$.
Proof. Note that $1 \leqslant\left|N_{D_{B}}(z)\right| \leqslant 2$ as $G$ is $K_{2,3}$ free. Note that $x_{1} v, x_{1} y, x_{1} z, w v, v_{1} v, v y \notin$ $E(G)$ as $G$ is $\left\{K_{4}^{-}, C_{5}^{+}\right\}$-free. By Claim 17, $\mu(v)=\mu(u, v)=1$ and $\left(A_{v}, B_{v}\right) \in \mathscr{P}$; moreover, $u \in A_{v}^{-}$and $x_{1} \in B_{v}^{-}$. Note also that $d_{A_{v}}(w)=d_{A}(w)-\mu\left(x_{1}, w\right)=d_{A \backslash\left\{u, x_{1}\right\}}(w)=$ $a(w)-1$. Thus, $u, w \in A_{v}^{-}$and $x_{1} \in B_{v}^{-}$, implying $B_{v}^{-}=\left\{x_{1}\right\}$ by Claim 14. If $\left|N_{D_{B}}(z)\right|=2$, then there exists $v^{\prime} \in D_{B} \backslash\left\{v_{1}, v\right\}$ such that $x_{1} v^{\prime}, v v^{\prime} \notin E(G)$ as $G$ is $K_{4}^{-}$-free. Note that $d_{B_{v}}\left(v^{\prime}\right)=d_{B}\left(v^{\prime}\right)=b\left(v^{\prime}\right)-1$, indicating $v^{\prime} \in D_{B_{v}} \subseteq B_{v}^{-}$, a contradiction. Hence, $N_{D_{B}}(z)=\{v\}$. This implies that $1 \leqslant\left|N_{D}(z)\right| \leqslant 2$. If $\left|N_{D}(z)\right|=1$, then $d_{B_{v}}(z)=d_{B}(z)-\mu(v, z)=d_{B \backslash D}(z) \leqslant b(z)-1$, thus $z \in D_{B_{v}} \subseteq B_{v}^{-}$, a contradiction. Thus, we conclude that $N_{D}(z)=\{v, y\}$. Observe that $z \in B \backslash B^{-}$; otherwise, $\left\{u, v_{1}, x_{1}, y, z\right\}$ contains a $C_{5}^{+}$as $u z \in E(G)$ by Claim 11. Note that $\mu(v)=\mu(y)=1$ by Claims 17 and 19 as $x_{1} v, u y \notin E(G)$. Hence, $b(z)+\mu(z)-1 \leqslant d_{B}(z) \leqslant b(z)+1$ by (8), giving that $\mu(z) \leqslant 2$. If $\mu(z)=2$, then $d_{B}(z)=b(z)+1$ and $z \in B^{=}$. It follows that $z \in N_{B}=(y)$, implying $v_{1} z \in E(G)$ by Claim 20(ii), a contradiction. Hence, $\mu(z)=1$ and $z \notin B^{=}$, indicating $d_{B}(z)=b(z)+1$.


Figure 1: Partitions in $\mathscr{P}$
Note that $\left(A_{v}, B_{v}\right) \in \mathscr{P}$ by Claim 17; additionally, $u \in A_{v}^{-}, v \in A_{v}^{=}$and $x_{1} \in B_{v}^{-}$. In what follows, we show that $B_{v}^{-}=\left\{x_{1}\right\}, u, w \in D_{A_{v}}, v_{1} \in N_{B_{\bar{v}}}\left(x_{1}\right)$ with $d_{B_{v} \backslash\left\{x_{1}\right\}}\left(v_{1}\right)=$ $b\left(v_{1}\right)-1, y \in N_{B_{\bar{v}}}\left(v_{1}\right)$ with $d_{B_{v} \backslash\left\{x_{1}, v_{1}\right\}}(y)=b(y)-1$, and $v \in N_{A_{\overline{\bar{v}}}}(u)$ with $d_{A_{v} \backslash D_{A_{v}}}(v)=$
$a(v)-1$. If so, we may view $B_{v}, A_{v}$ as the new parts $A, B$ by the symmetry between the functions $a, b$, and make sure that we are still in Case 1 as $v_{1} u \in E(G)$.

