*Combinatorics, Probability and Computing* (2010) 19, 47–60. © Cambridge University Press 2009
doi:10.1017/S0963548309990320

# Duality of Ends

HENNING BRUHN[1] and MAYA STEIN[2†]

[1]Mathematisches Seminar, Universität Hamburg, Bundesstraße 55, 20146 Hamburg, Germany
(e-mail: hbruhn@gmx.net)
[2]Centro de Modelamiento Matemático, Universidad de Chile, Blanco Encalada 2120, Santiago, Chile
(e-mail: mstein@dim.uchile.cl)

*Received 17 January 2008; revised 10 June 2009; first published online 10 August 2009*

We investigate the end spaces of infinite dual graphs. We show that there exists a natural homeomorphism $*$ between the end spaces of a graph and its dual, and that $*$ preserves the 'end degree'. In particular, $*$ maps thick ends to thick ends. Along the way, we prove that Tutte-connectivity is invariant under taking (infinite) duals.

## 1. Introduction

In 1932 Whitney [19] introduced the concept of dual graphs: a (multi-)graph $G^*$ is a dual of a finite (multi-)graph $G$ if there exists a bijection $* : E(G) \to E(G^*)$ such that a set $F \subseteq E(G)$ is a circuit of $G$ precisely when $F^*$ is a bond in $G^*$. Building on work by Thomassen [14, 15], Bruhn and Diestel [1] extended duality to (a superclass of) locally finite graphs. Many properties of dual graphs are retained in infinite graphs, such as Whitney's planarity criterion, the symmetry of the duality relation (*i.e.*, that $G$ is a dual of $G^*$), and the uniqueness of the dual of 3-connected planar graphs: see [1].

The main aim of this work is the study of an as yet unexplored aspect of duality in infinite graphs, namely the relation between the end space of a graph and the end space of its dual. Our first result states that there exists a homeomorphism between these two spaces that arises in a natural way from the bijection $*$ on the edges.

More precisely, we will demonstrate that, given a pair $G, G^*$ of (infinite) duals, the end-vertices of a set $F \subseteq E(G)$ converge towards an end $\omega$ of $G$ if and only if the end-vertices of $F^*$ converge towards the dual end $\omega^*$. For this, we shall define a topological space $|G|$ on the point set of $G$ together with its set of ends $\Omega(G)$ (and analogously for $G^*$). This space will be defined in Section 2; see also Chapter 8 of [4]. Further discussion of Theorem 1.1 can be found in Section 3.

† Supported by FAPESP grant no. 2005/54051-9.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548309990320 Published online by Cambridge University Press

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let $G$ and $G^*$ be 2-connected dual graphs. Then there is a homeomorphism $* : \Omega(G) \to \Omega(G^*)$, where the two spaces are endowed with the subspace topology of $|G|$ (resp. $|G^*|$), so that:*

$$\text{For all } F \subseteq E(G) \text{ and ends } \omega, \text{ we have } \omega \in \overline{F} \text{ if and only if } \omega^* \in \overline{F^*}. \tag{1.1}$$

*Thick ends*, those that contain an infinite set of disjoint rays, play an important role in the study of the automorphism group of a graph, see for instance Halin [9] or Thomassen and Woess [16]. We will prove that thickness is preserved in the dual end.

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let $G, G^*$ be a pair of dual graphs, and let $\omega$ be an end of $G$. Then $\omega$ is thick if and only if $\omega^*$ is thick.*

In fact, we shall prove something stronger. Following [2] and [13] we introduce the *degree* $d_G(\omega)$ of an end $\omega$ (for a locally finite graph this will be the supremum of the cardinalities of sets of disjoint rays in $\omega$; for details and the definition of the end degree for arbitrary graphs see Section 6). Theorem 1.2 will be a consequence of the following result.

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let $G$ and $G^*$ be a pair of 2-connected dual graphs, and let $\omega$ be an end of $G$. Then $d_G(\omega) = d_{G^*}(\omega^*)$.*

In order to prove Theorem 1.3, we make use of a notion of connectivity, introduced by Tutte [17], that coincides with the connectivity of the cycle matroid of the graph. As a by-product we obtain the following result, which for finite graphs is a theorem of Tutte [17].

**Theorem 1.4.** *Let $G$ and $G^*$ be a pair of dual graphs, and let $k \geqslant 2$. Then $G$ is $k$-Tutte-connected if and only if $G^*$ is $k$-Tutte-connected.*

We will define Tutte-connectivity in Section 5 (all other definitions can be found in the next section), but let us remark here that a graph is 3-Tutte-connected if and only if it is 3-connected. Therefore, Theorem 1.4 has the following consequence.

**Corollary 1.5 (Thomassen [15]).** *Let $G$ and $G^*$ be a pair of dual graphs. Then $G$ is 3-connected if and only if $G^*$ is 3-connected.*

Duality for infinite graphs was first explored by Thomassen. Faced with the incongruity that an infinite graph may have infinite cuts as well as finite ones but (in the traditional definition) only finite circuits, he chose to ignore infinite cuts. Consequently, $G^*$ is a dual of $G$, in the sense of Thomassen, if, for all *finite* sets $F \subseteq E(G)$, $F$ is a circuit precisely when $F^*$ is a bond. This concept allowed him to prove an infinite version of Whitney's planarity criterion: a 2-connected graph $G$ has a (Thomassen-)dual if and only if it is

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548309990320 Published online by Cambridge University Press

planar and satisfies

Every two vertices of G can be separated by finitely many edges. (†)

However, Thomassen's definition is not completely satisfactory, as the symmetry in taking duals is lost, as well as the uniqueness of the duals of 3-connected graphs. These deficits are ultimately due to the disregard of infinite cuts.

