A Note on the Song-Zhang Theorem For Hamiltonian Graphs

Kewen Zhao
Department of Mathematics
Qiongzhou University, Sanya, Hainan, 572022
P.R. China

Ronald J. Gould
Dept. Mathematics and Computer Science
Emory University, Atlanta, GA, 30322
USA

July 23, 2009

Abstract

An independent set S of a graph G is said to be essential if S has a pair of vertices that are distance two apart in G. Essential independent sets are a useful idea and have been considered in a number of papers. In 1994, Song and Zhang considered independent sets S and proved that if for each independent set S of cardinality $k+1$, one of the following condition holds:
(i) there exist $u \neq v \in S$ such that $d(u)+d(v) \geq n$ or $|N(u) \cap N(v)| \geq \alpha(G)$;
(ii) for any distinct pair u and v in S, $|N(u) \cup N(v)| \geq n - \max\{d(x)|x \in S\}$, then G is Hamiltonian. In this paper, we consider essential independent sets and prove that if for each essential independent set S of cardinality $k+1$, one of conditions (i) or (ii) holds, then G is Hamiltonian. A number of established results on Hamiltonian graphs are corollaries of this result

Keywords Hamiltonian graphs; independent set; essential independent set.
MSC(2000): 05C38; 05C45.

1 Introduction

We consider only finite simple graphs in this paper; undefined nonation and terminology can be found in [1]. In particular, we use $V(G)$, $E(G)$, $k(G)$, $\alpha(G)$ and $\delta(G)$ to denote the vertex set, edge set, connectivity, independence number and minimum degree of G, respectively. If G is a graph and $u, v \in V(G)$, then a path in G from u to v is called a (u,v)-path of G. If $v \in V(G)$ and H is a subgraph of G, then $N_H(v)$ denotes the set of vertices in H that are adjacent to v in G. Thus, $d_H(v)$, the degree of v relative to H, is $|N_H(v)|$. We also write $d(v) = d_G(v)$ and $N(v) = N_G(v)$ when the graph in use is clear. If C and H are subgraphs of G, then $N_C(H) = \cup_{u \in V(H)} N_C(u)$, and $G - C$ denotes the subgraph of G induced by $V(G) - V(C)$. For vertices $u, v \in V(G)$, the distance between u and v, denoted $d(u,v)$, is the length of a shortest (u,v)-path in G, or ∞ if no such path exists.

Let $C_m = x_0x_1 \ldots x_{m-1}x_1$ denote a cycle of order m. Define $N^+_{C_m}(u) = \{x_{i+1} : x_i \in N_{C_m}(u)\}$, $N^-_{C_m}(u) = \{x_{i-1} : x_i \in N_{C_m}(u)\}$ and define $N^{\pm}_{C_m}(u) = N^+_{C_m}(u) \cup N^-_{C_m}(u)$, where subscripts are taken modulo m. Let $S \subseteq V(G)$, and define $\Delta(S) = \max\{d(x) : x \in S\}$.

A subset $S \subseteq V(G)$ is said to be an *essential independent set* (**EIS**) if S is an independent set in G and there exist two distinct vertices $x, y \in S$ with $d(x, y) = 2$.

Three classical results on Hamiltonian graphs are:

Theorem 1.1 (*Dirac,* [4]). *If $\delta(G) \geq n/2$, then G is Hamiltonian.*

Theorem 1.2 (*Ore,* [11]). *If $d(u) + d(v) \geq n$ for each pair of nonadjacent vertices $u, v \in V(G)$, then G is Hamiltonian.*

Theorem 1.3 (*Chvátal and Erdös,* [3]). *If G is graph with $\kappa(G) \geq \alpha(G)$, then G is Hamiltonian.*

Theorem 1.2 was generalized by Fan [5] who showed that only pairs of vertices at distance 2 are essential in Theorem 1.2. In 1996, Chen et al. [2] proved a Dirac-type result for essential independent sets with k vertices.

Theorem 1.4 (*Chen et al.,* [2]). *Let G be a k-connected ($k \geq 2$) graph on $n \geq 3$ vertices. If $\max\{d(u) : u \in S\} \geq n/2$ for any essential independent set S with k vertices in G, then G is Hamiltonian.*

In 1997, Liu and Wei [10] considered essential independent sets with $k + 1$ vertices in the following:

Theorem 1.5 (*Liu and Wei,* [10]). *Let G be a k-connected ($k \geq 2$) graph on $n \geq 3$ vertices. If $\max\{d(u) : u \in S\} \geq n/2$ for any essential independent set S with $k + 1$ vertices in G, then G is Hamiltonian or in one of three exceptional classes of graphs.*

In 2002, Hirohata [9] considered essential independent sets with k vertices and showed that the length of a longest cycle was dependent on max $\{d(u) : u \in S\}$. Recently, in [8] Theorem 1.5 as well as some other results were generalized.

Neighborhood unions have already been shown to be very useful in studying Hamiltonian graphs. The first use of this generalized degree condition was to provide another generalization of Dirac's theorem by Faudree et al, [6] in 1989.

Theorem 1.6 (*Faudree et al,* [6]). *If G is a 2-connected graph and if $|N(u) \cup N(v)| \geq (2n - 1)/3$ for each pair of nonadjacent vertices $u, v \in V(G)$, then G is Hamiltonian.*

In 1991, Faudree et al [7] considered the effect of $\delta(G)$.

Theorem 1.7 (*Faudree et al.,* [7]). *If G is a 2-connected graph and if $|N(u) \cup N(v)| \geq n - \delta(G)$ for each pair of nonadjacent vertices $u, v \in V(G)$, then G is Hamiltonian.*

In 1994, Song and Zhang [12] considered independent sets with $k + 1$ vertices and proved the following theorem.

