

Packing a number of copies of a (p, q) -graph*

Yun Wang, Jin Yan[†]

School of Mathematics, Shandong University, Jinan 250100, China

Abstract

Let k, p, q be three positive integers. A graph G with order n is said to be k -placeable if there are k edge disjoint copies of G in the complete graph on n vertices. A (p, q) -graph is a graph of order p with q edges. Packing results have proved useful in the study of the complexity of graph properties. Bollobás et al. investigated the k -placeability of $(n, n-2)$ -graphs and $(n, n-1)$ -graphs with $k=2$ and $k=3$. Motivated by their results, this paper characterizes $(n, n-1)$ -graphs with girth at least 9 which are 4-placeable. We also consider the k -placeability of $(n, n+1)$ -graphs and 2-factors.

Keywords: Packing; (p, q) -Graph; 2-Factor; k -Placeable

1 Introduction

This paper considers only finite simple graphs and uses standard terminology and notation from [7] except as indicated. For any graph G , we denote by $V(G)$ (resp. $E(G)$) the vertex set (resp. the edge set). The *maximum degree* (resp. *minimum degree*) of G is denoted by $\Delta(G)$ (resp. $\delta(G)$). For two graphs H_1 and H_2 , we use $H_1 \uplus H_2$ to represent the vertex disjoint union of H_1 and H_2 . A *2-factor* is a graph whose components are all cycles. Let K_n be the complete graph of order n . A path, cycle and star with order n is denoted by P_n, C_n and S_n , respectively. The tree S_a^b , of order $a+b$, is obtained from star S_a by inserting b vertices into an edge of S_a . The girth of G , i.e. the length of a shortest cycle of G , is denoted by $g(G)$. A vertex of G with degree 1 is a *leaf*.

We say that a k -tuple $\Phi = (\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_k)$ is a k -placement of a graph G on n vertices if for each i , ϕ_i is a permutation: $V(G) \rightarrow V(K_n)$ such that $E(\phi_i(G)) \cap E(\phi_j(G)) = \emptyset$ for $i \neq j$. If G has a k -placement, then G is k -placeable. A graph with p vertices and q edges is called a (p, q) -graph.

Packing results have proved useful in the study of the complexity of graph properties [3]. It is worthwhile mentioning that the packing problem is NP-complete. Interestingly, the 2-placeability of $(n, n-2)$ -graphs was independently solved by several groups of researchers almost at the same time, see Bollobás and Eldridge [4], Burns and Schuster [8] and Sauer and Spencer [27]. As for 2-placeability of $(n, n-1)$ -graphs, the first result was given by Hedetniemi,

*The author's work is supported by NNSF of China (No.11671232, 12071260) and NSF of Shandong Province (No. ZR2017MA018).

[†]Corresponding author: Jin Yan, Email: yanj@sdu.edu.cn

Hedetniemi and Slater in [21]. They solved the problem when the $(n, n - 1)$ -graph is a tree. Later, Burns and Schuster [9] and Yap [32] generalized this result to all $(n, n - 1)$ -graphs and proved the following.

Theorem 1.1 ([9]) *Let G be a graph of order n with at most $n - 1$ edges. Then either G is 2-placeable or G is isomorphic to one of the following graphs: S_n , $S_{n-3} \uplus C_3$ ($n \geq 8$), $K_1 \uplus 2C_3$, $K_1 \uplus C_4$, $K_1 \uplus C_3$, $K_2 \uplus C_3$.*

On packing three graphs, Woźniak and Wojda [30] proved that nearly all $(n, n - 2)$ -graphs are 3-placeable. Motivated by this result, Wang and Sauer [28, 29] considered the 3-placeability of connected $(n, n - 1)$ -graphs (each of them is a tree) and disconnected $(n, n - 1)$ -graphs, respectively. They proved the following theorem.

Theorem 1.2 ([29]) *Let G be an $(n, n - 1)$ -graph with $g(G) \geq 5$ and order $n \geq 6$. Then G is 3-placeable if and only if G is not isomorphic to one of the following graphs: S_n , $C_5 \uplus K_1$, S_4^2 , S_{n-1}^1 .*

Since $e(K_n) = \frac{n(n-1)}{2} \geq k(n-1)$ holds only if $n \geq 2k$, an $(n, n - 1)$ -graph with $2 \leq n \leq 2k - 1$ is not k -placeable (the case $n = 1$ is trivial). Also, no connected graph with $\Delta(G) \geq n - k + 1$ is k -placeable. A natural and interesting problem arises.

Problem 1.3 *Let G be an $(n, n - 1)$ -graph with $n \geq 2k$ and $\Delta(G) \leq n - k$. Is G k -placeable? If G is not k -placeable, can we characterize its structure?*

Actually, Žak [34] considered k -placeability of sparse graphs. He proved that a graph G of order $n \geq 2(k - 1)^3$ is k -placeable if $|E(G)| \leq n - 2(k - 1)^3$. In general, the problem of k -placeability is more difficult for dense graphs than for sparse graphs. We consider the case $k = 4$ with large girth of Problem 1.3 in this paper. Note that Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 imply that some graphs containing small cycles are not 2-placeable and 3-placeable. Moreover, the graph $C_7 \uplus K_1$ is not 4-placeable because the degree of each vertex in K_8 is odd. For this reason and in order to make it clear for readers to understand the tricks in our paper, we investigate $(n, n - 1)$ -graphs with $g(G) \geq 9$, rather than $g(G) \geq 8$ or $g(G) \geq 7$. Let W be the set of graphs depicted in Fig. 1. The following theorem is our main result.

Theorem 1.4 *Let G be an $(n, n - 1)$ -graph with $g(G) \geq 9$ and order $n \geq 8$. Then G is 4-placeable if and only if $\Delta(G) \leq n - 4$ and $G \notin W$.*




Figure 1: W

Haler and Wang solved the case that G is connected by proving the following.

Theorem 1.5 ([20]) *A tree T of order $n \geq 8$ is 4-placeable if and only if $\Delta(T) \leq n - 4$ and $T \notin W$.*

Theorems mentioned above focus on k copies of a given graph. In fact, there are also some results concerning the packing of different graphs, see [25, 31] and other kinds of packing problems, see, e.g. [18] (a list version of packing) and [26]. Several conjectures on packing problems have appeared in the literature. Let us mention two of the best-known and interesting, which are still open.

One is the Tree Packing Conjecture (TPC) posed by Gyárfás [16]: Any set of $n - 1$ trees T_2, T_3, \dots, T_n such that every T_i of order i has a packing into K_n . Many partial results of TPC discovered by a number of researchers, see, e.g., the papers [2] by Balogh and Palmer, [5] by Bollobás, [35] by Žak and [36] by Zaks and Liu. It is worthwhile mentioning that it is not known when the biggest four can be non-stars, so the state-of-the art knowledge is three trees [23] while by [20] one can pack four copies of a tree. In particular, [24] is a recent breakthrough in this topic, which showed that the TPC holds for all bounded degree trees. In [17], Gyárfás showed that if such $n - 1$ trees has a packing into K_n , then they can be also packed into any n -chromatic graph. Instead of packing trees into the complete graph, Gerbner et al. [19] and Hobbs et al. [23] conjectured that the trees T_2, T_3, \dots, T_n have a packing into k -chromatic graphs and the complete bipartite graph $K_{n-1, \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil}$, respectively. For more on the latter conjecture, see [12, 22, 33, 36].

Another interesting packing problem is the Bollobás-Eldridge-Catlin (BEC) conjecture [4, 13], which considers packing two graphs G_1 and G_2 with $(\Delta(G_1) + 1)(\Delta(G_2) + 1) \leq n + 1$ into K_n . The conjecture is correct for $\Delta(G_1) = 2$ and $\Delta(G_1) = 3$ and n sufficiently large [1, 14], some classes of graphs [6, 15], and graphs with restrictions on degree or girth [10, 11].

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: The aim of Section 2 is to prepare some notation and terminology used in the paper. In Section 3, we show some lemmas which are useful in the proof of Theorem 1.4. In Section 4, the proof of Theorem 1.4 is given.

2 Notation

We use the following notation throughout the paper. The *order* (resp. *size*) of a graph G is defined by $v(G)$ (resp. $e(G)$). That is, $v(G) = |V(G)|$, $e(G) = |E(G)|$. A *degree* of a vertex $v \in V(G)$ is denoted by $d_G(v)$. A vertex of degree at least two adjacent to a leaf is called a *node*. For a subset U of $V(G)$, the subgraph in G induced by U is denoted by $G[U]$, and let $G - U = G[V(G) \setminus U]$. A *vertex* v of G is *k-placed* (resp. *k-fixed*) by Φ if for each $i \neq j \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$, $\phi_i(v) \neq \phi_j(v)$ (resp. $\phi_i(v) = \phi_j(v)$). Moreover, if every vertex of G is *k-placed*, then Φ is *dispersed*. An *edge* e is *k-placed* by Φ if the set of edges $\{\phi_i(e) : i = 1, 2, \dots, k\}$ are vertex disjoint.

