

Structure fault diameter of hypercubes*

Honggang Zhao^a, Eminjan Sabir^{a,†}, and Cheng-Kuan Lin^b

^aCollege of Mathematics and System Sciences, Xinjiang University,
Urumqi, 830046, P. R. China

^bDepartment of Computer Science, National Yang Ming Chiao Tung
University, Hsinchu 30010, Taiwan

Abstract: Structure connectivity and substructure connectivity are innovative indicators for assessing network reliability and fault tolerance. Similarly, fault diameter evaluates fault tolerance and transmission delays in networks. This paper extends the concept of fault diameter by introducing two new variants: structure fault diameter and substructure fault diameter, derived from structure connectivity and substructure connectivity respectively. For a connected graph G with W -structure connectivity $\kappa(G;W)$ or W -substructure connectivity $\kappa^s(G;W)$, the W -structure fault diameter $D_f(G;W)$ and W -substructure fault diameter $D_f^s(G;W)$ are defined as the maximum diameter of any subgraph of G resulting from removing fewer than $\kappa(G;W) - 1$ W -structures or $\kappa^s(G;W) - 1$ W -substructures. For the n -dimensional hypercube Q_n with $n \geq 3$ and $1 \leq m \leq n - 2$, we determine both $D_f(Q_n;Q_m)$ and $D_f^s(Q_n;Q_1)$. These findings generalize existing results for the diameter and fault diameter of Q_n , providing a broader understanding of the hypercube's structural properties under fault conditions.

Keywords: Connectivity; Structure connectivity; Substructure connectivity; Structure fault diameter; Substructure fault diameter; Hypercube

1 Introduction

In the study of communication networks, graphs serve as powerful tools for modeling network structures and analyzing their properties. The *connectivity* and *diameter* are fundamental parameters to measure fault tolerance and communication delay. A reliable communication network must not only withstand faults but also maintain a minimal diameter to ensure efficient communication despite failures. This is particularly crucial in large-scale distributed systems,

*The research is supported by NSFC (No. 12261085)

†Corresponding author: eminjan20150513@163.com

where disruptions can severely affect performance. To tackle this issue, the concept of *fault diameter* has been introduced, which evaluates the impact of faults on a network's diameter.

The fault diameter, $D_f(G)$, is defined as the maximum diameter of any subgraph of a connected graph G obtained after removing up to $\kappa(G) - 1$ vertices, where $\kappa(G)$ represents the graph's connectivity. The study of fault diameter provides critical insights into a network's resilience to failures and the impact of faults on communication delay. This is particularly relevant in applications such as data centers, cloud computing, and parallel processing, where maintaining low-latency communication is essential. Analyzing fault diameter deepens our understanding of graph structures and their robustness under adversarial conditions. This analysis provides valuable insights for designing resilient network topologies capable of effectively managing node failures. For example, hypercube networks and their variations are extensively employed in distributed computing due to their exceptional characteristics, such as symmetry, scalability, and inherent fault tolerance. A thorough understanding of their fault diameters is essential for optimizing these networks to maintain performance and reliability during failure scenarios.

Krishnamoorthy and Krishnamurthy first introduced the concept of fault diameter, demonstrating that the fault diameter of the n -dimensional hypercube Q_n is $n + 1$ [7]. This foundational work has since been expanded to more intricate network structures. Tsai et al. studied the exchanged hypercube $EH(s, t)$ and discovered that after removing fewer than s vertices, the diameter of the resulting graph is $s + t + 3$ for $3 \leq s \leq t$ [19]. Qi and Zhu established upper bounds for the fault diameters of two families of twisted hypercubes, H_n and $Z_{n,k}$ [15]. Additionally, Day and Al-Ayyoub found that the fault diameter of the k -ary n -cube Q_n^k increases by at most one compared to its fault-free diameter [4]. Similar findings have been reported for other topologies, including star graphs [16], hierarchical cubic networks [5], and exchanged crossed cubes [13].

Despite these advancements, there remains a need to investigate fault diameters across a wider range of graph structures, particularly within modern network models that incorporate complex and hierarchical designs. Such research not only enriches the theoretical understanding of network robustness but also provides practical insights for designing reliable and efficient communication systems in environments prone to faults. This paper aims to address this gap by introducing new fault diameter concepts based on structure connectivity and substructure connectivity, and applying these concepts to analyze the fault-tolerant properties of Q_n under various fault conditions.

By considering the impact of structures becoming faulty instead of individual vertices, Lin et al. introduced the notions of structure connectivity and substructure connectivity [10]. For a connected graph G , let W be a subgraph of G . Then W -structure connectivity (resp. W -substructure connectivity) of G , denoted $\kappa(G; W)$ (resp. $\kappa^s(G; W)$), is the cardinality of a minimal set of vertex-disjoint subgraphs $\mathcal{W} = \{W_1, W_2, \dots, W_t\}$, such that each $W_k \in \mathcal{W}$ is isomorphic to W (resp. each $W_k \in \mathcal{W}$ is a connected subgraph of W) for $k = 1, 2, \dots, t$, and removing \mathcal{W} disconnects G . They also determined $\kappa(Q_n; W)$ and $\kappa^s(Q_n; W)$ and structure $W \in \{K_1, K_{1,1}, K_{1,2}, K_{1,3}, C_4\}$.

Following this trend, many scholars have engaged in this research field. For instance, in the split-star networks S_n^2 , Zhao and Wang determined both $\kappa(S_n^2; W)$ and $\kappa^s(S_n^2; W)$ for $W \in$

$\{P_t, C_q\}$, where $4 \leq t \leq 3n - 5$ and $6 \leq q \leq 3n - 5$ [24]. Ba et al. investigated P_t -structure connectivity and P_t -substructure connectivity of augmented k -ary n -cubes AQ_n^k [1]. Yang et al. proved that $\kappa(S_n; K_{1,m}) = \kappa^s(S_n; K_{1,m}) = n - 1$ for $n \geq 4$ and $0 \leq m \leq n - 1$, where S_n is a star graph [22]. Wang et al. proposed the concept of *double-structure connectivity* and studied the double-structure connectivity of hypercubes [20]. For the n -dimensional hypercube Q_n , Sabir and Meng considered a special kind of substructure connectivity, called *W -subcube connectivity* $\kappa^{sc}(Q_n; W)$, by restricting the structure W and its subgraphs to subcubes of Q_n [17].

In this paper, we propose two novel extensions of the fault diameter, defined based on the concepts of structure connectivity and substructure connectivity. The *W -structure fault diameter*, denoted as $D_f(G; W)$, of a connected graph G with W -structure connectivity $\kappa(G; W)$, is the maximum diameter of any subgraph of G obtained by removing up to $\kappa(G; W) - 1$ W -structures. Similarly, the *W -substructure fault diameter*, denoted as $D_f^s(G; W)$, of G with W -substructure connectivity $\kappa^s(G; W)$, is the maximum diameter of any subgraph of G obtained by removing up to $\kappa^s(G; W) - 1$ W -substructures. Importantly, when W is a single vertex (i.e., K_1), the W -structure fault diameter and W -substructure fault diameter reduce to the traditional fault diameter. Furthermore, it can be observed from the definitions that $D_f^s(G; W) \geq D_f(G; W)$.

