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#### Abstract

Let $t>0$ be a real number and $G$ be a graph. We say $G$ is $t$-tough if for every cutset $S$ of $G$, the ratio of $|S|$ to the number of components of $G-S$ is at least $t$. Determining toughness is an NP-hard problem for arbitrary graphs. The Toughness Conjecture of Chvátal, stating that there exists a constant $t_{0}$ such that every $t_{0^{-}}$ tough graph with at least three vertices is hamiltonian, is still open in general. A graph is called $\left(P_{2} \cup P_{3}\right)$-free if it does not contain any induced subgraph isomorphic to $P_{2} \cup P_{3}$, the union of two vertex-disjoint paths of order 2 and 3 , respectively. In this paper, we show that every 15 -tough $\left(P_{2} \cup P_{3}\right)$-free graph with at least three vertices is hamiltonian.


Mathematics Subject Classifications: 05C38

## 1 Introduction

Graphs considered in this paper are simple, undirected, and finite. Let $G$ be a graph. Denote by $V(G)$ and $E(G)$ the vertex set and edge set of $G$, respectively. For $v \in V(G)$, $N_{G}(v)$ denotes the set of neighbors of $v$ in $G$. For $S \subseteq V(G)$ and $x \in V(G)$, define $\operatorname{deg}_{G}(x, S)=\left|N_{G}(x) \cap S\right|$. If $H \subseteq G$, we simply write $\operatorname{deg}_{G}(x, H)$ for $\operatorname{deg}_{G}(x, V(H))$. We skip the subscript $G$ if the graph in consideration is clear from the context. Let $S \subseteq V(G)$. Then the subgraph induced on $V(G) \backslash S$ is denoted by $G-S$. For notational simplicity, we write $G-x$ for $G-\{x\}$. If $u v \in E(G)$ is an edge, we write $u \sim v$. Let $V_{1}, V_{2} \subseteq V(G)$ be two disjoint vertex sets. Then $E_{G}\left(V_{1}, V_{2}\right)$ is the set of edges of $G$ with one end in $V_{1}$ and the other end in $V_{2}$.

The number of components of $G$ is denoted by $c(G)$. Let $t \geqslant 0$ be a real number. The graph $G$ is said to be $t$-tough if $|S| \geqslant t \cdot c(G-S)$ for each $S \subseteq V(G)$ with $c(G-S) \geqslant 2$. The toughness $\tau(G)$ is the largest real number $t$ for which $G$ is $t$-tough, or is $\infty$ if $G$ is complete. This concept, a measure of graph connectivity and "resilience" under removal of vertices,
was introduced by Chvátal [7] in 1973. It is easy to see that if $G$ has a hamiltonian cycle then $G$ is 1 -tough. Conversely, Chvátal [7] conjectured that there exists a constant $t_{0}$ such that every $t_{0}$-tough graph is hamiltonian (Chvátal's toughness conjecture). Bauer, Broersma and Veldman [2] have constructed $t$-tough graphs that are not hamiltonian for all $t<\frac{9}{4}$, so $t_{0}$ must be at least $\frac{9}{4}$. It is not difficult to see that a non-complete $t$-tough graph is $2\lceil t\rceil$-connected.

There are many papers on Chvátal's toughness conjecture, and it has been verified when restricted to a number of graph classes [3], including planar graphs, claw-free graphs, co-comparability graphs, and chordal graphs. A graph $G$ is called $2 K_{2}$-free if it does not contain two independent edges as an induced subgraph. In 2014, Broersma, Patel and Pyatkin [5] proved that every 25 -tough $2 K_{2}$-free graph on at least three vertices is hamiltonian, and the author of this paper improved the required toughness in this result from 25 to 3 [13].

Let $P_{\ell}$ denote a path on $\ell$-vertices. A graph is $\left(P_{2} \cup P_{3}\right)$-free if it does not contain any induced copy of $P_{2} \cup P_{3}$, the disjoint union of $P_{2}$ and $P_{3}$. In this paper, we confirm Chvátal's toughness conjecture for the class of $\left(P_{2} \cup P_{3}\right)$-free graphs, a superclass of $2 K_{2^{-}}$ free graphs.

Theorem 1. Let $G$ be a 15 -tough $\left(P_{2} \cup P_{3}\right)$-free graph with at least three vertices. Then $G$ is hamiltonian.

In [10] it was shown that every $3 / 2$-tough split graph on at least three vertices is hamiltonian. And the authors constructed a sequence $\left\{G_{n}\right\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ of split graphs (graphs whose vertices can be partitioned into a clique and an independent set) with no 2-factor and $\tau\left(G_{n}\right) \nearrow 3 / 2$. So $3 / 2$ is the best possible toughness for split graphs to be hamiltonian. Since split graphs are ( $P_{2} \cup P_{3}$ )-free, we cannot decrease the bound in Theorem 1 below $3 / 2$. Although it is certain that 15 -tough is not optimal, we are not sure about the best possible toughness for giving a hamiltonian cycle in a ( $P_{2} \cup P_{3}$ )-free graph.

The class of $2 K_{2}$-free graphs is well studied, for instance, see [5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12]. It is a superclass of split graphs. One can also easily check that every cochordal graph (i.e., a graph that is the complement of a chordal graph) is $2 K_{2}$-free and so the class of $2 K_{2}$-free graphs is at least as rich as the class of chordal graphs. By the definition, the class of $\left(P_{2} \cup P_{3}\right)$-free graphs is a superclass of $2 K_{2}$-free graphs but with much more complicated structures than graphs that are $2 K_{2}$-free. The proof techniques used in [5] and [13] for showing that certain tough $2 K_{2}$-free graphs are hamiltonian do not seem to be applicable for $\left(P_{2} \cup P_{3}\right)$-free graphs. The proof approach used in this paper for showing Theorem 1 is new and more general and reveals some structural properties of $\left(P_{2} \cup P_{3}\right)$-free graphs.

## 2 Proof of Theorem 1

We start this section with some definitions. Let $G$ be a graph and $S \subseteq V(G)$ a cutset of $G$, and let $D$ be a component of $G-S$. For a vertex $x \in S$, we say that $x$ is adjacent to $D$ if $x$ is adjacent in $G$ to a vertex of $D$. We call $D$ a clique component of $G-S$ if
$V(D)$ is a clique in $G$. We call $D$ a trivial component of $G-S$ if $D$ has only one vertex, otherwise $D$ is nontrivial.

A star-matching is a set of vertex-disjoint copies of stars. The vertices of degree at least 2 in a star-matching are called the centers of the star-matching. In particular, if all the stars in a star-matching are isomorphic to $K_{1, t}$, where $t \geqslant 1$ is an integer, we call the star-matching a $K_{1, t}$-matching. For a star-matching $M$, we denote by $V(M)$ the set of vertices covered by $M$.

Let $C$ be an oriented cycle. For $x \in V(C)$, denote the immediate successor of $x$ on $C$ by $x^{+}$and the immediate predecessor of $x$ on $C$ by $x^{-}$. For $u, v \in V(C), u \vec{C} v$ denotes the segment of $C$ starting at $u$, following $C$ in the orientation, and ending at $v$. Likewise, $u \stackrel{\leftharpoonup}{C} v$ is the opposite segment of $C$ with endpoints as $u$ and $v$. We assume all cycles in consideration afterwards are oriented. A path $P$ connecting two vertices $u$ and $v$ is called a $(u, v)$-path, and we write $u P v$ or $v P u$ in specifying the two endvertices of $P$. Let $u P v$ and $x Q y$ be two paths. If $v x$ is an edge, we write $u P v x Q y$ as the concatenation of $P$ and $Q$ through the edge $v x$.

Lemma 2 ([1], Theorem 2.10). Let $G$ be a bipartite graph with partite sets $X$ and $Y$, and let $f$ be a function from $X$ to the set of positive integers. If for every $S \subseteq X$, it holds that $\left|N_{G}(S)\right| \geqslant \sum_{x \in S} f(x)$, then $G$ has a subgraph $H$ such that $X \subseteq V(H), d_{H}(x)=f(x)$ for every $x \in X$, and $d_{H}(y)=1$ for every $y \in Y \cap V(H)$.

