Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Discrete Mathematics

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/disc

Hamiltonian paths in k-quasi-transitive digraphs

Ruixia Wang*, Hui Zhang

School of Mathematical Sciences, Shanxi University, Taiyuan, Shanxi, 030006, PR China

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

Article history: Received 10 November 2014 Received in revised form 26 February 2016 Accepted 26 February 2016 Available online 27 April 2016

Keywords: Quasi-transitive digraph *k*-quasi-transitive digraph Hamiltonian path Let D = (V(D), A(D)) be a digraph and k be an integer with $k \ge 2$. A digraph D is k-quasitransitive, if for any path $x_0x_1 \dots x_k$ of length k, x_0 and x_k are adjacent. In this paper, we consider the traceability of k-quasi-transitive digraphs with even $k \ge 4$. We prove that a strong k-quasi-transitive digraph D with even $k \ge 4$ and diam $(D) \ge k+2$ has a Hamiltonian path. Moreover, we show that a strong k-quasi-transitive digraph D such that either k is odd or k = 2 or diam(D) < k + 2 may not contain Hamiltonian paths.

© 2016 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Terminology and introduction

We shall assume that the reader is familiar with the standard terminology on digraphs and refer the reader to [1] for terminology not defined here. We only consider finite digraphs without loops or multiple arcs. Let *D* be a digraph with vertex set *V*(*D*) and arc set *A*(*D*). For any $x, y \in V(D)$, we will write $x \rightarrow y$ if $xy \in A(D)$, and also, we will write \overline{xy} if $x \rightarrow y$ or $y \rightarrow x$. For disjoint subsets *X* and *Y* of *V*(*D*) or subdigraphs of *D*, $X \rightarrow Y$ means that every vertex of *X* dominates every vertex of *Y*, $X \Rightarrow Y$ means that there is no arc from *Y* to *X* and $X \mapsto Y$ means that both of $X \rightarrow Y$ and $X \Rightarrow Y$ hold. For subsets *X*, *Y* of *V*(*D*), we define (*X*, *Y*) = { $xy \in A(D) : x \in X, y \in Y$ }. If $X = {x}$, then we write (*x*, *Y*) instead of ({*x*}, *Y*). Likewise, if $Y = {y}$, then we write (*X*, *y*) instead of (*X*, {*y*}). Let *D* be a subdigraph of *D* and $x \in V(D) \setminus V(D')$. We say that *x* and *D*' are adjacent if *x* and some vertex of *D* are adjacent. For $S \subseteq V(D)$, we denote by *D*[*S*] the subdigraph of *D* induced by the vertex set *S*. The converse of *D* is the digraph which one obtains from *D* by reversing all arcs.

Let *x* and *y* be two vertices of *V*(*D*). The *distance* from *x* to *y* in *D*, denoted d(x, y), is the minimum length of an (x, y)-path, if *y* is reachable from *x*, and otherwise $d(x, y) = \infty$. The distance from a set *X* to a set *Y* of vertices in *D* is $d(X, Y) = \max\{d(x, y) : x \in X, y \in Y\}$. The *diameter* of *D* is diam(*D*) = d(V(D), V(D)). Clearly, *D* has finite diameter if and only if it is strong.

Let $P = y_0y_1 \dots y_k$ be a path or a cycle of *D*. For $i < j, y_i, y_j \in V(P)$ we denote by $P[y_i, y_j]$ the subpath of *P* from y_i to y_j . Let $Q = q_0q_1 \dots q_n$ be a vertex-disjoint path or cycle with *P* in *D*. If there exist $y_i \in V(P)$ and $q_j \in V(Q)$ such that $y_iq_j \in A(D)$, then we will use $P[y_0, y_i]Q[q_j, q_n]$ to denote the path $y_0y_1 \dots y_iq_jq_{j+1} \dots q_n$. Let *C* be a cycle of length *k* and V_1, V_2, \dots, V_k be pairwise disjoint vertex sets. The extended cycle $C[V_1, V_2, \dots, V_k]$ is the digraph with vertex set $V_1 \cup V_2 \cup \dots \cup V_k$ and arc set $\bigcup_{i=1}^k \{v_iv_{i+1} : v_i \in V_i, v_{i+1} \in V_{i+1}\}$, where subscripts are taken modulo *k*. That is, we have $V_1 \mapsto V_2 \mapsto \dots \mapsto V_k \mapsto V_1$ and there are no other arcs in this extended cycle.

