

Circumference of 3-connected cubic graphs

Qinghai Liu*

Center for Discrete Mathematics
Fuzhou University
Fuzhou, 350002, China

Xingxing Yu†

School of Mathematics
Georgia Institute of Technology
Atlanta, GA 30332,

Zhao Zhang‡

College of Mathematics Physics and Information Engineering
Zhejiang Normal University
Jinhua, Zhejiang, 321004, China

March 13, 2022

Abstract

The circumference of a graph is the length of its longest cycles. Jackson established a conjecture of Bondy by showing that the circumference of a 3-connected cubic graph of order n is $\Omega(n^{0.694})$. Bilinski *et al.* improved this lower bound to $\Omega(n^{0.753})$ by studying large Eulerian subgraphs in 3-edge-connected graphs. In this paper, we further improve this lower bound to $\Omega(n^{0.8})$. This is done by considering certain 2-connected cubic graphs, finding cycles through two given edges, and distinguishing the cases whether or not these edges are adjacent.

*email: qliu@fzu.edu.cn; partially supported by NSFC Projects 11301086 and 11401103, and the Natural Science Foundation of Fujian Province(2014J05004).

†email: yu@math.gatech.edu; partially supported by NSF grants DMS-1265564 and DMS-1600738, and the Hundred Talents Program of Fujian Province.

‡email: hxhzz@sina.com; partially supported by NSFC 11531011 and Xinjiang Talent Youth Project 2013711011

1 Introduction

Tait [10] conjectured in 1880 that every 3-connected cubic planar graph contains a Hamilton cycle. This conjecture remained open until a counterexample was found in 1946 by Tutte [11]. There has since been extensive research concerning longest cycles in graphs, see [6] for more references. We use $|G|$ to denote the *order* of a graph G , i.e., the number of vertices in G ; and refer to the length of a longest cycle in G as the *circumference* of G . We will be concerned with lower bounds on the circumference of 3-connected cubic graphs.

Barnette [4] showed that every 3-connected cubic graph of order n has circumference $\Omega(\log n)$. Bondy and Simonovits [7] improved this bound to $\exp(\Omega(\sqrt{\log n}))$ and conjectured that it can be improved further to $\Omega(n^c)$ for some constant $0 < c < 1$. This conjecture was confirmed by Jackson [8], with $c = \log_2(1 + \sqrt{5}) - 1 \approx 0.694$. Bondy and Simonovits [7] constructed an infinite family of 3-connected cubic graphs with circumference $\Theta(n^{\log_9 8}) \approx \Theta(n^{0.946})$.

Recently, Bilinski, Jackson, Ma and Yu [6] showed that every 3-connected cubic graph of order n has circumference $\Omega(n^\alpha)$, where $\alpha \approx 0.753$ is the real root of $4^{1/x} - 3^{1/x} = 2$. This is proved by reducing the problem to one about Eulerian subgraphs in 3-edge-connected graphs.

In this paper, we further improve this lower bound by considering certain vertex weighted, 2-connected cubic graphs (multiple edges allowed). Let G be a graph and let $w : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^+$, where here \mathbb{Z}^+ denotes the set of non-negative integers. For any $H \subseteq G$, we write $w(H) := \sum_{v \in V(H)} w(v)$.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $r = 0.8$ and $c = 1/(8^r - 6^r) \approx 0.922$. Let G be a 2-connected cubic graph, let $w : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^+$, and let $e, f \in E(G)$. Suppose every 2-edge cut in G separates e from f . Then there is a cycle C in G with $e, f \in E(C)$ such that*

- (a) $w(C) \geq w(G)^r$ when e, f are adjacent, and
- (b) $w(C) \geq cw(G)^r$ when e, f are not adjacent.

We remark that in Theorem 1.1, we may further assume that the weight function w satisfies $w(V(\{e, f\})) = 0$. For otherwise, we define a new weight function $w' : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $w'(v) = w(v)$ for all $v \notin V(e) \cup V(f)$ and $w'(v) = 0$ for all $v \in V(e) \cup V(f)$. Let $w_0 = w(V(e) \cup V(f))$. Then $w(G) = w'(G) + w_0$. If Theorem 1.1 holds for w' then there is a cycle C such that $e, f \in E(C)$ and either $w'(C) \geq w'(G)^r$ or $w'(C) \geq cw'(G)^r$. Thus $w(C) = w'(C) + w_0$ and either $w(C) \geq (w(G) - w_0)^r + w_0 \geq w(G)^r$ or $w(C) \geq c(w(G) - w_0)^r + w_0 \geq cw(G)^r$. Thus, Theorem 1.1 also holds for w . Hence, in Sections 3 and 4, we may assume w is a weight function such that $w(V(\{e, f\})) = 0$.

In our proof of Theorem 1.1 we divide G into a few smaller parts, find long cycles in some of these parts, and merge these cycles into the desired cycle in G . The length of the cycle will be guaranteed by various properties of the function x^r (see Lemma 2.4). We will need structural information of graphs obtained from a 3-connected cubic graph after certain operations, and we will also need cycles through some specified edges and vertices in such graphs. Those results are presented in Section 2. In Section 3, we prove Theorem 1.1(a) by inductively applying Theorem 1.1 (both (a) and (b)); and in Section 4, we prove Theorem 1.1(b) by inductively applying Theorem 1.1 (both (a) and (b)). In Section 5, we complete the proof of Theorem 1.1 and give some concluding remarks.

We end this section with notation needed for our presentation. Let G be a 2-connected cubic graph and $e = uv \in E(G)$. Let e_1, e_2 be the edges of $G - e$ incident with u , and let e_3, e_4 be the edges of $G - e$ incident with v . Suppose e_1 and e_2 do not form multiple edges, and e_3, e_4 do not form multiple edges. We use $G \ominus e$ to represent the graph obtained from G by deleting e and then merging e_1 with e_2 (equivalently, suppressing the degree 2 vertex u) and merging e_3 with e_4 (equivalently, suppressing the degree 2 vertex v). So $G \ominus e$ is a cubic graph in which we use e_1 , or e_2 , or $e_1 = e_2$ (respectively, e_3 , or e_4 , or $e_3 = e_4$) to denote the edge resulting from the merging of e_1 and e_2 (respectively, e_3 and e_4). If $H = G \ominus e$, then we also say $G = H \oplus e$, or $G = (H \oplus e, e_i, e_j)$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and $j \in \{3, 4\}$, i.e., G is obtained from H by subdividing e_i and e_j and adding the edge e between the new vertices.

Let G be a graph and $A, B \subseteq G$. We use $[A, B]$ to represent the set of edges with one end in A and the other in B , and write $\partial_G(A) := [A, G - V(A)]$. If A is connected then we use G/A to represent the graph obtained from G by contracting A to a single vertex (multiple edges are preserved but loops are deleted). In general, if $A_1, \dots, A_k \subseteq G$ are disjoint and connected then $G/(A_1, \dots, A_k)$ represents the graph obtained from G by contracting each A_i to a single vertex, for $i = 1, \dots, k$. Note that if G is cubic and $|\partial_G(A_i)| = 3$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$ then $G/(A_1, \dots, A_k)$ is also cubic. For convenience, we view any $U \subseteq V(G)$ as a subgraph of G with vertex set U and no edges. Also, for any $F \subseteq E(G)$, we let $V(F)$ denote the set of vertices of G incident with F .

2 Useful lemmas

In our proof of Theorem 1.1, the following result will be used frequently.

Lemma 2.1. *Suppose A and B are subgraphs of a 3-connected cubic graph G with $|\partial_G(A)| = |\partial_G(B)| = 3$. If $V(A \cap B) \neq \emptyset$ and $V(A \cup B) \neq V(G)$ then $|\partial_G(A \cup B)| = 3$.*

Proof. Since G is 3-connected, $|\partial_G(A \cap B)| \geq 3$ and $|\partial_G(A \cup B)| \geq 3$. Thus, by the following submodular inequality

$$3 \leq |\partial_G(A \cup B)| \leq |\partial_G(A)| + |\partial_G(B)| - |\partial_G(A \cap B)| \leq 3.$$

This forces $|\partial_G(A \cup B)| = 3$. ■

We will need to find cycles that contain certain given edges. It is well known that any two edges in a 2-connected graph are contained in a cycle. The following lemma due to Lovász [9] deals with three edges in 3-connected graphs, see [1] for a proof.

Lemma 2.2 (Lovász). *Let G be a 3-connected graph and e_1, e_2, e_3 three distinct edges of G . If $\{e_1, e_2, e_3\}$ is not an edge cut of G , then there is a cycle in G containing $\{e_1, e_2, e_3\}$.*

We now use Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2 to prove the following result about cycles in cubic graphs.

Lemma 2.3. *Let G be a 3-connected cubic graph, $u \in V(G)$, $e \in E(G)$ with $u \notin V(e)$, $N(u) = \{v_1, v_2, v_3\}$, and $N(v_i) = \{u, z_i, w_i\}$ for $i = 1, 2$. Suppose $|\partial_G(X)| \geq 4$ for any $X \subseteq G$ with $|V(X)| \geq 2$, $V(e) \not\subseteq V(X)$, $u, v_3 \notin V(X)$ and $|V(X) \cap \{v_1, v_2\}| = 1$. Then for some $k \in \{1, 2\}$, there is a cycle in $G \ominus uv_k$ containing $\{e, v_{3-k}v_3, z_k w_k\}$.*

Proof. It should be noted that, for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, if $e = v_i w_i$ or $e = v_i z_i$ then $e = z_i w_i$ in $G \ominus uv_i$. Let $G_i = G \ominus uv_i$ for $i = 1, 2$. First, suppose neither G_1 nor G_2 is 3-connected. Then, since G is 3-connected, there exists $X'_i \subseteq G_i$ such that $|\partial_{G_i}(X'_i)| = 2$, $w_i, z_i \in X'_i$, and $v_{3-i}, v_3 \notin X'_i$. Set $X_i = V(X'_i) \cup \{v_i\}$. Then $|X_i| \geq 2$ and $|\partial_G(X_i)| = 3$. By the assumption of this lemma, $e \in E(G[X_i])$ for $i = 1, 2$; and hence $X_1 \cap X_2 \neq \emptyset$. By Lemma 2.1, $|\partial_G(X_1 \cup X_2)| = 3$ and, as a consequence, $|\partial_G(X_1 \cup X_2 \cup \{u\})| = 2$, a contradiction.

Thus, we may assume without loss of generality that G_1 is 3-connected. If $\{e, v_2 v_3, z_1 w_1\}$ is not an edge cut in G_1 or $e = z_1 w_1$ in G_1 then, by Lemma 2.2, there is a cycle in G_1 containing $\{e, v_2 v_3, z_1 w_1\}$. So we may assume that in G_1 , $e \neq z_1 w_1$ and $\{e, v_2 v_3, z_1 w_1\}$ is an edge cut. Let A be a component of $G_1 - \{e, v_2 v_3, z_1 w_1\}$ such that $v_3 \notin V(A)$. Then $|\partial_G(A)| = 3$, $e \notin E(A)$, $u, v_1, v_3 \notin V(A)$, and $v_2 \in V(A)$. So by the assumption of this lemma, $V(A) = \{v_2\}$. Hence $v_1 v_2 \in E(G)$, $e \neq v_1 v_2$, and e is incident with v_2 . However, in this case, G_2 and G_1 are isomorphic, as both may be obtained from G by contracting the triangle $uv_1 v_2 u$. Hence, G_2 is also 3-connected; so the same argument above shows that e is incident with v_1 . Therefore, since $e \neq v_1 v_2$, e and $v_1 v_2$ are multiple edges between v_1 and v_2 . However $|\partial_G(\{v_1, v_2, u\})| = 1$, a contradiction to the assumption that G is 3-connected. ■

We also need a lemma concerning properties of the function x^r , which will be used to bound the length of a cycle obtained by merging several cycles. The parameters in this lemma will represent weights of subgraphs in our proof of Theorem 1.1.

