Discussiones Mathematicae Graph Theory 20 (2000) 71–79

# SOME NEWS ABOUT THE INDEPENDENCE NUMBER OF A GRAPH

JOCHEN HARANT

Department of Mathematics, Technical University of Ilmenau D-98684 Ilmenau, Germany

#### Abstract

For a finite undirected graph G on n vertices some continuous optimization problems taken over the n-dimensional cube are presented and it is proved that their optimum values equal the independence number of G.

Keywords: graph, independence.

1991 Mathematical Subject Classification: 05C35.

### 1 Introduction and Results

Let G be a finite simple and undirected graph on  $V(G) = \{1, 2, ..., n\}$  with its edge set E(G). A subset I of V(G), such that the subgraph of G induced by I is edgeless, is called an *independent set* of G, and the maximum cardinality of an independent set of G is named the *independence* number  $\alpha(G)$  of G. N(i) and  $d_i$  denote the set and the number of neighbours of  $i \in V(G)$  in G, respectively, and let  $\Delta(G) = \max\{d_i \mid i \in V(G)\}$ and  $C^n = \{(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n) \mid 0 \leq x_i \leq 1, i = 1, 2, ..., n\}$ . For events A and B and for a random variable Z of an arbitrary random space, P(A), P(A|B), and  $\mathcal{E}(Z)$  denote the probability of A, the conditional probability of A given B, and the expectation of Z, respectively. Since the computation of  $\alpha(G)$  is difficult (INDEPENDENT SET is an NP-complete problem; see [6]), much work was done to establish bounds on  $\alpha(G)$  (e.g., see [1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17]), to find efficient algorithms forming a large independent set of G (e.g., see [2, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12]), or to replace the combinatorial optimization problem to determine  $\alpha(G)$  by a continuous one (e.g., see [9, 11]). The last approach leads to bounds on  $\alpha(G)$  as well as to efficient algorithms (e.g., see [8, 9]). In the present paper some new continuous optimization problems taken over  $C^n$  are presented and it is proved that their optimum values equal  $\alpha(G)$ . Theorem 1 gives a remarkable result of T.S. Motzkin and E.G. Straus [11] and Theorem 2 is proved in [9].

#### Theorem 1.

$$\alpha(G) = \max_{(0,0,\dots,0) \neq (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in C^n} \frac{\left(\sum_{i \in V(G)} x_i\right)^2}{\sum_{i \in V(G)} x_i^2 + 2\sum_{i j \in E(G)} x_i x_j}.$$

**Theorem 2.**  $\alpha(G) = \max_{(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in C^n} \sum_{i \in V(G)} (x_i \prod_{j \in N(i)} (1 - x_j)).$ 

A classical lower bound on  $\alpha(G)$  due to Y. Caro and V.K. Wei [3, 17] is given by the following theorem.

Theorem 3.  $\alpha(G) \ge \sum_{i \in V(G)} \frac{1}{1+d_i}$ .

The next Theorems 4, 5, 6, and 7 are the main results of the present paper.

Theorem 4. 
$$\alpha(G) = \max_{(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in C^n} e_G(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n), \text{ where}$$
  
 $e_G(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = \sum_{i \in V(G)} \left( \frac{x_i}{1 + \sum_{j \in N(i)} x_j} + \frac{(1 - x_i) \prod_{j \in N(i)} (1 - x_j)}{1 + \sum_{j \in N(i)} \prod_{l \in N(j) \setminus (N(i) \cup \{i\})} (1 - x_l)} \right).$ 

**Theorem 5.**  $\alpha(G) = \max_{(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n) \in C^n} f_G(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n), where$ 

$$f_G(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n) = \sum_{i \in V(G)} \left( x_i + \frac{\prod_{j \in N(i) \ l \in N(j) \setminus (N(i) \cup \{i\})} (1-x_i)}{1 + \sum_{j \in N(i) \ l \in N(j) \setminus (N(i) \cup \{i\})} (1-x_l)} \right) - \sum_{ij \in E(G)} x_i x_j.$$

The following Theorem 6 looks more "complicate", but it is "stronger" than Theorem 4 and Theorem 5 (see Remark 1).

