

## The Pigeonhole Principle (1)

**Ramsey Theory** refers to the study of partitions of large structures, and generalizes the pigeonhole principle. A typical result states that a special substructure *must* occur in some class of the partition.

**The pigeonhole principle:** If a set consisting of more than  $kn$  objects is partitioned into  $n$  classes, then some class receives more than  $k$  objects.

**Example.** For a simple graph  $G$  with 6 vertices, the sum of the degrees of a vertex  $x$  in  $G$  and  $\overline{G}$  is 5, so either  $d_G(x) \geq 3$  or  $d_{\overline{G}}(x) \geq 3$ . (This is the first half of the proof showing that either  $G$  or  $\overline{G}$  contains a clique of size 3.)

© Patric Östergård

## Ramsey's Theorem (1)

We consider partitions of sets and use the language of coloring—a  $k$ -coloring is a partition into  $k$  subsets. The set of all  $r$ -element subsets ( $r$ -sets) of  $S$  is denoted by  $\binom{S}{r}$ .

**homogeneous** A set  $T \subseteq S$  is homogeneous under a coloring of  $\binom{S}{r}$  if all  $r$ -sets in  $T$  receive the same color; it is  *$i$ -homogeneous* if that color is  $i$ .

**Ramsey number** For given positive integers  $r$  and  $p_1, p_2, \dots, p_k$ , the smallest integer  $N$  such that every  $k$ -coloring of  $\binom{[N]}{r}$  yields an  $i$ -homogeneous set of size  $p_i$  for some  $i$ ; denoted by  $R(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_k; r)$ .

© Patric Östergård

## The Pigeonhole Principle (2)

**Theorem 8.3.3** Every list with more than  $n^2$  distinct numbers has a monotone sublist of length greater than  $n$ .

**Proof:** Let  $a = a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{n^2+1}$  be the list, and assign position  $k$  the label  $(x_k, y_k)$ , where  $x_k$  ( $y_k$ ) is the length of a longest increasing (decreasing) sublist ending at  $a_k$ . With  $n^2 + 1$  labels and  $1 \leq x_k, y_k \leq n$ , at least two of the labels must coincide. But this is not possible: for any  $i > j$ ,  $a_i$  increases the length of either of the lists ending at  $a_j$ , since  $a_i \neq a_j$ .  $\square$

© Patric Östergård

## Ramsey's Theorem (2)

**Example 1.** The pigeonhole principle corresponds to  $r = 1$ .

**Example 2.** Consider  $r = 2$  and  $k = 2$ . If we view the set  $S$  as a set of vertices, then  $\binom{S}{r} = \binom{S}{2}$  is the set of edges of a complete graph. These edges are colored with  $k = 2$  colors, but since one color class gives the other, we may look at this as a graph  $G$  and its complement  $\overline{G}$ . The Ramsey number is then the smallest integer such that for any graph  $G$  of this order, either  $G$  has a clique of size  $p_1$  or an independent set of size  $p_2$  (we have seen the case  $p_1 = p_2 = 3$  several times earlier).

R. L. Graham, B. L. Rothschild, and J. H. Spencer, *Ramsey Theory*, 2nd ed., Wiley, New York, 1990.

© Patric Östergård

### Ramsey's Theorem (3)

**Theorem.**  $R(p_1, p_2; 2) \leq R(p_1 - 1, p_2; 2) + R(p_1, p_2 - 1; 2)$ .

**Proof:** Assuming that  $R(p_1 - 1, p_2; 2) = s$  and  $R(p_1, p_2 - 1; 2) = t$  exist, let  $N$  be their sum. Proving the bound for  $R(p_1, p_2; 2)$  means showing that every red/blue-coloring (red=color1, blue=color2) of the edges of a complete  $N$ -vertex graph yields a  $p_1$ -set of vertices within which all edges are red or a  $p_2$ -set of vertices within which all edges are blue.

