Graph Theory

Jeremy Le — UNSW MATH5425 25T1

Contents

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Definitions

A **graph** $G = (V, E)$ is a set V of *vertices* and a set E of unordered pairs of distinct vertices, called *edges*. Write vw or $\{v, w\}$ for the edge joining v and w, and say that v and w are **neighbours** or that they are *adjacent*.

In these notes, unless otherwise stated, graphs are:

- **finite**: $|V| \in \mathbb{N}$.
- **labelled**: vertices are distinguishable, usually $V = [n] := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$.
- **undirected**: edges are *unordered* pairs of vertices.
- **simple**: no loops $\{v, v\}$ or multiple edges (since E is not a multiset).

A graph G with vertex set $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ has **adjacency matrix** $A(G) = (a_{ij})$ where

$$a_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } v_i v_j \in E, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

$A(G)$ is a **symmetric** $n \times n$ 0-1 matrix with zero diagonal.

The **trivial graph** has at most one vertex. Hence it has no edges.

A **subgraph** of a graph $G = (V, E)$ is a graph $H = (W, F)$ such that $W \subseteq V$ and $F \subseteq E$.

We say that H is an **induced subgraph** if for all $v, w \in W$ if $vw \in E(G)$ then $vw \in E(H)$. Write $H = G[W]$, and say that H is the subgraph of G *induced by* the vertex set W.
The number of **vertices** of G, written $|G| = |V(G)|$, is called the *order* of G. The number of **edges** of G, sometimes written $||G|| = |E(G)|$, is called the *size* of G.

Two graphs $G = (V, E)$ and $H = (W, F)$ are **isomorphic** if there exists a *bijection* $\phi : V \to W$ such that $\phi(v)\phi(w) \in F$ if and only if $vw \in E$. The map ϕ is called a *graph isomorphism* or *isomorphism*.

1.2 The Degree of a Vertex

If $v \in e$ where v is a vertex and e is an edge, then we say that e is *incident with* v. The **degree** $d_G(v)$ of vertex v in a graph G is the number of *edges* of G which are *incident with* v. A vertex of degree 0 is an *isolated vertex.*

Let $N_G(v)$ be the set of all **neighbours** of v in G, then $d(v) = |N(v)|$.

Lemma 1.2.1 (The Handshaking Lemma)**.** In any graph, $G = (V, E)$,

$$\sum_{v \in V} d(v) = 2|E|.$$

Let $\delta(G) = \min_{v \in V} d(v)$ be the minimum degree in G, and $\Delta(G) = \max_{v \in V} d(v)$ be the maximum degree in G.

1.2.1 Some Special Graphs

A graph is k**-partite** if there exists a partition of its vertex set

$$V = V_1 \cup V_2 \cup \cdots V_k$$

into k nonempty disjoint subsets (parts) such that there are no edges between vertices in the same part.

The **complete graph** on r vertices, denoted K_r, has all $\binom{r}{2}$ edges present. The **complete bipartite graph** K_r, s has r vertices in one part of the vertex bipartition, s vertices in the other, and all rs present.

A graph is **regular** if every vertex has the same degree. If every vertex of a graph has degree d then we say that the graph is d-regular.

The **complement** of a graph G is the graph $\bar{G} = (V, \bar{E})$ where $vw \in \bar{E}$ if and only if $vw \notin E$. Note that $\bar{K_n}$ is the graph with n vertices and no edges.

If $G = (V, E)$ and $X \subset V$ then $G - X$ denotes the graph obtained from G by deleting all vertices in X and all edges which are incident with vertices in X. If $F \subseteq E$ then $G - F$ denotes the graph $(V, E - F)$ obtained from G by deleting the edges in F.

1.3 Paths and Cycles

A **walk** in the graph G is a sequence of vertices $v_0 v_1 v_2 \cdots v_k$ such that $v_i v_{i+1} \in E$ for $i = 0, 1, \ldots, k-1$. The **length** of this walk is k. The walk is **closed** if $v_0 = v_k$.

An **Euler tour** is a *closed walk* in a graph which uses every edge precisely once. A graph is Eulerian if it has an Euler tour.

Theorem 1.3.1 (Euler, 1736)**.** A connected graph is Eulerian if and only if every vertex has even degree.

A walk is a **path** if it does not visit any vertex more than once. A path is a sequence of *disinct* vertices, with subsequence vertices joined by an edge. A path $v_0 v_1 \ldots v_k$ with k edges is called a k-path and has length k.

If $k \geq 3$ and $P = v_0 v_1 \cdots v_{k-1}$ is a path of length $k-1$ then $C = P + v_0 v_{k-1}$ is a **cycle** of length k, also called a $k-cycle$. It is a closed walk which visits no internal vertex more than once.

An edge which joins two vertices of a cycle C, but which is not an edge of C, is called a **chord**. An **induced cycle** is a cycle which has no chords.

Proposition 1.3.2. Every graph G contains a path of length $\delta(G)$ and a cycle of length at least $\delta(G)+1$, if $\delta(G) \geq 2$.

Proof. Let $P = x_0 x_1 \ldots x_k$ be the longest path in G. By maximality of P, all neighbours of x_k lie on P. Hence $\delta(G) \leq d(x_k) \leq k = |\{x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_{k-1}\}|$, which proves the first statement. Let x_i be the smallest-indexed neighbour of x_k in P. Then $C = x_k x_i x_{i+1} \ldots x_{k-1} x_k$ is a cycle of length $\geq \delta(G)+1$ because C contains $d(x_k) \geq \delta(G)$ neighbours of x_k as well as x_k. $\square$

The *minimum length* of a cycle in G is the **girth** of G, denoted by $g(G)$.

Given $x, y \in V$, let $d_G(x,y)$ be the length of a shortest path from x to y in G, called the **distance** from x to y in G. Set $d_G(x,y) = \infty$ if no such path exists.

We say that G is **connected** if $d_G(x,y)$ is finite for all $x, y \in V$.

Let the **diameter** of G be $\operatorname{diam}(G) = \max_{x,y \in V} d_G(x,y)$.