The n -dimensional hypercube Q_n , known for its symmetry, scalability, and fault tolerance, is one of the most popular interconnection networks. It is well established that the diameter $D(Q_n)$ and the fault diameter $D_f(Q_n)$ of Q_n are n and $n + 1$, respectively. In this paper, we extend these results by proving the following:

1. $D_f(Q_n; Q_m) = n$ for $n = m + 2$ and $D_f(Q_n; Q_m) = n + 1$ for $n \geq m + 3$.
2. $D_f^s(Q_n; Q_m) = n + 1$ for $m \geq 0$ and $n \geq m + 3$, where $Q_0 \cong K_1$.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the definitions and notations used throughout this study. In Section 3, we present our main results and proofs. Finally, in Section 4, we conclude the paper and discuss potential directions for future research.

2 Preliminaries

The definitions and notation of graph are based on [2]. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a *graph* with vertex set V and edge set E . A graph G is *vertex transitive* if there is an isomorphism f from G into itself such that $f(u) = v$ for any two vertices u and v of G . A graph G is *edge transitive* if there is an isomorphism f from G into itself such that $f((u, v)) = (x, y)$ for any two edges (u, v) and (x, y) . For a vertex u in a graph G , $N_G(u)$ denotes the *neighborhood* of u , which is the set $\{v \mid (u, v) \in E\}$. A *path* P is a sequence of adjacent vertices, written as $\langle u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n \rangle$. The *length* of a path P , denoted $l(P)$, is the number of edges in P . We also write the path $\langle u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n \rangle$ as $\langle u_1, P_1, u_i, u_{i+1}, \dots, u_j, P_2, u_t, \dots, u_n \rangle$, where P_1 is the path $\langle u_1, u_2, \dots, u_i \rangle$ and P_2 is the path $\langle u_j, u_{j+1}, \dots, u_t \rangle$. Hence, it is possible to write a path as $\langle u_1, Q, u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n \rangle$ if $l(Q) = 0$. We use $d_G(u, v)$ to denote the *distance* between u and v , that is, the length of a shortest path joining u and v in G . The *diameter* of a graph G , denoted $D(G)$, is defined as




Figure 1: The n -dimensional hypercube for $n \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$.

$\max\{d(u, v) \mid u, v \in V(G)\}$. We use $\langle u, P_s, v \rangle$ to denote the shortest path between u and v in a graph G . And we use K_n to represent the complete graph with n vertices.

An n -dimensional hypercube is an undirected graph, Q_n , with 2^n vertices and $2^{n-1}n$ edges. Each vertex in Q_n can be represented as an n -bit binary string. We use boldface to denote vertices in Q_n . For any vertex $\mathbf{x} = x_1x_2 \cdots x_n$ in Q_n , we set $(\mathbf{x})^i = x_1^i x_2^i \cdots x_n^i$ is the neighbor of \mathbf{x} in dimension i , where $x_j^i = x_j$ for every $j \neq i$ and $x_i^i = 1 - x_i$. In particular, Q_0 represents K_1 and Q_1 represents K_2 . The x_i in $\mathbf{x} = x_1x_2 \cdots x_n$ is defined as i th bit. Fig. 1 shows Q_n for $n \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. By fixing the n th bit of the vertices in Q_n , we get two $(n-1)$ -dimensional hypercubes named of $Q_n^{\{0\}}$ whose n th bit is 0 and $Q_n^{\{1\}}$ whose n th bit is 1, respectively. In this way, we divide Q_n into two parts $Q_n^{\{0\}}$ and $Q_n^{\{1\}}$. For any vertex \mathbf{x} in $Q_n^{\{0\}}$ (resp. in $Q_n^{\{1\}}$), there exists an unique external neighbor $(\mathbf{x})^n$ in $Q_n^{\{1\}}$ (resp. in $Q_n^{\{0\}}$). It is known that Q_n has many attractive properties, such as being bipartite, n -regular, n -connected, vertex transitive and edge transitive [9].

The *cartesian product* of simple graphs G and H is the graph $G \square H$ whose vertex set is $V(G) \times V(H)$ and whose edge set is the set of all pairs (u_1v_1, u_2v_2) such that either $(u_1, u_2) \in E(G)$ and $v_1 = v_2$, or $(v_1, v_2) \in E(H)$ and $u_1 = u_2$ [2]. Hypercubes also can be represented in the form of cartesian product, i.e., $Q_n = \underbrace{K_2 \square K_2 \square \cdots \square K_2}_n$ [6]. In this way, we can decompose $Q_n =$

$Q_m \square Q_{n-m}$. Now, for any $\mathbf{t} \in V(Q_{n-m})$ we denote by (Q_m, \mathbf{t}) the subgraph of Q_n induced by the vertices whose last $n-m$ bits form the tuple \mathbf{t} . It is easy to observe that (Q_m, \mathbf{t}) is isomorphic to Q_m . As Q_{n-m} is $(n-m)$ -regular and $(n-m)$ -connected, every vertex in $V(Q_{n-m})$ is adjacent to exactly $n-m$ vertices in Q_{n-m} . Let $N_{Q_{n-m}}(\mathbf{t}) = \{\mathbf{t}_1, \mathbf{t}_2, \dots, \mathbf{t}_{n-m}\}$. Hence induced subgraph




Figure 2: $Q_5 = Q_2 \square Q_3$.




Figure 3: An example of $|F_3^n| = 6$, $|A_{3,0}^n| = 3$, $|A_{3,1}^n| = 1$ and $|B_3^n| = 2$.

(Q_m, \mathbf{t}) of Q_n is adjacent to exactly $n - m$ subcubes, namely $(Q_m, \mathbf{t}_1), (Q_m, \mathbf{t}_2), \dots, (Q_m, \mathbf{t}_{n-m})$. Clearly, (Q_m, \mathbf{t}_i) is not adjacent to (Q_m, \mathbf{t}_j) for $1 \leq i, j \leq n - m$, and (Q_m, \mathbf{t}) and (Q_m, \mathbf{t}_i) can form a subcube, namely (Q_m, \mathbf{t}_i^*) , which is isomorphic to Q_{m+1} . Fig. 2 shows $Q_5 = Q_2 \square Q_3$.

For any two vertices $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in Q_n$, the *Hamming distance* $H_{Q_n}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$ is defined to be the number of different positions between the two strings. Then \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} are called *symmetric* if $H_{Q_n}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = n$, and \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} are called *unsymmetric* if $H_{Q_n}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \leq n - 1$. By definition of hypercubes, we know that any pair of vertices is either symmetric or unsymmetric in Q_n . We list some symbols in Table 1 and their illustrations in Figure 3.

The following results play crucial role in the proof of our main results.

Lemma 2.1. [8] For $n \geq 2$, after the removal of $n - 2$ or less vertices in Q_n , the diameter of the remaining graph is still n .

Lemma 2.2. [7] For $n \geq 3$, $D_f(Q_n) = n + 1$.

Lemma 2.3. [10] For $n \geq 3$, $\kappa(Q_n; Q_1) = \kappa^s(Q_n; Q_1) = n - 1$

Lemma 2.4. [17] For $n \geq 3$ and $m \leq n - 2$, $\kappa^{sc}(Q_n; Q_m) = \kappa(Q_n; Q_m) = n - m$.

