

ON THE CONNECTIVITY OF THE DISJOINTNESS GRAPH OF SEGMENTS OF POINT SETS IN GENERAL POSITION IN THE PLANE

J. LEAÑOS¹, M. K. CHRISTOPHE NDJATCHI², AND L. M. RÍOS-CASTRO³

1

ABSTRACT. Let P be a set of $n \geq 3$ points in general position in the plane. The *edge disjointness graph* $D(P)$ of P is the graph whose vertices are all the closed straight line segments with endpoints in P , two of which are adjacent in $D(P)$ if and only if they are disjoint. We show that the connectivity of $D(P)$ is at least $(\lfloor \frac{n-2}{2} \rfloor) + (\lceil \frac{n-2}{2} \rceil)$, and that this bound is tight for each $n \geq 3$.

Keywords: Disjointness graph of segments; Connectivity; Menger's theorem; Crossings of segments.
AMS Subject Classification Numbers: 05C40.

1. INTRODUCTION

Throughout this paper, P is a set of $n \geq 3$ points in general position in the plane. The *edge disjointness graph* $D(P)$ of P is the graph whose vertices correspond to the closed straight line segments with endpoints in P and in which two vertices are adjacent if and only if the corresponding segments are disjoint. See Figure 1 for an example.

The edge disjointness graph and other similar graphs were introduced by Araujo, Dumitrescu, Hurtado, Noy and Urrutia in [2], as geometric analogs of the Kneser graphs. We recall that if m and k are positive integers with $k \leq m/2$, then the *Kneser graph* $KG(m; k)$ is the graph whose vertices are all the k -subsets of $\{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ and in which two vertices are adjacent if and only if the corresponding k -subsets are disjoint. Kneser conjectured [11] in 1956 that the chromatic number $\chi(KG(m; k))$ of $KG(m; k)$ is equal to $m - 2k + 2$. This conjecture was proved by Lovász [9] in 1978 using topological methods, and (independently) by Bárány [3] in the same year. For more about the study of several other aspects and combinatorial properties of Kneser graphs, see for instance [1, 4, 5, 10, 15].

The study of the graph invariants of the edge disjointness graph $D(P)$ began in [2] with the estimation of a general lower bound for the chromatic number $\chi(D(P))$ of $D(P)$. Up to now the problem of determining the exact value of $\chi(D(P))$ remains open in general. As far as we know, the exact value of $\chi(D(P))$ is known only for two particular cases: when P is in convex position [7, 8], and when P is the double chain [6]. In 2017 Pach, Tardos, and Tóth [12] studied the chromatic number and the clique number of $D(P)$ in the more general setting of \mathbb{R}^d for $d \geq 2$, i.e., when P is a subset of \mathbb{R}^d . More precisely, in [12] was shown that the chromatic number of $D(P)$ is bounded by above by a polynomial function that depends on its clique number $\omega(D(P))$, and that the problem of determining any of $\chi(D(P))$ or $\omega(D(P))$ is NP-hard. Two years later, Pach and Tomon [13] have showed that if G is the disjointness graph of a set of grounded x -monotone curves in \mathbb{R}^2 and $\omega(G) = k$, then $\chi(G) \leq k + 1$. We remark that the set of grounded x -monotone curves play the role of our closed straight line segments.

The basic notations that we will use in this work are the following. If x and y are distinct points of P , then we shall use xy to denote the closed straight line segment whose endpoints are x and y . Similarly, we will use \mathcal{P} to denote the set of segments $\{xy : x, y \in P \text{ and } x \neq y\}$, and we shall refer to the elements of \mathcal{P} as the *segments* of \mathcal{P} . Then, \mathcal{P} is the vertex set of $D(P)$. We often make no distinction between an element of \mathcal{P} and its corresponding vertex in $D(P)$. We also note that \mathcal{P} naturally defines a rectilinear drawing of K_n in the plane. Let x_1y_1 and x_2y_2 be two distinct elements of \mathcal{P} , and suppose that $x_1y_1 \cap x_2y_2 \neq \emptyset$. Then

¹Unidad Académica de Matemáticas, Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas, México. Email: jleanos@matematicas.reduaz.mx

²Academia de Físico-Matemáticas, Instituto Politécnico Nacional, UPIIZ, P.C. 098160, Zacatecas, México.

Email: mndjatchi@ipn.mx

³Ciencias Básicas, Universidad Autónoma de Fresnillo, P.C. 99039, Fresnillo, Zacatecas, México. Email: lriosc@uaf.edu.mx

$x_1y_1 \cap x_2y_2$ consists precisely of one point $o \in \mathbb{R}^2$, because P is in general position. If o is an interior point of both x_1y_1 and x_2y_2 , then we say that they *cross* at o .

We will denote by $CH(P)$ the boundary of the convex hull of P , and by \bar{P} to $P \cap CH(P)$. See Figure 1. In particular, note that if P is in convex position, then $P = \bar{P}$.




FIGURE 1. The set $\{p_1, \dots, p_5\}$ of points in general position on the left is P . We note that $\bar{P} = \{p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4\}$. In the middle we have \mathcal{P} , which can be seen as the rectilinear drawing of K_5 induced by P . Note that $CH(P)$ is the convex quadrilateral formed by the union of the segments p_1p_2, p_2p_3, p_3p_4 , and p_4p_1 . The graph on the right is the edge disjointness graph $D(P)$ corresponding to P .

Let $H = (V(H), E(H))$ be a (non-empty) simple connected graph. If u and v are distinct vertices of H , then the distance between u and v in H will be denoted by $d_H(u, v)$, and we write uv to mean that u and v are adjacent in H . We emphasize that this last notation is similar to that used to denote the straight line segment xy defined by the points $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^2$. However, none of these notations should be a source of confusion, because the former objects are vertices of a graph, and the latter are points of the plane.

The *neighborhood* of v in H is the set $\{u \in V(H) : uv \in E(H)\}$ and is denoted by $N_H(v)$. The *degree* $\deg_H(v)$ of v is the number $|N_H(v)|$. The number $\delta(H) := \min\{\deg_H(v) : v \in V(H)\}$ is the *minimum degree* of H , and $\Delta(H) := \max\{\deg_H(v) : v \in V(H)\}$ is its *maximum degree*. A $u - v$ *path* of H is a path of H having an endpoint in u and the other endpoint in v . Similarly, if U is a subgraph of H , then $H \setminus U$ is the subgraph of H that results by removing U from H .

We recall that if k is a nonnegative integer, then H is k -*connected* if $|V(H)| > k$ and $H \setminus W$ is connected for every set $W \subset V(H)$ with $|W| < k$. The *connectivity* $\kappa(H)$ of H is greatest integer k such that H is k -connected.

Throughout this paper, if m is a nonnegative integer, then $[m] := \emptyset$ if $m = 0$, $[m] := \{1, \dots, m\}$ if $m > 0$, and by convention $\binom{m}{2} := 0$ if $m < 2$.

Our aim in this paper is to study the connectivity of $D(P)$. As far as we know, this parameter of $D(P)$ has not been investigated previously, which is somehow surprising for us. Our main result is the following.

