9-1991

The Arboricity of the Random Graph

Paul A. Catlin

Zhi-Hong Chen
Butler University, chen@butler.edu

The Arboricity of the Random Graph

Paul A. Catlin*
Zhi-Hong Chen*

INTRODUCTION

The arboricity $a(G)$ of a graph G is the minimum number of forests in G whose union contains G. Nash-Williams [6] proved

(1) $$a(G) = \max_{H \subseteq G} \left\lceil \frac{|E(H)|}{|V(H)| - 1} \right\rceil,$$

where the maximum runs over all nontrivial subgraphs H of G We shall show that if G is the random graph, then the expression $|E(H)|/(|V(H)| - 1)$ attains its maximum in (1) if and only if $H = G$. This result also gives the maximum number of edge-disjoint spanning trees in the random graph.

Let p be a fixed real number between 0 and 1. Write $\mathcal{G}(n, p)$ for the probability space of simple graphs of order n, where the probability that any two distinct vertices are adjacent is p, and where these probabilities are independent. Except in a concluding remark, when we write of "the random graph" G or "almost every graph" G, we are in the space $\mathcal{G}(n, p)$ and G has order n. This is Model A of Palmer [7].

We shall follow the notation of Bondy and Murty [2], and we use Landau's notation $O(f(n))$ for a term which, after division by $f(n)$, remains bounded as $n \longrightarrow \infty$; and $o(f(n))$ is a term which, after division by $f(n)$, approaches 0 as $n \longrightarrow \infty$.

*Department of Mathematics, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI 48202.

SOME KNOWN RESULTS

For any connected graph G, define

$$\gamma(G) = \max_{H \subseteq G} \frac{|E(H)|}{|V(H)| - 1}, \tag{2}$$

where the maximum is taken over all nontrivial subgraphs of G. Also define

$$\eta(G) = \min_{E \subseteq E(G)} \frac{|E|}{\omega(G - E) - 1}, \tag{3}$$

where $\omega(G-E)$ is the number of components of $G-E$. Let $t(G)$ denote the maximum number of edge-disjoint spanning trees in G. Tutte [10] and Nash-Williams [7] proved

$$t(G) = \lfloor \eta(G) \rfloor. \tag{4}$$

By (1) and (2),

$$a(G) = \lceil \gamma(G) \rceil. \tag{5}$$

Lemma 1. [3] For any connected graph G of order n, these are equivalent:
(a) $|E(G)| = \gamma(G)(n-1)$;
(b) $|E(G)| = \eta(G)(n-1)$;
(c) $\eta(G) = \gamma(G)$. □

Also,

$$\eta(G) \le \frac{|E(G)|}{n-1} \le \gamma(G) \tag{6}$$

if G is connected of order n. Although $\gamma(G)$ and $\eta(G)$ may not be integers, they are often easier to use than $a(G)$ and $t(G)$.

Lemma 2. For almost every graph G, the minimum degree is

$$\delta(G) = pn + O((n \log n)^{1/2}). \quad \square$$

Stronger versions of Lemma 2 appear in [1].

Lemma 3. (Bollobás [1, Lemma 18]) Let $\epsilon > 0$. For almost every graph G, if $r > n^{\epsilon}$ then every induced subgraph H of order r has

$$|E(H)| = p\binom{r}{2} + o(r^2). \quad \square \tag{7}$$

THE MAIN RESULTS

Let G be a connected graph. (Almost all graphs are connected [7, p. 14].) Define $\mathcal{F}(G)$ to be the family of nontrivial subgraphs H of G such that

$$\gamma(G) = \frac{|E(H)|}{|V(H)|-1}. \tag{8}$$

Thus, $H \in \mathcal{F}(G)$ implies $\gamma(H) = \gamma(G)$. Payan [8] introduced the invariant $\gamma(G)$ and he called G decomposible if $G \in \mathcal{F}(G)$. Ruciński and Vince [9] called G strongly balanced if $G \in \mathcal{F}(G)$, and they proved that there is a strongly balanced graph with order n and with m edges if and only if

$$1 \leq n-1 \leq m \leq \binom{n}{2}.$$

Also, they remarked [9, p. 255] that for such values of m and n, either $n-1=m$ or there is a simple graph G of order n and size m with $\mathcal{F}(G) = \{G\}$. Condition (a) of Lemma 1 holds if and only if $G \in \mathcal{F}(G)$.

Theorem 4 For the random graph G, $\mathcal{F}(G) = \{G\}$.

Proof: Let G be a random graph of order $n > 1$. We may assume that G is connected. Let $H \in \mathcal{F}(G)$ and denote $|V(H)|$ by r. We shall prove $H = G$. Clearly $r > 1$ since $G \neq K_1$.

