CC BY

Necessary Structural Conditions for a Minimal Counterexample to Barnette's Conjecture

Rajni Yadav[1], Rajpal*

PhD Scholar, Department of Mathematics, School of Basic and Applied Sciences, Raffles University, Neemrana, 301705, Kotputli, Behro, Rajasthan, India.
***Corresponding author:** Rajpal**,** Email: Rajpal@rafflesuniversity.edu.in

Abstract
Barnette's conjecture asserts that every cubic, 3-connected, planar, bipartite graph is Hamiltonian. Although the conjecture remains unresolved, computational verification and structural graph theory impose substantial restrictions on any hypothetical counterexample. This article develops a self-contained structural analysis of hypothetical minimal counterexamples. The central object is a hypothetical non-Hamiltonian Barnette graph of minimum order. Elementary counting shows that its order is even and that its two bipartition classes have equal size. Bipartiteness and simplicity exclude facial cycles of odd length and, in particular, triangular faces. Combining the parity restriction with the published computer-assisted verification of Barnette's conjecture through order 90 yields the lower bound $|V(G)| \geq 92$. We also formulate precisely the reduction-and-lifting principle underlying the study of reducible configurations, and identify the additional configuration-specific verification required before that principle can be applied as an unconditional theorem. The results are collected into a structural profile that can guide future enumeration and construction attempts. The article does not claim to settle Barnette's conjecture.

Keywords: Barnette's conjecture; Hamiltonian cycle; cubic planar graph; bipartite graph; minimal counterexample; reducible configuration; computational verification.

Introduction

A Hamiltonian cycle in a graph is a cycle containing every vertex exactly once. Determining whether an arbitrary graph has such a cycle is computationally difficult; the Hamiltonian-cycle problem is a classical NP-complete problem [3]. For graphs with strong structural restrictions, however, the existence of Hamiltonian cycles can sometimes be established by global arguments involving connectivity, planarity, parity, and face structure.

Barnette's conjecture is one of the central problems in this area.

Conjecture 1 (Barnette [1]). *Every cubic, 3-connected, planar, bipartite graph is Hamiltonian.*

A graph satisfying these four conditions will be called a *Barnette graph*. The conjecture combines the planarity condition from the classical theory of polyhedral graphs with the parity restrictions imposed by bipartiteness. It remains open in its full generality.

There are two complementary ways to study an unresolved universal conjecture of this type. One is to prove Hamiltonicity for increasingly broad subclasses. The other is to assume that a counterexample exists and determine the structural restrictions that a smallest such graph must satisfy. The second approach is the subject of this article.

Let G be a Barnette graph of minimum order among all non-Hamiltonian Barnette graphs, if any such graph exists. We call G a *minimal counterexample*. Minimality is always understood with respect to the number of vertices, not merely the number of edges. The distinction matters because deleting an edge from a cubic graph destroys cubicity at its two endpoints and therefore does not produce a smaller Barnette graph.

This article develops three strands of restrictions: (i) parity and order constraints; (ii) restrictions on facial cycles; and (iii) avoidance of reducible configurations through reduction and Hamiltonian-cycle lifting. The first two strands yield unconditional statements with short proofs. The third is naturally expressed as a reduction principle: a configuration can be excluded from a minimal counterexample only after its reduction is shown, for that particular configuration and every permitted boundary attachment, to preserve the Barnette conditions and to permit a Hamiltonian cycle to be lifted back.

The contributions of the present article are therefore deliberately stated at the level justified by the arguments. We give complete proofs of the elementary structural lemmas, update the computational lower bound using the published verification through 90 vertices, and isolate the exact hypotheses needed for a reducibility argument. In particular, we do not treat an informal description of a configuration family as a substitute for a configuration-by-configuration proof.

Preliminaries and notation

All graphs in this article are finite and simple unless explicitly stated otherwise. A plane graph is a graph together with a fixed embedding in the plane. The length of a facial boundary is counted with multiplicity; for a 3-connected plane graph, each face boundary is a cycle.