We will apply the following consequences of Lemma 2 in our proof.
Corollary 3. Let $G$ be a graph and $X \subseteq V(G)$ be an independent set in $G$. If $G$ does not have a subgraph $H$ such that $X \subseteq V(H), d_{H}(x)=2$ for every $x \in X$, and $d_{H}(y)=1$ for every $y \in Y \cap V(H)$, where $Y \subseteq V(G) \backslash X$, then there exists $X_{1} \subseteq X$ such that $\left|N_{G}\left(X_{1}\right) \cap Y\right|<2\left|X_{1}\right|$.

Proof. Let $R[X, Y]$ be the bipartite graph with bipartition $X$ and $Y$ and with $E(R)$ being the set of edges in $G$ between $X$ and $Y$. Let $f$ be a function on $X$ such that $f(x)=2$ for each $x \in X$. The assumption that $G$ does not have a subgraph $H$ with the requirements implies that $R$ does not have such a subgraph also. Applying Lemma 2, we find $X_{1} \subseteq X$ such that $\left|N_{R}\left(X_{1}\right)\right|<2\left|X_{1}\right|$. Since $X$ is an independent set in $G$, $N_{R}\left(X_{1}\right)=N_{G}\left(X_{1}\right) \cap Y$. Therefore there exists $X_{1} \subseteq X$ such that $\left|N_{G}\left(X_{1}\right) \cap Y\right|<2\left|X_{1}\right|$, as desired.

Corollary 4. Let $G$ be a 2-tough graph with at least three vertices and $X \subseteq V(G)$ be an independent set in $G$. Then $G$ has a subgraph $H$ such that $X \subseteq V(H), d_{H}(x)=2$ for every $x \in X$, and $d_{H}(y)=1$ for every $y \in(V(G) \backslash X) \cap V(H)$.

Proof. Let $Y=V(G) \backslash X$, and $R[X, Y]$ be the bipartite graph with bipartition $X$ and $Y$ and with $E(R)$ being the set of edges in $G$ between $X$ and $Y$. Let $f$ be a function on $X$ such that $f(x)=2$ for each $x \in X$. Let $S \subseteq X$. If $|S| \leqslant 1$, then since $G$ is 4-connected, $\left|N_{R}(S)\right|=\left|N_{G}(S)\right| \geqslant 2|S|$. Thus, $|S| \geqslant 2$. Note that $c\left(G-N_{G}(S)\right) \geqslant|S| \geqslant 2$. By the
toughness of $G,\left|N_{R}(S)\right|=\left|N_{G}(S)\right| \geqslant 2|S|$. Therefore, by Lemma $2, R$ and so $G$ has a desired subgraph $H$ such that $X \subseteq V(H), d_{H}(x)=2$ for every $x \in X$, and $d_{H}(y)=1$ for every $y \in(V(G) \backslash X) \cap V(H)$.

Lemma 5 (Bauer et al. [4]). Let $t>0$ be real and $G$ be a $t$-tough $n$-vertex graph ( $n \geqslant 3$ ) with $\delta(G)>\frac{n}{t+1}-1$. Then $G$ is hamiltonian.

Lemmas 6 and 7 below are consequences of $\left(P_{2} \cup P_{3}\right)$-freeness.
Lemma 6. Let $G$ be a $\left(P_{2} \cup P_{3}\right)$-free graph and $S \subseteq V(G)$ a cutset of $G$. If $G-S$ has a component that is not a clique component, then all other components of $G-S$ are trivial. Consequently, if $G-S$ has at least two nontrivial components, then all components of $G-S$ are clique components.

Lemma 7. Let $G$ be a $\left(P_{2} \cup P_{3}\right)$-free graph and $S \subseteq V(G)$ a cutset of $G$, and let $x \in S$. Suppose that $x$ is adjacent to exactly one component $D$ of $G-S$, and $G-S$ has a nontrivial component to which $x$ is not adjacent, then $x$ is adjacent in $G$ to all vertices of $D$.

Lemma 8. Let $G$ be a connected $\left(P_{2} \cup P_{3}\right)$-free graph and $S \subseteq V(G)$ a cutset of $G$ such that each vertex in $S$ is adjacent to at least two components of $G-S$. Then each of the following statement holds.
(i) For every nontrivial clique component $D \subseteq G-S$ and for every vertex $x \in S, x$ is adjacent to $D$.
(ii) For every nontrivial clique component $D \subseteq G-S$ and for every vertex $x \in S$, if $x$ is adjacent in $G$ to at least three components of $G-S$, then $x$ is adjacent in $G$ to at least $|V(D)|-1$ vertices of $D$.
(iii) Let $D_{1}$ and $D_{2}$ be two nontrivial clique components of $G-S$. Then for every vertex $x \in S$, either $x$ is adjacent in $G$ to at least $\left|V\left(D_{i}\right)\right|-1$ vertices of each $D_{i}$, or $x$ is adjacent in $G$ to all vertices of one of $D_{i}, i=1,2$.

Proof. Let $w_{1}$ and $w_{2}$ be two neighbors of $x$ in $G$ respectively from two distinct components of $G-S$. Then $w_{1} x w_{2}$ is an induced $P_{3}$. Now for every nontrivial component $D$, if $V(D) \cap\left\{w_{1}, w_{2}\right\} \neq \varnothing$, then $x$ is already adjacent to $D$ in $G$. So $V(D) \cap\left\{w_{1}, w_{2}\right\}=\varnothing$. For every edge $u v \in E(D), x$ is adjacent to $u$ or $v$ by the assumption of $G$ being $\left(P_{2} \cup P_{3}\right)$-free. This proves (i). For (ii), let $x \in S$ and $D$ be a nontrivial clique component of $G-S$. Since $x$ is adjacent in $G$ to at least three components of $G-S$, there exists $u$, $w$, respectively from two components of $G-S$ that are distinct from $D$ such that $x \sim u$ and $x \sim w$ in $G$. Thus, $u x w$ is an induced $P_{3}$ in $G$. Furthermore, since $u, w \in V(G) \backslash(S \cup V(D))$, $E_{G}(\{u, w\}, V(D))=\varnothing$. Thus, by the $\left(P_{2} \cup P_{3}\right)$-freeness assumption, for every edge in $D$, $x$ is adjacent to at least one endvertex of that edge. This, together with the fact that $D$ is a clique component of $G-S$, we know that $x$ is adjacent in $G$ to at least $|V(D)|-1$ vertices of $D$. For (iii), assume to the contrary that the statement does not hold. By symmetry, we assume that there exists $u v \in E\left(D_{1}\right)$ such that $x \nsim u, v$ in $G$, and there exists $w \in V\left(D_{2}\right)$ such that $x \nsim w$ in $G$. Let $y \in V\left(D_{2}\right) \cap N_{G}(x)$ that exists by Lemma 8 (i). Then $u v \cup x y w$ is an induced $P_{2} \cup P_{3}$, giving a contradiction.

Lemma 9. Let $t>0$ and $G$ be a non-complete n-vertex $t$-tough graph. Then $|W| \leqslant \frac{1}{t+1} n$ holds for every independent set $W$ in $G$.

Proof. Since $G$ is $2\lceil t\rceil$-connected, $n \geqslant 2\lceil t\rceil+1 \geqslant 2 t+1 \geqslant t+1$. Therefore, if $|W|=1$, then $|W| \leqslant \frac{1}{t+1} n$. Suppose $|W| \geqslant 2$. Let $S=V(G) \backslash W$ and $\alpha=\frac{|W|}{n}$. Clearly $|S|=$ $(1-\alpha) n$. Since $c(G-S)=|W| \geqslant 2$ and $G$ is $t$-tough, we get

$$
(1-\alpha) n=|S| \geqslant t \cdot c(G-S)=t|W|=t \alpha n
$$

Therefore, we get $(1-\alpha) n \geqslant t \alpha n$, which yields $\alpha \leqslant \frac{1}{t+1}$ and $|W| \leqslant \frac{1}{t+1} n$.
Lemma 10. Let $t \geqslant 1$ and $G$ be an n-vertex $t$-tough graph, and let $C$ be a non-hamiltonian cycle of $G$. If $x \in V(G) \backslash V(C)$ satisfies that $\operatorname{deg}(x, C)>\frac{n}{t+1}$, then $G$ has a cycle $C^{\prime}$ such that $V\left(C^{\prime}\right)=V(C) \cup\{x\}$.

