

Extremal Values for the Maximum Degree in a Twin-Free Graph

Irène Charon

Institut TELECOM - TELECOM ParisTech
& Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique
LTCI UMR 5141
46, rue Barrault, 75634 Paris Cedex 13 - France
irene.charon@telecom-paristech.fr

Olivier Hudry

Institut TELECOM - TELECOM ParisTech
& Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique
LTCI UMR 5141
46, rue Barrault, 75634 Paris Cedex 13 - France
olivier.hudry@telecom-paristech.fr

Antoine Lobstein

Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique
LTCI UMR 5141
& Institut TELECOM - TELECOM ParisTech
46, rue Barrault, 75634 Paris Cedex 13 - France
antoine.lobstein@telecom-paristech.fr

Abstract

Consider a connected undirected graph $G = (V, E)$ and an integer $r \geq 1$; for any vertex $v \in V$, let $B_r(v)$ denote the ball of radius r centred at v , i.e., the set of all vertices linked to v by a path of at most r edges. If for all vertices $v \in V$, the sets $B_r(v)$ are different, then we say that G is r -twin-free.

In r -twin-free graphs, we prolong the study of the extremal values that can be reached by some classical parameters in graph theory, and investigate here the maximum degree.

Running Head: Maximum degree in twin-free graphs

Key Words: Graph Theory, Identifying Codes, Twins, Maximum Degree

Corresponding Author:

A. Lobstein, ENST, Dpt INFRES

46 rue Barrault, 75634 Paris cedex 13 - France

e-mail: antoine.lobstein@telecom-paristech.fr fax: +33 1 45 81 31 19

1 Introduction

1.1 Definitions and notation

Given a connected, undirected, finite graph $G = (V, E)$ and an integer $r \geq 1$, we define $B_r(v)$, the *ball* of radius r centred at $v \in V$, by

$$B_r(v) = \{x \in V : d(x, v) \leq r\},$$

where $d(x, v)$ denotes the number of edges in any shortest path between v and x .

Whenever $d(x, v) \leq r$, we say that x and v *r-cover* each other (or simply *cover* if there is no ambiguity). A set $X \subseteq V$ covers a set $Y \subseteq V$ if every vertex in Y is covered by at least one vertex in X .

Two vertices $v_1, v_2 \in V$ such that $B_r(v_1) = B_r(v_2)$ are called *r-twins* or *twins*. If G has no *r-twins*, that is, if

$$\forall v_1, v_2 \in V \text{ with } v_1 \neq v_2, B_r(v_1) \neq B_r(v_2), \quad (1)$$

then we say that G is *r-twin-free* or *twin-free*.

The trivial graph with one vertex is twin-free, the trivial connected graph with two vertices is not, and generally we consider graphs with at least three vertices.

Twin-free graphs are of interest because they are strongly connected with *identifying codes* [6], which we now define.

A *code* C is a nonempty set of vertices, and its elements are called *codewords*. For each vertex $v \in V$, we denote by

$$K_{C,r}(v) = C \cap B_r(v)$$

the set of codewords which *r-cover* v . Two vertices v_1 and v_2 with $K_{C,r}(v_1) \neq K_{C,r}(v_2)$ are said to be *r-separated*, or *separated*, by code C .

A code C is called *r-identifying*, or *identifying*, if the sets $K_{C,r}(v), v \in V$, are all nonempty and distinct [6]. In other words, all vertices must be covered and pairwise separated by C .

Remark 1. For given $G = (V, E)$ and integer r , the graph G admits at least one r -identifying code if and only if it is r -twin-free. Indeed, if for all $v_1, v_2 \in V$, $B_r(v_1)$ and $B_r(v_2)$ are different, then $C = V$ is r -identifying. Conversely, if for some $v_1, v_2 \in V$, $B_r(v_1) = B_r(v_2)$, then for any code $C \subseteq V$, we have $K_{C,r}(v_1) = K_{C,r}(v_2)$. This is why r -twin-free graphs are also called r -identifiable. For instance, there is no r -identifying code in a complete graph (or clique) with at least two vertices.

In the following, n will denote the number of vertices of G . For any integer $q > 0$, P_q will denote the path on q vertices, and the length of P_q will be equal to $q - 1$, its number of edges. Moreover, if v_1, v_2, \dots, v_q denote the vertices in P_q , we shall assume that these vertices are numbered in such a way that the edges in P_q are $\{v_i, v_{i+1}\}$ for $1 \leq i < q$.

Remark 2. It is easy to observe that a connected r -twin-free graph has one vertex or at least $2r + 1$ vertices. Actually, it can be shown that a connected r -twin-free graph with at least two vertices has P_{2r+1} as a subgraph [3], and even as an induced subgraph [1],[2].

The cycle of length q (with q vertices and q edges), consisting of P_q to which we add the edge $\{v_q, v_1\}$, will be denoted by C_q . The following graph will be used in the sequel: we shall call it the n -star, or star, and it consists of n vertices $0, 1, \dots, n - 1$, and $n - 1$ edges $\{0, i\}$, $1 \leq i \leq n - 1$.

1.2 Illustration

The motivations for identifying codes come, for instance, from fault diagnosis in multiprocessor systems [6]. Such a system can be modeled as a graph where vertices are processors and edges are links between processors. Assume that at most one of the processors is malfunctioning and we wish to test the system and locate the faulty processor. For this purpose, some processors (constituting the code) will be selected and assigned the task of testing their r -neighbourhoods (i.e., the vertices at distance at most r). Whenever a selected processor (i.e., a codeword) detects a fault, it sends an alarm signal, saying that one element in its neighbourhood is malfunctioning, and we require that we can uniquely tell the location of the malfunctioning processor based only on the information which ones of the codewords gave the alarm.

