Abstract

A list assignment of a graph $G$ is a function $L$ that assigns a list $L(v)$ of colors to each vertex $v \in V(G)$. An $(L, d)^*$-coloring is a mapping $\pi$ that assigns a color $\pi(v) \in L(v)$ to each vertex $v \in V(G)$ so that at most $d$ neighbors of $v$ receive color $\pi(v)$. A graph $G$ is said to be $(k, d)^*$-choosable if it admits an $(L, d)^*$-coloring for every list assignment $L$ with $|L(v)| \geq k$ for all $v \in V(G)$. In 2001, Lih et al. [6] proved that planar graphs without 4- and $l$-cycles are $(3, 1)^*$-choosable, where $l \in \{5, 6, 7\}$. Later, Dong and Xu [3] proved that planar graphs without 4- and $l$-cycles are $(3, 1)^*$-choosable, where $l \in \{8, 9\}$.

There exist planar graphs containing 4-cycles that are not $(3, 1)^*$-choosable (Crown, Crown and Woodall, 1986 [1]). This partly explains the fact that in all above known sufficient conditions for the $(3, 1)^*$-choosability of planar graphs the 4-cycles are completely forbidden. In this paper we allow 4-cycles nonadjacent to relatively short cycles. More precisely, we prove that every planar graph without 4-cycles adjacent to 3- and 4-cycles is $(3, 1)^*$-choosable. This is a common strengthening of all above mentioned results. Moreover as a consequence we give a partial answer to a question of Xu and Zhang [11] and show that every planar graph without 4-cycles is $(3, 1)^*$-choosable.
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1 Introduction

All graphs considered in this paper are finite, loopless, and without multiple edges. A plane graph is a particular drawing of a planar graph in the Euclidean plane. For a graph $G$, we use $V(G)$, $E(G)$, $|G|$, $|E(G)|$ and $\delta(G)$ to denote its vertex set, edge set, order, size and minimum degree, respectively. For $v \in V(G)$, $N_G(v)$ denotes the set of neighbors of $v$ in $G$. If there is no confusion about the context, we write $N(v)$ for $N_G(v)$.
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A $k$-coloring of $G$ is a mapping $\pi$ from $V(G)$ to a color set $\{1, 2, \cdots, k\}$ such that $\pi(x) \neq \pi(y)$ for any adjacent vertices $x$ and $y$. A graph is $k$-colorable if it has a $k$-coloring. Cowen, Cowen, and Woodall [11] considered defective colorings of graphs. A graph $G$ is said to be $d$-improper $k$-colorable, or simply, $(k, d)^*$-colorable, if the vertices of $G$ can be colored with $k$ colors in such a way that each vertex has at most $d$ neighbors receiving the same color as itself. Obviously, a $(k, 0)^*$-coloring is an ordinary proper $k$-coloring.

A list assignment of $G$ is a function $L$ that assigns a list $L(v)$ of colors to each vertex $v \in V(G)$. An $L$-coloring with impropriety of integer $d$, or simply an $(L, d)^*$-coloring, of $G$ is a mapping $\pi$ that assigns a color $\pi(v) \in L(v)$ to each vertex $v \in V(G)$ so that at most $d$ neighbors of $v$ receive color $\pi(v)$. A graph is $k$-choosable with impropriety of integer $d$, or simply $(k, d)^*$-choosable, if there exists an $(L, d)^*$-coloring for every list assignment $L$ with $|L(v)| \geq k$ for all $v \in V(G)$. Clearly, a $(k, 0)^*$-choosable is the ordinary $k$-choosability introduced by Erdős, Rubin and Taylor [5] and independently by Vizing [10].

The concept of list improper coloring was independently introduced by Škrekovski [7] and Eaton and Hull [4]. They proved that every planar graph is $(3, 2)^*$-choosable and every outerplanar graph is $(2, 2)^*$-choosable. These are both improvement of the results showed in [11] which say that every planar graph is $(3, 2)^*$-colorable and every outerplanar graph is $(2, 2)^*$-colorable. Let $g(G)$ denote the girth of a graph $G$, i.e., the length of a shortest cycle in $G$. The $(k, d)^*$-choosability of planar graph $G$ with given $g(G)$ has been studied by Škrekovski in [9]. He proved that every planar graph $G$ is $(2, 1)^*$-choosable if $g(G) \geq 9$, $(2, 2)^*$-choosable if $g(G) \geq 7$, $(2, 3)^*$-choosable if $g(G) \geq 6$, and $(2, d)^*$-choosable if $d \geq 4$ and $g(G) \geq 5$. Recently, Cushing and Kierstead [2] proved that every planar graph is $(4, 1)^*$-choosable. So it would be interesting to investigate the sufficient conditions of $(3, 1)^*$-choosability of subfamilies of planar graphs where some families of cycles are forbidden. Škrekovski proved in [8] that every planar graph without 3-cycles is $(3, 1)^*$-choosable. Lih et al. [6] proved that planar graphs without 4- and $l$-cycles are $(3, 1)^*$-choosable, where $l \in \{5, 6, 7\}$. Later, Dong and Xu [3] proved that planar graphs without 4- and $l$-cycles are $(3, 1)^*$-choosable, where $l \in \{8, 9\}$. Moreover, Xu and Zhang [11] asked the following question:

**Question 1** *Is it true that every planar graph without adjacent triangles is $(3, 1)^*$-choosable?*

Recall that there is a planar graph containing 4-cycles that is not $(3, 1)^*$-colorable [11]. Therefore, while describing $(3, 1)^*$-choosability planar graphs, one must impose these or those restrictions on 4-cycles. Note that in all previously known sufficient conditions for the $(3, 1)^*$-choosability of planar
graphs, the 4-cycles are completely forbidden. In this paper we allow 4-cycles, but disallow them to have a common edge with relatively short cycles.

The purpose of this paper is to prove the following

**Theorem 1** Every planar graph without 4-cycles adjacent to 3- and 4-cycles is $(3, 1)^*$-choosable.

Clearly, Theorem 1 implies Corollary 1 which is a common strengthening of the results in [6, 3].

**Corollary 1** Every planar graph without 4-cycles is $(3, 1)^*$-choosable.

Moreover, Theorem 1 partially answers Question since adjacent triangles can be regarded as a 4-cycle adjacent to a 3-cycle.