Consider a red/blue-coloring of  $K_N$ , and choose a vertex  $x$ . There are  $N - 1 = s + t - 1$  vertices other than  $x$ , so  $x$  has at least  $s$  incident red edges or  $t$  incident blue edges.

©Patric Östergård

### Ramsey Numbers (1)

When  $r = 2$ , we may simply write  $R(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_k)$ . Values and best known bounds for  $R(p, q)$  with small parameters are as follows:

$p \backslash q$	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
3	6	9	14	18	23	28	36
4		18	25	35–41	49–61	56–84	69–115
5			43–49	58–87	80–143	95–216	121*–316
6				102–165	111–298	127–495	153–780

\*: By Harri Haanpää (HUT).

©Patric Östergård

### Ramsey's Theorem (4)

**Proof:** (cont.) By symmetry, we may assume that  $x$  has at least  $s$  incident red edges. By the definition of  $s$ , the complete subgraph induced by the neighbors of  $x$  along these edges has a blue  $p_2$ -clique or a red  $(p_1 - 1)$ -clique. The latter would combine with  $x$  to form a red  $p_1$ -clique. In either case, we obtain an  $i$ -homogeneous set of size  $p_i$  for some  $i$ .  $\square$

Since  $R(2, p; 2) = R(p, 2; 2) = p$ ,  $R(p_1, p_2; 2)$  is defined for all  $p_1, p_2 \geq 2$ .

**Theorem 8.3.7.** Given positive integers  $r$  and  $p_1, p_2, \dots, p_k$ , there exists an integer  $N$  such that every  $k$ -coloring of  $\binom{[N]}{r}$  yields an  $i$ -homogeneous set of size  $p_i$  for some  $i$ .

©Patric Östergård

### Ramsey Numbers (2)

To find a lower bound on a Ramsey number,  $R(p, q) > N$ , one should find an explicit red/blue vertex-coloring of an  $N$ -vertex complete graph that has neither a red clique of size  $p$  nor a blue clique of size  $q$  (or prove its existence in some way).

To find an upper bound on a Ramsey number,  $R(p, q) \leq N'$  one must show that every  $N'$ -vertex graph has the desired properties; for example, the recursive theorem  $R(p, q) \leq R(p - 1, q) + R(p, q - 1)$  can be used.

**Example.**  $R(3, 3) = 6$ . We know that  $R(3, 3) \leq 6$ . The graph  $C_5$  proves that  $R(3, 3) > 5$ .

©Patric Östergård

## Random Graphs (1)

There are several models for studying random graphs. Making all graphs with vertex set  $[n]$  equally likely is equivalent to letting each vertex pair appear as an edge with probability  $1/2$ . This is the most common model for random graphs and leads to the simplest computations. We may allow the probability to depend on  $n$ .

**Model A.** Given  $n$  and  $p(n)$ , generate graphs with vertex set  $[n]$  by letting each pair of vertices be an edge with probability  $p$ , independently. The random variable  $G^p$  denotes a graph generated in this way.

The random graph means Model A with  $p = 1/2$ .

© Patric Östergård

## The Probabilistic Method (1)

**The probabilistic method** can be used to prove the existence of desired combinatorial objects without constructing them. The main idea: if we take a random object and the probability that it has property  $P$  is positive, then there must exist such objects with this property.

N. Alon and J. H. Spencer, *The Probabilistic Method*, 2nd ed., Wiley, New York, 2000.

© Patric Östergård

## Random Graphs (2)

We get another model if we fix the number of edges,  $m$ .

**Model B.** Given  $n$  and  $m(n)$ , let each graph with vertex set  $[n]$  and  $m$  edges occur with the same probability,  $\binom{N}{m}^{-1}$ , where  $N = \binom{n}{2}$ . The random variable  $G^m$  denotes a graph generated in this way.

It turns out that Model B is accurately described by Model A when  $n$  is large and  $p = m/\binom{n}{2}$ , so one may restrict the attention to Model A.

