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For a graph $G$ let $L(G)$ and $l(G)$ denote the size of the largest and smallest maximum matching of a graph obtained from $G$ by removing a maximum matching of $G$. We show that $L(G) \leq 2 l(G)$, and $L(G) \leq \frac{3}{2} l(G)$ provided that $G$ contains a perfect matching. We also characterize the class of graphs for which $L(G)=2 l(G)$. Our characterization implies the existence of a polynomial algorithm for testing the property $L(G)=2 l(G)$. Finally we show that it is $N P$-complete to test whether a graph $G$ containing a perfect matching satisfies $L(G)=\frac{3}{2} l(G)$.

## 1. Introduction

In the paper graphs are assumed to be finite, undirected, without loops or multiple edges. Let $V(G)$ and $E(G)$ denote the sets of vertices and edges of a graph $G$, respectively. If $v \in V(G)$ and $e \in E(G)$, then $e$ is said to cover $v$ if $e$ is incident to $v$. For $V^{\prime} \subseteq V(G)$ and $E^{\prime} \subseteq E(G)$ let $G \backslash V^{\prime}$ and $G \backslash E^{\prime}$ denote the graphs obtained from $G$ by removing $V^{\prime}$ and $E^{\prime}$, respectively. Moreover, let $V\left(E^{\prime}\right)$ denote the set of vertices of $G$ that are covered by an edge from $E^{\prime}$. A subgraph $H$ of $G$ is said to be spanning for $G$, if $V(E(H))=V(G)$.

The length of a path (cycle) is the number of its edges. A $k$-path ( $k$-cycle) is a path (cycle) of length $k$. A 3-cycle is called a triangle.

A set $V^{\prime} \subseteq V(G)\left(E^{\prime} \subseteq E(G)\right)$ is said to be independent, if $V^{\prime}\left(E^{\prime}\right)$ contains no adjacent vertices (edges). An independent set of edges is called matching. A matching of $G$ is called perfect, if it covers all vertices of $G$. Let $\nu(G)$ denote the cardinality of a largest matching of $G$. A matching of $G$ is maximum, if it contains $\nu(G)$ edges.

For a positive integer $k$ and a matching $M$ of $G$, a $(2 k-1)$-path $P$ is called $M$ augmenting, if the $2^{\text {nd }}, 4^{t h}, 6^{\text {th }}, \ldots,(2 k-2)^{\text {th }}$ edges of $P$ belong to $M$, while the endvertices of $P$ are not covered by an edge of $M$. The following theorem of Berge gives a sufficient and necessary condition for a matching to be maximum:
Theorem 1 (Berge [2]) A matching $M$ of $G$ is maximum, if $G$ contains no $M$-augmenting path.

[^0]For two matchings $M$ and $M^{\prime}$ of $G$ consider the subgraph $H$ of $G$, where $V(H)=$ $V\left(M \triangle M^{\prime}\right)$ and $E(H)=M \triangle M^{\prime}$. The connected components of $H$ are called $M \triangle M^{\prime}$ alternating components. Note that $M \triangle M^{\prime}$ alternating components are always paths or cycles of even length. For a graph $G$ define:

$$
\begin{aligned}
L(G) & \equiv \max \{\nu(G \backslash F): F \text { is a maximum matching of } G\}, \\
l(G) & \equiv \min \{\nu(G \backslash F): F \text { is a maximum matching of } G\} .
\end{aligned}
$$

It is known that $L(G)$ and $l(G)$ are $N P$-hard calculable even for connected bipartite graphs $G$ with maximum degree three [4], though there are polynomial algorithms which construct a maximum matching $F$ of a tree $G$ such that $\nu(G \backslash F)=L(G)$ and $\nu(G \backslash F)=$ $l(G)$ (to be presented in [5]).

In the same paper [5] it is shown that $L(G) \leq 2 l(G)$. In the present paper we reprove this equality, and also show that $L(G) \leq \frac{3}{2} l(G)$ provided that $G$ contains a perfect matching.

A naturally arising question is the characterization of graphs $G$ with $L(G)=2 l(G)$ and the graphs $G$ with a perfect matching that satisfy $L(G)=\frac{3}{2} l(G)$. In this paper we solve these problems by giving a characterization of graphs $G$ with $L(G)=2 l(G)$ that implies the existence of a polynomial algorithm for testing this property, and by showing that it is $N P$-complete to test whether a bridgeless cubic graph $G$ satisfies $L(G)=\frac{3}{2} l(G)$. Recall that by Petersen theorem any bridgeless cubic graph contains a perfect matching (see, for example, theorem 3.4.1 of [ 6$]$ ).

Terms and concepts that we do not define can be found in [1, 2, 6, 8, 8 .

## 2. Some auxiliarly results

We will need the following:
Theorem 2 Let $G$ be a graph. Then:
(a) for any two maximum matchings $F, F^{\prime}$ of $G$, we have $\nu\left(G \backslash F^{\prime}\right) \leq 2 \nu(G \backslash F)$;
(b) $L(G) \leq 2 l(G)$;
(c) If $L(G)=2 l(G), F_{L}, F_{l}$ are two maximum matchings of the graph $G$ with $\nu\left(G \backslash F_{L}\right)=$ $L(G), \nu\left(G \backslash F_{l}\right)=l(G)$, and $H_{L}$ is any maximum matching of the graph $G \backslash F_{L}$, then:
(c1) $F_{l} \backslash F_{L} \subset H_{L}$;
(c2) $H_{L} \backslash F_{l}$ is a maximum matching of $G \backslash F_{l}$;
(c3) $F_{L} \backslash F_{l}$ is a maximum matching of $G \backslash F_{l}$;
(d) if $G$ contains a perfect matching, then $L(G) \leq \frac{3}{2} l(G)$.

Proof. (a)Let $H^{\prime}$ be any maximum matching in the graph $G \backslash F^{\prime}$. Then:
$\nu\left(G \backslash F^{\prime}\right)=\left|H^{\prime}\right|=\left|H^{\prime} \cap F\right|+\left|H^{\prime} \backslash F\right| \leq\left|F \backslash F^{\prime}\right|+\nu(G \backslash F)=\left|F^{\prime} \backslash F\right|+\nu(G \backslash F) \leq 2 \nu(G \backslash F)$.
(b) follows from (a).

