

# The Minimality of the Georges–Kelmans Graph

Gunnar Brinkmann<sup>a</sup>, Jan Goedgebeur<sup>a,b,1</sup>, Brendan D. McKay<sup>c,2</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Department of Applied Mathematics, Computer Science & Statistics,  
Ghent University, 9000 Ghent, Belgium*

<sup>b</sup>*Computer Science Department,  
University of Mons, 7000 Mons, Belgium*

<sup>c</sup>*Research School of Computer Science,  
Australian National University, Canberra ACT 2601, Australia*

---

## Abstract

In 1971, Tutte wrote in an article that *it is tempting to conjecture that every 3-connected bipartite cubic graph is hamiltonian*. Motivated by this remark, Horton constructed a counterexample on 96 vertices. In a sequence of articles by different authors several smaller counterexamples were presented. The smallest of these graphs is a graph on 50 vertices which was discovered independently by Georges and Kelmans. In this article we show that there is no smaller counterexample. As all non-hamiltonian 3-connected bipartite cubic graphs in the literature have cyclic 4-cuts—even if they have girth 6—it is natural to ask whether this is a necessary prerequisite. In this article we answer this question in the negative and give a construction of an infinite family of non-hamiltonian cyclically 5-connected bipartite cubic graphs.

In 1969 Barnette gave a weaker version of the conjecture stating that 3-connected planar bipartite cubic graphs are hamiltonian. We show that Barnette’s conjecture is true up to at least 90 vertices. We also report that a search of small non-hamiltonian 3-connected bipartite cubic graphs did not find any with genus less than 4.

*Keywords:* hamiltonian cycle, bipartite, cubic, connectivity, Tutte’s conjecture, Barnette’s conjecture, genus

---

## 1. Introduction

In this article all graphs will be simple and undirected unless explicitly stated otherwise. For any standard graph theoretical concepts not explicitly defined here, please refer to [8].

Tait conjectured in 1880 that every 3-connected planar cubic graph is hamiltonian. This conjecture was disproved in 1946 by Tutte [22] who constructed a counterexample on 46 vertices. If Tait’s conjecture had been true, it would have implied the Four Colour Theorem. In the years that followed, several researchers constructed smaller counterexamples. In 1988, Holton and McKay [14] completely settled the problem by showing that the smallest non-hamiltonian 3-connected planar cubic graphs have 38 vertices and that there are exactly 6 such graphs of that order (one of which is the famous Barnette–Bosák–Lederberg graph).

---

*Email addresses:* `Gunnar.Brinkmann@ugent.be` (Gunnar Brinkmann), `Jan.Goedgebeur@ugent.be` (Jan Goedgebeur), `Brendan.McKay@anu.edu.au` (Brendan D. McKay)

<sup>1</sup>Supported by a Postdoctoral Fellowship of the Research Foundation Flanders (FWO).

<sup>2</sup>Supported by a Francqui International Professorship.

A graph is *cyclically  $k$ -edge-connected* if the deletion of fewer than  $k$  edges does not create two components both of which contain at least one cycle. Similarly, for *cyclically  $k$ -vertex-connected*. With the exception of a few graphs on 6 or fewer vertices, the cyclic edge-connectivity and cyclic vertex-connectivity of a connected cubic graph both equal the size of the smallest cut of independent edges [19]. (Edges are *independent* if they have no endpoints in common.) Consequently we will call this number just *cyclic connectivity*. Also note that cyclic 3-connectivity implies 3-connectivity.


In 1971, Tutte [23] wrote that *it is tempting to conjecture that every 3-connected bipartite cubic graph is hamiltonian*. This tempting conjecture was disproved in 1976 by Horton [3, p. 240] who constructed a counterexample on 96 vertices. In 1982 he constructed a smaller counterexample on 92 vertices [15]. Later Ellingham [9] constructed an infinite family of non-hamiltonian 3-connected bipartite cubic graphs. The smallest member of his family has 78 vertices.

All of the examples mentioned so far had cyclic connectivity 3. In 1983, Ellingham and Horton [10] published a non-hamiltonian cyclically 4-connected bipartite cubic graph. Their 54-vertex graph can be seen in Figure 1(a).

Finally, Georges [11] and Kelmans [16, 17] independently discovered another infinite family of non-hamiltonian cyclically 4-connected bipartite cubic graphs, the smallest of which has 50 vertices. Their 1986 submission dates were only 15 days apart. This graph is shown in Figure 1(b) and is the smallest known.

In [16] it is written that Lomonosov and Kelmans proved without computer assistance that Tutte's conjecture holds up to 30 vertices, but no reference is given. Recently, Knauer and Valicov [18] verified Tutte's conjecture up to 40 vertices using computational methods. Our aim in this paper is to prove that the Georges–Kelmans graph is in fact minimal.

**Theorem 1.1.** *There is no smaller non-hamiltonian 3-connected bipartite cubic graph than the Georges–Kelmans graph (which has 50 vertices). Moreover if there is another example with 50 vertices, it has girth and cyclic connectivity exactly 6.*



**Figure 1:** The Ellingham–Horton graph on 54 vertices (a) and the Georges–Kelmans graph on 50 vertices (b). (The asterisks are used in Section 3.)

Since we plan on liberal use of the computer, the reader may wonder why we don't just test all the 3-connected bipartite cubic graphs up to 48 vertices. The reason is that there are far too many of them. Based on exact counts for smaller sizes (Table 1 below;

see [6] for some of the graphs) we estimate that there are about  $5 \times 10^{17}$  cubic bipartite graphs with 48 vertices, most of them 3-connected. With our programs able to generate and test about 50,000 bipartite cubic graphs per second, this approach would take about 320,000 CPU years.

