

COSPECTRAL VERTICES, WALK-REGULAR PLANAR GRAPHS AND THE ECHOLOCATION PROBLEM

SHI-LEI KONG, EMMETT L. WYMAN, AND YAKUN XI

ABSTRACT. We study cospectral vertices on finite graphs in relation to the echolocation problem on Riemannian manifolds. First, We prove a computationally simple criterion to determine whether two vertices are cospectral. Then, we use this criterion in conjunction with a computer search to find minimal examples of various types of graphs on which cospectral but non-similar vertices exist, including minimal walk-regular non-vertex-transitive graphs, which turn out to be non-planar. Moreover, as our main result, we classify all finite 3-connected walk-regular planar graphs, proving that such graphs must be vertex-transitive.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let G be a finite graph with adjacency matrix A . Let $\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_n$ be an orthonormal basis of eigenfunctions (eigenvectors) of A with respective eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n$. We say two vertices a and b are *cospectral* if

$$(1.1) \quad \sum_{\lambda_j=\lambda} |\phi_j(a)|^2 = \sum_{\lambda_j=\lambda} |\phi_j(b)|^2 \quad \text{for all eigenvalues } \lambda.$$

All graphs considered in this article will be finite, simple, undirected, and connected unless otherwise specified.

The study of cospectral vertices has gained more attention recently, (see e.g., [God12, GS17, CCT⁺19, EKL19, KSSW20]), especially due to their significant role in quantum information theory. It has been shown [God12] that for a perfect quantum state transfer to occur between two vertices in an interacting qubits network, it is necessary for these vertices to be cospectral.

We say two vertices a, b are *similar* if there is an automorphism of G mapping a to b . Two similar vertices are clearly also cospectral. Recently, Kempton, Sinkovic, Smith, and Webb [KSSW20] show that two vertices are cospectral if and only if they are similar in a certain weaker sense. We are interested in the exceptional situation where two vertices are cospectral but not similar. We come to this problem from the smooth setting, where a graph is replaced with a Riemannian manifold. One can formulate a notion of cospectral points that reads exactly as (1.1), provided the adjacency matrix is replaced with the Laplace-Beltrami operator (see Remark 3.2). The question of whether or not there exists a pair of cospectral points that are not in the same orbit has a musical interpretation: *Can one hear, up to symmetry, where a drum is struck?* We refer to this question as the echolocation problem. The last two authors show that for most compact Riemannian manifolds, the answer is ‘yes’ [WX23]. So far, there are no known examples of connected manifolds where the answer is ‘no’.

In search of such negative examples, we turn to the graph-theoretic setting, where we might use a computer search. In fact, it is well-known that graphs with non-similar cospectral vertices exist. The first such example recorded in literature is a tree with 9 vertices observed by Schwenk [Sch73]. To find more such examples and study their properties, we must find a way to check when two vertices are cospectral that avoids floating point errors. The criterion (1.1) is not convenient in this way, so we need an alternative.

Our method builds off of work by Godsil and Smith [GS17], who show that two vertices a and b of a graph are cospectral with respect to the adjacent matrix A , if and only if $(A^k)_{a,a} = (A^k)_{b,b}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. In other words, a and b are cospectral if, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the number of walks of length k starting and ending at a is equal to the number of walks of length k starting and ending at b . See also [CB23, Mon22] for results in other settings. When it comes to computation, this condition can be used to distinguish non-cospectral vertices but would require seemingly infinitely many operations to confirm that two vertices are cospectral. In this paper, we show that, in fact, one only needs to compute a finite number of powers of A to check cospectrality for a finite graph.

Proposition 1.1. *Let G be a graph (possibly with self-loops) with n vertices and A be the corresponding adjacent matrix. Then two vertices a and b are cospectral if and only if*

$$(1.2) \quad (A^k)_{a,a} = (A^k)_{b,b}, \quad \text{for all } 0 \leq k \leq n-1.$$

Moreover, this condition is sharp in the sense that the upper limit $n-1$ cannot be made smaller.

We remark that, even though Godsil and Smith did not state it explicitly, the first part of Proposition 1.1 follows by the proof of [GS17, Lemma 2.1]. We shall include a proof of Proposition 1.1 in Section 2 for completeness. Then, we employ this condition in a computer search to find minimal examples of regular graphs with cospectral yet non-similar vertices in Section 3.

Theorem 1.2. *The smallest graph containing a pair of vertices that are cospectral but not similar has eight vertices.*

Riemannian manifolds have some rigid structure that graphs, in general, lack. We impose a variety of kinds of regularity on our graphs to emulate this structure. We first search amongst the regular graphs for examples. This setting comes with the benefit that the adjacency matrix A and the two standard symmetric normalizations of the Laplacian $L = D - A$ and $\mathcal{L} = I - D^{-\frac{1}{2}}AD^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ all have precisely the same eigenfunctions. Indeed, we find such examples, but only amongst graphs of ten or more vertices.

Theorem 1.3. *The smallest regular graph containing a pair of non-similar cospectral vertices has ten vertices.*

Even more structured are *walk-regular graphs* [GM80], all of whose vertices are cospectral. A vertex a has degree $(A^2)_{a,a}$, and hence all walk-regular graphs are also regular. Seeking minimal examples amongst walk-regular graphs yields:

Theorem 1.4. *The smallest walk-regular graph containing a pair of non-similar vertices has twelve vertices.*




FIGURE 1. All the 13 semi-regular polyhedrons. The graphics are due to Wikipedia user Cyp [Cyp12], used with permission.

Smooth analogs of walk-regular graphs were studied by Wang and the last two authors in [WWX23]. There they show that every compact two-dimensional surface satisfying the smooth version of walk-regularity is also homogeneous—the isometry group acts transitively on the points in the surface. The assumption that our manifold is two-dimensional is essential to the proof, and it is yet unknown if there are any higher-dimensional manifolds that are walk-regular but not homogeneous. In addition, none of the walk-regular graphs we found are planar. This leads us to consider planar walk-regular graphs.

We are able to prove the following discrete analog of the result of [WWX23].

Theorem 1.5. *Every 3-connected walk-regular planar graph is isomorphic to the polyhedral graphs of one of the following:*

- 5 regular polyhedrons, also known as Platonic solids: tetrahedron, hexahedron, octahedron, dodecahedron, and icosahedron;
- 13 semi-regular polyhedrons, also known as Archimedean solids, pictured in Figure 1;
- the m -gonal prisms for $m = 3$ and $m \geq 5$; and
- the m -gonal antiprisms for $m \geq 4$.

Consequently, every walk-regular planar graph is vertex-transitive.

A direct consequence of the classical theorem of Mani [Man71] says that all 3-connected planar vertex-transitive finite graphs are exactly those listed above. Fleischner and Imrich [FI79] employed the modified Schläfli symbol to give a direct proof of this fact. Theorem 1.5 is a refinement of this result of Mani and Fleischner–Imrich, as walk-regularity is, in general, strictly weaker than vertex-transitivity. The modified Schläfli symbol again plays a crucial role in our proof of Theorem 1.5. To be more detailed, we first attribute the counting of short closed walks to the counting of short cycles, and by some delicate arguments, we prove that in most 3-connected walk-regular planar graphs, every short cycle without chords must be

a face, further demonstrating that the modified Schläfli symbol at each vertex is identical.

Remark 1.6. Although the planarity assumption might seem excessively restrictive, it is sharp in the sense that there exists a walk-regular toroidal graph that is not vertex-transitive. See Figure 4.

Organization of the paper. In Section 2, we prove Proposition 1.1. In Section 3, we give a short overview of our computer search and present a few of our minimal examples. The code is available in full on GitHub, along with a repository of minimal examples (<https://github.com/ewy-man/graph-echolocation>). Section 4 is dedicated to the proof of Theorem 1.5.