Theorem 1. *If P is any set of $n \geq 3$ points in general position in the plane, then*

$$\kappa(D(P)) \geq \binom{\lfloor \frac{n-2}{2} \rfloor}{2} + \binom{\lceil \frac{n-2}{2} \rceil}{2}.$$

Our next statement is an immediate consequence of Theorem 1 and the well-known fact that the connectivity of a graph is bounded by above by its minimum degree.

Corollary 1. *If P is any set of $n \geq 3$ points in general position in the plane and $\delta(D(P)) = \binom{\lfloor \frac{n-2}{2} \rfloor}{2} + \binom{\lceil \frac{n-2}{2} \rceil}{2}$, then*

$$\kappa(D(P)) = \binom{\lfloor \frac{n-2}{2} \rfloor}{2} + \binom{\lceil \frac{n-2}{2} \rceil}{2}.$$

As we will see in Proposition 2, the lower bound of $\kappa(D(P))$ given in Theorem 1 is in fact a lower bound for the minimum degree of $D(P)$. Moreover, in that proposition we also show that each point set in the collection $\{C_n\}_{n=3}^\infty$, where C_n denotes the set of n points in general and convex position, satisfy the hypothesis of Corollary 1, and hence $\kappa(D(C_n))$ attains the bound in Theorem 1 for each $n \geq 3$.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce additional terminology and give some auxiliary results which will be used in the proof Theorem 1. Finally, in Section 3 we give the proof of our main result.

2. PRELIMINARIES

For the rest of the paper, P is a fixed set of $n \geq 3$ points in general position in the plane, and (for brevity) $\kappa(n) := \binom{\lfloor \frac{n-2}{2} \rfloor}{2} + \binom{\lceil \frac{n-2}{2} \rceil}{2}$. Similarly, we will use $\eta(P; a, b)$ to denote the maximum number of pairwise internally disjoint $a - b$ paths of $D(P)$.

Proposition 2. *If P and n are as above, then $\delta(D(P)) \geq \kappa(n)$ and $\Delta(D(P)) = \binom{n-2}{2}$. If additionally P is in convex position, then $\delta(D(P)) = \kappa(n)$.*

Proof. Let $f = uv$ be a vertex of $D(P)$, and let P_1 and P_2 be the subsets of $P \setminus \{u, v\}$ separated by the line spanned by f . Let $n_1 := |P_1|$ and $n_2 := |P_2|$. Then, $n_1 + n_2 = n - 2$. Since each segment of \mathcal{P} having both endpoints in P_i ($i = 1, 2$) is disjoint from f , then each of these segments is adjacent to f in $D(P)$. Hence $\deg(f) \geq \binom{n_1}{2} + \binom{n_2}{2}$. On the other hand, it is well known that the sum $\binom{n_1}{2} + \binom{n_2}{2}$ attains its minimum when $\{n_1, n_2\} = \{\lfloor \frac{n-2}{2} \rfloor, \lceil \frac{n-2}{2} \rceil\}$. From the last two assertions it follows that $\deg(f) \geq \kappa(n)$. Since f is an arbitrary vertex of $D(P)$, then $\delta(D(P)) \geq \kappa(n)$.

It follows from $n \geq 3$ and the fact that P is in general position that $CH(P)$ is a polygon of at least three sides. Note that if $g = xy$ is a segment (side) of $CH(P)$, then g is disjoint from any segment joining two points of $P \setminus \{x, y\}$. This implies that $\deg(g) \geq \binom{n-2}{2}$, and so $\Delta(D(P)) \geq \binom{n-2}{2}$. On the other hand, note that for $f = uv$ there are exactly $2(n-2)$ segments of $\mathcal{P} \setminus \{f\}$ that share an endpoint with f , (namely, those incident with exactly one of u or v). Since f cannot be adjacent to any of these segments, then $\deg(f) \leq \binom{n}{2} - 1 - 2(n-2) = \binom{n-2}{2}$. Again, since f is an arbitrary vertex of $D(P)$, then $\Delta(D(P)) \leq \binom{n-2}{2}$, as required.

Finally, suppose that P is in convex position. Let us label the points of P by x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n in clockwise order. Let h be the segment of \mathcal{P} joining x_1 with x_j , where $j := \lfloor (n+2)/2 \rfloor$. Then the line spanned by h separates $S_1 := \{x_2, \dots, x_{j-1}\}$ from $S_2 := \{x_{j+1}, \dots, x_n\}$. Then $|S_1| = \lfloor \frac{n-2}{2} \rfloor$ and $|S_2| = \lceil \frac{n-2}{2} \rceil$. Since P is in convex position, then any segment of \mathcal{P} with an endpoint in S_1 and the other in S_2 crosses h , and hence the only neighbours of h in $D(P)$ are those segments that have both endpoints in exactly one of S_1 or S_2 . This implies that $\deg(h) \leq \kappa(n)$, showing the last assertion of Proposition 2. \square

Proposition 3. *Let H be a connected graph. Then H is k -connected if and only if H has k pairwise internally disjoint $a - b$ paths, for any two vertices a and b of H such that $d_H(a, b) = 2$.*

Proof. The forward implication follows directly from Menger's Theorem. Conversely, let U be a vertex cut of H of minimum order. Let H_1 and H_2 be two distinct components of $H \setminus U$, and let $u \in U$. Since U is a minimum cut, then u has at least a neighbor v_i in H_i , for $i = 1, 2$. Then $d_H(v_1, v_2) = 2$. By hypothesis, H has k pairwise internally disjoint $v_1 - v_2$ paths. Since each of these k paths intersects U , then we have that $|U| \geq k$, as required. \square

Remark 1. *Let a, b be vertices of $D(P)$ such that $d_{D(P)}(a, b) = 2$. By Proposition 3 and Menger's Theorem, in order to show Theorem 1 it is enough to show that $\eta(P; a, b) \geq \kappa(n)$.*

In view of Remark 1, for the rest of the paper we can assume that a and b are two fixed vertices of $D(P)$ such that $d_{D(P)}(a, b) = 2$. Then a and b are not adjacent in $D(P)$, and hence $a \cap b \neq \emptyset$. This inequality and the fact that the points of P are in general position imply that $a \cap b$ consists precisely of one point of \mathbb{R}^2 , which will be denoted by o . Then a and b cross at o , or o is common endpoint of a and b .

An endpoint of a or b that is in exactly one of a or b will be called a *leaf* of $\{a, b\}$. Thus, if a and b cross at o , then each endpoint of a and b is a leaf. Otherwise o is a common endpoint of a and b , and each of a and b has exactly one leaf, namely the endpoint of a (respectively, b) distinct from o . We say that a (respectively,

b is *large with respect to P* if any leaf of $\{a, b\}$ is in \overline{P} . If there is only one point set under consideration, then we shall simply say that a (respectively, b) is “large”.

