

Cycles of the given length in multipartite tournaments*

Jie Zhang, Zhilan Wang, Jin Yan[†]

School of Mathematics, Shandong University, Jinan 250100, China

Abstract

Let c be an integer. A c -partite tournament is an orientation of a complete c -partite graph. In this paper, we characterize the structure of all strong c -partite ($c \geq 8$) tournaments without $(c+2)$ -cycle such that each partite set has at least two vertices. Our result extends a theorem of Guo and Volkmann [J. Combin. Theory Ser. B 66 (1996) 140–145].

Keywords multipartite tournaments; cycles; strong

AMS Subject Classification 05C70, 05C38

1 Introduction

In this paper we consider only finite simple digraphs without loops or multiple arcs. For a digraph D , we denote its vertex set by $V(D)$ and its arc set by $A(D)$. A digraph is *strong* if for any pair of distinct vertices x and y there is a path from x to y . The notation q -cycle (q -path) means a cycle (path) of length q . We will use (A, B) -arc to denote an arc from a vertex in A to a vertex in B . A c -partite tournament is an orientation of a complete c -partite graph. It is clear that *tournaments* are special c -partite tournaments with exactly c vertices. We denote \mathcal{D} the family of all strong c -partite ($c \geq 5$) tournaments in which each partite set has at least two vertices.

*The author's work is supported by NNSF of China (No.12071260).

[†]Corresponding author: Jin Yan, Email: yanj@sdu.edu.cn

An increasing interest is to generalize tournaments to obtain larger classes of digraphs, such as multipartite tournaments. Many researchers have done a lot of work on the study of cycles whose length does not exceed the number of partite sets. In 1976, Bondy [6] proved that every strong c -partite ($c \geq 3$) tournament contains a k -cycle for all $k \in \{3, 4, \dots, c\}$. He also showed that every c -partite tournament in \mathcal{D} contains a q -cycle with some $q > c$. In connection with the last statement, he asked the following question: does every multipartite tournament of \mathcal{D} contains a $(c + 1)$ -cycle? A negative answer to this question was obtained by Gutin [7]. The same counterexample was found independently by Balakrishnan and Paulraja in [1]. Gutin [8] also proved the following result.

Theorem 1. [8] *Every multipartite tournament in \mathcal{D} has a $(c + 1)$ -cycle or a $(c + 2)$ -cycle.*

In [9], \mathcal{W}_m is defined as follows. Let $c \geq 5$ be an integer and $P = x_1 \cdots x_m$ be a path with $m \geq c$. The c -partite tournament consisting of P and the arcs $x_i x_j$ for all i and j satisfying $i - j > 1$ and $i \not\equiv j \pmod{c}$ is denoted by W_m . The set of all c -partite tournaments obtained from W_m by replacing x_i by a vertex set A_i with $i \in \{1, 2, m - 1, m\}$ is denoted by \mathcal{W}_m .

In 1996, Guo and Volkmann [9] gave a complete solution of this problem of Bondy and determined the structure of all c -partite tournaments of \mathcal{D} , which have no $(c + 1)$ -cycle.

Theorem 2. [9] *Let D be a c -partite ($c \geq 5$) tournament in \mathcal{D} . Then D has no $(c + 1)$ -cycle if and only if D is isomorphic to a member of \mathcal{W}_m .*

In this paper, we characterize all such c -partite ($c \geq 8$) tournaments without $(c + 2)$ -cycle. Before defining families \mathcal{Q}_m and \mathcal{H} , we present the main theorem.

Theorem 3. *Let D be a c -partite ($c \geq 8$) tournament in \mathcal{D} . Then D has no $(c + 2)$ -cycle if and only if D is isomorphic to a member of \mathcal{Q}_m or \mathcal{H} .*

The families \mathcal{Q}_m and \mathcal{H} are described as follows.

- Let i be an integer with $2 < i < c - 1$. Define \mathcal{H}' the set of $(c + 1)$ -partite tournaments whose partite sets are V_1, \dots, V_{c+1} , where $V_1 = \{v_1\}$, $|V_i| \geq 1$ and $|V_j| \geq 2$ for $j \in [c + 1] \setminus \{1, i\}$, and the arc set consists of arcs satisfying $V_{j_1} \rightarrow V_{j_2}$, where $2 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq c + 1$, and arcs between v_1 and vertices in other partite sets with arbitrary directions. The family of all c -partite tournaments obtained from a member of \mathcal{H}' by deleting all arcs between v_1 and V_i is denoted by \mathcal{H} .




Figure 1: An example of the c -partite tournament H with $c = 8$, $|V_1| = 3$ and $|V_j| = 2$ for $2 \leq j \leq c$. In the picture, we omit the arcs which are incident to v_1 .

• Let s and t be two fixed integers with $1 \leq s < t - 1 \leq c$. We denote Q'_m the $(c + 1)$ -partite tournament consisting of P and the arcs $x_i x_j$ for all i and j satisfying $i - j > 1$ and $i \not\equiv j \pmod{(c + 1)}$. Deleting arcs of Q'_m between $\{x_i \mid i \equiv s \pmod{(c + 1)}\}$ and $\{x_j \mid j \equiv t \pmod{(c + 1)}\}$, we obtain a c -partite tournament Q_m^1 .

Let $\mathcal{Q}_m = \mathcal{Q}_m^1 \cup \mathcal{Q}_m^2$, where \mathcal{Q}_m^1 and \mathcal{Q}_m^2 are defined as follows.

