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#### Abstract

Let $G$ be a 4-connected graph. For an edge $e$ of $G$, we do the following operations on $G$ : first, delete the edge $e$ from $G$, resulting the graph $G-e$; second, for all the vertices $x$ of degree 3 in $G-e$, delete $x$ from $G-e$ and then completely connect the 3 neighbors of $x$ by a triangle. If multiple edges occur, we use single edges to replace them. The final resultant graph is denoted by $G \ominus e$. If $G \ominus e$ is still 4 -connected, then $e$ is called a removable edge of $G$. In this paper we prove that every 4 -connected graph of order at least six (excluding the 2 -cyclic graph of order six) has at least $(4|G|+16) / 7$ removable edges. We also give the structural characterization of 4-connected graphs for which the lower bound is sharp.
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## 1. Introduction

All graphs considered here are finite and simple. For notations and terminology not defined here, we refer the reader(s) to [1]. The concepts of contractible edges and

[^0]removable edges of graphs are very important in studying the structures of graphs and in proving some properties of graphs by induction. In 1961, Tutte [3] gave the structural characterization for 3 -connected graphs by using the existence of contractible edges and removable edges. He proved that every 3-connected graph with order at least 5 contains contractible edges. Perhaps, this is the earliest result concerning the concepts of contractible edges and removable edges.

Removable edges and contractible edges in 3-connected graphs have been studied extensively in literature. In this paper we shall focus on the study of only removable edges in 4-connected graphs. First of all, we give the definition of a removable edge for a 4-connected graph. Let $G$ be a 4 -connected graph and $e$ an edge of $G$. Consider the graph $G-e$ obtained by deleting the edge $e$ from $G$. If $G-e$ has vertices of degree 3 , we do the following operations on $G-e$. For all vertices $x$ of degree 3 in $G-e$, delete $x$ from $G-e$ and then completely connect the three neighbors of $x$ by a triangle. If multiple edges occur, we use single edges to replace them. The final resultant graph is denoted by $G \ominus e$. Note that if there is no vertex of degree 3 in $G-e$, then $G \ominus e$ is simply the graph $G-e$.

Definition 1.1. For a 4-connected graph $G$ and an edge $e$ of $G$, if $G \ominus e$ is still 4-connected, then the edge $e$ is called removable; otherwise, it is called unremovable. The set of all removable edges of $G$ is denoted by $E_{R}(G)$; whereas the set of unremovable edges of $G$ is denoted by $E_{N}(G)$. The number of removable edges and the number of unremovable edges of $G$ is denoted by $e_{R}(G)$ and $e_{N}(G)$, respectively.

The aim to introduce the concept of removable edges in 4-connected graphs is to find a new method to construct 4 -connected graphs and a new method to prove some properties of 4 -connected graphs. In [4], Yin proved that there always exist removable edges in 4-connected graphs $G$ unless $G$ is a 2-cyclic graph with order 5 or 6 , where a 2 -cyclic graph is the graph of the square of a cycle [2]. He showed that a 4 -connected graph can be obtained from a 2-cyclic graph by the following four operations: (i) adding edges, (ii) splitting vertices, (iii) adding vertices and removing edges, and (iv) extending vertices. In this paper we shall obtain a sharp lower bound for the number of removable edges in a 4-connected graph, and moreover, we shall give the structural characterization of the 4-connected graphs for which the lower bound is sharp.

Without specific statement, in the following $G$ always denotes a 4-connected graph. The vertex set and edge set of $G$ is denoted, respectively, by $V(G)$ and $E(G)$. The order and size of $G$ is denoted, respectively, by $|G|$ and $|E(G)|$. For $x \in V(G)$, we simply write $x \in G$. The neighborhood of $x \in G$ is denoted by $\Gamma_{G}(x)$ and the degree of $x$ is denoted by $d_{G}(x)=\left|\Gamma_{G}(x)\right|$. If no confusion, we simply write $d(x)$ for $d_{G}(x)$. If $x$ and $y$ are the two end-vertices of an edge $e$, we write $e=x y$. For a nonempty subset $F$ of $E(G)$, or $N$ of $V(G)$, the induced subgraph by $F$ or $N$ in $G$ is denoted by $[F]$ or $[N]$. Let $A, B \subset V(G)$ such that $A \neq \emptyset \neq B$ and $A \cap B=\emptyset$, define $[A, B]=$ $\{x y \in E(G) \mid x \in A, y \in B\}$. If $H$ is a subgraph of $G$, we say that $G$ contains $H$. For a subset $S$ of $V(G), G-S$ denotes the graph obtained by deleting all the vertices in $S$
from $G$ together with all the incident edges. If $G-S$ is disconnected, we say that $S$ is a vertex-cut of $G$. If $|S|=s$ for such an $S$, we say that $S$ is an $s$-vertex-cut. A cycle of $G$ with length $l$ is simply called an $l$-cycle of $G$. We denote the 2-cyclic graphs of order 5 and 6 by $C_{5}^{2}$ and $C_{6}^{2}$, respectively. For $e \in E(G)$ and $S \subset V(G)$ such that $|S|=3$, if $G-e-S$ has exactly two (connected) components, say $A$ and $B$, such that $|A| \geqslant 2$ and $|B| \geqslant 2$, then we say that $(e, S)$ is a separating pair and $(e, S ; A, B)$ is a separating group, in which $A$ and $B$ are called the edge-vertex-cut fragments.

## 2. Some known results

First of all, we list some known results on removable edges of 4-connected graphs, which can be found in [4] and will be used in the sequel.

Theorem 2.1. Let $G$ be a 4-connected graph with $|G| \geqslant 7$. An edge $e$ of $G$ is unremovable if and only if there is a separating pair $(e, S)$, or a separating group $(e, S ; A, B)$ in $G$.

Theorem 2.2. Let $G$ be a 4-connected graph with $|G| \geqslant 8$ and let $(x y, S ; A, B)$ be a separating group of $G$ such that $x \in A, y \in B$ and $|A| \geqslant 3$. Then, every edge in $[\{x\}, S]$ is removable.

Corollary 2.3. Let $G$ be a 4 -connected graph with $|G| \geqslant 8$. Then, every 3-cycle of $G$ contains at least one removable edge.

Theorem 2.4. Let $G$ be a 4 -connected graph with $|G| \geqslant 8$. If for an unremovable edge $x y$, i.e., $x y \in E_{N}(G)$, there is a separating group $(x y, S ; A, B)$, then all the edges in $E([S])$ are removable, i.e., $E([S]) \subseteq E_{R}(G)$.

In the subsequent sections we shall obtain a sharp lower bound for the number of removable edges in a 4-connected graph.

## 3. Terminology and notations for subgraphs with special structures

For convenience, we introduce the following special terminology and notations for some subgraphs with special structures in a graph $G$.

Definition 3.1. Let $G$ be a 4 -connected graph and $H$ a subgraph of $G$ such that $V(H)=\left\{a, x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}, x_{4}, v_{1}, v_{2}, v_{3}, v_{4}\right\} \quad$ and $\quad E(H)=\left\{a x_{1}, a x_{2}, a x_{3}, a x_{4}, x_{1} x_{2}, x_{2} x_{3}\right.$, $\left.x_{3} x_{4}, x_{4} x_{1}, x_{1} v_{1}, x_{2} v_{2}, x_{3} v_{3}, x_{4} v_{4}\right\}$. If $H$ satisfies the following conditions:
(i) $d(a)=d\left(x_{i}\right)=4$ for $i=1,2,3,4$,
(ii) $a x_{1}, a x_{2}, a x_{3}, a x_{4} \in E_{N}(G)$ and $x_{1} x_{2}, x_{2} x_{3}, x_{3} x_{4}, x_{4} x_{1} \in E_{R}(G)$,
then $H$ is called a helm, and the edges $a x_{i}$ for $i=1,2,3,4$ are called inner edges of $H$.

Definition 3.2. Let $G$ be a 4 -connected graph and $H$ a subgraph of $G$ such that $V(H)=\left\{a, b, x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{l+3}\right\}$ and $E(H)=\left\{x_{1} x_{2}, x_{2} x_{3}, \ldots, x_{l+2} x_{l+3}, a x_{2}, a x_{3}, \ldots\right.$, $\left.a x_{l+2}, b x_{2}, b x_{3}, \ldots, b x_{l+2}\right\}$ with $l \geqslant 1$. If $H$ satisfies the following conditions:
(i) $x_{i} x_{i+1} \in E_{N}(G)$ for $i=1,2, \ldots, l+2$,
(ii) $a x_{j}, b x_{j} \in E_{R}(G)$ for $j=2,3, \ldots, l+2$,
(iii) $d\left(x_{j}\right)=4$ for $j=2,3, \ldots, l+2$,
then $H$ is called an l-bi-fan.
An $l$-bi-fan $H$ is said to be maximal if $\Gamma_{G}\left(x_{1}\right) \neq\left\{a, b, x_{2}, u\right\}$ and $\Gamma_{G}\left(x_{l+3}\right) \neq\left\{a, b, x_{l+2}, v\right\}$ for any $u, v \in G$. The edges $x_{j} x_{j+1}$ for $j=2,3, \ldots, l+1$ of an $l$-bi-fan or a maximal $l$-bi-fan $H$ are called inner edges of $H$.

Definition 3.3. Let $G$ be a 4 -connected graph and $H$ a subgraph of $G$ such that $V(H)=\left\{x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{l+2}, y_{1}, y_{2}, \ldots, y_{l+2}\right\}$ and $E(H)=E_{1}(H) \cup E_{2}(H)$ where $E_{1}(H)=\left\{x_{1} x_{2}, x_{2} x_{3}, \ldots, x_{l+1} x_{l+2}, y_{1} y_{2}, y_{2} y_{3}, \ldots, y_{l+1} y_{l+2}\right\} \quad$ and $\quad E_{2}(H)=\left\{y_{1} x_{2}\right.$, $\left.x_{2} y_{2}, y_{2} x_{3}, \ldots, y_{l} x_{l+1}, x_{l+1} y_{l+1}, y_{l+1} x_{l+2}\right\}$. Then, $H$ is called an l-belt if the following conditions are satisfied
(i) $E_{1}(H) \subseteq E_{N}(G)$ and $E_{2}(H) \subseteq E_{R}(G)$,
(ii) $d\left(x_{i}\right)=d\left(y_{j}\right)=4$ for $i=2,3, \ldots, l+1 ; j=2,3, \ldots, l+1$.

An $l$-belt $H$ is said to be maximal if $\Gamma_{G}\left(y_{1}\right) \neq\left\{x_{1}, x_{2}, y_{2}, u\right\}$ and $\Gamma_{G}\left(x_{l+2}\right) \neq\left\{x_{l+1}, y_{l+1}, y_{l+2}, v\right\}$ for any $u, v \in G$. The edges $x_{i} x_{i+1}, y_{j} y_{j+1}$ for $i=$ $2,3, \ldots, l+1 ; j=1,2, \ldots, l$ of an $l$-belt or a maximal $l$-belt $H$ are called inner edges of $H$.

Definition 3.4. Let $G$ be a 4 -connected graph and $H$ a subgraph of $G$ such that $V(H)=\left\{x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{l+2}, x_{l+3}, y_{1}, y_{2}, \ldots, y_{l+2}\right\}$ and $E(H)=E_{1}(H) \cup E_{2}(H)$ where $E_{1}(H)=\left\{x_{1} x_{2}, x_{2} x_{3}, \ldots, x_{l+1} x_{l+2}, x_{l+2} x_{l+3}, y_{1} y_{2}, y_{2} y_{3}, \ldots, y_{l+1} y_{l+2}\right\} \quad$ and $\quad E_{2}(H)=$ $\left\{y_{1} x_{2}, x_{2} y_{2}, y_{2} x_{3}, \ldots, y_{l} x_{l+1}, x_{l+1} y_{l+1}, y_{l+1} x_{l+2}, x_{l+2} y_{l+2}\right\}$. Then, $H$ is called an l-cobelt if the following conditions are satisfied:
(i) $E_{1}(H) \subseteq E_{N}(G)$ and $E_{2}(H) \subseteq E_{R}(G)$,
(ii) $d\left(x_{i}\right)=d\left(y_{j}\right)=4$ for $i=2,3, \ldots, l+2 ; j=2,3, \ldots, l+1$.

An $l$-co-belt $H$ is said to be maximal if $\Gamma_{G}\left(y_{1}\right) \neq\left\{x_{1}, x_{2}, y_{2}, u\right\}$ and $\Gamma_{G}\left(y_{l+2}\right) \neq\left\{x_{l+2}, y_{l+1}, x_{l+3}, v\right\}$ for any $u, v \in G$. The edges $x_{i} x_{i+1}, y_{j} y_{j+1}$ for $i=$ $2,3, \ldots, l+1 ; j=1,2, \ldots, l+1$ of an $l$-co-belt or a maximal $l$-co-belt $H$ are called inner edges of $H$.

Definition 3.5. Let $G$ be a 4-connected graph and $H$ a subgraph of $G$ such that $V(H)=$ $\left\{x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}, y_{1}, y_{2}, y_{3}, y_{4}\right\} \quad$ and $\quad E(H)=\left\{x_{1} x_{2}, x_{2} x_{3}, y_{1} y_{2}, y_{2} y_{3}, y_{3} y_{4}, x_{1} y_{2}, \quad x_{2} y_{2}\right.$, $\left.x_{2} y_{3}, x_{3} y_{3}\right\}$. Then, $H$ is called a $W$-framework if the following conditions are satisfied:
(i) $x_{i} x_{i+1} \in E_{N}(G)$ for $i=1,2$,
(ii) $d\left(x_{2}\right)=d\left(y_{2}\right)=d\left(y_{3}\right)=4$,
(iii) $y_{2} y_{3}, x_{1} y_{2}, x_{2} y_{2}, x_{2} y_{3}, x_{3} y_{3} \in E_{R}(G)$.

The edges $x_{1} x_{2}, x_{2} x_{3}$ of a $W$-framework $H$ are called inner edges of $H$.
Definition 3.6. Let $G$ be a 4 -connected graph and $H$ a subgraph of $G$ such that $V(H)=\left\{x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}, y_{1}, y_{2}, y_{3}, y_{4}\right\} \quad$ and $E(H)=\left\{x_{1} x_{2}, x_{2} x_{3}, x_{1} x_{3}, y_{1} y_{2}, y_{2} y_{3}, y_{3} y_{4}\right.$, $\left.x_{1} y_{2}, x_{2} y_{2}, x_{2} y_{3}, x_{3} y_{3}\right\}$. Then, $H$ is called a $W^{\prime}$-framework if the following conditions are satisfied:
(i) $x_{i} x_{i+1} \in E_{N}(G)$ for $i=1,2$,
(ii) $d\left(x_{2}\right)=d\left(x_{3}\right)=d\left(y_{2}\right)=d\left(y_{3}\right)=4$ and $d\left(x_{1}\right) \geqslant 5$,
(iii) $y_{2} y_{3}, x_{1} y_{2}, x_{2} y_{3}, x_{3} y_{3}, x_{1} x_{3} \in E_{R}(G), x_{2} y_{2} \in E_{N}(G)$.

The edges $x_{1} x_{2}, x_{2} x_{3}, x_{2} y_{2}$ of a $W^{\prime}$-framework $H$ are called inner edges of $H$.
For convenience, some special notations are introduced as follows.
By $L_{1}$ we denote the maximal 1-belt such that $V\left(L_{1}\right)=\left\{x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}, y_{1}, y_{2}, y_{3}\right\}$ and $E\left(L_{1}^{\prime}\right)=\left\{x_{1} x_{2}, x_{2} x_{3}, y_{1} y_{2}, y_{2} y_{3}, y_{1} x_{2}, x_{2} y_{2}, y_{2} x_{3}\right\}$. We say that $x_{2} x_{3}, y_{1} y_{2}$ are inner edges of $L_{1}$.

By $L_{2}$ we denote the maximal 2-belt such that $V\left(L_{2}\right)=\left\{x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}, x_{4}, y_{1}, y_{2}, y_{3}\right.$, $\left.y_{4}\right\}$ and $E\left(L_{2}^{\prime}\right)=\left\{x_{1} x_{2}, x_{2} x_{3}, x_{3} x_{4}, y_{1} y_{2}, y_{2} y_{3}, y_{3} y_{4}, y_{1} x_{2}, x_{2} y_{2}, y_{2} x_{3}, x_{3} y_{3}, y_{3} x_{4}\right\}$. We say that $x_{2} x_{3}, x_{3} x_{4}, y_{1} y_{2}, y_{2} y_{3}$ are inner edges of $L_{2}$.

By $L_{1}{ }^{\prime}$ we denote the maximal 1 -co-belt such that $V\left(L_{1}{ }^{\prime}\right)=\left\{x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}, x_{4}, y_{1}, y_{2}\right.$, $\left.y_{3}\right\}$ and $E\left(L_{1}{ }^{\prime}\right)=\left\{x_{1} x_{2}, x_{2} x_{3}, x_{3} x_{4}, y_{1} y_{2}, y_{2} y_{3}, y_{1} x_{2}, x_{2} y_{2}, y_{2} x_{3}, x_{3} y_{3}\right\}$. We say that $x_{2} x_{3}, y_{1} y_{2}, y_{2} y_{3}$ are inner edges of $L_{1}{ }^{\prime}$.

By $L_{2}{ }^{\prime}$ we denote the maximal 2-co-belt such that $V\left(L_{2}^{\prime}\right)=\left\{x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}, x_{4}, x_{5}, y_{1}\right.$, $\left.y_{2}, y_{3}, y_{4}\right\}$ and $E\left(L_{2}^{\prime}\right)=\left\{x_{1} x_{2}, x_{2} x_{3}, x_{3} x_{4}, x_{4} x_{5}, y_{1} y_{2}, y_{2} y_{3}, y_{3} y_{4}, y_{1} x_{2}, x_{2} y_{2}, y_{2} x_{3}, x_{3} y_{3}\right.$, $\left.y_{3} x_{4}, x_{4} y_{4}\right\}$. We say that $x_{2} x_{3}, x_{3} x_{4}, y_{1} y_{2}, y_{2} y_{3}, y_{3} y_{4}$ are inner edges of $L_{2}{ }^{\prime}$.

By $F$ we denote the maximal 1-bi-fan such that $V(F)=\left\{a, b, x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}, x_{4}\right\}$ and $E(F)=\left\{x_{1} x_{2}, x_{2} x_{3}, x_{3} x_{4}, a x_{2}, a x_{3}, b x_{2}, b x_{3}\right\}$. We say that $x_{2} x_{3}$ is the inner edge of $F$.

By $W$ we denote the $W$-framework such that $V(W)=\left\{x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}, y_{1}, y_{2}, y_{3}, y_{4}\right\}$ and $E(W)=\left\{x_{1} x_{2}, x_{2} x_{3}, y_{1} y_{2}, y_{2} y_{3}, y_{3} y_{4}, x_{1} y_{2}, x_{2} y_{2}, x_{2} y_{3}, x_{3} y_{3}\right\}$. We say that $x_{1} x_{2}$, $x_{2} x_{3}$ are inner edges of $W$.

By $W^{\prime}$ we denote the $W^{\prime}$-framework such that $V\left(W^{\prime}\right)=\left\{x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}, y_{1}, y_{2}, y_{3}, y_{4}\right\}$ and $E\left(W^{\prime}\right)=\left\{x_{1} x_{2}, x_{2} x_{3}, x_{1} x_{3}, y_{1} y_{2}, y_{2} y_{3}, y_{3} y_{4}, x_{1} y_{2}, y_{2} x_{2}, x_{2} y_{3}, y_{3} x_{3}\right\}$. We say that $x_{1} x_{2}, x_{2} x_{3}, x_{2} y_{2}$ are inner edges of $W^{\prime}$.