Lemma 2.4. *Let $t, w, x, y, z \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, let $r = 0.8$ and $c = 1/(8^r - 6^r) \approx 0.922$. Then the following statements hold.*

- (i) *If $x \geq 8.956z$ and $y \geq 1.036z$ then $x^r + y^r \geq (x + y + z)^r$.*
- (ii) *If $x \leq 10.174y$ then $cx^r + y^r \geq (x + y)^r$.*
- (iii) *If $0.5y \leq x \leq 8.884y$ then $x^r + y^r \geq (1 + 1/10.174)^r (x + y)^r$.*
- (iv) *If $z < 1.98(t + w + x + y)$ and $0 < t \leq 2.072 \cdot \min\{w/1.036, x, y, z/5.884\}$ then $w^r + x^r + y^r + cz^r \geq (t + w + x + y + z)^r$.*
- (v) *If $w \leq \min\{x, y, z\}$ then $cx^r + y^r + z^r \geq c(w + x + y + z)^r$.*
- (vi) *If $x \geq 6z$ and $y \geq z$ then $cx^r + y^r \geq c(x + y + z)^r$.*

Proof. Clearly, (i) holds when $z = 0$. So we may assume that $z > 0$. Then $x > 0$ and $y > 0$. Let $f(x, y, z) := x^r + y^r - (x + y + z)^r$. Then the partial derivative

$$f_x(x, y, z) = \frac{r}{x^{1-r}} - \frac{r}{(x + y + z)^{1-r}} > 0.$$

So $f(x, y, z)$ is increasing with respect to x . Similarly, we can show that $f(x, y, z)$ is increasing with respect to y . Hence

$$f(x, y, z) \geq f(8.956z, 1.036z, z) = z^r (8.956^r + 1.036^r - 10.992^r) \approx 2.918 \times 10^{-5} z^r > 0,$$

and (i) holds.

To prove (ii), let $f(x, y) := cx^r + y^r - (x + y)^r$. We may assume $x > 0$, as (ii) holds when $x = 0$. Note that

$$f_x(x, y) = \frac{cr}{x^{1-r}} - \frac{r}{(x + y)^{1-r}}.$$

So $f_x(x, y) \geq 0$ if and only if $\frac{c^{1/(1-r)}}{x} \geq \frac{1}{x+y}$; and hence $f_x(x, y) \geq 0$ if and only if $x \leq \alpha y$, where $\alpha := \frac{c^{1/(1-r)}}{1-c^{1/(1-r)}} \approx 1.983$. Thus, if $x \leq \alpha y$ then $f(x, y)$ is non-decreasing with respect to x and $f(x, y) \geq f(0, y) = 0$. If $\alpha y \leq x \leq 10.174y$ then $f(x, y)$ is decreasing with respect to x ; so

$$f(x, y) \geq f(10.174y, y) = y^r(10.174^r c + 1 - 11.174^r) \geq 0,$$

and (ii) holds.

For (iii), let $\beta := (1 + 1/10.174)^r$ and $f(x, y) := x^r + y^r - \beta(x + y)^r$. If $y = 0$ then $x = 0$, and (iii) holds. So we may assume $y > 0$. Hence

$$f_y(x, y) = \frac{r}{y^{1-r}} - \frac{\beta r}{(x + y)^{1-r}}.$$

If $f_y(x, y) \leq 0$ then $1/y < \beta^{1/(1-r)}/(x + y) \approx 1.455/(x + y) < 1.5/(x + y)$; so $x < 0.5y$. Thus, if $x \geq 0.5y$ then $f_y(x, y) > 0$ and $f(x, y)$ is increasing with respect to y ; hence,

$$f(x, y) \geq f(x, x/8.884) = \left(\frac{x}{8.884}\right)^r (8.884^r + 1 - 9.884^r \beta) \approx 0.0018 \left(\frac{x}{8.884}\right)^r \geq 0.$$

So (iii) holds.

For (iv), fix $t > 0$ and let $f(w, x, y, z) := w^r + x^r + y^r + cz^r - (t + w + x + y + z)^r$. As in the argument for (i), we can easily show that $f(w, x, y, z)$ is increasing with respect to w, x and y . For z ,

$$f_z(w, x, y, z) = \frac{cr}{z^{1-r}} - \frac{r}{(t + w + x + y + z)^{1-r}}.$$

So $f'_z(w, x, y, z) \leq 0$ if and only if $c/z^{1-r} \leq 1/(t + w + x + y + z)^{1-r}$ if and only if $d/(1 - d) \leq z/(t + w + x + y)$, where $d = c^{1/(1-r)}$. Note that $d/(1 - d) > 1.98$; so if $z < 1.98(t + w + x + y + z)$ then $f_x(w, x, y, z) > 0$ and, hence,

$$\begin{aligned} f(w, x, y, z) &\geq f(1.036t/2.072, t/2.072, t/2.072, 5.884t/2.072) \\ &= (t/2.072)^r (1.036^r + 2 + 5.884^r c - 10.992^r) \\ &\approx 0.0275(t/2.072)^r \\ &\geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have (iv).

To prove (v), consider $f(w, x, y, z) := cx^r + y^r + z^r - c(w + x + y + z)^r$. Clearly (v) holds if $w = 0$. So assume $w > 0$; hence $x > 0, y > 0$ and $z > 0$. It is easy to check that f is increasing with respect to x, y, z . Hence $f(w, x, y, z) \geq f(w, w, w, w) = (c + 2 - 4^r c)w^r \approx 0.128w^r \geq 0$. This implies (v).

For (vi), we may assume $z > 0$ as (vi) holds when $z = 0$. Then $x > 0$ and $y > 0$. Let $f(x, y, z) := cx^r + y^r - c(x + y + z)^r$ which is increasing with respect to x, y . So $f(x, y, z) \geq f(6z, z, z) = (6^r c + 1 - 8^r c)z^r = 0$ (by the definition of c), and (vi) holds. \blacksquare

As mentioned in Section 1, we will merge small cycles into a large one. For this, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 2.5. *Let $n \geq 4$ be an integer and r, G, e, f, w be defined as in Theorem 1.1. Assume that Theorem 1.1 holds for graphs of order less than n . Let $X_1, \dots, X_s \subseteq V(G) - (V(e) \cup V(f))$ be pairwise disjoint non-trivial sets (i.e. $|X_i| \geq 2$) and $G' = G/(X_1, \dots, X_s)$ be cubic. For $i = 1, \dots, s$, let v_i denote the vertex obtained by contracting X_i . Assign weight 0 to all v_i and, for all other vertices of G' , keep their weights from G . Let $e_1, \dots, e_t \in E(G')$. If $G' \ominus e_1 \ominus \dots \ominus e_t$ has a cycle C' such that $\partial_G(X_i) \cap E(C') \neq \emptyset$ for $i \in I \subseteq \{1, \dots, k\}$ then G has a cycle C such that $E(C') \subseteq E(C)$ and $w(C) \geq w(C') + \sum_{i \in I} w(X_i)^r$.*

Proof. Since G' is cubic and X_1, \dots, X_s are pairwise disjoint, $|\partial_G(X_i)| = 3$ for $1 \leq i \leq s$. Let $\partial_G(X_i) = \{f_i, g_i, h_i\}$ and $G_i = G/(G - V(X_i))$ for $1 \leq i \leq s$. If G_i is not 3-connected then there is an $A \subseteq G[X_i]$ such that $|\partial_{G_i}(A)| \leq 2$. Note that $|\partial_G(A)| = |\partial_{G_i}(A)|$. Since G is 2-connected, $\partial_G(A)$ is a 2-edge cut in G , which does not separate e for f (because $e, f \notin E(G[X_i])$), a contradiction. Hence G_i is a 3-connected cubic graph. In G_i , assign weight 0 to the vertex resulting from contracting $G - V(X_i)$ and let all other vertices inherit their weights from G . Then Theorem 1.1 holds for G_i .

Let $I = \{1 \leq i \leq k : \partial_G(X_i) \cap E(C') \neq \emptyset\}$. Without loss of generality, let $f_i, g_i \in E(C')$ for each $i \in I$. Applying Theorem 1.1 to G_i , there is a cycle C_i in G_i such that $f_i, g_i \in E(C_i)$ and $w(C_i) \geq w(X_i)^r$. Let $C := G[E(C') \cup \bigcup_{i \in I} E(C_i)]$. Then C is a cycle in G such that $E(C') \subseteq E(C)$ and $w(C) = w(C') + \sum_{i \in I} w(C_i) \geq w(C') + \sum_{i \in I} w(X_i)^r$. ■

3 Adjacent edges

In this section we prove Theorem 1.1(a) for graphs of order n under the assumption that Theorem 1.1 holds for graphs of order less than n . Recall from the remark following Theorem 1.1 that we may assume $w(V(\{e, f\})) = 0$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $r = 0.8$ and $n \geq 4$ be an integer, and assume that Theorem 1.1 holds for graphs of order less than n . Let G be a 2-connected cubic graph of order n , let $e, f \in E(G)$ such that e and f are adjacent, and every 2-edge cut in G separates e from f , and let $w : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $w(V(\{e, f\})) = 0$. Then there is a cycle C in G such that $e, f \in E(C)$ and $w(C) \geq w(G)^r$.*

Proof. Since e and f are adjacent, there is no 2-edge cut in G separating e from f . So by the assumption of this lemma, G is 3-connected.

Claim 1. We may assume that no nontrivial 3-edge cut in G contains e or f .

For, let S be a nontrivial 3-edge cut in G such that $e \in S$. Let A, B be the components of $G - S$; then $|A| \geq 2$ and $|B| \geq 2$ (since S is nontrivial). So G/A and G/B are 3-connected cubic graphs of order less than n . By assumption, Theorem 1.1 holds for both G/A and G/B . Assign weight 0 to the new vertices resulting from contracting A and B , and let all other vertices of G/A and G/B inherit their weights from G .

Without loss of generality, we may assume that $f \in E(G/A)$. Since Theorem 1.1 holds for G/A , there is a cycle C_A in G/A such that $e, f \in E(C_A)$ and $w(C_A) \geq w(G/A)^r$. By Lemma 2.5, there is a cycle C in G such that $e, f \in E(C)$ and

$$w(C) \geq w(G/A)^r + w(B)^r \geq (w(B) + w(A))^r = w(G)^r,$$

completing the proof of Claim 1.

Let $e = u_1u_2$ and $f = u_2u_3$, let e_1, e_2 be the edges of $G - e$ incident with u_1 , let e_3, e_4 be the edges of $G - f$ incident with u_3 , and let e_5 be the edge of $G - \{e, f\}$ incident with u_2 . See Fig. 1.

Claim 2. We may assume that $\{e_1, e_2\} \cap \{e_3, e_4\} = \emptyset$.

