Connectivity of lexicographic product and direct product of graphs*

Chao Yang Jun-Ming Xu
Department of Mathematics
University of Science and Technology of China
Hefei, 230026, China
yangchao@mail.ustc.edu.cn (C. Yang)
xujm@ustc.edu.cn (J.-M. Xu)

Abstract

In this paper, we prove that the connectivity and the edge connectivity of the lexicographic product of two graphs G_1 and G_2 are equal to $\kappa_1 v_2$ and $\min\{\lambda_1 v_2^2, \delta_2 + \delta_1 v_2\}$, respectively, where $\delta_i, \kappa_i, \lambda_i$ and v_i denote the minimum degree, the connectivity, the edge-connectivity and the number of vertices of G_i, respectively. We also obtain that the edge-connectivity of the direct product of K_2 and a graph H is equal to $\min\{2\lambda, 2\beta, \min_{j=\lambda}^{\delta}\{j + 2\beta_j\}\}$, where β is the minimum size of a subset $F \subset E(H)$ such that $H - F$ is bipartite and $\beta_j = \min\{\beta(C)\}$, where C takes over all components of $H - B$ for all edge-cuts B of size $j \geqslant \lambda = \lambda(H)$.

Keywords: Connectivity, lexicographic product, direct product
AMS Subject Classification: 05C40

1 Introduction

Throughout this paper, a graph $G = (V, E)$ always means a finite undirected graph without self-loops or multiple edges, where $V = V(G)$ is the vertex-set and $E = E(G)$ is the edge-set. The symbol K_n denotes a complete graph with n vertices. For two disjoint subsets X and Y in $E(G)$, the symbol $E_G(X, Y)$ (sometimes $[X, Y]$ for short) denotes the set of edges in G with one end-vertex in X and the other in Y. For the graph theoretical terminology and notation not defined here, we refer the reader to [15].

*The work was supported by NNSF of China (No.10671191).

It is well-known that when the underlying topology of an interconnection network is modelled by a connected graph $G = (V, E)$, where V is the set of processors and E is the set of communication links in the network, the connectivity $\kappa(G)$ and the edge-connectivity $\lambda(G)$ of G are two important measurements for fault-tolerance of the network. In general, the larger $\kappa(G)$ or $\lambda(G)$ is, the more reliable the network is. It is well-known that $\kappa(G) \leq \lambda(G) \leq \delta(G)$, where $\delta(G)$ is the minimum degree of G. A connected graph G is called to be *κ-maximal* and *λ-maximal* if $\kappa(G) = \delta(G)$ and $\lambda(G) = \delta(G)$, respectively.

Product graphs have always been a good method to construct large graphs from small ones, thus it also has many applications in the design of interconnection networks (see [14]). There are many ways to define products of two graphs, the most widely used one may be the Cartesian product, first introduced by Sabidussi [9]. In the same paper, Sabidussi also proposed another kind of product, the strong product. It has been known for a long time that the connectivity and the edge-connectivity of the Cartesian product of two graphs are at least the sum of the connectivity and the edge-connectivity of the two factor graphs, respectively (see [1, 10, 13]). Recently, the authors [16, 17] have determined the connectivity and edge-connectivity of the Cartesian product of two graphs in terms of the minimum degree, connectivity, edge-connectivity and vertex number of the factor graphs. The connectivity of the strong product of graphs has been studied by Sun and Xu in [11].

In this paper, we study the connectivity of another two kinds of product graphs, the lexicographic product and the direct product. Let $G_1 = (V_1, E_1)$ and $G_2 = (V_2, E_2)$ be two graphs. The *lexicographic* product $G_1 \circ G_2$ has $V_1 \times V_2$ as its vertex-set, and two vertices x_1x_2 and y_1y_2 are adjacent if and only if either $x_1y_1 \in E_1$, or $x_1 = y_1$ and $x_2y_2 \in E_2$. According to [6], the lexicographic product is first defined by Hausdorff [4]. Many graph theoretical invariants of lexicographic product of graphs have been studied in the literature, see [7, 8] for example. The *direct product* $G_1 \times G_2$ also has the vertex-set $V_1 \times V_2$. Two vertices x_1x_2 and y_1y_2 are adjacent if and only if $x_1y_1 \in E_1$ and $x_2y_2 \in E_2$. The direct product sometimes appears in the literature with other names, such as the cross product [2, 3], the categorical product [12], the cardinal product [5] and so on.