Infinite circuits, which have been proposed by Diestel and Kühn [5, 6, 7], promise a way out of this dilemma. Taking infinite circuits into account led to the more restrictive definition of duals in [1]: there, a set $F \subseteq E(G)$, finite or infinite, is a circuit if and only if $F^*$ is a bond. These duals overcome the drawbacks of Thomassen's definition, *i.e.*, they retain the basic properties of finite duals. We will define and very briefly discuss infinite circuits in the next section.

## 2. Definitions and preliminaries

All our graphs are allowed to have loops and parallel edges, with the exception of 2-connected graphs, which we require to be loopless, and of 3-connected graphs, which, in addition, cannot have parallel edges. Otherwise our notation follows Diestel [4].

Let $G$ be a fixed graph. A 1-way infinite path is called a *ray*; a 2-way infinite path is a *double ray*. Two rays are called *equivalent* if there are infinitely many disjoint paths between them. The equivalence classes of rays are the *ends of* $G$; we denote the set of these by $\Omega(G)$.

The proof of the following lemma, which is not hard, can be found in [4, Lemma 8.2.2].

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let $G$ be a connected graph, and let $U$ be an infinite subset of $V(G)$. Then $G$ contains a ray $R$ with infinitely many disjoint $R$–$U$ paths or a subdivided star with infinitely many leaves in $U$.*

Diestel and Kühn [5, 6, 7] employed a topological approach to define (finite and infinite) circuits in infinite graphs. For them, a circuit of $G$ is the edge set of a homeomorphic image of the unit circle in a topological space based on $G$.

We shall introduce the topology in two steps. First we define a topological space $|G|$, whose points are the vertices and ends of $G$, as well as the interior points of edges of $G$. In the second step we shall identify some of the points of $|G|$.

So, in order to define $|G|$, see $G$ as endowed with the topology of a 1-complex, so every edge is homeomorphic to the unit interval, and a basic open neighbourhood of a vertex consists of the union of half-open edges, one for each incident edge. In order to describe the neighbourhoods of an end $\omega$, pick a finite vertex set $S$, and denote the component of $G - S$ that contains a ray of $\omega$ (and thus a subray for every ray in $\omega$) by $C(S, \omega)$. We say that $\omega$ *belongs to* $C(S, \omega)$. A basic open neighbourhood of $\omega$ now consists of $C(S, \omega)$, all ends that have a ray in $C(S, \omega)$, and the union of all interior points of edges between $S$ and $C(S, \omega)$. In the case of a locally finite graph, the resulting space $|G|$ is called the *Freudenthal compactification* of $G$.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548309990320 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In non-locally finite graphs, we say that a vertex $v$ *dominates* an end $\omega$ if there are infinitely many paths between $v$ and a ray in $\omega$ that pairwise only meet in $v$. We define an equivalence relation $\sim$ on $|G|$ as follows. For two ends $\omega$ and $\omega'$, let $\omega \sim \omega'$ if both $\omega$ and $\omega'$ are dominated by the same vertex. For a vertex $v$ and an end $\omega$, let $v \sim \omega$ if $v$ dominates $\omega$. We denote by $\tilde{G}$ the quotient space of $|G|$ under the equivalence relation $\sim$. In particular, if $G$ is locally finite, then $\tilde{G} = |G|$. Observe furthermore that, if $G$ satisfies (†), then no two vertices of $G$ are identified in $\tilde{G}$.

We shall need to work within both spaces $|G|$ and $\tilde{G}$. In order to distinguish between closures of sets $X \subseteq V(G) \cup E(G)$ in the two spaces, we write $\overline{X}$ for the closure of $X$ in $|G|$, and $\widetilde{X}$ for the closure of $X$ in $\tilde{G}$.

Next, we define *circles* in $\tilde{G}$ as the homeomorphic images of the unit circle. If a circle contains an interior point of an edge then it contains the whole edge. Thus it makes sense to speak of the edge set of a circle, which is called a *circuit*. The homeomorphic image of the unit interval $[0, 1]$ in $\tilde{G}$ is an *arc*. Observe that circuits as well as arcs must contain edges.

For the merits of infinite circuits and the topological cycle space, which is based on this definition, see the overview article by Diestel [3]. Let us remark that a more general approach to cycle spaces has been pursued by Richter and Vella [18], who define (infinite) circuits for a wider range of topological spaces.

Now, we can finally define duals. For this, assume that $G$ satisfies (†); as Thomassen [15] observed, this is a necessary condition for a graph to have a dual (in Thomassen's and thus in our sense as well). We call a graph $G^*$ a *dual* of $G$ if there is a bijection $* : E(G) \to E(G^*)$ such that a (finite or infinite) set $F \subseteq E(G)$ is a circuit of $G$ precisely when $F^*$ is a bond in $G^*$. (A *bond* is a minimal non-empty cut.)

The dual $G^*$ then can be seen to satisfy (†) as well. So, the class of graphs with (†) is closed under taking duals, unlike the class of locally finite graphs. Whenever we speak of duals we will therefore tacitly assume that the original graph (and then automatically the dual too) satisfies (†). We refer to [1] for more details.

We list two properties of duals, which we shall need throughout the paper.

**Lemma 2.2.** *Let $G$ and $G^*$ be a pair of dual graphs. Then $G$ is 2-connected if and only if $G^*$ is 2-connected.*

The lemma follows easily from the fact that every two edges lie in a common circuit if and only if the graph is 2-connected, which is the case precisely when every two edges lie in a common bond. Variants of this lemma can be found in Thomassen [14] as well as in [1].

**Theorem 2.3. [1]** *Let $G^*$ be a dual graph of a graph $G$. Then $G$ is also a dual of $G^*$.*

For convenience we will, for a set $F$ of edges, write $V[F]$ to denote the set of end-vertices of the edges in $F$.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548309990320 Published online by Cambridge University Press




*Figure 1.* No correspondence between edge-ends of duals.