Definition (Barnette graph) 2.1.
A graph G is a Barnette graph if it is:
(i)
cubic: $\deg_G(v) = 3$ for every $v \in V(G)$;
(ii)
planar;
(iii)
3-vertex-connected; and
(iv)
bipartite.
Definition (Minimal counterexample) 2.2.
A graph G is a minimal counterexample to Barnette's conjecture if G is a non-Hamiltonian Barnette graph and every Barnette graph H with $|V(H)| < |V(G)|$ is Hamiltonian.
Write $n = |V(G)|$, $m = |E(G)|$, and $f = |\mathcal{F}(G)|$. Let U, W denote the two colour classes of a bipartition of G. For a plane embedding, let f_k denote the number of faces of length k, when this notation is needed.
Lemma (Cubic order and bipartition balance) 2.3.
Let $G = (U, W; E)$ be a cubic bipartite graph. Then

$$|U| = |W| = \frac{n}{2}, \qquad m = \frac{3n}{2}.$$

In particular, n is even.
Proof.
By the handshaking lemma,

$$3n = \sum_{v \in V(G)} \deg(v) = 2m,$$

so $m = 3n/2$, and hence n is even. Every edge has exactly one endpoint in U and one in W. Counting edges from the two sides gives

$$3|U| = m = 3|W|.$$

Thus $|U| = |W|$, and since $|U| + |W| = n$, both classes have size $n/2$.
Lemma (Euler relations for cubic plane graphs) 2.4.
If G is a connected cubic plane graph, then

$$n - m + f = 2, \qquad 3n = 2m, \qquad f = \frac{n}{2} + 2, \qquad m = \frac{3n}{2}.$$

Moreover, if f_k denotes the number of faces of length k, then

$$\sum_{k \geq 3} f_k = f, \qquad \sum_{k \geq 3} k\, f_k = 2m = 3n.$$

Proof.
The first identity is Euler's formula and the second is the handshaking lemma. Substituting $m = 3n/2$ into Euler's formula gives $f = n/2 + 2$. The final identity counts each edge twice, once from each incident face.
Facial restrictions imposed by bipartiteness
The face-size restriction in this section is a direct consequence of bipartiteness. It is useful because it constrains every Barnette graph, not only a minimal counterexample.
Lemma (Even-cycle property) 3.1.
Every cycle in a bipartite graph has even length.
Proof.
Let G have bipartition (U, W). Along every walk, consecutive vertices alternate between U and W. A cycle returns to its initial vertex, and therefore must contain an even number of edges.
Theorem (Minimum facial length) 3.2.
Every face of a Barnette graph has length at least 4. In particular, no Barnette graph has a triangular face.
Proof.
A Barnette graph is 3-connected, so it is simple and every facial boundary is a cycle. By 3.1, each such cycle has even length. Simplicity excludes cycles of length 1 and 2, while evenness excludes length 3. Hence every facial boundary has length at least 4.
Remark 3.3.
Theorem 3.2 is stronger in scope than a statement restricted to minimal counterexamples: it holds for every Barnette graph. Its proof is elementary and should be presented as a preliminary structural observation rather than as the principal novelty of a research article.
Proposition (A face-count identity) 3.4.
For a Barnette graph with f_k faces of length k,

$$\sum_{k \geq 4} (k - 4)\, f_k = n - 8.$$

Proof.
By Theorem 3.2, all faces have length at least 4. Therefore

$$\sum_{k\geq 4} k\, f_k = 3n \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{k\geq 4} f_k = f = \frac{n}{2} + 2$$

by 2.4. Subtracting four times the second equality from the first yields

$$\sum_{k\geq 4} (k-4)\, f_k = 3n - 4\left(\frac{n}{2} + 2\right) = n - 8.$$

Corollary 3.5.

If a Barnette graph has only quadrilateral and hexagonal faces, and q and h denote their respective numbers, then

$$q = 6, \qquad n = 2h + 8, \qquad m = 3h + 12, \qquad f = h + 6.$$

Proof.

In this case 3.4 becomes $2h = n - 8$, so $n = 2h + 8$. Since $3n = 2m$, we obtain $m = 3h + 12$. Euler's formula gives $f = h + 6$, and $q = f - h = 6$.

A lower bound on the order of a minimal counterexample

Computational verification has played an important role in the study of Barnette's conjecture. Early enumerations verified the conjecture for successively larger ranges of orders. The result relevant to the present paper is the computer-assisted verification by Brinkmann, Goedgebeur, and McKay, who established that every Barnette graph with at most 90 vertices is Hamiltonian [2].

We state the computational input separately from the deduction made here.

Theorem (Published computational verification [2) 4.1.

Every Barnette graph with at most 90 vertices is Hamiltonian.

Theorem (Order bound for a minimal counterexample) 4.2.

If a minimal counterexample to Barnette's conjecture exists, then its order satisfies

$$n \geq 92.$$

Proof.

Let G be a minimal counterexample. By 2.3, n is even. By 4.1, every Barnette graph of order at most 90 is Hamiltonian. Since G is non-Hamiltonian, $n > 90$. The smallest even integer strictly greater than 90 is 92, and consequently $n \geq 92$.

