

Dense Matchings of Linear Size in Graphs of Independence Number 2

Jung Hon Yip[†]

December 2, 2025

Abstract

For a real number $c > 4$, we prove that every graph G with $\alpha(G) \leq 2$ and $|V(G)| \geq ct$ has a matching M with $|M| = t$ such that the number of non-adjacent pairs of edges in M is at most:

$$\left(\frac{1}{c(c-1)^2} + O_c(t^{-1/3}) \right) \binom{t}{2}.$$

This is related to an open problem of Seymour (2016) about Hadwiger's Conjecture, who asked if there is a constant $\varepsilon > 0$ such that every graph G with $\alpha(G) \leq 2$ has $\text{had}(G) \geq (\frac{1}{3} + \varepsilon)|V(G)|$.

1 Introduction

A graph H is a *minor* of a graph G if H can be obtained from G by deleting vertices and edges, and by contracting edges. The maximum integer n such that the complete graph K_n is a minor of G is called the *Hadwiger number* of G , denoted $\text{had}(G)$. A *proper colouring* of a graph G assigns a colour to each vertex so that adjacent vertices receive distinct colours. The minimum integer k such that G has a proper colouring with k colours is called the *chromatic number* of G , denoted $\chi(G)$. The cardinality of the largest set of pairwise non-adjacent vertices is called the *independence number* of G , denoted $\alpha(G)$. For any standard graph theory notation not defined above, see Diestel [11]¹.

Hadwiger's Conjecture is widely considered to be one of the deepest unsolved problems in graph theory [16]. See [7, 18, 24, 25] for surveys. It asserts that $\text{had}(G) \geq \chi(G)$ for every graph G . Since $\chi(G)\alpha(G) \geq |V(G)|$ for every graph G , Hadwiger's Conjecture would imply that $\text{had}(G) \geq |V(G)|/\alpha(G)$. However, it is open if $\text{had}(G) \geq |V(G)|/\alpha(G)$ for every graph G . Several results in this direction are known [2, 4, 12–14, 20]. A classical result of Duchet and Meyniel [12] states that:

[†]School of Mathematics, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia, junghon.yip@monash.edu. Supported by a Monash Graduate Scholarship.

¹Unless stated otherwise, all graphs are simple and finite.

Theorem 1 (Duchet and Meyniel [12]). *For every graph G , $\text{had}(G) \geq |V(G)|/(2\alpha(G) - 1)$.*

When $\alpha(G) = 2$, Theorem 1 implies $\text{had}(G) \geq |V(G)|/3$, but in this case Hadwiger's Conjecture asserts that $\text{had}(G) \geq |V(G)|/2$. This gap is large, and thus the restriction of Hadwiger's Conjecture to graphs with independence number 2 is interesting. For convenience, we denote this special case $\text{HC}_{\alpha=2}$.

Conjecture 2 ($\text{HC}_{\alpha=2}$). *For every graph G with $\alpha(G) \leq 2$, $\text{had}(G) \geq \chi(G)$.*

$\text{HC}_{\alpha=2}$ is a key open case of Hadwiger's Conjecture [3, 5, 9, 10, 22, 23]. Every graph G with $\alpha(G) = 2$ has $\chi(G) \geq |V(G)|/2$, but the weakening of $\text{HC}_{\alpha=2}$ remains open:

Conjecture 3 ($\text{HC}_{n/2}$). *For every graph G with $\alpha(G) \leq 2$, $\text{had}(G) \geq |V(G)|/2$.*

If G is a graph with $\alpha(G) \leq 2$, then $\chi(G) \geq |V(G)|/2$, and thus $\text{HC}_{\alpha=2}$ implies $\text{HC}_{n/2}$. Plummer, Stiebitz, and Toft [23] proved that if G is a minimal counterexample to $\text{HC}_{\alpha=2}$, then G is a counterexample to $\text{HC}_{n/2}$. Therefore, $\text{HC}_{\alpha=2}$ and $\text{HC}_{n/2}$ are equivalent.

Norin and Seymour [22] proved a dense variant of $\text{HC}_{n/2}$.

Theorem 4 (Norin and Seymour [22]). *Every graph G with $\alpha(G) = 2$ contains a minor H with $|V(H)| = \lceil |V(G)|/2 \rceil$ and*

$$|E(H)| \geq (\gamma - o(1)) \binom{|V(H)|}{2},$$

where $\gamma \approx 0.986882$.

