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#### Abstract

In this paper, we prove that for an integer $r \geq 1$, every regular tournament $T$ of degree $3 r-1$ contains at least $\frac{21}{16} r-\frac{10}{3}$ disjoint directed 4cycles. Our result is an improvement of Lichiardopol's theorem when taking $q=4$ [Discrete Math. 310 (2010) 2567-2570]: for given integers $q \geq 3$ and $r \geq 1$, a tournament $T$ with minimum out-degree and in-degree both at least $(q-1) r-1$ contains at least $r$ disjoint directed cycles of length $q$.
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## 1. Introduction

This paper considers only digraphs. For a digraph $D$, we write $V(D)$ for the vertex set of $D$, and the order of $D$ is the cardinality of $V(D)$. We write $A(D)$ for the set of the arcs of $D$. Two or several subgraphs are independent or disjoint if they are pairwise vertex-disjoint.

We say that a vertex $y$ is an out-neighbor (in-neighbor) of a vertex $x$ if $(x, y)$ (respectively $(y, x)$ ) is an arc of $D$. The number of out-neighbors of $x$ is the out-degree $d^{+}(x)$ of $x$, and the number of in-neighbors of $x$ is the in-degree $d^{-}(x)$ of $x$. The minimum out-degree $\delta^{+}(D)$ of $D$ is the smallest of the out-degrees of the vertices of $D$, and the minimum in-degree $\delta^{-}(D)$ of $D$ is the smallest of the in-degrees of the vertices of $D$.

[^0]A path of length $m$ of a digraph $D$ is a sequence $P$ with $P=\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{m+1}\right)$ of distinct vertices of $D$ such that $\left(x_{i}, x_{i+1}\right) \in A(D)$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$. If $\left\{x_{1}, \ldots\right.$, $\left.x_{m+1}\right\}=V(D)$, then $P$ is a Hamiltonian path. A cycle of length $m$ in $D$ is a sequence $C$ with $C=\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{m}, x_{1}\right)$ such that the vertices $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{m}$ are distinct, $\left(x_{i}, x_{i+1}\right) \in A(D)$ for $1 \leq i \leq m-1$, and $\left(x_{m}, x_{1}\right) \in A(D)$. If $\left\{x_{1}, \ldots, x_{m}\right\}=V(D)$, then $C$ is a Hamiltonian cycle. A cycle of length 3 is a triangle. A triangle $(x, y, z, x)$ will often be denoted by $(x, u, x)$, where $u$ is the $\operatorname{arc}(y, z)$.

A tournament is a digraph $T$ such that for any two distinct vertices $x$ and $y$, exactly one of the ordered pairs $(x, y)$ and $(y, x)$ is an arc of $T$. A regular tournament of degree $d$ is a tournament $T$ such that $d^{+}(x)=d^{-}(x)=d$ for every vertex $x$. Necessarily the order of $T$ is $2 d+1$. For a subset $S$ of $V(T), T[S]$ denotes the subtournament induced by the vertices of $S$.

It is well-known (Redei's Theorem) that any tournament contains a Hamiltonian path, and (Camion's Theorem) a tournament is strong if and only if it contains a Hamiltonian cycle. It is also known (Moon's Theorem) that a strong tournament $T$ of order $|T|$ is pancyclic, i.e., it has cycles of all lengths $3, \ldots,|T|$. In particular this means that if $C$ is a $q$-cycle of $T$, then the tournament $T[V(C)]$ has cycles of all lengths $3, \ldots, q$. A $C_{q}$-free tournament is a tournament $T$ without a $q$-cycle.

In 1981, Bermond and Thomassen [3] conjectured that for any positive integer $r$, any digraph of minimum out-degree at least $2 r-1$ contains at least $r$ disjoint directed cycles. It is trivially true when $r=1$. It was proved by Thomassen [8] when $r=2$ in 1983. The case $r=3$ was proved by Lichiardopol et al. in [5]. It is still open for large values of $r$. In 2014, Bang-Jensen et al. proved the conjecture for tournaments in [2]. Lichiardopol proposed a conjecture for tournaments [7]: for given integers $q \geq 3$ and $r \geq 1$, a tournament $T$ with minimum out-degree at least $(q-1) r-1$ contains at least $r$ disjoint $q$-cycles. In 2012, Lichiardopol [6] proved that for an integer $r \geq 1$, every regular tournament $T$ of degree $2 r-1$ contains at least $\frac{7}{6} r-\frac{7}{3}$ disjoint directed cycles. By pancyclic property of tournaments, the following is easy to see.