On upper bounds for parameters related to construction of special maximum matchings3
(c) Consider the proof of (a) and take $F^{\prime}=F_{L}, H^{\prime}=H_{L}$ and $F=F_{l}$. Since $L(G)=$ $2 l(G)$, we must have equalities throughout, thus properties (c1)-(c3) should be true.
(d) Let $F_{L}, F_{l}$ be two perfect matchings of the graph $G$ with $\nu\left(G \backslash F_{L}\right)=L(G), \nu\left(G \backslash F_{l}\right)=$ $l(G)$, and assume $H_{L}$ to be a maximum matching of the graph $G \backslash F_{L}$. Define:

$$
\begin{array}{r}
X=\left\{e=(u, v) \in F_{L}: u \text { and } v \text { are incident to an edge from } H_{L} \cap F_{l}\right\} \\
x=|X|, k=\left|H_{L} \cap F_{l}\right| ;
\end{array}
$$

Clearly, $\left(H_{L} \backslash F_{l}\right) \cup X$ is a matching of the graph $G \backslash F_{l}$, therefore, taking into account that $\left(H_{L} \backslash F_{l}\right) \cap X=\emptyset$, we deduce

$$
l(G)=\nu\left(G \backslash F_{l}\right) \geq\left|H_{L} \backslash F_{l}\right|+|X|=\left|H_{L}\right|-\left|H_{L} \cap F_{l}\right|+|X|=L(G)-k+x
$$

Since $F_{L}$ is a perfect matching, it covers the set $V\left(H_{L} \cap F_{l}\right) \backslash V(X)$, which contains

$$
\left|V\left(H_{L} \cap F_{l}\right) \backslash V(X)\right|=2\left|\left(H_{L} \cap F_{l}\right)\right|-2|X|=2 k-2 x
$$

vertices. Define the set $E_{F_{L}}$ as follows:

$$
E_{F_{L}}=\left\{e \in F_{L}: e \text { covers a vertex from } V\left(H_{L} \cap F_{l}\right) \backslash V(X)\right\} .
$$

Clearly, $E_{F_{L}}$ is a matching of $G \backslash F_{l}$, too, and therefore

$$
l(G)=\nu\left(G \backslash F_{l}\right) \geq\left|E_{F_{L}}\right|=2 k-2 x
$$

Let us show that

$$
\max \{L(G)-k+x, 2 k-2 x\} \geq \frac{2 L(G)}{3}
$$

Note that
if $x \geq k-\frac{L(G)}{3}$ then $L(G)-k+x \geq L(G)-k+k-\frac{L(G)}{3}=\frac{2 L(G)}{3}$;
if $x \leq k-\frac{L(G)}{3}$ then $2 k-2 x \geq \frac{2 L(G)}{3}$,
thus in both cases we have $l(G) \geq \frac{2 L(G)}{3}$ or

$$
\frac{L(G)}{l(G)} \leq \frac{3}{2}
$$

The proof of the theorem 2 is completed.
Lemma 1 (Lemma 2.20, 2.41 of [5]) Let $G$ be a graph, and assume that $u$ and $v$ are vertices of degree one sharing a neighbour $w \in V(G)$. Then:

$$
L(G)=L(G \backslash\{u, v, w\})+1, l(G)=l(G \backslash\{u, v, w\})+1
$$

Proof. The proofs of these two equalities are similar, thus we will stop only on the proof of the first one. Our proof is based on the ideas of [5].

First of all, observe that $\nu(G)=\nu(G \backslash\{u, v, w\})+1$. Let us show that $L(G) \geq$ $L(G \backslash\{u, v, w\})+1$. Take any maximum matching $F$ of $G \backslash\{u, v, w\}$ with $\nu((G \backslash\{u, v, w\}) \backslash F)=$ $L(G \backslash\{u, v, w\})$, and let $H$ be any maximum matching of $(G \backslash\{u, v, w\}) \backslash F$. Define:

$$
F^{\prime}=F \cup\{(u, w)\}, H^{\prime}=H \cup\{(v, w)\}
$$

Observe that $F^{\prime}$ is a maximum matching of $G$, and $H^{\prime}$ is a matching of $G \backslash F^{\prime}$. Thus,

$$
L(G) \geq \nu\left(G \backslash F^{\prime}\right) \geq\left|H^{\prime}\right|=1+|H|=1+\nu((G \backslash\{u, v, w\}) \backslash F)=1+L(G \backslash\{u, v, w\})
$$

To complete the proof of the first equality, it suffices to show that $L(G) \leq L(G \backslash\{u, v, w\})+$ 1. First of all, let us show that there is a maximum matching $F^{\prime}$ of $G$ with $\nu\left(G \backslash F^{\prime}\right)=$ $L(G)$, such that $F^{\prime}$ contains one of the edges $(u, w)$ and $(v, w)$.

Take any maximum matching $F^{\prime}$ of $G$ with $\nu\left(G \backslash F^{\prime}\right)=L(G)$, and assume that $F^{\prime} \cap$ $\{(u, w),(v, w)\}=\emptyset$. Morever, let $H^{\prime}$ be a maximum matching of $G \backslash F^{\prime}$. Since $F^{\prime}$ is a maximum matching of $G, F^{\prime}$ must contain an edge $(w, z)$, where $z \neq u, v$. Define:

$$
F^{\prime \prime}= \begin{cases}\left(F^{\prime} \backslash\{(w, z)\}\right) \cup\{(w, u)\}, & \text { if }(w, u) \notin H ; \\ \left(F^{\prime} \backslash\{(w, z)\}\right) \cup\{(w, v)\}, & \text { if }(w, u) \in H .\end{cases}
$$

Observe that $F^{\prime \prime}$ is a maximum matching of $G$, and $H^{\prime}$ is a matching of $G \backslash F^{\prime \prime}$. Thus,

$$
\nu\left(G \backslash F^{\prime \prime}\right) \geq\left|H^{\prime}\right|=\nu\left(G \backslash F^{\prime}\right)=L(G)
$$

The last inequality implies that $\nu\left(G \backslash F^{\prime \prime}\right)=L(G)$. Moreover, $F^{\prime \prime} \cap\{(u, w),(v, w)\} \neq \emptyset$.
Thus, initially we can assume that $F^{\prime}$ is a maximum matching of $G$ with $\nu\left(G \backslash F^{\prime}\right)=$ $L(G)$, such that $F^{\prime}$ contains one of the edges $(u, w)$ and $(v, w)$. Without loss of generality, we can also assume that this edge is $(u, w)$. Now, we claim that there is a maximum matching $H^{\prime}$ of $G \backslash F^{\prime}$ that contains the edge $(v, w)$.

