

Uniquely restricted matchings in subcubic graphs

Maximilian Fürst² Michael A. Henning^{1,*} Dieter Rautenbach²

¹Department of Pure and Applied Mathematics

University of Johannesburg
Auckland Park, 2006 South Africa

Email: mahenning@uj.ac.za

²Institute of Optimization and Operations Research

Ulm University, Ulm, Germany

Email: maximilian.fuerst, dieter.rautenbach@uni-ulm.de

Abstract

A matching M in a graph G is uniquely restricted if no other matching in G covers the same set of vertices. We conjecture that every connected subcubic graph with m edges and b bridges that is distinct from $K_{3,3}$ has a uniquely restricted matching of size at least $\frac{m+b}{6}$, and we establish this bound with b replaced by the number of bridges that lie on a path between two vertices of degree at most 2. Moreover, we prove that every connected subcubic graph of order n and girth at least 7 has a uniquely restricted matching of size at least $\frac{n-1}{3}$, which partially confirms a Conjecture of Fürst and Rautenbach (Some bounds on the uniquely restricted matching number, arXiv:1803.11032).

Keywords: Matching; uniquely restricted matching; subcubic; bridge; girth

AMS subject classification: 05C70

*Research supported in part by the South African National Research Foundation and the University of Johannesburg

1 Introduction

We consider only simple, finite, and undirected graphs, and use standard terminology. A matching M in a graph G is *uniquely restricted* [4] if no other matching in G covers the same set of vertices, and M is *acyclic* [3] if the subgraph induced by the set of vertices of G covered by M is a forest. The maximum sizes of a matching, a uniquely restricted matching, and an acyclic matching are denoted by $\nu(G)$, $\nu_{ur}(G)$, and $\nu_{ac}(G)$, respectively. While unrestricted matchings are tractable [6], uniquely restricted matchings and acyclic matchings are both NP-hard in general [3,4], and uniquely restricted matchings are also NP-hard in bipartite subcubic graphs [7]. This motivates the search for tight lower bounds. Golumbic, Hirst, and Lewenstein [4] observed that a matching M in a graph G is uniquely restricted if and only if there is no M -alternating cycle in G , which implies $\nu_{ur}(G) \geq \nu_{ac}(G)$. Hence, the main result in [1] implies the following.

Theorem 1. *If G is a connected cubic graph with m edges that is distinct from $K_{3,3}$, then $\nu_{ur}(G) \geq \frac{m}{6}$.*

Since bridges lie in no cycles, and, in particular, in no M -alternating cycles, we believe that this result can be improved as follows.

Conjecture 2. *If G is a connected subcubic graph with m edges and b bridges that is distinct from $K_{3,3}$, then $\nu_{ur}(G) \geq \frac{m+b}{6}$.*

The bound in Conjecture 2 is achieved with equality for every subcubic graph G that arises from a subcubic tree T with matching number $\frac{n(T)-1}{3}$, by replacing some of the vertices of degree 1 in T with endblocks isomorphic to $K_{2,3}$, see Figure 2. Note that there are infinitely many subcubic trees with matching number $\frac{n(T)-1}{3}$ [5]. In fact, if we perform k such replacements, then G has size $m = n(T) - 1 + 6k$ and $b = n(T) - 1$ bridges. Since a uniquely restricted matching can contain at most one edge from each $K_{2,3}$ subgraph, it follows easily that $\nu_{ur}(G) = \frac{n(T)-1}{3} + k = \frac{m+b}{6}$.




Figure 1: A graph where Conjecture 2 is tight.

We prove the following weakening of Conjecture 2.

A bridge in a graph is *good* if it lies on a path between two vertices of degree at most 2.

Theorem 3. *If G is a connected subcubic graph with m edges and b good bridges that is distinct from $K_{3,3}$, then $\nu_{ur}(G) \geq \frac{m+b}{6}$.*

Since every bridge in the graphs constructed above is good, Theorem 3 is also tight for these graphs. Fürst and Rautenbach [2] conjectured that $\nu_{ur}(G) \geq \frac{n-1}{3}$ for every connected subcubic graph G of girth at least 5. We prove this conjecture for graphs of girth at least 7.

Theorem 4. *If G is a connected subcubic graph of order n and girth at least 7, then $\nu_{ur}(G) \geq \frac{n-1}{3}$.*

The next section contains the proofs of our two results.

2 Proofs of Theorem 3 and Theorem 4

We immediately proceed to the proof of Theorem 3.

Proof of Theorem 3. Suppose, for a contradiction, that G is a counterexample of minimum size m . Clearly, G has order at least 2. Since no bridge in a cubic graph is good, Theorem 1 implies that G is not cubic.