By translating P , if necessary, from now on we will assume that $o = (0, 0)$. Let ℓ_a and ℓ_b be the straight lines spanned by a and b , respectively. Clearly, $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{\ell_a, \ell_b\}$ consists of four open semiplanes $Y^-, Y^+, X^-,$ and X^+ , where Y^- denotes the semiplane containing the negative y -axis, and so on. Let $Y^-(P) := P \cap Y^-$, and let $Y^+(P), X^-(P)$, and $X^+(P)$ be defined analogously. Then, P minus the endpoints of a and b is the disjoint union of $Y^-(P), Y^+(P), X^-(P)$, and $X^+(P)$. Let $r := |Y^-(P)|, s := |Y^+(P)|, p - 1 := |X^-(P)|$, and $q - 1 := |X^+(P)|$. See Figure 2. If there is no danger of confusion, we often omit the argument P in all these expressions.

We recall that the set \mathcal{P} of segments with endpoints in P is the vertex set of $D(P)$. We now split the set of neighbours of a and b into three sets as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} A &:= \{e \in \mathcal{P} \mid e \cap a = \emptyset \text{ and } e \cap b \neq \emptyset\}, \\ B &:= \{e \in \mathcal{P} \mid e \cap b = \emptyset \text{ and } e \cap a \neq \emptyset\}, \\ D &:= \{e \in \mathcal{P} \mid e \cap a = \emptyset \text{ and } e \cap b = \emptyset\}. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, A, B, D , and $\{a, b\}$ are pairwise disjoint. Moreover, note that $N_{D(P)}(a) = A \cup D$ and $N_{D(P)}(b) = B \cup D$. Let $\delta_2 := |D|$ and $\delta_3 := \min\{|A|, |B|\}$. Let us denote by $\delta(P; a, b)$ the minimum of $|A \cup D|$ and $|B \cup D|$. Then, $\delta(P; a, b) = \delta_2 + \delta_3$.

Let G be the subgraph of $D(P)$ with vertex set $V(G) = A \cup B \cup D \cup \{a, b\}$, and such that two vertices of G are adjacent if and only if they are adjacent in $D(P)$. In particular, note that $N_G(a) = N_{D(P)}(a)$ and $N_G(b) = N_{D(P)}(b)$. We shall see later that the subgraph G contains (almost all) the $\kappa(n)$ $a - b$ paths mentioned in Remark 1. The following observation is easy to check.

Observation 4. *Let $d, h \in V(G) \setminus \{a, b\}$. Then $adhb$ is an $a - b$ path of G of length 3 if and only if $adhb$ satisfies the following conditions: (i) $d \in A$, (ii) $h \in B$, and (iii) d and h are disjoint.*

With the facts and the terminology given in this section in mind, we are ready to prove our main result. According to Remark 1, all we need to show is that $\eta(P; a, b) \geq \kappa(n)$.

3. THE PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Since Theorem 1 is trivial for $n \in \{3, 4\}$, and easy for $n = 5$, from now on we assume that $n \geq 6$. We analyze several cases, depending on whether or not a and b are large with respect to P . In each of these cases we will construct the required number of pairwise internally disjoint $a - b$ paths of $D(P)$.

CASE 1. Suppose that a and b are large with respect to P and that they cross at o . By performing a suitable rotation of all the points of P around o , if necessary, we may assume that $|Y^+| \geq \max\{|Y^-|, |X^-|, |X^+|\}$. Additionally, by reflecting P along the y -axis, if necessary, we also can assume that $|X^+| \geq |X^-|$.

Remark 2. *Hence p, q, r , and s are integers such that $s \geq r \geq 0, q \geq p \geq 1$, and $n = p + q + s + r + 2$.*

Let x_1^- and x_{q+1}^+ (respectively, x_1^+ and x_{p+1}^-) be the leaves of a (respectively, b). Since a and b are large with respect to P , then x_1^-, x_{q+1}^+, x_1^+ , and x_{p+1}^- are in \overline{P} . Without loss of generality, we may assume that they are placed as in Figure 2. We now label the rest of points of P in radial order around o as follows. If Y^- (respectively, X^-, Y^+, X^+) is nonempty, then we let $Y^- = \{y_1^-, \dots, y_r^-\}$ (respectively, $X^- = \{x_2^-, \dots, x_p^-\}, Y^+ = \{y_1^+, \dots, y_s^+\}, X^+ = \{x_q^+, \dots, x_2^+\}$), where the order listed of the points in each set corresponds to their clockwise order around o . See Figure 2.

From Figure 2 it is easy to see that the segment uv is a member of A if and only if (u, v) belongs to some of the following six subsets: $X^+ \times \{x_1^+\}, X^+ \times Y^-, \{x_1^+\} \times Y^-, X^- \times \{x_{p+1}^-\}, X^- \times Y^+$, and $\{x_{p+1}^-\} \times Y^+$.

Similarly, uv is an element of B if and only if (u, v) belongs to some of the following six sets: $Y^+ \times \{x_{q+1}^+\}, Y^+ \times X^+, \{x_{q+1}^+\} \times X^+, Y^- \times \{x_1^-\}, Y^- \times X^-,$ and $\{x_1^-\} \times X^-$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} |A| &= (q - 1) + (q - 1)r + r + (p - 1) + (p - 1)s + s = p(s + 1) + q(r + 1) - 2, \\ |B| &= s + s(q - 1) + (q - 1) + r + r(p - 1) + (p - 1) = p(r + 1) + q(s + 1) - 2. \end{aligned}$$




FIGURE 2. The point $o = (0,0)$ is an inner point of both a and b , and $a = x_1^- x_{q+1}^+$, $b = x_{p+1}^- x_1^+$ are large with respect to P . Here none of Y^- , Y^+ , X^- , and X^+ is empty.

From the last equalities, the definition of δ_3 , and Remark 2 it follows that:

$$(3.1) \quad \delta_3 = |A| = p(s+1) + q(r+1) - 2.$$

We now proceed to produce the required $\kappa(n)$ $a - b$ paths.

Proposition 5. *Let a, b, p, q, r and s be as above, and let $\eta_2(a, b)$ be the maximum number of pairwise internally disjoint $a - b$ paths of G of length 2. Then $\eta_2(a, b) = \delta_2$, and*

$$\delta_2 = \binom{q-1}{2} + \binom{p-1}{2} + \binom{r}{2} + \binom{s}{2}.$$

Proof. Let $\mathbb{P}_0 := \{aeb \mid e \in D\}$. From the definition of D it follows that each element of \mathbb{P}_0 is an $a - b$ path of G of length 2. Conversely, if T is an $a - b$ path of G of length 2, then the definition of G implies that the inner vertex of T must be a segment of D , and so \mathbb{P}_0 consists precisely of all the $a - b$ paths of G of length 2. Since the paths in \mathbb{P}_0 have length 2, then they are pairwise internally disjoint if and only if they are pairwise distinct. Then $\eta_2(a, b) = |\mathbb{P}_0|$. From $|\mathbb{P}_0| = |D| = \delta_2$, we conclude that $\eta_2(a, b) = \delta_2$.

