

The sum of degrees in cliques

Béla Bollobás^{*†‡} and Vladimir Nikiforov^{*}

October 28, 2018

Abstract

For every graph G , let

$$\Delta_r(G) = \max \left\{ \sum_{u \in R} d(u) : R \text{ is an } r\text{-clique of } G \right\}$$

and let $\Delta_r(n, m)$ be the minimum of $\Delta_r(G)$ taken over all graphs of order n and size m . Write $t_r(n)$ for the size of the r -chromatic Turán graph of order n .

Improving earlier results of Edwards and Faudree, we show that for every $r \geq 2$, if $m \geq t_r(n)$, then

$$\Delta_r(n, m) \geq \frac{2rm}{n}, \quad (1)$$

as conjectured by Bollobás and Erdős.

It is known that inequality (1) fails for $m < t_r(n)$. However, we show that for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there is $\delta > 0$ such that if $m > t_r(n) - \delta n^2$ then

$$\Delta_r(n, m) \geq (1 - \varepsilon) \frac{2rm}{n}.$$

Finally, we generalize (1) to graphs with edge weights.

1 Introduction

Our notation and terminology are standard (see, e.g. [1]): thus $G(n, m)$ stands for a graph of n vertices and m edges. For a graph G and a vertex $u \in V(G)$, we write $\Gamma(u)$ for the set of vertices adjacent to u and set $d_G(u) = |\Gamma(u)|$; we write $d(u)$ instead of $d_G(u)$ if the graph G is understood. However, somewhat unusually, for $U \subset V(G)$, we set $\hat{\Gamma}(U) = |\cap_{v \in U} \Gamma(v)|$ and $\hat{d}(U) = |\hat{\Gamma}(U)|$.

We write $T_r(n)$ for the r -chromatic Turán graph on n vertices and $t_r(n)$ for the number of its edges.

^{*}Department of Mathematical Sciences, University of Memphis, Memphis TN 38152, USA

[†]Trinity College, Cambridge CB2 1TQ, UK

[‡]Research supported in part by DARPA grant F33615-01-C-1900.

For every $r \geq 2$ and every graph G , let $\Delta_r(G)$ be the maximum of the sum of degrees of the vertices of an r -clique, as in the Abstract. If G has no r -cliques, we set $\Delta_r(G) = 0$. Furthermore, let

$$\Delta_r(n, m) = \min_{G=G(n, m)} \Delta_r(G).$$

Since $T_r(n)$ is a K_{r+1} -free graph, it follows that $\Delta_r(n, m) = 0$ for $m \leq t_{r-1}(n)$. In 1975 Bollobás and Erdős [2] conjectured that for every $r \geq 2$, if $m \geq t_r(n)$, then

$$\Delta_r(n, m) \geq \frac{2rm}{n}. \quad (2)$$

Edwards [3], [4] proved (2) under the weaker condition $m > (r-1)n^2/2r$; he also proved that the conjecture holds for $2 \leq r \leq 8$ and $n \geq r^2$. Later Faudree [7] proved the conjecture for any $r \geq 2$ and $n > r^2(r-1)/4$.

For $t_{r-1}(n) < m < t_r(n)$ the value of $\Delta_r(n, m)$ is essentially unknown even for $r = 3$ (see [5], [6] and [7] for partial results.) An explicit construction due to Erdős (see [7]) shows that, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that if $t_{r-1}(n) < m < t_r(n) - \delta n^2$ then

$$\Delta_r(n, m) \leq (1 - \varepsilon) \frac{2rm}{n}.$$

In this note we prove a stronger form of (2) for every r and n . Furthermore, we prove that $\Delta_r(n, m)$ is “stable” as m approaches $t_r(n)$. More precisely, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there is $\delta > 0$ such that if $m > t_r(n) - \delta n^2$ then

$$\Delta_r(n, m) \geq (1 - \varepsilon) \frac{2rm}{n}$$

for n sufficiently large.

1.1 Preliminary observations

Let M_1, \dots, M_k are subsets of a (finite) set V with complements $\overline{M}_1, \dots, \overline{M}_k$. Then

$$\sum_{i=1}^k |\overline{M}_i| \geq |\cup_{i=1}^k \overline{M}_i|$$

and so,

$$|\cap_{i=1}^k M_i| \geq \sum_{i=1}^k |M_i| - (k-1)|V|. \quad (3)$$

The size $t_r(n)$ of the Turán graph $T_r(n)$ is given by

$$t_r(n) = \frac{r-1}{2r} (n^2 - s^2) + \binom{s}{2},$$

where s is the remainder of n modulo r : Hence,

$$\frac{r-1}{2r} n^2 \geq t_r(n) \geq \frac{r-1}{2r} n^2 - \frac{r}{8}. \quad (4)$$

2 A greedy algorithm

In what follows we shall identify a clique with its vertex set.

