Edge-dominating cycles, k-walks and Hamilton prisms in $2K_2$ -free graphs

Mou, Gao; Pasechnik, Dmitrii V.

2016

Mou, G., & Pasechnik, D. V. (2016). Edge-dominating cycles, k-walks and Hamilton prisms in $2K_2$ -free graphs. *Journal of Knot Theory and Its Ramifications*, 25(12), 1642011-.

<https://hdl.handle.net/10356/83360>

<https://doi.org/10.1142/S0218216516420116>

© 2016 World Scientific Publishing Company. This is the author created version of a work that has been peer reviewed and accepted for publication by *Journal of Knot Theory and Its Ramifications*, World Scientific Publishing Company. It incorporates referee's comments but changes resulting from the publishing process, such as copyediting, structural formatting, may not be reflected in this document. The published version is available at: [<http://dx.doi.org/10.1142/S0218216516420116>].

Downloaded on 26 Apr 2023 18:07:01 SGT

Edge-dominating cycles, k -walks and Hamilton prisms in $2K_2$ -free graphs

Gao Mou¹ and Dmitrii V. Pasechnik²

¹ School of Physical and Mathematical Sciences, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore,

`gaom0002@e.ntu.edu.sg`

² Department of Computer Science, The University of Oxford, UK,

`dimpase@cs.ox.ac.uk`

To the memory of Sergei Duzhin.

Abstract. We show that an edge-dominating cycle in a $2K_2$ -free graph can be found in polynomial time; this implies that every $\frac{1}{k-1}$ -tough $2K_2$ -free graph admits a k -walk, and it can be found in polynomial time. For this class of graphs, this proves a long-standing conjecture due to Jackson and Wormald (1990). Furthermore, we prove that for any $\epsilon > 0$ every $(1 + \epsilon)$ -tough $2K_2$ -free graph is prism-Hamiltonian and give an effective construction of a Hamiltonian cycle in the corresponding prism, along with few other similar results.

1 Introduction

A graph G is called β -tough, for a real $\beta > 0$, if for any $p \geq 2$ it cannot be split into p components by removing less than $p\beta$ vertices. This concept, a measure of graph connectivity and “resilience” under vertex subsets removal, was introduced in 1973 by Chvátal [7], while studying Hamiltonicity of graphs. For a survey of results on graph toughness till 2006 see [3].

In general, toughness of a graph is NP-hard to compute [2]. Considerable work went into investigating this computational problem for various classes of graphs. In particular, recently, Broersma, Patel and Pyatkin proved [6] that toughness of a $2K_2$ -free graph, i.e. a graph that does not contain an induced copy of the disjoint union of two edges, can be found in polynomial time.

Note that $2K_2$ -free graphs are an interesting class from algorithmic complexity point of view; most classical algorithmic problems for them are hard, with a notable exception of the maximum weighted independent set problem [1], [13, Graphclass: $2K_2$ -free]. In particular Hamiltonian cycle problem is NP-complete already for a subclass of $2K_2$ -free graphs, the *split* graphs—graphs for which the set of vertices can be partitioned into a clique and an independent set [9, Exercise 6.2]. Due to the latter, for $2K_2$ -free graphs it makes sense to study computational complexity of concepts which are generalisations of the Hamiltonian cycle problem, such as k -walk.

Let $p \times G$ denote the multigraph obtained from G by taking each edge p times. A k -walk is a spanning subgraph W of $2k \times G$ such that each vertex of W has even degree at most $2k$. In particular a graph has a 1-walk if and only if it is K_2 (i.e. one edge) or Hamiltonian. For a survey of results on walks in graphs till 2005 see [12]. In 1990 Jackson and Wormald conjectured [10] that for any integer $k \geq 2$ a $\frac{1}{k-1}$ -tough graph G admits a k -walk.

In this paper, we prove that Jackson and Wormald's Conjecture is true under the assumption that G is $2K_2$ -free.