Claim 1. *The minimum degree of G is 2.*

Proof of Claim 1: Suppose, for a contradiction, that u is a vertex of degree 1. Let v be the neighbor of u . Let $G' = G - \{u, v\}$ have m' edges and b' good bridges, see Figure 2. Clearly, $m' \geq m - 3$, and v is incident with at most 3 good bridges. Furthermore, since every vertex in $N_G(v) \setminus \{u\}$ has degree less than 3 in G' , every good bridge of G that belongs to G' is also a good bridge of G' . This implies $b' \geq b - 3$. Since adding uv to a uniquely restricted matching in G' yields a uniquely restricted matching in G , the choice of G implies the contradiction $\nu_{ur}(G) \geq \nu_{ur}(G') + 1 \geq \frac{m'+b'}{6} + 1 \geq \frac{m+b}{6}$. \square




Figure 2: An illustration for Claim 1.

Claim 2. *No triangle in G contains two vertices of degree 2.*

Proof of Claim 2: Suppose, for a contradiction, that uvw is a triangle in G such that u and v have degree 2. Let $G' = G - \{u, v\}$ have m' edges and b' good bridges, see Figure 3. Clearly, $m' \geq m - 3$, and neither u nor v is incident with a bridge. Again, every good bridge of G that belongs to G' is also a good bridge of G' , which implies $b' \geq b$. Since adding uv to a uniquely restricted matching in G' yields a uniquely restricted matching in G , the choice of G implies the contradiction $\nu_{ur}(G) \geq \nu_{ur}(G') + 1 \geq \frac{m'+b'}{6} + 1 > \frac{m+b}{6}$. \square




Figure 3: An illustration for Claim 2.

Claim 3. *No two vertices of degree 2 are adjacent in G .*

Proof of Claim 3: Suppose, for a contradiction, that uv is an edge in G such that u and v both have degree 2. Let u' be the neighbor of u distinct from v , and let $N_G(u') = \{u, w, w'\}$.

First, we assume that uv is not a good bridge. Let $G' = G - \{u, v, u'\}$ have m' edges and b' good bridges, see the left of Figure 4. Clearly, $m' \geq m - 5$. Since u and v have degree 2, the edge incident

with v distinct from uv as well as the edge uu' are not good bridges. If $u'w$ and $u'w'$ are both good bridges, then, necessarily, also uv would be a bridge, and, in view of the degrees of u and v , the edge uv would be a good bridge, which is a contradiction. Therefore, u' is incident with at most one good bridge. As before, every good bridge of G that belongs to G' is also a good bridge of G' , which implies $b' \geq b-1$. Since adding uv to a uniquely restricted matching in G' yields a uniquely restricted matching in G , the choice of G implies the contradiction $\nu_{ur}(G) \geq \nu_{ur}(G') + 1 \geq \frac{m'+b'}{6} + 1 \geq \frac{m+b}{6}$.

Hence, we may assume that uv is a good bridge. Let $G' = G - \{u, v\}$ have m' edges and b' good bridges, see the right of Figure 4. Clearly, $m' \geq m - 3$. As before, every good bridge of G that belongs to G' is also a good bridge of G' , which implies $b' \geq b - 3$. Since adding uv to a uniquely restricted matching in G' yields a uniquely restricted matching in G , the choice of G implies the contradiction $\nu_{ur}(G) \geq \nu_{ur}(G') + 1 \geq \frac{m'+b'}{6} + 1 \geq \frac{m+b}{6}$. \square



Figure 4: An illustration for Claim 3. The label “ b ” indicates a good bridge, while the label “ \bar{b} ” indicates an edge that is not a good bridge.

Let v be a vertex of degree 2. Let u and w be the neighbors of v .

Claim 4. u and w are not adjacent.

Proof of Claim 4: Suppose, for a contradiction, that u and w are adjacent. Clearly, both u and w are incident with at most one good bridge and v is incident with no good bridge.

First, we assume that w is incident with exactly one good bridge. Let $G' = G - \{u, v\}$ have m' edges and b' good bridges, see the left of Figure 5. Clearly, $m' \geq m - 4$. As before, every good bridge of G that belongs to G' is also a good bridge of G' , which implies $b' \geq b - 1$. Since adding uv to a uniquely restricted matching in G' yields a uniquely restricted matching in G , the choice of G implies the contradiction $\nu_{ur}(G) \geq \nu_{ur}(G') + 1 \geq \frac{m'+b'}{6} + 1 > \frac{m+b}{6}$.