- A *double lasso* $D(l, s, t)$ consists of a path $v_1 v_2 \dots v_l$ with additional edges $v_1 v_s$ and $v_l v_{l-t+1}$, where $3 \leq s \leq l, 3 \leq t < l$.

- A *lasso* $L(l, s)$ is obtained by deleting the edge $v_l v_{l-t+1}$ from $D(l, s, t)$. Clearly, $L(l, l) \cong C_l$.

- The graph obtained by replacing each leaf of S_{t+1} with a path P_{n_i} is $Q(n_1, \dots, n_t)$. It will be assumed that $1 \leq n_1 \leq n_2 \leq \dots \leq n_t$. Write v as the center of S_{t+1} and write $P_{n_i} = v_1^i v_2^i \dots v_{n_i}^i$, where v and v_1^i are adjacent for each i .

Observe that each connected $(n, n - 1)$ -graph is a tree, each connected (n, n) -graph contains a cycle and each connected $(n, n + 1)$ -graph contains a double lasso.

3 Preliminary results

Observation 3.1 *Let G be a graph and let U be a set of some leaves. If $G - U$ has a k -placement such that each vertex in $N_G(U)$ is k -placed, then G is k -placeable.*

Let A and B be two vertex disjoint induced subgraphs of G and let $U \subseteq V(G)$ be an independent set such that either $V(A), V(B), U$ is a partition of $V(G)$ or $V(A), V(B)$ is a partition of $V(G)$ with $U \subseteq V(A)$ or $U \subseteq V(B)$. We allow U to be an empty set. A graph G is an (A, U, B) -structure graph if

- (i) at most one vertex $a \in V(A) - U$ has neighbors in $B - U$, and for each $u \in U$, $|N_A(u)| \leq 1$ if $U \cap V(A) = \emptyset$ and $|N_B(u)| \leq 1$ if $U \cap V(B) = \emptyset$,
- (ii) each of A and B has a k -placement such that the vertices in $N_G(U)$ and a are k -placed, and each vertex in U is k -fixed.




Figure 2: A partition of G

Lemma 3.2 *If G is an (A, U, B) -structure graph, then G is k -placeable.*

Proof. Suppose $v(G) = n$. First, we consider the case $U \cap V(A \uplus B) = \emptyset$ (as shown in Fig. 2). Let $\Phi(A), \Phi(U)$ and $\Phi(B)$ be the k -placements of A, U and B , respectively. Now we construct a k -placement of G . First divide K_n into three vertex disjoint subgraphs $K_{v(A)}$, $K_{v(U)}$ and $K_{v(B)}$, and put $\Phi(A), \Phi(U)$ and $\Phi(B)$ into these three subgraphs, respectively. Recall that G is an (A, U, B) -structure graph, that is, A, B and U satisfy the condition (i) of the definition above. Since the vertices of $N_G(U)$ and a are k -placed and each vertex in U is k -fixed, it is not difficult to check that the k copies of edges between A, B and U are edge disjoint. That is, one can obtain a k -placement $\Phi(G)$ of G , where $\Phi(G) = \Phi(A) \cup \Phi(U) \cup \Phi(B)$.

In the cases $U \subseteq V(A)$ and $U \subseteq V(B)$, divide K_n into two vertex disjoint subgraphs $K_{v(A)}$ and $K_{v(B)}$. Put the k -placements of A and B into these two subgraphs, a k -placement of G can be obtained similarly. \square

The following interesting lemma is a key lemma, which improves Lemma 7 in [34] of Žak.

Lemma 3.3 *Let $U \subseteq V(G)$ be a set of k leaves such that the vertices in U have distinct neighbors and let $V = N_G(U)$. Suppose that $G - U$ is k -placeable in K_{n-k} , where $n = |V(G)|$. Let $\phi_i(V) = V_i$ for each $1 \leq i \leq k$. Then in K_n there exist k edge disjoint matchings M_1, M_2, \dots, M_k that match V_1, V_2, \dots, V_k to U , respectively. That is, G is also k -placeable.*

Proof. Let $U = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_k\}$ and $W = V_1 \cup V_2 \cup \dots \cup V_k$. Note that $0 \leq |V_i \cap V_j| \leq k$ for each $1 \leq i, j \leq k$ as each V_i is a set of k vertices. Let $B(U, W)$ be a bipartite graph with partition classes U and W such that every vertex in V_i is adjacent to u_i for each $1 \leq i \leq k$. It is well-known that the edge chromatic number of a bipartite graph B equals the maximum degree of B (König's theorem). So the edges of the bipartite graph $B(U, W)$ can be colored with exactly k colors such that adjacent edges are colored distinct colors. Assume these k colors are c_1, c_2, \dots, c_k .

For each i , we construct a perfect matching M_i between V_i and U as follows: for each $w \in V_i$, if there is an edge incident with w colored with c_j in $B(U, W)$, then add u_jw to M_i in K_n . Since the k edges of $B(U, W)$ incident to u_i have distinct colours, M_i is indeed a perfect matching between V_i and U . Moreover, the k matchings M_1, \dots, M_k are edge-disjoint. If not, assume $u_iw \in M_j \cap M_l$. Then clearly $w \in V_j \cap V_l$ and then $u_jw, u_lw \in E(B(U, W))$. Moreover, the edges u_jw and u_lw are colored by the same color c_i in $B(U, W)$, a contradiction. \square

Let t, k be two positive integers with $t \geq 2k$. Now we construct a dispersed k -placement of the path $P_t = v_1, \dots, v_t$ in K_t . Let $V(K_t) = \{u_1, \dots, u_t\}$. Define

$$\phi_i(P_t) = u_i u_{t-1+i} u_{i+1} u_{t-2+i} \cdots u_{\lfloor \frac{t}{2} \rfloor + i} \text{ for } i = 1, 2, \dots, k, \quad (1)$$

where the subscripts of the u_j 's are taken modulo t in $\{1, 2, \dots, t\}$ (see Fig. 3 (a), ϕ_i with $2 \leq i \leq k$ can be obtained by rotating ϕ_{i-1} one 'unit' in the direction of the arrow. One can check that $\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_{k-1}$ and ϕ_k are pairwise edge-disjoint because $t \geq 2k$.

In order to show the property of the k -placement of the path P_t in K_t , we use a table to exhibit $\Phi(P_t)$ (see Fig. 3 (b)), where the vertex u_i is replaced by i .




Figure 3: $\Phi(P_t)$

In the table, since $t \geq 2k$, the k -placements of v_1 and v_{2k} , i.e., the elements $1, 2, \dots, k, t-k+1, t-k+2, \dots, t$ are pairwise distinct. More generally, the following important property holds.

The k -placements of v_a and v_b with $|a-b| \geq 2k-1$ are pairwise distinct. (2)

To see this, observe that each vertex u_i arises exactly k times in the table. Furthermore, suppose that columns s and t are the first and last column in which u_i appears, respectively, then $|s-t| \leq 2k-2$ (for example, see u_{2s} in the table). Thus if two vertices v_a and v_b has 'large' distance ($|a-b| \geq 2k-1$) on the path P_t , then the k -placements of v_a and v_b are $2k$ distinct vertices, that is, $\phi_i(v_a) \neq \phi_j(v_b)$ for each $1 \leq i, j \leq k$.

By the construction of the dispersed k -placement of a path and (2), the following lemma follows immediately.

Lemma 3.4 *The path $P = v_1 \cdots v_l$ with $l \geq 2k$ has a dispersed k -placement. Moreover, the $2k$ elements $\phi_i(a), \phi_j(b)$ with $|a-b| \geq 2k-1$ and $1 \leq i, j \leq k$ are pairwise distinct.*

Lemma 3.5 *Let k be an integer with $k \geq 4$. Label $C_l, L(l, s)$ and $D(l, s, t)$ as defined. Then the following statements are true.*

(i) *The cycle C_l with $l \geq 2k+1$ has a k -placement such that all vertices except v_1 are k -placed.*

(ii) The lasso $L(l, s)$ with $s \geq 2k + 1$ has a k -placement such that all vertices except v_1 are k -placed.

