

ON THE P -VERTEX PROBLEM IN BIPARTITE GRAPHS

G. ARUNKUMAR AND PUJA SAMANTA*

ABSTRACT. Property (P) , introduced in recent work and rooted in the classical theory of Parter vertices, concerns the existence of a nonsingular matrix $A \in S(G)$ for which every vertex of G is a P -vertex. Previous investigations have fully characterized the property for trees, established it for cycles, extended it to unicyclic graphs, and shown that bipartite graphs with a perfect matching always satisfy property (P) . However, whether the converse holds for connected bipartite graphs remains open in general.

In this paper, we make progress toward answering this question on multiple fronts. We first prove that every connected bipartite graph satisfying property (P) must be balanced, providing a fundamental necessary condition. We further establish complete characterizations for several significant families of bipartite graphs. Specially, we show that every connected bipartite graph of order at most 8 has property (P) if and only if it has a perfect matching, and more generally, that a connected bipartite graph of order $8 + 2k$ with at least k pendant edges satisfies property (P) exactly when it has a perfect matching. We further prove that within the class of triangular bipartite graphs, property (P) is equivalent to the existence of a perfect matching, providing a full characterization for this broad structural subclass.

In addition, we introduce the threaded union over a graph, a general operation for assembling larger graphs from smaller components, and show that threaded union over a tree-cycle block graph preserves property (P) . This significantly generalizes earlier result about joining two graphs with property (P) by a single edge preserves property (P) .

Collectively, these results sharpen the structural understanding of property (P) , strengthen its connection to matching theory in bipartite graphs, and introduce a versatile construction that generates broad new families of graphs guaranteed to satisfy property (P) .

Keywords: Property (P) ; P -vertex; tree; cycle; bipartite graph; biadjacency matrix; perfect matching.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we follow the graph-theoretic terminology of [18]. We consider a simple undirected graph G with vertex set $V(G) := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and edge set $E(G)$. Let P_n denote the path graph and C_n be the cycle graph on n vertices. A connected graph G is called *unicyclic* if it contains exactly one cycle.

Throughout this article, all matrices are real. The superscript \top for a matrix will denote the transpose operation. Let $A = [a_{ij}] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be symmetric and let λ be an eigenvalue of A . Denote by $m_A(\lambda)$ the algebraic multiplicity of λ . For A , define the support graph $G(A)$ on vertex set $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$ with edge set

$$E(G(A)) = \{(i, j) : i \neq j \text{ and } a_{ij} \neq 0\}.$$

Given a graph G on n vertices, define

$$S(G) := \{A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} : A^\top = A \text{ and } G(A) = G\}.$$

A matrix $A \in S(G)$ is an irreducible acyclic matrix if the graph G is a tree [2].

For a nonempty index set $\alpha \subseteq [n]$, let $A(\alpha)$ denote the principal submatrix obtained by deleting the rows and columns indexed by α (for $\alpha = \{i\}$ we write $A(i)$). By Cauchy interlacing theorem [8, Theorem 4.3.17], for each $i \in [n]$ and eigenvalue λ of A ,

$$m_{A(i)}(\lambda) - m_A(\lambda) \in \{-1, 0, 1\}.$$

It is convenient to write

$$\delta_i(\lambda) := m_{A(i)}(\lambda) - m_A(\lambda).$$

We call $i \in V(G)$ a *Fiedler-vertex* of A for the eigenvalue λ if $\delta_i(\lambda) \in \{0, 1\}$; when $\lambda = 0$ we say i is an *F-vertex*. If $\delta_i(\lambda) = 1$ then i is a *Parter-vertex* of A for λ [10, 11]; when $\lambda = 0$ this is a *P-vertex*. An *F-vertex* that is not a *P-vertex* (i.e., $\delta_i(\lambda) = 0$) is called a *neutral* vertex, and a vertex with $\delta_i(\lambda) = -1$ is called a *downer* vertex [11].

For any nonempty $\alpha \subseteq [n]$ and an eigenvalue λ of A we have

$$m_{A(\alpha)}(\lambda) \leq m_A(\lambda) + |\alpha|.$$

If equality holds, then α is a *Parter-set* of A for the eigenvalue λ ; when $\lambda = 0$ it is a *P-set* [13]. Let $P_\nu(A)$ denote the number of *P-vertices* of A . A graph G of order n is said to have *full P-vertices* if there exists $A \in S(G)$ with $P_\nu(A) = n$.

Name	Defining condition	Special case $\lambda = 0$
Fiedler-vertex	$\delta_i(\lambda) \in \{0, 1\}$	<i>F-vertex</i>
Parter-vertex	$\delta_i(\lambda) = 1$	<i>P-vertex</i>
Neutral vertex	$\delta_i(\lambda) = 0$	(an <i>F-vertex</i> , not <i>P</i>)
Downer vertex	$\delta_i(\lambda) = -1$	—
Parter-set $\alpha \neq \emptyset$	$m_{A(\alpha)}(\lambda) = m_A(\lambda) + \alpha $	<i>P-set</i>

TABLE 1. Vertex/Set notions via multiplicity changes under principal deletions. Here $\delta_i(\lambda) = m_{A(i)}(\lambda) - m_A(\lambda)$.

The notion of *P-vertices* can be traced back to the foundational work of Parter [15], who investigated how the structure of a graph—especially a tree—affects the multiplicities of eigenvalues of associated real symmetric matrices. Wiener [17] later expanded and enriched this line of research by providing a comprehensive analysis of the location and multiplicity of eigenvalues of sign symmetric acyclic matrices. The formal introduction and systematic study of *P-vertices* appeared subsequently in [11, 12], where the concept was refined and explored in greater depth. Godsil has also studied an analogous notion within the framework of the matching polynomial theory, where such vertices appear as a θ -positive vertex of a graph G [1, 7]. In the special case $\theta = 0$, this notion coincides with what is known in the matrix setting as a *P-vertex* of a matrix $A \in S(G)$ [13].

Johnson and Sutton [11] showed that every singular acyclic matrix of order n has at most $n - 2$ number of *P-vertices*. Kim and Shader [12] later proved that this bound need not extend

to nonsingular acyclic matrices by exhibiting a counterexample. Moreover, for a nonsingular tridiagonal matrix A of order n they established

$$P_\nu(A) \leq \begin{cases} n-1, & \text{if } n \text{ is odd,} \\ n, & \text{if } n \text{ is even.} \end{cases}$$

In particular, the equality $P_\nu(A) = n$ is possible only when n is even.

Theorem 1.1. [12, Theorem 4] *Let P_n be a path graph on n vertices.*

- (1) *If n is even, then there exists a nonsingular matrix $A \in S(P_n)$ such that $P_\nu(A) = n$.*
- (2) *If n is odd, then for each nonsingular matrix $A \in S(P_n)$, $P_\nu(A) \leq n-1$.*

Kim and Shader [12] posed several open questions about the number of P -vertices of acyclic matrices. These were subsequently resolved in [1, 2, 4, 5]. In particular, Anđelić et al. characterized the trees that admit a nonsingular matrix in which every vertex is a P -vertex [2, Theorem 3.2], and they showed that any such tree must have even order:

Theorem 1.2. [2, Theorem 3.1] *If T is a tree on n vertices and $A \in S(T)$ is nonsingular with each vertex a P -vertex, then n is even.*

In [3, Theorem 5.1], the authors established a structural characterization of trees that satisfy full P -vertex property:

Theorem 1.3. *Let T be a tree on $n \geq 2$ vertices. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) *There exists a nonsingular matrix $A \in S(T)$ such that $P_\nu(A) = n$.*
- (2) *T can be obtained from P_2 the path graph on two vertices by repeatedly attaching a pendant P_2 at arbitrary vertices; that is, for a chosen vertex v of the current tree, add two new vertices x, y and the edges vx and xy .*
- (3) *The adjacency matrix of T , $A(T)$ is nonsingular.*
- (4) *$P_\nu(A(T)) = n$.*

Recently, Howlader et al. introduced the terminology *property (P)* to describe graphs for which every vertex is a P -vertex for some nonsingular matrix in $S(G)$ [9, Definition 1.1]:

Definition 1.4. A graph G on n vertices is said to have *property (P)* if there exists $A \in S(G)$ such that $\det A \neq 0$ and if the number of P -vertices of A is equal to n , that is, $P_\nu(A) = n$.

The behavior of *property (P)* has been studied for several basic graph families. For cycles, it was shown in [1, Theorem 4.2] that every cycle C_n has *property (P)*. Recently, Howlader et al. extended this line of investigation to unicyclic graphs [9, Theorem 6.1], thereby advancing the study of P -vertex problems beyond trees and cycles to this natural next class of graphs.

Parallel to these developments, *property (P)* has also been investigated in the context of bipartite graphs. A fundamental contribution in this direction is due to Sharma et al. [16], who proved that every bipartite graph containing a perfect matching satisfies *property (P)*.

Theorem 1.5. [16, Theorem 3.1] *If a bipartite graph G has a perfect matching, then G has *property (P)*.*

Moreover, for two important subclasses—trees and unicyclic bipartite graphs—the situation is even more rigid: the existence of a perfect matching is both necessary and sufficient: a tree or unicyclic bipartite graph has property (P) if and only if it admits a perfect matching [16, Theorem 3.3, Theorem 3.8].

However, the full converse statement:

"If a connected bipartite graph has property (P) , then it has a perfect matching."

remained unsolved. The authors verified this implication under additional hypotheses [16, Theorem 3.12], leaving the general necessity question open.

In this work we make substantial progress toward resolving this gap. We first show that any bipartite graph with property (P) must be balanced, a fundamental structural constraint and a necessary condition for the existence of a perfect matching. Building on this observation, we develop several new criteria that further clarify when property (P) forces a perfect matching in the bipartite setting. We completely classify all connected balanced bipartite graphs of order at most eight, proving that such a graph has property (P) precisely when it possesses a perfect matching. This characterization extends naturally to larger balanced bipartite graphs with pendant edges: any connected graph on $8 + 2k$ vertices that contains at least k pendant edges satisfies property (P) if and only if it contains a perfect matching. Additionally, we introduce the class of triangular bipartite graphs, defined by the existence of an ordering of the partite sets for which the biadjacency matrix becomes upper triangular, and we prove that within this class, property (P) is again equivalent to the existence of a perfect matching. These results collectively establish broad new families of bipartite graphs for which property (P) and perfect matching coincide.

Sharma et al. further showed that certain non-bipartite graphs with a unique perfect matching also satisfy property (P) , provided an additional structural requirement is met [16, Theorem 4.1, Theorem 4.3].

It is important to emphasize that the correspondence between property (P) and the existence of a perfect matching does not hold for arbitrary graphs. Certain non-bipartite graphs—such as odd cycles—possess property (P) despite lacking a perfect matching. This observation highlights that the equivalence established for trees and its partial extension to bipartite graphs cannot be generalized without additional structural constraints. Consequently, understanding the precise boundaries of this correspondence becomes a natural and intriguing direction for further investigation.

In the same work [16], the authors proved a useful constructive principle: if two graphs G and H each has property (P) , then the graph obtained by joining them with a single edge also has property (P) . This provides a basic mechanism for building larger graphs from smaller ones known to satisfy the property. Motivated by this considerations, the present work is to generalize and systematize such constructive principles. In Section 3 we introduce the *threaded union over graph*, a new operation that extends the "single-edge join" used in [16] to a significantly broader setting. Instead of attaching two graphs along a single edge, our construction allows an arbitrary graph to serve as a base along which component graphs are attached according to its adjacency relations.

A key observation is that if each component has property (P) after deleting a suitable edge set, then the entire threaded union inherits property (P) . This leads to unified framework for

building large and intricate families of graphs—all guaranteed to have property (P) —from simpler building blocks. It also subsumes, as a special case, the edge-joining result of Sharma et al. To illustrate the breadth of this framework, we apply it to various classical graph families, including lollipop graphs, barbell graphs, and generalized barbell graphs, and we determine conditions under which these graphs have property (P) . These examples demonstrate the versatility of the threaded union and its role in extending the landscape of graphs known to satisfy property (P) .

2. BIPARTITE GRAPHS

In this section, we study property (P) within the class of bipartite graphs.

Building on the foundational results of [16], we establish necessary conditions for a bipartite graph to satisfy property (P) , beginning with the observation that any such graph must be balanced. This leads to refined understanding of how property (P) interacts with matchings and parity structures in bipartite graphs, and positions our results as a partial converse to Theorem 1.5.

We denote by $G(X, Y; E)$ a bipartite graph G with bipartition (X, Y) . Further, if $|X| = |Y|$, then G is said to be *balanced* bipartite graph.

For a bipartite graph $G := G(X, Y; E)$ and a subset $S \subseteq X$, the *neighborhood* of S is defined as

$$N(S) := \{y \in Y : \exists x \in S \text{ with } (x, y) \in E\}.$$

The following classical theorem characterizes the existence of a perfect matching in bipartite graphs.

