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#### Abstract
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## 1. Introduction

Although connectivity is a basic concept in graph theory, problems involving the enumeration of the connected induced subgraphs of a graph have only recently received attention. The topic of this paper is the average order of a connected induced subgraph of a graph. Let $G$ be a connected finite simple graph with vertex set $V$, and let $U \subseteq V$. The set $U$ is said to be a connected set if the subgraph of $G$ induced by $U$ is connected.

[^0]Denote the collection of all connected sets, excluding the empty set, by $\mathcal{C}=\mathcal{C}(G)$. The number of connected sets in $G$ will be denoted by $N(G)$. Let

$$
S(G)=\sum_{U \in \mathcal{C}}|U|
$$

be the sum of the sizes of the connected sets. Further, let $n$ denote the order of $G$ and

$$
A(G)=\frac{S(G)}{N(G)} \quad \text { and } \quad D(G)=\frac{A(G)}{n}
$$

denote, respectively, the average size of a connected set of $G$ and the proportion of vertices in an average size connected set. The parameter $D(G)$ is referred to as the density of connected sets of vertices. The density allows us to compare the average size of connected sets of graphs of different orders. The density is also the probability that a vertex chosen at random from $G$ will belong to a randomly chosen connected set of $G$. If, for example, $G$ is the complete graph $K_{n}$, then $A\left(K_{n}\right)$ is the average size of a nonempty subset of an $n$-element set, which is $n \frac{2^{n-1}}{2^{n}-1}$, the density then being $\frac{2^{n-1}}{2^{n}-1}$, which is asymptotically $1 / 2$.

There are a number of papers on the average size and density of connected sets in trees. The invariant $A(G)$, in this case, is the average order of a subtree of a tree. Although results are known for trees, beginning with Jamison's 1983 paper [5], nearly nothing is known for graphs in general. We review the literature in Section 2. Concerning lower bounds, Jamison proved that the density, over all trees of order $n$, is minimized by the path $P_{n}$. In particular $A(T) \geq(n+2) / 3$ for every tree $T$ of order $n$ with equality only for $P_{n}$; therefore $D(T)>1 / 3$ for every tree. Kroeker, Mol, and Oellermann conjectured in their 2018 paper [7] that $P_{n}$ minimizes the average size of a connected set over all connected graphs. The main result of this paper confirms this conjecture.

Theorem 1.1. If $G$ is a connected graph of order $n$, then

$$
A(G) \geq \frac{n+2}{3}
$$

with equality if and only if $G$ is a path. In particular, $D(G)>1 / 3$ for all connected graphs $G$.

After reviewing the relevant literature in Section 2, each of the Sections 3, 4, 5 and 6 contain a preliminary result required for the proof of Theorem 1.1. In Section 3, the result (Theorem 3.1) concerns the average size a connected set of $G$ containing a fixed connected subset $H$. In Section 4, the result (Lemma 4.3) is that certain very sparse graphs satisfy the inequality in Theorem 1.1. In Section 5, the result (Theorem 5.1) gives an inequality relating the number of connected sets containing a given vertex $x$ to the number of connected sets not containing $x$. In Section 6, the result (Theorem 6.1) is
an essential inequality valid for graphs with at least one cut-vertex. Section 7 provides the final step in the proof of Theorem 1.1. Two problems that remain open are discussed in Section 8.

## 2. Previous results

Following Jamison's study [5], a number of papers on the average order of a subtree of a tree followed [3,6,8-10,12,13]. Concerning upper bounds, Jamison [5] provided a sequence of trees (certain "batons") showing that there are trees with density arbitrarily close to 1 . However, if the density $D\left(T_{n}\right)$ of a sequence $T_{n}$ of trees tends to 1 , then the proportion of vertices of degree 2 in $T_{n}$ must also tend to 1 . This led to the question of upper and lower bounds on the density for trees whose internal vertices have degree at least three. Vince and Wang [10] proved that if $T$ is a tree all of whose internal vertices have degree at least three, then $\frac{1}{2} \leq D(T)<\frac{3}{4}$. Both bounds are best possible in the sense that there exists an infinite sequence $\left\{S T_{n}\right\}$ of trees (stars, for example) such that $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} D\left(S T_{n}\right)=1 / 2$ and an infinite sequence $\left\{C A T_{n}\right\}$ of trees (certain "caterpillers") such that $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} D\left(C A T_{n}\right)=3 / 4$.

A subtree of a tree $T$ is a connected induced subgraph of $T$. So it is natural to extend from trees to graphs $G$ by asking about the average order of a connected induced subgraph of $G$ - or, in our terminology, the average size of a connected set of vertices of G. Kroeker, Mol, and Oellermann [7] carried out such an investigation for cographs, i.e., graphs that contain no induced $P_{4}$. For a connected cograph $G$ of order $n$, they proved that $n / 2<A(G) \leq(n+1) / 2$, with equality on the right if and only if $n=1$. Complete bipartite graphs are examples of cographs. In fact, cographs have the following known characterization: a graph $G$ is a cograph if and only if $G=K_{1}$ or there exist two cographs $G_{1}$ and $G_{2}$ such that either $G$ is the disjoint union of $G_{1}$ and $G_{2}$ or $G$ is obtained from the disjoint union by adding all edges joining the vertices of $G_{1}$ and $G_{2}$. Proving bounds on $A(G)$ for cographs is therefore amenable to an inductive approach not applicable to graphs in general. Balodis, Mol, Kroeker, and Oellermann [1] proved that for block graphs of order $n$, i.e., graphs for which each maximal 2-connected component is a complete graph, the path $P_{n}$ minimizes the average size of a connected set. A tree is a block graph, thus their result extends Jamison's lower bound from trees to block graphs. Theorem 1.1 extends this lower bound to all connected graphs.

## 3. The average size of connected sets containing a given connected set

If $V$ is the set of vertices of a connected graph $G$ and $H$ is a connected subset of $V$, let $N(G, H), S(G, H)$, and $A(G, H)$ denote the number of connected sets in $G$ containing $H$, the sum of the sizes of all connected sets containing $H$, and the average size of a connected set containing $H$, respectively. If $H=\{x\}$ is a singleton, then we write $N(G, x), S(G, x)$ and $A(G, x)$, respectively. Jamison [5, Theorem 4.6] proved the statement of the following theorem for trees.

Theorem 3.1. If $H \subseteq V$ is a connected subset of size $h \geq 1$ of a connected graph $G$ of order $n$, then

$$
A(G, H) \geq \frac{n+h}{2}
$$

Proof. The proof is by induction on the integer $d=n-h$. If $d=0$, then $H=$ $V, N(G, H)=1$ and $S(G, H)=n$. Therefore $S(G, H)=n=\frac{n+n}{2} \cdot 1=\frac{n+h}{2} N(G, H)$. This is the base case of the induction. Assume that the statement is true for $0,1,2, \ldots, d-$ 1 and let $(G, H)$ be such that $n-h=d$. The remainder of the proof is divided into two cases. Let $Q$ be the set of vertices that are adjacent to some vertex in $H$ but are not in $H$.

