

(n, d, λ) -GRAPHS:
PROPERTIES AND APPLICATIONS

Benny Sudakov
Princeton University

WHAT MAKES A GRAPH RANDOM?

QUESTIONS:

- What are the essential properties of random graphs?
- How can one tell when a given graph behaves like a random graph?
- How to create deterministically graphs that look random-like?

A POSSIBLE ANSWER:

Probably the most important characteristic of truly random graph is its *edge distribution*. Thus may be a pseudo-random graph is a graph whose edge distribution resembles the one of a random graph with the same edge density.

NOTATION:

The adjacency matrix A_G of a graph G has

$$a_{uv} = \text{number of edges from } u \text{ to } v.$$

It is a symmetric matrix with real eigenvalues $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n$.

DEFINITION:

G is an (n, d, λ) -graph if it is d -regular, has n vertices, and

$$\max_{i \geq 2} |\lambda_i| \leq \lambda.$$

REMARK:

- If G is d -regular, then $\lambda_1 = d$.
- If $d \leq n/2$ and G is (n, d, λ) , then $\lambda \geq \sqrt{\frac{d(n-d)}{n-1}} = \Omega(\sqrt{d})$.

NOTATION:

Let G be an (n, d, λ) -graph. For $B, C \subseteq V(G)$

$$e(B, C) = |\{(b, c) \in E(G) \mid b \in B, c \in C\}|$$

$$e(B) = \frac{1}{2}e(B, B) = |\{(b, b') \in E(G) \mid b, b' \in B\}|$$

THEOREM: (Alon, Alon-Chung 80's)

- For any $B, C \subseteq V(G)$ (not necessarily disjoint)

$$\left| e(B, C) - \frac{d}{n}|B||C| \right| \leq \lambda\sqrt{|B||C|},$$

- For any $B \subseteq V(G)$

$$\left| e(B) - \frac{d}{n} \frac{|B|^2}{2} \right| \leq \frac{1}{2}\lambda|B| \left(1 - \frac{|B|}{n} \right).$$

COROLLARY: (*Hoffman*)

The independence number of an (n, d, λ) -graph G is at most

$$\alpha(G) \leq \frac{\lambda}{d + \lambda} n$$

COROLLARY:

The maximum number of edges in a cut of G

$$\text{MaxCut}(G) \leq \frac{d + \lambda}{4} n = \frac{e(G)}{2} + \frac{\lambda n}{4}.$$

DEFINITION:

The vertex boundary of $X \subset V(G)$ in a graph G is

$$\partial X = \{y \in V(G) \setminus X \mid \exists x \in X : \{x, y\} \in E(G)\}.$$

COROLLARY: *(Alon-Milman 84, Tanner 84)*

If G is an (n, d, λ) -graph G and $X \subset V(G)$ of size at most $n/2$, then

$$|\partial X| \geq \frac{2(d - \lambda)}{3d - 2\lambda} |X|.$$

CONVERSE RESULTS

THEOREM: (*Alon 1986*)

If G is d -regular graph with eigenvalues $\lambda_1 = d \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n$ such that $|\partial X| \geq c|X|$ for every $X \subset V, |X| \leq n/2$, then

$$\lambda_2 \leq d - \frac{c^2}{4 + 2c^2}.$$

THEOREM: (*Bilu and Linial 2004*)

If $G = (V, E)$ is d -regular graph with eigenvalues $\lambda_1 = d \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n$ such that for every $B, C \subset V$

$$\left| e(B, C) - \frac{d}{n}|B||C| \right| \leq \alpha \sqrt{|B||C|},$$

then $\max \{|\lambda_2|, |\lambda_n|\} \leq O(\alpha \log(d/\alpha))$.

CHROMATIC NUMBER

DEFINITION:

Chromatic number $\chi(G)$ is the minimum number of colors needed to color $V(G)$ such that adjacent vertices get different colors.

THEOREM: (*Hoffman*)

If G is an (n, d, λ) -graph then $\chi(G) \geq 1 + \frac{d}{\lambda}$.

THEOREM: (*Alon, Krivelevich and S. 99*)

If G is an (n, d, λ) and $d \leq 2n/3$ then $\chi(G) \leq O\left(\frac{d}{\log(1+d/\lambda)}\right)$.