Theorem 2.1 (Hall’s Theorem). [14, Page no. 13] *A bipartite graph $G := G(X, Y; E)$, with $|X| = |Y|$, has a perfect matching if and only if*

$$|N(S)| \geq |S|,$$

for all $S \subseteq X$.

Definition 2.2. For a matrix $M = (m_{ij}) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, the *support* of M is

$$\text{supp}(M) := \{(i, j) \in \{1, \dots, m\} \times \{1, \dots, n\} : m_{ij} \neq 0\}.$$

Two matrices $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ are said to have the same *zero-nonzero pattern* if

$$\text{supp}(A) = \text{supp}(B).$$

Given a bipartite graph $G = G(U, V; E)$ with $|U| = m$ and $|V| = n$, we say that a matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ has the *zero-nonzero pattern of G* when

$$\text{supp}(M) = \{(i, j) : (u_i, v_j) \in E\}.$$

Theorem 2.3. *Let G be a bipartite graph. If G has property (P) , then G must be a balanced bipartite graph.*

Proof. Let the bipartition of G be $U = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_m\}$ and $V = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$.

Since G has property (P) , there exists a nonsingular matrix $A = (A_{ij}) \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+n) \times (m+n)}$ with $A \in S(G)$ such that

$$\det(A(i)) = 0 \text{ for all } i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m+n\}.$$

Throughout the discussion we index the rows and columns of A so that the first m rows and columns correspond to vertices of U , and the last n rows and columns correspond to vertices of V .

With this convention, any matrix $A \in S(G)$ naturally takes the block form

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} X & D \\ D^\top & Y \end{bmatrix},$$

where $X \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ and $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ are diagonal matrices, and $D \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ has the zero-nonzero pattern of G .

Let A^{-1} be partitioned compatibly as

$$A^{-1} := \begin{bmatrix} P & Q \\ Q^\top & R \end{bmatrix},$$

where $P \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ and $R \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$.

Since $\det(A(i)) = 0$ for all i , so, $(A^{-1})_{ii} = 0$ for all i . Hence, $P_{ii} = 0$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ and $R_{jj} = 0$ for all $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$.

From $AA^{-1} = I_{m+n}$, we obtain the block equations:

$$XP + DQ^\top = I_m, \tag{2.1}$$

$$D^\top Q + YR = I_n, \tag{2.2}$$

$$XQ + DR = \mathbf{0}, \tag{2.3}$$

$$D^\top P + YQ^\top = \mathbf{0}. \tag{2.4}$$

Taking the trace of (2.1) and using $(XP)_{ii} = 0$ (since X is a diagonal matrix and P has zero diagonal entries) for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$,

$$\text{Tr}(XP + DQ^\top) = \text{Tr}(DQ^\top) = m. \tag{2.5}$$

Taking the trace of (2.2) and using $(YR)_{jj} = 0$ (since Y is a diagonal matrix and R has zero diagonal entries) for all $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$

$$\text{Tr}(D^\top Q + YR) = \text{Tr}(D^\top Q) = n. \tag{2.6}$$

Now, from (2.5) and (2.6),

$$m = \text{Tr}(DQ^\top) = \text{Tr}(QD^\top) = \text{Tr}(D^\top Q) = n.$$

Hence, we obtain $m = n$, which implies that

$$|U| = |V|.$$

Therefore, G is a balanced bipartite graph. □

Remark 2.4. An immediate consequence of the Theorem 2.3 is that any unbalanced bipartite graph fails to satisfy property (P) . Thus, balance is a necessary structural requirement for bipartite graphs to satisfy property (P) .

We record a related observation from existing results. Since every k -regular bipartite graph admits a perfect matching, and bipartite graphs with a perfect matching are known to satisfy property (P) (Theorem 1.5), it follows that all k -regular bipartite graphs have property (P).

This fact is independent of Theorem 2.3, but we include it here for completeness.

Lemma 2.5. [14, Exercises 1.4.2(i)] *For any $k > 0$, every k -regular bipartite graph has a perfect matching.*

Proof. Let $G := G(A, B; E)$ be a k -regular bipartite graph, so, every vertex in G has degree k . Counting the number of edges by degrees on each side gives

$$k|A| = \sum_{a \in A} \deg(a) = |E| = \sum_{b \in B} \deg(b) = k|B|,$$

hence, $|A| = |B|$.

Now, for any subset $S \subseteq A$, its neighborhood $N(S) = \{b \in B : \exists a \in S \text{ with } (a, b) \in E\}$.

Double-counting the edges between S and $N(S)$ gives

$$k|S| = \sum_{a \in S} \deg_{N(S)}(a) \leq \sum_{b \in N(S)} \deg(b) = k|N(S)|,$$

hence, $|S| \leq |N(S)|$ for every such subset.

Therefore, by Hall's Theorem, G has a perfect matching. □

Corollary 2.6. *Every k -regular bipartite graph (with $k > 0$) has property (P).*

Proof. Since every k -regular bipartite graph admits a perfect matching by Lemma 2.5, the conclusion follows immediately from Theorem 1.5. □

Before proceeding, we recall two structural results from [9] that describe how property (P) behaves under the addition of pendant vertices and the presence of multiple pendant edges at a single vertex.

Theorem 2.7. [9, Theorem 2.3] *Let G be a graph on n vertices, and let*

$$G' = G \cdot P_1$$

denote the graph obtained by attaching the path P_1 (that is, a single pendant vertex) to a designated vertex $v \in V(G)$.

Then G' has property (P) if and only if $G - v$ has property (P).

For a graph G , let $G - v$ denote the graph obtained from G by deleting the vertex v and all edges incident to it.

The next result recalls an obstruction to property (P) arising from vertices incident with multiple pendant edges. In [9, Definition 4.2], an *antenna graph* is defined as a graph G containing a vertex v that is adjacent to more than one pendant. The authors proved the following:

Theorem 2.8. [9, Theorem 4.3] *Any antenna graph does not have property (P).*

We now combine this obstruction with Hall's theorem to completely characterize the property (P) for all connected bipartite graphs of order at most 8.

Theorem 2.9. *Let G be a connected bipartite graph of order at most 8. Then G has property (P) if and only if G has a perfect matching.*

Proof. Let $G = G(A, B; E)$ be a connected bipartite graph. If G has a perfect matching, then by Theorem 1.5 it follows that G has property (P) .

For the converse, assume G has property (P) , hence by Theorem 2.3 G is a balanced bipartite graph. Suppose that G does not have a perfect matching. By Hall's theorem, there exists a subset $S \subseteq A$ such that

$$|N(S)| < |S|.$$

Since, G is balanced and of order at most 8, we have $|A| = |B| \leq 4$. As, G is connected,

$$1 < |S| \leq 3.$$

Case 1: $|S| = 2$

Then $|N(S)| = 1$. Thus the unique vertex in $N(S)$ is adjacent to two pendant vertices in S , so G contains a vertex with two pendant vertices adjacent to it. By Theorem 2.8, G does not have property (P) .

Case 2: $|S| = 3$

Then $|A| = |B| = 4$, and hence, $|N(S)| \leq 2$.

- If $|N(S)| = 1$, the unique vertex in $N(S)$ is adjacent to three pendant vertices in S . By Theorem 2.8, G does not have property (P) .
- If $|N(S)| = 2$. Let

$$A - S = \{v\}, \quad B - N(S) = \{w_1, w_2\}.$$

Since, w_1 and w_2 have no neighbors in S , connectivity forces v to be adjacent to both of them. Moreover, to maintain connectivity of G , the vertex v must also be adjacent to at least one vertex in $N(S)$. Thus v has at least two pendant neighbors, again, by Theorem 2.8, G does not have property (P) .

In all cases, the failure of Hall's condition implies the presence of a vertex with more than one pendant vertices adjacent to it, which in turn guarantees that G does not have property (P) .

Therefore, a connected balanced bipartite graph G of order at most 8 has property (P) if and only if it has a perfect matching. \square

Theorem 2.10. *Let G be a connected bipartite graph of order $8 + 2k$ and G has at least k pendant edges. Then G has property (P) if and only if G has a perfect matching.*

Proof. The forward direction is immediate from Theorem 1.5.

We prove the converse:

Assume G has property (P) , then by Theorem 2.3 G is a connected balanced bipartite graph. We will show that G has perfect matching.

The proof is by induction on k .

For $k = 0$, the order of G is 8. By Theorem 2.9, any connected bipartite graph of order at most 8 has property (P) if and only if it has a perfect matching. Thus claim holds for $k = 0$.

Assume the statement holds for $k - 1$, that is, if G is a connected bipartite graph of order $8 + 2(k - 1)$ and G has at least $k - 1$ many pendant edges, then G has property (P) if and only if G has a perfect matching.

Now, Let G be a connected balanced bipartite graph of order $8 + 2k$ with property (P) and containing k pendant edges.

Case 1: Some vertex of G is incident with two or more pendant edges.

Then G is an antenna graph. By Theorem 2.8, G does not have property (P) , contradiction.

Thus, if G has property (P) , every pendant edge must adjacent to distinct vertex.

Case 2: Every pendant edges has a distinct attachment vertex.

Since, G has at least k pendant edges, choose one pendant edge (v, u) with pendant vertex u and attachment vertex v . We can write G as

$$G = G_1 \cdot P_1,$$

where $G_1 = G - u$.

By Theorem 2.7, as G has property (P) , it implies $G_1 - v$ has property (P) .

Now,

$$|V(G_1 - v)| = (8 + 2k) - 2 = 8 + 2(k - 1).$$

$G_1 - v$ is a connected balanced bipartite graph of order $8 + 2(k - 1)$ and has at least $k - 1$ pendant edges and $G_1 - v$ has property (P) . Hence, by induction hypothesis, $G_1 - v$ has a perfect matching, say M' .

Finally, the set

$$M := M' \cup \{(v, u)\}$$

is a perfect matching of G .

Therefore, G has a perfect matching.


This completes the induction and the proof. \square

Definition 2.11. Let G be a graph. We define \bar{G} for the graph obtained from G by the following iterative reduction process:

At each step, select a pendant edge and delete that edge together with both of its incident vertices. Continue this process until the resulting graph \bar{G} satisfies one of the following:


- \bar{G} has no pendant edges (that \bar{G} is pendant-free).
- \bar{G} contains an antenna, that is, a vertex in \bar{G} is incident with multiple pendant edges.

Thus, \bar{G} is the graph obtained when this reduction process terminates.

FIGURE 1. A bipartite graph G of order 12.

Example 2.12. Consider the graph of order 12, in Figure 1:

We now apply the reduction process described earlier. At each step, we delete a pendant edge together with its two incident vertices. After all possible such deletions, the resulting reduced graph \bar{G} is shown in Figure 2.

FIGURE 2. The graph \bar{G} obtained from G in Figure 1, by iteratively deleting pendant edges and both incident vertices.

In the reduced graph \bar{G} , the vertex 6 is incident with two pendant edges. Thus, \bar{G} contains an antenna, and by definition of the reduction process, the iteration terminates at this stage.

Now, the iterative deletion of pendant edges provides a natural mechanism for generalizing Theorem 2.10 further. By removing each pendant edge along with both of its incident vertices, we extract a reduced "core" of the graph that captures its essential structural complexity.

If the reduced graph \bar{G} is small—specifically, of order at most 8—then the behavior of property (P) becomes completely characterized by the presence or absence of a perfect matching in the original graph G . This observation yields the following extension of Theorem 2.10.

Theorem 2.13. *Let G be a bipartite graph, and suppose that the reduced graph \bar{G} obtained from G has order at most 8. Then G has property (P) if and only if G has a perfect matching.*

Proof. If G has a perfect matching, then by Theorem 1.5, G has property (P) .

Conversely, assume that G has property (P) . We show that G must have a perfect matching.

If G does not have any pendant edge, then by definition $\bar{G} = G$ and, then G has order at most 8. Hence, Theorem 2.9 implies that G has a perfect matching.

If G has at least one pendant edge.

Let $e_1 = (u_1, v_1)$ be a pendant edge, with u_1 the pendant vertex.

Delete e_1 along with both vertices u_1 and v_1 , and let the resulting graph be \bar{G}_1 . Equivalently, writing

$$G = G_1 \cdot P_1,$$

where $\bar{G}_1 = G_1 - v_1$. By Theorem 2.7, since G has property (P) , then \bar{G}_1 has property (P) .

If \bar{G}_1 has no pendant edges, then $\bar{G} = \bar{G}_1$ and hence, \bar{G}_1 is a bipartite graph of order at most 8 and has property (P) . Therefore, by Theorem 2.9 \bar{G}_1 has a perfect matching. Let this perfect matching be M_1 . Then

$$M = M_1 \cup \{e_1\}$$

is a perfect matching of G .

If \bar{G}_1 still contains pendant edges, we repeat the same reduction procedure.