Acknowledgements. Xi was supported by the National Key Research and Development Program of China No. 2022YFA1007200 and NSF China Grant No. 12171424. Kong was supported by NSF China Grant No. 12301109 and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities of China No. YJ202343. Wyman was supported by NSF grant DMS-2204397. Wyman extends a thanks to Richard Lange for his very patient guidance through setting up a GitHub repository.

2. CLOSED WALKS OF BOUNDED LENGTH DETERMINE IF TWO VERTICES ARE COSPECTRAL

Let A be the adjacency matrix of some graph G on n vertices, or any real-symmetric $n \times n$ matrix for that matter. Let ϕ_1, \dots, ϕ_n be a real orthonormal eigenbasis for A with respective eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$. For each vertex a , consider the measure

$$\mu_a = \sum_j |\phi_j(a)|^2 \delta_{\lambda_j}$$

on \mathbb{R} . Observe that two vertices a and b are cospectral if and only if $\mu_a = \mu_b$.

Let $m \leq n$ denote the count of *distinct* eigenvalues and note each measure μ_a is determined by its pairing with degree $m-1$ polynomials. In particular, the measure μ_a is uniquely determined by its pairings

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} t^k d\mu_a(t) = \sum_j |\phi_j(a)|^2 \lambda_j^k \quad \text{for } k = 0, \dots, m-1$$

with the standard basis $\{1, t, \dots, t^{m-1}\}$ for the degree $m-1$ polynomials. We can arrive at the same set of quantities from a different direction, namely

$$A_{a,a}^k = \sum_{j,\ell} \phi_j(a) (\phi_j^t A^k \phi_\ell) \phi_\ell(a) = \sum_j |\phi_j(a)|^2 \lambda_j^k.$$

In summary, we have shown:

Lemma 2.1. *Let A be a real-symmetric $n \times n$ matrix. Then, $\mu_a = \mu_b$ if and only if*

$$A_{a,a}^k = A_{b,b}^k \quad \text{for all } k = 0, 1, \dots, n-1.$$

We note that the number $n-1$ of counts is sharp since the adjacency matrix A of a simple path with n vertices for every odd $n = 2\ell + 1$ (i.e., $A_{i,j} = \delta_{|i-j|=1}$) as well as the adjacency matrix A of a simple path with n vertices and a self-loop




FIGURE 2. Four examples of graphs with eight vertices with a pair of non-similar cospectral vertices. The non-similar cospectral pairs are marked in red.

attached to the last vertex for every even $n = 2\ell$ (i.e., $A_{i,j} = \delta_{|i-j|=1} + \delta_{i=j=n}$) satisfies

$$A_{\ell,\ell}^k = A_{\ell+1,\ell+1}^k \quad \text{for all } k = 0, 1, \dots, n-2 \quad \text{but} \quad A_{\ell,\ell}^{n-1} < A_{\ell+1,\ell+1}^{n-1}.$$

3. MINIMAL EXAMPLES

An exhaustive list of minimal examples of graphs with cospectral, non-similar vertices under regularity conditions of varying strength can be found on GitHub (<https://github.com/ewy-man/graph-echolocation>) along with the code used to generate them.

The code is written in the Julia language (see [BEKS17,FBS⁺21]) and contains a number of tools:

- (1) A few functions that generate exhaustive lists of non-isomorphic graphs on a specified number of vertices. An optional filter may be passed to these functions to narrow down and speed up the search.
- (2) A function which returns the orbits of the action of the isomorphism group on the vertices.
- (3) A function that determines the cospectrality of the vertices via Proposition 1.1.
- (4) A number of other convenience functions, such as those that determine if a graph is walk-regular or if there exist non-similar cospectral pairs.

Once loaded into the Julia REPL, these functions can be called to generate the minimal examples below and to check that they are indeed minimal. The first listed operation is the most time-intensive, but typically does not take more than a minute to run on a personal computer.

3.1. Minimal graphs with non-similar cospectral vertices. The smallest graphs that contain non-similar cospectral pairs of vertices have eight vertices. Of all 12346 non-isomorphic graphs on 8 vertices, 126 of them contain non-similar cospectral vertices. Four examples are depicted in Figure 2. Furthermore, all of the 126 minimal examples are connected and none of them are trees.

3.2. Minimal regular graphs with non-similar cospectral vertices. The smallest regular graphs which contain non-similar cospectral pairs of vertices have ten vertices, and of those only those of degree 3, 4, 5, and 6 have minimal examples.

d	number of d -regular examples	number of d -regular graphs
3	3	21
4	22	60
5	22	60
6	3	21

The symmetry in the table is not a coincidence.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a finite graph and let $G' = (V, E^c)$ denote its edge complement.*

- (1) G and G' have the same graph isomorphism group.
- (2) If G and G' are both connected, then two vertices are cospectral in G if and only if they are cospectral in G' .

The proposition explains the symmetry we see in the table. Indeed, all of the minimal examples counted by the table here happen to be connected. Each degree 3 example's edge complement is a minimal degree 6 example, and similarly for degree 4 and 5 examples.

Remark 3.2. Given a d -regular graph G with adjacency matrix A , its graph Laplacian is written

$$L = dI - A.$$

As such, A and L share precisely the same eigenfunctions. Hence, two vertices a and b of a d -regular graph are cospectral if and only if

$$\sum_{\lambda_j=\lambda} |\phi_j(a)|^2 = \sum_{\lambda_j=\lambda} |\phi_j(b)|^2$$

where ϕ_1, \dots, ϕ_n is an orthonormal Laplace eigenbasis with $L\phi_j = \lambda_j\phi_j$.

Proof. Part (1) is obvious and well-known. For part (2), note the Laplacian L' on G' can be written in terms of the Laplacian L on G as

$$L' = nI - \mathbf{1} - L,$$

where $\mathbf{1}$ is the $n \times n$ matrix with a one in every entry. It suffices to show that an eigenfunction ϕ for L is also an eigenfunction for L' . Since G and G' are both connected, their trivial eigenspaces are both spanned by the constant function, so it suffices to show L and L' share nonconstant eigenfunctions. If ϕ is an eigenfunction of L with eigenvalue $\lambda > 0$, it is orthogonal to the constant eigenspace and hence lies in the kernel of $\mathbf{1}$. Hence,

$$L'\phi = (n - \lambda)\phi.$$

The reverse argument is identical. □

We remark that, as a consequence, the edge complement of a walk-regular graph is again walk-regular. This is Theorem 4.2 in the work of Godsil and McKay [GM80] on walk-regular graphs.




FIGURE 3. These graphs and their edge-complements are the only walk-regular, non-vertex-transitive graphs on 12 vertices. Red vertices belong to one orbit and blue vertices belong to the other.




FIGURE 4. A walk-regular non-vertex-transitive toroidal graph.

3.3. Minimal walk-regular, non-vertex-transitive graphs. There are no walk-regular, non-vertex-transitive graphs, which have less than 12 vertices. There are exactly four minimal examples with twelve vertices, one each of degree 4, 5, 6, and 7. Again, these minimal examples are connected, and so can be put into edge-complement pairs; the examples of degrees 4 and 7 are edge complements, and so are the examples of 5 and 6. The degree 4 and 5 examples are depicted in Figure 3. Furthermore, even though the degree 4 example is not planar, it can be embedded into a torus, as shown in Figure 4.

4. WALK-REGULAR PLANAR GRAPHS

4.1. Auxiliary lemmas. Here we set up the tools we will need in order to classify 3-connected walk-regular planar graphs and prove Theorem 1.5.

