

On the Spouse-Loving Variant of the Oberwolfach Problem

Noah Bolohan and Iona Buchanan

University of Ottawa

Andrea Burgess

University of New Brunswick

Mateja Šajna*

University of Ottawa

Ryan Van Snick

University of New Brunswick

August 1, 2024

Abstract

We prove that $K_n + I$, the complete graph of even order with a 1-factor duplicated, admits a decomposition into 2-factors, each a disjoint union of cycles of length $m \geq 5$ if and only if $m|n$, except possibly when m is odd and $n = 4m$. In addition, we show that $K_n + I$ admits a decomposition into 2-factors, each a disjoint union of cycles of lengths m_1, \dots, m_t , whenever m_1, \dots, m_t are all even.

Keywords: Oberwolfach Problem, 2-factorization, complete graph plus a 1-factor, resolvable minimum covering by cycles, Spouse-Loving Variant.

1 Introduction

The well-known *Oberwolfach Problem* asks the following: Given t round tables of sizes m_1, \dots, m_t such that $m_1 + \dots + m_t = n$, is it possible to seat n people around the t tables for an appropriate number of meals so that every person sits next to every other person exactly once? In graph-theoretic terms, the question is asking whether K_n can be decomposed into

*Email: msajna@uottawa.ca. Mailing address: Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, ON, K1N 6N5, Canada.

2-factors, each a disjoint union of cycles of lengths m_1, \dots, m_t , whenever $m_1 + \dots + m_t = n$. Since a graph with odd-degree vertices cannot admit a 2-factorization, Huang, Kotzig, and Rosa [7] proposed the analogous problem for $K_n - I$, the complete graph of even order with a 1-factor removed. They called it the *Spouse-Avoiding Variant* since it models a sitting arrangement of $\frac{n}{2}$ couples, where each person gets to sit next to every other person, except their spouse, exactly once, and never gets to sit next to their spouse.

For both of these two basic variants of the Oberwolfach Problem, the cases with uniform cycle length were completely solved decades ago [1, 2, 6]. In addition, many solutions are now known for variable cycle lengths; most notably, the problem is solved for m_1, \dots, m_t all even [4]; for $t = 2$ [10]; and for $n \leq 40$ [5]. In general, however, it is still open.

The Spouse-Avoiding Variant of the Oberwolfach Problem can also be viewed as the *maximum packing* variant. This paper, however, pertains to the *minimum covering* version of the problem; in other words, we are interested in decomposing $K_n + I$ (the complete graph of even order with a 1-factor duplicated) into 2-factors, each a disjoint union of cycles of lengths m_1, \dots, m_t , where $m_1 + \dots + m_t = n$. We denote this problem by $OP^+(m_1, \dots, m_t)$, or $OP^+(n; m)$ when $m_1 = \dots = m_t = m$. This variant, nicknamed the *Spouse-Loving Variant*, models a situation where we wish for each person to sit next to exactly one other person — their spouse — twice, and next to every other person exactly once.

Necessary and sufficient conditions for $OP^+(n; 3)$ to have a solution were previously determined by Assaf, Mendelsohn, and Stinson [3], and Lamken and Mills [8] under the term *resolvable minimum coverings by triples*.

Theorem 1.1 [3, 8] *$OP^+(3t; 3)$ has a solution if and only if t is even and $t \geq 6$.*

In this paper, we prove the following main result.

Theorem 1.2 *Let n be an even integer and $m \geq 5$ an integer such that $n \neq 4m$ when m is odd. Then $OP^+(n; m)$ has a solution if and only if $m|n$.*

In addition, we show that the complete solution to the Oberwolfach Problem for bipartite 2-factors [1, 4] implies the following.

Theorem 1.3 *Let m_1, \dots, m_t be even integers greater than 3. Then $OP^+(m_1, \dots, m_t)$ has a solution.*

2 Preliminaries

As usual, K_n denotes the complete graph with n vertices, and for n even, $K_n - I$ and $K_n + I$ denote the complete graph K_n with the edges of the 1-factor I deleted and duplicated,

respectively. By $K_{\alpha[k]}$ we denote the complete equipartite graph with α parts of size k . A cycle of length m (or m -cycle) is denoted by C_m .

A set $\{H_1, \dots, H_k\}$ of subgraphs of a graph G is called a *decomposition* of G if $\{E(H_1), \dots, E(H_k)\}$ is a partition of $E(G)$. If this is the case, we write $G = H_1 \oplus \dots \oplus H_k$.

