

Polyhedra without cubic vertices are prism-hamiltonian

Simon Špacapan*

April 12, 2021

Abstract

The prism over a graph G is the Cartesian product of G with the complete graph on two vertices. A graph G is prism-hamiltonian if the prism over G is hamiltonian. We prove that every polyhedral graph (i.e. 3-connected planar graph) of minimum degree at least four is prism-hamiltonian.

Key words: Hamiltonian cycle, circuit graph

AMS subject classification (2010): 05C10, 05C45

1 Introduction

The study of hamiltonicity of planar graphs is largely concerned with finding subclasses of 3-connected planar graphs for which each member of the subclass is hamiltonian or has some hamiltonian-type property. One such result was obtained in 1956 by Tutte who proved that all 4-connected planar graphs are hamiltonian [21]. Although not every 3-connected planar graph is hamiltonian it is possible to prove that this class of graphs satisfies (hamiltonian-type) properties weaker than hamiltonicity. A 2-walk in a graph is a closed spanning walk that visits every vertex at most twice. Clearly, every hamiltonian graph has a 2-walk. In [8] Gao and Richter proved that every 3-connected planar graph has a 2-walk.

There is an extensive list of non-hamiltonian 3-connected planar graphs with special properties, such as graphs with small order and size [2], plane triangulations [15], regular graphs [20, 22], $K_{2,6}$ -minor-free graphs [6], and graphs with few 3-cuts [4]. However some classes of graphs mentioned above are prism-hamiltonian. For example every plane triangulation is prism-hamiltonian [3], and every cubic 3-connected graph is prism-hamiltonian [5],[16]. It is well known that every prism-hamiltonian graph has a 2-walk, so the result obtained in [3] strengthens the result of Gao and Richter mentioned above.

Rosenfeld and Barnette [17] conjectured that every 3-connected planar graph is prism-hamiltonian (see also [11]). This conjecture was recently refuted in [18] where

*University of Maribor, FME, Smetanova 17, 2000 Maribor, Slovenia. e-mail: simon.spacapan@um.si.

vertex degrees play a central role in construction of counterexamples. In particular every counterexample to Rosenfeld-Barnette conjecture given in [18] has many cubic vertices and two vertices of “high” degree (linear in order of the graph). In [9] the authors show that there is an infinite family of 3-connected planar graphs, each of them not prism-hamiltonian, such that the ratio of cubic vertices tends to 1 when the order goes to infinity, and maximum degree stays bounded by 36.

Vertex degrees in relation to hamiltonicity properties are discussed already by Ore in [13] and later by Jackson and Wormald in [10]. Let $\sigma_k(G)$ be the minimum sum of vertex degrees of an independent set of k vertices. Ore showed that $\sigma_2(G) \geq n$ implies that G is hamiltonian, and Jackson and Wormald showed that $\sigma_3(G) \geq n$ implies that G has a 2-walk (provided that G is connected). This was strenghtened by Ozeki in [14] who showed that $\sigma_3(G) \geq n$ implies that G is prism-hamiltonian.

In this paper we prove that every 3-connected planar graph of minimum degree at least four is prism-hamiltonian. Equivalently, every 3-connected planar graph which is not prism-hamiltonian must have at least one cubic vertex. In particular this implies that every regular 3-connected planar graph is prism-hamiltonian. The class of 3-connected planar graphs of minimum degree at least four is neither hamiltonian nor traceable (even when restricted to plane triangulations, or to regular graphs), see [15] and [22]. In this sense prism-hamiltonicity appears to be the strongest hamiltonian-type property this class has.

The proof we give in this article builds on results obtained in [8], where a method of decomposing graphs into plain chains is developed. In [8] the authors work with circuit graphs (which where originally defined in [1]). A plane graph is a circuit graph if it is obtained from a 3-connected plane graph G by deleting all vertices that lie in the exterior of a cycle of G . A cactus is a connected graph G such that every block of G is either a K_2 or a cycle, and such that every vertex of G is contained in at most two blocks of G (the last condition is usually omitted, however for us it will be crucial, so we include it in the definition). The main result of [8] is that any circuit graph (and hence also any 3-connected plane graph) has a spanning cactus as a subgraph. Here we improve this result by proving that any circuit graph with no internal cubic vertex has a spanning bipartite cactus as a subgraph. Every cactus has a 2-walk while every bipartite cactus is prism-hamiltonian. Our result thus implies that circuit graphs with all internal vertices of degree at least 4 are prism-hamiltonian.

We mention that 3-connected planar graphs of minimum degree at least 4 also appear in [19] where the author proved that no graph in this class is hypohamiltonian.

2 Preliminaries

We refer to [12] for terminology not defined here. Let $G = (V(G), E(G))$ be a graph, $x \in V(G)$ and $X \subseteq V(G)$. We say that x is *adjacent* to X , if x is adjacent to some vertex of X . If u and v are adjacent then $e = uv$ denotes the edge with endvertices u and v ; the subgraph induced by u and v is a path denoted by u, v . The *union* of graphs $G = (V(G), E(G))$ and $H = (V(H), E(H))$ is the graph $G \cup H = (V(G) \cup V(H), E(G) \cup E(H))$.

$E(H)$) and the *intersection* of G and H is $G \cap H = (V(G) \cap V(H), E(G) \cap E(H))$. The graph $G - X$ is obtained from G by deleting all vertices in X and edges incident to a vertex in X . Similarly, for $M \subseteq E(G)$, $G - M$ is the graph obtained from G by deleting all edges in M . If $X = \{x\}$ we write $G - x$ instead of $G - \{x\}$.

Let G be a plane graph. Vertices and edges incident to the unbounded face of G are called *external vertices* and *external edges*, respectively. If a vertex (or an edge) is not an external vertex (or edge), then it is called an *internal vertex* (or an *internal edge*). A path P is an *external* resp. *internal* path of G if all edges of P are external resp. internal edges.

We use $[n]$ to denote the set of positive integers less or equal n . A path of odd/even length is called an *odd/even path*, respectively. Similarly we define *odd* and *even faces*, based on the parity of their degree.

Recall that every vertex of a cactus G is contained in at most two blocks of G . A vertex of a catus G is *good* if it is contained in exactly one block of G .

A *prism* over a graph G is the Cartesian product of G and the complete graph on two vertices K_2 . The following proposition is given in [7] (Theorem 2.3.). For the sake of completeness we include the proof of it also here.

Proposition 2.1 *Every bipartite cactus is prism-hamiltonian.*

Proof. We denote $V(K_2) = \{a, b\}$. We use induction to prove the following stronger statement. Every prism $G \square K_2$ over a bipartite cactus G has a Hamilton cycle C such that for every good vertex x of G , we have $(x, a)(x, b) \in E(C)$. This is clearly true when G is an even cycle or K_2 .

Let G be a bipartite cactus and assume that the statement is true for all bipartite cactuses with fewer vertices than $|V(G)|$. If all vertices of G are good, then G is an even cycle or K_2 . Otherwise, there is a vertex x , which is not a good vertex of G . Hence, x is contained in exactly two blocks of G .

Let G'_1 and G'_2 be connected components of $G - x$, and let $G_1 = G - G'_2$ and $G_2 = G - G'_1$. Both, G_1 and G_2 , are bipartite cactuses. Moreover, x is a good vertex in G_i , for $i = 1, 2$. By induction hypothesis there is a Hamilton cycle C_i in G_i such that C_i uses the edge $e = (x, a)(x, b)$ in G_i . The desired Hamilton cycle in G is $(C_1 \cup C_2) - e$. Observe that every good vertex of G is a good vertex of G_1 or G_2 . It follows that for every good vertex x of G , we have $(x, a)(x, b) \in E(C)$. \square

Corollary 2.2 *Every graph G , that has a bipartite cactus H as a spanning subgraph, is prism-hamiltonian.*

If G is plane graph and H is a subgraph of G , then H is also a plane graph and we assume that the embedding of H in the plane is the one given by G .

Let G be a plane graph and G^+ the graph obtained from G by adding a vertex to G and making it adjacent to all external vertices of G . The graph G is a *circuit graph* if G^+ is 3-connected.

It follows from the definition that any circuit graph is 2-connected, and hence every face of a circuit graph is bounded by a cycle. If G is a 3-connected plane graph (or if G is a circuit graph) and C is a cycle of G , then the subgraph of G bounded by C is a circuit graph. Observe also that for any circuit graph G with outer cycle C , and any separating set S of size 2 in G , every connected component of $G - S$ intersects C .

A graph G is a *chain of blocks* if the block-cutvertex graph of G is a path. We denote the blocks and cutvertices of G , by

$$B_1, b_1, B_2, \dots, b_{n-1}, B_n,$$

where B_i are blocks for $i \in [n]$, and $b_i \in V(B_i) \cap V(B_{i+1})$ are cutvertices of G for $i \in [n-1]$. A plane graph G is a *plane chain of blocks* if it is a chain of blocks

$$G = B_1, b_1, B_2, \dots, b_{n-1}, B_n$$

such that every external vertex of $B_i, i \in [n]$ is also an external vertex of G . The following lemma is given in [8] (Lemma 3, p. 261).