(\mathcal{Q}_m^1) The set of all c -partite tournaments obtained from Q_m^1 by substituting x_i with a vertex set A_i is denoted by \mathcal{Q}_m^1 for

- (1) $i \in \{1, 2, m - 1, m\}$; or
- (2) $i = t$ when $s = 1$ and $t = 3$ or 4 ; or
- (3) $i = m - 2$ when $\{m, m - 2\} \equiv \{s, t\} \pmod{(c + 1)}$, or $i = m - 3$ when $\{m, m - 3\} \equiv \{s, t\} \pmod{(c + 1)}$.

(\mathcal{Q}_m^2) The digraphs of \mathcal{Q}_m^2 obtained from a member of \mathcal{Q}_m^1 by reversing some arcs satisfying

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} (A_2, A_3)\text{-arcs,} & \text{when } t = 3, s = 1; \\ (A_1, A_2)\text{-arcs,} & \text{when } t = c + 1, s = 2; \\ (A_{m-2}, A_{m-1})\text{-arcs,} & \text{when } \{m - 2, m\} \equiv \{s, t\} \pmod{(c + 1)}; \\ (A_{m-1}, A_m)\text{-arcs,} & \text{when } \{m - 1, m - c\} \equiv \{s, t\} \pmod{(c + 1)}. \end{array} \right.$$

For results on tournaments and multipartite tournaments, we refer the readers to [2, 3, 4, 5, 10]. We conclude this section by giving the following organization. In

section 2, we set up notation and some helpful lemmas. The proof of the main theorem is presented in the third section.




Figure 2: An example of Q_m^1 . In the picture, we only show the arcs which are incident to x_1, x_s or x_t .

2 Notation and useful lemmas

2.1 Notation

For terminology and notation not defined here, we refer to [3]. Let D be a digraph. For the vertex $x \in V(D)$, the set of out-neighbours of x is denoted by $N_D^+(x) = \{y \in V(D) \mid xy \in A(D)\}$ and the set of in-neighbours of x is denoted by $N_D^-(x) = \{y \in V(D) \mid yx \in A(D)\}$, respectively. For a vertex set $X \subseteq V(D)$, we define $N^+(X) = N_D^+(X) = \cup_{x \in X} N_D^+(x) \setminus X$ and $N^-(X) = N_D^-(X) = \cup_{x \in X} N_D^-(x) \setminus X$. We define $D[X]$ as the sub-digraph of D induced by X , and let $D - X = D[V(D) \setminus X]$. Define $[t] = \{1, \dots, t\}$ for simplicity.

Let C be a cycle (or path). For a vertex v of C , the successor and the predecessor of v on C are denoted by v^+ and v^- , respectively. Further, we write the i -th successor and the i -th predecessor of v on C as v^{i+} and v^{i-} , respectively. The notation $v_i C v_j$ means the sub-path of C from v_i to v_j along the orientation of C . We often identify C with its vertex set $V(C)$, for example we write $N^+(C)$ instead of $N^+(V(C))$. The length of C is the number of arcs of C . We call a vertex x outside C *inserted* into C if there is an in-neighbour of x on C , say v , such that v^+ is an out-neighbour of x . Two vertices x and y are *equivalent* on C if they have the same in-neighbours and out-neighbours.

If xy is an arc in $A(D)$, then we write $x \rightarrow y$ and say that x dominates y . If X and Y are two disjoint vertex sets of D , we use $X \rightarrow Y$ to denote that every vertex of X dominates every vertex of Y . And define $A \Rightarrow B$ that there is no arc from a vertex in B to a vertex in A . If X or Y consists of a single vertex, we omit the braces in all

following notation. Correspondingly, $x \not\rightarrow y$ expresses that $xy \notin A(D)$.

A path $P = x \cdots y$ is *minimal* if no proper subset of $V(P)$ induces a sub-digraph of D which contains a path from x to y . For two vertices x and y in D , the distance from x to y in D , denoted by $\text{dist}(x, y)$, is the length of a shortest path from x to y in D . The *diameter* of D , denote by $\text{diam}(D)$, is the maximum distance between two of its vertices.

2.2 Useful lemmas.

We give the following results that are frequently used in the proof of Theorem 3.

Theorem 2.1. [9] *Let D be a strong c -partite tournament. If D has a k -cycle containing vertices from exactly l partite sets with $l < c$, then D has a t -cycle for all t satisfying $k \leq t \leq c + (k - l)$.*

Fact 2.2. *Let C be a k -cycle in a digraph D . If D contains no $(k + 1)$ -cycle, then no vertex can be inserted into C .*

Lemma 2.3. *Let D be a c -partite tournament in \mathcal{D} and $C = x_1x_2 \cdots x_iy_1x_{i+1} \cdots x_cx_1$ a $(c + 1)$ -cycle of D , where $x_j \in V_j$ for $j \in [c]$ and $y_1 \in V_1$. Suppose that D has no $(c + 2)$ -cycle and $y_j \in V_j \cap (D - C)$ for $j \in [c] \setminus \{1\}$. If $y_j \in N^+(C) \cap N^-(C)$, then $x_j^- \rightarrow y_j \rightarrow x_j^+$.*

Proof. Set $j \in [c] \setminus \{1\}$. If $y_jx_j^- \in A(D)$, then $y_j \Rightarrow C$ because D has no $(c + 2)$ -cycle, which contradicts the assumption. Thus $x_j^-y_j \in A(D)$ for $j \in \{2, \dots, c\}$. Similarly, we obtain that $y_j \rightarrow x_j^+$ for $j \in \{2, \dots, c\}$. \square