Theorem 1.1. For an integer $r \geq 1$, every regular tournament $T$ of degree $2 r-1$ contains at least $\frac{7}{6} r-\frac{7}{3}$ disjoint triangles.

We consider the number of 4 -cycles in a regular tournament and prove the following theorem.

Theorem 1.2. For an integer $r \geq 1$, every regular tournament $T$ with degree $3 r-1$ contains at least $\frac{21}{16} r-\frac{10}{3}$ disjoint 4-cycles.

In 2012, Lichiardopol [7] proved the following theorem.

Theorem 1.3 ([7]). For given integers $q \geq 3$ and $r \geq 1$, a tournament $T$ with $\min \left\{\delta^{+}(T), \delta^{-}(T)\right\} \geq(q-1) r-1$ contains at least $r$ disjoint $q$-cycles.

If we take $q=4$, it is easy to see
Theorem 1.4. For an integer $r \geq 1$, every regular tournament $T$ with degree $3 r-1$ contains at least $r$ disjoint 4 -cycles.

Our result improves this lower bound to $\frac{21}{16} r-\frac{10}{3}$.
There are many analogous results on bipartite tournaments, for example, Bai et al. in [1] proved the following theorem.
Theorem 1.5 ([1]). Let BT be a bipartite tournament with minimum out-degree at least $q r-1$ and let $t_{1}, \ldots, t_{r} \in[4,2 q]$ be any $r$ even integers. Then $B T$ contains $r$ disjoint cycles of length $t_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, t_{r}^{\prime}$ such that $t_{i}^{\prime}=t_{i}$ for $t_{i}=0(\bmod 4)$ and $t_{i}^{\prime} \in\left\{t_{i}, t_{i}+2\right\}$ for $t_{i}=2(\bmod 4)$, where $1 \leq i \leq r$.

## 2. Lemma

In this section, we list a lemma to prove Theorem 1.2.
Lemma 2.1. Let $M$ be a proper subset of $N$ with $|N|=n$ and $|M|=m$. Suppose that $T[N]$ is $C_{4}$-free and $P=\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{n-1}, x_{n}\right)$ is a Hamiltonian path of $T[N]$. If $\left\{x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{n-1}, x_{n}\right\} \subseteq M$, then there is a Hamiltonian path $Q=\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{m}\right)$ of $T[M]$ such that $y_{1}=x_{1}, y_{m}=x_{n}$.
Proof. We construct $Q$ from $P$ by deleting vertices that are not contained in $M$ by the following two steps.
Step 1. (1) If there exists $x_{i}$ for $i \geq 3$ such that none of $x_{i}, x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_{j}$ belongs to $M(j \geq i+1)$, delete $x_{i}, x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_{j}$ from $P$.
(2) If there exists $x_{i}$ for $i \geq 3$ such that $x_{i} \notin M, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1} \in M$ and $\left(x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}\right) \in A(T)$, delete $x_{i}$ from $P$. Do (1) and (2) until there are no such vertices.

We claim that after Step 1 the remaining vertices can still form a path as the prior order. It is obvious for Step 1(2). For Step 1(1), we can prove that $\left(x_{i-1}, x_{j+1}\right) \in A(T)$. Suppose on the contrary that $\left(x_{j+1}, x_{i-1}\right) \in A(T)$, then $\left\{x_{i-1}, x_{i}, \ldots, x_{j}, x_{j+1}, x_{i-1}\right\}$ is a cycle of length at least 4. By property of pancyclic, it has a 4 -cycle, a contradiction (since $T[N]$ is $C_{4}$-free). Denote this new path by $Q^{\prime}=\left(z_{1}, \ldots, z_{l}\right)$. Clearly, $Q^{\prime}$ has the following property: if $x_{i} \notin M$ then $x_{i-1}, x_{i+1} \in M$ and $\left(x_{i+1}, x_{i-1}\right) \in A(T)$. Since $\left\{x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{n-1}, x_{n}\right\} \subseteq M$, we have $z_{1}=x_{1}, z_{2}=x_{2}, z_{l-1}=x_{n-1}, z_{l}=x_{n}$.
Step 2. If none of $z_{j}, z_{j+2}, \ldots, z_{j+2 i}$ belongs to $M(i \geq 0)$, but $z_{j-1}, z_{j+2 i+1} \in M$, we delete $z_{j}, z_{j+2}, \ldots, z_{j+2 i}$ from $Q^{\prime}$ and replace the segment $\left(z_{j-2}, \ldots, z_{j+2 i+2}\right)$
by $\left(z_{j-2}, z_{j+2 i+1}, z_{j+2 i-1}, \ldots, z_{j+1}, z_{j-1}, z_{j+2 i+2}\right)$. Repeat the procedure until there are no such vertices.

