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#### Abstract

A vertex-transitive but not edge-transitive graph $\Gamma$ is called locally bi-2-transitive if the stabiliser $S$ in the full automorphism group of $\Gamma$ of every vertex $v$ of $\Gamma$ has two orbits of equal size on the neighbourhood of $v$, and $S$ acts 2 -transitively on each of these two orbits. Also a graph is called cycle-regular if the number of cycles of a given length passing through a given edge in the graph is a constant, and a graph with girth $g$ is called edge-girth-regular if the number of cycles of length $g$ passing through any edge in the graph is a constant.

In this paper, we prove that a graph of girth 3 is edge-girth-regular and locally bi2 -transitive if and only if $\Gamma$ is the line graph of a semi-symmetric locally 3 -transitive graph. Then as an application, we prove that every tetravalent edge-girth-regular locally bi-2-transitive graph of girth 3 is cycle-regular. This shows that vertextransitive cycle-regular graphs need not to be edge-transitive, and hence resolves the problem posed by Fouquet and Hahn at the end of their paper 'Cycle regular graphs need not be transitive', in Discrete Appl. Math. 113 (2001) 261-264.
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## 1 Introduction

The main purpose of this paper is to resolve the problem posed by Fouquet and Hahn at the end of their 2001 paper on cycle regular graphs [12].

All graphs we consider are finite, connected, simple and undirected. For any graph $\Gamma$, we let $V(\Gamma), E(\Gamma)$ and $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)$ be its vertex set, edge set, and full automorphism group, respectively. Also we say that $\Gamma$ is vertex-transitive if for any two vertices of $\Gamma$, there exists an automorphism of $\Gamma$ that sends one to the other. Note that every vertextransitive graph is regular, in the sense of having constant valency, but the converse does not hold. Similarly, we say that $\Gamma$ is edge-transitive if for any two edges of $\Gamma$, there exists an automorphism of $\Gamma$ that sends one to the other. If $\Gamma$ is regular and edge-transitive but not vertex-transitive, then we say that $\Gamma$ is semi-symmetric.

Now let $\Gamma$ be a graph with girth $g$. For each $v \in V(\Gamma)$ and $e \in E(\Gamma)$, and for each integer $k$ with $g \leq k \leq|V(\Gamma)|$, let $c_{k}(v)$ and $c_{k}(e)$ be the number of simple cycles of length $k$ in $\Gamma$ that pass through $v$ and $e$, respectively. We say that $\Gamma$ is cycle-regular if $c_{k}$ is constant on edges for every $k$ (so that the value of $c_{k}(e)$ depends only on $k$ ), and say that $\Gamma$ is vertex-cycle-regular if $c_{k}$ is constant on vertices for every $k$ (so that the value of $c_{k}(v)$ depends only on $k$ ). It is easy to see that every cycle-regular graph having constant valency is also vertex-cycle-regular, and that every edge-transitive graph is cycle-regular, while every vertex-transitive graph is vertex-cycle-regular.

As pointed out by Fouquet and Hahn in [12], vertex-cycle-regular graphs that are regular need not be vertex-transitive. Indeed every semi-symmetric graph is cycle-regular and hence vertex-cycle-regular, but is not vertex-transitive. Moreover, there are infinitely many finite counter-examples, because there are infinitely many finite semi-symmetric graphs; see $[4,6,7,11]$ for example. Also Fouquet and Hahn constructed in [12] an infinite tetravalent vertex-cycle-regular graph that is not vertex-transitive, but they could not determine whether vertex-transitive cycle-regular graphs are edge-transitive, so they posed the following problem:

Problem 1 [12, Problem] Is there a cycle-regular, vertex transitive but not edge transitive graph, finite or infinite?

We will give a positive answer to this problem by investigating what we will call 'locally bi-2-transitive' graphs. Recall that an arc in a graph is an ordered edge, or equivalently, an ordered pair of adjacent vertices. Similarly, a 2 -arc in a graph $\Gamma$ is an ordered triple $(u, v, w)$ of three distinct vertices of $\Gamma$ such that $v$ is adjacent to both $u$ and $w$.

A vertex-transitive graph $\Gamma$ is said to be bi-arc-transitive if $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)$ has two orbits of equal size on the set of all arcs (ordered edges) of $\Gamma$, and similarly, bi-edge-transitive if Aut $(\Gamma)$ has two orbits of equal size on the edge set of $\Gamma$. Bi-arc-transitive graphs that are edge-transitive are also called half-arc-transitive. Such graphs have been extensively studied in the literature; see $[8,21,25,27,33]$, for example. Analogously, a graph is called half-edge-transitive if it is bi-arc-transitive and bi-edge-transitive. The latter kind of graphs were introduced in [31], where the authors proved that tetravalent half-edgetransitive graphs can have arbitrarily large vertex-stabilisers. We will show that every bi-arc-transitive graph has even valency $\geq 4$; see Lemma 2.1.

Now let $\Gamma$ be a half-edge-transitive graph with valency $2 k \geq 4$, and let $E_{1}$ and $E_{2}$ be the two orbits of $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)$ on $E$. Then $\Gamma_{1}=\left(V(\Gamma), E_{1}\right)$ and $\Gamma_{2}=\left(V(\Gamma), E_{2}\right)$ are two subgraphs of $\Gamma$, admitting $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)$ as an arc-transitive automorphism group. We say that $\Gamma$ is locally bi-2-transitive if $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)$ acts transitively on the 2 -arcs of both $\Gamma_{1}$ and $\Gamma_{2}$.

In this paper, we will characterise the locally bi-2-transitive graphs with girth 3 having the property that the number of 3 -cycles passing through any edge is a constant. (Actually, a graph with girth $g$ having the property that $c_{g}$ is constant on edges is called edge-girthregular. Such graphs were introduced in [15], where several of their basic properties were given, and the trivalent and tetravalent cases were investigated systematically.)

Before stating our main results, we introduce some more definitions and notation.
For a permutation group $G$ on a set $\Omega$, we use $G_{\alpha}$ to denote the stabiliser in $G$ of a point $\alpha \in \Omega$, and we say that $G$ is $t$-transitive on $\Omega$ if for any two ordered $t$-tuples of pairwise distinct elements of $\Omega$, there exists $g \in G$ sending one to the other. Also we denote by $\mathbb{Z}_{n}$ the cyclic group of order $n$, and by $K_{n}$ the complete graph with $n$ vertices.

Next, let $\Gamma$ be a graph. For $u, v \in V(\Gamma)$, denote by $\{u, v\}$ the edge incident to $u$ and $v$ in $\Gamma$, and by $\Gamma(u)$ the set of vertices adjacent to $u$ in $\Gamma$, and for a subset $S$ of $V(\Gamma)$, denote by $\Gamma[S]$ the subgraph of $\Gamma$ induced by $S$. The line graph $L(\Gamma)$ of $\Gamma$ is the graph with vertex set $E(\Gamma)$ where two edges of $\Gamma$ are adjacent in $L(\Gamma)$ if and only if they share a vertex in $\Gamma$. It is easy to see that if $\Gamma$ has at least one 2 -arc, then $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)$ acts transitively on the 2 -arcs of $\Gamma$ if and only if $\Gamma$ is vertex-transitive and $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{u}$ acts 2 -transitively on $\Gamma(u)$ for some $u \in V(\Gamma(u))$. Finally, a semi-symmetric graph $\Gamma$ is called locally 3-transitive if $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{u}$ acts 3-transitively on $\Gamma(u)$, for every $u \in V(\Gamma)$.

Our first main theorem gives a characterisation of edge-girth-regular locally bi-2transitive graphs of girth 3 .

Theorem 1.1 A graph $\Gamma$ of girth 3 is locally bi-2-transitive and edge-girth-regular if and only if $\Gamma$ is the line graph of a semi-symmetric locally 3-transitive graph.

Applying this gives the following two theorems, and a positive answer to Problem 1.
Theorem 1.2 Every connected tetravalent edge-girth-regular locally bi-2-transitive graph of girth 3 is cycle-regular.

Theorem 1.3 For every integer $n \geq 3$, there exist infinitely many connected semi-symmetric locally 3-transitive graphs of valency $n$.

By Theorems 1.1 and 1.3, there exist infinitely many connected tetravalent edge-girthregular locally bi-2-transitive graphs of girth 3, and by Theorem 1.2, there are infinitely many connected vertex-transitive cycle-regular graphs that are not edge-transitive.

Finally, before proceeding, we point out that we have been unable to decide if there exists a trivalent cycle-regular graph that is vertex-transitive but not edge-transitive. We leave the existence or non-existence of such a graph as an open problem for future consideration. (We know that there exists no such graph with girth less than 6, by using the classification of cubic vertex-transitive graphs of girth at most 5 given in [10, Theorems 6.1-6.3], and we believe there is also no such graph with girth equal to 6 . Also we have verified that every trivalent vertex-transitive cycle-regular graph of order at most 300 is edge-transitive, with the help of Magma [3] and the census of trivalent vertex-transitive graphs of order up to 1280 (see [23, 24]).)

## 2 Locally bi-2-transitive graphs of girth 3

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.1, using the following lemma that establishes some basic properties of bi-arc-transitive graphs.

Lemma 2.1 A graph $\Gamma$ is bi-arc-transitive if and only if $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)$ is transitive on $V(\Gamma)$ and $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{u}$ has two orbits of equal size on $\Gamma(u)$, for some $u \in V(\Gamma(u))$. In particular, every bi-arc-transitive graph has even valency at least 4.

Proof For necessity in the first part, assume that $\Gamma$ is bi-arc-transitive. Then $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)$ is transitive on $V(\Gamma)$ and has two orbits of equal size on the arc set of $\Gamma$. Now take any vertex $u$ of $\Gamma$. Then $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{u}$ is intransitive on $\Gamma(u)$, so take $x, y \in \Gamma(u)$ such that

$$
U_{1}:=\left\{\left(u, x^{g}\right) \mid g \in \operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{u}\right\} \neq\left\{\left(u, y^{g}\right) \mid g \in \operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{u}\right\}=: U_{2} .
$$

Then $O_{1}=\left\{(u, x)^{a} \mid a \in \operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)\right\}$, so $O_{2}=\left\{(u, y)^{a} \mid a \in \operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)\right\}$ are the two orbits of $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)$ on the arcs of $\Gamma$, and it follows that $\left|O_{1}\right|=\left|O_{2}\right|$, and that $U_{1} \cup U_{2}=\Gamma(u)$. Since $\Gamma$ is vertex-transitive, also $\left|O_{i}\right|=|V(\Gamma)|\left|U_{i}\right|$ for $i=1,2$, and hence $\left|U_{1}\right|=\left|U_{2}\right|$. Thus $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{u}$ has two orbits $U_{1}$ and $U_{2}$ of equal size on $\Gamma(u)$, as required.

For sufficiency (in the first part), assume that $B_{1}$ and $B_{2}$ are two orbits of $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{u}$ of equal size on $\Gamma(u)$ for some vertex $u$ of $\Gamma$, and take $b_{1} \in B_{1}$ and $b_{2} \in B_{2}$. As $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)$ is transitive on $V(\Gamma)$, by hypothesis, $A_{1}:=\left\{\left(u, b_{1}\right)^{g} \mid g \in \operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)\right\}$ and $A_{2}:=\left\{\left(u, b_{2}\right)^{g} \mid\right.$ $g \in \operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)\}$ are the two orbits of $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)$ on the arcs of $\Gamma$. Then by an easy computation, $\left|A_{1}\right|=|V(\Gamma)|\left|B_{1}\right|=|V(\Gamma)|\left|B_{2}\right|=\left|A_{2}\right|$, and so $\Gamma$ is bi-arc-transitive.