Theorem 6. 
$$\alpha(G) = \max_{(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n) \in C^n} g_G(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n), where$$
  
 $g_G(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n) = \sum_{i \in V(G)} \left( \left( x_i + \frac{1 - x_i}{1 + \sum_{j \in N(i)} \prod_{l \in N(j) \setminus (N(i) \cup \{i\})} (1 - x_l)} \right) \prod_{j \in N(i)} (1 - x_j) \right)$ 

Some News about the Independence Number ...

$$+\sum_{i\in V'}\frac{x_i(1-\prod_{j\in N(i)}(1-x_j))^2}{1-\prod_{j\in N(i)}(1-x_j)+\sum_{j\in N(i)}x_j} \text{ and } V' = \left\{i\in V(G)|\sum_{j\in N(i)}x_j>0\right\}.$$

A "weaker" (see Remark 1), but a more "transparent" and (see Remark 2) an "algorithmically realizable" version of Theorem 5 is the following one.

**Theorem 7.** 
$$\alpha(G) = \max_{\substack{(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n) \in C^n \\ h_G(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n)}} h_G(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n), where h_G(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n) = \sum_{i \in V(G)} x_i - \sum_{i j \in E(G)} x_i x_j.$$

### 2 Proofs

Throughout the proofs we will use the well-known fact that for a random subset M of a given finite set N,

$$\mathcal{E}(|M|) = \sum_{y \in N} P(y \in M) = \sum_{k=0}^{|N|} k P(|M| = k).$$

Let *I* be a maximum independent set of *G* and let  $x_i^* = 1$  if  $i \in I$  and  $x_i^* = 0$  if  $i \notin I$ . Since  $(1 - x_i^*) \prod_{j \in N(i)} (1 - x_j^*) = 0$  for  $i \in V(G)$  and  $\sum_{ij \in E(G)} x_i^* x_j^* = 0$ , we obtain

**Lemma 1.**  $\alpha(G) = e_G(x_1^*, x_2^*, ..., x_n^*) = f_G(x_1^*, x_2^*, ..., x_n^*) = g_G(x_1^*, x_2^*, ..., x_n^*) = h_G(x_1^*, x_2^*, ..., x_n^*).$ 

With Lemma 1, it is clear that Theorem 7 follows from Theorem 5.

Now, let  $(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n)$  be an arbitrary member of  $C^n$ . We form a set  $X \subseteq V(G)$  by random and independent choice of  $i \in V(G)$ , where  $P(i \in X) = x_i$ . Let  $H_1$ ,  $H_2$ , and  $H_3$  be the subgraph of G induced by the vertices of X, by the vertices  $i \in X$  with  $N(i) \cap X \neq \emptyset$ , and by the vertices  $i \notin X$  with  $N(i) \cap X = \emptyset$ , respectively. Furthermore, let Y be a smallest subset of  $V(H_2)$  covering all edges of  $H_2$ , i.e., the graph induced by  $V(H_2) - Y$  is edgeless, and let  $I_1$  and  $I_3$  be a maximum independent set of  $H_1$  and  $H_3$ , respectively. It can be seen easily that  $|Y| = |V(H_2)| - \alpha(H_2)$ ,  $|Y| \leq |E(H_2)|$  and that  $(X - Y) \cup I_3$  and  $I_1 \cup I_3$  are independent sets of G. Because of these remarks and the property of the expectation to be an average value, we have Lemma 2 as follows. **Lemma 2.**  $\alpha(G) \geq \mathcal{E}(|X - Y|) + \mathcal{E}(\alpha(H_3)), \ \alpha(G) \geq \mathcal{E}(\alpha(H_1)) + \mathcal{E}(\alpha(H_3)),$  $\mathcal{E}(|X - Y|) = \mathcal{E}(|X|) - \mathcal{E}(|Y|) \geq \mathcal{E}(|X|) - \mathcal{E}(|E(H_2)|), \ and$  $\mathcal{E}(|X - Y|) = \mathcal{E}(|X|) - \mathcal{E}(|V(H_2)|) + \mathcal{E}(\alpha(H_2)).$ 

Lower bounds on  $\mathcal{E}(\alpha(H_1))$ ,  $\mathcal{E}(\alpha(H_2))$ , and  $\mathcal{E}(\alpha(H_3))$  are given in Lemma 3.