On the other hand, from our labeling and the general position of P it follows that any segment of D must have both endpoints in exactly one of the following four sets: X^+ , X^- , Y^- , or Y^+ . Then $|D| = \binom{q-1}{2} + \binom{p-1}{2} + \binom{r}{2} + \binom{s}{2}$, as required. \square

For convenience, we define $y_0^- := x_1^+$, $y_{r+1}^- := x_1^-$, $y_0^+ := x_{p+1}^-$, and $y_{s+1}^+ := x_{q+1}^+$. See Figure 2. For $t \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, let $X_t^+ := \{x_j^+ \mid x_j^+ \in X^+ \text{ and } j \leq t\}$ and $Y_t^+ := \{y_i^+ \mid y_i^+ \in Y^+ \text{ and } i \leq t\}$. Let $\mathcal{I} := \{x_{p+1}^- y_s^+\} \cup \{x_1^+ y_r^- \mid Y^- \neq \emptyset\} \cup \{x_1^+ x_q^+ \mid X^+ \neq \emptyset\}$. We remark that $\mathcal{I} = \{x_{p+1}^- y_s^+\}$ whenever $Y^- = \emptyset$ and $X^+ = \emptyset$. Let $A' := A \setminus \mathcal{I}$.

We now consider the mapping ψ from A' to B defined as follows:

$$(3.2) \quad \psi(uv) := \begin{cases} y_1^- x_j^- & \text{if } (u, v) \in A_1 := X_p^+ \times \{x_1^+\} \text{ and } uv = x_j^+ x_1^+, \\ y_{i+1}^- x_j^- & \text{if } (u, v) \in A_2 := X_p^+ \times Y^- \text{ and } uv = x_j^+ y_i^-, \\ y_{i+1}^- x_1^- & \text{if } (u, v) \in A_3 := \{x_1^+\} \times Y_{r-1}^- \text{ and } uv = x_1^+ y_i^-, \\ y_1^+ x_j^+ & \text{if } (u, v) \in A_4 := X^- \times \{x_{p+1}^-\} \text{ and } uv = x_j^- x_{p+1}^-, \\ y_{i+1}^+ x_j^+ & \text{if } (u, v) \in A_5 := X^- \times Y^+ \text{ and } uv = x_j^- y_i^+, \\ y_{i+1}^+ x_{p+1}^+ & \text{if } (u, v) \in A_6 := \{x_{p+1}^-\} \times Y_{s-1}^+ \text{ and } uv = x_{p+1}^- y_i^+, \\ y_{s-i+1}^+ x_{j+1}^+ & \text{if } (u, v) \in A_7 := (X^+ \setminus X_p^+) \times Y^- \text{ and } uv = x_j^+ y_i^-, \\ x_{j+1}^+ x_{q+1}^+ & \text{if } (u, v) \in A_8 := (X_{q-1}^+ \setminus X_p^+) \times \{x_1^+\} \text{ and } uv = x_j^+ x_1^+. \end{cases}$$

Note that if $A_i \neq \emptyset$, then $|\psi(A_i)| = |A_i|$. Indeed, from the definition of ψ it is easy to see that,

- (3.3)
- (1) $\psi(A_1) = \{wz \mid (w, z) \in \{y_1^-\} \times X^-\}$, and so $|\psi(A_1)| = p - 1 = |A_1|$.
 - (2) $\psi(A_2) = \{wz \mid (w, z) \in \{y_2^-, \dots, y_r^-, y_{r+1}^-\} \times X^-\}$, and so $|\psi(A_2)| = r(p - 1) = |A_2|$.
 - (3) $\psi(A_3) = \{wz \mid (w, z) \in \{y_2^-, \dots, y_r^-\} \times \{x_1^-\}\}$, and so $|\psi(A_3)| = r - 1 = |A_3|$.
 - (4) $\psi(A_4) = \{wz \mid (w, z) \in \{y_1^+\} \times X_p^+\}$, and so $|\psi(A_4)| = p - 1 = |A_4|$.
 - (5) $\psi(A_5) = \{wz \mid (w, z) \in \{y_2^+, \dots, y_s^+, y_{s+1}^+\} \times X_p^+\}$, and so $|\psi(A_5)| = s(p - 1) = |A_5|$.
 - (6) $\psi(A_6) = \{wz \mid (w, z) \in \{y_2^+, \dots, y_s^+\} \times \{x_{p+1}^+\}\}$, and so $|\psi(A_6)| = s - 1 = |A_6|$.
 - (7) $\psi(A_7) = \{wz \mid (w, z) \in \{y_s^+, y_{s-1}^+, \dots, y_{s-r+1}^+\} \times \{x_{p+2}^+, \dots, x_{q+1}^+\}\}$, and so $|\psi(A_7)| = r(q - p) = |A_7|$.
 - (8) $\psi(A_8) = \{wz \mid (w, z) \in \{x_{p+2}^+, \dots, x_q^+\} \times \{x_{q+1}^+\}\}$, and so $|\psi(A_8)| = q - p - 1 = |A_8|$.

Proposition 6. *Let $\psi : A' \rightarrow B$ be as above. Then*

$$\mathbb{P}_1 := \{a(uv)(\psi(uv))b \mid uv \in A'\},$$

is a collection of $|A'|$ pairwise internally disjoint $a - b$ paths of $G \setminus D$ of length 3.

Proof. Let $uv \in A'$. From the definitions of uv and ψ it is easy to see that $a(uv)(\psi(uv))b$ satisfies each of the conditions (i)-(iii) of Observation 4. Then $a(uv)(\psi(uv))b$ is an $a - b$ path of $G \setminus D$ of length 3.

In order to show that the paths in \mathbb{P}_1 are pairwise internally disjoint, it is enough to show that ψ is injective. Let u_1v_1 and u_2v_2 be distinct segments of A' . A simple inspection of Equations (3.3) reveals that $\psi(A_{i_1}) \cap \psi(A_{i_2}) = \emptyset$ whenever $i_1 \neq i_2$. This implies that $\psi(u_1v_1) \neq \psi(u_2v_2)$ for $u_1v_1 \in A_{i_1}$ and $u_2v_2 \in A_{i_2}$, with $i_1 \neq i_2$. Then we may assume that $u_1v_1, u_2v_2 \in A_{i_0}$ for some $i_0 \in \{1, 2, \dots, 8\}$. Again, from Equations (3.3) we know that $|\psi(A_{i_0})| = |A_{i_0}|$. Since $|A_{i_0}|$ is finite, then the restriction of ψ to A_{i_0} is a bijection, and so $\psi(u_1v_1) \neq \psi(u_2v_2)$, as required. \square

Proposition 7. *Let a, b, p, q, r , and s be as above, and let $\eta_3(a, b)$ be the maximum number of pairwise internally disjoint $a - b$ paths of $G \setminus D$ of length 3, then*

$$(3.4) \quad \eta_3(a, b) = \begin{cases} \delta_3 - 1 & \text{if } q = 1 \text{ and } r = 0 \\ \delta_3 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Proof. We recall that $s \geq 1, s \geq r \geq 0$, and $q \geq p \geq 1$. Let $\psi, A', \mathcal{I}, A_i$, and \mathbb{P}_1 be as above. From Proposition 6 and Equation (3.3) we know that the number of pairwise internally disjoint $a - b$ paths of $G \setminus D$ of length 3 provided by \mathbb{P}_1 is equal to

$$(3.5) \quad |\mathbb{P}_1| = \sum_{i=1}^8 |A_i| = p(s + 2) + (q - 1)r - 3 + \max\{0, r - 1\} + \max\{0, q - p - 1\}.$$

From Equation (3.1) we know that $\delta_3 = p(s+1) + q(r+1) - 2$.