Proposition 1.3.3. Every graph G which contains a cycle satisfies $g(G) \leq 2\operatorname{diam}(G) + 1$.

Proof. Let C be a shortst cycle in G, so $|C| = g(G)$. For a contradiction, assume $g(G) \geq 2\operatorname{diam}(G) + 2$.

Choose vertices x, y on C with $d_C(x,y) \geq \operatorname{diam}(G)+1$. In G the distance $d_G(x,y)$ is strictly smaller, so any shortest path P from x to y in G is not a subgraph of C. But using P together with the shorter arc of C from x to y gives a closed walk of length $< |C|$. This closed walk contains a shorter cycle than C which is a contradiction. $\square$

1.4 Connectivity

A maximal connected subgraph of G is called a **component** (or **connected component**) of G.

Proposition 1.4.1. The vertices of a connected graph can be labelled $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n$ such that $G_n = G$ and $G_i = G[v_1, \ldots, v_i]$ is connected for all i.

Proof. Choose v_1 arbitrarily. Now suppose that we have labelled $v_1, \ldots, v_i$ such that $G_j = G[v_1, \ldots, v_j]$ is connected for all $j = 1, \ldots, i$.

If $i < n$ then $G_i \neq G$, so there exists some $v_j \in \{v_1, \ldots, v_i\}$ with a $w \notin \{v_1, \ldots, v_i\}$ in G. (Otherwise $G_i \neq G$ is a component of G, impossible as G is connected.) Let $v_{i+1} = w$, then $G_{i+1} = G[v_1, \ldots, v_{i+1}]$ is connected. This completes the proof, by induction. $\square$

Let $A, B \subseteq V$ be sets of vertices. An (A,B)**-path** in G is a path $P = x_0x_1\cdots x_k$ such that

$$P \cap A = \{x_0\}, \quad P \cap B = \{x_k\}.$$

Let $A, B \subseteq V$ and let $X \subseteq V \cup E$ be a set of vertices and edges. We say that X **separates** A and B in G if every $(A,B)-$path in G contains a vertex or edge from X.
Note that we do not assume that A and B are disjoint and if X separates A and B then $A \cap B \subseteq X$.
We say that X **separates** two vertices a, b if $a, b \notin X$ and X separates the sets $\{a\}, \{b\}$.

More generally, we say that X *separates* G, and call X a **separating set** for G, if X separates two vertices of G. That is, X separates G if there exist distinct vertices $a, b \notin X$ such that X separates a and b.

If $X = \{x\}$ is a separating set for G, where $x \in V$, then we say that x is a **cut vertex**.

If $e \in E$ and $G - e$ has more components than G then e is a **bridge**.

The unordered pair (A, B) is a **separation** of G if $A \cup B = V$ and G has no edge between $A - B$ and $B - A$. The second conditions says that $A \cap B$ separates A from B in G. If both $A - B$ and $B - A$ are nonempty then the separation is **proper**. The order of the separation is $|A \cap B|$.

Definition. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$. The graph G is **k-connected** if $|G| > k$ and $G - X$ is connected for all subsets $X \subseteq V$ with $|X| < k$.

The **connectivity** $\kappa(G)$ of G is defined by

$$\kappa(G) = \max\{k : G \text{ is } k\text{-connected}\}.$$

So, $\kappa(G) = 0$ iff G is trivial or G is disconnected. Also, $\kappa(K_n) = n - 1$ for all positive integers n.

Definition. Let $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ and let G be a graph with $|G| \geq 2$. If $G - F$ is connected for all $F \subseteq E$ with $|F| < \ell$ then G is ℓ**-edge-connected**.

The **edge connectivity** $\lambda(G)$ is defined by

$$\lambda(G) = \max\{\ell : G \text{ is } \ell\text{-edge-connected}\}.$$

Proposition 1.4.2. If $|G| \geq 2$ then $\kappa(G) \leq \lambda(G) \leq \delta(G)$.

Theorem 1.4.3 (Mader, 1973)**.** Let k be a positive integer. Every graph G with average degree at least $4k$ has a $(k+1)$-connected subgraph H with

$$\frac{|E(H)|}{|V(H)|} > \frac{|E(G)|}{|V(G)|} - k.$$

Proof. We write $|G|$ instead of $|V(G)|$. Let $\gamma = \frac{|E(G)|}{|G|} \geq 2k$. Consider subgraphs G' of G which satisfy:

$$|G'| \geq 2k \quad \text{and} \quad |E(G')| > \gamma(|G'| - k). \tag{1.1}$$

such graphs G' exists as G satisfies 1.1. (Average degree of G is $\frac{2|E(G)|}{|G|} \geq 4k$, so

$|G| \geq 4k$ and $\gamma(|G| - k) = |E(G)|\frac{(|G|-k)}{|G|} < |E(G)|$.)

Now let H be a subgraph of G of smallest order which satisfies 1.1. We continue the proof by proving three claims.

Claim 1. If G' satisfies 1.1 then $|G'| > 2k$.
Proof. If G' satisfies 1.1 and $|G'| = 2k$ then $|E(G')| > \gamma(|G'| - k) \geq 2k^2 > \binom{|G'|}{2}$, contradiction.

Claim 2. $S(H) > \gamma$.
Proof. For a contradiction, suppose that $S(H) \leq \gamma$. Let G' be obtained from H by deleting a vertex of degree $\leq \gamma$. Then $|G'| < |H|$ and G' satisfies 1.1, which is a contradiction. To see this, check:

$$\begin{aligned} |G'| = |H| - 1 \geq 2k, &\quad \text{by Claim 1, and} \\ |E(G')| \geq |E(H)| - \gamma > \gamma(|H| - k - 1), &\quad \text{as } H \text{ satisfies 1.1} \\ = \gamma(|G'| - k). & \end{aligned}$$

Hence $S(H) > \gamma$. It follows that $|H| \geq \gamma$. Thus,

$$\frac{|E(H)|}{|H|} > \frac{\gamma(|H| - k)}{|H|}. \qquad \text{(as } H \text{ satisfies 1.1)}$$

Claim 3. H is $(k + 1)$-connected.
Proof. By Claim 1, $|H| \geq 2k + 1 \geq k + 2$ as $k \geq 1$. So H is large enough. For a contradiction, suppose that H is not $(k+1)$-connected. Then H has a proper separation $\{U_1, U_2\}$ of order at most k.