Note that in the sense of isomorphism the direct product satisfies the commutative law, while the lexicographic product does not. The lexicographic product and the direct product, together with the Cartesian product ($\Box$) and the strong product ($\boxtimes$), are the main four standard products of graphs that is being treated in the monograph [6]. The monograph devotes to all aspects related to these products. The graphs shown in Figure 1 illustrate the differences of these four kinds of products.

In Section 2, we determine the connectivity and the edge-connectivity

Figure 1: Four kinds of products of K_2 and P_2

of the lexicographic product $G_1 \circ G_2$ of two graphs G_1 and G_2, that is, $\kappa(G_1 \circ G_2) = \kappa_1 v_2$ and $\lambda(G_1 \circ G_2) = \min\{\lambda_1 v_2^2, \delta_2 + \delta_1 v_2\}$. And in Section 3, we study the edge-connectivity of the direct product of K_2 and an arbitrary connected graph H and obtain that $\lambda(K_2 \times H) = \min\{2\lambda, 2\beta, \min_{j=\lambda}^{\delta}\{j + 2\beta_j\}\}$. All throughout this paper, $\delta_i, \kappa_i, \lambda_i$ and v_i will denote the minimum degree, the connectivity, the edge-connectivity and the number of vertices of the graph $G_i (i = 1, 2)$, respectively; while the parameters β and β_j will be defined in Section 3.

2 Lexicographic product

Lemma 1 *Let G_1 and G_2 be two graphs, then $\delta(G_1 \circ G_2) = \delta_2 + \delta_1 v_2$.*

By simple observation, $G_1 \circ G_2$ is connected if and only if G_1 is connected.

Theorem 1 *Let G_1 and G_2 be two graphs. If G_1 is non-trivial, non-complete and connected, then*

$$\kappa(G_1 \circ G_2) = \kappa_1 v_2.$$

Proof. By the hypothesis that G_1 is a non-complete graph, there are separating sets in G_1 and $G_1 \circ G_2$. Let S_1 be a minimum separating set of G_1. Then, by the definition, $S_1 \times V_2$ is a separating set of $G_1 \circ G_2$ and so $\kappa(G_1 \circ G_2) \leqslant |S_1 \times V_2| = \kappa_1 v_2$.

Now, let S be any separating set of $G_1 \circ G_2$. We need to show that $|S| \geqslant \kappa_1 v_2$. It is easy to see that there exist two vertices $x_1 y_1$ and $x_2 y_2$ in $G_1 \circ G_2 - S$ such that they are in distinct components of $G_1 \circ G_2 - S$

and $x_1 \neq x_2$. Then x_1 and x_2 are not adjacent in G_1, otherwise x_1y_1 and x_2y_2 are adjacent in $G_1 \circ G_2$, which means that S can not separates x_1y_1 and x_2y_2 in $G_1 \circ G_2$, a contradiction. So there are κ_1 internal-disjoint (x_1, x_2)-paths $P_1, P_2, \ldots, P_{\kappa_1}$ in G_1.

Let $P_i = (x_1, t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_k, x_2)$. If for each $j = 1, 2, \ldots, k$ there exists a $z_j \in V_2$ such that $t_j z_j \notin S$, then the (x_1y_1, x_2y_2)-path $(x_1y_1, t_1z_1, \ldots, t_kz_k, x_2y_2)$ avoids S in $G_1 \circ G_2$, which contradicts to our hypothesis that S separates x_1y_1 and x_2y_2 in $G_1 \circ G_2$. Thus, for each $i = 1, 2, \ldots, \kappa_1$, there is at least one internal vertex t^i in P_i such that $\{t^i\} \times V_2 \subset S$. It follows that

$$|S| \geqslant \sum_{i=1}^{\kappa_1} |\{t^i\} \times V_2)| = \kappa_1 v_2.$$

The proof is complete. □

By similar argument, it is easy to see that $\kappa(K_n \circ G_2) = (n-1)v_2 + \kappa_2$, where $G_1 = K_n$. So, $G_1 \circ G_2$ is κ-maximal if and only if G_1 is a complete graph and G_2 is κ-maximal.

