

On Evolution and Fundamental Results in Large Cycles Theory

Zh.G. Nikoghosyan*

January 27, 2023

Abstract

Large cycles theory is a natural extension of classic hamiltonian problem including Hamilton cycles, longest cycles, dominating cycles and some their generalizations as the main research objects. Arising around NP -complete problems, large cycles theory has undergone a natural growth and evolution, giving rise to a wide variety of results. In this paper we classify the results in large cycles theory into groups (kinds, species) according to their structure, change and common origins such that each kind has descended from a common ancestor (fundamental result) through generalizations. Generalizations save the fundamental result without any change as a special case, since it is assumed to be best possible (sharp), and are the main developmental mechanism generating the great part of results in large cycles theory. Actually, creation of fundamental results and their generalizations are two parallel processes in developments around large cycles. Kinds have no relationship to one another through generalizations. Every fundamental result can be considered as a special "intersection" in structures of large cycles problems, and its generalizations (kinds) as a parallel transport of this intersection.

Key words. Evolution, fundamental results, kinds, large cycles theory.

1 Introduction

A Hamilton cycle of a graph is a cycle which passes through every vertex of the graph exactly once, and a graph is hamiltonian if it contains a Hamilton cycle. Classic hamiltonian problem; determining when a graph contains a Hamilton cycle, is one of the most central notions in graph theory and is one of the most attractive and most investigated problems among NP -complete problems that Karp listed in his seminal paper [38]. Cook [16] conjectured that one cannot hope for a simple classification of hamiltonian graphs. In other words, it seems to be impossible to obtain a criterion for a graph to be hamiltonian which

*G.G. Nicoghossian (up to 1997)

implies a polynomial-time algorithm. This fact gave rise to a growing number of conditions that are either necessary or sufficient. Moreover, the fact that the developments around various *NP*-complete problems have undergone a natural gradual growth and evolution, force to think that Cook's conjecture is true. The challenge is to classify the results in different areas (formed around *NP*-complete problems) according to their developmental mechanisms and common origins.

If a graph G does not satisfy a sufficient condition for hamiltonicity, we cannot guarantee the existence of a Hamilton cycle. But if G is close to satisfy the condition, we may hope find some "hamiltonian-like" structures such as long cycles and hamiltonian paths. Further extensions of these notions lead to cycle and path covers, maximum matching, spanning trees with smallest number of leaves and many others that are rather far from Hamilton cycles. Actually, each of these questions is really a part of the general area called "hamiltonian graph theory".

Large cycles theory can be considered as a simplified alternative to hamiltonian graph theory concerning the main "hamiltonian-like" structures in graphs. In fact, large cycles theory is a natural extension of classic hamiltonian problem including Hamilton cycles, longest cycles, dominating cycles, as well as some generalized cycles including Hamilton and dominating cycles as special cases. In the last 60 years, the developments in large cycles theory gave rise to a wide variety of results [8], [30], [31].

In this paper we classify the results in large cycles theory into groups (kinds, species) according to their structure, change and common origins such that each kind has descended from a common ancestor (fundamental result) through generalizations (extensions). Generalizations save the fundamental result without any change as a special case, since it is assumed to be best possible (sharp) and cannot be improved. Kinds have no relationship to one another through generalizations. Every fundamental result can be considered as a special "intersection" in structures of large cycles problems, and its generalizations (kind) as a parallel transport of this intersection. The list of fundamental results in large cycles theory is presented in Section 6.

Generalizations have inexhaustible reserves to give rise to continuously growing diversity descended from some fundamental result. They are the main developmental mechanism generating the great part of results in large cycles theory. But for evolution, some source (fundamental) results must initially exist. Actually, creation of fundamental results and their generalizations are two parallel processes in developments around large cycles. Fundamental results grow more slowly. Remember that by the main postulate of biology, all life shares a common ancestor.

The term "fundamental result" is used in various fields of science to characterize mainly the central and most important results in the area, based on subjective perception. In this paper, this term is used according to the second much more important mean: "forming the source or base from which everything else is made; not able to be divided any further". Observe also that in general, there are no physical and abstract units in the nature, lying in the base of all

material or abstract notions. However, every notion in large cycles theory has certain origins due to certain frames of this theory.

2 Terminology

Throughout this article we consider only finite undirected graphs without loops or multiple edges. A good reference for any undefined terms is [12]. Denote by $d(x)$ the degree of a vertex x in the graph G . The neighborhood of x will be denoted by $N(x)$.

A simple cycle (or just a cycle) C of length t is a sequence $v_1v_2\dots v_tv_1$ of distinct vertices v_1, \dots, v_t with $v_iv_{i+1} \in E(G)$ for each $i \in \{1, \dots, t\}$, where $v_{t+1} = v_1$. When $t = 2$, the cycle $C = v_1v_2v_1$ on two vertices v_1, v_2 coincides with the edge v_1v_2 , and when $t = 1$, the cycle $C = v_1$ coincides with the vertex v_1 . So, by this standard definition, all vertices and edges in a graph can be considered as cycles of lengths 1 and 2, respectively. If Q is a cycle then we use $|Q|$ to denote the length of Q , that is $|Q| = |V(Q)|$. A path (cycle) on n vertices is denoted by P_n (C_n , respectively).

A graph G is hamiltonian if G contains a Hamilton cycle, i.e. a cycle of length n . We call Q a large cycle in a graph G if it dominates some certain subgraph structures in G in a sense that every such structure has a vertex in common with Q . If Q dominates all vertices in G then clearly C is a Hamilton cycle. A cycle Q is a dominating cycle if it dominates all edges in G . A cycle Q is a PD_λ (path dominating) cycle if it dominates all paths in G of length at least some fixed integer λ . Finally, a cycle Q is a QD_λ (cycle dominating) cycle if it dominates all cycles in G of length at least λ .

We reserve n, q, δ, κ and α to denote the number of vertices (order), number of edges (size), minimum degree, connectivity and independence number of a graph, respectively. The length c of a longest cycle in a graph is called the circumference. For C a longest cycle in G , let \bar{p} and \bar{c} denote the lengths of a longest path and a longest cycle in $G \setminus C$, respectively. Let $s(G)$ denote the number of components of a graph G . A graph G is t -tough if $|S| \geq ts(G \setminus S)$ for every subset S of the vertex set $V(G)$ with $s(G \setminus S) > 1$. The toughness of G , denoted $\tau(G)$, is the maximum value of t for which G is t -tough (taking $\tau(K_n) = \infty$ for all $n \geq 1$). Woodall [56] defined the binding number $b(G)$ of a graph G as follows:

$$b(G) = \min_{X \in F} \frac{|N(X)|}{|X|},$$

where $F = \{X : \emptyset \neq X \subseteq V(G)\}$ and $N(X) = \cup_{x \in X} N(x)$.

A graph G is said to be planar if G is embeddable into the plane without crossing edges. A projective plane, sometimes called a twisted sphere, is a surface without boundary derived from a usual plane by addition of a line at infinity. Just as a straight line in projective geometry contains a single point at infinity at which the endpoints meet, a plane in projective geometry contains a single line at infinity at which the edges of the plane meet. A projective plane can be constructed by gluing both pairs of opposite edges of a rectangle together

giving both pairs a half-twist. It is a one-sided surface, but cannot be realized in three-dimensional space without crossing itself.

