



HAL
open science

Decomposition into cycles I: Hamilton decompositions

Brian Alspach, Jean-Claude Bermond, Dominique Sotteau

► **To cite this version:**

Brian Alspach, Jean-Claude Bermond, Dominique Sotteau. Decomposition into cycles I: Hamilton decompositions. Workshop on Cycles and Rays, 1987, Montreal, Canada. pp.9-18. hal-03013446

HAL Id: hal-03013446

<https://inria.hal.science/hal-03013446>

Submitted on 18 Nov 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

DECOMPOSITION INTO CYCLES I: HAMILTON DECOMPOSITIONS

B. ALSPACH

Department of Mathematics and Statistics
Simon Fraser University
Burnaby, B.C., V5A 1S6
Canada

J.-C. BERMOND*, D. SOTTEAU

C.N.R.S., UA410 Informatique
Bât. 490
Université Paris-Sud
91405 Orsay
France

Abstract

In this part we survey the results concerning the partitions of the edge-set of a graph into Hamilton cycles or into Hamilton cycles and a single perfect matching.

By and large the terminology of [15] will be followed. The topic under discussion is the partitioning of the edge-set of a graph into Hamilton cycles. An obvious necessary condition for such a partition to exist is that the graph be regular of even degree. However, if a graph is regular of odd degree, then the closest one can come to such a partition is a partition of the edge-set into a single perfect matching (also called a 1-factor) and Hamilton cycles. The following definition is used in order to incorporate odd degree and even degree into a single definition.

Definition 1 Let G be a regular graph with edge-set $E(G)$. It is said to have a *Hamilton decomposition* (or be *Hamilton decomposable*) if either

- (i) $\deg(G) = 2d$ and $E(G)$ can be partitioned into d Hamilton cycles, or
- (ii) $\deg(G) = 2d + 1$ and $E(G)$ can be partitioned into d Hamilton cycles and a perfect matching.

*This article was written while the second author was visiting Simon Fraser University; support of Advanced Systems Foundations and Simon Fraser University is gratefully acknowledged.

The earliest results about Hamilton decompositions deal with the complete graph K_n and are attributed to Walecki in [32].

Theorem 1 *The complete graph K_n has a Hamilton decomposition for all n .*

Proof: The following functional notation makes Walecki's construction easy to describe. If H is a subgraph of the graph K_n and $f : V(H) \rightarrow V(G)$ is a 1-1 function, then $f(H)$ denotes the subgraph of K_n whose vertex-set is $f(V(H))$ where $f(u)$ is adjacent to $f(v)$ in $f(H)$ if and only if u is adjacent to v in H . The result is trivially true for $n = 1$ and $n = 2$. Let $n = 2m + 1 \geq 3$ be odd. Let the vertices of K_n be labelled $u_0, u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{2m}$, let C be the Hamilton cycle $u_0 u_1 u_2 u_{2m} u_3 u_{2m-1} u_4 u_{2m-2} \dots u_{m+3} u_m u_{m+2} u_{m+1} u_0$ and let σ be the permutation $(u_0)(u_1 u_2 u_3 u_4 \dots u_{2m-1} u_{2m})$. Then $C, \sigma(C), \sigma^2(C), \dots, \sigma^{m-1}(C)$ is a Hamilton decomposition of K_n .

When $n = 2m \geq 4$ is even, let C be the Hamilton cycle

$$u_0 u_1 u_2 u_{2m-1} u_3 u_{2m-2} \dots u_{m-1} u_{m+2} u_m u_{m+1} u_0$$

and let σ be the permutation $(u_0)(u_1 u_2 u_3 \dots u_{2m-2} u_{2m-1})$. Then, $C, \sigma(C), \dots, \sigma^{m-2}(C)$ are $m-1$ edge disjoint Hamilton cycles. The remaining edges $u_0 u_m, u_{m-1} u_{m+1}, u_{m-2} u_{m+2}, \dots, u_1 u_{2m-1}$ form a perfect matching. \square

Corollary 1 *The complete graph K_{2m} has a decomposition into Hamilton paths.*

Proof: Simply take a Hamilton decomposition of K_{2m+1} and remove a vertex and its incident edges from K_{2m+1} . \square

The above constructions of Walecki have been used in a wide variety of settings. One of them leads to the following problem. Consider the Walecki construction for the Hamilton decomposition of K_{2m+1} , $m \geq 1$. There are m Hamilton cycles each of which may be oriented in two ways to produce a Hamilton directed cycle. If each of the m Hamilton cycles is given an orientation, the resulting regular tournament is called a *Walecki tournament*. There are 2^m different orientation schemes but different orientations may produce isomorphic tournaments.

Problem 1 (Alspach) *Enumerate the Walecki tournaments of order $2m + 1$.*

The results about the complete graph lead one to consider just how large the degree of a regular graph must be before it is guaranteed to have a Hamilton decomposition.