Theorem 1. *For any integer $k \geq 2$, every $\frac{1}{k-1}$ -tough $2K_2$ -free graph G admits a k -walk. Moreover, the latter can be found in time polynomial in $|V(G)|$.*

If for $k \geq 2$ we let the toughness value $\frac{1}{k-1}$ increase to $\frac{1}{k-2}$ then one does not need $2K_2$ -freeness. Indeed, it is shown in [10] that every $\frac{1}{k-2}$ -tough graph has a k -walk.

Clearly, if G is Hamiltonian, then G is 1-tough. More generally, if G has a k -walk, then G is $\frac{1}{k}$ -tough [10]. However, the converse is not true already for $k = 1$ (there even exist 2-tough graphs which are not Hamiltonian, cf. [4]).

This more or less summarises the situation with t -tough graphs, $t \leq 1$. On the $t > 1$ side a famous conjecture of Chvátal [7] claims that there exists a constant β such that every β -tough graph is Hamiltonian. Towards this, Ellingham and Zha [8] proved that every 4-tough graph has a 2-walk (cf. Theorem 2 below).

It was recently shown [6] that every 25-tough $2K_2$ -free graph on at least three vertices is Hamiltonian. Our Theorem 1 was inspired by this result. However, our approach is technically quite different.

Our next result concerns a structure that is half-way between 1- and 2-walks. The *prism* over a graph G is the Cartesian product $G \square K_2$ of G with the complete graph K_2 . G is called *prism-Hamiltonian* if $G \square K_2$ is Hamiltonian. If G is Hamiltonian, then $G \square K_2$ is also Hamiltonian, but the converse does not hold in general, cf. [11]. As well, this property is stronger than having a 2-walk: cf. figure on the right, where we have a $2K_2$ -free graph with a 2-walk, but without Hamiltonian prism.

Theorem 2. *Every $(1 + \epsilon)$ -tough $2K_2$ -free graph G is prism-Hamiltonian, for any $\epsilon > 0$. Moreover, a Hamiltonian cycle in the prism over G can be found in time polynomial in $|V(G)|$.*

It is worth mentioning that the toughness constant in Theorem 2 is much better than $\frac{3}{2}$, the lower bound on toughness of a $2K_2$ -free graph needed for its Hamiltonicity, see [6, Sect. 4].

To prove Theorem 1 and Theorem 2, we first prove a result on edge-dominating subgraphs (a subgraph S of G is called *edge-dominating* if each edge of G contains at least one vertex from $V(S)$).

Theorem 3. *Let G be a $2K_2$ -free graph. Then*

1. G admits an edge-dominating cycle (or an edge, or a vertex) C ;
2. if G contains a triangle, then G admits an edge-dominating cycle C , with three successive vertices on C forming a triangle in G .

Moreover, C can be found in time polynomial in $|V(G)|$.

In fact, in 1983 Veldman [14] has proved the existence of edge-dominating cycles for $2K_2$ -free graphs. However, his proof is based on contraposition, so it neither tells how to find C in (1), nor allows to restrict C as in (2).

In the remainder of the paper we provide the proofs, and then discuss related open questions.

2 Proof of Theorem 3

2.1 The proof of the first part of Theorem 3

If G is a tree, then, as it is $2K_2$ -free, it must either have an edge-dominating vertex, or an edge-dominating edge. Indeed, in this case, if any two edges intersect, then, as G has no cycles, they all must intersect in a vertex, which will be dominating. Now, assume that there are two non-intersecting edges, say xy and uv . As they cannot form a $2K_2$, they are on a 3-path, $xyuv$, without loss of generality. Now we claim that yu is a dominating edge. Indeed, suppose to the contrary that an edge ab does not intersect yu . Then, as they cannot form $2K_2$, $abyu$ is a 3-path, without loss of generality. As G is a tree, by is the only edge connecting vertices of ab and yu . Thus either ab and uv form a $2K_2$, or b lies in a cycle; in both cases this is a contradiction, proving that yu is a dominating edge.