Let a, b, t, k be integers with $k \leq t$. We use $H(a, b, t, k)$ to denote the graph obtained from $tK_a + \overline{K}_t$ by taking any k vertices in subgraph \overline{K}_t and joining each of them to all vertices of K_b . Let L_δ be the graph obtained from $3K_\delta + K_1$ by taking one vertex in each of three copies of K_δ and joining them each to other. For odd $n \geq 15$, construct the graph G_n from $\overline{K}_{\frac{n-1}{2}} + K_\delta + K_{\frac{n+1}{2}-\delta}$, where $n/3 \leq \delta \leq (n-5)/2$, by joining every vertex in K_δ to all other vertices and by adding a matching between all vertices in $K_{\frac{n+1}{2}-\delta}$ and $(n+1)/2 - \delta$ vertices in $\overline{K}_{\frac{n-1}{2}}$. It is easily seen that G_n is 1-tough but not hamiltonian. A variation of the graph G_n , with K_δ replaced by \overline{K}_δ and $\delta = (n-5)/2$, will be denoted by G_n^* .

A graph G is the intersection graph of subgraphs H_1, \dots, H_m of a graph H if the vertices of G one-to-one correspond to the subgraphs H_1, \dots, H_m and two vertices of G are adjacent if and only if the corresponding subgraphs intersect.

A graph is an interval graph if and only if it is an intersection graph of subpaths of a path. Next, a graph is a split graph if and only if it is an intersection graph of subtrees of a star, i.e., a graph $K_{1,m}$. Further, a graph is chordal if and only if it is an intersection graph of subtrees of a tree. Finally, a comparability graph is a graph whose edges can be transitively oriented (i.e. if $x > y$ and $y > z$, then $x > z$); a cocomparability graph G is a graph whose complement \overline{G} is a comparability graph. Spider graphs are the intersection graphs of subtrees of subdivisions of stars. Thus, spider graphs are chordal graphs that form a common superclass of interval and split graphs.

If a graph G contains no induced copy of H , we say that G is H -free.

3 On the complexity classes of computational problems

Computational complexity theory focuses on classifying computational problems according to their inherent difficulty, and relating those classes to each other. Graph theory and combinatorics focus on particular problems and their real difficulties.

Significant progress has been made in combinatorics and graph theory toward improving our understanding of the inherent difficulty in computational problems and what can be computed efficiently. Today, most problems of known interest have been classified as to whether they are polynomial-time solvable or NP -complete.

An algorithm is said to be polynomial time if its running time is upper bounded by a polynomial expression in the size of the input for the algorithm. Problems for which a polynomial time algorithm exists belong to the complexity class P , which is central in the field of computational complexity theory. Polynomial time is a synonym for "tractable", "feasible", "efficient", or "fast". The following problems are polynomial-time solvable: shortest path problem, min-

imum spanning tree problem, linear programming, matching, Eulerian cycle problem, network flow problem and so on.

An algorithm is deterministic if at each step there is only one choice for the next step given the values of the variables at that step. An algorithm is non-deterministic if there is a step that involves parallel processing. A problem is said to be in the class NP of problems if it can be solved by an algorithm which is non-deterministic and has a time complexity function which is polynomial. NP problems are recognized by the fact that their solutions can be checked for correctness by a deterministic polynomial time algorithm. Every problem in P is also in NP . The non-deterministic algorithm that can be used is "guess the answer". The guess can be checked in polynomial time by the algorithm which solves the problem. A famous and long standing open problem is whether or not $P = NP$. There is a collection of problems with the property that any polynomial time deterministic algorithm which solves one of them can be converted to a polynomial time algorithm which solves any other one of them (they are said to be polynomially equivalent problems) and if such an algorithm existed for any one of them, then $P = NP$. These problems are called NP -hard problems. NP -hard problems may or may not be NP problems. Those that are NP are called NP -complete problems. An example of an NP -complete problem is the Traveling Salesman Problem.

The concept of NP -completeness was introduced in 1971 by Stephen Cook [16], who conjectured that NP -complete problems are not solvable in polynomial time. Today, most of important developments in discrete mathematics are centered on various NP -complete problems in trying to find different "effective layers" or "effective subspaces" in structures of NP -complete problems. By Cook's conjecture [16], NP -complete problems can not be covered by such layers. Today, after intensive investigations, many NP -complete problems are like unbreakable rock fragments with numerous cuttings and bore-holes.

4 The beginning of large cycles theory

Irish physicist, astronomer and mathematician Sir William Rowan Hamilton (1805-1865) invented the "Icosian Calculus", a noncommutative algebra so called because it involved a planar embedding of the graph of a dodecahedron, which has 20 vertices. The system has two operations: L and R , standing for "left" and "right" respectively, the idea being that if one has just arrived at a vertex, one can choose to go left or right, with the value 1 being reserved for an expression which returns to one's point of origin. For example, a path that turns right twice and then left once can be expressed as the term $R2L$. Similarly, since each face of a dodecahedron is pentagonal, we know that $R5 = L5 = 1$. Hamilton showed that symmetry notwithstanding, the equation

$$LLRRRLLRLLRRRLLR = 1$$

defines the only Hamiltonian Cycle on a dodecahedron. Since $LR \neq RL$, the Icosian Calculus is clearly noncommutative. However, it is associative. For

example, $(LR)L = L(RL)$. Hamilton's first communication about his Icosian Calculus was to his friend Robert Graves in a letter dated Oct. 7th, 1856.

However, Hamilton Cycles should not have been named after Hamilton at all. In fairness, they should be called "Kirkman Cycles" after Thomas Penyngton Kirkman, the man who actually first discovered them. His interest in polyhedra led him to discover Hamilton cycles in a paper received by the Royal Society on Aug. 6th, 1855, predates Hamilton's earliest communication, let alone his first publication on the subject, by more than a year. However, precedence is not the only argument on Kirkman's side. Whereas Hamilton considered only the one special case of cycles in the dodecahedron, Kirkman's result was much more general, because he pondered the existence of Hamiltonian Cycles in all graphs corresponding to planar embeddings of solid shapes. In addition, Kirkman was the first to discover an infinite class of non-hamiltonian polyhedra. He showed that any bipartite graph with an odd number of vertices must be non-hamiltonian. He gave an example of a planar, 3-connected, bipartite, non-hamiltonian graph.

Systematic investigations of Hamilton cycles began only in 1952 when Swiss mathematician Gabriel Andrew Dirac (1925-1984) [19] discovered the first sufficient condition for the existence of a Hamilton cycle and the first lower bound for the length of a longest cycle in graphs, based on two simplest graph invariants - order n and minimum degree δ .

Theorem A (Dirac [19], 1952). Every graph with $\delta \geq \frac{n}{2}$ is hamiltonian.

Theorem 19 (Dirac [19], 1952). Every 2-connected graph either has a Hamilton cycle or has a cycle of length at least 2δ .

5 On evolution of large cycles theory

The following attributes are important toward understanding the evolution processes in large cycles theory.

- Research objects,
- Research tools,
- Evolutional mechanisms,
- Fundamental results.

5.1 Research objects

Large cycle structures are centered around well-known Hamilton (spanning) cycles. Other types of large cycles were introduced for different situations when the graph contains no Hamilton cycles or it is difficult to find it. Generally, a cycle C in a graph G is a large cycle if it dominates some certain subgraph

structures in G in a sense that every such structure has a vertex in common with C . When C dominates all vertices in G then C is a Hamilton cycle. When C dominates all edges in G then C is called a dominating cycle introduced by Nash-Williams [43]. Further, if C dominates all paths in G of length at least some fixed integer λ then C is a PD_λ (path dominating)-cycle introduced by Bondy [11]. Finally, if C dominates all cycles in G of length at least λ then C is a CD_λ (cycle dominating)-cycle, introduced in [49].

5.2 Research tools

Graph invariants provide a powerful analytical tool for investigation of abstract structures of graphs. They, combined in convenient algebraic relations, contain global and general information about a graph and its particular substructures such as cycle structures, factors, matchings, colorings, and coverings. The discovery of these relations is the primary problem of graph theory.

