

The Parity Hamiltonian Cycle Problem

Hiroshi Nishiyama¹, Yusuke Kobayashi², Yukiko Yamauchi¹,
Shuji Kijima¹, and Masafumi Yamashita¹

¹ Graduate School of Information Science and Electrical Engineering,
Kyushu University, Fukuoka, 819-0395, Japan
{hiroshi.nishiyama, yamauchi, kijima, mak}@inf.kyushu-u.ac.jp

² Faculty of Engineering, Information and Systems,
University of Tsukuba, Tsukuba, Ibaraki, 305-8573, Japan
kobayashi@sk.tsukuba.ac.jp

January 27, 2022

Abstract

Motivated by a relaxed notion of the celebrated *Hamiltonian cycle*, this paper investigates its variant, *parity Hamiltonian cycle (PHC)*: A PHC of a graph is a closed walk which visits every vertex an odd number of times, where we remark that the walk may use an edge more than once. First, we give a complete characterization of the graphs which have PHCs, and give a linear time algorithm to find a PHC, in which every edge appears at most four times, in fact. In contrast, we show that finding a PHC is \mathcal{NP} -hard if a closed walk is allowed to use each edge at most z times for each $z = 1, 2, 3$ (PHC _{z} for short), even when a given graph is two-edge connected. We then further investigate the PHC₃ problem, and show that the problem is in \mathcal{P} when an input graph is four-edge connected. Finally, we are concerned with three (or two)-edge connected graphs, and show that the PHC₃ is in \mathcal{P} for any $C_{\geq 5}$ -free or P_6 -free graphs. Note that the Hamiltonian cycle problem is known to be \mathcal{NP} -hard for those graph classes.

Keywords: Hamiltonian cycle problem, T -join, graph factor

1 Introduction

It is said that the graph theory has its origin in the seven bridges of Königsberg settled by Leonhard Euler [2]. An *Eulerian cycle*, named after him in modern terminology, is a cycle which uses every edge exactly once, and now it is well-known that a connected undirected graph has an Eulerian cycle if and only if every vertex has an even degree. A *Hamiltonian cycle* (HC), a similar but completely different notion, is a cycle which visits every vertex exactly once. In contrast to the clear characterization of an Eulerian graph, the question if a given graph has a Hamiltonian cycle is a celebrated NP-complete problem due to Karp [16]. The HC problem is widely interested in computer science or mathematics, and has been approached with several variant or related problems. The traveling salesman problem (TSP) in a graph is a problem to minimize the length of a walk which visits every vertex at least once, instead of exactly once. Another example may be a two-factor (in cubic graphs), which is a collection of cycles covering every vertex exactly once, meaning that the connectivity of the HC is relaxed (cf. [13, 14, 3, 4]).

It could be a natural idea for the HC problem to modify the condition on the visiting number keeping the connectivity condition. This paper proposes the *parity Hamiltonian cycle (PHC)*,

Table 1: Time complexity of the PHC problem.

Each edge is used at most z times	Complexity
$z \geq 4$	\mathcal{P} (Thm. 3.3)
$z = 3$	\mathcal{NP} -complete (Thm. 3.8) \Rightarrow see Table 2
$z = 2$	\mathcal{NP} -complete (Thm. 3.7)
$z = 1$	\mathcal{NP} -complete (Thm. 3.6)

Table 2: Time complexity of the PHC_3 problem.

Edge connectivity	Complexity	Refinement by graph classes
4-edge connected	\mathcal{P} (Thm. 3.9)	
3-edge connected	unknown	See Fig. 1 (Section 4)
2-edge connected	\mathcal{NP} -complete (Thm. 3.8)	
1-edge connected	\mathcal{NP} -complete (from 2-edge connected case)	Reduced to 2-edge connected (Prop. 5.2, 5.3)

which is a variant of the Hamiltonian cycle: a PHC is a closed walk which visits every vertex an odd number of times (see Section 2, for more rigorous description). Note that a closed walk is allowed to use an edge more than once. The PHC problem is to decide if a given graph has a PHC. We remark that another version of the problem which is to find a closed walk visiting each vertex an even number of times is trivial: find a spanning tree and trace it twice.

It may not be trivial if the PHC problem is in \mathcal{NP} , since the length of a PHC is unbounded in the problem. This paper firstly shows in Section 3.1 that the PHC problem is in \mathcal{P} , in fact. Precisely, we give a complete characterization of the graphs which have PHCs. Furthermore, we show that if a graph has a PHC then we can find a PHC_4 in linear time, where PHC_z for a positive integer z denotes a PHC which uses each edge at most z times. In contrast, Section 3.2 shows that the PHC_z problem is \mathcal{NP} -complete for each $z = 1, 2, 3$ (see Table 1)¹. We then further investigate the PHC_3 problem. In precise, the PHC_3 problem is \mathcal{NP} -complete for *two*-edge connected graphs, while Section 3.3 shows that it is solved in polynomial time for *four*-edge connected graphs. The complexity of the PHC_3 for *three*-edge connected graphs remains unsettled (see Table 2).

As an approach to the PHC_3 problem for three-edge connected graphs, we in Section 4 utilize the celebrated *ear-decomposition*, which is actually a well-known characterization of *two*-edge connected graphs. Then, Section 4 shows that the PHC_3 problem is in \mathcal{P} for any two-edge connected $C_{\geq 5}$ -free or P_6 -free graphs (see Section 2.2 for the graph classes). The classes of $C_{\geq 5}$ -free or P_6 -free contain some important graph classes such as chordal, chordal bipartite and cograph. We remark that it is known that the Hamiltonian cycle is \mathcal{NP} -complete for $C_{\geq 4}$ -free graphs, as well as P_5 -free graphs (cf. [5]).

In precise, we in Section 4 introduce a stronger notion of *all-roundness* (and *bipartite all-roundness*) of a graph, which is a sufficient condition that a graph has a PHC. Catlin [7] presented a similar notion of *collapsible* in the context of spanning Eulerian subgraphs, and the all-roundness is an extended notion of the collapsible. Then, we show that any two-edge connected $C_{\geq 5}$ -free or P_6 -free graphs are all-round or bipartite all-round. We conjecture that any two-edge connected

¹ Notice that those hardness results are independent, e.g., “ $z = 3$ is hard” does not imply “ $z = 2$ is hard,” and vice versa.




Figure 1: PHC_3 is in \mathcal{P} for $C_{\geq 5}$ -free graphs and P_6 -free graphs.

$C_{\geq 7}$ -free graphs are all-round, while it seems not true for $C_{\geq 8}$ -free nor P_7 -free.

Section 5 is for a miscellaneous discussion. Section 5.1 extends the results for two-edge connected graphs in Section 4 to (one-edge) connected graphs. In Section 5.2, we remark that a dense graph is also all-round using some techniques in Section 4. Before closing the paper, Section 5.3 briefly discusses the connection between the PHC and other problems, such as Hamiltonian cycle or Eulerian cycle, regarding a generalized problem described in Section 4.

Related works Here, we refer to the work by Brigham et al. [6], which investigated a similar (or, essentially the same) problem. Brigham et al. [6] showed that any connected undirected graph has a parity Hamiltonian path or cycle (see Section 3.1.2). Their proof was constructive, and they gave a linear time algorithm based on the depth first search. As far as we know, it is the uniquely known result on the problem². To be precise, we remark that their argument does not imply that the PHC problem is in \mathcal{P} : for the purpose, we need an argument when a graph does not contain a parity Hamiltonian *cycle*.

Notice that the condition that a HC visits each vertex $1 \in \mathbb{R}$ times is replaced by $1 \in \text{GF}(2)$ times in the PHC. Modification of the field is found in some graph problems, such as group-labeled graphs or nowhere-zero flows [15, 17]. It was shown that the extension complexity of the TSP is exponential [24, 9, 10], while it is an interesting question if the PHC has an efficient (extended) formulation over $\text{GF}(2)$.

2 Preliminary

This section introduces graph terminology of the paper. First, we define the *parity Hamiltonian cycle* in Section 2.1, with an almost minimal introduction of a graph terminology. Then, we in Section 2.2 give some other terminology, such as T -join, ear decomposition, graph classes, which are commonly used in the graph theory.

² Very recently, we have investigated a PHC on directed graphs in [21] after this paper.

2.1 Parity Hamiltonian cycle

2.1.1 Definition

An *undirected simple graph* (simply we say “*graph*”) $G = (V, E)$ is given by a vertex set V (or we use $V(G)$) and an edge set $E \subseteq \binom{V}{2}$ (or $E(G)$). Let $\delta_G(v)$ denote the set of incident edges to v , and let $d_G(v)$ denote the degree of a vertex v in G , i.e., $d_G(v) = |\delta_G(v)|$. We simply use $\delta(v)$ and $d(v)$ without a confusion.

A *walk* is an alternating sequence of vertices and edges $v_0 e_1 v_1 \cdots v_{\ell-1} e_\ell v_\ell$ with an appropriate $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, such that $e_i = \{v_{i-1}, v_i\} \in E$ for each i ($1 \leq i \leq \ell$). Note that each vertex or edge may appear more than once in a walk. A walk is *closed* if $v_\ell = v_0$. A graph G is *connected* if there exists a walk from u to v for any pair of vertices $u, v \in V$.

For a closed walk $w = v_0 e_1 \cdots e_\ell v_\ell$, the *visit number* of $v \in V$, denoted by $\text{visit}(v)$, is the number that v appears in the walk except for v_0 (since $v_0 = v_\ell$). A *parity Hamiltonian cycle* (PHC for short) of a graph G is a closed walk in which $\text{visit}(v) \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$ holds for each $v \in V$. Remark again that an edge may appear more than once in a PHC w . Clearly, a graph must be connected to have a PHC, and this paper is basically concerned with connected graphs.

An *edge count vector* $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^E$ of a closed walk w is an integer vector where x_e for $e \in E$ counts the number of occurrence of e in w . Remark that

$$\text{visit}(v) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{e \in \delta(v)} x_e \quad (1)$$

holds for any closed walk. Thus, we see that a PHC is a closed walk whose edge count vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^E$ satisfies the *parity condition*

$$\sum_{e \in \delta(v)} x_e \equiv 2 \pmod{4} \quad (2)$$

for each $v \in V$.