Proof. It is clear that if $x$ is adjacent to two consecutive vertices $u, w$ on $C$, then

$$
C^{\prime}=(C-\{u w\}) \cup\{u x, x w\}
$$

is a cycle with the desired property. So we assume that for any $u, w \in N_{G}(x) \cap V(C)$, $u w \notin E(C)$. Let $W=\left\{u^{+} \mid u \in N_{G}(x) \cap V(C)\right\}$ be the set of the successors of the neighbors of $x$ on $C$. Because there is a one-to-one correspondence between $W$ and $N_{G}(x) \cap V(C)$, by the assumption that $\operatorname{deg}(x, C)>\frac{n}{t+1}$, we know that

$$
\begin{equation*}
|W|>\frac{n}{t+1} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus, $W$ is not an independent set in $G$ by Lemma 9 , and there exist $u^{+}, w^{+} \in W$ with $u, w \in N_{G}(x) \cap V(C)$ such that $u^{+} \sim w^{+}$in $G$. Then

$$
C^{\prime}=u^{+} \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{C} w x u \stackrel{\llcorner }{C} w^{+} u^{+}
$$

is a desired cycle.
Lemma 11. Let $G$ be an n-vertex 15 -tough $\left(P_{2} \cup P_{3}\right)$-free graph, and let $C$ be a nonhamiltonian cycle of $G$. Let $P \subseteq G-V(C)$ be an $(x, z)$-path. If both $x$ and $z$ are adjacent in $G$ to more than $\frac{4.5 n}{16}$ vertices from $V(C)$, then $G$ has a cycle $C^{\prime}$ such that $V\left(C^{\prime}\right)=V(C) \cup V(P)$.

Proof. It is clear that if $x$ is adjacent to a vertex $u$ on $C$ and $z$ is adjacent to a vertex $w$ on $C$ such that $u w \in E(C)$, then

$$
C^{\prime}=(C-\{u w\}) \cup\{u x, z w\} \cup P
$$

is a cycle with the desired property. So we assume that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { for any } u \in N_{G}(x) \cap V(C) \text { and any } w \in N_{G}(z) \cap V(C), u w \notin E(C) \text {. } \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let

$$
\begin{aligned}
& W_{x}=\left\{u^{+} \mid u \in N_{G}(x) \cap V(C)\right\}, \\
& W_{z}=\left\{u^{+} \mid u \in N_{G}(z) \cap V(C)\right\} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Clearly,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|W_{x}\right|=\left|N_{G}(x) \cap V(C)\right|>\frac{4.5 n}{16}, \quad \text { and } \quad\left|W_{z}\right|=\left|N_{G}(z) \cap V(C)\right|>\frac{4.5 n}{16} . \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

If there exist $u^{+} \in W_{x}$ and $w^{+} \in W_{z}$ with $u \in N_{G}(x) \cap V(C)$ and $w \in N_{G}(z) \cap V(C)$ such that $u^{+} \sim w^{+}$in $G$, then

$$
C^{\prime}=u^{+} \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{C} w z P x u \stackrel{\iota}{C} w^{+} u^{+}
$$

is a desired cycle. Therefore, we assume

$$
\begin{equation*}
E_{G}\left(W_{x}, W_{z}\right)=\varnothing \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

We further claim that
no two vertices in $N_{G}(x) \cap V(C)$ or $N_{G}(z) \cap V(C)$ are consecutive on $C$.
By symmetry, we only show that no two vertices in $N_{G}(x) \cap V(C)$ are consecutive on $C$.
Assume to the contrary that there exists a path $v_{1} v_{2} \cdots v_{\ell} \subseteq C$ with $\ell \geqslant 2$ such that for each $i$ with $1 \leqslant i \leqslant \ell, v_{i} \in N_{G}(x) \cap V(C), v_{1}^{-} \notin N_{G}(x) \cap V(C)$, and $v_{\ell}^{+} \notin$ $N_{G}(x) \cap V(C)$. Note that such vertices $v_{1}$ and $v_{\ell}$ exist by the assumption in (2) and the fact that $N_{G}(z) \cap V(C) \neq \varnothing$. By (3) and Lemma $9, W_{z}$ is not an independent set in $G$ and so there exist $w_{1}, w_{2} \in W_{z}$ such that $w_{1} \sim w_{2}$ in $G$.

Then $x v_{\ell} v_{\ell}^{+}$is an induced $P_{3}$ in $G$. Consider the edge $w_{1} w_{2}$. By the assumption in (2), $x \nsim w_{1}, w_{2}$ in $G$ (otherwise, $w_{1}^{-} w_{1} \in E(C)$ or $w_{2}^{-} w_{2} \in E(C)$ with $\left.w_{1}^{-}, w_{2}^{-} \in N_{G}(z) \cap V(C)\right)$, and by the assumption in (4), $v_{\ell}^{+} \nsim w_{1}, w_{2}$ in $G$. Thus, $v_{\ell} \sim w_{1}$ or $v_{\ell} \sim w_{2}$ in $G$ by the $\left(P_{2} \cup P_{3}\right)$-freeness assumption. However, $v_{\ell}=v_{\ell-1}^{+} \in W_{x}$, showing a contradiction to (4).

Therefore, by (5),

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(N_{G}(x) \cap V(C)\right) \cap W_{x}=\varnothing, \quad \text { and } \quad\left(N_{G}(z) \cap V(C)\right) \cap W_{z}=\varnothing . \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Also, by (2),

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(N_{G}(x) \cap V(C)\right) \cap W_{z}=\varnothing, \quad \text { and } \quad\left(N_{G}(z) \cap V(C)\right) \cap W_{x}=\varnothing . \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let

$$
W_{x z}=W_{x} \cap W_{z} .
$$

By the assumption in (4), $W_{x z}$ is an independent set in $G$. By Lemma $9,\left|W_{x z}\right| \leqslant \frac{n}{16}$. Therefore, $\left|N_{G}(x) \cap N_{G}(z) \cap V(C)\right| \leqslant \frac{n}{16}$. These, together with (3), (6) and (7), imply

$$
\begin{aligned}
n & \geqslant\left|\left(N_{G}(x) \cap V(C)\right) \cup\left(N_{G}(z) \cap V(C)\right) \cup W_{x} \cup W_{z}\right| \\
& >\frac{9 n}{16}+\frac{9 n}{16}-\left|N_{G}(x) \cap N_{G}(z) \cap V(C)\right|-\left|W_{x z}\right| \\
& \geqslant \frac{16 n}{16}=n,
\end{aligned}
$$

showing a contradiction.

Lemma 12. Let $G$ be an n-vertex 15 -tough $\left(P_{2} \cup P_{3}\right)$-free graph, and let $S \subseteq V(G)$ be a cutset of $G$ with $|S| \leqslant \frac{3 n}{4}$. Assume that $G-S$ has at least two nontrivial clique components, and that for every edge $u v \in E(G), d(u)+d(v) \geqslant|S|$. Then $G$ has a hamiltonian cycle.
Proof. By Lemma 6, every component of $G-S$ is a clique component. If there exists $x \in S$ such that $x$ is adjacent to exactly one component, say $D$ of $G-S$, then we move $x$ from $S$ into $D$. By Lemma 7, every component of $G-(S \backslash\{x\})$ is still a clique component. We move out all such vertex $x$ from $S$ iteratively and denote the remaining vertices in $S$ by $S_{1}$. Note that $S_{1} \neq \varnothing$, since $G$ is a connected graph and $S$ is a cutset of $G$. Also, $c(G-S)=c\left(G-S_{1}\right)$ and $G-S_{1}$ has at least two nontrivial components. By Lemma 6, every component of $G-S_{1}$ is a clique component. Let

$$
\begin{aligned}
& S_{0}=\left\{x \in S_{1} \mid x \text { is not adjacent to any component of } G-S_{1}\right\} \\
& S_{2}=\left\{x \in S_{1} \mid x \text { is adjacent to at least two components of } G-S_{1}\right\} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Note that $S_{2}=S_{1}-S_{0}$.
Since $G-S_{1}$ has a nontrivial component that has no edge going to $S_{0}$, the $\left(P_{2} \cup P_{3}\right)$ freeness of $G$ implies that $G\left[S_{0}\right]$ consists of vertex-disjoint complete subgraphs of $G$. Thus $S_{2}$ is a cutset of $G$ with components consisting those from $G-S_{1}$ and $G\left[S_{0}\right]$. Also, all components of $G-S_{2}$ are clique components in which at least two of them are nontrivial. By the toughness of $G,\left|S_{2}\right| \geqslant 15 c\left(G-S_{2}\right)$.