There are a number of well-known basic (initial) invariants of a graph G occurring in various hamiltonian results and having significant impact on large cycle structures, namely order n , size q , minimum degree δ , connectivity κ , binding number $b(G)$, independence number α , toughness τ and the lengths of a longest path and longest cycle in $G \setminus C$ for a given longest cycle C , denoted by \bar{p} and \bar{c} , respectively.

These research tools and their convenient combinations can be considered as different cutting planes to recognize some layers or subspaces in large cycle structures.

The order n and size q one by one are neutral graph invariants with respect to cycle structures. Meanwhile, they become more effective combined together (as in Theorem 1).

The minimum degree δ plays a central role in majority of hamiltonian results. It is not too primitive and not too complicated, becoming the most flexible invariant for various possible generalizations. Minimum degree is a more essential invariant than the order and size, providing some dispersion of the edges in a graph. The combinations between order n and minimum degree become much more fruitful especially under some additional connectivity conditions.

The impact of some relations on cycle structures can be strengthened under additional conditions of the type $\delta \geq \alpha \pm i$ if for appropriate integer i . Determining the independence number α is shown in [29] to be NP -hard problem.

Connectivity is the most valuable research tool toward cognition of large cycle structures. In [21], it was proved that connectivity κ can be determined in polynomial time. Many graph theorists think that the connectivity is at the heart of all path and cycle questions providing comparatively more uniform dispersion of the edges.

The binding number $b(G)$ is a measure of how well-knot a graph is. Like the connectivity, the binding number also can be computed in polynomial time, using network techniques [17].

An alternate connectedness measure is toughness τ - the most powerful and less investigated graph invariant introduced by Chvátal [14] as a means of study-

ing the cycle structure of graphs. Moreover, it was proved [2] that for any positive rational number t , recognizing t -tough graphs (in particular 1-tough graphs) is an *NP*-hard problem. Chvátal [14] conjectured that there exists a finite constant i_0 such that every i_0 -tough graph is hamiltonian. This conjecture is still open.

For a given cycle C , the idea of using $G \setminus C$ appropriate structures lies in the base of almost all existing proof techniques in trying to construct longer cycles in graphs by the following standard procedure: choose an initial cycle C_0 in G and try to enlarge it by replacing a segment P' of C_0 with a suitable path P'' longer than P' , having the same end vertices and passing through $G \setminus C_0$. To find suitable P' and P'' , one can use the paths or cycles (preferably large) in $G \setminus C_0$ and connections (preferably high) between these paths (cycles) and C_0 . The latter are closely related to \bar{p}, \bar{c} , as well as minimum degree δ (local connections) and connectivity κ (global connections).

Forbidden small subgraphs provide the next powerful tool of structural nature that directly force the graph to have large cycles. For example, P_3 -free graphs are hamiltonian since they are complete graphs. The most common of forbidden subgraphs is the claw ($K_{1,3}$).

Finally, some special graph classes, that can be defined by direct description, provide convenient environments to construct large cycles in graphs. They are regular graphs, planar graphs, bipartite graphs, chordal graphs, interval graphs and so on.

According to above research tools, we distinguish three types of conditions for large cycles appearing in various theorems in large cycles theory:

- algebraic (numerical) relations between graph invariants,
- structural limitations defined by direct description,
- structural limitations defined by forbidden subgraphs.

5.3 Evolution mechanisms

Generalization is the main developmental mechanism generating the great part of results in large cycles theory. But for evolution, some source (fundamental) results must initially exist. Actually, creation of fundamental results and their generalizations are two parallel processes in developments around large cycles.

According to this observation, the results in large cycles theory can be classified into groups (kinds, species) such that each kind has descended from a common ancestor (fundamental result) through generalizations.

Fundamental results are naturally assumed to be best possible, that is they can not be directly improved. This means that fundamental results can be evaluated only by generalizations.

Each generalization can be considered as an extension of the initial result, saving it without any change as a special case. In other words, generalizations save the genetic information coming from the fundamental result. Kinds have no relationship to one another through generalizations.

The term "improvement", widely used in discrete mathematics, is applicable with respect to results that are not best possible (incomplete). For example, the statement "every graph with $\delta \geq (n+1)/2$ is hamiltonian" is incomplete (is not best possible, sharp) and can be improved to a best possible one: "every graph with $\delta \geq n/2$ is hamiltonian". Very often, a relaxing of the "main" condition in a theorem can be qualified as improvement, at the same time strengthening another "secondary" condition.

Every fundamental result is a special "intersection" in structures of hamiltonian problem, and its generalizations (kind) present a parallel transport of this intersection.

We demonstrate these mechanisms on the following three typical theorems along with Theorem A.

Theorem C (Ore [53], 1960). If G is a graph such that $d(x) + d(y) \geq n$ for every pair of nonadjacent vertices x and y , then G is Hamiltonian.

Theorem D (Moon and Moser [42], 1963). Every balanced bipartite graph is hamiltonian if $\delta \geq \frac{1}{4}(n+2)$.

Theorem E (Jung [33], 1978). Every graph with $n \geq 11$, $\tau \geq 1$ and $\delta \geq (n-4)/2$ is Hamiltonian.

Clearly, Theorem C generalizes Theorem A, containing it without any changes as a special case. At the same time, Theorem C can not improve Theorem A, since the latter is best possible, that is the bound $n/2$ in Theorem A can not be replaced by $(n-1)/2$.

Theorem D can be considered as an essential improvement of Theorem A in special graph environment formed by special structural limitation (bipartite graphs). Therefore, it is not a generalization and can be considered as a modification of Theorem A, where one condition has been strengthened and another condition has been weakened.

Theorem E neither is a generalization nor an improvement of Theorem A. Moreover, having no forerunners, Theorem E is a fundamental theorem.

The best possibility (in all respects) is an important condition for a result to be fundamental. A result is said to be best possible if the main conclusion cannot be strengthened and each condition in it cannot be relaxed saving the conclusion. In a case when we do not know how to relax a condition (for example a structural limitation), it will be removed instead of relaxing. Consider the following theorem based on structural limitations.

Theorem F (Broersma and Veldman [13], 1997). Every 2-connected $\{K_{1,3}, P_6\}$ -free graph is hamiltonian.

In order to claim that Theorem F is best possible, we first need some natural definition.

Definition. We say that the condition " G is H_1 -free" is stronger than " G is H_2 -free" if H_1 is an induced subgraph of H_2 .

For example, the condition " G is P_4 -free" is stronger than " G is P_5 -free" or " G is P_6 -free", and the condition " G is $N_{0,0,0}$ -free" is stronger than " G is H -free" for each

$$H \in \{N_{0,0,1}, N_{0,0,2}, N_{0,1,1}, N_{0,0,3}, N_{0,1,2}, N_{1,1,1}\}.$$

The following theorem will help to show the best possibility of some results based on structural limitations.

Theorem G (Faudree and Gould [25], 1997)

Let R and S be connected graphs ($R, S \neq P_3$) and G be a 2-connected graph of order $n \geq 10$. Then G is (R, S) -free implies G is hamiltonian if and only if $R = K_{1,3}$ and S is one of the graphs: $P_4, P_5, P_6, N_{0,0,0}, N_{0,0,1}, N_{0,0,2}, N_{0,1,1}, N_{0,0,3}, N_{0,1,2}$ or $N_{1,1,1}$.

By Theorem G, the condition " G is P_6 -free" in Theorem F can not be relaxed by replacing it with " G is H -free" for each

$$H \in \{P_4, P_5, N_{0,0,0}, N_{0,0,1}, N_{0,0,2}, N_{0,1,1}, N_{0,0,3}, N_{0,1,2}, N_{1,1,1}\}.$$

Further, the condition " G is $\{K_{1,3}, P_6\}$ -free" in Theorem F can not be relaxed by replacing it with " G is $K_{1,3}$ -free" or " G is P_6 -free" by the following theorem.

