



Decomposing graphs into a spanning tree, an even graph, and a star forest

Lyngsie, Kasper Szabo; Merker, Martin

Published in:
The Electronic Journal of Combinatorics

Publication date:
2019

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link back to DTU Orbit](#)

Citation (APA):
Lyngsie, K. S., & Merker, M. (2019). Decomposing graphs into a spanning tree, an even graph, and a star forest. *The Electronic Journal of Combinatorics*, 26(1), Article P1.33.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Decomposing graphs into a spanning tree, an even graph, and a star forest

Kasper Szabo Lyngsie Martin Merker*

Department of Applied Mathematics and Computer Science
Technical University of Denmark
Lyngby, Denmark

{ksly,marmer}@dtu.dk

Submitted: Jun 29, 2018; Accepted: Feb 21, 2019; Published: Mar 8, 2019

© The authors. Released under the CC BY-ND license (International 4.0).

Abstract

We prove that every connected graph can be edge-decomposed into a spanning tree, an even graph, and a star forest.

Mathematics Subject Classifications: 05C05, 05C38

1 Introduction

All graphs in this paper are simple and finite. A decomposition of a graph G is a collection of edge-disjoint subgraphs whose union is G . A graph is called *even* if every vertex has even degree. It is easy to see that every graph can be decomposed into a forest and an even graph. In 1979, Malkevitch [9] studied cubic graphs which admit such a decomposition where the forest is a spanning tree. In this case it is equivalent to the existence of a spanning tree containing no vertices of degree 2. Such a spanning tree is called *homeomorphically irreducible*, or a *HIST*.

For general graphs, the existence of a HIST is much less restrictive than the existence of a decomposition into a spanning tree and an even graph. However, even the existence of a HIST is not guaranteed by large connectivity or regularity, as was shown by Albertson et al. [3]. Douglas [5] showed that it is NP-complete to decide whether a planar subcubic graph contains a HIST.

In cubic graphs, the removal of the edges of a spanning tree results in a collection of cycles and paths. Hoffmann-Ostenhof [4] (see also [6]) conjectured that the spanning tree can be chosen such that the collection of paths is a matching.

*Supported by the Danish Council for Independent Research, Natural Sciences, grant DFF-1323-00178, AlgoDisc.

Conjecture 1 (3-Decomposition Conjecture). Every connected cubic graph can be decomposed into a spanning tree, a collection of cycles, and a matching.

Akbari, Jensen, and Siggers [2] showed that any cubic graph has a decomposition into a spanning forest, a collection of cycles, and a matching. Abdolhosseini et al. [1] verified the 3-Decomposition Conjecture for traceable cubic graphs and Ozeki and Ye [10] verified it for 3-connected planar cubic graphs. The latter was extended by Hoffmann-Ostenhof, Kaiser, and Ozeki [7] to all planar cubic graphs. The following theorem is the main result of our paper and is in some sense a generalization of the 3-Decomposition Conjecture to the class of all connected graphs.

Theorem 2. *Every connected graph can be decomposed into a spanning tree, an even subgraph, and a star forest.*

As a special case our result implies that every cubic graph has a decomposition into a spanning tree, a collection of cycles, and a collection of paths of length at most 2. This was previously shown by Li and Cui [8].

One might be tempted to think that every connected graph admits a decomposition into a spanning tree, an even graph, and a matching. However, this is easily seen to be false since the complete bipartite graph $K_{2,n}$ has no such decomposition. Such a decomposition is also not guaranteed if we restrict our attention to regular graphs.

Theorem 3. *For each $r \geq 4$, there exists an r -regular connected graph which has no decomposition into a spanning tree, an even graph, and a matching.*

Proof. Let $r \geq 4$ be given and let G be the graph obtained from K_{r+1} by subdividing each edge once. Let G' be a graph obtained from K_{r+1} by subdividing $r - 2$ edges once and adding an edge between each pair of vertices of degree 2. For each vertex v of degree 2 in G , let G_v denote a copy of G' . Now let G'' be obtained from the disjoint union of G and all the graphs G_v by adding edges between v and the vertices of degree $r - 1$ in G_v , for each vertex v of degree 2 in G . Note that G'' is r -regular and any decomposition of G'' into a spanning tree, an even graph, and a matching also induces such a decomposition of G . Clearly, the even graph cannot contain any edges of G , therefore this corresponds to a decomposition of G into a spanning tree and a matching. The graph G has $r(r + 1)$ edges, and every spanning tree of G has $r + \frac{r(r+1)}{2}$ edges, thus the matching has to contain at least $\frac{r(r-1)}{2} \geq r + 2$ edges. However, the size of a maximal matching in G is $r + 1$, so G cannot be decomposed into a spanning tree and a matching. \square

The construction in the proof above shows that for r -regular graphs the size of the stars in the forest in Theorem 2 grows at least linearly in r .