Otherwise, G has a cycle, say $C = x_1x_2 \cdots x_kx_1$, where $k \geq 3$. If C is edge-dominating, then we are done. Otherwise there must be an edge v_1v_2 (assume there are $t > 0$ such edges), with neither v_1 nor v_2 on C . Since G is $2K_2$ -free, v_1 and v_2 have at least two distinct neighbours on C . Let $x_1v_1 \in E(G)$ without loss of generality;

1. if $x_2v_1 \in E(G)$, then $C' = x_1v_1x_2x_3 \cdots x_kx_1$ is a longer cycle;
2. if $x_2v_2 \in E(G)$, then $x_1v_1v_2x_2x_3 \cdots x_kx_1$ is a longer cycle;
3. if $x_2v_1, x_2v_2 \notin E(G)$, then applying $2K_2$ -freeness to v_1v_2 and x_2x_3 , we get either $x_3v_1 \in E(G)$ or $x_3v_2 \in E(G)$.
 - (a) If $x_3v_2 \in E(G)$, then $C' = x_1v_1v_2x_3 \cdots x_kx_1$ is a longer cycle;
 - (b) if $x_3v_2 \notin E(G)$, then $x_3v_1 \in E(G)$.
 - i. if x_2 is adjacent to no vertex outside C , then use $C' = x_1v_1x_3 \cdots x_kx_1$ instead of C . We know that C and C' have the same length, but C' dominates all the edges that are dominated by C , and C' also dominates v_1v_2 , which is not dominated by C . So replacing C by C' decreases t .
 - ii. Otherwise x_2 is adjacent to a vertex outside C , say z . As x_2 is not adjacent to v_1 or v_2 , we have z adjacent to either v_1 or v_2 . If $zv_1 \in E(G)$, then $C' = x_1v_1zx_2x_3 \cdots x_kx_1$ is a longer cycle. Otherwise $C' = x_1v_1v_2zx_2x_3 \cdots x_kx_1$ is a longer cycle.

Repeat the process above. At each iteration either $|V(C)|$ increases, or t decreases. Thus the process will stop, with $t = 0$, in at most $|E(G)|^2$ steps. $\square$

2.2 The proof of the second part of Theorem 3

The algorithmic procedure for the second part is almost the same, requiring only a minor modification described below.

Let G contain a triangle $w_1w_2w_3$. If $w_1w_2w_3$ is edge-dominating, then there is nothing to prove. Otherwise, there is $u_1u_2 \in E(G)$, with neither u_1 nor u_2 on $w_1w_2w_3$. Then, by the $2K_2$ -freeness, we either can connect $w_1w_2w_3$ and u_1u_2 together, to get a 5-cycle C , with $w_{\pi(1)}$, $w_{\pi(2)}$ and $w_{\pi(3)}$ successive on C for some permutation π of $\{1, 2, 3\}$, or else (without loss in generality) u_1 is adjacent to w_1 and w_2 . In the latter case set $C = u_1w_1w_3w_2$.

If C is edge-dominating, then we are done. Otherwise, we proceed by induction on $k := |V(C)|$. Suppose $k \geq 4$, and there are three successive vertices on C , namely X' , X and X'' forming a triangle in G . Let $v_1v_2 \in E(G)$ such that neither v_1 nor v_2 is on C . We claim that then we can find a cycle C' such that C' dominates more edges than C (perhaps all), and X' , X and X'' are also successive on C' .

Now we dispense with the case $k = 4$. By construction, there is an edge u_1u_2 with u_2 not in $C = u_1w_1w_3w_2$. If u_2 is joined to a vertex $w \neq u_1$ on C , then we use this extra edge to turn C into a 5-cycle through u_1u_2 and w_j ($j = 1, 2, 3$). Indeed, as w_j ($j = 1, 2, 3$) form a triangle, they will give, in some order, three successive vertices $X'XX''$ forming a triangle, as required. Namely, if $w = w_1$ or $w = w_2$, we will have $X'XX'' = w_1w_3w_2$, whereas for $w = w_3$ we will have $X'XX'' = w_3w_2w_1$. Thus, we are left with the case where the only edge joining u_2 and C is u_1u_2 .

