

CYCLES THROUGH SPECIFIED VERTICES IN TRIANGLE-FREE GRAPHS

DANIEL PAULUSMA

Department of Computer Science, Durham University
Science Laboratories, South Road, Durham DH1 3LE, England

e-mail: daniel.paulusma@durham.ac.uk

AND

KIYOSHI YOSHIMOTO*

Department of Mathematics
College of Science and Technology
Nihon University, Tokyo 101-8308, Japan

e-mail: yosimoto@math.cst.nihon-u.ac.jp

Abstract

Let G be a triangle-free graph with $\delta(G) \geq 2$ and $\sigma_4(G) \geq |V(G)| + 2$. Let $S \subset V(G)$ consist of less than $\sigma_4/4 + 1$ vertices. We prove the following. If all vertices of S have degree at least three, then there exists a cycle C containing S . Both the upper bound on $|S|$ and the lower bound on σ_4 are best possible.

Keywords: cycle, path, triangle-free graph.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 05C38, 05C45.

1. Introduction

Let $G = (V(G), E(G))$ be a graph, where $V(G)$ is a finite set of vertices and $E(G)$ is a set of unordered pairs of two different vertices, called edges.

*Supported by JSPS. KAKENHI (14740087).

All notation and terminology not explained is given in [6]. For simplicity, the order of a graph is denoted by n and $G - V(H)$ by $G - H$. Let

$$\sigma_k(G) = \min \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^k d_G(x_i) \mid x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k \text{ are independent} \right\},$$

where $d_G(x_i)$ is the degree of a vertex x_i . If the independence number of G is less than k , then we define $\sigma_k(G) = \infty$.

Ore [11] showed that a graph G with $\sigma_2 \geq n$ is hamiltonian and Bondy [3] proved that if G is a 2-connected graph with $\sigma_3 \geq n+2$, then for any longest cycle C , $E(G - C) = \emptyset$. Enomoto *et al.* [9] generalized this theorem as follows: if G is a 2-connected graph with $\sigma_3 \geq n+2$, then $p(G) - c(G) \leq 1$, where $p(G)$ and $c(G)$ are the order of longest paths and the circumference, respectively.

In this paper we study triangle-free graphs. For triangle-free graphs with $\sigma_2 \geq (n+1)/2$, all longest cycles are dominating [16]. This lower bound is almost best possible by the examples due to Ash and Jackson [1]. Corresponding to the theorem by Enomoto *et al.*, the following result has been proven.

Theorem 1 ([13]). *Let G be a triangle-free graph with $\delta \geq 2$. If $\sigma_4 \geq n+2$, then for any path P , there exists a cycle C such that $|V(P - C)| \leq 1$ or G is isomorphic to the graph in Figure 1.*




Figure 1

In the literature the question has been studied whether for a given graph G any subset S of vertices of restricted size has some cycle passing through it. Many results on general graphs and graph classes are known (see, e.g., [2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 15, 17]). For triangle-free graphs the following result has been proven.

Theorem 2 ([13]). *Let G be a triangle-free graph with $\delta \geq 2$. If $\sigma_4 \geq n + 2$, then for any set S of at most δ vertices, there exists a cycle C containing S .*

In this paper, we show the following related theorem.

Theorem 3. *Let G be a triangle-free graph with $\delta \geq 2$ and $\sigma_4 \geq n + 2$. Let $S \subset V(G)$ consist of less than $\sigma_4/4 + 1$ vertices. If all vertices of S have degree at least three, then there exists a cycle C containing S .*

The several bounds in these theorems are all tight. We show this by a number of counter examples. For these counter examples we use the following notations. We denote the *complement* of graph $G = (V, E)$ by $\overline{G} = (V, (V \times V) \setminus E)$. For two graphs $G_1 = (V_1, E_1)$ and $G_2 = (V_2, E_2)$, we denote their *union* by $G_1 \cup G_2 = (V_1 \cup V_2, E_1 \cup E_2)$ and their *join* by $G_1 * G_2 = (V_1 \cup V_2, E_1 \cup E_2 \cup (V_1 \times V_2))$. A *complete* graph is a graph with an edge between every pair of vertices. The complete graph on n vertices is denoted by K_n . The *complete bipartite* graph $\overline{K_k} * \overline{K_\ell}$ is denoted by $K_{k,\ell}$.

