Article No. eujc.1999.0335 Available online at http://www.idealibrary.com on IDI *Europ. J. Combinatorics* (1999) **20**, 789–796



# **Strongly Closed Subgraphs in a Regular Thick Near Polygon**

#### AKIRA HIRAKI

In this paper we show that a regular thick near polygon has a tower of regular thick near subpolygons as strongly closed subgraphs if the diameter *d* is greater than the numerical girth *g*.

c 1999 Academic Press

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Brouwer and Wilbrink [\[3](#page-7-0)] studied a regular thick near polygon of the numerical girth  $g = 4$ and showed the existence of a tower of regular thick near sub-polygons.

On the other hand we gave a constructing method of strongly closed subgraphs in a distanceregular graph of arbitrary numerical girth [\[6](#page-7-1)].

The purpose of this paper is to apply this constructing method to regular thick near polygons of arbitrary numerical girth and to show the existence of a tower of regular thick near subpolygons as strongly closed subgraphs if the diameter *d* is larger than the numerical girth *g*.

First we recall our notation and terminology.

All graphs in this paper are undirected finite simple graphs. Let  $\Gamma$  be a connected graph with usual distance ∂<sub>Γ</sub>. We identify Γ with the set of vertices. The *diameter* of Γ, denoted by  $d_{\Gamma}$ , is the maximal distance of two vertices in  $\Gamma$ . Let  $u \in \Gamma$ . We denote by  $\Gamma_i(u)$  the set of vertices which are at distance *j* from *u*.

Let *x*,  $y \in \Gamma$  with  $\partial_{\Gamma}(x, y) = i$ . Define

$$
C(x, y) := \Gamma_{i-1}(x) \cap \Gamma_1(y),
$$
  
\n
$$
A(x, y) := \Gamma_i(x) \cap \Gamma_1(y)
$$
  
\nand 
$$
B(x, y) := \Gamma_{i+1}(x) \cap \Gamma_1(y).
$$

We say  $c_i$  *exists* if  $c_i = |C(x, y)|$  does not depend on the choice of x and y under the condition  $\partial_{\Gamma}(x, y) = i$ . Similarly, we say  $a_i$  *exists*, or  $b_i$  *exists*.

A connected graph  $\Gamma$  with the diameter  $d_{\Gamma}$  is said to be *distance-regular* if  $c_i$ ,  $a_i$  and  $b_{i-1}$ exist for all  $1 \leq i \leq d_{\Gamma}$ .

The reader is referred to [[1](#page-7-2)[, 2\]](#page-7-3) for more detailed descriptions of distance-regular graphs. Let  $\Gamma$  be a connected graph of the diameter  $d_{\Gamma} = d \geq 2$ .

For any  $x, y \in \Gamma$  and  $\emptyset \neq \Delta \subseteq \Gamma$ , we define

$$
\Delta^{\perp} := \{ z \in \Gamma \mid \partial_{\Gamma}(x, z) \le 1 \text{ for any } x \in \Delta \}
$$

and

$$
S(x, y) := \{y\} \cup C(x, y) \cup A(x, y) = \{y\}^{\perp} - B(x, y).
$$

We identify  $\Delta$  with the induced subgraph on it. A subgraph  $\Delta$  is called a *clique* (resp. *coclique*) if any two vertices on it are adjacent (resp. non-adjacent).

For  $v \in \Delta$ ,  $\Delta$  is said to be *strongly closed with respect to* v if  $S(v, v') \subseteq \Delta$  for any  $v' \in \Delta$ .  $\Delta$  is called *strongly closed* if it is strongly closed with respect to v for all  $v \in \Delta$ .

*Singular lines* of  $\Gamma$  are the sets of the form  $\{x, y\}^{\perp \perp}$  where  $(x, y)$  is an edge in  $\Gamma$ . In particular, a singular line of  $\Gamma$  is always a clique.

0195–6698/99/080789 + 08 \$30.00/0 c 1999 Academic Press

Let  $(NP)_j$  be the following condition:

 $(NP)_j$ : If  $x \in \Gamma$  and *L* is a singular line with  $\partial_{\Gamma}(x, L) := \min{\{\partial_{\Gamma}(x, z) \mid z \in L\}} = j$ , then there is a unique vertex  $y \in L$  such that  $\partial_{\Gamma}(x, y) = j$ .

We write  $(NP)_{\leq m}$  holds if  $(NP)_i$  holds for any  $1 \leq i \leq m$ .

Let *m* be an integer with  $1 \le m \le d$ .

 $\Gamma$  is said to be *of order* (*s*, *t*; *t*<sub>2</sub>, . . . , *t*<sub>*m*</sub>) if the following conditions hold.

- (1) All singular lines have size  $s + 1$  and all vertices lie on  $t + 1$  singular lines.
- (2)  $(NP)_{\leq m}$  holds.
- (3) For any  $1 \le i \le m$  and  $x, y \in \Gamma$  with  $\partial_{\Gamma}(x, y) = i$ , there are exactly  $t_i + 1$  singular lines containing *y* at distance  $i - 1$  from *x*, where  $t_1 := 0$ .

