

STABILITY OF GRAPH PAIRS INVOLVING CYCLES

XIAOMENG WANG, SHOU-JUN XU, AND SANMING ZHOU

ABSTRACT. A graph pair (Γ, Σ) is called stable if $\text{Aut}(\Gamma) \times \text{Aut}(\Sigma)$ is isomorphic to $\text{Aut}(\Gamma \times \Sigma)$ and unstable otherwise, where $\Gamma \times \Sigma$ is the direct product of Γ and Σ . A graph is called R -thin if distinct vertices have different neighbourhoods. Γ and Σ are said to be coprime if there is no nontrivial graph Δ such that $\Gamma \cong \Gamma_1 \times \Delta$ and $\Sigma \cong \Sigma_1 \times \Delta$ for some graphs Γ_1 and Σ_1 . An unstable graph pair (Γ, Σ) is called nontrivially unstable if Γ and Σ are R -thin connected coprime graphs and at least one of them is non-bipartite. This paper contributes to the study of the stability of graph pairs with a focus on the case when $\Sigma = C_n$ is a cycle. We give two sufficient conditions for (Γ, C_n) to be nontrivially unstable, where $n \neq 4$ and Γ is an R -thin connected graph. In the case when Γ is an R -thin connected non-bipartite graph, we obtain the following results: (i) if (Γ, K_2) is unstable, then (Γ, C_n) is unstable for every even integer $n \geq 4$; (ii) if an even integer $n \geq 6$ is compatible with Γ in some sense, then (Γ, C_n) is nontrivially unstable if and only if (Γ, K_2) is unstable; (iii) if there is an even integer $n \geq 6$ compatible with Γ such that (Γ, C_n) is nontrivially unstable, then (Γ, C_m) is unstable for all even integers $m \geq 6$. We also prove that if Γ is an R -thin connected graph and $n \geq 3$ is an odd integer compatible with Γ , then (Γ, C_n) is stable.

1. INTRODUCTION

All graphs considered in this paper are finite and undirected with no loops or parallel edges. As usual, for a graph Γ , we use $V(\Gamma)$ and $E(\Gamma)$ to denote its vertex set and edge set respectively, and call $|V(\Gamma)|$ the order of Γ . The edge between two adjacent vertices u, v of Γ is denoted by $\{u, v\}$, the neighbourhood of a vertex u in Γ is denoted by $N_\Gamma(u)$, and the degree of u in Γ is defined as $\deg(u) = |N_\Gamma(u)|$. Denote by $d(u, v)$ the distance in Γ between two vertices u, v of Γ and by $\Gamma[S]$ the subgraph of Γ induced by a subset S of $V(\Gamma)$. An *automorphism* of Γ is a permutation σ of $V(\Gamma)$ such that for any $u, v \in V(\Gamma)$, $\{u, v\}$ is an edge of Γ if and only if $\{u^\sigma, v^\sigma\}$ is an edge of Γ , where for each $w \in V(\Gamma)$, w^σ is the image of w under σ . The *automorphism group* of Γ , denoted by $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$, is the group of automorphisms of Γ under the composition of permutations. A graph Γ is called *vertex-transitive* if for any $u, v \in V(\Gamma)$ there exists an element $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ such that $u^\sigma = v$. We use K_n to denote the complete graph with order $n \geq 1$ and C_n the cycle with order $n \geq 3$. A graph is *trivial* if it has only one vertex and *nontrivial* otherwise.

The *direct product* [1] of two graphs Γ and Σ , denoted by $\Gamma \times \Sigma$, is the graph with vertex set $V(\Gamma) \times V(\Sigma)$ in which (u, v) and (x, y) are adjacent if and only if u is adjacent to x in Γ and v is adjacent to y in Σ . In particular, $\Gamma \times K_2$ is the *canonical double cover* $D(\Gamma)$ of Γ . A graph is *prime* with respect to the direct product if it is nontrivial and cannot be represented as the direct product of two nontrivial graphs. Two graphs Γ and Σ are said to be *coprime* with respect to the direct product if there is no nontrivial graph Δ such that $\Gamma \cong \Gamma' \times \Delta$ and $\Sigma \cong \Sigma' \times \Delta$ for some graphs Γ' and Σ' . It is readily seen that for any graphs Γ and Σ , $\text{Aut}(\Gamma) \times \text{Aut}(\Sigma)$ (direct product

Date: April 16, 2024.

Key words and phrases. stable graph pair, stable graph, expected automorphism, direct product of graphs.

of groups) is isomorphic to a subgroup of $\text{Aut}(\Gamma \times \Sigma)$. As defined by Qin *et al.* in [10], a graph pair (Γ, Σ) is called *stable* if $\text{Aut}(\Gamma) \times \text{Aut}(\Sigma)$ is isomorphic to $\text{Aut}(\Gamma \times \Sigma)$ and *unstable* otherwise. This definition generalizes the notion of the stability of a graph [5, 14] in the sense that (Γ, K_2) is stable or unstable if and only if Γ is stable or unstable, respectively. The stability of graphs has been studied considerably in the past more than three decades [4, 5, 6, 7, 12, 13, 14]. For example, in [14, Theorems C.1-C.4], Wilson gave four sufficient conditions (see [8] for an amendment to one of them) for a circulant graph to be unstable. In [8, Conjecture 1.3], Qin *et al.* conjectured that there is no nontrivially unstable circulant of odd order, and in [8, Theorem 1.4] they proved that this is true for circulants of prime order. The stability of the generalized Petersen graphs has been completely determined owing to [14, Theorems P.1-P.2] and [9, Corollary 1.3]. In contrast, the study of the stability of general graph pairs started only recently [10, 11].

A graph Γ is called *R-thin* (or *vertex-determining*) if $N_\Gamma(u) \neq N_\Gamma(v)$ for any two distinct vertices u, v of Γ . Graphs which are not *R-thin* are called *R-thick*. An unstable graph is called *nontrivially unstable* [10, 14] if it is connected, non-bipartite and *R-thin*, and trivially unstable otherwise. In [10, Theorem 1.3], Qin *et al.* proved that if (Γ, Σ) is stable, then Γ and Σ are coprime *R-thin* graphs, and if in addition both $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ and $\text{Aut}(\Sigma)$ are nontrivial groups, then both Γ and Σ are connected and at least one of them is non-bipartite. Due to this result an unstable graph pair (Γ, Σ) is called *nontrivially unstable* [10] if Γ and Σ are *R-thin* connected coprime graphs and at least one of them is non-bipartite. This definition agrees with the concept of a nontrivially unstable graph introduced in [14] in the sense that (Γ, K_2) is nontrivially unstable if and only if Γ is nontrivially unstable.

Let Γ and Σ be graphs with $V(\Sigma) = \{1, \dots, n\}$. As in [10, Definition 2.3], we use $P(\Gamma, \Sigma)$ to denote the set of elements of $\text{Aut}(\Gamma \times \Sigma)$ that leave the partition $\{V(\Gamma) \times \{i\} : i \in V(\Sigma)\}$ invariant. Note that $P(\Gamma, \Sigma)$ is a subgroup of $\text{Aut}(\Gamma \times \Sigma)$. An n -tuple of permutations $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ of $V(\Gamma)$ is called [10] a Σ -*automorphism* of Γ if for all $u, v \in V(\Gamma)$, $\{u, v\} \in E(\Gamma)$ if and only if $\{u^{\alpha_i}, v^{\alpha_j}\} \in E(\Gamma)$ for all $i, j \in V(\Sigma)$ with $\{i, j\} \in E(\Sigma)$. A Σ -automorphism $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ of Γ is said to be *nondiagonal* if $\alpha_i \neq \alpha_j$ for at least one pair of vertices i, j of Σ . The set of all Σ -automorphisms of Γ with operation defined by $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n) = (\alpha_1\beta_1, \dots, \alpha_n\beta_n)$ is a group, written $\text{Aut}_\Sigma(\Gamma)$, which is called [10] the Σ -*automorphism group* of Γ . In particular, $\text{Aut}_{K_2}(\Gamma)$ is exactly the *two-fold automorphism group* of Γ (see [2, 3, 4]) and its elements are called the *two-fold automorphisms* of Γ .

In [10, Theorem 1.8], Qin *et al.* proved that, for a connected regular graph Γ and a connected vertex-transitive graph Σ with coprime degrees, if both Γ and Σ are *R-thin* and at least one of them is non-bipartite, then (Γ, Σ) is nontrivially unstable if and only if at least one Σ -automorphism of Γ is nondiagonal. In the same paper they proposed to study the stability of graph pairs (Γ, Σ) for various special families of graphs Γ and/or various special families of graphs Σ , including the case when Σ is K_n or C_n . In [11, Theorem 6], Qin *et al.* proved that, if Γ and Σ are regular of coprime degrees and Σ is vertex-transitive, then (Γ, Σ) is nontrivially unstable if and only if (Γ, K_2) is nontrivially unstable. In the same paper they also studied the stability of (Γ, C_n) in the case when Γ is regular ([11, Proposition 17]), and they asked under what conditions the pair (Γ, C_n) is nontrivially unstable given that Γ is stable and $m \geq 6$ is even ([11, Question 18]).

Motivated by the works above, in this paper we study the stability of (Γ, C_n) , where $n \geq 3$ and Γ needs not be regular. In Section 2, we prove a few preliminary results on Σ -automorphisms of Γ for a general pair (Γ, Σ) , enriching the theories of Σ -automorphisms developed in [10]. In particular, we give three necessary conditions for Γ to be R -thin in terms of nondiagonal Σ -automorphisms of Γ (Lemma 2.3). In Section 3, we study the stability of (Γ, C_n) , where $n \neq 4$ and Γ is an R -thin connected graph which is non-bipartite when n is even. We prove that if n is “compatible” with Γ in some sense (Definition 2.5) or n is odd and $N_\Gamma(u) \cap N_\Gamma(v)$ is not an independent set of Γ for any edge $\{u, v\}$ of an auxiliary graph Γ^* (Definition 2.5) associated with Γ , then (Γ, C_n) is nontrivially unstable if and only if at least one C_n -automorphism of Γ is non-diagonal (Theorem 3.1). In Section 4, we first prove that if Γ is R -thin, connected, non-bipartite and unstable, then (Γ, C_n) is unstable for every even integer $n \geq 4$ (Theorem 4.3). We then prove that, for an R -thin connected non-bipartite graph Γ , if an even integer $n \geq 6$ is compatible Γ , then (Γ, C_n) is nontrivially unstable if and only if Γ is unstable, and if there is an even integer $n \geq 6$ compatible with Γ such that (Γ, C_n) is nontrivially unstable, then (Γ, C_m) is unstable for all even integers $m \geq 6$ (Theorem 4.5). Finally, we prove that if Γ is an R -thin connected graph and $n \geq 3$ is an odd integer compatible with Γ , then (Γ, C_n) is stable (Theorem 4.6).

2. PRELIMINARIES

Let Γ and Σ be graphs with $V(\Sigma) = \{1, \dots, n\}$, and let $\phi \in \text{Aut}(\Sigma)$. Then

$$(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)^\phi = (\alpha_{1^\phi}, \dots, \alpha_{n^\phi}), \text{ for } (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \text{Aut}_\Sigma(\Gamma)$$

defines a bijection from $\text{Aut}_\Sigma(\Gamma)$ to $\text{Aut}_\Sigma(\Gamma)$.