(7.1) Suppose that $q = 1$ and $r = 0$. Since $q \geq p \geq 1$, then $p = 1$ and $\delta_3 = s$. From Equation (3.5) we have that $|\mathbb{P}_1| = s - 1$, and so $\eta_3(a, b) \geq s - 1$.

On the other hand, note that if $adhb$ is an $a - b$ path of $G \setminus D$ of length 3, then there exist integers i, j such that $1 \leq i < j \leq s$, and $d = x_{p+1}^- y_i^+, h = x_{q+1}^+ y_j^+$. From $1 \leq i < j \leq s$ we can deduce that the number of such pairs (y_i^+, y_j^+) is at most $s - 1$, and so $\eta_3(a, b) = s - 1$, as required. This proves the Case (7.1).

On the other hand, by Observation 4 and Equation (3.1) we have that $\eta_3(a, b) \leq \delta_3 = p(s+1) + q(r+1) - 2$. Then, for the rest of the cases, it is enough to exhibit a collection of $p(s+1) + q(r+1) - 2$ pairwise internally disjoint $a - b$ paths of $G \setminus D$ of length 3.

(7.2) Suppose that $q > p$ and $r \geq 1$. From Equation (3.5) we have that

$$|\mathbb{P}_1| = p(s+2) + (q-1)r - 3 + (r-1) + (q-p-1) = p(s+1) + q(r+1) - 5.$$

Let $d_1 := x_{p+1}^- y_s^+, d_2 := x_1^+ x_q^+, d_3 := x_1^+ y_r^-$, $h_1 := x_2^+ x_{q+1}^+$, $h_2 := y_1^+ x_{q+1}^+$, and $h_3 := x_1^- y_1^-$. See Figure 3. From $q > p, r \geq 1$, and the definition of \mathbb{P}_1 it is easy to check that none of d_1, d_2, d_3, h_1, h_2 , and h_3 belongs




FIGURE 3. Here $q > p$ and $r \geq 1$. Note that $\mathcal{I} = \{d_1, d_2, d_3\}$ and $\{h_1, h_2, h_3\} \in B$.

to any path of \mathbb{P}_1 . Similarly, note that $d_i \in A, h_i \in B$, and $d_i \cap h_{3-i+1} = \emptyset$, for $i = 1, 2, 3$. From these facts and Observation 4 it follows that

$$\mathbb{P}_2 := \mathbb{P}_1 \cup \{ad_1h_3b, ad_2h_2b, ad_3h_1b\},$$

is the required collection.

(7.3) Suppose that $q > p$ and $r = 0$. From Equation (3.5) we have that

$$|\mathbb{P}_1| = p(s+2) + (q-1)r - 3 + (q-p-1) = p(s+1) + q(r+1) - 4.$$

Let d_1, d_2, h_1 , and h_2 as in Case (7.2). Again, note that $d_i \in B, h_i \in A$, and $d_i \cap h_i = \emptyset$, for $i = 1, 2$. These and Observation 4 imply that

$$\mathbb{P}_3 := \mathbb{P}_1 \cup \{ad_1h_1b, ad_2h_2b\},$$

is the required collection.

(7.4) Suppose that $q = p$ and $r = 0$. By Case (7.1) we may assume that $q = p \geq 2$. Then Equation (3.5) implies that

$$|\mathbb{P}_1| = p(s+2) + (q-1)r - 3 = p(s+1) + q(r+1) - 3.$$

Since (d_1, h_1) satisfies the conditions of Observation 4, then

$$\mathbb{P}_4 := \mathbb{P}_1 \cup \{ad_1h_1b\},$$

is the required collection.

(7.5) Suppose that $q = p$ and $r \geq 1$. Then Equation (3.5) implies that

$$|\mathbb{P}_1| = p(s+2) + (q-1)r - 3 + (r-1) = p(s+1) + q(r+1) - 4.$$

Let d_1, d_3, h_2 , and h_3 as in Case (7.2). Again, note that each pair (d_1, h_3) and (d_3, h_2) satisfies the conditions of Observation 4, and so

$$\mathbb{P}_5 := \mathbb{P}_1 \cup \{ad_1h_3b, ad_3h_2b\},$$

is the required collection. \square

Lemma 1. *If a and b are large with respect to P , and o is an inner point of both, then $\eta(P; a, b) = \delta(P; a, b)$.*

Proof. Trivially, $\eta(P; a, b) \leq \delta(P; a, b)$. Then we need to show that $\eta(P; a, b) \geq \delta(P; a, b)$. Let $p, q, r, s, X^-, X^+, Y^-,$ and Y^+ be as above. For $i \in \{1, \dots, 5\}$, let \mathbb{P}_0 and \mathbb{P}_i be as in the proofs of Propositions 5 and 7, respectively. From the definition of \mathbb{P}_i , we know that no segment of D belongs to any path of \mathbb{P}_i , and hence $\mathbb{P}_0 \cup \mathbb{P}_i$ is a collection of $|\mathbb{P}_0| + |\mathbb{P}_i|$ pairwise internally disjoint $a - b$ paths of G .

Let us first assume that the four endpoints of a and b are consecutive in \overline{P} . Since $Y^+ \neq \emptyset$, then this case corresponds precisely to the case in which $X^- = \emptyset, Y^- = \emptyset$, and $X^+ = \emptyset$ (or equivalently, $q = p = 1$ and $r = 0$). Then $a = x_1^-x_2^+$ and $b = x_1^+x_2^-$. Moreover, note that $x_2^-x_1^-, x_1^-x_1^+$ and $x_1^-x_1^+, x_1^+x_2^+$ are pairs of consecutive segments in $CH(P)$. Since $n \geq 6$, then $s = |Y^+| \geq 2$, and so y_1^+ and y_s^+ exist and are distinct. It is not hard to check that none of $x_1^-x_1^+, x_2^-y_s^+$, or $y_1^+x_2^+$ belongs to any path of $\mathbb{P}_0 \cup \mathbb{P}_1$. Since $T^* := a(x_2^-y_s^+)(x_1^-x_1^+)(y_1^+x_2^+)b$ is an $a - b$ path of $D(P)$ (of length 4), then from Propositions 5 and 7 we know that $\mathbb{P}_0 \cup \mathbb{P}_1 \cup \{T^*\}$ is a collection of $\delta_2 + (\delta_3 - 1) + 1 = \delta(P; a, b)$ pairwise internally disjoint $a - b$ paths of $D(P)$, and hence $\eta(P; a, b) \geq \delta(P; a, b)$, as required.

