

Graduate Graph Theory

GNU Math 842

Classnotes

Mark Siggers

These notes are for a graduate level introduction to Graph Theory. They draw largely from Diestel's text [2] Graph Theory, and Devos' class notes [1]. The source for Section 7 is Hell and Nešetřil's text Graphs and Homomorphisms [3].

1 Introduction to Graph Theory

Definition 1.1. A graph G consists of a non-empty set $V(G)$ of *vertices* and a set $E(G) \subset 2^{\binom{V}{2}}$ of *edges*: or 2-element subsets of V . Where it is clear, we write V for $V(G)$ and E for $E(G)$.

We often write uv for $\{u, v\}$, and say it is an edge of G of in many ways: u and v are *adjacent*, u and v are *neighbours*, $u \sim v$, u and v are the *endpoints* of (some edge) e .

One can generalise the idea of a graph to

- *digraphs* by making edges ordered sets: uv and vu are different,
- *multigraphs* by making the edgeset E a multiset,
- *hypergraphs* by allowing edges to contain more than two vertices,
- *non-simple graphs* by allowing edges of the form uu .

We mostly don't consider these generalisations.


Two graphs G and G' are *isomorphic* if there is a bijection $f : V(G) \rightarrow V(G')$ such that f and f^{-1} both preserve adjacency. We usually only care about graphs upto their isomorphism class.

Deciding if two graphs are isomorphic is a pretty hard problem.

1.1 Some Common Graphs

- Complete graph, or clique, K_n : $V(K_n) = [n]$ and $E(K_n) = 2^{\binom{[n]}{2}}$.
- n -cycle C_n : $V = \mathbb{Z}_n$ and $E = \{\{i, i + 1\} \mid i \in \mathbb{Z}_n\}$.
- n -path P_n : $V = \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$ and $E = \{\{i, i + 1\} \mid i = 0, \dots, n - 1\}$.
- complete bipartite graph $K_{m,n}$: where $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_m\}$ and $B = \{b_1, \dots, b_n\}$, $V = A \cup B$ and $E = A \times B$.
- n -cube Q_n : $V = \{0, 1\}^n$, E : $u \sim v$ if u and v differ in exactly one coordinate.

- The Petersen Graph:



The following is useful in proving things about the Petersen graph.

Problem 1.1. Show that for any vertex u and any other vertex v of the Petersen graph P , there is an *automorphism* f (that is, an isomorphism $f : P \rightarrow P$) such that $f(u) = v$. Graphs with this property are called *vertex transitive*.

1.2 Subgraphs and Complements

Given a graph G , another graph G' is a *subgraph* of G , written $G' \leq G$ if $V(G') \subset V(G)$ and $E(G') \subset E(G)$.

A subgraph G' of G is *spanning* if $V(G') = V(G)$, or *induced* if $E(G') = \{uv \in E(G) \mid u, v \in V(G')\}$. A subgraph G' of G is a *proper* subgraph of G if $E(G')$ is a proper subset of $E(G)$.

A subgraph of G isomorphic to K_n , C_n or P_n is called, respectively, an n -clique, n -cycle, or n -path of G .

Problem 1.2. Let G contain a cycle C and let there be a path of length at least k between vertices of C . Show that G contains a cycle of girth at least \sqrt{k} .

(This seems trivial when you first look at it, but the path can intersect the cycle, so there is something to do.)

A graph G is *connected* if for every two vertices u and v of G there is a (u, v) -path in G : a path in G with u and v as endpoints. A maximally connected subgraph of G is a *component*.

The *complement* \overline{G} of a graph G is the graph defined by $V(\overline{G}) = V(G)$ and $E(\overline{G}) = \overline{E(G)}$, (where the universe used for complementation is the set $\{uv \mid u \neq v \in V(G)\}$ of all possible edges on $V(G)$).

Problem 1.3. Show that a subgraph G' of G is induced if and only if $\overline{G'}$ is a subgraph of \overline{G} .

Problem 1.4. For a graph G show that either G or \overline{G} is connected.

1.3 Degrees and Degree Sequences

The *degree* $d(v)$ of a vertex of G is the number of edges it is in. The *graph score* of G is the multiset of the degrees of the vertices of G . We usually order the graph score of a graph so that its elements are in decreasing order, and then call it the *degree sequence* of the graph.

The minimum degree, $\delta(G)$, and the maximum degree, $\Delta(G)$, of G are the minimum and maximum degrees respectively in its degree sequence. If $\delta(G) = \Delta(G) = k$ then G is *k-regular*.

Here is a simple observation about degree sequence:

Theorem 1.2. *If (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n) is the degree sequence of a graph, then the degree sum: $\sum_{i=1}^n d_i$ is equal to $2|E(G)|$.*

Corollary 1.3. *In any graph G , there is an even number of vertices of odd degree.*

A sequence $D = (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n)$ non-increasing integers is *graphic* if there is a graph G on the vertices v_1, \dots, v_n such that $d(v_i) = d_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$. Such a graph G is called a *realisation* of D . We saw above that one necessary condition for a sequence to be graphic is that it sums to an even number. But this is not sufficient: $(4, 2, 0)$ is not graphic.

Problem 1.5. Show that the following condition is also necessary for a sequence (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n) to be graphic. For all $1 \leq k \leq n$,

$$\sum_{i=1}^k d_i \leq k(k-1) + \sum_{i=k+1}^n \min(k, d_i).$$

In fact, this condition is also sufficient. But this is fair bit harder to show:

Theorem 1.4. (Erdős-Gallai '60) *A sequence (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n) is graphic if and only if $\sum_{i=1}^k d_i$ is even and for all $1 \leq k \leq n$,*

$$\sum_{i=1}^k d_i \leq k(k-1) + \sum_{i=k+1}^n \min(k, d_i).$$

The Erdős-Gallai condition is what we use to decide if a sequence is graphic, but there is also a recursive method to decide it. It depends on the following idea:

Lemma 1.5. (Havel-Hakimi) *If a sequence $D = (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n)$ is graphic, then there is a graph with degree sequence D such that the maximum degree vertex is adjacent to the d_1 vertices of next highest degree.*

Problem 1.6. Prove this! And present it next class!

Note

It isn't so hard to prove. Look up a 2010 paper by Tripathi, Venugopalan and West for a nice short proof.

Thus to decide if a sequence D , such as $(3, 3, 2, 2, 2)$, is graphic, the *Havel-Hakimi algorithm* is as follows. While D is not all zeros,

- remove d_1 , and
- remove 1 from the next d_1 degrees d_2, \dots, d_{d_1+1} ,

if possible.

The algorithm clearly terminates. If it terminates with an empty sequence, (or a sequence of zeros), then D is graphic. Otherwise, it is not graphic.

Starting with $(3, 3, 2, 2, 2)$, we get $(\cancel{3}, 3 - 1, 2 - 1, 2 - 1, 2) = (2, 2, 1, 1)$, and then $(1, 0, 1) = (1, 1)$, and then $(0, 0)$. So $(3, 3, 2, 2, 2)$ is graphic.

2 Walks, trails, paths, circuits and cycles

Let x and y be vertices in a graph G . An xy -walk is a finite alternating sequence of vertices and edges:

$$x = x_0, e_1, x_1, e_2, e_2, \dots, x_{l-1}, e_l, x_l = y$$

where $e_i = x_{i-1}x_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, l$. The length of the walk is l , the number of edges. The walk is a *trail* if the edges are distinct, and is a *path* if the vertices are distinct. An xy -walk is *closed*, or a *circuit* if $x = y$.

Usually we just write the vertices


$$x_0x_1 \dots x_n,$$

or, if x and y are known, the edges

$$e_1e_2 \dots e_n.$$

Theorem 2.1. *Any xy -trail in a graph has an xy -path as a subgraph.*

Intuitively, we just start with an xy -trail and 'chop' out the repeated bits until it is a path. A lot of times it is very hard to write the intuitive proof rigorously. Try it.

Problem 2.1.  Prove that any odd circuit in a graph has an odd cycle as a subgraph.

2.1 Girth and Distance

The *girth* of a graph is the minimum girth of all cycles in the graph.

The *distance*, $\text{dist}(u, v)$ between two vertices u and v in a graph G is the length of the shortest uv -walk in G . Where $V = V(G)$, the *diameter* $\text{diam}(G)$ of G is


$$\max_{u, v \in V} \text{dist}(u, v),$$

and the *radius* $\text{rad}(G)$ of G is

$$\min_{u \in V} \max_{v \in V} \text{dist}(u, v).$$

A vertex u that minimises $\max_{v \in V} \text{dist}(u, v)$ is called *central*.


Problem 2.2.  Show that for a graph G containing a cycle, the girth of G is at most $2\text{diam}(G) + 1$.

Problem 2.3.  How many vertices can a graph of radius k and maximum degree Δ have?

2.2 Eulerian Graphs

It is often told that the first problem of graph theory was the problem of the Bridges of Königsberg. In the fictional city of Königsberg (Problem: prove or disprove my unpopular claim that Königsberg is fictional.) there were seven bridges. The dandies of the city, on a slow Sunday, would walk about the town, playing a riddish game. Starting wherever they pleased, they were to walk around, crossing every bridge, without crossing any bridge more than once. This game went on for centuries, and several liars claimed to have done it. Fermat once wrote in the margin of a book that it was simple enough. Until eventually, Euler proved it was impossible, and stabbed Fermat in a dual. (Prove that any of this is true.)

The city of Königsburg consisted of four dots, connected by seven bridges. It looked a lot like this:



How Euler proved it is lost in the depths of historical fiction. But our story inspires the following definitions.

An *euler trail* in a graph G is a trail containing all edges and vertices of G . If it is closed, it is an *euler circuit*. A graph is called *eulerian* if it contains an euler circuit.

The following is what Euler claims to have proved.

Theorem 2.2. *A graph is eulerian if and only if it is connected, and all of its vertices have even degree.*

Proof. That an eulerian graph is connected has all vertices of even degree is clear.

We show that it has an eulerian circuit. Indeed, as a length 1 walk uses no edges, there are trails in G . Let

$$W = v_0, e_1, v_1, e_2, \dots, v_{n-1}, e_n, v_n$$

be the longest trail. We will show that W is an Eulerian circuit.

Claim 2.3. $v_n = v_0$

Proof. If not, the vertex v_n occurs only in an odd number of edges in W . As it has even degree, there is some edge $e_{n+1} = \{v_n, v_{n+1}\}$ that is not used in W . But then W can be extended by e_{n+1} , which contradicts the choice of W . \diamond

Claim 2.4. All vertices of G are in W .

Proof. If some u is not in W , then as G is connected, there is a path P from u to some $v_i \in W$, none of whose edges are in W . But then the trail

$$u \xrightarrow{P} v_i, e_{i+1}, v_{i+1}, \dots, e_n, v_0, e_1, v_1 \dots e_i, v_i$$

is a longer trail in G than W , contradicting the choice of W . \diamond

Claim 2.5. All edge of G are used in W .

Proof. If some edge e is not used, then as W contains all vertices, $e = \{v_i, v_j\}$ for some v_i and v_j in W . We may assume that $i < j$. But then

$$v_i, e_{i+1}, \dots, v_j, e, v_i, e_i, v_{i-1}, \dots, v_0, e_n, v_n, \dots, e_{j+1}, v_j$$

is a longer trail in G than W . \diamond

Thus W is an Eulerian tour of G . \square


Observe that the same proof works if G is allowed to have loops or multiedges.