Lemma 2.4. *Let D be a multipartite tournament in \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{C} the family of all $(c + 1)$ -cycles of D . Suppose that D has no $(c + 2)$ -cycle. If $D - C \subseteq N^+(C) \cap N^-(C)$ for every $C \in \mathcal{C}$, then $D \in \mathcal{H}$.*

Proof. Since D has no $(c + 2)$ -cycle, it follows by Theorem 2.1 that each $(c + 1)$ -cycle of D meets all partite sets of D . This implies that each $(c + 1)$ -cycle contains exactly two vertices in some partite set and one vertex in other each partite set. Let $C \in \mathcal{C}$ and assume it contains two vertices of V_1 , that is, $C = x_1x_2 \cdots x_iy_1x_{i+1} \cdots x_cx_1$, where $x_j \in V_j$ for $j \in [c]$ and $y_1 \in V_1$.

Since every partite set of D has at least two vertices, there exist $c - 1$ vertices y_2, \dots, y_c such that $y_j \in V_j$ for $j \in \{2, \dots, c\}$. By Lemma 2.3, we have $x_j^- \rightarrow y_j \rightarrow x_j^+$ for $j \in [c] \setminus \{1\}$. Note that x_i and y_i are equivalent on C . Since y_i is any vertex that is

distinct with x_i in V_i , each vertex in V_i has the same in- or out-neighbors with x_i for $i = 2, \dots, c$. In the following, we often use this property to determine the direction of the arcs in $A(D)$. We get $x_1 \rightarrow V_2 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow V_i \rightarrow y_1 \rightarrow V_{i+1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow V_c \rightarrow x_1$. Let C' be the $(c+1)$ -cycle $x_1 y_2 \dots y_i y_1 y_{i+1} \dots y_c x_1$.

Claim 2.1. *The following statements hold.*

- (1) $\{V_2, \dots, V_{j-1}\} \rightarrow V_j \rightarrow \{V_{j+1}, \dots, V_i\}$ for $2 \leq j \leq i-1$;
- (2) $\{V_{i+1}, \dots, V_{j-1}\} \rightarrow V_j \rightarrow \{V_{j+1}, \dots, V_c\}$ for $i+1 \leq j \leq c-1$.

Proof. Suppose that there exists an integer $t \in \{2, \dots, c\} \setminus \{2, i, i+1, c\}$ such that $y_{t+1} \rightarrow y_{t-1}$. If $x_t^{2+} \rightarrow y_t$, then there is a 6-cycle $x_t^{2+} y_t y_{t+1} y_{t-1} x_t x_t^+ x_t^{2+}$ containing vertices from exactly four partite sets. If $x_t \rightarrow x_t^{2-}$, then $x_t x_t^{2-} x_t^- y_t y_t^+ y_t^- x_t$ is a 6-cycle containing vertices from exactly four partite sets. In both cases, we deduce from Theorem 2.1 that D contains a $(c+2)$ -cycle, a contradiction. This implies that $y_t \rightarrow x_t^{2+}$ and $x_t^{2-} \rightarrow x_t$. Then $y_t x_t^{2+} C x_t^{2-} x_t y_{t+1} y_{t-1} y_t$ is a $(c+2)$ -cycle, a contradiction. Thus we obtain that $y_{t-1} \rightarrow y_{t+1}$ for $t \in \{2, \dots, c\} \setminus \{2, i, i+1, c\}$. By symmetry, we have $V_{t-1} \rightarrow V_{t+1}$. Since $c \geq 8$, it is not hard to obtain that $x_j^{3-} \rightarrow y_j$ for $5 \leq j \leq i-1$ and $i+4 \leq j \leq c$ and $y_j \rightarrow x_j^{3+}$ for $2 \leq j \leq i-3$ and $i+1 \leq j \leq c-3$. We continue in this fashion to obtain $\{x_{j-1}, \dots, x_2\} \rightarrow y_j \rightarrow \{x_{j+1}, \dots, x_i\}$ for $j \in \{2, \dots, i-1\}$ and $\{x_{j-1}, \dots, x_{i+1}\} \rightarrow y_j \rightarrow \{x_{j+1}, \dots, x_c\}$ for $j \in \{i+1, \dots, c-1\}$, successively. This proves Claim 2.1. \square

By Claim 2.1, we can obtain a $(c+2)$ -cycle from a cycle with larger length. Now consider the arcs between V_i and V_{i+1} . If $x_i x_{i+1}, x_{i+1} y_i \in A(D)$, then D has a $(c+3)$ -cycle $x_i x_{i+1} y_i y_1 y_{i+1} x_{i+2} C x_i$. If $x_{i+1} x_i, x_i y_{i+1} \in A(D)$, then there is a $(c+3)$ -cycle $x_{i+1} x_i y_{i+1} C' y_1 x_{i+1}$. By $c \geq 8$ and Claim 2.1, we can obtain a $(c+2)$ -cycle from such a $(c+3)$ -cycle. Thus $V_i \rightarrow V_{i+1}$ or $V_{i+1} \rightarrow V_i$.