Let $H_i = H[U_i]$ for $i = 1, 2$. Since any vertex $v \in U_1 - U_2$ has $d_H(v) \geq S(H) > \gamma$ (by Claim 2), and all neighbours of v in H belong to H_1, we have $|H_1| \geq \gamma \geq 2k$. Similarly, $|H_2| \geq 2k$. By minimality of H, neither H_1 nor H_2 satisfies 1.1. Hence $|E(H_i)| \leq \gamma(|H_i| - k)$ for $i = 1, 2$. But then

$$\begin{aligned} |E(H)| &\leq |E(H_1)| + |E(H_2)| \\ &\leq \gamma(|H_1| + |H_2| - 2k) \\ &\leq \gamma(|H| - k), \qquad \text{(by inclusion-exclusion)} \end{aligned}$$

since $|U_1 \cup U_2| \leq k$. This contradicts 1.1 for H. So H is $(k + 1)$-connected, completing the proof of Claim 3 and of the theorem. □

1.5 Trees and Forests

A graph with no cycles is a **forest** (also called an acyclic graph). A connected graph with no cycles is a **tree**.

Theorem 1.5.1. The following are equivalent for a graph T:

(i) T is a tree;

(ii) Any two vertices of T are linked by a *unique* path in T;

(iii) T is *minimally connected*: that is, T is connected but $T - e$ is disconnected for every $e \in E(T)$;

(iv) T is *maximally acyclic*: that is, T is acyclic but $T + xy$ has a cycle for any two nonadjacent vertices x, y in T.

Corollary 1.5.2. If G is connected then G has a spanning tree.

Proof. Let be a connected graph and let H be a minimal connected spanning subgraph of G. (Note H exists as G is a connected spanning subgraph of itself.) By theorem 1.5.1, H is a tree. $\square$

Corollary 1.5.3. The vertices of a tree can be labelled as $v_1, \ldots, v_n$ so that for $i \geq 2$, vertex v_i has a unique neighbour in $\{v_1, \ldots, v_{i-1}\}$.

Proof. We use the labelling from Proposition 1.4.1. This labels the vertices of a given tree G as $v_1, \ldots, v_n$ such that $G[v_1, \ldots, v_n]$ is connected. Let $i \geq 1$ then $G[v_1, \ldots, v_i]$ is a tree. Note $G[v_1, \ldots, v_{i+1}]$ is connected by Proposition 1.4.1, so v_{i+1} has at least one neighbour in $G[v_1, \ldots, v_i]$.

For a contradiction, suppose that v_{i+1} has two neighbours z and w in $G[v_1, \ldots, v_i]$. There is a (unique) path P in $G[v_1, \ldots, v_i]$ between z and w, and this path does not visit v_{i+1}. Hence $P \cup \{zv_{i+1}, wv_{i+1}\}$ is a cycle in G, contradiction. $\square$

Corollary 1.5.4. A connected graph with n vertices is a tree if and only if it has $n - 1$ edges.

Proof. Suppose that G is a tree on n vertices. The result is true when $n = 1$. Now suppose the result is true when $n = k$. Let G be a tree on $k + 1$ vertices. Let v be a leaf in G (e.g .take an end vertex of a longest path in G.) Then $G - v$ is a tree on k vertices, so $G - v$ has $k - 1$ edges (inductive hypothesis). Therefore G has k edges as v has degree 1. This concluses the proof, by induction.

Conversely, suppose that $G$is connected with n vertices and $n-1$ edges. Then G contains a spanning tree H, by an earlier corollary. Then H has exactly $n - 1$ edges, since it is a tree on n vertices. Hence $H = G$, so G is a tree. $\square$

Corollary 1.5.5. If T is a tree and G is any graph with $\delta(G) \geq |T| - 1$ then G has a subgraph isomorphic to T.

Chapter 2

Matchings and Hamilton Cycles

Two edges in a graph are called **independent** if they have no vertices in common.
A set M of pairwise independent edges in a graph is called a **matching**.

Given $G = (V, E)$ and $U \subseteq V$, say that $M \subseteq E$ is a **matching of U** if M is matching and every vertex in U is incident with an edge of M. We say that the vertices in U are matched by M, and t hat the vertices not incident with any edge of M are **unmatched**.

A matching M is a **maximal matching** of G if $M \cup \{e\}$ is not a matching for any $e \in E - M$.
A **maximum matching** of G is a matching of G such that no set of edges with size greater than $|M|$ is a matching.

A **perfect matching** of G is a matching of G which matches every vertex of G. Note: a perfect matching is a 1-regular spanning subgraph of G also called a **1-factor** of G.

A k**-factor** is a k-regular spanning subgraph. A **2-factor** in a graph is the union of disjoint cycles which covers all the vertices.

2.1 Matchings in Bipartite Graphs

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a bipartite graph with vertex bipartition $V = A \cup B$. Here A, B are nonempty disjoint sets. We use the convention that all vertices called $a, a', a'', \dots$ belong to A and similarly for B.

Let M be matching in G. A path in G which starts at an *unmatched* vertex of A and contains, alternately, edges from $E - M$ and from M, is called an **alternating path** with respect to M.
If an alternating path P ends in an unmatched vertex of B then it is called an **augmenting path**.

Definition 2.1.1. A set $U \subseteq V$ is a **cover** (or **vertex cover**) of G if every edge of G is incident with a vertex in U.

Theorem 2.1.2 (König, 1931)**.** Let G be a bipartite graph. The size of a maximum matching in G is equal to the size of the minimum vertex cover of G.

Proof. Let $\hat{U}$ be a cover in G and let Mbe a maximum matching. Then $|\hat{U}| \geq |M|$ as we must cover every edge of M. Hence it suffices to construct a cover U of G with $|U| = |M|$.

