

Question 1. We'll assume  $n_k \geq 1$ .

$$n = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} n_j; \text{ total degree} = 2n - 2 = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} jn_j$$

$$\begin{aligned} n &= n_1 + n_2 + n_3 + \cdots + n_k + \cdots \\ 2n - 2 &= n_1 + 2n_2 + 3n_3 + \cdots + kn_k + \cdots \end{aligned}$$

We then have

$$2(n_1 + n_2 + n_3 + \cdots + n_k + \cdots) - 2 = n_1 + 2n_2 + 3n_3 + \cdots + kn_k + \cdots$$

Move the  $n_1$  terms to the left; everything else to the right, and use  $n_i \geq 0, n_k \geq 1$  to obtain an inequality.

The quantity  $D(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$  being even means that **a** and **b** must be in the same “part” considering  $Q_n$  as a bipartite graph.

We're looking at  $n$ -ary trees:

**Definition.** A rooted tree  $(T, r)$  is said to be an  **$n$ -ary tree** if every vertex has at most  $n$  children.

If  $n = 2$ , we have a **binary tree**; if  $n = 3$ , we have a **ternary tree**.

**Definition.** A vertex of an  $n$ -ary tree is said to be **saturated** if it has  $n$  children.

**Definition.** An  $n$ -ary tree is **full** if every parent is saturated.

**Observations.**

- A trivial rooted tree is an example of a full  $n$ -ary tree for any  $n \geq 0$ .
- If  $(T, r)$  is an  $n$ -ary tree, then it is also an  $(n + 1)$ -ary tree. The word “full” is not being used in this observation.
- For a nontrivial full  $n$ -ary tree, the root has degree  $n$ , every other parent has degree  $n + 1$ , and every nonparent has degree 1.

**Theorem.** Given a full  $n$ -ary tree  $(T, r)$ , if there are  $k$  parents, then there are exactly  $(n - 1)k + 1$  non-parents.

*Proof.* Let  $\ell$  be the number of non-parents. If  $T$  is trivial, then  $k = 0$  and  $\ell = 1 = (n - 1)0 + 1$ , as desired.

If  $T$  is nontrivial, the total degree of  $T$  is

$$\begin{aligned} n + (k - 1)(n + 1) + \ell &= n + 1 + (k - 1)(n + 1) + \ell - 1 \\ &= k(n + 1) + \ell - 1. \end{aligned}$$

The number of edges is one less than the number of vertices; the number of vertices is  $k + \ell$  and so the number of edges is  $k + \ell - 1$ .

By the handshaking lemma,

$$2(k + \ell - 1) = k(n + 1) + \ell - 1$$

or

$$2k + 2\ell - 2 = kn + k + \ell - 1.$$

Solving this for  $\ell$  gives us

$$\ell = (n - 1)k + 1$$

as desired.

**Corollary.** In a full binary tree with  $k$  parents (these are often called “interior vertices” in the literature), there are  $k + 1$  non-parents (usually called “leaves”).

**Corollary.** In any full binary tree, the number of vertices must be odd.

**Corollary.** In any full  $n$ -ary tree, the number of vertices must be one more than a multiple of  $n$ .

Now, let's try to squeeze as many vertices onto level  $L$  as possible in an  $n$ -ary tree.

**Theorem.** For integers  $n \geq 1$  and  $L \geq 0$ , an  $n$ -ary tree has at most  $n^L$  vertices at level  $L$ .

*Proof.* We proceed by induction on  $L$ , letting  $N_L$  be the maximum number of vertices at level  $L$ . For the base case, there is 1 vertex at level 0, namely the root. Hence,  $N_0 = 1$ .

For the inductive step, assume  $N_L \leq n^L$ . Since every vertex at level  $L + 1$  is a child of a vertex at level  $L$  and every vertex at level  $L$  has at most  $n$  children, we have

$$N_{L+1} \leq n N_L \leq n \cdot n^L = n^{L+1},$$

completing the inductive step and the proof.