A graph  $\Gamma$  of order  $(s, t; t_2, \ldots, t_d)$  with the diameter  $d \geq 2$  is called (the collinearity graph of) *a regular near polygon.* A regular near polygon is called a *regular near*  $2d$ -gon if  $t_d = t$ , a *regular near* (2*d* + 1)*-gon* otherwise. A regular near polygon is also called a *regular thick near polygon* if  $s > 1$ .

It is known that regular near polygons are distance-regular (see Section [3](#page-3-0)).

More detailed descriptions of a regular near polygon will be found in [[1,](#page-7-2) Section III.3] and [[2,](#page-7-3) Section 6.4].

<span id="page-1-1"></span>The main results of this paper are the following.

THEOREM 1.1. Let r and m be positive integers with  $r + 1 \le m$ . Let  $\Gamma$  be a graph of order  $(s, t; t_2, \ldots, t_{m+r})$  with  $0 = t_1 = \cdots = t_r < t_{r+1}$ . Suppose  $s > 1$ . Then  $t_{r+1} < \cdots < t_{m-1} <$  $t_m$ *. Moreover, for any integer q with r* + 1  $\leq q \leq m$  *and any pair of vertices*  $(u, v)$  *at distance q*, there exists a regular near 2q-gon of order  $(s, t_q; t_2, \ldots, t_q)$  containing  $(u, v)$  as a strongly *closed subgraph in*  $\Gamma$ *.* 

As a direct consequence of our theorem we have the following.

COROLLARY 1.2. Let  $\Gamma$  be a regular thick near polygon of order  $(s, t; t_2, \ldots, t_d)$  with 0 =  $t_1$  = · · · =  $t_r$  <  $t_{r+1}$ . If 2 $r + 1 \le d$ , then  $t_{r+1}$  < · · · <  $t_{d-r}$  and for any integer q with *r* + 1 ≤ *q* ≤ *d* − *r* there exists a regular near 2*q*-gon of order  $(s, t_q; t_2, ..., t_q)$  as a strongly *closed subgraph in*  $\Gamma$ .

Our results are generalizations of the result of Brouwer and Wilbrink [\[3](#page-7-0)] and an application of the result of [[6\]](#page-7-1).

In Section [2](#page-1-0), we recall the method and results introduced in the previous paper [\[6](#page-7-1)]. In Section [3,](#page-3-0) we collect several basic properties and show that regular near polygons are distanceregular. We prove our main theorem in Section [4.](#page-5-0)

## <span id="page-1-2"></span>2. STRONGLY CLOSED SUBGRAPHS

<span id="page-1-0"></span>In this section, we recall a constructing method of strongly closed subgraphs and the results obtained in the previous paper [[6\]](#page-7-1). For the proofs and more detailed descriptions the reader is referred to [\[6](#page-7-1)].

Let  $\Gamma$  be a distance-regular graph of the diameter  $d_{\Gamma} = d \geq 2$ . Fix an integer *q* with  $1 \leq q < d$ .

A quadruple (w, *x*, *y*,*z*) of vertices is called a *root of size q* if

$$
\partial_{\Gamma}(w, x) = \partial_{\Gamma}(y, z) = q, \qquad \partial_{\Gamma}(w, y) \le 1, \qquad \partial_{\Gamma}(x, z) \le 1, \n\partial_{\Gamma}(w, z) \le q \qquad \text{and} \qquad \partial_{\Gamma}(x, y) \le q.
$$

A triple  $(x, y, z)$  of vertices with  $\partial_{\Gamma}(x, z) = \partial_{\Gamma}(y, z) = q$  is called a *conron of size q* if there exist three sequences of vertices

 $(x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_m = x),$   $(y_0, y_1, \ldots, y_m = y)$  and  $(z_0, z_1, \ldots, z_m = z)$ 

such that  $\partial_{\Gamma}(x_0, y_0) \leq 1$ ,  $(x_{i-1}, z_{i-1}, x_i, z_i)$  and  $(y_{i-1}, z_{i-1}, y_i, z_i)$  are roots of size q for all  $1 \leq i \leq m$ .

The conditions  $(SS)_{q}$ ,  $(CR)_{q}$  and  $(SC)_{q}$  are defined as follow:

- $(SS)_{q}$ :  $S(x, z) = S(y, z)$  for any triple of vertices  $(x, y, z)$ with  $\partial_{\Gamma}(x, z) = \partial_{\Gamma}(y, z) = q$  and  $\partial_{\Gamma}(x, y) \leq 1$ .
- $(CR)_q$ :  $S(x, z) = S(y, z)$  for any conron  $(x, y, z)$  of size q.
- $(SC)<sub>a</sub>$ : For any given pair of vertices at distance *q*, there exists a strongly closed subgraph of the diameter *q* containing them.

We also write  $(SS)_{< t}$  holds if  $(SS)_i$  holds for any  $1 \leq i < t$ .