Since $z_{1}=x_{1}, z_{2}=x_{2}, z_{l-1}=x_{n-1}, z_{l}=x_{n}, j \geq 3$ and $j+2 i \leq l-2$, we have $j-2 \geq 1$ and $j+2 i+2 \leq l$. Denote the path after Step 2 by $Q=\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{m}\right)$. Then it is the desired Hamiltonian path.

## 3. Proof of Theorem 1.2

The proof of this theorem is inspired mainly by the proof of the main theorem in [6]. We begin with a preliminary result. Let $(x, y)$ be an arc of a tournament $T$ of order $n$ with $n \geq 3$. We define:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& B(x, y)=\{z \in V(T):(x, z) \in A(T),(y, z) \in A(T)\}, \\
& E(x, y)=\{z \in V(T):(z, x) \in A(T),(y, z) \in A(T)\}, \\
& F(x, y)=\{z \in V(T):(x, z) \in A(T),(z, y) \in A(T)\} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Observe that $E(x, y)$ is the set of vertices $z$ such that $x, y$ and $z$ form a triangle. We denote by $b(x, y), e(x, y)$ and $f(x, y)$ the respective cardinalities of these three sets. It is easy to see that $d^{+}(x)=b(x, y)+f(x, y)+1$ and $d^{+}(y)=b(x, y)+e(x, y)$. It follows that $e(x, y)=f(x, y)+d^{+}(y)-d^{+}(x)+1$. Hence if $T$ is regular, then we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
e(x, y)=f(x, y)+1 \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

If $u=(x, y)$, then $E(x, y), e(x, y), F(x, y)$ and $f(x, y)$ will also be denoted by $E(u), e(u), F(u)$ and $f(u)$, respectively.

The order of the regular tournament $T$ of degree $3 r-1$ is $6 r-1$. By Theorem 1.4, $T$ contains at least $r$ disjoint 4 -cycles. When $r \leq 10$, it holds that $r \geq \frac{21}{16} r-\frac{10}{3}$, and so Theorem 1.2 holds in this case. So from now on, we suppose $r \geq 11$.

Let $s$ be the maximum number of disjoint 4 -cycles of $T$. In particular, let $S=\left\{C_{1}, \ldots, C_{s}\right\}$ be a set of $s$ disjoint 4 -cycles with $C_{i}=\left(a_{i}, b_{i}, u_{i}, v_{i}, a_{i}\right)$ for $1 \leq i \leq s$. Let us define $V_{1}=\bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq s} V\left(C_{i}\right)$ and $V_{2}=V(T) \backslash V_{1}$. Let $T_{s}$ be the subtournament of $T$ induced by the vertices of $V_{2}$. Its vertices can be ordered into a Hamiltonian path $\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{t}\right)$ where $t=6 r-1-4 s$. Note that $T_{s}$ is a $C_{4}$-free tournament by the maximality of $s$.

Suppose first that $t \leq 20$. This means $6 r-1-4 s \leq 20$, so $s \geq \frac{3}{2} r-\frac{21}{4}$. Since $r \geq 11$ implies $\frac{3}{2} r-\frac{21}{4} \geq \frac{21}{16} r-\frac{10}{3}$, it follows that $s \geq \frac{12}{16} r-\frac{10}{3}$ and Theorem 1.2 holds in this case.

So, from now on, we suppose that $t \geq 21$ (and $r \geq 11$ ).
Since $T_{s}$ is $C_{4}$-free, it is easy to see the following.

