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Abstract. A graph $G$ with $n$ vertices is Hamiltonian if it admits an embedded cycle containing all vertices of $G$. In any Hamiltonian graph, each vertex is the starting point of a Hamiltonian path. In this paper we explore the converse. We show that for $2 < n < 9$, if $G$ admits Hamiltonian paths starting at every vertex then $G$ is Hamiltonian. We also show that this is not true for $n > 9$. We then investigate the number of pairs of vertices in a non-Hamiltonian graph $G$ which can be connected by Hamiltonian paths. In particular we construct a family of non-Hamiltonian graphs with approximately $4/5$ of the pairs of vertices connected by Hamiltonian paths.

1. Introduction

The study of graphs has long been of interest to mathematicians. One of the earliest examples of graph theory was Euler’s solution to the famous Königsberg bridges problem [Wil13]. Graph theory has continued to be studied because of the many interesting problems it poses and because of the usefulness of graphs in many fields including computer science, natural sciences, social sciences, and other areas of math.

One common question in graph theory is whether or not some embedded path in the graph can meet each vertex exactly once; such a path is called a Hamiltonian path. If there exists a Hamiltonian path which is also a cycle, we say that the graph is Hamiltonian. There has been much work on necessary and sufficient conditions to ensure that a graph is Hamiltonian; for example, see [Nas71] and [Ore60].

One reason that Hamiltonian paths and cycles are interesting is because they give maximally efficient paths in a graph which encounter every vertex. Any such path must contain at least $|G| - 1$ edges, and any non-Hamiltonian path touching every vertex must contain strictly more edges. In the case of a Hamiltonian cycle, one can start such a path at any vertex. In this paper, we consider the converse: Suppose you can start a Hamiltonian path at every vertex of the graph. Does this imply that the graph must be Hamiltonian? In general, the answer is no; there exist graphs with Hamiltonian paths from every vertex that are not Hamiltonian. Two examples are $K_2$ and the Petersen graph, $P$ (see Figure 1). The Petersen graph has no Hamiltonian cycles, but has a Hamiltonian path between any two non-adjacent vertices. In fact, for sufficiently large vertex sets, there is always a graph which admits a Hamiltonian path starting at every vertex, but is not Hamiltonian.
Figure 1. These graphs, $K_2$ and $P_4$, admit a Hamiltonian path starting at every vertex (in other words, they are 2- and 10-strung, respectively) but neither are Hamiltonian. For each graph, a Hamiltonian path is colored in red.

To study this phenomenon, we introduce a new property of graphs.

**Definition 1.1.** A graph $G$ is $k$-strung if $k$ of the vertices in $G$ can be the starting vertex in a Hamiltonian path of $G$.

We prove the following theorem, which describes how the properties of being $|G|$-strung and Hamiltonian are related. The relationship depends on the size of a graph.

**Theorem A.** For $n = 2$ and $n \geq 9$, there exists a non-Hamiltonian graph $G$ with $n$ vertices that is $n$-strung. For $3 \leq n \leq 8$, every $n$-strung graph on $n$ vertices is Hamiltonian.

When we decrease the value of $k$, we can find $k$-strung graphs that are not Hamiltonian for all sizes of graph.

**Theorem B.** For all integers $n > 2$, there exists a non-Hamiltonian graph on $n$ vertices that is $(n - 1)$-strung.

In fact, a stronger statement is true. First, consider a graph $G$. Define the ratio $c_G = \frac{k}{|G|}$, where $k$ is the largest number such that $G$ is $k$-strung:

**Theorem C.** For any rational number $c \in [0, 1]$ there exists a non-Hamiltonian graph that has $c_G = c$.

1.1. **Organization.** The rest of the paper is organized as follows: In Section 2 we introduce some definitions and establish notation. In Section 3 we prove Theorem A. The proof for $n \geq 9$ is constructive, and the proof for $3 \leq n \leq 8$ is computer aided (the algorithm is described in Section 6).
We prove Theorem $B$ and Theorem $C$ in Section $4$. The proofs are constructive. In Section $5$ we extend the concept of $k$-strung graphs to consider Hamiltonian paths between specified pairs of vertices, and include some preliminary results regarding Hamiltonicity of graphs given a specified number of Hamiltonian paths between pairs of vertices.
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2. Background and Notation

In this section, we introduce some standard definitions and establish notation. A good introductory reference to graph theory is [Bol98]. Readers familiar with graph theory can probably skip this section without confusion.