The second part follows easily.

## Proof of Theorem 1.1

First, we establish sufficiency in the statement of Theorem 1.1. Let $\Gamma$ be the line graph of a semi-symmetric locally 3 -transitive graph $\Pi$ with valency $d$. Then $\Gamma$ is edge-girthregular, and has girth 3. A well known theorem about the line graphs (for example, see [1, p.1455]) states that if a connected graph $X$ has at least 5 vertices then $\operatorname{Aut}(X) \cong$ $\operatorname{Aut}(L(X))$, where $L(X)$ is the line graph of $X$. Since $\Pi$ is semi-symmetric, $\Pi$ has more than 5 vertices. Accordingly, if we view $\operatorname{Aut}(\Pi)$ as a permutation group on $E(\Pi)$, then we see that $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma) \cong \operatorname{Aut}(\Pi)$, and hence that $\Gamma$ is vertex-transitive. Now take an edge $e=\{x, y\}$ of $\Pi$, and let $B_{x}$ be the set of edges of $\Pi$ incident with $x$, and $B_{y}$ be the set of edges of $\Pi$ incident with $y$. Then $\Gamma\left[\{e\} \cup B_{x}\right] \cong \Gamma\left[\{e\} \cup B_{y}\right] \cong K_{d}$. Also because $\Pi$ is semi-symmetric, $\operatorname{Aut}(\Pi)_{e}=\operatorname{Aut}(\Pi)_{x y}$, and because $\Pi$ is locally 3 -transitive, $\operatorname{Aut}(\Pi)_{x y}$ acts 2-transitively on both $B_{x}$ and $B_{y}$. Hence by Lemma 2.1, we find $\Gamma$ is bi-arc-transitive. To show that $\Gamma$ is locally bi-2-transitive, we need only show that $\Gamma$ is bi-edge-transitive. If that is not the case, then $\Gamma$ is edge-transitive. So now take any $x_{a}=\{a, x\} \in B_{x}$ and any $y_{b}=\{y, b\} \in B_{y}$. Then $\left\{x_{a}, e\right\}$ and $\left\{e, y_{b}\right\}$ are two edges of the line graph $\Gamma$, so there exists some $\alpha \in \operatorname{Aut}(\Pi)$ taking $\left\{x_{a}, e\right\}$ to $\left\{e, y_{b}\right\}$. But these give 2-paths axy and $x y b$ in the graph $\Pi$, and it follows that $\alpha$ sends $x$ to $y$. This, however, is impossible, because $\Pi$ is semi-symmetric and so no automorphism of $\Pi$ can take a vertex of $\Pi$ to one of its neighbours. This establishes sufficiency.

For necessity, suppose first that $\Gamma$ is a locally bi-2-transitive edge-girth-regular graph of girth 3 with valency $2 k$ for some $k>1$. Now every locally bi-2-transitive graph is also bi-edge-transitive, and so $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)$ has two orbits of equal size on $E(\Gamma)$, say $E^{\prime}$ and $E^{\prime \prime}$.

Let $\Gamma^{\prime}=\left(V(\Gamma), E^{\prime}\right)$ and $\Gamma^{\prime \prime}=\left(V(\Gamma), E^{\prime \prime}\right)$. Then $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)$ acts 2-arc-transitively on both $\Gamma^{\prime}$ and $\Gamma^{\prime \prime}$. Take a vertex $u$ in $V(\Gamma)$. Then $\Gamma(u)=\Gamma^{\prime}(u) \cup \Gamma^{\prime \prime}(u)$ and $\left|\Gamma^{\prime}(u)\right|=\left|\Gamma^{\prime \prime}(u)\right|$, and $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{u}$ acts 2-transitively on both $\Gamma^{\prime}(u)$ and $\Gamma^{\prime \prime}(u)$. Also because $\Gamma$ is an edge-girthregular graph of girth 3 , there exists at least one triangle passing through any given edge of $\Gamma$, and hence that in any 3 -cycle in $\Gamma$, there exist two incident edges that lie in the same orbit of $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)$ on $E(\Gamma)$. Moreover, by vertex-transitivity of $\Gamma$, we may assume that $\Gamma^{\prime}(u)$ contains two vertices that are adjacent in $\Gamma$, and then because $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{u}$ acts 2 -transitively on $\Gamma^{\prime}(u)$, it follows that $\Gamma\left[\{u\} \cup \Gamma^{\prime}(u)\right] \cong K_{k+1}$.

Next we show that $\Gamma\left[\{u\} \cup \Gamma^{\prime \prime}(u)\right] \cong K_{k+1}$. Since $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{u}$ acts 2-transitively on $\Gamma^{\prime \prime}(u)$, it suffices to show that $\Gamma^{\prime \prime}(u)$ contains two vertices that are adjacent in $\Gamma$. By way of contradiction, suppose that no two vertices of $\Gamma^{\prime \prime}(u)$ are adjacent in $\Gamma$. As $\Gamma$ is edge-girth-regular (by hypothesis), we know that $c_{3}(\{u, v\}) \geq k-1>0$ for any $v \in \Gamma^{\prime}(u)$. Hence in particular, $c_{3}(\{u, w\}) \geq k-1>0$ for all $w \in \Gamma^{\prime \prime}(u)$. Then since no two vertices of $\Gamma^{\prime \prime}(u)$ are adjacent in $\Gamma$, we have $k-1 \leq c_{3}(\{u, w\}) \leq k$, and so $u$ and $w$ share at least $k-1$ common neighbours in $\Gamma^{\prime}(u)$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $v$ is a common neighbour of $u$ and $w$, and then because $w \in \Gamma^{\prime \prime}(u)$, it follows that $c_{3}(\{u, v\}) \geq k$. But $c_{3}(\{u, w\}) \leq k$, so the edge-girth-regularity of $\Gamma$ implies that $c_{3}(\{u, w\})=k$, and therefore $w$ is adjacent to all vertices in $\Gamma^{\prime}(u)$. Then since $w$ was an arbitrary vertex in $\Gamma^{\prime \prime}(u)$, this shows that every vertex in $\Gamma^{\prime}(u)$ is adjacent to every vertex in $\Gamma^{\prime \prime}(u)$. That, however, implies that $c_{3}(\{u, v\})=2 k-1>k=c_{3}(\{u, w\})$, which is a contradiction, allowing us conclude that $\Gamma\left[\{u\} \cup \Gamma^{\prime \prime}(u)\right] \cong K_{k+1}$.

Now we shall show that both $\Gamma^{\prime}$ and $\Gamma^{\prime \prime}$ are unions of cliques isomorphic to $K_{k+1}$.
If $k=2$, we can do this by showing that $c_{3}(\{u, v\})=1$ for every $v \in \Gamma^{\prime}(u)$ and $c_{3}(\{u, w\})=1$ for every $w \in \Gamma^{\prime \prime}(u)$. First, if $c_{3}(\{u, v\})=3$ then $\Gamma \cong K_{5}$, which is arctransitive, a contradiction. Second, if $c_{3}(\{u, v\})=2$, then there are two exactly parallel edges in $\Gamma$ between $\Gamma^{\prime}(u)$ and $\Gamma^{\prime \prime}(u)$, and $v$ has a unique neighbour, say $w$, which is not adjacent to $u$. Moreover, again since $c_{3}(\{v, w\})=2$, we find that $w$ shares at least three common neighbours with $u$. If there exists a vertex $x \in \Gamma(u)$ which is not adjacent to $w$, then $x$ has a neighbour, say $y$, which is not adjacent to $u$, but then $y$ would share at least three common neighbours with $u$, which is impossible because $\Gamma$ has valency 4 . Thus $\Gamma(w)=\Gamma(u)$, and $\Gamma$ is the octahedron, which again is arc-transitive, a contradiction. Thus, $c_{3}(\{u, v\})=1$. Next let $z$ be the unique common neighbour of $u$ and $v$. By vertextransitivity, some $g \in \operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)$ takes $u$ to $v$, and then $\{v, u\}$ and $\{v, z\}$ lie in the same orbit of $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)$ on $E(\Gamma)$. This implies that $\Gamma^{\prime}$ is a union of triangles. Similarly, we have $c_{3}(\{u, w\})=1$ for any $w \in \Gamma^{\prime \prime}(u)$, and hence also $\Gamma^{\prime \prime}$ is a union of triangles.

On the other hand, if $k>2$, then $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{u}$ acts 2-transitively on $\Gamma^{\prime}(u)$ and on $\Gamma^{\prime \prime}(u)$, and also $E\left(\Gamma\left[\Gamma^{\prime}(u)\right]\right)$ is contained in one orbit of $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)$ on $E(\Gamma)$, while $E\left(\Gamma\left[\Gamma^{\prime \prime}(u)\right]\right)$ is contained in the other. As $k>2$, there exists at least one triangle whose edges are contained in the same orbits of $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)$ on $E(\Gamma)$. By vertex-transitivity of $\Gamma$, there exists a triangle $\Delta$ passing through $u$ whose edges are contained in the same orbit of $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)$ on
$E(\Gamma)$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\Delta$ is contained in $\{u\} \cup \Gamma^{\prime}(u)$, and then all edges of $\Gamma\left[\{u\} \cup \Gamma^{\prime}(u)\right]$ are contained in $E^{\prime}$. It now follows from Lemma 2.1 that $\Gamma^{\prime}=\left(V(\Gamma), E^{\prime}\right)$ has valency $k$, and so $\Gamma^{\prime}$ is a union of cliques isomorphic to $K_{k+1}$.