A *2-factor* in a graph G is a spanning 2-regular subgraph of G . A 2-factor consisting of disjoint cycles of lengths m_1, m_2, \dots, m_t , respectively, is called a $(C_{m_1}, C_{m_2}, \dots, C_{m_t})$ -factor, and a (C_m, C_m, \dots, C_m) -factor is also called a C_m -factor.

A *2-factorization* of a graph G is a decomposition of G into 2-factors. A $(C_{m_1}, C_{m_2}, \dots, C_{m_t})$ -factorization is a 2-factorization consisting of $(C_{m_1}, C_{m_2}, \dots, C_{m_t})$ -factors; a C_m -factorization is defined analogously.

Apart from direct constructions, the following two previous results will form the most important tools for the proofs of our two main theorems.

Theorem 2.1 [9] *Let α , k , and ℓ be positive integers, $\alpha \geq 2$, and $3 \leq \ell \leq \alpha k$. Then $K_{\alpha[k]}$ admits a C_ℓ -factorization if and only if*

1. $\alpha k \equiv 0 \pmod{\ell}$,
2. $k(\alpha - 1)$ is even,
3. ℓ is even if $\alpha = 2$, and
4. $(k, \alpha, \ell) \notin \{(2, 3, 3), (6, 3, 3), (2, 6, 3), (6, 2, 6)\}$.

Theorem 2.2 [1, 4] *Let m_1, \dots, m_t be even integers greater than 3. Then $OP(m_1, \dots, m_t)$ has a solution, that is, $K_n - I$ admits a $(C_{m_1}, C_{m_2}, \dots, C_{m_t})$ -factorization for $n = m_1 + \dots + m_t$.*

3 Results

Our Theorem 1.3 is an easy corollary to Theorem 2.2 [4].

PROOF OF THEOREM 1.3. Let $n = m_1 + \dots + m_t$, and let I denote a chosen 1-factor of K_n . By Theorem 2.2 [4], there exists a $(C_{m_1}, C_{m_2}, \dots, C_{m_t})$ -factorization of $K_n - I$. It is easy to see that, since all m_i are even, there exists a 1-factor I' of K_n such that $I \oplus I'$ is a $(C_{m_1}, C_{m_2}, \dots, C_{m_t})$ -factor. Thus $K_n \oplus I'$ admits a $(C_{m_1}, C_{m_2}, \dots, C_{m_t})$ -factorization, and $OP^+(m_1, \dots, m_t)$ has a solution. \square

We now turn our attention to odd-length cycles.

Lemma 3.1 *For all odd $m \geq 5$, there exists a C_m -factorization of $K_{2m} + I$.*



Figure 1: Starter 2-factors in a C_5 -factorization of $K_{10} + I$ (left) and a C_7 -factorization of $K_{14} + I$ (right).

PROOF. Let the vertex set of $K_{2m} + I$ be $V = \{x_i : i \in \mathbb{Z}_m\} \cup \{y_i : i \in \mathbb{Z}_m\}$. Edges of the form $x_i x_{i+d}$ and $y_i y_{i+d}$ will be called of *pure left* and *pure right difference* d , respectively, while an edge of the form $x_i y_{i+d}$ will be called of *mixed difference* d .

Define a permutation $\rho = (x_0 x_1 \dots x_{m-1})(y_0 y_1 \dots y_{m-1})$. In each of the cases below, we construct a starter C_m -factor F containing exactly one edge of each pure left and pure right difference, exactly two edges of a single mixed difference, and exactly one edge of every other mixed difference. It then easily follows that $\{\rho^\ell(F) : \ell \in \mathbb{Z}_m\}$ is a C_m -factorization of $K_{2m} + I$. Figure 1 shows the starter 2-factors in a C_5 -factorization of $K_{10} + I$ and a C_7 -factorization of $K_{14} + I$, respectively.

CASE $m \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$. First assume $m \neq 11$. Define the following walks (Figure 2).

$$\begin{aligned} P &= x_0 y_0 x_1 y_{-1} x_2 y_{-2} \dots x_{\frac{m-3}{4}} y_{-\frac{m-3}{4}} x_{\frac{m+5}{4}}, \\ P' &= y_1 x_{-1} y_2 x_{-2} \dots y_{\frac{m-3}{4}} x_{-\frac{m-3}{4}} y_{\frac{m+5}{4}} x_{\frac{m+1}{4}} y_{\frac{m+1}{4}}, \\ Q &= x_{\frac{m+5}{4}} x_{-\frac{m+1}{4}} x_{\frac{m+9}{4}} x_{-\frac{m+5}{4}} \dots x_{\frac{m-1}{2}} x_{-\frac{m-3}{2}} x_{-\frac{m-1}{2}} x_0. \end{aligned}$$

It is not difficult to verify that each of these walks is in fact a path, and that these three paths are pairwise vertex-disjoint, except that P and Q have the same pair of endpoints.