(iii) The double lasso $D(l, s, t)$ with $s \geq 2k + 1$, $t \geq 2k + 1$ has a k -placement such that all vertices except v_1, v_l are k -placed.

Proof. It suffices to prove (ii) and (iii) as $C_l = L(l, l)$. To prove (iii), let $P_{l-2} = v_2 v_3 \cdots v_{l-1}$ and define a dispersed k -placement $\Phi(P_{l-2})$ as (1). Moreover, (2) implies that $\phi_i(v_2), \phi_j(v_s)$ (and $\phi_i(v_{l-1}), \phi_j(v_{l-t+1})$) are pairwise distinct for $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$. Adding vertices v_1, v_l and edges $v_1 \phi_i(v_2), v_1 \phi_i(v_s), v_l \phi_i(v_{l-1})$ and $v_l \phi_i(v_{l-t+1})$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$, we obtain a k -placement of $D(l, s, t)$ such that all vertices except v_1, v_l are k -placed.

The proof of (ii) is similar. Let $P_{l-1} = v_2 v_3 \cdots v_l$. Construct a dispersed k -placement of P_{l-1} ($\Phi(P_{l-1})$) as (1) and then add a vertex v_1 and edges $v_1 \phi_i(v_2), v_1 \phi_i(v_s)$, we obtain a k -placement of $L(l, s)$ such that all vertices except v_1 are k -placed. \square

Using Lemma 3.5, we claim that $(n, n + 1)$ -graphs with large girth and minimum degree at least 2 are k -placeable.

Corollary 3.6 *Let k be an integer with $k \geq 4$. If G is an $(n, n + 1)$ -graph with $g(G) \geq 2k + 1$ and $\delta(G) \geq 2$, then G is k -placeable.*

Proof. Clearly, $\Delta(G) \geq 3$. From Lemma 3.5 (i), we assume that G contains no cycle as a component. Since $\delta(G) \geq 2$ and $\sum_{v \in V(G)} d_G(v) = 2n + 2 \geq \Delta(G) + 2(n - 1)$, we derive that $3 \leq \Delta(G) \leq 4$. Then $G \cong D(n, s, t)$ with $s \geq 2k + 1, t \geq 2k + 1$ and $3 \leq s, t < n$. And if $\Delta(G) = 4$, then $s = n - t + 1$. Lemma 3.5 (iii) implies that the corollary holds. \square

Lemma 3.7 *The following statements are true.*

- (i) ([20]) Each of $Q(2, 2, 3)$ and $Q(2, 2, 2, 2)$ has a dispersed 4-placement.
- (ii) $C_l \uplus Q(2, 2, 2)$ with $l \geq 9$ has a dispersed 4-placement.
- (iii) Let s, l_i ($1 \leq i \leq s$) be positive integers with $s \geq 2$. If $\sum_{i=1}^s l_i \geq 3$, then $\uplus_{i=1}^s P_{l_i} \uplus K_1$ has a dispersed 4-placement.
- (iv) $2K_1 \uplus Q(n_1, n_2, n_3)$ with $2 \leq n_1 \leq n_2 \leq n_3$ has a 4-placement such that $2K_1$ and all nodes of $Q(n_1, n_2, n_3)$ are 4-placed.

Proof. (ii) Label $Q(2, 2, 2)$ as defined. Lemma 3.4 and (i) imply that each of P_{l-1} and $Q(2, 2, 3)$ has a dispersed 4-placement. Let u, v be the end-vertices of P_{l-1} . After adding edges $\phi_i(v_3^3) \phi_i(u), \phi_i(v_3^3) \phi_i(v)$ and deleting edges $\phi_i(v_3^3 v_2^3)$ for $1 \leq i \leq 4$, we obtain a dispersed 4-placement of $C_l \uplus Q(2, 2, 2)$.

(iii) It suffices to prove the case of $s = 2$. If $l_1 + l_2 \geq 7$, Lemma 3.4 implies that $P_{l_1} \uplus P_{l_2} \uplus K_1$ has a dispersed 4-placement. If $3 \leq l_1 + l_2 \leq 6$, the dispersed 4-placement $\Phi(P_{l_1} \uplus P_{l_2} \uplus K_1)$ is exhibited in the Fig. 4. The one shown by bold lines is $\phi_1(P_{l_1} \uplus P_{l_2} \uplus K_1)$. For $i = 2, 3$, ϕ_i can be obtained by rotating ϕ_{i-1} one ‘unit’ counterclockwise. And one can always put ϕ_4 as shown by thin dashed lines in Fig. 4 to obtain a dispersed 4-placement. For example, see Fig. 4 (d), let $P_4 = v_1 v_2 v_3 v_4$ and put $\phi_4(v_4)$ and $\phi_1(v_1), \phi_2(v_3)$ on the same vertex (i.e. the top vertex), then we get a dispersed $\Phi(P_4 \uplus 2K_1)$.

(iv) Adding three edges between $2K_1$ and $Q(n_1, n_2, n_3)$, we obtain $L(n_1 + n_2 + n_3 + 3, n_2 + n_3 + 3)$. If $n_2 + n_3 \geq 6$, then $n_3 \geq 3$ and $2K_1 \uplus Q(n_1, n_2, n_3)$ has a 4-placement such that all vertices except v_1^3 are 4-placed by Lemma 3.5 (ii). Thus (iv) holds. Therefore, we may assume that $n_1 = n_2 = 2$, $n_3 = 2$ or $n_3 = 3$. The graph $2K_1 \uplus Q(2, 2, 2)$ has a dispersed 4-placement by (i) ($Q(2, 2, 2, 2)$).

Furthermore, $2K_1 \uplus Q(2, 2, 3)$ has a 4-placement such that $2K_1$ and the nodes of $Q(n_1, n_2, n_3)$ are 4-placed by Observation 3.1 ($U = \{v_3\}$). \square




Figure 4: $\Phi(P_{l_1} \uplus P_{l_2} \uplus K_1)$

Žak [34] proved that a graph G on n vertices is k -placeable if $2(k-1)\Delta(G)^2 < n$. That is, every graph of order $n > 8(k-1)$ with $\Delta(G) = 2$ is k -placeable. In fact, the lower bound $8(k-1)$ can be improved by Lemma 3.5 (i) and the following Theorem 3.8.

Theorem 3.8 *Let k be a positive integer. A graph G of order $n \geq 6k - 4$ with $\Delta(G) = 2$ is k -placeable.*

Proof. We proceed by induction on k . Clearly, G is 1-placeable because the complete graph K_n contains G . Assume that G is s -placeable with $1 \leq s < k$. Now, we prove that G is $(s+1)$ -placeable. Let H be the graph obtained from K_n by deleting the edges of s copies of G . Clearly, $\delta(H) \geq n - 1 - 2s \geq \frac{2n-1}{3}$ for $1 \leq s < k$ because $n \geq 6k - 4$. So the proof of the theorem is completed by the result of Aigner and Brandt [1]: A graph H of order n with $\delta(H) \geq \frac{2n-1}{3}$ contains any graph G of order at most n with $\Delta(G) = 2$. \square

It should be noted that a 2-factor is an (n, n) -graph. The following corollary follows immediately by Lemma 3.5 (i) and Theorem 3.8.

Corollary 3.9 *Let k be a positive integer. Any 2-factor of order n with $n \geq 6k - 4$ is k -placeable. Moreover, a cycle of order n with $n \geq 2k + 1$ is k -placeable for $k \geq 4$.*

4 Proof of Theorem 1.4

Let G be an $(n, n-1)$ -graph on $n \geq 8$ vertices. If G is connected, then Theorem 1.5 implies that Theorem 1.4 holds. Therefore, we may assume that G is a disconnected $(n, n-1)$ -graph, then G has at least one cycle. Suppose that $g(G) \geq 9$ and $\Delta(G) \leq n-4$. Clearly, C_9 is 4-placeable by Lemma 3.5 (i). Thus we only need to prove sufficiency of Theorem 1.4 with $n \geq 10$.