| Vertices | Girth at least 4  | Girth at least 6 | Girth at least 8 |
|----------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|
| 6        | 1                 |                  |                  |
| 8        | 1                 |                  |                  |
| 10       | 2                 |                  |                  |
| 12       | 5                 |                  |                  |
| 14       | 13                | 1                |                  |
| 16       | 38                | 1                |                  |
| 18       | 149               | 3                |                  |
| 20       | 703               | 10               |                  |
| 22       | 4 132             | 28               |                  |
| 24       | 29 579            | 162              |                  |
| 26       | 245 627           | 1 201            |                  |
| 28       | 2 291 589         | 11 415           |                  |
| 30       | 23 466 857        | 125 571          | 1                |
| 32       | 259 974 248       | 1 514 489        | 0                |
| 34       | 3 087 698 618     | 19 503 476       | 1                |
| 36       | 39 075 020 582    | 265 448 847      | 3                |
| 38       | 524 492 748 500   | 3 799 509 760    | 10               |
| 40       | 7 439 833 931 266 | 57 039 155 060   | 101              |
| 42       | ?                 | 896 293 917 129  | 2 510            |
| 44       | ?                 | ?                | 79 605           |
| 46       | ?                 | ?                | 2 607 595        |
| 48       | ?                 | ?                | 81 716 416       |
| 50       | ?                 | ?                | 2 472 710 752    |

**Table 1:** Counts of connected bipartite cubic graphs with girth at least 4, 6 or 8.

We will instead take an incremental approach that combines theory and computation, successively eliminating the possibilities that a non-hamiltonian 3-connected bipartite cubic graph smaller than the Georges–Kelmans graph is cyclically 3-connected, cyclically 4-connected, cyclically 5-connected, and finally show that it doesn’t exist. The required amount of computer time was large but available.

Furthermore, noting that all previous examples had cyclic connectivity at most 4, we construct an infinite family of non-hamiltonian cyclically 5-connected bipartite cubic graphs, of which the smallest has 300 vertices.

Another important strongly related conjecture is Barnette’s conjecture, which is a weakened combination of Tait and Tutte’s conjectures. Barnette [2] conjectured in 1969 that every 3-connected *planar* bipartite cubic graph is hamiltonian. Even after 50 years, this conjecture is still open. Holton, Manvel and McKay [13] showed that Barnette’s conjecture is true up to at least 64 vertices and this was later improved to 84 vertices by Aldred, Brinkmann and McKay [1]. We will show that Barnette’s conjecture is true up to at least 90 vertices. We also did a non-exhaustive search for non-hamiltonian 3-connected bipartite cubic graphs that are close to planar in the sense of having low genus. However we did not find any with genus less than 4.

The article is organised as follows. In Section 2 we give the theoretical and computational results necessary to prove Theorem 1.1. We verified the correctness of each of our computational results by making an independent implementation of every program which was specifically developed for this project (often using an alternative algorithm) and using it to replicate each computational result as far as CPU time limits allowed. These correctness tests are described in Section 2 as well. In Section 3 we present an infinite family of non-hamiltonian cyclically 5-connected bipartite cubic graphs. In Section 4 we verify Barnette’s conjecture up to 90 vertices and give the results about the genera of the non-hamiltonian 3-connected bipartite cubic graphs constructed in this project. As this project required the discovery of more than  $10^{14}$  hamiltonian cycles in cubic graphs of up to 50 vertices, we needed a very efficient practical algorithm for this. We describe this algorithm in Section 5.

## 2. Properties of a minimal non-hamiltonian bipartite cubic 3-connected graph

**Lemma 2.1.** *In a bipartite graph with vertices of degree 2 and 3, the number of vertices of degree 2 of each colour are equal modulo 3.*

*Proof.* Define  $n_{d,c}$  to be the number of vertices of degree  $d$  and colour  $c$ , for  $d = 2, 3$  and  $c = 0, 1$ . Counting the edges in two different ways, we have  $3n_{3,0} + 2n_{2,0} = 3n_{3,1} + 2n_{2,1}$ , from which it follows that  $n_{2,0}$  and  $n_{2,1}$  are equal modulo 3.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.2.** *A minimal non-hamiltonian 3-connected bipartite cubic graph is cyclically 4-connected.*

*Proof.* Suppose that a non-hamiltonian 3-connected bipartite cubic graph  $G$  has an independent 3-edge cut  $\{e_1, e_2, e_3\}$ . Divide  $G$  into two parts at the cut. Due to Lemma 2.1, in each part the vertices of degree 2 have the same colour, so we can use one extra vertex for each part and connect it to the three vertices of degree 2 to form two bipartite cubic 3-connected graphs  $G_1, G_2$ . For  $j = 1, 2$  we label the new edges  $\{e_{1,j}, e_{2,j}, e_{3,j}\}$  so that for  $1 \leq i \leq 3$ ,  $e_{i,j}$  is in  $G_j$  and has one endpoint the same as  $e_i$ . As the cut was independent,  $G_1$  as well as  $G_2$  are smaller than  $G$ .

If one of  $G_1, G_2$  was non-hamiltonian,  $G$  would not be minimal, so we may assume that both,  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ , are hamiltonian.


Now assume that one smaller graph, w.l.o.g.  $G_1$  has a hamiltonian cycle not containing  $e_{i,1}$ . If  $G_2$  had a hamiltonian cycle not containing  $e_{i,2}$ , these cycles could be combined to form a hamiltonian cycle of  $G$ . If for one smaller graph all edges of  $\{e_{1,j}, e_{2,j}, e_{3,j}\}$  could be avoided by a hamiltonian cycle or for both smaller graphs there would be at least two edges that can be avoided, there would be a combination of hamiltonian cycles where the same edge would be avoided—so they could be combined to form a hamiltonian cycle of  $G$ . So in one smaller graph at most one edge can be avoided (which means that this *forbidden* edge is in no hamiltonian cycle) and in the other at most two edges can be avoided (which means that there is a *forced* edge that lies in each hamiltonian cycle).

A straightforward computation using the programs *minibaum* and *cubhamg* showed that forced edges first appear at 30 vertices and forbidden edges first appear at 34 vertices. (*Minibaum* [4] is a generator for cubic graphs which can also generate bipartite cubic graphs efficiently and *cubhamg* is described in Section 5.) Using an independent implementation of a program to test if a graph contains forced or forbidden edges, we obtained exactly the same number of graphs with forced/forbidden edges up to 34 vertices. Therefore, this construction only yields non-hamiltonian graphs with at least 62 vertices—larger than the Georges–Kelmans graph.  $\square$


**Lemma 2.3.** *A minimal non-hamiltonian 3-connected bipartite cubic graph cannot have cyclic connectivity 4 unless it is the Georges–Kelmans graph. Moreover, a minimal non-hamiltonian 3-connected bipartite cubic graph has girth at least 6.*

*Proof.* For a cubic graph  $H$ , define two types of edge  $e$ :

- Type 1: There is a hamiltonian cycle through at most 3 of the 4 paths of three edges whose central edge is  $e$ .
- Type 2: At least one of the auxiliary (non-bipartite) graphs  $H', H''$  defined as in Figure 2 has no hamiltonian cycle.