## 3. Discussion

Before turning to the proofs of our main results, we shall discuss why their statements have the precise forms they do. Let us start with the bijection we wish to define between the end spaces of two dual graphs $G$ and $G^*$. Our mapping will be an extension of the bijection $* : E(G) \to E(G^*)$ on the edges (and we will therefore, slightly abusing notation, denote it with $*$ too). More precisely, we aim at a bijection $*$ between $\Omega(G)$ and $\Omega(G^*)$, so that for all $F \subseteq E(G)$, the end-vertices of $F$ converge against an end $\omega$ of $G$ if and only if the end-vertices of $F^*$ converge against $\omega^*$.

In the space $\tilde{G}$, which is instrumental in the definition of duality, the accumulation points of vertex sets are the identification classes of ends. Recall that any two ends that cannot be separated by finitely many edges are identified, giving rise to larger equivalence classes of rays called *edge-ends* by some authors (*e.g.*, Hahn, Laviolette and Širáň [8]). So, should we not search for a bijection of the edge-ends rather than of the ends?

Figure 1 demonstrates that there is no hope for a bijection between edge-ends (even without any structural requirements). The double ladder has two edge-ends, while its dual graph has only one edge-end.

The reason that this attempt fails lies in the nature of duals. The existence of finite edge-cuts between (edge-)ends will not be preserved in the dual. In fact, such a (minimal) cut corresponds to a circuit in the dual, which need not separate anything. In contrast, a vertex separation whose deletion results in two sufficiently large sides does, in some sense, carry over to the dual graph; this is the essence of Theorem 1.4 and will be further explored in Section 5.

Our bijection will thus be between the ends of $G$ and $G^*$. This means that we will work in $|G|$, since any two identified ends cannot be distinguished topologically in $\tilde{G}$. Endowing $\Omega(G)$ (resp. $\Omega(G^*)$) with the subspace topology of $|G|$ (resp. $|G^*|$), we will show the existence of a bijection $\Omega(G) \to \Omega(G^*)$ that is structure-preserving in the sense above. Moreover, Theorem 1.1 ensures that $*$ is a homeomorphism.

We remark that the requirement that $G$ and $G^*$ are 2-connected cannot be dropped. This is illustrated by the example of the double ray. Every dual of the double ray is a

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548309990320 Published online by Cambridge University Press




*Figure 2.* Edge-thick end with edge-thin dual end.

graph whose edge set is the union of countably many loops, and thus contains no end at all.

We shall prove Theorem 1.1 in the next section.

Let us now turn to our second objective: showing that our bijection $*$ preserves thickness. This will be achieved in Theorem 1.2. Again, we are confronted with the question why focus on preserving (vertex-)thickness instead of 'edge-thickness', *i.e.*, the existence of infinitely many edge-disjoint rays in an end.

This is answered by Figure 2, which shows a graph that has a single edge-thick end while the unique end of its dual graph does not even possess two edge-disjoint rays. The reason is the same as above: although (or because) the notion of duals is based on edges and operations with edges, the existence of (small) edge separators is not preserved in the dual.

Since not all vertex separators are preserved in the dual, connectivity is not an invariant of (finite or infinite) duals, as we have already remarked in the Introduction. However, the related notion of *Tutte-connectivity* is. We defer to Section 5 for the definition; suffice it to say here that there are two reasons why a graph may have low Tutte-connectivity: either it has a small vertex separator or it contains a small circuit. In Section 5 we prove that Tutte-connectivity is an invariant of infinite duals too (Theorem 1.4).

Theorem 1.4 is an important step on our way to proving Theorem 1.3 and thus Theorem 1.2. Our proof of Theorem 1.4 differs from the usual proof of Tutte's finite version, which is done in two steps. First, one shows that Tutte-connectivity coincides with the connectivity of the cycle matroid of the graph. Then one observes that matroid connectivity is invariant under duality.

If we want to use this approach for Theorem 1.4 as well, we first have to answer two questions. Which notion of infinite matroids should we use? And how do we define higher connectivity in a matroid?

The first question is easy to answer. Although it is sometimes claimed that there is no proper concept of an infinite matroid that provides duality and the existence of bases at the same time, B-matroids, as defined by Higgs [10], accomplish that (see also Oxley [11]). Moreover, one can prove that duality in B-matroids is compatible with taking dual graphs. While the second problem, the definition of higher connectivity, can also be overcome in

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548309990320 Published online by Cambridge University Press

a satisfactory way, its solution together with the introduction of B-matroids would take quite a bit of time and effort. Therefore, we will, in Section 5, present a matroid-free proof of Theorem 1.4.

## 4. $*$ induces a homeomorphism on the ends

Before we are able to prove Theorem 1.1, we need two lemmas.

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let $G$ be a 2-connected graph satisfying (†). If $U$ is an infinite set of vertices then $\overline{U}$ contains an end of $G$.*

**Proof.** Suppose otherwise. Then there is no ray $R$ in $G$ with infinitely many disjoint $R$–$U$ paths. So, an application of Lemma 2.1 yields a subdivided star $S$ that contains an infinite subset $U'$ of $U$. We delete the centre of $S$ and apply Lemma 2.1 again, this time to $U'$, which yields another subdivided star $S'$ with infinitely many leaves in $U'$. However, the centre of $S$ and the centre of $S'$ are then infinitely connected, contradicting (†). □

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let $G$ be a 2-connected graph, and let $X$ and $Y$ be two sets of edges such that $\overline{X} \cap \overline{Y} \cap \Omega(G) \neq \emptyset$. Then there are infinitely many (edge-)disjoint finite circuits, each of which meets both $X$ and $Y$.*

**Proof.** Let $\mathcal{Z}$ be an $\subseteq$-maximal set of finite disjoint circuits such that each $C \in \mathcal{Z}$ meets both $X$ and $Y$, and suppose that $|\mathcal{Z}|$ is finite. Putting $Z := \bigcup \mathcal{Z}$, for every two $x, y \in V[Z]$ for which it is possible, we pick an $x$–$y$ path $P_{x,y}$ that is edge-disjoint from $Z$. Let $Z'$ denote the union of $Z$ with the edge sets of all these paths, and observe that still $|Z'| < \infty$.