Hence, by symmetry between u and w , we may assume that neither u nor w is incident with a good bridge. Let $G' = G - \{u, v, w\}$ have m' edges and b' good bridges, see the right of Figure 5. Clearly, $m' \geq m - 5$. As before, every good bridge of G that belongs to G' is also a good bridge of G' , which implies $b' \geq b$. Since adding uv to a uniquely restricted matching in G' yields a uniquely restricted matching in G , the choice of G implies the contradiction $\nu_{ur}(G) \geq \nu_{ur}(G') + 1 \geq \frac{m'+b'}{6} + 1 > \frac{m+b}{6}$. \square



Figure 5: An illustration for Claim 4.

Claim 5. u and w have at most two common neighbors.

Proof of Claim 5: Suppose, for a contradiction, that u and w have three common neighbors. Let $G' = G - \{u, v, w\}$ have m' edges and b' good bridges. Since $m' \geq m - 6$, $b' \geq b$, and adding uw to a uniquely restricted matching in G' yields a uniquely restricted matching in G , the choice of G implies the contradiction $\nu_{ur}(G) \geq \nu_{ur}(G') + 1 \geq \frac{m'+b'}{6} + 1 \geq \frac{m+b}{6}$. \square

Claim 6. v is the only common neighbor of u and w .

Proof of Claim 6: Suppose, for a contradiction, that u and w have two common neighbors.

First, we assume that u is incident with a good bridge uu' . Let $G' = G - \{u, v, w, u'\}$ have m' edges and b' good bridges, see the left of Figure 6. Since $m' \geq m - 8$, $b' \geq b - 4$, and adding uu' as well as vw to a uniquely restricted matching in G' yields a uniquely restricted matching in G , the choice of G implies the contradiction $\nu_{ur}(G) \geq \nu_{ur}(G') + 2 \geq \frac{m'+b'}{6} + 2 \geq \frac{m+b}{6}$.

Hence, we may assume that neither u nor w is incident with a good bridge. Let $G' = G - \{u, v, w\}$ have m' edges and b' good bridges, see the right of Figure 6. Since $m' \geq m - 6$, $b' \geq b$, and adding vw to a uniquely restricted matching in G' yields a uniquely restricted matching in G , the choice of G implies the contradiction $\nu_{ur}(G) \geq \nu_{ur}(G') + 1 \geq \frac{m'+b'}{6} + 1 \geq \frac{m+b}{6}$. \square



Figure 6: An illustration for Claim 6.

Claim 7. At most one of the two edges incident with v is a good bridge.

Proof of Claim 7: Suppose, for a contradiction, that uv and vw are both good bridges. Let $N_G(u) = \{v, u', u''\}$.

First, we assume that uu' and uu'' are both not good bridges. Let $G' = G - \{u, v\}$ have m' edges and b' good bridges, see the left of Figure 7. Since $m' \geq m - 4$, $b' \geq b - 2$, and adding uv to a uniquely restricted matching in G' yields a uniquely restricted matching in G , the choice of G implies the contradiction $\nu_{ur}(G) \geq \nu_{ur}(G') + 1 \geq \frac{m'+b'}{6} + 1 \geq \frac{m+b}{6}$.

Hence, we may assume that uu' is a good bridge. Let $G' = G - \{u, v\} + \{u'w\}$ have m' edges and b' good bridges, see the right of Figure 7. Clearly, $m' \geq m - 3$. Since uu' and vw are good bridges of G , the newly inserted edge $u'w$ is a good bridge of G' . Note that this also implies that every good bridge of G that belongs to G' is a good bridge of G' . Since u is incident with at most 3 good bridges, we obtain $b' \geq b - 3$. Let M' be a uniquely restricted matching in G' . If $u'w \notin M'$, then let $M = M' \cup \{uv\}$; otherwise, let $M = (M' \setminus \{u'w\}) \cup \{uu', vw\}$. Since M is a uniquely restricted matching in G , the choice of G implies the contradiction $\nu_{ur}(G) \geq \nu_{ur}(G') + 1 \geq \frac{m'+b'}{6} + 1 \geq \frac{m+b}{6}$. \square



Figure 7: An illustration for Claim 7.

Claim 8. *No edge incident with v is a good bridge.*

Proof of Claim 8: Suppose, for a contradiction, that uv is a good bridge but vw is not.

First, we assume that u is incident with an edge that is not a good bridge. Let $G' = G - \{u, v\}$ have m' edges and b' good bridges, see the left of Figure 8. Since $m' \geq m - 4$, $b' \geq b - 2$, and adding uv to a uniquely restricted matching in G' yields a uniquely restricted matching in G , the choice of G implies the contradiction $\nu_{ur}(G) \geq \nu_{ur}(G') + 1 \geq \frac{m'+b'}{6} + 1 \geq \frac{m+b}{6}$.