**Figure 2:** Auxiliary graphs for type 2 edges used in the proof of Lemma 2.3.



**Figure 3:** Splitting a graph into two at a 4-edge cut.

Now let  $G$  be a minimal non-hamiltonian bipartite cubic graph with cyclic connectivity 4. By Lemma 2.1, we can divide  $G$  into two parts at a 4-edge cut and use new edges  $e_1, e_2$  to complete the parts into bipartite cubic 3-connected graphs  $G_1, G_2$  as shown in Figure 3. The 3-connectivity of  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  follows from the observation that a 2-cut in either of them would imply a 3-edge cut in  $G$ .

If  $G_1$  has a hamiltonian cycle using  $e_1$ , then  $e_2$  must have type 1, since otherwise  $G$  would be hamiltonian. Similarly, if  $G_1$  has a hamiltonian cycle avoiding  $e_1$ , then  $e_2$  must have type 2, since otherwise  $G$  would be hamiltonian.

A direct computation, again using *minibaum* and *cubhamg*, showed that type 1 or type 2 edges first appear at 18 vertices, so we have  $|V(G_1)| \geq 18$ , and similarly  $|V(G_2)| \geq 18$ . Consequently, it suffices to test combinations of graphs  $G_1, G_2$  with  $18 \leq |V(G_1)| \leq 26$  and  $18 \leq |V(G_2)| \leq 54 - |V(G_1)|$  with  $G_1$  restricted to graphs having an edge of type 1 or type 2. We could also restrict  $G_2$  in the same way, but the number of possibilities for  $G_1$  when  $G_2$  is large is so small that simply testing every graph as  $G_2$  is as fast as checking  $G_2$  for edges of type 1 or type 2.

This computation yielded only the Georges–Kelmans graph. The counts are shown in Table 2 (which includes graphs that are connected but not 3-connected). Using an

independent implementation, we obtained exactly the same number of graphs with type 1 or type 2 edges as in Table 2. Using another independent program we again tested all combinations of  $G_1, G_2$  and this indeed only yielded the Georges–Kelmans graph.

For the second part of the lemma, it is only necessary to observe that the Georges–Kelmans graph has girth 6.  $\square$


| $ V(G_1) $ | type 1 count | type 2 count | $G_1$ total | $ V(G_2) $ | $G_2$ count   |
|------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|------------|---------------|
| 18         | 1            | 1            | 0           | 18–36      | 6 461 410 120 |
| 20         | 1            | 1            | 2           | 18–34      | 3 373 711 502 |
| 22         | 5            | 3            | 8           | 18–32      | 286 012 884   |
| 24         | 15           | 14           | 27          | 18–30      | 26 038 636    |
| 26         | 71           | 56           | 121         | 18–28      | 2 571 779     |

**Table 2:** Computation for Lemma 2.3.

At this stage we could consider finishing the proof of Theorem 1.1 by computation alone. However, we estimate the number of bipartite cubic graphs with girth 6 up to 48 vertices to be around  $4.5 \times 10^{15}$ . With a slower generation rate of about 40,000 graphs per second, this still amounts to 3,500 CPU years.

**Lemma 2.4.** *A minimal non-hamiltonian 3-connected bipartite cubic graph cannot have cyclic connectivity 5.*

*Proof.* Define a *5-piece* to be a connected bipartite graph of girth at least 6, cubic apart from 5 vertices of degree 2. By Lemma 2.1, a 5-piece has a vertex of degree 2 whose colour is different from the other vertices of degree 2; call that the *special vertex* of the 5-piece. Also, the number of vertices in the 5-piece with the same colour as the special vertex is one less than the number with the other colour.




**Figure 4:** Splitting a graph into two at a 5-edge cut.

Let  $G$  be a non-hamiltonian bipartite cubic graph with at most 50 vertices and cyclic connectivity 5. Separate  $G$  at a 5-cut into 5-pieces  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  as in Figure 4. We know that  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  are connected since otherwise  $G$  would have an edge cut of two independent edges. The special vertices of  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  are adjacent in  $G$ ; call that the *special edge* of  $G$ .

The difference in numbers of vertices in the two colour classes in 5-pieces imply:

- (a) If a hamiltonian cycle in  $G$  uses 4 edges of the cut, then one of those edges is the special edge.



**Figure 5:** Three of the 12 test graphs of a 5-piece.

- (b) If a hamiltonian cycle in  $G$  uses only 2 edges of the cut, then neither of those edges is the special edge.

Given a 5-piece  $H$ , a “test graph” for  $H$  is formed by adjoining two vertices of degree 2, together adjacent to four distinct vertices of degree 2 in  $H$ , one of which is the special vertex. There are 12 test graphs, three of which are shown in Figure 5.

Classify 5-pieces as follows:


- Class 0: None of the test graphs is hamiltonian;
- Class 1: At least one of the test graphs is hamiltonian;
- Class 2: All of the test graphs are hamiltonian (a subset of Class 1).

*Claim 1:* If  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  are in Class 1, with one of them in Class 2, then  $G$  is hamiltonian.

*Proof:* Suppose that  $G_2$  is in Class 2. Since  $G_1$  is in Class 1, it can be covered by two paths with endpoints  $v_1, v_2$  and  $w_1, w_2$ , where one of  $v_1, v_2, w_1, w_2$  is the special vertex. Join these two paths into a hamiltonian cycle in  $G$  using the hamiltonian cycle in the test graph of  $G_2$  where one vertex was connected to  $v_1, v_2$  and the other to  $w_1, w_2$ .

*Claim 2:* If  $|V(G_1)| \leq 13$ , then  $G$  is hamiltonian.

*Proof:* There are no 5-pieces of order less than 11, one of order 11 and two of order 13. They are depicted in Figure 6. All of them are in Class 2. So, by Claim 1, the only possibility that  $G$  is non-hamiltonian is for  $G_2$  to be in Class 0. A hamiltonian cycle in  $G$  that uses 4 edges of the cut would imply hamiltonicity of one of  $G_2$ 's test graphs, so the only possibility is a hamiltonian cycle in  $G$  that uses 2 edges of the cut (none of them the special edge) and induces hamiltonian paths in  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ .



**Figure 6:** The smallest 5-pieces.

Looking at the hamiltonian paths in  $G_1$ , we find that the non-special vertices of degree 2 can be labelled  $v_1, v_2, w_1, w_2$  such that any pair of them can be joined by a

hamiltonian path except  $v_1, v_2$  and possibly  $w_1, w_2$ . (See Figure 6.) Let  $v'_1, v'_2, w'_1, w'_2$  be the vertices of  $G_2$  adjacent in  $G$  to  $v_1, v_2, w_1, w_2$ , respectively. Now construct a bipartite cubic graph  $G_2^+$  from  $G_2$  by adjoining a path  $xyz$  with  $x$  adjacent to  $v'_1$  and  $v'_2$ ,  $y$  adjacent to the special vertex, and  $z$  adjacent to  $w'_1$  and  $w'_2$ . Since  $|V(G_2^+)| < |V(G)|$ , and it is 3-connected since otherwise  $G$  would have a 3-edge cut,  $G_2^+$  is hamiltonian by the minimality of  $G$ . Also, since  $G_2$  is in Class 0, any hamiltonian cycle in  $G_2^+$  cannot use exactly one of the edges  $xy$  and  $yz$  (else one of the test graphs of  $G_2$  is hamiltonian), so it must use both  $xy$  and  $yz$ . This provides a hamiltonian path in  $G_2$  from a vertex in  $\{v'_1, v'_2\}$  to a vertex in  $\{w'_1, w'_2\}$ . Any such path can be combined with a hamiltonian path in  $G_1$  to make a hamiltonian cycle in  $G$ . This completes the proof of Claim 2.

| $n$ | 5-pieces        | Class 1 \ Class 2 |
|-----|-----------------|-------------------|
| 11  | 1               | 0                 |
| 13  | 2               | 0                 |
| 15  | 12              | 2                 |
| 17  | 90              | 7                 |
| 19  | 754             | 14                |
| 21  | 7 003           | 25                |
| 23  | 70 639          | 68                |
| 25  | 766 134         | 251               |
| 27  | 8 862 333       | 1 086             |
| 29  | 108 917 294     | 6 098             |
| 31  | 1 417 268 482   | 44 842            |
| 33  | 19 471 253 036  | 393 423           |
| 35  | 281 715 327 672 | 3 887 896         |

**Table 3:** Computation for Lemma 2.4.

Now we can complete the proof of the lemma. We used the program *multigraph* to construct all 5-pieces and tested them with *cubhamg*. (*Multigraph* can generate all simple graphs or multigraphs with a given degree sequence. It implements the same ideas as *minibaum* [4] but for general degree sequences, and as it does not contain new ideas, it was never published. For a large number of degree sequences its results were tested and confirmed by the program described in [12].) The computations showed that there are no 5-pieces of order at most 35 in Class 0. The number in Class 1 \ Class 2 are listed in Table 3. The total computation time was about 5 CPU years. We also independently determined all 5-pieces up to 29 vertices by using *minibaum* to generate all bipartite cubic graphs and using a separate program to remove one vertex and two of its neighbours in all possible ways of each input graph and retaining the connected graphs of girth at least 6 among the graphs resulting from this operation. We then determined the class of each 5-piece using another independent implementation and the results were in complete agreement with the counts reported in Table 3.

We joined all combinations of two of these 5-pieces in Class 1 \ Class 2 up to 50 vertices and found only the Georges–Kelmans graph among those that were 3-connected. (Also here we replicated this result using an independent implementation of the joining program.) The Georges–Kelmans graph has cyclic connectivity 4. Together with Claims 1 and 2, this completes the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.5.** *All bipartite cubic graphs with girth at least 8 up to 50 vertices are hamiltonian.*

*Proof.* This result was purely computational. There are only about  $2.5 \times 10^9$  such graphs (see Table 1) but the much slower generation time for girth 8 meant that it took about 22 CPU years.

After completing this long computation, we found that a modification of Meringer’s program *genreg* [21] made by the first author could generate the graphs in only 8 CPU months. This prompted us to perform a stronger test: all bipartite cubic graphs with girth at least 8 up to 50 vertices have the property that for each pair of distinct edges  $e, e'$  there is a hamiltonian cycle using  $e$  and not using  $e'$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.* Let  $G$  be a non-hamiltonian 3-connected bipartite cubic graph with at most 48 vertices. By Lemmas 2.2–2.5, we know that  $G$  is cyclically 6-connected and has girth 6.

Our approach is as follows: We define a reduction that transforms a bipartite cubic graph with girth 6 on  $n$  vertices to a bipartite cubic graph with some 4-cycles on  $n - 8$  vertices. The set of reduced graphs will be much smaller than the set of original graphs, but there will also be irreducible graphs on  $n$  vertices. The irreducible graphs have to be generated and tested directly and on the reduced graphs some tests have to be performed in order to guarantee that they do not come from a non-hamiltonian graph, and reduced graphs that don’t pass the test have to be extended and checked for hamiltonicity.


In order to be able to reduce the computation time to an amount available on a modern cluster, there has to be a balance between the two parts. On one hand the reduction should be so that there are not too many irreducible graphs and that it is possible to generate all irreducible graphs. On the other hand the tests necessary on the reduced graphs must not be too expensive, so that the reduced graphs can be tested in an affordable amount of time. The (admittedly very technical) reduction we used is the following:

Let  $\hat{G}$  be the bipartite graph with 16 vertices depicted on the left hand side of Figure 7. We will call a bipartite cubic graph  $G$  of girth 6 *reducible* if it contains  $\hat{G}$  in a way that has the following properties:

- (i) Neither  $v'_8$  and  $v'_3$  nor  $v'_7$  and  $v'_4$  are adjacent.
- (ii) At least one of the paths  $v'_1, v_1, v_2, v'_2$  and  $v'_5, v_5, v_6, v'_6$  lies on a 6-cycle.
- (iii) If exactly one of the paths in (ii) lies on a 6-cycle, then in addition at least one of the paths  $v'_8, v_8, v_1, v_2, v_3, v'_3$  and  $v'_4, v_4, v_5, v_6, v_7, v'_7$  lies on an 8-cycle.