We claim that, for every component $K$ of $G - V[Z']$, we have

$$\text{For every } v, w \in N(K) \text{ there is a } v\text{–}w \text{ path in } (V[Z'], Z' \setminus Z). \tag{4.1}$$

Indeed, by construction, there are $x, y \in V[Z]$ and (possibly trivial) $v$–$x$ (resp. $w$–$y$) paths $Q_v$ (resp. $Q_w$) with edges in $Z' \setminus Z$. Then $x$ and $y$ are connected through $K \cup Q_v \cup Q_w \subseteq G - Z$. Hence, in $P_{x,y} \cup Q_v \cup Q_w \subseteq (V[Z'], Z' \setminus Z)$ we find a $v$–$w$ path. This proves (4.1).

Now, because $\overline{X} \cap \overline{Y}$ contains an end, there exists a component $K$ of $G - V[Z']$ which contains infinitely many vertices of both $V[X]$ and $V[Y]$. Choose edges $e_X, e_Y \in E(K) \cup E(K, G - K)$ such that $e_X \in X$, and $e_Y \in Y$. Since $G$ is 2-connected, there is a finite circuit $C$ which contains both $e_X$ and $e_Y$. The maximality of $\mathcal{Z}$ implies that $C$ meets $Z$ in at least one edge. In particular, $C$ contains the edge sets of (possibly identical) $N(K)$-paths $P_X$ and $P_Y$ such that $e_X \in E(P_X)$, and $e_Y \in E(P_Y)$.

Being connected, $K$ contains a $V(P_X)$–$V(P_Y)$ path $P$. Thus, we find in $P \cup P_X \cup P_Y$ an $N(K)$-path $P'$ with $e_X, e_Y \in E(P')$. By (4.1), there exists a path $R$ in $(V[Z'], Z' \setminus Z)$ between the end-vertices of $P'$. Now, $E(P') \cup E(R)$ is a circuit that meets both $X$ and $Y$ but is edge-disjoint from $Z$, a contradiction to the maximality of $\mathcal{Z}$. □

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548309990320 Published online by Cambridge University Press

**Proof of Theorem 1.1.** We start by claiming that, for each $F \subseteq E(G)$ and each end $\omega$ of $G$, the following is true:

$$\text{If } \overline{F} \cap \Omega(G) = \{\omega\}, \text{ then } \overline{F^*} \text{ contains exactly one end.} \tag{4.2}$$

Suppose the claim is not true. By Lemma 4.1, this cannot be because $\overline{F^*}$ fails to contain an end; rather there must be (at least) two ends, $\alpha_1$ and $\alpha_2$, in $\overline{F^*}$. Take a finite connected subgraph $T$ of $G^*$ such that $V(T)$ separates $\alpha_1$ and $\alpha_2$ in $G^*$. For $i = 1, 2$, denote by $K_i$ the component of $G^* - T$ to which $\alpha_i$ belongs, and set $X_i^* := (E(K_i) \cup E(K_i, T)) \cap F^*$. Since each of the $X_i^*$ is infinite, it follows from Lemma 4.1 that $\overline{X_i}$ contains an end. As $\overline{X_i} \subseteq \overline{F}$, this end must be $\omega$. Hence, Lemma 4.2 yields disjoint finite circuits $C_1, C_2, \ldots$ in $G$, each of which meets $X_1$ as well as $X_2$.

We claim that each of the bonds $C_i^*$ contains an edge of $T$. Indeed, let $M_1$ and $M_2$ be the two components of $G^* - C_i^*$. Since $C_i^*$ meets both $X_1^*$ and $X_2^*$, each $M_j$ contains a vertex in $K_1 \cup T$ and a vertex in $K_2 \cup T$. Since, for $j = 1, 2$, $M_j$ is connected, it follows that $V(M_j) \cap V(T) \neq \emptyset$. So, since $T$ is connected, there is an $M_1$–$M_2$ edge in $E(T)$, *i.e.*, $C_i^* \cap E(T) \neq \emptyset$, for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$. This yields a contradiction, since the $C_i^*$ are disjoint but $T$ is finite. Therefore, claim (4.2) is established.

Now, we define $* : \Omega(G) \to \Omega(G^*)$. Given an end $\omega \in \Omega(G)$, pick any set $F \subseteq E(G)$ with $\overline{F} \cap \Omega(G) = \{\omega\}$ (choose, for instance, the edge set of a ray in $\omega$). Define $\omega^* = \omega^*(F)$ to be the, by (4.2), unique end in $\overline{F^*}$. To see that this mapping is well-defined, *i.e.*, that it does not depend on the choice of $F$, consider a second set $D \subseteq E(G)$ as above, and observe that $\omega^*(D) = \omega^*(D \cup F) = \omega^*(F)$. Since $G$ is a dual of $G^*$ (Theorem 2.3), we may apply (4.2) to $G^*$ and see that $*$ is a bijection and satisfies (1.1).

Next, we prove that $* : \Omega(G) \to \Omega(G^*)$ is continuous. For this, let an end $\omega^* \in \Omega(G^*)$ and an open neighbourhood $U^* \subseteq \Omega(G^*)$ of $\omega^*$ be given. Then there exists a finite vertex set $S \subseteq V(G^*)$, and a component $K$ of $G^* - S$ such that $W^* := K \cap \Omega(G^*) \subseteq U^*$.