By $H$ we denote the helm such that $V(H)=\left\{a, x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}, x_{4}, v_{1}, v_{2}, v_{3}, v_{4}\right\}$ and $E(H)=\left\{a x_{1}, a x_{2}, a x_{3}, a x_{4}, x_{1} x_{2}, x_{2} x_{3}, x_{3} x_{4}, x_{4} x_{1}, x_{1} v_{1}, x_{2} v_{2}, x_{3} v_{3}, x_{4} v_{4}\right\}$. We say that the edges $a x_{i}$ for $i=1,2,3,4$ are inner edges of $H$.

The set of all the above mentioned subgraphs with special notations $L_{1}, L_{2}, L_{1}{ }^{\prime}$, $L_{2}{ }^{\prime}, F, W, W^{\prime}$ and $H$ of a graph $G$ is denoted by $\mathfrak{R}$. Then, we have the following result.

Lemma 3.7. There is no common inner edge between any two different subgraphs of $G$ in $\mathfrak{R}$.

Proof. By contradiction. Suppose that there are two different subgraphs $H$ and $H^{\prime}$ of $G$ in $\mathfrak{R}$ that have a common inner edge. Then, we discuss the following cases.
(1). $H$ is a maximal 1-belt $L_{1}$. Then, $x_{2} x_{3}$ and $y_{1} y_{2}$ are the inner edges of $H$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $x_{2} x_{3}$ is also an inner edge of $H^{\prime}$. Similarly, we can treat the case that $y_{1} y_{2}$ is a common inner edge of $H$ and $H^{\prime}$. We discuss the following subcases for $H^{\prime}$ :
(1.1). $H^{\prime}$ is a maximal 1-belt. Let $V\left(H^{\prime}\right)=\left\{u_{1}, u_{2}, u_{3}, v_{1}, v_{2}, v_{3}\right\}$ and $E\left(H^{\prime}\right)=$ $\left\{u_{1} u_{2}, u_{2} u_{3}, v_{1} v_{2}, v_{2} v_{3}, v_{1} u_{2}, u_{2} v_{2}, v_{2} u_{3}\right\}$, and let the inner edges of $H^{\prime}$ be $u_{2} u_{3}, v_{1} v_{2}$. If $x_{2} x_{3}=u_{2} u_{3}$, then we have $x_{2}=u_{2}, x_{3}=u_{3}$ or $x_{2}=u_{3}, x_{3}=u_{2}$. If $x_{2}=u_{2}, x_{3}=u_{3}$, then $H=L_{1}=H^{\prime}$. If $x_{2}=u_{3}, x_{3}=u_{2}$, then we have $d\left(x_{3}\right)=4$ and $x_{3} y_{3} \in E(G)$ or we have $d\left(y_{1}\right)=4$ and $x_{1} y_{1} \in E(G)$. However, this contradicts to that $H=L_{1}$ is a maximal 1-belt.
(1.2). Obviously, a similar argument can lead to that $H^{\prime}$ is not a maximal 1-co-belt, a maximal 2 -belt or a maximal 2 -co-belt. And vice versa.
(1.3). $H^{\prime}$ is a maximal 1-bi-fan. Then, we have that $x_{3} y_{1} \in E(G)$ or $x_{1} x_{3} \in E(G)$. If $x_{1} x_{3} \in E(G)$, then from the definition of the maximal 1-bi-fan, we have that $x_{1} x_{2} \in E_{R}(G)$, which contradicts to the definition of the maximal 1-belt $H=L_{1}$. If $x_{3} y_{1} \in E(G)$, since $y_{1} y_{2} \in E_{N}(G)$, we take the corresponding separating group $\left(y_{1} y_{2}, S ; A, B\right)$ such that $y_{1} \in A, y_{2} \in B$. Since $y_{1} y_{2} x_{2} y_{1}, y_{1} y_{2} x_{3} y_{1}$ are 3-cycles of $G$, we have that $x_{2} x_{3} \in E([S])$. From Theorem 2.4 we have that $x_{2} x_{3} \in E_{R}(G)$, which contradicts to the definition of the maximal 1-belt $H=L_{1}$. Therefore, any inner edge of the maximal 1-belt cannot be inner edge of any maximal 1-bi-fan. And vice versa.
(1.4). $H^{\prime}$ is a $W$-framework or a $W^{\prime}$-framework. Then, we have that $y_{1} y_{2} \in E_{R}(G)$, which contradicts to the definition of the maximal 1-belt $H=L_{1}$. Hence, any inner edge of the maximal 1 -belt cannot be inner edge of any $W$-framework or $W^{\prime}$-framework. And vice versa.
(1.5). $H^{\prime}$ is a helm. Then, either $x_{2}$ or $x_{3}$ is incident with four unremovable edges in $G$. Obviously, it is impossible since $x_{2} x_{3}$ is an inner edge of the maximal 1-belt $H=L_{1}$. Therefore, any inner edge of the maximal 1-belt cannot be inner edge of any helm, and vice versa.
(2). $H$ is a maximal 2-belt $L_{2}$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $x_{2} x_{3}$ is a common inner edge of $H$ and $H^{\prime}$. We discuss the following subcases for $H^{\prime}$ :
(2.1). $H^{\prime}$ is also a maximal 2-belt. Let $V\left(H^{\prime}\right)=\left\{u_{1}, u_{2}, u_{3}, u_{4}, v_{1}, v_{2}, v_{3}, v_{4}\right\}$ and $E\left(H^{\prime}\right)=\left\{u_{1} u_{2}, u_{2} u_{3}, u_{3} u_{4}, v_{1} v_{2}, v_{2} v_{3}, v_{3} v_{4}, v_{1} u_{2}, u_{2} v_{2}, v_{2} u_{3}, u_{3} v_{3}, v_{3} u_{4}\right\}$, and let $u_{2} u_{3}$, $u_{3} u_{4}, v_{1} v_{2}, v_{2} v_{3}$ be the inner edges of $H^{\prime}$. If $x_{2} x_{3}=u_{2} u_{3}$, then one of the following things holds: (i) $H=L_{2}=H^{\prime}$; (ii) $d\left(y_{1}\right)=4$ and $x_{1} y_{1} \in E(G)$, which contradicts to that $H=L_{2}$ is a maximal 2-belt. If $x_{2} x_{3}=v_{1} v_{2}$, it is easy to see that $u_{1} v_{1} \in E(G)$ and $d\left(v_{1}\right)=4$, which contradicts to that $H^{\prime}$ is a maximal 2-belt. By symmetry, for the other cases, we may employ a similar argument to show that the conclusion holds.
(2.2). Since a maximal 1-co-belt is a subgraph of a maximal 2-belt, it is easy to see that $x_{2} x_{3}$ or $y_{1} y_{2}$ is not an inner edge of a maximal 1-co-belt. Otherwise, it would lead to a contradiction to the definition of the maximal 1-co-belt. Similarly, a maximal 2-belt and a maximal 2-co-belt do not have any common inner edge.
(2.3). Obviously, it is impossible that an inner edge of a maximal 2-belt is an inner edge of the following subgraphs: maximal 1-bi-fan, $W$-framework, $W^{\prime}$-framework or helm. And vice versa.
(3). $H$ is a maximal 2-co-belt. It is easy to see that an argument similar to that used in (2). can be employed to deduce contradictions.
(4). $H$ is a maximal 1-bi-fan. If $H^{\prime}$ is also a maximal 1-bi-fan $F^{\prime}$, it is easy to see that this is true only if $F=F^{\prime}$ holds. Obviously, it is impossible that the inner edge $x_{2} x_{3}$ of $H$ is an inner edge of the following subgraphs: $W$-framework, $W^{\prime}$-framework or helm.
(5). $H$ is a $W$-framework, or a $W^{\prime}$-framework, or a helm. Obviously, no matter whatever $H^{\prime}$ is, we always can deduce contradictions. The details are omitted, and the proof is complete.

## 4. Preliminary results

In order to obtain the sharp lower bound for the number of removable edges in a 4-connected graph, we need to prove the following preliminary results.

Theorem 4.1. Let $G$ be a 4-connected graph and $F$ a maximal $l$-bi-fan of $G$ with $l \geqslant 2$. Then, there exists an edge $e^{\prime}$ in $F$ such that $e^{\prime} \in E_{R}(G)$ and $e_{R}(G) \geqslant e_{R}\left(G \ominus e^{\prime}\right)+1$.

Proof. Let $F$ be defined as in Definition 3.2. First, we claim that $d(a) \geqslant 5, d(b) \geqslant 5$. Otherwise, we may assume that $d(a)=4$ and let $\Gamma_{G}(a)=\left\{x_{2}, x_{3}, x_{4}, v\right\}$. Obviously, $v \neq b$, otherwise, $\left\{x_{2}, x_{4}, b\right\}$ would be a 3 -vertex-cut of $G$, a contradiction. Let $A=$ $\left\{a, x_{3}\right\}, S=\left\{x_{2}, x_{4}, v\right\}, e=b x_{3}, B=G-e-A-S$, then $\left(b x_{3}, S ; A, B\right)$ is a separating group of $G$, and therefore, $b x_{3} \in E_{N}(G)$, which contradicts to that $F$ is $l$-bi-fan.

Let $e^{\prime}=a x_{3}, H=G \ominus e^{\prime}$. We will show that for any edge $e \neq x_{2} x_{4}$ in $H$, if $e \in E_{R}(H)$, then we have $e \in E_{R}(G)$.

By contradiction. Assume that there exists an edge $e \in E_{R}(H)$, but $e \in E_{N}(G)$. Let $e=x y$. Since $x y \in E_{N}(G)$, from Theorem 2.1 we can take its corresponding separating group $(e, T ; C, D)$ such that $x \in C, y \in D$. We distinguish the following cases to proceed the proof:

Case 1: $a, x_{3} \in T$.
Since $d\left(x_{3}\right)=4$ and $a x_{3} \in E(G)$, we have that $\left|\Gamma_{G}\left(x_{3}\right) \cap C\right|=1$ or $\left|\Gamma_{G}\left(x_{3}\right) \cap D\right|=$ 1. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\left|\Gamma_{G}\left(x_{3}\right) \cap C\right|=1$. Let $\Gamma_{G}\left(x_{3}\right) \cap C=\left\{v_{1}\right\}, T=\left\{a, x_{3}, w\right\}$. If $|C| \geqslant 3$, let $T^{\prime}=\left\{a, v_{1}, w\right\}, C^{\prime}=C-\left\{v_{1}\right\}$ and $D^{\prime}=H-x y-T^{\prime}-C^{\prime}$. We claim that $v_{1} \neq x$. Otherwise, we have that $\left\{a, w, v_{1}\right\}$ is a 3 -vertex-cut of $G$, which contradicts to that $G$ is 4 -connected. It is easy to see that ( $e, T^{\prime} ; C^{\prime}, D^{\prime}$ ) is a separating group of $H$, and therefore $e \in E_{N}(H)$, a contradiction. If $|C|=2$, then $v_{1} x \in E(G)$. Since $d(b) \geqslant 5$ and obviously $v_{1} \neq b$, we have $v_{1} \in\left\{x_{2}, x_{4}\right\}$. If $v_{1}=x_{2}$, then $x=x_{1}$. Since $\Gamma_{G}\left(x_{2}\right)=\left\{b, x_{1}, x_{3}, a\right\}$, we have that $w=b$ and $\Gamma_{G}\left(x_{1}\right)=$ $\left\{a, b, x_{2}, y\right\}$. Obviously, $\left\{a x_{1}, b x_{1}\right\} \subset E_{R}(G)$ and $x_{1} y \in E_{N}(G)$, which contradicts to the definition of a maximal $l$-bi-fan of $G$. If $v_{1}=x_{4}$, then $w=b$, and therefore
$\Gamma_{G}(x)=\left\{a, b, x_{4}, y\right\}$, and so $x=x_{5}$. Let $C^{\prime}=\left\{x_{4}, x\right\}, e=x y, T^{\prime}=\left\{a, b, x_{2}\right\}$, $D^{\prime}=H-e-C^{\prime}-T^{\prime}$. Then, we have that $\left(e, T^{\prime} ; C^{\prime}, D^{\prime}\right)$ is a separating group of $H$, and so $e \in E_{N}(H)$, which contradicts to that $e \in E_{R}(H)$.

Case 2: $a \in T, x_{3} \in C$.
So, $\Gamma_{G}\left(x_{3}\right)=\left\{a, b, x_{2}, x_{4}\right\}$. If $|C| \geqslant 3$, then it is easy to see that $\left(e, T ; C-\left\{x_{3}\right\}, D\right)$ is a separating group of $H$, and hence $e \in E_{N}(H)$, which contradicts to that $e \in E_{R}(H)$. Therefore, $|C|=2$, and so $x \in \Gamma_{G}\left(x_{3}\right)$. If $x=b$, then $T=\left\{a, x_{2}, x_{4}\right\}$, $\Gamma_{G}(b)=\left\{a, x_{2}, x_{3}, x_{4}, y\right\}, \Gamma_{G}\left(x_{2}\right) \cap D=\left\{x_{1}\right\} . \quad$ Since $x_{1} x_{4} \notin E(G)$ and $x_{1} \neq y$, we have that $|D| \geqslant 3$. Let $T^{\prime}=\left\{a, x_{1}, x_{4}\right\}, D^{\prime}=D-\left\{x_{1}\right\}, C^{\prime}=H-x y-T^{\prime}-D^{\prime}$, then $\left(x y, T^{\prime} ; C^{\prime}, D^{\prime}\right)$ is a separating group of $H$, and so $e \in E_{N}(H)$, a contradiction. If $x=x_{2}$, then $y=x_{1}$. Obviously, if we let $e=x_{2} x_{1}, C^{\prime}=\left\{x_{2}, x_{4}\right\}, T^{\prime}=$ $\left\{a, b, x_{5}\right\}, D^{\prime}=H-e-C^{\prime}-T^{\prime}$, then $\left(e, T^{\prime} ; C^{\prime}, D^{\prime}\right)$ is a separating group of $H$, and so $x_{2} x_{1} \in E_{N}(H)$, a contradiction. If $x=x_{4}$, then we have that $y=x_{5}$. Let $C^{\prime}=\left\{x_{2}, x_{4}\right\}, T^{\prime}=\left\{a, b, x_{1}\right\}, D^{\prime}=H-x_{4} x_{5}-T^{\prime}-C^{\prime}$, then $\left(x_{4} x_{5}, T^{\prime} ; C^{\prime}, D^{\prime}\right)$ is a separating group of $H$, and so $x_{4} x_{5} \in E_{N}(H)$, a contradiction to the assumption.

Case 3: $a \in C, x_{3} \in T$.
If $|C|=2$, then $a=x$, and so $C-\{a\}=\left\{x_{2}\right\}$ or $C-\{a\}=\left\{x_{4}\right\}$. If $C-\{a\}=$ $\left\{x_{2}\right\}$, then $b \in T$. Since $x_{3} x_{4} \in E_{N}(G)$, from Theorem 2.4 we have $x_{4} \notin T$. If $x_{4} \in D-$ $\{y\}$, then $a x_{4} \notin E(G)$, a contradiction. If $C-\{a\}=\left\{x_{4}\right\}$, a similar argument can lead to a contradiction, and therefore $|C| \geqslant 3$. Since $a \in C$, we have that $x_{2}, x_{4} \in C \cup T$. Noticing that $\Gamma_{G}\left(x_{3}\right) \cap D \neq \emptyset$, we have $b \in D$, and so $x_{2}, x_{4} \in T$. Here, $\left\{x_{2}, x_{4}, x\right\}$ is a 3-vertex-cut of $H$, a contradiction.

Case 4: $a, x_{3} \in C$.
Obviously, here we have that $|C| \geqslant 3$, a similar argument can lead to $e \in E_{N}(H)$ if $e \in E_{N}(G)$.

Based on the above arguments, we know that if $e \in E_{R}(H)$ and $e \neq x_{2} x_{4}$, then $e \in E_{R}(G)$. Noticing that $a x_{3}, b x_{3} \in E_{R}(G)$, but $a x_{3}, b x_{3} \notin E(H)$, we have that $e_{R}(G) \geqslant e_{R}(G \ominus e)+1$. The proof is now complete.

Theorem 4.2. Let $G$ be a 4 -connected graph and $L$ a maximal $l$-belt of $G$ with $l \geqslant 3$. Then, there exists an edge $e^{\prime}$ in $G$ such that $e_{R}(G) \geqslant e_{R}\left(G \ominus e^{\prime}\right)+2$.

Proof. Let $L$ be defined as in Definition 3.3. Take $e^{\prime}=x_{3} y_{3}$ and let $H=G \ominus e^{\prime}$. Then, we delete three removable edges $y_{2} x_{3}, y_{3} x_{3}, y_{3} x_{4}$ from $G$ and add three edges $y_{2} x_{4}, x_{2} x_{4}, y_{2} y_{4}$ to get $H$. Let $A^{\prime}=\left\{y_{2}, x_{2}\right\}, e_{1}=y_{2} y_{4}, S^{\prime}=\left\{x_{1}, y_{1}, x_{4}\right\}$ and $B^{\prime}=$ $G-e_{1}-S^{\prime}-A^{\prime}$, then $\left(e_{1}, S^{\prime} ; A^{\prime}, B^{\prime}\right)$ is a separating group of $H$, and hence $y_{2} y_{4} \in E_{N}(G)$. A similar argument can lead to $x_{2} x_{4} \in E_{N}(H)$. Here, we only need to show that for any $e \in E(H)$ and $e \neq y_{2} x_{4}$, if $e \in E_{R}(H)$ then $e \in E_{R}(G)$.

By contradiction. Assume that there exists an edge $e \in E_{R}(H)$, but $e \in E_{N}(G)$. Let $e=x y$. From Theorem 2.1 we take its corresponding separating group $(e, S ; A, B)$ such that $x \in A, y \in B$. Next we will distinguish the following cases to proceed the proof:

Case 1: $x_{3}, y_{3} \in S$.

Let $S=\left\{x_{3}, y_{3}, w\right\}, w \in G$ and $U=\left\{x_{2}, x_{4}, y_{2}, y_{4}\right\}$. From $\Gamma_{G}\left(x_{3}\right)=\left\{x_{2}, x_{4}, y_{2}, y_{3}\right\}$ and $\Gamma_{G}\left(y_{3}\right)=\left\{x_{3}, x_{4}, y_{2}, y_{4}\right\}$, we claim that $|A \cap U|=2=|B \cap U|$. Otherwise, we may assume that $|A \cap U|=1$. Let $A \cap U=\left\{v_{1}\right\}$, then $\left\{x, v_{1}, w\right\}$ would be a 3-vertexcut of $G$, which contradicts to that $G$ is 4 -connected. If $|A|=3$, since $l \geqslant 3$, obviously we have that $|G| \geqslant 10$, and so $|B| \geqslant 4$. Let $B \cap U=\left\{v_{1}, v_{2}\right\}$. Then, if we let $S_{1}=$ $\left\{v_{1}, v_{2}, w\right\}, B_{1}=B-\left\{v_{1}, v_{2}\right\}, A_{1}=H-e-S_{1}-B_{1}$, then $\left(e, S_{1} ; A_{1}, B_{1}\right)$ is a separating group of $H$, and so $e \in E_{N}(H)$, a contradiction to the assumption. If $|A| \geqslant 4$, let $A \cap U=\left\{u_{1}, u_{2}\right\}, S_{1}=\left\{u_{1}, u_{2}, w\right\}, A_{1}=A-\left\{u_{1}, u_{2}\right\}, B_{1}=H-e-S_{1}-A_{1}$. Then ( $e, S_{1} ; A_{1}, B_{1}$ ) is a separating group of $H$, and so $e \in E_{N}(H)$, which contradicts to the assumption.