Theorem 2 *Let G_1 and G_2 be two non-trivial graphs, and G_1 is connected, then*

$$\lambda(G_1 \circ G_2) = \min\{\lambda_1 v_2^2, \delta_2 + \delta_1 v_2\}.$$

Proof. We only need to prove that $\lambda(G_1 \circ G_2) \geqslant \min\{\lambda_1 v_2^2, \delta_2 + \delta_1 v_2\}$ since the reversed inequality is obvious by finding two edge-cuts of size $\lambda_1 v_2^2$ and $\delta_2 + \delta_1 v_2$, respectively. Let $G = G_1 \circ G_2$. For $x \in V_1$, let G_2^x denote the subgraph of G induced by $\{x\} \times V_2$. It is clear that G_2^x is isomorphic to G_2. Let B be a minimum edge-cut in G. Then $G - B$ has exactly two components (see, for example, the exercise 4.3.2 in [15]), denoted by C_1 and C_2.

Let $X = \{x \in V(G_1) : xy \in V(C_1)$ for some $y \in V(G_2)\}$ and $Y = \{x \in V(G_1) : xy \in V(C_2)$ for some $y \in V(G_2)\}$. Then $X \neq \emptyset$ and $Y \neq \emptyset$, clearly.

It $X \cap Y = \emptyset$, then $\{X, Y\}$ is a partition of $V(G_1)$. Thus

$$|B| \geqslant \sum_{xy \in E_{G_1}(X,Y)} |E_G(V(G_2^x), V(G_2^y))| = |E_{G_1}[X, Y]| v_2^2 \geqslant \lambda_1 v_2^2.$$

We assume $X \cap Y \neq \emptyset$ below and let $x_0 \in X \cap Y$. Note that for each neighbor x of x_0, the graph that consists of the vertex-set $V(G_2^{x_0}) \cup V(G_2^x)$ and the edge-set $E_G(V(G_2^{x_0}), V(G_2^x))$ is isomorphic to a complete bipartite K_{v_2,v_2}, denoted by $G_2^{[x_0,x]}$, has edge-connectivity v_2. Let $B_{x_0x} = B \cap E_G(V(G_2^{x_0}), V(G_2^x))$. Then $|B_{x_0x}| \geqslant v_2$ for each neighbor x of x_0, otherwise

$G_2^{x_0} - B$ is connected through G_2^x, a contradiction. Next we claim that

$$|B_{x_0x}| + |B_{x_0}| \geqslant \delta_2 + v_2, \tag{1}$$

where $B_{x_0} = B \cap E(G_2^{x_0})$ and x is a neighbor of x_0. Let $D = V(G_2^{x_0}) \cap V(C_1)$, $F = V(G_2^{x_0}) \cap V(C_2)$, and assume that $|D| \leqslant |F|$. If $|D| = 1$, then (1) holds since $|B_{x_0}| \geqslant \delta_2$. If $|D| \geqslant 2$, we will find $|D|v_2$ edge-disjoint (D, F)-paths in $G_2^{[x_0,x]}$. Let $D = \{u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_t\}$ and $\{w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_t\} \subseteq F$. Then for each $i (1 \leqslant i \leqslant t)$, there are v_2 edge-disjoint (u_i, w_i)-paths in $G_2^{[x_0,x]}$: (u_i, xz, w_i) with $z \in V(G_2)$. So all together, we find $|D|v_2$ edge-disjoint (D, F)-paths. In order to disconnect D from F, we must have $|B_{x_0,x}| \geqslant |D|v_2 \geqslant 2v_2 > \delta_2 + v_2$ and (1) also holds. Let $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{\delta_1}$ be δ_1 neighbors of x_0 in G_1, then

$$\begin{aligned} |B| &\geqslant (|B_{x_0,x_1}| + |B_{x_0}|) + \sum_{i=2}^{\delta_1} |B_{x_0,x_i}| \\ &= \delta_2 + v_2 + (\delta_1 - 1)v_2 \\ &= \delta_2 + \delta_1 v_2. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. □

