# Chapter 1. Introduction 

Definition. Let

$$
X: x=v_{0}, v_{1}, \ldots, v_{k-1}, v_{k}=y
$$

be an $x-y$ walk and let

$$
Y: y=v_{k}, v_{k+1}, \ldots, v_{k+\ell-1}, v_{k+\ell}=z
$$

be a $y-z$ walk. We say that the walk $Z=v_{0}, \ldots, v_{k}, v_{k+1}, \ldots, v_{k+\ell}$ results from concatenating $Y$ to $X$.

Let $X$ be as above and let $i$ and $j$ be such that $0 \leq i<j \leq k$. Then the $v_{i}-v_{j}$ walk $X^{\prime}: v_{i}, v_{i+1}, \ldots, v_{j-1}, v_{j}$ is said to be a subwalk of $X$. Deleting the subwalk $X^{\prime}$ from $X$ means "removing all edges and internal vertices of $X^{\prime}$ from $X$." If $v_{i} \neq v_{j}$, then we get two distinct walks (a $v_{0}-v_{i}$ walk and a $v_{j}-v_{k}$ walk) after deletion. But if $v_{i}=v_{j}$, then we get one walk ( $a v_{0}-v_{k}$ walk) after deletion.

We prove Theorem 1.6 by algorithm.
Theorem (Theorem 1.6, CZ). If a graph $G$ contains a $u-v$ walk of length $\ell$, then $G$ contains a $u-v$ path of length at most $\ell$.

Proof. Given a $u-v$ walk $W$ in $G$ of length $\ell$, we execute the following algorithm.
1: $\quad$ while $W$ contains repeated vertices do \{
2: let $x$ be some vertex that occurs (at least) twice on $W$
3: $\quad$ delete an $x-x$ subwalk from $W$
4: \}
5: $\quad$ return $W$ as the desired path
We prove this algorithm correct by showing that

1. If the algorithm terminates, then it returns a $u-v$ path of length at most $\ell$.
2. The algorithm terminates.

First note that $W$ is a $u-v$ walk before and after each iteration of the while loop. Suppose the algorithm terminates. Then line 5 must have been executed, which means the while loop exits. Since the loop exits only when $W$ contains no repeated vertices, we see that the algorithm returns a $u-v$ path. This path must have length at most $\ell$ since it is derived from the input walk by having some (if any) subwalk(s) deleted from it.

Each time the body of the loop executes, the length of the walk $W$ decreases by some positive amount. Now, a walk of shortest possible length is the trivial walk of length 0 . Since the input walk has length $\ell$, the while statement iterates no more than $\ell$ times. This means the algorithm terminates.

This completes the proof.

Definition. Let $G=(V, E)$ be a graph. A path $P: v_{0}, v_{1}, \ldots, v_{\ell-1}, v_{\ell}$ in $G$ is called maximal if all neighbors of the ends of $P$ are on $P$. In other words, if $v_{0} x$ is an edge of $G$ then $x=v_{i}$ for some $0<i \leq \ell$, and if $v_{\ell} x$ is an edge of $G$ then $x=v_{i}$ for some $0 \leq i<\ell$.

Exercise. Give an algorithm for getting a maximal path.
We prove Thereom 1.9 by consideration of a maximal path (instead of longest geodesic like in CZ ).

Theorem (Theorem 1.9, CZ). If $G$ is a connected graph of order 2 or more, then $G$ contains two distinct vertices $u$ and $v$ such that $G-u$ is connected and $G-v$ is connected.

Proof. Let $P$ be a maximal path in $G$, and let $u$ and $v$ be the end vertices of $P$. Since $G$ is connected and nontrivial, $G$ has no isolated vertex. Thus, none of $G$ 's maximal paths is trivial. Therefore, $u \neq v$.

First we'll prove that $G-u$ is connected. Let $x$ and $y$ be any vertices in $G-u$. Since $G$ is connnected, $G$ contains an $x-y$ path, say $Q$. We consider two possibilities.

Case 1: $u$ is not on $Q$. Then $Q$ is an $x-y$ path in $G-u$ as well. Thus, $x \sim y$ in $G-u$.
Case 2: $u$ is on $Q$. Then $u$ appears on $Q$ exactly once since $Q$ is a path. Say that $Q: x=w_{0}, w_{1}, \ldots, w_{i}, w_{i+1}=u, w_{i+2}, \ldots, w_{k}=y$. Since $P$ is a maximal path with $u$ as one of its end vertices, all neighbors of $u$ is on $P$. This means that $P$ contains a $w_{i}-w_{i+2}$ subpath $P^{\prime}$. Now let $Q^{\prime}$ be the result of replacing the subpath $w_{i}, u, w_{i+2}$ on $Q$ by $P^{\prime}$.

Then $Q^{\prime}$ is an $x-y$ walk in $G-u$. By Thereom 1.6, $Q^{\prime}$ contains an $x-y$ path (in $G-u$ ). Thus, $x \sim y$ in $G-u$.

In both cases, we have shown that $x \sim y$ in $G-u$. Thus, $G-u$ is connected.
That $G-v$ is connected can be proved in a similar way.