Problem 2.4.  Show that every $4k$ -regular graph has a decomposition into edge-disjoint paths of length 2.

2.3 Hamilton Paths and Cycles

A path, or cycle, in G is *hamilton* if it is bijective. A graph G is *hamiltonian* if it contains a hamiltonian cycle.

There were some nice conditions that characterised the eulerian graphs. We are not so lucky with hamilton graphs. In fact, the problem of deciding if a graph on n vertices is hamiltonian, is NP-complete. This means the best known algorithm we have for deciding, takes time that is exponential in n , (at least for some graphs). This doesn't mean we can't say anything about graphs that are hamiltonian. Indeed they must be connected, and have no leaves. We can say a bit more. We look at some sufficient conditions on a graph to imply that it is hamiltonian.

Problem 2.5.  Find a hamilton path in Q_n .

Problem 2.6.  Let G be a 3-regular graph that is uniquely 3-edge-colourable (there is a unique partition of the edges into 3 parts such that no part contains edges sharing a vertex). Show that G is hamiltonian.

Here is an early result of Dirac.

Theorem 2.6 (Dirac 1952). *A graph G with n vertices is hamiltonian if $\delta(G) \geq n/2$.*

This is implied by the slightly stronger result of Ore.

Theorem 2.7 (Ore 1960). *A graph G with $n \geq 3$ vertices is hamiltonian if for every two vertices $x \neq y$ with $x \not\sim y$, we have $d(x) + d(y) \geq n$.*

Proof. Towards contradiction, let G be a maximal counterexample on $n \geq 3$ vertices. So G is not hamiltonian, and satisfies

$$(*) \quad x \not\sim y \Rightarrow d(x) + d(y) \geq n,$$

but $G + xy$ is hamiltonian for any $x \not\sim y$. (We may assume that G is not complete, as complete graphs are clearly hamiltonian.) Let $H = G + xy$ for some $x \not\sim y$ in G . Then H is hamiltonian, and any Hamilton cycle contains xy . So there is a hamilton path

$$x = x_1 \sim x_2 \sim \dots \sim x_n = y.$$

Now if $x_1 \sim x_i$ and $x_{i-1} \sim x_n$, then

$$x_1 \sim x_2 \sim \dots \sim x_{i-1} \sim x_n \sim x_{n-1} \sim \dots \sim x_i \sim x_1$$

is a hamilton cycle not using xy so in G , which is a contradiction. So for each of x s $d(x)$ neighbours x_i in $\{x_2, \dots, x_{n-1}\}$ (recall that $x \not\sim y = x_n$), x_{i-1} is not a neighbour of y . So

$$d(x) + d(y) = d(x_1) + d(x_n) \leq d(x_1) + (n - 1 - d(x_1)) \leq n - 1$$

This contradicts $(*)$, so the theorem is true. \square

Both Dirac's and Ore's theorem give us conditions on the degree sequence of a graph that are sufficient to imply the existence of a Hamilton cycle. Are there others? There are, we look at one more generalisation, which is best possible in the sense that for any weakening of the condition (strictly in terms of the degrees) there is a non-hamiltonian graph satisfying the weakening.

First, Bondy and Chvatal both observed that the proof of the Ore condition actually proves the following.

Lemma 2.8. *Let G be a simple graph on n vertices, and x and y be non-adjacent vertices satisfying the (BC) condition*

$$deg(x) + deg(y) \geq n.$$

Then G is hamiltonian if $G + xy$ is.

This leads to the following definition.

Definition 2.9. For a graph G , the (hamilton) closure $c(G)$ is the graph constructed by recursively adding the edge xy for non-adjacent vertices satisfying (BC).

To see that this definition is well defined, assume that $G_1 = G + e_1 + \dots + e_a$ and $G_2 = G + f_1 + \dots + f_b$ are two closures of G under the definition. We show that all of the e_i are among the f_i . If not, there is a first e_i not in G_2 . Then

$$G_1^* = (G + e_1 + \dots + e_{i-1}) \leq G_2$$

so the degree sum of the endpoints of e_i in G_2 is greater than that in G_1^* , and so G_2 is not closed, a contradiction.

It follows from the lemma that a graph is hamilton if and only if its closure is. This is a nice condition, but doesn't settle the problem of deciding whether or not a graph is hamiltonian. It is still difficult to decide if the closure is hamiltonian. However, if we are lucky, the closure will be a clique, and then we know it is hamiltonian. Using this idea, Chvatal showed the following.


Theorem 2.10 (Chvatal '72). *Let G be a graph on $n \geq 3$ vertices, with degree sequence $D = (d_1, \dots, d_n)$ such that for all $m \leq n/2$ either $d_{n-m} > m$ or $d_m \geq n - m$. Then G is hamiltonian.*


Proof. Let G be a graph satisfying this condition, we show that $c(G)$ is a clique. As cliques are hamiltonian, this is enough.

Towards contradiction assume that $c(G)$ is not a clique, so there are non adjacent vertices u and v . Where $d(v)$ denotes the degree of v in $c(G)$, let u and v be non-adjacent vertices that maximise $d(u) + d(v)$. Assume that $m := d(u) \leq d(v)$. As $d(u) + d(v) < n$ because $u \not\sim v$, we have $m \leq n/2$ and $d(v) < n - m$. We show that $d_{n-m} \leq m$ and $d_m < n - m$ to contradict the assumption.

To get that $d_m < n - m$ we show that there are at least $n - m + 1$ vertices with degree less than $n - m$. We saw above that $d(v) < n - m$ and by assumption $d(u) \leq d(v)$, so this is two such vertices. But also by the choice of u and v we have that every non-neighbour of u has degree at most $d(v)$ so these $n - m - 1$ vertices also have degree less than $n - m$. This gives the $n - m + 1$ vertices we needed.

To see $d_{n-m} \leq m$ we similarly find at least $m + 1$ vertices with degree at most m : u and the $n - 1 - d(v) \geq m$ non-neighbours of v . \square

Problem 2.7.  Show that every connected graph G with $n > 2\delta(G)$ vertices has a path of length $2\delta(G)$. Deduce that every $2k$ -regular graph on $4k + 1$ vertices is hamiltonian.

Problem 2.8.  Let G have $n \geq 3$ vertices and degree sequence (d_1, \dots, d_n) where now $d_1 \leq d_2 \leq \dots \leq d_n$. Show that if for all $i < n/2$ we have

$$d_i \leq i \Rightarrow d_{n-i} \geq n - i$$

then G is hamiltonian

3 Trees

A graph is *acyclic* or a *forest* if it has no cycles. A *tree* is a connected acyclic graph. A *leaf* of a tree is a vertex of degree one.

A *cut edge* of a graph G is any edge whose removal increases the number of components of G .

Lemma 3.1. *An edge in a graph G is a cut edge if and only if it is not in any cycles in G .*

Theorem 3.2. *A graph T is a tree if and only if it is connected and every edge is a cut edge.*

Problem 3.1. 🐛 Prove Lemma 3.1, and use it to prove Theorem 3.2.

A *spanning tree* of a graph G is a spanning subgraph which is a tree.

Theorem 3.3. *A graph G is connected if and only if it has a spanning tree.*

Proof. Let G be a graph with a spanning tree T . Let x and y be any two vertices in G . As T is spanning, they are also in T . As T is connected, there is an xy -path $P = e_1e_2 \dots e_d$ in T . But $E(T) \subset E(G)$ so P is in G as well, that is, it is an xy -path in G . This was for any $x, y \in V(G)$, so G is connected.

On the other hand assume that G is connected. Let H be a minimal connected spanning subgraph of G , that is, a connected spanning subgraph, which itself has no connected spanning proper subgraph. By minimality, H has no cut edges, so is a tree by Theorem 3.2. \square

Lemma 3.4. *Any tree has a leaf.*

Lemma 3.5. *For any tree T and any leaf v of T , the graph $T' = T \setminus \{v\}$ we get from T by removing v (and any incident edges) is also a tree.*

Theorem 3.6. *For a tree T , $|V(T)| = |E(T)| + 1$.*

Problem 3.2. 🐛 Prove Lemmas 3.4 and 3.5 and use them to prove Theorem 3.6.

Theorem 3.7. *Let T be a graph with n vertices and m edges. Then the following are equivalent.*

- i. T is a tree; ie. it is connected and acyclic.*
- ii. T has no cycles, and $m = n - 1$.*
- iii. T is connected, and $m = n - 1$.*
- iv. T is connected, but every edge is a cut edge.*

v. Any two vertices of G are connected by a unique path.

Proof. From Theorem 3.2 we have the equivalence of (i) and (iv). By Theorem 3.6 we have that (i) implies (ii) and (iii). We show that (ii) \Rightarrow (i) and (iii) \Rightarrow (iv). This shows the equivalence of the first four statements. As an exercise, show that statement (v) is also equivalent.

(ii) \Rightarrow (i): Assume that G has no cycles, so each component of G is a tree. For each component C we thus have that $|V(C)| = |E(C)| + 1$. So $n = m + c$ where c is the number of components. By $n = m + 1$, there is only one component, so it is a tree.

(ii) \Rightarrow (iv): Assume that G is connected and has $n = m + 1$. If there is some edge e that is not a cut-edge, then $G' = G \setminus \{e\}$, the graph we get by removing e , is connected, and so contains a spanning tree T . Thus $n = |V(G')| = |V(T)| = |E(T)| + 1 \leq |E(G')| + 1 = m + 2$, but this is a contradiction.

□

3.1 Cayley's Formula

How many different trees are there on n vertices?

Theorem 3.8 (Cayley's formula). *There are $T_n = n^{n-2}$ different labelled trees on n vertices.*

By labelled, we mean that the path $1 \sim 2 \sim 3$ on the vertex set $\{1, 2, 3\}$ is different from the path $2 \sim 1 \sim 3$. (But it is the same as the path $3 \sim 2 \sim 1$.) So as a corollary, we get that there are between $n^{n-2}/n!$ and n^{n-2} non-isomorphic trees on n vertices. We can count them using generating functions, we might get to that later.

In this section we give two proofs of Cayley's theorem. The first, due to Prüfer, we only sketch.

3.1.1 Prüfer's Proof

This is a proof by bijection. Observe that the number of $(n - 2)$ -element sequences $s \in [n]^{n-2}$ of integers from the set $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ is exactly n^{n-2} . We show a correspondence between these sequences and the labelled trees on n vertices.

Prüfer Encoding

Given a tree T_1 with vertices labelled with the integers $[n]$, construct $s \in [n]^{n-2}$ as follows.

For $i = 1, \dots, n - 2$ do

- Let l_i be the lowest labelled leaf in T_i .
- Let s_i be the unique neighbour of l_i in T_i .
- Let $T_{i+1} = T_i \setminus l_i$.

Prüffer Decoding

Given an sequence $s = (s_1, \dots, s_{n-2})$, construct a tree T on the vertex set $[n]$ as follows. Let L_1 be empty, and let $Z_i = (s_i, s_{i+1}, \dots, s_{n-2})$ for $i = 1, \dots, n - 2$.

For i from 1 to $n - 2$ do

- Let l_i be lowest number not in $L_i \cup Z_i$.
- Add the edge $l_i s_i$.
- Let $L_{i+1} = L_i \cup \{l_i\}$.

When the above algorithm terminates, there are two vertices not in L_{n+1} . Add the edge between them.

Problem 3.3. 🐞 Show that Prüffer encoding and Prüffer decoding are inverse operations.