Case 2: $x_{3} \in A, y_{3} \in S$.
Subcase 2.1: If $|A|=2$, then $x \in \Gamma_{G}\left(x_{3}\right)$. If $x=x_{2}$, then $S=\left\{y_{2}, y_{3}, x_{4}\right\}$. Since $x_{2} y_{3}, x_{2} x_{4} \notin E(G)$, we have that $d\left(x_{2}\right)<4$, a contradiction. If $x=x_{4}$, a similar argument can lead to $d\left(x_{4}\right)<4$, a contradiction. If $x=y_{2}$, then $y=y_{1}$. Let $A_{1}=\left\{y_{2}, x_{4}\right\}, e=y_{1} y_{2}, S_{1}=\left\{x_{2}, x_{5}, y_{4}\right\}, \quad B_{1}=H-e-A_{1}-S_{1}$, then $\left(e, S_{1} ; A_{1}, B_{1}\right)$ is a separating group of $H$, and so $e \in E_{N}(H)$, which contradicts to the assumption.

Subcase 2.2: If $|A| \geqslant 3$, since $x_{3} \in A$, it is easy to see that $B \cap \Gamma_{G}\left(y_{3}\right)=\left\{y_{4}\right\}$. If $|B| \geqslant 3$, let $\quad B_{1}=B-\left\{y_{4}\right\}, S_{1}=\left\{y_{4}\right\} \cup S-\left\{y_{3}\right\}, A_{1}=H-e-S_{1}-B_{1}$. Then $\left(e, S_{1} ; A_{1}, B_{1}\right)$ is a separating group of $H$, and so $e \in E_{N}(H)$. If $|B|=2$, since $\Gamma_{G}\left(y_{4}\right)=\left\{y_{3}, y_{5}, x_{4}, x_{5}\right\}$, then we have $y \in\left\{x_{4}, x_{5}, y_{5}\right\}$. If $y=x_{4}$, then this is true only if $x=x_{3}$ holds, a contradiction. If $y=x_{5}$, since $y_{3} x_{5} \notin E(G)$, we have that $d\left(x_{5}\right)=4$ and $S=\left\{y_{3}, y_{5}, x_{4}\right\}$. Let $A_{1}=A-\left\{y_{2}\right\}, S_{1}=\left\{y_{2}, y_{5}, x_{4}\right\}, B_{1}=H-e-S_{1}-A_{1}$, then $\left(e, S_{1} ; A_{1}, B_{1}\right)$ is a separating group of $H$, and hence $e \in E_{N}(H)$. If $y=y_{5}$, then $S=\left\{x_{4}, x_{5}, y_{3}\right\}$. Note that $y_{3} y_{5}, x_{4} y_{5} \notin E(G)$. So, $d\left(y_{5}\right)<4$, a contradiction.

To sum up, from the above arguments we know that in Case 2 we always have $e \in E_{N}(H)$.

Case 3: $x_{3} \in S, y_{3} \in A$.
By symmetry, an argument analogous to that used in Case 2 can lead to that $e \in E_{N}(H)$.

Case 4: $x_{3}, y_{3} \in A$.
If $|A| \geqslant 4$, obviously, $e \in E_{N}(H)$, a contradiction to the assumption. So, $|A| \leqslant 3$. Obviously, $x_{3} \neq x, y_{3} \neq x$. Therefore, we have that $|A|=3$. Since $A$ is a connected subgraph of $G$, we may assume that $x_{3} x \in E(G)$. If $x=x_{4}$, then $x y=x_{4} x_{5}$. Let $S_{1}=\left\{y_{1}, y_{4}, x_{2}\right\}, A_{1}=\left\{y_{2}, x_{4}\right\}, B_{1}=H-e-S_{1}-A_{1}$, then $\left(e, S_{1} ; A_{1}, B_{1}\right)$ is a separating group of $H$, and so $e \in E_{N}(H)$. If $x=y_{2}$, then $y=y_{1}$. Let $e=y_{2} y_{1}, A_{1}=$ $\left\{y_{2}, x_{4}\right\}, S_{1}=\left\{x_{2}, x_{5}, y_{4}\right\}, B_{1}=H-e-S_{1}-A_{1}$, then $\left(e, S_{1} ; A_{1}, B_{1}\right)$ is a separating group of $H$, and so $e \in E_{N}(H)$. If $x=x_{2}$, then $S=\left\{y_{2}, y_{4}, x_{4}\right\}$. It is easy to see that $d\left(x_{2}\right)<4$, a contradiction.

Based on all the above arguments, we have that $E_{R}(H) \subseteq E_{R}(G)$ except the edge $y_{2} x_{4}$. Noticing that $y_{2} x_{3}, x_{3} y_{3}, x_{4} y_{3} \in E_{R}(G)$, we have that $e_{R}(G) \geqslant e_{R}(G \ominus e)+2$. The proof is now complete.

Lemma 4.3. Let $G$ be a 4-connected graph and $(x y, S ; A, B)$ a separating group of $G$ such that $x \in B, y \in A$. If there exists another edge $y z \in E_{N}(G)$ and its corresponding
separating group $\left(y z, S^{\prime} ; A^{\prime}, B^{\prime}\right)$ such that $y \in A^{\prime}, z \in B^{\prime}$ which satisfy the following conditions:
(i) $A \cap A^{\prime}=\{y\}, A \cap B^{\prime}=\{z\}, A \cap S^{\prime}=\{a\}, A^{\prime} \cap S=\{b\}, B^{\prime} \cap S=\{u, v\}$ such that $a, b, u, v \in G$,
(ii) $\{z u, z v\} \cap E_{N}(G) \neq \emptyset, a b \in E_{N}(G)$,
then we have that au, av cannot belong to $E(G)$ simultaneously.
Proof. By contradiction. Assume that $a u, a v \in E(G)$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $z u \in E_{N}(G)$. So, there is a corresponding separating group $\left(z u, T_{1} ; C_{1}, D_{1}\right)$ such that $z \in C_{1}, u \in D_{1}$. Then, we have that $z \in C_{1} \cap B^{\prime}, u \in B^{\prime} \cap D_{1}$. Since $a z u a$ is a 3-cycle of $G$, we have $a \in T_{1}$, and so $a \in S^{\prime} \cap T_{1}$. Let

$$
\begin{aligned}
& Y_{1}=\left(A^{\prime} \cap T_{1}\right) \cup\left(S^{\prime} \cap T_{1}\right) \cup\left(C_{1} \cap S^{\prime}\right), \\
& Y_{2}=\left(C_{1} \cap S^{\prime}\right) \cup\left(S^{\prime} \cap T_{1}\right) \cup\left(B^{\prime} \cap T_{1}\right), \\
& Y_{3}=\left(B^{\prime} \cap T_{1}\right) \cup\left(S^{\prime} \cap T_{1}\right) \cup\left(S^{\prime} \cap D_{1}\right), \\
& Y_{4}=\left(D_{1} \cap S^{\prime}\right) \cup\left(S^{\prime} \cap T_{1}\right) \cup\left(A^{\prime} \cap T_{1}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Obviously, $y \in A^{\prime} \cap C_{1}$ or $y \in A^{\prime} \cap T_{1}$. Next we will distinguish the following cases to proceed the proof.

Case 1: If $y \in A^{\prime} \cap C_{1}$, then $Y_{1}$ is a vertex-cut of $G-y z$. Since $G$ is 4-connected, we have that $\left|Y_{1}\right| \geqslant 3$. By a similar argument, we can deduce that $\left|Y_{3}\right| \geqslant 3$. Since $\left|Y_{1}\right|+$ $\left|Y_{3}\right|=\left|S^{\prime}\right|+\left|T_{1}\right|=6$, we have that $\left|Y_{1}\right|=\left|Y_{3}\right|=3$, and so $\left|A^{\prime} \cap T_{1}\right|=$ $\left|S^{\prime} \cap D_{1}\right|,\left|S^{\prime} \cap C_{1}\right|=\left|B^{\prime} \cap T_{1}\right|$. Since $a \in S^{\prime} \cap T_{1}$ and $a b \in E_{N}(G)$, from Theorem 2.4 we have that $b \notin T_{1}$ and $b \notin S^{\prime}$. Since $b y \in E(G)$, we have that $b \in A^{\prime} \cap C_{1}$. From $z v \in E(G)$ and $v \in B^{\prime}$, we know that $v \in B^{\prime} \cap\left(C_{1} \cup T_{1}\right)$. Hence, we have that $\left|A^{\prime} \cap T_{1}\right|=$ $\left|S^{\prime} \cap D_{1}\right|=0,1$ or 2 .

Now we discuss the following subcases:
Subcase 1.1: If $\left|A^{\prime} \cap T_{1}\right|=\left|D_{1} \cap S^{\prime}\right|=2$, then noticing that $\left|T_{1}\right|=\left|S^{\prime}\right|=3$ and $a \in S^{\prime} \cap T_{1}$, we have that $\left|S^{\prime} \cap C_{1}\right|=\left|B^{\prime} \cap T_{1}\right|=0$. Since avza is a 3-cycle of $G$, we have that $v \in B^{\prime} \cap C_{1}$, and so $\left|B^{\prime} \cap C_{1}\right| \geqslant 2$. Then, $\{a, z\}$ would be a 2 -vertex-cut of $G$, which contradicts to that $G$ is 4 -connected.

Subcase 1.2: If $\left|A^{\prime} \cap T_{1}\right|=\left|D_{1} \cap S^{\prime}\right|=1$, then $\left|S^{\prime} \cap T_{1}\right| \leqslant 2$. First, we claim that $B^{\prime} \cap D_{1}=\{u\}$. Otherwise, if $\left|B^{\prime} \cap D_{1}\right| \geqslant 2$, since $\Gamma_{G}(a)=\{y, z, u, v, b\}$, by the foregoing argument we have that $\Gamma_{G}(a) \cap\left(B^{\prime} \cap D_{1}\right)=\{u\}$. Then, $\{u\} \cup\left(Y_{3}-\{a\}\right)$ would be a 3-vertex-cut of $G$, a contradiction. Hence, $D_{1} \cap B^{\prime}=\{u\}$. Let $D_{1} \cap S^{\prime}=$ $\left\{u_{1}\right\}$. If $S \cap T_{1}=\{a\}$, then $\left|Y_{4}\right|=3$. Since $G$ is 4-connected, we have that $D_{1} \cap A^{\prime}=$ $\emptyset$. Then, $u_{1} \in \Gamma_{G}(a)$. However, it is easy to see that $u_{1} \notin\{y, z, b, u, v\}$, a contradiction. Therefore, $\left|S^{\prime} \cap T_{1}\right|=2$. It is easy to see that $\Gamma_{G}(a) \cap\left(A^{\prime} \cap D_{1}\right)=\emptyset$. If $A^{\prime} \cap D_{1} \neq \emptyset$, then $Y_{4}-\{a\}$ would be a 3-vertex-cut of $G$, a contradiction. If $A^{\prime} \cap D_{1}=\emptyset$, then it is easy to see that $a u_{1} \in E(G)$. However, $u_{1} \notin\{b, u, v, y, z\}$, a contradiction.

Subcase 1.3: If $\left|A^{\prime} \cap T_{1}\right|=\left|D_{1} \cap S^{\prime}\right|=0$, since $D_{1}$ is a connected subgraph of $G$, we have that $A^{\prime} \cap D_{1}=\emptyset$. From $\left|D_{1}\right| \geqslant 2$, we have that $\left|D_{1} \cap B^{\prime}\right| \geqslant 2$. By an analogous
argument we can deduce that $\Gamma_{G}(a) \cap\left(D_{1} \cap B^{\prime}\right)=\{u\}$. Since $\left|Y_{3}\right|=\left|T_{1}\right|=3$, $\{u\} \cup\left(Y_{3}-\{a\}\right)$ would be a 3-vertex-cut, a contradiction.

Case 2: $y \in A^{\prime} \cap T_{1}$.
Since $y z \in E_{N}(G)$, from Theorem 2.2 we have that $\left|C_{1}\right|=2$. Since $C_{1}$ is a connected subgraph of $G$, we have that $A^{\prime} \cap C_{1}=\emptyset$. If $S^{\prime} \cap C_{1} \neq \emptyset$, from $\left|C_{1}\right|=2$ we have that $\left|S^{\prime} \cap C_{1}\right|=1$. Since $a \in S^{\prime} \cap T_{1}$, we have that $\left|D_{1} \cap S^{\prime}\right| \leqslant 1$. Since $Y_{3}$ is a vertex-cut of $G-z u$, we have that $\left|Y_{3}\right| \geqslant 3$, and so $\left|B^{\prime} \cap T_{1}\right| \geqslant 1$. Noticing that $\left|T_{1}\right|=3$, we have that $A^{\prime} \cap T_{1}=\{y\}$ and $\left|Y_{4}\right|=3$. Since $G$ is 4-connected, we have that $A^{\prime} \cap D_{1}=\emptyset$, and therefore, we have that $A^{\prime}=\{y\}$, which contradicts to that $\left|A^{\prime}\right| \geqslant 2$. If $S^{\prime} \cap C_{1}=$ $\emptyset$, then $\left|B^{\prime} \cap C_{1}\right|=2$. Since $A^{\prime} \cap T_{1} \neq \emptyset$, we have that $\left|Y_{2}\right|=\left|T_{1} \cap\left(B^{\prime} \cup S^{\prime}\right)\right| \leqslant 2$, and so $\{z\} \cup Y_{2}$ would be a vertex-cut of $G$. However, $\left|\{z\} \cup Y_{2}\right|<4$, a contradiction.

From all the above arguments we have that $a u, a v$ cannot belong to $E(G)$ simultaneously. The proof is now complete.

A 4-connected graph $G$ is said to have property $(\star)$ if there does not exist any edge $x y \in E_{R}(G)$ such that both $d(x) \geqslant 5$ and $d(y) \geqslant 5$.

Theorem 4.4. Let $G$ be a 4 -connected graph with property $(\star),|G| \geqslant 8$, and $C^{\prime}$ be a cycle of $G$. If $C^{\prime}$ does not contain any removable edges of $G$, then $G$ has one of the following structures as its subgraph: l-belt, l-bi-fan ( $l \geqslant 1$ ), $W$-framework, $W^{\prime}$-framework or helm, such that it intersects $C^{\prime}$ at its some inner edge(s).

Proof. For every edge $e=x y$ in $C^{\prime}$, from Theorem 2.1 there exists a separating group $(e, S ; A, B)$ of $G$, in which we always choose $A$ and $B$ such that $\min \{|A|,|B|\}$ is as small as possible. Without loss of generality, we may assume $|A| \leqslant|B|$ such that $y \in A, x \in B$. Then, we take $f=y z \in E\left(C^{\prime}\right), z \neq x$, and its corresponding separating group $(f, T ; C, D)$ such that $y \in C, z \in D$ in $G$. Let

$$
\begin{aligned}
& X_{1}=(S \cap C) \cup(S \cap T) \cup(A \cap T), \\
& X_{2}=(A \cap T) \cup(S \cap T) \cup(S \cap D), \\
& X_{3}=(S \cap D) \cup(S \cap T) \cup(B \cap T), \\
& X_{4}=(B \cap T) \cup(S \cap T) \cup(S \cap C) .
\end{aligned}
$$

It is easy to see that the edge $e=x y$ is the unique edge connecting $A$ and $B$, and the edge $f=y z$ is the unique edge connecting $C$ and $D$, and so $x \notin D, z \notin B$. Since $X_{1}$ is a vertex-cut of $G-y x-y z$ and $G$ is 4 -connected, we have that $\left|X_{1}\right| \geqslant 2$.

Next we will distinguish the following cases to proceed the proof:
Case 1: $x \in B \cap C, z \in D \cap S$.
From Theorem 2.2 we have that $|A|=2$. Since $A \cap C \neq \emptyset$ and $A$ is a connected subgraph of $G$, we have that $A \cap D=\emptyset$, and so $|A \cap T| \leqslant 1$. If $|A \cap T|=0$, then $|A \cap C|=2$. Since $S \cap D \neq \emptyset$, by noticing that $|S|=3$, we have that $\left|X_{1}\right|=$ $|(S \cap C) \cup(S \cap T)| \leqslant 2$, and thus $X_{1} \cup\{y\}$ would be a vertex-cut of $G$. However, $\left|X_{1} \cup\{y\}\right|<4$, which contradicts to that $G$ is 4-connected. Therefore, $|A \cap T|=$ $1, A \cap C=\{y\}$. Since $X_{4}$ is a vertex-cut of $G-x y$, we have that $\left|X_{4}\right| \geqslant 3$, and hence
$|S \cap C| \geqslant|A \cap T|=1,|B \cap T| \geqslant|S \cap D| \geqslant 1$. So, $S \cap T=\emptyset$ or $|S \cap T|=1$. We claim that $S \cap T=\emptyset$. Otherwise, if $|S \cap T|=1$, then $\left|X_{3}\right|=3$, and so $B \cap D=\emptyset$. Since $A \cap D=\emptyset$, it is easy to see that $D=D \cap S=\{z\}$, which contradicts to that $|D| \geqslant 2$, and thus $S \cap T=\emptyset$. Noticing that $|T|=3$, we have that $|B \cap T|=2$. If $|S \cap C|=2$, then $|S \cap D|=1$. A similar argument can be used to get that $D=\{z\}$, which contradicts to that $|D| \geqslant 2$. Therefore, $|C \cap S|=1$, and so $|D \cap S|=2$.

Let $A \cap T=\{a\}, S \cap C=\{b\}, S \cap D=\{z, c\}$. It is easy to see that $\Gamma_{G}(y)=$ $\{x, z, a, b\}, \Gamma_{G}(a)=\{y, z, b, c\}$. Next we will show that $a y, a z, b y \in E_{R}(G)$ by contradiction.
(1). Assume that $a y \in E_{N}(G)$ and we take a separating group ( $a y, U ; A^{\prime}, B^{\prime}$ ) such that $a \in A^{\prime}, y \in B^{\prime}$. Since ayza, abya are 3-cycles of $G$, we have that $z, b \in U$. Since $y z \in E_{N}(G)$, from Theorem 2.2 we have that $\left|B^{\prime}\right|=2$. Let $B^{\prime}=\left\{v_{1}, y\right\}$, then $b y v_{1} b$ is a 3 -cycle of $G$ and $v_{1} \neq a$, and so this is true only if $v_{1}=x$ holds. However, $x z \notin E(G)$, and so $d(x)<4$, a contradiction.
(2). Assume that $a z \in E_{N}(G)$ and we take its separating group ( $a z, U ; A^{\prime}, B^{\prime}$ ) such that $a \in A^{\prime}, z \in B^{\prime}$ in $G$. Since ayza is a 3-cycle of $G$, we have that $y \in U$. Since $y z \in E_{N}(G)$, from Theorem 2.2 we have that $\left|B^{\prime}\right|=2$. Let $B^{\prime}=\left\{z, v_{1}\right\}$, then $y z v_{1} y$ is a 3-cycle of $G$ and $v_{1} \neq a$, which is impossible to hold in $G$. Therefore, $a z \in E_{R}(G)$.
(3). Assume that $b y \in E_{N}(G)$. First, let $A^{\prime}=C \cap(B \cup S), S^{\prime}=\{y\} \cup(B \cap T), B^{\prime}=$ $G-a b-A^{\prime}-S^{\prime}$, then $\left(a b, S^{\prime} ; A^{\prime}, B^{\prime}\right)$ is a separating group of $G$, and hence $a b \in E_{N}(G)$. Since $b y \in E_{N}(G)$, we take its separating group ( $b y, U ; A^{\prime}, B^{\prime}$ ) such that $b \in A^{\prime}, y \in B^{\prime}$. Since $a b y a$ is a 3-cycle of $G$, we have that $a \in S^{\prime}$. Since $a b \in E_{N}(G)$, from Theorem 2.2 we have that $\left|A^{\prime}\right|=2$. Let $A^{\prime}=\left\{b, v_{1}\right\}$. Then $a b v_{1} a$ is a 3-cycle of $G$ and $v_{1} \neq y$, which is impossible in $G$, and therefore, we have $b y \in E_{R}(G)$.