Case 1. Assume that there is a vertex $x$ in $Q$ that is not a cut-vertex of $G$. Let $G^{\prime}=$ $G \backslash\{x\}$, which is a connected graph. For simplicity we use the notation $H+x=H \cup\{x\}$. By the induction hypothesis

$$
\begin{aligned}
S(G, H) & =S\left(G^{\prime}, H\right)+S(G, H+x) \geq \frac{(n-1)+h}{2} N\left(G^{\prime}, H\right)+\frac{n+(h+1)}{2} N(G, H+x) \\
& =\frac{n+h}{2}\left(N\left(G^{\prime}, H\right)+N(G, H+x)\right)+\frac{1}{2}\left(N(G, H+x)-N\left(G^{\prime}, H\right)\right) \\
& =\frac{n+h}{2} N(G, H)+\frac{1}{2}\left(N(G, H+x)-N\left(G^{\prime}, H\right)\right) \geq \frac{n+h}{2} N(G, H) .
\end{aligned}
$$

The last inequality follows because, for each connected set $U$ counted in $N\left(G^{\prime}, H\right)$, the connected set $U+x$ is counted in $N(G, H+x)$. (Note that this is not true if $h=0$.)

Case 2. Assume that all vertices in $Q$ are cut-vertices of $G$, and let $x$ be one of these vertices. Let $G^{\prime}=G-x$. Let $G_{1}$ be the connected component of $G-x$ containing $H$ and let $G_{2}$ be the union of the other components. Denote the vertex set of $G_{2}$ by $V_{2}$, and let $m=\left|V_{2}\right|$. Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
N(G, H) & =N(G, H+x)+N\left(G^{\prime}, H\right)=N(G, H+x)+N\left(G_{1}, H\right) \\
S(G, H) & =S(G, H+x)+S\left(G^{\prime}, H\right)=S(G, H+x)+S\left(G_{1}, H\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

By the induction hypothesis

$$
\begin{aligned}
S(G, H) & =S(G, H+x)+S\left(G_{1}, H\right) \\
& \geq \frac{n+(h+1)}{2} N(G, H+x)+\frac{(n-1-m)+h}{2} N\left(G_{1}, H\right) \\
& =\frac{n+h}{2}\left(N(G, H+x)+N\left(G_{1}, H\right)\right)+\frac{1}{2}\left(N(G, H+x)-(m+1) N\left(G_{1}, H\right)\right) \\
& =\frac{n+h}{2} N(G, H)+\frac{1}{2}\left(N(G, H+x)-(m+1) N\left(G_{1}, H\right)\right) \geq \frac{n+h}{2} N(G, H) .
\end{aligned}
$$

The last inequality is proved as follows. Denote the vertices in $V_{2}$ by $x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{m}$. Let $x_{0}=x$, and let $p_{i}, 0 \leq i \leq m$, be a path from a point in $H$ adjacent to $x$ to $x_{i}$. These paths all contain $x$. For each connected set $W$ counted by $N\left(G_{1}, H\right)$, let $W_{i}, 0 \leq i \leq m$, be the union of $W$ and the vertices of $p_{i}$. Therefore, for each connected set counted by $N\left(G_{1}, H\right)$, there are at least $m+1$ connected sets counted by $N(G, H+x)$.

Corollary 3.2. If $x$ is any vertex of a connected graph $G$ of order $n$, then

$$
A(G, x) \geq \frac{n+1}{2}
$$

Proof. This is the case $h=1$ in Theorem 3.1.

## 4. Near trees

It will be helpful in investigating graphs with at least one cut-vertex to consider the block-cut tree $\mathbb{T}=\mathbb{T}(G)$ of a graph $G$. The vertex set of $\mathbb{T}$ is the union of the cutvertices of $G$ and the blocks, i.e., the maximal 2-connected components, of $G$. The latter includes the cut-edges of $G$. A cut-vertex $x$ and a block $B$ are adjacent in $\mathbb{T}$ if $x$ lies in $B$. Call a block $B$ of $G$ a leaf if it is a leaf of the tree $\mathbb{T}(G)$; otherwise call $B$ interior. Color the vertices in $\mathbb{T}$ corresponding to a block $B$ in $G$ red if the order of $B$ is at least 3. Color the corresponding blocks in $G$ also red.

Lemma 4.1. Assume that $G$ is a connected graph of order $n$ with exactly one red block $B$. If $B$ has order 3 , then $A(G)>(n+2) / 3$.

Proof. Let $v_{1}, v_{2}, v_{3}$ be the three vertices of $B$, and let $G_{1}, G_{2}, G_{3}$ be the corresponding connected components of $G \backslash\left\{v_{1}, v_{2}, v_{3}\right\}$. For $i=1,2,3$, let $G_{i}^{\prime}$ be the tree induced by $V\left(G_{i}\right) \cup\left\{v_{i}\right\}$. It is possible that $G_{i}$ is empty, in which case $G_{i}^{\prime}=\left\{v_{i}\right\}$. Without loss of generality, let $G_{1}^{\prime}, G_{2}^{\prime}$ be the two with largest order. Hence if $G_{1}^{\prime}, G_{2}^{\prime}$ have orders $n_{1}, n_{2}$, respectively, then $n_{1}+n_{2} \geq 2 n / 3$. Let $e$ be the edge $\left\{v_{1}, v_{2}\right\}$ and let $T$ be the tree obtained by deleting $e$ from $G$. From [5], we know that $A(T) \geq(n+2) / 3$. If $\mathcal{C}:=\mathcal{C}(G) \backslash \mathcal{C}(T)$, then let $N(\mathcal{C})=|\mathcal{C}|$ and let $S(\mathcal{C})$ be the sum of the sizes of the sets in $\mathcal{C}$. Note that $\mathcal{C}$ comprises those connected sets that contain $v_{1}$ and $v_{2}$, but not $v_{3}$.

We claim that $S(\mathcal{C}) / N(\mathcal{C})>(n+2) / 3$, which would prove Lemma 4.1. To simplify notation, let $N_{i}=N\left(G_{i}^{\prime}, v_{i}\right)$ and $S_{i}=S\left(G_{i}^{\prime}, v_{i}\right)$ for $i=1,2$. Using Corollary 3.2, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{S(\mathcal{C})}{N(\mathcal{C})} & =\frac{S_{1} N_{2}+S_{2} N_{1}}{N_{1} N_{2}} \geq \frac{\left(n_{1}+1\right) N_{1} N_{2}+\left(n_{2}+1\right) N_{1} N_{2}}{2 N_{1} N_{2}} \\
& \geq \frac{2 n / 3+2}{2}=\frac{n+3}{3}>\frac{n+2}{3} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Definition 4.2. A near tree is a graph $G$ such that one of the following holds:
(1) $G$ is a tree;
(2) $G$ has exactly one red block and that block is a $K_{3}$; or
(3) $G$ has no interior red blocks and all red leaf blocks have order 3 or 4 .


Fig. 1. Figure used in the proof of Lemma 4.3.

Lemma 4.3. If $G$ is a near tree, then $A(G) \geq(n+2) / 3$, with equality if and only if $G$ is a path.

Proof. If $G$ is a tree, i.e., case (1) holds in the definition of near tree, then Lemma 4.3 follows from [5]. If case (2) holds, the statement is an immediate consequence of Lemma 4.1.

