

LARGE $2P_3$ -FREE GRAPHS WITH BOUNDED DEGREE

Myung S. Chung and Douglas B. West[†]
University of Illinois
Urbana, IL 61801-2975

Abstract

Let $ex^*(D; H)$ be the maximum number of edges in a connected graph with maximum degree D and no induced subgraph H ; this is finite if and only if H is a disjoint union of paths. If the largest component of such an H has order m , then $ex^*(D; H) = O(D^2 ex^*(D; P_m))$. Constructively, $ex^*(D; qP_m) = \Theta(qD^2 ex^*(D; P_m))$ if $q > 1$ and $m > 2$ ($\Theta(qD^2)$ if $m = 2$). For $H = 2P_3$ (and $D \geq 8$), the maximum number of edges is $\frac{1}{8}[D^4 + D^3 + D^2 + 6D]$ if D is even and $\frac{1}{8}[D^4 + D^3 + 2D^2 + 3D + 1]$ if D is odd, achieved by a unique extremal graph.

1991 AMS Subject Classification: 05C35

Keywords: Extremal problem, forbidden subgraph

Running head: LARGE $2P_3$ -FREE GRAPHS

[†]Research supported in part by NSA Grants MDA904-90-H-4011 and MDA904-93-H-3040.

Revised October, 1993 and December, 1994.

1. INTRODUCTION

The archetypal problem of extremal graph theory is to determine the maximum number of edges in an n -vertex graph that does not contain some fixed graph H as a subgraph; this is usually written as $ex(n; H)$. Turán solved this for cliques; an extensive discussion of this and related problems appears in [1]. In this paper we study large graphs when we forbid H as an *induced* subgraph; such graphs are called *H -free*. Since any large clique is H -free when H is not a clique, and since disjoint copies of a graph introduce no new connected subgraphs, we obtain a more sensible problem by defining $ex^*(D; H)$ to be the maximum number of edges in a connected graph G with maximum degree at most D . The problem has been solved for $H = P_4$ in [3] and for $H = 2K_2$ by F. Chung, Gyarfás, Trotter, and Tuza in [2]. The results are $ex^*(D; P_4) = D^2$ for all D , and $ex^*(D; 2K_2) = \frac{5}{4}D^2$ when D is even. In these cases the extremal graph is unique; for $H = P_4$ the graph is $K_{D,D}$, and for $H = 2K_2$ it is the graph obtained by expanding each vertex of a 5-cycle into $D/2$ vertices with the same neighborhood ($ex^*(D; 2K_2)$ is slightly smaller as a function of D when D is odd). In this paper, we solve the problem exactly for $H = 2P_3$ except for small values of D ; again the extremal graph is unique. We refer to a largest connected H -free graph with maximum degree D as an *extremal H -free graph*.

It was observed in [3] that $ex^*(D; H)$ is undefined unless H is a disjoint union of paths. An arbitrarily long cycle has no fixed-length cycle or vertex of degree more than 2, so there are arbitrarily large 2-regular H -free connected graphs (and also D -regular D -connected H -free graphs [3]) unless H is acyclic and has maximum degree 2.

If $H = \cup_{i=1}^q P_{m_i}$ and $m = q - 1 + \sum_{i=1}^q m_i$, then an H -free graph is also P_m -free. The diameter of a P_m -free graph is less than $m - 1$. A graph with maximum degree at most D and diameter less than $m - 1$ has at most $1 + D \frac{(D-1)^{m-2} - 1}{D-2}$ vertices (by counting the vertices reachable at each distance from a fixed vertex). Multiplying by $D/2$ to count edges, we have $ex^*(D; P_m)$ bounded by a polynomial in D with leading term $\frac{1}{2}D^{m-1}$ [3]. Simple constructions in [3] achieve roughly the square root of this bound; the P_7 -free graph constructed there is in fact the unique largest $2P_3$ -free graph.