Theorem H (Faudree and Gould [25], 1997)

Let R be a connected graph and G be a 2-connected graph. Then G is R -free implies G is hamiltonian if and only if $R = P_3$.

Finally, the graph $2K_5 + K_1$ shows that the condition $\kappa \geq 2$ in Theorem F can not be replaced by $\kappa \geq 1$.

So, Theorem F, as well as Theorems 21-25 are best possible and therefore, are fundamental.

Generalizations have inexhaustible reserves to give rise to continuously growing diversity descended from some fundamental results. The majority of generalizations in large cycles theory are based on initial notion "minimum degree": degree sequences, degree sums, neighborhood unions, generalized degrees and so on.

Some of well-known graph extensions such as hypergraphs, digraphs and or-graphs, labeled and weighted graphs, infinite graphs, random graphs, and so on, can be considered in the context of more extended theories, where it is necessary to revise the research objects, research tools and evolutionary mechanisms.

In this paper we present 57 fundamental results in large cycles theory.

6 Fundamental results in large cycles theory

6.1 Hamilton cycles

Theorem 1 (Erdős and Gallai, 1959) [23]
Every graph is hamiltonian if

$$q \geq \frac{n^2 - 3n + 5}{2}.$$

Example for sharpness. To see that the size bound $(n^2 - 3n + 5)/2$ in Theorem 1 is best possible, note that the graph formed by joining one vertex of K_{n-1} to K_1 , contains $(n^2 - 3n + 4)/2$ edges and is not hamiltonian.

Theorem 2 (Erdős, 1962) [22]
Every graph is hamiltonian if $1 \leq \delta \leq n/2$ and

$$q > \max \left\{ \frac{(n - \delta)(n - \delta - 1)}{2} + \delta^2, \frac{(n - \lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor)(n - \lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor - 1)}{2} + \left\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \right\rfloor^2 \right\}.$$

Example for sharpness. The graph consisting of a complete graph on $n - \delta$ vertices, δ of which are joined to each of δ independent vertices, shows that the condition in Theorem 2 cannot be weakened.

Theorem 3 (Moon and Moser, 1963) [42]
Every balanced bipartite graph is hamiltonian if

$$q \geq \frac{n^2 - 2n + 5}{4}.$$

Examples for sharpness. Clearly, the condition "G is balanced" in Theorem 3 can not be removed. The graph obtained from $K_{t,t}$ by deleting $t - 1$ edges with a common vertex, shows that the condition $q \geq (n^2 - 2n + 5)/4$ in Theorem 3 can not be replaced by $q \geq (n^2 - 2n + 4)/4$.

Theorem 4 (Moon and Moser, 1963) [42]
Every balanced bipartite graph is hamiltonian if

$$q > \frac{n(n - 2\delta)}{4} + \delta^2.$$

Examples for sharpness. Clearly, the condition "G is balanced" in Theorem 4 can not be removed. Consider the balanced bipartite graph $G = (X, Y; E)$ with vertex classes of the form $X = P \cup Q$, $Y = R \cup S$, where $|P| = |R| = \delta$, $|Q| = |S| = n/2 - \delta$, $N_G(x) = R$ for all $x \in P$, and $N_G(x) = Y$ for all $x \in Q$. This example shows that Theorem 4 is best possible.

Theorem 5 (Nikoghosyan, 2011) [50]

Every graph is hamiltonian if

$$q \leq \delta^2 + \delta - 1.$$

Example for sharpness. $K_1 + 2K_\delta$.

Theorem 6 (Dirac, 1952) [19]

Every graph is hamiltonian if

$$\delta \geq \frac{n}{2}.$$

Example for sharpness. $2K_\delta + K_1$.

Theorem 7 (Moon and Moser, 1963) [42]

Every balanced bipartite graph is hamiltonian if

$$\delta \geq \frac{n+1}{4}.$$

Examples for sharpness. Clearly, the condition "G is balanced" in Theorem 7 can not be removed. Since n is even, the condition $\delta \geq (n+1)/4$ in Theorem 7 yields a stronger condition $\delta \geq (n+2)/4$. Let $P_i = x_i y_i z_i w_i$ ($i = 1, 2, 3$) be three disjoint paths. Form a graph from P_1, P_2, P_3 by identifying x_1, x_2, x_3 in one vertex and w_1, w_2, w_3 in another vertex. The resulting graph shows that the condition $\delta \geq (n+1)/4$ in Theorem 7 can not be replaced by $\delta \geq n/4$.

Theorem 8 (Jung, 1978) [33]

Every graph is hamiltonian if $n \geq 11$, $\tau \geq 1$ and

$$\delta \geq \frac{n-4}{2}.$$

Examples for sharpness. Petersen graph; $K_{\delta, \delta+1}$; G_n^* .

Theorem 9 (Nikoghosyan, 2012) [52]

Every graph is hamiltonian if $\tau > 4/3$ and

$$\delta \geq \frac{n-5}{2}.$$

Examples for sharpness. The Petersen graph shows that the condition $\tau > 4/3$ in Theorem 9 can not be replaced by $\tau = 4/3$. Let H_1 be a complete graph with vertex set $V(H_1) = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5\}$ and H_2 a complete bipartite graph with bipartition (V_1, V_2) , where $V_1 = \{y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4, y_5\}$ and $|V_2| = 2$. The graph obtained from disjoint graphs H_1 and H_2 by adding the edges $x_i y_i$ ($i = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5$), shows that the condition $\delta \geq (n-5)/2$ in Theorem 9 can not be replaced by $\delta \geq (n-6)/2$.

Theorem 10 (Nikoghosyan, 1981) [45]

Every graph is hamiltonian if $\kappa \geq 2$ and

$$\delta \geq \frac{n + \kappa}{3}.$$

Examples for sharpness. $2K_\delta + K_1$; $H(1, \delta - \kappa + 1, \delta, \kappa)$ ($2 \leq \kappa < n/2$).

Theorem 11 (Bauer and Schmeichel, 1991) [5]

Every graph is hamiltonian if $\tau \geq 1$ and

$$\delta \geq \frac{n + \kappa - 2}{3}.$$

Examples for sharpness. $K_{\delta, \delta+1}$; L_δ .

Theorem 12 (Nash-Williams, 1971) [43]

Every graph is hamiltonian if $\kappa \geq 2$ and

$$\delta \geq \max \left\{ \frac{n+2}{3}, \alpha \right\}.$$

Examples for sharpness. $(\lambda+1)K_{\delta-\lambda+1} + K_\lambda$ ($\delta \geq 2\lambda$); $(\lambda+2)K_{\delta-\lambda} + K_{\lambda+1}$ ($\delta \geq 2\lambda+1$); $H(\lambda, \lambda+1, \lambda+3, \lambda+2)$.

Theorem 13 (Bigalke and Jung, 1979) [9]

Every graph is hamiltonian if $\tau \geq 1$ and

$$\delta \geq \max \left\{ \frac{n}{3}, \alpha - 1 \right\}.$$

Examples for sharpness. $K_{\delta, \delta+1}$ ($n \geq 3$); L_δ ($n \geq 7$); $K_{\delta, \delta+1}$ ($n \geq 3$).

Theorem 14 (Fraisse, 1986) [28]

Let G be a graph and λ a positive integer. Then G is hamiltonian if $\kappa \geq \lambda + 1$ and

$$\delta \geq \max \left\{ \frac{n+2}{\lambda+2} + \lambda - 1, \alpha + \lambda - 1 \right\}.$$

Examples for sharpness. $(\lambda+1)K_{\delta-\lambda+1} + K_\lambda$ ($\delta \geq 2\lambda$); $(\lambda+2)K_{\delta-\lambda} + K_{\lambda+1}$ ($\delta \geq 2\lambda+1$); $H(\lambda, \lambda+1, \lambda+3, \lambda+2)$. Theorem 14 can be considered as a union (not a generalization) of fundamental results for all possible values of λ .