For, suppose $\{e_1, e_2\} \cap \{e_3, e_4\} \neq \emptyset$ and, without loss of generality, assume $e_2 = e_3$. Let $G' := G/G[\{u_1, u_2, u_3\}]$, assign weight 0 to the vertex resulting from the contraction of $G[\{u_1, u_2, u_3\}]$, and let the other vertices of G' inherit their weights from G . Then $w(G') = w(G)$ as $w(\{u_1, u_2, u_3\}) = w(V(\{e, f\})) = 0$. Since $|G'| < n$, it follows from the assumption of this lemma that Theorem 1.1 holds for G' . So G' has a cycle C' such that $e_1, e_4 \in E(C')$ and $w(C') \geq w(G')^r$. Now $C := G[E(C') \cup \{e, f\}]$ is a cycle in G such that $e, f \in E(C)$ and

$$w(C) \geq w(G')^r = w(G)^r,$$

completing the proof of Claim 2.

For $1 \leq i \leq 5$, let $X_i \subseteq G$ be maximal subject to the following conditions: $e_i \in \partial_G(X_i)$, $|\partial_G(X_i)| = 3$, and $\{u_1, u_2, u_3\} \cap V(X_i) = \emptyset$. Note that such X_i exists, as G is cubic and $V(e_i) - \{u_1, u_2, u_3\}$ satisfies these conditions. Moreover, $G[X_i]$ is connected as G_i is 3-connected.

Claim 3. For each $1 \leq i \leq 5$, X_i is uniquely defined, and $(G/X_i) \ominus e_i$ is 3-connected.

First, let $X'_i \subseteq G$ be maximal such that $e_i \in \partial_G(X'_i)$, $|\partial_G(X'_i)| = 3$, and $\{u_1, u_2, u_3\} \cap V(X'_i) = \emptyset$. By definition, $X_i \cap X'_i \neq \emptyset$ and $X_i \cup X'_i \neq G$. Hence, since G is 3-connected, it follows from Lemma 2.1 that $|\partial_G(X_i \cup X'_i)| = 3$. By the maximality of X_i and X'_i , we have $X_i = X'_i$.

Now suppose $(G/X_i) \ominus e_i$ is not 3-connected for some $1 \leq i \leq 5$, and let F be a 2-edge cut in $(G/X_i) \ominus e_i$. Then $F \cup \{e_i\}$ is a 3-edge cut in G and X_i is properly contained in a component of $G - (F \cup \{e_i\})$. By Claim 1, this component of $G - (F \cup \{e_i\})$ containing X_i is disjoint from $\{u_1, u_2, u_3\}$, contradicting the maximality of X_i .

Claim 4. $X_1 \cap X_2 = \emptyset$, $X_3 \cap X_4 = \emptyset$, and $X_5 \cap X_i = \emptyset$ for $1 \leq i \leq 4$.

Suppose $X_1 \cap X_2 \neq \emptyset$. Then as G is 3-connected and $X_1 \cup X_2 \neq G$, it follows from Lemma 2.1 that $|\partial_G(X_1 \cup X_2)| = 3$. Hence $X_1 = X_2$ by the maximality of X_1 and X_2 . Therefore, $e_1, e_2 \in \partial_G(X_1)$ and, thus, $|\partial_G(X_1 \cup \{u_1\})| = 2$, contradicting the fact that G is 3-connected. So $X_1 \cap X_2 = \emptyset$. Similarly, we have $X_3 \cap X_4 = \emptyset$.

Now suppose $X_5 \cap X_i \neq \emptyset$ for some $1 \leq i \leq 4$. By symmetry, we may assume $i = 1$. Then by Lemma 2.1 and by the maximality of X_1 and X_5 , we can show that $X_1 = X_5$ and $e_1, e_5 \in \partial_G(X_1)$. By Claim 2, the 3-edge cut $\partial_G(X_1 \cup \{u_1, u_2\})$ is nontrivial; but it contains f , contradicting Claim 1. This completes the proof of Claim 4.

Claim 5. $[X_1, X_2] = \emptyset$ and $[X_3, X_4] = \emptyset$.

If $[X_1, X_2] \neq \emptyset$ then $\partial_G(X_1 \cup X_2 \cup \{u_1\})$ is a nontrivial 3-edge cut containing e , a contradiction to Claim 1. Hence $[X_1, X_2] = \emptyset$. Similarly, $[X_3, X_4] = \emptyset$, completing the proof of Claim 5.

By Claim 4, we have two cases to consider: $(X_1 \cup X_2) \cap (X_3 \cup X_4) = \emptyset$ and $(X_1 \cup X_2) \cap (X_3 \cup X_4) \neq \emptyset$. Note that for distinct X_i and X_j , $|[X_i, X_j]| \leq 1$ as G is 3-connected. However, we will see that it is possible to have $|[X_i, X_j]| = 1$.

Case 1. $(X_1 \cup X_2) \cap (X_3 \cup X_4) = \emptyset$.

In this case, we have from Claim 4 that $X_i \cap X_j = \emptyset$ for $1 \leq i < j \leq 5$. Let $x_i := w(X_i)$ and $\partial_G(X_i) = \{e_i, e_{i1}, e_{i2}\}$ for $1 \leq i \leq 5$ (see Fig. 1), and let $Z := G - \bigcup_{i=1}^5 X_i$ and $z := w(Z)$. Then

$$w(G) = x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4 + x_5 + z.$$

By symmetry, we may assume that $x_1 = \min\{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4\}$ and $x_3 \leq x_4$. We will find several cycles in G and show that one of these is the desired cycle.




Fig. 1: An illustration for Case 1.

Let $G_{12} := G/X_1 \ominus e_1/X_2$ (with order of operation from left to right), let v_2 denote the vertex resulting from the contraction of X_2 , and let $w(v_2) = 0$ and all other vertices of G_{12} inherit their weights from G . Note that

$$w(G_{12}) = w(G) - x_1 - x_2 = x_3 + x_4 + x_5 + z.$$

Also note that by Claim 3, $G/X_1 \ominus e_1$ is 3-connected; so G_{12} is 3-connected. Hence by assumption, Theorem 1.1 holds for G_{12} .

Thus G_{12} has a cycle C_1 such that $e = e_2, f \in E(C_1)$ and $w(C_1) \geq w(G_{12})^r$. Note that C_1 goes through the vertex representing the contraction of X_2 . By Lemma 2.5, there is a cycle C_{12} in G such that $e, f \in E(C_{12})$ and

$$w(C_{12}) \geq w(G_{12})^r + x_2^r = (x_3 + x_4 + x_5 + z)^r + x_2^r. \quad (3.1)$$

Let $G_{52} := G/X_5 \ominus e_5/X_2$, assign weight 0 to the vertex resulting from the contraction of X_2 , and let all other vertices of G_{52} inherit their weights from G . Similarly, let $G_{54} :=$

$G/X_5 \ominus e_5/X_4$, assign weight 0 to the vertex resulting from the contraction of X_4 , and let all other vertices of G_{54} inherit their weights from G . Note that

$$w(G_{52}) = w(G) - x_2 - x_5 = x_1 + x_3 + x_4 + z$$

and

$$w(G_{54}) = w(G) - x_4 - x_5 = x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + z.$$

By an argument similar to that for G_{12} , we see that both G_{52} and G_{54} are 3-connected, and we can find a cycle in G_{52} through $e = f$ and e_2 (and the vertex representing the contraction of X_2), and a cycle in G_{54} through $e = f$ and e_4 (and the vertex representing the contraction of X_4). By Lemma 2.5, there exist two cycles C_{52} and C_{54} in G such that $e, f \in E(C_{52}) \cap E(C_{54})$ and

$$w(C_{52}) \geq w(G_{52})^r + x_2^r = (x_1 + x_3 + x_4 + z)^r + x_2^r, \quad (3.2)$$

$$w(C_{54}) \geq w(G_{54})^r + x_4^r = (x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + z)^r + x_4^r. \quad (3.3)$$

Let $G_5 := G/X_5 \ominus e_5$. Denote by e', f' the edges obtained from merging e and f and merging e_{51} and e_{52} , respectively. Then G_5 is 3-connected (by Claim 3), and

$$w(G_5) = w(G) - x_5 = x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4 + z.$$

By assumption of this lemma, Theorem 1.1 holds for G_5 ; so G_5 has a cycle C_1 such that $e', f' \in E(C_1)$ and $w(C_1) \geq cw(G_5)^r$ (here e' and f' are not adjacent). By Lemma 2.5, there is a cycle C_5 in G such that $e, f \in E(C_5)$ and

$$w(C_5) \geq cw(G_5)^r + x_5^r = c(x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4 + z)^r + x_5^r. \quad (3.4)$$

Let $H = G/(X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, X_5) - \{u_1, u_2, u_3\}$ and $S = \{v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4, v_5\}$, with each v_i representing the contraction of X_i .

We may assume $V(H) \neq S$. For, if $V(H) = S$ then $H \cong C_5$ because $||X_i, X_j|| \leq 1$ for all $i \neq j$. Hence, H has an edge between $\{v_1, v_2\}$ and $\{v_3, v_4\}$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $v_1v_3 \in E(H)$. Then $(H - v_1v_3) \cup v_1u_1u_2u_3v_3$ is a hamiltonian cycle in $G/(X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, X_5)$. By Lemma 2.5, G has a cycle C such that $e, f \in E(C)$ and

$$w(C) \geq x_1^r + x_2^r + x_3^r + x_4^r + x_5^r \geq (x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4 + x_5)^r = w(G)^r,$$

and the assertion of the lemma holds.

Let G_z be the graph obtained from H by suppressing all vertices of degree 2 (i.e., vertices in S). Since $V(H) \neq S$, G_z is cubic. For any $A \subseteq G_z$, let A^H be the subgraph of H obtained from A by un-suppressing the vertices in S .

We claim that G_z is 2-connected. Otherwise, G_z has disjoint induced subgraphs Z_1, Z_2 such that $V(G_z) = V(Z_1) \cup V(Z_2)$ and $||Z_1, Z_2|| \leq 1$. Without loss of generality we may assume that $|V(Z_1^H) \cap S| \leq 2$. Since G is 3-connected, $|V(Z_1^H)| \geq 3$, $|V(Z_1^H) \cap S| = 2$ and $||Z_1, Z_2|| = 1$. If we let $V(Z_1^H) \cap S = \{v_k, v_l\}$ and $[Z_1, Z_2] = \{g\}$ then $\{e_k, e_l, g\}$ is a 3-edge cut in G contradicting the maximality of X_k and X_l .

Let A_1, \dots, A_t denote the minimal induced subgraphs of G_z such that $|\partial_{G_z}(A_i)| = 2$. We claim that if $t > 0$ then $|V(A_i^H) \cap S| \geq 2$ for all i , and thus $t \leq 2$. For, if there exists some $A_i \subseteq G_2$ with $V(A_i^H) \cap S = \{v_s\}$ and $\partial_H(A_i^H) = \{g_1, g_2\}$ then $\partial_G(A_i^H) = \{e_s, g_1, g_2\}$ is a 3-edge cut in G , contradicting the maximality of X_s .

