THE

AUSTRALASIAN

JOURNAL

OF

COMBINATORICS

CMSA

The Australasian Journal of Combinatorics

- Home
- About the Journal
- Editorial Team
- Author Guidelines

- Current Volume
- Past Volumes
- Search
- Subscription to Updates

The Australasian Journal of Combinatorics is an international journal which publishes original research papers and survey articles in all branches of combinatorics. Articles published in the journal are reviewed in MathSciNet and Zentralblatt MATH, and are indexed by Scopus and the Emerging Sources Citation Index. Publication is free of charge for authors, and all published papers are freely available to the public.

The journal began publication in 1990. Since 2005, three volumes have been published annually. The journal is now electronic only, with immediate online access, free for both authors and readers. This is the "diamond open access" model of publishing, which complies with the policy of the Research Councils of UK on access to research outputs. The full texts of all published papers can be freely downloaded, including all papers which appeared during the print era from 1990 to 2013. The depositing of our published papers in other repositories for non-commercial use is allowed, although we prefer the format used to be identical to that as published by us, with our pagination and layout.

Cover of the journal in the print era

The latest papers and papers in past volumes are available by clicking on the tabs marked *Current Volume* and *Past Volumes*, respectively. Articles can also be located using the search facility that can be found by clicking on the *Search* tab.

Indexed by:

Scopus

Member of:

FREE JOURNAL NETWORK   MathOA

- Cited documents
- Uncited documents

Australasian Journal of Combinatorics

Q2 — Discrete Mathematics and Combinatorics — best quartile

SJR 2021
0.59

powered by scimagojr.com

← Show this widget in your own website

Just copy the code below and paste within your html code:

`<a href="https://www.scimag`

Quartiles

Discrete Mathematics and Combinatorics

Home
About the Journal
Editorial Team
Author Guidelines

Current Volume
Past Volumes
76-82: 2020 - 2022
82: Feb 2022
81: Oct 2021
80: Jun 2021
79: Feb 2021
78: Oct 2020
77: Jun 2020
76: Feb 2020
61-75: 2015 - 2019
46-60: 2010 - 2014
31-45: 2005 - 2009
21-30: 2000 - 2004
11-20: 1995 - 1999
1-10: 1990 - 1994
Search
Subscription to Updates

VOLUME 82 (2022)

Part 1

Part 2

Part 3

EDITORIAL TEAM

Honorary Editor
Peter J. Cameron, University of St Andrews, UK

Editors-In-Chief
Michael Albert, University of Otago, New Zealand
Elizabeth J. Billington, The University of Queensland, Australia

Managing Editors
Nick Brettell, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand
Robert Brignall, The Open University, UK
Thomas Britz, The University of New South Wales, Australia
Nicholas Cavenagh, The University of Waikato, New Zealand
Daniel Cranston, Virginia Commonwealth University, USA
Graham Farr, Monash University, Australia
Luca Ferrari, University of Firenze, Italy
Kevin McAvaney, Australian Mathematics Trust, Australia
David Pike, Memorial University of Newfoundland, Canada
Jamie Simpson, Curtin University of Technology, Australia
Gabriel Verret, The University of Auckland, New Zealand

Editorial Board
Brian Alspach, The University of Newcastle, Australia
Rosemary Bailey, The University of St Andrews, UK
Elizabeth J. Billington, The University of Queensland, Australia
Darryn Bryant, The University of Queensland, Australia

Lou Caccetta, Curtin University of Technology, Australia
John Cannon, The University of Sydney, Australia
Marston Conder, The University of Auckland, New Zealand
Ed Dawson, Queensland University of Technology, Australia
Chris Godsil, University of Waterloo, Canada
Catherine Greenhill, The University of New South Wales, Australia
Hans-Dietrich Gronau, Universität Rostock, Germany
Christos Koukouvinos, National Technical University of Athens, Greece
Rudi Mathon, University of Toronto, Canada
Brendan McKay, Australian National University, Australia
Cheryl E. Praeger, The University of Western Australia, Australia
Chris Rodger, Auburn University, USA
Alex Rosa, McMaster University, Canada
Victor Scharaschkin, The University of Queensland, Australia
Jennifer Seberry, University of Wollongong, Australia
Jozef Širáň, The Open University, UK
Carsten Thomassen, Technical University of Denmark, Denmark
Walter D. Wallis, Southern Illinois University, USA
Nick Wormald, Monash University, Australia
Sanming Zhou, The University of Melbourne, Australia

All unicyclic Ramsey (mK_2, P_4)-minimal graphs

Edy Tri Baskoro

Combinatorial Mathematics Research Group
Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences
Institut Teknologi Bandung, Indonesia
ebaskoro@itb.ac.id

Kristiana Wijaya

Graph and Algebra Research Group
Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences
Universitas Jember, Indonesia
kristiana.fmipa@unej.ac.id

Joe Ryan

School of Electrical Engineering and Computing
Faculty of Engineering and the Built Environment
University of Newcastle, Australia
joe.ryan@newcastle.edu.au

Abstract

For graphs F, G and H, we write $F \to (G, H)$ to mean that if the edges of F are colored with two colors, say red and blue, then the red subgraph contains a copy of G or the blue subgraph contains a copy of H. The graph F is called a Ramsey (G, H) graph if $F \to (G, H)$. Furthermore, the graph F is called a Ramsey (G, H)-minimal graph if $F \to (G, H)$ but $F - e \nrightarrow (G, H)$ for any edge $e \in E(F)$. In this paper, we characterize all unicyclic Ramsey (G, H)-minimal graphs when G is a matching mK_2 for any integer $m \geq 2$ and H is a path on four vertices.

1 Introduction

All the graphs discussed in this paper are finite and simple, without isolated vertices, unless otherwise specified. For any graphs F, G, and H, we write $F \to (G, H)$ to mean that if the edges of F are colored with two colors, say red and blue, then there exists either a red copy of G or a blue copy of H as a subgraph of F. The graph

F is called a *Ramsey (G, H) graph* if $F \to (G, H)$. The *Ramsey number $R(G, H)$* is the smallest natural number n such that $K_n \to (G, H)$. There have been extensive studies on Ramsey numbers $R(G, H)$ for a general graph G versus a graph H; see an interesting survey paper [10] regarding the current progress on the Ramsey numbers for general graphs.

From now on, what we mean by 'coloring' is an edge-coloring of a graph. A (G, H)-*coloring* of F is a red-blue coloring of F such that neither a red copy of G nor a blue copy of H occurs. Furthermore, a Ramsey (G, H) graph F is *minimal* if for any edge $e \in E(F)$, $F - e \nrightarrow (G, H)$. In other words, a Ramsey (G, H) graph F is *minimal* if for every edge $e \in E(F)$, there exists a (G, H)-coloring of $F - e$. The set of all Ramsey (G, H)-minimal graphs is denoted by $\mathcal{R}(G, H)$. A pair of graphs (G, H) is said to be *Ramsey-infinite* if there are infinitely many minimal graphs F for which $F \to (G, H)$. If a pair (G, H) is not Ramsey-infinite, then it is said to be *Ramsey-finite.*

The problem of Ramsey-infinite pairs of graphs is studied extensively in the literature; for example, Łuczak [7] showed that for every forest F other than a matching, and every graph H containing a cycle, there exists an infinite number of graphs J such that $J \in \mathcal{R}(F, H)$.

In this paper we focus on a pair of Ramsey-finite graphs. Let us briefly discuss some results concerning Ramsey-finiteness. The problem of characterizing a pair (G, H) that is Ramsey-finite was first addressed by Burr et al. [3] in 1978. It was proved that if G is a matching then (G, H) is Ramsey-finite for any graph H. They stated that in general it is difficult to determine the members of $\mathcal{R}(G, H)$, even if (G, H) is Ramsey-finite. In fact the problem appears to be very difficult for $\mathcal{R}(mK_2, H)$. One trivial case is $\mathcal{R}(K_2, H) = \{H\}$ for an arbitrary graph H. Burr et al. [3] also gave two non-trivial sets $\mathcal{R}(G, H)$, namely, $\mathcal{R}(2K_2, 2K_2)$ and $\mathcal{R}(2K_2, K_3)$. Next, the set $\mathcal{R}(mK_2, 2K_2)$ for $m \in [3, 4]$ is given by Burr et al. [4]. Other results concerning Ramsey-finiteness can be seen in [1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 13]. Most recently, Wijaya et al. [12] showed a relation between Ramsey (mK_2, H)-minimal graphs and $((m - 1)K_2, H)$-minimal graphs as follows.