We will construct a hamiltonian cycle in $G$ through two steps: (1) combing spanning cycles from every clique component of $G-S_{2}$ that has at least three vertices into a single cycle $C$, and (2) inserting remaining vertices in $V(G) \backslash V(C)$ into $C$ to obtain a hamiltonian cycle of $G$.

Suppose that $G-S_{2}$ has exactly $h$ clique components $D_{1}, D_{2}, \cdots, D_{h}$ with $\left|V\left(D_{1}\right)\right| \geqslant$ $\left|V\left(D_{2}\right)\right| \geqslant \cdots \geqslant\left|V\left(D_{h}\right)\right| \geqslant 1$, and that the first $t(0 \leqslant t \leqslant h)$ of them are components that contain at least three vertices. Since $G-S_{2}$ has at least two nontrivial components, both $D_{1}$ and $D_{2}$ are nontrivial.
Claim 1. The component $D_{1}$ contains at least 5 vertices.
Proof: Since $\left|S_{2}\right| \leqslant|S| \leqslant \frac{3 n}{4}, n \geqslant \frac{4\left|S_{2}\right|}{3}$. Also, $c\left(G-S_{2}\right) \leqslant \frac{\left|S_{2}\right|}{15}$ by $\tau(G) \geqslant 15$. Therefore, a largest component of $G-S_{2}$ contains at least

$$
\frac{n-\left|S_{2}\right|}{c\left(G-S_{2}\right)} \geqslant \frac{\frac{4\left|S_{2}\right|}{3}-\left|S_{2}\right|}{\frac{\left|S_{2}\right|}{15}}=5
$$

vertices.
Let

$$
\begin{aligned}
& Q_{1}=\left\{x \in S_{2} \mid x \text { is adjacent to a component distinct from } D_{1} \text { and } D_{2}\right\}, \\
& Q_{2}=\left\{x \in S_{2} \mid x \text { is adjacent to less than } \frac{\left|V\left(D_{1}\right)\right|-1}{2} \text { vertices of } D_{1}\right\}, \\
& Q_{3}=\left\{x \in S_{2} \mid x \text { is adjacent to less than } \frac{\left|V\left(D_{2}\right)\right|-1}{2} \text { vertices of } D_{2}\right\} .
\end{aligned}
$$

By Lemma 8 (i) and the definition of $Q_{1}$, we know that if $Q_{1} \neq \varnothing$, then every vertex in $Q_{1}$ is adjacent to at least three components of $G-S_{2}$. By Lemma 8 (ii), we get the following claim.

Claim 2. Suppose that $Q_{1} \neq \varnothing$. Then for every $x \in Q_{1}$ and for every nontrivial component $D$ of $G-S_{2}, x$ is adjacent to at least $|V(D)|-1$ vertices of $D$.
Claim 3. Suppose that $Q_{2} \neq \varnothing$. Then for every $x \in Q_{2}, x$ is adjacent to all vertices of $D_{2}$ and $Q_{2}$ is a clique in $G$.
Proof: Note that both $D_{1}$ and $D_{2}$ are nontrivial components of $G-S_{2}$. Since $D_{1}$ is a nontrivial component, $\frac{\left|V\left(D_{1}\right)\right|+1}{2}>1$. Hence, by the definition of $Q_{2}, D_{1}$ contains at least two vertices that are not adjacent to $x$ in $G$. Therefore, $x$ is adjacent in $G$ to all vertices of $D_{2}$ by Lemma 8 (iii). For the second part, suppose to the contrary that there exist $x, y \in Q_{2}$ such that $x \nsim y$ in $G$. Let $w \in V\left(D_{2}\right)$. Then $w \sim x$ and $w \sim y$ in $G$ by the first part of this claim. Thus, we find an induced $P_{3}=x w y$. Since $E_{G}\left(\{w\}, V\left(D_{1}\right)\right)=\varnothing$, the $\left(P_{2} \cup P_{3}\right)$-freeness implies that for every edge in $D_{1}$, at least one of $x$ and $y$ is adjacent to at least one endpoint of the edge. Since $D_{1}$ is complete, by Pigeonhole Principle, one of $x$ and $y$ is adjacent to at least $\frac{\left|V\left(D_{1}\right)\right|-1}{2}$ vertices of $D_{1}$. This gives a contradiction to the assumption that $x, y \in Q_{2}$.

Similarly, we have the following result.
Claim 4. Suppose that $Q_{3} \neq \varnothing$. Then for every $x \in Q_{3}, x$ is adjacent to all vertices of $D_{1}$ and $Q_{3}$ is a clique in $G$.

By Claims 2 to 4, we have that

$$
\begin{equation*}
Q_{i} \cap Q_{j}=\varnothing, i \neq j, i, j=1,2,3 \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Define

$$
W=\bigcup_{\max \{t+1,3\} \leqslant i \leqslant h} V\left(D_{i}\right) .
$$

Since $\left|V\left(D_{i}\right)\right| \leqslant 2$ for each $i$ with $t+1 \leqslant i \leqslant h$, we have $\sum_{i=t+1}^{h}\left|V\left(D_{i}\right)\right| \leqslant 2(h-t)$. Moreover, since $S_{2}$ is a cutset of $G$, the toughness of $G$ yields $\left|S_{2}\right| \geqslant 15 c\left(G-S_{2}\right)=15 h$. Therefore, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
|W| \leqslant \sum_{i=t+1}^{h}\left|V\left(D_{i}\right)\right| \leqslant 2(h-t) \leqslant \frac{2\left|S_{2}\right|}{15}-2 t . \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

If $W \neq \varnothing$, we claim that there is a $K_{1,2}$-matching $M$ between $W$ and $S_{2}$ such that every vertex in $W$ is the center of a $K_{1,2}$-star. This is clearly true if $|W| \leqslant 2$, as $G$ is non-complete and 15 -tough and so is 30 -connected. Thus, we assume that $|W| \geqslant 3$, and suppose to the contrary that there is no $K_{1,2}$-matching between $W$ and $S_{2}$. Let $G^{*}$ be obtained from $G$ by deleting all edges within $W$. Applying Corollary 3 on $G^{*}$ with $W$ and $S_{2}$, there exists $W_{1} \subseteq W$ such that $2\left|W_{1}\right|>\left|N_{G^{*}}\left(W_{1}\right) \cap S_{2}\right|$. Note that $\left|W_{1}\right| \geqslant 3$ by the argument in the beginning of this paragraph. Let $W_{1}^{\prime} \subseteq W \backslash W_{1}$ be the set of all vertices that is adjacent in $G$ to a vertex in $W_{1}$. As each component in $G[W]$ is either $K_{1}$ or $K_{2},\left|W_{1}^{\prime}\right| \leqslant\left|W_{1}\right|$, and $G-\left(\left(N_{G}\left(W_{1}\right) \cap S_{2}\right) \cup W_{1}^{\prime}\right)$ has at least $\left\lceil\left|W_{1}\right| / 2\right\rceil \geqslant 2$ components. Therefore,

$$
\frac{\left|\left(N_{G}\left(W_{1}\right) \cap S_{2}\right) \cup W_{1}^{\prime}\right|}{c\left(G-\left(\left(N_{G}\left(W_{1}\right) \cap S_{2}\right) \cup W_{1}^{\prime}\right)\right)}<\frac{3\left|W_{1}\right|}{\left|W_{1}\right| / 2}<15 .
$$

This gives a contradiction to the toughness.
Let $M$ be a $K_{1,2}$-matching between $W$ and $S_{2}$.
Claim 5. It holds that $N_{G}(W) \cap S_{2} \subseteq Q_{1}$ and $N_{G}(W) \cap S_{2}=Q_{1}$ if $t=2$. Consequently, for every $x \in N_{G}(W) \cap S_{2}$ and every nontrivial component $D$ of $G-S_{2}, x$ is adjacent in $G$ to at least $|V(D)|-1$ vertices of $D$.

