

LOCALLY SEMICOMPLETE WEAKLY DISTANCE-REGULAR DIGRAPHS

YUEFENG YANG, SHUANG LI*, AND KAISHUN WANG

ABSTRACT. A digraph is semicomplete if any two vertices are connected by at least one arc and is locally semicomplete if the out-neighbourhood (resp. in-neighbourhood) of any vertex induces a semicomplete digraph. In this paper, we characterize all locally semicomplete weakly distance-regular digraphs under the assumption of commutativity.

1. INTRODUCTION

A *digraph* Γ is a pair $(V(\Gamma), A(\Gamma))$ where $V(\Gamma)$ is a finite nonempty set of vertices and $A(\Gamma)$ is a set of ordered pairs (*arcs*) (x, y) with distinct vertices x and y . A subdigraph of Γ induced by a subset $U \subseteq V(\Gamma)$ is denoted by $\Gamma[U]$. For any arc $(x, y) \in A(\Gamma)$, if $A(\Gamma)$ also contains an arc (y, x) , then $\{(x, y), (y, x)\}$ can be viewed as an *edge*. We say that Γ is an *undirected graph* or a *graph* if $A(\Gamma)$ is a symmetric relation. A vertex x is *adjacent* to y if $(x, y) \in A(\Gamma)$. In this case, we also call y an *out-neighbour* of x , and x an *in-neighbour* of y . The set of all out-neighbours of x is denoted by $N_{\Gamma}^{+}(x)$, while the set of in-neighbours is denoted by $N_{\Gamma}^{-}(x)$. If no confusion occurs, we write $N^{+}(x)$ (resp. $N^{-}(x)$) instead of $N_{\Gamma}^{+}(x)$ (resp. $N_{\Gamma}^{-}(x)$). A digraph is said to be *regular of valency* k if the number of in-neighbour and out-neighbour of all vertices are equal to k . The *adjacency matrix* A of Γ is the $|V(\Gamma)| \times |V(\Gamma)|$ matrix whose (x, y) -entry is 1 if $y \in N^{+}(x)$, and 0 otherwise.

Given digraphs Γ and Σ_x for every $x \in V(\Gamma)$, a *generalized lexicographic product* of Γ and $(\Sigma_x)_{x \in V(\Gamma)}$, denoted by $\Gamma \circ (\Sigma_x)_{x \in V(\Gamma)}$ is the digraph with the vertex set $\cup_{x \in V(\Gamma)} (\{x\} \times V(\Sigma_x))$ where $((x, u_x), (y, v_y)) \in A(\Gamma \circ (\Sigma_x)_{x \in V(\Gamma)})$ whenever $(x, y) \in A(\Gamma)$, or $x = y$ and $(u_x, v_x) \in A(\Sigma_x)$. If $\Sigma_x = \Sigma$ for all $x \in V(\Gamma)$, then $\Gamma \circ (\Sigma_x)_{x \in V(\Gamma)}$ becomes the standard *lexicographic product* $\Gamma \circ \Sigma$.

A *path* of length r from x to y in the digraph Γ is a finite sequence of vertices $(x = w_0, w_1, \dots, w_r = y)$ such that $(w_{t-1}, w_t) \in A(\Gamma)$ for $1 \leq t \leq r$. A digraph (resp. graph) is said to be *strongly connected* (resp. *connected*) if, for any vertices x and y , there is a path from x to y . A path $(w_0, w_1, \dots, w_{r-1})$ is called a *circuit* of length r when $(w_{r-1}, w_0) \in A(\Gamma)$. The *girth* of Γ is the length of a shortest circuit in Γ . The length of a shortest path from x to y is called the *distance* from x to y in Γ , denoted by $\partial_{\Gamma}(x, y)$. The maximum value of the distance function in Γ is called the *diameter* of Γ . Let $\tilde{\partial}_{\Gamma}(x, y) := (\partial_{\Gamma}(x, y), \partial_{\Gamma}(y, x))$ be the *two-way distance* from x to y , and $\tilde{\partial}(\Gamma) := \{\tilde{\partial}_{\Gamma}(x, y) \mid x, y \in V(\Gamma)\}$ the *two-way distance set* of Γ . If no confusion occurs, we write $\partial(x, y)$ (resp. $\tilde{\partial}(x, y)$) instead of $\partial_{\Gamma}(x, y)$ (resp. $\tilde{\partial}_{\Gamma}(x, y)$). For any

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 05E30.

Key words and phrases. weakly distance-regular digraph; locally semicomplete; association scheme; doubly regular team tournament.

*Corresponding author.

$\tilde{i} := (a, b) \in \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma)$, we define $\Gamma_{\tilde{i}}$ to be the set of ordered pairs (x, y) with $\tilde{\partial}(x, y) = \tilde{i}$, and write $\Gamma_{a,b}$ instead of $\Gamma_{(a,b)}$. An arc (x, y) of Γ is of type $(1, r)$ if $\partial(y, x) = r$.

In [11], the third author and Suzuki proposed a natural directed version of a distance-regular graph (see [4, 5] for a background of the theory of distance-regular graphs) without bounded diameter, i.e., a weakly distance-regular digraph. A strongly connected digraph Γ is said to be *weakly distance-regular* if, for any $\tilde{h}, \tilde{i}, \tilde{j} \in \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma)$, the number of $z \in V(\Gamma)$ such that $\tilde{\partial}(x, z) = \tilde{i}$ and $\tilde{\partial}(z, y) = \tilde{j}$ is constant whenever $\tilde{\partial}(x, y) = \tilde{h}$. This constant is denoted by $p_{\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}}^{\tilde{h}}(\Gamma)$. The integers $p_{\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}}^{\tilde{h}}(\Gamma)$ are called the *intersection numbers* of Γ . If no confusion occurs, we write $p_{\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}}^{\tilde{h}}$ instead of $p_{\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}}^{\tilde{h}}(\Gamma)$. We say that Γ is *commutative* if $p_{\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}}^{\tilde{h}} = p_{\tilde{j}, \tilde{i}}^{\tilde{h}}$ for all $\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}, \tilde{h} \in \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma)$. Some special families of weakly distance-regular digraphs with small valency were classified, see [9, 11] for valency 2 and [9, 12–14] for valency 3. For more information about weakly distance-regular digraphs, see [6, 8, 15–18].

A digraph Γ is *semicomplete*, if for any pair of vertices $x, y \in V(\Gamma)$, either $(x, y) \in A(\Gamma)$, or $(y, x) \in A(\Gamma)$, or both. A digraph Γ is *locally semicomplete*, if $\Gamma[N^+(x)]$ and $\Gamma[N^-(x)]$ are both semicomplete for every vertex x of Γ . Note that a semicomplete digraph is also locally semicomplete. Locally semicomplete digraphs were introduced in 1990 by Bang-Jensen [2]. If a semicomplete weakly distance-regular digraph is not a complete graph, then it has diameter 2 and girth $g \leq 3$ (see [17, Proposition 3.5]).

Let K_{n_1, \dots, n_r} be a complete multipartite graph with r parts and part sizes n_1, \dots, n_r . If $n_1 = \dots = n_r = m$, then $K_{m, \dots, m}$ denoted by K_m^r . A (r, m) -*team tournament* is a digraph obtained from K_m^r by replacing every edge $\{(x, y), (y, x)\}$ by exactly one of the arcs (x, y) or (y, x) . A regular (r, m) -*team tournament* with adjacency matrix A is said to be a *doubly regular (r, m) -team tournament with parameters (α, β, γ)* if $A^2 = \alpha A + \beta A^t + \gamma(J - I - A - A^t)$, where J is the matrix with 1 in every entry, and I denotes the identity matrix. [7, Theorem 4.3] implies that a doubly regular (r, m) -*team tournament* is of type I, II or III. Let T be a doubly regular (r, m) -*team tournament* with parameters (α, β, γ) , where $V(T) = V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_r$ is the partition of the vertex set into r independent sets of size m . We say that T is of *type II* if $\beta - \alpha = 0$, m is even and $|N^+(x) \cap V_i| = r/2$ for all $x \notin V_i$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$. For a positive integer k with $k \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$, [7, Theorem 4.3] and [11, Theorem 3.1] imply that a doubly regular $(k+1, 2)$ -*team tournament* of type II is a locally semicomplete weakly distance-regular digraph.

In this paper, we give a characterization of locally semicomplete commutative weakly distance-regular digraphs which are not semicomplete. The main result is as follows.

Theorem 1.1. *Let Γ be a commutative weakly distance-regular digraph of valency more than 3. Then Γ is locally semicomplete but not semicomplete if and only if Γ is isomorphic to one of the following digraphs:*

- (i) $\Lambda \circ K_m$;
- (ii) $\text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_6, \{1, 2\}) \circ K_n$;
- (iii) $\text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_{iq}, \{1, i\}) \circ (\Sigma_x)_{x \in \mathbb{Z}_{iq}}$.

Here, $m \geq 1$, $n \geq 2$, $q \geq 4$, $i \in \{1, 2\}$, $(\Sigma_x)_{x \in \mathbb{Z}_{iq}}$ are semicomplete weakly distance-regular digraphs with $p_{\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}}^{\tilde{h}}(\Sigma_0) = p_{\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}}^{\tilde{h}}(\Sigma_x)$ for each x and $\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}, \tilde{h}$, and Λ is a doubly regular $(k+1, 2)$ -*team tournament* of type II for a positive integer k with $k \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce some basic results for weakly distance-regular digraphs. In Sections 3 and 4, we give a characterization of mixed arcs of type $(1, q-1)$ in a locally semicomplete commutative weakly distance-regular digraph, and divide it into two sections according to the value of q . In Section 5, we determine special subdigraphs of a locally semicomplete commutative weakly distance-regular digraph based on the results in Sections 3 and 4. In Section 6, we prove Theorem 1.1 based on the results in Section 5.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we always assume that Γ is a weakly distance-regular digraph. We shall give some results for Γ which are used frequently in this paper.

Let $R = \{\Gamma_{\tilde{i}} \mid \tilde{i} \in \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma)\}$. Then $(V(\Gamma), R)$ is an association scheme (see [3, 19, 20] for the theory of association schemes), which is called the *attached scheme* of Γ . For each $\tilde{i} := (a, b) \in \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma)$, we define $\tilde{i}^t := (b, a)$. Denote $\Gamma_{\tilde{i}}(x) = \{y \in V(\Gamma) \mid \tilde{\partial}(x, y) = \tilde{i}\}$ and $P_{\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}}(x, y) = \Gamma_{\tilde{i}}(x) \cap \Gamma_{\tilde{j}^t}(y)$ for all $\tilde{i}, \tilde{j} \in \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma)$ and $x, y \in V\Gamma$. The size of $\Gamma_{\tilde{i}}(x)$ depends only on \tilde{i} , and is denoted by $k_{\tilde{i}}$. For the sake of convenience, we write $k_{a,b}$ instead of $k_{(a,b)}$.

Lemma 2.1. ([3, Chapter II, Proposition 2.2] and [1, Proposition 5.1]) *The following hold:*

- (i) $k_{\tilde{d}}k_{\tilde{e}} = \sum_{\tilde{f} \in \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma)} p_{\tilde{d}, \tilde{e}}^{\tilde{f}} k_{\tilde{f}}$;
- (ii) $p_{\tilde{d}, \tilde{e}}^{\tilde{f}} k_{\tilde{f}} = p_{\tilde{f}, \tilde{e}^t}^{\tilde{d}} k_{\tilde{d}} = p_{\tilde{d}^t, \tilde{f}}^{\tilde{e}} k_{\tilde{e}}$;
- (iii) $\sum_{\tilde{e} \in \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma)} p_{\tilde{d}, \tilde{e}}^{\tilde{f}} = k_{\tilde{d}}$;
- (iv) $\sum_{\tilde{f} \in \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma)} p_{\tilde{d}, \tilde{e}}^{\tilde{f}} p_{\tilde{g}, \tilde{f}}^{\tilde{h}} = \sum_{\tilde{i} \in \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma)} p_{\tilde{g}, \tilde{d}}^{\tilde{i}} p_{\tilde{i}, \tilde{e}}^{\tilde{h}}$.

We recall the definitions of pure arcs and mixed arcs introduced in [15]. Let $T = \{q \mid (1, q-1) \in \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma)\}$. For $q \in T$, an arc of type $(1, q-1)$ in Γ is said to be *pure*, if every circuit of length q containing it consists of arcs of type $(1, q-1)$; otherwise, this arc is said to be *mixed*. We say that $(1, q-1)$ is pure if any arc of type $(1, q-1)$ is pure; otherwise, we say that $(1, q-1)$ is mixed.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $p_{(1,s-1),(1,t-1)}^{(2,q-2)} \neq 0$. If $q \in T \setminus \{s\}$, then $(1, q-1)$ is mixed.*

Proof. Assume the contrary, namely, $(1, q-1)$ is pure. It follows that there exists a circuit $(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{q-1})$ consisting of arcs of type $(1, q-1)$. Observe that $(x_1, x_3) \in \Gamma_{2,q-2}$. Since $p_{(1,s-1),(1,t-1)}^{(2,q-2)} \neq 0$, there exists $x'_2 \in P_{(1,s-1),(1,t-1)}(x_1, x_3)$. This implies that $(x_0, x_1, x'_2, x_3, \dots, x_{q-1})$ is a circuit of length q containing an arc of type $(1, q-1)$ such that $(x_1, x'_2) \notin \Gamma_{1,q-1}$, a contradiction. \square

For two nonempty subsets E and F of R , define

$$EF := \{\Gamma_{\tilde{h}} \mid \sum_{\Gamma_{\tilde{i}} \in E} \sum_{\Gamma_{\tilde{j}} \in F} p_{\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}}^{\tilde{h}} \neq 0\}.$$

We write $\Gamma_{\tilde{i}}\Gamma_{\tilde{j}}$ instead of $\{\Gamma_{\tilde{i}}\}\{\Gamma_{\tilde{j}}\}$, and $\Gamma_{\tilde{i}}^2$ instead of $\{\Gamma_{\tilde{i}}\}\{\Gamma_{\tilde{i}}\}$.

Lemma 2.3. *If $\tilde{h}, \tilde{i} \in \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma)$ and $\tilde{j} \in \{\tilde{i}, \tilde{i}^t\}$, then $\Gamma_{\tilde{h}}\Gamma_{\tilde{j}^t} = \{\Gamma_{\tilde{i}}\}$ if and only if $p_{\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}}^{\tilde{h}} = k_{\tilde{i}}$.*

Proof. The sufficiency is immediate. We now prove the necessity. Assume that $\Gamma_{\tilde{h}}\Gamma_{\tilde{j}^t} = \{\Gamma_{\tilde{i}}\}$. Since $k_{\tilde{i}} = k_{\tilde{j}}$, by setting $\tilde{d} = \tilde{h}$ and $\tilde{e} = \tilde{j}^t$ in Lemma 2.1 (i),

one has $p_{\tilde{h}, \tilde{j}t}^{\tilde{i}} = k_{\tilde{h}}$, which implies $p_{\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}}^{\tilde{h}} = k_{\tilde{i}}$ from Lemma 2.1 (ii). The desired result follows. \square

For a nonempty subset F of R , we say F *closed* if $\Gamma_{\tilde{i}t}\Gamma_{\tilde{j}} \subseteq F$ for any $\Gamma_{\tilde{i}}$ and $\Gamma_{\tilde{j}}$ in F . Let $\langle F \rangle$ be the minimum closed subset containing F . Denote $F(x) = \{y \in V(\Gamma) \mid (x, y) \in \cup_{f \in F} f\}$. For a subset I of T and a vertex $x \in V(\Gamma)$, let $\Delta_I(x)$ be the digraph $(F_I(x), \cup_{q \in I} \Gamma_{1, q-1})$, where $F_I = \langle \{\Gamma_{1, q-1}\}_{q \in I} \rangle$. For the sake of convenience, we also write F_q (resp. $\Delta_q(x)$) instead of $F_{\{q\}}$ (resp. $\Delta_{\{q\}}(x)$). If the digraph $\Delta_I(x)$ does not depend on the choice of vertex x up to isomorphism and no confusion occurs, we write Δ_I instead of $\Delta_I(x)$.

Lemma 2.4. *Let I be a nonempty subset of T . Suppose that $\Delta_I(x)$ is semicomplete for some $x \in V(\Gamma)$. Then $\Delta_I(y)$ is a weakly distance-regular digraph for all $y \in V(\Gamma)$. Moreover, $p_{\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}}^{\tilde{h}}(\Delta_I(x)) = p_{\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}}^{\tilde{h}}(\Delta_I(y))$ for all $y \in V(\Gamma)$ and $\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}, \tilde{h}$.*

Proof. Since Γ is a weakly distance-regular digraph and $\Delta_I(x)$ is semicomplete, $F_I = \{\Gamma_{1, r-1}, \Gamma_{r-1, 1} \mid r \in I\} \cup \{\Gamma_{0, 0}\}$.

