

GRAPHS WITH THE SAME TRUNCATED CYCLE MATROIDS

José F. De Jesús (University of Puerto Rico, San Juan, Puerto Rico, U.S.A.)

Alexander Kelmans (University of Puerto Rico, San Juan, Puerto Rico, U.S.A.)

Abstract

The classical Whitney's 2-Isomorphism Theorem describes the families of graphs having the same cycle matroid. In this paper we describe the families of graphs having the same truncated cycle matroid and prove, in particular, that every 3-connected graph, except for K_4 , is uniquely defined by its truncated cycle matroid.

Key words: graph, matroid, cycle matroid, truncated matroid.

MSC Subject Classification: 05B35, 05C99

1 Introduction

In 1933 H. Whitney [3] described the families of graphs having the same cycle matroid. He also proved, in particular, that every 3-connected graph is uniquely defined by its cycle matroid [4]. In this paper we describe the families of graphs having the same truncated cycle matroid and prove, in particular, that every 3-connected graph, except for K_4 , is uniquely defined by its cycle matroid. The dual version of our paper is described by R. Chen and Z.Gao [1].

2 Main notions, notation, and simple observations

Given two finite sets X and Y , let $X\Delta Y = (X \setminus Y) \cup (Y \setminus X)$.

Given a finite set E , let 2^E denote the set of all subsets of E and $\binom{E}{k}$ denote the set of all k -element subsets of E .

Given $\mathcal{S} \subseteq 2^E$, let $\Delta(\mathcal{S}) = \Delta\{S : S \in \mathcal{S}\}$.

2.1 On graphs

A *graph* G is a triple (V, E, ϕ) such that V and E are disjoint finite sets, $V \cap E = \emptyset$, $V \neq \emptyset$, and $\phi : E \rightarrow \binom{V}{2}$. We will also put $V = V(G)$ and $E = E(G)$.

The elements of $V = V(G)$ and $E = E(G)$ are called *vertices and edges of graph* G , respectively. If $\phi(e) = \{u, v\}$, we say that *vertices* u and v are *incident to edge* e and are the *end-vertices of* e in G .

We say that *graph* $G' = (V', E', \phi')$ is a *subgraph of graph* $G = (V, E, \phi)$ and write $G' \leq G$ if $V' \subseteq V$, $E' \subseteq E$, and function ϕ' is a restriction of function ϕ on V' .

The *degree* $d(v, G)$ of vertex v in G is the number of edges incident to v in G .

A *cycle* in graph G is an \leq -minimal subgraph of G with every vertex of degree two. An (x, y) -*path* in graph G is an \leq -minimal subgraph of G with exactly two vertices x and y of degree one.

A cycle C in graph G is called *Hamiltonian*, if $V(C) = V(G)$. A cycle Q in graph G is called *quasi-Hamiltonian*, if $V(Q) = V(G) \setminus q$ for some $q \in V(G)$.

A *forest* in graph G is a subgraph of G with no cycles. A forest F in graph G is called *maximal* if F is not a proper subgraph of another forest in G .

A graph G with at least two vertices is *connected* if G has an (x, y) -path for every two vertices x and y in G . Obviously, a maximal forest in a connected graph G is a tree T with $V(T) = V(G)$ (called a *spanning tree* of G).

Let $G = (V, E, \phi)$ and $X \subseteq E$. Let $G[X]$ be the graph such that $E(G[X]) = X$ and $V(G[X])$ is the set of vertices of G incident to at least one edge in X . We say that $G[X]$ is the *subgraph of G induced by the edge subset X* .

A graph G is called *even* if every vertex of G is incident to an even number of edges in G (i.e. the degree of every vertex in G is even). For example, a cycle is an even graph.

Graphs $G = (V, E, \phi)$ and $G' = (V', E', \phi')$ are *equal* if $V = V'$, $E = E'$, and $\phi = \phi'$.