Claim 3.1. For $1 \leq i \leq t-3, j \geq i+3,\left(x_{i}, x_{j}\right) \in A(T)$.
Since $t \geq 21$, by Claim 3.1, it is easy to see that $\omega_{i}=\left(x_{i}, x_{t+1-i}\right) \in A(T)$ for each $1 \leq i \leq 7$. Denote by $\Omega_{s}$ the set of the independent $\operatorname{arcs} \omega_{1}, \ldots, \omega_{7}$.

Claim 3.2. For $1 \leq i \leq 7, f\left(\omega_{i}\right) \geq t-2 i-2, e\left(\omega_{i}\right) \geq t-2 i-1$.
Proof. Since $T_{s}$ is $C_{4}$-free, by Claim 3.1, there are at most two vertices (they are $\left.x_{i+2}, x_{t-i-1}\right)$ between $x_{i}$ and $x_{t+1-i}$ that do not belong to $F\left(\omega_{i}\right)$. So we get $f\left(\omega_{i}\right) \geq t-2 i-2$. By equation (1), we get $e\left(\omega_{i}\right) \geq t-2 i-1$.

Put $e\left(\Omega_{s}\right)=\sum_{1 \leq i \leq 7} e\left(\omega_{i}\right)$. Then we have
Claim 3.3. $e\left(\Omega_{s}\right) \geq 7 t-63$.
Proof. By Claim 3.2, we get $e\left(\omega_{i}\right) \geq t-2 i-1$. It follows that $e\left(\Omega_{s}\right)=$ $\sum_{1 \leq i \leq 7} e\left(\omega_{i}\right) \geq \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 7}(t-2 i-1)$, so $e\left(\Omega_{s}\right) \geq 7 t-63$.

Let $W=\left\{x_{8}, \ldots, x_{t-7}\right\}$ be the set of vertices between $x_{7}$ and $x_{t-6}, F_{W}\left(\omega_{i}\right)$ denote the vertices in $W$ that belong to $F\left(\omega_{i}\right)$, and $f_{W}\left(\omega_{i}\right)=\left|F_{W}\left(\omega_{i}\right)\right|$. Since $t \geq 21$, there are at least seven vertices between $x_{7}$ and $x_{t-6}$. Similarly to the proof of Claim 3.2, there are at least five of these vertices in $M$ belonging to $F\left(\omega_{i}\right)$, for each $1 \leq i \leq 7$, i.e., $f_{W}\left(\omega_{i}\right) \geq 5$.

Claim 3.4. For each $1 \leq i \leq 7, E\left(\omega_{i}\right) \cap V_{2}=\emptyset$.
Proof. If $E\left(\omega_{i}\right) \cap V_{2} \neq \emptyset$, then there exists a vertex $x_{j}$ such that $x_{j} \in E\left(\omega_{i}\right) \cap V_{2}$. Since $f_{W}\left(\omega_{i}\right) \geq 5$, there is a vertex $x_{k}$ with $k \neq j$ such that $x_{k} \in F_{W}\left(\omega_{i}\right)$. Thus $\left(x_{i}, x_{k}, x_{t+1-i}, x_{j}, x_{i}\right)$ is a 4-cycle of $T_{s}$, a contradiction.

By Claim 3.4, the set $E\left(\omega_{i}\right)$ does not contain any vertex of $T_{s}$.
For a vertex $x \in V_{1}$, let $E_{\Omega_{s}}(x)$ denote the set of the $\operatorname{arcs} \omega_{i} \in \Omega_{s}$ such that $x \in E\left(\omega_{i}\right)$, and put $e_{\Omega_{s}}(x)=\left|E_{\Omega_{s}}(x)\right|$. For a 4-cycle $C_{i}$ of $S$, let $e_{\Omega_{s}}\left(C_{i}\right)=$ $\sum_{x \in V\left(C_{i}\right)} e_{\Omega_{s}}(x)$.

We then get $e\left(\Omega_{s}\right)=\sum_{x \in V_{1}} e_{\Omega_{s}}(x)=\sum_{1 \leq i \leq s} e_{\Omega_{s}}\left(C_{i}\right)$, by double-counting, and interchanging the order of summation. Then we get

Claim 3.5. If a vertex $v$ of a 4-cycle $C$ of $S$ satisfies $e_{\Omega_{s}}(v) \geq 2$, then $e_{\Omega_{s}}(w)=0$ for every vertex $w$ of $C$ distinct from $v$.