First, consider the case $v_2 = u_2$. Then v_1 must be adjacent to the edge w_1w_2 , otherwise v_1u_2 and w_1w_2 form a $2K_2$. Thus we obtain a 5-cycle $\Omega(u_2)$ through u_1u_2 , v_1 , w_1 , and w_2 , with $\{X, X', X''\} = \{u_1, w_1, w_2\}$.

It remains to consider the case of $v_i \neq u_2$ ($i = 1, 2$). As u_1u_2 and v_1v_2 cannot form a $2K_2$, and as we already considered the case of u_2 adjacent to a vertex not on C , we may assume that v_2 is adjacent to u_1 . This gives us the already considered configuration, with u_2 replaced by v_2 , from which we obtain a 5-cycle $\Omega(v_2)$.

From now on we can assume $k \geq 5$. By $2K_2$ -freeness, v_1 and v_2 are adjacent to at least two of $\{X, X', X''\}$, and thus to at least one of $\{X', X''\}$. Suppose, without loss of generality, that $v_1X' \in E(G)$; label the vertices in C in the following way: X' is labeled by x_1 ; the neighbour of x_1 on C distinct from X is labeled by x_2 ; the other vertices on C are labeled successively, see Figure 1.

Note that for $k \geq 5$ the operation used in the proof of the first part of Theorem 3 of replacing C by C' (enlarging $|V(C)|$ or reducing t) does not touch the edges $x_{k-1}x_k$ and x_kx_1 . Thus the triangle-forming vertices X'' , X and X' are always successive on C in our process. Then they are on the edge-dominating cycle we obtain there. $\square$

Fig. 1. The cycle C of length k

3 Proof of Theorem 1

Combining Theorem 3 and the following Lemma 1, we obtain Theorem 1.

Lemma 1. *Let $k \geq 2$. If G has an edge-dominating cycle C (or an edge, or a vertex) and if G is $\frac{1}{k-1}$ -tough then G admits a k -walk. Moreover, the latter can be found in time polynomial in $|V(G)|$.*

Proof. The induced subgraph $D = G - C$ is an independent set. Define an auxiliary bipartite graph Γ , with one part $V(D)$ and the other consisting of $k-1$ copies of $V(C)$, so that each edge $dc \in V(D) \times V(C)$ corresponds to $k-1$ edges $dc_1, \dots, dc_{k-1}$ of Γ . Let Φ denote the $(k-1)$ -to-1 map $\Phi : E(\Gamma) \rightarrow E(G)$ sending each dc_j , for $1 \leq j \leq k-1$, to $dc = \Phi(dc_j)$.

For any $D' \subset D$, by $\frac{1}{k-1}$ -toughness, D' has at least $\lceil \frac{|D'|}{k-1} \rceil$ neighbours in C . Thus D' has at least $|D'|$ neighbours in Γ . By Hall's Theorem [5, Theorem 16.4] applied to Γ , it has a matching M saturating D ; i.e. each $v \in V(D)$ is incident to an $e \in M$, and each v in the other part of Γ is incident to at most one $e \in M$.

Hence for each $e \in \Phi(M) \subset E(G)$ we have $e \in D \times C$. Moreover, each $v \in V(D)$ is incident to exactly one $e \in \Phi(M)$, while each $v \in V(C)$ is incident to at most $k-1$ edges in $\Phi(M)$. Then the (doubled) edges in $\Phi(M)$ and the edges in the edge-dominating cycle (respectively, the doubled edge in the case of existence of a dominating edge) C form a k -walk in G .

To show the last claim, it suffices to notice that M (a maximum matching in a bipartite graph) can be found in time polynomial in $|V(G)|$. $\square$

4 Proof of Theorem 2

The following lemma is the key technique in the proof of Theorem 2.

