Discussiones Mathematicae
Graph Theory 28 (2008) 137–149

(H, k) STABLE GRAPHS WITH MINIMUM SIZE

Aneta Dudek*
Artur Szymański and Małgorzata Zwonek

Faculty of Applied Mathematics AGH
Mickiewicza 30, 30–059 Kraków, Poland

Abstract

Let us call a G (H, k) graph vertex stable if it contains a subgraph H ever after removing any of its k vertices. By $Q(H, k)$ we will denote the minimum size of an (H, k) vertex stable graph. In this paper, we are interested in finding $Q(C_3, k)$, $Q(C_4, k)$, $Q(K_{1,p}, k)$ and $Q(K_s, k)$.

Keywords: graph, stable graph.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 05C35.

1. Introduction

We deal with simple graphs without loops and multiple edges. As usual $V(G)$ and $E(G)$ denote the vertex set and the edge set of G, respectively, $|G|$, $e(G)$ the order and the size of G and $deg_G(v)$ the degree of $v \in V(G)$. By C_n we denote the cycle of order n and by K_r the complete graph on r vertices and by $K_{1,p}$ the star on $1+p$ vertices. The union $G \cup H$ of graphs G and H is defined *by* $V(G \cup H) := V(G) \cup V(H)$, $E(G \cup H) := E(G) \cup E(H)$, and we shall suppose that the components of the union are vertex disjoint.

By $G - e$ we shall denote the graph without the edge e and by $G - v$ the graph obtained from G by deleting the vertex $v \in V(G)$ and its incident edges.

In [1] G.Y. Katona and P. Frankl considered the following problem. What is the minimum size of a r-uniform hypergraph such that after removing any k hyperedges there is still a hamiltonian chain. To give a lover bound of the minimum size of the mentioned r-uniform hypergraphs the authors

*This work was carried out while the first author was visiting UPC in Barcelona.

of [1] define the (P_4, k) edge stable graph as the graph in which after removing any k edges there is still P_4 and ask about the minimum size of (P_4, k) edge stable graph. This was intended as an attempt to solve the problem of finding the minimum size of a (P_4, k) edge stable graph. In [2] G.Y. Katona and I. Horváth considered the minimum size of (P_n, k) edge stable graphs. It is worth pointing out that there is no other result concerning edge stable graphs.

The aim of this paper is to consider a similar problem but in a vertex version. So let us give the following definition:

Definition 1. Let us call a (H, k) graph *vertex stable* if it contains a connected subgraph H ever after removing any of its k vertices. By $Q(H, k)$ we will denote the minimum size of an (H, k) vertex stable graph.

In this paper we estimate $Q(C_3, k)$, $Q(C_4, k)$, $Q(K_{1,p}, k)$ and give lower and upper bounds for $Q(K_s, k)$. For simplicity we will write stable instead of vertex stable.

The proofs are based on the facts given below.

Definition 2. W say that an (H, k) stable graph G is (H, k) *strong stable* if G is not $(H, k+1)$ stable and $G - e$ is not (H, k) stable for every $e \in E(G)$.

Proposition 1. *If G is an (H, k) stable graph with minimum size, then G is an (H, k) strong stable graph. Thus $Q(H, k) \leq e(G)$ where G is an (H, k) strong stable graph.*

Proof. Suppose G is an (H, k) stable graph with minimum size. Then clearly $G - e$ for any $e \in E(G)$ is not (H, k) stable. Suppose G is $(H, k+1)$ stable and $deg_G(v) > 0$, then $G - v$ is (H, k) stable with smaller size than $e(G)$, a contradiction. ■

Lemma 1. *If G is an (H, k) strong stable graph then every vertex as well as every edge of G belongs to some subgraph of G isomorphic to H.*

Proof. Suppose there is an edge e which is not in any $E(H)$. Then $G - e$ is still (H, k) stable with a smaller size than $e(G)$, a contradiction. If there exists a vertex v which is not in any $V(H)$, then each edge incident with v is not in $E(H)$, a contradiction. ■

Corollary 1. *If G is an (H, k) stable graph with a minimum size than every vertex as well as every edge of G belongs to some subgraph of G isomorphic to H.*

2. $Q(C_n, k)$

Theorem 2. $Q(C_3, k) = 3k + 3$.