Lemma 2.3 *Let G be a circuit graph with outer cycle C and let $x \in V(C)$. Let x' and x'' be the neighbors of x in C . Then*

- (i) *$G - x$ is a plane chain of blocks $B_1, b_1, B_2, \dots, b_{n-1}, B_n$ and each nontrivial block of $G - x$ is a circuit graph.*
- (ii) *Setting $x' = b_0$ and $x'' = b_n$, then $B_i \cap C$ is a path in C with endvertices b_{i-1} and b_i , for every $i \in [n]$.*

It follows from the above lemma that for every nontrivial block B_i of $G - x$, with outer cycle C_i , C_i is the union of two $b_{i-1}b_i$ -paths P_i and P'_i , where P_i is an internal path in G and P'_i is an external path in G .

3 The proof of main result

In this section we prove that any circuit graph G such that every internal vertex of G is of degree at least 4 is prism-hamiltonian.

Definition 3.1 *Let G be a circuit graph with outer cycle C and let $x, y \in V(C)$. We say that G is bad with respect to x and y if*

- (i) *G has exactly one bounded odd face F*
- (ii) *x and y are incident to F*
- (iii) *If x and y are adjacent, then $e = xy$ is an internal edge of G .*

We say that G is good with respect to x and y if it's not bad with respect to x and y .

If G is a circuit graph and G is bad with respect to x and y , then there is no hamiltonian cycle C in $G \square K_2$ such that C uses vertical edges at x and y (edges between the two layers of G). For example, an odd cycle is bad with respect to any two non-adjacent vertices, and hence the prism over an odd cycle has no hamiltonian cycle that uses vertical edges at two non-adjacent vertices of this cycle. Conversely, it turns out (and is a consequence of Theorem 3.19) that for any circuit graph G with all internal vertices of degree at least 4, and any external vertices x and y of G such that G is good with respect to x and y , there is a hamiltonian cycle in $G \square K_2$ that uses vertical edges at x and y .

Note also that a bipartite circuit graph B is good with respect to any two external vertices of B (this fact we shall use frequently). In order to simplify the formulation of statements, we also say that complete graphs K_1 and K_2 are good with respect to any of its vertices.

Definition 3.2 Let $G = B_1, b_1, B_2, \dots, b_{n-1}, B_n$ be a plain chain of blocks such that each nontrivial block B_i is a circuit graph. Let $b_0 \neq b_1$ be an external vertex of B_1 , and $b_n \neq b_{n-1}$ be an external vertex of B_n . We say that G is a good chain with respect to b_0 and b_n if B_i is good with respect to b_{i-1} and b_i for every $i \in [n]$.

The same definition is used when only one of the two vertices b_0 and b_n is given, and in this case we say that G is a good chain with respect to b_0 or with respect to b_n . If $G = B_1$ has only one block we say that G is a good chain with respect to any external vertex of G .

Lemma 3.3 Let B be a bipartite circuit graph with outer cycle C such that all internal vertices of B are of degree at least 4. Then B has at least 4 external vertices of degree 2.

Proof. Let C be a k -cycle, $k \geq 4$. Let \mathcal{F} be the set of faces of B , and set $e = |E(B)|$, $v = |V(B)|$ and $f = |\mathcal{F}|$. Since B is bipartite

$$2e = \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}} \deg(F) \geq 4(f - 1) + k.$$

We use the Euler's formula to obtain

$$\sum_{x \in V(B)} \deg(x) = 2e \leq 4v - k - 4.$$

Since every internal vertex of B is of degree at least 4 we get

$$\sum_{x \in V(C)} \deg(x) \leq 3k - 4.$$

Since all vertices of C are of degree at least 2, the claim of the lemma follows from the pigeonhole principle. \square

The following lemma is a well known fact.

Lemma 3.4 *A plane graph G is bipartite if and only if all bounded faces of G are even.*

Lemma 3.5 *Let B be a circuit graph with outer cycle C such that all internal vertices of B are of degree at least 4. Let x and y be any vertices of C , and Q a xy -path in C . Suppose that all vertices in $V(C) \setminus V(Q)$ are of degree at least three in B . Then B is good with respect to x and y .*

Proof. Suppose to the contrary, that B is bad with respect to x and y . Then x and y are incident to odd face F of B , and F is the only bounded odd face of B . Moreover, x and y are not adjacent in C . It follows that $B - \{x, y\}$ has exactly two components.

Let H be the component of $B - \{x, y\}$ that contains a vertex of Q . If $xy \in E(B)$ and F is contained in the exterior of the cycle $E(Q) \cup \{xy\}$ define $H' = (B - V(H)) - xy$. Otherwise define $H' = B - V(H)$. H' is a plain chain of blocks and each nontrivial block of H' is a bipartite circuit graph (by Lemma 3.4), so assume

$$H' = D_1, d_1, D_2, \dots, d_{m-1}, D_m.$$

Let $d_0 = x$ and $d_m = y$. If $j \in [m]$ and $u \in V(D_j) \setminus \{d_{j-1}, d_j\}$, then $\deg_{D_j}(u) > 2$. So if D_j is nontrivial, then it has at most two vertices of degree 2 in D_j ; since D_j is bipartite this contradicts Lemma 3.3. It follows that all blocks of H' are trivial. If H' is K_2 then x and y are adjacent in C (a contradiction), otherwise a vertex in $V(C) \setminus V(Q)$ is of degree ≤ 2 (this contradicts the assumption of the lemma). \square

Lemma 3.6 *Let B be a circuit graph with outer cycle C such that all internal vertices of B are of degree at least 4. Let $x \in V(C)$ be any vertex and*

$$B - x = B_1, b_1, B_2, \dots, b_{n-1}, B_n.$$

Let $b_0 \in V(B_1)$ and $b_n \in V(B_n)$ be the neighbors of x in C . Then for every $i \in [n]$, B_i is good with respect to b_{i-1} and b_i .

Proof. Let B_i be a nontrivial block with outer cycle C_i , and define $Q = C \cap B_i$. Q is a path in C_i with endvertices b_{i-1} and b_i , and every vertex in $V(C_i) \setminus V(Q)$ is of degree more than 2 in B_i . By Lemma 3.5, B_i is good with respect to b_{i-1} and b_i . \square

Lemma 3.7 *Let B be a circuit graph with outer cycle C such that all internal vertices of B are of degree at least 4. Let x and y be any vertices of C and Q a xy -path in C such that all vertices in $V(C) \setminus V(Q)$ are of degree at least three in B . If $B - x$ is bipartite, then $|V(B_i \cap Q)| \geq 2$ for every block B_i of $B - x$.*

Proof. If $V(C) = V(Q)$, the lemma follows from Lemma 2.3. Assume $V(C) \neq V(Q)$, and let $u \in V(C) \setminus V(Q)$ be the neighbor of x . The block B_1 of $B - x$ containing u is nontrivial, for otherwise $\deg_B(u) = 2$. If $|V(B_1 \cap Q)| < 2$, then B_1 has at most two vertices of degree two in B_1 . Therefore, by Lemma 3.3, B_1 is non-bipartite and hence $B - x$ is non-bipartite. \square

Lemma 3.8 *Let B be a circuit graph with outer cycle C such that all internal vertices of B are of degree at least 4. Let $x \in V(C)$ be any vertex, and let*

$$B - x = B_1, b_1, B_2, \dots, b_{n-1}, B_n.$$

Then for every $k \in [n - 1]$ the graph

$$G = B - \bigcup_{i=k+1}^n V(B_i)$$

is a good chain with respect to x .

Proof. Let $b_0 \in V(B_1)$ be the neighbor of x in C . Denote the path x, b_0 by B_0 .

Case 1: Suppose that B_k is trivial.

If x is not adjacent to a vertex in $G - b_0$, then G induces a plain chain of blocks

$$B_0, b_0, B_1, \dots, b_{k-2}, B_{k-1}$$

and, by Lemma 3.6, B_i is good with respect to b_{i-1} and b_i for $i \in [k - 1]$. Assume therefore that x is adjacent to a vertex in $G - b_0$. Let $\ell \in [k]$ be the maximum number such that x is adjacent to $B_\ell - \{b_{\ell-1}, b_\ell\}$. Since B_k is trivial, $\ell \neq k$. The graph H induced by $\bigcup_{i=0}^{\ell} V(B_i)$ is a nontrivial block of G . Moreover, since H is a subgraph of B bounded by a cycle of B , H is a circuit graph. Note also that if x and b_ℓ are incident to a bounded face F of H , then x and b_ℓ are adjacent, moreover xb_ℓ is an external edge of H . It follows that H is good with respect to x and b_ℓ , and therefore

$$G = H, b_\ell, B_{\ell+1}, \dots, b_{k-2}, B_{k-1}$$

is a good chain with respect to x .

Case 2: Suppose that B_k is nontrivial.