A graph, $G$, consists of a finite, non-empty set, $V(G)$, of vertices along with an edge set, $E(G)$, of unordered pairs of distinct nodes from $V(G)$. We say that the size of a graph, $|G|$, is equal to the size of its vertex set.

A path of length $n$ in a graph is a map $\gamma : [0,n] \to G$ so that $\gamma(i)$ is in $V(G)$ for all $i \in \{0,1,\ldots,n\}$. In practice, we will identify $\gamma$ with its image, and use a list of vertices, $\gamma(0), \gamma(1), \ldots, \gamma(n)$, to identify $\gamma$. We say that $\gamma$ is an embedded path if $\gamma$ is an injective map. Two paths $\gamma = v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n$ and $\gamma' = w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_m$ can be concatenated into a single path, $\gamma \cdot \gamma' = v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n, w_1, \ldots, w_m$ if $(v_n, w_1) \in E(G)$.

In this paper, we will assume that all of our graphs are connected. In particular, we assume that given any two vertices $v, w$ in $V(G)$, there exists a path $\gamma$ of length $n$ in $G$ such that $\gamma(0) = v$ and $\gamma(n) = w$.

If $\gamma$ is a path of length $n$ and $\gamma(0) = \gamma(n)$, we say that $\gamma$ is a cycle. If $\gamma$ is injective except at 0 and $n$, we say that $\gamma$ is an embedded cycle. By writing $\gamma = v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n, v_1$, we can see that $\gamma$ also gives rise to $2n - 1$ other cycles, given by cyclic permutations and inversions of the sequence $v_1, \ldots, v_n$.

A Hamiltonian path in a graph is an embedded path of length $|G| - 1$ and a Hamiltonian cycle is an embedded cycle of length $|G|$. A graph, $G$, that admits a Hamiltonian cycle is said to be Hamiltonian.

Some standard examples of families of graphs include complete graphs, written $K_n$. A graph is complete if for every pair of vertices there is an edge between them. A star on $k + 1$ vertices, denoted $S_k$, is defined by $V(S_k) = \{s, v_1, \ldots, v_k\}$ and $E(S_k) = \{(s, v_i) | 1 \leq i \leq k\}$. The path graph on $n$ vertices, denoted $P_n$, is defined by $V(P_k) = \{v_1, \ldots, v_n\}$ and $E(P_k) = \{(v_i, v_{i+1}) | i = 1, 2, \ldots, n - 1\}$. An example complete graph, star graph, and path graph are shown in Figure $2$.

Note that for any $k \geq 3$, the star graph $S_k$ contains no Hamiltonian paths or cycles. Indeed, for any path in $S_k$, any two vertices $v_i, v_j$ cannot be adjacent to each other, since they are adjacent only to vertex $s$. Therefore, a path which contains all vertices must contain $s$ at least $k - 1$ times, and therefore can not be Hamiltonian.
Path graphs contain exactly two Hamiltonian paths, and no Hamiltonian cycles.

Another important graph, which we will use extensively in this paper, is the Peterson graph, $P$, illustrated in Figure 1. One reason the Peterson graph is so ubiquitous in graph theory is its symmetry. In particular, for any pair of edges $e, e'$, there is an automorphism of the Petersen graph which sends $e$ to $e'$. It’s a well known folk theorem that the Petersen graph is not Hamiltonian but admits many Hamiltonian paths. The following lemma gives one such path.

**Lemma 2.1.** For any vertex $w$ in the Petersen graph there exists a Hamiltonian path starting at $w$ and containing each of the following edges:

$$(p_1, p_6), (p_2, p_8), (p_3, p_{10}), (p_4, p_7), (p_5, p_9),$$

where vertices are labeled as in Figure 1.

**Proof.** Suppose $w = p_1$. Then the following path is sufficient:

$$\gamma = p_1, p_6, p_7, p_4, p_5, p_9, p_8, p_2, p_3, p_{10}.$$  

By the symmetry of the Peterson graph, we can find analogous paths beginning at all other vertices. □

In fact, it can be verified that for any two non-adjacent vertices it is possible to find a Hamiltonian path that begins at one and ends at the other. As a result, $P$ is 10-strung, but not Hamiltonian.

3. **Fully Strung non-Hamiltonian Graphs**

In this section, we fully classify when being maximally strung implies Hamiltonicity. We will consider several cases depending on the number of vertices in the graph, $n$. When $n = 2$, there is only one connected graph to consider. For $n = 9$ we consider a specific graph and show that it is 9-strung but not Hamiltonian. For $n = 10$ the Petersen graph is 10-strung but not Hamiltonian, and for $n > 10$ we use the Petersen graph as a base from which we can create a graph $P_n$ with $|P_n| = n$ which is $n$-strung but not Hamiltonian. To show that every graph of size $2 < n < 9$ which is
Figure 3. This graph on 9 vertices is 9 strung. A Hamiltonian path on the graph is drawn in red.