2.1.2 PHC as an Eulerian cycle of a multigraph

As given an arbitrary integer vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^E$, the parity condition (2) is a necessary condition that \mathbf{x} is an edge count vector of a PHC. In fact, the following easy but important observation provides an if-and-only-if condition.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be an undirected simple graph and let $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^E$ be an arbitrary integer vector. Let $F = \{e \in E \mid x_e > 0\}$, then, \mathbf{x} is an edge count vector of a PHC in G if and only if \mathbf{x} satisfies (2) and the subgraph $H = (V, F)$ of G is connected.*

As a preliminary of the proof of Proposition 2.1, we introduce an *Eulerian cycle* of a *multigraph*. For a simple graph $G = (V, E)$ and any nonnegative integer vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^E$, let $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{x}}$ be a *multiset* such that $e \in E$ appears x_e times in $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{x}}$. Then, let (G, \mathbf{x}) represent a *multigraph* with a vertex set V and a multiedge set $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{x}}$. Note that $(G, \mathbf{1}) = G$ where $\mathbf{1} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^E$ denotes the all one vector. We say (G, \mathbf{x}) is connected if a simple graph $H = (V, F)$ is connected where $F = \{e \in E \mid x_e > 0\}$. An *Eulerian cycle* of (G, \mathbf{x}) is a closed walk which uses each element of the multiset $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{x}}$ exactly once. It is celebrated fact due to Euler [8] that (G, \mathbf{x}) has an Eulerian cycle if and only if (G, \mathbf{x}) is connected and \mathbf{x} satisfies the *Eulerian condition*

$$\sum_{e \in \delta(v)} x_e \equiv 0 \pmod{2} \quad (3)$$

holds for any $v \in V$.

Proof of Proposition 2.1. The ‘only if’ part is easy from the definition. We prove the ‘if’ part. Note that \mathbf{x} satisfies (3) since \mathbf{x} satisfies (2). Since H is connected by the hypothesis, the multigraph (G, \mathbf{x}) has an Eulerian cycle w . Considering (1), it is not hard to see that w is a PHC since \mathbf{x} satisfies (2). \square

For convenience, we say $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^E$ admits a PHC in G if \mathbf{x} is an edge count vector of a PHC in G . In summary, Proposition 2.1 implies the following.

Corollary 2.2. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be an undirected simple graph and let $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^E$ be an arbitrary integer vector. Then, \mathbf{x} admits a PHC in G if and only if (G, \mathbf{x}) is connected and \mathbf{x} satisfies (2).*

2.1.3 PHC with an edge constraint

As we repeatedly remarked, a PHC may use an edge more than once. For convenience, let PHC_z for $z \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ denote a PHC using each edge at most z times.

2.2 Other graph terminology

This subsection introduces some other graph terminology which we will use in this paper.

2.2.1 Fundamental notations

A *simple path* is a walk $w = v_0 e_1 v_1 e_2 \cdots e_\ell v_\ell$ which visits every vertex (and hence every edge) at most once, where $\ell \geq 0$ is the *length of the path* w . Similarly, a *simple cycle* is a closed walk $w = v_0 e_1 v_1 e_2 \cdots e_\ell v_0$ which visits every vertex at most once, where $\ell \geq 0$ is the *length of the cycle* w . An *odd cycle* is a simple cycle of odd length.

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph. For an *edge* subset $F \subseteq E$, let $G - F$ denote a graph $H = (V, E \setminus F)$. For a vertex subset $S \subseteq V$, let $G - S$ denote the subgraph induced by $V \setminus S$, i.e., $G - S$ is given by deleting from G all vertices of S and all edges incident to S . For convenience, we simply use $G - e$ for $e \in E$ instead of $G - \{e\}$, and $G - v$ for $v \in V$ as well. For a pair of graphs G and H , let $G + H = (V(G) \cup V(H), E(G) \cup E(H))$.

2.2.2 T -join

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph and let T be a subset of V such that $|T|$ is even. Then, $J \subseteq E$ is a *T -join* if the graph $H = (V, J)$ satisfies

$$d_H(v) \equiv \begin{cases} 1 & (\text{mod } 2) & \text{if } v \in T, \\ 0 & (\text{mod } 2) & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

for any $v \in V$ [23]. Notice that a graph $H' = (T, J)$ may not be connected, in general. A T -join is a generalized notion of a matching, meaning that J is a matching when all edges in J are disjoint.

Theorem 2.3 (cf. [18]). *For any connected simple graph $G = (V, E)$ and for any $T \subseteq V$ satisfying that $|T|$ is even, G contains a T -join.*

A T -join is found in $O(|V| + |E|)$ time (see Section A).

2.2.3 Edge connectivity

A graph is *k-edge connected* for a positive integer k if the graph remains connected after removing arbitrary $k - 1$ edges. A *k-edge connected component* H of G is a maximal induced subgraph of G such that H is k -edge connected.

The *ear decomposition* is a celebrated characterization of two-edge connected graphs. An *ear* $w = v_0 e_1 v_1 e_2 \cdots e_\ell v_\ell$ of a graph G is a simple path ($v_0 = v_\ell$ may hold) of length at least one where v_0 and v_ℓ are in the same two-edge connected component of $G - w$ and $d(v_i) = 2$ for each $i = 1, \dots, \ell - 1$. A cycle graph, which consists of a simple cycle only, is two-edge connected. It is not difficult to see that any two-edge connected graph, except for a cycle graph, has an ear. By the definition, a graph deleting an ear w except for v_0 and v_ℓ from a two-edge connected graph G is again two-edge connected unless G is a cycle graph. Recursively deleting ears from a two-edge connected graph G , we eventually obtain a cycle graph. The sequence of ears in the operation is called *ear decomposition* of G . The following fact is well-known.

Theorem 2.4 (cf. [23]). *A graph G is two-edge connected if and only if G has an ear decomposition.*

2.2.4 Graph classes

Let P_n ($n \geq 2$) denote a graph consisting of a simple path with n vertices. Notice that the *length* of the path P_n is $n - 1$. Let C_n ($n \geq 3$) denote a cycle graph with n vertices. A graph is *P_k -free* (resp. *C_k -free*) if it does not contain P_k (resp. C_k) as an induced subgraph. A graph is *$C_{\geq k}$ -free*³ if G is $C_{k'}$ -free for all $k' \geq k$. Clearly, any P_k -free graph is also P_{k+1} -free, as well as any $C_{\geq k}$ -free graph is also $C_{\geq k+1}$ -free. We can also observe that any P_k -free graph is $C_{\geq k+1}$ -free. However, any $C_{\geq k}$ -free is not included in P_l -free for any l , since a tree, clearly $C_{\geq 3}$ -free, admits a path of any length.

Many important graph classes are known to be characterized as P_k -free or $C_{\geq k}$ -free. For instance, *cographs* is equivalent to P_4 -free, *chordal* is equivalent to $C_{\geq 4}$ -free, and *chordal bipartite* is $C_{\geq 6}$ -free bipartite (cf. [5])⁴.

3 Computational Complexity of The PHC Problems

It may not be trivial if the PHC problem is in \mathcal{NP} , since the length of a closed walk is unbounded in the problem. Section 3.1 completely characterizes the graphs which have PHCs, and shows that the PHC problem is in \mathcal{P} . Furthermore, if a graph has a PHC then we can find a PHC_4 in linear time. In contrast, Section 3.2 shows that the PHC_z problems is \mathcal{NP} -hard for each $z = 1, 2, 3$. Section 3.3 further investigates the PHC_3 problem, and shows that the problem is in \mathcal{P} for four-edge connected graphs.

3.1 The characterization of the graphs which have PHCs

To begin with, we give an if-and-only-if characterization of graphs which have PHCs.

Theorem 3.1. *A connected graph $G = (V, E)$ contains a PHC if and only if the order $|V|$ is even or G is non-bipartite.*

³ $C_{\geq k}$ -free is often denoted by C_{n+k} -free [5].

⁴ Here, we omit the definitions of cograph, chordal and chordal bipartite. This paper requires the properties of P_k -free or $C_{\geq k}$ -free, only.




Figure 2: Example for the proof of Theorem 3.1 when $|V|$ is odd and G is non-bipartite. (a) Given graph G , and an odd cycle C , (b) \mathbf{x}' given by (6) where double circles denote T , (c) \mathbf{x}'' given by (7).

Proof. We show the ‘if’ part in a constructive way. First, we are concerned with the case that $|V|$ is even. Let $J \subseteq E$ be a V -join of G , which always exists by Theorem 2.3. Let $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^E$ be given by

$$x_e = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } e \in J, \\ 4 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

Then, \mathbf{x} satisfies the parity condition (2), that is $\sum_{e \in \delta(v)} x_e \equiv 2 \pmod{4}$, for each vertex $v \in V$ since J is a V -join of G . Clearly, (G, \mathbf{x}) is connected since G is connected and $x_e \geq 1$ for any $e \in E$. By Corollary 2.2, \mathbf{x} admits a PHC in G .

Next, we are concerned with the case that $|V|$ is odd and G is non-bipartite. As a preliminary step, let C be an arbitrary odd cycle of G . Let $T = V \setminus V(C)$, where notice that $|T|$ is even. Using Theorem 2.3, let $J \subseteq E$ be a T -join. Let $\mathbf{x}' \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^E$ be given by

$$x'_e = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } e \in J, \\ 4 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

Then, \mathbf{x}' satisfies the parity condition exactly for each $v \in T$, i.e.,

$$\sum_{e \in \delta(v)} x'_e \equiv \begin{cases} 2 \pmod{4} & \text{if } v \in T, \\ 0 \pmod{4} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

hold since J is a T -join of G . Recalling that $V \setminus T = V(C)$, we modify \mathbf{x}' to \mathbf{x}'' by adding $E(C)$, i.e.,

$$x''_e = \begin{cases} x'_e + 1 & \text{if } e \in E(C), \\ x'_e & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

This modification increases the visit number of each vertex of $V \setminus T$ exactly by one, and hence \mathbf{x}'' satisfies the parity condition (2) for each $v \in V$. Clearly, the multigraph (G, \mathbf{x}'') is connected, and \mathbf{x}'' admits a PHC by Corollary 2.2.

Finally, we show the ‘only if’ part. Suppose that $G = (U, V; E)$ is a bipartite graph with an odd order. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $|U|$ is odd, and hence $|V|$ is even. Assume for a contradiction that G has a PHC. Since $\text{visit}(v)$ of a PHC is odd for each $v \in U \cup V$, $\sum_{v \in U} \text{visit}(v)$ is odd and $\sum_{v \in V} \text{visit}(v)$ is even, respectively. On the other hand, any closed walk of G satisfies that $\sum_{u \in U} \text{visit}(u) = \sum_{v \in V} \text{visit}(v)$ since G is bipartite. Contradiction. \square

3.1.1 The PHC_4 problem

The proof of Theorem 3.1 implies a PHC using every edge at most *five* times: if G is even order then \mathbf{x} given by (5) uses every edge at most four times, while if G is odd order and nonbipartite then \mathbf{x}'' given by (6) and (7) uses every edge at most five times. An enhancement of Theorem 3.1 is given as follows.

