

# A complete characterization of split digraphs with a strong arc decomposition

Jiangdong Ai<sup>\*</sup>, Fankang He<sup>†</sup>, Zhaoxiang Li<sup>‡</sup>, Zhongmei Qin<sup>§</sup>, Changxin Wang<sup>¶</sup>

August 6, 2024

## Abstract

A **strong arc decomposition** of a (multi-)digraph  $D(V, A)$  is a partition of its arc set  $A$  into two disjoint arc sets  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  such that both of the spanning subdigraphs  $D(V, A_1)$  and  $D(V, A_2)$  are strong. In this paper, we fully characterize all split digraphs that do not have a strong decomposition. This resolves two problems proposed by Bang-Jensen and Wang and contributes to a series of efforts aimed at addressing this problem for specific graph classes. This work continues the research on semicomplete composition [Bang-Jensen, Gutin and Yeo, *J. Graph Theory*, 2020]; on locally semicomplete digraphs [Bang-Jensen and Huang, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 2010]; on a type of tournaments [Bang-Jensen and Yeo, *Combinatorica*, 2004].

## 1 Introduction

For a straightforward look at the background of the topic and our results, we move some necessary notation and definitions to Section 2 and refer readers to [2] for the standard terminology and notation not introduced in this paper.

A **strong arc decomposition** of a (multi-)digraph  $D(V, A)$  is a partition of its arc set  $A$  into two disjoint arc sets  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  such that both of the spanning subdigraphs  $D(V, A_1)$  and  $D(V, A_2)$  are strong. Determining whether a (multi-)digraph  $D(V, A)$  has a strong arc decomposition attracted a lot of attention. We can easily see that every digraph  $D$  with a strong arc decomposition is 2-arc-strong. Then, asking if every 2-arc-strong digraph has a strong arc decomposition is natural. Unfortunately, the following digraphs give a negative answer.

Let  $S_4$  be the digraph depicted in Figure 1. It is not hard to check that  $S_4$  is 2-arc-strong but does not contain a strong arc decomposition.

---

<sup>\*</sup>Corresponding author. School of Mathematical Sciences and LPMC, Nankai University, Tianjin 300071, P.R. China. Email: jd@nankai.edu.cn. Partially supported by the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities, Nankai University.

<sup>†</sup>School of Mathematical Sciences and LPMC, Nankai University, Tianjin 300071, P.R. China. Email: hefankang@mail.nankai.edu.cn.

<sup>‡</sup>School of Mathematical Sciences and LPMC, Nankai University, Tianjin 300071, P.R. China. Email: ZhaoxiangLi@mail.nankai.edu.cn.

<sup>§</sup>School of Science, Chang'an University, Xi'an 710064, Shaanxi Province, P.R.China. Email:qinzhm@chd.edu.cn. Partially supported by Natural Science Basic Research Program of Shaanxi (Program No.2024JC-YBMS-041, 2022JM-019) and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities, Chang'an University.

<sup>¶</sup>School of Mathematics and Statistics, Northwestern Polytechnical University, Xi'an, Shaanxi 710129, PR China. Email: Simonang@163.com.

Bang-Jensen and Yeo [7] proved that for a 2-arc-strong semicomplete digraph  $D$ ,  $S_4$  is the only exception that does not have a strong arc decomposition. For completeness of the venation, we give the theorem here.

**Theorem 1.1.** [7] *A 2-arc-strong semicomplete digraph  $D$  has a strong arc decomposition if and only if  $D$  is not isomorphic to the digraph  $S_4$  depicted in Figure 1. Furthermore, a strong arc decomposition of  $D$  can be obtained in polynomial time when it exists.*

Bang-Jensen, Gutin and Yeo [3] generalized the above theorem to semicomplete multidigraphs with six more exceptions, see Figure 1.

**Theorem 1.2.** [3] *A 2-arc-strong semicomplete multi-digraph  $D = (V, A)$  on  $n$  vertices has a strong arc decomposition if and only if  $D$  is not isomorphic to one of the exceptional digraphs depicted in Figure 1. Furthermore, a strong arc decomposition of  $D$  can be obtained in polynomial time when it exists.*




Figure 1: 2-arc-strong directed multigraphs without strong arc decompositions.

Later, Bang-Jensen and Huang [5] extended semicomplete digraphs to locally semicomplete digraphs, see the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.3.** [5] *A 2-arc-strong locally semicomplete digraph  $D$  has a strong arc decomposition if and only if  $D$  is not the square of an even cycle. Every 3-arc-strong locally semicomplete digraph has a strong arc decomposition and such a decomposition can be obtained in polynomial time.*

Bang-Jensen, Gutin and Yeo [3] considered the strong arc decomposition of semicomplete composition and solved it completely.

**Theorem 1.4.** [3] *Let  $T$  be a strong semicomplete digraph on  $t \geq 2$  vertices and let  $G_1, \dots, H_t$  be arbitrary digraphs. Then  $Q = T[G_1, \dots, H_t]$  has a strong arc decomposition if and only if  $Q$  is 2-arc-strong and is not isomorphic to one of the following four digraphs:  $S_4$ ,  $C_3[\bar{K}_2, \bar{K}_2, \bar{K}_2]$ ,  $C_3[\bar{K}_2, \bar{K}_2, P_2]$  and  $C_3[\bar{K}_2, \bar{K}_2, \bar{K}_3]$ . In particular, every 3-arc-strong semicomplete composition has a strong arc decomposition.*

Recently, Bang-Jensen and Wang [6] have considered the strong arc decomposition of split digraphs, which is another generalization of semicomplete digraphs. Their main result is the following:

**Theorem 1.5.** [6] *Let  $D = (V_1, V_2; A)$  be a 2-arc-strong split digraph such that  $V_1$  is an independent set and the subdigraph induced by  $V_2$  is semicomplete. If every vertex of  $V_1$  has both out- and in-degree at least 3 in  $D$ , then  $D$  has a strong arc decomposition.*

They presented an infinite family of split digraphs to demonstrate that being 2-arc-strong is not sufficient to ensure a strong arc decomposition in a split digraph. Additionally, they proposed the following open problems:

**Problem 1.6.** Does all but a finite number of 2-arc-strong semicomplete split digraphs have a strong arc decomposition?

**Problem 1.7.** Does every 2-arc-strong split digraph with minimum degree at least 5 have a strong arc decomposition?

In this paper, we enhance the aforementioned theorem to make it in a consistent framework with semicomplete digraphs, semicomplete multidigraphs, and semicomplete compositions. Our main result is as follows:

**Theorem 1.8.** *A 2-arc-strong split digraph  $D = (V_1, V_2; A)$  has a strong arc decomposition if and only if  $D$  is not isomorphic to any of the digraphs illustrated in Lemma 2.11, Lemma 3.12, the Appendix, or their arc-reversed versions (reverse all arcs).*

Our result also addresses and resolves Problem 1.6 and Problem 1.7. Regarding Problem 1.7, the answer is correct. In fact, there are infinitely many counterexamples, but the number becomes finite when restricted to semicomplete split digraphs. As for Problem 1.6, the answer is negative. Moreover, we provide the unique counterexample  $(iv)^* \times (iv)$  which is illustrated in Appendix.

## 2 Preliminaries

Throughout this paper, we primarily follow the standard terminology and notation as in [2]. In this section, we first provide some necessary definitions to ensure the paper is self-contained.

A *directed graph* (or just a *digraph*)  $D$  consists of a non-empty finite set  $V(D)$  of elements called *vertices* and a finite set  $A(D)$  of ordered pairs of distinct vertices called *arcs*. If we allow  $A(D)$  to be a multiset, i.e., contains multiple copies of the same arc (often, called *multiple* or *parallel arcs*), then  $D$  is a *directed multigraph* or *multi-digraph*. A (multi-)digraph is *semicomplete* if it has no pair of nonadjacent vertices.

For a digraph  $D = (V_D, A_D)$  and an arc set  $A_1$ , we use the symbol  $D + A$  to denote the multi-digraph  $(V \cup V(A), A_D \cup A_1)$ .

Let  $D$  be a (multi-)digraph and let  $X$  be a subset of  $V(D)$ . We use  $D[X]$  to denote the (multi-)digraph induced by  $X$ . If  $X \subseteq V(D)$ , the (multi-)digraph  $D - X$  is the subdigraph induced by  $V(D) - X$ , i.e.,  $D - X = D[V(D) - X]$ . For a subdigraph  $H$  of  $D$ , we define  $D - H = D - V(H)$ . We may use  $x$  to represent single vertex set  $\{x\}$  and write  $v \in H$  instead of  $v \in V(H)$ . A cycle and a path always mean a directed cycle and path. For subsets  $X, Y$  of  $V(D)$ , a path  $P$  is an  $(X, Y)$ -path if it starts at a vertex  $x$  in  $X$  and ends at a vertex  $y$  in  $Y$  such that  $V(P) \cap (X \cup Y) = \{x, y\}$ . For a path  $P$ , we use  $P[x, y]$  to denote the subpath of  $P$  from  $x$  to  $y$ .

A digraph  $D$  is a *split digraph* if  $V(D)$  can be partitioned into two sets  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  such that  $V_1$  is an independent set and  $V_2$  induces a semicomplete digraph. We will denote a split digraph  $D$  by  $D = (V_1, V_2; A)$ , where the order in the union matters. And we use  $A(V_1, V_2)$  to denote the arcs between  $V_1$  and  $V_2$ . Given a split digraph  $D = (V_1, V_2; A)$ , we say the vertex partition  $V(D) = V_1 \cup V_2$  is a *maximal partition* if there is no vertex partition  $V = V'_1 \cup V'_2$  such that  $V'_1$  is an independent set,  $V'_2$  induces a semicomplete digraph and  $V'_2 \supsetneq V_2$ . That is to say,  $V_2$  is a maximal vertex subset such that the induced digraph of it is semicomplete.

A digraph  $D$  is *strong* if for every pair  $x, y$  of distinct vertices in  $D$ , there exists an  $(x, y)$ -path and a  $(y, x)$ -path. A digraph  $D$  is *k-arc-strong* if  $D - W$  is also strong for any subset  $W \subseteq A(D)$  with a size less than  $k$ . An arc  $e$  in a strong digraph  $D$  is called a *cut-arc* if  $D - e$  is not strong.

A *strong component* of a digraph  $D$  is a maximal induced subdigraph of  $D$  which is strong. For every digraph  $D$ , we can label its strong components  $D_1, \dots, D_t$  ( $t \geq 1$ ) such that there is no arc from  $D_j$  to  $D_i$  unless  $j \leq i$ . We call such an ordering an *acyclic ordering* of the strong components of  $D$ . For a semicomplete digraph  $D$ , it is easy to see that the acyclic ordering  $D_1, \dots, D_t$  ( $t \geq 1$ ) is unique and we call  $D_1$  (resp.,  $D_t$ ) the *initial* (resp., *terminal*) strong component of  $D$ .

## 2.1 Useful tools from known results

A *vertex decomposition* of a digraph  $D$  is a partition of its vertex set  $V(D)$  into disjoint sets  $(U_1, \dots, U_\ell)$  where  $\ell \geq 1$ . The *index* of a vertex  $v$  in the decomposition, denoted by  $ind(v)$ , is the index  $i$  such that  $v \in U_i$ . An arc  $xy$  is called a *backward arc* if  $ind(x) > ind(y)$ . A *nice decomposition* of a digraph  $D$ , introduced in [4], is a vertex decomposition such that  $D[U_i]$  is strong for all  $i \in [l]$ , and the set of cut-arcs of  $D$  is exactly the set of backward arcs. A *natural ordering*  $(x_1y_1, \dots, x_r y_r)$  of its backward arcs is the ordering of these arcs in decreasing order according to the index of their tails.

Bang-Jensen, Havet and Yeo [4] provided the following theorem.

**Theorem 2.1.** [4] *Every strong semicomplete digraph  $D$  of order at least 4 admits a unique nice decomposition. Furthermore, the nice decomposition can be constructed in polynomial time.*

Moreover, the authors of [4] gave a rough construction of the nice composition.

**Proposition 2.2.** [4] *Let  $D$  be a strong semicomplete digraph of order at least 4. Suppose that  $(U_1, \dots, U_\ell)$  is the nice decomposition of  $D$  and  $(x_1y_1, \dots, x_r y_r)$  is the natural ordering of the backward arcs. Then the following statements hold.*

- (i)  $x_1 \in U_\ell$  and  $y_r \in U_1$ ;
- (ii)  $ind(y_{j+1}) < ind(y_j) \leq ind(x_{j+1}) < ind(x_j)$  for all  $j \in [r - 1]$  and  $ind(y_{j+1}) \leq ind(x_{j+2}) < ind(y_j)$  for all  $j \in [r - 2]$ .

Next, we introduce the concept of *splitting-off* (for convenience, we have employed this term incorrectly in terms of its grammatical function sometimes), a useful operation for obtaining a semicomplete multi-digraph on  $V_2$  from a split graph  $D = (V_1, V_2; A)$ .

**Definition 2.3.** Let  $D = (V_1, V_2; A)$  be a split digraph and let  $P$  be a path with both end-points in  $V_2$ . For each vertex  $t \in V(P) \cap V_1$ , we call splitting-off the pair  $(ut, tv)$  at  $t$  if we replace  $ut, tv \in P$  with a new arc  $uv$  (or a multi-arc if  $uv$  already exists). The arc  $uv$  is called a *splitting arc*. For all  $t \in V(P) \cap V_1$ , if we split off all such pairs at  $t$ , then we call this operation by splitting-off the path  $P$ . The reverse operation where we replace a splitting arc with the two original arcs is called *lifting* the arc.

We can derive various semicomplete multi-digraphs from the splitting-off operation on  $V_2$ . Theorem 1.2 ensures the existence of strong arc decompositions of multi-digraphs. Bang-Jensen and Wang [6] gave the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.4.** [6] *Let  $D$  be a multi-digraph and  $X$  a subset of  $V(D)$  such that every vertex of  $D - X$  has two in-neighbors and two out-neighbors in  $X$ . If  $X$  has a strong arc decomposition then  $D$  has a strong arc decomposition.*

## 2.2 Finding a strong arc decomposition

We will now prove two important lemmas that will assist us in finding strong arc decompositions of a 2-arc-strong split digraph.

**Definition 2.5.** Let  $D = (V_1, V_2; A)$  be a split digraph. We say two arc-disjoint strong subdigraphs  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  constitute a *pending decomposition* of  $D$  if, for each  $i \in [2]$ , we have  $V_2 \subseteq V(D_i)$  and for any vertex  $t \in V(D_i) \setminus V(D_{3-i})$ ,  $t$  has at least one in-arc and one out-arc in  $A(D) \setminus A(D_i)$ .

**Lemma 2.6.** *If a 2-arc-strong split digraph  $D = (V_1, V_2; A)$  has a pending decomposition, then  $D$  has a strong arc decomposition.*

*Proof.* Since  $D$  is 2-arc-strong, we have  $d^+(v) \geq 2$  and  $d^-(v) \geq 2$  for any  $v \in V(D)$ . Let  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  be a pending decomposition of  $D$ . We first show that  $G = D[V(D_1) \cup V(D_2)]$  has a strong arc decomposition.

For any  $t \in V(D_1) \setminus V(D_2)$ ,  $t$  has at least one in-arc and one out-arc, denoted as  $t^-t$  and  $tt^+$ , respectively, in  $A(D) \setminus A(D_1)$ . Let  $A_2$  be the arc set obtained by adding such  $t^-t$  and  $tt^+$  for each  $t \in V(D_1) \setminus V(D_2)$  to  $A(D_2)$ . Similarly, do the same for all  $s \in V(D_2) \setminus V(D_1)$  and let  $A_1$  be the corresponding arc set. Then  $A_1 \cap A_2 = \emptyset$  and  $G[A_i]$  is strong for  $i \in [2]$ . We can freely assign the remaining arcs in  $A(G) \setminus (A_1 \cup A_2)$  to  $A_1$  or  $A_2$  and then find the desired strong arc decomposition of  $G = D[V(D_1) \cup V(D_2)]$ . Moreover, for any  $v \in V(D \setminus G) \subseteq V_1$ ,  $v$  has at least two in-neighbors and two out-neighbors in  $V(G)$ . By Lemma 2.4,  $D$  has a strong arc decomposition.  $\square$

Since  $D = (V_1, V_2; A)$  is 2-arc-strong, there are two arc-disjoint  $(X, Y)$ -paths  $Q_1, Q_2$  for any two disjoint proper subsets  $X, Y \subset V_2$ .

We say an arc set  $C \subseteq A(V_1, V_2)$  is *feasible* if there is a partition  $C = S_1 \cup S_2 \cup \dots \cup S_k$ , where each  $S_i$  has the form  $\{v_i x_i, x_i u_i\}$  with  $v_i, u_i \in V_2, v_i \neq u_i$  and  $x_i \in V_1$  and  $x_i \neq x_j$  for  $i \neq j$ . Let  $V_1(C)$  denote the vertices in  $V_1$  that have an incident arc in  $C$ , i.e.  $V_1(C) = \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ ; and let  $\bar{C}$  be the arc (multi-)set by splitting-off  $S_i$  for all  $i \in [k]$ . Denote by  $A'(Q_i)$  the set of arcs between  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  in  $Q_i$ , let  $A_{Q_1, Q_2}(C) = (A'(Q_1) \cup A'(Q_2)) \setminus C$  and  $V_{Q_1, Q_2}(C) = V_1(A_{Q_1, Q_2}(C))$ . When  $C = \emptyset$ , we simply use  $A_{Q_1, Q_2}, V_{Q_1, Q_2}$  to denote  $A_{Q_1, Q_2}(\emptyset), V_{Q_1, Q_2}(\emptyset)$  respectively. We use  $V_1(Q_i)$  to denote  $V_1 \cap V(Q_i)$ .

**Definition 2.7.** Let  $D = (V_1, V_2; A)$  be a split digraph and let  $X, Y$  be two disjoint proper subsets of  $V_2$ . We say an arc-disjoint  $(X, Y)$ -path pair  $\{Q_1, Q_2\}$  is  $(X, Y)_C$ -critical, in which  $C$  is feasible, if  $V_{Q_1, Q_2}(C) \cap V_1(C) = \emptyset$  and there is no arc-disjoint  $(X, Y)$ -path pair  $\{Q_3, Q_4\}$  such that  $A_{Q_3, Q_4}(C) \subsetneq A_{Q_1, Q_2}(C)$ .