An *isomorphism* from $G = (V, E, \phi)$ to $G' = (V', E', \phi')$ is a pair (ν, ε) , where $\nu : V \rightarrow V'$ and $\varepsilon : E \rightarrow E'$ are bijections such that $\phi(e) = \{x, y\} \Leftrightarrow \phi'(\varepsilon(e)) = \{\nu(x), \nu(y)\}$. Graphs G and G' are *isomorphic* (denoted by $G \sim G'$) if there exists an isomorphism from G to G' (or, equivalently, an isomorphism from G' to G).

A *vertex star* in graph G is the set of edges in G incident to the same vertex. Graphs G and G' are *strongly isomorphic* (denoted by $G \approx G'$) if they have the same family of vertex stars.

2.2 On matroids

Let M be a matroid on the ground set E with the set of bases $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(M)$ and the set of circuits $\mathcal{C}(M)$. A circuit H in M is called *Hamiltonian* if the number of elements in H is equal to the number of elements in a base of M plus one.

We will need the following (known and easy to prove) fact.

Claim 2.1 *Let M be a matroid on the ground set E and*

$$\mathcal{B}_t(M) = \{B - x : B \in \mathcal{B}(M), x \in B\}.$$

Then

- (c1) \mathcal{B}_t is the set of bases of a matroid on the ground set E (denoted by M_t) and
- (c2) $\mathcal{C}(M_t) = \mathcal{C}(M) \cup \mathcal{B}(M) \setminus \mathcal{H}(M)$, where $\mathcal{H}(M)$ is the family of Hamiltonian circuits of M .

Matroid M_t is called the *truncation of matroid M* or, simply, a *truncated matroid*.

2.3 On matroids of a graph

Let $G = (V, E, \phi)$ be a graph with the vertex set V , the non-empty edge set E , and the incident function ϕ . Let $\mathcal{B}(G)$ be the family of the edge sets of maximal forests and $\mathcal{C}(G)$ be the family of the edge sets of cycles in graph G .

It is known and easy to prove that $\mathcal{B}(G)$ is the set of bases and $\mathcal{C}(G)$ is the set of circuits of a *matroid* M on the ground set E called *the cycle matroid of graph G* and denoted by $M(G)$.

Obviously, if graph G is connected, then $\mathcal{B}(G)$ is the family of the edge sets of spanning trees in G and $\mathcal{B}_t(G)$ is the family of the edge-sets of maximal two-component forests in G .

3 Main Result

We need the following (easy to prove) claim.

Claim 3.1 *Suppose that*

- (a1) G is a graph and $Y, Z \subseteq E(G)$ and
- (a2) $G[Y]$ is an even subgraph of G and $G[Z]$ is a cycle of G .

Then

- (c1) $G[Y \Delta Z]$ is also an even subgraph of G , and therefore
- (c2) if \mathcal{F} is a family of the edge sets of cycles in G , then $G[\Delta \mathcal{F}]$ is an even subgraph of G .

Put $\mathcal{C}(M_t(G)) = \mathcal{C}_t(G)$. From the definition of $M_t(G)$ we have:

Lemma 3.2 *Let G be a connected graph with no loops and no parallel edges.*

Then $\mathcal{C}_t(G) = \mathcal{T}(G) \cup \mathcal{Q}(G) \cup \mathcal{S}(G)$, where

$\mathcal{T}(G)$ *is the family of the edge-sets of spanning trees of G ,*

$\mathcal{Q}(G)$ *is the family of the edge-sets of quasi-Hamiltonian cycles of G , and*

$\mathcal{S}(G)$ *is the family of the edge-sets of small cycles of G .*

We say that a pair of graphs $\{G, F\}$ satisfies condition \mathcal{K} if the following conditions hold:

- (b0) G and F are connected graphs,
- (b1) G and F are graphs with no loops and no parallel edges,
- (b2) $E(G) = E(F) = E$,
- (b3) $M_t(G) = M_t(F)$, and
- (b4) $M(G) \neq M(F)$.