At each step we remove a pendant edge together with its two incident vertices, and by repeated application of Theorem 2.7, every intermediate reduced graph preserves property (P) .

Since, each iteration removes two vertices, the process must terminate after finitely many steps. Let the final reduced graph be \bar{G} . By construction \bar{G} satisfies one of the two terminal conditions in our reduction definition: either \bar{G} is pendant-free, or \bar{G} contains an antenna.

We now rule out the antenna case. Since property (P) is preserved at each reduction step, the final graph \bar{G} also has property (P) . Theorem 2.8 states that any antenna graph does not have property (P) , hence, \bar{G} cannot contain antenna. Therefore, \bar{G} is pendant-free.

By hypothesis order of \bar{G} is at most 8, so Theorem 2.9 implies that \bar{G} has a perfect matching, say $M_{\bar{G}}$.

Let the pendant edges removed during the process be e_1, e_2, \dots, e_k . Since, none of the e_i share a common vertex with each other.

Therefore,

$$M = M_{\bar{G}} \cup \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_k\}$$

is a perfect matching of G .

□

The preceding results describes how pendant edges and small balanced bipartite structures determine when a graph satisfies property (P) . We now shift our attention to a different structural setting—bipartite graphs whose biadjacency matrix can be arranged in upper triangular form. In this setting as well, the presence of a perfect matching turns out to be precisely the condition needed for property (P) .

Definition 2.14. Let $G = G(A, B; E)$ be a bipartite graph, where

$$A = \{a_1, \dots, a_m\}, \quad B = \{b_1, \dots, b_n\}.$$

The *biadjacency matrix* of G with respect to these ordering is the $m \times n$ 0 – 1 matrix $M = (M_{ij})$ defined by

$$M_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } (a_i, b_j) \in E, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Thus, the i -th row corresponds to the neighbors of a_i in B , and the j -th column corresponds to the neighbors of b_j in A .

Definition 2.15 (Triangular bipartite graph). Let $G = G(A, B; E)$ be a balanced bipartite graph with $|A| = |B| = n$. We say that G is an *triangular bipartite graph* if its biadjacency matrix is upper triangular up to relabeling: that is, there exists ordering of the partite sets

$$A = \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}, \quad B = \{b_1, \dots, b_n\},$$

such that in the corresponding biadjacency matrix M ,

$$\text{if } i > j, \text{ then } M_{ij} = 0.$$

That is, all edges lie weakly on or above the main diagonal of the matrix after an appropriate relabeling.

Theorem 2.16. *A connected triangular bipartite graph has property (P) if and only if it has a perfect matching.*

Proof. Let $G = G(A, B; E)$ be a connected triangular bipartite graph of order $2n$, and assume that in the vertex ordering

$$A = \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}, \quad B = \{b_1, \dots, b_n\}.$$

If G has a perfect matching then by Theorem 1.5, it follows that G has property (P).

Conversely, assume G has property (P), so, there exists a nonsingular matrix $A \in S(G)$ such that $\det(A(i)) = 0$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, 2n\}$.

Throughout the argument we index matrices as follows: the first n rows and columns correspond to vertices of A , and the last n rows and columns correspond to vertices of B .

Using the same relabeling of the partite sets that makes the biadjacency matrix upper triangular matrix, every matrix $A \in S(G)$ naturally takes the block form

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} X & D \\ D^\top & Y \end{bmatrix},$$

where X and Y are diagonal matrices of order $n \times n$, and the off-diagonal block D is an upper triangular $n \times n$ matrix (since the biadjacency matrix is upper triangular matrix).

Let A^{-1} be written in the compatible block form

$$A^{-1} := \begin{bmatrix} P & Q \\ Q^\top & R \end{bmatrix},$$

where $P, R \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$.

Since, $\det(A(i)) = 0$ for all i , so, $(A^{-1})_{ii} = 0$ for all i . Hence, $P_{ii} = 0$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and $R_{jj} = 0$ for all $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$.

From $AA^{-1} = I_{2n}$, we obtain the block identities:

$$XP + DQ^\top = I_n, \quad (2.7)$$

$$D^\top Q + YR = I_n, \quad (2.8)$$

$$XQ + DR = \mathbf{0}, \quad (2.9)$$

$$D^\top P + YQ^\top = \mathbf{0}. \quad (2.10)$$

We will show inductively that every diagonal entry D_{ii} is nonzero.

Step 1: (The first diagonal entry.)

Consider (2.8), equating the first diagonal entry on both side and since $R_{11} = 0$, $(D^\top Q)_{11} = 1$, as D is upper triangular matrix, we get

$$Q_{11} = \frac{1}{D_{11}},$$

in particular D_{11} is nonzero.

From (2.10) equating the first diagonal entry on both side, $(D^\top P + YQ^\top)_{11} = 0$, and using the fact that D is upper triangular matrix and $P_{11} = 0$, we obtain $Q_{11}Y_{11} = 0$. Since, $Q_{11} \neq 0$, we get $Y_{11} = 0$. For the first row of (2.10), we have

$$(D^\top P + YQ^\top)_{1i} = 0 \quad \text{where } i \geq 1.$$

Since, D is upper triangular and $Y_{11} = 0$, we get $P_{1i} = 0$ for $i \geq 1$.

Now, from (2.8) equating the entries from the first row for $i > 1$,

$$(D^\top Q + YR)_{1i} = 0,$$

we obtain $Q_{1i} = 0$ for all $i > 1$.

Step 2: (The second and third diagonal entry.)

From (2.8) equating second diagonal entry $(D^\top Q + YR)_{22} = 1$,

and applying $Q_{12} = 0$ and $R_{22} = 0$, we obtain

$$Q_{22} = \frac{1}{D_{22}},$$

hence, D_{22} is nonzero.

In (2.10) equating the second diagonal entry

$$(D^\top P + YQ^\top)_{22} = 0,$$

and applying $P_{12} = 0$, we obtain $Y_{22} = 0$, and for the second row of (2.10) we have

$$(D^\top P + YQ^\top)_{2i} = 0 \quad \text{where } i \geq 1. \quad (2.11)$$

from (2.11), we obtain $P_{2i} = 0$ for all i .

Now, from (2.8) equating the entries from the second row, we obtain $Q_{2i} = 0$ for all $i > 2$.

From (2.8) equating third diagonal entry $(D^\top Q + YR)_{33} = 1$,

applying $Q_{13} = 0$ and $Q_{23} = 0$, we obtain

$$Q_{33} = \frac{1}{D_{33}},$$

hence, D_{33} is nonzero.

Step 3: (Inductive step.)

Suppose for indices up to k we have established that

$$Q_{kk} = \frac{1}{D_{kk}},$$

and $P_{ki} = 0$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and $Q_{ki} = 0$ for all $i > k$.

Again, from (2.8) equating $(k+1)^{th}$ diagonal entry $(D^\top Q + YR)_{(k+1)(k+1)} = 1$,

applying $Q_{1(k+1)} = Q_{2(k+1)} = \dots = Q_{k(k+1)} = 0$, we obtain

$$Q_{(k+1)(k+1)} = \frac{1}{D_{(k+1)(k+1)}},$$

hence, $D_{(k+1)(k+1)}$ is nonzero.

Therefore,

$$Q_{ii} = \frac{1}{D_{ii}}, \quad \text{for all } i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}.$$

Hence, $D_{ii} \neq 0$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$.

So,

$$(a_i, b_i) \in E \quad \text{for each } i.$$

Hence

$$M = \{(a_1, b_1), (a_2, b_2), \dots, (a_n, b_n)\}$$

is a matching of size n .

Since, $|A| = |B| = n$, M is a perfect matching of G .

This completes the proof. □

2.1. Applications: property (P) of several well-known classes of graphs. In this subsection, we apply Theorem 2.3 together with Corollary 2.6 to identify several infinite families of graphs that satisfy property (P).

In particular, we show that the following classes of graphs all have property (P):

- (1) Hypercube Graphs Q_n , $n \geq 1$;
- (2) Complete balanced bipartite graphs $K_{n,n}$;
- (3) Grid graphs $G_{m,n}$ whenever mn is even;
- (4) Generalized Peterson graphs whenever n is even and k is odd.

These examples highlight the breadth of graph families covered by the connection between perfect matchings and property (P) in the bipartite context, and illustrate the usefulness of the structural criteria developed in the previous subsection.

Example 2.17 (Hypercube graphs Q_n , $n \geq 1$). The n -dimensional hypercube $Q_n = (V, E)$ has vertex set $V = \{0, 1\}^n$, where two vertices are adjacent if they differ in exactly one coordinate. The natural partition—vertices with an even number of 1s and those with an odd number of 1s—gives a bipartition of Q_n . Each vertex has degree n , so Q_n is an n -regular bipartite graph. Hence, by Corollary 2.6, every hypercube Q_n has property (P).

For example, in Q_4 ,




FIGURE 3. Q_4 with bipartition and a perfect matching.

Example 2.18 (Complete balanced bipartite graphs, $K_{n,n}$). The complete bipartite graph $K_{m,n}$ consists of two partite sets of size m and n , with every vertex in one partition adjacent to every vertex in the other partition.

When $m = n$, the graph $K_{n,n}$ is balanced and n -regular; thus, it has property (P) by Corollary 2.6.

In contrast, if $m \neq n$, $K_{m,n}$ is not balanced. Therefore, by Theorem 2.3 $K_{m,n}$ does not have property (P) when $m \neq n$.

We next consider another classical and widely studied family of bipartite graphs: the grid graphs $G_{m,n}$.

Definition 2.19. An $m \times n$ grid graph, $G_{m,n}$ is the graph whose vertices are the integer lattice points

$$V = \{(i, j) : 1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n\},$$

arranged in m rows and n columns,

with the edge set consisting of all pairs $((i, j), (i', j'))$ with $|i - i'| + |j - j'| = 1$.

The following result is well known in the literature.

Proposition 2.20. *The grid graph $G_{m,n}$ is bipartite. Moreover, $G_{m,n}$ has a perfect matching if and only if mn is even.*

Proof. Define

$$A := \{(i, j) : i + j \text{ is even}\}, \quad B := \{(i, j) : i + j \text{ is odd}\}.$$

If (i, j) is adjacent to (i', j') , then $|i - i'| + |j - j'| = 1$, so $i' + j' = (i + j) \pm 1$.

Hence, one endpoint lies in A and the other in B . Thus, (A, B) is a bipartition of $G_{m,n}$. If $G_{m,n}$ has a perfect matching, then $G_{m,n}$ has even number of vertices, so, mn is even. Conversely, if mn is even, then $|A| = |B| = \frac{mn}{2}$. We exhibit a perfect matching:

- (1) When m is even, for each row i , match vertices in consecutive column pairs:

$$\{((i, 2t - 1), (i, 2t)) : 1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq t \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor\}.$$

When n is odd, pair the last column vertically: match $(2s - 1, n)$ with $(2s, n)$ for $1 \leq s \leq \frac{m}{2}$. This yields a disjoint set of edges, which is a perfect matching.

- (2) When n is even, symmetrically, match vertically in each column in consecutive row pairs, and if m is odd, use horizontal pairs in the last row.

In either case, the constructed edges are disjoint and cover all the vertices, hence forming a perfect matching.

Therefore, $G_{m,n}$ is bipartite and it has a perfect matching exactly when mn is even. \square

Remark 2.21. If mn is odd, then $|A| = \frac{mn+1}{2}$ and $|B| = \frac{mn-1}{2}$, so $G_{m,n}$ is an *unbalanced bipartite graph*.

Example 2.22 (Grid graph $G_{m,n}$, mn is even). The grid graph $G_{m,n}$ is bipartite and admits a perfect matching exactly when mn is even by Proposition 2.20.

Consequently, Theorem 1.5 implies that the grid graphs $G_{m,n}$ possess property (P) whenever mn is even.




FIGURE 4. The grid graph $G_{4,3}$. It is a bipartite graph with 4×3 vertices and admits a perfect matching, shown here in blue. Therefore, $G_{4,3}$ possess property (P)

Conversely, if mn is odd, then $G_{m,n}$ is unbalanced bipartite graph, and thus cannot have property (P) by Theorem 2.3.

We next discuss generalized Petersen graphs.

Definition 2.23. [6] [Generalized Petersen graphs] The *generalized Petersen graph* $P(n, k)$ is defined for integers $n \geq 3$ and $1 \leq k \leq \frac{n-1}{2}$. It has the vertex set

$$V(P(n, k)) = \{u_0, u_1, \dots, u_{n-1}\} \cup \{v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{n-1}\},$$

and edge set

$$E(P(n, k)) = \{(u_i, u_{i+1}) : 0 \leq i < n\} \cup \{(v_i, v_{i+k}) : 0 \leq i < n\} \cup \{(u_i, v_i) : 0 \leq i < n\},$$

where indices are taken modulo n .

Thus, each vertex has degree 3, making $P(n, k)$ a 3-regular graph.

