

CS201A:Mathematics for Computer Science - I

Assignment 3

Anuj Singhal
Roll No. 210166

October 2022

1 [2+2+4 points]

1.1 Recall the complete graph K_n . How many subgraphs does K_n have?

We know, number of edges in a complete graph on n vertices $= \binom{n}{2} = \frac{n(n-1)}{2}$
Now every subset of $E(K_n)$ defines the edge set of a unique subgraph of K_n
So the number of subgraphs of $K_n = \#$ subsets of $E(K_n)$
i.e. number of subgraphs of $K_n = 2^{|E(K_n)|} = 2^{\frac{n(n-1)}{2}}$

1.2 When will K_n have an Eulerian circuit?

We use a theorem derived in class that states:

A graph has a Eulerian circuit iff every vertex has even degree

Now, since in a complete graph all vertices have equal degree, each equal to $(n-1)$, we can immediately conclude from above theorem that:

A complete graph K_n has an Eulerian circuit iff $n-1$ is even i.e n is odd.

$\implies K_n$ will have an Eulerian circuit iff n is odd.

1.3 What are the eigenvalues of the adjacency matrix of K_n ?

We can write the adjacency matrix A of K_n as:

$$K_n = J_n - I_n$$

where J_n is $n \times n$ matrix of all 1's and I_n is identity matrix, i.e.

$$K_n = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & \dots & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & \dots & 1 \\ \vdots & & \ddots & 1 \\ 1 & \dots & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

For calculating the eigenvalues of K_n , we find the roots of equation

$$\begin{aligned} |K_n - \lambda I_n| &= 0 \\ \Rightarrow \begin{vmatrix} -\lambda & 1 & \dots & 1 \\ 1 & -\lambda & \dots & 1 \\ \vdots & & \ddots & 1 \\ 1 & \dots & 1 & -\lambda \end{vmatrix} &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

Now we replace the 1st row by sum of all rows:

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{vmatrix} -\lambda & 1 & \dots & 1 \\ 1 & -\lambda & \dots & 1 \\ \vdots & & \ddots & 1 \\ 1 & \dots & 1 & -\lambda \end{vmatrix} &= \begin{vmatrix} (n-1) - \lambda & (n-1) - \lambda & \dots & (n-1) - \lambda \\ 1 & -\lambda & \dots & 1 \\ \vdots & & \ddots & 1 \\ 1 & \dots & 1 & -\lambda \end{vmatrix} \\ \text{i.e. } ((n-1) - \lambda) \begin{vmatrix} 1 & 1 & \dots & 1 \\ 1 & -\lambda & \dots & 1 \\ \vdots & & \ddots & 1 \\ 1 & \dots & 1 & -\lambda \end{vmatrix} &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

Now subtracting 1st column from all other columns, we get:

$$\text{i.e. } ((n-1) - \lambda) \begin{vmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 1 & -1 - \lambda & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & 0 & -1 - \lambda & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & 0 & 0 & \ddots & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 & -1 - \lambda \end{vmatrix} = 0$$

$$\implies ((n-1) - \lambda)(-1 - \lambda)^{n-1} = 0$$

i.e $\lambda = n-1$ or $\lambda = -1$ ($n-1$ times repeated root)

2 [5+4 points]

Let G be a graph, A be its adjacency matrix, and d be its maximum degree.

2.1 Show that the maximum eigenvalue of A is atmost d .

Let d be the maximum degree of all vertices and λ be an eigenvalue of the adjacency matrix $A = [a_{ij}]$.

Also let b be an eigenvector corresponding to eigenvalue λ such that $|b| = 1$,
 $\implies Ab = \lambda b$

$$\implies \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}b_j = \lambda b_i$$

$$\implies \left| \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}b_j \right| = |\lambda b_i|$$

$$\implies \sum_{j=1}^n |a_{ij}b_j| \geq |\lambda b_i|$$

Thus,

$$\sum_{j=1}^n |a_{ij}| \geq |\lambda|$$

Hence,

$$d \geq |\lambda|$$

$$d \geq \lambda$$

So, the maximum eigenvalue can be atmost d .
hence proved.

