

Ladislav Nebeský

Characterizing the maximum genus of a connected graph

Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal, Vol. 43 (1993), No. 1, 177–185

Persistent URL: <http://dml.cz/dmlcz/128386>

Terms of use:

© Institute of Mathematics AS CR, 1993

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



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

CHARACTERIZING THE MAXIMUM GENUS
OF A CONNECTED GRAPH

LADISLAV NEBESKÝ, Praha

(Received December 10, 1991)

In this paper a generalization of Tutte's theorem on perfect matchings and a generalization of Rado's theorem on independent transversals will be used for characterizing the maximum genus of a connected graph.

0. By a graph we mean here a graph in the sense of [4], i.e. a pseudograph in the sense of [2]. A graph G is determined by its vertex set $V(G)$, its edge set $E(G)$, and its incidence relation between edges and vertices. A graph in the sense of [2] will be called here a simple graph, similarly as in [4] or [18]. Note that a simple graph G is determined by $V(G)$ and $E(G)$ only.

A trivial graph (i.e. a graph with only one vertex and no edge) will be considered to be 2-edge-connected. Any maximal 2-edge-connected subgraph of a graph G will be referred to as leaf of G .

Let G be a graph. We denote by $c(G)$ the number of components of G . We define $p(G) = |V(G)|$, $q(G) = |E(G)|$, and $\beta(G) = q(G) - p(G) + c(G)$, thus, if G is connected, then $\beta(G) = q(G) - p(G) + 1$. Moreover, we denote by $b(G)$ or $b^\lambda(G)$ the number of components F_1 of G such that $\beta(F_1)$ is odd, or the number of leaves F_2 of G such that $\beta(F_2)$ is odd, respectively.

Let G be a connected graph. We denote by \mathcal{A}_G the set of all $A \subseteq E(G)$ such that $G - A$ is connected. We denote by $\mathcal{T}(G)$ the set of all spanning trees of G . If $T \in \mathcal{T}(G)$, then we denote by $\mathcal{A}_G(T)$ the set of all $A \subseteq E(G) - E(T)$. Clearly,

$$\mathcal{A}_G = \bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}(G)} \mathcal{A}_G(T).$$

For every graph G we denote by $\Gamma(G)$ the set of all integers i such that there exists a 2-cell embedding of G into the closed orientable surface of genus i (for the

above mentioned concepts of topological graph theory the reader is referred to [17] or to Chapter 5 of [2]). As follows from the properties of 2-cell embeddings, $\Gamma(G)$ is finite for every graph G . Moreover, $\Gamma(G) \neq \emptyset$ if and only if G is connected. Duke [5] proved that if G is a connected graph, $i, k \in \Gamma(G)$ and j is an integer such that $i < j < k$, then $j \in \Gamma(G)$. (As was proved in [14], this result does not hold for signed graphs.) For every connected graph G , the maximum genus $\gamma_M(G)$ of G is defined as the maximum integer in $\Gamma(G)$. As was shown in [11], $\gamma_M(G) \leq [\beta(G)/2]$ for every connected graph G . Since the beginning of the seventies many papers concerning the maximum genus have been written. (The maximum nonorientable genus has been also studied. Ringel [13] proved that the maximum nonorientable genus of a connected graph G is equal to $\beta(G)$.)

The maximum genus of a connected graph was determined by Homenko, Ostrovkhy and Kusmenko [8] and independently by Xuong [19]. We will present the result obtained in [19]. The result obtained in [8] looks rather dissimilarly but in substance it is the same.

If G is a connected graph and $T \in \mathcal{T}(G)$, then we denote by $x_G(T)$ the number of components F of $G - E(T)$ such that $|E(F)|$ is odd.

Theorem A ([19]). *Let G be a connected graph. Then*

$$\gamma_M(G) = \frac{1}{2}(\beta(G) - \min_{T \in \mathcal{T}(G)} x_G(T)).$$

For the case when $\gamma_M(G) = [\frac{1}{2}\beta(G)]$, the formula was proved independently by Jungerman [9].