$n$-strung is also Hamiltonian we use a computer program which enumerates all possible $n$-strung graphs and decides whether they are Hamiltonian.

**Theorem A.** For $n = 2$ and $n \geq 9$, there exists a non-Hamiltonian graph $G$ with $n$ vertices that is $n$-strung. For $3 \leq n \leq 8$, every $n$-strung graph on $n$ vertices is Hamiltonian.

**Proof.** We will consider several cases.

**Claim 3.1.** Theorem A holds for $n = 2$.

**Proof.** The complete graph $K_2$ has a Hamiltonian path between its vertices but no Hamiltonian cycle. \(\square\)

**Claim 3.2.** Theorem A holds for $n = 9$.

**Proof.** Consider the graph $G$ shown in Figure 3. This graph is made by taking two copies of $K_3$, one with vertices labeled $\{a_1, a_2, a_3\}$ (called the outer triangle) and the other with vertices labeled $\{c_1, c_2, c_3\}$ (called the inner triangle). We add in three vertices $\{b_1, b_2, b_3\}$ and edges $(a_i, b_i)$ and $(b_i, c_i)$ for each $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$.

We claim that this is a 9-strung graph that is not Hamiltonian. To show this is 9-strung, consider the Hamiltonian path $a_1, b_1, c_1, c_2, c_3, b_3, a_3, a_2, b_2$, as illustrated in Figure 3. The symmetry of the graph gives Hamiltonian paths starting (or ending) at the other 7 vertices.

To show this graph is not Hamiltonian, suppose for contradiction that this graph admits a Hamiltonian cycle, $C = v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_9$. Up to cyclic permutations of $C$, we may assume that $v_1 = a_1$. Notice that if $v_i = b_j$ (where the subscripts are taken modulo 9), then $v_{i-1}$ is one of $a_j$ or $c_j$, and $v_{i+1}$ the other. In particular, every time the cycle crosses one of the
Claim 3.3. Theorem A holds for \( n \geq 10 \).

Proof. The Petersen graph, \( P \), is a 10-strung graph on 10 vertices that is not Hamiltonian. Label the vertices of the Petersen graph \( p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_{10} \) as in Figure 1, such \( P \) contains the edges \((p_1, p_6), (p_2, p_8), (p_3, p_{10}), (p_4, p_7), (p_5, p_9)\). The other 10 edges are along the cycles \( p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4, p_5 \) and \( p_6, p_7, p_8, p_9, p_{10} \). For \( n > 10 \), we construct a graph \( P_n \) which is \( n \)-strung on \( n \)-vertices and not Hamiltonian. Consider a copy of \( K_{n-10} \), with vertices labeled \( \{x_1, \ldots, x_{n-10}\} \).

We construct \( P_n \) by joining \( P \) and \( K_{n-10} \) so that \( V(P_n) = V(P) \cup V(K_{n-10}) \) and \( E(P_n) = E(P) \cup E(K_{n-10}) \cup \{(x_i, p_1), (x_i, p_6) \mid i \in [n-10]\} \). The graph \( P_n \) is illustrated in Figure 2.

By Lemma 2.1, for any vertex \( p_i \in P \) there exists a Hamiltonian path \( \gamma \) in \( P \) starting at \( p_i \), with \( p_1 \) and \( p_6 \) in succession. Therefore \( \gamma \) is of the form \( \gamma = p_i, \ldots, p_1, p_6, \ldots, p_j \). Define a path \( \gamma' \) in \( P_n \) as follows:

\[
\gamma' = p_i, \ldots, p_1, x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{n-10}, p_6, \ldots, p_j.
\]

Since \( x_1, \ldots, x_{n-10} \) is a Hamiltonian path in \( K_{n-10} \), and \((p_1, x_1)\) and \((p_6, x_{n-10})\) are edges in \( G \), \( \gamma' \) is a Hamiltonian path in \( P_n \).

Next we show that for each vertex \( x_i \in K_{n-10} \) there is a Hamiltonian path in \( P_n \) starting at \( x_i \). There is an embedded path \( x_i, x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_{i-1} \) (where subscripts are taken modulo \( n-10 \)) in \( K_{n-10} \). There is an embedded Hamiltonian path in \( P \) given by \( p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_{10} \). Now, consider the path:

\[
\lambda = x_i, x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_{i+n-10}, p_1, \ldots, p_{10}.
\]

This is an embedded Hamiltonian path in \( P_n \). Thus \( P_n \) is \( n \)-strung.