Lemma 3. 
$$\mathcal{E}(\alpha(H_1)) \geq \sum_{i \in V(G)} \frac{x_i}{1 + \sum_{j \in N(i)} x_j},$$
  
 $\mathcal{E}(\alpha(H_2)) \geq \sum_{i \in V'} \frac{x_i(1 - \prod_{j \in N(i)} (1 - x_j))^2}{1 - \prod_{j \in N(i)} (1 - x_j) + \sum_{j \in N(i)} x_j}, \text{ where } V' = \{i \in V(G) | \sum_{j \in N(i)} x_j > 0\},$   
and  
 $\mathcal{E}(\alpha(H_3)) \geq \sum_{i \in V(G)} \frac{(1 - x_i) \prod_{j \in N(i)} (1 - x_j)}{1 + \sum_{j \in N(i)} \prod_{l \in N(j) \setminus (N(i) \cup \{i\})} (1 - x_l)}.$ 

**Proof.** For  $i \in V(G)$  define the random variable  $Z_i^1$  with  $Z_i^1 = \frac{1}{1+k}$  if  $i \in X$  and  $|N(i) \cap X| = k \ge 0$ , and  $Z_i^1 = 0$  if  $i \notin X$ . Using Theorem 3,

$$\begin{split} &\mathcal{E}(\alpha(H_1)) \geq \mathcal{E}(\sum_{i \in V(G)} Z_i^1) = \sum_{i \in V(G)} \mathcal{E}(Z_i^1) \\ &= \sum_{i \in V(G)} \sum_{k=0}^{d_i} \frac{1}{1+k} P(i \in X \text{ and } |N(i) \cap X| = k) \\ &= \sum_{i \in V(G)} \sum_{k=0}^{d_i} \frac{1}{1+k} P(i \in X) P(|N(i) \cap X| = k) \\ &= \sum_{i \in V(G)} x_i \sum_{k=0}^{d_i} \frac{1}{1+k} P(|N(i) \cap X| = k)). \end{split}$$
  
For  $i \in V(G)$  we have  $\sum_{k=0}^{d_i} P(|N(i) \cap X| = k) = 1$ . With Jensen's inequality  $\sum_{l=1}^{m} \tau_l \phi(y_l) \geq \phi(\sum_{l=1}^{m} \tau_l y_l)$  for any convex function  $\phi$  and any  $\tau_l \geq 0$  for  $l = 1, 2, ..., m$  with  $\sum_{l=1}^{m} \tau_l = 1,$   
 $\mathcal{E}(\alpha(H_1)) \geq \sum_{i \in V(G)} x_i \frac{1}{1+\sum_{k=0}^{d_i} kP(|N(i) \cap X| = k)} = \sum_{i \in V(G)} \frac{x_i}{1+\sum_{j \in N(i)} x_j}. \end{split}$   
Now, let  $V' = \{i \in V(G) \mid \sum x_i > 0\}$ . For  $i \in V(G)$  let  $Z_i^2$  be the

Now, let  $V' = \{i \in V(G) | \sum_{j \in N(i)} x_j > 0\}$ . For  $i \in V(G)$  let  $Z_i^2$  be the random variable with  $Z_i^2 = \frac{1}{1+k}$  if  $i \in X$  and  $|N(i) \cap X| = k \ge 1$ , and  $Z_i^2 = 0$  otherwise. Then,

Some News about the Independence Number ...

$$\begin{split} \mathcal{E}(\alpha(H_2)) &\geq \mathcal{E}(\sum_{i \in V(G)} Z_i^2) = \sum_{i \in V(G)} \mathcal{E}(Z_i^2) \\ &= \sum_{i \in V(G)} \sum_{k=1}^{d_i} \frac{1}{1+k} P(i \in X \text{ and } |N(i) \cap X| = k) \\ &= \sum_{i \in V(G)} \sum_{k=1}^{d_i} \frac{1}{1+k} P(i \in X) P(|N(i) \cap X| = k) \\ &= \sum_{i \in V(G)} x_i \sum_{k=1}^{d_i} \frac{1}{1+k} P(|N(i) \cap X| = k). \\ P(|N(i) \cap X| = 0) + \sum_{k=1}^{d_i} P(|N(i) \cap X| = k) = 1 \text{ for } i \in V(G) \text{ and with} \\ \mu_i = P(|N(i) \cap X| = 0) = \prod_{j \in N(i)} (1-x_j) \text{ and } \sigma_{ik} = P(|N(i) \cap X| = k), \\ \mathcal{E}(\alpha(H_2)) &\geq \sum_{i \in V(G)} x_i \sum_{k=1}^{d_i} \frac{1}{1+k} \sigma_{ik} = \sum_{i \in V(G), \mu_i < 1} x_i \sum_{k=1}^{d_i} \frac{1}{1+k} \sigma_{ik} \\ &= \sum_{i \in V'} x_i \sum_{k=1}^{d_i} \frac{1}{1+k} \sigma_{ik} = \sum_{i \in V'} x_i (1-\mu_i) \sum_{k=1}^{d_i} \frac{\sigma_{ik}}{(1+k)(1-\mu_i)}. \\ \text{For } \lambda_{ik} = \frac{\sigma_{ik}}{1-\mu_i} \text{ we have } \lambda_{ik} \geq 0, \sum_{k=1}^{d_i} \lambda_{ik} = 1 \text{ if } i \in V', \text{ and again using Jensen's inequality,} \end{split}$$