Suppose that $V_i \rightarrow V_{i+1}$. We show that $\{V_2, \dots, V_{i-1}\} \rightarrow \{V_i, \dots, V_c\}$. If $x_{i+2} x_i \in A(D)$, then $x_{i+2} x_i x_{i+1} y_{i+1} C' y_{i+1} x_{i+2}$ is a $(c+4)$ -cycle. We can obtain a $(c+2)$ -cycle because of $c \geq 8$ and Claim 2.1. Based on this, considering arcs between x_{i+3}, \dots, x_c and x_i in order, we get $x_i \rightarrow \{x_{i+3}, \dots, x_c\}$. Similarly, it is immediate that $\{x_2, \dots, x_{i-1}\} \rightarrow \{x_{i+1}, \dots, x_c\}$. Thus $\{V_2, \dots, V_i\} \rightarrow \{V_{i+1}, \dots, V_c\}$. For $V_{i+1} \rightarrow V_i$, we will get $\{V_{i+1}, \dots, V_c\} \rightarrow \{V_2, \dots, V_i\}$ in the same way. Note that the structures obtained in two cases are isomorphic, so we only consider the first structure in the following.

We declare that

$$\{V_2, \dots, V_i\} \rightarrow y_1 \rightarrow \{V_{i+1}, \dots, V_c\}. \quad (1)$$

If $y_1x_j \in A(D)$ for some $j \in [i-1]$, then D contains a $(c+2)$ -cycle $x_1C'y_1x_jy_{i+1}C'x_1$, a contradiction. If $x_jy_1 \in A(D)$ for some $j \in \{i+2, \dots, c\}$, then $(c+2)$ -cycle $x_jy_1C'x_1Cx_ix_j$ is in D . Thus (1) holds.

If $|V_1| = 2$, we are done since D is a member of \mathcal{H} . Thus we assume that $|V_1| \geq 3$. We first show that every vertex in $V_1 \setminus \{x_1, y_1\}$ is equivalent to y_1 . To see this, let z_1 be a vertex in $V_1 \setminus \{x_1, y_1\}$. Suppose that $z_1 \rightarrow x_i$. It is easy to see $z_1 \rightarrow x_2, \dots, x_{i-1}$. If $x_j \rightarrow z_1$ for some $j \in \{i+1, \dots, c\}$, then $x_t \rightarrow z_1$ for all $t \in \{j+1, \dots, c\}$. Recall that $V(D-C) \subseteq N^+(C) \cap N^-(C)$, we have $x_c \rightarrow z_1$. Observe that there is a 6-cycle $z_1x_2y_cx_1y_2x_cz_1$ which meets 3 partite sets of D , a contradiction by Theorem 2.1 again. Thus $x_i \rightarrow z_1$. Then $\{x_2, \dots, x_{i-1}\} \rightarrow z_1$. Otherwise there exists a $(j+4)$ -cycle $x_iz_1x_jx_cx_1C'y_jx_i$ which meets $j+2$ partite sets of D for $j \in \{2, \dots, i-1\}$, a contradiction. It is easy to see $z_1 \rightarrow \{x_{i+1}, \dots, x_j\}$ if $z_1x_{j+1} \in A(D)$ for some $j \in \{i+1, \dots, c\}$. On the other hand, since $z_1 \in N^+(C) \cap N^-(C)$, we have $z_1x_{i+1} \in A(D)$. Thus $x_1x_2 \cdots x_iz_1x_{i+1} \cdots x_cx_1$ is also a $(c+1)$ -cycle. This implies that z_1 is equivalent to y_1 and then D is a member of \mathcal{H} . We are done. \square

3 Proof of Theorem 3

Now we are ready to prove our main theorem. It is easily seen that every element of \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{Q}_m has no $(c+2)$ -cycle. Hence, it suffices to show the converse is true as well.

Suppose that D is a c -partite tournament in \mathcal{D} such that D has no $(c+2)$ -cycle and is not isomorphic to any element of \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{Q}_m . Let V_1, \dots, V_c be partite sets of D . By Theorem 1, we know that D contains a $(c+1)$ -cycle. It follows by Theorem 2.1 that each $(c+1)$ -cycle of D visits exactly one partite set twice and each other partite sets once. Let \mathcal{C} be the family of all $(c+1)$ -cycles of D .

Lemma 2.4 gives that for every $C \in \mathcal{C}$, if all vertices of $D-C$ are contained in $N^+(C) \cap N^-(C)$, then $D \in \mathcal{H}$. Thus there exists at least one cycle C in \mathcal{C} such that $D-C$ contains a vertex outside $N^+(C) \cap N^-(C)$. Denote $C = x_1x_2 \cdots x_{c+1}x_1$, where $x_j \in V_j$ for $j \in [i-1]$, $x_j \in V_{j-1}$ for $j \in \{i+1, \dots, c\}$ and $x_i \in V_1$. Without loss of generality, assume that there exists a vertex $z \notin N^-(C)$. Because D is strong, there is a path from z to C . Let $P = zz_2 \cdots z_p$ be such a minimal path and assume that $z_p = x_t$. It is clear that $p \geq 3$ and $z_2, \dots, z_{p-2} \notin N^-(C)$. Particularly $z_{p-2} \rightarrow x_{t-2}$ and $x_{t-1} \rightarrow z_{p-2}$. Since D has no $(c+2)$ -cycle, we see that $x_{t-2}z_{p-2} \notin A(D)$. This implies that there is no arc between z_{p-2} and x_{t-2} , that is x_{t-2} and z_{p-2} must belong to the same partite set of D . It is not hard to get $z_{p-1} \rightarrow x_{t-1}$. Since, otherwise, x_{t-3}

and z_{p-2} must belong to the same partite set of D , which is impossible. Together with $x_{t-1} \rightarrow z_{p-1}$ we obtain that x_{t-1} and z_{p-1} belong to the same partite set of D . Further, vertices x_{t-i} and z_{p-i} belong to the same partite set for $1 \leq i \leq p-1$. It is obvious that $x_{t-2} \rightarrow z_{p-1}$ due to $V(C) \setminus x_t \Rightarrow z_{p-1}$.