Theorem 1.8 (*Song and Zhang,* [12]). *Let G be a k-connected graph ($k \geq 2$) with independence number α. If for each independent set S of cardinality $k + 1$, one of the following conditions holds:*
(i) there exist $u \neq v \in S$ such that $d(u) + d(v) \geq n$ or $|N(u) \cap N(v)| \geq \alpha$;
(ii) for any distinct pair u and $v \in S$, $|N(u) \cup N(v)| \geq n - \max\{d(x)|x \in S\}$,
then G is Hamiltonian.

The purpose of this paper is to unify and extend the theorems above through the use of essential independent sets by proving the following result.

Theorem 1.9 *Let G be a k-connected graph ($k \geq 2$) with independence number α. If for each essential independent set S of cardinality $k+1$, one of the following conditions holds:*
(i) there exists $u \neq v \in S$ such that $d(u) + d(v) \geq n$ or $|N(u) \cap N(v)| \geq \alpha$;
(ii) for any distinct pair u and $v \in S$, $|N(u) \cup N(v)| \geq n - \max\{d(x)|x \in S\}$,
then G is Hamiltonian.

Obviously, Theorem 1.9 generalizes Theorem 1.1, Theorem 1.2, Theorem 1.3, Theorem 1.6, Theorem 1.7 and Theorem 1.8. Next we present an example that shows that Theorem 1.9 is stronger than Theorem 1.8.

Let $k \geq 2$ and $n \geq (k+1)(k+3)+k+2+1 = k^2+5k+6$. Let $H = K_{n-(k+2)}$ and build a graph G as follows. Take H along with a disjoint set of vertices $S = \{x_1, x_2, ..., x_{k+2}\}$. Now join each $x_i \in S$, $1 \leq i \leq k+1$, to a distinct set of $k+3$ vertices of H. That is, make the neighborhoods of these vertices of S disjoint. Next join x_{k+2} to a set of k vertices of H, such that $N(x_{k+2}) \cap N(x_i) = \emptyset$, for $1 \leq i \leq k+1$.

Now the resulting graph G is clearly k-connected. Also $\alpha(G) = k+3$. If we consider the independent vertex set $S' = \{x_1, ..., x_{k+1}\}$ we see that $d(x_i) + d(x_j) = 2k+6 < n$.

Also, for two vertices in the set S' we have $|N(x_i) \cap N(x_j)| = \emptyset$. Thus condition (i) of the Song-Zhang Theorem fails to hold. Further,

$$|N(x_i) \cup N(x_j)| = 2k+6 < n - max\{d(x)|x \in S\} = n - (k+3)$$

(using the bound on n). Thus, condition (ii) of the Song-Zhang Theorem also fails to hold. Hence, Theorem 1.8 cannot be applied to G.

However, the only essential independent sets of order $k+1$ contain a vertex y in H and k vertices from $S = \{x_1, \ldots, x_{k+2}\}$. For any such essential independent set, there exists some vertex x_i such that $d(y, x_i) = 2$ and

$$d(y) + d(x_i) = n - (k+2) - 1 + k + 3 = n.$$

Therefore, Theorem 1.9 does apply.

2 Proof of Theorem 1.9

Before we begin the proof of Theorem 1.9, we need to establish a few basic facts. Within these facts we will also establish some useful inequalities.

For a cycle $C_m = x_0x_1 \ldots x_{m-1}x_0$, we write $[x_i, x_j]$ to denote the subpath $x_i, x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_j$ of the cycle C_m, where subscripts are taken modulo m. For notational convenience, $[x_i, x_j]$ will denote the $(x_i - x_j)$-path of C_m as well as the vertex set of this path.

Claim: Let G be 2-connected non-Hamiltonian graph. Let $C_m = x_0x_1 \ldots x_{m-1}x_0$ be a longest cycle of G, H a component of $G - C_m$, $x \in V(H)$, $x_i \in N_{C_m}(x)$, and let $x_j \in N_{C_m}(H)$ satisfying $\{x_{i+1}, x_{i+2}, \ldots, x_{j-1}\} \cap N_{C_m}(H) = \emptyset$, then the following facts (I) - (III) and inequalities (1) - (5) all hold.

Proof of Claim. Let P be a path in H with its two end-vertices adjacent to $x_i, x_j \in V(C_m)$, respectively.

Fact (I): Suppose $x_h \in \{x_{i+1}, x_{i+2}, \dots, x_{j-2}\} - \{x_j, x_{j-1}\}$ is adjacent to x_{j+1}, then x_{h+1} is not adjacent to x_{i+1} and x.

First, since $\{x_{i+1}, x_{i+2}, \dots, x_{j-1}\} \cap N_{C_m}(H) = \emptyset$, then x_{h+1} is not adjacent to x.
If x_{h+1} is adjacent to x_{i+1} we obtain the cycle

$$C^* = x_i P x_j x_{j-1} \dots, x_{h+1} x_{i+1} x_{i+2} \dots, x_h x_{j+1} x_{j+2} \dots x_i$$

which is longer than C_m, a contradiction.
Fact (II): Suppose $x_h \in \{x_{j+1}, x_{j+2}, \dots, x_i\}$ is adjacent to x_{j+1}, then x_{h-1} is not adjacent to x_{i+1} and x.

Otherwise, if x_{h-1} is adjacent to x_{i+1}, then the cycle

$$C^* = x_i P x_j x_{j-1} \dots x_{i+1} x_{h-1} x_{h-2} \dots x_{j+1} x_h x_{h+1} \dots x_i$$

is longer than C_m, a contradiction. Also, suppose x_{h-1} is adjacent to x. Let P' be a path of H with its two end-vertices adjacent to x_{h-1}, x_j, respectively. Then

$$C^* = x_{h-1} P' x_j x_{j-1} \dots x_h x_{j+1} x_{j+2} \dots x_{h-1}$$

is a cycle longer than C_m, a contradiction. Thus, x_{h-1} is not adjacent to x.

Fact (III): Suppose $y \in V(G - C_m)$ is adjacent to x_{j+1}, then y is not adjacent to x_{i+1} and x.

