

Forbidden subgraphs and 2-factors in $3/2$ -tough graphs

Masahiro Sanka*

Department of Mathematics, Keio University,
3-14-1 Hiyoshi, Kohoku-ku, Yokohama 223-8522, Japan

Abstract

A graph G is H -free if it has no induced subgraph isomorphic to H , where H is a graph. In this paper, we show that every $\frac{3}{2}$ -tough $(P_4 \cup P_{10})$ -free graph has a 2-factor. The toughness condition of this result is sharp. Moreover, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a $(2 - \varepsilon)$ -tough $2P_5$ -free graph without a 2-factor. This implies that the graph $P_4 \cup P_{10}$ is best possible for a forbidden subgraph in a sense.

Keywords. Toughness, $(P_4 \cup P_{10})$ -free graph, 2-factor, Hamiltonian cycle

1 Introduction

We begin with a few definitions. The terminology not defined here can be found in [8], and additional definitions will be given as needed.

All graphs in this paper are finite, undirected and simple. Let G be a graph with vertex set $V(G)$ and edge set $E(G)$. For $x \in V(G)$, we denote by $N_G(x)$ and $d_G(x)$ the neighborhood and the degree of x in G , respectively. We denote by $\delta(G)$ and $\omega(G)$ the minimum degree and the number of components of G , respectively.

Let $U \subset V(G)$. Then we define that $N_G(U) = (\bigcup_{x \in U} N_G(x)) \setminus U$. If any two vertices in U are adjacent in G , we call U a *clique*. Also, if any two vertices in U are not adjacent in G , we call U an *independent set*. Let H be a subgraph of G . Then we write $N_G(H)$ for $N_G(V(H))$. If $E(H) = \{uv \mid u, v \in V(H) \text{ and } uv \in E(G)\}$, we say that H is an *induced subgraph* of G , and $V(H)$ induces H . The subgraph of G induced on $V(G) \setminus U$ is denoted by $G - U$. For notational simplicity we write $G - x$ for $G - \{x\}$.

Let $X, Y \subset V(G)$, and $x \in V(G)$. We use $e_G(x, Y)$ to denote the number of edges of G joining x to a vertex in Y , $e_G(X, Y)$ to denote $\sum_{x \in X} e_G(x, Y)$, $N_Y(x)$ to denote $Y \cap N_G(x)$ and $N_Y(X)$ to denote $Y \cap N_G(X)$. If $e_G(x, Y) \geq 1$ ($e_G(X, Y) \geq 1$), we say that x and Y (X and Y) are *adjacent*.

*E-mail address: sankamasa@keio.jp

For two graphs G and H and a positive integer m , we define that $G \cup H$ is the disjoint union of G and H and mG is the disjoint union of m copies of G . We use K_n and P_n to denote the complete graph and the path with n vertices, respectively.

A k -factor of a graph G is a spanning subgraph of G in which every vertex has degree k . In particular, a 2-factor is a spanning subgraph in which every component is a cycle. We call a connected 2-factor a *hamiltonian cycle*, and say that G is *hamiltonian* if G has a hamiltonian cycle.

The *toughness* of a graph G , denoted by $t(G)$, is defined by

$$t(G) = \min \left\{ \frac{|U|}{\omega(G-U)} \mid U \subset V(G) \text{ and } \omega(G-U) \geq 2 \right\}$$

or $t(G) = \infty$ if G is complete. For a real number t , if $t(G) \geq t$, then we say that G is a t -tough graph. Clearly, a graph G is t -tough if and only if $t \cdot \omega(G-U) \leq |U|$ for any subset $U \subset V(G)$ with $\omega(G-U) \geq 2$.

The notion of toughness was introduced in the study of hamiltonian graphs by Chvátal [7]. It is well known that every hamiltonian graph is 1-tough, but the converse does not hold. Chvátal has conjectured that the converse holds at least in an approximate sense.

Conjecture 1.1 ([7], 1973). *There exists a constant t_0 such that every t_0 -tough graph on at least three vertices is hamiltonian.*

In [2], Bauer, Broersma and Veldman constructed a $(\frac{9}{4} - \varepsilon)$ -tough graph which is not hamiltonian for any $\varepsilon > 0$. Thus, the constant t_0 is at least $\frac{9}{4}$ if Conjecture 1.1 is true. However, it is still open whether every $\frac{9}{4}$ -tough graph on at least three vertices is hamiltonian. For details of known results on Conjecture 1.1, we refer the reader to the survey [1].

Partial results related to Conjecture 1.1 have been obtained in some restricted classes of graphs. In particular, our work was inspired by the result on the class of split graphs. A graph G is a *split graph* if the vertex set of G can be partitioned into a clique and an independent set. Kratsch, Lehel and Müller showed the following theorem.

Theorem 1.2 ([13], 1996). *Every $\frac{3}{2}$ -tough split graph on at least three vertices is hamiltonian. Moreover, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a $(\frac{3}{2} - \varepsilon)$ -tough split graph which has no 2-factor.*

It has been shown that Conjecture 1.1 is true for some superclass of split graphs, for example, spider graphs [11], chordal graphs [6, 10], $2K_2$ -free graphs [5, 15, 14], and $(P_2 \cup P_3)$ -free graphs [16]. However, some of the above results are not known to be best about the toughness condition, which cannot be smaller than $\frac{3}{2}$ by Theorem 1.2.

In order to estimate the condition for the existence of hamiltonian cycles, it is natural to study 2-factors. In the general case, the following theorem was proved by Enomoto, Jackson, Katerinis and Saito.