Lemma 2.1. *Let Γ and Σ be connected graphs with $V(\Sigma) = \{1, \dots, n\}$. Then for any $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \text{Aut}_\Sigma(\Gamma)$ and $\phi \in \text{Aut}(\Sigma)$ we have $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)^\phi \in \text{Aut}_\Sigma(\Gamma)$. Moreover, $\text{Aut}(\Sigma)$ is a subgroup of the automorphism group of $\text{Aut}_\Sigma(\Gamma)$.*

Proof. Since $\phi \in \text{Aut}(\Sigma)$, for all $i', j' \in V(\Gamma)$, there exist $i, j \in V(\Gamma)$ such that $i' = i^\phi$ and $j' = j^\phi$. Moreover, (i, j) and (i', j') determine each other uniquely, and $\{i', j'\} \in E(\Sigma)$ if and only if $\{i, j\} \in E(\Sigma)$. Since $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \text{Aut}_\Sigma(\Gamma)$, for any $u, v \in V(\Gamma)$, $\{u, v\} \in E(\Gamma)$ if and only if $\{u^{\alpha_{i'}}, v^{\alpha_{j'}}\} \in E(\Gamma)$ for any $i', j' \in V(\Sigma)$ with $\{i', j'\} \in E(\Sigma)$. That is, $\{u, v\} \in E(\Gamma)$ if and only if $\{u^{\alpha_{i^\phi}}, v^{\alpha_{j^\phi}}\} \in E(\Gamma)$ for any $i^\phi, j^\phi \in V(\Sigma)$ with $\{i^\phi, j^\phi\} \in E(\Sigma)$. Therefore, $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)^\phi \in \text{Aut}_\Sigma(\Gamma)$.

Now for any $\phi \in \text{Aut}(\Sigma)$ and $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n), (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n) \in \text{Aut}_\Sigma(\Gamma)$, set $\gamma_i = \alpha_i \beta_i$ and $i' = i^\phi$ for $i \in V(\Sigma)$. Since $\phi \in \text{Aut}(\Sigma)$, when i ranges over all vertices of Σ so does i' . Hence

$$\begin{aligned} (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)^\phi (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n)^\phi &= (\alpha_{1^\phi}, \dots, \alpha_{n^\phi}) (\beta_{1^\phi}, \dots, \beta_{n^\phi}) \\ &= (\alpha_{1'} \beta_{1'}, \dots, \alpha_{n'} \beta_{n'}) \\ &= (\gamma_{1'}, \dots, \gamma_{n'}) \\ &= (\gamma_{1^\phi}, \dots, \gamma_{n^\phi}) \\ &= (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n)^\phi \\ &= (\alpha_1 \beta_1, \dots, \alpha_n \beta_n)^\phi \\ &= ((\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n))^\phi. \end{aligned}$$

This means that $\text{Aut}(\Sigma)$ is a subgroup of the automorphism group of $\text{Aut}_\Sigma(\Gamma)$. \square

In [3, Proposition 3.2], Lauri *et al.* proved that for any two-fold automorphism (α_1, α_2) of a graph Γ , either both α_1 and α_2 are automorphisms of Γ , or neither of them is. The following is a generalization of this result.

Lemma 2.2. *Let Γ and Σ be connected graphs with $V(\Sigma) = \{1, \dots, n\}$. Then for any $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \text{Aut}_\Sigma(\Gamma)$, either $\alpha_i \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ or $\alpha_i \notin \text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$.*

Proof. Suppose that $\alpha_i \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ for some i . Then $(\alpha_i^{-1}, \dots, \alpha_i^{-1}) \in \text{Aut}_\Sigma(\Gamma)$. Since $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \text{Aut}_\Sigma(\Gamma)$ and $\text{Aut}_\Sigma(\Gamma)$ is a group, we have $(\alpha_1 \alpha_i^{-1}, \dots, \alpha_i \alpha_i^{-1}, \dots, \alpha_n \alpha_i^{-1}) \in \text{Aut}_\Sigma(\Gamma)$. Since $\alpha_i \alpha_i^{-1} = \text{id}$, this shows that we may assume without loss of generality that $\alpha_i = \text{id}$ in $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \text{Aut}_\Sigma(\Gamma)$. Then for any $u, v \in V(\Gamma)$ and $j \in N_\Sigma(i)$, $\{u, v\} \in E(\Gamma)$ if and only if $\{u^{\alpha_i}, v^{\alpha_j}\} = \{u, v^{\alpha_j}\} \in E(\Gamma)$. Moreover, if $\{u, v^{\alpha_j}\} \in E(\Gamma)$, then $\{v^{\alpha_j}, u\} \in E(\Gamma)$ and hence $\{(v^{\alpha_j})^{\alpha_i}, u^{\alpha_j}\} = \{v^{\alpha_j}, u^{\alpha_j}\} \in E(\Gamma)$. So we have proved that $\{u, v\} \in E(\Gamma)$ implies $\{u^{\alpha_j}, v^{\alpha_j}\} \in E(\Gamma)$. In other words, α_j maps edges of Γ to edges of Γ . Since α_j is a permutation of $V(\Gamma)$, we obtain further that α_j maps different edges of Γ to different edges of Γ . So $\{u, v\} \notin E(\Gamma)$ implies $\{u^{\alpha_j}, v^{\alpha_j}\} \notin E(\Gamma)$. Therefore, $\alpha_j \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ for all $j \in N_\Sigma(i)$.

If $N_\Sigma(j) \subseteq N_\Sigma(i)$ for any vertex $j \in N_\Sigma(i)$, then $N_\Sigma(i) \cup \{i\} = V(\Gamma)$ and so $\alpha_j \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ for all $j \in N_\Sigma(i)$. We now consider the case $V(\Sigma) \setminus N_\Sigma(i) \neq \emptyset$. Define $(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n)$ such that $\beta_j = \alpha_j$ for $j \in N_\Sigma(i)$ and $\beta_j = \text{id}$ for $j \in V(\Sigma) \setminus N_\Sigma(i)$. Then for any $u, v \in V(\Gamma)$ and $\{k, l\} \in E(\Sigma)$, $\{u^{\beta_k}, v^{\beta_l}\}$ is equal to $\{u, v\}$, $\{u^{\alpha_k}, v\}$, $\{u, v^{\alpha_l}\}$ or $\{u^{\alpha_k}, v^{\alpha_l}\}$, depending on whether $k \in N_\Sigma(i)$ and/or $l \in N_\Sigma(i)$. This together with what we proved in the previous paragraph implies that $\{u, v\} \in E(\Gamma)$ if and only if $\{u^{\beta_k}, v^{\beta_l}\} \in E(\Gamma)$. Hence $(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n) \in \text{Aut}_\Sigma(\Gamma)$. Since $\text{Aut}_\Sigma(\Gamma)$ is a group, we then have $(\beta_1^{-1}, \dots, \beta_n^{-1}) \in \text{Aut}_\Sigma(\Gamma)$ and consequently $(\alpha_1 \beta_1^{-1}, \dots, \alpha_n \beta_n^{-1}) \in \text{Aut}_\Sigma(\Gamma)$. Note that $\alpha_j \beta_j^{-1} = \text{id}$ for $j \in N_\Sigma(i)$ and $\alpha_j \beta_j^{-1} = \alpha_j$ for $j \in V(\Sigma) \setminus N_\Sigma(i)$. Thus, for any $\{u, v\} \in E(\Gamma)$ and any $j \in N_\Sigma(i)$ and $l \in N_\Sigma(j)$, $\{u, v\} \in E(\Gamma)$ if and only if $\{u^{\alpha_j \beta_j^{-1}}, v^{\alpha_l \beta_l^{-1}}\} = \{u, v^{\alpha_l}\} \in E(\Gamma)$. On the other hand, by $\{u, v^{\alpha_l}\} \in E(\Gamma)$ we have $\{v^{\alpha_l}, u\} \in E(\Gamma)$ and so $\{(v^{\alpha_l})^{\alpha_j \beta_j^{-1}}, u^{\alpha_l \beta_l^{-1}}\} = \{v^{\alpha_l}, u^{\alpha_l}\} \in E(\Gamma)$. Thus $\{u, v\} \in E(\Gamma)$ implies $\{u^{\alpha_l}, v^{\alpha_l}\} \in E(\Gamma)$ for all $l \in N_\Sigma(j)$ with $j \in N_\Sigma(i)$. That is, α_l maps edges of Γ to edges of Γ . Since α_l is a permutation of $V(\Gamma)$, it must map different edges of Γ to different edges of Γ . Thus $\{u, v\} \notin E(\Gamma)$ implies $\{u^{\alpha_l}, v^{\alpha_l}\} \notin E(\Gamma)$. Therefore, $\alpha_l \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ for all $l \in N_\Sigma(j)$ with $j \in N_\Sigma(i)$. Since Σ is a finite connected graph, by repeating the process a finite number of times we obtain that $\alpha_j \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ for all $1 \leq j \leq n$. \square

Lemma 2.3. *Let Γ and Σ be connected graphs with $V(\Sigma) = \{1, \dots, n\}$. If Γ is R -thin, then the following statements hold for every nondiagonal $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \text{Aut}_\Sigma(\Gamma)$:*

- (a) $\alpha_i \notin \text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$;
- (b) α_i for $1 \leq i \leq n$ all have the same order;
- (c) $\alpha_i \neq \alpha_j$ for every $\{i, j\} \in E(\Sigma)$.

Proof. Suppose that Γ is R -thin. Let $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \text{Aut}_\Sigma(\Gamma)$ be an arbitrary nondiagonal Σ -automorphism of Γ .

(a) Suppose for a contradiction that $\alpha_i \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ for at least one $1 \leq i \leq n$. Then by Lemma 2.2 we have $\alpha_i \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. Since Σ is connected and $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ is nondiagonal,

there exists an edge $\{i, j\} \in E(\Sigma)$ such that $\alpha_i \neq \alpha_j$ and hence $\gamma := \alpha_j \alpha_i^{-1}$ is a non-identity element of $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$. So γ moves at least one vertex of Γ , say, u , so that $v := u^\gamma \neq u$. Assume without loss of generality that $i < j$. Then $(\alpha_1 \alpha_i^{-1}, \dots, \alpha_i \alpha_i^{-1}, \dots, \alpha_j \alpha_i^{-1}, \dots, \alpha_n \alpha_i^{-1}) \in \text{Aut}_\Sigma(\Gamma)$ by Lemma 2.1. For each $w \in N_\Gamma(u)$, we have $\{w, u^\gamma\} = \{w, v\}$. Hence each neighbour w of u in Γ is also a neighbour of v in Γ . So $N_\Gamma(u) \subseteq N_\Gamma(v)$. By Lemma 2.1 again, we have $((\alpha_1 \alpha_i^{-1})^{-1}, \dots, (\alpha_i \alpha_i^{-1})^{-1}, \dots, (\alpha_j \alpha_i^{-1})^{-1}, \dots, (\alpha_n \alpha_i^{-1})^{-1}) \in \text{Aut}_\Sigma(\Gamma)$. Since $\gamma^{-1} = (\alpha_j \alpha_i^{-1})^{-1}$, we obtain that $\{w, v^{\gamma^{-1}}\} = \{w, u\} \in E(\Gamma)$ for any $w \in N_\Gamma(v)$. In other words, $N_\Gamma(v) \subseteq N_\Gamma(u)$. Therefore, $N_\Gamma(u) = N_\Gamma(v)$ and thus Γ is not R -thin, but this is a contradiction.