The following result is well-known.

Proposition 2.24. [6] *The generalized Petersen graph $P(n, k)$ is bipartite if and only if n is even and k is odd.*

Proof. If the generalized Petersen graph $P(n, k)$ is bipartite, then it has no odd cycle. If n is odd, the cycle $u_0, u_1, \dots, u_{n-1}, u_0$ has odd length, so $P(n, k)$ is not bipartite.

Again, if k is even, (v_0, v_k) is an edge in $P(n, k)$, and the closed walk $v_0, u_0, u_1, \dots, u_k, v_k, v_0$ is a cycle of odd length $k + 3$, and hence $P(n, k)$ contains an odd cycle, contrary to the fact that $P(n, k)$ is bipartite.

Conversely, if n is even and k is odd. Define two disjoint sets

$$A := (u_i : i \text{ is even}) \cup (v_j : j \text{ is odd}), \quad B := (u_i : i \text{ is odd}) \cup (v_j : j \text{ is even}).$$

As n is even and k is odd, every edge of $P(n, k)$ has one endpoint in A and the other in B . Therefore, $P(n, k)$ is bipartite graph. \square

Example 2.25. By Proposition 2.24 the generalized Petersen graph $P(n, k)$ is a 3-regular bipartite graph whenever n is even and k is odd. Therefore, by Corollary 2.6, every such $P(n, k)$ has property (P).




FIGURE 5. The generalized Petersen graph $P(8, 3)$ has property P by Corollary 2.6. The perfect matching formed by the spokes $u_i v_i$ is highlighted in blue.

Remark 2.26. The generalized Petersen graph $P(n, k)$ is *not bipartite* whenever n is odd or k is even by Proposition 2.24. Since, Corollary 2.6 applies only to bipartite graphs, it cannot be invoked in these cases. Consequently, when $P(n, k)$ is not bipartite (that is, when n is odd or k is even), the hypotheses of the theorem are not met, and its conclusion does not need to hold.

Remark 2.27. In this section, we prove that certain classes of bipartite graphs—specially those whose pendant edge reduction \bar{G} has order 8—satisfy the implication that if G has property (P), then G admits a perfect matching. However, the converse part of Theorem 1.5, namely whether every bipartite graph with property (P) necessarily has a perfect matching, remains open and thus constitutes an interesting direction for future investigation.

3. THREADED UNION OVER A GRAPH AND PROPERTY (P)

In this section, we study how property (P) behaves under certain graph operations. In particular, we are interested in constructing larger and more complex graphs that inherit

property (P) from smaller constituent graphs which have already property (P) [1, 3, 9, 12, 16]. To formalize this, we introduce a systematic method for combining graphs, which we call the *threaded union*.

3.1. Threaded union of graphs. Recently, in [16, Definition 2.5], they defined the following graph operation, let G_1, \dots, G_m be m connected graphs. The graph $G_i \cdot H$ denotes the graph obtained by attaching a designated vertex of G_i to a specified vertex of H by an edge. This operation has been used to study how property (P) preserves under this operation [16, Theorem 5.3].

Motivated by this construction, we introduce a more general operation, which we refer to as the *threaded union* of graphs.

Definition 3.1 (Threaded union over a graph). Let H be a graph with vertex set $V(H) = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$. Let $\mathcal{G} = \{(G_i, v_1^{(i)}) : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ be a collection of graphs, and assume that each G_i has vertex set $V(G_i) = \{v_j^{(i)} : 1 \leq j \leq n_i\}$ with an arbitrary (but fixed) designated vertex $v_1^{(i)} \in V(G_i)$, called the *bail vertex* of G_i .

The term “bail vertex” is inspired by jewelry design, where a *bail* refers to the small hook or loop through which a chain or thread passes to hold a pendant. Analogously, in our construction, the vertex $v_1^{(i)}$ serves as the point through which the graph G_i is attached or “threaded” to other graphs along H .

The *threaded union* of the graphs in the collection \mathcal{G} over H , denoted by $T_H[\mathcal{G}]$, is the graph with vertex set

$$V(T_H[\mathcal{G}]) = \bigcup_{i=1}^n V(G_i),$$

and edge set

$$E(T_H[\mathcal{G}]) = \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^n E(G_i) \right) \cup \{(v_1^{(i)}, v_1^{(j)}) : (v_i, v_j) \in E(H)\}.$$

In other words, we take the disjoint union of the graphs G_i and then, for each edge $(v_i, v_j) \in E(H)$, we add an edge between the corresponding bail vertices $v_1^{(i)}$ and $v_1^{(j)}$. Thus, the graphs G_i are joined along the “thread” H through their respective bail vertices.




FIGURE 6. Threaded union of graphs $\mathcal{G} = \{(G_1, v_1^{(1)}), (G_2, v_1^{(2)}), (G_3, v_1^{(3)})\}$ over path graph $H = P_3$.

Remark 3.2. When $H = K_2$ and $\mathcal{G} = \{(G_1, v_1^{(1)}), (G_2, v_1^{(2)})\}$, where G_1 and G_2 are connected graphs, the graph $T_H[\mathcal{G}]$ coincides with $G_1 \cdot G_2$ as defined in [16, Definition 2.5]. In this sense, our graph operation is an extension of the operation $G_1 \cdot G_2$.



FIGURE 7. Threaded union of two P_3 over K_2 with two different bail vertices: (a) the central vertices serve as the bail vertices, and (b) the pendant vertices serve as the bail vertices.

It is easy to see that a threaded union $T_H(\mathcal{G})$ depends not only on the component graphs G_i and the base graph H , but also crucially on the choice of the bail vertices $v_1^{(i)} \in V(G_i)$. For example, consider the diagrams given in Figure 7.

This construction provides a flexible framework for generating new graphs with property (P) from known ones: In the following theorem, we show that if each component graph G_i possesses property (P) , their threaded union over H is also guaranteed to have property (P) when H is a *tree-cycle block* graph generalizing some main results proved in [16, Section 5].

Definition 3.3. A graph G is called a *tree-cycle block graph* if the deletion of all its cut-edges (bridges) results in connected components, each of which is either an isolated vertex or a cycle. In particular, a graph is a tree-cycle block graph with no cut-edges if and only if it is a cycle.

Theorem 3.4. Let H be a tree-cycle block graph of order n . Let G_1, G_2, \dots, G_n be connected graphs that have property (P) , and let $\mathcal{G} = \{(G_i, v_1^{(i)}) : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$. Then the graph $T_H[\mathcal{G}]$ also has the property (P) . Furthermore, this conclusion is independent of the choice of the designated bail vertex $v_1^{(i)}$ in each G_i .

As a particular case, we obtain [16, Theorem 5.3] as a corollary:

Corollary 3.5. Let G_1 and G_2 be two connected graphs with property (P) . Then $T_{K_2}[\mathcal{G}]$ has property (P) , where $\mathcal{G} = \{(G_1, v_1^{(1)}), (G_2, v_1^{(2)})\}$. Furthermore, this is true for any choice of the bail vertices. So, $G_1 \cdot G_2$ has property (P) .

We proceed to the proof of Theorem 3.4 in the following subsections.

3.2. Some fundamental matrix theoretic results. In this subsection, we establish several fundamental matrix-theoretic facts that will be used repeatedly.

Let M be a $n \times n$ Symmetric matrix partitioned as

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} M_{11} & M_{12} \\ M_{21} & M_{22} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (3.1)$$

if M_{11} is non-singular $k \times k$ block with $1 \leq k < n$.

The Schur complement of M_{11} in M is defined and denoted by

$$M/M_{11} = M_{22} - M_{21}M_{11}^{-1}M_{12}.$$

Similarly, if M_{22} is non-singular $t \times t$ block with $1 \leq t < n$. The Schur complement of M_{22} in M is given by

$$M/M_{22} = M_{11} - M_{12}M_{22}^{-1}M_{21}.$$

The following lemma summarizes fundamental determinant identities involving Schur complements.

Lemma 3.6. *Let M be a square matrix partitioned as in (3.1).*

If M_{11} is non-singular, then

$$\det(M) = \det(M_{11}) \det(M/M_{11}).$$

Similarly, if M_{22} is non-singular, then

$$\det(M) = \det(M_{22}) \det(M/M_{22}).$$

Lemma 3.7. *[8, Page no. 25] Let M be a square matrix partitioned as in (3.1) satisfying both M and M_{11} are non-singular. Then M/M_{11} is nonsingular and*

$$M^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} M_{11}^{-1} + M_{11}^{-1}M_{12}(M/M_{11})^{-1}M_{21}M_{11}^{-1} & -M_{11}^{-1}M_{12}(M/M_{11})^{-1} \\ -(M/M_{11})^{-1}M_{21}M_{11}^{-1} & (M/M_{11})^{-1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

If E_{ij} is an elementary matrix of order $m \times n$ whose $(i, j)^{th}$ position is 1, and A be a matrix of order $n \times n$, then

$$(E_{ij}AE_{ij}^T)_{pq} = \sum_r (E_{ij}A)_{pr}(E_{ij}^T)_{rq} = (E_{ij}A)_{pj}(E_{ij}^T)_{jq} = \begin{cases} (A)_{jj}, & p = i, q = i, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

3.3. Proof of Theorem 3.4 : H is a tree. Recall that for a nonsingular symmetric matrix A , we have $P_\nu(A) = n$ when all of its principal minors of order $n - 1$ vanish; that is, $\det(A(j)) = 0$ for all $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$.

Lemma 3.8. *Let M_1 and M_2 be real symmetric nonsingular matrices of order n_1 and n_2 , respectively, satisfying*

$$P_\nu(M_k) = n_k > 1 \quad \text{for } k \in \{1, 2\}.$$

Fix indices $i \in \{1, \dots, n_1\}$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, n_2\}$, and let E_{ij} denote the $n_1 \times n_2$ elementary matrix having a single entry 1 in position (i, j) and zeros elsewhere.

For any real number c , consider the block matrix

$$B = \begin{bmatrix} M_1 & cE_{ij} \\ cE_{ij}^T & M_2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then B is nonsingular and

$$P_\nu(B) = n_1 + n_2.$$

Proof. Given that $P_\nu(M_k) = n_k$ for $k = 1, 2$. This implies that, $\det(M_k(t)) = 0$, for all $t \in \{1, \dots, n_k\}$ and for each $k \in \{1, 2\}$ where $M_k(t)$ denotes the principal submatrix of M_k obtained by deleting its t -th row and column.

If $c = 0$, then the proof follows immediately.

We assume $c \neq 0$.

$$B = \begin{bmatrix} M_1 & cE_{ij} \\ cE_{ij}^\top & M_2 \end{bmatrix} \quad (3.1)$$

Since, M_1 and M_2 are non-singular by Schur's formula,

$$\det(B) = \det(M_1) \det(M_2 - cE_{ij}^\top M_1^{-1} cE_{ij}), \text{ as } M_1 \text{ is invertible.} \quad (3.2)$$

$$\det(B) = \det(M_2) \det(M_1 - cE_{ij} M_2^{-1} cE_{ij}^\top), \text{ as } M_2 \text{ is invertible.} \quad (3.3)$$

Now, by (p, q) -th position of the matrix $E_{ij}^\top M_1^{-1} cE_{ij}$ is,

$$(cE_{ij}^\top M_1^{-1} cE_{ij})_{pq} = \begin{cases} c^2 (M_1^{-1})_{ii}, & \text{if } p = j \text{ and } q = j; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (3.4)$$

Since $(M_1^{-1})_{ii} = 0$ (because $\det(M_1(t)) = 0$, for all $t \in \{1, \dots, n_1\}$), it follows that the matrix $cE_{ij}^\top M_1^{-1} cE_{ij}$ is zero matrix. Similarly, $cE_{ij} M_2^{-1} cE_{ij}^\top$ is also the zero matrix. Therefore, we obtain

$$\det(B) = \det(M_1) \det(M_2),$$

which implies B is non-singular.

We now compute $\det(B(l))$ for $1 \leq l \leq n_1 + n_2$.

Case 1: $l = i$.

Then

$$B(i) = \begin{bmatrix} M_1(i) & \mathbf{0}_{(n_1-1) \times n_2} \\ \mathbf{0}_{n_2 \times (n_1-1)} & M_2 \end{bmatrix}$$

where $\mathbf{0}$ denotes a zero matrix.

Since $\det(M_1(i)) = 0$, we obtain

$$\det(B(i)) = \det(M_2) \det(M_1(i)) = 0.$$

Case 2: $l = n_1 + j$.

Using the same reasoning as above (via Schur complement), we obtain

$$\det(B(n_1 + j)) = \det(M_1) \det(M_2(j)) = 0,$$

since $\det(M_2(j)) = 0$.

Case 3: $l \notin \{i, n_1 + j\}$.