Theorem 1.3 ([9], 1985). *Let $k \geq 2$ and $n \geq k + 1$ be integers with kn even. Then every k -tough graph on n vertices has a k -factor. Moreover, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a $(k - \varepsilon)$ -tough graph on n vertices with $n \geq k + 1$ and kn even which has no k -factor.*

Theorem 1.3 implies that every 2-tough graph on at least three vertices has a 2-factor, and that there exists an infinite sequence of graphs without 2-factor having toughness approaching 2. On the other hand, the toughness boundary for split graphs to have a 2-factor is $\frac{3}{2}$. This result was extended to the class of chordal graphs in [3].

For a graph H , a graph G is H -free if it contains no induced subgraph isomorphic to H . Note that for two graphs H and K , if H contains an induced subgraph isomorphic to K , then every K -free graph is an H -free graph. So in this paper, we study as large a graph H as possible, such that every $\frac{3}{2}$ -tough H -free graph has a 2-factor, and show the following result.

Theorem 1.4. *Every $\frac{3}{2}$ -tough $(P_4 \cup P_{10})$ -free graph on at least three vertices has a 2-factor.*

Since the class of $(P_4 \cup P_{10})$ -free graphs is a superclass of split graphs, the toughness condition of Theorem 1.4 is sharp. Furthermore, in [4], Bauer and Schmeichel constructed a $(2 - \varepsilon)$ -tough $2P_5$ -free graph without 2-factor for any $\varepsilon > 0$. Since the class of $2P_5$ -free graphs is a common subclass of $(P_4 \cup P_{11})$ -free graphs and $(P_5 \cup P_{10})$ -free graphs, the length of the forbidden paths in the assumptions of Theorem 1.4 is best.

The proof of Theorem 1.4 is given in the subsequent sections. In Section 2, we recall a well-known theorem of Tutte [17] for the existence of 2-factors and introduce related lemmas. In Section 3, we prove Theorem 1.4. We believe that our work might be useful in proving Conjecture 1.1 for more classes of graphs.

2 Tutte's 2-factor theorem and related lemmas

In this section, we write a criterion given in [17] by Tutte for a graph to have a 2-factor. Let S and T be disjoint subsets of $V(G)$, and C be a component of $G - (S \cup T)$. Then C is said to be an *odd component* if $e_G(C, T) \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$. Let $h(S, T)$ be the number of odd components of $G - (S \cup T)$. Also, let

$$\eta(S, T) = 2|S| - 2|T| + \sum_{x \in T} d_{G-S}(x) - h(S, T).$$

The following theorem is the case $k = 2$ of Tutte's k -factor theorem.

Theorem 2.1 ([17], 1952). *For a graph G , each of the following holds:*

- (i) *For every disjoint sets $S, T \subset V(G)$, $\eta(S, T)$ is even.*
- (ii) *G has a 2-factor if and only if $\eta(S, T) \geq 0$ for every disjoint sets $S, T \subset V(G)$.*

Let G be a graph without 2-factor. Then by Theorem 2.1, there exists a pair (S, T) of disjoint subsets of $V(G)$ with $\eta(S, T) \leq -2$, and we call such a pair a *Tutte pair* for G . We call a Tutte pair (S, T) a *special Tutte pair* if among all the Tutte pairs for G ,

- (a) $|S|$ is maximum;
- (b) $|T|$ is minimum subject to (a); and
- (c) $h(S, T)$ is minimum subject to (b).

We use the following lemma for a special Tutte pair. This lemma was proved, for example, in [12].

Lemma 2.2 ([12], Lemma 3.2, Lemma 3.3). *Let G be a graph without 2-factor, and let (S, T) be a special Tutte pair of G . Then each of the followings holds:*

- (i) *The set T is independent in G .*
- (ii) *Each vertex $x \in T$ is adjacent to exactly $d_{G-S}(x)$ odd components of $G - (S \cup T)$.*
- (iii) *If C is an odd component of $G - (S \cup T)$, then for any $y \in V(C)$, $e_G(y, T) \leq 1$.*
- (iv) *Let $x \in T$ be a vertex with $d_{G-S}(x) \geq 2$. If x is adjacent to an odd component C of $G - (S \cup T)$, then $|V(C)| \geq 3$.*

3 Proof of Theorem 1.4

In order to prove Theorem 1.4, suppose that G is a $\frac{3}{2}$ -tough $(P_4 \cup P_{10})$ -free graph on at least three vertices which has no 2-factor. Then we can take a special Tutte pair (S, T) for G by Theorem 2.1. Note that $\delta(G) \geq 3$ since G is a $\frac{3}{2}$ -tough non-complete graph.

Claim 3.1. $S \neq \emptyset$ and $|T| \geq 2$.

Proof. The expression $\eta(S, \emptyset) = 2|S|$ immediately shows that T is not empty. Suppose that $S = \emptyset$. Then we have $h(\emptyset, T) \geq \delta(G) \geq 3$ by Lemma 2.2(ii). Since G is $\frac{3}{2}$ -tough, $h(\emptyset, T) \leq \omega(G - T) \leq \frac{2}{3}|T|$ holds. However, since (\emptyset, T) is a Tutte pair, we have

$$-2 \geq \eta(\emptyset, T) = -2|T| + \sum_{x \in T} d_G(x) - h(\emptyset, T) \geq |T| - h(\emptyset, T) \geq \frac{|T|}{3} \geq \frac{1}{3},$$

a contradiction. Thus, S is not empty.