Let $y \in V(\Gamma)$. Pick distinct vertices $z, w \in F_I(y)$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\tilde{\partial}_{\Delta_I(y)}(z, w) = (1, i)$ with $i \geq 1$. Suppose $i > 2$. For $u \in N_{\Delta_I(y)}^+(w)$, since $\Delta_I(y)$ is semicomplete, we have $(z, u) \in A(\Delta_I(y))$, and so $N_{\Delta_I(y)}^+(w) \cup \{w\} \subseteq N_{\Delta_I(y)}^+(z)$, contrary to the fact that $\Delta_I(y)$ is regular. Then $i \in \{1, 2\}$, and so $I \subseteq \{2, 3\}$. It follows that $\tilde{\partial}_{\Gamma}(z, w) = \tilde{\partial}_{\Delta_I(y)}(z, w)$. Since the distinct vertices $z, w \in F_I(y)$ were arbitrary, one gets $\tilde{\partial}(\Delta_I(y)) \subseteq \{(0, 0), (1, 1), (1, 2), (2, 1)\}$. This implies that

$$[\Delta_I(y)]_{\tilde{i}}(z) \cap [\Delta_I(y)]_{\tilde{j}t}(w) = P_{\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}}(z, w) \quad (1)$$

for $\tilde{i}, \tilde{j} \in \tilde{\partial}(\Delta_I(y))$ and $z, w \in F_I(y)$. By the weakly distance-regularity of Γ , $\Delta_I(y)$ is weakly distance-regular. Since $y \in V(\Gamma)$ was arbitrary, from (1), $p_{\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}}^{\tilde{h}}(\Delta_I(x)) = p_{\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}}^{\tilde{h}}(\Delta_I(y))$ for all $y \in V(\Gamma)$ and $\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}, \tilde{h}$. \square

Lemma 2.5. ([17, Proposition 3.5]) *If Γ is a semicomplete digraph, then $\tilde{\partial}(\Gamma) \subseteq \{(0, 0), (1, 1), (1, 2), (2, 1)\}$.*

In the remainder of this section, Γ always denotes a locally semicomplete commutative weakly distance-regular digraph. The commutativity of Γ will be used frequently in the sequel, so we no longer refer to it for the sake of simplicity.

Lemma 2.6. *Let $q \in T$ and $I = \{r \mid \Gamma_{1, r-1} \in \Gamma_{1, q-1}\Gamma_{q-1, 1}\} \neq \emptyset$. If $\Gamma_{1, r-1}\Gamma_{1, q-1} = \{\Gamma_{1, q-1}\}$ for all $r \in I$, then $\Delta_I(x)$ is a semicomplete weakly distance-regular digraph with $p_{\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}}^{\tilde{h}}(\Delta_I(x)) = p_{\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}}^{\tilde{h}}(\Delta_I(y))$ for all $x, y \in V(\Gamma)$ and $\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}, \tilde{h}$.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.4, it suffices to show that $\Delta_I(x)$ is semicomplete. Pick distinct vertices $y, z \in F_I(x)$. Then there exists a path $(y = x_0, x_1, \dots, x_l = z)$ in $\Delta_I(x)$. Let $w \in \Gamma_{1, q-1}(y)$ and $(x_i, x_{i+1}) \in \Gamma_{1, r_i-1}$ for $0 \leq i \leq l-1$. Since $\Gamma_{1, r-1}\Gamma_{q-1, 1} = \{\Gamma_{1, q-1}\}$ for all $r \in I$, one obtains $p_{(1, q-1), (q-1, 1)}^{(1, r_i-1)} = k_{1, q-1}$ from Lemma 2.3, which implies that $(x_i, w) \in \Gamma_{1, q-1}$ for $0 \leq i \leq l$ by induction. Since $w \in P_{(1, q-1), (q-1, 1)}(y, z)$ and Γ is locally semicomplete, one gets $(y, z) \in \Gamma_{1, r-1}$ or $(z, y) \in \Gamma_{r-1, 1}$ for some $r \in I$. Since the distinct vertices $y, z \in F_I(x)$ were arbitrary, $\Delta_I(x)$ is semicomplete. \square

Lemma 2.7. *Let $2 \in T$. If $\Gamma_{1, 2} \notin \Gamma_{1, 1}^2$, then Δ_2 is isomorphic to $K_{k_{1, 1}+1}$.*

Proof. Let $x \in V(\Gamma)$. Pick distinct vertices $y, z \in F_2(x)$. Since $\Gamma_{1,2} \notin \Gamma_{1,1}^2$ and Γ is locally semicomplete, one has $\Gamma_{1,1}^2 \subseteq \{\Gamma_{0,0}, \Gamma_{1,1}\}$. By induction, we get $\Gamma_{1,1}^i \subseteq \{\Gamma_{0,0}, \Gamma_{1,1}\}$ for $i \geq 2$, which implies $(y, z) \in \Gamma_{1,1}$. This implies that $\Delta_2(x) \simeq K_{k_{1,1}+1}$. \square

Lemma 2.8. *Suppose that $(1, 2)$ is mixed. Then $\Delta_{\{2,3\}}(x)$ is a semicomplete weakly distance-regular digraph with $p_{\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}}^{\tilde{h}}(\Delta_{\{2,3\}}(x)) = p_{\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}}^{\tilde{h}}(\Delta_{\{2,3\}}(y))$ for all $x, y \in V(\Gamma)$ and $\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}, \tilde{h}$. Moreover, $F_{\{2,3\}} = \{\Gamma_{0,0}, \Gamma_{1,1}, \Gamma_{1,2}, \Gamma_{2,1}\}$.*

Proof. Since $(1, 2)$ is mixed, we have $\Gamma_{1,r-1} \in \Gamma_{1,q-1}^2$ with $\{q, r\} = \{2, 3\}$. Denote $I = \{r \mid \Gamma_{1,r-1} \in F_q\}$. Pick a vertex $x \in V(\Gamma)$. Let y, z be distinct vertices in $F_I(x)$. Since $F_q = F_I$, there exists a shortest path $(y, x_1, \dots, x_l = z)$ consisting of arcs of type $(1, q-1)$.

We show that (y, z) or $(z, y) \in A(\Delta_I(x))$ by induction on l . Assume that (y, x_{l-1}) or $(x_{l-1}, y) \in A(\Delta_I(x))$. It follows that there exists $r \in I$ such that (y, x_{l-1}) or $(x_{l-1}, y) \in \Gamma_{1,r-1}$. Suppose $(x_{l-1}, y) \in \Gamma_{1,r-1}$ or $q = 2$. Since Γ is locally semicomplete, we have (y, z) or $(z, y) \in \Gamma_{1,s-1}$ for some $s \in I$, which implies that (y, z) or $(z, y) \in A(\Delta_I(x))$. Suppose $(y, x_{l-1}) \in \Gamma_{1,r-1}$ with $r > 1$ and $q = 3$. It follows that $\Gamma_{1,1} \in \Gamma_{1,2}^2$. By Lemma 2.1 (ii), we have $p_{(2,1),(1,1)}^{(1,2)} \neq 0$, which implies that there exists $w \in P_{(2,1),(1,1)}(x_{l-1}, z)$. The fact that Γ is locally semicomplete implies $w = y$, $(y, w) \in \Gamma_{1,s-1}$ or $(w, y) \in \Gamma_{s-1,1}$ for some $s \in I$. Since $2 \in I$, one gets (y, z) or $(z, y) \in \Gamma_{1,t-1}$ for some $t \in I$, which implies (y, z) or $(z, y) \in A(\Delta_I(x))$.

Since the distinct vertices $y, z \in F_I(x)$ were arbitrary, $\Delta_I(x)$ is semicomplete. By Lemma 2.4, the first statement is valid. The second statement is also valid from Lemma 2.5. \square

Lemma 2.9. *If $(1, 2)$ is pure and $2 \in T$, then $\Gamma_{1,1}\Gamma_{1,2} = \{\Gamma_{1,2}\}$.*

Proof. Let $(x, y) \in \Gamma_{1,1}$ and $(y, z) \in \Gamma_{1,2}$. Since $(1, 2)$ is pure, we have $p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(2,1)} \neq 0$, which implies that there exists $w \in P_{(1,2),(1,2)}(z, y)$. Since $x, z \in N^+(y)$ and $w, x \in N^-(y)$, one gets $(x, z), (w, x) \in A(\Gamma)$. It follows that (z, w, x) is a circuit containing an arc of type $(1, 2)$. Then $(x, z) \in \Gamma_{1,2}$. Since $z \in \Gamma_{1,2}(y)$ was arbitrary, we obtain $\Gamma_{1,1}\Gamma_{1,2} = \{\Gamma_{1,2}\}$. \square

Lemma 2.10. *Let $\Gamma_{2,i} \in \Gamma_{1,2}\Gamma_{1,q}$ with $i > 1$ and $q > 0$. If $(1, 2)$ is pure, then $i = 2$ and $q \in \{2, 3\}$.*

Proof. Let $(x, z) \in \Gamma_{2,i}$ and $y \in P_{(1,2),(1,q)}(x, z)$. Since Γ is locally semicomplete and $i > 1$, we have $q > 1$. The fact that $(1, 2)$ is pure implies $p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(2,1)} \neq 0$. It follows that there exists $y' \in P_{(1,2),(1,2)}(y, x)$. Since $z, y' \in N^+(y)$ and Γ is locally semicomplete, one gets (y', z) or $(z, y') \in A(\Gamma)$. If $(y', z) \in A(\Gamma)$, then (x, z) or $(z, x) \in A(\Gamma)$ since $x, z \in N^+(y')$, contrary to the fact that $(x, z) \in \Gamma_{2,i}$ with $i > 1$. Hence, $(z, y') \in A(\Gamma)$. Since (z, y', x) is a path, we get $\partial(z, x) = i = 2$, and so $q \in \{2, 3\}$. \square

3. ARCS OF TYPE $(1, 3)$

In this section, we always assume that Γ is a locally semicomplete commutative weakly distance-regular digraph. For $q \in T$, we say that the configuration $C(q)$ (resp. $D(q)$) exists if $p_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}^{(1,q-2)} \neq 0$ (resp. $p_{(1,q-2),(q-2,1)}^{(1,q-1)} \neq 0$) and $(1, q-2)$ is pure. We will characterize mixed arcs of type $(1, 3)$. The main result is as follows.

Proposition 3.1. *If $(1, 3)$ is mixed, then the following hold:*

- (i) $C(4)$ exists;
- (ii) $\Gamma_{1,2}\Gamma_{3,1} = \{\Gamma_{1,3}\}$;
- (iii) $\Gamma_{1,3}^2 = \{\Gamma_{1,2}\}$.

In order to prove Proposition 3.1, we need some auxiliary lemmas.

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose that $(1, 3)$ is mixed. Then $C(4)$ or $D(4)$ exists.*

Proof. Let (x, y) be an arc of type $(1, 3)$. Suppose that each shortest path from y to x does not contain an arc of type $(1, 2)$. Since $(1, 3)$ is mixed, there exists $z \in \Gamma_{1,1}(y)$ such that $\partial(z, x) = 2$. The fact that Γ is locally semicomplete implies that $(x, z) \in \Gamma_{1,2}$. Since each shortest path from y to x does not contain an arc of type $(1, 2)$, each shortest path from z to x consisting of edges, which implies $\Gamma_{1,2} \in \Gamma_{1,1}^2$. Then $(1, 2)$ is mixed. By Lemma 2.8, one gets $F_{\{2,3\}} = \{\Gamma_{0,0}, \Gamma_{1,2}, \Gamma_{2,1}, \Gamma_{1,1}\}$, contrary to the fact $z \in P_{(1,2),(1,1)}(x, y)$. Then there exists $z \in \Gamma_{1,2}(y)$ such that $\partial(z, x) = 2$.

Assume the contrary, namely, $(1, 2)$ is mixed. It follows that $\Gamma_{2,1} \in \Gamma_{1,1}^2 \cup \Gamma_{1,1}\Gamma_{1,2}$. Then there exists $w \in P_{(1,1),(1,i)}(z, y)$ for some $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Since $x, w \in N^-(y)$, we get (x, w) or $(w, x) \in A(\Gamma)$. The fact $x, z \in N^-(w)$ or $x, z \in N^+(w)$ implies $(x, z) \in \Gamma_{1,2}$. Since $z \in P_{(1,2),(2,1)}(x, y)$, we obtain $\Gamma_{1,3} \in F_{\{2,3\}}$, contrary to Lemma 2.8. Thus, $(1, 2)$ is pure.

Suppose that $D(4)$ does not exist. It suffices to show that $p_{(1,3),(1,3)}^{(1,2)} \neq 0$. Since $D(4)$ does not exist, we have $\Gamma_{1,3} \notin \Gamma_{1,2}\Gamma_{2,1}$. It follows that $(x, z) \in \Gamma_{2,2}$. Since $(1, 2)$ is pure, there exists $w \in P_{(1,2),(1,2)}(z, y)$. Since $(x, z) \in \Gamma_{2,2}$ and $x, w \in N^-(y)$, we have $(w, x) \in \Gamma_{1,s}$ with $s \in \{2, 3\}$. Since $\Gamma_{1,3} \notin \Gamma_{1,2}\Gamma_{2,1}$, we have $w \notin P_{(2,1),(1,2)}(x, y)$, and so $s = 3$. The fact $x \in P_{(1,3),(1,3)}(w, y)$ implies $p_{(1,3),(1,3)}^{(1,2)} \neq 0$. The desired result follows. \square

Lemma 3.3. *Let i, q be positive integers and $\Gamma_{2,i} \in \Gamma_{1,3}\Gamma_{1,q}$. If $(1, 3)$ is mixed, then $i = 2$ and $q \in \{2, 3\}$.*

Proof. Let $(x, z) \in \Gamma_{2,i}$ and $y \in P_{(1,3),(1,q)}(x, z)$. It follows that $i > 1$. Since Γ is locally semicomplete, we have $q > 1$. Since $(1, 3)$ is mixed, from Lemma 3.2, we have $p_{(1,3),(1,3)}^{(1,2)} \neq 0$ or $p_{(1,2),(2,1)}^{(1,3)} \neq 0$. By Lemma 2.1 (ii), we have $p_{(1,2),(3,1)}^{(1,3)} \neq 0$ or $p_{(1,2),(2,1)}^{(1,3)} \neq 0$. It follows that there exists $w \in \Gamma_{1,2}(x)$ such that $(y, w) \in \Gamma_{1,2} \cup \Gamma_{1,3}$. Since $w, z \in N^+(y)$ and $(x, z) \in \Gamma_{2,i}$ with $i > 1$, we have $(w, z) \in \Gamma_{1,r}$ with $r \geq 1$. Since $w \in P_{(1,2),(1,r)}(x, z)$, from Lemma 2.10, one obtains $i = 2$ and $q \in \{2, 3\}$. \square

Lemma 3.4. *Let $(1, 2)$ be pure and $I = \{r \mid \Gamma_{1,r-1} \in F_3\}$.*

- (i) *If $(1, 3)$ is mixed, then $\Gamma_{2,2} \in \Gamma_{1,2}\Gamma_{1,3} \cup \Gamma_{1,3}^2$;*
- (ii) *If $\Gamma_{2,2} \notin \Gamma_{1,2}^2 \cup \Gamma_{1,2}\Gamma_{1,3}$, then $\Delta_I(x)$ is semicomplete for each $x \in V(\Gamma)$.*

Proof. Suppose that $(1, 3)$ is mixed and $\Gamma_{2,2} \notin \Gamma_{1,2}\Gamma_{1,3} \cup \Gamma_{1,3}^2$, or $\Gamma_{2,2} \notin \Gamma_{1,2}^2 \cup \Gamma_{1,2}\Gamma_{1,3}$. Let $q = 4$ if $(1, 3)$ is mixed and $\Gamma_{2,2} \notin \Gamma_{1,2}\Gamma_{1,3} \cup \Gamma_{1,3}^2$, and $q = 3$ if $\Gamma_{2,2} \notin \Gamma_{1,2}^2 \cup \Gamma_{1,2}\Gamma_{1,3}$.