Faudree [7] introduced the following algorithm \mathfrak{P} which constructs a clique $\{v_1, \dots, v_k\}$ in a graph G :

Step 1: v_1 is a vertex of maximum degree in G ;

Step 2: having selected v_1, \dots, v_{i-1} , if $\widehat{\Gamma}(v_1 \dots v_{i-1}) = \emptyset$ then \mathfrak{P} stops, otherwise \mathfrak{P} selects a vertex of maximum degree $v_i \in \widehat{\Gamma}(v_1 \dots v_{i-1})$ and step 2 is repeated again.

Faudree's main reason to introduce this algorithm was to mainly to prove Conjecture (2) for n sufficiently large, so he did not study \mathfrak{P} in great detail. In this section we shall establish some properties of \mathfrak{P} for their own sake. Later, in Section 3, we shall apply these results to prove an extension of (2) for every n .

Note that \mathfrak{P} need not construct a unique sequence. Sequences that can be constructed by \mathfrak{P} are called \mathfrak{P} -sequences; the definition of \mathfrak{P} implies that $\widehat{\Gamma}(v_1 \dots v_k) = \emptyset$ for every \mathfrak{P} -sequence v_1, \dots, v_k .

Theorem 1 *Let $r \geq 2$, $n \geq r$ and $m \geq t_r(n)$. Then every graph $G = G(n, m)$ is such that:*

- (i) *every \mathfrak{P} -sequence has at least r terms;*
- (ii) *for every \mathfrak{P} -sequence v_1, \dots, v_r ,*

$$\sum_{i=1}^r d(v_i) \geq (r-1)n; \quad (5)$$

- (iii) *if equality holds in (5) for some \mathfrak{P} -sequence v_1, \dots, v_r then $m = t_r(n)$.*

Proof Without loss of generality we may assume that \mathfrak{P} constructs exactly the vertices $1, \dots, k$ and hence $d(1) \geq \dots \geq d(k)$.

Proof of (i) and (ii) To prove (i) we have to show that $k \geq r$. For every $i = 1, \dots, k$, let $M_i = \Gamma(i)$; clearly,

$$\sum_{i=1}^k d(i) \leq (q-1)n,$$

since, otherwise, (3) implies that $\widehat{\Gamma}(v_1 \dots v_k) \neq \emptyset$, and so $1, \dots, k$ is not a \mathfrak{P} -sequence, contradicting the choice of k . Suppose $k < r$, and let q be the smallest integer such that the inequality

$$\sum_{i=1}^h d(i) > (h-1)n \quad (6)$$

holds for $h = 1, \dots, q-1$, while

$$\sum_{i=1}^q d(i) \leq (q-1)n. \quad (7)$$

Clearly, $1 < q \leq k$.

Partition $V = \cup_{i=1}^q V_i$, so that

$$\begin{aligned} V_1 &= V \setminus \Gamma(1), \\ V_i &= \widehat{\Gamma}([i-1]) \setminus \widehat{\Gamma}([i]) \quad \text{for } i = 2, \dots, q-1, \\ V_q &= \widehat{\Gamma}([q-1]). \end{aligned}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} 2m &= \sum_{j \in V} d(j) = \sum_{h=1}^q \sum_{j \in V_h} d(j) \leq \sum_{i=1}^q d(i) |V_i| \\ &= d(1)(n - d(1)) + \sum_{i=2}^{q-1} d(i) \left(\widehat{d}([i-1]) - \widehat{d}([i]) \right) + d(q) \widehat{d}([q-1]) \\ &= d(1)n + \sum_{i=1}^{q-1} \widehat{d}([i]) (d(i+1) - d(i)). \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

For every $h \in [q-2]$, applying (3) with $M_i = \Gamma(i)$, $i \in [h]$, we see that,

$$\widehat{d}([h]) = \left| \widehat{\Gamma}([h]) \right| \geq \sum_{i=1}^h d(i) - (h-1)n = n - \sum_{i=1}^h (n - d(i)) > 0,$$

and hence, by $d(h+1) \leq d(h)$, it follows that

$$\widehat{d}([h]) (d(h+1) - d(h)) \leq \left(n - \sum_{i=1}^h (n - d(i)) \right) (d(h+1) - d(h)). \quad (9)$$