Table 1: Symbol table

Symbol	Definition
$\kappa(G; W)$	W -structure connectivity of G
$\kappa^s(G; W)$	W -substructure connectivity of G
$D_f(G; W)$	W -structure fault diameter of G
$D_f^s(G; W)$	W -substructure fault diameter of G
Q_n	the n -dimensional hypercube
$\kappa^{sc}(Q_n; Q_m)$	Q_m -subcube connectivity of Q_n
$D_f^{sc}(Q_n; Q_m)$	Q_m -subcube fault diameter of Q_n
$Q_n^{\{h\}}$	the $(n-1)$ -dimensional hypercube with $V(Q_n^{\{h\}}) = \{\mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{x} = x_1x_2\cdots x_n, x_n = h\}$, where $h \in \{0, 1\}$
$S_k(Q_n)$	the set $\{U \mid U \subseteq V(Q_n) \text{ and the subgraph induced by } U \text{ is isomorphic to } Q_k\}$
\mathcal{F}_k^n	the vertex-disjoint subset of $\cup_{i=0}^k S_i(Q_n)$, i.e., any two distinct $A, B \in \mathcal{F}_k^n$ have no common vertex
$\mathcal{A}_{k,h}^n$	the set of $\mathcal{F}_k^n \cap \cup_{i=0}^k S_i(Q_n^{\{h\}})$
\mathcal{B}_k^n	the set of $\mathcal{F}_k^n \setminus (\mathcal{A}_{k,0}^n \cup \mathcal{A}_{k,1}^n)$
F_k^n	the subset of \mathcal{F}_k^n , and for any $A \in F_k^n$, we have $A \in S_k(Q_n)$
$A_{k,h}^n$	the set of $F_k^n \cap S_k(Q_n^{\{h\}})$
B_k^n	the set of $F_k^n \setminus (A_{k,0}^n \cup A_{k,1}^n)$
E^n	the set of edges which connect $Q_n^{\{0\}}$ and $Q_n^{\{1\}}$

Lemma 2.5. [14] Any two vertices \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} in $Q_n (n \geq 3)$ have exactly 2 common neighbors if they have any. Besides, there are two common neighbors if and only if $((\mathbf{u})^i)^j = \mathbf{v}$, where $1 \leq i \neq j \leq n$.

Let Q_m be a subcube of Q_n . For any two vertices \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} in $Q_m (m \geq 2)$, if \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} have common neighbors, by Lemma 2.5, they have exactly two common neighbors and $H_{Q_n}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = H_{Q_m}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = 2$. Clearly, their common neighbors are in Q_m . Moreover, the two vertices of Q_1 have no common neighbors. Then we have the following corollary of Lemma 2.5.

Corollary 2.6. Let Q_m be a subcube of Q_n . Then, any two vertices of Q_m have no common neighbor in $Q_n - Q_m$.

We get the following lemma easily by the cardinality of symmetric vertices.

Lemma 2.7. For $n \geq 2$, let S be any vertex set of Q_n with $|S| < 2^{n-1}$. If $Q_n - S$ is connected, then $D(Q_n - S) \geq n$.

3 Q_1 -structure fault diameter Q_1 -substructure fault diameter

We provide some lemmas for later use.

Lemma 3.1. Let $m \leq n-3$ and $|\mathcal{F}_m^n| \leq n-1$. For any two symmetric vertices \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} in $Q_n - \mathcal{F}_m^n$, there exists a pair of vertices $(\mathbf{u})^j$ and $(\mathbf{v})^j$ in $Q_n - \mathcal{F}_m^n$ for some $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$.




Figure 4: An illustration of the proof in Theorem 3.2

Proof. Let $(\mathbf{u})^j$ and $(\mathbf{v})^k$ respectively be neighbors of \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} in Q_n , where $j, k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Then $H_{Q_n}((\mathbf{u})^j, (\mathbf{v})^k) = n$ if $j = k$, and $H_{Q_n}((\mathbf{u})^j, (\mathbf{v})^k) = n - 2$ if $j \neq k$. Combining this with the condition $m \leq n - 3$, we infer that no subcube in \mathcal{F}_m^n can contain both $(\mathbf{u})^j$ and $(\mathbf{v})^k$ simultaneously. By Corollary 2.6, no subcube in \mathcal{F}_m^n can contain both $(\mathbf{u})^j$ and $(\mathbf{u})^h$ for $j \neq h$ simultaneously. The same is holds for $(\mathbf{v})^j$ and $(\mathbf{v})^h$ for $j \neq h$. This implies that the removal of any subcube in \mathcal{F}_m^n reduces the neighbors of \mathbf{u} or \mathbf{v} by at most one. Note that $d_{Q_n}(\mathbf{u}) = d_{Q_n}(\mathbf{v}) = n$. However, $|\mathcal{F}_m^n| \leq n - 1$. So there must exist a pair of vertices $(\mathbf{u})^j$ and $(\mathbf{v})^j$ in $Q_n - \mathcal{F}_m^n$. \square

Theorem 3.2. $D_f^s(Q_3; Q_1) = 3$.

Proof. By Lemma 2.3, $\kappa^s(Q_3; Q_1) = 2$. Thus, we need to consider the event $|\mathcal{F}_1^3| \leq 1 = \kappa^s(Q_3; Q_1) - 1$. By Lemma 2.1, $D(Q_3 - \mathcal{F}_1^3) = 3$ if $|F_1^3| = 0$. Bellow, we suppose that $|F_0^3| = 0$ and $|F_1^3| = 1$. Since Q_3 is vertex transitive and edge transitive, we may assume that $F_1^3 = \{\{000, 001\}\}$ is a faulty Q_1 -structure in Q_3 . From Figure 4, we get that the diameter of $Q_3 - F_1^3$ is 3, and so $D_f^s(Q_3; Q_1) = 3$. \square

Lemma 3.3. For $n \geq 4$, $D_f(Q_n; Q_1) \geq n + 1$ and $D_f^s(Q_n; Q_1) \geq n + 1$.

Proof. Let $\mathbf{x} = 00 \cdots 0$ and $\mathbf{z} = (\mathbf{x})^1$. Then, we set $\mathcal{F}_1^n = \{\{(\mathbf{x})^i, (\mathbf{z})^i\} \mid 2 \leq i \leq n - 1\}$. Obviously, $|\mathcal{F}_1^n| = n - 2$, $Q_n^{\{0\}} - \mathcal{F}_1^n$ is disconnected and one of components of $Q_n^{\{0\}} - \mathcal{F}_1^n$ contains $\{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}\}$. Further, we let $\mathbf{y} = 11 \cdots 10$. Clearly, $\{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}\}$ and \mathbf{y} are in the distinct components of $Q_n^{\{0\}} - \mathcal{F}_1^n$. Since $Q_n - \mathcal{F}_1^n$ is connected and $N_{Q_n - \mathcal{F}_1^n}(\mathbf{x}) = \{\mathbf{z}, (\mathbf{x})^n\}$, there are two paths $\langle \mathbf{x}, (\mathbf{x})^n, P_1, \mathbf{y} \rangle$ and $\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}, (\mathbf{z})^n, P_2, \mathbf{y} \rangle$ between \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} in $Q_n - \mathcal{F}_1^n$. Note that $H_{Q_n}((\mathbf{x})^n, \mathbf{y}) = n$ and $H_{Q_n}((\mathbf{z})^n, \mathbf{y}) = n - 1$, so we have $l(P_1) \geq n$ and $l(P_2) \geq n - 1$, respectively. Thus, the length of any path between \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} is at least $n + 1$. This implies $D_f(Q_n; Q_1) \geq n + 1$. Moreover, since $D_f^s(Q_n; Q_1) \geq D_f(Q_n; Q_1)$, $D_f^s(Q_n; Q_1) \geq n + 1$. \square

Lemma 3.4. $D_f^s(Q_4; Q_1) \leq 5$.