2 Notation

A vertex of degree $k$ (resp. at least $k$, at most $k$) will be called a $k$-vertex (resp. $k^+$-vertex, $k^-$-vertex). A similar notation will be used for cycles and faces. A triangle is synonymous with a 3-cycle. For $f \in F(G)$, we use $b(f)$ to denote the boundary walk of $f$ and write $f = [u_1u_2\cdots u_n]$ if $u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_n$ are the boundary vertices of $f$ in cyclic order. For any $v \in V(G)$, we let $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_d(v)$ denote the neighbors of $v$ in a cyclic order. Let $f_i$ be the face with $vv_i$ and $vv_{i+1}$ as two boundary edges for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, d(v)$, where indices are taken modulo $d(v)$. Moreover, we let $t(v)$ denote the number of 3-faces incident to $v$ and let $n_3(v)$ denote the number of 3-vertices adjacent to $v$.

An $m$-face $f = [v_1v_2\cdots v_m]$ is called an $(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m)$-face if the degree of the vertex $v_i$ is $a_i$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, m$. Suppose $v$ is a 4-vertex incident to a 4$^-$-face $f$ and adjacent to two 3-vertices not on $b(f)$. If $d(f) = 3$, then we call $v$ a light 4-vertex. Otherwise, we call $v$ a soft 4-vertex if $d(f) = 4$.

A vertex $v$ is called an $S$-vertex if it is either a 3-vertex or a light 4-vertex. Moreover, we say a 3-face $f = [v_1v_2v_3]$ is an $(a_1, *, a_3)$-face if $d(v_i) = a_i$ for each $i \in \{1, 3\}$ and $v_2$ is an $S$-vertex. Suppose $v$ is a 5-vertex incident to two 3-faces $f_1 = [vv_1v_2]$ and $f_3 = [vv_3v_4]$. Let $v_5$ be the neighbour of $v$ not belonging to the 3-faces. If $d(v_5) = 3$ and $f_1$ is a $(5, *, 4)$-face, then we call $v$ a bad 5-vertex.

For all figures in the following section, a vertex is represented by a solid circle when all of its incident edges are drawn; otherwise it is represented by a hollow circle. Moreover, we use a hollow square to denote an $S$-vertex.
3 Proof of Theorem 1

The proof of Theorem 1 is done by reducible configurations and discharging procedure. Suppose the theorem is not true. Let $G$ be a counterexample with the least number of vertices and edges embedded in the plane. Thus, $G$ is connected. We will apply a discharging procedure to reach a contradiction.

We first define a weight function $\omega$ on the vertices and faces of $G$ by letting $\omega(v) = 3d(v) - 10$ if $v \in V(G)$ and $\omega(f) = 2d(f) - 10$ if $f \in F(G)$. It follows from Euler’s formula $|V(G)| - |E(G)| + |F(G)| = 2$ and the relation $\sum_{v \in V(G)} d(v) = \sum_{f \in F(G)} d(f) = 2|E(G)|$ that the total sum of weights of the vertices and faces is equal to

$$\sum_{v \in V(G)} (3d(v) - 10) + \sum_{f \in F(G)} (2d(f) - 10) = -20.$$

We then design appropriate discharging rules and redistribute weights accordingly. Once the discharging is finished, a new weight function $\omega^*$ is produced. The total sum of weights is kept fixed when the discharging is in process. Nevertheless, after the discharging is complete, the new weight function satisfies $\omega^*(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in V(G) \cup F(G)$. This leads to the following obvious contradiction,

$$-20 = \sum_{x \in V(G) \cup F(G)} \omega(x) = \sum_{x \in V(G) \cup F(G)} \omega^*(x) \geq 0$$

and hence demonstrates that no such counterexample can exist.

3.1 Reducible configurations of $G$

In this section, we will establish structural properties of $G$. More precisely, we prove that some configurations are reducible. Namely, they cannot appear in $G$ because of the minimality of $G$. Since $G$ does not contain a 4-cycle adjacent to an $i$-cycle, where $i = 3, 4$, by hypothesis, the following fact is easy to observe and will be frequently used throughout this paper without further notice.

Observation 1 $G$ does not contain the following structures:

![Diagram of configurations](image-url)
adjacent 3-cycles;
(b) a 4-cycle adjacent to a 3-cycle;
(c) a 4-cycle adjacent to a 4-cycle.

We first present Lemma 1 whose proof was provided in [6].

Lemma 1 [6]
(A1) $\delta(G) \geq 3$.
(A2) No two adjacent 3-vertices.
(A3) There is no (3, 4, 4)-face.

Before showing Lemmas 2-7, we need to introduce some useful concepts, which were firstly defined by Zhang in [12].

Definition 1 For $S \subseteq V(G)$, let $G[S]$ denote the subgraph of $G$ induced by $S$. We simply write $G - S = G[V(G) \setminus S]$. Let $L$ be an arbitrary list assignment of $G$, and $\pi$ be an $(L, 1)^*$-coloring of $G - S$. For each $v \in S$, let $L_\pi(v) = L(v) \setminus \{\pi(u) : u \in N_{G - S}(v)\}$, and we call $L_\pi$ an induced assignment of $G[S]$ from $\pi$. We also say that $\pi$ can be extended to $G$ if $G[S]$ admits an $(L_\pi, 1)^*$-coloring.

![Figure 2: The configuration (Q) in Lemma 2](image)

Lemma 2 Suppose that $G$ contains the configuration (Q), depicted in Figure 2. Let $\pi$ be an $(L, 1)^*$-coloring of $G - S$, where $S = \{v, v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4\}$. Denote by $L_\pi$ an induced list assignment of $G[S]$. If $|L_\pi(v_i)| \geq 1$ for each $i \in \{1, \cdots, 4\}$, then $\pi$ can be extended to the whole graph $G$.

Proof. Since $|L_\pi(v_i)| \geq 1$ for each $i \in \{1, \cdots, 4\}$, we can color each $v_i$ with a color $\pi(v_i) \in L_\pi(v_i)$ properly. Note that $|L_\pi(v)| \geq 2$. If there exists a color in $L_\pi(v)$ which appears at most once on the set $\{v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4\}$, then we assign such a color to $v$. It is easy to check that the resulting coloring is
Let \( L \) be a list assignment such that \( |L(v)| = 3 \) for all \( v \in V(G) \). We make use of contradiction to show (B1)-(B5).

(B1) Suppose that \( v \) is adjacent to three 3-vertices \( v_1, v_2 \) and \( v_3 \). Denote \( G' = G - \{v, v_1, v_2, v_3\} \). By the minimality of \( G \), \( G' \) admits an \((L, 1)^*\)-coloring \( \pi \). Let \( L_\pi \) be an induced list assignment of \( G - G' \). It is easy to deduce that \( |L_\pi(v)| \geq 2 \) and \( |L_\pi(v_i)| \geq 1 \) for each \( i \in \{1, 2, 3\} \). So for each \( v_i \), we assign the color \( \pi(v_i) \in L_\pi(v_i) \) to it. Now we observe that there exists a color in \( L_\pi(v) \) appearing at most once on the set \( \{v_1, v_2, v_3\} \). We color \( v \) with such a color. The obtained coloring is an \((L, 1)^*\)-coloring of \( G \). This contradicts the choice of \( G \).