Setting $F^* := E(G^*) \setminus (E(K) \cup E(S, K))$, we observe that $W^* = \Omega(G^*) \setminus \overline{F^*}$. Hence, by (1.1), $W = \Omega(G) \setminus \overline{F}$. So, $W$ is an open neighbourhood of $\omega$ whose image is contained in $U^*$. Finally, by interchanging the roles of $G$ and $G^*$ we see that the inverse of $*$ is continuous as well. □

## 5. Tutte-connectivity

In this and in the next section, we are concerned with how (Tutte-)connectivity is preserved in the dual. The main idea underlying our proofs is the duality of spanning trees: given a pair of finite connected dual graphs $G$ and $G^*$, a set $D$ is the edge set of a spanning tree of $G$ if and only if $E(G^*) \setminus D^*$ is the edge set of a spanning tree in $G^*$.

For a pair of infinite graphs, the situation is slightly more complicated. In fact, if $E(G^*) \setminus D^*$ is the edge set of a spanning tree, then $(V(G), D)$ might very well be disconnected; topologically, however, $\widetilde{D}$ (the closure of $D$ in $\tilde{G}$) is always connected.

Moreover, $\widetilde{D}$ forms a *topological spanning tree* (TST for short) of $\tilde{G}$: a path-connected circuit-free subspace of $\tilde{G}$ that contains all vertices of $G$, and every edge of which it contains an interior point. For more on the relation between spanning trees in $G$ and $G^*$,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548309990320 Published online by Cambridge University Press

see [1]. TSTs were first introduced by Diestel and Kühn in [7], where it is proved that $\tilde{G}$ always has a TST provided $G$ is connected.

We will use the tree duality implicitly in the key lemma, Lemma 5.3, below. The next two lemmas help to relate the tree duality to vertex separations.

**Lemma 5.1.** *Let $G$ be a graph satisfying (†), let $T$ be a subgraph that does not contain any circuits, and let $U \subseteq V(T)$ such that $0 < |U| < \infty$. Then there exists a set $F \subseteq E(T)$ of size at most $|U| - 1$ such that every arc in $\widetilde{T}$ between two vertices in $U$ meets $F$.*

**Proof.** We use induction on $|U|$. The assertion is trivial for $|U| = 1$, so for the induction step assume that $|U| > 1$. Choose $v \in U$; then by the induction assumption there is a set $D \subseteq E(T)$ such that each vertex $w$ of $U \setminus \{v\}$ lies in a different path component $K_w$ of $\widetilde{T} - D$. If there is no vertex $w \in U \setminus \{v\}$ such that $v \in K_w$, we are done, so assume there is such a $w$.

Observe that there exists exactly one $v$–$w$ arc $A$ in $\widetilde{T} - D$. Indeed, if there were two, then it is easy to see that the edge set of their union would contain a circuit. Now, choose any edge $e$ on $A$, and set $F := D \cup \{e\}$. Clearly, $F$ is as desired, which completes the proof. □

**Lemma 5.2.** *Let $H$ be a connected graph, let $F \subseteq E(H)$, and let $W \subseteq V(H)$. If every $W$-path in $H$ meets $F$, then $|F| \geqslant |W| - 1$.*

**Proof.** Since no two vertices of $W$ can lie in the same component of $H - F$, we deduce that $H - F$ has at least $|W|$ components. As each deletion of a single edge increases the number of components by at most one, $H - F$ can have at most $|F| + 1$ components. □

Let us now introduce the notion of Tutte-connectivity: see Tutte [17]. For finite graphs, Tutte-connectivity coincides with the connectivity of the cycle matroid of the graph. We remark that for $k \in \{2, 3\}$, a graph is $k$-Tutte-connected if and only if it is $k$-connected. For greater $k$, the two notions of connectivity are not equivalent.

**Definition.** A *$k$-Tutte-separation* of a graph $G$ is a partition $(X, Y)$ of $E(G)$ so that $|X|, |Y| \geqslant k$ and so that at most $k$ vertices of $G$ are incident with edges in both of $X$ and $Y$.

We say that a graph $G$ is *$k$-Tutte-connected* if $G$ has no $\ell$-Tutte-separation for any $\ell < k$.

Consider a $k$-Tutte-separation $(X, Y)$ in a (2-connected) graph $G$ with a dual $G^*$. To prove that Tutte-connectivity is invariant under taking duals, we would ideally like to see that $(X^*, Y^*)$ is a $k$-Tutte-separation in $G^*$. This, however, is not always true: if the two sides of the separation do not induce connected subgraphs of $G^*$, then the number of vertices in $V[X^*] \cap V[Y^*]$ can be much higher than $k$. Thus we will strengthen the requirements and lessen our expectations. By demanding the subgraph $(V[Y], Y) - V[X]$ to be connected, we shall be able to guarantee that at least $(V[Y^*], Y^*)$ is connected.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548309990320 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Moreover, we will be content with finding an $\ell$-Tutte-separation of $G^*$ for some $\ell \leqslant k$ that is derived from $(X^*, Y^*)$.

The statement of the next lemma, which accomplishes just that, is a bit more general than we need for Theorem 1.4, as we shall re-use it for Theorem 1.3.