Lemma 3.3 *Suppose that a pair of graphs $\{G, F\}$ satisfies condition \mathcal{K} .*

Then there exists $X \subseteq E$ such that exactly one of the following holds:

- (c1) $G[X]$ is a quasi-Hamiltonian cycle in G and $F[X]$ is a spanning tree in F or
- (c2) $F[X]$ is a quasi-Hamiltonian cycle in F and $G[X]$ is a spanning tree in G .

Proof Put $\mathcal{C}(M_t(G)) = \mathcal{C}_t(G)$. By Lemma 3.2, $\mathcal{C}_t(G) = \mathcal{T}(G) \cup \mathcal{Q}(G) \cup \mathcal{S}(G)$. Obviously,

$$M_t(G) = M_t(F) \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{C}_t(G) = \mathcal{C}_t(F). \text{ It is easy to see that } \mathcal{S}(G) = \mathcal{S}(F).$$

Therefore,

$$M_t(G) = M_t(F) \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{T}(G) \cup \mathcal{Q}(G) = \mathcal{T}(F) \cup \mathcal{Q}(F).$$

Now

$$M(G) \neq M(F) \Rightarrow \mathcal{T}(G) \neq \mathcal{T}(F) \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{T}(G) \Delta \mathcal{T}(F) \neq \emptyset.$$

Thus, there exists $X \subseteq E$ such that at least one of the following holds:

$$X \in \mathcal{Q}(G) \setminus \mathcal{Q}(F) \text{ and } X \in \mathcal{T}(F) \setminus \mathcal{T}(G) \text{ or}$$

$$X \in \mathcal{Q}(F) \setminus \mathcal{Q}(G) \text{ and } X \in \mathcal{T}(G) \setminus \mathcal{T}(F). \quad \square$$

Claim 3.4 *The edge set X in Lemma 3.3 is not the symmetric difference of the edge sets of small cycles in G (i.e. of members of set $\mathcal{S}(G)$).*

Proof Suppose, on the contrary, that $X = \Delta \mathcal{F}$ for some family of edge sets of cycles in G . Then by Claim 3.1, $F[\Delta \mathcal{F}]$ is an even graph and therefore is not a spanning tree in graph F . This contradicts Lemma 3.3. \square

Without loss of generality we can assume by Lemma 3.3 that $G[X]$ is a quasi-Hamiltonian cycle in G and $F[X]$ is a spanning tree in F .

Let $G[X] = R$ and $F[X] = T$. Then $V(G) \setminus V(R)$ consists of one vertex that we denote by c . Since graph G is connected, there exists an edge s incident to c and to a vertex (say, r) in R . Thus, $R' = R \cup (csr)$ is a connected spanning subgraph of G , and so if e is an edge in G , then one of its end-vertices is in R and the other one is either equal to c or is also in R .

We call cycle R the *rim* of G , an edge of G incident to c a *spoke* of G , and an edge h in $E(G) \setminus E(R)$ with both end-vertices in R a *chord* of G .

Claim 3.5 *Graph G has no chords, and therefore G has at least one spoke.*

Proof Suppose, on the contrary, that G has a chord h with the end-vertices u and v . Then h belongs to two cycles C_1 and C_2 in G such that

$$(p1) \ E(C_1), E(C_2) \in \mathcal{S}(G) = \mathcal{S}(F) \text{ and}$$

$$(p2) \ E(C_1) \Delta E(C_2) = E(R).$$

This contradicts Claim 3.4. \square

Claim 3.6 *Suppose that s and s' are some different spokes in G with the end-vertices r and r' in R , respectively. Let $P = P(r, r')$ be a shortest path in R with the end-vertices r and r' . Then path P has at most two edges.*