Recall that $\mu(v)=\mu(y)=1$. Since $G$ is $\left\{K_{4}^{-}, C_{5}^{+}\right\}$-free, we have $x_{1} v, x_{1} y, v y, u y \notin$ $E(G)$. Note that $d_{A_{v}}(w)=d_{A \backslash\left\{u, x_{1}\right\}}(w)=a(w)-1$ and $d_{B_{v}}\left(v_{1}\right)=d_{B}\left(v_{1}\right)+\mu\left(x_{1}, v_{1}\right)=$ $b\left(v_{1}\right)-1+\mu\left(x_{1}, v_{1}\right) \leqslant b\left(v_{1}\right)+\mu\left(v_{1}\right)-1$. It follows that $w \in D_{A_{v}}$ and $v_{1} \in B_{v}^{-} \cup B_{v}^{=}$. Since $u, w \in A_{v}^{-}$and $x_{1} \in B_{v}^{-}$, we have $B_{v}^{-}=\left\{x_{1}\right\}$ and $v_{1} \in B_{v}^{=}$by Claim 14. Thus, $d_{B_{v}}\left(v_{1}\right)=b\left(v_{1}\right)+\mu\left(v_{1}\right)-1$ and $\mu\left(x_{1}, v_{1}\right)=\mu\left(v_{1}\right)$. This implies that $d_{B_{v} \backslash\left\{x_{1}\right\}}\left(v_{1}\right)=$ $d_{B_{v}}\left(v_{1}\right)-\mu\left(x_{1}, v_{1}\right)=b\left(v_{1}\right)-1$ and $d_{B_{v} \backslash\left\{x_{1}, v_{1}\right\}}(y)=d_{B}(y)-\mu\left(v_{1}, y\right)=b(y)-1$. In addition, $N_{A_{v}^{-}}(v)=\{u\}$ as $G$ is $C_{5}^{+}$-free and $d_{A_{v} \backslash D_{A_{v}}}(v)=d_{A_{v}}(v)-\mu(u, v)=a(v)-1$. It remains to show that $u \in D_{A_{v}}$. By Claim 10, $A_{v} \backslash D_{A_{v}}$ is ( $a-1$ )-degenerate. Thus, there exists $w^{\prime} \in A_{v} \backslash D_{A_{v}}$ such that $d_{A_{v} \backslash D_{A_{v}}}\left(w^{\prime}\right) \leqslant a\left(w^{\prime}\right)-1$ and $\left|N_{D_{A_{v}}}\left(w^{\prime}\right)\right|=1$ by Claim 18. We may assume that $N_{D_{A_{v}}}\left(w^{\prime}\right)=\left\{u_{1}\right\}$ and $u \notin D_{A_{v}}$. Clearly, $u_{1} v_{1} \notin E(G)$ and $w^{\prime} \neq u$ as $G$ is $K_{4}^{-}$-free. Now, we may view $B_{v}, A_{v}$ as the new parts $A, B$ by the symmetry between the functions $a, b$, and $x_{1}, u_{1}, v_{1}$ play the roles in $\left(B_{v}, A_{v}\right)$ that $u, v, x_{1}$ occupied in the original partition $(A, B)$, respectively. Let $A_{6}=A_{v} \cup\left\{v_{1}\right\} \backslash\left\{u_{1}\right\}$ and $B_{6}=B_{v} \cup\left\{u_{1}\right\} \backslash\left\{v_{1}\right\}$. By Claim 17, we have $\mu\left(u_{1}\right)=1,\left(A_{6}, B_{6}\right) \in \mathscr{P}, v_{1} \in A_{6}^{-}$and $x_{1} \in B_{6}^{-}$. Note that $d_{A_{6}}\left(w^{\prime}\right)=d_{A_{v} \backslash D_{A_{v}}}\left(w^{\prime}\right) \leqslant a\left(w^{\prime}\right)-1$ and $d_{B_{6}}(y)=d_{B_{v}}(y)-\mu\left(v_{1}, y\right)=b(y)-1$. Thus, $v_{1}, w^{\prime} \in A_{6}^{-}$and $x_{1}, y \in B_{6}^{-}$. This contradicts Claim 14. Hence, $u \in D_{A_{v}}$.