We may assume that z_t is on the path $x_{i+1}Cx_1$. If C has a path from x_t to x_{t-2} with at most $c-1$ vertices, then together with the path $x_{t-2}x_{t-1}z_{p-2}z_{p-1}x_t$, we can form the path into a cycle of length at most $c+2$, which contains the vertices x_{t-1} , z_{p-1} and x_{t-2} , z_{p-2} in the same partite sets respectively. We deduce that D has a $(c+2)$ -cycle from Theorem 2.1, a contradiction. This gives $x_{j+2}Cx_{t-2} \Rightarrow x_j \Rightarrow x_tCx_{j-1}$. For the same reason, $x_{t-1} \Rightarrow x_iCx_{t-3}$ when $t \geq i+2$; and $x_{t-1} \Rightarrow x_1Cx_{t-3}$ when $t = i+1$ or $i+2$.

Claim 3.1. $diam(D) \geq c+2$.

Proof. Since $x_{t-2}z_{p-1} \in A(D)$, it is not hard to obtain that x_{t-1} dominates each vertex of $x_{t+1}Cx_{i-1}$ when $t \geq i+2$. Therefore, $D[C]$ is isomorphic to \mathcal{Q}_{c+1} with the initial vertex x_t and the terminal vertex x_{t-1} . This implies that every minimal path from z to C must end at x_t and $dist(z, x_{t-1}) \geq c+2$. Thus $diam(D) \geq c+2$ when $t \geq i+2$. If there is a vertex $x \notin V(C) \cup N^-(C)$ such that the minimal path from x to C which ends at the path $x_{i+2}Cx_1$, we complete the proof. Then all such minimal paths from x to C end at x_{i+1} . The following proof is divided into two cases.

Case 1: $i \geq 5$ or $i = 4$ and $j \leq c$. If $x_i \rightarrow x_j$, observe that $x_jx_ix_2x_3x_1z_{p-2}z_{p-1}x_{i+1}Cx_j$ is a cycle of length at most $c+2$ which visits V_1 three times, a contradiction. Thus when $i \geq 5$ or $i = 4$ and $x_i \rightarrow x_{c+1}$ we have $dist(z, x_{t-1}) \geq c+2$.

Case 2: $i = 4$ and $x_{c+1} \rightarrow x_i$. Recall that every set of D has at least two vertices. Hence there is at least one vertex y in $V_c \setminus \{x_{c+1}\}$. If $y \in N^+(C) \setminus N^-(C)$, then $dist(y, x_1) \geq c+2$. If $y \in N^-(C) \setminus N^+(C)$, by considering the digraph D' obtained by reversing all arcs of D , we get $diam(D') \geq c+2$, that is $diam(D) \geq c+2$. If $y \in N^+(C) \cap N^-(C)$, then $x_c \rightarrow y \rightarrow x_1$ by Lemma 2.3. This implies that D contains a $(c+2)$ -cycle $x_cyx_1Cx_{i-1}x_{c+1}z_{p-1}x_{i+1}Cx_c$, a contradiction. Thus $diam(D) \geq c+2$ when $i \in \{3, 4\}$. This completes the proof of the claim. \square

Let $P = x_1x_2 \cdots x_m$ be a path of D with $dist(x_1, x_m) = diam(D) = m-1 \geq c+2$. As D contains no $(c+2)$ -cycle, vertices x_i and x_{c+i+1} must belong to the same partite set. If there exists vertex set $\{x_{i_1}, x_{j_1}, x_{i_2}, x_{j_2}\} \subset V(D)$ with $\max\{i_1, j_1, i_2, j_2\} - \min\{i_1, j_1, i_2, j_2\} \leq c$ such that x_{i_1} and x_{j_1} belong to the same partite set and x_{i_2} and x_{j_2} belong to the same another partite set, then D contains a $(c+2)$ -cycle by applying

Theorem 2.1, a contradiction. Thus x_1Px_c meets all partite sets of D and contains two vertices of exactly one partite set. Therefore, $D[P]$ is isomorphic to Q_m with the initial vertex x_1 and the terminal vertex x_m . If $|V(D)| = m$, we are done. So $|V(D)| > m$. Assume that $x_j \in V_j$ for $j \in [i-1]$, $x_j \in V_{j-1}$ for $j \in \{i+1, \dots, c\}$ and $x_i \in V_t$ for some $t \in [i-1]$. Let x be a vertex of $D - P$. Suppose that $x \in N^+(P) \cap N^-(P)$, we now consider the arcs between it and $V(P)$. And we use V_m to indicate the partite set which x_m is in.