- Consider the graph $\overline{K_{k-1}} * \overline{K_k} * K_1 * \overline{K_k} * \overline{K_{k-1}}$ with $\delta = (n + 1)/4$ and $\sigma_4 = n + 1$. If we choose two vertices from each $\overline{K_k}$, obviously there is no cycle containing the vertices. See Figure 2(i). Hence, in Theorem 2 and Theorem 3, the lower bound on σ_4 is best possible.




Figure 2

- Consider the graph $\overline{K_{k-2}} * \overline{K_k} * \overline{K_2} * \overline{K_k} * \overline{K_{k-2}}$ with $\delta = (n + 2)/4$ and $\sigma_4 = n + 2$. There is no cycle containing all $k = (n + 2)/4$ vertices of the left $\overline{K_k}$ and a vertex in the right $\overline{K_{k-2}}$. See Figure 2(ii). Hence, in Theorem 2 and Theorem 3, the upper bound on $|S|$ is best possible.

We cannot relax the degree condition of vertices in S in Theorem 3 into “all vertices of S have degree at least two”. For example in the graph in Figure 1, $\sigma_4/4 + 1 = 10/4 + 1$. So we can choose three vertices. However, if we choose the three white vertices of degree two in the graph, obviously there is no desired cycle. There is even a class of counter examples of large order as follows. Consider the graph $K_{k,k}$ for any $k \geq 3$. Let x, x' be two vertices in the same partite set of this graph. Add two extra vertices w, w' and add all edges between $\{x, x'\}$ and $\{w, w'\}$. This way we obtain a graph G_k with $\sigma_4 = 2k + 4 = n + 2 \geq 10$. Now let $S \subset V(G_k)$ consist of the vertices w, w' and some vertex u not in $\{x, x'\}$. Then $|S| = 3 < 10/4 + 1 \leq \sigma_4/4 + 1$. However, the only cycle in G_k that contains both w and w' is the cycle on the four vertices x, x', w, w' . This means that G_k does not contain a cycle passing through S . We note that S contains two vertices of degree two. The following conjecture seems to hold.

Conjecture 4. Let G be a triangle-free graph with $\delta \geq 2$ and $\sigma_4 \geq n + 2$. Let $S \subset V(G)$ consist of less than $\sigma_4/4 + 1$ vertices. If S contains at most one vertex of degree 2, then there exists a cycle C containing S .

Finally, we give some additional definitions and notations. The set of all the neighbours of a vertex $x \in V(G)$ is denoted by $N_G(x)$ or simply $N(x)$, and its cardinality by $d_G(x)$ or $d(x)$. For a subgraph H of G , we denote $N_G(x) \cap V(H)$ by $N_H(x)$ and its cardinality by $d_H(x)$. For simplicity, we denote $|V(H)|$ by $|H|$ and “ $u_i \in V(H)$ ” by “ $u_i \in H$ ”. The set of neighbours $\bigcup_{v \in H} N_G(v) \setminus V(H)$ is written by $N_G(H)$ or $N(H)$, and for a subgraph $F \subset G$, $N_G(H) \cap V(F)$ is denoted by $N_F(H)$. Especially, for an edge $e = xy$, we denote $N(e) = (N(x) \cup N(y)) \setminus \{x, y\}$ and $d(e) = |N(e)|$.

Let $C = v_1 v_2 \dots v_p v_1$ be a cycle with a fixed orientation. The segment $v_i v_{i+1} \dots v_j$ is written by $v_i \overrightarrow{C} v_j$ where the subscripts are to be taken modulo $|C|$. The converse segment $v_j v_{j-1} \dots v_i$ is written by $v_j \overleftarrow{C} v_i$. The successor of u_i is denoted by u_i^+ and the predecessor by u_i^- . For a subset $A \subseteq V(C)$, we write $\{u_i^+ \mid u_i \in A\}$ and $\{u_i^- \mid u_i \in A\}$ by A^+ and A^- , respectively.

2. The Proof of Theorem 3

In the proof we make use of the following lemma. A cycle C in a graph G is called a *swaying* cycle of a subset $S \subseteq V(G)$ if $|C \cap S|$ is maximum in all cycles of G .