Theorem 15 (Yamashita, 2008) [58]

Every graph is hamiltonian if $\kappa \geq 3$ and

$$\delta \geq \max \left\{ \frac{n + \kappa + 3}{4}, \alpha \right\}.$$

Examples for sharpness. $3K_{\delta-1} + K_2$; $H(2, n - 3\delta + 3, \delta - 1, \kappa)$; $H(1, 2, \kappa + 1, \kappa)$.

Theorem 16 (Chvátal and Erdős, 1972) [15]
Every graph is hamiltonian if

$$\kappa \geq \alpha.$$

Example for sharpness. $K_{\delta, \delta+1}$.

Theorem 17 (Woodall, 1973) [56]
Every graph G is hamiltonian if

$$b(G) \geq \frac{3}{2}.$$

Example for sharpness. $aK_2 + \overline{K}_{a-1}$.

Theorem 18 (Fleischner, 1974) [27]
The square of every 2-connected graph is hamiltonian.

Examples for sharpness. Clearly, the power of a graph can not be reduced to one in Theorem 18, since there are 2-connected nonhamiltonian graphs. Next, 2-connectivity condition in Theorem 18 can not be relaxed since the square of a graph G is not hamiltonian if $G - x$ has at least three nontrivial components in which x has exactly one neighbor.

Theorem 19 (Tutte, 1956) [55]
Every 4-connected planar graph is hamiltonian.

Examples for sharpness. Tutte's graph shows that 4-connectivity condition in Theorem 19 can not be relaxed. Complete bipartite graph $K_{4,5}$ shows that planarity is a necessary condition in Theorem 19.

Theorem 20 (R. Thomas and X. Yu, 1994) [54]
Every 4-connected projective-plane graph is hamiltonian.

Examples for sharpness. The simplest non-orientable surface on which the Petersen graph can be embedded without crossings is the projective plane. The Petersen graph shows that 4-connectivity condition in Theorem 20 can not be relaxed. On the other hand, there are 4-connected non hamiltonian graphs that can not be embedded on projective plane (otherwise, all 4-connected graphs are hamiltonian), implying that the condition " G is projective plane graph" can not be removed in Theorem 20.

Theorem 21 (Faudree and Gould, 1997) [25]
Every 2-connected P_3 -free graph is hamiltonian.

Examples for sharpness. See Subsection 5.3.

Theorem 22 (Broersma, Veldman, 1997) [13]

Every 2-connected $\{K_{1,3}, P_6\}$ -free graph is hamiltonian.

Examples for sharpness. See Subsection 5.3.

Theorem 23 (Faudree, Gould, Ryjáček and Schiermeyer, 1997) [26]

Every 2-connected $\{K_{1,3}, N_{0,0,3}\}$ -free graph is hamiltonian.

Examples for sharpness. See Subsection 5.3.

Theorem 24 (Bedrossian, 1997) [7]

Every 2-connected $\{K_{1,3}, N_{0,1,2}\}$ -free graph is hamiltonian.

Examples for sharpness. See Subsection 5.3.

Theorem 25 (Duffus, Jakobson and Gould, 1997) [20]

Every 2-connected $\{K_{1,3}, N_{1,1,1}\}$ -free graph is hamiltonian.

Examples for sharpness. See Subsection 5.3.

Theorem 26 (Keil, 1985) [39]

Every 1-tough interval graph is hamiltonian.

Examples for sharpness. Star graphs are interval nonhamiltonian graphs with $\tau < 1$, implying that 1-toughness condition in Theorem 26 can not be relaxed. The Petersen graph shows that the condition "G is interval graph" in Theorem 26 can not be removed.

Theorem 27 (Kratsch, Lehel and Müller, 1996) [41]

Every $3/2$ -tough split graph is hamiltonian.

Examples for sharpness. In [41], $(3/2 - \epsilon)$ -tough split graphs are constructed that are not hamiltonian. There are non hamiltonian graphs with $\tau = 9/4 - \epsilon > 3/2$, implying that the condition "G is split graph" in Theorem 27 can not be removed.

Theorem 28 (Deogun, Kratsch and Steiner, 1997) [18]

Every 1-tough cocomparability graph is hamiltonian.

Examples for sharpness. Clearly, any complete graph is a comparability graph and hence, any empty graph is a cocomparability graph with $\tau < 1$, implying that the condition "G is 1-tough" in Theorem 28 can not be relaxed. On the other hand, there are 1-tough non hamiltonian non cocomparability graphs (otherwise, all 1-tough graphs are hamiltonian), implying that the condition "G is cocomparability graph" in Theorem 28 can not be removed.

Theorem 29 (Böhme, Harant and Tkáč, 1999) [10]

Every chordal, planar graph with $\tau > 1$ is hamiltonian.

Examples for sharpness. In [10], it is proved that for any $\epsilon > 0$, there is a 1-tough chordal planar graph G_ϵ such that the length of a longest cycle of G_ϵ is less than $\epsilon|V(G_\epsilon)|$, implying that the condition $\tau > 1$ in Theorem 29 can not be relaxed. Chvátal [14] obtained $(3/2 - \epsilon)$ -tough graphs without a 2-factor, implying that the planarity condition in Theorem 29 can not be removed. Finally, Harant [32] found $3/2$ -tough planar nonhamiltonian graphs, implying that the condition "G is chordal" in Theorem 29 can not be removed.

Theorem 30 (Kaiser, Král and Stacho, 2007) [36]
Every $3/2$ -tough spider (intersection) graph is hamiltonian.

Examples for sharpness. In [36], Kaiser, Král and Stacho constructed $(3/2 - \epsilon)$ -tough spider graphs that do not contain a Hamilton cycle, implying that the condition "G is $3/2$ -tough" in Theorem 30 can not be relaxed. On the other hand, the condition "G is spider graph" in Theorem 30 can not be removed since there are $3/2$ -tough nonhamiltonian graphs.

6.2 Dominating cycles

Theorem 31 (Nikoghosyan, 2011) [51]
Let G be a graph. Then each longest cycle in G is a dominating cycle if $\kappa \geq 2$ and

$$q \leq \begin{cases} 8 & \text{if } \delta = 2, \\ \frac{3(\delta-1)(\delta+2)-1}{2} & \text{if } \delta \geq 3. \end{cases}$$

Examples for sharpness. To show that Theorem 31 is sharp, suppose first that $\delta = 2$. The graph $K_1 + 2K_2$ shows that the connectivity condition $\kappa \geq 2$ in Theorem 31 can not be relaxed by replacing it with $\kappa \geq 1$. The graph with vertex set $\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_8\}$ and edge set

$$\{v_1v_2, v_2v_3, v_3v_4, v_4v_5, v_5v_6, v_6v_1, v_1v_7, v_7v_8, v_8v_4\},$$

shows that the size bound $q \leq 8$ can not be relaxed by replacing it with $q \leq 9$. Finally, the graph $K_2 + 3K_1$ shows that the conclusion "each longest cycle in G is a dominating cycle" can not be strengthened by replacing it with "G is hamiltonian". Analogously, we can use $K_1 + 2K_\delta$, $K_2 + 3K_{\delta-1}$ and $K_\delta + (\delta + 1)K_1$, respectively, to show that Theorem 31 is sharp when $\delta \geq 3$. So, Theorem 31 is best possible in all respects.

Theorem 32 (Nash-Williams, 1971) [43]
Let G be a graph. Then each longest cycle in G is a dominating cycle if $\kappa \geq 2$ and

$$\delta \geq \frac{n+2}{3}.$$

Examples for sharpness. $2K_3 + K_1$; $3K_{\delta-1} + K_2$; $H(1, 2, 4, 3)$.