Suppose that $|T| = 1$, and let $T = \{x\}$. Then by Lemma 2.2(ii), $d_{G-S}(x) = h(S, T)$ holds. However, since S is not empty and (S, T) is a Tutte pair, we have

$$-2 \geq \eta(S, T) = 2|S| - 2 + d_{G-S}(x) - h(S, T) = 2|S| - 2 \geq 0,$$

a contradiction. Thus, we conclude $|T| \geq 2$. \square

In the following, the special Tutte pair (S, T) is fixed. Thus, we let $h = h(S, T)$. Let

$$m = \max\{d_{G-S}(x) \mid x \in T\}, \text{ and} \\ T_j = \{x \in T \mid d_{G-S}(x) = j\} \text{ for } j = 0, 1, \dots, m.$$

Clearly,

$$|T| = \sum_{j=0}^m |T_j| \text{ and } \sum_{x \in T} d_{G-S}(x) = \sum_{j=0}^m j|T_j|$$

hold. Therefore, we have

$$\eta(S, T) = 2|S| + \sum_{j=0}^m (j-2)|T_j| - h \leq -2. \quad (1)$$

Let \mathcal{D} be the set of components of $G - S$ intersecting with $T \setminus T_0$ and \mathcal{C} be the set of odd components of $G - (S \cup T)$. For each $D \in \mathcal{D}$ and $x \in T \setminus T_0$, we define

$$\mathcal{C}_D = \{C \in \mathcal{C} \mid C \text{ is included in } D\} \text{ and } \mathcal{C}_x = \{C \in \mathcal{C} \mid e_G(x, C) = 1\}.$$

Note that for any $x \in V(D) \cap T$ where $D \in \mathcal{D}$, the set \mathcal{C}_x is a subset of \mathcal{C}_D .

Let $C \in \mathcal{C}$. If $e_G(C, T) \geq 3$, we say that C is *strong*; otherwise, C is *weak*. Note that if C is weak, then $e_G(C, T) = 1$. For each $D \in \mathcal{D}$, we take a vertex $x_D \in V(D) \cap T$ such that the number of strong odd components adjacent to x_D is maximum.

Case 1. For any $D \in \mathcal{D}$, every odd component in $\mathcal{C}_D \setminus \mathcal{C}_{x_D}$ is weak.

In this case, we define

$$T^{\text{I}} = \{x_D \mid D \in \mathcal{D}\}, \\ T_j^{\text{I}} = T^{\text{I}} \cap T_j \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, m, \\ T^{\text{II}} = \left\{ y \in T \mid y \text{ is adjacent to some } C \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \left(\bigcup_{D \in \mathcal{D}} \mathcal{C}_{x_D} \right) \right\}, \text{ and} \\ T_j^{\text{II}} = T^{\text{II}} \cap T_j \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, m.$$

Let $D \in \mathcal{D}$ and $y \in T^{\text{II}} \cap V(D)$. Since x_D and y are in the same component D , we have $\mathcal{C}_{x_D} \cap \mathcal{C}_y \neq \emptyset$, which implies

$$h = \sum_{D \in \mathcal{D}} \left(|\mathcal{C}_{x_D}| + \sum_{y \in T^{\text{II}} \cap V(D)} |\mathcal{C}_y \setminus \mathcal{C}_{x_D}| \right) \leq \sum_{j=1}^m (j|T_j^{\text{I}}| + (j-1)|T_j^{\text{II}}|). \quad (2)$$

Let

$$W = S \cup T^{\text{II}} \cup N_G(T_1 \setminus T_1^{\text{I}}).$$

Then each vertex in $T_0 \cup (T_1 \setminus T_1^{\text{I}})$ is an isolated vertex in the graph $G - W$. Also, for any $D \in \mathcal{D}$, each component in $\mathcal{C}_D \setminus \mathcal{C}_{x_D}$ is separated from D in the graph $G - W$ by the assumption of Case 1. Therefore, since $|\mathcal{D}| = |T^{\text{I}}|$ and $\sum_{D \in \mathcal{D}} |\mathcal{C}_D \setminus \mathcal{C}_{x_D}| \geq |T^{\text{II}}|$, the graph $G - W$ has at least

$$|T_0| + |T_1 \setminus T_1^{\text{I}}| + |T^{\text{I}}| + |T^{\text{II}}| = |T_0| + |T_1| + |T^{\text{I}} \setminus T_1| + |T^{\text{II}}|$$

components. Moreover, (1) and (2) imply

$$\begin{aligned} |W| &= |S| + |T_1| + |T^{\text{II}}| - |T_1^{\text{I}}| \\ &\leq |T_0| + \frac{3}{2}|T_1| + \frac{1}{2} \left(h - \sum_{j=2}^m (j-2)|T_j| \right) - 1 + |T^{\text{II}}| - |T_1^{\text{I}}| \\ &\leq |T_0| + \frac{3}{2}|T_1| + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=2}^m (2|T_j^{\text{I}}| + |T_j^{\text{II}}|) - 1 + |T^{\text{II}}| - \frac{|T_1^{\text{I}}|}{2} \\ &\leq |T_0| + \frac{3}{2}|T_1| + |T^{\text{I}} \setminus T_1| + \frac{3}{2}|T^{\text{II}}| - \frac{|T_1^{\text{I}}|}{2} - 1 \\ &< |T_0| + \frac{3}{2}|T_1| + |T^{\text{I}} \setminus T_1| + \frac{3}{2}|T^{\text{II}}|. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Suppose that $\omega(G - W) = 1$. Then since $|T| \geq 2$ by Claim 3.1, $T_0 = T_1 = T^{\text{II}} = \emptyset$ and $|T^{\text{I}}| = 1$ hold. Let $T^{\text{I}} = \{x\}$. Then all odd components of $G - (S \cup T)$ are adjacent to x , which implies $m \leq h = d_{G-S}(x) \leq m$. However, (1) follows

$$-2 \geq \eta(S, T) = 2|S| + \sum_{j=2}^m (j-2)|T_j| - h \geq 2|S| + m - 2 - m = 2|S| - 2$$

implying $|S| = 0$, contrary to Claim 3.1. Therefore, $\omega(G - W) \geq 2$ holds. Since the graph G is $\frac{3}{2}$ -tough, we have

$$\frac{3}{2} (|T_0| + |T_1| + |T^{\text{I}} \setminus T_1| + |T^{\text{II}}|) \leq \frac{3}{2} \omega(G - W) \leq |W|,$$

a contradiction to (3).