Now, we consider the partition $\left(B_{v}, A_{v}\right)$, which satisfies all the conditions of Case 1 by the above argument. We mention that $x_{1}, u, v_{1}, v, y$ play the roles in $\left(B_{v}, A_{v}\right)$ that $u, v_{1}, x_{1}, y, w$ occupied in the original partition $(A, B)$, respectively. By Claim 21, we may assume that there exist $u^{\prime} \in D_{A_{v}} \backslash\{u\}$ and $z^{\prime} \in A_{v} \backslash\left(D_{A_{v}} \cup\{v\}\right)$ such that $N_{D_{A_{v}} \cup\{u\}}\left(z^{\prime}\right)=$ $\left\{v, u^{\prime}\right\}, \mu\left(u^{\prime}\right)=\mu\left(z^{\prime}\right)=1$ and $d_{A_{v}}\left(z^{\prime}\right)=a\left(z^{\prime}\right)+1$.

Let $A_{7}=A_{v} \cup\{y\} \backslash\left\{u^{\prime}\right\}$ and $B_{7}=B_{v} \cup\left\{u^{\prime}\right\} \backslash\{y\}$. Since $G$ is $\left\{K_{4}^{-}, C_{5}^{+}\right\}$-free, we know that $u^{\prime} y, u^{\prime} u, u^{\prime} v_{1}, u^{\prime} v, x_{1} y, u y, v y \notin E(G)$. Then we have the following equalities: (i) $d_{A_{7}}(y)=d_{A_{v}}(y)=d_{G}(y)-d_{B_{v}}(y)=a(y)-1$; (ii) $d_{A_{7}}(u)=d_{A_{v}}(u)=a(u)-1$; (iii) $d_{A_{7}}(v)=d_{A_{v}}(v)=a(v)$; (iv) $d_{B_{7}}\left(u^{\prime}\right)=d_{B_{v}}\left(u^{\prime}\right)=d_{G}\left(u^{\prime}\right)-d_{A_{v}}\left(u^{\prime}\right)=b\left(u^{\prime}\right)$; (v) $d_{B_{7}}\left(x_{1}\right)=d_{B_{v}}\left(x_{1}\right)+\mu\left(u^{\prime}, x_{1}\right)=b\left(x_{1}\right)+\mu\left(x_{1}\right)-1$; (vi) $d_{B_{7}}\left(v_{1}\right)=d_{B_{v}}\left(v_{1}\right)-\mu\left(v_{1}, y\right)=$ $b\left(v_{1}\right)+\mu\left(v_{1}\right)-2$. We claim that $\left(A_{7}, B_{7}\right) \in \mathscr{P}$. Clearly, $A_{7}$ is $(a-1)$-meager. If not, then there is an $a$-nice subset $A^{\prime} \subseteq A_{7}$. Since $A_{v}$ is $(a-1)$-meager, we have $y \in A^{\prime}$ and $d_{A_{7}}(y) \geqslant d_{A^{\prime}}(y) \geqslant a(y)+\mu(y)-1=a(y)$, a contradiction. Now we prove that $B_{7}$ is $(b-1)-$ meager. If not, then there is a $b$-nice subset $B^{\prime} \subseteq B_{7}$. Since $B_{v}$ is $(b-1)$-meager, we have $u^{\prime} \in B^{\prime}$ and $d_{B_{7}}\left(u^{\prime}\right) \geqslant d_{B^{\prime}}\left(u^{\prime}\right) \geqslant b\left(u^{\prime}\right)+\mu\left(u^{\prime}\right)-1=b\left(u^{\prime}\right)$. Thus, $d_{B_{7}}\left(u^{\prime}\right)=d_{B^{\prime}}\left(u^{\prime}\right)=b\left(u^{\prime}\right)$, implying $x_{1} \in B^{\prime}$ as $x_{1} u \in E(G)$. Then, $d_{B_{7}}\left(x_{1}\right) \geqslant d_{B^{\prime}}\left(x_{1}\right) \geqslant b\left(x_{1}\right)+\mu\left(x_{1}\right)-1$. It follows that $d_{B_{7}}\left(x_{1}\right)=d_{B^{\prime}}\left(x_{1}\right)=b\left(x_{1}\right)+\mu\left(x_{1}\right)-1$, implying $v_{1} \in B^{\prime}$ as $v_{1} x_{1} \in E(G)$. Hence, $d_{B_{7}}\left(v_{1}\right) \geqslant d_{B^{\prime}}\left(v_{1}\right) \geqslant b\left(v_{1}\right)+\mu\left(v_{1}\right)-1$, a contradiction. Thus, $\left(A_{7}, B_{7}\right)$ is an ( $a-1, b-1$ )-meager partition. By (3) and (4), $\omega\left(A_{7}, B_{7}\right)=\omega(A, B)$, as claimed.

Note that $u, y \in D_{A_{7}}, v \in A_{7}^{\overline{\overline{7}}}, v_{1} \in B_{7}^{-}$and $u^{\prime}, x_{1} \in B_{7}^{\overline{ }}$. In what follows, we prove that $B_{7}^{-}=\left\{v_{1}\right\}, x_{1} \in N_{B_{\overline{7}}}\left(v_{1}\right)$ with $d_{B_{\urcorner} \backslash\left\{v_{1}\right\}}\left(x_{1}\right)=b\left(x_{1}\right)-1$, and $v \in N_{A_{\overline{7}}}(u)$ with $d_{A_{7} \backslash D_{A_{7}}}(v)=a(v)-1$, If so, we may view $B_{7}, A_{7}$ as the new parts $A, B$ by the symmetry between the functions $a, b$, and again we are still in Case 1 as $x_{1} u \in E(G)$.

By Claim 14, $B_{7}^{-}=\left\{v_{1}\right\}$. Now, we show that $d_{B_{7} \backslash\left\{v_{1}\right\}}\left(x_{1}\right)=b\left(x_{1}\right)-1$. Note that $d_{B_{7} \backslash\left\{v_{1}\right\}}\left(x_{1}\right)=d_{B_{7}}\left(x_{1}\right)-\mu\left(v_{1}, x_{1}\right)=b\left(x_{1}\right)+\mu\left(x_{1}\right)-1-\mu\left(v_{1}, x_{1}\right) \geqslant b\left(x_{1}\right)-1$. It suffices to
prove that $d_{B_{7} \backslash\left\{v_{1}\right\}}\left(x_{1}\right) \leqslant b\left(x_{1}\right)-1$. Suppose for a contradiction that $d_{B_{7} \backslash\left\{v_{1}\right\}}\left(x_{1}\right)>b\left(x_{1}\right)$. By Claim 10, $B_{7} \backslash\left\{v_{1}\right\}$ is ( $b-1$ )-degenerate as $G$ has no $(a, b)$-feasible pair. This implies that there exists $y^{\prime \prime} \in B_{7} \backslash\left\{v_{1}\right\}$ such that $d_{B_{7} \backslash\left\{v_{1}\right\}}\left(y^{\prime \prime}\right) \leqslant b\left(y^{\prime \prime}\right)-1$. Clearly, $y^{\prime \prime} \neq x_{1}$ and $d_{B_{7}}\left(y^{\prime \prime}\right) \geqslant b\left(y^{\prime \prime}\right)+\mu\left(y^{\prime \prime}\right)-1$. Note also that $d_{B_{7}}\left(y^{\prime \prime}\right)=d_{B_{7} \backslash\left\{v_{1}\right\}}\left(y^{\prime \prime}\right)+\mu\left(v_{1}, y^{\prime \prime}\right) \leqslant$ $b\left(y^{\prime \prime}\right)-1+\mu\left(y^{\prime \prime}\right)$. Thus, $d_{B_{7}}\left(y^{\prime \prime}\right)=b\left(y^{\prime \prime}\right)+\mu\left(y^{\prime \prime}\right)-1$ and $y^{\prime \prime} \in B_{7}^{\overline{7}}$. Then $v_{u v_{1}} y^{\prime \prime}$ forms a special path with respect to $\left(A_{7}, B_{7}\right)$. By Claim 15, either $v_{1} v \in E(G)$ or $u y^{\prime \prime} \in E(G)$ as $u \in D_{A_{7}}$. In either case, we have a $K_{4}^{-}$, a contradiction. It remains to prove that $d_{A_{7} \backslash D_{A_{7}}}(v)=a(v)-1$. By Claim 11, we have $N_{D_{A_{7}}}(v)=\{u\}$ as $G$ is $C_{5}^{+}$-free. Thus, $d_{A_{7} \backslash D_{A_{7}}}(v)=d_{A_{7}}(v)-\mu(u, v)=a(v)-1$ (by noting that $\mu(v)=1$ ), as desired.

Now, we consider the partition $\left(B_{7}, A_{7}\right)$, and $v_{1}, u, x_{1}, v$ play the roles in $\left(B_{7}, A_{7}\right)$ that $u, v_{1}, x_{1}, y$ occupied in the original partition $(A, B)$, respectively. We show that $u^{\prime} z, u z^{\prime} \in E(G)$; if so, then $\left\{u, v, z, u^{\prime}, z^{\prime}\right\}$ contains a $C_{5}^{+}$, a contradiction. Recall that $\mu(z)=1$ and $d_{B}(z)=b(z)+1$ by Claim 21. If $u^{\prime} z \notin E(G)$, then $d_{B_{7}}(z)=d_{B_{v}}(z)-\mu(y, z)=$ $d_{B}(z)-\mu(v, z)-\mu(y, z)=b(z)-1$, implying $z \in D_{B_{7}}$. Thus, $u, y \in A_{7}^{-}$and $v_{1}, z \in B_{7}^{-}$, contradicting Claim 14. Next, we show that $u z^{\prime} \in E(G)$. Since $G$ is $K_{2,3}$-free, $y z^{\prime} \notin E(G)$. Note that $\mu\left(z^{\prime}\right)=1$ and $d_{A_{v}}\left(z^{\prime}\right)=a\left(z^{\prime}\right)+1$. Thus, $d_{A_{7}}\left(z^{\prime}\right)=d_{A_{v}}\left(z^{\prime}\right)-\mu\left(u^{\prime}, z^{\prime}\right)=a\left(z^{\prime}\right)$, implying $z^{\prime} \in A_{\overline{7}}^{\overline{\bar{\prime}}}$. By Claim 20(ii), $u z^{\prime} \in E(G)$ as $z^{\prime} \in N_{A_{\overline{7}}}(v)$. Thus, we complete the proof of Case 1 .