We now assume that the endpoints of a and b are not consecutive in \overline{P} . Then at least one of $q > 1$ or $r > 0$ holds, and the corresponding case in the proof of Proposition 7 is the Case (7.i) for some $i \in \{2, 3, 4, 5\}$. In any of these four cases, we know from Proposition 7 that $|\mathbb{P}_i| = \delta_3$, and so $\mathbb{P}_0 \cup \mathbb{P}_i$ provides $\delta_2 + \delta_3 = \delta(P; a, b)$ pairwise internally disjoint $a - b$ paths of G , and so $\eta(P; a, b) \geq \delta(P; a, b)$, as required. \square

The next result follows directly from Lemma 1 and Proposition 2, and concludes the proof of Case 1.

Corollary 2. *If a and b are large with respect to P , and o is an inner point of both, then $\eta(P; a, b) \geq \kappa(n)$.*

We now emphasize some crucial properties of the collections of $a - b$ paths constructed above, which will be exploited in the next two cases. Note that all the $\delta(P; a, b)$ paths, except $T^* = a(x_2^-y_s^+)(x_1^-x_1^+)(y_1^+x_2^+)b$, provided by Lemma 1 are contained in G , and that only in the case when $q = p = 1$, and $r = 0$ was needed to use exactly a vertex not in G , namely $x_1^-x_1^+$.

We will say that an $a - b$ path $afgb$ of length 3 of $D(P)$ is *ordered with respect to o* if there exists a straight line ℓ passing through o such that the vertices (segments) f and g lie on distinct sides of ℓ . Similarly, a collection of $a - b$ paths of $D(P)$ will be called *ordered* if each of its paths of length 3 is ordered with respect to o . The following observation is easy to check and will be used in the next cases.

Observation 8. *Each path of length 3 constructed in Lemma 1 is ordered with respect to o , and hence each of the collections of $\delta(P; a, b)$ $a - b$ paths given in the proof of Lemma 1 is ordered.*

CASE 2. Suppose that a and b are large with respect to P and o is endpoint of both a and b .

By performing a suitable rotation of P around o , if necessary, we may assume that the leaves of a and b have negative y -coordinate. Let x_1^- and x_1^+ be the leaves of a and b , respectively. Then $a = ox_1^-$ and $b = ox_1^+$. Also, by reflecting P along the y -axis, if necessary, we can assume that $p-1 = |X^-(P)| \leq |X^+(P)| = q-1$. See Figure 4.

Remark 3. Hence p, q, r , and s are integers such that $r, s \geq 0$, $q \geq p \geq 1$, and $n = p + q + s + r + 1$.

We start by noting that Lemma 1 holds for any $n \geq 6$. Roughly speaking, our strategy to prove Case 2 is as follows. For the first part of the proof we make slight modifications of P, a , and b in such a way that the corresponding objects P', a' , and b' satisfy the hypotheses of Lemma 1. Once we have the $\delta(P'; a', b')$ $a' - b'$ paths of $D(P')$ provided by Lemma 1, we proceed to show that some of such paths of $D(P')$ can be slightly modified in such a way that they produce the required number of $a - b$ paths of $D(P)$ in most cases. For the remaining case we use induction on s , and also the facts established in the first part of the proof. We now focus on the proof of Case 2, which we restate in a slightly stronger form.

Lemma 2. If a and b are large with respect to P , and o is a common endpoint of a and b , then $D(P)$ has an ordered collection \mathbb{Q} of pairwise internally disjoint $a - b$ paths with $|\mathbb{Q}| \geq \kappa(n)$.

Proof. We start by defining P', a' , and b' as follows. Enlarge both segments a and b in the direction of o , until the resulting larger segments $a' := o^+x_1^-$ and $b' := o^-x_1^+$ cross each other at o , and each of them be large with respect to $P' := (P \setminus \{o\}) \cup \{o^-, o^+\}$. More precisely, the points $o^- \in \ell_b \setminus b$ and $o^+ \in \ell_a \setminus a$ can be chosen so that: (i) P' is in general position, (ii) the segments $a' := x_1^-o^+$ and $b' := x_1^+o^-$ contain, respectively, a and b as proper subsegments, (iii) $\overline{P'} = \overline{P} \cup \{o^-, o^+\}$, and (iv) a' and b' cross each other at o and are large with respect to P' . See Figure 4.

Since a' and b' satisfy the hypotheses of Lemma 1 with respect to P' , then Lemma 1 implies that $D(P')$ has a collection \mathbb{P}' of $\delta(P'; a', b')$ pairwise internally disjoint paths with endvertices a' and b' . From the constructions given in the proof of that lemma we can assume that \mathbb{P}' is ordered, has at most one path of length 4, and that the rest of its paths have length 2 and 3. Moreover, if \mathbb{P}' has a path T^* of length 4, then, from the construction we know that T^* has exactly one inner vertex d^* that is not in $N' := N_{D(P')}(a') \cup N_{D(P')}(b') \cup \{a', b'\}$.

Let C' be the set of vertices that are in $D(P')$ but not in $D(P)$. Then the elements of C' correspond precisely to the segments of \mathcal{P}' that have at least one endpoint in $\{o^-, o^+\}$. Let C^* be the set formed by the vertices of C' that are in some path of \mathbb{P}' . Since the vertices of any path of \mathbb{P}' belong to $N' \cup \{d^*\}$, then any $d \in C^*$ satisfies at least one of the following statements: (i) $d = d^*$, (ii) d has an endpoint in o^- and the other in $X^- \cup Y^+$, or (iii) d has an endpoint in o^+ and the other in $Y^+ \cup X^+$. These imply that $|C^*| \leq |X^-(P')| + 2|Y^+(P')| + |X^+(P')| + 1 = |X^-(P)| + 2|Y^+(P)| + |X^+(P)| + 1 = (p-1) + 2s + (q-1) + 1$.

Since any segment of C^* intersects at least one of a' or b' , then no vertex of C^* can belong to a path of length 2 of \mathbb{P}' . This implies that the number of paths of \mathbb{P}' containing vertices of C^* is at most $(p+2s+q-1)/2$.

Let \mathbb{Q}' be the set of paths of \mathbb{P}' that do not contain vertices of C' . If $Q' \in \mathbb{Q}'$, then we shall use (Q') to denote the subpath of Q' that results by removing a' and b' from Q' . From the definitions of C' and \mathbb{Q}' we know that (Q') is a path of $D(P)$. From this and the fact that a and b are subsegments of a' and b' , respectively, we have that $Q := a(Q')b$ is an $a - b$ path of $D(P)$ with the same length as Q' . Since \mathbb{P}' is an ordered collection of $\delta(P'; a', b')$ pairwise internally disjoint $a' - b'$ paths of $D(P')$, then

$$\mathbb{Q} := \{a(Q')b \mid Q' \in \mathbb{Q}'\},$$

is an ordered collection of $|\mathbb{P}'| - |C^*|/2 \geq \delta(P'; a', b') - (p+2s+q-1)/2$ pairwise internally disjoint $a - b$ paths of $D(P)$. We now show that \mathbb{Q} provides all the required $\kappa(n)$ $a - b$ paths of $D(P)$, except when $p < q$ and $r < s$.