Since, from (7), we have

$$d(q) \leq (q-1)n - \sum_{i=1}^{q-1} d(i) = \sum_{i=1}^{q-1} (n - d(i)), \quad (10)$$

in view of (3), (6), and (8), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{d}([q-1]) (d(q) - d(q-1)) &\leq \left(n - \sum_{i=1}^{q-1} (n - d(i)) \right) (d(q) - d(q-1)) \\ &\leq \left(n - \sum_{i=1}^{q-1} (n - d(i)) \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^{q-1} (n - d(i)) - d(q-1) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Recalling (9) and (10), this inequality implies that

$$2m \leq nd(1) + \sum_{h=1}^{q-2} \left(n - \sum_{i=1}^h (n - d(i)) \right) (d(h+1) - d(h)) \\ + \left(n - \sum_{i=1}^{q-1} (n - d(i)) \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^{q-1} (n - d(i)) - d(q-1) \right).$$

Dividing by 2 and rearranging the right-hand side, we obtain

$$m \leq \left(n - \sum_{i=1}^{q-1} (n - d(i)) \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^{q-1} (n - d(i)) \right) + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq q-1} (n - d(i)) (n - d(j)). \quad (11)$$

Furthermore, for every $i \in [q-1]$, set $k_i = n - d(i)$; let $k_q = n - (k_1 + \dots + k_{q-1})$. Clearly, $k_i > 0$ for every $i \in [q]$; also, $k_1 + \dots + k_q = n$. Note that the right-hand side of (11) is exactly

$$\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq q} k_i k_j,$$

and this is precisely $e(K(k_1, \dots, k_q))$. Given n and $k_1 + \dots + k_q = n$, the value $e(K(k_1, \dots, k_q))$ attains its maximum if and only if all k_i differ by at most 1, that is to say, when $K(k_1, \dots, k_q)$ is exactly the Turán graph $T_q(n)$. Hence, $m \geq t_r(n)$ and (11) imply

$$t_r(n) \leq m \leq e(K(k_1, \dots, k_q)) \leq t_q(n). \quad (12)$$

Since $q < r \leq n$ implies $t_q(n) < t_r(n)$, contradicting (12), the proof of (i) is complete.

To prove (ii) suppose (5) fails, i.e.,

$$\sum_{i=1}^r d(i) < (r-1)n.$$

Hence, (10) holds with a strict inequality and so, the proof of (12) gives $t_r(n) < t_r(n)$. This contradiction completes the proof of (ii).

Proof of (iii) Suppose that for some \mathfrak{P} -sequence v_1, \dots, v_r equality holds in (5). We may and shall assume that $v_1, \dots, v_r = 1, \dots, r$, i.e.,

$$\sum_{i=1}^r d(i) = (r-1)n.$$

Following the arguments in the proof of (i) and (ii), from (12) we conclude that

$$t_r(n) \leq m \leq t_r(n).$$

and this completes the proof. \square

3 Degree sums in cliques

In this section we turn to the problem of finding $\Delta_r(n, m)$ for $m \geq t_r(n)$. We shall apply Theorem 1 to prove that every graph $G = G(n, m)$ with $m \geq t_r(n)$ contains an r -clique R with

$$\sum_{i \in R} d(i) \geq \frac{2rm}{n}. \quad (13)$$

As proved by Faudree [7], the required r -clique R may be constructed by the algorithm \mathfrak{P} . Note that the assertion is trivial for regular graphs; as we shall show, if G is not regular, we may demand strict inequality in (13).

Theorem 2 *Let $r \geq 2$, $n \geq r$, $m \geq t_r(n)$ and let $G = G(n, m)$ be a graph which is not regular. Then there exists a \mathfrak{P} -sequence v_1, \dots, v_r such that*

$$\sum_{i=1}^r d(v_i) > \frac{2rm}{n}.$$

Proof Part (iii) of Theorem 1 implies that for some \mathfrak{P} -sequence of r vertices, say $1, \dots, r$, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^r d(i) > (r-1)n.$$

Since $d(i) < n$, we immediately obtain

$$\sum_{i=1}^s d(i) > (s-1)n \quad (14)$$

for every $s \in [r]$.

The rest of the proof consists of two parts: In part (a) we find an upper bound for m in terms of $\sum_{i=1}^r d(i)$ and $\sum_{i=1}^r d^2(i)$. Then, in part (b), we prove that

$$\frac{1}{r} \sum_{i=1}^r d(i) \geq \frac{2m}{n},$$

and show that if equality holds then G is regular.