Hence, we may assume that all three edges incident with u are good bridges. For a neighbor u' of u distinct from v , let the graph $G' = G - \{u, v\} + \{u'w\}$ have m' edges and b' good bridges, see the right of Figure 8. Note that $u'w$ is not a good bridge of G' , because, otherwise, vw would be a good bridge of G . Nevertheless, we obtain $m' \geq m - 3$ and $b' \geq b - 3$. Let M' be a uniquely restricted matching in G' . If $u'w \notin M'$, then let $M = M' \cup \{uw\}$; otherwise, let $M = (M' \setminus \{u'w\}) \cup \{uu', vw\}$. Since M is a uniquely restricted matching in G , the choice of G implies the contradiction $\nu_{ur}(G) \geq \nu_{ur}(G') + 1 \geq \frac{m'+b'}{6} + 1 \geq \frac{m+b}{6}$. \square



Figure 8: An illustration for Claim 8.

Now, we are in a position to derive the final contradiction.

First, we assume that u and w are both not incident with any good bridge. Let $G' = G - \{u, v, w\}$ have m' edges and b' good bridges, see the left of Figure 9. Since $m' \geq m - 6$, $b' \geq b$, and adding uv to a uniquely restricted matching in G' yields a uniquely restricted matching in G , the choice of G implies the contradiction $\nu_{ur}(G) \geq \nu_{ur}(G') + 1 \geq \frac{m'+b'}{6} + 1 \geq \frac{m+b}{6}$.

Next, we assume that u is incident with two good bridges. Let $G' = G - \{u, v\}$ have m' edges and b' good bridges, see the middle of Figure 9. Since $m' \geq m - 4$, $b' \geq b - 2$, and adding uv to a uniquely restricted matching in G' yields a uniquely restricted matching in G , the choice of G implies the contradiction $\nu_{ur}(G) \geq \nu_{ur}(G') + 1 \geq \frac{m'+b'}{6} + 1 \geq \frac{m+b}{6}$.

Hence, by symmetry between u and w , we may assume that u is incident with exactly one good bridge uu' , and that w is incident with at most one good bridge. Let $G' = G - \{u, v, w, u'\}$ have m' edges and b' good bridges, see the right of Figure 9. Since $m' \geq m - 8$, $b' \geq b - 4$, and adding uu' as well as vw to a uniquely restricted matching in G' yields a uniquely restricted matching in G , the choice of G implies the contradiction $\nu_{ur}(G) \geq \nu_{ur}(G') + 2 \geq \frac{m'+b'}{6} + 2 \geq \frac{m+b}{6}$, which completes the proof.




Figure 9: An illustration of the final contradiction.

□

In order to prove Theorem 4, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 5. *If G is a connected subcubic graph of order n and girth at least 7 that is not a tree and not cubic, then $\nu_{ur}(G) \geq \frac{n}{3}$.*

Proof. Suppose, for a contradiction, that G is a counterexample of minimum order.

First, we assume that G has a vertex u of degree 1. Let v be the unique neighbor of u , and let $G' = G - \{u, v\}$. Note that G' has at most 2 components, none of which is cubic. Since G is not a tree, at most one component of G' is a tree, and such a component K has a uniquely restricted matching of size at least $\frac{n(K)-1}{3}$. Therefore, since adding uv to a uniquely restricted matching in G' yields a uniquely restricted matching in G , we obtain the contradiction $\nu_{ur}(G) \geq \nu_{ur}(G') + 1 \geq \frac{n-2-1}{3} + 1 = \frac{n}{3}$. Hence, we may assume that G has minimum degree 2.

Let $P : u_1v_1u_2v_2 \dots u_kv_ku_{k+1}$ be a maximal path in G such that the vertices v_1, \dots, v_k all have degree 2 in G . Let $G' = G - V(P)$, let \mathcal{T} be the set of components of G' that are trees, and let $c = |\mathcal{T}|$, see Figure 10. If T is in \mathcal{T} , then the minimum degree of G implies that there are at least two edges between $V(P)$ and $V(T)$. Since there are at most $k+3$ edges between $V(P)$ and $V(G')$, we obtain $c \leq \frac{k+3}{2}$. If $c \leq k-1$, then, since adding u_1v_1, \dots, u_kv_k to a uniquely restricted matching in G' yields a uniquely restricted matching in G , we obtain the contradiction $\nu_{ur}(G) \geq \nu_{ur}(G') + k \geq \frac{n-n(P)-c}{3} + k \geq \frac{n-(2k+1)-(k-1)}{3} + k = \frac{n}{3}$. Hence, we may assume that $c \geq k$, which, together with $c \leq \frac{k+3}{2}$, implies that $k \leq 3$.