Observe that P contains exactly one edge of each of the mixed differences in

$$D(P) = \left\{ 0, -1, -2, -3, \dots, -\frac{m-3}{2}, \frac{m-1}{2} \right\},$$

P' contains exactly one edge of each of the mixed differences in

$$D(P') = \left\{ 0, 1, 2, 3, \dots, \frac{m-3}{2}, -\frac{m-1}{2} \right\},$$

while Q contains exactly one edge of each pure left difference in

$$D(Q) = \left\{ 1, 2, \dots, \frac{m-1}{2} \right\}.$$




Figure 2: The general construction for Case $m \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$. Paths P and P' (A); path Q (B); the periodic segment of path Q' (C); the non-periodic segment of path Q' for $m \equiv 3, 7, 11 \pmod{12}$ (D,E,F, respectively).

Our starter 2-factor will contain the m -cycle $C = PQ$, as well as the m -cycle $C' = P'Q'$, where Q' is the $(y_{\frac{m+1}{4}}, y_1)$ -path to be defined as follows below.

First, for $i \leq \frac{m-9}{2}$ of the form $i = \frac{m+1}{4} + 3j$, where $j \in \mathbb{N}$, define a 6-path

$$Q_i = y_i y_{-(i+1)} y_{i+2} y_{-i} y_{i+4} y_{-(i+2)} y_{i+3}.$$

Observe that Q_i contains exactly one edge of each of the pure right differences in

$$D(Q_i) = \{-(2i+1), -(2i+2), \dots, -(2i+6)\}.$$

Thus, if $j > 0$, paths Q_i and Q_{i+3j} have no edges of the same difference, and share no vertices except that the terminus of Q_i equals the source of Q_{i+3} . We use paths Q_i to define Q' as follows.

If $m \equiv 3 \pmod{12}$, let

$$Q' = Q_{\frac{m+1}{4}} Q_{\frac{m+13}{4}} Q_{\frac{m+25}{4}} \dots Q_{\frac{m-13}{2}} y_{\frac{m-7}{2}} y_{-\frac{m-5}{2}} y_{\frac{m-3}{2}} y_{-\frac{m-7}{2}} y_{-\frac{m-1}{2}} y_{\frac{m-1}{2}} y_{-\frac{m-3}{2}} y_1.$$

If $m \equiv 7 \pmod{12}$, let

$$Q' = Q_{\frac{m+1}{4}} Q_{\frac{m+13}{4}} Q_{\frac{m+25}{4}} \dots Q_{\frac{m-9}{2}} y_{\frac{m-3}{2}} y_{-\frac{m-1}{2}} y_{-\frac{m-3}{2}} y_1.$$

If $m \equiv 11 \pmod{12}$, let

$$Q' = Q_{\frac{m+1}{4}} Q_{\frac{m+13}{4}} \dots Q_{\frac{m-17}{2}} y_{\frac{m-11}{2}} y_{-\frac{m-9}{2}} y_{\frac{m-7}{2}} y_{-\frac{m-11}{2}} y_{\frac{m-3}{2}} y_{-\frac{m-5}{2}} y_{\frac{m-5}{2}} y_{-\frac{m-7}{2}} y_{-\frac{m-1}{2}} y_{\frac{m-1}{2}} y_{-\frac{m-3}{2}} y_1.$$

Note that for $m \in \{7, 15, 23\}$, the walk Q' contains no paths Q_i .

It is not difficult to verify that in each case, Q' is in fact a path, and contains exactly one edge of each pure right difference in

$$D(Q') = \left\{ 1, 2, \dots, \frac{m-1}{2} \right\}.$$

Moreover, the paths P' and Q' are internally vertex-disjoint and share the endpoints, so $C' = P'Q'$ is an m -cycle. Furthermore, the m -cycles C and C' are disjoint, and $F = \{C, C'\}$ is an C_m -factor in $K_{2m} + I$ containing exactly one edge of each pure left difference, each pure right difference, and each mixed difference, except that it contains exactly two edges of mixed difference 0. Hence $\{\rho^\ell(F) : \ell \in \mathbb{Z}_m\}$ is a C_m -factorization of $K_{2m} + I$.