(B2) It suffices to prove that \( G \) does not contain a \((4, 4, 4)\)-face by (A3). Suppose \( f = [v_1v_2v_3] \) is a 3-face with \( d(v_1) = d(v_2) = d(v_3) = 4 \). For each \( i \in \{1, 2, 3\} \), let \( x_i, y_i \) denote the other two neighbors of \( v_i \) not on \( b(f) \). Denote by \( G' \) the graph obtained from \( G \) by deleting
edge \(v_1v_2\). By the minimality of \(G\), \(G'\) has an \((L, 1)^*\)-coloring \(\pi\). If \(\pi(v_1) \neq \pi(v_2)\), then \(G\) itself is \((L, 1)^*\)-colorable and thus we are done. Otherwise, suppose \(\pi(v_1) = \pi(v_2)\). If \(\pi\) is not an \((L, 1)^*\)-coloring of the whole graph \(G\), then without loss of generality, assume that \(\pi(v_1) = \pi(v_2) = \pi(x_1) = 1\) and \(\pi(v_3) = 2\). Moreover, none of \(x_1\)'s neighbors except \(v_1\) is colored with 1. First, we recolor each \(v_i\) with a color \(\pi'(v_i)\) in \(L(v_i) \setminus \{\pi(x_1), \pi(y_i)\}\), where \(i \in \{1, 2, 3\}\). We should point out that \(\pi'(v_i)\) may be the same as \(\pi(v_i)\), but it does not matter. Note that if at most two of \(\pi'(v_1), \pi'(v_2), \pi'(v_3)\) are equal then the resulting coloring is an \((L, 1)^*\)-coloring and thus we are done. Otherwise, suppose that \(\pi'(v_1) = \pi'(v_2) = \pi'(v_3)\). Since \(\pi'(v_1) \neq 1\) and \(1 \in L(v_1)\), we may further reassign color 1 to \(v_1\) to obtain an \((L, 1)^*\)-coloring of \(G\). This contradicts the choice of \(G\).

(B3) Suppose \(f = [v_1v_2v_3]\) is a \((5^+, 4, 4)\)-face incident to two light 4-vertices \(v_2\) and \(v_3\). By definition, we see that each \(v_i\) \((i \in \{2, 3\})\) is incident to two other 3-vertices, denoted by \(x_i\) and \(y_i\), which are not on \(b(f)\). Let \(G'\) denote the graph obtained from \(G\) by deleting edge \(v_2v_3\). Obviously, \(G'\) has an \((L, 1)^*\)-coloring \(\pi\) by the minimality of \(G\). Similarly, if \(\pi(v_2) \neq \pi(v_3)\), then \(G\) itself is \((L, 1)^*\)-colorable and thus we are done. Otherwise, suppose \(\pi(v_2) = \pi(v_3)\).

If \(\pi\) is not an \((L, 1)^*\)-coloring of \(G\), then w.l.o.g., assume that \(\pi(v_2) = \pi(v_3) = \pi(x_2) = 1\) and \(\pi(v_1) = 2\). Erase the color of \(v_2\) and recolor \(y_2\) with a color \(a \in L(y_2)\) different from its neighbors. If \(L(v_2) \neq \{1, 2, a\}\), then color \(v_2\) with a color in \(L(v_2) \setminus \{1, 2, a\}\). Otherwise, color \(v_2\) with \(a\). It is easy to verify that the resulting coloring is an \((L, 1)^*\)-coloring of \(G\), which is a contradiction.

(B4) Suppose that a 5-vertex \(v\) is incident to a \((5^+, *, 4)\)-face \(f_1 = [vv_1v_2]\) and adjacent to two 3-vertices \(v_3\) and \(v_4\). Let \(G' = G - \{v, v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4\}\). By the minimality of \(G\), \(G'\) has an \((L, 1)^*\)-coloring \(\pi\). Let \(L_\pi\) be an induced list assignment of \(G - G'\). Obviously, \(|L_\pi(v_i)| \geq 1\) for each \(i \in \{1, \cdots, 4\}\) and \(|L_\pi(v)| \geq 2\). By Lemma 2, \(\pi\) can be extended to \(G\), which is a contradiction.

(B5) Suppose that a 6-vertex \(v\) is incident to two \((6, 4^-, 4^-)\)-faces \(f_1, f_3\) and one \((6, *, 4)\)-face \(f_5\) such that \(d(v_i) \leq 4\) for each \(i = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}\), \(d(v_6) = 4\) and \(v_5\) is an \(S\)-vertex. Namely, \(v_5\) is either a 3-vertex or a light 4-vertex. Let \(G' = G - \{v, v_1, v_2, \cdots, v_6\}\). By minimality, \(G'\) admits an \((L, 1)^*\)-coloring \(\pi\). Denote by \(L_\pi\) an induced list assignment of \(G - G'\). It is easy to verify that \(|L_\pi(v_i)| \geq 1\) for each \(i \in \{1, \cdots, 6\}\) and \(|L_\pi(v)| \geq 3\). So we can color \(v_i\) with \(\pi(v_i) \in L_\pi(v_i)\) for each \(i \in \{1, 2, \cdots, 6\}\). If there exists a color \(a \in L_\pi(v)\) appearing at most once on the set \(\{v_1, v_2, \cdots, v_6\}\), then we further assign color \(a\) to \(v\) and thus obtain an \((L, 1)^*\)-coloring of \(G\).
Otherwise, each color in $L_\pi(v)$ appears exactly twice on the set $\{v_1, v_2, \cdots, v_6\}$. Since $v_5$ is an $S$-vertex, we can apply versions of arguments (i) and (ii) in the proof of Lemma 2 to obtain an $(L, 1)^*$-coloring of $G$.

**Lemma 4** Suppose that $f = [uxy]$ is a $(3, 4, m, 4)$-face. Then

(F1) $m \neq 3$.

(F2) $x$ cannot be a soft 4-vertex.

**Proof.** (F1) Suppose to the contrary that $m = 3$. Let $G' = G - \{u, v, x, y\}$. By the minimality of $G$, $G'$ admits an $(L, 1)^*$-coloring $\pi$. Let $L_\pi$ be an induced list assignment of $G - G'$. Notice that $|L_\pi(y)| > 1$, $|L_\pi(v)| > 1$, $|L_\pi(u)| > 2$, and $|L_\pi(x)| > 2$. First, we color $v$ with $a \in L_\pi(v)$ and color $y$ with $b \in L_\pi(y)$. Then color $u$ with $c \in L_\pi(u) \setminus \{a\}$ and $x$ with $d \in L_\pi(x) \setminus \{b\}$. One can easily check that the resulting coloring of $G$ is an $(L, 1)^*$-coloring. This contradicts the assumption of $G$.