Therefore, since $t \leq 2$, there exist $k \in \{1, 2\}$ and $l \in \{3, 4\}$ such that $(G_z \oplus h, e_{k1}, e_{l1})$ is 3-connected. So Theorem 1.1 holds for $G_z \oplus h$. Let the vertices of G_z inherit their weights from G , and let the new vertices of $G_z \oplus h$ have weight 0. By Claim 5, $e_{11} \neq e_{21}$ and $e_{31} \neq e_{41}$. Then for any $i \in \{3 - k, 7 - l, 5\}$, there is a cycle D_i in $G_z \oplus h$ such that $h, e_{i1} \in E(D_i)$ and

$$w(D_i) \geq cw(G_z \oplus h)^r = cz^r.$$

Note that D_i goes through the vertices representing the contractions of X_i, X_k, X_l . By Lemma 2.5, choosing $i \in \{3 - k, 7 - l, 5\}$ to maximize x_i , there is a cycle C_z in G such that $e, f \in E(C_z)$ and

$$w(C_z) \geq x_k^r + x_l^r + cz^r + \max\{x_{3-k}^r, x_{7-l}^r, x_5^r\}.$$

Since $x_1 \leq x_2$ and $x_3 \leq x_4$ and because $k \in \{1, 2\}$ and $l \in \{3, 4\}$, we have

$$w(C_z) \geq x_1^r + x_3^r + cz^r + \max\{x_2^r, x_4^r, x_5^r\}. \quad (3.5)$$

We now show that

$$\max\{w(C_{12}), w(C_{52}), w(C_{54}), w(C_5), w(C_z)\} \geq w(G)^r = (x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4 + x_5 + z)^r.$$

In view of (3.1)–(3.5), let

$$\begin{aligned} f_1(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5, z) &:= (x_3 + x_4 + x_5 + z)^r + x_2^r - (x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4 + x_5 + z)^r, \\ f_2(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5, z) &:= (x_1 + x_3 + x_4 + z)^r + x_2^r - (x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4 + x_5 + z)^r, \\ f_3(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5, z) &:= (x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + z)^r + x_4^r - (x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4 + x_5 + z)^r, \\ f_4(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5, z) &:= c(x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4 + z)^r + x_5^r - (x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4 + x_5 + z)^r, \\ f_5(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5, z) &:= x_1^r + x_3^r + x_2^r + cz^r - (x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4 + x_5 + z)^r, \\ f_6(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5, z) &:= x_1^r + x_3^r + x_4^r + cz^r - (x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4 + x_5 + z)^r, \\ f_7(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5, z) &:= x_1^r + x_3^r + x_5^r + cz^r - (x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4 + x_5 + z)^r. \end{aligned}$$

By (3.1)–(3.5), it suffices to show that for all $x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5, z \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, we have $\max\{f_i : 1 \leq i \leq 7\} \geq 0$.

Suppose this is not true. Then there exist $x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5, z \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $f_i(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5, z) < 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq 7$. Thus $x_1 > 0$ as otherwise $f_1 \geq 0$. So $x_i \geq x_1 > 0$ for $i = 2, 3, 4$. Also $x_5 > 0$ as otherwise $f_3 \geq 0$. Hence we may take partial derivatives of f_i (for $1 \leq i \leq 7$) with respect to any variable, and obtain information about monotonicity of f_i . Note that each f_i is continuous at $x_j = 0$ ($1 \leq j \leq 5$) and $z = 0$.

Suppose $z \geq 1.98(x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4 + x_5)$. Since $x_i \geq x_1$ for $i = 2, 3, 4$ and $x_5 \geq 0$, we have $z \geq 7.92x_1$; and since f_1 is increasing with respect to each of z, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5 , we have $f_1 \geq f_1(x_1, x_1, x_1, x_1, 0, 7.92x_1) = (9.92x_1)^r + x_1^r - (11.92x_1)^r \approx 0.00775x_1^r \geq 0$, a contradiction.

Hence, $z < 1.98(x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4 + x_5)$. Then, since $f_i < 0$ for $i = 5, 6, 7$, it follows from Lemma 2.4(iv) that, for each permutation jkl of $\{2, 4, 5\}$,

$$x_j + x_k > 2.072 \cdot \min\{x_l/1.036, x_1, x_3, z/5.884\}.$$

If we choose j, k, l so that $x_j \leq x_k \leq x_l$ then, since $2.072x_l/1.036 = 2x_l \geq x_j + x_k$, $x_j + x_k > 2.072 \cdot \min\{x_1, x_3, z/5.884\}$. Since $x_1 \leq x_3$,

$$\min\{x_4 + x_5, x_5 + x_2, x_2 + x_4\} > 2.072 \cdot \min\{x_1, z/5.884\} \quad (3.6)$$

Moreover, since $f_4 < 0$, it follows from Lemma 2.4(ii) that

$$x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4 + z > 10.174x_5. \quad (3.7)$$

Suppose $z/5.884 \geq x_1$. Then by (3.6), $\min\{x_4 + x_5, x_5 + x_2, x_2 + x_4\} > 2.072x_1$. Hence $x_3 + x_4 + x_5 + z \geq (1 + 2.072 + 5.884)x_1 = 8.956x_1$. If $x_2 \geq 1.036x_1$ then by Lemma 2.4(i), we have $f_1 \geq 0$, a contradiction. So $x_2 < 1.036x_1$. Then, since $x_2 + x_5 > 2.072x_1$, $x_5 > 1.036x_1$. By (3.7), $x_3 + x_4 + z > 10.174x_5 - x_1 - x_2 > 8.5x_1$. Since f_1 is increasing with respect to $x_3 + x_4 + z$, x_2 and x_5 ,

$$f_1 \geq (8.5x_1 + 1.036x_1)^r + x_1^r - (2x_1 + 8.5x_1 + 1.036x_1)^r = (9.536^r + 1 - 11.536^r)x_1^r \geq 0,$$

a contradiction.

Hence, $z/5.884 < x_1$. By (3.7), we have

$$f_2 > g_2 := (x_1 + x_3 + x_4 + z)^r + x_2^r - (1 + 1/10.174)^r(x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4 + z)^r.$$

Suppose $x_4 < x_2$. Then, since $z/5.884 < x_1$ and $x_1 \leq x_3 \leq x_4$, we have $x_1 + x_3 + x_4 + z < 8.884x_2$. Since $g_2 < f_2 < 0$, it follows from Lemma 2.4(iii) that $0.5x_2 > x_1 + x_3 + x_4 + z \geq 3x_1$. Hence $x_2 \geq 6x_1$, and so $f_1 \geq f_1(x_1, 6x_1, x_1, x_1, 0, 0) \geq (2x_1)^r + (6x_1)^r - (9x_1)^r \approx 0.134x_1^r \geq 0$, a contradiction.

Hence, $x_2 \leq x_4$. By (3.7) we have

$$f_3 \geq g_3 := (x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + z)^r + x_4^r - (1 + 1/10.174)^r(x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4 + z)^r.$$

Since $z/5.884 < x_1$, $x_1 \leq x_2 \leq x_4$ and $x_3 \leq x_4$, we have $x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + z < 8.884x_4$. Since $g_3 \leq f_3 < 0$, it follows from Lemma 2.4(iii) that $0.5x_4 > x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + z \geq 3x_1$. Hence $x_4 \geq 6x_1$. If $x_2 \geq 2x_1$ then $f_1 \geq f_1(x_1, 2x_1, x_1, 6x_1, 0, 0) = (7x_1)^r + (2x_1)^r - (10x_1)^r \approx 0.175x_1^r \geq 0$, a contradiction. So $x_2 < 2x_1$. If $x_5 \leq 1.5x_1$ then $f_3 \geq f_3(x_1, x_1, x_1, 6x_1, 1.5x_1, 0) = (3x_1)^r + (6x_1)^r - (10.5x_1)^r \approx 0.04x_1^r \geq 0$, a contradiction. So $x_5 > 1.5x_1$. Then from (3.7) we deduce $x_3 + x_4 + x_5 + z \geq 11.174x_5 - x_1 - x_2 > 13.76x_1$. So $f_1 \geq (13.76x_1)^r + x_1^r - (15.76x_1)^r \approx 0.066x_1^r \geq 0$, a contradiction.

Case 2. $(X_1 \cup X_2) \cap (X_3 \cup X_4) \neq \emptyset$.

Without loss of generality, we may assume that $X_2 \cap X_4 \neq \emptyset$. Then by Lemma 2.1 and by the maximality of X_2 and X_4 , we have $X_2 = X_4$.

We may assume that $X_1 \cap X_3 = \emptyset$. For, suppose $X_1 \cap X_3 \neq \emptyset$. Then $X_1 = X_3$ by Lemma 2.1 and by the maximality of X_1 and X_3 . Let $\partial_G(X_1) = \{e_1, e_3, f_1\}$ and $\partial_G(X_2) = \{e_2, e_4, f_2\}$,

and let $U := G[X_1 \cup X_2 \cup \{u_1, u_2, u_3\}]$. Then $\partial_G(U) = \{e_5, f_1, f_2\}$. So G/U is 3-connected and Theorem 1.1 holds for G/U . Assign weight 0 to the vertex of G/U resulting from the contraction of U , and let all other vertices of G/U inherit their weights from G . Then G/U has a cycle C_1 such that $f_1, f_2 \in E(C_1)$ and $w(C_1) \geq (w(G) - w(U))^r$. Note that C_1 goes through the vertices representing the contractions of X_1, X_2 . Hence, by Lemma 2.5, there is a cycle C in G such that $e, f \in E(C)$ and $w(C) \geq w(X_1)^r + w(X_2)^r + (w(G) - w(U))^r \geq w(G)^r$.

Relabel $X_2 = X_4$ as Y_1 and let $\partial_G(Y_1) = \{e_2, e_4, e_6\}$. Let $Y_2 \subseteq G - Y_1 - \{u_1, u_2, u_3\}$ be maximal such that $e_6 \in \partial_G(Y_2)$ and $|\partial_G(Y_2)| = 3$. Note that Y_2 exists (as G is cubic) and $G[Y_2]$ is connected as G is 3-connected. Moreover, Y_2 is uniquely defined by the same argument for Claim 3 (that X_i is uniquely defined).

We claim that $Y_2 \cap (X_1 \cup X_3) = \emptyset$. For, suppose $Y_2 \cap X_i \neq \emptyset$ for some $i \in \{1, 3\}$. Then by Lemma 2.1 and the maximality of Y_2 and X_i , we have $Y_2 = X_i$. Thus $[X_i, Y_1] \neq \emptyset$, contradicting Claim 5.

We may assume that $Y_2 \cap X_5 = \emptyset$. For, if $Y_2 \cap X_5 \neq \emptyset$ then $Y_2 = X_5$ by Lemma 2.1 and the maximality of X_5 and Y_2 . Let $\partial_G(Y_2) = \{e_5, e_6, f_1\}$, and $U = G[Y_1 \cup Y_2 \cup \{u_1, u_2, u_3\}]$. Then $\partial_G(U) = \{e_1, e_3, f_1\}$. So G/U is 3-connected, and Theorem 1.1 holds for G/U . Assign weight 0 to the vertex of G/U resulting from the contraction of U , and let all other vertices of G/U inherit their weights from G . Now G/U has a cycle C_1 such that $e_1, f_1 \in E(C_1)$ and $w(C_1) \geq (w(G) - w(U))^r$. Note that C_1 goes through the vertices representing the contractions of Y_1, Y_2 . By Lemma 2.5, there is a cycle C in G such that $e, f \in E(C)$ and $w(C) \geq (w(G) - w(U))^r + w(Y_1)^r + w(Y_2)^r \geq w(G)^r$.

Thus, G has the structure described in Fig. 2. Let $x_i := w(X_i)$ for $i = 1, 3, 5$, $y_i := w(Y_i)$ for $i = 1, 2$, $Z := G - (X_1 \cup X_3 \cup X_5 \cup Y_1 \cup Y_2)$, and $z := w(Z)$. Then

$$w(G) = x_1 + x_3 + x_5 + y_1 + y_2 + z.$$

Let $\partial_G(X_i) = \{e_i, e_{i1}, e_{i2}\}$ for $i = 1, 3, 5$, and let $\partial_G(Y_2) = \{e_6, e_{61}, e_{62}\}$. By symmetry, we may assume that $x_1 \leq x_3$. We will produce several cycles in G and show that one of these is the desired cycle.