**Remark 2.8.** For an  $(X, Y)_C$ -critical path pair  $\{Q_1, Q_2\}$ , if there exists  $v \in V_1(Q_1) \cap V_1(Q_2)$ , we have  $v \notin V_1(C)$ . Consequently,  $A'(Q_i) \setminus C$  is feasible for  $i = 1, 2$ . Additionally, for any arc-disjoint  $(X, Y)$ -path pair  $\{Q_1, Q_2\}$  such that  $V_{Q_1, Q_2}(C) \cap V_1(C) = \emptyset$ , we can always find an  $(X, Y)_C$ -critical path pair  $\{Q_3, Q_4\}$  such that  $A_{Q_3, Q_4}(C) \subseteq A_{Q_1, Q_2}(C)$ .

Let  $D = (V_1, V_2; A)$  be a split digraph and  $C$  a feasible set. For an  $(X, Y)_C$ -critical path pair  $\{Q_1, Q_2\}$ , we use  $\bar{A}_{Q_1, Q_2}(C)$  to denote a (multi-)set obtained by adding  $A'(Q_1) \setminus \bar{C}$  to  $A'(Q_2) \setminus \bar{C}$ .

**Lemma 2.9.** *Let  $D = (V_1, V_2; A)$  be a split digraph and  $C$  a feasible set. If  $\{Q_1, Q_2\}$  is an  $(X, Y)_C$ -critical path pair such that  $D[V_2] + \bar{A}_{Q_1, Q_2}(C) + \bar{C}$  has a strong arc decomposition, then  $D$  has a strong arc decomposition.*

*Proof.* Suppose that  $D[V_2] + \bar{A}_{Q_1, Q_2}(C) + \bar{C}$  has a strong arc decomposition  $D_1 = (V_2, A_1)$  and  $D_2 = (V_2, A_2)$ . Then we lift all splitting arcs in  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  to obtain the corresponding strong subdigraphs,  $D'_1$  and  $D'_2$ , of  $D$ .

If there is some vertex  $t \in V_1$  only contained in  $D'_i$ , we have the following claim.

**Claim 1.**  $d_{D'_i}^+(t) = d_{D'_i}^-(t) = 1$ .

*Proof.* Since  $t$  appears after lifting, we have  $d_{D'_i}^+(t) = d_{D'_i}^-(t) \in \{1, 2\}$ . Suppose that  $d_{D'_i}^+(t) = d_{D'_i}^-(t) = 2$ , then there are 4 arcs  $at, tb, ct, td \in A_{Q_1, Q_2}(C)$  in  $D'_i$ . Since  $D'_i$  and  $D'_{3-i}$  are strong, there is an  $(X, Y)$ -path  $P_i$  in  $D'_i$  and an  $(X, Y)$ -path  $P_{3-i}$  in  $D'_{3-i}$ .

As  $P_i$  is a path, there are at least two arcs of  $\{at, tb, ct, td\}$  not in  $P_i$ , we may assume these two arcs are  $at, tb$ . Then,  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  are two arc-disjoint  $(X, Y)$ -paths such that  $A_{P_1, P_2}(C) \subsetneq A_{Q_1, Q_2}(C)$ , which is a contradiction to the fact that  $\{Q_1, Q_2\}$  is  $(X, Y)_C$ -critical.  $\square$

Notice that for all  $t \in V_1(C) \cup V_{Q_1, Q_2}(C)$  and  $i \in [2]$ , we have  $d_{D'_i}^+(t) = d_{D'_i}^-(t) \in \{0, 1\}$ . This implies that  $D'_1$  and  $D'_2$  form a pending decomposition of  $D$ . Therefore,  $D$  has a strong arc decomposition by Lemma 2.6.  $\square$

**Remark 2.10.** The above proof provides a slightly stronger statement: if the decomposition  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  is a strong arc decomposition of  $D[V_2] + \bar{A}_{Q_1, Q_2}(C) + \bar{C}$ , then the decomposition  $D'_1$  and  $D'_2$  is a pending decomposition of  $D$ , where  $D'_1$  ( $D'_2$ ) is obtained by lifting all splitting arcs in  $D_1$  ( $D_2$ ).

**Lemma 2.11.** *Let  $D = (V_1, V_2; A)$  be a 2-arc-strong split digraph, if  $D$  has a copy of at least one of the following structures, then  $D$  has no strong arc decomposition.*

- There are  $x_1, x_2, u \in V(D)$  such that  $N_D^+(u) = \{x_1, x_3\}$ ,  $N_D^-(u) = \{x_1, x_2\}$ ,  $N_D^+(x_1) = \{x_2, u\}$ ,  $N_D^+(x_2) = \{v, u\}$ , where  $x_3 \in V(D) \setminus \{x_1, x_2, u\}$ ,  $v \in V(D) \setminus \{x_1, x_2, u\}$ .
- There are  $x_1, x_2, u \in V(D)$  such that  $N_D^-(u) = \{x_1, x_3\}$ ,  $N_D^+(u) = \{x_1, x_2\}$ ,  $N_D^-(x_1) = \{x_2, u\}$ ,  $N_D^-(x_2) = \{v, u\}$ , where  $x_3 \in V(D) \setminus \{x_1, x_2, u\}$ ,  $v \in V(D) \setminus \{x_1, x_2, u\}$ .

**Remark 2.12.** As we have characterized all the neighbors of  $u$ , we have  $u \in V_1$  and  $x_1, x_2, x_3 \in V_2$  when  $|V_2| \geq 5$  by the structure of the split digraph. And note that  $x_3 = v$  is possible.

*Proof of Lemma 2.11.* If the first case occurs, suppose, for the sake of contradiction, that  $D$  has a strong arc decomposition  $D_1, D_2$ . Without loss of generality, assume  $x_1 x_2 \in D_1$  and  $x_1 u \in D_2$  since  $d_D^+(x_1) = 2$ . As  $d_D^-(u) = 2$ , we have  $x_2 u \in D_1$ . Since  $d_D^+(x_2) = 2$ , we have  $x_2 v \in D_2$ . As  $d_D^+(u) = 2$ , it follows that only one of  $ux_1$  or  $ux_3$  can be in  $D_1$ .




Figure 2: An illustration of Proof of Lemma 2.11

If  $ux_1 \in D_1$ , then  $ux_3 \in D_2$ . There is no arc from  $\{x_1, x_2, u\}$  to other vertices in  $D_1$ , which contradicts the fact that  $D_1$  is strong. If  $ux_1 \in D_2$ , then  $ux_3 \in D_1$ . There is no arc from  $\{x_1, u\}$  to other vertices in  $D_2$ , which contradicts the fact that  $D_2$  is strong.

By similar arguments,  $D$  also has no strong arc decomposition if the second case occurs.  $\square$

### 3 Proof of Theorem 1.8 when $|V_2| \geq 5$

Let us consider the induced subdigraph  $D[V_2]$ . If  $D[V_2]$  is 2-arc-strong and  $|V_2| \geq 5$ , then  $D[V_2]$  has a strong arc decomposition by Theorem 1.1. Consequently,  $D$  also has a strong arc decomposition by Lemma 2.4. Therefore, we will focus on the case where  $D[V_2]$  is not 2-arc-strong and  $|V_2| \geq 5$  in the following.

#### 3.1 When $D[V_2]$ is strong but not 2-arc-strong

Since  $D[V_2]$  is strong but not 2-arc-strong and  $|V_2| \geq 5$ , by Theorem 2.1, it has a nice decomposition  $(U_1, \dots, U_\ell)$  and a natural ordering of the backward arcs  $(x_1y_1, \dots, x_ry_r)$  of this decomposition.

Let  $\{Q_1, Q_2\}$  be a  $(U_\ell, U_1)_B$ -critical path pair in  $D$ , where  $B \subseteq A(V_1, V_2)$  is a feasible arc set. Since we can choose  $B = \emptyset$  and  $D$  is 2-arc-strong, such  $B$  and  $\{Q_1, Q_2\}$  exist. If the multi-digraph  $D[V_2] + \bar{A}_{Q_1, Q_2}(B) + \bar{B}$  is 2-arc-strong, then it has a strong arc decomposition by Theorem 1.2. Therefore,  $D$  has a strong arc decomposition by Lemma 2.9.

Suppose that  $D[V_2] + \bar{A}_{Q_1, Q_2}(B) + \bar{B}$  is not 2-arc-strong, which implies there is at least one cut-arc  $e$  in it. Note that  $e$  is not a splitting arc because  $D[V_2]$  is strong. Therefore, we have  $e \in A(D[V_2])$ . Since  $D[V_2]$  has a nice decomposition  $(U_1, \dots, U_\ell)$  and a natural ordering of the backward arcs  $(x_1y_1, \dots, x_ry_r)$ , the arc  $e$  must be a backward arc. We can assume  $e = x_iy_i$  for some  $i \in [r]$ .

**Lemma 3.1.** *If  $x_iy_i \in D[V_2]$  is a cut-arc in  $\bar{G} := D[V_2] + \bar{A}_{Q_1, Q_2}(B) + \bar{B}$ , then at least one of the following cases holds:*

$$(\alpha 1). \quad i = 2, U_\ell = \{x_1\}, U_{\ell-1} = \{y_1\} = \{x_2\}, d_{\bar{G}}^+(x_2) = 1.$$

$$(\alpha 2). \quad i = r - 1, U_1 = \{y_r\}, U_2 = \{x_r\} = \{y_{r-1}\}, d_{\bar{G}}^-(y_{r-1}) = 1.$$

*Proof.* Since  $Q_1$  and  $Q_2$  are arc-disjoint, there is an integer  $j \in [2]$  such that  $x_iy_i \notin Q_j$ . Given that  $x_iy_i$  is a cut-arc, there are no other  $(x_i, y_i)$ -paths other than  $x_iy_i$  in  $\bar{G}$ . Consider the following structure:

$$x_i \dashrightarrow U_\ell \xrightarrow{Q_j} U_1 \dashrightarrow y_i.$$

Then at least one of the following cases occurs:

- There is no  $(x_i, U_\ell)$ -path in  $\bar{G} \setminus x_i y_i$ ,
- There is no  $(U_1, y_i)$ -path in  $\bar{G} \setminus x_i y_i$ .

If  $x_i y_i$  is a cut-arc such that there is no  $(x_i, U_\ell)$ -path in  $\bar{G} \setminus x_i y_i$ , then  $x_i \notin U_\ell$ . According to Proposition 2.2, we have  $x_1 \in U_\ell, y_i \notin U_\ell$ , which means  $x_1 \neq y_i, x_i$ . Additionally, all vertices in  $U_\ell$  must dominate  $x_i$  as there is no  $(x_i, U_\ell)$ -path in  $\bar{G} \setminus x_i y_i$ . This implies  $U_\ell = \{x_1\}$  and  $x_i = y_1$  as  $x_1 y_1$  is the only backward arc from  $U_\ell$ .

If  $\{x_i\} \neq U_{\ell-1}$ , then there is a vertex  $z \in U_{\ell-1}$  such that  $x_i \rightarrow z \rightarrow x_1$ , which contradicts the fact that there is no  $(x_i, U_\ell)$ -path in  $\bar{G} \setminus x_i y_i$ . Hence,  $U_{\ell-1} = \{x_i\}$ . Furthermore,  $x_i = x_2$  and  $y_i = y_2$ , considering the structure of backward arcs.

If  $d_G^+(x_i) \geq 2$ , then there is a vertex  $x_i^+ \neq x_i$  (possibly,  $x_i^+ = x_1$ ) such that  $x_i \rightarrow x_i^+ \rightarrow x_1$  in  $\bar{G} \setminus x_i y_i$ , which leads to a contradiction. Finally, we have  $U_\ell = \{x_1\}, U_{\ell-1} = \{x_i\} = \{y_1\} = \{x_2\}$  and  $d_G^+(x_i) = 1$ . A rough construction of  $\bar{G}$  can be seen in Figure 3.




Figure 3: An illustration of a nice decomposition  $(U_1, \dots, U_\ell)$  with backward arcs  $\{x_1 y_1, x_2 y_2, \dots, x_r y_r\}$  where  $x_2 = y_1$ . All arcs between different  $U_i$  which are not shown are from left to right. The green arcs are splitting arcs, and  $x_2 y_2$  is a cut-arc.

Similarly, if  $x_i y_i$  is a cut-arc such that there is no  $(U_1, y_i)$ -path in  $\bar{G} \setminus x_i y_i$ , then we have  $U_1 = \{y_r\}, U_2 = \{y_i\} = \{x_r\} = \{y_{r-1}\}$  and  $d_G^-(y_{r-1}) = 1$ .  $\square$

We can see that there can be at most two cut-arcs  $x_2 y_2, x_{r-1} y_{r-1}$  in  $D[V_2] + \bar{A}_{Q_1, Q_2}(B) + \bar{B}$  as established by Lemma 3.1. The approach for the remaining part of this subsection is as follows: Based on structures shown in  $D[V_2] + \bar{A}_{Q_1, Q_2}(B) + \bar{B}$ , we first attempt to find another feasible arc set  $B_{\text{new}}$  (which maybe empty), and a  $(U_\ell, U_1)_{B_{\text{new}}}$ -critical path pair  $\{Q_3, Q_4\}$  such that neither  $(\alpha 1)$  nor  $(\alpha 2)$  occurs in  $D[V_2] + \bar{A}_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}}) + \bar{B}_{\text{new}}$ , thereby making  $D[V_2] + \bar{A}_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}}) + \bar{B}_{\text{new}}$  2-arc-strong. To find such a feasible  $B_{\text{new}}$ , we will follow an algorithmic procedure. This procedure may involve adding some additional arcs in  $D[V_2]$ . However, in the final pending decomposition of  $D$ , these additional arcs will not be used.

**Lemma 3.2.** *If  $(\alpha 1)$  occurs for  $D[V_2] + \bar{A}_{Q_1, Q_2}(B) + \bar{B}$ , then we can find a  $(U_\ell, U_1)_B$ -critical path pair  $\{Q'_1, Q'_2\}$ , such that  $A_{Q_1, Q_2}(B) = A_{Q'_1, Q'_2}(B)$  and for some  $i \in [2]$  we have  $x_1 x_2 \in A(Q'_i)$ .*

*Proof.* If  $x_1 x_2 \in Q_i$  for some  $i \in [2]$ , then we are done. Suppose  $x_1 x_2 \notin Q_i$  for  $i \in [2]$ , we may assume  $Q_1 = x_1 t_1 t_1^+ Q_1[t_1^+, U_1], Q_2 = x_1 t_2 t_2^+ Q_2[t_2^+, U_1]$  where  $t_1, t_2 \in V_1$ . Consider the  $(U_\ell, U_1)$ -path  $Q_3 = x_1 x_2 Q_3[x_2, U_1]$  in  $D[V_2]$ , the existence of such a path is from that  $D[V_2]$  is strong.

If  $Q_3$  is arc-disjoint with  $Q_1, Q_2$ , then  $\{Q_1, Q_3\}$  is an arc-disjoint  $(U_\ell, U_1)$ -path pair. As  $\{Q_1, Q_2\}$  is a  $(U_\ell, U_1)_B$ -critical path pair, we have  $A_{Q_1, Q_3}(B) = A_{Q_1, Q_2}(B)$ , and  $\{Q_1, Q_3\}$  is  $(U_\ell, U_1)_B$ -critical path pair as desired.



If  $Q_3$  is not arc-disjoint with  $Q_1, Q_2$ , consider the first common arc  $ab$  in  $Q_3$ , we may assume  $ab \in Q_1$ . As  $x_1x_2 \notin Q_1$ , we have  $ab \neq x_1x_2$ , then replace  $Q_1$  with  $Q'_1 = Q_3[x_1, b]Q_1[b, U_1]$ , by a similar argument, we have  $\{Q'_1, Q_2\}$  is the path pair as desired.  $\square$

First, we set  $B = \emptyset$  and let  $\{Q_1, Q_2\}$  be a  $(U_\ell, U_1)_B$ -critical path pair. By symmetry, we may assume that  $(\alpha 1)$  occurs (of course, may both cases occur). By Lemma 3.2, we may assume  $Q_1 = x_1tt^+Q_1[t^+, U_1]$  and  $Q_2 = x_1x_2y_2Q_2[y_2, U_1]$ , where  $t \in V_1, x_2 \notin V(Q_1)$ .

For convenience, we denote by  $G$  the digraph  $D[V_2] + B + A_{Q_1, Q_2}(B)$  and  $\bar{G}$ , the digraph  $D[V_2] + \bar{B} + \bar{A}_{Q_1, Q_2}(B)$ . Similarly, we can define  $\bar{G}_{\text{new}}$  after we define  $G_{\text{new}}$ , which we will determine later in different cases. Since  $D$  is 2-arc-strong, there is a vertex  $u \in V_1 \cap N_D^+(x_2)$  as  $d_{\bar{G}}^+(x_2) = 1$  ( $y_2$  contributes in  $D[V_2]$ ). Depending on the situations of  $u, t$ , and other related vertices, we distinguish among eight cases (which we will see later), from **(A1)** to **(A8)**. We give the corresponding operations on  $D, B$  and  $\{Q_1, Q_2\}$  to avoid  $(\alpha 1)$  among the first seven cases and the eighth case will result in some counterexamples. Regarding the first seven cases, sometimes we call them *procedures* for simplicity and convenience.

Here, we will introduce an operation for rebuilding  $B$ . For a vertex  $f \in V_1(D)$ , let  $e$  be an in-neighbor of  $f$ . If  $f \notin V_1(B)$ , there is an out-neighbor  $f^+$  of  $f$  which is not  $e$ , since  $D$  is 2-arc-strong. Add arcs  $ef$  and  $ff^+$  to  $B$ . If  $f \in V_1(B)$ , which means there are arcs  $f^-f, ff^+ \in B$ , then replace  $f^-f$  with  $ef$  and replace  $ff^+$  with  $ff'$ , where  $f'$  is another out-neighbor of  $f$ , if  $f^+ = e$ . We use  $B \leftarrow \{ef, ff^+\}$  to denote the above operation.