2 Proof of Theorem 2

Before we begin the proof of our main theorem, we introduce a few definitions.

Definition 4 (separating cycle). A cycle C in a connected graph G is called **separating** if $G - E(C)$ is disconnected.

Note that in the literature a cycle is called separating in a graph if the removal of its vertex-set results in a disconnected graph, while for us the removal of its edge-set is relevant. In particular, every cycle containing a vertex of degree 2 is separating.

Definition 5 (fragile). A graph G is called **fragile**, if G is connected and every cycle of G is separating.

Fragile graphs have also been investigated in the context of planar graphs by Hoffmann-Ostenhof et al. [7]. Their 2-Decomposition Conjecture, which is equivalent to Conjecture 1, states that every subcubic fragile graph can be decomposed into a spanning tree and a matching.

Note that if we remove an even subgraph H such that $G - E(H)$ is connected and if we choose such a subgraph of maximal size, then $G - E(H)$ is fragile. In particular, every connected graph decomposes into an even graph and a fragile graph. Therefore it is sufficient to prove that every fragile graph has a decomposition into a spanning tree and a star forest. For brevity, we introduce the following notation.

Definition 6 (starlit). A spanning tree T of a graph G is called **starlit** if $G - E(T)$ is a star forest.

All we need to show is that every fragile graph contains a starlit spanning tree. We prove an even stronger result, where we prescribe that all edges at a specified vertex belong to the spanning tree in the decomposition.

Definition 7 (v -full). A spanning tree T of a graph G is called **v -full** for some vertex v in G , if all edges incident with v in G are also in T .

We can now state the theorem we are going to prove.

Theorem 8. *If v is a vertex in a fragile graph G , then G has a starlit v -full spanning tree.*

As already discussed, Theorem 2 follows immediately from Theorem 8. We finish this section by proving Theorem 8.

Proof of Theorem 8. Let G be a counterexample of minimal size.

Claim 1: G is 2-connected.

Proof. Suppose the claim is false and u is a cutvertex in G . Let K be a component of $G - u$, let G_1 denote the subgraph of G induced by $V(K) \cup \{u\}$, and let G_2 denote the graph induced by the edges in $G - E(G_1)$. We can assume that $v \in V(G_1)$. Clearly G_1 and G_2 are fragile and contain fewer edges than G , so G_1 contains a starlit v -full spanning tree T_1 , and G_2 contains a starlit u -full spanning tree T_2 . Now the union of T_1 and T_2 is a starlit v -full spanning tree in G . \square

Note that Claim 1 implies that the minimum degree of G is at least 2.

Claim 2: There are no adjacent vertices of degree 2 in G .

Proof. Suppose x and y are two adjacent vertices of degree 2 and let z denote the neighbour of y different from x . We may assume without loss of generality that $v \neq y$. The graph $G' = G - xy$ is fragile, so by minimality of G there exists a starlit v -full spanning tree T' of G' . If $v \neq x$, then $T = T'$ is also a starlit v -full spanning tree of G . If $v = x$, then we choose instead a starlit z -full spanning tree T'' of G' . Now $T'' + xy - yz$ is a starlit v -full spanning tree of G . \square

Let H be the subgraph of G induced by the vertices of degree at least 3.

Claim 3: H contains no isolated vertices and no cycles of length 3.

Proof. Suppose u is an isolated vertex in H . That is, u is a vertex of degree at least 3 in G all of whose neighbours have degree 2.

First, suppose $u = v$. Let x be a neighbour of u , and y the neighbour of x different from u . By Claim 2, y has degree at least 3 and is therefore not adjacent to u . Let G' be the graph obtained from G by removing x and adding the edge uy . Since u has only one neighbour of degree greater than 2 in G' , every cycle through u is still separating. Thus, G' is fragile and contains a starlit u -full spanning tree T' . Now $T = T' - uy + ux + xy$ is a starlit u -full spanning tree of G .

Thus we can assume $u \neq v$. The graph $G' = G - u$ is connected by Claim 1. Clearly G' is fragile and therefore contains a v -full starlit spanning tree T' . If v is a neighbour of u , then $T = T' + uv$ is a starlit v -full spanning tree of G . If v is not a neighbour of u , then adding an arbitrary edge incident with u to T' results in a starlit v -full spanning tree of G . This contradiction shows that the minimum degree of H is at least 1.

Finally, suppose H contains a cycle C of length 3. Since every vertex of C has degree at least 3, and since G is 2-connected, it is easy to see that C is not separating, which contradicts G being fragile. \square

For $u \in V(H)$, we write $d_H(u)$ to denote the degree of u in H and $d_G(u)$ for its degree in G .

Claim 4: If u is a vertex in H different from v , then $d_H(u) \geq 2$.