(F2) Suppose to the contrary that $x$ is a soft 4-vertex. By definition, $x$ has other two neighbors whose degree are both 3, say $x_1$ and $x_2$. Observe that neither $x_1$ nor $x_2$ is on $b(f)$. Let $G' = G - \{u, v, x, y, x_1, x_2\}$. Obviously, $G'$ admits an $(L, 1)^*$-coloring $\pi$. Let $L_\pi$ be an induced list assignment of $G - G'$. For each $w \in \{v, x, x_1, x_2\}$, we deduce that $|L_\pi(w)| > 1$. Moreover, $|L_\pi(u)| > 2$. We first color $w$ with $\pi(w) \in L_\pi(w)$ and color $u$ with a color in $L_\pi(u) \setminus \{\pi(v)\}$. If at least one of $x_1$ and $x_2$ has the same color as $\pi(v)$, we can color $x$ with a color different from that of $v$ and $y$. Otherwise, we can color $x$ with a color different from $x_1$ and $y$. Therefore, we achieve an $(L, 1)^*$-coloring of $G$, which is a contradiction. □

(Figure 3: Adjacent soft 4-vertices $u$ and $v$.)

**Lemma 5** There is no adjacent soft 4-vertices.

**Proof.** Suppose to the contrary that $u$ and $v$ are adjacent soft 4-vertices such that $[uxyv]$ is a 4-face and $u_1, u_2, v_1, v_2$ are 3-vertices, which is depicted in Figure 3. By Observation 1(b), $u_i$ cannot be coincided with $v_j$, where $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$. Let $G' = G - \{u_1, u_2, v_1, v_2, u, v\}$. For each $i \in \{1, 2\}$,
we color \( u_i \) and \( v_i \) with a color in \( L_\pi(u_i) \) and \( L_\pi(v_i) \), respectively. If \( L(u) \neq \{ \pi(x), \pi(u_1), \pi(u_2) \} \), then color \( u \) with \( a \in L(u) \setminus \{ \pi(x), \pi(u_1), \pi(u_2) \} \). It is easy to see that there exists at least one color in \( L(v) \setminus \{ \pi(y) \} \) which appears at most once on the set \( \{ u, v_1, v_2 \} \). So we may assign such a color to \( v \). Now suppose that \( L(u) = \{ \pi(x), \pi(u_1), \pi(u_2) \} \). By symmetry, we may suppose that \( L(v) = \{ \pi(y), \pi(v_1), \pi(v_2) \} \). This implies that \( \pi(v_1) \neq \pi(v_2) \). Thus, we can first color \( u \) with \( \pi(u_1) \) and then assign a color in \( L(v) \setminus \{ \pi(u_1), \pi(y) \} \) to \( v \).

\[ \square \]

**Lemma 6** Suppose \( v \) is a 5-vertex incident to two 3-faces \( f_1 = [vv_1v_2] \) and \( f_3 = [vv_3v_4] \). Let \( v_5 \) be the neighbour of \( v \) not belonging to \( f_1 \) and \( f_3 \). Then the following holds.

(C1) If \( f_1 \) and \( f_3 \) are both \((5, 4^-, 4^-)\)-faces, then \( d(v_5) \geq 4 \).

(C2) If \( f_1 \) is a \((5, *, 4^-)\)-face and \( f_3 \) is a \((5, *, 4^+)\)-face, then \( d(v_5) \geq 4 \).

(C3) \( f_1 \) and \( f_3 \) cannot be both \((5, *, 4^-)\)-faces.

**Proof.** In each of following cases, we will show that an \((L, 1)^*\)-coloring of \( G' \subset G \) can be extended to \( G \), which is a contradiction.

(C1) We only need to show that \( d(v_5) \neq 3 \) since \( \delta(G) \geq 3 \) by (A1). Suppose that \( v_5 \) is a 3-vertex. Let \( G' = G - \{ v, v_1, \cdots, v_5 \} \). By the minimality of \( G \), \( G' \) has an \((L, 1)^*\)-coloring \( \pi \). Let \( L_\pi \) be an induced list assignment of \( G - G' \). It is easy to deduce that \( |L_\pi(v_i)| \geq 1 \) for each \( i \in \{ 1, \cdots, 5 \} \) and \( |L_\pi(v)| \geq 3 \). So we first color each \( v_i \) with \( \pi(v_i) \in L_\pi(v_i) \). Observe that there exists a color \( a \in L_\pi(v) \) that appears at most once on the set \( \{ v_1, v_2, \cdots, v_5 \} \). Therefore, we can color \( v \) with \( a \) to obtain an \((L, 1)^*\)-coloring of \( G \).

(C2) Suppose that \( d(v_2) = 4 \), \( d(v_5) = 3 \) and \( v_1 \) and \( v_3 \) are both \( S \)-vertices. By definition, we see that \( v_i \) is either a 3-vertex or a light 4-vertex, where \( i \in \{ 1, 3 \} \). Let \( G' = G - \{ v, v_1, v_2, v_3, v_5 \} \). By the minimality of \( G \), \( G' \) has an \((L, 1)^*\)-coloring \( \pi \). Let \( L_\pi \) be an induced list assignment of \( G - G' \). The proof is split into two cases in light of the conditions of \( v_3 \).

- Assume \( v_3 \) is a 3-vertex. It is easy to calculate that \( |L_\pi(v_i)| \geq 1 \) for each \( i \in \{ 1, 2, 3, 5 \} \) and \( |L_\pi(v)| \geq 2 \). By Lemma\( \square \), \( \pi \) can be extended to \( G \).

- Assume \( v_3 \) is a light 4-vertex. By definition, let \( x_3, y_3 \) denote the other two neighbors of \( v_3 \) not on \( b(f_3) \). Recolor \( x_3 \) and \( y_3 \) with a color different from its neighbors. Next, we will show how to extend the resulting coloring \( \pi' \) to \( G \). Denote \( L_{\pi'} \) be the induced assignment of \( G - G' \). Notice that \( |L_{\pi'}(v_i)| \geq 1 \) for each \( i \in \{ 1, 2, 5 \} \). If \( |L_{\pi'}(v_3)| \geq 1 \), then by Lemma\( \square \) \( \pi' \) can be extended to \( G \). Otherwise, we derive that \( L(v_3) = \)
\{\pi'(x_3), \pi'(y_3), \pi'(v_4)\}. First we assign a color in \(L_{\pi'}(v_i)\) to each \(v_i\), where \(i \in \{1, 2, 5\}\). It is easy to see that there is at least one color, say \(a\), belonging to \(L(v) \setminus \{\pi'(v_4)\}\) that appears at most once on the set \(\{v_1, v_2, v_3\}\). We assign such a color \(a\) to \(v\). Then color \(v_3\) with a color in \(\{\pi'(x_3), \pi'(y_3)\}\) but different from \(a\).

