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Abstract

Let $F$ be a 2-regular graph of order $v$. The Oberwolfach problem, $OP(F)$, asks for a 2-factorization of the complete graph on $v$ vertices in which each 2-factor is isomorphic to $F$. Posed by G. Ringel in the 1960s, this problem is still open, even though infinitely many cases have been solved. For example, solutions are known to exist asymptotically [12], for infinitely many prime orders [3], when $F$ consists of cycles of the same length [13], or when $F$ has two components [22]. In this paper, we give a complete solution of the Oberwolfach problem over infinite complete graphs, proving the existence of solutions that are regular under the action of a given involution free group $G$. Moreover, we characterize the infinite subgraphs $E$ of $F$ such that there exists a solution to $OP(F)$ containing a solution to $OP(E)$.
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1 Introduction

In this paper we deal with graphs, finite or infinite, which are simple and with no loops. Given a graph $\Lambda$ we denote by $V(\Lambda)$ and $E(\Lambda)$ the set of vertices and the set of edges of $\Lambda$, respectively. As usual we will use the notation $K_V$ for the complete graph whose vertex set is $V$.

We denote by $(c_1, \ldots, c_k)$ the cycle of length $k$ (briefly a $k$-cycle) whose edges are the pairs $[c_i, c_{i+1}]$ with $i = 1, 2, \ldots, k$ where the vertices $c_i$’s are distinct and the subscripts are considered modulo $k$. Similarly we will use the notation $[p_1, \ldots, p_k]$ for the path of length $k - 1$ whose edges are the pairs $[p_i, p_{i+1}]$ with $i = 1, 2, \ldots, k - 1$ and the vertices $p_i$’s are distinct and the notation $P^\infty := [\ldots, p_{-i}, \ldots, p_{-1}, p_0, p_1, \ldots, p_i, \ldots]$ for the path on the infinite set $\{p_i | i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$; $P^\infty$ will be also called the (infinite) open path.

We say that two vertices $p_1$ and $p_2$ of $F$ are connected if there exists a path between them, and we call connected component of $v$ the set of all vertices of $V(F)$ that are connected with $v$. A graph $F$ is said to be 2-regular if every vertex of $V(F)$ belongs to exactly two edges of $E(F)$. Clearly the connected components of a 2-regular graph $F$ can be only cycles or infinite open paths and thus $F$ is the disjoint
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union of the cycles of $\mathcal{C}_F := \{C | C$ is a cycle component of $F\}$ and the infinite open paths of $\mathcal{P}_F := \{P | P$ is an open path component of $F\}$.

We are now able to provide the definitions of 2-factor and 2-factorization:

**Definition 1.**  
- A 2-factor of a graph $\Lambda$ is a 2-regular subgraph $F$ of $\Lambda$ such that $V(F) = V(\Lambda)$.
- A 2-factorization $\mathfrak{F}$ of a graph $\Lambda$ is a partition of the edges of $\Lambda$ into 2-factors.

Keeping that definition in mind, we introduce the famous Oberwolfach problem:

**Problem 1.** Given a 2-factor $F$ of a complete graph $K$, the Oberwolfach problem $\text{OP}(F)$ asks for a 2-factorization of $K$ whose members are all isomorphic to $F$.

We remark that two 2-regular graphs $F_1$ and $F_2$ are isomorphic if and only if there exists a bijections $\sigma$ between their components that preserve the lengths of the cycles (resp. open paths). In case $F$ is finite, it has only cycle components and we may assume $F$ consists of $m_i$ cycles of length $k_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, t$. In this case the $\text{OP}(F)$ is denoted by:

$$\text{OP}(k_1^{m_1}, \ldots, k_t^{m_t}).$$

The original formulation, given by Ringel in 1967, asks to arrange a series of meals for an odd number $v$ of people around $t$ tables of sizes $k_1, \ldots, k_t$ so that each person sits next to each other exactly once. Despite its simple formulation, a complete solution of the classical $\text{OP}$ has not been achieved yet.

Some important existence results on that problem has been obtained in the so called equipartite case, i.e. the $\text{OP}(k^n)$ (Liu and Lick, 2003 [13]), in the two table case $\text{OP}(k_1, k_2)$ (Traetta, 2013 [22]) and in the case $|V(F)|$ belongs to an infinite set of prime numbers (Bryant and Scharaschkin, 2009 [3]) or $|V(F)|$ is big enough (Glock, Joos, Kim, Kühn, Osthus, 2018 [12]). It is also known that, up to 4 exceptions, every instance of the problem has a solution whenever $|V(F)| \leq 40$ (Deza, Franek, Hua, Meszka and Rosa, 2010 [11]). A variant of the $\text{OP}$ can be considered when $v$ is even: here one can look for 2-factorizations of the so called cocktail party graph. This case has been solved whenever all cycles have even length (Hagkvist, 1985; Bryant and Danziger, 2011 [2]).