Finally, we show that there is no Hamiltonian cycle in \( P_n \). Assume for contradiction that there is. Up to cyclic permutations of the cycle, we may assume that the cycle begins at \( p_6 \). Label the vertices so that \( w_i \) are vertices of \( P \) not including \( p_1, p_6 \), and \( x_i \) are the vertices of \( K_{n-10} \). Notice that every vertex \( x_i \) is adjacent only to vertices labeled \( p_1, p_6 \), or \( x_j \), and similarly any vertex \( w_i \) is adjacent only to vertices labeled \( p_1, p_6 \), or \( w_j \). So the cycle must take the form \( C = p_6, w_1, \ldots, w_8, p_1, x_1, \ldots, x_{n-10} \) (up to inversion). Removing \( x_1, \ldots, x_{n-10} \) then gives a path \( p_1, w_1, \ldots, w_8, p_6 \) in \( P \). However, since there is an edge between \( p_1 \) and \( p_6 \), this gives a Hamiltonian cycle in the Petersen graph, which is impossible. 

Claim 3.4. Theorem A holds for \( 3 \leq n \leq 8 \).
Figure 4. The graph $P_n$ shown here has $n > 10$ vertices and is $n$-strung, but is not Hamiltonian.

Proof. This is proven by computer algorithm which checks all potential graphs with $3 \leq n \leq 8$ vertices. The algorithm is provided in Section 6, and the program can be found at [CFne].

By Claims 1, 2, 3, and 4, for $n = 2$ and $n \geq 9$, there exists a non-Hamiltonian graph $G$ with $n$ vertices that is $n$-strung, and for $3 \leq n \leq 8$, every $n$-strung graph on $n$ vertices is Hamiltonian.

4. Spectrum Results

In Section 3, we established that for sufficiently large graphs $G$, there exist $|G|$-strung graphs which are not Hamiltonian. In this section, we show that this is also true when we consider $k$-strungness, for $k < |G|$.

Definition 4.1. For a graph $G$, let $c_G = \max\left\{ \frac{k}{|G|} | G \text{ is } k\text{-strung} \right\}$.

From Theorem A, we know that there are graphs for which $c_G = 1$ and $G$ is not Hamiltonian. In this section, we will show that for any rational number $c \in [0, 1]$ there is some graph $G$ so that $c_G = c$ and $G$ is not Hamiltonian. In fact, we will show that not only is it possible to achieve any rational number between 0 and 1, but also that for any positive integers $1 < m < n$ such that $c = \frac{m}{n}$, we can find a non-Hamiltonian graph $G$ on $n$ vertices which is $m$-strung and not Hamiltonian.

We begin by showing that we can achieve $c = \frac{n-1}{n}$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}_{>2}$. The main idea of this proof is to construct a graph with a vertex through which any Hamiltonian cycle would have to pass through twice.

Theorem B. For all integers $n > 2$, there exists a non-Hamiltonian graph on $n$ vertices that is $(n-1)$-strung.
Figure 5. The graph illustrated here has \( n + k - 1 \) vertices. It contains \( A \), the complete graph on \( n - 1 \) vertices, and is \((n - 1)\)-strung.

**Proof.** Let \( A = K_{n-1} \) be a complete graph and \( a \in V(A) \) one of its vertices. Define a graph \( G \) by adding another vertex, \( v \), to \( A \) and adding an edge between \( a \) and \( v \). We then have \( V(G) = V(A) \cup \{v\} \) and \( E(G) = E(A) \cup \{(a, v)\} \). We will now show that \( G \) is non-Hamiltonian and \((k - 1)\)-strung.

Suppose that \( G \) were Hamiltonian. Any Hamiltonian cycle would include a sub-path from \( v \) to \( a \) and an edge-disjoint sub-path from \( a \) to \( v \). But both of these sub-paths must contain the edge \((a, v)\), which is a contradiction. Similarly, there is no Hamiltonian path in \( G \) that begins at \( a \) because it would have to pass through \( a \) to switch between \( A \) and \( \{v\} \), which it must do to visit every vertex.