Proof. By Lemma 2.3, $\kappa^s(Q_4; Q_1) = 3$. Thus, we need to consider the event $|\mathcal{F}_1^4| \leq 2$. By Lemma 2.2, $D(Q_4 - \mathcal{F}_1^4) \leq 5$ if $|F_1^4| < 2$. Thus, we suppose that $|F_0^4| = 0$ and $|F_1^4| = 2$. Since

Q_4 is vertex transitive and edge transitive, we assume that $\mathbf{x} \neq (\mathbf{y})^4$ for each $\{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}\} \in F_1^4$. Thus, $|B_1^4| = 0$ and $F_1^4 = A_{1,0}^4 \cup A_{1,1}^4$. Without of generality, we assume $|A_{1,0}^4| \geq |A_{1,1}^4|$. Let \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} be any two vertices in $Q_4 - F_1^4$, then we have the following cases:

Case 1. $|A_{1,0}^4| = 2$. Since $D(Q_3) = 3$, $d_{Q_4 - F_1^4}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \leq 3$ if $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in Q_4^{\{1\}}$. If $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in Q_4^{\{0\}}$, then there exists a path $\langle \mathbf{u}, (\mathbf{u})^4, P_s, (\mathbf{v})^4, \mathbf{v} \rangle$ between \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} in $Q_4 - F_1^4$, where P_s is in $Q_4^{\{1\}}$. Since $l(P_s) \leq D(Q_4^{\{1\}}) = 3$, $d_{Q_4 - F_1^4}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \leq 5$. Obviously, if $\mathbf{u} \in Q_4^{\{0\}}$ and $\mathbf{v} \in Q_4^{\{1\}}$, then there exists a path $\langle \mathbf{u}, (\mathbf{u})^4, P_s, \mathbf{v} \rangle$ between \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} in $Q_4 - F_1^4$, where P_s is in $Q_4^{\{1\}}$. then $d_{Q_4 - F_1^4}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \leq 4$.

Case 2. $|A_{1,0}^4| = 1$ and $|A_{1,1}^4| = 1$. By Theorem 3.2, $d_{Q_4 - F_1^4}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \leq 3$ if $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in Q_4^{\{0\}}$ or $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in Q_4^{\{1\}}$. So we only need to consider that $\mathbf{u} \in Q_4^{\{0\}}$ and $\mathbf{v} \in Q_4^{\{1\}}$. Since $N_{Q_4^{\{0\}} - A_{1,0}^4}(\mathbf{u}) \geq 2$, we set $N_{Q_4^{\{0\}} - A_{1,0}^4}(\mathbf{u}) = \{\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2\}$. Since $((\mathbf{u}_1)^4)^i \neq (\mathbf{u}_2)^4$ for each $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, there must exist $(\mathbf{u}_1)^4 \in Q_4^{\{1\}} - A_{1,1}^4$ or $(\mathbf{u}_2)^4 \in Q_4^{\{1\}} - A_{1,1}^4$. We suppose the former, i.e., $(\mathbf{u}_1)^4 \in Q_4^{\{1\}} - A_{1,1}^4$. Thus, there exists a path $\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}_1, (\mathbf{u}_1)^4, P_s, \mathbf{v} \rangle$ between \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} in $Q_4 - F_1^4$, where P_s is in $Q_4^{\{1\}} - A_{1,1}^4$. Clearly, $l(P_s) \leq D(Q_4^{\{1\}} - A_{1,1}^4) = 3$, then $d_{Q_4 - F_1^4}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \leq 5$. \square

Lemma 3.5. $D_f^s(Q_n; Q_1) \leq n + 1$ for $n \geq 4$.

Proof. We prove this lemma by induction on n . By Lemma 3.4, the lemma holds for $n = 4$. Thus, we assume that this lemma holds for $4 \leq k \leq n - 1$, i.e., $D_f^s(Q_k; Q_1) \leq k + 1$ for $4 \leq k \leq n - 1$. Note that $\kappa^s(Q_n; Q_1) = n - 1$ by Lemma 2.3, then $Q_n - \mathcal{F}_1^n$ is connected for $|\mathcal{F}_1^n| \leq n - 2$. And let \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} be any two vertices in $Q_n - \mathcal{F}_1^n$.

Case 1. \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} are symmetric. We may assume $\mathbf{u} = 00 \cdots 0$ and $\mathbf{v} = 11 \cdots 1$. Since $n \geq 5$ and $|\mathcal{F}_1^n| \leq n - 2$, by Lemma 3.1, there must exist a pair of vertices $(\mathbf{u})^j$ and $(\mathbf{v})^j$ in $Q_n - \mathcal{F}_1^n$ for some $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Thus we may assume $(\mathbf{u})^n, (\mathbf{v})^n \in Q_n - \mathcal{F}_1^n$. Note that \mathcal{F}_1^n contains at most $2(n - 2)$ vertices. So we may assume $Q_n^{\{0\}}$ has at most $n - 2$ faulty vertices. Then there exists a path $\langle \mathbf{u}, P_s, (\mathbf{v})^n, \mathbf{v} \rangle$ between \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} in $Q_n - \mathcal{F}_1^n$, where P_s is in $Q_n^{\{0\}} - \mathcal{F}_1^n$. By Lemma 2.2, we have $D_f^s(Q_n^{\{0\}}; Q_1) \leq n$. Thus, $l(P_s) \leq n$ and $d_{Q_n - \mathcal{F}_1^n}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \leq n + 1$.

Case 2. \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} are unsymmetric. Without loss of generality, we may assume $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in Q_n^{\{0\}}$.

Case 2.1. $|\mathcal{A}_{1,1}^n| \geq 1$. Then $|\mathcal{A}_{1,0}^n| + |\mathcal{B}_1^n| \leq n - 3$. Thus, there exists a path $\langle \mathbf{u}, P_s, \mathbf{v} \rangle$ between \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} in $Q_n - \mathcal{F}_1^n$, where P_s is in $Q_n^{\{0\}} - \mathcal{A}_{1,0}^n - \mathcal{B}_1^n$. By the induction hypothesis, we infer $l(P_s) \leq n$, and so we get $d_{Q_n - \mathcal{F}_1^n}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \leq n$.

Case 2.2. $|\mathcal{A}_{1,1}^n| = 0$. If $|\mathcal{A}_{1,0}^n| = 0$, then there exists a path $\langle \mathbf{u}, P_s, \mathbf{v} \rangle$ between \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} in $Q_n - \mathcal{F}_1^n$, where P_s is in $Q_n^{\{0\}} - \mathcal{B}_1^n$. Since $l(P_s) \leq D(Q_n^{\{0\}} - \mathcal{B}_1^n) \leq D_f(Q_{n-1}) = n$, $d_{Q_n - \mathcal{F}_1^n}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \leq n$. If $|\mathcal{A}_{1,0}^n| \geq 1$, then there exists a path $\langle \mathbf{u}, (\mathbf{u})^n, P_s, (\mathbf{v})^n, \mathbf{v} \rangle$ between \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} in $Q_n - \mathcal{F}_1^n$, where P_s is in $Q_n^{\{1\}} - \mathcal{B}_1^n$ and $|\mathcal{B}_1^n| \leq n - 3$. By Lemma 2.1, we have $D(Q_n^{\{1\}} - \mathcal{B}_1^n) = n - 1$. Then $l(P_s) \leq n - 1$, and so $d_{Q_n - \mathcal{F}_1^n}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \leq n + 1$. \square

Combining Theorem 3.2, Lemma 3.3, and Lemma 3.5 with the fact $D_f^s(G; W) \geq D_f(G; W)$, we have the following result.