Lemma 2. *Let G be $(1 + \epsilon)$ -tough, for some $\epsilon > 0$.*

1. *If G contains an edge-dominating cycle C with even number of vertices, then the prism over G is Hamiltonian.*

2. If G contains an edge-dominating cycle $C = v_1 v_2 \cdots v_{2p+1} v_1$ of odd length, and there are three vertices v_1 , v_{2q} and v_{2q+1} , for some $1 \leq q \leq p$, inducing a triangle in G , then the prism over G is Hamiltonian.

Proof. For the first part (see Figure 2), denote $C = v_1 v_2 \cdots v_{2p} v_1$. The set $D = V(G) - V(C)$ of vertices outside C is an independent set. By Hall's Theorem and 1-toughness, there is a matching M between D and C . That means that for any vertex u_j in D , there is a vertex v_{i_j} on C adjacent to u_j in M .

Obviously, we have a Hamiltonian cycle in $\bar{C}$, the prism over C , namely

$$v_1 v'_1 v'_2 v_2 \cdots v_{2p-1} v'_{2p-1} v'_{2p} v_{2p} v_1.$$

Now, we change every $v_{i_j} v'_{i_j}$ (or $v'_{i_j} v_{i_j}$) into $v_{i_j} u_j u'_j v'_{i_j}$ (or $v'_{i_j} u'_j u_j v_{i_j}$) to get a Hamilton cycle in $\bar{G}$.

Fig. 2. G has an edge-dominating cycle of even length

For the second part, denote $C = v_1 v_2 \cdots v_{2p+1} v_1$ (see Figure 3). The set $D = V(G) - V(C)$ of vertices outside C is an independent set. By Hall's Theorem, and $(1 + \epsilon)$ -toughness, there is a matching M between D and $C - \{v_1\}$. This means that for any vertex u_j in D , there is a vertex v_{i_j} in $C - \{v_1\}$ adjacent to u_j in M .

Clearly, we have a Hamiltonian cycle in $\bar{C}$, namely

$$v_1 v_2 v'_2 v'_3 v_3 \cdots v_{2q-1} v_{2q} v'_{2q} v'_1 v'_{2q+1} v_{2q+1} \cdots v_{2p+1} v_1.$$

Now, we change every $v_{i_j} v'_{i_j}$ (or $v'_{i_j} v_{i_j}$) into $v_{i_j} u_j u'_j v'_{i_j}$ (or $v'_{i_j} u'_j u_j v_{i_j}$) to get a Hamilton cycle in $\bar{G}$. $\square$

Now we complete the proof of Theorem 2. Suppose G is a triangle-free $2K_2$ -free graph. By [6, Theorem 4], if $|V(G)| \geq 3$ then G is Hamiltonian,³ and so

³ We only need to rely on [6, Theorem 4] for the case of G not having a dominating cycle C of even length, for otherwise we have case 1 of Lemma 2 at our disposal; $|C|$ can be odd only in the case of G not bipartite; such a G is, by [6, Lemma 2], of C_5^* -type, i.e. it has a rather special structure.

Fig. 3. G has an edge-dominating cycle of odd length

prism-Hamiltonian. A polynomial-time algorithm to construct a Hamiltonian cycle in G is implicit in the proof of [6, Theorem 4], and building up a Hamiltonian cycle in the prism over G from a Hamiltonian cycle $C = v_1 v_2 \cdots v_m v_1$ in G is trivially (and in time polynomial in $|V(G)|$) done by concatenating the path $v_1 \dots v_{m-1} v_m$, i.e. C without the last edge, with the path $v'_m v'_{m-1} \cdots v'_1$.