If case (3) holds, then let $G$ be a graph that has no red interior blocks, and all red leaf blocks have order 3 or 4 . The proof is by induction on the number $m$ of red leaf blocks. If $m=0$, then $G$ is a tree and hence the lemma is true. Assume that the statement is true for $m-1$ and let $G$ be a graph with $m$ red leaf blocks. There are now five cases.

Case 1. Let $B$ be a red leaf block of the type on the left in Fig. 1. Note that, in Fig. 1 the vertex $a$ is the only vertex with neighbors outside the block $B$. If $H$ is the graph obtained from $G$ by deleting edge $e$, then $H$ has $m-1$ red blocks, and by the induction hypothesis $A(H) \geq(n+2) / 3$ with equality if and only if $H$ is a path. If $\mathcal{C}:=\mathcal{C}(G) \backslash \mathcal{C}(H)$, then let $N(\mathcal{C})=|\mathcal{C}|$ and let $S(\mathcal{C})$ be the sum of the sizes of the sets in $\mathcal{C}$. Note that $\mathcal{C}$ comprises those connected sets that contain $a$ and $d$, but not both $b$ and c. It now suffices to show that $S(\mathcal{C}) / N(\mathcal{C})>(n+2) / 3$. Let $G^{\prime}$ be the graph obtained from $G$ by deleting vertices $b, c, d$. To simplify notation, let $N=N\left(G^{\prime}, a\right)$ and $S=S\left(G^{\prime}, a\right)$. Using Corollary 3.2, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{S(\mathcal{C})}{N(\mathcal{C})} & =\frac{(S+N)+(S+2 N)+(S+2 N)}{3 N}=\frac{S}{N}+\frac{5}{3} \geq \frac{(n-3)+1}{2}+\frac{5}{3} \\
& =\frac{n}{2}+\frac{2}{3}>\frac{n+2}{3}
\end{aligned}
$$

In the first equality above, the term $(S+N)$ is for the connected sets containing just vertices $a$ and $d$; the first term $(S+2 N)$ is for the connected sets containing just vertices $a, b$, and $d$; and the second $(S+2 N)$ is for the connected sets containing just vertices $a, c$, and $d$.

Case 2. Let $B$ be a red leaf block of the type on the right in Fig. 1. If $H$ is the graph obtained from $G$ by deleting edges $e$ and $f$, then $H$ has $m-1$ red blocks, and by the induction hypothesis $A(H)>(n+2) / 3$ (it cannot be a path). If $\mathcal{C}:=\mathcal{C}(G) \backslash \mathcal{C}(H)$, then
let $N(\mathcal{C})=|\mathcal{C}|$ and let $S(\mathcal{C})$ be the sum of the sizes of the sets in $\mathcal{C}$. Note that $\mathcal{C}$ comprises those connected sets that contain $b$ and either $a$ or $c$, but not $d$. It now suffices to show that $S(\mathcal{C}) / N(\mathcal{C})>(n+2) / 3$. Let $G^{\prime}$ be the graph obtained from $G$ by deleting vertices $b, c, d$. To simplify notation, let $N=N\left(G^{\prime}, a\right)$ and $S=S\left(G^{\prime}, a\right)$. Using Corollary 3.2, we have

$$
\frac{S(\mathcal{C})}{N(\mathcal{C})}=\frac{(S+N)+2+(S+2 N)}{N+1+N} \geq \frac{((n-3)+1) N+3 N+2}{2 N+1}=\frac{(n+1) N+2}{2 N+1}
$$

In the first equality above, the term $(S+N)$ is for the connected sets containing just vertices $a$ and $b$, the term 2 is for the single connected set $\{b, c\}$, and the term $S+2 N$ is for the connected sets containing $a, b$ and $c$. It remains to show that $\frac{(n+1) N+2}{2 N+1}>(n+2) / 3$, which is equivalent to $N(n-1)>n-4$, which holds for all $n \geq 1$.

Case 3. Let $B$ be a red leaf block of the type on the left in Fig. 1, but with one additional edge $g$ joining vertices $a$ and $c$. If $\mathcal{C}:=\mathcal{C}(G) \backslash \mathcal{C}(G-g)$, then let $N(\mathcal{C})=|\mathcal{C}|$ and let $S(\mathcal{C})$ be the sum of the sizes of the sets in $\mathcal{C}$. Note that $\mathcal{C}$ comprises those connected sets that contain $a$ and $c$, but not $b$ and $d$. By Case 1 in the proof of this lemma, it suffices to show that $S(\mathcal{C}) / N(\mathcal{C}) \geq(n+2) / 3$. To this end we have

$$
\frac{S(\mathcal{C})}{N(\mathcal{C})}=\frac{S+N}{N}=\frac{S}{N}+1 \geq \frac{(n-3)+1}{2}+1=\frac{n}{2} \geq \frac{n+2}{3}
$$

the last inequality because $n \geq 4$.

Case 4. Let $B$ be a red leaf block of the type on the right in Fig. 1, but with one additional edge $g$ joining vertices $a$ and $c$. The proof of Case 4 is exactly as for Case 3 .

Case 5 . Let $B$ be a leaf block that is a $K_{3}$. The proof in this case is a much simpler version of the proofs in Cases 1 and 2.

## 5. An inequality relating the number of connected sets containing a given vertex to the number of connected sets not containing the vertex

Let $G$ be a connected graph and $x$ a vertex of $G$. For ease of notation, let $G-x$ denote the subgraph of $G$ induced by $V(G) \backslash\{x\}$. Let $T$ be a shortest-path spanning tree of $G$ rooted at $x$. For each connected set $U \in \mathcal{C}(G-x)$ of vertices in $G-x$, fix a vertex $v_{U}$ that is closest to $x$, with distance being the length of the path $p_{U}$ in $T$ between $v_{U}$ and $x$. Let $\bar{U}=U \cup p_{U}$, where we regard a path as its set of vertices. Let $\mathcal{C}(G, x)$ denote the set of connected sets in $G$ containing vertex $x$. For $Q \in \mathcal{C}(G, x)$, let

$$
W(Q)=\{U: U \in \mathcal{C}(G-x) \text { and } \bar{U}=Q\}
$$

If $W(Q) \neq \emptyset$, there is a linear order on $W(Q)$ defined by $U \preceq U^{\prime}$ if $p_{U^{\prime}} \subseteq p_{U}$. Note that $U \preceq U^{\prime}$ implies that $U \subseteq U^{\prime}$. Let $U_{Q}$ denote the minimal set in $W(Q)$ with respect to this order, and let

$$
\mathcal{M}(G-x)=\left\{U_{Q}: Q \in \mathcal{C}(G, x)\right\}
$$

be the collection of all minimals. Note that $\{v\}$ is a minimal set for all $v \in V(G)$. Let

$$
a v=a v(G, x)=\frac{1}{|\mathcal{M}(G-x)|} \sum_{U \in \mathcal{M}(G-x)}\left|p_{U}\right|
$$

be the average length of the paths $p_{U}$ over all minimals $U$. Here $\left|p_{U}\right|$ denotes the length of path $p_{U}$, i.e., the number of edges.