We claim that $J := \{r \mid \Gamma_{1,r-1} \in F_q\} \subseteq \{2, 3\}$ and $\Delta_J(x)$ is semicomplete for all $x \in V(\Gamma)$. Let $x \in V(\Gamma)$. Pick distinct vertices $y, z \in F_J(x)$. Since $F_J(x) = F_q(x)$, there exists a path $(x_0 = y, x_1, \dots, x_l = z)$ consisting of arcs of type $(1, q-1)$. We prove (y, z) or $(z, y) \in A(\Delta_J(x))$ by induction on l . Now assume (y, x_{l-1}) or $(x_{l-1}, y) \in A(\Delta_J(x))$. If $(x_{l-1}, y) \in \Gamma_{1,r}$, then $\Gamma_{1,r} \in F_q$, and (y, z) or $(z, y) \in \Gamma_{1,s} \in F_q$ since Γ is locally semicomplete. We only need to consider the case $(x_{l-1}, y) \notin A(\Delta_J(x))$. Let $(y, x_{l-1}) \in \Gamma_{1,r} \in F_q$ with $r > 1$. If $(y, z) \in \Gamma_{2,i}$ with $i > 1$, from Lemmas 2.10

and 3.3, then $i = 2$ and $r \in \{2, 3\}$ since $x_{l-1} \in P_{(1,r),(1,q-1)}(y, z)$ with $q \in \{3, 4\}$, contrary to the fact that $\Gamma_{2,2} \notin \Gamma_{1,q-1}^2 \cup \Gamma_{1,2}\Gamma_{1,3}$. Hence, $(y, z) \in \Gamma_{1,s} \in \Gamma_{1,r}\Gamma_{1,q-1}$ or $(y, z) \in \Gamma_{s,1} \in \Gamma_{1,r}\Gamma_{1,q-1}$. Since $\Gamma_{1,r} \in F_q$, we obtain $\Gamma_{1,s} \in F_q$, and so (y, z) or $(z, y) \in A(\Delta_J(x))$. Since $y, z \in F_J(x)$ were arbitrary, $\Delta_J(x)$ is semicomplete. By Lemmas 2.4 and 2.5, we have $J \subseteq \{2, 3\}$. Thus, our claim is valid.

(i) is immediate from the claim.

(ii) Now we have $q = 3$. By the claim, we have $I = J \subseteq \{2, 3\}$, and $\Delta_I(x)$ is semicomplete. Thus, (ii) is valid. \square

Lemma 3.5. *Suppose that $(1, 2)$ is pure. Then the following hold:*

- (i) $\Gamma_{1,2}^2 \subseteq \{\Gamma_{1,2}, \Gamma_{1,3}, \Gamma_{2,1}, \Gamma_{2,2}\}$;
- (ii) $\Gamma_{1,2}\Gamma_{2,1} \subseteq \{\Gamma_{0,0}, \Gamma_{1,1}, \Gamma_{1,2}, \Gamma_{1,3}, \Gamma_{2,1}, \Gamma_{3,1}\}$.

Proof. (i) Since $(1, 2)$ is pure, we have $\Gamma_{1,2}^2 \subseteq \{\Gamma_{1,2}, \Gamma_{1,3}, \Gamma_{1,4}, \Gamma_{2,1}, \Gamma_{2,2}\}$ from Lemma 2.10. It suffices to show that $\Gamma_{1,4} \notin \Gamma_{1,2}^2$. Assume the contrary, namely, $\Gamma_{1,4} \in \Gamma_{1,2}^2$. By Lemmas 2.4 and 2.5, $\Delta_I(x)$ is not semicomplete for all $x \in V(\Gamma)$, where $I = \{r \mid \Gamma_{1,r-1} \in F_3\}$. Lemma 3.4 (ii) implies that $\Gamma_{2,2} \in \Gamma_{1,2}\Gamma_{1,q}$ for some $q \in \{2, 3\}$.

Let $(x, z) \in \Gamma_{2,2}$ and $y \in P_{(1,2),(1,q)}(x, z)$. Since $p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(1,4)} \neq 0$, from Lemma 2.1 (ii), we have $p_{(1,4),(2,1)}^{(1,2)} \neq 0$. Pick a vertex $w \in P_{(1,4),(2,1)}(x, y)$. Since $z, w \in N^+(y)$, one gets $(w, z) \in A(\Gamma)$. It follows that $\partial(w, x) \leq 1 + \partial(z, x) = 3$, a contradiction. Thus, (i) is valid.

(ii) Let x, y, z be vertices such that $(x, y), (z, y) \in \Gamma_{1,2}$. Note that $\partial(z, x) \leq 1 + \partial(y, x) = 3$. Since Γ is locally semicomplete, (ii) is valid. \square

Lemma 3.6. *Suppose that $(1, 3)$ is mixed. Then the following hold:*

- (i) $\Gamma_{1,2}\Gamma_{1,3} \cup \Gamma_{1,3}^2 \subseteq \{\Gamma_{1,2}, \Gamma_{1,3}, \Gamma_{2,2}\}$;
- (ii) $\Gamma_{1,3}\Gamma_{3,1} \subseteq \{\Gamma_{0,0}, \Gamma_{1,1}, \Gamma_{1,2}, \Gamma_{2,1}, \Gamma_{1,3}, \Gamma_{3,1}\}$;
- (iii) $\Gamma_{1,3}\Gamma_{2,1} \subseteq \{\Gamma_{1,2}, \Gamma_{2,1}, \Gamma_{1,3}, \Gamma_{3,1}\}$;
- (iv) $\Gamma_{1,2}\Gamma_{3,1} \subseteq \{\Gamma_{1,2}, \Gamma_{2,1}, \Gamma_{1,3}, \Gamma_{3,1}\}$.

Proof. We claim that $\Gamma_{1,4} \notin \Gamma_{1,3}\Gamma_{3,1} \cup \Gamma_{1,3}\Gamma_{2,1}$. Assume the contrary, namely, $\Gamma_{1,4} \in \Gamma_{1,3}\Gamma_{q,1}$ for some $q \in \{2, 3\}$. Let $(x, z) \in \Gamma_{1,4}$ and $y \in P_{(1,3),(q,1)}(x, z)$. By Lemma 3.2, we have $p_{(1,3),(1,3)}^{(1,2)} \neq 0$ or $p_{(1,2),(2,1)}^{(1,3)} \neq 0$. In view of Lemma 2.1 (ii), one gets $p_{(1,2),(3,1)}^{(1,3)} \neq 0$ or $p_{(1,2),(2,1)}^{(1,3)} \neq 0$, which implies that there exists $w \in P_{(1,2),(r,1)}(x, y)$ for some $r \in \{2, 3\}$. The fact $4 = \partial(z, x) \leq \partial(z, w) + \partial(w, x)$ implies that (z, w) is not an arc. Since $w, z \in N^+(x)$, one gets $(w, z) \in A(\Gamma)$. Since (w, z, y) is a circuit, we obtain $q = r = 2$. By Lemma 3.2 again, $(1, 2)$ is pure, which implies that $(w, z) \in \Gamma_{1,2}$. Since $w \in P_{(1,2),(1,2)}(x, z)$, one has $\Gamma_{1,4} \in \Gamma_{1,2}^2$, contrary to Lemma 3.5 (i). Thus, the claim is valid.

(i) Let $\Gamma_{1,q} \in \Gamma_{1,3}\Gamma_{1,r}$ with $q \geq 2$ and $r \in \{2, 3\}$. By Lemma 3.4 (i), there exist vertices x, y, z such that $(x, z) \in \Gamma_{2,2}$ and $y \in P_{(1,3),(1,s)}(x, z)$ with $s \in \{2, 3\}$. Since $p_{(1,3),(1,r)}^{(1,q)} \neq 0$, from Lemma 2.1 (ii), one obtains $p_{(1,q),(r,1)}^{(1,3)} \neq 0$, which implies that there exists $w \in P_{(1,q),(r,1)}(x, y)$. Since $w, z \in N^+(y)$ and $(x, z) \in \Gamma_{2,2}$, we have $(w, z) \in A(\Gamma)$. Then $q = \partial(w, x) \leq 1 + \partial(z, x) = 3$. By Lemma 3.3, we get $\Gamma_{1,2}\Gamma_{1,3} \cup \Gamma_{1,3}^2 \subseteq \{\Gamma_{1,2}, \Gamma_{1,3}, \Gamma_{2,2}\}$. Thus, (i) is valid.

(ii) Since Γ is locally semicomplete, from the claim, (ii) is valid.

(iii) By Lemma 3.2, $(1, 2)$ is pure. It follows from Lemma 2.9 that $\Gamma_{1,3} \notin \Gamma_{1,1}\Gamma_{1,2}$. In view of Lemma 2.1 (ii), one has $\Gamma_{1,1} \notin \Gamma_{1,3}\Gamma_{2,1}$. Since Γ is locally semicomplete, from the claim, (iii) is valid.

(iv) is also valid from (iii). \square

Lemma 3.7. *Let $(1, 2)$ be pure and $I = \{r \mid \Gamma_{1,r-1} \in F_3\}$.*

- (i) *If $(1, 3)$ is mixed, then $\Gamma_{2,2}\Gamma_{1,3} \subseteq \{\Gamma_{2,1}, \Gamma_{3,1}, \Gamma_{2,2}\}$;*
- (ii) *If $\Delta_I(x)$ is not semicomplete for some $x \in V(\Gamma)$, then $\Gamma_{2,2}\Gamma_{1,2} \subseteq \{\Gamma_{2,1}, \Gamma_{3,1}, \Gamma_{2,2}\}$.*

Proof. Suppose that $(1, 3)$ is mixed, or $\Delta_I(x)$ is not semicomplete. Let $q = 3$ if $(1, 3)$ is mixed, and $q = 2$ if $\Delta_I(x)$ is not semicomplete.

We claim that $\Gamma_{2,2}\Gamma_{1,q} \subseteq \{\Gamma_{2,1}, \Gamma_{3,1}, \Gamma_{2,2}\}$. By Lemma 3.4, we have $p_{(1,q),(1,r)}^{(2,2)} \neq 0$ for some $r \in \{2, 3\}$. Let $(x, z) \in \Gamma_{2,2}$, $y \in P_{(1,q),(1,r)}(x, z)$ and $(x, w) \in \Gamma_{1,q}$. Since $(z, x) \in \Gamma_{2,2}$ and Γ is locally semicomplete, we get $(z, w) \notin A(\Gamma)$. By Lemma 3.5 (ii) and Lemma 3.6 (ii), one gets $(w, y) \in \Gamma_{0,0}$, $(w, y) \in \Gamma_{1,s}$ or $(w, y) \in \Gamma_{s,1}$ for some $s \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. If $(w, y) \in \Gamma_{0,0}$, then $w = y$, and so $(z, w) \in \Gamma_{2,1} \cup \Gamma_{3,1}$. If $(w, y) \in \Gamma_{1,1}$, then $(z, w) \in \Gamma_{2,1} \cup \Gamma_{3,1}$ since Γ is locally semicomplete. If $(w, y) \in \Gamma_{s,1}$ for some $s \in \{2, 3\}$, from Lemma 3.5 (ii) and Lemma 3.6 (ii)–(iv), then $(z, w) \in \Gamma_{2,1} \cup \Gamma_{3,1}$ since $y \in P_{(s,1),(1,r)}(w, z)$. If $(w, y) \in \Gamma_{1,s}$ for some $s \in \{2, 3\}$, by Lemma 3.5 (i) and Lemma 3.6 (i), then $(z, w) \in \Gamma_{2,2} \cup \Gamma_{2,1} \cup \Gamma_{3,1}$ since $y \in P_{(1,s),(1,r)}(w, z)$. Thus, the claim is valid.

(i) Since $(1, 3)$ is mixed, from the claim, (i) is valid.

(ii) Since $\Delta_I(x)$ is not semicomplete, from the claim, (ii) is also valid. \square

Lemma 3.8. *Suppose that $(1, 3)$ mixed. The following hold:*

- (i) $p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(1,3)} = 0$;
- (ii) $p_{(1,3),(1,2)}^{(1,3)} p_{(1,3),(1,2)}^{(1,2)} = 0$;
- (iii) $p_{(1,3),(1,2)}^{(2,2)} p_{(2,1),(2,2)}^{(2,2)} = p_{(1,3),(1,2)}^{(2,2)} p_{(2,1),(1,3)}^{(1,3)}$.

Proof. Since Γ is locally semicomplete, we have $p_{(1,r),(s,1)}^{(2,2)} = 0$ for $r, s \in \{2, 3\}$. By Lemma 2.1 (ii), one gets $p_{(1,s),(2,2)}^{(1,r)} = 0$.

By setting $\tilde{d} = \tilde{e} = \tilde{h} = (1, 3)$ and $\tilde{g} = (1, 2)$ in Lemma 2.1 (iv), from Lemma 3.6 (i), we have

$$p_{(1,3),(1,3)}^{(1,2)} p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(1,3)} + p_{(1,3),(1,3)}^{(1,3)} p_{(1,2),(1,3)}^{(1,3)} = p_{(1,2),(1,3)}^{(1,2)} p_{(1,2),(1,3)}^{(1,3)} + p_{(1,2),(1,3)}^{(1,3)} p_{(1,3),(1,3)}^{(1,3)},$$

which implies

$$p_{(1,3),(1,3)}^{(1,2)} p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(1,3)} = p_{(1,2),(1,3)}^{(1,2)} p_{(1,2),(1,3)}^{(1,3)}. \quad (2)$$

(i) By setting $\tilde{d} = \tilde{e} = \tilde{h} = (1, 2)$ and $\tilde{g} = (1, 3)$ in Lemma 2.1 (iv), one has

$$p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(1,3)} p_{(1,3),(1,3)}^{(1,2)} + p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(2,1)} p_{(1,3),(2,1)}^{(1,2)} = p_{(1,3),(1,2)}^{(1,3)} p_{(1,3),(1,2)}^{(1,2)}$$

from Lemma 3.5 (i) and Lemma 3.6 (i). It follows from (2) that $p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(2,1)} p_{(1,3),(2,1)}^{(1,2)} = 0$.

Since $(1, 2)$ is pure from Lemma 3.2, one gets $p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(2,1)} \neq 0$, which implies $p_{(1,3),(2,1)}^{(1,2)} = 0$. By Lemma 2.1 (ii), we obtain $p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(1,3)} = 0$.

(ii) is also valid from (i) and (2).

(iii) By (i) and Lemma 2.1 (ii), we have $p_{(2,1),(1,3)}^{(1,2)} = 0$. Note that $p_{(1,r),(s,1)}^{(2,2)} = 0$ for all $r, s \in \{2, 3\}$. By setting $\tilde{d} = (1, 3)$, $\tilde{h} = (2, 2)$ and $\tilde{e} = \tilde{g}^t = (1, 2)$ in Lemma 2.1 (iv), we have $p_{(1,3),(1,2)}^{(2,2)} p_{(2,1),(2,2)}^{(2,2)} = p_{(2,1),(1,3)}^{(1,3)} p_{(1,3),(1,2)}^{(2,2)}$ from Lemma 3.6 (i) and (iii). Thus, (iii) is valid. \square

Lemma 3.9. *If $(1, 3)$ is mixed, then $p_{(1,2),(2,1)}^{(1,3)} = 0$ and $C(4)$ exists.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.2, $C(4)$ or $D(4)$ exists, which implies that $(1, 2)$ is pure. Assume the contrary, namely, $D(4)$ exists. Then $p_{(1,2),(2,1)}^{(1,3)} \neq 0$. By Lemma 2.1 (ii), we have $p_{(1,3),(1,2)}^{(1,2)} \neq 0$. Lemma 3.8 (ii) implies

$$p_{(1,3),(3,1)}^{(1,2)} = p_{(1,2),(1,3)}^{(1,3)} = p_{(2,1),(1,3)}^{(1,3)} = 0.$$

In view of Lemma 3.8 (i), one gets $p_{(2,1),(1,3)}^{(1,2)} = p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(1,3)} = 0$. By setting $\tilde{d} = \tilde{e} = (1, 3)$ and $\tilde{h} = \tilde{g}^t = (1, 2)$ in Lemma 2.1 (iv), we obtain

$$p_{(1,3),(1,3)}^{(1,2)} p_{(2,1),(1,2)}^{(1,2)} + p_{(1,3),(1,3)}^{(2,2)} p_{(2,1),(2,2)}^{(1,2)} = 0. \quad (3)$$

from Lemma 3.6 (i) and (iii).

Case 1. $p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(2,2)} = 0$.

Since $\Gamma_{1,3} \in F_3$, from Lemmas 2.4 and 2.5, $\Delta_I(x)$ is not semicomplete for all $x \in V(\Gamma)$, where $I = \{r \mid \Gamma_{1,r-1} \in F_3\}$. By Lemma 3.4 (ii), we have $p_{(1,2),(1,3)}^{(2,2)} \neq 0$. In view of Lemma 3.8 (iii), one gets $p_{(2,2),(1,2)}^{(2,2)} = p_{(1,3),(2,1)}^{(1,3)} = 0$.