Let $A^{\prime}=\{a, y\}, S^{\prime}=\{b, z, x\}, B^{\prime}=G-a c-S^{\prime}-A^{\prime}$, then $\left(a c, S^{\prime} ; A^{\prime}, B^{\prime}\right)$ is a separating group of $G$, and so $a c \in E_{N}(G)$. It is easy to see that $(a b, B \cap T \cup\{y\})$ is a separating pair of $G$, so $a b \in E_{N}(G)$.

Obviously, $y z$ is an inner edge of an $l$-belt or $l$-co-belt with $l \geqslant 1$, and so the conclusion holds.

Case 2: $z \in S \cap D, x \in B \cap T$.
From Theorem 2.2 we have that $|A|=|C|=2$. Since $A$ and $C$ are two connected subgraphs of $G$, we have that $A \cap D=\emptyset=B \cap C$. First, we claim that $|A \cap C|=1$. Otherwise, $|A \cap C|=2$, and so $A \cap T=\emptyset=S \cap C$. Since $B \cap T \neq \emptyset \neq S \cap D$, we have that $\left|X_{1}\right|=|S \cap T| \leqslant 2$, and so $X_{1} \cup\{y\}$ would be a vertex-cut of $G$. However, $\left|X_{1} \cup\{y\}\right|<4$, which contradicts to that $G$ is 4-connected. Therefore, $|A \cap T|=$ $1,|S \cap C|=1$. Second, we claim that $S \cap T=\emptyset$. Otherwise, $|S \cap T|=1$. Then, $\left|X_{3}\right|=$ 3, and so $B \cap D=\emptyset$. Hence, $D=D \cap S=\{z\}$, which contradicts to that $|D| \geqslant 2$. Therefore, we have that $|B \cap T|=|S \cap D|=2$.

Let $A \cap T=\{a\}, S \cap C=\{b\}, D \cap S=\{z, v\}, B \cap T=\{x, u\}, \quad$ then $\quad \Gamma_{G}(y)=$ $\{x, z, a, b\}, \Gamma_{G}(a)=\{x, z, b, v\}, \Gamma_{G}(b)=\{x, y, a, u\}$.

Next we will show $a z \in E_{R}(G)$. By contradiction, assume that $a z \in E_{N}(G)$ and we take the corresponding separating group $\left(a z, U ; A^{\prime}, B^{\prime}\right)$ such that $a \in A^{\prime}, z \in B^{\prime}$. Since azya is a 3-cycle of $G$, we have that $y \in U$. Since $y z \in E_{N}(G)$, from Theorem 2.2 we have that $\left|B^{\prime}\right|=2$. Let $B^{\prime}=\left\{z, v_{1}\right\}$, then $y z v_{1} y$ is a 3-cycle of $G$ and $v_{1} \neq a$, and so this is true only if $v_{1}=x$ holds. Since $b x \in E(G)$, we have $b \in U$. Then, $(U-\{y\}) \cup\{a\}$
would be a 3-vertex-cut of $G$, a contradiction. Therefore, $a z \in E_{R}(G)$ holds. By symmetry, we have that $b x \in E_{R}(G)$. Let $A^{\prime}=\{a, y\}, S^{\prime}=\{x, z, b\}, B^{\prime}=G-a v-$ $S^{\prime}-A^{\prime}$, then $\left(a v, S^{\prime} ; A^{\prime}, B^{\prime}\right)$ is a separating group of $G$, and so $a v \in E_{N}(G)$. A similar argument can lead to $b u \in E_{N}(G)$.

Now we discuss the following subcases:
Subcase 2.1: $x z \notin E(G)$. We will show that $a y, b y \in E_{R}(G)$. By contradiction, assume that $a y \in E_{N}(G)$ and we take its separating group (ay, $\left.U ; A^{\prime}, B^{\prime}\right)$ such that $a \in A^{\prime}, y \in B^{\prime}$. Since ayza is a 3-cycle of $G$, we have that $z \in U$. Since $y z \in E_{N}(G)$, from Theorem 2.2 we have that $\left|B^{\prime}\right|=2$. Let $B^{\prime}=\left\{y, v_{1}\right\}$, then $y z v_{1} y$ is a 3-cycle of $G$. Obviously, $v_{1} \neq a$. Note that $x z \notin E(G)$, and so $v_{1} \neq x$, which is impossible in $G$. Therefore, we have that $a y \in E_{R}(G)$. By symmetry, we have that $b y \in E_{R}(G)$. It is easy to see that if $a b \in E_{N}(G)$, then $G$ contains an $l$-belt or an $l$-co-belt with $l \geqslant 1$ such that $y z$ is its an inner edge. If $a b \in E_{R}(G)$, then $G$ contains a $W$-framework such that $y z$ is its an inner edge. Therefore, the conclusion holds.

Subcase 2.2: $x z \in E(G)$. Since $x y, y z \in E_{N}(G)$, from Corollary 2.3 we have $x z \in E_{R}(G)$. Since $G$ has property $(\star)$, we have that $d(x)=4$ or $d(z)=4$.

Subsubcase 2.2.1: $d(x)=4, d(z) \geqslant 5$. Let $\Gamma_{G}(x)=\{y, z, b, w\}$. Since $|G| \geqslant 8$, we have that $B \cap D \neq \emptyset$, and so $w \in B \cap D$. Let $A^{\prime}=\{x, y\}, U=\{w, z, b\}, B^{\prime}=G-a y-$ $U-A^{\prime}$. Then ( $a y, U ; A^{\prime}, B^{\prime}$ ) is a separating group of $G$, and so $a y \in E_{N}(G)$. We claim that $a b \in E_{R}(G)$. Otherwise, $a b \in E_{N}(G)$. Then, we take a separating group (ay, $T_{1} ; C_{1}, D_{1}$ ) of $G$ such that $a \in C_{1}, y \in D_{1}$. Obviously, $z, b \in T_{1}$. Since $a b, y z \in E_{N}(G)$, from Theorem 2.2 we have that $\left|C_{1}\right|=\left|D_{1}\right|=2$, which contradicts to that $|G| \geqslant 8$, and so $a b \in E_{R}(G)$. We claim that $b y \in E_{R}(G)$. Otherwise, $b y \in E_{N}(G)$, and we take its separating group (by, $T_{1} ; C_{1}, D_{1}$ ) such that $b \in C_{1}, y \in D_{1}$. Since byxb is a 3-cycle of $G$, we have $x \in T_{1}$. Since $x y \in E_{N}(G)$, from Theorem 2.2 we have that $\left|D_{1}\right|=2$. Let $D_{1}=\left\{y, v_{1}\right\}$, then $y x v_{1} y$ is a 3-cycle of $G$, and hence this is true only if $v_{1}=z$ holds. However, $d\left(v_{1}\right)=4$, which contradicts to that $d(z) \geqslant 5$. Therefore, $b y \in E_{R}(G)$. Obviously, here $x y, y z$ are inner edges of a $W^{\prime}$-framework in $G$. The conclusion holds.

Subsubcase 2.2.2: $d(x) \geqslant 5, d(z)=4$. By symmetry, from an argument similar to that used in Subsubcase 2.2 .1 we can get the conclusion.

Subsubcase 2.2.3: $d(x)=d(z)=4$. Let $\Gamma_{G}(x)=\{y, z, b, w\}$. Let $A^{\prime}=\{x, y\}, U=$ $\{w, z, b\}, B^{\prime}=G-a y-U-A^{\prime}$, then (ay, $U ; A^{\prime}, B^{\prime}$ ) is a separating group of $G$, and so $a y \in E_{N}(G)$. By symmetry, we have that $b y \in E_{N}(G)$. Since $x y, y z \in E_{N}(G)$, from Corollary 2.3 we have that $a b, b x, x z, z a \in E_{R}(G)$. Obviously, $G$ contains a helm as a subgraph such that $x y, y z$ are its inner edges. Therefore, the conclusion holds.

Case 3: $z \in A \cap D, x \in B \cap T$.
From Theorem 2.2 we have that $|C|=2$. Since $|A| \leqslant|C|$, we have that $|A|=2$, and hence $A=\{y, z\}, A \cap T=\emptyset$. Since $A \cap D \neq \emptyset$, we have that $\left|X_{2}\right| \geqslant 3$. Noticing that $|S|=3$, we have that $|A \cap T| \geqslant|S \cap C|$, and so $|S \cap C|=0$. Since $C$ is a connected subgraph of $G$ and $|C|=2$, from $A=\{y, z\}$ we can get that $A \cap C=\{y\}$. Therefore, $C \cap S \neq \emptyset$, a contradiction. So, Case 3 cannot occur.

Case 4: $z \in A \cap D, x \in B \cap C$.
So, $A \cap D \neq \emptyset \neq B \cap C$, and therefore $\left|X_{2}\right| \geqslant 3,\left|X_{4}\right| \geqslant 3$. Since $\left|X_{2}\right|+\left|X_{4}\right|=|S|+$ $|T|=6$, we have that $\left|X_{2}\right|=\left|X_{4}\right|=3$, and so $|A \cap T|=|S \cap C|,|B \cap T|=|S \cap D|$.

First, we claim that $A \cap D=\{z\}$. Otherwise, $|A \cap D| \geqslant 2$. Let $U^{\prime}=X_{2}, A^{\prime}=$ $A \cap D, B^{\prime}=G-y z-U^{\prime}-A^{\prime}$, then $\left(y z, U^{\prime} ; A^{\prime}, B^{\prime}\right)$ is a separating group of $G$, and $y z \in E\left(C^{\prime}\right),\left|A^{\prime}\right|<|A|$, which contradicts to that $|A|$ is as small as possible. Therefore, $A \cap D=\{z\}$. Since $D$ is a connected subgraph of $G$ and $|D| \geqslant 2$, we have that $D \cap S \neq \emptyset \neq B \cap T$, and so $|S \cap T| \leqslant 2$. If $|S \cap T|=1$, we claim that $S \cap C \neq \emptyset \neq A \cap T$. Otherwise, $\left|X_{1}\right|=1$. Obviously, $|A \cap C| \geqslant 2$, and so $\{y\} \cup(S \cap T)$ would be a 2-vertex-cut of $G$, a contradiction. Therefore, $|S \cap C|=|A \cap T|=1,|D \cap S|=$ $|B \cap T|=1$, and hence $\left|X_{3}\right|=3$. Then, we have that $B \cap D=\emptyset$ and $|D|=2$. However, $|A| \geqslant 3$. Then, $|D|<|A|$, which contradicts to that $|A|$ is as small as possible. Therefore, $|S \cap T|=0$ or $|S \cap T|=2$.

Next we will show that $|S \cap T| \neq 0$. Assume that $|S \cap T|=0$. Then, $|B \cap T|=$ $|S \cap D|=2$ and $|A \cap T|=|S \cap C|=1$ must hold. We claim that $A \cap C=\{y\}$. Otherwise, $|A \cap C| \geqslant 2$. Then, $X_{1} \cup\{y\}$ would be a 3 -vertex-cut of $G$, which contradicts to that $G$ is 4-connected, and so $d(y)=4$. Let $A \cap T=\{a\}, S \cap C=$ $\{b\}, S \cap D=\{u, v\}$. First, let $A^{\prime}=\{a, z\}, S^{\prime}=\{y\} \cup(S \cap D), B^{\prime}=G-a b-S^{\prime}-A^{\prime}$, then $\left(a b, S^{\prime} ; A^{\prime}, B^{\prime}\right)$ is a separating group of $G$, and so $a b \in E_{N}(G)$. Second, we claim that $a z \in E_{R}(G)$. Otherwise, $a z \in E_{N}(G)$, we take the separating group ( $a z, S^{\prime} ; A^{\prime}, B^{\prime}$ ) such that $a \in A^{\prime}, z \in B^{\prime}$. Obviously, $y \in S^{\prime}$. Since $y z \in E_{N}(G)$, from Theorem 2.2 we have that $\left|B^{\prime}\right|=2$, say $B^{\prime}=\left\{z, v_{1}\right\}$. Then, $z v_{1} y z$ is a 3-cycle of $G$ and $v_{1} \neq a$, which is impossible to hold, so $a z \in E_{R}(G)$. Since $C^{\prime}$ is a cycle of $G$, we have that $\{z u, z v\} \cap E_{N}(G) \neq \emptyset$. From Lemma 4.3 we have that $a u, a v$ cannot belong to $E(G)$ simultaneously. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $a u \notin E(G)$. Let $S^{\prime}=$ $(S-\{u\}) \cup\{z\}, A^{\prime}=A-\{z\}, B^{\prime}=B \cup\{u\}$, then $\left(x y, S^{\prime} ; A^{\prime}, B^{\prime}\right)$ is a separating group of $G$, and $\left|A^{\prime}\right|<|A|$, which contradicts to that $|A|$ is as small as possible. Therefore, $S \cap T \neq \emptyset$, and so $|S \cap T|=2$. Then, we have that $|S \cap D|=|B \cap T|=$ $1,|A \cap T|=|S \cap C|=0, A \cap C=\{y\}$.

Let $S \cap T=\{a, b\}, S \cap D=\{u\}$. It is easy to see that $\Gamma_{G}(y)=\{x, a, b, z\}, \Gamma_{G}(z)=$ $\{y, a, b, u\}$.

First, we will show that the conclusion of the theorem holds if $a z \in E_{N}(G)$. From Theorem 2.1 we take its corresponding separating group ( $a z, S_{1} ; A_{1}, B_{1}$ ) such that $a \in B_{1}, z \in A_{1}$. Since ayza is a 3-cycle of $G$, we have $y \in S_{1}$, and so $y \in S_{1} \cap C, a \in B_{1} \cap T$. From Theorem 2.2 we have that $\left|A_{1}\right|=|D|=2$. If $\left|A_{1} \cap D\right|=2$, since $S_{1} \cap C \neq \emptyset$, then $\left|S_{1} \cap T\right| \leqslant 2$, and so $\{z\} \cup\left(S_{1} \cap T\right)$ would be a vertex-cut with cardinality less than 4 , a contradiction. Therefore, $\left|A_{1} \cap D\right|=1$. Since $b \in T$ and $b z \in E(G)$, we have that $b \in A_{1} \cap T$. Since $D$ is a connected subgraph of $G$ and $|D|=2$, it is easy to see that $\left|D \cap S_{1}\right|=1$. Since $z u \in E(G)$, we have that $D \cap S_{1}=\{u\}$. We claim that $S_{1} \cap T=\emptyset$. Otherwise, $\left|S_{1} \cap T\right|=1$. Then, $\left|S_{1} \cap C\right|=\left|B_{1} \cap T\right|=1$. Obviously, $\mid\left(S_{1} \cap C\right) \cup$ $\left(S_{1} \cap T\right) \cup\left(B_{1} \cap T\right) \mid=3$. Since $G$ is 4-connected, we have that $B_{1} \cap C=\emptyset$. Therefore, $|C|=\left|C \cap S_{1}\right|=1$, which contradicts to that $|C| \geqslant 2$. Hence, $S_{1} \cap T=\emptyset$, and therefore, $\left|S_{1} \cap C\right|=\left|B_{1} \cap T\right|=2$. Here we need to discuss the following cases:
(1). If $d(y)=4, d(a) \geqslant 5$, an argument similar to that used in Subsubcase 2.2.1 can lead to that $G$ contains a $W^{\prime}$-framework such that $y z$ is its an inner edge. Then, the conclusion holds.
(2). If $d(y)=d(a)=4$, an argument similar to that used in Subsubcase 2.2.3 can lead to that $G$ contains a helm such that $y z$ is its an inner edge. The conclusion holds.

If $b z \in E_{N}(G)$, by the symmetry of $a z$ and $b z$, a similar argument can be used to get the conclusion. Therefore, we may assume that $a z, b z \in E_{R}(G)$.

Next we consider ay. Assume $a y \in E_{N}(G)$. From Theorem 2.1 we take its separating group ( $a y, S_{1} ; A_{1}, B_{1}$ ) such that $a \in A_{1}, y \in B_{1}$. It is easy to see that $z \in S_{1} \cap D, y \in B_{1} \cap C$ and $a \in A_{1} \cap T$. Since $a y, y z \in E_{N}(G)$, from Theorem 2.2 we have that $|C|=2=\left|B_{1}\right|$, and so $C=\{y, x\}$. By an argument analogous to that used in Case 2, we can get that $\left|B_{1} \cap T\right|=\left|S_{1} \cap C\right|=1, B_{1} \cap C=\{y\},\left|A_{1} \cap T\right|=$ $\left|D \cap S_{1}\right|=2$. Then, $S_{1} \cap C=\{x\}$. Since byzb is a 3-cycle of $G$, it is easy to see that $B_{1} \cap T=\{b\}$ and $d(x)=d(b)=d(z)=4$. Here we need to discuss the following cases:
(1). If $d(a) \geqslant 5$, an argument analogous to that used in Subsubcase 2.2.1 can lead to that $G$ contains a $W^{\prime}$-framework such that $x y, y z$ are its inner edges. Then, the conclusion holds.
(2). If $d(a)=4$, an argument analogous to that used in Subsubcase 2.2.3 can lead to that $G$ contains a helm such that $x y, y z$ are its inner edges. Then, the conclusion holds.

Thus, we may assume that $a y, b y \in E_{R}(G)$. Then, according to the definition of the $l$-bi-fan, $(l \geqslant 1), G$ contains a $l$-bi-fan such that $y z$ is its an inner edge. The proof is now complete.