The first tool shall be used to obtain the number of short closed walks through a vertex from the number of cycles through it. Let G be a d -regular graph with $d \geq 3$. A closed walk is said to be *contractible* if it traces no cycles. For a vertex v

and $m \geq 3$, we let

$$\mathcal{C}_m(v) = \#\{m\text{-cycles through } v\}.$$

As every closed walk of length 3 traces a triangle in one of two directions,

$$(A^3)_{v,v} = 2\mathcal{C}_3(v).$$

Starting at v there are exactly $d(d-1) + d^2$ contractible closed walks with length 4. Adding in the ones tracing 4-cycles, we have

$$(A^4)_{v,v} = 2d^2 - d + 2\mathcal{C}_4(v).$$

Now we assume that $\mathcal{C}_3(v_i) \equiv \mathcal{C}_3$ for all vertices v_i . Note that every closed walk $\overline{va_1a_2a_3a_4v}$ traces either a 5-cycle or an edge attached to a triangle; among the latter ones, there are exactly $2d\mathcal{C}_3$ with $v = a_2$, $2d\mathcal{C}_3$ with $v = a_3$, $2(d-2)\mathcal{C}_3$ with $a_1 = a_4$ and $v \notin \{a_2, a_3\}$, $2(d-2)\mathcal{C}_3$ with $a_1 = a_3$ and $a_2 \notin \{v, a_3\}$, $2(d-2)\mathcal{C}_3$ with $a_2 = a_4$ and $a_3 \notin \{v, a_1\}$, and $2\mathcal{C}_3$ with $a_1 = a_3$ and $a_2 = a_4$. In total we have

$$(A^5)_{v,v} = 10(d-1)\mathcal{C}_3 + 2\mathcal{C}_5(v).$$

Furthermore, assume that $\mathcal{C}_4(v_i) \equiv \mathcal{C}_4$ for all vertices v_i . If G is triangle-free (i.e., $\mathcal{C}_3 = 0$), similarly, we count the closed walks starting at v with length 6: $d^3 + 2d^2(d-1) + 2d(d-1)^2$ of them are contractible, $2 \cdot 2d\mathcal{C}_4 + 4 \cdot 2(d-2)\mathcal{C}_4 + 2 \cdot 2\mathcal{C}_4$ of them trace some 4-cycles with attached edges, and the remaining $2\mathcal{C}_6(v)$ trace some 6-cycles. Therefore,

$$(A^6)_{v,v} = 5d^3 - 6d^2 + 2d + 12(d-1)\mathcal{C}_4 + 2\mathcal{C}_6(v).$$

If $\mathcal{C}_3 = 1$, compared to the triangle-free case, there are two fewer contractible closed walks of length 6 but four more such walks that trace the triangle through v twice. In this case, it follows that

$$(A^6)_{v,v} = 5d^3 - 6d^2 + 2d + 12(d-1)\mathcal{C}_4 + 2\mathcal{C}_6(v) + 2.$$

A direct consequence of the above formulas is that

Lemma 4.1. *Let G be a walk-regular graph. Then*

- (1) $\mathcal{C}_3(v) \equiv \mathcal{C}_3$, $\mathcal{C}_4(v) \equiv \mathcal{C}_4$, and $\mathcal{C}_5(v) \equiv \mathcal{C}_5$ for all vertices v_i ;
- (2) if $\mathcal{C}_3 \leq 1$, $\mathcal{C}_6(v)$ is also constant over all vertices v_i .

Hereafter G will be a 3-connected walk-regular planar graph with degree d on n vertices and e edges. By Whitney's theorem, G has an essentially unique planar embedding, where each vertex v is surrounded clockwise or counterclockwise by d faces $f_i(v)$, $1 \leq i \leq d$. We label v by its *modified Schläfli symbol*

$$r(v) = (r_1(v), r_2(v), \dots, r_d(v)),$$

where $r_i(v)$ is the number of edges of $f_i(v)$. The first face $f_1(v)$, as well as the labeling direction, are chosen to minimize the label $r(v)$ lexicographically so that it is uniquely defined. In particular, $3 \leq r_1(v) = \min_{1 \leq i \leq d} r_i(v)$. With such a label, we count the total number f of faces in the graph by

$$f = \sum_v p(v), \quad \text{where } p(v) := \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{1}{r_i(v)}.$$

Using Euler's identity $n + f - e = 2$ and $e = nd/2$, we get

$$(4.1) \quad \frac{1}{n} \sum_v p(v) = \frac{d-2}{2} + \frac{2}{n}.$$




FIGURE 5. Step by step reconstruction of the $(3, 4, 5, 4)$ -solid.

In order to prove Theorem 1.5, we shall prove the following key lemma.

Lemma 4.2. *For any 3-connected walk-regular planar graph with degree $d \geq 3$, the modified Schläfli symbol is constant over all vertices, that is*

$$(4.2) \quad r(v) \equiv (r_1, r_2, \dots, r_d) \quad \text{for all vertices } v.$$

However, establishing (4.2) succinctly appears challenging. Instead, we will justify (4.2) in each individual case.

We remark that, once we prove Lemma 4.2, it is routine to check that Theorem 1.5 holds in each case. Indeed, the numbers of vertices, edges, and faces are determined by Lemma 4.2 and Euler's identity. The graph can then be reconstructed in a deterministic fashion, starting with an arbitrary polygon as the outer face. We illustrate this fact for the most complicated case when $r(v) \equiv (3, 4, 5, 4)$ in Figure 5. The only exception is the case when $r(v) \equiv (3, 4, 4, 4)$, for which one runs into two possible reconstructions, the polyhedral graphs of the $(3, 4, 4, 4)$ -solid and twisted $(3, 4, 4, 4)$ -solid. However, the twisted one is not walk-regular. See Case (13) in the proof.

We fix a vertex v_1 such that $p(v_1) = \max_v p(v)$. Let

$$r_1 = r_1(v_1) \quad \text{and} \quad k = \#\{1 \leq i \leq d : r_i(v_1) = r_1(v_1)\}.$$

In view of (4.1), to prove Lemma 4.2, we only need to discuss the fifteen cases enumerated below. For the convenience of the reader, we have also included an exhaustive list of the possible walk-regular planar graphs belonging to each case. From now on and throughout the paper, for the purpose of simplicity, we shall not distinguish between a solid and its polyhedral graph.

Case	d, r_1, k	Solids
(1)	3, 3, 3	Tetrahedron
(2)	3, 3, 2	
(3)	3, 3, 1	Triangular prism, (3, 6, 6)-, (3, 8, 8)-, and (3, 10, 10)-solids
(4)	3, 4, 3	Hexahedron
(5)	3, 4, 2	m -gonal prism, $m \geq 5$
(6)	3, 4, 1	(4, 6, 6)-, (4, 6, 8)-, and (4, 6, 10)-solids
(7)	3, 5, 3	Dodecahedron
(8)	3, 5, 2	
(9)	3, 5, 1	(5, 6, 6)-solid
(10)	4, 3, 4	Octahedron
(11)	4, 3, 3	m -gonal antiprism, $m \geq 4$
(12)	4, 3, 2	(3, 4, 3, 4)- and (3, 5, 3, 5)-solids
(13)	4, 3, 1	(3, 4, 4, 4)- and (3, 4, 5, 4)-solids
(14)	5, 3, 5	Icosahedron
(15)	5, 3, 4	(3, 3, 3, 3, 4)- and (3, 3, 3, 3, 5)-solids.

TABLE 1. 15 possible cases.

To effectively use Lemma 4.1 in discussions, we need another tool to convert the number of short cycles into the one of faces. We label an m -cycle $C = \overline{a_1 a_2 \cdots a_m a_1}$ by its *inner degree sequence*

$$d_*(C) = (d_*(a_1), d_*(a_2), \dots, d_*(a_m)),$$

where $d_*(a_i)$ is the number of incident edges of a_i inside C ; here an object (vertex, edge, cycle, face, etc) is said to be “inside C ” if it lies in the region bounded by C in the planar embedding. Again, $d_*(C)$ is uniquely defined, once we choose a_1 and the direction to minimize the sequence lexicographically. Clearly, C is a face if and only if $d_*(C) = (0, 0, \dots, 0)$ or $(d-2, d-2, \dots, d-2)$ (the latter means that C is the unique outer face of the embedding). For $m = 3$, we have

Lemma 4.3. *In a 3-connected walk-regular planar graph, every triangle is a face.*

Note that a cycle C in G with length ≥ 4 is not necessarily a face. The typical situation is that C has a *chord*, an edge not in C whose endpoints lie in C . For instance, the (3,3,3,3,4)-solid contains a 4-cycle with one chord, a 5-cycle with one chord and a 5-cycle with two chords; none of them are faces. We also observe that the 4-cycle encircling four triangles in the octahedron, the 5-cycle encircling five triangles in the icosahedron, and the 5-cycle encircling three triangles and a quadrangular face in the 4-gonal antiprism are not faces, even though all of them are *chordless*. Indeed, by excluding these cases, we have the next two lemmas for 4- and 5-cycles.