Lemma 5. *Let G be a connected graph such that for any path P , there exists a cycle C such that $|P - C| \leq 1$. Let $S \subset V(G)$. Then for any longest swaying cycle C of S , $S \subset V(C)$ or $N(x) \subset C$ for any $x \in S - C$.*

Proof. Let $S \subset V(G)$ and C a longest swaying cycle of S . Suppose $S - C \neq \emptyset$. For any vertex $x \in S - C$, there is a path Q joining x and C . Let P be a longest path containing $V(C \cup Q)$. Then there exists a cycle D such that $|P - D| \leq 1$. If x has neighbours in $G - C$, then $|P| \geq |C| + 2$ and so $|D| \geq |C| + 1$. Because $|D \cap S| \geq |C \cap S|$, this contradicts the assumption that C is a longest swaying cycle. Hence $N_{G-C}(x) = \emptyset$. ■

Now let G be a graph with $\delta \geq 2$ and $\sigma_4 \geq n + 2$. Let $S \subset V(G)$ be a set of less than $\sigma_4/4 + 1$ vertices that all have degree at least three. Let \mathcal{C} be the set of all longest swaying cycles of S . Suppose a cycle in \mathcal{C} does not contain all vertices in S .

Claim 1. If there exists a swaying cycle D of S and $v \in S - D$ such that $N(v) \subset V(D)$, then $d(v) \leq |D \cap S|$, and so $d(v) < \sigma_4/4$.

Proof. If $d(v) > |D \cap S|$, then there exist $y, z \in N(v)$ such that $y^+ = z$ or $y^+ \vec{D} z^- \cap S = \emptyset$ because $N(v) \subset V(D)$. Then the cycle $yvz\vec{D}y$ contains $|D \cap S| + 1$ vertices in S . This contradicts the assumption that D is a swaying cycle. Hence $d(v) \leq |D \cap S| \leq |S| - 1 < \sigma_4/4$. ■

Note that our statement holds if G is isomorphic to the graph in Figure 1. Hence Claim 1 together with Theorem 1 and Lemma 5 implies that

$$(1) \quad d(v) < \sigma_4/4 \text{ for any } D \in \mathcal{C} \text{ and } v \in S - D.$$

Let $C = u_1 u_2 \cdots u_{|C|} \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $\max\{d(v) \mid v \in S - C\}$ is maximum in \mathcal{C} , and let $x \in S - C$ such that $d(x)$ is maximum in $S - C$. Then $d(x) < \sigma_4/4$ by (1). Let $N(x) = \{u_{\tau(1)}, u_{\tau(2)}, \dots, u_{\tau(d(x))}\}$ which occur on C in the order of their indices. Then clearly

$$(2) \quad N(x)^+ \text{ is an independent set;}$$

otherwise there is a cycle containing $|C \cap S| + 1$ vertices of S . As G is triangle-free, a vertex $u_{\tau(l)}^+ \in N(x)^+$ is not adjacent to x . If $u_{\tau(l)}^+$ is adjacent to a vertex $y \in G - (C \cup x)$, then the order of the path $yu_{\tau(l)}^+ \vec{C} u_{\tau(l)} x$ is

$|C| + 2$. By Theorem 1, there is a cycle D' such that $|D' \cap S| \geq |C \cap S|$ and $|D'| \geq |C| + 1$. This is a contradiction. Therefore

$$(3) \quad N(u_{\tau(l)}^+) \subset V(C) \text{ for } u_{\tau(l)}^+ \in N(x)^+.$$

Let $I_l = u_{\tau(l)}^+ \overrightarrow{C} u_{\tau(l+1)}$ and $J_l = u_{\tau(l+1)}^+ \overrightarrow{C} u_{\tau(l)}$, and

$$L = \{u_{\tau(i)}^+ \mid d(u_{\tau(i)}^+) \text{ is maximum in } N(x)^+\}.$$

Because $\sigma_4/4 > d(x) \geq 3$ and $N(x)^+ \cup x$ is an independent set, there is a vertex in $N(x)^+$ whose degree is at least $\sigma_4/4$. Hence the degree of a vertex in L is greater than $\sigma_4/4$. If $u_{\tau(i)}^{++} \in L^+$ is adjacent to $u_{\tau(j)}^+ \in (N(x) \setminus u_{\tau(i)})^+$, then the cycle $u_{\tau(i)}^{++} u_{\tau(j)}^+ \overrightarrow{C} u_{\tau(i)} x u_{\tau(j)} \overleftarrow{C} u_{\tau(i)}^{++}$ and $u_{\tau(i)}^+ \in S$ contradict (1). If $u_{\tau(i)}^{++} x \in E(G)$, then the cycle $u_{\tau(i)} x u_{\tau(i)}^{++} \overrightarrow{C} u_{\tau(i)}$ and $u_{\tau(i)}^+$ contradict (1). Hence

$$(4) \quad u_{\tau(i)}^{++} \in L^+ \text{ is adjacent to none of } (N(x) \setminus u_{\tau(i)})^+ \cup x.$$

For each $u_{\tau(l)}^+ \in N(x)^+$, we denote the edge $u_{\tau(l)}^+ u_{\tau(l)}^{++}$ by e_l .