(a) Partition the set V into r sets $V = V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_r$, where,

$$\begin{aligned} V_1 &= V \setminus \Gamma(1), \\ V_i &= \widehat{\Gamma}([i-1]) \setminus \widehat{\Gamma}([i]) \text{ for } i = 2, \dots, r-2, \\ V_r &= \widehat{\Gamma}([r-1]). \end{aligned}$$

We have,

$$\begin{aligned} 2m &= \sum_{i \in V} d(i) = \sum_{h=1}^r \sum_{j \in V_h} d(j) \leq \sum_{i=1}^r d(i) |V_i| \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} (d(i) - d(r)) |V_i| + nd(r) \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Clearly, for every $i \in [r-1]$, from (3), we have

$$\left| \widehat{\Gamma}([i+1]) \right| \geq \left| \widehat{\Gamma}([i]) \right| + |\Gamma(i+1)| - n = \left| \widehat{\Gamma}([i]) \right| + d(i+1) - n$$

and hence, $|V_i| \leq n - d(i)$ holds for every $i \in [r-1]$. Estimating $|V_i|$ in (15) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 2m &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} (d(i) - d(r)) (n - d(i)) + nd(r) \\ &= n \sum_{i=1}^r d(i) - \sum_{i=1}^r d^2(i) + d(r) \left(\sum_{i=1}^r d(i) - n(r-1) \right). \end{aligned}$$

(b) Let $S_r = \sum_{i=1}^r d(i)$. From $d(r) \leq S_r/r$ and Cauchy's inequality we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} 2m &\leq nS_r - \sum_{i=1}^r d^2(i) + \frac{S_r}{r} (S_r - (r-1)n) \\ &\leq nS_r - \frac{1}{r} (S_r)^2 + \frac{S_r}{r} (S_r - (r-1)n) \leq \frac{nS_r}{r}, \end{aligned}$$

and so,

$$\sum_{i=1}^r d(i) \geq \frac{2rm}{n}. \quad (16)$$

To complete the proof suppose we have an equality in (16). This implies that

$$\sum_{i=1}^r d^2(i) = \frac{1}{r} \left(\sum_{i=1}^r d(i) \right)^2$$

and so, $d(1) = \dots = d(r)$. Therefore, the maximum degree $d(1)$ equals the average degree $2m/n$, contradicting the assumption that G is not regular. \square

Since for every $m \geq t_r(n)$ there is a graph $G = G(n, m)$ whose degrees differ by at most 1, we obtain the following bounds on $\Delta_r(n, m)$.

Corollary 1 *For every $m \geq t_r(n)$*

$$\frac{2rm}{n} \leq \Delta_r(n, m) < \frac{2rm}{n} + r.$$

4 Stability of $\Delta_r(n, m)$ as m approaches $t_r(n)$

It is known that inequality (2) is far from being true if $m \leq t_r(n) - \varepsilon n$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$ (e.g., see [7]). However, it turns out that, as m approaches $t_r(n)$, the function $\Delta_r(n, m)$ approaches $2rm/n$. More precisely, the following stability result holds.

Theorem 3 For every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist $n_0 = n_0(\varepsilon)$ and $\delta = \delta(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that if $m > t_r(n) - \delta n^2$ then

$$\Delta_r(n, m) > (1 - \varepsilon) \frac{2rm}{n}$$

for all $n > n_0$.

Proof Without loss of generality we may assume that

$$0 < \varepsilon < \frac{2}{r(r+1)}.$$

Set

$$\delta = \delta(\varepsilon) = \frac{1}{32}\varepsilon^2.$$

If $m \geq t_r(n)$, the assertion follows from Theorem 2, hence we may assume that

$$\frac{2rm}{n} < \frac{2rt_r(n)}{n} \leq (r-1)n.$$

Clearly, our theorem follows if we show that $m > t_r(n) - \delta n^2$ implies

$$\Delta_r(n, m) > (1 - \varepsilon)(r-1)n \quad (17)$$

for n sufficiently large.

Suppose the graph $G = G(n, m)$ satisfies $m > t_r(n) - \delta n^2$. By (4), if n is large enough,

$$m > t_r(n) - \delta n^2 > \left(\frac{r-1}{2r} - \delta\right)n^2 - \frac{r}{8} \geq \left(\frac{r-1}{2r} - 2\delta\right)n^2. \quad (18)$$

Let $M_\varepsilon \subset V$ be defined as

$$M_\varepsilon = \left\{ u : d(u) \leq \left(\frac{r-1}{r} - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right)n \right\}.$$

The rest of the proof consists of two parts. In part (a) we shall show that $|M_\varepsilon| < \varepsilon n$, and in part (b) we shall show that the subgraph induced by $V \setminus M_\varepsilon$ contains an r -clique with large degree sum, proving (17).