Now, consider any vertex \( w_1 \in V(A) - \{a\} \). Since \( A \) is complete, there is a Hamiltonian path \( w_1, \ldots, w_{n-2}, a, v \). Thus there is a Hamiltonian path starting from every vertex in \( G \) other than \( a \), and \( G \) is a non-Hamiltonian graph on \( n \) vertices that is \((n - 1)\)-strung. \( \square \)

A similar construction yields a proof of Theorem C. However, instead of adding a single vertex \( v \) to the complete graph, we will add a path graph with vertices \( v, v_2, v_3, \ldots, v_k \). This increases the number of vertices that can not be the beginning vertex in a Hamiltonian path.

**Theorem C.** For any rational number \( c \in [0, 1] \) there exists a non-Hamiltonian graph that has \( c_G = c \).

In the following proof, we let \( c = p/q \) and construct a graph with \( n = 2q \) vertices which is \( 2p \)-strung. This may seem surprising; why not construct a graph with \( n = q \) vertices? This doubling is necessary because there is no graph (with more than one vertex) which is 1-strung. Since any Hamiltonian path has two possible starting vertices, every graph that admits one Hamiltonian path must be at least 2-strung. For any \( c = 1/n < 1 \), it is impossible to find a graph on \( n \) vertices which is 1-strung.

**Proof.** Recall that any star graph \( S_k \) with \( k \geq 3 \) cannot have a Hamiltonian path, and is therefore 0-strung. From Theorem A we know that the graphs
$P_n$ are $n$-strung, non-Hamiltonian, and have $n$-vertices, where $n > 10$. So for $c = 0$ and $c = 1$, there exists an $n$ such that there exists a graph on $n$ vertices that is $cn$-strung.

Consider some $c = \frac{p}{q} \in (0, 1)$ where $p, q \in \mathbb{N}$. We will construct a $2p$-strung graph on $2q$ vertices. Let $A = K_{2p}$ be a complete graph and $a \in V(A)$ one of its vertices. Let $k = 2q - 2p$, and let $B = L_k$ with endpoints $v_1$ and $v_k$. Define a graph, $G$, by adding an edge between $a$ and $v_1$. We then have $V(G) = V(A) \cup V(B)$ and $E(G) = E(A) \cup E(B) \cup \{(a, v_1)\}$, as illustrated in Figure 5. We will now show that $G$ is non-Hamiltonian and $2p$-strung.

By similar argument as in the proof of Theorem B, $G$ is not Hamiltonian, and there is no Hamiltonian path originating at $a$. Additionally, any vertex $x \in B \setminus \{v_k\}$ cannot be the origin of a Hamiltonian path by a similar argument.

Now, consider any vertex $w_1 \in V(A) \setminus \{a\}$. Since $A$ is complete, there is a Hamiltonian path $w_1, \ldots, w_{2p-1}, a, v_1, \ldots, v_k$. Thus there is a Hamiltonian path starting from $v_k$ as well as every vertex in $V(A) \setminus \{a\}$. Therefore $c_G = \frac{2p}{2q} = \frac{p}{q} = c$ as desired.

\[\square\]

**Corollary 4.2.** For any rational number $c \in (0, 1)$ and natural number $n \geq 2$ such that $cn \in \mathbb{N}$ and $cn \neq 1$, we can construct a non-Hamiltonian graph on $n$ vertices that has $c_G = c$.

**Proof.** This result follows from the same construction used in the proof of Theorem B. Take the union of a $cn$-complete graph and a path graph of length $n - cn$, as in the construction above. This graph will be $cn$-strung with $n$ vertices. \[\square\]

## 5. Pair strung Graphs

If a graph on $n$ vertices is Hamiltonian then any pair of vertices adjacent to each other in the Hamiltonian cycle are the start and end vertices of a Hamiltonian path. Therefore there are at least $n$ pairs of vertices in $G$ which are connected by a Hamiltonian path. In this section, we explore the converse: Is there a value $k$ such that if a graph $G$ has Hamiltonian paths connecting $k$ pairs of vertices, then $G$ must be Hamiltonian? With this in mind we introduce the following definition.

**Definition 5.1.** A graph $G$ is $k$-pair-strung if $k$ pairs of the vertices in $G$ have a Hamiltonian path between them.

**Definition 5.2.** If a graph, $G$, is $k$-pair-strung, define

$$r_G = \max \left\{ \frac{k}{|G|} \mid G \text{ is } k\text{-pair-strung} \right\}.$$

Given a set of graphs, $\mathcal{G}$, define $R_\mathcal{G} = \sup \{r_G \mid G \in \mathcal{G} \text{ and } G \text{ is not Hamiltonian} \}$. In the case when all $G \in \mathcal{G}$ are Hamiltonian, we say $R_\mathcal{G} = 0$. If $\mathcal{G}_n$ is the set
For a graph, $G$, $r_G$ is the fraction of pairs of vertices that have a Hamiltonian path between them, therefore $r_G \leq 1$ for all $G$, and $R \leq 1$. If $G \in \mathcal{G}$ and $r_G > R_G$, then $G$ must be Hamiltonian. We spend the rest of this section establishing bounds on $R_n$ and $R$.