Case 2. There exists $D \in \mathcal{D}$ such that the set $\mathcal{C}_D \setminus \mathcal{C}_{x_D}$ has some strong odd components.

We use the following terminology for paths. Let P be a path. If u and v are the end-vertices of P , we say that P is a uv -path. For $x, y \in V(P)$, xPy denotes the subpath of P between x and y . Let P be an xy -path and Q be a yz -path. If P and Q are internally disjoint, then $xPyQz$ denotes a path between x and z passing through P and Q . For a set U , if the end-vertices of a path P are both in U , we say that P is a U -path. The term defined below plays an important role in the proof.

Definition 3.2. Let $C \in \mathcal{C}$ be strong. For $U \subset N_T(C)$ with $|U| \geq 2$, a U -path P is called a *basic U -path for C* if

- all internal vertices of P are on C , and
- P is an induced path in G passing through at most two vertices in $N_C(U)$.

In Definition 3.2, for any vertex $u \in U$, we can take a basic U -path for C starting in u . In fact, we can just choose the shortest path that starts from u and goes through C to another vertex of U . Moreover, by Lemma 2.2(iii), every basic U -path for C is on at least 4 vertices.

Let $D \in \mathcal{D}$ and $x = x_D$. Suppose that $\mathcal{C}_D \setminus \mathcal{C}_x$ has some strong odd components. Then we can take a strong odd component $C_0 \in \mathcal{C}_D \setminus \mathcal{C}_x$ such that there exists $C_1 \in \mathcal{C}_x$ with $N_T(C_0) \cap N_T(C_1) \neq \emptyset$. For $U_1 = \{x\} \cup (N_T(C_0) \cap N_T(C_1))$, let Q_1 be a basic U_1 -path for C_1 starting in x and $y \in N_T(C_0) \cap N_T(C_1)$ be the other end-vertex of Q_1 . Now we assume that the strong odd component $C_0 \in \mathcal{C}_D \setminus \mathcal{C}_x$ is chosen so that the number of vertices on Q_1 is as small as possible.

Since C_0 is strong, we can take a basic $N_T(C_0)$ -path Q_0 for C_0 starting in y . Let $z \in N_T(C_0) \setminus \{y\}$ be the other end-vertex of Q_0 . Also, by the choice of x and $C_0 \in \mathcal{C}_D \setminus \mathcal{C}_x$, there exists a strong odd component $C_2 \in \mathcal{C}_x \setminus \mathcal{C}_y$. We take a basic $(N_T(C_2) \setminus \{z\})$ -path Q_2 for C_2 starting in x and let $w \in N_T(C_2) \setminus \{x, z\}$ be the other end-vertex of Q_2 . By the choice of those paths, Claim 3.3 immediately follows.

Claim 3.3. *Each of the following holds.*

- (i) *Let $C \in \mathcal{C}_D \setminus \mathcal{C}_x$. If C is strong, then for any $u \in N_T(C) \setminus \{y\}$ we have $e_G(u, Q_1) = 0$.*
- (ii) *For any $u \in T \setminus \{y, z\}$ we have $e_G(u, Q_0) = 0$.*
- (iii) *For any $u \in T \setminus \{w, x, z\}$ we have $e_G(u, Q_2) = 0$.*




Figure 1: A sketch of the path Q . The dotted lines can be edges of G .

We define a path Q in G as

$$Q = \begin{cases} wQ_2xQ_1yQ_0z & \text{if } e_G(w, Q_1) = 0 \text{ and } e_G(z, Q_2) = 0; \\ wQ_2z_2zQ_0yQ_1x & \text{if } e_G(w, Q_1) = 0 \text{ and } e_G(z, Q_2) = 1; \\ xQ_2ww_1Q_1yQ_0z & \text{if } e_G(w, Q_1) = 1 \text{ and } e_G(z, Q_2) = 0; \\ xQ_1w_1wQ_2z_2zQ_0y & \text{if } e_G(w, Q_1) = 1 \text{ and } e_G(z, Q_2) = 1, \end{cases}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} z_2 &\in N_G(z) \cap V(Q_2) && \text{if } e_G(z, Q_2) = 1, \text{ and} \\ w_1 &\in N_G(w) \cap V(Q_1) && \text{if } e_G(w, Q_1) = 1. \end{aligned}$$

The path Q is sketched in Figure 1. By Claim 3.3, Q is an induced path in G on at least 10 vertices.

Claim 3.4. *Let $C \in \mathcal{C}$ and $v \in T \setminus (T_0 \cup T_1)$. Then each of the following holds.*

- (i) *If C is strong, then C is adjacent to at least one of $\{x, y, z, w\}$.*
- (ii) *If v is adjacent to some weak odd component in \mathcal{C} , then v is adjacent to at least one of $\{C_0, C_1, C_2\}$.*

Proof. For (i), suppose that there exists a strong odd component $C \in \mathcal{C}$ such that C is not adjacent to x, y, z and w . Then we can take a basic $N_T(C)$ -path P for C , which is

an induced path in G on at least 4 vertices. Let $u, v \in N_T(C)$ be the end-vertices of P . By Claim 3.3, both u and v are not adjacent to any vertex on Q . Thus, $P \cup Q$ would contain $P_4 \cup P_{10}$ which is an induced subgraph of G , contrary to the assumption.