Claim 3.2. *Suppose that $x \in N^+(P) \cap N^-(P)$. If there exist two vertices x_p and x_q on P with $p < q$ such that $x_p \rightarrow x \rightarrow x_q$, then x belongs to one of $\{V_1, V_2, V_{m-1}, V_m\}$. Moreover, x has the same in-neighbours and out-neighbours on P as $x_l \in \{x_2, x_3, x_4, x_{m-3}, x_{m-2}, x_{m-1}\}$, where*

$$\begin{cases} x_3 \in V_1, & \text{when } l = 3; \\ x_4 \in V_1, & \text{when } l = 4; \\ x_{m-2} \in V_m, & \text{when } l = m - 2; \\ x_{m-3} \in V_m, & \text{when } l = m - 2. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Since D has no $(c+2)$ -cycle, there is an integer l such that $x_{l-1} \rightarrow x \rightarrow x_{l+1}$ and x is in the same partite set with x_l . If $3 \leq l \leq m-2$, it easy to check that $D[P \cup \{x\}]$ contains a $(c+2)$ -cycle C as follows:

(1) when $m \geq c+l-1$,

- $C = x_{l-1}xx_{l+1}Px_{c+l-1}x_lx_{l-2}x_{l-1}$, or
- $C = x_{l-1}xx_{l+1}Px_{c+l-2}x_lx_{l-3}x_{l-2}x_{l-1}$ unless $x_3 \in V_1$ and $l = 3$, or
- $C = x_{l-1}xx_{l+1}Px_{c+l-3}x_lx_{l-4}Px_{l-1}$ unless $x_4 \in V_1$ and $l = 4$;

or (2)when $l \geq c-1$,

- $C = x_{l-1}xx_{l+1}x_{l+2}xx_{l+2-c}Px_{l-1}$, or
- $C = x_{l-1}xx_{l+1}x_{l+2}x_{l+3}xx_{l+3-c}Px_{l-1}$ unless $x_{m-2} \in V_m$ and $l = m-2$, or
- $C = x_{l-1}xx_{l+1}Px_{l+4}xx_{l+4-c}Px_{l-1}$ unless $x_{m-3} \in V_m$ and $l = m-3$.

Then we consider $m < c+l-1$ and $l < c-1$. Recall that $m \geq c+3$. This implies that $l \geq 4$. Clearly, if $x_lx_1, x_{c+1}x_l \in A(D)$, there is a $(c+2)$ -cycle $x_1Px_{l-1}xx_{l+1}Px_{c+1}x_lx_1$. If $x_l, x_{c+1} \in V_l$, then $D[P \cup \{x\}]$ contains a $(c+2)$ -cycle $x_2Px_{l-1}xx_{l+1}Px_{c+2}x_lx_2$. Thus

$x_l \in V_1$. Observe that $D[P \cup \{x\}]$ contains $x_3Px_{l-1}xx_{l+1}Px_{c+3}x_lx_3$ which is a $(c+2)$ -cycle unless $l = 4$. Thus x belongs to V_1, V_2, V_{m-1} or V_m . We also get $l \in \{2, 3, 4, m-3, m-2, m-1\}$ and $x_3 \in V_1$ when $l = 3$; $x_4 \in V_1$ when $l = 4$; $x_{m-2} \in V_m$ when $l = m-2$; and $x_{m-3} \in V_m$ when $l = m-3$.

In all cases, it is easy to check that x and x_l have the same in-neighbours and out-neighbours on P , otherwise $D[P \cup \{x\}]$ contains a cycle of length at most $(c+2)$ and two pairs of vertices which belong to the same partite set. By Theorem 2.1, we get a contradiction. \square




Figure 3: A cycle of length at most $(c+2)$ in $D[P \cup \{x\}]$ which contains two vertices in V_1 and two vertices in V_2 .

Claim 3.3. *Suppose that $x \in N^+(P) \cap N^-(P)$. If all vertices x_p and x_q with $x_p \rightarrow x \rightarrow x_q$ satisfy $p > q$, then*

- (i) x has the same in-neighbours and out-neighbours on P as x_1 or x_m ; or
- (ii) $D[P \cup \{x\}]$ has four specific structures (see Figure 4); or
- (iii) $x \rightarrow x_1, x_2Px_m \Rightarrow x$ and $x \in V_{c+1}$; or
- (iv) $x_m \rightarrow x, x \Rightarrow x_1Px_{m-1}$ and $x \in V_{m-c}$.

Proof. Note that if some vertex $x_q \rightarrow x$ (or $x \rightarrow x_q$, respectively) then $x_qPx_m \Rightarrow x$ (or $x \Rightarrow x_1Px_q$, respectively). Let q be the maximum integer such that $x \rightarrow x_q$.

First we suppose that x has at least two in-neighbours and two out-neighbours on P . Let x_{q_2} be the out-neighbour of x on P which is nearest to x_q and let x_{p_1}, x_{p_2} be two in-neighbours of x on P which is nearest to x_q . Clearly, we have $p_2 - q_2 < 5$. Otherwise, $xx_{q_2}Px_{p_2}x$ is a 7-cycle meeting five partite sets of D , a contradiction by Theorem 2.1. Hence there exists at most one vertex in $x_{q_2}Px_{p_2}$ such that it is non-adjacent to x . Let x_l be such vertex if it exists. According to the position of x_l , there are four possible sequences of $x_{q_2}Px_{p_2}$: (1) $x_{q_2}x_qx_{p_1}x_{p_2}$, (2) $x_{q_2}x_lx_qx_{p_1}x_{p_2}$, (3) $x_{q_2}x_qx_lx_{p_1}x_{p_2}$ and (4) $x_{q_2}x_qx_{p_1}x_lx_{p_2}$.

