

Graphs

Definition ((c_e, c_v) -graph): We define a (c_e, c_v) -**graph** to be a simple undirected graph where each vertex and edge is assigned a colour from $[c_e], [c_v]$ respectively.

Definition (Isomorphism): A function $f: V(G) \rightarrow V(H)$ for G, H (c_e, c_v) -graphs is an isomorphism if it is a classic graph isomorphism and preserves colours. We write $G \cong H$.

Definition (Graph Family): If \mathbb{G}^{c_e, c_v} is the class of all (c_e, c_v) -graphs then a **graph family** $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathbb{G}^{c_e, c_v}$ is just some subclass.

Flags

The choice of \mathcal{G} informs all the following definitions.

Modified from (Silva, Filho, Sato - 2016: [Flag Algebras: A First Glance](#)).

Original definitions: Section 2.1 of (Razborov - 2007: [Flag Algebras](#)).

Definition (Type): A **type of size** $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ is some $\sigma \in \mathcal{G}$ with $V(\sigma) = [k]$. We write $|\sigma|$ for the size of the type.

Definition (Embedding): An **embedding** of a type σ of size k into $F \in \mathcal{G}$ is an injective function $\theta: [k] \rightarrow V(F)$ such that θ is an isomorphism between σ and $F[\text{im } \theta]$.

Definition (Flag): A pair (F, θ) where $F \in \mathcal{G}$ and θ is an embedding of σ into F is a **σ -flag**.

Notation: We denote the collection of all σ -flags with up to isomorphism \mathcal{G}^σ . Use a subscript \mathcal{G}_n^σ to denote only flags of size n . If $\sigma = \emptyset$ we can drop the σ superscript.

Notation: We will often implicitly treat a type σ as a σ -flag. Specifically one with the $\text{id}: [|\sigma|] \rightarrow [|\sigma|]$ embedding.

Definition (Labelled): We refer to a vertex in (F, θ) as labelled if it is in the image of θ , and often call $\text{im } \theta$ the *labelled part of F* .

Definition (Flag Isomorphism): $f: V(F) \rightarrow V(F')$ is a σ -flag isomorphism from $(F, \theta) \rightarrow (F', \theta')$ if it is an isomorphism $F \rightarrow F'$ which preserves labels, meaning $f(\theta(i)) = \theta'(i) \forall i \in [|\sigma|]$. We can write $(F, \theta) \cong (F', \theta')$ if such an f exists.

Empty-flags: If $\sigma = \emptyset$, the empty graph then flags are just graphs with trivial embeddings. We usually just write F rather than (F, θ) and treat graphs as implicit \emptyset -flags.

Induced Count

Definition (Induced Count): Fix two σ -flags $(F, \theta), (G, \eta)$. We define the induced count of (F, θ) in (G, η) written $c((F, \theta); (G, \eta))$ (abbreviated as $c(F; G)$ if θ, η are implicit) as the number of induced copies of F in G s.t. the labelled part of F maps to the labelled part of G .

Specifically this is the number of subsets $\text{im}(\eta) \subseteq U \subseteq V(G)$ such that $(F, \theta) \cong (G[U], \eta)$. Clearly $c(F, G) = 0$ if $|G| < |F|$.

Extension to multiple flags: Take a finite number of σ -flags $(F_i, \theta_i), i \in [t]$ and another σ -flag (G, η) . We now define $c(F_1, \dots, F_t; G)$ as the number of t -tuples of induced copies of F_1, \dots, F_t in G which are disjoint except precisely at the labelled part of G .

Precisely this is the number of subsets $U_1, \dots, U_t \subseteq V(G)$ such that $\text{im} \eta = U_i \cap U_j \forall i, j \in [t]$ where $i \neq j$ and $(F_i, \theta_i) \cong (G[U_i], \eta)$ for all $i \in [t]$.

Definition (Fit): Note that if $c(F_1, \dots, F_t; G) > 0$ then $|G| - |\sigma| \geq \sum_{i=1}^t |F_i| - |\sigma|$. If this holds we say F_1, \dots, F_t **fit in** G .

Classic Density

This is the classic density used in Razborov's flag algebras: [\(Razborov - 2007\)](#).

Definition (Induced Density): For σ -flags (F, θ) and (G, η) define $p((F, \theta), (G, \eta))$ (abbreviated as $p(F, G)$) as the proportion of subsets $\text{im} \eta \subseteq U \subseteq V(G)$ such that $(F, \theta) \cong (G[U], \eta)$:

$$p(F; G) = \frac{c(F; G)}{\binom{|G| - |\sigma|}{|F| - |\sigma|}}.$$

Extension to finite set of flags: As with $c(F, G)$ we can extend to a finite collection of flags $(F_i, \theta_i), i \in [t]$ where we normalise $c(F_1, \dots, F_t; G)$ by the total number of possible subsets $U_1, \dots, U_t \subseteq V(G)$ such that $U_i \cap U_j = \text{im} \eta \forall i \neq j$.

$$p(F_1, \dots, F_t; G) = \frac{c(F_1, \dots, F_t; G)}{\binom{|G| - |\sigma|}{|F_1| - |\sigma|, \dots, |F_t| - |\sigma|, R}}$$

using multinomial coefficient notation where $R = (|G| - |\sigma|) - \sum_{i=1}^t |F_i| - |\sigma|$.