Even the smallest improvement to Theorem 1 in the $\alpha(G) = 2$ case would be interesting. In particular, Seymour [24] conjectured that the constant factor of $1/3$ in Theorem 1 could be improved:

Conjecture 5 (HC_{ε}). *There is a constant $\varepsilon > 0$ such that every graph G with $\alpha(G) \leq 2$ satisfies $\text{had}(G) \geq (\frac{1}{3} + \varepsilon)|V(G)|$.*

HC_{ε} turns out to be equivalent to a conjecture about connected matchings, which we define below.

For disjoint subsets $A, B \subseteq V(G)$, A and B are *adjacent* if some vertex in A is adjacent to some vertex in B , otherwise A and B are *non-adjacent*. For $M \subseteq E(G)$, let $V(M) := \{v \in V(G) : v \text{ is an endpoint of an edge } e \in M\}$. For an edge $e \in E(G)$, let $V(e) := V(\{e\})$. A matching $M \subseteq E(G)$ is *connected* if for every two edges $e, f \in M$, $V(e)$ and $V(f)$ are adjacent. By contracting the edges of a connected matching M of G and deleting the unmatched vertices, one obtains a $K_{|M|}$ -minor of G . For a graph G , let $\text{cm}(G)$ be the largest size of a connected matching in G . Conjecture 6 is due to Füredi, Gyárfás, and Simonyi [15] (although they note that other authors may have independently made the same conjecture).

Conjecture 6 (Linear-CM). There is a constant $c > 0$ such that for every integer $t \geq 1$, every graph G with $\alpha(G) \leq 2$ and $|V(G)| \geq ct$ has a connected matching of size t .

Thomassé first noted that **Linear-CM** and HC_ε are equivalent (see [15]). A proof is given by Kawarabayashi, Plummer, and Toft [19]. Therefore, improving the constant $1/3$ in Theorem 1 is as hard as finding a connected matching of linear size. See [3, 6, 8, 13, 15] for partial results on **Linear-CM**. We remark that there is a precise version of **Linear-CM** conjectured by Füredi et al. [15], who asked if for every integer $t \geq 1$, every graph G with $\alpha(G) \leq 2$ and $|V(G)| \geq 4t - 1$ has a connected matching of size at least t . The bound $4t - 1$ is best possible, since the disjoint union of two copies of the complete graph K_{2t-1} does not have a connected matching of size t .

The goal of this paper is to prove a dense variant of **Linear-CM**, Theorem 7. The proof of Theorem 7 is based on ideas from the proof of Theorem 4 by Norin and Seymour [22].

Theorem 7. *Let $c > 4$ be a real number, and $t \geq 1$ be an integer. Let G be a graph with $\alpha(G) \leq 2$ and $|V(G)| \geq ct$. Then there is a matching M of G with $|M| = t$ such that the number of non-adjacent pairs of edges in M is at most*

$$\left(\frac{1}{c(c-1)^2} + O_c(t^{-1/3}) \right) \binom{t}{2}.$$

Similar results on dense minors have been studied [17, 21, 22]. In particular, Nguyen [21] proved that for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $k > 0$ such that for every integer $t \geq 2$, every graph with chromatic number kt contains a minor with t vertices and edge density at least $1 - \varepsilon$. However, this does not imply Theorem 7, since we require each branch set to have two vertices. Fox [13] used probabilistic methods to prove that every sufficiently large² graph G with $\alpha(G) = 2$ has a connected matching of size at least $\Omega(n^{4/5} \log^{1/5} n)$, where $n = |V(G)|$. However, this does not imply Theorem 7.

2 Proof

We use $\omega(G)$ to denote the *clique number*, $\delta(G)$ to denote the *minimum degree*, and $\Delta(G)$ to denote the *maximum degree* of G . Let \overline{G} denote the *complement* of G . We begin with a lemma, proved by Cambie [6]. For completeness, we include the proof here.

Lemma 8 (Cambie [6]). *For every integer $t \geq 1$, if G is a graph with $\alpha(G) = 2$, $|V(G)| \geq 4t - 1$, and $\text{cm}(G) \leq t - 1$, then $\omega(G) \leq \text{cm}(G)$.*

Proof. If G is disconnected, then G is the union of two complete graphs. One component of G has order at least $2t$, implying $\text{cm}(G) \geq t$. Hence G is connected. Note that

²**Linear-CM** is equivalent to the assertion that $\text{cm}(G) \geq \Omega(|V(G)|)$.

