A spectral condition for the existence of $C_{2k+1}$ in non-bipartite graphs
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Abstract: A graph $G$ is $H$-free, if it contains no subgraph isomorphic to $H$. In 2010, Nikiforov proposed a Brualdi-Solheid-Turán type problem: what is the maximum spectral radius of an $H$-free graph of order $n$? Guo, Lin and Zhao proved a Brualdi-Solheid-Turán type problem on non-bipartite graphs for pentagon. In this paper, we study that if $G$ is a non-bipartite graph with sufficiently large order $n$ and $\rho(G) \geq \rho(K_{\lceil \frac{n-2}{3} \rceil}, \lceil \frac{n-2}{3} \rceil) \cdot K_3$, then $G$ contains a $C_{2k+1}$ unless $G \cong K_{\lceil \frac{n-2}{3} \rceil}, \lceil \frac{n-2}{3} \rceil} \cdot K_3$, where $K_{a,b} \cdot K_3$ is the graph obtained by identifying a vertex of $K_{a,b}$ belonging to the part of size $b$ and a vertex of $K_3$.
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1 Introduction

Throughout this paper we consider finite, undirected, and simple graphs. For notation and terminology not defined here, we refer the reader to Bondy and Murty [1]. Let $G$ be a graph of order $n$ with vertex set $V(G)$ and edge set $E(G)$, and let $e(G) = |E(G)|$. For $u, v \in V(G)$, denoted by $N_G(u) = \{v \mid v$ is adjacent to $u\}$, $N_G[u] = N_G(u) \cup \{u\}$, $d_G(u) = |N_G(u)|$ and $\delta(G) = \min\{d_G(u) : u \in V(G)\}$. Let $\omega(G)$ be the number of connected components of $G$. For the sake of simplicity, we omit all the subscripts if $G$ is clear from the context. The adjacency matrix of $G$ is an $n \times n$ matrix $A(G)$ whose $(i, j)$-entry is 1 if $v_i$ is adjacent to $v_j$ and 0 otherwise. We denote by $\rho(G)$ the spectral radius of $A(G)$.

As usual, we write $K_l$, $P_l$, $C_l$ for the complete graph, the path, the cycle of order $l$, respectively. Also, let $S_{n,k}$ be the graph obtained from $K_k$ by joining $n - k$ isolated vertices with each vertex in $K_k$, and $S_{n,k}^-$ be the graph obtained by adding one edge within the independent set of $S_{n,k}$. For any $V_1 \subseteq V(G)$, let $G[V_1]$ and $G - V_1$ (or $G - G[V_1]$) be the subgraphs of $G$ induced by $V_1$ and $V(G) - V_1$, respectively. For any natural number $k$, denote by $kG$ the disjoint union of $k$ copies of $G$.

A graph $G$ is $H$-free, if it contains no $H$ as a subgraph. In 2010, Nikiforov [13] investigated how large $\rho(G)$ could be when $G$ contains no cycles and paths of specified order. He also raised a Brualdi-Solheid-Turán type problem: “what is the maximum spectral radius of an $H$-free graph of order $n$?” and put forward the following conjecture:

Conjecture 1. ([13]) For $k \geq 2$ and sufficiently large $n$, $S_{n,k}^+$ is the unique graph attaining the maximum spectral radius among all graphs with no $C_{2k+2}$.
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Up to now, Conjecture 1 has been confirmed for hexagon, i.e., \( k = 3 \) in [16]. For small cycles \( C_4 \), Zhai and Wang [17] and Nikiforov [12] characterized the extremal graphs among \( C_4 \)-free graphs with odd and even order, respectively. Also, much attention has been paid to Brualdi-Solheid-Turán type problem for other kinds of \( H \), such as clique [15], path [13], and complete bipartite graph [10], etc. For more relevant results, we refer the reader to [2, 3, 7, 14] and references therein. In particular, Nikiforov [11] presented the following result, which gave a spectral condition for the existence of \( C_{2k+1} \) in a graph.

**Theorem 1.1.** ([11]) Let \( G \) be a graph of sufficiently large order \( n \) with \( \rho(G) > \sqrt{\frac{\pi^2}{4}} \). Then \( G \) contains a cycle of length \( t \) for every \( t \leq \frac{n}{220} \).

Ning and Peng [9] slightly refined Theorem 1.1 as \( n \geq 160t \). Very recently, by using completely different methods, Zhai and Lin [18] improved the result to \( n \geq 7t \) by omitting the condition “sufficiently large order \( n \)”, and Li and Ning [7] showed it to \( n \geq 4t \). Since the extremal graph is a balanced complete bipartite graph, The authors [6] posed a natural Brualdi-Solheid-Turán type problem for non-bipartite graphs as follows.

**Problem 1.** ([6]) What is the maximum spectral radius of a \( C_7 \)-free non-bipartite graph of order \( n \)?

It is clearly that if \( l \) is even, then the answer to Problem 1 also implies Conjecture 1. If \( l \) is odd, Lin, Ning and Wu [8] solved Problem 1 for \( l = 3 \). Let \( a, b \) be two positive integers with \( a + b = n - 2 \). We denote by \( K_{a,b} \cdot K_3 \) the graph obtained by identifying a vertex of \( K_{a,b} \) belonging to the part of size \( b \) and a vertex of \( K_3 \). Very recently, for a non-bipartite graph \( G \), Guo, Lin and Zhao [6] gave an answer to Problem 1 for \( l = 5 \). They further posed the following problem.