**Lemma 5.3.** Let $G$ be $k$-pair-strung graph on three or more vertices. If $k + |E(G)| > \binom{|G|}{2}$, then $G$ admits a Hamiltonian cycle.

**Proof.** By the pigeon hole principal, there exists a pair of vertices that have both an edge and a Hamiltonian path between them. Since $|G| \geq 3$, any Hamiltonian path must have length at least 2, so the edge between the vertices can not be in the Hamiltonian path. Connecting the edge and path, we get a Hamiltonian cycle. \qed

This shows that $k$-pair-strungness implies Hamiltonicity if $r_G$ is sufficiently large. We now aim to tighten the bound for which $r_G$ serves as a sufficient condition. The following three theorems give upper and lower bounds on $R_n$, respectively. We suspect that these bounds can be made sharper with further analysis.

**Theorem D.** For a graph $G$ with $|G| > 3$, $R_n \leq \frac{|G|-2}{|G|}$.

**Proof.** Consider a non-Hamiltonian graph, $G$, with at least one Hamiltonian path $\gamma$ and $n$ vertices. Label the vertices $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n$ in order along $\gamma$. Consider any other Hamiltonian path $\gamma' = v_{i_1}, v_{i_2}, \ldots, v_{i_n}$. If $i_1 = k$ and $i_n = k \pm 1$, then $\gamma$ is a Hamiltonian cycle. Thus any Hamiltonian path in $G$ can not start and end on vertices with labels differing by one. We enumerate the pairs of vertices that aren’t adjacent with respect to our labeling by counting the lower numbered vertex. Starting from $v_1$, we have $n-2$ pairs. From $v_k$, we have $n-2-k+1$. The total number of non-adjacent pairs is then

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n-2} i = \frac{(n-1)(n-2)}{2}.$$

Dividing by the number of pairs of vertices, $\binom{n}{2}$, we get $R_n \leq \frac{n-2}{n}$. \qed

**Remark 5.4.** It follows that any graph $G$ on three or more vertices with $r_G = 1$ must be Hamiltonian. Thus $R_n \leq 1$ for all $n \geq 3$.

We now explore lower bounds for $R_n$ in Theorems E and F.

**Theorem E.** Let $G$ be a graph with $|G| = n$. If $n > 1$ is odd, $R_n \geq \frac{n-1}{2n}$. If $n$ is even, $R_n \geq \frac{n-2}{2n-2}$.

**Proof.** We construct non-Hamiltonian graphs that are appropriately pair-strung.
First suppose $n = 2k + 1$ is odd. Let $G$ be the graph constructed as follows: Let $A = K_k$, $B = K_k$, and $\{v\}$ be a single vertex. Let $V(G) = V(A) \uplus V(B) \uplus \{v\}$ and $E(G) = E(A) \uplus E(B) \uplus \{(u, v) | u \in V(A) \uplus V(B)\}$.

For every pair of vertices where one is in $A$ and the other is in $B$, there is a Hamiltonian path between them. These are the only Hamiltonian paths in $G$, since any other Hamiltonian path would pass through $\{v\}$ twice. Therefore $G$ is $k^2$-pair-strung, and we have

$$r_G = \frac{k^2}{\binom{n}{2}} = \frac{2k^2}{(2k + 1)(2k)} = \frac{k}{2k + 1} = \frac{n - 1}{2n}.$$  

Now suppose that $n = 2k$ is even. Let $G$ be the graph constructed as above, but with $B = K_{k-1}$ (so $B$ is the complete graph on $k - 1$ vertices, instead of on $k$ vertices). Then $G$ is $k(k - 1)$-pair-strung and

$$r_G = \frac{k(k - 1)}{\binom{n}{2}} = \frac{k(k - 1)}{k(2k - 1)} = \frac{k - 1}{2k - 1} = \frac{n - 2}{2n - 2}.$$  

Theorem E gives us a preliminary lower bound for $R_n$ for all natural numbers $n$. We now explore a different construction, which gives us a much higher lower bound for certain sufficiently large multiples of 5.