An interesting related problem, recently studied by Danziger, Mendelsohn, Stevens and Traetta (see [9]) is the existence of suitable subsystems. More precisely, let us consider a 2-regular graph $F$, a solution $\mathfrak{F}$ of the $\text{OP}(F)$ over the complete graph $\mathbb{K}_V$, and a 2-regular subgraph $E$ of $F$. We say that a solution $\mathfrak{E}$ of the $\text{OP}(E)$ over $\mathbb{K}_W$ is a subsystem of $\mathfrak{F}$ if $W \subset V$ and $\mathfrak{E}$ is the restriction of $\mathfrak{F}$ on $\mathbb{K}_W$. When $F$ only contains 3–cycles, an $F$–factorization with subsystems is nothing but a (nearly) Kirkman triple system with subsystems whose existence has been completely proven in [1, 2, 3]. Very little is known when $F$ is any other 2-regular graph.

In this paper we will consider both the existence of solutions of the $\text{OP}(F)$ in the case of an infinite 2-regular graph $F$ and the existence of subsystems relative to a given infinite subgraph $E$. In fact, as done also by other authors in the case of resolvable designs (see Danziger, Horsley and Webb [3]) and in the case of 1-factorization (see Bonvicini and Mazzuoccolo [1]), it seem quite natural to consider the infinite case also for the Oberwolfach problem.
In particular in section 2 we will recall some known facts about difference graphs and decompositions that are regular under the action of an additive group \( G \). Using those results, in section 3, we will prove that the \( OP(F) \) has a solution for any infinite 2-regular graph \( F \). In that proof we will treat separately the countable and the uncountable cases and, in the latter, we will use the axiom of choice: more precisely we will assume the ZFC axiomatic system. Moreover, if we consider a group \( G \) that has no involutions (we will say that \( G \) is involution free) of the same cardinality of \( F \), there exists a solution of the \( OP(F) \) that is regular under the action of \( G \). Finally, in section 4, we give a characterization of the infinite subgraphs \( E \) of \( F \) such that there exists solution of the \( OP(F) \) that contains a subsystem relative to \( E \).

2 Difference Graphs

We first recall some basic definitions about graph decompositions. Let \( \Lambda \) and \( \Gamma \) be graphs (not necessary finite). A \( \Gamma \)-decomposition of \( \Lambda \) is a set \( C \) of copies of \( \Gamma \) such that each edge of \( \Lambda \) belongs to exactly one graph of \( C \). We say that \( C \) is regular if it admits an automorphism group \( G \) that acts sharply transitively over the vertex set. Following [4], from now on all groups will be written additively. We recall the following result.

**Proposition 1** (See [4]). A \( \Gamma \)-decomposition \( C \) of \( \Lambda \) is sharply vertex transitive under the group \( G \) if and only if, up to isomorphism, the following conditions hold:

- the vertex set of \( \Lambda \) is \( G \);
- for all \( B \in C \) and \( g \in G \), \( B + g \in C \).

Clearly to describe a regular \( \Gamma \)-decomposition it is sufficient to exhibit a complete system \( B \) of representatives for the orbits of \( C \) under the action of \( G \). The elements of \( B \) will be called base graphs of \( C \). Here we are interest in the case in which \( \Lambda \) is the complete graph whose vertex set is an infinite group \( G \). However the problem of finding regular decompositions has attracted much attention also in the finite case and one of the most efficient tool applied for solving this problem is the difference method (see, for example, [4, 17, 18, 19]).

**Definition 2.** Given a graph \( \Gamma \) with vertices in an additive group \( G \), the list of differences of \( \Gamma \) is the multiset \( \Delta(\Gamma) \) of all differences \( b - b' \) between two adjacent vertices of \( \Gamma \).

More generally, given a set \( B \) of copies of \( \Gamma \) with vertices in \( G \), by \( \Delta B \) one means the union (counting multiplicities) of all multisets \( \Delta \Gamma' \), where \( \Gamma' \in B \).

**Theorem 1.** Let \( B \) be a set of copies of \( \Gamma \) with vertices in the group \( G \).

- If \( \Delta B = G \setminus \{0\} \) then \( C := \{B + g \mid B \in B, g \in G\} \) is a \( \Gamma \)-decomposition of the complete graph \( \mathbb{K}_G \) that is regular under the action of \( G \) and \( B \) is a set of base graphs of \( C \).
In case the set $\mathcal{B}$ is given by a single graph $\Gamma$ and $\Delta(\Gamma) = G \setminus \{0\}$, the graph $\Gamma$ is said to be a difference graph.