Lemma 4.4. *In a 3-connected walk-regular planar graph which is not isomorphic to the octahedron, every chordless 4-cycle is a face.*

Lemma 4.5. *In a 3-connected walk-regular planar graph which is not isomorphic to the 4-gonal antiprism or the icosahedron, every chordless 5-cycle is a face.*

Next, we will provide the proofs of Lemmas 4.3–4.5 separately in the cases $d = 3, 4, 5$, and conclude the proof of Lemma 4.2, and thus Theorem 1.5 for each case.

4.2. The cubic cases. Assume that G is cubic (i.e., 3-regular). When a chordless m -cycle C in G is not a face, the 3-connectedness yields that ≥ 3 vertices on C have incident edges inside C , and ≥ 3 of them have incident edges outside C , hence $m \geq 6$. This justifies Lemmas 4.3–4.5 for all cubic cases. Consequently, for any vertex v , we have

$$r_1(v) \equiv r_1 \quad \text{and} \quad k(v) := \#\{1 \leq i \leq 3 : r_i(v) = r_1\} \equiv k.$$

Among the cases (1)–(9) in Table 1, (2) and (8) are simply impossible to realize. Also, one quickly sees the symbols $r(v)$ of the graphs realizing cases (1), (4), and (7) must be constant, where the corresponding determined solids are the tetrahedron, the hexahedron, and the dodecahedron.

In case (5) ($d = 3, r_1 = 4, k = 2$), the face $f_3(v_1)$ surrounded by $m = r_3(v_1) \geq 5$ quadrangular faces determines the unique pattern up to isomorphism. Therefore, $r(v) \equiv (4, 4, m)$ and the graph is isomorphic to the m -gonal prism.

For the other three cases (with $d = 3, k = 1$), we need to consider the second shortest cycles in G , that is, the cycles with length

$$\ell = \min\{m > r_1 : \mathcal{C}_m(v) > 0 \text{ for some vertex } v\}.$$

It is clear that $\ell \leq r_2(v_1)$. We will claim in each individual case that

Lemma 4.6. *In a 3-connected walk-regular planar graph with $d = 3$ and $k = 1$, every ℓ -cycle is a face.*

Case (3). ($d = 3, r_1 = 3, k = 1$) Note that each ℓ -cycle is chordless, and it should be adjacent to exactly $\ell/2$ triangles, and thus ℓ must be even. Suppose that an ℓ -cycle C is not a face. Then by the 3-connectedness, C has ≥ 3 neighbors inside C and ≥ 3 neighbors outside C . Since C is chordless and each vertex must be adjacent to a triangle, we must have $\ell \geq 12$. However, in this situation one has $r_2(v_1) \geq 12$ and

$$p(v_1) \leq \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{12} + \frac{1}{12} = \frac{1}{2},$$

which violates (4.1). This proves Lemma 4.6 for $r_1 = 3$, and the possible $\ell = 4, 6, 8$ or 10.

Assume $\ell = 4$ or 6. It follows from Lemma 4.1 that $\mathcal{C}_4(v)$ or $\mathcal{C}_6(v)$ is constant for all vertices v . For $\ell = 8$, we can count the number of 8-cycles through a vertex in its 4-neighborhood to obtain

$$(A^8)_{v,v} = 591 + 2\mathcal{C}_8(v).$$

For $\ell = 10$, a similar counting in the 5-neighborhood of the vertex v provides

$$(A^{10})_{v,v} = 4223 + 2\mathcal{C}_{10}(v).$$

Hence whatever ℓ is, we have $\mathcal{C}_\ell(v) \equiv \mathcal{C}_\ell$. Since 3 is odd, drawing a triangular face on which each vertex is adjacent to exactly one face with length ℓ is impossible. The only other possibility is $\mathcal{C}_\ell = 2$, and it follows that $r(v) \equiv (3, \ell, \ell)$. The corresponding solids are the triangular prism, the (3, 6, 6)-solid, the (3, 8, 8)-solid and the (3, 10, 10)-solid respectively.

Case (6). ($d = 3, r_1 = 4, k = 1$) We first claim that every cycle has even length. If this was false, we let $\ell' = \min\{\text{odd } m : \mathcal{C}_m(v) > 0 \text{ for some vertex } v\}$, and let C be a *minimal* ℓ' -cycle, in the sense that no ℓ' -cycles are properly contained in the closed region bounded by C . Suppose that a vertex b_1 is inside C . The walk-regularity implies that, starting at b_1 there is at least one closed walk with length ℓ' , denoted by $C' = \overline{b_1 b_2 \cdots b_{\ell'} b_1}$. By the minimality of ℓ' and C , C' should be a cycle, and some of vertices on C' lie outside C . Let b_i, b_j be the first and the last intersection vertices of C and C' respectively, that is, $i = \min\{m : b_m \text{ lies on } C\}$ and $j = \max\{m : b_m \text{ lies on } C\}$. Such b_i and b_j divide C into two paths $\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2$ with length ℓ_1, ℓ_2 , and since $\ell_1 + \ell_2 = \ell'$ is odd, one of ℓ_1, ℓ_2 (say ℓ_1) has the same parity as $\ell' + i - j$. As the union of two paths $\overline{b_i b_{i-1} \cdots b_1 b_{\ell'} b_{\ell'-1} \cdots b_j}$ and \mathcal{P}_2 form a cycle with odd length $\ell' + i - j + \ell_2$ inside the closed region bounded by C , it follows again from the minimality of ℓ' and C that $\ell' + i - j + \ell_2 > \ell'$. But now, one has the union of two paths $\overline{b_i b_{i+1} \cdots b_j}$ and \mathcal{P}_1 as a closed walk with odd length $j - i + \ell_1 < \ell'$, which still violates the minimality of ℓ' . Therefore, C has no inner neighbors, and it should be an inner face in the planar embedding; however, this is also impossible, since at least one adjacent 4-cycle of C shares three vertices with C , of which the middle one must have an inner incident edge contradicting Lemma 4.4. The claim is justified.

Using (4.1), we obtain $\ell \leq r_2(v_1) < 8$. By the claim, the only possibility is $\ell = r_2(v_1) = 6$. For a 6-cycle C , it has either two or three adjacent 4-cycles. In the former situation, C has only two inner neighbors and two outer neighbors, which violates 3-connectedness. For the latter one, to be 3-connected all of the three adjacent 4-cycles must lie outside C whenever C is not the outer face. This proves that every 6-cycle is a face, and justifies Lemma 4.6 for $r_1 = 4$.

In view of Lemma 4.1, $\mathcal{C}_6(v) \equiv \mathcal{C}_6 = 1$ or 2. For $\mathcal{C}_6 = 2$, we have $r(v) \equiv (4, 6, 6)$, and the graph is isomorphic to the $(4, 6, 6)$ -solid.

Now we consider the sub-case $\mathcal{C}_6 = 1$. It follows from (4.1) and the claim that $r_3(v_1) = 8$ or 10. For a vertex v with $r(v) = (4, 6, m)$, by counting in the 4- and 5-neighborhood of v we obtain

$$(A^8)_{v,v} = 809 + \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } m = r_3(v_1) = 8, \\ 0 & \text{if } m > r_3(v_1) = 8, \end{cases}$$

and

$$(A^{10})_{v,v} = 6063 + \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } m = r_3(v_1) = 10, \\ 0 & \text{if } m > r_3(v_1) = 10. \end{cases}$$

Hence, $r(v) \equiv (4, 6, 8)$ or $\equiv (4, 6, 10)$, which corresponds to the $(4, 6, 8)$ -solid or the $(4, 6, 10)$ -solid respectively.