Identifying codes were introduced in [6], and they constitute now a topic of their own, studied in a large number of various papers, investigating particular graphs or families of graphs (such as certain infinite regular grids, trees, chains, cycles, planar graphs, or the hypercube), dealing with complexity issues, or using heuristics such as the noising methods for the construction of small codes. For a bibliography, see [9].

Therefore, it is quite natural to study some of the parameters of twin-free graphs, since these graphs, and only these graphs, admit identifying codes.

1.3 Scope of the paper

We intend to investigate the extremal values that some parameters, classical in graph theory, can reach in connected twin-free graphs. More precisely, for a parameter p such as the number of edges, the maximum degree, the diameter, . . . , we fix r and search for the smallest value, $f_r(p)$, that this parameter can reach in G , or we fix r and n and search for the smallest and largest values, $f_{r,n}(p)$ and $F_{r,n}(p)$, respectively, that this parameter can reach in G :

$$f_r(p) = \min\{p(G) : G \in \mathcal{G}_r\},$$

where $\mathcal{G}_r = \{G : G \text{ connected, } r\text{-twin-free with at least } 2r + 1 \text{ vertices}\}$;

$$f_{r,n}(p) = \min\{p(G) : G \in \mathcal{G}_{r,n}\} \text{ and } F_{r,n}(p) = \max\{p(G) : G \in \mathcal{G}_{r,n}\},$$

where $\mathcal{G}_{r,n} = \{G : G \text{ connected, } r\text{-twin-free with } n \geq 2r + 1 \text{ vertices}\}$.

The function $F_r(p) = \max\{p(G) : G \in \mathcal{G}_r\}$ would present much less interest, since, for the parameters that we deal with, F_r is not bounded by above.

In this paper, we are interested in the maximum degree, Δ_{\max} , and we shall study the functions $f_r(\Delta_{\max})$, $f_{r,n}(\Delta_{\max})$ and $F_{r,n}(\Delta_{\max})$.

In [4], the same study was run for the following four parameters: number of vertices, minimum size of an r -identifying code, r -domination number, maximum size of a clique. The number of edges was investigated in [8, Sec. 4.1.2], and the minimum degree in [7],[5].

2 The maximum degree, Δ_{\max}

In any connected graph with n vertices, the maximum degree lies between 1 (if $n = 2$) or 2 (paths P_n and cycles C_n , $n \geq 3$), and $n - 1$ (clique, star, . . .).

It is straightforward to obtain the exact values for $f_r(\Delta_{\max})$ and $f_{r,n}(\Delta_{\max})$.

Theorem 1 *For all $r \geq 1$, we have: $f_r(\Delta_{\max}) = 2$. For all $r \geq 1$ and $n \geq 2r + 1$, we have: $f_{r,n}(\Delta_{\max}) = 2$. Δ*

We distinguish between two cases in the study of $F_{r,n}(\Delta_{\max})$, $r = 1$ and $r > 1$.

Theorem 2 *For all $n \geq 3$, we have: $F_{1,n}(\Delta_{\max}) = n - 1$.*

Proof. The n -star, defined in the Introduction, is a connected 1-twin-free graph with maximum degree equal to $n - 1$, which is of course the upper bound. \triangle

For $r \geq 2$, we first give an upper bound.

Theorem 3 For all $r \geq 2$ and $n \geq 2r + 1$, we have: $F_{r,n}(\Delta_{\max}) \leq k$, where k is the largest integer such that

$$k + (r - 2)\lceil \log_3(k + 1) \rceil + \lceil \log_2(k + 1) \rceil \leq n - 1. \quad (2)$$

Proof. Let $G = (V, E)$ be any connected r -twin-free graph with n vertices, let a be any vertex in V , the degree of which we denote by $\deg(a)$ or δ . Let $V_0(a) = V_0$ be the set of vertices adjacent to a : $|V_0| = \delta$. For $i = 1, 2, \dots, r, \dots$, let $V_i(a) = V_i = \{x \in V \setminus \{a\} : d(x, V_0) = i\}$, where as usual $d(x, V_0)$ is the smallest distance between x and the vertices in V_0 . Obviously, the sets V_i , $i = 0, 1, \dots$, partition $V \setminus \{a\}$, and we have the following property:

- (P) any vertex in V_i is at distance $i, i + 1$ or $i + 2$ from any vertex in V_0 , and is at distance exactly $i + 1$ from a .

We also observe that edges in G can exist only between a and V_0 , inside the sets V_i or between V_i and V_{i+1} , for $i = 0, 1, \dots$ (there is no jump between non-consecutive sets V_i). See Figure 1, where the sets V_i are represented up to $i = r$, in a partial view of the graph.

For each vertex $x \in V_0 \cup \{a\}$, we define the couples $C_i(x)$, $1 \leq i \leq r - 1$, as follows:

$$C_i(x) = (B_i(x) \cap V_i, B_{i+1}(x) \cap V_i).$$

Obviously, $C_i(a) = (\emptyset, V_i)$.