Next for (ii), suppose that there exists a vertex $v \in T \setminus (T_0 \cup T_1)$ such that v is adjacent to some weak odd component $C \in \mathcal{C}$, but not to C_0, C_1 and C_2 . By Lemma 2.2(ii), we can take an odd component $C' \in \mathcal{C}_v \setminus \{C\}$. Also, by Lemma 2.2(iv), the odd component C has at least 3 vertices. Let $p \in N_C(v), q \in N_{C'}(v)$ and $r \in N_C(p)$. Then $P = rpvq$ is an induced path in G on 4 vertices. Thus, $P \cup Q$ would contain $P_4 \cup P_{10}$ which is an induced subgraph of G , contrary to the assumption. \square

We define

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{C}^* &= \mathcal{C} \setminus (\mathcal{C}_x \cup \mathcal{C}_y \cup \mathcal{C}_z \cup \mathcal{C}_w), \\ T^{\text{I}} &= \{x, y, z, w\}, \\ T_j^{\text{I}} &= T^{\text{I}} \cap T_j \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, m, \\ T^{\text{II}} &= \{u \in T \mid u \text{ is adjacent to some } C \in \mathcal{C}^*\}, \text{ and} \\ T_j^{\text{II}} &= T^{\text{II}} \cap T_j \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, m.\end{aligned}$$

The definitions of \mathcal{C}^* and T^{II} imply $T^{\text{I}} \subset T \setminus T^{\text{II}}$. By Claim 3.4(i), every odd component in \mathcal{C}^* is weak. Moreover, by Claim 3.4(ii), every vertex in $T^{\text{II}} \setminus T_1^{\text{II}}$ is adjacent to at least one of $\{C_0, C_1, C_2\}$. Thus, we obtain

$$|\mathcal{C}^*| \leq |T_1^{\text{II}}| + \sum_{j=2}^m (j-1)|T_j^{\text{II}}|,$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned}h &= |\mathcal{C}| \\ &= |\mathcal{C}^* \cup \mathcal{C}_x \cup \mathcal{C}_y \cup \mathcal{C}_z \cup \mathcal{C}_w| \\ &\leq |\mathcal{C}^*| + |\mathcal{C}_x| + |\mathcal{C}_y \setminus \{C_1\}| + |\mathcal{C}_z \setminus \{C_0\}| + |\mathcal{C}_w \setminus \{C_2\}| \\ &\leq |T_1^{\text{II}}| + \sum_{j=2}^m (j-1)|T_j^{\text{II}}| + \sum_{j=1}^m j|T_j^{\text{I}}| - 3.\end{aligned}\tag{4}$$

Let

$$W = S \cup (T^{\text{II}} \setminus T_1^{\text{II}}) \cup N_G(T_1 \setminus T_1^{\text{II}}).$$

Then each vertex in $T_0 \cup (T_1 \setminus T_1^{\text{II}})$ is an isolated vertex in the graph $G - W$. Also, each component in \mathcal{C}^* is separated from the component D in the graph $G - W$. Therefore, since $|\mathcal{C}^*| \geq |T^{\text{II}}|$, the graph $G - W$ has at least

$$|T_0| + |T_1 \setminus T_1^{\text{II}}| + |T^{\text{II}}| + 1 = |T_0| + |T_1| + |T^{\text{II}} \setminus T_1^{\text{II}}| + 1$$

components. Moreover, (1) and (4) imply

$$\begin{aligned}
|W| &= |S| + |T^{\text{II}} \setminus T_1^{\text{II}}| + |T_1 \setminus T_1^{\text{II}}| \\
&\leq |T_0| + \frac{3}{2}|T_1| + \frac{1}{2} \left(h - \sum_{j=2}^m (j-2)|T_j| \right) - 1 + |T^{\text{II}} \setminus T_1^{\text{II}}| - |T_1^{\text{II}}| \\
&\leq |T_0| + \frac{3}{2}|T_1| + \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{j=2}^m (2|T_j^{\text{I}}| + |T_j^{\text{II}}|) + |T_1^{\text{I}}| - 3 \right) - 1 + |T^{\text{II}} \setminus T_1^{\text{II}}| - \frac{|T_1^{\text{II}}|}{2} \quad (5) \\
&\leq |T_0| + \frac{3}{2}|T_1| + \frac{3}{2} + \frac{3}{2}|T^{\text{II}} \setminus T_1^{\text{II}}| - \frac{|T_1^{\text{II}}|}{2} \\
&\leq \frac{3}{2}(|T_0| + |T_1| + |T^{\text{II}} \setminus T_1^{\text{II}}| + 1).
\end{aligned}$$

Case 2.1. $\omega(G - W) \geq 2$.

Since the graph G is $\frac{3}{2}$ -tough, we have

$$\frac{3}{2}(|T_0| + |T_1| + |T^{\text{II}} \setminus T_1^{\text{II}}| + 1) \leq \frac{3}{2}\omega(G - W) \leq |W|,$$

and so (4) and (5) achieve the equations. Therefore, we immediately see that the following statements hold.

- T_0 , T_1^{I} and T_1^{II} are empty. In particular, $z, w \notin T_1$, which implies that $\mathcal{C}_z \setminus \{C_0\}$ and $\mathcal{C}_w \setminus \{C_2\}$ are not empty.
- The sets \mathcal{C}_x , $\mathcal{C}_y \setminus \{C_1\}$, $\mathcal{C}_z \setminus \{C_0\}$ and $\mathcal{C}_w \setminus \{C_2\}$ are pairwise disjoint. Thus, we get $Q = wQ_2xQ_1yQ_0z$.