Clearly, y is not in H, so y is not adjacent to x. If y is adjacent to x_{i+1}, then cycle

$$C^* = x_i P x_j x_{j-1} \dots x_{i+1} y x_{j+1} x_{j+2} \dots x_i$$

is longer than C_m, a contradiction. In Fact (I) above, we do not consider whether the two vertices $\{x_j, x_{j-1}\}$ are adjacent to x_{j+1} or not. Hence, we have

$$|N(x_{i+1}) \cup N(x)| \leq n - (d(x_{j+1}) - |\{x_{j-1}, x_j\}|) - |\{x_{i+1}, x\}| \leq n - d(x_{j+1}). \tag{1}$$

Clearly, all of $N^+_{C_m}(H) \cup V(H)$ are not adjacent to x_{i+1} and x_{j+1}. Hence, we also have

$$|N(x_{i+1}) \cup N(x_{j+1})| \leq n - |N^+_{C_m}(H) \cup V(H)| \leq n - |N^+_{C_m}(x)| - |V(H)|. \tag{2}$$

Moreover, if x_{j-1} is adjacent to x_{j+1}, then x_j is not adjacent to x_{i+1}. Combining this with the discussions above Facts (I), (II) and (III), there are at least $(d(x_{j+1}) - |\{x_j\}|) - |\{x_{i+1}\}| - |V(H)|$ vertices not adjacent to x_{i+1}. Hence,

$$d(x_{i+1}) \leq n - (d(x_{j+1}) - |\{x_j\}|) - |\{x_{i+1}\}| - |V(H)|,$$

which implies that

$$d(x_{i+1}) + d(x_{j+1}) \leq n - |V(H)|. \tag{3}$$

Similarly, all of $N^+_{C_m}(x_{j+1}) \cup N_{G-C_m}(x_{j+1}) \cup \{x\}$ is not adjacent to x, thus we have

$$d(x) \leq n - |N^+_{C_m}(x_{j+1}) \cup N_{G-C_m}(x_{j+1}) \cup \{x\}|,$$

which implies

$$d(x) + d(x_{j+1}) \leq n - 1. \tag{4}$$

Clearly, the common neighbors of x_{i+1} and x are all on C_m. Hence, we also have

$$|N(x_{i+1}) \cap N(x)| \leq \alpha - 1. \tag{5}$$

Proof of Theorem 1.9. Assume that G is not Hamiltonian. Let $C_m = x_0x_1 \ldots x_{m-1}x_0$ be a longest cycle of G and H a component of $G - C_m$. Since G is k-connected, then $|N_{C_m}(H)| \geq k$. Let P be a path in H whose end vertices x^*, y^* are adjacent to x_i and x_j on C_m respectively. Let $x \in V(H)$ and $x_i \in N_{C_m}(x)$. Let S^* denote k vertices of $N^+_{C_m}(H)$ containing vertex x_{i+1} and let $S = S^* \cup \{x\}$. Clearly, S is an EIS. Now, G satisfies conditions (i) or (ii) of the Theorem.

Suppose (i) holds, that is, there exist $u, v \in S$ with $u \neq v$ such that $d(u) + d(v) \geq n$ or $|N(u) \cap N(v)| \geq \alpha$.

Since S is an EIS, then $\alpha(G) \geq k + 1$. Then, by inequalities (3) and (4) of the Claim, $d(u) + d(v) \geq n$ is impossible. Together with (i), this implies $|N(u) \cap N(v)| \geq \alpha$. By inequality (5) of the Claim, if $|N(u) \cap N(v)| \geq \alpha(G)$, then $u, v \in N^+_{C_m}(H)$. Without loss of generality, assume $\{u, v\} = \{x_{i+1}, x_{j+1}\}$.

Since C_m is a longest cycle of G, the vertices of $N(x_{i+1}) \cap N(x_{j+1})$ are not in $G - C_m$ for otherwise, a cycle longer than C_m is easily found. Thus, $N(x_{i+1}) \cap N(x_{j+1}) \subseteq V(C_m)$, which implies $|N(x_{i+1}) \cap N(x_{j+1})| = |N_{C_m}(x_{i+1}) \cap N_{C_m}(x_{j+1})| = |N^-_{C_m}(x_{i+1}) \cap N^-_{C_m}(x_{j+1})|$. Since C_m is a longest cycle of G, then $N^-_{C_m}(x_{i+1}) \cap N^-_{C_m}(x_{j+1})$ is an independent set (or again using P, a longer cycle is easily found). Let w be a vertex of H, then $\{w\} \cup (N^-_{C_m}(x_{i+1}) \cap N^-_{C_m}(x_{j+1}))$ is also an independent set. By condition (i) of the Theorem, $|N^-_{C_m}(x_{i+1}) \cap N^-_{C_m}(x_{j+1})| \geq \alpha$. This implies that $|\{w\} \cup (N^-_{C_m}(x_{i+1}) \cap N^-_{C_m}(x_{j+1}))| \geq \alpha + 1$, contradicting the fact the independence number of G is α.

Now suppose (ii) holds, that is, suppose for any distinct pair $u, v \in S$, $|N(u) \cup N(v)| \geq n - \max\{d(x) | x \in S\} = n - \Delta(S)$.

When $\Delta(S) = d(x)$, then by inequality (2) of the Claim, we have $|N(x_{i+1}) \cup N(x_{j+1})| \leq n - d(x) - 1$, but condition (ii) says that $|N(u) \cup N(v)| \geq n - \Delta(S)$, a contradiction.

We now consider the following two cases.

Case 1: Suppose $k \geq 3$ and $|N_{C_m}(H)| \geq k$.