Next recall that $\Gamma\left[\{u\} \cup \Gamma^{\prime \prime}(u)\right] \cong K_{k+1}$, and $E\left(\Gamma\left[\Gamma^{\prime \prime}(u)\right]\right) \subseteq E^{\prime \prime}$ or $E\left(\Gamma\left[\Gamma^{\prime \prime}(u)\right]\right) \subseteq E^{\prime}$. If $E\left(\Gamma\left[\Gamma^{\prime \prime}(u)\right]\right) \subseteq E^{\prime \prime}$, then because $\Gamma^{\prime \prime}$ has valency $k$, we find that $\Gamma^{\prime \prime}$ is a union of copies of $K_{k+1}$, as required. So suppose that $E\left(\Gamma\left[\Gamma^{\prime \prime}(u)\right]\right) \subseteq E^{\prime}$. We will show this case is impossible. As $\Gamma^{\prime}$ is a union of copies of $K_{k+1}$, there exists $w \in V(\Gamma)$ for which $\Gamma^{\prime}\left[\{w\} \cup \Gamma^{\prime \prime}(u)\right] \cong K_{k+1}$, and so $\Gamma^{\prime \prime}(u)=\Gamma^{\prime}(w)$. By vertex-transitivity of $\Gamma$, for any $x \in V(\Gamma)$ there exists a unique $y \in V(\Gamma)$ such that $\Gamma^{\prime}(x)=\Gamma^{\prime \prime}(y)$, and consequently $c_{3}(e) \geq k$ for every edge $e$ of $\Gamma$. Hence for each $x \in \Gamma^{\prime}(u)$, there exists a unique $y \in \Gamma^{\prime \prime}(u)$ such that $\Gamma^{\prime}(x)=\Gamma^{\prime \prime}(y)$. Moreover, because $\Gamma^{\prime}(u)$ and $\Gamma^{\prime \prime}(u)$ are two orbits of $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{u}$, each $x \in \Gamma^{\prime}(u)$ is adjacent (in $\Gamma^{\prime \prime}$ ) to $k-1$ vertices in $\Gamma^{\prime \prime}(u)$. Now take $x \in \Gamma^{\prime}(u)$. Then there exists a unique $z \in \Gamma(x)$ which is not adjacent to $u$ in $\Gamma$. Clearly $x \in \Gamma^{\prime \prime}(z)$, so $\Gamma^{\prime \prime}(z)=\Gamma^{\prime}(u)$. Also $\left|\Gamma^{\prime \prime}(x) \cap \Gamma^{\prime \prime}(u)\right|=k-1$ and $\Gamma\left[\Gamma^{\prime \prime}(x)\right] \cong K_{k}$, and it follows that $z$ is adjacent in $\Gamma^{\prime}$ to $k-1$ vertices of $\Gamma^{\prime \prime}(u)$. But now if $a \in \Gamma^{\prime \prime}(u)$ is adjacent in $\Gamma^{\prime}$ to $z$, then $\{z\} \cup\{w\} \cup\left(\Gamma^{\prime \prime}(u) \backslash\{a\}\right) \subseteq \Gamma^{\prime}(a)$, and clearly $z \neq w$ because $w$ is not adjacent in $\Gamma^{\prime}$ to $x$, and therefore $a$ has at least $k+1$ neighbours in $\Gamma^{\prime}$, which is impossible because $\Gamma^{\prime}$ has valency $k$.

Hence we know that both $\Gamma^{\prime}$ and $\Gamma^{\prime \prime}$ are unions of copies of $K_{k+1}$.
Furthermore, $\{u\} \cup \Gamma^{\prime}(u)$ and $\{u\} \cup \Gamma^{\prime \prime}(u)$ are two blocks of imprimitivity of $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)$ on $V(\Gamma)$. As $E=E^{\prime} \cup E^{\prime \prime}$, there exist no edges between $\Gamma^{\prime}(u)$ and $\Gamma^{\prime \prime}(u)$ in $\Gamma$.

Now by a theorem of Krausz (see [14]), we know that a graph is a line graph if and only if its edge-set can be partitioned into cliques such that every vertex is contained in at most two cliques. In our context, let $\Pi$ be the graph whose vertex set is the set of all cliques $K_{k+1}$ of $\Gamma$, with two such cliques being adjacent if and only if they share a common vertex in $\Gamma$. It is easy to see that $\Gamma$ is isomorphic to the line graph of $\Pi$.

If we view $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)$ as a permutation group on $V(\Pi)$, then $\operatorname{Aut}(\Pi) \cong \operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)$, and as $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)$ acts 2-arc-transitively on both $\Gamma^{\prime}$ and $\Gamma^{\prime \prime}$, we see that $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)$ has exactly two orbits on $V(\Pi)$. Also there are exactly two copies of $K_{k+1}$ containing any given vertex of $\Gamma$, and it follows that $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)$ is edge-transitive on $\Pi$, and hence $\Pi$ is semi-symmetric.

Moreover, $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{u}$ acts 2 -transitively on $\Gamma^{\prime}(u)$, and so the subgroup $H$ of $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)$ preserving the clique $\Gamma\left[\{u\} \cup \Gamma^{\prime}(u)\right]$ set-wise acts 3-transitively on $\{u\} \cup \Gamma^{\prime}(u)$, and hence $H$ acts 3-transitively on the neighbourhood of the clique $\Gamma\left[\{u\} \cup \Gamma^{\prime}(u)\right]$ in $\Pi$. Similarly, $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{\{u\} \cup \Gamma^{\prime \prime}(u)}$ acts 3-transitively on the neighbourhood of the clique $\Gamma\left[\{u\} \cup \Gamma^{\prime \prime}(u)\right]$ in $\Pi$, and this establishes necessity in the statement of Theorem 1.1.

## 3 Proof of Theorem 1.2

Lemma 3.1 Let $\Gamma$ be a connected edge-girth-regular locally bi-2-transitive graph of girth 3 . Let $E_{1}, E_{2}$ be the two orbits of $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)$ on $E(\Gamma)$, and let $\{u, x\} \in E_{1}$ and $\{u, y\} \in E_{2}$. Then for every $k \geq 4$,

$$
\left|\bigcup_{\{x, a\} \in E_{2}} C_{k}(u x a)\right|=\left|\bigcup_{\{y, b\} \in E_{1}} C_{k}(u y b)\right|
$$

where $C_{k}(u x a)$ and $C_{k}(u y b)$ are the sets of $k$-cycles of $\Gamma$ passing through the 2-paths uxa and uyb, respectively.

Proof First we note that by Lemma 2.1, the graph $\Gamma$ has valency $2 d$ for some $d>1$, and then by Theorem 1.1, we know that $\Gamma$ is the line graph of a semi-symmetric locally 3 -transitive graph $\Delta$ of valency $d+1$. Moreover, by the proof of Theorem 1.1, the edge set of $\Gamma$ can be partitioned into edge-disjoint copies of $K_{d+1}$, in such a way that every vertex of $\Gamma$ is contained in exactly two of these cliques.

Now let $X$ and $Y$ be disjoint subsets of $\Gamma(u)$ whose union is $\Gamma(u)$ and having the property that $\Gamma[\{u\} \cup X] \cong \Gamma[\{u\} \cup Y] \cong K_{d+1}$. From the last paragraph in the proof of Theorem 1.1, we know that $X$ and $Y$ are two orbits of $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{u}$. Also let

$$
\Gamma^{\prime}=\bigcup_{g \in \operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)} \Gamma\left[\left\{u^{g}\right\} \cup X^{g}\right] \quad \text { and } \quad \Gamma^{\prime \prime}=\bigcup_{g \in \operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)} \Gamma\left[\left\{u^{g}\right\} \cup Y^{g}\right]
$$

As $\Gamma$ is locally bi-2-transitive, the edge sets of $\Gamma^{\prime}$ and $\Gamma^{\prime \prime}$ are the two equal-length orbits of $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)$ on the $E(\Gamma)$, and $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{u}$ acts 2-transitively on each of $X$ and $Y$.

Next, let $X(u)=\{u\} \cup(X \backslash\{x\})$ and $Y(u)=\{u\} \cup(Y \backslash\{y\})$. Then $X(u)$ is an orbit of $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{x}$ on $\Gamma(x)$, and $Y(u)$ is an orbit of $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{y}$ on $\Gamma(y)$.

Let $A$ be the orbit of $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{x}$ on $\Gamma(x)$ that is distinct from $X(u)$, and let $B$ be the orbit of $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{y}$ on $\Gamma(y)$ that is distinct from $Y(u)$.

In order to prove our lemma, it suffices to show that

$$
\left|\bigcup_{a \in A} C_{k}(u x a)\right|=\left|\bigcup_{b \in B} C_{k}(u y b)\right|
$$

By vertex-transitivity of $\Gamma$, there exists an automorphism $\delta^{\prime}$ of $\Gamma$ taking $x$ to $y$. This automorphism $\delta^{\prime}$ takes every clique $K_{d+1}$ containing $x$ to a clique $K_{d+1}$ containing $y$, and so $\delta^{\prime}$ takes the two orbits of $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{x}$ on $\Gamma(x)$ to the two orbits of $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{y}$ on $\Gamma(y)$, in some order; that is, $\{X(u), A\}^{\delta^{\prime}}=\{Y(u), B\}$. But the edges of $\Gamma[X(u)]$ and $\Gamma[Y(u)]$ are contained in different orbits of $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)$ on the edge set of $\Gamma$, and so it follows that $\delta^{\prime}$ takes $X(u)$ to $B$, and $A$ to $Y(u)$. Hence for every $a \in A$, we find that

$$
(u x a)^{\delta^{\prime}}=u^{\prime} y b^{\prime} \text { where } u^{\prime} \in Y(u) \text { and } b^{\prime} \in B
$$

Also we know that $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{y}$ acts 2-transitively on both $Y(u)$ and $B$, and so there exists an automorphism $\alpha^{\prime} \in \operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{y}$ taking $u^{\prime}$ to $u$, and then $(u x a)^{\delta^{\prime} \alpha^{\prime}}=u y\left(b^{\prime}\right)^{\alpha^{\prime}}$. Hence for every $a \in A$, there exists some $\delta \in \operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)$ such that

$$
(u x a)^{\delta}=u y b \text { where } b \in B
$$

By a similar argument, for every $b^{\prime} \in B$ there exists some $\sigma \in \operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)$ such that

$$
\left(u y b^{\prime}\right)^{\sigma}=u x a^{\prime} \text { where } a^{\prime} \in A
$$

Now let $a_{1}$ and $a_{2}$ be two vertices that lie in different orbits of $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{u x}$ on $A$.

The above argument shows that there exist $\delta_{1}, \delta_{2} \in \operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)$ and $b_{1}, b_{2} \in B$ such that

$$
\left(u x a_{1}\right)^{\delta_{1}}=u y b_{1} \quad \text { and } \quad\left(u x a_{2}\right)^{\delta_{2}}=u y b_{2} .
$$

If there exists $\sigma \in \operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{u y}$ taking $b_{1}$ to $b_{2}$, then $\left(u x a_{1}\right)^{\delta_{1} \sigma}=\left(u x a_{2}\right)^{\delta_{2}}$ and it follows that $\left(u x a_{1}\right)^{\delta_{1} \sigma \delta_{2}^{-1}}=u x a_{2}$, and so $\delta_{1} \sigma \delta_{2}^{-1}$ fixes $x$, but then since Aut $(\Gamma)_{x}$ preserves both $X(u)$ and $A$ set-wise, we find that $\delta_{1} \sigma \delta_{2}^{-1}$ fixes $u$ and takes $a_{1}$ to $a_{2}$. This, however, contradicts the assumption that $a_{1}$ and $a_{2}$ lie in different orbits of $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{u x}$ on $A$. Thus $b_{1}$ and $b_{2}$ must lie in different orbits of $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{u y}$ on $B$.

Similarly, if $b_{1}^{\prime}$ and $b_{2}^{\prime}$ are two vertices that lie in different orbits of $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{u y}$ on $B$, then there exist $\sigma_{1}, \sigma_{2} \in \operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)$ and $a_{1}^{\prime}, a_{2}^{\prime} \in A$ such that

$$
\left(u y b_{1}^{\prime}\right)^{\sigma_{1}}=u x a_{1}^{\prime} \quad \text { and } \quad\left(u y b_{2}^{\prime}\right)^{\sigma_{2}}=u x a_{2}^{\prime}
$$

and it follows that $a_{1}^{\prime}$ and $a_{2}^{\prime}$ lie in different orbits of $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{u x}$ on $A$.
We summarise the observations just made, as follows:
Fact 1. Let $A_{1}, A_{2}, \ldots, A_{t}$ be the distinct orbits of $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{u x}$ on $A$, with representatives $a_{i} \in A_{i}$ for $1 \leq i \leq t$. Then for $1 \leq i \leq t$, there exists $\delta_{i} \in \operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{u x}$ such that $\left(u x a_{i}\right)^{\delta_{i}}=u y b_{i}$, and moreover, the vertices $b_{1}, b_{2}, \ldots, b_{t}$ are representatives of the $t$ distinct orbits $B_{1}, B_{2}, \ldots, B_{t}$ of $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{u y}$ on $B$, with $b_{i} \in B_{i}$ for $1 \leq i \leq t$.