Fig. 2: An illustration for Case 2.

Let $G_1 := G/X_1 \ominus e_1 / (G[Y_1 \cup \{u_2, u_3\}], Y_2, X_3)$, with the order of operation from left to

right. Assign weight 0 to the three vertices resulting from contracting $G[Y_1 \cup \{u_2, u_3\}]$, Y_2 , and X_3 and let all other vertices of G_1 inherit their weights from G . Then $w(G_1) = x_5 + z$. By Claim 3, $G/X_1 \ominus e_1$ is 3-connected. Since $|\partial_{G/X_1 \ominus e_1}(G[Y_1 \cup \{u_2, u_3\}])| = |\partial_{G/X_1 \ominus e_1}(Y_2)| = |\partial_{G/X_1 \ominus e_1}(X_3)| = 3$, G_1 is 3-connected. Hence, Theorem 1.1 holds for G_1 ; so G_1 has a cycle D_1 such that $e_3, e_6 \in E(D_1)$ and $w(D_1) \geq w(G_1)^r = (x_5 + z)^r$. Note that D_1 goes through the vertices representing the contractions of X_3, Y_1, Y_2 . So by Lemma 2.5, there is a cycle C_1 in G such that $e, f \in E(C_1)$ and

$$w(C_1) \geq y_1^r + y_2^r + x_3^r + (x_5 + z)^r. \quad (3.8)$$

Now let $G_2 := G/X_5 \ominus e_5 / (G[Y_1 \cup \{u_1, u_3\}], Y_2, X_3)$. Assign weight 0 to the three vertices resulting from contracting $G[Y_1 \cup \{u_1, u_3\}]$, Y_2 , and X_3 , and let all other vertices of G_2 inherit their weights from G . By Claim 3 and the maximality of X_5 , $G/X_5 \ominus e_5$ is 3-connected; so G_2 is 3-connected. Hence, Theorem 1.1 holds for G_2 and, thus, G_2 has a cycle D_1 such that $e_3, e_6 \in E(D_1)$ and $w(D_1) \geq w(G_2)^r = (x_1 + z)^r$. Note D_1 goes through the vertices representing the contractions of Y_1, Y_2, X_3 . Hence, by Lemma 2.5, there is a cycle C_2 in G such that $e, f \in E(C_2)$ and

$$w(C_2) \geq y_1^r + y_2^r + x_3^r + (x_1 + z)^r. \quad (3.9)$$

Next, let $G_y := G/(Y_1, Y_2) \ominus e_6 / (X_1, G[\{u_1, u_2, u_3\}], X_3)$. Assign weight 0 to the three vertices resulting from the contraction of X_1 , $G[\{u_1, u_2, u_3\}]$ and X_3 and let all other vertices of G_y inherit their weights from G . Then $w(G_y) = x_5 + z$. If $G/(Y_1, Y_2) \ominus e_6$ has an edge-cut F with $|F| \leq 2$ then, since $G/(Y_1, Y_2)$ is 3-connected, $|F| = 2$ and $F' := F \cup \{e_6\}$ is a 3-edge-cut in G ; but the component of $G - F'$ containing Y_2 contradicts the maximality of Y_2 . Hence, $G/(Y_1, Y_2) \ominus e_6$ is 3-connected; so G_y is 3-connected, and Theorem 1.1 holds for G_y . Thus G_y has a cycle D_y such that $e_1, e_3 \in E(D_y)$ and $w(D_y) \geq w(G_y)^r = (x_5 + z)^r$. Note that D_1 going through e, f and the vertices representing the contractions of X_1, X_3 . Hence, by Lemma 2.5, there is a cycle C_y in G such that $e, f \in E(C_y)$ and

$$w(C_y) \geq x_1^r + x_3^r + (x_5 + z)^r. \quad (3.10)$$

Finally, let $G_z := G/X_5 \ominus e_5 / (G[Y_1 \cup \{u_1, u_3\}], X_1, X_3, Y_2)$. Assign weight 0 to the four vertices resulting from the contractions of $G[Y_1 \cup \{u_1, u_3\}]$, X_1 , X_3 and Y_2 , respectively, and let other vertices of G_z inherit their weights from G . Let $e_1 = u_1v_1$, $e_5 = u_2v_2$ and $e_3 = u_3v_3$, and let $N_{G_z}(v_i) = \{u_i, z_i, w_i\}$. By the maximality of X_1 and X_3 , G_z satisfies the conditions of Lemma 2.3. So by Lemma 2.3, $G_z \ominus uv_2$ contains a cycle through e_{51}, v_1v_3, e_{31} , or $G_z \ominus uv_1$ contains a cycle through e_{51}, v_3v_2, e_{11} . Assume the former. Then G contains a cycle D_z through $e_1, e, f, e_4, e_6, e_{51}, e_{31}$. By Lemma 2.5, there is a cycle C_z in G such that $e, f \in E(C_z)$ and

$$w(C_z) \geq x_1^r + x_3^r + x_5^r + y_1^r + y_2^r. \quad (3.11)$$

Similarly, such C_z exists if $G \ominus uv_1$ has a cycle through e_{51}, v_3v_2, e_{11} (with e_{51} playing the role of e).

We now show that $\max\{w(C_1), w(C_2), w(C_y), w(C_z)\} \geq w(G)^r$ from which the assertion of the lemma holds. We may assume $x_1 > 0$ as otherwise C_1 is the desired cycle; hence $x_3 > 0$

as $x_3 \geq x_1$. Similarly, $x_5 > 0$, $y_1 + y_2 > 0$ and $z > 0$; as otherwise C_2 , C_y or C_z is the desired cycle.

It is easy to verify that $w(C_1) - w(G)^r$, $w(C_2) - w(G)^r$, $w(C_y) - w(G)^r$ and $w(C_z) - w(G)^r$ are increasing functions with respect to x_3 . Therefore, since we assume $x_1 \leq x_3$, we may further assume that $x_1 = x_3$ and denote it by x . Furthermore, by noting that $y_1^r + y_2^r \geq (y_1 + y_2)^r$ and writing $y := y_1 + y_2$, it suffices to show $\max\{f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4\} \geq 0$ for all $x, x_5, y, z \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, where

$$\begin{aligned} f_1(x, x_5, y, z) &= x^r + y^r + (x_5 + z)^r - (2x + x_5 + y + z)^r, \\ f_2(x, x_5, y, z) &= x^r + y^r + (x + z)^r - (2x + x_5 + y + z)^r, \\ f_3(x, x_5, y, z) &= 2x^r + (x_5 + z)^r - (2x + x_5 + y + z)^r, \text{ and} \\ f_4(x, x_5, y, z) &= 2x^r + x_5^r + y^r - (2x + x_5 + y + z)^r. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose, for a contradiction, that there exist $x, x_5, y, z \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $f_i(x, x_5, y, z) < 0$ for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$. Let $t = \min\{x, y, x_5\}$. Then $t > 0$. Moreover, $z > t$; otherwise, since f_4 is increasing with respect to x, y, x_5 and decreasing with respect to z , $f_4(x, x_5, y, z) \geq f_4(t, t, t, t) = 4t^r - (5t)^r \approx 0.376t^r \geq 0$, a contradiction.

If $t = x$ then, since f_1 is increasing with respect to x_5, y, z , $f_1(x, x_5, y, z) \geq f_1(t, t, t, t) = (2 + 2^r - 5^r)t^r \approx 0.117t^r > 0$, a contradiction. Similarly, if $t = x_5$ then $f_2(x, x_5, y, z) \geq f_2(t, t, t, t) \approx 0.117t^r > 0$, and if $t = y$ then $f_3(x, x_5, y, z) \geq f_3(t, t, t, t) \approx 0.117t^r > 0$. ■

4 Nonadjacent edges

In this section we prove Theorem 1.1(b) for graphs of order n under the assumption that Theorem 1.1 holds for graphs of order less than n .

Lemma 4.1. *Let $n \geq 4$ be an integer and assume that Theorem 1.1 holds for graphs of order less than n . Let G be a 2-connected cubic graph of order n , let $w : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^+$, and let $e, f \in E(G)$ such that $w(V(\{e, f\})) = 0$, e and f are nonadjacent, and every 2-edge cut in G separates e from f . Then there is a cycle C in G such that $e, f \in E(C)$ and $w(C) \geq cw(G)^r$, where $r = 0.8$ and $c = 1/(8^r - 6^r)$.*

Proof. First, we may assume *Claim 1*. G is 3-connected.

For, suppose that there exists a 2-edge cut, say F , in G . Then by assumption, F separates e from f in G ; so let A, B denote the components of $G - F$ containing e, f , respectively. Let G_1 be the graph obtained from A by adding an edge (call it f') between the vertices in $V(F) \cap V(A)$, and let G_2 denote the graph obtained from B by adding an edge (call it e') between the vertices in $V(F) \cap V(B)$.

It is easy to see that G_1 and G_2 are 2-connected, and any 2-edge cut in G_1 (respectively, G_2) must separate e (respectively, e') from f' (respectively, f). Hence Theorem 1.1 holds for G_1 and G_2 . So G_1 has a cycle C_1 such that $e, f' \in E(C_1)$ and $w(C_1) \geq cw(G_1)^r = cw(A)^r$, and G_2 has a cycle C_2 such that $e', f \in E(C_2)$ and $w(C_2) \geq cw(G_2)^r = cw(B)^r$. Now $C := G[E(C_1 - f') \cup E(C_2 - e') \cup F]$ is a cycle in G such that $e, f \in E(C)$ and $w(C) \geq cw(A)^r + cw(B)^r \geq cw(G)^r$, completing the proof of *Claim 1*.

The same argument for Claim 1 in the proof of Lemma 3.1 can be used here to give

Claim 2. No nontrivial 3-edge cut in G contains e or f .

We now prove that we may assume

Claim 3. No 3-edge cut in G separates e from f .

For, suppose $S = \{f_1, f_2, f_3\}$ is a 3-edge cut in G and let A, B denote the components of $G - S$ such that $e \in E(A)$ and $f \in E(B)$. Clearly G/A and G/B are 3-connected. So Theorem 1.1 holds for G/A and G/B . Let the new vertices in G/A and G/B resulting from contractions have weight 0, and let all other vertices of G/A and G/B inherit their weights from G . So for each $1 \leq i \leq 3$, G/B has a cycle C_i such that $e, f_i \in E(C_i)$ and $w(C_i) \geq cw(G/B)^r = cw(A)^r$, and G/A has a cycle C'_i such that $f_i, f \in E(C'_i)$ and $w(C'_i) \geq cw(G/A)^r = cw(B)^r$.

The sets $E(C_i) \cap S$, $1 \leq i \leq 3$, include at least two of $\{f_1, f_2\}$, $\{f_1, f_3\}$, $\{f_2, f_3\}$, as do the sets $E(C'_j) \cap S$, $1 \leq j \leq 3$. Therefore, there are i and j such that $E(C_i) \cap S = E(C'_j) \cap S$. Then $C := G[E(C_i) \cup E(C'_j)]$ is a cycle in G such that $e, f \in E(C)$ and $w(C) \geq cw(A)^r + cw(B)^r \geq cw(G)^r$, completing the proof of Claim 3.

Next we show that e and f cannot be very close to each other. Specifically, we may assume

Claim 4. There is no edge adjacent to both e and f .