Proof. If $e_{\Omega_{s}}(w)>0$, then there exists an $\operatorname{arc} \omega_{j}$ of $\Omega_{s}$ such that $w \in E\left(\omega_{j}\right)$. Since $e_{\Omega_{s}}(v) \geq 2$, there exists an arc $\omega_{k}$ of $\Omega_{s}$ with $k \neq j$ such that $v \in E\left(\omega_{k}\right)$. Since $f_{W}\left(\omega_{j}\right) \geq 5$ and $f_{W}\left(\omega_{k}\right) \geq 5$, there exist two distinct vertices $x, y \in W$ such that $x \in F_{W}\left(\omega_{j}\right), y \in F_{W}\left(\omega_{k}\right)$. Clearly, $C^{\prime}=\left(w, x_{j}, x, x_{t+1-j}, w\right)$ and $C^{\prime \prime}=\left(v, x_{k}, y, x_{t+1-k}, v\right)$ are two disjoint 4-cycles. Now $(S \backslash\{C\}) \cup\left\{C^{\prime}, C^{\prime \prime}\right\}$ is a collection of $s+1$ disjoint 4-cycles, which is impossible by the maximality of $s$. So the result is proved.

Let $U_{s}=\left\{x \in V_{1}: e_{\Omega_{s}}(x) \geq 4\right\}$, and let $u_{s}=\left|U_{s}\right|$. Clearly, this claim implies that every 4 -cycle $C$ of $S$ which is disjoint from $U_{s}$, satisfies $e_{\Omega_{s}}(C) \leq 4$. It implies also that every 4 -cycle of $S$ contains at most one vertex of $U_{s}$.

Now, we choose $S$ such that $u_{s}$ is as large as possible. Suppose first that $u_{s}=0$. Since $e\left(\Omega_{s}\right)=\sum_{1 \leq i \leq s} e_{\Omega_{s}}\left(C_{i}\right)$, from Claim 3.3 and Claim 3.5, we get $7 t-63 \leq 4 s$. That is $7(6 r-1-4 s)-63 \leq 4 s$, so $32 s \geq 42 r-70$. Hence $s \geq \frac{21}{16} r-\frac{35}{16}>\frac{21}{16} r-\frac{10}{3}$. Therefore, Theorem 1.2 holds in this case.

Suppose now $u_{s}>0$. By Claim 3.5, without loss of generality, we may suppose that the $u_{s}$ vertices of $U_{s}$ are $a_{1}, \ldots, a_{u_{s}}$. We denote $\Delta_{s}=\left\{C_{1}, \ldots, C_{u_{s}}\right\}$. Note that $\Delta_{s} \subset S$ when $u_{s}<s$. For each 4-cycle $C_{i}$ of $\Delta_{s}$ we have $e_{\Omega_{s}}\left(C_{i}\right)=$ $e_{\Omega_{s}}\left(a_{i}\right) \leq 7$.

We denote $U_{s}^{\prime}=\bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq u_{s}}\left\{b_{i}, u_{i}, v_{i}\right\}$ (where $V\left(C_{i}\right)=\left\{a_{i}, b_{i}, u_{i}, v_{i}\right\}$ ) and $V_{s}^{\prime}=$ $V_{2} \cup U_{s}^{\prime}$. Clearly, $\left|V_{s}^{\prime}\right|=\overline{3} u_{s}+t$.

Claim 3.6. The subtournament induced by the set $V_{s}^{\prime}$ is $C_{4}$-free.
Proof. On the contrary, let $C^{\prime}$ be a 4-cycle of $T\left[V_{s}^{\prime}\right]$ with $C^{\prime}=(w, x, y, z, w)$. Since $T\left[V_{2}\right]$ is $C_{4}$-free, two cases are possible.

