



1-1-2007

An s -Hamiltonian Line Graph Problem

Zhi-Hong Chen

Butler University, chen@butler.edu

Wai-Chee Shiu

Deying Li

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.butler.edu/facsch_papers



Part of the [Computer Sciences Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

An s -Hamiltonian Line Graph Problem, *Graphs and Combinatorics* 23, 241-248 (2007)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences at Digital Commons @ Butler University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Scholarship and Professional Work - LAS by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Butler University. For more information, please contact fgaede@butler.edu.

An s -Hamiltonian Line Graph Problem

Zhi-Hong Chen *

Butler University, Indianapolis, IN 46208

Hong-Jian Lai

West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV 26506

Wai-Chee Shiu

Hong Kong Baptist University, Hong Kong

Deying Li

People University, Beijing, P. R. China

February 11, 2006

Abstract

For an integer $k > 0$, a graph G is k -triangular if every edge of G lies in at least k distinct 3-cycles of G . In [J. Graph Theory, 11 (1987), 399-407], Broersma and Veldman proposed an open problem: For a given positive integer k , determine the value s for which the statement

Let G be a k -triangular graph. Then $L(G)$, the line graph of G , is s -hamiltonian if and only if $L(G)$ is $(s + 2)$ -connected

is valid. Broersma and Veldman proved in 1987 that the statement above holds for $0 \leq s \leq k$ and asked, specifically, that if the statement holds when $s = 2k$. In this paper, we proved that the statement above holds for $0 \leq s \leq \max\{2k, 6k - 16\}$.

1 Introduction

Graphs considered in this paper are simple and finite. Undefined terms and notations can be found in [2]. The line graph of a graph G , denoted by $L(G)$, has $E(G)$ as its vertex set, where two vertices in $L(G)$ are adjacent if and only if the corresponding edges in G are adjacent. An edge cut X of G is **essential** if each side of $G - X$ contains an edge. Note that G has an essential edge cut of size k if and only if $L(G)$ has a vertex cut of k vertices. For an integer $k \geq 0$, a graph G is **k -triangular** if every edge of G lies in at least k triangles of G . A graph G is **k -hamiltonian** if for every subset

*email: Chen@butler.edu

$U \subseteq V(G)$ such that $|U| \leq k$, $G - U$ is hamiltonian. Throughout this paper, for a graph G and an integer $i \geq 1$, $D_i(G)$ denotes the set of vertices of degree i in G .

In [1], Broersma and Veldman proposed an open problem: For a given positive integer k , determine the value s for which the statement

Let G be a k -triangular graph. Then $L(G)$, the line graph of G , is s -hamiltonian if and only $L(G)$ is $(s + 2)$ -connected.

is valid. Broersma and Veldman proved the following:

Theorem 1.1 (Broersma and Veldman, [1]) *Let $k \geq s \geq 0$ be integers and let G be a k -triangular simple graph. Then $L(G)$ is s -hamiltonian if and only $L(G)$ is $(s + 2)$ -connected.*

In [1], Broersma and Veldman asked the question if the conclusion of Theorem 1.1 remains valid for other values of s when k is given. In particular, they asked if Theorem 1.1 is still valid when $s = 2k$. In this paper, we investigate this problem and prove that s can be much larger than k , and prove the following main theorem.

Theorem 1.2 *Let k and s be positive integers such that $0 \leq s \leq \max\{2k, 6k - 16\}$, and let G be a k -triangular simple graph. Then $L(G)$ is s -hamiltonian if and only $L(G)$ is $(s + 2)$ -connected.*

As noted in [1], when $k = \delta(G) - 2$ and $s = 2k = 2\delta(G) - 4$, Theorem 1.2 implies the following former result.

Corollary 1.3 (Lesniak-Foster, [10]) *If G is a 2-connected simple graph with $\delta(G) \geq 4$, then $L(L(G))$ is $(2\delta(G) - 4)$ -hamiltonian.*

The technique employed in this paper is a modified version of Catlin's reduction method, different from that used in [1]. Section 2 provides certain backgrounds of the reduction method and their connection to the current problem. The proof for the main result is in Section 3.