Before proceeding, note that for any two paths of the same length in $\Gamma$, if there exists an automorphism of $\Gamma$ sending one to the other, then the numbers of $k$-cycles passing through these two paths are equal.

By Fact 1, we have

$$
\left|\bigcup_{a \in A} C_{k}(u x a)\right|=\sum_{i=1}^{t}\left|A_{i}\right|\left|C_{k}\left(u x a_{i}\right)\right|
$$

and

$$
\left|\bigcup_{b \in B} C_{k}(u y b)\right|=\sum_{i=1}^{t}\left|B_{i}\right|\left|C_{k}\left(u y b_{i}\right)\right| .
$$

If $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{u x}$ is transitive on $A$, then $t=1$ and we have

$$
\left|\bigcup_{a \in A} C_{k}(u x a)\right|=\left|A \left\|C _ { k } ( u x a ) \left|=\left|B \| C_{k}(u y b)\right|=\left|\bigcup_{b \in B} C_{k}(u y b)\right|,\right.\right.\right.
$$

as required, and similarly, if $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{u y}$ is transitive on $B$, then we have

$$
\left|\bigcup_{a \in A} C_{k}(u x a)\right|=\left|\bigcup_{b \in B} C_{k}(u y b)\right|
$$

as required.
In what follows, assume that $t>1$, so that $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{u x}$ is intransitive on $A$, and $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{u y}$ is intransitive on $B$. For any subset $D$ of $V(\Gamma)$, let $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(D)}$ be the subgroup of $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)$ fixing $D$ point-wise. Then $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(X(u))} \unlhd \operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{x}$ and $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(X(u))} \leq \operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{u x}$. Also
because $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{x}$ acts 2-transitively on $A$, we find that $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(X(u))}$ acts trivially on $A$ and so $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(X(u))} \leq \operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(A)}$.

By Fact 1 , for every $b \in B$ there exists $\sigma \in \operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)$ such that $(u y b)^{\sigma}=u x a$ for some $a \in A$, and then $(u, y, b)^{\sigma}=(a, x, u)$, and so $\left(\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{u y}\right)^{\sigma}=\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{a x}$ is intransitive on $B^{\sigma}=X(u)$. Now 2-transitivity of $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{x}$ on $X(u)$ implies that $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(A)} \leq \operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(X(u))}$, and so $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(A)}=\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(X(u))}$.

Next, let $G$ be the set-wise stabiliser in $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)$ of $\{u\} \cup X$ set-wise, and $H$ set-wise stabiliser in $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)$ of $\{x\} \cup A$. Then $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(X(u))}$ is normal in each of $G$ and $H$. Note also that $G$ and $H$ are stabilisers of the two end-vertices of an edge of the graph $\Delta$ (of which $\Gamma$ is the line graph), and so $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)=\langle G, H\rangle$, and since $\Delta$ is edge-transitive, $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{(X(u))}=1$.

Thus, $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{x}$ acts faithfully on both $X(u)$ and $A$. Similarly, $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{y}$ acts faithfully on both $Y(u)$ and $B$. We now make a second key observation, as follows:

Fact 2. Assume that $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{u x}$ has two orbits on $A$, say $A_{1}$ and $A_{2}$. If there exists a vertex $a_{1} \in A_{1}$ such that $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{a_{1} x}$ has also two orbits on $X(u)$, say $X_{1}$ and $X_{2}$, with $u \in X_{1}$ and $\left|X_{1}\right|=\left|A_{1}\right|$, then $\left|\bigcup_{a \in A} C_{k}(u x a)\right|=\left|\bigcup_{b \in B} C_{k}(u y b)\right|$.

To see this, note that by Fact 1 there exists $\delta \in \operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)$ taking $\left(u, x, a_{1}\right)$ to $\left(b_{1}, y, u\right)$ for some $b_{1} \in B$, with $b_{1}=u^{\delta} \in X_{1}^{\delta}$, and then $X_{1}^{\delta}$ and $X_{2}^{\delta}$ are two orbits of $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{u y}=$ $\left(\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{a_{1} x}\right)^{\delta}$ on $B$. Clearly $\left|X_{1}^{\delta}\right|=\left|X_{1}\right|=\left|A_{1}\right|$, and $\left|X_{2}^{\delta}\right|=\left|X_{2}\right|=\left|A_{2}\right|=d-\left|A_{1}\right|$. Next let $a_{2} \in A_{2}$. Then by Fact 1 there exists $\delta^{\prime} \in \operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)$ such that $\left(u, x, a_{2}\right)^{\delta^{\prime}}=\left(b_{2}, y, u\right)$ for some $b_{2} \in X_{2}^{\delta}$, and it follows that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mid \bigcup_{a \in A} C_{k}(\text { uxa }) \mid & =\left|A_{1}\right|\left|C_{k}\left(u x a_{1}\right)\right|+\left|A_{2}\right|\left|C_{k}\left(u x a_{2}\right)\right| \\
& =\left|A_{1}\right|\left|C_{k}\left(u x a_{1}\right)\right|+\left(d-\left|A_{1}\right|\right)\left|C_{k}\left(u x a_{2}\right)\right| \\
& =\left|X_{1}^{\delta}\right|\left|C_{k}\left(u_{1}\right)\right|+\left|X_{2}^{\delta}\right|\left|C_{k}\left(u_{1} b_{2}\right)\right| \\
& =\left|\bigcup_{b \in B} C_{k}(u y b)\right|,
\end{aligned}
$$

as required.
Now we are ready to finish the proof of our lemma.
Suppose the actions of $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{x}$ on $X(u)$ and $A$ are equivalent. Then there exists $a \in A$ such that $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{u x}=\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{x a}$. Clearly, $\{a\}$ and $A \backslash\{a\}$ are two orbits of $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{u x}$ on $A$, while $\{u\}$ and $X(u) \backslash\{u\}$ are two orbits of $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{x a}$ on $X(u)$. Hence by Fact 2, we have $\left|\bigcup_{a \in A} C_{k}(u x a)\right|=\left|\bigcup_{b \in B} C_{k}(u y b)\right|$, as required.

Suppose (on the other hand) that the actions of $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{x}$ on $X(u)$ and $A$ are inequivalent. Then letting $G=\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{\{u\} \cup X}$, which acts faithfully and 3-transitively on $\{u\} \cup X$, we may deduce from [5, Theorem 5.3] and [16, Appendix 1] that $G$ is isomorphic to one of the following permutation groups of degree $d+1$ :
(a) $S_{d+1}$ when $d \geq 3$;
(b) $A_{d+1}$ when $d \geq 4$;
(c) $\operatorname{AGL}(n, 2)$ when $d=2^{n}-1 \geq 3$;
(d) $\mathbb{Z}_{2}^{4}: A_{7}$ when $d=15$;
(e) one of the five Mathieu simple groups $M_{d+1}$ when $d=10,11,21,22$ or 23 , or $M_{11}$ when $d=11$, or $\operatorname{Aut}\left(M_{22}\right) \cong M_{22} \cdot \mathbb{Z}_{2}$ when $d=21$;
(f) a 3-transitive group $G$ satisfying $\mathrm{PGL}(2, d) \leq G \leq \mathrm{P} \Gamma \mathrm{L}(2, d)$ for some prime-power $d \geq 3$; noting that $\operatorname{PGL}(2,4) \cong \operatorname{PGL}(2,5) \cong A_{5}$.

In cases (a) and (b), we have $d=6$ because the vertex stabiliser $G_{x}$ has two inequivalent 2-transitive representations, but then $G_{u x}$ is transitive on $A$, a contradiction which rules out these two cases.

In case (c), we have $G_{x}=\operatorname{SL}(n, 2)$. Here we may assume that $X(u)$ and $A$ are the set of points and the set of hyperplanes of the projective space $\operatorname{PG}(n-1,2)$, respectively. Then the hyperplanes containing $u$ form an orbit $A_{1}$ of $G_{x u}$ on $A$, while the hyperplanes not containing $u$ form another orbit $A_{2}$ of $G_{x u}$ on $A$. It is easy to see that $\left|A_{1}\right|=2^{n-1}-1$, and if $a_{1} \in A_{1}$, then the set $X_{1}$ of points contained in hyperplane $a_{1}$ is an orbit of $G_{x a_{1}}$ on $X(u)$, and the set $X_{2}$ of points not contained in $a_{1}$ is another orbit of $G_{x a_{1}}$ on $X(u)$. Moreover, by a direct computation we have $\left|X_{1}\right|=2^{n-1}-1$, and hence by Fact 2, it follows immediately that $\left|\bigcup_{a \in A} C_{k}(u x a)\right|=\left|\bigcup_{b \in B} C_{k}(u y b)\right|$, as required.

In case (d), we have $G_{x}=A_{7}$. Also a computation using Magma [3] shows that $G_{u x}$ has two orbits on $A$, say $A_{1}$ and $A_{2}$, with $\left|A_{1}\right|=7$ and $\left|A_{2}\right|=8$, and furthermore, there exists $a \in A_{1}$ such that $G_{x a}$ has two orbits on $X(u)$, say $X_{1}$ and $X_{2}$, with $\left|X_{1}\right|=7$ and $\left|X_{2}\right|=8$, and $u \in X_{1}$. Again by Fact 2 it follows that $\left|\bigcup_{a \in A} C_{k}(u x a)\right|=\left|\bigcup_{b \in B} C_{k}(u y b)\right|$.

In case (e), we find that $d=21$ because the vertex stabiliser $G_{x}$ has two inequivalent 2-transitive representations, and then either $G=M_{22}$ and $G_{x}=\operatorname{PSL}(3,4)$, or $G=M_{22} \cdot \mathbb{Z}_{2}$ and $G_{x}=\operatorname{PSL}(3,4) . \mathbb{Z}_{2}$. A computation using Magma [3] shows that $G_{u x}$ has two orbits on $A$, say $A_{1}$ and $A_{2}$, with $\left|A_{1}\right|=16$ and $\left|A_{2}\right|=5$, and there exists $a \in A_{1}$ such that $G_{x a}$ has two orbits on $X(u)$, say $X_{1}$ and $X_{2}$, with $\left|X_{1}\right|=16$ and $\left|X_{2}\right|=5$, and $u \in X_{1}$. Once again by Fact 2 it follows that $\left|\bigcup_{a \in A} C_{k}(u x a)\right|=\left|\bigcup_{b \in B} C_{k}(u y b)\right|$.

Finally, in case (f), we have $\operatorname{AGL}(1, d) \leq G_{x} \leq \mathrm{A} \Gamma \mathrm{L}(1, d)$, but then $G_{x}$ has only one 2-transitive representation, a contradiction which rules out that case.

