

## Some Remarks on the Theory of Graphs

BAMS 1947

Theorem 1. Let  $k \geq 3$ . Then

$$2^{k/2} < f(k, k) \leq C_{2k-2, k-1} < 4^{k-1}$$

[...] Let  $N \leq 2^{k/2}$ . Clearly the number of different graphs of  $N$  vertices equals  $2^{N(N-1)/2}$ .

[...] The number of different graphs containing a given complete graph of order  $k$  is clearly  $2^{N(N-1)/2} / 2^{k(k-1)/2}$ . Thus the number of graphs of  $N \leq 2^{k/2}$  vertices containing a complete graph of order  $k$  is less than

$$C_{N,k} \frac{2^{N(N-1)/2}}{2^{k(k-1)/2}} < \frac{N^k 2^{N(N-1)/2}}{k! 2^{k(k-1)/2}} < \frac{2^{N(N-1)/2}}{2} \quad (1)$$

since by a simple calculation for  $N \leq 2^{k/2}$  and  $k \geq 3$

$$2N^k < k! 2^{k(k-1)/2}$$

But it follows immediately from (1) that there exists a graph such that neither it nor its complementary graph contains a complete subgraph of order  $k$ , which completes the proof of Theorem 1.

Graph Theory and Probability. II,  
Canad J Math 1961

Lemma 1. Almost all  $G_\alpha^n$  have the property that for every  $G^{(x)}$  there is an edge  $e_{\alpha,x}$  contained in both  $G_\alpha^n$  and  $G^{(x)}$ , which is not contained in any triangle whose edges are in  $G_\alpha^n$  and whose third vertex is not in  $G^{(x)}$ .

Lemma 5. Almost all  $G_\alpha^n$  have the property that for every  $G^{(x)}$  there are more than  $\frac{1}{2}\binom{x}{2}$  edges of  $G^{(x)}$  which do not occur in any triangle, the other two sides of which are in  $G_\alpha^n$  and whose third vertex is not in  $G^{(x)}$ .

Paul Erdős and Alfred Rényi

Magyar Tud Akad Mat Kut Int Közl 1960

ON THE *EVOLUTION* OF RANDOM GRAPHS

The study of the evolution of graphs leads to rather surprising results. For a number of fundamental structural properties  $A$  there exists a function  $A(n)$  tending monotonically to  $+\infty$  for  $n \rightarrow +\infty$  such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{n, N(n)}(A) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N(n)}{A(n)} = 0 \\ 1 & \text{if } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N(n)}{A(n)} = \infty \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

If such a function  $A(n)$  exists we shall call it a “*threshold function*” of the property  $A$ .

If a graph  $G$  has  $n$  vertices and  $N$  edges we call the number  $\frac{2N}{n}$  the “*degree*” of the graph.

[. . .] If a graph  $G$  has the property that  $G$  has no subgraph having a larger degree than  $G$  itself, we call  $G$  a *balanced* graph.

## THE DOUBLE JUMP

There is however a surprisingly abrupt change in the structure of  $\Gamma_{n,N}$  with  $N \sim cn$  when  $c$  surpasses the value  $\frac{1}{2}$ .

...

This double “jump” of the size of the largest component when  $\frac{N(n)}{n}$  passes the value  $1/2$  is one of the most striking facts concerning random graphs.



On a Combinatorial problem, I.

Nordisk Mat Tidskr 1963

Hajnal and I [2] recently published a paper on the property B and its generalizations. One of the unsolved problems we state asks: What is the smallest integer  $m(p)$  for which there exists a family  $F$  of finite sets  $A_1, \dots, A_{m(p)}$ , each having  $p$  elements, which does not possess property B?

Theorem 1. Let  $\{A_i\}$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq k$  be a family  $F$  of finite sets,  $|A_i| = \alpha_i \geq 2$ . If

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{2^{\alpha_i}} \leq \frac{1}{2} \quad (3)$$

[...] holds, then  $F$  has property B.