Theorem 3.6. $D_f^s(Q_3; Q_1) = D_f(Q_3; Q_1) = 3$ and $D_f^s(Q_n; Q_1) = D_f(Q_n; Q_1) = n + 1$ if $n \geq 4$.

4 Q_m -subcube fault diameter and Q_m -structure fault diameter

For the Q_m -subcube connectivity $\kappa^{sc}(Q_n; Q_m)$ of Q_n , we define the Q_m -subcube fault diameter $D_f^{sc}(Q_n; Q_m)$ is the maximum diameter of any sub-graph of Q_n obtained by removing $\kappa^{sc}(Q_n; Q_m) - 1$ or less Q_m -subcubes. Since Q_m -structure fault diameter is a special case of Q_m -subcube fault diameter, let's first determine Q_m -subcube fault diameter $D_f^{sc}(Q_n; Q_m)$.

Theorem 4.1. $D_f^{sc}(Q_{m+2}; Q_m) = m + 2$ for $m \geq 0$.

Proof. Firstly, we prove $D_f^{sc}(Q_{m+2}; Q_m) \leq m + 2$ by induction on m . Clearly, $D_f^{sc}(Q_2; Q_0) = D_f(Q_2) = 2$ and $D_f^{sc}(Q_3; Q_1) = D_f^s(Q_3; Q_1) = 3$, so the lemma is true for $m = 0, 1$. In the following, we assume that the statement holds for $1 \leq k \leq m - 1$, i.e., $D_f^{sc}(Q_{k+2}; Q_k) \leq k + 2$ for $1 \leq k \leq m - 1$. Note that $\kappa^{sc}(Q_{m+2}; Q_m) = 2$ by Lemma 2.4. For $|\mathcal{F}_m^{m+2}| \leq 1$, without loss of generality, we may assume $\mathcal{F}_m^{m+2} \subseteq \cup_{i=0}^m S_i(Q_{m+2})$. Let \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} be any two vertices in $Q_{m+2} - \mathcal{F}_m^{m+2}$.

Case 1. $|F_m^{m+2}| = 0$. Since $\mathcal{F}_m^{m+2} = F_m^{m+2} \cup \mathcal{F}_{m-1}^{m+2}$, $|\mathcal{F}_{m-1}^{m+2}| \leq 1$. By the induction hypothesis, we have $D(Q_{m+2}^{0} - \mathcal{F}_{m-1}^{m+2}) \leq D_f^{sc}(Q_{m+1}; Q_{m-1}) \leq m + 1$. Then $d_{Q_{m+2} - \mathcal{F}_m^{m+2}}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \leq m + 1$ if $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in Q_{m+2}^{0}$. Obviously, $d_{Q_{m+2} - \mathcal{F}_m^{m+2}}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \leq m + 1$ if $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in Q_{m+2}^{1}$. Since $(\mathbf{u}, (\mathbf{u})^{m+2}) \in E(Q_{m+2} - \mathcal{F}_m^{m+2})$, there exists a path $\langle \mathbf{u}, (\mathbf{u})^{m+2}, P_s, \mathbf{v} \rangle$ between $\mathbf{u} \in Q_{m+2}^{0}$ and $\mathbf{v} \in Q_{m+2}^{1}$ in $Q_{m+2} - \mathcal{F}_m^{m+2}$, where P_s is in Q_{m+2}^{1} . Note that $l(P_s) \leq D(Q_{m+2}^{1}) = m + 1$, then $d_{Q_{m+2} - \mathcal{F}_m^{m+2}}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \leq m + 2$.

Case 2. $|F_m^{m+2}| = 1$. Since $Q_{m+2}^{0} - F_m^{m+2}$ is connected and isomorphic to Q_{m+1} , $d_{Q_{m+2} - \mathcal{F}_m^{m+2}}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \leq m + 1$ if $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in Q_{m+2}^{0}$. With similar argument used in Case 1, one can get that $d_{Q_{m+2} - \mathcal{F}_m^{m+2}}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \leq m + 1$ if $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in Q_{m+2}^{1}$, and $d_{Q_{m+2} - \mathcal{F}_m^{m+2}}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \leq m + 2$ if $\mathbf{u} \in Q_{m+2}^{0}$ and $\mathbf{v} \in Q_{m+2}^{1}$. Since there are 2^{m+1} pairs of symmetric vertices in Q_{m+2} and $2^{m+1} > 2^m$, we have $D_f^{sc}(Q_{m+2}; Q_m) \geq m + 2$ by Lemma 2.7.

In summary, we get $D_f^{sc}(Q_{m+2}; Q_m) = m + 2$. □

Lemma 4.2. $D_f^{sc}(Q_{m+3}; Q_m) \leq m + 4$ for $m \geq 0$.

Proof. We prove this lemma by induction on m . Clearly, $D_f^{sc}(Q_3; Q_0) = D_f(Q_3) = 4$ and $D_f^{sc}(Q_4; Q_1) = D_f^s(Q_4; Q_1) \leq 5$, so the result holds for $m = 0, 1$. In the following, we assume that the statement holds for $1 \leq k \leq m - 1$, i.e., $D_f^{sc}(Q_{k+3}; Q_k) \leq k + 4$ for $1 \leq k \leq m - 1$. Note that $\kappa^{sc}(Q_{m+3}; Q_m) = 3$. So we assume $|\mathcal{F}_m^{m+3}| \leq 2$ and let \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} be any two vertices in $Q_{m+3} - \mathcal{F}_m^{m+3}$.

Case 1. \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} are symmetric. Without loss of generality, we take $\mathbf{u} = 00 \cdots 0$ and $\mathbf{v} = 11 \cdots 1$. For $m \geq 2$ and $|\mathcal{F}_m^{m+3}| \leq 2 \leq m+2$, by Lemma 3.1, there exists a pair of vertices $(\mathbf{u})^j$ and $(\mathbf{v})^j$ in $Q_{m+3} - \mathcal{F}_m^{m+3}$. For convenience, we may assume $(\mathbf{u})^{m+3}, (\mathbf{v})^{m+3} \in Q_{m+3} - \mathcal{F}_m^{m+3}$.

Case 1.1. $|\mathcal{A}_{m,0}^{m+3}| + |\mathcal{B}_m^{m+3}| = 2$. Then $|\mathcal{A}_{m,1}^{m+3}| = 0$ and $|\mathcal{B}_m^{m+3}| \leq 2$. Thus, there exists a path $\langle \mathbf{u}, (\mathbf{u})^{m+3}, P_s, \mathbf{v} \rangle$ between \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} in $Q_{m+3} - \mathcal{F}_m^{m+3}$, where P_s is in $Q_{m+3}^{\{1\}} - \mathcal{B}_m^{m+3}$. By the induction hypothesis, we have $l(P_s) \leq D(Q_{m+3}^{\{1\}} - \mathcal{B}_m^{m+3}) \leq D_f^{sc}(Q_{m+2}; Q_{m-1}) \leq m+3$. Thus $d_{Q_{m+3} - \mathcal{F}_m^{m+3}}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \leq m+4$.