(b) Suppose to the contrary that there exist $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ such that α_i and α_j have different orders. Since Σ is connected, this assumption implies that there exist $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ with $\{i, j\} \in E(\Sigma)$ such that α_i and α_j have different orders. Without loss of generality we may assume $\{1, n\} \in E(\Sigma)$ and α_1, α_n have orders p, q , respectively, for some $p < q$. Since $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \text{Aut}_\Sigma(\Gamma)$, we have $(\alpha_1^p, \alpha_2^p, \dots, \alpha_n^p) = (\text{id}, \alpha_2^p, \dots, \alpha_n^p) \in \text{Aut}_\Sigma(\Gamma)$. Moreover, $(\text{id}, \alpha_2^p, \dots, \alpha_n^p)$ is nondiagonal as $\alpha_n^p \neq \text{id}$. Since $\text{id} \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma)$, this contradicts what we have proved in part (a).

(c) Suppose that there exists some $\{i, j\} \in E(\Sigma)$ such that $\alpha_i = \alpha_j$. Since $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \text{Aut}_\Sigma(\Gamma)$ and $\{i, j\} \in E(\Sigma)$, for any $\{u, v\} \in E(\Gamma)$, we have $\{u^{\alpha_i}, v^{\alpha_i}\} = \{u^{\alpha_i}, v^{\alpha_j}\} \in E(\Gamma)$. Hence $\alpha_i \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma)$. But this contradicts what we have proved in part (a). \square

Proposition 2.4. *Let Γ be an R -thin connected graph and Σ a connected graph with $V(\Sigma) = \{1, \dots, n\}$. Let Δ be a subgraph of Σ . Then any $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \text{Aut}_\Sigma(\Gamma)$ gives rise to a Δ -automorphism of Γ , namely $(\alpha_i)_{i \in V(\Delta)} \in \text{Aut}_\Delta(\Gamma)$.*

Proof. Since Δ is a subgraph of Σ , without loss of generality we may assume $V(\Delta) = \{1, \dots, m\}$. Then for $i, j \in V(\Delta)$, $\{i, j\} \in E(\Sigma)$ whenever $\{i, j\} \in E(\Delta)$. Since $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \text{Aut}_\Sigma(\Gamma)$, for all $u, v \in V(\Gamma)$ and any $\{i, j\} \in E(\Sigma)$, $\{u, v\} \in E(\Gamma)$ if and only if $\{u^{\alpha_i}, v^{\alpha_j}\} \in E(\Gamma)$. Since $E(\Delta) \subseteq E(\Sigma)$, the same statement holds for $\{i, j\} \in E(\Delta)$ and hence $(\alpha_i)_{i \in V(\Delta)} \in \text{Aut}_\Delta(\Gamma)$. \square

The following definition is essential for establishing our results in the next two sections.

Definition 2.5. Given a graph Γ , define Γ^* to be the graph with vertex set $V(\Gamma)$ in which $u, v \in V(\Gamma)$ are adjacent if and only if $\deg(u) = \deg(v) = 2|N_\Gamma(u) \cap N_\Gamma(v)|$.

For any $u \in V(\Gamma)$, if u is an isolated vertex of Γ^* , define $L(u) = \{0\}$; if u has degree 1 in Γ^* , define $L(u) = \{0, 1\}$; if u has degree at least 2 in Γ^* , define $L(u)$ to be the set of lengths of the cycles containing u in Γ^* .

We say that an integer $n \geq 3$ is *compatible* with Γ if either n is odd and $n \notin \bigcap_{u \in V(\Gamma)} L(u)$ or n is even and $n/2 \notin \bigcap_{u \in V(\Gamma)} L(u)$. An integer $n \geq 3$ is *incompatible* with Γ if it is not compatible with Γ .

Note that if n is compatible with Γ , then Γ and C_n must be coprime. Note also that if Γ has a vertex of odd degree, then any integer $n \geq 3$ is compatible with Γ .

3. SUFFICIENT CONDITIONS FOR (Γ, C_n) TO BE NONTRIVIAALLY UNSTABLE

The purpose of this section is to prove the following result. It is in the same spirit as [10, Theorem 1.8] where Γ is regular and Σ is vertex-transitive. Here Γ needs not be regular, but we assume Σ is a cycle among other things.

Theorem 3.1. *Let Γ be an R -thin connected graph and $n \geq 3$ an integer with $n \neq 4$. Suppose that at least one of Γ and C_n is non-bipartite. Then the following statements hold:*

- (a) *if n is compatible with Γ , then (Γ, C_n) is nontrivially unstable if and only if at least one C_n -automorphism of Γ is nondiagonal;*
- (b) *if n is odd and for any two distinct vertices $u, v \in V(\Gamma)$ with $\{u, v\} \in E(\Gamma^*)$, $N_\Gamma(u) \cap N_\Gamma(v)$ is not an independent set of Γ , then (Γ, C_n) is nontrivially unstable if and only if at least one C_n -automorphism of Γ is nondiagonal.*

We will use the following known results in our proof of Theorem 3.1. Recall that $P(\Gamma, \Sigma)$ denotes the set of elements of $\text{Aut}(\Gamma \times \Sigma)$ which leave the partition $\{V(\Gamma) \times \{i\} : i \in V(\Sigma)\}$ invariant ([10, Definition 2.3]).

Lemma 3.2. *Let Γ and Σ be graphs.*

- (a) *If $\text{Aut}(\Gamma \times \Sigma) = P(\Gamma, \Sigma)$, then (Γ, Σ) is unstable if and only if at least one Σ -automorphism of Γ is nondiagonal ([10, Lemma 2.6]).*
- (b) *If both Γ and Σ are connected, R -thin and non-bipartite, then (Γ, Σ) is stable if and only if Γ and Σ are coprime ([10, Lemma 3.7]).*

Denote by π_1 and π_2 the projections from $V(\Gamma \times \Sigma)$ to $V(\Gamma)$ and $V(\Sigma)$, respectively. That is, $(u, i)^{\pi_1} = u$ and $(u, i)^{\pi_2} = i$ for any $(u, i) \in V(\Gamma \times \Sigma)$. The *Boolean square* of Γ , denoted by $B(\Gamma)$, is the graph with vertex set $V(\Gamma)$ and edge set $\{\{u, v\} : u, v \in V(\Gamma), u \neq v, N_\Gamma(u) \cap N_\Gamma(v) \neq \emptyset\}$. In particular, if Γ is the cycle C_n with vertices labelled $1, \dots, n$ consecutively, then $B(C_n)$ is the graph with vertex set $\{1, \dots, n\}$ such that each i is adjacent to $i + 2$ and $i - 2$ modulo n . Note that $B(C_n)$ is a cycle of length n when n is odd, and $B(C_n)$ is the union of two cycles of length $n/2$ when n is even. Recall that the automorphism group of C_n is the dihedral group $D_{2n} = \langle a, b \mid a^n = b^2 = e, bab = a^{-1} \rangle$ of order $2n$. For a graph Γ and a partition \mathcal{B} of $V(\Gamma)$, the *quotient graph* $\Gamma_{\mathcal{B}}$ of Γ with respect to \mathcal{B} is defined to have vertex set \mathcal{B} such that two blocks B, C of \mathcal{B} are adjacent if and only if there exists at least one edge of Γ with one end-vertex in B and the other end-vertex in C .

The next technical lemma will be used to prove another lemma (Lemma 3.4) which in turn will be vital to the proof of Theorem 3.1.

Lemma 3.3. *Let Γ be an R -thin connected graph and $n \geq 3$ an integer with $n \neq 4$. Set $V(C_n) = \{0, 1, \dots, n - 1\}$. Then the following statements hold:*

- (a) *for any $u \in V(\Gamma)$, $\{i, j\} \in E(B(C_n))$ and $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma \times C_n)$, if $(u, i)^{\sigma\pi_2} \neq (u, j)^{\sigma\pi_2}$, then $(u, i)^{\sigma\pi_1} = (u, j)^{\sigma\pi_1}$;*
- (b) *for any $u \in V(\Gamma)$, $\{i, j\} \in E(B(C_n))$ and $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma \times C_n)$, if $(u, i)^{\sigma\pi_2} = (u, j)^{\sigma\pi_2}$, then $(u, i)^{\sigma\pi_2} = (u, k)^{\sigma\pi_2}$ where $k \equiv i + 2r \pmod{n}$ for any $1 \leq r \leq (n/2) - 1$.*

Moreover, if at least one of Γ and C_n is non-bipartite, then the following statements hold:

- (c) for any $u \in V(\Gamma)$, $\{i, j\} \in E(B(C_n))$ and $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma \times C_n)$, if $(u, i)^{\sigma\pi_2} \neq (u, j)^{\sigma\pi_2}$, then $(u, k)^{\sigma\pi_2} \neq (u, l)^{\sigma\pi_2}$ for any distinct $k, l \in \{1, \dots, n\}$;
- (d) for any $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma \times C_n)$, if there exist $u \in V(\Gamma)$ and $\{i, j\} \in E(B(C_n))$ such that $(u, i)^{\sigma\pi_2} \neq (u, j)^{\sigma\pi_2}$, then $(v, i)^{\sigma\pi_2} \neq (v, j)^{\sigma\pi_2}$ for every $v \in V(\Gamma)$;
- (e) if for any $u \in V(\Gamma)$ and $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma \times C_n)$ there exists $\{i, j\} \in E(B(C_n))$ such that $(u, i)^{\sigma\pi_2} \neq (u, j)^{\sigma\pi_2}$, then for any $v, w \in V(\Gamma)$ joined by an even-length walk in Γ , any $k \in V(C_n)$, and any $\delta \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma \times C_n)$, we have $(v, k)^{\delta\pi_2} = (w, k)^{\delta\pi_2}$;
- (f) if there exist $u \in V(\Gamma)$ and $\{i, j\} \in E(B(C_n))$ such that $(u, i)^{\sigma\pi_2} \neq (u, j)^{\sigma\pi_2}$ for any $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma \times C_n)$, then $\text{Aut}(\Gamma \times C_n) = \text{P}(\Gamma, C_n)$.

Proof. In this proof operations on $V(C_n) = \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$ are performed modulo n . Note that for any $\{i, j\} \in E(B(C_n))$, we have $j \equiv i+2 \pmod{n}$ or $j \equiv i-2 \pmod{n}$, and without loss of generality we may assume $j \equiv i+2 \pmod{n}$.

(a) Assume that $u \in V(\Gamma)$, $\{i, j\} \in E(B(C_n))$ and $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma \times C_n)$. Set $(v, k) = (u, i)^\sigma$. Taking a vertex $(w, i+1) \in N_{\Gamma \times C_n}((u, i))$, we have $(w, i+1)^{\sigma\pi_2} = k-1$ or $k+1$. Since $\{(w, i+1), (u, i+2)\}$ is an edge of $\Gamma \times C_n$, $(u, i+2)^\sigma$ is adjacent to $(w, i+1)^\sigma$. Hence $(u, i+2)^{\sigma\pi_2} = k-2, k+2$ or k . Thus, either $(u, i+2)^{\sigma\pi_2} \in \{k+2, k-2\}$ or $(u, j)^{\sigma\pi_2} = k$. Note that $(u, i)^{\sigma\pi_2} \neq (u, j)^{\sigma\pi_2}$ by our assumption. Consider first the case where $(u, j)^{\sigma\pi_2} \equiv k+2 \pmod{n}$. We aim to prove $(u, i)^{\sigma\pi_1} = (u, j)^{\sigma\pi_1}$. Suppose otherwise. Then $(u, j)^\sigma = (w, k+2)$ for some $w \in V(\Gamma)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} |N_{\Gamma \times C_n}((u, i)^\sigma) \cap N_{\Gamma \times C_n}((u, j)^\sigma)| &= |N_{\Gamma \times C_n}((v, k)) \cap N_{\Gamma \times C_n}((w, k+2))| \\ &= |N_\Gamma(v) \cap N_\Gamma(w)| \cdot |N_{C_n}(k) \cap N_{C_n}(k+2)| \\ &= |N_\Gamma(v) \cap N_\Gamma(w)|. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} |N_{\Gamma \times C_n}((u, i)^\sigma) \cap N_{\Gamma \times C_n}((u, j)^\sigma)| &= |N_{\Gamma \times C_n}((u, i)) \cap N_{\Gamma \times C_n}((u, j+2))| \\ &= |N_\Gamma(u) \cap N_\Gamma(u)| \cdot |N_{C_n}(i) \cap N_{C_n}(j+2)| \\ &= |N_\Gamma(u) \cap N_\Gamma(u)| \\ &= |N_\Gamma(u)|. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $|N_\Gamma(u)| = |N_\Gamma(v) \cap N_\Gamma(w)|$, but this contradicts the assumption that Γ is R -thin. This contradiction shows that we have $(u, i)^{\sigma\pi_1} = (u, j)^{\sigma\pi_1}$ when $(u, j)^{\sigma\pi_2} \equiv k+2 \pmod{n}$. Similarly, we can prove $(u, i)^{\sigma\pi_1} = (u, j)^{\sigma\pi_1}$ when $(u, i+2)^{\sigma\pi_2} \equiv k-2 \pmod{n}$.