First, we show that the couples $C_i(x)$, $i \in \{1, \dots, r - 1\}$, are all distinct when x runs through V_0 . Assume on the contrary that x and y exist in V_0 , such that, for some j_0 between 1 and $r - 1$,

$$B_{j_0}(x) \cap V_{j_0} = B_{j_0}(y) \cap V_{j_0}, \quad (3)$$

and

$$B_{j_0+1}(x) \cap V_{j_0} = B_{j_0+1}(y) \cap V_{j_0}. \quad (4)$$

Since there are no r -twins in G , there is a vertex $z \in V$ which, say, r -covers x , not y . Obviously, $z \neq a$ and $z \notin V_i$, $i \leq r - 2$, otherwise z would r -cover y ; and $z \notin V_i$, $i \geq r + 1$, otherwise z would not r -cover x . So $z \in V_{r-1} \cup V_r$.

Assume first that $z \in V_r$. Then the distance between x and z is exactly r , and there is a path $x, a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{r-1}, z$, where $a_i \in V_i$ is at distance i from x and at distance $r - i$ from z . In particular a_{j_0} belongs to




Figure 1: A partial representation of the vertex a and the sets V_i .

$B_{j_0}(x) \cap V_{j_0}$, which by (3) implies that $a_{j_0} \in B_{j_0}(y)$, i.e., $d(a_{j_0}, y) \leq j_0$ and finally $d(z, y) \leq (r - j_0) + j_0 = r$, a contradiction.

Next, assume that $z \in V_{r-1}$. Then the distance between x and z is $r - 1$ or r . Consider a shortest path between x and z ; it goes through at least one vertex in V_{j_0} , which we call a_{j_0} . Now the distance between a_{j_0} and x is j_0 or $j_0 + 1$: if it were $j_0 + 2$, then the distance from x to z would be at least $(j_0 + 2) + (r - 1 - j_0) = r + 1 > r$. If $d(a_{j_0}, x) = j_0$, i.e., $a_{j_0} \in B_{j_0}(x)$, then (3) shows that $d(a_{j_0}, y) = j_0$. If $d(a_{j_0}, x) = j_0 + 1$, then by (4), we have $d(a_{j_0}, y) \leq j_0 + 1$. In both cases, $d(a_{j_0}, x) \geq d(a_{j_0}, y)$, which implies that $d(y, z) \leq r$, again a contradiction.

Therefore we have proved that for any $i \in \{1, \dots, r - 1\}$, the couples $C_i(x)$, $x \in V_0$, are all distinct. Next, we show that, for any $x \in V_0$ and any $i \in \{1, \dots, r - 1\}$, we have $C_i(x) \neq C_i(a)$. Assume on the contrary that there is a vertex $x \in V_0$ such that $C_{j_0}(x) = C_{j_0}(a) = (\emptyset, V_{j_0})$ for some j_0 between 1 and $r - 1$; in particular, we have

$$V_{j_0} = B_{j_0+1}(x) \cap V_{j_0}. \quad (5)$$

Consider a vertex $z \in V_r$. We have $d(z, a) = r + 1$ and $d(z, x) \geq r$. But the assumption that $B_{j_0}(x) \cap V_{j_0} = \emptyset$ shows that $d(z, x) \geq r + 1$, and so z r -covers neither x nor a .

Consider a vertex $z \in V_{r-1}$. By property (P), we have $d(z, a) = r$ and $d(z, x) \leq r + 1$. A path of length r from z to a goes through a vertex $a_{j_0} \in V_{j_0}$. Obviously, $d(z, a_{j_0}) = r - 1 - j_0$. By (5), $a_{j_0} \in V_{j_0}$ implies that $a_{j_0} \in B_{j_0+1}(x) \cap V_{j_0}$, so $d(a_{j_0}, x) \leq j_0 + 1$ and finally $d(z, x) \leq (r - 1 - j_0) + (j_0 + 1) = r$, i.e., z r -covers both x and a . Since this is also true for vertices $z \in V_i$ with $i < r - 1$, we see that a and x are r -twins, a contradiction.

All in all, we have just proved that the couples $C_i(x)$, $i \in \{1, \dots, r - 1\}$, are all distinct when x runs through $V_0 \cup \{a\}$.

When, inside V_i , the set $B_i(x) \cap V_i$ is fixed with size s , there are $2^{|V_i| - s}$ possibilities for the choice of $B_{i+1}(x) \cap V_i$, so there are at most

$$\sum_{0 \leq s \leq |V_i|} \binom{|V_i|}{s} 2^{|V_i| - s} = (2 + 1)^{|V_i|} = 3^{|V_i|}$$

different couples $C_i(x)$, for $x \in V_0 \cup \{a\}$ and $i = 1, \dots, r - 1$. This establishes that

$$|V_0 \cup \{a\}| = \deg(a) + 1 = \delta + 1 \leq 3^{|V_i|}, \quad (6)$$

for every i between 1 and $r - 1$.

We have seen earlier that if z r -covers $x \in V_0$ and not $y \in V_0$, then $z \in V_r \cup V_{r-1}$. The same is true for a vertex r -covering $x \in V_0$ and not a ,




Figure 2: Constructions for Theorem 4, when $r = 2$, $n = 2p+1$ or $n = 2p+3$.

or a vertex r -covering a and not $x \in V_0$. This implies that

$$|V_0 \cup \{a\}| = \delta + 1 \leq 2^{|V_{r-1} \cup V_r|}. \quad (7)$$

Therefore, using (6) and (7), we obtain

$$1 + \delta + (r-2) \lceil \log_3(\delta+1) \rceil + \lceil \log_2(\delta+1) \rceil \leq |V_0 \cup \{a\}| + \sum_{i=1}^{r-2} |V_i| + |V_{r-1} \cup V_r| \leq n,$$

which shows that any degree in the graph satisfies inequality (2). \triangle

We now give constructions where there is one vertex with large degree. We distinguish between the cases $r = 2$ and $r \geq 3$, because in the case $r = 2$, we are able to determine the exact value for $F_{r,n}(\Delta_{\max})$.