Case 1.2. $|\mathcal{A}_{m,0}^{m+3}| + |\mathcal{B}_m^{m+3}| \leq 1$. Then there exists a path $\langle \mathbf{u}, P_s, (\mathbf{v})^{m+3}, \mathbf{v} \rangle$ between \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} in $Q_{m+3} - \mathcal{F}_m^{m+3}$, where P_s is in $Q_{m+3}^{\{0\}} - \mathcal{A}_{m,0}^{m+3} - \mathcal{B}_m^{m+3}$. By Theorem 4.1, $l(P_s) \leq D(Q_{m+3}^{\{0\}} - \mathcal{A}_{m,0}^{m+3} - \mathcal{B}_m^{m+3}) \leq D_f^{sc}(Q_{m+2}; Q_m) = m+2$. So we have $d_{Q_{m+3} - \mathcal{F}_m^{m+3}}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \leq m+3$.

Case 2. \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} are unsymmetric. We may assume $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in Q_n^{\{0\}}$.

Case 2.1. $|\mathcal{A}_{m,0}^{m+3}| + |\mathcal{B}_m^{m+3}| = 2$ and $|\mathcal{B}_m^{m+3}| = 2$. Then $|\mathcal{A}_{m,0}^{m+3}| = 0$. Thus, there exists a path $\langle \mathbf{u}, P_s, \mathbf{v} \rangle$ between \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} in $Q_{m+3} - \mathcal{F}_m^{m+3}$, where P_s is in $Q_{m+3}^{\{0\}} - \mathcal{B}_m^{m+3}$. By the induction hypothesis, $l(P_s) \leq D(Q_{m+3}^{\{0\}} - \mathcal{B}_m^{m+3}) \leq D_f^{sc}(Q_{m+2}; Q_{m-1}) \leq m+3$. So $d_{Q_{m+3} - \mathcal{F}_m^{m+3}}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \leq m+3$.

Case 2.2. $|\mathcal{A}_{m,0}^{m+3}| + |\mathcal{B}_m^{m+3}| = 2$ and $|\mathcal{B}_m^{m+3}| \leq 1$. Note that $|\mathcal{A}_{m,1}^{m+3}| = 0$. Thus, there exists a path $\langle \mathbf{u}, (\mathbf{u})^{m+3}, P_s, (\mathbf{v})^{m+3}, \mathbf{v} \rangle$ between \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} in $Q_{m+3} - \mathcal{F}_m^{m+3}$, where P_s is in $Q_{m+3}^{\{1\}} - \mathcal{B}_m^{m+3}$. By Theorem 4.1, we have $l(P_s) \leq D(Q_{m+3}^{\{1\}} - \mathcal{B}_m^{m+3}) \leq D_f^{sc}(Q_{m+2}; Q_m) = m+2$. So $d_{Q_{m+3} - \mathcal{F}_m^{m+3}}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \leq m+4$.

Case 2.3. $|\mathcal{A}_{m,0}^{m+3}| + |\mathcal{B}_m^{m+3}| \leq 1$. There exists a path $\langle \mathbf{u}, P_s, \mathbf{v} \rangle$ between \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} in $Q_{m+3} - \mathcal{F}_m^{m+3}$, where P_s is in $Q_{m+3}^{\{0\}} - \mathcal{A}_{m,0}^{m+3} - \mathcal{B}_m^{m+3}$. By Case 1.2, we get $l(P_s) \leq m+2$, and thus $d_{Q_{m+3} - \mathcal{F}_m^{m+3}}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \leq m+2$. \square

Lemma 4.3. Let $m \geq 0$ and $n \geq m+3$. If $D_f^{sc}(Q_{n-1}; Q_m) \leq n$, then $D(Q_{n-1} - \mathcal{F}_m^{n-1}) \leq n-1$ for $|\mathcal{F}_m^{n-1}| \leq n-m-3$.

Proof. For $|\mathcal{F}_m^{n-1}| \leq n-m-3$, we prove $D(Q_{n-1} - \mathcal{F}_m^{n-1}) \leq n-1$ by induction on n . Obviously, $D(Q_{m+2} - \mathcal{F}_m^{m+2}) = D(Q_{m+2}) = m+2$ for $|\mathcal{F}_m^{m+2}| = 0$. Next, we prove $D(Q_{m+3} - \mathcal{F}_m^{m+3}) \leq m+3$ for $|\mathcal{F}_m^{m+3}| \leq 1$. Without loss of generality, we may assume $\mathcal{F}_m^{m+3} \subseteq \cup_{i=0}^m \mathcal{S}_i(Q_{m+3}^{\{0\}})$. Let \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} be two vertices in $Q_{m+3} - \mathcal{F}_m^{m+3}$. By Theorem 4.1, $d_{Q_{m+3} - \mathcal{F}_m^{m+3}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \leq m+3$ if $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in Q_{m+3}^{\{0\}}$ or $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in Q_{m+3}^{\{1\}}$. Since $(\mathbf{x}, (\mathbf{x})^{m+3}) \in E(Q_{m+3} - \mathcal{F}_m^{m+3})$, $d_{Q_{m+3} - \mathcal{F}_m^{m+3}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \leq m+3$ for $\mathbf{x} \in Q_{m+3}^{\{0\}}$ and $\mathbf{y} \in Q_{m+3}^{\{1\}}$. This means that the result holds for $n = m+3$ and $n = m+4$. Thus, we assume that the result also holds for $m+4 \leq k \leq n-1$, i.e., $D(Q_{k-1} - \mathcal{F}_m^{k-1}) \leq k-1$ for $m+4 \leq k \leq n-1$. Let \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} be any two vertices in $Q_{n-1} - \mathcal{F}_m^{n-1}$.

Case 1. \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} are symmetric. We set $\mathbf{u} = 00 \cdots 0$ and $\mathbf{v} = 11 \cdots 1$. For $m \leq n-5$ and $|\mathcal{F}_m^{n-1}| \leq n-m-3$, by Lemma 3.1, there exists a pair of vertices $(\mathbf{u})^j$ and $(\mathbf{v})^j$ in $Q_{n-1} - \mathcal{F}_m^{n-1}$. We may assume $(\mathbf{u})^{n-1}, (\mathbf{v})^{n-1} \in Q_{n-1} - \mathcal{F}_m^{n-1}$.

Case 1.1. $|\mathcal{A}_{m,0}^{n-1}| + |\mathcal{B}_m^{n-1}| = n - m - 3$. Then $|\mathcal{A}_{m,1}^{n-1}| = 0$ and $|\mathcal{B}_m^{n-1}| \leq n - m - 3$. This means that there exists a path $\langle \mathbf{u}, (\mathbf{u})^{n-1}, P_s, \mathbf{v} \rangle$ between \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} in $Q_{n-1} - \mathcal{F}_m^{n-1}$, where P_s is in $Q_{n-1}^{\{1\}} - \mathcal{B}_m^{n-1}$. By the induction hypothesis, we have $l(P_s) \leq D(Q_{n-1}^{\{1\}} - \mathcal{B}_m^{n-1}) \leq D(Q_{n-2} - \mathcal{F}_m^{n-2}) \leq n - 2$. Thus $d_{Q_{n-1} - \mathcal{F}_m^{n-1}}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \leq n - 1$.