Let $C_3 \in \mathcal{C}_z \setminus \{C_0\}$, $C_4 \in \mathcal{C}_w \setminus \{C_2\}$, $z_0 \in N_{C_0}(z)$ and $w_4 \in N_{C_4}(w)$. Suppose that C_3 is strong. Then we can take a basic $(N_T(C_3) \setminus \{z\})$ -path Q_3 for C_3 . Note that Q_3 is not adjacent to Q_0 , Q_1 and Q_2 by Claim 3.3. Thus, $Q_3 \cup (w_4wQz_0)$ would contain $P_4 \cup P_{10}$ which is an induced subgraph of G , contrary to the assumption. Therefore, all odd components in $\mathcal{C}_z \setminus \{C_0\}$ are weak, and likewise all odd components in $\mathcal{C}_w \setminus \{C_2\}$ are weak. These statements imply

$$\omega(G - W - \{z, w\}) \geq |T_1| + |T^{\text{II}}| + d_{G-S}(z) + d_{G-S}(w) - 1 \geq 2. \quad (6)$$

On the other hand, since G is $\frac{3}{2}$ -tough, we have

$$\frac{3}{2}\omega(G - W - \{z, w\}) \leq |W| + 2 = \frac{3}{2}(|T_1| + |T^{\text{II}}| + 1) + 2. \quad (7)$$

However, (6) and (7) imply $d_{G-S}(z) + d_{G-S}(w) \leq \frac{10}{3} < 4$, a contradiction to $z, w \notin T_1$.

Case 2.2. $\omega(G - W) = 1$.

In this case, the sets T_0, T_1, T^{II} and \mathcal{C}^* are empty. Since $W = S$, Claim 3.1 and (5) implies $|S| = 1$. Therefore, (1) implies

$$h \geq 4 + \sum_{j=2}^m (j-2)|T_j| \geq \sum_{j=2}^m j|T_j^{\text{I}}| - 4. \quad (8)$$

Using the toughness assumption, we prove Claims 3.5 and 3.6.

Claim 3.5. *All odd components of $G - (S \cup T)$ are strong.*

Proof. Suppose that $C \in \mathcal{C}$ is weak. Then C is adjacent to exactly one vertex $v \in T^{\text{I}}$. Since the set $S \cup \{v\}$ separates C from the others in G , the graph $G - S - v$ has at least two components. However, it implies

$$\omega(G - S - v) \geq 2 > \frac{4}{3} = \frac{2}{3}(|S| + 1),$$

a contradiction to the toughness assumption. \square

Claim 3.6. *Let $C \in \mathcal{C}$. Then for any vertex $v \in N_T(C)$ there exists a basic $N_T(C)$ -path avoiding $N_C(v)$.*

Proof. Let $C \in \mathcal{C}$ and suppose that there is no basic $N_T(C)$ -path avoiding $N_C(v)$ for a vertex $v \in N_T(C)$. Since C is strong by Claim 3.5, we can take two vertices $a, b \in N_T(C) \setminus \{v\}$. Let $u \in N_C(v)$. Then by the hypothesis, the vertices in $N_C(T)$ are separated in $C - u$. However, it implies

$$\omega(G - S - \{a, b, u\}) \geq 3 > \frac{8}{3} = \frac{2}{3}(|S| + 3),$$

a contradiction to the toughness assumption. \square

Using Claim 3.6 for some odd components, we will show that the graph G contains $P_4 \cup P_{10}$ as an induced subgraph. First, we show that the graph $G - (S \cup T)$ has an odd component which is adjacent to both z and w .

Claim 3.7. *For any $C \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{C}_x$ we have $e_G(C, \{y, z, w\}) \geq 2$.*

Proof. Let $C \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{C}_x$. Then C is adjacent to at least one of $\{y, z, w\}$ by Claim 3.4. Suppose that $e_G(C, \{y, z, w\}) = 1$, and let $v \in \{y, z, w\}$ with $e_G(v, C) = 1$. Then by Claim 3.6, we can take a basic $N_T(C)$ -path P avoiding $N_C(v)$, which is an induced path of G on at least 4 vertices. By Claim 3.3, we have $e_G(P, Q) = 0$. Thus, $P \cup Q$ would contain $P_4 \cup P_{10}$ which is an induced subgraph of G , contrary to the assumption. \square

Claim 3.8. *There exists an odd component $C_3 \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \{C_0, C_1, C_2\}$ which is adjacent to both z and w .*

Proof. Note that by (8), there is at most one odd component of $G - (S \cup T)$ that belongs to at least two of the sets \mathcal{C}_x , $\mathcal{C}_y \setminus \{C_1\}$, $\mathcal{C}_z \setminus \{C_0\}$ and $\mathcal{C}_w \setminus \{C_2\}$. If w is adjacent to some $C \in \{C_0, C_1\}$, then there exists $C' \in \mathcal{C}_z \setminus \{C_0, C_1, C_2\}$ with $e_G(C', \{x, y, w\}) = 0$, contrary to Claim 3.7. Thus, we get $e_G(w, C_0) = e_G(w, C_1) = 0$, implying that $\mathcal{C}_w \setminus \{C_0, C_1, C_2\}$ is not empty. Let $C_3 \in \mathcal{C}_w \setminus \{C_0, C_1, C_2\}$. Then one of $\{x, y, z\}$ is adjacent to C_3 by Claim 3.7. If $e_G(C_3, \{x, y\}) \geq 1$, then there exists $C \in \mathcal{C}_z \setminus \{C_0, C_1, C_2, C_3\}$ with $e_G(C, \{x, y, w\}) = 0$, contrary to Claim 3.7. Thus, we obtain $e_G(C_3, \{x, y\}) = 0$ implying $e_G(C_3, z) = 1$. \square

By Claim 3.8, we can take an odd component $C_3 \in (\mathcal{C}_z \cap \mathcal{C}_w) \setminus \{C_0, C_1, C_2\}$. Thus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} h &= |\mathcal{C}_x| + |\mathcal{C}_y \setminus \{C_1\}| + |\mathcal{C}_z \setminus \{C_0\}| + |\mathcal{C}_w \setminus \{C_2, C_3\}| \\ &= \sum_{j=2}^m (j-2)|T_j| + 4 = \sum_{j=2}^m j|T_j^I| - 4, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that the following statements hold.

