

NOTES

On the Construction of Certain Graphs

Denote by $G(n)$ a graph of n vertices and by $G(n; m)$ a graph of n vertices and m edges. $I(G)$ denotes the cardinal number of the largest independent set of vertices (i.e., the largest set x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_r} , $r = I(G)$ of vertices of G no two of which are joined by an edge). $\nu(x)$, the valency of the vertex x , denotes the number of edges incident to x , $c_1 \dots$ will denote positive absolute constants.

1. Turán [8] proved that every $G(n; [n^2/4] + 1)$ contains a triangle and that the only graph $G(n; [n^2/4])$ which does not contain a triangle is defined as follows: Its vertices are $x_1, \dots, x_{[n/2]}$; $y_1, \dots, y_{[(n+1)/2]}$, and its edges are (x_i, y_j) , $1 \leq i \leq [n/2]$, $1 \leq j \leq [(n+1)/2]$; in other words if $G(n; [n^2/4])$ does not contain a triangle then

$$I\left(G\left(n; \left[\frac{n^2}{4}\right]\right)\right) = \left[\frac{n+1}{2}\right].$$

Andrásfai [1] has investigated the following question: Let $u < [(n+1)/2]$. Determine the largest integer $f(n, u)$ for which there is a $G(n; f(n, u))$ which contains no triangle and for which $I(G) \leq u$. Andrásfai determines $f(n, u)$ for $u \geq [2n/5]$. It is clear that $f(n, u) \leq un/2$ since the $\nu(x)$ vertices joined to x must be independent (for otherwise our graph would contain a triangle); hence $\nu(x) \leq u$ for all vertices of G thus G has at most $un/2$ edges. Andrásfai [1] in fact determines all graphs for which

$$f(n, u) = un/2 \tag{1}$$

for $u \geq [2n/5]$ and gives some examples of graphs satisfying (1) for $u > n/3$.

In the present note, I will construct graphs for which (1) holds and

$$u = I(G) = n^{1-c+o(1)}, \quad c = \frac{5 \log 2 - 3 \log 3}{2 \log 2}. \quad (2)$$

Denote by $g(n)$ the largest integer so that every graph of n vertices which contains no triangle satisfies $I(G(n)) \geq g(n)$. A very special case of the well-known theorem of Ramsey [7] implies $g(n) \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Szekeres and I [2] proved that $g(n) \geq \sqrt{2n} + O(1)$ and I showed first by a direct construction that $g(n) < n^{1-c_1}$ [3] and later by a "probabilistic" method that $g(n) < x_2 n^{1/2} \log n$. I cannot at present decide whether $g(n) < c_3 n^{1/2}$ is true, in fact perhaps $g(n) = \sqrt{2n} + O(1)$. It would be of interest to construct all graphs satisfying (1) — this may be difficult or impossible — or at least to decide if (1) is possible if $u = n_{1/2+\epsilon}$. I cannot even show that $f(n, u) = (1 + o(1)) un/2$ can hold if $u = n_{1/2+\epsilon}$. The construction given here does not seem to help to settle this problem. The construction given in [3] only yields $f(n, u) = (1 + o(1)) un/2$ and not (1) for $u > n^{1-c_1}$.

I conjectured and Kleitman [6] proved the following result: Denote by $\{A_i\}$ $1 \leq i \leq 2^n$ the 2^n sequences of 0's and 1's of length n . Put $A_i = (\epsilon_1^{(i)}, \dots, \epsilon_n^{(i)})$, ($\epsilon_n^{(i)} = 0$ or 1). Define

$$d(A_i, A_j) = \sum_{r=1}^n |\epsilon_r^{(i)} - \epsilon_r^{(j)}|.$$

Let A_{i_1}, \dots, A_{i_s} be a family of sequences satisfying

$$d(A_{i_u}, A_{i_v}) \leq 2k, \quad k < n/2, \quad 1 \leq u < v \leq s.$$

Then

$$\max s = \sum_{l=0}^k \binom{n}{l} \quad (3)$$

We have equality in (3) if the A 's are the sequences having at most k 1's.

Using Kleitman's theorem we now construct our graphs as follows: Put $n = 3k + 1$. The vertices of our graph will be the sequences $\{A_i\}$, $1 \leq i \leq 2^n$; A_i and A_j are joined if and only if

$$d(A_i, A_j) \geq 2k + 1.$$

Our graph has 2^{3k+1} vertices and $2^{3k} \sum_{i=0}^k \binom{3k+1}{i}$ edges. It is easy to see that our graph contains no triangle. To see this, observe that if it would contain a triangle we could assume without loss of generality that one of its vertices has all its coordinates 0, i.e., is $(0, \dots, 0)$. The other two vertices must be sequences containing at least $2k+1$ ones and hence they must coincide in at least $k+1$ places, or their distance is $\leq 2k$; thus they are not joined. In other words our graph contains no triangle. The valency of each vertex of our graph clearly equals

$$\sum_{i=0}^k \binom{3k+1}{i}.$$

On the other hand if A_{i_1}, \dots, A_{i_s} is an independent set of vertices we must evidently have $d(A_{i_u}, A_{i_v}) \leq 2k$ (for if not then by definition A_{i_u} and A_{i_v} are joined and the set was not independent). But then by the theorem of Kleitman

$$\max s = \sum_{i=0}^k \binom{3k+1}{i} = V(X_i), \quad 1 \leq i \leq 2^{3k+1}.$$