Case 2. $u y \in E(G)$. Clearly, $x_{1} v_{1} \notin E(G)$ and $N_{D_{B}}(y)=\left\{v_{1}\right\}$. By Claims 17 and $19, \mu\left(v_{1}\right)=\mu\left(x_{1}\right)=1$. Note that $1 \leqslant\left|N_{D}(z)\right| \leqslant 2$ as $G$ is $K_{2,3}$-free. If $\left|N_{D}(z)\right|=2$, then $y z \in E(G)$; otherwise, we have $z \in B \backslash D_{B}$ such that $d_{B \backslash D_{B}}(z) \leqslant b(z)-1$, implying $\left|N_{D_{B}}(z)\right|=1$ by Claim 18, a contradiction. It follows that $v_{1} z \notin E(G)$ as $G$ is $K_{4}^{-}$-free. Thus, there exists $v \in D_{B} \backslash\left\{v_{1}\right\}$ such that $v z \in E(G)$ and $\left\{u, v, v_{1}, y, z\right\}$ contains a $C_{5}^{+}$, a contradiction. Hence, $\left|N_{D}(z)\right|=1$ and $d_{B}(z) \leqslant b(z)-1+\mu(z)$ by (8).

Claim 22. $N_{D}(z)=\left\{v_{2}\right\}$ for some $v_{2} \in D_{B} \backslash\left\{v_{1}\right\}$.
Proof. Suppose not. Clearly, $z \in B^{=}$as $G$ is $K_{4}^{-}$-free. It follows that $d_{B \backslash D}(z)=b(z)-1$ and $d_{D}(z)=\mu(z)$. If $N_{D}(z)=\left\{v_{1}\right\}$, then $x_{1} u v_{1} z$ forms a special path with respect to $(A, B)$. Since $v_{1} \in D_{B}$, either $x_{1} v_{1} \in E(G)$ or $u z \in E(G)$ by Claim 15, implying a $K_{4}^{-}$in both cases, a contradiction. If $N_{D}(z)=\{y\}$, then $d_{B}(z)=b(z)+\mu(z)-$ 1 and $\mu(y, z)=\mu(z)$. Since $G$ is $\left\{K_{4}^{-}, C_{5}^{+}\right\}$-free, we have $x_{1} v_{1}, x_{1} y, x_{1} z, v_{1} z \notin E(G)$. By Claim 17, $\left(A_{v_{1}}, B_{v_{1}}\right) \in \mathscr{P}, u \in A_{v_{1}}^{-}, v_{1} \in A_{v_{1}}^{=}$and $x_{1} \in D_{B_{v_{1}}} \subseteq B_{v_{1}}^{-}$. Note that $d_{B_{v_{1}}}(y)=d_{B}(y)-\mu\left(v_{1}, y\right)=d_{B \backslash D_{B}}(y) \leqslant b(y)-1$. It follows that $y \in D_{B_{v_{1}}} \subseteq B_{v_{1}}^{-}$. Thus, $A_{v_{1}}^{-}=\{u\}$ by Claim 14. Since $G$ is $C_{5}^{+}$-free, we have $N_{D_{B_{v_{1}}}}(z)=\{y\}$. Thus, $d_{B_{v_{1}} \backslash D_{B_{v_{1}}}}(z)=d_{B_{v_{1}}}(z)-\mu(y, z)=d_{B}(z)-\mu(y, z)=b(z)-1$. Moreover, $v_{1} \in A_{v_{1}}^{=}$with $d_{A_{v_{1}} \backslash\{u\}}\left(v_{1}\right)=d_{A_{v_{1}}}\left(v_{1}\right)-\mu\left(u, v_{1}\right)=a\left(v_{1}\right)-1$. Now, we view $A_{v_{1}} B_{v_{1}}$ as the new parts $A, B$ and the case can be reduced to Case 1 as $v_{1} y \in E(G)$. In fact, $v_{1}, u, y, z$ play the roles in $\left(A_{v_{1}}, B_{v_{1}}\right)$ that $x_{1}, u, v_{1}, y$ occupied in the original partition $(A, B)$ of Case 1, respectively.