By Lemma 2.3, $B_k - b_k$ is a plain chain of blocks, so let

$$B_k - b_k = D_1, d_1, D_2, \dots, d_{m-1}, D_m.$$

Let C_k be the outer cycle of B_k , and $d_0 \in V(D_1), d_m \in V(D_m)$ be the neighbors of b_k in C_k . Without loss of generality assume that $b_k d_0$ is an internal edge of B . Note that D_1 is nontrivial if $b_{k-1} \neq d_0$, for otherwise $\deg_B(d_0) \leq 3$ (this is a contradiction because d_0 is an internal vertex of B if $b_{k-1} \neq d_0$).

Suppose that x is adjacent to $D_1 - \{b_{k-1}, d_1\}$ (it is possible that $b_{k-1} = d_1$). Then D_1 is nontrivial. Let $j \in [m]$ be such that $b_{k-1} \in V(D_j) \setminus \{d_{j-1}\}$ and let H' be the graph induced by

$$\bigcup_{i=0}^{k-1} V(B_i) \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^j V(D_i).$$

H' is bounded by a cycle of B , so it is a circuit graph. We shall prove that H' is good with respect to x and d_j . Suppose that x and d_j are incident to a face F' of H' ,

and that F' is the only bounded odd face of H' . Then $d_j = b_{k-1}$, and all bounded faces of D_1 are even. This contradicts Lemma 3.3, because $\deg_{D_1}(u) > 2$ for every $u \in V(D_1) \setminus \{d_0, d_1\}$. It follows that

$$G = H', d_j, D_{j+1}, \dots, d_{m-1}, D_m$$

is a good chain with respect to x .

Suppose that x is not adjacent to $D_1 - \{b_{k-1}, d_1\}$. We claim that $|V(D_1) \cap V(C)| \geq 2$. To prove the claim suppose the contrary, that $|V(D_1) \cap V(C)| < 2$. Then $\{b_k, d_1\}$ is a separating set in B , and $D_1 - \{b_k, d_1\}$ is a component of $B - \{b_k, d_1\}$ disjoint with C . It follows that B is not a circuit graph, a contradiction. This proves the claim.

Define ℓ and H as in Case 1. We claim that

$$G = H, b_\ell, B_{\ell+1}, \dots, B_{k-1}, b_{k-1}, D_1, d_1, \dots, d_{m-1}, D_m$$

is a good chain with respect to x . We have already shown (in Case 1) that H is good with respect to x and b_ℓ . By Lemma 3.6, B_i is good with respect to b_{i-1} and b_i for $i \in [k-1] \setminus [\ell]$, and D_i is good with respect to d_{i-1} and d_i for $i \in [m], i \neq 1$. It remains to prove that D_1 is good with respect to b_{k-1} and d_1 . Let C' be the outer cycle of D_1 and let $Q = C \cap D_1$ (or equivalently $Q = C \cap C'$). Note that for every vertex $z \in V(C') \setminus V(Q)$, $\deg_{D_1}(z) > 2$. By Lemma 3.5, D_1 is good with respect to b_{k-1} and d_1 . \square

Definition 3.9 *Let B be a circuit graph with outer cycle C . Let $\{x, y\} \subseteq V(C)$ and $\{u_1, u_2\} \subseteq V(C)$ be any sets. A set of pairwise disjoint chains $\mathcal{C} = \{G_1, \dots, G_k\}$ is a $(x, y; u_1, u_2)$ -set of chains in B if there exists a xy -path P in B such that*

- (i) $V(B) \setminus V(P) \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^k V(G_i)$
- (ii) For $i \in [k]$, G_i intersects P in exactly one vertex x_i , and G_i is a good chain with respect to x_i .
- (iii) For $j \in [2]$, either G_i is a good chain with respect to u_j and x_i for some $i \in [k]$, or $u_j \notin \bigcup_{i=1}^k V(G_i)$.

A path P that fulfills (i), (ii) and (iii) is called a \mathcal{C} -path. The set \mathcal{C} is an odd or an even $(x, y; u_1, u_2)$ -set of chains if there exists an odd or an even \mathcal{C} -path, respectively.

We say that a set of pairwise disjoint chains G_1, \dots, G_k is a $(x, y; u_1)$ -set of chains if it satisfies (i), (ii) and (iii) for $j = 1$. Moreover, \mathcal{C} is a (x, y) -set of chains if it satisfies (i) and (ii) of Definition 3.9.

We also use Definition 3.9 in slightly more general settings in which B is a plain chain of blocks (and each block is a circuit graph). More precisely, if B is a plain chain of blocks, x, y are two external vertices of B , and \mathcal{C} is a set of pairwise disjoint plain chains that satisfy (i), (ii) and (iii), then \mathcal{C} is a $(x, y; u_1, u_2)$ -set of chains in B .

Lemma 3.10 *Let G be a bipartite plain chain of blocks*

$$G = B_1, b_1, B_2, \dots, b_{n-1}, B_n$$

such that for $i \in [n]$ each nontrivial block B_i of G is a circuit graph with outer cycle C_i . Suppose that $u, x, y \in V(C_j), u \neq b_j$, and that \mathcal{C} is a $(x, y; u, b_j)$ -set of chains in B_j for some $j \in [n]$. Then for every $\ell > j$ and any vertex $v \in V(C_\ell) \setminus V(C_{\ell-1})$, there is a $(x, y; u, v)$ -set of chains in $\bigcup_{i=j}^\ell B_i$. Moreover, if $u = b_{j-1}$, then for every $\ell' < j$ and any vertex $v' \in V(C_{\ell'}) \setminus V(C_{\ell'+1})$, there is a $(x, y; v', v)$ -set of chains in $\bigcup_{i=\ell'}^\ell B_i$.

Proof. Let $\ell > j$ and $v \in V(C_\ell) \setminus V(C_{\ell-1})$. Suppose that $\mathcal{C} = \{G_1, \dots, G_k\}$ is a $(x, y; u, b_j)$ -set of chains in B_j and that P is a \mathcal{C} -path. Then (a) or (b) occurs.

- (a) There is a chain $G_r \in \mathcal{C}$ such that G_r is a good chain with respect to x_r and b_j , where $\{x_r\} = V(G_r) \cap V(P)$
- (b) $b_j \notin \bigcup_{i=1}^k V(G_i)$.

In case (a), $G'_r = G_r \cup \bigcup_{i=j+1}^\ell B_i$ is a good chain with respect to x_r and v , and therefore $\mathcal{C}' = \mathcal{C} \cup \{G'_r\} \setminus \{G_r\}$ is a $(x, y; u, v)$ -set of chains in $\bigcup_{i=j}^\ell B_i$. In case (b), $G_0 = \bigcup_{i=j+1}^\ell B_i$ is a good chain with respect to b_j and v , and therefore $\mathcal{C}' = \{G_0, \dots, G_k\}$ is a $(x, y; u, v)$ -set of chains in $\bigcup_{i=j}^\ell B_i$. In both cases a \mathcal{C}' -path is P . The last sentence of the lemma is proved analogously. \square

If we use the notation of the above lemma, we note that a $(x, y; b_j)$ -set of chains in B_j can be extended to a (x, y) -set of chains in $\bigcup_{i=j}^\ell B_i$ (in fact the construction given in the above proof works also in this case). Note also that a $(x, y; u, v)$ -set of chains in $\bigcup_{i=j}^\ell B_i$ exists also under the assumption that B_i is bipartite for $i > j$ (and G may be non-bipartite). In [8] the following result was proved (Theorem 5, p.262).

Theorem 3.11 *Let B be a bipartite circuit graph with outer cycle C . If $x, y \in V(C)$, then for any vertex $u \in V(C)$ (not necessarily distinct from x and y) there exists a $(x, y; u)$ -set of chains in B .*

Lemma 3.12 *Let B be a bipartite circuit graph with outer cycle C . Suppose that $x, y \in V(C)$ and that Q is a xy -path in C . If every internal vertex of B is of degree at least 4 and every vertex in $V(C) \setminus V(Q)$ is of degree at least 3 in B , then there exists a $(x, y; x, y)$ -set of chains in B .*

Proof. By Lemma 2.3, $B - x$ is a plain chain of blocks

$$B - x = B_1, b_1, B_2, \dots, b_{n-1}, B_n.$$

By Lemma 3.7, $|V(B_i \cap Q)| \geq 2$ for $i \in [n]$. We may assume, without loss of generality, that $y \in V(B_1)$ and $y \neq b_1$. If B_1 is nontrivial then $B_1 - y$ is a plain chain of blocks

$$B_1 - y = D_1, d_1, D_2, \dots, d_{m-1}, D_m.$$

Let $d_0 \in V(D_1)$ be the neighbor of y in Q , and define $k = \max\{i \mid D_i \cap Q \neq \emptyset\}$.

Case 1: Suppose that D_k intersects Q in exactly one vertex (in this case d_{k-1}). Then $G = \bigcup_{i=k}^m D_i$ is a good chain with respect to d_{k-1} .