Lemma 4.5. Let $G$ be a 4-connected graph with property ( $\star$ ), and let $P=y_{1} y_{2} \cdots y_{k}$ be a path of $\left[E_{N}(G)\right]$ with $k \geqslant 3$ and take a set $D$ such that $\emptyset \neq D \subset V(G)$. Suppose that $\left(y_{1} y_{2}, U^{\prime} ; X^{\prime}, Y^{\prime}\right)$ is a separating group of $G$ such that $y_{1} \in Y^{\prime}, y_{2} \in X^{\prime}$ and $D \cap Y^{\prime} \neq \emptyset$. We choose $i \in\{1,2, \ldots, k\}$ and a separating group $\left(y_{i} y_{i+1}, S ; A, B\right)$ satisfying $y_{i} \in B, y_{i+1} \in A, D \cap B \neq \emptyset$ such that $|A|$ is as small as possible. If $i \leqslant k-2$, we take another separating group $\left(y_{i+1} y_{i+2}, S^{\prime} ; A^{\prime}, B^{\prime}\right)$ such that $y_{i+1} \in B^{\prime}, y_{i+2} \in A^{\prime}$, Then, one of the following conclusions holds:
(i) $A \cap B^{\prime}=\left\{y_{i+1}\right\}, A \cap A^{\prime}=\left\{y_{i+2}\right\}, A \cap S^{\prime}=\{a\}, B^{\prime} \cap S=\{b\}, S \cap S^{\prime}=\emptyset, y_{i} \in B \cap B^{\prime}$, $\left|B \cap S^{\prime}\right|=\left|A^{\prime} \cap S\right|=2, A^{\prime} \cap S=\{u, v\}$, where $y_{i+2} u, y_{i+2} v, y_{i+2} a \in E_{R}(G)$ and $a, b, u, v \in G$.
(ii) $A \cap A^{\prime}=\left\{y_{i+2}\right\}, y_{i+1} \in A \cap B^{\prime}, S \cap S^{\prime}=\emptyset=A^{\prime} \cap B, B \cap S^{\prime}=\{d\}=D \cap B, D \cap B^{\prime}$ $=\emptyset, A^{\prime} \cap S=\{c\},\left|B^{\prime} \cap S\right|=\left|A \cap S^{\prime}\right|=2, y_{i} \in B \cap B^{\prime}$, where $d, c \in G$.
(iii) $A \cap A^{\prime}=\left\{y_{i+2}\right\}, \quad y_{i+1} \in A \cap B^{\prime}, S \cap S^{\prime}=\{w\}, \quad D \cap B=\{d\}=B \cap S^{\prime}, D \cap B^{\prime}=$ $\emptyset=B \cap A^{\prime}, A^{\prime} \cap S=\{c\}, \quad\left|B^{\prime} \cap S\right|=\left|A \cap S^{\prime}\right|=1, y_{i} \in B \cap B^{\prime}, \quad$ where $\quad d, c$, $w \in G$.
(iv) $G$ contains one of the following structures: $l$-belt, $(l \geqslant 1)$, helm, $W$-framework, $W^{\prime}$-framework, $l$-bi-fan, $(l \geqslant 1)$, as its subgraph, such that it intersects $P$ at its some inner edge(s).

Proof. Let

$$
\begin{aligned}
& X_{1}=\left(A \cap S^{\prime}\right) \cup\left(S \cap S^{\prime}\right) \cup\left(B^{\prime} \cap S\right), \\
& X_{2}=\left(A \cap S^{\prime}\right) \cup\left(S \cap S^{\prime}\right) \cup\left(A^{\prime} \cap S\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& X_{3}=\left(A^{\prime} \cap S\right) \cup\left(S \cap S^{\prime}\right) \cup\left(B \cap S^{\prime}\right), \\
& X_{4}=\left(B^{\prime} \cap S\right) \cup\left(S \cap S^{\prime}\right) \cup\left(B \cap S^{\prime}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

We will distinguish the following cases to proceed the proof.
Case 1: $y_{i} \in B \cap B^{\prime}, y_{i+2} \in A \cap A^{\prime}$.
Since $B \cap B^{\prime} \neq \emptyset$, then $X_{4}$ is a vertex-cut of $G-y_{i} y_{i+1}$. Since $G$ is 4-connected, we have that $\left|X_{4}\right| \geqslant 3$. By a similar argument we can deduce that $\left|X_{2}\right| \geqslant 3$. Since $\left|X_{2}\right|+$ $\left|X_{4}\right|=|S|+\left|S^{\prime}\right|=6$, we have that $\left|X_{2}\right|=\left|X_{4}\right|$, and so $\left|A \cap S^{\prime}\right|=\left|B^{\prime} \cap S\right|,\left|A^{\prime} \cap S\right|=$ $\left|B \cap S^{\prime}\right|$.

First, we claim that $A^{\prime} \cap(B \cup S) \neq \emptyset$. Otherwise, $A^{\prime} \cap(B \cup S)=\emptyset$. Since $\left|A^{\prime} \cap S\right|=$ 0 , we have that $S^{\prime} \cap B=\emptyset$. Since $B$ is a connected subgraph of $G$, we have that $B=B \cap B^{\prime}$. Therefore, we have that $\emptyset \neq D \cap B=D \cap\left(B \cap B^{\prime}\right) \subset D \cap B^{\prime}$. For the separating group $\left(y_{i+1} y_{i+2}, S^{\prime} ; A^{\prime}, B^{\prime}\right)$ of $G$, we have that $y_{i+1} \in B^{\prime}$, $y_{i+2} \in A^{\prime}, D \cap B^{\prime} \neq \emptyset$, and $A^{\prime} \subset A,\left|A^{\prime}\right|<|A|$, which contradicts to that $|A|$ is as small as possible, and so $A^{\prime} \cap(B \cup S) \neq \emptyset$. Since $A^{\prime}$ is a connected subgraph of $G$ and $A \cap A^{\prime} \neq \emptyset \neq A^{\prime} \cap(B \cup S)$, we have that $A^{\prime} \cap S \neq \emptyset \neq B \cap S^{\prime}$. If $\left|A^{\prime} \cap S\right|=3$, then $\left|X_{1}\right|=$ 0 , and so $\left\{y_{i}, y_{i+2}\right\}$ would be a 2 -vertex-cut of $G$, a contradiction. Therefore, $\left|A^{\prime} \cap S\right|=2$ or $\left|A^{\prime} \cap S\right|=1$.

Next we will discuss the following subcases.
Subcase 1.1: $\left|A^{\prime} \cap S\right|=\left|S^{\prime} \cap B\right|=2$. Let $A^{\prime} \cap S=\{u, v\}$. Since $G$ is 4-connected and $X_{1}$ is a vertex-cut of $G-y_{i} y_{i+1}-y_{i+1} y_{i+2}$, we have that $\left|X_{1}\right| \geqslant 2$. Noticing that $|S|=\left|S^{\prime}\right|=3$, it is easy to see that $\left|A \cap S^{\prime}\right|=\left|B^{\prime} \cap S\right|=1,\left|S \cap S^{\prime}\right|=0$. Let $A \cap S^{\prime}=$ $\{a\}, B^{\prime} \cap S=\{b\}$. First, we claim that $A \cap B^{\prime}=\left\{y_{i+1}\right\}$. Otherwise, $\left|A \cap B^{\prime}\right| \geqslant 2$, and so $X_{1} \cup\left\{y_{i+1}\right\}$ would be a 3-vertex-cut of $G$, a contradiction. Second, we claim that $A \cap A^{\prime}=\left\{y_{i+2}\right\}$. Otherwise, $\left|A \cap A^{\prime}\right| \geqslant 2$. Let $A_{1}=A \cap A^{\prime}, \quad S_{1}=X_{2}, B_{1}=G-$ $y_{i+1} y_{i+2}-S_{1}-A_{1}$. It is easy to see that $D \cap B_{1} \neq \emptyset$. Then, $\left(y_{i+1} y_{i+2}, S_{1} ; A_{1}, B_{1}\right)$ is a separating group of $G$ such that $y_{i+1} \in B_{1}, y_{i+2} \in A_{1}$ and $D \cap B_{1} \neq \emptyset$. However, $\left|A_{1}\right|<|A|$, which contradicts to that $|A|$ is as small as possible. Therefore, $A \cap A^{\prime}=$ $\left\{y_{i+2}\right\}$. Obviously, $\left(a b, S_{1}\right)$ is a separating pair of $G$ such that $S_{1}=\left\{y_{i+1}, u, v\right\}$, and so $a b \in E_{N}(G)$. We claim that $y_{i+2} u, y_{i+2} v \in E_{R}(G)$. Otherwise, $\left\{y_{i+2} u, y_{i+2} v\right\} \cap E_{N}(G) \neq \emptyset$. From Lemma 4.3 we have that $a u, a v$ cannot belong to $E(G)$ simultaneously. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $a u \notin E(G)$. Let $A_{1}=A-\left\{y_{i+2}\right\}, S_{1}=\left\{y_{i+2}\right\} \cup(S-\{u\}), B_{1}=G-y_{i} y_{i+1}-S_{1}-A_{1}$, then $\left(y_{i} y_{i+1}, S_{1} ; A_{1}, B_{1}\right)$ is a separating group of $G$ such that $D \cap B_{1} \neq \emptyset$. However, $\left|A_{1}\right|<|A|$, which contradicts to that $|A|$ is as small as possible. Therefore, $y_{i+2} u, y_{i+2} v \in E_{R}(G)$. We claim that $a y_{i+2} \in E_{R}(G)$. Otherwise, $a y_{i+2} \in E_{N}(G)$, and we take its separating group $\left(a y_{i+2}, T^{\prime} ; C^{\prime}, D^{\prime}\right)$ such that $a \in C^{\prime}, y_{i+2} \in D^{\prime}$. Since $a y_{i+1} y_{i+2} a$ is a 3-cycle of $G$, we have that $y_{i+1} \in T^{\prime}$. Since $y_{i+1} y_{i+2} \in E_{N}(G)$, from Theorem 2.2 we have that $\left|D^{\prime}\right|=2$. Let $D^{\prime}=\left\{y_{i+2}, v_{1}\right\}$, then $v_{1} y_{i+1} y_{i+2} v_{1}$ is a 3-cycle of $G$ and $v_{1} \neq a$. Obviously, it is impossible to hold in $G$, and hence, $a y_{i+2} \in E_{R}(G)$. Then, the conclusion (i) holds.

Subcase 1.2: $\left|A^{\prime} \cap S\right|=\left|B \cap S^{\prime}\right|=1$.
Let $A^{\prime} \cap S=\{c\}, B \cap S^{\prime}=\{d\}$. Then, we will discuss the following subsubcases.
Subsubcase 1.2.1: $\left|S \cap S^{\prime}\right|=0,\left|B^{\prime} \cap S\right|=\left|A \cap S^{\prime}\right|=2$.

It is easy to see that $\left|X_{3}\right|=2$. Since $G$ is 4-connected, we have that $A^{\prime} \cap B=\emptyset$ and $\left|X_{2}\right|=3$. We claim that $A \cap A^{\prime}=\left\{y_{i+2}\right\}$. Otherwise, $\left|A \cap A^{\prime}\right| \geqslant 2$. Let $A_{1}=$ $A \cap A^{\prime}, S_{1}=X_{2}, B_{1}=G-y_{i+1} y_{i+2}-S_{1}-A_{1}$, then $\left(y_{i+1} y_{i+2}, S_{1} ; A_{1}, B_{1}\right)$ is a separating group. Obviously, $D \cap B_{1} \neq \emptyset$ and $\left|A_{1}\right|<|A|$, which contradicts to that $|A|$ is as small as possible. Therefore, $A \cap A^{\prime}=\left\{y_{i+2}\right\}$, and so $A^{\prime}=\left\{y_{i+2}, c\right\},\left|A^{\prime}\right|=2<|A|$. By the minimum property of $|A|$, we have that $B^{\prime} \cap D=\emptyset$, and therefore, $B \cap D=$ $B \cap S^{\prime}=\{d\}$ and $|B \cap D|=1$. Then, conclusion (ii) holds.

Subsubcase 1.2.2: $\left|S \cap S^{\prime}\right|=1,\left|B^{\prime} \cap S\right|=\left|A \cap S^{\prime}\right|=1$.
Let $A^{\prime} \cap S=\{c\}, S \cap S^{\prime}=\{w\}, B \cap S^{\prime}=\{d\}$. Since $\left|X_{3}\right|=3<4$, we have that $B \cap A^{\prime}=\emptyset$. An argument similar to that used in Subsubcase 1.2.1 can lead to that $A \cap A^{\prime}=\left\{y_{i+2}\right\}, y_{i+1} \in A \cap B^{\prime}$. Since $\left|A^{\prime}\right|=2<|A|$, by an argument similar to that used in Subsubcase 1.2.1, we have that $B^{\prime} \cap D=\emptyset$, and so $D \cap B=B \cap S^{\prime}=\{d\}$. Then, conclusion (iii) holds.

Subsubcase 1.2.3: $\left|S \cap S^{\prime}\right|=2,\left|B^{\prime} \cap S\right|=\left|A \cap S^{\prime}\right|=0$,
Let $S \cap S^{\prime}=\{a, b\}$. We claim that $A \cap B^{\prime}=\left\{y_{i+1}\right\}$. Otherwise, $\left|A \cap B^{\prime}\right| \geqslant 2$. Then, $\left\{y_{i+1}, a, b\right\}$ would be a 3 -vertex-cut of $G$, which contradicts to that $G$ is 4-connected. It is easy to see that $\left|X_{2}\right|=3$. An argument similar to that used in Subsubcase 1.2.1 can lead to that $A \cap A^{\prime}=\left\{y_{i+2}\right\}$. From Corollary 2.3 we have that $\left\{a y_{i+1}, a y_{i+2}\right\} \cap E_{R}(G) \neq \emptyset,\left\{b y_{i+1}, b y_{i+2}\right\} \cap E_{R}(G) \neq \emptyset$. Next we discuss the following cases.
(1). If $a y_{i+2} \in E_{N}(G)$, then $A^{\prime} \cap B=\emptyset$ and we take the corresponding separating group $\left(a y_{i+2}, S_{1} ; A_{1}, B_{1}\right)$ such that $y_{i+2} \in A_{1}, a \in B_{1}$. Since $a y_{i+1} y_{i+2} a$ is a 3 -cycle of $G$, we have that $y_{i+1} \in S_{1}$, and so $y_{i+1} \in S_{1} \cap B^{\prime}$. Since $a \in S^{\prime}$, we have that $a \in S^{\prime} \cap B_{1}$. Obviously, $d\left(y_{i+1}\right)=d\left(y_{i+2}\right)=4$. By an argument analogous to that used in Subcase 2.2 of Theorem 4.4, we can get that $y_{i+1} y_{i+2}$ is an inner edge of a $W^{\prime}$-framework or a helm, and so conclusion (iv) holds. For $b y_{i+2} \in E_{N}(G)$, we may employ a similar argument to get conclusion (iv). Hence, we may assume that $a y_{i+2}, b y_{i+2} \in E_{R}(G)$.
(2). If $a y_{i+1} \in E_{N}(G)$, we take the corresponding separating group $\left(a y_{i+1}, S_{1} ; A_{1}, B_{1}\right)$ such that $y_{i+1} \in A_{1}, a \in B_{1}$. Then, $y_{i+1} \in A_{1} \cap B^{\prime}, a \in B_{1} \cap S^{\prime}$. Since $a y_{i+1} y_{i+2} a$ is a 3 -cycle of $G$, we have that $y_{i+2} \in S_{1}$, and so $y_{i+2} \in A^{\prime} \cap S_{1}$. Since $a y_{i+2} \in E(G)$ and $d\left(y_{i+2}\right)=4$, by an argument analogous to that used in Subcase 2.2 of Theorem 4.4 we can get that $y_{i+1} y_{i+2}$ is an inner edge of a $W^{\prime}$-framework or a helm, and hence, conclusion (iv) holds. For $b y_{i+1} \in E_{N}(G)$, we may employ a similar argument to get conclusion (iv).

Based on the above arguments, we may assume that $a y_{i+1}, b y_{i+1}$, $a y_{i+2}, b y_{i+2} \in E_{R}(G)$, and so $G$ contains a $l$-bi-fan such that $y_{i+1} y_{i+2}$ is its an inner edge. Therefore, conclusion (iv) holds.

Case 2: $y_{i+2} \in A \cap A^{\prime}, y_{i} \in B \cap S^{\prime}$.
Since $y_{i} y_{i+1} \in E_{N}(G)$, from Theorem 2.2 we have that $\left|B^{\prime}\right|=2$. Since $B^{\prime}$ is a connected subgraph of $G$, we have that $B \cap B^{\prime}=\emptyset$. Because $G$ is 4-connected and $X_{1}$ is a vertex-cut of $G-y_{i} y_{i+1}-y_{i+1} y_{i+2}$, we have that $\left|X_{1}\right| \geqslant 2$. A similar argument can lead to that $\left|X_{2}\right| \geqslant 3$. We claim that $A \cap B^{\prime}=\left\{y_{i+1}\right\}$. If not, i.e., $\left|A \cap B^{\prime}\right|=2$, from $B \cap S^{\prime} \neq \emptyset$ and $\left|S^{\prime}\right|=3$ we have that $\left|X_{1}\right| \leqslant 2$, and so $X_{1} \cup\left\{y_{i+1}\right\}$ is a vertex-cut of $G$ with cardinality less than 4 , which contradicts to that $G$ is 4 -connected. Therefore, $\left|A \cap B^{\prime}\right|=\left|B^{\prime} \cap S\right|=1$. If $\left|B \cap S^{\prime}\right|=1$, then $\left|X_{3}\right|=3$, and so $A^{\prime} \cap B=\emptyset$. Then, we
have that $|B|=\left|B \cap S^{\prime}\right|=1$, which contradicts to that $|B| \geqslant 2$, and so $\left|B \cap S^{\prime}\right| \geqslant 2$. If $\left|B \cap S^{\prime}\right|=3$, then we have that $A \cap S^{\prime}=\emptyset=S \cap S^{\prime}$, and so $\left|X_{1}\right|=1$, which contradicts to that $\left|X_{1}\right| \geqslant 2$. Therefore, $\left|B \cap S^{\prime}\right|=2$ and $\left|S \cap S^{\prime}\right| \leqslant 1$. If $\left|S \cap S^{\prime}\right|=1$, then $A \cap S^{\prime}=\emptyset$ and $\left|A^{\prime} \cap S\right|=1$, and hence $\left|X_{2}\right|=2$, which contradicts to that $\left|X_{2}\right| \geqslant 3$. Then, we can conclude that $S \cap S^{\prime}=\emptyset$ and $\left|A \cap S^{\prime}\right|=1$. From $|S|=3$ we know that $\left|A^{\prime} \cap S\right|=2,\left|X_{2}\right|=3$. We claim that $A \cap A^{\prime}=\left\{y_{i+2}\right\}$. If not, i.e., $\left|A \cap A^{\prime}\right| \geqslant 2$, then we take $A_{1}=A \cap A^{\prime}, S_{1}=X_{2}, B_{1}=G-y_{i+1} y_{i+2}-S_{1}-A_{1}$, and so $\left(y_{i+1} y_{i+2}, S_{1} ; A_{1}, B_{1}\right)$ is a separating group of $G$. It is easy to see that $B_{1} \cap D \neq \emptyset$. However, we have that $\left|A_{1}\right|<|A|$, which contradicts to that $|A|$ is as small as possible. Therefore, $A \cap A^{\prime}=\left\{y_{i+2}\right\}$.