Theorem 3.2. *A connected graph $G = (V, E)$ contains a PHC_4 if and only if the order $|V|$ is even or G is non-bipartite.*

Proof. Notice that (6) and (7) imply that $x_e'' \in \{2, 3, 4, 5\}$. Then, we modify \mathbf{x}'' to $\mathbf{x}''' \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}^E$ by setting

$$x_e''' = 1 \quad (8)$$

for each $e \in E$ satisfying $x_e'' = 5$. This modification preserves the parity condition (2) for each $v \in V$. Clearly, $x_e \geq 1$ for each $e \in E$, meaning that (G, \mathbf{x}) is connected. By Corollary 2.2, we obtain the claim. \square

We remark that the construction in the proofs of Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 implies the following fact, since a T -join is found in linear time by Theorem 2.3.

Corollary 3.3. *The PHC_z problem for any $z \geq 4$ is solved in linear time.* \square

3.1.2 A related topic: a maximization version of the PHC problem

For a graph which does not have a PHC, a reader may be interested in a maximization version of the problem. The following theorem answers the question.

Theorem 3.4 (cf. [6]). *Every connected graph has a closed walk visiting all vertices such that the walk visits at least $|V| - 1$ vertices an odd number of times and uses each edge at most four times.*

Theorem 3.4 is suggested by Brigham et al. [6], in which they gave a linear time algorithm based on the depth first search. We here show a slightly generalized claim using a T -join, in an approach different from [6]. Given a graph $G = (V, E)$ and $S \subseteq V$, an S -odd walk is a closed walk of G which visits every vertex of S an odd number of times and visits every other vertex an even number of times. Clearly, a V -odd walk is a PHC of G .

Theorem 3.5. *For any graph G and any $S \subseteq V(G)$, G contains an S -odd walk if and only if $|S|$ is even or G is non-bipartite. Furthermore, we can find an S -odd walk which uses each edge at most four times.*

Theorem 3.5 (and Theorem 3.2) implies Theorem 3.4, by arbitrarily letting $S \subset V$ satisfy $|S| = |V| - 1$ for a bipartite graph $G = (V, E)$ with an odd order. We will use Theorem 3.5 in the proof of Lemma 4.3 in Section 4.1.

Proof of Theorem 3.5. The ‘only-if’ part is (essentially) the same as Theorem 3.1. The ‘if’ part is also similar to Theorems 3.1 and 3.2, as follows. When $|S|$ is even, let J be a S -join of G . Let $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^E$ be given by

$$x_e = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } e \in J \\ 4 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

then (G, \mathbf{x}) has an Eulerian cycle, which in fact an S -odd walk since J is a S -join of G .

When $|S|$ is odd and G is non-bipartite, let C be an odd cycle of G . Let

$$T = \{v \in V(G) \setminus V(C) \mid v \in S\} \cup \{v \in V(C) \mid v \notin S\},$$

and let J' be a T -join of G . Let $\mathbf{x}' \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^E$ be given by

$$x'_e = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } e \in J \text{ and } e \notin E(C), \\ 3 & \text{if } e \in J \text{ and } e \in E(C), \\ 4 & \text{if } e \notin J \text{ and } e \notin E(C), \\ 1 & \text{if } e \notin J \text{ and } e \in E(C), \end{cases}$$

then $\text{visit}(v)$ is odd for each vertex in S since J' is a T -join, while $\text{visit}(v)$ is even for others. \square

3.2 The PHC_z problems when $z = 1, 2, 3$

In Section 3.1, we have established that the PHC_z problem for any $z \geq 4$ is polynomial time solvable. This section shows that the PHC_z problem is \mathcal{NP} -complete for each $z \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Remark that the following Theorems 3.6, 3.7, and 3.8 are independent, e.g., the fact that PHC_3 is \mathcal{NP} -complete does not imply the fact that PHC_2 is \mathcal{NP} -complete, and vice versa.

Theorem 3.6. *The PHC_1 problem is \mathcal{NP} -complete.*

Proof. It is known that the HC problem is \mathcal{NP} -complete even when a given graph is three-edge connected planar cubic [11]. It is not difficult to see that the PHC problem with $z = 1$ for a cubic graph is exactly same as the HC problem. \square

Theorem 3.7. *The PHC_2 problem is \mathcal{NP} -complete, even when a given graph is two-edge connected.*

Proof. We reduce the HC problem for cubic graphs to the PHC_2 problem. Let G be a cubic graph, which is an input of the HC problem. Then we construct a graph H as an input of the PHC_2 problem, as follows (see also Figure 3):

- Subdivide every edge $e = \{v, u\} \in E(G)$ into a path of length three, i.e., remove e and add vertices v_e, u_e and edges $\{v, v_e\}, \{v_e, u_e\}, \{u_e, u\}$.
- For each vertex $v \in V(G)$, attach a cycle of length four, i.e., add vertices w_{v1}, w_{v2}, w_{v3} and edges $\{v, w_{v1}\}, \{w_{v1}, w_{v2}\}, \{w_{v2}, w_{v3}\}, \{w_{v3}, v\}$.

For convenience, let V denote the set of original vertices, i.e., $V = V(G)$, let V_s denote the set of vertices u_e, v_e added by subdivision, i.e., $|V_s| = 2|E(G)|$, and let V_c denote the set of vertices w_{v1}, w_{v2}, w_{v3} in attached cycles, i.e., $|V_c| = 3|V(G)|$, and hence $V(H) = V \cup V_s \cup V_c$. Then, we show that G has a HC if and only if H has a PHC_2 .

If G has a HC, we claim that a PHC_2 is in H . Suppose that $C \subset E(G)$ is a HC of G . For a path $v\{v, v_e\}v_e\{v_e, u_e\}u_e\{u_e, u\}u$, set $x_{\{v, v_e\}} = x_{\{v_e, u_e\}} = x_{\{u_e, u\}} = 1$ if $e \in C$, otherwise set $x_{\{v, v_e\}} = x_{\{u_e, u\}} = 2$ and $x_{\{v_e, u_e\}} = 0$. For a cycle attached to $v \in V(G)$, set $x_{\{v, w_{v1}\}} = x_{\{w_{v1}, w_{v2}\}} = x_{\{w_{v2}, w_{v3}\}} = x_{\{w_{v3}, v\}} = 1$ (see Figure 3, right). It is not difficult to see that \mathbf{x} indicates a connected closed walk in H , since $\sum_{e' \in \delta_H(v')} x_{e'}$ is even for each $v' \in V(H)$, and HC C is connected in G . It is also not difficult to see that every vertex is visited an odd number of times; the visit number is three for each vertex in V and one for each vertex in $V_s \cup V_c$. Hence \mathbf{x} admits a PHC_2 of H .

For the converse, assuming that H has a PHC_2 , we claim that G has a HC. Let \mathbf{x} be the edge count vector of the PHC_2 of H . Notice that $d_H(v') = 2$ for $v' \in V_s \cup V_c$, and it implies that any PHC_2 in H visits every vertex of $V_s \cup V_c$ exactly once since any PHC_2 is allowed to use every edge at




Figure 3: A PHC_2 around vertex v .

most twice. Then it is not difficult to observe that $x_e = 1$ for every edge of the attached cycles, that is, $x_{\{v,w_1\}} = x_{\{w_1,w_2\}} = x_{\{w_2,w_3\}} = x_{\{w_3,v\}} = 1$. Furthermore, there are three possible assignments of $(x_{\{v,v_e\}}, x_{\{v_e,u_e\}}, x_{\{u_e,u\}})$, that is $(1, 1, 1)$, $(2, 0, 2)$ or $(0, 2, 0)$, where $(0, 2, 0)$ is inadequate because a PHC_2 must be connected. Now, noting that $d_H(v) = 5$ holds for each $v \in V$ since G is cubic, let $a, b, c, \{v, w_{v1}\}, \{v, w_{v3}\}$ be the edges incident to v . Then, any assignments $x_a, x_b, x_c, x_{\{v,w_{v1}\}}, x_{\{v,w_{v3}\}}$ of a PHC_2 must satisfy

$$x_a + x_b + x_c + x_{\{v,w_{v1}\}} + x_{\{v,w_{v3}\}} \equiv 2 \pmod{4}$$

by the parity condition on v . As we saw, $x_{\{v,w_{v1}\}} = x_{\{v,w_{v3}\}} = 1$ holds, which implies

$$x_a + x_b + x_c \equiv 0 \pmod{4}.$$

Since each value of x_a, x_b, x_c is at most two and none of them is equal to zero, exactly two of x_a, x_b, x_c must be assigned to one and the other must be assigned to two; exactly two of the three subdivided paths incident to v are assigned to $(1, 1, 1)$'s and the remaining one is assigned to $(2, 0, 2)$. Now, let $C' \subset E(G)$ be the set of edges corresponding to $(1, 1, 1)$ paths in a PHC_2 in H . From the connectedness of PHC_2 in H it is clear that C' is a HC in G . \square

In a similar way to Theorem 3.7, but more complicated, we can show the hardness of the PHC_3 problem.

Theorem 3.8. *The PHC_3 problem is \mathcal{NP} -complete, even when a given graph is two-edge connected.*

Proof. We reduce an instance G of the HC problem for cubic graphs to an instance H of the PHC_3 problem exactly in the same way as the proof of Theorem 3.7 (see Fig. 3). We here reuse the notations in the proof of Theorem 3.7. If G has an HC, we obtain a PHC_3 of H by Theorem 3.7, where we remark that a PHC_2 is a PHC_3 .

The opposite direction is similar to Theorem 3.7. Let \mathbf{x} be the edge count vector of the PHC_3 of H . Since PHC_3 visits the vertices in V_c an odd number of times, the assignment of the edges $\{v, w_{v1}\}, \{w_{v1}, w_{v2}\}, \{w_{v2}, w_{v3}\}, \{w_{v3}, v\}$ are valued to either all ones or all threes. Meanwhile, the possible assignments of $(x_{\{v,v_e\}}, x_{\{v_e,u_e\}}, x_{\{u_e,u\}})$ are

$$(1, 1, 1), (2, 0, 2), (3, 3, 3), (0, 2, 0), \quad (9)$$

where $(0, 2, 0)$ is inadequate since any PHC_3 is connected.