Kotzig (unpublished) conjectured that any self-complementary regular graph of order $4k + 1$ has a Hamilton decomposition. This is a particular case of:

Conjecture 1 (Nash-Williams [35]) *Every $2k$ -regular graph with at most $4k + 1$ vertices has a Hamilton decomposition.*

A very strong result has been obtained recently by Häggkvist [20] who has proved that for any $p < 4$ every sufficiently large $2k$ -regular graph with at most pk vertices has a Hamilton decomposition.

Most of the remaining results that deal with Hamilton decompositions of graphs involve various products of graphs. Since terminology for products is not uniform, the definitions are included.

The *cartesian product* $G_1 \times G_2$ of G_1 and G_2 (also called the cartesian sum) has vertex-set $V(G_1) \times V(G_2)$ with (u_1, u_2) adjacent to (v_1, v_2) if and only if either $u_1 = v_1$ and u_2 is adjacent to v_2 in G_2 or $u_2 = v_2$ and u_1 is adjacent to v_1 in G_1 .

The *lexicographic product* $G_1 \otimes G_2$ of G_1 and G_2 (also called the composition, or tensor product, or wreath product) is the graph with vertex-set $V(G_1) \times V(G_2)$ and an edge joining (u_1, u_2) to (v_1, v_2) if and only if either u_1 is adjacent to v_1 in G_1 or $u_1 = v_1$ and u_2 is adjacent to v_2 in G_2 .

The *conjunction* $G_1 \cdot G_2$ of G_1 and G_2 (also called the cartesian product) is the graph with vertex-set $V(G_1) \times V(G_2)$ and an edge joining (u_1, u_2) to (v_1, v_2) if and only if both u_1 and v_1 are adjacent in G_1 and u_2 and v_2 are adjacent in G_2 .

The cartesian product has probably attracted the most attention and the following conjecture is the prominent unsolved problem.

Conjecture 2 (Bermond [10]) *If G_1 and G_2 have decompositions into Hamilton cycles, then so does $G_1 \times G_2$.*

The above conjecture is a general version of earlier conjectures and results. Kotzig [29] proved that $C_r \times C_n$ can be decomposed into two Hamilton cycles and conjectured that $C_r \times C_s \times C_n$ could be decomposed into three Hamilton cycles. The latter conjecture was solved by Foregger [19]. Kotzig also conjectured that if G_1, G_2, \dots, G_p can all be decomposed into n Hamilton cycles then $G_1 \times G_2 \times \dots \times G_p$ can be decomposed into pn Hamilton cycles. Independent of any knowledge of Kotzig's conjecture, Myers [34] proved that $C_r \times C_r$ and $K_r \times K_r$ have Hamilton decompositions.

Ringel [36] earlier proved that the 2^n -cube, $n \geq 1$, has a Hamilton decomposition and posed the problem of whether or not the $2n$ -cube has a Hamilton decomposition for $n \geq 1$ [36, Problem 2]. Some recent work disposes of Ringel's problem and unifies the above work.

Theorem 2 (Aubert and Schneider [5]) *If C is a cycle and G is a 4-regular graph which is decomposable into two Hamilton cycles, then $C \times G$ can be decomposed into three Hamilton cycles.*

The proof of Theorem 2 is constructive and has a handful of cases to consider. It has several corollaries, including the results below, which we now state.

Corollary 2 *If G_1 has a decomposition into n_1 Hamilton cycles and G_2 has a decomposition into n_2 Hamilton cycles, where $n_1 \leq n_2 \leq 2n_1$, then $G_1 \times G_2$ has a Hamilton decomposition.*

Proof: Let \oplus denote edge disjoint union of spanning subgraphs. Then $G_1 = H_1 \oplus H_2 \oplus \dots \oplus H_{n_1}$ and $G_2 = H'_1 \oplus H'_2 \oplus \dots \oplus H'_{n_2}$ where the H_i 's and H'_i 's are Hamilton cycles. Then letting $n_2 = n_1 + d$,

$$G_1 \times G_2 = (H_1 \times (H'_1 \oplus H'_{n_1+1})) \oplus (H_2 \times (H'_2 \oplus H'_{n_1+2})) \oplus \dots \\ \oplus (H_d \times (H'_d \oplus H'_{n_1+d})) \oplus (H_{d+1} \times H'_{d+1}) \oplus \dots \oplus (H_{n_1} \times H'_{n_1}).$$

Each of the terms in the preceding expression has a Hamilton decomposition by either Theorem 2 or Kotzig's result. The result then follows. \square

Corollary 3 *The cartesian product $C_{i_1} \times C_{i_2} \times \dots \times C_{i_n}$ has a Hamilton decomposition.*