Let $A \cap S^{\prime}=\{a\}, B^{\prime} \cap S=\{b\}$. Next we will show that $b y_{i}, b y_{i+1}, a y_{i+1} \in E_{R}(G)$ by contradiction.
(1). If $b y_{i} \in E_{N}(G)$, we take its corresponding separating group ( $b y_{i}, T ; C, K$ ) of $G$ such that $b \in C, y_{i} \in K$. Since $b y_{i} y_{i+1} b$ is a 3 -cycle of $G$, we have that $y_{i+1} \in T$. Since $y_{i} y_{i+1} \in E_{N}(G)$, from Theorem 2.2 we can get $|K|=2$, say $K=\left\{y_{i}, v_{1}\right\}$. Then, $v_{1} y_{i+1} y_{i} v_{1}$ is a 3-cycle of $G$ and $v_{1} \neq b$, which is impossible in $G$, and hence $b y_{i} \in E_{R}(G)$.
(2). If $b y_{i+1} \in E_{N}(G)$, similarly we take its corresponding separating group ( $b y_{i+1}, T ; C, K$ ) of $G$ such that $b \in C, y_{i+1} \in K$. It is easy to see that $\left\{a, y_{i}\right\} \subset T$. Since $y_{i} y_{i+1} \in E_{N}(G)$, from Theorem 2.2 we have that $|K|=2$, say $K=\left\{y_{i+1}, v_{1}\right\}$. Then, $v_{1} \in \Gamma_{G}\left(y_{i}\right) \cap \Gamma_{G}\left(y_{i+1}\right) \cap \Gamma_{G}(a)$, which is impossible in $G$, and so $b y_{i+1} \in E_{R}(G)$.
(3). If $a y_{i+1} \in E_{N}(G)$, again similarly we take its corresponding separating group $\left(a y_{i+1}, T ; C, K\right)$ such that $a \in C, y_{i+1} \in K$. Since $a y_{i+1} y_{i+2} a$ is a 3-cycle of $G$, we have $y_{i+2} \in T$. Since $y_{i+1} y_{i+2} \in E_{N}(G)$, from Theorem 2.2 we have that $|K|=2$. Let $K=$ $\left\{y_{i+1}, v_{1}\right\}$, then $y_{i+1} v_{1} y_{i+2} y_{i+1}$ is a 3-cycle of $G$, and $v_{1} \neq a$, which is impossible in $G$, and so $a y_{i+1} \in E_{R}(G)$.

Let $A_{1}=\left\{a, y_{i+2}\right\}, S_{1}=S \cap A^{\prime} \cup\left\{y_{i+1}\right\} \quad$ and $\quad B_{1}=G-a b-S_{1}-A_{1}$, then ( $a b, S_{1} ; A_{1}, B_{1}$ ) is a separating group of $G$, and so $a b \in E_{N}(G)$.

Noticing that $d(b)=d\left(y_{i+1}\right)=4$, by the definition of an $l$-belt we know that $G$ contains an $l$-belt such that $y_{i} y_{i+1}$ is its an inner edge. Therefore, conclusion (iv) holds.

Case 3: $y_{i} \in B \cap S^{\prime}, y_{i+2} \in A^{\prime} \cap S$.
From Theorem 2.2 we have that $|A|=2,\left|B^{\prime}\right|=2$. Since $A$ and $B^{\prime}$ are connected subgraphs of $G$, we have that $A \cap A^{\prime}=\emptyset=B \cap B^{\prime}$. If $\left|A \cap B^{\prime}\right|=2$, then $B^{\prime} \cap S=\emptyset=$ $A \cap S^{\prime}$. Since $B \cap S^{\prime} \neq \emptyset \neq A^{\prime} \cap S$, by noticing that $|S|=\left|S^{\prime}\right|=3$, we have that $\left|S \cap S^{\prime}\right| \leqslant 2$, and so $\left\{y_{i+1}\right\} \cup\left(S \cap S^{\prime}\right)$ is a vertex-cut of $G$ with cardinality less than 4, which contradicts to that $G$ is 4-connected. Therefore, $A \cap B^{\prime}=\left\{y_{i+1}\right\}$, and so $\left|B^{\prime} \cap S\right|=\left|A \cap S^{\prime}\right|=1$. If $\left|A^{\prime} \cap S\right|=1$, then $A^{\prime} \cap B \neq \emptyset$. Then, $X_{3}$ is a vertex-cut of $G$, and so $\left|X_{3}\right| \geqslant 4$. Then, $1=\left|A^{\prime} \cap S\right|>\left|A \cap S^{\prime}\right|=1$, a contradiction. Hence, $\left|A^{\prime} \cap S\right|=$ 2, and so $S \cap S^{\prime}=\emptyset,\left|B \cap S^{\prime}\right|=2$. By an argument similar to that used in Case 2 of Theorem 4.4, we know that conclusion (iv) of the lemma holds.

Case 4: $y_{i} \in B \cap B^{\prime}, y_{i+2} \in A^{\prime} \cap S$.
An argument analogous to that used in Case 1 of Theorem 4.4 can show that $G$ contains an $l$-belt such that $y_{i+1} y_{i+2}$ is its an inner edge. Therefore, conclusion (iv) of the lemma holds. The proof of the lemma is complete.

Theorem 4.6. Let $G$ be a 4 -connected graph with property $(\star)$. Suppose that $H$ is a helm of $G$ such that $H$ is defined as in Definition 3.1. Let $V(H)=$ $\left\{a, x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}, x_{4}, v_{1}, v_{2}, v_{3}, v_{4}\right\}$ and $P=y_{1} y_{2} \cdots y_{h}$ is a path in $\left[E_{N}(G)\right]$ with $h \geqslant 2$ such that $a \notin V(P)$ and $\left\{y_{1}, y_{h}\right\} \subset\left\{x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}, x_{4}\right\}$. Then, $G$ contains one of the following structures $H_{1}$ as its subgraph: l-belt, l-bi-fan, $(l \geqslant 1)$, W-framework, $W^{\prime}$-framework or helm, such that at least one inner edge of $H_{1}$ belongs to $E(P \cup H)$, and $H$ and $H_{1}$ do not have any common inner edge.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume that $y_{1}=x_{1}$, then it is easy to see that $y_{2}=v_{1}$. Let $k=h+1, y_{k}=a$, then $P^{\prime}=y_{1} y_{2} \cdots y_{k}$ is also a path of $\left[E_{N}(G)\right]$ where $k \geqslant 3$. Let $D=\{a\}$. We take the separating group ( $x_{1} v_{1}, S_{1} ; A_{1}, B_{1}$ ) such that $S_{1}=$ $\left\{x_{2}, x_{3}, x_{4}\right\}, B_{1}=\left\{x_{1}, a\right\}, A_{1}=G-x_{1} v_{1}-S_{1}-B_{1}$. Obviously, $D \cap B_{1} \neq \emptyset$.

We take the separating group $\left(y_{i} y_{i+1}, S ; A, B\right)$ of $G$, where $i=1,2, \ldots, k-1$, such that $y_{i} \in B, y_{i+1} \in A, D \cap B \neq \emptyset$ and $|A|$ is as small as possible. We claim that $i+$ $1 \leqslant k-1$ holds. Otherwise, $y_{i+1}=y_{k}$, i.e., $y_{i+1}=a$. Then, $a \in A \cup S$, which contradicts to that $D \cap B \neq \emptyset$. Therefore, $i+1 \leqslant k-1$.

We take another separating group $\left(y_{i+1} y_{i+2}, S^{\prime} ; A^{\prime}, B^{\prime}\right)$ such that $y_{i+1} \in B^{\prime}, y_{i+2} \in A^{\prime}$, and $\left|A^{\prime}\right|$ is as small as possible. From Lemma 4.5 we know that one of the four conclusions of Lemma 4.5 holds. Now we discuss them as follows.
(1). Conclusion (i) of Lemma 4.5 holds. It is easy to see that $P^{\prime}+a x_{1}$ is a cycle of [ $\left.E_{N}(G)\right]$. Then, each vertex of $P$ is incident with at least two unremovable edges of $G$. However, from conclusion (i) we have that $d\left(y_{i+2}\right)=4$ and $y_{i+2}$ is incident with three removable edges of $G$. Therefore, conclusion (i) cannot hold.
(2). Conclusion (ii) of Lemma 4.5 holds. Then, $B \cap S^{\prime}=\{d\}=\{a\}=D \cap B$, $c \in\left\{x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}, x_{4}\right\}$, and $a c(=d c)$ is not in any 3-cycle of $G$. However, from the definition of the helm, we know that $a c\left(=a x_{j}\right)$ for each $j=1,2,3,4$ is in two 3-cycles of $G$, a contradiction.
(3). Conclusion (iii) of Lemma 4.5 holds. Then, $\{d\}=B \cap S^{\prime}=\{a\}=D \cap B$. Since $a c \in E(G)$, we have $c \in\left\{x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}, x_{4}\right\}$. Then, we have that $a c$ is in two 3-cycles of $G$. However, this is impossible to hold in $G$. Therefore, conclusion (iii) cannot hold.
(4). If conclusion (iv) of Lemma 4.5 holds, then the theorem holds. The proof is complete.

Theorem 4.7. Let $G$ be a 4-connected graph with property $(\star)$ and $L_{1}$ a maximal 1belt of $G$ defined as in Definition 3.3 such that $V\left(L_{1}\right)=\left\{x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}, y_{1}, y_{2}, y_{3}\right\}$. Suppose that $P=l_{1} l_{2} \cdots l_{h}$ is a path of $\left[E_{N}(G)\right]$ such that $\left\{l_{1}, l_{h}\right\} \subset\left\{x_{1}, x_{3}, y_{1}, y_{3}\right\}$ and $\left\{x_{2}, y_{2}\right\} \cap V(P)=\emptyset$. Then, $G$ contains one of the following structures $L^{\prime}$ as its subgraph: l-belt, $(l \geqslant 1)$, helm, $W$-framework, $W^{\prime}$-framework or l-bi-fan, $(l \geqslant 1)$, such that at least one inner edge of $L^{\prime}$ belongs to $E\left(P \cup L_{1}\right)$.

Proof. We distinguish the following cases.
Case 1: If $l_{h}=y_{3}$, by letting $k=h+1, l_{k}=y_{2}$, then $P^{\prime}=l_{1} l_{2} \cdots l_{k}$ is also a path of $\left.{ }_{[E}(G)\right]$. Let $D=\left\{x_{2}, y_{2}\right\}$, and take a separating group $\left(l_{1} l_{2}, S_{1} ; A_{1}, B_{1}\right)$ of $G$ such
that $l_{1} \in B_{1}, l_{2} \in A_{1}$. Next we will show that $B_{1} \cap D \neq \emptyset$. We discuss the following subcases:

Subcase 1.1: If $l_{1}=x_{1}$, we claim that $x_{2} \in B_{1}$. Otherwise, $x_{2} \in S_{1}$. Since $x_{1} x_{2} \in E_{N}(G)$, from Theorem 2.2 we have that $\left|B_{1}\right|=2$. Let $B_{1}=\left\{l_{1}, v_{1}\right\}$, then $v_{1} \in \Gamma_{G}\left(x_{1}\right) \cap \Gamma_{G}\left(x_{2}\right)$. If $v_{1}=y_{1}$, then $\Gamma_{G}\left(y_{1}\right)=\left\{x_{1}, x_{2}, y_{2}, w\right\}$, where $w \in V(G)$, which contradicts to that $L_{1}$ is a maximal 1-belt. If $v_{1}=x_{3}$, then $\Gamma_{G}\left(x_{3}\right)=\left\{x_{2}, y_{2}, x_{1}, w\right\}$. It is easy to see that $\left(x_{2} y_{1}, T\right)$ is a separating pair of $G$ such that $T=\left\{w, y_{2}, x_{1}\right\}$, and so $x_{2} y_{1} \in E_{N}(G)$, which contradicts to the definition of the $l$-belt. Therefore, $x_{2} \in B_{1}$ holds, i.e., $D \cap B_{1} \neq \emptyset$.

Subcase 1.2: If $l_{1}=y_{1}$, then if $y_{2} \in S_{1}$, since $y_{1} y_{2} \in E_{N}(G)$, from Theorem 2.2 we have that $\left|B_{1}\right|=2$. It is easy to see that $B_{1}=\left\{y_{1}, x_{2}\right\}$, and so $D \cap B_{1} \neq \emptyset$. If $y_{2} \in B_{1}$, then $D \cap B_{1} \neq \emptyset$.

Subcase 1.3: If $l_{1}=x_{3}$, we claim that $D \cap B_{1} \neq \emptyset$. Otherwise, $D \cap B_{1}=\emptyset$. From $x_{3} y_{2}, x_{3} x_{2} \in E(G)$ we have that $x_{2}, y_{2} \in S_{1}$. Since $x_{2} x_{3} \in E_{N}(G)$, from Theorem 2.2 we have that $\left|B_{1}\right|=2$. Let $B_{1}=\left\{x_{3}, v_{1}\right\}$, then it is easy to see that $v_{1} \in \Gamma_{G}\left(x_{2}\right) \cap \Gamma_{G}\left(y_{2}\right) \cap \Gamma_{G}\left(x_{3}\right)$. Then $v_{1}=y_{1}$ holds, i.e., $y_{1} x_{3} \in E(G)$. Since $x_{2} x_{3} \in E_{N}(G)$, we take the separating group $\left(x_{2} x_{3}, T_{1} ; C_{1}, D_{1}\right)$ such that $x_{2} \in C_{1}, x_{3} \in D_{1}$. Then $y_{1}, y_{2} \in T_{1}$. From Theorem 2.4, we have that $y_{1} y_{2} \in E_{R}(G)$, which contradicts to the definition of the $l$-belt. Therefore, $D \cap B_{1} \neq \emptyset$.

We take the separating group $\left(l_{i} l_{i+1}, S ; A, B\right)$ of $G$ such that $l_{i} \in B, l_{i+1} \in A, D \cap B \neq \emptyset$ and $|A|$ is as small as possible. We claim that $i+1 \leqslant k-1$. Otherwise, $i+1=k$ holds. Then, $l_{k}=y_{2}$. From $x_{2} y_{2} \in E(G)$ we have that $\left\{x_{2}, y_{2}\right\} \subset A \cup S$, which contradicts to that $D \cap B \neq \emptyset$. Therefore, $i+1 \leqslant k-1$ holds.

Case 2: If $l_{h}=x_{3}$, we take the separating group ( $l_{1} l_{2}, S_{1} ; A_{1}, B_{1}$ ) of $G$ such that $l_{1} \in B_{1}, l_{2} \in A_{1}$. Let $D=\left\{x_{2}, y_{2}\right\}$. Similarly, we need to show that $D \cap B_{1} \neq \emptyset$.

Subcase 2.1: If $l_{1}=y_{1}$, from $y_{1} y_{2} \in E(G)$ we have that $y_{2} \in B_{1} \cup S_{1}$. If $y_{2} \in S_{1}$, since $y_{1} y_{2} \in E_{N}(G)$, from Theorem 2.2 we have that $\left|B_{1}\right|=2$. Let $B_{1}=\left\{y_{1}, v_{1}\right\}$. Then, $y_{1} y_{2} v_{1} y_{1}$ is a 3 -cycle of $G$. It is easy to see that $v_{1}=x_{2}$. Then, $D \cap B_{1} \neq \emptyset$.

By the symmetry of the maximal 1-belt, for the other cases we may employ a similar argument.

We take the separating group $\left(l_{i} l_{i+1}, S ; A, B\right)$ such that $l_{i} \in B, l_{i+1} \in A, D \cap B \neq \emptyset$ and $|A|$ is small as possible, where $i=1,2 \cdots, h-1$. We claim that $i+1 \leqslant h-1$. Otherwise, $l_{h}=x_{3} \in A$. From $x_{2} x_{3}, y_{2} x_{3} \in E(G)$ we have that $x_{2}, y_{2} \in A \cup S$, which contradicts to that $D \cap B \neq \emptyset$.

We take the separating group $\left(l_{i+1} l_{i+2}, S^{\prime} ; A^{\prime}, B^{\prime}\right)$ of $G$ such that $l_{i+1} \in B^{\prime}, l_{i+2} \in A^{\prime}$ and $\left|A^{\prime}\right|$ is as small as possible. From Lemma 4.5 we have that one of the four conclusions of Lemma 4.5 holds. Here we will discuss them as follows:
(1). It is easy to see that each vertex of $P$ is incident with at least two unremovable edges, and so conclusion (i) of Lemma 4.5 cannot hold.
(2). If conclusion (ii) of Lemma 4.5 holds, then we have that $B \cap S^{\prime}=D \cap B=$ $\{d\} \subset\left\{x_{2}, y_{2}\right\}$. By the symmetry of $x_{2}$ and $y_{2}$, without loss of generality, we may assume that $d=x_{2}$. For $d=y_{2}$, we may employ a similar argument.

From Lemma 4.5, we know that $A \cap A^{\prime}=\left\{l_{i+2}\right\}, l_{i+1} \in A \cap B^{\prime}$. Let $A \cap S^{\prime}=$ $\left\{v_{1}, v_{2}\right\}$. If $v_{1} l_{i+2} \in E_{N}(G)$, we take the corresponding separating group $\left(v_{1} l_{i+2}, T ; C, K\right)$ such that $v_{1} \in C, l_{i+2} \in K$, and so $v_{1} \in S^{\prime} \cap C$.
(2.1). If $l_{i+1} \in B^{\prime} \cap K$, by the argument analogous to that used in Case 1 of Theorem 4.4, we can get that $\left|A^{\prime}\right|=2,\left|K \cap A^{\prime}\right|=\left|A^{\prime} \cap T\right|=1,\left|C \cap S^{\prime}\right|=2,\left|S^{\prime} \cap K\right|=1$. Let $K \cap S^{\prime}=\{b\}, A^{\prime} \cap T=\{a\}, S^{\prime} \cap C=\left\{v_{1}, w\right\}$. Then, by an argument analogous to that used in Case 1 of Theorem 4.4, we have that $a l_{i+2}, a v_{1} \in E_{R}(G), b l_{i+2} \in E_{R}(G)$, $a b \in E_{N}(G), d(a)=d\left(l_{i+2}\right)=4$. It is easy to see that the $l$-belt is a subgraph of $G$, where $l \geqslant 1$, and $\Gamma_{G}\left(l_{i+2}\right)=\left\{l_{i+1}, v_{1}, a, b\right\}$. We claim that $l_{i+2}$ is not an end-vertex of $P$. Otherwise, we have $l_{i+2} \in\left\{x_{1}, x_{3}, y_{1}, y_{3}\right\}$. Since $B \cap S^{\prime}=\left\{x_{2}\right\}$, and $x_{1}, x_{3}, y_{1} \in \Gamma_{G}\left(x_{2}\right)$, then this is true only if $l_{i+2}=y_{3}$ holds. Let $A^{\prime} \cap S=\{k\}$. Noticing that $\left(k x_{2}, T^{\prime}\right)$ will be the separating pair of $G$ such that $T^{\prime}=\left\{l_{i+1}\right\} \cup\left(S^{\prime}-\left\{x_{2}\right\}\right)$, we have that $k \in\left\{x_{3}, x_{1}\right\}$. If $k=x_{3}$, then we will have that $x_{3} y_{3} \in E(G)$ and $d\left(x_{3}\right)=4$, which contradicts to the definition of the maximal 1-belt. If $k=x_{1}$, noticing that $y_{2} \notin V(P)$, then $l_{i+1} \neq y_{2}$, and so we will have that $x_{1} y_{2} \in E(G)$, a contradiction. Therefore, we have that $l_{i+2}$ is not an end-vertex of $P$. From $a l_{i+2}, b l_{i+2} \in E_{R}(G)$ we have that $l_{i+2} v_{1} \in E(P)$ and $l_{i+2} v_{1}$ is an inner edge of the $l$-belt. Hence, the theorem holds.
(2.2). If $l_{i+1} \in B^{\prime} \cap T$, then by an argument analogous to that used in Case 2 of Theorem 4.4, we have that $l_{i+1} l_{i+2}$ is an inner edge of one of the following subgraphs of $G$ : helm, $W^{\prime}$-framework, $W$-framework or $l$-belt. Therefore, the theorem holds.