DEFINITION 2.1. Let  $\Gamma$  be a distance-regular graph and *q* be a fixed integer with *b*<sub>*q*−1</sub> > *b*<sup>*q*</sup> . Assume  $(CR)_q$  holds. Let *u*,  $v \in \Gamma$  with  $\partial_{\Gamma}(u, v) = q$ . For any *x*, *y* ∈  $\Gamma_q(u)$  define the relation  $x \approx y$  iff  $(x, y, u)$  is a conron of size q. Then this is an equivalence relation on  $\Gamma_q(u)$ . (See [\[6](#page-7-1), Lemma 2.2(2)].) Let  $\Psi(u, v)$  be the equivalence class containing v. Define

$$
\Delta(u, v) := \{x \in \Gamma \mid \partial_{\Gamma}(u, x) + \partial_{\Gamma}(x, z) = q \text{ for some } z \in \Psi(u, v)\}
$$

the subgraph induced on all vertices lying on shortest paths between *u* and vertices in  $\Psi(u, v)$ .

**PROPOSITION 2.2** [6, Theorem 1.1]. Let  $\Gamma$  be a distance-regular graph and q be a fixed *integer with bq*−<sup>1</sup> > *b<sup>q</sup>* . *Suppose the following conditions hold.*

- (i)  $(SS)_{\leq q}$  *holds*,
- (ii)  $(CR)_q$  *holds and*  $\Delta(w, x) = \Delta(y, z)$  *if*  $(w, x, y, z)$  *is a root of size q.*

*Then for any pair of vertices*  $(u, v)$  *in*  $\Gamma$  *at distance q,*  $\Delta(u, v)$  *is a strongly closed subgraph of the diameter q which is*  $(c_q + a_q)$ *-regular. In particular,*  $(SC)_q$  *holds.* 

A *circuit* of length *m* is a sequence of distinct vertices  $(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{m-1})$  such that  $(x_{i-1},$  $x_i$ ) is an edge of  $\Gamma$  for all  $1 \le i \le m$ , where  $x_m = x_0$ . A circuit of length *m* is called *reduced* if  $m \geq 4$  and any proper subset of it does not form a circuit. A shortest reduced circuit is called a *minimal circuit*. The *numerical girth* of  $\Gamma$ , denoted by  $g$ , is the length of a minimal circuit.

PROPOSITION 2.3 [\[6](#page-7-1), Proposition 3.1(2)]. Let q be a positive integer. Let  $\Gamma$  be a distance*regular graph with the numerical girth*  $g = 2r + 2$ *, the diameter*  $d \geq q + r$ *. If the following conditions* (a) *and* (b) *hold, then*  $(CR)_q$  *holds.* 

- (a) Let  $u, v, p, p' \in \Gamma$  with  $\partial_{\Gamma}(u, p) = \partial_{\Gamma}(v, p) = q$ ,  $\partial_{\Gamma}(u, v) \leq 1$  and  $\partial_{\Gamma}(p, p') = r$ . *Then*  $\partial_{\Gamma}(u, p') = q + r$  *implies*  $\partial_{\Gamma}(v, p') = q + r$ .
- (b) Let  $(w, x, y, z)$  be a root of size q with  $x \neq z$  and  $(x = x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_r, z_r, \ldots, z_0 = z)$ *be a minimal circuit. Then*  $\partial_{\Gamma}(w, x_r) = q + r$  *implies*  $\partial_{\Gamma}(y, z_r) = q + r$ .

LEMMA 2.4 [[6,](#page-7-1) Lemmas 2.4 and 2.6]. *Let*  $\Gamma$  *be a distance-regular graph with*  $b_{q-1} > b_q$ *and* (*C R*)*<sup>q</sup> holds. Then we have the following.*

- (1) *If*  $(w, x, y, z)$  *is a root of size q, then*  $\Psi(y, z) \subseteq \Delta(w, x)$ *.*
- (2) If  $(SS)_{ holds, then for any pair of vertices  $(u, v)$  at distance q,  $\Delta(u, v)$  is strongly$ *closed with respect to u.*

LEMMA 2.5 [[6](#page-7-1), Lemma 4.4]. Let  $\Gamma$  be a distance-regular graph of the diameter  $d_{\Gamma}$ , and *h* be an integer with  $h < d_{\Gamma}$ . Assume  $c_{h+1} > 1$ ,  $b_{h-1} > b_h$  and  $(SC)_h$  holds. If there exist *a vertex u and a path*  $(x_0, \ldots, x_h)$  *of length h such that*  $\partial_{\Gamma}(x_0, x_h) = \partial_{\Gamma}(u, x_i) = h$  for all  $0 \le i \le h$ , then  $a_h \le a_{h+1}$ .

REMARK. For the results in this section  $\Gamma$  need not be a distance-regular graph. Suppose  $\Gamma$  is a graph such that  $c_i$ ,  $a_i$  and  $b_i$  exist for all  $0 \le i \le q$ . Then the results are proved by the same manner as in [\[6](#page-7-1)].

Let  $\Delta$  be a strongly closed subgraph of the diameter *q* in  $\Gamma$ . Then  $c_i$  and  $a_i$  of  $\Delta$  exist for all  $1 \leq i \leq q$  which are the same as those of  $\Gamma$ . Moreover, if  $\Delta$  is a regular graph of valency  $k_{\Delta}$ , then  $b_i$  of  $\Delta$  exists with  $b_i = k_{\Delta} - c_i - a_i$  for all  $0 \le i \le q - 1$ , and hence it is distance-regular.

### <span id="page-3-3"></span><span id="page-3-1"></span>3. SOME BASIC PROPERTIES

<span id="page-3-0"></span>In this section we collect some basic properties and prove the following result.