**(A1).** When  $u \notin V_{Q_1, Q_2}$ :

Let  $B_{\text{new}} := B \leftarrow \{x_2u, uu^+\}$ . Since  $V_{Q_1, Q_2}(B_{\text{new}}) \cap V_1(B_{\text{new}}) = \emptyset$ , there is a  $(U_\ell, U_1)_{B_{\text{new}}}$ -critical path pair  $\{Q_3, Q_4\}$  such that  $A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}}) \subseteq A_{Q_1, Q_2}(B_{\text{new}})$ . Let  $G_{\text{new}}$  be  $D[V_2] + B_{\text{new}} + A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}})$ . In this case,  $d_{G_{\text{new}}}^+(x_2) \geq 2$  which avoids  $(\alpha 1)$ .

**Remark 3.3.** We consider the following two cases:

- (a) If  $|A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}})| = |A_{Q_1, Q_2}(B)|$ , then for each vertex  $v \in V_2 \setminus \{x_2\}$ , we have  $d_{\bar{G}}^-(v) \leq d_{\bar{G}_{\text{new}}}^-(v)$ . This yields that if  $(\alpha 2)$  does not occur in  $\bar{G}$ , then it will not occur in  $\bar{G}_{\text{new}}$  as well since the in-degree of  $y_{r-1}$  in  $\bar{G}_{\text{new}}$  will not decrease to 1 if  $y_{r-1} \neq x_2$ . If  $y_{r-1} = x_2$  and  $d_{\bar{G}_{\text{new}}}^-(v) = 1$ , it is a contradiction to that  $|V_2| \geq 4$ .
- (b) If  $A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}}) \subsetneq A_{Q_1, Q_2}(B)$ , then  $|A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}})| < |A_{Q_1, Q_2}(B)|$ .

Thus, we have either  $|A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}})| < |A_{Q_1, Q_2}(B)|$  or  $(\alpha 2)$  does not occur after this procedure if it did not occur before. And  $V_1(B) \subseteq V_1(B_{\text{new}})$ . We can verify that these properties hold in the following procedures as well.

**(A2).** When  $u \in Q_2$ :

There exists  $u^- \in V_2 \setminus \{x_2\}$  such that  $u^-u \in A(Q_2)$ . If  $u^-u \in B$ , let  $B_{\text{new}} := B \leftarrow \{x_2u, uu^+\}$ . And if  $u^-u \notin B$ , we define  $B_{\text{new}} := B$ . Let  $Q'_2 = x_1x_2uQ_2[u, U_1]$ . Observe that  $Q'_2$  is arc-disjoint with  $Q_1$ , and  $V_{Q_1, Q'_2}(B_{\text{new}}) \cap V_1(B_{\text{new}}) = \emptyset$ , we can find a  $(U_\ell, U_1)_{B_{\text{new}}}$ -critical path pair  $\{Q_3, Q_4\}$  such that  $A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}}) \subseteq A_{Q_1, Q'_2}(B_{\text{new}})$ .

Let  $G_{\text{new}} := D[V_2] + B_{\text{new}} + A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}})$ . If  $x_2u \notin G_{\text{new}}$ , then  $B_{\text{new}} = B$ ,  $A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B) \subsetneq A_{Q_1, Q_2}(B)$ , which contradicts to the fact that  $\{Q_1, Q_2\}$  is  $(U_\ell, U_1)_B$ -critical. So, we have  $x_2u \in G_{\text{new}}$ , then we have  $d_{G_{\text{new}}}^+(x_2) \geq 2$ , which avoids  $(\alpha 1)$ .

(A3). When  $u \notin Q_2, u \in Q_1$  and  $u \neq t$ :

There exists  $u^- \in V_2 \setminus \{x_2\}$  such that  $u^-u \in A(Q_1)$ . If  $u^-u \in B$ , let  $B_{\text{new}} := B \leftarrow \{x_2u, uu^+\}$ . and if  $u^-u \notin B$ , we define  $B_{\text{new}} := B$ .

Let  $Q'_2 = x_1x_2uQ_1[u, U_1]$ , and let

$$Q'_1 = \begin{cases} x_1tt^+Q_2[t^+, U_1], & \text{if } t^+ \in V(Q_2), \\ x_1tt^+x_2Q_2[x_2, U_1], & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Observe that  $Q'_1$  is arc-disjoint with  $Q'_2$ , and  $V_{Q'_1, Q'_2}(B_{\text{new}}) \cap V_1(B_{\text{new}}) = \emptyset$ , so we can find a  $(U_\ell, U_1)_{B_{\text{new}}}$ -critical path pair  $\{Q_3, Q_4\}$  such that  $A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}}) \subseteq A_{Q'_1, Q'_2}(B_{\text{new}})$ . Let  $G_{\text{new}} := D[V_2] + B_{\text{new}} + A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}})$ , and the same arguments follow as (A2).

(A4). When  $u \notin Q_2, u \in Q_1, u = t$  and there exists  $s \in (N_D^+(x_1) \cap V_1), s \neq t$ , and  $s \notin V_{Q_1, Q_2}(B)$ :

Firstly, we get  $B_{\text{new}}$  from  $B$  by doing the following two operations.

- If  $x_1t \in B$ , replace it with  $x_2t$ . And if  $x_1t \notin B$ , add  $x_2t$  and  $tt^+$  to  $B$ .
- $B \leftarrow \{x_1s, ss^+\}$ .

Let  $Q'_1 = x_1x_2tt^+Q_1[t^+, U_1]$  and let

$$Q'_2 = \begin{cases} x_1ss^+Q_2[s^+, U_1], & \text{if } s^+ \in V(Q_2), \\ x_1ss^+, & \text{if } s^+ \notin V(Q_2), s \in U_1, \\ x_1ss^+x_2Q_2[x_2, U_1], & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Observe that  $Q'_1$  is arc-disjoint with  $Q'_2$ , and  $V_{Q'_1, Q'_2}(B_{\text{new}}) \cap V_1(B_{\text{new}}) = \emptyset$ , so we can find a  $(U_\ell, U_1)_{B_{\text{new}}}$ -critical path pair  $\{Q_3, Q_4\}$  such that  $A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}}) \subseteq A_{Q'_1, Q'_2}(B_{\text{new}})$ . Let  $G_{\text{new}} := D[V_2] + B_{\text{new}} + A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}})$ . We have  $d_{G_{\text{new}}}^+(x_2) \geq 2$ , which avoids  $(\alpha 1)$ , as  $x_2t \in B_{\text{new}}$ .

(A5). When  $u \notin Q_2, u \in Q_1, u = t$  and there exists  $s \in (N_D^+(x_1) \cap V_1), s \neq t$ , and  $s \in V_{Q_1, Q_2}(B)$ :

Firstly, we get  $B_{\text{new}}$  from  $B$  by doing the following two operations.

- If  $x_1t \in B$ , replace it with  $x_2t$ . And if  $x_1t \notin B$ , add  $x_2t$  and  $tt^+$  to  $B$ .
- If  $s \in V_1(B)$ , which means there exists an arc  $s^-s \in B$ , then replace it with  $x_1s$ . And if  $s \notin V_1(B)$ , then we do nothing.

If  $s \in Q_1$ , then  $Q'_1 = x_1sQ_1[s, U_1]$  is arc-disjoint with  $Q'_2 = Q_2$ .

If  $s \notin Q_1$ , then  $s \in Q_2$ ,  $Q'_1 = x_1x_2tQ_1[t, U_1]$  is arc-disjoint with  $Q'_2 = x_1sQ_2[s, U_1]$ .

Observe that  $V_{Q'_1, Q'_2}(B_{\text{new}}) \cap V_1(B_{\text{new}}) = \emptyset$ , so we can find a  $(U_\ell, U_1)_{B_{\text{new}}}$ -critical path pair  $\{Q_3, Q_4\}$  such that  $A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}}) \subseteq A_{Q'_1, Q'_2}(B_{\text{new}})$ . Let  $G_{\text{new}} := D[V_2] + B_{\text{new}} + A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}})$ . We have  $d_{G_{\text{new}}}^+(x_2) \geq 2$ , which avoids  $(\alpha 1)$ , as  $x_2t \in B_{\text{new}}$ .

**If (A1)-(A5) do not occur for all  $u \in V_1 \cap N_D^+(x_2)$ , then we have  $N_D^+(x_1) \cap V_1 = N_D^+(x_2) \cap V_1 = \{t\}$  with  $t \notin V(Q_2)$ . Then we do the following operations.**

**(A6).** When there exists  $w \in N_D^+(t) \setminus \{x_1, t^+\}$ :

We additionally add two parallel arcs  $x_2x_1$  and another arc  $x_1x_2$  to  $D[V_2]$ . Let  $B_{\text{new}} = B \leftarrow \{x_2t, tt^+\}$ , and we can check  $\{Q_3 = x_1x_2tQ_1[t, U_1], Q_4 = Q_2\}$  is a  $(U_\ell, U_1)_{B_{\text{new}}}$ -critical path pair, and let  $G_{\text{new}} := D[V_2] + B_{\text{new}} + A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}})$ . We have  $d_{G_{\text{new}}}^+(x_2) \geq 2$ , which avoids  $(\alpha 1)$ .

**(A7).** When  $N_D^+(t) = \{x_1, t^+\}$  and there exists  $w \in N_D^-(t) \setminus \{x_1, x_2\}$ :

We do the same thing as that of **(A6)**.

**(A8).** When **(A1)**-**(A7)** do not occur for all  $u \in V_1 \cap N_D^+(x_2)$ :

We have  $N_D^+(x_1) \cap V_1 = N_D^+(x_2) \cap V_1 = \{t\}$  with  $t \notin Q_2$  and  $N_D^+(t) = \{x_1, t^+\}$ ,  $N_D^-(t) = \{x_1, x_2\}$ , note that  $D$  satisfies the structure in Lemma 2.11. Therefore,  $D$  has no strong arc decomposition.

We may use **(A1)**\*-**(A8)**\* to denote the symmetric procedures of **(A1)**-**(A8)** when  $(\alpha 2)$  occurs, and denote by  $t^*, u^*, s^*, w^*$  the symmetric vertices of  $t, u, s, w$ , respectively if  $(\alpha 2)$  occurs. If we enter either **(A8)** or **(A8)**\*, then  $D$  has no strong arc decomposition by Lemma 2.11. And if neither **(A8)** nor **(A8)**\* is entered, we proceed as follows.

If  $(\alpha 1)$  occurs in  $\tilde{G}$ , then we enter one of the procedures from **(A1)** to **(A7)** to obtain  $G_{\text{new}}$ , which avoids  $(\alpha 1)$ . If  $(\alpha 2)$  then occurs in  $\tilde{G}_{\text{new}}$ , then we can find new  $\{Q_1, Q_2\}$  such that  $y_{r-1}y_r \in A(Q_2)$  and  $A_{Q_1, Q_2}(B_{\text{new}}) = A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}})$ , similar to the process described in Lemma 3.2 for its symmetric case. We then update  $G_{\text{new}}$  to  $G$ ,  $B_{\text{new}}$  to  $B$ . Next, enter one of the procedures from **(A1)**\*-**(A7)**\* to obtain a new  $G_{\text{new}}$ . This process is repeated if  $(\alpha 1)$  occurs again for this new  $G_{\text{new}}$ .

We remark that at the end of each procedure, the critical path pair is called  $\{Q_3, Q_4\}$ . If we are not done after one procedure, it indicates that we have to enter another one, and in this case,  $\{Q_3, Q_4\}$  will be renamed as  $\{Q_1, Q_2\}$  to reflect the default settings for the new procedure. The feasible set  $B_{\text{new}}$  will also be subject to similar adjustments.

This process usually takes more steps than it looks like, as a sequence of operations aimed at avoiding  $(\alpha 1)$  may inadvertently lead to  $(\alpha 2)$ , and vice versa. Although this process will eventually come to an end, it can be quite complex.

**Claim 2.** *The process will eventually terminate. And if we enter procedure **(A6)** or **(A7)** (**(A6)**\* or **(A7)**\*), then  $(\alpha 1)$  ( $(\alpha 2)$ ) will not occur, regardless of the steps taken in **(A1)**\*-**(A7)**\* (**(A1)**-**(A7)**).*

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $(\alpha 1)$  occurs initially and that  $\{Q_1, Q_2\}$  is a  $(U_\ell, U_1)_B$ -critical path pair, with  $B = \emptyset$ . According to Remark 3.3, either we are done if  $(\alpha 2)$  does not occur or  $|A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}})| < |A_{Q_1, Q_2}(B)|$ . Thus, we can obtain a 2-arc-strong  $\tilde{G}_{\text{new}}$  in finite steps since the original  $|A_{Q_1, Q_2}|$  is bounded. And if we enter **(A6)** or **(A7)** (**(A6)**\* or **(A7)**\*), then  $(\alpha 1)$  ( $(\alpha 2)$ ) will not occur, regardless of the steps taken in **(A1)**\*-**(A7)**\* (**(A1)**-**(A7)**) as these procedure do not remove the additional arcs. This implies that  $d_{G_{\text{new}}}^+(x_2) \geq 2$ .  $\square$

If we have never entered **(A6)**, **(A7)**, **(A6)**\* or **(A7)**\*, then  $G_{\text{new}}$  is a subdigraph of  $D$ . For  $|V_2| \geq 5$ ,  $\tilde{G}_{\text{new}}$  has a strong arc decomposition by Theorem 1.2. Consequently,  $D$  has a strong arc decomposition by Lemma 2.9.

If we have entered **(A6)**, **(A7)**, **(A6)**\* or **(A7)**\*, then by the following lemma and Lemma 2.6,  $D$  has a strong arc decomposition.

**Lemma 3.4.** *If we have entered (A6), (A7), (A6)\* or (A7)\*, then we can find a pending decomposition of  $D$  for  $|V_2| \geq 4$ .*

*Proof.* We can first assume we have entered (A6) or (A7) by symmetry (of course we can also have entered (A6)\* or (A7)\*). Since we have added additional arcs in  $D[V_2]$ , resulting in two parallel arcs  $x_1x_2$  and two parallel arcs  $x_2x_1$  in  $\bar{G}_{\text{new}}$ , so  $\bar{G}_{\text{new}}$  is not isomorphic to the counterexamples in Theorem 1.2. So, we can find a strong arc decomposition  $\bar{G}_1$  and  $\bar{G}_2$  of  $\bar{G}_{\text{new}}$ . By lifting all splitting arcs in  $\bar{G}_1$  and  $\bar{G}_2$ , we obtain  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ , which form a pending decomposition of  $D$  with the additional arcs by Remark 2.10. The next step is to reallocate the arcs in  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  to ensure that they remain strong. And we have the following:

- (1).  $x_2y_2 \in G_1, x_2t, tt^{\S} \in G_2$  as  $x_2y_2, x_2t^+$  are all out-arcs of  $\{x_1, x_2\}$  in  $\bar{G}_{\text{new}}$ .
- (2). Let  $G_i$  contain 2-cycle  $x_1x_2x_1$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . Because the parallel arcs do not contribute to making a graph strong.
- (3). For any  $v \in V_2 \setminus \{x_1, x_2, y_2\}$ ,  $vx_i \in A(G_1)$  and  $vx_{3-i} \in A(G_2)$  for some  $i \in [2]$  since there are 2-cycle  $x_1x_2x_1$  in both  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ .
- (4).  $y_2x_1 \in G_2$ , as if not, we can move it from  $G_1$  to  $G_2$ , we can check  $G_1$  is still strong by finding a  $(y_2, x_2)$ -path in  $G_1$ . Since  $G_1$  is strong before moving  $y_2x_1$ , there is a  $(y_2, v)$ -path  $P$  for any  $v \in V_2 \setminus \{x_1, x_2, y_2\}$  as  $|V_2| \geq 4$ , and observe that  $y_2x_1 \notin P$  as  $x_1$  can only reach to  $x_2$ , and  $x_2$  can only reach to  $x_1$  and  $y_2$ . Now, we are done because we have  $vx_2 \in G_1$  or  $vx_1 \in G_1$  by (3).

**Claim 3.**  $G_2$  is still strong after removing  $t^+x_1$  and  $t^+x_2$  (if it exists, as  $y_2x_2$  may not in  $D$ ).

*Proof.* We prove this by finding another  $(t^+, \{x_1, x_2\})$ -path in  $G_2$  without passing through  $t^+x_1$  and  $t^+x_2$ , given that there is a 2-cycle  $x_1x_2x_1$  in  $G_2$ . Since  $G_2$  is strong before removing any arcs, there is a  $(t^+, v)$ -path  $P$  for any  $v \in V_2 \setminus \{x_1, x_2, t^+\}$  as  $|V_2| \geq 4$ . Observe that  $t^+x_1, t^+x_2 \notin P$  as  $x_1$  can only reach  $x_2$ ,  $x_2$  can only reach  $x_1$  and  $t$ , and  $t$  can only reach  $t^+$ . Now, we are done because we have  $vx_1 \in G_2$  or  $vx_2 \in G_2$  by (3) and (4).  $\square$

We will continue by considering the following two cases.

**Case 1:** We do not enter (A6)\* and (A7)\*.

**Case 1.1:** We enter (A6). Recall that there exists  $w \in N_D^+(t) \setminus \{x_1, t^+\}$ .

1. By Claim 3, we move  $t^+x_1$  and  $t^+x_2$  (if it exists) from  $G_2$  to  $G_1$ . Both  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  remain strong.

2. We remove the additional arcs  $x_1x_2, x_2x_1$  from  $G_1$  and the additional arc  $x_2x_1$  from  $G_2$ .

3. We add arcs  $x_1t, tw$ , Which are not in  $G_{\text{new}}$ , to  $G_1$ .

We want to show that through reallocation of arcs in  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ , the resulting two graphs (we continue to refer to as  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  for convenience) remain strong and can form a pending decomposition. In the following, we only move the arcs incident to  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ , in addition, for any vertex  $v \in V_2 \setminus \{x_1, x_2, y_2\}$ , once we move  $vx_i$  from  $G_j$  to  $G_{3-j}$ , then we move  $vx_{3-i}$  from  $G_{3-j}$  to  $G_j$  for  $i, j = [2]$ . After performing this reallocation, it suffices to verify the presence of an  $(x_1, x_2)$ -path and an  $(x_2, x_1)$ -path in each  $G_i$  for  $i = [2]$  to ensure that both  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  remain strong.

---

$\S$ In order to match our symbols, if we entered procedure (A6), and we replace  $tt^+$  with  $tw$  in some procedure later from (A1)\*-(A7)\*, which implies  $w \in \{y_{r-1}, y_r\}$ , then we exchange the name of  $t^+$  and  $w$ . The same arguments also hold for (A6)\*.