The reduced graph  $G_r$  is then obtained by deleting  $v_1, \dots, v_8$  and adding the edges  $e_1 = \{v'_1, v'_2\}$ ,  $e_2 = \{v'_8, v'_3\}$ ,  $e_3 = \{v'_7, v'_4\}$ , and  $e_4 = \{v'_6, v'_5\}$ , as depicted on the right hand side of Figure 7. It is obvious that the resulting graph is bipartite and cubic and from the fact that it has girth 6 and property (i) it follows that it is simple. Since  $G_r$  is cubic, each component of  $G_r$  contains a cycle. If cycles  $Z_1$  and  $Z_2$  lie in different components of  $G_r$ , then the cyclic 5-connectivity of  $G$  means that there are at least 5 edge-disjoint paths in  $G$  from  $Z_1$  to  $Z_2$ . However, at most 4 of these paths can contain vertices of the set  $\{v_1, \dots, v_8\}$ , so one of them connects  $Z_1$  and  $Z_2$  in  $G_r$ , contradicting the assumption that  $Z_1$  and  $Z_2$  are in different components. Thus,  $G_r$  is connected.

If  $G_r$  is hamiltonian, this does not necessarily imply that  $G$  is also hamiltonian, but some hamiltonian cycles in  $G_r$  imply hamiltonicity in  $G$ . We call a hamiltonian cycle  $H_r$



**Figure 7:** The reduction of an 8-cycle.

of  $G_r$  extendable for  $(e_1, \dots, e_4)$  if  $H \cap \{e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4\}$  is one of  $\{e_1\}$ ,  $\{e_4\}$ ,  $\{e_1, e_2\}$ ,  $\{e_2, e_3\}$  and  $\{e_3, e_4\}$ . In each of these cases it is easy to see that  $H_r \setminus \{e_1, \dots, e_4\}$  can be extended to a hamiltonian cycle in  $G$ .

Our strategy now consists of two parts:

- (a) Generate all irreducible bipartite cubic graphs of girth 6 on up to 48 vertices and test them for hamiltonicity.
- (b) Generate all connected bipartite cubic graphs  $G_r$  with at most 40 vertices that may be the reduction of a bipartite cubic graph  $G$  of girth 6. For each 4-tuple  $(e_1, \dots, e_4)$  of edges of  $G_r$  that may be the new edges added in the reduction, determine whether  $G_r$  has a hamiltonian cycle extendable for  $(e_1, \dots, e_4)$ . If not, reconstruct  $G$  and test it for hamiltonicity.

For part (a) we used the program *minibaum*. The algorithm used in *minibaum* constructs the graphs by recursively adding one edge at a time. The subgraph constructed at each step remains part of all descendants, so as soon as the subgraph on the left hand side of Figure 7 appears with conditions (i)–(iii) satisfied, we know that all cubic graphs descended from this step are reducible. Consequently, the generation tree can be pruned at this point.

The program was run on a cluster with various different processors. It needed about 7 CPU years and generated 136,941,076 irreducible graphs. Among the graphs were 4 non-hamiltonian ones, but they were not 3-connected. We also independently generated all irreducible graphs up to 40 vertices using the unmodified version of *minibaum* to generate all bipartite cubic graphs of girth 6 and an independently implemented program to filter the irreducible graphs. The results were in complete agreement.

Part (b) of the proof was the most computationally expensive step in our whole project. We illustrate the magnitude of the task for  $G_r$  having 40 vertices. As indicated in Table 1, there are 7,439,833,931,266 connected bipartite cubic graphs with 40 vertices. In total (up to reversal), there were 129,922,879,860,637,000 possibilities for the 4-tuple  $(e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4)$ . In all but 417,626,620,084 of these (1 in 311,098) there was an extendable hamiltonian cycle. Since hamiltonian cycles can be extendable for many 4-tuples, the total number of hamiltonian cycles found was “only” 131,062,665,710,324. Of the 417,626,620,084 4-tuples for which there was no extendable hamiltonian cycle, the reconstructed graph on 48 vertices was hamiltonian except in 368 cases, none of them 3-connected. The total time was 5 CPU years for generation and 85 CPU years for hamil-

tonian cycle investigation. We also independently verified the computations for part (b) up to 34 vertices.

That completes the proof of the first part of Theorem 1.1. For the second part, recall that Lemmas 2.2–2.5 apply also to 50 vertices.  $\square$

**Remark 2.6.** *There are infinitely many non-hamiltonian 3-connected bipartite cubic graphs for every even girth  $g \geq 4$ .*

*Proof.* There exist 3-connected bipartite cubic graphs of arbitrary large even girth  $g$  (see e.g. the survey [24]). A non-hamiltonian 3-connected bipartite cubic graph of arbitrary even girth  $g$  can be obtained by replacing every vertex of a non-hamiltonian 3-connected bipartite cubic graph by a 3-connected bipartite cubic graph of girth  $g$  with one vertex removed.  $\square$


### 3. Non-hamiltonian cyclically 5-connected bipartite cubic graphs

Cubic graphs of course cannot have connectivity greater than 3, but among all cubic 3-connected graphs, the cyclic connectivity provides a measure of how strong the connections between the parts of the graph are. Though the Georges–Kelmans graph has girth 6, which is a necessary prerequisite for being cyclically 6-connected, it is only cyclically 4-connected. To be exact: it has no cyclic edge-cuts of size 3, but 8 cyclic edge-cuts of size 4.

Extending a folklore technique (described to us by Carol Zamfirescu) for constructing graphs without hamiltonian paths from graphs without hamiltonian cycles, we will now describe how to construct non-hamiltonian cyclically 5-connected bipartite cubic graphs out of a suitable non-hamiltonian bipartite cubic graph with lower cyclic connectivity, such as the Georges–Kelmans graph.