**Lemma 5.3.** *Let $G$ and $G^*$ be a pair of 2-connected dual graphs, and let $(X, Y)$ be a $k$-Tutte-separation such that $C_Y := (V[Y], Y) - V[X]$ is non-empty and connected, and such that $Y = E(C_Y) \cup E(C_Y, V[X])$. Then:*

(i) *there exists a component $L$ of $(V[X^*], X^*)$ such that $(E(L), E(G^*) \setminus E(L))$ is an $\ell$-Tutte-separation for some $\ell \leqslant k$; and*

(ii) *for each component $K$ of $(V[X^*], X^*)$ with $|E(K)| \geqslant k$, we have $(E(K), E(G^*) \setminus E(K))$ is a $k$-Tutte-separation.*

**Proof.** First, we prove that:

$$\widetilde{Y^*} \text{ is path-connected in } \tilde{G}^*. \tag{5.1}$$

Suppose that this is not the case. Then we can write $Y$ as the disjoint union of two sets $Y_1$ and $Y_2$ such that there is no $Y_1^*$–$Y_2^*$ arc in $\tilde{G}^*$ that only uses edges from $Y^*$.

In particular, there is no circle in $\tilde{G}^*$ that only uses edges from $Y^*$ and meets both $Y_1^*$ and $Y_2^*$. Equivalently, there is no bond in $G$ that only uses edges from $Y$, and meets both $Y_1$ and $Y_2$.

However, since $C_Y$ is connected and since every edge in $Y$ is incident with a vertex in $C_Y$, there is a vertex $x \in V(C_Y)$ which is incident with both $Y_1$ and $Y_2$. Observe that the cut $B_x$ of $G$, which consists of all edges incident with $x$, is a subset of $Y$. As $G$ is 2-connected, $B_x$ is a bond, which yields the desired contradiction and thus proves (5.1).

Now, set $U := V[X] \cap V[Y]$ and $W := V[X^*] \cap V[Y^*]$. Observe that each vertex in $W$ is incident with both $X^*$ and $Y^*$. So, if $|W|$ is infinite, then Lemma 4.1 implies that $\overline{X^*} \cap \overline{Y^*}$ contains an end, while $\overline{X} \cap \overline{Y}$ does not (as $X$ and $Y$ are finitely separated by $U$). This contradicts Theorem 1.1. We have thus shown that:

$$|W| \text{ is finite.} \tag{5.2}$$

Let $T_X$ be the edge set of a maximal topological spanning forest of $\widetilde{X}$, *i.e.*, the union of TSTs of the spaces $\tilde{C}$ corresponding to the components $C$ of $(V[X], X)$. We point out that every circuit of $G$ that lies entirely in $X$ is a circuit of $(V[X], X)$. It follows that $T_X$ does not contain any circuits of $G$.

Next, we prove that:

$$\text{Every } W\text{-path in } (V[X^*], X^*) \text{ meets } T_X^*. \tag{5.3}$$

Suppose there is a $W$-path whose edge set $D^*$ lies in $X^* \setminus T_X^*$. By (5.1), there is a circuit $C^*$ of $G^*$ with $C^* \cap X^* = D^*$. Thus, $C$ is a bond in $G$, and hence $D$ is a finite cut of the subgraph $(V[X], X)$ of $G$. Consequently, $D$ contains a bond $B$ of $(V[X], X)$, which then is completely contained in a component $K_B$ of $(V[X], X)$. As $B \subseteq D \subseteq X \setminus T_X$, the intersection of $B$ with $T_X$ is empty. Thus, $B$ is a finite cut of $K_B$ that is disjoint from $T_X$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548309990320 Published online by Cambridge University Press

but that separates two vertices incident with $T_X$. Since, on the other hand, $\widetilde{T_X}$ restricted to $\widetilde{K_B}$ is path-connected, we obtain a contradiction. This proves (5.3).

Next, Lemma 5.1 yields a set $F \subseteq T_X$ of at most $|U|-1$ edges so that every $U$-arc in $\widetilde{T_X} \subseteq \widetilde{X}$ meets $F$. This means that every circuit $C$ of $G$ with $C \cap X \subseteq T_X$ meets $F$. Thus, every bond $B^*$ of $G^*$ with $B^* \cap X^* \subseteq T_X^*$ meets $F^*$. Hence, denoting by $\mathcal{K}$ the set of components of $(V[X^*], X^*)$, we obtain that:

$$\text{For every } K \in \mathcal{K}, \text{ the graph } H_K := K - (T_X^* \setminus F^*) \text{ is connected.} \tag{5.4}$$

Now, for every $K \in \mathcal{K}$, observe that by (5.3), every $W$-path in $H_K$ meets $F^*$. So, by (5.4), we may apply Lemma 5.2 to $H_K$. Doing so for each $K \in \mathcal{K}$, we obtain that $|F^*| \geqslant |W| - |\mathcal{K}|$. On the other hand, $|F^*| = |F| \leqslant |U| - 1$ by the choice of $F$, implying that

$$|W| \leqslant |U| + |\mathcal{K}| - 1. \tag{5.5}$$

Suppose that for every $K \in \mathcal{K}$ we have $|V(K) \cap W| > |E(K)|$. Then

$$|W| = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}} |V(K) \cap W| \geqslant \sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}} (|E(K)| + 1) = |X^*| + |\mathcal{K}|.$$

As $|X^*| = |X| \geqslant |U|$, we obtain that $|W| \geqslant |U| + |\mathcal{K}|$. This yields a contradiction to (5.5), since by (5.2), $|W|$ is finite. Therefore, there exists an $L \in \mathcal{K}$ with

$$\ell := |V(L) \cap W| \leqslant |E(L)|.$$

Observe that if we can show now that $\ell \leqslant k$, then it follows that $(E(L), E(G^*) \setminus E(L))$ is an $\ell$-Tutte-separation of $G^*$, as desired for (i). So, in order to prove (i), and (ii), it suffices to prove that, for each $K \in \mathcal{K}$,

$$|V(K) \cap W| \leqslant |U|.$$

Suppose otherwise. Then there exists an $M \in \mathcal{K}$ such that

$$|W| = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}} |V(K) \cap W| \geqslant (|U| + 1) + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}, K \neq M} |V(K) \cap W|.$$

Because $G$ is 2-connected, so is $G^*$ (Lemma 2.2). Thus $|V(K) \cap W| \geqslant 1$ for every $K \in \mathcal{K}$, resulting again in $|W| \geqslant |U| + |\mathcal{K}|$, a contradiction, as desired. □

We now prove that Tutte-connectivity is invariant under taking duals.