Proof: This follows easily by induction on n . The initial values are handled by Kotzig's result and Theorem 2 or Foregger's result. For larger n write

$$C_{i_1} \times C_{i_2} \times \dots \times C_{i_n} = (C_{i_1} \times \dots \times C_{i_m}) \times (C_{i_{m+1}} \times \dots \times C_{i_n})$$

where $m = \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$. □

Proposition 1 *The n -cube has a Hamilton decomposition for all n .*

Proof: For even n , the n -cube is nothing more than $C_4 \times C_4 \times \dots \times C_4$ so that the result follows from Corollary 3. For odd n , view the n -cube as two $(n-1)$ -cubes joined by a perfect matching. Remove one edge from each Hamilton cycle of a Hamilton decomposition of the $(n-1)$ -cube so that the removed edges have no vertices in common. Do the same for the other $(n-1)$ -cube. Use the perfect matching to form Hamilton cycles in the n -cube. This can always be done [3] so that the n -cube has a Hamilton decomposition. □

From 9 it follows also that Kotzig's conjecture above is true.

Corollary 4 *If G_1, G_2, \dots, G_p can all be decomposed into n Hamilton cycles, then $G_1 \times G_2 \times \dots \times G_p$ can be decomposed into pn Hamilton cycles.*

There has been some recent progress on Conjecture 2 by Stong [38]. His results are summarized below.

Theorem 3 *If G_1 has a decomposition into n_1 Hamilton cycles and G_2 has a decomposition into n_2 Hamilton cycles, $n_1 \leq n_2$, then $G_1 \times G_2$ has a Hamilton decomposition if any one of the following is true:*

- (i) $n_2 \leq 3n_1$,
- (ii) $n_1 \geq 3$,
- (iii) G_1 has an even number of vertices, or
- (iv) $|V(G_2)| \geq 6 \lfloor \frac{n_2}{n_1} \rfloor - 3$.

Aubert and Schneider also proved the following result [6].

Theorem 4 *The cartesian product $K_n \times K_m$ has a Hamilton decomposition for all n and m .*

Alspach and Rosenfeld [4] studied the cartesian product of a cubic graph and K_2 for Hamilton decomposability. They give a necessary and sufficient condition which implies that $G \times K_2$ has a Hamilton decomposition if G is cubic and has a perfect 1-factorization, that is, G has a 1-factorization such that the union of any pair of 1-factors is a Hamilton cycle. They asked for other conditions on a cubic graph G that guarantee that $G \times K_2$ has a Hamilton decomposition. The following example is one condition that one might suggest.

Question 1 (Alspach and Rosenfeld [4]) *If G is a 3-connected cubic graph having a Hamilton cycle, does $G \times K_2$ have a Hamilton decomposition?*

A first result about the lexicographic product is the following.

Theorem 5 (Auerbach and Laskar [8] and Hetyei [21]) *The complete multipartite graph $K_{r;s}$ has a Hamilton decomposition.*

A general study of Hamilton decomposition of complete regular s -partite graphs has been done by Hilton and Roger [22].

The analogue of Conjecture 2 for lexicographic products asked in [10] has been solved.

Theorem 6 (Baranyai and Szasz [9]) *If G_1 can be decomposed into m_1 Hamilton cycles, G_2 can be decomposed into m_2 Hamilton cycles and G_2 has n vertices, then $G_1 \otimes G_2$ can be decomposed into $m_2 + m_1 n$ Hamilton cycles.*

The preceding result supercedes several special cases that had been proved earlier. For example, the statement of the theorem does not indicate what happens in the degenerate case that $G_2 = \overline{K}_n$ (the complement of K_n). The result is still true in this case and follows easily from the following result.

Theorem 7 (Laskar [31] and Hetyei [21]) *The graph $C_r \otimes \overline{K}_n$ has a Hamilton decomposition.*

However, the generalization of Theorem 7 to arbitrary Hamilton decomposable graphs is unsettled. That is, if G_1 is connected and has a decomposition into Hamilton cycles and a perfect matching, it is not known whether or not $G_1 \otimes G_2$ has a Hamilton decomposition. On the other hand, if G_1 has a decomposition into one or more Hamilton cycles and G_2 is Hamilton decomposable, then $G_1 \otimes G_2$ has a Hamilton decomposition.

In [10] Bermond has shown that the following two results hold.

Theorem 8 *The conjunction of two cycles $C_r \cdot C_s$ can be decomposed into two Hamilton cycles if and only if at least one of r and s is odd.*

Corollary 5 *If both G_1 and G_2 can be decomposed into Hamilton cycles and one of G_1 or G_2 has odd order, then the conjunction $G_1 \cdot G_2$ has a Hamilton decomposition.*

Many of the special cases discussed above are, in fact, Cayley graphs on abelian groups. This led Alspach [2] to ask the following question.