- $t^+ = y_2$ : As  $t^+ = y_2$ , we have moved  $y_2x_1$  to  $G_1$ . If  $w \neq x_2$ , we choose  $wx_2$  in  $G_1$  and  $wx_1$  in  $G_2$  as  $w \neq t^+$ .  $G_1$  is strong as  $x_1twx_2y_2x_1$  is a cycle; Observe that there is a  $(y_2, w)$ -path  $P$  in  $G_2$  which do not go through  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ , then  $x_1x_2ty_2Pwx_1$  is a cycle,  $G_2$  is strong. If  $w = x_2$ , then there exists  $v \in V_2 \setminus \{x_1, x_2, y_2\}$  as  $|V_2| \geq 4$ , and we choose  $vx_2$  in  $G_1$  and  $vx_1$  in  $G_2$ . By a similar argument, we have that  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  are strong.
- $t^+ \neq y_2$ : We have moved  $t^+x_1$  and  $t^+x_2$  to  $G_1$ . Observe that there is a  $(y_2, t^+)$ -path  $Q$  in  $G_1$  which do not go through  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ , then  $x_2y_2Qt^+x_1$  is a  $(x_2, x_1)$ -path in  $G_1$ . If  $w = x_2$ , then  $x_1tx_2$  is a  $(x_2, x_1)$ -path in  $G_1$ , if  $w = y_2$ , then  $x_1ty_2Qt^+x_2$  is a  $(x_2, x_1)$ -path in  $G_1$ , if  $w \neq x_2, y_2$ , then we choose  $wx_2$  in  $G_1$  and  $wx_2 \in G_2$ ,  $x_1twx_2$  is a  $(x_2, x_1)$ -path in  $G_1$ . So  $G_1$  is strong. As  $y_2x_1 \in G_2$ , Observe that there is a  $(t^+, y_2)$ -path  $P$  in  $G_2$  which do not go through  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ , then  $x_1x_2tt^+Py_2x_1$  is a cycle,  $G_2$  is strong.

**Case 1.2:** We enter (A7). Recall that  $N_D^+(t) = \{x_1, t^+\}$  and there exists a vertex  $w \in N_D^-(t) \setminus \{x_1, x_2\}$ .

1. We remove the additional arc  $x_2x_1$  from  $G_1$  and the additional arcs  $x_1x_2, x_2x_1$  from  $G_2$ .
2. Add arcs  $wt, tx_1$  to  $G_1$  and arc  $x_1t$  to  $G_2$ , which are not in  $G_{\text{new}}$ .

What we will do next is analogous to Case 1.1.

If  $t^+ = y_2$ , then there exists a vertex  $v \in V_2 \setminus \{x_1, x_2, y_2\}$  as  $|V_2| \geq 4$ , and we choose  $vx_2$  in  $G_2$  and  $vx_1$  in  $G_1$ . Observe that there is a  $(y_2, v)$ -path  $P$  in  $G_2$  which does not pass through  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ , then  $x_1ty_2Pvx_2$  is an  $(x_1, x_2)$ -path in  $G_2$ ,  $x_2ty_2x_1$  is an  $(x_1, x_2)$ -path in  $G_2$  as  $y_2x_1 \in G_2$ . Thus,  $G_2$  is strong.

If  $t^+ \neq y_2$ , then we choose  $t^+x_2$  in  $G_2$  and  $t^+x_1$  in  $G_1$ . Observe that there is a  $(t^+, y_2)$ -path  $Q$  in  $G_2$  which does not pass through  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ , then  $x_1tt^+x_2$  is an  $(x_1, x_2)$ -path in  $G_2$ ,  $x_2tt^+Qy_2x_1$  is a  $(x_2, x_1)$ -path in  $G_2$  as  $y_2x_1 \in G_2$ . So  $G_2$  is strong.

As  $x_1x_2 \in G_1$ , we only need to check the presence of an  $(x_2, x_1)$ -path in  $G_1$ . If  $w = y_2$ , then  $x_2y_2tx_1$  is the path we need, and if  $w \neq x_2$ , observe that there is a  $(y_2, w)$ -path  $P$  in  $G_1$  which does not pass through  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ , then  $x_2y_2Pwtx_1$  is the path we need. Thus,  $G_1$  is strong in either case.

Refer to Figure 4 for an illustration of Case 1.1 and Case 1.2.




Figure 4: An illustration of Case 1.1 and Case 1.2, where red arcs are in  $G_1$ , green arcs are in  $G_2$ .

**Case 2:** We also enter (A6)\* or (A7)\*.

**Case 2.1:** When  $t = t^*$ , then the procedures we have entered are (A6) and (A6)\*, as  $x_1t, x_2t, t^*y_{r-1}, t^*y_r \in A(D)$ .

1. Note that  $x_2t^+ = t^*y_{r-1}$  in  $\bar{G}_{\text{new}}$ , we have a stronger result of (1), that is  $x_2y_2, x_{r-1}, y_{r-1} \in G_1, x_2t, tt^+ \in G_2$ .

2. A stronger result of (2), we let  $G_i$  contain 2-cycle  $y_r y_{r-1} y_r$  for  $i = 1, 2$ .

3. We remove the additional arcs  $x_1x_2, x_2x_1, y_r y_{r-1}, y_{r-1}y_r$  from  $G_1$ , and the additional arcs  $x_2x_1, y_r y_{r-1}$  from  $G_1$ . And we add arcs  $x_1t, ty_r$ , which are not in  $G_{\text{new}}$ , to  $G_1$ .

In the following, we only move the arcs  $y_r x_2, y_{r-1}x_1, y_r x_1$  and if we can find cycles containing the vertices  $x_1x_2y_{r-1}, y_r$  in both  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ , then  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  are strong.

We move  $y_r x_1$  to  $G_2$ , and move  $y_r x_2, y_{r-1}x_1$  to  $G_1$ . In  $G_2$ ,  $x_1x_2ty_{r-1}y_r x_1$  is the cycle we need, so  $G_2$  is strong. If  $r-1=2$ , then  $x_2y_{r-1}x_1ty_r x_2$  is the cycle we need, and if  $r-1 \neq 2$ , then observe that there is a  $(y_2, x_{r-1})$ -path  $P$  (of course  $y_2 = x_{r-1}$  is possible) in  $G_1$  which does not pass through  $x_1, x_2, y_{r-1}, y_r$  (the same path as in  $G_1$  before removing additional arcs), then  $x_2y_2Px_{r-1}y_{r-1}x_1ty_r x_2$  is the cycle we need, so  $G_2$  is strong.

**Case 2.2:** When  $t \neq t^*$ :

We recommend that readers refer to Remark 3.5 before proceeding with the following operations.

1. We do the same arguments as those in Case 1.1 if we have entered **(A6)** or Case 1.2 if we have entered **(A7)** to obtain a pending decomposition of  $D$  with the additional arcs  $y_r y_{r-1}, y_r y_{r-1}, y_{r-1}y_r$ .

2. We apply **(1)\*-(4)\*** on  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ , where **(1)\*-(4)\*** denote the symmetric operations of **(1)-(4)**.

3. We do the same arguments as those in Case 1.1\* if we entered **(A6)\*** or Case 1.2\* if we entered **(A7)\*** to get a pending decomposition of  $D$ , where Case 1.1\* and Case 1.2\* are the symmetric cases of Case 1.1 and Case 1.2.

In every case from Case 1 to Case 2, we can always get a pending decomposition  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  of  $D$ , which meets our needs.  $\square$

**Remark 3.5.** Recall that during the process of this proof, when we apply **(1)-(4)** and Case 1.1, Case 1.2, all the conditions we need are:

- i).  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  are strong;
- ii). All out-arcs of  $\{x_1, x_2\}$  in  $A(G_1) \cup A(G_2)$  before we do **(1)** are  $x_2y_2, x_2t$ ;
- iii). All arcs incident to  $t$  in  $\in A(G_1) \cup A(G_2)$  are  $x_2t$  and  $tt^+$ , so we can find a distinct in-arc and a distinct out-arc of  $t$  in  $D$  to add to  $G_1$ .

To do **(1)\*-(4)\*** and Case 1.1\*, Case 1.2\*, we need to check the symmetric conditions, which are:

- i)\*.  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  are strong;
- ii)\*. All in-arcs of  $\{y_{r-1}, y_r\}$  in  $A(G_1) \cup A(G_2)$  before we do **(1)\*** are  $x_{r-1}y_{r-1}, t^*y_{r-1}$ ;
- iii)\*. All arcs incident to  $t^*$  in  $\in A(G_1) \cup A(G_2)$  are  $t^*y_{r-1}, t^*-t^*$ , so we can find a distinct in-arc and a distinct out-arc of  $t$  in  $D$  to add to  $G_1$ .

i)\* is straightforward to verify. For ii)\*, as  $t^* \neq t$  and  $N^-(y_r) \cap V_1 = N^-(y_{r-1}) \cap V_1 = \{t^*\}$ , so all in-arcs of  $\{y_{r-1}, y_r\}$  in  $A(G_1) \cup A(G_2)$  are  $x_{r-1}y_{r-1}, t^*y_{r-1}$ . For iii)\*, because  $t^* \neq t$ , we did not add any arcs incident to  $t^*$ . This necessitates distinguishing between Case 2.1 and Case 2.2 in this proof.

### 3.2 $D[V_2]$ is not strong

If  $D[V_2]$  is not strong, then it has the acyclic ordering of its strong component  $C_1, \dots, C_p$  ( $p \geq 2$ ). Similar to Lemma 3.1, we have the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.6.** *If the multi-digraph  $D[V_2] + C$ , where  $C$  is a set of some arcs with both endpoints in  $V_2$ , has two arc-disjoint  $(C_p, C_1)$ -paths  $Q_1$  and  $Q_2$ , then  $D[V_2] + C$  is strong. Besides, if  $D[V_2] + C$  is not 2-arc-strong, which means there exists a cut-arc  $xy$ , then  $xy \notin C$  and at least one of the following occurs:*

$$(\beta 1). \quad C_p = \{y\}, C_{p-1} = \{x\}, d_{D[V_2]+C}^+(x) = 1,$$

$$(\beta 2). \quad C_1 = \{x\}, C_2 = \{y\}, d_{D[V_2]+C}^-(y) = 1,$$

$$(\beta 3). \quad xy \in A(D[C_p]),$$

$$(\beta 4). \quad xy \in A(D[C_1]).$$

*Proof.* Since  $D[V_2]$  is semicomplete and  $C_1, \dots, C_p$  is its acyclic ordering,  $D[V_2] + Q_i, i \in [2]$  is strong, and so  $D[V_2] + C$  is strong.

If  $D[V_2] + C$  is not 2-arc-strong, let  $xy$  be a cut-arc in  $D[V_2] + C$ . If  $xy \in C$ , then there exists  $i \in [2]$  such that  $xy \notin Q_i$  since  $Q_1$  and  $Q_2$  are arc-disjoint. This yields that  $(D[V_2] + C) \setminus xy \supseteq D[V_2] + Q_i$  is still strong, which contradicts to the fact  $xy$  is cut-arc. Hence  $xy \notin C$ .

By checking the existence of the following form of path

$$x \dashrightarrow C_p \xrightarrow{Q_i} C_1 \dashrightarrow y,$$

in  $(D[V_2] + C) \setminus xy$ , where  $xy \notin Q_i$ , we have  $xy \notin D[V_2 - C_1 - C_p]$ .

If  $y \in C_p, x \notin C_p$ . If  $C_p \neq \{y\}$ , then there exists  $z \in C_p$  and  $z$  dominates  $y$  because of  $C_p$  is strong, and  $x \rightarrow z \rightarrow y$  is an  $(x, y)$ -path other than  $xy$ , which contradicts to the fact that  $xy$  is a cut-arc in  $D[V_2] + C$ . Hence  $C_p = \{y\}$ . If  $x \notin C_{p-1}$ , then  $x \rightarrow z \rightarrow y$  is an  $(x, y)$ -path other than  $xy$ , where  $z \in C_{p-1}$ , which contradicts to the fact that  $xy$  is a cut-arc in  $D[V_2] + C$ . Hence  $x \in C_{p-1}$ . If  $C_{p-1} \neq \{x\}$ , then as  $C_{p-1}$  is strong, there exists out-arc  $xz \in D[C_{p-1}]$ , and  $x \rightarrow z \rightarrow y$  is an  $(x, y)$ -path other than  $xy$ , which contradicts to the fact that  $xy$  is a cut-arc in  $D[V_2] + C$ . Hence  $C_{p-1} = \{x\}$ . If  $d_{D[V_2]+C}^+(x) \geq 2$ , then there exists an  $x^+$  (maybe  $y$ ), such that  $x \rightarrow x^+ \rightarrow y$  (or  $x \rightarrow y$ ) in  $(D[V_2] + C) \setminus xy$ , which contradicts to the fact that  $xy$  is a cut-arc in  $D[V_2] + C$ . Hence  $d_{D[V_2]+C}^+(x) = 1$ . In conclusion,  $C_p = \{y\}, C_{p-1} = \{x\}, d_{D[V_2]+C}^+(x) = 1$ .

Similarly, if  $x \in C_1, y \notin C_1$ , then  $C_1 = \{x\}, C_2 = \{y\}, d_{D[V_2]+C}^-(y) = 1$ .

As  $xy \in D[V_2]$ , then  $x \in C_p, y \notin C_p$  or  $y \in C_1, x \notin C_1$  will not occur, so the left cases are  $(\beta 3)$  and  $(\beta 4)$ .  $\square$

Let  $(U_1, \dots, U_l)$  be the nice decomposition of  $C_p$  when  $|C_p| \geq 4$ . Similarly, suppose that  $(W_1, \dots, W_p)$  is the nice decomposition of  $C_1$  when  $|C_1| \geq 4$ .

$$X = \begin{cases} U_l, & \text{if } |C_p| \geq 4; \\ C_p, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad Y = \begin{cases} W_1, & \text{if } |C_1| \geq 4; \\ C_1, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The following proof is similar to the proof for the case that  $D[V_2]$  is strong. First, we let  $B = \emptyset$  and  $\{Q_1, Q_2\}$  be an  $(X, Y)_B$ -critical path pair. If  $D[V_2] + \bar{A}_{Q_1, Q_2}(B) + \bar{B}$  is 2-arc-strong, then by

Lemma 2.9, Theorem 1.2 and  $|V_2| \geq 5$ , we are done. If it is not 2-arc-strong, then by Lemma 3.6, at least one of  $(\beta 1)$  to  $(\beta 4)$  occurs. Note that  $(\beta 1)$  and  $(\beta 3)$  (or  $(\beta 2)$  and  $(\beta 4)$ ) can not occur at the same time. By symmetry of  $(\beta 1)$  and  $(\beta 2)$  and also symmetry of  $(\beta 3)$  and  $(\beta 4)$ , we may assume that  $(\beta 1)$  or  $(\beta 3)$  occurs (of course,  $(\beta 2)$  or  $(\beta 4)$  may occur at the same time). Similar to the proof for  $D[V_2]$  is strong, we do the following operations for different cases.

For convenience, we denote by  $G$  the digraph  $D[V_2] + B + A_{Q_1, Q_2}(B)$  and  $\bar{G}$  the digraph  $D[V_2] + \bar{B} + \bar{A}_{Q_1, Q_2}(B)$ . Similarly, we can define  $\bar{G}_{\text{new}}$  after we define  $G_{\text{new}}$ , which we will determine later in different cases. We give the corresponding procedures on  $D$ ,  $B$  and  $\{Q_1, Q_2\}$  to avoid  $(\beta 1)$  or  $(\beta 3)$ .

Here, we recall an operation for rebuilding  $B$ . For a vertex  $f \in V_1(D)$ , let  $e$  be an in-neighbor of  $f$ . If  $f \notin V_1(B)$ , there is an out-neighbor  $f^+$  of  $f$  which is not  $e$ , since  $D$  is 2-arc-strong. Add arcs  $ef$  and  $ff^+$  to  $B$ . If  $f \in V_1(B)$ , which means there are arcs  $f^-f, ff^+ \in B$ , then replace  $f^-f$  with  $ef$  and replace  $ff^+$  with  $ff'$ , where  $f'$  is another out-neighbor of  $f$ , if  $f^+ = e$ . We use  $B \leftarrow \{ef, ff^+\}$  to denote this operation.

### 3.2.1 $|C_p| = 1$

If  $(\beta 1)$  or  $(\beta 3)$  occurs, then it can only be  $(\beta 1)$ . And we have  $C_p = \{b\}$ ,  $C_{p-1} = \{a\}$ ,  $d_{D[V_2]+C}^+(a) = 1$ , where  $ab$  is the cut-arc in  $D[V_2] + \bar{A}_{Q_1, Q_2}(B) + \bar{B}$ . We may assume  $Q_1 = bb_1b_1^+Q_1[b_1^+, Y]$ ,  $Q_2 = bb_2b_2^+Q_2[b_2^+, Y]$ , where  $b_1, b_2 \in V_1$ ,  $a \notin V(Q_1)$ ,  $a \notin V(Q_2)$ . As  $D$  is 2-arc-strong, there is another out-neighbor of  $a$ , say  $u$ . And  $u \in V_1$  since  $a$  has exactly one out-neighbor in  $V_2$ . We give the following procedures to avoid  $(\beta 1)$ .

**(B1).** When  $u \notin V_{Q_1, Q_2}$ :

Let  $B_{\text{new}} := B \leftarrow \{au, uu^+\}$ . Observe that  $V_{Q_1, Q_2}(B_{\text{new}}) \cap V_1(B_{\text{new}}) = \emptyset$ , so there is an  $(X, Y)_{B_{\text{new}}}$ -critical path pair  $\{Q_3, Q_4\}$  such that  $A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}}) \subseteq A_{Q_1, Q_2}(B_{\text{new}})$ . Let  $G_{\text{new}}$  be  $D[V_2] + B_{\text{new}} + A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}})$ . In this case,  $d_{G_{\text{new}}}^+(a) \geq 2$  which avoids  $(\beta 1)$ .

Additionally, Remark 3.3 applies here as do the following procedures from **(B2)** to **(D5)**. Therefore, either  $|A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}})| < |A_{Q_1, Q_2}(B)|$  or for each vertex  $v \in V_2 \setminus \{a\}$ , we have  $d_{\bar{G}}^-(v) \leq d_{\bar{G}_{\text{new}}}^-(v)$ , and  $V_1(B) \subseteq V_1(B_{\text{new}})$ .