Claim 2. For any $u_{\tau(i)}^+ \in L$, it holds that:

1. $N_{I_i}(e_i)^- \cap N_{I_i}(u_{\tau(i+1)}^+) = \emptyset$.
2. $N_{J_i}(x)^+ \cap N_{J_i}(e_i) = \emptyset$.
3. $N_{J_i}(e_i) \cap N_{J_i}(u_{\tau(i+1)}^+)^- = \emptyset$.

Proof. Suppose there is a vertex $u_l \in N_{I_i}(e_i)^- \cap N_{I_i}(u_{\tau(i+1)}^+)$, and let $y \in V(e_i) \cap N(u_l^+)$. Then the cycle

$$D = y \overrightarrow{C} u_l u_{\tau(i+1)}^+ \overrightarrow{C} u_{\tau(i)} x u_{\tau(i+1)} \overleftarrow{C} u_l^+ y$$

contains all vertices of $V(C) \cup x$ if $y = u_{\tau(i)}^+$, i.e., $|D| = |C \cap S| + 1$. See Figure 3(i). This contradicts the assumption that $C \in \mathcal{C}$. If $y = u_{\tau(i)}^{++}$, then $D \in \mathcal{C}$ and $d(u_{\tau(i)}^+) \geq \sigma_4/4$. This contradicts (1). Hence $N_{I_i}(e_i)^- \cap N_{I_i}(u_{\tau(i+1)}^+) = \emptyset$. Similarly, we can show the other statements. See Figure 3(ii)–(iii). ■




Figure 3

Let $\alpha_i = |N_{J_i}(x)^+ \cap N_{J_i}(u_{\tau(i+1)}^+)^-|$. By this number, we will divide our argument into three cases, and in each case, the following claim will be used.

Claim 3. For any $u_{\tau(i)}^+ \in L$, $n \geq d(u_{\tau(i)}^+) + d(u_{\tau(i)}^{++}) + d(u_{\tau(i+1)}^+) + d(x) - 2 - \alpha_i$. Especially if the equality holds, then $u_{\tau(i+1)}^{++} \in N(e_i)$ and $u_{\tau(i+1)}^+ \in S$, and

$$J_i = (N_{J_i}(x) \setminus u_{\tau(i)})^+ \cup N_{J_i}(e_i) \cup N_{J_i}(u_{\tau(i+1)}^+)^-.$$

Proof. By the previous claim, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} |I_i| &\geq |N_{I_i}(e_i)^- \cup N_{I_i}(u_{\tau(i+1)}^+) \cup \{u_{\tau(i)}^+\}| \\ &\geq |N_{I_i}(e_i)^-| + |N_{I_i}(u_{\tau(i+1)}^+)| + |\{u_{\tau(i)}^+\}| \\ &= d_{I_i}(e_i) + d_{I_i}(u_{\tau(i+1)}^+) + 1, \\ |J_i| &\geq |(N_{J_i}(x) \setminus u_{\tau(i)})^+ \cup N_{J_i}(e_i) \cup N_{J_i}(u_{\tau(i+1)}^+)^-| \\ &\geq |(N_{J_i}(x) \setminus u_{\tau(i)})^+| + |N_{J_i}(e_i)| + |N_{J_i}(u_{\tau(i+1)}^+)^-| - \alpha_i \\ &= d_{J_i}(x) - 1 + d_{J_i}(e_i) + d_{J_i}(u_{\tau(i+1)}^+) - \alpha_i. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
n &\geq |C| + d_{G-C}(e_i) + |\{x\}| = |I_i| + |J_i| + d_{G-C}(e_i) + 1 \\
&\geq (d_{I_i}(e_i) + d_{I_i}(u_{\tau(i+1)}^+)) + (d_{J_i}(x) + d_{J_i}(e_i) + d_{J_i}(u_{\tau(i+1)}^+) - \alpha_i) \\
&\quad + d_{G-C}(e_i) + 1 \\
&= (d_{I_i}(e_i) + d_{J_i}(e_i) + d_{G-C}(e_i)) + (d_{I_i}(u_{\tau(i+1)}^+) + d_{J_i}(u_{\tau(i+1)}^+)) \\
&\quad + (d_{J_i}(x) + 1) - \alpha_i \\
&= d(e_i) + d(u_{\tau(i+1)}^+) + d(x) - \alpha_i \\
&= d(u_{\tau(i)}^+) + d(u_{\tau(i)}^{++}) + d(u_{\tau(i+1)}^+) + d(x) - 2 - \alpha_i.
\end{aligned}$$