**Proof of Theorem 1.4.** We show that if $G$ has a $k$-Tutte-separation $(X, Y)$, then $G^*$ has an $\ell$-Tutte-separation for some $\ell \leqslant k$. By Theorem 2.3, this is enough to prove the theorem.

First, assume that $V[Y] \setminus V[X] \neq \emptyset$. Let $K$ be a component of $(V[Y], Y) - V[X]$, and set $Z := E(K) \cup E(K, G-K)$. As $E(K, G-K)$ contains at least one edge for each vertex in $N(K)$, it follows that $|Z| \geqslant |N(K)|$. Thus, $(Z, E(G) \setminus Z)$ is a $k'$-Tutte-separation of $G$ for $k' := |N(K)| \leqslant k$. We can now apply Lemma 5.3(i) to obtain the desired $\ell$-Tutte-separation of $G^*$.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548309990320 Published online by Cambridge University Press

So, we may assume that $V[Y] \setminus V[X] = \emptyset$. Then, since $|Y| \geqslant k$, there is a circuit $C$ in $Y$, say of length $\ell \leqslant k$. Hence, $C^*$ is a bond of size $\ell$ in $G^*$; let $K_1$ and $K_2$ be the components of $G^* - C^*$. Now,

$$|E(K_1 \cup K_2)| = |X^*| + |Y^*| - |C^*| \geqslant 2k - \ell.$$

Thus, we can partition $C^*$ into $C_1^*$ and $C_2^*$ such that each $Z_i^* := E(K_i) \cup C_i^*$ has cardinality at least $\ell$.

In order to show that $(Z_1^*, Z_2^*)$ is an $\ell$-Tutte-separation of $G^*$ it remains to check that $U := V[Z_1^*] \cap V[Z_2^*]$ has cardinality at most $\ell$. To this end, consider a vertex $v \in U$, and let $j$ be such that $v \in V(K_j)$. Then $v$ is incident with an edge $e_v^* \in C_{3-j}^*$, whose other end-vertex lies in $K_{3-j}$, because $C^*$ is a cut. This defines an injection from $U \to C^*$, which implies $|U| \leqslant |C^*| \leqslant \ell$, as desired. □

## 6. The dual preserves the degrees

In this section we will use Lemma 5.3 in order to prove Theorem 1.3, which relates the 'degree' of an end $\omega$ to the degree of its dual end $\omega^*$. Let us first discuss the degree notion.

For an end $\omega$, define $m(\omega)$ to be the supremum of the cardinalities of sets of disjoint rays in $\omega$; Halin [9] showed that this supremum is indeed attained. In [2] and in [13] the number of vertex- (or edge-)disjoint rays in an end has been successfully used to serve as the degree of an end in a locally finite graph (whether vertex- or edge-disjoint rays should be considered depends on the application). This motivates the definition of the degree $d(\omega) := m(\omega)$ of an end $\omega$ of a locally finite graph.

Now, if $G$ and $G^*$ are a dual pair of 2-connected locally finite graphs, then it will turn out that $m(\omega) = m(\omega^*)$ for every end $\omega$ of $G$. In non-locally finite graphs we need to be a bit more careful: Figure 2 indicates that dominating vertices should be taken into account.

For an end $\omega \in \Omega(G)$ and a finite vertex set $S$, we say that $U \subseteq V(G)$ *separates* $S$ *from* $\omega$ if $U$ meets every ray in $\omega$ that starts in $S$. We define here the *degree* $d(\omega)$ of an end $\omega \in \Omega(G)$ to be the minimal number $k$ such that, for each finite set $S \subseteq V(G)$, we can separate $S$ from $\omega$ in $G$ by deleting at most $k$ vertices from $G$. If there is no such $k$, we set $d(\omega) := \infty$. Lemma 6.1 will show that this definition is consistent with the one given above for locally finite graphs.

So, denote by $\mathrm{dom}(\omega)$ the number of vertices that dominate an end $\omega$ (possibly infinite). Note that the graphs we are interested in, namely those that satisfy (†), are such that $\mathrm{dom}(\omega) \in \{0, 1\}$ for every end $\omega$.

**Lemma 6.1.** *Let $G$ be a graph and let $\omega \in \Omega(G)$. Then $d(\omega) = m(\omega) + \mathrm{dom}(\omega)$.*

**Proof.** It is easy to see that $d(\omega)$ is at least $m(\omega) + \mathrm{dom}(\omega)$. For the other direction, we may assume that $\mathrm{dom}(\omega) < \infty$. Denote by $D$ the set of vertices that dominate $\omega$. As $D$ is a finite set, there is an obvious bijection between the ends of $G - D$ and $G$, which we will tacitly use.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548309990320 Published online by Cambridge University Press

We observe first that for any finite vertex set $T$, there exists a finite $T$–$\omega$ separator $T'$ in $G - D$ that is contained in $C_{G-D}(T, \omega)$. Indeed, otherwise, by Menger's theorem,[1] $G[T \cup C(T, \omega)] - D$ contains infinitely many paths between $T$ and some ray in $\omega$ that are pairwise disjoint except possibly in $T$. As $T$ is finite, this implies that $T \setminus D$ contains a vertex which dominates $\omega$, contradicting our choice of $D$.