$$\mathcal{E}(\alpha(H_2)) \ge \sum_{i \in V'} x_i (1-\mu_i) \frac{1}{1+\sum_{k=1}^{d_i} k \lambda_{ik}}$$
  
=  $\sum_{i \in V'} \frac{x_i (1-\prod_{j \in N(i)} (1-x_j))^2}{1-\prod_{j \in N(i)} (1-x_j) + \sum_{k=1}^{d_i} k P(|N(i) \cap X|=k)} = \sum_{i \in V'} \frac{x_i (1-\prod_{j \in N(i)} (1-x_j))^2}{1-\prod_{j \in N(i)} (1-x_j) + \sum_{j \in N(i)} x_j}.$ 

Finally, let us consider the random variable  $Z_i^3$  with  $Z_i^3 = \frac{1}{1+k}$  if  $i \in V(H_3)$ and  $|N(i) \cap V(H_3)| = k \ge 0$ , and  $Z_i^3 = 0$  if  $i \notin V(H_3)$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(\alpha(H_3)) &\geq \mathcal{E}(\sum_{i \in V(G)} Z_i^3) = \sum_{i \in V(G)} \mathcal{E}(Z_i^3) \\ &= \sum_{i \in V(G)} \sum_{k=0}^{d_i} \frac{1}{1+k} P(i \in V(H_3) \text{ and } |N(i) \cap V(H_3)| = k) \\ &= \sum_{i \in V(G)} \sum_{k=0}^{d_i} \frac{1}{1+k} P(i \in V(H_3)) P(|N(i) \cap V(H_3)| = k \mid i \in V(H_3)) \\ &= \sum_{i \in V(G)} \left( (1-x_i) \prod_{j \in N(i)} (1-x_j) \sum_{k=0}^{d_i} \frac{1}{1+k} P(|N(i) \cap V(H_3)| = k \mid i \in V(H_3)) \right) \end{aligned}$$

J. HARANT

$$\geq \sum_{i \in V(G)} \left( (1 - x_i) \prod_{j \in N(i)} (1 - x_j) \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{k=0}^{d_i} kP(|N(i) \cap V(H_3)| = k \mid i \in V(H_3))} \right)$$

$$= \sum_{i \in V(G)} \left( (1 - x_i) \prod_{j \in N(i)} (1 - x_j) \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{j \in N(i)} \prod_{l \in N(j) \setminus (N(i) \cup \{i\})} (1 - x_l)} \right),$$
and Lemma 2 is meaned

and Lemma 3 is proved.

Theorem 4, 5, and 6 follow with  $\mathcal{E}(|X|) = \sum_{i \in V(G)} x_i, \mathcal{E}(|E(H_2)|)$ =  $\sum_{ij \in E(G)} x_i x_j, \mathcal{E}(|V(H_2)|) = \sum_{i \in V(G)} x_i (1 - \prod_{j \in N(i)} (1 - x_j))$ , Lemma 1, 2, and 3.

# 3 Remarks

For  $\phi, \psi \in \{e, f, g, h\}$  define  $\phi \leq \psi$  if  $\phi_G(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n) \leq \psi_G(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n)$ for every graph G on n vertices and for every  $(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n) \in C^n$ . We write  $\phi <> \psi$  if neither  $\phi \leq \psi$  nor  $\psi \leq \phi$ .

