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Abstract

The famous Dirac’s Theorem gives an exact bound on the minimum degree of an n-vertex graph guaranteeing the existence of a hamiltonian cycle. We prove exact bounds of similar type for hamiltonian Berge cycles in r-uniform, n-vertex hypergraphs for all 3 ≤ r < n. The bounds are different for r < n/2 and r ≥ n/2, and the proofs are different for r < (n−2)/2 and r ≥ (n−2)/2.
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1 Introduction and Results

Terminology. A hypergraph H is a family of subsets of a ground set. We refer to these subsets as the edges of H and the elements of the ground set as the vertices of H. We use E(H) and V(H) to denote the set of edges and the set of vertices of H respectively. We say H is r-uniform (r-graph, for short) if every edge of H contains exactly r vertices. A graph is a 2-graph.

The degree dH(v) of a vertex v in a hypergraph H is the number of edges containing v. The minimum degree, δ(H), is the minimum over degrees of all vertices of H.

A hamiltonian cycle in a graph is a cycle which visits every vertex. Sufficient conditions for existence of hamiltonian cycles in graphs have been well-studied. In particular, the first extremal result of this type was due to Dirac in 1952.

Theorem 1 [Dirac [4]]. Let n ≥ 3. If G is an n-vertex graph with minimum degree δ(G) ≥ n/2, then G has a hamiltonian cycle.

Recently, a series of results of the same flavor was proved for Berge cycles in hypergraphs.

Definition 1.1. A Berge cycle of length ℓ in a hypergraph is a list of ℓ distinct vertices and ℓ distinct edges (v1, e1, v2, . . . , eℓ−1, vℓ, eℓ, v1) such that {v1, v1+1} ⊆ e1 for all 1 ≤ i ≤ ℓ (here we take indices modulo ℓ). Similarly, a Berge path of length ℓ is a list of ℓ + 1 distinct vertices and ℓ distinct edges (v1, e1, v2, . . . , eℓ, vℓ+1) such that {v1, vℓ+1} ⊆ ei for all 1 ≤ i ≤ ℓ.
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Although the edges in a Berge cycle may contain other vertices, we say $V(C) = \{v_1, \ldots, v_t\}$, and $E(C) = \{e_1, \ldots, e_t\}$. The vertices in $V(C)$ are called key vertices. Notation for Berge paths is similar.

An analogue of Dirac’s Theorem for non-uniform hypergraphs was given in [7]. For $r$-uniform hypergraphs, Coulson and Perarnau proved the following result for $n$ much larger than $r$.

**Theorem 2** (Coulson and Perarnau [3]). Let $H$ be an $r$-graph on $n$ vertices such that $r = o(\sqrt{n})$. If $H$ has minimum degree $\delta(H) \geq \left(\frac{n-1}{2}\right) + 1$, then $H$ contains a hamiltonian Berge cycle.

This bound in Theorem 2 on $\delta(H)$ is sharp. Moreover, Coulson and Perarnau’s result is a corollary of their stronger result for rainbow cycles in graphs. With their methods, $r = o(\sqrt{n})$ is best possible, so the case $r = \Omega(\sqrt{n})$ remained open. Various results by Bermond, Germa, Heydemann, and Sotteau [1]; Clemens, Ehrenmüller, and Person [2]; and Ma, Hou, and Gao [9] provided upper bounds for the minimum degree when $r = \Omega(\sqrt{n})$. The best bound to date was due to Ma, Hou and Gao.

**Theorem 3** (Ma, Hou and Gao [9]). Let $r \geq 4$ and $n \geq 2r + 4$, and let $H$ be an $r$-graph on $n$ vertices. If $H$ has minimum degree $\delta(H) \geq \left(\frac{n}{r-1}\right) + \left[\frac{n}{2}\right]$, then $H$ contains a hamiltonian Berge cycle.

In this paper we derive exact bounds for all possible $3 \leq r < n$, improving the aforementioned theorems.

**Theorem 4.** Let $t = t(n) = \left\lceil \frac{n-1}{2}\right\rceil$, and suppose $3 \leq r < n$. Let $H$ be an $r$-graph with

$$\delta(H) \geq \begin{cases} \left(\frac{t}{r-1}\right) + 1 & \text{when } r \leq t, \\ \frac{n}{r} & \text{when } r \geq n/2. \end{cases}$$

Then $H$ contains a hamiltonian Berge cycle.

This bound is best possible due to the following constructions.

**Construction 1.** Suppose $r \leq t$. If $n$ is odd, let $H_1$ consist of two copies of $K_{(n-1)/2}^{(r)}$ that share exactly one vertex. If $n$ is even, let $H_1$ consist of two disjoint $K_{n/2}^{r}$ and a single edge intersecting both cliques.

**Construction 2.** Suppose $r \leq t$. Let $H_2$ have vertex set $X \cup Y$ such that $|X| = t$ and $|Y| = n - t$. The edge set of $H_2$ consists of every edge with at most one vertex in $Y$.

**Construction 3.** Suppose $r \geq n/2$. Let $H_3$ be obtained by removing a single edge from an $r$-uniform tight cycle on $n$ vertices.

It is easy to check that both $H_1$ and $H_2$ have minimum degree $\left(\frac{t}{r-1}\right)$. Observe that neither $H_1$ nor $H_2$ have a hamiltonian Berge cycle: $H_1$ has a either a cut vertex or a cut edge, and in $H_2$ a hamiltonian Berge cycle must visit two vertices in $Y$ consecutively, but no edge of $H_2$ contains any pair of vertices from $Y$.

Since an $r$-uniform tight cycle is $r$-regular, $\delta(H_3) = r - 1$. Also, $H_3$ does not have a hamiltonian Berge cycle because $|E(H_3)| = n - 1$.

Note that the length of the longest cycle in Construction 1 is $\lceil n/2 \rceil$. Thus Theorem 3 yields exact bounds on the minimum degree guaranteeing the existence of any cycle of length at least $k$ in $n$-vertex $r$-uniform hypergraphs for all $r \leq t$ and all $k \geq 1 + n/2$.

The proofs for $r < t$ and for $r \geq t$ are quite different. For $r < t$ we use the original approach of Dirac using lollipops. In Section 2 we set up the proof for this case and prove that our $r$-graph
must have a cycle of length at least \( t + 2 \). In Section 3 we analyze lollipops with a long (but not hamiltonian) Berge cycle, and in all cases get a contradiction. In Section 4 we start the case \( r \geq t \), introduce suitable ends and state the main lemmas. In subsequent sections we prove the lemmas, and in the last section finish the whole proof. The case \( r = t \) is especially difficult and adds substantially to the length of the sections in which we consider \( r \geq t \).

Also, since we always consider only Berge paths and cycles, below we drop the word “Berge”.

2 Setup for \( r < t \)

A lollipop is a pair \((C, P)\) such that \( C \) is a cycle, \( P \) is a path, \( E(C) \cap E(P) = \emptyset \), \( |V(C) \cap V(P)| = 1 \), and the shared vertex of \( V(C) \) and \( V(P) \) is one of the endpoints of \( P \). If \( E(P) \neq \emptyset \), then the end of the lollipop \((C, P)\) is the endpoint vertex of \( P \) that is not in \( C \). If \( E(P) = \emptyset \), then \((C, P)\) has no end.

A lollipop \((C, P)\) is better than a lollipop \((C', P')\) if

(i) \(|E(C)| > |E(C')|\), or

(ii) \(|E(C)| = |E(C')|\) and \(|E(P)| > |E(P')|\), or

(iii) \(|E(C)| = |E(C')|\), \(|E(P)| = |E(P')|\) \(\geq 1\) and the number of edges in \( C \) containing the end of \((C, P)\) is greater than the number of edges in \( C' \) containing the end of \((C', P')\).

The original proof [4] of Dirac’s Theorem considered a best lollipop and showed that it could be only a hamiltonian cycle. We use the same strategy for \( r < t \).

Let \( r < t \) and let \( H \) be an \( n \)-vertex hypergraph with minimum degree at least \( \binom{t}{r-1} + 1 \). Suppose \( H \) does not have a hamiltonian cycle. Let \((C, P)\) be a best lollipop in \( H \).

Let \( C = (v_1, e_1, v_2, \ldots, e_{k-1}, v_k, e_k, v_1) \) with \( V(C) \cap V(P) = \{v_1\} \), and \( P = (u_1, f_1, u_2, \ldots, f_t, u_{t+1}) \) with \( u_1 = v_1 \) and \( u_{t+1} = x \). So, \( C \) has length \( k \), \( P \) has length \( \ell \) and \( x \) is the end of \((C, P)\) when \( \ell \geq 1 \).

Define \( H' = (V(H), E(H) - (E(C) \cup E(P))) \). That is, \( E(H') \) is the set of edges not in the lollipop. For a vertex \( v \), define \( E_v = \{ e \in E(H') : v \in e \} \) and \( N_{H'}(v) = \{ v \in V(H) : v \in e \text{ for some } e \in E_v \} \). We call a vertex \( u \) an \( H' \)-neighbor of \( v \) if \( u \in N_{H'}(v) \).

Let \( B = (V(P) - \{x\}) \cup (N_{H'}(x) \cap V(C)) \) and set \( b = |B| \). In this and next sections, we will provide better and better bounds on \( k \) and \( \ell \). We begin from a lemma providing that \( k \geq t + 2 \).

**Lemma 2.1.** \(|V(C)| \geq t + 2 = [(n + 3)/2]\).

**Proof.** Suppose \( H \) has no cycles of length at least \( t + 2 \). Let \( Q \) be a longest path in \( H \), say \( Q = (v_1, e_1, v_2, \ldots, e_{s-1}, v_s) \). Let \( q = \min \{t + 1, s\} \), \( V(q) = \{v_1, \ldots, v_q\} \) and let \( Q(q) \) denote the subpath of \( Q \) with vertex set \( V(q) \) and edge set \( E(q) = \{e_1, \ldots, e_{q-1}\} \). Among such paths \( Q \), choose one in which

(a) the most edges in \( E(q) \) are contained in \( V(q) \), and

(b) modulo (a), the fewest edges in \( E(q) \cup \{e_q\} \) contain \( v_1 \).

Let \( H_1 = H - E(Q) \). Since \( H \) has no cycles of length at least \( t + 2 \) and \( Q \) is a longest path, all neighbors of \( v_1 \) in \( H_1 \) are in \( V(q) \). Thus \( d_{H_1}(v_1) \leq \binom{q-1}{r-1} \). By the same reason, the edges \( e_i \) for \( q + 1 \leq i \leq s - 1 \) must not contain \( v_1 \). So

\[
d_H(v_1) \leq d_{H_1}(v_1) + \min\{q, s - 1\} \leq \binom{q-1}{r-1} + \min\{q, s - 1\}.
\]
If \( q = s \leq t \), then since \( 3 \leq r \leq t - 1 \), this is at most \( \binom{t-1}{r-1} + t - 1 \leq \binom{t}{r-1} \), contradicting the minimum degree condition. Hence \( s \geq t + 1 \) and \( q = t + 1 \). Let \( E'(q) = E(q) \cup \{e_q\} \) if \( e_q \) exists, and \( E'(q) = E(q) \) otherwise.

Let \( E_0 \) be the set of edges in \( E'(q) \) not containing \( v_1 \), \( E_1 \) be the set of edges in \( E'(q) \) containing \( v_1 \) and contained in \( V(q) \), and \( E_2 = E'(q) - E_0 - E_1 \). In particular, \( e_q \in E_0 \cup E_2 \).

Let us show that
\[
|E_1 \cup E_2| \leq t - 1. \tag{3}
\]

Indeed, suppose \( |E_1 \cup E_2| = m \). For every \( 2 \leq i \leq t + 1 \), we can consider the path \( Q_i \) from \( v_i \) to \( v_s \) obtained from \( Q \) by replacing the subpath \( (v_i, e_1, v_2, \ldots, e_i, v_{i+1}) \) with the subpath \( (v_i, e_{i-1}, v_{i-1}, \ldots, e_1, v_1, e_i, v_{i+1}) \). This path uses the same edges as \( Q \), so by Rule (a) in (1) it is also a valid choice for a best path, and if \( v_i \) is in fewer than \( m \) edges in \( E'(q) \), then \( Q_i \) is better by Rule (b). Hence each \( v_i \) such that \( e_i \in E_1 \cup E_2 \) is in at least \( m \) edges in \( E'(q) \). Thus, \( m^2 \leq r(t + 1) \leq (t - 1)(t + 1) \), and so \( m < t \). This proves (3).

Let \( R = R(v_1) \) be the set of \( r \)-tuples contained in \( V(q) \) that contain \( v_1 \) and are not edges of \( H \). Since the only edges containing \( v_1 \) and not contained in \( V(q) \) are those in \( E_2 \),
\[
d_H(v_1) = \binom{t}{r-1} + |E_2| - |R|. \tag{4}
\]

So, if \( E_2 = \emptyset \), then \( d_H(v_1) \leq \binom{t}{r-1} \), a contradiction. Hence for some \( j \in [t + 1] \), \( e_j \in E_2 \), i.e., \( x \in e_j \) but \( e_j \not\subset V(q) \). Choose the smallest such \( j \).

**Case 1:** \( j = 1 \). If there is an edge \( g \subset V(q) \) in \( E(H) - E'(q) \) containing \( \{v_1, v_2\} \), then by replacing \( e_1 \) with \( g \) we get a contradiction to (1)(a). Thus each of the \( \binom{t-1}{r-2} \) \( r \)-tuples \( g \subset V(q) \) containing \( \{v_1, v_2\} \) is in \( R \cup E_1 \).

**Case 1.1:** \( r = 3 \). For any edge \( e_i \) containing \( v_1 \), \( \{v_i, v_{i+1}, v_1\} \subseteq e_i \). Then only \( e_2 \) may contain \( \{v_1, v_2\} \) and be contained in \( V(q) \). Moreover for \( 2 \leq i \leq t \), if \( x \in e_i \), then \( e_i = \{v_1, v_i, v_{i+1}\} \subseteq V(q) \), so \( |E_2| \leq 1 \). Hence
\[
d_H(v_1) \leq \binom{t}{2} - |R| + |\{e_2, e_q\}| \leq \binom{t}{2} - \binom{t-1}{1} + 2 \leq \binom{t}{r-1},
\]
a contradiction.