Let $a, b, c \in E(H)$ denote three edges incident to v other than $\{v, w_{v1}\}$ and $\{v, w_{v3}\}$. Then, any assignments $x_a, x_b, x_c, x_{\{v, w_{v1}\}}, x_{\{v, w_{v3}\}}$ must satisfy

$$x_a + x_b + x_c + x_{\{v, w_{v1}\}} + x_{\{v, w_{v3}\}} \equiv 2 \pmod{4}$$

by the parity condition of v . As we saw, $x_{\{v, w_{v1}\}} = x_{\{v, w_{v3}\}} = 1$ or 3 , both of which implies

$$x_a + x_b + x_c \equiv 0 \pmod{4}.$$

Since each of x_a, x_b, x_c is at most three and none of them are equal to zero by (9), the possible assignments are either

$$(x_a, x_b, x_c) = (1, 1, 2) \text{ or } (3, 3, 2).$$

In the former assignment, the assignment for the three subdivided paths incident to v consists of two $(1, 1, 1)$ s and one $(2, 0, 2)$, and two $(3, 3, 3)$ s and one $(2, 0, 2)$ in the latter case.

Let $C' \in E(G)$ be the set of edges which are corresponding to paths in H assigned as $(1, 1, 1)$ and $(3, 3, 3)$. Since PHC_3 is connected, C' clearly suggests an HC of G . \square

3.3 The PHC_3 problem for four-edge connected graphs

The PHC_3 problem is \mathcal{NP} -complete for *two-edge* connected graphs, as we have shown in Theorem 3.8. This subsection establishes the following.

Theorem 3.9. *A four-edge connected graph $G = (V, E)$ contains a PHC_3 if and only if the order $|V|$ is even or G is non-bipartite.*

To prove Theorem 3.9, we use the following celebrated theorem.

Theorem 3.10 ([19, 12]). *Every four-edge connected graph has two edge disjoint spanning trees.*

Proof of Theorem 3.9. The ‘only-if’ part follows that of Theorem 3.1. We show the ‘if’ part, in a constructive way. Suppose that G is four-edge connected. Then, let τ and τ' be a pair of edge disjoint spanning trees of G , implied by Theorem 3.9. Intuitively, we construct a *connected* closed walk on τ , and control the parity condition using edges in τ' , then we obtain a PHC_3 .

Let $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^E$ be given by

$$x_e = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } e \in E(\tau), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

Then, (G, \mathbf{x}) is connected, and has an Eulerian cycle, say w . Let S be the set of vertices with even degree in τ , i.e., S is the entire set of vertices each of which w visits an even number of times. We also remark that $|V \setminus S|$ is even, by the shake-hands-theorem. In the following, we consider two cases whether $|V|$ is even or odd.

If $|V|$ is even, then $|S|$ is even. Let $J \subseteq E(\tau')$ be an S -join in the tree τ' . Then, let $\mathbf{x}' \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^E$ be defined by

$$x'_e = \begin{cases} x_e + 2 & \text{if } e \in J, \\ x_e & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

It is easy to see that \mathbf{x}' satisfies the parity condition (2) for each vertex of V since J is a S -join. Clearly (G, \mathbf{x}') is connected, and \mathbf{x}' admits a PHC by Corollary 2.2. Notice that $J \subseteq E(\tau')$ is disjoint with $E(\tau)$, meaning that (10) and (11) imply that $x'_e \leq 2$ for each $e \in E$. We obtain the claim in the case.

If $|V|$ is odd, then $|S|$ is odd. By the hypothesis, G is non-bipartite and hence G contains an odd cycle, say C . Then, let $\mathbf{x}'' \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^E$ be defined by

$$x_e'' = \begin{cases} x_e + 1 & \text{if } e \in E(C), \\ x_e & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

i.e., increase the value of x_e for every $e \in E(C)$ by one. We can observe from the construction that (G, \mathbf{x}'') again has an Eulerian cycle, say w' . Let $S' = S \oplus V(C)$, then S' is the entire set of vertices each of which w' visits an even number of times. Since $|S|$ is odd and $|V(C)|$ is odd, $|S'|$ is even. Let $J \subseteq E(\tau')$ be a S' -join of τ' , and let $\mathbf{x}''' \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^E$ be defined by

$$x_e''' = \begin{cases} x_e'' + 2 & \text{if } e \in J, \\ x_e'' & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

Now, it is easy to see that \mathbf{x}''' satisfies the parity condition (2) for each vertex of V since J is a S' -join. Clearly (G, \mathbf{x}''') is connected, and \mathbf{x}''' admits a PHC. Considering the fact that $J \subseteq E(\tau')$ and $E(\tau)$ are disjoint, we observe from (10), (12) and (13) that

$$x_e''' = \begin{cases} 3 & \text{if } e \in (E(\tau) \cup J) \cap E(C), \\ 2 & \text{if } e \in (E(\tau) \cup J) \setminus E(C), \\ 1 & \text{if } e \in E(C) \setminus (E(\tau) \cup J), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

hold, meaning that $x_e''' \leq 3$ for each $e \in E$. We obtain the claim. \square

It is known (cf. [23]) that edge disjoint spanning trees τ and τ' in four-edge connected graph are found in polynomial time (e.g., $\mathcal{O}(|E(G)|^2)$ time, due to Roskind, Tarjan [22]). Thus, the proof of Theorem 3.9 also implies a polynomial time (e.g., $\mathcal{O}(|E(G)|^2)$) algorithm to find a PHC_3 in a four-edge connected graph G .

4 The PHC_3 Problem for Two-Edge Connected Graphs

The PHC_3 problem is \mathcal{NP} -complete for *two*-edge connected graphs (Theorem 3.8), while it is solved in polynomial time for any *four*-edge connected graph (Theorem 3.9). As an approach to *three*-edge connected graphs, this section further investigates the PHC_3 problem using the celebrated ear decomposition. This section establishes the following theorem.

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose that a two-edge connected graph G is P_6 -free or $C_{\geq 5}$ -free. Then, $G = (V, E)$ contains a PHC_3 if and only if the order $|V|$ is even or G is non-bipartite.*

Notice that $C_{\geq 5}$ -free contains some important graph classes such as chordal (equivalent to $C_{\geq 4}$ -free), chordal bipartite (equivalent to $C_{\geq 5}$ -free bipartite), and cograph (equivalent to P_4 -free). We also remark that the Hamiltonian cycle problem is \mathcal{NP} -complete for $C_{\geq 4}$ -free graphs, as well as P_5 -free graphs (cf. [5]).

4.1 Preliminary

For the purpose, we introduce the notion of the *all-roundness* of a graph in Section 4.1.

4.1.1 Generalized problem

Section 4 is actually concerned with the following problem, slightly generalizing the PHC_3 problem.

Problem 1. *Given a graph $G = (V, E)$ and a map $f: V \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$, find $\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}^E$ satisfying the conditions that*

$$\sum_{e \in \delta(v)} x_e \equiv f(v) \pmod{4} \quad \text{for any } v \in V, \quad (15)$$

$$(G, \mathbf{x}) \text{ is connected.} \quad (16)$$

Clearly, PHC_3 is given by setting $f(v) = 2$ for any $v \in V$ (recall Corollary 2.2). For convenience, we call $\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}^E$ a *mod-4 f -factor* of G if \mathbf{x} satisfies (15). A mod-4 f -factor $\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}^E$ is *connected* if it satisfies (16), i.e., Problem 1 is a problem to find a *connected mod-4 f -factor*. We remark the following two facts.

Proposition 4.2. *A graph $G = (V, E)$ has a mod-4 f -factor only when the map f satisfies that*

$$\sum_{v \in V} f(v) \text{ is even.} \quad (17)$$

Proof. Summing up (15) over V , we obtain

$$\sum_{v \in V} f(v) \equiv \sum_{v \in V} \sum_{e \in \delta(v)} x_e \pmod{4}. \quad (18)$$

It is not difficult to see that

$$\sum_{v \in V} \sum_{e \in \delta(v)} x_e = 2 \sum_{e \in E} x_e \quad (19)$$

holds, in an analogy with the handshaking lemma, that is $\sum_{v \in V} \sum_{e \in \delta(v)} 1 = \sum_{e \in E} 2$. By (18) and (19), we obtain that

$$\sum_{v \in V} f(v) \equiv 2 \sum_{e \in E} x_e \pmod{4}$$

which implies the claim. \square

We will later show in Lemma 4.11 that (17) is also sufficient for any connected non-bipartite graph to have a mod-4 f -factor. For bipartite graphs, we need an extra necessary condition on f .

Proposition 4.3. *A bipartite graph $G = (U, V; E)$ has a mod-4 f -factor only when the map f satisfies that*

$$\sum_{v \in U} f(v) \equiv \sum_{v \in V} f(v) \pmod{4}. \quad (20)$$

Proof. Since $G = (U, V; E)$ is bipartite,

$$\sum_{v \in U} \sum_{e \in \delta(v)} x_e = \sum_{v \in V} \sum_{e \in \delta(v)} x_e \quad (21)$$

is required. Summing up (15) over U and V , respectively, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{v \in U} f(v) &\equiv \sum_{v \in U} \sum_{e \in \delta(v)} x_e \pmod{4}, \quad \text{and} \\ \sum_{v \in V} f(v) &\equiv \sum_{v \in V} \sum_{e \in \delta(v)} x_e \pmod{4} \end{aligned}$$

hold, which with (21) implies the claim. \square




Figure 4: K_3 is all-round.

Notice that the condition (20) implies (17). We will show in Lemma 4.11 that (20) is also sufficient for any connected bipartite graph.

4.1.2 All-roundness

Then, we introduce the following two notions.

Definition 4.4. A graph G is all-round if G has a connected mod-4 f -factor for any map f satisfying (17).

Definition 4.5. A bipartite graph G is bipartite all-round if G has a connected mod-4 f -factor for any map f satisfying (20).

It is not difficult to see that Definitions 4.4 and 4.5 are (too strong) sufficient condition that a graph contains a PHC_3 . In the rest of Section 4, we will show the following theorems, which immediately implies Theorem 4.1.

Theorem 4.6. Every two-edge connected $C_{\geq 5}$ -free graph is either all-round or bipartite all-round.

Theorem 4.7. Every two-edge connected P_6 -free graph, except for C_5 , is either all-round or bipartite all-round.