Theorem 4 *Let $n \geq 5$ and $p \geq 2$ be two integers. If $2p + 1 \leq n \leq 2p + p$, then there exists a connected 2-twin-free graph with n vertices and maximum degree $n - p - 1$.*

Proof. Giving overlapping intervals for n makes the proof easier. We shall see in the next theorem that this construction is optimal.

We start from a basic construction for $n = 2p + 1$, where $G = (V, E)$ with

$$V = \{x\} \cup \{y_i, z_i : 1 \leq i \leq p\} \text{ and } E = \{\{x, y_i\}, \{y_i, z_i\} : 1 \leq i \leq p\},$$

see the left part of Figure 2. We set $V_0 = \{y_i : 1 \leq i \leq p\}$ and $V_1 = \{z_i : 1 \leq i \leq p\}$. This construction is easily seen to give a 2-twin-free graph, and the degree of x is $p = n - p - 1$.

If $n = 2p + 2$, then we can add a vertex y_0 in V_0 , adjacent only to x . The resulting graph is still 2-twin-free, and the degree of x becomes equal to $p + 1 = n - p - 1$.

Similarly, when increasing n up to $n = 2p + p$, we are going to prove that we can successively add vertices y_{p+1}, y_{p+2}, \dots , in V_0 , provided that

each new vertex y_j , $j > p$, is linked to x and to a subset of V_1 which is different from V_1 and different from $B_1(y_i) \cap V_1$ for any y_i in V_0 , $0 \leq i < j$. See the right part of Figure 2 when $n = 2p + 3$. The degree of x is equal to $|V_0| = n - p - 1$, and we now show that the graph is 2-twin-free.

Two vertices $z_i, z_j \in V_1$, $1 \leq i < j \leq p$, cannot be twins, since y_i is within distance two from z_i and not from z_j .

Two vertices $z_i \in V_1, y_j \in V_0$, $1 \leq i \leq p$, $0 \leq j \leq n - p - 1$, cannot be twins, since any vertex y_k , $k \neq i$, $0 \leq k \leq p$, is within distance two from y_j and not from z_i .

Two vertices $y_i, y_j \in V_0$, $0 \leq i < j \leq n - p - 1$, cannot be twins, since $B_2(y_i) \cap V_1 = B_1(y_i) \cap V_1$, $B_2(y_j) \cap V_1 = B_1(y_j) \cap V_1$, and, by construction, these two sets are different.

Lastly, $B_2(x)$ is the set of all vertices, and since we forbade $B_1(y) \cap V_1 = V_1$ for any $y \in V_0$, x is the only vertex in this case.

So the graph is 2-twin-free, and we see that we can have up to $2^p - 1$ vertices in V_0 , leading to all the values of n between $2p + 1$ and $2^p + p$. Δ

We now show that this constructive lower bound is the exact value.

Theorem 5 For all $p \geq 2$ and $n \geq 5$, if $2^{p-1} + p - 1 < n \leq 2^p + p$, then we have: $F_{2,n}(\Delta_{\max}) = n - p - 1$.

Proof. For alleviation of notation, in this proof we denote $F_{2,n}(\Delta_{\max})$ simply by F_2 . By Theorem 3, for all $n \geq 5$, we have:

$$F_2 + \lceil \log_2(F_2 + 1) \rceil \leq n - 1. \quad (8)$$

We assume that n satisfies the conditions of Theorem 5, and that $F_2 \geq n - p$. The former implies that

$$n - p + 1 > 2^{p-1} = (2^{p-1} + p - 1) - p + 1, \quad (9)$$

the latter that

$$F_2 + \lceil \log_2(F_2 + 1) \rceil \geq (n - p) + \lceil \log_2(n - p + 1) \rceil. \quad (10)$$

By (9), $\lceil \log_2(n - p + 1) \rceil \geq p$, and, plugging this inequality into (10), we obtain $F_2 + \lceil \log_2(F_2 + 1) \rceil \geq n$, contradicting (8) and proving that $F_2 \leq n - p - 1$. Combining this result with Theorem 4, we obtain our claim, provided that $n \geq 2p + 1$. Since $n > 2^{p-1} + p - 1$, this is always true, unless $p = 2$; in this case however, the fact that $n \geq 5$ implies that $n \geq 2p + 1$. Δ

We now show various constructions for $r \geq 3$, giving lower bounds which will be compared to the upper bound given by Theorem 3. Note that the cases $r = 3$ and $r > 3$ are somewhat different.

The intervals given in the following theorem are mutually exclusive and give, for each value of $r \geq 3$, all the values of n starting from $2r + 1$.

Theorem 6 (a) We consider the case $r = 3$.