Corollary (Associated size parameters) 4.3.

If a minimal counterexample exists, then

$$|V(G)| \geq 92, \qquad |E(G)| \geq 138, \qquad |\mathcal{F}(G)| \geq 48,$$

and each colour class has at least 46 vertices.

Proof.

The edge bound follows from $m = 3n/2$, the face bound from $f = n/2 + 2$, and the colour-class bound from 2.3.

Remark (Dependence on the computational input) 4.4.

The lower bound follows by combining the published verification through (90) vertices with the even-order property of cubic bipartite graphs. The computational theorem supplies the verified range, while the parity argument gives the next possible order. No independent reproduction of the computational enumeration is claimed here.

Minimality and reduction arguments

A common strategy in the study of minimal counterexamples is to identify a local plane configuration that can be replaced by a smaller patch. If the replacement preserves the defining properties of the graph and if every Hamiltonian cycle in the reduced graph can be expanded to a Hamiltonian cycle in the original graph, then the configuration cannot occur in a minimal counterexample.

This section formulates that reasoning precisely. The formulation also clarifies what must be checked before a named family of configurations can be excluded.

Definition (Hamiltonicity-preserving reduction) 5.1.

Let G be a Barnette graph containing a specified plane subgraph K. A reduction of K is an operation producing a graph G_K such that:

1. G_K is a Barnette graph;
2. $|V(G_K)| < |V(G)|$; and
3. every Hamiltonian cycle of G_K can be transformed, by a specified inverse operation, into a Hamiltonian cycle of G.

A configuration K for which such a reduction is valid in every permitted host embedding is called reducible (for the class of Barnette graphs).

Theorem (Exclusion principle for reducible configurations) 5.2.

A minimal counterexample to Barnette's conjecture contains no configuration that admits a Hamiltonicity-preserving reduction in the sense of the preceding definition.

Proof.

Suppose that a minimal counterexample G contains such a configuration K. By (R1), the reduced graph G_K is a Barnette graph, and by (R2) it has fewer vertices than G. Minimality of G therefore implies that G_K is Hamiltonian. By (R3), a Hamiltonian cycle of G_K lifts to a Hamiltonian cycle of G. This contradicts the assumption that G is non-Hamiltonian. Thus no such configuration can occur in G.

Configuration-specific verification

For any proposed reducible configuration, the reduction principle above gives the logical framework. To establish an exclusion theorem for a particular configuration, the following items must be supplied for its precise embedded form:

(a)

a complete drawing or adjacency-list specification of the configuration and its boundary vertices;

(b)

the exact replacement patch and the resulting graph;

(c)

a proof that all affected vertices have degree 3;

(d)

a proof that the bipartition extends consistently across the replacement;

(e)

a proof that the replacement is planar and preserves 3-connectivity;

(f)

an explicit case analysis of how a Hamiltonian cycle in the reduced graph meets the replacement edge or patch, followed by a valid lifting construction.

A reduction-and-lifting argument must be checked against the exact attachment conditions. In particular, a statement that a replacement patch is cubic or 3-connected "by construction" is not a proof unless the construction and its boundary conditions are stated. Thus, 5.2 is a general theorem; applying it to a particular configuration requires verification of items (a)–(f).

Remark 5.3.

The exclusion principle is a standard minimal-counterexample argument. Its force comes not from the abstract principle alone, but from the discovery and rigorous verification of useful reductions. A complete catalogue of configurations, with all boundary cases checked, would be needed to obtain a strong irreducibility theorem for minimal counterexamples.

The combined structural profile

The unconditional conclusions established above can be collected in one statement.

Proposition (Necessary conditions) 6.1.

If a minimal counterexample G to Barnette's conjecture exists, then:

(i)

$n = |V(G)|$ is even and $m = 3n/2$;

(ii)

the bipartition classes have equal cardinality $n/2$;

(iii)

every facial boundary has even length and length at least 4;

(iv)

$f = n/2 + 2$;

(v)

$\sum_{k\geq 4} (k-4)\, f_k = n - 8$;

(vi)

$n \geq 92$, $m \geq 138$, $f \geq 48$, and each bipartition class has at least 46 vertices;

(vii)

G contains no configuration for which a valid Hamiltonicity-preserving reduction has been established.

Proof.

Items (i) and (ii) follow from 2.3; (iii) follows from 3.2; (iv) and (v) follow from 2.4 and 3.4; (vi) follows from 4.2 and 4.3; and (vii) follows from 5.2.

Remark 6.2.

The conditions in 6.1 are necessary, not sufficient. A graph satisfying them is not thereby shown to be non-Hamiltonian, nor does the proposition imply that a minimal counterexample exists. The proposition describes restrictions that any such graph would have to satisfy.