So, we may assume that $v_{1} l_{i+2} \in E_{R}(G)$. If $v_{2} l_{i+2} \in E_{N}(G)$, we may employ a similar argument. So, we may assume that $v_{2} l_{i+2} \in E_{R}(G)$. Let $A^{\prime} \cap S=\{c\}$. Since $P$ is a path of $\left[E_{N}(G)\right]$, and $l_{i+2}$ is not an end-vertex of $P$, we have that $l_{i+2} c \in E_{N}(G) \cap E(P)$. If $c v_{1} \in E_{N}(G)$, we take the corresponding separating group $\left(c v_{1}, T^{\prime} ; C^{\prime}, D^{\prime}\right)$ of $G$ such that $v_{1} \in C^{\prime}, c \in D^{\prime}$. Obviously, $l_{i+2} \in T^{\prime}$. Since $c l_{i+2} \in E_{N}(G)$, from Theorem 2.2 we have that $\left|D^{\prime}\right|=2$, and so $D^{\prime}=\left\{c, v_{2}\right\}$. Then, $\left|\Gamma_{G}(c) \cap \Gamma_{G}\left(v_{2}\right)\right| \geqslant 2$. Noticing that $v_{1} \in C_{1}$, obviously it is impossible to hold in $G$. So, $c v_{1} \in E_{R}(G)$. By an analogous argument, we have that $c v_{2} \in E_{R}(G)$. It is easy to see that $c l_{i+2}$ is an inner edge of an $l-$ bi-fan, and so the theorem holds.
(3). If conclusion (iii) of Lemma 4.5 holds, then we have that $B \cap S^{\prime}=D \cap B=$ $\{d\} \subset\left\{x_{2}, y_{2}\right\}$. By the symmetry of $x_{2}$ and $y_{2}$, we may assume that $d=y_{2}$. Let $A \cap S^{\prime}=\left\{v_{1}\right\}, \quad S \cap S^{\prime}=\{w\}, A^{\prime} \cap S=\{c\}$, then $\quad \Gamma_{G}(c)=\left\{l_{i+2}, v_{1}, w, y_{2}\right\}$. Since $c w \in E([S])$, from Theorem 2.4 we have that $c w \in E_{R}(G)$. By an analogous argument used in (2.1). we can get that $l_{i+2}$ is not an end-vertex of $P$.
(3.1). If $l_{i+2} v_{1} \in E_{N}(G)$, we take the corresponding separating group $\left(l_{i+2} v_{1}, T ; C, K\right)$ such that $l_{i+2} \in K, v_{1} \in C$. Then, $l_{i+2} \in A^{\prime} \cap K, v_{1} \in C \cap S^{\prime}, l_{i+1} \in B^{\prime}$. We claim that $l_{i+1} \notin B^{\prime} \cap K$. Otherwise, $l_{i+1} \in B^{\prime} \cap K, A^{\prime}=\left\{l_{i+2}, c\right\}$. By an argument analogous to that used in Case 1 of Theorem 4.4, we can get that $\left.\left.A^{\prime} \cap K=l_{i+2}\right\}, A^{\prime} \cap T \mid!=c\right\}, T \cap S^{\prime}=\emptyset,\left|T \cap B^{\prime}\right|=\left|C \cap S^{\prime}\right|=2,\left|K \cap S^{\prime}\right|=1$. Since $w l_{i+2} \in E(G)$, we have $w \in K \cap S^{\prime}$. Let $A_{2}=\left(K \cap B^{\prime}\right) \cup\{w\}, S_{2}=\left(T \cap B^{\prime}\right) \cup\left\{l_{i+2}\right\}$, $B_{2}=G-c w-S_{2}-A_{2}$, then $\left(c w, S_{2} ; A_{2}, B_{2}\right)$ is a separating group of $G$. So, $c w \in E_{N}(G)$, which contradicts to that $c w \in E_{R}(G)$. Hence, $l_{i+1} \notin B^{\prime} \cap K$, and so $l_{i+1} \in B^{\prime} \cap T$. By an argument analogous to that used in Case 2 of Theorem 4.4, we have that $\left|A^{\prime}\right|=|K|=2$ and $\left|K \cap S^{\prime}\right|=\left|A^{\prime} \cap T\right|=1$. Noticing that $c \in A^{\prime}, w \in S^{\prime}, \Gamma_{G}\left(l_{i+2}\right)=\left\{l_{i+1}, c, w, v_{1}\right\}$, it is easy to see that $K \cap S^{\prime}=\{w\}, A^{\prime} \cap T=$ $\{c\}$. By an argument analogous to that used in Case 2 of Theorem 4.4, and noticing that $c w \in E_{R}(G)$, we have that $l_{i+1} l_{i+2}$ is an inner edge of one of the following
subgraphs of $G$ : $W^{\prime}$-framework, $W$-framework or helm. Therefore, the theorem holds.

So, we may assume that $l_{i+2} v_{1} \in E_{R}(G)$.
(3.2). If $w l_{i+2} \in E_{N}(G)$, we take the corresponding separating group $\left(w l_{i+2}, T^{\prime} ; C^{\prime}, D^{\prime}\right)$ of $G$ such that $w \in C^{\prime}, l_{i+2} \in D^{\prime}$. Then, $w \in S^{\prime} \cap C^{\prime}$.
(3.2.1). If $l_{i+1} \in B^{\prime} \cap D^{\prime}$, by an argument analogous to that used in Case 1 of Theorem 4.4, we know that $w l_{i+2}$ is an inner edge of an $l$-belt, where $l \geqslant 1$, and $c l_{i+2} \in E_{R}(G)$. Since $l_{i+2}$ is incident with only two unremovable edges $l_{i+1} l_{i+2}, w l_{i+2}$, and $l_{i+2}$ is not an end-vertex of $P$, we have $w l_{i+2} \in E(P)$. Hence, the theorem holds.
(3.2.2). If $l_{i+1} \in B^{\prime} \cap T^{\prime}$, then by an argument analogous to that used in Case 2 of Theorem 4.4, we know that $l_{i+1} l_{i+2}$ is an inner edge of one of the following subgraphs of $G$ : $l$-belt, $W$-framework, $W^{\prime}$-framework or helm, and so the theorem holds.

Therefore, next we may assume that $w l_{i+2} \in E_{R}(G)$.
Since $E(P) \subset E_{N}(G)$, we have $c l_{i+2} \in E_{N}(G)$. If $c v_{1} \in E_{N}(G)$, we take the corresponding separating group $\left(c v_{1}, T^{\prime} ; C^{\prime}, D^{\prime}\right)$ such that $v_{1} \in C^{\prime}, c \in D^{\prime}$. Obviously, $l_{i+2} \in T^{\prime}$. Since $c l_{i+2} \in E_{N}(G)$, from Theorem 2.2 we have that $\left|D^{\prime}\right|=2$. Let $D^{\prime}=$ $\{u, c\}$, then $c u l_{i+2} c$ is a 3 -cycle of $G$, and so this is true only if $u=w$ holds. From $c y_{2}(=c d) \in E(G)$ we have that $y_{2} \in T^{\prime}$, and so $w y_{2} \in E(G)$. We take the separating group $\left(c l_{i+2}, T_{1} ; C_{1}, D_{1}\right)$ such that $c \in C_{1}, l_{i+2} \in D_{1}$. Since $c v_{1} l_{i+2} c$ is a 3cycle of $G$, we have $v_{1} \in T_{1}$. Then, we have that $l_{i+2} \in D_{1} \cap T^{\prime}, v_{1} \in C^{\prime} \cap T_{1}, c \in D^{\prime} \cap C_{1}$. By an argument analogous to that used in Case 2 of Theorem 4.4, and by noticing that $d\left(l_{i+2}\right)=4$, and $v_{1} l_{i+2} \in E(G)$, we can get that $c l_{i+2}$ is an inner edge of one of the following subgraphs of $G$ : $W^{\prime}$-framework or helm. Therefore, the theorem holds.

So, we may assume that $c v_{1} \in E_{R}(G)$. It is easy to see that $G$ contains an $l$-bi-fan such that $c l_{i+2}$ is its an inner edge, where $l \geqslant 1$. An analogous argument can lead to that $c l_{i+2} \in E(P)$. So, the theorem holds.
(4). If conclusion (iv) of Lemma 4.5 holds, then the Theorem holds. The proof is now complete.

Corollary 4.8. Let $G$ be a 4 -connected graph with property $(\star)$ and $L_{1}{ }^{\prime}$ a maximal 1-co-belt of $G$ defined as in Definition 3.4. $V\left(L_{1}{ }^{\prime}\right)=\left\{x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}, x_{4}, y_{1}, y_{2}, y_{3}\right\}$. Suppose that $P=l_{1} l_{2} \cdots l_{h}$ is a path of $\left[E_{N}(G)\right]$ such that $\left\{x_{2}, x_{3}, y_{2}\right\} \cap V(P)=\emptyset$ and $\left\{l_{1}, l_{h}\right\} \subset\left\{x_{1}, x_{4}, y_{1}, y_{3}\right\}$. Then, $G$ contains one of the following structures as its subgraph: l-belt, $(l \geqslant 1)$, $W$-framework, $W^{\prime}$-framework, helm or l-bi-fan, $(l \geqslant 1)$, such that it has some inner edge(s) belonging to $E(P)$.

Proof. We distinguish the following cases:
Case 1: If $l_{h}=x_{4}$, by letting $k=h+1, l_{k}=x_{3}$, then $P^{\prime}=l_{1} l_{2} \cdots l_{k}$ is also a path of $\left[E_{N}(G)\right]$. Let $D=\left\{x_{2}, x_{3}, y_{2}\right\}$, and take a separating group $\left(l_{1} l_{2}, S_{1} ; A_{1}, B_{1}\right)$ of $G$ such that $l_{1} \in B_{1}, l_{2} \in A_{1}$. Next we will show that $B_{1} \cap D \neq \emptyset$. We discuss the following subcases:

Subcase 1.1: If $l_{1}=x_{1}$, we claim that $x_{2} \in B_{1}$. Otherwise, $x_{2} \in S_{1}$. Since $x_{1} x_{2} \in E_{N}(G)$, from Theorem 2.2 we have that $\left|B_{1}\right|=2$. Let $B_{1}=\left\{l_{1}, v_{1}\right\}$, then $v_{1} \in \Gamma_{G}\left(x_{1}\right) \cap \Gamma_{G}\left(x_{2}\right)$. If $v_{1}=y_{1}$, then $\Gamma_{G}\left(y_{1}\right)=\left\{x_{1}, x_{2}, y_{2}, w\right\}$, where $w \in V(G)$, which
contradicts to that $L_{1}{ }^{\prime}$ is a maximal 1-co-belt. Obviously, $v_{1} \notin\left\{x_{3}, y_{2}\right\}$, and therefore $x_{2} \in B_{1}$ holds, i.e., $D \cap B_{1} \neq \emptyset$.

Subcase 1.2: If $l_{1}=y_{1}$, then if $y_{2} \in S_{1}$, since $y_{1} y_{2} \in E_{N}(G)$, from Theorem 2.2 we have that $\left|B_{1}\right|=2$. It is easy to see that $B_{1}=\left\{y_{1}, x_{2}\right\}$, and so $D \cap B_{1} \neq \emptyset$. If $y_{2} \in B_{1}$, then $D \cap B_{1} \neq \emptyset$.

Subcase 1.3: If $l_{1}=y_{3}$, we claim that $D \cap B_{1} \neq \emptyset$. Otherwise, $D \cap B_{1}=\emptyset$. From $x_{3} y_{3}, y_{2} y_{3} \in E(G)$ we have that $x_{3}, y_{2} \in S_{1}$. Since $y_{2} y_{3} \in E_{N}(G)$, from Theorem 2.2 we have that $\left|B_{1}\right|=2$. Let $B_{1}=\left\{y_{3}, v_{1}\right\}$, then it is easy to see that $v_{1} \in \Gamma_{G}\left(y_{2}\right) \cap \Gamma_{G}\left(y_{3}\right) \cap \Gamma_{G}\left(x_{3}\right)$, which is impossible to hold in $G$. Therefore, $D \cap B_{1} \neq \emptyset$.

We take the separating group $\left(l_{i} l_{i+1}, S ; A, B\right)$ of $G$ such that $l_{i} \in B, l_{i_{+} 1} \in A, D \cap B \neq \emptyset$ and $|A|$ is as small as possible. We claim that $i+1 \leqslant k-1$. Otherwise, $i+1=k$. Then, $l_{k}=x_{3}$. From $x_{2} x_{3}, y_{2} x_{3} \in E(G)$ we have that $\left\{x_{2}, x_{3}, y_{2}\right\} \subset A \cup S$, which contradicts to that $D \cap B \neq \emptyset$. Therefore, $i+1 \leqslant k-1$ holds.

Case 2: If $l_{h}=y_{3}$, by letting $k=h+1, l_{k}=y_{2}$, then $P^{\prime}=l_{1} l_{2} \cdots l_{k}$ is also a path of $\left[E_{N}(G)\right]$. Let $D=\left\{x_{2}, x_{3}, y_{2}\right\}$. We take the separating group ( $l_{1} l_{2}, S_{1} ; A_{1}, B_{1}$ ) of $G$ such that $l_{1} \in B_{1}, l_{2} \in A_{1}$. Similarly, we need to show that $D \cap B_{1} \neq \emptyset$.

Subcase 2.1: If $l_{1}=y_{1}$, from $y_{1} y_{2}, y_{1} x_{2} \in E(G)$ we have that $x_{2}, y_{2} \in B_{1} \cup S_{1}$. If $x_{2}, y_{2} \in S_{1}$, since $y_{1} y_{2} \in E_{N}(G)$, from Theorem 2.2 we have that $\left|B_{1}\right|=2$. Let $B_{1}=$ $\left\{y_{1}, v_{1}\right\}$. Then, $v_{1}=\Gamma_{G}\left(y_{1}\right) \cap \Gamma_{G}\left(y_{2}\right) \cap \Gamma_{G}\left(x_{2}\right)$, which is impossible to hold in $G$. Then, $D \cap B_{1} \neq \emptyset$.

By the symmetry of the maximal 1-co-belt, for the other cases we may employ a similar argument.

We take the separating group $\left(l_{i} l_{i+1}, S ; A, B\right)$ such that $l_{i} \in B, l_{i+1} \in A, D \cap B \neq \emptyset$ and $|A|$ is small as possible, where $i=1,2 \cdots, k-1$. We claim that $i+1 \leqslant k-1$. Otherwise, $l_{k}=y_{2} \in A$. From $x_{2} y_{2}, y_{2} x_{3} \in E(G)$ we have that $x_{2}, x_{3}, y_{2} \in A \cup S$, which contradicts to that $D \cap B \neq \emptyset$.

We take the separating group ( $l_{i+1} l_{i+2}, S^{\prime} ; A^{\prime}, B^{\prime}$ ) of $G$ such that $l_{i+1} \in B^{\prime}, l_{i+2} \in A^{\prime}$ and $\left|A^{\prime}\right|$ is as small as possible. From Lemma 4.5 we have that one of the four conclusions of Lemma 4.5 holds. Here we will discuss them as follows:
(1). It is easy to see that each vertex of $P$ is incident with at least two unremovable edges, and so conclusion (i) of Lemma 4.5 cannot hold.
(2). If conclusion (ii) of Lemma 4.5 holds, then we have that $B \cap S^{\prime}=D \cap B=$ $\{d\} \subset\left\{x_{2}, x_{3}, y_{2}\right\}$.

First, we claim that $l_{i+2}$ is not the end-vertex of $P$, otherwise, we assume that $l_{i+2} \in\left\{x_{1}, x_{4}, y_{1}, y_{3}\right\}$ holds. Let $A^{\prime} \cap S=\{k\}$. Noticing that $\left(k d, T^{\prime}\right)$ is a separating pair of $G$ such that $T^{\prime}=\left\{l_{i+1}\right\} \cup\left(S^{\prime}-\{d\}\right)$, so $k d \in E_{N}(G)$. If $d=x_{2}$, from $x_{1} x_{2}, x_{2} y_{1} \in E(G)$, we have that $l_{i+2} \in\left\{y_{3}, x_{4}\right\}:$ (1). If $l_{i+2}=x_{4}$, it is easy to see that $k \in\left\{x_{1}, x_{3}\right\}$, if $k=x_{1}$, noticing that $x_{3} \notin V(P)$, then $l_{i+1} \neq x_{3}$, then we will have that $x_{1} x_{3} \in E(G)$, a contradiction; if $k=x_{3}$, then we will have that $\left|\Gamma_{G}\left(x_{3}\right) \cap \Gamma_{G}\left(x_{4}\right)\right|=2$, which is impossible to hold in $G$. (2). If $l_{i+2}=y_{3}$, we claim that $k \neq x_{3}$, otherwise, we will have that $y_{3} x_{4} \in E(G)$ and $d\left(y_{3}\right)=4$, which contradicts to the definition of maximal 1 -co-belt. Then only $k=x_{1}$ holds, then we will have that $\left|\Gamma_{G}\left(x_{1}\right) \cap \Gamma_{G}\left(y_{3}\right)\right|=2, x_{1} y_{3} \in E(G)$ and $d\left(x_{1}\right)=d\left(y_{3}\right)=4$ holds, which is impossible to hold in $G$. Therefore, $d \neq x_{2}$. By the symmetry of $x_{2}$ and $x_{3}$, we have that $d \neq x_{3}$.

Therefore, $d=y_{2}$ holds, then we have that $l_{i+2} \in\left\{x_{1}, x_{4}\right\}$ and $k \in\left\{y_{1}, y_{3}\right\}$. (1). If $l_{i+2}=x_{1}$ : We claim that $k \neq y_{1}$, otherwise, we will have that $x_{1} y_{1} \in E(G), d\left(y_{1}\right)=4$, which contradicts to the definition of the maximal 1-co-belt, so $k=y_{3}$ holds, then we will have that $\left|\Gamma_{G}\left(x_{1}\right) \cap \Gamma_{G}\left(y_{3}\right)\right|=2$ and $x_{1} y_{3} \in E(G), d\left(x_{1}\right)=d\left(y_{3}\right)=4$ holds, which is impossible to hold in $G$. (2). If $l_{i+2}=x_{4}$, by the symmetry of $x_{1}$ and $x_{4}$, we may employ a similar argument to get that the assumption is not true.

From the above argument, we have that $l_{i+2}$ is not the end-vertex of $P$.
We may employ an argument similar to that used in (2) of Theorem 4.7 to show that the corollary is true.
(3). If conclusion (iii) of Lemma 4.5 holds, then we have that $B \cap S^{\prime}=D \cap B=$ $\{d\} \subset\left\{x_{2}, x_{3}, y_{2}\right\}$.

We may employ an argument analogous to that used in (2) to show that $l_{i+2}$ is not an end-vertex of $P$. We may also employ an argument similar to that used in (3) of Theorem 4.7 to conclude that the corollary is true.
(4). If conclusion (iv) of Lemma 4.5 holds, then the corollary is true.

## 5. The number of removable edges in a 4-connected graph

After we have been well prepared with the results in the above section, we are arriving at the point to show our main results of this paper in this section.