$\text{cm}(G) \geq \lfloor \omega(G)/2 \rfloor$, so $\omega(G) \leq 2t - 1$. Since $\alpha(G) \leq 2$, the non-neighbours of each vertex of G form a clique, so $\delta(G) \geq |V(G)| - 1 - \omega(G) \geq 2t - 1$. Let A be a clique of order $\omega(G)$ and let $B = V(G) \setminus A$. Let M be the largest matching in the bipartite subgraph induced by the edges between A and B . Any matching from A to B is connected since A is a clique, so $|M| \leq \text{cm}(G) \leq t - 1$. Suppose for contradiction that $\omega(G) > \text{cm}(G) \geq |M|$. This implies there is a vertex $x \in A$ unmatched by M . However, there is no neighbour of x contained in $B - V(M)$, otherwise this contradicts the maximality of M . Therefore, all neighbours of x are contained in $A \cup V(M)$. Since $\deg_G(x) \geq 2t - 1$, $|A \cup V(M)| \geq 2t$. Observe that

$$2|M| + |A \setminus V(M)| = |V(M) \cup (A \setminus V(M))| = |A \cup V(M)| \geq 2t.$$

Therefore, $|A \setminus V(M)| \geq 2t - 2|M|$, implying there are at least $2t - 2|M|$ vertices in A left unmatched by M . We can extend the matching M by pairing the remaining unmatched vertices of A , obtaining a connected matching of size t , a contradiction. \square

Let S be a finite set with $|S|$ even. Let $\binom{S}{2}$ denote the set of all pairs³ of elements from S . A *random partition of S into pairs* is a partition of S into pairs, chosen uniformly at random from the set of all partitions of S into pairs. Let X be a random partition of S into pairs. Note that $|\binom{S}{2}| = \binom{|S|}{2}$, $|X| = |S|/2$, and that for each $e \in \binom{S}{2}$ and every $f \in \binom{S}{2}$ disjoint from e ,

$$\mathbb{P}(e \in X) = \frac{1}{|S| - 1} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}(e, f \in X) = \frac{1}{(|S| - 1)(|S| - 3)}. \quad (1)$$

For $F \subseteq \binom{S}{2}$, Lemma 9 bounds the concentration of $|F \cap X|$ around $|F|/(|S| - 1)$. Lemma 9 was first proved by Norin and Seymour [22], but for completeness we provide the proof here.

Lemma 9 (Norin and Seymour [22]). *Let S be a finite set with $|S| \geq 4$ even, and let X be a random partition of S into pairs. Then for every $F \subseteq \binom{S}{2}$ and every real number $\lambda > 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left||F \cap X| - \frac{|F|}{|S| - 1}\right| \geq \lambda\right) \leq \frac{|S|}{\lambda^2}.$$

Proof. For $\lambda > 0$, let E be the event that

$$\frac{|F|}{|S| - 1} - \lambda < |F \cap X| < \frac{|F|}{|S| - 1} + \lambda.$$

Let $F^C := \binom{S}{2} \setminus F$, so that $|F^C \cap X|$ counts the number of elements of X not in F . Then E occurs if and only if (noting that $|X| = |S|/2$):

$$\frac{|S|}{2} - \frac{|F|}{|S| - 1} - \lambda \leq |F^C \cap X| \leq \frac{|S|}{2} - \frac{|F|}{|S| - 1} + \lambda.$$

³In this paper, a *pair* is an unordered two-element set of distinct elements.

Expanding,

$$\frac{|S|(|S| - 1) - 2|F|}{2(|S| - 1)} - \lambda \leq |F^C \cap X| \leq \frac{|S|(|S| - 1) - 2|F|}{2(|S| - 1)} + \lambda.$$

However, $|S|(|S| - 1) - 2|F| = 2\binom{S}{2} \setminus F = 2|F^C|$. Thus E occurs if and only if

$$\frac{|F^C|}{|S| - 1} - \lambda \leq |F^C \cap X| \leq \frac{|F^C|}{|S| - 1} + \lambda.$$