PROPOSITION 3.1. Let  $\Gamma$  *be a graph of order*  $(s, t; t_2, \ldots, t_m)$ *. Then*  $(SS)_{\leq m}$  *holds. Moreover, c*<sub>*i*</sub>,  $a_{i-1}$  *and*  $b_{i-1}$  *exist for all*  $1 \leq i \leq m$  *which satisfy* 

 $c_i = t_i + 1$ ,  $a_{i-1} = (t_{i-1} + 1)(s - 1)$  and  $b_{i-1} = s(t - t_{i-1})$ ,

*where*  $t_0 = -1$  *and*  $t_1 = 0$ *.* 

*In particular, regular near polygons are distance-regular.*

Throughout this section  $\Gamma$  denotes a graph of the diameter  $d_{\Gamma} = d \geq 2$ .

LEMMA 3.2. *Suppose*  $(NP)_h$  *holds. Then*  $(SS)_h$  *holds.* 

PROOF. Let  $(x, y, z)$  be a triple of vertices with  $\partial_{\Gamma}(x, z) = \partial_{\Gamma}(y, z) = h$  and  $\partial_{\Gamma}(x, y) \leq 1$ . Suppose there exists  $w \in S(y, z) - S(x, z)$  to derive a contradiction. Then we have  $\partial_{\Gamma}(x, w) =$  $h + 1$ ,  $\partial_{\Gamma}(x, y) = 1$  and  $\partial_{\Gamma}(y, w) = h$ . As  $(NP)_h$  holds, there exists  $v \in \{z, w\}^{\perp}$  $\Gamma_{h-1}(y)$ . Then  $\partial_{\Gamma}(x, v) = h$  from the triangle inequality on  $(x, y, w, v)$ . This shows  $\{v, z\} \subseteq$  ${x \in S(y, z) \subseteq S(x, z)}$ . By symmetry we *z*<sub>{*z*</sub>, *w*}<sup>⊥⊥</sup> ∩ Γ<sub>*h*</sub>(*x*) contradicting our assumption. Hence *S*(*y*, *z*) ⊆ *S*(*x*, *z*). By symmetry we have  $S(x, z) = S(y, z)$ .

<span id="page-3-2"></span>LEMMA 3.3. *If*  $(SS)_{\leq h}$  *holds, then the following hold.* 

- *(1)*  $C(u, x)$  *is a coclique for any*  $u, x \in \Gamma$  *with*  $\partial_{\Gamma}(u, x) = i \leq h$ .
- *(2)* Let  $1 \le m < h$  and  $(u, v, p, p')$  be a quadruple of vertices with  $\partial_{\Gamma}(u, p) = \partial_{\Gamma}(v, p)$  $m, \partial_{\Gamma}(u, v) \leq 1$  *and*  $\partial_{\Gamma}(p, p') = h - m$ . Then  $\partial_{\Gamma}(u, p') = h$  *implies*  $\partial_{\Gamma}(v, p') = h$ .
- PROOF. (1) We prove the assertion by induction on *i*. The case  $i = 1$  is clear. Let 2 <  $i \leq h$ . Suppose there exists an edge  $(v, z)$  in  $C(u, x)$ . Let  $v \in C(v, u) \subseteq C(x, u)$ . From our inductive assumption  $C(v, x)$  is a coclique and thus  $\partial_{\Gamma}(v, z) = i - 1$ . Then  $\partial_{\Gamma}(u, z) = \partial_{\Gamma}(v, z) = i - 1$  and  $x \in S(v, z) - S(u, z)$  contradicting our assumption.

(2) Let ( $p = p_m$ ,  $p_{m+1}$ , ...,  $p_h = p'$ ) be a shortest path connecting them. Assume  $\partial_{\Gamma}(u, \mathbf{r})$  $p'$  = *h*. Then we have  $\partial_{\Gamma}(u, p_i) = i$  for all  $m \le i \le h$ . Since  $(SS)_m$  holds, we have  $S(u, p_m) = S(v, p_m)$ . This implies  $p_{m+1} \in B(u, p_m) = B(v, p_m)$  and  $\partial_{\Gamma}(u, p_{m+1}) =$  $\partial_{\Gamma}(v, p_{m+1}) = m + 1$ . Inductively, we have  $p_i \in B(u, p_{i-1}) = B(v, p_{i-1})$  and  $\partial_{\Gamma}(v, p_i) = i$  for all  $m + 1 \leq i \leq h$ . The desired result is proved.

Next we show the following well-known result.

LEMMA 3.4. *Let*  $2 \le h \le d$ . *Suppose*  $a_1$  *and*  $c_i$  *exist* for all  $1 \le i \le h$ . *Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

- $(i)$   $(NP)_{\leq h}$  *holds.*
- *(ii)* For any  $1 \le i \le h$  and any pair of vertices *u* and *x* at distance *i*, we have  $C(u, x)$  *is a coclique and*

<span id="page-4-0"></span>
$$
\bigcup_{z \in C(u,x)} A(z,x) \subseteq A(u,x). \tag{*}
$$

*Moreover if*  $i \neq h$ *, then the equality holds.* 

*(iii)* There exists no induced subgraph  $K_{2,1,1}$  and  $a_i$  exists with  $a_i = c_i a_1$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq h$ .