THEOREM: (*Alon, Krivelevich and S. 99 and Vu 00*)

The choice number of G satisfies a similar inequality.

HAMILTONICITY

DEFINITION:

Graph G is hamiltonian if it has Hamilton cycle, i.e., a cycle containing all vertices of G .

THEOREM: (*Krivelevich and S. 02*)

If G is an (n, d, λ) -graph with

$$\lambda < \frac{d}{\log n},$$

then G is hamiltonian.

CONJECTURE:

There exist an $\epsilon > 0$ such that if $\lambda < \epsilon d$ then G is hamiltonian.

SMALL SUBGRAPHS

SETTING:

- H = fixed graph with s vertices, r edges and max. degree Δ .
- $G = (V, E)$ is an (n, d, λ) -graph and $U \subseteq V$ of size m .

THEOREM: (Alon)

If $m \gg \lambda \left(\frac{n}{d}\right)^\Delta$ then U contains

$$(1 + o(1)) \frac{s!}{|Aut(H)|} \binom{m}{s} \left(\frac{d}{n}\right)^r$$

copies of H

REMARK:

If $d^r \gg \lambda n^{r-1}$ then G contains a complete graph K_{r+1} .

SPECTRAL TURÁN'S THEOREM

QUESTION:

How large can be K_{r+1} -free subgraph of (n, d, λ) -graph?

(Every G has such subgraph with at least $\frac{r-1}{r}e(G)$ edges.)

THEOREM: (S., Szabó, Vu 2005)

Let $r \geq 2$, and let G be an (n, d, λ) -graph with $d^r \gg \lambda n^{r-1}$. Then the size of the largest K_{r+1} -free subgraph of G is

$$\frac{r-1}{r}e(G) + o(e(G)).$$

REMARKS:

- The complete graph K_n has $d = n - 1$ and $\lambda = 1$. Thus we have an asymptotic extension of Turán's theorem.
- The theorem is tight for $r = 2$. By a result of Alon, there are (n, d, λ) -graphs with $d^2 = \Theta(\lambda n)$ which contain no triangles.

EXAMPLES OF (n, d, λ) -GRAPHS

FRIEDMAN 03:

For every fixed $\epsilon > 0$ and $d \geq 3$, a random d -regular graph on n vertices is, asymptotically almost surely, an (n, d, λ) -graph with

$$\lambda = 2\sqrt{d-1} + \epsilon.$$

PALEY GRAPH:

- $V(G) = \mathbb{Z}_p$, where p is a prime $p \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$.
- $(i, j) \in E(G)$ iff $i - j = r^2 \pmod{p}$ is a quadratic residue.

G is an (n, d, λ) -graph with

$$n = p, \quad d = \frac{p-1}{2}, \quad \lambda = \frac{1 + \sqrt{p}}{2}.$$

ERDŐS-RÉNYI GRAPH:

G is polarity graph of lines-point incidence graph of finite projective plane of order q .

- $V(G) =$ lines through the origin in \mathbb{F}_q^3 , q is a prime power.
- Two lines are adjacent if they orthogonal.

G has no 4-cycles and is an (n, d, λ) -graph with

$$n = q^2 + q + 1, \quad d = q + 1, \quad \lambda = \sqrt{q}.$$

EXAMPLES OF (n, d, λ) -GRAPHS

LUBOTZKY-PHILLIPS-SARNAK 86, MARGULIS 88:

For every $d = p + 1$ where p is prime $p \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$, there are infinitely many $(n, d, 2\sqrt{d-1})$ -graphs.

ALON 94:

For every $k, 3 \nmid k$ there is a triangle-free (n, d, λ) -graph with

$$n = 2^{3k}, \quad d = (1/4 + o(1))n^{2/3}, \quad \lambda = (9 + o(1))n^{1/3}.$$

APPLICATIONS: MAXCUT

DEFINITION:

$f(G)$ = the number of edges in MaxCut, i.e., a maximum bipartite subgraph of G .

CLAIM: (*Folklore*)

Every graph G with m edges contains a cut of size at least $m/2$.