A digraph is quasi-transitive, if for any path $x_0x_1x_2$ of length 2, x_0 and x_2 are adjacent. The concept of *k*-quasi-transitive digraphs was introduced in [5] as a generalization of quasi-transitive digraphs. A digraph is *k*-quasi-transitive, if for any path $x_0x_1...x_k$ of length *k*, x_0 and x_k are adjacent. The *k*-quasi-transitive digraphs have been studied in [5,3,7,6].

* Corresponding author. E-mail address: wangrx@sxu.edu.cn (R. Wang).

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.disc.2016.02.020 0012-365X/© 2016 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.







A digraph *D* is traceable if *D* possesses a Hamiltonian path. A digraph *D* is unilateral if, for every pair *x*, *y* of vertices of *D*, *x* is reachable from *y* or *y* is reachable from *x* (or both). A path *P* is unilateral; being unilateral is a necessary condition for traceability of digraphs. Clearly, every strong digraph is unilateral. In this paper, we consider the traceability of strong *k*-quasi-transitive digraphs. By the definition of *k*-quasi-transitive digraphs, a semicomplete bipartite digraph must be a *k*-quasi-transitive digraph with odd *k*. Clearly a semicomplete bipartite digraph $D = (V_1, V_2)$ with $|V_1| - |V_2| \ge 2$ has no Hamiltonian path. Hence we only consider the traceability of strong *k*-quasi-transitive digraphs with even *k*.

It can be shown that a strong *k*-quasi-transitive digraph with diam $(D) \le k + 1$ may not contain Hamiltonian paths. For example, see the following three digraphs. Let the digraph $D_1 = C_{k+1}[V_1, V_2, ..., V_{k+1}]$ with $V_1 = \{x_1, x'_1, x''_1\}$ and $V_i = \{x_i\}$ for $i \in \{2, 3, ..., k+1\}$. Observe that $d_{D_1}(x_1, x'_1) = k+1$ and $d_{D_1}(x, y) \le k+1$ for any $x, y \in V(D_1)$. Hence diam $(D_1) = k+1$. Let the digraph $D_2 = D_1 \cup \{x_3x_1, x_3x'_1, x_3x''_1\}$. Observe that $d_{D_2}(x_{k+1}, x_k) = k$ and $d_{D_2}(x, y) \le k$ for any $x, y \in V(D_2)$. Hence diam $(D_2) = k$. Let the digraph $D_3 = C_s[V_1, V_2, ..., V_s]$ with $|V_1| \ge 3$, $|V_i| = 1$ for $i \in \{2, 3, ..., s\}$ and $s \le k - 1$. Note that diam $(D_3) = s \le k - 1$. It is not difficult to see that the digraphs D_1, D_2 and D_3 are all strong *k*-quasi-transitive digraphs and do not poses any Hamiltonian path.

It can also be shown that a strong quasi-transitive digraph with diam(D) = 4 may not contain Hamiltonian paths. For example, see the following digraph. Denote a digraph D_4 with vertex set $\{x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3, x, y, z\}$ and arc set $\{x_0x_1, x_1x_2, x_2x_3, x_3x_0, x_3x_1, x_2x_0\} \cup \{xx_i, yx_i, zx_i, x_3x, x_3y, x_3z\}$ for $i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$. It is easy to check that D_4 is a quasi-transitive digraph. Observe that $d_{D_4}(x_0, x) = 4$ and $d_{D_4}(x, y) \le 4$ for any $x, y \in V(D_4)$. Hence diam(D_4) = 4. If P is a Hamiltonian path in D_4 , then one of x, y and z must be an intermediate vertex of P, say x. Hence $x_3x \in A(P)$ and so $x_3y, x_3z \notin A(P)$. Combining this with $d^-(y) = d^-(z) = 1$, we have y and z are both the initial vertex of P, a contradiction. Thus D_4 has not Hamiltonian paths. In Section 2, we shall show that a strong k-quasi-transitive digraph D with even $k \ge 4$ and diam(D) $\ge k + 2$ has a Hamiltonian path.

2. Main results

The following easy facts will be very useful in our proofs of main results.

Lemma 2.1 ([5]). Let k be an integer with $k \ge 2$, D be a k-quasi-transitive digraph and $u, v \in V(D)$ such that there exists a (u, v)-path. Then each of the following holds:

- (1) If d(u, v) = k, then d(v, u) = 1.
- (2) If d(u, v) = k + 1, then $d(v, u) \le k + 1$.