Case (9). ($d = 3, r_1 = 5, k = 1$) Using (4.1) we immediately get $\ell = r_2(v_1) = 6$. We will prove that every 6-cycle is a face in this case, and conclude the proof of Lemma 4.6.

Proof of Lemma 4.6 for $r_1 = 5$. Suppose that a 6-cycle $C = \overline{a_1 a_2 \cdots a_6 a_1}$ is not a face. Without loss of generality, we further assume that such C is *minimal* among all the 6-cycles that are not faces. More precisely, this minimality of C implies that any 6-cycle properly contained in the closed region bounded by C should be a face.

By the 3-connectedness of the graph, C has exactly three inner incident edges and three outer incident edges. There is a unique (up to isomorphism) possible




FIGURE 6. An impossible 6-cycle with $r_1 = 5$.

neighborhood of C such that $\mathcal{C}_5(a_i) = 1$ for all vertices a_i on C , as depicted in Figure 6, where C is adjacent to a face $\overline{b_2 a_4 a_5 a_6 b_3 b_2}$ with length 5 inside C and a pentagon face outside C bounded by the path $\overline{a_1 a_2 a_3}$. Note that the inner neighbor b_1 of a_2 is not adjacent to b_2 or b_3 , and hence, both the face bounded by the path $\overline{b_1 a_2 a_1 a_6 b_3}$ and the one bounded by $\overline{b_1 a_2 a_3 a_4 b_2}$ have length > 5 . Besides these two faces, the remaining adjacent face of b_1 should be of length 5 so that $\mathcal{C}_5(b_1) = 1$. However, no matter which adjacent face of b_1 is of length 6, the minimality of C implies that $\mathcal{C}_6(b_1) < \mathcal{C}_6(a_2)$, which contradicts Lemma 4.1. \square

Now using Lemmas 4.1 and 4.6 we have $\mathcal{C}_6(v) \equiv \mathcal{C}_6 = 1$ or 2. A pentagon face on which each vertex is adjacent to exactly one face with length 6 is simply impossible, and hence $\mathcal{C}_6 = 2$. This yields that $r(v) \equiv (5, 6, 6)$, and the graph is isomorphic to the $(5, 6, 6)$ -solid.

4.3. The 4-regular cases. Now we assume that G is 4-regular. We first justify that every triangle in G is a face:

Proof of Lemma 4.3 for $d = 4$. Suppose that a triangle C is not a face. By the 3-connectedness, each vertex a_i has at least one incident edge inside C and at least one incident edge outside C . Therefore, it must have $d_*(C) = (1, 1, 1)$. However, this is simply impossible as the total degree of the induced subgraph of the vertices inside C is odd. \square

Consequently, the octahedron is determined as $r(v) \equiv (3, 3, 3, 3)$ in case (10). For case (11) ($d = 4, r_1 = 3, k = 3$), the face $f_4(v_1)$ surrounded by $m = r_4(v_1) \geq 4$ triangular faces determines the unique pattern up to isomorphism, hence $r(v) \equiv (3, 3, 3, m)$ and the graph is isomorphic to the m -gonal antiprism.

The other two cases (12) and (13) are more involved. We need to prove that every 4-cycle is either a face or the boundary of two adjacent triangular faces there.

Proof of Lemma 4.4 for $d = 4$. Suppose that a chordless 4-cycle $C = \overline{a_1 a_2 a_3 a_4 a_1}$ is not a face. By the 3-connectedness, at least three of $\{a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4\}$ have incident edges inside C , and at least three of them have incident edges outside C . Without loss of generality, we assume that such C is *minimal*, that is, any chordless 4-cycle properly contained in the closed region bounded by C should be a face.

Since the total degree of the subgraph inside C is even, the number of incident edges of $\{a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4\}$ inside C equals 4. The possible inner degree sequence of C




FIGURE 7. An impossible 4-cycle with $d_*(C) = (0, 1, 1, 2)$.

is $(0, 1, 1, 2)$, $(0, 1, 2, 1)$ or $(1, 1, 1, 1)$. The case $d_*(C) = (0, 1, 2, 1)$ is simply ruled out, as $\{a_2, a_4\}$ should not be a cut-set of the graph.

Case: $d_*(C) = (0, 1, 1, 2)$. Note that $\mathcal{C}_3 = \mathcal{C}_3(v_1) \geq 1$. In this case, $\mathcal{C}_3 \geq 2$ is impossible since $\{a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4\}$ has ≥ 3 neighbors inside C and ≥ 3 neighbors outside C (by the 3-connectedness). It follows that $\mathcal{C}_3 = 1$, and every 4-cycle inside C is chordless so is a face. Using (4.1), we have $\mathcal{C}_4 = \mathcal{C}_4(v_1) \geq 2$. Lemma 4.3 implies that every vertex inside C is surrounded by at most one face with length > 4 . Let b_1, b_2 be the two neighbors of a_4 inside C . When $\overline{b_1 b_2}$ is an edge, to have $\mathcal{C}_3(a_3) = \mathcal{C}_3(a_4) = 1$, a_2 and a_3 have exactly one common neighbor u , and this gives a cut-set $\{a_4, u\}$ if u lies inside C or a cut-set $\{a_1, u\}$ if u lies outside C , which violates the 3-connectedness.

Now the only possibility left is that one of b_1, b_2 (say b_1) is adjacent to a_3 , and one of the neighbors of a_1 outside C is adjacent to a_2 . Let b_3 be the neighbor of a_2 inside C . Since the face bounded by $\overline{b_2 a_4 a_1 a_2 b_3}$ has length > 4 , we have $\mathcal{C}_4 = 2$, and both the face bounded by $\overline{b_2 a_4 b_1}$ and the one bounded by $\overline{b_3 a_2 a_3 b_1}$ have length 4, as drawn in Figure 7. Then, to have $\mathcal{C}_3(b_1) + \mathcal{C}_4(b_1) = 3$, the undetermined face with $\overline{b_1 b_3}$ should have length > 4 , contradicting the fact that $\mathcal{C}_3(b_3) + \mathcal{C}_4(b_3) = 3$.

Case: $d_*(C) = (1, 1, 1, 1)$. One special situation is that $\{a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4\}$ has a common neighbor inside C , in which $\mathcal{C}_3 = 4$ and the graph is isomorphic to the octahedron. If this is not the case, again by the 3-connectedness, there are at least three distinct neighbors of $\{a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4\}$ inside C as well as at least three distinct ones outside C . From this we know that $\mathcal{C}_3 = 1$, one edge (say $\overline{a_1 a_4}$) of C lies on an incident triangle inside C , and the opposite edge ($\overline{a_2 a_3}$) of C lies on an incident triangle outside C . Denote by b_1, b_2, b_3 the neighbors of a_1, a_2, a_3 inside C respectively. Note that there are no chorded 4-cycles inside C or else $\mathcal{C}_3 \geq 2$, and hence every 4-cycle inside C is a face by the minimality of C , thus $\mathcal{C}_4 \leq 3$.

If $\mathcal{C}_4 = 3$, then none of the faces inside C has length > 4 , and it forces $\overline{b_1 b_2 b_3 b_1}$ to be a triangle but not a face, which violates Lemma 4.3.

Now we suppose $\mathcal{C}_4 = 2$. Once b_2, b_3 are adjacent, to have $\mathcal{C}_4(a_2) = \mathcal{C}_4(a_3) = 2$, both the face bounded by $\overline{b_2 a_2 a_1 b_1}$ and the one bounded by $\overline{b_3 a_3 a_4 b_1}$ have length > 4 , which yields that $\mathcal{C}_4(b_1) \leq 1$. Hence any graph with $\overline{b_2 b_3}$ is ruled out.




FIGURE 8. An impossible 4-cycle with $d_*(C) = (1, 1, 1, 1)$.