For $m = 11$, we define P and Q as above, and modify P' and Q' as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} P' &= y_1 x_{-1} y_2 x_{-2} y_4 x_3 y_5, \\ Q' &= y_5 y_{-4} y_{-5} y_3 y_{-3} y_1. \end{aligned}$$

We obtain a C_m -factorization of $K_{2m} + I$ (for $m = 11$) as before. Note that, in this case, the duplicated mixed difference is 2.




Figure 3: The general construction for Case $m \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$. Paths P and P' (A); path Q' (B); the initial and periodic segments of path Q (C); the non-periodic segment of path Q for $m \equiv 1, 5, 9 \pmod{12}$ (D,E,F, respectively).

CASE $m \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$. First assume $m \geq 13$. Define the following walks (Figure 3).

$$\begin{aligned} P &= x_0 y_0 x_1 y_{-1} x_2 y_{-2} \dots x_{\frac{m-1}{4}} y_{-\frac{m-1}{4}} x_{-\frac{m+3}{4}}, \\ P' &= y_1 x_{-1} y_2 x_{-2} \dots y_{\frac{m-1}{4}} x_{-\frac{m-1}{4}} x_{\frac{m+7}{4}} y_{\frac{m+3}{4}}, \\ Q' &= y_{\frac{m+3}{4}} y_{-\frac{m+3}{4}} y_{\frac{m+7}{4}} y_{-\frac{m+7}{4}} \dots y_{\frac{m-3}{2}} y_{-\frac{m-3}{2}} y_{\frac{m-1}{2}} y_{-\frac{m-1}{2}} y_1. \end{aligned}$$

It is not difficult to verify that each of these walks is in fact a path, and that these three paths are pairwise vertex-disjoint, except that P' and Q' have the same endpoints.

Observe that P contains exactly one edge of each of the mixed differences in

$$D(P) = \left\{ 0, -1, -2, \dots, -\frac{m-1}{2}, 1 \right\},$$

P' contains an edge of pure left difference $\frac{m-3}{2}$ and exactly one edge of each of the mixed differences in

$$D(P') = \left\{ -1, 2, 3, \dots, \frac{m-1}{2} \right\},$$

and Q contains exactly one edge of each pure right difference in

$$D(Q') = \left\{ 1, 2, \dots, \frac{m-1}{2} \right\}.$$

Next, let $C' = Q'P'$ and observe that C' is an m -cycle. The second cycle in our starter 2-factor will be $C = PQ$, where Q is the $(x_{-\frac{m+3}{4}}, x_0)$ -path to be defined as follows below.

First, for $i \leq \frac{m-11}{2}$ of the form $i = \frac{m+19}{4} + 3j$, where $j \in \mathbb{N}$, define a 6-path

$$Q_i = x_{-(i-3)} x_{i+2} x_{-(i+2)} x_{i+1} x_{-(i+1)} x_i x_{-i}.$$

Observe that Q_i contains exactly one edge of each pure left difference in

$$D(Q_i) = \{-2i-1, -2i, \dots, -(2i+4)\}.$$

Thus, for $j > 0$, paths Q_i and Q_{i+3j} contain no edges of a common difference, and share no vertices except that the terminus of Q_i equals the source of Q_{i+3} .

For $m \geq 17$, we additionally define

$$Q_{\frac{m+7}{4}} = x_{-\frac{m+3}{4}} x_{\frac{m+15}{4}} x_{-\frac{m+15}{4}} x_{\frac{m+11}{4}} x_{-\frac{m+11}{4}} x_{\frac{m+3}{4}} x_{-\frac{m+7}{4}}.$$

Thus $Q_{\frac{m+7}{4}}$ contains exactly one edge of each pure left difference in

$$D(Q_{\frac{m+7}{4}}) = \left\{ \frac{m-15}{2}, \frac{m-13}{2}, \dots, \frac{m-5}{2} \right\}$$

and shares no differences and no vertices with any path $Q_{\frac{m+19}{4}+3j}$ for $j \in \mathbb{N}$, except that the terminus of $Q_{\frac{m+7}{4}}$ equals the source of $Q_{\frac{m+19}{4}}$. We use the paths Q_i to define Q as follows.