This completes the proof of Lemma 3.1.
Proof of Theorem 1.2 Let $\Gamma$ be a connected tetravalent edge-girth-regular locally bi-2-transitive graph of girth 3. By Theorem 1.1, we know that $\Gamma$ is the line graph of a semi-symmetric locally 3 -transitive graph $\Delta$ of valency 3 . Moreover, by the proof of Theorem 1.1, the edge set of $\Gamma$ can be partitioned into edge-disjoint copies of $K_{3}$, such that every vertex of $\Gamma$ is contained in exactly two of these cliques.

Now take any vertex $u$ in $V(\Gamma)$, and let $\Gamma(u)=\left\{x, x^{\prime}, y, y^{\prime}\right\}$ be such that $\Gamma\left[\left\{u, x, x^{\prime}\right\}\right] \cong$ $\Gamma\left[\left\{u, y, y^{\prime}\right\}\right] \cong K_{3}$. Set $X=\left\{x, x^{\prime}\right\}$ and $Y=\left\{y, y^{\prime}\right\}$. From the last paragraph in the proof of Theorem 1.1, we know that $X$ and $Y$ are two orbits of $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{u}$. Also let

$$
\Gamma^{\prime}=\bigcup_{g \in \operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)} \Gamma\left[\left\{u, x, x^{\prime}\right\}^{g}\right] \quad \text { and } \quad \Gamma^{\prime \prime}=\bigcup_{g \in \operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)} \Gamma\left[\left\{u, y, y^{\prime}\right\}^{g}\right]
$$

As $\Gamma$ is locally bi-2-transitive, the edge sets of $\Gamma^{\prime}$ and $\Gamma^{\prime \prime}$ are the two equal-length orbits of $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)$ on the $E(\Gamma)$, and $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{u}$ acts transitively on each of $X$ and $Y$.

It is easy to see that $c_{k}(e)=c_{k}(\{u, x\})$ or $c_{k}(\{u, y\})$ for any edge $e$ of $\Gamma$ and for $3 \leq k \leq|V(\Gamma)|$, since $E\left(\Gamma^{\prime}\right)$ and $E\left(\Gamma^{\prime \prime}\right)$ are the edge-orbits of Aut $(\Gamma)$.

To show that $\Gamma$ is cycle-regular, we will extend the cycle-count notation by letting $C_{k}(P)$ be the set of $k$-cycles of $\Gamma$ containing a given path $P$ (of length 1 or more) or single vertex $P=\{v\}$, and prove the following.
Claim: $c_{k}(\{u, x\})=c_{k}(\{u, y\})$ and $c_{k}\left(u x x^{\prime}\right)=c_{k}\left(u y y^{\prime}\right)$ for $3 \leq k \leq|V(\Gamma)|$.
We shall prove this claim by using induction on $k$. It is clearly true for $k=3$, so we may assume that $k>3$.

Suppose $C_{k}\left(u x x^{\prime}\right) \neq \emptyset$, and let $C$ be any $k$-cycle in $C_{k}\left(u x x^{\prime}\right)$. We may consider $C$ as suxx ${ }^{\prime} \cup P$, where $P$ is a $(k-3)$-path $x^{\prime} \cdots s$ with $s \in Y$, and then $C^{\prime}=s u x^{\prime} \cup P$ is a $(k-1)$ cycle containing the edge $\left\{u, x^{\prime}\right\}$. Conversely, for any $C^{\prime \prime} \in C_{k-1}\left(\left\{u, x^{\prime}\right\}\right)$, if $C^{\prime \prime}$ does not pass through $x$, then we may assume that $C^{\prime \prime}=s u x^{\prime} \cup P$, where $P=x^{\prime} \cdots s$ is a $(k-3)$-path with $s \in Y$ and $x \notin P$. So $C^{\prime \prime \prime}=s u x x^{\prime} \cup P$ is a $k$-cycle passing through the 2-path $u x x^{\prime}$. This gives a bijection between $C_{k}\left(u x x^{\prime}\right)$ and $C_{k-1}\left(\left\{u, x^{\prime}\right\}\right) \backslash\left(C_{k-1}\left(\left\{u, x^{\prime}\right\}\right) \cap C_{k-1}(\{x\})\right)$.

For an arbitrary $\mathcal{C} \in\left(C_{k-1}\left(\left\{u, x^{\prime}\right\}\right) \cap C_{k-1}(\{x\})\right)$, if $\mathcal{C} \notin C_{k-1}\left(u x^{\prime} x\right) \cup C_{k-1}\left(x u x^{\prime}\right)$, then we have $\mathcal{C}=C_{1} \cup C_{2}$, where $C_{1}$ is an $\ell_{1}$-path $x \cdots u$ and $C_{2}$ is an $\ell_{2}$-path $x^{\prime} \cdots x$ such that $V\left(C_{1}\right) \cap V\left(C_{2}\right)=\{x\}, \ell_{1}, \ell_{2} \geq 2$ and $\ell_{1}+\ell_{2}=k-2$. Then $C_{1} x \in C_{\ell_{1}+1}(\{x, u\})$ and $C_{2} x^{\prime} \in C_{\ell_{2}+1}\left(\left\{x, x^{\prime}\right\}\right)$. On the other hand, if $C$ is an s-cycle passing through $\{u, x\}$ and $C^{\prime}$ is a $t$-cycle passing through $\left\{x^{\prime}, x\right\}$ with $s+t=k$ and $V(C) \cap V\left(C^{\prime}\right)=\{x\}$, then we have $C=Q x$ and $C^{\prime}=Q^{\prime} x$, where $Q$ is an $(s-1)$-path from $x$ to $u$ and $Q^{\prime}$ is $(t-1)$-path from $x^{\prime}$ to $x$. Then $Q Q^{\prime}$ is a $(k-1)$-cycle belonging to $\left(\left(C_{k-1}\left(\left\{u, x^{\prime}\right\}\right) \cap C_{k-1}(\{x\})\right) \backslash\right.$ $\left(C_{k-1}\left(u x^{\prime} x\right) \cup C_{k-1}\left(x u x^{\prime}\right)\right)$.

It follows that

$$
\left|C_{k}\left(u x x^{\prime}\right)\right|=\left|C_{k-1}\left(\left\{u, x^{\prime}\right\}\right)\right|-\left|C_{k-1}\left(u x^{\prime} x\right)\right|-\left|C_{k-1}\left(x u x^{\prime}\right)\right|-|U|,
$$

where

$$
U=\left\{\left\{C, C^{\prime}\right\}: C \in C_{s}(\{u, x\}), C^{\prime} \in C_{t}\left(\left\{x^{\prime}, x\right\}\right), s+t=k, V(C) \cap V\left(C^{\prime}\right)=\{x\}\right\} .
$$

Note that $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{\left\{u, x, x^{\prime}\right\}}$ acts 3-transitively on $\left\{u, x, x^{\prime}\right\}$. It follows that $\left|C_{k-1}\left(\left\{u, x^{\prime}\right\}\right)\right|=$ $\left|C_{k-1}(\{u, x\})\right|$ and $\left|C_{k-1}\left(u x^{\prime} x\right)\right|=\left|C_{k-1}\left(u x x^{\prime}\right)\right|=\left|C_{k-1}\left(x u x^{\prime}\right)\right|$, giving

$$
\left|C_{k}\left(u x x^{\prime}\right)\right|=\left|C_{k-1}(\{u, x\})\right|-2\left|C_{k-1}\left(u x x^{\prime}\right)\right|-|U| .
$$

By a similar argument to the one above, we also find that

$$
\left|C_{k}\left(u y y^{\prime}\right)\right|=\left|C_{k-1}(\{u, y\})\right|-2\left|C_{k-1}\left(u y y^{\prime}\right)\right|-|W|,
$$

where

$$
W=\left\{\left\{D, D^{\prime}\right\}: D \in C_{s^{\prime}}(\{u, y\}), D^{\prime} \in C_{t^{\prime}}\left(\left\{y^{\prime}, y\right\}\right), s^{\prime}+t^{\prime}=k, V(D) \cap V\left(D^{\prime}\right)=\{y\}\right\} .
$$

Also we can make an inductive hypothesis that $\left|C_{k-1}(\{u, x\})\right|=\left|C_{k-1}(\{u, y\})\right|$ and $\left|C_{k-1}\left(u x x^{\prime}\right)\right|=\left|C_{k-1}\left(u y y^{\prime}\right)\right|$, and then to show that $\left|C_{k}\left(u x x^{\prime}\right)\right|=\left|C_{k}\left(u y y^{\prime}\right)\right|$, it suffices to prove that $|U|=|W|$. Since $\Gamma$ is vertex-transitive, there exists $g \in \operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)$ sending $x$ to $y$. Take an arbitrary $\left\{C, C^{\prime}\right\} \in U$. We may assume that $C \in C_{s}(\{u, x\})$ and $C^{\prime} \in C_{t}\left(\left\{x^{\prime}, x\right\}\right)$,
where $s+t=k$ and $V(C) \cap V\left(C^{\prime}\right)=\{x\}$. Let $c \in V(C) \backslash\{u\}, c^{\prime} \in V\left(C^{\prime}\right) \backslash\left\{x^{\prime}\right\}$ be adjacent to $x$. Then $\Gamma(x)=\left\{c, c^{\prime}, u, x^{\prime}\right\}$. Furthermore, $\{c, x\},\left\{c^{\prime}, x\right\} \in E\left(\Gamma^{\prime \prime}\right)$, and so $\{c, x\}^{g},\left\{c^{\prime}, x\right\}^{g} \in E\left(\Gamma^{\prime \prime}\right)$. Since $x^{g}=y$, one has $\Gamma(y)=\Gamma\left(x^{g}\right)=\left\{c^{g},\left(c^{\prime}\right)^{g}, u^{g},\left(x^{\prime}\right)^{g}\right\}$ and $\left\{y, u^{g}\right\},\left\{y,\left(x^{\prime}\right)^{g}\right\} \in E\left(\Gamma^{\prime}\right)$. Note that $u, y^{\prime} \in \Gamma(y)$ and $\{y, u\},\left\{y, y^{\prime}\right\} \in E\left(\Gamma^{\prime \prime}\right)$. It follows that $\left\{u, y^{\prime}\right\}=\left\{c^{g},\left(c^{\prime}\right)^{g}\right\}$, and so either $C^{g} \in C_{s}(\{u, y\})$ and $\left(C^{\prime}\right)^{g} \in C_{s}\left(\left\{y^{\prime}, y\right\}\right)$, or $C^{g} \in C_{s}\left(\left\{y^{\prime}, y\right\}\right)$ and $\left(C^{\prime}\right)^{g} \in C_{t}(\{u, y\})$. Clearly, $V\left(C^{g}\right) \cap V\left(\left(C^{\prime}\right)^{g}\right)=\left\{x^{g}\right\}=\{y\}$, so $\left\{C^{g},\left(C^{\prime}\right)^{g}\right\} \in W$. This implies that $g$ induces a map, say $\phi$, from $U$ to $W$. Since $g \in \operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma), \phi$ is injective.