Implications for structural and computational searches

The preceding results provide a set of filters for future searches. Any candidate counterexample must have even order at least 92, equal bipartition classes, and a plane embedding whose facial cycles all have even length at least 4. Its face counts must satisfy the identity in 3.4. These conditions can be used before an expensive Hamiltonicity test is attempted.

For a cubic plane graph, the number of faces is fixed by its order. The face-length identity gives a further consistency check on any proposed facial distribution. For example, if all faces have length 4 or 6, then 3.5 forces exactly six quadrilateral faces. More generally, faces of length greater than 4 contribute a total excess of $n - 8$, measured by $\sum(k-4)f_k$. This is a bookkeeping identity rather than a Hamiltonicity criterion, but it is useful when generating or checking candidate plane graphs.

The reduction principle in 5.2 suggests a second search filter. Once a finite list of reducible configurations has been rigorously specified, a candidate minimal counterexample must avoid every member of that list. Such a

filter is only as reliable as the proofs of the reductions: a configuration should not be rejected computationally merely because it resembles a schematic drawing if the required boundary conditions have not been checked.
The model of a road, communication, or circuit network can be useful as an illustration of Hamiltonian cycles as complete closed traversals. However, the graph-theoretic conclusions here apply only when the network genuinely satisfies all four Barnette conditions. In particular, a physical network need not be planar, cubic, or bipartite, and a Hamiltonian cycle is not automatically a fault-tolerant route after an edge or vertex failure. We therefore regard such applications as motivation for the mathematical model, not as engineering guarantees without additional assumptions.

Discussion
The analysis separates three kinds of information that are sometimes conflated in discussions of Barnette's conjecture.
First, parity and Euler counting yield unconditional structural identities. They are valid for every Barnette graph and can be used without assuming the existence of a counterexample. Second, the lower bound $n \geq 92$ combines an external computer-assisted theorem with the even-order property. It is a rigorous deduction, but it does not represent a new enumeration carried out in this article. Third, reducible-configuration arguments require local proofs that are sensitive to the precise boundary pattern. The general exclusion principle is elementary once a valid reduction and lifting map have been established; the difficult work lies in verifying those maps.
This separation is important for interpreting the scope of the results. The minimum-face-size statement is a direct consequence of bipartiteness and simplicity. The order bound is only as current as the computational verification used as input. The reducible-configuration approach is a promising structural programme, but a universal claim about a configuration family requires exact specifications and a complete case analysis. Stating these distinctions explicitly strengthens the reliability and reproducibility of the argument.
The present results do not resolve Barnette's conjecture. They instead describe a necessary structural profile for any minimal counterexample and identify the precise role that reducible configurations can play in narrowing the search.

Conclusion
We have established a set of necessary conditions for a hypothetical minimal counterexample to Barnette's conjecture. The elementary part of the analysis proves that every Barnette graph has even order, balanced bipartition classes, no odd facial cycles, and minimum face length at least 4. Euler's formula yields the face-count identities, including the exact count of six quadrilateral faces in the quadrilateral–hexagonal subclass. Using the published verification of Barnette's conjecture through 90 vertices, the even-order condition gives the lower bound $n \geq 92$.
We have also formalised the reduction-and-lifting argument that underlies the exclusion of reducible configurations from a minimal counterexample. The principle is rigorous once the reduction preserves all Barnette properties and every Hamiltonian cycle in the reduced graph can be lifted. Applying it to particular named configurations requires complete configuration-specific proofs.
The resulting profile is a set of necessary conditions, not a proof that a counterexample exists or that Barnette's conjecture is true. Further progress through the reducibility approach will require a fully specified catalogue of configurations and verified reductions, while computational work can use the order, parity, face, and configuration restrictions as preliminary filters.

Declarations
Funding: No funding.
Conflict of interest: Author declares no conflict of interest.
Data availability: No datasets were generated or analyzed.

References
1. D. W. Barnette, Conjecture 5, in W. T. Tutte (ed.), *Recent Progress in Combinatorics*, Academic Press, New York, 1969, p. 343.
2. G. Brinkmann, J. Goedgebeur and B. D. McKay, The minimality of the Georges–Kelmans graph, *Mathematics of Computation* **91** (2022), no. 335, 1483–1500. https://doi.org/10.1090/mcom/3701.
3. M. R. Garey, D. S. Johnson and R. E. Tarjan, The planar Hamiltonian circuit problem is NP-complete, *SIAM Journal on Computing* **5** (1976), no. 4, 704–714.