3.1.2 Pitman's Proof

This beautiful little double counting proof of Cayley's Formula by Pitman, can be found in 'Proofs from the Book' by Aigner and Zeigler. It's a nice book.

We need some definitions.

An *oriented graph* \vec{G} is a graph G in which we apply a orientation, or direction, to each edge. An oriented edge is often referred to as an *arc*. We write $u \rightarrow v$ to denote that there is an arc $a = (u, v)$ from u to v . We say that u is the *source* or *start* of the arc, and v is the *terminus* or *end* of the arc. We also say a is an *in-arc* of v and an *out-arc* of u . The *in-degree* of a vertex in an oriented graph is the number of in-arcs, and the *out-degree* is the number of out-arcs. A path $P = v_1 \sim v_2 \sim \dots \sim v_d$ is a *directed path*, directed from v_1 to v_d if it is given the following orientation: $v_1 \rightarrow v_2 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_d$. An oriented cycle is directed if every vertex has in-degree one and out-degree one.

A *rooted tree* is a tree in which there is a particular vertex designated as the *root*.

We also need some easy observations. Given a tree T , choosing a root r defines a unique orientation on the tree in which for every vertex $u \neq r$ the unique path between u and r in T is a directed path from u to r . As such, we

call an oriented tree a *rooted tree* if there is some vertex r with such that every arc is directed towards r .

Problem 3.4. Show that an oriented tree is a rooted tree with root r , if and only if every vertex but r has out-degree one, if and only if it has max out-degree 1.

Pitman's proof of Cayley's theorem comes from counting the possible constructions of a rooted tree in two ways.

Let F_n be the number of sequences $(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{n-1})$ of arcs on the set of vertices $[n]$, such that the oriented graph \vec{G} with vertices $[n]$ and arcs a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{n-1} is a rooted tree.

First we observe that $F_n = T_n \cdot n!$. Indeed, we choose a tree in T_n ways, and a root in n ways. The $n - 1$ arcs are determined, but the order they come in in the sequence can be now chosen in $(n - 1)!$ ways. Together, this is $T_n \cdot n!$, as needed.

On the other hand we can construct a sequence as follows. Let a_1 be any arc. This can be chosen in $n(n - 1)$ ways. At step i , let a_i be any arc such that the oriented graph with arcs a_1, \dots, a_i has no vertex of out-degree greater than one, and no cycles.

Observe that the arc we add at step i must go between components, or it makes a cycle. So it reduces the number of components by one. Thus before adding a_i there are $n - i$ components. Further, as each component has max out-degree 1 and is a tree, it has a unique vertex, its root, with out-degree 0. The arc a_i may end at any vertex v , and must then begin at the root of any component other than the component containing v . So can be chosen in $n(i - 1)$ ways. This gives

$$F_n = \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} n \cdot (n - i) = n^{n-1} \cdot (n - 1)! = n^{n-2} \cdot n!.$$

So $T_n \cdot n! = F_n = n^{n-2} \cdot n!$, which yields Cayley's formula: $T_n = n^{n-2}$.

3.2 The Matrix Tree Theorem

We have counted the number of trees on $[n]$ vertices. We can view each as a spanning subtree of K_n . This was hard enough for K_n . It should be harder for a general graph G on n vertices. And it is. But it turns out, that the number of spanning subtrees of G is counted by the determinant of a particular $m \times m$ matrix which we get by multiplying two $n \times m$ matrices which we use to encode our graph. (Recall n is the number of vertices and m is the number of edges.) Multiplying the matrices takes $O(m^2n) = O(n^5)$ operations and computing the determinant takes $O(n^4)$, so this is not a bad calculation. This is the subject of this subsection. We start by looking at a couple matrices associated to a graph.

We will *index* the rows and columns of a matrix M by sets. For sets R and C the matrix $M = [m]_{R,C}$ has entry $m_{r,c}$ in the row indexed by r and column indexed by c . For a subset S of R , M^S is the matrix consisting of the rows of M indexed by elements of S . For $S \subset C$ M_S is the matrix consisting of columns indexed by elements of S . If $S = \{s\}$ we simply write M^s or M_s . We denote vectors by bold lettering.

Recall that the product $LM = [x]_{I,J}$ of matrixes $L = [l]_{I,K}$ and $M = [m]_{K,J}$ defined using the dot product by

$$x_{i,j} = L^i \cdot M_j$$

3.2.1 The Adjacency Matrix $A = A(G)$

The *adjacency matrix* $A = A(G)$ of a graph is the $n \times n$ matrix $A = [a]_{V,V}$ where

$$a_{i,j} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i \sim j \\ 0 & \text{if not.} \end{cases}$$

Observe that this is a symmetric matrix. The number of '1's in the v^{th} row A^v or column A_v is the degree of vertex v .

Problem 3.5. 🐞 Where $A = A(G)$, show that $[A^2]_{u,v}$ is the number ij -walks of length 2 in G , and in particular that $[A^2]_{i,i}$ is the degree of i in G . Show, more generally that $[A^k]_{i,j}$ is the number of ij -walks of length k in G .

3.2.2 The Incidence Matrix $M = M(G)$

The *incidence matrix* $M = M(G)$ is the $n \times m$ matrix $M = [m]_{V,E}$ such that

$$m_{v,e} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } v \in e \\ 0 & \text{if not.} \end{cases}$$

Notice that where $\mathbf{1}$ is the appropriate size vector of ones, $\mathbf{1}M = \mathbf{21}$. For all our applications, it will be more useful to assume an arbitrary orientation on G , and to define $M = M(G) = M(\vec{G})$ to reflect that orientation:

$$m_{v,e} = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } v \text{ is the start of } e \\ 1 & \text{if } v \text{ is the terminus of } e \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

As we are not allowing loops, this is well defined, and is skew-symmetric. Moreover, we now have that

$$\mathbf{1}M = 0.$$

Infact, we have the following more general fact.

Problem 3.6. Show that $\mathbf{1}M_s = 0$ if and only if the subgraph G graph induced by S is a union of components of G . (That is, there are no edges between S and $V \setminus S$.)

Now consider the matrix equation $\mathbf{x}M = \mathbf{b}$.

A solution \mathbf{x} assigns a value x_v to each vertex v . That it is a solution means that

$$b_e = x_t - x_s$$

where $e = (s, t)$.

Problem 3.7. If T is a subtree of G then $\mathbf{x}M_{E(T)}^{V(T)} = b$ has a solution for any b .

Problem 3.8. If C is an l -cycle in G then $\mathbf{x}M_{E(C)}^{V(C)} = b$ if and only if $b_l = \sum v_i b_i p_i$ where p_i is 1 or -1 depending on whether the i^{th} arc is $(i, i + 1)$ or $(i + 1, i)$.

Fix an arbitrary vertex r of G and let $M^* = M(G)^{V(G) \setminus \{r\}}$.

Lemma 3.9. For a set S of $n - 1$ edges of G , M_S^* has full rank if and only if S is a spanning tree of G .

Proof. For a subset S of $n - 1$ edges of G , M_S is an $n \times n - 1$ matrix, so has rank at most $n - 1$.

If S is a spanning tree, then we have by Problem 3.7 that M_S has rank exactly $n - 1$. As $\mathbf{1}M_S = \mathbf{0}$, we have that the row M_S^r is a linear combination of the other rows, and so M_S^* also $n - 1$ independent rows. So the $n - 1 \times n - 1$ matrix M_S^* has full rank.

On the other hand, if S it is not a spanning tree, then it has a cycle, and so by Problem 3.8, M_S has rank less than $n - 1$. Thus M_S^* also has rank less than $n - 1$. \square

3.2.3 The Matrix Tree Theorem

Recall the Binet Cauchy formula for an $m \times n$ matrix A and an $n \times m$ matrix B :

$$\det(AB) = \sum_{S \subset [m], |S|=n} \det(A_S B^S)$$


With this, we can prove the following.

Theorem 3.10. Given a connected graph G and a vertex $r \in V(G)$, let $M = M(\vec{G})$ for some orientation \vec{G} of G and let $M^* = M^{V(G) \setminus \{r\}}$. Then the number of spanning trees of G is $\det(M^*(M^*)^T)$.

Proof.


$$\begin{aligned}
 \det(M^*(M^*)^T) &= \sum_{S \subseteq E, |S|=n-1} \det(M_S^*((M^*)^T)^S) \\
 &= \sum_{S \subseteq E, |S|=n-1} \det(M_S^*)^2 \\
 &= \sum_{S \subseteq E, |S|=n-1} \begin{pmatrix} (\pm 1)^2 & \text{if } S \text{ is a tree} \\ 0^2 & \text{otherwise} \end{pmatrix} \\
 &= \text{the number of spanning trees of } G.
 \end{aligned}$$

□

Problem 3.9.  The *Laplacian matrix* of a graph G is the $n \times n$ matrix $L(G) = MM^T$ where $M = M(\mathbf{G})$ for some orientation \mathbf{G} of G . Show that $L(G) = [x]_{v,v}$ satisfies

$$x_{u,v} = \begin{cases} d(u) & \text{if } u = v \\ -1 & \text{if } u \sim v \\ 0 & \text{if neither of those,} \end{cases}$$

independent of the ordering of G .

Problem 3.10.  Show how Cayley's theorem follows from the Matrix Tree Theorem.

4 Connectivity

A graph G is k -connected if for any set S of k vertices, $G \setminus S$ is connected. The *connectivity* $\kappa(G)$ of a graph G is the maximum k for which it is k -connected.

4.1 2-connected graphs

In this section we give a useful characterisation of 2-connected graphs.

For distinct vertices a, b and c in a connected graph G , a c *avoiding ab -path* is an ab -path that does not contain c . The vertex c is an *ab -separator* if there are no c -avoiding ab -paths.


Problem 4.1. Prove the following.

- i. A connected graph G is 2-connected if and only if there is no ab -separator for any two vertices a and b .
- ii. If a and b are in a cycle in G then there is no ab -separator.


An *ear* of a graph H is a path $P = p_0 \sim \cdots \sim p_d$ with $V(H) \cap V(P) = \{p_0, p_d\}$.

Theorem 4.1. *A graph G is 2-connected if and only if it is a cycle or can be constructed from a proper 2-connected subgraph H by adding an ear.*

Proof. Let G be such a graph. If G is a cycle we are done. So we assume that it can be constructed from a 2-connected subgraph H by adding an ear P .

Problem 4.2.  Show that G is 2-connected

On the other hand, let G be 2-connected. Then G has a cycle, and so has some maximal subgraph H constructed as above. By its maximality, H must be an induced subgraph. So, unless we are done, there is some vertex $a \in G \setminus H$ with an edge ab to H . Since G is 2-connected there is a b -avoiding ah -path P for some vertex h of H (take a minimal one). But then $b \sim a \xrightarrow{P} h$ is an ear of H , and its union with H is a larger graph constructible as above. \square

Problem 4.3.  Using Theorem 4.1 prove the converse of Problem 4.1(ii).

We generalise this now.

4.2 Menger's Theorem

For a graph G and an edge $e = xy$ of G , the graph G/e which we get from G by contracting e is the graph with vertex set

$$V(G) \setminus \{x, y\} \cup \{v_e\}$$

and edgeset

$$\{uv \in E(G) \mid u, v \in V(G)\} \cup \{uv_e \mid ux \in E(G)\} \cup \{uv_e \mid uy \in E(G)\}.$$

For sets A and B of G a path with an endpoint in each of A and B is an AB -path. (If A and B share a vertex v then the length 0 path v is an AB -path.) An AB -path is X -avoiding for a set X if it contains no vertices of X . A set X is an AB -separator if there are no X -avoiding AB -paths.