Theorem 5.1. For a connected graph $G$ and vertex $x$, we have

$$
\operatorname{av}(G, x) \cdot(N(G, x)-1) \geq N(G-x)
$$

Proof. For a minimal set $U \in \mathcal{M}(G-x)$, let $p_{U}=\left\{v_{U}=p_{0}, p_{1}, p_{2}, \ldots, p_{k}=x\right\}$, vertices of $p_{U}$ in succession, where $k:=k_{U}$ depends on $U$. Let

$$
Y(U)=\left\{U \cup\left\{p_{0}, p_{1}, p_{2}, \ldots, p_{j}\right\}: 0 \leq j<k_{U}\right\}
$$

Clearly $|Y(U)|=\left|p_{U}\right|$.
We claim that the sets $Y(U)$ are pairwise disjoint, i.e., if $U \neq U^{\prime}$, then $Y(U) \cap Y\left(U^{\prime}\right)=$ $\emptyset$. To verify this, define $U(i)=U \cup\left\{p_{0}, p_{1}, p_{2}, \ldots, p_{i}\right\}$ for $0 \leq i<k_{U}$ and $U^{\prime}(j)=$ $U^{\prime} \cup\left\{p_{0}^{\prime}, p_{1}^{\prime}, p_{2}^{\prime}, \ldots, p_{j}^{\prime}\right\}$ for $0 \leq j<k_{U^{\prime}}$. Assume that there exist $U, U^{\prime} \in \mathcal{M}(G-x)$ and $0 \leq i<k_{U}$ and $0 \leq j<k_{U^{\prime}}$ such that $U(i)=U^{\prime}(j)$. Assume, without loss of generality, that $i \geq j$. First consider the case where $j \geq 1$. By the definition of $T$, the vertex $p_{i}$ is the unique closest vertex in $U(i)$ to $x$, and vertex $p_{j}^{\prime}$ is the unique closest vertex in $U^{\prime}(j)$ to $x$. Since $U(i)=U^{\prime}(j)$, it must be the case that $p_{i}=p_{j}^{\prime}$ and therefore $U(i-1)=U^{\prime}(j-1)$. Reasoning inductively, we have $U^{\prime}=U^{\prime}(0)=U \cup\left\{p_{0}, p_{1}, p_{2}, \ldots, p_{j}\right\}$ for some $0 \leq j<k_{U}$. If $j>0$, then this would contradict the minimality of $U^{\prime}$. Therefore $j=0$ and $U^{\prime}=U^{\prime}(0)=U(0)=U$.

Now

$$
\mathcal{C}(G-x)=\bigcup_{U \in \mathcal{M}(G-x)} Y(U)
$$

Thus $\{Y(U): U \in \mathcal{M}(G-x)\}$ partitions $\mathcal{C}(G-x)$. Consider the map $f: \mathcal{C}(G-x) \rightarrow$ $\mathcal{C}(G, x)$ defined by $f(U)=\bar{U}$. For $U \in \mathcal{M}(G-x)$, each set in $Y(U)$ is mapped to the same set in $\mathcal{C}(G, x)$; for distinct $U, U^{\prime} \in \mathcal{M}(G-x)$ each pair of sets $A \in Y(U)$ and $B \in Y\left(U^{\prime}\right)$ are mapped to distinct sets in $\mathcal{C}(G, x)$. Therefore
$N(G-x)=\sum_{U \in \mathcal{M}(G-x)}\left|p_{U}\right|=a v(G, x) \cdot|\mathcal{M}(G-x)| \quad$ and $\quad N(G, x) \geq|\mathcal{M}(G-x)|+1$.
The +1 is to count the singleton set $\{x\}$. Therefore $N(G, x) \geq N(G-x) / a v(G, x)+1$ and hence $\operatorname{av}(G, x) \cdot(N(G, x)-1) \geq N(G-x)$.

Theorem 5.2. For any 2 -connected graph $G$ of order $n$ and any vertex $x$ of $G$, we have $a v(G, x) \leq(n-1) / 2$, with equality if and only if $G=K_{3}$.

Proof. According to [2, Theorem 1], the diameter of a 2-connected graph is at most $\lceil(n-1) / 2\rceil$. If $n$ is odd, then the diameter is at most $(n-1) / 2$. Unless $G=K_{3}$, there is at least one vertex in $G-x$ whose distance from $x$ is less than $(n-1) / 2$. Since a vertex is a minimal set, in the odd case we have $a v(G, x)<(n-1) / 2$ unless $G=K_{3}$, in which case $\operatorname{av}(G, x)=1=(n-1) / 2$.

If $n$ is even, let $y$ be a vertex of $G$ furthest from $x$. If the distance from $x$ to $y$ is less than $n / 2$, then it is clear that $a v(G, x) \leq n / 2-1<(n-1) / 2$. So assume that the distance between $x$ and $y$ is exactly $n / 2$. Since $G$ is 2 -connected, there is a cycle $C$ containing $x$ and $y$. Because the distance between $x$ and $y$ is exactly $n / 2$, the cycle $C$ contains all the vertices of $G$. There is a shortest-path spanning tree $T$ of $G$ that contains all edges of $C$ except one that is incident to $y$, say $\{y, w\}$. The only minimal set $U$ with $\left|p_{U}\right|=n / 2$ is the singleton $\{y\}$. For all other minimal sets $U$ we have $\left|p_{U}\right| \leq \frac{n}{2}-1=\frac{n-2}{2}$, and there are at least three such minimal sets: $\{w\},\{y, w\}$, and a singleton vertex, other than $w$, that is adjacent to $y$. This already brings $a v(G, x)$ to at most $\frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{n}{2}+3\left(\frac{n-2}{2}\right)\right)=\frac{n-3 / 2}{2}<\frac{n-1}{2}$.

Corollary 5.3. Let $H$ be a maximal 2-connected subgraph of order at least 3 of a graph $G$ of order $n$. Let $x$ be a vertex of $H$ such that the set of all neighbors of $x$ induce a complete subgraph of $H$. Then $\operatorname{av}(G, x) \leq(n-1) / 2$, with equality if and only if $G=K_{3}$.

Proof. Theorem 5.2 settles the case $G=H$, so assume that $H$ is a proper subgraph of $G$. Construct a shortest-path spanning tree $T$ of $G$, rooted at $x$, by first constructing a shortest-path spanning tree $T$ of $H$ and extending it to $G$. Denote the order of $H$ by $h$. Let $K$ denote the complete graph induced by the neighbors of $x$. Note that no edge of $K$ is in $T$.

Consider a set $U \in \mathcal{M}(G-x)$ such that $U$ has a vertex in $H$. Since $H$ is a proper subgraph of $G$, we have $h \leq n-1$. As in the proof of Theorem 5.2, we have $\left|p_{U}\right| \leq h / 2 \leq$ $(n-1) / 2$. In the case that $h$ is odd, we have $\left|p_{U}\right| \leq(h-1) / 2 \leq(n-2) / 2$.