In other words, $I(G) = V(x_i)$, $1 \leq i \leq 2^{3k+1}$, and thus (1) holds for our graph. A simple computation using Stirling's formula shows that (2) is also satisfied.

This construction could be generalized if the following generalization of Kleitman's result would hold: Let $t_r \geq 1$, $1 \leq r \leq n$, and denote by $\{B_i\}$, $1 \leq i \leq \prod_{r=1}^n (t_r + 1)$, the sequences of the form $(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_n)$, $0 \leq \delta_r \leq t_r$. Let $B_i = (\delta_1^{(i)}, \dots, \delta_n^{(i)})$, $B_j = (\delta_1^{(j)}, \dots, \delta_n^{(j)})$, define $d(B_i, B_j) = \sum_{r=1}^n |\delta_r^{(i)} - \delta_r^{(j)}|$. Let $k < \frac{1}{2} \sum_{r=1}^n t_r$ and let B_{i_1}, \dots, B_{i_s} be a family of sequences satisfying

$$d(B_{i_u}, B_{i_v}) \leq 2k, \quad 1 \leq u < v \leq s.$$

Then s is maximal if the B_{i_u} are the sequences satisfying $\sum_{r=1}^n \delta_r \leq k$. But even if this would be true we could not improve (2) by this method.¹

¹ Kleitman showed that this generalization is false, but perhaps it holds if all the t_r 's are equal.

2. A graph is called k -chromatic if its vertices can be split into k classes so that no two vertices of the same class are joined, but such a splitting is not possible into fewer than k classes. Tutte and Zykov were the first to show that for every integer k there is a k -chromatic graph which contains no triangle. Rado and I [5] showed that for every infinite cardinal m there is a graph of m vertices which contains no triangle and which has chromatic number m .

A very simple and intuitive proof of this result could be given if the following conjecture of Czipser and myself would hold: Is it true that the unit sphere of an m -dimensional Hilbert space is not the union of fewer than m subsets of diameter less than $2 - \varepsilon$. The unit sphere of the m -dimensional Hilbert space is the set of all transfinite sequences of real numbers $\{x_\alpha\}$ where α runs through an index set of power m and $\sum_\alpha x_\alpha^2 \leq 1$ (all but denumerably many of the x_α 's are 0). As far as I know this conjecture has not even been settled for $m = \aleph_1$.

If the answer to our conjecture is affirmative our graph can be constructed as follows: The vertices of our graph are the sequences $\{x_\alpha\}$, $\sum_\alpha x_\alpha^2 \leq 1$, where all the x_α are rational and only a finite number of them are different from 0. Clearly our graph has m vertices and the points of the m -dimensional unit sphere defined by these vertices are dense in the unit sphere. Two vertices are joined if their distance (in the m -dimensional Hilbert space) is greater than $\sqrt{3}$. Clearly this graph contains no triangle and the diameter of any independent set is $\leq \sqrt{3}$. Thus if the answer to our conjecture is affirmative, the vertices of our graph cannot be split into the union of fewer than m independent sets, i.e., our graph is m -chromatic.

REFERENCES

1. B. ANDRASFAI, Graphentheoretische Extremalprobleme, *Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar.* **15** (1964), 413-438.
2. P. ERDÖS AND G. SZEKERES, A Combinatorial Problem in Geometry, *Compositio Math.* **2** (1935), 463-470.
3. P. ERDÖS, Remarks on a Theorem of Ramsey, *Bull. Res. Council Israel Sect. F7* (1957), 21-24.
4. P. ERDÖS, Graph Theory and Probability, II. *Canad. J. Math.* **13** (1961), 346-352.
5. P. ERDÖS AND R. RADO, A Construction of Graphs without Triangles Having Pre-assigned Order and Chromatic Number, *J. London Math. Soc.* **35** (1960), 445-448.

6. D. J. KLEITMAN, Families of Non-disjoint Subsets, *Journal of Combinatorial Theory* **1**, (1966) 153-155.
7. F. P. RAMSAY, Collected papers, pp. 82-111; see also reference 2.
8. P. TURAN, On the Theory of Graphs, *Colloq. Math.* **3** (1954), 19-30.

P. ERDÖS,
Panjab University
Chandigarh, India