**Theorem F.** Let $n = 10 + 5k$ where $k$ is a non-negative integer. Then $R_n \geq \frac{4(n^2 - 25)}{5(n-1)n}$. 

\[\text{Figure 6. The Peterson graph, with labeling as indicated in the proof of Theorem E. We obtain the family of graphs constructed in that proof by attaching a copy of $K_{(n-10)/5}$ for each red edge, with an edge between each vertex in $K_{(n-10)/5}$ and the endpoints of the corresponding red edge.}\]
Proof. We construct a graph, $G$, on $n = 10 + 5k$ vertices for which $r_G = 4(n^2 - 25)/5(n-1)$. We begin by labelling the Peterson graph $P$ as in Figure 5. Note that $p_i$ is adjacent to $q_j$ exactly when $i = j$, and $P$ contains two disjoint cycles $p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4, p_5$ and $q_1, q_2, q_3, q_4, q_5, q_6$.

We construct $G$ as follows: Take the Peterson graph, $P$, and five complete graphs labeled $A_i$ for $i \in [5]$. Add edges from $p_i$ and $q_i$ to each vertex in $A_i$. Thus $V(G) = V(P) \{V(A_i)\}$, and $E(G) = E(P) \{E(A_i)\} \{(a_j,p_i),(a_k,q_i)\}$. Then $|G| = 10 + 5n$. We will show that $G$ is $(10k^2 + 30k + 40)$-pair-strung.

Claim 5.5. The graph $G$ is not Hamiltonian.

Proof. The proof is analogous to that of Claim 3.3. □

Claim 5.6. Let $u$ a vertex in $V(A_i) \{p_i,q_i\}$ and $v$ a vertex in $V(A_i)$. Then there is no Hamiltonian path between $u$ and $v$.

Proof. Suppose $u,v \in V(A_i)$. Any Hamiltonian path from $u$ to $v$ would have length $> 2$, so it could not contain the edge between $u$ and $v$. Thus such a path would be a Hamiltonian cycle, contradicting Claim 5.5. Suppose that $u \in \{p_i,q_i\}$. By the same argument, there can be no Hamiltonian path connecting $u$ and $v$. □

Claim 5.7. Let $u \in V(A_i)$ and $v \in V(A_j)$, where $i \neq j$. There is a Hamiltonian path starting at $u$ and ending at $v$.

Proof. By symmetry of the Peterson graph, it suffices to prove this for $i = 1$ and $j = 5$.

For each $i \in [5]$, let $\gamma_i$ denote a Hamiltonian path in $A_i$, chosen so that the first vertex of $\gamma_1$ is $u$ and the last vertex of $\gamma_5$ is $v$. Then the following path is Hamiltonian:

$$\gamma = \gamma_1 \cdot q_1, p_1, p_2 \cdot q_2, q_4, \gamma_4 \cdot p_4, p_3 \cdot q_3, q_5 \cdot q_5, p_5.$$ □

Claim 5.8. Let $u \in V(A_i)$ and $v \in V(P) - \{p_i,q_i\}$. There is a Hamiltonian path connecting $u$ to $v$.

Proof. We may assume that $u \in V(A_1)$. There are two cases: Either the shortest path from $v$ to $A_1$ has length 2, or it has length 3.

We will define 5 paths that we will use. For each $i \in \{2,3,4,5\}$, let $\gamma_i$ be a Hamiltonian path in $A_i$. Let $\gamma_1$ be a path in $A_1$ containing every vertex except $u$.

Suppose that the shortest path from $v$ to $A_1$ has length 3. We can assume without loss of generality that $v = q_2$. The following path suffices:

$$\gamma = u, \gamma_1, p_1, q_1, q_4, \gamma_4, p_4, q_5, \gamma_5, q_5, q_3, \gamma_3, p_3, p_2, \gamma_2, q_2.$$ If instead the shortest path from $v$ to $A_1$ has length 2, we can assume without loss of generality that $v = p_2$. The following path suffices:

$$\gamma = u, q_1 \gamma_1, p_1, p_5, \gamma_5, q_5, q_3, \gamma_3, p_3, q_4, \gamma_4, q_4, q_2, \gamma_2, p_2.$$
Claim 5.9. For the graph $G$ as defined above, $r_G = \frac{4(n^2-25)}{5(n-1)n}$.

Proof. We enumerate the pairs of vertices of $G$ which are connected by a Hamiltonian path. First, we consider pairs of vertices where both vertices lie in distinct subgraphs $A_i$ and $A_j$. There are $\binom{5}{2} = 10$ such pairs. In each pair, we can choose from $k$ vertices in either subgraph. Thus there are $10k^2$ pairs of this type.