**Case 1.2:** \( r \geq 4 \). It follows that
\[
d_H(v_1) \leq |E_2| + \binom{t}{r-1} - \binom{t-1}{r-2} - |E_1| = |E_1 \cup E_2| + \binom{t}{r-1} - \binom{t-1}{r-2}.
\]
In order to have \( d_H(v_1) \geq 1 + \binom{t}{r-1} \), we need \( \binom{t-1}{r-2} \leq |E_1 \cup E_2| - 1 \). Since \( r - 2 \geq 2 \) and \( t - 1 - (r - 2) \geq 2 \), we have \( \binom{t-1}{r-2} \geq \binom{t-1}{2} \). So, using (3), we need \( \frac{(t-1)(t-2)}{2} \leq t - 2 \), which does not hold for integer \( t \geq 4 \).

**Case 2:** \( 2 \leq j \leq t \). In order for \( e_j \) to contain \( v_1, v_j, v_{j+1} \) and a vertex outside of \( V(q) \), we need \( r \geq 4 \). Similarly to Case 1, if there is an edge \( g \subset V(q) \) in \( E(H) - E'(q) \) containing \( \{v_1, v_{j+1}\} \), then the path
\[
(v_j, e_{j-1}, v_{j-1}, \ldots, e_1, v_1, g, v_{j+1}, e_{j+1}, v_{j+2}, \ldots, e_{n-1}, v_n)
\]
contradicts \([11](a)\). Hence each of the \(\binom{t-1}{r-2}\) \(r\)-tuples \(g \subset V(q)\) containing \(\{v_1,v_{j+1}\}\) is in \(R \cup E_1\).

So, now we repeat the argument of Case 1.2 word by word.

**Case 3:** \(j = t+1\). This means all edges containing \(v_1\) apart from \(e_{t+1}\) are contained in \(V(q)\). Then \(d_H(x) \leq \left(\frac{t}{r-1}\right) - |R| + 1\), so we may assume \(|R| = 0\). In other words,

\[
\text{all \(r\)-tuples contained in \(V(q)\) and containing \(v_1\) are edges of \(H\). (5)}
\]

Since \(r < t\), there is \(i \leq t\) such that \(v_i \notin e_{t+1}\). By \([5]\), we can construct a path on the vertices \((v_i,v_{i-1},\ldots,v_1,v_{i+1},v_{i+2},\ldots,v_{t+1})\) all edges of which are contained in \(V(q)\). So, we will have no edges containing \(v_i\) and not contained in \(V(q)\), a contradiction.

Our next step is to show that \(P\) is nontrivial.

**Lemma 2.2.** \(\ell \geq 1\). On the other hand, if \(n\) is even, then \(\ell \leq t\), and if \(n\) is odd, then \(\ell \leq t - 1\).

**Proof.** The upper bound follows from the fact that \(k + \ell \leq n\) and by Lemma 2.1.

For the lower bound, suppose \(\ell = 0\), that is, \(P\) has no edges. Fix any \(v \in V(H) - V(C)\). If there exists an edge \(e \in H'\) such that \(e \cap V(C) \neq \emptyset\) and \(v \in e\), then the path \(P'\) with only the edge \(e\) forms together with \(C\) a lollipop better than \((C,P)\). So we may assume that for all \(v \in V(H) - V(C)\), every edge \(e \in H'\) containing \(v\) does not intersect \(V(C)\). Symmetrically, every edge \(f\) containing a vertex \(u \in V(C)\) either is in \(E(C)\) is contained in \(V(C)\).

**Case 1:** There are two consecutive edges \(e_i, e_{i+1}\) in \(C\) containing \(v\). If \(v \in e\) for some \(e \in H'\), then we can replace \(v_{i+1}\) with \(v\) in \(C\) to obtain a cycle \(C'\) with the same length and a path \(P'\) with the unique edge \(e\), so that \((C',P')\) is better than \((C,P)\). Thus, \(v\) cannot belong to any edge of \(H'\), hence \(d_H(v) \leq |C| \leq n - 1\). If \(n \geq 11\), this is at most \(\binom{t}{r-1}\), a contradiction. Suppose \(n \leq 10\). Then \(t \leq 4\). Since \(r \geq 3\), this means \(r = 3, t = 4\), \(\delta(H) \geq 7\), and \(n \in \{9,10\}\). So each of \(v\) and \(v_{i+1}\) belongs to at least 7 edges of \(C\), and since \(r = 3\), only \(e_i\) and \(e_{i+1}\) may contain both. Thus, \(|C| \geq 2 \cdot 7 - 2 = 12 > n\), a contradiction.

**Case 2:** \(v\) is not contained in two consecutive edges in \(C\). Then \(v\) is contained in at most \(\binom{n-k-1}{r-1}\) edges in \(H'\) and at most \(\lfloor k/2 \rfloor\) edges in \(C\). By Lemma 2.1 \(k \geq t + 2\), so \(|V(H) - V(C)| \leq n - (t+2) \leq t\). Thus whenever \(k \leq n - 4\),

\[
d_H(v) \leq \binom{n-k-1}{r-1} + \lfloor k/2 \rfloor \leq \binom{t-1}{r-1} + \lfloor (n-4)/2 \rfloor \leq \binom{t-1}{r-1} + \binom{t-1}{r-2} = \binom{t}{r-1},
\]

a contradiction.

If \(k > n - 4\), then

\[
d_H(v) \leq \binom{2}{r-1} + \lfloor k/2 \rfloor \leq 1 + \frac{n-1}{2} = \frac{n+1}{2}.
\]

Notice that \(\frac{n+1}{2} \leq \binom{t}{r-1}\) for all \(n \geq 9\), a contradiction. \(\square\)

Based on these two lemmas, in the next section we prove the bound in a sequence of claims.
3 Proof of the bound for \( r < t \)

Let \( W = W(C) = \{ v_2, \ldots, v_{\ell+1} \} \cup \{ v_k, \ldots, v_{k-\ell+1} \} \). When \( k \leq 2\ell + 1 \), \( W = V(C) - \{ v_1 \} \).

**Claim 3.1.** Suppose \( x \in e \in E(H') \). Then \( e \subseteq V(C) \cup V(P) - W \).

**Proof.** Suppose first there is a vertex \( y \in V(H) - (V(C) \cup V(P)) \) such that \( y \in e \). Let \( P' \) be the path on \( V(P) \cup \{ y \} \) obtained by joining the edge \( e \) to the end of \( P \). Then \((C, P')\) is a lollipop with \( |V(P')| > |V(P)| \), a contradiction.

Now suppose \( e \) contains \( v_i \) for some \( i \in \{ 2, \ldots, \ell + 1 \} \). Recall that \( x = u_{\ell+1} \) and \( v_1 = u_1 \).

Let \( C' = (v_1, f_1, u_2, \ldots, f_{\ell}, u_{\ell+1}, e, v_i, v_{i+1}, \ldots, e_{k-1}, v_k, e_k, v_1) \) and \( P' \) be the 1-vertex path. Then lollipop \((C', P')\) is better than \((C, P)\) since \( |V(C')| > |V(C)| + 1 \).

The proof for \( i \in \{ k, \ldots, k - \ell + 1 \} \) is similar, so we omit it.

The next two claims have a similar flavor.

**Claim 3.2.** If \( u_j \) is an \( H' \)-neighbor of \( x \) in \( V(P) \), then \( f_j \) does not contain a vertex outside of \( V(P) \cup V(C) - W \).

**Proof.** Let \( e \) be any edge in \( H' \) containing \( x \) and \( u_j \).

Suppose first \( f_j \) contains a vertex \( y \notin V(P) \cup V(C) \) (so \( \{ y, u_j, u_{j+1} \} \subset f_j \)). The path

\[
P' = (u_1, f_1, u_2, \ldots, f_{j-1}, u_j, e, x, f_\ell, u_\ell, f_{\ell-1}, u_{\ell-1}, \ldots, f_{j+1}, u_{j+1}, f_j, y)
\]

is a longer than \( P \); so lollipop \((C, P')\) is better than \((C, P)\), a contradiction.

Suppose now there is an \( i \in \{ 2, \ldots, \ell + 1 \} \) such that \( v_i \in f_j \). Let

\[
C' = (v_1, f_1, u_2, \ldots, f_{j-1}, u_j, e, u_{\ell+1}, f_\ell, u_\ell, \ldots, f_{j+1}, u_{j+1}, f_j, v_i, v_{i+1}, \ldots, e_{k-1}, v_k, e_k, v_1)
\]

and \( P' \) be the 1-vertex path. Then lollipop \((C', P')\) is better than \((C, P)\) since \( |V(C')| > |V(C)| + 1 \).

The proof for \( i \in \{ k, \ldots, k - \ell + 1 \} \) is similar, so we omit it.

**Claim 3.3.** \( x \) does not belong to any edge in the set \( \{ e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_\ell \} \) or \( \{ e_k, e_{k-1}, \ldots, e_{k-\ell+1} \} \).

**Proof.** Suppose \( i \leq \ell \) and suppose \( x \in e_i \). The cycle obtained by replacing the segment from \( v_1 \) to \( v_{i+1} \) with the path \( (v_1, f_1, u_2, \ldots, f_\ell, x, v_i, v_{i+1}) \) has length at least \( |V(C)| + 1 \), contradicting the choice of \( C \). The argument for \( e_{k-i+1} \) is symmetric, so we omit the proof.

**Claim 3.4.** For each \( 1 \leq i \leq k \), if some edge \( g \notin E(C) \) contains \( \{ x, v_i \} \), then

(a) neither of \( e_{i-1} \) and \( e_i \) contains \( x \), and

(b) no edge in \( H' \) contains \( \{ x, v_{i-1} \} \) or \( \{ x, v_{i+1} \} \) (indices count modulo \( k \)).

**Proof.** If \( x \in e_{i-1} \), consider

\[
C' = (v_1, e_1, v_2, \ldots, e_{i-2}, v_{i-1}, g, x, e_i, v_i, e_{i+1}, v_{i+1}, \ldots, e_{k-1}, v_k, e_k, v_1).
\]

Then \( C' \) is longer than \( C \), contradicting the choice of \( C \). If \( x \in e_i \), the proof is symmetric. This proves (a).

Suppose now some \( e \in E(H') \) contains \( \{ x, v_{i-1} \} \) (the case in which \( e \in E(H') \) contains \( \{ x, v_{i-1} \} \) is symmetric). If \( e \neq g \), then the cycle

\[
(v_1, e_1, v_2, \ldots, e_{i-2}, v_{i-1}, e, x, g, v_{i+1}, e_i, v_i, \ldots, e_{k-1}, v_k, e_k, v_1)
\]

is better than \( (C, P) \), a contradiction.
is longer than \( C \), a contradiction.

If \( e = g \), then by (a), \( x \notin e_{i-1} \). Let

\[
C'' = (v_1, e_1, v_2, \ldots, e_{i-2}, v_{i-1}, e, v_i, e_i, v_{i+1}, \ldots, e_{k-1}, v_k, e_k v_1).
\]

Cycle \( C'' \) has \( k \) edges, but more edges containing \( x \) than \( C \), contradicting condition (iii) in the choice of \( (C, P) \).

In the remainder of the proof, we let \( C(x) = \{ e_i : x \in e_i \} \), \( P(x) = \{ f_j : x \in f_j \} \), \( c = c(x) = \vert C(x) \vert \) and \( p = p(x) = \vert P(x) \vert \). We have

\[
d_H(x) = \vert E_x \vert + c + p. \tag{6}
\]

By Claim 3.3, each edge in \( E_x \) is contained in \( V(C) \cup V(P) - W \), and so \( \vert E_x \vert \leq \binom{b}{r-1} \). By Claim 3.3, \( c \leq k - 2\ell \). Since \( p \leq \ell \) and \( k + \ell \leq n \), these facts give

\[
d_H(x) \leq \left( \frac{b}{r-1} \right) + c + \ell \quad \text{and} \quad d_H(x) \leq \left( \frac{b}{r-1} \right) + n - 2\ell. \tag{7}
\]

**Claim 3.5.** \( k > 2\ell + 1 \).

**Proof.** Suppose first that \( k = 2\ell + 1 \). Since \( n \geq k + \ell = 3\ell + 1, \ell \leq (n-1)/3 \). By Claims 3.1 and 3.3, \( B = V(P) - \{ x \} \) and the only edge in \( C \) that may contain \( x \) is \( e_{\ell+1} \). Therefore by (7),

\[
d_H(x) \leq \left( \frac{\ell}{r-1} \right) + 1 + \ell \leq \left( \left\lfloor \frac{(n-1)/3}{r-1} \right\rfloor \right) + 1 + \left\lfloor \frac{(n-1)/3}{r-1} \right\rfloor \leq \left( \frac{t-2}{r-1} \right) + t - 1 \leq \left( \frac{t}{r-1} \right),
\]

a contradiction.

Suppose now that \( k < 2\ell + 1 \). By Claims 3.1 and 3.3, \( B = V(P) - \{ x \} \), and moreover \( x \) cannot be contained in any edge of \( C \). Then by (6), \( d_H(x) \leq \left( \frac{\ell}{r-1} \right) + \ell \).