4.1.3 All-roundness of small graphs

As a preliminary step of the proof, we remark the following facts, which are confirmed by brute force search.

Proposition 4.8. C_3 (i.e., K_3) is all-round (See Figure 4).

Proposition 4.9. C_4 and C_6 are bipartite all-round, respectively.

The following fact may be counterintuitive.

Proposition 4.10. C_5 is not all-round.

Figure 5 shows an example of f for which Problem 1 does not have a solution. Notice that C_5 clearly has a PHC_3 .



Figure 5: A counterexample of the all-roundness (C_5).

4.2 All-roundness of $C_{\geq 5}$ -free: Proof of Theorem 4.6

This section shows Theorem 4.6, presenting some useful idea on a mod-4 f -factor of a graph, and all-roundness or bipartite all-roundness. To begin with, we show for any appropriate map f that it is easy to find a mod-4 f -factor, which may be disconnected.

Lemma 4.11. *Any connected non-bipartite graph has a mod-4 f -factor for any map f satisfying (17). Any connected bipartite graph has a mod-4 f -factor for any map f satisfying (20).*

Proof. We give a constructive proof. Let $T := \{v \in V \mid f(v) \text{ is odd}\}$. We remark that $|T|$ is even since $\sum_{v \in V} f(v)$ is even by (17). Then, let $J \subseteq E$ be a T -join, and let $\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}^E$ be given by

$$x_e = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } e \in J \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let $f': V \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ be

$$f'(v) = \left(f(v) - \sum_{e \in \delta(v)} x_e \right) \bmod 4. \quad (22)$$

Remark that $f'(v)$ is even for any $v \in V$, i.e., $f'(v) = 0$ or 2 for any $v \in V$. Let $S = \{v \in V \mid f'(v) = 2\}$. If $|S|$ is even, then let $J' \subseteq E$ be a S -join and let $\mathbf{x}' \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}^E$ be defined by

$$x'_e = \begin{cases} x_e + 2 & \text{if } e \in J' \\ x_e & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It is not difficult to observe that \mathbf{x}' satisfies (15), and $x'_e \leq 3$ holds for any $e \in E$. Thus, we obtain the claim in the case. Here we remark that if G is bipartite then $|S|$ is even, since (20) implies

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{v \in U \cup V} f'(v) &= \sum_{v \in U} f'(v) + \sum_{v \in V} f'(v) \\ &\equiv \sum_{v \in U} f'(v) - \sum_{v \in V} f'(v) \\ &\equiv 0 \pmod{4}. \end{aligned}$$

If $|S|$ is odd, we need an extra process. Notice that G is non-bipartite in the case, since the above argument. Let C be an odd cycle of G and let $\mathbf{x}'' \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}^{E(G)}$ be

$$x''_e = \begin{cases} x_e + 1 & \text{if } e \in E(C) \\ x_e & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$



Figure 6: Connecting lemma. Left figure shows that H_1 and H_2 are disconnected in (G, \mathbf{x}) . Right figure shows that a mod-4 f -factor in H is replaced by another *connected* one. The hypothesis that H is all-round or bipartite all-round implies such a connected mod-4 f -factor in H .

Let $f'': V \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ be

$$f''(v) = \left(f(v) - \sum_{e \in \delta(v)} x_e'' \right) \bmod 4. \quad (23)$$

Let $S' = \{v \in V(G) \mid f''(v) = 2\}$. Then, $S' = S \oplus V(C)$ holds, which implies $|S'|$ is even since $|S|$ and $|V(C)|$ are respectively odd. Let $J' \subseteq E(G)$ be an S' -join and let $\mathbf{x}''' \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}^{E(G)}$ be

$$x_e''' = \begin{cases} x_e'' + 2 \pmod{4} & \text{if } e \in J' \\ x_e'' & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then we obtain a mod-4 f -factor. □

To obtain a *connected* mod-4 f -factor, the notions of all-roundness and bipartite all-roundness play an important role. The following lemma is an easy observation from the definition.

Lemma 4.12 (connecting lemma). *Let \mathbf{x} be a mod-4 f -factor of G , and let H_1 and H_2 be a distinct pair of connected components of (G, \mathbf{x}) . Suppose that there is a connected subgraph H of G such that $V(H)$ intersects both $V(H_1)$ and $V(H_2)$, and that H is all-round or bipartite all-round. Then, G has another mod-4 f -factor \mathbf{x}' such that H_1 and H_2 are connected in (G, \mathbf{x}') where other connected components are respectively kept being connected.*

Proof. As given $\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}^{E(G)}$ and H described in the hypothesis, we define a map $f_H: V(H) \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ by

$$f_H(v) = \sum_{e \in \delta_H(v)} x_e \bmod 4.$$

Let $\mathbf{y} \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}^{E(H)}$ be defined by $y_e = x_e$ for each $e \in E(H)$, then clearly \mathbf{y} is a mod-4 f_H -factor of H . Proposition 4.2 implies that f_H satisfies (17), as well as Proposition 4.3 implies that f_H satisfies (20) if H is bipartite. The hypothesis that H is all-round or bipartite all-round implies that there is a *connected* mod-4 f_H -factor $\mathbf{y}' \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}^{E(H)}$ of H . Let $\mathbf{x}' \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}^{E(G)}$ be

$$x'_e = \begin{cases} y'_e & \text{if } e \in E(H), \\ x_e & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

then, it is not difficult to observe that \mathbf{x}' is a desired mod-4 f -factor of G (See also Figure 6). □

It is not difficult to see that Lemmas 4.11 and 4.12 imply the following useful lemma.

Lemma 4.13. *Let G be a graph. Suppose that for any edge $e \in E(G)$ there exists a subgraph H of G such that $e \in E(H)$ and H is all-round or bipartite all-round. Then, G is all-round, or bipartite all-round.*

Proof. For any appropriate f , meaning that f satisfies (17), and (20) if G is bipartite, Lemma 4.11 implies a mod-4 f -factor \mathbf{x} . Since the hypothesis, we can obtain a connected mod-4 f -factor by iteratively applying the connecting lemma (Lemma 4.12) to \mathbf{x} . \square

In fact, the all-roundness of $C_{\geq 5}$ -free (Theorem 4.6) is immediate from Lemma 4.13.

Proof of Theorem 4.6. Let G be a two-edge connected $C_{\geq 5}$ -free graph. Then, any edge e of G is contained in C_3 or C_4 . Since C_3 is all-round (Proposition 4.8), and C_4 is bipartite all-round (Proposition 4.9), Lemma 4.13 implies that G is all-round or bipartite all-round. \square

We will use Lemma 4.13 again in the proof of Theorem 4.7, with some extra arguments. We also show another example in Section 5.2 where we apply Lemma 5.2 to dense graphs.

4.3 All-roundness of P_6 -free: Proof of Theorem 4.7

We cannot directly apply Lemma 4.13 to a P_6 -free graph G , since G may contain C_5 that is NOT all-round (recall Proposition 4.10). To prove Theorem 4.7, we investigate the all-roundness (or bipartite all-roundness) of two-edge connected graphs, considering ear-decomposition in Section 4.3.1.

4.3.1 Ear-decomposition for mod-4 all-round graphs

This section presents three lemmas, which claim a short ear preserves the all-roundness or bipartite all-roundness.

Lemma 4.14. *Let G and G' be two-edge connected non-bipartite graphs, where G' is given by adding to G an ear of length at most seven. If G is all-round, then G' is all-round.*

Proof. The proof idea is similar to Lemma 4.13: construct a mod-4 f -factor which may not be connected (Lemma 4.11), and let it be connected using the connecting lemma (Lemma 4.12) on assumption that G is all-round. A technical issue of the proof idea is that the ear is not bipartite all-round. We show that a desired mod-4 f -factor always exist if the ear is short.

Let $p = v_0 e_1 v_1 e_2 \cdots e_\ell v_\ell$ denote the ear added to G , and let $P = (\{v_0, v_1, \dots, v_\ell\}, \{e_1, \dots, e_\ell\})$, where $\ell \leq 7$. Remark that $v_0, v_\ell \in V(G)$. As given an arbitrary map $f: V(G') \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ satisfying (17), let $\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}^{E(G')}$ be a mod-4 f -factor implied by Lemma 4.11. For convenience, let $\mathbf{x}^{(0)} = (x_1, \dots, x_\ell) \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}^{E(P)}$ where x_i denotes x_{e_i} for simplicity. We also define $\mathbf{x}^{(a)} \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}^{E(P)}$ for each $a \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ by

$$x_i^{(a)} = \begin{cases} (x_i + a) \bmod 4 & \text{if } i \text{ is odd,} \\ (x_i - a) \bmod 4 & \text{if } i \text{ is even.} \end{cases}$$

Notice that $x_i^{(a)}$ for each $a \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ is a mod-4 $f_P^{(a)}$ -factor for a map $f_P^{(a)}: V(P) \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ given by

$$f_P^{(a)}(v) = \begin{cases} (x_1 + a) \bmod 4 & \text{if } v = v_0, \\ (x_i + x_{i+1}) \bmod 4 = f(v) & \text{if } v \in \{v_1, \dots, v_{\ell-1}\}, \\ (x_\ell + (-1)^\ell a) \bmod 4 & \text{if } v = v_\ell. \end{cases}$$

At the same time, let $f_G^{(a)}: V(G) \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ be defined for each $a \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ by

$$f_G^{(a)}(v) = \begin{cases} (f(v) - f_P^{(a)}(v)) \bmod 4 & \text{if } v \in \{v_0, v_\ell\}, \\ f(v) & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

then G has a *connected* mod-4 $f_G^{(a)}$ -factor $\mathbf{y}^{(a)} \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}^{E(G)}$ since G is all-round by the hypothesis. If $(P, \mathbf{x}^{(a)})$ consists of at most two connected component, i.e., $x_i^{(a)} = 0$ holds at most one $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, \ell\}$, then $\mathbf{x}^{(a)}$ and $\mathbf{y}^{(a)}$ implies a connected mod-4 f -factor of G' .

Then, we claim that there is $a \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ such that $(P, \mathbf{x}^{(a)})$ consists of at most two connected component. Remark that $\{x_i^{(0)}, x_i^{(1)}, x_i^{(2)}, x_i^{(3)}\} = \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ holds for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, \ell\}$. By a version of the pigeon hole principle, the hypothesis of $\ell \leq 7$ implies that there is an index $a \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ such that $x_j^{(a)} = 0$ holds for at most one $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, \ell\}$; otherwise the multiset $\{x_j^{(a)} \mid a \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, \ell\}\}$ contains 8 or more 0's. The $\mathbf{x}^{(a)}$ is the desired mod-4 $f_P^{(a)}$ -factor for P , and we obtain the claim. \square

The following lemma is a version of Lemma 4.14 for bipartite graphs. The proof is essentially the same, and we omit it.