2 Catlin's Reduction Method

For a graph G , $O(G)$ denotes the set of vertices of G with odd degree in G . A connected graph G is **eulerian** if $O(G) = \emptyset$. A subgraph H of a graph G is **dominating** if $G - V(H)$ is edgeless. A **dominating eulerian subgraph** is also called a DES, and a **spanning eulerian subgraph**

is also called an SES. Clearly, every SES of a graph G is a DES of G . A graph with as SES is also called a **supereulerian** graph. See Catlin's survey [4] and its update [7] for an overview of supereulerian graphs.

There is a close relationship between dominating eulerian subgraphs in graphs and hamilton cycles in $L(G)$.

Theorem 2.1 (Harary and Nash-Williams [9]) *Let G be a graph with $|E(G)| \geq 3$. Then $L(G)$ is hamiltonian if and only if G has a DES.*

To search for eulerian subgraphs with certain properties, Catlin in [3] invented the collapsible graphs. Let G be a graph and let $R \subseteq V(G)$ be a subset with $|R|$ even. A subgraph Γ of G is called an **R -subgraph** if $O(\Gamma) = R$ and $G - E(\Gamma)$ is connected. A graph G is **collapsible** if for any even subset R of $V(G)$, G has an R -subgraph. Catlin showed in [3] that every vertex of G lies in a unique maximal collapsible subgraph of G . The **reduction** of G is obtained from G by contracting all maximal collapsible subgraph. A graph G is **reduced** if G has no nontrivial collapsible subgraphs. A **nontrivial vertex** in a contraction of G is a vertex whose contraction preimage is a nontrivial connected subgraph of G . Note that if G has an $O(G)$ -subgraph Γ , then $G - E(\Gamma)$ is a spanning eulerian subgraph of G . Therefore, every collapsible graph is supereulerian. We summarize some results on Catlin's reduction method and other related facts as follows.

Theorem 2.2 *Let G be a graph and let H be a collapsible subgraph of G . Let v_H denote the vertex onto which H is contracted in G/H . Each of the following holds.*

(i) (Catlin, Theorem 3 of [3]) *G is collapsible (supereulerian, respectively) if and only if G/H is collapsible (supereulerian, respectively). In particular, G is supereulerian if and only if the reduction of G is supereulerian; and G is collapsible if and only if the reduction of G is K_1 .*

(ii) *Let G' be the reduction of G . Then G has a DES if and only if G' has a DES that contains all the nontrivial vertices of G' .*

(iii) *2-cycles and 3-cycles are collapsible.*

(iv) (Catlin, Han and Lai, [5]) *Let G be a 2-edge-connected reduced graph with $n > 1$ vertices. Then either $|D_2(G)| = n - 2$ or $2|D_2(G)| + |D_3(G)| \geq 10$. \square*

Theorem 2.3 (Chen, [6]) *Let M be a maximum matching of a connected reduced graph G , with $|V(G)| = n$, $\delta(G) \geq 2$ and $|D_2(G)| = l$. Then*

$$|M| \geq \min \left\{ \frac{n-1}{2}, \frac{n+4-l}{3} \right\}.$$

Theorem 2.4 (Chen and Lai, [8]) *Let G be a 3-edge-connected reduced graph with $|V(G)| \leq 13$. Then either G is supereulerian or G is the Petersen graph.*

3 The Proof of Main Result

Since any hamiltonian graph must be 2-connected, it is necessary that any s -hamiltonian graph be $(s + 2)$ -connected. Therefore, it suffices to show that if $L(G)$ is $(s + 2)$ -connected, then $L(G)$ is s -hamiltonian.

Throughout the rest of this section, k denotes a positive integer, G denotes a simple k -triangular graph and s denotes an integer with $0 \leq s \leq \max\{2k, 6k - 16\}$.