Proof: For the first part of the Claim, we may assume that $N_{G}(W) \cap S_{2} \neq \varnothing$. If $G-$ $S_{2}$ has at least three nontrivial components, then every vertex of $S_{2}$ is adjacent to all those nontrivial components by Lemma 8 (i). Therefore, $S_{2}=Q_{1}$ by the definition of $Q_{1}$. In particular, $N_{G}(W) \cap S_{2} \subseteq Q_{1}$. Hence, we assume that $G-S_{2}$ has exactly two nontrivial components, which are $D_{1}$ and $D_{2}$. This assumption implies that $\left|V\left(D_{3}\right)\right| \leqslant 1$. Consequently, $\left|V\left(D_{3}\right)\right|=1$ since $N_{G}(W) \cap S_{2} \neq \varnothing$. Then for every $x \in N_{G}(W) \cap S_{2}, x$ is adjacent to both $D_{1}$ and $D_{2}$ by Lemma 8 (i), and also $x$ is adjacent to a trivial component of $G-S_{2}$. Thus $N_{G}(W) \cap S_{2} \subseteq Q_{1}$. When $t=2$, if $Q_{1} \neq \varnothing$, then for every $x \in Q_{1}$, $x \in N_{G}(W)$. Therefore, $Q_{1} \subseteq N_{G}(W) \cap S_{2}$. Hence, $N_{G}(W) \cap S_{2}=Q_{1}$ when $t=2$. The second part of Claim 5 is a consequence of Claim 2.
Claim 6. There is a cycle $C$ in $G-V(M)$ with at least $\frac{3 n}{20}$ vertices such that $C$ contains all vertices from every $D_{i}, i=1,2, \cdots, \max \{2, t\}$, and $Q_{2} \cup Q_{3} \subseteq V(C)$.
Proof: Suppose first that $G-S_{2}$ has at least three nontrivial components, that is, $t \geqslant 3$. Then by Lemma 8 (i), every vertex of $S_{2}$ is adjacent to all those nontrivial components of $G-S_{2}$. Consequently, $S_{2}=Q_{1}$ and $Q_{2}=Q_{3}=\varnothing$. Therefore, for every $x \in S_{2}$ and every $D_{i}, x$ is adjacent to at least $\left|V\left(D_{i}\right)\right|-1$ vertices of $D_{i}$ by Claim 2.

Let $x_{1}, \cdots, x_{t}$ be $t$ distinct vertices in $S_{2} \backslash V(M)$. (By the toughness of $G,\left|S_{2}\right| \geqslant$ $15 c\left(G-S_{2}\right)$. Since $\left|V(M) \cap S_{2}\right| \leqslant 4 c\left(G-S_{2}\right)$, we have enough vertices in $S_{2} \backslash V(M)$ to pick.) Let $C_{i}$ be a hamiltonian cycle of $D_{i}$, and let $u_{i}, v_{i} \in V\left(C_{i}\right)$ with $u_{i} v_{i} \in E\left(C_{i}\right)$ such that for $i=1,2, \cdots, t-1, x_{i} \sim v_{i}, u_{i+1}$, and $x_{t} \sim u_{1}, v_{t}$ in $G$. Then

$$
C=u_{1} \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{C}_{1} v_{1} x_{1} u_{2} \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{C}_{2} v_{2} \cdots u_{t-1} \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{C}_{t-1} v_{t-1} x_{t-1} u_{t} \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{C}_{t} v_{t} x_{t} u_{1}
$$

is a cycle that contains all vertices from each $D_{i}$ and the vertices $x_{1}, \cdots, x_{t}$ from $S_{2} \backslash V(M)$. Also $Q_{2} \cup Q_{3} \subseteq V(C)$ trivially as $Q_{2}=Q_{3}=\varnothing$.

So we assume that $G-S_{2}$ has exactly two nontrivial clique components, which are $D_{1}$ and $D_{2}$, call this assumption (*). Let

$$
G_{1}=G\left[V\left(D_{1}\right) \cup Q_{3}\right] \quad \text { and } \quad G_{2}=G\left[V\left(D_{2}\right) \cup Q_{2}\right] .
$$

By Claims 3 and 4, we know that both $G_{1}$ and $G_{2}$ are complete subgraphs of $G$.
Suppose firstly that $t=1$ and $Q_{2}=\varnothing$. Then $D_{2}$ has exactly two vertices. Consequently, $Q_{3}=\varnothing$ by Lemma 8 (i) and $G_{1}=D_{1}$. Let $V\left(D_{2}\right)=\{u, v\}$. By Lemma 8 (i), every vertex from $S_{2}$ is adjacent in $G$ to a vertex of $D_{2}$. Since $Q_{2}=\varnothing$, every vertex from $S_{2}$ is adjacent in $G$ to at least $\frac{\left|V\left(D_{1}\right)-1\right|}{2} \geqslant 2$ vertices of $D_{1}$. Suppose there exist distinct $u_{1}, v_{1} \in S_{2} \backslash V(M)$ such that $u \sim u_{1}$ and $v \sim v_{1}$. Let $u_{2}, v_{2} \in V\left(D_{1}\right)$ be
distinct such that $u_{1} \sim u_{2}$ and $v_{1} \sim v_{2}$. Let $P$ be a hamiltonian $\left(u_{2}, v_{2}\right)$-path of $D_{1}$. Then $C=u_{1} u_{2} P v_{2} v_{1} v u u_{1}$ is a desired cycle. Thus, we assume, without loss of generality, that for every $x \in S_{2} \backslash V(M), x \sim u$ and $x \nsim v$. Since $G$ is 15 -tough, there exists $v_{1}^{\prime} \in V(M) \cap S_{2}$ such that $v \sim v_{1}^{\prime}$. Let $v_{1}^{\prime} w v_{1} \in M$ be the $K_{1,2}$-star that contains the vertex $v_{1}^{\prime}$, where $v_{1}, v_{1}^{\prime} \in S_{2}$ and $w \in W$. Let $u_{1} \in S_{2} \backslash V(M)$, and $u_{2}, v_{2} \in V\left(D_{1}\right)$ be distinct such that $u_{1} \sim u_{2}$ and $v_{1} \sim v_{2}$. Let $P$ be a hamiltonian $\left(u_{2}, v_{2}\right)$-path of $D_{1}$. Then $C=u_{1} u_{2} P v_{2} v_{1} w v_{1}^{\prime} v u u_{1}$ is a desired cycle. (For the latter case, we still denote the $K_{1,2}$-matching $M \backslash\left\{v_{1}^{\prime} w v_{1}\right\}$ by $M$.)

Thus, we assume that $t \geqslant 2$ or $Q_{2} \neq \varnothing$. By assumption ( $*$ ), we have either $t=2$ or $t=1$ and $Q_{2}=\varnothing$. Since $D_{1}$ has at least three vertices by Claim $1, G_{1}$ contains at least three vertices. Note that $\left|V\left(D_{2}\right)\right| \geqslant 2$ by the assumption that $G-S_{2}$ has at least two nontrivial components and $D_{2}$ is one of them. Thus, $G_{2}$ contains at least three vertices either by $t=2$ or $Q_{2} \neq \varnothing$.

If there are two disjoint edges between $G_{1}$ and $G_{2}$, then $G\left[V\left(G_{1}\right) \cup V\left(G_{2}\right)\right]$ has a hamiltonian cycle $C$. Thus, we may assume, without loss of generality, that there is either no edge between $G_{1}$ and $G_{2}$ or all edges between $G_{1}$ and $G_{2}$ are incident to only a single vertex, say in $G_{1}$.

If $c\left(G-S_{2}\right)=2$, then $M=\varnothing$ by the definitions of $W$ and $M$. Since $G$ is 15 -tough and thus is 2 -connected, there are vertex-disjoint paths $P_{1}$ and $P_{2}$ connecting $G_{1}$ and $G_{2}$ in $G$ such that each $P_{i}$ only has exactly one of its endvertices in $G_{1}$ and $G_{2}$. Let $V\left(P_{i}\right) \cap V\left(G_{1}\right)=\left\{x_{i}\right\}$ and $V\left(P_{i}\right) \cap V\left(G_{2}\right)=\left\{y_{i}\right\}, i=1,2$. Let $C_{1}$ be a hamiltonian cycle in $G_{1}$ such that $x_{1} x_{2} \in E\left(C_{1}\right)$, and $C_{2}$ be a hamiltonian cycle in $G_{2}$ such that $y_{1} y_{2} \in E\left(C_{2}\right)$. Then

$$
C=x_{1} P_{1} y_{1} \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{C}_{2} y_{2} P_{2} x_{2} \stackrel{\llcorner }{C}_{1} x_{1}
$$

is a cycle that contains all vertices in clique components of $G-S_{2}$ that contain at least three vertices and the vertices from $P_{1}$ and $P_{2}$. Also $Q_{2} \cup Q_{3} \subseteq V(C)$ by the construction of $C$.