Lemma 4.1 *If $10 \leq n \leq 13$, then G is 4-placeable.*

Proof. Since G is a disconnected $(n, n-1)$ -graph with $g(G) \geq 9$ and $n \leq 13$, G does not contain $D(l, s, t)$ as a subgraph. Moreover, G has exactly two components A and B , where A contains a cycle C_s ($s \geq 9$). If $A \not\cong C_s$, delete some leaves of A to obtain $L(l, s)$ with l maximum. Let $w \in V(L(l, s))$ with degree three. Moreover, we can get a lasso $L(l, s)$ from A such that there exists $u \in N_{C_s}(w)$ with $d_G(u) = 2$. Similarly, delete some leaves of B to obtain a path P_t with t maximum. Then add an edge between the leaf of $L(l, s)$ (or any vertex of A if $A \cong C_s$) and a vertex of P_t with degree at most one to get $L(l+t, s)$. Lemma 3.5 (ii) implies that $L(l+t, s)$ has a 4-placement such that all vertices except u are 4-placed. Then G has a 4-placement by Observation 3.1. \square

Suppose that $n \geq 14$. We prove Theorem 1.4 by induction on n and assume that Theorem 1.4 holds for $(n', n'-1)$ -graphs with $10 \leq n' < n$. Now we consider the case $v(G) = n$.

Lemma 4.2 *Let A, B be two disjoint induced subgraphs of G and $V(G) = V(A) \cup V(B)$. Suppose that A consists of x trees with $x \geq 3$ and it contains a vertex $u \in V(A)$ such that $E(u, B) = E(A, B)$. If $e(u, B) \geq x$, then B has a 4-placement in $K_{v(B)}$.*

Proof. Let $v(B) = l$ and $y = e(u, B)$. Recall that G has a cycle and the girth of G is at least 9, so B is an $(l, l-1+x-y)$ -graph with $g(B) \geq 9$. Also since G contains a cycle, A is a forest and $E(A, B) = E(u, B)$, we conclude that B or $G[V(B) \cup \{u\}]$ contains a cycle with length at least 9. Thus there is an induced path of order at least 8 in B . So $l \geq 8$. In fact, $l \geq 9$ by $y \geq x \geq 3$ and $g(G) \geq 9$. Suppose that $B \cong C^1 \uplus C^2 \uplus \dots \uplus C^s$, where C^i is a component of B . Add edges e_1, e_2, \dots in turn between the components of B until we obtain an $(l, l-1)$ -graph B' , where $e_j = u_j u_{j+1}$ such that u_j, u_{j+1} has minimum degree in $\uplus_{i=1}^j C^i, C^{j+1}$, respectively.

Obviously $g(B') = g(B) \geq 9$ and $v(B') = v(B) \geq 9$. In addition, B' also contains an induced path with order at least 8. Thus $\Delta(B') \leq l-4$. Further, B' does not belong to W (shown in Fig. 1) because each tree in W does not contain a path of order at least 8. Then by the induction hypothesis, B' , consequently B has a 4-placement in $K_{v(B)}$. \square

Lemma 4.3 *If G has four distinct leaves such that they have distinct neighbors, then G is 4-placeable. Moreover, if G contains four nodes, then G is 4-placeable.*

Proof. Let U be a set of four leaves such that the vertices in U has distinct neighbors and let $H = G - U$. Clearly, H is a disconnected $(n-4, n-5)$ -graph with $g(H) \geq 9$, where $n-4 \geq 10$. It follows by $g(H) \geq 9$ that $\Delta(H) \leq v(H) - 4$. Thus H is 4-placeable by the induction hypothesis. Moreover, Lemma 3.3 implies that G is 4-placeable. Clearly, if G has four nodes, then it has four distinct leaves such that they have distinct neighbors. \square

In the following, we prove that if there are two components of G each of which is a tree, then G is 4-placeable. First, we prove a useful claim.

Claim 4.4 *Suppose that G is not 4-placeable. If there are three consecutive vertices on a path with degree sequence S in G , then G contains at most x isolated vertices, where*

$$x = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } S = (3, 2, 2), \\ 2, & \text{if } S = (3, 2, 3), \text{ and} \\ 3, & \text{if } S = (3, 3, 3). \end{cases}$$

Proof. Suppose the claim does not hold. Assume that G contains $x + 1$ isolated vertices s_1, \dots, s_{x+1} , and let u, v, w be three consecutive vertices of G satisfying the specific degree sequence S . Suppose that $N_G(u) = \{u_1, u_2, v\}$, $N_G(v) = \{v_1, u, w\}$ and $N_G(w) = \{w_1, w_2, v\}$, where v_1, w_2 may not exist. Let $M = G[\{s_1, \dots, s_{x+1}, u, v, w\}]$ and $H = G - M$. Divide K_n into two disjoint subgraphs $K_{v(H)}$ and $K_{v(M)}$.

First we claim that H has a 4-placement in $K_{v(H)}$. Clearly, H is a $(v(H), v(H) - 1)$ -graph with $g(H) \geq 9$. By the induction hypothesis, it suffices to show that $v(H) \geq 8$, $\Delta(H) \leq v(H) - 4$ and $H \notin W$. It follows by $g(G) \geq 9$ that H or $G[V(H) \cup \{u, v, w\}]$ contains an induced cycle with length at least 9. In the former case, since $g(G) \geq 9$, H satisfies the three properties above clearly. Thus we may assume that the latter holds, that is, H is a tree (recall that H is a $(v(H), v(H) - 1)$ -graph) and $G[V(H) \cup \{u, v, w\}]$ contains an induced cycle with length at least 9. So there is an induced path in H of order at least six and then $\Delta(H) \leq v(H) - 4$ as $g(G) \geq 9$. Moreover, since $g(G) \geq 9$ and $|N_H(\{u, v, w\})| \geq 3$, we have that $v(H) \geq 8$ and $H \notin W$ (shown in Fig. 1).

Thus, in order to obtain a 4-placement of G (which contradicts the assumption that G is not 4-placeable), it suffices to put four edge-disjoint copies of M in $K_{v(M)}$ such that $\Phi(E(M, H))$ are edge disjoint. In fact, we only need to consider how to put 4 copies of u, v and w in $K_{v(M)}$ such that $\Phi(E(M, H))$ are edge disjoint: If $\phi_i(\{u, v, w\})$ is known in $K_{v(M)}$, then embed s_1, \dots, s_{x+1} arbitrarily in $K_{v(M)} - \{\phi_i(u), \phi_i(v), \phi_i(w)\}$. So, in the following, we omit $\phi_i(s_j)$ for $1 \leq i \leq 4$, $1 \leq j \leq x + 1$. For convenience, let $V(K_{v(H)}) = V(H)$ and $V(K_{v(M)}) = V(M)$. In particular, we write $\phi_i(u, v, w) = (\phi_i(u), \phi_i(v), \phi_i(w))$ (an ordered 3-tuple).

Case 1. $S = (3, 2, 2)$.

Observe that the 4-placement of w_1 affects the 4-placement of w . In fact, if w_1 is 4-fixed (resp. 4-placed), then we can construct a 4-placement of M such that w is 4-placed (resp. 4-fixed). So we divided the proof into the following three cases. If w_1 is 4-fixed, let $A = M$, $B = H$ and $U = \{w_1\}$. If w_1 is 4-placed, let $A = G[V(M) - \{w\}]$, $U = \{w\}$ and $B = H$. Lemmas 3.7 (iii) and 3.2 imply that G is 4-placeable in both cases. So we may assume that $\phi_1(w_1) = p, \phi_2(w_1) = p, \phi_3(w_1) = q$ and $\phi_4(w_1) \in \{p, q, r\}$, where p, q, r are three distinct vertices of $V(K_{v(H)})$. We define $\phi_i(u, v, w)$ as follows.

$$\begin{cases} (v, w, s_1), & i = 1 \\ (s_1, v, u), & i = 2 \\ (s_2, s_1, u), & i = 3 \\ (w, x, y), & \text{where } (x, y, \phi_4(w_1)) \in \{(s_2, v, p), (u, s_2, q), (s_2, u, r)\}, i = 4. \end{cases}$$

We can check that whatever $\Phi(\{u_1, u_2\})$ is, we can get a 4-placement of G because u is 4-placed and $\phi_i(N_H(u)) \cap \phi_i(N_H(w)) = \emptyset$ for each $1 \leq i \leq 4$.

Case 2. $S = (3, 2, 3)$ or $S = (3, 3, 3)$.

Recall that we already put four copies of H in $K_{v(H)}$. For convenience, suppose $\phi_1(N_H(u)) = \phi_1(\{u_1, u_2\}) = \{u_1, u_2\}$ and $\phi_1(N_H(w)) = \phi_1(\{w_1, w_2\}) = \{w_1, w_2\}$ in $\Phi(H)$. If v_1 exists, suppose $\phi_1(N_H(v)) = \phi_1(\{v_1\}) = \{v_1\}$. We choose l, t (and also l', t') to be some permutation of u, w , that is, $\{l, t\} = \{l', t'\} = \{u, w\}$. Further, if $l = u$ (resp. w), we sometimes use $N_H(l)$ to denote $N_H(u)$ (resp. $N_H(w)$) and use l_1, l_2 to denote u_1, u_2 (resp. w_1, w_2). One can define $N_H(t), N_H(l'), N_H(t'), t_i, l'_i$ and t'_i for $i = 1, 2$ in this way. Observe that if $\phi_\alpha(N_H(l)) \cap \phi_\beta(N_H(l')) = \emptyset$ for $1 \leq \alpha \neq \beta \leq 4$, then we can put $\phi_\alpha(l)$ and $\phi_\beta(l')$ on a same vertex of $K_{v(M)}$.