To see $\phi$ is also surjective, take an arbitrary $\left\{D, D^{\prime}\right\} \in W$. We may assume that $D \in C_{s^{\prime}}(\{u, y\}), D^{\prime} \in C_{t^{\prime}}\left(\left\{y^{\prime}, y\right\}\right)$, where $s^{\prime}+t^{\prime}=k$ and $V(D) \cap V\left(D^{\prime}\right)=\{y\}$. Let $d \in V(D) \backslash\{u\}$ and $d^{\prime} \in V(D) \backslash\left\{y^{\prime}\right\}$ be adjacent to $y$. Then $\Gamma(y)=\left\{u, y^{\prime}, d, d^{\prime}\right\}$. Since we already have $\Gamma(y)=\Gamma\left(x^{g}\right)=\left\{c^{g},\left(c^{\prime}\right)^{g}, u^{g},\left(x^{\prime}\right)^{g}\right\}$ and $\left\{u, y^{\prime}\right\}=\left\{c^{g},\left(c^{\prime}\right)^{g}\right\}$, one has $\left\{d, d^{\prime}\right\}^{g^{-1}}=\left\{u, x^{\prime}\right\}$. This implies that either $D^{g^{-1}} \in C_{s^{\prime}}(\{u, x\})$ and $\left(D^{\prime}\right)^{g^{-1}} \in C_{t^{\prime}}\left(\left\{x^{\prime}, x\right\}\right)$, or $D^{g^{-1}} \in C_{s^{\prime}}\left(\left\{x^{\prime}, x\right\}\right)$ and $\left(D^{\prime}\right)^{g^{-1}} \in C_{t^{\prime}}(\{u, x\})$. Furthermore, $V\left(D^{g^{-1}}\right) \cap V\left(\left(D^{\prime}\right)^{g^{-1}}\right)=$ $\left\{y^{g^{-1}}\right\}=\{x\}$. So $\left\{D^{g^{-1}},\left(D^{\prime}\right)^{g^{-1}}\right\} \in U$. Clearly, $\left\{D^{g^{-1}},\left(D^{\prime}\right)^{g^{-1}}\right\}^{\phi}=\left\{D, D^{\prime}\right\}$. Thus, $\phi$ is a bijection between $U$ and $W$, and hence $|U|=|W|$. Thus, we have shown that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|C_{k}\left(u x x^{\prime}\right)\right|=\left|C_{k}\left(u y y^{\prime}\right)\right| . \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Next, let $X(u)=\left\{u, x^{\prime}\right\}$ and $Y(u)=\left\{u, y^{\prime}\right\}$. Then $X(u)$ is an orbit of $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{x}$ on $\Gamma(x)$, and $Y(u)$ is an orbit of $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{y}$ on $\Gamma(y)$.

Let $A=\left\{a_{1}, a_{2}\right\}$ be the orbit of $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{x}$ on $\Gamma(x)$ that is distinct from $X(u)$, and let $B=\left\{b_{1}, b_{2}\right\}$ be the orbit of $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)_{y}$ on $\Gamma(y)$ that is distinct from $Y(u)$.

Because $k>3$, every $k$-cycle of $\Gamma$ containing the edge $\{u, x\}$ must contain the 2-path $u x a_{1}, u x a_{2}$ or $u x x^{\prime}$. Hence we find that

$$
C_{k}(\{u, x\}) \subseteq C_{k}\left(u x a_{1}\right) \cup C_{k}\left(u x a_{2}\right) \cup C_{k}\left(u x x^{\prime}\right)
$$

Also every $k$-cycle in $C_{k}\left(u x a_{1}\right) \cup C_{k}\left(u x a_{2}\right) \cup C_{k}\left(u x x^{\prime}\right)$ contains the edge $\{u, x\}$, and therefore

$$
\begin{equation*}
C_{k}(\{u, x\})=C_{k}\left(u x a_{1}\right) \cup C_{k}\left(u x a_{2}\right) \cup C_{k}\left(u x x^{\prime}\right), \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

and similarly, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
C_{k}(\{u, y\})=C_{k}\left(u y b_{1}\right) \cup C_{k}\left(u y b_{2}\right) \cup C_{k}\left(u y y^{\prime}\right) . \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now clearly $c_{k}(\{u, x\})=\left|C_{k}(\{u, x\})\right|=\left|C_{k}\left(u x a_{1}\right) \cup C_{k}\left(u x a_{2}\right)\right|+\left|C_{k}\left(u x x^{\prime}\right)\right|$ and $c_{k}(\{u, y\})=\left|C_{k}(\{u, y\})\right|=\left|C_{k}\left(u y b_{1}\right) \cup C_{k}\left(u y b_{2}\right)\right|+\left|C_{k}\left(u y y^{\prime}\right)\right|$. By Equation (1), we have $\left|C_{k}\left(u x x^{\prime}\right)\right|=\left|C_{k}\left(u y y^{\prime}\right)\right|$, and by Lemma 3.1, we see that

$$
\left|C_{k}\left(u x a_{1}\right) \cup C_{k}\left(u x a_{2}\right)\right|=\left|C_{k}\left(u y b_{1}\right) \cup C_{k}\left(u y b_{2}\right)\right| .
$$

Now by Equations (2) and (3), we obtain the proof of Theorem 1.2.
Note. The method for proving $|U|=|W|$ does not always work for the case where $\Gamma$ has valency $2 d>4$. Indeed for any $\left\{C, C^{\prime}\right\} \in W$, let $c \in V(C) \backslash\{u\}$ and $c^{\prime} \in V\left(C^{\prime}\right) \backslash\left\{x^{\prime}\right\}$ be vertices adjacent to $x$. When $2 d>4$, it might happen that $\{x, c\}$ or $\left\{x, c^{\prime}\right\}$ belongs to
$E\left(\Gamma^{\prime}\right)$, and then at least three of the four edges in $C \cup C^{\prime}$ incident with $x$ are in $E\left(\Gamma^{\prime}\right)$. But on the other hand, for any $\left\{D, D^{\prime}\right\} \in W$, at least two edges in $D \cup D^{\prime}$ incident with $y$ are in $E\left(\Gamma^{\prime \prime}\right)$, and this would imply that the automorphism $g$ of $\Gamma$ sending $x$ to $y$ will not send $\left\{C, C^{\prime}\right\}$ to some element in $U$.

## 4 A class of semi-symmetric locally 3-transitive graphs

In this final section, we prove Theorem 1.3 and thereby solve Problem 1, by constructing a family of semi-symmetric locally 3 -transitive graphs. Our construction is based on assumptions and notation given in the following definition:

## Definition 4.1

(1) $n$ is an integer greater than 2;

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Omega=\{1,2, \ldots, n, n+1, \ldots, 2 n-1,2 n, \ldots, 3 n-1\} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

(3) $a, b, c, x, y$ and $z$ are six permutations on $\Omega$, defined as follows:
$a=(1,2,3, \ldots, n-1, n)$,
$b=(1,2,3, \ldots, n-2, n-1)$,
$c=(1,2)$,
$x=(n+1, n+2, \ldots, 2 n-2,2 n-1)(2 n+1,2 n+2, \ldots, 3 n-2,3 n-1)$,
$y=(n+1, n+2)(2 n+1,2 n+2)$,
$z=(n, n+1, n+2, \ldots, 2 n-2,2 n-1)(2 n, 2 n+1,2 n+2, \ldots, 3 n-2,3 n-1)$;
(4) $G=\langle a, b, c, x, y, z\rangle, H=\langle a, b, c, x, y\rangle$ and $K=\langle b, c, x, y, z\rangle$;
(5) $\Delta=\{1,2, \ldots, n\}, \Pi=\{n, n+1, \ldots, 2 n-1\}$ and $\Lambda=\{2 n, 2 n+1 \ldots, 3 n-2,3 n-1\}$.

Before giving the construction (in Theorem 4.4 below), we make two key observations.
Observation $4.2 G \cong \operatorname{Sym}(\Delta \cup \Pi) \times \operatorname{Sym}(\Lambda) \cong S_{2 n-1} \times S_{n}$.
First $G$ has two orbits on $\Omega$, namely $\Delta \cup \Pi$ and $\Lambda$, which have lengths $2 n-1$ and $n$, respectively. Also $\langle a, b, c\rangle=\operatorname{Sym}(\Delta)$, because the conjugates of $c$ by elements of $\langle a, b\rangle$ include a set of transpositions that generate $S_{n}$.

Now let

$$
\begin{aligned}
& x_{1}=(n+1, n+2, \ldots, 2 n-2,2 n-1), \\
& y_{1}=(n+1, n+2) \\
& z_{1}=(n, n+1, n+2, \ldots, 2 n-2,2 n-1), \\
& x_{2}=(2 n+1,2 n+2, \ldots, 3 n-2,3 n-1), \\
& y_{2}=(2 n+1,2 n+2), \\
& z_{2}=(2 n, 2 n+1,2 n+2, \ldots, 3 n-2,3 n-1) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Then $\left\langle x_{1}, y_{1}, z_{1}\right\rangle=\operatorname{Sym}(\Pi),\left\langle x_{2}, y_{2}, z_{2}\right\rangle=\operatorname{Sym}(\Lambda)$, and $\left\langle a, b, c, x_{1}, y_{1}, z_{1}\right\rangle=\operatorname{Sym}(\Delta \cup \Pi)$, by similar arguments. Also because $x=x_{1} x_{2}, y=y_{1} y_{2}$ and $z=z_{1} z_{2}$, it follows that
$G=\langle a, b, c, x, y, z\rangle$ induces a 2-transitive group on $\Delta \cup \Pi$, and moreover, $G$ induces $\operatorname{Sym}(\Delta \cup \Pi)$ on $\Delta \cup \Pi$ because $(1,2)=c \in G$. In particular, some element $g \in G$ induces the permutation $(1,2,3, \ldots, n, n+1, \ldots, 2 n-1)$ on $\Delta \cup \Pi$.

Next, $G$ contains $c^{g^{i-1}}=(1,2)^{g^{i-1}}=(i, i+1)$ for $1 \leq i \leq 2 n-2$, and hence $G$ actually contains $\operatorname{Sym}(\Delta \cup \Pi)$. In particular, $G$ contains $x_{1}, y_{1}, z_{1}$, and so also contains $x_{2}=x_{1}^{-1} x$, $y_{2}=y_{1}^{-1} y$ and $z_{2}=z_{1}^{-1} z$, and therefore $G$ contains $\left\langle x_{2}, y_{2}, z_{2}\right\rangle=\operatorname{Sym}(\Lambda)$ as well. Thus $G \cong \operatorname{Sym}(\Delta \cup \Pi) \times \operatorname{Sym}(\Lambda)$, as claimed.

Observation 4.3 If $n>5$, then every automorphism of $G$ that preserves $H \cap K$ is an inner automorphism of $G$ induced by an element of $H \cap K$; that is, if $\alpha \in \operatorname{Aut}(G)$ satisfies $(H \cap K)^{\alpha}=H \cap K$, then there exists $g \in H \cap K$ such that $\alpha: u \mapsto g^{-1} u g$ for all $u \in G$.