Recall that minimal cyclic edge cuts in cubic graphs are always independent edge cuts. We denote the distance between vertices  $v, w$  by  $d(v, w)$ . Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a cyclically 4-connected cubic graph, so that there is a vertex  $v \in V$  with neighbours  $N(v) = \{w_1, w_2, w_3\}$  and an edge  $e = \{x, y\}$ , so that  $d(v, x) \geq 3$ ,  $d(v, y) \geq 3$ , and for each independent edge cut  $C$  of  $G$  with  $|C| = 4$  we have that neither  $v$  nor  $x$  are contained in an edge of  $C$  and that  $v$  and  $x$  are in different components of  $G \setminus C$ . Such graphs have girth at least 5, as a 4-cycle containing  $v$  or  $x$  would imply a 4-cut containing  $v$  or  $x$ , and a 4-cycle not containing  $v$  or  $x$  would imply a 4-cut with  $v$  and  $x$  in the same component. It is easy to see by inspection that the Georges–Kelmans graph has in fact several vertex-edge pairs with this property, for example the pair marked with asterisks in Figure 1. In the figures showing the operations we use coloured vertices to illustrate that we can choose to maintain bipartiteness; nevertheless the construction is not restricted to bipartite graphs.

Take three copies  $G_1, G_2, G_3$  of  $G$  with corresponding vertices  $v_i, w_{i,1}, w_{i,2}, w_{i,3}, x_i, y_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq 3$  and add three new vertices  $z_1, z_2, z_3$ . Then remove  $v_1, v_2, v_3$  and for  $1 \leq i \leq 3$  and  $1 \leq j \leq 3$  connect  $z_j$  with  $w_{i,j}$  and remove the edge  $\{x_i, y_i\}$ . This operation is depicted on the left hand side of Figure 8. We call the result of this operation a *triple* and each of the copies  $G_i$  of  $G$  with  $v_i$  and  $\{x_i, y_i\}$  removed a *block*. Then we can take an arbitrary 3-edge connected cubic multigraph  $M$ , replace each vertex by a triple and assign the three blocks to the three adjacent edges. Finally we connect vertices  $x_k$  and  $y_\ell$  from different blocks that are assigned to the same edge. On the right hand side of Figure 8 this is depicted for the graph  $M = K_4$ , but the smallest choice for  $M$  is the cubic multigraph with 2 vertices. We call this operation the *triple-operation*  $\mathcal{T}(G, v, e, M)$ .



**Figure 8:** Constructing a cyclically 5-connected graph from a cyclically 4-connected one. The colour of the vertices  $z_i$  and the vertices  $w_{i,j}$  can be the other way around. Between the vertices  $x_i$  and  $y_i$  there is no edge.

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a cyclically 4-connected cubic non-hamiltonian graph and  $v \in V$ ,  $e = \{x, y\} \in E$  so that  $d(v, x) \geq 3$ ,  $d(v, y) \geq 3$ , and for each cyclic edge cut  $C$  of  $G$  with  $|C| = 4$  we have that neither  $v$  nor  $x$  are contained in an edge of  $C$  and that  $v$  and  $x$  are in different components of  $G \setminus C$ . Furthermore let  $M$  be a 3-edge-connected cubic multigraph. Then  $\mathcal{T}(G, v, e, M)$  is a cyclically 5-connected non-hamiltonian graph.*

*Proof.* Let  $C = \{e_1, \dots, e_4\}$  be a set of four independent edges in  $\mathcal{T}(G, v, e, M)$ . We have to show that  $C$  is not a cut of  $\mathcal{T}(G, v, e, M)$ .

A block  $B$  containing at most 2 edges of  $C$  is connected:

Assume that this is not the case and let  $C' \subset C$  denote a set of minimal size so that  $B$  is not connected. This means that  $B \setminus C'$  has two components, say  $P_1$  and  $P_2$ , each of which has at most two endpoints of  $C'$ . Since every vertex of  $B$  has degree as least two, neither of  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  can be isolated vertices, and the only vertices that might have degree 1 in  $B \setminus C'$  are  $x, y, w_1, w_2, w_3$  (if they are also endpoints of edges in  $C'$ ).

Since each component is not an isolated vertex and has at most two vertices of degree 1, it has a cycle unless it is a non-trivial path within the vertices  $x, y, w_1, w_2, w_3$ . As any two vertices of  $x, y, w_1, w_2, w_3$  have distance at least 2 from each other ( $\{x, y\}$  is removed when forming  $B$ ,  $\{x, w_i\}$  or  $\{y, w_i\}$  are not present as  $d(v, x) \geq 3$ ,  $d(v, y) \geq 3$  and an edge  $\{w_i, w_j\}$  would be a triangle in  $G$  contradicting that it is cyclically 4-connected), this cannot be the case. So both components contain a cycle.

One of  $P_1, P_2$  would contain at most one of  $w_1, w_2, w_3$ ; w.l.o.g.  $P_1$  contains only  $w_1$ . If  $P_1$  contains none of  $x, y$  or both, then  $C' \cup \{\{v, w_1\}\}$  would be a cyclic cut of  $G$  with at most 3 edges, otherwise  $C' \cup \{\{v, w_1\}, \{x, y\}\}$  would be a cyclic cut of  $G$  with at most 4 edges containing the edge  $\{x, y\}$ . Both cases are in contradiction to the assumptions on  $G$ , so  $B$  is connected.

As only one block can contain more than two edges of  $C$ , at most one block is not connected. Assume first that there is a disconnected block  $B$  in a triple  $T$ . Then there is at most one edge not in  $B$  and two blocks in the same triple (different from  $T$ ) belong to the same component of  $\mathcal{T}(G, v, e, M) \setminus C$ . Due to  $M$  being 3-connected all triples

different from  $T$  belong to the same component. The two blocks in  $T$  different from  $B$  are connected to blocks in other triples, so they belong to the same component. If  $B$  contains all 4 edges of  $C$ , then each component contains a vertex of  $x, y, w_1, w_2, w_3$ , as otherwise  $C$  would be a cut in  $G$  not separating  $v$  and  $x$ . As  $x, y, w_1, w_2, w_3$  are connected to the other triples, in this case the graph is connected. If  $B$  contains only 3 edges of  $C$ , each component contains at least two vertices of  $x, y, w_1, w_2, w_3$  (otherwise we had a 4-cut in  $G$  containing  $x$  or  $v$ ) and the result follows analogously.

In  $B$  each vertex is either in a component with all of  $w_1, w_2, w_3$ —at least two of which have a path to another block in the triple—or with both of  $x, y$  and at least one of them is connected to another triple. So in this case  $\mathcal{T}(G, v, e, M) \setminus C$  is connected.