For, suppose there is an edge $g = u_1u_2$ such that $u_1 \in V(e)$ and $u_2 \in V(f)$. Let e', f' be the edges in $G - \{e, f, g\}$ incident with u_1, u_2 , respectively. Then any 2-edge cut in $G \ominus g$ separates $e = e'$ from $f = f'$, since G is 3-connected (by Claim 1). So by the assumption of this lemma, Theorem 1.1 holds for $G \ominus g$ and, hence, there is a cycle C_1 in $G \ominus g$ such that $e = e', f = f' \in E(C_1)$ and $w(C_1) \geq cw(G \ominus g)^r = cw(G)^r$. Now $C := G[E(C_1) \cup \{e, e', f, f'\}]$ is a cycle in G such that $e, f \in E(C)$ and $w(C) = w(C_1) \geq cw(G)^r$, completing the proof of Claim 4.

We now fix some notation. Let $e = u_1u_2$ and $f = u_3u_4$. For each $1 \leq i \leq 4$, let e_{i1}, e_{i2} denote the edges of $G - \{e, f\}$ incident with u_i . By Claim 4, $e_{ij} \neq e_{kl}$ if $(i, j) \neq (k, l)$. For each $1 \leq i \leq 4$ and $j = 1, 2$, let $X_{ij} \subseteq G - \{u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4\}$ be maximal such that $|\partial_G(X_{ij})| = 3$ and $e_{ij} \in \partial_G(X_{ij})$. Note X_{ij} exists, as G is cubic and $V(e_{ij}) - \{u_i\}$ satisfies these conditions (except for the maximality). Since G is 3-connected and cubic, each X_{ij} is connected. Moreover, by the maximality of X_{ij} , X_{ij} is uniquely defined. Moreover, for any i, j ,

$$G/X_{ij} \ominus e_{ij} \text{ is a 3-connected cubic graph.} \quad (4.1)$$

For, if F is a 2-edge-cut in $G/X_{ij} \ominus e_{ij}$ then $F' := F \cup \{e_{ij}\}$ is a 3-edge-cut in G . However, F' separates e from f , contradicting Claim 3.

Claim 5. $X_{11}, X_{12}, X_{21}, X_{22}$ (respectively, $X_{31}, X_{32}, X_{41}, X_{42}$) are pairwise disjoint.

By symmetry, it suffices to show that $X_{11} \cap X_{12} = \emptyset$ and $X_{11} \cap X_{21} = \emptyset$. If $X_{11} \cap X_{12} \neq \emptyset$ then by Lemma 2.1 and by the maximality of X_{11} and X_{12} , we have $X_{11} = X_{12}$; so $\partial_G(X_{11} \cup \{u_1\})$ is a 2-edge cut in G , contradicting Claim 1. If $X_{11} \cap X_{21} \neq \emptyset$ then by Lemma 2.1 and the maximality of X_{11} and X_{21} we have $X_{11} = X_{21}$; so $\partial_G(X_{11} \cup \{u_1, u_2\})$ is a 3-edge cut in G separating e from f , contradicting Claim 3.

Claim 6. If $X_{ij} \cap X_{kl} \neq \emptyset$ for some $i \in \{1, 2\}$, $k \in \{3, 4\}$, and $j, l \in \{1, 2\}$ then $X_{ij} = X_{kl}$, $G/(X_{i(3-j)}, X_{kl}) \ominus e_{i(3-j)} \ominus e_{kl}$ is 2-connected and every 2-edge cut in it separates e from f ,

and $G/(X_{k(3-l)}, X_{ij}) \ominus e_{k(3-l)} \ominus e_{ij}$ is 2-connected and every 2-edge cut in it separates e from f .

Note the symmetry in the statement of Claim 6. Suppose Claim 6 fails and, without loss of generality, let $X_{11} \cap X_{31} \neq \emptyset$. By Lemma 2.1 and the maximality of X_{11} and X_{31} , we have $X_{11} = X_{31}$. Let $G' := G/(X_{12}, X_{31}) \ominus e_{12} \ominus e_{31}$ and $G'' = G/(X_{12}, X_{31}) \ominus e_{12}$. Then $G' = G'' \ominus e_{31}$. Since $G'' = G/X_{12} \ominus e_{12}/X_{31}$ and because of (4.1), G'' is 3-connected. Hence G' is 2-connected. Since $G'' = (G' \oplus e_{31}, e, f)$ and G'' is 3-connected, every 2-edge cut in G' must separate e from f , completing the proof of Claim 6.

We may assume

Claim 7. $\{X_{i1}, X_{i2}\} \neq \{X_{j1}, X_{j2}\}$ for $1 \leq i \neq j \leq 4$.

By Claim 5, we only need to prove Claim 7 for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and $j \in \{3, 4\}$. By symmetry, it suffices to show that $\{X_{11}, X_{12}\} \neq \{X_{31}, X_{32}\}$. Suppose $X_{11} = X_{31}$ and $X_{12} = X_{32}$. Let $\partial_G(X_{11}) = \{e_{11}, e_{31}, f_1\}$ and $\partial_G(X_{12}) = \{e_{12}, e_{32}, f_2\}$. Since $X_{11} = X_{31}$, it follows from Claim 6 that $G' := G/(X_{12}, X_{31}) \ominus e_{12} \ominus e_{31}$ is 2-connected and any of its 2-edge cuts separates e from f . So by the assumption of this lemma, Theorem 1.1 holds for G' . Assign weight 0 to the new vertices resulting from contractions, and let the other vertices of G' inherit their weights from G . Then there is a cycle C_1 in G' such that $e = e_{11} = f_1, f = e_{32} = f_2 \in E(C_1)$ and $w(C_1) \geq cw(G')^r$. Note that C_1 goes through the vertices representing the contractions of X_{11} and X_{12} . By Lemma 2.5, there is a cycle C in G such that $e, f \in E(C)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} w(C) &\geq cw(G')^r + w(X_{11})^r + w(X_{12})^r \\ &\geq c(w(G') + w(X_{11}) + w(X_{12}))^r \\ &= cw(G)^r. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of Claim 7.

We may further assume

Claim 8. $\{X_{i1}, X_{i2}\} \neq \{X_{jj'}, X_{kk'}\}$ for $i, j', k' \in \{1, 2\}, j, k \in \{3, 4\}$ or $j, j', k, k' \in \{1, 2\}, i \in \{3, 4\}$.

By the assumption of this claim, $i \notin \{j, k\}$. By Claim 7, we may assume $j \neq k$. So by symmetry, it suffices to show $\{X_{21}, X_{22}\} \neq \{X_{31}, X_{41}\}$. Suppose the contrary, we may assume by symmetry that $X_{21} = X_{31}$ and $X_{22} = X_{41}$. Let $X_1 := X_{32}, X_2 := X_{42}, Y_1 := X_{21}$ and $Y_2 := X_{22}$. Further, let $\partial_G(X_1) = \{e_{32}, f_{32}, g_{32}\}$, $\partial_G(X_2) = \{e_{42}, f_{42}, g_{42}\}$, $\partial_G(Y_1) = \{e_{21}, e_{31}, h_1\}$, and $\partial_G(Y_2) = \{e_{22}, e_{41}, h_2\}$. Let $x_i := w(X_i)$ and $y_i := w(Y_i)$ for $i = 1, 2$, and let $z := w(G) - x_1 - x_2 - y_1 - y_2$. Then $w(G) = x_1 + x_2 + y_1 + y_2 + z$. By symmetry, we may assume

$$y_1 \leq y_2.$$

Let $G_y := G/(Y_1, Y_2) \ominus e_{21} \ominus e_{41}/X_2$. Assign weight 0 to the vertex resulting from the contraction of X_2 , and let other vertices of G_y inherit their weights from G . Then $w(G_y) = x_1 + z$. By Claim 6 (using $X_{22} = X_{41}$), $G/(Y_1, Y_2) \ominus e_{21} \ominus e_{41}$ (and hence G_y) is 2-connected and every 2-edge cut separates e from f ; so Theorem 1.1 holds for G_y . Thus, there is a cycle C_1 in G_1 such that $e = e_{22} = h_2, f = e_{42} \in E(C_1)$ and $w(C_1) \geq c(x_1 + z)^r$. Note that C_1 goes through the vertices representing the contractions of X_2 and X_3 . Hence by Lemma 2.5, there

is a cycle C_y in G such that $e, f \in E(C_y)$ and

$$w(C_y) \geq c(x_1 + z)^r + x_2^r + y_2^r.$$

Therefore, we may assume $y_1 > 0$; as otherwise C_y gives the desired cycle.

Let $G_x := G/(Y_1, Y_2) \ominus e_{21} \ominus e_{41}/X_2/X_1 \ominus e_{32}$. Assign weight 0 to the vertex resulting from the contraction of X_2 , and let all other vertices inherit their weights from G . Then $w(G_x) = z$. By Claim 6 (using $X_{22} = X_{41}$), $G/(Y_1, Y_2) \ominus e_{21} \ominus e_{41}/X_2$ is 2-connected and each of its 2-edge cuts separates e from f . Thus, G_x is 2-connected. If there is a 2-edge cut F in G_x not separating e from f then e, f lie in a common component A of $G' := G/(Y_1, Y_2) \ominus e_{21} \ominus e_{41} - (F \cup \{e_{32}\})$. By Claim 6, $F \cup \{e_{32}\}$ is a minimum edge-cut in G' . Let B be the component in G' different from A . Then $e_{32} \in \partial_G(B)$ and $|\partial_G(B \cup X_1)| = 3$, contradicting the maximality of X_1 . So G_x is a 2-connected graph such that each of its 2-edge cuts must separate e from f . Hence by assumption, Theorem 1.1 holds for G_x . So there is a cycle C_1 in G_x such that $e = e_{22} = h_2, f = e_{42} = e_{31} = h_1 \in E(C_1)$ and $w(C_1) \geq cz^r$. Note that C_1 goes through the vertices representing the contractions of X_2, Y_1, Y_2 . Hence by Lemma 2.5, there is a cycle C_x in G such that $e, f \in E(C_x)$ and

$$w(C_x) \geq cz^r + x_2^r + y_1^r + y_2^r.$$

Therefore, we may assume $x_1 > 0$; as otherwise C_x gives the desired cycle.

Similarly, by using $X_{21} = X_{31}$ and considering $G'_x := G/(Y_2, Y_1) \ominus e_{22} \ominus e_{31}/X_1/X_2 \ominus e_{42}$, we obtain a cycle C'_x in G such that $e, f \in E(C'_x)$ and

$$w(C'_x) \geq cz^r + x_1^r + y_1^r + y_2^r.$$

Thus, we may assume $x_2 > 0$; as otherwise C'_x gives the desired cycle.

Hence, it suffices to show that $\max\{w(C_x), w(C'_x), w(C_y)\} \geq cw(G)^r = c(x_1 + x_2 + y_1 + y_2 + z)^r$. Since x_1, x_2, y_1 are all positive, we see that $w(C_x) - cw(G)^r$ is increasing with respect to x_2, y_1, y_2, z ; $w(C_y) - cw(G)^r$ is increasing with respect to x_1, x_2, y_2, z ; and $w(C'_x) - cw(G)^r$ is increasing with respect to x_1, y_1, y_2, z .