Clearly if two sets A and B in $V(G)$ have a AB separator X with $|X| = k$ there can be at most k disjoint AB -paths. Menger showed the following.

Theorem 4.2 (Menger 1927). *For vertex sets $A, B \subset V(G)$ of a graph G if the smallest AB -separator has k vertices, then G contains k disjoint AB -paths.*

Proof. The proof is an induction on the number of edges. With no edges the result is trivial. So assume G has an edge $e = xy$ and the result holds for $G' = G/e$.

Let A and B be sets in G . Let $A' = A \cap V(G')$ and add v_e to it if either of x or y are in A . Construct B' from B similarly. If G' has k disjoint $A'B'$ -paths then G clearly has k disjoint AB -paths, so we may assume that G' has at most $k - 1$ disjoint $A'B'$ -paths. By the induction hypothesis, G' contains an $A'B'$ -separator X' with $k - 1$ vertices. If v_e is not in X' then it is an AB -separator in G , which is impossible, so v_e is in X' . Let $X = X' \setminus \{v_e\} \cup \{x, y\}$. This is an AB -separator in G having k vertices.

Now, consider the graph $H = G \setminus e$.



Any AX -separator in H is an AX -separator in G , so is an AB -separator in G , so has at least k vertices. Similarly and XB -separator in H has at least k vertices. By induction there are k disjoint AX -paths in H and k disjoint XB paths. As $|X| = k$ we can patch them together at X , and get k disjoint AB -paths. \square

Two ab -paths P and Q in a graph are *internally disjoint* if $V(P) \cap V(Q) = \{a, b\}$.

Problem 4.4. Show that a graph (with at least $k+1$ vertices) is k -connected if and only if for every pair (a, b) of distinct vertices it contains a set of k ab -paths, any two of which are internally disjoint.

A graph is k -edge-connected if for any set S of $k-1$ edges, $G \setminus S$ is connected.

Problem 4.5. Show that a graph G is k -edge-connected if and only if it contains k edge-disjoint paths between any two vertices.

Hint Consider the *line graph* $L = L(G)$ of G . It is defined by $V(L) = E(G)$ and $ef \in E(L)$ if $|e \cap f| = 1$.

5 Planar Graphs

A graph G is *planar* if it can be drawn in the plane with no edges crossing. A drawing of the graph in the plane with no edges crossing is called a *plane graph* or an (*planar*) *embedding* of G .

Problem 5.1. Show that K_4 is planar but that K_5 is not.

We can show that K_5 is not planar by ad-hoc arguments, but such arguments difficult for larger graphs.

5.1 Euler's Formula and applications

A planar embedding of a graph G defines *faces* in the plane: the little bits of plane you get by cutting along all the edges of the embedded graph. Where $|V(G)| = n$ and $|E(G)| = m$ and f is the number of faces. Euler showed the following fundamental identity.

Theorem 5.1 (Euler's Formula). *For any embedding of a connected graph G in the plane,*

$$n - m + f = 2.$$

Proof. The proof is by induction on m . As G is connected, $m \geq n - 1$. If $m = n - 1$ then G is a tree, so there is only one face, and the identity holds. This is our base case.

Now assume that $m \geq n$. Then there is a non-cut edge e . Remove it. Its removal joins two faces, so reduces f by one, but also reduces m by one. So the identity holds from the induction hypothesis. \square

Corollary 5.2. *If G is connected and planar and $n \geq 3$, then*

$$m \leq 3n - 6.$$

Proof. Count the number N of pairs (e, r) where e is an edge, and r is a face with e on the boundary. We show that

$$f \leq \frac{2}{3}m,$$

plugging it into $2 = n - m + f = 2$ gives

$$2 \leq n - m + \frac{2}{3}m = n - m/3,$$

so $m \leq 3n - 6$ as needed.

If there is only one face, then $f \leq \frac{2}{3}m$ hold by the assumption that G is connected and $n \geq 3$. So we may assume that there are at least 2 faces. We count the number N of pairs (F, e) where F is a face containing the edge e . As every face has at least 3 edges, and every edge is in at most 2 faces, we have

$$3f \leq N \leq 2m$$

which gives us $f \leq \frac{2}{3}m$. □

Problem 5.2. 🐞 Use this corollary to show that K_5 is not planar. Improve it to show that $K_{3,3}$ is not planar.

Problem 5.3. 🐞 Show that any planar graph has a vertex of degree at most 5.

5.1.1 Dual Graphs

Given an embedding of a graph G we construct a (multi-)graph G^* , called the *dual of G* , from G as follows.

The vertices of G^* are

$$V(G^*) = \{v_f \mid f \text{ is a face of } G\}.$$

The edges are defined as follows. For every edge e of G let $e^* = v_f v_g$, where f and g are the faces of G incident to e . Then $E(G^*)$ is the **multiset**

$$E(G^*) = \{e^* \mid e \in E(G)\}.$$

(Note that both $V(G^*)$ and $E(G^*)$ depend on the particular embedding we chose for G .) Not only is G^* a multigraph, it can have loops.

Problem 5.4. Find conditions on a graph G so that its dual G^* has no loops. Find conditions on G so that its dual, under any embedding, has no multi-edges.

Problem 5.5. Show for an embedded planar graph G , the dual of the dual is G .

Problem 5.6. Show that the dual of an embedded graph is planar.

Problem 5.7. Show for an embedded planar graph G , the dual of the dual is G . Show this isn't true for a non-connected graph.

Theorem 5.3. Let G be planar and G^* the dual of an embedding of G . Then G is bipartite if and only if G^* is eulerian.

Proof. (Sketch) One way is easy. Let G be a bipartite graph embedded in the plane. We show that every vertex of G^* has even degree. We may assume that G has no leaves, as the removal of a leaf changes the degree of a vertex of G^* by 2. For any vertex v_f of G^* , the walk around the boundary of f is a closed walk. As G is bipartite, it is even, so v_f has even degree. This was for any vertex of G^* , so G^* is eulerian.


On the other hand, assume that G^* is eulerian. We want to show that every cycle of G is even. (This is clear of the boundary of faces under a given embedding but not of every cycle.) Fix an embedding of G .

Let C be a cycle in G , and let $A \subset F(G)$ be the set of faces inside C relative to the embedding. Then C is the symmetric difference of the edge sets of faces in A . Each face has an even number of edges, so so does their symmetric difference. Thus C is even. \square

5.1.2 The Platonic Solids

Recall that a *platonic solid* is a 3-dimensional convex solid bounded by f copies of the same flat face, such that every vertex (point of intersection of more than two faces) intersects the same number of faces.

There are 5 platonic solids:



It isn't the original proof, but Euler's formula gives a nice proof that these are the only platonic solids.

The set of vertices of such a solid and the set of edges (intersections of 2 faces) make up a regular graph, and it is not hard that this graph can be drawn in the plane so that every face has the same number of bounding edges.

(Recall a graph is regular if every vertex has the same degree.)

Theorem 5.4. *The only connected regular graphs that can be drawn in the plane with each face having the same number of edges, are the 5 we get from the platonic solids above, and cycles.*

Proof. Let G be a planar graph that is regular with degree d , and assume there is a planar drawing such that every face has b edges. Let f be the number of faces.

We have seen that the sum of the degrees of a graph is $2m$, so

$$2m = dn.$$

Summing the number of edges per face over all the faces, we get fb and clearly every edge was counted twice, so

$$fb = 2m.$$

By Euler's formula we then get that

$$2 = n - m + f = \frac{2m}{d} - m + \frac{2m}{b}$$


yielding

$$\frac{1}{m} = \frac{1}{d} - \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{b}$$

and so

$$\frac{1}{d} + \frac{1}{b} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{m}.$$

If $b, d \geq 4$ then $\frac{1}{d} + \frac{1}{b} \leq \frac{1}{2}$ so there is no solution to above equation. If one of b or d is 3 and the other is at least 6, the again there is no solution. (b can never be less than 3 as there is no face with 2 edges; if d is less than 3 then G can only be a cycle.) If $b = 3$ then the d can be 3 (tetrahedron), 4 (octahedron) or 5 (icosahedron). If $d = 3$ then b can be 3 (tetrahedron), 4 (cube), or 5 (dodecahedron). \square

Problem 5.8.  Let G be a 2-edge coloured plane graph. For each vertex v , cyclicly order the edges incident to v by how you encounter them as you travel in a circle around the vertex. Show that there is some vertex v in which all incident red edges occur consecutively.

5.2 Kuratowski's Theorem

So K_5 and $K_{3,3}$ are not planar. Is the Petersen graph? That K_5 is not planar tells us that a lot of other graphs are not planar.

5.2.1 Graph Minors

For a graph G , any graph M that can be formed from G by a series of vertex deletions, edge deletions, and edge contractions, is a minor of M .

It should be pretty clear that a graph with a K_5 or $K_{3,3}$ minor is not planar. Can you think of any other graphs that are not planar? Please don't look ahead. It will ruin the surprise.

Okay. Here's the surprise.

Theorem 5.5 (Kuratowski's Theorem). *A graph is planar if and only if it contains no K_5 or $K_{3,3}$ minor.*

Proof. Assume G has no K_5 or $K_{3,3}$ minor. The proof is by induction on $n+m$. The base case is trivial. Clearly we may assume G is connected. If it has a cut vertex then the induction is trivial, as we can always embed a planar graph with any vertex on the outside.

Claim 5.6. *We may assume that G is 3-connected.*


Proof. If not there is a separator $\{u, v\}$ separating H_1 and H_2 with $H_1 \cup H_2 = G$ and $H_1 \cap H_2 = \{u, v\}$. If $u \sim v$ then we can embed H_1 and H_2 and glue the embeddings together on $u \sim v$. So assume that $u \not\sim v$. Let $z_i \in H_1 \setminus \{u, v\}$. By Menger, there are two internally disjoint paths from z_1 to z_2 ; one must go through u and the other through v . These paths in H_2 imply that $H_1 + \{u, v\}$ is a minor of G and in H_1 imply that $H_2 + \{u, v\}$ is a minor. They are therefore both free of K_5 and $K_{3,3}$ minors, so can be embedded and then joined on $u \sim v$.



◇


Claim 5.7. *For all edges uv , $G \setminus uv$ is 2-connected.*

Proof. If not, there is a separator $H_1 \cap H_2 = \{u, v, w\}$. Where $z_1 \in H_1$ and $z_2 \in H_2$ there are 3 internally disjoint $z_1 z_2$ -paths. Let




be the minors they yield. They are embeddable so can be embedded with z on the outside as shown, and so can be patched together. ◇

Now let xy be an edge of G and let $G' = G/xy$ where $v = v_{xy}$. Then G' has no K_5 or $K_{3,3}$ minor, so can be embedded. Further, by the claim, $G' - v = G - xy$ is 2-connected, so the face on which v lived was a cycle C .



We expand v back to xy . Let X be the neighbours of x on C and Y those of Y . If $|X| < 2$ or $|Y| < 2$ then the expansion is trivial, so assume that both contain at least 2 vertices. Also $|X \cap Y| \leq 2$ or we have a K_5 minor. If there exist x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2 in that order around the cycle, then there is a $K_{3,3}$ minor. So some x_1 and x_2 in X split C into paths A and B , such that $X \subset A$ and $Y \subset B$.



So there is an embedding.