We argue by contradiction and assume that $L(G)$ is $(s + 2)$ -connected but $L(G)$ is not s -Hamiltonian. Therefore, there exists an edge subset $U \subset E(G)$ with $|U| = s$ such that $L(G) - U$ is not hamiltonian. Let $G_0 = (G - U) - (D_0(G - U) \cup D_1(G - U))$, and let G'_0 denote the reduction of G_0 . Note that each edge in G'_0 is also an edge in G . By Theorem 2.2(iii), every edge in $G - U$ lying in a cycle of length at most 3 in a collapsible subgraph of $G - U$. Since G is k -triangulated, every edge in G'_0 is adjacent to an edge of U in G . Then by Theorem 2.1 and by Theorem 2.2(i), we have

Lemma 3.1 *Each of the following holds.*

(i) G'_0 does not have an eulerian subgraph H such that H contains all nontrivial vertices as well as those vertices that are adjacent to a vertex in $D_1(G - U)$.

(ii) G'_0 is not supereulerian and not collapsible.

Proof By Theorem 2.2(ii), the subgraph H described in Lemma 3.1(i), if exists, would be corresponding to a DES of G , and so by Theorem 2.1, $L(G) - U$ would be hamiltonian, contrary to the assumption that $L(G) - U$ is not hamiltonian. As collapsible graphs are supereulerian, and as an SES of G'_0 satisfies the description for H , G'_0 cannot be supereulerian nor collapsible. \square

Lemma 3.2 G'_0 is 2-edge-connected.

Proof If G'_0 has more than one components, then U will contain an edge cut of G separating two edges of G , contrary to the assumption that $L(G)$ is $(s + 2)$ -connected. If G'_0 has a cut edge e , then e cannot be incident with a vertex in $D_1(G - U)$, for otherwise the degree one vertex would have been deleted in getting G_0 . Therefore, $U \cup \{e\}$ contains an edge cut of G separating two edges of G , contrary to the assumption that $L(G)$ is $(s + 2)$ -connected. \square

Let $e \in E(G)$. If e is incident with vertices u and v , then write $V(e) = \{u, v\}$. Denote $\mathcal{C}(e)$ to be the collection of 3-cycles in G that contains e and let

$$E(e) = \cup_{C \in \mathcal{C}(e)} E(C) - \{e\}.$$

Lemma 3.3 *Let X be an edge cut of G'_0 such that $G'_0 - X$ has two components G'_1 and G'_2 , let $i \in \{1, 2\}$, and let $e_i \in E(G'_i)$. Each of the following holds.*

(i) *If C_1, C_2 are two 3-cycles of G , then $C_1 = C_2$ if and only if $|E(C_1) \cap E(C_2)| \geq 2$.*

(ii) *If $e \in E(G)$, then $|E(e)| \geq 2k$.*

(iii) *If $e \in E(G'_0)$, then $|E(e) \cap U| \geq k$.*

(iv) *If $U \cup X$ is an edge cut of G , then $|(U \cup X) \cap C| = 2$, for any $C \in \mathcal{C}(e_1)$.*

(v) *If $U \cup X$ is an edge cut of G , then $|(U \cup X) \cap E(e_1)| \geq 2k$.*

(vi) *Fix an $i \in \{1, 2\}$. If $U \cup X$ is an edge cut of G and if $\{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_l\} \subseteq E(G'_i)$ induces a $K_{1,l}$ in G'_i , then $|(U \cup X) \cap (\cup_{j=1}^l E(e_j))| \geq (l+1)k$.*

Proof (i) follows from the assumption that G is a simple graph. By Lemma 3.3(i) and by the assumption that G is k -triangular, $|E(e)| \geq 2k$. Since $e \in E(G'_0)$ and since G'_0 is reduced, e lies in no 3-cycle of G'_0 , and so by (1), each member in $\mathcal{C}(e)$ must intersect U . Thus $|E(e) \cap U| \geq |\mathcal{C}(e)| \geq k$. This proves (ii) and (iii).