Therefore, if $x_1 \leq x_2$ then $w(C_y) - cw(G)^r \geq cx_1^r + x_1^r + y_1^r - c(2x_1 + 2y_1)^r$ and $w(C_x) - cw(G)^r \geq x_1^r + 2y_1^r - c(2x_1 + 2y_1)^r$; and if $x_2 \leq x_1$ then $w(C_y) - cw(G)^r \geq cx_2^r + x_2^r + y_1^r - c(2x_2 + 2y_1)^r$ and $w(C'_x) - cw(G)^r \geq x_2^r + 2y_1^r - c(2x_2 + 2y_1)^r$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} f_1(x, y) &:= x^r + 2y^r - c(2x + 2y)^r, \\ f_2(x, y) &:= cx^r + x^r + y^r - c(2x + 2y)^r. \end{aligned}$$

Then it suffices to show $\max\{f_1, f_2\} \geq 0$ for all $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. For any $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, if $x \leq y$ then by Lemma 2.4(v) we have $f_1(x, y) \geq 0$. So we may assume $x > y$. Then also by Lemma 2.4(v), $f_2(x, y) \geq 0$. This completes the proof of Claim 8.

Let $q := |\{(X_{ij}, X_{kl}) : X_{ij} \cap X_{kl} \neq \emptyset \text{ and } (i, j) \neq (k, l)\}|$. By Claims 5 and 8, we have $0 \leq q \leq 2$. So we have three cases to consider. Let $x_{ij} := w(X_{ij})$ for $1 \leq i \leq 4$ and $j = 1, 2$.

Case 1. $q = 0$.

By symmetry, we may assume that $x_{11} \leq x_{ij}$ for $1 \leq i \leq 4$ and $j = 1, 2$. Let $\partial_G(X_{12}) = \{e_{12}, f_1, f_2\}$, and let $z := w(G - \bigcup X_{ij})$. Then $w(G) = \sum x_{ij} + z$. (The union and summation are taken over all $1 \leq i \leq 4$ and $j = 1, 2$.)

Consider $G_x := (G/X_{11} \ominus e_{11})/X_{12}$. Assign weight 0 to the vertex resulting from the contraction of X_{12} , and let other vertices of G_x inherit their weights from G . Then by (4.1), G_x is 3-connected and cubic, and $w(G_x) = w(G) - x_{11} - x_{12}$. So by assumption, Theorem 1.1 holds for G_x . Thus there is a cycle C_1 in G_x such that $e = e_{12}, f \in E(C_1)$ and $w(C_1) \geq cw(G_x)^r$. Note that C_1 goes through the vertex representing the contraction of X_{12} . By Lemma 2.5, there is a cycle C in G such that $e, f \in E(C)$ and

$$w(C) \geq cw(G_x)^r + x_{12}^r = c(x_{21} + x_{22} + x_{31} + x_{32} + x_{41} + x_{42} + z)^r + x_{12}^r.$$

Since $x_{12} \geq x_{11}$ and $x_{21} + x_{22} + x_{31} + x_{32} + x_{41} + x_{42} + z \geq 6x_{11}$, it follows from Lemma 2.4(vi) that $w(C) \geq cw(G)^r$.

Case 2. $q = 1$.

By symmetry, we may assume that $X_{22} \cap X_{32} \neq \emptyset$. Then $X_{22} = X_{32}$ by Lemma 2.1 and the maximality of X_{22} and X_{32} . Let $\partial_G(X_{ij}) = \{e_{ij}, f_{ij}, g_{ij}\}$ for $X_{ij} \notin \{X_{22}, X_{32}\}$, let $\partial_G(X_{22}) = \{e_{22}, e_{32}, h_1\}$, and let $Y := X_{22}$. Let $y := w(Y_1) = x_{22} = x_{32}$ and $z := w(G - \bigcup X_{ij})$, where the union is taken over all $1 \leq i \leq 4$ and $j = 1, 2$. Then

$$w(G) = x_{11} + x_{12} + x_{21} + x_{31} + x_{41} + x_{42} + y + z.$$

By symmetry, we may assume $x_{11} = \min\{x_{11}, x_{12}, x_{41}, x_{42}\}$. We now find cycles in G and show that one of these is the desired cycle.

Let $G_1 := G/X_{11} \ominus e_{11}/X_{12}$. Assign weight 0 to the vertex resulting from the contraction of X_{12} and let the other vertices of G_1 inherit their weights from G . Then

$$w(G_1) = w(G) - x_{11} - x_{12} = x_{21} + x_{31} + x_{41} + x_{42} + y + z.$$

By (4.1), G_1 is 3-connected. Hence by assumption, Theorem 1.1 holds for G_1 . So there is a cycle C_1 in G_1 such that $e = e_{12}, f \in E(C_1)$ and $w(C_1) \geq cw(G_1)^r$. Note that C_1 goes through the vertex representing the contraction of X_{12} . Hence by Lemma 2.5, there is a cycle C_x in G such that $e, f \in E(C_x)$ and

$$w(C_x) \geq cw(G_1)^r + x_{12}^r = c(x_{21} + x_{31} + x_{41} + x_{42} + y + z)^r + x_{12}^r.$$

Let $G_2 := G/(X_{21}, X_{32}) \ominus e_{21} \ominus e_{32}/X_{31}$. Assign weight 0 to the vertex resulting from the contraction of X_{31} , and let the other vertices of G_2 inherit their weights from G . Then

$$w(G_2) = x_{11} + x_{12} + x_{41} + x_{42} + z.$$

By Claim 6, $G/(X_{21}, X_{32}) \ominus e_{21} \ominus e_{32}$ (and hence G_2) is 2-connected and any of its 2-edge cuts separates e from f . By the assumption of this lemma, Theorem 1.1 holds for G_2 . So there is a cycle C_1 in G_2 such that $e = e_{22} = h_1, f = e_{31} \in E(C_1)$ and $w(C_1) \geq cw(G_2)^r$. Note that C_1 goes through the vertices representing the contractions of X_{31}, Y . Hence, by Lemma 2.5, there is a cycle C'_x in G such that $e, f \in E(C)$ and

$$w(C'_x) \geq c(x_{11} + x_{12} + x_{41} + x_{42} + z)^r + x_{31}^r + y^r.$$

Similarly, by considering $G'_2 := G/(X_{31}, X_{22}) \ominus e_{31} \ominus e_{22}/X_{21}$ we obtain a cycle C''_x in G such that $e, f \in E(C''_x)$ and

$$w(C''_x) \geq c(x_{11} + x_{12} + x_{41} + x_{42} + z)^r + x_{21}^r + y^r.$$

Finally, let $G_3 := G/Y \ominus e_{22}/X_{21}$. Assign weight 0 to the vertex resulting from the contraction of X_{21} and let all other vertices of G_3 inherit their weights from G . Then

$$w(G_3) = x_{11} + x_{12} + x_{31} + x_{41} + x_{42} + z.$$

By (4.1), G_3 is 3-connected. By assumption, Theorem 1.1 holds for G_3 . So there is a cycle C_1 in G_3 such that $e = e_{21}, f \in E(C_1)$ and $w(C_1) \geq cw(G_3)^r$. Note that C_1 goes through the vertex representing the contraction of X_{21} . By Lemma 2.5, there is a cycle C_y in G such that $e, f \in E(C_y)$ and

$$w(C_y) \geq c(x_{11} + x_{12} + x_{31} + x_{41} + x_{42} + z)^r + x_{21}^r.$$

It suffices to show that if $x_{21} \leq x_{31}$ then $\max\{w(C_x), w(C'_x), w(C_y)\} \geq cw(G)^r$, and if $x_{31} \leq x_{21}$ then $\max\{w(C_x), w(C''_x), w(C_y)\} \geq cw(G)^r$.

We may assume $x_{11} > 0, x_{21} > 0, x_{31} > 0, y > 0$; otherwise C_x or C'_x or C''_x or C_y is the desired cycle. Therefore, $x_{12} > 0, x_{41} > 0$ and $x_{42} > 0$. Thus, it is easy to see that the functions $w(C_x) - cw(G)^r, w(C'_x) - cw(G)^r$ and $w(C_y) - cw(G)^r$ are increasing with respect to each of $x_{12}, x_{41}, x_{42}, x_{31}$ and z ; and the function $w(C''_x) - cw(G)^r$ is increasing with respect to each of $x_{12}, x_{41}, x_{42}, x_{21}$ and z .

Suppose $x_{31} \geq x_{21}$. Since $x_{11} = \min\{x_{11}, x_{12}, x_{41}, x_{42}\}$ and $z \geq 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} w(C_x) - cw(G)^r &\geq f_1(x_{11}, x_{21}, y) := c(2x_{11} + 2x_{21} + y)^r + x_{11}^r - c(4x_{11} + 2x_{21} + y)^r, \\ w(C'_x) - cw(G)^r &\geq f_2(x_{11}, x_{21}, y) := c(4x_{11})^r + x_{21}^r + y^r - c(4x_{11} + 2x_{21} + y)^r, \\ w(C_y) - cw(G)^r &\geq f_3(x_{11}, x_{21}, y) := c(4x_{11} + x_{21})^r + x_{21}^r - c(4x_{11} + 2x_{21} + y)^r. \end{aligned}$$

For the case when $x_{21} \geq x_{31}$, we use, in the above expressions, C''_x, x_{31} instead of C'_x, x_{21} , respectively. So we only consider the case $x_{31} \geq x_{21}$.

We now prove that for $x_{11}, x_{21}, y \in \mathbb{Z}^+, \max\{f_1, f_2, f_3\} \geq 0$. Suppose that this is not true. Then there exist $x_{11}, x_{21}, y \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $f_i(x_{11}, x_{21}, y) < 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq 3$. Now $f_1 < 0$ and Lemma 2.4(vi) imply $2x_{11} + 2x_{21} + y < 6x_{11}$. Hence $2x_{21} + y < 4x_{11}$. Also $f_2 < 0$ and Lemma 2.4(v) imply $y < x_{21}$ as $4x_{11} > 2x_{21} + y > x_{21}$. Finally, $f_3 < 0$ and Lemma 2.4(vi) imply $4x_{11} + x_{21} < 6y$ as $x_{21} > y$. Therefore, an easy calculation shows that

$$4x_{11} + y < 6x_{21}, \quad x_{21} < 2y, \quad \text{and} \quad 4x_{11} > 3y. \quad (4.2)$$

It is easy to see that f_2 is increasing with respect to x_{11} . By differentiating f_2 with respect to x_{21} , we have

$$\frac{\partial f_2}{\partial x_{21}} = \frac{r}{x_{21}^{1-r}} - \frac{2cr}{(4x_{11} + 2x_{21} + y)^{1-r}}.$$

So $\partial f_2 / \partial x_{21} \geq 0$ if and only if $4x_{11} + 2x_{21} + y \geq (2c)^{1/(1-r)} x_{21} \approx 21.275x_{21}$. Thus, from (4.2) we see that $\partial f_2 / \partial x_{21} < 0$. So f_2 is decreasing with respect to x_{21} . Hence, by (4.2), we have

$$f_2 \geq f_2(3y/4, 2y, y) = c(3y)^r + (2y)^r + y^r - c(8y)^r = (3^r c + 2^r + 1 - 8^r c)y^r \approx 0.096y^r > 0,$$

a contradiction.

Case 3. $q = 2$.

By Claims 5, 7 and 8 and by symmetry, we may assume that $X_{12} = X_{32}$ and $X_{22} = X_{42}$. Let $\partial_G(X_{i1}) = \{e_{i1}, f_{i1}, g_{i1}\}$ for $1 \leq i \leq 4$, $Y_i := X_{i2}$ for $i = 1, 2$, $\partial_G(Y_1) = \{e_{12}, e_{32}, h_1\}$, $\partial_G(Y_2) = \{e_{22}, e_{42}, h_2\}$. Let $x_i := w(X_{i1})$ for $1 \leq i \leq 4$, $y_i := w(Y_i)$ for $i = 1, 2$, and $z := w(G - \bigcup X_{ij})$ (where the union is taken over all i, j). Then

$$w(G) = \sum_{i=1}^4 x_i + y_1 + y_2 + z.$$

By symmetry, we may assume $x_1 = \min\{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4\}$.