Assume now that all blocks are connected. If no triple contains three or more edges of  $C$ , then all triples are connected and as  $M$  is 3-edge connected (so with the edges doubled 6-edge connected), all triples are in the same component of  $\mathcal{T}(G, v, e, M) \setminus C$ .

The last case is that a triple  $T$  contains three or more edges of  $C$  and is disconnected, which means that the edges are adjacent to the three new vertices, which are nevertheless still connected to at least two blocks in the triple. The other triples are still connected, and as each block in  $T$  is connected with at least one edge to a block in another triple, the blocks of  $T$  also belong to the same component. This completes the proof of cyclic 5-connectivity.

Next we prove the non-hamiltonicity. Assume that  $\mathcal{T}(G, v, e, M)$  has a hamiltonian cycle  $H$ . Each edge-cut must contain a positive even number of edges of  $H$ , so the 6-edge-cut isolating a triple from the rest of the graph contains 2, 4 or 6 edges of  $H$ . If it contains 2 edges, one of the blocks has no edges going to another triple, so it must have 2 edges going to the vertices in the triple not belonging to a block—but this implies a hamiltonian cycle in  $G$ .

So the edge-cut contains at least 4 edges of  $H$  and there is a block  $B$  where both edges  $e_1, e_2$  going to another triple belong to  $H$ . After  $H$  enters  $B$  at  $e_1$ , it must first leave at  $e_2$ ; otherwise there is another segment of  $H$  that enters  $B$  at  $e_2$  and these two segments together would allow us to construct a hamiltonian cycle in the non-hamiltonian graph  $G$ . The same argument applies to the other block which  $e_1$  is incident with, giving us a cycle made of segments of  $H$  involving only two blocks, in contradiction to  $H$  being a hamiltonian cycle.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.2.** *There are infinitely many non-hamiltonian cyclically 5-connected bipartite cubic graphs. The smallest one has at most 300 vertices.*

*Proof.* This is a direct consequence of Theorem 3.1 and the fact that the construction can be carried out to preserve bipartiteness. The lower bound is obtained by applying the construction to the Georges–Kelmans graph and the cubic multigraph on 2 vertices.  $\square$

#### 4. Barnette’s conjecture

In this section, we turn our attention to Barnette’s conjecture [2], which states that every 3-connected *planar* bipartite cubic graph is hamiltonian. Here our main result is the following.

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let  $G$  be a 3-connected planar bipartite cubic graph with  $n$  vertices. Then*

- (a)  $n \leq 90$  implies that  $G$  is hamiltonian;

(b)  $n \leq 78$  implies that every edge of  $G$  lies on a hamiltonian cycle;


(c)  $n \leq 66$  implies that for any two edges  $e_1, e_2$  of  $G$ , there is a hamiltonian cycle through  $e_1$  but avoiding  $e_2$ .

*Proof.* Using the generator *plantri* [7] and the program *cubhamg*, we established part (c) by direct computation. This required approximately 37 CPU years. We also found that the same property holds for those 3-connected planar bipartite cubic graphs on 68 or 70 vertices that do not have a 4-face adjacent to two other 4-faces. This required another 5 CPU years. Parts (a) and (b) now follow as in [13, Theorem 5].  $\square$

Even assuming that Barnette’s conjecture is true, it is natural to ask how close to planarity non-hamiltonian 3-connected bipartite cubic graphs can be; in particular, what is the minimum genus of a non-hamiltonian 3-connected bipartite cubic graph?

Using the program *multi\_genus* [5] to determine the genus, we found that the Georges–Kelmans graph has genus 5. The Ellingham–Horton graphs on 54 and 78 vertices have genus 4 and 7, respectively. The graphs of Horton with 92 and 96 vertices have genus 8 or 9, and genus between 8 and 10, respectively.

During our project we compiled a collection of small non-hamiltonian 3-connected bipartite cubic graphs by a mixture on unsystematic searches. For 50–64 vertices, the number of graphs in our collection is 1, 4, 30, 187, 1334, 3377, 29529, 204069, respectively. (The non-hamiltonicity of these graphs was confirmed with a separate program.) The smallest genus that occurs in the collection is 4, and the smallest graph found with genus 4 has 52 vertices (see Figure 9).



**Figure 9:** A non-hamiltonian 3-connected bipartite cubic graph of genus 4 on 52 vertices. Join two vertices of degree 2 if they have the same colour and shape. The two edges for each colour can be drawn on one handle.

Note that the condition of being 3-connected is essential for Barnette’s conjecture. Requiring only connectivity but not 3-connectivity, there is a non-hamiltonian planar bipartite cubic graph already on 26 vertices. For genus 1 and 2, the smallest bipartite cubic non-hamiltonian graphs have 24 and 20 vertices, respectively.

## 5. A fast practical algorithm to search for hamiltonian cycles

As mentioned, this project required the discovery of more than  $10^{14}$  hamiltonian cycles, in cubic graphs of up to 50 vertices. A naive search that grows a path one edge at a time has no chance of achieving this feat in an acceptable amount of time. A much faster approach, available as the program *cubhamg* (which is part of the *nauty* package [20]), has been used in several investigations since [14] but never published. We now give a brief description here.

At each point of time, every edge has a label NO (not in the hamiltonian cycle), YES (in the hamiltonian cycle), or UNDEC (undecided). Every edge is initialized to UNDEC, except for edges we wish to force into or out of the hamiltonian cycle.

Given an edge labelling, a *propagation* process can be performed by applying the following rules until no further rules can be applied.

- (a) If a vertex has two incident NOs or three incident YESes, a failure condition occurs.
- (b) If a vertex has one incident NO, then the other two incident edges will be labelled YES.
- (c) If a vertex has two incident YESes, then the other incident edge will be labelled NO.
- (d) Let  $P$  be a maximal path of edges labelled YES.
  - (i) If  $P$  is a hamiltonian path whose ends are adjacent by an edge labelled UNDEC or YES, then a hamiltonian cycle has been found. Otherwise, a failure condition occurs.
  - (ii) If  $P$  is not a hamiltonian path and its ends are adjacent, then the edge between the ends will be labelled NO.
  - (iii) If there are distinct vertices  $x, y$  not in  $P$ , such that the neighbours of  $x$  are  $y$  and the two ends of  $P$ , then the edge  $\{x, y\}$  will be labelled YES.