Secondly, we look at pairs of vertices where one vertex lies in a complete subgraph and the other does not. There are 10 vertices that are not in a complete subgraph. Each of these vertices has edges to exactly one of the complete subgraphs, while having Hamiltonian paths between it and the vertices in the other four complete subgraphs. Thus, there are $10 \times 4 \times k = 40k$ pairs of this type.

Lastly, we count pairs where both vertices are in the Petersen graph part of $G$. Recall that the Petersen graph has a Hamiltonian path between all non-adjacent vertices. This gives 30 pairs of vertices where neither are in a complete subgraph that are connected by a Hamiltonian path.

We thus have

$$r_G = \frac{10k^2 + 40k + 30}{\binom{10+5k}{2}} = \frac{20k^2 + 80k + 60}{25k^2 + 95k + 90}.$$  

Plugging in $k = \frac{n-10}{5}$ we get

$$r_G = \frac{4(n^2 - 25)}{5(n-1)n}$$

as desired.

Since $G$ is a non-Hamiltonian graph on $n$ vertices, for all $n = 10 + 5k$, with $k \geq 0$,

$$R_n \geq \frac{4(n^2 - 25)}{5(n-1)n},$$

Asymptotically, this implies that $R \geq \frac{4}{5}$. However, the maximum value is actually obtained when $k = 50$, giving us the following slightly stronger result.

Corollary 5.10. $\frac{198}{245} \leq R \leq 1$.

Proof. For $k = 50$, Theorem F tells us that $R_G = \frac{198}{245}$, therefore $R \geq \frac{198}{245} \approx .808$.  

\[ \square \]
Figure 7. Overview of algorithm checking for $n$-strung non-Hamiltonian graphs on $n$ vertices.

6. Algorithm for Theorem B

The algorithm described here (and illustrated in Figure 7) is used in the proof of Theorem B. For a fixed number $n$, it enumerates all graphs with $n$ vertices that contain at least one Hamiltonian path. For each graph, the program first uses a ‘Backtracking Algorithm’ (see for example Section 4.5 in [JS03]) to check whether there is a Hamiltonian cycle in the graph. It then checks for a Hamiltonian path starting at every vertex, again using the Backtracking Algorithm. Computer code realizing this algorithm can be found at [CFnc].

In this code, graphs are enumerated by adjacency matrices. Since we only check graphs with at least one Hamiltonian path, we number the vertices in the graph by following that path. Thus every adjacency matrix will be a symmetric $n \times n$ matrix with 0’s along the main diagonal, 1’s along the adjacent diagonals, and 0’s in the upper right and lower left corners, as below:
where each * can take the value 0 or 1. Since adjacency matrices are symmetric, there are \(2^{(n^2-3n)/2}\) possible matrices to check.

Here is the full algorithm. It returns TRUE if there exists a graph on \(n\) vertices which is \(n\)-strung but not Hamiltonian. It returns FALSE otherwise.

1. Input \(n\).
2. Set \(\text{maxID} = 2^{(n^2-3n)/2}\).
3. For integer \(\text{id} = 0\) to \(\text{maxID}\):
   a. Create adjacency matrix \(M\) via the following:
      i. Convert \(\text{id}\) to a string that gives its value in binary.
      ii. Pad the string on the left with zeros so that the total length of the string is \((n^2-n)/2 - n = (n^2-3n)/2\). Call the new string \(\text{idString}\).
      iii. Insert a 0 into \(\text{idString}\) at position \(\text{len(idString)} - n + 3\). (This corresponds to the 0’s in the upper right and lower left corners of \(M\).)
      iv. Initialize an \(n \times n\) matrix, \(M\).
      v. Fill in the main diagonal of \(M\) with 0’s and fill the diagonals adjacent to the main one with 1’s.
      vi. Iterate over the characters of \(\text{idString}\) from right to left while simultaneously iterating over the entries of \(M\) (top to bottom, left to right only looking at the upper triangle of non-filled entries and filling in the bottom triangle to make it symmetric) and putting a 0 or 1 into \(M\) as specified by \(\text{idString}\).
   b. Use the Backtracking Algorithm to determine if the corresponding graph has a Hamiltonian cycle.
   c. Use the Backtracking Algorithm starting at each vertex to determine if the corresponding graph has a Hamiltonian path starting from each vertex.
   d. If graph has no Hamiltonian cycle and has Hamiltonian path starting from each vertex, RETURN TRUE
4. RETURN FALSE
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