Suppose $p_{(2,1),(1,2)}^{(1,2)} = 0$. By Lemma 2.1 (ii), we have $\Gamma_{1,2} \notin \Gamma_{1,2}^2$. Since $p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(2,2)} = p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(1,3)} = 0$, from Lemma 3.5 (i), one gets $\Gamma_{1,2}^2 = \{\Gamma_{2,1}\}$. Let $(x, z) \in \Gamma_{2,2}$ and $y \in P_{(1,2),(1,3)}(x, z)$. Pick a vertex $w \in \Gamma_{1,2}(y)$. Then $(w, x) \in \Gamma_{1,2}$. Since $p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(2,2)} = 0$ and $w, z \in N^+(y)$, from Lemma 3.6 (iii), one has $w \in P_{(1,2),(3,1)}(y, z)$, which implies $p_{(1,2),(3,1)}^{(1,3)} = k_{1,2}$. It follows from Lemma 2.1 (iii) that $p_{(1,2),(2,1)}^{(1,3)} = 0$, a contradiction. Then, $p_{(2,1),(1,2)}^{(1,2)} \neq 0$.

By (3), $p_{(1,3),(1,3)}^{(1,2)} = 0$. In view of Lemma 2.1 (ii), we have $p_{(3,1),(1,2)}^{(1,3)} = 0$. Since Γ is locally semicomplete, we have $p_{(1,r),(s,1)}^{(2,2)} = 0$ for $r, s \in \{2, 3\}$. Since $p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(1,3)} = 0$, by setting $\tilde{d} = \tilde{e} = (1, 2)$, $\tilde{g} = (3, 1)$ and $\tilde{h} = (2, 2)$ in Lemma 2.1 (iv), from Lemma 3.5 (i) and Lemma 3.6 (iv), one obtains

$$p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(2,1)} p_{(3,1),(2,1)}^{(2,2)} + p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(2,2)} p_{(3,1),(2,2)}^{(2,2)} = 0,$$

contrary to the fact that $p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(2,1)} p_{(3,1),(2,1)}^{(2,2)} \neq 0$.

Case 2. $p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(2,2)} \neq 0$.

By Lemma 2.1 (ii), we have $p_{(2,1),(2,2)}^{(1,2)} \neq 0$, which implies $p_{(1,3),(1,3)}^{(2,2)} = 0$ from (3). In view of Lemma 3.4 (i), one gets $p_{(1,2),(1,3)}^{(2,2)} \neq 0$. Lemma 3.8 (iii) implies

$$p_{(2,2),(1,2)}^{(2,2)} = p_{(1,3),(2,1)}^{(1,3)} = p_{(1,3),(1,2)}^{(1,3)} = 0.$$

Suppose $p_{(1,3),(1,3)}^{(1,2)} = 0$. Since $p_{(1,3),(1,3)}^{(2,2)} = 0$, from Lemma 3.6 (i), we have $\Gamma_{1,3}^2 = \{\Gamma_{1,3}\}$. Let $(u, v) \in \Gamma_{1,3}$. It follows that $\Gamma_{1,3}(v) \cup \{v\} \subseteq \Gamma_{1,3}(u)$, a contradiction. Thus, $p_{(1,3),(1,3)}^{(1,2)} \neq 0$. By (3), one gets $p_{(1,2),(2,1)}^{(1,2)} = 0$.

Let $(x, z) \in \Gamma_{2,2}$. Since $p_{(1,3),(1,2)}^{(2,2)} \neq 0$, there exists $y \in P_{(1,3),(1,2)}(x, z)$. Pick a vertex $w \in P_{(1,2),(2,1)}(x, y)$. The fact $w, z \in N^+(y)$ implies $(z, w) \notin A(\Gamma)$, and so $(w, z) \in \Gamma_{1,2} \cup \Gamma_{1,3}$. Since $p_{(1,2),(2,1)}^{(1,2)} = 0$, we have $w \in P_{(1,2),(1,3)}(y, z)$, and so $p_{(1,2),(2,1)}^{(1,3)} \leq p_{(1,2),(1,3)}^{(1,2)}$. By Lemma 2.1 (ii), one gets $p_{(1,2),(2,1)}^{(1,3)} k_{1,3} = p_{(1,2),(1,3)}^{(1,2)} k_{1,2}$,

which implies $k_{1,3} \geq k_{1,2}$. Pick a vertex $w' \in P_{(1,3),(1,3)}(y, z)$. Since $p_{(1,3),(1,3)}^{(2,2)} = 0$, from Lemma 3.6 (i), one has $w' \in P_{(1,2),(3,1)}(x, y)$, and so $p_{(1,3),(1,3)}^{(1,2)} \leq p_{(1,2),(3,1)}^{(1,3)}$. By Lemma 2.1 (ii), we get $p_{(1,3),(1,3)}^{(1,2)} k_{1,2} = p_{(1,2),(3,1)}^{(1,3)} k_{1,3}$, which implies $k_{1,2} \geq k_{1,3}$. Thus, $k_{1,2} = k_{1,3}$.

Since $p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(1,3)} = p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(1,2)} = 0$ from Lemma 2.1 (ii), we have $\Gamma_{1,2}^2 \subseteq \{\Gamma_{2,2}, \Gamma_{2,1}\}$ by Lemma 3.5 (i). Since $p_{(1,2),(2,2)}^{(2,2)} = p_{(1,3),(1,2)}^{(1,3)} = 0$, by setting $\tilde{d} = \tilde{e} = (1, 2)$, $\tilde{g} = (1, 3)$ and $\tilde{h} = (2, 2)$ in Lemma 2.1 (iv), from Lemma 3.6 (i), one gets $p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(2,2)} p_{(1,3),(2,2)}^{(2,2)} = p_{(1,3),(1,2)}^{(1,2)} p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(2,2)}$. It follows that $p_{(1,3),(2,2)}^{(2,2)} = p_{(1,3),(1,2)}^{(1,2)}$. Since $p_{(1,3),(1,3)}^{(2,2)} = p_{(1,2),(2,2)}^{(2,2)} = 0$, from Lemma 2.1 (ii) and Lemma 3.7, we obtain $\Gamma_{2,2} \Gamma_{1,2} \subseteq \{\Gamma_{2,1}, \Gamma_{3,1}\}$ and $\Gamma_{2,2} \Gamma_{1,3} \subseteq \{\Gamma_{2,1}, \Gamma_{2,2}\}$. In view of Lemma 2.1 (iii), one has

$$p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(2,2)} = k_{1,2} - p_{(1,2),(1,3)}^{(2,2)} = k_{1,2} - (k_{1,3} - p_{(1,3),(2,2)}^{(2,2)}) = p_{(1,3),(2,2)}^{(2,2)} = p_{(1,3),(1,2)}^{(1,2)}.$$

Let $y' \in P_{(1,2),(1,2)}(x, z)$. The fact $p_{(1,3),(1,2)}^{(1,2)} \neq 0$ implies that there exists $u \in P_{(1,3),(1,2)}(y', z)$. Since $p_{(1,3),(2,1)}^{(1,3)} = 0$, from Lemma 2.1 (ii), we get $p_{(1,3),(3,1)}^{(1,2)} = 0$. Since $p_{(1,2),(2,2)}^{(2,2)} = 0$, from Lemma 3.6 (i), one has $(x, u) \in \Gamma_{1,2}$. It follows that $P_{(1,3),(1,2)}(y', z) \cup \{y'\} \subseteq P_{(1,2),(1,2)}(x, z)$, contrary to the fact that $p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(2,2)} = p_{(1,3),(1,2)}^{(1,2)}$.

Since D(4) does not exist, from Lemma 3.2, $p_{(1,2),(2,1)}^{(1,3)} = 0$ and C(4) exists. \square

Lemma 3.10. *If $2 \in T$ and $(1, 3)$ is mixed, then $\Gamma_{1,1} \Gamma_{1,3} = \{\Gamma_{1,3}\}$.*

Proof. Let $(x, y) \in \Gamma_{1,1}$ and $(y, z) \in \Gamma_{1,3}$. Since $x, z \in N^+(y)$, we have $(x, z) \in \Gamma_{1,r}$ with $r > 1$. Lemma 3.9 implies that $p_{(1,3),(1,3)}^{(1,2)} \neq 0$ and $(1, 2)$ is pure. By Lemma 2.1 (ii), one gets $p_{(1,2),(3,1)}^{(1,3)} \neq 0$. Then there exists $w \in P_{(1,2),(3,1)}(y, z)$. Since $p_{(1,2),(2,1)}^{(1,1)} = k_{1,2}$ by Lemmas 2.3 and 2.9, we obtain $w \in P_{(1,2),(2,1)}(x, y)$. It follows that $r = \partial(z, x) \leq 1 + \partial(w, x) = 3$. If $r = 2$, then $z \in P_{(1,2),(3,1)}(x, y)$, a contradiction. Then $r = 3$, and so $\Gamma_{1,1} \Gamma_{1,3} = \{\Gamma_{1,3}\}$. \square

Lemma 3.11. *If $(1, 3)$ is mixed, then $\Gamma_{1,2}^2 \subseteq \{\Gamma_{1,2}, \Gamma_{2,1}\}$ and $p_{(1,2),(1,3)}^{(1,3)} = p_{(1,2),(2,1)}^{(1,2)}$.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.9, $p_{(1,2),(2,1)}^{(1,3)} = 0$ and C(4) exists. Since $(1, 2)$ is pure, there exists a circuit (u, x, y) consisting of arcs of type $(1, 2)$. The fact $p_{(1,3),(1,3)}^{(1,2)} \neq 0$ implies that there exists $z \in P_{(1,3),(1,3)}(y, u)$. It follows that $(x, z) \in \Gamma_{2,2}$. Suppose $p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(2,2)} \neq 0$. It follows that there exists $y' \in P_{(1,2),(1,2)}(x, z)$. Since $x \in P_{(2,1),(1,2)}(y, y')$ and $p_{(1,2),(2,1)}^{(1,3)} = 0$, from Lemma 3.5 (ii), we have $(y, y') \in \Gamma_{1,1} \cup \Gamma_{1,2}$. Since $z \in P_{(1,3),(2,1)}(y, y')$, from Lemma 2.9, one gets $(y, y') \in \Gamma_{1,2}$. The fact $y' \in P_{(1,2),(1,2)}(y, z)$ implies $p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(1,3)} \neq 0$, contrary to Lemma 3.8 (i). Hence, $p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(2,2)} = 0$. It follows from Lemma 3.5 (i) and Lemma 3.8 (i) that $\Gamma_{1,2}^2 \subseteq \{\Gamma_{1,2}, \Gamma_{2,1}\}$.

If $w \in P_{(1,2),(2,1)}(x, y)$, then $(w, z) \in A(\Gamma)$ since $z, w \in N^+(y)$ and $(x, z) \in \Gamma_{2,2}$, which implies $w \in P_{(1,2),(1,3)}(y, z)$ from Lemma 3.6 (iii) and Lemma 3.8 (i). Then $p_{(1,2),(2,1)}^{(1,2)} \leq p_{(1,2),(1,3)}^{(1,3)}$. If $w' \in P_{(1,2),(1,3)}(y, z)$, then $(w', x) \notin A(\Gamma)$ since Γ is locally semicomplete and $(x, z) \in \Gamma_{2,2}$, which implies $w' \in P_{(1,2),(2,1)}(x, y)$ by $\Gamma_{1,2}^2 \subseteq \{\Gamma_{1,2}, \Gamma_{2,1}\}$. Then $p_{(1,2),(1,3)}^{(1,3)} \leq p_{(1,2),(2,1)}^{(1,2)}$, and so $p_{(1,2),(1,3)}^{(1,3)} = p_{(1,2),(2,1)}^{(1,2)}$. \square

Proof of Proposition 3.1. (i) By Lemma 3.9, $C(4)$ exists. This proves (i).

(ii) By Lemma 3.8 (i) and Lemmas 3.9, 3.11, we have

$$p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(2,2)} = p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(1,3)} = p_{(1,2),(2,1)}^{(1,3)} = 0.$$

It follows from Lemma 2.1 (ii) that

$$p_{(2,1),(2,2)}^{(1,2)} = p_{(2,1),(1,3)}^{(1,2)} = p_{(1,3),(1,2)}^{(1,2)} = 0.$$

In view of Lemma 3.11, one has $p_{(1,2),(1,3)}^{(1,3)} = p_{(1,2),(2,1)}^{(1,2)}$. By setting $\tilde{d} = \tilde{e} = (1, 3)$ and $\tilde{h} = \tilde{g}^t = (1, 2)$ in Lemma 2.1 (iv), from Lemma 3.6 (i) and (iii), we get

$$p_{(1,3),(1,3)}^{(1,2)} p_{(1,2),(1,3)}^{(1,3)} = p_{(1,3),(1,3)}^{(1,2)} p_{(1,2),(2,1)}^{(1,2)} = p_{(2,1),(1,3)}^{(1,3)} p_{(1,3),(1,3)}^{(1,2)} + p_{(2,1),(1,3)}^{(3,1)} p_{(1,3),(3,1)}^{(1,2)}.$$

Since $p_{(1,2),(1,3)}^{(1,3)} = p_{(2,1),(1,3)}^{(1,3)}$ from Lemma 2.1 (ii), we have $p_{(2,1),(1,3)}^{(3,1)} p_{(1,3),(3,1)}^{(1,2)} = 0$. Since $p_{(1,3),(1,3)}^{(1,2)} \neq 0$, from Lemma 2.1 (ii), one has $p_{(2,1),(1,3)}^{(3,1)} \neq 0$, and so $p_{(1,3),(3,1)}^{(1,2)} = 0$. Since $p_{(1,3),(3,1)}^{(1,2)} = p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(1,3)} = p_{(1,2),(2,1)}^{(1,3)} = 0$, from Lemma 2.1 (ii), one gets $\Gamma_{3,1}, \Gamma_{1,2}, \Gamma_{2,1} \notin \Gamma_{1,2}\Gamma_{3,1}$. Lemma 3.6 (iv) implies $\Gamma_{1,2}\Gamma_{3,1} = \{\Gamma_{1,3}\}$. This proves (ii).

(iii) By (ii), one gets $p_{(1,3),(3,1)}^{(1,2)} = 0$. It follows from Lemma 2.1 (ii) and Lemma 3.11 that $p_{(1,2),(1,3)}^{(1,3)} = p_{(1,2),(2,1)}^{(1,2)} = 0$. Since $p_{(1,2),(2,1)}^{(1,3)} = 0$ from Lemma 3.9, by Lemma 3.5 (ii), one obtains $\Gamma_{1,2}\Gamma_{2,1} \subseteq \{\Gamma_{0,0}, \Gamma_{1,1}\}$. Lemma 2.1 (i) and Lemmas 2.3, 2.9 imply $k_{1,2} = k_{1,1} + 1$.

Let $(x, y) \in \Gamma_{1,2}$ and $(y, z) \in \Gamma_{1,3}$. Since $p_{(1,3),(1,3)}^{(1,2)} \neq 0$, from Lemma 2.1 (ii), we have $p_{(1,2),(3,1)}^{(1,3)} \neq 0$, which implies that there exists $w \in P_{(1,2),(3,1)}(y, z)$. Since $p_{(1,2),(2,1)}^{(1,2)} = 0$, from Lemma 2.1 (ii), one gets $\Gamma_{1,2} \notin \Gamma_{1,2}^2$. It follows from Lemma 3.11 that $\Gamma_{1,2}^2 = \{\Gamma_{2,1}\}$, and so $(x, w) \in \Gamma_{2,1}$. Then $(z, x) \in \Gamma_{2,2}$, and so $\Gamma_{1,2}\Gamma_{1,3} = \{\Gamma_{2,2}\}$.

Pick a vertex $y' \in \Gamma_{1,2}(x)$. If $y' = y$, then $y' \in P_{(1,2),(1,3)}(x, z)$. Suppose $y' \neq y$. Since $\Gamma_{1,2}\Gamma_{2,1} \subseteq \{\Gamma_{0,0}, \Gamma_{1,1}\}$, we have $(y, y') \in \Gamma_{1,1}$. By Lemma 3.10, one gets $y' \in P_{(1,2),(1,3)}(x, z)$. It follows that $p_{(1,2),(1,3)}^{(2,2)} = k_{1,2}$. By setting $\tilde{d} = (1, 3)$ and $\tilde{e} = (1, 2)$ in Lemma 2.1 (i), we obtain $k_{2,2} = k_{1,3}$.

By Lemma 2.1 (ii), one gets $p_{(1,3),(1,3)}^{(2,2)} = p_{(2,2),(3,1)}^{(1,3)}$. Suppose $p_{(1,3),(1,3)}^{(2,2)} \neq 0$. Then there exists a circuit (x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3) consisting of arcs of type $(1, 3)$ with $(x_1, x_3) \in \Gamma_{2,2}$. Since $p_{(1,3),(1,2)}^{(2,2)} \neq 0$, there exists $x'_2 \in P_{(1,3),(1,2)}(x_1, x_3)$. The fact $\Gamma_{1,2}\Gamma_{1,3} = \{\Gamma_{2,2}\}$ implies $x'_2 \in P_{(2,2),(3,1)}(x_0, x_1)$. For any $y_2 \in P_{(1,3),(1,3)}(x_1, x_3)$, we obtain $y_2 \in P_{(2,2),(3,1)}(x_0, x_1)$. It follows that $P_{(1,3),(1,3)}(x_1, x_3) \cup \{x'_2\} \subseteq P_{(2,2),(3,1)}(x_0, x_1)$, contrary to the fact that $p_{(1,3),(1,3)}^{(2,2)} = p_{(2,2),(3,1)}^{(1,3)}$. Thus, $p_{(1,3),(1,3)}^{(2,2)} = 0$.