**Problem 2.** ([6]) Let \( G \) be a non-bipartite graph with order \( n \) and \( k \) be a positive integer. If \( n \) is sufficiently large with respect to \( k \) and \( \rho(G) \geq \rho(K_{\lfloor \frac{n+2}{2}\rfloor,\lfloor \frac{n+2}{2}\rfloor} \cdot K_3) \), does \( G \) always contain a \( C_{2k+1} \) unless \( G \cong K_{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2}\rfloor,\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2}\rfloor} \cdot K_3 \)?

In this paper, we confirm Problem 2 as follows.

**Theorem 1.2.** Let \( G \) be a non-bipartite graph with order \( n \) and \( k \) be a positive integer. If \( n \) is sufficiently large with respect to \( k \) and \( \rho(G) \geq \rho(K_{\lfloor \frac{n}{2}\rfloor,\lfloor \frac{n}{2}\rfloor} \cdot K_3) \), then \( G \) contains a \( C_{2k+1} \) unless \( G \cong K_{\lfloor \frac{n}{2}\rfloor,\lfloor \frac{n}{2}\rfloor} \cdot K_3 \).

**2 Preliminaries**

Let \( K_{1,n-2}^1 \) be the tree obtained by appending a path \( P_2 \) to a pendant vertex of \( K_{1,n-2} \), and let \( K_{n-1}^3 \) be the graph obtained by appending a complete graph \( K_{n-1} \) to a pendant vertex of a path \( P_2 \). Then Guo et al. [5] first give a new upper bound on the spectral radius of a graph which improves Hong’s bound:

**Lemma 1.** ([5]) If \( G \) is a connected simple graph with \( n \geq 10 \) vertices and \( m \) edges, then \( \rho(G) \leq \sqrt{2m - n} \) unless \( G \cong K_{1,n-2}^1, K_{1,n-2}^1, K_{n-1}, K_{n-1}^3 \).

The following Lemma was deduced by Li and Ning in [7].

**Lemma 2.** ([7]) Let \( G \) be a graph. For any \( v \in V(G) \), then \( \rho^2(G) \leq \rho^2(G - v) + 2d(v) \).

**Lemma 3.** ([7]) Let \( \varepsilon \) be real with \( 0 < \varepsilon < \frac{1}{4} \). Then there exists an integer \( N := N(\varepsilon) \) such that if \( G \) is a graph on \( n \) vertices with \( n \geq N \) and \( \rho(G) > \sqrt{\frac{\pi^2}{4}} \), then \( G \) contains all cycles \( C_l \) with \( l \in [3, (\frac{1}{4} - \varepsilon)n] \).
Lemma 4. ([11]) Let $0 < \alpha < \frac{1}{4}$, $0 < \beta < \frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\alpha}{4} < \gamma \leq 1$, $K \geq 0$. For a sufficiently large integer $n$, if $G$ is a graph of order $n$ with
\[ \rho(G) \geq \gamma n - \frac{K}{n} \] and $\delta(G) \leq (\gamma - \alpha)n$,
then there exists an induced subgraph $H \subset G$ with $|H| \geq (1 - \beta)n$ and satisfying one of the following conditions:
\[ (i) \rho(H) > \gamma(1 + \frac{\alpha \beta}{2})|H|, \quad (ii) \rho(H) > \gamma|H| \text{ and } \delta(H) > (\gamma - \alpha)|H|. \]

Lemma 5. ([11]) Let $G$ be a non-bipartite graph of sufficiently large order $n$, and $\delta(G) \geq \frac{n}{4}$. Then $G$ contains a cycle of length $4 \leq n$ and satisfying one of the following conditions:
\[ |H| \geq n \delta(G) - 1 \] for every integer $i \in [4, \delta(G) + 1]$, $G$ contains a cycle of length $l$ for $l \geq 3$.

Lemma 6. ([6]) Let $G$ be a non-bipartite graph with order $n \geq 21$. If $\rho(G) \geq \rho(K_{\lceil \frac{n}{4} \rceil}, \lceil \frac{n}{4} \rceil) \cdot K_3$,
then $G$ contains a pentagon unless $G \cong K_{\lceil \frac{n}{4} \rceil}, \lceil \frac{n}{4} \rceil) \cdot K_3$.

3 Proof of Theorem 1.2

Now, we shall give the proof of Theorem 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. If $G$ is a disconnected graph and $G_1, \ldots, G_\eta$ are the components of $G$. Let $G'$ be a connected graph obtained from $G$ by adding $\eta - 1$ edges. It is clear that $G'$ does not create any new cycle, and so $G'$ contains a cycle of length $l$ if and only if $G'$ contains a cycle of length $l$ for $l \geq 3$. By using the Rayleigh quotient and the Perron-Frobenius theorem, we can deduce that $\rho(G') \geq \rho(G)$. Thus, we can assume that $G$ is a connected graph.