(b) Assume that $u \in V(\Gamma)$, $\{i, j\} \in E(B(C_n))$ and $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma \times C_n)$. We proceed by induction on r . If $r = 1$, then $k = i+2$. Thus $k = j$ and we obtain the result by the assumption. Suppose that, for some $m \geq 1$, the result is true for every r between 1 and $m-1$. That is, if $(u, i)^{\sigma\pi_2} = (u, j)^{\sigma\pi_2}$, then $(u, i)^{\sigma\pi_2} = (u, i+2r)^{\sigma\pi_2}$ for $1 \leq r \leq m-1$. We aim to prove that the result is also true when $r = m$. By our hypothesis, it suffices to prove $(u, i+2m-2)^{\sigma\pi_2} = (u, i+2m)^{\sigma\pi_2}$. Suppose for a contradiction that $(u, i+2m-2)^{\sigma\pi_2} \neq (u, i+2m)^{\sigma\pi_2}$. Then by part (a) we have $(u, i+2m-2)^{\sigma\pi_1} = (u, i+2m)^{\sigma\pi_1}$. Since $(u, i+2m-2)^{\sigma\pi_2} \neq (u, i+2m)^{\sigma\pi_2}$, either $(u, i+2m)^{\sigma\pi_2} = (u, i+2m-2)^{\sigma\pi_2} + 2$ or $(u, i+2m)^{\sigma\pi_2} = (u, i+2m-2)^{\sigma\pi_2} - 2$. Consider the former case first. In this case we have $(u, i+2m-2)^{\sigma\pi_2} = l$ and

$(u, i + 2m)^{\sigma\pi_2} \equiv l + 2 \pmod{n}$ for some $l \in V(C_n)$. So $(u, i + 2m - 4)^{\sigma\pi_2} = (u, i + 2m - 2)^{\sigma\pi_2} = l$. Thus there exists a vertex $(v, i + 2m - 3) \in N_{\Gamma \times C_n}((u, i + 2m - 4)) \cap N_{\Gamma \times C_n}((u, i + 2m - 2))$ such that $(v, i + 2m - 3)^{\sigma\pi_2} \equiv l + 1 \pmod{n}$ and $(v, i + 2m - 3)^\sigma \in N_{\Gamma \times C_n}((u, i + 2m - 4)^\sigma) \cap N_{\Gamma \times C_n}((u, i + 2m - 2)^\sigma)$. So $(v, i + 2m - 3)^\sigma \in N_{\Gamma \times C_n}((u, i + 2m)^\sigma)$, but this contradicts the fact that $(v, i + 2m - 3)$ is not adjacent to $(u, i + 2m)$. Similarly, one can derive a contradiction in the case when $(u, i + 2m)^{\sigma\pi_2} = (u, i + 2m - 2)^{\sigma\pi_2} - 2$. Therefore, we must have $(u, i + 2m - 2)^{\sigma\pi_2} = (u, i + 2m)^{\sigma\pi_2}$ and hence the result is true when $r = m$. This completes the proof by mathematical induction.

In the rest of the proof we assume that at least one of Γ and C_n is non-bipartite. Equivalently, n is odd when Γ is bipartite.

(c) Suppose that $u \in V(\Gamma)$, $\{i, j\} \in E(B(C_n))$ and $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma \times C_n)$ such that $(u, i)^{\sigma\pi_2} \neq (u, j)^{\sigma\pi_2}$, where $j \equiv i + 2 \pmod{n}$. Set $(u, i)^{\sigma\pi_2} = i_1$ and assume without loss of generality that $(u, i + 2)^{\sigma\pi_2} \equiv i_1 + 2 \pmod{n}$. Since both Γ and C_n are connected and at least one of them is non-bipartite, $\Gamma \times C_n$ is connected. So for any $(u, i) \in V(\Gamma \times C_n)$, there exists a walk from (u, i) to $(u, i + 1)$ with vertices in $V(\Gamma) \times \{i, i + 1\}$, say, $(u, i) = (u_0, i), (u_1, i + 1), (u_2, i), \dots, (u_{2r}, i), (u_{2r+1}, i + 1) = (u, i + 1)$, for some r between 0 and $|V(\Gamma)| - 1$. Since $(u, i)^{\sigma\pi_2} = i_1$ and $(u, i + 2)^{\sigma\pi_2} \equiv i_1 + 2 \pmod{n}$, for each $v \in N_\Gamma(u)$ we have $(v, i + 1)^{\sigma\pi_2} \equiv i_1 + 1 \pmod{n}$ and $(v, i - 1)^{\sigma\pi_2} \equiv i_1 - 1 \pmod{n}$. Combining this with $u_1 \in N_\Gamma(u)$, we obtain that $(u_1, i + 1)^{\sigma\pi_2} \equiv i_1 + 1 \pmod{n}$. By part (b), we have $(u_1, i + 1) \neq (u_1, i + 1 + 2r)$ for any integer r between 0 and $n/2$. Thus for each $w \in N_\Gamma(u_1)$ we have $(w, i)^{\sigma\pi_2} = i_1$ and $(w, i + 2)^{\sigma\pi_2} \equiv i_1 + 2 \pmod{n}$. Hence $(u_2, i)^{\sigma\pi_2} = i_1$. Applying successively the same argument to pairs of every other vertices in the walk above, we obtain that $(u_{2t+1}, i + 1)^{\sigma\pi_2} \equiv i_1 + 1 \pmod{n}$ for $0 \leq t \leq r$ and $(u_{2t}, i)^{\sigma\pi_2} = i_1$ for $1 \leq t \leq r$. Thus $(u, i + 1)^{\sigma\pi_2} \equiv i_1 + 1 \pmod{n}$. Similarly, we can prove that for any $0 \leq t \leq n$, $(u, i + t)^{\sigma\pi_2} \equiv i_1 + t \pmod{n}$ when $(u, i)^{\sigma\pi_2} = i_1$ and $(u, i + 2)^{\sigma\pi_2} \equiv i_1 + 2 \pmod{n}$. Hence $(u, k)^{\sigma\pi_2} \neq (u, l)^{\sigma\pi_2}$ for any distinct $k, l \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.

(d) Let $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma \times C_n)$. Assume that there exist $u \in V(\Gamma)$ and $\{i, j\} \in E(B(C_n))$ such that $(u, i)^{\sigma\pi_2} \neq (u, j)^{\sigma\pi_2}$. We aim to prove $(v, i)^{\sigma\pi_2} \neq (v, j)^{\sigma\pi_2}$ for all $v \in V(\Gamma)$. Since this inequality holds when $v = u$, we assume $v \neq u$ in the sequel. Since $(u, i)^{\sigma\pi_2} \neq (u, j)^{\sigma\pi_2}$, by part (c), we have $(u, k)^{\sigma\pi_2} \neq (u, l)^{\sigma\pi_2}$ for any distinct $k, l \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Thus, if u and v are adjacent in Γ , then $(u, i - 1)^{\sigma\pi_2}$, $(u, i + 1)^{\sigma\pi_2}$ and $(u, i + 3)^{\sigma\pi_2}$ are pairwise distinct, and hence $(v, i)^{\sigma\pi_2} \neq (v, i + 2)^{\sigma\pi_2}$. By part (c) again, we have $(v, k)^{\sigma\pi_2} \neq (v, l)^{\sigma\pi_2}$ for any distinct $k, l \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, and so $(v, i)^{\sigma\pi_2} \neq (v, j)^{\sigma\pi_2}$. If u and v are not adjacent in Γ , then there is a path in Γ from u to v with length at least 2, say, $u = u_0, u_1, \dots, u_p = v$. As shown above, we have $(u_1, i)^{\sigma\pi_2} \neq (u_1, i + 2)^{\sigma\pi_2}$. Similarly to the proof in the case when u and v are adjacent, we can prove $(u_2, i)^{\sigma\pi_2} \neq (u_2, i + 2)^{\sigma\pi_2}$. Applying successively what we have proved to other vertices in the path $u = u_0, u_1, \dots, u_p = v$, we obtain $(u_k, i)^{\sigma\pi_2} \neq (u_k, i + 2)^{\sigma\pi_2}$ for $0 \leq k \leq p$. In particular, we have $(v, i)^{\sigma\pi_2} \neq (v, i + 2)^{\sigma\pi_2}$. By part (c), we then obtain $(v, i)^{\sigma\pi_2} \neq (v, j)^{\sigma\pi_2}$ as desired.

(e) Assume that for any $u \in V(\Gamma)$ and $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma \times C_n)$ there exists $\{i, j\} \in E(B(C_n))$ such that $(u, i)^{\sigma\pi_2} \neq (u, j)^{\sigma\pi_2}$. Let $v, w \in V(\Gamma)$ be such that $d(v, w) = 2r$ is even. Consider the case $r = 1$ first. In this case we have $N_\Gamma(v) \cap N_\Gamma(w) \neq \emptyset$ and so we may take $x \in N_\Gamma(v) \cap N_\Gamma(w)$. For any $k \in V(C_n)$, set $W = \{(x, k - 1), (x, k + 1)\}$. Then $W \subseteq N_{\Gamma \times C_n}((v, k)) \cap N_{\Gamma \times C_n}((w, k))$. Since $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma \times C_n)$, we have $W^\sigma = \{(x, k - 1)^\sigma, (x, k + 1)^\sigma\} \subseteq N_{\Gamma \times C_n}((v, k)^\sigma) \cap N_{\Gamma \times C_n}((w, k)^\sigma)$. Since $(u, i)^{\sigma\pi_2} \neq (u, j)^{\sigma\pi_2}$,

by part (d), we have $(x, i)^{\sigma\pi_2} \neq (x, j)^{\sigma\pi_2}$ for any $x \in V(\Gamma)$. Moreover, by part (c), we have $(x, k-1)^{\sigma\pi_2} \neq (x, k+1)^{\sigma\pi_2}$. Combining this with part (a), we obtain $(x, k-1)^{\sigma\pi_1} = (x, k+1)^{\sigma\pi_1}$. Note that $(v, k)^\sigma$ and $(w, k)^\sigma$ are in $N_{\Gamma \times C_n}((x, k-1)^\sigma) \cap N_{\Gamma \times C_n}((x, k+1)^\sigma)$ and $(x, k-1)^{\sigma\pi_1} = (x, k+1)^{\sigma\pi_1}$. Hence either $(v, k)^{\sigma\pi_2} = (w, k)^{\sigma\pi_2}$ or $C_n = C_4$. Since $n \neq 4$ by our assumption, we have $(v, k)^{\sigma\pi_2} = (w, k)^{\sigma\pi_2}$ as required. Now assume $r \geq 2$. Since $d(v, w) = 2r$, there is a path in Γ from v to w with length $2r$. Applying what we have proved to pairs of every other vertices in this path, we can obtain the desired result.