So we assume that $c\left(G-S_{2}\right) \geqslant 3$. By Claims 2 to $4, Q_{1}, Q_{2}$ and $Q_{3}$ are pairwise disjoint. Now, by the definition of $Q_{1}, D_{3}, \ldots, D_{h}$ are all components of $G-Q_{1}$. Moreover, there exits a component of $G-Q_{1}$ which contains $D_{1}$. This together with $h=c\left(G-S_{2}\right) \geqslant 3$ yields $c\left(G-Q_{1}\right) \geqslant h-1 \geqslant 2$. Hence we have $\left|Q_{1}\right| \geqslant 15(h-1)$ and $\left|Q_{1} \backslash V(M)\right| \geqslant$ $15(h-1)-2(h-2)=13 h-11 \geqslant 28$ since each component $D_{i}$ with $i \in\{t+1, \ldots, h\}$ is a trivial component and so uses exactly two vertices from $S_{2} \cap V(M)$. Hence, we can find two vertices $x, y \in Q_{1} \backslash V(M) \subseteq S_{2} \backslash\left(Q_{2} \cup Q_{3} \cup V(M)\right)$ such that both $x$ and $y$ are adjacent to at least $\left|V\left(D_{1}\right)\right|-1$ vertices of $D_{1}$, and at least $\left|V\left(D_{2}\right)\right|-1$ vertices of $D_{2}$ by Claim 5. We claim that $x$ is adjacent to at least two vertices of $G_{2}$. This is clear if $x$ is adjacent to at least two vertices of $D_{2}$. So we assume $\left|N_{G}(x) \cap V\left(D_{2}\right)\right| \leqslant 1$. Then since $\left|N_{G}(x) \cap V\left(D_{2}\right)\right| \geqslant\left|V\left(D_{2}\right)\right|-1$ and $D_{2}$ is a nontrivial component, $\left|V\left(D_{2}\right)\right|=2$ and $\left|N_{G}(x) \cap V\left(D_{2}\right)\right|=1$. This means $t=1$ by Claim 1 and hence $Q_{2} \neq \varnothing$. Let $V\left(D_{2}\right)=\left\{w, w_{1}\right\}$ and $N_{G}(x) \cap V\left(D_{2}\right)=\{w\}$. Also, since $Q_{2} \neq \varnothing$, we can take $w_{2} \in Q_{2}$. If $x \sim w_{2}$, we get $\left|N_{G}(x) \cap V\left(G_{2}\right)\right| \geqslant 2$. Thus, we may assume $x \nsim w_{2}$. Therefore, $x \nsim w_{1}, w_{2}$ in $G$. Note that $w_{1}$ is not adjacent to any vertex of $D_{1}$, and $w_{2}$ is adjacent to less than
$\frac{\left|V\left(D_{1}\right)\right|-1}{2}$ vertices of $D_{1}$. Therefore, we can find a vertex $w^{*} \in V\left(D_{1}\right)$ such that $w_{1}, w_{2} \nsim w^{*}$ in $G$ and $x \sim w^{*}$ in $G$. By the choice of $x$, there is a vertex $w^{\prime} \in V(G) \backslash\left(S_{2} \cup V\left(D_{1}\right) \cup V\left(D_{2}\right)\right)$ such that $x \sim w^{\prime}$ in $G$. However, $w_{1} w_{2} \cup w^{*} x w^{\prime}$ is an induced $P_{2} \cup P_{3}$. This gives a contradiction. Since $D_{1}$ has at least 5 vertices, both $x$ and $y$ have at least four neighbors in $D_{1}$. Thus we can select distinct vertices $x_{1}, y_{1} \in V\left(G_{1}\right)$ and $x_{2}, y_{2} \in V\left(G_{2}\right)$ such that $x \sim x_{1}, x_{2}$ and $y \sim y_{1}, y_{2}$ in $G$.

Let $C_{1}$ be a hamiltonian cycle of $G_{1}$ such that $x_{1} y_{1} \in E\left(C_{1}\right)$, and let $C_{2}$ be a hamiltonian cycle of $G_{2}$ such that $x_{2} y_{2} \in E\left(C_{2}\right)$. Then

$$
C=x_{1} x x_{2} \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{C}_{2} y_{2} y y_{1} \stackrel{\llcorner }{C}_{1} x_{1}
$$

is a cycle that contains all vertices in nontrivial clique components $D_{1}$ and $D_{2}$ of $G-S_{2}$ and the vertices $x$ and $y$. Furthermore, $Q_{2} \cup Q_{3} \subseteq V(C)$.

Since for each $i, 1 \leqslant i \leqslant \max \{2, t\}, V\left(D_{i}\right) \subseteq V(C)$ and $\bigcup_{1 \leqslant i \leqslant t} V\left(D_{i}\right) \subseteq V(G) \backslash\left(S_{2} \cup\right.$ $W$ ), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
|V(C)| & \geqslant n-\left|S_{2}\right|-|W| \geqslant n-\left|S_{2}\right|-2 c\left(G-S_{2}\right) \\
& \geqslant n-\left|S_{2}\right|-\frac{2\left|S_{2}\right|}{15} \geqslant n-\frac{17}{15} \cdot \frac{3 n}{4}=\frac{3 n}{20} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Claim 7. Let $C$ be the cycle defined in Claim 6. For any $x \in S_{2} \backslash V(C), x$ has more than $\frac{n}{16}$ neighbors on $C$.
Proof: Note that every vertex in $S_{2}$ is adjacent to at least two components of $G-S_{2}$. If $G-S_{2}$ has at least three nontrivial clique components, then Lemma 8 (ii) implies that for every $x \in S_{2}$, and for every nontrivial clique component $D$ of $G-S_{2}, x$ is adjacent to at least $|V(D)|-1$ vertices of $D$. By $(\mathbf{9})$ that $\sum_{i=t+1}^{h}\left|V\left(D_{i}\right)\right| \leqslant \frac{2\left|S_{2}\right|}{15}-2 t$, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|N_{G}(x) \cap\left(\bigcup_{1 \leqslant i \leqslant t} V\left(D_{i}\right)\right)\right| & \geqslant \sum_{i=1}^{t}\left(\left|V\left(D_{i}\right)\right|-1\right)=\sum_{i=1}^{t}\left|V\left(D_{i}\right)\right|-t \\
& =\left(n-\left|S_{2}\right|-\sum_{i=t+1}^{h}\left|V\left(D_{i}\right)\right|\right)-t \\
& \geqslant n-\left|S_{2}\right|-\frac{2\left|S_{2}\right|}{15}+2 t-t \\
& \geqslant n-\frac{17\left|S_{2}\right|}{15} \geqslant \frac{3 n}{20}>\frac{n}{16},
\end{aligned}
$$

since $\left|S_{2}\right| \leqslant|S| \leqslant \frac{3 n}{4}$. Therefore, $x$ has more than $\frac{n}{16}$ neighbors on $C$.
So we assume that $G-S_{2}$ has exactly two nontrivial clique components. Since $S_{2} \backslash$ $V(C) \subseteq S_{2} \backslash\left(Q_{2} \cup Q_{3}\right)$ (recall that $Q_{2} \cup Q_{3} \subseteq V(C)$ ), we know that $x$ is adjacent to at least $\frac{\left|V\left(D_{1}\right)\right|-1}{2}$ vertices of $D_{1}$, and is adjacent to at least $\frac{\left|V\left(D_{2}\right)\right|-1}{2}$ vertices of $D_{2}$. We show that $\left|V\left(D_{1}\right)\right|+\left|V\left(D_{2}\right)\right|$ is large. Since $G$ is 15 -tough, $\left|S_{2}\right|^{2} \geqslant 15 c\left(G-S_{2}\right)=15 h$. On
the other hand, since $D_{1}$ and $D_{2}$ are the only nontrivial components of $G-S_{2}$, we have $n-\left|S_{2}\right|=\left|V\left(D_{1}\right)\right|+\left|V\left(D_{2}\right)\right|+h-2$. Combining these inequalities, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|V\left(D_{1}\right)+\left|V\left(D_{2}\right)\right|\right| & =n-\left|S_{2}\right|-h+2 \geqslant n-\left|S_{2}\right|-\frac{\left|S_{2}\right|}{15}+2 \\
& >n-\frac{16\left|S_{2}\right|}{15} \geqslant n-\frac{16}{15} \cdot \frac{3 n}{4}=\frac{n}{5} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $C$ contains all vertices from $D_{1} \cup D_{2}$, we conclude that $x$ is adjacent to at least $\frac{n}{10}-1>\frac{n}{16}($ by $n \geqslant 31)$ neighbors on $C$.