Lemma 1.1. [12] *Let H be a graph and $m \geq 2$. $F \to (mK_2, H)$ if and only if the following conditions hold:*

(i) *for every $v \in V(F)$, $F - \{v\} \to ((m - 1)K_2, H)$;*

(ii) *for every $K_3 \subseteq F$, $F - E(K_3) \to ((m - 1)K_2, H)$; and*

(iii) *for every $F[S_{2m-1}]$ of F, $F - E(F[S_{2m-1}])$ contains a graph H, where $F[S_{2m-1}]$ is a subgraph of F induced by any $(2m - 1)$-set $S_{2m-1} \subseteq V(F)$.*

Theorem 1.2. [12] *Let H be a graph and $m \geq 2$. If $F \in \mathcal{R}(mK_2, H)$, then for every $v \in V(F)$ and $K_3 \subseteq F$, both graphs $F - \{v\}$ and $F - E(K_3)$ contain a Ramsey $((m - 1)K_2, H)$-minimal graph.*

In [12], it is also shown that for any connected graph H, the graph $F \cup G \in \mathcal{R}(mK_2, H)$ if and only if $F \in \mathcal{R}(sK_2, H)$ and $G \in \mathcal{R}((m - s)K_2, H)$ for every

positive integer $s < m$. Let P_n denote a path on n vertices. Wijaya et al. [11] characterized all unicyclic graphs, namely connected graphs containing exactly one cycle, in $\mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_3)$ for any integer $m \geq 2$. More general results as in the following theorem have been also obtained.

Theorem 1.3. [11]

(a) *There is no tree belonging to $\mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_n)$, for any integers $m, n > 1$.*

(b) *The forest in $\mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_n)$ is only the disjoint union of m paths with n vertices, mP_n.*

(c) *Let $m > 1$ and $n > 2$ be positive integers. A cycle graph C_s belongs to $\mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_n)$ if and only if $mn - n + 1 \leq s \leq mn - 1$.*

In this paper we give the characterization of all unicyclic graphs in $\mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_4)$ for any natural number $m \geq 2$. A *unicyclic graph* is a connected graph containing exactly one cycle. Finding all unicyclic graphs in $\mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_4)$ is not as simple as finding all unicyclic graphs in $\mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_3)$. We prove that the only unicyclic graphs other than cycles in $\mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_4)$ are the graphs formed from a cycle by attaching some pendant paths P_2 and/or P_3 with a certain distribution on them. Note that what we mean by a *pendant path* in a unicyclic graph F is the path with one of the end-vertices in the cycle of F, while the remaining vertices are not in the cycle.

2   Properties of Graphs in $\mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_4)$

In this section we derive some properties of a graph belonging to $\mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_4)$. By considering Theorems 1.2 and 1.3(b), we have the following corollary.

Corollary 2.1. *Let $F \in \mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_n)$, $v \in V(F)$ and $m, n \geq 2$. If $F - \{v\}$ is a forest, then $F - \{v\}$ must contain an $(m - 1)P_n$.*

Proof. By Theorem 1.2, for every $v \in V(F)$, $F - \{v\}$ contains a graph G in $\mathcal{R}((m - 1)K_2, P_n)$. Since $F - \{v\}$ is acyclic, by Theorem 1.3(b), G must be isomorphic to $(m - 1)P_n$. □

Lemma 2.2. *Let $m \geq 2$ and $n \geq 4$ be natural numbers. If $F \in \mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_n)$, then no two vertices of degree 1 have a common neighbor.*

Proof. Let $F \in \mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_n)$. For a contradiction, assume there were two vertices of degree 1 in F, say u_1 and u_2, having a common neighbor v. Now, consider two edges $e_1 = u_1 v$ and $e_2 = u_2 v$. Since $F \in \mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_n)$, there exists an (mK_2, P_n)-coloring ϕ_1 of $F - e_1$. This means that there are at most $(m-1)$ independent red edges in ϕ_1 of $F - e_1$. Now, if $\phi_1(e_2)$ is red then these $(m-1)$ red edges in $F - e_1$ must include e_2. Therefore, we can define a new red-blue coloring ϕ of F such that

$$\phi(x) = \begin{cases} \phi_1(x) & \text{for } x \in F - e_1, \\ \text{red} & \text{for } x = e_1. \end{cases}$$

Then the new coloring ϕ is an (mK_2, P_n)-coloring of F, which is a contradiction. Therefore $\phi_1(e_2)$ must be blue. Since ϕ_1 is an (mK_2, P_n)-coloring of $F - e_1$, there is neither a red mK_2 nor a blue P_n in $F - e_1$. Now, consider a new red-blue coloring φ of F such that

$$\varphi(x) = \begin{cases} \phi_1(x) & \text{for } x \in F - e_1, \\ \text{blue} & \text{for } x = e_1. \end{cases}$$

However, the new coloring φ is now an (mK_2, P_n)-coloring of F, a contradiction. Therefore there are no two vertices of degree 1 in F having a common neighbor. $\square$

Lemma 2.3. *Let F be a unicyclic graph in $\mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_4)$ with $m \geq 2$. Then there is no P_4 in F consisting of exactly one vertex in the cycle of F.*

Proof. Let F be a unicyclic graph in $\mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_4)$ with $m \geq 2$. On the contrary, assume there were a path P_4 consisting one vertex v in the cycle of F and three vertices a, b, c not in the cycle. By Corollary 2.1, $F - \{v\}$ must contain an $(m-1)P_4$. Clearly the vertices a, b and c are not contained in the forest $(m-1)P_4$. So, together with the vertex v, these three vertices will form a P_4 in F. Therefore F contains mP_4, a contradiction to the minimality of F. $\square$

Theorem 2.4. *Let F be a unicyclic graph in $\mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_4)$ with the cycle C. Then $F - E(C)$ is a linear forest with each component being either P_1, P_2 or P_3.*

Proof. Let F be a unicyclic graph in $\mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_4)$ with the cycle C. Since F is unicyclic, the graph $F - E(C)$ is a linear forest with $|V(C)|$ components. By Lemmas 2.2 and 2.3, each component must be either a singleton vertex or a path with one or two edges. $\square$

We now present a very useful necessary and sufficient condition for any unicyclic graph F satisfying $F \to (mK_2, P_4)$.

Theorem 2.5. *Let F be a unicyclic graph. Then $F \to (mK_2, P_4)$ for any $m \geq 2$ if and only if, for any $v \in V(F)$, the graph $F - \{v\} \supseteq (m-1)P_4$.*

Proof. Let F be a unicyclic graph and say $F \to (mK_2, P_4)$. If F is a cycle, then $F - \{v\}$ is a path for each $v \in V(F)$. By Corollary 2.1, $F - \{v\}$ contains a forest $(m-1)P_4$. Now, if F is not a cycle, then for each $v \in V(F)$, the graph $F - \{v\}$ can be either acyclic or a (connected or disconnected) graph containing exactly one cycle. By Corollary 2.1, if $F - \{v\}$ is an acyclic graph, then F contains an $(m-1)P_4$ and the proof is complete. Now, consider the case $F - \{v\}$ is a (connected or disconnected) graph containing exactly one cycle. Let C be the cycle of $F - \{v\}$. Now, choose the vertex $w \in V(C)$ such that $d(v, w) \leq d(v, u)$ for all $u \in V(C)$. We have that $(F - \{v\}) - \{w\}$ is a forest with two components where the first component is a tree and the second one is a path P_r for some natural number r. By Theorem 2.4, $1 \leq r \leq 2$. By Corollary 2.1, the graph $(F - \{v\}) - \{w\}$ contains a forest $(m-1)P_4$. Clearly the path P_r is not contained in the forest $(m-1)P_4$. Hence the graph $F - \{v\}$

contains the same $(m-1)P_4$ as in $(F - \{v\}) - \{w\}$. Therefore, for each $v \in V(F)$, the graph $F - \{v\}$ contains an $(m-1)P_4$.