Let $M$ be a 5 -wheel such that $V(M)=\{a, x, y, z, v\}$ and $a$ is its center. Let $T_{1}, T_{2}, T_{3}, T_{4}$ be four trees such that for each $i \in\{1,2,3,4\}, T_{i}$ has $k$ vertices of degree one and $\left|T_{i}\right|-k$ vertices of degree four. Let the vertices of degree four be $u_{i}^{(1)}, u_{i}^{(2)}, \ldots, u_{i}^{\left(\left|T_{i}\right|-k\right)}$, and the vertices of degree one be $x_{i}^{(1)}, x_{i}^{(2)}, \ldots, x_{i}^{(k)}$. Let $M_{1}, M_{2}, \ldots, M_{k}$ be $k$ copies of $M$ and $a^{(j)}, x^{(j)}, y^{(j)}, z^{(j)}, v^{(j)}$ be the vertices of $M_{j}$ corresponding to the vertices $a, x, y, z, v$ of $M$, respectively, where $j=1,2, \ldots, k$. For each $j \in\{1, \ldots, k\}$, identify $x_{1}^{(j)}, x_{2}^{(j)}, x_{3}^{(j)}, x_{4}^{(j)}$ with $x^{(j)}, y^{(j)}, z^{(j)}, v^{(j)}$ such that each of $x_{1}^{(j)}, x_{2}^{(j)}, x_{3}^{(j)}, x_{4}^{(j)}$ identifies with one and only one of $x^{(j)}, y^{(j)}, z^{(j)}, v^{(j)}$. Denote the resulting graph by $G$. It is easy to see that $G$ is 4 -connected. Next we will show that for each 4-cycle $C=x^{(j)} y^{(j)} z^{(j)} v^{(j)} x^{(j)}$ of $G$, we have that $E(C) \subset E_{R}(G)$, and the other edges in $G$ are unremovable, where $j=1,2, \ldots, k$. For $y^{(j)} u_{i}^{(l)} \in E(G)$, let $S=$ $\left\{x^{(j)}, v^{(j)}, z^{(j)}\right\}, A=\left\{a^{(j)}, y^{(j)}\right\}, B=G-y^{(j)} u_{i}^{(l)}-S-A$, then $\left(y^{(j)} u_{i}^{(l)}, S ; A, B\right)$ is a separating group of $G$, and hence $y^{(j)} u_{i}^{(l)} \in E_{N}(G)$. Symmetrically, we can show that $x^{(j)} u_{i}^{(l)}, z^{(j)} u_{i}^{(l)}, v^{(j)} u_{i}^{(l)} \in E_{N}(G)$, where $j=1,2, \ldots, k ; i=1,2,3,4 ; l=1,2, \ldots,|T|-$ $k$. For each edge $a^{(j)} x^{(j)}$, it is easy to see that $\left(a^{(j)} x^{(j)}, T\right)$ is a separating pair of $G$ such that $T=\left\{y^{(j)}, v^{(j)}, u_{i}^{(j)}\right\}$ and $u_{i}^{(l)} z^{(j)} \in E(G)$. By symmetry, we have that $a^{(j)} y^{(j)}, a^{(j)} z^{(j)}, a^{(j)} v^{(j)} \in E_{N}(G)$. From Corollary 2.3 it is easy to see that for each 4cycle $C=x^{(j)} y^{(j)} z^{(j)} v^{(j)} x^{(j)}$, we have that $E(C) \subset E_{R}(G)$. For each edge $e$ of $T_{i}$, for example, $e=u_{1}^{(l)} u_{1}^{(l+1)}$, it is easy to see that $(e, S)$ is a separating pair of $G$ such that $S=\left\{u_{2}^{(l)}, u_{3}^{(l)}, u_{4}^{(l)}\right\}$. Therefore, for each edge $e$ of $T_{i}$, where $i=1,2,3,4$, we have that
$e \in E_{N}(G), \quad$ and $\quad$ so $\quad e_{R}(G)=4 k,\left|T_{i}\right|=(3 k-2) / 2,(i=1,2,3,4),|G|=7 k-4$, $e_{R}(G)=(4|G|+16) / 7$. We denote the set of all the above constructed graphs by $\mathfrak{I}$.

Theorem 5.1. Let $G$ be a 4-connected graph of order at least 5. If $G$ is neither $C_{5}^{2}$ nor $C_{6}^{2}$, then $e_{R}(G) \geqslant(4|G|+16) / 7$ and the equality holds if and only if $G \in \mathfrak{I}$.

Proof. Let $|G|=n,|E(G)|=m$. We proceed by induction on $(n+m)$. Since $G$ is not $C_{5}^{2}$, we have that $n \geqslant 6$. If $n=6$, since $G$ is not $C_{6}^{2}$, we have that $m \geqslant 13,(n+m) \geqslant 19$. It is easy to see that $e_{R}(G) \geqslant 9>(4 n+16) / 7$. If $n=7$, then it is easy to that $e_{R}(G) \geqslant 9>(4 n+16) / 7$. Therefore, we may assume that $n \geqslant 8$.

Case 1: If $G$ does not have property $(\star)$, i.e., there exists an edge $e=x y \in E_{R}(G)$ such that $d(x) \geqslant 5$ and $d(y) \geqslant 5$ in $G$, then consider $G \ominus e=G-x y$. It is easy to see that removable edges in $G-x y$ are also removable edges in $G$, and hence $e_{R}(G) \geqslant e_{R}(G \ominus e)+1$. Then, $\quad|G|=|G \ominus e|,|E(G \ominus e)|=m-1$, and therefore $|G \ominus e|+|E(G \ominus e)|<n+m$. If $G \ominus e$ is $C_{5}^{2}$ or $C_{6}^{2}$, then $e_{R}(G) \geqslant 9>(4 n+16) / 7$. If $G \ominus e$ is neither $C_{5}^{2}$ nor $C_{6}^{2}$, by the induction hypothesis we know that $e_{R}(G) \geqslant e_{R}(G \ominus e)+1 \geqslant(4 n+16) / 7+1>(4 n+16) / 7$.

Next we suppose that $G$ has property ( $\star$ ).
Case 2: If $G$ contains a 2-bi-fan as its subgraph, from Theorem 4.1 we know that there exists an edge $e \in E(G)$ such that $e_{R}(G) \geqslant e_{R}(G \ominus e)+1$. Here, $|G \ominus e|=n-1$, $|E(G \ominus e)|=m-3$. Then, $|G \ominus e|+|E(G \ominus e)|<n+m$. If $G \ominus e$ is $C_{5}^{2}$ or $C_{6}^{2}$, then $e_{R}(G) \geqslant 10>(4 n+16) / 7$. If $G \ominus e$ is neither $C_{5}^{2}$ nor $C_{6}^{2}$, by the induction hypothesis we know that $e_{R}(G) \geqslant e_{R}(G \ominus e)+1 \geqslant[4(n-1)+16] / 7+1>(4 n+16) / 7$.

Case 3: If $G$ contains an $l$-belt as its subgraph where $l \geqslant 3$. Then, from Theorem 4.2 we have that there exists an edge $e \in E(G)$ such that $e_{R}(G) \geqslant e_{R}(G \ominus e)+2$. If $G \ominus e$ is either $C_{5}^{2}$ or $C_{6}^{2}$, then $e_{R}(G) \geqslant 12>(4 n+16) / 7$. If $G \ominus e$ is neither $C_{5}^{2}$ nor $C_{6}^{2}$, by the induction hypothesis we know that $e_{R}(G) \geqslant e_{R}(G \ominus e)+2 \geqslant[4(n-2)+16] / 7+$ $2>(4 n+16) / 7$.

Case 4: If for any edge $e \in E_{R}(G)$, when $|G \ominus e|=n$, we have that $e_{R}(G)<e_{R}(G \ominus e)$; when $|G \ominus e|=n-1$, we have that $e_{R}(G)<e_{R}(G \ominus e)+1$; when $|G \ominus e|=n-2$, we have that $e_{R}(G)<e_{R}(G \ominus e)+2$, then we discuss the following subcases.

Subcase 4.1: If $\left[E_{N}(G)\right]$ is a forest, then $e_{N}(G)=n-t$ such that $t$ is the number of components in $\left[E_{N}(G)\right]$. Therefore, $e_{R}(G) \geqslant 2 n-n+t=n+t>(4 n+16) / 7$.

Subcase 4.2: If $\left[E_{N}(G)\right]$ contains a cycle, from Theorem 4.4 and the above argument in Cases 2 and 3 we can get that $G$ contains some structures in $\mathfrak{R}$ as its subgraphs. Let $G$ contain $k_{1}$ maximal 1-belts, $k_{2}$ maximal 1-bi-fans, $k_{3}$ maximal 1-co-belts, $k_{4} W$-frameworks, $k_{5} W^{\prime}$-frameworks, $k_{6}$ maximal 2-belts, $k_{7}$ maximal 2-co-belts, and $h$ helms. Let $E_{1}$ be the set of inner edges of the above-mentioned subgraphs. Then,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|E_{1}\right|=2 k_{1}+k_{2}+3 k_{3}+2 k_{4}+3 k_{5}+4 k_{6}+5 k_{7}+4 h \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $E_{0}=E_{N}(G)-E_{1}$, then we have the following results:
(1). $\left[E_{0}\right]$ is a forest. This follows from Theorem 4.4, Lemma 3.7, and the definitions of the above-mentioned subgraphs.
(2). Let $r=\sum_{x \in G}(d(x)-4)=\sum_{x \in G} d(x)-4 n$, then $e(G)=2 n+r / 2$. Let $n_{1}=$ $n-h-\left|\left[E_{0}\right]\right|$, then $n_{1} \geqslant 0$, and $n_{1}=0$ if and only if $V(G)=V\left(\left[E_{0}\right]\right) \bigcup\left\{a_{1}, a_{2}, \ldots, a_{h}\right\}$ such that $a_{i}$ is the center of a helm, where $i=1,2, \ldots, h$.
(3). $e_{R}(G)=e(G)-e_{N}(G), e_{N}(G)=\left|E_{0}\right|+\left|E_{1}\right|=\left|\left[E_{0}\right]\right|-t+\left|E_{1}\right|=n-n_{1}-h-$ $t+\left|E_{1}\right|$, where $t$ is the number of components in $\left[E_{0}\right]$.

By noticing the number of removable edges in the above-mentioned subgraphs, we have the following result

$$
\begin{align*}
e_{R}(G) & =e(G)-e_{N}(G)=2 n+r / 2-n+h+n_{1}+t-\left|E_{1}\right| \\
& \geqslant 3 k_{1}+4 k_{2}+4 k_{3}+5 k_{4}+5 k_{5}+5 k_{6}+6 k_{7}+4 h . \tag{2}
\end{align*}
$$

From the formulas $\langle 1\rangle$ and $\langle 2\rangle$, we have the following result

$$
n+r / 2-7 h+n_{1}+t-5 k_{1}-5 k_{2}-7 k_{3}-7 k_{4}-8 k_{5}-9 k_{6}-11 k_{7} \geqslant 0
$$

Then,

$$
6 n+3 r-42 h+6 n_{1}+6 t-30 k_{1}-30 k_{2}-42 k_{3}-42 k_{4}-48 k_{5}-54 k_{6}-66 k_{7} \geqslant 0
$$

and so

$$
\begin{align*}
e_{R}(G)= & n+r / 2+n_{1}+t+h-\left|E_{1}\right|=4 n / 7+\left(6 n+7 r+14 n_{1}+14 t-42 h-28 k_{1}\right. \\
& \left.-14 k_{2}-42 k_{3}-28 k_{4}-42 k_{5}-56 k_{6}-70 k_{7}\right) / 14 \\
\geqslant & 4 n / 7+\left(6 n+3 r+6 n_{1}+6 t-42 h-30 k_{1}-30 k_{2}-42 k_{3}\right. \\
& \left.-42 k_{4}-48 k_{5}-54 k_{6}-66 k_{7}\right) / 14 \\
& +\left(4 r+8 n_{1}+8 t+2 k_{1}+16 k_{2}+14 k_{4}+6 k_{5}-2 k_{6}-4 k_{7}\right) / 14 \\
\geqslant & 4 n / 7+\left(4 r+8 n_{1}+8 t+2 k_{1}+16 k_{2}+14 k_{4}+6 k_{5}-2 k_{6}-4 k_{7}\right) / 14 . \tag{3}
\end{align*}
$$

Therefore, $e_{R}(G) \geqslant(4 n+16) / 7$ holds only if the following formula holds

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta=2 r+4 n_{1}+4 t+k_{1}+8 k_{2}+7 k_{4}+3 k_{5}-k_{6}-2 k_{7} \geqslant 16 . \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $L_{1}{ }^{\prime}$ be a maximal 1 -co-belt. It is easy to see that $x_{2} \in G-\left\{a_{1}, a_{2}, \ldots, a_{h}\right\}-$ $V\left(\left[E_{0}\right]\right)$, and so $L_{1}{ }^{\prime}$ will contribute 1 to $n_{1}$. Since $G$ contains $k_{3}$ maximal 1-belts, and so they will contribute $k_{3}$ to $n_{1}$. Analogously, for each maximal 2-belt, it will contribute 2 to $n_{1}$, and so $k_{6}$ maximal 2 -belts will contribute $2 k_{6}$ to $n_{1}$. For $W^{\prime}-$ frameworks, maximal 2-co-belts and $W$-frameworks, we analyze them analogously. Then, we can get the following formula

$$
\begin{equation*}
n_{1} \geqslant k_{3}+k_{4}+k_{5}+2 k_{6}+3 k_{7} . \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

From the formulas $\langle 5\rangle$ and $\langle 4\rangle$, we can get the following formula

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta \geqslant 2 r+4 t+k_{1}+8 k_{2}+4 k_{3}+11 k_{4}+7 k_{5}+7 k_{6}+10 k_{7} . \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

We will discuss the following cases.
(4). $\mathrm{h}=0, \mathrm{k}=\mathrm{k}_{1}+\mathrm{k}_{2}+\mathrm{k}_{3}+\mathrm{k}_{4}+\mathrm{k}_{5}+\mathrm{k}_{6}+\mathrm{k}_{7} \leqslant 2$.

First, we claim that $\left[E_{N}(G)\right]$ contains at most two cycles. Otherwise, suppose that there are at least three cycles in $\left[E_{N}(G)\right]$. Then, we take a cycle $C_{1}$. From Theorem 4.6 and the assumption, we have that $G$ contains some structure $H_{1} \in \mathfrak{R}$ as its subgraph such that $H_{1}$ has an inner edge $e_{1}$ on $C_{1}$. We take another cycle $C_{2}$ in $\left[E_{N}(G)\right]-C_{1}$. Analogously, we have that $G$ contains some structure $H_{2} \in \mathfrak{R}$ as its subgraph such that $H_{2}$ has an inner edge $e_{2}$ on $C_{2}$. Last, we take a cycle $C_{3}$ in $\left[E_{N}(G)\right]-C_{1}-C_{2}$. Then, $G$ contains some structure $H_{3} \in \mathfrak{R}$ as its subgraph such that $H_{3}$ has an inner edge $e_{3}$ on $C_{3}$. Since $e_{1}$ is an inner edge of $H_{1}$, but not any of $H_{2}$, we have that $H_{1} \neq H_{2}$. Analogously, we have that $H_{1} \neq H_{3}, H_{2} \neq H_{3}$. From Lemma 3.7 we know that any two of $H_{1}, H_{2}$ and $H_{3}$ do not have common inner edge, and so $k \geqslant 3$, a contradiction. Therefore, there are at most two cycles in $\left[E_{N}(G)\right]$. So, $e_{N}(G) \leqslant n+1$, and hence $e_{R}(G) \geqslant 2 n-n-1>(4 n+16) / 7$.
(5). $h=0, k=k_{1}+k_{2}+k_{3}+k_{4}+k_{5}+k_{6}+k_{7} \geqslant 3$.
(5.1). $k_{1}+k_{3}=0$, and so $k_{2}+k_{4}+k_{5}+k_{6}+k_{7} \geqslant 3$. Noticing that $t \geqslant 1$, from the formula $\langle 6\rangle$ we have that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Delta & \geqslant 2 r+4+7\left(k_{2}+k_{4}+k_{5}+k_{6}+k_{7}\right)+k_{2}+4 k_{4}+3 k_{7} \\
& \geqslant 4+7\left(k_{2}+k_{4}+k_{5}+k_{6}+k_{7}\right) \geqslant 25,
\end{aligned}
$$

here the inequality $\langle 4\rangle$ rigidly holds.
(5.2). $k_{1}+k_{3} \geqslant 1$. We may assume that $G$ contains a maximal 1 -belt $L_{1}$ such that $V\left(L_{1}\right)=\left\{x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}, y_{1}, y_{2}, y_{3}\right\}$. From Theorem 4.7 we know that if $x_{3}, y_{1} \in\left[E_{0}\right]$, then $n_{1} \geqslant 2, t \geqslant 2$. From the formulas $\langle 4\rangle$ and $\langle 5\rangle$ we have that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Delta \geqslant & 2 r+3 n_{1}+4 t+\left(k_{1}+k_{3}\right)+8 k_{2}+8 k_{4}+4 k_{5}+k_{6}+k_{7} \geqslant 3 n_{1}+4 t+\left(k_{1}+k_{2}\right. \\
& \left.+k_{3}+k_{4}+k_{5}+k_{6}+k_{7}\right) \geqslant 6+8+3=17 .
\end{aligned}
$$

If $x_{3} \in\left[E_{0}\right], y_{1} \notin\left[E_{0}\right]$, then $n_{1} \geqslant 1, t \geqslant 3$. Similarly, we can get that $\Delta \geqslant 18$.
If $x_{3}, y_{1} \in\left[E_{0}\right]$, then $t \geqslant 4$, and so $\Delta \geqslant 19$, here the inequality $\langle 4\rangle$ rigidly holds.
(6). $h \geqslant 1$. We take a helm $H$ such that $V(H)=\left\{a, x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}, x_{4}, v_{1}, v_{2}, v_{3}, v_{4}\right\}$. From Theorem 4.6 we have that any two of the edges $x_{1} v_{1}, x_{2} v_{2}, x_{3} v_{3}, x_{4} v_{4}$ are in different components, and so $t \geqslant 4$. From the formula $\langle 6\rangle$ we know that $\Delta \geqslant 16$, i.e., $e_{R}(G) \geqslant(4 n+16) / 7$, and the equality holds only if $k_{i}=0$, where $i=1,2, \ldots, 7, r=$ $0, t=4, n_{1}=0$, i.e., $\left[E_{0}\right]$ has only four components $T_{1}, T_{2}, T_{3}, T_{4}$, and $V(G)=$ $V\left(\left[E_{0}\right]\right) \cup\left\{a_{1}, a_{2}, \ldots, a_{h}\right\}$. Then, from $r=0$ we know that $G$ is a 4-connected and 4-regular graph. From $e_{R}(G)=4 h, e_{N}(G)=10 h-8$, we can get that $n=7 h-4$. Moreover, all the edges but $x_{1}^{(p)} x_{2}^{(p)}, x_{2}^{(p)} x_{3}^{(p)}, x_{3}^{(p)} x_{4}^{(p)}, x_{4}^{(p)} x_{1}^{(p)}$ of each helm $H_{p}$ in $G$ are unremovable, whereas different edges of $x_{i}^{(p)} v_{i}^{(p)}$ of $H_{p}$ are in different components $T_{i}$, and every vertex $v_{i}^{(p)}$ is of degree 1 in $T_{i}$. Based on the above arguments, we can conclude that $T_{i}$ has $h$ vertices with degree 1 and $\left|T_{i}\right|-h$ vertices with degree 4 . Therefore, $G \in \mathfrak{I}$. The proof is now complete.
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