**Remark 1.**  $h \leq f \leq g, e \leq g$  and  $e \ll f$ .

**Proof.** We will use the following Lemma 4, which can be seen easily by induction on r.

**Lemma 4.** For an integer  $r \ge 1$  and  $a_1, a_2, ..., a_r \in [0, 1]$ ,  $\sum_{q=1}^r a_q + \prod_{q=1}^r (1 - a_q) \ge 1.$ 

The inequality  $h \leq f$  is obvious. To see  $f \leq g$ , first notice that  $\sum_{i \in V(G)} x_i - \sum_{ij \in E(G)} x_i x_j = \sum_{i \in V(G)} x_i (1 - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \in N(i)} x_j).$  If  $\sum_{j \in N(i)} x_j = 0$  for an  $i \in V(G)$  then  $x_i = x_i (\prod_{j \in N(i)} (1 - x_j)) = x_i (1 - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \in N(i)} x_j).$  Hence, with the abbreviation  $\mu_i = \prod_{j \in N(i)} (1 - x_j)$  and  $\rho_i = \sum_{j \in N(i)} x_j$  for  $i \in V(G)$ we have to show  $\sum_{i \in V'} (x_i (\mu_i + \frac{(1 - \mu_i)^2}{1 - \mu_i + \rho_i})) \geq \sum_{i \in V'} (x_i (1 - \frac{1}{2}\rho_i)),$  where again  $V' = \{i \in V(G) \mid \sum_{j \in N(i)} x_j > 0\}.$ Using Lemma 4, even  $\mu_i + \frac{(1 - \mu_i)^2}{1 - \mu_i + \rho_i} \geq 1 - \frac{1}{2}\rho_i$  for all  $i \in V'$ .

To prove  $e \leq g$ , we have to show

76

Some News about the Independence Number ...

$$\sum_{i \in V(G)} \frac{x_i}{1 + \sum_{j \in N(i)} x_j} \leq \sum_{i \in V(G)} x_i \prod_{j \in N(i)} (1 - x_j) + \sum_{i \in V'} \frac{x_i (1 - \prod_{j \in N(i)} (1 - x_j))^2}{1 - \prod_{j \in N(i)} (1 - x_j) + \sum_{j \in N(i)} x_j}.$$
  
Since  $\frac{x_i}{1 + \sum_{j \in N(i)} x_j} = x_i \prod_{j \in N(i)} (1 - x_j)$  if  $\sum_{j \in N(i)} x_j = 0$ , it is sufficient to establish  $\frac{1}{1 + \rho_i} \leq \mu_i + \frac{(1 - \mu_i)^2}{1 - \mu_i + \rho_i}$  if  $\sum_{j \in N(i)} x_j > 0$ , what is verified easily.

For a cycle  $C_n$  on n vertices  $e_{C_n}(\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}, ..., \frac{1}{3}) < f_{C_n}(\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}, ..., \frac{1}{3}), e_{C_n}(\frac{2}{3}, \frac{2}{3}, ..., \frac{2}{3}) > f_{C_n}(\frac{2}{3}, \frac{2}{3}, ..., \frac{2}{3})$  and Remark 1 is proved.

With  $h \leq f$  and  $e \ll f$  it is clear that  $e \leq h$  does not hold. It remains open, whether  $h \ll e$  or  $h \leq e$ .

Theorems 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, and 7 are of that type that the independence number  $\alpha(G)$  of a graph G on n vertices equals the optimum value of a continuous optimization problem O(G) to maximize a certain function  $\phi_G$  over  $C^n$ . Hence,  $\phi_G(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n)$  is a lower bound on  $\alpha(G)$  for every  $(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n) \in C^n$ . Let  $(x'_1, x'_2, ..., x'_n) \in C^n$  be the solution of an arbitrary approximation algorithm for O(G). How to find an independent set I of G in polynomial time such that  $|I| \ge \phi_G(x'_1, x'_2, ..., x'_n)$ ? In [8] and [9] efficient algorithms forming I with  $|I| \ge \phi_G(x'_1, x'_2, ..., x'_n)$  are given if O(G) is the optimization problem of Theorem 1 or of Theorem 2. Remark 2 shows that this is also possible if we consider the case  $\phi_G = h_G$ . In case  $\phi_G = e_G$ ,  $\phi_G = f_G$  or  $\phi_G = g_G$  the problem remains open, whether such an algorithm exists.

**Remark 2.** There is an  $\mathcal{O}(\Delta(G)n)$ -algorithm with INPUT:  $(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n) \in C^n$ , OUTPUT: an independent set  $I \subseteq V(G)$  with  $|I| \ge \sum_{i \in V(G)} x_i - \sum_{ij \in E(G)} x_i x_j$ .