FIGURE 9. Three impossible 5-cycles with $d_*(C) = (0, 0, 1, 1, 2)$, $(0, 1, 0, 1, 2)$ and $(0, 1, 1, 1, 1)$ respectively.

Without $\overline{b_2b_3}$, the face bounded by $\overline{b_2a_2a_3b_3}$ has length > 4 . To have $\mathcal{C}_4(b_2) = \mathcal{C}_4(b_3) = 2$, both b_2, b_3 must be adjacent to b_1 , which gives a cut-set $\{b_2, b_3\}$ of the graph (Figure 8), a contradiction. □

Case (12). ($d = 4, r_1 = 3, k = 2$) We first justify Lemma 4.5 for this case.

Proof of Lemma 4.5 for case (12). Suppose a chordless 5-cycle $C = \overline{a_1a_2a_3a_4a_5a_1}$ is not a face. Note that the number of inner incident edges of C must be even. By the 3-connectedness, the possible choices for $d_*(C)$ are $(0, 0, 1, 1, 2)$, $(0, 1, 0, 1, 2)$, $(0, 1, 1, 1, 1)$, $(0, 1, 1, 2, 2)$, $(0, 1, 2, 1, 2)$ or $(1, 1, 1, 1, 2)$. In view of the symmetry between the inside and outside of C , it suffices to rule out the first three situations, as illustrated in Figure 9.

Sub-case: $d_(C) = (0, 0, 1, 1, 2)$.* Note that one of the two incident triangles of a_1 is bounded by $\overline{a_1a_2}$, and one of the two incident triangles of a_5 is bounded by $\overline{a_4a_5}$. To have three distinct inner neighbors of C (by the 3-connectedness), a_3 has no incident triangles inside C , and thus a_2, a_3, a_4 have a common outer neighbor. This leads to $\mathcal{C}_4(a_4) \geq 2 > \mathcal{C}_4(a_5)$, a contradiction.

Sub-case: $d_(C) = (0, 1, 0, 1, 2)$.* As in the first sub-case, a triangle outside C is bounded by $\overline{a_1a_2}$ and one inside C is bounded by $\overline{a_4a_5}$. It follows similarly that a_2




FIGURE 10. Our “bee” graph.

has no inner incident triangles, and this forces a_1, a_2, a_3 to have a common neighbor outside C which has three incident triangles.

Sub-case: $d_*(C) = (0, 1, 1, 1, 1)$. By the 3-connectedness, there is at most one inner incident triangle of C . We also note that, in $\{a_2, a_3, a_4, a_5\}$ the vertices with two incident triangles outside C cannot be adjacent, otherwise four of the vertices on C have a common neighbor that is incident to three triangles. Therefore, the only possible choice of the unique inner incident triangle of C is the one bounded by $\overline{a_3 a_4}$. However, in this situation C has only two outer neighbors, which violates the 3-connectedness. \square

Now we are ready to finish off Case (12). In this case, each vertex is incident to two triangles and two other faces of length ≥ 4 . In view of Lemma 4.1, we subdivide the argument into four sub-cases where $\mathcal{C}_4(v) \equiv \mathcal{C}_4 = 0, 1, 2$ or ≥ 3 .

Sub-case: $\mathcal{C}_4 = 0$. There are no faces of length 4, and no two triangles share an edge. It follows that for each v , $r(v)$ is of the form $(3, m, 3, m')$ for some $5 \leq m \leq m'$. Such graphs have plenty of structure. Firstly, each face of length ≥ 5 is adjacent only to triangular faces. Furthermore, each such face is, through each vertex, opposed to another face of length ≥ 5 .

Using Lemma 4.1 and (4.1), we have $\mathcal{C}_5(v) = \mathcal{C}_5(v_1) \geq 1$ for any vertex v . Also we note that every 5-cycle is chordless, and so is a face by Lemma 4.5. If we attempt to construct a triangle on which each vertex is incident to exactly one pentagon face, we quickly run into absurdities. Hence, we are left with $r(v) \equiv (3, 5, 3, 5)$, and the graph is isomorphic to the $(3, 5, 3, 5)$ -solid.

Sub-case: $\mathcal{C}_4 = 1$. First, we rule out the possibility that such a graph has a square face. If we start with a square face, we obtain a graph resembling that in Figure 10, which we will call a “bee” since it looks like it has a head with two antennae, a thorax with two wings, and an abdomen. Note, one or both of the antennae may attach to a wing to form a pentagon face. Applying Lemma 4.5, we find that, $\mathcal{C}_5(v) \geq 4$ for any vertex v on the square face, while $\mathcal{C}_5(v') \leq 3$ for the vertex v' at the “neck” of the bee. This is contrary to Lemma 4.1.




FIGURE 11. The left-center vertex is forced to be incident to three 4-cycles.




FIGURE 12. 2-neighborhood of a vertex incident to four 4-cycles.

Combining this and Lemma 4.4, we have shown that the only 4-cycles we find are the boundary of the union of two triangular faces. Since there are no square faces, there must be at least one pentagon face. The graph self-destructs upon any attempt to draw the 1-neighborhood of a pentagon face.

Sub-case: $\mathcal{C}_4 = 2$. There are a few situations we must rule out. We first establish that each vertex must be incident to a square face. Suppose v is not adjacent to a square face. Then, $r(v) = (3, 3, m, m')$ or $(3, m, 3, m')$, where $m, m' \geq 5$. The first is incident to only one 4-cycle, so is ruled out. We try to draw the graph starting at this vertex and obtain the one in Figure 11, which forces a vertex to lie on at least three 4-cycles.

With this in hand, any construction of a graph with a vertex with the label $(3, 3, 4, m)$ for $m \geq 5$ fails after drawing a few faces. Hence, every vertex of our graph must have label $(3, 4, 3, 4)$, and we obtain the $(3, 4, 3, 4)$ -solid.

Sub-case: $\mathcal{C}_4 \geq 3$. The only way a vertex can be incident to four 4-cycles is if its 2-neighborhood is that in Figure 12. However, this vertex's neighbors are only ever incident to three 4-cycles. Hence, all that remains is to exclude the case $\mathcal{C}_4 = 3$.

A similar argument as the one above excludes the case where v is incident to a face of length ≥ 5 . Hence, for each vertex v , we have either $r(v) = (3, 4, 3, 4)$ or $r(v) = (3, 3, 4, 4)$. There is a unique graph with these properties, depicted in Figure 13. This graph, however, is not walk-regular. The three innermost and outermost





FIGURE 13. The graph with exactly three 4-cycles through each vertex.

FIGURE 14. $(3,4,4,4)$ -solid and twisted $(3,4,4,4)$ -solid.

vertices all have seven incident 5-cycles, while the other vertices have eight.

Case (13). ($d = 4, r_1 = 3, k = 1$) As in the proof of the previous case, we subdivide the argument according to \mathcal{C}_4 , the number of 4-cycles through each vertex. Since there is exactly 1 triangular face incident to each vertex, \mathcal{C}_4 is exactly the number of square faces around it. By (4.1), we must have $p(v_1) > 1$, and thus $\mathcal{C}_4 \geq 2$.

Sub-case: $\mathcal{C}_4 = 3$. This case is straightforward since we already know that $r(v) \equiv (3, 4, 4, 4)$. We remark that, however, when one wants to reconstruct the $(3, 4, 4, 4)$ -solid, there are two possible graphs, the other one being the twisted $(3, 4, 4, 4)$ -solid graph. Nonetheless, there are vertices on the twisted $(3, 4, 4, 4)$ -solid that have different numbers of closed walks of length 7, and thus, this twisted case should be ruled out. See Figure 14.