2.2 Show that the minimum eigenvalue of A is atleast $-d$.

Using the exactly same result that we have obtained from part 1

$$d \geq |\lambda|$$

It immediately follows that

$$-d \leq \lambda$$

So, the minimum eigenvalue is atleast $-d$.
hence proved.

3 [5 points]

Show that the number of walks of length m between vertex i and vertex j is the (i, j) - th entry of A^m

We will try to apply induction to prove that #walks of length m between vertex i and $j = (i, j)$ - th entry of A^m

First, base case is for $m = 1$ can be proved by the definition of adjacency matrix itself.

Now for the induction step, consider that the theorem holds for $m - 1$ i.e.

Consider any pair (i, j) then every walk of length m from i to j can be represented as a walk of length 1 from i to one of its adjacent vertex say v and a walk of length $m - 1$ from v to j .

So, if we define $\phi(i, j, m)$ to denote the number of walks from any vertex i to j of length m , then we can formally write

$$\phi(i, j, m) = \sum_{v=1}^n \phi(i, v, 1) \times \phi(v, j, m - 1)$$

Now, $\phi(i, v, 1)$ is basically the number of edges from vertex i to v which is the (i, v) - th entry of A from the definition of adjacency matrix. i.e $A_{i,v}$

Also, from the induction step, we can assume for all v ,

$$\phi(v, j, m - 1) = A_{v,j}^{m-1}$$

$$\implies \phi(i, j, m) = \sum_{v=1}^n \phi(i, v, 1) \times \phi(v, j, m - 1) = \sum_{v=1}^n A_{i,v} A_{v,j}^{m-1}$$

Which by definition of matrix multiplication is:

$$\implies \phi(i, j, m) = \sum_{v=1}^n A_{i,v} A_{v,j}^{m-1} = (A \times A^{m-1})_{i,j} = A_{i,j}^m$$

Hence we have proved inductively that the number of walks of length m from i to j is equal to the (i, j) - th entry of A^m Hence proved.

4 [12 points]

Define graph product of G_1 and G_2 , on vertex set $V_1 \times V_2$, as the graph $G_1 \hat{\otimes} G_2$ as follows:

**$((u, i), (v, j))$ is an edge in $G_1 \hat{\otimes} G_2$ if,
 $(u = v \text{ and } (i, j) \in E(G_2)) \text{ or } ((u, v) \in E(G_1) \text{ and } i = j).$**

Show that $\chi(G) \leq t$ iff $\alpha(G \hat{\otimes} K_t) = |V(G)|$.

(Note: $\chi(\cdot)$ is the chromatic number and $\alpha(\cdot)$ is the stability number.)

5 [2+5 points]

5.1 What is the chromatic number of a bipartite graph?

Consider a bipartite graph $G(X \sqcup Y, E)$

Our claim is that we can always have a valid coloring with 2 different colors.

Proof: We color the vertices from set X with color c_1 and from set Y with color c_2 then by the property of bipartite graph, all the edges are between a vertex from X and a vertex from Y i.e. between vertices of different colors c_1 and c_2 .

Hence, any bipartite graph can be colored with 2 colors.

Now, if the graph has zero edges, then the graph can also be colored with only 1 color. In which case the chromatic number is 1.

Hence proved that the chromatic number of a bipartite graph is $\chi(G) \leq 2$

5.2 Show that a regular bipartite graph has a perfect matching.

Consider a bipartite graph $G(X \sqcup Y, E)$ which is d -regular

Then each vertex has degree d .

We know that the count of edges in the graph will be the count of edges from X to Y .

Now the number of edges going out from $X = d|X|$ Similarly the number of edges entering $Y = d|Y|$

$$\implies d|X| = d|Y| \implies |X| = |Y|$$

Now since $|X| = |Y|$, any complete matching will be a perfect matching.

Let us assume the opposite that there does not exist a complete matching, then for a subset $S \subseteq X$, by Hall's marriage theorem (using converse of it)

$$|S| > |N(S)|$$

where $N(S)$ denotes the neighbourhood of S

Also, number of edges arising from $S = d|S|$ (regular bipartite graph)

Consider a function $\phi(v)$ such that $\phi(v) = \# \text{number of edges from a vertex } v \text{ to set } S$.