If D_i is trivial define $P_i = D_i$ and $\mathcal{C}_i = \emptyset$, for $i \in [k-1]$. If D_i is nontrivial then, by Theorem 3.11, there is a $(d_{i-1}, d_i; d_i)$ -set of chains \mathcal{C}_i in D_i , for $i \in [k-1]$. In this case let P_i be a \mathcal{C}_i -path in D_i .

If B_i is trivial define $R_i = B_i$ and $\mathcal{F}_i = \emptyset$, for $i \in [n], i \neq 1$. If B_i is nontrivial then, by Theorem 3.11, there is a $(b_{i-1}, b_i; b_{i-1})$ -set of chains \mathcal{F}_i in B_i , for $i \in [n], i \neq 1$. In this case let R_i be a \mathcal{F}_i -path in B_i . Let b_n be the neighbor of x in Q , and let R_{n+1} be the path x, b_n . Additionally let P_0 be the path y, d_0 . Define

$$P = \bigcup_{i=0}^{k-1} P_i \cup \bigcup_{i=2}^{n+1} R_i.$$

The chain G together with chains $\mathcal{C}_i, i \in [k-1]$ and $\mathcal{F}_i, i \in [n], i \neq 1$ is a $(x, y; x, y)$ -set of chains in B . If we call this set of chains \mathcal{C} , then P is a \mathcal{C} -path.

Case 2: Suppose that D_k intersects Q in more than one vertex. Then, by Theorem 3.11, there is a $(d_{k-1}, b_1; d_k)$ -set of chains \mathcal{H} in D_k . By Lemma 3.10 (see also the note directly after Lemma 3.10) there is a (d_{k-1}, b_1) -set of chains in $\bigcup_{i=k}^m D_i$. The rest of the proof is similar as in Case 1.

If B_1 is trivial, then x and y are adjacent in C (for otherwise $\deg_B(u) = 2$, where u is the neighbor of x in $V(C) \setminus V(Q)$) and $V(Q) = V(C)$. Define $R_1 = B_1$. In this case $\bigcup_{i=2}^n \mathcal{F}_i$ is a $(x, y; x, y)$ -set of chains in B . The corresponding path is $\bigcup_{i=1}^{n+1} R_i$. \square

Lemma 3.13 *Let B be a bipartite circuit graph with outer cycle C . Let $x, y, u_1, u_2 \in V(C)$ be such that $\{x, y\} \neq \{u_1, u_2\}$. If every internal vertex of B is of degree at least 4, then there is a $(x, y; u_1, u_2)$ -set of chains in B .*

Proof. Suppose that the claim of the lemma is not true; let B be a counterexample with minimum number of vertices. It's easy to verify the lemma when B is a 4-cycle, or any even cycle.

By Lemma 2.3, $B - x$ is a plain chain of blocks

$$B - x = B_1, b_1, B_2, \dots, b_{n-1}, B_n.$$

Let Q and Q' be the xy -paths in C . Let $b_0 \in V(B_1)$ and $b_n \in V(B_n)$ be the neighbors of x in Q and Q' , respectively. We set $B_0 = \emptyset$ (to avoid ambiguity in the following definitions). Let $k \in [n]$ be such that $y \in V(B_k) \setminus V(B_{k-1})$, and let $k_j \in [n]$ be such that $u_j \in V(B_{k_j}) \setminus V(B_{k_j-1})$ for $j = 1, 2$ (if $x \in \{u_1, u_2\}$ this applies only to k_1 and we set $u_2 = x$). We may assume, without loss of generality, that $y \neq b_0$ (otherwise $y \neq b_n$ and we have a similar proof) and that $k_1 \leq k_2$.

We shall construct a xy -path P in B . For $i \in [k]$, if B_i is trivial define $\mathcal{C}_i = \emptyset$ and $P_i = B_i$. In the sequel we define \mathcal{C}_i and P_i for nontrivial blocks B_i .

By minimality of B , Lemma 3.13 is true for every nontrivial block B_i of $B - x$ and therefore, for every $i \in [k]$ we can apply the statement of Lemma 3.13 to B_i .

Denote the outer cycle of B_i by C_i . Since $Q_i = B_i \cap C$ is a $b_{i-1}b_i$ -path in C_i and every vertex of $V(C_i) \setminus V(Q_i)$ is of degree at least 3 in B_i , we can also apply Lemma 3.12 to B_i . The following statements are obtained either by an application of Lemma 3.13 or Lemma 3.12 to B_i . For $i \in [k-1]$ and $j = 1, 2$ there exists:

- (i) a $(b_{i-1}, b_i; b_{i-1}, b_i)$ -set of chains in B_i (by Lemma 3.12),
- (ii) a $(b_{k-1}, y; b_{k-1}, b_k)$ -set of chains in B_k (by minimality of B (i.e. by the statement of Lemma 3.13) if $y \neq b_k$, and by Lemma 3.12 if $y = b_k$),
- (iii) a $(b_{k_j-1}, b_{k_j}; b_{k_j-1}, u_j)$ -set of chains in B_{k_j} (by minimality of B if $u_j \neq b_{k_j}$, and by Lemma 3.12 if $u_j = b_{k_j}$),
- (iv) if $k_j = k$ and $u_j \neq y$, there is a $(b_{k-1}, y; b_{k-1}, u_j)$ -set of chains in B_k (by minimality of B),
- (v) if $k_j = k$ and $u_j \neq b_k$, there is a $(b_{k-1}, y; u_j, b_k)$ -set of chains in B_k (by minimality of B),
- (vi) if $k_1 = k_2$, there is a $(b_{k_1-1}, b_{k_1}; u_1, u_2)$ -set of chains in B_{k_1} (by minimality of B),
- (vii) if $k_1 = k_2 = k$, there is a $(b_{k-1}, y; u_1, u_2)$ -set of chains in B_k (by minimality of B).

Since $\{x, y\} \neq \{u_1, u_2\}$ we may assume, without loss of generality, that $y \notin \{u_1, u_2\}$. Therefore we have the following possibilities (1) $u_1, u_2 \notin V(Q')$, (2) $u_1 \notin V(Q'), u_2 \notin V(Q)$, (3) $u_2 = x$ and $u_1 \notin V(Q')$. All other possibilities are symmetric, and they can be obtained from one of the above cases by exchanging the roles of Q and Q' ; for example, $u_1, u_2 \notin V(Q')$ is symmetric to $u_1, u_2 \notin V(Q)$. Therefore we can also assume that $u_1 \notin V(Q')$. With this assumption the following cases with regard to k, k_1 and k_2 may appear. Next to each particular case below we also write which of the above statements we use to prove the existence of a $(x, y; u_1, u_2)$ -set of chains in B . Later we give detailed arguments.

- (a) $k_1 < k_2 < k$, we use (i) for $i \in [k-1] \setminus \{k_1, k_2\}$, (iii) for $j \in [2]$, and (ii).
- (b) $k_1 < k_2 = k$, we use (i) for $i \in [k-1] \setminus \{k_1\}$, (iii) for $j = 1$, and (iv) for $j = 2$.
- (c) $k_1 < k < k_2$, we use (i) for $i \in [k-1] \setminus \{k_1\}$, (iii) for $j = 1$, and (ii).
- (d) $k_1 = k_2 < k$, we use (i) for $i \in [k-1] \setminus \{k_1\}$, (vi) for $j = 1$, and (ii).
- (e) $k_1 = k_2 = k$, we use (i) for $i \in [k-1]$, and (vii).
- (f) $k_1 < k$ and $u_2 = x$, we use (i) for $i \in [k-1] \setminus \{k_1\}$, and (ii).
- (g) $k_1 = k$ and $u_2 = x$, we use (i) for $i \in [k-1]$, and (v) for $j = 1$.

We prove cases (a), (c) and (g) in detail. Cases (b),(d) and (e) are similar to case (a), and case (f) is similar to case (g), so here we skip details.

Case (a). Suppose that $k_1 < k_2 < k$. By (i), there is a $(b_{i-1}, b_i; b_{i-1}, b_i)$ -set of chains \mathcal{C}_i in B_i , for $i \in [k-1] \setminus \{k_1, k_2\}$. By (iii), there is a $(b_{k_j-1}, b_{k_j}; b_{k_j-1}, u_j)$ -set of chains \mathcal{C}_{k_j} in B_{k_j} for $j = 1, 2$. By (ii), there is a $(b_{k-1}, y; b_{k-1}, b_k)$ -set of chains \mathcal{C}_k in B_k . Denote by P_i a \mathcal{C}_i -path in B_i , for $i \in [k]$.

By Lemma 3.8, $G_0 = B - \bigcup_{i=1}^k V(B_i)$ is a good chain with respect to x . Let P_0 be the path x, b_0 . Define $P = \bigcup_{i=0}^k P_i$ (and recall that $P_i = B_i$, if B_i is trivial). Then $\mathcal{C} = \{G_0\} \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^k \mathcal{C}_i$ is a $(x, y; u_1, u_2)$ -set of chains in B .