Note that $\rho(G) \geq \rho(K_{\lceil \frac{n}{4} \rceil}, \lceil \frac{n}{4} \rceil) \cdot K_3$. It is clearly that $K_{\lceil \frac{n}{4} \rceil}, \lceil \frac{n}{4} \rceil) \cdot K_3$ contains $K_{\lceil \frac{n}{4} \rceil}, \lceil \frac{n}{4} \rceil)$ as a proper subgraph and $\rho(K_{\lceil \frac{n}{4} \rceil}, \lceil \frac{n}{4} \rceil) \cdot K_3 \geq \sqrt{\frac{n^2 - 4n + 3}{4}}$. Then,
\[ \rho^2(G) \geq \rho^2(K_{\lceil \frac{n}{4} \rceil}, \lceil \frac{n}{4} \rceil) \cdot K_3) > \frac{n^2 - 4n + 3}{4}. \tag{1} \]

Combining (1) with Lemma 1, we deduce that $2e(G) \geq \frac{n^2 + 3}{4}$, which follows that the average degree of $G$ is $\bar{d}(G) = \frac{2e(G)}{n} > \frac{n}{4}$. Let $H$ with order $h$ be a maximal induced subgraph of $G$ with $\delta(H) > \frac{n}{8}$ and $V_1 = V(G) - V(H) = \{v_1, \ldots, v_t\}$. It is clearly $\omega(H) \leq 8$ and $n = h + t$ (since otherwise, $\delta(H) \leq \frac{n}{8}$, a contradiction). We shall show the existence of $H$ by proving $\bar{d}(H) > \frac{n}{4}$. By the way of contradiction, we may suppose $\bar{d}(H) \leq \frac{n}{4}$. Then
\[ \bar{d}(G) = \frac{2e(H) + 2d_G(v_{i1}) + 2d_G(v_{i2}) + \cdots + 2d_G(v_{i8})}{n} \leq \frac{\bar{d}(H)|H| + t \times 2 \times \frac{n}{8}}{n} \leq \frac{n}{4}, \] a contradiction.

Then by Lemma 2, we have
\[ \rho^2(G - v_{i1}) \geq \rho^2(G) - 2 \cdot \frac{n}{8}, \]
\[ \rho^2(G - \{v_{i1}, v_{i2}\}) \geq \rho^2(G - v_{i1}) - 2 \cdot \frac{n}{8}, \]
\[ \vdots \]
\[ \rho^2(G - \{v_{i1}, \ldots, v_{i(t-1)}\}) \geq \rho^2(G - \{v_1, \ldots, v_{i(t-2)}\}) - 2 \cdot \frac{n}{8}, \]
\[ \rho^2(G - V_1) = \rho^2(H) \geq \rho^2(G - \{v_1, \ldots, v_{i(t-1)}\}) - 2 \cdot \frac{n}{8}. \]
Combining this with (1), we deduce that
\[
\rho^2(H) \geq \rho^2(G) - 2r\frac{n}{8} \geq \frac{n^2 - (4+t)n + 3}{4} \geq \frac{(h+t)(h-4) + 3}{4}.
\] (2)

Let \( F \) be a subgraph of \( H \) constructed by using the following procedure. We may define a sequence of graphs \( H_0, \ldots, H_r \), satisfying \( H_{i+1} = H_i - v_i \) for \( i = 0, \ldots, r-1 \) and \( F = H_r \) has no cut vertex:

begin
set \( H_0 = H; \)
set \( i = 0; \)
while there exists a cut vertex \( v_i \) in \( H_i \) do
begin
select a cut vertex \( v_i \) in \( H_i; \)
set \( H_{i+1} = H_i - v_i; \)
add 1 to \( i; \)
end; end.

Denoted by \( V_2 = \{v_j, \ldots, v_{j_p}\} = V(H) - V(F) \). Then we assert \( \omega(H) \leq 8 \), which implies \( |V_2| = p \leq 7 \).

Indeed, recall that \( \omega(H - V_2) = \omega(H) \leq 8 \) as \( V_2 = \emptyset \). Now, we suppose \( V_2 \neq \emptyset \). Then there exists a proper subset \( V_2 \) of \( V_2 \) such that \( \omega(H - V_2) \leq 8 \) and \( |V_2| \leq 7 \). Next, let \( u_1 \in V_2 - V_2 \) and \( V_2 = V_2 \cup \{u_1\} \). We assert that \( \omega(H - V_2) \leq 8 \). Since otherwise, we may assume \( \omega(H - V_2) \geq 9 \). According to \( \delta(H) > \frac{9}{8} \) and \( |V_2| \leq 7 \), we deduce that \( \frac{9}{8} - \delta(H - V_2) \leq \frac{9}{8} \), which is a contradiction for large \( n \). Similarly, let \( u_2 \in V_2 - V_2 \) and \( V_2 = V_2 \cup \{u_2\} \). We also assert \( \omega(H - V_2) \leq 8 \). Since otherwise, we may assume \( \omega(H - V_2) \geq 9 \). Thus \( \frac{9}{8} - \delta(H - V_2) \leq \frac{9}{8} \), a contradiction. Repeat the process. We can obtain \( \omega(H - V_{2q}) \leq 8 \), where \( V_{2q} \cup \{v\} = V_2 \), and yield that \( \omega(H - V_2) \leq 8 \), as required.