Proof Let $H = rscs'r'$ and let $P' = P'(r, r')$ be the path in R such that $P \cup P' = R$. Let $C = P \cup H$ and $C' = P' \cup H$. Then $E(R) = E(C) \Delta E(C')$. Suppose, on the contrary, that

$p = e(P) \geq 3$. Then also $e(P') \geq 3$, and so $e(R) \geq 2p \geq 6$. Also $e(C) = e(P) + 2$ and $e(C') = e(P') + 2$. Therefore $e(C) < e(R)$ and $e(C') < e(R)$. Then, $E(C), E(C') \in \mathcal{S}(G)$ and $E(C) \Delta E(C') = E(R)$. Now by Lemma 3.1, $F[E(C) \Delta E(C')]$ is an even graph and therefore is not a spanning tree in graph F . This contradicts Lemma 3.3. \square

Claim 3.7 *Graph G has at least one and at most three spokes. Moreover,*

(c1) *if G has two spokes s_1 and s_2 , then their end-vertices r_1 and r_2 in R are on distance one or two in R (see Fig. 3.7[c1,1] and Fig.3.7[c1,2]) and*

(c2) *if G has three spokes $s_1, s_2,$ and s_3 , then their end-vertices $r_1, r_2,$ and r_3 belong to a 3-vertex path in R (see Fig3.7[c2,p1]).*

Proof By Claim 3.5, G has at least one spoke. If G has at most two spokes, then our claim (c1) follows from Claim 3.6.

Now we prove (c2). Suppose that G has exactly three spokes $s_1, s_2,$ and s_3 with the end-vertices $r_1, r_2,$ and r in R , respectively.

(p1) Suppose first that some two vertices from $\{r_1, r_2, r\}$, say, r_1 and r_2 , are adjacent in R . If r is adjacent to r_1 or r_2 , then $r_1, r_2,$ and r belong to a 3-vertex path in R , and we are done (see Fig.[c2,p1]). Therefore r is on distance at least 2 from r_1 and r_2 in R . Then $E(R) = X$ is the symmetric difference of the edge sets of three small cycles. This contradicts Claim 3.4.

(p2) Now suppose that no two vertices from $\{r_1, r_2, r\}$ are adjacent in R . Then by Claim 3.6 every two vertices from r_1, r_2, r are on distance 2 in R . Therefore R is a 6-edge cycle and $E(R) = X$ is the symmetric difference of the edge sets of three squares $S_i, i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ in G . This contradicts Claim 3.4. \square

Put $M_t = M_t(G) = M_t(F)$.

Claim 3.8 *Suppose that*

(a1) *a pair of graphs $\{G, F\}$ satisfies condition \mathcal{K} and*

(a2) *G has exactly one spoke s with its end-vertex r in $R = G[X]$.*

Then

(c1) *either F is isomorphic to G or F is a cycle and*

(c2) *M_t is isomorphic to a uniform matroid $U_{m-2,m} = (E, \mathcal{B})$,*

where m is the number of elements in E and $\mathcal{B} = \binom{E}{m-2}$ is the set of bases of matroid $U_{m-2,m}$.

Proof As we have assumed above, $R = G[X]$ is a quasi-hamiltonian cycle in G and $T = F(X)$ is a spanning tree in F . Then $T \cup s = F[X \cup s]$ has a cycle, say D . If D is a small cycle, then $E(D)$ induces a small cycle in G , a contradiction. Therefore one of the following holds:

(h1) D is a quasi-hamiltonian cycle in F , and so F is isomorphic to G or

(h2) D is a hamiltonian cycle in F , and so $D = F$ is a cycle.