If $m \equiv 1 \pmod{12}$ and $m \geq 37$, let

$$Q = Q_{\frac{m+7}{4}} Q_{\frac{m+19}{4}} \dots Q_{\frac{m-15}{2}} x_{-\frac{m-15}{2}} x_{\frac{m-5}{2}} x_{\frac{m-1}{2}} x_{-\frac{m-9}{2}} x_{\frac{m-9}{2}} x_{-\frac{m-7}{2}} x_{\frac{m-7}{2}} x_{-\frac{m-5}{2}} x_{\frac{m-3}{2}} x_{-\frac{m-3}{2}} x_{-\frac{m-1}{2}} x_0.$$

Modifications are required for small values of m : for $m = 13$, we take $Q = x_{-4}x_6x_4x_{-5}x_{-6}x_0$, and for $m = 25$, we take $Q = x_{-7}x_{10}x_{12}x_{-8}x_7x_{-9}x_9x_{-10}x_{11}x_{-11}x_{-12}x_0$ instead.

If $m \equiv 5 \pmod{12}$ and $m \geq 29$, let

$$Q = Q_{\frac{m+7}{4}} Q_{\frac{m+19}{4}} Q_{\frac{m+31}{4}} \dots Q_{\frac{m-11}{2}} x_{-\frac{m-11}{2}} x_{\frac{m-1}{2}} x_{\frac{m-3}{2}} x_{-\frac{m-3}{2}} x_{\frac{m-5}{2}} x_{-\frac{m-5}{2}} x_{-\frac{m-1}{2}} x_0,$$

while for $m = 17$, we take $Q = x_{-5}x_8x_7x_{-7}x_5x_{-6}x_{-8}x_0$.

If $m \equiv 9 \pmod{12}$ and $m \geq 33$, let

$$Q = Q_{\frac{m+7}{4}} Q_{\frac{m+19}{4}} Q_{\frac{m+31}{4}} \dots Q_{\frac{m-13}{2}} x_{-\frac{m-13}{2}} x_{\frac{m-3}{2}} x_{\frac{m-1}{2}} x_{-\frac{m-3}{2}} x_{\frac{m-5}{2}} x_{-\frac{m-5}{2}} x_{\frac{m-7}{2}} x_{-\frac{m-7}{2}} x_{-\frac{m-1}{2}} x_0,$$

while for $m = 21$, take $Q = x_{-6}x_9x_{10}x_{-9}x_8x_{-8}x_6x_{-7}x_{-10}x_0$ instead.

It is not difficult to verify that in each case, the walk Q is in fact a path, and contains exactly one edge of each pure left difference in

$$D(Q) = \left\{ 1, 2, 3, \dots, \frac{m-5}{2}, \frac{m-1}{2} \right\}.$$

Recall that pure left difference $\frac{m-3}{2}$ was used in the cycle C' .

Since paths P and Q are internally vertex-disjoint and share their endpoints, $C = PQ$ is indeed an m -cycle. Moreover, $F = \{C, C'\}$ is a pair of disjoint m -cycles in $K_{2m} + I$ containing exactly one edge of each pure left difference, each pure right difference, and each mixed difference, except it contains exactly two edges of mixed difference -1 . Hence F is a starter 2-factor of a C_m -factorization of $K_{2m} + I$.

For $m = 9$, we define paths P and Q' as before, and modify P' and Q as

$$P' = y_1x_{-1}y_2x_{-2}x_{-4}y_3 \quad \text{and} \quad Q = x_{-3}x_3x_4x_0.$$

In this case, the duplicated mixed difference is -2 .

Finally, for $m = 5$, we let

$$C = x_0y_1y_{-1}x_{-1}x_{-2}x_0 \quad \text{and} \quad C' = y_0x_1y_{-2}y_2x_2y_0,$$

so that $F = \{C, C'\}$ is a starter 2-factor with a duplicated mixed difference 0.

This completes all cases of the construction of a C_m -factorization of $K_{2m} + I$. □

We round up this section with the proof of our main result.

PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2. Let n be an even integer and $m \geq 5$. If $\text{OP}^+(n; m)$ has a solution, then clearly $m|n$.

Conversely, assume n is even and $n = tm$ for an integer t . If m is even, then $\text{OP}^+(n; m)$ has a solution by Theorem 1.3. Hence assume m is odd and $t \neq 4$. The result follows from Lemma 3.1 if $t = 2$. Hence let $t \geq 6$. Decompose $K_{tm} + I$ into $\frac{t}{2}$ disjoint copies of $K_{2m} + I$ and the complete equipartite graph with $\frac{t}{2}$ parts of size $2m$. The first graph admits a C_m -factorization by Lemma 3.1, and the second by Theorem 2.1. Hence $K_n + I$ admits a C_m -factorization, and $\text{OP}^+(n; m)$ has a solution. \square

4 Conclusion

The main result of this paper is an almost complete solution to the Spouse-Loving Variant of the Oberwolfach Problem with uniform cycle lengths. The only case that remains unsolved is captured by the following conjecture.