PROOF. (i)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii): The first assertion follows from Lemmas [3.2](#page-3-1) and [3.3](#page-3-2). Assume *i* < *h*. Take any  $y \in A(u, x)$ . Then there exists  $z \in \{x, y\}^{\perp \perp} \cap \Gamma_{i-1}(u)$  as  $(NP)_i$  holds. Hence *y* is in the left-hand side of (∗).

(ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (iii): Γ has no induced subgraph  $K_{2,1,1}$  since  $C(u, u')$  is a coclique for any *u* and *u'* at distance 2. This implies that the left-hand side of (∗) is a disjoint union and

 $\mathbf{I}$ 

 $\mathbf{r}$ 

$$
|A(u, x)| = \left| \bigcup_{z \in C(u, x)} A(z, x) \right| = c_i a_1
$$

for any  $u, x \in \Gamma$  with $\partial_{\Gamma}(u, x) = i < h$ . Thus the desired result follows.

(iii)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii): We prove the assertion by induction on *i*. The case  $i = 1$  is clear. If there exists an edge  $(y, z)$  in  $C(u, x)$ , then  $z \in A(u, y)$  and there exists  $w \in C(u, y)$  such that  $z \in A(u, y)$  $A(w, y)$  from our inductive hypothesis. Then  $(w, y, z, x)$  forms  $K_{2,1,1}$  which contradicts our assumption. Hence  $C(u, x)$  is a coclique and the left-hand side of (\*) is included in  $A(u, x)$ . Comparing the sizes of both sides we have the assertion.

(ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i): Let *u* ∈  $\Gamma$  and *L* be a singular line of  $\Gamma$  such that  $\partial_{\Gamma}(u, L) = i \langle h \rangle$ . If there exist distinct vertices *x* and *x'* in *L* such that  $\partial_{\Gamma}(u, x) = \partial_{\Gamma}(u, x') = i$ , then

$$
x' \in A(u, x) = \bigcup_{z \in C(u, x)} A(z, x).
$$

Thus there exists  $z \in C(u, x)$  such that  $x' \in A(z, x)$ . Then we have  $z \in \{x, x'\}^{\perp \perp} = L$  which contradicts  $\partial_{\Gamma}(u, L) = i$ .

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3.1. The first assertion is a direct consequence of Lemma [3.2.](#page-3-1)

Since all singular lines have size  $s + 1$  and all vertices lie on  $t + 1$  singular lines,  $c_1$ ,  $a_1$ , *a*<sub>0</sub> and *b*<sub>0</sub> exist such that  $c_1 = 1$ ,  $a_1 = s - 1$ ,  $a_0 = 0$  and  $b_0 = s(t + 1)$ . For any integer *i* with  $1 \le i \le m$  and any vertices  $x, y \in \Gamma$  at distance *i*, there are exactly  $t_i + 1$  singular lines containing *y* at distance  $i - 1$  from *x*, and each singular line has unique vertex at distance  $i - 1$ from *x*. It follows that  $c_i$  exists with  $c_i = t_i + 1$ . Then Lemma [3.4](#page-4-0) shows that  $a_i$  and  $b_i$  exist such that  $a_i = c_i a_1 = (t_i + 1)(s - 1)$  and  $b_i = b_0 - c_i - a_i = s(t - t_i)$  for all  $1 \le i \le m - 1$ .

If  $m = d$ , then  $b_m$  exists with  $b_m = 0$  and hence  $a_m$  exists with  $a_m = b_0 - c_m$ . Hence  $\Gamma$  is  $distance$ -regular. The proposition is proved.  $\Box$ 

From a basic property of graphs we have the following corollary.

COROLLARY 3.5. *For a graph of order*  $(s, t; t_2, \ldots, t_m)$ *, we have*  $0 \le t_2 \le \cdots \le t_m$ *.* 

The rest of this section we prove the following result.

LEMMA 3.6. Let q be a positive integer and  $\Gamma$  be a graph of the diameter  $d_{\Gamma} > q$  such that  $B(x, y) \neq \emptyset$  for any  $x, y \in \Gamma$  *with*  $\partial_{\Gamma}(x, y) = i \leq q$ . Suppose  $(SC)_q$  holds. Then  $(SS)_{\leq q}$ *holds.*

PROOF. Let  $(x, y, z)$  be a triple of vertices with  $\partial_{\Gamma}(x, y) \le 1$  and  $\partial_{\Gamma}(x, z) = \partial_{\Gamma}(y, z)$ *h* ≤ *q*. Suppose there exists  $w \text{ ∈ } S(y, z) - S(x, z)$  to derive a contradiction. Then  $\partial_{\Gamma}(x, w) =$ *h* + 1,  $\partial_{\Gamma}(x, y) = 1$  and  $\partial_{\Gamma}(y, w) = h$ . Let  $w_h := w$  and take  $w_i \in B(x, w_{i-1}) \subseteq B(y, w_{i-1})$ for  $h + 1 \le i \le q$ . Then  $\partial_{\Gamma}(x, w_q) = q + 1$  and  $\partial_{\Gamma}(y, w_q) = q$ . Since  $(SC)_q$  holds, there exists a strongly closed subgraph  $\Delta$  of the diameter *q* containing  $(y, w_q)$ . Then  $w_h \in \Delta$  as it is on a shortest path between *y* and  $w_q$ . Thus  $z \in S(y, w_h) \subseteq \Delta$  and  $x \in S(z, y) \subseteq \Delta$ . We have  $q + 1 = \partial_{\Gamma}(x, w_q) \leq d_{\Delta} = q$ , which is a contradiction. The lemma is proved.

