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Lecture 5: Ramsey Theory

Week 1 of 1 Mathcamp 2010

Question 1 Amongst any collection of 6 people, can you always find three mutual friends or three mutual strangers?

Solution. In the language of graph theory, our question is the following: if you (possibly improperly) color the edges of $K_{6}$ red and blue, do you always have to create a monochrome triangle?

We claim that you will always do so. To see why: pick any red-blue coloring of $K_{6}$, and any vertex $v \in K_{6}$. There must be three edges leaving $v$ of one of our two colors, as $\operatorname{deg}(v)=5$; suppose without loss of generality that those three edges are red. Let $\left\{w_{1}, w_{2}, w_{3}\right\}$ be the endpoints of these edges.

Then, there are two cases:

- There is some edge $\left\{w_{i}, w_{j}\right\}$ that's red. In this case, the vertices $v, w_{i}, w_{j}$ form a red triangle.
- Every edge $\left\{w_{i}, w_{j}\right\}$ is blue. In this case, the vertices $w_{1}, w_{2}, w_{3}$ form a blue triangle.

A natural generalization of the above question is the following:
Question 2 Let $C=\{1, \ldots c\}$ be some collection of colors, and $n_{1}, \ldots n_{c}$ integers. Is there always some value of $n$ such that if $K_{n}$ is colored with $c$ colors, then $K_{n}$ necessarily contains a i-monochrome $K_{n_{i}}$, for some $1 \leq i \leq c$ ?

Theorem 3 (Ramsey's Theorem) The answer to this question is yes!
Proof. Let $R\left(n_{1}, \ldots, n_{c}\right)$ denote the smallest value of $n$ such that if $K_{n}$ is colored with $c$ colors, then $K_{n}$ necessarily contains a $i$-monochrome $K_{n_{i}}$. We seek to show that $R$ is well-defined.

To do this, we proceed by induction on the number of colors $C=\{1, \ldots, c\}$. When $c=1$, note that this is trivial, as $R(k)=k$ for all $k$.

Now, consider the two-color case. We trivially have $R(n, 1)=R(1, n)=1$ and $R(n, 2)=$ $R(2, n)=n$. Furthermore, we claim that we have the following recursive bound on the growth of $R(r, s)$ :

$$
R(r, s) \leq R(r, s-1)+R(r-1, s) .
$$

To see why: take a complete graph $K$ on $(R(r, s-1)+R(r-1, s))$ many vertices, and color its edges red and blue (or 1 and 2 , if you prefer integers). Pick any $v \in K$, and partition the rest of $K$ 's vertices into two sets:

- $B^{\prime}$, which contains all of the vertices in $K$ connected to $v$ by a blue edge, and
- $R^{\prime}$, which contains all of the vertices in $K$ connected to $v$ by a red edge.

Let $B$ and $R$ be the subgraphs of $K$ induced by these vertices, respectively.
Because $K$ has

$$
R(r, s-1)+R(r-1, s)=|B|+|R|+1
$$

many vertices, either $|B| \geq R(r, s-1)$ or $|R| \geq R(r-1, s)$. If the former, then induction on the values of $r$ and $s$ tells us that we either have

- a blue $K_{s}$ inside of $B$, or
- a red $K_{r-1}$ inside of $R$, in which case we have that there's a red $K_{r}$ inside of $v \cup R$;
consequently, we're done! (Analogous reasoning applies to the case $|R| \geq R(r-1, s)$.)
So: now suppose that we've settled our theorem for $c-1$ colors. We seek to resolve it for $c$ colors. Specifically, we make the following claim:

$$
R\left(n_{1}, \ldots n_{c}\right) \leq R\left(n_{1}, \ldots n_{c-2},\left(R\left(n_{c-1}, R_{c}\right)\right)\right)
$$

To see this: let $K$ be the complete graph on $R\left(n_{1}, \ldots n_{c-2},\left(R\left(n_{c-1}, R_{c}\right)\right)\right)$ many vertices, and color $K$ 's vertices with $c$ different colors.

Now: become selectively colorblind! In other words, pretend temporarily that $c-1$ and $c$ have the same colors.

Then, by our inductive hypothesis, either

- there is an $i$-monochrome $K_{n_{i}}$, for $1 \leq i \leq c-2$, or
- there is a $(c \& c-1)$-colored $K_{R\left(n_{c-1}, n_{c}\right)}$. By the definition of $R\left(n_{c-1}, n_{c}\right)$, this means that there's either a $(c-1)$-monochrome $K_{n_{c-1}}$, or a $c$-monochrome $K_{n_{c}}$.

So we're done!
In the language of the proof above, the opening question for this lecture can be thought of as showing $R(3,3)=6$.

To illustrate a few ideas that go into finding a Ramsey number, and to maybe illustrate some of the difficulty of finding such numbers, consider the following question:

Question 4 What's $K_{3,4}$ ?
Solution. Pick $n$ such that for any red-blue coloring of $K_{n}$, we have neither a blue $K_{3}$ nor a red $K_{4}$. Pick any $x \in K_{n}$, and again let

- $B$ be the subgraph induced by the set of vertices in $K_{n}$ connected to $v$ by a blue edge, and
- $R$ be the subgraph induced by the set in $K_{n}$ connected to $v$ by a red edge.

If there is a blue edge in $B$, then $x \cup B$ will yield a blue $K_{3}$; similarly, if there is a red $K_{3}$ in $R, x \cup R$ yields a red $K_{4}$. Because $R(2,4)=4$ and $R(3,3)=6$, we have that if neither situation occurs, we must have $|B| \leq 3$ and $|R| \leq 5$. In other words, we've just shown that for any vertex $x \in K_{n}$, we have $\operatorname{deg}_{b}(x) \leq 3$ and $\operatorname{deg}_{r}(x) \leq 5$. Consequently, the total degree of $x$ must be $\leq 8$; i.e. $n \leq 9$, and thus $R(3,4) \leq 10$.

Consider the case $n=9$. In this case, each $x$ must have $\operatorname{deg}_{b}(x)=3$ and $\operatorname{deg}_{r}(x)=5$; consequently, the number of blue edges in $K_{n}$ can be counted, via the degree-sum formula, to be $\frac{1}{2} \sum_{x \in K_{n}} d e g_{b}(x)=27 / 2=13.5$. Since we can't have half of a blue edge, this is also impossible! So $R(3,4) \leq 9$.

Conversely: consider the following drawing below. The solid edges form a graph with girth $\geq 4$, and so do not contain a $K_{3}$. As well, picking any four points on the boundary of a 8 -cycle necessarily involves picking two opposite points or two adjacent points; so there is no complete $K_{4}$ amongst 4 points within the dashed edges.


Thus, $R(3,4)>8$; i.e. $R(3,4)=9$.