In this case, let $x_{i1}, x_{i2}, \ldots, x_{ik} \in N_{C_m}(H)$ be choosen satisfying the condition that there are no neighbors of H in the intervals $[x_{it+1}, \ldots, x_{i(t+1)-1}]$ for $t = 1, 2, \ldots, k - 1$.
Let $z \in V(H)$ be adjacent to some vertex of $\{x_{i1}, x_{i2}, \ldots, x_{ik}\}$ and let

$$S = \{z, x_{i1+1}, x_{i2+1}, \ldots, x_{ik+1}\}.$$

Clearly, S is an EIS. Without loss of generality, say $\Delta(S) = d(x_{ik+1})$.

When $x_{ik-1}x_{ik+1} \notin E(G)$, then by (1) of the Claim, there exists

$$(d(x_{ik+1}) - |\{x_{ik}\}|) + |\{x_{i(k-1)+1}, z\}|$$

vertices that are not adjacent to $x_{i(k-1)+1}$ and z, hence we have:

$$|N(x_{i(k-1)+1}) \cup N(z)| \leq n - (d(x_{ik+1}) - |\{x_{ik}\}|) - |\{x_{i(k-1)+1}, z\}| \leq n - d(x_{ik+1}) - 1,$$

a contradiction.

Suppose $x_{ik-1}x_{ik+1} \in E(G)$. Without loss of generality, say that x_{ik+t} is not adjacent to x_{ik-1}, and all of $\{x_{ik+1}, x_{ik+2}, \ldots, x_{ik+t-2}, x_{ik+t-1}\}$ are adjacent to x_{ik-1} (clearly, x_{ik+t} must exist in the set $\{x_{ik+1}, x_{ik+2}, \ldots, x_{i(k+1)-1}\}$, since $x_{i(k+1)-1}$ is not adjacent to x_{ik-1}). Then, without loss of generality, say that $x \in V(H)$ is adjacent to some vertex of $\{x_{i1}, x_{i2}, \ldots, x_{i(k-1)}\}$. Let $S^* = \{x, x_{i1+1}, x_{i2+1}, \ldots, x_{i(k-1)+1}, x_{ik+t}\}$. Clearly, S^* is an EIS (for otherwise, a longer cycle easily exists, a contradiction). For the EIS S^* we will prove that conditions (i) and (ii) of the Theorem fail to hold.

First, when $w, y \in \{x, x_{i1+1}, x_{i2+1}, \ldots, x_{i(k-1)+1}, x_{ik+t}\} \setminus \{x_{ik+t}\}$, we can easily check that $d(w) + d(y) \leq n - 1$ and $|N(w) \cap N(y)| \leq \alpha - 1$.

Next, suppose $w = x_{ik+t}$ and $y = x$. Clearly we also have $d(w) + d(y) \leq n - 1$ and $|N(w) \cap N(y)| \leq \alpha - 1$.

Now suppose $w = x_{ik+t}$ and $y \in \{x_{i1+1}, x_{i2+1}, \ldots, x_{i(k-1)+1}\}$.

Since $x_{ik-1}x_{ik+1} \in E(G)$ and each vertex of $\{x_{ik+1}, x_{ik+2}, \ldots, x_{ik+t-1}\}$ is adjacent to x_{ik-1}, then we have that each vertex of $\{x, x_{i1+1}, x_{i2+1}, \ldots, x_{ik+t}\} \setminus \{x_{ik+t}\}$ is not adjacent to any vertex of $\{x_{ik}, x_{ik+1}, \ldots, x_{ik+t-2}, x_{ik+t-1}\}$ (otherwise, we easily get a longer cycle). Then clearly, for any $x_{i(k-r)+1}$ $(1 \leq r \leq k-1)$,
(F1) if $x_h \in \{x_{i(k-r)+1}, x_{i(k-r)+2}, \ldots, x_{ik-1}\}$ is adjacent to $x_{i(k-r)+1}$, then x_{h-1} is not adjacent to x_{ik+t} (otherwise, the cycle

$$x_{ik}x_{ik+1}x_{ik+2} \ldots x_{ik+t-1}x_{ik-1}x_{ik-2} \ldots x_h x_{i(k-r)+1}x_{i(k-r)+2} \ldots x_{h-1}x_{ik+t}x_{ik+t+1} \ldots x_{i(k-r)}Px_{ik}$$

is longer than C_m, a contradiction. Similarly,
(F2) If $x_h \in \{x_{ik+t+1}, x_{ik+t+2}, \ldots, x_{i(k-r)}\} \setminus \{x_{i(k-r)}\}$ is adjacent to $x_{i(k-r)+1}$, then x_{h+1} is not adjacent to x_{ik+t}.

If there exist p vertices of $C_m \setminus \{x_{i(k-i)}\}$ adjacent to $x_{i(k-r)+1}$ or x_{ik+t}, then there must also exist p vertices of $C_m \setminus \{x_{i(k-r)}\}$ not adjacent to x_{ik+t} or $x_{i(k-r)+1}$. And every vertex of H is not adjacent to both $x_{i(k-r)+1}$ and x_{ik+t}, and every vertex of $G - C_m - H$ is at most adjacent to one of $\{x_{i(k-r)+1}, x_{ik+t}\}$, and $x_{i(k-r)+1}$ and x_{ik+t} are not adjacent to both $x_{i(k-r)+1}$ and x_{ik+t}. Hence, we have $d(x_{i(k-r)+1}) + d(x_{ik+t}) \leq n - 1$.

Then, we have $|N^-(x_{i(k-r)+1}) \cap N^-(x_{ik+t})| \leq \alpha - 1$ (otherwise, by a proof similar to Case (i), we must get a longer cycle). Thus, $|N(x_{i(k-r)+1}) \cap N(x_{ik+t})| \leq \alpha(G) - 1$.

Therefore, when $w = x_{ik+t}$, $y \in \{x_{i1+1}, x_{i2+1}, \ldots, x_{i(k-1)+1}\}$, we also have $d(w) + d(y) \leq n - 1$ and $|N(w) \cap N(y)| \leq \alpha(G) - 1$.

Now, we consider condition (ii) of the Theorem.