By (ii), we have $p_{(1,3),(3,1)}^{(1,2)} = 0$. It follows from Lemma 3.6 (ii) that $\Gamma_{1,3}\Gamma_{3,1} \subseteq \{\Gamma_{0,0}, \Gamma_{1,1}, \Gamma_{1,3}, \Gamma_{3,1}\}$. By Lemma 2.1 (i) and Lemmas 2.3, 3.10, one gets $p_{(1,3),(3,1)}^{(1,3)} = (k_{1,3} - k_{1,1} - 1)/2$. In view of Lemma 2.1 (ii), we obtain $p_{(1,3),(1,3)}^{(1,3)} = (k_{1,3} - k_{1,1} - 1)/2$.

By (ii) and Lemma 2.3, one has $p_{(1,3),(1,3)}^{(1,2)} = k_{1,3}$. In view of Lemma 2.1 (ii), we obtain $p_{(1,2),(3,1)}^{(1,3)} = k_{1,2}$. Since $p_{(1,3),(1,3)}^{(2,2)} = 0$, from Lemma 2.1 (i) and Lemma 3.6 (i), we get

$$k_{1,3}^2 = p_{(1,3),(1,3)}^{(1,3)} k_{1,3} + p_{(1,3),(1,3)}^{(1,2)} k_{1,2}.$$

Since $p_{(1,3),(1,3)}^{(1,3)} = (k_{1,3} - k_{1,1} - 1)/2$ and $k_{1,2} = k_{1,1} + 1$, one obtains $k_{1,2} = k_{1,3} = k_{1,1} + 1$. It follows that $\Gamma_{1,3} \notin \Gamma_{1,3}^2$, and so $\Gamma_{1,3}^2 = \{\Gamma_{1,2}\}$. This proves (iii). \square

4. ARCS OF TYPE $(1, q - 1)$ WITH $q \geq 5$

In this section, we always assume that Γ is a locally semicomplete commutative weakly distance-regular digraph. We will characterize mixed arcs of type $(1, q - 1)$ with $q \geq 5$. The main result is as follows.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $q \geq 5$. Then $(1, q - 1)$ is mixed if and only if $C(q)$ exists.*

In order to prove Proposition 4.1, we need some auxiliary lemmas.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $(1, q - 1)$ is pure with $q > 3$. Then $\Delta_q \simeq \text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_q, \{1\})[\overline{K}_{k_{1,q-1}}]$ and $\Gamma_{2,q-2}\Gamma_{q-1,1} = \{\Gamma_{1,q-1}\}$. Moreover, if $\Gamma_{1,r-1} \in \Gamma_{1,q-1}\Gamma_{q-1,1}$, then $\Gamma_{1,r-1}\Gamma_{1,q-1} = \{\Gamma_{1,q-1}\}$.*

Proof. Since $(1, q - 1)$ is pure, there exists a circuit $(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{q-1})$ consisting of arcs of type $(1, q - 1)$. It follows that $\partial(x_i, x_{i+j}) = j$ for $1 \leq j \leq q - 1$, where the indices are read modulo q . If $k_{1,q-1} = 1$, then the desired result follows.

Now consider the case that $k_{1,q-1} > 1$. Let $y \in \Gamma_{1,q-1}(x_0)$ such that $(x_1, y) \in A(\Gamma)$. Since $y, x_2 \in N^+(x_1)$, (y, x_2) or (x_2, y) is an arc. Since $(x_0, x_2) \in \Gamma_{2,q-2}$ with $q > 3$, one gets $(x_2, y) \notin A(\Gamma)$, and so $(y, x_2) \in A(\Gamma)$. The fact $(1, q - 1)$ is pure implies $(y, x_2) \in \Gamma_{1,q-1}$. It follows that $\cup_i P_{(1,q-1),(i,1)}(x_0, x_1) \subseteq P_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}(x_0, x_2)$.

Let $\Gamma_{1,i} \in \Gamma_{q-1,1}\Gamma_{1,q-1}$ with $i \geq 1$. Suppose that there exists a vertex z such that $(z, x_1) \in \Gamma_{1,i}$ and $(x_0, z) \notin \Gamma_{1,q-1}$. Since $x_0, z \in N^-(x_1)$, (x_0, z) or (z, x_0) is an arc. If (x_0, z) is an arc, then $(z, x_2) \notin \Gamma_{1,q-1}$ since $(1, q - 1)$ is pure and $(x_0, z) \notin \Gamma_{1,q-1}$; if (z, x_0) is an arc, then $(z, x_2) \notin \Gamma_{1,q-1}$ since $(x_0, x_2) \in \Gamma_{2,q-2}$ with $q > 3$. Hence,

$$\Gamma_{1,i}(x_1) \setminus P_{(1,q-1),(1,i)}(x_0, x_1) \subseteq \Gamma_{1,i}(x_1) \setminus P_{(i,1),(1,q-1)}(x_1, x_2).$$

By Lemma 2.1 (ii), one has $p_{(1,q-1),(1,i)}^{(1,q-1)} = p_{(i,1),(1,q-1)}^{(1,q-1)}$, and so

$$\Gamma_{1,i}(x_1) \setminus P_{(1,q-1),(1,i)}(x_0, x_1) = \Gamma_{1,i}(x_1) \setminus P_{(i,1),(1,q-1)}(x_1, x_2).$$

Then $P_{(1,q-1),(1,i)}(x_0, x_1) = P_{(i,1),(1,q-1)}(x_1, x_2)$. Since $\Gamma_{1,i} \in \Gamma_{q-1,1}\Gamma_{1,q-1}$ was arbitrary, we get $\cup_i P_{(1,q-1),(1,i)}(x_0, x_1) \subseteq P_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}(x_0, x_2)$.

Since Γ is locally semicomplete, one obtains $\tilde{i} = (1, i)$ or $(i, 1)$ with $i > 0$ for all $\Gamma_{\tilde{i}} \in \Gamma_{1,q-1}\Gamma_{q-1,1} \setminus \{\Gamma_{0,0}\}$. The fact $\cup_i P_{(1,q-1),(i,1)}(x_0, x_1) \subseteq P_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}(x_0, x_2)$ implies $\Gamma_{1,q-1}(x_0) \subseteq P_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}(x_0, x_2)$, and so $p_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}^{(2,q-2)} = k_{1,q-1}$. Then the first statement is valid from [16, Lemma 2.4] and Lemma 2.3.

Now suppose $\Gamma_{1,r-1} \in \Gamma_{1,q-1}\Gamma_{q-1,1}$. Let $(x, y) \in \Gamma_{1,r-1}$ and $(y, z) \in \Gamma_{1,q-1}$. By the commutativity of Γ , there exists $w \in P_{(q-1,1),(1,q-1)}(x, y)$. From the first statement, one gets $\Gamma_{1,q-1}^2 = \{\Gamma_{2,q-2}\}$ and $p_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}^{(2,q-2)} = k_{1,q-1}$, which imply $(w, z) \in \Gamma_{2,q-2}$ and $(x, z) \in \Gamma_{1,q-1}$. Thus, the second statement is also valid. \square

Lemma 4.3. *Let $(1, q - 1)$ is pure with $q > 3$. If $\Gamma_{1,r} \in \Gamma_{1,q-1}\Gamma_{q-1,1}$, then $r \in \{1, 2\}$.*

Proof. For all $\Gamma_{1,s} \in \Gamma_{1,q-1}\Gamma_{q-1,1}$, by Lemma 4.2, one gets $\Gamma_{1,s}\Gamma_{1,q-1} = \{\Gamma_{1,q-1}\}$. It follows from Lemmas 2.5 and 2.6 that $r \in \{1, 2\}$. The desired result follows. \square

Lemma 4.4. *If $C(q)$ exists with $q \geq 5$, then $\Gamma_{1,q-1}\Gamma_{1,q-2} = \{\Gamma_{2,q-2}\}$.*

Proof. Pick a path (x, x_1, x_2) such that $(x, x_1) \in \Gamma_{1,q-1}$ and $(x_1, x_2) \in \Gamma_{1,q-2}$. Since $p_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}^{(1,q-2)} \neq 0$, from Lemma 2.1 (ii), we have $p_{(q-1,1),(1,q-2)}^{(1,q-1)} \neq 0$, which implies that there exists $x_0 \in P_{(q-1,1),(1,q-2)}(x, x_1)$. Since $(1, q - 2)$ is pure, from Lemma 4.2, we have $\Gamma_{1,q-2}^2 = \{\Gamma_{2,q-3}\}$, which implies that $(x_0, x_2) \in \Gamma_{2,q-3}$. The fact $q - 2 \leq \partial(x_2, x) \leq 1 + \partial(x_2, x_0) = q - 2$ implies $\partial(x_2, x) = q - 2$. By Lemma 2.2, one gets

$P_{(1,q-1),(1,q-2)}(x_0, x_2) = \emptyset$, which implies $(x, x_2) \in \Gamma_{2,q-2}$. This completes the proof of this lemma. \square

Lemma 4.5. *If $C(q)$ exists with $q \geq 5$, then $\Gamma_{1,q-2}\Gamma_{q-1,1} = \{\Gamma_{1,q-1}\}$.*

Proof. Pick a path (x_0, x_1, x_2) consisting of arcs of type $(1, q-2)$. Since $p_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}^{(1,q-2)} \neq 0$, there exists $y \in P_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}(x_0, x_1)$. By Lemma 4.2, we have $\Gamma_{1,q-2}^2 = \{\Gamma_{2,q-3}\}$, which implies that $(x_0, x_2) \in \Gamma_{2,q-3}$.

Assume the contrary, namely, $p_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}^{(1,q-2)} \neq k_{1,q-1}$. Pick a vertex $z \in \Gamma_{1,q-1}(x_0)$ such that $(z, x_1) \notin \Gamma_{1,q-1}$. Since $z, x_1 \in N^+(x_0)$, we have (z, x_1) or $(x_1, z) \in A(\Gamma)$. Suppose $(x_1, z) \in A(\Gamma)$. The fact $z, x_2 \in N^+(x_1)$ implies that (z, x_2) or $(x_2, z) \in A(\Gamma)$. Since $(x_0, x_2) \in \Gamma_{2,q-3}$ with $q > 4$, one gets $(z, x_2) \in \Gamma_{1,r}$ for some $r > 0$. Since $z \in P_{(1,q-1),(1,r)}(x_0, x_2)$, we obtain $p_{(1,q-1),(1,r)}^{(2,q-3)} \neq 0$, contrary to Lemma 2.2. Then $(z, x_1) \in \Gamma_{1,r}$ with $r \neq q-1$.

If $r = q-2$, then $x_1 \in P_{(1,q-2),(q-2,1)}(x_0, z)$, which implies $\Gamma_{1,q-1} \in \Gamma_{1,q-2}\Gamma_{q-2,1}$, contrary to Lemma 4.3. Since $r = \partial(x_1, z) \leq \partial(x_1, x_0) + 1$, we obtain $r < q-2$. Since $\partial(x_2, z) \leq 1 + \partial(x_2, x_0) = q-2$ and $(1, q-2)$ is pure, we have $\partial(x_2, z) = q-2$, and so $\partial(z, x_2) = 2$. By Lemma 4.4, one has $(y, x_2) \in \Gamma_{2,q-2}$. The fact $x_1 \in P_{(1,r),(1,q-2)}(z, x_2)$ implies that there exists $x'_1 \in P_{(1,r),(1,q-2)}(y, x_2)$. Since $x_1, x'_1 \in N^+(y)$, one gets (x_1, x'_1) or $(x'_1, x_1) \in A(\Gamma)$. If $(x_1, x'_1) \in A(\Gamma)$, then $q-1 = \partial(x_1, y) \leq 1 + \partial(x'_1, y) = r+1 < q-1$, a contradiction. Then $(x'_1, x_1) \in \Gamma_{1,s}$ with $s > 1$.

Since $x_2 \in P_{(1,q-2),(q-2,1)}(x'_1, x_1)$, from Lemma 4.3, we get $s = 2$. Since

$$q-1 = \partial(x_1, y) \leq 2 + \partial(x'_1, y) = r+2 \leq q-1,$$

we have $r = q-3$.

Since $(x'_1, x_1) \in \Gamma_{1,2}$, there exists a path (x_1, x'_2, x'_1) . Since $y, x'_2 \in N^-(x'_1)$ and $(y, x_1) \in \Gamma_{1,q-1}$, we have $(y, x'_2) \in A(\Gamma)$. Since $\partial(x'_2, y) \leq 1 + \partial(x'_1, y) = q-2$, one gets

$$q-1 = \partial(x_1, y) \leq 1 + \partial(x'_2, y) \leq q-1,$$

and so $(y, x'_2) \in \Gamma_{1,q-2}$. The fact $x'_1 \in P_{(1,q-3),\partial(x'_1,x'_2)}(y, x'_2)$ implies that there exists $w \in \Gamma_{1,q-3}(x_0)$ such that $(x_1, w) \in A(\Gamma)$. Since $w, x_2 \in N^+(x_1)$ and $(x_0, x_2) \in \Gamma_{2,q-3}$ with $q \geq 5$, we get $(w, x_2) \in \Gamma_{1,t}$ for some $t > 0$. Since $w \in P_{(1,q-3),(1,t)}(x_0, x_2)$, we obtain $p_{(1,q-3),(1,t)}^{(2,q-3)} \neq 0$, contrary to Lemma 2.2. \square

Lemma 4.6. *Let $r \neq q-1$ with $q \geq 5$. Suppose that $C(q)$ exists. The following hold:*

- (i) $\Gamma_{1,r} \in \Gamma_{1,q-2}\Gamma_{q-2,1}$ if and only if $\Gamma_{1,r} \in \Gamma_{1,q-1}\Gamma_{q-1,1}$;
- (ii) If $\Gamma_{1,r} \in \Gamma_{1,q-1}\Gamma_{q-1,1}$, then $\Gamma_{1,r}\Gamma_{1,q-1} = \{\Gamma_{1,q-1}\}$.

Proof. We claim that $\Gamma_{1,r} \in \Gamma_{1,q-1}\Gamma_{q-1,1}$ and $p_{(1,q-1),(q-1,1)}^{(1,r)} = k_{1,q-1}$ for each $\Gamma_{1,r} \in \Gamma_{1,q-2}\Gamma_{q-2,1}$. Let $(x, z) \in \Gamma_{1,r}$ and $y \in P_{(1,q-2),(q-2,1)}(x, z)$. Pick a vertex $w \in \Gamma_{1,q-1}(x)$. By Lemmas 2.3 and 4.5, one has $p_{(1,q-1),(q-1,1)}^{(1,q-2)} = k_{1,q-1}$, which implies that $w \in P_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}(x, y)$ and $w \in P_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}(z, y)$. Then $\Gamma_{1,r} \in \Gamma_{1,q-1}\Gamma_{q-1,1}$ and $p_{(1,q-1),(q-1,1)}^{(1,r)} = k_{1,q-1}$. Thus, our claim is valid.

(i) Suppose $\Gamma_{1,r} \in \Gamma_{1,q-1}\Gamma_{q-1,1}$. Let $(x, z) \in \Gamma_{1,r}$ and $y \in P_{(1,q-1),(q-1,1)}(x, z)$. Pick a vertex $w \in \Gamma_{1,q-2}(x)$. Since $p_{(1,q-1),(q-1,1)}^{(1,q-2)} = k_{1,q-1}$, we have $y \in P_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}(x, w)$. Since $z, w \in N^+(x)$, we have (z, w) or $(w, z) \in A(\Gamma)$. The fact that (z, y, w) is a path consisting of arcs of type $(1, q-1)$ implies $(z, w) \in A(\Gamma)$. Since $r \neq q-1$, from Lemma 4.5, we obtain $(z, w) \notin \Gamma_{1,q-1}$. Since $q-2 \leq \partial(w, z) \leq 1 + \partial(w, x) = q-1$,

one has $(z, w) \in \Gamma_{1,q-2}$. The fact $w \in P_{(1,q-2),(q-2,1)}(x, z)$ implies $\Gamma_{1,r} \in \Gamma_{1,q-2}\Gamma_{q-2,1}$. Combining with the claim, (i) is valid.