If \( \ell \leq t - 1 \), then this is at most \( \left( \frac{t}{r-1} \right) \). So suppose \( \ell \geq t \). By Lemma 2.2, \( \ell = t \) and \( n = 2t + 2 \). Suppose that exactly \( t \) edges \( f_j, \ldots, f_{j_s} \) containing \( x \) are not contained in \( V(P) \). If \( s = 0 \), then \( d_H(x) \leq \left( \frac{\ell}{r-1} \right) \leq \left( \frac{t}{r-1} \right), \) a contradiction. Let \( s \geq 1 \). By Claim 3.2, none of \( u_{j_1}, \ldots, u_{j_s} \) is an \( H' \)-neighbor of \( x \). Therefore \( \vert N_{H'}(x) \vert \leq \ell - s \), so \( d_H(x) \leq \left( \frac{t-s}{r-1} \right) + \ell \). Since \( r - 1 \leq \ell - 2 \), the last expression can exceed \( \left( \frac{t}{r-1} \right) \) only if \( s = 1 \) and \( r = 3 \). If \( s = 1 \), \( r = 3 \) and at least one 3-tuple \( A \subset B \cup \{ x \} \) containing \( x \) and \( u_{j_1} \) is not in \( \{ f_1, \ldots, f_{j_1-1}, f_{j_1+1}, \ldots, f_{\ell} \} \), then \( d_H(x) \leq \left( \frac{\ell}{r-1} \right) - 1 + 1 \), a contradiction again. Otherwise, for each \( i \in \{ 1, \ldots, \ell \} - \{ j_1 \} \), the triple \( \{ u_i, u_{j_1}, x \} \) is in \( \{ f_1, \ldots, f_{j_1-1}, f_{j_1+1}, \ldots, f_{\ell} \} \). For this, at least two of \( i, j_1 \) and \( \ell + 1 \) must be consecutive integers. Then \( j_1 \geq 2 \) and \( \ell + 1 - j_1 \leq 3 \). Moreover, if \( \ell + 1 - j_1 = 3 \), then we know that \( f_i \neq \{ u_{j_1}, u_{j_1+1}, x \} \), so \( \ell + 1 - j_1 \leq 2 \), and hence \( \ell \leq -1 + j_1 + 2 \leq -1 + 2 + 2 = 3 \). But \( \ell = t \geq r + 1 \geq 4 \), a contradiction.

From now on, we heavily use the fact that \( k > 2\ell + 1 \). The following technical fact will also be helpful.

**Claim 3.6.** If \( Q = w_1, \ldots, w_q \) is a graph path, \( A \) is any set of \( c \) edges of \( Q \) and \( I \) is an independent subset of \( \{ w_2, \ldots, w_{q-1} \} \) disjoint from all edges in \( A \), then \( \vert I \vert \leq \left\lceil \frac{q-1-c}{2} \right\rceil \).
Proof. We show the claim by induction on $q$. Since $c \leq q - 1$ and $w_1, w_q \notin I$, the claim holds for $q \leq 2$. For the induction step, let $Q_i$ denote the subpath $w_1, \ldots, w_i$ of $Q$. If $w_{q-1} \notin I$, then since at least $c - 1$ edges of $A$ are in $Q_{q-1}$, by induction $|I| \leq \left\lceil \frac{(q-1) - 1 - (c-1)}{2} \right\rceil = \left\lceil \frac{q-1-c}{2} \right\rceil$, as claimed. So suppose $w_{q-1} \in I$. Then $w_{q-2} \notin I$ and all $c$ edges of $A$ are in $Q_{q-2}$. Again by induction, $|I \cap Q_{q-2}| \leq \left\lceil \frac{(q-2) - 1 - c}{2} \right\rceil$, and so $|I| \leq 1 + |I \cap Q_{q-2}| \leq \left\lceil \frac{q-1-c}{2} \right\rceil$. This proves the claim. \hfill $\square$

Claim 3.7. $b = |B| \leq \left\lceil \frac{k-1-c}{2} \right\rceil$.

Proof. By Claims 3.2 and 3.1 if $v$ is an $H'$-neighbor of $x$, then $v \in (V(P) - \{x\}) \cup \{v_{\ell+2}, v_{\ell+3}, \ldots, v_{k-\ell}\}$. Since $B$ contains exactly $\ell$ vertices in $P$, we need to prove that
\begin{equation}
|B \cap \{v_{\ell+2}, v_{\ell+3}, \ldots, v_{k-\ell}\}| \leq \left\lceil \frac{k-1-c}{2} \right\rceil - \ell. \tag{8}
\end{equation}

By Claim 3.4, no two $H'$-neighbors of $x$ in $C$ may be consecutive. By Claim 3.3 if $x \in e_i$ then $e_i \in \{e_{\ell+1}, \ldots, e_{k-\ell}\}$. Finally, by Claim 3.3 if some $v_i$ is an $H'$-neighbor of $x$, then neither of $e_{i-1}$ and $e_i$ contains $x$. Thus, since $|\{v_{t+1}, v_{t+2}, \ldots, v_{k-\ell+1}\}| = k - 2\ell + 1$, applying Claim 3.6 with $Q = v_{t+1}, v_{t+2}, \ldots, v_{k-\ell+1}, A = C(x)$, and $I = B \cap \{v_{t+1}, v_{t+2}, \ldots, v_{k-\ell+1}\}$ yields our claim. \hfill $\square$

Claim 3.8. If $n$ is odd, then $k = n - 1$, and if $n$ is even, then $k \in \{n - 2, n - 1\}$.

Proof. By Claim 3.7, $b \leq \left\lceil \frac{k-1-c}{2} \right\rceil$. If $\left\lceil \frac{k-1-c}{2} \right\rceil < r - 1$, then by (7), $d_H(x) \leq n - 2\ell \leq n - 2 \leq \binom{r}{\ell}$ when $n \geq 11$. Suppose $n \leq 10$, then we must have $r = 3, t = 4$, and $n \in \{9, 10\}$. Additionally, the statement holds if $k \geq 8$, so we have $k \leq 7$. If $\ell \geq 2$, then $d_H(x) \leq n - 2\ell \leq \binom{r}{\ell - 1}$, so we may assume $\ell = 1$. We also know $d_H(x) \leq c + \ell \leq c + 1$, so we reach a contradiction if $c \leq 5$. Since $c \geq 6$ and $k \leq 7$, $x$ must be contained in all but at most one edge of $C$. But by Claim 3.3 $x$ is not contained in $e_1$ or $e_k$, a contradiction. Therefore we may assume $\left\lceil \frac{k-1-c}{2} \right\rceil \geq r - 1$.

Suppose first that either $n$ is odd and $k \geq t + 3$ or $n$ is even and $k \geq t + 4$. Then since $|E(C) \cup E(P)| \leq n$, we have that $\ell = |E(P)| \leq n - k \leq t - 2$. Therefore if $k \leq n - 2$ and $n$ is odd or $k \leq n - 3$ and $n$ is even,
\begin{equation}
d_H(x) \leq \binom{\left\lceil \frac{k-1-c}{2} \right\rceil}{\ell} + c + t - 2.
\end{equation}
This quantity is maximized when $c$ is either 0 or 1, depending on the parity of $k$. Thus,
\begin{equation}
d_H(x) \leq \binom{(n-3)/3}{r-1} + 1 + t - 2 \leq \binom{t-1}{r-1} + \binom{t-1}{r-2} \leq \binom{t}{r-1},
\end{equation}
a contradiction.

Otherwise, by Lemma 2.11 either $n$ is odd and $k = t + 2$ or $n$ is even and $k \in \{t + 2, t + 3\}$. If $n$ is odd and $k = t + 2$ or $n$ is even and $k = t + 3$, then $k \leq n - 3$. Moreover, if $n$ is even and $k = t + 2$, then $k \leq n - 4$. We have that $\ell \leq n - k = t - 1$ if $n$ is odd or $n$ is even and $k = t + 3$, and $\ell = t$ otherwise.

If $n$ is odd, then by (7),
\begin{equation}
d_H(x) \leq \binom{n-4-c}{r-1} + c + \ell \leq \binom{n-4-c}{r-1} + 1 + t - 1 \leq \binom{t-2}{r-1} + t \leq \binom{t}{r-1}.
\end{equation}
Suppose $n$ is even. If $k = t + 3$, then
\[
 d_H(x) \leq \left( \frac{n - 3 - c}{r - 1} \right) + c + \ell \leq \left( \frac{n - 4 - 0}{r - 1} \right) + 0 + t - 1 \leq \left( \frac{t}{r - 1} \right).
\]
Otherwise, if $k = t + 2$, we instead get
\[
 d_H(x) \leq \left( \frac{n - 5 - c}{r - 1} \right) + c + \ell \leq \left( \frac{n - 4}{r - 1} \right) + t + 0 = \left( \frac{t - 1}{r - 1} \right) + t.
\]
If $r \geq 4$, then this quantity is at most $\left( \frac{t}{r-1} \right)$. If $r = 3$, then for every $f_i \in E(P)$ such that $x \in f_i$ and $i \leq \ell - 1$, $f_i = \{ u_i, u_{i+1}, x \}$, i.e., $f_i \subseteq B \cup \{ x \}$. So instead we have
\[
 d_H(x) \leq |\{ e : x \in e, e \subseteq B \cup \{ x \} \}| + |\{ e_i : x \in e_i \}| + |\{ f_i \}| \leq \left( \frac{b}{r - 1} \right) + c + 1
\]
\[
 \leq \left( \frac{n - 5 - c}{r - 1} \right) + c + 1 = \left( \frac{2 - 4}{r - 1} \right) + 1 \leq \left( \frac{t - 1}{r - 1} \right) + 1 < \left( \frac{t}{r - 1} \right).
\]
In either case, we get a contradiction. \( \square \)

**Claim 3.9.** If $u_j$ is an $H'$-neighbor of $x$ and $x \in f_j$, then $f_j - \{ x \} \subseteq B$.

**Proof.** Suppose that there exists some $v \in f_j - B$. By Claim 3.2, $v \in V(C) - W$, say $v = v_i$, where $\ell + 2 \leq i \leq k - \ell$.

By Claim 3.4, $v_i \notin B^+ \cup B^-$ because $\{ v, x \}$ is contained in $f_j \notin E(C)$. Thus we must have $v_{i-1}, v_i, v_{i+1} \notin B$. By Claim 3.4 we know $x \notin e_i, e_i-1$. Thus, taking in Claim 3.6 $r = \{ v_i \} \cup (B \cap \{ v_{i+1}, v_{i+2}, \ldots, v_{k-\ell+1} \})$ yields $b \leq \left( \frac{k - 1 - c}{2} \right) - 1$.

**Case 1:** $n$ is odd and $k = n - 1$. Then
\[
 d_H(x) \leq \left( \frac{k - 1 - c}{r - 1} \right) + 1 \leq \left( \frac{k - 3}{r - 1} \right) + 1, \quad c + \ell \leq \max\left( \frac{(n - 3)}{r - 1} + 1, c + \ell \right).
\]
We have that $\left( \frac{n - 3}{r - 1} \right) + 1 \leq \left( \frac{t}{r - 1} \right)$, and by Claim 3.4 and Claim 3.3 $c \leq k - 3$. Hence $c + \ell \leq n - 3 \leq \left( \frac{t}{r - 1} \right)$ as well, a contradiction.

**Case 2:** $n$ is even and $k \in \{ n - 2, n - 1 \}$. Then as in the previous case,
\[
 d_H(x) \leq \left( \frac{k - 1 - c}{2} - 1 \right) + c + \ell \leq \max\left( \frac{(n - 4)}{r - 1} + 2, c + \ell \right).
\]
We have that $\left( \frac{n - 4}{r - 1} \right) + 2 \leq \left( \frac{t}{r - 1} \right)$, and by Claim 3.4 and Claim 3.3 $c \leq k - 3$. Hence $c + \ell \leq n - 3 \leq \left( \frac{t}{r - 1} \right)$, which gives a contradiction unless $n = 10, k = 9, c = 6$, and $\ell = 1$.

In this remaining case, we get a contradiction if $i \neq 2$, since by Claim 3.4 this will give $c \leq k - 4$.

Also since $n = 10$, we have $r = 3, t = 4$. Then $f_1 = \{ x, v_1, v_2 \}$ and $e_1 = \{ v_1, v_2, v_i' \}$ for some $i'$. We may assume $3 \leq i' \leq 6$ without loss of generality. Since $c = 6$, we know $x \in e_3, e_4, \ldots, e_8$. Then we have the cycle
\[
 (v_2, f_1, x, e_i', v_{i'+1}, e_{i'+1}, v_{i'+2}, \ldots, e_9, v_1, e_1, v_{i'}, e_{i'-1}, v_{i'-1}, \ldots, e_2, v_2).
\]
\( \square \)
Claim 3.10. If every \( u_i \) in \( V(P) - \{x\} \) is an \( H' \)-neighbor of \( x \), then \( d_H(x) \leq \left( \frac{b}{r-1} \right) + c \). Otherwise if there exists \( s \) vertices in \( V(P) - \{x\} \) that are not \( H' \)-neighbors of \( x \), then \( d_H(x) \leq \left( \frac{b-s}{r-1} \right) + \ell + c \).

Proof. By Claim 3.9, if every \( u_i \) is an \( H' \)-neighbor of \( x \), then for any edge \( f_i \in E(P) \) containing \( x \), \( f_i \subseteq B \cup \{x\} \). It follows that the only edges containing \( x \) that may also contain vertices outside of \( B \cup \{x\} \) are the edges in \( C \). Therefore we have

\[
d_H(x) \leq |\{ e : e \in e, e \subseteq B \cup \{x\} \}| + c \leq \left( \frac{b}{r-1} \right) + c.
\]

Next let \( u_{j1}, \ldots, u_{js} \) be non-\( H' \)-neighbors of \( x \) in \( V(P) - \{x\} \). By definition, for all \( e \in E_x, e \subseteq (B - \{u_{j1}, \ldots, u_{js}\}) \cup \{x\} \). We start from \( 0 \) and obtain \( d_H(x) \leq \left( \frac{b-s}{r-1} \right) + \ell + c \).

Claim 3.11. Every vertex in \( V(P) - \{x\} \) is an \( H' \)-neighbor of \( x \).

Proof. By Claim 3.3, we only need to consider the cases where \( n \) is odd and \( k = n-1 \) or \( n \) is even and \( k \in \{n-1, n-2\} \). In all cases, \( \ell \leq 2 \). By Claim 3.10 if \( V(P) - \{x\} \) contains a non-\( H' \)-neighbor of \( x \), then

\[
d_H(x) \leq \left( \frac{b-1}{r-1} \right) + \ell + c = \left( \frac{\lceil \frac{k-1-c}{r} \rceil - 1}{r-1} \right) + 2 + c \leq \left( \frac{\lceil \frac{n-c}{2} \rceil - 1}{r-1} \right) + 2 + c.
\]

This quantity is maximized when \( c = 0 \) for \( n \) odd and \( c = 1 \) for \( n \) even. In both cases, we get \( \lceil \frac{n-2-c}{2} \rceil - 1 = t - 1 \). Therefore \( d_H(x) \leq \left( \frac{t-1}{r-1} \right) + 3 \leq \left( \frac{t}{r-1} \right) \).