Case (c). Suppose that $k_1 < k < k_2$. By (i) there is a $(b_{i-1}, b_i; b_{i-1}, b_i)$ -set of chains \mathcal{C}_i in B_i , for $i \in [k-1] \setminus \{k_1\}$. By (iii) there is a $(b_{k_1-1}b_{k_1}; b_{k_1-1}, u_1)$ -set of chains \mathcal{C}_{k_1} in B_{k_1} . By (ii) there is a $(b_{k-1}, y; b_{k-1}, b_k)$ -set of chains \mathcal{C}_k in B_k .

Since \mathcal{C}_k is a $(b_{k-1}, y; b_{k-1}, b_k)$ -set of chains in B_k , by Lemma 3.10 there is a $(b_{k-1}, y; b_{k-1}, u_2)$ -set of chains \mathcal{D}_k in $\bigcup_{i=k}^{k_2} B_i$.

By Lemma 3.8, $G_1 = B - \bigcup_{i=1}^{k_2} V(B_i)$ is a good chain with respect to x . Then G_1 together with chains in $\mathcal{C}_i, i \in [k-1]$ and \mathcal{D}_k forms a $(x, y; u_1, u_2)$ -set of chains in B (the corresponding path is $P = \bigcup_{i=0}^k P_i$).

Case (g). By (i) there is a $(b_{i-1}, b_i; b_{i-1}, b_i)$ -set of chains \mathcal{C}_i in B_i , for $i \in [k-1]$. Since $u_1 \notin V(Q')$, by an assumption, we have $u_1 \neq b_k$. By (v), there is a $(b_{k-1}, y; u_1, b_k)$ -set of chains \mathcal{C}_k in B_k . By Lemma 3.10 there is a $(b_{k-1}, y; u_1)$ -set of chains \mathcal{F}_k in $\bigcup_{i=k}^n B_i$.

Let P_i be a \mathcal{C}_i -path in B_i , for $i \in [k]$, and define $P = \bigcup_{i=0}^k P_i$. Then chains in $\mathcal{C}_i, i \in [k-1]$ and \mathcal{F}_k form a $(x, y; u_1, x)$ -set of chains in B , with P being the corresponding path. \square

Definition 3.14 *Let B be a circuit graph with outer cycle C , and let $u_1, u_2, u_3 \in V(C)$. A set of pairwise disjoint chains $\mathcal{C} = \{G_1, \dots, G_k\}$ is a $[u_1, u_2, u_3]$ -set of chains in B if there exists an even cycle C' in B such that*

$$(i) \ V(B) \setminus V(C') \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^k V(G_i)$$

(ii) *For $i \in [k]$, G_i intersects C' in exactly one vertex x_i , and G_i is a good chain with respect to x_i .*

(iii) *For $j \in [3]$, either G_i is a good chain with respect to u_j and x_i for some $i \in [k]$, or $u_j \notin \bigcup_{i=1}^k V(G_i)$.*

A cycle C' that fulfills (i),(ii) and (iii) is called a \mathcal{C} -cycle.

If \mathcal{C} fulfills (i),(ii) and (iii) for $j = 1, 2$, then \mathcal{C} is a $[u_1, u_2]$ -set of chains in B .

Lemma 3.15 *Let B be a bipartite circuit graph with outer cycle C , and let u_1, u_2, u_3 be any vertices of C . If all internal vertices of B are of degree at least 4, then there exists a $[u_1, u_2, u_3]$ -set of chains in B .*

Proof. By Lemma 2.3, $B - u_3$ is a plain chain of blocks

$$B - u_3 = B_1, b_1, B_2, \dots, b_{n-1}, B_n.$$

Let $k_i \in [n]$ be such that $u_i \in V(B_i) \setminus V(B_{i-1})$ (here we set $B_0 = \emptyset$). For $i \in [n]$, define $P_i = B_i$ and $\mathcal{C}_i = \emptyset$, if B_i is trivial. In the sequel we define P_i and \mathcal{C}_i for nontrivial blocks B_i .

Case 1: $k_1 \neq k_2$. By Lemma 3.12 and 3.13 there is

- (i) a $(b_{i-1}, b_i; b_{i-1})$ -set of chains \mathcal{C}_i in B_i , if $i \notin \{k_1, k_2\}$,
- (ii) a $(b_{i-1}, b_i; b_{i-1}, u_j)$ -set of chains \mathcal{C}_i in B_i , if $i = k_j$ for $j = 1, 2$.

Let P_i be the corresponding \mathcal{C}_i -path in B_i , for $i \in [n]$. Let $b_0 \in V(B_1)$ and $b_n \in V(B_n)$ be the neighbors of x in C and define $P_0 = x, b_0$ and $P_{n+1} = b_n, x$. Define $C' = \bigcup_{i=0}^{n+1} P_i$ and

$$\mathcal{C} = \bigcup_{i=1}^n \mathcal{C}_i.$$

Then \mathcal{C} is a $[u_1, u_2, u_3]$ -set of chains, and C' is a corresponding \mathcal{C} -cycle.

Case 2: $k_1 = k_2$. By Lemma 3.12 and 3.13 there is

- (i) a $(b_{i-1}, b_i; b_{i-1}, b_i)$ -set of chains \mathcal{C}_i in B_i , if $i \neq k_1$,
- (ii) a $(b_{k_1-1}, b_{k_1}; u_1, u_2)$ -set of chains \mathcal{C}_{k_1} in B_{k_1} .

The rest of the proof is the same as above. □

Lemma 3.16 *Let B be a non-bipartite circuit graph with outer cycle C . Suppose that $x, y \in V(C)$ and that Q is a xy -path in C . If all internal vertices of B are of degree at least 4, every vertex in $V(C) \setminus V(Q)$ is of degree at least 3 in B , and $B - x$ is bipartite, then for any vertex $u \in V(C - x)$ there is an odd and an even $(x, y; u)$ -set of chains in B .*

Proof. We claim that for any neighbor z of x , there is a $(x, y; u)$ -set of chains \mathcal{C} in B such that a \mathcal{C} -path contains the edge xz . Before we prove the claim let us see how we prove the lemma using this claim. Since B is non-bipartite and 2-connected, there is an odd cycle C' containing x . Let x_1 and x_2 be the neighbors of x in C' . Let R be the x_1x_2 -path in C' not containing x . Suppose that R_i is a x_iy -path in $B - x$ for $i = 1, 2$. Since $B - x$ is bipartite, $R_1 \cup R_2 \cup R$ is an even closed walk, and since R is odd, R_1 and R_2 have different parities. It follows that every x_1y -path in $B - x$ is odd, and every x_2y -path in $B - x$ is even (or vice-versa). Using the above claim and setting $z = x_1$ (resp. $z = x_2$) we get an even (resp. an odd) $(x, y; u)$ -set of chains in B .

In the rest of the proof we prove the claim. Let

$$B - x = B_1, b_1, B_2, \dots, b_{n-1}, B_n$$

and suppose that $xz \in E(B)$. By Lemma 3.7, $|V(B_i \cap Q)| \geq 2$ for $i \in [n]$, hence we may assume that $y \in V(B_n) \setminus V(B_{n-1})$. Let $k_u, k_z \in [n]$ be such that $u \in V(B_{k_u}) \setminus V(B_{k_u+1})$ and $z \in V(B_{k_z}) \setminus V(B_{k_z+1})$ (here we set $B_{n+1} = \emptyset$). It follows from these definitions that $u \neq b_{k_u}$ and $z \neq b_{k_z}$.

We shall construct a $(x, y; u)$ -set of chains \mathcal{C} in B , and a \mathcal{C} -path P in B , so that P contains the edge xz . We distinguish several cases with regard to k_u and k_z . In each case we define $P_i = B_i$ and $\mathcal{C}_i = \emptyset$, if B_i is trivial and $i \in [n]$. Now we treat different cases and define P_i and \mathcal{C}_i , if B_i is nontrivial.

Suppose that $k_z < k_u < n$. By Lemma 3.12 and Lemma 3.13 there is

- (i) a $(z, b_{k_z}; b_{k_z-1}, b_{k_z})$ -set of chains in B_{k_z} , where $k_z \neq k_u$
- (ii) a $(b_{i-1}, b_i; b_{i-1}, b_i)$ -set of chains in B_i , for $k_z < i < n, i \neq k_u$
- (iii) a $(b_{n-1}, y; b_{n-1})$ -set of chains in B_n , where $n \neq k_u$
- (iv) a $(b_{k_u-1}, b_{k_u}; u)$ -set of chains in B_{k_u} .

Let \mathcal{C}_i be the set of chains in B_i (as defined above), and let P_i be a \mathcal{C}_i -path for $i \in [n] \setminus [k_z - 1]$. By Lemma 3.8, $G_0 = B - \bigcup_{i=k_z}^n V(B_i)$ is a good chain with respect to x in B (if $k_z = 1$ this is irrelevant). Let P_0 be the path x, z and define $P = P_0 \cup \bigcup_{i=k_z}^n P_i$. Then

$$\mathcal{C} = \{G_0\} \cup \bigcup_{i=k_z}^n \mathcal{C}_i$$

is a $(x, y; u)$ -set of chains in B and P is a \mathcal{C} -path. If $k_z = k_u < n$ we use (ii) and (iii), and instead of (iv) we use

- (v) there is a $(z, b_{k_u}; u)$ -set of chains in B_{k_u} .