The graph $2K_3 + K_1$ shows that the connectivity condition $\kappa \geq 2$ in Theorem 32 can not be replaced by $\kappa \geq 1$. The second graph shows that the minimum degree condition $\delta \geq (n+2)/3$ can not be replaced by $\delta \geq (n+1)/2$. Finally, the third graph shows that the conclusion "is a dominating cycle" can not be strengthened by replacing it with "is a Hamilton cycle".

Theorem 33 (Bigalke and Jung, 1979) [9]

Let G be a graph. Then each longest cycle in G is a dominating cycle if $\tau \geq 1$ and

$$\delta \geq \frac{n}{3}.$$

Examples for sharpness. $2(\kappa+1)K_2 + \kappa K_1$; L_3 ; G_n^* .

Theorem 34 (Yamashita, 2008) [58]

Let G be graph. Then each longest cycle in G is a dominating cycle if $\kappa \geq 3$ and

$$\delta \geq \frac{n + \kappa + 3}{4}.$$

Examples for sharpness. $3K_{\delta-1} + K_2$; $H(2, n-3\delta+3, \delta-1, \kappa)$; $H(1, 2, \kappa+1, \kappa)$.

6.3 CD_λ -cycles

Theorem 35 (Jung, 1990) [35]

Let G be a graph. Then each longest cycle in G is a CD_3 -cycle if $\kappa \geq 3$ and

$$\delta \geq \frac{n+6}{4}.$$

Examples for sharpness. $\lambda K_{\lambda+1} + K_{\lambda-1}$ ($\lambda \geq 2$); $(\lambda+1)K_{\delta-\lambda+1} + K_\lambda$ ($\lambda \geq 1$); $H(\lambda-1, \lambda, \lambda+2, \lambda+1)$ ($\lambda \geq 2$).

Theorem 36 (Nikoghosyan, 2009) [49]

Let G be a graph and λ a positive integer. Then each longest cycle in G is a $CD_{\min\{\lambda, \delta-\lambda+1\}}$ -cycle if $\kappa \geq \lambda$ and

$$\delta \geq \frac{n+2}{\lambda+1} + \lambda - 2.$$

Examples for sharpness. $\lambda K_{\lambda+1} + K_{\lambda-1}$ ($\lambda \geq 2$); $(\lambda+1)K_{\delta-\lambda+1} + K_\lambda$ ($\lambda \geq 1$); $H(\lambda-1, \lambda, \lambda+2, \lambda+1)$ ($\lambda \geq 2$).

6.4 Long cycles

Theorem 37 (Dirac, 1952) [19]

In every graph,

$$c \geq \delta + 1.$$

Example for sharpness. Join two copies of $K_{\delta+1}$ by an edge.

Theorem 38 (Kouider, 1994) [40]

In every graph,

$$c \geq \frac{n}{\lceil \alpha/\kappa \rceil}.$$

Example for sharpness. Complete bipartite graph with $\kappa = \alpha$ shows that the bound in Theorem 38 is sharp. The original result is formulated for 2-connected graphs. However, Theorem 38 is true under assumption that each vertex (edge) is a cycle of length one (two, respectively).

Theorem 39 (Nikoghosyan, 1998) [46]

Let G be a graph and C a longest cycle in G . Then

$$|C| \geq (\bar{p} + 2)(\delta - \bar{p}).$$

Example for sharpness. $(\kappa + 1)K_{\delta-\kappa+1} + K_\kappa$.

Theorem 40 (Nikoghosyan, 2000) [47]

Let G be a graph and C a longest cycle in G . Then

$$|C| \geq (\bar{c} + 1)(\delta - \bar{c} + 1).$$

Example for sharpness. $(\kappa + 1)K_{\delta-\kappa+1} + K_\kappa$.

Theorem 41 (Nikoghosyan, 2000) [48]

Let G be a graph with $\kappa \geq 2$ and C a longest cycle in G . If $\bar{c} \geq \kappa$ then

$$|C| \geq \frac{(\bar{c} + 1)\kappa}{\bar{c} + \kappa + 1}(\delta + 2).$$

Otherwise,

$$|C| \geq \frac{(\bar{c} + 1)\bar{c}}{2\bar{c} + 1}(\delta + 2).$$

Example for sharpness. $(\kappa + 1)K_{\delta-\kappa+1} + K_\kappa$.

6.5 Hamilton cycles and long cycles

Theorem 42 (Woodall, 1976) [57]

Let G be a graph and λ, t, r be integers with $n = t(\lambda - 1) + r + 1$, where $\lambda \geq 2$, $t \geq 0$ and $0 \leq r < \lambda - 1$. If

$$q > t \binom{\lambda}{2} + \binom{r+1}{2}$$

then

$$c > \lambda.$$

Example for sharpness. The result is best possible, in view of the graph consisting of t copies of K_λ and one copy of K_{r+1} , all having exactly one vertex in common.

Theorem 43 (Fan, Lv and Wang, 2004) [24]

Let G be a 2-connected graph and let $2 \leq \lambda \leq n - 1$. If

$$q > \max \left\{ f(n, 2, \lambda), f(n, \left\lfloor \frac{\lambda}{2} \right\rfloor, \lambda) \right\}$$

then

$$c > \lambda,$$

where $f(n, t, \lambda) = (\lambda + 1 - t)(\lambda - t)/2 + t(n - \lambda - 1 + t)$ and $2 \leq t \leq \lambda/2$.

Examples for sharpness. The result is best possible, in view of the graph obtained from $K_{\lambda+1-t}$ by adding $n - (\lambda + 1 - t)$ isolated vertices, each joined to the same t vertices of $K_{\lambda+1-t}$.

Theorem 44 (Alon, 1986) [1]

Let G be a graph and λ a positive integer. If $\delta \geq \frac{n}{\lambda+1}$ then

$$c \geq \frac{n}{\lambda}.$$

Examples for sharpness. $(\lambda + 1)K_\lambda + K_1$; $\lambda K_{\lambda+1}$.

Theorem 45 (Dirac, 1952) [19]

Let G be a graph. If $\kappa \geq 2$ then

$$c \geq \min\{n, 2\delta\}.$$

Examples for sharpness. $(\lambda + 1)K_{\lambda+1} + K_\lambda$ ($\lambda \geq 1$); $(\lambda + 3)K_{\lambda-1} + K_{\lambda+2}$ ($\lambda \geq 2$); $(\lambda + 2)K_\lambda + K_{\lambda+1}$ ($\lambda \geq 1$).

Theorem 46 (Kaneko and Yoshimoto, 1952) [37]

Let G be a 2-connected balanced bipartite graph. Then

$$c \geq \min\{n, 4\delta - 2\}.$$

Examples for sharpness. Clearly, the condition "G is balanced" in Theorem 46 can not be removed. Consider the balanced bipartite graph $G = (X, Y; E)$

with vertex classes of the form $X = P \cup Q$, $Y = R \cup S$ with $z \in Q$, where $|P| = |R| = |Q| = |S| = n/4$, $N_G(x) = R$ for all $x \in P$, $N_G(x) = S$ for all $x \in Q - z$ and $N_G(z) = Y$. This example shows that 2-connectivity condition in Theorem 46 cannot be weakened. Next, consider the balanced bipartite graph $G = (X, Y; E)$ with vertex classes of the form $X = P \cup Q$, $Y = R \cup S$, where $|P| = |R| = |Q| = |S| = n/4$, $N_G(x) = R$ for all $x \in P$, and $N_G(x) = Y$ for all $x \in Q$. This example shows that the bound $4\delta - 2$ in Theorem 46 cannot be improved.