If we have a difference graph that is also a 2-factor of $\mathbb{K}_G$ we can say even more:

**Proposition 2.** Let $G$ be an additive group and let $F$ be a 2-factor of $\mathbb{K}_G$. If $F$ is also a difference graph then it is a base graph of a regular 2-factorization of $\mathbb{K}_G$. In particular the $OP(F)$ is solvable.

Unfortunately, the above proposition can only be applied in the infinite case.

**Remark 1.** Let $G$ be a finite group. Then there does not exist any graph $F$ with vertices in $G$ that is both a difference graph and a 2-factor of $\mathbb{K}_G$.

**Proof.** Indeed, if $F$ were a difference graph, we would have $\Delta(F) = G \setminus \{0\}$ and hence:

$$2|E(F)| = |G| - 1.$$

Instead, if $F$ were a 2-factor of $\mathbb{K}_G$:

$$|E(F)| = |G|.$$

\[ \square \]

In the finite case, however, it worth to recall the similar concept of a 2-starter (see [5, 6, 7, 21, 22]) that has strongly inspired our work.

In the infinite case, instead, the idea of proposition 2 can be used and indeed the rest of the paper will be dedicated to prove the following proposition:

**Proposition 3.** Let $G$ be an infinite, involution free group and let $F$ be a 2-regular graph of the same cardinality. Then there is a copy $F'$ of $F$ with vertices in $G$ that is both:

- a 2-factor of $\mathbb{K}_G$;
- a difference graph.

# 3 Proof of Proposition 3

This section is dedicated to provide a proof of Proposition 3. Here we need to consider two different cases: the countable one and the uncountable one. In particular, in order to solve the latter case, we will use the well-ordering theorem that is equivalent to the axiom of choice.

## 3.1 The countable case

First of all we prove that, under suitable hypothesis, a graph $\Gamma$ with vertices in a group $G$ can be extended in such a way that a given element $g$ of $G$ belongs to $V(G)$ or to $\Delta(G)$. 


Lemma 1. Let $\Gamma$ be a finite graph with vertices in an infinite, involution free group $G$. If $\Delta(\Gamma)$ is a simple set (i.e. a multiset without repetitions), given $g \in G$ the following statements hold.

1A) If $\Gamma$ has a path component $P = [p_1, \ldots, p_l]$, there exist distinct $v, w$ in $G \setminus V(\Gamma)$ such that, defining $P' := [p_1, \ldots, p_l, v, w]$ and $\Gamma := \Gamma \cup P'$, we have that $\Delta(\Gamma')$ is a set and $g \in V(\Gamma')$.

1B) If $\Gamma$ has a path component $P = [p_1, \ldots, p_l]$, there exist distinct $v, w$ in $G \setminus V(\Gamma)$ such that, defining $P' := [v, w, p_1, \ldots, p_l]$ and $\Gamma := \Gamma \cup P'$, we have that $\Delta(\Gamma')$ is a set and, if $g$ is nonzero, then $g \in \Delta(\Gamma')$.

2A) For every $k \geq 3$, there exists a $k$-cycle $C$ with vertices in $G \setminus V(\Gamma)$ such that defining $\Gamma' := \Gamma \cup C$, we have that $\Delta(\Gamma')$ is still a set and $g \in V(\Gamma')$.

2B) For every $k \geq 3$, there exists a $k$-cycle $C$ with vertices in $G \setminus V(\Gamma)$ such that defining $\Gamma' := \Gamma \cup C$, we have that $\Delta(\Gamma')$ is still a set and, if $g$ is nonzero, $g \in \Delta(\Gamma')$.

Proof. 1) We can assume that $g \notin V(\Gamma)$. If we choose $w = g$, then we need to find a vertex $v$ such that:

- $v$ is different from $g$ and it is not in $V(\Gamma)$;
- $\pm(v - p_1)$ and $\pm(v - g)$ are different and not in $\Delta(\Gamma)$.

We note that the set $V$ of vertices $v$ in $G$ such that $\pm(v - p_1)$ is not different from $\pm(v - g)$ or one of those values belongs to $\Delta(\Gamma)$ is finite. Since $G$ is infinite there exists a vertex $v \notin (V(\Gamma) \cup \{g\} \cup V)$. Thus we can choose a vertex $v$ that satisfies the required conditions. With a similar proof we can get an extension $\Gamma'$ such that $g \in \Delta(\Gamma')$ instead of $g \in V(\Gamma')$.