Notice that \( d_H(v) \leq h - 1 \) for any \( v \in V(H) \). Therefore, combining this with (2) and Lemma 2, it follows that
\[
\frac{n^2 - (4+t)n + 3}{4} \leq \rho^2(H) \leq \rho^2(F) + 2p(h-1) \leq \rho^2(F) + 14(h-1).
\]

Hence, we obtain
\[
\rho^2(F) \geq \frac{n^2 - (4+t)n + 3}{4} - 14(h-1) = \frac{n}{4} - 14)(h-4) - \frac{165}{4}.
\] (3)

Recall that \( F \) has no cut-vertex, i.e., each component of \( F \) is 2-connected. Let \( F_1 \) be a component of \( F \) with \( \rho(F_1) = \rho(F) \). Now we shall derive the proof by the following two cases.

Case 1. \( F_1 \neq H \).

Then it implies that \( F \) has another component \( F_2 \). Recall that \( \delta(H) > \frac{9}{8} \), \( F = H - V_2 \) and \( |V_2| = p \leq 7 \). We have \( \delta(F) \geq \frac{9}{8} - 7 \). Hence, \( |F_1|, |F_2| \geq \delta(F) + 1 \geq \frac{4}{8} - 6 \), which leads to \( \frac{9}{8} - 6 \leq |F_1| \leq h - (\frac{9}{8} - 6) < \frac{2h}{8} + 6 \). Combining this with (3), we deduce
\[
\rho^2(F_1) = \rho^2(F) \geq \left(\frac{n}{4} - 14)(h-4) - \frac{165}{4}\right) \geq \left(\frac{7h/8 + 6}{4}\right)^2 > \frac{|F_1|^2}{4}
\]
for sufficiently large \( n \), where the second inequality holds by \( n \geq h \). Thus, by Lemma 3, \( F_1 \) contains a cycle of length \( l \) for every \( l \in [3, \frac{8k+1}{24}] \). Note that \( n \) is sufficiently large with respect to \( k \) and \( |F_1| \geq \frac{n}{8} - 6 \). We have \( C_{2k+1} \leq H \leq G \), as required.

Case 2. \( F_1 = H \).
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In this case, $H$ is a 2-connected graph. If $t \geq 5$, by (2) and $n = h + t$, we deduce that

$$\rho^2(H) \geq \frac{(h+t)(h-4) + 3}{4} \geq \frac{(h+5)(h-4) + 3}{4} = \frac{h^2 + h - 17}{4} > \frac{h^2}{4}$$

for $h \geq 18$. According to Lemma 3, $H$ contains a cycle of length $l$ for every $l \in [3, \frac{h}{3}]$. Then $C_{2k+1} \subseteq H$. Thus, we only need to consider the situation of $t \leq 4$.

Let $0 < \theta < \frac{1}{10}$, $\alpha = \frac{1}{10} + \theta$, $\beta = 40\theta$, $\gamma = \frac{1}{5} - \theta$ and $K = 0$. Combining this with (2), we have $\rho^2(H) \geq \frac{(h+t)(h-4) + 3}{4} \geq \frac{h(h-	heta h)}{4}$ for large $h$. Recall that $\delta(H) > \frac{\rho}{8}$ and $n = h + t \leq h + 4$. Then we distinguish two subcases to complete our proof.

**Subcase 2.1** $\delta(H) > (\gamma - \alpha)h = (\frac{2}{5} - 2\theta)h$. Notice that $\delta(H) > (\frac{2}{5} - 2\theta)h > \frac{h}{5}$. Then, if $H$ is a non-bipartite graph, we have that $H$ contains each cycle $C_l$ for $4 \leq l \leq \delta(H) + 1$ by Lemma 5. Since $h = O(n)$ and $n$ is sufficiently large with respect to $k$, we obtain that $C_{2k+1} \subseteq H$, as required.

Now we may suppose that $H$ is a bipartite graph. Denote by $V_{1H}$ and $V_{2H}$ the two parts of $H$.

We first give the following claim.

**Claim 1.** For any vertex $v_1, v_2 \in V_{1H}$ (or $v_1, v_2 \in V_{2H}$), $|N_H(v_1) \cap N_H(v_2)| > k$.

**Proof.** Note that $\delta(H) > (\frac{2}{5} - 2\theta)h$. Then $|V_{1H}|, |V_{2H}| > (\frac{2}{5} - 2\theta)h$, which follows $|V_{1H}|, |V_{2H}| \leq (\frac{2}{5} + 2\theta)h$ since $|V_{1H}| + |V_{2H}| = h$. Without loss of generality, we suppose $v_1, v_2 \in V_{1H}$. Then,

$$d_H(v_1) + d_H(v_2) - |V_{2H}| \geq (\frac{4}{5} - 4\theta)h - (\frac{3}{5} + 2\theta)h = (\frac{1}{5} - 6\theta)h > k$$

for large $h$, which implies $|N_H(v_1) \cap N_H(v_2)| > k$. As required. \[\square\]

Furthermore, we have the following result.

**Claim 2.** For any vertex $v_1 \in V_{1H}$ and $v_2 \in V_{2H}$, there exists each path $P_{v_1v_2}$ of order $2l$ in $H$ for $2 \leq l \leq k$.