Sub-case: $\mathcal{C}_4 = 2$. In this sub-case, $r(v_1)$ is either $(3, 4, 4, 5)$ or $(3, 4, 5, 4)$. We first consider the case $r(v_1) = (3, 4, 4, 5)$. One can try to draw such a graph starting from




FIGURE 15. $r(v_1) = (3, 4, 4, 5)$

v_1 and end up with a neighborhood of the shape as in Figure 15. Here, vertex v_1 is what we started with. We claim that the unknown face incident to vertex v_3 must be of length 5. Then a similar argument will show that all unknown faces within the 2-neighborhood of the center face must be of length 5. To do so, we count the 5-cycles incident to v_1 and to v_3 . Note that v_1 and v_3 always share the same number of “houses” (i.e., the 5-cycle with a chord), and v_1 is already incident to a pentagon face. To satisfy $\mathcal{C}_5(v_1) = \mathcal{C}_5(v_3)$, we must have a chordless 5-cycle C through v_3 , and there are three possible situations: (i) $C = \overline{u_1 u_2 v_3 u_3 u_4 u_1}$, (ii) $C = \overline{u_2 v_3 u_3 u_4 u_5 u_2}$, and (iii) u_2, u_4 have a common neighbor w such that $C = \overline{w u_2 v_3 u_3 u_4 w}$.

Among these situations, (i) is simply ruled out as $\{u_2, u_4\}$ would be a cut-set of the graph. For (ii), the 3-connectedness yields that each of u_2 and u_5 has an incident edge inside C , and these two edges must have a common endpoint x to bound the incident triangle of u_2 . However, there is still a cut-set $\{x, u_4\}$ of the graph. Now we are left with (iii). Using a similar argument, it is impossible to have ≥ 3 inner neighbors of $C = \overline{w u_2 v_3 u_3 u_4 w}$, which is a contradiction. Hence, this C must be a face with length 5, and thus the claim is justified.

Next, we claim that we will get a contradiction if the center face is of length ≥ 6 . In this case, to have $\mathcal{C}_5(v_1) = \mathcal{C}_5(v_2)$, we cannot create more “houses” in the outer layer for vertex v_1 . This forces us to get three square faces in a row. After drawing all the square faces we arrive at Figure 16, which is impossible since there are vertices incident to more than 2 triangles. Therefore, we conclude that we must have a pentagon face at the center, and this in turn implies that we must add an additional “house” to vertex v_1 , so we arrive at Figure 17.

We remark that this is exactly part of the twisted $(3, 4, 5, 4)$ -solid. Counting the number of 6-cycles through v_1 and through v_2 , we have $\mathcal{C}_6(v_1) = 4 \neq 5 = \mathcal{C}_6(v_2)$, which is contrary to Lemma 4.1. Therefore, there is no vertex v satisfying $r(v) = (3, 4, 4, 5)$ in this sub-case, and v_1 satisfies $r(v_1) = (3, 4, 5, 4)$.




FIGURE 16. An impossible graph when the center face is of length ≥ 6 .




FIGURE 17. 3-neighborhood of v_1 with $r(v_1) = (3, 4, 4, 5)$.

By a similar counting of the 5-cycles, we exclude $r(v) = (3, 4, 4, m)$ with $m > 5$, as such vertex v gives $\mathcal{C}_5(v) \leq 4 < \mathcal{C}_5(v_1)$. Now the label of each v is of the form $(3, 4, m, 4)$ with $m \geq 5$. Again, counting the 5-cycles in the 2-neighborhood of v , we have

$$\mathcal{C}_5(v) = \begin{cases} 6 & \text{if } r(v) = (3, 4, 5, 4), \\ 5 & \text{if } r(v) = (3, 4, m, 4) \text{ with } m > 5. \end{cases}$$

As a consequence, $r(v) \equiv (3, 4, 5, 4)$, and we obtain the $(3, 4, 5, 4)$ -solid.

We remark that the above discussion also completes the proof of Lemma 4.5 for $d = 4$.




FIGURE 18. An impossible triangle with $d_*(C) = (1, 1, 2)$.



4.4. **The 5-regular cases.** Finally we assume that G is 5-regular. The following discussion completes the proof of Lemma 4.3.

Proof of Lemma 4.3 for $d = 5$. Suppose that a triangle $C = \overline{a_1 a_2 a_3 a_1}$ is not a face. The 3-connectedness implies that $d_*(a_i) \in \{1, 2\}$ for all i . Again, we further assume that such C is *minimal* among all the triangles that are not faces. Then each v inside C cannot be adjacent to all vertices a_1, a_2, a_3 of C , and around such v there is at most one face with length ≥ 4 since $\mathcal{C}_3(v) = \mathcal{C}_3(v_1) \geq 4$. Moreover, it follows that each edge inside C lies on at least one triangle. In view of these facts, we can simply rule out the case $d_*(C) = (1, 1, 1)$, and eliminate the other three cases by drawing the adjacent vertices of C :

Case: $d_(C) = (1, 1, 2)$.* Note that the two adjacent vertices b_1, b_2 of a_1, a_2 inside C cannot be identical, otherwise around this common neighbor there are at least two faces with length ≥ 4 . Since each of the edges $\overline{a_1 b_1}, \overline{a_2 b_2}$ belongs to some triangle, both b_1 and b_2 must be adjacent to a_3 (Figure 18). Now $\{b_1, b_2\}$ is a cut-set of the graph, and this violates the 3-connectedness.

Case: $d_(C) = (1, 2, 2)$.* Let b_1 be the neighbor of a_1 inside C . As $\mathcal{C}_3(a_1) \geq 4$ and C is minimal, we can see that the edge $\overline{a_1 b_1}$ belongs to exactly one triangle, and there are at least two incident triangles of a_1 outside C . Therefore, one of a_2, a_3 (say a_2) has a common neighbor with a_1 outside C . By the 3-connectedness there are at least three distinct neighbors of $\{a_1, a_2, a_3\}$ outside C , and thus a_3 has no common neighbors with a_1 and a_2 outside C . Now we have $\mathcal{C}_3 = 4$, which forces that a_2, a_3 have exactly two and three incident triangles inside C respectively. We can draw four incident triangles $\overline{a_1 b_1 a_3 a_1}, \overline{a_2 b_3 b_2 a_2}, \overline{a_2 a_3 b_3 a_2}$ and $\overline{a_3 b_1 b_3 a_3}$ as in Figure 19. As $\mathcal{C}_3(b_1) = \mathcal{C}_3(b_2) = 4$, the undetermined neighbor of b_3 must be adjacent to b_1 and b_2 . This leads to $\mathcal{C}_3(b_3) = 5$, a contradiction.

Case: $d_(C) = (2, 2, 2)$.* Again by the 3-connectedness, to have three distinct neighbors of $\{a_1, a_2, a_3\}$ outside C , no incident triangles outside C are allowed. It follows from $\mathcal{C}_3 \geq 4$ that each a_i has exactly three incident triangles inside C as in Figure 20. However, the center triangle $\overline{b_1 b_2 b_3 b_1}$ cannot be a face, and this violates the minimality of C . The proof of Lemma 4.3 is complete. \square

FIGURE 19. An impossible triangle with $d_*(C) = (1, 2, 2)$.FIGURE 20. An impossible triangle with $d_*(C) = (2, 2, 2)$.

As a result, in case (14) we have $r(v) \equiv (3, 3, 3, 3, 3)$, and the graph is isomorphic to icosahedron. To solve the last case ($d = 5, r_1 = 3, k = 4$), we also need the fact that every chordless 4-cycle must be a face there.

Proof of Lemma 4.4 for $d = 5$. Suppose that a chordless 4-cycle $C = \overline{a_1 a_2 a_3 a_4 a_1}$ is not a face, and such C is minimal. This means that every chordless 4-cycle inside C must be a face, and thus, every vertex inside C is adjacent to at most 2 vertices on C . Note that $\mathcal{C}_3 = \mathcal{C}_3(v_1) = 4$ or 5. If $\mathcal{C}_3 = 5$, then each a_i has exactly two neighbors inside C , and $\{a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4\}$ must have a common neighbor outside C , which is a cut-vertex of the graph. Therefore, we are left with $\mathcal{C}_3 = 4$. For the case $d_*(a_1) = 0$, it is impossible to have ≥ 3 distinct neighbors of $\{a_2, a_3, a_4\}$ inside C , which violates the 3-connectedness. Similarly, we rule out the case $d_*(a_i) = 3$.