Claim 3.12. \( |V(C)| = n-1 \) and \( n \) is even.

Proof. Suppose first that \( n \) is odd and \( k = n-1 \). By Claims 3.11 and 3.10

\[
d_H(x) \leq \left( \frac{b}{r-1} \right) + c \leq \left( \frac{\lceil \frac{n-2-c}{2} \rceil}{r-1} \right) + c,
\]

which is maximized when \( c = 0 \). Thus \( d_H(x) \leq \left( \frac{n-1}{r-1} \right) = \left( \frac{t}{r-1} \right) \), a contradiction.

Now we may assume \( n \) is even and \( k = n-2 \). Similarly,

\[
d_H(x) \leq \left( \frac{b}{r-1} \right) + c \leq \left( \frac{\lceil \frac{n-3-c}{2} \rceil}{r-1} \right) + c,
\]

which is maximized when \( c = 0 \). Thus \( d_H(x) \leq \left( \frac{n-2}{r-1} \right) = \left( \frac{t}{r-1} \right), \) a contradiction.
with equality if and only if every subset consisting of \( x \) along with \( r - 1 \) vertices in \( B \) is an edge of \( H \), and \( x \) is contained in exactly one edge of \( C \), say \( e_j \). By Claim 3.11, \( u_i = v_1 \), the unique vertex in \( V(P) \) is an \( H' \)-neighbor of \( x \). By Claim 3.41, \( v_i \) and \( v_{i+1} \) are not \( H' \)-neighbors of \( x \).

Hence we may assume there are exactly \( (n - 2)/2 = t \) \( H' \)-neighbors of \( x \). By Claim 3.4, all vertices in \( \{v_1, v_3, \ldots, v_{i-1}\} \cup \{v_{i+2}, v_{i+4}, \ldots, v_{n-2}\} \) are \( H' \)-neighbors.

Let \( v_j \in V(C) - e_i \) be a vertex that is not an \( H' \)-neighbor of \( x \). By Claim 3.9, \( v_j \) is not contained in the unique edge of \( P \). Let \( e^* \) be any edge containing \( v_j \). Note that \( x \notin e^* \) since \( v_j \) is not an \( H' \)-neighbor and \( e_i \) is the only edge in \( C \) containing \( x \). We claim that all vertices of \( e^* \) are \( H' \)-neighbors of \( x \) except for \( v_j \). Suppose for contradiction that \( v_r \in e^* \) and \( v_r \) is not an \( H' \)-neighbor. Without loss of generality, assume \( j < i \).

First suppose \( v_r \neq v_i \). So \( v_{r+1} \) is an \( H' \)-neighbor. Let \( e \) and \( e' \) be distinct edges of \( E_x \) such that \( v_{j+1} \in e \) and \( v_{r+1} \in e' \). Then the cycle

\[(v_1, e_1, v_2, \ldots, e_{j-1}, v_j, e^*, v_r, e_{r-1}, v_{r-1}, \ldots, e_{j+1}, v_{j+1}, e, x, e', v_{r+1}, e_{r+1}, v_{r+2}, \ldots, e_{k-1}, v_k, e_k, v_1)\]

is longer than \( C \), a contradiction.

Otherwise if \( v_r = v_i \), let \( e \in E_x \) be any edge containing \( v_{j+1} \). Then we instead take the cycle

\[(v_1, e_1, v_2, \ldots, e_{j-1}, v_j, e^*, v_i, e_{i-1}, v_{i-1}, \ldots, e_{j+1}, v_{j+1}, e, x, e_i, v_{i+1}, e_{i+1}, v_{i+2}, \ldots, e_{k-1}, v_k, e_k, v_1)\]

Therefore all vertices of \( e^* \) are \( H' \)-neighbors except for \( v_j \), and the argument applies to every edge containing \( v_j \). Thus \( d_H(v_j) \leq (t_{r-1}) \), a contradiction. This proves Theorem 4 for \( r < t \).

4 Setup for \( r \geq t \)

In order to prove Theorem 4 for \( r \geq t \), among non-hamiltonian \( r \)-uniform hypergraphs with \( \delta(H) \geq \max\{t + 1, r\} \), we choose \( H \) with the maximum number of edges. In particular, adding any edge to \( H \) creates a hamiltonian cycle. Therefore \( H \) contains a hamiltonian path.

For each such path \( P = (v_1, e_1, v_2, \ldots, e_{n-1}, v_n) \), an end \( v_1 \) (respectively, \( v_n \)) is suitable if it belongs to at least two edges in \( E(H) - E(P) \), or belongs to some edge \( f \in E(H) - E(P) \) that contains \( v_2 \) (respectively, \( v_{n-1} \)). This notion will be quite useful in our proofs.

For \( s \in \{1, n\} \) and a suitable end \( v_s \) of \( P \) above, let \( E_s(P) \) denote the set of the edges of \( H \) containing \( v_s \) that are not in \( E(P) \). If none of the edges in \( E_1(P) \) (respectively, in \( E_n(P) \)) contains \( v_2 \) (respectively, \( v_{n-1} \)), then we define the set \( A_1 = A_1(P) = E_1(P) \) (respectively, \( A_n = A_n(P) = E_n(P) \)); otherwise we let \( A_1 = A_1(P) = E_1(P) \cup e_1 \) (respectively, \( A_n = A_n(P) = E_n(P) \cup e_{n-1} \)). By the definition of a suitable end, \( |A_s| \geq 2 \) in all cases.

Denote \( S_1 = S_1(P) = \{v_i \in V(P) : v_1 \in e_i\} \) and \( S_n = S_n(P) = \{v_{i+1} \in V(P) : v_n \in e_i\} \). For a set of vertices \( S \), set \( S^- = \{v_i : v_{i+1} \in S\} \) and \( S^+ = \{v_i : v_{i-1} \in S\} \).

Our plan is to prove in the four subsequent sections the series of four lemmas below and use the last of them to prove the nonexistence of the above counterexamples \( H \) to Theorem 4 in the final section.

**Lemma 4.1.** Let \( P = (v_1, e_1, v_2, \ldots, e_{n-1}, v_n) \) be any hamiltonian path in \( H \). Then we may find another hamiltonian path \( P' = (w_1, f_1, w_2, \ldots, f_{n-1}, v_n) \) such that \( v_n = w_n \), \( w_1 \) belongs to at least one edge outside of \( P' \), and if \( v_n \) is suitable or belongs to an edge not in \( P \), then \( w_n \) is suitable or belongs to an edge not in \( P' \), respectively.
Lemma 4.2. $H$ has a Hamiltonian path $P = (v_1, e_1, v_2, \ldots, e_{n-1}, v_n)$ with at least one suitable end.

Lemma 4.3. $H$ has a Hamiltonian path $P = (v_1, e_1, v_2, \ldots, e_{n-1}, v_n)$ with both ends suitable.

Lemma 4.4. If $H$ has a Hamiltonian path $P = (v_1, e_1, v_2, \ldots, e_{n-1}, v_n)$ with both ends suitable, then either $H$ is Hamiltonian or $r = t$ and $H$ has a cycle $C$ of length $n - 1$ such that the vertex $v \in V(H) - V(C)$ belongs to at most 2 edges in $C$. Moreover, these edges are either consecutive on $C$ or separated by 1 edge.

But first we make two useful observations.

Remark 1. If $r = t$, then $H$ has at least $n + 3$ edges, and if $r \geq t + 1$, then $H$ has at least $n$ edges.

Indeed, for $r = t$ the sum of degrees of $H$ is at least $(t + 1)n$, so

$$|E(H)| \geq \left\lceil \frac{(t + 1)n}{t} \right\rceil = \left\lceil \frac{(n + 1)n}{n - 1} \right\rceil = n + 3.$$

Similarly, for $r \geq t + 1$, $|E(H)| \geq nr/r = n$.

Claim 4.1. Let $P = (v_1, e_1, v_2, \ldots, e_{n-1}, v_n)$ be a path. For any $f_1 \in A_1(P)$ and/or $f_n \in A_n(P)$,

(i). $(f_1 - \{v_1\})^- \cap f_n = \emptyset$ and $f_1 \cap (f_n - \{v_n\})^+ = \emptyset$, and

(ii). $S_1(P) \cap f_n = \emptyset$ and $S_n(P) \cap f_1 = \emptyset$.

Proof. For (i), let $v_i \in (f_1 - \{v_1\})^- \cap f_n$. Suppose first that $f_1 \in E_1(P)$ and $f_n \in E_n(P)$, i.e., $f_1, f_n \notin E(P)$. Then there exists a Hamiltonian cycle

$$C = (v_1, e_1, v_2, \ldots, e_{j-1}, v_j, f_n, v_n, e_{n-1}, v_{n-1}, \ldots, e_{i+1}, v_i, f_1, v_1).$$

Recall that the only edge outside $P$ that can possibly be contained in $A_1$ is $e_1$. Similarly, the only edge outside of $P$ that can be contained in $A_n$ is $e_{n-1}$. If $f_1 = e_1$ and/or $f_n = e_{n-1}$, there exists some edge $f'_1 \in A_1$ and/or $f'_n \in A_n$ such that $f'_1 \neq e_1, v_2, e_{j+1}$ and/or $f'_n \neq e_{n-1}, v_n, e_{n-1, v_{n-1}}$. Then we simply replace $e_1$ and/or $e_{n-1}$ with $f'_1$ and/or $f'_n$ respectively in $C$ to get a Hamiltonian cycle.

The proof for $f_1 \cap (f_n - \{v_n\})^+$ is similar. This proves (i).

We now prove (ii). If $v_j \in S_1 \cap f_n$ and $f_n \neq e_{n-1}$, then we get the Hamiltonian cycle

$$(v_1, e_1, v_2, \ldots, e_{j-1}, v_j, f_n, v_n, e_{n-1}, v_{n-1}, \ldots, e_{j+1}, v_{j+1}, e_j, v_1).$$

If $f_n = e_{n-1}$, then $A_n$ contains an edge $f'_n$ such that $\{v_n, v_{n-1}\} \subseteq f'_n$. Then we may replace $e_{n-1}$ in the previous cycle with $f'_n$ to get a Hamiltonian cycle. The proof for $S_n \cap f_1$ is similar. □

5 Proof of Lemma 4.1

Let $P = (v_1, e_1, v_2, \ldots, e_{n-1}, v_n)$ be a Hamiltonian path in $H$ and suppose $v_1$ is not contained in any edges of $E(H) - E(P)$. Then

$$|S_1| \geq d_H(v_1) \geq t + 1. \quad (9)$$
Let $F := \bigcup_{f \in E(H) - E(P)} f$. Note that $v_1 \notin F$. By Remark 1 we have that

$$|F| \geq r, \text{ and if } r = t, \text{ then } |F| \geq t+1 \text{ with equality if and only if } |f \cap f'| = t-1 \text{ for all } f, f' \notin E(P).$$

(10)

If there is $v_i \in F \cap S_1$, then the end $v_i$ of the hamiltonian path

$$P_0 = (v_i, e_{i-1}, v_{i-1}, \ldots, e_1, v_1, e_i, v_{i+1}, e_{i+1}, v_{i+2}, \ldots, e_{n-1}, v_n)$$

belongs to at least one edge of $E(H) - E(P_0)$. Since $E(P_0) = E(P)$, we are done. Thus we may assume that $S_1 \cap F = \emptyset$. It follows that $|S_1| + |F| \leq n \in \{2t + 1, 2t + 2\}$. By (10) and (9), $|F| + |S_1| \geq (t+1) + (t+1)$. If $|F| + |S_1| > 2(t+1)$, then we obtain a contradiction. Therefore we may assume that $n = 2t + 2$ and $|F| = |S_1| = t+1$. In particular, $r \in \{t, t+1\}$. The next fact follows.

Each vertex in $P$ is in exactly one of $S_1$ or $F$.  \hfill (11)

Let $s$ be the largest index such that $v_s \in S_1$. Fix any $v_i \in S_1 - \{v_1, v_s\}$ and let $P_0$ be as above. For simplicity, let us rename the vertices and edges of $P_0 = (u_1, g_1, u_2, \ldots, g_{n-1}, u_n)$ where $u_1 = v_i$ and $u_n = v_n$. If $u_1$ belongs to an edge of $E(H) - E(P_0) = E(H) - E(P)$), then we are done. Otherwise we observe that since $E(P_0) = E(P)$, $d_{P_0}(u_1) = d_H(v_i) \geq t+1$. Moreover, (11) applies to $S_1(P_0)$ and $F$. Therefore $S_1(P_0) = V(H) - F = S_1(P)$. In particular, since $v_s \in S_1(P)$ and $P_0$ and $P$ are identical starting with the vertex $v_{i+1} (u_{i+1} \in P_0)$, by (11), we have that $u_1 = v_i$ belongs to the edge $g_a = e_s$. Since $v_i$ was an arbitrary vertex in $S_1 - \{v_s\}$, the same holds for all $t$ other vertices in $S_1$, i.e., the edge $e_s$ contains all of $S_1$ as well as $v_{s+1}$. Then $|e_s| \geq t+1 + 1 > r$, a contradiction.

\hfill \Box

6 Proof of Lemma 4.2

Suppose the lemma fails. Let $P = (v_1, v_1, v_2, \ldots, e_{n-1}, v_n)$ be a hamiltonian path in $H$ such that there exist $f_1, f_n \in E(H) - E(P)$ with $v_1 \in f_1, v_n \in f_n$. We may assume $f_1$ and $f_n$ exist by applying the previous lemma twice (once for each endpoint of $P$). If neither $v_1$ nor $v_n$ are suitable, then $v_2 \notin f_1, v_{n-1} \notin f_n$, and $v_1$ and $v_n$ each are contained in at least $max\{t+1, r\} - 1$ edges in $P$. By Claim 4.1, $(f_1 - \{v_1\})^{-} \cap f_n = \emptyset$ and $S_1 \cap F = \emptyset$.