3 Direct product

Lemma 2 *Let G_1 and G_2 be two graphs, then $\delta(G_1 \times G_2) = \delta_1\delta_2$.*

Lemma 3 *Let G_1 and G_2 be two non-trivial connected graphs, then $G_1 \times G_2$ is connected if and only if at least one of G_1 and G_2 is non-bipartite.*

Proof. First assume both G_1 and G_2 are bipartite graphs with partite sets $V(G_1) = (A, B)$ and $V(G_2) = (C, D)$. Then there are no edges between the sets of vertices $(A \times C) \cup (B \times D)$ and $(B \times C) \cup (A \times D)$ in $G_1 \times G_2$, hence $G_1 \times G_2$ is disconnected.

Conversely, we suppose, without loss of generality, that G_2 is non-bipartite. Then G_2 contains odd cycles certainly. To show that $G_1 \times G_2$ is connected, it is sufficient to prove $K_2 \times G_2$ is connected since G_1 is connected. Let $V(K_2) = \{a, b\}$. Let u and w be two vertices of $K_2 \times G_2$, then we have to show there is a (u, w)-path in $K_2 \times G_2$. There are four cases: (i) $u = ax$ and $w = ay$; (ii) $u = bx$ and $w = by$; (iii) $u = ax$ and $w = by$ and (iv) $u = bx$ and $w = ay$, where x and y are two arbitrary vertices in G_2. The first two cases are symmetric, and the last two cases are also symmetric. In case (iii) u has a neighbor $u' = bx'$ in $K_2 \times G_2$, where $x' \in N_{G_2}(x)$, thus case (iii) can be reduced to case (ii). So we only need to show that there is an (ax, ay)-path in $K_2 \times G_2$, namely case (i). Since G_2 is connected, there is an (x, y)-path in G_2. If there is an (x, y)-path $(x, z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_{2k-1}, y)$ of even length in G_2, then $(ax, bz_1, az_2, \ldots, bz_{zk-1}, ay)$ is an (ax, ay)-path in $K_2 \times G_2$, and so the lemma follows. Suppose below that there is no (x, y)-path of even length in G_2.

Suppose that at least one of x and y, say x, lies in an odd cycle $C_0 = (x, w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_{2t}, x)$ in G_2 and let $Q = (y, z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_k)$ be a shortest path from y to C_0 in G_2. Then $V(Q) \cap V(C_0) = z_k$. If $z_k \neq x$, then Q can be extend to an (x, y)-path G_2 along C_0 to x such that it is of even length since C_0 is an odd cycle, which contradicts to our hypothesis. Thus, $z_k = x$ and Q is of odd length. Let $k = 2m + 1$, then Q can be extended to an (x, y)-trail $Q^* = (x, w_{2t}, \ldots, w_2, w_1, x, z_{2m}, \ldots, z_2, z_1, y)$ in G_2. Therefore, $(ax, bw_{2t}, \ldots, bw_2, aw_1, bx, az_{2m}, \ldots, az_2, bz_1, ay)$ is an (ax, ay)-path in $K_2 \times G_2$.

Suppose now that neither x nor y lies in any odd cycle in G_2. Let C_0' be an arbitrary odd cycle in G_2. Choose a shortest path P_x from x to C_0' and a shortest path P_y from y to C_0' in G_2 such that they have as many common vertices as possible. If P_x and P_y have no vertices in common, then they can be joint through C_0' to form an even (x, y)-path in G_2, which contradicts to our hypothesis. Thus, P_x and P_y have vertices in common. We assume that z_1 is the first common vertex of P_x and P_y. Let $(x, x_1, \ldots, x_r, z_1)$ be the section of P_x from x to z_1 and $(y, y_1, \ldots, y_s, z_1)$ be the section of P_y from y to z_1. By our hypothesis, $r + s$ is odd certainly. By the choice of P_x and P_y, we can suppose that a common section of P_x and P_y from z_1 to z_k is $(z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_k)$. So, without loss of generality, assume $r = 2m$, $s = 2h + 1$ and $k = 2n$ (the case that k is odd is similar). Let $C_0' = (w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_{2t+1}, w_1)$ where $w_1 = z_k$. Then $(ax, bx_1, \ldots, ax_{2m}, bz_1, \ldots, az_{2n}, bw_2, \ldots, aw_{2t+1}, bz_{2n}, \ldots, az_1, by_{2h+1}, \ldots, by_1, ay)$ is an (ax, ay)-path in $K_2 \times G_2$. The proof of the lemma is complete. □

