

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/243772113>

A Cure for the Telephone Disease

Article in Canadian mathematical bulletin = Bulletin canadien de mathématiques · September 1972

DOI: 10.4153/CMB-1972-081-0

CITATIONS

97

READS

248

3 authors, including:



András Hajnal

Hungarian Academy of Sciences

168 PUBLICATIONS 5,375 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

A CURE FOR THE TELEPHONE DISEASE

BY

A. HAJNAL, E. C. MILNER AND E. SZEMERÉDI⁽¹⁾

The following problem due to A. Boyd, has enjoyed a certain popularity in recent months with several mathematicians. A different solution to the one given here has been given independently by R. T. Bumby and J. Spencer.⁽²⁾

The Problem. There are n ladies, and each one of them knows an item of scandal which is not known to any of the others. They communicate by telephone, and whenever two ladies make a call, they pass on to each other, as much scandal as they know at that time. How many calls are needed before all the ladies know all the scandal?

If $f(n)$ is the minimum number of calls needed, then it is easy to verify that $f(1)=0$, $f(2)=1$, $f(3)=3$, $f(4)=4$. It is also easy to see that $f(n+1) \leq f(n)+2$, for the $(n+1)$ -th lady first calls one of the others and someone calls her back after the remaining n ladies have communicated all the scandal to each other. It follows that $f(n) \leq 2n-4$ ($n \geq 4$). We will prove that

$$(1) \quad f(n) = 2n-4 \quad (n \geq 4).$$

We shall represent the n ladies by the set of vertices, V , of a multigraph. A sequence of calls

$$(2) \quad c(1), c(2), \dots, c(t)$$

between them can be represented by the edges of the multigraph labelled according to the order in which the calls are made.

The interchange rule. Suppose (2) is a given sequence of calls, and suppose that the a calls $c(i), c(i+1), \dots, c(i+a-1)$ are **vertex disjoint** from the succeeding b calls $c(i+a), \dots, c(i+a+b-1)$. Then we can interchange the order of these two blocks of a and b calls, i.e. if we make the same calls as in (2) but in the order

$$c(1), \dots, c(i-1)c(i+a), \dots, c(i+a+b-1), \\ c(i), \dots, c(i+a-1), c(i+a+b), \dots, c(t)$$

then the total information conveyed is exactly the same as for the sequence (2). If $c'(1), \dots, c'(t)$ is a rearrangement of the sequence (2) obtained by a number of interchanges of adjacent blocks of vertex disjoint calls of the kind just described, we say that c' is an *equivalent* calling system and write $c' \sim c$.

⁽¹⁾ Research supported by National Research Council Grant A-5198.

⁽²⁾ Since this paper was written we have received another solution from R. Tijdeman. His paper will appear in *Nieuw Archief voor Wiskunde*.

Let (2) be a given sequence of calls. A vertex x of the graph will be called an F -point if the corresponding lady **knows everything** after the t calls have been made. Obviously, if $c' \sim c$, then the sequence of calls $c'(1), \dots, c'(t)$ gives the same F -points as c . In order that there be any F -points at all, the graph G , with vertex set V and edge set (2), must be connected. Consequently, we have

LEMMA 1. *There are no F -points after $n-2$ calls.*

In order to prove (1) it is enough to prove

LEMMA 2. *After $n+k-4$ calls there are at most k F -points.*

Proof. We shall actually prove the following stronger assertion

$P(k)$: *If $c(1), \dots, c(n+k-4)$ is a sequence of $n+k-4$ calls, then there are at most k F -points. Further, if there are k F -points, then there is an equivalent calling sequence $c' \sim c$ in which the last k calls*

$$c'(n-3), c'(n-2), \dots, c'(n+k-4)$$

are all between F -points.

The first part of $P(k)$ follows from Lemma 1 if $k=0, 1$, or 2 and for these values of k the second part of $P(k)$ is satisfied vacuously. We now assume $k > 2$ and use induction on k .

Suppose there are $k+1$ F -points after the $n+k-4$ calls. Since the last call $c(n+k-4)$ can produce **at most two** F -points, it follows from the induction hypothesis that there must be $k-1$ F -points $\{x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}\}$ after the first $n+k-5$ calls and the last call $c(n+k-4)$ is between two additional F -points $\{x_k, x_{k+1}\}$. By the second part of $P(k-1)$, we can assume that the last $k-1$ calls of the sequence $c(1), \dots, c(n+k-5)$ are between the F -points $\{x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}\}$. By the **interchange rule**, the last call $c(n+k-4)$ could be made before $c(n-3), \dots, c(n+k-5)$. It follows that after the $n-3$ calls

$$c(1), c(2), \dots, c(n-4), c(n+k-4)$$

there would be two F -points $\{x_k, x_{k+1}\}$ **contrary** to Lemma 1. This shows that there can be at most k F -points.