(C3) Suppose that \(f_1\) and \(f_2\) are both \((5, \ast, 4)\)-faces such that \(d(v_2) = d(v_4) = 4\) and \(v_1\) and \(v_3\) are \(S\)-vertices. Let \(G' = G - \{v, v_1, \ldots, v_4\}\). Obviously, \(G'\) has an \((L, 1)^*\)-coloring \(\pi\) by the minimality of \(G\). Let \(L_{\pi}\) be an induced list assignment of \(G - G'\). We assert that \(v_i\) satisfies that \(|L_{\pi}(v_i)| \geq 1\) for each \(i \in \{1, \ldots, 4\}\) and \(|L_{\pi}(v)| \geq 2\). By Lemma \ref{lem:extend} we can extend \(\pi\) to the whole graph \(G\) successfully.

![Figure 4: The configuration in Lemma 7](image)

**Lemma 7** There is no 3-face incident to two bad 5-vertices.

**Proof.** Suppose to the contrary that there is a 3-face \([uvw]\) incident to two bad 5-vertices \(v\) and \(w\), depicted in Figure 4. Let \(G' = G - \{v, w, v_1, v_2, v_3, w_1, w_2, w_3\}\). By the minimality of \(G\), \(G'\) has an \((L, 1)^*\)-coloring \(\pi\). Let \(L_{\pi}\) be an induced list assignment of \(G - G'\). Since each \(w_i\) has at most two neighbors in \(G'\), we deduce that \(|L_{\pi}(w_i)| \geq 1\) for each \(i \in \{1, 2, 3\}\). So we first color each \(w_i\) with a color \(\pi(w_i) \in L_{\pi}(w_i)\). If \(|L_{\pi}(w)| \geq 1\), namely \(L(w) \neq \{\pi(u), \pi(w_1), \pi(w_2), \pi(w_3)\}\), then by Lemma \ref{lem:extend} we may extend \(\pi\) to \(G\), since \(|L_{\pi}(v_i)| \geq 1\) for each \(i \in \{1, 2, 3\}\). Otherwise, we deduce that there exists a color \(a\) in \(L(w) \setminus \{\pi(u)\}\) that is the same as \(\pi(w_{i^*})\) for some fixed \(i^* \in \{1, 2, 3\}\). Color \(w\) with \(a\) and \(v_i\) with a color \(\pi(v_i) \in L_{\pi}(v_i)\) firstly, where \(i \in \{1, 2, 3\}\). For our simplicity, denote \(V^* = \{v_1, v_2, v_3, w\}\).

First, suppose that there is a color, say \(b \in L(v) \setminus \{\pi(u)\}\), appearing at most once on the set \(V^*\). We assign such a color \(b\) to \(v\). If \(b \neq a\), the obtained coloring is obvious an \((L, 1)^*\)-coloring. Otherwise, assume that \(b = a\). Now we erase the color \(a\) from \(w\). One may check that the resulting coloring, say \(\pi'\), satisfies that each of \(v, w_1, w_2, w_3\) has at least one possible color in \(G - G'\). In other words, \(|L_{\pi'}(s)| \geq 1\) for each \(s \in \{v, w_1, w_2, w_3\}\). Hence, by Lemma \ref{lem:extend} we can easily extend \(\pi'\) to \(G\).
Now, w.l.o.g., suppose that $L(v) = \{1, 2, 3\}$, $\pi(u) = 1$, $\pi(w) = 2$ and each color in $\{2, 3\}$ appears exactly twice on the set $V^\ast$. It implies that $\pi(v_1) \in \{2, 3\}$. We apply versions of discussion (i) and (ii) in the proof of Lemma 2. After doing that, one may check that now $v$ is colored with $\pi(v_2)$ and $v_1$ is recolored with a new color, say $\alpha$. There are two cases left to discuss: if $\pi(v_2) = 3$, namely the new color of $v$ is 3, then the obtained coloring is an $(L, 1)^\ast$-coloring and thus we are done; otherwise, we uncolor $w$. Again, it is easy to see that the resulting coloring, say $\pi''$, satisfies that $|L_{\pi''}(s)| \geq 1$ for each $s \in \{v, w_1, w_2, w_3\}$. Therefore, we can easily extend $\pi''$ to $G$ successfully by Lemma 2.  

\[Q.E.D.\]

### 3.2 Discharging progress

We now apply a discharging procedure to reach a contradiction. Suppose that $u$ is adjacent to a 3-vertex $v$ such that $uv$ is not incident to any 3-faces. We call $v$ a free 3-vertex if $t(v) = 0$ and a pendant 3-vertex if $t(v) = 1$. For simplicity, we use $\nu_3(u)$ to denote the number of free 3-vertices adjacent to $u$ and $p_3(u)$ to denote the number of pendant 3-vertices of $u$. Suppose that $v$ is a soft 4-vertex such that $f_1 = [vv_1uv_2]$ is a 4-face and $d(v_3) = d(v_4) = 3$. If the opposite face to $f_1$ via $v$, i.e., $f_3$, is of degree at least 5, then we call $v$ a weak 4-vertex. We notice that every weak 4-vertex is soft but not vice versa.

For $x \in V(G)$ and $y \in F(G)$, let $\tau(x \rightarrow y)$ denote the amount of weights transferred from $x$ to $y$. Suppose that $f = [v_1v_2v_3]$ is a 3-face. We use $(d(v_1), d(v_2), d(v_3)) \rightarrow (c_1, c_2, c_3)$ to denote $\tau(v_i \rightarrow f) = c_i$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. Our discharging rules are defined as follows:

(R1) Let $f = [v_1v_2v_3]$ be a 3-face. We set

- (R1.1) $(3, 4, 5^+) \rightarrow (0, 1, 3)$;
- (R1.2) $(3, 5^+, 5^+) \rightarrow (0, 2, 2)$;
- (R1.3) $(4, 4, 5^+) \rightarrow \begin{cases} (0, 1, 3) & \text{if } v_1 \text{ is a light 4-vertex;} \\ (1, 1, 2) & \text{if neither } v_1 \text{ nor } v_2 \text{ is a light 4-vertex.} \end{cases}$
- (R1.4) $(4, 5^+, 5^+) \rightarrow \begin{cases} (1, 1, 2) & \text{if } v_2 \text{ is a bad 5-vertex;} \\ (0, 2, 2) & \text{if neither } v_2 \text{ nor } v_3 \text{ is a bad 5-vertex.} \end{cases}$
- (R1.5) $(5^+, 5^+, 5^+) \rightarrow \begin{cases} (1, 3, 3) & \text{if } v_1 \text{ is a bad 5-vertex;} \\ (4, 4, 4) & \text{if none of } v_1, v_2, v_3 \text{ is a bad 5-vertex.} \end{cases}$

(R2) Suppose that $v$ is a $5^+$-vertex incident to a 4-face $f = [vv_1uv_2]$. Then
(R2.1) \( \tau(v \rightarrow f) = 1 \) if \( d(v_1) \geq 4 \) and \( d(v_2) \geq 4 \);

(R2.2) \( \tau(v \rightarrow f) = \frac{1}{3} \) otherwise.

