Discussiones Mathematicae
Graph Theory 29 (2009) 377–383

ON $\mathcal{F}$-INDEPENDENCE IN GRAPHS

Frank Göring

Fakultät für Mathematik
TU Chemnitz, 09107 Chemnitz, Germany

e-mail: frank.goering@mathematik.tu-chemnitz.de

Jochen Harant
Dieter Rautenbach

Institut für Mathematik
TU Ilmenau, Postfach 100565, 98684 Ilmenau, Germany

e-mail: jochen.harant@tu-ilmenau.de
e-mail: dieter.rautenbach@tu-ilmenau.de

and

Ingo Schiermeyer

Institut für Diskrete Mathematik und Algebra
TU Bergakademie Freiberg, 09596 Freiberg, Germany

e-mail: schierme@math.tu-freiberg.de

Abstract

Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a set of graphs and for a graph G let $\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(G)$ and $\alpha^*_{\mathcal{F}}(G)$ denote the maximum order of an induced subgraph of G which does not contain a graph in $\mathcal{F}$ as a subgraph and which does not contain a graph in $\mathcal{F}$ as an induced subgraph, respectively. Lower bounds on $\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(G)$ and $\alpha^*_{\mathcal{F}}(G)$ are presented.

Keywords: independence, complexity, probabilistic method.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 05C69.

1. Introduction

We consider finite, undirected and simple graphs G with vertex set $V(G)$ and edge set $E(G)$ and refer to [8] for undefined notation.

A generalization of the well-studied concept of independent sets [12] in graphs was introduced in [4] and [7] (see also [3] and [11]). The following problem is considered there: *For two given graphs F and G, what is the maximum order of an induced subgraph of G that either does not contain F as a subgraph or does not contain F as an induced subgraph?*

The purpose of the present paper is to formalize the independence concept corresponding to this problem and to initiate its study. Therefore, for a graph G and a set $\mathcal{M}$ of graphs we denoted by $f(G, \mathcal{M})$ the maximum order $|S|$ of a subgraph $G[S]$ of G induced by $S \subseteq V(G)$ such that $G[S]$ belongs to $\mathcal{M}$. Choosing $\mathcal{M}$ appropriately allows to capture the problem mentioned above. More precisely, let $\mathcal{F}$ be a set of graphs and for a graph G let $\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(G)$ and $\alpha^*_{\mathcal{F}}(G)$ denote the maximum order of an induced subgraph of G which does not contain a graph in $\mathcal{F}$ as a subgraph and which does not contain a graph in $\mathcal{F}$ as an induced subgraph, respectively. Clearly, if we define $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}$ as the set of all graphs which do not contain a graph in $\mathcal{F}$ as a subgraph and $\mathcal{M}^*_{\mathcal{F}}$ as the set of all graphs which do not contain a graph in $\mathcal{F}$ as an induced subgraph, then $\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(G) = f(G, \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}})$ and $\alpha^*_{\mathcal{F}}(G) = f(G, \mathcal{M}^*_{\mathcal{F}})$. If $\mathcal{F} = \{F\}$, then we write $\alpha_F(G)$ and $\alpha^*_F(G)$ for short.

Several well-known graph parameters are special cases of these notions as shown in the following result which collects some obvious basic observations.

Proposition 1. *Let G be a graph.*

(i) $\alpha_{K_2}(G)$ *equals the independence number* $\alpha(G)$ *of* G.

(ii) $\alpha_{\bar{K}_2}(G)$ *equals the clique number of* G.

(iii) $\alpha_{P_3}(G)$ *equals the dissociation number of* G [2].

(iv) $\alpha_{K_r}(G) = \alpha^*_{K_r}(G)$.

(v) $\alpha_{\bar{K}_r}(G) = \min\{|V(G)|, r-1\}$.

(vi) $\alpha^*_{\bar{K}_r}(G) = \max\{|S| \mid S \subseteq V(G), \alpha(G[S]) \leq r-1\}$.

(vii) $\alpha^*_{\mathcal{F}}(G) = \alpha^*_{\{\bar{F} | F \in \mathcal{F}\}}(\bar{G})$.

Our next result is a lower bound on $f(G, \mathcal{M})$ provided the set $\mathcal{M}$ has some natural properties.