If G is a connected graph and $A \subseteq E(G)$, then we denote

$$y_G(A) = c(G - A) + b(G - A) - 1 - |A|.$$

Proposition A. *If G is a connected graph, then*

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{A_0 \subseteq E(G)} (b^\lambda(G - A_0) - |A_0|) &= \max_{A \subseteq E(G)} y_G(A) \\ &= \max_{A_1 \in \mathcal{A}_G} (b^\lambda(G - A_1) - |A_1|). \end{aligned}$$

Proof (outlined). Let $A \subseteq E(G)$; there exists $A' \subseteq A$ such that $G - A'$ is connected and $|A - A'| = c(G - A) - 1$; we can see that $b^\lambda(G - A') \geq b(G - A)$. Let $A_1 \in \mathcal{A}_G$; there exists $A'' \subseteq E(G)$ such that $A_1 \subseteq A''$ and the set of components of $G - A''$ is the same as the set of leaves of $G - A_1$; hence $|A'' - A_1| = c(G - A'') - 1$. Finally, let $A_0 \subseteq E(G)$; there exists $A^* \subseteq A_0$ such that $A^* \in \mathcal{A}_G$ and $b^\lambda(G - A^*) = b^\lambda(G - A_0)$. The result of the proposition easily follows. \square

Homenko and Glukhov [7] and independently Nebeský [10] have found that for any connected graph G ,

$$\min_{T \in \mathcal{T}(G)} x_G(T)$$

can be expressed as the maximum of a function. Homenko and Glukhov [7] proved that if G is a connected graph, then

$$\min_{T \in \mathcal{T}(G)} x_G(T) = \max_{A \subseteq E(G)} (b^\lambda(G - A) - |A|).$$

The present author proved the following theorem:

Theorem B ([10]). *If G is a connected graph, then*

$$\min_{T \in \mathcal{T}(G)} x_G(T) = \max_{A \subseteq E(G)} y_G(A).$$

Note that Širáň and Škoviera [15] generalized Theorems A and B to signed graphs. In Section 2 of the present paper an extension of Theorem B will be given.

1. Let G be a connected graph different from a tree, and let $T \in \mathcal{T}(G)$. It is clear that if e_1 and e_2 are distinct edges in $E(G) - E(T)$, then the subgraph $T + e_1 + e_2$ of G has at least one and at most two nontrivial (i.e. cyclic) leaves. We denote by $G\#T$ the simple graph with

$$V(G\#T) = E(G) - E(T)$$

and with the property that

$ef \in E(G\#T)$ if and only if the subgraph $T + e + f$ of G has only one nontrivial leaf

for any distinct $e, f \in E(G) - E(T)$.

Lemma 1. *Let G be a nontrivial 2-edge-connected graph, and let $T \in \mathcal{T}(G)$. Then $G\#T$ is connected.*

Proof. We assume, to the contrary, that $G\#T$ is not connected. Then there exist $E_1, E_2 \subseteq \mathcal{A}_G(T)$ such that $E_1 \neq \emptyset \neq E_2$, $E_1 \cap E_2 = \emptyset$ and $E_1 \cup E_2 = E(G) - E(T)$, and that $T + e_1 + e_2$ has two nontrivial leaves for any $e_1 \in E_1$ and $e_2 \in E_2$. We denote by \mathcal{E} the set of all $E \in \mathcal{A}_G(T)$ with the properties that $E \cap E_1 \neq \emptyset \neq E \cap E_2$ and the subgraph $T + E$ of G has only one nontrivial leaf. Clearly, $\mathcal{E} \neq \emptyset$.

Consider $E_0 \in \mathcal{E}$ such that no proper subset of E_0 belongs to \mathcal{E} . We can see that $|E_0| \geq 3$. Without loss of generality we will assume that $|E_0 \cap E_2| \geq 2$. Consider an arbitrary $e_0 \in E_0 \cap E_2$. Obviously, $E_0 - \{e_0\} \notin \mathcal{E}$. According to the definition, $T + (E_0 - \{e_0\})$ has at least two nontrivial leaves. Clearly, there exists a leaf F_1 of $T + (E_0 - \{e_0\})$ such that $E(F_1) \cap E_1 \neq \emptyset$. Denote $E^* = E(F_1) - E(T)$. Since $T + (E_0 - \{e_0\})$ has at least two nontrivial leaves, we conclude that E^* is a proper subset of $E_0 - \{e_0\}$, and therefore $E^* \cup \{e_0\}$ is a proper subset of E_0 . Hence $E^* \cup \{e_0\} \notin \mathcal{E}$.

On the other hand, F_1 is a nontrivial leaf of $T + (E_0 - \{e_0\})$ and $T + (E_0 - \{e_0\}) + e_0$ has only one nontrivial leaf. It is easy to see that $T + (E(F_1) - E(T)) + e_0$ has only one nontrivial leaf. Thus we get $E^* \cup \{e_0\} \in \mathcal{E}$, which is a contradiction. The lemma is proved. \square

Corollary. *Let G be a connected graph different from a tree, and let $T \in \mathcal{T}(G)$. Then there exists a bijection φ of the set of all nontrivial leaves of G onto the set of all components of $G \# T$ such that*

$$V(\varphi(F)) = E(F) - E(T)$$

for each nontrivial leaf F of G .