Next partition $\mathcal{M}(G-x)$ into three sets $A, B, C$ as follows. We will consider the average of the $\left|p_{U}\right|$ for $U$ in each of the sets $A, B, C$. Let $A$ consist of all those connected sets $U \in \mathcal{M}(G-x)$ such that $U$ has a vertex in $H$ but does not contain all vertices in $K$. Let $B^{\prime}$ consist of all those connected sets $U \in \mathcal{M}(G-x)$ with no vertex in $H$. For $U \in B^{\prime}$ let $p$ be the subpath of $p_{U}$ with one end vertex in $K$ and the other in $U$. Let $U^{\prime}=U \cup p \cup K$, and note that $U^{\prime} \in \mathcal{M}(G-x)$ and $\left|p_{U^{\prime}}\right|=1$. The map $f: B^{\prime} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(G-x)$
defined by $f(U)=U^{\prime}$ is an injection. Let $B=B^{\prime} \cup f\left(B^{\prime}\right)$. Let $C$ be the complement of $A \cup B$ in $\mathcal{M}(G-x)$, and note that $\left|p_{U}\right|=1$ for all $U \in C$.

We have already shown that the average of the path distances $\left|p_{U}\right|$ for $U \in A$ is at most $(n-1) / 2$ if $h$ is odd and at most $(n-2) / 2$ if $h$ is even. Concerning the set $B$, the average

$$
\left(|p(U)|+\left|p\left(U^{\prime}\right)\right|\right) / 2 \leq\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\frac{1}{2}\left((n-h)+\frac{h}{2}+1\right)=\frac{1}{2}\left(n-\frac{h}{2}+1\right) \leq \frac{n-1}{2} \quad \text { if } h \text { is even } \\
\frac{1}{2}\left((n-h)+\frac{h-1}{2}+1\right)=\frac{1}{2}\left(n-\frac{h}{2}+\frac{1}{2}\right) \leq \frac{n-1}{2} \quad \text { if } h \text { is odd. }
\end{array}\right.
$$

Therefore, the average of the path distances $\left|p_{U}\right|$ for $U \in B$ is at most $(n-1) / 2$. The path distance $\left|p_{U}\right|=1$ for all connected sets in $C$. Therefore we have $\operatorname{av}(G, x)<(n-1) / 2$ unless $G=K_{3}$.

## 6. An inequality for graphs with a cut-vertex

Let $x$ be a cut-vertex of a connected graph $G$ of order $n$, and let $M=M(x)=M(G, x)$ denote the number of connected components of $G-x$. Denote these components by $G_{1}, \ldots, G_{M}$, and let $n_{1}, \ldots, n_{M}$ be their respective orders. Note that $n=1+n_{1}+$ $n_{2}+\cdots+n_{M}$. For $i=1,2, \ldots, M$, denote by $G_{i}^{\prime}$ the subgraph of $G$ induced by the vertices $V\left(G_{i}\right) \cup\{x\}$. To simplify notation, let $N_{i}=N\left(G_{i}\right)$ and $N_{i}(x)=N\left(G_{i}^{\prime}, x\right)$. Let $a_{i}=\operatorname{av}\left(G_{i}^{\prime}, x\right) / n_{i}$. Note that $a_{i} \leq 1$ for all $i$.

The main result of this section is the following inequality, which is essential to our proof of Theorem 1.1. The proof of Theorem 6.1 appears at the end of this section, after several lemmas.

Theorem 6.1. If $G$ is a connected graph with at least one cut-vertex, but not a near tree, then there is a cut-vertex $x$ such that following inequality holds:

$$
\begin{equation*}
(n-1) \prod_{i=1}^{M} N_{i}(x)>2 \sum_{i=1}^{M}\left(n-n_{i}\right) N_{i} \tag{6.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

The cut-vertex $x$ in Theorem 6.1 will be called the root vertex of $G$. The theorem states that we can choose a root vertex that satisfies inequality (6.1).


Fig. 2. A dashed line indicates any number of vertices. The left figure includes trees of order $n \geq 3$.

Lemma 6.2. If $x$ is a vertex of degree at least 2 in a tree $T$ of order $n$, then $N(T, x) \geq 2 n$ unless $T$ is one of the trees in Fig. 2.

Proof. If every vertex of $T$, except $x$, is adjacent to $x$, then $N(T, x)=2^{n-1} \geq 2 n$ unless $n=3$, in which case $T$ is a tree in the left panel of Fig. 2.

It is routine to check that if $T$ is a tree of order at most 6 with $\operatorname{deg}(x) \geq 2$, not a tree in Fig. 2, then $N(T, x) \geq 2 n$. Proceeding by induction on $n$, assume the statement is true for all trees of order $n$ with $n \geq 6$ and not in Fig. 2, and let $T$ be a tree of order $n+1$.

Remove a leaf $y$ of $T$ that is at a maximum distance from $x$ to obtain a tree $T^{\prime}$ of order $n$. By the induction hypothesis, either $N\left(T^{\prime}, x\right) \geq 2 n$ or $T^{\prime}$ is a graph of the form in Fig. 2. In the first case, adding $y$ back adds at least two new connected subtrees containing $x$, the path $p$ from $x$ to $y$ and the union of $p$ and a child of $x$ not on $p$. Therefore $N(T, x) \geq N\left(T^{\prime}, x\right) \geq 2 n+2=2(n+1)$. In the second case, if $T^{\prime}$ is the graph on the right in Fig. 2, then $T$ has order at most 6 . If $T^{\prime}$ is a graph of the form on the left in Fig. 2, then either $T$ itself is a graph of the type on the left in Fig. 2 or $T$ is obtained from the graph on the left by joining leaf $y$ to vertex $z$. In the latter case it is easy to check that $N(T, x)=2(n+1)$.


Fig. 3. The dashed line indicates any number of vertices.

Corollary 6.3. If $x$ is a vertex in a connected graph $G$ of order n, and $x$ is contained in a 2 -connected subgraph of $G$, then $N(G, x) \geq 2 n$ unless $G$ is a subgraph containing $x$ of one of the graphs in Fig. 3.

Proof. Let $T$ be a spanning tree of $G$ containing all edges incident to $x$. By Lemma 6.2 we have $N(G, x) \geq N(T, x) \geq 2 n$ unless $T$ is one of the trees $T$ in Fig. 2. The fact that $x$ lies in a 2 -connected graph implies $G$ has at least one more edge $e$ than $T$. If $T$ is the right tree in Fig. 2 and adding $e$ does not result in the rightmost graph of Fig. 3, then at least two more connected sets containing $x$ are added, resulting in $N(G, x) \geq N(T, x)+2=9+2 \geq 2 \cdot 5=2 n$. If $T$ is the left tree in Fig. 2 and adding $e$ does not result in one of the three leftmost graphs of Fig. 3, then at least two more connected sets containing $x$ are added, resulting in $N(G, x) \geq N(T, x)+2=(2 n-2)+2=2 n$.