Conjecture 4.1 *Let m be a positive odd integer. Then $\text{OP}^+(4m; m)$ has a solution if and only if $m \geq 5$.*

It is worthwhile observing that this case is analogous to the only case left unsolved in [2], where the Oberwolfach Problem with uniform cycle lengths was almost completely solved. The reason is the same: the reduction to case $n = 2m$ does not work since $K_{2m, 2m}$ admits no C_m -factorization when m is odd. A solution to $\text{OP}(4m; m)$, which appeared in [6] two years after [2], required a rather different and highly involved construction.

The reader may be wondering whether a solution to $\text{OP}^+(4m; m)$ may be constructed similarly to our solution to $\text{OP}^+(2m; m)$. Suppose this is indeed the case. Analogously to the proof of Lemma 3.1, denote $V(K_{4m} + I) = \{x_i : i \in \mathbb{Z}_{2m}\} \cup \{y_i : i \in \mathbb{Z}_{2m}\}$ and $\rho = (x_0 x_1 \dots x_{2m-1})(y_0 y_1 \dots y_{2m-1})$, and let F be a starter 2-factor such that $\{\rho^i(F) : i \in \mathbb{Z}_{2m}\}$ is a C_m -factorization of $K_{4m} + I$. Then F contains exactly one edge of each difference in $K_{4m} + I$, and since the edges of pure left difference m and pure right difference m lie in orbits of length m , they must be the ones forming the duplicated 1-factor I . Hence the freedom of choosing I that we enjoyed in the case $n = 2m$ is lost. However, the fatal flaw is as follows. The graph $K_{4m} + I$ contains edges of exactly $4m$ distinct differences (which is promising), of which exactly $2m + 1$ are odd ($\frac{m+1}{2}$ of the pure left differences, $\frac{m+1}{2}$ of the pure right differences, and m of the mixed differences). However, each cycle in F must contain an even number of odd differences — a contradiction.

Thus, proving Conjecture 4.1 will require a different approach. So far we have been able to verify it for $5 \leq m \leq 23$, using a combination of general construction, case-specific construction, and, for larger m , a computer search. However, despite considerable effort, we have to conclude that a complete proof of Conjecture 4.1 is presently out of our reach.

Acknowledgement

A. Burgess and M. Šajna gratefully acknowledge support by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada.

References

- [1] B. Alspach, R. Häggkvist, Some observations on the Oberwolfach problem, *J. Graph Theory* **9** (1985), 177–187.
- [2] B. Alspach, P. J. Schellenberg, D. R. Stinson, D. Wagner, The Oberwolfach problem and factors of uniform odd length cycles, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* **52** (1989), 20–43.
- [3] A. Assaf, E. Mendelsohn, D. R. Stinson, On resolvable coverings of pairs by triples, *Utilitas Math.* **32** (1987), 67–74.
- [4] D. Bryant, P. Danziger, On bipartite 2-factorizations of $K_n - I$ and the Oberwolfach problem, *J. Graph Theory* **68** (2011), 22–37.
- [5] A. Deza, F. Franek, W. Hua, W., M. Meszka, M., A. Rosa, Solutions to the Oberwolfach problem for orders 18 to 40, *J. Combin. Math. Combin. Comput.* **74** (2010), 95–102.
- [6] D. G. Hoffman, P. J. Schellenberg, The existence of C_k -factorizations of $K_{2n} - F$, *Discrete Math.* **97** (1991), 243–250.
- [7] C. Huang, A. Kotzig, A. Rosa, On a variation of the Oberwolfach problem, *Discrete Math.* **27** (1979), 261–277.
- [8] E. R. Lamken, W. H. Mills, Resolvable coverings, Proceedings of the Twenty-fourth Southeastern International Conference on Combinatorics, Graph Theory, and Computing (Boca Raton, FL, 1993), *Congr. Numer.* **96** (1993), 21–26.
- [9] J. Liu, The equipartite Oberwolfach problem with uniform tables, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* **101** (2003), 20–34.
- [10] T. Traetta, A complete solution to the two-table Oberwolfach problems, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* **120** (2013), 984–997.