(R3) Suppose that \( v \) is a non-weak 4-vertex incident to a 4-face \( f = [vv_1u_2] \).

(R3.1) Assume \( d(v_1) = d(v_2) = 3 \). Then

(R3.1.1) \( \tau(v \rightarrow f) = \frac{1}{3} \) if the opposite face to \( f \) via \( v \) is of degree 3;

(R3.1.2) \( \tau(v \rightarrow f) = \frac{2}{3} \) otherwise.

(R3.2) Assume \( d(v_1) \geq 4 \) and \( d(v_2) \geq 4 \). Then

(R3.2.1) \( \tau(v \rightarrow f) = 1 \) if at least one of \( v_1 \) and \( v_2 \) is a soft 4-vertex;

(R3.2.2) \( \tau(v \rightarrow f) = \frac{2}{3} \) otherwise.

(R3.3) Assume \( d(v_1) = 3 \) and \( d(v_2) \geq 4 \). Then \( \tau(v \rightarrow f) = \frac{2}{3} \).

(R4) Every 4\(^+\)-vertex sends 1 to each pendant 3-vertex and \( \frac{1}{3} \) to each free 3-vertex.

According to (R3), we notice that a weak 4-vertex does not send any charge.

We first consider the faces. Let \( f \) be a \( k \)-face.

**Case** \( k = 3 \). Initially \( \omega(f) = -4 \). Let \( f = [v_1v_2v_3] \) with \( d(v_1) \leq d(v_2) \leq d(v_3) \). By (A1), \( d(v_1) \geq 3 \). If \( d(v_1) = 3 \), then \( d(v_2) \geq 4 \) by (A2). Together with (B2), we deduce that \( f \) is either a \((3, 4, 4^+)-face\), a \((3, 5^+, 5^+)-face\), a \((4, 4, 4^+)-face\), a \((4, 5^+, 4^+)-face\) or a \((5^+, 5^+, 5^+)-face\). It follows from (B3) and Lemma 7 that every possibility is indeed covered by rule (R1). Obviously, \( f \) takes charge 4 in total from its incident vertices. Therefore, \( \omega^*(f) = -4 + 4 = 0 \).

**Case** \( k = 4 \). Clearly, \( w(f) = -2 \). Assume that \( f = [uxuy] \) is a 4-face. By (A2), there are no adjacent 3-vertices in \( G \). It follows that \( f \) is incident to at most two 3-vertices. By symmetry, we have to discuss three cases depending on the conditions of these 3-vertices.

- \( d(x) = d(y) = 3 \). By (F1), we deduce that at least one of \( u \) and \( v \) is of degree at least 5. Moreover, if one of \( u \) and \( v \) is a 4-vertex, say \( v \), we claim that \( v \) cannot be weak by definition and (B1). Hence, \( \omega^*(f) \geq -2 + \frac{4}{3} + \frac{2}{3} = 0 \) by (R2) and (R3).

- \( d(x) = 3 \) and \( d(y) \geq 4 \). Note that \( u \) and \( v \) are both 4\(^+\)-vertices. Similarly, neither \( u \) nor \( v \) can be a weak 4-vertex. It follows from (R3.3) and (R2) that each of \( u \) and \( v \) sends charge at least \( \frac{2}{3} \) to \( f \). So if one of them is a 5\(^+\)-vertex, say \( v \), then by (R2) we have that \( \tau(v \rightarrow f) = \frac{3}{5} \) and thus \( f \) gets \( \frac{2}{3} + \frac{4}{3} = 2 \) in total from incident vertices of \( f \). Otherwise, suppose \( d(u) = d(v) = 4 \). Now by (F2), \( y \) cannot be a soft 4-vertex and thus not weak. Hence, \( \omega^*(f) \geq -2 + \frac{2}{3} \times 3 = 0 \) by (R3.2).
• \(d(x) \geq 4\) and \(d(y) \geq 4\). Namely, \(f\) is a \((4^+, 4^+, 4^+, 4^+)-\)face. If at most one of \(u, v, x, y\) is a weak 4-vertex, then \(\omega^*(f) \geq -2 + \frac{2}{3} \times 3 = 0\). Otherwise, by Lemma[5], assume that \(v\) and \(u\) are weak 4-vertices and thus soft. We see that \(\tau(x \to f) = \tau(y \to f) = 1\) by (R3.2.1) and (R2.1) which implies that \(\omega^*(f) \geq -2 + 1 \times 2 = 0\).

**Case** \(k \geq 5\). Then \(\omega^*(f) = \omega(f) = 2d(f) - 10 \geq 0\).

Now we consider the vertices. Let \(v\) be a \(k\)-vertex with \(k \geq 3\) by (A1). For \(v \in V(G)\), we use \(m_4(v)\) to denote the number of faces incident to \(v\). So by Observation[1](a) and (b), we derive that \(t(v) \leq \left\lfloor \frac{d(v)}{2} \right\rfloor\) and \(m_4(v) \leq \left\lfloor \frac{d(v)}{2} \right\rfloor\). Furthermore, \(t(v) + m_4(v) \leq \left\lfloor \frac{d(v)}{2} \right\rfloor\) by Observation[1](c).

**Observation 2** Suppose \(v\) is a \(4^+\)-vertex which is incident to a 3-face \(f\). Then, by (RI), we have the following:

(a) \(\tau(v \to f) \leq 1\) if \(d(v) = 4\);

(b) \(\tau(v \to f) \in \{3, 2, \frac{3}{2}, \frac{4}{3}, 1\}\) if \(d(v) \geq 5\); moreover, if \(\tau(v \to f) = 3\) then \(f\) is a \((5^+, *, 4)^{-}\)face.