By Claim 7, and by applying Lemma 10 for $C$ and vertices in $S_{2} \backslash(V(C) \cup V(M))$ iteratively, we get a longer cycle $C^{\prime}$ such that $V\left(C^{\prime}\right)=V(C) \cup\left(S_{2} \backslash(V(C) \cup V(M))\right)$. Note also that
$S_{2} \backslash V\left(C^{\prime}\right)=V(M) \cap S_{2} \subseteq N_{G}(W) \cap S_{2}$ and $V(G) \backslash\left(S_{2} \cup V\left(C^{\prime}\right)\right)=V(M) \cap\left(V(G) \backslash S_{2}\right)=W$.
Recall that for every $x \in S_{2} \backslash V\left(C^{\prime}\right)=S_{2} \cap V(M), x$ is adjacent to at least $\left|V\left(D_{i}\right)\right|-1$ vertices in each $D_{i}, i=1,2, \cdots, t$ by Claim 5 . Assume $\left|S_{2}\right| \leqslant \frac{7 n}{12}$. Then by the same argument as in the first case of proving Claim 7, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|N_{G}(x) \cap V\left(C^{\prime}\right)\right| & \geqslant\left|N_{G}(x) \cap\left(\bigcup_{1 \leqslant i \leqslant t} V\left(D_{i}\right)\right)\right| \geqslant n-\left|S_{2}\right|-\frac{2\left|S_{2}\right|}{15}+t \\
& \geqslant n-\frac{17}{15} \cdot \frac{7}{12} n=\frac{61}{180} n>\frac{4.5}{16} n
\end{aligned}
$$

Applying Lemma 11 for $C^{\prime}$ and every path in $M$ iteratively, we obtain a hamiltonian cycle in $G$. Hence we assume

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|S_{2}\right|>\frac{7 n}{12} \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

Claim 8. For any two $K_{1,2}$-stars $x_{1} u_{1} y_{1}, x_{2} u_{2} y_{2} \in M$, if $u_{1} u_{2}$ is a 2 -vertex component of $G-S_{2}$ and $\left|S_{2}\right|>\frac{7 n}{12}$, then at least one of $u_{1}$ and $u_{2}$ has more than $\frac{n}{16}$ neighbors on $C^{\prime}$. Proof: For otherwise, since $u_{i}$ is adjacent to exactly one vertex in $V(M) \cap\left(V(G) \backslash S_{2}\right)$, and $\left|V(M) \cap S_{2}\right| \leqslant 2\left|V(M) \cap\left(V(G) \backslash S_{2}\right)\right|=2|W| \leqslant \frac{4\left|S_{2}\right|}{15}$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
d_{G}\left(u_{1}\right)+d_{G}\left(u_{2}\right) & \leqslant 2\left(\frac{n}{16}+1+\left|V(M) \cap S_{2}\right|\right) \leqslant 2\left(\frac{n}{16}+1+\frac{4\left|S_{2}\right|}{15}\right) \\
& <2\left(\frac{1}{16} \cdot \frac{12}{7}\left|S_{2}\right|+1+\frac{4\left|S_{2}\right|}{15}\right)=\frac{157}{210}\left|S_{2}\right|+2
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $n \geqslant 31$, we have $\left|S_{2}\right|>\frac{7}{12} \cdot 31>18$. Therefore, $\frac{157}{210}\left|S_{2}\right|+2<\left|S_{2}\right| \leqslant|S|$. This contradicts the assumption that for every edge $u v \in E(G), d_{G}(u)+d_{G}(v) \geqslant|S|$.

Let

$$
M_{1}=\left\{u w v \in M \left\lvert\, \operatorname{deg}_{G}\left(w, C^{\prime}\right)>\frac{n}{16}\right.\right\}, \quad M_{2}=M \backslash M_{1} .
$$

Take $u w v \in M_{1}$, note that $u, v \in S_{2}$ and $w \in V(G) \backslash S_{2}$. By the definition of $M_{1}$, $\operatorname{deg}\left(w, C^{\prime}\right)>\frac{n}{16}$. By Claim 7, $\operatorname{deg}\left(u, C^{\prime}\right)>\frac{n}{16}$ and $\operatorname{deg}\left(v, C^{\prime}\right)>\frac{n}{16}$. Now applying Lemma 10 for $C^{\prime}$ and every path in $M_{1}$ iteratively, we get a longer cycle $C^{*}$ such that $V\left(C^{*}\right)=V\left(C^{\prime}\right) \cup V\left(M_{1}\right)$.

By the toughness of $G, G-S_{2}$ has at most $\frac{\left|S_{2}\right|}{15}$ components in total. Particularly, $G-S_{2}$ has at most $\frac{\left|S_{2}\right|}{15}$ components that have at most two vertices in total. By Claim 8, we know that for every 2 -vertex component $u v$ of $G-S_{2}$, at least one of $u$ or $v$ has more than $\frac{n}{16}$ neighbors on $C^{\prime}$. Therefore, at least one of the two $K_{1,2}$-stars centered, respectively, at $u$ and $v$ is contained in $M_{1}$. In other words, there is at most one $K_{1,2}$-star from $M_{2}$ that centers at a vertex from a same component of $G-S_{2}$. Therefore,

$$
\left|V\left(M_{2}\right)\right| \leqslant \frac{\left|S_{2}\right|}{15}+\frac{2\left|S_{2}\right|}{15}=\frac{\left|S_{2}\right|}{5} .
$$

By the definition of $M_{2}$ and by the assumption that for any $u v \in E(G), d_{G}(u)+d_{G}(v) \geqslant$ $|S|$, we know that for any path $x w y \in M_{2}$, where $x, y \in S_{2}$ and $w \in V(G) \backslash S_{2}$, we have $d_{G}(x)+d_{G}(w) \geqslant|S| \geqslant\left|S_{2}\right|$. Therefore, the number of neighbors that $x$ has in $G$ on $C^{*}$ is at least

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left|S_{2}\right|-\operatorname{deg}_{G}\left(x, G-V\left(C^{*}\right)\right)-d_{G}(w) \\
\geqslant & \left|S_{2}\right|-\operatorname{deg}_{G}\left(x, V\left(M_{2}\right)\right)-\left(\operatorname{deg}_{G}\left(w, C^{*}\right)+\operatorname{deg}_{G}\left(w, S_{2} \cap V\left(M_{2}\right)\right)\right) \\
\geqslant & \left|S_{2}\right|-\frac{\left|S_{2}\right|}{5}-\left(\frac{n}{16}+\frac{2\left|S_{2}\right|}{15}\right)=\frac{2\left|S_{2}\right|}{3}-\frac{n}{16} \\
> & \frac{2 \cdot 7 n}{3 \cdot 12}-\frac{n}{16}=\frac{47 n}{144}>\frac{4.5 n}{16} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Similarly, the vertex $y$ has in $G$ at least $\frac{4.5 n}{16}$ neighbors on $C^{*}$. Now applying Lemma 11 for $C^{*}$ and every path in $M_{2}$ iteratively gives a hamiltonian cycle in $G$.

Proof of Theorem 1. We may assume that $G$ is not a complete graph. Since $G$ is 15 -tough, it is 30 -connected, and consequently, $\delta(G) \geqslant 30$. By Lemma 5 , we may assume that

$$
\begin{equation*}
n \geqslant(\delta(G)+1) \cdot(\tau(G)+1) \geqslant 31 \cdot 16, \quad \text { and } \quad \delta(G) \leqslant \frac{n}{16}-1 \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

We consider two cases to finish the proof.
Case 1: For every edge $e=u v \in E(G), d_{G}(u)+d_{G}(v)>\frac{3 n}{4}$.
Denote by

$$
\begin{equation*}
V_{1}=\left\{v \in V(G) \left\lvert\, d_{G}(v) \leqslant \frac{3 n}{8}\right.\right\} \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

By the assumption of Case 1, we know that $V_{1}$ is an independent set in $G$. Therefore,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|V_{1}\right| \leqslant \frac{n}{16} \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

by Lemma 9 .