Theorem 47 (Bauer and Schmeichel, 1987) [4]

Let G be a graph. If $\tau \geq 1$ then

$$c \geq \min\{n, 2\delta + 2\}.$$

Examples for sharpness. $K_{\delta, \delta+1}$; L_2 .

Theorem 48 (Nikoghosyan, 2012) [52]

Let G be a graph. If $\tau > 4/3$ then

$$c \geq \min\{n, 2\delta + 5\}.$$

Examples for sharpness. The Petersen graph shows that the condition $\tau > 4/3$ in Theorem 48 cannot be replaced by $\tau = 4/3$. Let H_1 be a complete bipartite graph with bipartition $V_1 = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5\}$ and $V_2 = \{y_1, y_2\}$, and let H_2 be a complete graph with vertex set $V = \{z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4, z_5\}$. The graph obtained from disjoint graphs H_1 and H_2 by adding the edges $x_i z_i$ ($i = 1, \dots, 5$), shows that the bound $c \geq 2\delta + 5$ in Theorem 48 can not be replaced by $c \geq 2\delta + 6$.

Theorem 49 (Nikoghosyan, 1981) [45]

Let G be a graph. If $\kappa \geq 3$ then

$$c \geq \min\{n, 3\delta - \kappa\}.$$

Examples for sharpness. $3K_{\delta-1} + K_2$; $H(1, \delta - \kappa + 1, \delta, \kappa)$.

Theorem 50 (Jung, 1977) [33]

Let G be a graph. If $\kappa \geq 3$ and $\delta \geq \alpha$ then

$$c \geq \min\{n, 3\delta - 3\}.$$

Examples for sharpness. $(\lambda + 2)K_{\lambda+2} + K_{\lambda+1}$; $(\lambda + 4)K_{\lambda} + K_{\lambda+3}$; $(\lambda + 3)K_{\lambda+1} + K_{\lambda+2}$.

Theorem 51 (Nikoghosyan, 2009) [49]

Let G be a graph and λ a positive integer. If $\kappa \geq \lambda + 2$ and $\delta \geq \alpha + \lambda - 1$ then

$$c \geq \min\{n, (\lambda + 2)(\delta - \lambda)\}.$$

Examples for sharpness. $(\lambda + 2)K_{\lambda+2} + K_{\lambda+1}$; $(\lambda + 4)K_{\lambda} + K_{\lambda+3}$; $(\lambda + 3)K_{\lambda+1} + K_{\lambda+2}$.

Theorem 52 (M.Zh. Nikoghosyan and Zh.G. Nikoghosyan, 2011) [44]
Let G be a graph. If $\kappa \geq 4$ and $\delta \geq \alpha$ then

$$c \geq \min\{n, 4\delta - \kappa - 4\}.$$

Examples for sharpness. $4K_{\delta-2} + K_3$; $H(1, 2, \kappa+1, \kappa)$; $H(2, n-3\delta+3, \delta-1, \kappa)$.

Theorem 53 (Bauer, Morgana, Schmeichel and Veldman, 1989) [3]
Let G be a graph. If $\kappa \geq 2$ and $\delta \geq \frac{n+2}{3}$ then

$$c \geq \min\{n, n + \delta - \alpha\}.$$

Examples for sharpness. $2K_{\delta} + K_1$; $3K_{\delta-1} + K_2$; $K_{2\delta-2, \delta}$.

Theorem 54 (Bauer, Schmeichel and Veldman, 1987) [6]
Let G be a graph. If $\tau \geq 1$ and $\delta \geq \frac{n}{3}$ then

$$c \geq \min\{n, n + \delta - \alpha + 1\}.$$

Examples for sharpness. $K_{\delta, \delta+1}$; L_{δ} ; G_n^* .

6.6 Dominating cycles and long cycles

Theorem 55 (Jung, 1981) [34]

Let G be a graph. If $\kappa \geq 3$ then either each longest cycle in G is a dominating cycle or

$$c \geq 3\delta - 3.$$

Examples for sharpness. $(\lambda + 1)K_{\lambda+1} + K_{\lambda}$ ($\lambda \geq 1$); $(\lambda + 3)K_{\lambda-1} + K_{\lambda+2}$ ($\lambda \geq 2$); $(\lambda + 2)K_{\lambda} + K_{\lambda+1}$ ($\lambda \geq 1$).

Theorem 56 (M.Zh. Nikoghosyan and Zh.G. Nikoghosyan, 2011) [44]

Let G be a graph. If $\kappa \geq 4$ then either each longest cycle in G is a dominating cycle or

$$c \geq 4\delta - \kappa - 4.$$

Examples for sharpness. $4K_{\delta-2} + K_3$; $H(2, \delta - \kappa + 1, \delta - 1, \kappa)$; $H(1, 2, \kappa + 1, \kappa)$.

6.7 CD_{λ} -cycles and long cycles

Theorem 57 (Nikoghosyan, 2009) [49]

Let G be a graph and λ a positive integer. If $\kappa \geq \lambda + 1$ then either each longest cycle in G is a $CD_{\min\{\lambda, \delta - \lambda\}}$ -cycle or

$$c \geq (\lambda + 1)(\delta - \lambda + 1).$$

Examples for sharpness. $(\lambda + 1)K_{\lambda+1} + K_{\lambda}$ ($\lambda \geq 1$); $(\lambda + 3)K_{\lambda-1} + K_{\lambda+2}$ ($\lambda \geq 2$); $(\lambda + 2)K_{\lambda} + K_{\lambda+1}$ ($\lambda \geq 1$).

References

- [1] N. Alon, The longest cycle of a graph with a large minimum degree, *J. Graph Theory* 10 (1986) 123-127.
- [2] D. Bauer, S.L. Hakimi and E. Schmeichel, Recognizing tough graphs is *NP*-hard, *Discrete Appl. Math.* 28 (1990) 191-195.
- [3] D. Bauer, A. Morgana, E. Schmeichel and H.J. Veldman, Long cycles in graphs with large degree sums, *Discrete Math.* 79 (1989/90) 59-70.
- [4] D. Bauer and E. Schmeichel, Long cycles in tough graphs, preprint (1987).
- [5] D. Bauer and E. Schmeichel, On a theorem of Häggkvist and Nicoghossian, *Graph Theory, Combinatorics, Algorithms and Applications* (1991) 20-25.
- [6] D. Bauer, E. Schmeichel and H.J. Veldman, A generalization of a theorem of Bigalke and Jung, *Ars Combinatoria*, v.26 (1988) 53-58.
- [7] P. Bedrossian, Forbidden subgraphs and minimum degree conditions for hamiltonicity, PhD thesis, Memphis State University, 1991.
- [8] J.C. Bermond, Hamiltonian graphs, In: Beineke and Wilson, *Selected topics in graph theory*, Academic press, London (1978).
- [9] A. Bigalke and H.A. Jung, Über Hamiltonische Kreise und unabhängige Ecken in Graphen, *Monatsh. Math.* 88 (1979) 195-210.
- [10] T. Böhme, J. Harant and M. Tkáč, More than one tough chordal planar graphs are hamiltonian, *J. Graph Theory* 32 (1999) 405-410.
- [11] J.A. Bondy, Integrity in graph theory, in: G. Chartrand, Y. Alavi, D.L. Goldsmith, L. Lesniak-Foster, D.R. Lick (Eds.), *In the Theory and Application of Graphs*, Wiley, New York, 1981, pp. 117-125. MR83e:05070.
- [12] J.A. Bondy and U.S.R. Murty, *Graph Theory with Applications*, Macmillan, London and Elsevier, New York (1976).
- [13] H. Broersma and H.J. Veldman, Restrictions on induced subgraphs ensuring Hamiltonicity of $K_{1,3}$ -free graphs, in: *Contemporary methods in graph theory*, Bibliographisches Inst., Mannheim (1990) 181-194.
- [14] V. Chvátal, Tough graphs and Hamiltonian circuits, *Discrete Math.* 5 (1973) 215-228.