Proof. Let G_k be a graph which is a vertex-disjoint union of $k+1$ triangles. Clearly, G_k is a (C_3, k) strong stable graph so $Q(C_3, k) \leq 3k + 3$.

We prove $Q(C_3, k) \geq 3k + 3$ by induction on k. It is clear that $Q(C_3, 0) = 3$. Suppose that the statement holds for any $k < k_0$. We prove the validity of our claim for k_0 indirectly.

Suppose that there is a graph G_{k_0} which is (C_3, k) strong stable but $e(G_{k_0}) < 3k + 3$. If the maximum degree in G_{k_0} is at most 2, then by Lemma 1 the graph consists only of cycle components. Since the number of edges in the graph is at most $3k + 2$, at most k components can be a triangle. So removing a vertex from each of these will destroy all triangles, a contradiction.

If there is a vertex v of degree greater or equal to 3, then $G_{k_0} - v$ is clearly a $(C_3, k - 1)$ strong stable graph with less than $3k$ edges, a contradiction again. ■

Lemma 2. *If G is (H, k) stable, then $G - v$ is $(H, k - 1)$ stable for any $v \in V(G)$. Moreover, if some edges in $G - v$ cannot be contained in any H subgraphs, then the graph obtained from $G - v$ by removing all these edges is still $(H, k - 1)$ stable.*

Proof. The first part of the proof follows from the definition of an (H, k) stable graph. From Corollary 1 it follows that all edges in $(H, k - 1)$ stable graphs belong to some H subgraph which finishes the proof. ■

Theorem 3. $Q(C_4, k) = 4k + 4$.

Proof. Let G_k be a graph which is a vertex-disjoint union of $(k + 1)$ C_4. Clearly, G_k is a (C_4, k) stable graph so $Q(C_4, k) \leq 4k + 4$.

We prove $Q(C_4, k) \geq 4k + 4$ by induction on k. It is clear that $Q(C_4, 0) = 4$. Suppose that the statement holds for any $k < k_0$. We prove the validity of our claim for k_0 indirectly.

Suppose that there is a graph G_{k_0} which is (C_4, k) stable with minimum size and $e(G_{k_0}) < 4k + 4$. From Corollary 1 it follows that $deg_{G_{k_0}}(x) \geq 2$ for every $x \in V(G_{k_0})$.

We shall consider the following cases:

Case 1. $\Delta(G_{k_0}) \geq 4$.
Let $deg_{G_{k_0}}(x) \geq 4$. Then $G_{k_0} - x$ is a $(C_4, k-1)$ stable graph with smaller size than $4k$, a contradiction.

Case 2. $\Delta(G_{k_0}) \leq 3$.
Suppose first that G_{k_0} contains a cycle as a component. Corollary 1 implies that it is C_4. If we delete one vertex of this C_4, then the remaining 2 edges of C_4 are not contained in any C_4 subgraphs. However, the graph without these 4 edges is still $(C_4, k-1)$ stable by Lemma 2. This contradicts the inductive hypothesis. Next suppose that $x_1x_2 \in E(G_{k_0})$ and $deg_{G_{k_0}}(x_1) = 3$, $deg_{G_{k_0}}(x_2) = 2$. By deleting x_1 using Lemma 2 we can derive a similar contradiction as before. Hence G_{k_0} contains only cubic components.

If K_4 is a component of G_{k_0} then it may be replaced by C_4 since both of them are $(C_4, 0)$ stable, and we get a graph with smaller size than G_{k_0}, a contradiction. Since the order of a $(C_4, 1)$ cubic graph is at least 6, then $Q(C_4, 1) \geq 9 > 8$. Since the order of a $(C_4, 2)$ cubic graph is at least 10 (see [3]), then we may estimate $Q(C_4, 2) \geq 15 > 12$. Denote by $(x_1x_2x_3x_4)$ a cycle C_4 in a cubic graph. If x_1x_3 or x_2x_4 is in $E(G_{k_0})$ it is in a contradiction with Corollary 1 or K_4 is a component of G_{k_0}. So we assume neither x_1x_3 nor x_2x_4 is in $E(G_{k_0})$. In the same way as before after deleting x_1 and x_3 we may remove all edges from the cycle $(x_1x_2x_3x_4)$ and all edges incident with vertices of the cycle and by Lemma 2 we get a $(C_4, k-2)$ stable graph with smaller size than $4k - 4$, a contradiction. ■

For $n \geq 6$ and $k \geq 0$ it is easy to see that a $(k+1)$ disjoint union of C_n is a (C_n, k) strong stable graph. The following theorem is evident.