Therefore (c1) holds. Moreover, in both cases M_t satisfies (c2). \square

Claim 3.9 *Suppose that*

- (a1) *a pair of graphs $\{G, F\}$ satisfies condition \mathcal{K} and*
- (a2) *G has exactly two spokes s_1 and s_2 and their end-vertices r_1 and r_2 are incident to an edge, say x , in $R = G[X]$.*

Then

- (c1) *graphs G and F are isomorphic,*
- (c2) *graph F can be obtained from graph G by a series of some Whitney 2-vertex cut switches and, possibly, also by exchanging two edges e and s_i for some $i \in \{1, 2\}$ (which is not a Whitney graph operation), and*
- (c3) *graphs G and F are 2-connected.*

Proof By Claim 3.3, $R = G[X]$ is a quasi-hamiltonian cycle in G and $F[X]$ is a spanning tree T in F . Since G has exactly two spokes s_1 and s_2 and their end-vertices r_1 and r_2 in $R = G[X]$ are on distance one in R , there is an edge x in R such that $\Delta = cs_1r_1xr_2s_2c$ is a 3-cycle in G . Clearly, $e \in E(R) \cap E(T)$. Then $E(\Delta)$ is the edge-set of a 3-cycle Z in F .

Let $V(Z) = \{z, z_1, z_2\}$, where vertices z_1, z_2 are incident to edge x , and so vertex z is not incident to edge x . Let zPz' be a shortest path in tree T from z to $\{z_1, z_2\}$. Let $z' = z_1$, and so s_1 is the edge in Z incident to vertices z and z_1 in T . Obviously, $x \notin E(P)$. If $e(P) < e(T - x)$, then $P \cup s_1$ is a small cycle in F , and therefore $E(P) \cup s_1$ is the edge set of a small cycle in G distinct from Δ , a contradiction. Then $e(P) = e(T - x)$, and so $E(P) = E(T - x)$, a tree T is the path zPz_1xz_2 , and $F = T \cup s_2$. Thus, F is isomorphic to G , and therefore (c1) holds. It also follows that (c2) and (c3) holds. \square

Claim 3.10 *Suppose that*

- (a1) *a pair of graphs $\{G, F\}$ satisfy condition \mathcal{K} and*
- (a2) *G has exactly two spokes s_1 and s_2 and their end-vertices r_1 and r_2 in R are the end-vertices of a two-edge path $r_1x_1rx_2r_2$ in R .*

Then

- (c1) *graphs G and F are isomorphic,*
- (c2) *graph F can be obtained from graph G by a series of some Whitney 2-vertex cut switches and, possibly, also by exchanging two edges e_i and s_j for some $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$ (which is not a Whitney graph operation), and*
- (c3) *graphs G and F are 2-connected.*

Proof By (a2), $\diamond = cs_1r_1x_1rx_2r_2s_2c$ is an induced 4-cycle in G . Then $E(\diamond)$ is also the edge-set of an induced 4-cycle in F . Let R^* be the cycle in G with $E(R^*) = (E(R) \setminus \{x_1, x_2\}) \cup \{s_1, s_2\}$.

Consider the path $Z = R - r$ with the end-vertices r_1 and r_2 . Then $Z = R^* - c$. Obviously, $e(Z) \geq 1$. Also $\{s_1, s_2, x_1, x_2\}$ is the edge set of a 4-cycle in F .

Suppose first that Z has one edge, say z . Then $Q_c = (R \cup z) \setminus r$ and $Q_r = (R^* \cup z) \setminus c$ are triangles and the only quasi-hamiltonian cycles in G . By Lemma 3.3, we can assume

that $E(Q_c)$ induces a spanning tree in F . Then $v(F) = v(G) = 4$, $E(F) = E(G)$, and $e(F) = e(G) = 5$. Therefore graphs G and F are isomorphic.

Now suppose that $e(Z) \geq 2$. Let $z_1, z_2 \in E(Z)$, where $z_1 \neq z_2$. Let $Z_i = Z - z_i$ and $T_i = Z_i \cup (r_1 s_1 c s_2 r_2) \cup \{x_i, r\}$, where $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Then each T_i is a spanning tree of G and $G = T_1 \cup T_2$. Let $E_i = E(T_i)$. Obviously, $F = F(E_1) \cup F(E_2)$.