**Case** \(k = 3\). Then \(\omega(v) = -1\). Clearly, \(t(v) \leq 1\). If \(t(v) = 1\), then there exists a neighbor of \(v\), say \(u\), so that \(v\) is a pendant 3-vertex of \(u\). By (A2), \(d(u) \geq 4\). Thus, \(\omega^*(v) = -1 + 1 = 0\) by (R4). Otherwise, we obtain that \(\omega^*(v) = -1 + \frac{1}{3} \times 3 = 0\) by (R4).

**Case** \(k = 4\). Then \(\omega(v) = 2\). Note that \(t(v) \leq 2\). If \(t(v) = 2\), then \(m_4(v) = 0\) and \(p_3(v) = 0\). So \(\omega^*(v) \geq 2 - 1 \times 2 = 0\) by Observation[2](a). If \(t(v) = 0\), then \(n_3(v) \leq 2\) by (B1) and \(m_4(v) \leq 2\).

We need to consider following cases.

• \(m_4(v) = 2\). W.l.o.g., assume that \(f_1 = [vv_1uv_2]\) and \(f_3 = [vv_3wv_4]\) are incident 4-faces. Obviously, \(p_3(v) = 0\) by Observation[1](b). However, \(n_3(v) \leq 2\) by (B1). By (R3), \(v\) sends charge at most 1 to \(f_i\), where \(i = 1, 3\). If \(n_3(v) = 0\), then \(\omega^*(v) = 0\) and thus \(\omega^*(v) \geq 2 - 1 \times 2 = 0\). If \(n_3(v) = 1\), say \(v_1\) is a 3-vertex, then \(\tau(v \to f_1) \leq \frac{2}{3}\) by (R3.3) and thus \(\omega^*(v) \geq 2 - \frac{2}{3} - 1 - \frac{1}{3} = 0\) by (R4). Now suppose that \(n_3(v) = 2\). By symmetry, we have two cases depending on the conditions of these two 3-vertices. If \(d(v_1) = d(v_2) = 3\), then \(\tau(v \to f_1) = \frac{4}{3}\) by (R3.1.2). By (B1), \(v_3\) and \(v_4\) are both \(4^+\)-vertices. Moreover, neither \(v_3\) nor \(v_4\) is a soft 4-vertex according to Lemma[5] So by (R3.2.2), \(\tau(v \to f_3) \leq \frac{2}{3}\). Hence \(\omega^*(v) \geq 2 - \frac{2}{3} - \frac{3}{2} - \frac{1}{3} = 0\). Otherwise, suppose that \(d(v_i) = d(v_j) = 3\), where \(i \in \{1, 2\}\) and \(j \in \{3, 4\}\). We derive that \(\omega^*(v) \geq 2 - \frac{2}{3} \times 2 - \frac{1}{3} \times 2 = 0\) by (R3.3).

• \(m_4(v) = 1\). W.l.o.g, assume that \(d(f_1) = 4\). This implies that \(d(f_3) \geq 5\). Again, \(\tau(v \to f_1) \leq 1\) by (R3). If \(n_3(v) \leq 1\) then we have that \(\omega^*(v) \geq 2 - 1 - 1 = 0\) by (R4). So in what follows, we
assume that \( m_3(v) = 2 \). If \( d(v_3) = d(v_4) = 3 \) then \( v \) is a weak 4-vertex, implying that \( v \) sends nothing to \( f_1 \). So \( \omega^*(v) \geq 2 - 1 \times 2 = 0 \) by (R4). If \( d(v_1) = d(v_2) = 3 \), then \( p_3(v) = 0 \) by Observation\( ^1(b) \). We deduce that \( \omega^*(v) \geq 2 - \frac{2}{3} - \frac{1}{3} \times 2 = \frac{2}{3} \) by (R3.1.2) and (R4). Otherwise, suppose \( d(v_i) = d(v_j) = 3 \), where \( i \in \{1, 2\} \) and \( j \in \{3, 4\} \). It follows immediately from (R3.3) and (R4) that \( \omega^*(v) \geq 2 - \frac{2}{3} - 1 - \frac{1}{3} = 0 \).

- \( m_4(v) = 0 \). Obviously, \( \omega^*(v) \geq 2 - 1 \times 2 = 0 \) by (R4).

Now, in the following, we consider the case \( t(v) = 1 \). Assume that \( f_1 \) is a 3-face. By (A1) and (B2), \( f_1 \) is either a \((4, 3, 5^+)\)-face, a \((4, 4, 5^+)\)-face or a \((4, 5^+, 5^+)\)-face. Observe that \( m_4(v) \leq 1 \). First assume that \( m_4(v) = 0 \). If \( f_1 \) is a \((4, 3, 5^+)\)-face, then \( p_3(v) \leq 1 \) by (B1) and hence \( \omega^*(v) \geq 2 - 1 - 1 = 0 \) by Observation\( ^2(a) \) and (R2). Next suppose that \( f_1 \) is a \((4, 4, 5^+)\)-face. If \( n_3(v) = 2 \), then \( v \) is a light 4-vertex. By (R1.3), we see that \( v \) sends something to \( f_1 \) and therefore \( \omega^*(v) \geq 2 - 1 \times 2 = 0 \) by (R4). Otherwise, at most one of \( v_3, v_4 \) is a 3-vertex and hence \( \omega^*(v) \geq 2 - 1 - 1 = 0 \) by Observation\( ^2(a) \) and (R4). Finally, we suppose that \( f_1 \) is a \((4, 5^+, 5^+)\)-face. If neither \( v_1 \) nor \( v_2 \) is a bad 5-vertex, then \( v \) sends nothing to \( f_1 \) by (R1.4) and thus \( \omega^*(v) \geq 2 - 1 \times 2 = 0 \) by (R4). Otherwise, one of \( v_1 \) and \( v_2 \) is a bad 5-vertex. If follows directly from (C2) that \( n_3(v) \leq 1 \). Therefore, \( \omega^*(v) \geq 2 - 1 = 0 \) by (R4). Now suppose that \( m_4(v) = 1 \). By Observation\( ^1(c) \), we may assume that \( f_3 = [v v_3 w v_4] \) is a 4-face. In this case, \( p_3(v) = 0 \). If \( d(v_3) = d(v_4) = 3 \), then \( \tau(v \rightarrow f_3) = \frac{4}{3} \) by (R3.1.1). It follows from (B1) and (C2) that \( f \) is neither a \((4, 3, 5^+)\)-face nor a \((4, 5^+, 5^+)\)-face such that \( v_2 \) is a bad 5-vertex. So we deduce that \( f_1 \) gets nothing from \( v \) by (R1.3), which implies that \( \omega^*(v) \geq 2 - \frac{2}{3} - \frac{1}{3} \times 2 = 0 \). If exactly one of \( v_3, v_4 \) is a 3-vertex, then \( \tau(v \rightarrow f_3) \leq \frac{2}{3} \) by (R3.3). Thus, \( \omega^*(v) \geq 2 - 1 - \frac{2}{3} - \frac{1}{3} = 0 \) by Observation\( ^2(a) \) and (R4). Otherwise, we suppose that \( v_3, v_4 \) are both of degree at least 4. In this case, \( n_3(v) = 0 \) and hence \( \omega^*(v) \geq 2 - 1 - 1 = 0 \) by (R3.2) and Observation\( ^2(a) \).