Let $Z:=\left\{z^{*} \in B \backslash D: d_{B \backslash D}\left(z^{*}\right) \leqslant b\left(z^{*}\right)-1\right\}$. Clearly, $z \in Z \subseteq B^{-} \cup B^{=}$. By Claim 22 , for each $z^{*} \in Z$, we may assume that $N_{D}\left(z^{*}\right)=\left\{v^{*}\right\}$ for some $v^{*} \in D_{B} \backslash\left\{v_{1}\right\}$. Now, we show that $u z^{*} \in E(G)$ for each $z^{*} \in Z$. If $z^{*} \in B^{-}$, then we're done by Claim 11 .

Thus, $z^{*} \in B^{=}$and $x_{1} u v^{*} z^{*}$ forms a special path with respect to $(A, B)$. By Claim 15 , either $x_{1} v^{*} \in E(G)$ or $u z^{*} \in E(G)$. If $x_{1} v^{*} \in E(G)$, then the case can be reduced to Case 1 , where $z^{*}$ and $v^{*}$ play the roles of $y$ and $v_{1}$. Thus, we conclude that $u z^{*} \in E(G)$ for each $z^{*} \in Z$.

Note that $N_{D \cup Z}(y)=N_{D_{B}}(y)$ as $y z^{*} \notin E(G)$ for each $z^{*} \in Z$. Thus, $d_{B \backslash(D \cup Z)}(y)=$ $d_{B \backslash D_{B}}(y)=b(y)-1 \geqslant 1$, i.e., $B \backslash(D \cup Z) \neq \emptyset$. By Claim $10, B \backslash(D \cup Z)$ is $(b-1)$ degenerate. Hence, there exists $z^{\prime} \in B \backslash(D \cup Z)$ such that $d_{B \backslash(D \cup Z)}\left(z^{\prime}\right) \leqslant b\left(z^{\prime}\right)-1$, implying $\left|N_{D \cup Z}\left(z^{\prime}\right)\right| \geqslant 1$ by noting that $d_{B}\left(z^{\prime}\right) \geqslant b\left(z^{\prime}\right)$. Since $u$ is adjacent to each vertex in $D \cup Z$, we have $\left|N_{D \cup Z}\left(z^{\prime}\right)\right| \leqslant 2$ as $G$ is $K_{2,3}{ }^{-}$-free. If $\left|N_{D \cup Z}\left(z^{\prime}\right)\right|=2$, then $N_{D \cup Z}\left(z^{\prime}\right) \nsubseteq D_{B}$ by Claim 18. It is easy to check that $G$ contains a $K_{4}^{-}$or $C_{5}^{+}$, a contradiction. Let $N_{D \cup Z}\left(z^{\prime}\right)=\left\{y^{\prime}\right\}$. If $y^{\prime} \in D$, then $d_{B \backslash D}\left(z^{\prime}\right)=d_{B \backslash(D \cup Z)}\left(z^{\prime}\right) \leqslant b\left(z^{\prime}\right)-1$, indicating $z^{\prime} \in Z$, a contradiction. Thus, $y^{\prime} \in Z$ and $d_{B \backslash\left(D_{B} \cup\left\{y^{\prime}\right\}\right)}\left(z^{\prime}\right)=d_{B \backslash(D \cup Z)}\left(z^{\prime}\right) \leqslant b\left(z^{\prime}\right)-1$. Now, we may view $y^{\prime}, z^{\prime}$ and $D_{B} \cup\left\{y^{\prime}\right\}$ as the new $y, z$ and $D$, respectively. Since $u y^{\prime} \in E(G)$, we are still in Case 2. By Claim 22, we have $N_{D_{B} \cup\left\{y^{\prime}\right\}}\left(z^{\prime}\right) \subseteq D_{B}$. This leads to a contradiction as $y^{\prime} \notin D_{B}$, completing the proof of Case 2. Thus, we complete the proof of Theorem 5.
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