To justify this, we first note that $G \cong M \times N$ where $M=\operatorname{Sym}(\Delta \cup \Pi) \cong S_{2 n-1}$ and $N=\operatorname{Sym}(\Lambda) \cong S_{n}$, by Observation 4.2, and furthermore,
$M=\left\langle a, b, c, x_{1}, y_{1}, z_{1}\right\rangle \cong S_{2 n-1}$, in its single-orbit action on $\Delta \cup \Pi=\{1,2, \ldots, 2 n-1\}$, $N=\left\langle x_{2}, y_{2}, z_{2}\right\rangle \cong S_{n}$, in its single-orbit action on $\Lambda=\{2 n, 2 n+1 \ldots, 3 n-2,3 n-1\}$,
$H=\langle a, b, c\rangle \times\langle x, y\rangle \cong S_{n} \times S_{n-1}$, in its 3-orbit action on $\Omega=\{1,2, \ldots, 3 n-2,3 n-1\}$, $K=\langle b, c\rangle \times\langle x, y, z\rangle \cong S_{n-1} \times S_{n}$, in its 3-orbit action on $\Omega \backslash\{1\}$, and $H \cap K=\langle b, c\rangle \times\langle x, y\rangle \cong S_{n-1} \times S_{n-1}$, in its 3-orbit action on $\Omega \backslash\{n, 2 n\}$,
noting that the effect of each of $x, y$ and $z$ on $\Lambda=\{2 n, 2 n+1 \ldots, 3 n-2,3 n-1\}$ is analogous to its effect on $\Pi=\{n, n+1, \ldots, 2 n-1\}$, in that if it takes $n+j$ to $n+k$ in $\Pi$, then it takes $2 n+j$ to $2 n+k$ in $\Lambda$.

Now let $D$ be the subgroup of $\operatorname{Aut}(G)$ preserving $H \cap K$. Since $M \cong S_{2 n-1}$ and $N \cong S_{n}$ are characteristic subgroups of $G \cong M \times N \cong S_{2 n-1} \times S_{n}$, we know that $M$ and $N$ are invariant under $\operatorname{Aut}(G)$, and it follows that $M \cap(H \cap K)$ is invariant under $D$. In fact $M \cap(H \cap K)=\left\langle a, b, c, x_{1}, y_{1}, z_{1}\right\rangle \cap\langle b, c, x, y\rangle=\langle b, c\rangle \cong S_{n-1}$ because $M$ fixes $\Lambda$ and $H \cap K$ fixes $n$ (and the effect of each of $x, y$ and $z$ on $\Lambda$ is analogous to its effect on $\Pi$ ), and so $D$ preserves $\langle b, c\rangle$. Then since $\langle b, c\rangle \cong S_{n-1}$ has trivial centre, it follows that $D$ also preserves $C_{H \cap K}(\langle b, c\rangle)=\langle x, y\rangle$.

Now let $\alpha$ be any element of $D$. Then since $\alpha$ preserves $M \cong S_{2 n-1}$, it induces an inner automorphism of $M$, and hence its effect on $M$ can be represented by a permutation $\pi$ of $\Delta \cup \Pi=\{1,2, \ldots, 2 n-1\}$. Also $\alpha$ preserves $\langle b, c\rangle$ and $\langle x, y\rangle$, and so $\pi$ must preserve their non-trivial orbits $\{1,2, \ldots, n-1\}$ and $\{n+1, n+2, \ldots, 2 n-1\}$ on $\Delta \cup \Pi$, and therefore $\pi$ fixes $n$. Moreover, as $\pi$ preserves $\langle x, y\rangle \cong S_{n-1}$, we find that $\alpha$ must induce a permutation $\pi^{\prime}$ on $\Lambda=\{2 n, 2 n+1 \ldots, 3 n-2,3 n-1\}$ analogous to the one it induces on $\Pi=\{n, n+1, \ldots, 2 n-1\}$, in that if $\pi$ takes $n+j$ to $n+k$ in $\Pi$, then $\pi^{\prime}$ takes $2 n+j$ to $2 n+k$ in $\Lambda$. Hence in particular, $\pi^{\prime}$ must fix the point $2 n$, because $n$ and $2 n$ are the fixed points of $\langle x, y\rangle$ on $\Pi$ and $\Lambda$.

It follows that the automorphism $\alpha$ is completely determined by the effects of $\pi$ and $\pi^{\prime}$ on the sets $\{1,2, \ldots, n-1\}$ and $\{n+1, n+2, \ldots, 2 n-1\}$, and hence by the effects of $\alpha$ on $\langle b, c\rangle$ and $\langle x, y\rangle$. As these are determined by inner automorphisms of $\langle b, c\rangle$ and $\langle x, y\rangle$, we find that $\alpha$ itself is an inner automorphism of $\langle b, c\rangle \times\langle x, y\rangle=H \cap K$, as claimed.

We can now state and prove the following:
Theorem 4.4 Under the notation set out in Definition 4.1, let $\Gamma=\operatorname{Cos}(G, H, K)$ be a graph with vertex set $\{H u: u \in G\} \cup\{K v: v \in G\}$, and with edges all pairs $\{H u, K v\}$ of these cosets having non-empty intersection $H u \cap K v$ in $G$. Then $\Gamma$ is a connected semi-symmetric locally 3-transitive graph of valency $n$.

Proof First, $\Gamma$ is bipartite, with parts $P=\{H u: u \in G\}$ and $Q=\{K v: v \in G\}$, and as $G$ is generated by $H=\langle a, b, c, x, y\rangle$ and $K=\langle b, c, x, y, z\rangle$, we see that $\Gamma$ is connected. Also $G$ acts naturally as a group of automorphisms of $\Gamma$, with $P$ and $Q$ as its orbits, by right multiplication on the (right) cosets of $H$ and $K$, respectively. Moreover, since $H$ and $K$ are core-free subgroups of $G$ (each being isomorphic to $S_{n} \times S_{n-1}$ ), the action of $G$ is faithful on each of $P$ and $Q$ and hence on $V(\Gamma)$.

Next, $H$ is adjacent to $K$ in $\Gamma$ (because $H \cap K$ contains $b$ and hence is non-empty), and then since $H \cap K \cong S_{n-1} \times S_{n-1}$ has precisely $n$ right cosets in $H \cong S_{n} \times S_{n-1}$, the neighbours of $H$ in $\Gamma$ are the $n$ cosets of the form $K x$ where $x \in H$ (corresponding to the fact that $H \cap K x=H x \cap K x=(H \cap K) x \neq \emptyset)$. Similarly, the neighbours of $K$ in $\Gamma$ are the $n$ cosets of the form $H y$ where $y \in K$. Thus $\Gamma$ is regular with valency $n$, and moreover, each of the subgroups $H$ and $K$ acts transitively on its neighbourhood in $\Gamma$, and then since $G$ acts transitively on each of its two parts, $\Gamma$ is both edge-transitive and locally arc-transitive.

In fact, the stabiliser of the $\operatorname{arc}(H, K)$ is $H \cap K \cong S_{n-1} \times S_{n-1}$, so the action of $H \cong S_{n} \times S_{n-1}$ on its neighbourhood $\Gamma(H)$ is equivalent to the action of $S_{n} \times S_{n-1}$ on right cosets of $S_{n-1} \times S_{n-1}$, which is 3 -transitive. The analogous property holds for the action of $K$ on $\Gamma(K)$, and so $\Gamma$ is locally 3 -transitive.

All that remains for us to do is prove that $\Gamma$ is not vertex-transitive (and is therefore semi-symmetric). This can be verified easily using Magma [3] for the cases where $n=3,4$ or 5 , and so we may assume that $n>5$ and that $\Gamma$ is vertex-transitive. Indeed under this assumption, $\Gamma$ will be 2 -arc-transitive.

Now let $A=\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma)$, let $u=H$ and $v=K$ (as vertices of $\Gamma$ ), let $A_{u}^{*}$ be the subgroup of $A_{u}$ fixing all the neighbours of $u$, and $A_{v}^{*}$ be the subgroup of $A_{v}$ fixing all the neighbours of $v$, and define $G_{u}^{*}$ and $G_{v}^{*}$ in the same way. As noted above for the actions of $H$ and $K$ on $\Gamma(H)$ and $\Gamma(K)$, we have $G_{u} / G_{u}^{*} \cong S_{n} \cong G_{v} / G_{v}^{*}$, with $G_{u v} / G_{u}^{*} \cong S_{n-1} \cong G_{u v} / G_{v}^{*}$, and in fact $G_{u}^{*}=\langle x, y\rangle \cong S_{n-1}$ and $G_{v}^{*}=\langle b, c\rangle \cong S_{n-1}$, and $G_{u}^{*} \cap G_{v}^{*}$ is trivial. It then follows that also $A_{u} / A_{u}^{*} \cong S_{n} \cong A_{v} / A_{v}^{*}$ and $A_{u v} / A_{u}^{*} \cong S_{n-1} \cong A_{u v} / A_{v}^{*}$, since $\Gamma$ has valency $n$.

Next, as $G_{v}^{*}$ fixes $u \in \Gamma(v)$, we find that $G_{v}^{*} \cap A_{u}^{*} \leq G_{u} \cap A_{u}^{*} \leq G_{u}^{*}$, which implies that $G_{u}^{*}=G_{u}^{*}\left(G_{v}^{*} \cap A_{u}^{*}\right)=G_{u}^{*} G_{v}^{*} \cap A_{u}^{*}$, and so by the Second Group Homomorphism Theorem,
$G_{v}^{*} G_{u}^{*} / G_{u}^{*}=G_{v}^{*} G_{u}^{*} /\left(G_{u}^{*} G_{v}^{*} \cap A_{u}^{*}\right) \cong\left(G_{v}^{*} G_{u}^{*}\right) A_{u}^{*} / A_{u}^{*}=G_{v}^{*}\left(G_{u}^{*} A_{u}^{*}\right) / A_{u}^{*} \leq A_{v}^{*} A_{u}^{*} / A_{u}^{*} \leq A_{u v} / A_{u}^{*}$.
On the left-hand, we have $G_{v}^{*} G_{u}^{*} / G_{u}^{*} \cong G_{u}^{*} /\left(G_{u}^{*} \cap G_{v}^{*}\right) \cong G_{u}^{*} \cong S_{n-1}$, while at the righthand, we have $A_{u v} / A_{u}^{*} \cong S_{n-1}$, and hence the inequalities are equalities. Thus $A_{u}^{*} / A_{u v}^{*}=$ $A_{u}^{*} /\left(A_{u}^{*} \cap A_{v}^{*}\right) \cong A_{v}^{*} A_{u}^{*} / A_{u}^{*} \cong S_{n-1}$, and by the analogous argument, also $A_{v}^{*} / A_{u v}^{*} \cong S_{n-1}$.

Furthermore, by the Thompson-Wielandt theorem described in [13, 26, 30] (for example), we know that $A_{u v}^{*}=A_{u}^{*} \cap A_{v}^{*}$ is a $p$-group for some prime $p$, and as the quotients $A_{u}^{*} / A_{u v}^{*}$ and $A_{v}^{*} / A_{u v}^{*}$ are isomorphic to $S_{n-1}$ and hence almost-simple, $A_{u v}^{*}$ is the unique maximal normal $p$-subgroup of each of $A_{v}^{*}$ and $A_{u}^{*}$, and therefore characteristic in both of them, and hence is normal in each of $A_{u}$ and $A_{v}$. But $\left\langle A_{u}, A_{v}\right\rangle$ contains $\left\langle G_{u}, G_{v}\right\rangle=\langle H, K\rangle=G$ and so $\left\langle A_{u}, A_{v}\right\rangle$ is transitive on the edges of $\Gamma$, and it follows that the normal subgroup $A_{u v}^{*}$ of $\left\langle A_{u}, A_{v}\right\rangle$ is trivial.