THEOREM: (*Edwards 73,75*)

Every graph G with m edges contains a cut (a bipartite subgraph) of size at least

$$f(G) \geq \frac{m}{2} + \frac{-1 + \sqrt{8m + 1}}{8} = \frac{m}{2} + \Omega(\sqrt{m}).$$

MAXCUT IN TRIANGLE-FREE GRAPHS

CONJECTURE: (*Erdős 70's*)

If G contains no short cycles than it has bigger cut.

THEOREM: (*Alon 96, improving Erdős-Lovász, Poljak-Tuza, Shearer*)

If G is triangle-free and has m edges then

$$f(G) \geq \frac{m}{2} + \Omega(m^{4/5}).$$

The constant $4/5$ tight

PROOF OF TIGHTNESS:

Use an (n, d, λ) -graph with $d \approx \frac{1}{4}n^{2/3}$, $\lambda \approx 9n^{1/3}$, no triangles.

MAXCUT IN GRAPHS OF HIGH GIRTH

THEOREM: (*Alon, Bollobás, Krivelevich and S. 02*)

If G has girth (length of the shortest cycle) r and m edges, then

$$f(G) \geq \frac{m}{2} + \Omega(m^{\frac{r}{r+1}}).$$

This is tight for $r = 5$ (and $r = 4$).

PROOF OF TIGHTNESS:

Uses a random modification of Erdős-Renyi graph, which is C_4 -free ($n, d \approx n^{1/2}, \lambda \approx n^{1/4}$)-graph. Hence $m = \Omega(n^{3/2})$ and

$$\text{MaxCut} \leq \frac{m}{2} + \frac{\lambda n}{4} = \frac{m}{2} + O(n^{5/4}) = \frac{m}{2} + O(m^{5/6}).$$

CONJECTURE:

Exponent $\frac{r}{r+1}$ is tight also for all $r > 5$.

MAXCUT IN H -FREE GRAPHS

CONJECTURE:

For every fixed H there is $c_H > 3/4$ such that if G is an H -free graph with m edges, then

$$f(G) \geq \frac{m}{2} + \Omega(m^{c_H}).$$

THEOREM: (Alon, Krivelevich and S. 05)

- $H =$ cycle of length $r = 4, 6, 10$ then $c_H = \frac{r+1}{r+2}$.
- $H = K_{2,s}$ complete bipartite graph with parts of size 2 and $s \geq 2$ then $c_H = 5/6$.
- $H = K_{3,s}$ complete bipartite graph with parts of size 3 and $s \geq 3$ then $c_H = 4/5$.

A GEOMETRIC PROBLEM

PROBLEM: (Lovász 79)

Estimate $f(n) = \max \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n v_i \right\|$, where

- $v_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\|v_i\| = 1$.
- Among any three v_i 's some two are orthogonal.

RESULTS:

- Konyagin 81: $\Omega(n^{0.54}) \leq f(n) \leq n^{2/3}$.
- Kashin-Konyagin 83: $\Omega\left(\frac{n^{2/3}}{\log^{1/2} n}\right) \leq f(n)$.

THEOREM: (Alon 94)

$$f(n) \geq (1/6 - o(1))n^{2/3}.$$

PROOF OF LOWER BOUND:

G is a triangle-free (n, d, λ) -graph with $d = \Omega(n^{2/3})$, $\lambda = O(n^{1/3})$.
 A is its adjacency matrix.

$\frac{1}{\lambda}(A + \lambda I)$ is positive semidefinite, so there is matrix B such that

$$B^T B = \frac{1}{\lambda}(A + \lambda I).$$

Let v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n be the columns of B . Then

- Each $\|v_i\| = 1$.
- Among any three v_i 's some two are orthogonal.

-

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n v_i \right\|^2 &= \sum_{i,j} \left[\frac{1}{\lambda}(A + \lambda I) \right]_{ij} \\ &= n + \frac{nd}{\lambda} = \Omega(n^{4/3}). \end{aligned}$$

DEFINITION:

Given \mathcal{H} a family of graphs (e.g., all trees, planar graphs and etc.), G is called \mathcal{H} -universal if it contains copy of every $H \in \mathcal{H}$.

GOAL: *(motivated by VLSI design)*

Find sparse universal graph G for \mathcal{H} .