Question 2 (Alspach [2]) *Does every connected Cayley graph on an abelian group have a Hamilton decomposition?*

If the degree of the graph is 2, then the answer is obviously yes. If the degree is 3, the answer is again yes since such a graph has a Hamilton cycle as proved by many authors (see the survey of Witte and Galian [42]). The case of degree 4 recently has been solved by Bermond, Favaron and Maheo [13] and the answer is again yes. The answer is also yes for degree 5 [3]. In the case of degree 4, when the group is the additive group of integers modulo n , the Cayley graphs are known as double loop graphs and the problem was asked by Bermond, Illiades and Peyrat [14]. More generally the construction of graphs admitting a decomposition into k Hamilton cycles and having the smallest diameter possible is an open problem arising in the context of computer loop networks (see the survey by Bermond, Comellas and Hsu [12]).

There is one positive result about the more general class of vertex-transitive graphs.

Theorem 9 (Alspach [1]) *Every connected vertex-transitive graph of order $2p$, p prime, $p \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ has a Hamilton decomposition.*

The graph O_k (called the *odd graph*) is a k -regular graph whose vertices are indexed by the $(k-1)$ -subsets of a $(2k-1)$ -set. Two vertices are adjacent if and only if their indexing subsets are disjoint. For example, O_3 is the Petersen graph. Meredith and Lloyd [33] proved that O_4 , O_5 and O_6 admit a Hamilton decomposition and more generally they conjectured.

Conjecture 3 [33] *The odd graph O_m has a Hamilton decomposition, for $m \geq 4$.*

The graph B_k (called *boolean graph*) is a k -regular bipartite graph with one part consisting of vertices by the $(k-1)$ -subsets of a $(2k-1)$ -set, and the other part of vertices indexed by its k -subsets. Adjacency is given by containment. Notice that in other words B_k is the subgraph induced by the middle two levels of the boolean lattice representation of a $(2k-1)$ -cube.

The boolean graphs are conjectured to be hamiltonian. However it may be interesting to notice that, for $k = 2^m$, $m \geq 1$, if O_k has a Hamilton decomposition, then so does B_k (see [17] for more details).

There are some more general decomposition problems involving Hamilton cycles that should be mentioned at this time.

Conjecture 4 (Kotzig [28]) *The complete graph K_{2m} has a perfect 1-factorization for all $m \geq 2$.*

This conjecture for some time has been known to be true for $2m = p+1$ and $2p$, p a prime, and for $2m = 16, 28, 244$ and 344 . Recently, Seah and Stinson [37] have shown it is true for 36, Ihrig, Seah and Stinson [24] have shown it is true for 50, and Kobayashi and Kiyasu-Zen'iti [27] have shown it is true for 1,332 and 6,860. The following result is proved in [18] for other reasons but it is related to Conjecture 4.

Theorem 10 *There is a 1-factorization $\{I_1, I_2, \dots, I_{2m-1}\}$ of K_{2m} such that $I_1 \cup I_j$ is a Hamilton cycle for all $j \geq 2$.*

There are two conjectures related to Theorem 10 given in [18]. One of them conjectures that if $I'_1, I'_2, \dots, I'_{2m-2}$ are any $2m-2$ 1-factors of K_{2m} , then there is a 1-factorization $\{I_1, I_2, \dots, I_{2m-1}\}$ of K_{2m} such that $I_i \cup I'_i$ is a Hamilton cycle for $i = 1, \dots, 2m-2$. The second, and weaker, conjecture is the same except that the conclusion is that $I_i \cap I'_i = \emptyset$ for all $i = 1, \dots, 2m-2$.

Definition 2 A *Kotzig factorization* of K_{2m+1} consists of a decomposition into Hamilton cycles H_1, H_2, \dots, H_m and a decomposition into m -matchings $M_1, M_2, \dots, M_{2m+1}$ such that $|E(H_i) \cap E(M_j)| = 1$ for all i and j .

Theorem 11 (Horton [23]) *The complete graph K_{2m+1} has a Kotzig factorization for all $m \geq 1$.*

A Kotzig factorization is a special case of a more general factorization considered in [2] and discussed by Alspach at the "Cycles in Graphs 1982" workshop held at Simon Fraser University in July 1982. Let $\mathcal{F} = \{F_1, F_2, \dots, F_r\}$ be any 2-factorization of a $2r$ -regular graph G . An r -matching M is said to be *orthogonal* to \mathcal{F} if $|M \cap F_i| = 1$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, r$. Alspach asked the following two questions at the workshop. (Also see Discrete Math. 69 (1988), p.106).

Question 3 *If F_1, F_2, \dots, F_r is any 2-factorization of a $2r$ -regular graph G , does there always exist an orthogonal r -matching?*

Question 4 *What conditions on a 2-factorization \mathcal{F} of a $2r$ -regular graph G guarantee that the edge-set of G can be partitioned into r -matchings each of which is orthogonal to \mathcal{F} ?*

Recently Kouider and Sotteau [30] gave a positive answer to Question 3 for $2r$ -regular graphs G of order $m \geq 3.23r$.