Take any maximum matching $H^{\prime}$ of $G \backslash F^{\prime}$ and suppose that $(v, w) \notin H^{\prime}$. Since $H^{\prime}$ is a maximum matching of $G \backslash F^{\prime}$, there must exist an edge $(w, z) \in H^{\prime}$, where $z \neq u, v$. Define:

$$
H^{\prime \prime}=\left(H^{\prime} \backslash\{(w, z)\}\right) \cup\{(w, v)\}
$$

Observe that $H^{\prime \prime}$ is a maximum matching of $G \backslash F^{\prime}$, since $\left|H^{\prime \prime}\right|=\left|H^{\prime}\right|=\nu\left(G \backslash F^{\prime}\right)=L(G)$. Moreover, it contains the edge $(w, v)$. Thus, initially we can assume that $H^{\prime}$ is a maximum matching of $G \backslash F^{\prime}$ that contains the edge $(v, w)$.

We are ready to show that $L(G) \leq L(G \backslash\{u, v, w\})+1$. Since $\nu(G)=\nu(G \backslash\{u, v, w\})+1$, we have that $F^{\prime} \backslash\{(u, w)\}$ is a maximum matching of $G \backslash\{u, v, w\}$. Taking into account that $H^{\prime} \backslash\{(v, w)\}$ is a matching of $(G \backslash\{u, v, w\}) \backslash\left(F^{\prime} \backslash\{(u, w)\}\right)$, we deduce:

$$
\begin{array}{r}
L(G)=\nu\left(G \backslash F^{\prime}\right)=\left|H^{\prime}\right|=1+\left|H^{\prime} \backslash\{(v, w)\}\right| \leq 1+\nu\left((G \backslash\{u, v, w\}) \backslash\left(F^{\prime} \backslash\{(u, w)\}\right)\right) \leq \\
1+L(G \backslash\{u, v, w\})
\end{array}
$$

Corollary 1 Let $G$ be a graph with $L(G)=2 l(G)$. Then there are no vertices $u$, $v$ of degree one, that are adjacent to the same vertex $w$.

Proof. Suppose not. Then lemma 1 and (b) of theorem 2 imply

$$
L(G)=1+L(G-\{u, v, w\}) \leq 1+2 l(G-\{u, v, w\})=1+2(l(G)-1)<2 l(G)
$$

a contradiction.
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## 3. Characterization of graphs $G$ satisfying $L(G)=2 l(G)$

Let $T$ be the set of all triangles of $G$ that contain at least two vertices of degree two. Note that any vertex of degree two lies in at most one triangle from $T$. From each triangle $t \in T$ choose a vertex $v_{t}$ of degree two, and define $V_{1}(G)$ as follows:

$$
V_{1}(G)=\left\{v: d_{G}(v)=1\right\} \cup\left\{v_{t}: t \in T\right\}
$$

Theorem 3 Let $G$ be a connected graph with $|V(G)| \geq 3$. Then $L(G)=2 l(G)$ if and only if
(1) $G \backslash V_{1}(G)$ is a bipartite graph with a bipartition $(X, Y)$;
(2) $\left|V_{1}(G)\right|=|Y|$ and any $y \in Y$ has exactly one neighbour in $V_{1}(G)$;
(3) the graph $G \backslash V_{1}(G)$ contains $|X|$ vertex disjoint 2-paths.

Proof. Sufficiency. Let $G$ be a connected graph with $|V(G)| \geq 3$ satisfying the conditions (1)-(3). Let us show that $L(G)=2 l(G)$.

For each vertex $v$ with $d(v)=1$ take the edge incident to it and define $F_{1}$ as the union of all these edges. For each vertex $v_{t} \in V_{1}(G)$ take the edge that connects $v_{t}$ to a vertex of degree two, and define $F_{2}$ as the union of all those edges. Set:

$$
F=F_{1} \cup F_{2}
$$

Note that $F$ is a matching with $|F|=\left|V_{1}(G)\right|=|Y|$. Moreover, since $G$ is bipartite and $\left|V_{1}(G)\right|=|Y|$, the definitions of $F_{1}$ and $F_{2}$ imply that there is no $F$-augmenting path in $G$. Thus, by Berge theorem, $F$ is a maximum matching of $G$, and

$$
\nu(G)=|F|=\left|V_{1}(G)\right|=|Y| .
$$

Observe that the graph $G \backslash F$ is a bipartite graph with $\nu(G \backslash F) \leq|X|$, thus

$$
l(G) \leq \nu(G \backslash F) \leq|X|
$$

Now, consider the $|X|$ vertex disjoint 2-paths of the graph $G \backslash V_{1}(G)$ guaranteed by (3). (2) implies that these 2-paths together with the $|F|=\left|V_{1}(G)\right|=|Y|$ edges of $F$ form $|X|$ vertex disjoint 4-paths of the graph $G$.

Consider matchings $M_{1}$ and $M_{2}$ of $G$ obtained from these 4 -paths by adding the first and the third, the second and the fourth edges of these 4-paths to $M_{1}$ and $M_{2}$, respectively. Define:

$$
F^{\prime}=\left(F \backslash M_{2}\right) \cup\left(M_{1} \backslash F\right) .
$$

Note that $F^{\prime}$ is a matching of $G$ and $\left|F^{\prime}\right|=|F|$, thus $F^{\prime}$ is a maximum matching of $G$. Since $F^{\prime} \cap M_{2}=\emptyset$, we have

$$
L(G) \geq \nu\left(G \backslash F^{\prime}\right) \geq\left|M_{2}\right|=2|X| \geq 2 l(G)
$$

(b) of theorem 2 implies that $L(G)=2 l(G)$.