- The sets \mathcal{C}_x , $\mathcal{C}_y \setminus \{C_1\}$, $\mathcal{C}_z \setminus \{C_0\}$ and $\mathcal{C}_w \setminus \{C_2, C_3\}$ are pairwise disjoint. Thus, we get $Q = wQ_2xQ_1yQ_0z$.
- $T \setminus T^I \subset T_2$.

We shall show that the set $T \cup V(C_0) \cup V(C_1) \cup V(C_2) \cup V(C_3)$ contains a subset which induces a subgraph of G isomorphic to $P_4 \cup P_{10}$.

Using Claim 3.6, we can take a basic $N_T(C_3)$ -path R_3 avoiding $N_{C_3}(z)$. Let $a, b \in N_T(C_3) \setminus \{z\}$ be the end-vertices of R_3 . Note that any vertex in $\{a, b\} \setminus \{w\}$ is not adjacent to Q by Claim 3.3. Since G is $(P_4 \cup P_{10})$ -free, $w \in \{a, b\}$ and we may set $b = w$. Let $Q' = aR_3wQy$. Then Q' is an induced path in G on at least 10 vertices.

Using Claim 3.6 again, we can take a basic $N_T(C_0)$ -path R_0 avoiding $N_{C_0}(y)$. Let $b, c \in N_T(C_0) \setminus \{y\}$ be the end-vertices of R_0 (note that the vertex z may be in $\{b, c\}$). Now any vertex in $\{b, c\} \setminus \{a\}$ is not adjacent to Q' . Since G is $(P_4 \cup P_{10})$ -free, $a \in \{b, c\}$ and we may set $c = a$. Replace Q' with $bR_0aQ'x$. Then Q' is still an induced path in G on at least 10 vertices.

Using Claim 3.6 again, we can take a basic $N_T(C_1)$ -path R_1 avoiding $N_{C_1}(x)$. Let $c, d \in N_T(C_1) \setminus \{x\}$ be the end-vertices of R_1 (note that the vertex y may be in $\{c, d\}$). Since $a \in T \setminus T^I \subset T_2$, $a \notin \{c, d\}$. Moreover, any vertex in $\{c, d\} \setminus \{b\}$ is not adjacent to Q' . Thus, since G is $(P_4 \cup P_{10})$ -free, $b \in \{c, d\}$ and we may set $d = b$ (also $b \neq z$ turns

out). Replace Q' with $cR_1bQ'w$. Then Q' is still an induced path in G on at least 10 vertices.

Using Claim 3.6 again, we can take a basic $N_T(C_2)$ -path R_2 avoiding $N_{C_2}(w)$. Let $d, e \in N_T(C_2) \setminus \{w\}$ be the end-vertices of R_2 (note that the vertex x may be in $\{d, e\}$). Since $a, b \in T \setminus T^1 \subset T_2$, $\{d, e\} \cap \{a, b\} = \emptyset$. Moreover, any vertex in $\{d, e\} \setminus \{c\}$ is not adjacent to Q' . Thus, since G is $(P_4 \cup P_{10})$ -free, either $c \in \{d, e\}$ and we may set $e = c$ (also $c \neq y$ turns out). Replace Q' with $dR_2cQ'a$. Then Q' is still an induced path in G on at least 10 vertices.

Suppose $d \notin N_T(C_3)$. Using Claim 3.6, we take a basic $N_T(C_3)$ -path R avoiding $N_{C_3}(a)$. Let $e, f \in N_T(C_3) \setminus \{a\}$ be the end-vertices of R . Then we have $d \notin \{e, f\}$ by the hypothesis. However, then $R \cup Q'$ would contain $P_4 \cup P_{10}$ which is an induced subgraph of G , contrary to the assumption. Thus, we obtain $d \in N_T(C_3)$ (also $d \neq x$ turns out). (The situation around the paths Q and Q' is shown in Figure 2.)

Since $e_G(C_3, T) \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$, there exists a vertex $e \in N_T(C_3) \setminus \{a, d, w, z\}$. Then e is adjacent to neither Q nor Q' . Let R be a basic $N_T(C_3)$ -path starting in e and $f \in N_T(C_3)$ be the other end-vertex of R . If $f \notin \{a, d\}$, then $R \cup Q'$ would contain $P_4 \cup P_{10}$ which is an induced subgraph of G . Otherwise, $R \cup Q$ would contain $P_4 \cup P_{10}$ which is an induced subgraph of G . Both cases contradict the assumption. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.4. \square




Figure 2: The situation around the paths Q and Q' .

4 Examples of graphs without 2-factor

In this section, we show the examples of $2P_5$ -free graphs without a 2-factor mentioned in Section 1. The examples appear in [4], but we will describe the details again here.