Lemma 4 *Let G be a connected graph, and H be a spanning bipartite subgraph of G with maximum number of edges, then H is connected.*

Proof. Let $\{X, Y\}$ be a bipartition of H. Suppose to the contrary that H is not connected. Then H can be view as the union of two disjoint bipartite graphs H_1 and H_2 with partitions $\{X_1, Y_1\}$ and $\{X_2, Y_2\}$, respectively, such that $X = X_1 \cup X_2$ and $Y = Y_1 \cup Y_2$. Then there is neither (X_1, Y_2)-edges nor (X_2, Y_1)-edges in G since H has maximum number of edges. But G is connected, so there is at least one edge e in G but not in H, linking H_1 and H_2. So e must be an (X_1, X_2)-edge or a (Y_1, Y_2)-edge. Let H' be the spanning bipartite graph of G induced by the bipartition $\{X_1 \cup Y_2, X_2 \cup Y_1\}$. Note that all edges of H still lie in H', and H' has at least one more edge e, a contradiction. □

Lemma 5 *Let H be a connected bipartite graph and K_2 be a complete graph with vertex-set $\{a, b\}$, then $K_2 \times H$ has exactly two components. Moreover, for each $x \in V(H)$, ax and bx are in distinct components of $K_2 \times H$.*

Proof. Let $\{X, Y\}$ be a bipartition of H. By Lemma 3, $K_2 \times H$ is not connected. The subgraph induced by $(\{a\} \times X) \cup (\{b\} \times Y)$ is isomorphic to H, hence is connected and is one component of $K_2 \times H$. The other component is the subgraph induced $(\{b\} \times X) \cup (\{a\} \times Y)$. Thus the lemma follows. □

Note that especially, Lemma 5 is true for $H = K_1$, which is a degenerated bipartite. Let $\beta(G)$ be the minimum number of edges in a subset $F \subset E(G)$ such that $G - F$ is bipartite (including the degenerated bipartite K_1). It follows immediately from the definition that $\beta(G) = 0$ if and only if G is bipartite. For each $j \geqslant \lambda$, let $\beta_j(G) = \min\{\beta(C) :\ C$ is a component of $G - B$ for an edge-cut B consisting of j edges in $G\}$, where the minimum is taken over all components of $G - B$ for any edge-cut B consisting of j edges in G. We omit the graph G in the parenthesis of β and β_j when the underlying graph G is clear by context. Obviously, for a given graph G, $\beta_{j+1} \leqslant \max\{\beta_j - 1, 0\}$, $\beta_j \leqslant \beta$ for all $j \geqslant \lambda$, and $\beta_\delta = 0$ (we view K_1 as a degenerated bipartite, so $\beta(K_1) = 0$).

Theorem 3 *Let H be a non-trivial connected graph of edge-connectivity λ, minimum degree δ, $\beta = \beta(H)$ and $\beta_j = \beta_j(H)$. Then*

$$\lambda(K_2 \times H) = \min\{2\lambda, 2\beta, \min_{j=\lambda}^{\delta}\{j + 2\beta_j\}\}. \tag{2}$$

Proof. If H is bipartite, then the lemma holds by Lemma 3 and the fact that $\beta = 0$. So in the rest of the proof, we assume H is non-bipartite. We first prove

$$\lambda(K_2 \times H) \leqslant \min\{2\lambda, 2\beta, \min_{j=\lambda}^{\delta}\{j + 2\beta_j\}\}. \tag{3}$$

To do this, let B_H be a minimum edge-cut of H. Then $B = \{(ax, by), (bx, ay) : xy \in B_H\}$ is an edge-cut of $K_2 \times H$ and $|B| = 2|B_H| = 2\lambda$, which implies $\lambda(K_2 \times H) \leqslant 2\lambda$.