Lemma 4.15. *Let G and G' be two-edge connected bipartite graphs, where G' is given by adding to G an ear of length at most seven. If G is bipartite all-round, then G' is bipartite all-round. \square*

Finally, we show the following lemma, which claims a connection between a bipartite all-round graph and an all-round graph.

Lemma 4.16. *Let G be a two-edge connected bipartite graph, and let G' be a two-edge connected non-bipartite graph given by adding to G an ear of length at most three. If G is bipartite all-round, then G' is all-round.*

Proof. The proof is similar to Lemma 4.14. Let $p = v_0 e_1 v_1 e_2 \dots e_\ell v_\ell$ denote the ear added to G where $\ell \leq 3$, and let $P = (\{v_0, v_1, \dots, v_\ell\}, \{e_1, \dots, e_\ell\})$. Remark that $v_0, v_\ell \in V(G)$. As given an arbitrary map $f: V(G') \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ satisfying (17), let $\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}^{E(G')}$ be a mod-4 f -factor implied by Lemma 4.11. For convenience, let $\mathbf{x}^{(0)} = (x_1, \dots, x_\ell) \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}^{E(P)}$ where x_i denotes x_{e_i} for simplicity. We also define $\mathbf{x}^{(2)} \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}^{E(P)}$ by

$$x_i^{(2)} = (x_i + 2) \bmod 4.$$

Notice that $x_i^{(2)}$ is also a mod-4 $f_P^{(2)}$ -factor for a map $f_P^{(2)}: V(P) \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ given by

$$f_P^{(2)}(v) = \begin{cases} (x_1 + 2) \bmod 4 & \text{if } v = v_0, \\ (x_i + x_{i+1}) \bmod 4 = f(v) & \text{if } v \in \{v_1, \dots, v_{\ell-1}\}, \\ (x_\ell + 2) \bmod 4 & \text{if } v = v_\ell. \end{cases}$$

At the same time, let $f_G^{(a)}: V(G) \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ be defined for each $a \in \{0, 2\}$ by

$$f_G^{(a)}(v) = \begin{cases} (f(v) - f_P^{(a)}(v)) \bmod 4 & \text{if } v \in \{v_0, v_\ell\}, \\ f(v) & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

then $f_G^{(0)}$ clearly satisfies (20), and $f_G^{(2)}$ as well. Thus, G has a *connected* bipartite mod-4 $f_G^{(a)}$ -factor $\mathbf{y}^{(a)} \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}^{E(G)}$ for each $a \in \{0, 2\}$ since G is bipartite all-round by the hypothesis. If $(P, \mathbf{x}^{(a)})$

consists of at most two connected component, i.e., $x_i^{(a)} = 0$ holds at most one $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, \ell\}$, then $\mathbf{x}^{(a)}$ and $\mathbf{y}^{(a)}$ implies a connected mod-4 f -factor of G' .

Then, we claim that $(P, \mathbf{x}^{(0)})$ or $(P, \mathbf{x}^{(2)})$ consists of at most two connected component. Remark that $\{x_i^{(0)}, x_i^{(2)}\} = \{0, 2\}$ or $\{1, 3\}$ holds for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, \ell\}$. Since $\ell \leq 3$, it is not difficult to observe the claim. \square

4.3.2 Proof of Theorem 4.7

Now, we show Theorem 4.7. In fact, we prove the following lemma, which with Lemma 4.13 immediately implies Theorem 4.7.

Lemma 4.17. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a two-edge connected P_6 -free graph such that $G \neq C_5$. For any edge $e \in E$, there is a subgraph H of G such that H contains e and it is all-round or bipartite all-round.*

Proof. Suppose that an edge e is contained in a cycle C of length ℓ . If $\ell = 3, 4, 6$, then C itself is all-round or bipartite all-round, and we obtain the claim. Thus, we will show the cases of $\ell = 5$ and $\ell \geq 7$.

First, we show the case $\ell \geq 7$. To begin with, we remark that P_6 -free implies that the cycle C has at least two chords, say f and h , which do not share their end vertices; otherwise, suppose they share a vertex v then the induced subgraph removing v contains P_6 (or longer). For convenience, we say a chord *separates* C into $(a, \ell - a)$ ($a \in \{2, 3, \dots, \lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor\}$) if the chord connects vertices in the distance a along C . The proof idea is an induction on ℓ , i.e., we show a shorter cycle containing e . Recall that C_3 is all-round (Proposition 4.8), and C_4 and C_6 are bipartite all-round (Proposition 4.9), while C_5 is not all-round (Lemma 4.10).

In the case of $\ell = 7$. If a chord separates C into $(2, 5)$, then e is contained in C_3 or C_6 , and we obtain the claim. If both chords f and g separates C into $(3, 4)$, then we claim that $H = C + f + g$ is all-round. Note that H is isomorphic to one of two graphs in Figure 7. In the left graph, we can find an ear decomposition consisting of C_4 (1-5-6-7-1, in Figure 7) and ears of length 3 (1-2-3-7) and 2 (3-4-5). Let H' denote the graph consisting of C_4 (1-5-6-7-1) and an ear of length 3 (1-2-3-7), then Lemma 4.15 implies that H' is bipartite all-round. Since H is given by H' and an ear of length two, Lemma 4.16 implies that H is all-round. In the right graph, we can find an ear decomposition consisting of C_4 (1-5-6-7-1), an ear of length 2 (5,4,7), and an ear of length 3 (1,2,3,4). Then, H is also all-round by a similar argument.

In the case of $\ell = 8$. Then, a chord possibly separates C into $(2, 6)$, $(3, 5)$ or $(4, 4)$. The cases of $(2, 6)$ and $(3, 5)$ are easy; In the case of $(2, 6)$, e is contained in C_3 or C_7 , where the latter case is reduced to the above case of $\ell = 7$. In the case of $(3, 5)$, e is contained in C_4 or C_6 . Finally, in the case that both f and g separates C into $(4, 4)$, then $H = C + f + g$ is isomorphic one of two graphs in Figure 8. One graph (upper one) consists of C_4 (1-5-4-8-1) and two ears of length 3 (1-2-3-4 and 5-6-7-8), and it is all-round by Lemma 4.16. The other consists of C_6 (1-5-4-3-7-8-1) and ears of length 2 (1-2-3 and 5-6-7), and it is bipartite all-round, by Lemma 4.15. Thus we obtain the claim in the case.

In the case of $\ell = 9$. Then, a chord possibly separates C into $(2, 7)$, $(3, 6)$ or $(4, 5)$. In the case of $(2, 6)$ and $(3, 5)$ are easy, since e is contained in C_3 , C_7 , C_4 or C_6 . If both f and g separates C into $(4, 5)$, then $H = C + f + g$ is isomorphic one of three graphs in Figure 9. We can observe that each graph has an ear decomposition consisting of C_6 (1-2-3-4-5-6-1) with ears of length two and three. Then, each graph is all-round by Lemmas 4.14, 4.15 and 4.16.

In the case of $\ell \geq 10$. Suppose that a chord separates C into $(a, \ell - a)$ where $a \leq \ell - a$, then e is in C_{a+1} or $C_{\ell-a+1}$. Unless $e \in C_5$, i.e., $a = 4$ and $e \in C_{a+1}$, the case is reduced to a shorter




Figure 7: $\ell = 7$.




Figure 8: $\ell = 8$.

cycle. Suppose $e \in C_{a+1}$ where $a = 4$. Then, $\ell - a + 1 \geq 7$ implies that $C_{\ell-a+1}$ contains another chord. Using the chord, we can reduce the case to a shorter cycle.

Next, we show the remaining case of $\ell = 5$. Suppose that e is contained in a cycle C of length five. We consider two cases: C is the unique cycle which contains e , or there is another cycle containing e .

First, we consider the former case. Since there is no cycle containing e other than C , C has no chord. Furthermore, since $G \neq C_5$, there exists a vertex $v \in V(C)$ that is contained in another cycle, which implies there exists an edge $f \in \delta(v) \setminus E(C)$. Since G is a two-edge connected P_6 -free graph, f is contained in a C_3 : Otherwise G has a P_6 as an induced subgraph. Then, Lemma 4.14 implies that $C + C_3$ is all-round, and we obtain the claim in the case.

Next, we consider the second case. If there exists another cycle containing e and its length is not five, the argument for $\ell \neq 5$ establishes Lemma 4.17 for e . Suppose every cycle containing e has length five. Let C'' be one of the cycles containing e other than C . Then C and C'' has common edges. Let k be the number of the common edges. If $k = 2$ or 3 , Lemma 4.16 implies that $C + C''$ is all-round. If $k = 1$, $C + C'' - e$ is a cycle of length eight. Then $C + C'' - e$ has a chord $f \neq e$ because G is P_6 -free. By the argument of the case $\ell = 8$, $C + C'' + f$ is all-round. \square




Figure 9: $\ell = 9$.

5 Miscellaneous Discussions

This section remarks three related topics. Section 5.1 extends the arguments in Section 4 to graphs with bridges, and presents Theorem 5.4, which extends Theorem 4.1 about two-edge connected graphs to any connected. Section 5.2 remarks an all-roundness of dense graphs applying Lemma 4.13. Section 5.3 briefly explains a connection between the PHC problem and other problems such as the HC problem.

5.1 All-roundness of graphs with bridges

This subsection is concerned with graphs with bridges.