- (a1) For $n = 7, 8$, we have: $F_{3,n}(\Delta_{\max}) \geq n - 5$;
- (a2) for $n = 9, 10, 11$, we have: $F_{3,n}(\Delta_{\max}) \geq n - 6$;
- (a3) for $n = 12, 13$, we have: $F_{3,n}(\Delta_{\max}) \geq n - 7$;
- (a4) for $14 \leq n \leq 18$, we have: $F_{3,n}(\Delta_{\max}) \geq n - 8$;
- (a5) for $19 \leq n \leq 25$, we have: $F_{3,n}(\Delta_{\max}) \geq n - 9$;
- (a6) for $26 \leq n \leq 33$, we have: $F_{3,n}(\Delta_{\max}) \geq n - 10$.

For all $p \geq 4$,

- (a7) if $3^{p-1} + 2p - 1 \leq n \leq 4 \times 3^{p-2} + 2p + 2$, then $F_{3,n}(\Delta_{\max}) \geq n - 3p + 1$;
- (a8) if $4 \times 3^{p-2} + 2p + 3 \leq n \leq 2 \times 3^{p-1} + 2p + 1$, then $F_{3,n}(\Delta_{\max}) \geq n - 3p$;
- (a9) if $2 \times 3^{p-1} + 2p + 2 \leq n \leq 3^p + 2p$, then $F_{3,n}(\Delta_{\max}) \geq n - 3p - 1$.

(b) For all $p \geq 2$, we define $\lambda(p) = 1$ if $p = 2$, 0 otherwise, and $\mu(p) = 1$ if $p = 3$, 0 otherwise. For all $r \geq 4$, $n \geq 2r + 1$, and $p \geq 2$,

- (b1) if $n = 2r + 1$, then $F_{r,n}(\Delta_{\max}) = 2$;
- (b2) if $n = 2r + 2$, then $F_{r,n}(\Delta_{\max}) = 3$;
- (b3) if $p = 3$ and $pr + 8 \leq n \leq pr + 9$, or if $p \geq 4$ and $3^{p-1} + pr - 1 \leq n \leq 4 \times 3^{p-2} + p(r - 2) + 2$, then $F_{r,n}(\Delta_{\max}) \geq n - rp + 1$;
- (b4) if $4 \times 3^{p-2} + p(r - 2) + 3 + \mu(p) \leq n \leq 2 \times 3^{p-1} + p(r - 2) + 3$, then $F_{r,n}(\Delta_{\max}) \geq n - rp$;
- (b5) if $2 \times 3^{p-1} + p(r - 2) + 4 \leq n \leq 3^p + p(r - 2) + \lambda(p)$, then $F_{r,n}(\Delta_{\max}) \geq n - rp - 1$;
- (b6) if $3^p + p(r - 2) + 1 + \lambda(p) \leq n \leq 3^p + pr + 1$, then $F_{r,n}(\Delta_{\max}) \geq n - rp - 2$;
- (b7) if $3^p + pr + 2 \leq n \leq 3^p + (p + 1)r - 2$, then $F_{r,n}(\Delta_{\max}) \geq 3^p - 1$.

Sketch of proof. If $n = 2r + 1$, then it is not difficult to see that the only connected r -twin-free graph is the path P_{2r+1} , which has maximum degree two. Thus claim (b1) is true.

If $n = 2r + 2$, then $k = 4$ does not satisfy inequality (2) in Theorem 3. On the other hand, a degree equal to three is possible, for instance in the following r -twin-free graph: $G = (V, E)$, where $V = \{x_i : 1 \leq i \leq 2r + 2\}$ and $E = \{\{x_i, x_{i+1}\} : 1 \leq i \leq 2r\} \cup \{\{x_{r+1}, x_{2r+2}\}\}$. Thus claim (b2) is true.

Now we give a basic construction, for n between $pr + 3$ and $3^p + pr + 1$, in which there is a vertex with degree $n - pr - 2$. This construction is easy to understand and will be the starting point for many variations. We start with $n = pr + 3$, and build the graph $G = (V, E)$, where

$$V = \{x, y_1, w\} \cup \{a_{i,j} : 1 \leq i \leq p, 1 \leq j \leq r\},$$

$$E = \{\{x, y_1\}\} \cup \{\{y_1, a_{i,1}\}, \{w, a_{i,r}\} : 1 \leq i \leq p\} \cup \{\{a_{i,j}, a_{i,j+1}\} : 1 \leq i \leq p, 1 \leq j \leq r - 1\},$$




Figure 3: A first construction in the proof of Theorem 6.

see Figure 3. It is rather straightforward to check that this graph is r -twin-free, because it mainly consists of chordless cycles of length $2r + 2$. We set $I_0 = \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$, $V_0 = \{y_1\}$, and $V_j = \{a_{i,j} : i \in I_0\}$, for $j = 1, 2, \dots, r$.

In a way similar to the proof of Theorem 4, we can progressively add vertices in V_0 , all adjacent to x , and keep the graph twin-free while increasing the degree of x . First, we add a vertex y_0 which is linked to x only. Then we add vertices $y_{J,J}$, where the sets J are distinct subsets of I_0 (different from I_0 and from the empty set), and where $y_{J,J}$ is linked to x and to the vertices $a_{j,1} \in V_1$ for $j \in J$. With this notation, we see that $y_1 = y_{I_0, I_0}$ and $y_0 = y_{\emptyset, \emptyset}$.

Once we have all possible vertices $y_{J,J}$ in V_0 , we can add even more vertices to V_0 : we denote these vertices by $y_{I,J}$, where $J \subsetneq I \subseteq I_0$, $(I, J) \neq (I_0, \emptyset)$, and the couple (I, J) has not been used already; any new vertex $y_{I,J}$ is linked to x , to $y_{I,I}$, and to the vertices $a_{j,1}$, for $j \in J$. See Figure 4 for an illustration.