(f) Suppose that there exist $u \in V(\Gamma)$ and $\{i, j\} \in E(B(C_n))$ such that $(u, i)^{\sigma\pi_2} \neq (u, j)^{\sigma\pi_2}$ for any $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma \times C_n)$. We may assume $j \equiv i + 2 \pmod{n}$ without loss of generality. By part (d), we have $(v, i)^{\sigma\pi_2} \neq (v, j)^{\sigma\pi_2}$ for any $v \in V(\Gamma)$. Moreover, by part (c), we have $(v, k)^{\sigma\pi_2} \neq (v, l)^{\sigma\pi_2}$ for any distinct $k, l \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$.

Consider first the case where n is odd. We aim to prove $(v, k)^{\sigma\pi_2} = (w, k)^{\sigma\pi_2}$ for any distinct $v, w \in V(\Gamma)$, any $k \in V(C_n)$, and any $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma \times C_n)$. If there is a walk from v to w in Γ with even length, then we obtain the result by part (e). Assume there is no such a walk in the sequel. Consider the case where v and w are adjacent first. In this case, for any $i \in V(C_n)$, we can construct a cycle $C_{v,w}$ of length $2n$ in $\Gamma \times C_n$ containing (v, i) , namely

$$C_{v,w} : (v, i), (w, i+1), (v, i+2), (w, i+3) \cdots, (v, i-1), (w, i), (v, i+1), \cdots, (w, i-1), (v, i).$$

Since $(v, i)^{\sigma\pi_2} \neq (v, i+2)^{\sigma\pi_2}$ for any $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma \times C_n)$, by part (a) we have $(v, i)^{\sigma\pi_1} = (v, i+2)^{\sigma\pi_1}$. Since $C_{v,w}$ is a cycle in $\Gamma \times C_n$ and (v, r) and (w, r) are antipodal in $C_{v,w}$ for $0 \leq r \leq n-1$, $C_{v,w}^\sigma$ is a cycle in $\Gamma \times C_n$ and $(v, i)^{\sigma\pi_2}$ and $(w, i)^{\sigma\pi_2}$ are antipodal in $C_{v,w}^\sigma$. Therefore, $(v, i)^{\sigma\pi_2} = (w, i)^{\sigma\pi_2}$. Now consider the case where v and w are not adjacent. Since Γ is connected, there exists a walk from v to w of odd length in Γ , say, $v = v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{2r+1} = w$, for some $r \geq 1$. Then for any $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma \times C_n)$, as shown above, we have $(v_1, k)^{\sigma\pi_2} = (v_0, k)^{\sigma\pi_2}$ for any $k \in V(C_n)$. Since there is a walk from v_1 to v_{2r+1} with even length, we have $(v_1, k)^{\sigma\pi_2} = (v_{2r+1}, k)^{\sigma\pi_2}$ for any $k \in V(C_n)$. Thus, $(v_0, k)^{\sigma\pi_2} = (v_{2r+1}, k)^{\sigma\pi_2}$, that is, $(v, k)^{\sigma\pi_2} = (w, k)^{\sigma\pi_2}$, for any $k \in V(C_n)$, which implies that $\sigma \in \text{P}(\Gamma, C_n)$ for any $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma \times C_n)$. Hence $\text{Aut}(\Gamma \times C_n) = \text{P}(\Gamma, C_n)$ when n is odd.

Now consider the case where $n \geq 4$ is even. Since by our assumption at least one of Γ and C_n is non-bipartite, in this case Γ must be non-bipartite. Set $\Delta = \Gamma \times C_n$ and $\mathcal{B} = \{V(\Gamma) \times \{j\} : j \in V(C_n)\}$. Then the quotient graph $\Delta_{\mathcal{B}}$ of Δ with respect to the partition \mathcal{B} of $V(\Delta)$ is isomorphic to C_n . Since n is even, C_n is bipartite and hence $\Gamma \times C_n$ is bipartite. Moreover, since $\Gamma \times C_n$ is connected, any two vertices $(v, i), (w, i) \in V(\Gamma \times C_n)$ are joined by a path of even length in $\Gamma \times C_n$, which implies that there is a walk of even length from v to w in Γ . Thus, by part (e), we obtain that any $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma \times C_n)$ satisfies $(v, k)^{\sigma\pi_2} = (w, k)^{\sigma\pi_2}$ for any $v, w \in V(\Gamma)$ and $k \in V(C_n)$, and hence any $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma \times C_n)$ belongs to $\text{P}(\Gamma, C_n)$. Therefore, $\text{Aut}(\Gamma \times C_n) \subseteq \text{P}(\Gamma, C_n)$ and consequently $\text{Aut}(\Gamma \times C_n) = \text{P}(\Gamma, C_n)$ when n is even. \square

The following lemma plays a key role in our proof of Theorem 3.1. It will also be used to prove two results (Theorems 4.5 and 4.6) in the next section.

Lemma 3.4. *Let Γ be an R -thin connected graph and $n \geq 3$ an integer with $n \neq 4$. Suppose that at least one of Γ and C_n is non-bipartite. Then the following statements hold:*

- (a) *if n is compatible with Γ , then $\text{Aut}(\Gamma \times C_n) = \text{P}(\Gamma, C_n)$;*

(b) if n is odd and for any $u, v \in V(\Gamma)$ with $\{u, v\} \in E(\Gamma^*)$, $N_\Gamma(u) \cap N_\Gamma(v)$ is not an independent set of Γ , then $\text{Aut}(\Gamma \times C_n) = \text{P}(\Gamma, C_n)$.

Proof. Set $V(C_n) = \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$, in which operations are taken modulo n . Recall that for any $\{i, j\} \in E(\text{B}(C_n))$, $j \equiv i+2 \pmod{n}$ or $j \equiv i-2 \pmod{n}$. Without loss of generality we may assume $j \equiv i+2 \pmod{n}$ whenever $\{i, j\} \in E(\text{B}(C_n))$. By Lemma 3.3(f), we only need to prove the existence of $u \in V(\Gamma)$ and $\{i, j\} \in E(\text{B}(C_n))$ such that $(u, i)^{\sigma\pi_2} \neq (u, j)^{\sigma\pi_2}$ for any $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma \times C_n)$.

(a) We only prove the result when n is even as the proof for odd n is similar. Since n is even and n is compatible with Γ , we may take a vertex $u \in V(\Gamma)$ such that $n/2 \notin L(u)$. Suppose for a contradiction that there exist $(v, i) \in V(\Gamma \times C_n)$ and $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma \times C_n)$ such that $(v, i)^{\sigma\pi_2} = (v, i+2)^{\sigma\pi_2}$. Then by Lemma 3.3(d) we have $(w, i)^{\sigma\pi_2} = (w, i+2)^{\sigma\pi_2}$ for each $w \in V(\Gamma)$. Set $u = (w, i)^{\sigma\pi_1}$ and $m = (n/2) - 1$. By Lemma 3.3(b), for any r between 0 and m , we have $(w, i)^{\sigma\pi_2} = (w, k)^{\sigma\pi_2}$, where $k \equiv i+2r \pmod{n}$. Thus there are $n/2$ distinct vertices $u = u_0, u_1, \dots, u_m \in V(\Gamma)$ and one vertex $l \in V(C_n)$ such that $(w, k)^\sigma = (u_r, l)$ where $k \equiv i+2r \pmod{n}$ for $0 \leq r \leq m$. Since $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma \times C_n)$, it follows that $\deg((w, k)) = \deg((u_r, l))$. Moreover, since C_n is a regular graph with degree 2, we obtain further that $\deg(w) = \deg(u_r)$ for $0 \leq r \leq m$. Note that for $0 \leq r \leq m$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} |N_{\Gamma \times C_n}((w, i+2r)^\sigma) \cap N_{\Gamma \times C_n}((w, i+2r+2)^\sigma)| &= |N_{\Gamma \times C_n}((u_r, l)) \cap N_{\Gamma \times C_n}((u_{r+1}, l))| \\ &= |N_\Gamma(u_r) \cap N_\Gamma(u_{r+1})| \cdot |N_{C_n}(l)| \\ &= 2|N_\Gamma(u_r) \cap N_\Gamma(u_{r+1})|. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} |N_{\Gamma \times C_n}((w, i+2r)^\sigma) \cap N_{\Gamma \times C_n}((w, i+2r+2)^\sigma)| &= |N_{\Gamma \times C_n}((w, i+2r)) \cap N_{\Gamma \times C_n}((w, i+2r+2))| \\ &= |N_\Gamma(w) \cap N_\Gamma(w)| \cdot |N_{C_n}(i+2r) \cap N_{C_n}(i+2r+2)| \\ &= |N_\Gamma(w) \cap N_\Gamma(w)| \\ &= |N_\Gamma(w)|. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $N_\Gamma(w) = 2|N_\Gamma(u_r) \cap N_\Gamma(u_{r+1})|$ for $0 \leq r \leq m$. So there is a cycle in Γ^* with length $n/2$ which contains u , but this is a contradiction. Therefore, we have $(w, i)^{\sigma\pi_2} \neq (w, j)^{\sigma\pi_2}$ for any $\{i, j\} \in E(\text{B}(C_n))$. Since this holds for any $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma \times C_n)$, by Lemma 3.3(e) we obtain that $(v, i)^{\sigma\pi_2} \neq (v, i+2)^{\sigma\pi_2}$ for any $(v, i) \in V(\Gamma \times C_n)$ and $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma \times C_n)$. This together with Lemma 3.3(f) yields $\text{Aut}(\Gamma \times C_n) = \text{P}(\Gamma, C_n)$.

(b) Suppose, for a contradiction, that there exist $(u, i) \in V(\Gamma \times C_n)$ and $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma \times C_n)$ such that $(u, i)^{\sigma\pi_2} = (u, i+2)^{\sigma\pi_2}$. Since n is odd, by Lemma 3.3(b), we have $(u, i)^{\sigma\pi_2} = (u, k)^{\sigma\pi_2}$ for any $k \in V(C_n)$. So there are vertices $(v, k), (v, k+2) \in V(\Gamma \times C_n)$ such that $(u, i)^\sigma = (v, k)$ and $(u, i+2)^\sigma = (v, k+2)$. Note that $\deg(u) = \deg(v) = \deg(w)$ and $\deg(u) = 2|N_\Gamma(v) \cap N_\Gamma(w)|$. By our assumption, $N_\Gamma(v) \cap N_\Gamma(w)$ contains two adjacent vertices, say, x and y . By parts (b) and (d) of Lemma 3.3, we obtain that $(v, l)^{\sigma\pi_2} = (v, l+2)^{\sigma\pi_2}$ and $(w, l)^{\sigma\pi_2} = (w, l+2)^{\sigma\pi_2}$ for any $l \in V(C_n)$. Moreover, since n is odd, we have $(v, l)^{\sigma\pi_2} = (v, l+2r)^{\sigma\pi_2}$ and $(w, l)^{\sigma\pi_2} = (w, l+2r)^{\sigma\pi_2}$ for $0 \leq r \leq (n/2) - 1$. Let $k_1 = (v, l)^{\sigma\pi_2}$ and $k_2 = (w, l)^{\sigma\pi_2}$. Since $N_\Gamma(v) \cap N_\Gamma(w) \neq \emptyset$, either $k_1 = k_2$ or $k_1 \in \{k_2 + 2, k_2 - 2\}$.