Let F be a set of edges consisting of β edges in H such that $H - F$ is bipartite. Then $B = \{(ax, by), (bx, ay) : xy \in F\}$ is an edge-cut of $K_2 \times H$ and $|B| = 2|F| = 2\beta$ since $K_2 \times H - B = K_2 \times (H - F)$ is the direct product of two bipartite graphs. This fact shows $\lambda(K_2 \times H) \leqslant 2\beta$.

Now, for each $\lambda \leqslant j \leqslant \delta$, let B_j be an edge-cut consisting of j edges of H, and C_j a component of $H - B_j$ with $\beta(C_j) = \beta_j$. Hence there is a set of edges F_j of C_j such that $|F_j| = \beta_j$ and $C_j - F_j$ is bipartite. Let

$$B' = \{(ax, by), (bx, ay) : xy \in F_j\}.$$

Then $(K_2 \times C_j) - B' = K_2 \times (C_j - F_j)$ is the direct product of two bipartite graphs and, hence, disconnected. By Lemma 4, $C_j - F_j$ is a connected bipartite graph and, hence, by Lemma 5, $K_2 \times (C_j - F_j)$ has exactly two components and ax and bx are in distinct components for each $x \in V(C_j)$. Let C be a component of $(K_2 \times C_j) - B'$. Define a injection mapping φ from B_j to $E(K_2 \times H)$ as follows: for each edge $e = xy \in B_j$ with $x \in V(C_j)$, $\varphi(e) = (ax, by)$ if $ax \in V(C)$; and $\varphi(e) = (bx, ay)$ if $ax \notin V(C)$(which implies $bx \in V(C)$). Let

$$B'' = \varphi(B_j).$$

Then $B' \cup B''$ is an edge-cut of $K_2 \times H$ since C is a component of $(K_2 \times H) - (B' \cup B'')$. And $|B' \cup B''| = |B'| + |B''| = 2|F_j| + |B_j| = j + 2\beta_j$, which implies that $\lambda(K_2 \times H) \leqslant \min_{j=\lambda}^{\delta}\{j + 2\beta_j\}$, and so the inequality (3) follows.

Next, we will show

$$\lambda(K_2 \times H) \geqslant \min\{2\lambda, 2\beta, \min_{j=\lambda}^{\delta}\{j + 2\beta_j\}\}. \tag{4}$$

Let $B = [S, \overline{S}]$ be a minimum edge-cut of $K_2 \times H$. Partition the vertex-set $V(H)$ into four parts:

$$P = \{x \in V(H) : ax \in \overline{S}, bx \in \overline{S}\}, \quad Q = \{x \in V(H) : ax \in S, bx \in S\},$$
$$R = \{x \in V(H) : ax \in S, bx \in \overline{S}\}, \quad T = \{x \in V(H) : ax \in \overline{S}, bx \in S\}.$$

And let $Z = R \cup T$. We prove the inequality (4) by considering the following four cases, respectively.

Case 1: $Z = \emptyset$, then $P \neq \emptyset$ and $Q \neq \emptyset$. Hence

$$|B| \geqslant 2|[P, Q]| \geqslant 2\lambda.$$

Case 2: $Z \neq \emptyset$, $P \neq \emptyset$ and $Q \neq \emptyset$. Without loss of generality, we may assume $|E_H(P, Z)| \leqslant |E_H(Q, Z)|$. Note that $[P, Q \cup Z]$ is an edge-cut of H, so $|[P, Q \cup Z]| \geqslant \lambda$. For each edge $xy \in [P, Q]$, we can see that both the edges (ax, by) and (ay, bx) are in B. For each $xy \in [P, Z]$ or $xy \in [Q, Z]$, exactly one of (ax, by) and (ay, bx) is in B. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} |B| &\geqslant 2|[P, Q]| + |[P, Z]| + |[Q, Z]| \\ &\geqslant 2|[P, Q]| + 2|[P, Z]| \\ &= 2|[P, Q \cup Z]| \\ &\geqslant 2\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