2) We can assume that $g \notin V(\Gamma)$. If we choose $c_1 = g$, then we need to find a cycle $C := (g, c_2, \ldots, c_k)$ such that:

- the vertices $g, c_2, \ldots, c_k$ are different and not in $V(\Gamma)$;
- the differences $\pm(c_i - c_{i+1})$, for $i = 1, \ldots, k - 1$, and $\pm(c_k - g)$ are different and not in $\Delta(\Gamma)$.

We construct that cycle recursively starting with $c_1 = g$. Given $c_1, \ldots, c_j$ with $j < k - 1$, we note that the set $V$ of vertices $v$ in $G$ such that $\pm(c_j - v)$ is not different from $\pm(c_i - c_{i+1})$, for $i = 1, \ldots, j - 1$ or $\pm(c_j - v)$ belongs to $\Delta(\Gamma)$ is finite. Since $G$ is infinite we can choose a vertex $c_{j+1} \notin (V(\Gamma) \cup \{g, c_2, \ldots, c_j\} \cup V)$. Now, given $c_1, \ldots, c_{k-1}$, we note that the set $V$ of vertices $v$ in $G$ such that $\pm(c_{k-1} - v)$ and $\pm(v - g)$ are not different from each others or one of $\pm(c_{k-1} - v), \pm(v - g)$ belongs to $\Delta(\Gamma) \cup \Delta([c_1, \ldots, c_{k-1}])$ is still finite. Therefore we can choose a vertex $c_k \notin (V(\Gamma) \cup \{g, c_2, \ldots, c_{k-1}\} \cup V)$. In that way we obtain a cycle $C$ that satisfies the required conditions. With a similar proof we can get an extension $\Gamma'$ such that $g \in \Delta(\Gamma')$ instead of $g \in V(\Gamma')$. 

Now we are able to give the proof of Proposition\[3\] in the countable case.
Proposition 4. Let $G$ be an involution free countable group and let $F$ be a 2-regular countable graph. Then there is a copy $F'$ of $F$ with vertices in $G$ that is both:

- a 2-factor of $K_G$;
- a difference graph.

Proof. We recall that the set of the connected components $K_F$ of $F$ is the union of:

$$\mathcal{P}_F := \{P | P \text{ is an infinite path component of } F\};$$

$$\mathcal{C}_F := \{C | C \text{ is a cycle component of } F\}.$$  

Since $F$ is countable both $\mathcal{P}_F$ and $\mathcal{C}_F$ are countable or finite. Let us enumerate their elements: we can assume $\mathcal{P}_F = \{P_1, P_2, \ldots, P_i, \ldots\}$ and $\mathcal{C}_F = \{C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_i, \ldots\}$.

Since also $G$ is countable we assume $G = \{g_1, g_2, \ldots, g_i, \ldots\}$.

In the following we want to define, on the vertex set $G$, a sequence of finite graphs $F_1, F_2, \ldots, F_i, \ldots$ such that $F_i \subseteq F_{i+1}$ and whose union is a copy of $F$ that is both a 2-factor and a difference graph. In particular the connected components of each graph $F_i$ will be either copies of cycles of $\mathcal{C}_F$ or paths, denoted by $P_{i,n}$ where $n$ is an integer in $[1, \pi]$ and $\pi$ is the cardinality of $\mathcal{P}_F$ (that could be infinite). Those paths will be defined in such a way that $P_{1,n}$ is empty, $P_{i,n} \subseteq P_{i+1,n}$ and $\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty P_{i,n}$ is an infinite open path. At each step of the sequence we extend one path of $F_i$ or we adjoin a new cycle in order to add a suitable element $g$ of $G$ either to $V(F_i)$ or to $\Delta(F_i)$. For this purpose, denoted by $\gamma$ the cardinality of $\mathcal{C}_F$ (that could be infinite), we define the following subset of $Z \times Z$:

$$X := (Z \times \{z \in Z | 1 \leq z \leq \pi\}) \cup (\{z \in Z | 1 \leq z \leq \gamma\} \times \{0\}).$$

The set $X$ is countable and thus $X = \{(x(1), y(1)), (x(2), y(2)), \ldots, (x(i), y(i)), \ldots\}$. We can also suppose, without loss of generality that, for any integer $n \in [1, \pi]$, the first time we have $y(i) = n$ is when $x(i) = 0$. The auxiliary set $X$ and its ordering will tell us which connected component of $F_i$ we need to extend, or which new component we need to add, at the step $i$ and how. More precisely we define:

- $F_1$ as the empty graph.
- $F_{i+1}$ as the extension of $F_i$ obtained in the following way:

1A) If $y(i+1) > 0$ and $x(i+1) = 0$; $F_{i+1}$ is given by $F_i$ join with the singleton $P_{i+1,g(i+1)} := \{g\}$, where $g$ is the first vertex with respect to the ordering of $G$, such that $g \notin V(F_i)$.