We note that $\deg_{D(P')}(a') = \binom{p+s}{2} + \binom{q+r}{2}$ and $\deg_{D(P')}(b') = \binom{p+r}{2} + \binom{q+s}{2}$, and recall that $p \leq q$. From these equalities it is easy to see that $\deg_{D(P')}(a') \leq \deg_{D(P')}(b')$ if and only if $r \leq s$. We also note that if any of $p = q$ or $s = r$ holds, then $\deg_{D(P')}(a') = \deg_{D(P')}(b')$ independently of the other values.

We split the rest of the proof of Case 2 in several subcases depending on the values of p, q, r , and s .

CASE 2.1. Suppose that $p = q$. Then $\deg_{D(P')}(a') = \deg_{D(P')}(b')$, and hence $\delta(P'; a', b') = \binom{p+s}{2} + \binom{q+r}{2}$. Since $p-1+s+q+r = n-2$, then $\binom{p+s}{2} + \binom{q+r}{2} = \sum_{j=1}^{p-1+s} j + \binom{q+r}{2} = (p-1+s) + \sum_{j=1}^{p-2+s} j + \binom{q+r}{2} =$

$(p-1+s) + \binom{p-1+s}{2} + \binom{q+r}{2} \geq \kappa(n) + (p-1+s)$. This implies that $|\mathbb{Q}| \geq \kappa(n) + (p-1+s) - (p+2s+q-1)/2 = \kappa(n) - (q-p+1)/2 = \kappa(n) - 1/2$. Since $|\mathbb{Q}|$ and $\kappa(n)$ are integers, we conclude $|\mathbb{Q}| \geq \kappa(n)$, as required.

CASE 2.2. Suppose that $s = 0$ or $r \geq s$. Then $\deg_{D(P')}(a') \geq \deg_{D(P')}(b')$, and hence $\delta(P'; a', b') = \binom{p+r}{2} + \binom{q+s}{2}$. Since $p+r+q-1+s = n-2$, then $\binom{p+r}{2} + \binom{q+s}{2} = \binom{p+r}{2} + \binom{q-1+s}{2} + (q-1+s) \geq \kappa(n) + (q-1+s)$. This and $p < q$ imply that $|\mathbb{Q}| \geq \kappa(n) + (q-1+s) - (p+2s+q-1)/2 = \kappa(n) + (q-p-1)/2 \geq \kappa(n)$, as required.

CASE 2.3. Suppose that $1 \leq p < q$ and $0 \leq r < s$. We verify this case by induction on s . The base case is $s = 0$, and it has been verified in previous case. Since $s > 0$, then $Y^+(P)$ has at least one point, say y .

By the induction hypothesis, we can assume that $D(P \setminus \{y\})$ has an ordered collection \mathbb{T} of at least $\kappa(n-1)$ pairwise internally disjoint $a-b$ paths. We now consider the set \mathcal{Y} of straight segments with an endpoint at y and the other in $X^-(P) \cup (Y^+(P) \setminus \{y\}) \cup X^+(P)$. Clearly, such segments are not vertices of $D(P \setminus \{y\})$. Moreover, since $y \in Y^+(P)$, then each $h \in \mathcal{Y}$ is disjoint from a and b , and hence ahb is an $a-b$ path of length 2 of $D(P)$. The $\kappa(n-1)$ $a-b$ paths of \mathbb{T} , together with the $(p-1) + (s-1) + (q-1)$ paths provided by the elements of \mathcal{Y} , yield an ordered collection of at least $\kappa(n-1) + p + q + s - 3$ pairwise internally disjoint $a-b$ paths of $D(P)$.

On the other hand, from the definition of $\kappa(n)$ it is easy to see that

$$(3.6) \quad \kappa(n) - \kappa(n-1) = \begin{cases} \frac{n-3}{2} & \text{if } n \text{ is odd,} \\ \frac{n-4}{2} & \text{if } n \text{ is even.} \end{cases}$$

From Remark 3 we know that $p + q + s + r = n - 1$. This equality and the hypotheses $1 \leq p < q, r < s$ imply that $q + s \geq (n+1)/2$, and so $p + q + s - 3 \geq (n-3)/2$. From this inequality and Eq. (3.6) we have that $\kappa(n-1) + p + q + s - 3 \geq \kappa(n-1) + (n-3)/2 \geq \kappa(n)$, as claimed. \square




FIGURE 4. The point set on the left is P . Here $o \in P$ and o is a common endpoint of $a = ox_1^-$ and $b = ox_1^+$, and a and b are large with respect to P . The point set on the right is $P' := (P \setminus \{o\}) \cup \{o^-, o^+\}$, where o^- and o^+ are points lying on ℓ_b and ℓ_a , respectively. The points o^- and o^+ are chosen so that a', b' , and P' satisfy all the hypotheses of Lemma 1.

CASE 3. Suppose that some of a or b is no large with respect to P . Our strategy for proving this case is similar to the used in Case 2. First we enlarge a and b in such a way that the resulting for objects P', a' , and b' lie on some of the previous cases. Once we have the $\kappa(n)$ $a'-b'$ paths of $D(P')$ provided by Lemma 1 or Lemma 2, we proceed to show that there exists a one-to-one mapping between such $a'-b'$ paths of $D(P')$ and certain subset of $a-b$ pairwise internally disjoint paths of $D(P)$. We formalize these ideas as follows.

Let L be the set of leaves of $\{a, b\}$. Then $|L| \in \{2, 4\}$. We recall that $o = (0, 0)$ is the intersection point between the segments a and b , and so $o \notin L$. As before, by rotating P around o if necessary, we can assume that L has exactly two leaves, say $u \in a$ and $v \in b$, with negative y -coordinate. Without loss of generality we assume that u has negative x -coordinate and that v has positive x -coordinate. See Figure 5.

For $x \in L$, let ℓ_x be the ray starting at o and passing through x . As P is finite, then there exists a circumference $O \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ centered at the origin o , which contains P in its interior. Let us define $\gamma(x) := \ell_x \cap O$ for $x \in L$, and $\gamma(x) := x$ for $x \in P \setminus L$. Clearly, we can choose O so that the resulting n point set

$P' := \{\gamma(x) \mid x \in P\}$ is in general position. Then γ is a bijection from P to P' . Moreover, it is not hard to see that if for $xy \in \mathcal{P}$, we let $\gamma(xy) := \gamma(x)\gamma(y)$, then this “extension” of γ defines a bijection from \mathcal{P} to \mathcal{P}' . If h is a vertex (segment) of $D(P)$, then $\gamma(h)$ denote its corresponding vertex (segment) in $D(P')$. It follows from the definition of γ that $a' := \gamma(a)$ (respectively, $b' := \gamma(b)$) contains a (respectively, b) as subsegment. See Figure 5.