**(B2).** When there exists  $i \in [2]$  such that  $u \in Q_i$ , and  $b_i \neq u$ :

If  $u \in V_1(B)$ , we define  $B_{\text{new}} := B \leftarrow \{au, uu^+\}$ , and if  $u \notin V_1(B)$ , we define  $B_{\text{new}} := B$ . Let  $Q'_i = bb_i b_i^+ au Q_i[u, Y]$ , observe that  $Q'_i$  is arc-disjoint with  $Q_{3-i}$ , and  $V_{Q'_{3-i}, Q'_i}(B_{\text{new}}) \cap V_1(B_{\text{new}}) = \emptyset$ , so there is an  $(X, Y)_{B_{\text{new}}}$ -critical path pair  $\{Q_3, Q_4\}$  such that  $A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}}) \subseteq A_{Q_{3-i}, Q'_i}(B_{\text{new}})$ .

Let  $G_{\text{new}} := D[V_2] + B_{\text{new}} + A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}})$ . If  $au \notin G_{\text{new}}$ , then  $B_{\text{new}} = B$ ,  $A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B) \subsetneq A_{Q_1, Q_2}(B)$  as  $u^-u \notin A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B)$ , which contradicts to the fact that  $\{Q_1, Q_2\}$  is  $(X, Y)_B$ -critical. So, we have  $au \in G_{\text{new}}$ , then we have  $d_{G_{\text{new}}}^+(a) \geq 2$ , which avoids  $(\beta 1)$ .

**If (B1)-(B2) do not occur for all  $u \in V_1 \cap N_D^+(a)$ , then we have  $N_D^+(a) \cap V_1 \subseteq \{b_1, b_2\}$ . If  $b_i \in N_D^+(a) \cap V_1$  for some  $i \in [2]$ , we have  $b_i \notin Q_{3-i}$ , since if  $b_i \in Q_{3-i}$ , this makes **(B2)** occur as  $b_1 \neq b_2$ . Then we enter the following procedures.**

**(B3).** When there exists another out-neighbor  $b_3 \neq b_1, b_2$  of  $b$ :



As  $N_D^+(a) \cap V_1 \neq \emptyset$ , there exists  $i \in [2]$ , such that  $b_i \in N_D^+(a) \cap V_1$ . Like **(A4)** and **(A5)**, firstly, we get  $B_{\text{new}}$  from  $B$  by doing the following two operations.

- $B \leftarrow \{ab_i, b_i b_i^+\}$ .
- If  $b_3 \notin V_{Q_1, Q_2}(B)$ , then  $B \leftarrow \{bb_3, b_3 b_3^+\}$ . And if  $b_3 \in V_{Q_1, Q_2}(B)$ , then we do nothing.

If  $b_3 \notin Q_1, Q_2$ , then let  $Q'_i = bb_3 b_3^+ ab_i Q_i[b_i, Y]$  ( $b_3^+$  can be  $a$ , or in  $Y$ ),  $Q'_{3-i} = Q_{3-i}$ .

If  $b_3 \in Q_i$ , then let  $Q'_i = bb_3 Q_i[b_3, Y]$ ,  $Q'_{3-i} = Q_{3-i}$ .

If  $b_3 \notin Q_i, b_3 \in Q_{3-i}$ , then let  $Q'_i = bb_3 Q_{3-i}[b_3, Y]$ ,  $Q'_{3-i} = bb_{3-i} b_{3-i}^+ ab_i Q_i[b_i, Y]$  ( $b_{3-i}^+$  can be in  $Y$ ).

Observe that  $Q'_1$  is arc-disjoint with  $Q'_2$ , and  $V_{Q'_1, Q'_2}(B_{\text{new}}) \cap V_1(B_{\text{new}}) = \emptyset$ , so there an  $(X, Y)_{B_{\text{new}}}$ -critical path pair  $\{Q_3, Q_4\}$  such that  $A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}}) \subseteq A_{Q'_1, Q'_2}(B_{\text{new}})$ . Let  $G_{\text{new}} := D[V_2] + B_{\text{new}} + A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}})$ . We have  $d_{G_{\text{new}}}^+(a) \geq 2$ , which avoids  $(\beta 1)$ , as  $ab_i \in B_{\text{new}}$ .

**(B4)**. When  $N_D^+(b) = \{b_1, b_2\}$ , and  $N_D^+(a) \cap V_1 = \{b_i\}$  for some  $i \in [2]$ :

If  $N_D^+(b_i) = \{b_i^+, a\}$ ,  $N_D^-(b_i) = \{a, b\}$ , note that  $D$  satisfies the structure in Lemma 2.11. Therefore,  $D$  has no strong arc decomposition.

If there exists  $w \in N_D^+(b_i) \setminus \{b_i^+, a\}$  or if  $N_D^+(b_i) = \{b_i^+, a\}$  and there exists  $w \in N_D^-(b_i) \setminus \{a, b\}$ , then we additionally add two parallel arcs  $ba$  and another arc  $ab$  to  $D[V_2]$ . Let  $B_{\text{new}} = B \leftarrow \{ab_i, b_i b_i^+\}$ , and we can check  $\{Q_3 = Q_1, Q_4 = Q_2\}$  is an  $(X, Y)_{B_{\text{new}}}$ -critical path pair, and let  $G_{\text{new}} := D[V_2] + B_{\text{new}} + A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}})$ . We have  $d_{G_{\text{new}}}^+(a) \geq 2$ , which avoids  $(\beta 1)$ . Compared with the case  $D[V_2]$  is strong but not 2-arc-strong, if we regard vertex  $a$  as  $x_1$ ,  $b$  as  $x_2$ ,  $b_i$  as  $t$ , 2-path  $bb_{3-i} b_{3-i}^+$  as arc  $x_2 y_2$ , then what we do here is indeed the same as those in **(A6)** and **(A7)**. Let  $R := \{b_i\}$ , we call it optional vertex set.

**(B5)**. When  $N_D^+(b) = \{b_1, b_2\}$ ,  $N_D^+(a) \cap V_1 = \{b_1, b_2\}$ , and  $N_D^+(b_i) = \{b_i^+, a\}$ ,  $N_D^-(b_i) = \{a, b\}$  for all  $i \in [2]$ :

We additionally add two parallel arcs  $ba$  and another arc  $ab$  to  $D[V_2]$ . Let  $B_{\text{new}} = (B \leftarrow \{ab_1, b_1 b_1^+\}) \leftarrow \{ab_2, b_2 b_2^+\}$ ,  $Q_3 = bab_1 Q_1[b_1, Y]$ ,  $Q_4 = bab_2 Q_2[b_2, Y]$ . Observe that  $\{Q_3, Q_4\}$  is  $(X, Y)_{B_{\text{new}}}$ -critical path pair, we define  $G_{\text{new}} := D[V_2] + B_{\text{new}} + A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}})$ .

**(B6)**. When  $N_D^+(b) = \{b_1, b_2\}$ ,  $N_D^+(a) \cap V_1 = \{b_1, b_2\}$ , and not in **(B5)**:

Let  $R$  be th optional vertex set defined as  $R := \{b_i \mid i \in [2], \text{ such that } N_D^+(b_i) \neq \{b_i^+, a\} \text{ or } N_D^-(b_i) \neq \{a, b\}\}$ . Note that  $R \neq \emptyset$ , otherwise we are in case **(B5)**. Then, we proceed by applying the same operations as those in **(B4)** for some  $b_i \in R$ . Note that the choice of  $b_i$  depends on additional considerations related to  $(\beta 2)$  and  $(\beta 4)$ .

### 3.2.2 $|C_p| = 2$

If  $(\beta 1)$  or  $(\beta 3)$  occurs, then it must be  $(\beta 3)$ . Since  $C_p$  is strong, then  $D[C_p]$  forms a 2-cycle. As  $G$  has a cut-arc in  $D[C_p]$ , we can deduce that paths  $Q_1$  and  $Q_2$  must share the same initial vertex, denoted  $b$ , and another vertex in  $C_p$  is denoted  $a$ . Observe that only  $ab$  can be the cut-arc and the out-degree of  $a$  in  $G$  must be 1, so if we can prove  $d_{G_{\text{new}}}^+(a) \geq 2$ ,  $d_{G_{\text{new}}}^+(b) \geq 2$  for the  $G_{\text{new}}$  we get in the following, then we can avoid  $(\beta 3)$ . As  $D$  is 2-arc-strong, we have  $u \in N_D^+(a) \cap V_1$ , we proceed with the following operations:

(C1). When  $u \notin V_{Q_1, Q_2}$ :

Let  $B_{\text{new}} := B \leftarrow \{au, uu^+\}$ . Observe that  $V_{Q_1, Q_2}(B_{\text{new}}) \cap V_1(B_{\text{new}}) = \emptyset$ , so there is a  $(X, Y)_{B_{\text{new}}}$ -critical path pair  $\{Q_3, Q_4\}$  such that  $A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}}) \subseteq A_{Q_1, Q_2}(B)$ . Let  $G_{\text{new}}$  be  $D[V_2] + B_{\text{new}} + A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}})$ .

In this case,  $d_{G_{\text{new}}}^+(a) = 2, d_{G_{\text{new}}}^+(b) \geq 2$  which avoids  $(\beta 3)$  as  $au \in B_{\text{new}}$ .

(C2). When  $u \in V_{Q_1, Q_2}$ :

There exists  $i \in [2]$  such that  $u \in Q_i$ . If  $u \in V_1(B)$ , we define  $B_{\text{new}} := B \leftarrow \{au, uu^+\}$ , and if  $u \notin V_1(B)$ , we define  $B_{\text{new}} := B$ . Let  $Q'_i = auQ_i[u, Y]$ , observe that  $Q'_i$  is arc-disjoint with  $Q_{3-i}$  and  $V_{Q'_i, Q_{3-i}}(B_{\text{new}}) \cap V_1(B_{\text{new}}) = \emptyset$ , so there is an  $(X, Y)_{B_{\text{new}}}$ -critical path pair  $\{Q_3, Q_4\}$  such that  $A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}}) \subseteq A_{Q_{3-i}, Q'_i}(B_{\text{new}})$ .

Let  $G_{\text{new}} := D[V_2] + B_{\text{new}} + A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}})$ .

If  $au \notin G_{\text{new}}$ , then  $B_{\text{new}} = B$ ,  $A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B) \subsetneq A_{Q_1, Q_2}(B)$  as  $u^-u \notin A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B)$ , which contradicts to the fact that  $\{Q_1, Q_2\}$  is  $(X, Y)_B$ -critical. So, we have  $au \in G_{\text{new}}$ , then we have  $d_{G_{\text{new}}}^+(a) = 2, d_{G_{\text{new}}}^+(b) \geq 2$ , which avoids  $(\beta 3)$ .

### 3.2.3 $|C_p| = 3$

If either  $(\beta 1)$  or  $(\beta 3)$  occurs, it must specifically be  $(\beta 3)$ . There exists a 3-cycle  $abca$  in  $D[C_p]$ . We can perform preliminary operations on  $Q_1, Q_2$  to obtain a somewhat ‘minimal’  $(X, Y)$ -path pair.

(D0). We may assume that  $Q_1 = q_1q_1^+Q_1[q_1^+, Y], Q_2 = q_2q_2^+Q_2[q_2^+, Y]$  (The vertices  $q_1$  and  $q_2$  are allowed to coincide). If, for  $v \in \{a, b, c\}$ , there exists  $u \in (V_1(Q_i) \setminus \{q_i^+\}) \cap N^+(v)$  for some  $i \in [2]$  and  $vu \neq q_{3-i}q_{3-i}^+$ , then there exists  $u^-$  such that  $u^-u \in A(Q_i)$ . If  $u^-u \in B$ , we replace  $u^-u$  with  $vu$  in  $B$  to get  $B_{\text{new}}$ , and if  $u^-u \notin B$ , we define  $B_{\text{new}} := B$ . For this  $i$ , let  $Q'_i = vuQ_i[u, Y]$ , observe that  $Q'_i$  is arc-disjoint with  $Q_{3-i}$  and  $V_{Q'_i, Q_{3-i}}(B_{\text{new}}) \cap V_1(B_{\text{new}}) = \emptyset$ , there exists an  $(X, Y)_{B_{\text{new}}}$ -critical path pair  $\{Q_3, Q_4\}$  such that  $A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}}) \subseteq A_{Q_{3-i}, Q'_i}(B_{\text{new}})$ . And we choose  $Q_3 = Q_{3-i}, Q_4 = Q'_i$  if  $\{Q'_i, Q_{3-i}\}$  is already an  $(X, Y)_{B_{\text{new}}}$ -critical path pair. Let  $G_{\text{new}} := D[V_2] + B_{\text{new}} + A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}})$ . In the end, we rename  $G_{\text{new}}$  as  $G$ ,  $B_{\text{new}}$  as  $B$ ,  $\{Q_3, Q_4\}$  as  $\{Q_1, Q_2\}$ . We repeat the above process until we can not find such vertices  $v$  and  $u$ .

**Claim 4.** *Procedure (D0) will stop in some  $G$ .*

*Proof.* Observe that  $|A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}})| \leq |A_{Q'_i, Q_{3-i}}(B_{\text{new}})| \leq |A_{Q_1, Q_2}(B)|$ . If  $|A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}})| = |A_{Q_1, Q_2}(B)|$ , then  $A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}}) = A_{Q'_i, Q_{3-i}}(B_{\text{new}})$ , so we have that  $Q_3 = Q_{3-i}, Q_4 = Q'_i$  and  $|A_{Q_3, Q_4}| < |A_{Q_i, Q_{3-i}}|$ . Since the original  $|A_{Q_1, Q_2}|$  is bounded, the process of repeating (D0) will end in a finite number of repetitions if  $|A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}})| = |A_{Q_1, Q_2}(B)|$  always holds. Thus, if the claim does not hold, then the event that  $|A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}})| < |A_{Q_1, Q_2}(B)|$  will occur infinitely, which contradicts that the original  $|A_{Q_1, Q_2}(B)|$  is bounded.  $\square$

**Observation 3.7.** *After (D0), for any  $v \in \{a, b, c\}$ , if there exists  $u \in N_D^+(v) \cap V_{Q_1, Q_2}$ , then  $u \in \{q_1^+, q_2^+\}$ , where  $Q_1 = q_1q_1^+Q_1[q_1^+, Y], Q_2 = q_2q_2^+Q_2[q_2^+, Y]$ .*

**Observation 3.8.** *As  $\{Q_1, Q_2\}$  is an  $(X, Y)_B$ -critical path pair, we have at least one of  $q_1^+, q_2^+$  will not appear in another path if  $q_1^+ \neq q_2^+$ , where  $Q_1 = q_1q_1^+Q_1[q_1^+, Y], Q_2 = q_2q_2^+Q_2[q_2^+, Y]$ .*

**Observation 3.9.** For  $G = D[V_2] + B + A_{Q_1, Q_2}(B)$  with  $Q_1 = q_1 q_1^+ Q_1[q_1^+, Y]$ ,  $Q_2 = q_2 q_2^+ Q_2[q_2^+, Y]$ , let  $B_{\text{new}} := B \leftarrow \{q_3 q_i^+, q_i^+ q_i^{++}\}$  if  $q_i^+ \in V_1(B)$  and  $B_{\text{new}} := B$  if  $q_i^+ \notin V_1(B)$  for some  $q_3 \in X$ ,  $q_3 \neq q_i$ , then  $\{Q_3, Q_4\}$  is an  $(X, Y)_{B_{\text{new}}}$ -critical path pair, where  $Q_3 = q_3 q_i^+ Q_i[q_i^+, Y]$ ,  $Q_4 = q_{3-i} q_{3-i}^+ Q_{3-i}[q_{3-i}^+, Y]$ . Because we just replace an initial vertex of some  $Q_i$ ,  $i \in [2]$ , with another vertex in  $X$ . In the following context, when we use this observation, we may omit to define  $B_{\text{new}}$  and  $Q_3, Q_4$  for simplicity.

If  $(\beta 3)$  still occurs after **(D0)**, we enter one of the following procedures for different conditions.

**(D1).** The initials of  $Q_1, Q_2$  are same, says  $a$ , and  $(N_D^+(b) \cup N_D^+(c)) \cap V_{Q_1, Q_2} = \emptyset$ :

We may assume  $Q_1 = aa_1 a_1^+ Q_1[a_1^+, Y]$ ,  $Q_2 = aa_2 a_2^+ Q_2[a_2^+, Y]$ . By observation 3.8, there exists  $i \in [2]$ , such that  $a_i \notin V_1(Q_{3-i})$ , we move  $aa_i, a_i a_i^+$  to  $B$  if they belong to  $A_{Q_1, Q_2}(B)$ .

(a) When  $ba \in D$ , as  $(\beta 3)$  occurs, we have  $cb \notin D[C_p]$  and  $d_G^+(c) = 1$ ,  $ca$  is the cut-arc. There is another out-neighbor of  $c$  in  $V_1$ , which says  $u$ .  $B_{\text{new}} := B \leftarrow \{cu, uu^+\}$ . We can find an  $(X, Y)_{B_{\text{new}}}$ -critical path pair  $\{Q_3, Q_4\}$  such that  $A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}}) \subseteq A_{Q_1, Q_2}(B_{\text{new}})$ . Let  $G_{\text{new}} := D[V_2] + B_{\text{new}} + A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}})$ . This avoids  $(\beta 3)$  as  $\{aa_i, aa_i^+, cu, uu^+\} \subseteq B_{\text{new}}$ .

(b) When  $ba \notin D$ :

If for any  $u \in N_D^+(b) \cap V_1$ ,  $N_D^+(u) = \{b, c\}$ , then there exist two distinct vertices  $u_1, u_2 \in V_1$ , such that  $bu_1, u_1 c, cu_2, u_2 u_2^+ \in D$ , where  $u_2^+ \in V_2 \setminus \{b, c\}$  as there is another  $(\{b, c\}, V_2 \setminus \{b, c\})$ -path, besides the arc  $ca$ . Let  $B_{\text{new}} := (B \leftarrow \{bu_1, u_1 c\}) \leftarrow \{cu_2, u_2 u_2^+\}$ . We can find an  $(X, Y)_{B_{\text{new}}}$ -critical path pair  $\{Q_3, Q_4\}$  such that  $A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}}) \subseteq A_{Q_1, Q_2}(B_{\text{new}})$ . Let  $G_{\text{new}} := D[V_2] + B_{\text{new}} + A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}})$ . As  $\{aa_i, aa_i^+, bu_1, u_1 c, cu_2, u_2 u_2^+\} \subseteq B_{\text{new}}$ , we avoid  $(\beta 3)$ .