Since the inner degree sequence is defined lexicographically, if $d_*(a_1) = 2$, then we must have $d_*(C) = (2, 2, 2, 2)$. Since there are at least three distinct neighbors outside C , the four incident edges outside C provide at most one incident triangle, which is not enough to make $\mathcal{C}_3(a_i) = 4$ for each $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$.

Now the only possibility is $d_*(a_1) = 1$. Let b_1 be the neighbor of a_1 inside C . To have $\mathcal{C}_3(a_1) = 4$, a_1 has exactly three incident triangles outside C , and either a_2 or a_4 should be the second neighbor of b_1 on C . As the only face around b_1 with length > 3 is bounded by $a_1 b_1$, the second neighbor of b_1 on C should have two




FIGURE 21. An impossible 4-cycle with $d_*(C) = (1, 1, 2, 2)$.

neighbors inside C . Since $d_*(a_2) \leq d_*(a_4)$, we may assume that this neighbor of b_1 is a_4 , and $d_*(a_4) = 2$.

If $d_*(a_2) = 1$, then following the same argument as above, the neighbor b_2 of a_2 inside C is adjacent to a_3 , and $d_*(a_3) = 2$. To have $\mathcal{C}_3(a_2) = \mathcal{C}_3(a_3) = \mathcal{C}_3(a_4) = 4$, there are three incident triangles of a_2 outside C , three incident triangles of a_3 as well as three of a_4 inside C , and thus a_3, a_4 have a common neighbor b_3 inside C (Figure 21). Now either of the two undetermined faces around b_3 is a triangle. However, no matter which one is not a triangle, it becomes the second face around b_1 or b_2 with length > 3 , which is contrary to $\mathcal{C}_3(b_1) = \mathcal{C}_3(b_2) = 4$.



The last case we will rule out is $d_*(a_2) = 2$. As $\mathcal{C}_3(a_2) = 4$, a_2 has two incident triangles outside C , so that the common neighbor of a_1 and a_2 is adjacent to a_3 . To have three distinct neighbors of $\{a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4\}$ outside C , $d_*(a_3)$ should be 1, and hence no triangles are bounded by $\overline{a_3 a_4}$, which violates $\mathcal{C}_3(a_3) = \mathcal{C}_3(a_4) = 4$. The proof of Lemma 4.4 is complete. \square

Case (15). ($d = 5, r_1 = 3, k = 4$) As $p(v_1) > \frac{3}{2}$ by (4.1), $r_5(v_1) = 4$ or 5. Since around each vertex four triangular faces are determined by Lemma 4.3, we are able to draw the 2-neighborhood of a face with length ≥ 4 , as in Figure 22. It is straightforward to count that

$$\mathcal{C}_4(v) = \begin{cases} 7 & \text{if } r(v) = (3, 3, 3, 3, 4), \\ 6 & \text{if } r(v) = (3, 3, 3, 3, m) \text{ with } m > 4. \end{cases}$$

In view of Lemma 4.1, $r(v) \equiv (3, 3, 3, 3, 4)$ and the graph is isomorphic to the $(3, 3, 3, 3, 4)$ -solid provided that $r_5(v_1) = 4$.

When $r_5(v_1) = 5$, each vertex v lies on a face with length ≥ 5 . Note that in the 2-neighborhood of such face, the vertices in the 2-neighborhood of v with undetermined neighbors are u_1, u_2 and u_3 . As there are no faces with length 4, u_2 is not adjacent to u_3 . Moreover, u_1 is not adjacent to u_3 either, otherwise they form a 4-cycle that is not a face, which is contrary to Lemma 4.4. Therefore, each 5-cycle through v can be found in the Figure 23, which is either a union of three adjacent triangles or a face with length 5 (we remark that the proof of Lemma 4.5

FIGURE 22. The 2-neighborhood of faces with length 4 and > 4 respectively.FIGURE 23. The 2-neighborhood of faces with length 5 and > 5 respectively when $r_5(v_1) = 5$.

is complete here). A counting of these 5-cycles gives

$$\mathcal{C}_5(v) = \begin{cases} 11 & \text{if } r(v) = (3, 3, 3, 3, 5), \\ 10 & \text{if } r(v) = (3, 3, 3, 3, m) \text{ with } m > 5. \end{cases}$$

Again by Lemma 4.1, we finally have $r(v) \equiv (3, 3, 3, 3, 5)$, and the graph is isomorphic to the $(3, 3, 3, 3, 5)$ -solid.

REFERENCES

- [BEKS17] Jeff Bezanson, Alan Edelman, Stefan Karpinski, and Viral B Shah. Julia: A fresh approach to numerical computing. *SIAM review*, 59(1):65–98, 2017.
- [CB23] Gabriel Coutinho and Pedro Ferreira Baptista. Quantum walks in the normalized laplacian. *Linear and Multilinear Algebra*, 0(0):1–11, 2023.
- [CCT⁺19] Ada Chan, Gabriel Coutinho, Christino Tamon, Luc Vinet, and Hanmeng Zhan. Quantum fractional revival on graphs. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 269:86–98, 2019. Graph Spectra, Combinatorics and Optimization - in honor of Professor Domingos M. Cardoso on the occasion of his 65th birthday.
- [Cyp12] Cyp (Wikipedia). <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/User:Cyp>, 2012.

- [EKL19] Or Eisenberg, Mark Kempton, and Gabor Lippner. Pretty good quantum state transfer in asymmetric graphs via potential. *Discrete Mathematics*, 342(10):2821–2833, 2019. Algebraic and Extremal Graph Theory.
- [FBS⁺21] James Fairbanks, Mathieu Besançon, Schölly Simon, Júlio Hoffman, Nick Eubank, and Stefan Karpinski. Juliagraphs/graphs.jl: an optimized graphs package for the julia programming language, 2021.
- [FI79] Herbert Fleischner and Wilfried Imrich. Transitive planar graphs. *Mathematica Slovaca*, 29(2):97–106, 1979.
- [GM80] Christopher David Godsil and Brendan D Mckay. Feasibility conditions for the existence of walk-regular graphs. *Linear algebra and its applications*, 30:51–61, 1980.
- [God12] Chris Godsil. State transfer on graphs. *Discrete Mathematics*, 312(1):129–147, 2012. Algebraic Graph Theory — A Volume Dedicated to Gert Sabidussi on the Occasion of His 80th Birthday.
- [GS17] Chris Godsil and Jamie Smith. Strongly cospectral vertices. arXiv:1709.07975, 2017.
- [KSSW20] Mark Kempton, John Sinkovic, Dallas Smith, and Benjamin Webb. Characterizing cospectral vertices via isospectral reduction. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 594:226–248, 2020.
- [Man71] P. Mani. Automorphismen von polyedrischen Graphen. *Math. Ann.*, 192:279–303, 1971.
- [Mon22] Hermie Monterde. Strong cospectrality and twin vertices in weighted graphs. *Electronic Journal of Linear Algebra*, 38, 2022.
- [Sch73] Allen J Schwenk. Almost all trees are cospectral. *New directions in the theory of graphs*, pages 275–307, 1973.
- [WWX23] Feng Wang, Emmett L. Wyman, and Yakun Xi. Surfaces in which every point sounds the same. arXiv:2307.06224, 2023.
- [WX23] Emmett Wyman and Yakun Xi. Can you hear your location on a manifold? arXiv:2304.04659, 2023.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, SICHUAN UNIVERSITY, CHENGDU 610065, PR CHINA
Email address: `slkong@scu.edu.cn`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, BINGHAMTON UNIVERSITY, BINGHAMTON NY
Email address: `ewyman@binghamton.edu`

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, ZHEJIANG UNIVERSITY, HANGZHOU 310027, PR CHINA
Email address: `yakunxi@zju.edu.cn`