**Proof.** First we give the Algorithm:

- 1. For i = 1 to n do if  $\sum_{j \in N(i)} x_j < 1$  then  $x_i := 1$  else  $x_i := 0$ .
- 2. For i = 1 to *n* do if  $(x_i = 1 \text{ and } \prod_{j \in N(i)} (1 x_j) = 0)$  then  $x_i := 0$ .
- 3.  $I := \{i \in V(G) \mid x_i = 1\}.$

It is obvious that the algorithm in an  $\mathcal{O}(\Delta(G)n)$ -algorithm. For the input vector  $(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n) \in C^n$  set

$$\sum_{k \in V(G)} x_k - \sum_{kj \in E(G)} x_k x_j = a.$$

After step 1, the current  $(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n)$  is a 0-1-vector and

$$\sum_{k \in V(G)} x_k - \sum_{kj \in E(G)} x_k x_j \ge a$$

because

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left( \sum_{k \in V(G)} x_k - \sum_{kj \in E(G)} x_k x_j \right) = 1 - \sum_{j \in N(i)} x_j, \text{ i.e., } \sum_{k \in V(G)} x_k - \sum_{kj \in E(G)} x_k x_j \text{ is multilinear.}$$

In step 2,  $\prod_{j \in N(i)} (1 - x_j) = 0$  if and only if there is at least one  $j \in N(i)$  such that  $x_j = 1$ . With  $x_i = 0$  instead of  $x_i = 1$  the sum  $\sum_{k \in V(G)} x_k$  decreases by 1 and the sum  $\sum_{kj \in E(G)} x_k x_j$  decreases by at least 1, hence  $\sum_{k \in V(G)} x_k - \sum_{kj \in E(G)} x_k x_j$  does not decrease. After step 2,  $x_k x_j = 0$  for all  $kj \in E(G), |I| = \sum_{k \in V(G)} x_k = \sum_{k \in V(G)} x_k - \sum_{kj \in E(G)} x_k x_j \ge a$ 

and Remark 2 is proved.

## References

- E. Bertram, P. Horak, Lower bounds on the independence number, Geombinatorics, (V) 3 (1996) 93–98.
- [2] R. Boppana, M.M. Halldorsson, Approximating maximum independent sets by excluding subgraphs, BIT 32 (1992) 180–196.
- [3] Y. Caro, New results on the independence number (Technical Report, Tel-Aviv University, 1979).
- [4] S. Fajtlowicz, On the size of independent sets in graphs, in: Proc. 9th S-E Conf. on Combinatorics, Graph Theory and Computing (Boca Raton 1978) 269–274.
- [5] S. Fajtlowicz, Independence, clique size and maximum degree, Combinatorica 4 (1984) 35–38.
- [6] M.R. Garey, D.S. Johnson, Computers and Intractability, A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness (W.H. Freeman and Company, San Francisco, 1979).

- [7] M.M. Halldorsson, J. Radhakrishnan, Greed is good: Approximating independent sets in sparse and bounded-degree graphs, Algorithmica 18 (1997) 145-163.
- [8] J. Harant, A lower bound on the independence number of a graph, Discrete Math. 188 (1998) 239-243.
- [9] J. Harant, A. Pruchnewski, M. Voigt, On dominating sets and independent sets of graphs, Combinatorics, Probability and Computing 8 (1999) 547–553.
- [10] J. Harant, I. Schiermeyer, On the independence number of a graph in terms of order and size, submitted.
- [11] T.S. Motzkin, E.G. Straus, Maxima for graphs and a new proof of a theorem of Turán, Canad. J. Math. 17 (1965) 533–540.
- [12] O. Murphy, Lower bounds on the stability number of graphs computed in terms of degrees, Discrete Math. 90 (1991) 207–211.
- [13] S.M. Selkow, The independence number of graphs in terms of degrees, Discrete Math. 122 (1993) 343–348.
- [14] S.M. Selkow, A probabilistic lower bound on the independence number of graphs, Discrete Math. 132 (1994) 363–365.
- [15] J.B. Shearer, A note on the independence number of triangle-free graphs, Discrete Math. 46 (1983) 83–87.
- [16] J.B. Shearer, A note on the independence number of triangle-free graphs, II, J. Combin. Theory (B) 53 (1991) 300–307.
- [17] V.K. Wei, A lower bound on the stability number of a simple graph (Bell Laboratories Technical Memorandum 81-11217-9, Murray Hill, NJ, 1981).

Received 8 February 1999