First, we assume that $1 \leq l \leq n_1$. Then

$$B(l) = \begin{bmatrix} M_1(l) & cE'_{i'j'} \\ cE'^{\top}_{i'j'} & M_2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (3.5)$$

where $cE'_{i'j'}$ is an $(n_1 - 1) \times n_2$ matrix with a single non-zero entry is c in the (i', j') -position.

Since, M_2 is invertible, applying Schur's formula,

$$\det(B(l)) = \det(M_2) \det(M_1(l) - cE'_{i'j'}M_2^{-1}cE'^{\top}_{i'j'}).$$

As, diagonal entries of M_2^{-1} are zero, $cE'_{i'j'}M_2^{-1}cE'^{\top}_{i'j'}$ is the zero matrix. Hence,

$$\det(B(l)) = \det(M_2) \det(M_1(l)) = 0,$$

since $\det(M_1(l)) = 0$.

A similar argument show that $\det(B(l)) = 0$ whenever $n_1 < l \leq n_1 + n_2$.

Therefore,

$$\det(B(l)) = 0, \text{ for all } l \in \{1, \dots, n_1 + n_2\},$$

implies,

$$P_\nu(B) = n_1 + n_2.$$

□

Remark 3.9. This result is the same as Theorem 5.3 in [16], whose existence we became aware of only recently. However, since our proof is formulated in a more general setting and is essential for establishing the main result of this section, Theorem 3.4, we have chosen to retain it.

By translating the matrix formulation of the above theorem into a graph-theoretic framework, we obtain the following result, whose proof follows immediately from that of the same theorem.

Theorem 3.10. *Let G be a connected graph with a set of cut-edges $T = \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_k\}$. Let G_1, G_2, \dots, G_{k+1} denote the connected components of $G - T$. If all of the components G_1, G_2, \dots, G_{k+1} possess property (P) , then the graph G also has property (P) .*

Proof. G is a connected graph, such that

$$T = \{e_1, \dots, e_k\}$$

is a set of cut-edges of G , and G_1, \dots, G_{k+1} be the connected components of $G - T$.

Assume that each G_i has property (P) . We prove that G has property (P) by induction on k .

For $k = 1$.

$T = \{e_1\}$ and $G - T$ has exactly two connected components G_1 and G_2 . Let $n_i = |V(G_i)|$ for $i = \{1, 2\}$.

Since each G_i has property (P) , there exist nonsingular matrices

$$M_i \in S(G_i), \quad i = 1, 2,$$

such that $\det(M_i(j)) = 0$ for all $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n_i\}$ (equivalently $P_\nu(M_i) = |V(G_i)| = n_i > 1$). Fix $c(\neq 0) \in \mathbb{R}$.

Define

$$B := \begin{bmatrix} M_1 & cE_{p,q} \\ cE_{p,q}^\top & M_2 \end{bmatrix},$$

where $E_{p,q}$ is an elementary matrix of order $n_1 \times n_2$ which has a single 1 in position (p, q) and is inserted so that the nonzero off-diagonal entries correspond precisely to the bridge e_1 .

Then $B \in S(G)$ and is of the form required in Lemma 3.8. By Lemma 3.8, B is nonsingular and satisfies

$$\det(B(t)) = 0 \quad \text{for all } t \in \{1, 2, \dots, n_1 + n_2\}.$$

Thus G has property (P) when $k = 1$.

Now, assume the result holds for any connected graph with $k - 1$ cut-edges. Consider G with the set $T = \{e_1, \dots, e_k\}$ of k cut-edges.

Since contracting each component of G_i of $G - T$ to a single vertex yields a tree (because all edges in T are cut-edges), the resulting structure is acyclic. Therefore, we may relabel the components so that:

- e_1 joins a vertex of G_1 to a vertex of G_2 ;
- for each $i \geq 2$, the cut-edge e_i has one endpoint in

$$V(G_1) \cup \dots \cup V(G_i)$$

and the other endpoint in $V(G_{i+1})$.

Using the base case, attaching G_1 and G_2 along e_1 produces a connected graph, \overline{G}_1 that has property (P) .

Now consider the remaining cut-edges $\{e_2, \dots, e_k\}$ in the graph G .

Removing these $k - 1$ edges yields k connected components $\overline{G}_1, G_3, \dots, G_{k+1}$, each of which has property (P) , since \overline{G}_1 has property (P) by the previous paragraph, and each G_3, \dots, G_{k+1} has property (P) by hypothesis.

By the inductive hypothesis, successively reattaching these components across the bridges e_2, \dots, e_k results in a graph with property (P) . But this graph is precisely G .

Therefore, G has property (P) .

□

Remark 3.11. Theorem 3.10 is not explicitly stated in [16], their result covers only the case where $k = 1$. This result extends their conclusion to the more general setting of any $k \geq 1$.

Corollary 3.12. *Let H be a tree of order n . Let G_1, G_2, \dots, G_n be connected graphs that have property (P) , and let*

$$\mathcal{G} = \{(G_i, v_1^{(i)}) : 1 \leq i \leq n\}.$$

Then the graph $T_H[\mathcal{G}]$ also has the property (P) . Furthermore, this conclusion is independent of the choice of the designated bail vertex $v_1^{(i)}$ in each G_i .

Proof. H is a tree on n vertices and $\mathcal{G} = \{(G_i, v_1^{(i)}) : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ is the collection of graphs with designated bail vertices. Form the threaded union $T_H[\mathcal{G}]$ over H by joining, for every

edge $(v_i, v_j) \in E(H)$ the corresponding bail vertices $v_1^{(i)}$ and $v_1^{(j)}$, by an edge. Denote by \mathcal{C} the set of all such inter-component edges; since H is a tree we have $|\mathcal{C}| = |E(H)| = n - 1$.

By construction, since, H is a tree, every edge in \mathcal{C} is cut-edge in $T_H[\mathcal{G}]$. Removing these edges disconnects the graph into n components, G_1, G_2, \dots, G_n , each of which has property (P) . Therefore, by Theorem 3.10, $T_H[\mathcal{G}]$ must also have property (P) .

Finally, the conclusion is independent of the particular choice of the designated bail vertices, changing the bail vertex inside some G_i alters which vertex of G_i is incident with the inter-component edges, but it does not change the underlying component graphs after deleting the inter-component edges. Since, Theorem 3.10 requires only that there exists a set of cut-edges whose deletion yields components each with property (P) , the property (P) of $T_H[\mathcal{G}]$ does not depend on the selection of the bail vertices. \square




FIGURE 8. Threaded union of the graphs G_1, G_2, G_3, G_4 over the star $K_{1,3}$. The shaded vertices indicate the designated bail vertices $v_1^{(i)}$, which are joined according to the adjacency in $H = K_{1,3}$.

3.4. Proof of Theorem 3.4 : H is a cycle. In Theorem 3.10, we considered the deletion of a set of k cut-edges, resulting in $k + 1$ connected components of G . In the next step, we address a related situation where the deletion of $k (> 2)$ edges from G produces exactly $k (> 2)$ many connected components.

To analyze this case, we require an extension of the preceding matrix result Lemma 3.8, which we state next.

Lemma 3.13. *Let M_1 and M_2 be real symmetric nonsingular matrices of orders n_1 and n_2 , respectively, satisfying*

$$P_\nu(M_t) = n_t > 1 \quad \text{for } t = 1, 2.$$

Fix indices $i \in \{1, \dots, n_1\}$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, n_2\}$. Let B_1 be the symmetric matrix of order $(n_1 + n_2)$ described in Lemma 3.8, namely,

$$B_1 = \begin{bmatrix} M_1 & cE_{ij} \\ cE_{ij}^\top & M_2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (3.1)$$

where E_{ij} denotes the $n_1 \times n_2$ elementary matrix with a single entry 1 in position (i, j) and zeros elsewhere.

Let M_3 be a real symmetric nonsingular matrix of order $n_3 > 1$ with $P_\nu(M_3) = n_3$, and consider the symmetric matrix B of order $(n_1 + n_2 + n_3)$ given by

$$B = \begin{bmatrix} B_1 & R \\ R^\top & M_3 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (3.2)$$

where R is an $(n_1 + n_2) \times n_3$ matrix having exactly two nonzero entries, both equal to 1, located at positions

$$(p, s) \quad \text{and} \quad (n_1 + j, s),$$

for some $p \in \{1, \dots, n_1\}$ and $s \in \{1, \dots, n_3\}$, and where the index j in $(n_1 + j, s)$ is the same fixed index appearing in the block cE_{ij} of B_1 .

Then B is nonsingular and

$$P_\nu(B) = n_1 + n_2 + n_3.$$

Proof. By Lemma 3.8, the matrix B_1 is non-singular and satisfies $P_\nu(B_1) = n_1 + n_2$, which implies,

$$\det(B_1(l)) = 0, \quad \text{for all } l \in \{1, \dots, n_1 + n_2\}.$$

Similarly, since M_3 is non-singular and $P_\nu(M_3) = n_3$, we have

$$\det(M_3(l)) = 0, \quad \text{for all } l \in \{1, \dots, n_3\}.$$

Using Schur's determinant formula, we obtain

$$\det(B) = \det(M_3) \det(B_1 - RM_3^{-1}R^\top) \quad (3.3)$$

We now compute entries of the matrix $RM_3^{-1}R^\top$. The (a, b) -entry is

$$\begin{aligned} (RM_3^{-1}R^\top)_{ab} &= \sum_{k=1}^{n_3} r_{ak} (M_3^{-1}R^\top)_{kb} \\ &= (M_3^{-1}R^\top)_{sb} \\ &= \sum_{l=1}^{n_3} (M_3^{-1})_{sl} r_{bl} \\ &= (M_3^{-1})_{ss} \\ &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

where the last equality follows from

$$(M_3^{-1})_{ss} = \frac{\det(M_3(s))}{\det(M_3)} = 0.$$

Hence, $RM_3^{-1}R^\top$ is a zero-matrix. Therefore, $\det(B) = \det(M_3) \det(B_1) \neq 0$, proving B is nonsingular.

We now compute $\det(B(l))$ for $1 \leq l \leq n_1 + n_2 + n_3$.

Case 1: $l \in \{1, \dots, (n_1 + n_2)\}$

If $l = p$, then $B(p)$ has the block form (3.5), implying $\det(B(p)) = 0$.

Similarly, for $l = n_1 + j$, we again obtain $\det(B(n_1 + j)) = 0$.

Now assume $l \notin \{p, n_1 + j\}$,

$$B(l) = \begin{bmatrix} B_1(l) & R' \\ R'^\top & M_3 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Here R' is the matrix of order $(n_1 + n_2 - 1) \times n_3$, after deleting the l^{th} row from R . Using Schur's formula again,

$$\det(B(l)) = \det(M_3) \det(B_1(l) - R' M_3^{-1} R'^\top).$$

By the same calculation as in (3.4), $R' M_3^{-1} R'^\top$ is the zero matrix. Thus,

$$\det(B(l)) = \det(M_3) \det(B_1(l)) = 0,$$

since, $\det(B_1(l)) = 0$.

Therefore, $\det(B(l)) = 0$ for all $l \in \{1, \dots, (n_1 + n_2)\}$.

Case 2: $l \in \{n_1 + n_2 + 1, \dots, n_1 + n_2 + n_3\}$

Let $l' = l - (n_1 + n_2)$. Then

$$B(l) = \begin{bmatrix} B_1 & \bar{R} \\ \bar{R}^\top & M_3(l') \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3.5)$$

Here, \bar{R} is the matrix of order $(n_1 + n_2) \times (n_3 - 1)$, after deleting the l^{th} -column from the matrix R .

If $l = n_1 + n_2 + s$, then

$$B(l) = \begin{bmatrix} B_1 & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & M_3(s) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Here, $\mathbf{0}$ is the zero matrix of order $(n_1 + n_2) \times (n_3 - 1)$.

Hence, $\det(B(n_1 + n_2 + s)) = \det(B_1) \det(M_3(s)) = 0$, as $\det(M_3(s)) = 0$.