Therefore, suppose event E occurs. By replacing F with F^C if needed, we may without loss of generality assume that

$$|F| \leq \frac{|S|(|S| - 1)}{4}.$$

For each pair $e \in F$, let Z_e be the indicator random variable with $Z_e = 1$ if $e \in X$ and $Z_e = 0$ otherwise. Let $Z = \sum_{e \in F} Z_e = |F \cap X|$. By (1), $\mathbb{E}(Z) = |F|/(|S| - 1)$ and

$$\text{Var}(Z) = \sum_{(e,f) \in F \times F} \text{Cov}(Z_e, Z_f)$$

Note that if $e \cap f \neq \emptyset$, then e and f cannot be both in X . Hence, $\mathbb{E}(Z_e \cdot Z_f) = 0$. By definition of covariance, $\text{Cov}(Z_e, Z_f) = \mathbb{E}(Z_e \cdot Z_f) - \mathbb{E}(Z_e) \cdot \mathbb{E}(Z_f) \leq 0$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(Z) &\leq \sum_{e \in F} \text{Cov}(Z_e, Z_e) + \sum_{e \in F} \left(\sum_{f \in F, f \cap e = \emptyset} \text{Cov}(Z_e, Z_f) \right) \\ &= |F| \cdot \text{Var}(Z_e) + \sum_{e \in F} \left(\sum_{f \in F, f \cap e = \emptyset} \mathbb{E}(Z_e \cdot Z_f) - \mathbb{E}(Z_e) \cdot \mathbb{E}(Z_f) \right) \\ &\leq |F| \cdot \mathbb{P}(Z_e = 1) + \sum_{e \in F} \left(\sum_{f \in F, f \cap e = \emptyset} \left(\frac{1}{(|S| - 1)(|S| - 3)} - \left(\frac{1}{|S| - 1} \right)^2 \right) \right) \\ &\leq \frac{|F|}{|S| - 1} + |F|^2 \left(\frac{1}{(|S| - 1)(|S| - 3)} - \left(\frac{1}{|S| - 1} \right)^2 \right) \\ &\leq \frac{|S|}{4} + \frac{|S|^2}{8(|S| - 3)} \leq |S|. \end{aligned}$$

By Chebyshev's inequality (see for instance [1], Theorem 4.1.1),

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| |F \cap X| - \frac{|F|}{|S| - 1} \right| \geq \lambda \right) \leq \left(\frac{\sqrt{\text{Var}(Z)}}{\lambda} \right)^2 \leq \frac{|S|}{\lambda^2},$$

as desired. □

Let G be a graph. An ordered sequence of four distinct vertices (u, v, w, z) is a *bad quadruple*

if $uv, wz \in E(G)$, and $uw, uz, vw, vz \notin E(G)$. Observe that every pair of non-adjacent edges that do not share an endpoint corresponds to eight bad quadruples.

Lemma 10. *Let $k \geq 1$ be an integer, and let G be a graph such that $|E(\overline{G})| = b$, and suppose $\delta(G) \geq |V(G)| - k$. Then the number of bad quadruples is at most $2b(k-1)^2$.*

Proof. Let (u, v, w, z) be a bad quadruple. There are $2|E(\overline{G})| = 2b$ ways to choose (u, w) with $uw \notin E(G)$. For a fixed (u, w) , $v \notin \{u, w\}$ is chosen from at most $k-1$ non-neighbours of w , and $z \notin \{u, v, w\}$ is chosen from at most $k-1$ non-neighbours of u . Thus, the number of bad quadruples is at most $2b(k-1)^2$. \square

Lemma 11. *For an integer $t \geq 1$, let G be a graph with $\alpha(G) \leq 2$ and $|V(G)|$ even. Suppose $c \geq 4$ is a real number such that $|V(G)| = ct$ and suppose $\text{cm}(G) \leq t-1$. Let ℓ be a real number such that $\ell^2 > c/t$ and $\ell \leq \frac{1}{2}c - \frac{3}{2}$. Let $q := 1 - \frac{c}{\ell^2 t}$, let $k := \frac{1}{2}(c-1) - \ell$, so that $q > 0$ and $k \geq 1$, and let $p := 1/k$. Then there is a matching M of G with $|M| = t$ such that the number of non-adjacent pairs of edges is at most*

$$\frac{p^2 ct(t-1)^3}{8q(ct-1)(ct-3)}.$$

Proof. Let \mathcal{A}_ℓ be the set of all partitions X of $V(G)$ into pairs such that

$$|X \cap E(G)| \geq \frac{1}{2}(c-1)t - \ell t.$$

Since $|V(G)| \geq ct$ and $\text{cm}(G) \leq t-1$, by Lemma 8, $\omega(G) \leq t-1$. Since $\alpha(G) \leq 2$, the non-neighbours of each vertex form a clique, which implies that $\Delta(\overline{G}) \leq t-1$ and $\delta(G) \geq |V(G)| - 1 - (t-1) \geq (c-1)t$.