We build U be choosing one vertex from each edge of M to place into U, as follows:

- If $ab \in M$ and some alternating path in G with respect to M ends in b. Then put b into U otherwise put a into U.

Let $ab \in E$. If $ab \in M$ then $a \in U$ or $b \in U$ by definition of U. Now assume $abb \notin M$. Since M is maximum, there exists $a'b' \in M$ with $a = a'$ or $b = b'$. If a is unmatched in M then $b = b'$ for some $a'b' \in M$. Hence ab is an alternating path ending in $b = b'$, so we chose b' to go into U from the edge $a'b' \in M$. So the edge ab is covered by U in this case.

Hence we assume that $a = a'$ for some $a'b' \in M$. If $a = a' \in U$ then we are done. Otherwise $b' \in U$, so there is an alternating path P ending in b'. Then $P = a_1b_1a_2b_2 \dots b'$, and we have three cases:

(i) P does not include a or b. Then $Pab = a_1a_2 \dots b'ab$ is an alternating path in G with respect to M. By maximality of M, b is matched or else we have an augmenting path. Hence $b \in U$ as b is the chosen vertex from its matching edge.

(ii) If b is on P before a, or $b \in P$ and $a \notin P$, then $P = a_1b_1a_2 \dots b \dots b'$. Then we let $P' = a_1b_1 \dots b$. This is an alternating path ending in b, so finish proof as case above.

(iii) If a is on P before b, or $a \in P$ and $b \notin P$. Then $P = a_1b_1 \dots a_rb_r \dots b'$ and we take $P' = a_1b_1 \dots ab$. This is an alternating path ending in b, so finish proof as case above.

This proves U is a cover of G and since $|U| = |M|$, this completes the proof. □

For a subset $S \subseteq A$, let $N(S) = \bigcup_{v \in S} N(v)$ be the set of vertices in B which are neighbours of some vertex in S.

Theorem 2.1.3 (Hall, 1935)**.** Let G be a bipartite graph. Then G contains a matching of A if and only if

$$|N(S)| \geq |S| \quad \text{for all } S \subseteq A. \tag{2.1}$$

Proof. We have that this condition is necessary. Now suppose that (2.1) holds. For a contradiction, suppose that G has no matching of A. Then König's Theorem (Theorem 2.1.2) says that G has a cover U with $|U| < |A|$. Suppose that $U = A' \cup B'$ with $A' \subseteq A$ and $B' \subseteq B$. Then $|A'| + |B'| = |U| < |A|$, so $|B'| < |A| - |A'| = |A - A'|$. Since U is a cover, G has no edges from $A - A'$ to $B - B'$. Hence $N(A - A') \subseteq B'$, and so $|N(A - A')| \leq |B'| < |A - A'|$. This contradicts Hall's condition 2.1 for $S = A - A'$. Hence G contains a matching of A. □

Corollary 2.1.4. Let G be a bipartite graph and $d \in \mathbb{N}$. If $|N(S)| \geq |S| - d$ for all $S \subseteq A$ then G has a matching of size $|A| - d$.

Proof. Add d new vertices to B and join each of them by an edge to each vertex of A. Then for all $S \subseteq A$, in the new graph G', $|N_{G'}(S) \geq |S| - d + d = |S|$. Hall's condition is satisfied in G'. Therefore there is a matching M in G' which matches all of A. At least $|A| - d$ edges in M are edges of G. □

Corollary 2.1.5. If G is a k-regular bipartite graph then G has a perfect matching.

Proof. Assume $k \geq 1$. Since G is k-regular, $|E(G) = k|A| = k|B|$, so $|A| = |B|$. Hence it suffices to prove that G contains a matching of A. Every set $S \subseteq A$ is joined to $N(S)$ by a total of $k|S|$ edges. These edges are a subset of the $k|N(S)|$ edges incident with $|N(S)$. Hence $k|S| \leq k|N(S)|$

and diving by k shows that Hall's condition holds. Thus, G has a matching of A. $\square$

Corollary 2.1.6. Every regular graph of positive even degree has a 2-factor.

Proof. Let G be any $2k$-regular graph, $k \geq 1$. Without loss of generality, suppose that G is connected (or apply this argument to each component). By Theorem 1.3.1, G has an Euler tour $v_0 v_1 \dots v_{l-1} v_l$ where $v_l = v_0, e_i = v_i v_{i+1} \in E(G)$ using each edge exactly once.

Replace each vertex $v \in V$ with a pair of vertices v^-, v^+, and replace every edge $e_i = v_i v_{i+1}$ by the edge $v_i^+ v_{i+1}^-$. The resulting graph G' is a k-regular bipartite graph. Hence by Corollary 2.1.5, G' has a perfect matching (1-factor). Collapse every vertex pair (v^-, v^+) back into a single vertex v, for all $v \in V$. The 1-factor of G' becomes a 2-factor of G. $\square$

2.2 Hamilton Cycles

A **Hamilton cycle** is a connected 2-factor. That is, it is a cycle which includes every vertex.

Say G is **Hamiltonian** if it contains a Hamilton cycle. A Hamiltonian graph G must be connected with minimum degree $\delta(G) \geq 2$.

Theorem 2.2.1 (Dirac, 1952)**.** Every graph with $n \geq 3$ vertices and with minimum degree at least $n/2$ has a Hamilton cycle.

Proof. Let G be a graph with minimum degree $\geq n/2$ and $n \geq 3$ vertices. Then G is connected, as otherwise the degree of any vertex in the smaller component must be $< n/2$. Let $P = x_0 \dots x_k$ be a longest path in G. by maximality, all neighbours of x_0 and x_k lie on P. So at least $n/2$ of the vertices $x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}$ are adjacent to x_k and at least $n/2$ of these same vertices satisfy $x_0 x_{i+1} \in E(G)$. By the pigeonhole principle, as $k < n$, there exists $i \in \{0, \dots, k-1\}$ with $x_0 x_{i+1}, x_i x_k \in E(G)$. This gives a cycle $x_0 x_1 \dots x_i x_k \dots x_{i+1} x_0$. We claim this is a Hamilton cycle. If not then, as G is connected, there is some $u \notin C$ with a neighbour $v \in C$. Then we can start at u, go to$v$ then go around C (in some direction) and stop just before we reach v again (i.e. stop at $x \in N_C(v)$). This gives a path which is longer than P, contradiction. $\square$

2.3 Matchings in General Graphs

Given a graph G, let C_G be the set of its components and let $q(G)$ denote the number of odd components (connected components having an odd number of vertices).