Let $G_1 := G/(X_{11}, Y_1) \ominus e_{11} \ominus e_{32}/X_{31}$. Assign weight 0 to the vertex resulting from the contraction of X_{31} and let the other vertices of G_1 inherit their weights from G . Then

$$w(G_1) = x_2 + x_4 + y_2 + z.$$

Recall that $Y_1 = X_{32}$; so by Claim 6, $G/(X_{11}, Y_1) \ominus e_{11} \ominus e_{32}$ (and hence G_1) satisfies the assumption of our lemma. Therefore, Theorem 1.1 holds for G_1 . So there is a cycle C_1 in G_1 such that $e = e_{12} = h_1, f = e_{31} \in E(C_1)$ and $w(C_1) \geq cw(G_1)^r$. Note that C_1 goes through the vertices representing the contractions of X_{31}, Y_1 . Hence, by Lemma 2.5, there is a cycle C_x in G such that $e, f \in E(C_x)$ and

$$w(C_x) \geq c(x_2 + x_4 + y_2 + z)^r + x_3^r + y_1^r.$$

Let $G_2 := G/Y_1 \ominus e_{12}/X_{11}$. Assign weight 0 to the vertex resulting from the contraction of X_{11} , and let the other vertices of G_2 inherit their weights from G . Then by (4.1), G_2 is 3-connected; and

$$w(G_2) = w(G) - x_1 - y_1 = x_2 + x_3 + x_4 + y_2 + z.$$

By assumption, Theorem 1.1 holds for G_2 . So there is a cycle C_1 in G_2 such that $e = e_{11}, f \in E(C_1)$ and $w(C_1) \geq cw(G_2)^r$. Note that C_1 goes through the vertex representing the contraction of X_{11} . So by Lemma 2.5, there is a cycle C_y in G such that $e, f \in E(C_y)$ and

$$w(C_y) \geq c(x_2 + x_3 + x_4 + y_2 + z)^r + x_1^r.$$

We now show that $\max\{w(C_x), w(C_y)\} \geq cw(G)^r$. We may assume $x_1 > 0$ and $y_1 > 0$; otherwise, C_x or C_y is the desired cycle. Therefore $x_i \geq x_1 > 0$ for $i = 2, 3, 4$. It is easy to see that the functions $w(C_x) - cw(G)^r$ and $w(C_y) - cw(G)^r$ are increasing with respect to each of x_2, x_3, x_4, y_2 and z . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} w(C_x) - cw(G)^r &\geq f_1(x_1, y_1) := c(2x_1)^r + x_1^r + y_1^r - c(4x_1 + y_1)^r, \\ w(C_y) - cw(G)^r &\geq f_2(x_1, y_1) := c(3x_1)^r + x_1^r - c(4x_1 + y_1)^r. \end{aligned}$$

It suffices to show that $\max\{f_1, f_2\} \geq 0$ for all $x_1, y_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Suppose that this is not true. Then $f_1(x_1, y_1) < 0$ and $f_2(x_1, y_1) < 0$ for some $x_1, y_1 \geq 0$. Since $f_1 < 0$, it follows from Lemma 2.4(v) that $y_1 < x_1$. Hence, since $f_2 < 0$, it follows from Lemma 2.4(vi) that $3x_1 < 6y_1$. Thus, $y_1 > x_1/2$. Since f_1 is increasing with respect to y_1 , $f_1 \geq f_1(x_1, x_1/2) \geq c(2x_1)^r + x_1^r + (x_1/2)^r - c(9x_1/2)^r \approx 0.109x_1^r \geq 0$, a contradiction. \blacksquare

5 Conclusion

We can now complete the proof of Theorem 1.1. We apply induction on $|G|$, the order of G . If $|G| = 2$ then $\{e, f\}$ is contained in a Hamilton cycle; so Theorem 1.1 holds. Thus we may assume that $|G| \geq 4$ and that Theorem 1.1 holds for graphs of order less than $|G|$. By the remark in Section 1, we may further assume that the weight function satisfies $w(V(\{e, f\})) = 0$ for the edges e, f . Then by Lemma 3.1, Theorem 1.1(a) holds for G ; and by Lemma 4.1, Theorem 1.1(b) holds for G . \blacksquare

The exponent 0.8 in Theorem 1.1 can be increased to the root of the $8.956^r + 1.036^r = 10.992^r$, which is larger than 0.800008. This can be done by modifying some calculations, because this root is the largest number satisfying Lemma 2.4 (more precisely, Lemma 2.4(i)).

In [6], the problem for bounding the circumference of cubic graphs is reduced to one for finding a large Eulerian subgraph in a 3-edge-connected graph. We take an opposite approach, and prove the following result as a consequence of Theorem 1.1. However, the result we have is about vertex-weighted graphs while the result in [6] is about edge-weighted graphs.

Corollary 5.1. *Let $r = 0.8$ and let $c = 1/(8^r - 6^r) \approx 0.922$. Let G be a 3-edge connected graph, let $w : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^+$, and $e, f \in E(G)$. Then G has an Eulerian subgraph H such that*

- (a) $e \in E(H)$ and $w(H) \geq w(G)^r$, or
- (b) $e, f \in E(H)$ and $w(H) \geq cw(G)^r$.

Proof. First, we describe a process that constructs a 3-connected cubic graph L from G such that any cycle C in L gives rise to an Eulerian subgraph in G with weight $w(C)$.

- Pick an arbitrary $u \in V(G)$ with degree at least 4. If no such vertex exists, let $L := G$.
- Suppose $G - u$ is connected. Let w_i , $1 \leq i \leq k$, be the neighbors of u . Let G_1 be obtained from $G - u$ by adding a cycle $v_1 v_2 \dots v_k v_1$ (disjoint from $G - u$) and the edges $w_i v_i$, for $i = 1, \dots, k$. (So no v_i is a cut vertex of G_1 and G_1 is 3-edge-connected.) Extend the weight function w by letting $w(v_1) = w(u)$, and $w(v_i) = 0$ for $2 \leq i \leq k$.
- Suppose $G - u$ is not connected. Let C_1, \dots, C_k denote the components of $G - u$ and, for each $1 \leq s \leq k$, let $w_s^1, \dots, w_s^{n_s}$ be the neighbors of u in C_s . Give each w_i^j a new neighbor v_i^j , arrange the v_i^j 's in the natural order $v_1^1 v_1^2 \dots v_1^{n_1} v_2^1 v_2^2 \dots v_2^{n_2} \dots v_k^1 \dots v_k^{n_k}$, then swap $v_s^{n_s}$ and v_{s+1}^1 for each $s = 1, 2, \dots, k$, where $k + 1$ is taken as 1, and use this order to construct a cycle on the v_i^j 's. Extend the weight function w by letting $w(v_1^1) = w(u)$, and $w(v_i^j) = 0$ for $(i, j) \neq (1, 1)$, $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $1 \leq j \leq n_i$.
- Repeat the above steps for G_1 , and so on, until we arrive at a cubic graph L .

From the construction of L , we see that each $u \in V(G)$ with degree at least 4 in G corresponds to a cycle C_u . For those edges of L which are not in the cycles C_u , we view them as edges of G and use the same notation in both G and L .

We now show that L is 3-connected. Clearly, L is 2-connected and, since L is cubic, it suffices to show that L is 3-edge-connected. Let $F = \{e_1, e_2\}$ be a 2-edge cut of L . Then since G is 3-edge-connected, $F \not\subseteq E(G)$. For $i \in \{1, 2\}$, since e_{3-i} is a cut edge of $L - e_i$, if $e_i \in E(G)$ then e_{3-i} cannot lie in any cycle C_u , which implies $e_{3-i} \in E(G)$, a contradiction. Hence $e_1, e_2 \notin E(G)$. Since $\{e_1, e_2\}$ is a 2-edge cut in L , e_1, e_2 cannot lie in two disjoint cycles in L . Thus, both e_1 and e_2 lie in the cycle C_u in L corresponding to some $u \in V(G)$; so u is a cut vertex of G . Let P_1, P_2 be the components of $C_u - \{e_1, e_2\}$ and, for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$, let L_i denote the component of $L - \{e_1, e_2\}$ containing P_i . Since L is cubic, $L_i \neq P_i$. On the other hand, since u is a cut vertex in G and because of the construction of L , P_1 contains some neighbor of L_2 and P_2 contains some neighbor of L_1 , showing that $L - \{e_1, e_2\}$ is connected, a contradiction. Hence, L is 3-connected.

Since $e \in E(G)$, $e \in E(L)$. By Theorem 1.1(a), there is a cycle C' in L such that $e \in E(C')$ and $w(C') \geq w(L)^r$. By contracting all cycles C_u of L corresponding to vertices u of G back to u , we obtain from C' an Eulerian subgraph H such that $e \in E(H)$ and $w(H) \geq w(G)^r$. Likewise, by Theorem 1.1(b) we find an Eulerian subgraph H such that $e, f \in E(H)$ and $w(H) \geq cw(G)^r$. ■

Recall the upper bound $\Theta(n^{\log_9 8})$ on the circumference of 3-connected cubic graphs, provided by a construction of Bondy and Simonovits in [7]. The lower bound $\Omega(n^{0.8})$ in Theorem 1.1 is significant in the sense that the exponent breaks above $\log_4 3 \approx 0.7925$. So we feel that one may be able to improve the exponent further to $\log_5 4 \approx 0.861$.

We have used Lemma 2.3 to find cycles in cubic graphs through given vertices and edges. There are other results concerning cycles in cubic graphs which might be useful for further improving the bound given in Theorem 1.1. We refer the reader to [2, 3, 5].

ACKNOWLEDGMENT. We thank the anonymous referee for a through reading of the original manuscript and very detailed and helpful suggestions.

References

- [1] R. E. L. Aldred, D. A. Holton and C. Thomassen, Cycles through four edges in 3-connected cubic graphs, *Graphs and Comb.*, **1** (1985) 7-11.
- [2] R. E. L. Aldred and D. A. Holton, Cycles through five edges in 3-connected cubic graphs, *Graphs and Comb.*, **3** (1987) 299-311.
- [3] R. E. L. Aldred, S. Bau, D. A. Holton, and B. D. McKay, Cycles through 23 vertices in 3-connected cubic planar graphs, *Graphs and Comb.*, **15** (1999) 373-376.
- [4] D. Barnette, Trees in polyhedral graphs, *Canad. J. Math.*, **18** (1966) 731-736.
- [5] S. Bau and D. A. Holton, Cycles containing 12 vertices in 3-connected cubic graphs, *J. Graph Theory*, **15** (1991) 421-429.
- [6] M. Bilinski, B. Jackson, J. Ma and X. Yu, Circumference of 3-connected claw-free graphs and large Eulerian subgraphs of 3-edge connected graphs, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, **101** (2011) 214-236.
- [7] J. A. Bondy and M. Simonovits, Longest cycles in 3-connected 3-regular graphs, *Canad. J. Math.*, **32** (1980) 987-992.
- [8] B. Jackson, Longest cycles in 3-connected cubic graphs, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, **41** (1986) 17-26.
- [9] L. Lovász, Problem 5, *Period Math. Hungar.*, **4** (1973) 82.
- [10] P. G. Tait, Remarks on colouring maps, *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Ser. A*, **10** (1880) 729.
- [11] W. T. Tutte, On Hamilton circuits, *J. London Math. Soc.*, **21** (1946) 98-101.