Claim 11.1. $\mathcal{A}_\ell \neq \emptyset$.

Proof. Let X be a random partition of $V(G)$ into pairs. By taking $F = E(G)$ and $S = V(G)$ in Lemma 9,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left||E(G) \cap X| - \frac{|E(G)|}{|V(G)|-1}\right| \geq \ell t\right) \leq \frac{|V(G)|}{\ell^2 t^2}.$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{|E(G)|}{|V(G)|-1} - \ell t \leq |E(G) \cap X| \leq \frac{|E(G)|}{|V(G)|-1} + \ell t\right) \geq 1 - \frac{|V(G)|}{\ell^2 t^2} = q > 0. \quad (2)$$

Note that when $|X \cap E(G)| \geq \frac{|E(G)|}{|V(G)|-1} - \ell t$,

$$|X \cap E(G)| \geq \frac{|E(G)|}{|V(G)|-1} - \ell t \geq \frac{|V(G)|(c-1)t}{2(|V(G)|-1)} - \ell t \geq \frac{1}{2}(c-1)t - \ell t,$$

and therefore $X \in \mathcal{A}_\ell$. By (2),

$$\mathbb{P}(X \in \mathcal{A}_\ell) \geq q > 0. \quad (3)$$

Thus, $\mathcal{A}_\ell \neq \emptyset$. \square

We now describe our process of choosing a random matching M of size t in G . Choose $X \in \mathcal{A}_\ell$ (which by Claim 11.1 is non-empty) uniformly at random. Then, choose a matching M with t edges from $X \cap E(G)$; such a choice is possible because $|X \cap E(G)| \geq \frac{1}{2}(c-1)t - \ell t = kt \geq t$. Observe that each edge of $X \cap E(G)$ is chosen to be in M with probability at most $p = 1/k$, and therefore for any edge $e \in E(G)$:⁴

$$\mathbb{P}(e \in M \mid e \in X \text{ and } X \in \mathcal{A}_\ell) = \frac{t}{|X \cap E(G)|} \leq \frac{t}{kt} = \frac{1}{k} = p.$$

For any two distinct edges $e, f \in E(G)$ that do not share an endpoint:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(e, f \in M \mid e \in X \text{ and } X \in \mathcal{A}_\ell) &= \frac{t}{|X \cap E(G)|} \cdot \frac{t-1}{|X \cap E(G)|-1} \\ &\leq \frac{t}{kt} \cdot \frac{t-1}{kt-1} \leq \left(\frac{t}{kt}\right)^2 = p^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Claim 11.2. *For any two distinct edges $e, f \in E(G)$ that do not share an endpoint,*

$$\mathbb{P}(e \in X \mid X \in \mathcal{A}_\ell) \leq \frac{1}{q(ct-1)}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}(e, f \in X \mid X \in \mathcal{A}_\ell) \leq \frac{1}{q(ct-1)(ct-3)}.$$

Proof. Consider a random partition X of $V(G)$ into pairs. By (3):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(e \in X) &\geq \mathbb{P}(e \in X \text{ and } X \in \mathcal{A}_\ell) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(e \in X \mid X \in \mathcal{A}_\ell) \cdot \mathbb{P}(X \in \mathcal{A}_\ell) \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}(e \in X \mid X \in \mathcal{A}_\ell) \cdot q. \end{aligned}$$

By (1),

$$\mathbb{P}(e \in X) = \frac{1}{|V(G)|-1} \leq \frac{1}{ct-1}.$$

Rearranging gives the desired result. The second claim follows from a similar argument. \square

Since $\Delta(\overline{G}) \leq t-1$, $|E(\overline{G})| \leq \frac{1}{2}ct(t-1)$. By Lemma 10, the number of bad quadruples of G is at most $ct(t-1)^3$. Therefore, there are at most $ct(t-1)^3/8$ non-adjacent pairs of edges

⁴Note that we have described two random processes. The first defines X to be a random partition of $V(G)$ into pairs. The second chooses $X \in \mathcal{A}_\ell$ uniformly at random. The probabilities in Claim 11.2 refer to the second process. From now on, we use $\mathbb{P}(\cdots \mid X \in \mathcal{A}_\ell)$ to emphasise that these probabilities refer to the second process. For probabilities in the first process, we do not condition on $X \in \mathcal{A}_\ell$.