Suppose $d(x_{ik+t}) \leq \max\{d(x_{ih+1}) : h = 1, 2, \ldots, (k-1)\}$. Without loss of generality, assume $\Delta(S^*) = d(x_{ih+1})$, where $h \in \{1, 2, \ldots, (k-1)\}$. Clearly x_{ih+1} is not adjacent to x_{ik+2} (otherwise, the cycle $C^* = x_{ih}Px_{ik}x_{ik+1}x_{ik-1}x_{ik-2} \ldots x_{ih+1}x_{ik+2}x_{ik+3} \ldots x_{ih}$ is longer than C_m. Further, both

$x_{i(h-1)+1}$ and x are both not adjacent to x_{ik+1} (otherwise, we must get a longer cycle). Thus, by inequality (1) of the Claim, we have

$$|N(x_{i(h-1)+1})\cup N(x)| \leq n-(d(x_{ih+1})-|\{x_{ih-1},x_{ih}\}|)-|\{x_{i(h-1)+1},x\}|-|\{x_{ik+1}\}| \leq n-d(x_{ih+1})-1,$$

a contradiction.

Suppose $d(x_{ik+t}) > \max\{d(x_{ih+1}) : h = 1, 2, \ldots, (k-1)\}$.

In this case, clearly, none of $\{x_{i(k-1)+1}, x_{i(k-1)+2}, \ldots, x_{ik-1}\}$ are adjacent to x. By the choice of x_{ik+t}, we have that none of $\{x_{ik+1}, x_{ik+2}, \ldots, x_{ik+t}\}$ is adjacent to $x_{i(k-1)+1}$ and x (otherwise, we obtain a cycle longer than C_m).

Since C_m is a longest cycle of G,

(I): When $x_{i(k-1)+r} \in \{x_{i(k-1)+2}, x_{i(k-1)+3}, \ldots, x_{ik-2}\}$ is adjacent to x_{ik+t}, then $x_{i(k-1)+r+1}$ is not adjacent to $x_{i(k-1)+1}$ and x.

(II): When $x_{ik+r} \in \{x_{ik+t}, x_{ik+t+1}, \ldots, x_{i(k-1)}\}$ is adjacent to x_{ik+t}, then x_{ik+r-1} is not adjacent to $x_{i(k-1)+1}$ and x.

(III): When $x_{ik+r} \in \{x_{ik}, x_{ik+1}, \ldots, x_{ik+t-1}\} \setminus \{x_{ik}\}$ is adjacent to x_{ik+t}, then x_{ik+r} is not adjacent to $x_{i(k-1)+1}$ and x. Similar to the discussion of inequality (1) of the Claim, we have

$$|N(x_{i(k-1)+1}) \cup N(x)| \leq n - (d(x_{ik+t}) - |\{x_{ik}\}|) - |\{x_{i(k-1)+1}, x\}| \leq n - d(x_{ik+t}) - 1,$$

a contradiction.

Case 2. Suppose $|N_{C_m}(H)| = |\{x_i, x_j\}| = 2$.

In this case, without loss of generality, assume $d(x_{i+1}) \leq d(x_{j+1})$.

Claim (a): Let x, y be two vertices of H which are adjacent to x_i, x_j, respectively. If $d(x_{i+1}, x_{j+1}) = 2$, then H has a hamilton-path in the subgraph H with two end-vertices x, y.

Proof of Claim (a). Let P' be a longest path of H with two end-vertices x, y. If P' is not a hamilton-path of the subgraph H, let w be a vertex of $H - P'$ which adjacent to some vertex of P'. Clearly, $\{x_{i+1}, x_{j+1}, w\}$ is an EIS. Further, we know that condition (i) of the Theorem does not hold. Thus, condition (ii) of the Theorem must hold. Then we can check that w must be adjacent to every vertex of $H - \{w\}$, for otherwise, by inequality (1) of the claim, we again reach a contradiction. Thus, we get a path of H longer than P' with end-vertices x, y, a contradiction.

Claim (b): When $u \in V(H)$ is adjacent to x_i, then u must be adjacent to x_j.

Proof of Claim (b). If u is not adjacent to x_j, then, by a proof similar to that of inequality (1) of the Claim, one can check that $|N(x_{i+1}) \cup N(x)| \leq n - (d(x_{j+1}) - |\{x_j\}| - |\{x_{i+1}, x\}| \leq n - d(x_{j+1}) - 1$, a contradiction.

Subcase 2.1. Suppose $|V(H)| \geq 2$.

Let $\{x_i, x_j\} = N_{C_m}(H)$, and let $x, y \in V(H)$ be adjacent to x_i, x_j, respectively. And let $|V(H)| = h$.

Subcase2.1.1. Suppose $d(x_{i+1}, x_{j+1}) \geq 3$.

Subcase 2.1.1.1 Suppose $d(x) \geq \max\{d(x_{i+1}), d(x_{j+1})\}$ or $d(y) \geq \max\{d(x_{i+1}), d(x_{j+1})\}$.

Without loss of generality, say $d(x) \geq \max\{d(x_{i+1}), d(x_{j+1})\}$. Clearly $\{x, x_{i+1}, x_{j+1}\}$ is an EIS. Further, we know that condition (i) of the Theorem does not hold. Thus, condition (ii) of the Theorem must hold. But we can check that

$$|N(x_{i+1}) \cup N(x_{j+1})| \leq n - |N(x)| \leq n - \max\{d(x)|x \in S\} - 1,$$

contrary to condition (ii) of the Theorem.

Subcase 2.1.1.2 Subcase2.1.1.1 fails to hold.