If equalities hold in the above inequalities, then

$$|J_i| = |(N_{J_i}(x) \setminus u_{\tau(i)}^+)^+ \cup N_{J_i}(e_i) \cup N_{J_i}(u_{\tau(i+1)}^+)^-|$$

also holds and so

$$J_i = (N_{J_i}(x) \setminus u_{\tau(i)}^+)^+ \cup N_{J_i}(e_i) \cup N_{J_i}(u_{\tau(i+1)}^+)^-.$$

Because G is triangle-free, $u_{\tau(i+1)}^{++} \notin N(u_{\tau(i+1)}^+)^-$ and $u_{\tau(i+1)}^{++} \notin N(x)^+$, and so $u_{\tau(i+1)}^{++} \in N(e_i)$.

Let $y = V(e_i) \cap N(u_{\tau(i+1)}^{++})$ and

$$C' = y \overrightarrow{C} u_{\tau(i+1)} x u_{\tau(i)} \overleftarrow{C} u_{\tau(i+1)}^{++} y.$$

Suppose $u_{\tau(i+1)}^+ \notin S$. Because C' does not contain $|C \cap S| + 1$ vertices of S , we have $y \neq u_{\tau(i)}^+$ and $u_{\tau(i)}^+ \in S$. Therefore $N(u_{\tau(i)}^+) \subset V(C')$ by (2) and (3). This contradicts Claim 1 as $u_{\tau(i)}^+ \in L$. See Figure 3(iv). Hence $u_{\tau(i+1)}^+ \in S$. \blacksquare

For $u_{\tau(i)}^+ \in L$, if the vertex $u_{\tau(i+1)}^+$ is adjacent to $u_{\tau(s)}^{++} \in (N_{J_i}(x) \setminus u_{\tau(i)}^+)^{++}$, then the cycle

$$C' = u_{\tau(i+1)}^+ u_{\tau(s)}^{++} \overrightarrow{C} u_{\tau(i+1)} x u_{\tau(s)} \overleftarrow{C} u_{\tau(i+1)}^+$$

is a longest swaying cycle of S . Hence $u_{\tau(s)}^+ \in S$; otherwise $|C' \cap S| \geq |C \cap S| + 1$. Therefore from (1), it holds that

$$(5) \quad u_{\tau(s)}^+ \in S \text{ and } d(u_{\tau(s)}^+) < \sigma_4/4 \text{ for all } u_{\tau(s)}^+ \in N_{J_i}(x)^+ \cap N_{J_i}(u_{\tau(i+1)}^+)^-.$$

If there are three vertices in $N_{J_i}(x)^+ \cap N_{J_i}(u_{\tau(i+1)}^+)^-$, then the three vertices and x are independent by (2), however, the sum of these degrees are less than σ_4 . Therefore, $\alpha_i \leq 2$. Now we divide our argument.

Case 1. There is $u_{\tau(i)}^+ \in L$ such that $\alpha_i = 1$.

Let $\{u_{\tau(s)}^+\} = N_{J_i}(x)^+ \cap N_{J_i}(u_{\tau(i+1)}^+)^-$. By (5), $d(u_{\tau(s)}^+) < \sigma_4/4 \leq d(u_{\tau(i)}^+)$, and by (2) and (4), $\{u_{\tau(i)}^{++}, u_{\tau(i+1)}^+, u_{\tau(s)}^+, x\}$ is an independent set. Hence by Claim 3, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} n &\geq d(u_{\tau(i)}^+) + d(u_{\tau(i)}^{++}) + d(u_{\tau(i+1)}^+) + d(x) - 2 - 1 \\ &\geq d(u_{\tau(i)}^{++}) + d(u_{\tau(i+1)}^+) + d(u_{\tau(s)}^+) + d(x) + (d(u_{\tau(i)}^+) - d(u_{\tau(s)}^+)) - 3 \\ &\geq \sigma_4 + (d(u_{\tau(i)}^+) - d(u_{\tau(s)}^+)) - 3 \\ &\geq (n + 2) + 1 - 3 = n. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore all equalities have to hold in the above inequalities, and so we have