in G that do not share an endpoint. Define:

$$\mathcal{U} := \left\{ \{e, f\} \in \binom{E(G)}{2} : e \text{ and } f \text{ do not share an endpoint and are non-adjacent} \right\}.$$

Then

$$|\mathcal{U}| \leq \frac{ct(t-1)^3}{8}. \quad (5)$$

For any two distinct edges $e, f \in E(G)$ that do not share an endpoint, if $e, f \in M$, then $e, f \in X$, and thus:

$$\mathbb{P}(e, f \in M \mid X \in \mathcal{A}_\ell) = \mathbb{P}(e, f \in M \text{ and } e, f \in X \mid X \in \mathcal{A}_\ell).$$

By (4) and Claim 11.2,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(e, f \in M \mid X \in \mathcal{A}_\ell) &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(e, f \in M \text{ and } e, f \in X \mid X \in \mathcal{A}_\ell)}{\mathbb{P}(e, f \in X \mid X \in \mathcal{A}_\ell)} \cdot \mathbb{P}(e, f \in X \mid X \in \mathcal{A}_\ell) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(e, f \in M \mid e, f \in X \text{ and } X \in \mathcal{A}_\ell) \cdot \mathbb{P}(e, f \in X \mid X \in \mathcal{A}_\ell) \\ &\leq p^2 \cdot \frac{1}{q(ct-1)(ct-3)}. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

From (5) and (6), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(\text{number of non-adjacent pairs of edges in } M \mid X \in \mathcal{A}_\ell) &= \sum_{\{e, f\} \in \mathcal{U}} \mathbb{P}(e, f \in M \mid X \in \mathcal{A}_\ell) \\ &\leq \frac{p^2 ct(t-1)^3}{8q(ct-1)(ct-3)}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that there is a matching M of G with $|M| = t$ such that the number of non-adjacent pairs of edges is at most $\frac{p^2 ct(t-1)^3}{8q(ct-1)(ct-3)}$, as desired. \square

We minimise the bound in Lemma 11 for t large relative to c . We use the following observation repeatedly.

Observation 12. *Let f and g be monic polynomials with $\deg(f) = n$ and $\deg(g) = m$. Then*

$$\frac{f(x)}{g(x)} = x^{n-m} + O(x^{n-m-1}).$$

We now finish the proof of the main theorem, Theorem 7.

Theorem 7. *Let $c > 4$ be a real number, and $t \geq 1$ be an integer. Let G be a graph with $\alpha(G) \leq 2$ and $|V(G)| \geq ct$. Then there is a matching M of G with $|M| = t$ such that the*

number of non-adjacent pairs of edges in M is at most

$$\left(\frac{1}{c(c-1)^2} + O_c(t^{-1/3}) \right) \binom{t}{2}.$$

Proof. If $\text{cm}(G) \geq t$, then we are done. Otherwise, if $|V(G)|$ is odd, then let G' be the graph obtained from G by deleting an arbitrary vertex from G . If $|V(G)|$ is even, then let $G' := G$. Therefore, $|V(G')|$ is even. Let $c' > 0$ be a constant such that $c't = |V(G')|$. Then $c't \geq |V(G')| \geq |V(G)| - 1 \geq ct - 1$, so $c' \geq c - \frac{1}{t}$. When t is large relative to c , since $c > 4$, we have $c' \geq 4$. Applying Lemma 11 to G' , for every real number ℓ such that $\ell^2 > c'/t$ and $\ell \leq \frac{1}{2}c' - \frac{3}{2}$, there is a matching M of G' with $|M| = t$ such that at most

$$\frac{p^2 c' t (t-1)^3}{8q(c't-1)(c't-3)}$$

pairs of edges are non-adjacent, where $k := \frac{1}{2}(c' - 1) - \ell$, $q := 1 - \frac{c'}{\ell^2 t}$ and $p := \frac{1}{k}$. Plugging these in yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{p^2 c' t (t-1)^3}{8q(c't-1)(c't-3)} &= \frac{\left(\frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}(c'-1)-\ell} \right)^2 c' t (t-1)^3}{8 \left(1 - \frac{c'}{\ell^2 t} \right) (c't-1)(c't-3)} \\ &= \frac{c' t (t-1)^3}{2(c'-1-2\ell)^2 \left(1 - \frac{c'}{\ell^2 t} \right) (c't-1)(c't-3)} := f(c', t, \ell). \end{aligned}$$