Proof is obvious.

Let G be a graph. If M is a matching in G and $u \in V(G)$ is such that u is incident with no edge in M , then we say that u is an unsaturated vertex of M . A matching M in G is referred to as a maximum matching in G if $|M_0| \leq |M|$ for every matching M_0 in G .

If H is a graph, then we denote by $c_0(H)$ the number of components F of H such that $p(F)$ is odd. We shall need the following theorem:

Theorem C (Berge [3]). *Let G be a graph. Then the number of unsaturated vertices of a maximum matching in G is equal to*

$$\max_{U \subseteq V(G)} (c_0(G - U) - |U|).$$

Note that Theorem C is a generalization of Tutte's theorem on perfect matchings [16].

If G is a connected graph different from a tree and $T \in \mathcal{T}(G)$, then we shall denote by $z_G(T)$ the number of unsaturated vertices of a maximum matching in $G \# T$.

Lemma 2. *Let G be a connected graph different from a tree, and let $T \in \mathcal{T}(G)$. Then*

$$z_G(T) = \max_{A \in \mathcal{A}_G(T)} (b^\lambda(G - A) - |A|).$$

Proof. According to Theorem C,

$$z_G(T) = \max_{A \subset E(G) - E(T)} (c_0((G \# T) - A) - |A|).$$

Consider an arbitrary $A \subset E(G) - E(T)$. The corollary implies that

$$c_0((G - A) \# T) = b^\lambda(G - A).$$

It is easy to see that

$$(G \# T) - A = (G - A) \# T.$$

Obviously, $b^\lambda(G - (E(G) - E(T))) = 0$. Hence, the statement of the lemma follows. \square

In the next section we will prove that if G is a connected graph different from a tree, then there exists $T \in \mathcal{T}(G)$ such that

$$\min_{T_0 \in \mathcal{T}(G)} x_G(T_0) = x_G(T) = z_G(T) = \max_{T_1 \in \mathcal{T}(G)} z_G(T_1).$$

2. The following proposition can be easily proved:

Proposition B. *If G is a connected graph, then*

$$y_G(A) \equiv \beta(G) \pmod{2}$$

for every $A \subseteq E(G)$.

For the proof see [10].

If G is a connected graph, then we denote by $\mathcal{M}(G)$ the set of all $A \subseteq E(G)$ such that

$$y_G(A) = \max_{A' \subseteq E(G)} y_G(A')$$

and $y_G(A'') < y_G(A)$ for every $A'' \subseteq E(G)$ such that A is a proper subset of A'' .

A complete proof of the next Lemma can be found in [10].

Lemma A. *Let G be a connected graph, let $A \in \mathcal{M}(G)$, and let F be a component of $G - A$. If $\beta(F)$ is even, then $q(F) = 0$. If $\beta(F)$ is odd, then $F - e$ is connected and*

$$\max_{A_F \subseteq E(F-e)} y_{F-e}(A_F) = 0$$

for each $e \in E(F)$.

Proof (outlined). The case when $\beta(F)$ is even is clear. Let $\beta(F)$ be odd. Consider an arbitrary $e \in E(F)$. Since $A \in \mathcal{M}(G)$, we get that $F - e$ is connected. Let $A_F \subseteq E(F - e)$. Then

$$y_G(A) > y_G(A \cup \{e\} \cup A_F) = y_G(A) + y_{F-e}(A_F) - 2,$$

and thus $y_{F-e}(A_F) < 2$. Proposition B implies that $y_{F-e}(A_F) \leq 0$. Since $y_{F-e}(\emptyset) = 0$, the proof is complete. \square

We shall need a theorem from the intersection of matroid theory and transversal theory; see Wilson [18], for example. Corollary 33B in [18] can be reformulated as follows:

Theorem D. *Consider a matroid on a finite nonempty set A with rank function r . Let D_1, \dots, D_k ($k \geq 1$) be nonempty subsets of A . Denote $\mathcal{D} = (D_1, \dots, D_k)$. Then the maximum size of an independent transversal of \mathcal{D} is equal to*

$$k - \max_{I \subseteq \{1, \dots, k\}} \left(|I| - r\left(\bigcup_{i \in I} D_i\right) \right).$$

Clearly, Theorem D is a generalization of Rado's theorem on independent transversals [12].