Theorem 4. *$Q(C_n, k) \leq kn + n$.*

3. $Q(K_{1,p}, k)$

Theorem 5. *Let $p \geq 3$. Then $Q(K_{1,p}, k) = pk + p$.*

Proof. Let G_k be a graph which is a vertex-disjoint union of $k+1$ stars $K_{1,p}$. Clearly, G_k is a $(K_{1,p}, k)$ strong stable graph so $Q(K_{1,p}, k) \le pk + p$.

We prove $Q(K_{1,p}, k) \ge pk + p$ by induction on k. It is clear that $Q(K_{1,p}, 0) = p$. Suppose that the statement holds for any $k < k_0$. We prove the validity of our claim for k_0 indirectly.

Suppose that there is a graph G_{k_0} which is $(K_{1,p}, k)$ strong stable with minimum size but $e(G_{k_0}) < pk + p$. From Lemma 1 it follows there is at least one vertex v of degree at least p. So $G_{k_0} - v$ is clearly a $(K_{1,p}, k-1)$ strong stable graph with size smaller than pk, a contradiction. ■

Observe that a disjoint union of $(k+1)$ stars $K_{(1,p)}$ is a $(K_{(1,p)}, k)$ strong stable graph.

4. $Q(K_s, k)$

Let $k \ge 0$ and $s \ge 0$. Let $G = (V(G); E(G))$ be a graph of order greater than $k + s$.

For a fixed k, $k > 0$ cases for $s = 0, 1, 2$ are trivial, the case for $s = 3$ was considered as C_3, so we turn to the case $s = 4$.

4.1. $Q(K_4, k)$

Theorem 6.

$$Q(K_4, k) = \begin{cases} 6 & \textit{for} \;\; k = 0, \\ 5k + 5 & \textit{for} \;\; k \ge 1. \end{cases}$$

Proof. It is obvious that $Q(K_4, 0) = 6$. Let G_k be a graph which is a vertex-disjoint union of $\frac{k+1}{2}$ K_5 for k odd, and a vertex-disjoint union of $(\frac{k-2}{2}$ $K_5) \cup K_6$ for k even. Clearly, G_k is (K_4, k) strong stable, so $Q(K_4, k) \le 5k + 5$.

We prove $Q(K_4, k) \ge 5k + 5$ by induction on k. It is easy to see that $Q(K_4, 1) = 10$. Suppose that the statement holds for any $k < k_0$. We prove the validity of our claim for k_0 indirectly.

Suppose that there is a G_{k_0} graph which is (K_4, k) strong stable with minimum size and $e(G_{k_0}) < 5k + 5$.

We shall consider the following cases.

Case 1. $\Delta(G_{k_0}) \ge 5$.

Let $v \in G_{k_0}$ and $deg_{G_{k_0}}(v) \ge 5$. Then $G_{k_0} - v$ is $(K_4, k-1)$ strong stable and $e(G_{k_0} - v) < 5k$, a contradiction.

Case 2. $\Delta(G_{k_0}) = 4$ and $\delta(G_{k_0}) = 3$.
Let $v, z \in V(G_{k_0})$ and $deg_{G_{k_0}}(v) = 4$, $deg_{G_{k_0}}(z) = 3$.

Subcase 2a. Suppose $vz \in E(G_{k_0})$. Since edges incident to z in $G_{k_0} - v$ are not in K_4, then we may remove them. The graph obtained is $(K_4, k-1)$ strong stable and $e(G_{k_0} - v) < 5k - 1$, a contradiction.

Subcase 2b. Suppose there is no vertex of degree 3 adjacent to vertex of degree 4. It is easy to see that by Lemma 1 since every edge must be in K_4 it means that G_{k_0} contains K_4 as a component (K_5 will be considered in Case 3). Deleting one vertex from K_4 we get three edges which cannot be in any K_4 so we may delete them. We get a $(K_4, k-1)$ strong stable graph with smaller size than $5k - 1$, a contradiction.