By parts (b) and (d) of Lemma 3.3 again, we also obtain that $(x, l)^{\sigma\pi_2} = (x, l + 2r)^{\sigma\pi_2}$ and $(y, l)^{\sigma\pi_2} = (y, l + 2r)^{\sigma\pi_2}$ for any $l \in V(C_n)$ and $0 \leq r \leq (n/2) - 1$. Let $k_3 = (x, l)^{\sigma\pi_2}$ and $k_4 = (y, l)^{\sigma\pi_2}$.

Since x is adjacent to y , (x, l) is adjacent to $(y, l + 1)$ and $(y, l - 1)$. Hence $(x, l)^{\sigma\pi_2} \equiv (y, l + 1)^{\sigma\pi_2} + 1 \pmod{n}$ or $(x, l)^{\sigma\pi_2} \equiv (y, l - 1)^{\sigma\pi_2} - 1 \pmod{n}$, that is, $k_3 \equiv k_4 - 1 \pmod{n}$ or $k_3 \equiv k_4 + 1 \pmod{n}$. Since v is adjacent to x and y , (v, l) is adjacent to $(x, l - 1)$ and $(y, l - 1)$, which implies that $(v, l)^{\sigma\pi_2}$ is adjacent to $(x, l - 1)^{\sigma\pi_2}$ and $(y, l - 1)^{\sigma\pi_2}$. Hence $(v, l)^{\sigma\pi_2} \equiv (x, l - 1)^{\sigma\pi_2} + 1 \pmod{n}$ or $(v, l)^{\sigma\pi_2} \equiv (x, l - 1)^{\sigma\pi_2} - 1 \pmod{n}$, that is, $k_1 \equiv k_3 + 1 \pmod{n}$ or $k_1 \equiv k_3 - 1 \pmod{n}$. Similarly, we have $k_1 \equiv k_4 + 1 \pmod{n}$ or $k_1 \equiv k_4 - 1 \pmod{n}$.

Since w is adjacent to x and y , (w, l) is adjacent to $(x, l - 1)$ and $(y, l - 1)$, which implies that $(w, l)^{\sigma\pi_2}$ is adjacent to $(x, l - 1)^{\sigma\pi_2}$ and $(y, l - 1)^{\sigma\pi_2}$. Thus $(w, l)^{\sigma\pi_2} \equiv (x, l - 1)^{\sigma\pi_2} + 1 \pmod{n}$ or $(w, l)^{\sigma\pi_2} \equiv (x, l - 1)^{\sigma\pi_2} - 1 \pmod{n}$, that is, $k_2 \equiv k_3 + 1 \pmod{n}$ or $k_2 \equiv k_3 - 1 \pmod{n}$. Similarly, we have $k_2 \equiv k_4 + 1 \pmod{n}$ or $k_2 \equiv k_4 - 1 \pmod{n}$.

The two paragraphs above show that we have $k_1 \equiv k_2 \pmod{n}$, $k_1 \equiv k_2 - 2 \pmod{n}$, or $k_1 \equiv k_2 + 2 \pmod{n}$. If $k_1 \equiv k_2 \pmod{n}$, then we may assume $k_1 \equiv k_2 \equiv k_3 - 1 \pmod{n}$ and $k_1 \equiv k_2 \equiv k_4 - 1 \pmod{n}$, which contradicts the fact that $k_3 \equiv k_4 + 1 \pmod{n}$ or $k_3 \equiv k_4 - 1 \pmod{n}$. Hence $k_1 \not\equiv k_2 \pmod{n}$. Suppose that $k_1 \equiv k_2 - 2 \pmod{n}$. Then by $k_1 \equiv k_3 + 1 \pmod{n}$ or $k_3 - 1 \pmod{n}$ and $k_1 \equiv k_4 + 1 \pmod{n}$ or $k_4 - 1 \pmod{n}$, we obtain that $k_2 \equiv k_3 + 1 \pmod{n}$ or $k_3 - 3 \pmod{n}$ and $k_2 \equiv k_4 + 1 \pmod{n}$ or $k_4 - 3 \pmod{n}$. However, we have $k_2 \equiv k_3 - 1 \pmod{n}$ or $k_3 + 1 \pmod{n}$ and $k_2 \equiv k_4 - 1 \pmod{n}$ or $k_4 + 1 \pmod{n}$. Hence $k_2 \equiv k_3 + 1 \pmod{n}$ and $k_2 \equiv k_4 + 1 \pmod{n}$. Thus, $k_3 \equiv k_4 \pmod{n}$, which is a contradiction. Therefore, $k_1 \not\equiv k_2 - 2 \pmod{n}$. Similarly, we can prove that $k_1 \not\equiv k_2 + 2 \pmod{n}$. This final contradiction shows that for any $(u, i) \in V(\Gamma \times C_n)$ and $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma \times C_n)$ we have $(u, i)^{\sigma\pi_2} \neq (u, i + 2)^{\sigma\pi_2}$. Using this and Lemma 3.3, we obtain $\text{Aut}(\Gamma \times C_n) = \text{P}(\Gamma, C_n)$ immediately. \square

Finally, Theorem 3.1 follows from Lemmas 3.2 and 3.4 immediately.

4. MORE RESULTS ON THE STABILITY OF R -THIN CONNECTED GRAPHS VERSUS CYCLES

In this section we prove more results on the stability of R -thin connected graphs against cycles. The main results will be given in Theorems 4.3, 4.5 and 4.6.

In [14], Wilson introduced the concept of expected automorphisms of $\Gamma \times K_2$. We now generalize this concept from $\Gamma \times K_2$ to $\Gamma \times C_n$. Set $V(C_n) = \{0, 1, \dots, n - 1\}$. Recall that $\text{Aut}(C_n)$ is isomorphic to the dihedral group D_{2n} . For any $\delta \in D_{2n}$, let $\bar{\delta}$ be the permutation of $V(\Gamma \times C_n)$ defined by

$$(u, i)^{\bar{\delta}} = (u, i^\delta), \text{ for } (u, i) \in V(\Gamma \times C_n).$$

It is readily seen that $\bar{\delta}$ is an automorphism of $\Gamma \times C_n$. Set $\overline{\text{Aut}(C_n)} = \{\bar{\delta} : \delta \in D_{2n}\}$. Then $\overline{\text{Aut}(C_n)}$ is a subgroup of $\text{Aut}(\Gamma \times C_n)$ isomorphic to $\text{Aut}(C_n)$. Similarly, for any $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma)$, let $\bar{\sigma}$ be the automorphism of $\Gamma \times C_n$ defined by

$$(u, i)^{\bar{\sigma}} = (u^\sigma, i), \text{ for } (u, i) \in V(\Gamma \times C_n).$$

Set $\overline{\text{Aut}(\Gamma)} = \{\bar{\sigma} : \sigma \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma)\}$. Then $\overline{\text{Aut}(\Gamma)}$ is a subgroup of $\text{Aut}(\Gamma \times C_n)$ isomorphic to $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$. Note that $\bar{\sigma}\bar{\delta} = \bar{\delta}\bar{\sigma}$.

It is known that $\text{Aut}(\Gamma) \times \text{Aut}(C_n)$ is isomorphic to a subgroup of $\text{Aut}(\Gamma \times C_n)$. In fact, it is isomorphic to the subgroup

$$\mathbf{R}(\Gamma, C_n) := \overline{\langle \text{Aut}(\Gamma), \text{Aut}(C_n) \rangle}$$

of $\text{Aut}(\Gamma \times C_n)$ generalized by $\overline{\text{Aut}(\Gamma)}$ and $\overline{\text{Aut}(C_n)}$. Note that $\mathbf{R}(\Gamma, C_n)$ is a subgroup of $\mathbf{P}(\Gamma, C_n)$ and is the normalizer of $\overline{\text{Aut}(C_n)}$ in $\text{Aut}(\Gamma \times C_n)$. The elements of $\mathbf{R}(\Gamma, C_n)$ are called the *expected automorphisms* of $\Gamma \times C_n$, and the elements of $\mathbf{P}(\Gamma, C_n) \setminus \mathbf{R}(\Gamma, C_n)$ are called the *unexpected automorphisms* of $\Gamma \times C_n$. It is readily seen that for any $\gamma \in \mathbf{R}(\Gamma, C_n)$, $u \in V(\Gamma)$, and $i, j \in V(C_n)$, we have $(u, i)^{\gamma\pi_1} = (u, j)^{\gamma\pi_1}$. Of course, if $\text{Aut}(\Gamma \times C_n) = \mathbf{R}(\Gamma, C_n)$, then (Γ, C_n) is stable; otherwise, (Γ, C_n) is unstable.

For a vertex u of Γ and a subgroup H of $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$, let $u^H = \{u^h : h \in H\}$ be the H -orbit on $V(\Gamma)$ containing u . Let Γ/H be the quotient graph of Γ with respect to the partition $\{u^H : u \in V(\Gamma)\}$ of $V(\Gamma)$ ([14]). That is, Γ/H is the graph with vertex set $\{u^H : u \in V(\Gamma)\}$ in which $\{u^H, v^H\}$ is an edge if and only if $u^H \neq v^H$ and there exist $u' \in u^H$ and $v' \in v^H$ such that $\{u', v'\} \in E(\Gamma)$. In particular, for $\gamma \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma)$, we write Γ/γ in place of $\Gamma/\langle\gamma\rangle$. An *arc* of Γ is an ordered pair of adjacent vertices (u, v) of Γ . Denote by $A(\Gamma)$ the set of arcs of Γ . The following concepts are all extracted from [14].

Definition 4.1. ([14]) Let Γ be a connected graph.

- (a) Let $\gamma \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ be an involution and $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma/\gamma$. Let $\alpha_1 \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma_1)$ and let π be the natural projection from Γ to Γ/γ (that is, π sends $u \in V(\Gamma)$ to $u^{\langle\gamma\rangle} \in V(\Gamma/\gamma)$). A *covering permutation* of α_1 is a permutation α of $V(\Gamma)$ such that $(u^\alpha)^\pi = (u^\pi)^{\alpha_1}$ for every $u \in V(\Gamma)$. An *anti-automorphism* of Γ is a permutation α of $V(\Gamma)$ which commutes with γ such that $\{u^\alpha, v^{\gamma\alpha}\} \in E(\Gamma)$ whenever $\{u, v\} \in E(\Gamma)$.
- (b) Let ϕ be an automorphism of Γ with order at least 3. If $\{u^\phi, v^{\phi^{-1}}\} \in E(\Gamma)$ whenever $\{u, v\} \in E(\Gamma)$, then Γ is called a (*generalized*) *cross-cover* of Γ/ϕ .
- (c) Let Γ_1 be a graph and $\alpha \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma_1)$. Let $H = \mathbb{Z}_2^n$ and $\gamma \in \text{Aut}(H)$. Let L be a map from $V(\Gamma_1)$ to the set of subgroups of H such that $L(v^\alpha) = L(v)^\gamma$ for all $v \in V(\Gamma_1)$. Let ω be a map from $A(\Gamma_1)$ to the set of subsets of H such that $\omega(v, u) = \{x^{-1} : x \in \omega(u, v)\}$ for any $(u, v) \in A(\Gamma_1)$ and there is a fixed element $h_0 \in H \setminus (\bigcap_{v \in V} L(v))$ satisfying $\omega((u, v)^\alpha) = \omega(u, v)^\gamma + h_0$ for all $(u, v) \in A(\Gamma_1)$. Define $\Gamma = GV(\Gamma_1, H, L, \omega)$ to be the graph with vertex set $V(\Gamma) = \{(v, L(v) + h) : v \in V(\Gamma_1), h \in H\}$ and arc set

$$A(\Gamma) = \{((u, L(u) + h), (v, L(v) + h + x)) : (u, v) \in A(\Gamma_1), h \in H, x \in \omega(u, v)\}.$$

We call $\Gamma = GV(\Gamma_1, H, L, \omega)$ a *twist* of Γ_1 .