Conversely, if for each $v \in V(F)$ we have $F - \{v\} \supseteq (m-1)P_4$, then we will show that $F \to (mK_2, P_4)$ provided F is a unicyclic graph. Consider any red-blue coloring of the edges of F containing no red copy of mK_2. Then there are at most $(m-1)$ independent red edges in such a coloring on F. Now, choose any vertex v in F incident to red edge in such a coloring. By the assumption that $F - \{v\} \supseteq (m-1)P_4$ for such a vertex v and since such a coloring has at most $(m-1)$ independent red edges (including one red edge incident with v), then the other $(m-2)$ independent red edges will be distributed in the subgraph $(m-1)P_4$ and leave one path P_4 without red color. It means that there is a blue P_4 in such a coloring. So, $F \to (mK_2, P_4)$. □

The following assertion is a direct consequence of Theorem 2.5.

Corollary 2.6. *Let $m \geq 2$ be a natural number. Let F be a unicyclic graph and $F \to (mK_2, P_4)$. If there is an edge $e \in E(F)$ such that $(F - e) - \{v\} \supseteq (m-1)P_4$ for any vertex $v \in V(F)$, then F is not minimal.*

Proof. Let F be a unicyclic graph and $F \to (mK_2, P_4)$. So, if there is an edge $e \in E(F)$ such that $(F - e) - \{v\} \supseteq (m-1)P_4$ for any vertex $v \in V(F)$, then by Theorem 2.5, we have $(F - e) \to (mK_2, P_4)$. This means that F is not minimal. □

Now we discuss a circumference of a unicyclic graph belonging to $\mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_4)$. The *circumference* of a graph refers to the length of a longest cycle in the graph.

Lemma 2.7. *Let $m \geq 2$ be a natural number. If $F \in \mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_4)$ is a unicyclic graph other than a cycle, then the cycle in F has circumference s with $2m \leq s \leq 4m - 4$.*

Proof. Let F be a unicyclic Ramsey (mK_2, P_4)-minimal graph other than a cycle. Then F contains a unique cycle C. By Theorem 1.3(c), the cycle C must have circumference s at most $4m - 4$, that is, $s \leq 4m - 4$. Otherwise, F contains either a cycle in $\mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_4)$ or a forest mP_4. Now, suppose for a contradiction, that $s \leq 2m - 1$. Define a red-blue coloring of the edges of F such that all edges in the cycle C are colored red, and the other edges (namely all edges of pendant paths) are colored blue. By Lemma 2.4, no pendant path in F contains a copy of P_4. So, by such a coloring, there is neither a red mK_2 nor a blue P_4 in F; a contradiction. Therefore $2m \leq s \leq 4m - 4$. □

Next, we discuss the lower bound of the number of edges in a unicyclic graph F in $\mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_4)$.

Lemma 2.8. *Let $m \geq 2$ be a natural number. Let $F \in \mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_4)$ be a unicyclic graph other than a cycle. Then $|E(F)| \geq 4m - 2$.*

Proof. Let C be the cycle in F and let $v \in V(C)$ be of degree 3. By Theorem 2.5, we have $F - \{v\} \supseteq (m-1)P_4$. Since every two consecutive P_4s in $(m-1)P_4$ must be separated by at least one edge, it follows that we have in total at least $3(m-1) + (m-2) + 3 = 4m - 2$ edges. □

By Theorem 2.4, we can conclude that each pendant path in a unicyclic Ramsey (mK_2, P_4)-minimal graph must be isomorphic to either P_2 or P_3. Let us define classes of such unicyclic graphs. A unicyclic graph $F \in \mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_4)$ is said to have a *gap sequence* $(a_i)_1^{t-1} = (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{t-1})$ if all cycle vertices of degree 3 in F can be cyclically ordered as $u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_t$ such that a_i is the length of path from u_i to u_{i+1} for each $i \in [1, t-1]$. If we shift the label u_1 to u_2, u_2 to u_3, and so on until u_t to u_1, then a gap sequence of this graph is $(a_2, a_3, \ldots, a_{t-1}, a_t)$ where $a_t = s - \sum_{i=1}^{t-1} a_i$. So a gap sequence depends on the labels of vertices of degree 3. For $r = 2$ or 3, denote by $C_s[(t, P_r); (a_i)_1^{t-1}]$ the unicyclic graph F with circumference s and having the gap sequence $(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{t-1})$ such that at every vertex u_i, $i \in [1, t]$, there is a pendant path P_r starting from it. So the order of the graph $C_s[(t, P_r); (a_i)_1^{t-1}]$ is $s + (r-1)t$. For example, two graphs in Figure 1 are isomorphic, where the gap sequence depends on the label u_1. To determine all unicyclic Ramsey (mK_2, P_4)-


$$C_{14}[(4, P_2); (1, 2, 3)] \qquad C_{14}[(4, P_2); (2, 3, 8)]$$

Figure 1: Two isomorphic graphs with distinct gap sequences.

minimal graphs F other than a cycle, we consider whether the graph F contains pendant path P_2 or P_3 only or both.

3   The graph $C_s[(t, P_2); (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{t-1})]$

In this section we characterize all the graphs $C_s[(t, P_2); (a_i)_1^{t-1}]$ with circumference s and gap sequence $(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{t-1})$ which are Ramsey unicyclic (mK_2, P_4)-minimal graphs.

Lemma 3.1. *Let m, s and t be natural numbers with $m \geq 2$ and $2m \leq s \leq 4m - 4$. Let F be a unicyclic graph $C_s[(t, P_2); (a_i)_1^{t-1}]$. If there exists some $i \in [1, t-1]$ such that a_i is even and for any $v \in V(F)$, $F - \{v\} \supseteq (m-1)P_4$, then $t \geq 4m - s - 1$.*

Proof. Suppose for each $v \in V(F)$, $F - \{v\} \supseteq (m-1)P_4$. Then $|V(F)| \geq 4(m-1)+1$. For a contradiction, assume $t = 4m - s - 2$. So, F has $t + s$ $(= 4m - 2)$ vertices. Let u_i be the vertex of degree 3 and x_i be the pendant vertex adjacent to u_i for each $i \in [1, t]$. Without loss of generality, we may assume a_1 is even. Then the graph $F - \{u_1\}$ must be isomorphic to a disconnected graph $K_1 \cup T_{4m-4}$ where T_{4m-4} is a tree of order $4m-4$. Since a_1 is even, there is at most one independent P_4 formed by the five vertices (including u_2 and x_2), as depicted in Figure 2. Then the remaining $4m - 9$ vertices are insufficient to form $(m-2)P_4$ in $F - \{u_1\}$, which contradicts the fact that $F - \{v\} \supseteq (m-1)P_4$ for any $v \in F$. Therefore we conclude that $t \geq 4m - s - 1$. □

Figure 2: A path P_4 from the five vertices.

Lemma 3.2. *Let m, s and t be natural numbers with $m \geq 2$ and $2m \leq s \leq 4m - 4$. Let F be a unicyclic graph $C_s[(t, P_2); (a_i)_1^{t-1}]$. If $F \in \mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_4)$, then all the a_i are odd.*

Proof. Let $F \in \mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_4)$ be a unicyclic graph $C_s[(t, P_2); (a_i)_1^{t-1}]$ with circumference s and a gap sequence $(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{t-1})$. On the contrary, suppose that there exists some $i \in [1, t-1]$ such that a_i is even. Without loss of generality, we can assume a_1 is even. Let u_i be the vertex of degree 3 and x_i be the pendant vertex of F adjacent to u_i for each $i \in [1, t]$. According to Lemma 3.1, $t \geq 4m - s - 1$. Now consider the pendant edge $e = u_2 x_2$. Since $F \in \mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_4)$, by Theorem 2.5, for each $v \in V(F)$, $F - \{v\} \supseteq (m-1)P_4$. From the proof of Lemma 3.1, there is a path P_4 not containing the edge e as depicted in Figure 2. This means that for each $v \in V(F)$, $(F - e) - \{v\}$ contains an $(m-1)P_4$, for some pendant edge $e = x_2 u_2$. By Corollary 2.6, F is not minimal, which contradicts the fact that $F \in \mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_4)$. Therefore all the a_i are odd. $\square$

For an illustration, consider $F = C_{14}[(5, P_2); (2, 1, 3, 1)]$. In this case, $m = 5$, $s = 14$ and $t = 5$. Then, $F \to (5K_2, P_4)$ as depicted in Figure 3. We can see that for each vertex $v \in V(F)$, $F - \{v\} \supseteq 4P_4$ (in this case, by removing the red vertex of the graph F we have $4P_4$ (in blue)) and the red pendant edge e is not included. Since a gap a_1 is even, for each $v \in V(F)$, $(F - e) - \{v\}$ contains a $4P_4$. So the graph $F = C_{14}[(5, P_2); (2, 1, 3, 1)]$ is not minimal.