□

6 Graph Colouring

A (proper) k -colouring of a graph G is a function $f : V(G) \rightarrow [k]$ such that

$$u \sim v \Rightarrow f(u) \neq f(v).$$

If G has a k -colouring, it is k -colourable. The *chromatic number* $\chi(G)$ of G is the minimum k for which G is k -colourable. If $k = \chi(G)$, we also say that G is k -chromatic.

Problem 6.1. Show a graph is 2-colourable if and only if it has no odd cycles. (Use this to give an polynomial time algorithm to decide if a graph is 2-colourable.)

For any $k \geq 3$, it is an NP-complete problem to decide if a given graph is k -colourable. But there are several quick bounds we can get on the chromatic number.

The *clique number* $\omega(G)$ of a graph G is the maximum n such that K_n is a subgraph of G . The *independence number* $\alpha(G)$ is $\omega(\overline{G})$.

Problem 6.2. Show that $\chi(G) \geq \omega(G)$ and that $\chi(G) \geq n/\alpha(G)$.

Problem 6.3. Show that $\chi(G) \leq \sqrt{2m + 1/4} + 1/2$.

A graph is k -degenerate if its vertices can be ordered v_1, \dots, v_n such that for each i , v_i is adjacent to at most $k - 1$ vertices in $\{v_1, \dots, v_{i-1}\}$. The *degeneracy*, $\text{degen}(G)$, of G is the minimum k such that G is k -degenerate.

The greedy algorithm clearly gives

$$\chi(G) \leq \text{degen}(G) + 1.$$

Proposition 6.1. $\text{degen}(G) = \max\{\delta(H) \mid H \leq G\} + 1$

Proof. Clearly $\text{degen}(G) \geq \delta(H) + 1$ for any subgraph of H because for any ordering of the vertices of G , there is a last vertex of H , and $\delta(H)$ of its neighbours occurred previous to it.

On the other hand, consider the following ordering of $V(G)$. For $i = n$ to 1, let v_i be the vertex of minimum degree in $G|_{V \setminus \{v_n, \dots, v_{i+1}\}}$. Some vertex v_i has $\text{degen}(G) - 1$ neighbours in $G_i = G|_{\{v_1, \dots, v_i\}}$. And by choice of v_i this is the min-degree in G_i . So $\delta(G_i) = \text{degen}(G) - 1$. \square

Corollary 6.2. Every graph G with $\chi(G) = k$ has a subgraph H with $\delta(H) = k - 1$.

Conjecture 6.3 (Hadwiger '43). Any k -chromatic graph has a K_k -minor.

Hadwiger proved the case $k = 4$. The proof is difficult.

Theorem 6.4 (Brooks '41). *Let G be connected. If G is not an odd cycle or a clique. Then $\chi(G) \leq \Delta(G)$.*

Proof. The theorem is trivial if $\Delta(G) \leq 2$ so assume that $\Delta = \Delta(G) \geq 3$. We proceed by induction on $n = |G|$. Let v be vertex of G and let $H = G \setminus v$. Then $\chi(H) \leq \Delta$: indeed, if a component H' of H is a clique or odd cycle then $\Delta(H') < \Delta$ and so $\chi(H') \leq \Delta(H') + 1 \leq \Delta$; $\chi(H') \leq \chi(H) \leq \Delta(H) \leq \Delta$.

Fixing a Δ -colouring ϕ of H , we extend it to G . The following is clear:

Claim 6.5. *We may assume that $d_H(v) = \Delta$ and ϕ assigns a distinct colour to each vertex.*


Call the neighbour of v_1, \dots, v_i and assume that $\phi(v_i) = i$ for all i . Let H_{ij} be the subgraph of H induced by vertices of colours i and j .

Claim 6.6. *For $i \neq j$, v_i and v_j lie in the same component C_{ij} of H_{ij} .*

Proof. Assume they don't and let C be the component of H_{ij} that contains v_i . If we toggle the colours on C , that is, replace ϕ with the colouring ϕ' we get by setting

$$\phi'(x) = \begin{cases} i & \text{if } x \in C \text{ and } \phi(x) = j \\ j & \text{if } x \in C \text{ and } \phi(x) = i \\ \phi(x) & \text{if otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then ϕ' is a Δ -colouring and has $\phi'(v_i) = j = \phi'(v_j)$. So we are done by Claim 6.5. \diamond

Problem 6.4.  Show the following two claims.

Claim 6.7. *For $i \neq j$, C_{ij} is a path from v_i to v_j .*

Claim 6.8. *For distinct i, j, k , $C_{ij} \cap C_{jk} = v_j$.*

Now, if the vertices of $\{v_1, \dots, v_\Delta\}$ are pairwise adjacent then G is a clique, and we are done, so wlog $v_1 \not\sim v_2$.

Let $u \sim v_1$ in $C_{1,2}$. Toggle the colours in $C_{1,3}$ giving a new colouring ϕ' of H . We have that $\phi'(u) = \phi(u) = 2$, so $u \in C''_{2,3}$. But u is still in a 1, 2-path from v_2 , so is in $C'_{1,2}$, contradicting the last claim. \square

For planar graphs, omitting 3-cycles reduces the maximum possible chromatic number from 4 to 3. This doesn't help in general

7 Graph Homomorphisms

See the book **Graphs and Homomorphisms** by Hell and Nešetřil [3] for this material.

Given two graphs G and H , a homomorphism $\phi : G \rightarrow H$ is a vertex mapping $\phi : V(G) \rightarrow V(H)$ that preserves edges:

$$u \sim_G v \Rightarrow \phi(u) \sim_H \phi(v).$$

The language of homomorphisms is useful for much graph terminology:

- A walk of length n in a graph H is a homomorphism of a P_n to H .
- It is a trail if the homomorphism is edge-injective and a path if the homomorphism is vertex-injective.
- A k -colouring of a graph G is a homomorphism of G to K_k .
- A graph is bipartite if and only if it admits a homomorphism to K_2 .
- A graph is bipartite if and only if it admits no homomorphism from an odd cycle.

Problem 7.1. Show that the relation $G \rightarrow H$ is a transitive reflexive relation on the class of all graphs, but not asymmetric.

Two graphs G and H are *homomorphically equivalent* if $G \rightarrow H$ and $H \rightarrow G$.

Problem 7.2. Let $[H]$ be the set of graphs that are homomorphically equivalent to a graph H . Show that, upto isomorphism, there is a unique smallest (wrt number of vertices) graph C in $[H]$. This graph C is the *core* of H .

Homomorphism defines a partial order on the family of cores: $G \leq H$ if $G \rightarrow H$.

Problem 7.3. Does the graph homomorphism order have a maximum or minimum element. (We consider only finite graphs.)

Clearly

$$K_1 \rightarrow K_2 \rightarrow K_3 \rightarrow K_4 \rightarrow \dots$$

is an infinite ascending chain in this order and

$$\dots \rightarrow C_{11} \rightarrow C_9 \rightarrow C_7 \rightarrow C_5 \rightarrow C_3$$

is an infinite descending chain.

An *antichain* in the homomorphism order is a set of graphs amongst which there are no homomorphisms.

Theorem 7.1 (Mycielski 1955). *For $k \geq 3$ there is a k -chromatic graph containing no K_3 .*

Proof. For a graph G let the Mycielski graph $M = M(G)$ be the graph defined as follows.

$$V(M) = \{w_0\} \cup \bigcup_{v_i \in V(G)} \{v_i, u_i\}$$

$$E(M) = \bigcup \{u_i v_j, v_i v_j \mid v_i v_j \in E(G)\} \cup \{w_0 u_i \mid v_i \in V(G)\}.$$

Problem 7.4. Show that if G is K_3 -free then $M(G)$ is and that $\chi(M) = \chi(G) + 1$

The proof follows by induction, starting with $G = C_5$. □

Problem 7.5. Alter Mycielski's construction to show that for every odd $g \geq 3$ there is a g -chromatic graph with odd girth $2g + 1$.

Problem 7.6. Show that there are infinite antichains in the homomorphism order.

A pair (A, B) is a *gap* in the homomorphism order if $A < B$ and there is no graph C such that $A < C < B$.

Problem 7.7. Show that (K_1, K_2) is a gap.

We will show that (K_1, K_2) is the only gap in the homomorphism order. This also follows from Problem 7.5 but uses a couple more nice little ideas.

Mycielski's result can be strengthened as follows. The proof uses the probabilistic method; we will see it later.

Theorem 7.2 (Erdős 1959). *For all $g, k \geq 3$ there exist graphs of girth g and chromatic number k .*

7.1 Products and the Exponential Graph

The (*categorical*) *product* $G \times H$ of two graphs G and H is defined by $V(G \times H) = V(G) \times V(H)$ and

$$(g, h) \sim (g', h') \iff g \sim g' \text{ and } h \sim h'.$$

Problem 7.8. Show that $G \times H$ has the following property, (which means that it is the *product* in the category of graphs).

For any graph R with homomorphisms $g : R \rightarrow G$ and $h : R \rightarrow H$, there is a unique homomorphism $f : R \rightarrow G \times H$ such that $g = \pi_1 \circ f$ and $h = \pi_2 \circ f$.

A graph K is *multiplicative* if $G \times H \rightarrow K$ implies that $G \rightarrow K$ or $H \rightarrow K$.

Hedetniemi conjectured that all complete graphs are multiplicative:

Conjecture 7.3 (Hedetniemi). *If the product $G \times H$ is k -colourable, then one of its factors G or H is k -colourable.*

This was proved for $k = 3$ by El-zahar and Sauer in 1985. The proof is quite difficult. The conjecture is still open for $k \geq 4$.

Problem 7.9. Rödl and Pudlack showed that the Hedetniemi conjecture is not true if we allow G and H to be digraphs. Let T be the transitive tournament on 4 vertices; that is $V(T) = \{1, \dots, 4\}$ and $i \rightarrow j \iff i < j$; and let S be T with the arc $(1, 4)$ reversed. Viewing K_3 as the digraph on 3 vertices with 6 arcs, show that $T \not\rightarrow K_3$ and $S \not\rightarrow K_3$ but $T \times S \rightarrow K_3$.

For graphs G and H , let the *exponential graph* H^G has as its vertices the set of mappings (not homomorphisms) of $V(G)$ to $V(H)$. Two maps ϕ and ϕ' are adjacent if $\phi(g) \sim \phi'(g')$ for all edges $g \sim g'$ of G .

Proposition 7.4. *For graphs F, G and H we have*

- $H^{G+F} \cong H^G \times H^F$
- $H^{G \times F} \cong (H^G)^F$
- $F \times G \rightarrow H$ if and only if $F \rightarrow H^G$.

Proof. i) We claim that $\Phi : H^{G+F} \rightarrow H^G \times H^F$ defined for a map $\phi \in H^{G+F}$ by $\Phi(\phi) = (\phi|_G, \phi|_F)$ is an isomorphism. It is clearly a bijection as $\phi \neq \phi'$ if and only if ϕ and ϕ' differ on some vertex g of G or f of F , if and only if $\phi|_G$ differs from $\phi'|_G$ or $\phi|_F$ differs from $\phi'|_F$.