If not, then there exists a vertex  $u \in N_D^+(b) \cap V_1$ , and it has an out-neighbor  $u^+ \in V_2 \setminus \{b, c\}$ . let  $B_{\text{new}} := B \leftarrow \{bu, uu^+\}$ . We can find an  $(X, Y)_{B_{\text{new}}}$ -critical path pair  $\{Q_3, Q_4\}$  such that  $A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}}) \subseteq A_{Q_1, Q_2}(B_{\text{new}})$ . Let  $G_{\text{new}} := D[V_2] + B_{\text{new}} + A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}})$ . And if  $(\beta 3)$  still occurs for  $G_{\text{new}}$ , then we have  $cb \notin D$ , and  $N_{G_{\text{new}}}^+(c) = 1$ . We regard  $G_{\text{new}}$  as  $G$ ,  $b$  as  $x_1$ ,  $c$  as  $x_2$ ,  $u$  as  $t$  and enter the procedures of **(A1)**-**(A8)** to get the new  $G_{\text{new}}$  or enter a counterexample.

Initially, we move  $\{aa_i, aa_i^+\} \subseteq B$ . As  $a_i \notin N_D^+(b) \cup N_D^+(c)$ , we have never removed these two arcs from  $B$  when we enter **(A1)**-**(A7)**. So, we can avoid  $(\beta 3)$  now as there are two arc-disjoint  $(\{b\}, Y)$ -paths and  $d_{G_{\text{new}}}^+(c) \geq 2$ . Note that if we enter **(A6)** or **(A7)**, then we define optional vertex set  $R := \{u\}$ .

**(D2).** The initials of  $Q_1, Q_2$  are same, says  $a$ , and  $(N^+(b) \cup N^+(c)) \cap V_{Q_1, Q_2} \neq \emptyset$ :

We may assume that  $Q_1 = aa_1 Q_1[a_1, Y]$ ,  $Q_2 = aa_2 Q_2[a_2, Y]$ . As what we did in **(D0)**, we have  $(N^+(b) \cup N^+(c)) \cap V_{Q_1, Q_2} \in \{a_1, a_2\}$ . If there exists  $i \in [2]$ , such that  $a_i$  is an out-neighbor of  $b$ , then we replace  $aa_i$  in  $G$  with  $ba_i$  to get  $G_{\text{new}}$ . If not, then there exists  $i \in [2]$ , such that  $a_i$  is an out-neighbor of  $c$ , we replace  $aa_i$  in  $G$  with  $ca_i$  to get  $G_{\text{new}}$ .

Now the initials of  $Q_3, Q_4$  are different and  $\{Q_3, Q_4\}$  is still  $(X, Y)_{B_{\text{new}}}$ -critical path pair by Observation 3.9, and if  $(\beta 3)$  still occurs for  $G_{\text{new}}$ , we rename  $G_{\text{new}}$  as  $G$ ,  $B_{\text{new}}$  as  $B$ ,  $\{Q_3, Q_4\}$  as  $\{Q_1, Q_2\}$  and do one of the following operations.

**In the following cases, the initials of  $Q_1, Q_2$  are different, we may assume  $Q_1 = aa_1 a_1^+ Q_1[a_1^+, Y]$ ,  $Q_2 = bb_1 b_1^+ Q_2[b_1^+, Y]$  by relabeling the name of  $a, b, c$ . Besides, as**

( $\beta 3$ ) occurs for  $G$ , we have  $d_{G_{\text{new}}}^+(c) = 1, cb \notin D$ . And as what we did in (D0), if there is an out-neighbor  $u$  of some vertex in  $\{a, b, c\}$ , such that  $u \in V_{Q_1, Q_2}$ , then it must be  $a_1$  or  $b_1$ .

(D3). When there exists  $u \in N_D^+(c) \cap V_1$ , such that  $u \notin V_{Q_1, Q_2}$ :

Let  $B_{\text{new}} := B \leftarrow \{cu, uu^+\}$ , we can find an  $(X, Y)_{B_{\text{new}}}$ -critical path pair  $\{Q_3, Q_4\}$  such that  $A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}}) \subseteq A_{Q_1, Q_2}(B_{\text{new}})$ . Let  $G_{\text{new}} := D[V_2] + B_{\text{new}} + A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}})$ .

If ( $\beta 3$ ) still occurs for  $G_{\text{new}}$ , then we have  $A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}}) \subsetneq A_{Q_1, Q_2}(B_{\text{new}})$ , which means  $|A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}})| < |A_{Q_1, Q_2}(B_{\text{new}})|$ . Then we rename  $G_{\text{new}}$  as  $G$ ,  $B_{\text{new}}$  as  $B$ ,  $\{Q_3, Q_4\}$  as  $\{Q_1, Q_2\}$  and repeat the whole process from (D0).

(D4). When  $N_D^+(c) \cap V_1 \subseteq V_{Q_1, Q_2}$ , and  $a_1 = b_1$ :

As what we did in (D0), we have  $N_D^+(c) \cap V_1 = \{a_1\}$ .

If there exists  $x \in \{a, b\}$ , such that there exists  $u \in N_D^+(x) \cap V_1, u \neq a_1$ , then as what we do in (D0), we have  $u \notin V_{Q_1, Q_2}$ . We replace  $xa_1$  with  $ca_1$  in  $G$  to obtain  $G_{\text{new}}$ , and if ( $\beta 3$ ) still occurs, then we relabel the name of  $a, b, c$  and enter (D3).

If  $N_D^+(a) \cap V_1 = N_D^+(b) \cap V_1 = N_D^+(c) \cap V_1 = \{a_1\}$ , then we add additional arcs  $ab, bc, ca$  to  $D[V_2]$  to get  $G_{\text{new}}$ .

(D5). When  $N_D^+(c) \cap V_1 \subseteq V_{Q_1, Q_2}$ , and  $a_1 \neq b_1$ :

If  $N_D^+(c) \cap V_1 = \{a_1\}$ , we replace  $aa_1$  in  $G$  with  $ca_1$  to get  $G_{\text{new}}$  by Observation 3.9, if ( $\beta 3$ ) still occurs for  $G_{\text{new}}$ , we rename  $G_{\text{new}}$  as  $G$ ,  $B_{\text{new}}$  as  $B$ ,  $\{Q_3, Q_4\}$  as  $\{Q_1, Q_2\}$ , and we relabel  $a, b, c$  to fit the conditions, then we enter (D3) or enter (D5) with  $b_1 \in N_D^+(c)$ . Thus, We can always assume  $b_1 \in N_D^+(c)$ .

If  $ba \in D$ , then we replace  $bb_1$  with  $cb_1$  in  $G$  to get  $G_{\text{new}}$  by Observation 3.9, which avoid ( $\beta 3$ ), so we may assume  $ba \notin D$ .

If there exists  $u \in N_D^+(b) \cap V_1, u \notin \{a_1, b_1\}$ , we replace  $bb_1$  in  $G$  with  $cb_1$  to get  $G_{\text{new}}$  by Observation 3.9, if ( $\beta 3$ ) still occurs for  $G_{\text{new}}$ , we rename  $G_{\text{new}}$  as  $G$ ,  $B_{\text{new}}$  as  $B$ ,  $\{Q_3, Q_4\}$  as  $\{Q_1, Q_2\}$ , and we relabel  $a, b, c$  to fit the conditions, so we enter (D3) by Observation 3.7.

Now, we consider the following two cases with  $ba \notin D, N_D^+(b) \cap V_1 \subseteq \{a_1, b_1\}$ .

(a) When  $N_D^+(c) \cap V_1 = \{b_1\}$ :

If  $N_D^+(b) \cap V_1 = \{b_1\}$ , then we regard  $b$  as  $x_1, c$  as  $x_2, b_1$  as  $t$ , and same arguments as those in (A6), (A7) and (A8) as  $b_1 \notin V(Q_1)$  by (D0). And if it is the case like (A6), (A7), then we define optional vertex set  $R := \{b_1\}$

If  $N_D^+(b) \cap V_1 = \{a_1, b_1\}$ , and if  $ac \in D$ , then we replace  $bb_1$  with  $cb_1, aa_1$  with  $ba_1$  in  $G$  to get  $G_{\text{new}}$  by Observation 3.9, which avoid ( $\beta 3$ ), so we may assume  $ac \notin D$ .

i. When there exists  $u \in N_D^+(a) \cap V_1, u \notin \{a_1, b_1\}$ , we replace  $bb_1$  with  $cb_1, aa_1$  with  $ba_1$  in  $G$  to get  $G_{\text{new}}$  by Observation 3.9, and we relabel  $a, b, c$  to fit the conditions and enter (D3) by Observation 3.7.

ii. When  $N_D^+(a) \cap V_1 \subseteq \{a_1, b_1\}$ . If it is in the case we illustrate in Lemma 3.12, then  $D$  has no strong arc decomposition.

If not, as (B6), we define  $R \subseteq \{a_1, b_1\}$ , such that if  $a_1$  satisfies  $N_D^+(a_1) \neq \{a_1^+, a\}$  or  $N_D^-(a_1) \neq \{a, b\}$ , then  $a_1 \in R$  and if  $b_1$  satisfies  $N_D^+(b_1) \neq \{b_1^+, b\}$  or  $N_D^-(b_1) \neq \{b, c\}$ ,

then  $b_1 \in R$ , we call  $R$  optional vertex set. Note that  $R \neq \emptyset$ , otherwise it is in the case we illustrate in Lemma 3.12.

We choose a vertex in  $R$ , and do the following operation to avoid  $(\beta 3)$ . Note that the choice of vertex depends on another side which is related to  $(\beta 2)$  and  $(\beta 4)$

As what we do in **(D0)**, we have  $a_1 \notin V(Q_2), b_1 \notin V(Q_1)$ .

If we choose  $b_1$ , let  $B \leftarrow \{aa_1, a_1a_1^+\}$ , then we regard  $b$  as  $x_1$ ,  $c$  as  $x_2$ ,  $b_1$  as  $t$ , and same arguments as those in **(A6)** and **(A7)**. If we choose  $a_1$ , let  $B \leftarrow \{cb_1, b_1b_1^+\}$ , then we regard  $a$  as  $x_1$ ,  $b$  as  $x_2$ ,  $a_1$  as  $t$ , and same operations as those in **(A6)** and **(A7)**.

(b) When  $N_D^+(c) \cap V_1 = \{a_1, b_1\}$ :

If  $ac \in D$ , then we replace  $aa_1$  with  $ca_1$  in  $G$  to get  $G_{\text{new}}$  by Observation 3.9, which avoid  $(\beta 3)$ , so we may assume  $ac \notin D$ .

- i. If there exists  $u \in N_D^+(a) \cap V_1, u \notin \{a_1, b_1\}$ , we replace  $aa_1$  with  $ca_1$  in  $G$  to get  $G_{\text{new}}$  by Observation 3.9, if  $(\beta 3)$  still occurs for  $G_{\text{new}}$ , we rename  $G_{\text{new}}$  as  $G$ ,  $B_{\text{new}}$  as  $B$ ,  $\{Q_3, Q_4\}$  as  $\{Q_1, Q_2\}$ , and we relabel  $a, b, c$  to fit the conditions, so we enter **(D3)** by Observation 3.7.
- ii. If  $N_D^+(a) \cap V_1 = \{a_1\}$ , then we replace  $aa_1$  in  $D$  with  $ca_1$  to get  $G_{\text{new}}$  by Observation 3.9, if  $(\beta 3)$  still occurs for  $G_{\text{new}}$ , we rename  $G_{\text{new}}$  as  $G$ ,  $B_{\text{new}}$  as  $B$ ,  $\{Q_3, Q_4\}$  as  $\{Q_1, Q_2\}$ , and we relabel  $a, b, c$  to fit the conditions, then enter **(D5)a)**.
- iii. If  $N_D^+(a) \cap V_1 = \{a_1, b_1\}$ . As this is not the case we illustrate in Lemma 3.12, then we do similar operations to those in **(D5)(a)ii)**, which is:

As **(B6)**, we define  $R \subseteq \{a_1, b_1\}$ , such that  $b_1 \in R$  and if  $a_1$  satisfies  $N_D^+(a_1) \neq \{a_1^+, c\}$  or  $N_D^-(a_1) \neq \{a, c\}$ , then  $a_1 \in R$ . We call  $R$  optional vertex set.

We choose a vertex in  $R$ , and do the following operation to avoid  $(\beta 3)$ . Note that the choice of vertex depends on another side which is related to  $(\beta 2)$  and  $(\beta 4)$

As what we do in **(D0)**, we have  $a_1 \notin V(Q_2), b_1 \notin V(Q_1)$ .

If we choose  $b_1$ , let  $B \leftarrow \{aa_1, a_1a_1^+\}$ , then we regard  $b$  as  $x_1$ ,  $c$  as  $x_2$ ,  $b_1$  as  $t$ , and same arguments as those in **(A6)** and **(A7)**. If we choose  $a_1$ , replace  $aa_1$  with  $ca_1$  in  $G$ , let  $B \leftarrow \{bb_1, b_1b_1^+\}$ , then we regard  $c$  as  $x_1$ ,  $a$  as  $x_2$ ,  $a_1$  as  $t$ , and do the same operations as those in **(A6)** and **(A7)**.

**Remark 3.10.** If a loop occurs, it will involve passing through **(D3)**. Since we can only enter **(D3)** a finite number of times, there will be no infinite loop. This is ensured because each entry into **(D3)** decreases  $|A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}})|$  compared to  $|A_{Q_1, Q_2}(B)|$  if it is not the final entry. Specifically,  $|A_{Q_1, Q_2}(B)|$  does not increase at any step in this paper.

### 3.2.4 $|C_p| \geq 4$

If  $(\beta 1)$  or  $(\beta 3)$  occurs, then it can only be  $(\beta 3)$ . In this case,  $X = U_\ell$ . Like Lemma 3.1, if there is cut-arc  $xy \in A(D[C_p])$ , then there is no path in form  $x \rightarrow X \xrightarrow{Q_j} Y \rightarrow y$  in  $G \setminus xy$ , where  $xy \notin Q_j$  for some  $j \in [2]$ . Observe that there is always a path  $Y \rightarrow y$  as  $Y \subseteq C_1, y \in C_p$ , so by Lemma 3.1, we have  $X = U_\ell = \{x_1\}, U_{\ell-1} = \{y_1\} = \{x_2\} = \{x\}, d_G^+(x_2) = 1$ , then enter **(A1)-(A8)**.

### 3.2.5 Completion of the proof

We may use **(B1)\*-(D5)\*** to denote the symmetric procedures of **(B1)-(D5)** if  $(\beta 2)$  or  $(\beta 4)$  occurs, and denote by  $u^*$  the corresponding vertex of  $u$  ( $u$  is an arbitrary vertex). If  $D$  has the structure as we illustrated in Theorem 2.11 or Theorem 3.12, then  $D$  has no strong arc decomposition. If  $D$  has no such structure, then we do the following:

Like what we do when  $D[V_2]$  is strong but not 2-arc-strong, we can finally get a 2-arc-strong  $\bar{G}_{\text{new}}$  by repeating **(A1)-(D5)** and **(A1)\*-(D5)\***. The process can come to an end by the following claim.

**Claim 5.** *The process will eventually terminate.*

*Proof.* If the process does not terminate, the following event will occur infinitely often:  $(\beta 1)$  or  $(\beta 3)$  occurs for  $\bar{G}$  and  $(\beta 2)$  or  $(\beta 4)$  does not occur for  $\bar{G}$ . However, after **(A1)-(D5)**,  $(\beta 2)$  or  $(\beta 4)$  occurs for  $\bar{G}_{\text{new}}$ , that means in an infinite number of the repetitions of this event, we have  $|A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}})| = |A_{Q_1, Q_2}(B)|$ , because the original  $|A_{Q_1, Q_2}(B)|$  is bounded. However, this is impossible under the following two cases:

1. When  $|C_1| = 1, 2$  or  $|C_1| \geq 4$ , if  $(\beta 2)$  or  $(\beta 4)$  occurs, then  $d_{\bar{G}_{\text{new}}}^-(x) = 1$  for some  $x \in C_1$  or  $\{x\} = C_2, |C_1| = 1$ . And when  $|A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}})| = |A_{Q_1, Q_2}(B)|$ , we have that the in-degree of  $x$  will not decrease.
2. When  $|C_1| = \{a^*, b^*, c^*\}$ , if  $(\beta 4)$  does not occur for  $\bar{G}$  and  $|A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}})| = |A_{Q_1, Q_2}(B)|$ , we can deduce that  $d_{\bar{G}_{\text{new}}}^-(x) \geq 2$  for all  $x \in C_1$ , in addition, if  $(\beta 4)$  occurs for  $\bar{G}_{\text{new}}$  then we can deduce that the terminals of  $Q_3$  and  $Q_4$  are same, say  $a^*$ , and there is no arc from  $V_2 \setminus C_1$  to  $b^*, c^*$ . When  $|A_{Q_3, Q_4}(B_{\text{new}})| = |A_{Q_1, Q_2}(B)|$ , entering **(A1)-(D5)** will neither decrease the in-degree for all  $x \in C_1$ , nor produce a new arc with both side in  $C_1$ , we can deduce that  $(\beta 4)$  occurs for  $\bar{G}$ , which is a contradiction.

Thus, we can finally obtain a 2-arc-strong  $\bar{G}_{\text{new}}$  in a finite number of steps since the original  $|A_{Q_1, Q_2}|$  is bounded.  $\square$

When we encounter the optional vertex set  $R$  or  $R^*$ , we obey the following rules:

Without loss of generality, if we encounter  $R$  first, we randomly choose a vertex  $x$  in  $R$ . If we also encounter  $R^*$  later, we choose the same vertex  $x$  for  $R^*$  when  $x \in R^*$ ; otherwise, we randomly choose a vertex in  $R^*$ . Note that once we handle  $R$  ( $R^*$ ),  $(\beta 1)$  ( $(\beta 2)$ ) and  $(\beta 3)$  ( $(\beta 4)$ ) will not occur again in the remaining process. This follows from the proof of Claim 2.