We are now prepared to prove the main result of the present paper.

Theorem 1. *Let G be a connected graph different from a tree. Then there exists $T \in \mathcal{T}(G)$ such that*

$$\min_{T_0 \in \mathcal{T}(G)} x_G(T_0) = x_G(T) = \max_{A \in E(G)} y_G(A) = z_G(T) = \max_{T_1 \in \mathcal{T}(G)} z_G(T_1).$$

Proof. For every connected graph H we denote

$$x_H = \min_{T \in \mathcal{T}(G)} x_H(T) \quad \text{and} \quad y_H = \max_{A \subseteq E(G)} y_H(A).$$

We shall prove that

(I) there exists $T \in \mathcal{T}(G)$ such that $x_G(T) \leq y_G \leq z_G(T)$ and $y_G \leq x_G$ and that

$$(II) \max_{T_1 \in \mathcal{T}(G)} z_G(T_1) = y_G.$$

(I) We proceed by induction on $q(G)$. Since G is different from tree, we get that $q(G) \geq 1$. The case when $q(G) = 1$ is obvious. Let $q(G) \geq 2$. Consider an arbitrary $A \in \mathcal{M}(G)$. Let \mathcal{B} denote the set of all components F of $G - A$ such that $\beta(F)$ is odd. We put $k = b(G - A)$. Since G is not a tree and $A \in \mathcal{M}(G)$, we can see that $k \geq 1$. There exist mutually distinct components B_1, \dots, B_k of $G - A$ such that $\mathcal{B} = \{B_1, \dots, B_k\}$. For every $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ we denote by N_i the set of all $e \in A$ such that e is incident with a vertex of B_i . For $I \subseteq \{1, \dots, k\}$ we denote

$$N_I = \bigcup_{i \in I} N_i.$$

Let r denote the mapping of $\exp A$ into the set of integers defined as follows:

$$r(A_0) = |A_0| - c(G - A_0) + 1 \quad \text{for every } A_0 \subseteq A.$$

If $I \subseteq \{1, \dots, k\}$, then

$$|I| - r(N_I) = |I| - |N_I| + c(G - N_I) - 1 \leq y_G(N_I) \leq y_G.$$

It is easy to see that

$$k - r(N_{\{1, \dots, k\}}) = y_G(A).$$

Thus,

$$\max_{I \subseteq \{1, \dots, k\}} (|I| - r(N_I)) = y_G.$$

It is not difficult to see that r is the rank function of a matroid on A . According to Theorem D, the maximum size of an independent partial transversal of (N_1, \dots, N_k) is equal to $k - y_G$. Thus, without loss of generality we will assume that there exists an independent transversal of (N_1, \dots, N_{k-y_G}) . This means that there exist mutually distinct $a_1, \dots, a_{k-y_G} \in A$ such that

$$a_i \in N_i, \quad \text{for each } i \in \{1, \dots, k - y_G\},$$

and $G - a_1 - \dots - a_{k-y_G}$ is connected. Denote

$$A^* = A - \{a_1, \dots, a_{k-y_G}\}.$$

We can see that $|A^*| = c(G - A) - 1$.

Let $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. We choose an edge e_i of B_i such that if $i \leq k - y_G$, then there exists a vertex incident with both a_i and e_i . According to Lemma A, $B_i - e_i$ is connected and $y_{B_i - e_i} = 0$. If $B_i - e_i$ is not a tree, then it follows from the induction hypothesis that there exists $T_i \in \mathcal{T}(B_i - e_i)$ such that $x_{B_i - e_i}(T_i) = 0$. If $B_i - e_i$ is a tree, we put $T_i = B_i - e_i$.

We denote by T the subgraph of G induced by the set of edges

$$A^* \cup E(T_1) \cup \dots \cup E(T_k).$$

Clearly, T is a spanning tree of G . It is easy to see that $x_G(T) \leq y_G$.

According to Lemma 2,

$$z_G(T) = \max_{A_0 \in \mathcal{A}_G(T)} (b^\lambda(G - A_0) - |A_0|).$$

Since $|A^*| = c(G - A) - 1$, we can see that

$$b^\lambda(G - \{a_1, \dots, a_{k-y_G}\}) - |\{a_1, \dots, a_{k-y_G}\}| = y_G.$$

Hence $y_G \leq z_G(T)$.