Necessity. Now, assume that $G$ is a connected graph with $|V(G)| \geq 3$ and $L(G)=2 l(G)$. By proving a series of claims, we show that $G \backslash V_{1}(G)$ satisfies the conditions (1)-(3) of the theorem.

Claim 1 For any maximum matchings $F_{L}, F_{l}$ of the graph $G$ with $\nu\left(G \backslash F_{L}\right)=L(G)$, $\nu\left(G \backslash F_{l}\right)=l(G), F_{L} \cup F_{l}$ induces a spanning subgraph, that is $V\left(F_{L}\right) \cup V\left(F_{l}\right)=V(G)$.

Proof. Suppose that there is a vertex $v \in V(G)$ that is covered neither by $F_{L}$ nor by $F_{l}$. Since $F_{L}$ and $F_{l}$ are maximum matchings of $G$, for each edge $e=(u, v)$ the vertex $u$ is incident to an edge from $F_{L}$ and to an edge from $F_{l}$.

Case 1: there is an edge $e=(u, v)$ such that $u$ is incident to an edge from $F_{L} \cap F_{l}$.
Note that $\{e\} \cup\left(F_{L} \backslash F_{l}\right)$ is a matching of $G \backslash F_{l}$ which contradicts (c3) of the theorem 2,
Case 2: for each edge $e=(u, v) u$ is incident to an edge $f_{L} \in F_{L} \backslash F_{l}$ and to an edge $f_{l} \in F_{l} \backslash F_{L}$.

Let $H_{L}$ be any maximum matching of $G \backslash F_{L}$. Due to (c1) of theorem $2 f_{l} \in H_{L}$. Define:

$$
H_{L}^{\prime}=\left(H_{L} \backslash\left\{f_{l}\right\}\right) \cup\{e\} .
$$

Note that $H_{L}^{\prime}$ is a maximum matching of $G \backslash F_{L}$ such that $F_{l} \backslash F_{L}$ is not a subset of $H_{L}^{\prime}$ contradicting (c1) of theorem 2.

Claim 2 For any maximum matchings $F_{L}, F_{l}$ of the graph $G$ with $\nu\left(G \backslash F_{L}\right)=L(G)$, $\nu\left(G \backslash F_{l}\right)=l(G)$, the alternating components $F_{L} \triangle F_{l}$ are 2-paths.

Proof. It suffices to show that there is no edge $f_{L} \in F_{L}$ that is adjacent to two edges from $F_{l}$. Suppose that some edge $f_{L} \in F_{L}$ is adjacent to edges $f_{l}^{\prime}$ and $f_{l}^{\prime \prime}$ from $F_{l}$. Let $H_{L}$ be any maximum matching of $G \backslash F_{L}$. Due to (c1) of theorem $2 f_{l}^{\prime}, f_{l}^{\prime \prime} \in H_{L}$. This implies that $\left\{f_{L}\right\} \cup\left(H_{L} \backslash F_{l}\right)$ is a matching of $G \backslash F_{l}$ which contradicts (c2) of theorem 2.

Claim 3 For any maximum matchings $F_{L}, F_{l}$ of the graph $G$ with $\nu\left(G \backslash F_{L}\right)=L(G)$, $\nu\left(G \backslash F_{l}\right)=l(G)$
(a) if $u \in V\left(F_{l}\right) \backslash V\left(F_{L}\right)$ then $d(u)=1$ or $d(u)=2$. Moreover, in the latter case, if $v$ and $w$ denote the two neighbours of $u$, where $(u, w) \in F_{l}$, then $d(w)=2$ and $(v, w) \in F_{L}$.
(b) if $u \in V\left(F_{L}\right) \backslash V\left(F_{l}\right)$ then $d(u) \geq 2$.

Proof. (a) Assume that $u$ is covered by an edge $e_{l} \in F_{l}$ and $u \notin V\left(F_{L}\right)$. Suppose that $d(u) \geq 2$, and there is an edge $e=(u, v)$ such that $e \notin F_{l}$. Taking into account the claim 1. we need only to consider the following four cases:

Case 1: $v \in V\left(F_{l}\right) \backslash V\left(F_{L}\right)$.
This is impossible, since $F_{L}$ is a maximum matching.
Case 2: $v$ is covered by an edge $f \in F_{L} \cap F_{l}$;
Let $H_{L}$ be any maximum matching of $G \backslash F_{L}$. Due to (c1) of theorem 2 $e_{l} \in H_{L}$, thus $e \notin H_{L}$.

Define:

$$
F_{L}^{\prime}=\left(F_{L} \backslash\{f\}\right) \cup\{e\}
$$

Note that $F_{L}^{\prime}$ is a maximum matching, and $H_{L}$ is a matching of $G \backslash F_{L}^{\prime}$. Moreover,

$$
\nu\left(G \backslash F_{L}^{\prime}\right) \geq\left|H_{L}\right|=\nu\left(G \backslash F_{L}\right)=L(G)
$$
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thus $H_{L}$ is a maximum matching of $G \backslash F_{L}^{\prime}$ and $\nu\left(G \backslash F_{L}^{\prime}\right)=L(G)$. This is a contradiction because $F_{L}^{\prime} \triangle F_{l}$ contains a component which is not a 2-path contradicting claim 2.

Case 3: $v$ is incident to an edge $f_{L} \in F_{L}, f_{l} \in F_{l}$ and $f_{L} \neq f_{l}$.
Let $H_{L}$ be any maximum matching of $G \backslash F_{L}$. Due to (c1) of theorem 2, $e_{l}, f_{l} \in H_{L}$. Define:

$$
F_{L}^{\prime}=\left(F_{L} \backslash\left\{f_{L}\right\}\right) \cup\{e\} .
$$

Note that $F_{L}^{\prime}$ is a maximum matching, and $H_{L}$ is a matching of $G \backslash F_{L}^{\prime}$. Moreover,

$$
\nu\left(G \backslash F_{L}^{\prime}\right) \geq\left|H_{L}\right|=\nu\left(G \backslash F_{L}\right)=L(G)
$$

thus $H_{L}$ is a maximum matching of $G \backslash F_{L}^{\prime}$ and $\nu\left(G \backslash F_{L}^{\prime}\right)=L(G)$. This is a contradiction because $F_{L}^{\prime} \triangle F_{l}$ contains a component which is not a 2-path contradicting claim 2.