Now assume $l \neq n_1 + n_2 + s$. Applying Schur's formula to (3.5), we obtain

$$\det(B(l)) = \det(B_1) \det(M_3(l') - \bar{R}^\top B_1^{-1} \bar{R}) \quad (3.6)$$

The matrix \bar{R} has exactly two nonzero entries, located in the positions (p, s') and $(n_1 + j, s')$, let us say. We now compute entries of the matrix $\bar{R}^\top B_1^{-1} \bar{R}$, the (a, b) -entry is

$$\begin{aligned}
(\bar{R}^\top B_1^{-1} \bar{R})_{ab} &= \sum_{k=1}^{(n_1+n_2)} \bar{R}_{ka} (B_1^{-1} \bar{R})_{kb} \\
&= (B_1^{-1} \bar{R})_{pb} + (B_1^{-1} \bar{R})_{(n_1+j)b} \\
&\text{(if } (\bar{R}^\top B_1^{-1} \bar{R})_{ab} \text{ is non-zero, then } a = s', k = p \text{ and } n_1 + j) \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{(n_1+n_2)} (B_1^{-1})_{pk} \bar{R}_{kb} + \sum_{k=1}^{(n_1+n_2)} (B_1^{-1})_{(n_1+j)k} \bar{R}_{kb} \\
&\text{(for non-zero entry of } \bar{R}, b = s') \\
&= (B_1^{-1})_{pp} + (B_1^{-1})_{p(n_1+j)} + (B_1^{-1})_{(n_1+j)p} + (B_1^{-1})_{(n_1+j)(n_1+j)} \\
&= 2(B_1^{-1})_{p(n_1+j)}, \text{ (as } B_1^{-1} \text{ is symmetric.)}
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we get

$$(\bar{R}^\top B_1^{-1} \bar{R})_{ab} = \begin{cases} 2(B_1^{-1})_{p(n_1+j)} & \text{if } a = b = s'; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (3.7)$$

Now given,

$$B_1 = \begin{bmatrix} M_1 & cE_{ij} \\ cE_{ij}^\top & M_2 \end{bmatrix}$$

We know that $B/M_1 = M_2 - cE_{ij}M_1^{-1}cE_{ij}^\top = M_2$ is non-singular, by Lemma 3.7,

$$B_1^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} M_1^{-1} + M_1^{-1}cE_{ij}M_2^{-1}cE_{ij}^\top M_1^{-1} & -M_1^{-1}cE_{ij}M_2^{-1} \\ -M_2^{-1}cE_{ij}^\top M_1^{-1} & M_2^{-1} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3.8)$$

From (3.8), it is clear that $(B_1^{-1})_{p(n_1+j)} = -(M_1^{-1}cE_{ij}M_2^{-1})_{pj}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
(M_1^{-1}cE_{ij}M_2^{-1})_{pj} &= \sum_{k=1}^{n_1} (M_1^{-1})_{pk} (cE_{ij}M_2^{-1})_{kj} \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{n_1} (M_1^{-1})_{pk} \left(\sum_{l=1}^{n_2} (cE_{ij})_{kl} (M_2^{-1})_{lj} \right) \\
&= c(M_1^{-1})_{pi} (M_2^{-1})_{jj} \\
&= 0 \text{ (since } (M_2^{-1})_{jj} = 0)
\end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

Therefore, we get $\bar{R}^\top B_1^{-1} \bar{R}$ is the zero matrix and the equation (3.6) is now

$$\det(B(l)) = \det(B_1) \det(M_3(l')).$$

Since, $\det(M_3(l')) = 0$ for all $1 \leq l' \leq n_3$. Hence, $\det(B(l)) = 0$ for all $n_1 + n_2 + 1 \leq l \leq n_1 + n_2 + n_3$.

Therefore, $\det(B(l)) = 0, \forall l \in \{1, \dots, n_1 + n_2 + n_3\}$ implies $P_\nu(B) = n_1 + n_2 + n_3$. \square

We now apply Lemma 3.13 to the setting of graphs in the following corollary, obtaining the corresponding result for the case in which the deletion of three edges results in exactly three connected components.

Theorem 3.14. *Let G be a graph and let $\{e_1, e_2, e_3\} \subseteq E(G)$. Suppose there exist vertices $\{u, w\} \subseteq V(G)$ such that e_1 and e_2 are incident with u , and e_2 and e_3 are incident with w . Let G_1, G_2, G_3 denote the three connected components obtained by deleting the edges $\{e_1, e_2, e_3\}$ from G . If each of G_1, G_2, G_3 satisfies Property (P), then G also satisfies Property (P).*




FIGURE 9. An illustration of a graph composed of three distinct subgraphs, denoted by G_1, G_2 , and G_3 . Four specific vertices: v_1 and $v_2 \in V(G_1)$, vertex $u \in V(G_2)$, and vertex $w \in V(G_3)$. The subgraphs are interconnected by a set of three highlighted edges, labeled $e_1 = (v_1, u)$, $e_2 = (v_2, w)$, and $e_3 = (u, w)$.

Proof. Let $V(G) = n_1 + n_2 + n_3$ and $|V(G_i)| = n_i$, for all $i = 1, 2, 3$. By construction, the edges e_1 and e_2 share a vertex $u \in V(G_2)$, and the edges e_2 and e_3 share a vertex $w \in V(G_3)$, and there exist vertices $v_1, v_2 \in V(G_1)$ such that v_1 is incident with e_1 , and v_2 is incident with e_3 (the vertices $v_1, v_2 \in V(G_1)$ may coincide).

Since G_1 and G_2 both have property (P), and e_1 be the cut-edge connecting them, consider the subgraph

$$G' = (V(G_1) \cup V(G_2), E(G_1) \cup E(G_2) \cup \{e_1\}).$$

By Theorem 3.10, the graph G' has property (P), as G_1, G_2 have property (P), and there exists a nonsingular matrix

$$B_1 = \begin{bmatrix} M_1 & cE_{v_1 u} \\ cE_{v_1 u}^\top & M_2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (3.10)$$

where, M_1, M_2 are the non-singular symmetric matrices corresponding to G_1 and G_2 , respectively, and $P_\nu(M_t) = |V(G_t)| = n_t > 1$ for $t = 1, 2$.

Now, let M_3 be the non-singular symmetric matrix for G_3 such that $P_\nu(M_3) = |V(G_3)| = n_3 > 1$ (since, G_3 has property (P)).

Define

$$B := \begin{bmatrix} B_1 & R \\ R^\top & M_3 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (3.11)$$

where R is an $(n_1 + n_2) \times n_3$ matrix such that it has only two non-zero entries equal to c , located at positions (v_2, w) and $(n_1 + u, w)$, corresponding to the edges e_2 and e_3 . Then, $B \in S(G)$.

By Lemma 3.13, we have

$$P_\nu(B) = n_1 + n_2 + n_3.$$

Therefore, G has property (P) . \square

Remark 3.15. In Theorem 3.14, observe that in the edge set $\{e_1, e_2, e_3\}$, the edges e_1 and e_2 share a common endpoint, and likewise e_2 and e_3 share a common endpoint. These adjacency conditions are essential for the proof of Theorem 3.14. Note that e_1 and e_3 may or may not be adjacent.

This structure is required in order to apply Lemma 3.13. Specially, if the (v_1, u) -entry in the off diagonal block $cE_{v_1, u}$ of matrix B_1 (3.10) is non-zero, then the off diagonal block R of the matrix B (3.11) must contain exactly two nonzero entries, located in the same column—namely at positions (v_2, w) and $(n_1 + u, w)$. Thus, the vertices $u \in V(G_2)$ and $w \in V(G_3)$ are fixed reference points corresponding to the edges e_1 , e_2 and e_3 .

We now apply Corollary 3.12 and Theorem 3.14 to establish the Theorem 3.4 in the special case where H is a cycle.

Corollary 3.16. *Let H be a cycle C_n of order n . Let G_1, G_2, \dots, G_n be connected graphs, and*

$$\mathcal{G} = \{(G_i, v_1^{(i)}) : 1 \leq i \leq n\},$$

such that each G_i has property (P) . Then the threaded union $T_H[\mathcal{G}]$ has property (P) . Furthermore, this conclusion is independent of the choice of the designated bail vertex $v_1^{(i)}$ in any G_i .

Proof. Label the vertices of $H = C_n$ as $V(H) = \{v_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$, and let the edges be

$$E(H) = \{e_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\}, \text{ where } e_i = (v_i, v_{i+1}) \text{ for } 1 \leq i < n \text{ and } e_n = (v_n, v_1).$$

Choose three consecutive edges, say $\{e_1, e_2, e_3\}$, where e_1 and e_2 share vertex v_2 , and e_2 and e_3 share vertex v_3 .

Consider the path subgraph $\tilde{P} \subseteq H$ obtained by removing the chosen three edges; this path has order $n - 2$ and connects v_4 to v_1 . Since each G_i has property (P) for all $i = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, applying Corollary 3.12 to \tilde{P} and the collection

$$\tilde{\mathcal{G}} = (G_1, v_1^{(1)}) \cup \{(G_i, v_1^{(i)}) : 4 \leq i \leq n\}$$

implies that the threaded union $T_{\tilde{P}}[\tilde{\mathcal{G}}]$, denoted by \tilde{G}_1 , has property (P) .

Now, observe that after deletion of the edges $\{e_1, e_2, e_3\}$, the threaded union $T_H[\mathcal{G}]$ separates into three connected components: \tilde{G}_1 , G_2 and G_3 . Each of these inherits property (P) . Therefore, applying Theorem 3.14 to these three components yields that the threaded union $T_H[\mathcal{G}]$ has property (P) .

Finally, the argument nowhere relies on a particular choice of designated bail vertices, so the result holds regardless of the selected $v_1^{(i)}$ in each G_i . \square




FIGURE 10. Threaded union of the graphs G_1, G_2, G_3, G_4 over the cycle C_4 . Each G_i is represented as a large circle, and the shaded vertices denote the designated bail vertices $v_1^{(i)}$, which are connected according to the adjacency in $H = C_4$.

3.5. Proof of Theorem 3.4 : H is a tree-cycle block graph. Finally, using the results established in the previous subsection, particularly Corollary 3.12 and Corollary 3.16, we are now in a position to prove the Theorem 3.4, when H is tree-cycle block graph but H is neither tree nor a cycle. This theorem extends the structural characterization of graphs satisfying property (P) to a broader class of connected graphs obtained by sequentially joining multiple components through consecutive cut-edges.

Corollary 3.17. *Let H be a tree-cycle block graph of order n that is neither tree nor a cycle. Let*

$$\mathcal{G} = \{(G_i, v_1^{(i)}) : 1 \leq i \leq n\},$$

where each G_i has property (P). Then the threaded union $T_H[\mathcal{G}]$ has property (P). Furthermore, this conclusion is independent of the choice of the designated bail vertex $v_1^{(i)}$ in any G_i .

Proof. Since H is a tree-cycle block graph and is neither tree nor a cycle, deletion all of its cut-edges yields a collection of connected components, each of which is either an isolated vertex or a cycle. Let \mathcal{K} denote the set of cut-edges of H . Let

$$\mathcal{A}_1 = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_r\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{A}_2 = \{C_1, C_2, \dots, C_s\}$$

be the sets of isolated vertex components and cycle components, respectively after deleting the set of cut-edges \mathcal{K} from H . These satisfy

$$|\mathcal{A}_1| + |\mathcal{A}_2| = r + s = |\mathcal{K}| + 1.$$

Choose a labeling of the vertices of H , and use the same labeling to index the corresponding graphs G_i .

Isolated vertex components.

For each isolated vertex component $a_i \in \mathcal{A}_1$, the component consists of a single vertex, which we denote by $v^{(a_i)}$. Define

$$\mathcal{G}_i = \{(G_{a_i}, v_1^{(a_i)})\}.$$

Since a_i is a isolated vertex, $T_{a_i}[\mathcal{G}_i] = G_{a_i}$.

Therefore, $T_{a_i}[\mathcal{G}_i]$ has property (P) , as each G_{a_i} has property (P) for all $a_i \in \mathcal{A}_1$.

Cycle components.

Similarly, for each cycle component $C_j \in \mathcal{A}_2$, define

$$\mathcal{G}_j = \{(G_k, v_1^{(k)}) : k \in [V(C_j)]\}.$$

By Corollary 3.16, the threaded union $T_{C_j}[\mathcal{G}_j]$ has property (P) for every $C_j \in \mathcal{A}_2$.

Thus, each component obtained after deleting the cut-edges of H — that is, each element of

$$\mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{A}_2$$

– give rise to a threaded union with property (P) .

Since, there are $|\mathcal{K}| + 1$ such components, we can apply Theorem 3.10. This establishes that the threaded union $T_H[\mathcal{G}]$ has property (P) .

The argument above does not depend on the specific choice of bail vertices $v_1^{(i)}$ in the graph G_i . In every Corollary 3.12 and Corollary 3.16, the proof relies only on the property (P) of each G_i , and the threaded construction remains valid regardless of which vertex in each G_i is designated as the bail vertex. Hence, the conclusion that $T_H[\mathcal{G}]$ has property (P) is independent of these choices. \square

Remark 3.18. The converse of Theorem 3.4 does not hold in general, that is, even if the threaded union $T_H[\mathcal{G}]$ has property (P) , it does not necessarily follow that each individual component G_i must have property (P) .

In particular, If at least one of G_i does not possess property (P) , then the threaded union $T_H[\mathcal{G}]$ may or may not have property (P) , depending on the structure of H and the choice of bail vertices $v_1^{(i)} \in V(G_i)$.

This phenomenon was already observed for the simplest case $H = K_2$, that is, when two connected graphs are joined through a single edge.