REMARK.  $\Gamma$  has no induced subgraph  $K_{2,1,1}$  iff  $(SS)_1$  holds. More information about the relations among  $(SS)_h$ ,  $(CR)_i$  and  $(SC)_j$ , the reader is referred to [\[6](#page-7-1),7].

#### <span id="page-5-3"></span>4. PROOF OF THE THEOREM

<span id="page-5-0"></span>In this section we prove our main theorem. First we prove the following result.

**PROPOSITION 4.1.** Let  $\Gamma$  be a graph such that  $c_i$ ,  $a_i$  and  $b_i$  exist for all  $i \leq q$  with  $a_1 > 0$ *and*  $b_{q-1}$  >  $b_q$ . Suppose  $(CR)_q$  *and*  $(SS)_{\leq q}$  *hold. Then*  $\Delta(w, x) = \Delta(y, z)$  *for any root*  $(w, x, y, z)$  *of size q. In particular,*  $(SC)<sub>q</sub>$  *holds.* 

PROOF. The second assertion follows from Proposition 2.2 and the first assertion.

Let  $(w, x, y, z)$  be a root of size q. Suppose  $\Delta(y, z) \nsubseteq \Delta(w, x)$  to derive a contradiction. We take a vertex  $p \in \Delta(y, z) - \Delta(w, x)$  that has the maximal distance from *y*. Let  $m :=$  $\partial_{\Gamma}(y, p) = \max{\{\partial_{\Gamma}(y, v) \mid v \in \Delta(y, z) - \Delta(w, x)\}}$ . There exists  $z' \in \Psi(y, z)$  such that *p* is on a shortest path between *y* and *z'*. We have  $p \notin \Psi(y, z)$  from Lemma 2.4(1) and thus  $z' \neq p$ . Take  $p' \in C(z', p) \subseteq B(y, p)$ . Since  $p'$  is on a shortest path between *y* and *z*  $\left\langle x, y \right\rangle$  and  $\left\langle y, z \right\rangle$  and hence  $p' \in \Delta(w, x)$  from the maximality of *m*. We have  $\partial_{\Gamma}(w, p) = \partial_{\Gamma}(w, p') + 1$ , otherwise  $p \in S(w, p') \subseteq \Delta(w, x)$  from Lemma 2.4(2). The triangle inequality on  $(w, y, p, p')$  implies  $\partial_{\Gamma}(w, p') = \partial_{\Gamma}(y, p) = m$ ,  $\partial_{\Gamma}(w, y) = 1$  and  $\partial_{\Gamma}(w, p) = \partial_{\Gamma}(y, p') = m + 1$ . We can take  $v \in A(p, p')$  as  $a_1 > 0$ . Then  $\partial_{\Gamma}(w, v) =$  $\partial_{\Gamma}(y, v) = m + 1$  from Lemma [3.3\(](#page-3-2)1). Lemma 2.4(2) implies  $v \in A(y, p') \subseteq \Delta(y, z)$  and thus  $v \in \Delta(w, x)$  from the maximality of *m*. Hence we have  $p \in A(w, v) \subseteq \Delta(w, x)$  from Lemma 2.4(2). This is a contradiction. Therefore  $\Delta(y, z) \subseteq \Delta(w, x)$ .

By symmetry, we have  $\Delta(w, x) = \Delta(y, z)$ . The proposition is proved.

<span id="page-5-1"></span>Next we prove the following result.

**PROPOSITION 4.2.** Let r and q be positive integers with  $r + 1 \leq q$ . Let  $\Gamma$  be a graph with *the numerical girth g* =  $2r + 2$ *, the diameter*  $d_{\Gamma} \geq q + r$  *such that*  $c_i$ *,*  $a_i$  *and*  $b_i$  *exist for all i* ≤ *q* with  $a_1 > 0$  *and*  $b_{q-1} > b_q$ . Suppose  $(NP)_q$  *and*  $(SS)_{\leq q+r}$  *hold. Then*  $(CR)_q$  *and*  $(SC)$ <sub>q</sub> hold.

<span id="page-5-2"></span>To show this we prove the conditions (a) and (b) of Proposition 2.3 hold.

LEMMA 4.3. Let  $\Gamma$  be a graph as in Proposition [4.2](#page-5-1) satisfying  $(NP)_q$  and  $(SS)_{\leq q+r}$ . *Let*  $(x, x', z, z')$  *be a quadruple of vertices with*  $\partial_{\Gamma}(x, z) = \partial_{\Gamma}(x', z') = 1$ ,  $\partial_{\Gamma}(x, x') = 1$  $\partial_{\Gamma}(z, z') = r$  and  $\partial_{\Gamma}(x, z') = \partial_{\Gamma}(z, x') = r + 1$ . Then the following hold.