**Proof.** Since $\delta(H) > (\frac{2}{5} - 2\theta)h$, there exists $v_2 \in N_H(v_1)$ distinguishing from $v_2$. By Claim 1, we may find a vertex $v_1$ distinguishing from $v_1$ in $V_{1H}$ such that $v_1 \in N_H(v_2) \cap N_H(v_2)$. By the same reason, there exists $v_2 \in N_H(v_1)$ distinguishing from $v_2$ and a vertex distinguishing from $v_1, v_1 \in V_{1H}$, say $v_1$, such that $v_2 \in N_H(v_2) \cap N_H(v_2)$. Repeat the proceed, we find $v_{2(k-1)} \in N_H(v_{1(k-2)})$ distinguishing from $v_{1, v_2, \cdots, v_{2(k-2)}}$ and a vertex $v_{1(k-1)} \in N_H(v_2(k-2)) \cap N_H(v_2(k-1))$ distinguishing from $v_{1, v_2, \cdots, v_{2(k-2)}}$. Then we find a path $P_{v_1v_2}$ of order $2l$ in $H$ for $2 \leq l \leq k$, as required. \[\square\]

Recall that $\rho(G) \geq \rho(K_{\frac{2+\alpha}{\beta^2}}, \frac{2+\alpha}{\beta^2} \cdot K_3$. According to Lemma 6, we have $C_5 \subseteq G$ unless $G \cong K_{\frac{2+\alpha}{\beta^2}, \frac{2+\alpha}{\beta^2}} \cdot K_3$. Notice that $H$ is an induced bipartite graph of $G$ and $t = n - h \leq 4$. Then $1 \leq |V(C_5) \cap V(G - H)| \leq 4$, i.e., $1 \leq |V(C_5) \cap V(H)| \leq 4$. Now, we shall distinguish three situations as follows.

(i) $3 \leq |V(C_5) \cap V(H)| \leq 4$, (ii) $|V(C_5) \cap V(H)| = 2$, (iii) $|V(C_5) \cap V(H)| = 1$.

For (i), there exist two vertices $u, v$ of $C_3$ belonging to $V_{1H}$ and $V_{2H}$, respectively. Then by Claim 2, we may find a path $P_{uv}$ of order $2l$ in $H$ for $2 \leq l \leq k$, which follows $C_{2k+1} \subseteq G$, as required.

For (ii), let $V(C_5) \subseteq V(H) = \{u, v\}$. If $u \in V_{1H}$ and $v \in V_{2H}$, then as (i), we complete the proof. Denote by $C_5 = z_1z_2z_3z_4z_5z_1$. Without loss of generality, if $|V(C_5) \cap V_{1H}| = 2$, say $\{z_3, z_5\}$, then we obtain $v_21 \in V_{2H}$ and $v_21 \in N(z_3) \cap N(z_5)$. Thus, we find a $C_5$ with $\{z_1, z_2, z_3, v_21, z_5\}$. Moreover, by Claim 2, we can find a path $P_{z_1z_2}$ of order $2(k-1)$ in $H$ and $z_5 \notin P_{z_1z_2}$, which deduce $C_{2k+1} \subseteq G$, as required.

For (iii), without loss of generality, if $|V(C_5) \cap V_{1H}| = 1$, say $\{z_5\}$, which implies $t = 4$, then we assert that $d_G(z_i) \geq \frac{n}{8} - 7$ for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$. Indeed, it is clearly that $\frac{n}{8} \geq d_G(z_i) \geq \frac{n}{8} - 7$.
$d_G(z_{j+1}) - j$ for $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, and $d_G(z_1) \leq \frac{n}{8}$. It follows $d_G(z_2) \leq \frac{n}{8} + 1$, $d_G(z_3) \leq \frac{n}{8} + 2$, $d_G(z_4) \leq \frac{n}{8} + 3$. Thus, $\frac{n}{8} + 6 \geq \sum_{i=1}^{4} d_G(z_i)$ and the degree sum of any three vertex in $\{z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4\}$ does not exceed $\frac{3n}{8} + 6$. Combining this with Lemma 2, we have

\[
\rho^2(G - z_1) \geq \rho^2(G) - 2d_G(z_1),
\]

\[
\rho^2(G - \{z_1, z_2\}) \geq \rho^2(G - z_1) - 2d_G(z_2),
\]

\[
\rho^2(G - \{z_1, z_2, z_3\}) \geq \rho^2(G - \{z_1, z_2\}) - 2d_G(z_3),
\]

\[
\rho^2(H) = \rho^2(G - \{z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4\}) \geq \rho^2(G - \{z_1, z_2, z_3\}) - 2d_G(z_4),
\]

which gives $2 \sum_{i=1}^{4} d_G(z_i) \geq \rho^2(G) - \rho^2(H)$. Recall that $H$ is a bipartite graph and $h = n - t = n - 4$.

Thus, $\rho^2(H) \leq \frac{k^3}{4} = \frac{(n-4)^2}{4}$. Combining this with (1), we obtain

\[
\frac{n}{2} + 6 \geq \sum_{i=1}^{4} d_G(z_i) \geq \frac{n^2 - 4n + 3}{8} - \frac{(n-4)^2}{8} = \frac{n}{2} - \frac{13}{8}.
\]

If there exists some $z_j \in V(C_3) \setminus \{z_3\}$ such that $d_G(z_j) \leq \frac{n}{8} - 8$, then

\[
\frac{3n}{8} + 6 \geq \sum_{z_i \in V(C_3) \setminus \{z_3\}} d_G(z_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{4} d_G(z_i) - d_G(z_j) \geq \frac{n}{2} - \frac{13}{8} - \frac{n-8}{8} = \frac{3n}{8} + \frac{51}{8},
\]

which deduces a contradiction. Thus, for any $z_i \in V(C_3)$, $1 \leq i \leq 4$, we have $|N(z_i) \cap V(H)| > 2$. Let $v_{11} \in N(z_3) \cap V(H)$. Then if $v_{11} \in N(z_3) \cap V_{1H}$ and $v_{11} \notin z_3$, by Claim 1, we obtain $v_{21} \in N_H(z_3) \cap N_H(v_{11})$. Furthermore, by Claim 2, there exists a path $P_{v_{11}v_{21}}$, of order $2l$ in $H$ for $2 \leq l \leq k$ and $z_3 \notin V(P_{v_{11}v_{21}})$. Thus, $C_{2k+1} \subseteq G$. If $v_{11} \in N(z_3) \cap V_{2H}$, combining with Claim 2, then $C_{2k+1} \subseteq G$.