1B) If $y(i+1) > 0$ and $x(i+1) < 0$; $F_{i+1}$ is the graph whose component $P_{i+1,g(i+1)}$ is obtained, following Lemma 1A by extending, on the right, the path $P_{i,g(i+1)}$ so that the first element $g$, with respect to the ordering of $G$ such that $g \notin V(F_i)$, belongs to $P_{i+1,g(i+1)}$. All the other path and cycle components of $F_{i+1}$ are the same of $F_i$. 


1C) If \( y(i+1) > 0 \) and \( x(i+1) > 0 \); \( F_{i+1} \) is the graph whose component \( F_{i+1,y(i+1)} \) is obtained, following Lemma 1B by extending, on the left, the path \( P_{i,y(i+1)} \) so that the first nonzero element \( g \), with respect to the ordering of \( G \) such that \( g \not\in \Delta(F_i) \), belongs to \( \Delta(P_{i+1,y(i+1)}) \). All the other path and cycle components of \( F_{i+1} \) are the same of \( F_i \).

2A) If \( y(i+1) = 0 \) and \( x(i+1) \) is odd; because of Lemma 2A, we can add to \( F_i \), a cycle \( C'_{x(i+1)} \), of the same length of \( C_{x(i+1)} \) so that the first element \( g \), with respect to the ordering of \( G \) such that \( g \not\in V(F_i) \), belongs to \( F_{i+1} \).

2B) If \( y(i+1) = 0 \) and \( x(i+1) \) is even; because of Lemma 2B, we can add to \( F_i \), a cycle \( C'_{x(i+1)} \), of the same length of \( C_{x(i+1)} \) so that the first nonzero element \( g \), with respect to the ordering of \( G \) such that \( g \not\in \Delta(F_i) \), belongs to \( \Delta(F_{i+1}) \).

We define \( F' := \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} F_i \) and \( P'_n := \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} P_{i,n} \). Since, for each path \( P'_{n} \), we take infinitely many steps both of type 1B and 1C, we have that \( P'_{n} \) is an infinite open path. Because of the definition, the connected components of \( F' \) are the cycles of \( C' := \{C'_{n}|C_n \in C\} \) and the infinite open paths of \( P' := \{P'_{n}|P_{n} \in P\} \). It follows that \( F' \) is a 2-regular graph isomorphic to \( F \).

Since for any \( i \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \) we have that \( \Delta(F'_i) \) is a set, it follows that also \( \Delta(F') \) is a set. Moreover since we make infinitely many steps of type 1C or 2B we have that every nonzero \( g \in G \) is in \( \Delta(F') \). It follows that \( \Delta(F') = G \setminus \{0\} \). Similarly, since we make infinitely many steps also of type 1B or 2A, we have that \( V(F') = G \) and hence \( F' \) is the required 2-factor of \( \mathbb{K}_G \).

### 3.2 The uncountable case

In this subsection we will prove the Proposition 3 in the uncountable case. Since here we will need to apply the so called well-ordering theorem, we first recall some facts of logic.

**Definition 3.** A well-order \( < \) on a set \( X \) is a total order on \( X \) with the property that every non-empty subset of \( X \) has a least element.

The well-order property is used for stating the following theorem that is equivalent to the axiom of choice.

**Theorem 2** (Well-ordering theorem). *Every set \( X \) admits a well-order \( < \).*

Given an element \( x \in X \) we define the section associated to it:

\[
X_{<x} := \{ y \in X | y < x \}.
\]

**Corollary 1.** *Every set \( X \) admits a well-order \( < \) such that the cardinality of any section is smaller that the one of \( X \).*

**Proof.** Let us consider a well-order \( < \) on \( X \). Let \( x \) be the smallest element such that \( X_{<x} \) has the same cardinality of \( X \). The set \( Y := X_{<x} \) is such that all its sections respect to the order \( < \) have smaller cardinality. Since \( Y \) instead has the same cardinality of \( X \), the order \( < \) on \( Y \) induces an order \( \prec' \) on \( X \) with the required property. \( \square \)
The well-orderings are useful because they allow proofs by induction:

**Theorem 3** (Transfinite induction). Let $X$ be a set with a well-order $\prec$ and let $P_x$ be a proposition. Suppose that for all $x \in X$ we have:

$$P_y | y \in X_{\prec x} \implies P_x.$$  

Then $P_x$ is true for any $x \in X$.