If $m \geq c+q$, then there is the $(c+2)$ -cycle $xx_qPx_{c+q}x$ for sequences (1), (3) and (4) and the $(c+2)$ -cycle $xx_{q_2}Px_{q_2+c}x$ for sequence (2) unless x and x_{q+c-2} are in the same

partite set. Observe that for sequence (2) if $q \geq 5$, then there still exists a $(c+2)$ -cycle $xx_{q-5}Px_{q-5+c}x$ via $x_{q+c-2}x \notin A(D)$. If $q \geq c$, then $xx_{q-c+1}Px_{p_1}x$ is a $(c+2)$ -cycle for sequences (1)-(3) and $xx_{q-c+3}Px_{p_2}x$ is a $(c+2)$ -cycle for sequence (4) unless x and x_{q-c+3} belong to the same partite set. We also note that for sequence (4) if $q \geq m-5$ and $q \geq c$, then there still exists a $(c+2)$ -cycle $xx_{q-c+5}Px_{q+5}x$. Hence, $m < c+q$ and $q < c$ or P meets the partite sets of D along two special orders (see Figure 4). Moreover, x has exactly two in-neighbours or two out-neighbours and $x \in \{V_1, V_2, V_m, V_{m-1}\}$.




Figure 4: The structure of $D[P \cup \{x\}]$ of Type I – Type IV in Claim 3.3.

Clearly, $x \in V_1$ or $x \in V_{c+1}$. Otherwise, there is a $(c+2)$ -cycle $xx_1Px_{c+1}x$ in D . First suppose that $x \in V_1$. If $x_3 \notin V_1$, then $xx_3Px_{c+3}x$ is an $(c+2)$ -cycle because x has at least two out-neighbours. Then $x_3 \in V_1$ and $x \rightarrow x_4$. Note that x_4 and x_{c+5} belong to the same partite set. If $x_5 \rightarrow x$, then $q = 4$, $m = c+3$ and P is isomorphic to Type I in Figure 4. Else we obtain a $(c+2)$ -cycle $xx_5Px_{c+5}x$ when $m \geq c+5$. Hence $m = c+3$ or $m = c+4$ and $P = x_1x_2 \cdots x_{c+3}(x_{c+4})$ where $x_3, x_{c+2}(x_{c+4}) \in V_1$. Next, suppose that $x \in V_{c+1}$. Obviously, there is a $(c+2)$ -cycle $xx_2Px_{c+2}x$ when $x \notin V_2$. Similarly, when $x_4 \rightarrow x$ we have $q = 3$ and $m = c+2$, which is impossible. Then $x \rightarrow x_4$. We obtain a $(c+2)$ -cycle $xx_4Px_{c+4}x$ when $m \geq c+4$. Hence $m = n+3$ and $P = x_1x_2 \cdots x_{c+3}$ where $x_{c+1} \in V_2$. In a word, when x has at least two in-neighbours and two out-neighbours, P has four specific structures (see Figure 4) based on the partite set which x belongs to.

Therefore, x has either one in-neighbour or one out-neighbour. Then (i) $x \in V_1$ or $x \in V_m$ and x has the same in-neighbours and out-neighbours on P as x_1 or x_m ; or (ii)

$x \rightarrow x_1, x_2Px_m \Rightarrow x$ and $x \in V_{c+1}$; or (iii) $x_m \rightarrow x, x \Rightarrow x_1Px_{m-1}$ and $x \in V_{m-c}$. \square

Summarizing Claim 3.2 and Claim 3.3, we get the following.

Proposition 1. *If $x \in N^+(P) \cap N^-(P)$, then x and P satisfy one of the following statements.*

(i) x and one of x_1, x_2, x_{m-1} and x_m belong to the same partite set and their in-neighbours and out-neighbours on P are same;

(ii) x and $x_l \in \{x_3, x_4, x_{m-3}, x_{m-2}\}$ belong to the same partite set and their in-neighbours and out-neighbours on P are same, where $x_3 \in V_1$ when $l = 3$; $x_4 \in V_1$ when $l = 4$; $x_{m-2} \in V_m$ when $l = m - 2$; and $x_{m-3} \in V_m$ when $l = m - 3$;

(iii) $D[P \cup x]$ has four specific structures Type(I–IV) which are shown in Figure 4;

(iv) $x \rightarrow x_1, x_2Px_m \Rightarrow x$ and $x \in V_{c+1}$ or $x_m \rightarrow x, x \Rightarrow x_1Px_{m-1}$ and $x \in V_{m-c}$.




Figure 5: The structure of $D[P \cup \{x\}]$ of Proposition 1(iv).

Next, suppose that x has only in-neighbours in $V(P)$, that is $P \Rightarrow x$. Since D is strong, there is a path from x to P . Let $P' = x \cdots x'x''$ be a shortest path such that $x'' \in N^-(P)$. If $N^-(x'') \cap V(P) = \emptyset$, then there is an integer $j \leq 4$ such that $x_{j+c-1} \rightarrow x'$ and further D contains a $(c+2)$ -cycle $x'x''x_jPx_{j+c-1}x'$, a contradiction. Then $x'' \in N^-(P) \cap N^+(P)$. By Proposition 1, there are several possible structures of $D[x'' \cup P]$. In each case, we obtain a $(c+2)$ -cycle or $\text{diam}(D) \geq m$, which contradicts the initial assumption or Claim 3.1.