Theorem 2.3.1 (Tutte, 1947)**.** A graph G has a perfect matching if and only if

$$q(G - S) \leq |S| \quad \text{for all } S \subseteq V(G). \tag{2.2}$$

Proof. We have seen that the condition (2.2) is necessary: if G has a perfect matching then (2.2) holds. Now suppose that G has no perfect matching. We want to find a "bad" set S_0 which fails condition (2.2). If $|G|$ is odd then, $S_0 = \emptyset$ is bad. So assume $|G|$ is even.

Claim 1. If G' is obtained from G by adding edges and $S_0 \subseteq V$ is bad for G' then S_0 is bad for G.

Proof. If S_0 bad for G' then $q(G - S_0) > |S_0|$. But each odd component of $G' - S$ is a disjoint union of components of $G - S$, at least one of which must be odd. So $q(G - S) \geq q(G' - S)$.

Hence by Claim 1, we can assume that G has no perfect matching but adding any edge to G gives a graph G' which has a perfect matching.

Claim 2. S is a bad set for G if and only if all components of $G - S$ are complete and every vertex in S is adjacent to all other vertices in G.
Proof. For proof, call the second half of the claim (*). If S is bad for G but does satisfy (*) then we can add an edge to G to get a graph G' with S still bad for G'. This contradicts our assumption on the maximality of G. Conversely suppose S satisfies (*) but S is not bad. Then we can form a perfect matching since $|G|$ is even. This is a contradiction as G has no perfect matching. Hence S is bad.

Define $S_0 = \{v \in V : d_G(v) = n - 1\}$ to be the set of all vertices v in G which are adjacent to every other vertex $w \neq v$.

Claim 3. S_0 is bad.
Proof. We need to show that S_0 satisfies (*). For a contradiction, suppose that S_0 does not satisfy (*). Then $G - S_0$ has a component K which is not complete. Let $a, a' \in V(K)$ with $aa' \notin E(G)$. Fix a shortest path from a to a' in K which starts $abc \dots a'$. Such a path has length ≥ 2 and $ac \notin E(G)$. Note $b \in K$, so $b \in S_0$, so there is some $d \in V$ with $bd \notin E$. By maximality of G, there is a perfect matching M_1 in $G + ac$ and a perfect matching M_2 in $G + bd$. Take a maximal path P in G, starting at d with an edge from M_1, and taking alternately edges from M_1 and M_2. Say $P = d \dots v$.

- If the last edge of P is in M_1 then $v = b$ or we could extend P. Let $C = P + bd$ (cycle in $G + bd$).
- If the last edge of P is in M_2 then $v \in \{a, c\}$ as the M_1 edge incident with v must be ac. Let C be the cycle $d \dots vbd$.

In each case, C is an alternating (even length) cycle in $G + bd$ which contains bd. Form M_2' from M_2 by replacing $M_2 \cap C$ by $C - M_2$. This gives a perfect matching of G, contradiction. Hence S_0 satisfies (*), so Claim 3 holds and the proof is complete. □

Corollary 2.3.2 (Petersen, 1891)**.** Every bridge cubic (3-regular) graph has a perfect matching.

Proof. Let G be a bridgeless cubic graph. We prove that G satisfies Tutte's condition. Let $S \subseteq V(G)$ be given and consider an odd component C of $G - S$. The sum of the degrees of vertices in C is $3|C|$, which is an odd number. Every edge with both end vertices in C contributes an even number to this sum. Hence the number of edges from C to S is odd.

As G has no bridge, there must be at least 3 edges from S to C. Therefore the number of edges from S to $G - S$ is at least $3q(G - S)$. But the number of edges from S to $G - S$ is bounded above by the sum of the degrees of vertices in S, which is $3|S|$ as G is cubic. Hence $3q(G - S) \leq$ # edges from S to G - S $\leq 3|S|$ and thus $q(G - S) \leq |S|$. Therefore by Tutte's Theorem, G has a perfect matching. □

Chapter 3

The Probabilistic Method

This chapter assumes knowledge of elementary probability knowledge. Content from first year is sufficient.

Example 3.0.1. Let Ω be the set of all graphs on the vertex set $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$. Then $|\Omega| = 2^{\binom{n}{2}}$. Define $\pi(G) = 2^{\binom{n}{2}}$ for all $G \in \Omega$. This is the *uniform model of random graphs.*

Lemma 3.0.2. The expected number of edges in a uniformly chosen graph on the vertex set $\{1, 2, \ldots n\}$ is $\frac{1}{2}\binom{n}{2}$.

Proof. (From Definition) For $0 \leq m \leq \binom{n}{2} = N$, there $\binom{N}{m}$ are exactly of graphs on vertex set $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ with m edges. Let X be the number of edges in the random graph. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
EX &= \sum_{m=0}^{N} \Pr(X = m) \cdot m \\
&= \sum_{m=0}^{N} \frac{\binom{N}{m}}{2^N} \cdot m \\
&= \frac{N}{2^N} \sum_{m=1}^{N} \frac{(N-1)!}{(m-1)!(N-m)!} \\
&= \frac{N}{2^N} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \binom{N-1}{j} && \text{(j = m -1)} \\
&= \frac{N}{2^N} 2^{N-1} && \text{(by the binomal theorem)} \\
&= \frac{N}{2} = \frac{1}{2}\binom{n}{2}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Let $A \subseteq \Omega$ be an event. The indicator variable I_A for $A \subseteq \Omega$ is

$$I_A(z) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } z \in A \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Definition 3.0.3 (Linearity of Expectation)**.** Let $X_1, \ldots, X_k$ be random variables on Ω and let $c_1, \ldots, c_k \in \mathbb{R}$. Define the random variable $X = c_1 X_1 + \cdots + c_k X_k$. Then

$$\mathbb{E}[X] = c_1 \mathbb{E}[X_1] + c_2 \mathbb{E}[X_2] + \cdot + c_k \mathbb{E}[X_k].$$