In fact, such α, β, l, l' exist. If not, for each $l \in \{u, w\}$ and each $2 \leq \alpha \leq 4$, we have $\phi_\alpha(N_H(l)) \cap \phi_1(N_H(u)) \neq \emptyset$ and $\phi_\alpha(N_H(l)) \cap \phi_1(N_H(w)) \neq \emptyset$ ($\beta = 1$). Then $\{\phi_\alpha(N_H(u)), \phi_\alpha(N_H(w))\}$ is $\{\{u_1, w_1\}, \{u_2, w_2\}\}$ or $\{\{u_1, w_2\}, \{u_2, w_1\}\}$ for each $\alpha \in \{2, 3, 4\}$. So there exist $\alpha \neq \beta \in \{2, 3, 4\}$ such that $\{\phi_\alpha(N_H(u)), \phi_\alpha(N_H(w))\} = \{\phi_\beta(N_H(u)), \phi_\beta(N_H(w))\}$. Then one can choose $l, l' \in \{u, w\}$ satisfying $\phi_\alpha(N_H(l)) \cap \phi_\beta(N_H(l')) = \emptyset$ easily. Choose α, β, l, l' such that

$$\phi_\alpha(N_H(l)) \cap \phi_\beta(N_H(l')) = \emptyset \text{ and then, } |\phi_\alpha(N_H(t)) \cap \phi_\beta(N_H(l'))| \text{ is maximum.} \quad (*)$$

Without loss of generality, assume that $\alpha = 1$ and $\beta = 2$.

Subcase 2.1. $S = (3, 2, 3)$.

Note that in this case, the vertex v has no neighbor in H . First put $\phi_1(l)$ and $\phi_2(l')$ on u in $K_{v(M)}$ as $\phi_1(N_H(l)) \cap \phi_2(N_H(l')) = \emptyset$. If $\phi_1(N_H(t)) \cap \phi_2(N_H(t')) = \emptyset$, then put $\phi_1(t)$ and $\phi_2(t')$ on w (See Fig. 5 (a)). Further, one may get a 4-placement of G by choosing

$$\phi_1(v) = v, \phi_2(v) = s_1, \phi_3(u, v, w) = (s_2, u, s_3), \text{ and } \phi_4(u, v, w) = (s_1, s_2, v).$$

This is a contradiction to the assumption that G is not 4-placeable. So in the following, we may assume that $t_1 \in \phi_1(N_H(t)) \cap \phi_2(N_H(t'))$ (recall that $\phi_1(N_H(t)) = \{t_1, t_2\}$). Further, let $\phi_1(l, v, t) = (u, v, w)$ and $\phi_2(l', v, t') = (u, s_1, v)$.

If $\phi_i(N_H(y)) \cap \phi_1(N_H(t)) = \emptyset$ for some $y \in \{u, w\}$ and some $i \in \{3, 4\}$, then let $\phi_i(y) = \phi_1(t) = w$, $\phi_i(v) = u$ and $\phi_i(\{u, w\} - \{y\}) = s_2$. And, set $\phi_j(u, v, w) = (s_1, s_2, s_3)$, where $\{i, j\} = \{3, 4\}$ (see Fig. 5 (b)). Therefore, $\phi_i(N_H(y)) \cap \{t_1, t_2\} \neq \emptyset$ for every $y \in \{u, w\}$ and every $i \in \{3, 4\}$. Assume that $\{\phi_3(N_H(u)), \phi_3(N_H(w))\} = \{\{t_1, a\}, \{t_2, b\}\}$ and $\{\phi_4(N_H(u)), \phi_4(N_H(w))\} = \{\{t_1, c\}, \{t_2, d\}\}$, where $a, b, c, d \in V(H) - \{t_1, t_2\}$, $a \neq b$ and $c \neq d$.




Figure 5: The subcases of the case $S = (3, 2, 3)$.

If there exist $y, z \in \{u, w\}$ such that $\phi_3(N_H(y)) \cap \phi_4(N_H(z)) = \emptyset$, then let $\phi_3(y, v, \{u, w\} - \{y\}) = (s_3, u, s_2)$ and $\phi_4(z, v, \{u, w\} - \{z\}) = (s_3, s_2, s_1)$ (see Fig. 5 (c)). It is not difficult to check that a 4-placement of G is obtained in this way, contradicting the assumption. Thus $\phi_3(N_H(y)) \cap \phi_4(N_H(z)) \neq \emptyset$ for each $y, z \in \{u, w\}$. Then, more precisely, we may assume that

$$\{\phi_3(N_H(u)), \phi_3(N_H(w))\} = \{\{t_1, a\}, \{t_2, b\}\} \text{ and } \{\phi_4(N_H(u)), \phi_4(N_H(w))\} = \{\{t_1, b\}, \{t_2, a\}\}.$$

Recall that $t_1 \in \phi_2(N_H(t'))$ and $|N_H(t')| = 2$. Then $\{t_2, a\}$ or $\{t_2, b\}$ does not intersect with $\phi_2(N_H(t'))$. (Observe that $t_2 \notin \phi_2(N_H(t'))$ as otherwise $\phi_2(N_H(t')) = \{t_1, t_2\}$). In this case since $\phi_2(N_H(l')) \cap \phi_2(N_H(t')) = \emptyset$ and $\phi_2(N_H(t')) = \phi_1(N_H(t)) = \{t_1, t_2\}$, we obtain that $|\phi_2(N_H(l')) \cap \phi_1(N_H(t))| = 0$. Then we obtain a contradiction with the choice (*) as $\phi_2(N_H(t')) \cap \phi_1(N_H(l)) = \emptyset$ and $|\phi_2(N_H(t')) \cap \phi_1(N_H(t))| = 2 > |\phi_2(N_H(l')) \cap \phi_1(N_H(t))|$. Suppose $\phi_i(N_H(y)) = \{t_2, b\}$ with $\{t_2, b\} \cap \phi_2(N_H(t')) = \emptyset$ for some $i \in \{3, 4\}$ and some $y \in \{u, w\}$. Let $\phi_i(y, v, \{u, w\} - \{y\}) = (v, s_2, s_1)$

and $\phi_j(u, v, w) = (s_2, u, s_3)$, where $\{i, j\} = \{3, 4\}$ (see Fig. 5 (d)). We get a 4-placement of G , a contradiction again.

Subcase 2.2. $S = (3, 3, 3)$.

In this case, $|N_H(u)| = |N_H(w)| = 2$ and $|N_H(v)| = 1$. Roughly speaking, if we put $\phi_1(M)$, $\phi_2(M)$ and $\phi_3(M)$ on $K_{v(M)}$ properly, then we may put $\phi_4(M)$ easily. More precisely, we claim that after putting $\phi_1(M)$, $\phi_2(M)$ and $\phi_3(M)$ on $K_{v(M)}$, if a, b and c are three independent vertices in $K_{v(M)}$ with $e(a, H) \leq 2$, $e(b, H) \leq 1$ and $e(c, H) = 0$, then one can put $\phi_4(\{u, v, w\})$ easily on $\{a, b, c\}$. Set $\{r, y, z\} = \{u, v, w\}$, since $e(a, H) \leq 2$, $|N_H(u)| = |N_H(w)| = 2$ and $|N_H(v)| = 1$, there is a vertex in $\{r, y, z\}$, say r , such that $\phi_4(N_H(r)) \cap N_H(a) = \emptyset$ and then let $\phi_4(r) = a$. Also, since $e(b, H) \leq 1$, there is a vertex in $\{y, z\}$, say y , such that $\phi_4(N_H(y))$ does not intersect with $N_H(b)$. So we may let $\phi_4(y) = b$ and $\phi_4(z) = c$.




Figure 6: The case of $S = (3, 3, 3)$.