- **Case 1:** x'' satisfies Proposition 1 (i) and $x_l \in \{x_2, x_{m-1}, x_m\}$. It is easy to check that D contains a $(c+2)$ -cycle.
- **Case 2:** x'' satisfies Proposition 1 (ii). There exists a $(c+2)$ -cycle $x_2x_3x'x''x_4Px_cx_2$ when $l = 3$ (or $x_2x_3x_4x'x''x_5Px_cx_2$ when $l = 4$, resp.). For the case $l = m - 2$ and $l = m - 3$, we can obtain a $(c+2)$ -cycle similarly.
- **Case 3:** x'' satisfies Proposition 1 (iii). $D[P \cup \{x', x''\}]$ contains a $(c+2)$ -cycle $x_1x_2x'x''x_3Px_cx_1$ (or $x_1x_2x_3x'x''x_4Px_cx_1$) for Type I, III. For Type II, there is a

$(c + 2)$ -cycle $x_{m-1}x'x''x_{m-c}Px_{m-1}$ unless there is no arc between x'' and x_{m-c} . And D contains $x_mx'x''x_{m-c+1}Px_m$ unless there is no arc between x' and x_m . Then $x_{m-2}x'x''x_{m-c-1}Px_{m-2}$ is a cycle when $x'' \not\rightarrow x_{m-c}$ and $x_m \not\rightarrow x'$.

- **Case 4: x'' satisfies Proposition 1 (iv) and $x_m \rightarrow x''$.** There is a $(c + 2)$ -cycle $x_{m-c}x'x''x_{m-c+1}Px_{m-1}x_{m-c}$ unless x_{m-c} , x'' and x_{m-1} belong to the same partite set. Then $D[P \cup \{x', x''\}]$ contains a $(c+2)$ -cycle $x_{m-c}x'x''x_{m-c+2}Px_mx_{m-c}$.
- **Case 5: x'' satisfies Proposition 1 (i) $x_l \in \{x_2, x_{m-1}, x_m\}$ or (iv) $x'' \rightarrow x_1$.** According to the analysis of Cases 1 – 4, we get $dist(x', x_m) \geq m$, a contradiction.

Hence, it is impossible that x has only in-neighbours on P . Analogously, we can show that $D - P$ does not have any vertex which only has out-neighbours on P .

Since each partite set of D has at least two vertices, P is not of Type III and $m \geq 2c + 1$. We show that no vertex out of P satisfies (iv). Assume there is a vertex x satisfying (iv) and $x \rightarrow x_1$, $x_2Px_m \Rightarrow x$. If there is a vertex y out of P such that $x \rightarrow y$, it is easy to obtain that y is equivalent to x_1 ; or y satisfies (iv) and $x_m \rightarrow y$, $y \Rightarrow x_1Px_{m-1}$; or $D[P \cup y]$ is of Type II. Thus $x_cxyx_{c+1}x_2Px_c$ is a $(c + 2)$ -cycle unless $x_{c+1} \not\rightarrow x_2$. However, we obtain that D contains $x_3xyx_4Px_cx_1x_2x_3$ or $x_3xyx_5Px_{c+1}x_1x_2x_3$. Thus y is equivalent to x_1 . This implies that $dist(x, x_m) = m$, a contradiction. Analogously, if there is a vertex x satisfying (iv) and $x_m \rightarrow x$, $x \Rightarrow x_1Px_{m-1}$, we will get $dist(x_1, x) = m$, a contradiction. Hence no vertex out of P satisfies (iv). Finally, if there exist vertices x of Type I and y of Type II such that $x \rightarrow y$, then D contains a $(c + 2)$ -cycle $x_1Px_4xyx_5Px_cx_1$ or $x_1Px_4x_6Px_{c+1}x_1$, a contradiction. Thus for any vertex x of Type I and any vertex y of Type II, there is no arc between x and y or $y \rightarrow x$. Observe that D is isomorphic to a member of \mathcal{Q}_m . This proves Theorem 3.

4 Data Availability Statement

No data were generated or used during the study.

References

- [1] R. Balakrishnan, P. Paulraja, Note on the existence of directed $(k + 1)$ -cycles in disconnected complete k -partite digraphs, *J. Graph Theory* 8 (1984) 423–426.
- [2] J. Bang-Jensen, F. Havet, Tournaments and semicomplete digraphs, *Classes of directed graphs*, Springer, Cham (2018) 35–124.
- [3] J. Bang-Jensen, G. Gutin, *Digraphs: Theory, algorithms and applications*, Springer, London, 2000.
- [4] J. Bang-Jensen, G. Gutin, Generalizations of tournaments: a survey, *J. Graph Theory* 28 (1998) 171–202.
- [5] L. W. Beineke, K. B. Reid, Tournaments, *Selected topics in graph theory*, Academic Press, N.Y (1978) 169–204.
- [6] J. A. Bondy, Disconnected orientations and a conjecture of Las Vergnas, *J. London Math. Soc.* 14 (1976) 277–282.
- [7] G. Gutin, On cycles in complete n -partite digraphs, Depon. in VINITI, No. 2473, Gomel Politechnic Institute, 1982. [Russian]
- [8] G. Gutin, On cycles in strong n -partite tournaments, *Vest. Acad. Navuk. BSSR Ser. Fiz.-Mat. Navuk.* 5 (1984) 105–106. [Russian]
- [9] Y. Guo, L. Volkmann, A complete solution of a problem of Bondy concerning multipartite tournaments, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* 66 (1996) 140–145.
- [10] L. Volkmann, Multipartite tournaments: a survey, *Discrete Math.* 307 (2007) 3097–3129.