The overall structure is a backtrack search. If propagation ends with a hamiltonian cycle, we are done. If it finishes with a failure condition, backtracking occurs. If propagation finishes with neither a hamiltonian cycle nor failure, we choose a vertex with an incident edge labelled UNDEC, and branch on which of its incident edges labelled UNDEC will be relabelled NO. For each choice we apply propagation again.

The efficiency of this process is high because propagation usually gives new labels to many edges. Also, propagation can be carried out very quickly. Each vertex  $v$  has an attribute  $a_v$  whose meaning is “if this vertex is an end of a maximal path of edges labelled YES, then the other end is  $a_v$ ”. With this simple data structure, each of the propagation operations can be carried out in constant time.

Note that our theorems don’t depend on the absence of hamiltonian cycles being detected by the algorithm, but only on their easily-checked existence being confirmed. As an example, if Table 2 contained a few graphs that didn’t belong, it would only mean that we have more pairs  $G_1, G_2$  to join.

## 6. The graphs mentioned in this paper

For the reader’s convenience, in Table 4 we give the identification by which the graphs mentioned in this paper can be examined and downloaded at the *House of Graphs* [6].

| order | description of non-hamiltonian graph         | HoG id |
|-------|--|--------|
| 20    | smallest connected bipartite cubic graph     | 6923   |
| 24    | ditto, of genus 1                            | 34282  |
| 26    | ditto, planar                                | 34286  |
| 38    | Barnette–Bosak–Lederberg graph               | 954    |
| 50    | Georges–Kelmans graph                        | 1096   |
| 52    | 3-connected bipartite cubic graph of genus 4 | 33805  |
| 54    | Ellingham–Horton graph                       | 1059   |
| 78    | Ellingham–Horton graph                       | 1061   |
| 92    | Horton graph                                 | 1179   |
| 96    | Horton graph                                 | 1181   |

**Table 4:** *House of Graphs* id numbers for graphs mentioned in this paper.

## Acknowledgements

Most of the extensive computational results were obtained from the Stevin Super-computer Infrastructure provided by Ghent University, the Hercules Foundation and the Flemish Government, department EWI.

## References

- [1] R.E.L. Aldred, G. Brinkmann, and B.D. McKay. Announcement about Barnette’s conjecture, 2000. See: <https://www.fmf.uni-lj.si/%7Emohar/Problems/P4BarnetteConjecture.html>.
- [2] D. Barnette. Conjecture 5. Recent Progress in Combinatorics. In *Proceedings of the Third Waterloo Conference on Combinatorics*. Academic Press New York, 1969.
- [3] J.A. Bondy and U.S.R. Murty. *Graph theory with applications*. Macmillan London, 1976.
- [4] G. Brinkmann. Fast generation of cubic graphs. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 23(2):139–149, 1996. The latest version of the software is available at <https://caagt.ugent.be/minibaum/>.
- [5] G. Brinkmann. A practical algorithm for the computation of the genus. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.08243*, 2020.
- [6] G. Brinkmann, K. Coolsaet, J. Goedgebeur, and H. Mélot. House of Graphs: a database of interesting graphs. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 161(1–2):311–314, 2013. Available at <http://hog.grinvin.org/>.
- [7] G. Brinkmann and B.D. McKay. Fast generation of planar graphs. *MATCH Commun. Math. Comput. Chem.*, 58(2):323–357, 2007. The latest version of the software is available at <http://users.cecs.anu.edu.au/~bdm/plantri/>.
- [8] R. Diestel. *Graph theory*, volume 173 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer, Heidelberg, fourth edition, 2010.
- [9] M.N. Ellingham. Cycles in 3-connected cubic graphs. Master’s thesis, University of Melbourne, 1982.

- [10] M.N. Ellingham and J.D. Horton. Non-hamiltonian 3-connected cubic bipartite graphs. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 34(3):350–353, 1983.
- [11] J.P. Georges. Non-hamiltonian bicubic graphs. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 46(1):121–124, 1989.
- [12] R. Grund. Konstruktion schlichter Graphen mit gegebener Gradpartition. *Bayreuther Mathematische Schriften*, 44:73–104, 1993.
- [13] D.A. Holton, B. Manvel, and B.D. McKay. Hamiltonian cycles in cubic 3-connected bipartite planar graphs. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 38(3):279–297, 1985.
- [14] D.A. Holton and B.D. McKay. The smallest non-hamiltonian 3-connected cubic planar graphs have 38 vertices. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 45(3):305–319, 1988.
- [15] J.D. Horton. On two-factors of bipartite regular graphs. *Discrete Mathematics*, 41(1):35–41, 1982.
- [16] A.K. Kelmans. Cubic bipartite cyclic 4-connected graphs without hamiltonian circuits. *Russian Mathematical Surveys*, 43(3):205, 1988.
- [17] A.K. Kelmans. Constructions of cubic bipartite 3-connected graphs without hamiltonian cycles. *Selected Topics in Discrete Mathematics (Moscow, 1972-1990)*, pages 127–140, 1994.
- [18] K. Knauer and P. Valicov. Cuts in matchings of 3-connected cubic graphs. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 76:27–36, 2019.
- [19] W. McCuaig. Edge reductions in cyclically  $k$ -connected cubic graphs. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 56:16–44, 1992.
- [20] B.D. McKay and A. Piperno. Practical graph isomorphism, II. *J. Symbolic Comput.*, 60:94–112, 2014. The latest version of the software is available at <http://users.cecs.anu.edu.au/~bdm/nauty/>.
- [21] M. Meringer. Fast generation of regular graphs and construction of cages. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 30:137–146, 1999.
- [22] W.T. Tutte. On hamiltonian circuits. *Journal of the London Mathematical Society*, 1(2):98–101, 1946.
- [23] W.T. Tutte. On the 2-factors of bicubic graphs. *Discrete Mathematics*, 1(2):203–208, 1971.
- [24] N.C. Wormald. Models of random regular graphs. In J.D. Lamb and D.A. Preece, editors, *Surveys in Combinatorics, 1999*, volume 267. Cambridge University Press, 1999.