(a) Our first goal is to show that $|M_\varepsilon| < \varepsilon n$. Indeed, assume the opposite and select an arbitrary $M' \subset M_\varepsilon$ satisfying

$$\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}\right)\varepsilon n < |M'| < \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}\right)\varepsilon n. \quad (19)$$

Let G' be the subgraph of G induced by $V \setminus M'$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} e(G) &= e(G') + e(M', V \setminus M') + e(M') \leq e(G') + \sum_{u \in M'} d(u) \\ &\leq e(G') + |M'| \left(\frac{r-1}{r} - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right)n. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Observe that second inequality of (19) implies

$$n - |M'| > (1 - \varepsilon) n.$$

Hence, if

$$e(G') \geq \frac{r-1}{2r} (n - |M'|)^2$$

then, applying Theorem 2 to the graph G' , we see that

$$\Delta_r(G) \geq \Delta_r(G') \geq \frac{2re(G')}{n - |M'|} \geq (r-1)(n - |M'|) > (r-1)(1 - \varepsilon)n,$$

and (17) follows. Therefore, we may assume

$$e(G') < \frac{r-1}{2r} (n - |M'|)^2.$$

Then, by (18) and (20),

$$\frac{r-1}{2r} (n - |M'|)^2 > e(G') > -|M'| \left(\frac{r-1}{r} - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right) n + \left(\frac{r-1}{2r} - 2\delta \right) n^2.$$

Setting $x = |M'|/n$, this shows that

$$\frac{r-1}{2r} (1-x)^2 + x \left(\frac{r-1}{r} - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right) - \left(\frac{r-1}{2r} - 2\delta \right) > 0,$$

which imply that

$$x^2 - \varepsilon x + 4\delta > 0.$$

Hence, either

$$|M'| > \left(\frac{\varepsilon - \sqrt{\varepsilon^2 - 16\delta}}{2} \right) n = \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \right) \varepsilon n$$

or

$$|M'| < \left(\frac{\varepsilon + \sqrt{\varepsilon^2 - 16\delta}}{2} \right) = \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \right) \varepsilon n,$$

contradicting (19). Therefore, $|M_\varepsilon| < \varepsilon n$, as claimed

(b) Let G_0 be the subgraph of G induced by $V \setminus M_\varepsilon$. By the definition of M_ε , if $u \in V \setminus M_\varepsilon$, then

$$d_G(u) > \left(\frac{r-1}{r} - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right) n,$$

and so

$$d_{G_0}(u) > \left(\frac{r-1}{r} - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right) n - |M_\varepsilon| > \frac{r-2}{r-1} (n - |M_\varepsilon|).$$

Hence, by Turán's theorem, G_0 contains an r -clique and, therefore,

$$\Delta_r(G) > r \left(\frac{r-1}{r} - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right) n \geq (1 - \varepsilon)(r-1)n,$$

proving (17) and completing the proof of our theorem. \square

Acknowledgement The authors thank Prof. D. Todorov for pointing out a fallacy in an earlier version of the proof of Theorem 2.

References

- [1] B. Bollobás, *Modern Graph Theory*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics 184, Springer Verlag, 1998, xiv+394pp.
- [2] B. Bollobás and P. Erdős, Unsolved problems, *Proc. Fifth Brit. Comb. Conf. (Univ. Aberdeen, Aberdeen, 1975)*, Winnipeg, Util. Math. Publ., 678–680.
- [3] C. Edwards, The largest vertex degree sum for a triangle in a graph, *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.*, **9** (1977), 203–208.
- [4] C. Edwards, Complete subgraphs with largest sum of vertex degrees, *Combinatorics (Proc. Fifth Hungarian Colloq., Keszthely, 1976), Vol. I, Colloq. Math. Soc. János Bolyai*, **18**, North-Holland, Amsterdam-New York, 1978, pp. 293–306.
- [5] P. Erdős and R. Laskar, On maximum chordal subgraph, Proceedings of the fourteenth Southeastern conference on combinatorics, graph theory and computing (Boca Raton, Fla., 1983). *Congr. Numer.* **39** (1983), 367–373.
- [6] G. Fan, Degree sum for a triangle in a graph, *J. Graph Theory* **12** (1988), 249–263.
- [7] R. Faudree, Complete subgraphs with large degree sums, *J. Graph Theory* **16** (1992), 327–334.