The following lemma is extracted from [4] and [14].

Lemma 4.2. *The following hold:*

- (a) *If a graph has an anti-automorphism, or is a cross-cover or twist of some graph, then it must be unstable ([14, Theorems 2–4]).*
- (b) *If a graph is nontrivially unstable, then it has an anti-automorphism, or is a cross-cover of a twist of a graph ([14, Theorem 5]).*

(c) If Γ is an R -thin connected non-bipartite graph, then the following conditions are equivalent:

- (i) Γ is unstable;
- (ii) Γ is nontrivially unstable;
- (iii) Γ has a nondiagonal two-fold automorphism;
- (iv) Γ has an anti-automorphism, or is a cross-cover or twist of some graph.

Proof. A nontrivially unstable graph is precisely an R -thin connected non-bipartite unstable graph. Thus an R -thin connected non-bipartite graph is nontrivially unstable if and only if it is unstable. By [4, Theorem 3.2], a graph is unstable if and only if it has a nondiagonal two-fold automorphism. Combining all these with the statements in (a) and (b), we conclude that conditions (i)–(iv) in (c) are equivalent for R -thin connected non-bipartite graphs. \square

Theorem 4.3. *Let Γ be an R -thin connected non-bipartite graph. If (Γ, K_2) is unstable, then (Γ, C_{2k}) is unstable for every $k \geq 2$.*

Proof. Set $V(C_{2k}) = \{0, 1, \dots, 2k - 1\}$. Suppose that (Γ, K_2) is unstable. Since C_4 is not R -thin, (Γ, C_4) is unstable, and hence the result is true when $k = 2$. It remains to prove that (Γ, C_{2k}) is unstable for all $k \geq 3$. Since (Γ, K_2) is unstable, there is a nondiagonal two-fold automorphism (α_1, α_2) of Γ . Define a permutation σ of $V(\Gamma \times C_{2k})$ as follows: For any $(u, i) \in V(\Gamma \times C_{2k})$, if i between 0 and $2k - 1$ is odd, then set $(u, i)^\sigma = (u^{\alpha_2}, i)$; if i between 0 and $2k - 1$ is even, then set $(u, i)^\sigma = (u^{\alpha_1}, i)$. Since α_1 and α_2 are permutations of $V(\Gamma)$, σ is indeed a permutation of $V(\Gamma \times C_{2k})$.

In order to prove $\sigma \in P(\Gamma, C_{2k})$, we first prove $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma \times C_{2k})$. For any $\{(u, i), (v, i + 1)\} \in E(\Gamma \times C_{2k})$, $\{(u, i)^\sigma, (v, i + 1)^\sigma\}$ is equal to $\{(u, i)^{\alpha_1}, (v, i + 1)^{\alpha_2}\} = \{(u^{\alpha_1}, i), (v^{\alpha_2}, i + 1)\}$ or $\{(u, i)^{\alpha_2}, (v, i + 1)^{\alpha_1}\} = \{(u^{\alpha_2}, i), (v^{\alpha_1}, i + 1)\}$. Thus $\{(u, i), (v, i + 1)\}^\sigma \in E(\Gamma \times C_{2k})$ by the definition of (α_1, α_2) . Hence σ maps edges of $\Gamma \times C_{2k}$ to edges of $\Gamma \times C_{2k}$. Moreover, since σ is a permutation of $V(\Gamma \times C_{2k})$, it maps different edges of $\Gamma \times C_{2k}$ to different edges of $\Gamma \times C_{2k}$. Thus, $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma \times C_{2k})$. By the definition of σ , for any $(u, i) \in V(\Gamma \times C_{2k})$, we have $(u, i)^{\sigma^2} = i$ and hence $\sigma \in P(\Gamma, C_{2k})$. Moreover, since (α_1, α_2) is nondiagonal, we have $\alpha_1 \neq \alpha_2$ and so there exists $v \in V(\Gamma)$ such that $v^{\alpha_1} \neq v^{\alpha_2}$. This together with the definition of σ implies that $(v, 2i)^{\sigma^{\pi_1}} \neq (v, 2i + 1)^{\sigma^{\pi_1}}$ for $0 \leq i \leq k$. Let δ be the unique automorphism of C_{2k} satisfying $i^\delta \equiv i + 1 \pmod{2k}$ for any $i \in V(C_{2k})$. Then $\bar{\delta} \in \overline{\text{Aut}(C_{2k})}$ is an automorphism of $\Gamma \times C_{2k}$ satisfying $(u, i)^{\bar{\delta}} = (u, i + 1)$ for any $(u, i) \in V(\Gamma \times C_{2k})$. We have $\sigma \bar{\delta} \neq \bar{\delta} \sigma$. Thus σ is an unexpected automorphism of $\Gamma \times C_{2k}$. Hence $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_1, \alpha_2)$ is a nondiagonal C_{2k} -automorphism of Γ . Therefore, by [10, Lemma 2.6], $\Gamma \times C_{2k}$ is unstable. \square

Note that $P(\Gamma, \Sigma) \cong \text{Aut}_\Sigma(\Gamma) \rtimes \text{Aut}(\Sigma)$ for any graph pair (Γ, Σ) (see [10, Lemma 2.4]). So, for any $\sigma \in P(\Gamma, \Sigma)$, there exist $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \text{Aut}_\Sigma(\Gamma)$ and $\delta \in \text{Aut}(\Sigma)$ such that σ corresponds to $((\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n), \delta) \in \text{Aut}_\Sigma(\Gamma) \rtimes \text{Aut}(\Sigma)$. In the case when $\Sigma = C_n$, $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ is uniquely determined by σ and $(u, i)^{\sigma^{\pi_1}} = u^{\alpha_i}$ holds for any $(u, i) \in V(\Gamma \times C_n)$.

Lemma 4.4. *Let Γ be an R -thin connected non-bipartite graph and $k \geq 3$ an integer. If $2k$ is compatible with Γ and (Γ, C_{2k}) is nontrivially unstable, then Γ has an anti-automorphism, or is a cross-cover or twist of some graph.*

Proof. Set $V(C_{2k}) = \{1, \dots, 2k\}$. Since Γ is an R -thin connected non-bipartite graph and $2k$ is compatible with Γ , by Lemma 3.4, we have $\text{Aut}(\Gamma \times C_{2k}) = \text{P}(\Gamma, C_{2k})$. Since (Γ, C_{2k}) is nontrivially unstable, there are unexpected automorphisms of $\Gamma \times C_{2k}$. Consider an arbitrary unexpected automorphism $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma \times C_{2k})$. For each $i \in V(C_{2k})$, define $u^{\alpha_i} = (u, i)^{\sigma\pi_1}$ for $u \in V(\Gamma)$. Note that for any $\{u, v\} \in E(\Gamma)$ and $\{i, i+1\} \in E(C_{2k})$ we have $\{u^{\alpha_i}, v^{\alpha_{i+1}}\} = \{(u, i)^{\sigma\pi_1}, (v, i+1)^{\sigma\pi_1}\}$. Since $\{(u, i), (v, i+1)\} \in E(\Gamma \times C_{2k})$ and $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma \times C_{2k})$, we see that $\{(u, i)^\sigma, (v, i+1)^\sigma\} \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma \times C_{2k})$ and so $\{u^{\alpha_i}, v^{\alpha_{i+1}}\} \in E(\Gamma)$. Hence $\{u, v\} \in E(\Gamma)$ if and only if $\{u^{\alpha_i}, v^{\alpha_{i+1}}\} \in E(\Gamma)$. So $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2k})$ is a C_{2k} -automorphism of Γ . Since σ is an unexpected automorphism, there exist distinct vertices $(u, i), (u, j) \in V(\Gamma \times C_{2k})$ such that $(u, i)^{\sigma\pi_1} \neq (u, j)^{\sigma\pi_1}$, that is, $u^{\alpha_i} \neq u^{\alpha_j}$ and therefore $\alpha_i \neq \alpha_j$. Let δ be the unique automorphism of C_{2k} satisfying $i^\delta = 2k - i \pmod{2k}$ for $i \in V(C_{2k})$. By Lemma 2.1, $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2k})^\delta = (\alpha_1, \alpha_{2k}, \alpha_{2k-1}, \dots, \alpha_{k+2}, \alpha_{k+1}, \alpha_k, \dots, \alpha_2)$ is a C_{2k} -automorphism of Γ . Since $\text{Aut}_{C_{2k}}(\Gamma)$ is an group, $(\alpha_1^{-1}, \alpha_{2k}^{-1}, \alpha_{2k-1}^{-1}, \dots, \alpha_{k+2}^{-1}, \alpha_{k+1}^{-1}, \dots, \alpha_2^{-1})$ is a C_{2k} -automorphism of Γ . Hence $(\text{id}, \alpha_2\alpha_{2k}^{-1}, \dots, \text{id}, \alpha_{k+2}\alpha_k^{-1}, \dots, \alpha_{2k}\alpha_2^{-1})$ is also a C_{2k} -automorphism of Γ . Since Γ is R -thin, by Lemma 2.3, this C_{2k} -automorphism of Γ must be diagonal. This implies that $\alpha_2 = \alpha_{2k}, \alpha_3 = \alpha_{2k-1}, \dots, \alpha_{k+2} = \alpha_k$. Thus $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2k}) = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \dots, \alpha_k, \alpha_{k+1}, \alpha_k, \alpha_{k-1}, \dots, \alpha_3, \alpha_2)$. Let τ be the unique automorphism of C_{2k} satisfying $i^\tau \equiv i + 2 \pmod{2k}$ for $i \in V(C_{2k})$. Then $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \dots, \alpha_k, \alpha_{k+1}, \alpha_k, \alpha_{k-1}, \dots, \alpha_3, \alpha_2)^\tau = (\alpha_3, \alpha_4, \dots, \alpha_k, \alpha_{k-1}, \alpha_{k-2}, \dots, \alpha_1, \alpha_2)$, which, by Lemma 2.1, is a C_{2k} -automorphism of Γ . Hence $(\alpha_3^{-1}, \alpha_4^{-1}, \dots, \alpha_k^{-1}, \alpha_{k-1}^{-1}, \alpha_{k-2}^{-1}, \dots, \alpha_1^{-1}, \alpha_2^{-1})$ is a C_{2k} -automorphism of Γ and so $(\alpha_1\alpha_3^{-1}, \alpha_2\alpha_4^{-1}, \dots, \text{id}, \alpha_{k+1}\alpha_{k-1}^{-1}, \alpha_k\alpha_{k-2}^{-1}, \dots, \alpha_3\alpha_1^{-1}, \text{id})$ is also a C_{2k} -automorphism of Γ . Since Γ is R -thin, $\alpha_1 = \alpha_3 = \dots = \alpha_{2k-1}$ and $\alpha_2 = \alpha_4 = \dots = \alpha_{2k}$. So we have proved that for any unexpected automorphism of $\Gamma \times C_{2k}$ there corresponds a C_{2k} -automorphism of Γ with the form $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_1, \alpha_2)$. Note that $\alpha_1 \neq \alpha_2$ and $\{u^{\alpha_1}, v^{\alpha_2}\} \in E(\Gamma)$ for any $\{u, v\} \in E(\Gamma)$. Thus (α_1, α_2) is a two-fold automorphism of Γ . Since $\alpha_1 \neq \alpha_2$, this two-fold automorphism is nondiagonal and hence Γ is unstable. Thus, by Lemma 4.2(b), Γ has an anti-automorphism, or is a cross-cover or twist of some graph. \square

Theorem 4.5. *Let Γ be an R -thin connected non-bipartite graph.*

- (a) *If $k \geq 3$ is an integer such that $2k$ is compatible with Γ , then (Γ, C_{2k}) is nontrivially unstable if and only if (Γ, K_2) is unstable.*
- (b) *If there exists an integer $k \geq 3$ such that $2k$ is compatible with Γ and (Γ, C_{2k}) is nontrivially unstable, then (Γ, C_{2l}) is unstable for every $l \geq 3$.*

Proof. (a) Suppose $2k \geq 6$ is compatible with Γ . If (Γ, C_{2k}) is nontrivially unstable, then by Lemma 4.4, Γ satisfies condition (iv) in Lemma 4.2(c). Hence, by Lemma 4.2(c), Γ is unstable, that is, (Γ, K_2) is unstable. Conversely, if (Γ, K_2) is unstable, then by Theorem 4.3, (Γ, C_{2k}) is unstable. Since $2k$ is compatible with Γ , Γ and C_{2k} must be coprime. Note that C_{2k} is R -thin as $2k \geq 6$ and Γ is non-bipartite by our assumption. Hence (Γ, C_{2k}) is nontrivially unstable.