We denote by $G+H$ the join of two graphs G and H , which is defined by $V(G+H) = V(G) \cup V(H)$ and $E(G+H) = E(G) \cup E(H) \cup \{uv \mid u \in V(G) \text{ and } v \in V(H)\}$. For two integers $l \geq 1$ and $m \geq 2$, we construct the graph $G(l, m)$ as follows. Let A_1, \dots, A_{2m+1} be $2m+1$ copies of K_{2l+1} , and B be a copy of $K_{(2l+1)(2m+1)}$. Let A be the union of A_1, \dots, A_{2m+1} . The graph $H(l, m)$ is obtained by first joining the vertices of A to the vertices of B by a perfect matching, and then subdividing each matching edge with a single vertex. We write the set of $(2l+1)(2m+1)$ subdividing vertices by T . We define the graph $G(l, m)$ as $G(l, m) = S + H(l, m)$, where S is a copy of K_m . The graph $G(l, m)$ is sketched in Figure 3.

For the pair of sets (S, T) , since every vertex $v \in T$ satisfies $d_{G(l, m)-S}(v) = 2$ and A_1, \dots, A_{2m+1} and B are odd components of $G(l, m) - (S \cup T)$, we have

$$\eta(S, T) = 2|S| - 2|T| + \sum_{v \in T} d_{G(l, m)-S}(v) - h(S, T) = 2m - (2m+2) = -2.$$

Thus, by Theorem 2.1(ii), the graph $G(l, m)$ does not contain 2-factor for any l and m . Moreover, for any l and m , the graph $G(l, m)$ is a $2P_5$ -free graph. Indeed, any induced path in $G(l, m)$ on at least 3 vertices is in $H(l, m)$ and any induced path in $H(l, m)$ on at least 5 vertices must contain at least one vertex in B . Therefore, since B is complete, the graph $G(l, m)$ does not contain induced subgraph isomorphic to $2P_5$.

The toughness of $G(l, m)$ is given by

$$t(G(l, m)) = \frac{m + (2l+1)(2m+1) + 2l(2m+1)}{(2l+1)(2m+1) + 1} = 2 - \frac{m+3}{(2l+1)(2m+1) + 1}.$$




Figure 3: The graph $G(l, m)$.

In particular, a set $W \subset V(G(l, m))$ with $\omega(G(l, m) - W) \geq 2$ that satisfies

$$t(G(l, m)) = \frac{|W|}{\omega(G(l, m) - W)}$$

is obtained as follows. First, for each $i = 1, \dots, 2m + 1$, we take one vertex $a_i \in A_i$. Next, we choose one vertex $a \in \{a_1, \dots, a_{2m+1}\}$, and let $x \in T$ be the vertex adjacent to a and $b \in B$ be the vertex adjacent to x . Then the set W is obtained by

$$W = S \cup (A \setminus \{a_1, \dots, a_{2m+1}\}) \cup (B \setminus \{b\}) \cup \{x\}.$$

By fixing m and choosing l large, we can make the toughness of the graph $G(l, m)$ approach to 2 from below.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the referee and Professor Katsuhiko Ota for their helpful comments. The author's work was supported by JST Doctoral Program Student Support Project (JPMJSP2123).

References

- [1] D. Bauer, H. J. Broersma, and E. Schmeichel, Toughness in graphs – a survey, *Graphs and combinatorics*, 22(1):1–35, 2006.
- [2] D. Bauer, H. J. Broersma, and H. J. Veldman, Not every 2-tough graph is hamiltonian, In *Proceedings of the 5th Twente Workshop on Graphs and Combinatorial Optimization (Enschede, 1997)*, volume 99, pages 317–321, 2000.
- [3] D. Bauer, G. Y. Katona, D. Kratsch, and H. J. Veldman, Chordality and 2-factors in tough graphs, *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 99:323–329, 2000.
- [4] D. Bauer and E. Schmeichel, Toughness, minimum degree and the existence of 2-factors, *J. Graph Theory*, 18:241–256, 1994.
- [5] H. J. Broersma, V. Patel, and A. Pyatkin, On toughness and hamiltonicity of $2K_2$ -free graphs, *J. Graph Theory*, 75(3):244–255, 2014.
- [6] G. Chen, M. S. Jacobson, A. E. Kézdy, and J. Lehel, Tough enough chordal graphs are hamiltonian, *Networks*, 31(1):29–38, 1998.
- [7] V. Chvátal, Tough graphs and hamiltonian circuits, *Discrete Math.*, 5(3):87–95, 1973.

- [8] R. Diestel, *Graph theory*, Number 173 in Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer, fifth edition, 2017.
- [9] H. Enomoto, B. Jackson, P. Katerinis, and A. Saito, Toughness and the existence of k -factors, *J. Graph Theory*, 9(1):87–95, 1985.
- [10] A. Kabela and T. Kaiser, 10-tough chordal graphs are hamiltonian, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 122:417–427, 2017.
- [11] T. Kaiser, D. Král, and L. Stacho, Tough spiders, *J. Graph Theory*, 56(1):23–40, 2007.
- [12] J. Kanno and S. Shan, Vizing’s 2-factor conjecture involving toughness and maximum degree conditions, *Electron. J. Combin.*, 26(2):Paper No. P2.17, 2019.
- [13] D. Kratsch, J. Lehel, and H. Müller, Toughness, hamiltonicity and split graphs, *Discrete Math.*, 150:231–245, 1996.
- [14] K. Ota and M. Sanka, Hamiltonian cycles in 2-tough $2K_2$ -free graphs, submitted for publication, arXiv: 2103.06760, 2021.
- [15] S. Shan, Hamiltonian cycles in 3-tough $2K_2$ -free graphs, *J. Graph Theory*, 94(3):1–15, 2019.
- [16] S. Shan, Hamiltonian cycles in tough $(P_2 \cup P_3)$ -free graphs, *Electron. J. Combin.*, 28(1):Paper No. P1.36, 2021.
- [17] W. T. Tutte, The factors of graphs, *Canad. J. Math.*, 4:314–328, 1952.