Without loss of generality, say $d(x_{j+1}) = \max\{d(x_{i+1}), d(x_{j+1}), d(x), d(y)\}$. Since $d(x_{i+1}, x_{j+1}) \geq 3$, let $x_r \in \{x_{j+1}, x_{j+2}, \ldots, x_i\}$ be adjacent to x_{j+1} with r is as large as possible. Then x_r is not adjacent to x_{i+1}. Let $x_h \in \{x_{i+1}, x_{i+2}, \ldots, x_{j-1}\}$ be adjacent to x_{j+1} with h as small as possible. Then x_h is not adjacent to x_{i+1}. Hence, one can check that

$$|N(x_{i+1}) \cup N(x)| \leq n - (d(x_{j+1}) - |\{x_j, x_{j-1}\}|) - |\{x_{i+1}, x\}| - |\{x_k, x_h\}| \leq n - d(x_{j+1}) - 2,$$

a contradiction.

Subcase 2.1.2. Suppose $d(x_{i+1}, x_{j+1}) = 2$.

By Claim (a), H has a Hamilton-path with two end-vertices x, y.

Case (I): If $x_f \in \{x_{j+1}, x_{j+2}, \ldots, x_i\}$ is adjacent to x_{i+1} and $x_{f+r} \in \{x_{j+1}, x_{j+2}, \ldots, x_i\}$ is adjacent to x_{j+1} (where $r \geq 1$ and x_{f+1} is not adjacent to x_{i+1}). Then, none of $\{x_{f+1}, x_{f+2}, \ldots, x_{f+h}\}$ is adjacent to x_{j+1} (otherwise, together with Claim(a) that H has a Hamilton-path with two end-vertices x, y, we can get a cycle longer than C_m). Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned}|N(x_{i+1}) \cup N(x)| \leq n \quad &- \quad (d(x_{j+1}) - |\{x_{j-1}, x_j\}|) - |\{x_{i+1}, x\}| \\ &- \quad (|\{x_{f+1}, x_{f+2}, \ldots, x_{f+h}\}| - 1) \\ &\leq \quad n - d(x_{j+1}) - 1,\end{aligned}$$

a contradiction.

Similarly, if $x_f \in \{x_{i+1}, x_{i+2}, \ldots, x_{j-1}\}$ is adjacent to x_{j+1}, and x_{f+r} is adjacent to x_{i+1}, we also can get a contradiction.

Case (II): Suppose Case (I) fails to hold. Namely, when $x_f \in \{x_{j+1}, x_{j+2}, \ldots, x_i\}$ is adjacent to x_{j+1}, then none of $\{x_{j+1}, x_{j+2}, \ldots, x_{f-1}\}$ is adjacent to x_{i+1}. When $x_f \in \{x_{i+1}, x_{i+2}, \ldots, x_{j-1}\}$ is adjacent to x_{j+1}, then none of $\{x_{f+1}, x_{f+2}, \ldots, x_j\}$ are adjacent to x_{i+1}. In this case, under the conditions of the Theorem, when $x_f \in \{x_{j+1}, x_{j+2}, \ldots, x_i\}$ is adjacent to x_{j+1}, and none of $\{x_{f+1}, x_{f+2}, \ldots, x_i\}$ are adjacent to x_{j+1}, then all of $\{x_{j+1}, x_{j+2}, \ldots, x_f\}$ are adjacent to x_{j+1}, every vertex of $\{x_f, x_{f+1}, \ldots, x_i\}$ is adjacent to x_{i+1}. Similarly, when $x_t \in \{x_{i+1}, x_{i+2}, \ldots, x_j\}$ is adjacent to x_{i+1}, and none of $\{x_{t+1}, x_{t+2}, \ldots, x_j\}$ are adjacent to x_{i+1}, then every vertex of $\{x_{i+1}, x_{i+2}, \ldots, x_t\}$ is adjacent to x_{i+1} (otherwise we obtain the contradiction that $|N(x_{i+1} \cup N(x)| \leq n - d(j+1) - 1)$. Clearly x_{f-1} is not adjacent to any of $\{x_f, x_{f+1}, \ldots, x_t\} - \{x_f, x_t\}$ and

x_{f-1} is not adjacent to x_j (otherwise, we again obtain a longer cycle). Then, if $d(x_{i+1}) \leq d(x_{f-1})$, we have

$$|N(x_{i+1}) \cup N(x)| \leq n - (d(x_{f-1}) - |\{x_f, x_t\}|) - |\{x_{i+1}, x, x_j\}| \leq n - d(x_{f-1}) - 1,$$

a contradiction. If $d(x_{i+1}) \ > d(x_{f-1})$, we have

$$|N(x_{f-1}) \cup N(x)| \leq n - (d(x_{i+1}) - |\{x_f, x_t\}|) - |\{x_{i-1}, x, x_j\}| \leq n - d(x_{i+1}) - 1,$$

a contradiction.

Subcase 2.2. Suppose $|V(H)| = 1$.

Let $V(H) = \{x\}$ and $|N_{C_m}(x)| = 2 = |\{x_1, x_f\}|$ In this case, we have $C_m = C_{n-1}$, since otherwise, as we are not in Subcase 2.1 or Subcase 2.2.1, then any component H' of $G - C_m - H$ has $|V(H')| = 1$. Without loss of generality, let $V(H') = \{y\}$, so $|N_{C_m}(y)| = 2$. This implies that $|N(x) \cup N(y)| \leq 4$. Since C_m is a longest cycle, y is not adjacent to at least one of $\{x_2, x_{f+1}\}$,. Without loss of generality, say y is not adjacent to x_2. Then $d(x_2) \leq n - |\{x, y, x_2, x_{f+1}\}| = n - 4$. Clearly, $S = \{x, y, x_2\}$ is an EIS, by condition (ii) of the Theorem, for any distinct pair u and v in S, $|N(u) \cup N(v)| \geq n - \Delta(S)$. Together with $d(x_2) \leq n - 4$, we have $|N(x) \cup N(y)| = 4$ implys $m \geq 4$ and $d(x_2) = n - 4$. Since C_m is a longest cycle we easily can check that $m \geq 6$ and $n \geq 8$. By inequality (3) of the Claim, we have $d(x_{f+1}) \leq n - |V(H)| - d(x_2) = 3$. If y is not adjacent to x_{f+1}, then $S = \{x, y, x_{f+1}\}$ is an EIS. Then condition (ii) of the Theorem implies that $|N(x) \cup N(y)| \geq n\Delta(S)$ fails, a contradiction. If y is adjacent to x_{f+1}. Let $N(y) = \{x_i, x_j\}$, say $i < j$. Since C_m is a longest cycle of G, when $x_{h+1} = x_i$, then x_{j-1} is not adjacent to x_2. The we have $d(x_2) < n - 4$, which contradicts the above result that $d(x_2) = n - 4$. When $x_{f+1} = x_j$, then since C_m is a longest cycle of G, then x_{i+1} is not adjacent to x_2 and we have that $d(x_2) < n - 4$, again contradicting that $d(x_2) = n - 4$. Therefore, $C_m = C_{n-1}$ holds.