$$(6) \quad n = d(u_{\tau(i)}^+) + d(u_{\tau(i)}^{++}) + d(u_{\tau(i+1)}^+) + d(x) - 3,$$

$$(7) \quad d(u_{\tau(i)}^+) = d(u_{\tau(s)}^+) + 1.$$

Because $u_{\tau(i+1)}^+ u_{\tau(s)}^{++} \overrightarrow{C} u_{\tau(i+1)} x u_{\tau(s)} \overleftarrow{C} u_{\tau(i+1)}^+ \in \mathcal{C}$, we have $d(x) \geq d(u_{\tau(s)}^+)$ by the maximality of $d(x)$. Then $d(x) + 1 \geq d(u_{\tau(s)}^+) + 1 = d(u_{\tau(i)}^+) \geq \sigma_4/4$ by (7). On the other hand, $d(x) + 1 \leq |C \cap S| + 1 \leq |S| < \sigma_4/4 + 1$ by Claim 1. Thus

$$\frac{\sigma_4}{4} \leq d(x) + 1 \leq |S| < \frac{\sigma_4}{4} + 1,$$

i.e., $|S| = d(x) + 1$. Therefore $|u_{\tau(l)}^+ \overrightarrow{C} u_{\tau(l+1)}^- \cap S| = 1$ for all $l \leq d(x)$; otherwise we can easily obtain a cycle containing $|C \cap S| + 1$ vertices of S

as in the proof of Claim 1. However, by (6) and Claim 3, $u_{\tau(i+1)}^+ \in S$, and by (5), $u_{\tau(s)}^+ \in S$, and hence

$$u_{\tau(i+1)}^{++} \overrightarrow{C} u_{\tau(i+2)}^- \cap S = u_{\tau(s)}^{++} \overrightarrow{C} u_{\tau(s+1)}^- \cap S = \emptyset.$$

Then, the cycle $u_{\tau(i+1)}^+ u_{\tau(s)}^{++} \overleftarrow{C} u_{\tau(i+2)}^- x u_{\tau(s+1)}^- \overrightarrow{C} u_{\tau(i+1)}^+$ contains $|C \cap S| + 1$ vertices in S . See Figure 4. This contradicts the assumption that C is a swaying cycle.




Figure 4

Case 2. There exists $u_{\tau(i)}^+ \in L$ such that $\alpha_i = 2$.

Let $\{u_{\tau(s)}^{++}, u_{\tau(t)}^{++}\} = N_{J_i}(x)^+ \cap N_{J_i}(u_{\tau(i+1)}^+)^-$. By (2), $\{u_{\tau(s)}^+, u_{\tau(t)}^+, x, u_{\tau(i+1)}^+\}$ is an independent set. By (5), both of the degrees of $u_{\tau(s)}^+$ and $u_{\tau(t)}^+$ are less than $\sigma_4/4$, and so $d(u_{\tau(i+1)}^+) \geq \sigma_4/4$. Thus, it holds that

$$d(u_{\tau(s)}^+) < \sigma_4/4 \leq d(u_{\tau(i)}^+) \text{ and } d(u_{\tau(t)}^+) < \sigma_4/4 \leq d(u_{\tau(i+1)}^+).$$

Therefore by Claim 3,

$$\begin{aligned} n &\geq d(u_{\tau(i)}^+) + d(u_{\tau(i)}^{++}) + d(u_{\tau(i+1)}^+) + d(x) - 2 - 2 \\ &\geq d(u_{\tau(i)}^{++}) + d(u_{\tau(s)}^+) + d(u_{\tau(t)}^+) + d(x) \\ &\quad + (d(u_{\tau(i)}^+) - d(u_{\tau(s)}^+)) + (d(u_{\tau(i+1)}^+) - d(u_{\tau(t)}^+)) - 4 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\geq \sigma_4 + (d(u_{\tau(i)}^+) - d(u_{\tau(s)}^+)) + (d(u_{\tau(i+1)}^+) - d(u_{\tau(t)}^+)) - 4 \\
&\geq (n+2) + 1 + 1 - 4 = n
\end{aligned}$$

because $\{u_{\tau(i)}^{++}, u_{\tau(s)}^+, u_{\tau(t)}^+, x\}$ is an independent set by (2) and (4). Thus all equalities hold in the above inequalities, and we can use the same arguments as in Case 1.