Definition 3.0.4 (Markov's Inequality)**.** SUppose that $X : \Omega \to [0, \infty)$ is a nonnegative random variable on Ω and let $k > 0$. Then

$$\Pr(X \geq k) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[X]}{k}.$$

In particular, if X is a nonnegative integer-valued random variable then

$$\Pr(X \neq 0) \leq \mathbb{E}[X].$$

Let $k \geq 2$ be an integer. Events $A_1, \ldots, A_k$ in Ω are **mutually independent** if for all $j, \ell_1, \ldots, \ell_j$ with $2 \leq j \leq k$ and $1 \leq \ell_1 < \ell_2 < \cdots < \ell_j \leq k$,

$$\Pr\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^{j} A_{\ell_i}\right) = \prod_{i=1}^{j} \Pr(A_{\ell_i}).$$

Lemma 3.0.5. Let Ω be the set of all subsets of some given set S, where $|S| = n$. Define a random set $X \subseteq S$ by setting $\Pr(x \in X) = \frac{1}{2}$, independently for each $x \in S$. Then $\Pr(X = A) = 2^{-n}$ for all $A \subseteq S$, so this gives the uniform probability space on Ω.

Proof. Fix $A \subseteq \Omega$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(X = A) &= \prod_{x \in A} \Pr(\text{heads}) \cdot \prod_{x \notin A} \Pr(\text{tails}) && \text{(using independence)} \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{|A|} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{n-|A|} \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{n} = 2^{-n} \end{aligned}$$

as claimed. □

Theorem 3.0.6 (Alon & Spencer, Theorem 2.2.1)**.** Let G be a graph with n vertices and m edges. Then G contains a bipartite subgraph with at least $m/2$ edges.

Proof. Let Ω be the set of all subsets of $V(G)$. Then $|\Omega| = 2^n$. Consider the uniform probability space on Ω. Let $A \subseteq V$ be a randomly chosen element of Ω and define $B = V - A$. Call $xy \in E(G)$ a crossing edge if exactly one of x, y belongs to A. Let X be the number of crossing edges. Finally, for each edge $e \in E(G)$ define the indicator variable

$$X_e = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } e \text{ is a crossing edge,} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then $X = \sum_{e \in E(G)} X_e$. For any $e = xy \in E(G)$, we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(x \in A \text{ and } y \notin A) &= \Pr(x \in A)\Pr(y \in A) && \text{(using independence)} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \times \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{4}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}X_e &= \Pr((x \in A \text{ and } y \notin A) \text{ or } (x \notin A \text{ and } y \in A)) \\ &= \Pr(x \in A \text{ and } y \notin A) + \Pr(x \notin A \text{ and } y \in A) && \text{(events are disjoint)} \\ &= \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{4} = \frac{1}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by linearity of expectation,

$$\mathbb{E}X = \sum_{e \in E(G)} \mathbb{E}X_e = \frac{m}{2}.$$

Thus there exists a fixed set $A_0 \subseteq V(G)$ which has at least $\frac{m}{2}$ crossing edges. The corresponding bipartition $(A_0, V(G) - A_0)$ defines a bipartite subgraph consisting of the $\geq \frac{m}{2}$ crossing edges. $\square$

An **independent set** in a graph G is a subset $U \subseteq V$ such that if $v, w \in U$ then $vw \in E(G)$. Let $\alpha(G)$ be the size of a maximum independent set in G, called the **independence number**.

Theorem 3.0.7. Let G have n vertices and $nd/2$ edges, where $d \geq 1$. Then $\alpha(G) \geq \frac{n}{25T1d}$. Note d, is the average degree of G.

Proof. Define the random subset $S \subseteq V(G)$ by $\Pr(v \in S) = p$, independently for all $v \in V$. Here $p \in [0, 1]$ which we will fix later.

Let $X = |S|$ and let Y be the number of edges of G with both endvertices in S. Then $\mathbb{E}X = pn$. For $e \in E(G)$ let Y_e be the indicator variable for the event $e \subseteq S$. Then for every $e = xy \in E(G)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}Y_e &= \Pr(x \in S \text{ and } y \in S) \\
&= \Pr(x \in S) \cdot \Pr(y \in S) && \text{(by independence)} \\
&= p^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by linearity of expectation and the fact that $Y = \sum_{e \in E(G)}$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}Y = \sum_{e \in E(G)} \mathbb{E}Y_e = \frac{nd}{2}p^2.$$

By linearity of expectation,

$$\mathbb{E}(X - Y) = \mathbb{E}X - \mathbb{E}Y = pn - p^2\frac{nd}{2}.$$

Want to choose p to maximise this, so $p = \frac{1}{d}$ and $p \in [0, 1]$. Substituting gives $\mathbb{E}(X - Y) = \frac{n}{2d}$. Hence there exists a fixed set $S_0 \subseteq V(G)$ with $|S_0| - (\#\text{ edges in} S_0) \geq \frac{n}{2d}$. Delete one vertex from each edge within S_0 to give a set S^* of at least $\frac{n}{2d}$ vertices which is an independent set. $\square$

Chapter 4

Graph Colourings

A **vertex colouring** of a graph $G = (V, E)$ is a function $c : V \to S$ such that $c(u) \neq c(v)$ whenever $uv \in E$. Here S is the set of available colours, usually $S = \{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$ for some positive integer k.

A k**-colouring** of G is a colouring $c : V \to \{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$. Often we want the smallest value of k for which a k-colouring of G exists. This smallest value of k is called the **chromatic number** of G, denoted $\chi(G)$.