Case 3. $\Delta(G_{k_0}) = 4$ and $\delta(G_{k_0}) = 4$.
By Lemma 1 we have that every edge must be in K_4, so it means that G_{k_0} is a vertex disjoint union of K_5. Because $e(G_{k_0}) < 5k + 5$, there is at most $(\lceil \frac{k+1}{2} \rceil - 1)$ K_5. If we delete k vertices, two from every K_5, we will destroy all K_4, a contradiction.

Observe that the family given in the above theorem is also (K_4, k) strong stable with minimum size. ■

4.2. The upper bound of $Q(K_s, k)$ for $s \geq 5$

The following assumption will be needed throughout this subsection

1. $k \geq 0$ and $s \geq 5$ is fixed,
2. $1 \leq r \leq k+1, j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, r\}, i_j \geq s$ and $i_1 \leq i_2 \leq \ldots \leq i_r$.

Let $\mathcal{A}_r^{(K_s,k)}$ be a family of graphs consisting of vertex disjoint unions of r complete graphs K_{i_j} satisfying the following condition:

$$\sum_{j=1}^{r} (i_j - s) + r - 1 = k\,.$$

For simplicity, we will write $\mathcal{A}_r^{(K_s,k)}$ without repetition of the above assumption.

Observe that for $r = 1$ the family $\mathcal{A}_r^{(K_s,k)}$ is reduced to a complete graph K_{s+k}, and for $r = k+1$ it consist only of a vertex disjoint union of $k+1$ graphs K_s. Obviously, these graphs are (K_s, k) strong stable.

For a fixed k, we will show that all graphs from $\mathcal{A}_r^{(K_s,k)}$ are (K_s, k) strong stable and give the construction of a family $A(K_s, k)$ with the smallest size. This gives us an upper bound of $Q(K_s, k)$.

Lemma 3. *For a fixed k, $k \geq 0$. Then $G \in \mathcal{A}_r^{(K_s,k)}$ is (K_s, k) strong stable.*

Proof. The proof will be divided into two steps. Let $G \in \mathcal{A}_r^{(K_s,k)}$.

Step 1. We show that G is (K_s, k) stable.
Deleting $\sum_{j=1}^{r}(i_j - s) = k - (r - 1)$ vertices we obtain a union of complete graphs in which:

Case 1a. There is a complete graph of order greater than or equal to $s + r - 1$. Hence after removing any $r - 1$ vertices from the graph we still have K_s.

Case 1b. All complete graphs have their size less than $s + r - 1$.
It means that it is a union of exactly r complete graphs and each of them contains K_s. Hence after removing any $r - 1$ vertices we still have K_s.

Step 2. We show that G is not $(K_s, k + 1)$ stable and $G - e$ is not (K_s, k) stable for every $e \in E(G)$.

Deleting k vertices from G we obtain that the order of the remaining graph is: $i_1 + i_2 + \ldots + i_r = r(s - 1) + 1$. So we may create a union of r graphs containing $(r - 1)$ graphs K_{s-1} and exactly one K_s. The proof is completed by removing one vertex or one edge from K_s. ■

Definition 3. For a fixed k, $k \geq 0$. We call $G \in \mathcal{A}_r^{(K_s,k)}$ a *balanced union* if $|i_j - i_q| \in \{0, 1\}$ $j, q \in \{1, 2, \ldots, r\}$.

Remark 1. For a fixed k and r there is exactly one balanced union $B_r^{(K_s,k)} \in \mathcal{A}_r^{(K_s,k)}$.

Proof. For a fixed k and r let $G \in \mathcal{A}_r^{(K_s,k)}$. Suppose G consists of a vertex disjoint union of p graphs K_{s+i+1} and $r - p$ graphs K_{s+i}. $G \in \mathcal{A}_r^{(K_s,k)}$ therefore:

$$\sum_{1}^{r-p}(s+i-s)+\sum_{1}^{p}(s+i+1-s)+r-1=k,$$
$$(r-p)i+p(i+1)+r-1=k,$$
$$ri+p+r-1=k.$$

Hence $p = k - ri - r + 1$ and $i = \frac{(k-r+1)}{r} - \frac{p}{r}$. Obviously, i must be an integer. Moreover, $0 \le p < r$, so there is exactly one p such that $\left\lfloor \frac{k-r+1}{r} \right\rfloor = \frac{(k-r+1)}{r} - \frac{p}{r} = i$. Therefore G is a unique balanced union, hence, $G = B_r^{(K_s,k)}$. ■

