

A necessary and sufficient condition for a spanning tree with specified vertices having large degrees

YOSHIMI EGAWA* AND KENTA OZEKI[†]

Let G be a connected graph and let X be a subset of $V(G)$. Let f be a mapping from X to $\{2, 3, \dots\}$. In this talk, we concentrate on a spanning tree T in G such that $d_T(x) \geq f(x)$ for any $x \in X$, where $d_T(x)$ is the degree of x in T . For an easy notation, we call such a spanning tree an (X, f) -tree.

In particular, we will consider a necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of an (X, f) -tree. But, in general, it seems to be difficult to give it, because the problem of determining whether a graph G has an (X, f) -tree or not is at least as hard as the problem for a hamilton path, which is well-known as an NP -complete problem. Formally, when we would like to determine whether a given graph G has a hamilton path, we construct a graph G' by joining two new vertices to G , and let $X := V(G)$ and $f \equiv 2$. Then G has a hamilton path if and only if G' has an (X, f) -tree.

However, when we restrict X to an independent set, we can obtain a necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of an (X, f) -tree. Frank and Gyárfás, and independently, Kaneko and Yoshimoto gave the following result.

THEOREM 1. (Frank and Gyárfás [1], Kaneko and Yoshimoto [2]) *Let G be a connected graph, let $X \subseteq V(G)$ be an independent set, and let f be a mapping from X to $\{2, 3, \dots\}$. Then there exists an (X, f) -tree in G if and only if for any nonempty subset $S \subseteq X$,*

$$\left| \bigcup_{x \in S} N_G(x) \right| \geq \sum_{x \in S} f(x) - |S| + 1.$$

In the case where X is not an independent set, we similarly obtain the following necessary condition for the existence of an (X, f) -tree. For a vertex set $S \subseteq V(G)$, we denote the number of components of $G[S]$ by $\omega_G(S)$, where $G[S]$ is the subgraph of G induced by S .

PROPOSITION 2. *Let G be a connected graph, let $X \subseteq V(G)$ and let f be a mapping from X to $\{2, 3, \dots\}$. If there exists an (X, f) -tree in G , then for any nonempty*

*Department of Mathematical Information Science, Tokyo University of Science, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 162-8601, Japan.

[†]Department of Mathematics, Keio University, 3-14-1, Hiyoshi, Kohoku-ku, Yokohama 223-0061, Japan. E-mail: ozeki@comb.math.keio.ac.jp

subset $S \subseteq X$,

$$(1) \quad \left| \bigcup_{x \in S} N_G(x) - S \right| \geq \sum_{x \in S} f(x) - 2|S| + \omega_G(S) + 1.$$

Note that for an independent set X , the condition (1) is equivalent to the necessary condition in Theorem 1, because $\bigcup_{x \in S} N_G(x) - S = \bigcup_{x \in S} N_G(x)$ and $\omega_G(S) = |S|$.

One might expect that the condition (1) is also a sufficient condition. However, as mentioned before, it is impossible to show that (unless $P = NP$). In fact, even when X induces a path consisting of four vertices, there exists an example that satisfies the condition (1) but has no (X, f) -trees.

By the gap between the case of an independent set and that of a general vertex set, it is natural to ask why the gap appears, in other words, what properties guarantee the condition (1) is also a sufficient condition. The main purpose of this talk is to give an answer of this question by showing the following result; when $G[X]$ has no induced path of order four, the condition (1) is also a sufficient condition.

THEOREM 3. *Let G be a connected graph, and let $X \subseteq V(G)$ such that each component of $G[X]$ has no induced path of order four. Let f be a mapping from X to $\{2, 3, \dots\}$. Then there exists an (X, f) -tree in G if and only if for any nonempty subset $S \subseteq X$,*

$$\left| \bigcup_{x \in S} N_G(x) - S \right| \geq \sum_{x \in S} f(x) - 2|S| + \omega_G(S) + 1.$$

References

- [1] A. Frank and A. Gyarfas, How to orient the edges of a graph? *Colloq. Math. Soc. Janos Bolyai* **18** (1976) 353–364.
- [2] A. Kaneko and K. Yoshimoto, On spanning trees with restricted degrees, *Inform. Process. Lett.* **73** (2000) 163–165.