Subcase 2.2 $\frac{n}{8} < \delta(H) \leq (\gamma - \alpha)h = (\frac{7}{8} - 2\theta)h$. Then by Lemma 4, we may find an induced subgraph $H_0$ of $H$ with $|H_0| \geq (1 - \beta)h = (1 - 40\theta)h \geq (1 - 40\theta)(n - 4) > \frac{280}{321}n$ and satisfying one of the following conditions:

(i) $\rho(H_0) > \gamma h + \frac{|H_0|}{4} = \frac{1}{4} + 8\theta^2 - 20\theta^3|H_0|$, 

(ii) $\rho(H_0) > \gamma |H_0| = \frac{1}{4} - \theta|H_0|$ and $\delta(H_0) > (\gamma - \alpha)|H_0| = \frac{7}{8} - 2\theta|H_0|$.

For (i), it is clearly that $\rho(H_0) \geq \frac{|H_0|}{4}$, which follows that $H_0$ contains each cycle $C_l$ for $3 \leq l < \frac{|H_0|}{4}$ by Lemma 3. Note $|H_0| > \frac{280}{321}n$ and $n$ is sufficiently large with respect to $k$. Thus, $H_0$ contains a cycle $C_{2k+1}$, as required.

For (ii), notice that $\frac{7}{8} - 2\theta|H_0| > \frac{|H_0|}{4}$. If $H_0$ is a non-bipartite graph, then $H_0$ contains each cycle $C_l$ for $4 \leq l \leq \delta(H_0) + 1$ by Lemma 5. Thus, $H_0$ contains $C_{2k+1}$, as required. Now, we focus on the situation that $H_0$ is a bipartite graph. Denote by $V_{1H_0}$ and $V_{2H_0}$ the two parts of $H_0$. (See Figure 1.)

![Figure 1: The graph $G$ and $H_0 \subseteq H \subseteq G$](image)

Then by a similar method as Claims 1 and 2, respectively, we obtain the following results.
Claim 3. For any vertex \( v_1, v_2 \in V_{1H_0} \) (or \( v_1, v_2 \in V_{2H_0} \)), \( |N_{H_0}(v_1) \cap N_{H_0}(v_2)| > k \).

Claim 4. For any vertex \( v_1 \in V_{1H_0} \) and \( v_2 \in V_{2H_0} \), there exists each path \( P_{v_1v_2} \) of order \( 2l \) in \( H_0 \) for \( 2 \leq l \leq k \).

Recall that \( |H_0| \geq (1 - 40\theta)(n - 4) \), \( 0 < \theta \leq \frac{1}{327} \) and \( H_0 \) is an induced subgraph of \( G \). Then

\[
|G - H_0| = |G| - |H_0| \leq n - (1 - 40\theta)(n - 4) < \frac{1}{8}n - 8. \tag{4}
\]

Notice that \( \rho(G) \geq \rho(K_{n/2}\cup K_{n/2} \cdot K_3) \). According to Lemma 6, we have \( C_5 \subseteq G \) unless \( G \cong K_{n/2}\cup K_{n/2} \cdot K_3 \). Thus, \( 0 \leq |V(C_5) \cap V(H_0)| \leq 4 \). Now, we shall distinguish four situations as follows.

(i) \( 3 \leq |V(C_5) \cap V(H_0)| \leq 4 \), (ii) \( |V(C_5) \cap V(H_0)| = 2 \),

(iii) \( |V(C_5) \cap V(H_0)| = 1 \), (iv) \( |V(C_5) \cap V(H_0)| = 0 \).

Note that \( H_0 \) is a bipartite graph. For (i), we may find two vertices \( u, v \) of \( C_5 \) belonging to \( V_{1H_0} \) and \( V_{2H_0} \), respectively. Then by Claim 4, we always find a path \( P_{uv} \) of order \( 2l \) in \( H_0 \) for \( 2 \leq l \leq k \), which follows \( C_{2k+1} \subseteq G \). As required.

For (ii), let \( V(C_5) \cap V(H_0) = \{u, v\} \). If \( u \in V_{1H_0} \) and \( v \in V_{2H_0} \), then as (i), we find a \( C_{2k+1} \subseteq G \), as required. Denote by \( C_5 = z_1z_2z_3z_4z_5 \). Without loss of generality, if \( |V(C_5) \cap V_{1H_0}| = 2 \), say \( \{z_3, z_5\} \), then we obtain \( v_21 \in V_{2H_0} \) and \( v_21 \in N(z_3) \cap N(z_5) \). Thus, we find a \( C_6 \) with \( \{z_1, z_2, z_3, v_21, z_5\} \). Moreover, by Claim 4, we can obtain a path \( P_{v_2121} \) of order \( 2(k - 1) \) in \( H_0 \) and \( z_5 \notin P_{v_2121} \), which deduce \( C_{2k+1} \subseteq G \), as required.