To see that it is an isomorphism show that if $\phi \sim \psi$ in H^{G+F} if and only if then $\phi|_G \sim \psi|_G$ in H^G and $\phi|_F \sim \psi|_F$ in H^F . Both are true if and only if $\phi|_G(g) = \psi|_G(g) \sim \psi|_G(g')$ for every $g \sim g'$ in G and blah blah for F .

ii) Exercise (Or see Hell Nešetřil.)

iii) This is immediate from ii) as $H^{G \times F}$ has a loop if and only if $(H^G)^F$ does. \square

Theorem 7.5. *The only gap in the homomorphism order is (K_1, K_2) .*

Proof. We must show that if $(G, H) \neq (K_1, K_2)$ and $G \rightarrow H$ (but $G \not\rightarrow H$), then there is a graph M such that $G \rightarrow M \rightarrow H$ (but $G \not\rightarrow M \not\rightarrow H$).

The graph $M = G + (Z \times H)$ will do, where Z is a graph, from Problem 7.5, of odd girth greater than the odd girth of G having chromatic number greater than the chromatic number of G^H .

Indeed, G maps to the copy of G in M , and as $G \rightarrow H$ and $Z \times H \xrightarrow{\pi_3} H$, we have that $M \rightarrow H$. On the other hand as Z has large odd girth, so does $Z \times H$, and so $H \not\rightarrow Z \times H$, we also have $H \not\rightarrow G$, so $H \not\rightarrow M$. Finally, if $M \rightarrow G$, then in particular $Z \times H \rightarrow G$ and so $Z \rightarrow G^H$; but Z has larger chromatic number than G^H , so this is impossible.

□

7.2 H -Colouring Dichotomy

For a graph H the problem of H -colouring denoted $\text{Hom}(H)$ is to decide for a given instance G whether or not there is a homomorphism $G \rightarrow H$.

As 3-colouring is difficult, or NP -complete, we have that $\text{Hom}(K_3)$ is NP -complete.

Problem 7.10. 🧠 Show that $\text{Hom}(H)$ can be decided in polynomial time.

What about for other graphs? Hell and Nes etřil showed the following in 1990.

Theorem 7.6. For any H containing an odd cycle, $\text{Hom}(H)$ is NP -complete.

The proof of this uses a series of polynomial reductions.

Example 7.7 (Proof that C_5 is in NPC). Let C_5 have vertices $1, \dots, 5$ with vertices being adjacent if they are consecutive mod 5. Let P be a path on the four vertices v_1, \dots, v_4 with vertices being adjacent if their indices are consecutive.

Given an instance G of $\text{Hom}(K_5)$, let the graph G^* be constructed from G by the following construction. For every original edge uv of G , remove uv and add a new copy of P by identifying the vertices v_1 and v_4 in the copy of P with the vertices u and v of G respectively.

Notice that there for $i \neq j \in \{1, \dots, 5\}$ there are C_5 -colourings ϕ_{ij} of P such that $\phi_{ij}(v_1) = i$, and $\phi_{ij}(v_4) = j$; however, there is no C_5 -colouring of P that takes both v_1 and v_4 to the same image. One can thus verify that

$$G^* \rightarrow C_5 \iff G \rightarrow K_5.$$

Thus $K_5 <_{NP} C_5$, and so because K_5 is in NPC , so is C_5 .

Problem 7.11. 🧠 Using a similar indicator construction as in the example above, prove that if $\text{Hom}(H)$ is NP -complete for all graphs containing a triangle, then it is true for all graphs containing an odd cycle.

The rest of the proof of Theorem 7.6 takes some work. But it follows easily from a (much stronger) result of Barto and Kozik which holds for all relational structures H .

A homomorphism $\phi : H^d \rightarrow H$ is a *cycle term* if

$$\phi(v_1, \dots, v_n) = \phi(v_2, \dots, v_n, v_1) = \dots = \phi(v_n, v_1, \dots, v_{n-1}).$$

Theorem 7.8. *If H has no cycle term of arity p , for any given prime $p > |V(H)|$, then $\text{Hom}(H)$ is NP-complete.*

Now let H be a simple graph containing an odd cycle. Let p be an odd prime greater than n . By the theorem, if we can show that H has no cycle term or arity p , then $\text{Hom}(H)$ is NP-complete. Assume it has a p -cycle term.

Problem 7.12. Show that if H has an odd cycle of length $g \leq p$ for p odd, then it has a closed circuit $v_1 \sim v_2 \sim \dots \sim v_p \sim v_1$ of length p .

But then

$$\phi(v_1, \dots, v_p) = \phi(v_2, \dots, v_p, v_1)$$

and

$$\phi(v_1, \dots, v_p) \sim \phi(v_2, \dots, v_p, v_1)$$

which means that H contains a loop. But this is a contradiction.

The converse of the Theorem 7.8 is an open conjecture.

Conjecture 7.9 (CSP-dichotomy conjecture). *If a digraph (or any relational structure) H has a cycle term, then $\text{Hom}(H)$ is polynomial time solvable.*

We know this is true if H has a totally symmetric idempotent ϕ :

$$\phi(v_1, \dots, v_n) = \phi(v_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, v_{\sigma(n)})$$

for all permutations σ of $[n]$.

8 Colouring Planar Graphs

We saw that every graph G with $\chi(G) = k$ has a subgraph H with $\delta(H) = k - 1$. So we get the following.

In fact, more is true:

Theorem 8.1. *(The Four-Colour Theorem [Haken-Appel 1976]) Any planar graph is 4-colourable.*

The proof of the Four-Colour Theorem is very long and difficult. This is slightly easier, but still interesting:

Theorem 8.2 (Heawood 1890 (based on Kempe)). *Any planar graph is 5-colourable.*

Proof. (Sketch)

- Induction on $n = |V(G)|$, so we may assume that $n \geq 6$.
- By Euler's theorem there is a vertex v of degree at most 5, and by induction $G \setminus \{v\}$ has a 5-colouring, giving its neighbours v_1, \dots, v_5 , embedded cyclically, distinct colours.
- There is a $\{1, 3\}$ -path between v_1 and v_3 or recolour á la Brooke's.
- With v this is a cycle separating v_2 and v_4 .
- v_2 and v_4 cannot be in same component of $\{2, 4\}$ -subgraph of G .

□

Problem 8.1. This proof is based on an incorrect proof of the 4-colour Theorem by Kempe. Find the incorrect proof of the 4-colour Theorem on the internet.


8.1 List Colourings

For a graph G a *set of lists* is a function $L : V(G) \rightarrow 2^{\mathbb{Z}}$. A function $\phi : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ is a *list colouring* of (G, L) if it is a proper colouring of G and $\phi(v) \in L(v)$ for all $v \in V(G)$.

A graph G is k -list-colourable if there is a list colouring of (G, L) for any list L such that $|L(v)| = k$ for all v . The *list chromatic number* $\chi_L(G)$ of G is the minimum k for which G is k -list-colourable.

Clearly $\chi(G) \leq \chi_L(G)$ as one can take $L(v) = [k]$ for all v . And I know you think we have equality, because the lists are most restrictive when they are the same. But that isn't actually true.

Try to find a colouring of this set of lists for $K_{3,3}$



Problem 8.2. Find a bipartite graph B with $\chi_L(B) = k$ for any $k > 2$.

Thomassen proved the following.

Theorem 8.3. *Every planar graph is 5-list colourable.*

Proof. We actually prove the following stronger statement. Let G be a plane graph in which every face, but possibly the outer face, is a triangle. Let $v_1 \sim v_2$ be an edge on the boundary B of the outer face. Then (G, L) has a list colouring for any set of lists L satisfying

- $|L(v)| \geq 5$ for $v \notin B$
- $|L(v)| \geq 3$ for $v \in B \setminus \{v_1, v_2\}$
- $|L(v_1)| = |L(v_2)| = 1$.

The proof is by induction on $n = |V(G)|$, and is clear if $n = 2$.

Case B isn't a cycle: Then there is a cut-vertex $u \in B$ separating G into G_1 and G_2 . We may assume that v_1 and v_2 are in G_1 . By induction G_1 has an L -colouring ϕ_1 . On G_2 , reduce the list $L(u)$ to $\phi_1(u)$ and the list of some neighbour in B to size 1. Then the list on G_2 meet the conditions above, so there is a colouring. This yields an L colouring of G .

Case B has a chord uw : Then $u \sim w$ is the intersection of a 2-separation $G_1 \cup G_2$ of G . Again we may assume that v_1 and v_2 are in G_1 , and get that G_1 has an L colouring ϕ_1 by induction. Reducing the lists of u and w in G_2 we still get a good set of lists, so can colour it.

Case B is an induced cycle: Let v_3 be the other neighbour of v_2 in B , and let $v_2, u_1, \dots, u_k, v_4$ be a cyclic ordering of the neighbours of v_3 . $L(v_3)$ contains two colours a and b not in $L(v_2)$. Removing v_3 from the graph and the colours a and b from the lists of u_1, \dots, u_k and v_4 (unless $v_4 = v_1$), we can list colour $G \setminus \{v_3\}$ by induction. Replacing v_3 , possibly v_4 has been coloured a or b , but one of them is available to colour v_3 . \square

8.2 Discharging

Discharging is a beautiful technique that has yielded many difficult results. We see how a simple example of it is used to give the following technical Lemma which is used in the proof of the 4-colour theorem.

Lemma 8.4. *Let G be a triangulation of the plane. Then one of the following is true*

- i. G has a vertex of degree ≤ 4 .*
- ii. G has two adjacent vertices of degree 5.*

iii. G has a triangle with vertices of degrees 5 and 6.

Proof. Assuming i) is false we show that ii) or iii) hold.

Start by assigning an initial charge $f_0(v) = 3(6 - d(v))$ to every vertex v . By Euler's formula we have that

$$12 = 6n - 2m = \sum_V (6 - d(v))$$

so $\sum_v f_0(v) = 36$ is the total initial charge.

Now, for every vertex v of degree 5, and every neighbour v' of v of degree at least 7, move a charge of 1 from v to v' , and let $f_1 : V \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ be the final charge function. Clearly f_1 satisfies $\sum_V f_1(v) = 36$, so there is some vertex u with $f_1(u) > 0$. If u has degree 5, then since it started with charge 3, it has at most 2 neighbours of degree greater than 6. So either it has a neighbour of degree 5 or adjacent neighbours of degree 6.

Also u cannot have degree 6 as such vertices have initial and final charge 0.


If u has degree 7, then it started with charge -3 , so has at least 4 neighbours of degree 5, two of which must be adjacent.

If u has degree 8, then it started with charge -6 so has at least 7 neighbours of degree 5, two of which must be adjacent.


u cannot have degree 9 because then it had initial charge -9 and this could not be made positive with 9 neighbours. \square

Using a similar Lemma, one can show that a planar graph must contain one of about 600 special subgraphs. One can then replace these with smaller subgraphs and use induction. One such examples is the following.

Problem 8.3. Let G be a planar graph containing the subgraph



show that it can be 4-coloured if the graph G' we get from it by replacing the above subgraph with the following one can be 4-coloured.



(We contract edges ax and xb , w, y and z , and add edge fd .)

9 Extremal Graph Theory

The basic idea of Extremal Graph Theory is to find the largest (smallest) graph with (without) a given property. Largest (smallest) can refer to the number n of vertices or m of edges, but often n is fixed, and largest refers to m .

9.1 Turan's Theorem

For a graph H , the *extremal number* $\text{ex}(n, H)$ for H is the maximum number of edges a graph on n vertices can have without containing a copy of H as a subgraph.

The Turan graph $T_{k-1}(n)$ is the complete $(k-1)$ -partite graph with vertex partition

$$V = V_1 \cup V_2 \cup \dots \cup V_{k-1}$$

where

$$|V_1| \leq |V_2| \leq \dots \leq |V_{k-1}| \leq |V_1| + 1.$$

When $n = q(k-1)$ for integer q , this has $\binom{k-1}{2}q^2 = \frac{k-2}{2(k-1)}n^2$ edges.