Thus $A_{u}^{*} \cong S_{n-1} \cong A_{v}^{*}$, from which it follows that $\left|A_{u}\right|=\left|S_{n}\right|\left|S_{n-1}\right|=|H|=\left|G_{u}\right|$ and similarly $\left|A_{v}\right|=\left|S_{n}\right|\left|S_{n-1}\right|=|K|=\left|G_{v}\right|$, so $A_{u}=G_{u}$ and $A_{v}=G_{v}$. Then since $G$ has two orbits on $V(\Gamma)$ while $A$ has just one, we find that $|A: G|=2$, and in particular, $G$ is normal in $A$. Moreover, because $\Gamma$ is arc-transitive, there exists some $t \in A \backslash G$ such that $t$ interchanges $u$ and $v$, and then conjugation by $t$ gives an automorphism $\alpha$ of $G$ that interchanges $H=G_{u}$ with $G_{v}=K$. This automorphism of $G$ preserves $G_{u v}=H \cap K$, and so by Observation 4.3, we find that $\alpha$ induces an inner automorphism of $H \cap K=G_{u v}$, the same as conjugation by some element $g \in G_{u v}$. But then it follows that $K=G_{v}=G_{u}^{\alpha}=G_{u}^{g}=G_{u}=H$ (because $g \in G_{u v} \leq G_{u}$ ), a contradiction.

Hence $\Gamma$ cannot be vertex-transitive, and is therefore semi-symmetric, as required.
Based on the construction of this family of graphs, we can now prove Theorem 1.3, and hence solve the problem posed by Fouquet and Hahn in 2001.

## Proof of Theorem 1.3

Let $n$ be any integer $\geq 3$, and let $\Gamma$ be the semi-symmetric locally 3 -transitive graph of valency $n$ given in Theorem 4.4, with $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma) \cong S_{2 n-1} \times S_{n}$.

Next let $p$ be any prime $>81$. Then by [9, Theorem 2.11] (see also [2, 17, 18]), there exists a connected covering graph $\Sigma$ of $\Gamma$ such that $\operatorname{Aut}(\Sigma)$ has an edge-transitive subgroup $X$ satisfying the following conditions:
(a) the subgroup $X$ has an elementary abelian normal $p$-subgroup $N$ which acts semiregularly on $V(\Sigma)$ and has order $p^{\beta(\Gamma)}$, where $\beta(\Gamma)=|E(\Gamma)|-|V(\Gamma)|+1$ (the Betti number of $\Gamma$ );
(b) the graph $\Gamma$ is isomorphic to the quotient graph $\Sigma_{N}$, the vertices of which are the orbits of $N$ on $V(\Sigma)$, with two such orbits adjacent in $\Sigma_{N}$ whenever there exists an edge in $\Sigma$ between a pair of vertices lying in those two orbits;
(c) $\operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma) \cong \operatorname{Aut}\left(\Sigma_{N}\right)=X / N$.

For notational convenience, write $\bar{X}=X / N$, and $\bar{g}=g N \in \bar{X}$ for any $g \in X$, and also denote by $\bar{v}$ the vertex of $\Sigma_{N}$ representing the orbit $v^{N}$ of any vertex $v \in V(\Sigma)$. Then the neighbourhood $\Sigma_{N}(\bar{v})$ of $\bar{v}$ consists of all the vertices $\bar{w}$ representing some $w \in \Sigma(v)$, and because $N$ is semi-regular on $V(\Sigma)$, the stabiliser $\bar{X}_{\bar{v}}$ in $\bar{X}$ of $\bar{v}$ is $X_{v} N / N$, which is isomorphic to $X_{v}$.

Now let $\phi$ be the isomorphism from $X_{v}$ to $\bar{X}_{\bar{v}}$, given by $\phi: g \mapsto \bar{g}$ for $g \in X_{v}$. If we label the vertices in $\Sigma(v)$ as $w_{1}, w_{2}, \ldots, w_{k}$, say, then for any $w_{i}, w_{j} \in \Sigma(v)$ and $g \in X_{v}$, we see that $w_{i}^{g}=w_{j}$ if and only if $\bar{w}_{i}^{\bar{g}}=\left(w_{i}^{N}\right)^{g N}=w_{i}^{g g^{-1} N g N}=\left(w_{i}^{g}\right)^{N N}=w_{j}^{N}=\bar{w}_{j}$,
and so the action of $\bar{X}_{\bar{v}}$ on $\Sigma_{N}(\bar{v})$ is permutationally isomorphic to the action of $X_{v}$ on $\Sigma(v)$. Thus $X_{v} \cong X_{v} N / N \cong S_{n} \times S_{n-1}$, and it follows that $\Sigma$ is locally 3-transitive.

Hence to complete the proof, all we have to do is show that $\Sigma$ is semisymmetric.
So assume to the contrary that $\Sigma$ is vertex-transitive, and therefore arc-transitive. Also let $A=\operatorname{Aut}(\Sigma)$, let $\{u, v\}$ be any edge of $\Sigma$, and for any subgroup $L$ of $A$ and any vertex $w$ of $\Sigma$, let $L_{w}^{*}$ be the the subgroup of $L_{w}$ fixing the neighbourhood $\Sigma(w)$ of $w$ point-wise.

By equations (2) and (3) in Section 3 and the argument in the last four paragraphs of our proof of Theorem 4.4 above, we find that

$$
A_{u} / A_{u}^{*} \cong A_{v} / A_{v}^{*} \cong S_{n} \quad \text { and } \quad A_{u}^{*} A_{v}^{*} / A_{u}^{*} \cong A_{u}^{*} A_{v}^{*} / A_{v}^{*} \cong S_{n-1}
$$

and also by the Thompson-Wielandt theorem (as mentioned in [13, 26, 30]), we know that $A_{u}^{*} \cap A_{v}^{*}$ is a $q$-group for some prime $q$.

Now if $n>5$, then $A_{u}^{*} /\left(A_{u}^{*} \cap A_{v}^{*}\right) \cong A_{u}^{*} A_{v}^{*} / A_{v}^{*} \cong S_{n-1}$ is almost simple, and so $A_{u}^{*} \cap A_{v}^{*}$ is a unique maximal normal $q$-subgroup of $A_{u}^{*}$, and therefore characteristic in $A_{u}^{*}$ and so normal in $A_{u}$. The same argument shows that $A_{u}^{*} \cap A_{v}^{*}$ is normal in $A_{v}$, and so $A_{u}^{*} \cap A_{v}^{*}$ is normal in $\left\langle A_{u}, A_{v}\right\rangle$, and then since $\left\langle A_{u}, A_{v}\right\rangle$ is transitive on the edges of $\Sigma$, we find that $A_{u}^{*} \cap A_{v}^{*}=1$. Similarly, because $X / N \cong \operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma) \cong S_{2 n-1} \times S_{n}$, which is insoluble, the $p$-subgroup $N$ is the unique maximal normal $p$-subgroup of $X$, and so $N$ is characteristic in $X$. Next, because $X_{v} \cong X_{u} \cong S_{n} \times S_{n-1}$, it follows that $A_{u}=X_{u}$ and $A_{v}=X_{v}$, and therefore $X=\left\langle X_{u}, X_{v}\right\rangle=\left\langle A_{u}, A_{v}\right\rangle$, which is a normal subgroup of $A$ with index 2. Hence $N$ is normal in $A$, but that makes $A / N$ a vertex-transitive subgroup of $\operatorname{Aut}\left(\Sigma_{N}\right)$, and so $\Gamma \cong \Sigma_{N}$ is vertex-transitive, contradiction.

Thus $3 \leq n \leq 5$. Here we need some other information before we can proceed along the same lines. First note that $X_{v} \leq A_{v}$, and that $X_{v} \cong S_{n} \times S_{n-1}$ as above. If $n=3$, then by Tutte's theory of arc-transitive cubic graphs [28, 29], we find that $\left|A_{v}\right|$ divides $2^{4} \cdot 3=48$ and then $\left|A_{v}: X_{v}\right|$ divides 4 . Similarly, if $n=4$, then $\left|A_{v}\right|$ divides $3^{6} \cdot 2^{4}$ (by [20, Theorem 4]), and then $\left|A_{v}: X_{v}\right|$ divides $3^{4}=81$, while if $n=5$, then $\left|A_{v}\right|$ divides $2^{9} \cdot 3^{2} \cdot 5$ and then $\left|A_{v}: X_{v}\right|$ divides $2^{3}=8$ (by [19, Table 2]). But we know that $\left|\left\langle A_{u}, A_{v}\right\rangle\right|=\frac{1}{2}|V(\Gamma)|\left|A_{v}\right|$ (since $\Sigma$ is bipartite), and $|X|=\frac{1}{2}|V(\Gamma)|\left|X_{v}\right|$, and it follows that $\left|\left\langle A_{u}, A_{v}\right\rangle: X\right|$ divides either 8 or 81 . Moreover, $X / N \cong \operatorname{Aut}(\Gamma) \cong S_{2 n-1} \times S_{n}$ (the order of which is divisible only by primes $\leq 7$ ), and so $N$ is a characteristic $p$-subgroup of $X$. Hence the index of the normaliser of $N$ in $\left\langle A_{u}, A_{v}\right\rangle$ divides $\left|\left\langle A_{u}, A_{v}\right\rangle: X\right|$, and so cannot be greater than 81, but $p>81$, and therefore by Sylow theory $N$ is a normal Sylow $p$-subgroup of $\left\langle A_{u}, A_{v}\right\rangle$. Again it now follows that $N$ is characteristic in $\left\langle A_{u}, A_{v}\right\rangle$ and hence normal in $A$, which leads to the same contradiction as in the case $n>5$.

Final note: One of the referees of this paper kindly suggested two alternative ways to prove Theorem 1.3, and we summarise these as follows.

For one way, by [4, Corollary 3], we know that there is a semisymmetric locally 3transitive graph $\Upsilon$ with valency $n$ for every $n \geq 3$. The stabiliser in Aut $(\Upsilon)$ of a vertex $v$ of $\Upsilon$ acts as the full symmetric group on the neighbourhood $\Upsilon(v)$, and as $\Upsilon$ is 2-arctransitive, the order of this vertex-stabiliser is bounded by a function of $n$ (see [32]). Using this fact and a similar argument to the one in our proof of Theorem 1.3, we see that
for every large enough prime $p$, there exists a semi-symmetric locally 3 -transitive $p^{b}$-fold regular cover $\tilde{\Upsilon}$ of $\Gamma$, where $b=|E(\Upsilon)|-|V(\Upsilon)|+1$.

For the second way, take any regular bipartite graph $\Gamma$ admitting an edge-transitve and locally 3 -transitive but not vertex-transitive group $G$. (For example, let $\Gamma$ be the complete bipartite graph $K_{n, n}$, and take $G=S_{n} \times S_{n}$.) By Theorem 6 of [22], for every prime $p \geq 3$ there exists a $q$-fold regular cover $\tilde{\Gamma}$ of $\Gamma$ for some power $q$ of $p$, such that the maximal lifted group of automorphisms of $\Gamma$ is $G$. In this case, the lift $\tilde{G}=P \cdot G$ of $G$ (with $P$ being a group of order $q$ ) acts as a non-vertex-transitive locally 3-transitive group on the covering graph $\tilde{\Gamma}$. Again, using the bound on the order of the vertex-stabiliser in 2-arc-transitive graphs (see [32]) and the Sylow theorem (as in the proof of Theorem 1.3), one can see that for every large enough prime $p$, the covering graph $\tilde{\Gamma}$ will be semi-symmetric and locally 3 -transitive.
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