Figure 3: The graph $C_{14}[(5, P_2); (2, 1, 3, 1)]$.

Theorem 3.3. *Let m, s and t be natural numbers with $m \geq 2$ and $2m \leq s \leq 4m-4$. Let F be a unicyclic graph $C_s[(t, P_2); (a_i)_1^{t-1}]$. Then $F \in \mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_4)$ if and only if (i) all the a_i are odd and (ii) $t = 4m - s - 2$.*

Proof. Let F be a unicyclic graph $C_s[(t, P_2); (a_i)_1^{t-1}]$ and $F \in \mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_4)$. First, by Lemma 3.2, all the a_i are odd. Now we will show that $t = 4m-s-2$. By Lemma 2.8, we have $|E(F)| \geq 4m - 2$ and so $|V(F)| \geq 4m - 2$ (since F is a unicyclic graph). Therefore $t \geq 4m - s - 2$. Since every $C_s[(t, P_2); (a_i)_1^{t-1}]$ with $t > 4m - s - 2$ must contain $C_s[(t^*, P_2); (a_i)_1^{t^*-1}]$ with $t^* = 4m - s - 2$ as a subgraph by removing the last consecutive pendant edges, then to get the minimality of F we must have that $F = C_s[(t, P_2); (a_i)_1^{t-1}]$ with $t = 4m - s - 2$.

Conversely, let F be a unicyclic graph $C_s[(t, P_2); (a_i)_1^{t-1}]$ with a gap sequence $(a_i)_1^{t-1}$, where all the a_i are odd and $t = 4m - s - 2$. We can see that for every $v \in V(F)$, $F - \{v\} \supseteq (m-1)P_4$. By Theorem 2.5, we get $F \to (mK_2, P_4)$. Next, to prove the minimality, let e be any edge of F. If e is a pendant edge, then for each vertex w of degree 3, $(F - e) - \{w\} \not\supseteq (m-1)P_4$. If e is an edge in the cycle C of F, then $F - e$ is a tree with $4m - 2$ vertices and $4m - 3$ edges. Now, choose a vertex z in C such that $(F - e) - \{z\}$ is isomorphic to a disconnected graph $P_r \cup G$, where $2 \leq r \leq 3$ and G is a forest having at most two components. So G has q edges, where $4m - 8 \leq q \leq 4m - 6$. In this case, $G \not\supseteq (m - 1)P_4$, since G does not have enough edges. Therefore $(F - e) - \{z\} \not\supseteq (m-1)P_4$. So we have shown that for any edge e, $(F - e) \not\to (mK_2, P_4)$. Hence $F \in \mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_4)$. $\qquad\square$

In Figure 4, we give an example of graphs $C_{10}[(4, P_2); (a_i)_1^3]$ with all odd a_i that belong to $\mathcal{R}(4K_2, P_4)$.

$$C_{10}[(4, P_2); (1, 1, 1)] \qquad C_{10}[(4, P_2); (1, 1, 3)] \qquad C_{10}[(4, P_2); (1, 3, 3)]$$

Figure 4: Some examples of the graphs in $\mathcal{R}(4K_2, P_4)$.

4   The graph $C_s[(t, P_3); (b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_{t-1})]$

In this section, we derive necessary and sufficient conditions for unicyclic graphs $C_s[(t, P_3); (b_i)_1^{t-1}]$ with circumference s and a gap sequence $(b_i)_1^{t-1} = (b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_{t-1})$ to be members of $\mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_4)$.

Lemma 4.1. *Let t and m be natural numbers with $m \geq 2$ and $2m \leq s \leq 4m-4$. Let F be a unicyclic graph $C_s[(t, P_3); (b_i)_1^{t-1}]$. If $F \in \mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_4)$, then $b_i \not\equiv 0, 3 \bmod 4$ for each $i \in [1, t - 1]$.*

Proof. Let F be a unicyclic graph $C_s[(t, P_3); (b_i)_1^{t-1}]$. For a contradiction, assume there exists $i \in [1, t-1]$ such that $b_i \equiv 0$ or $3 \bmod 4$. Without loss of generality we assume $b_1 \equiv 0$ or $3 \bmod 4$. Let $b_1 \equiv 0 \bmod 4$. Consider now the subgraph B_1 of F obtained by removing all vertices (of degree 1 or 2) in all pendant paths other than two consecutive pendant paths causing a gap b_1. Therefore B_1 is isomorphic to a graph $C_s[(2, P_3); (4k)]$, for some positive integer k. Now, relabeling (if necessary) the vertices of B_1 in such a way we have the graph depicted in Figure 5(a). Consider a path $\mathbb{P}_1 := (x_1, x_2, v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{1+4k}, y_2, y_1)$ in B_1 of length $4(k+1)$ (depicted with yellow vertices). It is clear that $\mathbb{P}_1 \supseteq (k+1)P_4$ and $\mathbb{P}_1 - \{v_1\} \supseteq kP_4$ where y_1 can be


Figure 5: Two unicyclic graphs $B_1 = C_s[(2, P_3); (4k, s-4k)]$ for some $k \geq 1$ and $B_2 = C_s[(2, P_3); (3+4k_1, s-3-4k_1)]$ for some $k_1 \geq 0$.

included in $V(kP_4)$ but $v_2 \notin V(kP_4)$. This kP_4 is a part of $(m-1)P_4$ in $F - \{v_1\}$. Since the four vertices x_1, x_2, v_1 and v_2 can form a path P_4, it follows that $F \supseteq mP_4$. Hence F is not minimal, a contradiction.

The case $b_1 \equiv 3 \bmod 4$ is treated similarly by considering a path $\mathbb{P}_2 := (x_1, x_2, v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{4+4k_1}, y_2, y_1)$ in B_2 of length $7 + 4k_1$ (depicted with yellow vertices) as depicted in Figure 5(b), where B_2 is the subgraph $C_s[(2, P_3); (3+4k_1)]$ of F obtained by deleting all vertices in all pendant paths except two consecutive pendant paths causing a gap b_1. $\square$

Lemma 4.2. *Let F be a unicyclic graph $C_s[(t, P_3); (b_i)_1^{t-1}]$. If there are two gaps b_i and b_j with $b_i, b_j \equiv 1 \bmod 4$ for some $i, j \in [1, t-1]$ and for each $v \in V(F)$, $F - \{v\} \supseteq (m-1)P_4$, then $t > 2m - \lceil \frac{s}{2} \rceil$.*

Proof. For a contradiction, assume that $t \leq 2m - \lceil \frac{s}{2} \rceil$. Then $|V(F)| \leq 2t + s = 4m + s - 2\lceil \frac{s}{2} \rceil$. We consider two cases. First, consider the case where b_i and b_j are consecutive. We can assume that $i = 1$ and $j = 2$, namely $b_1 = 1 + 4k_1$ and $b_2 = 1 + 4k_2$ for some positive integers k_1 and k_2. Write $F = C_s[(t, P_3); (1 + 4k_1, 1 + 4k_2, b_3, \dots, b_{t-1})]$. Consider the subgraph $B_{3a} = C_s[(3, P_3); (1 + 4k_1, 1 + 4k_2)]$ of F. We relabel the vertices of B_{3a} as depicted in Figure 6(a).