Since $e_1, e_2 \in E(G'_0)$, for any $C \in \mathcal{C}(e_i)$ ($i = 1, 2$), $C \cap (U \cup X) \neq \emptyset$. Since $U \cup X$ is an edge cut, Lemma 3.3(iv) follows from the fact that $|C \cap (U \cup X)|$ must be an even number. Lemma 3.3(v) and (vi) follow from Lemma 3.3(iv) and (iii). \square

Lemma 3.4 *G'_0 does not contain a 2 edge cut X of G'_0 such that each side of $G'_0 - X$ contains an edge or a nontrivial vertex or a vertex that is adjacent to a vertex in $D_1(G - U)$. In particular, $D_2(G'_0)$ is an independent set.*

Proof By contradiction, suppose that G'_0 has an edge cut X with $|X| = 2$ and let G'_1 and G'_2 denote the two components of $G'_0 - X$, and let G_1 and G_2 be the two components of $G_0 - X$ such that the reduction of G_i is G'_i , $1 \leq i \leq 2$. Note that each G_i contains an edge or a nontrivial vertex or a vertex that is adjacent to a vertex in $D_1(G - U)$. Since $L(G)$ is $(s+2)$ -connected, and since $|U| = s$, it must be the case that $U \cup X$ is an edge cut of G such that $G - U = G_0$ and such that $G - (U \cup X) = G_1 \cup G_2$. We have the following observations.

Claim 1 For each $i \in \{1, 2\}$, G'_i does not have an edge joining two vertices in $D_2(G'_i) \cup D_3(G'_i)$.

Suppose not. Then there exist $v_1, v_2 \in D_2(G'_i) \cup D_3(G'_i)$ such that $e_0 = v_1 v_2 \in E(G)$. Let X_1 be the set of edges in $G'_i - e_0$ incident with v_1 or v_2 . Then X_1 is an essential edge cut of G'_i . Since $L(G)$ is $(s+2)$ -connected, and since $|X_1| \leq 4$, there are at least $s-2$ edges in $U \cup X$ joining a vertex in the preimages of v_1 or v_2 to a vertex in G_{3-i} , and so there are at most 2 edges in $U \cup X$ not incident with a vertex in the preimages of v_1 and v_2 . Since G'_i contains no cycles of length less than 4 (Theorem 2.2(iii)), we can choose v_1 and v_2 so that G'_i has an edge e_1 not incident with v_1 nor v_2 . By Lemma 3.3(v), $|(U \cup X) \cap E(e_1)| \geq 2k$. Since e_1 is not adjacent with v_1 nor v_2 , and since there are at most 2 edges in $U \cup X$ not incident with a vertex in the preimages of v_1 and v_2 , we have $2 \geq 2k$, and so it must be $k = 1$. Hence $s \leq 2$ and $|U \cup X| \leq |U| + |X| = s + 2 \leq 4$. By Lemma 3.3(iv), each edge in $E(G'_i)$ must be adjacent to two edges in $U \cup X$, and by Theorem 2.2(iii),

G'_i cannot have a 2 or 3-cycle. It follows by Lemma 3.2 that G'_i must be a path with at most 4 vertices such that the two edges in X are incident with the two ends of the path in G'_i , respectively. Therefore, G'_0 is a cycle, contrary to Lemma 3.1(ii). This proves Claim 1.

Claim 2 For each $i \in \{1, 2\}$, $\Delta(G'_i) \leq 3$.