Problem 9.1. Find a general formula for the size $t_{k-1}(n)$ of $T_{k-1}(n)$.

Theorem 9.1. [Turan 1941] For all $n \geq k > 1$, $\text{ex}(n, K_k) = t_{k-1}(n)$.

Proof. It is enough to show that the maximum number of edges in a graph omitting K_k is a complete multipartite—by convexity the Turan graph has the most edges for a fixed number of parts, and the edges count increases in the number of parts, which is bounded by $k-1$, so this will do.

Let G be an extremal K_k -free graph on n vertices. If it is not complete multipartite, then there are adjacent vertices y_1 and y_2 with common non-neighbour x . If $d(y_1) > d(x)$, then deleting x and replacing it with a clone of y_1 gives a K_k -free graph with more edges; a contradiction. On the other hand, if $d(y_1), d(y_2) \leq d(x)$, then removing y_1 and y_2 and cloning x twice gives a K_k -free graph with more edges. \square

Problem 9.2. Show that when we add an edge to $T_{k-1}(n)$ we get not only one copy of K_k , but at least $\lfloor \frac{n}{k-1} \rfloor^{k-2}$ of them.

This is not only true of the Turan graphs.

Theorem 9.2. [Erdős-Stone '46] For all integers $k \geq 2$ and $s \geq 1$, and every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists an integer n_0 such that every graph with $n \geq n_0$ vertices and at least $t_{k-1}(n) + \varepsilon n^2$ edges, contains a $K_{s,s,\dots,s}$ (with k 's's).

We will prove this later with the regularity lemma.

9.2 Ramsey Theory

Ramsey showed the following.

Theorem 9.3. *For all $s, t \geq 3$ there exists a number n such that for any red-blue colouring of the edges of K_n there is either a red K_s or a blue K_t .*

The *ramsey number* $r(s, t)$ is the minimum such n . The ramsey numbers that we know are:

s, t	3	4	5
3	6		
4	9	18	
5	14	25	43 – 49
6	18	35 – 41	58 – 87
7	23	49 – 61	80 – 143

Problem 9.3. 🐼 Show that for all $t \geq 3$, $r(t, t) < 2^{2t}$.

The proof of the following theorem is one of the early uses of the probabilistic method, which we will see more of, in the next section.

Theorem 9.4 (Erdős). *For all $t \geq 3$ we have $r(t, t) > 2^{t/2}$*

Proof. Red-blue colour the edges of K_n as by letting each edge (independently) be blue with probability $1/2$. For a random set S of vertices, the probability that S induces a mono-chromatic K_t is

$$2 \cdot \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{\binom{t}{2}} = 2^{1-\binom{t}{2}}.$$

There are $\binom{n}{t}$ such sets, so the probability that at least one is monochromatic is less than

$$\binom{n}{t} \frac{2}{2^{\binom{t}{2}}} < \frac{n^t}{t!} \frac{2}{2^{\binom{t}{2}}} = \frac{n^t}{2^{t^2/2}} \frac{2}{t!} < \frac{n^t}{2^{t^2/2}}.$$

Setting $n = 2^{t/2}$, this is less than 1, so some random colouring of K_n yields no mono-chromatic K_t . □

More generally we can define $R(H_r, H_b)$ for two graphs H_r and H_b as the minimum n such that for any red-blue colouring of the edges of K_n there is a red copy of H_r or a blue copy of H_b .

This is clearly equivalent to finding the minimum n such that for any graph G on n vertices, either G contains a copy of H_r or \overline{G} contains a copy of H_b .

Problem 9.4. For a tree T on t vertices, find $R(T, K_s)$.

We will show the following, once we have seen the regularity lemma.

Theorem 9.5 (Chvatal, Rödl, Szemerédi, Trotter '83). *For all Δ there exists $c_\Delta > 0$ such that for all H with $\Delta(H) \leq \Delta$ we have $R(H, H) < c_\Delta |V(H)|$.*

9.3 VanDerWaerden

The *Van Der Waerden number* $W(2, l)$ is the smallest n such that an 2-colouring of $[n]$ yields a monochromatic arithmetic progression of length l . Van Der Waerden proved such numbers exist, in 1927. (They still exist.)

Problem 9.5. Show that $W(2, 5) < 325$.

The best known bound for $W(k, l)$ is

$$W(k, l) < 2^{2^{k \cdot 2^{l+9}}}$$

by Gowers. Graham offers \$1000 for showing

$$W(2, l) < 2^{k^2}.$$

10 Probabilistic Method

We saw one proof using the probabilistic Method in Section 9.2. Proofs like this are simply counting proofs.

Consider the following two proofs of a simple result. They are essentially the same proof.

Proposition 10.1. *Every graph G has a bipartite subgraph H with $m_H \geq m_G/2$.*

Counting proof. Count the number P of pairs (S, e) where S is a subset of $V(G)$ and $e = \{u, v\}$ is an edge of G with one endpoint in S . We choose the edge, then endpoint, and then the other elements of S ; so

$$P = m_G \cdot 2 \cdot 2^{n-2} = m_G 2^{n-1}.$$

There are 2^n different subsets S , so one is counted in at least $m_G/2$ pairs. H is the bipartite subgraph of G induced by the partite sets S and $V(G) \setminus S$. \square

Probabilistic Version. Randomly choose a subset S of $V(G)$ by putting each vertex v of G in S with probability $1/2$. Let H be the bipartite subgraph of G

induced by partite sets S and $V(G) \setminus S$. We show that the expected number of edges in H is at least $m_G/2$. Indeed, each edge of G is in H with probability $1/2$. So the expected number of edges in H is $\sum_{e \in G} 1/2 = m_G/2$.

It follows that there is some choice of S so that the induced subgraph H has at least $m_G/2$ edges. \square

10.1 Random Graphs

The *Erdős Rényi Random Graph* $G_{n,p}$ on n vertices $[n]$ is constructed as follows. For each pair of vertices u, v the edge (u, v) is in $G_{n,p}$ with probability p , independent of the existence of other edges.

Formally, the random graph $G_{n,p}$ as a probability space, containing the $2^{\binom{n}{2}}$ (labelled) graphs on n vertices. The probability that $G_{n,p}$ is a given graph H on the vertices $[n]$ depends on the number of edges of H . If H has $|E(H)| = m$ edges, then the probability that $G_{n,p} = H$ is $p^m(1-p)^{\binom{n}{2}-m}$.

Computing the probability that $G_{n,p}$ contains an isomorphic copy of a certain subgraph is a little harder. But a starting point is to look at the expected number of copies of a subgraph.

Technically, we define a random variable $X_H = X_H(G_{n,p})$ that counts the copies of a subgraph H , and use the linearity of expectation to find its expected value.

The expected number of edges, or copies of K_2 in $G_{n,p}$ is $\sum_{u \neq v \in [n]} p = p \cdot \binom{n}{2}$. To find the expected number of k -cycles we observe that there are $n!/2k(n-k)!$ possible k -cycles on $[n]$ and that each occurs in $G_{n,p}$ with probability p^k . So the expected number of k -cycles is

$$n!/2k(n-k) \cdot p^k < (np)^k/k2$$

More generally, the expected number of cycles of length less than or equal to k is

$$\sum_{i=3}^k \frac{n^i p^i}{2i} < (k-2)(np)^k.$$

Now think of p as a function of n . If $p < n$, that is, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p/n < 1$ then the expected number C of cycles of length k or less is $o(1)$.

Markov's inequality allows us to use expected value to bound the probability of an event:

For any positive random variable X

$$Prob(X \geq a) \leq E(X)/a,$$

where $E(X)$ is the expected value of X .

Note

$f(x) = o(g(x))$:

$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(x)}{g(x)} = 0$.

Apply this to the RV X that counts the cycles in $G_{n,p}$. If $p < n$ then the expected number of cycles $E(X)$ is less than ε for large enough n , so Markov's inequality gives us that the probability that $G_{n,p}$ has a cycle, i.e. that $X \geq 1$ is less than ε .

That is, when $p < n$, $G_{n,p}$ is *asymptotically almost surely (aas)* acyclic: the probability that $G_{n,p}$ is acyclic goes to 1 as n goes to ∞ .

Problem 10.1. Show that when $p = 1/n$ the expected number of cycles of any length is less than $\ln(n/2)$.

Problem 10.2. Show that if $1/n = o(p)$ then $G_{n,p}$ has a cycle asymptotically almost surely.

Note

In fact, letting p increase from 0 to 1 we can look at $G_{n,p}$ as evolving from the empty graph on n vertices to the complete graph. Some epochs of the evolution are as follows.

- If $p = o(1/n)$ then $G_{n,p}$ is asymptotically almost surely a forest.
- If $p = c/n$ for $c < 1$ then $G_{n,p}$ is aas a union of single cycle components.
- If $p = c/n$ for $c > 1$ then $G_{n,p}$ aas has a giant component of $\Theta(n^{2/3})$ vertices.
- If $p = c \log n/n$ then $G_{n,p}$ is aas connected.

Now, we prove Theorem 7.2, which says that there is a graph of girth at least g and chromatic number at least k .

Proof of Theorem 7.2. The main idea is to choosing p so that $G_{n,p}$

- has at most $n/2$ cycles of length at most k , with probability less than $1/2$
- has an independent set of size at least $n/2k$, with probability less than $1/2$.

It follows that there exists a graph on n vertices with both of these properties. Then we can kill all cycles of length k or less by removing at most $n/2$ vertices. The remaining graph has at least $n/2$ vertices and independent set of size at most $n/2k$, so has chromatic number at least k . This is enough.

Let $k \geq 3$ be given. To choose p , fix some ε with $0 < \varepsilon < 1/k$ such that

$$\frac{6k \ln n}{n} < \frac{n^\varepsilon}{n} < \frac{n^{1/k}}{n},$$

and let $p = n^\varepsilon/n$.

We first show that the probability that the independence number α of $G = G_{n,p}$ is greater than $n/2k$ goes to 0 as n goes to ∞ . Indeed, the probability that $G_{n,p}$ has an independent set of size t (or greater) is less than

$$\binom{n}{t} (1-p)^{\binom{t}{2}} < \left(n(1-p)^{(t-1)/2} \right)^t \leq (ne^{-p(t-1)/2})^t$$

where the last inequality uses that $1-x < e^{-x}$ for $x > 0$.

Using, in this, that $p \geq \frac{6k \ln n}{n}$ and $t > n/(2k)$ we get that

$$\begin{aligned} ne^{-p(t-1)/2} &< ne^{-\frac{pt}{2} + \frac{p}{2}} \\ &\leq ne^{-\frac{3 \ln n}{2} + \frac{p}{2}} \\ &\leq nn^{-3/2} e^{p/2} \\ &\leq n^{-1/2} e^{1/2} = \sqrt{e}/\sqrt{n} \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

Now we show that the probability that the number of cycles of length k is less is greater than $n/2$, also goes to 0. Indeed, using Markov's inequality and the expected number of cycles we computed above, this probability is at most

$$(k-2)n^{k-1}p^k = (k-2)n^{k-1}n^{(\varepsilon-1)k} = (k-2)n^{k\varepsilon-1} < (k-2)n^{\varepsilon-1} \rightarrow 0.$$

As both probabilities go to 0, we have for large enough n that they are both less than $1/2$, as needed. □

11 Regularity Lemma

The Regularity Lemma says that any big enough graph can be 'almost' partitioned up into 'random-like' bipartite graphs.