We claim that all the successive graphs obtained from the graph given in Figure 3 by adding, one by one, vertices $y_{I,I}$, then, one by one, vertices $y_{I,J}$, as described above, are r -twin-free, have a number of vertices n lying between $pr + 3$ and $3^p + pr + 1$, and that the degree of x is equal to $n - pr - 2$.

First, a vertex in $V_0 \cup \{x\}$ and a vertex in $V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_r \cup \{w\}$ cannot be twins, because the latter is r -covered by w and the former is not. It is equally easy to see that w cannot be the twin of any vertex. And x has no twins either: the only candidate would be a vertex in V_0 which is linked to x and to the only vertex in V_0 which is linked to all the vertices in V_1 , namely, y_{I_0, I_0} ; but precisely, we mentioned that we forbid the couple




Figure 4: How the vertex $y_{I,J}$ is added to V_0 , after $y_{I,I}$ has been. Here, the sets I and J in V_1 stand for $\{a_{i,1} : i \in I\}$ and $\{a_{i,1} : i \in J\}$, respectively.

$(I, J) = (I_0, \emptyset)$. So all we have to check is that there are no twins inside V_0 , or inside $V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_r$.

It is quite straightforward to notice that for any vertex $y_{I,J} \in V_0$, where we allow $I = J$, we have:

$$B_r(y_{I,J}) = \{x\} \cup V_0 \cup \dots \cup V_{r-2} \cup (V_{r-1} \cap \{a_{i,r-1} : i \in I\}) \cup (V_r \cap \{a_{i,r} : i \in J\}),$$

i.e.,

$$B_r(y_{I,J}) = \{x\} \cup V_0 \cup \dots \cup V_{r-2} \cup \{a_{i,r-1} : i \in I\} \cup \{a_{i,r} : i \in J\}. \quad (11)$$

By the successive choices for the couples (I, I) or (I, J) , these sets are all different, and therefore there are no twins inside V_0 .

Finally, it is easily understood that two distinct vertices $a_{i,j} \in V_j$ and $a_{i',j'} \in V_{j'}$, $j, j' > 0$, are not twins if one sees any such two vertices as belonging to a chordless cycle of length $2r + 2$ (containing w and a vertex in V_0 , for instance $y_1 = y_{I_0, I_0}$). We can now conclude that our graph is r -twin-free.

How many vertices can we have? In V_0 , we put vertices $y_{I,J}$, where $J \subseteq I \subseteq I_0$, with $(I, J) \neq (I_0, \emptyset)$. Therefore V_0 can contain up to

$$\left(\sum_{k=0}^p \binom{p}{k} 2^k \right) - 1 = (2 + 1)^p - 1 = 3^p - 1$$

vertices, and n can be as large as $3^p + pr + 1$. In all cases, the degree of x is $n - pr - 2$.

This ends the description of our basic construction, and proves the penultimate claim, (b6), since $pr + 3 \leq 3^p + p(r - 2) + 1$ for all $p \geq 2$.

We denote by $G^{(n)} = (V^{(n)}, E^{(n)})$ the graph obtained, with n ranging between $pr + 3$ and $3^p + pr + 1$.

There is a first trivial modification to $G^{(n)}$, which works best when $n = 3^p + pr + 1$: just add a “tail” to w , that is, a path z_1, z_2, \dots , with z_1 linked to w . The degree of x remains the same, equal to $3^p - 1$. This proves the last claim, (b7), in Theorem 6, since the tail can be as long as necessary.

Slightly more difficult is to try to remove the vertex w . If we remove w from $G^{(3^p + pr + 1)}$, then there are twins: the sets $B_r(a_{i,1})$, $i \in I_0$, consist of all vertices except $\{a_{j,r} : j \in I_0 \setminus \{i\}\}$, and if we compare to (11), which still holds after the removal of w , we see that $B_r(a_{i,1}) = B_r(y_{I_0, \{i\}})$. Therefore, in the basic construction of $G^{(n)}$, we are led to forbid the vertices $y_{I_0, \{i\}}$, $i \in I_0$. Similarly, the sets $B_r(a_{i,2})$ consist of all vertices except $\{a_{j,r}, a_{j,r-1} : j \in I_0 \setminus \{i\}\}$ when $r \geq 4$, whereas, when $r = 3$, in addition the vertex $y_{\emptyset, \emptyset}$ does not belong to any set $B_r(a_{i,2})$. We see that in the former case, $B_r(a_{i,2}) = B_r(y_{\{i\}, \{i\}})$, and we are moreover led to banish the vertices $y_{\{i\}, \{i\}}$. In conclusion, we modify $G^{(3^p + pr + 1)}$ by removing the vertex w , but forbidding the p vertices $y_{I_0, \{i\}}$ if $r = 3$, or the $2p$ vertices $y_{I_0, \{i\}}, y_{\{i\}, \{i\}}$ if $r \geq 4$; we leave it to the reader to check that the new graph is indeed twin-free. If $r = 3$ (respectively, $r \geq 4$), this graph has $3^p + 2p$ (respectively, $3^p + (r - 2)p$) vertices, the degree of x is $3^p - p - 1 = n - 3p - 1$ (respectively, $3^p - 2p - 1 = n - rp - 1$). Obviously, more vertices $y_{I,J}$ can be removed, down to $pr + 2$. This proves claim (a9), since $3p + 2 \leq 2 \times 3^{p-1} + 2p + 2$ for all $p \geq 4$, and claim (b5) (except for $\lambda(p) = 1$, i.e., $p = 2$ and $n = 2r + 6$), since $pr + 2 \leq 2 \times 3^{p-1} + p(r - 2) + 4$ for all $p \geq 2$. When $n = 2r + 6$, we use the special construction given by Figure 5, where x has degree $5 = n - 2r - 1$; we leave the checking to the reader.