Now consider the subgraph of B_{3a} induced by the set $U = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{3+4(k_1+k_2)}, x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2, z_1, z_2\}$. Since $F - \{v_1\} \supseteq (m-1)P_4$, it follows that the subgraph induced by the set $U - \{v_1\}$ will contribute $(1 + k_1 + k_2)P_4$ and $F - U$ must contain $(m - 2 - k_1 - k_2)P_4$. However, there are only at most $4(m - 2 - k_1 - k_2) - 1$ vertices

Figure 6: Two graphs $B_{3a} = C_s[(3, P_3); (1 + 4k_1, 1 + 4k_2)]$ and $B_{3b} = C_s[(4, P_3); (1 + 4k_1, 2 + 4k_2, 1 + 4k_3)]$ for some integers $k_1, k_2, k_3 \geq 0$.

in $F - U$ since

$$\begin{aligned} |V(F)| - |U| &\leq (4m + s - 2\lceil \tfrac{s}{2} \rceil) - (4k_1 + 4k_2 + 9) \\ &= 4(m - 2 - k_1 - k_2) - (2\lceil \tfrac{s}{2} \rceil) - s + 1. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore the supposition that $t \leq 2m - \lceil \tfrac{s}{2} \rceil$ leads to a contradiction. Hence $t > 2m - \lceil \tfrac{s}{2} \rceil$ if b_i and b_j are consecutive.

Now consider the case where b_i and b_j are not consecutive. Without loss of generality, let $b_1 = 1 + 4k_1$ and $b_2 = 2 + 4k_2$, and $b_3 = 1 + 4k_3$ for some non-negative integers k_1, k_2, and k_3. Write $F = C_s[(t, P_3); (1 + 4k_1, 2 + 4k_2, 1 + 4k_3, b_4, \ldots, b_{t-1})]$. Consider a subgraph $B_{3b} = C_s[(4, P_3); (1 + 4k_1, 2 + 4k_2, 1 + 4k_3)]$ of F. We relabel the vertices of B_{3b} as depicted in Figure 6(b). Consider the subgraph of B_{3b} induced by the set $U = \{v_1, \ldots, v_{5+4(k_1+k_2+k_3)}, w_1, w_2, x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2, z_1, z_2\}$. Since $F - \{v_1\} \supseteq (m-1)P_4$, it follows that the subgraph induced by the set $U - \{v_1\}$ will contribute at most $(2 + k_1 + k_2 + k_3)P_4$ and the subgraph $F - U$ must contain the remaining $(m - 3 - k_1 - k_2 - k_3)P_4$. However, there are only at most $4(m - 3 - k_1 - k_2 - k_3) - 1$ vertices in $F - U$ since

$$\begin{aligned} |V(F)| - |U| &\leq (4m + s - 2\lceil \tfrac{s}{2} \rceil) - (4k_1 + 4k_2 + 4k_3 + 13) \\ &= 4(m - 3 - k_1 - k_2 - k_3) - (2\lceil \tfrac{s}{2} \rceil) - s + 1. \end{aligned}$$

So this leads to a contradiction. Thus $t > 2m - \lceil \tfrac{s}{2} \rceil$. $\qquad \square$

Lemma 4.3. *Let t and m be natural numbers with $m \geq 2$ and $2m \leq s \leq 4m - 4$. Let F be a unicyclic graph $C_s[(t, P_3); (b_i)_1^{t-1}]$. If $F \in \mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_4)$, then there exists at most one $i_0 \in [1, t-1]$ such that $b_{i_0} \equiv 1 \bmod 4$, and for the remaining $i \neq i_0$, $b_i \equiv 2 \bmod 4$.*

Proof. Let F be a unicyclic graph $C_s[(t, P_3); (b_i)_1^{t-1}]$ and $F \in \mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_4)$. By Lemma 4.1, we have $b_i \equiv 1$ or $2 \bmod 4$. Now, for a contradiction, suppose that there were two distinct indices i_0 and i_1 such that $b_{i_0} = 1 + 4k_1$ and $b_{i_1} = 1 + 4k_2$ for some positive integers k_1 and k_2. By Lemma 4.2, $t \geq 2m + 1 - \lceil \frac{s}{2} \rceil$. If both b_{i_0} and b_{i_1} are consecutive, then the graph B_{3a} in Figure 6(a) is a subgraph of F (see the proof of Lemma 4.2). If b_{i_0} and b_{i_1} are not consecutive, then F contains the graph B_{3b} as depicted in Figure 6(b). In each of these subgraphs, consider the edge $e = v_1 x_2$. We can see that for each $v \in V(F)$, $(F - e) - \{v\}$ contains an $(m-1)P_4$. By Corollary 2.6, $(F - e) \to (mK_2, P_4)$. This means that F is not minimal, a contradiction. Thus we conclude that there is at most one $i_0 \in [1, t-1]$ such that $b_{i_0} \equiv 1 \bmod 4$. $\qquad \square$

Theorem 4.4. *Let t, m, s be natural numbers with $m \geq 2$ and $2m \leq s \leq 4m - 4$. Let F be a unicyclic graph $C_s[(t, P_3); (b_i)_1^{t-1}]$. Then the graph F satisfies $F \in \mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_4)$ if and only if the following three conditions hold:*

  (i) *there exists at most one $i_0 \in [1, t-1]$ such that $b_{i_0} \equiv 1 \bmod 4$ and the remaining b_i satisfy $b_i \equiv 2 \bmod 4$;*

 (ii) *s is odd; and*

(iii) *$t = 2m - \lceil \frac{s}{2} \rceil$.*

Proof. Let F be a unicyclic graph $C_s[(t, P_3); (b_i)_1^{t-1}]$ satisfying the three conditions above. It is easy to check that for each $v \in V(F)$, we have $F - \{v\} \supseteq (m-1)P_4$. By Theorem 2.5, we obtain $F \to (mK_2, P_4)$. To prove the minimality, we consider an edge $e \in E(F)$. If e is an edge of a cycle of F, then choose the vertex w in the cycle of F such that the graph $(F - e) - \{w\}$ is either $P_3 \cup T_a$ or $P_6 \cup T_b$ where T_a or T_b is a tree of order $4m - 5$ or $4m - 8$, respectively. We obtain $(F - e) - \{w\} \not\supseteq (m-1)P_4$. Next, let e be an edge of a pendant path of F. Choose a vertex w of degree 3 in $F - e$. Then we find that $(F - e) - \{w\} \not\supseteq (m-1)P_4$. Hence, for each $e \in E(F)$, we have $(F - e) \not\to (mK_2, P_4)$. Therefore F is minimal.

Conversely, suppose that $F \in \mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_4)$. First, by Lemma 4.3, there is at most one $i_0 \in [1, t - 1]$ such that $b_i \equiv 1 \bmod 4$ and for the remaining $i \neq i_0$, $b_i \equiv 2 \bmod 4$, so (i) holds. We are going to show that s must be odd. Assume, to the contrary, that s were even. Now, if $t \geq 2m - \lceil \frac{s}{2} \rceil$, then $F \supseteq mP_4$. So F is not minimal. If $t < 2m - \lceil \frac{s}{2} \rceil$, then we can choose a vertex u of degree 3 in F to obtain $F - \{u\} \not\supseteq (m - 1)P_4$. So $F \not\to (mK_2, P_4)$, a contradiction, and the second condition holds. Next, we prove that the third condition must be satisfied, namely $t = 2m - \lceil \frac{s}{2} \rceil$. For a contradiction, let $t > 2m - \lceil \frac{s}{2} \rceil$. Then F would be not minimal, since F must contain an mP_4. However, if $t < 2m - \lceil \frac{s}{2} \rceil$, then there exists a vertex w of degree 3 in F so that $F - \{w\} \not\supseteq (m - 1)P_4$. This means that $F \not\to (mK_2, P_4)$, a contradiction. Therefore the condition $t = 2m - \lceil \frac{s}{2} \rceil$ holds. $\qquad \square$

As an illustration, in Figure 7 we provide the graphs $C_{13}[(3, P_3); (2, 2)]$ and $C_{13}[(3, P_3); (1, 2)]$ which are in $\mathcal{R}(5K_2, P_4)$.

