Graph Theory - Homework 3

Kishlaya Jaiswal

February 15, 2020

Exercise 1

Proof. .

(a) Since, |T - e + e'| = |T| = |V| - 1, it suffices to show that the induced subgraph on T - e + e' is connected for some $e' \in T' - T$. If e = (x, y), then it suffices to show that there is a path between $x \leadsto y$ in T - e + e'.

Consider $T \setminus \{e\}$. It has two connected components X, Y such that $X \sqcup Y = V(T)$ and $x \in X, y \in Y$. Now since $X \sqcup Y = V(T')$, there are vertices $x' \in X, y' \in Y$ such that $e' = (x', y') \in T' - T$. Thus, $x \leadsto x' \xrightarrow{e'} y' \leadsto y$ is a path between x, y in T - e + e'.

(b) Since, |T' + e - e'| = |T'| = |V| - 1, it suffices to show that the induced subgraph on T' + e - e' has no cycles for some $e' \in T' - T$.

Consider T'+e. It contains a cycle C passing through the edge e=(x,y). Let $e'\in T'-T$ be any other edge on this cycle C. We claim that T'+e-e' has no cycles. For the sake of contradiction, suppose it has a cycle C'. If $e \notin C'$ then $C' \subseteq T'$ which is a contradiction to T' being a tree. Otherwise if $e \in C'$, then consider the path $C' \setminus \{e\}$ between x, y in T'. But then $C \setminus \{e\}$ is also a path between x, y in T', which is clearly different from $C' \setminus \{e\}$ as $e' \in C$ but $e' \notin C'$. But a tree has a unique path between any two vertices.

Exercise 2

Proof. We use Kirchoff's theorem which says that number of spanning trees of a connected graph G is given by:

$$t(G) = \frac{1}{n}\lambda_1\lambda_2\dots\lambda_{n-1}$$

where λ_i are the non-zero eigenvalues of laplacian L(G).

We have $G = K_{m,n}$, L(G) = D(G) - A(G)

$$L(G) = \begin{pmatrix} nI & -J \\ -J & mI \end{pmatrix}$$

Let $v = (v_1 \dots v_m, u_1 \dots u_n)^T$, then $L(G)v = \lambda v$ gives us following two equations:

$$(n-\lambda)v_i = \sum u_j$$

$$(m-\lambda)u_j = \sum v_i$$

Case 1: $\lambda = n$. $u_1 = u_2 = \dots u_n = 0$ and $\sum v_i = 0$. Hence $v = (v_1 \dots v_m, 0 \dots 0)^T$ is an eigenvector with eigenvalue n. This gives us that $\lambda = n$ has an eigenspace of dimension m-1.

Case 2: $\lambda = m$. $v_1 = v_2 = \dots v_m = 0$ and $\sum v_j = 0$. Hence $v = (0 \dots 0, u_1 \dots u_n)^T$ is an eigenvector with eigenvalue m. This gives us that $\lambda = m$ has an eigenspace of dimension n-1.

Case 3: $\lambda \neq m, n$ Then we have $v_1 = v_2 = \ldots = v_m$ and $u_1 = u_2 = \ldots = u_n$. Thus

$$u_1 = \frac{mv_1}{m-\lambda}; v_1 = \frac{nu_1}{n-\lambda} = \left(\frac{n}{n-\lambda}\right) \left(\frac{mv_1}{m-\lambda}\right)$$

If $v_1 = 0 \implies v_i = u_j = 0$. Hence

$$\left(\frac{n}{n-\lambda}\right)\left(\frac{m}{m-\lambda}\right) = 1 \implies \lambda = 0, m+n$$

(Observation: Case 3 was unnecessary as we know $\sum \lambda = 2mn$ and from the first two cases we already have that n(m-1) + m(n-1) = 2mn - (m+n), so the last eigenvalue has to be m+n)

Finally,

$$t(G) = \frac{1}{m+n} n^{m-1} m^{n-1} (m+n) = n^{m-1} m^{n-1}$$