**Case** \( k = 5 \). Then \( \omega(v) = 5 \). Also, \( t(v) \leq 2 \). We have three cases to discuss.

Assume \( t(v) = 0 \). If \( m_4(v) = 0 \), then \( \omega^*(v) \geq 5 - 1 \times 5 = 0 \) by (R4). If \( m_4(v) = 1 \), then \( p_3(v) \leq 3 \). Thus \( \omega^*(v) \geq 5 - \frac{4}{3} - 1 \times 3 - 2 \times \frac{1}{3} = 0 \) by (R2) and (R4). Now suppose that \( m_4(v) = 2 \). By Observation\( ^1(c) \), we assert that \( p_3(v) \leq 1 \). So \( \omega^*(v) \geq 5 - \frac{4}{3} \times 2 - \frac{1}{3} \times 4 = 1 = 0 \).

Next assume \( t(v) = 1 \), say \( f_1 \). Then \( \tau(v \rightarrow f_1) \leq 3 \) by Observation\( ^2(b) \). Moreover, equality holds iff \( f_1 \) is a \((5, 5^+, 4)\)-face. So if \( \tau(v \rightarrow f_1) = 3 \) then at most one of \( v_3, v_4, v_5 \) is a 3-vertex by (B4). Furthermore, \( m_4(v) \leq 1 \). When \( m_4(v) = 0 \), we deduce that \( \omega^*(v) \geq 5 - 3 - 1 = 1 \) by (R4). When \( m_4(v) = 1 \), by symmetry, say \( f_3 \) is a 4-face, we have two cases to discuss: if \( p_3(v) = 1 \), namely, \( v_5 \) is a 3-vertex, then \( \tau(v \rightarrow f_3) \leq 1 \) by (R2) and neither \( v_3 \) nor \( v_4 \) takes charge from \( v \). Thus \( \omega^*(v) \geq 5 - 3 - 1 = 1 \); otherwise, \( p_3(v) = 0 \) and we have \( \omega^*(v) \geq 5 - 3 - \frac{2}{3} - \frac{1}{3} = \frac{1}{3} \). Now
suppose that \( \tau(v \to f_1) \leq 2 \). By (R2) and (R4), \( \omega^*(v) \geq 5 - 2 - 1 \times 3 = 0 \) if \( m_4(v) = 0 \) and \( \omega^*(v) \geq 5 - 2 - \frac{3}{4} - 1 - 2 \times \frac{1}{4} = 0 \) if \( m_4(v) = 1 \).

Now assume \( t(v) = 2 \). By symmetry, assume \( f_1 \) and \( f_3 \) are both 3-faces. Observe that \( m_4(v) = 0 \).

For simplicity, denote \( \tau(v \to f_1) = \sigma_1 \) and \( \tau(v \to f_3) = \sigma_2 \). Let \( \sigma = \max\{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\} \). If \( \sigma \leq 2 \), then \( \omega^*(v) \geq 5 - 2 \times 2 - 1 = 0 \) by (R2). Now assume that \( \sigma = 3 \), i.e., \( f_1 \) gets charge 3 from \( v \). It means that \( f_1 \) is a \((5, \ast, 4)\)-face by Observation [2]. By (C3), \( f_3 \) cannot be a \((5, \ast, 4)\)-face. This implies that \( \sigma_2 \leq 2 \). Moreover, if \( v_5 \) is a 3-vertex, then \( f_3 \) is neither a \((5, \ast, 4^+)\)-face by (C2) nor a \((5, 4, 4)\)-face by (C1). It follows from (R1.4) and (R1.5) that \( \sigma_2 \leq 1 \), since \( v \) is a bad 5-vertex. Thus, \( \omega^*(v) \geq 5 - 3 - 1 - 1 = 0 \) by (R2). Otherwise, we easily obtain that \( \omega^*(v) \geq 5 - 3 - 2 = 0 \).

**Case** \( k \geq 6 \). Notice that \( t(v) \leq \left\lfloor \frac{d(v)}{3} \right\rfloor \). If \( v \) is incident to a 4-face \( f_i \), then by (R2) we inspect \( v \) sends a charge at most \( \frac{4}{3} \) to \( f_i \), while \( \frac{1}{3} \) to each of \( v_i \) and \( v_{i+1} \). So we may consider \( v \) as a vertex which sends charge at most \( \frac{4}{3} + 2 \times \frac{1}{3} = 2 \) to \( f_i \). So by (R4) and Observation [2] we have

\[
\omega^*(v) \geq 3d(v) - 10 - 3t(v) - 2m_4(v) - (d(v) - 2t(v) - 2m_4(v)) = 2d(v) - 10 - t(v) \equiv \tau(v)
\]

If \( d(v) \geq 7 \), then \( \tau(v) \geq 2d(v) - 10 - \frac{d(v)}{2} = \frac{3}{2}d(v) - 10 \geq \frac{3}{2} \times 7 - 10 = \frac{1}{2} > 0 \). Now suppose that \( d(v) = 6 \). If \( t(v) \leq 2 \) then \( \tau(v) \geq 2 \times 6 - 10 - 2 = 0 \). So, in what follows, assume that \( t(v) = 3 \) and \( d(f_i) = 3 \) for \( i = 1, 3, 5 \). Clearly, \( m_4(v) = 0 \). Similarly, if there are at most two of 3-faces get charge 3 \times 2 in total from \( v \), then \( \omega^*(v) \geq 8 - 2 \times 3 - 2 = 0 \). Otherwise, suppose \( \tau(v \to f_i) = 3 \) for each \( i \in \{1, 3, 5\} \). By Observation [2] (b), we assert that \( f_i \) is a \((6, \ast, 4)\)-face. Noting that a \((6, \ast, 4)\)-face is also a \((6,4^-, 4^-)\)-face, we may regard \( v \) as a 6-vertex which is incident to two \((6, 4^-, 4^-)\)-faces and one \((6, \ast, 4)\)-face. However, it is impossible by (B5).

Therefore, we complete the proof of Theorem [1] \( \square \)
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