Let R be a random bipartite graph with partite sets X and Y such that for each $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$ the edges xy is in R with probability p .

We can count the expected number of $K_{t,t}$ in R :

$$\binom{|X|}{t} \binom{|Y|}{t} \cdot p^{t^2};$$

and so taking $|X|, |Y| > tp^{-t/2}$ we expect at least

$$\left(\frac{tp^{-t/2}}{t} \right)^2 p^{t^2} > \left(\frac{tp^{-t/2}}{t} \right)^{2t} p^{t^2} = 1$$

copies of $K_{t,t}$.

In a regular bipartite graph, we should be able to do close to the same: for some edge-density d analogous to a probability, we want so say that if the edge sets are of size at least $td^{-t/2}$, then we get a copy of $K_{t,t}$.

For vertex sets X and Y in a graph G , let $|X, Y|$ be the number of edges in the bipartite subgraph of G induced between X and Y . The *density* between X and Y is

$$d(X, Y) = \frac{|X, Y|}{|X| \cdot |Y|}.$$

A pair X, Y of sets is ε -regular if for all $A \subset X$ and $B \subset Y$ with $|A| > \varepsilon|X|$ and $|B| > \varepsilon|Y|$ we have

$$|d(A, B) - d(X, Y)| < \varepsilon.$$

Lemma 11.1 (Bipartite Blowup Lemma). *Given any density $\delta > 0$ and integers $s, t \geq 1$ there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that the following holds. If X and Y are an ε -regular pair of sets (in a graph G), with density $d(X, Y) > \delta + \varepsilon$, and $|X| > t(\delta^{-s})$ and $|Y| > 2s$, then there is a copy of $K_{t,s}$ between X and Y in G .*

Proof. Assume s, t, δ, n and X, Y satisfy the setup of the lemma. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be such that $\varepsilon < \delta^{s-1}$. Where $d = d(X, Y)$, we have that $d - \varepsilon > \delta$. Let $n = |X|$ and $m = |Y|$. Let $X = X_0$ and $Y = Y_0$. For $i = 1 \rightarrow s$, let

- y_i be a maximum degree vertex of Y_{i-1} ,
- $Y_i = Y_{i-1} \setminus \{y_i\}$, and
- $X_i = N_{X_{i-1}}(y_i)$.

Clearly always $|Y_i| > \varepsilon|Y|$. By induction we get that $|X_i| > \delta^i|X| > \varepsilon|X|$ so (X_i, Y_i) have density at least δ , so y_{i+1} has degree at least $\delta|X_i|$. Thus $|X_s| > \delta^s|X| > t$, and we are done: X_s and $\{y_1, \dots, y_t\}$ are the vertices of a $K_{t,s}$. \square

Recall that a partition $V = V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_t$ of a set V is equitable if

$$|V_1| \leq |V_2| \leq \dots \leq |V_t| \leq |V_1| + 1.$$

Theorem 11.2 (Szemerédi's Regularity Lemma). *For all $\varepsilon > 0$ and m , there exist M and N_0 such that for all graphs G with $N > N_0$ vertices, we have an equitable partition*

$$V(G) = V_1 \cup V_2 \cup \dots \cup V_t$$

for $m < t < M$ such that all but εt^2 of the pairs V_i, V_j are ε -regular

Proof. The proof of this can be found in Diestel. It is not terribly hard, but takes 4-5 pages in that text, so is a bit long for us. \square

Note

There are a number of parameters here, so the Regularity Lemma can be difficult to understand and use. Here are some points to keep in mind.

One should, of course, take ε small to be useful. This makes the regular sets very regular and allows few non-regular pairs.

The Lemma says nothing about edges in a set V_i , and so these are essentially wasted. There may be upto $t(N/t)^2 = N^2/t$ of these. Taking m large assures that t is large so that N^2/t is small. The Lemma only has teeth for fairly dense graphs: a graph should have cN^2 edges, where c is quite a bit bigger than $1/t$.

Also, if t is close to N , then sets the V_i are small; so ε -regularity doesn't mean much. This is why we need the bound M on t . We choose N much bigger than M . Usually we write $N = nt$, so sets have size n .

The proof of Erdős-Stone will use this this version of the Blowup Lemma.

THIS NEEDS FIXING. AS DOES THEN ERDOS STONE.

Lemma 11.3 (Clique Blowup Lemma). *For all densities $\delta > 0$, and integers s and $k \geq 3$ there exists $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_{s,k,\delta} > 0$ and $n = n_{s,k,\delta}$ such the following holds. For any family of k disjoint sets V_1, \dots, V_k of size at least n each, such that V_i and V_j is ε -regular (in a graph G) with density d at least $\delta + \varepsilon$ for all $i \neq j$, G contains k -partite $K_{s,s,\dots,s}$.*

Proof. For fixed δ (so we remove δ from the subscripts of our constants), the proof, for all s , is an induction on k using the bipartite blowup lemma. Indeed the bipartite blowup lemma gives the case $k = 2$ with $n_{s,2} = s\delta^{-s}$.

Now assume the lemma holds for $k-1$ and all s . Let $n_{s,k} = \max(s\delta^{-ks}, n_{s\delta^{-sk}, k-1})$ where NOPE. NO GOOD. $2s^* = \max(2s, \varepsilon n)$.

Let V_1, \dots, V_k be as in the statement of the lemma, having size $n > n_{s,k}$. Applying the Cliqu Blowup Lemma for δ, s and $k-1$ to V_1, \dots, V_{k-1} we get subsets of size $V'_i \subset V_i$ of size at least $2s$ each inducing

bipartite Blowup Lemma to V_1 and V_2 (with get a $K_{s\delta n(k-1), n(k-1)}$ on subset $V_1^1 \subset V_1$ and V_2^1 of V_2). Applying the case $i = 2$ to V_1^1 and V_3 we get a $K_{n(k-2), n(k-2)}$ on some subset V_1^2 of V_1^1 and V_3^1 of V_3 . Continuing, we get a $K_{n(1), n(1)}$ between $V_1^k \subset V_1$ and $V_i^1 \subset V_i$ for all i . Applying the $k-1$ case of the lemma to V_2^1, \dots, V_k^1 , we complete a k -partite $K_{s,s,\dots,s}$. \square

After applying the regularity lemma to a graph G we get a partition into t sets V_i . For a density d , with $0 < d \leq 1$, the d -partition graph of G is the graph $P(G)$ on the vertices $[t]$ such that ij is an edge if V_i, V_j is an ε -regular pair with $d(V_i, V_j) \geq d$.

Recall the Erdős-Stone theorem, Theorem 9.2.

Theorem 11.4. *For all integers $k \geq 2$ and $s \geq 1$, and every $\gamma > 0$ there*

exists an integer n_0 such that every graph with $n \geq n_0$ vertices and at least $t_{k-1}(n) + \gamma n^2$ edges, contains a $K_{s,s,\dots,s}$ (with k 's's).

Proof. Let $d = \gamma/4$. As we already have s and k , the Clique Blowup Lemma gives us ε_0 and n_0 such that if we can get an ε_0 -regular partition of a graph G into parts of size at least n_0 vertices, such that the d -partition graph contains a K_k , we are done.

So $d = \gamma/4$; let $m > 4/\gamma$ and $\varepsilon < \min(\gamma/4, \varepsilon_0)$. The regularity Lemma gives us M and N_0 such that if G has more than N_0 vertices it has an ε -regular partition into t sets with $m < t < M$.

Let G be a graph on $N > \max(N_0, Mn_0)$ vertices. The regularity Lemma gives us an ε -regular partition V_1, \dots, V_t . Let P be the d -partition graph of G . Set $n = N/t$.

As $t > m$ the number of edges of G that are within vertex sets is at most $t \cdot n^2 = t \cdot (N/t)^2 = N^2/t < N^2/m < \frac{\gamma}{4}N^2$. The number of edges in irregular pairs is at most $\varepsilon t^2 \cdot (N/t)^2 = \varepsilon N^2 < \frac{\gamma}{4}N^2$. The number of edges in regular pairs of density less than d is at most $dt^2(n/t)^2 = dN^2 < \frac{\gamma}{4}N^2$.

This means that there are still more than $t_{k-1}(N)$ edges of G between regular pairs of the partition having density at least d . As each such pair can have at most N^2 of these, they are in more than $t_{k-1}(N) \cdot (t/N)^2 = t_{k-1}(t)$ pairs. So the partition graph $P(G)$ has more than $t_{k-1}(t)$ edges, so contains a K_k , as needed.

□

The s -Blowup of a graph P is the graph we get by replacing each vertex i with a set S_i of s vertices, and if ij is an edge, putting all edges between S_i and S_j .

Problem 11.1. 🌀 Alter the proof of the Clique Blowup Lemma to prove that for any δ and Δ , there are ε and n such that for any ε -regular partition of a graph G into parts of size sn , any graph H of max degree Δ in the s -blowup of the $\delta + \varepsilon$ -partition graph $P(G)$, there is a copy of H in G .

Recall Theorem 9.5 of Chvatal, Rödl, Szemerédi, and Trotter.

Theorem 11.5. For all Δ there exists $c_\Delta > 0$ such that for all H with $\Delta(H) \leq \Delta$ we have $R(H, H) < c_\Delta |V(H)|$.

Sketch. For given Δ , let $k = r(\Delta, \Delta)$ and $\delta = 1/2k$. The (Problem following the) Blowup Lemma gives us n_0 and ε_0 .

Let M and N_0 be the constants given by the Regularity lemma for $\varepsilon = \min(\varepsilon_0, 1/2k)$ and $m > 1/\varepsilon$.

All constants above are independent of $|V(H)|$. As H has max degree Δ (and isn't a clique) it is Δ -colourable. The maximum number of vertices in a colour class is $s < |V(H)|$.

Let $N = \max Mn_0, N_0$ and consider a red-blue edge coloured K_{sN} . Now, we didn't prove it, so we don't know this, but in the proof of the regularity lemma, we are allowed to choose any initial partition of V into m parts V_1, \dots, V_m . When we do this, for each pair of parts V_i, V_j we keep only the red edges or blue edges, whichever there are more of. (Denote this red-blue subgraph of K_N by G .) By the Regularity Lemma there is an ε -regular t -partition of G , and G has at least $1/2 \binom{sN}{2}$ edges.

Calculating the number of edges in irregular or low density pairs (ie of density less than $d = 1/2k$) or within parts, we still have at least $(1 - 1/k)(sN)^2/2$ edges. So the d -partition graph $P(G)$ is red-blue coloured and has at least $(1 - 1/k)t^2/2$ edges. By Turan's theorem it contains a K_k which is two coloured, and as $k = r(\Delta, \Delta)$ this contains a monochromatic K_Δ , so the Δ -partite $K_{s, \dots, s}$ is in the s -blowup of P .

Each part V_i has $sN/t = sn$ vertices, so applying the Blowup Lemma we get a copy of H in G .

So $R(H, H) < sN$, where s depends on $|V(H)|$ and N is independent of it. \square

Problem 11.2.  Fill in the details.

References

- [1] M. Devos *Graph Theory Class Notes*
<http://www.sfu.ca/~mdevos/notes/graph/>
- [2] R. Diestel *Graph Theory (4th edition)* Springer 2010.
<http://diestel-graph-theory.com/>
- [3] P. Hell, J. Nešetřil *Graphs and Homomorphism* Oxford university press 2004.