If we have never added additional arcs to  $D[V_2]$ , then  $G_{\text{new}}$  is a subdigraph of  $D$ , and for  $|V_2| \geq 5$ ,  $\bar{G}_{\text{new}}$  has a strong arc decomposition by Theorem 1.2, and so  $D$  has a strong arc decomposition by Lemma 2.9.

If we add additional arcs to  $D[V_2]$ , then by the following lemma and Lemma 2.6,  $D$  has a strong arc decomposition.

**Lemma 3.11.** *For  $D$  with  $|V_2| \geq 4$  and  $D[V_2]$  is not strong. If additional arcs have been added to  $G_{\text{new}}$ , then we can find a pending decomposition of  $D$ .*

*Proof.* Note that sometimes we regard some vertices in the form of **(A6)** or **(A7)** to enter **(A6)** or **(A7)**, for convenience, we use the term ‘enter **(A6)** or **(A7)**’ in the following, though we are now dealing with the non-strong part.

We can see that adding additional arcs only occurs in cases like **(A6)**, **(A7)**, **(B5)**, **(D4)**, **(A6)\***, **(A7)\***, **(B5)\*** and **(D4)\***.

We may first assume we always added additional arcs in **(A1)**-**(D5)** by symmetry.

As we have added additional arcs in  $D[V_2]$ , such that there are two pairs of parallel arcs in the form of  $x_1x_2, x_2x_1$  or three pair of parallel arcs  $ab, bc, ca$  in  $\bar{G}_{\text{new}}$ , so  $\bar{G}_{\text{new}}$  is not isomorphic to the counterexamples in Theorem 1.2. Thus, we can find a strong arc decomposition  $\bar{G}_1$  and  $\bar{G}_2$  of  $\bar{G}_{\text{new}}$ . By lifting all splitting arcs in  $\bar{G}_1$  and  $\bar{G}_2$  to obtain  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ , which is a pending decomposition of  $D$  with the additional arcs by Remark 2.10. What to do next is to reallocate the arcs of  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  so that they are always strong. And we have the following: (For convenience, here we continue the case count from Lemma 3.4)

**Case 3:** We have added additional arcs for exact one time.

**Case 3.1:** If enter **(A6)** or **(A7)**, then we do **(1)**-**(4)** and the same proof in Case 1.1 and Case 1.2 in the proof of Lemma 3.4.

**Case 3.2:** If we enter **(B5)**, like **(1)**-**(3)** of Lemma 3.4, we may assume  $ab_1, b_1b_1^+ \in G_1, ab_2, b_2b_2^+ \in G_2$ . Let  $G_i$  contain 2-cycle  $aba$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . For any  $v \in V_2 \setminus \{a, b\}$ ,  $va \in A(G_i)$  and  $vb \in A(G_{3-i})$  for some  $i \in [2]$  since  $G_i$  contains a 2-cycle  $aba$  for  $i = [2]$ .

Remove the additional arcs  $ab, ba$  in  $G_1$ , and the additional arc  $ba$  in  $G_2$ . Add  $bb_2, b_2a$  to  $G_1$ ,  $bb_1, b_1a$  to  $G_2$ .

We want to show that by some reallocation of arcs in  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ , the resulting two graphs (we still call them  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  for convenience) are still strong and can make up a pending decomposition. In the following, we only move the arcs which are incident to  $a$  and  $b$ , in addition, for any vertex  $v \in V_2 \setminus \{a, b\}$ , once we move  $vx_i$  from  $G_j$  to  $G_{3-j}$ , then we move  $vx_{3-i}$  from  $G_{3-j}$  to  $G_j$  for  $i, j = [2]$ . After applying reallocation, we only need to check if there is an  $(a, b)$ -path and a  $(b, a)$ -path in  $G_i$  for  $i = [2]$  to make sure that both  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  remain strong.

Choose parallel arc  $b_1^+b$  in  $G_1$ ,  $b_1^+a$  in  $G_2$ ,  $b_2^+b$  in  $G_1$ ,  $b_2^+a$  in  $G_2$ , and there is no conflict if  $b_1^+ = b_2^+$ . It's obvious that there is an  $(a, b)$ -path and a  $(b, a)$ -path in  $G_i$  for  $i = [2]$ .

**Case 3.3:** If we enter **(D4)**, like **(1)**-**(3)** of Lemma 3.4, we may assume  $aa_1, a_1a_1^+ \in G_1, ba_1, a_1b_1^+ \in G_2$ . Let  $G_i$  contain 3-cycle  $abca$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . For any  $v \in V_2 \setminus \{a, b, c\}$ ,  $vv_1 \in A(G_1)$  and  $vv_2 \in A(G_2)$  for some  $v_1, v_2 \in \{a, b, c\}$  since  $G_i$  contains a 2-cycle  $aba$  for  $i = 1, 2$ .

Remove the additional arc  $ab$  from  $G_1$ , and the additional arcs  $bc, ca$  from  $G_2$ . Add  $ca_1$  to  $G_2$ .

What we do next is like Case 3.2.

Choose parallel arc  $a_1^+b$  in  $G_1$ ,  $a_1^+a, a_1^+c$  in  $G_2$ .  $b_1^+b$  in  $G_1$ ,  $b_1^+a, b_1^+c$  in  $G_2$ . It's obvious that there is an  $(a, b)$ -path, a  $(b, c)$ -path and a  $(c, a)$ -path in  $G_i$  for  $i = [2]$ .

See Figure 5 as an illustration.




Figure 5: An illustration of reduction in **(B5)**,**(D4)**, where red arcs are in  $G_1$ , green arcs are in  $G_2$ .

**Case 4:** We add additional arcs two times. We define  $S := \{t\}$  if we enter **(A6)** or **(A7)**,  $S := \{b_1, b_2\}$  if we enter **(B5)**,  $S := \{a_1\}$  if we enter **(D4)**, and so we can define the corresponding  $S^*$ .

**Case 4.1:** When  $S \cap S^* \neq \emptyset$ :

If we enter **(D4)**, then we must enter **(D4)\***, as there are 4 arcs incident to  $a_1$  in  $G_{\text{new}}$ , and for **(A6)\*** and **(A7)\***, there are only 2 arcs incident to  $t^*$ , for **(B5)**, there are only 2 arcs incident to both  $b_1^*$  and  $b_2^*$ . Firstly, we do the same operations as those in Case 3.3, and then we do the same operations as those in Case 3.3\*, where Case 3.3\* is the symmetric operation of Case 3.3. The reason why we can do this is that after Case 3.3,  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  are strong, and  $a_1^*c^*$  has not been used in  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ .

If we enter **(A7)**, then  $S \cap S^* \neq \emptyset$  is impossible, as for any vertex  $x$  in  $S^*$ ,  $x$  has at least two out-neighbors besides  $x_1, x_2$ , and  $t$  has only one out-neighbor besides  $x_1, x_2$ . For a similar reason, if we enter **(B5)**, then  $S \cap S^* \neq \emptyset$  is impossible.

The only remained case is that we enter **(A6)** and **(A6)\***. We do the same operations as those in **(1)-(4)** and Case 2.1 in Lemma 3.4.

**Case 4.2:** When  $S \cap S^* = \emptyset$  and we may assume we encounter  $R$  first by symmetry:

**Step 1.** We do the same arguments as those in Case 3.

**Step 2.** We do the same arguments as those in Case 3\*, where Case 3\* is the symmetric case of Case 3.

In every case from Case 1 to Case 4, we can always get a pending decomposition  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  of  $D$ , which meets our needs.

The reason why we can do the above two steps is that:

- If  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  are strong, and  $a_1^*c^*$  has not been used in  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ , then we can enter Case 3.3\*. This is guaranteed by  $S \cap S^* = \emptyset$ .
- If  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  are strong, and  $b_2^*b^*, a^*b_2^*, b_1^*b^*, a^*b_1^*$  have not been used in  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ , then we can enter Case 3.2\*. This is guaranteed by  $S \cap S^* = \emptyset$ .
- If  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  satisfy i)\*, ii)\*, iii)\* in Remark 3.5, we can enter Case 3.1\*. i)\* is guaranteed by  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  are strong. iii)\* is guaranteed by  $S \cap S^* = \emptyset$ . We may assume we choose  $x$  in  $R$ , as  $S \cap S^* = \emptyset$ , so  $x \notin R^*$  and this guarantees ii)\*.

□



**Lemma 3.12.** *Let  $D = (V_1, V_2; A)$  be a 2-arc-strong split digraph with  $|V_2(D)| \geq 4$  and  $D[V_2]$  is not strong, which means it has the acyclic ordering of its strong component  $C_1, \dots, C_p$  ( $p \geq 2$ ). If  $D$  has a copy of at least one of the following structures, then  $D$  has no strong arc decomposition.*

- $D[C_p]$  is a 3-cycle, say  $abca$ , and there exists  $u, v \in V_1$ , such that  $N_D^+(b) = \{u, v, c\}$ ,  $N_D^+(c) = \{v, a\}$ ,  $N_D^+(a) = \{u, b\}$ ,  $N_D^+(u) = \{a, u^+\}$ ,  $N_D^+(v) = \{b, v^+\}$ , where  $u^+, v^+ \in V_2 \setminus C_p$ , and they can be the same one, besides,  $N_D^-(u) = \{a, b\}$ ,  $N_D^-(v) = \{b, c\}$ .
- Reversing arcs in the first case.

*Proof.* If the first case occurs, suppose to the contrary that  $D$  has a strong arc decomposition  $D_1, D_2$  and we may assume  $au \in D_1$  and  $ab \in D_2$  as  $d_D^+(a) = 2$ . Since  $d_D^-(u) = 2, d_D^+(u) = 2$ , we have  $uu^+ \in D_1, bu, ua \in D_2$ , otherwise there is no out-arc of  $\{a, u\}$  in  $D_1$ . Besides, we have  $vv^+ \in D_2$  as there is a  $(\{a, b, c\}, V_2 \setminus \{a, b, c\})$ -path in  $D_2$ . Consider the  $(\{a, b, u\}, v)$ -path in  $D_2$ , if it is  $bcv$ , then there is no  $(b, c)$ -path in  $D_1$ , so it must be  $bv \in D_2$  and  $cv, vb \in D_1$  as  $d_D^-(v) = 2, d_D^+(v) = 2$ . Besides,  $ca \in D_2$  as  $d_D^+(c) = 2$ . Now, there is no  $(c, a)$ -path in  $D_1$  no matter how we distribute other arcs, which contradicts the fact that  $D_1$  is strong. So,  $D$  has no strong arc decomposition. By the same arguments, we can prove the second case.  $\square$




Figure 6: An illustration of Proof of Lemma 3.12

## 4 Concluding remarks

The proofs of Theorem 1.8 when  $|V_2| \leq 4$  are included in the appendix. These cases are somewhat tedious but not particularly difficult.

By Theorem 1.8, we can conclude the following interesting result.

**Corollary 4.1.** *For any 2-arc-strong split graph  $D = (V_1, V_2; A)$ , it has a strong arc decomposition by adding at most 1 specific arc in  $D[V_2]$ .*

## References

- [1] J. Ai, S. Gerke, G. Gutin, A. Yeo, and Y. Zhou. Results on the small quasi-kernel conjecture.
- [2] J. Bang-Jensen, G. Gutin, Digraphs-Theory, Algorithms and Applications, 2nd Ed., Springer Monographs in Mathematics, London: Springer-Verlag London, Ltd., 2009.
- [3] J. Bang-Jensen, G. Gutin, A. Yeo, Arc-disjoint strong spanning subdigraphs of semicomplete compositions. J. Graph Theory, 95(2):267–289, 2020.

- [4] J. Bang-Jensen, F. Havet, A. Yeo, Spanning eulerian subdigraphs in semicomplete digraphs, *J. Graph Theory*, 102(3):527–606, 2023.
- [5] J. Bang-Jensen, J. Huang, Decomposing locally semicomplete digraphs into strong spanning subdigraphs, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 102:701–714, 2010.
- [6] J. Bang-Jensen, Y. Wang, Strong arc decomposition of split digraphs, arXiv:2309.06904.
- [7] J. Bang-Jensen, A. Yeo, Decomposition  $k$ -arc-strong tournaments into strong spanning subdigraphs, *Combinatorica*, 24(3):331–349, 2004.
- [8] P. Hell and C. Hernández-Cruz. Strict chordal and strict split digraphs. *Discret. Appl. Math.*, 216:609–617, 2017.
- [9] M. D. Lamar. Split digraphs. *Discret. Math.*, 312(7):1314–1325, 2012.
- [10] Y. Sun, G. Gutin, and J. Ai. Arc-disjoint strong spanning subdigraphs in compositions and products of digraphs. *Discret. Math.*, 342(8):2297–2305, 2019.
- [11] C. Thomassen. Connectivity in tournaments. In *Graph theory and combinatorics (Cambridge, 1983)*, pages 305–313. Academic Press, 1984.
- [12] C. Thomassen. Configurations in graphs of large minimum degree, connectivity, or chromatic number. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 555:402–412, 1989.

# Appendix

## A Proof of Theorem 1.8 when $|V_2| \leq 3$

Let  $D = (V_1, V_2; A)$  be a 2-arc-strong split digraph. We say  $\{V_1, V_2\}$  is a *maximal partition* if there is no vertex  $x$  in  $V_1$  such that  $N(x) = V_2$ . If  $V_1 = \emptyset$ , then  $D$  is a semicomplete digraph which is reduced to Theorem 1.1. Now, suppose  $V_1 \neq \emptyset$ . Since each vertex in  $V_1$  has out-degree and in-degree at least 2, we have  $|V_2| \geq 2$ . When  $|V_2| = 2$ , say  $V_2 = \{u, v\}$ , for any vertex  $x \in V_1$ , the digraph must contain 2-cycles  $xux$  and  $xvx$ . This implies that we can find a new vertex partition  $V(D) = V'_1 \cup V'_2$  where  $V'_2 = V_2 \cup \{x\}$  for some vertex  $x \in V_1$  and  $V'_1 = V(D) \setminus V'_2$ , such that  $V'_1$  is an independent set and the subdigraph induced by  $V'_2$  is semicomplete. Thus, the case when  $|V_2| = 2$  is reduced to the case when  $|V_2| = 3$  with maximal partition  $V(D) = V_1 \cup V_2$ .

**Proposition A.1.** *Let  $D = (V_1, V_2; A)$  be a 2-arc-strong split multi-digraph with maximal partition  $V(D) = V_1 \cup V_2$  such that  $V_1$  is an independent set,  $V_2$  induces a semicomplete multi-digraph and there is no multi-arc between  $V_1$  and  $V_2$ . If  $|V_2| = 3$ , then  $D$  has a strong arc decomposition.*

*Proof.* Let  $V_2 = \{u, v, w\}$ . We prove this result by induction on  $|V_1|$ . When  $|V_1| = 0$ , the result follows directly from Theorem 1.2. Now, assume that  $|V_1| = n \geq 1$  and that the result holds for all 2-arc-strong split multi-digraphs with maximal partition  $V(D) = V_1 \cup V_2$  and  $|V_1| \leq n - 1$ . Choose a vertex  $x \in V_1$ , there is exactly one vertex in  $V_2$ , say  $w$ , which is not adjacent to  $x$ , since partition  $V(D) = V_1 \cup V_2$  is maximal. And so the vertex  $x$  dominates  $u, v$  and is also dominated by  $u, v$ . We split off the pair  $(ux, xv)$  at  $x$  to obtain a splitting arc  $\tilde{u}v$ , and similarly, we split off the pair  $(vx, xu)$  at  $x$  to obtain a splitting arc  $\tilde{v}u$ . Let  $D_x$  denote the new multi-digraph obtained after these two splitting-off. Note that  $d_{D_x}^+(x) = d_{D_x}^-(x) = 0$ . Let  $D' = D_x - x$ . Let  $V'_1 = V_1 \setminus \{x\}$ , then  $V(D') = V'_1 \cup V_2$  is also maximal partition of  $D'$ .

**Claim 6.** *The multi-digraph  $D'$  is 2-arc-strong.*

*Proof.* Let  $a$  and  $b$  be two distinct vertices in  $V(D')$ , and thus also in  $V(D)$ . Then there are two arc-disjoint paths from  $a$  to  $b$  in  $D$ , denoted as  $P_1$  and  $P_2$ . If path  $P_i$  (where  $i = 1, 2$ ) contains  $x$ , then  $P_i$  must include both  $u$  and  $v$  since  $N^-(x) = N^+(x) = \{u, v\}$ . We can then replace the segment  $uxv$  on path  $P_i$  with the corresponding splitting arc to get a new path  $P'_i$  from  $a$  to  $b$  in  $D'$ . Thus, we find two arc-disjoint paths from  $a$  to  $b$  in  $D'$ .  $\square$

Hence,  $D'$  has a strong arc decomposition  $A(D') = B_1 \cup B_2$  by induction hypothesis. Now we consider the distribution of the splitting arcs  $\tilde{u}v$  and  $\tilde{v}u$ . If both  $B_1$  and  $B_2$  have exactly one splitting arc, without loss of generality, let  $\tilde{u}v$  lie in  $B_1$  and  $\tilde{v}u$  lie in  $B_2$ . Then  $B'_1 := (B_1 \setminus \{\tilde{u}v\}) \cup \{ux, xv\}$  and  $B'_2 := (B_2 \setminus \{\tilde{v}u\}) \cup \{vx, xu\}$  will form a strong arc decomposition of  $D$ .