Jaeger [25] proved that if G can be decomposed into an even number of Hamilton cycles, then its line graph $L(G)$ is 1-factorable. The key of the proof lies in the following result: If G can be decomposed into two Hamilton cycles, then its line graph $L(G)$ can be decomposed into three Hamilton cycles. Kotzig proved that if G is a cubic Hamilton graph, then its line graph can be decomposed into two Hamilton cycles. That leads to the following conjecture.

Conjecture 5 (Bermond [11]) *If G has a Hamilton decomposition, then its line graph can be decomposed into Hamilton cycles.*

In a personal letter, Jackson has asked a question for which an affirmative answer implies Conjecture 5. A *separating transition* in a graph G is a set of two adjacent edges e_1 and e_2 such that $G - \{e_1, e_2\}$ is disconnected. If G is a $2r$ -regular graph, a necessary condition for $L(G)$ to have a Hamilton decomposition is that G have no separating transitions. Jackson has asked whether or not this condition is also sufficient. He has also conjectured that a 3-connected, $2r$ -regular graph has a line-graph which is Hamilton decomposable. He has verified the latter conjecture when $r = 2$.

Also let us mention that Thomason [39] has proved that if a $2k$ -regular graph has a Hamilton decomposition, then it has at least $(3k - 2)(3k - 5) \dots 7 \cdot 4$ Hamilton decompositions. Colbourn [16] gave all the non-isomorphic Hamilton decompositions of K_n for $n = 7, 9$ and those which have a non-trivial automorphism group for $n = 11$.

Finally let us conclude with some results concerning Hamilton decompositions of directed graphs. Some of these decompositions are obtained from the decompositions of the underlying undirected graph in particular when the directed graph is symmetric by associating to each Hamilton cycle of the underlying graph two opposite directed Hamilton cycles. For example from Theorem 1, we have that the complete symmetric directed graph K_{2n+1}^* has a decomposition into $2n$ directed Hamilton cycles. The following strong result cannot be obtained in that way. (For earlier results see the survey [10]).

Theorem 12 (Tillson [41]) *If $2n \geq 8$, K_{2n}^* can be decomposed into $2n - 1$ directed Hamilton cycles.*

Aubert and Schneider [7] studied the decompositions into directed Hamilton cycles of the symmetric digraph G^* associated to a cubic graph G consisting of a cycle plus a perfect matching. In particular they proved that if the number of vertices of G (which must be even) is a multiple of 4 then G^* has no Hamilton decomposition.

Recent results have been obtained concerning products of directed graphs and tournaments.

A characterization of the Cayley digraphs of finite abelian groups which can be decomposed into two directed Hamilton cycles has been given by Keating [26]. That implies that the cartesian product of two directed cycles C_r and C_s can be decomposed into directed Hamilton cycles if and only if there exist positive integers u and v such that $u+v = \gcd(r, s)$ and $\gcd(uv, rs) = 1$ (result first obtained by Lindgren). In [26] can also be found results on the conjunction of two digraphs. The conjecture that if the two digraphs G_1 and G_2 can be decomposed into directed Hamilton cycles then their lexicographic product can also be decomposed into directed Hamilton cycles is still open (see [9] for partial results). Even the analogous version of Theorem 5 for complete multipartite digraphs is still open.

Substantial progress has been made on Kelly's conjecture that every regular tournament can be decomposed into directed Hamilton cycles by Thomassen [40] who proved that every regular tournament of order n can be covered by a collection of $12n$ directed Hamilton cycles and by Häggkvist [20] who proved that the conjecture is true for sufficiently large regular tournaments. Furthermore he proved that every sufficiently large k -regular digraph with at most $2k$ vertices has a Hamilton decomposition.

References

- [1] B. Alspach, Hamiltonian partitions of vertex-transitive graphs of order $2p$, *Congressus Numerantium* **28**(1980) 217–221.
- [2] B. Alspach, Research Problem 59, *Discrete Math.* **50**(1984), 115.
- [3] B. Alspach, K. Heinrich and G. Liu, Orthogonal factorizations of graphs, preprint.
- [4] B. Alspach and M. Rosenfeld, On Hamilton decompositions of prisms over simple 3-polytopes, *Graphs and Combinatorics* **2**(1986), 1–8.
- [5] J. Aubert and B. Schneider, Décompositions de la somme cartésienne d'un cycle et de l'union de 2 cycles Hamiltoniens, *Discrete Math.* **38**(1982), 7–16.
- [6] J. Aubert and B. Schneider, Décomposition de $K_m + K_n$ en cycles Hamiltoniens, *Discrete Math.* **37**(1981), 19–27.
- [7] J. Aubert and B. Schneider, Graphes orientés indécomposables en circuits Hamiltoniens, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* **32**(1982), 347–349.
- [8] B. Auerbach and R. Laskar, On decompositions of r -partite graphs into edge-disjoint Hamiltonian circuits, *Discrete Math.* **14**(1976) 265–268.
- [9] Z. Baranyai and Gy. R. Szasz, Hamiltonian decomposition of lexicographic product, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* **31**(1981), 253–261.