As done in the previous section, before giving the proof of Proposition 3 for the uncountable case, we state a technical lemma.

**Lemma 2.** Let $\Gamma$ be a graph with vertices in an involution free uncountable group $G$. Let us suppose the cardinality of $V(\Gamma)$ is smaller than the one of $G$. Then, if $\Delta(\Gamma)$ is a simple set, given $p \in G$, we can also set $p := g(c)$ for some $g \in G$ such that $\Delta(g(c))$ is smaller than the one of $G$.

Let $\Gamma$ be a graph with vertices in an involution free uncountable group $G$. Let us suppose the cardinality of $V(\Gamma)$ is smaller than the one of $G$. Then, if $\Delta(\Gamma)$ is a simple set, given $p \in G$, we can also set $p := g(c)$ for some $g \in G$ such that $\Delta(g(c))$ is smaller than the one of $G$.

1) It is possible to extend $\Gamma$ to $\Gamma'$ by adding an open path $P_g$ with vertices in $G \setminus V(\Gamma)$ such that $\Delta(\Gamma')$ is still a simple set, $g \in V(\Gamma')$ and, if $g \neq 0$, $g \in \Delta(\Gamma')$.

2) For any $k \geq 3$, we can extend $\Gamma$ to $\Gamma'$ by adding a $k$-cycle $C_g$ with vertices in $G \setminus V(\Gamma)$ such that $\Delta(\Gamma')$ is still a simple set, $g \in V(\Gamma')$ and, if $g \neq 0$, $g \in \Delta(\Gamma')$.

**Proof.**

1) We assume $g \notin V(\Gamma)$ and $g \notin \Delta(\Gamma)$. We choose $p_0 = g$, then we want to find a path $P_g := \ldots, p_{-2}, p_{-1}, g, p_1, p_2, \ldots$ in $G \setminus V(\Gamma)$ such that:

- the difference $p_1 - p_2$ is $g$ (if $g$ is nonzero);
- all the differences $\pm(p_{i+1} - p_i), i \in \mathbb{Z}$ are different and not in $\Delta(\Gamma)$.

We note that the set $V$ of vertices $v$ such that $\pm(g - v)$ is in $\Delta(\Gamma) \cup -g + v$ is in $V(\Gamma)$ has a cardinality that is smaller than the one of $G$. Thus we can choose any vertex $p_1 \notin (V(\Gamma) \cup \{g\} \cup V)$. Since $g \notin \Delta(\Gamma)$ and $-g + p_1 \notin V(\Gamma)$, we can also set $p_2 := -g + p_1$ so that $p_1 - p_2 = g$. Then we follow the order $p_{-1}, p_{-2}, p_3, p_{-3}, p_4, p_{-4}, \ldots, p_i, p_{-i}$ and, at each step, the set $V$ of vertices $v$ such that $\pm(v - p_i) \in \Delta(\Gamma) \cup \Delta([p_{-1}, \ldots, p_{-2}, p_{-1}, p_0, p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_i])$ has a cardinality that is smaller than the one of $G$. Therefore we can always choose the next vertex $p_{i+1}$ (or $p_{-(i+1)}$) in $G \setminus (V(\Gamma) \cup \{g\} \cup V)$ and we eventually obtain a path $P_g := \ldots, p_{-i}, \ldots, p_{-2}, p_{-1}, p_0, p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_i, \ldots$ that satisfies the required conditions.

2) We assume $g \notin V(\Gamma)$ and $g \notin \Delta(\Gamma)$. We choose $c_1 = g$ and we want to find a $k$-cycle $C_g := (g, c_2, c_3, \ldots, c_k)$ in $G \setminus V(\Gamma)$ such that:

- the difference $c_3 - c_2$ is $g$ (if $g$ is nonzero);
- all the differences $\pm(c_{i+1} - c_i)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k - 1$ and $\pm(g - c_k)$ are different and not in $\Delta(\Gamma)$.  


Let $k = 3$. We note that the set $V$ of vertices $v$ such that one of $\pm(g-v), \pm(g+v-g)$ is in $\Delta(\Gamma)$ or $g+v$ is in $V(\Gamma)$ has a cardinality that is smaller than the one of $G$. Therefore we can choose a vertex $c_2 \notin (V(\Gamma) \cup \{g\} \cup V)$ and set $c_3 := g + c_2$ so that $c_3 - c_2 = g$. Then the cycle $(c_1, c_2, c_3)$ satisfies the required propriety.