**Case 1:** $r \geq t+1$. We have $|f_n \cup (f_1 - \{v_1\})^{-}| \geq 2r - 1$. Since $v_n \notin f_1$ and $v_{n-1} \notin f_n$, $v_{n-1} \notin f_n \cup (f_1 - \{v_1\})^{-}$. Similarly, since $v_1 \notin f_n$ and $v_2 \notin f_1$, $v_1 \notin f_n \cup (f_1 - \{v_1\})^{-}$. Thus $|f_n \cup (f_1 - \{v_1\})^{-}| \leq n-2 < 2r-1$, a contradiction.

**Case 2:** $r = t$. By Remark 1, there are distinct edges $f_3$ and $f_4$ in $E(H) - E(P) - f_1 - f_n$. Let $F = f_3 \cup f_4$. Since $f_4 \neq f_3$,

$$|F| \geq t+1, \text{ and if } |F| = t+1, \text{ then } |f_3 \cap f_4| = t-1.$$ 

(12)

If there is $v_i \in F \cap (f_1 - \{v_1\})^{-}$, then the end $v_i$ of the hamiltonian path

$$P_1 = (v_i, e_{i-1}, v_{i-1}, \ldots, e_1, v_1, f_1, v_{i+1}, e_{i+1}, v_{i+2}, \ldots, e_{n-1}, v_n)$$

belongs to at least one of $f_3$ and $f_4$ and to $e_i$ that are not in $E(P_1)$, and hence is a suitable end of $P_1$, as claimed.
Thus $F \cap (f_1 - \{v_1\})^- = \emptyset$. Similarly, $F \cap (f_n - \{v_n\})^+ = \emptyset$. Also by definition, $v_n \not\in F \cup (f_1 - \{v_1\})^-$. Since $v_2 \notin f_1$, also $v_1 \not\in F \cup (f_1 - \{v_1\})^-$. It follows that $|(f_1 - \{v_1\})^-| + |F| \leq n - 2 = 2t$. Since $|(f_1 - \{v_1\})^-| = t - 1$, we must have that the second part of (12) holds. In particular,

$$|F| = t + 1$$ and every vertex in $\{v_2, \ldots, v_{n-1}\}$ must belong to exactly one of $F$ or $(f_1 - \{v_1\})^-$.  

(13)

By (13), we conclude that $(f_n - \{v_n\})^+ = (f_1 - \{v_1\})^-$. That is, $f_n = \{v_i : v_{i+2} \in f_1 \cup \{v_n\}\}$. Denote $B = (f_n - \{v_n\})^+ = (f_1 - \{v_1\})^-$. 

By Claim 4, $B \cap f_n = \emptyset$. By (13), $f_n - \{v_n\} \subseteq F$. Moreover, because $(f_n - \{v_n\})^+ \cap F = \emptyset$, $f_n$ does not contain a pair of consecutive vertices in $P$. Symmetrically, we get $f_1 - \{v_1\} \subseteq F$ and $f_1$ does not contain a pair of consecutive vertices. Since $v_1 \not\in f_n$ and $B = (f_n - \{v_n\})^+$, $v_1, v_2 \not\in B$. Symmetrically, $v_n, v_{n-1} \not\in B$. Since $|B| = t - 1$,

$$|B^- \cup B^+| \geq t,$$ with equality if and only if $B = \{v_i, v_{i+2}, v_{i+4}, \ldots, v_{i+2(t-2)}\}$ for some $i$.  

(14)

**Case 2.1:** There exists $2 \leq i \leq n - 1$ such that $v_i \in e_i$ and $v_i \in (f_1 \cup f_n) - \{v_1, v_n\}$. Then the hamiltonian path

$$P_2 = \langle v_i, e_{i-1}, v_{i-1}, \ldots, e_1, v_1, e_i, v_i, e_{i+1}, v_{i+1}, e_{i+2}, \ldots, e_{n-1}, v_n \rangle$$

begins with the suitable vertex $v_i$, since $v_i$ belongs to $f_1 \cup f_n$ and $(f_1 \cup f_n) - \{v_1, v_n\} \subseteq F$, it also belongs to at least one of $\{f_3, f_4\}$.

**Case 2.2:** There exists $2 \leq i \leq n - 1$ such that $v_n \in e_{i-1}$ and $v_i \in (f_1 \cup f_n) - \{v_1, v_n\}$. This is symmetric to Case 2.1.

**Case 2.3:** For all $2 \leq i \leq n - 1$ such that $v_1 \in e_i$, $v_i \notin (f_1 \cup f_n) - \{v_1, v_n\}$ and for all $2 \leq i \leq n - 1$ such that $v_n \in e_{i-1}$, $v_i \notin (f_1 \cup f_n) - \{v_1, v_n\}$. Recall that $(f_1 \cup f_n) - \{v_1, v_n\} = B^+ \cup B^-$. Let $I_1 = S_1 - \{v_1\}$ and $I_2 = S_n - \{v_n\}$. We know that $|I_1| = |I_2| \geq t - 1$. By the case,

$$I_1, I_2 \subseteq \{2, \ldots, n-1\} - (B^- \cup B^+).$$

(15)

By (14), the RHS of (15) has size at most $2t - t = t$. So there is $j \in I_1 \cap I_2$. Note that $B \cap (B^+ \cup B^-) = \emptyset$ since $B^+ \cup B^- \subseteq F$ and by Claim 4. Thus by the structure of $B$, either $v_j \in B$ or $j \in \{2, n-1\}$.

**Case 2.3.1:** $v_j \in B$. Then $v_{j-1} \in f_n$ and $v_{j+1} \in f_1$. Consider the hamiltonian path

$$P_3 = \langle v_{j+1}, e_{j+1}, v_{j+2}, \ldots, e_{n-1}, v_n, f_n, v_j, e_j, v_j, v_{j-2}, v_{j-3}, \ldots, e_1, v_1, e_j, v_j \rangle$$

The end $v_{j+1}$ of this path is suitable, since $v_{j+1}$ belongs to at least one of $f_3$ and $f_4$ (because $B^+ \subseteq F$) and in $e_j$ that was not used in this path.

**Case 2.3.2:** $j = n - 1$ (the case $j = 2$ is symmetric to this). Then the only possible $B$ is $\{v_3, v_5, \ldots, v_{n-3}\}$, so $f_1 = \{v_1, v_4, v_6, \ldots, v_{n-2}\}$ and $f_n = \{v_2, v_4, \ldots, v_{n-4}, v_n\}$. Since $t-1 \geq 2$, there is $i \in I_1 - \{j\}$. Consider very similar to $P_3$ hamiltonian path

$$P_4 = \langle v_{i+1}, e_{i+1}, v_{i+2}, \ldots, e_{n-1}, v_n, f_n, v_i, e_i, v_{i-2}, v_{i-3}, \ldots, e_1, v_1, e_i, v_i \rangle$$

By the case, $v_{i+1} \in f_1$ and hence it also belongs to some of $f_3$ and $f_4$ which are not used in $P_4$. Thus, $v_{i+1}$ is suitable for $P_4$, as claimed. \qed
7 Proof of Lemma 4.3

Suppose the lemma fails. By Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2, \( H \) has a hamiltonian path \( P = (v_1, e_1, v_2, \ldots, e_{n-1}, v_n) \) with suitable end \( v_n \).

Let \( F_n = \bigcup_{f \in A_n} f \). Since \( |A_n| \geq 2 \),

\[
|F_n| \geq r + 1, \text{ and if } |F_n| = t + 1, \text{ then } r = t \text{ and } |f \cap f'| = t - 1 \text{ for all distinct } f, f' \in A_n. \quad (16)
\]

Recall \( S_1 = \{v_i \in V(P) : v_i \in e_i\} \). Similarly to (10), \( |S_1| \geq d_H(v_i) - 1 \geq t \). By Claim 4.1(ii), \( F_n \cap S_1 = \emptyset \), and hence \( |F_n| + |S_1| \leq n \leq 2t + 2 \). If \( |F_n| + |S_1| \leq 2t \), then we get a contradiction since \( |F_n| \geq t + 1 \) and \( |S_1| \geq t \).

From now on, we may assume by Lemma 4.1 that \( v_i \) belongs to exactly one edge \( f_1 \in E(H) - E(P) \).

Case 1: \(|F_n| + |S_1| = n\). In this case, each \( v_i \) is in exactly one of \( F_n \) and \( S_1 \).

Let \( j = j(P) \) be the smallest index larger than 1 such that \( v_j \in f_1 \). Since \( v_1 \) is not suitable, \( j \geq 3 \). Among such paths \( P \) with one end suitable, choose one with the smallest value of \( j(P) \). Then \( v_j \) is in exactly one of \( F_n \) and \( S_1 \). By Claim 4.1, there cannot be an edge \( f \in A_n \) such that \( v_{j-1} \in f \), i.e., \( v_{j-1} \not\in F_n \). So, we may assume \( v_{j-1} \in S_1 \). This means \( v_1 \in e_{j-1} \). Recall \( v_j \in f_1 \). If \( f_1 \neq e_1 \), then consider path

\[
P_i = (v_{j-1}, e_{j-2}, v_{j-2}, \ldots, e_1, v_1, f_1, v_j, e_j, v_{j+1}, \ldots, e_{n-1}, v_n).
\]

Observe that \( v_n \) is still a suitable end of \( P_i \) and that \( e_{j-1} \in E(H) - E(P_i) \). Moreover, the next vertex of \( e_{j-1} \) on \( P_i \) is \( v_1 \) which is closer than \( j-1 \) to \( v_{j-1} \). This means \( j(P_i) < j(P) \), a contradiction to the choice of \( P \). If \( f_1 = e_1 \), then we may replace \( e_1 \) in \( P_i \) with the edge \( e' \in A_1 \setminus \{f_1\} \) and obtain the same conclusion.

Case 2: \(|F_n| + |S_1| = n - 1\). In this case, \(|S_1| = t\), \(|F_n| = t + 1\), and all but one \( v_i \) are contained in exactly one of \( S_1 \) or \( F_n \). By (16), \( r = t \). Call a vertex \( v_i \) bad if it is not contained in \( S_1 \cup F_n \). Let \( j = j(P) \) be as defined in the previous case. If \( v_{j-1} \) is not bad then we are finished as before. Moreover, if for any \( i \in f_1 \setminus \{v_1\} \), \( v_{i-1} \in F_n \), then we may find a hamiltonian cycle as in the previous case. So we may assume for all \( v_i \in f_1 \setminus \{v_1, v_j\} \), \( v_{i-1} \in S_1 \). These vertices make up \( t - 2 \) of the \( t \) vertices in \( S_1 \).

Let \( s \) be the largest index such that \( v_s \in S_1 \). Fix any \( v_i \in S_1 \setminus \{v_1, v_s\} \). So \( v_i \in e_i \). Consider the path

\[
P_i = (v_i, e_{i-1}, v_{i-1}, \ldots, e_1, v_1, e_i, v_i, e_{i+1}, v_{i+1}, e_{i+2}, \ldots, e_{n-1}, v_n).
\]

For simplicity, rename \( P_i = (u_1, g_1, u_2, \ldots, g_{n-1}, u_n) \). Observe that \( u_1 = v_i \) and for all \( j \geq i + 1 \), \( u_j = v_j, g_j = e_j \). If \( u_1 \in F_n \), then we may find a hamiltonian cycle by extending \( P_i \) (possibly switching \( g_{n-1} \) with another edge in \( E(H) - E(P_i) \)). Therefore we again have that \( S_1(P_i) \cap F_n = \emptyset \).

We will show that \( e_s \) contains at least \( t + 1 > r \) vertices in \( S_1 \cup \{v_{s+1}\} \), giving us a contradiction.

If \(|S_1(P_i)| \geq t + 1\), then either \(|S_1| + |F_n| \geq n + 1\) and we can find a hamiltonian cycle or \(|S_1(P_i)| = t + 1\) and we have that \( S_1(P_i) \) and \( F_n \) form a partition of \( V(P) \). In particular, \( S_1(P) \subset S_1(P_i) \), and so \( v_s \in S_1(P_i) \). This implies that \( v_s \in g_s = e_s \).

Now suppose \(|S_1(P_i)| = t \). We have that \( S_1(P_i), S_1(P) \subset V(H) - F_n \). Since \( d_H(u_1) \geq t + 1 \), \( u_1 \) belongs to some edge \( f' \in E(H) - E(P_i) \). We may assume that \( u_j(P_i) \) is bad with respect to \( S_1(P_i) \), otherwise we get a contradiction as in Case 1. Similarly, we may assume that for every \( u_k \in f' \) with \( k > j(P_i) \), \( u_{k-1} \in S_1(P_i) \). Then \( S_1(P_i) = (S_1(P) - \{u_j(P_i)\}) \cup \{v_j(P_i)\} \). This
implies that \( u_{j(P)} - 1 \neq u_s \) since \( u_s \) is the last appearing vertex in \( S_1(P) \) and therefore \( S_1(P_i) \). We conclude that \( u_s \in S_1(P_i) \) and hence \( u_1 = v_i \in g_s = e_s \).

Altogether, we have that \( e_s \) contains every vertex in \( S_1(P) \) as well as the vertex \( v_{s+1} \). Therefore \( |e_s| \geq t + 1 > r \), a contradiction. \( \square \)

8 Proof of Lemma 4.4

Suppose towards contradiction that \( H \) contains a hamiltonian path with 2 suitable ends. We begin by recalling some definitions. If \( P = (v_1, e_1, v_2, \ldots, e_{n-1}, v_n) \) is such a path, for \( j \in \{1, n\} \), define \( E_j = E_j(P) \) be the set of edges in \( E(H) - E(P) \) containing \( v_j \). If there exists \( f \in E_1 \) (resp. \( E_n \)) such that \( v_2 \in f \) (resp. \( v_{n-1} \in f \)), then we set \( A_1 = A_1(P) = E_1 \cup \{e_1\} \) (resp. \( A_n = A_n(P) = E_n \cup \{e_{n-1}\} \)). Otherwise, we set \( E_1 = A_1 \) (resp. \( E_n = A_n \)).