This expression is minimised when

$$\ell := \left(\frac{c'(c'-1)}{2t} \right)^{1/3}. \quad (7)$$

When t is large relative to c' , observe that the value of ℓ in (7) satisfies $\ell^2 > c'/t$ and $\ell \leq \frac{1}{2}c' - \frac{3}{2}$. We handle the terms of $f(c', t, \ell)$ individually. Observe that:

$$\frac{c' t (t-1)^3}{(c't-1)(c't-3)} \leq \frac{t(t-1)}{c'}. \quad (8)$$

Using (7):

$$\begin{aligned}
c' - 1 - 2\ell &= c' - 1 - 2 \left(\frac{c'(c' - 1)}{2t} \right)^{1/3} \\
&= (c' - 1) - 2^{2/3} \left(\frac{c'(c' - 1)}{t} \right)^{1/3} \\
&= (c' - 1) \left(1 - \frac{2^{2/3} c'^{1/3}}{(c' - 1)^{2/3} t^{1/3}} \right) \\
&= (c' - 1)(1 - O_c(t^{-1/3})).
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

By (9),

$$\begin{aligned}
(c' - 1 - 2\ell)^2 &= (c' - 1)^2 \left(1 - O_c(t^{-1/3}) \right)^2 \\
&= (c' - 1)^2 \left(1 - 2 \cdot O_c(t^{-1/3}) + O_c(t^{-2/3}) \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

For the $(1 - \frac{c'}{\ell^2 t})$ term,

$$\ell^2 t = \left(\frac{c'(c' - 1)}{2t} \right)^{2/3} t = \frac{t^{1/3} (c'(c' - 1))^{2/3}}{2^{2/3}}.$$

By (9),

$$1 - \frac{c'}{\ell^2 t} = 1 - c' \cdot \frac{2^{2/3}}{t^{1/3} (c'(c' - 1))^{2/3}} = 1 - \frac{2^{2/3} c'^{1/3}}{(c' - 1)^{2/3} t^{1/3}} = 1 - O_c(t^{-1/3}). \tag{11}$$

By (8), (10) and (11), since t is large relative to c' ,

$$\begin{aligned}
f(c', t, \ell) &\leq \frac{1}{2c'} (t(t-1)) (c' - 1)^{-2} \left(1 - 2 \cdot O_c(t^{-1/3}) + O_c(t^{-2/3}) \right)^{-1} \left(1 - O_c(t^{-1/3}) \right)^{-1} \\
&= \frac{1}{2c'(c' - 1)^2} (t(t-1)) \left(1 + O_c(t^{-1/3}) \right)^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{2c'(c' - 1)^2} (t(t-1)) \left(1 + O_c(t^{-1/3}) \right) \\
&= \left(\frac{1}{c'(c' - 1)^2} + O_c(t^{-1/3}) \right) \binom{t}{2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Recall that $c' \geq c - \frac{1}{t}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
f(c', t, \ell) &\leq \left(\frac{1}{c'(c' - 1)^2} + O_c(t^{-1/3}) \right) \binom{t}{2} \\
&\leq \left(\frac{1}{(c - \frac{1}{t})(c - \frac{1}{t} - 1)^2} + O_c(t^{-1/3}) \right) \binom{t}{2} \\
&= \left(\frac{1}{c(c - 1)^2} \left(1 + O_c\left(\frac{1}{t}\right) \right)^3 + O_c(t^{-1/3}) \right) \binom{t}{2} \\
&= \left(\frac{1}{c(c - 1)^2} \left(1 + O_c\left(\frac{1}{t}\right) \right) + O_c(t^{-1/3}) \right) \binom{t}{2} \\
&= \left(\frac{1}{c(c - 1)^2} + O_c(t^{-1/3}) \right) \binom{t}{2}
\end{aligned}$$

as desired. \square

Acknowledgements. Thanks to David Wood for helpful comments on an early draft of this paper.