We leave it to the reader to verify that:

Proposition 7. *For a fixed k and r, $B_r^{(K_s,k)}$ has the smallest possible size among all graphs $G \in \mathcal{A}_r^{(K_s,k)}$.*

Lemma 4. *Let $s \ge 5$. There exists $k_1(s)$ such that $e(B_2^{(K_s,k)}) < e(K_{s+k})$ for $k \ge k_1(s)$.*

Proof. Let $B_2^{(K_s,k)} = K_{i_1} \cup K_{i_2}$. We will consider two cases:

Case 1. $i_1 = i_2$.
Then
$$k = \sum_{j=1}^{2}(i_j - s) + 2 - 1 = 2(i_1 - s) + 1$$

so $i_1 = \frac{1}{2}(k - 1 + 2s)$ and the inequality:

$$2\binom{\frac{1}{2}(k-1+2s)}{2} = e(K_{i_1}) + e(K_{i_2}) = e(B_2^{(K_s,k)}) < e(K_{s+k}) = \binom{s+k}{2}$$

holds for $k \ge k_1(s) = \lceil \sqrt{2s_2 + 6s + 4} \rceil$.

Case 2. $i_1 + 1 = i_2$.
A similar inequality holds for $k \ge k_1(s) = \lceil \sqrt{2s_2 + 6s + 5}\ \rceil$. ■

It is easily seen that:

Proposition 8. *If* $B_2^{(K_s,k)} = K_{i_1} \cup K_{i_2}$ *and* $G = K_{i_1+1} \cup K_{i_2}$, *then* $G = B_2^{(K_s,k+1)}$.

Lemma 5. *Let* $k_1(s)$ *be a value given by Lemma 4. If* $K_{s+k'}$ *is a component of* $B_r^{(K_s,k)}$ *for* $k' \geq k_1(s)$, *then there is a graph* $B_{r'}^{(K_s,k)}$ *such that* $e(B_{r'}^{(K_s,k)}) < e(B_r^{(K_s,k)})$ *and* $r' > r$.

Proof. Suppose that $K_{s+k'}$ and $K_{s+k'+1}$ are components of $B_r^{(K_s,k)}$ for $k' \geq k_1(s)$. Note that $K_{s+k'}$ is a (K_s, k') strong stable graph. From Lemma 4 it follows that there are integers i_1 and i_2 such that

$$e(K_{i_1}) \cup e(K_{i_2}) = e\left(B_2^{(K_s,k')}\right) < e(K_{s+k'}).$$

Denote by H^* a graph obtained by replacing all $K_{s+k'}$ in $B_r^{(K_s,k)}$ by $K_{i_1} \cup K_{i_2}$ and replacing all $K_{s+k'+1}$ in $B_r^{(K_s,k)}$ by $K_{i_1+1} \cup K_{i_2}$.

It is obvious that $e(H^*) < e(B_r^{(K_s,k)})$. Moreover, H^* is (K_s, k) strong stable and it is a balanced union, therefore there is an integer r' such $H^* = B_{r'}^{(K_s,k)}$. ■

Lemma 5 may be used to show by similar arguments as in Lemma 4 that there exists $k_n(s)$ such that $e(B_{n+1}^{(K_s,k)}) < e(B_n^{(K_s,k)})$ for $k \geq k_n(s)$.

Thus we may construct graphs $A(K_s, k)$ such that for $k_n(s) \leq k < k_{n+1}(s)$, $A(K_s, k) = B_{n+1}^{(K_s,k)}$. From the above construction the following theorem follows easily:

Theorem 9. $Q(K_s, k) \leq e(A(K_s, k)) \leq e(G)$ *for every* $G \in \mathcal{A}_r^{(K_s,k)}$ *where* $r \in \{1, \ldots, k+1\}$.

From the proof of Remark 1 we have the following estimation of this upper bound by sizes of (K_s, k) strong stable balanced unions

$$Q(K_s, k) \leq \min_{r \in \{1,\ldots,k+1\}} \left(r \binom{s + i_r}{2} + p_r(s + i_r) \right),$$

where $i_r = \left\lfloor \frac{k-r+1}{r} \right\rfloor$ and $p_r = k - r + 1 - r i_r$.

For a sufficiently large k, we may estimate the upper bound differently.