Case 4: $v$ is covered by an edge $e_{L} \in F_{L}$ and $v \notin V\left(F_{l}\right)$.
Note that if $e_{L}$ is not adjacent to $e_{l}$ then claim 2 implies that the edges $e, e_{L}$ and the edge $\tilde{e} \in F_{l} \backslash F_{L}$ that is adjacent to $e_{L}$ would form an augmenting 3 -path with respect to $F_{L}$, which would contradict the maximality of $F_{L}$.

Thus it remains to consider the case when $e_{L}$ is adjacent to $e_{l}$ and $d(u)=2$. Let $w$ be the vertex adjacent to both $e_{l}$ and $e_{L}$. Let us show that $d(w)=2$. Let $H_{L}$ be any maximum matching of $G \backslash F_{L}$. Due to (c1) of theorem 2, $e_{l} \in H_{L}$. Define:

$$
F_{L}^{\prime}=\left(F_{L} \backslash\left\{e_{L}\right\}\right) \cup\{e\}
$$

Note that $F_{L}^{\prime}$ is a maximum matching, and $H_{L}$ is a matching of $G \backslash F_{L}^{\prime}$. Moreover,

$$
\nu\left(G \backslash F_{L}^{\prime}\right) \geq\left|H_{L}\right|=\nu\left(G \backslash F_{L}\right)=L(G)
$$

thus $H_{L}$ is a maximum matching of $G \backslash F_{L}^{\prime}$ and $\nu\left(G \backslash F_{L}^{\prime}\right)=L(G)$. If $d(w) \geq 3$ there is a vertex $w^{\prime} \neq u, v$ such that $\left(w, w^{\prime}\right) \in E(G)$ and $w^{\prime}$ satisfies one of the conditions of cases 1,2 and 3 with respect to $F_{L}^{\prime}$ and $F_{l}$. A contradiction. Thus $d(w)=2$.

Clearly, $(v, w)=e_{L} \in F_{L}$.
(b) This follows from (a) of claim 3 and corollary 1, $\square$

Claim 4 Let $F_{L}, F_{l}$ be any maximum matchings of the graph $G$ with $\nu\left(G \backslash F_{L}\right)=L(G)$, $\nu\left(G \backslash F_{l}\right)=l(G)$. Then for any maximum matching $H_{L}$ of the graph $G \backslash F_{L}$ there is no edge of $F_{L} \cap F_{l}$ which is adjacent to two edges from $H_{L}$.

Proof. Due to (c3) of theorem 2 any edge from $H_{L}$ that is incident to a vertex covered by an edge of $F_{L} \cap F_{l}$ is also incident to a vertex from $V\left(F_{L}\right) \backslash V\left(F_{l}\right)$. If there were an edge $e \in F_{L} \cap F_{l}$ which is adjacent to two edges $h_{L}, h_{L}^{\prime} \in H_{L}$, then the edges $h_{L}, e$ and $h_{L}^{\prime}$ would form an augmenting 3-path with respect to $F_{l}$, which would contradict the maximality of $F_{l}$.

Claim 5 (1) for any maximum matchings $F_{L}, F_{l}$ of the graph $G$ with $\nu\left(G \backslash F_{L}\right)=L(G)$, $\nu\left(G \backslash F_{l}\right)=l(G)$, we have $\left(V\left(F_{L}\right) \backslash V\left(F_{l}\right)\right) \cap V_{1}(G)=\emptyset ;$
(2) there is a maximum matching $F_{l}$ of $G$ with $\nu\left(G \backslash F_{l}\right)=l(G)$ and a maximum matching $F_{L}$ of the graph $G$ with $\nu\left(G \backslash F_{L}\right)=L(G)$, such that $V_{1}(G) \subseteq V\left(F_{L} \cap F_{l}\right) \cup$ $\left(V\left(F_{l}\right) \backslash V\left(F_{L}\right)\right)$.

Proof. (1) On the opposite assumption, consider a vertex $x \in\left(V\left(F_{L}\right) \backslash V\left(F_{l}\right)\right) \cap V_{1}(G)$. Since $x \in V_{1}(G)$ then $d(x) \leq 2$. On the other hand, (b) of claim 3 implies that $d(x) \geq 2$, thus $d(x)=2$. Then there are vertices $y, z$ such that $(x, z) \in F_{L},(z, y) \in F_{l}$. Note that due to (a) of claim 3, we have $d(y) \leq 2$. Let us show that $d(y)=1$. Suppose that $d(y)=2$. Then due to (a) of claim 3, we have that $d(z)=2$, thus $G$ is the triangle, which is a contradiction, since $G$ does not satisfy $L(G)=2 l(G)$.

Thus $d(y)=1$. Since $x \in V_{1}(G)$, we imply that there is a vertex $w$ with $d(w)=2$ such that $w, x, z$ form a triangle. Note that $w$ is covered neither by $F_{L}$ nor by $F_{l}$, which contradicts claim 1 .
(2) Let $e_{t}$ be an edge of a triangle $t \in T$ connecting the vertex $v_{t} \in V_{1}(G)$ to a vertex of degree two. Let us show that there is a maximum matching $F_{l}$ of $G$ with $\nu\left(G \backslash F_{l}\right)=l(G)$ such that $e_{t} \in F_{l}$ for each $t \in T$.

Choose a maximum matching $F_{l}$ of $G$ with $\nu\left(G \backslash F_{l}\right)=l(G)$ that contains as many edges $e_{t}$ as possible. Let us show that $F_{l}$ contains all edges $e_{t}$. Suppose that there is $t_{0} \in T$ such that $e_{t_{0}} \notin F_{l}$. Define:

$$
F_{l}^{\prime}=\left(F_{l} \backslash\{e\}\right) \cup\left\{e_{t_{0}}\right\},
$$

where $e$ is the edge of $F_{l}$ that is adjacent to $e_{t_{0}}$. Note that

$$
\nu\left(G \backslash F_{l}^{\prime}\right) \leq \nu\left(G \backslash F_{l}\right)=l(G),
$$

thus $F_{l}^{\prime}$ is a maximum matching of $G$ with $\nu\left(G \backslash F_{l}\right)=l(G)$. Note that $F_{l}^{\prime}$ contains more edges $e_{t}$ than does $F_{l}$ which contradicts the choice of $F_{l}$.