Suppose that for some $i \in \{1, 2\}$, $l = \Delta(G'_i) \geq 4$. Then G'_i has a vertex v which is adjacent to some vertices in $\{v_1, v_2, v_3, \dots, v_l\}$ in G'_i . By $l \geq 4 > |X| = 2$, by the fact that G'_i does not have a cycle of length less than 4 (Theorem 2.2(iii)) and since G'_0 is 2-edge-connected (Lemma 3.2), G'_i must have a vertex $u \in V(G'_i) - \{v, v_1, \dots, v_l\}$ such that u is adjacent to two vertices $u_1, u_2 \in V(G'_i) - \{v, v_1, v_2\}$, renaming the vertices if needed. Therefore, each of $\{v, v_1, v_2\}$ and $\{u, u_1, u_2\}$ induces a $K_{1,2}$ in G'_i and these two $K_{1,2}$'s are disjoint. Since $X \subseteq E(G'_0)$, for any $e \in \{vv_1, vv_2, uu_1, uu_2\}$, by Theorem 2.2(iii), $C(e) \cap X = \emptyset$. By Lemma 3.3(vi), we have $6k \leq |(U \cup X) \cap \cup_{j=1}^2 E(uu_j)| + |(U \cup X) \cap \cup_{j=1}^2 E(vv_j)| = |U| = s \leq \max\{2k, 6k - 16\}$, a contradiction. This proves Claim 2.

Note that by Claim 2, G'_i must have an edge joining two vertices in $D_2(G'_i) \cup D_3(G'_i)$, contrary to Claim 1. This proves the lemma. \square

Let \tilde{G} be a graph obtained from G'_0 by contracting exactly one edge incident with each vertex in $D_2(G'_0)$. By Lemma 3.4, \tilde{G} is 3-edge-connected. The following is straightforward.

Lemma 3.5 *If \tilde{G} has an eulerian subgraph L' such that $V(L')$ contains all nontrivial vertices as well as all vertices that are adjacent to a vertex in $D_1(G - U)$, then each of the following holds.*

- (i) $G - U$ has a DES, and
- (ii) $L(G) - U$ is hamiltonian.

Proof Note that L' can be lifted to an eulerian subgraph L in G'_0 , by adding edges (whenever necessary) that had been contracted in the process of getting \tilde{G} from G'_0 . By the definition of \tilde{G} and by Lemma 3.4, L is a DES of G'_0 that contains all nontrivial vertices as well as all vertices that are adjacent to a vertex in $D_1(G - U)$. It follows by Theorem 2.2(ii) that $G - U$ has a DES. By Theorem 2.1, $L(G) - U$ is hamiltonian. \square

Lemma 3.6 \tilde{G} cannot be contracted to the Petersen graph.

Proof By contradiction, assume that \tilde{G} can be contracted to P_{10} , the Petersen graph. Note that for any $z \in V(P_{10})$, P_{10} has a cycle containing all vertices in $V(P_{10}) - z$. If there is one vertex $z \in V(P_{10})$ which is a trivial vertex and is not adjacent to a vertex in $D_1(G - U)$, then any cycle of this P_{10} containing $V(P_{10}) - z$ corresponds to a DES of $G - U$, contrary to Lemma 3.1. Therefore, every vertex of P_{10} is either a nontrivial vertex or adjacent to a vertex in $D_1(G - U)$. Let $v_0 \in V(P_0)$ and let X denote set of the 3 edges incident with v_0 in P_{10} . Then X is an essential edge cut of $G - U$. It follows by the assumption that $L(G)$ is $(s + 2)$ -connected that all but at most one edge

in U are linking a vertex in one side of $G - (X \cup U)$ to a vertex in the other side. Let $U' \subseteq U$ be a subset such that $|U - U'| \leq 1$ and such that $U' \cup X$ is an edge cut of G .