Note that a' and b' are large with respect to P' . Let \mathbb{T}' be the ordered collection of $a' - b'$ pairwise internally disjoint paths of $D(P')$ constructed following the procedure described in the proof of Lemma 1 (respectively, Lemma 2) if $|L| = 4$ (respectively, $|L| = 2$). Then \mathbb{T}' has at most one path of length 4, and the remaining paths have length 2 or 3. We also recall that $|\mathbb{T}'| \geq \kappa(n)$.

As before, let C' be the set of vertices that are in $D(P') \setminus D(P)$, i.e., the set of segments in \mathcal{P}' that have at least one endpoint in $\gamma(L)$. Let T' be a path of \mathbb{T}' . Again, we shall use (T') to denote the subpath obtained from T' after deleting its endvertices (namely a' and b'). Note that if (T') has no vertices of C' , then each vertex in (T') is also a vertex of $D(P)$, and so $a(T')b$ defines an $a - b$ path of $D(P)$, since a and b are contained in a' and b' , respectively. Then $\mathbb{T}_0 := \{a(T')b \mid T' \in \mathbb{T}' \text{ and } T' \cap C' = \emptyset\}$ is an ordered collection of pairwise internally disjoint $a - b$ paths of $D(P)$. Moreover, note that each path of length 2 of \mathbb{T}' contributes to \mathbb{T}_0 .

We now focus on the collection \mathbb{T}'_1 formed by the paths of \mathbb{T}' that intersect the set C' . Thus, if $T' \in \mathbb{T}'_1$, then $T' \cap C' \neq \emptyset$ and T' has length 3 or 4. Since \mathbb{T}' is ordered, we know that for each path $T' := a'f'g'b'$ of length 3 of \mathbb{T}' , there exists a line $\ell_{f',g'}$ which passes through o and separates f' from g' . It is no hard to see that the segments $\gamma^{-1}(f')$ and $\gamma^{-1}(g')$ in $D(P)$ remain separated by $\ell_{f',g'}$, and hence $a\gamma^{-1}(f')\gamma^{-1}(g')b$ defines an $a - b$ path of $D(P)$. Similarly, note that if \mathbb{T}' contains the path T^* of length 4 described in the proof of Lemma 1, then $\gamma^{-1}(T^*)$ defines an $a - b$ path of length 4 in $D(P)$. Since γ is a bijection between \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{P}' , then the $|\mathbb{T}'_1|$ paths of $D(P)$ produced by $\gamma^{-1}(\mathbb{T}'_1)$ are pairwise internally disjoint. These paths together with those in \mathbb{T}_0 provides the required $|\mathbb{T}'| \geq \kappa(n)$ paths of $D(P)$. This concludes the proof of Case 3, and hence the proof of Theorem 1. \square




FIGURE 5. Two possibilities for P, a , and b . In both cases O is a circumference centered at $o = (0, 0)$ and contains all the points of P . Note that on the left case $o \notin P$, but on the right we have $o \in P$. In both instances none of a and b is large with respect to its point set. The set of leaves L of $\{a, b\}$ on the left is $\{u, v, w, z\}$, while for the set on the right we have that $L = \{u, v\}$.

4. CONCLUDING REMARKS

A trivial upper bound for the connectivity $\kappa(H)$ of a graph H is its minimum degree $\delta(H)$. As we have observed in Proposition 2, if P is a set of $n \geq 3$ points in general position in the plane, then its disjointness graph of segments $D(P)$ has minimum degree $\delta(D(P)) \geq \kappa(n) := \binom{\lfloor \frac{n-2}{2} \rfloor}{2} + \binom{\lceil \frac{n-2}{2} \rceil}{2}$.

From Corollary 1 it follows that if $\delta(D(P)) = \kappa(n)$, then $\kappa(D(P)) = \delta(D(P))$, and hence Theorem 1 is best possible for such point sets. On the other hand, we remark that not only the points in convex position satisfy the hypothesis of Corollary 1, but also any point set P containing two points in \bar{P} such that the line spanned by them separates P into two sets of sizes as equal as possible. Finally, it would be interesting to determine a tight upper bound for $\delta(D(P)) - \kappa(D(P))$ for the case in which $\delta(D(P)) > \kappa(n)$.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. O. Albertson and D. L. Boutin. Using determining sets to distinguish Kneser graphs. *Electron. J. Combin.*, 14(1): Research paper 20 (Electronic), 2007.
- [2] G. Araujo, A. Dumitrescu, F. Hurtado, M. Noy, and J. Urrutia. On the chromatic number of some geometric type Kneser graphs. *Comput. Geom.*, 32(1):59–69, 2005.
- [3] I. Bárány, *A short proof of Kneser’s conjecture*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A, 25 (1978), 325–326.
- [4] Ya-Chen Chen, *Kneser graphs are Hamiltonian for $n \geq 3k$* , J. Combin. Theory Ser. B, 80 (2000), pp. 69–79.
- [5] G. B. Ekinici and J. B. Gauci, *The super-connectivity of Kneser graphs*, Discuss. Math. Graph Theory 39, (2019) 5–11.
- [6] R. Fabila-Monroy, C. Hidalgo-Toscano, J. Leaños, and M. Lomelí-Haro, The Chromatic Number of the Disjointness Graph of the Double Chain. In *Discrete Mathematics and Theoretical Computer Science*, **22**:1, 2020, #11.
- [7] R. Fabila-Monroy and D. R. Wood. *The chromatic number of the convex segment disjointness graph*. Computational geometry, volume 7579 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pages 79–84. Springer, Cham, 2011.
- [8] J. Jonsson (2011). *The exact chromatic number of the convex segment disjointness graph*.
- [9] L. Lovász, *Kneser’s conjecture, chromatic number, and homotopy*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A, 25 (1978), 319–324.
- [10] J. Matousek. *Using the Borsuk-Ulam theorem*. Universitext. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003. ISBN 3-540-00362-2. Lectures on topological methods in combinatorics and geometry, Written in cooperation with Anders Björner and Günter M. Ziegler.
- [11] M. Kneser. *Jahresbericht der Deutschen Mathematiker-Vereinigung*, volume 58, page 27. 1956. Aufgabe 360.
- [12] J. Pach, G. Tardos, and G. Tóth, *Disjointness graphs of segments*, in: Boris Aronov and Matthew J. Katz (eds.), *33th International Symposium on Computational Geometry (SoCG 2017)*, vol. 77 of Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs), 59:1–15, Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, Dagstuhl, 2017.
- [13] J. Pach and I. Tomon. On the Chromatic Number of Disjointness Graphs of Curves. In *35th International Symposium on Computational Geometry (SoCG 2019)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2019.
- [14] P. Reinfeld, *Chromatic polynomials and the spectrum of the Kneser graph*, tech. rep., London School of Economics, 2000. LSE-CDAM-2000-02.
- [15] M. Valencia-Pabon, J.-C. Vera, *On the diameter of Kneser graphs*, Discrete Math. 305 (2005) 383–385.