Since \( v_1 \) and \( v_n \) are suitable,

\[
|F_j| \geq r + 1, \text{ and if } |F_j| = r + 1, \text{ then } |f \cap f'| = r - 1 \text{ for all distinct } f, f' \in A_j. \tag{17}
\]

Let \( h = h(P) \) be the minimum index such that \( v_h \in F_n \) and \( h' = h'(P) \) be the maximum index such that \( v_{h'} \notin F_1 \).

A crossing pair in \( P \) is a pair of vertices \((v_i, v_j)\) such that \( i < j \), \( v_i \in F_n \), \( v_j \in F_1 \), and for all \( i < k < j \), \( v_k \notin F_1 \cup F_n \). For a crossing pair \((v_i, v_j)\), the gap of \((v_i, v_j)\) is the set of vertices \( \{v_{i+1}, \ldots, v_{j-1}\} \).

We will show that \( P \) contains at least one crossing pair with a gap of size 1 which will be used to find a cycle of length \( n - 1 \).

Let \( P \) and \( P' \) be hamiltonian paths with two suitable ends. We say that \( P \) is better than \( P' \) if

(i) \( P \) has a crossing pair and \( P' \) does not, or

(ii) \( P \) and \( P' \) both have a crossing pair, but the smallest gap of a crossing pair in \( P \) has fewer vertices than that of \( P' \), or

(iii) \( P \) and \( P' \) both do not have a crossing pair, but \( h(P) - h'(P) < h(P') - h'(P') \).

Among all hamiltonian paths with two suitable ends, choose \( P \) to be a best one.

As before, by Claim 4.1(i), we have

\[
F_n \cap (F_1 - \{v_1\}) = \emptyset. \tag{18}
\]

If \( r > t \), then by (17), \( |F_1 - \{v_1\}| + |F_n| \geq r + r + 1 \geq (t + 1) + (t + 2) > n \), contradicting (18). Therefore \( r = t \) and either \( n = 2t + 1 \) and \( |F_1| = |F_n| = t + 1 \), or \( n = 2t + 2 \) and \( \{|F_1|, |F_n|\} \subseteq \{t + 1, t + 2\} \).

Call a vertex typical (with respect to \( P \)) if it belongs to \( (F_1 - \{v_1\}) \cup F_n \), and atypical if it is not. If \( n = 2t + 1 \), or \( n = 2t + 2 \) and \( \{|F_1|, |F_n|\} = \{t + 1, t + 2\} \), then every vertex is typical. Otherwise, there is exactly one atypical vertex, \( |F_1| = |F_n| = t + 1 \), and \( n = 2t + 2 \).

By the definitions of \( v_h, v_{h'}, \{v_1, \ldots, v_{h-1}\} \cap F_n = \emptyset \), and \( \{v_{h+1}, \ldots, v_n\} \cap F_1 = \emptyset \). Moreover, since \( H \) contains at most one atypical vertex, \( \{v_1, \ldots, v_{h}\} \subseteq F_1 \) if and only if the atypical vertex is not contained in \( \{v_1, \ldots, v_{h-1}\} \), and the same holds for \( F_n \).

Claim 8.1. For \( k \leq h \), if \( v_k \in F_1 \), then for each \( v_i \in e_{k-1}, v_i \notin F_n \). In particular, if \( v_{i-1} \) is typical, then \( v_i \in F_1 \).
Proof. Suppose $v_k \in f_1 \in A_1$, $v_i \in e_{k-1}$ and $v_{i-1} \in f_n \in A_n$. Without loss of generality, we may assume $f_1 \neq e_1$ and $f_n \neq e_{n-1}$. Then we have the hamiltonian cycle

$$(v_n, f_n, v_{i-1}, e_{i-2}, v_{i-2}, \ldots, e_k, v_k, f_1, v_1, v_2, \ldots, e_{k-2}, v_{k-1}, e_{k-1}, v_i, e_i, v_{i+1}, \ldots, e_{n-1}, v_n),$$

a contradiction. \hfill \Box

Claim 8.2. Suppose there exists $j$ such that $\{v_j, v_{j+1}\} \subset F_1$. If (a) $|A_1 - \{e_1\}| \geq 2$, (b) $v_{j-1} \in e_j$, or (c) $e_{j-1} \subset F_1$ and $v_1 \in e_j$, then there exists a hamiltonian path $P_j$ starting at $v_j$ and ending at $v_n$ such that

1. both ends are suitable,
2. $e_j \notin E(P_j)$,
3. $E(P_j) \subseteq E(P) \cup A_1$, and
4. $P_j$ and $P$ are identical starting at $v_{j+1}$.

Proof. Let $f \in A_1$ be an edge containing $v_{j+1}$. Without loss of generality, $f \neq e_1$. Consider the hamiltonian path

$$P' = (v_j, e_{j-1}, v_{j-1}, \ldots, e_1, v_1, f, v_{j+1}, e_{j+1}, v_{j+2}, \ldots, e_{n-1}, v_n).$$

Note that $e_j \notin E(P')$ and $v_{j-1}$ is the second vertex of $P'$. If $|A_1(P) - \{e_1\}| \geq 2$ or if $v_{j-1} \in e_j$, then $P'$ has two suitable ends and satisfies (1)-(4).

Otherwise, $|A_1 - \{e_1\}| = 1$, $v_1 \in e_j$ and $e_{j-1} \subset F_1$. If $v_{j+1} \in e_{j-1}$, let $f_1 = e_{j-1}$ and let $f_2 \in A_1$ be an edge containing $v_j$. Without loss of generality, $f_2 \neq e_1$. Otherwise, if $v_{j+1} \notin e_{j-1}$, then $e_{j-1} = F_1 - \{v_{j+1}\}$, and every edge of $A_1$ contains $v_{j+1}$. Let $f_1 \in A_1$ be an edge containing $v_{j-1}$ (and $v_{j+1}$) and let $f_2 = e_{j-1}$. Again, we may assume $f_1 \neq e_1$. We obtain the hamiltonian path

$$P'' = (v_j, f_2, v_1, e_1, v_2, \ldots, e_{j-2}, v_{j-1}, f_1, v_{j+1}, e_{j+1}, v_{j+2}, \ldots, e_{n-1}, v_n).$$

Similarly, $e_j \notin E(P'')$ and $v_1$ is the second vertex of $P''$. Therefore $P''$ has both ends suitable and satisfies (1)-(4). \hfill \Box

Claim 8.3. $H$ contains at least one crossing pair.

Proof. It suffices to prove that $h < h'$. Suppose not. Since $|F_1|, |F_n| \geq t + 1$ and $h' \geq t + 1$, we have

$$h \leq n - t \leq 2t + 2 - t = t + 2.$$

Therefore either $h = h'$ or $h = h' + 1$, $|F_1| = |F_n| = t + 1$, and there is exactly one atypical vertex. Since $\{|F_1|, |F_n|\} \leq \{t + 1, t + 2\}$, we may assume $F_1 = \{v_1, \ldots, v_{t+1}\}$.

There are at most $\binom{t+1}{t-1} = t$ edges within $F_1$ that contain $v_1$, so $v_1$ must belong to at least $d_H(v_1) - t \geq 1$ edges which are not contained entirely in $F_1$. By the definition of $F_1$, these edges appear in $P$. Let $e_j$ be such an edge with $j$ minimized, and let $v_i \in e_j \cap \{v_{t+2}, \ldots, v_n\}$. By Claim 8.1, we have that $e_j \notin F_n$. Therefore $e_j \in \{e_1, \ldots, e_t\} \cup \{e_s\}$ where $e_s$ is the unique atypical vertex (if it exists).

Case 1: $j \leq t$. If $j$ satisfies (a), (b), or (c) of Claim 8.2, then let $P_j$ be a path guaranteed by the claim starting with $v_j$. Since $e_j \notin E(P_j)$, we have $h'(P_j) \geq i \geq t + 2 > h'(P)$ and $h(P_j) = h(P)$. Therefore either $h'(P_j) > h(P_j)$ or $|h'(P_j) - h(P_j)| < |h'(P) - h(P)|$. In either case, $P_j$ is better than $P$, a contradiction.
Therefore we may assume $|A_1 - \{e_1\}| = 1, v_{j-1} \notin e_j$, and $e_{j-1} \notin F_1$. Note that this third condition implies $v_1 \notin e_{j-1}$, by the choice of $j$. In particular, since $d_H(v_1) \geq t + 1$, and $|A_1 - E(P)| = 1, e_{j-1}$ is the unique edge in $\{e_1, \ldots, e_t\}$ that does not contain $v_1$. So $j-1 \geq 2$. Let $k \in \{t+2, \ldots, n\}$ be such that $v_k \in e_{j-1}$. By Claim 8.1 $v_{k-1} \notin F_n$, so $v_{k-1}$ must be the unique atypical vertex $v_s$. This shows that the only vertex in $e_{j-1}$ outside of $\{v_1, \ldots, v_{t+1}\}$ is $v_{t+1}$. Since $v_1 \notin e_{j-1}$, we have that $e_{j-1}$ omits exactly one vertex in $\{v_2, \ldots, v_{t+1}\}$.

If $v_{j+1} \in e_{j-1}$, then we consider the hamiltonian path

$$P' = (v_j, f_1, v_1, e_1, v_2, \ldots, e_{j-2}, v_{j-1}, e_{j-1}, v_{j+1}, e_{j+1}, v_{j+2}, \ldots, e_{n-1}, v_n),$$

where $f_1 \neq e_1$ is an edge of $A_1$ containing $v_j$. We have $h'(P') \geq i$, and as before this contradicts the choice of $P$.

Thus, if $j - 1 \geq 3$, then $v_{j-2} \in e_{j-1}$. Let $f_1 \in A_1$ contain $v_j$ where without loss of generality, $f_1 \neq e_1$. We obtain the hamiltonian path

$$P'' = (v_{j-1}, e_{j-2}, v_{j-3}, \ldots, e_1, v_1, f_1, v_j, e_j, v_{j+1}, \ldots, e_{n-1}, v_n),$$

which does not contain the edge $e_{j-1}$. Because $\{v_{j-1}, v_{j-2}\} \subset e_{j-1}$, both ends of $P''$ are suitable, and $h'(P'') \geq s + 1$. Similar to before, $P''$ contradicts the choice of $P$.

Finally, if $j - 1 = 2$, recall that $v_1 \in e_3$ and $\{v_1, v_2\} \subseteq F_1$. We may assume that $v_3 \in f_1 \in A_1$ and $f_1 \neq e_1$. Then we have path

$$P''' = (v_3, f_1, v_2, e_1, v_3, v_4, e_4, v_5, \ldots, e_{n-1}, v_n).$$

Again, $e_2 \notin E(P''')$ and the first two vertices of $P'''$ belong to $e_2$, so both ends of $P'''$ are suitable and $P'''$ is better than $P$.

**Case 2:** $j \geq t + 1$. Then $v_j = v_s$ is the unique atypical vertex. In particular, $e_j$ is the unique edge of $P$ which contains $v_1$ and intersects $\{v_{t+2}, \ldots, v_n\}$. If $|A_1 - \{e_1\}| \geq 2$, then for any $k \leq t$, fix a path $P_k$ given by Claim S.2. Either $h'(P_k) > h'(P)$, contradicting the choice of $P$, or $h'(P_k) = h'(P)$ and $F_1(P_k) = F_1(P) = \{v_1, \ldots, v_{t+1}\}$. Then repeating the arguments for $P_k$ instead, we have that its first vertex $v_k$ must also be contained in $e_j$. We conclude that $\{v_1, \ldots, v_t\} \cup \{v_j, v_{j+1}\} \subseteq e_j$. But then $|e_j| \geq t + 2$, a contradiction.

So suppose $|A_1 - \{e_1\}| = 1$. Then $v_1$ belongs to at least $d_H(v_1) - 1 \geq t$ edges in $P$, and at least $t - 1$ of them must be in $\{e_1, \ldots, e_t\}$. It if exists, let $e_m$ be the unique edge of $\{e_1, \ldots, e_t\}$ that does not contain $v_1$. Then for any $2 \leq k \leq t$ such that $k \neq m$, let $P_k$ be a path guaranteed by Claim S.2 starting with $v_k$. Then as before, we have $\{v_1, \ldots, v_t\} \cup \{v_j, v_{j+1}\} - \{v_m\} \subseteq e_j$. So $|e_j| \geq t + 1$.

\[\square\]

**Claim 8.4.** Suppose $(i, i + 2)$ is a crossing pair with a gap of size 1. If the vertex $v_{i+1}$ belongs to an edge $e_j$ with $j \leq i - 1$, then $v_{j+1} \notin F_1 \cup F_n$. Similarly, if $v_{i+1}$ belongs to $e_j$ with $j \geq i + 2$, then $v_j \notin F_1 \cup F_n$.

**Proof.** We will prove the claim for the case $j \leq i - 1$. The other case $j \geq i + 2$ is symmetric by considering $P$ in reverse order. Suppose $v_{i+1} \in e_j$. Since $v_{i+1} \in F_n$, by Claim 8.1 we cannot have $v_{j+1} \in F_1$.

If $v_{j+1} \in F_n$, let $f \in A_1$ contain $v_{i+2}$ and let $f' \in A_n$ contain $v_{j+1}$. Without loss of generality, $f \neq e_1, f' \neq e_{n-1}$. We instead get the hamiltonian cycle
(v_1, f, v_{i+2}, v_{i+3}, \ldots, v_n, f', v_{j+1}, e_{j+1}, v_{j+2}, \ldots, e_i, v_{i+1}, e_j, v_j, e_{j-1}, v_{j-1}, \ldots, e_1, v_1).

\square

Claim 8.5. Suppose v_{i-1} and v_i are typical. If v_i \notin F_1 \cup F_n, then v_i belongs to the gap of the crossing pair (v_{i-1}, v_{i+1}). In particular, this pair has a gap of size 1.