- *(1) Let*  $p \in \Gamma_q(x) \cap \Gamma_q(z)$ . Then  $\partial_{\Gamma}(p, x') = q + r$  implies  $\partial_{\Gamma}(p, z') = q + r$ .
- (2) Let  $u \in \Gamma_q(x) \cap \Gamma_{q-1}(z)$  and  $v \in \Gamma_{q-1}(x) \cap \Gamma_q(z)$  with  $\partial_{\Gamma}(u, v) = 1$ . Then  $\partial_{\Gamma}(u, x') =$  $q + r$  *implies*  $\partial_{\Gamma}(v, z') = q + r$ .
- (3) Let  $w, y \in \Gamma$  such that  $(w, x, y, z)$  is a root of size q. Then  $\partial_{\Gamma}(w, x') = q + r$  implies  $\partial_{\Gamma}(y, z') = q + r.$

PROOF. Note that  $C(\alpha, \beta)$  is a coclique if  $\partial_{\Gamma}(\alpha, \beta) \leq q + r$  from Lemma [3.3](#page-3-2)(1).

- (1) Since  $(NP)_q$  holds, there exists  $p' \in A(x, z) \cap \Gamma_{q-1}(p)$ . Then we have  $\partial_{\Gamma}(x', p') =$  $\partial_{\Gamma}(z', p') = r + 1$ . Applying Lemma [3.3](#page-3-2)(2) to  $(x', z', p', p)$  we have the assertion.
- (2) We have  $\partial_{\Gamma}(v, x') = q + r 1$  from the triangle inequality on  $(v, u, x, x')$ . Let  $p \in$ *A*(*u*, *v*). Then we have  $\partial_{\Gamma}(x, p) = \partial_{\Gamma}(z, p) = q$  and  $\partial_{\Gamma}(p, x') = q + r$ . Hence  $\partial_{\Gamma}(p, z') = q + r$  from (1). Thus  $\partial_{\Gamma}(u, z') = q + r - 1$  from the triangle inequality on  $(u, p, z, z')$ . Therefore  $\partial_{\Gamma}(v, z') = q + r$  since  $C(z', p)$  is a coclique.
- (3) Since  $(w, x, y, z)$  is a root of size q, we have  $\{\partial_{\Gamma}(w, z), \partial_{\Gamma}(x, y)\} \subseteq \{q 1, q\}$ . If  $\partial_{\Gamma}(w, z) = \partial_{\Gamma}(x, y) = q - 1$ , then the assertion follows from (2). If  $\partial_{\Gamma}(w, z) = q$ , then  $\partial_{\Gamma}(w, z') = q + r$  from (1). Applying Lemma [3.3\(](#page-3-2)2) to  $(w, y, z, z')$ we have  $\partial_{\Gamma}(y, z') = q + r$ . If  $\partial_{\Gamma}(x, y) = q$ , then  $\partial_{\Gamma}(y, x') = q + r$  by applying Lemma [3.3\(](#page-3-2)2) to  $(w, y, x, x')$ . Therefore  $\partial_{\Gamma}(y, z') = q + r$  from (1). In each case we have  $\partial_{\Gamma}(y, z') = q + r$ . The lemma is proved.

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 4.2. Conditions (a) and (b) of Proposition 2.3 hold from Lem-mas [3.3\(](#page-3-2)2) and [4.3](#page-5-2)(3). Hence  $(CR)_q$  holds. Therefore  $(SC)_q$  holds from Proposition [4.1.](#page-5-3)  $\Box$ 

<span id="page-6-0"></span>LEMMA 4.4. Let  $\Gamma$  *be a graph of order* (*s*, *t*; *t*<sub>2</sub>, . . . , *t*<sub>*h*</sub>) *with s* > 1. *If t*<sub>*h*-1</sub> < *t*<sub>*h*</sub>, *then there exist a vertex u and a path*  $(x_0, \ldots, x_h)$  *of length h in*  $\Gamma$  *such that*  $\partial_{\Gamma}(x_0, x_h) = \partial_{\Gamma}(u, x_i) = h$ *for all*  $0 < i < h$ *.* 

**PROOF.** Fix a vertex *u* in  $\Gamma$ . First we claim that  $A(u, w) \cap B(v, w) \neq \emptyset$  for any  $v, w \in \mathbb{R}$  $\Gamma_h(u)$  with  $\partial_{\Gamma}(v, w) = i < h$ . Suppose  $A(u, w) \cap B(v, w) = \emptyset$ . Then

$$
A(u, w) \subseteq C(v, w) \cup A(v, w).
$$

The right-hand side is a disjoint union of  $(t<sub>i</sub> + 1)$  cliques of size *s* and the left-hand side contains a disjoint union of  $(t_h + 1)$  cliques of size  $s - 1$  from Lemma [3.4.](#page-4-0) This contradicts  $t_i \leq t_{h-1} < t_h$ . Hence our claim is proved.

Take  $x_0 \in \Gamma_h(u)$ . Inductively we can take  $x_i \in A(u, x_{i-1}) \cap B(x_0, x_{i-1})$  for all  $1 \le i \le h$ from our claim. The lemma is proved.  $\Box$ 

PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1. Proposition [3.1](#page-3-3) shows that  $c_i$ ,  $a_{i-1}$  and  $b_{i-1}$  exist for all  $i \leq$  $m + r$  such that

 $c_i = t_i + 1$ ,  $a_{i-1} = (t_{i-1} + 1)(s - 1)$  and  $b_{i-1} = s(t - t_{i-1})$ .