Theorem 10. *There is an integer $k(s)$ such that $Q(K_s,k) \leq (2s-3)(k+1)$ for $k > k(s)$.*

Proof. Let G be a vertex disjoint union of p graphs K_{2s-2} and $r-p$ graphs K_{2s-3} where $r \in \{1,\ldots,k+1\}$ and $p \in \{0,\ldots,r\}$. Suppose that $G \in \mathcal{A}_r^{(K_s,k)}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_1^{r-p}(2s-3-s)+\sum_1^{p}(2s-2-s)+r-1=k,\\&r(s-3)+p+r-1=k,\\&r(s-2)+p-1=k.\end{aligned}$$

If $k > (s-2)(s-2)+(s-2)-1$, then $r \geq (s-2)$. Hence $p \in \{0,\ldots,s-2,\ldots,r\}$, and so there is a pair r', p' (not necessarily unique) which satisfies the equation. Therefore $G = B_{r'}^{(K_s,k)}$

Now we will show by induction on k that $e(B_{r'}^{(K_s,k)}) = (2s-3)(k+1)$.

For some integer $a > (s-2)$ let $k = a(s-2)-1$, then $r' = a$ and $p' = 0$. Therefore $B_{r'}^{(K_s,k)}$ is a vertex disjoint union of a complete graphs $K_{(2s-3)}$. So $e(B_{r'}^{(K_s,k)}) = a\binom{2s-3}{2}$ where $a = \frac{k+1}{s-2}$, hence $e(B_{r'}^{(K_s,k)}) = \frac{k+1}{s-2}(s-2)(2s-3) = (k+1)(2s-3)$.

For $k+1$ we shall consider two cases:

Case 1. $p' < r'$.
Denote by G a graph obtained by replacing one K_{2s-3} in $B_{r'}^{(K_s,k)}$ by K_{2s-2}. Then it is easy to see that $G = B_{r'}^{(K_s,k+1)}$ and $e(B_{r'}^{(K_s,k+1)}) = e(B_{r'}^{(K_s,k)}) + (2s-3)$ and by induction $e(B_{r'}^{(K_s,k+1)}) = (k+1)(2s-3)+(2s-3) = ((k+1)+1)(2s-3)$.

Case 2. $p' = r'$.
Since $B_{r'}^{(K_s,k)}$ is a vertex disjoint union of r' graphs K_{2s-2} so: $r'(2s-3-s)+r'+r'-1 = k$, hence $r' = \frac{k+1}{s-1}$. Now let us consider a graph $B_{r''}^{(K_s,k+1)}$ which is a vertex disjoint balanced union of p'' graphs K_{2s-2} and $r''-p''$ graphs K_{2s-3}, where $r'' = r'+1$ and $p'' \in \{0,\ldots,r''\}$.

Then

$$r''(2s-3-s)+p''+r''-1=k+1,$$
$$(r'+1)(2s-3-s)+p''+(r'+1)-1=k+1,$$
$$(2s-3-s)+p''+r'(2s-3-s)+r'+r'+1-1=k+1+r',$$
$$(2s-3-s)+p''+k+1=k+1+r',$$
$$p''=r'-(2s-3-s).$$

Observe that $B_{r''}^{(K_s,k+1)}$ can be constructed from $B_{r'}^{(K_s,k)}$ by replacing $r'-p''$ graphs K_{2s-2} with K_{2s-3} and adding one graph K_{2s-3}. Therefore,

$$e\left(B_{r''}^{(K_s,k+1)}\right)=e\left(B_{r'}^{(K_s,k)}\right)-(r'-p'')(2s-2)+e(K_{2s-3}),$$

and by induction

$$\left(B_{r''}^{(K_s,k+1)}\right)=(k+1)(2s-3)-(r'-r'+(2s-3-s))(2s-2)+\binom{2s-3}{2}$$
$$=(k+1)(2s-3)-(s-3)(2s-2)+(2s-3)(s-2)$$
$$=(k+1)(2s-3)+(2s-3)=((k+1)+1)(2s-3).$$ ■

Conjecture 1. There is an integer $k(s)$ such that $Q(K_s,k)=(2s-3)(k+1)$ for $k>k(s)$.

4.3. $Q(K_s,k)$ for $s\geq 5$ and $s\geq s(k)$

Now we assume $s\geq 5$ is fixed.