- [10] J.-C. Bermond, Hamilton decomposition of graphs, directed graphs and hypergraphs, in *Advances in Graph Theory, Annals of Discrete Mathematics* **3**(1978), 21–28.
- [11] J.-C. Bermond, Problem 97, *Discrete Math.* **71**(1988), 275–276.
- [12] J.-C. Bermond, F. Comellas and F. Hsu, Distributed loop computer networks, a survey, submitted IEEE Trans. on Computers.
- [13] J.-C. Bermond, O. Favaron and M. Maheo, Hamiltonian decomposition of Cayley graphs of degree four, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, to appear.
- [14] J.-C. Bermond, G. Illiades and C. Peyrat, An optimization problem in distributed loop computer networks, in *Proc. Coll. 3rd Int. Conf. on Combinatorial Mathematics*, New York, June 1985, Annals New York Acad. Sci., to appear.
- [15] J. A. Bondy and U. S. R. Murty, *Graph Theory with Applications*, MacMillan Press, 1976.
- [16] C. J. Colbourn, Hamiltonian decompositions of complete graphs, *Ars Combinatoria* **14**(1982) 261–270.
- [17] D. Duffus, P. Hanlon and R. Roth, Matching and Hamiltonian Cycles in Some Families of Symmetric Graphs, preprint.
- [18] H. Fleischner, A. J. W. Hilton and B. Jackson, On the maximum number of pairwise compatible Euler cycles, preprint.
- [19] M. F. Foregger, Hamiltonian decompositions of product of cycles, *Discrete Math.* **24**(1978) 251–260.
- [20] R. Häggkvist, Seminar Orsay 1986.
- [21] G. Hetyei, On Hamilton circuits and 1-factors of the regular complete n -partite graphs, *Acta Acad. Pedagog., Civitate Press Ser. 6*, **19**(1975), 5–10.
- [22] A. J. W. Hilton and C. A. Rodger, Hamiltonian decompositions of complete regular r -partite graphs, *Discrete Math.* **58**(1986), 63–78.
- [23] J. D. Horton, The construction of Kotzig factorizations, *Discrete Math.* **43**(1983), 199–206.
- [24] E. Ihrig, E. Seah and D. Stinson, A perfect one-factorization of K_{50} , *J. Combinatorial Math. and Combinatorial Computing* **1**(1987), 217–219.
- [25] F. Jaeger, The 1-factorization of some line graphs, *Discrete Math.* **46**(1983), 89–92.
- [26] K. Keating, Multiple-ply Hamiltonian graphs and digraphs, in *Cycles in graphs, Annals of Discrete Mathematics* **27**(1985), 81–88.
- [27] M. Kobayashi and Kiyasu-Zen'iti, Perfect 1-factorization of K_{1332} and K_{6860} , preprint.
- [28] A. Kotzig, Problem in Theory of Graphs and its Applications, Academic Press 1963, 162 and 63–82.

- [29] A. Kotzig, Every cartesian product of two circuits is decomposable into two Hamiltonian circuits, Rapport 233, Centre de Recherches Mathématiques, Montréal 1973.
- [30] M. Kouider and D. Sotteau, On the existence of a matching orthogonal to a 2-factorization, to appear in *Discrete Math.*
- [31] R. Laskar, Decomposition of some composite graphs into Hamiltonian cycles, in *Proc. 5th Hungarian Coll. Keszthely 1976*, North Holland, 1978, 705–716.
- [32] D. E. Lucas, *Recréations Mathématiques*, Vol. II. Gauthier Villars, Paris, 1892.
- [33] G. H. J. Meredith and E. K. Lloyd, The footballers of Croam, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* **15**(1973), 161–166.
- [34] B. R. Myers, Hamiltonian factorization of the product of a complete graph with itself, *Networks* **2**(1972) 1–9.
- [35] C. St. J. A. Nash-Williams, Hamiltonian arcs and circuits, in *Recent Trends in Graph Theory, Lecture Notes in Math.* 185, Springer Verlag (1971) 197–210.
- [36] G. Ringel, Über drei kombinatorische Probleme am n -dimensionalen Würfel and Würfelgitter, *Abh. Math. Sem. Univ. Hamburg* **20**(1956), 10–19.
- [37] E. Seah and D. Stinson, A perfect one factorization of K_{36} .
- [38] F. Stong, On Kotzig's conjecture, preprint.
- [39] A. G. Thomason, Hamiltonian cycles and uniquely edge colourable graphs, in *Annals of Discrete Mathematics* **3**(1978), 259–268.
- [40] C. Thomassen, Hamilton circuits in regular tournaments, in *Cycles in Graphs, Annals of Discrete Mathematics* **27**(1985), 159–162.
- [41] T. Tillson, A Hamiltonian decomposition of K_{2n} , $2n \geq 8$, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* **29**(1980), 68–74.
- [42] D. Witte and J. A. Gallian, A survey: Hamiltonian cycles in Cayley graphs, *Discrete Math.* **51**(1984), 293–304.