Theorem 5.1. *For a connected graph $G = (V, E)$, let $B \subseteq E$ denote the set of bridges, and let $S \subseteq V$ denote the set of isolated vertices in $G - B$. If $S = \emptyset$ and every two-edge connected component in $G - B$ is all-round then G is all-round.*

Proof. Let C_1, \dots, C_l be the two-edge connected components of $G - B$, and let H be a graph obtained by contracting every C_i of G . Notice that $E(H) = B$. Let u_1, \dots, u_l be the vertices of H where each u_i corresponds to C_i . For each C_i , let $T = \{u_i \mid \sum_{v \in C_i} f(v) \equiv 1 \pmod{2}\}$ and let J be a T -join of H . Then, let $\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}^{E(H)}$ be defined by

$$x_e = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } e \in J, \\ 2 & \text{if } e \notin J. \end{cases}$$

Let a map $f': V \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ be defined by

$$f'(v) = \left(f(v) - \sum_{e \in \delta_H(v)} x_e \right) \bmod 4$$

for each $v \in V(G)$. Notice that $f'(v) = 0$ for $v \in S$, since \mathbf{x} is a mod-4 f_H -factor. Since each C_i is all-round, G has a mod-4 f' -factor \mathbf{y} which are connected in each two-edge connected component

C_i . Let $\mathbf{x}' \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}^{E(G)}$ be defined by

$$x'_e = \begin{cases} x_e & \text{if } e \in B, \\ y_e & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

then we obtain a connected mod-4 f -factor. \square

Now, we are concerned with the PHC_3 problems again. The following two propositions are easy observations from the fact that any closed walk must pass each edge of $\delta(v)$ for any $v \in S$ an even number of times since they are bridges.

Proposition 5.2. *For a connected graph $G = (V, E)$, let $B \subseteq E$ denote the set of bridges and let $S \subseteq V$ denote the set of isolated vertices in $G - B$. If G contains a PHC_3 , then $d_G(v)$ is odd for any $v \in S$.* \square

Proposition 5.3. *For a connected graph $G = (V, E)$, let $B \subseteq E$ denote the set of bridges and let $S \subseteq V$ denote the set of isolated vertices in $G - B$. Suppose that $d_G(v)$ is odd for any $v \in S$ and that every connected component of $G - S$ is all-round, then G has a PHC_3 .* \square

By Theorem 5.1 and Propositions 5.2 and 5.3, we obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 5.4. *Suppose that $G = (V, E)$ is a connected P_6 -free, or $C_{\geq 5}$ -free graph. Let $S \subseteq V$ denote the set of isolated vertex in $G - B$. Note that $S = \emptyset$ if G is two-edge connected, while the reverse is not true. Then, G has a PHC_3 if and only if $d_G(v)$ is odd for every $v \in S$.* \square

5.2 All-roundness of dense graphs

This section shows another application of Lemma 4.13.

Proposition 5.5. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a connected graph where $|V| \geq 3$ and the minimum degree of G is at least $|V|/2$. Then, G is all-round, or bipartite all-round if G is bipartite.*

Proof. We show that every edge $e = uv \in E$ is contained in a cycle of length three or four, then Lemma 4.13 implies that G is all-round. If $|V|$ is odd, the degree of each u and v is strictly greater than $|V|/2$ by the hypothesis. This implies that u and v has a common neighbor w by the pigeon hole principle. Thus any edge is contained in a cycle of length three.

Suppose $|V|$ is even. If u and v has a common neighbor, then we obtain the claim. If it is not the case, we can observe that $|N(u) \setminus \{v\}| = |N(v) \setminus \{u\}| = |V|/2 - 1$ holds. Let $w \in N(u) \setminus \{v\}$, then $d(w) \geq |V|/2$ implies that w is connected to a vertex in $N(v) \setminus \{u\}$ by the pigeon hole principle. Thus we obtain a cycle of the length four in the case. \square

In fact, we can show the following stronger theorem with some complicated arguments (see Appendix B for the proof).

Theorem 5.6. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a connected graph where $|V| \geq 4$ and the minimum degree of G is at least $|V|/3$. Then, G is all-round, or bipartite all-round if G is bipartite.*

5.3 Connection of Parity Hamiltonian, Hamiltonian, Eulerian

We remark the connection between the PHC problem and the HC problem, or other related topics⁵. In fact, we are concerned with the following generalized version of Problem 1.

Problem 2 (connected mod- d f -factor with edge capacity constraints). *Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, a map $z: E \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, a positive integer d , and a map $f: V \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, find $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^E$ satisfying the conditions that*

$$\sum_{e \in \delta(v)} x_e \equiv f(v) \pmod{d} \quad \text{for any } v \in V, \quad (24)$$

$$(G, \mathbf{x}) \text{ is connected.} \quad (25)$$

$$x_e \leq z(e) \quad \text{for any } e \in E. \quad (26)$$

The PHC problem is given by setting $d = 4$ and $f(v) = 2$ for any $v \in V$ with an appropriate capacity constraint. Problem 1 is given by setting $d = 4$ and $z(e) = 3$ for any $e \in E$. The Hamiltonian cycle problem is represented by setting $d = n$, $f(v) = 2$ for any $v \in V$, and $z(e) = 1$ for any $e \in E$. We remark that the Hamiltonian cycle problem is also given (in its original form) by setting $d = \infty$, $f(v) = 2$ for any $v \in V$, and removing (26) (or setting $z(e) = \infty$ for any $e \in E$). The Eulerian cycle problem is given by setting $d = 2$, $f(v) = 0$ for any $v \in V$, and replacing (26) with $x_e = 1$ for any $e \in E$.

A two-factor plays a key role in the arguments of the HC problem in cubic graphs, where the connectivity constraint is relaxed [13, 14, 3, 4]. Motivated by a *connected* “factor,” this paper has investigated connected mod-4 factors. A mod- d factor for prime d is an interesting future work.

6 Concluding Remarks

In this paper, we have introduced the parity Hamiltonian cycle problem. We have shown that the problem is in \mathcal{P} when $z \geq 4$, while \mathcal{NP} -complete when $z \leq 3$. Then, we are involved in the case $z = 3$, and showed some graph classes for which the problem is in \mathcal{P} . It is open if the PHC_3 problem is in \mathcal{P} for three-edge connected graphs.

More sophisticated arguments on the connection between the PHC problem and related topics, such as HC, T -join, even-factors, extended complexities, jump systems, etc., are significant future works.

Acknowledgements

This work is partly supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 15K15938, 25700002, 15H02666, and Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research on Innovative Areas MEXT Japan Exploring the Limits of Computation (ELC).

References

- [1] M. Beck, T. Zaslavsky: The number of nowhere-zero flows on graphs and signed graphs, *Journal of Combinatorial Theory B*, **96** (2006), 901–908.

⁵ The argument of this section might be appropriate appearing in the section of Concluding Remarks. However, it is too long to put there, and we discuss just before the concluding remark.

- [2] N. Biggs, E. Lloyd, R. Wilson: Graph Theory, 1736-1936, Oxford University Press, 1986.
- [3] S. Boyd, R. Sitters, S. van der Ster, L. Stougie: TSP on cubic and subcubic graphs, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, **6655** (2011), 65–77
- [4] S. Boyd, S. Iwata, K. Takazawa: Finding 2-factors closer to TSP walks in cubic graphs, SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics, **27** (2013), 918–939.
- [5] A. Brandstaedt, V.B. Le, J.P. Spinrad: Graph Classes: A Survey, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 1987.
- [6] R.C. Brigham, R.D. Dutton, P.Z. Chinn, F. Harary: Realization of parity visits in walking a graph, The College Mathematics Journal, **16** (1985), 280–282.
- [7] P.A. Catlin: A reduction method to find spanning Eulerian subgraphs, Journal of Graph Theory, **12** (1988), 29–44.
- [8] L. Euler: Solutio problematis ad geometriam situs pertinentis, Commentarii Academiae Scientiarum Imperialis Petropolitanae **8** (1736) 128–140 = Opera Omnia (1) **7** (1911-56), 1–10.
- [9] S. Fiorini, S. Massar, S. Pokutta, H.R. Tiwary, R. de Wolf: Exponential lower bounds for polytopes in combinatorial optimization, Journal of the ACM, **62** (2015), 17.
- [10] S. Fiorini, S. Massar, S. Pokutta, H.R. Tiwary, R. de Wolf: Linear vs. semidefinite extended formulations: exponential separation and strong lower bounds, Proc. of STOC 2012, 95–106.
- [11] M.R. Garey, D.S. Johnson, R.E. Tarjan: The planar Hamiltonian circuit problem is NP-complete, SIAM Journal on Computing, **5** (1976), 704–714.
- [12] D. Gusfield: Connectivity and edge-disjoint spanning trees, Information Processing Letters, **16** (1983), 87–89.
- [13] D. Hartvigsen: Extensions of Matching Theory, Ph.D. thesis, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA, 1984
- [14] D. Hartvigsen, Y. Li: Maximum cardinality simple 2-matchings in subcubic graphs, SIAM J. Optim., **21** (2011), 1027–1045.
- [15] M. Joglekar, N. Shah, A. A. Diwan: Balanced group-labeled graphs, Discrete mathematics, **312** (2012), 1542–1549.
- [16] R.M. Karp: Reducibility among combinatorial problems, Proc. Complexity of Computer Computations 1972, 85–103.
- [17] M. Kochol: Polynomials associated with nowhere-zero flows, Journal of Combinatorial Theory B, **84** (2002), 260–269.
- [18] B. Korte, J. Vygen: Combinatorial Optimization: Theory and Algorithms, Fifth Edition, Springer-Verlag, 2012.
- [19] C. St. J. A. Nash-Williams: Edge-disjoint spanning trees of finite graphs, Journal of the London Mathematical Society, **36** (1964), 445–450.
- [20] H. Nishiyama, Y. Kobayashi, Y. Yamauchi, S. Kijima, M. Yamashita: The parity Hamiltonian cycle problem, arXiv.org e-Print archive abs/1501.06323.

- [21] H. Nishiyama, Y. Yamauchi, S. Kijima, M. Yamashita: The parity Hamiltonian cycle problem in directed graphs, LNCS (ISCO 2016), to appear.
- [22] J. Roskind, R. E. Tarjan: A note on finding minimum-cost edge-disjoint spanning trees, Mathematics of Operations Research, **10** (1985), 701–708.
- [23] A. Schrijver: Combinatorial Optimization, Springer, 2003.
- [24] M. Yannakakis: Expressing combinatorial optimization problems by linear programs, Journal of Computer and System Sciences, **43** (1991), 441–466.

A Finding A T -Join in Linear Time

In this section we describe an linear-time algorithm to find a T -join of a graph. The algorithm is described in Algorithm A.1.

Algorithm A.1 Linear Time Algorithm to Find a T -join

```

MAKE- $T$ -JOIN ( $G, T$ )
  for all  $v \in V(G)$  do
     $v.color \leftarrow \text{WHITE}$ 
  end for
   $exchange\_flg \leftarrow \text{FALSE}$ 
   $J \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
  for all  $v \in V(G)$  do
    if  $v.color = \text{WHITE}$  then
      MAKE- $T$ -JOIN-REC ( $G, T, v$ )
      if  $exchange\_flg = \text{TRUE}$  then
        return FALSE
      end if
    end if
  end for
  return  $J$ 

```

The input of Algorithm A.1 is a pair of an undirected graph G^6 and a vertex set $T \subseteq V$. Algorithm A.1 outputs a T -join J if it exists, or FALSE otherwise.