In particular,  $(SS)_{< m+r}$  holds and  $\Gamma$  has the numerical girth  $g = 2r + 2$ .

We prove  $t_{h-1} < t_h$  and  $(SC)_h$  holds for all  $r + 1 \le h \le m$  by induction on  $h$ .

From our assumption we have  $t_r < t_{r+1}$  and hence  $b_r > b_{r+1}$ . Hence  $(SC)_{r+1}$  holds from Proposition [4.2.](#page-5-1)

Let  $r+1 \leq h < m$ . Suppose  $t_{h-1} < t_h$  and  $(SC)_h$  holds. Then  $a_h < a_{h+1}$  from Lemmas [4.4](#page-6-0) and 2.5. Thus  $t_h < t_{h+1}$  and  $(SC)_{h+1}$  holds from Proposition [4.2.](#page-5-1) Note that  $c_i$  and  $a_i$  of a strongly closed subgraph are the same as those of  $\Gamma$ . The theorem is proved.  $\Box$ 

REMARK. A regular near 2*d*-gon of order (*s*, *t*;*t*2, . . . , *t<sup>d</sup>* ) is called a *generalized* 2*d-gon of order*  $(s, t)$  if  $t_1 = \cdots = t_{d-1} = 0$  and  $t_d = t$ .

Feit and Higman showed that a generalized  $2d$ -gon has  $d \in \{2, 3, 4, 6\}$ , unless it is an ordinary polygon (see [[4\]](#page-7-5) or [[2,](#page-7-3) Theorem 6.5.1]).

Let *r* and *m* be positive integers with  $r+1 \le m$ . Let  $\Gamma$  be a graph of order  $(s, t; t_2, \ldots, t_{m+r})$ with  $s > 1$  and  $0 = t_1 = \cdots = t_r < t_{r+1}$ . Theorem [1.1](#page-1-1) shows that a graph  $\Gamma$  has a generalized  $2(r + 1)$ -gon of order  $(s, t_{r+1})$  as a strongly closed subgraph. Hence we have  $r \in \{1, 2, 3, 5\}$ from the result of Feit and Higman. This result was first proved in [[5\]](#page-7-6).

Here we conjecture the following.

CONJECTURE. Let  $\Gamma$  be a regular thick near polygon of the diameter *d* and the numerical girth  $g \geq 6$ . Then  $d < g$ .

Suppose  $\Gamma$  is a regular thick near polygon of order  $(s, t; t_2, \ldots, t_d)$  with the numerical girth  $g = 2r + 2 \ge 6$ . Suppose  $2r + 2 \le d$ . Then Corollary [1.2](#page-1-2) shows that  $0 = t_1 = \cdots = t_r$  $t_{r+1} < \cdots < t_{d-r}$  and there exists a tower of regular near sub-polygons

$$
\Delta^{r+1} \subset \Delta^{r+2} \subset \cdots \subset \Delta^{d-r}
$$

where  $\Delta^q$  is a regular near 2*q*-gon of order  $(s, t_q; t_2, \ldots, t_q)$ . In particular,  $r \in \{2, 3, 5\}$ .

To prove our conjecture it is enough to show that there does not exist a regular thick near 2(*r* + 2)-gon of order (*s*, *t*; *t*<sub>2</sub>, . . . , *t*<sub>*r*+2</sub>) with  $r \in \{2, 3, 5\}$  and  $0 = t_1 = \cdots = t_r < t_{r+1}$  $t_{r+2}$  which satisfying the condition  $(SC)_{r+1}$ .

### **REFERENCES**

- <span id="page-7-2"></span>1. E. Bannai and T. Ito, *Algebraic Combinatorics I*, Benjamin-Cummings, California, 1984.
- <span id="page-7-3"></span>2. A. E. Brouwer, A. M. Cohen and A. Neumaier, *Distance-regular Graphs*, Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1989.
- <span id="page-7-0"></span>3. A. E. Brouwer and H. A. Wilbrink, The structure of near polygons with quads, *Geom. Ded.*, **14** (1983), 145–176.
- <span id="page-7-5"></span>4. W. Feit and G. Higman, The non-existence of certain generalized polygons, *J. Algebra*, **1** (1964), 114–131.
- <span id="page-7-6"></span>5. A. Hiraki, Distance-regular subgraphs in a distance-regular graph, IV, *Europ. J. Combinatorics*, **18** (1997), 635–645.
- <span id="page-7-1"></span>6. A. Hiraki, Distance-regular subgraphs in a distance-regular graph, VI, *Europ. J. Combinatorics*, **19** (1998), 953–965.
- <span id="page-7-4"></span>7. A. Hiraki, A distance-regular graph with strongly closed subgraphs, preprint.

*Received 20 October 1998 and accepted in revised form 20 July 1999*

AKIRA HIRAKI *Division of Mathematical Sciences, Osaka Kyoiku University, Kashiwara, Osaka, 582-8582, Japan E-mail: hiraki@cc.osaka-kyoiku.ac.jp*