Case 3. $\alpha_i = 0$ for any $u_{\tau(i)+} \in L$.

For any $u_{\tau(s)}^+ \in (N(x) \setminus \{u_{\tau(i)}, u_{\tau(i+1)}\})^+$,

$$\begin{aligned}
n &\geq d(u_{\tau(i)}^+) + d(u_{\tau(i)}^{++}) + d(u_{\tau(i+1)}^+) + d(x) - 2 \\
&\geq d(u_{\tau(i)}^{++}) + d(u_{\tau(i+1)}^+) + d(u_{\tau(s)}^+) + d(x) + (d(u_{\tau(i)}^+) - d(u_{\tau(s)}^+)) - 2 \\
&\geq \sigma_4 + (d(u_{\tau(i)}^+) - d(u_{\tau(s)}^+)) - 2 \\
&\geq (n+2) - 2 = n
\end{aligned}$$

by Claim 3 because $\{u_{\tau(i)}^{++}, u_{\tau(i+1)}^+, u_{\tau(s)}^+, x\}$ is an independent set from (2) and (4). Therefore all equalities hold in the above inequalities, and so we have:

$$(8) \quad n = d(u_{\tau(i)}^+) + d(u_{\tau(i)}^{++}) + d(u_{\tau(i+1)}^+) + d(x) - 2 = \sigma_4 - 2,$$

$$(9) \quad d(u_{\tau(i)}^+) = d(u_{\tau(s)}^+).$$

From (9), we obtain $u_{\tau(s)}^+ \in L$, and so, by symmetry, $N(x)^+ \subset L$.

Claim 4. $u_{\tau(i)}^{++}$ is adjacent to all of $\{u_{\tau(s)}^{++} \mid s \neq i\}$.

Proof. By (8) and Claim 3, $u_{\tau(i+1)}^{++} \in N(e_i)$. Because $u_{\tau(i+1)}^+ \in L$, $u_{\tau(i+1)}^{++}$ is not adjacent to $u_{\tau(i)}^+$ by (4). Hence $u_{\tau(i)}^{++}u_{\tau(i+1)}^{++} \in E(G)$.

Suppose the vertex $u_{\tau(i)}^{++}$ is not adjacent to $u_{\tau(s)}^{++}$ ($s \neq i, i+1$). If $u_{\tau(i+1)}^+u_{\tau(s)}^{++} \notin E(G)$, i.e., $u_{\tau(s)}^{++} \notin N(u_{\tau(i+1)}^+)^-$, then $u_{\tau(s)}^{++} \in N(e_i)$ by (8) and Claim 3, and so $u_{\tau(i)}^+u_{\tau(s)}^{++} \in E(G)$. This contradicts (4) because $u_{\tau(s)}^+ \in L$.

Assume $u_{\tau(i+1)}^+ u_{\tau(s)}^{+++} \in E(G)$. By (4), (8) and (9) we have

$$\begin{aligned} & d(u_{\tau(s)}^{++}) + d(u_{\tau(i)}^{++}) + d(u_{\tau(i+1)}^+) + d(x) \\ & \geq \sigma_4 \\ & = d(u_{\tau(i)}^+) + d(u_{\tau(i)}^{++}) + d(u_{\tau(i+1)}^+) + d(x) \\ & = d(u_{\tau(s)}^+) + d(u_{\tau(i)}^{++}) + d(u_{\tau(i+1)}^+) + d(x). \end{aligned}$$

Hence $d(u_{\tau(s)}^{++}) \geq d(u_{\tau(s)}^+) \geq \sigma_4/4$.

Let

$$D = u_{\tau(i+1)}^+ \overrightarrow{C} u_{\tau(s)} x u_{\tau(i+1)} \overleftarrow{C} u_{\tau(s)}^{+++} u_{\tau(i+1)}^+.$$