The upper bounds can be improved recursively when H has more than one component. If the largest component of H has order m , then $ex^*(D; H) = O(D^2 ex^*(D; P_m))$. We prove constructively that $ex^*(D; qP_m) = \Theta(qD^2 ex^*(D; P_m))$ for $q > 1$ ($\Theta(qD^2)$ for $m = 2$). We have determined the complete answer for $qP_m = 2P_3$. The constructions and recursive approach appear in Section 2, with the upper bound for $ex^*(D; 2P_3)$ developed in the remainder of the paper.

Let $n(G) = |V(G)|$ and $e(G) = |E(G)|$ denote the order and size of a graph G . We use $N(x) = \{u \in V(G) : ux \in E(G)\}$ for the *neighborhood* of vertex x , and we let $N(S) = \cup_{x \in S} N(x)$. We use $G[S]$ to denote the subgraph of G induced by the vertex subset S . The degree of a vertex in G is $d(v)$, the maximum degree of G is $\Delta(G)$, and the number of vertices in the largest clique in G is $\omega(G)$. We use “clique” to refer both to a complete subgraph and to the vertex set of a complete subgraph, as is common with “independent set” for a clique in the complement.

2. THE GENERAL PROBLEM

Suppose $H = \sum_{i=1}^q P_{m_i}$, and let $H' = \sum_{i=1}^{q-1} P_{m_i}$. Because H' is an induced subgraph of H , every H' -free graph is also H -free, and $ex^*(D; H') \leq ex^*(D; H)$. If strict inequality holds, the extremal graph must have H' as an induced subgraph. This leads to the bound below.

THEOREM 1. If $H = \sum_{i=1}^q P_{m_i}$ and $H' = \sum_{i=1}^{q-1} P_{m_i}$, then

$$ex^*(D; H) \leq \max\{ex^*(D; H'), n(H')D^2[ex^*(D; P_{m_q}) + 1]\}.$$

Proof: Let G be an extremal H -free graph. As remarked above, $e(G)$ is bounded by $ex^*(D; H')$ unless G contains an induced copy of H' . Suppose $M_0 \subseteq V(G)$ induces H' . Let $M_1 = N(M_0) - M_0$, and let $M_2 = V(G) - (M_0 \cup M_1)$. Because there is no edge between M_0 and M_2 , every component of $G[M_2]$ is P_{m_q} -free. There are at most $|M_1|(D-1)$ such components. Since $|M_0| = n(H')$, we have $|M_1| \leq (D-1)n(H')$. Since each edge induced by M_1 contributes only once to $e(G)$, the edge count is bounded by allowing each edge incident to $x \in M_1$ to give rise to such a component, except for one edge to M_0 . The resulting bound is $e(G) \leq n(H')(D-1)^2[ex^*(D; P_{m_q}) + 1]$. \square

As remarked earlier, this implies $ex^*(D; H) = O(D^2 ex^*(D; P_m))$ when the largest component of H is P_m , except that for $m = 2$ we start with $2P_2$ since $ex^*(D; P_2) = 0$. We next present a construction to achieve this order of growth (as a function of D) for $H = qP_m$.

THEOREM 2. Letting $p(D, m) = ex^*(D; P_m)$, we have

$$(2q-1)\frac{D^2}{12}(p(D-1, m) + 1) \leq ex^*(D; qP_m) \leq m(q-1)D^2(p(D, m) + 1). \text{ For } m = 2, \text{ the lower bound can be improved to } (3q-1)D^2/4.$$

Proof: For simplicity, assume D is a multiple of 6. Arrange $2q-1$ cliques cyclically, each having $D/6$ vertices. Each vertex is adjacent to every vertex in its own clique and in the two neighboring cliques; this contributes $D/2-1$ to the degree of each vertex. Add $D/2+1$ pendant edges incident to each vertex, with each such edge also being incident to one of $(2q-1)\frac{D}{6}(\frac{D}{2}+1)$ disjoint copies of an extremal P_m -free graph with maximum degree at most $D-1$.

By construction, every induced P_m in this graph contains a vertex in the central ring of cliques. Since that induced subgraph has no independent set of size q , the graph cannot have q independent m -vertex paths. When $m > 2$, $p(D-1, m)$ is at least $\binom{D}{2}$. In this case the edge contribution from the central ring of cliques has smaller order, and we ignore it.