Put  $\cup_{i=1}^k A_i = T$ ,  $|T| = n$ . [...] Denote by  $F_T$  the family of sets  $S$  for which

$$S \subset T, A_i \cap S \neq \emptyset, A_i \not\subset S, 1 \leq i \leq k \quad (6)$$

We have to show that if (3) holds then  $|F_T| > 0$  (since this implies that the family of sets  $\{A_i\}$  satisfying (3) has property B.)

Denote by  $F_i$  the family of sets  $S$  satisfying

$$S \subset T, A_i \subset S \text{ or } A_i \cap S = \emptyset \quad (7)$$

Clearly an  $S \subset T$  is in the family  $F_T$  if it is in none of the families  $F_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq k$  (that is, it satisfies (6) if it does not satisfy (7) for any  $i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq k$ ). By a simple sieve process we thus have

$$|F_T| \geq 2^n - \sum_{i=1}^k |F_i| + 1 \quad (8)$$

[. . .] We evidently have

$$|F_i| = 2^{n-\alpha_i+1} \quad (9)$$

since clearly there are  $2^{n-\alpha_i}$  sets  $S \subset T$  satisfying  $A_i \subset S$  and  $2^{n-\alpha_i}$  sets satisfying  $A_i \cap S = \emptyset$ . From (8) and (9) we have  $|F_T| \geq 1$  if (3) is satisfied.

Now one can ask the following problem which I cannot answer: Let  $\{A_i\}$  be a finite or infinite family of finite sets which does not have property  $B$  and for which  $|A_i| \geq p \geq 2$  for all  $i$ . What is the upper bound  $C^{(p)}$  of  $\prod_i (1 - 2^{-\alpha_i})$  and the lower bound  $C_p$  of  $\sum_i 2^{-\alpha_i}$ . [...] Probably

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} C^{(p)} = 0, \lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} C_p = \infty$$

On a Combinatorial problem, II.

Acta math Acad Sci Hungar 1964

Theorem 1.  $m(n) < n^2 2^{n+1}$

Theorem 1 thus implies  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} m(n)^{1/n} = 2$ .

[...] It would be interesting to improve the bounds for  $m(n)$ . A reasonable guess seems to be that  $m(n)$  is of the order  $n2^n$ .

Paul Erdős and John Moon

On Sets of Consistent Arcs in a Tournament

Canad Math Bull 1965

$$f(n) \leq \frac{1 + \epsilon}{2} \binom{n}{2} \quad (2)$$

In a tournament  $T_n$  there are  $n!$  ways of relabelling the nodes and  $N = \binom{n}{2}$  pairs of distinct nodes. Hence, there are at most  $n! \binom{N}{k}$  such tournament whose largest set of consistent arcs contains  $k$  arcs. So, an upper bound for the number of tournaments  $T_n$  which contain a set of more than  $(1 + \epsilon)N/2$  consistent arcs is given by

$$n! \sum_{k > (1 + \epsilon)N/2} \binom{N}{k} < \dots < n! 2^N e^{-\epsilon^2 N/4} \quad (3)$$

[...] But for all sufficiently large  $n$  the last quantity in (3) is easily seen to be less than  $2^N$ , the total number of tournaments with  $n$  nodes. Hence, there must be at least one tournament  $T_n$  which does not contain any set of more than  $(1 + \epsilon)N/2$  consistent arcs.



The argument employed in the preceding paragraph illustrates the usefulness of probabilistic methods in extremal problems in graph theory, for while we can easily infer the existence of a tournament with a certain required property we are unable to give an explicit construction actually exhibiting such a tournament in general.

With a more careful analysis of inequality (3) this argument actually implies that

$$f(n) < \frac{1}{2} \binom{n}{2} + \left(\frac{1}{2} + o(1)\right) (n^3 \log n)^{1/2} \quad (4)$$

It would be desirable to obtain a better estimate for  $f(n)$ .