If $|V(G)| = 2$, i.e. G is a single edge, and obviously prism-Hamiltonian. Finally, if G is not triangle-free then we are done by Theorem 3 (2) and Lemma 2, and noting that the corresponding construction can be done in time polynomial in $|V(G)|$. $\square$

5 Concluding remarks

Lemma 1 can be used to prove existence of 2-walks in classes of graphs wider than $2K_2$ -free. For instance, it is immediate from [14, Corollary 3.2] that each 2-connected $3K_2$ -free graph admits an edge-dominating cycle. From the latter and Lemma 1, it is easy to obtain the following.

Theorem 4. *Let G be a 1-tough $3K_2$ -free graph. Then G admits a 2-walk.* $\square$

It would be interesting to find out whether Theorem 4 and similar results of this type can be made effective. Towards this end, we would like to propose the following

Conjecture 1. Let $\ell \geq 2$ be a fixed constant. Then for the $\ell - 1$ -connected ℓK_2 -free graphs there is a polynomial time algorithm finding an edge-dominating cycle.

Of independent interest would be finding out whether more general results from [14], in particular Theorem 5, can be made algorithmic.

Theorem 5. [14, Theorem 3]. *Let G be an $\ell - 1$ -connected graph such that for every induced ℓK_2 -subgraph H of G one has the sum of degrees of vertices in H at least $\frac{(\ell-1)(|V(G)|-\ell+1)}{2}$. Then G has an edge-dominating cycle.* $\square$

Acknowledgements.

The authors thank Nick Gravin, Edith Elkind, and the anonymous referee for helpful comments on versions of this text. Research supported by Singapore MOE Tier 2 Grant MOE2011-T2-1-090 (ARC 19/11) and by the EU Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme, grant agreement OpenDreamKit No 676541.

References

1. Balas, E., Yu, C.S.: On graphs with polynomially solvable maximum-weight clique problem. *Networks* 19(2), 247–253 (1989), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/net.3230190206>
2. Bauer, D., Hakimi, S.L., Schmeichel, E.: Recognizing tough graphs is NP-hard. *Discrete Appl. Math.* 28(3), 191–195 (1990), [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0166-218X\(90\)90001-S](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0166-218X(90)90001-S)
3. Bauer, D., Broersma, H., Schmeichel, E.: Toughness in graphs—a survey. *Graphs and Combinatorics* 22(1), 1–35 (2006)
4. Bauer, D., Broersma, H., Veldman, H.J.: Not every 2-tough graph is Hamiltonian. *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 99(1), 317–321 (2000)
5. Bondy, J.A., Murty, U.S.R.: *Graph theory*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 244. Springer, New York (2008), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-84628-970-5>
6. Broersma, H., Patel, V., Pyatkin, A.: On toughness and Hamiltonicity of $2K_2$ -free graphs. *Journal of Graph Theory* 75(3), 244–255 (2014)
7. Chvátal, V.: Tough graphs and hamiltonian circuits. *Discrete Mathematics* 5(3), 215–228 (1973)
8. Ellingham, M.N., Zha, X.: Toughness, trees, and walks. *Journal of Graph Theory* 33(3), 125–137 (2000)
9. Golumbic, M.C.: *Algorithmic graph theory and perfect graphs*, *Annals of Discrete Mathematics*, vol. 57. Elsevier Science B.V., Amsterdam, second edn. (2004), with a foreword by Claude Berge
10. Jackson, B., Wormald, N.C.: k -walks of graphs. *Australasian Journal of Combinatorics* 2, 135–146 (1990)
11. Kaiser, T., Ryjáček, Z., Král, D., Rosenfeld, M., Voss, H.J.: Hamilton cycles in prisms. *Journal of Graph Theory* 56(4), 249–269 (2007)
12. Kouider, M., Vestergaard, P.D.: Connected factors in graphs—a survey. *Graphs and Combinatorics* 21(1), 1–26 (2005)
13. de Ridder, H.N., et al.: *Information System on Graph Classes and their Inclusions (ISGCI)*. <http://www.graphclasses.org> (2015)
14. Veldman, H.J.: Existence of dominating cycles and paths. *Discrete Mathematics* 43(2), 281–296 (1983)