Addendum to the article
Hamiltonian Decompositions of Graphs Directed Graphs and
Hypergraphs

by J-C. Bermond.

(December 1986)

1) Concerning the hamiltonian decomposition of the **cartesian sum** of graphs:

Conjecture 1.8. concerning the decomposition of the cartesian **sum of 3 cycles** has been proved by M.F.Foregger[8]. J.Aubert and B.Schneider [4] proved that the cartesian sum of G and C (where G is decomposable into 2 hamiltonian cycles and C is a hamiltonian cycle) can itself be decomposed into 3 hamiltonian cycles. That implies the result of M.F.Foregger, but also **Ringel's conjecture** that the **2n-cube** can be decomposed into n hamiltonian cycles and the original **Kotzig's conjecture** saying that if the graphs G_i , $1 \leq i \leq p$, can be decomposed into n hamiltonian cycles then the cartesian sum of these graphs can also be decomposed into pn hamiltonian cycles (the 2n-cube is in fact the cartesian sum of $n C_4$ and Ringel's conjecture was a particular case of Kotzig's conjecture). Indeed Aubert and Schneider's result implies that if G_1 can be decomposed into n_1 hamiltonian cycles and G_2 can be decomposed into n_2 hamiltonian cycles, where $n_1 \leq n_2 \leq 2n_1$ then the cartesian sum of G_1 and G_2 can be decomposed into $n_1 + n_2$ hamiltonian cycles; then Kotzig's conjecture follows by induction.

Conjecture 1.10 concerning the hamiltonian decomposition of the cartesian sum of **two complete graphs** has been proved by J.Aubert and B.Schneider [5]. x

However the **general conjecture 1.11** saying that "if G_1 can be decomposed into n_1 hamiltonian cycles and G_2 can be decomposed into n_2 hamiltonian cycles, then the cartesian sum of G_1 and G_2 can be decomposed into $n_1 + n_2$ hamiltonian cycles" is still open.

B. Alspach and M. Rosenfeld [3] studied when the cartesian sum of a **cubic graph** G and K_2 has a hamiltonian decomposition; they give a necessary and sufficient condition which implies that it works if G has a perfect 1-factorization (a partition of the edges into 1-factors such that the union of every pair of 1-factors forms a hamiltonian cycle); they asked if it is still true when the graph G is only hamiltonian or admits a 1-factorization.

2) Concerning the hamiltonian decomposition of the **lexicographic product** of graphs:

Conjecture 1.16 (and therefore 1.15) concerning the hamiltonian decomposition of the **lexicographic product** of any two graphs has been proved by Z. Baranyai and Gy.R. Szasz [6]. Note that the particular cases where one graph is a stable set and the other a cycle (theorem 1.12.) or a complete graph (theorem 1.3.) were also proved by G. Hetyei [10].

3) Concerning the hamiltonian decomposition of the **conjunction** of two graphs:

Theorem 1.18. and corollary 1.19. as enonced are clearly false. Indeed the conjunction of two cycles is not connected if they are both of even length; theorem 1.18. is valid with the additional hypothesis that r and n are not both even. Simarly one has to add in corollary 1.19. that one of G_1 or G_2 is of odd order.

4) Other problems in the undirected cases:

B. Alspach asked the following problem [2]: does every connected **Cayley graph** on an abelian group with even degree admit a decomposition into hamiltonian cycles ? The particular case of degree 4 (which includes double loop or 2-jump circulant graphs) has been recently solved by J-C. Bermond, O. Favaron and M. Maheo [7]. In [1] B. Alspach proved that if G is a connected transitive graph of order $2p$, where p is a prime and $p \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ then G can be decomposed into hamiltonian cycles (or hamiltonian cycles plus a 1-factor).

→ reference
article

Witte Dave

Cayley digraphs of prime power are
hamiltonian JCTB 40 (86)
113-117

F. Jaeger [11] proved that if G can be decomposed into an even number of hamiltonian cycles then its line graph $L(G)$ is 1-factorable. The key of the proof lies in the following result: if G can be decomposed into two hamiltonian cycles then its line graph $L(G)$ can be decomposed into three hamiltonian cycles. We propose the following conjecture: if G can be decomposed into k hamiltonian cycles then its **line graph** $L(G)$ can be decomposed into $2k-1$ hamiltonian cycles.

