#### **Connectedness**

#### Stepan Kuznetsov

Computer Science Department, Higher School of Economics

#### **Outline**

Connectedness of Random Graphs

• Recall that G(n,p) is the Erdős – Rényi random graph on n vertices, where each edge is planted with probability p, independently from others.

- Recall that G(n,p) is the Erdős Rényi random graph on n vertices, where each edge is planted with probability p, independently from others.
- The probability p could depend on n.

- Recall that G(n,p) is the Erdős Rényi random graph on n vertices, where each edge is planted with probability p, independently from others.
- The probability p could depend on n.
- We start with  $p = \frac{1}{2}$ .

- Recall that G(n,p) is the Erdős Rényi random graph on n vertices, where each edge is planted with probability p, independently from others.
- The probability p could depend on n.
- We start with  $p = \frac{1}{2}$ .
- Recall that the probability of  $G(n, \frac{1}{2})$  to have an isolated vertex tends to 0 when  $n \to \infty$ .

• Let us generalize that computation and estimate the probability of  $G(n, \frac{1}{2})$  to be connected.

- Let us generalize that computation and estimate the probability of  $G(n, \frac{1}{2})$  to be connected.
- $P(G(n, \frac{1}{2}) \text{ is not connected}) \leq \sum_{\emptyset \neq V' \subset V} P(V' \text{ is isolated}) = \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} \frac{\binom{n}{m}}{2^{m(n-m)}}$

- Let us generalize that computation and estimate the probability of  $G(n, \frac{1}{2})$  to be connected.
- $P(G(n, \frac{1}{2}) \text{ is not connected}) \leq \sum_{\emptyset \neq V' \subset V} P(V' \text{ is isolated}) = \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} \frac{\binom{n}{m}}{2^{m(n-m)}}$
- Oops... this looks more like 1 (binomial formula).

- Let us generalize that computation and estimate the probability of  $G(n, \frac{1}{2})$  to be connected.
- $P(G(n, \frac{1}{2}) \text{ is not connected}) \leq \sum_{\emptyset \neq V' \subsetneq V} P(V' \text{ is isolated}) = \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} \frac{\binom{n}{m}}{2^{m(n-m)}}$
- Oops... this looks more like 1 (binomial formula).
- The problem is that our cases overlap too much.

 Let us do something stronger: show that the probability that any two vertices have a common neighbour tends to 1.

- Let us do something stronger: show that the probability that any two vertices have a common neighbour tends to 1.
- This implies connectedness, so connectedness will also have desired probability.

•  $P(\text{there are two vertices without a common neighbour}) \leq \sum_{i \neq j} P(v_i \text{ and } v_j \text{ do not have a common neighbour}) =$ 

•  $P(\text{there are two vertices without a common neighbour}) \leq \sum_{i \neq j} P(v_i \text{ and } v_j \text{ do not have a common neighbour}) = n(n-1)(\frac{3}{4})^{n-2}$ 

•  $P(\text{there are two vertices without a common neighbour}) \leq \sum_{i \neq j} P(v_i \text{ and } v_j \text{ do not have a common neighbour}) = n(n-1)(\frac{3}{4})^{n-2} \to 0$ 

- $P(\text{there are two vertices without a common neighbour}) \leq \sum_{i \neq j} P(v_i \text{ and } v_j \text{ do not have a common neighbour}) = n(n-1)(\frac{3}{4})^{n-2} \to 0$
- Indeed,  $v_i$  and  $v_j$  do not have a common neighbour if and only if for any w from the remaining n-2 vertices one of the edges  $\langle w, v_i \rangle$  and  $\langle w, v_j \rangle$  was not drawn.

- $P(\text{there are two vertices without a common neighbour}) \leq \sum_{i \neq j} P(v_i \text{ and } v_j \text{ do not have a common neighbour}) = n(n-1)(\frac{3}{4})^{n-2} \to 0$
- Indeed,  $v_i$  and  $v_j$  do not have a common neighbour if and only if for any w from the remaining n-2 vertices one of the edges  $\langle w, v_i \rangle$  and  $\langle w, v_j \rangle$  was not drawn. This happens with probability  $\frac{3}{4}$ .

• Now we know that  $G(n, \frac{1}{2})$  is almost surely connected, for  $n \to \infty$ .

- Now we know that  $G(n, \frac{1}{2})$  is almost surely connected, for  $n \to \infty$ .
- On the other hand, as shown before,  $G(n,2^{-n})$  almost surely has an isolated vertex, thus, it is disconnected.

- Now we know that  $G(n, \frac{1}{2})$  is almost surely connected, for  $n \to \infty$ .
- On the other hand, as shown before,  $G(n,2^{-n})$  almost surely has an isolated vertex, thus, it is disconnected.
- The exact boundaries are as follows:

- Now we know that  $G(n, \frac{1}{2})$  is almost surely connected, for  $n \to \infty$ .
- On the other hand, as shown before,  $G(n,2^{-n})$  almost surely has an isolated vertex, thus, it is disconnected.
- The exact boundaries are as follows:
  - if  $p<\frac{(1-\varepsilon)\ln n}{n}$  , then G(n,p) is almost surely disconnected;

- Now we know that  $G(n, \frac{1}{2})$  is almost surely connected, for  $n \to \infty$ .
- On the other hand, as shown before,  $G(n,2^{-n})$  almost surely has an isolated vertex, thus, it is disconnected.
- The exact boundaries are as follows:
  - if  $p<\frac{(1-\varepsilon)\ln n}{n}$ , then G(n,p) is almost surely disconnected;
  - if  $p>\frac{(1+\varepsilon)\ln n}{n}$ , then G(n,p) is almost surely connected.