Still more difficult are the proofs of the remaining claims, of which we only give a sketch.

One idea is to remove the vertex w and merge two vertices, $a_{1,r}$ and $a_{2,r}$, into one, see Figure 6(a). Then of course, vertices have to be removed in V_0 , or, equivalently, couples (I, J) must be forbidden. This is where we drop the delicate details, only to mention that the set V_0 can have up to $2 \times 3^{p-1} - p + 1$ vertices if $r = 3$ and up to $2 \times 3^{p-1} - 2p + 3$ vertices if $r \geq 4$. In the former case, the graph has between $3p + 1$ and $2 \times 3^{p-1} + 2p + 1$ vertices, in the latter case, it has between $rp + 1$ and $2 \times 3^{p-1} + (r - 2)p + 3$ vertices, and in both cases x has degree $n - rp$, which establishes claims (a8) and (b4).

Another idea is, after removing w , to merge two vertices twice, namely, $a_{1,r}$ and $a_{2,r}$ on the one hand, and $a_{3,r}$ and $a_{4,r}$ on the other (so necessarily,




Figure 5: The particular case $n = 2r + 6$.




Figure 6: Different ways of contracting vertices in the proof of Theorem 6.

$p \geq 4$), see Figure 6(b). This leads to graphs with a number of vertices ranging between $3p$ and $4 \times 3^{p-2} + 2p + 2$ if $r = 3$, or between pr and $4 \times 3^{p-2} + p(r - 2) + 2$ if $r \geq 4$. In both cases, x has degree $n - rp + 1$, which treats claim (a7) and the second part of claim (b3).

When $p = 3$ and $r \geq 4$, it is possible to merge the three vertices $a_{1,r}$, $a_{2,r}$, and $a_{3,r}$ into one, see Figure 6(c), to obtain the first part of claim (b3).

Finally, claims (a1)–(a6) are shown using the same kinds of constructions. There is no point describing these constructions here. One of the difficulties, as for the previous constructions, is to find the most efficient balance between the number of vertices in V_r and in V_0 . Δ

Tables 7 and 8 give the results obtained by Theorems 3 and 6, for $r = 3, 4, 5$ and 10 and $2r + 1 \leq n \leq 66$, as well as for some larger values of n .

Note that we have the *exact* value of $F_{r,n}(\Delta_{\max})$ for *infinitely many* values of n and r ; for instance, if $k = 3^p - 1$, $p \geq 1$, then (2) in Theorem 3 is satisfied by k and not by $k + 1$ for $r \geq 2$ and n between

$$A = 3^p + pr - (2p - \lceil p \log_2 3 \rceil) \text{ and } B = 3^p + pr + r - 2 - (2p - \lceil p \log_2 3 \rceil),$$

and $F_{r,n}(\Delta_{\max}) \leq 3^p - 1$ for these values. On the other hand, using Theorem 6(b7), and 6(b6) with $n = 3^p + pr + 1$, shows that $F_{r,n}(\Delta_{\max}) \geq 3^p - 1$ for $r \geq 4$ and n between

$$C = 3^p + pr + 1 \text{ and } D = 3^p + pr + r - 2.$$

Now we have: $A \leq C, B \leq D$, and, for $r \geq 3 + 2p - \lceil p \log_2 3 \rceil$: $C \leq B$. Therefore, for $r \geq 3 + 2p - \lceil p \log_2 3 \rceil$ and n between C and B , the value of $F_{r,n}(\Delta_{\max})$ is $3^p - 1$.

For instance we see in Table 7 that $F_{10,n}(\Delta_{\max}) = 26$ for n between 58 and 64. Another example, not from the tables, is $p = 10, r = 100, 60050 \leq n \leq 60143$, and $F_{100,n}(\Delta_{\max}) = 59048$.

We conclude this section by grossly approximating the lower and upper bounds given by Theorems 6 and 3, then their difference, for $r \geq 3$ fixed and n sufficiently large.

Inequalities in Theorem 6, where p is approximately equal to $\log_3 n$, show that $F_{r,n}(\Delta_{\max})$ is approximately greater than

$$n - r \log_3 n. \tag{12}$$

On the other hand, we can estimate the greatest integer k satisfying (2) in Theorem 3 by approximating it with the greatest k' such that