Theorem 2. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a set of graphs and let G be a graph.*

(i) *If $\mathcal{M}$ is closed under taking induced subgraphs, then*

$$f(G,\mathcal{M}) \geq \sum_{S:S\subseteq V(G),G[S]\in\mathcal{M}} \binom{|V(G)|}{|S|}^{-1}.$$

(ii) *If $\mathcal{M}$ is closed under taking induced subgraphs and under forming the union of graphs, then*

$$f(G,\mathcal{M}) \geq \sum_{S:S\subseteq V(G),G[S]\in\mathcal{M},G[S] \text{ is connected}} \binom{|N_G[S]|}{|S|}^{-1},$$

where $N_G[S] = \cup_{u\in S} N_G[u]$.

Proof. We only prove (ii) and leave the very similar proof of (i) to the reader. We choose a permutation $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n$ of the vertices of G uniformly at random. Let $S_0 = \emptyset$ and for $1 \leq i \leq n$ let $S_i = S_{i-1} \cup \{v_i\}$ if $G[S_{i-1} \cup \{v_i\}] \in \mathcal{M}$ and $S_i = S_{i-1}$ otherwise. Clearly, $f(G,\mathcal{M}) \geq |S_n|$ and $v_i \in S_n$ if and only if $v_i \in S_i$ and the component H_i of $G[S_i]$ containing v_i belongs to $\mathcal{M}$. Therefore, for a set $S \subseteq V(G)$ with $v_i \in S$ such that $G[S] \in \mathcal{M}$ and $G[S]$ is connected, a lower bound for the probability that $H_i = G[S]$ is the probability that in the chosen permutation the vertices $S \setminus \{v_i\}$ preceed v_i while v_i preceeds the vertices in $N_G[S] \setminus S$ which equals $\frac{1}{|S|}\binom{|N_G[S]|}{|S|}^{-1}$. Therefore, by linearity of expectation

$$\begin{aligned}
f(G,\mathcal{M}) &\geq \mathbf{E}(|S_n|) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{P}(v_i \in S_n)\\
&\geq \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{S:v_i\in S\subseteq V(G),G[S]\in\mathcal{M},G[S] \text{ is connected}} \frac{1}{|S|}\binom{|N_G[S]|}{|S|}^{-1}\\
&= \sum_{S:S\subseteq V(G),G[S]\in\mathcal{M},G[S] \text{ is connected}} \sum_{i:v_i\in S} \frac{1}{|S|}\binom{|N_G[S]|}{|S|}^{-1}\\
&= \sum_{S:S\subseteq V(G),G[S]\in\mathcal{M},G[S] \text{ is connected}} \binom{|N_G[S]|}{|S|}^{-1}
\end{aligned}$$

and the proof is complete. ■

Corollary 3. *Let G be a graph. Then*

(i) $\alpha(G) \geq \sum_{u \in V(G)} \frac{1}{1+d_G(v)}$ (Caro [5], Wei [14]).

(ii) *The dissociation number satisfies*

$$\alpha_{P_3}(G) \geq \sum_{u \in V(G)} \frac{1}{1+d_G(v)} + \sum_{uv \in E(G)} \frac{2}{|N_G[u] \cup N_G[v]| \left(|N_G[u] \cup N_G[v]| - 1\right)}.$$

Proof. Note that $\mathcal{M}_{\{K_2\}} = \{\bar{K}_r \mid r \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\{P_3\}} = \mathcal{M}_{\{K_2\}} \cup \{K_2 \cup \bar{K}_r \mid r \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Both statements follow immediately from Theorem 2(ii) and the observation that the only connected graph in $\mathcal{M}_{\{K_2\}}$ is K_1 and the only connected graphs in $\mathcal{M}_{\{P_3\}}$ are K_1 and K_2. ■

The famous bound due to Caro [5] and Wei [14] from Corollary 3 has yet another generalization in this context.

Theorem 4. *If G is a graph and $r \in \mathbb{N}$, then* $\alpha_{K_{r+1}}(G) \geq \sum_{v \in V(G)} \frac{1}{1+d_G(v)-\alpha_{K_r}(G[N_G(v)])}$.