Thus, there is a maximum matching $F_{l}$ of $G$ with $\nu\left(G \backslash F_{l}\right)=l(G)$ such that $e_{t} \in F_{l}$ for all $t \in T$. Now, for this maximum matching $F_{l}$ of $G$ choose a maximum matching $F_{L}$ of the graph $G$ with $\nu\left(G \backslash F_{L}\right)=L(G)$, such that $V\left(F_{L} \cap F_{l}\right) \cup\left(V\left(F_{l}\right) \backslash V\left(F_{L}\right)\right)$ covers maximum number of vertices from $V_{1}(G)$. Let us show that $V_{1}(G) \subseteq V\left(F_{L} \cap F_{l}\right) \cup\left(V\left(F_{l}\right) \backslash V\left(F_{L}\right)\right)$.

Suppose that there is a vertex $x \in V_{1}(G)$ such that $x \notin V\left(F_{L} \cap F_{l}\right) \cup\left(V\left(F_{l}\right) \backslash V\left(F_{L}\right)\right)$. Note that due to claim 1 and (b) of claim 3, any vertex of degree one is either incident to an edge from $F_{L} \cap F_{l}$ or to an edge $V\left(F_{l}\right) \backslash V\left(F_{L}\right)$. Thus due to definition of $V_{1}(G)$, $d(x)=2$ and if $y$ and $z$ denote the two neighbors of $x$, then $d(y)=2$ and $(y, z) \in E(G)$.

Since $x \notin V\left(F_{L} \cap F_{l}\right)$, we have that $(x, y) \notin F_{L}$, and since $x \notin\left(V\left(F_{l}\right) \backslash V\left(F_{L}\right)\right)$, we have that $(y, z) \notin F_{L}$, thus $(x, z) \in F_{L}$, as $F_{L}$ is a maximum matching. Let $H_{L}$ be any maximum matching of $G \backslash F_{L}$. As $L(G)=2 l(G)$, we have $(x, y) \in H_{L}$ ((c1) of theorem (2). Define:

$$
F_{L}^{\prime}=\left(F_{L} \backslash\{(x, z)\}\right) \cup\{(y, z)\} .
$$

Note that $F_{L}^{\prime}$ is a maximum matching of $G, H_{L}$ is a matching of $G \backslash F_{L}$, thus

$$
\nu\left(G \backslash F_{L}^{\prime}\right) \geq\left|H_{L}\right|=\nu\left(G \backslash F_{L}\right)=L(G)
$$

Therefore $F_{L}^{\prime}$ is a maximum matching of $G$ with $\nu\left(G \backslash F_{L}^{\prime}\right)=L(G)$. Now, observe that $V\left(F_{L}^{\prime} \cap F_{l}\right) \cup\left(V\left(F_{l}\right) \backslash V\left(F_{L}^{\prime}\right)\right)$ covers more vertices than does $V\left(F_{L} \cap F_{l}\right) \cup\left(V\left(F_{l}\right) \backslash V\left(F_{L}\right)\right)$ which contradicts the choice of $F_{L}$. The proof of the claim 5 is completed.
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Claim 6 For any maximum matchings $F_{L}, F_{l}$ of the graph $G$ with $\nu\left(G \backslash F_{L}\right)=L(G)$, $\nu\left(G \backslash F_{l}\right)=l(G)$, we have
(1) $V\left(F_{L}\right) \backslash V\left(F_{l}\right)$ is an independent set;
(2) no edge of $G$ connects two vertices that are covered by both $F_{L} \backslash F_{l}$ and $F_{l} \backslash F_{L}$;
(3) no edge of $G$ is adjacent to two different edges from $F_{L} \cap F_{l}$;
(4) no edge of $G$ connects a vertex covered by $F_{L} \cap F_{l}$ to a vertex covered by both $F_{L} \backslash F_{l}$ and $F_{l} \backslash F_{L}$;
(5) if $(u, v) \in F_{L} \cap F_{l}$ then either $u \in V_{1}(G)$ or $v \in V_{1}(G)$.

Proof. (1)There is no edge of $G$ connecting two vertices from $V\left(F_{L}\right) \backslash V\left(F_{l}\right)$ since $F_{l}$ is a maximum matching.
(2) follows from (c1) and (c2) of theorem 2.
(3) follows from (c3) of theorem 2,
(4) Suppose that there is an edge $e=\left(y_{1}, y_{2}\right)$, such that $y_{1}$ is covered by an edge $\left(z, y_{1}\right) \in F_{L} \cap F_{l}$ and $y_{2}$ is covered by both $F_{L} \backslash F_{l}$ and $F_{l} \backslash F_{L}$. Consider a maximum matching $H_{L}$ of the graph $G \backslash F_{L}$. Note that $y_{1}$ must be incident to an edge from $H_{L}$, as otherwise we could replace the edge of $H_{L}$ that is adjacent to $e$ and belongs also to $F_{l} \backslash F_{L}$ ((c1) of theorem 2) by the edge $e$ to obtain a new maximum matching $H_{L}^{\prime}$ of the graph $G \backslash F_{L}$ which would not satisfy (c1) of theorem 2.