First put $\phi_1(l)$ and $\phi_2(l')$ on u in $K_{v(M)}$ as $\phi_1(N_H(l)) \cap \phi_2(N_H(l')) = \emptyset$. If $\phi_1(N_H(t)) \cap \phi_2(N_H(t')) = \emptyset$, then let $\phi_1(l, v, t) = (u, v, w)$, $\phi_2(l', v, t') = (u, s_1, w)$ and $\phi_3(u, v, w) = (s_1, s_2, s_3)$. Now we claim that we may put $\phi_3(u)$ on s_1 . Since $|N_H(v)| = 1$, we get that $\phi_3(N_H(u)) \cap \phi_2(N_H(v)) = \emptyset$ or $\phi_3(N_H(w)) \cap \phi_2(N_H(v)) = \emptyset$. Here, we assume that the former holds. If the latter holds, then swap $\phi_3(u)$ and $\phi_3(w)$, that is, let $\phi_3(u, v, w) = (s_3, s_2, s_1)$. After putting $\phi_1(M)$, $\phi_2(M)$ and $\phi_3(M)$, we have $e(v, H) = e(s_2, H) = 1$ and $e(s_4, H) = 0$, so we can put $\phi_4(\{u, v, w\})$ on $\{v, s_2, s_4\}$ easily (see Fig. 6 (a)).

Thus we may assume $t_1 \in \phi_1(N_H(t)) \cap \phi_2(N_H(t'))$. If $v_1 \notin \phi_2(N_H(t'))$, then adjust $\phi_2(t')$ to $\phi_1(v)$ (i.e. to v) on the basis of Fig. 6 (a) and, put $\phi_4(\{u, v, w\})$ on $\{s_2, s_4, w\}$ (see Fig. 6 (b)). So it suffices to consider the case that $\phi_2(N_H(t')) = \{t_1, v_1\}$. In this case, we have $\phi_2(N_H(t')) \cap \phi_1(N_H(l)) = \{t_1, v_1\} \cap \{l_1, l_2\} = \emptyset$ and $|\phi_2(N_H(t')) \cap \phi_1(N_H(t))| = |\{t_1\}| = 1$. It follows from the choice (*) that $|\phi_2(N_H(l')) \cap \phi_1(N_H(t))| \geq 1$. Note that $\phi_2(N_H(l'))$, $\phi_2(N_H(v))$ and $\phi_2(N_H(t'))$ are pairwise disjoint. So $t_2 \in \phi_2(N_H(l'))$ and $\phi_2(N_H(v)) \cap \phi_1(N_H(t)) = \emptyset$. Let $\phi_2(l', v, t') = (u, w, s_1)$, $\phi_3(u, v, w) = (v, s_2, s_3)$ (here, we assume $\phi_3(N_H(u)) \cap \phi_1(N_H(v)) = \emptyset$, otherwise, similarly to the paragraph above, we swap $\phi_3(u)$ and $\phi_3(w)$ and put $\phi_4(\{u, v, w\})$ on $\{s_1, s_2, s_4\}$ (see Fig. 6 (c)). A 4-placement of G is obtained, contradicting the assumption. \square

Let T^1, \dots, T^a denote the components of G that are trees and let C^{a+1}, \dots, C^b denote the components of G that are not trees. Furthermore, say $v(T^1) \geq \dots \geq v(T^a)$. Note that at least one component of G must be a tree and recall that we may assume that G has at least one cycle, so indeed $b > a \geq 1$.

Lemma 4.5 *If G has at least two components each of which is a tree, then G is 4-placeable.*

Proof. Since G is an $(n, n-1)$ -graph, we have $\Delta(G - (T^1 \uplus T^2)) \geq 3$, say $u \in V(G - (T^1 \uplus T^2))$ is a vertex with maximum degree. If $v(T^1 \uplus T^2) \geq 3$, let $A = G[V(T^1 \uplus T^2) \cup \{u\}]$, $B = G - A$. By Lemma 4.3, $T^1 \uplus T^2$ contains at most three leaves with distinct neighbors, otherwise we are

done. Then deleting some leaves of $T^1 \uplus T^2$ if necessary, we obtain $K_1 \uplus P_{l_1} \uplus P_{l_2}$ with $l_1 + l_2 \geq 3$ or $2K_1 \uplus Q(n_1, n_2, n_3)$ with $n_1 \geq 2$ from A . Lemma 3.7 (iii), (iv) and Observation 3.1 imply that A has a 4-placement such that u is 4-placed. Moreover, B has a 4-placement by Lemma 4.2. Thus G is 4-placeable by Lemma 3.2 ($U = \emptyset$) and the lemma holds. Thus $T^1 \cong \dots \cong T^a \cong K_1$. That is, each tree T^i in G is in fact an isolated vertex.

First we consider the case that the number of isolated vertices in G is at least three, i.e., $a \geq 3$. In this case, we claim that $\Delta(G) = 3$. If not, assume $d_G(u) \geq 4$ and let $A = G[V(T^1 \uplus T^2 \uplus T^3) \cup \{u\}]$ and $B = G - A$. Clearly, A has a 4-placement such that u is 4-placed. Moreover, Lemma 4.2 implies that B has a 4-placement, then G is 4-placeable by Lemma 3.2 ($U = \emptyset$). We are done.

Further, since G is an $(n, n-1)$ -graph, there is a component C^i of G with at least $v(C^i) + 1$ edges. Then C^i contains a double lasso L as a subgraph. It follows by $\Delta(G) = 3$ that $\Delta(C^i) = 3$. Suppose $v \in V(L)$ with $d_G(v) = 3$. Since each vertex on the double lasso L has degree at least 2 in G , one may find three consecutive vertices on L with degree sequence (in G) either $(3, 2, 2)$, or $(3, 2, 3)$, or $(3, 3, 3)$. By Claim 4.4, we have that $a = 3$ and every three consecutive vertices of L have degree sequence $(3, 3, 3)$, otherwise we are done. In other words, each vertex on L has degree three in G .

Let x_i be the number of vertices in G with degree i for $1 \leq i \leq 3$. Since G is an $(n, n-1)$ -graph and $\Delta(G) = 3$ and $a = 3$, we obtain that $3 + x_1 + x_2 + x_3 = n$ and $x_1 + 2x_2 + 3x_3 = 2n - 2$. Thus $x_3 = 4 + x_1$. Lemma 4.3 implies that the number of nodes of G is at most three, then $x_1 \leq 6$ because $\Delta(G) = 3$ and G does not contain non-trivial tree. That is, $x_3 \leq 10$. However, it is easy to check that $v(L) > 10$ as $g(G) \geq 9$, a contradiction.

Now we consider the case $a = 2$, that is, G contains exactly two trees (isolated vertices) as components. In this case, the structure of G can be easily described: $G \cong 2K_1 \uplus C^3 \uplus \dots \uplus C^b$, where C^3 is a $(v(C^3), v(C^3) + 1)$ -graph and C^i is a $(v(C^i), v(C^i))$ -graph for each $4 \leq i \leq b$. Clearly, C^3 contains a double lasso L as a subgraph. Moreover, if $C^3 \cong L$, then by Lemma 3.5 (iii), C^3 is 4-placeable. By the induction hypothesis, $G - C^3$ is also 4-placeable (adding an edge between two isolated vertices one may get an $(l, l-1)$ -graph for some l). Then G is 4-placeable, the lemma holds.




Figure 7: The case of $a = 2$ in Lemma 4.5, where the white vertices are T^1 and T^2 . The bold lines indicate the subgraph T .

Therefore, in C^3 , there are some trees each of which intersects with the double lasso L at a leaf. Moreover, any two trees can only intersect at such leaves, and some of these trees may intersect L at a same vertex, see Fig. 7 (a). Now we claim that $\Delta(C^3) = 3$. Otherwise, choose $v \in V(C^3 - L)$ with $d_G(v) \geq 4$ unless all such vertices are in L , e.g. see Fig. 7 (b). Let $A = T^1 \uplus T^2 \uplus T$ and $B = G - A$, where T is a subgraph of C^3 containing v and $d_T(v) = 1$. It follows by Lemma 4.3 and the choice of v that T can be obtained by adding some leaves to a path or $Q(n_1, n_2, n_3)$. By Lemma 3.7 (iii)-(iv), Observation 3.1 and Claim 4.2, we see that A and B has a 4-placement, respectively. Then G is 4-placeable by Lemma 3.2 ($U = \emptyset$), we are done.