Now, without loss of generality, assume $d(x_2) \leq d(x_{f+1})$. Let $S = \{x, x_2, x_{f+1}\}$.

Claim (I): The vertex x_2 is not adjacent to x_f.

For otherwise, we have $|N(x_2) \cup N(x)| = d(x_2)$. By condition (ii) of the Theorem that implies $|N(x_2) \cup N(x)| \geq n - \Delta(S) = n - d(x_{f+1})$, and we have $d(x_2) \geq n - d(x_{f+1})$. This contradicts inequality (3) of the Claim.

Claim (II): The vertex x_{f-1} is adjacent to x_{f+1}.

For otherwise, by inequality (3) of the Claim and by Claim (I), we have

$$d(x_2) \leq n - (d(x_{f+1}) - |\{x_f\}|) - |\{x_2\}| - |\{x_f\}| - |V(H)| \leq n - d(x_{f+1}) - 2.$$

But by condition (ii) of the Theorem and Claim (I), we have

$$d(x_2) = |N(x_2) \cup N(x)| - 1 \geq n - \Delta(S) - 1 = n - d(x_{f+1}) - 1,$$

a contradiction.

Claim (III): The vertex x_2 is adjacent to x_{n-1}.

For otherwise, if x_2 is not adjacent to x_{n-1}, when $d(x_2) = d(x_{f+1})$, we can apply Claim (II) that x_2 is adjacent to x_{n-1}, a contradiction. Suppose $d(x_2) < d(x_{f+1})$. If $d(x_{n-1}) \geq d(x_{f-1})$, we can apply Claim (II) that x_2 is adjacent to x_{n-1}, again a contradiction. If $d(x_{n-1}) < d(x_{f-1})$, together with inequality (3) of the Claim we have $\max\{d(x_2), d(x_{n-1})\} < (n-1)/2$. Let $S = \{x, x_2, x_{n-1}\}$. Clearly, this contradicts condition (ii) of the Theorem.

Claim (IV): Let $x_t \in \{x_{f+1}, x_{f+2}, \ldots, x_{n-1}\}$ be adjacent to x_2 and suppose none of $\{x_{f+1}, x_{f+2}, \ldots, x_{t-2}, x_{t-1}\}$ are adjacent to x_2. Let $x_t \in \{x_2, x_3, \ldots, x_{f-1}\}$ be adjacent to x_{f+1} and none of $\{x_2, x_3, \ldots, x_k - 1\}$ be adjacent to x_{f+1}. Then, $d(x_{t-1}) + d(x_{k-1}) \leq n-3$.

In this case, x_t is adjacent to x_{f+1} (otherwise, by inequality (1) of the Claim, we have

$$|N(x_2) \cup N(x)| \leq n - (d(x_{f+1}) - |\{x_{f-1}, x_f\}|) - |\{x_2, x\}| - |\{x_{t-1}\}| = n - d(x_{f+1}) - 1,$$

contradicting condition (ii) of the Theorem.

Since C_{n-1} is a longest cycle of G, when $x_r \in \{x_2, x_3, \ldots, x_{f-1}\}$ is adjacent to x_2, then x_{r-1} is not adjacent to x_{t-1}. When $x_r \in \{x_t, x_{t+1}, \ldots, x_{n-1}, x_1\} - \{x_{n-1}, x_1\}$ is adjacent to x_2, then x_{r+1} is not adjacent to x_{t-1}. Clearly, x_2 is not adjacent to x_f and x_{f+1}, and x_{t-1} is not adjacent to x_{f-1} and x_f. Hence, we have

$$d(x_{t-1}) \leq n - (d(x_2) - |\{x_{n-1}, x_1\}|) - |\{x_{f-1}, x_f, x_{t-1}, x\}| = n - d(x_2) - 2.$$

Similarly, we have $d(x_{k-1}) \leq n - d(x_{f+1}) - 2$. This implies

$$d(x_{t-1}) + d(x_{k-1}) \leq [n - d(x_2) - 2] + [n - d(x_{f+1}) - 2]. \tag{6}$$

Without loss of generality, assume $d(x_2) \geq d(x_{f+1})$. By condition (ii) of the Theorem, we have $d(x_2)+1 = |N(x_2) \cup N(x)| \geq n - d(x_{f+1})$, which implies that $d(x_2)+d(x_{f+1}) \geq n-1$. By inequality (3) of the Claim, we have $d(x_2) + d(x_{f+1}) \leq n-1$,. This implies $d(x_2) + d(x_{f+1}) = n-1$. Together with inequality (6), we have

$$d(x_{t-1}) + d(x_{k-1}) \leq [n - d(x_2) - 2] + [n - d(x_{f+1}) - 2] = n - 3. \tag{7}$$

In what follows we will show that $d(x_{k-1}) + d(x_{t-1}) \geq n-2$, which contradicts the above inequality. First must establish the following claims.

Claim(A). If $x_{k-1}x_f \in E(G)$, then $d(x_{k-1}) \geq d(x_{f-1})$. If $x_{k-1}x_{f-1} \notin E(G)$, then $d(x_{k-1}) \geq d(x_{f+1}) - 1$.