- [15] V. Chvátal and P. Erdős, A note on hamiltonian circuits, *Discrete Math.* 2 (1972) 111-113.
- [16] S.A. Cook, The Complexity of Theorem-Proving Procedures, *Proceedings, Third Annual ACM Symposium on the theory of computing*, ACM, New York (1971) 151-158.
- [17] W.H. Cunningham, Computing the binding number of a graph, *Discrete Math.* 80 (1990) 283-285.
- [18] J.S. Deogun, D. Kratsch and G. Steiner, 1-Tough cocomparability graphs are hamiltonian, *Discrete Math.* 170 (1997) 99-106.
- [19] G.A. Dirac, Some theorems on abstract graphs, *Proc. London, Math. Soc.* 2 (1952) 69-81.
- [20] D. Duffus, M.S. Jacobson and R.J. Gould, Forbidden subgraphs and the Hamiltonian theme, in: *The theory and applications of graphs (Kalamazoo, Mich., 1980)* 297-316, Wiley, New York, 1981.
- [21] S. Even and R.E. Tarjan, Network flow and testing graph connectivity, *SIAM journal of computing*, 4 (1975) 507-518.
- [22] P. Erdős, Remarks on a paper of Pösa, *Magyar Tud. Akad. Mat. Kutató Int. Közl.* 7 (1962) 227-229.
- [23] P. Erdős and T. Gallai, On maximal paths and circuits of graphs, *Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar.* 10 (1959) 337-356.
- [24] G. Fan, X. Lv and P. Wang, Cycles in 2-connected graphs, *J. of Combin. Theory ser. B*92 (2004) 379-394.
- [25] R.J. Faudree and R.J. Gould, Characterizing forbidden pairs for Hamilton properties, *Discrete Math.* 173 (1997) 45-60.
- [26] R. Faudree, R. Gould, Z. Ryjáček and I. Schiermeyer, Forbidden subgraphs and pancyclicity, in: *Proceedings of the twenty-sixth Southeastern International Conference on Combinatorics, Graph Theory and Computing (Boca Raton, FL, 1995)* v. 109 (1995) 13-32.
- [27] H. Fleischner, The square of every two-connected graph is hamiltonian, *J. Combin. Theory Ser B*16 (1974) 29-34.
- [28] P. Fraisse, D_λ -cycles and their applications for Hamiltonian graphs, *Universite de Paris-sud*, preprint (1986).
- [29] M.R. Garey and D.S. Johnson, *Computers and Intractability: A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness*. New York: W.H. Freeman, 1983.
- [30] R.J. Gould, Updating the Hamiltonian Problem - A survey, *J. Graph Theory* 15 (1991) 121-157.

- [31] R.J. Gould, Advances on the Hamiltonian Problem - A survey, *Graphs and Combinatorics* 19 (2003) 7-52.
- [32] J. Harant, Toughness and nonhamiltonicity of polyhedral graphs, *Discrete Math.* 113 (1993) 249-253.
- [33] H.A. Jung, On maximal cycles in finite graphs, *Annals of Discrete Math.* 3 (1978) 129-144.
- [34] H.A. Jung, Longest circuits in 3-connected graphs, *Coll. Math. Soc. J. Bolyai* 37, Finite and infinite sets, Eger (1981) 403-438.
- [35] H.A. Jung, Long Cycles in Graphs with Moderate Connectivity, *Topics in combinatorics and graph theory*, R.Bodendieck and R.Henn (Editors), Phisika Verlag, Heidelberg (1990) 765-778.
- [36] T. Kaiser, D. Král and L. Stacho, Tough spiders, *J. Graph Theory* 56 (2007) 23-40.
- [37] A. Kaneko and K. Yoshimoto, On longest cycles in a 2-connected bipartite graph with Ore type condition, I (preprint) 2002.
- [38] R.M. Karp, Reducibility Among Computational Problems, in R.E. Miller and J.W. Thatcher (editors), *Complexity of Computer Computations*, Plenum (1972) 85-103.
- [39] J.M. Keil, Finding hamiltonian circuits in interval graphs, *Inf. Proc. Let.* 20 (1985) 201-206.
- [40] M. Kouider, Cycles in graphs with prescribed stability number and connectivity, *J. Combin. Theory, Ser. B* 60 (1994) 315-318.
- [41] D. Kratsch, J. Lehel and H. Müller, Toughness, hamiltonicity and split graphs, *Discrete Math.* 150 (1996) 231-245.
- [42] J.W. Moon and L. Moser, On hamiltonian bipartite graphs, *Israel J. Math.*, 1 (1963) 163-165.
- [43] C.St.J.A. Nash-Williams, Edge-disjoint hamiltonian cycles in graphs with vertices of large valency, in: L. Mirsky, ed., "Studies in Pure Mathematics", pp. 157-183, Academic Press, San Diego/London (1971).
- [44] M.Zh. Nikoghosyan and Zh.G. Nikoghosyan, Large cycles in 4-connected graphs, *Discrete Math.* 311 (2011) 302-306.
- [45] Zh.G. Nikoghosyan, On maximal cycle of a graph, *DAN Arm. SSR v. LXXII* 2 (1981) 82-87 (in Russian).
- [46] Zh.G. Nikoghosyan, Path-Extensions and Long Cycles in Graphs, *Transactions of the Institute for Informatics and Automation Problems of the NAS (Republic of Armenia) and Yerevan State University, Mathematical Problems of Computer Science* 19 (1998) 25-31.

- [47] Zh.G. Nikoghosyan, Cycle-Extensions and Long Cycles in Graphs, Transactions of the Institute for Informatics and Automation Problems of the NAS (Republic of Armenia) and Yerevan State University, Mathematical Problems of Computer Science 21 (2000) 121-128.
- [48] Zh.G. Nikoghosyan, Cycle-Extensions and Long Cycles in k -connected Graphs, Transactions of the Institute for Informatics and Automation Problems of the NAS (Republic of Armenia) and Yerevan State University, Mathematical Problems of Computer Science 21 (2000) 129-155.
- [49] Zh.G. Nikoghosyan, Dirac-type generalizations concerning large cycles in graphs, Discrete Math. 309 (2009) 1925-1930.
- [50] Zh.G. Nikoghosyan, A size bound for Hamilton cycles, Preprint available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/1107.2201v1> [math.CO] 12 Jul 2011.
- [51] Zh.G. Nikoghosyan, A size upper bound for dominating cycles, Preprint available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/1112.2467v1> [math.CO] 12 Dec 2011.
- [52] Zh.G. Nikoghosyan, A sharp bound for the Circumference in t -tough graphs with $t > 1$, Preprint available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/1204.6515v1> [math.CO] 29 Apr 2012.
- [53] O. Ore, A note on hamiltonian circuits, Am. Math. Month. 67 (1960) 55.
- [54] R. Thomas and X. Yu, 4-connected projective-plane graphs are hamiltonian, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B62 (1994) 114-132.
- [55] W.T. Tutte, A theorem on planar graphs, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 82 (1956) 99-116.
- [56] D.R. Woodall, The binding number of a graph and its Anderson numbers, J. Combin. Theory Ser. b15 (1973) 225-255.
- [57] D.R. Woodall, Maximal circuits of graphs, I, Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar. 28 (1976) 77-80.
- [58] T. Yamashita, A degree sum condition with connectivity for relative length of longest paths and cycles, Discrete Math. 309 (23-24) (2009) 6503-6507.

Institute for Informatics and Automation Problems
National Academy of Sciences
P. Sevak 1, Yerevan 0014, Armenia
E-mail: zhora@ipia.sci.am