If $M(x)=2$ in the statement of Theorem 6.1, then inequality (6.1) reduces to

$$
\begin{equation*}
(n-1) N_{1}(x) N_{2}(x)>2\left(n_{2}+1\right) N_{1}+2\left(n_{1}+1\right) N_{2} . \tag{6.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Lemma 6.4. If $x$ is a cut-vertex of $G$ such that $M(x)=2$ and both $N\left(G_{i}^{\prime}, x\right) \geq 2\left(n_{i}+1\right)$ and $a_{i} \leq 1 / 2$ for either $i=1$ or $i=2$, then

$$
(n-1) N_{1}(x) N_{2}(x)>2\left(n_{2}+1\right) N_{1}+2\left(n_{1}+1\right) N_{2} .
$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume that $N_{1}(x) \geq 2\left(n_{1}+1\right)$ and $a_{1} \leq 1 / 2$. Then using Theorem 5.1 and the obvious fact that $N_{2}(x) \geq n_{2}+1$ we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
(n-1) & N_{1}(x) N_{2}(x)-\left(2\left(n_{2}+1\right) N_{1}+2\left(n_{1}+1\right) N_{2}\right) \\
= & \left(n_{1} N_{1}(x) N_{2}(x)-2\left(n_{2}+1\right) N_{1}\right)+\left(n_{2} N_{1}(x) N_{2}(x)-2\left(n_{1}+1\right) N_{2}\right) \\
\geq & \left(n_{1} N_{1}(x) N_{2}(x)-2\left(n_{2}+1\right) a_{1} n_{1}\left(N_{1}(x)-1\right)\right) \\
& \quad+\left(n_{2} N_{1}(x) N_{2}(x)-2\left(n_{1}+1\right) n_{2} N_{2}(x)\right) \\
> & \left(n_{1} N_{1}(x) N_{2}(x)-2\left(n_{2}+1\right) a_{1} n_{1} N_{1}(x)\right) \\
& +\left(n_{2} N_{1}(x) N_{2}(x)-2\left(n_{1}+1\right) n_{2} N_{2}(x)\right) \\
= & n_{1} N_{1}(x)\left(N_{2}(x)-2\left(n_{2}+1\right) a_{1}\right)+n_{2} N_{2}(x)\left(N_{1}(x)-2\left(n_{1}+1\right)\right) \\
\geq & n_{1} N_{1}(x)\left(N_{2}(x)-\left(n_{2}+1\right)\right)+n_{2} N_{2}(x)\left(N_{1}(x)-2\left(n_{1}+1\right)\right) \geq 0 .
\end{aligned}
$$

Lemma 6.5. If there is a cut-vertex $x$ in $G$ such that either
(1) $M(x) \geq 4$ or
(2) $M(x)=3$ with $\min \left\{n_{1}, n_{2}, n_{3}\right\} \geq 2$ and at least two of $n_{1}, n_{2}, n_{3}$ are at least 3 , then inequality (6.1) holds with $x$ as the root of $G$.

Proof. Using Theorem 5.1 and the fact that $N_{i}(x) \geq n_{i}+1$ we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
(n-1) & \prod_{i=1}^{M} N_{i}(x)-2 \sum_{i=1}^{M}\left(n-n_{i}\right) N_{i}=\sum_{i=1}^{M}\left(n_{i} N_{1}(x) N_{2}(x) \cdots N_{M}(x)-2\left(n-n_{i}\right) N_{i}\right) \\
& >\sum_{i=1}^{M}\left(n_{i} N_{1}(x) N_{2}(x) \cdots N_{M}(x)-2\left(n-n_{i}\right) a_{i} n_{i} N_{i}(x)\right) \\
& \geq \sum_{i=1}^{M} n_{i} N_{i}(x)\left(\prod_{j \neq i} N_{j}(x)-2\left(1+\sum_{j \neq i} n_{j}\right)\right) \\
& \geq \sum_{i=1}^{M} n_{i} N_{i}(x)\left(\prod_{j \neq i}\left(n_{j}+1\right)-2\left(1+\sum_{j \neq i} n_{j}\right)\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

If $M \geq 4$, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\prod_{j \neq i}\left(n_{i}+1\right) \geq 2\left(1+\sum_{j \neq i} n_{j}\right), \tag{6.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

verifying inequality (6.1). If $M=3$, then, without loss of generality, assume that $i=3$ in inequality (6.3), in which case

$$
\prod_{j \neq i}\left(n_{i}+1\right)-2\left(1+\sum_{j \neq i} n_{j}\right)=n_{1} n_{2}-n_{1}-n_{2}-1=\left(n_{1}-1\right)\left(n_{2}-1\right)-2
$$

which is greater than or equal to 0 if $\min \left\{n_{1}, n_{2}\right\} \geq 2$ and $\max \left\{n_{1}, n_{2}\right\} \geq 3$. Therefore

$$
(n-1) \prod_{i=1}^{M} N_{i}(x)>2 \sum_{i=1}^{M}\left(n-n_{i}\right) N_{i}
$$

if $M \geq 4$ or if $M=3$ with $\min \left\{n_{1}, n_{2}, n_{3}\right\} \geq 2$ and at least two of $n_{1}, n_{2}, n_{3}$ at least 3.

Lemma 6.6. Let $x$ be a cut-vertex of $G$ with $M(x) \geq 3$ and denote the components of $G-x$ by $G_{1}, G_{2}, \ldots, G_{M}$. Assume, without loss of generality, that $\min \left\{N_{i}: 1 \leq i \leq M\right\}=N_{M}$. If the graph $G^{\prime}$ induced by the vertices $\{x\} \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{M-1} V\left(G_{i}\right)$ satisfies (6.1), then $G$ also satisfies (6.1).

Proof. Assume that $(n-1) \prod_{i=1}^{M-1} N_{i}(x)>2 \sum_{i=1}^{M-1}\left(n-n_{i}\right) N_{i}$ holds for the graph $G^{\prime}$, where $n$ is the order of $G$. We must show that

$$
\left(n+n_{M}-1\right) \prod_{i=1}^{M} N_{i}(x)>2 \sum_{i=1}^{M-1}\left(n+n_{M}-n_{i}\right) N_{i}+2 n N_{M}
$$

i.e.,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& N_{M}(x)(n-1) \prod_{i=1}^{M-1} N_{i}(x)+n_{M} N_{M}(x) \prod_{i=1}^{M-1} N_{i}(x) \\
& \quad>2 \sum_{i=1}^{M-1}\left(n-n_{i}\right) N_{i}+2 n_{M} \sum_{i=1}^{M-1} N_{i}+2 n N_{M}
\end{aligned}
$$

Because it is assumed that $G^{\prime}$ satisfies (6.1), this reduces to showing that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& N_{M}(x) 2 \sum_{i=1}^{M-1}\left(n-n_{i}\right) N_{i}+n_{M} N_{M}(x) \frac{2 \sum_{i=1}^{M-1}\left(n-n_{i}\right) N_{i}}{n-1} \\
& \quad \geq 2 \sum_{i=1}^{M-1}\left(n-n_{i}\right) N_{i}+2 n_{M} \sum_{i=1}^{M-1} N_{i}+2 n N_{M},
\end{aligned}
$$

i.e.,

$$
\sum_{i=1}^{M-1}\left(\left(N_{M}(x)-1\right)\left(n-n_{i}\right)+n_{M}\left(\frac{N_{M}(x)\left(n-n_{i}\right)}{n-1}-1\right)\right) N_{i} \geq n N_{M}
$$