For (iii), without loss of generality, denote by \( V(C_5) \cap V_{1H_0} = \{z_5\} \). Furthermore, we shall derive the proof by the following two situations:

\[
(a_1) |V(C_5) \cap V(G - H)| = 4, \quad (a_2) 0 \leq |V(C_5) \cap V(G - H)| \leq 3.
\]

For (a1), it implies \( t = 4 \), say \( \{z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4\} = V(C_5) \cap V(G - H) \), and then by a similar method as (iii) in Subcase 2.1, we have \( d_G(z_i) \geq \frac{n}{2} - 7 \) for \( i = 1, 2, 3, 4 \). Thus, combining with (4), for any \( z \in V(C_5) \), say \( z_4 \), we have \( |N_{H_0}(z_4) \cap N_{H_0}(v_11)| > 1 \). When \( v_11 \in N(z_4) \cap V_{1H_0} \) and \( v_11 \notin z_5 \), then by Claim 3, we obtain \( v_21 \in N_{H_0}(z_5) \cap N_{H_0}(v_11) \). Therefore, \( C_7 = z_1z_2z_3z_4v_11v_21z_5 \subseteq G \). Furthermore, there exists a path \( P_{v_11v_21} \) of order \( 2(k - 2) \) in \( H_0 \) by Claim 4 and \( z_5 \notin V(P_{v_11v_21}) \). Thus, \( C_{2k+1} \subseteq G \). When \( v_{11} \in N(z_4) \cap V_{2H_0} \), combining with Claim 4, then \( C_{2k+1} \subseteq G \).

For (a2), it follows \( 1 \leq |V(C_5) \cap V(H - H_0)| \leq 4 \), and then there exists one vertex \( z \in C_5 \cap (H - H_0) \) such that \( N(z) \cap V(H_0) \neq \emptyset \) since \( d_G(z) > \frac{n}{2} \) and \( |H - H_0| < \frac{1}{8}n - 8 \) by (4). Let \( z_0 \in N(z) \cap V(H_0) \). When \( z_0 \in N(z) \cap V_{1H_0} \), then there exists some vertex \( v_21 \in N(z_0) \cap N_{H_0}(z) \) by Claim 3. Thus, \( C_{2k+1} \subseteq G \) since we may find a path \( P_{v_21z_0} \subseteq H_0 \) of order \( 2l \) for \( 2 \leq l \leq k \) and \( z_5 \notin V(P_{v_21z_0}) \) by Claim 4. When \( z_0 \notin N(z) \cap V_{2H_0} \), Claim 4, we obtain \( C_{2k+1} \subseteq G \).

For (iv), then there exists at least one vertex belonging to \( V(C_5) \cap V(H - H_0) \) since \( t \leq 4 \). In the following, we shall derive the proof by the following three situations:

\[
(b_1) |V(C_5) \cap V(H - H_0)| = 1, \quad (b_2) |V(C_5) \cap V(H - H_0)| \geq 3, \quad (b_3) |V(C_5) \cap V(H - H_0)| = 2.
\]

For (b1), without loss of generality, suppose \( z_5 \in V(C_5) \cap V(H - H_0) \), i.e., \( t = 4 \), (see Figure 2(i)). Then as above \( d_G(z_i) \geq \frac{n}{2} - 7 \) for \( i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\} \) and \( |H - H_0| < \frac{1}{8}n - 8 \) by (4). Recall that \( C_5 = z_1z_2z_3z_4z_5z_1 \). Thus, there exists some vertex \( z_0 \in N(z_3) \cap V(H_0) \). Without loss of generality, we suppose \( z_0 \in N(z_3) \cap V_{1H_0} \). On the other hand, since \( z_5 \in V(H - H_0) \) and \( \delta(H) > \frac{n}{2} \), we have \( N(z_5) \cap V(H_0) \neq \emptyset \). When \( v \in N(z_5) \cap V_{1H_0} \), then by Claim 3, there exists some vertex \( v_21 \in N_{H_0}(z_0) \cap N_{H_0}(v) \). Furthermore, according to Claim 4, we may find a path \( P_{v_21z_0} \) of order \( 2l \) in \( H_0 \) for \( 2 \leq l \leq k \) and \( v \notin V(P_{v_21z_0}) \). Therefore, \( C_{2k+1} \subseteq G \). When \( v \in N(z_5) \cap V_{2H_0} \), then according to Claim 4, we may find a path \( P_{v_20} \) of order \( 2l \) in \( H_0 \) for \( 2 \leq l \leq k \). Therefore, \( C_{2k+1} \subseteq G \).
Furthermore, according to Claim 3, we only consider $z_l$ of order 2, which gives $4 \in v$. Without loss of generality, suppose there exists some vertex $v_1 \in N(z_3) \cap V_{1H_0}$. Then $v \in N(z_3) \cap V_{1H_0}$, by Claim 3, we obtain that there exists some vertex $v_{21} \in N_{H_0}(v_{11}) \cap N_{H_0}(v)$. Furthermore, according to Claim 4, we may find a path $P_{v_{11}v_{21}}$ of order $2l$ in $H_0$ for $2 \leq l \leq k$ and $v \notin V(P_{v_{11}v_{21}})$. Therefore, $C_{2k+1} \subseteq G$. When $v \in N(z_3) \cap V_{2H_0}$, according to Claim 4, we may find a path $P_{v_{11}v_{21}}$ of order $2l$ in $H_0$ for $2 \leq l \leq k$. Therefore, $C_{2k+1} \subseteq G$.