Case 1.2. $|\mathcal{A}_{m,0}^{n-1}| + |\mathcal{B}_m^{n-1}| \leq n - m - 4$. Then there exists a path $\langle \mathbf{u}, P_s, (\mathbf{v})^{n-1}, \mathbf{v} \rangle$ between \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} in $Q_{n-1} - \mathcal{F}_m^{n-1}$, where P_s is in $Q_{n-1}^{\{0\}} - \mathcal{A}_{m,0}^{n-1} - \mathcal{B}_m^{n-1}$. By the induction hypothesis, we have $l(P_s) \leq D(Q_{n-1}^{\{0\}} - \mathcal{A}_{m,0}^{n-1} - \mathcal{B}_m^{n-1}) \leq D(Q_{n-2} - \mathcal{F}_m^{n-2}) \leq n - 2$. So $d_{Q_{n-1} - \mathcal{F}_m^{n-1}}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \leq n - 1$.

Case 2. \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} are unsymmetric. We may assume $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in Q_{n-1}^{\{0\}}$. Note that $|\mathcal{A}_{m,0}^{n-1}| + |\mathcal{B}_m^{n-1}| \leq n - m - 3$ and $D_f^{sc}(Q_{n-1}; Q_m) \leq n$. Then there exists a path $\langle \mathbf{u}, P_s, \mathbf{v} \rangle$ between \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} in $Q_{n-1} - \mathcal{F}_m^{n-1}$, where P_s is in $Q_{n-1}^{\{0\}} - \mathcal{A}_{m,0}^{n-1} - \mathcal{B}_m^{n-1}$. We have $d_{Q_{n-1} - \mathcal{F}_m^{n-1}}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \leq D(Q_{n-1}^{\{0\}} - \mathcal{A}_{m,0}^{n-1} - \mathcal{B}_m^{n-1}) \leq D_f^{sc}(Q_{n-2}; Q_m) \leq n - 1$. \square

Lemma 4.4. $D_f^{sc}(Q_n; Q_m) \leq n + 1$ for $m \geq 0$ and $n \geq m + 3$.

Proof. We prove this lemma by induction on n . By Lemma 4.2, this lemma holds for $n = m + 3$. Thus, we assume that this lemma holds for $m + 3 \leq k \leq n - 1$, i.e., $D_f^{sc}(Q_k; Q_m) \leq k + 1$ for $m + 3 \leq k \leq n - 1$. Note that $\kappa^{sc}(Q_n; Q_m) = n - m$. Then, for $|\mathcal{F}_m^n| \leq n - m - 1$, let \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} be any two vertices in $Q_n - \mathcal{F}_m^n$.

Case 1. \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} are symmetric. Note that $m \leq n - 4$ and $|\mathcal{F}_m^n| \leq n - m - 1$. By Lemma 3.1, there must exist a pair of vertices $(\mathbf{u})^j$ and $(\mathbf{v})^j$ in $Q_n - \mathcal{F}_m^n$ for some $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, thus we may assume $(\mathbf{u})^n, (\mathbf{v})^n \in Q_n - \mathcal{F}_m^n$.

Case 1.1. $|\mathcal{A}_{m,0}^n| + |\mathcal{B}_m^n| = n - m - 1$. Then $|\mathcal{A}_{m,1}^n| = 0$ and $|\mathcal{B}_m^n| \leq n - m - 1$. This implies that there exists a path $\langle \mathbf{u}, (\mathbf{u})^n, P_s, \mathbf{v} \rangle$ between \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} in $Q_n - \mathcal{F}_m^n$, where P_s is in $Q_n^{\{1\}} - \mathcal{B}_m^n$. By the induction hypothesis, we have $l(P_s) \leq D(Q_n^{\{1\}} - \mathcal{B}_m^n) \leq D_f^{sc}(Q_{n-1}; Q_{m-1}) \leq n$. So $d_{Q_n - \mathcal{F}_m^n}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \leq n + 1$.

Case 1.2. $|\mathcal{A}_{m,0}^n| + |\mathcal{B}_m^n| \leq n - m - 2$. Then there exists a path $\langle \mathbf{u}, P_s, (\mathbf{v})^n, \mathbf{v} \rangle$ between \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} in $Q_n - \mathcal{F}_m^n$, where P_s is in $Q_n^{\{0\}} - \mathcal{A}_{m,0}^n - \mathcal{B}_m^n$. By the induction hypothesis, we have $l(P_s) \leq D(Q_n^{\{0\}} - \mathcal{A}_{m,0}^n - \mathcal{B}_m^n) \leq D_f^{sc}(Q_{n-1}; Q_m) \leq n$. Thus, $d_{Q_n - \mathcal{F}_m^n}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \leq n + 1$.

Case 2. \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} are unsymmetric. Without loss of generality, we may assume $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in Q_n^{\{0\}}$.

Case 2.1. $|\mathcal{A}_{m,0}^n| + |\mathcal{B}_m^n| = n - m - 1$, and $|\mathcal{A}_{m,1}^n| \geq 1$. Then $|\mathcal{A}_{m,1}^n| = 0$ and $|\mathcal{B}_m^n| \leq n - m - 2$. Thus, there exists a path $\langle \mathbf{u}, (\mathbf{u})^n, P_s, (\mathbf{v})^n, \mathbf{v} \rangle$ between \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} in $Q_n - \mathcal{F}_m^n$, where P_s is in $Q_n^{\{1\}} - \mathcal{B}_m^n$. By the induction hypothesis, we have $D_f^{sc}(Q_{n-1}; Q_{m-1}) \leq n$. Then, by Lemma 4.3, $l(P_s) \leq D(Q_n^{\{1\}} - \mathcal{B}_m^n) \leq D(Q_{n-1} - \mathcal{F}_m^{n-1}) \leq n - 1$. And so $d_{Q_n - \mathcal{F}_m^n}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \leq n + 1$.

Case 2.2. $|\mathcal{A}_{m,0}^n| + |\mathcal{B}_m^n| = n - m - 1$, and $|\mathcal{A}_{m,1}^n| = 0$. Then $|\mathcal{B}_m^n| = n - m - 1$. So there exists a path $\langle \mathbf{u}, P_s, \mathbf{v} \rangle$ between \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} in $Q_n - \mathcal{F}_m^n$, where P_s is in $Q_n^{\{0\}} - \mathcal{B}_m^n$. By the induction hypothesis, we have $l(P_s) \leq D(Q_n^{\{0\}} - \mathcal{B}_m^n) \leq D_f^{sc}(Q_{n-1}; Q_{m-1}) \leq n$. Thus $d_{Q_n - \mathcal{F}_m^n}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \leq n$.

Case 2.3. $|\mathcal{A}_{m,0}^n| + |\mathcal{B}_m^n| \leq n - m - 2$. Then there exists a path $\langle \mathbf{u}, P_s, \mathbf{v} \rangle$ between \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v}

in $Q_n - \mathcal{F}_m^n$, where P_s is in $Q_n^{\{0\}} - \mathcal{A}_{m,0}^n - \mathcal{B}_m^n$. By Case 1.2, we get $l(P_s) \leq n$. Therefore $d_{Q_n - \mathcal{F}_m^n}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \leq n$. \square

Lemma 4.5. For $m \geq 0$ and $n \geq m + 3$, $D_f(Q_n; Q_m) \geq n + 1$ and $D_f^{sc}(Q_n; Q_m) \geq n + 1$.

