

Jaroslav Blažek; Milan Koman

On an extremal problem concerning graphs (Preliminary communication)

Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae, Vol. 8 (1967), No. 1, 49--52

Persistent URL: <http://dml.cz/dmlcz/105092>

Terms of use:

© Charles University in Prague, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, 1967

Institute of Mathematics of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use. Each copy of any part of this document must contain these *Terms of use*.



This paper has been digitized, optimized for electronic delivery and stamped with digital signature within the project *DML-CZ: The Czech Digital Mathematics Library* <http://project.dml.cz>

ON AN EXTREMAL PROBLEM CONCERNING GRAPHS

Jaroslav BLAŽEK, Milan KOMAN, Praha

(Preliminary communication)

In this paper, a generalization of a problem proposed by P. Erdős (see e.g. [1, p.87]) and of a problem proposed by P. Turán (see e.g. [2]) is studied. This generalization may be formulated as follows (see also [3]): Let G be a finite graph without loops and multiple edges, the complementary graph of which consists of k components (of connectivity), each having the form of a complete graph $\langle n_i \rangle$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$. The problem is to find the minimal number of intersection points of edges for all immersions $x)$ of G into the Euclidean plane E_2 . This number will be denoted by $\nu_k(n_1, n_2, \dots, n_k)$.

1. Upper estimate of $\nu_k(n_1, n_2, \dots, n_k)$.

a) In a particular case (the problem of P. Erdős), for $n_1 = n_2 = \dots = n_k = 1$, the following upper bound has been proved (see [4] and [3]):

$$(1) \quad \nu_k(1, 1, \dots, 1) \leq \frac{1}{4} \left[\frac{k}{2} \right] \left[\frac{k-1}{2} \right] \left[\frac{k-2}{2} \right] \left[\frac{k-3}{2} \right].$$

b) In another particular case (the problem of P. Turán), for $k = 2$, K. Zarankiewicz proved in his paper [2]

x) The term "immersion" is used in the same sense as in [1].

$$(2) \mu_2(m_1, m_2) \leq \left[\frac{m_1}{2} \right] \left[\frac{m_1-1}{2} \right] \left[\frac{m_2}{2} \right] \left[\frac{m_2-1}{2} \right] = K(m_1, m_2).$$

c) For $k = 3$, by using a generalization of Zarankiewicz's construction from [2], it can be proved that

$$\mu_3(m_1, m_2, m_3) \leq K(m_1, m_2 + m_3) + K(m_2, m_1 + m_3) + K(m_3, m_1 + m_2) - K(m_1, m_2) - K(m_1, m_3) - K(m_2, m_3),$$

where $K(a, b)$ is the symbol defined in (2).

d) In general, for $k \geq 4$ we may suppose that in the sequence m_1, m_2, \dots, m_k all odd integers are preceded by all even integers. We shall use the following notations:

$$\bar{m} = \left[\frac{m+1}{2} \right], \quad \underline{m} = \left[\frac{m}{2} \right] \quad (\text{for any integer } m);$$

$$a_1 = \bar{m}_1, \quad a_2 = \underline{m}_2, \quad a_3 = \bar{m}_3, \quad a_4 = \underline{m}_4, \dots;$$

$$b_1 = \underline{m}_1, \quad b_2 = \bar{m}_2, \quad b_3 = \underline{m}_3, \quad b_4 = \bar{m}_4, \dots;$$

$$N_i = \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^k m_j \quad (i = 1, 2, \dots, k).$$

Then it is possible, by using a generalization of the construction B from [3], to prove this upper estimate:

$$\mu_k(m_1, m_2, \dots, m_k) \leq \sum_{i=1}^k K(m_i, N_i) - \sum_{\substack{i, j=1 \\ i < j}}^k K(m_i, m_j) + L(m_1, m_2, \dots, m_k) + \varepsilon M(a_i, b_i),$$

where

$$L(m_1, m_2, \dots, m_k) = \sum_{\substack{n, n', l, l'=1 \\ n < n' < l < l'}}^k (a_n a_{n'} a_l a_{l'} + a_n a_{n'} b_l b_{l'} + a_n b_{n'} b_l a_{l'} + b_n a_{n'} a_l b_{l'} + b_n b_{n'} a_l a_{l'} + b_n b_{n'} b_l b_{l'})$$

and where $\varepsilon = 1$ if in the number of odd integers in the sequence n_1, n_2, \dots, n_k is odd, and $\varepsilon = 0$ otherwise; $M(a_i, b_i)$ is a function of degree 2 in $a_1, \dots, a_k, b_1, \dots, b_k$.

2. Lower estimate of $r_k(n_1, n_2, \dots, n_k)$. It seems to us that all upper bounds mentioned in part 1 do not differ essentially from the number $r_k(n_1, n_2, \dots, n_k)$. But the establishment of a precise enough lower bound seems to be rather difficult.

In case $n_1 = n_2 = \dots = n_k = 1$ is proved in [4] and [3]

$$(3) \quad k r_{k-1}(1, 1, \dots, 1) \leq (k-4) r_k(1, 1, \dots, 1)$$

and

$$\frac{3}{280} k(k-1)(k-2)(k-3) \leq r_k(1, 1, \dots, 1).$$

For $k = 2$, in [2] the proof of the inequality

$$(4) \quad K(n_1, n_2) \leq r_2(n_1, n_2)$$

is not correct because of an incorrect application of Lemma 2 (see [2], p.139). We do not know (if $\min(n_1, n_2) \geq 5$) any proof of (4). We can only prove the following inequality analogous to (3):

$$(5) \quad n_1 r_2(n_1 - 1, n_2) \leq (n_1 - 2) r_2(n_1, n_2).$$

In general, we can prove

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^k n_i r_k(n_1, \dots, n_{i-1}, n_i - 1, n_{i+1}, \dots, n_k) &\leq \\ &\leq (n_1 + n_2 + \dots + n_k - 4) r_k(n_1, n_2, \dots, n_k) \end{aligned}$$

which is a generalization of (3) and (5).

R e f e r e n c e s

- [1] G. RINGEL: Extremal problems in the theory of graphs, Theory of graphs and its applications.

Proceedings of the Sympos. Prague (1963),
85-90.

- [2] K. ZARANKIEWICZ: On a problem of P. Turan concerning
graphs, *Fundamenta Mathem.*, XLI(1955), 137-145.
- [3] J. BLAŽEK, M. KOMAN: A minimal problem concerning complete plane graphs, *Theory of graphs and its applications. Proceedings of the Sympos. Prague(1963)*, 113-117.
- [4] R.K. GUY: A combinatorial problem, *Bull. of the Malayan Math. Soc.*, I, 2(1960), 68-72.

(Received December 1, 1966)