To complete the proof we must show that the **second part** of the inductive statement $P(k)$ holds.

Suppose there are k F -points after the $n+k-4$ calls

$$c(1), c(2), \dots, c(n+k-4).$$

Consider the disconnected graph G_0 with vertex set V and **edge set** $E_0 = \{c(1), \dots, c(n-2)\}$. Suppose G_0 has an **isolated** vertex x . There are at least $k-1$ F -points $x_i \neq x (1 \leq i < k)$ and each of these is connected to x by a path from the

edge set $E_1 = \{c(n-1), \dots, c(n+k-4)\}$. This implies that the points x, x_i ($1 \leq i < k$) are in a single component of the graph on V with edge set E_1 . This is impossible since $|E_1| + 1 < k$. Thus G_0 has no isolated vertex and each component of this graph has **at least one edge**. By the interchange rule, the first $n-3$ calls can be equivalently re-ordered so that the $(n-3)$ -rd call is in a different component of G_0 to $c(n-2)$. Therefore, we may assume that $c(n-3)$ and $c(n-2)$ are **disjoint**.

Now suppose that the last k calls of the given sequence are **not all between** F -points. Then there is p , $1 \leq p \leq k$, such that the last $p-1$ calls $c(n+k-p-2), \dots, c(n+k-4)$ are **all between F -points** but the preceding call, $c(n+k-p-3)$, is adjacent to **at most** one F -point. In fact, we can assume that $p < k$. For, if $p = k$ we can, by the last paragraph, consider instead the equivalent calling sequence obtained by interchanging $c(n-3)$ and $c(n-2)$.

If $c(n+k-p-3)$ is not adjacent to any F -point, then by the interchange rule, this call could be made last and then there would be k F -points after only $n+k-5$ calls

$$c(1), \dots, c(n+k-p-4), c(n+k-p-2), \dots, c(n+k-4).$$

This contradicts the induction hypothesis and so we can assume that $c(n+k-p-3)$ is adjacent to **exactly** one F -point.

Consider the graph \bar{G} on V having the p edges $c(n+k-p-3), \dots, c(n+k-4)$ and let C be the **component** of this graph containing the edge $c(n+k-p-3)$. Let $\bar{c}(1) = c(n+k-p-3)$, $\bar{c}(2), \dots, \bar{c}(r)$ be the edges of C in the order in which these calls are made and let $\bar{c}(1), \bar{c}(2), \dots, \bar{c}(p-r)$ be the remaining edges of \bar{G} in order. By the interchange rule, $\bar{c}(1)$ can be made before any of the calls in C and similarly for $\bar{c}(2), \dots, \bar{c}(p-r)$. Thus the original calling sequence is equivalent to the sequence of calls

$$(3) \quad c(1), c(2), \dots, c(n+k-p-4), \bar{c}(1), \dots, \bar{c}(p-r), \bar{c}(1), \dots, \bar{c}(r).$$

Since $\bar{c}(1)$ is adjacent to **only one F -point**, the component C contains **at most r F -points** (C has r edges and at most $r+1$ points). It follows that after the first $n+k-r-4$ calls in the sequence (3), there are at least $k-r$ F -points. Therefore, by the induction hypothesis there must be exactly $k-r$ such F -points (and the component C contains exactly r F -points) and there is an equivalent re-ordering of these $n+k-r-4$ calls so that the last $k-r$ are between the $k-r$ F -points not in C . In this way we obtain an equivalent calling sequence, say

$$(4) \quad c_1(1), \dots, c_1(n+k-r-4), \bar{c}(1), \dots, \bar{c}(r).$$

Since **the $k-r$ calls** $c_1(n-3), \dots, c_1(n+k-r-4)$ are vertex disjoint from $\bar{c}(1), \dots, \bar{c}(r)$ (they are between F -points not in C) it follows, again by the interchange rule, that an equivalent sequence is

$$(5) \quad c_1(1), \dots, c_1(n-4), \bar{c}(1), \dots, \bar{c}(r), c_1(n-3), \dots, c_1(n+k-r-4).$$

The first $n-4+r$ calls in the sequence (5) give rise to the r F -points in C . Therefore, by the induction hypothesis, these calls can be rearranged so that the last r calls are between F -points. After re-ordering the first $n+r-4$ calls of (5) in this way we obtain an equivalent calling system $c' \sim c$ in which the last k calls are all between F -points. This completes the proof of Lemma 2.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY,
CALGARY, ALBERTA