If $\chi(G) = k$ then G is said to be k-chromatic.
If $\chi(G) \leq k$ then G is said to be k-colourable.

The set of all vertices in G with a given colour under c is called a **colour class**. Each colour class is an independent set. k-colouring is a partition of $V(G)$ into k independent sets.

A **clique** in a graph G is a complete subgraph of G. The order of the largest clique in G is called the **clique number** of G, denoted $\omega(G)$.

Fact: $\chi(G) \geq \omega(G)$ and $\chi(G) \geq n/\alpha(G)$.

An **edge colouring** of G is a map $c : E \to S$ such that $c(e) \neq c(f)$ whenever e and f share an endvertex. If $S = \{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$ then c is a k**-edge-colouring** and G is k-edge-colourable.

Let $\chi'(G)$ be the smallest positive integer k for which G is k-edge-colourable. We call $\chi'(G)$ the **chromatic index** of G.

A **colour class** in an edge colouring is a matching of G. Hence an edge colouring displays $E(G)$ as a union of disjoint matchings.

The **line graph**, denoted $L(G)$, has vertex set $E(G)$ and $e, f \in E(G)$ form an edge of $L(G)$ if and only if e, f share an endvertex in G. Every edge-colouring of G is a vertex colour of $L(G)$ and vice-versa. So $\chi'(G) = \chi(L(G))$.

4.1 Vertex Colourings

Proposition 4.1.1. If graph G has m edges then $\chi(G) \leq \frac{1}{2} + \sqrt{2m + \frac{1}{4}}$.

Proof. Fix a k-colouring of G with $k = \chi(G)$ colours. Then Ghas at least one edge between any two distinct colour classes, or we could merge them to give a colouring of G with $\leq k-1$ colours. Hence $m \geq \binom{k}{2} = \frac{1}{2}(k)(k-1)$ then solve for k to complete the proof. □

Greedy Algorithm Given a graph G, fix an ordering $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n$ on the vertices of G and colour them one by one in this order using the first available colour (least positive integer) as you go along. Since v_i has at most $\Delta(G)$ neighbours, this produces a k-colouring of G with $k \leq \Delta(G)+1 \implies \chi(G) \leq \Delta(G)+1$.

Fact: $\chi(G) = \Delta(G) + 1$ if G is a complete graph or an odd cycle.

Theorem 4.1.2 (Brooks, 1941)**.** Let G be a connected graph. If G is neither complete nor a n odd cycle then $\chi(G) \leq \Delta(G)$. In fact we will prove the following restatement of Brooks Theorem, due to Zajac (2018):

Let $k \geq 3$ be an integer and let G be a graph with $\Delta(G) \leq k$. If G does not contain K_{k+1} as a subgraph then G is k-colourable.

We call this the "new" version of Brooks Theorem and prove that this implies Brooks Theorem.

Proof. Suppose that G is a graph which satisfies the assumptions of Brooks Theorem. That is, G be a connected graph which is not an odd cycle and which is not complete. Let $\Delta = \Delta(G)$ be the maximum degree of G. We want to show that $\chi(G) \leq \Delta$, as this is the conclusion required for Brooks Theorem.

First suppose that $\Delta \leq 2$. Then G is either a path or an even cycle, as G is connected. Hence G is bipartite and so $\chi(G) \leq 2 = \Delta$, as required.

Now suppose that $\Delta \geq 3$. We wish to apply the new version of Brooks Theorem with $k = \Delta$, so we must check that G does not contain $K_{\Delta+1}$ as a subgraph. For a contradiction, suppose that G does have a subgraph H which is isomorphic to $K_{\Delta+1}$. Then H is Δ-regular, and G has maximum degree Δ, so there is no edge from a vertex of H to a vertex of $G - V(H)$. It follows that H is a component of G. But G is connected, so the only possibility is that $G = H$. BUt this contradicts our assumption that G is not complete.

Therefore, G satisfies the assumptions of the new version of Brooks Theorem, and by applying this result we find that G is Δ-colourable. From this we conclude that $\chi(G) \leq \Delta$, as required.

In both cases, the conclusion of Brooks Theorem holds, completing the proof. □

We now prove that this "new" version is true.

Proof. First an obversation, let G be a graph with maximum degree $\Delta(G) \leq k$, where $\{1, \ldots, k\}$ will be our set of colours. Suppose that G is partially coloured. Let $P = v_1 v_2 \ldots v_j$ be a path in G such that all vertices of P are uncoloured. Then we can colour vertices $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_{j-1}$ in this order, since at the moment that we colour $v_i (1 \leq i \leq j-1)$, we know that $v_i$has an uncoloured neighbour v_{i+1} and hence aat most $\Delta - 1$ neighbours. Call this procedure $\texttt{PATHCOLOUR}(v_1, \ldots, v_{j-1}; v_j)$. Note that this procedure colours $v_1, \ldots, v_{j-1}$ but it leaves v_j uncoloured. In particular if $j = 1$ then $\texttt{PATHCOLOUR}(v_1)$ leaves the graph unchanged.

Proof by induction on $n = |G|$, where G is a graph with $\Delta(G) \leq k$ and $k \geq 3$. If $n \leq k$ then we can k-colour G by giving each vertex a distinct colour.

> **Claim.** If G has a vertex of degree $< k$ then G is k-colourable.
>
> **Proof.** Let v be a vertex of degree $< k$ and let $G' = G - v$. By the inductive hypothesis we can k-colour G'. Fix one such colouring C. Then at most $k - 1$ colours are used by C on neighbours of v, so we have an available colour which we can use to colour v.

Now we assume that G is k-regular. Let v be a vertex of G and consider $G[\{v\} \cup N(v)]$. Since G has no subgraph isomorphic to K_{k+1}, we know that v has two neighbours x, y which are not adjacent. Let $v_1 = x, v_2 = v, v_3 = y$, and extend the path $v_1v_2v_3$ to a maximal length path in $G, P = v_1v_2v_3 \dots v_r$ which starts with $v_1v_2v_3$.