A recent study [16, Theorem 5.5] analyzed the case of two paths P_n and P_m , where n and m are odd, joined by an edge and showed that, although both P_n and P_m do not have property (P) , the resulting joined graph $P_n \cdot P_m$ has property (P) depending on which vertices of both graphs are connected through an edge. In terms of the threaded union, if $\mathcal{G} = \{(G_1, v_1^{(1)}), (G_2, v_1^{(2)})\}$ and $G_1 = P_n$ and $G_2 = P_m$, where both n and m are odd, there are exactly

$$\frac{(n+1)(m+1)}{4}$$

distinct choices of pairs of bail vertices $(v_1^{(1)}, v_1^{(2)}) \in V(G_1) \times V(G_2)$ such that the threaded union $T_{K_2}[\mathcal{G}]$ has property (P) .

Again, for n , m and q all are odd, if $\mathcal{G} = \{(P_n, v_1^{(1)}), (P_m, v_1^{(2)}), (P_q, v_1^{(3)})\}$, then for any choice of bail vertices the threaded union $T_{P_3}[\mathcal{G}]$ does not have property (P) by Theorem 1.2 (since $n + m + q$ is odd).

These examples illustrate that the behavior of property (P) under threaded unions is subtle and highly sensitive to both the structure of the underlying graph H and the choice of bail vertices. Understanding precisely which combinations of component graphs and bail-vertex selections guarantee property (P) in threaded unions forms an interesting research direction. In particular, characterizing all pairs (or tuples) of graphs for which $T_H[\mathcal{G}]$ has property (P) despite some G_i failing property (P) appears to be a promising open problem.

3.6. Applications of Theorem 3.4. In this subsection, we illustrate the applicability of Theorem 3.4 by examining several classical graph families that can be viewed as threaded unions over suitable base graphs. Our goal is to determine when these graphs satisfy property (P) .

In particular, we focus on three important constructions: Lollipop graphs, barbell graphs, generalized barbell graphs and corona product of tree-cycle block graphs.

As a preliminary step, we first show that complete graphs K_n has property (P) for $n > 1$. This will play a crucial role in our subsequent discussions.

In the following result, we show that every complete graph has property (P) . Although this fact is likely known, we have not found a suitable reference in the literature, so we include a proof for completeness.

Theorem 3.19. *The complete graph K_n has the property (P) , for all $n(> 1)$.*

Proof. We consider a specific family of matrices for K_n .

Let $A_n[\alpha]$ be the $n \times n$ matrix with diagonal entries equal to α and all off-diagonal entries equal to 1.

$$A_n[\alpha] = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha & 1 & \dots & 1 \\ 1 & \alpha & \dots & 1 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & 1 & \dots & \alpha \end{bmatrix}$$

This matrix can be expressed as

$$A_n[\alpha] = (\alpha - 1)I_n + J_n,$$

where I_n is the $n \times n$ identity matrix and J_n is the $n \times n$ all-ones matrix.

To prove this theorem, we will find a value α_n such that for the matrix $A_n := A_n[\alpha_n]$, the P -vertex condition is met for all vertices. We will construct a nonsingular matrix A_n such that $\det(A_n(i)) = 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$.

The proof is based on a recursive hypothesis: the appropriate diagonal value α_n for the matrix A_n is a root of the determinant of the matrix $A_{n-1}[x]$. That is, $\det(A_{n-1}[\alpha_n]) = 0$.

Now, the determinant of the matrix $A_k[\alpha]$, $\det(A_k[\alpha]) = (\alpha + k - 1)(\alpha - 1)^{k-1}$. We seek a value α_n such that $\det(A_{n-1}[\alpha_n]) = 0$. We have:

$$(\alpha_n + (n - 1) - 1)(\alpha_n - 1)^{(n-1)-1} = (\alpha_n + n - 2)(\alpha_n - 1)^{n-2} = 0$$

This yields two potential solutions for α_n : $\alpha_n = 1$ or $\alpha_n = 2 - n$. The choice $\alpha_n = 1$ results in $A_n[1] = J_n$, which does not satisfy the P -vertex condition. We choose $\alpha_n = 2 - n$.

Let's define our matrix for K_n as $A_n = A_n[2 - n]$. We must verify two conditions.

(1) The eigenvalues of $A_n[2 - n]$ are obtained by substituting $\alpha = 2 - n$ and $k = n$:

- $\lambda_1 = (2 - n) + n - 1 = 1$
- $\lambda_2 = (2 - n) - 1 = 1 - n$

For $n \geq 2$, neither eigenvalue is zero. Thus, $A_n[2 - n]$ is nonsingular.

(2) A principal submatrix $A_n[2 - n](i)$ is formed by deleting row and column i from the matrix $A_n[2 - n]$. $A_n[2 - n](i) = A_{n-1}[2 - n]$. We need to find the nullity of this submatrix.

Let's compute the determinant of $A_{n-1}[2 - n]$.

$$\begin{aligned} \det(A_{n-1}[2 - n]) &= ((2 - n) + (n - 1) - 1)((2 - n) - 1)^{(n-1)-1} \\ &= (2 - n + n - 2)(1 - n)^{n-2} \\ &= (0)(1 - n)^{n-2} = 0 \end{aligned}$$

Since the determinant is zero, the matrix is singular. Therefore, $\det(A_n[2 - n](i)) = 0$.

We have shown that for the matrix $A_n = A_n[2 - n]$, $\det(A_n) \neq 0$ and $\det(A_n(i)) = 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$, completing the proof.

The constructed matrix has diagonal entries equal to $2 - n$ and all off-diagonal entries equal to 1. \square

3.6.1. The Lollipop Graph $L(m, n)$. The (m, n) -lollipop graph is a special type of graph, denoted by $L(m, n)$ consisting of a complete graph (clique) K_m on the m vertices and a path graph P_n on the n vertices, connected with a bridge.

Theorem 3.20. *The lollipop graph $L(m, n)$ has property (P) whenever $m > 1$ and n is even. Moreover, for every $n \geq 1$, the graph $L(m, n)$ has property (P) whenever $m > 2$.*

Proof. By Theorem 3.19, the complete graph K_m has property (P) for all $m > 1$.

Furthermore, by Theorem 1.1, the path P_n has property (P) when n is even.

Case 1: $m > 1$ and n is even.

Since both K_m and P_n have property (P), the lollipop graph

$$L(m, n) = T_{K_2}[\mathcal{G}] \text{ where } \mathcal{G} = \{(K_m, v_1^{(1)}), (P_n, v_1^{(2)})\}, v_1^{(1)} \in V(K_m) \text{ and } v_1^{(2)} \in V(P_n),$$

and $v_1^{(2)}$ is a pendant vertex in P_n .

Hence, $L(m, n)$ is a threaded union of two graphs with property (P) over K_2 . Therefore, by Theorem 3.4, $L(m, n)$ has property (P).

Case 2: n is odd and $m > 2$.

First consider the graph $L(m, 1) = K_m \cdot P_1$.

Since $m > 2$, by Theorem 3.19 the graph K_{m-1} has property (P), and therefore, $L(m, 1)$ also has property (P) by Theorem 2.7.

Now, let $n > 1$ be odd.

Observe that $L(m, n) = T_{K_2}[\mathcal{G}]$

where $\mathcal{G} = \{(L(m, 1), v_1^{(1)}), (P_{n-1}, v_1^{(2)})\}$, $v_1^{(1)} \in V(L(m, 1))$ and $v_1^{(2)} \in V(P_{n-1})$, and $v_1^{(2)}$ is a pendant vertex in P_{n-1} .

Since, $n - 1$ is even, P_{n-1} has property (P) . Hence, $L(m, 1)$ and P_{n-1} both have property (P) , and by Theorem 3.4, the entire lollipop graph $L(m, n)$ has property (P) . □




FIGURE 11. Lollipop Graph $L(6, 5)$

3.6.2. n -barbell graph and generalized barbell graph. The n -barbell graph is a simple graph obtained by connecting two copies of a complete graph K_n by a single bridge; it is denoted by $B(n)$.

A natural extension of this construction is the generalized barbell graph, formed by connecting two complete graphs K_m and K_n with a path of length $l (\geq 1)$. Generalized barbell graph is denoted as $B(m, n, l)$.




FIGURE 12. The generalized barbell graph $B(3, 4, 2)$.

The following Theorem describes precisely when these graphs satisfy property (P) .

Theorem 3.21. (1) The n -barbell graph $B(n)$ has property (P) for all $n \geq 1$.
 (2) For any path length $l \geq 1$, the generalized barbell graph $B(m, n, l)$ has property (P) , if $m > 2$ or $n > 2$.
 (3) The graph $B(2, 2, l)$ has property (P) , if and only if the path length l is odd.
 (4) If l is even and the complete graphs are K_1 and K_2 , so the resulting graph is $B(2, 1, l)$, then $B(2, 1, l)$ has property (P) .

Proof. (1) For $n = 1$, the graph $B(1)$ is simply K_2 , and hence it has property (P) .

For $n \geq 2$,

$$B(n) = T_{K_2}[\mathcal{G}] \text{ where } \mathcal{G} = \{(K_n, v_1^{(1)}), (K_n, v_1^{(2)})\},$$

for any bail vertices $v_1^{(1)}, v_1^{(2)} \in V(K_n)$. Since $n \geq 2$, K_n has property (P) (Theorem 3.19), it follows that $B(n)$ has property (P) for all $n \geq 2$ by Theorem 3.4.

Therefore, n -barbell graph $B(n)$ has property (P) for all $n \geq 1$.

(2) Suppose $m > 2$.

For $l = 1$, then

$$B(m, n, 1) = T_{K_2}[\mathcal{G}] \text{ where } \mathcal{G} = \{(K_m, v_1^{(1)}), (K_n, v_1^{(2)})\},$$

for any bail vertices $v_1^{(1)} \in V(K_m)$ and $v_1^{(2)} \in V(K_n)$. Therefore, by Theorem 3.4 $B(m, n, 1)$ has property (P) for any $n > 1$ (since, K_m and K_n both have property (P)).

If $n = 1$, $B(m, 1, 1) = L(m, 1)$; since $m > 2$, Theorem 3.20 implies $B(m, 1, 1)$ has property (P).

Now assume $l > 1$.

If $n > 1$,

$$B(m, n, l) = T_{K_2}[\mathcal{G}] \text{ where } \mathcal{G} = \{(L(m, l-1), v_1^{(1)}), (K_n, v_1^{(2)})\},$$

for any bail vertices $v_1^{(1)} \in V(L(m, l-1))$ and $v_1^{(2)} \in V(K_n)$. Because $m > 2$, Theorem 3.20 ensures that $L(m, l-1)$ has property (P), and thus, by Theorem 3.4, the graph $B(m, n, l)$ also has property (P).

If $n = 1$, $B(m, 1, l) = L(m, l)$, and since $m > 2$, Theorem 3.20 guarantees that $B(m, 1, l)$ has property (P).

(3) If $l = 1$, then $B(2, 2, 1) = B(2)$, and we have already established that $B(2)$ has property (P).

Now assume $l > 1$. When l is odd, the path joining the two copies of K_2 contains $l + 1$ vertices, an even number. Hence,

$$B(2, 2, l) = P_{l+3}.$$

Since $(l + 3)$ is even, it follows from Theorem 1.1 that $B(2, 2, l)$ has property (P).

Conversely, if l is even, then $l + 3$ is odd, and therefore $B(2, 2, l) = P_{l+3}$ does not have property (P) by Theorem 1.1.

(4) As the complete graphs are K_1 and K_2 , so $m = 2$ and $n = 1$. Let l be even. In this case,

$$B(2, 1, l) = P_{l+2},$$

which has property (P) since $l + 2$ is even.

□

3.6.3. The corona product $H \circ K_t$ for $n > 2$ and $t \geq 1$, when H is a tree-cycle block graph.

Definition 3.22. The corona product of graphs G and H , denoted by $G \circ H$, is obtained by taking one copy of G (called the center graph) and, for each vertex of G , attaching a distinct copy of H . Each vertex of G is then joined by an edge to every vertex of its corresponding copy of H .

Observation 3.23. Let H be a graph of order n . Let $G_1 = G_2 = \dots = G_n = K_p$, then

$$H \circ K_{p-1} = T_H[\mathcal{G}],$$

where $\mathcal{G} = \{(K_p, v_1^{(i)}) : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ for any choice of bail vertices $v_1^{(i)}$ in each K_p .

In [9], it was proved that the corona product $C_n \circ K_1$ has property (P) for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. More recently, in [16, Theorem 4.8], they established that the corona product $G \circ K_1$ has property (P) for any graph G . Here, instead of attaching K_1 , we consider K_t for any $t > 1$, and extend this result to tree-cycle block graphs as a consequence of Theorem 3.4,

Theorem 3.24. *Let G be a tree-cycle block graph. The corona product $G \circ K_t$ has property (P) for every $t > 1$.*

Proof. Let G be a tree-cycle block graph of order n . Since

$$G \circ K_t = T_G[\mathcal{G}],$$

where $\mathcal{G} = \{(K_t, v_1^{(i)}) : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ for any choice of bail vertices $v_1^{(i)} \in V(K_p)$.