Case 1. $C^{\prime}$ contains exactly one vertex of $U_{s}^{\prime}$. Let $w$ be this vertex; there exists $i$ with $1 \leq i \leq u_{s}$ such that $w \in V\left(C_{i}\right)$, and $w \neq a_{i}$. Since $e_{\Omega_{s}}\left(a_{i}\right) \geq 4$, there exists an arc $\omega_{j}$ of $E_{\Omega_{s}}\left(a_{i}\right)$ disjoint from $x, y, z$. Since $f_{W}\left(\omega_{j}\right) \geq 5$, there exists a vertex $a \in W$ distinct from $x, y, z$ such that $a \in F_{W}\left(\omega_{j}\right)$. Clearly, $C^{\prime}$ and $C^{\prime \prime}$, where $C^{\prime \prime}=\left(a_{i}, x_{j}, a, x_{t+1-j}, a_{i}\right)$, are disjoint 4-cycles. Now $\left(S \backslash\left\{C_{i}\right\}\right) \cup\left\{C^{\prime}, C^{\prime \prime}\right\}$ is a collection of $s+1$ disjoint 4 -cycles, a contraction.

Case 2. $C^{\prime}$ contains at least two vertices of $U_{s}^{\prime}$. Denote the set of these vertices by $\Gamma$. Then $2 \leq|\Gamma| \leq 4$. Let $m$ be the number of the 4 -cycles of $\Delta_{s}$ containing at least one vertex of $\Gamma$. Then $1 \leq m \leq|\Gamma| \leq 4$. Without loss of generality, we may suppose that $C_{1}, \ldots, C_{m}$ with $C_{i}=\left(a_{i}, b_{i}, u_{i}, v_{i}, a_{i}\right)$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$ are these 4 -cycles. Note that $a_{i} \in U_{s}$. Since $e_{\Omega_{s}}\left(a_{i}\right) \geq 4$, there exist $m$ independent arcs, say $\omega_{1}, \ldots, \omega_{m}$, of $\Omega_{s}$ which are disjoint with $V\left(C^{\prime}\right) \backslash \Gamma$, such that $\omega_{i} \in e_{\Omega_{s}}\left(a_{i}\right)$ for each $1 \leq i \leq m$. Since $f_{W}\left(\omega_{i}\right) \geq 5$ (for each $1 \leq i \leq m$ ), there exist $m$ vertices $\gamma_{1}, \ldots, \gamma_{m}$ of $W$ distinct from the vertices of $V\left(C^{\prime}\right) \backslash \Gamma$ such that $\gamma_{i} \in F_{W}\left(\omega_{i}\right)$. Clearly, $C^{i}=\left(a_{i}, x_{i}, \gamma_{i}, x_{t+1-i}, a_{i}\right), 1 \leq i \leq m$, and $C^{\prime}$ are $m+1$ disjoint 4-cycles. Now $\left(S \backslash\left\{C_{1}, \ldots, C_{m}\right\}\right) \cup\left\{C^{\prime}, C^{1}, \ldots, C^{m}\right\}$ is a collection of $s+1$ disjoint 4-cycles, a contraction.

Since the subtournament $T\left[V_{s}^{\prime}\right]$ is $C_{4}$-free, let $\left(\alpha_{1}, \ldots, \alpha_{\gamma_{s}}\right)$ be a Hamiltonian path of $T\left[V_{s}^{\prime}\right]$, where $\gamma_{s}=3 u_{s}+t=\left|V_{s}^{\prime}\right|$.
Claim 3.7. There exists a set $S^{\prime}$ of $s$ disjoint 4 -cycles such that $\left\{\alpha_{1}, \alpha_{2}, \alpha_{\gamma_{s}-1}\right.$, $\left.\alpha_{\gamma_{s}}\right\} \subseteq V\left(T_{s^{\prime}}\right)$.
Proof. Let $p$ be the number of the vertices of $\alpha_{1}, \alpha_{2}, \alpha_{\gamma_{s}-1}, \alpha_{\gamma_{s}}$ which are in $U_{s}^{\prime}$. When $p=0$, we take $S^{\prime}=S$ and clearly the result is proved. Now suppose
that $p \geq 1$ and let $m$ be the number of the 4 -cycles of $\Delta_{s}$ containing at least one vertex of $\alpha_{1}, \alpha_{2}, \alpha_{\gamma_{s}-1}, \alpha_{\gamma_{s}}$. Without loss of generality, we may suppose that $C_{1}, C_{2}, \ldots, C_{m}$ (with $\left.C_{i}=\left(a_{i}, b_{i}, u_{i}, v_{i}, a_{i}\right), 1 \leq i \leq m\right)$ are these 4 -cycles. Note that $a_{i} \in U_{s}$ for each $1 \leq i \leq m$. We have $1 \leq m \leq p \leq 4$ with $m \geq 2$ when $p=4$. Since $e_{\Omega_{s}}\left(a_{i}\right) \geq 4$ for each $1 \leq i \leq m$, there exist $m$ independent arcs, without loss of generality, say $\omega_{1}, \ldots, \omega_{m}$, of $\Omega_{s}$ with $\omega_{i} \in E_{\Omega_{s}}\left(a_{i}\right)$ for each $1 \leq i \leq m$. Since $f_{W}\left(\omega_{i}\right) \geq 5$, there exist $m$ distinct vertices $y_{i} \in W$ for each $1 \leq i \leq m$. This yields $m$ disjoint 4 -cycles $C_{i}^{\prime}=\left(a_{i}, x_{i}, y_{i}, x_{t+1-i}, a_{i}\right)$ for each $1 \leq i \leq m$, and these 4 -cycles do not contain any vertex of $\alpha_{1}, \alpha_{2}, \alpha_{\gamma_{s}-1}, \alpha_{\gamma_{s}}$. Then $S^{\prime}=\left(S \backslash\left\{C_{1}, \ldots, C_{m}\right\}\right) \cup\left\{C_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, C_{m}^{\prime}\right\}$ is a set of $s$ disjoint 4 -cycles. The vertices $\alpha_{1}, \alpha_{2}, \alpha_{\gamma_{s}-1}, \alpha_{\gamma_{s}}$ are in $T_{s^{\prime}}$, and the vertices of $V\left(T_{s^{\prime}}\right)$ are vertices of $T\left[V_{s}^{\prime}\right]$.