Case 1. Suppose that $r = n$. This means that all vertices of G lie on P (Hamilton Path). Let v_j be any neighbour of v_2 other than v_2 and v_3. Since G is k-regular and $k \geq 3$ we can choose such a vertex v_j. We now describe how to k-colour G.

- First colour v_1 and v_3 the same colour.
- Next apply $\texttt{PATHCOLOUR}(v_4, v_5, \dots, v_{j-1}; v_j)$ which colours $v_4, \dots, v_{j-1}$ and leaves v_j uncoloured.
- Next apply $\texttt{PATHCOLOUR}(v_n, v_{n-1}, \dots, v_j; v_2)$ which will colour all remaining vertices of G except v_2.
- Finally we have an available colour for v_2 since two of its neighbour (v_1 and v_3) have the same colour. Colour v_2 with an available colour.

Case 2. Now suppose that $r < n$. Recall that all neighbours of v_r lie on P. Let v_j be the neighbour of v_r with the smallest index. Then $C = v_jv_{j+1} \dots v_rv_j$ is a cycle in G. Let $G' = G - V(C)$. We can k-colour G' by induction. If there is no edge between G' and C then we can also k-colour $G[V(C)]$, by induction and we are done. Otherwise ($G[V(C)]$ is not a component of G): let v_ℓ be the vertex on C with largest index which has a neighbour in G', and let u be a neighbour of v_ℓ in G'. Note, v_ℓ is well defined as v_j has a neighbour in G' if $j \geq 2$. Note $\ell \leq r - 1$ since all neighbours of $v_r$belong to $V(C)$. Also $v_{\ell+1}$ has no neighbours outside C, by choice of v_ℓ. We now describe how to k-colour vertices of C, giving a k-colouring of G.

- First, colour $v_{\ell+1}$ with the colour assigned to u.
- Next, apply $\texttt{PATHCOLOUR}(v_{\ell+2}, \dots, v_r, v_j, v_{j+1}, \dots, v_{\ell-1}; v_\ell)$ which colours all remaining vertices of G except v_ℓ.
- Finally, colour v_ℓ with an available colour which exists because v_ℓ has two neighbours with the same colour.

This completes thr proof in Case 2, by mathematical induction. □

4.2 Edge Colourings

By considering a vertex of maximum degree, we see that the chromatic index $\chi'(G)$ satisfies $\chi'(G) \geq \Delta(G)$for all graphs G.

Proposition 4.2.1 (Köning, 1916)**.** If G is bipartite then $\chi'(G) = \Delta(G)$.

Proof. We prove t his by induction on $m = |E(G)|$. If $m = 0$ then the result is trivially true. So, assume that $m \geq 1$ and that the result holds for all bipartite graphs with at most $m - 1$ edges.

Let $\Delta = \Delta(G)$, choose $xy \in E$ and let $G' = G - xy$. By induction, we can fix a Δ-edge-colouring of G'. We call edges coloured α, "α-edges", etc. In G', vertices x, y both have degree $\Delta - 1$. So there are colours $\alpha, \beta \in \{1, 2, \ldots, \Delta\}$ such that x is not incident with an α-edge, and y is not incident with a β-edge.

If $\alpha = \beta$ then we can colour the edge xy with colour α to give a Δ-edge-colouring of G, and we are done. Now assume that $\alpha \neq \beta$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that x is incident with a β-edge xu. Extend the β-edge xu to a maximal walk W whose edges are coloured α, β alternately. Since no such walk can contain a vertex colour twice, W is a path.

> **Claim.** W does not contain y.
>
> **Proof.** For a contradiction, suppose that y lies on W. Then y must be an endvertex of W, and the edge of W incident with y must be an α-edge. Hence W has even length, and so $W + xy$ is an odd cycle in the bipartite graph G. This is a contradiction.

By maximality of W, we can swap the colours α and β on all edges of W. This gives a new Δ-edge-colouring of G' such that β does not appear on any edge incident with x. Since y does not lie on W, there is still no β-edge incident with y. FInally we can colour edge xy with colour β in G, giving a Δ-edge-colouring of G. This completes the proof, by induction. □

Theorem 4.2.2 (Vizing, 1964)**.** Every graph G satisfies

$$\Delta(G) \leq \chi'(G) \leq \Delta(G) + 1.$$

Chapter 5

Connectivity

5.1 2-Connected Graphs

Let G be a graph. A maximal connected subgraph of G with no cut vertex is called a **block**. Every block of G is either a maximal 2-connected subgraph of G or a bridge or an isolated vertex.

By maximality, different blocks of G overlap in at most one vertex, which must be a **cut vertex** in G. Hence every edge of G lies in a unique block, and G is the union of its blocks.

Let A be the set of cut vertices in G and let $\mathcal{B}$ be the set of blocks in G. Form the bipartite graph on $A \cup \mathcal{B}$ with edge set

$$\{aB : a \in A, B \in \mathcal{B} \text{ and } a \in B\}.$$

Lemma 5.1.1. The block graph of a connected graph is a tree.

Let H be a subgraph of a graph G. An H**-path** is a path in G which intersects H only in its endvertices.

Proposition 5.1.2. A graph is 2-connected if and only if it can be constructed from a cycle by successively adding H-paths to graphs H already constructed.

Proof. Every graph constructs in this way is 2-connected. Conversely, let G be 2-connected. Then $|G| \geq 3$ and G contains a cycle. Hence G has a maximal subgraph H which is constructible using the method described in the proposition stated.

If $H = G$, then we are done. For a contradiction, suppose that $H \neq G$. Since any edge $xy \in E(G) - E(H)$ with $x, y \in H$ is an H-path, by maximality we see that every $xy \in E(G)$ with $x, y \in H$ must belong to $E(H)$. Hence, H is an induced subgraph of G.

By the fact that G is connected, there is an edge vw with $v \in G - H, w \in H$. Since G is 2-connected we know that $G - W$ is connected. Let P be the shortest path from v to H in $G - w$. Then wvP is a H-path in G, and $H \cup wvP$ is a larger constructible subgraph than H, contradicting the maximality of H. $\square$