Proof. We take $\mathbf{x} = 00 \cdots 0 \in Q_m$ and assume $Q_m \subseteq Q_n^{\{0\}}$. Note that $Q_n^{\{0\}} = Q_m \square Q_{n-m-1}$. Let $\mathbf{t} \in V(Q_{n-m-1})$, and we take $N_{Q_{n-m-1}}(\mathbf{t}) = \{\mathbf{t}_1, \mathbf{t}_2, \dots, \mathbf{t}_{n-m-1}\}$. We set $\mathbf{y} = 11 \cdots 10 \in Q_n^{\{0\}}$. Clearly, $|\cup_{i=1}^{n-m-1} (Q_m, \mathbf{t}_i)| = n - m - 1$ and the removal of $\cup_{i=1}^{n-m-1} (Q_m, \mathbf{t}_i)$ disconnects $Q_n^{\{0\}}$ such that Q_m and \mathbf{y} are in the distinct components. For any $\mathbf{z} \in Q_m$, we have that \mathbf{z} and \mathbf{y} are also in the distinct components of $Q_n^{\{0\}} - \cup_{i=1}^{n-m-1} (Q_m, \mathbf{t}_i)$. Since $Q_n - \cup_{i=1}^{n-m-1} (Q_m, \mathbf{t}_i)$ is connected, there is a path $\langle \mathbf{x}, P_1, \mathbf{z}, (\mathbf{z})^n, P_2, \mathbf{y} \rangle$ between \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} in $Q_n - \cup_{i=1}^{n-m-1} (Q_m, \mathbf{t}_i)$. Note that $H_{Q_n}((\mathbf{z})^n, \mathbf{y}) = n - s$ if $H_{Q_m}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = s$, and $0 \leq s \leq m$. Then $l(P_1) \geq s$ and $l(P_2) \geq n - s$. Thus, the length of any path between \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} is at least $n + 1$. This implies $D_f(Q_n; Q_m) \geq n + 1$. Since $D_f(Q_n; Q_m) \leq D_f^{sc}(Q_n; Q_m)$, $D_f^{sc}(Q_n; Q_m) \geq n + 1$. \square

By Lemmas 4.4 and 4.5, we have the following theorem:

Theorem 4.6. $D_f^{sc}(Q_n; Q_m) = n + 1$ for $m \geq 0$ and $n \geq m + 3$.

On one hand, according to Theorem 4.6 and the fact $D_f(Q_n; Q_m) \leq D_f^{sc}(Q_n; Q_m)$, we obtain $D_f(Q_n; Q_m) \leq n + 1$. On the other hand, by Lemma 4.5, we derive $D_f(Q_n; Q_m) \geq n + 1$. Thus, $D_f(Q_n; Q_m) = n + 1$. Combining this with Theorem 4.1, we get the following theorem:

Theorem 4.7. For $n \geq 3$ and $0 \leq m \leq n - 2$, $D_f(Q_n; Q_m) = \begin{cases} n & \text{if } n = m + 2, \\ n + 1 & \text{if } n \geq m + 3. \end{cases}$

5 Concluding remarks

In this paper, we introduced two novel concepts of fault diameters for graphs: the *structure fault diameter* and the *substructure fault diameter*, applying these definitions to analyze the n -dimensional hypercube Q_n . Unlike the conventional wide diameter approach, our method focuses on determining the maximum diameter between any two vertices under structure faults. A natural extension of this work would involve determining the $K_{1,n}$ -structure fault diameter and $K_{1,n}$ -substructure fault diameter of various graph structures, further enriching our understanding of network robustness in the presence of complex fault scenarios.

References

- [1] L. Ba, Y. Zhang, and H. Zhang, The path-structure connectivity of augmented k -ary n -cubes, The Computer Journal 66 (2023) 3119-3128.
- [2] J. Bondy and U. Murty, Graph Theory with Applications, New York, Springer (2008).

- [3] X. Chen, Hamiltonicity of hypercubes with faulty vertices, *Information processing letters* 116 (2016) 343-346.
- [4] K. Day and A. E. Al-Ayyoub, Fault diameter of k -ary n -cube networks, *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems* 8 (1997) 903-907.
- [5] J.-S. Fu, G.-H. Chen, and D.-R. Duh, Node-disjoint paths and related problems on hierarchical cubic networks, *Networks* 40 (2002) 142-154.
- [6] F. Harary, *Graph Theory*, Addison-Wesley, Reading (1969).
- [7] M. S. Krishnamoorthy and B. Krishnamurthy, Fault diameter of interconnection networks, *Computers and Mathematics with Applications* 13 (1987) 577-582.
- [8] T.-L. Kung, C.-K. Lin, T. Liang, L.-Y. Hsu, and J. J.-M. Tan. Fault diameter of hypercubes with hybrid node and link faults, *Journal of Interconnection Networks* 10 (2009) 233-242.
- [9] F. T. Leighton, *Introduction to Parallel Algorithms and Architecture: Arrays, Trees, Hypercubes*, Morgan Kaufmann (1992).
- [10] C.-K. Lin, L. Zhang, J. Fan, and D. Wang, Structure connectivity and substructure connectivity of hypercubes, *Theoretical Computer Science* 634 (2018) 97-107.
- [11] Y. Lv, C.-K. Lin, J. Fan, and X. Jia, Hamiltonian cycle and path embeddings in 3-ary n -cubes based on $K_{1,3}$ -structure faults, *Journal of Parallel and Distributed Computing* 120 (2018) 1148-1158.
- [12] Y. Lv, C.-K. Lin, and J. Fan, Hamiltonian cycle and path embeddings in k -ary n -cubes based on structure faults, *The Computer Journal* 60 (2017) 159-179.
- [13] B. Niu, S. Zhou, T. Tian, and Q. Zhang, The wide diameter and fault diameter of exchanged crossed cube, *International Journal of Foundations of Computer Science* 35 (2024) 435-451.
- [14] K. Pan, Star fault tolerance of hypercube, *Theoretical Computer Science* 972 (2023) 114052.
- [15] H. Qi and X. Zhu, The fault-diameter and wide-diameter of twisted hypercubes, *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 235 (2018) 154-160.
- [16] Y. Rouskov and P. K. Srimani, Fault diameter of star graphs, *Information Processing Letters* 48 (1993) 243-251.
- [17] E. Sabir and J. Meng, Fault-tolerant hamiltonicity of hypercubes with faulty subcubes, *Information Processing letters* 172 (2021) 106160.
- [18] E. Sabir, J. Fan, J. Meng, and B. Cheng, Structure fault-tolerant hamiltonian cycle and path embeddings in bipartite k -ary n -cube networks, *IEEE Transactions on Reliability* 73 (2024) 257-269.

- [19] T.-H. Tsai, Y.-C. Chen, and J. J.-M. Tan, Topological properties on the wide and fault diameters of exchanged hypercubes, *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems* 25 (2014) 3317-3327.
- [20] G. Wang, J. Yu, Y. Zou, J. Fan, and W. Cheng, A new measure of fault-tolerance for network reliability: double-structure connectivity, *IEEE Transactions on Networking* 32 (2024) 874-889.
- [21] N. Wang, J. Meng, and Y. Tian, Reliability analyses of regular graphs based on edge-structure connectivity, *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 356 (2024) 329-342.
- [22] Y. Yang, X. Hua, and L. Yang, Hyper $K_{1,r}$ and sub- $K_{1,r}$ fault tolerance of star graphs, *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 339 (2023) 172-177.
- [23] Y. Zhang, W. Fan, Z. Han, Y. Song, and R. Wang, Fault-tolerant routing algorithm based on disjoint paths in 3-ary n -cube networks with structure faults, *The Journal of Supercomputing* 77 (2021) 13090-13114.
- [24] L. Zhao and S. Wang, Structure connectivity and substructure connectivity of split-star networks, *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 341 (2023) 359-371.