(3) Assume $d(u, v) = n \ge k+2$. If k is even, or k and n are both odd, then d(v, u) = 1; if k is odd and n is even, then $d(v, u) \le 2$.

Lemma 2.2 ([3]). Let k be an even integer with $k \ge 2$ and D be a k-quasi-transitive digraph. Suppose that $P = x_0x_1 \dots x_{k+2}$ is a shortest (x_0, x_{k+2}) -path. Then each of the following holds:

- (a) $x_{k+2} \to \{x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_k\};$
- (b) $x_{k+1} \rightarrow x_{k-i}$ for every even *i* such that $2 \le i \le k$.

Lemma 2.3. Let k be an even integer with $k \ge 2$ and D be a k-quasi-transitive digraph. Suppose that $P = x_0x_1 \dots x_{k+2}$ is a shortest (x_0, x_{k+2}) -path. Then $x_{k+1} \rightarrow x_{k-i}$ for every i such that $1 \le i \le k$.

Proof. By Lemma 2.2(b), $x_{k+1} \rightarrow \{x_0, x_2, \dots, x_{k-2}\}$. Below we prove that $x_{k+1} \rightarrow x_{k-i}$ by induction on odd *i* such that $1 \le i \le k - 1$.

By Lemma 2.2(a), $x_{k+2} \rightarrow \{x_0, x_1, \dots, x_k\}$. Then $x_{k+1}x_{k+2}P[x_1, x_{k-1}]$ is a path of length *k*. By the definition of *k*-quasi-transitive digraphs, we have that $\overline{x_{k+1}x_{k-1}}$. This, together with the minimality of *P*, implies that $x_{k+1} \rightarrow x_{k-1}$.

For the inductive step, let us suppose that $x_{k+1} \rightarrow x_{k-i}$ for some odd i with $1 \le i \le k-3$. By Lemma 2.1(1) and $d(x_0, x_k) = k$, we have $x_k \rightarrow x_0$. Then $x_{k+1}P[x_{k-i}, x_k]P[x_0, x_{k-(i+2)}]$ is a path of length k, which implies that $\overline{x_{k+1}x_{k-(i+2)}}$ and $x_{k+1} \rightarrow x_{k-(i+2)}$. Hence $x_{k+1} \rightarrow x_{k-i}$ for every odd i such that $1 \le i \le k-1$. \Box

Lemma 2.4 ([2]). Let D be a quasi-transitive digraph. Suppose that $P = x_0x_1 \dots x_n$ is a shortest (x_0, x_n) -path. Then the subdigraph induced by V(P) is a semicomplete digraph and $x_j \rightarrow x_i$ for $1 \le i + 1 < j \le n$, unless n = 3, in which case the arc between x_0 and x_n may be absent.

Lemma 2.4 can be generalized to *k*-quasi-transitive digraphs with even *k* as follows.

Lemma 2.5. Let k be an even integer with $k \ge 4$ and D be a k-quasi-transitive digraph. Suppose that $P = x_0x_1 \dots x_n$ is a shortest (x_0, x_n) -path with $n \ge k + 2$ in D. Then D[V(P)] is a semicomplete digraph and $x_i \to x_i$ for $1 \le i + 1 < j \le n$.

Proof. Note that if $\overline{x_i x_j}$ and $1 \le i + 1 < j \le n$, then $x_j \to x_i$ since *P* is shortest. Hence we only need to show that $\overline{x_i x_j}$ for $1 \le i + 1 < j \le n$. We prove the result by induction on *n*.

First prove the case n = k + 2. By Lemma 2.2(a), $x_{k+2} \rightarrow \{x_0, x_1, \dots, x_k\}$. By Lemma 2.3, $x_{k+1} \rightarrow \{x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}\}$. Now we show $x_i \rightarrow \{x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{i-2}\}$ for $2 \le i \le k$ by induction on *i*. For i = 2, the length of the path $x_2x_3 \dots x_{k+1}x_0$ is *k*, which implies that $\overline{x_2x_0}$. For the inductive step, let us suppose that $x_i \rightarrow \{x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{i-2}\}$ for $2 \le i \le k - 1$. Next we prove that

Download English Version:

https://daneshyari.com/en/article/4646992

Download Persian Version:

https://daneshyari.com/article/4646992

Daneshyari.com