The rest of the proof is the same as above. If $k_z < k_u = n$ we use (i) and (ii), and instead of (iv) we use

- (vi) there is a $(b_{n-1}, y; u)$ -set of chains in B_n

and the rest of the proof is (again) the same as above (note that (v) and (vi) follow from Lemma 3.13).

If $k_u < k_z < n$ then we use (i),(ii) and (iii). By Lemma 3.10 and (i), there is a $(z, b_{k_z}; b_{k_z}, u)$ -set of chains \mathcal{F}_{k_z} in $\bigcup_{i=k_u}^{k_z} B_i$. By Lemma 3.8, $G_1 = B - \bigcup_{i=k_u}^n V(B_i)$ is a good chain with respect to x in B . It follows that

$$\mathcal{C} = \{G_1\} \cup \mathcal{F}_{k_z} \cup \bigcup_{i=k_z+1}^n \mathcal{C}_i$$

is a $(x, y; u)$ -set of chains in B . The path P (as defined above) is a \mathcal{C} -path. This proves the claim when $k_z \neq n$.

Assume now that $k_z = n$. If $k_z = k_u = n$ and $z \neq y$ then, by Lemma 3.13, there is

(vii) a $(z, y; u)$ -set of chains \mathcal{H}_n in B_n .

By Lemma 3.8, $G_2 = B - V(B_n)$ is a good chain with respect to x in B . It follows that $\mathcal{C} = \{G_2\} \cup \mathcal{H}_n$ is a $(x, y; u)$ -set of chains in B , and P (as defined above) is a \mathcal{C} -path.

If $k_z = k_u = n$ and $z = y = u$ then xz is an edge of C (recall that $y \neq b_{n-1}$ and that y is an external vertex of B). By Lemma 3.6, $G_3 = B - y$ is a good chain with respect to x . Therefore $\mathcal{C} = \{G_3\}$ is a $(x, y; u)$ -set of chains, where a \mathcal{C} -path in B is the path x, y . If $z = y \neq u$ then B_n is a good chain with respect to y and u , and G_2 is a good chain with respect to x . It follows that $\{B_n, G_2\}$ is a $(x, y; u)$ -set of chains in B ; again a \mathcal{C} -path in B is the path on two vertices x, y . If $z \neq y$

Finally, if $k_u < k_z = n$ and $z \neq y$ there is

(viii) a $(z, y; b_{n-1})$ -set of chains in B_n .

By Lemma 3.10 and (viii), there is a $(z, y; u)$ -set of chains \mathcal{I}_n in $\bigcup_{i=k_u}^n B_i$. In this case $\mathcal{C} = \{G_1\} \cup \mathcal{I}_n$ is a $(x, y; u)$ -set of chains in B . If $z = y$, then $G_4 = \bigcup_{i=k_u}^n B_i$ is a good chain with respect to u and y , hence $\mathcal{C} = \{G_1, G_4\}$ is a $(x, y; u)$ -set of chains in B . This proves the claim, and hence also the lemma. \square

Theorem 3.17 *Let B be a non-bipartite circuit graph with outer cycle C , and let $x, y \in V(C)$. If all internal vertices of B are of degree at least 4, then for any vertex $u \in V(C)$ there is a $(x, y; u)$ -set of chains in B . Moreover, if Q is a xy -path in C such that every vertex in $V(C) \setminus V(Q)$ is of degree at least 3 in B , then for any vertex $u \in V(Q)$ there is an odd and an even $(x, y; u)$ -set of chains in B .*

Proof. Suppose the theorem is not true. Let B be a counterexample of minimum order. We may assume that $u \neq x$ (otherwise $u \neq y$, and the proof is analogous). By Lemma 2.3, $B - x$ is a plain chain of blocks

$$B - x = B_1, b_1, B_2, \dots, b_{n-1}, B_n.$$

Let $k_1, k_2 \in [n]$ be such that $u \in V(B_{k_1}) \setminus V(B_{k_1-1})$ and $y \in V(B_{k_2}) \setminus V(B_{k_2-1})$ (here we set $B_0 = \emptyset$). Let $b_0 \in V(B_1)$ and $b_n \in V(B_n)$ be the neighbors of x in C . We may assume that xb_0 is an edge of Q and xb_n is not an edge of Q , and that $u \in V(Q)$ (the last sentence of the theorem assumes $u \in V(Q)$, and for the proof of the first part of the theorem $u \in V(Q)$ may be assumed without loss of generality). Since $u \in V(Q)$ we have $k_1 \leq k_2$. We give two constructions. In both constructions we define $P_i = B_i$ and $\mathcal{C}_i = \emptyset$, if B_i is trivial. In the sequel we treat nontrivial blocks B_i .

Construction A. If $k_1 < k_2$ then, by minimality of B (if B_i is non-bipartite) and by Lemma 3.13 (if B_i is bipartite), there is

- (i) a $(b_{i-1}, b_i; b_i)$ -set of chains in B_i , for $i \in [k_1 - 1]$,
- (ii) a $(b_{k_1-1}, b_{k_1}; u)$ -set of chains in B_{k_1} ,

(iii) a $(b_{i-1}, b_i; b_{i-1})$ -set of chains in B_i , for $i \in [k_2 - 1] \setminus [k_1]$,

(iv) a $(b_{k_2-1}, y; b_{k_2-1})$ -set of chains in B_{k_2} ,

if $k_1 = k_2$ and $y \neq b_0$ there is

(v) a $(b_{k_2-1}, y; u)$ -set of chains in B_{k_2} .

Note that for $i \in [k_2 - 1]$ every vertex in $V(C_i) \setminus V(Q_i)$ is of degree at least 3 in B_i , where C_i is the outer cycle of B_i and $Q_i = Q \cap B_i$. By minimality of B we may apply the (last) statement of the theorem to B_i , if B_i is non-bipartite. Hence, if B_i is non-bipartite for some $i \in [k_2 - 1]$, there is an odd and an even set of chains for (i), (ii) and (iii). Additionally, if B_{k_2} is non-bipartite and $y = b_{k_2}$, then there is also an odd and an even set of chains \mathcal{C}_{k_2} for (iv) and (v) (by minimality of B).

Denote by \mathcal{C}_i the set of chains in B_i defined by (i)-(iv) if $k_1 < k_2$; and defined by (i) and (v) if $k_1 = k_2$ and $y \neq b_0$. The \mathcal{C}_i -path is denoted by P_i , for $i \in [k_2]$. Let P_0 be the path x, b_0 . Define $P = \bigcup_{i=0}^{k_2} P_i$. By Lemma 3.8, $G_1 = B - \bigcup_{i=1}^{k_2} B_i$ is a good chain with respect to x in B . Hence

$$\mathcal{C} = \{G_1\} \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{k_2} \mathcal{C}_i$$

is a $(x, y; u)$ -set of chains in B . The path P is a \mathcal{C} -path in B . Moreover, if a block $B_i, i \in [k_2 - 1]$ is non-bipartite, then there exists an odd and an even set of chains \mathcal{C}_i in B_i , and so \mathcal{C} is an odd or an even set of chains subject to the choice of \mathcal{C}_i .

If $y = b_0$ then $u = y = b_0$ (by our assumptions $u \in V(Q)$ and $u \neq x$). In this case $G_2 = B - y$ is a good chain with respect to x , by Lemma 3.6. Hence, $\mathcal{C} = \{G_2\}$ is a $(x, y; u)$ -set of chains, and $P = x, y$ is the corresponding \mathcal{C} -path. This proves the first claim of the theorem; and also the second claim of the theorem if B_i is non-bipartite for some $i \in [k_2 - 1]$, or if B_{k_2} is non-bipartite and $y = b_{k_2}$ (note that this, in particular, proves the theorem for the case if $y = b_n$ and $B - x$ is non-bipartite). To finish the proof of the second claim of the theorem we give construction B, in which we assume that every vertex in $V(C) \setminus V(Q)$ is of degree at least 3 in B . We also assume that B_i is bipartite for $i \in [k_2 - 1]$, and if $y = b_{k_2}$ then B_i is bipartite for $i \in [k_2]$.

Construction B. If $k_1 < k_2$ and $y \neq b_{k_2}$ then, by minimality of B (if B_i is non-bipartite) and by Lemma 3.13 (if B_i is bipartite), there is

(vi) a $(b_{i-1}, b_i; b_{i-1})$ -set of chains in B_i , for $i \in [n] \setminus [k_2]$,

(vii) a $(b_{k_2}, y; b_{k_2-1})$ -set of chains in B_{k_2} ,

and if $k_1 = k_2$ and $y \neq b_{k_2}$ there is

(viii) a $(b_{k_2}, y; u)$ -set of chains in B_{k_2} .