Let now $k > 3$. We note that the set $V$ of vertices $v$ such that $\pm(g-v)$ is in $\Delta(\Gamma)$ or $g+v$ is in $V(\Gamma)$ has a cardinality that is smaller than the one of $G$. Therefore we can choose a vertex $c_2 \notin (V(\Gamma) \cup \{g\} \cup V)$ and set $c_3 := g + c_2$. Then, following the order $c_4, c_5, \ldots, c_{k}$, we can always choose the next vertices and we obtain a $k$-cycle $C_g$ that satisfies the required conditions.

Now we are able to provide the proof of Proposition 5 also in the uncountable case.

**Proposition 5.** Let $G$ be an involution free uncountable group and let $F$ be 2-regular graph of the same cardinality. Then there is a copy $F'$ of $F$ with vertices in $G$ that is both:

- a 2-factor of $\mathbb{K}_G$;
- a difference graph.

**Proof.** We consider a well-order $\prec$ on $G$ that satisfies the condition of Corollary 1. We note that, since $F$ is uncountable, the set of its connected components $\mathcal{K}_F$ is the union of the open paths of $\mathcal{P}_F$ each of which is countable and of the cycles of $\mathcal{C}_F$. Hence $\mathcal{K}_F$ has the same cardinality of $F$ and thus of $G$. Therefore we can assume $\mathcal{K}_F := \{K_g|g \in G\}$.

Now we prove, using the transfinite induction (see Theorem 3), that there exists an ascending family of 2-regular graphs $\{F_g|g \in G\}$ with vertices in $G$, such that:

- $\Delta(F_g)$ is a set;
- $g \in V(F_g)$ and, if $g$ is nonzero, $g \in \Delta(F_g)$;
- the set of connected components of $F_g$ is $\mathcal{K}_{F_g} = \{K'_h|h \preceq g\}$ where $K'_h$ is a copy of $K_h$.
- $F_h$ is a subgraph of $F_g$ whenever $h \prec g$.

Let us assume there exists $F_h$ with such properties for all $h \prec g$. We define $F_{<g}$ to be $\cup_{h<g} F_h$. Because of Corollary 1 the section $G_{<g} := \{h \in G : h \prec g\}$ has a smaller cardinality respect to the one of $G$. Since each component of $F_{<g}$ is at most countable, also the size of $F_{<g}$ is smaller than the one of $G$. Therefore we can extend the graph $F_{<g}$ by applying the Lemma 2 in case $K_g$ is an open path $P$, we apply the point 1, in case $K_g$ is a cycle $C$ we apply point 2. Since there are no other options, we obtain an extension $F'_g$ of $F_{<g}$ that satisfies the required conditions.

Let now consider the graph $F' := \cup_{g \in G} F_g$. Because of the construction, the connected components of $F'$ are $\{K'_g|g \in G\}$ where $K'_g$ is a copy of $K_g$. Therefore $F'$ is isomorphic to $F$. Moreover, since each $F_g$ is such that $\Delta(F_g)$ is a set, also $\Delta(F')$ is a set. Finally, we note that, for any $g \in G$, $g \in V(F_g) \subseteq V(F')$ and, if $g$ is nonzero, $g \in \Delta(F_g) \subseteq \Delta(F')$. Therefore $F'$ is a copy of $F$ that is a 2-factor of $\mathbb{K}_G$ such that $\Delta(F') = G \setminus \{0\}$. □
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4 Conclusions

By applying Propositions 2 and 3 we obtain a complete solution of the infinite Oberwolfach problem:

**Theorem 4.** Let $G$ be an infinite involution free group and let $F$ be a 2-regular graph of the same cardinality. Then there exists a solution of the $OP(F)$ that is sharply vertex transitive under the group $G$.

In the previous Theorem we require that the group $G$ has no involutions, therefore one can ask what happens if $G$ has a non trivial involution. In that case Theorem 4 would be false; in fact we have the following non existence result.

**Remark 2.** Let $G$ be an infinite group with a non trivial involution $i$ and let $F$ be a 2-regular graph whose components are odd cycles. Then there does not exist any solution of the $OP(F)$ that is regular under the group $G$.

**Proof.** Let us suppose by absurd that there exists a solution of the $OP(F)$ that is sharply vertex transitive under the group $G$. Let $i$ be a non trivial involution, let $v \in V(F)$ and let $w := vi$ where by $v^i$ we denote the action of $i$ on the vertex $v$.

We note that the edge $e := \{v, w\}$ is fixed by the action of $i$, therefore the cycle $C := (w, c_2, c_3, \ldots, c_{k-1}, v)$ of the decomposition that contains $e$ is fixed too. This means that $i$ does not move the vertex $c_{(k-1)/2}$. But this is absurd because $c_{(k-1)/2}$ is fixed also by 0 and therefore the action of $G$ is not regular on $V(F)$.