Recall that $T_{s}$ is the $C_{4}$-free subtournament induced by the vertices of $T$ not contained in a 4 -cycle of $S$, and that the vertices of $T_{s}$ can be ordered into a Hamiltonian path which we denote here by $\left(x_{1}^{S}, \ldots, x_{t}^{S}\right)$. Clearly, this notation (and the other using $S$ as subscript or superscript) is valid for every set of $s$ disjoint 4-cycles.

Let $N=V_{s}^{\prime}, M=V\left(T_{s^{\prime}}\right), P=\left(\alpha_{1}, \ldots, \alpha_{\gamma_{s}}\right)$, by Claim 3.7 and Lemma 2.1, it is easy to see that
Claim 3.8. There exists a set $S^{\prime}$ of $s$ disjoint 4 -cycles such that $x_{1}^{S^{\prime}}=\alpha_{1}$, $x_{t}^{S^{\prime}}=\alpha_{\gamma_{s}}$.

Now we can achieve the proof of Theorem 1.2. We work on the set $S^{\prime}$ of $s$ disjoint 4-cycles constructed in Claim 3.7. Here $\Omega_{s^{\prime}}$ is the set of the independent $\operatorname{arcs} \omega_{i}^{S^{\prime}}$ with $\omega_{i}^{S^{\prime}}=\left(x_{i}^{S^{\prime}}, x_{t+1-i}^{S^{\prime}}\right)$ for each $1 \leq i \leq 7$.

First, since $e\left(\omega_{1}^{S^{\prime}}\right) \geq t+3 u_{s}-3$, we have $e\left(\Omega_{s^{\prime}}\right) \geq 7 t-63+3 u_{s}$.
On the other hand, since $e_{\Omega_{s^{\prime}}}(C) \leq 7$ when $C$ is a 4 -cycle of $\Delta_{s^{\prime}}$, and $e_{\Omega_{s^{\prime}}} \leq 4$ when $C$ is not a 4 -cycle of $\Delta_{s^{\prime}}$ (by Claim 3.5), we deduce $e\left(\Omega_{s^{\prime}}\right) \leq 7 u_{s^{\prime}}+4\left(s-u_{s^{\prime}}\right)$. It follows that $7 t-63+3 u_{s} \leq 3 u_{s^{\prime}}+4 s$.

As $u_{s^{\prime}} \leq u_{s}$ (by the maximality of $u_{s}$ ), it follows that $7 t-63+3 u_{s} \leq 3 u_{s}+4 s$. Hence $7 t-63 \leq 4 s$, which gives $s \geq \frac{21}{16} r-\frac{35}{16}>\frac{21}{16} r-\frac{10}{3}$. So Theorem 1.2 is proved.
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