Proof. We mimic a proof from [1]. For every vertex $v \in V(G)$ let the set $X_v \subseteq N_G(v)$ be such that $|X_v| = d_G(v) - \alpha_{K_r}(G[N_G(v)])$ and $G[N_G(v) \setminus X_v]$ does not contain K_r as a subgraph. Let $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n$ be a permutation of the vertices of G chosen uniformly at random and let $v_i \in S$ if and only if $X_{v_i} \cap \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_i\} = \emptyset$, i.e., v_i is the first vertex of $\{v_i\} \cup X_{v_i}$ that appears within the permutation. Clearly, $G[S]$ does not contain K_{r+1} as a subgraph and

$$\alpha_{K_{r+1}}(G) \geq \mathbf{E}(|S|) = \sum_{v \in V(G)} \mathbf{P}(v \in S) = \sum_{v \in V(G)} \frac{1}{1 + d_G(v) - \alpha_{K_r}(G[N_G(v)])}.$$

■

The next result relies on methods proposed in [10].

Theorem 5. *If G is a graph with vertex set $\{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n\}$ and $r \in \mathbb{N}$, then*

$$\alpha_{K_{1,r}}(G) = \max \sum_{v_i \in V(G)} p_i \sum_{Y : Y \subseteq N_G(v_i), |Y| < r} \left(\prod_{v_j \in Y} p_j \prod_{v_k \in N_G(v_i) \setminus Y} (1 - p_j) \right),$$

where the maximum is taken over all $(p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_n) \in [0, 1]^n$.

Proof. Let $p_i \in [0,1]$ for $1 \le i \le n$. We consider a random subset X of $V(G)$ formed by choosing every vertex v_i independently with probability p_i. If $S = \{v \in X \mid d_{G[X]}(v) < r\}$, then

$$\alpha_{K_{1,r}}(G) \ge \mathbf{E}(S) = \sum_{v_i \in V(G)} p_i \sum_{Y : Y \subseteq N_G(v_i), |Y| < r} \left(\prod_{v_j \in Y} p_j \prod_{v_k \in N_G(v_i) \setminus Y} (1 - p_j) \right).$$

Conversely, if $S \subseteq$ is such that $\alpha_{K_{1,r}}(G) = |S|$ and $G[S]$ has maximum degree less than r, then setting $p_i^* = 1$ for all $v_i \in S$ and $p_i^* = 0$ for all $v_i \notin S$ yields

$$\alpha_{K_{1,r}}(G) = \mathbf{E}(S) = \sum_{v_i \in V(G)} p_i^* \sum_{Y : Y \subseteq N_G(v_i), |Y| < r} \left(\prod_{v_j \in Y} p_j^* \prod_{v_k \in N_G(v_i) \setminus Y} (1 - p_j^*) \right)$$

which completes the proof. ∎

It is trivial that for several specific choices of $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{F}$ the decision problems associated with $f(G, \mathcal{M})$, $\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(G)$ and $\alpha^*_{\mathcal{F}}(G)$ are NP-complete. In view of Mihók's original problem, we consider the case that $\mathcal{F}$ consists of just one graph in more detail.

Theorem 6. *If F is a graph containing at least one edge, then the following problems are NP-complete.*

(i) *For a given graph G and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, decide whether $\alpha_F(G) \ge k$.*

(ii) *For a given graph G and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, decide whether $\alpha^*_F(G) \ge k$.*

Proof. Let uv be an arbitrary edge of F. For a graph G let the graph G' arise as follows: For every edge xy of G add a copy F_{xy} of F and identify the copy of the edge uv in F_{xy} with xy (in any orientation).

It is obvious that for every set $T \subseteq V(G')$ of minimum cardinality such that $G'[V(G') \setminus T]$ does not contain F as a subgraph (or induced subgraph), T must intersect every copy F_{xy} of F in G'. Since deleting either x or y from F_{xy} clearly deletes this copy of F, we can assume that $T \subseteq V(G)$ and that $T \cap \{x, y\} \ne \emptyset$ for all $xy \in E(G)$. Hence T is exactly a vertex cover of G. This implies $\alpha(G) = \alpha_F(G') = \alpha^*_F(G')$ and the desired statement follows from the NP-completeness of the corresponding decision problem for the independence number [9]. ∎

Note that in view Proposition 1(vii), the decision problem "$\alpha^*_{\mathcal{F}}(G) \geq k$?" remains NP-complete even if F is edgeless.