By the minimality of $N_{M}$ and the fact that $\sum_{i=1}^{M-1} n_{i}=n-1$, it now suffices to show that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left(N_{M}(x)-1\right. & \left.+\frac{n_{M} N_{M}(x)}{n-1}\right)(M n-2 n+1)-(M-1) n_{M} \\
& =\left(N_{M}(x)-1+\frac{n_{M} N_{M}(x)}{n-1}\right) \sum_{i=1}^{M-1}\left(n-n_{i}\right)-(M-1) n_{M} \\
& =\sum_{i=1}^{M-1}\left(\left(N_{M}(x)-1\right)\left(n-n_{i}\right)+n_{M}\left(\frac{N_{M}(x)\left(n-n_{i}\right)}{n-1}-1\right)\right) \geq n
\end{aligned}
$$

Because $N_{M}(x) \geq n_{M}+1$, we have

$$
N_{M}(x)-1+\frac{n_{M} N_{M}(x)}{n-1} \geq \frac{n_{M}\left(n_{M}+n\right)}{n-1}
$$

To finish the proof, the following inequality is required:

$$
(M n-2 n+1)\left(n_{M}\left(n_{M}+n\right)\right)-\left((M-1) n_{M}+n\right)(n-1) \geq 0
$$

As a function of $M$, the derivative of the left hand side of the inequality above is positive. Therefore it is sufficient to prove the inequality for $M=3$, i.e., $(n+1)\left(n_{3}^{2}+n n_{3}\right)-(n-1)\left(2 n_{3}+n\right)=n^{2}\left(n_{3}-1\right)+n n_{3}\left(n_{3}+1-2\right)+n_{3}^{2}+2 n_{3}+n \geq 0$, which clearly holds.

Proof of Theorem 6.1. If $G$ has a cut-vertex that satisfies condition (1) or (2) in the hypothesis of Lemma 6.5, then, by that lemma, Theorem 6.1 is true. Therefore it can be assumed that, for all cut-vertices $x$ of $G$, either
(a) $M(x)=2$, or
(b) $M(x)=3$ and at least two components of $G-x$ have order at most 2 or one of the components has order 1 .

In case (b), if $x$ is chosen as the root of $G$, then by Lemma 6.6 it may be assumed that
( $\mathrm{b}^{\prime}$ ) a component of $G-x$ has been removed and $M(x)=2$ for the resulting graph.
The proof is by cases. We will show that the inequality (6.1) holds when $G$ has:
(1) a red block of order at least 5;
(2) an interior red block of order 4;
(3) at least two red blocks, one of which is interior.

Our assumption that $G$ is not a near tree eliminates the cases:

- $G$ is a tree;
- $G$ has exactly one interior block of order 3 ;
- $G$ has no interior red blocks and all leaf blocks are of order 3 or 4 .

Hence cases 1-3 are exhaustive and their proof is sufficient to verify Theorem 6.1.

Case 1. Let $B$ be a block in $G$ of order at least 5 , and let $x$ a cut-vertex in $B$. Choose $x$ as the root of $G$. By items $(a)$ and $\left(b^{\prime}\right)$ above, it may be assumed that $M(x)=2$. Inequality (6.2) must be verified.

Let $G^{\prime}$ be the graph induced by the union of $x$ and the component of $G-x$ containing $B-x$. Without loss of generality, let this be the component whose parameters have index $i=1$ in inequality (6.2). Let $\widehat{G}$ be obtained from $G^{\prime}$ by adding an edge between every pair of neighbors of $x$. Note that $G^{\prime}$ and $\widehat{G}$ have the same set of vertices and the same set of connected sets containing $x$. Also, the number of connected sets in $\widehat{G}$ not containing $x$ is at least as large as the number of connected sets in $G^{\prime}$ not containing $x$. Therefore if inequality (6.2) holds with $G^{\prime}$ replaced by $\widehat{G}$, then it also holds for $G$. By Corollary 5.3 we have $a_{1} \leq 1 / 2$, and by Corollary 6.3 we have $N(\widehat{G}, x) \geq 2\left(n_{1}+1\right)$ unless $\widehat{G}$ is a subgraph containing $x$ of one of the graphs in Fig. 3. This is not possible since the order of $B$ is at least 5 . By Lemma 6.4, the proof of Case 1 is complete.

Case 2. Let block $B$ in $G$ be of order 4 and, since $B$ is interior, let $x$ and $y$ be distinct cut-vertices of $G$ on $B$. Take $x$ as the root of $G$. Let $G^{\prime}$ be the graph induced by the union of $x$ and the component of $G-x$ containing $B-x$. Note that $G^{\prime}$ contains $y$, and therefore $G^{\prime}$ cannot be a subgraph containing $x$ of any graph in Fig. 3. Hence $N\left(G^{\prime}, x\right) \geq 2\left(n_{1}+1\right)$ by Corollary 6.3. Now the proof proceeds as in Case 1.

Case 3. Let $B_{1}$ be a red block that is interior; let $B_{2}$ be another red block; and let $p$ be the unique path in $\mathbb{T}(G)$ joining $B_{1}$ and $B_{2}$. Since $B_{1}$ is interior, by Case 2 we can assume that it has order 3 . Let $x^{\prime}$ be a vertex in $\mathbb{T}(G)$ adjacent to $B_{1}$ that does not lie on $p$. Let $x$ be the vertex in $G$ corresponding to $x^{\prime}$, and choose $x$ as the root of $G$. We may assume by $(a)$ and $\left(b^{\prime}\right)$ above that $M(x)=2$, which reduces the problem to proving inequality (6.2). Let $G^{\prime}$ be the graph induced by the union of $x$ and the component of $G-x$ containing $B_{1}$ and $B_{2}$. By Corollaries 5.3 and 6.3 , we have $N(\widehat{G}, x) \geq 2\left(n_{1}+1\right)$ and $a_{1} \leq 1 / 2$. Lemma 6.4 completes the proof of Case 3 .

## 7. Proof of the lower bound theorem

Proposition 7.1. If $G$ is a connected graph with vertex set $\left\{x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right\}$, then $S(G)=$ $\sum_{i=1}^{n} N\left(G, x_{i}\right)$.

Proof. Count the number of pairs $(x, U)$ such that $x \in V(G), U \in \mathcal{C}(G)$ and $x \in U$, in two ways to obtain

$$
S(G)=\sum_{U \in \mathcal{C}}|U|=\sum_{x \in V(G)} N(G, x)=\sum_{i=1}^{n} N\left(G, x_{i}\right)
$$

Theorem 7.2. For a connected graph $G$ of order $n$ we have

$$
A(G) \geq \frac{n+2}{3}
$$

with equality if and only if $G$ is a path.
Proof. The proof is by induction on $n$. The statement is easily checked for $n \leq 4$. By Lemma 4.3, it is also true for near trees as in Definition 4.2. Assume it is true for graphs of order $n-1$, and let $G$ have order $n$. By Proposition 7.1, the average of the numbers $N(G, x)$ over all vertices $x$ in $G$ is $S(G) / n$. Let $x$ be a vertex such that $N(G, x) \geq S(G) / n$. Let $G^{\prime}=G-x$. There are two cases.