By (3), $N(u_{\tau(s)}^+) \subset V(C)$. As $u_{\tau(s)}^+ \in L$, the vertex $u_{\tau(s)}^{+++}$ is not adjacent to x . If $u_{\tau(s)}^{+++}$ is adjacent to the vertex $y \in G - C$, then the order of the path $yu_{\tau(s)}^{+++} \overrightarrow{C} u_{\tau(i+1)}^+ u_{\tau(s)}^{+++} \overrightarrow{C} u_{\tau(i+1)} x$ is $|C| + 2$. As in the proof of (3), this contradicts the assumption that $C \in \mathcal{C}$ by Theorem 1. Hence, we obtain $N(u_{\tau(s)}^{+++}) \subset V(C)$. Thus $N(e_s) \subset V(D)$. Because $|D \cap S| \leq |C \cap S| < \sigma_4/4$,

$$d(e_s) \geq \sigma_4/2 - 2 \geq \sigma_4/4 > |S \cap D|.$$

Therefore, there exist vertices $y, z \in D \cap N(e_s)$ such that $y^+ = z$ or $y^+ \overrightarrow{D} z^- \cap S = \emptyset$ and $y^+ \overrightarrow{D} z^- \cap N(e_s) = \emptyset$. If y and z are adjacent to distinct ends of e_s , say $yu_{\tau(s)}^+, zu_{\tau(s)}^{+++} \in E(G)$, then $yu_{\tau(s)}^+ u_{\tau(s)}^{+++} z \overrightarrow{D} y$ contains $|C \cap S| + 1$ vertices of S . Hence, by symmetry, we may assume $u_{\tau(s)}^+$ is adjacent to both y and z . Then the cycle $D' = yu_{\tau(s)}^+ z \overrightarrow{D} y$ is a swaying cycle and $N(u_{\tau(s)}^{+++}) \subset N(D')$. This contradicts Claim 1 because $d(u_{\tau(s)}^{+++}) \geq \sigma_4/4$. \blacksquare

By symmetry, the vertex $u_{\tau(i+1)}^{+++}$ is adjacent to $u_{\tau(s)}^{+++}$, and so there is the triangle $u_{\tau(i)}^{+++} u_{\tau(i+1)}^{+++} u_{\tau(s)}^{+++}$. This is a contradiction.

References

- [1] P. Ash and B. Jackson, *Dominating cycles in bipartite graphs*, in: Progress in Graph Theory, J.A. Bondy, U.S.R. Murty, eds., (Academic Press, 1984), 81–87.

- [2] B. Bollobás and G. Brightwell, *Cycles through specified vertices*, *Combinatorica* **13** (1993) 137–155.
- [3] J.A. Bondy, *Longest Paths and Cycles in Graphs of High Degree*, Research Report CORR 80-16 (1980).
- [4] J.A. Bondy and L. Lovász, *Cycles through specified vertices of a graph*, *Combinatorica* **1** (1981) 117–140.
- [5] H. Broersma, H. Li, J. Li, F. Tian and H.J. Veldman, *Cycles through subsets with large degree sums*, *Discrete Math.* **171** (1997) 43–54.
- [6] R. Diestel, *Graph Theory*, Second edition, Graduate Texts in Mathematics **173**, Springer (2000).
- [7] Y. Egawa, R. Glas and S.C. Locke, *Cycles and paths through specified vertices in k -connected graphs*, *J. Combin. Theory (B)* **52** (1991) 20–29.
- [8] J. Harant, *On paths and cycles through specified vertices*, *Discrete Math.* **286** (2004) 95–98.
- [9] H. Enomoto, J. van den Heuvel, A. Kaneko and A. Saito, *Relative length of long paths and cycles in graphs with large degree sums*, *J. Graph Theory* **20** (1995) 213–225.
- [10] D.A. Holton, *Cycles through specified vertices in k -connected regular graphs*, *Ars Combin.* **13** (1982) 129–143.
- [11] O. Ore, *Note on hamiltonian circuits*, *American Mathematical Monthly* **67** (1960) 55.
- [12] K. Ota, *Cycles through prescribed vertices with large degree sum*, *Discrete Math.* **145** (1995) 201–210.
- [13] D. Paulusma and K. Yoshimoto, *Relative length of longest paths and longest cycles in triangle-free graphs*, submitted, <http://www.math.cst.nihon-u.ac.jp/~yosimoto/paper/related.length1.sub.pdf>.
- [14] A. Saito, *Long cycles through specified vertices in a graph*, *J. Combin. Theory (B)* **47** (1989) 220–230.
- [15] L. Stacho, *Cycles through specified vertices in 1-tough graphs*, *Ars Combin.* **56** (2000) 263–269.
- [16] K. Yoshimoto, *Edge degree conditions and all longest cycles which are dominating*, submitted.
- [17] S.J. Zheng, *Cycles and paths through specified vertices*, *Journal of Nanjing Normal University, Natural Science Edition*, Nanjing Shida Xuebao, Ziran Kexue Ban **23** (2000) 9–13.

Received 8 March 2006
Revised 31 October 2006