Now, consider an arbitrary finite set $S \subseteq V(G)$. Starting with $S_0 := S \setminus D$, we can choose inductively finite vertex sets $S_i$ so that $S_i \subseteq V(C_{G-D}(S_{i-1}, \omega))$ is an $S_{i-1}$–$\omega$ separator in $G - D$, and has minimal cardinality with that property. Since $S_i \subseteq V(C_{G-D}(S_{i-1}, \omega))$, all the $S_i$ are pairwise disjoint.

Applying Menger's theorem repeatedly between $S_{i-1}$ and $S_i$, we obtain a set $\mathcal{R}$ of disjoint rays in $\omega$ of cardinality at least $|S_1|$. As $S_1 \cup D$ separates $S$ from $\omega$ in $G$, we have shown that $S$ can be separated from $\omega$ by at most $|S_1| + |D| \leqslant m(\omega) + \mathrm{dom}(\omega)$ vertices, thus proving the lemma. □

We remark that Lemma 6.1 can be obtained easily from results of Polat [12]; we chose to provide the proof nonetheless, since the statement of Polat's results together with the necessary adaptations would have taken about as much time and space.

We finally turn to the proof of Theorem 1.3, which asserts that the degree of an end is preserved by taking duals. In conjunction with Lemma 6.1 the theorem immediately yields Theorem 1.2.

**Proof of Theorem 1.3.** First assume that $d(\omega) \leqslant k$, where $k \in \mathbb{N}$ is a finite number. We wish to show that $\omega^*$ has vertex-degree $\leqslant k$ too.

So, let a finite vertex set $T \subseteq V(G^*)$ be given. Pick a finite edge set $F^*$ of cardinality at least $k$ so that $T \subseteq V[F^*]$ and so that $F^*$ induces a connected graph. Now, since $d(\omega) \leqslant k$ there is a set $U \subseteq V(G)$ of cardinality at most $k$ that separates (the finite set) $V[F]$ from $\omega$. If $C$ is the component of $G - U$ to which $\omega$ belongs, then set $Y := E(C) \cup E(C, U)$ and $X := E(G) \setminus Y$. Because $k \geqslant |U| = |V[X] \cap V[Y]|$, and because $|Y| = \infty$ and $|X| \geqslant |F| \geqslant k$, it follows that $(X, Y)$ is a $k$-Tutte-separation.

Since $F^* \subseteq X^*$ induces a connected subgraph, there is a component $K$ of $(V[X^*], X^*)$ that contains all of $F^*$. As $|F^*| \geqslant k$, Lemma 5.3(ii) implies that $(E(K), E(G^*) \setminus E(K))$ is a $k$-Tutte-separation. Moreover, as $\omega \notin \overline{X}$, it follows that $\omega^* \notin \overline{K}$. Thus, $N_{G^*}(G^* - K)$ is a vertex set of cardinality $\leqslant k$ that separates $T \subseteq V[F^*]$ from $\omega^*$, as desired.

In conclusion, since $G$ is also a dual of $G^*$ (Theorem 2.3), it follows that $d(\omega) = d(\omega^*)$ if either of $\omega$ and $\omega^*$ has finite degree. In the remaining case, we trivially have $d(\omega) = \infty = d(\omega^*)$. □

## References

[1] Bruhn, H. and Diestel, R. (2006) Duality in infinite graphs. *Combin. Probab. Comput.* **15** 75–90.

[1] We use here, and below, that the cardinality version of Menger's theorem holds in infinite graphs. This can easily be deduced from Menger's theorem for finite graphs: see, for instance, [4, Section 8.4].

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548309990320 Published online by Cambridge University Press

[2] Bruhn, H. and Stein, M. (2007) On end degrees and infinite circuits in locally finite graphs. *Combinatorica* **27** 269–291.
[3] Diestel, R. (2005) The cycle space of an infinite graph. *Combin. Probab. Comput.* **14** 59–79.
[4] Diestel, R. (2005) *Graph Theory*, 3rd edn, Springer.
[5] Diestel, R. and Kühn, D. (2004) On infinite cycles I. *Combinatorica* **24** 69–89.
[6] Diestel, R. and Kühn, D. (2004) On infinite cycles II. *Combinatorica* **24** 91–116.
[7] Diestel, R. and Kühn, D. (2004) Topological paths, cycles and spanning trees in infinite graphs. *Europ. J. Combin.* **25** 835–862.
[8] Hahn, G., Laviolette, F. and Širáň, J. (1997) Edge-ends in countable graphs. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* **70** 225–244.
[9] Halin, R. (1965) Über die Maximalzahl fremder unendlicher Wege in Graphen. *Math. Nachr.* **30** 63–85.
[10] Higgs, D. A. (1969) Matroids and duality. *Colloq. Math.* **20** 215–220.
[11] Oxley, J. G. (1992) Infinite matroids. In *Matroid Applications* (N. White, ed.), Vol. 40 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*, Cambridge University Press, pp. 73–90.
[12] Polat, N. (1991) A Mengerian theorem for infinite graphs with ideal points. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* **51** 248–255.
[13] Stein, M. (2007) Forcing highly connected subgraphs. *J. Graph Theory* **54** 331–349.
[14] Thomassen, C. (1980) Planarity and duality of finite and infinite graphs. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* **29** 244–271.
[15] Thomassen, C. (1982) Duality of infinite graphs. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* **33** 137–160.
[16] Thomassen, C. and Woess, W. (1993) Vertex-transitive graphs and accessibility. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* **58** 248–268.
[17] Tutte, W. T. (1966) Connectivity in matroids. *Canad. J. Math.* **18** 1301–1324.
[18] Vella, A. and Richter, R. B. (2008) Cycle spaces of topological spaces. *J. Graph Theory* **59** 115–144.
[19] Whitney, H. (1932) Non-separable and planar graphs. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **34** 339–362.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548309990320 Published online by Cambridge University Press