Let E be the set of edges of G between $V(P)$ and a component in \mathcal{T} . If neither u_1 nor u_{k+1} are incident with an edge in E , then $c \leq \frac{k-1}{2}$, contradicting $c \geq k$. Hence, by symmetry, we may assume that u_1w belongs to E . Let T be the component of G' that contains w .

If $k \leq 2$, then, by the girth condition, u_1w is the only edge in E incident with w . By the maximality of P , it follows that w has degree 3 in G . This implies that T has two endvertices x and y . Since $k \leq 2$, we may assume, by symmetry, that x is adjacent to u_1 . Again using the girth condition, we obtain that x is incident with exactly one edge in E . This implies that x has degree 2 in G , and, if z is the neighbor of x in T , then the path $zxu_1v_1 \dots u_kv_ku_{k+1}$ contradicts the maximality of P . Hence, we may assume that $k = 3$.

Since E contains at most 6 edges, $c = 3$, and every component in \mathcal{T} is incident with at least two edges in E , all edges of G that are incident with a vertex of P and do not belong to P , belong to E , and between $V(P)$ and every tree in \mathcal{T} there are exactly two edges.

Let u_2w' be in E , and let T' be the component of G' that contains w' . By the girth condition, u_2w' is the only edge in E incident with w' . This implies that T' has an endvertex x' distinct from w' . Since there are exactly two edges between $V(P)$ and $V(T')$, the maximality of P implies that x'

is adjacent to u_3 . If the two trees in $\mathcal{T} \setminus \{T'\}$ are isolated vertices, then G contains a cycle of length 4, which is a contradiction. Hence, $\mathcal{T} \setminus \{T'\}$ contains a tree T'' that has at least two endvertices w'' and x'' . By symmetry, we may assume that x'' is adjacent to u_1 . Since x'' is incident with only one edge in E , it has degree 2 in G , and, if z'' is the neighbor of x'' in T'' , then the path $z''x''u_1v_1 \dots u_kv_ku_{k+1}$ contradicts the maximality of P . \square




Figure 10: An illustration of Lemma 5.

It is now straightforward to prove Theorem 4.

Proof of Theorem 4. Suppose, for a contradiction, that G is a counterexample of minimum order.

First, we assume that G has a vertex u of degree 1. Let v be the unique neighbor of u , and let $G' = G - \{u, v\}$. Since G has order $n - 2$ and at most 2 components, and adding uv to a uniquely restricted matching in G' yields a uniquely restricted matching in G , we obtain the contradiction $\nu_{ur}(G) \geq \nu_{ur}(G') + 1 \geq \frac{n-2-2}{3} + 1 = \frac{n-1}{3}$. Hence, we may assume that G has minimum degree 2. By Lemma 5, we may assume that G is cubic. Let u be an endvertex of some spanning tree of G , and let $G' = G - u$. Clearly, G' is connected, subcubic and not cubic, and it is not a tree. Since every uniquely restricted matching in G' is a uniquely restricted matching in G , Lemma 5 implies $\nu_{ur}(G) \geq \nu_{ur}(G') \geq \frac{n-1}{3}$, which completes the proof. \square

References

- [1] M. Fürst and D. Rautenbach, A lower bound on the acyclic matching number of subcubic graphs, arXiv:1710.10076.
- [2] M. Fürst and D. Rautenbach, Some bounds on the uniquely restricted matching number, arXiv:1803.11032.
- [3] W. Goddard, S.M. Hedetniemi, S.T. Hedetniemi, and R. Laskar, Generalized subgraph-restricted matchings in graphs, Discrete Mathematics 293 (2005) 129-138
- [4] M.C. Golumbic, T. Hirst, and M. Lewenstein, Uniquely restricted matchings, Algorithmica 31 (2001) 139-154.
- [5] M.A. Henning and A. Yeo, Tight lower bounds on the matching number in a graph with given maximum degree, arXiv:1604.05020, to appear in Journal of Graph Theory.

- [6] L. Lovász and M.D. Plummer, Matching Theory, vol. 29, Annals of Discrete Mathematics, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1986.
- [7] S. Mishra, On the maximum uniquely restricted matching for bipartite graphs, Electronic Notes in Discrete Mathematics 37 (2011) 345-350.