Since $H \in \mathcal{F}(G)$, H is an induced subgraph of G and

$$\gamma(H) = \gamma(G) = \frac{|E(H)|}{r-1}. \tag{9}$$

Since H is simple of order r, (9) gives

$$r = \frac{2}{r-1}\binom{r}{2} \geq \frac{2}{r-1}|E(H)| = 2\gamma(H). \tag{10}$$

By Lemma 3, with G in place of H,

$$|E(G)| = p\binom{n}{2} + o(n^2). \tag{11}$$

By (10), (9), (6), and (11),

$$r \geq 2\gamma(H) = 2\gamma(G) \geq \frac{2|E(G)|}{n-1} = pn + o(n),$$

and so r is large enough so that Lemma 3 applies to the induced subgraph H. Thus,

$$|E(H)| = p\binom{r}{2}(1 + o(1)). \tag{12}$$

By (9) and (12),

$$\gamma(H) = \frac{|E(H)|}{r-1} = \frac{pr}{2}(1 + o(1)). \tag{13}$$

By (6) and (11),

$$\gamma(G) \geq \frac{|E(G)|}{n-1} = \frac{pn}{2} + o(n), \tag{14}$$

and so by (13), (9), and (14),

$$\frac{pr}{2}(1 + o(1)) = \gamma(H) = \gamma(G) \geq \frac{pn}{2} + o(n). \tag{15}$$

This gives

$$|V(G) - V(H)| = n - r = o(n). \tag{16}$$

By way of contradiction, suppose that there is a vertex $v \in V(G) - V(H)$. Define

$$H_v = G[V(H) \cup \{v\}].$$

Then $|V(H_v)| = r + 1$. By (6) (with H_v in place of G),

$$|E(H_v)| \leq \gamma(H_v)r. \tag{17}$$

Since $H \in \mathcal{F}(G)$,

$$\gamma(H_v) \leq \gamma(H). \tag{18}$$

By (17), (18), and (9),

$$|E(H_v)| \leq \gamma(H_v)r \leq \gamma(H)r = |E(H)| + \gamma(H). \tag{19}$$

Notice that (19) implies

$$|N(v) \cap V(H)| \leq \gamma(H). \tag{20}$$

By (20), (16), (13), and $r \leq n$, a bound on the degree of v is

$$\begin{aligned} d(v) &< |N(v) \cap V(H)| + |V(G) - V(H)| \\ &\leq \gamma(H) + o(n) \\ &= \frac{pr}{2}(1 + o(1)) + o(n) \\ &< \frac{pn}{2}(1 + o(1)). \end{aligned}$$

contrary to Lemma 2. Hence, v does not exist, and so H must equal G. This proves Theorem 4. □

Corollary 5 Almost every graph G satisfies

$$a(G) = \left\lceil \frac{|E(G)|}{n-1} \right\rceil$$

and

$$t(G) = \left\lfloor \frac{|E(G)|}{n-1} \right\rfloor .$$

Proof: Combine Theorem 4 and (5) to get $a(G)$. By Theorem 4, G satisfies (a) of Lemma 1. Use Lemma 1 and (4) to get $t(G)$. □

Corollary 6 For almost any graph G, $a(G) - t(G) = 1$.

Proof: By Corollary 5, $0 \leq a(G) - t(G) \leq 1$, and by (4), (5), and (6),

$$t(G) \leq \frac{|E(G)|}{n-1} \leq a(G).$$

Since $t(G)$ and $a(G)$ are integers, we see that to prove Corollary 6 it suffices to show that $|E(G)|/(n-1)$ is almost never an integer. This is routine and hence omitted. □

REMARKS

Frieze and Luczak [4] determined $t(G)$ for the graph G, when G is the random graph underlying the digraph chosen randomly according to Palmer's Model C. For positive integers r and n with $1 \leq r \leq n-1$, the sample space in Model C consists of all labelled digraphs of order n in which each vertex has outdegree r. For each vertex v, there are $\binom{n-1}{r}$ choices for the neighborhood of v in the digraph. The underlying graph thus has rn edges and hence cannot have $r+1$ edge-disjoint spanning trees. Frieze and Luczak [4] showed that the underlying graph almost always has r edge-disjoint spanning trees.

REFERENCES

1. B. BOLLOBÁS, Degree sequences of random graphs. Discrete Math. **33** (1981) 1-19.

2. J. A. BONDY and U. S. R. MURTY, Graph Theory with Applications, American Elsevier, New York (1976).

3. P. A. CATLIN, J. W. GROSSMAN, A. M. HOBBS, and H. J. LAI, Fractional arboricity, strength, and principal partitions in graphs and matroids. Discrete Appl. Math., to appear.

4. A. M. FRIEZE and T. LUCZAK, Edge disjoint spanning trees in random graphs. Preprint.

5. C. St. J. A. NASH-WILLIAMS, Edge-disjoint spanning trees of finite graphs. J. London Math. Soc. **36** (1961) 445-450.

6. C. St. J. A. NASH-WILLIAMS, Decompositions of finite graphs into forests. J. London Math. Soc. **39** (1964) 12.

7. E. M. PALMER, Graphical Evolution. Wiley-Interscience Series in Discrete Math., John Wiley & Sons, New York (1985).

8. C. PAYAN, Graphes équilibrés et arboricité rationnelle. Europ. J. Combinatorics **7** (1986) 263-270.

9. A. RUCIŃSKI and A. VINCE, Strongly balanced graphs and random graphs. J. Graph Theory **10** (1986) 251-264.

10. W. T. TUTTE, On the problem of decomposing a graph into n connected factors. J. London Math. Soc. **36** (1961) 221-230.