Figure 7: Two examples of the graphs in $\mathcal{R}(5K_2, P_4)$.

5   The graph $C_s[(t, P_2), (t^*, P_3); (a_1, \ldots, a_{t-1}), (b_0, b_1, \ldots, b_{t^*-1})]$

In this section, we characterize all unicyclic graphs G containing both pendant paths P_2 and P_3. First, we discuss the graphs G when all pendant paths P_2 are consecutive. We denote these graphs by $C_s[(t, P_2), (t^*, P_3); (a_i)_1^{t-1}, (b_j)_0^{t^*-1}]$ where $(a_i)_1^{t-1} = (a_1, \ldots, a_{t-1})$, $(b_j)_0^{t^*-1} = (b_0, b_1, \ldots, b_{t^*-1})$ and b_0 is the distance between the cycle vertex incident with the last pendant path P_2 and the cycle vertex incident with the first pendant path P_3. According to Lemma 3.2, all the a_i are odd for $i \in [1, t-1]$.

Lemma 5.1. *Let m, s, t, t^* be natural numbers and $m \geq 2$. Let F be a unicyclic graph $C_s[(t, P_2), (t^*, P_3); (a_i)_1^{t-1}, (b_j)_0^{t^*-1}]$. If F is a Ramsey (mK_2, P_4)-minimal graph, then $b_0 \equiv 1 \bmod 2$.*

Proof. Let F be a unicyclic Ramsey (mK_2, P_4)-minimal graph of the form $C_s[(t, P_2), (t^*, P_3); (a_i)_1^{t-1}, (b_j)_0^{t^*-1}]$. We are going to show that $b_0 \equiv 1 \bmod 2$. Suppose to the contrary that b_0 is even. To do this, we write $F = C_s[(t, P_2), (t^*, P_3); (a_i)_1^{t-1}, (0 \bmod 2, b_1, \ldots, b_{t^*-1})]$. We consider two cases: $b_0 = 2 + 4k$ or $b_0 = 4(k + 1)$ for some integer $k \geq 0$. We observe the subgraph $C_s[(1, P_2), (1, P_3); (b_0)]$ of F. For $b_0 = 2 + 4k$, consider the graph B_{4a}, while for $b_0 = 4(k + 1)$, consider the graph B_{4b}. Relabel these two graphs as depicted in Figure 8.

Figure 8: The graphs $B_{4a} = C_s[(1, P_2), (1, P_3); (2 + 4k)]$ and $B_{4b} = C_s[(1, P_2), (1, P_3); (4 + 4k)]$, for some integer $k \geq 0$.

Consider the subgraph of B_{4a} induced by the set U_a, where $U_a = \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_{3+4k}, x_1, y_1, y_2\}$. By Theorem 2.5, the graph $F - \{v_{3+4k}\}$ must contain a forest $(m-1)P_4$, where the path from $v_3, v_4, \ldots, v_{2+4k}$ contains a kP_4. We can see that x_1

and v_2 are the pendant vertivces of $F - e$ (with $e = v_2 v_3$). This means that we can exclude the vertex v_2 to form the forest $(m - 1)P_4$, and its role is replaced by x_1. However, the path from $v_2, v_3, \ldots, y_1$ contains a $(k+1)P_4$. It forces $F \supseteq m P_4$. Hence F is not minimal; a contradiction. Next we consider the subgraph of B_{4b} induced by the set U_b, where $U_b = \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_{1+4k}, x_1, y_1, y_2\}$. By Theorem 2.5, the graph $F - \{v_1\} \supseteq (m - 1)P_4$. The subgraph induced by the set $U_b - \{v_1\}$ must contain a $(k + 1)P_4$, and exclude the vertices y_1 and y_2. Since the induced subgraph $F[U_b]$ contains a $(k + 2)P_4$, it forces $F \supseteq m P_4$. So F is not minimal; a contradiction. $\square$

In the next corollary we show that there is no unicyclic graph $C_s[(1, P_2), (1, P_3); (b_0)]$ in $\mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_4)$ for any integers $m \geq 2$ and $s \geq 1$.

Corollary 5.2. *The graph $C_s[(1, P_2), (1, P_3); (b_0)]$ is not in $\mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_4)$ for any positive integers s and $m \geq 2$.*

Proof. Let F be a unicyclic graph $C_s[(1, P_2), (1, P_3); (b_0)]$ with any $s \geq 1$. By contradiction, assume that $F \in \mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_4)$. It follows from Theorem 3.3 that $C_{4m-4}[(2, P_2); (1 \bmod 2)]$ is in $\mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_4)$. Let F be a unicyclic graph $C_s[(1, P_2), (1, P_3); (b_0)]$. By Lemma 5.1, b_0 must be odd. For $s = 4m - 4$, $F \supseteq C_s[(2, P_2); (1 \bmod 2)]$. So $F \notin \mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_4)$. For $s \leq 4m - 5$, for each vertex u of degree 3 incident with the pendant path P_3, we have $F - \{w\} \not\supseteq (m-1)P_4$. This means that $F \not\rightarrow (mK_2, P_4)$. This leads to a contradiction. $\square$

Now we discuss the gap sequence $(b_j)_0^{t^*-1}$ for pendant paths P_3. It follows from Lemma 4.1 that $b_j \not\equiv 0, 3 \bmod 4$. By Lemma 4.3, there exists at most one $i_0 \in [1, t]$ such that $b_{j_0} \equiv 1 \bmod 4$ and for the remaining $i \neq i_0$, $b_j \equiv 2 \bmod 4$.

Lemma 5.3. *Let m, s, t and t^* be natural numbers with $m \geq 3$ and $2m \leq s \leq 4m-5$. Let F be a unicyclic graph $C_s[(t, P_2), (t^*, P_3); (a_i)_1^{t-1}, (b_j)_0^{t^*-1}]$ with all the a_i and b_0 odd. If $F \in \mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_4)$, then $b_j \equiv 2 \bmod 4$ for all $j \in [1, t^* - 1]$.*

Proof. For a contradiction, assume that $b_j \not\equiv 2 \bmod 4$ for some $j \in [1, t^*-1]$. According to Lemmas 4.1 and 4.3, there is exactly one $j_0 \in [1, t^*-1]$ such that $b_{j_0} \equiv 1 \bmod 4$ and for the remaining j, $b_j \equiv 2 \bmod 4$. Therefore F contains B_5 as a subgraph, where $B_5 = C_s[(1, P_2), (2, P_3); (1 + 2k_1, 1 + 4k_2)]$ for some natural numbers $k_1, k_2 \geq 0$. Relabeling all vertices of B_5 in such a way, we have the graph as depicted in Figure 9(a). By Theorem 3.3, we have $C_{4m-5}[(3, P_2); (1 \bmod 2)] \in \mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_4)$. Consequently, for $s = 4m - 5$, F is not minimal since F contains $C_{4m-5}[(3, P_2); (1 \bmod 2)]$.

Now, consider s even and $2m \leq s \leq 4m - 6$. Since b_0 is odd, clearly $t^* \geq 2$. By relabeling the graph B_5 with opposite direction (with v_1 fixed, v_s becomes v_2, $v_{3+2k_1+4k_2}$ becomes $v_{s-1-2k_1-4k_2}$, and so on; see Figure 9(b)), we obtain that the length of the path from the vertex v_1 to $v_{s-1-2k_1-4k_2}$ is b_0, where b_0 is even, which contradicts the fact that b_0 is odd.