Proof. Since v_i \notin F_n, v_i \in (F_1 - \{v_1\})^-, and hence v_{i+1} \in F_1. Because v_i \notin F_1, v_{i-1} \notin (F_1 - \{v_1\})^-, i.e., v_{i-1} \in F_n. This proves that (v_{i-1}, v_{i+1}) is a crossing pair whose gap is \{v_i\}.

\square

Claim 8.6. Suppose |F_1| = t + 1 and \{v_h, v_{h-1}\} \subset F_1. If (v_i, v_j) is a crossing pair and v_j is typical, then v_j \in F_n.

Proof. Suppose v_j \notin F_n. Then v_{j+1} \in F_1. Because (v_i, v_j) is a crossing pair, v_j \in F_1. Since all but at most one vertex in H is typical, by Claim 8.1 all but at most one v_i \in e_{h-1} belong to F_1.

We will show first that there exist three distinct edges f_1, f_2, f_3 \in F_1 \cup \{e_{h-1}, e_1\} such that (a) v_{h-1} \in f_1 and (b) v_1 \in f_2, (c) \{v_1, v_2\} \subseteq f_3, and (d) f_1 and f_2 each contain a different vertex in \{v_j, v_{j+1}\}.

Case 1: Every vertex of H is typical. Observe that e_{h-1} is a subset of size t in F_1 that contains v_{h-1}. Therefore it must contain at least one of \{v_j, v_{j+1}\}. Set f_1 = e_{h-1} and suppose for a \in \{j, j+1\}, v_a \in e_{h-1}. Let \{b\} = \{j, j+1\} - \{a\}. Since |A_1| \geq 2 and at most one edge of A_1 does not contain any given vertex, we may choose some f_2 \in A_1 containing v_b and f_3 \in A_1 containing v_2.

Case 2: There exists an atypical vertex v_s. If v_s \notin e_{h-1}, then we are done as in the previous case. Therefore since |F_1 \cup v_s| = t + 2, we have either \{v_j, v_{j+1}\} \cap e_{h-1} \neq \emptyset or e_{h-1} = F_1 \cup \{v_s\} - \{v_j, v_{j+1}\}.

In the first case, we take f_1 = e_{h-1}, let f_2 be any edge of A_1 containing v_b (as defined in the previous case), and f_3 any edge of A_1 - \{f_2\} containing v_2. In the latter case, set f_3 = e_{h-1}. Similar to before, we can find an edge f \in A_1 such that v_{h-1} \in f and f \cap \{v_j, v_{j+1}\} \neq \emptyset. Defining v_a, v_b as before, at most one edge does not contain v_b. If we can find f_2 \in A_1 - \{f_1\} containing v_b, then set f_1 = f and f_2 = f'. So assume |A_1| = 2, \{f'\} = A_1 - \{f\}, and f is the only edge of A_1 that contains v_b. Then f' must contain v_a and v_{h-1}. Set f_1 = f' and f_2 = f.

Finally we will show that there exists a hamiltonian cycle using f_1, f_2, and f_3. Let f' \in A_n contain v_h. Without loss of generality, f' \neq e_{n-1}. If v_{j+1} \in f_1 and v_j \notin f_2, then we take the cycle

(v_n, f', v_h, e_h, v_{h+1}, \ldots, e_{j-1}, v_j, f_2, v_{i+1}, f_3, v_2, e_2, v_3, \ldots, e_{h-2}, v_{h-1}, f_1, v_{j+1}, e_{j+1}, v_{j+2}, \ldots, e_{n-1}, v_n),

and if v_j \in f_1 and v_{j+1} \in f_2, then we take the cycle

(v_n, f', v_h, e_h, v_{h+1}, \ldots, e_{j-1}, v_j, f_1, v_{i+1}, e_{h-1}, v_{h-2}, v_{h-2}, \ldots, e_2, v_2, f_3, v_1, f_2, v_{j+1}, e_{j+1}, v_{j+2}, \ldots, e_{n-1}, v_n).

\square

Claim 8.7. P has a crossing pair (i, i + 2) with gap of size 1.

Proof. Suppose not. By Claim 8.3 there exists at least one crossing pair. If there are no atypical vertices, then by Claim 8.5 any crossing pair has a gap of size 1.
Suppose first that $P$ has at least two crossing pairs $(i_1, j_1), (i_2, j_2)$ where $j_1 \geq i_1 + 3$, and $j_2 \geq i_2 + 3$. Without loss of generality, $v_s \notin \{v_{i_1}, v_{i_1+1}\}$. Since $v_{i_1+1} \notin F_1 \cup F_n$, by Claim 8.3 $(v_{i_1}, v_{i_1+2})$ is a crossing pair with a gap of size 1.

Therefore we may assume $P$ contains a single crossing pair $(v_i, v_j)$ where $j \geq i + 3$. The vertices $v_{i+1}, \ldots, v_{j-2}$ are contained in neither $F_n$ nor $(F_1 - \{v_i\})^-$, and hence are all atypical. It follows that there may only be one such vertex, i.e., $v_{i+1}$ is the unique atypical vertex, $j = i + 3$, and the only crossing pair in $P$ has a gap of size 2. By Claim 8.6 applied to both $P$ and $P$ in reverse order, we obtain that $v_i \in F_1$ and $v_j \in F_n$ (here we use the fact that $h \leq i$ and $h' \geq j$).

Next we will show that $\{v_1, \ldots, v_{i-1}\} \cap F_n = \emptyset$. If there exists some $k < i$ such that $v_k \in F_n$, then $P$ would have another crossing pair contained between $v_k$ and $v_i$. Similarly, we obtain that $F_1 \cap \{v_{j+1}, \ldots, v_n\} = \emptyset$. Since all vertices of $\{v_1, \ldots, v_i\} \cup \{v_j, \ldots, v_n\}$ are typical, it follows that $F_1 = \{v_1, \ldots, v_i\} \cup \{v_j\}$ and $F_n = \{v_i\} \cup \{v_j, \ldots, v_n\}$. Moreover, since $|F_1| = |F_n| = t + 1$, we have $i = t$ and $j = t + 3$.

We will show that $e_{i+1}$ is the only edge containing $v_1$ that is not a subset of $F_1$. (19)

Indeed, because $d_H(v_1) \geq t + 1$, there exists an edge $e_k \in E(P)$ such that $v_1 \in e_k$ and $e_k \not\subseteq F_1$. We cannot have $k \geq i + 3$ or $k = i$, since $v_k \in F_n$, contradicting Claim 8.4(ii).

If $k = i + 2$, then if there exists $f \in A_1$ such that $\{v_{i+3}, v_{i-1}\} \subseteq f$, let $f' \in A_n$ contain $v_i$. Without loss of generality, $f \neq e_i$ and $f' \neq e_{n-1}$. Then we have the hamiltonian cycle

$$(v_1, e_1, v_2, \ldots, e_{i-2}, v_{i-1}, f, v_{i+3}, e_{i+3}, v_{i+4}, \ldots, e_{n-1}, v_n, f', v_i, e_i, v_{i+1}, e_{i+1}, v_{i+2}, e_{i+2}, v_1).$$

Otherwise, if no edge in $A_1$ contains $v_{i+3}$ and $v_{i-1}$, then by (17), $A_1 = \{e_1, f_1\}$ for some edge $f_1$. Without loss of generality, $v_{i-1} \in f_1$ and $v_{i+3} \in e_1$. Let $f_n \in A_n$ contain $v_i$ (without loss of generality, $f_n \neq e_{n-1}$). We get the hamiltonian cycle

$$(v_1, f_1, v_{i-1}, e_{i-2}, v_{i-2}, \ldots, e_2, v_2, e_1, v_{i+3}, e_{i+3}, v_{i+4}, \ldots, e_{n-1}, v_n, f_n, v_i, e_i, v_{i+1}, e_{i+1}, v_{i+2}, e_{i+2}, v_1).$$

Finally suppose $k \leq i - 1$. Moreover, among all edges containing $v_1$ that are not subsets of $F_1$, suppose we choose $e_k$ to have the smallest index. Let $v_m \in e_k - F_1$. If $|A_1 - \{e_1\}| \geq 2$, then let $P_k$ be a path guaranteed by Claim 8.2 say $P_k = (u_1, g_1, u_2, \ldots, g_{n-1}, u_n)$ where $u_1 = v_1$. Then $e_k \in A_1(P_k)$, and so $v_m \in F_1(P_k)$. By Claim 8.4(ii), $v_{i-1} \in F_n(P_k) = F_n(P)$. Therefore $m = i + 2$. We have that $(i, i + 2)$ is a crossing pair of $P_k$ with size 1. This violates the choice of $P$ as a best path.

So suppose $|A_1 - \{e_1\}| = 1$, i.e., $v_1$ belongs to exactly one edge outside of $P$. It follows that $v_1$ belongs to at least $d_H(v_1) - 1 \geq t$ edges of $P$, and we have shown that these edges cannot be in $\{e_{i+2}, e_{i+3}, \ldots, e_{n-1}\} \cup \{e_1\}$. Since $i = t$, it follows that $v_1$ belongs to every edge in the set $\{e_1, \ldots, e_{i-1}\} \cup \{e_{i+1}\}$. In particular, by the choice of $e_k$, we have $e_{k-1} \subseteq F_1$. Therefore we may apply Claim 8.2 again to get a path $P_k$ and similarly obtain a contradiction. This proves (19) which in turn implies that $v$ belongs to $d_H(v) - 1 \geq t = \binom{t}{i}^+ \leq t - 1$ edges which are subsets of $F_1$. That is, every $t$-subset of $F_1$ that contains $v_1$ is an edge of $H$.

We symmetrically obtain similar results for $v_n$. Without loss of generality, assume that $|e_{t+1} \cap F_1| = |e_{t+1} \cap F_n|$. Then since $\{v_1, v_n, v_{t+1}, v_{t+2}\} \subset e_{t+1}$, there is $\ell \in \{2, 3, \ldots, t - 2\}$ such that $v_\ell \notin e_{t+1}$. Since $d_H(v_\ell) \geq t + 1$, there is an edge $f_\ell$ containing $v_\ell$ and not contained in $F_1$. For
\[ s \in \{2, 3, \ldots, t, t + 3\}, \] let \( g_s = F_1 - \{v_s\}. \] We have shown that \( g_s \in E(H) \). Consider the new hamiltonian path
\[ P' = (v_\ell, f_1, v_1, g_\ell, v_2, g_\ell, v_3, g_\ell, v_4, g_\ell, v_5, \ldots, g_\ell - 3, v_\ell - 1, g_\ell - 2, v_\ell + 1, g_\ell - 1, v_\ell + 2, g_\ell + 1, v_\ell + 3, \ldots, g_\ell + 3, v_\ell, e_\ell, v_{\ell + 1}, \ldots, e_{n-1}, v_n). \]
All edges in \( F_n(P) \) are also in \( F_n(P') \), so \( v_n \) is suitable for \( P' \). The set \( A_1(P') \) contains \( f_\ell \) and \( g_\ell + 3 \) that are not in \( E(P') \). So, \( v_\ell \) is also a suitable end of \( P' \). Moreover, \( g_\ell + 3 \) contains the second vertex, \( v_1 \), of \( P' \). Hence \( g_\ell - 1 \) also is in \( A_1(P') \). It follows that \( F_1(P) \) contains \( F_1(P') \) and in addition contains a vertex from \( f_\ell \) that is not in \( F_1 \). Thus, \( |F_1(P')| \geq t + 2 \), and still \( v_t \in F_n(P') \) and \( v + 3 \in F_1(P') \). Since \( |F_n(P')| \geq t + 1 \), this implies that every vertex is typical with respect to \( P' \). Then Claims 8.3 and 8.5 imply that \( P' \) has a crossing pair with a gap of size 1, contradicting the choice of \( P \).

\[ \Box \]

Call a crossing pair \((i, j)\) \textbf{tight} if \( j = i + 2 \) and \( v_j \in F_n \). By Claim 8.5 if \((v_i, v_j)\) is a crossing pair such that \( v_i \) and \( v_{i+1} \) are both typical, then \( j = i + 2 \). Moreover by Claim 8.6 if also \( \{v_{h-1}, v_h\} \in F_1 \) and \( v_{i+2} \) is typical, then \((v_i, v_j)\) is a tight crossing pair. In particular, this shows that if all vertices of \( H \) are typical, then every crossing pair is tight.

**Claim 8.8.** Suppose \( H \) contains a tight crossing pair, and let \((i, i + 2)\) be the earliest occurring one. If \( H \) contains no atypical vertices, then \( v_{i+1} \) is not contained in any edge of \( E(P) - \{e_i, e_{i+1}\} \). Otherwise, if \( H \) contains one atypical vertex \( v_s \) with \( s \geq h \), then \( v_{i+1} \) belongs to at most two edges of \( E(P) - \{e_i, e_{i+1}\} \), and further those two edges must either be consecutive or separated by only one edge.

**Proof.** Suppose \( e_j \) contains \( v_{i+1} \). By Claim 8.4 if \( j \leq i - 1 \) then \( v_{j+1} \notin F_1 \cup F_n \), and if \( j \geq i + 2 \), then \( v_j \notin F_1 \cup F_n \). We will show that
\[ \text{If } j \geq i + 2 \text{ then } (v_{j-1}, v_{j+1}) \text{ is not a crossing pair.} \] (20)

Indeed, suppose not. Recall that \( v_{i+2} \in F_n \) since \((v_i, v_{i+2})\) is tight. Let \( f \in A_1 \) contain \( v_{i+1} \) and let \( f' \in A_n \) contain \( v_{i+2} \). Without loss of generality, \( f \neq e_1, f' \neq e_{n-1} \). Then we have the hamiltonian cycle
\[ (v_1, e_1, v_2, \ldots, e_i, v_{i+1}, e_j, v_j, e_j-1, v_{j-1}, \ldots, e_{i+2}, v_{i+2}, f', v_n, e_{n-1}, v_{n-1}, \ldots, e_{j+1}, v_{j+1}, f, v_1). \]
This proves (20).