Case 1. The vertex $x$ is not a cut-vertex, hence $G-x$ is connected. From Corollary 3.2, the induction hypothesis, and our choice of $x$ we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
S(G) & =S(G-x)+S(G, x) \geq \frac{n+1}{3} N(G-x)+\frac{n+1}{2} N(G, x) \\
& =\frac{n+1}{3}(N(G-x)+N(G, x))+\frac{n+1}{6} N(G, x)=\frac{n+1}{3} N(G)+\frac{n+1}{6} N(G, x) \\
& \geq \frac{n+1}{3} N(G)+\frac{n+1}{6} \frac{S(G)}{n} .
\end{aligned}
$$

This simplifies to $A(G)=S(G) / N(G) \geq \frac{2 n(n+1)}{5 n-1} \geq \frac{n+2}{3}$, the last inequality easily verified for $n \geq 1$.

Case 2. Every vertex such that $N(G, x) \geq S(G) / n$ is a cut-vertex. If $G$ is a near tree, then we are done. Otherwise, by Theorem 6.1, there is a cut-vertex $x$ that satisfies inequality (6.1). We use the notation introduced at the beginning of Section 6. Let $G_{1}, \ldots, G_{M}$ be the connected components of $G-x$. Note that $n=1+n_{1}+n_{2}+\cdots+n_{M}$. Now

$$
\begin{aligned}
N(G, x) & =\prod_{i=1}^{M} N\left(G_{i}^{\prime}, x\right) \\
S(G, x) & =\sum_{i=1}^{M}\left(S\left(G_{i}^{\prime}, x\right)-N\left(G_{i}^{\prime}, x\right)\right) \prod_{j \neq i} N\left(G_{j}^{\prime}, x\right)+\prod_{i=1}^{M} N\left(G_{i}^{\prime}, x\right) \\
& =\sum_{i=1}^{M} S\left(G_{i}^{\prime}, x\right) \prod_{j \neq i} N\left(G_{j}^{\prime}, x\right)-(M-1) \prod_{i=1}^{M} N\left(G_{i}^{\prime}, x\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

In the formula for $S(G, x)$, the terms $-N\left(G_{i}^{\prime}, x\right)$ and $\prod_{i=1}^{M} N\left(G_{i}^{\prime}, x\right)$ are to count the vertex $x$ the correct number of times. By the induction hypothesis and Theorem 3.1 we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
S(G) & =S(G-x)+S(G, x) \\
& =\sum_{i=1}^{M} S\left(G_{i}\right)+\sum_{i=1}^{M} S\left(G_{i}^{\prime}, x\right) \prod_{j \neq i} N\left(G_{j}^{\prime}, x\right)-(M-1) \prod_{i=1}^{M} N\left(G_{i}^{\prime}, x\right) \\
& \geq \sum_{i=1}^{M} \frac{n_{i}+2}{3} N\left(G_{i}\right)+\sum_{i=1}^{M}\left(\frac{n_{i}+2}{2} N\left(G_{i}^{\prime}, x\right) \prod_{j \neq i} N\left(G_{j}^{\prime}, x\right)\right)-(M-1) \prod_{i=1}^{M} N\left(G_{i}^{\prime}, x\right) \\
& =\sum_{i=1}^{M} \frac{n_{i}+2}{3} N\left(G_{i}\right)+\frac{n+1}{2} \prod_{i=1}^{M} N\left(G_{i}^{\prime}, x\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

It remains to show that the expression in the last line above is greater than

$$
\frac{n+2}{3} N(G)=\frac{n+2}{3}(N(G-x)+N(G, x))=\frac{n+2}{3}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{M} N\left(G_{i}\right)+\prod_{i=1}^{M} N\left(G_{i}^{\prime}, x\right)\right) .
$$

This is equivalent to showing that

$$
(n-1) \prod_{i=1}^{M} N\left(G_{i}^{\prime}, x\right)>2 \sum_{i=1}^{M}\left(n-n_{i}\right) N\left(G_{i}\right)
$$

which is exactly inequality (6.1) in Theorem 6.1.

## 8. Two open problems

Although, for a general connected graph, the lower bound of Theorem 1.1 is best possible, evidence indicates that $D(G)>1 / 2$ for a large class of graphs. The result of Kroeker, Mol, and Oellermann [7] referenced in Section 2, for example, proves that this is the case for cographs. We made the following conjecture in [11].

Conjecture 1. For any graph $G$, all of whose vertices have degree at least 3, we have $D(G)>\frac{1}{2}$.

One difficulty in proving this conjecture, if true, is that knowing exactly for which graphs $D(G)>\frac{1}{2}$ is problematic. There are graphs, all of whose vertices have degree at least 2 , whose density is less than $1 / 2$ and some whose density is greater. Adding an edge to a graph may increase the density or it may decrease the density, similarly for adding a vertex. This makes a proof by induction challenging.

As mentioned in Section 2, there are trees whose density is arbitrarily close to 1. Very recently J. Haslegrave [4] generalized a classical result of Jamison for trees by showing
that in order for the connected set density to approach 1 , the proportion of vertices of degree 2 must approach 1 . For trees where every vertex has degree at least 3 , the density is bounded above by $3 / 4$ and this is best possible [10]. A family of cubic graphs appearing in [11] has asymptotic density $5 / 6$. We know of no graph, all of whose vertices have degree at least 3 , with a larger density.

Question 2. What is the upper bound on the density of graphs all of whose vertices have degree at least 3 ?

## References

[1] K.J. Balodis, M.E. Kroeker, L. Mol, O.R. Oellermann, On the mean order of connected induced subgraphs of block graphs, Australas. J. Comb. 76 (2020) 128-148.
[2] L. Caccetta, W.F. Smyth, Graphs of maximum diameter, Discrete Math. 102 (1992) 121-141.
[3] J. Haslegrave, Extremal results on average subtree density of series-reduced trees, J. Comb. Theory, Ser. B 107 (2014) 26-41.
[4] J. Haslegrave, The number and average size of connected sets in graphs with degree constraints, arXiv:2105.13332.
[5] R.E. Jamison, On the average number of nodes in a subtree of a tree, J. Comb. Theory, Ser. B 35 (1983) 207-223.
[6] R.E. Jamison, Monotonicity of the mean order of subtrees, J. Comb. Theory, Ser. B 37 (1984) 70-78.
[7] M.E. Kroeker, L. Mol, O.R. Oellermann, On the mean connected induced subgraph order of cographs, Australas. J. Comb. 71 (2018) 161-183.
[8] L. Mol, O.R. Oellermann, Maximizing the mean subtree order, J. Graph Theory 91 (2018) 326-352.
[9] A.M. Stephens, O. Oellermann, The mean order of sub- $k$-trees of $k$-trees, J. Graph Theory 88 (2018) 61-79.
[10] A. Vince, H. Wang, The average order of a subtree of a tree, J. Comb. Theory, Ser. B 100 (2010) 161-170.
[11] A. Vince, The average size of a connected vertex set of a graph - explicit formulas and open problems, J. Graph Theory 97 (2020) 82-103.
[12] S. Wagner, H. Wang, On the local and global means of subtree orders, J. Graph Theory 81 (2016) 154-166.
[13] W. Yan, Y. Yeh, Enumeration of subtrees of trees, Theor. Comput. Sci. 369 (2006) 256-268.


[^0]:    की This work was partially supported by a grant from the Simons Foundation (322515 to Andrew Vince). I would like to thank the referees for a thorough reading. Their comments substantially improved the quality of the paper.

    E-mail address: avince@ufl.edu.