When $m = 2$, there is a better construction. Build a ring of $3q-1$ independent sets, each of size $D/2$, each pair of adjoining sets inducing $K_{D/2, D/2}$. This graph is qP_2 -free and has $(3q-1)D^2/4$ edges. \square

These examples indicate that the essential step in determining the order of growth

of $ex^*(D; H)$ as a function of D is determining the degree of the polynomial describing $p(D, m)$, for all m . Since the extremal values are known for $m \in \{2, 3, 4\}$ (and in [4] we will show that $ex^*(D; P_5) = \frac{2}{27}D^3 + O(D^2)$), the bounds above become

COROLLARY 3. The following lower and upper bounds hold for forbidden disjoint unions of $q \geq 2$ paths of the same length.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{3q-1}{4}D^2 &\leq ex^*(D; qP_2) \leq (2q-1)D^2 + O(D) \\ \frac{2q-1}{24}D^4 + O(D^3) &\leq ex^*(D; qP_3) \leq \frac{3q-3}{2}D^4 + O(D^3) \\ \frac{2q-1}{12}D^4 + O(D^3) &\leq ex^*(D; qP_4) \leq (4q-4)D^4 + O(D^3) \\ \frac{2q-1}{6 \cdot 27}D^5 + O(D^4) &\leq ex^*(D; qP_5) \leq \frac{2(5q-5)}{27}D^5 + O(D^4) \end{aligned}$$

□

For $H = 2P_3$, the asymptotic value is $\frac{1}{8}D^4$, improving the upper bound of $(3/2)D^4$ above and attaining the lower bound. The extremal graph is a special case of the construction above. When $q = 2$, the three cliques in the central ring of cliques induce a single large clique. For comparison with other graphs that arise in the proof, it is helpful to consider a larger family of examples, of which this has the most edges.

Fixing D , let G_k be the connected graph consisting of a central clique K of order k and $k(D+1-k)$ peripheral cliques of order D , with each vertex of K adjacent to $D+1-k$ of the peripheral cliques by a single cut edge (see Fig. 1). The maximum degree of G_k is D , and G_k is $2P_3$ -free, because every induced P_3 includes at least one vertex in K .




Fig. 1. The structure of the extremal graph

REMARK 4. For fixed D , the number of edges in G_k is maximized when $k = \lceil (D+1)/2 \rceil$, in which case the number of edges is

$$g(D) = \begin{cases} \frac{D^4 + D^3 + D^2 + 6D}{8} & \text{if } D \text{ is even} \\ \frac{D^4 + D^3 + 2D^2 + 3D + 1}{8} & \text{if } D \text{ is odd} \end{cases}$$

Proof: The number of edges in G_k is $k(D+1-k)\left[\binom{D}{2}+1\right]+\binom{k}{2}=\frac{1}{2}[k(D^3+D+1)-k^2(D^2-D+1)]$. This is a quadratic function in k with maximum at $k=\frac{(D^3+D+1)}{2(D^2-D+1)}=\frac{1}{2}(D+1+\frac{D}{D^2-D+1})$. Since k must be an integer, and a parabola is symmetric around its extreme, the maximum is achieved at the nearest integer to this, which is $\lceil(D+1)/2\rceil$ if $D\geq 2$. When this value of k is used, we obtain the expression $g(D)$ above. \square

3. STRUCTURAL DESCRIPTION

Let \mathbf{G} denote the class of connected $2P_3$ -free graphs with maximum degree D . Our approach to determining $ex^*(D;2P_3)$ is to bound the size of an arbitrary $G\in\mathbf{G}$ in terms of $\omega(G)$ and compare this with values of $e(G_k)$ for appropriate k . In this section we develop a useful structural description for G .

If G is a clique, then $e(G)\leq\binom{D+1}{2}<g(D)$, so we may assume G is not a clique. Let W be a maximum clique of G , with order $w\geq 2$. Since G is connected, some vertex γ outside W has a neighbor β in W . Since W is a maximum clique, some vertex α in W is not adjacent to γ . These fixed vertices $P=\{\alpha,\beta,\gamma\}$ induce P_3 .