Theorem 11. *For every $k\in N$ there exists $s(k)$ such that $Q(K_s,k)=\binom{s+k}{2}$ for every $s\geq s(k)$.*

Proof. For $k=0$ the proof is evident, we may assume $k\geq 1$. The inequality $Q(K_s,k)\leq\binom{s+k}{2}$ is immediate. Now we prove that $Q(K_s,k)\geq\binom{s+k}{2}$. Let G be a (K_s,k) stable graph with $e(G)=Q(K_s,k)$. Let $|V(G)|=s+k+\beta$ where $\beta\geq 0$. The proof falls naturally into two cases.

Case 1. $0\leq\beta\leq k$.

Subcase 1a. There are at most β vertices $x \in V(G)$ such that $deg_G(x) \leq s+k-2$. Therefore, there are at least $s+k$ vertices $x \in V(G)$ such that $deg_G(x) \geq s+k-1$. Then

$$Q(K_s, k) \geq \frac{(s+k)(s+k-1)}{2} = \binom{s+k}{2}.$$

Subcase 1b. There are at least $\beta+1$ vertices $x \in V(G)$ such that $deg_G(x) \leq s+k-2$.

Assume that $s \geq 2k^2+5k+2$. Put: $B = \{v_j \in V(G); j = 1, 2, \ldots, \beta+1$ and $deg_G(v_j) \leq s+k-2$ for every $j = 1, 2, \ldots, \beta+1\}$ and $W = \{v \in V(G)$; such that there is $v_j \in B$ such that $vv_j \notin E(G)\}$.

The number of elements in W is bounded above by the number of elements of $V(G)$ that are not adjacent to some v_j for $j = 1, \ldots, \beta+1$. But each element v_j is not adjacent to at most $s+k+\beta-(s-1)$ elements from $V(G)$ (there are $s+k+\beta$ elements in $V(G)$ and v_j is adjacent to at least $s-1$ elements). Note that in this reasoning v_j lies in W. Therefore, we get $|W| \leq (\beta+1)(s+k+\beta-(s-1)) = (\beta+1)(k+\beta+1)$. Since $0 \leq \beta \leq k$ we estimate $|W| \leq (k+1)(2k+1)$. Observe that $2k^2+5k+2 = (k+1)(2k+1)+2k+1$. Therefore, we may find vertices $w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_k \in V(G) \backslash (W \cup B)$. Observe that $w_i v_j \in E(G)$ for every $i = 1, 2, \ldots, k$ and $j = 1, 2, \ldots, \beta+1$. Denote by G' a graph obtained from a graph G by removing all the vertices w_i for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, k$. G is (K_s, k) stable so G' contains K_s as a subgraph. Since we removed exactly k vertices and $w_i \neq v_j$ for every $i = 1, 2, \ldots, k$ and $j = 1, 2, \ldots, \beta+1$ we have $|V(G')| = s+\beta$ and every vertex of B is a vertex of G'. We deduce there is at least one vertex of B which is a vertex in a complete subgraph K_s. Since $deg_{G'}(v_j) \leq s-2 < s-1$ for every $j = 1, 2, \ldots, \beta+1$ we get a contradiction.

Case 2. $\beta \geq k+1$.
If $s \geq k^2+k+1$, then since Lemma 1 implies that the minimum degree is $\geq s-1$,

$$Q(K_s, k) \geq \frac{(s+2k+1)(s-1)}{2} \geq \binom{s+k}{2}.$$

Since $k^2+k+1 < 2k^2+5k+2$ for $k \geq 1$ we complete the proof with $s(k) := 2k^2+5k+2$. ■

Remark 2. It follows from the proof that K_{s+k} is the only (K_s, k) stable graph with minimum size for $s \geq 2k^2+5k+2$.

Acknowledgement

The research was partially supported by the Research Training Network COMBSTRU. The author wishes to express his gratitude to Gyula Y. Katona for suggesting the problem and for many stimulating pieces of advice.

References

[1] P. Frankl and G.Y. Katona, *Extremal k-edge-hamiltonian hypergraphs*, accepted for publication in Discrete Math.

[2] I. Horváth and G.Y. Katona, *Extremal stable graphs*, manuscript.

[3] R. Greenlaw and R. Petreschi, Cubic Graphs, ACM Computing Surveys, No. 4, (1995).

Received 8 January 2007
Revised 16 October 2007
Accepted 26 October 2007