So the number of edges arising from S can be written in terms of number of edges coming to S from its neighbourhood, i.e.

$$d|S| = \sum_{i=1}^{|N(S)|} \phi(v_i)$$

Consider $\phi(v_o)$ to be the maximum of $\phi(v) \forall v \in N(S)$, then

$$d|S| \leq |N(S)|\phi(v_o)$$

By our assumption, $|S| > |N(S)|$

$$\implies \phi(v_o) > d$$

This is a contradiction as the maximum no. of edges from any vertex to S has to be upper bounded by its degree, d .

Hence our assumption was wrong, so by contradiction,

$$|S| \leq |N(S)| \forall S \subseteq X$$

Hence, by Hall's marriage theorem, there exist a complete matching, which will be a perfect matching because we earlier proved that $|X| = |Y|$

Hence proved.

6 [4+4 points]

Consider a quadratic equation $X^2 + aX + b = 0 \pmod{p}$, where p is a prime, and $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$. Formulate a condition on a, b, p that tells us whether the equation has zero, one or two solutions.

Can there be three, or more, solutions?

7 [5+6 points]

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Prove that, for every composite $n > 4$, $(n-1)! \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$.

Case 1: n is a prime power. Here we assume that n is a power of a prime number say p . i.e.

$$n = p^\alpha \text{ for } \alpha > 1 \text{ and prime } p$$

In this case, we further consider 2 cases

when $\alpha = 2$, we can have 2 integers p and $2p$ and since $n > 4$, these 2 integers will be strictly less than n , so they will be present in the product of $(n-1)!$ and their product is $2n$ so we say that $n \mid (n-1)!$

Otherwise if $\alpha > 2$ then we can take 2 distinct integers p and $p^{\alpha-1}$ such that both of them have to be less than n so they will be present in $(n-1)!$ and hence again $p^\alpha \mid (n-1)! \implies n \mid (n-1)!$

Hence proved.

Case 2: n is not a prime power. By Fundamental Theorem of Arithmetic, we can represent n in its prime factorisation.

$$n = p_1^{\alpha_1} p_2^{\alpha_2} \dots p_k^{\alpha_k} ; k > 1$$

Here we can simply take the set of integers $\{p_1^{\alpha_1}, p_2^{\alpha_2}, \dots, p_k^{\alpha_k}\}$

Since each of these terms are distinct and every term is present in the product $(n-1)!$ so $p_1^{\alpha_1} p_2^{\alpha_2} \dots p_k^{\alpha_k} \mid (n-1)! \implies n \mid (n-1)!$

Hence proved.

**More interestingly, show that for any $n > 1$,
 n is prime iff $(n - 1)! \equiv -1 \pmod n$.
(This is known as Wilson's primality criterion.)**

We have already proved one part of the required equivalent statement, that is p is not prime, then $(p - 1)! \not\equiv -1 \pmod n$. Now we just need to prove the remaining part that if p is prime then $(p - 1)! \equiv -1 \pmod p$

Clearly, if $p = 2$ or 3 the congruence is easily verified. Thus we may assume that $p \geq 5$.

Suppose that $1 \leq a \leq p - 1$. Then $(a, p) = 1$ so there will exist a unique inverse (a^{-1}) of $a \pmod p$.

So, all the integers from 1 to $p - 1$ and their inverses exist in the product $(n - 1)!$.

However, there are some x such that $x = x^{-1}$, which will not be cancelled in the product.

For them we need to prove another lemma, that:

If p is prime then $x^2 \equiv 1 \pmod p$ iff $x \equiv \pm 1 \pmod p$

Proof: We can rearrange the equation as:

$$\begin{aligned} x^2 \equiv 1 \pmod p &\iff (x - 1)(x + 1) \equiv 0 \pmod p \iff p \mid (x - 1) \text{ or } p \mid (x + 1) \\ &\implies x \equiv 1 \pmod p \text{ or } x \equiv -1 \pmod p \end{aligned}$$

Hence the lemma is proved.

Now we use this lemma to claim that only 1 and $p - 1$ are the cases where $x = x^{-1}$, so we handle them separately and write the result only for all $2 \leq x \leq p - 2$

$$\implies (p - 1)! \equiv (1)(1)(p - 1) \pmod p \equiv -1 \pmod p$$

Hence proved.

Acknowledgements

1. Class notes.
2. An Introduction to The Theory of Numbers by Ivan Niven