

# Werk

Label: Article **Jahr:** 1982

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?316342866\_0023|log21

## **Kontakt/Contact**

<u>Digizeitschriften e.V.</u> SUB Göttingen Platz der Göttinger Sieben 1 37073 Göttingen

### COMMENTATIONES MATHEMATICAE UNIVERSITATIS CAROLINAE

23,1 (1982)

#### ON COVERINGS OF RANDOM GRAPHS M. AJTAI, J. KOMLÓS, V. RŐDL, E. SZEMEREDI

Abstract: It is shown that almost all graphs have the property that almost all edges can be covered by edge disjoint triangles. Various generalizations of this statement are considered.

Key words: Random graph, covering.

Classification: 05099

Many papers have dealt recently with the problem of decomposing a graph into isomorphic aubgraphs. In this note we investigate related questions concerning random graphs. Let n be a positive integer; is it true that the majority of graphs with n vertices can be decomposed into edge disjoint triangles (or more generally into edge disjoint copies of a given graph F) so that only relatively few edges are left?

We prove, provided n is sufficiently large that it is so. (For the more detailed definitions concerning random graphs see [2].)

Theorem. Let  $\varepsilon$  be a positive,  $\varepsilon$  - 1 and G = (V,  $\mathscr E$ ) a random graph with n vertices, such that each edge is present with the prescribed probability p, independently of the presence or absence of any other edges. Then, with probability

tending to one (as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ) there exists a system T( $\zeta_p$ ) of edge disjoint triangles in  $\mathcal G$  so that all but at most  $arepsilon n^2$  edges: are covered by some triangle from  $T(\mathcal{G})$ .

Proof: A) We can clearly suppose without loss of generality that n = 6m + 1 or 6m+3. Let  $K = K_n$  be a complete graph with the vertex set V. From the existence of Steiner triple systems with n vertices ( $n \equiv 1$  or 3 (mod 6)) it immediately follows that there exists a covering  $\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{0}}$  of the edges of complete graph  $K = K_n$  by edge disjoint triangles. Let  $\mathcal{F}_1$ ,  $\tau_2, \dots, \tau_N$  be independent random permutations of the vertices in V, N will be chosen later. We assume that these permutations are also independent of the random graph G. (In other words, we work on a product space  $\{0,1\}$   $\stackrel{\binom{m}{2}}{\times}$   $\mathfrak{I}$   $\stackrel{\mathbb{N}}{\times}$  with the product measure  $P = P_e^{\binom{n}{2}} \times_{(a} N)$  where  $\pi$  is the set of all permutations of  $\{1,\ldots,n\}$  each one having  $\alpha$ -measure 1/n!, and P(1) = p, P(0) = 1-p.) We define the independent coverings  $c_1, \dots, c_N$  as follows: a triangle  $\{v_1, v_2, v_3\}$  belongs to  $c_i$  if  $\{\sigma_i v_1, \sigma_i v_2, \sigma_i v_3\}$  belongs to  $c_o$ .

Now our algorithm goes as follows. Select all triangles in G that appear in  $\mathbf{C}_1$ , then all triangles appearing in  $\mathbf{C}_2$ that are edge disjoint from the ones selected before, etc. This way we cover some portion of the edges of G by edge disjoint triangles, and hopefully a large portion.

Define the indicator variables

l if e  $\in \mathcal{E}$  , nevertheless e has not been covered in our procedure

O otherwise

and set  $d = E\chi_e$ , where E denotes the expectation of random variable  $\chi_{\,\mathrm{e}}$ . (E $\chi_{\,\mathrm{e}}$  does not depend on e because of complete symmetry.) For the number D of edges not covered we have

 $D = \sum_{e \in \binom{V}{2}} \chi_e \binom{V}{2} \text{ is a set of all pairs of V}, ED = \binom{n}{2} d.$  Now

$$P(D > \varepsilon \binom{n}{2}) p \ge ED \ell_{\varepsilon \binom{n}{2}p} = d \ell_{\varepsilon p}$$

and

$$P(1\%i < \frac{1}{2}\binom{n}{2}p) = o(1)$$

(if only  $(\frac{n}{2})p \to \infty$ ), thus in order to show that  $D_{(4)} \to 0$  it is sufficient to show that  $d/p \to 0$ .