For $(b_1)$, then $t = 3$ and $d_{G}(v) = \frac{7}{2} - 7$ for any $v \in V(G) - V(H)$. Recall (4). Then there exists $z_3$ not adjacent to $z_5$ in $C_5$ such that $z_3 \in N(z_5) \cap N(H_0)$. Thus, by a similar analysis as $(b_2)$, we obtain $C_{2k+1} \subseteq G$. If $t = 3$, then we suppose $\{z_5, z_3\} = V(C_5) \cap V(H - H_0)$. Note $\delta(H) > \frac{9}{2}$. When $z_5 = z_3$, where $z_3$ is not adjacent to $z_5$ in $C_5$, (see Figure 2:(b3.1)), then by a similar analysis as $(b_2)$, we obtain $C_{2k+1} \subseteq G$. When $z_5 = z_4$ with $z_4$ adjacent to $z_5$ in $C_5$, (see Figure 2:(b3.2)), then $\{z_1, z_2, z_3\} = V(G) - V(H)$ with $z_2$ not adjacent to $z_4$ and $z_5$ in $C_5$. We shall derive the proof of the situation by two cases. If there exist two distinguish vertex $u, v$ belonging to $N(z_4) \cap V_{1H_0}$ and $N(z_5) \cap V_{1H_0}$, respectively, then by Claim 3, we obtain that there exists some vertex $v_{21} \in N_{H_0}(u) \cap N_{H_0}(v)$. Furthermore, according to Claim 4, we may find a path $P_{u_{21}}$ of order $2l$ in $H_0$ for $2 \leq l \leq k$ and $u \notin V(P_{u_{21}})$. Therefore, $C_{2k+1} \subseteq G$. If $u \in N(z_5) \cap V_{1H_0}$ and $v \in N(z_4) \cap V_{2H_0}$, then we distinguish the degree of $z_2$ to complete the proof. When $d_G(z_2) \geq 3$, then there exists some vertex $z_0 \in N(z_2) \cap V(G - H)$. Note $\delta(H) > \frac{9}{2}$. Thus, $N(z_0) \cap N(H_0) \neq \emptyset$. By the symmetry, we only consider $u_1 \in N(z_0) \cap V_{1H_0}$. By Claim 3, we obtain that there exists some vertex $v_{21} \in N_{H_0}(u_1) \cap N_{H_0}(v)$. Furthermore, according to Claim 4, we may find a path $P_{v_{21}}$ of order $2l$ in $H_0$ for $2 \leq l \leq k$ and $u_1 \notin V(P_{v_{21}})$. Therefore, $C_{2k+1} \subseteq G$. When $d_G(z_2) = 2$, we assert that $d_G(z_1) > \frac{9}{2} - 7$ or $d_G(z_3) > \frac{9}{2} - 7$. Indeed, according to Lemma 2, we have

$$
p^2(G - z_1) \geq p^2(G) - 2d_G(z_1),
$$
$$
p^2(G - \{z_1, z_2\}) \geq p^2(G - z_1) - 2d_G(z_2) = p^2(G - z_1) - 4,
$$
$$
p^2(H) = p^2(G - \{z_1, z_2, z_3\}) \geq p^2(G - \{z_1, z_2\}) - 2d_G(z_3),
$$

which gives $4 + 2(d_G(z_1) + d_G(z_3)) \geq p^2(G) - p^2(H)$. Recall $|H| = n - t = n - 3$. If $p^2(H) > \frac{(n - 3)^2}{4}$, then by Lemma 3, we have $C_{2k+1} \subseteq H$. In the following, we suppose $p^2(H) \leq \frac{(n - 3)^2}{4}$. Combining this with (1), we have

$$
d_G(z_1) + d_G(z_3) \geq \frac{(n - 2)^2}{8} - \frac{(n - 3)^2}{8} - 2 = \frac{2n - 21}{8}.
$$
Thus, there exists, without loss of generality, $d_G(z_1) > \frac{5}{8} - 7$. Combining with (4), we have $N(z_1) \cap V(H_0) \neq \emptyset$, say $w \in N(z_1) \cap V(H_0)$. When $w \in V_1H_0$, then by Claim 3, we obtain that there exists some vertex $v_{21} \in N_{H_0}(u) \cap N_{H_0}(w)$. Furthermore, according to Claim 4, we may find a path $P_{wv_{21}}$ of order $2l$ in $H_0$ for $2 \leq l \leq k$ and $w \notin V(P_{wv_{21}})$. Therefore, $C_{2k+1} \subseteq G$. When $w \in V_2H_0$, then by Claim 3, we obtain that there exists some vertex $v_{11} \in N_{H_0}(v) \cap N_{H_0}(w)$. Furthermore, according to Claim 4, we may find a path $P_{vv_{11}}$ of order $2l$ in $H_0$ for $2 \leq l \leq k$ and $w \notin V(P_{vv_{11}})$. Therefore, $C_{2k+1} \subseteq G$.

To sum up, we complete the proof.
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