If these two splitting arcs  $\tilde{u}v$  and  $\tilde{v}u$  lie in the same set, say  $B_1$ . Since  $D[V_2]$  is semicomplete, either  $uv$  or  $vu$  lies in  $A(D[V_2])$ . Without loss of generality, suppose  $uv \in A(D[V_2])$ . If  $uv \in B_1$ , then  $D_x[B_1 \setminus \{\tilde{u}v\}]$  is still strong. This yields that  $A(D_x) = B'_1 \cup B'_2$ , in which  $B'_1 = B_1 \setminus \{\tilde{u}v\}$  and  $B'_2 = B_2 \cup \{\tilde{u}v\}$ , is a strong arc decomposition such that each set has exactly one splitting arc and so we are done. If  $uv \in B_2$ , then  $A(D_x) = B'_1 \cup B'_2$ , in which  $B'_1 = (B_1 \setminus \{\tilde{u}v\}) \cup \{uv\}$  and  $B'_2 = (B_2 \setminus \{uv\}) \cup \{\tilde{u}v\}$ , is a strong arc decomposition such that each set has exactly one splitting arc and so we are done.  $\square$


**Corollary A.2.** *Let  $D = (V_1, V_2; A)$  be a 2-arc-strong split digraph with maximal partition  $V(D) = V_1 \cup V_2$  such that  $V_1$  is an independent set and  $V_2$  induces a semicomplete digraph. If  $|V_2| = 3$ , then  $D$  has a strong arc decomposition.*

## B Proof of Theorem 1.8 when $|V_2| = 4$

We may only consider the case when each vertex in  $V_1$  is adjacent to at most 3 vertices in  $V_2$ . Since when there is a vertex adjacent to all vertices in  $V_2$ , then it can be viewed as a split digraph with  $|V_2| = 5$  or a semicomplete digraph on 5 vertices, which has been previously discussed.

In the previous proof when  $|V_2| \geq 5$ , the condition  $|V_2| \geq 5$  instead of  $|V_2| \geq 4$  is specifically used to avoid certain configurations. The key role of this condition is to ensure that the new digraph  $G_{\text{new}}$  (or original  $G$ , or  $D[V_2]$ ) remains 2-arc-strong without adding additional arcs. We use  $|V_2| \geq 5$  to avoid the case that  $G_{\text{new}}$  (or original  $G$ ) is isomorphic to one of the seven graphs shown in Theorem 1.2. So, here we only need to focus on this case.

Note that after removing parallel arcs in the seven graphs, each of them is isomorphic to  $S_4$ , so the semicomplete digraph  $D[V_2]$  must be a subdigraph of  $S_4$ , which implies that there is a 4-circle  $v_1v_2v_3v_4v_1$  in  $D[V_2]$ . Considering isomorphism,  $D[V_2]$  can only be one of the following three digraphs. We only focus on the cases where  $D$  has no strong arc decomposition.



**Lemma B.1.** *If  $D[V_2] + C$  has a strong arc decomposition, then  $D$  has a strong arc decomposition, where  $C$  is a splitting arc set, and for any vertex  $x$  in  $V_1$ ,  $x$  satisfies one of the following*

- *There are at most one splitting arc in  $C$  obtained by splitting-off an arc pair at  $x$ .*
- *At least one splitting arc in  $C$  obtained by splitting-off an arc pair at  $x$  has a parallel arc in  $D[V_2]$ .*

*Proof.* We may assume  $D[V_2] + C$  has a strong arc decomposition  $D'_1$  and  $D'_2$ . Fix an vertex  $x \in V_1$ , if there are more than two splitting arcs obtained by splitting-off arc pairs at  $x$  in  $C$ , say  $\tilde{ab}$  and  $\tilde{cd}$ , where  $\tilde{ab}$  is the splitting arc with parallel arc  $ab \in A(D[V_2])$ , then we can distribute  $\tilde{ab}$  and  $\tilde{cd}$  to different  $D'_i, i \in [2]$ . This is because if  $\tilde{ab}, \tilde{cd} \in A(D'_i)$ , then we can remove  $\tilde{ab}$  to  $A(D'_{3-i})$  and remove  $ab$  to  $A(D'_i)$  if  $ab \in A(D'_{3-i})$ , and we can check  $D'_1$  and  $D'_2$  are still strong. We do this distribution step by step for all  $x \in V_1$ . Now we lift all splitting arcs in  $D'_1$  and  $D'_2$  to get  $D_1$  and  $D_2$ , we can check  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  form a pending decomposition of  $D$ , therefore,  $D$  has a strong arc decomposition by Lemma 2.6.  $\square$

### B.1 $D[V_2]$ is $S_4$ .

If  $V_1 = \emptyset$ , then  $D = S_4$  which has no strong arc decomposition. Now we will prove that if  $|V_1| \geq 1$ , then  $D$  has a strong arc decomposition. Suppose for contradiction that  $D$  does not

have a strong arc decomposition. There exists  $a \in V_1$ , then  $D[V_2] + \{a^-a^+\}$  has no strong arc decomposition by Lemma B.1, where  $a^-a^+$  is obtained by splitting-off the arc pair  $(a^-a, aa^+)$  at  $a$ . So  $a^-a^+ = v_3v_1$  or  $v_1v_2$  in the sense of symmetry by Theorem 1.2. Now we consider the other arcs adjacent to  $a$  in  $D$ .

- We assume  $a^-a^+ = v_3v_1$ . If  $av_2 \in D$ , then  $D[V_2] + \{v_3v_2\}$  has a strong arc decomposition. If  $v_2a \in D$ , then  $D[V_2] + \{v_2v_1\}$  has a strong arc decomposition. By Lemma B.1,  $D$  has a strong arc decomposition. Thus,  $av_2, v_2a \notin D$ . Then,  $av_4 \in D$  or  $av_3 \in D$  as  $d_D^+(a) \geq 2$ ;  $v_1a \in D$  or  $v_3a \in D$  as  $d_D^-(a) \geq 2$ .

If  $av_4 \in D$  and  $v_1a \in D$ , then  $D[V_2] + \{v_1v_4\}$  has a strong arc decomposition. If  $av_4 \in D$  and  $v_4a \in D$ , then  $D[V_2] + \{v_4v_1, v_3v_4\}$  has a strong arc decomposition.

If  $av_3 \in D$  and  $v_1a \in D$ , then  $D[V_2] + \{v_1v_3, v_3v_1\}$  has a strong arc decomposition. If  $av_3 \in D$  and  $v_4a \in D$ , then  $D[V_2] + \{v_4v_3\}$  has a strong arc decomposition.

In conclusion, by Lemma B.1,  $D$  has a strong arc decomposition when  $a^-a^+ = v_3v_1$ , a contradiction.


- We assume that  $a^-a^+ = v_1v_2$ . It is a contradiction by a similar argument.

So, we have that  $a^-a^+ \neq v_3v_1$  or  $v_1v_2$ , which is a contradiction. Thus, if  $D[V_2]$  is isomorphic to  $S_4$ ,  $D$  has a strong arc decomposition if  $|V_1| \geq 1$ .

## B.2 $D[V_2]$ is $S_{4,-1}$ .

Since  $S_4$  is a subdigraph of  $\bar{G}_{\text{new}}$  (or  $\bar{G}$ ), then there exists a vertex  $a \in v_1$  such that  $v_4a, av_2 \in D$ . If there is another vertex  $b \in V_1$ , then  $D$  has a strong arc decomposition by splitting off  $(v_4a, av_2)$  at  $a$ , and applying the proof for the case where  $D[V_2]$  is  $S_4$ . Therefore, we only need to consider the case where  $V_1 = \{a\}$ .

When  $a$  is only adjacent to  $v_2$  and  $v_4$ :




It has no strong arc decomposition as  $(iv)^* \times (iv)$  has no strong arc decomposition.

When  $a$  is adjacent to  $v_2, v_4$  and  $v_1$ :


If  $av_1, v_1a \in D$ ,  $D$  has a strong arc decomposition as  $D[V_2] + \{v_4v_1, v_1v_2\}$  has a strong arc decomposition by Lemma B.1.

---

If  $av_1 \in D, v_1a \notin D$ :




It has no strong arc decomposition as  $(ii)^* \times (ii)$  has no strong arc decomposition.





---

If  $av_1 \notin D, v_1a \in D$ :




It has no strong arc decomposition as  $(iii)^* \times (iii)$  has no strong arc decomposition. (*iii* is isomorphic to *ii*)




---


When  $a$  is adjacent to  $v_2, v_4$  and  $v_3$ :

If  $v_3a, av_3 \in D$ :



---


If  $v_3a \notin D, av_3 \in D$ :



It has no strong arc decomposition no matter the existence of dashed arcs as  $(iv)^* \times (iv)$  has no strong arc decomposition.

---

If  $v_3a \in D, av_3 \notin D$ :



It has no strong arc decomposition no matter the existence of dashed arcs as  $(iii)^* \times (v)$  has no strong arc decomposition.

We have now completed all cases where  $D[V_2]$  is  $S_{4,-1}$ .

---


### B.3 $D[V_2]$ is $S_{4,-2}$ .


Similarly, as  $S_4$  is a subdigraph of  $\tilde{G}_{\text{new}}$  (or  $\tilde{G}$ ), there are arcs  $v_4a, av_2, v_3b, bv_1$  in  $D$  where  $a, b \in V_1$ .

If  $a = b$ , then  $a$  is adjacent to four vertices, which has been previously discussed. So we only consider the case  $a \neq b$  in the following. Additionally, if there is another vertex  $c \in V_1$  where  $c \neq a, b$ , then  $D$  has a strong arc decomposition by splitting off  $v_4a, av_2, v_3b, bv_1$  and applying the proof for the case where  $D[V_2]$  is  $S_4$ . Therefore, we only need consider the case  $V_1 = \{a, b\}$ .

Since we can split off either  $v_4a, av_2$  or  $v_3b, bv_1$  to obtain a graph similar to  $S_{4,-1}$ , if  $D$  has no strong arc decomposition, then each of  $a$  and  $b$  must fall into one of the cases  $(i), (ii), (iii), (iv)$  and  $(v)$ .

By reversing all arcs in cases  $(i), (ii), (iii), (iv)$  and  $(v)$ , rotate 180 degrees clockwise, and relabeling, we obtain the corresponding reversed and rotated cases:  $(i)^*, (ii)^*, (iii)^*, (iv)^*$ , and  $(v)^*$  as described below.





In this way, we only need to discuss the different combinations of cases  $(i)$ ,  $(ii)$ ,  $(iii)$ ,  $(iv)$  and  $(v)$ . Additionally, since  $(e)^* \times (f)$  can be transformed into  $(f)^* \times (e)$  by reversing arcs and relabeling, where  $e$  and  $f$  are elements of  $\{i, ii, iii, iv, v\}$ , we only need to examine 15 distinct graphs.

---

$(i)^* \times (i)$  has no strong arc decomposition as  $(iv)^* \times (iv)$  has no strong arc decomposition.

---

$(i)^* \times (ii)$  has no strong arc decomposition as  $(ii)^* \times (iv)$  has no strong arc decomposition.

---


$(i)^* \times (iii)$  has no strong arc decomposition as  $(iii)^* \times (v)$  has no strong arc decomposition.

---

$(i)^* \times (iv)$  has no strong arc decomposition as  $(iv)^* \times (iv)$  has no strong arc decomposition.

---


$(i)^* \times (v)$  has a strong arc decomposition regardless of the existence of the dashed arc. This is because the subdigraph  $D[V_2] + \{v_3v_1, v_1v_3, v_3v_4, v_4v_2\}$  has a strong arc decomposition by Lemma B.1.



It has no strong arc decomposition.

Assume, for the sake of contradiction, that  $D$  has a strong arc decomposition into  $D_1$  and  $D_2$ . Given that  $N^+(v_3) = 2$ , we may assume  $v_3b \in D_1$  and  $v_3v_4 \in D_2$ . Since  $N^-(b) = 2$ , we have  $v_4b \in D_2$ . Since  $N^-(v_4) = 2$ , we have  $v_2v_4 \in D_1$ . Since  $v_3v_4 \in D_2$  and there are only two arcs from  $\{v_1, v_3, b\}$  to  $\{v_2, v_4, a\}$ , we have  $v_1v_2 \in D_1$ . Since  $N^+(v_1) = 2$  and  $v_1v_2 \in D_1$ , we have  $v_1v_3 \in D_2$ . Since  $v_1v_2 \in D_1$  and  $N^-(v_2) = 2$ , we have  $av_2 \in D_2$ . We have  $v_4a \in D_2$  as there are only two arcs from  $\{v_1, v_3, v_4, b\}$  to  $\{v_2, a\}$ , and so  $v_2a, av_1 \in D_1$ . We can also conclude that  $bv_3 \in D_2, bv_1 \in D_1$  as there are only two arcs from  $\{v_3, b\}$  to  $\{v_1, v_2, v_4, a\}$ .  $v_1v_1 \in D_1$  as  $v_4$  need out-arc. Now there is no in-arc of  $v_1$  in  $D_2$ , a contradiction. So  $D$  has no strong arc decomposition.






It has no strong arc decomposition.

Assume, for the sake of contradiction, that  $D$  has a strong arc decomposition into  $D_1$  and  $D_2$ . Given that  $N^+(v_3) = 2$ , we may assume  $v_3b \in D_1, v_3v_4 \in D_2$ . we also have  $bv_1 \in D_1, v_4b, bv_3 \in D_2$  as there are only two arcs from  $\{v_3, b\}$  to  $\{v_1, v_2, v_4, a\}$ , and we have that  $v_4v_1 \in D_2$  since  $N^-(v_1) = 2$ . Since  $N^+(v_4) = 3$ , we have  $v_4a \in D_1$ , then  $av_2 \in D_1, v_1a, av_4 \in D_2$ , and  $v_1v_2 \in D_2$  as  $N^-(v_2) = 2$ .

Now, there is no arc from  $\{v_1, v_3, b\}$  to  $\{v_2, v_4, a\}$  in  $D_1$ , which leads to a contradiction. So,  $D$  has no strong arc decomposition.




It has no strong arc decomposition regardless of the existence of dashed arcs.

Assume, for the sake of contradiction, that  $D$  has a strong arc decomposition into  $D_1$  and  $D_2$ . Given that  $N_D^+(v_3) = 2$ , we may assume  $v_3b \in D_1, v_3v_4 \in D_2$ . Besides,  $bv_1 \in D_1, v_4b, bv_3 \in D_2, v_4v_1 \in D_2$  as  $N^-(v_1) = 2, v_1v_2 \in D_1$  as  $v_3v_4 \in D_2$  and they are from  $\{v_1, v_3, b\}$  to  $\{v_2, v_4, a\}$ ,  $v_4a \in D_1$  as  $N^+(v_4) = 3$ .

Now there is no in-arc of  $\{v_2, a\}$  in  $D_2$ , a contradiction. So,  $D$  has no strong arc decomposition.


(ii)\* × (v) has a strong arc decomposition regardless of the existence of the dashed arc as  $D[V_2] + \{v_3v_2, v_4v_1\}$  has a strong arc decomposition by Lemma B.1.



It has no strong arc decomposition.

Assume, for the sake of contradiction, that  $D$  has a strong arc decomposition into  $D_1$  and  $D_2$ . Given that  $N_D^+(v_3) = 2$ , we may assume  $v_3b \in D_1, v_3v_4 \in D_2$ . By the in-degree of  $v_1$ , out-degree of  $v_4$ , we have to divide  $b$  into  $v_3bv_1, v_1bv_4$ ,  $a$  into  $v_4av_2, v_1av_4$ .

Besides,  $bv_1 \in D_1, v_1b, bv_4 \in D_2, v_4v_1 \in D_2$  as  $N^-(v_1) = 2, v_4a, av_2 \in D_1, v_1a, av_4 \in D_2$  as  $N^+(v_4) = 2, v_1v_2 \in D_2$  as  $N^-(v_2) = 2$ . Then there is no arc from  $\{v_1, v_3, b\}$  to  $\{v_2, v_4, a\}$  in  $D_1$ , a contradiction. So,  $D$  has no strong arc decomposition.




It has no strong arc decomposition regardless of whether it has dashed arcs.

Assume, for the sake of contradiction, that  $D$  has a strong arc decomposition into  $D_1$  and  $D_2$ . Given that  $N^-(v_1) = 2$ , we may assume  $v_3b, bv_1 \in D_1, v_1b, bv_4, v_4v_1 \in D_2$ . Besides,  $v_3v_4 \in D_2$  as  $N^+(v_3) = 2$ ,  $v_1v_2 \in D_1$  as there are only two arcs from  $\{v_1, v_3, b\}$  to  $\{v_2, v_4, a\}$ ,  $v_4a \in D_1$  as  $N^+(v_4) = 2$ .

Now, there is no in-arc of  $\{a, v_2\}$  in  $D_2$ , which means  $D$  has no strong arc decomposition.

---




It has no strong arc decomposition no matter if it has dashed arcs.

Assume, for the sake of contradiction, that  $D$  has a strong arc decomposition into  $D_1$  and  $D_2$ . Given that  $N^-(v_1) = 2$ , we may assume  $v_3b, bv_1 \in D_1, v_1b, bv_4, v_4v_1 \in D_2$ . Besides,  $v_2v_3 \in D_1$  as there are only two arcs from  $\{v_2, v_4, a\}$  to  $\{v_1, v_3, b\}$ ,  $v_1v_3 \in D_2$  as  $N^-(v_3) = 2$ ,  $v_1v_2 \in D_1$  as  $N^+(v_1) = 3$ ,  $av_2 \in D_2$  as  $N^-(v_2) = 2$ ,  $av_4 \in D_1$  as  $N^+(a) = 2$ .

Now, there is no out-arc of  $\{a, v_4\}$  in  $D_1$ , which means  $D$  has no strong arc decomposition.

---



It has no strong arc decomposition no matter the existence of dashed arcs.

Assume, for the sake of contradiction, that  $D$  has a strong arc decomposition into  $D_1$  and  $D_2$ . Given that  $N_D^+(v_3) = 2$ , we may assume  $v_3b \in D_1, v_3v_4 \in D_2$ . Besides,  $bv_1 \in D_1, bv_3 \in D_2$  as  $N_D^+(b) = 2$  and  $v_3$  has no out-neighbor besides  $b$  in  $D_1$ ,  $v_1v_2 \in D_1$  as there are only two arcs from  $\{v_1, v_3, b\}$  to  $\{v_2, v_4, a\}$ ,  $v_4v_1 \in D_2$  as  $N_D^-(v_1) = 2$ ,  $v_4a \in D_1$  as  $N_D^+(v_4) = 2$ .

Now, there is no in-arc of  $\{a, v_2\}$  in  $D_2$ , which means  $D$  has no strong arc decomposition.

---

$(iv)^* \times (v)$  has a strong arc decomposition regardless of the existence of the dashed arc as  $D[V_2] + \{v_3v_1, v_2v_3, v_4v_2, v_3v_4\}$  has a strong arc decomposition by Lemma B.1.

---

$(v)^* \times (v)$  has a strong arc decomposition regardless of the existence of the dashed arc as  $D[V_2] + \{v_3v_1, v_1v_2, v_4v_2, v_3v_4\}$  has a strong arc decomposition by Lemma B.1.