References

- [1] NOGA ALON AND JOEL H. SPENCER. [The probabilistic method](#). John Wiley, 2nd edn., 2000.
- [2] JÓZSEF BALOGH AND A. V. KOSTOCHKA. [Large minors in graphs with given independence number](#). *Discrete Math.*, 311(20):2203–2215, 2011.
- [3] JONAH BLASIAK. [A special case of Hadwiger’s conjecture](#). *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 97(6):1056–1073, 2007.
- [4] THOMAS BÖHME, ALEXANDR KOSTOCHKA, AND ANDREW THOMASON. [Minors in graphs with high chromatic number](#). *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, 20(4):513–518, 2011.
- [5] CHRISTIAN BOSSE. [A note on Hadwiger’s conjecture for \$W_5\$ -free graphs with independence number two](#). *Discrete Math.*, 342(12):111595, 5, 2019.
- [6] STIJN CAMBIE. [Hadwiger’s conjecture implies a conjecture of Füredi-Gyárfás-Simonyi](#). 2021, arXiv:2108.10303.
- [7] KATHIE CAMERON AND KRISTINA VUŠKOVIĆ. [Hadwiger’s conjecture for some hereditary classes of graphs: a survey](#). *Bull. Eur. Assoc. Theor. Comput. Sci. EATCS*, 131:20–37, 2020.
- [8] RONG CHEN AND ZIJIAN DENG. [Connected matchings in graphs with independence number two](#). *Graphs and Combinatorics*, 41(5):107, 2025.
- [9] MARIA CHUDNOVSKY AND ALEXANDRA OVETSKY FRADKIN. [Hadwiger’s conjecture for quasi-line graphs](#). *J. Graph Theory*, 59(1):17–33, 2008.
- [10] MARIA CHUDNOVSKY AND PAUL SEYMOUR. [Packing seagulls](#). *Combinatorica*, 32(3):251–282, 2012.
- [11] REINHARD DIESTEL. [Graph theory](#), vol. 173 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer, 3rd edn., 2005.
- [12] PIERRE DUCHET AND HENRI MEYNIEL. [On Hadwiger’s number and the stability number](#). *Annals of Discrete Mathematics*, 13:71–73, 1982.
- [13] JACOB FOX. [Complete minors and independence number](#). *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 24(4):1313–1321, 2010.

- [14] ALEXANDRA FRADKIN. [Clique minors in claw-free graphs](#). *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 102(1):71–85, 2012.
- [15] ZOLTÁN FÜREDI, ANDRÁS GYÁRFÁS, AND GÁBOR SIMONYI. [Connected matchings and Hadwiger’s conjecture](#). *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, 14(3):435–438, 2005.
- [16] HUGO HADWIGER. [Über eine Klassifikation der Streckenkomplexe](#). *Vierteljschr. Naturforsch. Ges. Zürich*, 88:133–142, 1943.
- [17] KEVIN HENDREY, SERGEY NORIN, RAPHAEL STEINER, AND JÉRÉMIE TURCOTTE. [Finding dense minors using average degree](#). *J. Graph Theory*, 108(1):205–223, 2025.
- [18] KEN-ICHI KAWARABAYASHI. [Hadwiger’s conjecture](#). In *Topics in chromatic graph theory*, vol. 156 of *Encyclopedia Math. Appl.*, pp. 73–93. Cambridge Univ. Press, 2015.
- [19] KEN-ICHI KAWARABAYASHI, MICHAEL D. PLUMMER, AND BJARNE TOFT. [Improvements of the theorem of Duchet and Meyniel on Hadwiger’s conjecture](#). *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 95(1):152–167, 2005.
- [20] KEN-ICHI KAWARABAYASHI AND ZI-XIA SONG. [Some remarks on the odd Hadwiger’s conjecture](#). *Combinatorica*, 27(4):429–438, 2007.
- [21] TUNG H. NGUYEN. [Linear-sized minors with given edge density](#). 2022, arXiv:2206.143093.
- [22] SERGEY NORIN AND PAUL SEYMOUR. [Dense Minors of Graphs with Independence Number Two](#). *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 176:101–110, 2026.
- [23] MICHAEL D. PLUMMER, MICHAEL STIEBITZ, AND BJARNE TOFT. [On a special case of Hadwiger’s conjecture](#). *Discuss. Math. Graph Theory*, 23(2):333–363, 2003.
- [24] PAUL SEYMOUR. [Hadwiger’s conjecture](#). In JOHN FORBES NASH JR. AND MICHAEL TH. RASSIAS, eds., *Open Problems in Mathematics*, pp. 417–437. Springer, 2016.
- [25] BJARNE TOFT. [A survey of Hadwiger’s conjecture](#). *Congr. Numer.*, 115:249–283, 1996.