$$k' + (r - 2) \log_3 k' + \log_2 k' \leq n,$$

which, if we set $s = 2 - \log_2 3$ (the value of which is around 0.4), reads

$$k' + (r - s) \log_3 k' \leq n.$$

n	$r = 3$	4	5	10	n	$r = 3$	4	5	10
7	2				37	26-27	23-25	20-22	8
8	3				38	27-28	24-26	21-23	9
9	3	2			39	28-29	25-26	22-24	10
10	4	3			40	29-30	26	23-25	10-11
11	5	3	2		41	30-31	26-27	24-26	11-12
12	5-6	4	3		42	31	27-28	25-26	12-13
13	6-7	5	3		43	32	28-29	26	13-14
14	6-7	5-6	4		44	33	29-30	26	14-15
15	7-8	5-7	5		45	34	30-31	26-27	15
16	8	6-7	5-6		46	35	31	27-28	15-16
17	9	7-8	5-7		47	35-36	31-32	28-29	16-17
18	10	8	6-7		48	36-37	32-33	29-30	17-18
19	10-11	8	7-8		49	37-38	33-34	30-31	18-19
20	11-12	9	8		50	38-39	34-35	31	19-20
21	12-13	10	8	2	51	39-40	35-36	31-32	20-21
22	13-14	10-11	8	3	52	40-41	36-37	32-33	20-22
23	14-15	11-12	9	3	53	41-42	37-38	33-34	21-23
24	15	12-13	10	4	54	42-43	38-39	34-35	22-24
25	16	13-14	10-11	5	55	43-44	39-40	35-36	23-25
26	16-17	14-15	11-12	5-6	56	44-45	40-41	36-37	24-26
27	17-18	15	12-13	5-7	57	45-46	41-42	37-38	25-26
28	18-19	15-16	13-14	6-7	58	46-47	42-43	38-39	26
29	19-20	16-17	14-15	7-8	59	47-48	43-44	39-40	26
30	20-21	17-18	15	8	60	48-49	44-45	40-41	26
31	21-22	18-19	15-16	8	61	49-50	45-46	41-42	26
32	22-23	19-20	16-17	8	62	50-51	46-47	42-43	26
33	23-24	20-21	17-18	8	63	51-52	47-48	43-44	26
34	23-25	20-22	18-19	8	64	51-53	48-49	44-45	26
35	24-26	21-23	19-20	8	65	52-54	49-50	45-46	26-27
36	25-26	22-24	20-21	8	66	53-55	49-51	46-47	27-28

Figure 7: Lower and upper bounds on the maximum degree: $r = 3, 4, 5, 10$ and $2r + 1 \leq n \leq 66$.

n	$r = 3$	$r = 4$	$r = 5$	$r = 10$
1 000	979-982	972-975	965-968	931-933
10 000	9 973-9 976	9 964-9 967	9 955-9 958	9 910-9 913
20 000	19 971-19 974	19 961-19 964	19 951-19 954	19 901-19 904
100 000	99 967-99 971	99 956-99 960	99 945-99 949	99 890-99 894

Figure 8: Some lower and upper bounds on the maximum degree.

Now let $k_1 = n - (r - s) \log_3 n$ and $k_2 = n - (r - s) \log_3 n + (r - s)$. We see that

$$k_1 + (r - s) \log_3 k_1 \leq k_1 + (r - s) \log_3 n = n,$$

which shows that $k' \geq k_1$. And, if r is fixed and n grows (and even with weaker constraints actually), then $\log_3 k_2 \geq \log_3 n - 1$; therefore,

$$k_2 + (r - s) \log_3 k_2 \geq k_2 + (r - s) \log_3 n - (r - s) = n,$$

so $k' \leq k_2$. This shows that k' , hence k , behaves approximately like

$$n - (r - s) \log_3 n, \tag{13}$$

which, comparing to the approximate lower bound $n - r \log_3 n$, shows that the difference between lower and upper bounds can be roughly estimated by $0.4 \times \log_3 n$ (independent of r). This could already be empirically observed for the large values of n given in Table 8.

3 Conclusion

We have a fairly good estimation of $F_{r,n}(\Delta_{\max})$. The table below recapitulates some of the results obtained, for $r = 1$, $r = 2$, and $r \geq 3$.

r	$f_r(\Delta_{\max})$	$f_{r,n}(\Delta_{\max})$	$F_{r,n}(\Delta_{\max})$
1	2 [Th. 1]	2 [Th. 1]	$n - 1$ [Th. 2]
2	2 [Th. 1]	2 [Th. 1]	$n - p - 1$ for $2^{p-1} + p - 1 < n \leq 2^p + p$ [Th. 5]
≥ 3	2 [Th. 1]	2 [Th. 1]	$\gtrsim n - r \log_3 n$ [Th. 6 with (12)] $\lesssim n - (r - 0.4) \log_3 n$ [Th. 3 with (13)]

References

- [1] D. Auger, Problèmes d'identification métrique dans les graphes, Rapport Interne ENST-2007D013, Paris, France, 44 pp., 2007.
- [2] D. Auger, Induced paths in twin-free graphs, *Electron. J. Combin.* 15(1) (2008), N17.
- [3] I. Charon, I. Honkala, O. Hudry and A. Lobstein, Structural properties of twin-free graphs, *Electron. J. Combin.* 14(1) (2007), R16.
- [4] I. Charon, O. Hudry and A. Lobstein, Extremal values for identification, domination and maximum cliques in twin-free graphs, *Ars Combin.*, to appear.
- [5] S. Gravier and J. Moncel, Constructions of codes identifying sets of vertices, *Electron. J. Combin.* 12(1) (2005), R13.
- [6] M. G. Karpovsky, K. Chakrabarty and L. B. Levitin, On a new class of codes for identifying vertices in graphs, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* 44 (1998), 599–611.
- [7] T. Laihonen and S. Ranto, Codes identifying sets of vertices, *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* 2227 (2001), 82–91.
- [8] J. Moncel, Codes identifiants dans les graphes, Thèse de Doctorat de l'Université de Grenoble, France, 165 pp., 2005.
- [9] <http://www.infres.enst.fr/~lobstein/bibLOCDDOMetID.html>