(Use limited resources to achieve max. flexibility)

THEOREM: *(Bhatt, Chung, Leighton, Rosenberg 89)*

If \mathcal{H} is all trees on n vertices of maximum degree at most D , then there is universal G of order n with maximum degree $\leq f(D)$.

NEARLY SPANNING TREES IN (n, d, λ) -GRAPHS

THEOREM: (Alon-Krivelevich-S. 06, extending Friedman-Pippenger 87)

Let $D \geq 2$, $0 < \epsilon < 1/2$ and let G be an (n, d, λ) -graph such that

$$\frac{d}{\lambda} \geq \Omega\left(\frac{D^{5/2} \log(2/\epsilon)}{\epsilon}\right)$$

Then G contains a copy of every tree with $(1 - \epsilon)n$ vertices and with maximum degree at most D .

REMARK:

Random regular graphs, Lubotzky-Phillips-Sarnak graphs etc. are universal for almost spanning trees of bounded degree.

EMBEDDING STRATEGY

VERY BRIEF SKETCH:

- Cut tree T into pieces $T_1, \dots, T_s, s = f(D, \epsilon)$ of decreasing size. Embed T piece by piece respecting previous embedding.
- Use result of Friedman-Pippenger that if every subset X of graph G of size at least $2k$ satisfies that $|\partial X| \geq D|X|$, then G contains every tree on k vertices with maximum degree D .
- Use the fact that if induced subgraph of (n, d, λ) -graph has minimal degree at least $\Omega(\lambda\sqrt{D})$, then it is a very good expander.

CONJECTURE:

There is a constant C_D such that (n, d, λ) -graph with $d/\lambda > C_D$ contains every spanning tree of maximum degree at most D .

EDGE-DELETION PROBLEMS

DEFINITION:

A graph property \mathcal{P} is *monotone* if it is closed under deleting edges and vertices. It is *dense* if there are n -vertex graphs with $\Omega(n^2)$ edges satisfying it.

EXAMPLES:

- $\mathcal{P} = \{G \text{ is 5-colorable}\}$.
- $\mathcal{P} = \{G \text{ is triangle-free}\}$.
- $\mathcal{P} = \{G \text{ has a 2-edge coloring with no monochromatic } K_6\}$

DEFINITION:

Given a graph G and a monotone property \mathcal{P} , denote by

$E_{\mathcal{P}}(G) =$ smallest number of edge deletions needed to turn G into a graph satisfying \mathcal{P} .

THEOREM: (Alon, Shapira, S. 2005)

- For every monotone \mathcal{P} and $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a linear time, deterministic algorithm that given graph G on n vertices computes number X such that $|X - E_{\mathcal{P}}(G)| \leq \epsilon n^2$.
- For every monotone dense \mathcal{P} and $\delta > 0$ it is NP -hard to approximate $E_{\mathcal{P}}(G)$ for graph of order n up to an additive error of $n^{2-\delta}$.

REMARK:

Prior to this result, it was not even known that computing $E_{\mathcal{P}}(G)$ precisely for dense \mathcal{P} is NP -hard. We thus answer (in a stronger form) a question of Yannakakis from 1981.

HARDNESS PROOF: EXAMPLE

SETTING:

\mathcal{P} = property of being H -free, $\chi(H) = r + 1$.

$E_{r\text{-col}}(F)$ = number of edge-deletions needed to make graph F r -colorable. Computing $E_{r\text{-col}}(F)$ is NP -hard.

REDUCTION:

- Given F , let F' = blow-up of F : vertex \leftarrow large independent set, edge \leftarrow complete bipartite graph. Take union of F' with an appropriate (n, d, λ) -graph to get a graph G with large minimum degree.
- $E_{r\text{-col}}(F)$ changes in a controlled way, i.e., knowledge of an accurate estimate for $E_{r\text{-col}}(G)$ tells us the value of $E_{r\text{-col}}(F)$. Moreover $|E_{r\text{-col}}(G) - E_{\mathcal{P}}(G)| \leq n^{2-\gamma}$.
- Thus, approximating $E_{\mathcal{P}}(G)$ up to an additive error of $n^{2-\delta}$ is as hard as computing $E_{r\text{-col}}(F)$.