Since $G$ is 15 -tough, Corollary 4 implies that $G$ has a $K_{1,2}$-matching $M$ with all vertices in $V_{1}$ as the centers of the $K_{1,2}$-matching. Let $V_{2}$ be the set of the vertices contained in $M$. By (14), we have that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|V_{2}\right| \leqslant \frac{3 n}{16} \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

Denote by $G_{1}=G-V_{2}$. Then by the definitions of $V_{1}, V_{2}$ and (15), we get that

$$
\begin{align*}
\delta\left(G_{1}\right) & >\frac{3 n}{8}-\left|V_{2}\right| \geqslant \frac{3 n}{16},  \tag{16}\\
\operatorname{deg}_{G}\left(x, G_{1}\right) & >\frac{3 n}{8}-\left|V_{2}\right| \geqslant \frac{3 n}{16}, \quad \text { for any } x \in V_{2} \backslash V_{1} . \tag{17}
\end{align*}
$$

We first assume that $G_{1}$ has a hamiltonian cycle $C$. For every copy of $K_{1,2}$, say $x y z \in M$, by (17),

$$
\begin{align*}
\operatorname{deg}_{G}\left(x, G_{1}\right) & >\frac{3 n}{16}>\frac{n}{16}  \tag{18}\\
\operatorname{deg}_{G}\left(z, G_{1}\right) & >\frac{3 n}{16}>\frac{n}{16} .
\end{align*}
$$

Let

$$
M_{1}=\left\{u w v \in M \left\lvert\, \operatorname{deg}_{G}(w, C)>\frac{n}{16}\right.\right\}, \quad M_{2}=M \backslash M_{1} .
$$

By (18), applying Lemma 10 with respect to $C$ and every vertex in $M_{1}$ iteratively, we get a longer cycle $C^{*}$ such that $V\left(C^{*}\right)=V(C) \cup V\left(M_{1}\right)$.

By the definition of $M_{2}$ and by the assumption that for any $u v \in E(G), d_{G}(u)+d_{G}(v)>$ $\frac{3 n}{4}$, we know that for any path $x w y \in M_{2}$, where $x, y \in V_{2} \backslash V_{1}$ and $w \in V_{1}$, we have $d_{G}(x)+d_{G}(w)>\frac{3 n}{4}$. Therefore, the number of neighbors that $x$ has in $G$ on $C^{*}$ is at least

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{3 n}{4}-\operatorname{deg}_{G}\left(x, G-V\left(C^{*}\right)\right)-d_{G}(w) \\
\geqslant & \frac{3 n}{4}-\operatorname{deg}_{G}\left(x, V\left(M_{2}\right)\right)-\left(\operatorname{deg}_{G}\left(w, C^{*}\right)+\operatorname{deg}_{G}\left(w, V_{2}\right)\right) \\
\geqslant & \frac{3 n}{4}-\left|V_{2}\right|-\left(\frac{n}{16}+\left|V_{2} \backslash V_{1}\right|\right) \\
\geqslant & \frac{3 n}{4}-\frac{3 n}{16}-\frac{n}{16}-\frac{2 n}{16} \\
= & \frac{6 n}{16}>\frac{4.5 n}{16}
\end{aligned}
$$

Similarly, the vertex $y$ has in $G$ at least $\frac{4.5 n}{16}$ neighbors on $C^{*}$. Now applying Lemma 11 for $C^{*}$ and every path in $M_{2}$ iteratively gives a hamiltonian cycle in $G$.

Hence we assume that $G_{1}$ does not have a hamiltonian cycle. By Lemma 5, we have $\delta\left(G_{1}\right) \leqslant \frac{\left|V\left(G_{1}\right)\right|}{\tau\left(G_{1}\right)+1} \leqslant \frac{n}{\tau\left(G_{1}\right)+1}$. On the other hand, (16) yields $\delta\left(G_{1}\right)>\frac{3 n}{16}$. Combining these
inequalities, we have $\frac{3 n}{16}<\frac{n}{\tau\left(G_{1}\right)+1}$, which implies $\tau\left(G_{1}\right)<\frac{13}{3}<7$. Therefore, there exists $S_{1} \subseteq V\left(G_{1}\right)$ such that $c\left(G_{1}-S_{1}\right) \geqslant 2$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|S_{1}\right| / c\left(G_{1}-S_{1}\right)<7 \tag{19}
\end{equation*}
$$

Note $c\left(G_{1}-S_{1}\right)=c\left(G-\left(S_{1} \cup V_{2}\right)\right)$. If $\left|S_{1}\right| \geqslant \frac{3 n}{16}$, then we have $c\left(G_{1}-S_{1}\right)>\frac{\left|S_{1}\right|}{7} \geqslant \frac{3 n}{16 \cdot 7}$, and thus by (15),

$$
\frac{\left|S_{1} \cup V_{2}\right|}{c\left(G-\left(S_{1} \cup V_{2}\right)\right)}=\frac{\left|S_{1}\right|}{c\left(G_{1}-S_{1}\right)}+\frac{\left|V_{2}\right|}{c\left(G_{1}-S_{1}\right)}<7+\frac{3 n / 16}{3 n /(16 \cdot 7)}=14
$$

This contradicts $\tau(G) \geqslant 15$. So we assume $\left|S_{1}\right|<\frac{3 n}{16}$. Thus $\left|S_{1}\right| \leqslant\left\lfloor\frac{3 n}{16}\right\rfloor$. As $\delta\left(G_{1}\right) \geqslant$ $\left\lfloor\frac{3 n}{16}\right\rfloor+1$ by (16), we know that each component of $G_{1}$ contains at least

$$
\delta\left(G_{1}\right)-\left|S_{1}\right| \geqslant\left\lfloor\frac{3 n}{16}\right\rfloor+1-\left\lfloor\frac{3 n}{16}\right\rfloor+1=2
$$

vertices. By Lemma 6, we know that every component of $G_{1}-S_{1}$ is a clique component. Let $S=S_{1} \cup V_{2}$. We then see that all components of $G-S$ are nontrivial. Also, $|S|<\frac{6 n}{16}<\frac{3 n}{4}$ since $\left|S_{1}\right|<\frac{3 n}{16}$ and $\left|V_{2}\right| \leqslant \frac{3 n}{16}$ by (15). Furthermore, by the assumption of Case 1, for every edge $u v \in E(G), d_{G}(u)+d_{G}(v)>\frac{3 n}{4}>|S|$. Now we can apply Lemma 12 on $G$ and $S$ to find a hamiltonian cycle in $G$.
Case 2: There exists an edge $e=u v \in E(G)$ such that $d_{G}(u)+d_{G}(v) \leqslant \frac{3 n}{4}$.
Let

$$
S=\left(N_{G}(u) \cup N_{G}(v)\right) \backslash\{u, v\}
$$

such that $d_{G}(u)+d_{G}(v)$ is smallest among all the degree sums of two adjacent vertices in $G$.

By the assumption of this case and the choice of $S$, we know that

$$
\begin{equation*}
|S| \leqslant \frac{3 n}{4}-2, \quad \text { and } \quad \text { for any } u^{\prime} v^{\prime} \in E(G), d\left(u^{\prime}\right)+d\left(v^{\prime}\right) \geqslant|S| \tag{20}
\end{equation*}
$$

By the definition of $S, c(G-S) \geqslant 2$ and $u v$ is one of the components of $G-S$. Since $\tau(G) \geqslant 15$, and $|V(G) \backslash(S \cup\{u, v\})|=n-|S|-2 \geqslant \frac{|S|}{3}=\frac{5|S|}{15}, G-S-\{u, v\}$ has a component with at least 5 vertices. This, together with the fact that $u v$ is one of the components of $G-S$, Lemma 6 implies that every component of $G-S$ is a clique component, and $G-S$ has at least two nontrivial components. Again Lemma 12 implies that $G$ has a hamiltonian cycle.
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