Now consider the case s odd and $2m+1 \leq s \leq 4m-7$. If we take $s = 4m-7$, $t^* = 2$ and $t = 1$, then $F - \{v_1\} \not\supseteq (m - 1)P_4$. So $F \not\rightarrow (mK_2, P_4)$, a contradiction. If $t^* > 2$, F is not minimal since F contains a graph $C_{4m-7}[(3, P_3); (1 \bmod 4, 2 \bmod 4)] \in$

$\mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_4)$ (by Theorem 4.4). If $t > 1$ and t is even, then by relabeling the graph F with opposite direction we find that the length of the path from the vertex incident with the last pendant path P_3 to the vertex incident with the first pendant path P_2 is even, which produces a contradiction. Hence, for $s = 4m - 7$, it should be $b_j \equiv 2 \bmod 4$ for all $j \in [1, t^*-1]$. Any other odd values of s with $2m+1 \le s \le 4m-9$ can be proved in a similar fashion. $\qquad \square$


Figure 9: The graph $B_5 = C_s[(1, P_2), (2, P_3); (1+2k_1), (1+4k_2)]$ for some non-negative integers k_1 and k_2 with two different labelings.

According to Lemmas 2.8, 3.2, 4.1, 5.1, and 5.3 we have the following consequence.

Corollary 5.4. *If a unicyclic graph $C_s[(t, P_2)(t^*, P_3); (a_i)_1^{t-1}, (b_j)_0^{t^*-1}]$ is Ramsey (mK_2, P_4)-minimal, then the following three conditions hold:*

(i) *both b_0 and all the a_i are odd;*

(ii) *$b_j \equiv 2 \bmod 4$ for each $j \in [1, t^* - 1]$;*

(iii) *$t + 2t^* \ge 4m - s - 2$.*

Proof. Let $F \in \mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_4)$ be a unicyclic graph $C_s[(t, P_2)(t^*, P_3); (a_i)_1^{t-1}, (b_j)_0^{t^*-1}]$. By Lemmas 3.2, 4.1, 5.1 and 5.3, the conditions of (i) and (ii) hold. By Lemma 2.8, we obtain $|E(F)| = s + t + 2t^* \ge 4m - 2$. So $t + 2t^* \ge 4m - s - 2$, that is, the condition (iii) holds. $\qquad \square$

Lemma 5.5. *Let m, s, t and t^* be natural numbers with $m \ge 2$ and $2m + 1 \le s \le 4m - 6$. Let F be a unicyclic graph $C_s[(t, P_2), (t^*, P_3); (a_i)_1^{t-1}, (b_j)_0^{t^*-1}]$ with all the a_i and b_0 odd, and $b_j \equiv 2 \bmod 4$ for $i \in [1, t-1], j \in [1, t^* - 1]$. If s and t are the same parity, then $F \notin \mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_4)$.*

Proof. Let F be a unicyclic graph $C_s[(t, P_2), (t^*, P_3); (a_i)_1^{t-1}, (b_j)_0^{t^*-1}]$ with all the a_i and b_0 odd, and $b_j \equiv 2 \bmod 4$ for $i \in [1, t-1], j \in [1, t^* - 1]$. By Corollary 5.4(c), we have $t + 2t^* \ge 4m - s - 2$. Let s and t both be odd. For $t + 2t^* = 4m - s - 2$,

by choosing the vertex u of degree 3 incident with a pendant path P_3, we obtain $F - \{u\} \not\supseteq (m-1)P_4$. So $F \nrightarrow (mK_2, P_4)$. Now, for $t + 2t^* > 4m - s - 1$, we have $F \supseteq mP_4$. This implies that F is not minimal. Therefore, in each case, we obtain $F \notin \mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_4)$. Similarly we can show the result in the case that s and t are both even. $\qquad\square$

Theorem 5.6. *Let m, s, t and t^* be natural numbers with $m \geq 2$ and $2m + 1 \leq s \leq 4m - 5$. Let F be a unicyclic graph $C_s[(t, P_2), (t^*, P_3); (a_i)_1^{t-1}, (b_j)_0^{t^*-1}]$ for odd s. The graph $F \in \mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_4)$ if and only if the following conditions are satisfied:*

  (i) *t is even and $t + 2t^* = 4m - s - 1$;*

  (ii) *all the a_i and b_0 are odd, and $b_j \equiv 2 \bmod 4$ for $i \in [1, t-1]$, $j \in [1, t^*-1]$.*

Proof. Let F be a unicyclic graph $C_s[(t, P_2), (t^*, P_3); (a_i)_1^{t-1}, (b_j)_0^{t^*-1}]$ satisfying the two conditions above. It is easy to verify that for each $v \in V(F)$, the graph $F - \{v\} \supseteq (m-1)P_4$. So $F \to (mK_2, P_4)$. Next, we prove the minimality property of F. Let e be an edge of F. First we consider that e is an edge of a pendant path. Then, by choosing a cycle vertex u incident with a pendant path P_3, we obtain $(F - e) - \{u\} \not\supseteq (m-1)P_4$. Meanwhile, if e is an edge of the cycle of F, then $F - e$ is a tree. If possible, choose a vertex w of degree 2 such that $(F - e) - \{w\} = P_3 \cup T$, where T is a tree; otherwise, choose a cycle vertex z incident with a pendant path P_3. Then we obtain $(F - e) - \{z\} \not\supseteq (m-1)P_4$. Therefore the graph F is minimal.

Conversely, for a contradiction, assume t is odd. Since s is odd, by Lemma 5.5, we obtain $F \notin \mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_4)$ which leads to a contradiction. Hence t must be even. Next, by Corollary 5.4, $t + 2t^* \geq 4m - s - 2$. If $t + 2t^* = 4m - s - 2$, then we take a cycle vertex u incident with a pendant path P_3, such that $F - \{u\} \not\supseteq (m-1)P_4$. So $F \nrightarrow (mK_2, P_4)$. However, if $t + 2t^* > 4m - s - 1$ then F is not minimal, since $F \supseteq mP_4$. Hence $t + 2t^* = 4m - s - 1$. Next, by Corollary 5.4, condition (ii) holds. $\qquad\square$

The graphs in Figure 10 are examples of unicyclic graphs with circumference 13 belonging to $\mathcal{R}(5K_2, P_4)$.


$$C_{13}[(2, P_2), (2, P_3); (1), (1, 2)] \qquad\qquad C_{13}[(4, P_2), (1, P_3); (1, 1, 1), (3)]$$

Figure 10: Two non-isomorphic unicyclic graphs with circumference 13 both belong to $\mathcal{R}(5K_2, P_4)$.

Theorem 5.7. *Let m, s, t and t^* be natural numbers and $m \geq 3$ and $2m \leq s \leq 4m - 6$. Let F be a unicyclic graph $C_s[(t, P_2), (t^*, P_3); (a_i)_1^{t-1}, (b_j)_0^{t^*-1}]$ for even s. The graph $F \in \mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_4)$ if and only if the following conditions are satisfied.*

(i) *t is odd and $t + 2t^* = 4m - s - 1$;*

(ii) *for all $i \in [1, t-1]$, $j \in [1, t^*-1]$, $a_i \equiv 1 \bmod 2$, $b_0 \equiv 1 \bmod 2$ and $b_j \equiv 2 \bmod 4$.*

Proof. Let F be a unicyclic graph $C_s[(t, P_2), (t^*, P_3), (a_i)_1^{t-1}, (b_j)_0^{t^*-1}]$ for even s satisfying the above conditions (i) and (ii). Since for every $v \in V(F)$, the graph $F - \{v\} \supseteq (m-1)P_4$, we have $F \to (mK_2, P_4)$. Now we prove the minimality. Consider an edge $e \in E(F)$. If e is an edge of a pendant path, then choose any cycle vertex u of degree 3 of $F - e$; we obtain $(F - e) - \{u\} \not\supseteq (m-1)P_4$. Furthermore, if e is an edge of the cycle of F, then, if possible, choose a vertex w of degree 2 of the cycle such that $(F - e) - \{w\} = P_3 \cup T$, where T is a tree; otherwise choose a vertex z of degree 3 incident with a pendant path P_3. We again obtain $(F - e) - \{z\} \not\supseteq (m-1)P_4$. Hence F is minimal.