Consider $T' \in \mathcal{T}(G)$ such that $x_G(T') = x_G$. Let

$$\mathcal{B}_{\text{con}} = \{B \in \mathcal{B}; \text{the subgraph of } T' \text{ induced by } V(B) \text{ is connected}\}.$$

It is not difficult to see that $q(F)$ is odd for at least $|B_{\text{con}}| - |A - E(T)|$ components F of $G - E(T')$. Thus

$$x_G(T') \geq |B_{\text{con}}| - |A - E(T')| = |B_{\text{con}}| - |A| + |A \cap E(T')|.$$

Moreover, we can see that

$$|A \cap E(T')| \geq c(T' - A) - 1 \quad \text{and} \quad c(T' - A) \geq c(G - A) + |B - B_{\text{con}}|.$$

We get that $x_G(T') \geq y_G(A)$, and thus $x_G \geq y_G$.

(II) If we combine Lemma 2 with Proposition A, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{T_1 \in \mathcal{T}(G)} z_G(T_1) &= \max_{T_1 \in \mathcal{T}(G)} \max_{A_{T_1} \in \mathcal{A}_G(T_1)} (b^\lambda(G - A_{T_1}) - |A_{T_1}|) \\ &= \max_{A \in \mathcal{A}_G} (b^\lambda(G - A') - |A'|) = y_G. \end{aligned}$$

The proof of the theorem is complete. □

Theorem 1 is an extension of Theorem B. In the proof of Theorem 1 some ideas from [10] were utilized. On the other hand, the proof of Theorem 1 shows that Theorem B can be proved by using Theorem D; then the role of Theorem D is similar to the role of Hall's theorem on distinct representatives [6] in Anderson's proof [1] of Tutte's theorem on perfect matchings.

References

- [1] *I. Anderson*: Perfect matchings of a graph, *J. Combinatorial Theory B* 10 (1971), 183–186.
- [2] *M. Behzad, G. Chartrand and L. Lesniak-Foster*: *Graphs & Digraphs*, Prindle, Weber & Schmidt, Boston, 1979.
- [3] *C. Berge*: *Théorie des graphes et ses applications*, Dunod, Paris, 1958.
- [4] *J. A. Bondy and U.S.R. Murty*: *Graph Theory with Applications*, MacMillan, London, 1976.
- [5] *R. A. Duke*: The genus, regional number, and Betti number of a graph, *Canad. J. Math* 18 (1966), 817–822.
- [6] *P. Hall*: On representatives of subsets, *J. London Math. Soc.* 10 (1935), 26–30.
- [7] *N. P. Homenko and A. D. Glukhov*: Single-component 2-cell embeddings and the maximum genus of a graph, In: *Some Topological and Combinatorial Properties of Graphs*, preprint 80.8 (N. P. Homenko, ed.), IM AN USSR, Kiev, 1980, pp. 5–23. (In Russian.)
- [8] *N. P. Homenko, N. A. Ostroverkhyy and V. A. Kusmenko*: The maximum genus of a graph, In: *φ -Transformations of Graphs* (N. P. Homenko, ed.), IM AN URSSR, Kiev, 1973, pp. 180–207.
- [9] *M. Jungerman*: A characterization of upper-embeddable graphs, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 241 (1978), 401–406.
- [10] *L. Nebeský*: A new characterization of the maximum genus of a graph, *Czechoslovak Math. J.* 31 (106) (1981), 604–613.
- [11] *E. A. Nordhaus, B. M. Stewart and A. T. White*: On the maximum genus of a graph, *J. Combinatorial Theory B* 11 (1971), 258–267.
- [12] *R. Rado*: A theorem on independence relations, *Quart. J. Math. (Oxford)* 13 (1942), 83–89.
- [13] *G. Ringel*: The combinatorial map color theorem, *J. Graph Theory* 1 (1977), 141–155.
- [14] *J. Širáň*: Duke's theorem does not extend to signed graph embeddings, *Discrete Math.* 94 (1991), 233–238.
- [15] *J. Širáň and M. Škoviera*: Characterization of the maximum genus of a signed graph, *J. Combinatorial Theory B* 52 (1991), 124–146.
- [16] *W. T. Tutte*: The factorization of linear graphs, *J. London Math. Soc.* 22 (1947), 107–111.
- [17] *A. T. White*: *Graphs, Groups, and Surfaces*, North Holland, Amsterdam, 1973.
- [18] *R. J. Wilson*: *Introduction to Graph Theory*, Longman Group, London, 1975.
- [19] *N. H. Xuong*: How to determine the maximum genus of a graph, *J. Combinatorial Theory B* 26 (1979), 217–225.

Author's address: 116 38 Praha 1, nám. J. Palacha 2, Czech Republic (filozofická fakulta Univerzity Karlovy).