© Patric Östergård

## The Probabilistic Method (2)

**Theorem 8.5.4.** If  $\binom{n}{p}2^{1-\binom{p}{2}} < 1$ , then  $R(p, p) > n$ .

**Proof:** The bound  $R(p, p) > n$  means that there is an  $n$ -vertex graph with  $\alpha(G) < p$  and  $\omega(G) < p$ . We use Model A with vertex set  $[n]$  and  $p = 1/2$ . Let  $Q$  be the event “neither a  $p$ -clique nor an independent  $p$ -set”.

Each possible  $p$ -clique occurs with probability  $2^{-\binom{p}{2}}$ . The probability of having at least one  $p$ -clique is therefore bounded from above by  $\binom{n}{p}2^{-\binom{p}{2}}$ , and we get the same probability of having at least one independent  $p$ -set. Therefore the probability of  $Q$  is bounded from below by  $1 - 2\binom{n}{p}2^{-\binom{p}{2}}$ , and is positive when  $\binom{n}{p}2^{1-\binom{p}{2}} < 1$ .  $\square$

© Patric Östergård

### Expectation (1)

There exists an element of the probability space whose value is as large as (or as small as) the expectation  $E(X) = \sum_k kP(X = k)$ .

**Theorem 8.5.8.** Some  $n$ -vertex tournament has at least  $n!/2^{n-1}$  Hamiltonian paths.

**Proof:** Generate tournaments on  $[n]$  randomly by choosing  $i \rightarrow j$  or  $j \rightarrow i$  with equal probability for each pair  $\{i, j\}$ . Let  $X$  be the number of Hamiltonian paths;  $X$  is the sum of  $n!$  indicator variables (taking values 1 or 0 depending on whether we have a Hamiltonian path or not) for the possible Hamiltonian paths. Each Hamiltonian path occurs with probability  $1/2^{n-1}$ , so  $E(X) = n!/2^{n-1}$ .  $\square$

©Patric Östergård

### Properties of Almost All Graphs (1)

Given a sequence of probability spaces, let  $q_n$  be the probability that property  $Q$  holds in the  $n$ th space. Property  $Q$  **almost always holds** if  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} q_n = 1$ .

**Theorem 8.5.18.** If  $p$  is constant, then almost every  $G^p$  has diameter 2 (and hence is connected).

**Proof:** Let  $X(G^p)$  be the number of unordered vertex pairs with no common neighbor. If there are none, then  $G^p$  is connected and has diameter 2. By Markov's inequality (if  $X$  is nonnegative and integer-valued, then  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E(X) \rightarrow 0$  implies  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(X = 0) \rightarrow 1$  [Wes, Lemma 8.5.17]), we need only show  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E(X) \rightarrow 0$ .

©Patric Östergård

### Expectation (2)

**Theorem 8.5.9.**  $\alpha(G) \geq \sum_{v \in V(G)} \frac{1}{d(v)+1}$ .

**Proof:** Given an ordering of the vertices of  $G$ , the set of vertices that appear before all their neighbors form an independent set. When the ordering is chosen uniformly at random, the probability that  $v$  appears before all its neighbors is  $1/(d(v)+1)$ . Thus the right side of the inequality is the expected size of the independent set formed by choosing the vertices appearing before their neighbors in a random vertex ordering.  $\square$

©Patric Östergård

### Properties of Almost All Graphs (2)

**Proof:** (cont.) We express  $X$  as the sum of  $\binom{n}{2}$  indicator variables, one for each pair  $\{v_i, v_j\}$ , where  $X_{i,j} = 1$  iff  $v_i$  and  $v_j$  have no common neighbor.

When  $X_{i,j} = 1$ , the  $n-2$  other vertices fail to have edges to both of these, so  $P(X_{i,j} = 1) = (1-p^2)^{n-2}$  and  $E(X) = \binom{n}{2}(1-p^2)^{n-2}$ . When  $p$  is fixed,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E(X) \rightarrow 0$ , and the theorem follows.  $\square$

©Patric Östergård