We claim that each $F(E_i)$ is also a spanning tree of F . Suppose, on the contrary, that, say, $F(E_1)$ is not a spanning tree of F . Then $D = F(E_1)$ is a quasi-hamiltonian cycle in F containing a path with three edges x_1, s_1, s_2 . Hence x_2 is a cord of cycle D . Then the edge-set $(E(D) \cup x_2) \setminus \{s_1, s_2, x_1\}$ induces a small cycle in F but not in G , a contradiction. It follows that graphs G and F are isomorphic. Therefore (c1) holds. It follows that (c2) and (c3) also hold. \square

Claim 3.11 *Suppose that*

(a1) *a pair of graphs $\{G, F\}$ satisfies condition \mathcal{K} and*

(a2) *G has exactly three spokes s_1, s_2 , and s such that end-vertices r_1, r_2 , and r belong to a 3-vertex path $r_1 x_1 r x_2 r_2$ in R and spoke s is incident to r .*

Then

(c1) *graphs G and F are isomorphic,*

(c2) *graph F can be obtained from graph G by a series of some Whitney 2-vertex cut switches and, possibly, also by exchanging two edges e_i and s_i for some $i \in \{1, 2\}$ (which is not a Whitney graph operation), and*

(c3) *graphs G and F are 2-connected.*

Proof From (a2) it follows (as above) that in graph G there is a vertex r and edges x_1 and x_2 in R such that $\diamond = c s_1 r_1 x_1 r x_2 s_2 r_2 c$ is a 4-cycle in G . Let $G' = G \setminus s$ and $F' = F \setminus s$. Then by Claim 3.10, G' and F' are isomorphic. If $F = F' \cup s$ is not isomorphic to G , then s belongs to a small cycle D in F , which is also a small cycle in G , a contradiction. Therefore (c1) holds. It also follows that (c2) holds. \square

It is easy to prove the following

Claim 3.12 *Let H be a non-connected graph with no loops, no parallel edges, no isolated vertices, and with the set of components $\{C_i : i = 1, \dots, k\}$. Let $V = \{v_i \in V(C_i) : i = 1, \dots, k\}$ and let H^* be the graph obtained from H by identifying the vertices in V with a new vertex v .*

Then

(c1) *$v(H^*) \geq 3$ and H^* is of connectivity one (i.e. is connected, but not 2-connected),*

(c2) *$M(H) = M(H^*)$,*

(c3) *$M_t(H) = M_t(H^*)$, and*

(c4) *H^* satisfies condition \mathcal{K} .*

Claim 3.13 *Suppose that a pair of graphs $\{G, F\}$ satisfies all condition in \mathcal{K} , except for condition (b0), namely, at least one of G, F , say G , is not a connected graph. Then G has two components, namely, a one-edge component and a cycle.*

Proof By Claim 3.12, G^* satisfies condition \mathcal{K} .

By Claims 3.8, 3.9, 3.10, and 3.11, the graphs satisfying the conditions of these Claims are 2-connected. Since graph G^* is not 2-connected, G^* does not satisfy the assumptions of these Claims. Thus, G^* satisfies the assumptions of Claim 3.8. Therefore G has exactly two components, namely, a one-edge component and a cycle. \square

From the above we have in particular:

Claim 3.14 *Every 3-connected graph, except for K_4 , is uniquely defined by its truncated cycle matroid.*

References

- [1] R. Chen, Z. Gao, Representations of bicircular lift matroids, *The Electronic Journal of Combinatorics* **23** (3), (2016) #P3.42.
- [2] J. G. Oxley, *Matroid Theory*, Oxford University Press, 2006.
- [3] H. Whitney, 2-isomorphic graphs, *Amer. J. Math.* **55** (1933) 245-254.
- [4] H. Whitney, Congruent graphs and the connectivity of graphs, *Amer. J. Math.* **54** (1932) 159-168.