Tuza [13] observed the following nice relation between the independence number and the domination number $\gamma(G)$ of a graph G [10]:

$$\alpha(G) = \max\{\gamma(H) \mid H \text{ is an induced subgraph of } G\}.$$

We close with a generalization of this equality. For a set $\mathcal{F}$ of graphs and a graph G let $\gamma_{\mathcal{F}}(G)$ ($\gamma^*_{\mathcal{F}}(G)$) denote the minimum cardinality $|D|$ of a set $D \subseteq V(G)$ such that for every vertex $u \in V(G) \setminus D$ there is a graph $F \in \mathcal{F}$ and a set $D' \subseteq D$ with $|D'| = |V(F)| - 1$ such that $G[D' \cup \{u\}]$ contains a graph in $\mathcal{F}$ as an (induced) subgraph (see also [4]).

Theorem 7. *If $\mathcal{F}$ is a set of graphs and G is a graph, then*

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(G) &= \max\{\gamma_{\mathcal{F}}(H) \mid H \textit{ is an induced subgraph of } G\}, \\ \alpha^*_{\mathcal{F}}(G) &= \max\{\gamma^*_{\mathcal{F}}(H) \mid H \textit{ is an induced subgraph of } G\}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We only prove the first equality and leave the very similar proof of the second equality to the reader.

If $S \subseteq V(G)$ such that $|S| = \alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(G)$ and $G[S]$ does not contain a graph in $\mathcal{F}$ as a subgraph, then $\gamma_{\mathcal{F}}(G[S]) = |S| \geq \alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(G)$.

Conversely, if $G[S]$ is an induced subgraph of G for which $\gamma_{\mathcal{F}}(G[S])$ is maximum, then let $S' \subseteq S$ be of maximum cardinality such that $G[S']$ does not contain a graph in $\mathcal{F}$ as a subgraph. We obtain $\gamma_{\mathcal{F}}(G[S]) \leq |S'| = \alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(G[S]) \leq \alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(G)$ and the proof is complete. ∎

References

[1] N. Alon and J.H. Spencer, The probablilistic method (2nd ed.), (Wiley, 2000).

[2] R. Boliac, C. Cameron and V. Lozin, *On computing the dissociation number and the induced matching number of bipartite graphs*, Ars Combin. **72** (2004) 241–253.

[3] M. Borowiecki, I. Broere, M. Frick, P. Mihok and G. Semanisin, *Survey of hereditary properties of graphs*, Discuss. Math. Graph Theory **17** (1997) 5–50.

[4] M. Borowiecki, D. Michalak and E. Sidorowicz, *Generalized domination, independence and irredudance in graphs*, Discuss. Math. Graph Theory **17** (1997) 147–153.

[5] Y. Caro, New results on the independence number, Technical Report (Tel-Aviv University, 1979).

[6] Y. Caro and Y. Roditty, *On the vertex-independence number and star decomposition of graphs*, Ars Combin. **20** (1985) 167–180.

[7] G. Chartrand, D. Geller and S. Hedetniemi, *Graphs with forbiden subgraphs*, J. Combin. Theory **10** (1971) 12–41.

[8] G. Chartrand and L. Lesniak, Graphs and Digraphs (Chapman & Hall, 2005).

[9] M.R. Garey and D.S. Johnson, Computers and Intractability (W.H. Freeman and Company, San Francisco, 1979).

[10] J. Harant, A. Pruchnewski and M. Voigt, *On Dominating Sets and Independendent Sets of Graphs*, Combinatorics, Probability and Computing **8** (1999) 547–553.

[11] S. Hedetniemi, *On hereditary properties of graphs*, J. Combin. Theory (B) **14** (1973) 349–354.

[12] V. Vadim and D. de Werra, *Special issue on stability in graphs and related topics*, Discrete Appl. Math. **132** (2003) 1–2.

[13] Zs. Tuza, Lecture at Conference of Hereditarnia (Zakopane, Poland, September 2006).

[14] 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 25 March 2008
Revised 26 March 2008
Accepted 23 May 2008