B) Define the numbers pi recursively as follows

$$p_0 = 0$$

(1)

$$p_{k+1} = p_k + (p - p_k)^3$$

Taking  $d_k = p - p_k$  we have thus  $d_0 = p$ ,  $d_{k+1} = d_k - d_k^3$ . It is easy to see that  $d_k \longrightarrow 0$  (actually  $d_k \sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{2k}}$ ). Moreover, since  $d_k$  is decreasing we have  $0 < d_k < p - kd_k^3$  whence

(2) 
$$d_k < (p/k)^{1/3}, k=1,2,...$$

Now we are going to prove

$$(3) \qquad d < d_{\mathbf{N}} + 9^{\mathbf{N}} / \mathbf{n}$$

and thus  $^{d/}p \rightarrow 0$  if only  $9^{N/}_{np} \rightarrow 0$  and  $Np^2 \rightarrow \infty$  which holds if  $p\sqrt{\log n} \rightarrow \infty$  (choose  $N=\frac{1}{10}\log n$ ).

C) Consider an edge e. Let  $T_k = T_k(e)$  denote the triangle in  $C_k$  that cover e. Start with  $T_N(e)$ .

In  $C_{N-1}$  there are three triangles (not necessarily different) containing the edges of  $T_N(e)$ . In  $C_{N-2}$  there are nine triangles containing the nine edges that appeared so far, etc.

Let A = A(e) denote the event that the  $3 + 3^2 + ... + 3^N =$ 

=  $\frac{3}{2}(3^n - 1)$  edges thus appearing are all different, and  $B_k = B_k(e)$  the event that the edge e is covered up to the K-th step of our procedure  $(k=1,\ldots,N)$ .

We fix the covering  $c_1,\dots,c_N$  in such a way that A holds, and randomize G . Define the conditional probability

$$P_k = P(B_k | C_1, \dots, C_N)$$

for these fixed coverings.

For the probability  $P_{k+1} - P_k$  that e gets covered in exactly, the (k+1)-th step, we obviously have

$$P_{k+1} - P_k = (p - P_k)^3, P_1 = p^3$$

since the three edges of  $T_k(e)$  have to be drawn in  $\mathcal G$  and should not have been covered earlier (this explains  $p-P_k$ ), moreover, these three events are independent, for we fixed the C-s in A(e).

Thus  $P_{\underline{k}}$  , and also their mixture  $P(B_{\underline{k}} | A)$  satisfy (1), and hence are equal to  $p_{\underline{k}}.$ 

We have

 $d = p - P(B_N) = p - P(B_N | A)P(A) - P(B_N | \overline{A})P(\overline{A}) \leq p - p_N P(A) \leq$   $\leq p - p_N + P(\overline{A}) = d_N + P(\overline{A}).$ 

$$P(\bar{A}) < \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} 2.9^{k}/n < 9^{N}/n$$

for up to the k-th step (backwards) in the above argument C) we have  $3^k$  edges altogether, and the probability that the corresponding random  $3^k$  points (one step back) are all different from the  $(3^k + 3)/_2$  points obtained so far, is less than  $2.9^k/_n$ . Q.E.D.

Remark. Here we outline that in our theorem triangle can be replaced by any other graph F. Consider a graph (configuration of edges) F which  $K_n$  can be covered by. An important result of R.M. Wilson [1] shows that the trivial necessary conditions for n are also "asymptotically sufficient" and hence  $K_n$  can be covered by edge disjoint copies of F for all sufficiently large n satisfying the necessary conditions.

If F contains r edges rather than three, then we have to change (1) to

$$p_{k+1} = p_k + (p - p_k)^r, p_0 = 0$$

which leads to

$$d_k = p - p_k \sim ((r - 1)_k)^{1/r-1}$$

and also (3) to

$$d < d_{\overline{N}} + r^{2N} / n$$

which leads to the condition

$$p(\log n/\log r)^{1/r-1} \rightarrow \infty$$
.

Thus, with p = const (say 1/2), the procedure works for covering with subgraphs with o(log log n) edges, e.g. for o( $\sqrt{\log \log n}$ )-gons.

for fixed  ${\bf r}$  we have seen that the procedure works as long as:

i.e. as long as the number of edges is much larger than  $n^2/\left(\log n\right)^{1/r-1} \; .$ 

For triangles this is

$$n^2/\sqrt{\log n}$$
.

A good guess is, however, that even a random graph with  $\omega(n)n^{3/2}$ ,  $\omega(n) \longrightarrow \infty$ 

edges can be covered almost perfectly. This would be a strong statement and is completely beyond the power of our method. x)

### References

- [1] R.M. WILSON: Decompositions of complete graphs into subgraphs isomorphic to a given graph, Proc. 5th British Combinatorial Conf. (Aberdeen 1975), Congressus Numeratium XV, Utilitas Math. Publ. Inc., Winnipeg, 1976, 647-659.
- [2] P. ERDÖS; J. SPENCER: Probabilistic Methods in Combinatorics, Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest 1974.

Mathematical Institute of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest (Ajtai, Komlós, Szemeredi)

Czech. Technical University, Praha, Czechoslovakia (Rödl)

(Oblatum 3.7. 1981)

x) Added in proofs: Recently we have proved this conjecture.