Let me recall old conjectures which as far as I know are still unsolved:

The graph O_k (called **odd graph**) is a k -regular graph whose vertices are indexed by the $(k-1)$ -subsets of a $(2k-1)$ -set. Two vertices are adjacent if and only if their indexing subsets are disjoint. For example O_3 is the Petersen graph. G. H. J. Meredith and E. K. Lloyd [13] conjectured that O_{2k} (resp. O_{2k+1}) can be decomposed into hamiltonian cycles (resp. hamiltonian cycles plus a 1-factor). They proved that for O_5 and O_6 .

A. Kotzig (1973?) conjectured that any **self-complementary regular graph** of order $4k+1$ can be decomposed into hamiltonian cycles. This is a particular case of Nash-Williams' conjecture that every **$2k$ -regular graph** with at most $4k+1$ vertices has a hamiltonian decomposition. A very strong result has been recently obtained by R. Häggkvist [9] who proved that for any $p < 4$ every sufficiently large $2k$ -regular graph with at most pk vertices has a hamiltonian decomposition.

Finally let us mention that A. G. Thomason [14] has proved that if a $2k$ -regular graph has a hamiltonian decomposition, then it has at least $(3k-2)(3k-5) \dots 7 \cdot 4$ hamiltonian decompositions.

5) **Directed case:**

A characterization of the **Cayley digraphs** of finite abelian groups which can be decomposed into 2 hamiltonian circuits has been given by K. Keating [12]. That implies that the **cartesian sum of two directed** circuits C_r and C_s can be decomposed into hamiltonian circuits if and only if there exist positive integers u and v such that $u+v = \gcd(r,s)$ and $\gcd(uv,rs) = 1$ (result first obtained by J. Lindgren). In [12] can also be found results on the conjunction of two digraphs. The conjecture that if the two digraphs G_1 and G_2 can be decomposed into hamiltonian circuits then their **lexicographic product** can also be decomposed into hamiltonian circuits is still open (see [6] for partial results).

Substantial progress have been made on **Kelly's conjecture** that every **regular tournament** can be decomposed into hamiltonian circuits by C. Thomassen [15] who proved that every regular tournament of order n can be covered by a collection of $12n$ hamiltonian circuits and by R. Häggkvist [9] who proved that the conjecture is true for sufficiently large regular tournaments. Furthermore he proved that every sufficiently large k -regular digraph with at most $2k$ vertices has a hamiltonian decomposition.

f Jackson J. Zimla talk for NY (1989)

References

- [1] B. Alspach, Hamiltonian Partitions of vertex-transitive graphs of order $2p$, *Congressus Numerantium* 28 (1980) 217-221.
- [2] B. Alspach, Unsolved problem 4.5. in *Cycles in Graphs*, *Annals of Discrete Math.* 27 (1985) 464.
- [3] B. Alspach and M. Rosenfeld, On hamilton decompositions of prisms over simple 3-polytopes, *Graphs and Combinatorics* 2 (1986) 1-8.
- [4] J. Aubert and B. Schneider, Decomposition de la somme cartésienne d'un cycle et de l'union de 2 cycles hamiltoniens, *Discrete Mathematics* 38 (1982) 7-16.
- [5] J. Aubert and B. Schneider, Decomposition de $K_m + K_n$ en cycles hamiltoniens, *Discrete Mathematics* 37 (1981) 19-27.
- [6] Z. Baranyai and Gy.R. Szasz, Hamiltonian decomposition of lexicographic product, *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Ser. B* 31 (1981) 253-261.
- [7] J-C. Bermond, O. Favaron and M. Maheo, Hamiltonian decomposition of Cayley graphs of degree four, Research report LRI, submitted *J. Combinatorial Theory*.
- [8] M.F. Foregger, Hamiltonian decompositions of product of cycles, *Discrete Mathematics* 24 (1978) 251-260.
- [9] R. Häggkvist, seminar Orsay 1986.
- [10] G. Hetyei, On hamilton circuits and 1-factors of the regular complete n -partite graphs *Acta Acad. Pedagog. Civitate Pecs Ser 6*, 19 (1975) 5-10.
- [11] F. Jaeger, The 1-factorization of some line graphs, *Discrete Math.* 46(1983) 89-92.
- [12] K. Keating, Multiple-ply hamiltonian graphs and digraphs, in *Cycles in graphs*, *Annals of Discrete Mathematics* 27 (1985) 81-88.
- [13] G.H.J. Meredith and E.K. Lloyd, The footballers of Croam, *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Ser. B* 15 (1973) 161-166.
- [14] A.G. Thomason, Hamiltonian cycles and uniquely edge colourable graphs, in *Annals of Discrete Mathematics* 3 (1978) 259-268.
- [15] C. Thomassen, Hamilton circuits in regular tournaments, in *Cycles in graphs*, *Annals of Discrete Mathematics* 27 (1985) 159-162.