Note that $P_{10} - v_0$ has 6 edges $e_1, e_2, \dots, e_6 \in E(P_{10} - v_0)$ such that $\{e_i, e_{i+3}\}$ induces a subgraph H_i isomorphic to a $K_{1,2}$ in $P_{10} - v_0$, where $1 \leq i \leq 3$, and such that the H_i 's are mutually vertex disjoint. By Lemma 3.3(iv), by $|U - U'| \leq 1$ and by the fact that P_{10} has no 4-cycle, the only edge in $U - U'$ may be adjacent to at most two members in $\{e_1, \dots, e_6\}$. Therefore by Lemma 3.3(vi) (with $l = 2$), we have $|(\cup_{i=1}^6 E(e_i)) \cap (U' \cup X)| \geq 9k - 2$. By $|U - U'| \leq 1$ again and by $|X| = 3$, $|(\cup_{i=1}^6 E(e_i) - U')| \leq 4$. It follows that

$$9k - 2 \leq |\cup_{i=1}^6 E(e_i)| \leq |U'| + 4 = s + 4 \leq \max\{2k, 6k - 16\} + 4 = \max\{2k + 4, 6k - 12\},$$

contrary to the assumption that $k \geq 1$. \square

We shall derive a contradiction by showing that \tilde{G} is supereulerian. Let \tilde{G}' denote the reduction of \tilde{G} . By Theorem 2.2(1), we may assume, by contradiction, that \tilde{G}' is not supereulerian. Note that \tilde{G}' is a 3-edge-connected reduced graph.

Claim 1 $k \geq 5$ and so $s \leq 6k - 16$.

If not, then $k \leq 4$, and so $s \leq 2k$. By Theorem 2.4 and by Lemma 3.6, we may assume that $|V(\tilde{G}')| \geq 14$. It follows by Theorem 2.3 that \tilde{G} has a matching M with $|M| \geq 6$. Note that M is also a matching of G'_0 . By Lemma 3.3(iii), for each $e \in M$, $|E(e) \cap U| \geq k$. Since $M \in E(\tilde{G}') \subseteq E(G'_0)$, every edges in M lies in no 3-cycles in \tilde{G}' (by Theorem 2.2(iii)), and so every edge in M must be adjacent to k edges in U . Denote $M = \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_6\}$. Construct a new graph H with 7 vertices u_0, u_1, \dots, u_6 , such that each u_i , $1 \leq i \leq 6$ represents the edge $e_i \in M$. There are t_{ij} edges joining u_i and u_j if and only if there are t_{ij} edges in U which are adjacent to both e_i and e_j ; and each u_i is linked to u_0 with t_i edges if and only if U has t_i edges that are adjacent only to e_i and not to any other edges in M . Since M is a matching, any edge in U cannot be adjacent to more than 2 edges in M , and so we may assume that $U = E(H)$. By Lemma 3.3(iii), every vertex in $V(H) - \{u_0\}$ has degree at least k , and so it follows that $4k \geq 2s = 2|U| = 2|E(H)| \geq 6k$, a contradiction. This contradiction proves Claim 1.

Claim 2 G does not have an independent set $\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_6\}$ such that v_1, v_2, \dots, v_6 are in the preimages of 6 distinct vertices in $D_3(\tilde{G}')$.

By contradiction, we assume that such vertices v_1, \dots, v_6 exist. For notational convenience, we also use v_i ($1 \leq i \leq 6$) to denote the vertex in $D_3(\tilde{G})$ whose preimage contains v_i . Assume that each v_i is incident with an edge $e_i \in E(\tilde{G}') \subseteq E(G'_0)$. By Lemma 3.3(iii), $|E(e_i) \cap U| \geq k$. Let $E_i \subset E(e_i) \cap U$ denote the edges in $G - e_i$ incident with the vertex v_i together with possibly two more edges in $E(e_i) \cap U$ that will form a member in $\mathcal{C}(e_i)$ with the two edges in \tilde{G}' that are incident with v_i (recall that $v_i \in D_3(\tilde{G}')$). Thus $|E_i| \geq k$. Since all the v_i are mutually nonadjacent in \tilde{G}' , and since G is simple, $|E_i \cap E_j| \leq 1$ whenever $i \neq j$, and so there are at most 15 edges which are lying in at most two members of the E_i 's. It follows that $6k - 15 \leq |\cup_{i=1}^6 E_i| \leq |U| = s$, contrary to Claim 1. This proves Claim 2.