So let $y_{1}$ be incident to an edge $h_{L} \in H_{L}$, which connects $y_{1}$ with a vertex $x \in$ $V\left(F_{L}\right) \backslash V\left(F_{l}\right)$. Note that due to claim 4, $z$ is not incident to an edge from $H_{L}$. Now, let $x_{1}$ be a vertex such that $\left(x, x_{1}\right) \in F_{L} \backslash F_{l}$ (such a vertex exists since $x \in V\left(F_{L}\right) \backslash V\left(F_{l}\right)$ ). As $F_{l}$ is a maximum matching, $x_{1}$ is incident to an edge $\left(x_{1}, x_{2}\right) \in F_{l} \backslash F_{L}$. By (c1) of theorem 2, $\left(x_{1}, x_{2}\right) \in H_{L}$. Moreover, by claim 2, $x_{2}$ is not adjacent to an edge from $F_{L}$. Thus the edges $\left(z, y_{1}\right),\left(y_{1}, x\right),\left(x, x_{1}\right)$ and $\left(x_{1}, x_{2}\right)$ form an $F_{L}-H_{L}$ alternating 4-path $P$. Define:

$$
\begin{aligned}
F_{L}^{\prime} & =\left(F_{L} \backslash E(P)\right) \cup\left(H_{L} \cap E(P)\right) \\
H_{L}^{\prime} & =\left(H_{L} \backslash E(P)\right) \cup\left(F_{L} \cap E(P)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Note that $F_{L}^{\prime}$ is a maximum matching of $G, H_{L}^{\prime}$ is a matching of $G \backslash F_{L}^{\prime}$ of cardinality $\left|H_{L}\right|$, and

$$
\nu\left(G \backslash F_{L}^{\prime}\right) \geq\left|H_{L}^{\prime}\right|=\left|H_{L}\right|=\nu\left(G \backslash F_{L}\right)=L(G)
$$

thus $H_{L}^{\prime}$ is a maximum matching of $G \backslash F_{L}^{\prime}$ and $\nu\left(G \backslash F_{L}^{\prime}\right)=L(G)$. This is a contradiction since the edge $e$ connects two vertices which are covered by $F_{L}^{\prime} \backslash F_{l}$ and $F_{l} \backslash F_{L}^{\prime}((2)$ of claim 6).
(5)Suppose that $e=(u, v) \in F_{L} \cap F_{l}$. Since $G$ is connected and $|V| \geq 3$, we, without loss of generality, may assume that $d(v) \geq 2$, and there is $w \in V(G), w \neq u$ such that $(w, v) \in E(G)$. Consider a maximum matching $H_{L}$ of the graph $G \backslash F_{L}$. Note that, without loss of generality, we can assume that $v$ is incident to an edge from $H_{L}$, as otherwise we could replace the edge of $H_{L}$ that is incident to $w\left(H_{L}\right.$ is a maximum matching of $\left.G \backslash F_{L}\right)$
by the edge $(w, v)$ to obtain a new maximum matching $H_{L}^{\prime}$ of the graph $G \backslash F_{L}$ such that $v$ is incident to an edge from $H_{L}^{\prime}$.

So we can assume that there is an edge $(v, q) \in H_{L}, q \neq u$. Note that due to claim 4. $u$ is not incident to an edge from $H_{L}$. (c3) of theorem 2 implies that $q$ is incident to an edge from $\left(q, q_{1}\right) \in F_{L} \backslash F_{l}$. As $F_{l}$ is a maximum matching, $q_{1}$ is incident to an edge $\left(q_{1}, q_{2}\right) \in F_{l} \backslash F_{L}$. By (c1) of theorem 2, $\left(q_{1}, q_{2}\right) \in H_{L}$. Moreover, by claim 2, $q_{2}$ is not adjacent to an edge from $F_{L}$. Thus the edges $(u, v),(v, q),\left(q, q_{1}\right)$ and $\left(q_{1}, q_{2}\right)$ form an $F_{L}-H_{L}$ alternating 4-path $P$. Define:

$$
\begin{aligned}
F_{L}^{\prime} & =\left(F_{L} \backslash E(P)\right) \cup\left(H_{L} \cap E(P)\right) \\
H_{L}^{\prime} & =\left(H_{L} \backslash E(P)\right) \cup\left(F_{L} \cap E(P)\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Note that $F_{L}^{\prime}$ is a maximum matching of $G, H_{L}^{\prime}$ is a matching of $G \backslash F_{L}^{\prime}$ of cardinality $\left|H_{L}\right|$, and

$$
\nu\left(G \backslash F_{L}^{\prime}\right) \geq\left|H_{L}^{\prime}\right|=\left|H_{L}\right|=\nu\left(G \backslash F_{L}\right)=L(G)
$$

thus $H_{L}^{\prime}$ is a maximum matching of $G \backslash F_{L}^{\prime}$ and $\nu\left(G \backslash F_{L}^{\prime}\right)=L(G)$. Since $u \in V\left(F_{l}\right) \backslash V\left(F_{L}^{\prime}\right)$ (a) of claim 3 implies that either $d(u)=1$ and therefore $u \in V_{1}(G)$, or $d(u)=d(v)=2$ and therefore either $u \in V_{1}(G)$ or $v \in V_{1}(G)$. Proof of the claim 6 is completed.

We are ready to complete the proof of the theorem. Take any maximum matchings $F_{L}, F_{l}$ of the graph $G$ guaranteed by the (2) of claim 5 and consider the following partition of $V\left(G \backslash V_{1}(G)\right)=V(G) \backslash V_{1}(G)$ :

$$
X=X\left(F_{L}, F_{l}\right)=V\left(F_{L}\right) \backslash V\left(F_{l}\right), Y=Y\left(F_{L}, F_{l}\right)=V(G) \backslash\left(V_{1}(G) \cup X\right)
$$

Claim 6 implies that $X$ and $Y$ are independent sets of vertices of $G \backslash V_{1}(G)$, thus $G \backslash V_{1}(G)$ is a bipartite graph with a bipartition $(X, Y)$.

The choice of maximum matchings $F_{L}, F_{l}$, (a) of claim 3, (5) of claim6and the definition of the set $Y$ imply (2) of the theorem 3,

Let us show that it satisfies (3), too.
Consider the alternating 2-paths of

$$
\left(H_{L} \backslash F_{l}\right) \triangle\left(F_{L} \backslash F_{l}\right)
$$

(c2), (c3) of theorem 2 and the definition of the set $X$ imply that there are $|X|$ such 2-paths. Moreover, these 2-paths are in fact 2-paths of the graph $G \backslash V_{1}(G)$. Thus $G$ satisfies (3) of the theorem. The proof of the theorem 3 is completed.

Corollary 2 The property of a graph $L(G)=2 l(G)$ can be tested in polynomial time.
Proof. First of all note that the property $L(G)=2 l(G)$ is additive, that is, a graph satisfies this property if and only if all its connected components do. Thus we can concentrate only on connected graphs.