(ii) By (i), we have $\Gamma_{1,r} \in \Gamma_{1,q-2}\Gamma_{q-2,1}$, which implies $p_{(1,q-1),(q-1,1)}^{(1,r)} = k_{1,q-1}$ from the claim. It follows from Lemma 2.3 that $\Gamma_{1,r}\Gamma_{1,q-1} = \{\Gamma_{1,q-1}\}$. Thus, (ii) is valid. \square

Lemma 4.7. *If $C(q)$ exists with $q \geq 5$, then $\Gamma_{1,q-1} \notin \Gamma_{1,q-1}^2$.*

Proof. Pick a path (x, y, z) such that $(x, y) \in \Gamma_{1,q-1}$ and $(y, z) \in \Gamma_{1,q-2}$. By Lemma 4.4, we have $(x, z) \in \Gamma_{2,q-2}$. Assume the contrary, namely, $\Gamma_{1,q-1} \in \Gamma_{1,q-1}^2$. In view of Lemma 2.1 (ii), one gets $p_{(1,q-1),(q-1,1)}^{(1,q-1)} \neq 0$, which implies that there exists $y' \in P_{(1,q-1),(q-1,1)}(x, y)$. It follows from Lemmas 2.3 and 4.5 that $y' \in P_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}(y, z)$. Since $y' \in P_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}(x, z)$, we obtain $\Gamma_{2,q-2} \in \Gamma_{1,q-1}^2$.

Pick a vertex $w \in P_{(1,q-1),(q-1,1)}(x, y')$. Since $w, z \in N^+(y')$ and $(x, z) \in \Gamma_{2,q-2}$ with $q \geq 5$, we have $(w, z) \in A\Gamma$. Since $y' \in P_{(q-1,1),(1,q-1)}(w, z)$, from Lemma 4.6 (ii), one gets $P_{(q-1,1),(1,q-1)}(w, z) = \Gamma_{q-1,1}(w)$ or $(w, z) \in \Gamma_{1,q-1}$. The fact $x \in P_{(q-1,1),(2,q-2)}(w, z)$ implies $(w, z) \in \Gamma_{1,q-1}$. It follows that $P_{(1,q-1),(q-1,1)}(x, y') \subseteq P_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}(x, z)$. Pick a vertex $w' \in \Gamma_{1,q-1}(x)$ such that $(w', y') \notin \Gamma_{1,q-1} \cup \Gamma_{q-1,1}$. Since $y', w' \in N^+(x)$, one gets (w', y') or $(y', w') \in A(\Gamma)$. Since $x \in P_{(q-1,1),(1,q-1)}(y', w')$, from Lemma 4.6 (ii), we obtain $z \in P_{(1,q-1),(q-1,1)}(y', w')$. Thus,

$$\Gamma_{1,q-1}(x) \setminus P_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}(x, y') \subseteq P_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}(x, z),$$

and so

$$p_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}^{(2,q-2)} \geq k_{1,q-1} - p_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}^{(1,q-1)}.$$

Let (x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3) be a path such that $(x_0, x_2) \in \Gamma_{2,q-2}$, $x_1 \in P_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}(x_0, x_2)$ and $\partial(x_3, x_0) = q - 3$. Then $(x_1, x_3) \in \Gamma_{2,q-2}$. Let $x'_2 \in P_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}(x_1, x_3)$. It follows that $(x_0, x'_2) \in \Gamma_{2,q-2}$. Since x'_2 was arbitrary, we have $P_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}(x_1, x_3) \subseteq P_{(2,q-2),(q-1,1)}(x_0, x_1)$, which implies that

$$p_{(2,q-2),(q-1,1)}^{(1,q-1)} \geq p_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}^{(2,q-2)} \geq k_{1,q-1} - p_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}^{(1,q-1)}.$$

Then

$$p_{(2,q-2),(q-1,1)}^{(1,q-1)} + p_{(1,q-1),(q-1,1)}^{(1,q-1)} + p_{(1,q-2),(q-1,1)}^{(1,q-1)} > k_{1,q-1},$$

contrary to Lemma 2.1 (iii). \square

Lemma 4.8. *If $C(q)$ exists with $q \geq 5$, then $\Gamma_{1,q-1}^2 = \{\Gamma_{1,q-2}\}$.*

Proof. If $k_{1,q-1} = 1$, then $\Gamma_{1,q-1}^2 = \{\Gamma_{1,q-2}\}$. Now we consider the case $k_{1,q-1} > 1$. Let (x, y, z) be a path consisting of arcs of type $(1, q - 1)$ with $(x, z) \in \Gamma_{1,q-2}$. Pick a vertex $w \in \Gamma_{q-1,1}(y)$ such that $x \neq w$. It suffices to show that $(w, z) \in \Gamma_{1,q-2}$. Since $x, w \in N^-(y)$, from Lemma 4.7, we have $(x, w) \in \Gamma_{1,r} \cup \Gamma_{r,1}$ with $r \neq q - 1$, and so $\Gamma_{1,r} \in \Gamma_{1,q-1}\Gamma_{q-1,1}$. In view of Lemma 4.6 (i), one gets $\Gamma_{1,r} \in \Gamma_{1,q-2}\Gamma_{q-2,1}$. By Lemmas 2.3 and 4.2, we obtain $p_{(1,q-2),(q-2,1)}^{(1,r)} = k_{q-2,1}$, and so $z \in P_{(1,q-2),(q-2,1)}(x, w)$. The desired result follows. \square

Now we are ready to give a proof of Proposition 4.1.

Proof of Proposition 4.1. If $C(q)$ exists, it is obvious that $(1, q - 1)$ is mixed. We prove the converse. By way of contradiction, we may assume that q is the minimum positive integer such that $q \geq 5$, $(1, q - 1)$ is mixed and $C(q)$ does not exist. Pick a circuit $(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{q-1})$ such that $(x_{q-1}, x_0) \in \Gamma_{1,q-1}$.

Case 1. $\Gamma_{1,q-1} \in \Gamma_{l-1,1}^{q-1}$ for some $l \in \{2, 3, \dots, q - 1\}$.

Without loss of generality, we may assume $(x_i, x_{i+1}) \in \Gamma_{1,l-1}$ for $0 \leq i \leq q-2$. Suppose $l \geq 4$. By the minimality of q and Proposition 3.1 (i), $(1, l-1)$ is pure or $C(l)$ exists. If $C(l)$ exists, from Proposition 3.1 (iii) and Lemma 4.8, then $\partial(x_0, x_2) = 1$, a contradiction. Hence, $(1, l-1)$ is pure. By Lemma 4.2, one gets $\Gamma_{1,l-1}^{l-1} = \{\Gamma_{l-1,1}\}$ and $p_{(1,l-1),(1,l-1)}^{(2,l-2)} = k_{1,l-1}$ from Lemma 2.3. Then $(x_0, x_{l-1}) \in \Gamma_{l-1,1}$. If $l < q-1$, from Lemma 4.2, then $(x_{l-1}, x_{l+1}) \in \Gamma_{2,l-2}$, and so $x_0 \in P_{(1,l-1),(1,l-1)}(x_{l-1}, x_{l+1})$, a contradiction. Then $l = q-1$. Since $x_{q-2} \in P_{(q-2,1),(1,q-2)}(x_{q-1}, x_0)$, from Lemma 4.3, one gets $q-1 \in \{1, 2\}$, a contradiction. Thus, $l \leq 3$.

If $l = 2$, or $l = 3$ and $(1, 2)$ is mixed, from Lemmas 2.7 and 2.8, then $\Gamma_{1,q-1} \in F_l \subseteq \{\Gamma_{0,0}, \Gamma_{1,2}, \Gamma_{1,1}, \Gamma_{2,1}\}$, a contradiction. Then $l = 3$ and $(1, 2)$ is pure.

Since $\partial(x_0, x_2) = 2$, from Lemma 3.5 (i), we have $(x_0, x_2) \in \Gamma_{2,i}$ for some $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Since $\Gamma_{1,q-1} \in F_3$, from Lemmas 2.4 and 2.5, $\Delta_I(x_0)$ is not semicomplete, where $I = \{r \mid \Gamma_{1,r-1} \in F_3\}$. In view of Lemma 3.5 (ii) and Lemma 3.7 (ii), one gets

$$\Gamma_{2,i}\Gamma_{1,2} \subseteq \{\Gamma_{0,0}, \Gamma_{1,1}, \Gamma_{1,2}, \Gamma_{2,1}, \Gamma_{1,3}, \Gamma_{3,1}, \Gamma_{2,2}\}.$$

Since $\partial(x_0, x_3) = 3$, we obtain $(x_0, x_3) \in \Gamma_{3,1}$. Lemma 3.6 (iv) implies $\partial(x_0, x_4) < 4$, a contradiction.

Case 2. $\Gamma_{1,q-1} \notin \Gamma_{l-1,1}^{q-1}$ for all $l \in \{2, 3, \dots, q-1\}$.

Without loss of generality, we may assume $(x_0, x_1) \in \Gamma_{1,p-1}$ with $p < q$. Pick a vertex $x'_0 \in P_{(1,p-1),(1,q-1)}(x_{q-1}, x_1)$.

Assume that $(x_{q-1}, x_1) \in \Gamma_{1,q-2}$. By the minimality of q and Proposition 3.1 (i), $(1, q-2)$ is pure or $C(q-1)$ exists. Since $p_{(1,q-2),(1,q-2)}^{(2,q-3)} \neq 0$ or $p_{(1,q-2),(1,q-2)}^{(1,q-3)} \neq 0$, from Lemma 2.1 (ii), there exists $x'_2 \in \Gamma_{1,q-2}(x_1)$ such that $\partial(x'_2, x_{q-1}) = q-3$. Suppose that $(1, q-2)$ is pure. If $p = q-1$, then $x_{q-1} \in P_{(q-2,1),(1,q-2)}(x'_0, x_1)$, which implies $q \in \{2, 3\}$ from Lemma 4.3. Then $p \neq q-1$. Since $(1, q-2)$ is pure, one gets $\partial(x'_2, x'_0) = \partial(x'_2, x_0) = q-2$, and so $(x_0, x'_2), (x'_0, x'_2) \in \Gamma_{2,q-2}$. The fact $x_1 \in P_{(1,q-1),(1,q-2)}(x'_0, x'_2)$ implies that there exists $x'_1 \in P_{(1,q-1),(1,q-2)}(x_0, x'_2)$. By Lemma 4.2, we obtain $x'_1 \in P_{(1,q-2),(1,q-2)}(x_{q-1}, x'_2)$, which implies that $C(q)$ exists, a contradiction. Suppose that $C(q-1)$ exists. By Lemma 4.8, $(x_{q-1}, x'_2) \in \Gamma_{1,q-3}$. Since $x_0, x'_2 \in N^+(x_{q-1})$, one has $(x_0, x'_2) \in A(\Gamma)$ or $(x'_2, x_0) \in A(\Gamma)$, which implies that $\partial(x_0, x'_2) = 1$ or (x_0, x_1, x'_2) is a circuit, contrary to the fact that $\partial(x_0, x'_2) = 2$ and $\partial(x'_2, x_1) = q-2 \geq 3$. Thus, $(x_{q-1}, x_1) \in \Gamma_{2,q-2}$.

Suppose $\Gamma_{1,q-2} \notin \Gamma_{1,q-1}^2$. If $(x_{q-2}, x_{q-1}) \in \Gamma_{1,q-1}$, then $(x_{q-2}, x_0) \in \Gamma_{2,q-2}$; if $(x_{q-2}, x_{q-1}) \notin \Gamma_{1,q-1}$, by similar argument, then $(x_{q-2}, x_0) \in \Gamma_{2,q-2}$. Since $x_0 \in P_{(1,q-1),(1,p-1)}(x_{q-1}, x_1)$, there exists $x'_{q-1} \in P_{(1,q-1),(1,p-1)}(x_{q-2}, x_0)$. Note that the circuit $(x'_{q-1}, x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{q-2})$ contains at least two arcs of type $(1, p-1)$. Repeat this process, there exists a circuit of length q consisting of an arc of type $(1, q-1)$ and $q-1$ arcs of type $(1, p-1)$, contrary to the fact that $\Gamma_{1,q-1} \notin \Gamma_{1,p-1}^{q-1}$.

Since $\Gamma_{1,q-2} \in \Gamma_{1,q-1}^2$, there exists $x'_{q-2} \in \Gamma_{q-1,1}(x_{q-1})$ such that $(x'_{q-2}, x_0) \in \Gamma_{1,q-2}$. Since $C(q)$ does not exist, $(1, q-2)$ is mixed. By the minimality of q and Proposition 3.1 (i), $C(q-1)$ exists. In view of Lemma 2.1 (ii), we have $p_{(1,q-3),(q-2,1)}^{(1,q-2)} \neq 0$, which implies that there exists $x'_1 \in P_{(1,q-3),(q-2,1)}(x'_{q-2}, x_0)$. Since $x_{q-1}, x'_1 \in N^+(x'_{q-2})$, one gets $(x_{q-1}, x'_1) \in A(\Gamma)$ or $(x'_1, x_{q-1}) \in A(\Gamma)$. If $(x_{q-1}, x'_1) \in A(\Gamma)$, then $q-1 = \partial(x_{q-1}, x'_{q-2}) \leq 1 + \partial(x'_1, x'_{q-2}) = q-2$, a contradiction. If $(x'_1, x_{q-1}) \in A(\Gamma)$, then (x_{q-1}, x_0, x'_1) is a circuit containing an arc of type $(1, q-1)$, a contradiction. \square

5. SUBDIGRAPHS

Let Γ be a locally semicomplete commutative weakly distance-regular digraph. For a nonempty subset I of T and $x \in V(\Gamma)$, recall the notation of the set F_I and the digraph $\Delta_I(x)$ in Section 2. In this section, we focus on the existence of some special subdigraphs $\Delta_I(x)$ of Γ .

Lemma 5.1. *Let $(1, 2)$ be pure. Suppose that $4 \notin T$ or $(1, 3)$ is pure. Then $F_3 \subseteq \{\Gamma_{0,0}, \Gamma_{1,1}, \Gamma_{1,2}, \Gamma_{2,1}, \Gamma_{2,2}\}$. Moreover, if $\Gamma_{2,2} \in F_3$, then $\Gamma_{2,2} \in \Gamma_{1,2}^2$.*

Proof. If $F_3 \subseteq \{\Gamma_{0,0}, \Gamma_{1,1}, \Gamma_{1,2}, \Gamma_{2,1}\}$, then the desired result follows. Now we consider the case $F_3 \not\subseteq \{\Gamma_{0,0}, \Gamma_{1,1}, \Gamma_{1,2}, \Gamma_{2,1}\}$. We claim that $\Gamma_{1,3} \notin F_3$. Assume the contrary, namely, $\Gamma_{1,3} \in F_3$. By Lemmas 2.4 and 2.5, $\Delta_I(x)$ is not semicomplete for $x \in V(\Gamma)$, where $I = \{r \mid \Gamma_{1,r-1} \in F_3\}$. In view of Lemma 3.4 (ii), we have $\Gamma_{2,2} \in \Gamma_{1,2}^2 \cup \Gamma_{1,2}\Gamma_{1,3}$. Lemma 2.2 implies that $(1, 3)$ is mixed, a contradiction. Thus, our claim is valid.

By Lemma 3.5 (i) and the claim, we have $\Gamma_{1,2}^2 \subseteq \{\Gamma_{2,1}, \Gamma_{1,2}, \Gamma_{2,2}\}$. In view of Lemma 3.5 (ii), one gets $\Gamma_{1,2}\Gamma_{2,1} \subseteq \{\Gamma_{0,0}, \Gamma_{1,1}, \Gamma_{1,2}, \Gamma_{2,1}\}$. Suppose $\Gamma_{2,2} \notin \Gamma_{1,2}^2$. Then $\Gamma_{1,2}^2 \subseteq \{\Gamma_{2,1}, \Gamma_{1,2}\}$, and so $\Gamma_{1,2}^3 \subseteq \{\Gamma_{0,0}, \Gamma_{1,1}, \Gamma_{1,2}, \Gamma_{2,1}\}$. By induction and Lemma 2.9, we obtain $\Gamma_{1,2}^i \subseteq \{\Gamma_{0,0}, \Gamma_{1,1}, \Gamma_{1,2}, \Gamma_{2,1}\}$ for $i \geq 3$. It follows that $F_3 \subseteq \{\Gamma_{0,0}, \Gamma_{1,1}, \Gamma_{1,2}, \Gamma_{2,1}\}$, a contradiction. Then $\Gamma_{2,2} \in \Gamma_{1,2}^2$.