Thus $2 \leq d_G(w) \leq 3$ for each vertex $w \in V(L)$. Observe that there are at most three disjoint trees each of which intersects with L at a leaf because each such tree contributes a node to G . Since $g(G) \geq 9$, it is not difficult to check that there are three consecutive vertices on L with degree sequence $(3, 2, 2)$, which contradicts Claim 4.4. \square

We are in the position to prove Theorem 1.4. First, we describe the structure of G . Recall that $G = T^1 \uplus \dots \uplus T^a \uplus C^{a+1} \uplus \dots \uplus C^b$. Lemma 4.5 implies that $a = 1$. Moreover, since G is a disconnected $(n, n-1)$ -graph, each component C^i ($2 \leq i \leq b$) is a cycle or a $(v(C^i), v(C^i))$ -graph containing one cycle and some trees such that each tree intersects with the cycle at a leaf. Moreover, any two trees can only intersect at such leaves, and some of these trees may intersect the cycle at a same vertex (for convenience, when we say that some trees intersect with a cycle in the following, we assume that these trees satisfy this requirement).

Let G' be a subgraph obtained from G by deleting some leaves. Inspired by Observation 3.1, in order to get a 4-placement of G , it suffices to construct a 4-placement of G' such that all neighbors of leaves of G are 4-placed. We call such 4-placement of G' *good*. More precisely, we delete some leaves from component C^i (or T^i) of G with the following priority.

(i) If deleting some leaves from C^i of G we get a lasso $L(l, s)$ with $l > s$, then delete such leaves from C^i so that l is maximum; If $T^i \cong K_2$, delete one leaf of T^i to get K_1 ;

(ii) Let U be the set of leaves of C^i (or T^i). For each $u \in V - U$, let $b_u = |\{v \in N_G(u) : d_G(v) \geq 2\}|$. That is, $b_u = |N_G(u) - U|$. If $b_u = 0$ or $b_u \geq 2$, then we delete all leaves adjacent with u . Otherwise, we delete all leaves adjacent with u except one. See Fig. 8 for an example illustrating the deletion.




Figure 8: Examples of how G' can be obtained from G .

It is not difficult to check that if a vertex is a node of G' , then it is also a node of G (this is the reason why we don't delete all the leaves). Clearly, G' is a $(v(G'), v(G') - 1)$ -graph. In addition, it has at most 3 nodes as otherwise G has four nodes and then G is 4-placeable by Lemma 4.3, we are done. For convenience, we write $G' = T'^1 \uplus C'^2 \uplus \dots \uplus C'^b$. In fact, T'^1 and C'^i are known as $T'^1 \cong P_t$ ($t = 1$ or $t \geq 4$) or $T'^1 \cong Q(n_1, n_2, n_3)$ ($n_3 \geq n_2 \geq n_1 \geq 2$), where $t = 1$ if the component T'^1 of G is a star (i.e. $b_u = 0$, where u is the center of the star) and $t \geq 4$ if it is a non-star; Each C'^i ($(v(C'^i), v(C'^i))$ -graph) has one cycle and some trees such that each tree intersects with the cycle at a leaf.

Observe that if the component C'^i of G' is a cycle, then C^i must also be a cycle in G . It is worthwhile mentioning that if all nodes of C^i are on the unique cycle of C^i , we will obtain a lasso $L(s+1, s)$ in G' rather than a cycle C_s .

Case 1. $T'^1 \not\cong K_1$.

First we consider the case that $T'^1 \cong P_t$ with $t \geq 4$. Note that P_t ($t \geq 4$) has two nodes, then $C'^2 \uplus \dots \uplus C'^b$ has at most one node. That is, there is at most one lasso C'^2 and other components

are all cycles. Add an edge between P_t and C'^2 to get a lasso L . Lemma 3.5 (i) and (ii) imply that G' has a 4-placement such that all vertices are 4-placed except the vertex v_1 of the lasso L . Since G has at most three nodes and two nodes of P_t are also the nodes of G , we have that v_1 or v_{s-1} of the lasso is not a node of G . By symmetry, we may assume that v_1 is not a node. Therefore, such a 4-placement of G' is good. We are done.

Thus $T'^1 \cong Q(n_1, n_2, n_2)$ with $n_3 \geq n_2 \geq n_1 \geq 2$. Note $Q(n_1, n_2, n_2)$ has three nodes, so C'^2, \dots, C'^b are all cycles. Suppose that $C'^2 \cong C_s$ with $s \geq 9$. If $n_3 = 2$, then G' has a good 4-placement by Lemmas 3.7 (ii) and 3.5 (i). Thus $n_3 \geq 3$. Label $Q(n_1, n_2, n_3)$ as defined and label C^2 clockwise with u_1, u_2, \dots, u_s . Deleting u_2 from C'^2 and adding edges $v_{n_2}^2 u_3, v_{n_3}^3 u_1$, we obtain the lasso $L(n_1 + n_2 + n_3 + s, n_2 + n_3 + s)$.

Lemma 3.5 (ii) implies that the lasso has a 4-placement such that all vertices except for v_1^3 are 4-placed. Furthermore, for $1 \leq i, j \leq 4$, $\phi_i(u_1), \phi_j(u_3)$ are pairwise distinct by the construction of the 4-placement of a lasso (see the proof of Lemma 3.5 (ii)) and (2). Thus deleting edges $\phi_i(v_{n_2}^2 u_3), \phi_i(v_{n_3}^3 u_1)$ and adding a vertex u_2 , edges $u_2 \phi_i(u_1), u_2 \phi_i(u_3)$ for each $1 \leq i \leq 4$, we obtain a 4-placement of $C_s \uplus Q(n_1, n_2, n_3)$ such that all nodes of $Q(n_1, n_2, n_3)$ (such nodes of G' are also the nodes of G) are 4-placed. Then G' has a good 4-placement by Lemma 3.5 (i).

Case 2. $T'^1 \cong K_1$.

Recall that each C^i of G has one cycle and some trees such that each tree intersects with the cycle at a leaf. Note that if every component C^i of G has at most one tree intersecting with the unique cycle of C_i , and each of them in G' is a lasso or a cycle, then Lemma 3.5 (i) and (ii) imply that each of H and $K_1 \uplus H$ (is a subgraph of a lasso) has a 4-placement, where H is a lasso or cycle. Here since all vertices of the path of a lasso are 4-placed, such a 4-placement of G' is good, we are done.

Thus if G has three components C^2, C^3 and C^4 such that each C^i ($2 \leq i \leq 4$) has a tree intersecting with the unique cycle of C_i (in this case, each C'^i with $2 \leq i \leq 4$ in G' is a lasso because G has at most three nodes), we are done. So we only need to consider the following two cases:

- (a) C^2 of G has y ($1 \leq y \leq 3$) trees intersecting with the unique cycle of it;
- (b) C^2 and C^3 of G has x and y trees ($y \geq x$) intersecting with the unique cycle of them, respectively.

In particular, C'^2 (resp. each of C'^2 and C'^3) of G' is not a lasso when $y = 1$ (resp. $x = y = 1$) by the argument above. Notice that in both cases if G contains a cycle as a component, then G is 4-placeable by Lemma 3.5 (i) and the induction hypothesis. Thus G (consequently, G') contains no cycle as a component. In the following, we give an (A, U, B) -structure of G' such that G' has a good 4-placement or an (A, U, B) -structure of G directly, contradicting the assumption that G is not 4-placeable.

In the case (b), we give an (A, U, B) -structure of G' as exhibited in Fig. 9 (a), where each A and B consists of a lasso and a path of order at least one and $U = \emptyset$. Lemmas 3.5 (ii) and 3.2 imply that G' has a good 4-placement as all vertices on the path of a lasso are 4-placed. (Here, the components C'^2, C'^3 and the graph shown in Fig. 9 (a) have roughly the 'same' structure. More precisely, two trees may intersect with C'^3 at a same vertex, or there is only one tree ($Q(n_1, n_2, n_3)$) intersecting with the unique cycle of C'^3 .) Thus we may assume the case (a) holds. Notice that C'^2 has a cycle, say C_s , and deleting C_s from the C'^2 , we get a forest F .

Let $M = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{v(M)}\}$ be a vertex set with $u_i \in V(C_s)$ such that $N_F(u_i) \neq \emptyset$. Clearly, $1 \leq v(M) \leq 3$ as G' has at most 3 nodes. Thus we only need to prove the following two subcases.

Subcase 1. $1 \leq |M| \leq 2$.