Denote by \mathcal{C}_i the set of chains in B_i defined by (vi) and (vii) if $k_1 < k_2$ and $y \neq b_{k_2}$; and defined by (vi) and (viii) if $k_1 = k_2$ and $y \neq b_{k_2}$. The \mathcal{C}_i -paths are denoted by P_i , for $i \in [n] \setminus [k_2 - 1]$.

Suppose that $y \neq b_{k_2}$ and $k_1 < k_2$. Let R_1 and R_2 be the $y b_{k_2}$ -paths in C_{k_2} (where C_{k_2} is the outer cycle of B_{k_2}), and assume $b_{k_2-1} \in V(R_1)$. Since every vertex in $V(C) \setminus V(Q)$ is of degree at least 3 in B , we find that every vertex in $V(C_{k_2}) \setminus V(R_1)$ is of degree at least 3 in B_{k_2} . Therefore, by minimailty of B , if B_{k_2} is non-bipartite there is an odd and an even set of chains \mathcal{C}_{k_2} for (vii) and (viii). Moreover, if B_i is non-bipartite there exist odd and even sets of chains \mathcal{C}_i for $i \in [n] \setminus [k_2]$, as given by (vi).

If $u \neq b_{k_1}$ then, by Lemma 3.10 (see notes directly after Lemma 3.10) and (vii), there is a $(b_{k_2}, y; u)$ -set of chains \mathcal{D}_{k_2} in $\bigcup_{i=k_1}^{k_2} B_i$ (recall the assumption that B_i is bipartite for $i \in [k_2 - 1]$). By Lemma 3.8, $G_3 = B - \bigcup_{i=k_1}^n B_i$ is a good chain with respect to x . Let P_{n+1} be the path x, b_n . Define $P = \bigcup_{i=k_2}^{n+1} P_i$. Then

$$\mathcal{C} = \{G_3\} \cup \mathcal{D}_{k_2} \cup \bigcup_{i=k_2+1}^n \mathcal{C}_i$$

is a $(x, y; u)$ -set of chains in B . The corresponding \mathcal{C} -path is P .

If $u = b_{k_1}$ the construction of a $(x, y; u)$ -set of chains in B is analogous as in the case $u \neq b_{k_1}$ (the only difference is that \mathcal{D}_{k_2} is a $(b_{k_2}, y; u)$ -set of chains in $\bigcup_{i=k_1+1}^{k_2} B_i$, and $G_3 = B - \bigcup_{i=k_1+1}^n B_i$).

If $y \neq b_{k_2}$ and $k_1 = k_2$, we use (vi) and (viii). In this case

$$\mathcal{C} = \{G_3\} \cup \bigcup_{i=k_2}^n \mathcal{C}_i$$

is a $(x, y; u)$ -set of chains in B . If B_i is non-bipartite for some $i \in [n] \setminus [k_2 - 1]$ then we can choose \mathcal{C}_i so that \mathcal{C} is an odd or an even $(x, y; u)$ -set of chains in B (in all cases above). This proves the second claim of the theorem if $y \neq b_{k_2}$ and B_i is non-bipartite for some $i \in [n] \setminus [k_2 - 1]$.

Suppose now that $y = b_{k_2}$, $k_2 \neq n$ and $u \neq b_{k_1}$. If we use (vi) for $i = k_2 + 1$, we find that \mathcal{C}_{k_2+1} is a $(b_{k_2}, b_{k_2+1}; b_{k_2})$ -set of chains in B_{k_2+1} . Hence, by Lemma 3.10 (see notes after Lemma 3.10), there is a $(b_{k_2}, b_{k_2+1}; u)$ -set of chains \mathcal{F}_{k_2+1} in $\bigcup_{i=k_1}^{k_2+1} B_i$ (recall the assumption that B_i is bipartite for $i \in [k_2]$ if $y = b_{k_2}$). Then

$$\mathcal{C} = \{G_3\} \cup \mathcal{F}_{k_2+1} \cup \bigcup_{i=k_2+2}^n \mathcal{C}_i$$

is a $(x, y; u)$ -set of chains in B . The corresponding \mathcal{C} -path is P .

If $y = b_{k_2}$, $k_2 \neq n$ and $u = b_{k_1}$, then let \mathcal{H}_{k_2+1} be a $(b_{k_2}, b_{k_2+1}; u)$ -set of chains in $\bigcup_{i=k_1+1}^{k_2+1} B_i$ (it exists by Lemma 3.10) and define $G_4 = B - \bigcup_{i=k_1+1}^n B_i$. In this case $\mathcal{C} = \{G_4\} \cup \mathcal{H}_{k_2+1} \cup \bigcup_{i=k_2+2}^n \mathcal{C}_i$ is a $(x, y; u)$ -set of chains in B .

Observe that, if B_i is non-bipartite for some $i \in [n] \setminus [k_2]$, then we can choose P_i , and hence also P , so that \mathcal{C} is odd or even. This proves the second claim of the theorem if $y = b_{k_2}$ ($k_2 \neq n$) and B_i is non-bipartite for some $i \in [n] \setminus [k_2]$.

The last case to consider is when B_i is bipartite for $i \in [n]$. In this case $B - x$ is bipartite and the theorem follows from Lemma 3.16. \square

The proof of the following lemma is similar to the proof of Lemma 3.10 (so we skip this proof).

Lemma 3.18 *Let G be a bipartite plain chain of blocks*

$$G = B_1, b_1, B_2, \dots, b_{n-1}, B_n.$$

Let $u \in V(B_j) \setminus \{b_{j-1}, b_j\}$ for some $j \in \{2, \dots, n-1\}$, and suppose that there exists a $[b_{j-1}, b_j, u]$ -set of chains in B_j . Then for any $v' \in V(B_1) \setminus V(B_2)$ and $v'' \in V(B_n) \setminus V(B_{n-1})$, there exists a $[v', v'', u]$ -set of chains in G .

Theorem 3.19 *Let B be a non-bipartite circuit graph with outer cycle C . Suppose that $x, y \in V(C)$ and that B is good with respect to x and y . If every internal vertex of B is of degree at least 4 and B is not an odd cycle, then there exists a $[x, y]$ -set of chains in B .*

Proof. By Lemma 2.3, $B - x$ is a plain chain of blocks

$$B - x = B_1, b_1, B_2, \dots, b_{n-1}, B_n.$$

Let $b_0 \in V(B_1)$ and $b_n \in V(B_n)$ be the neighbors of x in C . Let $k \in [n]$ be such that $y \in V(B_k) \setminus V(B_{k-1})$ (here we set $B_0 = \emptyset$).

Suppose that at least one block B_i is non-bipartite. If B_i is trivial, define $\mathcal{C}_i = \emptyset$ and $P_i = B_i$. Otherwise, by Theorem 3.17 and Lemma 3.13 there is

- (i) a $(b_{i-1}, b_i; b_i)$ -set of chains in B_i , for $i \in [k-1]$,
- (ii) a $(b_{k-1}, b_k; y)$ -set of chains in B_k ,
- (iii) a $(b_{i-1}, b_i; b_{i-1})$ -set of chains in B_i for $i \in [n] \setminus [k]$.

Denote by \mathcal{C}_i the set of chains in B_i defined by (i), (ii) and (iii). The \mathcal{C}_i -paths are denoted by P_i , for $i \in [n]$. Let $P_0 = x, b_0$ and $P_{n+1} = b_n, x$, and define $C' = \bigcup_{i=0}^{n+1} P_i$. Since B_i is non-bipartite for some $i \in [n]$, there is an odd and an even set of chains \mathcal{C}_i for (i), (ii) or (iii). Hence, we can choose \mathcal{C}_i and P_i so that C' is even, and therefore $C = \bigcup_{i=1}^n \mathcal{C}_i$ is a $[x, y]$ -set of chains in B .

Suppose that all blocks $B_i, i \in [n]$ are bipartite. Then all odd faces of B are incident to x . Define $B_{n+1} = P_{n+1}$.

If $y \notin \{b_{k-1}, b_k\}$, then by Lemma 3.15 there exists a $[b_{k-1}, b_k, y]$ -set of chains \mathcal{D}_k in B_k . Let $G = B_1, b_1, B_2, \dots, b_{n-1}, B_n, b_n, B_{n+1}$. By Lemma 3.18 there is a $[x, y]$ -set of

chains in G , which is also a $[x, y]$ -set of chains in B (because G is a spanning subgraph of B).

Assume now that $y \in \{b_{k-1}, b_k\}$. Suppose that $y \in \{b_0, b_n\}$. We may assume $y = b_0$. If a block B_i of G is nontrivial, then by Lemma 3.15, there is a $[b_{i-1}, b_i]$ -set of chains \mathcal{F}_i in B_i . Therefore, by Lemma 3.18 there is a $[x, y]$ -set of chains in G , which is also a $[x, y]$ -set of chains in B . Otherwise all blocks $B_i, i \in [n+1]$ are trivial. If C is an even cycle, then C itself is a $[x, y]$ -set of chains in B . Otherwise C is odd, and since B is not an odd cycle, C has a chord. Hence B has an even cycle C_0 (which goes through x). Clearly, C_0 together with blocks B_i such that $|V(B_i) \cap V(C_0)| \leq 1$ forms a $[x, y]$ -set of chains in B .