Probabilistic Interpretation: You can interpret $p(F_1, \dots, F_t; G)$ as the probability that a uniformly random tuple $U_1, \dots, U_t \subseteq V(G)$ such that $U_i \cap U_j = \text{im} \eta \forall i \neq j$ has the property that $(F_i, \theta_i) \cong (G[U_i], \eta) \forall i \in [t]$.

Lemma (Chain Rule): If F_1, \dots, F_t are σ -flags which fit in G then for all $1 \leq s \leq t$ and every n such that F_1, \dots, F_s fit into a σ flag of size n and a σ -flag and F_{s+1}, \dots, F_t fit in G we have:

$$p(F_1, \dots, F_t; G) = \sum_{F \in \mathcal{G}_n^\sigma} p(F_1, \dots, F_s; F) p(F, F_{s+1}, \dots, F_t; G).$$

Labelling

Definition (Label Extension): Given a σ -flag (F, θ) and some unlabelled vertex $v \in V(F) \setminus \text{im} \theta$ we can construct a **label extension** $\theta': [\sigma] + 1 \rightarrow V(F)$ as

$$\theta'(i) = \begin{cases} \theta(i) & \text{if } i \in [\sigma] \\ v & \text{if } i = |\sigma| + 1. \end{cases}$$

This is an embedding of the type σ' with vertices $[\sigma] + 1$ obtained by adding a new vertex $|\sigma| + 1$ to σ such that $\sigma' \cong F[\text{im} \theta']$.

(F, θ') is then a σ' -flag.

Local Flags

🕒 Todo

Needs an example of a density hard to describe with classic flags. Maybe something like paths of length 2 in a Δ -regular graph.

🕒 Todo

Highlight that Δ being the max degree is not actually required for these definitions to make sense. All that's required is that the Δ -parameter bounds "degrees of freedom" in some way.

Assume the max degree $\Delta(G)$ is > 0 .

Definition (Local Density): Rather than normalising the induced count of σ -flags $c((F, \theta); (G, \eta))$ by $\binom{|G|-|\sigma|}{|F|-|\sigma|}$ we instead normalise by $\binom{\Delta(G)}{|F|-|\sigma|}$.

$$\rho(F; G) = \frac{c(F; G)}{\binom{\Delta(G)}{|F|-|\sigma|}}.$$

Note the $\rho \neq p$ notation.

Because of our choice of "normalisation" we are no longer guaranteed a $[0, 1]$ codomain. The full range for ρ is $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$.

🕒 Todo

Example of why ρ can be unbounded.

This unboundedness is undesirable. We will now define a restricted subset of the classic flags to the case where we do not have this divergent behaviour.

Once again these definitions are relative to some fixed family of graphs \mathcal{G} .

🕒 Todo

Needs an elucidatory example of a family of graphs \mathcal{G} where we describe which structures have divergent density and which do not.

Definition (Local Flag): Let σ be a type. Then a σ -flag (F, θ) is a **local σ -flag** if we have the following properties:

1. $(G, \eta) \rightarrow \rho((F, \theta); (G, \eta))$ is a bounded function as a function $\mathcal{G}^\sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$.
2. If we label any of F 's unlabelled vertices we get another local flag.

To state this 2nd property precisely: We require that for any label extension θ' of θ the induced extended flag (F, θ') is also a local flag.

This is not a circular definition as any label extension of (F, θ) reduces the number of unlabelled vertices by 1; We could define inductively starting with those flags with no unlabelled vertices.

What we're trying to capture here is that any "subflag" of F is also a local flag, meaning we can pin down F 's vertices and continue to get bounded local behaviour.

Note: This second property is not necessarily implied by the first, so it is a required part of the definition of a local flag.

Lemma: *There exists an infinite class of graphs \mathcal{G} and a flag (F, θ) such that $\rho((F, \theta); \cdot)$ is a bounded function but a label extension (F, θ') has unbounded density.*

✓ **Proof** >

Consider 3-vertex-coloured graphs (red, blue, black) and take \mathcal{G} to be the class of graphs with a single red vertex, $\Delta(G)^2$ blue vertices and the rest black vertices such that there are no red-blue edges.

Relative to this \mathcal{G} then the following \emptyset -flag is local: $F = (\bullet \bullet)$. We can calculate that for $G \in \mathcal{G}$ we have $c(F; G) = \Delta(G)^2$ as we have 1 choice for the red vertex and $\Delta(G)^2$ for the blue. Hence $\rho(F; G) = c(F; G) / \binom{\Delta(G)}{2} \leq 2$.

Consider labelling the red-vertex in F , giving $F' = (\circ \bullet)$ with type $\sigma = \bullet$. For any $G \in \mathcal{G}$ there is a unique embedding η_0 of σ , mapping this red vertex to the single red vertex. However we still have $c(F'; (G, \eta_0)) = \Delta(G)^2$ so $\rho(F'; (G, \eta_0)) = c(F'; (G, \eta_0)) / \Delta \sim \Delta(G)$ which is unbounded.

(■)

Notation: Write \mathcal{L}_n^σ to be the set of all local σ -flags of size n up to isomorphism. Write \mathcal{L}^σ for all local σ -flags. If $\sigma = \emptyset$ then we can drop the σ superscript.

⚠ **Warning**

The chain rule does not hold in general for local flags.

⚠ **Warning**

Just because valid local σ -flags exist does not necessarily mean σ itself is implicitly a local σ -flag.