Case 3: $Z \neq \emptyset$, $P = Q = \emptyset$. Then for each edge $xy \in E(G[R])$ or $xy \in E(G[T])$, both the edges (ax, by) and (ay, bx) are in B. Note that

$H - (E(G[R]) \cup E(G[T]))$ is bipartite, hence

$$|B| = 2(|E(G[R])| + |E(G[T])|) \geqslant 2\beta.$$

Case 4: $Z \neq \emptyset$, and exactly one of P and Q is empty. By the symmetry, we may assume that $P \neq \emptyset$ and $Q = \emptyset$. Let C be a maximally connected subgraph of H such that $V(C) \subseteq Z$, and let $R' = R \cap V(C)$ and $T' = T \cap V(C)$. Finally let $X = N_H(C)$, then $X \subseteq P$ by the maximality of C. Then

$$|B| \geqslant |[X, V(C)]| + 2(|E(G[S'])| + |E(G[T'])|). \tag{5}$$

Let $k = |[X, V(C)]|$. If $k > \delta$, then by (5),

$$|B| > \delta = \delta + 2\beta_\delta \geqslant \min_{j=\lambda}^{\delta}\{j + 2\beta_j\}.$$

If $k \leqslant \delta$, by (5) we have

$$|B| \geqslant k + 2\beta_k \geqslant \min_{j=\lambda}^{\delta}\{j + 2\beta_j\}.$$

Thus, the proof of the theorem is complete. □

We conclude by mention that each item of the right side of equation (2) cannot be omitted, since it is possible to find a graph with one item, say 2β, strictly less than other items. Such examples are easy to construct so we do not give them here.

References

[1] W.-S. Chiue and B.-S. Shieh, On connectivity of the Cartesian product of two graphs. *Appl. Math. and Comput.*, **102** (1999), 129-137.

[2] S. Gravier, Hamiltonicity of the cross product of two Hamiltonian graphs. *Discrete Math.*, **170**, (1997), 253-257.

[3] S. Gravier and A. Khelladi, On the domination number of cross products of graphs. *Discrete Math.*, **145** (1995), 273-277.

[4] F. Hausdorff, *Grundzüge der Mengenlehre.* Leipzig, 1914.

[5] W. Imrich, Factoring cardinal product graphs in polynomial time. *Discrete Math.*, **192** (1998), 119-144.

[6] W. Imrich and S. Klavžar, *Product Graphs: Structure and Recognition.* Wiley, New York, 2000.

[7] M. M. M. Jaradat and M. Y. Alzoubi, An upper bound of the basis number of the lexicographic product of graphs. *Australas. J. Combin.*, **32** (2005), 305–312.

[8] S. Klavžar, On the fractional chromatic number and the lexicographic product of graphs. *Discrte Math.*, **185** (1998), 259-263.

[9] G. Sabidussi, Graph multiplication. *Math. Z.*, **72** (1960), 446-457.

[10] G. Sabidussi, Graphs with given group and given graph theoretical properties. *Canadian J. of Math.*, **9** (1957), 515-525.

[11] L. Sun and J.-M. Xu, Connectivity of strong product graphs. *J. Univ. Sci. Tech. China*, **36** (3) (2006), 241-243.

[12] C. Tardif, The fractional chromatic number of the categorical product of graphs. *Combinatorica*, **25**(5) (2005), 625-632.

[13] J.-M. Xu, Connectivity of Cartesian product digraphs and fault-tolerant routings of generalized hypercubes. *Applied Math. J. Chinese Univ.*, **13B** (2) (1998), 179-187.

[14] J.-M. Xu, *Topological Structure and Analysis of Interonnection Networks.* Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordecht/Boston/London, 2001.

[15] J.-M. Xu, *Theory and Application of Graphs.* Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht/Boston/London, 2003.

[16] J.-M. Xu and C. Yang, Connectivity of Cartesian product grpahs. *Discrete Math.*, **306**(1) (2006), 159-165.

[17] J.-M. Xu and C. Yang, Connectivity and super-connectivity of Cartesian product graphs. to appear in *Ars Combin.*