Clearly, $\{x, x_{n-1}, x_{k-1}\}$ is an EIS. If the Claim fails to hold, then by condition (ii) of the Theorem, we have

$$d(x_{n-1}) + 1 = |N(x_{n-1}) \cup N(x)| \geq n - \Delta\{x, x_{n-1}, x_{k-1}\}. \tag{8}$$

If $d(x_{k-1}) \geq d(x_{n-1})$, then inequality (8) becomes

$$d(x_{n-1}) + 1 = |N(x_{n-1}) \cup N(x)| \geq n - \Delta\{x, x_{n-1}, x_{k-1}\} = n - d(x_{k-1}).$$

Since Claim (A) fails to hold

$$n - d(x_{f-1}) > n - d(x_{f-1}).$$

Thus, $d(x_{n-1})+1 > n-d(x_{h-1})$, which implies that $d(x_{n-1})+d(x_{h-1}) > n-1$, which contradicts inequality (3) of the Claim.

If $d(x_{k-1}) < d(x_{n-1})$, then combined with the above hypothesis that $d(x_{n-1}) \leq d(x_{f-1})$, and that Claim (A) fails, we get that when $x_{k-1}x_f \in E(G)$, that

$$d(x_{f-1})+1 > d(x_{k-1})+1 \geq |N(x_{k-1}) \cup N(x)|. \tag{9}$$

When $x_{k-1}x_f \notin E(G)$, then we get that

$$d(x_{f-1})+1 > d(x_{k-1})+2 \geq |N(x_{k-1}) \cup N(x)|. \tag{10}$$

Now $|N(x_{k-1}) \cup N(x)| \geq n - \Delta\{x, x_{n-1}, x_{k-1}\} = n - d(x_{n-1})$, which implies that $d(x_{n-1}) + d(x_{f-1}) > n-1$. However, this contradicts inequality (3) of the Claim. Thus, Claim (A) is proved.

Claim (B): If $x_{t-1}x_n \in E(G)$, then $d(x_{t-1}) \geq d(x_{n-1})$. If $x_{t-1}x_n \notin E(G)$, then $d(x_{t-1}) \geq d(x_{n-1})-1$.

The proof of Claim (B) is similar to that of (A) and is omitted.

Then, when x_{k-1} is adjacent to x_f or x_{t-1} is adjacent to x_n, we have that

$$d(x_{k-1})+d(x_{t-1}) \geq d(x_{n-1})+d(x_{f-1})-1 = n-2.$$

This contradicts inequality 7.

When x_{k-1} is not adjacent to x_f and x_{t-1} is not adjacent to x_n, we have that

$$d(x_{k-1})+d(x_{t-1}) \geq d(x_{n-1})+d(x_{f-1})-2 = n-3.$$

Together with inequality (7), we have $d(x_{k-1})+d(x_{t-1}) = n-3$. Then clearly, $x_{k-1}x_{t-1} \notin E(G)$ and $x_{k-1}x_1 \notin E(G)$ and $x_{k-1}x_f \notin E(G)$. Since $x_{k-1}x_f \in E(G)$ and $x_{t-1}x_n \notin E(G)$, all of the vertices of $\{x_{k-1}, x_{t-1}, x_1, x_f\}$ are not adjacent to both x_{k-1} and x_{t-1}. Together with the fact that $d(x_{k-1})+d(x_{t-1}) = n-3$, we see both x_{k-1} and x_{t-1} must have at least one common neighbor. Thus, $\{x, x_{t-1}, x_{k-1}\}$ is an EIS. Without loss of generality, say $d(x_{t-1}) \geq d(x_{k-1})$.

By condition (ii) of the Theorem, we have

$$d(x_{k-1})+2 = |N(x_{k-1}) \cup N(x)| \geq n - \Delta\{x, x_{t-1}, x_{k-1}\} = n - d(x_{t-1}),$$

which implies $d(x_{k-1})+d(x_{t-1}) \geq n-2$,

a contradiction to inequality (7), completing the proof of the Theorem.

Acknowledgment: We would like to thank Dr. Shao who provided many helpful suggestions and thank Professor Hongjian Lai for his encouragement. The work of the first author was supported by the NSF of Hainan Province(no.10501).

References

[1] J.A. Bondy and U.S.R. Murty, Graph theory with applications, Macmillan London, New York,1976.

[2] G.T. Chen, Y. Egawa, X. Liu and A. Saito, Essential independent sets and Hamiltonian cycles, J. Graph Theory 21(1996), 243-250

[3] V Chvátal, P Erdös, A note on Hamiltonian circuits, Discrete Math. 2 (1972), 111-113.

[4] G.A. Dirac, Some theorems on abstract graphs, Proc. London Math.Soc.2(1952) 69-81.

[5] G.H. Fan, New sufficient conditions for cycles in graphs, J. Combin. Theory Ser.B 37 (1984), 221-227

[6] R.J. Faudree, R.J. Gould, M.S. Jacobson and R.H. Schelp, Neighborhood unions and Hamiltonian properties in graphs, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B 47 (1989), 1, 1-9.

[7] R.J. Faudree, R.J. Gould, M.S. Jacobson, R.H. Schelp and L. Lesniak, Neighborhood unions and highly Hamilton graphs, Ars Combinatoria 31(1991) 139-148.

[8] R.J. Gould, K. Zhao, A new sufficient condition for Hamiltonian graphs, Arkiv för Matematik, 44 (2006), 2, 299-308

[9] K. Hirohata, Essential independent sets and long cycles, Discrete Math. 250 (2002), 1-3, 109-123.

[10] X. Liu, B. Wei, A generalization of Bondy's and Fan's sufficient conditions for Hamiltonian graphs, Discrete Math. 169 (1997) 249-255

[11] O. Ore., Note on Hamiltonian circuits, Amer. Math. Monthly 67 (1960), 55.

[12] Z. Song and K. Zhang, Neighborhood unions and Hamiltonian properties, Discrete Math.133(1994) 319-324.