**Case 1:** \( H \) contains no atypical vertices. Then every crossing is tight, and hence \((i, i + 2)\) is the first occurring crossing pair in \( P \). Suppose \( j \leq i - 1 \). By Claim 8.4, \( v_{j+1} \notin F_1 \cup F_n \). By Claim 8.5, \( v_{j+1} \) is in the gap of a crossing pair that occurs before \((v_i, v_{i+2})\), a contradiction. Therefore \( j \geq i + 2 \). Similarly, we have that \( v_j \notin F_1 \cup F_n \), so it must be in the gap of the crossing pair \((v_{j-1}, v_{j+1})\), but this is not possible by (20).

**Case 2:** \( H \) contains one atypical vertex, say \( v_s \). Without loss of generality, we may assume that \( s \geq h \) (otherwise we can reorient \( P \)). Therefore \( \{v_{h-1}, v_h\} \in F_1 \).
Suppose first that \( j \leq i - 1 \). Then by Claim 8.4, \( v_{j+1} \notin F_1 \cup F_n \). If \( v_j, v_{j+1}, \text{ and } v_{j+2} \) are all typical, then by Claims 8.5 and 8.6 \((v_j, v_{j+2})\) is a tight crossing pair, contradicting the
choice of \((v_i, v_{i+2})\). Therefore \(v_s\) must be one of these vertices. But there are at most 3 edges in 
\(E(P) - \{e_i, e_{i+1}\}\) containing \(v_{i+1}\) in this case, namely, \(e_{s-2}, e_{s-1}\), and \(e_s\). If \(v_{i+1}\) belongs to each of 
\(e_{s-2}, e_{s-1}\), and \(e_s\). By Claim 8.4 applied to each of these edges, we have \(v_{s-1}, v_s, v_{s+1} \notin F_1 \cup F_n\).

In particular, both \(v_{s-1}\) and \(v_s\) are atypical, a contradiction. Therefore \(v_{i+1}\) belongs to at most 2 of these 3 edges, and the result follows.

Next suppose \(j \geq i+2\). Then \(v_j \notin F_1 \cup F_n\). If \(v_{j-1}, v_j\) are typical, then by Claim 8.5 \((v_{j-1}, v_j)\) is a crossing pair, which is not possible by (20). Therefore \(v_s \in \{v_{j-1}, v_j\}\), but there are at most two such \(e_j\)'s where this can occur, namely \(e_s\) and \(e_{s+1}\).

Finally we are ready to prove the Lemma 4.4.

Without loss of generality, assume \(|F_1| = t + 1\) and if there exists an atypical vertex \(v_s\), then \(s \geq h\). In particular, this implies that \(\{v_h, v_{h-1}\} \subset F_1\). Suppose first that \(P\) has a tight crossing pair and let \((v_i, v_{i+2})\) be the first occurring one. Let \(f_1 \in A_1\) contain \(v_{i+2}\) and let \(f_n \in A_n\) contain \(v_i\). Without loss of generality, \(f_1 \neq e_1\) and \(f_n \neq e_{n-1}\). Consider the cycle

\[
C = (v_1, e_1, v_2, \ldots, e_{i-1}, v_i, f_n, v_n, e_{n-1}, v_{n-1}, \ldots, e_{i+2}, v_{i+2}, f_1, v_1).
\]

Note that \(C\) contains neither \(e_i\) nor \(e_{i+1}\). By Claim 8.8 vertex \(v_{i+1} \notin V(C)\) belongs to at most 2 edges in \(C\), and these edges are either consecutive in \(C\) or are separated by 1 edge, hence we are done.

Therefore by Claim 8.7 there exists a crossing pair \((v_i, v_{i+2})\) that is not tight. That is, \(v_{i+2} \notin F_n\). By Claim 8.6, \(v_{i+2}\) is the unique atypical vertex.

Suppose that \(P\) contains another crossing pair \((i', j')\). Then \(i \neq i'\) and \(i + 2 \neq j'\). Moreover, \(i' \neq i + 2\), otherwise \((i, i + 2)\) would be tight. Therefore the atypical vertex \(v_{i+2}\) is not contained in \(\{v_{i'}, \ldots, v_{j'}\}\). By Claims 8.5 and 8.6 \((v_{i'}, v_{j'})\) is tight, a contradiction. This proves that \((v_i, v_{i+2})\) is the unique crossing pair of \(P\).

By Claim 8.5 for any \(k \notin \{i + 1, i + 2, i + 3\}\), \(v_k \in F_1 \cup F_n\) (otherwise there would be another crossing pair). Then Claim 8.3 implies that the only edges in \(P\) that may contain \(v_{i+1}\) are \(e_i, e_{i+1}, e_{i+2}\), and \(e_{i+3}\). Therefore the same cycle \(C\) as above satisfies the Lemma.

\section{Proof of Theorem 4 for } \(r \geq t\)

We first prove two useful claims.

\textbf{Claim 9.1.} Let \(n \in \{2t + 1, 2t + 2\}\). Fix \(n - 1\) vertices \(V = \{v_1, \ldots, v_{n-1}\}\) and let \(f, g\) be distinct subsets of \(V\) of size at least \(t\). Then there exist vertices \(x \in f, y \in g\) such that \(\{x, y\} = \{v_i, v_{i+1}\}\) for some \(i\) with indices modulo \(n - 1\).

\textbf{Proof.} Suppose not. Then for all \(v_i \in f, v_{i+1} \notin g\). Let \(f^+ = \{v_{i+1} : v_i \in f\}\).

If \(f\) contains a pair of consecutive vertices, choose such a pair \(v_j, v_{j+1} \in f\) such that \(v_{j-1} \notin f\). Then \(v_j, v_{j+1} \notin g\), and hence \(g \cap (f^+ \cup \{v_j\}) = \emptyset\). We have \(|V - (f^+ \cup \{v_j\})| \leq (n - 1) - (t + 1) \leq (2t + 1) - (t + 1) = t\). Therefore we must have \(|f| = |g| = t\). Because \(|f| = t\), there exists a pair of consecutive vertices that both are not in \(f\), say \(v_i\) and \(v_{i+1}\). Let \(k = \) the first index that appears after \(i + 1\) (modulo \(n - 1\)) such that \(v_k \in f\) (possibly \(k = j\)). Then \(g \cap (F^+ \cup \{v_j, v_{k-1}\}) = \emptyset\), but \(|V - (f^+ \cup \{v_j, v_{k-1}\})| \leq 2t + 1 - (t + 2) = t - 1\), contradicting that \(|g| = t\).

Otherwise, \(f\) does not contain any two consecutive vertices. Without loss of generality, \(f = \{v_1, v_3, \ldots, v_{2t-1}\}\). Then it is easy to check that \(g = f\), a contradiction.
Claim 9.2. Let \( n \in \{2t+1, 2t+2\} \) and let \( H \) be a \( t \)-uniform hypergraph. Suppose there exists a cycle \( C = (v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_{n-1}, v_n) \) of length \( n-1 \) such that \( v \in V(H) - V(C) \). Let \( E_v \subseteq E(H) - E(C) \) be the set of edges outside of the cycle incident to \( v \). If \( |E_v| \geq 3 \), then either \( H \) contains a hamiltonian cycle or \( |\bigcup_{e \in E_v} e| = t + 1 \) and no two vertices in \( \bigcup_{e \in E_v} e \) are consecutive in \( C \).

Proof. Fix any \( f_1, f_2, f_3 \in E_v \). If there exists \( u \in f_3 \) such that \( u \notin f_1 \cup f_2 \), then we set \( f = f_1 \cup \{u\} - \{v\} \), and \( g = f_2 \cup \{v\} - \{v\} \). Then \( f \) and \( g \) are subsets of size \( t \) and so by Claim 9.1, without loss of generality there exist \( v_i \in f \) and \( v_{i+1} \in g \). Note that at most one of these vertices \( (u) \) may belong to \( f_3 \). Thus for some \( j, k \in \{1, 2, 3\} \), \( j \neq k \), we have that \( v_i \in f_j \) and \( v_{i+1} \in f_k \). We obtain a hamiltonian cycle by removing the edge from \( v_i \) to \( v_{i+1} \) and inserting the path \( (v_i, f_j, v, f_k, v_{i+1}) \).

Therefore we may assume \( f_3 \subseteq f_1 \cup f_2 \). But this holds for any arbitrary \( 3 \) edges.

Suppose there exist edges \( f_1 \) and \( f_2 \) such that \( f_1 \cup f_2 \) contains some pair \( \{v_i, v_{i+1}\} \). If both \( f_1 \) and \( f_2 \) contain at least one of these vertices, then we can construct a hamiltonian cycle as before. Otherwise, say \( \{v_i, v_{i+1}\} \subset f_1 \) and \( \{v_i, v_{i+1}\} \cap f_2 = \emptyset \). For any \( f_3 \), we have \( f_1 \subseteq f_3 \cup f_2 \). Therefore \( \{v_i, v_{i+1}\} \subset f_3 \) and we may again find a hamiltonian cycle.

Therefore, for all \( f_1, f_2 \in E_v, t+1 \leq |f_1 \cup f_2| \leq |\{C\}|/2 + 1 = t + 1 \). Moreover, each \( f_3 \neq f_1, f_2 \) is contained in these \( t+1 \) vertices. □

Proof of Theorem 4. By Lemma 4.1 there exists a cycle \( C \) of length \( n-1 \) such that \( v \in V(H) - V(C) \) belongs to at most \( 2 \) edges of \( C \), and moreover the edges in \( C \) that contain \( v \) are separated by at most one edge. Among all such cycles \( C \) and vertices \( v \) outside of the cycle, choose \( C \) and \( v \) such that \( v \) belongs to as few edges of \( C \) as possible.

Say \( C = (u_1, f_1, u_2, \ldots, f_{n-2}, u_{n-1}, f_{n-1}, u_1) \). Let \( E_v \) be the set of edges outside of \( C \) that contain \( v \), and let \( X = \bigcup_{e \in E_v} e \). By Claim 8.8, \( |E_v| \geq d_H(v) - d_C(v) \geq t + 1 - d_C(v) \).

Case 1. \( |E_v| \geq 3 \). By Claim 9.2, \( H \) is not hamiltonian, \( |X| = t + 1 \), and hence for all \( f, f' \in E_v, |f \cap f'| = t - 1 \). Moreover, because no two vertices in \( X \) are consecutive in \( C \), we may assume without loss of generality \( X = \{u_1, u_3, u_5, \ldots, u_{n-3}\} \).

Since \( d_H(v) \geq t + 1 \), \( v \) belongs to at least one edge \( f_j \) of \( C \). If \( u_{j+1} \in X \), then let \( f \in E_v \) be any edge containing \( u_{j+1} \). We obtain a hamiltonian cycle by replacing the edge \( f_j \) between \( u_j \) and \( u_{j+1} \) with the path \( (u_j, f_j, v, f, u_{j+1}) \).

Similarly, by reorienting \( C \), we cannot have \( u_j \in X \). Therefore the only edge of \( C \) that contains \( v \) is the edge \( f_{n-2} \).

Let \( u_k \in V(C) \) be an even-indexed vertex with \( k \leq n-4 \) (i.e., \( \{u_{k-1}, u_{k+1}\} \subseteq X \)). We will show also that \( u_k \notin f_j \) for any \( j \neq n-2 \). Indeed, if \( u_{j+1} \in X \), then let \( f, f' \in E_v \) be edges containing \( u_{k+1} \) and \( u_{j+1} \) respectively. Then we take the cycle

\[(u_{k+1}, f_{k+1}, u_{k+2}, \ldots, f_{j-1}, u_j, f_j, u_k, f_{k+1}, u_{k-1}, \ldots, f_{j+1}, u_{j+1}, f', v, f, u_{k+1}).\]

The argument for if \( v_j \in X \) is symmetric. It follows that the only edge in \( C' \) that may contain \( u_k \) is \( f_{n-2} \).

Observe that we may construct a new cycle by swapping \( u_j \) with \( v \) and \( f_{j-1}, f_j \) with some edges \( f, f' \in E_v \) that contain \( u_{j-1}, u_{j+1} \) respectively. Note that \( u_j \notin f \) for any \( f \in V_v \). Therefore, by the choice of \( C \) and \( v \), \( u_j \) must be contained in \( f_{n-2} \). This holds for all such \( u_j \), so \( \{u_2, u_4, \ldots, u_{n-4}\} \cup \{u_{n-2}, u_{n-1}\} \subseteq f_{n-2} \). Therefore \( |f_{n-2}| \geq t + 2 \), contradicting that \( H \) is \( t \)-uniform.
**Case 2.** $|E_v| \leq 2$. Since $|E_v| \geq d_H(v) - d_C(v) \geq t + 1 - d_C(v)$, we must have $d_C(v) = 2$, $t = 3$, and therefore $|E_v| = 2$. Let $f_i, f_j \in V(C)$ contain $v$. Recall that by Lemma 4.1, $f_i$ and $f_j$ are separated by at most one edge in $C$. Therefore the set $Y = \{u_i, u_{i+1}, u_j, u_{j+1}\}$ consists of consecutive vertices (possibly $u_{i+1} = u_j$). As in the previous case, if $Y \cap X \neq \emptyset$, then we can find a hamiltonian cycle in $H$.

Set $V' = \{u_1, \ldots, u_{i-1}, u^*, u_{j+2}, \ldots, u_{n-1}\}$, i.e., $V'$ is obtained by identifying the vertices of $Y$. If $E_v = \{f, g\}$, then let $f' = f - \{v\}$, and $g' = g - \{v\}$. Note that $u^* \notin f', g'$. We have $|f'| = |g'| = t - 1$ and $|V'| \leq 2t + 2 - 3 + 1 = 2t$. So $|f'| \geq \lceil(|V'| - 1)/2 \rceil$, and we may apply Claim 9.2 to find some $u_k \in f'$ and $u_{k+1} \in g'$. We obtain a hamiltonian cycle by replacing the edge in $C$ between $u_k$ and $u_{k+1}$ with the path $(u_k, f, v, g, u_{k+1})$. 
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