Hence we may assume that $y = b_k$ where $k \notin \{0, n\}$. Suppose that all bounded odd faces of B are incident to y (and recall that all bounded odd faces are incident to x). Then there are exactly one or two such faces. However, if there is exactly one bounded odd face in B , and this odd face is incident to x and y , then $xy \in E(C)$ (follows from the fact that B is good with respect to x and y) and so $y \in \{b_0, b_n\}$.

Therefore there are exactly two bounded odd faces in B (both adjacent to x and y). In this case the cycle C' (defined above) bounds exactly two odd faces of B and therefore C' is even. Hence, C (defined above) is a $[x, y]$ -set of chains in B .

We may therefore assume that there is a bounded odd face F of B , which is not incident to y , and that $y \notin \{b_0, b_n\}$. Let xx_1 and xx_2 be edges incident to F . Since F is not incident to $y = b_k$ we may assume, without loss of generality, that $x_1, x_2 \in \bigcup_{i=1}^k V(B_i)$. Since F is an odd face and G is bipartite, every x_1x -path in G is odd and every x_2x -path in G is even (or vice-versa).

Let $k' \in [k]$ be such that $x_1 \in V(B_{k'}) \setminus V(B_{k'+1})$. If $B_{k'}$ resp. B_i is nontrivial, then by Lemma 3.12 and Lemma 3.13 there is a

- (iv) a $(x_1, b_{k'}; b_{k'-1}, b_{k'})$ -set of chains $\mathcal{G}_{k'}$ in $B_{k'}$,
- (v) a $(b_{i-1}, b_i; b_{i-1}, b_i)$ -set of chains \mathcal{G}_i in B_i for $i \in [n] \setminus [k']$.

Let P_i be the \mathcal{G}_i -path in B_i for $i \in [n] \setminus [k' - 1]$ (if B_i is trivial, define $P_i = B_i$ and $\mathcal{G}_i = \emptyset$), and define $C'' = \bigcup_{i=k'}^{n+1} P_i \cup \{xx_1\}$ (recall that $P_{n+1} = b_n, x$). Since every x_1x -path in G is odd, C'' is even. By (iv) and Lemma 3.10, there is a $(x_1, b_{k'}; b_{k'})$ -set of chains $\mathcal{H}_{k'}$ in $\bigcup_{i=1}^{k'} B_i$. Then $\mathcal{G} = \bigcup_{i=k'+1}^n \mathcal{G}_i \cup \mathcal{H}_{k'}$ is a $[x, y]$ -set of chains in B , and C'' is a \mathcal{G} -cycle in B . \square

Theorem 3.20 *Let B be a circuit graph such that every internal vertex of B is of degree at least 4. Then B has a spanning bipartite cactus.*

Proof. Let C be the outer cycle of B . We prove a slightly stronger statement: if B is a circuit graph such that every internal vertex of B is of degree at least 4, and $x, y \in V(C)$ are vertices such that B is good with respect to x and y , then B has a spanning bipartite cactus T such that x and y are contained in exactly one block of T .

The proof is by induction on $|V(B)|$. The statement is clearly true if B is an even cycle. If B is an odd cycle and B is good with respect to x and y then x and y are

adjacent. A spanning xy -path in B is a bipartite spanning cactus in B such that x and y are contained in exactly one block of this cactus.

If B is not an odd cycle, then by Theorem 3.19 (if B is non-bipartite) and Lemma 3.15 (if B is bipartite), there is a $[x, y]$ -set of chains $\mathcal{C} = \{G_1, \dots, G_k\}$ in B . Let C' be a \mathcal{C} -cycle. Note that each block B' of a chain $G_i, i \in [k]$ is good with respect to (both) cutvertices of G_i contained in B' . Moreover, either $x \notin \bigcup_{i=1}^k V(G_i)$ or a chain of \mathcal{C} is good with respect to x (a similar fact is true for y). Therefore we can use the induction hypothesis, to obtain a spanning bipartite cactus $T(B')$ in B' such that (both) cutvertices of G_i contained in B' are contained in exactly one block of $T(B')$. Moreover the block B_x that contains x (if any) has a spanning bipartite cactus $T(B_x)$ such that x is contained in exactly one block of $T(B_x)$ (a similar fact is true for y). Let \mathcal{B} be the set of all blocks of $G_i, i \in [k]$ and define $T = C' \cup \bigcup_{B' \in \mathcal{B}} T(B')$. This gives the required bipartite cactus in B . \square

Let \mathcal{P} be the class of 3-connected planar graphs whose prisms are not hamiltonian. We end the article with the problem to determine the minimum ratio of cubic vertices in a graph $G \in \mathcal{P}$. Let $V_3(G)$ denote the set of cubic vertices in G .

Problem 3.21 *Determine minimum ϵ such that there exist arbitrary large graphs $G \in \mathcal{P}$ with $|V_3(G)|/|V(G)| < \epsilon$. In particular, can ϵ be arbitrary small ?*

Acknowledgement: The author thanks Uroš Milutinović for proofreading parts of the final version of this paper. This work was supported by the Ministry of Education of Slovenia [grant numbers P1-0297, J1-9109].

References

- [1] D.W. Barnette, Trees in polyhedral graphs, *Canad. J. Math.* 18 (1966), 731–736.
- [2] D. Barnette, E. Jucovič, Hamiltonian circuits on 3-polytopes. *J. Comb. Theory* 9 (1970), 54–59.
- [3] D. P. Biebighauser, M. N. Ellingham, Prism-Hamiltonicity of triangulations, *J. Graph Theory*, 57 (2008), 181–197.
- [4] G. Brinkmann, C. T. Zamfirescu, Polyhedra with few 3-cuts are hamiltonian, *Electron. J. Combin.* 26 (2019), no. 1, Paper No. 1.39, 16 pp.
- [5] R. Čada, T. Kaiser, M. Rosenfeld, Z. Ryjáček, Hamiltonian decompositions of prisms over cubic graphs, *Discrete Math.* 286 (2004), 45–56.
- [6] M. N. Ellingham, E. A. Marshall, K. Ozeki, S. Tsuchiya, Hamiltonicity of planar graphs with a forbidden minor, *J. Graph Theory* 90 (2019), no. 4, 459–483.
- [7] M. N. Ellingham, P. S. Nowbandegani, S. Shan, Toughness and prism-hamiltonicity of P4-free graphs. *Discrete Appl. Math.* 284 (2020), 201–206.

- [8] Z. Gao, R. B. Richter, 2-walks in circuit graphs, *J. Comb. Theory Ser. B*, 62 (1994), 259–267.
- [9] D. Ikegami, S. Maezawa, C. T. Zamfirescu, On 3-polytopes with non-Hamiltonian prisms, *J. Graph Theory*. (2021), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jgt.22672>
- [10] B. Jackson, N.C. Wormald, k-walks of graphs, *Australas. J. Combin.* 2 (1990) 135–146.
- [11] T. Kaiser, D. Král', M. Rosenfeld, Z. Ryjáček, H.-J. Voss, Hamilton cycles in prisms, *J. Graph Theory* 56 (2007), 249–269.
- [12] B. Mohar, C. Thomassen, *Graphs on surfaces*. Johns Hopkins Studies in the Mathematical Sciences. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD, 2001.
- [13] O. Ore, Note on Hamilton circuits, *Amer. Math. Monthly* 67 (1960) 55.
- [14] K. Ozeki, A degree sum condition for graphs to be prism Hamiltonian, *Discrete Math.* 309 (2009), no. 13, 4266–4269.
- [15] K. Ozeki, N. Van Cleemput, C. T. Zamfirescu, Hamiltonian properties of polyhedra with few 3-cuts — a survey. *Discrete Math.* 341 (2018), no. 9, 2646–2660.
- [16] P. Paulraja, A characterization of hamiltonian prisms, *J. Graph Theory* 17 (1993), 161–171.
- [17] M. Rosenfeld, D. Barnette, Hamiltonian circuits in certain prisms, *Discrete Math.* 5 (1973), 389–394.
- [18] S. Špacapan, A counterexample to prism-hamiltonicity of 3-connected planar graphs. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* 146 (2021), 364–371.
- [19] C. Thomassen. Hypohamiltonian graphs and digraphs, *Proc. Internat. Conf. Theory and Appl. of Graphs*, Kalamazoo, 1976, LNCS 642, Springer, Berlin (1978) 557–571.
- [20] W. T. Tutte, On Hamiltonian circuits, *J. London Math. Soc.* 21 (1946), 98–101.
- [21] W. T. Tutte, A theorem on planar graphs, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 82 (1956), 99–116.
- [22] N. Van Cleemput, C. T. Zamfirescu, Regular non-hamiltonian polyhedral graphs. *Appl. Math. Comput.* 338 (2018), 192–206.