More in general, given a group $G$ that has non trivial involutions, it makes sense to consider the following problem:

**Open Problem 1.** Given an infinite group $G$, characterize for which 2-regular graphs $F$ of the same cardinality there exists a solution of the $OP(F)$ that is regular under the group $G$.

As we said in the introduction an other interesting related problem is the existence of subsystems of a given $OP(F)$. A little it is known about this problem when $F$ is finite. In the infinite case, instead, by constructing carefully the solution of the $OP(F)$ we can find the conditions under which a given subsystem exists.

With almost the same proof of Proposition 3 we obtain the following statement.

**Proposition 6.** Let $F$ be an infinite 2-regular graph and let $G$ and $H$ be two involution free groups such that the size of $H$ is the same as $F$ and $|G| \leq |H|$.

Then there is a copy $F'$ of $F$ with vertices in $G \times H$ such that:

$$V(F') = \Delta(F') = (G \times H) \setminus (G \times \{0\}).$$

**Proof.** It suffices to adapt the proofs of Lemma 1 and Lemma 2 so that at each step the graph $F_i$ ($F_g$ in the uncountable case) has vertices and differences in $(G \times H) \setminus (G \times \{0\})$.

Proposition 6 can be used in order to characterize the existence of subsystems of the Oberwolfach problem in the infinite case.
Theorem 5. Let $F$ and $E$ be two infinite 2-regular graphs. Then there exists a solution of the $OP(F)$ that admits a subsystem relative to $E$ if and only if:

- $F$ contains a copy $\tilde{E}$ of $E$ such that $|F \setminus \tilde{E}| = |F|$.

Proof. Let us suppose condition $\star$ holds. Let $G$ be an involution free group with the same cardinality of $E$. Then, according to Proposition 3 there exists a copy $E'$ of $E$ that is a 2-factor of $K_G$ such that $\Delta(E') = G \setminus \{0\}$. Now let us consider an involution free group $H$ of the same cardinality of $F$ and $(F \setminus \tilde{E}) := K$. Since $|G| = |E| \leq |K| = |H|$, according to Proposition 6 there exists a copy $K'$ of $K$ such that:

$$V(K') = \Delta(K') = (G \times H) \setminus (G \times \{0\}).$$

We note that the graph $F' := K' \cup E'$ is a copy of $F$ that is a 2-factor of $K_{G \times H}$ such that $\Delta(F') = (G \times H) \setminus \{(0,0)\}$. Because of Proposition 2 the action of $G \times H$ over $F'$ gives us a solution of the $OP(F)$ while the action of $G$ over $E'$ gives us a solution of the $OP(E)$ that is contained in the first one.

Let us now suppose condition $\star$ does not hold and let us assume, by absurd, that there exists a solution $\mathfrak{S}$ of the $OP(F)$ over the graph $K_{V(F)}$, that contains a subsystem $\mathfrak{E}$ relative to $E$. This means that $F$ contains a copy $\tilde{E}$ of $E$ and the vertex set of $\mathfrak{E}$ is $K_{V(\tilde{E})}$. We can assume that $\mathfrak{S} := \{F_\alpha | \alpha \in \mathcal{F}\}$ and $\mathfrak{E} := \{E_\alpha | \alpha \in \mathcal{E}\}$ where $\mathcal{E}$ is a subset of $\mathcal{F}$ and $E_\alpha = F_\alpha \setminus V(\tilde{E})$. Since $\star$ does not hold we have that $|F \setminus \tilde{E}| < |F|$ and $|F| = |\tilde{E}|$. Let us consider a vertex $v \in \tilde{E}$, in the 2-factors of $\{F_\alpha | \alpha \in \mathcal{F} \setminus \mathcal{E}\}$, $v$ is connected with all (and only with) the vertex of $F \setminus \tilde{E}$. Therefore $2|\mathcal{F} \setminus \mathcal{E}| = |F \setminus \tilde{E}|$. Similarly, given a vertex $w \in F \setminus \tilde{E}$, in the 2-factors of $\{F_\alpha | \alpha \in \mathcal{F} \setminus \mathcal{E}\}$, $w$ is connected with all (and not necessarily only with) the vertex of $\tilde{E}$. Thus $|F| = |\tilde{E}| \leq 2|\mathcal{F} \setminus \mathcal{E}| = |F \setminus \tilde{E}|$. But this is absurd because $|F \setminus \tilde{E}| < |F|$. Therefore the condition $\star$ is necessary in order to have the required subsystem.
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