First, we consider $|M| = 1$. In graph G , if $v(F) \geq 6$, then by the induction hypothesis, $G[V(F) \cup \{u_1\} \cup V(T^1)]$ (recall that $T^1 \cong K_1$) has a 4-placement. Moreover, $P_{s-1} (C_s - u_1)$ has a 4-placement such that $\phi_i(p), \phi_j(q)$ ($1 \leq i \neq j \leq 4$) are pairwise distinct by Lemma 3.4 and (2), where p, q are end-vertices of P_{s-1} . Adding edges $\phi_i(p)\phi_i(u_1)$ and $\phi_j(q)\phi_j(u_1)$ for each $1 \leq i \leq 4$, we obtain a 4-placement of G , we are done. So assume $v(F) \leq 5$. Moreover, if C'^2 in G' is a lasso, then by the argument in the paragraph below Case 2, we are done. So by the way of deleting leaves we may assume that G' is isomorphic to the graph in Fig. 9 (b) or the structure of G' is like the graph in Fig. 9 (c) (i.e. B may be $K_1 \uplus P_2 \uplus P_3$ or A may be a cycle rather than a lasso).

We construct an (A, U, B) -structure of G' as follows in these two cases: let $A = C_s$ (or $L(s+1, s)$), $U = \emptyset$ and B consists of at least two paths and K_1 (see Fig. 9 (b)-(c)). Lemmas 3.5 (i), (ii) and 3.7 (iii) imply that each of A and B has a 4-placement such that u_1 in Fig. 9 (b) or the vertices on the path of the lasso (A) in Fig. 9 (c) are 4-placed. Then G' has a good 4-placement by Lemma 3.2. Here, since G has at most three nodes, v_1 or v_{s-1} of the lasso is not a node of G . By symmetry, we may assume that v_1 is not a node.




Figure 9: (A, U, B) -structures of G'

If $|M| = 2$, then the structure of G' is like one of the graphs in Fig. 9 (d)-(e). Let A be the cycle C_s , $U = \{u_1\}$ and $B = G - A$. Lemmas 3.5 (i) (u_1 is 4-fixed by the construction of the 4-placement of a cycle), 3.7 (iii) and 3.2 imply that G' has a good 4-placement. Notice that if u_1 in Fig. 9 (d) is a node, then we delete the leaves of u_1 and by the similar discussion of Fig. 9 (c), G has a 4-placement, since all vertices of $\Phi(C_s)$ except one are 4-placed.

Subcase 2. $|M| = 3$, i.e. $M = \{u_1, u_2, u_3\}$.

In this case, F consists of three vertex disjoint paths, say $P^i = u_1^i u_2^i \cdots u_{n_i}^i$ ($1 \leq i \leq 3$) with $n_3 \geq n_2 \geq n_1$, where $u_i u_1^i \in E(G')$. By the way of deleting leaves and the fact that C'^2 in G' is not a lasso, there are at least two nodes not on the cycle $C_s \in C'^2$. That is, $n_3 \geq n_2 \geq 2$. Let $A = L(s + n_1, s)$, $U = \{u_1^2\}$ and $B = K_1 \uplus G'[V(P^3 \uplus P^2) - \{u_1^2\}]$. By Lemma 3.5 (ii), we may get a 4-placement of A such that u_2, u_3 are 4-placed. Further by Lemmas 3.7 (iii) and 3.2, G' has a good 4-placement, we are done. \square

Acknowledgments

We are very grateful to the referees for their many valuable suggestions and comments, which make the proof much simpler and clearer.

References

- [1] M. Aigner, S. Brandt, Embedding arbitrary graphs of maximum degree two, *J. London Math. Soc.* 48 (1993) 39–51.
- [2] J. Balogh, C. Palmer, On the tree packing conjecture, *SIAM J. Discrete Math.* 27 (2013) 1995–2006.
- [3] B. Bollobás, *Extremal graph theory*, Academic Press, London 1978.
- [4] B. Bollobás, S. E. Eldridge, Packings of graphs and applications to computational complexity, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B.* 25 (1978) 105–124.
- [5] B. Bollobás, Some remarks on packing trees, *Discrete Math.* 46 (1983) 203–204.
- [6] B. Bollobás, A. Kostochka, K. Nakprasit, Packing d -degenerate graphs, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B.* 98 (2008) 85–94.
- [7] J. A. Bondy, U. S. R. Murty, *Graph Theory*, Springer London, 2008.
- [8] D. Burns, S. Schuster, Every $(p, p - 2)$ graph is contained in its complement, *J. Graph Theory* 1 (1977) 277–279.
- [9] D. Burns, S. Schuster, Embedding $(p, p - 1)$ -graph in their complements, *Israel J. Math.* 30 (1978) 313–320.
- [10] W. Cames Van Batenburg, R. J. Kang, Packing two graphs of even girth 10, *Electronic Notes in Discrete Math.* 61 (2017) 191–197.
- [11] W. Cames Van Batenburg, R. J. Kang, Packing graphs of bounded codegree. *Combin. Probab. Comput.* 27 (2018) 725–740.
- [12] Y. Caro and Y. Roditty, A note on packing trees into complete bipartite graphs and on Fishburn’s conjecture, *Discrete Math.* 82 (1990) 323–326.
- [13] P. A. Catlin, Embedding subgraphs and coloring graphs under extremal degree conditions, PhD thesis, The Ohio State University, 1976.
- [14] B. Csaba, A. Shokoufandeh, E. Szemerédi, Proof of a conjecture of Bollobás and Eldridge for graphs of maximum degree three, *Combinatorica* 23 (2003) 35–72.
- [15] B. Csaba, On the Bollobás-Eldridge conjecture for bipartite graphs. *Combin. Probab. Comput.* 16 (2007) 661–691.
- [16] A. Gyárfás, J. Lehel, Packing trees of different order into K_n . *Combinatorics (Proc. Fifth Hungarian Colloq., Keszthely, 1976)*, Vol.I, 463–469, *Colloq. Math. Soc. János Bolyai*, 18, North-Holland, Amsterdam-New York, 1978.
- [17] A. Gyárfás, Packing trees into n -chromatic graphs, *Discuss. Math. Graph Theory*, 34 (2014) 199–201.
- [18] E. Győri, A. Kostochka, A. McConvey, D. Yager, A list version of graph packing, *Discrete Math.* 339 (2016) 2178–2185.

- [19] D. Gerbner, B. Keszegh, C. Palmer, Generalizations of the tree packing conjecture, *Discuss. Math. Graph Theory* 32 (2012) 569–582.
- [20] S. P. Haler, H. Wang, Packing four copies of a tree into a complete graph, *Australas. J. Combin.* 59 (2014) 323–332.
- [21] S. M. Hedetniemi, S. T. Hedetniemi, P. J. Slater, A note on packing two trees into K_n , *Ars Combin.* 11 (1981) 149–153.
- [22] A. M. Hobbs, Packing trees, *Congr. Numer.* 33 (1981) 63–73.
- [23] A. M. Hobbs, B. A. Bourgeois, J. Kasiraj, Packing trees in complete graphs, *Discrete Math.* 67 (1987) 27–42.
- [24] F. Joos, J. Kim, D. Kühn, D. Osthus, Optimal packings of bounded degree trees, *J. Eur. Math. Soc.* 21 (2019) 3573–3647.
- [25] H. Kheddouci, S. Marshall, J. F. Saclé, M. Woźniak, On the packing of three graphs, *Discrete Math.* 236 (2001) 197–225.
- [26] A. V. Kostochka, A. McConvey, D. Yager, On a packing problem of Alon and Yuster, *Discrete Math.* 339 (2016) 2785–2792.
- [27] N. Sauer, J. Spencer, Edge disjoint placement of graphs, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B.* 25 (1978) 295–302.
- [28] H. Wang, N. Sauer, Packing three copies of a tree into a complete graph, *Eur. J. Combin.* 14 (1993) 137–142.
- [29] H. Wang, N. Sauer, Packing three copies of a graph, *J. Graph Theory* 21 (1996) 71–80.
- [30] M. Woźniak, A. P. Wojda, Triple placement of graphs, *Graphs Combin.* 9 (1993) 85–91.
- [31] M. Woźniak, Packing of graphs and permutations-a survey, *Discrete Math.* 276 (2004) 379–391.
- [32] H. P. Yap, Packing of graphs-a survey, *Discrete Math.* 72 (1988) 395–404.
- [33] R. Yuster, On packing trees into complete bipartite graphs, *Discrete Math.* 163 (1997) 325–327.
- [34] A. Žak, A note on k -placeable graphs, *Discrete Math.* 311 (2011) 2634–2636.
- [35] A. Žak, Packing large trees of consecutive orders, *Discrete Math.* 340 (2017) 252–263.
- [36] S. Zaks, C. L. Liu, Decomposition of graphs into trees. *Proceedings of the Eighth South-eastern Conference on Combinatorics, Graph Theory and Computing* (Louisiana State Univ., Baton Rouge, La., 1977), 643–654, *Congr. Numer. No. XIX*, (Utilitas Math., Winnipeg, Man., 1977).