Conversely, assume, to the contrary, that t is even. Since s is even, by Lemma 5.5, $F \notin \mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_4)$. Next, by Corollary 5.4, $t + 2t^* \geq 4m - s - 2$. If $t + 2t^* = 4m - s - 2$, then we choose any vertex u of degree 3 incident with a pendant path P_3, and we get $F - \{u\} \not\supseteq (m-1)P_4$. So $F \not\to (mK_2, P_4)$. However, if $t + 2t^* > 4m - s - 1$ then F is not minimal, since F contains an mP_4. Therefore the supposition that t is even or $t + 2t^* \neq 4m - s - 1$ leads to a contradiction. Therefore t must be odd and $t + 2t^* = 4m - s - 1$. The second condition holds by applying Corollary 5.4. $\square$

For example, to illustrate Theorem 5.7, we give two non-isomorphic graphs with circumference 14 belonging to $\mathcal{R}(5K_2, P_4)$ in Figure 11.


$$C_{14}[(1, P_2), (2, P_3); (3, 2)] \qquad C_{14}[(3, P_2), (1, P_3); (1, 3), (1)]$$

Figure 11: Two non-isomorphic graphs with circumference 14 that are in $\mathcal{R}(5K_2, P_4)$.

Now we are investigating a unicyclic graph F with pendant paths P_2 and P_3 alternating in a cycle C_s. We denote this graph by $C_s[(t, P_2, P_3); (a_i)_1^{t-1}]$, i.e., a unicyclic graph with circumference s and a gap sequence $(a_i)_1^{t-1} = (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{t-1})$ with pendant paths P_2 and P_3 alternating.

Let $V(C_s) = \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_s\}$ be the vertex set of the cycle of F. Hence there are t vertices of C_s having degree 3. Next, let $u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_t$ be the vertices of degree 3. A vertex u_i is said to be *close* to u_j if there is no other vertex of degree 3 between u_i and u_j in the cycle. In this case, we also say that a pendant path incident with

u_i is close to a pendant path incident with u_j. According to Lemmas 3.2, 4.3, 5.1, and 5.3, we have the remark below.

Remark 5.8. *Let m, s and t be natural numbers with $m \geq 2$. Let F be a unicyclic graph $C_s[(t, P_2, P_3); (a_i)_1^{t-1}]$, where pendant paths P_2 and P_3 are alternating in the cycle C_s. Let $u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_t$ be the vertices of degree 3 in the cycle C_s. If $F \in \mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_4)$, then the following conditions must be satisfied.*

(i) *If a pendant path P_2 incident with u_i is close to either a pendant path P_2 or P_3 incident with u_j, then $d(u_i, u_j)$ is odd.*

(ii) *If a pendant path P_3 incident with u_i is close to a pendant path P_3 incident with u_j, then $d(u_i, u_j) \equiv 2 \bmod 4$.*

A sequence of pendant paths appearing in distances $(a_i)_1^{t-1}$ of the graph $C_s[(t, P_2, P_3); (a_i)_1^{t-1}]$ is called a *pendant path sequence*. For example, the graph in Figure 12 has a pendant path sequence (P_2, P_3, P_2, P_3).


Figure 12: The graph $B_6 = C_s[(4, P_2, P_3); (1 + 2k_1, 1 + 2k_2, 1 + 2k_3)]$.

Theorem 5.9. *Let m, s and t be natural numbers with $m \geq 2$. There is no a unicyclic graph $C_s[(t, P_2, P_3); (a_i)_1^{t-1}]$ in $\mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_4)$.*

Proof. Let F be a unicyclic graph $C_s[(t, P_2, P_3); (a_i)_1^{t-1}]$. For a contradiction, assume that $F \in \mathcal{R}(mK_2, P_4)$. Without loss of generality, we could consider a subgraph of F by removing all pendant paths except any four pendant paths with the sequence (P_2, P_3, P_2, P_3). By Remark 5.8, we consider the unicyclic graph $B_6 = C_s[(t, P_2, P_3); (a_i)_1^{t-1}]$ having a gap sequence $a_i = 1 \bmod 2$ for each $i \in [1, 3]$. Now, relabeling (if necessary) the vertices of B_6 in such a way we have the graph depicted in Figure 12. Consider now the pendant edge $e = x_1 x_2$ of a pendant path P_3 (see Figure 12). For each $v \in V(F)$, we get $(F - e) - \{v\} \supseteq (m - 1)P_4$. By Corollary 2.6, F is not minimal, which is a contradiction. $\square$

6   Conclusion

To conclude this paper, we present the characterization of all unicyclic Ramsey (mK_2, P_4)-minimal graphs in the following theorem (as a summary from Theorems 1.3, 3.3, 4.4, 5.6, 5.7 and 5.9).

Theorem 6.1. *Let F be a unicyclic Ramsey (mK_2, P_4)-minimal graph. Then graph F is one of the following forms:*

(i) *a cycle C_s, where $s \in \{4m - 3, 4m - 2, 4m - 1\}$;*

(ii) *a graph $C_s[(t, P_2); (a_i)_1^{t-1}]$, where $2m \leq s \leq 4m - 4$, $t = 4m - s - 2$ and all the a_i are odd;*

(iii) *a graph $C_s[(t, P_3); (b_i)_1^{t-1}]$, where $2m+1 \leq s \leq 4m-5$ and s is odd, $t = 2m - \lceil \frac{s}{2} \rceil$ and there is at most one $i_0 \in [1, t-1]$ such that $b_{i_0} \equiv 1 \bmod 4$ and the remaining b_i satisfy $b_i \equiv 2 \bmod 4$; or*

(iv) *a graph $C_s[(t, P_2), (t^*, P_3); (a_i)_1^{t-1}, (b_j)_0^{t^*-1}]$, where $2m \leq s \leq 4m - 5$, $t + 2t^* = 4m - s - 1$, all the a_i and b_0 are odd, and $b_j \equiv 2 \bmod 4$ for $j \in [1, t^* - 1]$.* $\square$

Acknowledgments

References

[1] E. T. Baskoro and K. Wijaya, On Ramsey $(2K_2, K_4)$-minimal graphs, *Mathematics in the 21st Century*, Springer Proc. Math. Stat. **98** (2015), 11–17.

[2] E. T. Baskoro and L. Yulianti, On Ramsey minimal graphs for $2K_2$ versus P_n, *Adv. Appl. Discrete Math.* **8** (2) (2011), 83–90.

[3] S. A. Burr, P. Erdős, R. J. Faudree and R. H. Schelp, A class of Ramsey-finite graphs, *Proc. Ninth Southeastern Conf. on Combin., Graph Theory and Computing, Boca Raton* (1978), 171–180.

[4] S. A. Burr, P. Erdős, R. J. Faudree, C. C. Rousseau and R. H. Schelp, Ramsey minimal graphs for matchings, *The Theory and Applications of Graphs*, Kalamazoo, Mich. (1980), 159–168. (Wiley, New York, 1981).

[5] S. A. Burr, P. Erdős, R. Faudree, C. C. Rousseau and R. H. Schelp, Ramsey minimal graphs for forests, *Discrete Math.* **38** (10) (1982), 23–32.

[6] R. Faudree, Ramsey minimal graphs for forests, *Ars Combin.* **31** (1991), 117–124.

[7] T. Łuczak, On Ramsey minimal graphs, *Electron. J. Combin.* **1** (1994), #R4.

[8] I. Mengersen and J. Oeckermann, Matching-star Ramsey sets, *Discrete Appl. Math.* **95** (1999), 417–424.

[9] H. Muhshi and E. T. Baskoro, On Ramsey $(3K_2, P_3)$-minimal graphs, *AIP Conf. Proc.* **1450** (2012), 110–117.

[10] S. P. Radziszowski, Small Ramsey numbers, *Electron. J. Combin.* (2017), DS1.15.

[11] K. Wijaya, E. T. Baskoro, H. Assiyatun and D. Suprijanto, On unicyclic Ramsey (mK_2, P_3)-minimal graphs, *Procedia Comp. Sci.* **74** (2015), 10–14.

[12] K. Wijaya, E. T. Baskoro, H. Assiyatun and D. Suprijanto, On Ramsey (mK_2, H)-minimal graphs, *Graphs Combin.* **33** (1) (2017), 233–243.

[13] K. Wijaya, E. T. Baskoro, H. Assiyatun and D. Suprijanto, On Ramsey $(4K_2, P_3)$-minimal graphs, *AKCE Int. J. Graphs Combin.* **15** (2) (2018), 174–186.