All connected graphs with $|V(G)| \leq 2$ satisfy the equality $L(G)=2 l(G)$, thus we can assume that $|V(G)| \geq 3$.
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Next, we construct a set $V_{1}(G)$, which can be done in linear time. Now, we need to check whether the graph $G \backslash V_{1}(G)$ satisfies the conditions (1)-(3) of the theorem 3.

It is well-known that the properties (1) and (2) can be checked in polynomial time, so we will consider only the testing of (3).

From a graph $G \backslash V_{1}(G)$ with a bipartition $(X, Y)$ we construct a network $\vec{G}$ with new vertices $s$ and $t$. The arcs of $\vec{G}$ are defined as follows:

- connect $s$ to every vertex of $X$ with an arc of capacity 2 ;
- connect every vertex of $Y$ to $t$ by an arc of capacity 1 ;
- for every edge $(x, y) \in E(G), x \in X, y \in Y$ add an arc connecting the vertex $x$ to the vertex $y$ which has capacity 1 .

Note that

- the value of the maximum $s-t$ flow in $\vec{G}$ is no more than $2|X|$ (the capacity of the cut $(S, \bar{S})$, where $S=\{s\}, \bar{S}=V(\vec{G}) \backslash S$, is $2|X|)$;
- the value of the maximum $s-t$ flow in $\vec{G}$ is $2|X|$ if and only if the graph $G \backslash V_{1}(G)$ contains $|X|$ vertex disjoint 2-paths,
thus (3) also can be tested in polynomial time.
Remark 1 Recently Monnot and Toulouse in [7] proved that 2-path partition problem remains NP-complete even for bipartite graphs of maximum degree three. Fortunately, in theorem 3 we are dealing with a special case of this problem which enables us to present a polynomial algorithm in corollary 2 .


## 4. NP-completeness of testing $L(G)=\frac{3}{2} l(G)$ in the class of bridgeless cubic graphs

The reader may think that a result analogous to corollary 2 can be proved for the property $L(G)=\frac{3}{2} l(G)$ in the class of graphs containing a perfect matching. Unfortunately this fails already in the class of bridgeless cubic graphs, which by the well-known theorem of Petersen are known to possess a perfect matching (see theorem 3.4.1 of [6]).

Theorem 4 It is NP-complete to test the property $L(G)=\frac{3}{2} l(G)$ in the class of bridgeless cubic graphs.

Proof. Clearly, the problem of testing the property $L(G)=\frac{3}{2} l(G)$ for graphs containing a perfect matching is in $N P$, since if we are given perfect matchings $F_{L}, F_{l}$ of the graph $G$ with $\nu\left(G \backslash F_{L}\right)=L(G), \nu\left(G \backslash F_{l}\right)=l(G)$ then we can calculate $L(G)$ and $l(G)$ in polynomial time.

We will use the well-known 3-edge-coloring problem ([3]) to establish the NP-completeness of our problem.

Let $G$ be a bridgeless cubic graph. Consider a bridgeless cubic graph $G_{\triangle}$ obtained from $G$ by replacing every vertex of $G$ by a triangle. We claim that $G$ is 3-edge-colorable if and only if $L\left(G_{\triangle}\right)=\frac{3}{2} l\left(G_{\triangle}\right)$.

Suppose that $G$ is 3-edge-colorable. Then $G_{\triangle}$ is also 3-edge-colorable, which means that $G_{\triangle}$ contains two edge disjoint perfect matchings $F$ and $F^{\prime}$. This implies that

$$
L\left(G_{\triangle}\right) \geq \nu\left(G_{\triangle} \backslash F\right) \geq\left|F^{\prime}\right|=\frac{\left|V\left(G_{\triangle}\right)\right|}{2}
$$

On the other hand, the set $E(G)$ forms a perfect matching of $G_{\triangle}$, and

$$
l\left(G_{\triangle}\right) \leq \nu\left(G_{\triangle} \backslash E(G)\right)=\frac{\left|V\left(G_{\triangle}\right)\right|}{3}
$$

since every component of $G_{\triangle} \backslash E(G)$ is a triangle. Thus:

$$
\frac{L\left(G_{\triangle}\right)}{l\left(G_{\triangle}\right)} \geq \frac{3}{2}
$$

(d) of theorem 2 implies that $\frac{L\left(G_{\Delta}\right)}{l\left(G_{\Delta}\right)}=\frac{3}{2}$.

Now assume that $\frac{L\left(G_{\Delta}\right)}{l\left(G_{\Delta}\right)}=\frac{3}{2}$. Note that for every perfect matching $F$ of the graph $G_{\triangle}$ the graph $G_{\triangle} \backslash F$ is a 2 -factor, therefore

$$
\begin{aligned}
L\left(G_{\triangle}\right) & =\frac{\left|V\left(G_{\triangle}\right)\right|-w\left(G_{\triangle}\right)}{2} \\
l\left(G_{\triangle}\right) & =\frac{\left|V\left(G_{\triangle}\right)\right|-W\left(G_{\triangle}\right)}{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $w\left(G_{\triangle}\right)$ and $W\left(G_{\triangle}\right)$ denote the minimum and maximum number of odd cycles in a 2-factor of $G_{\triangle}$, respectively. Since $\frac{L\left(G_{\Delta}\right)}{l\left(G_{\Delta}\right)}=\frac{3}{2}$ we have

$$
W\left(G_{\triangle}\right)=\frac{\left|V\left(G_{\triangle}\right)\right|+2 w\left(G_{\triangle}\right)}{3} .
$$

Taking into account that $W\left(G_{\triangle}\right) \leq \frac{\left|V\left(G_{\Delta}\right)\right|}{3}$, we have:

$$
\begin{aligned}
W\left(G_{\triangle}\right) & =\frac{\left|V\left(G_{\triangle}\right)\right|}{3} \\
w\left(G_{\triangle}\right) & =0
\end{aligned}
$$

Note that $w\left(G_{\triangle}\right)=0$ means that $G_{\triangle}$ is 3-edge-colorable, which in its turn implies that $G$ is 3-edge-colorable. The proof of the theorem is completed.
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