Proof. Suppose u is a vertex of degree 1 in H , $u \neq v$, and x is the neighbour of u in H . Let $G' = G - u$. First, suppose that v is not a degree 2 vertex adjacent to u in G . By Claim 1, the graph G' is fragile, so it has a starlit v -full spanning tree T' by minimality of G . Now $T = T' + ux$ is a v -full starlit spanning tree of G . Thus, we can assume that v has degree 2 and is a neighbour of u in G . Let T'' be a starlit x -full spanning tree of G' . Clearly $T = T'' + uv$ is a v -full spanning tree of G . Since T'' is x -full, the spanning tree T is also starlit, contradicting our choice of G . \square

Claim 4 implies that there exists a cycle in H . The following claim shows that there are at most two vertices in H which have degree less than 3 in H .

Claim 5: If $u \in V(H)$ and $d_H(u) = 2$, then either $u = v$ or $d_G(v) = 2$ and $uv \in E(G)$.

Proof. Suppose u is a vertex of degree 2 in H , $u \neq v$, and $d_G(v) \geq 3$ or $uv \notin E(G)$. Let x and y denote the neighbours of u in H . Note that all other neighbours of u in G have degree 2. Let G' be the graph obtained from $G - u$ by adding the edge xy . Claim 1 implies that G is connected and Claim 3 implies that G' has no multiple edges. For a cycle C' in G' containing xy , the corresponding cycle C in G , which is obtained from C' by replacing xy with the path xuy , is separating if and only if C' is separating. Thus, G' is fragile and contains a starlit v -full spanning tree T' . If $xy \in E(T')$, then $T = T' - xy + ux + uy$ is a starlit v -full spanning tree in G . Thus, we can assume $xy \notin E(T')$. Since $G' - E(T')$ is a star forest, at least one of x and y has degree 1 in $G' - E(T')$, say x . Now $T = T' + uy$ is a starlit v -full spanning tree in G . \square

Let C be a cycle in H for which the component of $G - E(C)$ containing v has maximal size. Note that C is induced. Let K denote the component of $G - E(C)$ containing v .

Claim 6: $H \subseteq K \cup C$.

Proof. Since C is chordless, it suffices to show $V(H) \subseteq V(K \cup C)$. Suppose u is a vertex in H which is not in K or C . Let L denote the component of $G - E(C)$ containing u . There exists no cycle in $L \cap H$ since that cycle would contradict the choice of C . Claim 4 now implies that L contains a path P joining two vertices a and b on C such that all intermediate vertices are in $V(H) \setminus V(C)$. Let P_1 and P_2 be the two edge-disjoint subpaths of C joining a and b . We may assume that P_2 contains a vertex of K . Now the cycle formed by the union of P and P_1 contradicts the choice of C . \square

Since G is fragile, the graph $G - E(C)$ is disconnected so there is a vertex u on C which is not in K . Since C is induced, the vertex u has exactly two neighbours on C . Claim 6 implies that all neighbours of u not on C have degree 2. Now $d_H(u) = 2$ and $u \neq v$. By Claim 5, we have $d_G(v) = 2$ and $uv \in E(G)$, which implies that u is in K , contradicting our choice of u . \square

References

- [1] F. ABDOLHOSSEINI, S. AKBARI, H. HASHEMI, AND M. MORADIAN, *Hoffmann-Ostenhof's conjecture for traceable cubic graphs*, [arXiv:1607.04768](https://arxiv.org/abs/1607.04768), (2016).
- [2] S. AKBARI, T. R. JENSEN, AND M. SIGGERS, *Decompositions of graphs into trees, forests, and regular subgraphs*, *Discrete Mathematics*, 338 (2015), pp. 1322 – 1327.
- [3] M. O. ALBERTSON, D. M. BERMAN, J. P. HUTCHINSON, AND C. THOMASSEN, *Graphs with homeomorphically irreducible spanning trees*, *Journal of Graph Theory*, 14 (1990), pp. 247–258.

- [4] P. J. CAMERON, *Research problems from the BCC22*, Discrete Mathematics, 311 (2011), pp. 1074 – 1083.
- [5] R. J. DOUGLAS, *NP-completeness and degree restricted spanning trees*, Discrete Mathematics, 105 (1992), pp. 41 – 47.
- [6] A. HOFFMANN-OSTENHOF, *Nowhere-zero flows and structures in cubic graphs*, PhD thesis, University of Vienna, 2011.
- [7] A. HOFFMANN-OSTENHOF, T. KAISER, AND K. OZEKI, *Decomposing planar cubic graphs*, Journal of Graph Theory, 88 (2018), pp. 613–640.
- [8] R. LI, AND Q. CUI, *Spanning trees in subcubic graphs*, Ars Combinatoria, 117 (2014), pp. 411–415.
- [9] J. MALKEVITCH, *Spanning trees in polytopal graphs*, Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 319 (1979), pp. 362–367.
- [10] K. OZEKI AND D. YE, *Decomposing plane cubic graphs*, European Journal of Combinatorics, 52 (2016), pp. 40 – 46.