By Theorem 2.2(iv) and by Claim 2, we may assume that there exist $v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4 \in V(G)$ which are in the preimages of 4 vertices in $D_3(\tilde{G}')$, respectively, such that $e_1 = v_1v_2, e_2 = v_3v_4 \in E(\tilde{G}')$. Let $e_i, e'_i, e''_i \in E(\tilde{G}')$ be the edges incident with the vertex in $D_3(\tilde{G}')$ whose preimage contains v_i , ($1 \leq i \leq 4$).

Then $X_1 = \{e'_1, e''_1, e'_2, e''_2\}$ is an essential edge cut of \tilde{G}' , and so $X_1 \cup U$ must contain an essential edge cut of G . Therefore, there exists a set $U_1 \subset U$ such that $X_1 \cup U_1$ is an essential edge cut of G . Similarly, $X_2 = \{e'_3, e''_3, e'_4, e''_4\}$ is an essential edge cut of \tilde{G}' , and so there exists a set $U_2 \subset U$ such that $X_2 \cup U_2$ is an essential edge cut of G . Since $L(G)$ is $(s+2)$ -connected, $|U_i| + 4 = |U_i \cup X_i| \geq s+2$, and so $|U_i| \geq s-2$. It follows by the Principle of Inclusion and Exclusion that $|U_1 \cap U_2| \geq |U_1| + |U_2| - |U| \geq s-4$. Note that every edge in $U_1 \cap U_2$ must have its ends in the preimages of the vertices containing v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4 .

Since \tilde{G}' is 3-edge-connected with at least 10 vertices (Theorem 2.2(iv)), there exists an edge $e \in E(\tilde{G}')$ that is not adjacent to e_1 nor e_2 . By Lemma 3.3(iii), $k \leq |E(e) \cap U| = |E(e) \cap (U - U_1 \cap U_2)| \leq |U - U_1 \cap U_2| \leq 4$, contrary to Claim 1. Therefore \tilde{G}' must be supereulerian, and so by Theorem 2.2 and by Theorem 2.4, \tilde{G} must be supereulerian. Thus by Lemma 3.5, $L(G) - U$ must be hamiltonian. This proves Theorem 1.2. \square

References

- [1] H. J. Broersma and H. J. Veldman, 3-connected line graphs of triangular graphs are panconnected and 1-hamiltonian, *J. Graph Theory*, 11 (1987), 399-407.
- [2] J. A. Bondy and U. S. R. Murty, “*Graph Theory with Applications*”. American Elsevier (1976).
- [3] P. A. Catlin, A reduction method to find spanning eulerian subgraphs, *J. Graph Theory* **12** (1988) 29 - 45.
- [4] P. A. Catlin, Supereulerian graphs: A survey, *J. Graph Theory*, 16 (1992) 177 - 196.
- [5] P. A. Catlin, Z. Han and H.-J. Lai, Graphs without spanning closed trails, *Discrete Math.*, 160 (1996) 81-91.
- [6] Z.-H. Chen, Spanning closed trails in graphs, *Discrete Math.*, 117 (1993) 57-71.
- [7] Z.-H. Chen and H.-J. Lai, Reduction Techniques for Supereulerian Graphs and Related Topics—A Survey. in: Ku Tung-Hsin (ed.) *Combinatorics and Graph Theory '95 Vol.1*, World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd. 1995, pp. 53-69
- [8] Z.-H. Chen and H.-J. Lai, Supereulerian graph and the Petersen graph, II. *Ars Combinatoria*, 48 (1998) 271-282.
- [9] F. Harary and C. St. J. A. Nash-Williams, On eulerian and hamiltonian graphs and line graphs. *Canad. Math. Bull.* 8 (1965), 701-710.

- [10] Lesniak-Foster, On n -hamiltonian line graphs. J. Combin. Theory, Ser. B, 22 (1977) 263-273.