From Theorem 3.19, we know that Complete graph, K_t has property (P) for all $t > 1$. Applying Theorem 3.4, we conclude $G \circ K_t$ has property (P). \square

3.7. Generalized threaded union over a graph. In the definition of the threaded union (Definition 3), each component G_i is attached to the rest of the construction through a *single* designated vertex, called the bail vertex.

This restriction ensures a one-to-one correspondence between the vertices of the thread graph H and the attachment points in the resulting graph $T_H[\mathcal{G}]$.

However, in many natural constructions, a subgraph may connect to its neighbors through *multiple* distinct vertices. To capture such configurations while maintaining a controlled attachment pattern, we extend the notion of threaded union as follows.

Definition 3.25 (Generalized threaded union over a graph). Let H be a simple graph with vertex set $V(H) = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$. For each vertex $v_i \in V(H)$, let $\deg_H(v_i) = t_i$.

Let

$$\mathcal{G} = \{(G_i, B_i) : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$$

be a collection of connected graphs G_i , where each G_i has vertex set

$$V(G_i) = \{v_1^{(i)}, v_2^{(i)}, \dots, v_{n_i}^{(i)}\},$$

and is equipped with a distinguished subset

$$B_i = \{b_1^{(i)}, b_2^{(i)}, \dots, b_{r_i}^{(i)}\} \subseteq V(G_i),$$

called the *set of bail vertices* of G_i , satisfying $1 \leq r_i \leq t_i$.

These bail vertices serve as the designated attachment points through which G_i connects to other components along H .

The *generalized threaded union* of the family \mathcal{G} over H , denoted by $T_H^*[\mathcal{G}]$, is the graph defined by

$$V(T_H^*[\mathcal{G}]) = \bigcup_{i=1}^n V(G_i),$$

and

$$E(T_H^*[\mathcal{G}]) = \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^n E(G_i) \right) \cup \left\{ (b_{p_{ij}}^{(i)}, b_{p_{ji}}^{(j)}) : (v_i, v_j) \in E(H) \right\},$$

where for each edge $(v_i, v_j) \in E(H)$, exactly one pair of bail vertices $b_{p_{ij}}^{(i)} \in B_i$ and $b_{p_{ji}}^{(j)} \in B_j$ are chosen and connected by an edge.

Thus, we begin with the disjoint union of all G_i , and for each edge (v_i, v_j) of H , we add precisely one edge between selected bail vertices of the corresponding components. The condition $r_i \leq \deg_H(v_i)$ ensures that each G_i has enough bail vertices to accommodate all of its incident connections in H .

The resulting graph $T_H^*[\mathcal{G}]$ is called the *generalized threaded union* of \mathcal{G} over H .

When each component G_i has exactly one bail vertex (that is, $r_i = 1$ for all i), the above construction reduces to the ordinary threaded union $T_H[\mathcal{G}]$. Thus, the generalized threaded union provides a natural extension that accommodates graphs where components attach to their neighbors through multiple distinct vertices.




FIGURE 13. Generalized threaded union $T_H^*[\mathcal{G}]$ for $H = K_{1,3}$. Each G_i is represented by a circle, and the shaded (yellow) nodes denote the designated bail vertices $v_j^{(i)}$, which are connected according to the adjacency in H .

To encompass a wider class of configurations, we introduced in Definition 3.25 the notion of the *generalized threaded union*, in which each component G_i may have up to $\deg_H(v_i)$ bail vertices.

When the underlying graph H is a tree, the acyclic structure ensures that multiple attachment points do not introduce additional dependencies among the components, and the same

inductive argument used in Theorem 3.4 remains valid. This yields the following extension of our main result.

Theorem 3.26. *Let H be a tree of order n .*

For each vertex $v_i \in V(H)$, let G_i be a connected graph that possesses property (P) , and let $B_i \subseteq V(G_i)$ denote the corresponding set of bail vertices satisfying

$$1 \leq |B_i| \leq \deg_H(v_i).$$

Consider the collection

$$\mathcal{G} = \{(G_i, B_i) : 1 \leq i \leq n\},$$

and let $T_H^[\mathcal{G}]$ denote the generalized threaded union of \mathcal{G} over H .*

Then the graph $T_H^[\mathcal{G}]$ also has property (P) . Moreover, this conclusion is independent of the specific choice of bail vertices $b_p^{(i)} \in B_i$ are chosen to realize the attachments dictated by the edges of H .*

Proof. Since H is a tree, every inter-component connection in $T_H^*[\mathcal{G}]$ corresponds to a unique edge of H and introduces no cycles between distinct components. Hence, $T_H^*[\mathcal{G}]$ can be constructed recursively by attaching each component G_i along a single bail vertex to a previously built partial graph that already has property (P) .

Because every G_i has property (P) , and each attachment occurs along a single designated vertex, the inductive argument used in Theorem 3.10 applies directly. Thus property (P) is preserved at every step of the construction and the final graph $T_H^*[\mathcal{G}]$ also satisfies property (P) .

Moreover, the proof depends only on the fact that each attachment is made through a single bail vertex— not in which specific vertex from B_i is chosen. Therefore, the conclusion holds for every permissible selection of attachment vertices within the sets B_i . \square

Building upon the structural observation of Theorem 3.14, we can further extend the conclusion to more broader configurations.

Theorem 3.27. *Let G be a connected graph, and let $\{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n\} \subseteq E(G)$ with $n > 2$.*

Assume that among these edges there exist at least three consecutive edges, say

$\{e_i, e_{i+1}, e_{i+2}\}$, together with distinct vertices $u, w \in V(G)$ such that

e_i and e_{i+1} share common vertex at u , and e_{i+1} and e_{i+2} share common vertex at w .

Let G_1, G_2, \dots, G_n be the connected components of $G - \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n\}$.

If each component G_j has property (P) for all $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, then the original graph G also has property (P) .

Proof. Since the set $\{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n\}$ contains three consecutive edges sharing two distinct vertices, we may relabel indices so that e_{n-2}, e_{n-1} , and e_n form such a triple.

Consider the subgraph

$$G'_1 = (V(G_1) \cup V(G_2) \cup \dots \cup V(G_{n-2}), E(G_1) \cup E(G_2) \cup \dots \cup E(G_{n-2}) \cup \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_{n-3}\}).$$

Since each of G_1, G_2, \dots, G_{n-2} has property (P) , and these components are joined only through the edges e_1, e_2, \dots, e_{n-3} , by Theorem 3.10, the subgraph G'_1 has property (P) .

The remaining edges e_{n-2}, e_{n-1}, e_n connect G'_1 to the components G_{n-1} and G_n through two distinct vertices in succession, exactly matching the configuration addressed in Theorem 3.14.

Applying Theorem 3.14, we conclude that the entire graph G also has property (P) . \square




FIGURE 14. e_{n-2} is adjacent to e_{n-1} via u and e_{n-1} is adjacent to e_n via w .

Remark 3.28. From Theorem 3.27 we can conclude that, if G_1, G_2, \dots, G_n all have property (P) , then the graph in Figure 14 has property (P) .

When a component has two distinct bail vertices corresponding to its two neighbors on the cycle, the resulting configuration produces three consecutive inter-component edges meeting at two distinct vertices—precisely the situation addressed by Theorem 3.27.

This observation yields the following extension of Theorem 3.4 to generalized threaded unions over cycles. This is an immediate consequence of Theorem 3.27.

Theorem 3.29. *Let $H = C_n$ be the cycle on $n \geq 3$ vertices, and let*

$$\mathcal{G} = \{(G_i, B_i) : 1 \leq i \leq n\},$$

where each G_i is a connected graph with property (P) and $B_i \subseteq V(G_i)$ is the corresponding set of bail vertices satisfying $1 \leq |B_i| \leq 2$ (so $|B_i| \leq \deg_H(v_i) = 2$).

If there exist two consecutive components, say G_j and G_{j+1} , for which $|B_j| = |B_{j+1}| = 1$ (that is, each of G_j and G_{j+1} has a unique bail vertex), then the generalized threaded union $T_H^[\mathcal{G}]$ also has property (P) . Moreover, this conclusion is independent of the specific choice of bail vertices $b_p^{(i)} \in B_i$ used to form the interconnections corresponding to the edges of H .*

Remark 3.30. Theorem 3.26 and Theorem 3.29 together provide a unified approach for constructing extensive families of graphs that retain property (P) .

In the tree-based setting (Theorem 3.26), the acyclic structure of the base graph H ensure that any choice of set of bail vertices B_i , with $1 \leq |B_i| \leq \deg_H(v_i)$, preserve property (P) in the generalized threaded union.

For cycle-based construction (Theorem 3.29), property (P) is likewise preserved, provided that at least one pair of consecutive components G_j and G_{j+1} each has a unique bail vertex.

Consequently, whenever the base graph is a tree-cycle block graph, that is, the deletion of all its cut-edges (bridges) results in connected components, each of which is either an isolated vertex or a cycle—the generalized threaded union over such graph continues to satisfy property (P) , as long as each component G_i has property (P) and cyclic blocks meet the condition described above. This allows the construction of extensive families of larger graphs from small components while maintaining property (P) .

DECLARATION OF COMPETING INTEREST

There is no competing interest.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Puja Samanta acknowledges funding received from the National Board for Higher Mathematics (NBHM) Ph.D. Scholarship (0203/8(28)/2023-R&D-II), Govt. of India, for carrying out this work. G. Arunkumar's research was supported by the NFIG grant of the Indian Institute of Technology Madras RF/22-23/0985/MA/NFIG/009003 and the SERB Startup Research Grant SRG/2022/001281.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Andelić, C. M. da Fonseca and R. Mamede, On the number of P-vertices of some graphs, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **434** (2011), no. 2, 514–525; MR2741238
- [2] M. Andelić, A. L. Erić and C. M. da Fonseca, Nonsingular acyclic matrices with full number of P-vertices, *Linear Multilinear Algebra* **61** (2013), no. 1, 49–57; MR3003041
- [3] Z. Du and C. M. da Fonseca, Nonsingular acyclic matrices with an extremal number of P-vertices, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **442** (2014), 2–19; MR3134347
- [4] Z. Du and C. M. da Fonseca, The singular acyclic matrices with maximal number of P-vertices, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **438** (2013), no. 5, 2274–2279; MR3005289
- [5] A. L. Erić and C. M. da Fonseca, The maximum number of P-vertices of some nonsingular double star matrices, *Discrete Math.* **313** (2013), no. 20, 2192–2194; MR3084262
- [6] I. García-Marco and K. B. Knauer, Beyond symmetry in generalized Petersen graphs, *J. Algebraic Combin.* **59** (2024), no. 2, 331–357; MR4713504
- [7] C. D. Godsil, Algebraic matching theory, *Electron. J. Combin.* **2** (1995), Research Paper 8, approx. 14 pp.; MR1323978
- [8] R. A. Horn and C. R. Johnson, *Matrix analysis*, second edition, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2013; MR2978290
- [9] A. Howlader, P. R. Raickwade and K. C. Sivakumar, The full P-vertex problem for unicyclic graphs, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **713** (2025), 74–89; MR4880009
- [10] C. R. Johnson, A. Leal-Duarte and C. M. Saigo, The Parter-Wiener theorem: refinement and generalization, *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.* **25** (2003), no. 2, 352–361; MR2047422

- [11] C. R. Johnson and B. D. Sutton, Hermitian matrices, eigenvalue multiplicities, and eigenvector components, *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.* **26** (2004/05), no. 2, 390–399; MR2124154
- [12] I.-J. Kim and B. L. Shader, Non-singular acyclic matrices, *Linear Multilinear Algebra* **57** (2009), no. 4, 399–407; MR2522851
- [13] I.-J. Kim and B. L. Shader, On Fiedler- and Parter-vertices of acyclic matrices, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **428** (2008), no. 11-12, 2601–2613; MR2416575
- [14] C. L. Lucchesi and U. S. R. Murty, *Perfect matchings—a theory of matching covered graphs*, Algorithms and Computation in Mathematics, 31, Springer, Cham, [2024] ©2024; MR4769470
- [15] S. V. Parter, On the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of a class of matrices, *J. Soc. Indust. Appl. Math.* **8** (1960), 376–388; MR0112894
- [16] K. Sharma and S. K. Panda, The P-vertex problem for symmetric matrices whose associated graphs admit perfect matchings, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **731** (2026), 109–138; MR4989797
- [17] G. M. Wiener, Spectral multiplicity and splitting results for a class of qualitative matrices, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **61** (1984), 15–29; MR0755246
- [18] D. B. West, *Introduction to graph theory*, Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ, 1996; MR1367739

INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY MADRAS, CHENNAI, INDIA.

Email address: garunkumar@iitm.ac.in

INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY MADRAS, CHENNAI, INDIA.

Email address: ma23d004@smail.iitm.ac.in