(b) Suppose $k \geq 3$ is an integer such that $2k$ is compatible with Γ and (Γ, C_{2k}) is nontrivially unstable. Then, by (a), (Γ, K_2) is unstable. Hence, by Theorem 4.3, (Γ, C_{2l}) is unstable for every $l \geq 3$. \square

Theorem 4.6. *Let Γ be an R -thin connected graph and $k \geq 1$ an integer. If $2k + 1$ is compatible with Γ , then (Γ, C_{2k+1}) is stable.*

Proof. Set $V(C_{2k+1}) = \{0, 1, \dots, 2k\}$. Since Γ is an R -thin connected graph and C_{2k+1} is an odd cycle, both Γ and C_{2k+1} are R -thin and at least one of them is non-bipartite. Since $2k + 1$ is compatible with Γ , we have $\text{Aut}(\Gamma \times C_{2k+1}) = \text{P}(\Gamma, C_{2k+1})$ by Lemma 3.4(a). Suppose for a contradiction that (Γ, C_{2k+1}) is unstable. Then (Γ, C_{2k+1}) is nontrivially unstable. So there exists an unexpected automorphism σ of $\Gamma \times C_{2k+1}$. Define $u^{\alpha_i} = (u, i)^{\sigma\pi_1}$, $u \in V(\Gamma)$, for each $i \in V(C_{2k+1})$. Note that for any $\{u, v\} \in E(\Gamma)$ and $\{i, i + 1\} \in E(C_{2k+1})$, we have $\{u^{\alpha_i}, v^{\alpha_{i+1}}\} = \{(u, i)^{\sigma\pi_1}, (v, i + 1)^{\sigma\pi_1}\}$. Since $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma \times C_{2k+1})$ and $\{(u, i), (v, i + 1)\} \in E(\Gamma \times C_{2k+1})$, we obtain that $\{u, v\} \in E(\Gamma)$ if and only if $\{(u, i)^{\sigma\pi_1}, (v, i + 1)^{\sigma\pi_1}\} \in E(\Gamma)$. So $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_{2k+1})$ is a C_{2k+1} -automorphism of Γ . Since σ is an unexpected automorphism of $\Gamma \times C_{2k+1}$, there exists an automorphism $\bar{\delta} \in \overline{\text{Aut}(C_{2k+1})}$ such that $\sigma\bar{\delta} \neq \bar{\delta}\sigma$ and hence $\bar{\delta}^{-1}\sigma\bar{\delta} \neq \sigma$. Suppose that $(u, i)^{\bar{\delta}} = (u, j)$ for some $(u, i), (u, j) \in V(\Gamma \times C_{2k+1})$. Then $(u, i)^{\sigma\bar{\delta}} = ((u, i)^{\sigma\pi_1}, i)^{\bar{\delta}} = ((u, i)^{\sigma\pi_1}, j) \neq (u, i)^{\bar{\delta}\sigma} = (u, j)^{\sigma}$. Thus there exist distinct vertices $(u, i), (u, j) \in V(\Gamma \times C_{2k+1})$ such that $(u, i)^{\sigma\pi_1} \neq (u, j)^{\sigma\pi_1}$ and hence $\alpha_i \neq \alpha_j$. Hence $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2k+1})$ is nondiagonal. Let τ be the permutation of $V(C_{2k+1})$ such that $i^\tau = 2k + 1 - i \pmod{2k + 1}$ for any $i \in V(C_{2k+1})$. Then $\{i^\tau, j^\tau\} = \{2k + 1 - i, 2k + 1 - j\}$ for any $\{i, j\} \in E(C_{2k+1})$. Since $\{i, j\} \in E(C_{2k+1})$, we have $j \equiv i + 1 \pmod{2k + 1}$ or $j \equiv i - 1 \pmod{2k + 1}$. Without loss of generality, we may assume $j \equiv i + 1 \pmod{2k + 1}$. We can easily verify that $\{2k + 1 - i, 2k + 1 - j\} = \{2k + 1 - i, 2k - i\}$ is also an edge of C_{2k+1} . Since τ is a permutation of $V(C_{2k+1})$ and maps edges of C_{2k+1} to edges of C_{2k+1} , we see that τ is an automorphism of C_{2k+1} . Since τ maps i to $2k + 1 - i \pmod{2k + 1}$ for each $i \in V(C_{2k+1})$, we have $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2k+1})^\tau = (\alpha_1, \alpha_{2k+1}, \dots, \alpha_{k+2}, \alpha_{k+1}, \dots, \alpha_2)$. Since $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2k+1}) \in \text{Aut}_{C_{2k+1}}(\Gamma)$, it follows from Lemma 2.1 that $(\alpha_1, \alpha_{2k+1}, \dots, \alpha_{k+2}, \alpha_{k+1}, \dots, \alpha_2)$ is a C_{2k+1} -automorphism of Γ . Moreover, since $\text{Aut}_{C_{2k+1}}(\Gamma)$ is a group, $(\alpha_1^{-1}, \alpha_{2k+1}^{-1}, \dots, \alpha_{k+2}^{-1}, \alpha_{k+1}^{-1}, \dots, \alpha_2^{-1})$ is also a C_{2k+1} -automorphism of Γ . So $(\text{id}, \alpha_2\alpha_{2k+1}^{-1}, \dots, \alpha_{k+1}\alpha_{k+2}^{-1}, \alpha_{k+2}\alpha_{k+1}^{-1}, \dots, \alpha_{2k+1}\alpha_2^{-1})$ is a C_{2k+1} -automorphism of Γ . Since Γ is R -thin, by Lemma 2.3, this C_{2k+1} -automorphism of Γ must be diagonal. That is, $\alpha_i = \alpha_{2k+3-i}$ for $2 \leq i \leq 2k + 1$. So $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2k+1}) = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_{k+1}, \alpha_{k+1}, \dots, \alpha_2)$. Obviously, the permutation ϕ of $V(C_{2k+1})$ which maps i to $i - 1 \pmod{2k + 1}$ for each $i \in V(C_{2k+1})$ is an automorphism of C_{2k+1} . By Lemma 2.1 again, it follows that $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_{k+1}, \alpha_{k+1}, \dots, \alpha_2)^\phi = (\alpha_2, \alpha_3, \dots, \alpha_{k+1}, \alpha_{k+1}, \dots, \alpha_2, \alpha_1)$ is a C_{2k+1} -automorphism of Γ . Since $\text{Aut}_{C_{2k+1}}(\Gamma)$ is a group, $(\alpha_2^{-1}, \alpha_3^{-1}, \dots, \alpha_{k+1}^{-1}, \alpha_k^{-1}, \dots, \alpha_1^{-1})$ is also a C_{2k+1} -automorphism of Γ . Hence

$$(\alpha_1\alpha_2^{-1}, \alpha_2\alpha_3^{-1}, \dots, \text{id}, \alpha_{k+1}\alpha_k^{-1}, \alpha_2\alpha_2^{-1})$$

is a C_{2k+1} -automorphism of Γ . Again, by Lemma 2.3, this C_{2k+1} -automorphism of Γ must be diagonal. That is, $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \dots = \alpha_{2k+1}$ and so $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2k+1})$ is diagonal, a contradiction. Combining this with Lemma 3.2(a), we conclude that (Γ, C_{2k+1}) is stable. \square

Acknowledgement This work was funded in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grants No.12071194, 11571155).

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Hammack, W. Imrich and S. Klavžar, Handbook of Product graphs, 2nd ed., CRC Press, 2011.
- [2] J. Lauri, R. Mizzi, R. Scapellato, Two-fold orbital digraphs and other constructions, Int. J. Pure Appl. Math. 1 (2004) 63–93.
- [3] J. Lauri, R. Mizzi, R. Scapellato, Two-fold automorphisms of graphs, Australas. J. Combin. 49 (2014) 165–176.
- [4] J. Lauri, R. Mizzi, R. Scapellato, Unstable graphs: a fresh outlook via TF-automorphisms, Ars Math. Contemp. 8 (2015) 115–131.
- [5] D. Marušič, R. Scapellato, N. Zagaglia Salvi, A characterization of particular symmetric $(0, 1)$ matrices, Linear Algebra Appl. 119 (1989) 153–162.
- [6] D. Marušič, R. Scapellato, N. Zagaglia Salvi, Generalized Cayley graphs, Discrete Math. 102 (1992) 279–285.
- [7] R. Nedela, M. Škovič, Regular embeddings of canonical double coverings of graphs, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B 67(2) (1996) 249–277.
- [8] Y.-L. Qin, B. Xia, S. Zhou, Stability of circulant graphs, J. Combin Theory Ser. B 136 (2019) 154–169.
- [9] Y.-L. Qin, B. Xia, S. Zhou, Canonical double covers of generalized Petersen graphs, and double generalized Petersen graphs, J. Graph Theory 97(1) (2021) 70–81.
- [10] Y.-L. Qin, B. Xia, J.-X. Zhou, S. Zhou, Stability of graph pairs, J. Combin Theory Ser. B 147 (2021) 71–95.
- [11] Y.-L. Qin, B. Xia, S. Zhou, Stability of graph pairs involving vertex-transitive graphs, Discrete Math. 347 (2024) 113856.
- [12] D. Surowski, Stability of arc-transitive graphs, J. Graph Theory 38 (2001) 95–110.
- [13] D. Surowski, Automorphism groups of certain unstable graphs, Math. Slovaca 53 (2003) 215–232.
- [14] S. Wilson, Unexpected symmetries in unstable graphs, J. Combin Theory Ser. B 98 (2008) 359–383.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, LANZHOU UNIVERSITY, LANZHOU, GANSU 730000, P. R. CHINA
Email address: wangxm2015@lzu.edu.cn

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, LANZHOU UNIVERSITY, LANZHOU, GANSU 730000, P. R. CHINA
Email address: shjxu@lzu.edu.cn

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, THE UNIVERSITY OF MELBOURNE, PARKVILLE, VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA
Email address: sanming@unimelb.edu.au