Since $\{\Gamma_{2,1}, \Gamma_{2,2}\} \subseteq \Gamma_{1,2}^2 \subseteq \{\Gamma_{1,2}, \Gamma_{2,1}, \Gamma_{2,2}\}$, $\Delta_I(x)$ is not semicomplete for $x \in V(\Gamma)$, where $I = \{r \mid \Gamma_{1,r-1} \in F_3\}$. By Lemma 3.7 (ii) and the claim, one gets $\Gamma_{2,2}\Gamma_{1,2} \subseteq \{\Gamma_{2,1}, \Gamma_{2,2}\}$, and so $\Gamma_{1,2}^3 \subseteq \{\Gamma_{0,0}, \Gamma_{1,1}, \Gamma_{1,2}, \Gamma_{2,1}, \Gamma_{2,2}\}$. By induction and Lemma 2.9, we obtain $\Gamma_{1,2}^i \subseteq \{\Gamma_{0,0}, \Gamma_{1,1}, \Gamma_{1,2}, \Gamma_{2,1}, \Gamma_{2,2}\}$ for $i \geq 3$. The desired result follows. \square

Lemma 5.2. *Let $(1, 2)$ be pure and $2 \notin T$. Suppose that $4 \notin T$ or $(1, 3)$ is pure. If $\Gamma_{2,2} \in \Gamma_{1,2}^2$, then the following hold:*

- (i) $p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(1,2)} = p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(2,1)} = (k_{1,2} - 1)/2$;
- (ii) $p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(2,2)} = k_{1,2}$;
- (iii) $k_{2,2} = 1$.

Proof. We claim that $p_{(2,2),(2,2)}^{(2,2)} = 0$. Assume the contrary, namely, $p_{(2,2),(2,2)}^{(2,2)} \neq 0$. Let $(x_0, x_4) \in \Gamma_{2,2}$ and $x_2 \in P_{(2,2),(2,2)}(x_0, x_4)$. Since $\Gamma_{2,2} \in \Gamma_{1,2}^2$, there exist $x_1 \in P_{(1,2),(1,2)}(x_0, x_2)$, $x_3 \in P_{(1,2),(1,2)}(x_2, x_4)$ and $y_2 \in P_{(1,2),(1,2)}(x_0, x_4)$. Since $x_1, y_2 \in N^+(x_0)$, we have $(x_1, y_2) \in A(\Gamma)$ or $(y_2, x_1) \in A(\Gamma)$. If $(x_1, y_2) \in A(\Gamma)$, by $x_2, y_2 \in N^+(x_1)$, then $(x_2, y_2) \in A(\Gamma)$ since $(x_2, x_4) \in \Gamma_{2,2}$, which implies $(x_0, x_2) \in A(\Gamma)$ or $(x_2, x_0) \in A(\Gamma)$, a contradiction. If $(y_2, x_1) \in A(\Gamma)$, by $x_1, x_4 \in N^+(y_2)$, then $(x_4, x_1) \in A(\Gamma)$ since $(x_2, x_4) \in \Gamma_{2,2}$, which implies $(x_0, x_4) \in A(\Gamma)$ or $(x_4, x_0) \in A(\Gamma)$, a contradiction. Thus, our claim is valid.

Since $2 \notin T$, from Lemma 5.1, we have $F_3 = \{\Gamma_{0,0}, \Gamma_{1,2}, \Gamma_{2,1}, \Gamma_{2,2}\}$. By Lemma 3.5 (ii), one gets $\Gamma_{1,2}\Gamma_{2,1} \subseteq \{\Gamma_{0,0}, \Gamma_{1,2}, \Gamma_{2,1}\}$. Lemma 2.1 (i) implies that

$$k_{1,2}^2 = k_{1,2} + p_{(1,2),(2,1)}^{(1,2)}k_{1,2} + p_{(1,2),(2,1)}^{(2,1)}k_{1,2}.$$

By Lemma 2.1 (ii), we obtain

$$p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(1,2)} = p_{(1,2),(2,1)}^{(1,2)} = p_{(1,2),(2,1)}^{(2,1)} = (k_{1,2} - 1)/2.$$

In view of Lemma 3.5 (i), one has $\Gamma_{1,2}^2 \subseteq \{\Gamma_{1,2}, \Gamma_{2,1}, \Gamma_{2,2}\}$. By Lemma 2.1 (i), we get

$$k_{1,2}^2 = p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(1,2)}k_{1,2} + p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(2,1)}k_{1,2} + p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(2,2)}k_{2,2}.$$

Then

$$k_{2,2} = k_{1,2}(k_{1,2} + 1 - 2p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(2,1)}) / (2p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(2,2)}). \quad (4)$$

In view of Lemma 2.1 (ii), one has $p_{(2,1),(2,1)}^{(1,2)} = p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(2,1)}$ and $p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(2,2)}k_{2,2}/k_{1,2} = p_{(2,1),(2,2)}^{(1,2)}$. By setting $\tilde{d} = \tilde{e} = \tilde{h} = \tilde{g}^t = (1, 2)$ in Lemma 2.1 (iv), we get

$$(p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(2,1)})^2 + (p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(2,2)})^2 k_{2,2}/k_{1,2} = k_{1,2} + (p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(1,2)})^2,$$

which implies

$$(k_{1,2} + 1 - 2p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(2,1)})(k_{1,2} - 2p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(2,2)} + 1 + 2p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(2,1)}) = 0$$

from (4). Since $k_{2,2} \neq 0$, we obtain

$$p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(2,2)} = (k_{1,2} + 1)/2 + p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(2,1)}. \quad (5)$$

(i) Since $\Gamma_{2,2} \in F_3$, $\Delta_I(x)$ is not semicomplete for $x \in V(\Gamma)$, where $I = \{r \mid \Gamma_{1,r-1} \in F_3\}$. In view of Lemma 3.7 (ii), we have $\Gamma_{2,2}\Gamma_{1,2} \subseteq \{\Gamma_{2,1}, \Gamma_{2,2}\}$. By Lemma 2.1 (ii) and (iii), we have $p_{(1,2),(2,2)}^{(2,2)} = k_{1,2} - p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(2,2)}$, and so $p_{(1,2),(2,2)}^{(2,2)} = (k_{1,2} - 1)/2 - p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(2,1)}$. By the claim, one gets $\Gamma_{2,2}^2 \subseteq \{\Gamma_{0,0}, \Gamma_{1,2}, \Gamma_{2,1}\}$. In view of Lemma 2.1 (i) and (ii), one gets $k_{2,2}^2 = k_{2,2} + 2p_{(1,2),(2,2)}^{(2,2)}k_{2,2}$. (4) implies

$$(k_{1,2} + 1 - 2p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(2,1)})(k_{1,2} - 1 - 2p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(2,1)}) = 0. \quad (6)$$

Since $k_{2,2} \neq 0$, from (4), we obtain $k_{1,2} + 1 - 2p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(2,1)} \neq 0$, which implies that $p_{(1,2),(1,2)}^{(2,1)} = (k_{1,2} - 1)/2$ from (6). Thus, (i) holds.

(ii) It is immediate from (5) and (i).

(iii) It is immediate from (4), (i) and (ii). \square

Proposition 5.3. *Let $(1, 2)$ be pure and $2 \notin T$. Suppose that $4 \notin T$ or $(1, 3)$ is pure. If $\Gamma_{2,2} \in \Gamma_{1,2}^2$, then Δ_3 is isomorphic to a doubly regular $(k_{1,2} + 1, 2)$ -team tournament of type II with $k_{1,2} \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$.*

Proof. By Lemma 5.1, one gets $F_3 = \{\Gamma_{0,0}, \Gamma_{1,2}, \Gamma_{2,1}, \Gamma_{2,2}\}$. Let $x \in V(\Gamma)$. Pick distinct vertices $z, w \in F_3(x)$. Since $(1, 2)$ is pure and $\Gamma_{2,2} \in \Gamma_{1,2}^2$, we have $\tilde{\partial}_\Gamma(z, w) = \tilde{\partial}_{\Delta_3(x)}(z, w)$, which implies that $[\Delta_3(x)]_{\tilde{i}}(z) \cap [\Delta_3(x)]_{\tilde{j}^t}(w) = P_{\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}}(z, w)$ for $\tilde{i}, \tilde{j} \in \tilde{\partial}(\Delta_3(x))$ and $z, w \in F_3(x)$. By the weakly distance-regularity of Γ , $\Delta_3(x)$ is weakly distance-regular. By Lemma 5.2 (iii), one obtains $k_{2,2} = 1$. It follows from [7, Proposition 5.3] that $\Delta_3(x)$ is isomorphic to a doubly regular $(k_{1,2} + 1, 2)$ -team tournament Λ of type I or II. By Lemma 5.2 (i) and (ii), Λ has parameters $((k_{1,2} - 1)/2, (k_{1,2} - 1)/2, k_{1,2})$. It follows from [7, Theorem 4.3] that Λ is of type II. [10] implies that $k_{1,2} + 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$ or $k_{1,2} + 1 \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$. It follows from Lemma 5.2 (i) that $k_{1,2} \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$. Thus, the desired result follows. \square

Proposition 5.4. *If $(1, q - 1)$ is mixed with $q \geq 4$, then $\Delta_{\{q-1, q\}}$ is isomorphic to $\text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_{2q-2}, \{1, 2\})[\overline{K}_{k_{1,q-1}}]$.*

Proof. Let $(x_0, x_2, \dots, x_{2q-4})$ be a circuit consisting of arcs of type $(1, q - 2)$. Since $p_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}^{(1,q-2)} \neq 0$, there exist vertices $x_1, x_3, \dots, x_{2q-3}$ such that $(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{2q-3})$ is a circuit consisting of arcs of type $(1, q - 1)$, where the indices are read modulo $2q - 2$. Since $\Gamma_{1,q-1}^2 = \{\Gamma_{1,q-2}\}$ from Proposition 3.1 (iii) and Lemma 4.8, one has $(x_i, x_{i+2}) \in \Gamma_{1,q-2}$ for all integer i . Since $p_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}^{(1,q-2)} = k_{1,q-1}$ from Proposition

3.1 (ii), Lemmas 2.3 and 4.5, we get $P_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}(x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}) = \Gamma_{1,q-1}(x_{i-1})$. By setting $\tilde{d} = \tilde{e} = (1, q-1)$ in Lemma 2.1 (i), we have $k_{1,q-2} = k_{1,q-1}$. Since $\Gamma_{1,q-1}^2 = \{\Gamma_{1,q-2}\}$ again, one obtains $(y_i, y_{i+2}) \in \Gamma_{1,q-2}$ for all $y_i \in P_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}(x_{i-1}, x_{i+1})$ and $y_{i+2} \in P_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}(x_{i+1}, x_{i+3})$. Since $p_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}^{(1,q-2)} = k_{1,q-1}$ and $(y_i, x_{i+2}) \in \Gamma_{1,q-2}$, one gets $(y_i, y_{i+1}) \in \Gamma_{1,q-1}$ for all $y_i \in P_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}(x_{i-1}, x_{i+1})$ and $y_{i+1} \in P_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}(x_i, x_{i+2})$. Thus, the desired result follows. \square

6. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

In this section, we always assume that Γ is a locally semicomplete commutative weakly distance-regular digraph. To give a proof of Theorem 1.1, we need there auxiliary lemmas.

Lemma 6.1. *Let $T = \{2, 3\}$. Suppose that $(1, 2)$ is pure. If $\Gamma_{2,2} \in \Gamma_{1,2}^2$, then Γ is isomorphic to $\Sigma \circ K_{k_{1,1}+1}$, where Σ is a locally semicomplete weakly distance-regular digraph with $\tilde{\partial}(\Sigma) = \{(0, 0), (1, 2), (2, 1), (2, 2)\}$.*

Proof. By Lemmas 2.9 and 5.1, one gets $\tilde{\partial}(\Gamma) = \{(0, 0), (1, 1), (1, 2), (2, 1), (2, 2)\}$. Since $(1, 2)$ is pure, we have $\Gamma_{1,2} \notin \Gamma_{1,1}^2$. It follows from Lemma 2.7 that $F_2 = \{\Gamma_{0,0}, \Gamma_{1,1}\}$.

We define a digraph Σ with vertex set $\{F_2(x) \mid x \in V(\Gamma)\}$ in which $(F_2(x), F_2(y))$ is an arc whenever there is an arc in Γ from $F_2(x)$ to $F_2(y)$.

We claim that $(x', y') \in \Gamma_{1,2}$ for $x' \in F_2(x)$ and $y' \in F_2(y)$ for $(x, y) \in \Gamma_{1,2}$. Without loss of generality, we may assume $x' \neq x$. Since $F_2 = \{\Gamma_{0,0}, \Gamma_{1,1}\}$, we have $(x, x') \in \Gamma_{1,1}$. In view of Lemma 2.9, one gets $y \in P_{(1,2),(2,1)}(x, x')$. If $y = y'$, then our claim is valid. If $y \neq y'$, then $(y, y') \in \Gamma_{1,1}$, and so $x' \in P_{(2,1),(1,2)}(y, y')$. Thus, our claim is valid. By Lemma 2.7, Γ is isomorphic to $\Sigma \circ K_{k_{1,1}+1}$.

Let x and y be vertices with $y \notin F_2(x)$. Pick a shortest path $P := (x = x_0, x_1, \dots, x_l = y)$ from x to y in Γ . Since $y \notin F_2(x)$, P contains an arc of type $(1, 2)$. Suppose that P contains an edge. By the commutativity of Γ , we may assume that $(x_0, x_1) \in \Gamma_{1,1}$ and $(x_1, x_2) \in \Gamma_{1,2}$. By Lemma 2.9, one has $(x_0, x_2) \in \Gamma_{1,2}$, a contradiction. Then P consists of arcs of type $(1, 2)$. It follows that $(F_2(x_0), F_2(x_1), \dots, F_2(x_l))$ is a path in Σ , and so $\partial_\Sigma(F_2(x), F_2(y)) \leq \partial_\Gamma(x, y)$.

Pick a shortest path $(F_2(x) = F_2(y_0), F_2(y_1), \dots, F_2(y_h) = F_2(y))$ from $F_2(x)$ to $F_2(y)$ in Σ . It follows that there exists $y'_i \in F_2(y_i)$ for each $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, h\}$ such that $(y'_0, y'_1, \dots, y'_h)$ is a path consisting of arcs of type $(1, 2)$ in Γ . By the claim, $(x, y'_1, \dots, y'_{h-1}, y)$ is a path in Γ . It follows that $\partial_\Gamma(x, y) \leq \partial_\Sigma(F_2(x), F_2(y))$. Thus, $\partial_\Gamma(x, y) = \partial_\Sigma(F_2(x), F_2(y))$ and $\tilde{\partial}(\Sigma) = \{(0, 0), (1, 2), (2, 1), (2, 2)\}$.

Let $\tilde{h} \in \tilde{\partial}(\Sigma)$ and $(F_2(u), F_2(v)) \in \Sigma_{\tilde{h}}$. Then $(u, v) \in \Gamma_{\tilde{h}}$. For $\tilde{i}, \tilde{j} \in \tilde{\partial}(\Sigma)$, we have

$$P_{\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}}(u, v) = \cup_{w \in P_{\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}}(u, v)} F_2(w) = \cup_{F_2(w) \in \Sigma_{\tilde{i}}(F_2(u)) \cap \Sigma_{\tilde{j}}(F_2(v))} F_2(w).$$

Since $F_2 = \{\Gamma_{0,0}, \Gamma_{1,1}\}$, one gets $|F_2(w)| = k_{1,1} + 1$, which implies

$$|\Sigma_{\tilde{i}}(F_2(u)) \cap \Sigma_{\tilde{j}}(F_2(v))| = p_{\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}}^{\tilde{h}} / (k_{1,1} + 1).$$

Then Σ is a commutative weakly distance-regular digraph consisting of arcs of type $(1, 2)$. Since Γ is locally semicomplete, Σ is also locally semicomplete.

This completes the proof of this lemma. \square

Lemma 6.2. *Let $(1, q-1)$ be pure with $q \geq 4$. Suppose that $r \in T$ with $r \neq q$. The one of the following hold:*

- (i) $r \in \{2, 3\}$ and $\Gamma_{1,r-1}\Gamma_{1,q-1} = \{\Gamma_{1,q-1}\}$;
- (ii) $r = q + 1$ and $C(q + 1)$ exists.

Proof. By Lemma 4.2, there exists a path (x, y, z) consisting of arcs of type $(1, q - 1)$ with $(x, z) \in \Gamma_{2,q-2}$. Pick a vertex $w \in \Gamma_{1,r-1}(x)$. Since $y, w \in N^+(x)$, we have (w, y) or $(y, w) \in A(\Gamma)$. If $(y, w) \in A(\Gamma)$, by $w, z \in N^+(y)$, then $(w, z) \in \Gamma_{1,s}$ for some $s > 1$ since $(x, z) \in \Gamma_{2,q-2}$ with $q \geq 4$, which implies $w \in P_{(1,r-1),(1,s)}(x, z)$, contrary to Lemma 2.2. Then $(w, y) \in \Gamma_{1,s-1}$ with $s > 1$.

If $s = q$, then $y \in P_{(1,q-1),(q-1,1)}(x, w)$, which implies that (i) holds from Lemmas 4.2 and 4.3. We only need to consider the case $s \neq q$.