Algorithm A.1 essentially runs the depth first search, determining an edge should be picked for or removed from J while tracing edges. Algorithm A.1 uses two variables, $color$ and $exchange_flg$. $color$ is an attribute of each vertex v and it takes value of WHITE or BLACK. $v.color = \text{WHITE}$ indicates that v is not visited by the algorithm, otherwise v is already visited. $exchange_flg$ is a boolean variable which determines an edge the algorithm is looking now should be picked for J or not. If $exchange_flg$ is TRUE the algorithm does the following; if $e \notin J$ then picks e for J , otherwise removes e from J . If $exchange_flg$ is FALSE the algorithm does nothing for e .

Since Algorithm A.1 runs the depth first search with constant overheads, it clearly terminates in linear time. We show that the algorithm works correctly.

Proposition A.1. *Algorithm A.1 returns a T -join of G if it exists, or FALSE otherwise.*

⁶ Here we does not assume that G is connected.

Algorithm A.2 Body of the Algorithm

```
MAKE-T-JOIN-REC ( $G, T, v$ )  
   $v.color \leftarrow \text{BLACK}$   
  if  $v \in T$  then  
     $exchange\_flg \leftarrow \overline{exchange\_flg}$   
  end if  
  for all  $u \in N(v)$  do  
    if  $u.color = \text{WHITE}$  then  
      if  $exchange\_flg = \text{TRUE}$  then  
         $J \leftarrow J \triangle \{u, v\}$   
      end if  
      MAKE-T-JOIN-REC ( $G, T, u$ )  
      if  $exchange\_flg = \text{TRUE}$  then  
         $J \leftarrow J \triangle \{u, v\}$   
      end if  
    end if  
  end for
```

Proof. It suffices to show that Algorithm A.1 works correctly on connected graphs; if G has more than one connected components we can apply the correctness proof for each connected component. Suppose G does not have a T -join, i.e., $|T|$ is odd. Since the number of inversion of $exchange_flg$ is equal to $|T|$, the value of $exchange_flg$ is inverted an odd number of times. Then Algorithm A.2 ends the recursion with $exchange_flg$ being TRUE, Algorithm A.1 returns FALSE.

Suppose G has a T -join, i.e., $|T|$ is even. Let H be a graph obtained by doubling every edge in G . We can regard the depth first search on G as a connected closed walk of H which traces each edge exactly once. Let $e_1, e_2 \in E(H)$ be the copies of $e \in E(G)$, and let $J' \subseteq E(H)$ be a set of edges which are passed when $exchange_flg$ is TRUE. Then e is a member of the output of Algorithm A.1 J if and only if exactly one of e_1 and e_2 is a member of J' , that is,

$$J = \{e \in E(G) \mid (e_1 \in J') \oplus (e_2 \in J')\}. \quad (27)$$

The inversion of $exchange_flg$ occurs if and only if the algorithm visits $v \in T$ first time, which causes $|\delta_H(v) \cap J'|$ to be odd for each $v \in T$. On the other hand, it holds that $|\delta_H(v) \cap J'|$ is even for every $v \notin T$, since $exchange_flg$ is not inverted when the algorithm visits v . By (27), $|\delta_H(v) \cap J'| \equiv |\delta_G(v) \cap J| \pmod{2}$ for each $v \in V(G)$; $|\delta_G(v) \cap J| \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$ for $v \in T$ and $|\delta_G(v) \cap J| \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$ for $v \notin T$. Thus J is a T -join of G . \square

B Proof of Theorem 5.6

To prove Theorem 5.6, we need some more lemmas in the following.

Lemma B.1. *Let I be a graph given by connecting G and H by an edge, where G and H are all-round. Then, I is all-round.*

Proof. Let e be the edges connecting G and H . Notice that $\sum_{v \in V(G)} f(v) \equiv \sum_{v \in V(H)} f(v) \pmod{2}$ since f satisfies (17). Let $x_e = 1$ if $\sum_{v \in V(G)} f(v) \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$, otherwise let $x_e = 2$. Let f' be defined by (22), then f' satisfies (17). Since G and H are all-round, I has a connected mod-4 f -factor. \square

Lemma B.2. *Let I be a graph given by connecting G and H by two edges, where G is all-round and H is bipartite all-round. Then, I is all-round.*

Proof. Let e_1, e_2 be the edges connecting G and H . Set the value of x_{e_1} and x_{e_2} to satisfy the following two conditions:

$$\sum_{v \in V(G)} f'(v) \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$$

and

$$\sum_{v \in U(H)} f'(v) \equiv \sum_{v \in V(H)} f'(v) \pmod{4}$$

where f' is defined by (22) and $U(H)$ and $V(H)$ is the color classes of H . Since G is all-round and H is bipartite all-round, $G \cup H$ has a connected mod-4 f' -factor x^* . By a combination of x^* and x_{e_1}, x_{e_2} , we obtain a connected mod-4 f -factor of G . \square

Lemma B.3. *Let I be a graph given by connecting G and H by two edges, where G and H are bipartite all-round. Then, I is all-round or bipartite all-round.*

Proof. Let e_1, e_2 be the edges connecting G and H , and let $G = (A_1, B_1, E(G))$, $H = (A_2, B_2, E(H))$. There are three cases of which components e_1 and e_2 connect (see Figures 10, 11 and 12).

Case 1. If both e_1 and e_2 connect A_1 and B_2 , set the value of x_{e_1}, x_{e_2} to satisfy

$$\sum_{v \in A_1} f(v) - \sum_{v \in B_1} f(v) \equiv x_{e_1} + x_{e_2} \pmod{4} \quad (28)$$

and at least one of x_{e_1} or x_{e_2} is not equal to zero.

Case 2. If e_1 connects A_1 and B_2 , and e_2 connects A_2 and B_1 , set the value of x_{e_1}, x_{e_2} to satisfy

$$\sum_{v \in A_1} f(v) - \sum_{v \in B_1} f(v) \equiv x_{e_1} - x_{e_2} \pmod{4} \quad (29)$$

and at least one of x_{e_1} or x_{e_2} is not equal to zero.

Case 3. If e_1 connects A_1 and B_1 , and e_2 connects A_1 and B_2 , set the value of x_{e_1}, x_{e_2} to satisfy both

$$\sum_{v \in A_1} f(v) - \sum_{v \in B_1} f(v) \equiv x_{e_1} + x_{e_2} \pmod{4} \quad (30)$$

and

$$\sum_{v \in A_2} f(v) - \sum_{v \in B_2} f(v) \equiv x_{e_1} - x_{e_2} \pmod{4}, \quad (31)$$

and at least one of x_{e_1} or x_{e_2} is not equal to zero.

Let f' be defined by (22), $G \cup H$ has a connected mod-4 f' -factor x^* . By combining x^* and x_{e_1}, x_{e_2} , we obtain a connected mod-4 f -factor of G . \square

We also use the following two lemmas (we omit the proofs).

Lemma B.4. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a connected graph where $|V| \geq 8$ and the minimum degree of G is at least $|V|/3$. Then, every vertex in G belongs to a triangle or a square.*




Figure 10: Case 1.




Figure 11: Case 2.




Figure 12: Case 3.

Lemma B.5. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a connected graph where $|V| \geq 4$ and the minimum degree of G is at least $|V|/3$. Let C_1, \dots, C_k ($k \geq 3$) be induced subgraphs of G such that $\bigcup_{i=1}^k V(C_i) = V$ and $V(C_i) \cap V(C_j) = \emptyset$ for any $i \neq j$. Then there exists a pair C_i, C_j ($i \neq j$) such that $|\delta(V(C_i)) \cap \delta(V(C_j))| \geq 2$.*

Now we prove Theorem 5.6.

Proof of Theorem 5.6. Let $n = |V|$. We can check Theorem 5.6 is true for any graph with $n \leq 7$ by the brute force search. Suppose $n \geq 8$. We consider two cases whether G has a bridge or not⁷.

Case 1. G has a bridge.

Let e be the bridge and C_1, C_2 be the two components of $G - e$ (Note that neither C_1 nor C_2 is bipartite since $\delta(G) \geq n/3$). Then $|V(C_i)| \geq n/3 + 1$ for each $i = 1$ and 2 , therefore $n/3 + 1 \leq |V(C_i)| \leq (2/3)n - 1$ ($i = 1, 2$).

If $|V(C_i)| \leq (2/3)n - 2$ for both $i = 1, 2$,

$$\delta(C_i) \geq \frac{n}{3} - 1 = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{2}{3}n - 2 \right) \geq \frac{1}{2} |V(C_i)|$$

holds for each $i = 1, 2$, Theorem 5.5 implies the all-roundness of C_1 and C_2 . Thus, by Lemma B.1, G is all-round.

Suppose $|V(C_1)| = (2/3)n - 1$. Then $|V(C_2)| = (1/3)n + 1 \leq (2/3)n - 2$, therefore C_2 is all-round as same as the previous case. Let $v \in V(C_1)$ be an end vertex of e . Then we have

$$\delta(C_1 - v) \geq \frac{n}{3} - 1 = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{2}{3}n - 2 \right) \geq \frac{1}{2} |V(C_1 - v)|,$$

hence $C_1 - v$ is all-round. Since C_1 is obtained by adding ears of length at most two to $C_1 - v$, C_1 is all-round by Lemma 4.14. Thus C_1 and C_2 are both all-round, by Lemma B.1 G is all-round.

Case 2. G has no bridges.

If G has no bridges, G is two-edge connected. By Lemma B.4, every vertex of G belongs to a triangle or a square. Let C_1, \dots, C_k be the triangles and squares, all-round (or bipartite-all-round) subgraphs of G . If $k = 2$, There are at least two edges connecting C_1, C_2 since G is two-edge

⁷ G has at most one bridge since $\delta(G) \geq n/3$.

connected, thus G is all-round by Lemmas B.1, B.2 and B.3. If $k \geq 3$, we can find a pair C_i, C_j which has at least two connecting edges between them by Lemma B.5. By combining C_i and C_j together with the connecting edges, we obtain a larger subgraph C'_i which is all-round or bipartite all-round, by Lemmas B.1, B.2 and B.3. This operation reduces the number of the subgraphs k by one, by repeatedly taking this operation then we can reduce the case to $k = 2$. \square