If $s = r$, then $\Gamma_{1,q-1} \in \Gamma_{1,r-1}^2$. Suppose $s \neq r$. Since $w \in P_{(1,r-1),(1,s-1)}(x, y)$, there exists $w' \in P_{(1,s-1),(1,r-1)}(x, y)$. Since $(1, q - 1)$ is pure, from Lemma 2.2, we have $\partial(w, z) = \partial(w', z) = 2$. Since $q - 1 \leq \partial(z, w) \leq 1 + \partial(z, x)$ and $q - 1 \leq \partial(z, w') \leq 1 + \partial(z, x)$, one gets $(w, z), (w', z) \in \Gamma_{2,q-1}$. The fact $y \in P_{(1,r-1),(1,q-1)}(w', z)$ implies that there exists $y' \in P_{(1,r-1),(1,q-1)}(w, z)$. By Lemma 4.2, we have $y' \in P_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}(x, z)$, and so $\Gamma_{1,q-1} \in \Gamma_{1,r-1}^2$. Thus, we conclude that $\Gamma_{1,q-1} \in \Gamma_{1,r-1}^2$.

Suppose $r \leq 3$. Since $\Gamma_{1,q-1} \in \Gamma_{1,r-1}^2$, we have $3 \leq q - 1 \leq 2r - 2$, which implies $r = 3$. Since $\Gamma_{1,q-1} \in \Gamma_{1,2}^2$, from Lemma 2.8, $(1, 2)$ is pure. It follows from Lemma 3.5 (i) that $q = 4$, contrary to Lemma 5.1. Thus, $r \geq 4$. Since $\Gamma_{1,q-1} \in \Gamma_{1,r-1}^2$ again, from Lemma 4.2, $(1, r - 1)$ is mixed. By Proposition 3.1 (i) and Proposition 4.1, $C(r)$ exists. Proposition 3.1 (iii) and Lemma 4.8 imply $r = q + 1$. Thus, (ii) holds. \square

Lemma 6.3. *All digraphs in Theorem 1.1 are locally semicomplete commutative weakly distance-regular but not semicomplete.*

Proof. Routinely, all digraphs in Theorem 1.1 are locally semicomplete but not semicomplete. Since the digraph Λ in Theorem 1.1 (i) is a doubly regular $(k + 1, 2)$ -team tournament of type II, from [11, Theorem 3.1], Λ is a commutative weakly distance-regular digraph. By [11, Theorem 1.1], $\text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_6, \{1, 2\})$ in Theorem 1.1 (ii) is a commutative weakly distance-regular digraph. By [11, Proposition 2.6], all digraphs in Theorem 1.1 (i) and (ii) are commutative weakly distance-regular digraphs. It suffices to show that all digraphs in Theorem 1.1 (iii) are commutative weakly distance-regular digraphs.

Let $\Gamma'' = \Gamma' \circ (\Sigma_x)_{x \in \mathbb{Z}_{iq}}$, where $\Gamma' = \text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_{iq}, \{1, i\})$ for some $i \in \{1, 2\}$, $q \geq 4$, and $(\Sigma_x)_{x \in \mathbb{Z}_{iq}}$ are all semicomplete weakly distance-regular digraphs with $p_{i,j}^{\tilde{h}}(\Sigma_0) = p_{i,j}^{\tilde{h}}(\Sigma_x)$ for each x and $\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}, \tilde{h}$. It follows that $|V(\Sigma_x)| = t$ and $\tilde{\partial}(\Sigma_x) = J$ with $J \subseteq \{(0, 0), (1, 1), (1, 2), (2, 1)\}$ for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}_{iq}$. Since $q \geq 4$, one has $\tilde{\partial}(\Gamma') \cap J = \{(0, 0)\}$. Since $\Gamma'' = \Gamma' \circ (\Sigma_x)_{x \in \mathbb{Z}_{iq}}$, we get

$$\tilde{\partial}_{\Gamma''}((x, u_x), (y, v_y)) = \tilde{\partial}_{\Gamma'}(x, y) \text{ for all } (x, u_x), (y, v_y) \in V(\Gamma'') \text{ with } x \neq y, \quad (7)$$

$$\tilde{\partial}_{\Gamma''}((x, u_x), (x, v_x)) = \tilde{\partial}_{\Sigma_x}(u_x, v_x) \text{ for all } (x, u_x), (x, v_x) \in V(\Gamma''). \quad (8)$$

Then $\tilde{\partial}(\Gamma'') = \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma') \cup J$. It suffices to show that $|P_{\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}}((x, u_x), (y, v_y))|$ only depends on $\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}, \tilde{\partial}((x, u_x), (y, v_y)) \in \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma') \cup J$.

Suppose $\tilde{\partial}((x, u_x), (y, v_y)) \in J$. Since $\tilde{\partial}(\Gamma') \cap J = \{(0, 0)\}$, from (7), we have $x = y$. If $\{\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}\} \cap J \neq \emptyset$, from (8), then $\{\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}\} \subseteq J$, which implies

$$|P_{\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}}((x, u_x), (x, v_x))| = |\{z_x \mid \tilde{\partial}_{\Sigma_x}(u_x, z_x) = \tilde{i}, \tilde{\partial}_{\Sigma_x}(z_x, v_x) = \tilde{j}\}|.$$

If $\{\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}\} \cap J = \emptyset$, then $\tilde{i}, \tilde{j} \in \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma') \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$ since $\tilde{\partial}(\Gamma') \cap J = \{(0, 0)\}$, which implies that $\tilde{j} = \tilde{i}^t$ and

$$|P_{\tilde{i}, \tilde{i}^t}((x, u_x), (x, v_x))| = t \cdot |\{y \in V(\Gamma') \mid (x, y) \in \Gamma'_{\tilde{i}}\}|$$

by (7), where $t = |V(\Sigma_z)|$ for all $z \in \mathbb{Z}_{iq}$. Since Γ' is weakly distance-regular from [11, Theorem 1.1] and Σ_x is weakly distance-regular, $|P_{\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}}((x, u_x), (y, v_y))|$ only depends on $\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}, \tilde{\partial}((x, u_x), (y, v_y))$.

Suppose $\tilde{\partial}((x, u_x), (y, v_y)) \notin J$. Since $\tilde{\partial}(\Gamma') \cap J = \{(0, 0)\}$, from (8), we have $x \neq y$ and $\tilde{\partial}((x, u_x), (y, v_y)) \in \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma') \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$. If $\{\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}\} \cap \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma') = \emptyset$, then $\{\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}\} \subseteq J \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$, which implies that $x = y$ by (7), a contradiction. It follows that $\{\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}\} \cap \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma') \neq \emptyset$. If $\tilde{i}, \tilde{j} \in \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma')$, by (7) and (8), then

$$|P_{\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}}((x, u_x), (y, v_y))| = t \cdot |\{z \in V(\Gamma') \mid (x, z) \in \Gamma'_{\tilde{i}}, (z, y) \in \Gamma'_{\tilde{j}}\}|,$$

where $t = |V(\Sigma_z)|$ for all $z \in \mathbb{Z}_{iq}$. Now we consider the case $|\{\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}\} \cap \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma')| = 1$. Since the proofs are similar, we may assume $\tilde{i} \in J$ and $\tilde{j} \in \tilde{\partial}(\Gamma')$. By (7), one obtains $\tilde{\partial}((x, u_x), (y, v_y)) = \tilde{j}$, which implies

$$|P_{\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}}((x, u_x), (y, v_y))| = |\{(x, z_x) \mid \tilde{\partial}_{\Sigma_x}(u_x, z_x) = \tilde{i}\}|.$$

Since Γ' is weakly distance-regular from [11, Theorem 1.1] and Σ_x is weakly distance-regular, $|P_{\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}}((x, u_x), (y, v_y))|$ only depends on $\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}, \tilde{\partial}((x, u_x), (y, v_y))$.

Thus, the desired result follows. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.1. The sufficiency is immediate from Lemma 6.3. We now prove the necessity. Let $q = \max T$. We divide the proof into two cases according to whether $(1, q-1)$ is pure.

Case 1. $(1, q-1)$ is pure.

Since Γ is not semicomplete, we have $q \geq 3$.

Case 1.1. $q = 3$.

By Lemma 2.9, we obtain $2 \notin T$ or $\Gamma_{1,1} \in F_3$. Since Γ is not semicomplete, we have $F_3 \not\subseteq \{\Gamma_{0,0}, \Gamma_{1,1}, \Gamma_{1,2}, \Gamma_{2,1}\}$. By Lemma 5.1, we have $\Gamma_{2,2} \in \Gamma_{1,2}^2$, which implies $F_3 = \{\Gamma_{0,0}, \Gamma_{1,2}, \Gamma_{2,1}, \Gamma_{2,2}\}$ or $\{\Gamma_{0,0}, \Gamma_{1,1}, \Gamma_{1,2}, \Gamma_{2,1}, \Gamma_{2,2}\}$.

If $2 \notin T$, from Proposition 5.3, then Γ is isomorphic to the digraph in (i) with $m = 1$; if $2 \in T$, from Proposition 5.3 and Lemma 6.1, then Γ is isomorphic to the digraph in (i) with $m = k_{1,1} + 1$.

Case 1.2. $q \geq 4$.

By Lemma 4.2, there exists an isomorphism σ from $\text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_q, \{1\})[\overline{K}_m]$ to $\Delta_q(x)$ with $m = k_{1,q-1}$. In view of Lemma 6.2, we have $T \subseteq \{2, 3, q\}$. Since Γ is locally semicomplete, we have

$$\Gamma_{1,q-1}\Gamma_{q-1,1} \setminus \{\Gamma_{0,0}\} = \cup_{a \in T \setminus \{q\}} \{\Gamma_{1,a-1}, \Gamma_{a-1,1}\}, \quad (9)$$

which implies $F_q(x) = V(\Gamma)$. Since the valency of Γ is more than 3, one gets $\{q\} \subsetneq T$. Since $(\sigma(i, j), (\sigma(i+1, j'))) \in \Gamma_{1,q-1}$ for $j, j' \in \mathbb{Z}_m$, from (9), we obtain $F_{T \setminus \{q\}}(\sigma(i, 0)) = \{\sigma(i, j) \mid j \in \mathbb{Z}_m\}$. By Lemmas 2.6 and 6.2, $\Delta_{T \setminus \{q\}}(\sigma(i, 0))$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}_q$ are semicomplete weakly distance-regular digraphs with same intersection numbers. Thus, Γ is isomorphic to the digraph in (iii) with $i = 1$.

Case 2. $(1, q-1)$ is mixed.

Suppose $q = 3$. Then $T = \{2, 3\}$, and $\Gamma_{1,2} \in \Gamma_{1,1}^2$ or $\Gamma_{1,1} \in \Gamma_{1,2}^2$. By Lemma 2.8, Γ is semicomplete, a contradiction. Then $q \geq 4$.

In view of Proposition 3.1 (i) and Proposition 4.1, $C(q)$ exists. Then $\{q, q-1\} \subseteq T$. By Proposition 3.1 (ii) and Lemmas 2.3, 4.5, we have $p_{(1,q-1),(1,q-1)}^{(1,q-2)} = k_{1,q-1}$. In view of Proposition 3.1 (iii) and Lemma 4.8, one gets $\Gamma_{1,q-1}^2 = \{\Gamma_{1,q-2}\}$. Lemma 2.1 (i) implies $k_{1,q-1} = k_{1,q-2}$. By Proposition 5.4, there exists an isomorphism σ from $\text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_{2q-2}, \{1, 2\})[\overline{K}_m]$ to $\Delta_{\{q-1,q\}}(x)$ with $m = k_{1,q-1}$.

In view of Lemma 6.2, we have $T \subseteq \{2, 3, q-1, q\}$. Since Γ is locally semicomplete, from Lemma 4.6 (i) we have

$$\Gamma_{1,q-1}\Gamma_{q-1,1} \setminus \{\Gamma_{0,0}\} = \Gamma_{1,q-2}\Gamma_{q-2,1} \setminus \{\Gamma_{0,0}\} = \cup_{a \in T \setminus \{q\}} \{\Gamma_{1,a-1}, \Gamma_{a-1,1}\}, \quad (10)$$

which implies $F_q(x) = V(\Gamma)$. Since the valency of Γ is more than 3, one gets $\{q-1, q\} \subsetneq T$. Since $((\sigma(i, j)), (\sigma(i+1, j')))) \in \Gamma_{1,q}$ for $j, j' \in \mathbb{Z}_m$, from (10), we obtain $F_{T \setminus \{q-1,q\}}(\sigma(i, 0)) = \{\sigma(i, j) \mid j \in \mathbb{Z}_m\}$. By Lemmas 2.6 and 6.2, $\Delta_{T \setminus \{q-1,q\}}(\sigma(i, 0))$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{2q-2}$ are semicomplete weakly distance-regular digraphs with same intersection numbers. If $q = 4$, then $T = \{2, 3, 4\}$, which implies that Γ is isomorphic to the digraph in (ii); if $q > 4$, then Γ is isomorphic to the digraph in (iii) with $i = 2$.

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.1. □

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are grateful to Professor Hiroshi Suzuki for drawing our attention to [7] and for valuable suggestions. Y. Yang is supported by NSFC (12101575, 52377162) and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities (2652019319), K. Wang is supported by the National Key R&D Program of China (No. 2020YFA0712900) and NSFC (12071039, 12131011).

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

No data was used for the research described in the article.

REFERENCES

- [1] Z. Arad, E. Fisman and M. Muzychuk, Generalized table algebras, *Israel J. Math.*, 114 (1999), 29–60.
- [2] J. Bang-Jensen, Locally semicomplete digraphs: a generalization of tournaments, *J. Graph Theory*, 14 (1990), 371–390.
- [3] E. Bannai and T. Ito, *Algebraic Combinatorics I: Association Schemes*, Benjamin/Cummings, California, 1984.
- [4] A.E. Brouwer, A.M. Cohen and A. Neumaier, *Distance-Regular Graphs*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1989.
- [5] E.R. van Dam, J.H. Koolen and H. Tanaka, Distance-regular graphs, *Electron. J. Combin.*, (2016), DS22.
- [6] Y. Fan, Z. Wang and Y. Yang, Weakly distance-regular digraphs of one type of arcs, *Graphs Combin.*, 38 (2022), Paper 89.
- [7] L. Jørgensen, G. Jones, M. Klin, S.Y. Song, Normally regular digraphs, association schemes and related combinatorial structure, *Sém. Lothar. Combin.*, (2014), 1–39.
- [8] A. Munemasa, K. Wang, Y. Yang and W. Zhu, Weakly distance-regular circulants, I, *arXiv*: 2307.12710.
- [9] H. Suzuki, Thin weakly distance-regular digraphs, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 92 (2004), 69–83.

- [10] S.Y. Song, Class 3 Association schemes whose symmetrizations have two classes, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 70 (1995), 1–29.
- [11] K. Wang and H. Suzuki, Weakly distance-regular digraphs, *Discrete Math.*, 264 (2003), 225–236.
- [12] K. Wang, Commutative weakly distance-regular digraphs of girth 2, *European J. Combin.*, 25 (2004), 363–375.
- [13] Y. Yang, B. Lv and K. Wang, Weakly distance-regular digraphs of valency three, I, *Electron. J. Combin.*, 23(2) (2016), Paper 2.12.
- [14] Y. Yang, B. Lv and K. Wang, Weakly distance-regular digraphs of valency three, II, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 160 (2018), 288–315.
- [15] Y. Yang, B. Lv and K. Wang, Quasi-thin weakly distance-regular digraphs, *J. Algebraic Combin.*, 51 (2020), 19–50.
- [16] Y. Yang and K. Wang, Thick weakly distance-regular digraphs, *Graphs Combin.*, 38 (2022), Paper 37.
- [17] Y. Yang, Q. Zeng and K. Wang, Weakly distance-regular digraphs whose underlying graphs are distance-regular, I, *J. Algebraic Combin.*, (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10801-024-01312-3>
- [18] Q. Zeng, Y. Yang and K. Wang, P -polynomial weakly distance-regular digraphs, *Electron. J. Combin.*, 30(3) (2023), Paper 3.3.
- [19] P.H. Zieschang, *An Algebraic Approach to Association Schemes*, in: Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol.1628, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1996.
- [20] P.H. Zieschang, *Theory of Association Schemes*, Springer Monograph in Mathematics, Springer, Berlin, 2005.

SCHOOL OF SCIENCE, CHINA UNIVERSITY OF GEOSCIENCES, BEIJING 100083, CHINA
Email address: yangyf@cugb.edu.cn

LABORATORY OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPLEX SYSTEMS (MOE), SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, BEIJING NORMAL UNIVERSITY, BEIJING 100875, CHINA
Email address: lishuangyx@mail.bnu.edu.cn

LABORATORY OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPLEX SYSTEMS (MOE), SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, BEIJING NORMAL UNIVERSITY, BEIJING 100875, CHINA
Email address: wangks@bnu.edu.cn