Partition $V(G)$ into P,M_1,M_2 , where $M_1=N(P)-P$ and $M_2=V(G)-N(P)$. Let H_i be the subgraph of G induced by M_i . Because there are no edges between M_2 and P , there can be no induced P_3 in H_2 , so H_2 is a disjoint union of cliques. The components of H_2 may or may not be maximal cliques in G . We partition the set of components of H_2 into Q and Q' , where Q contains those that are maximal cliques in G , and Q' contains those that are not maximal cliques in G (being contained in the neighborhood of some vertex of M_1). Given $x\in M_1$, let $H(x)$ be the set of components of H_2 that contain a neighbor of x , and let $Q(x)=H(x)\cap Q$ and $Q'(x)=H(x)\cap Q'$.

LEMMA 5. If $x,y\in M_1$ are nonadjacent, then $Q(x)$ and $Q(y)$ are ordered by inclusion.

Proof: If not, then there exist cliques $X\in Q(x)$ and $Y\in Q(y)$ such that X has no neighbor of y and Y has no neighbor of x . Now $\{x,X,y,Y\}$ together contain six vertices inducing $2P_3$. \square

The next lemma will provide a bound on the size of Q .

LEMMA 6. The subgraph H_1 contains a clique K such that $Q=\cup_{x\in K}Q(x)$.

Proof: Among the cliques of H_1 , let K be one that maximizes $|\cup_{x\in K}Q(x)|$, and let $S=\cup_{x\in K}Q(x)$. Suppose T is an element of Q omitted by S . Choose y such that $T\in Q(y)$. If $x\in K$ is a nonneighbor of y , then $Q(x)$ and $Q(y)$ are ordered by inclusion. With $T\in Q(y)-Q(x)$, we conclude $Q(x)\subseteq Q(y)$. Hence we can replace all the nonneighbors of y by y , and $K'=y\cup(K\cap N(y))$ contradicts the choice of K . \square




Fig. 2. The structure of a $2P_3$ -free connected graph

This lemma is very helpful in bounding the size of Q . We will use a different method for Q' , which requires another definition and lemma. We define a *webbed star* to be the join of a single (“central”) vertex with a disjoint union of cliques. The central vertex is adjacent to all others.

LEMMA 7. Let H be a webbed star with $\Delta(H) \leq d$ and $\omega(H) \leq t$. Then $e(H) \leq h(d, t)$, where

$$h(d, t) = \begin{cases} \frac{dt}{2} & \text{if } t \leq \frac{d+1}{2} \\ \binom{t}{2} + \binom{d-t+2}{2} & \text{if } \frac{d+1}{2} \leq t \leq d+1 \\ \binom{d+1}{2} & \text{if } t \geq d+1 \end{cases} .$$

Proof: Let H be a webbed star, with central vertex v of degree d , and $\omega(H) = t$. Each vertex of $H - v$ has degree at most $t - 1$. Hence $e(H) \leq (d(t - 1) + d)/2 = dt/2$.

We can improve this bound when $t > \frac{d+1}{2}$. Suppose X is a t -clique in H . Note that $v \in X$, and the vertices of $X - v$ have no other incident edges. There are $d - t + 2$ vertices outside $X - v$, which is at most t if $t \geq d/2 + 1$. In this case, even with all possible edges present, we have $e(H) \leq \binom{t}{2} + \binom{d-t+2}{2}$.

By simple algebra, $dt < t(t - 1) + (d - t + 2)(d - t + 1)$ if and only if $t < d/2 + 1$. Furthermore, $h(d, t)$ is non-decreasing in d and t , so our computation for H also yields a bound for all webbed stars with smaller maximum degree or clique number. \square

4. A SIMPLE EDGE BOUND

Our purported extremal configuration has cliques of order D . The relatively easy edge bound we obtain next will enable us to prove that an example with more edges must have clique number bigger than $\max\{D/2, D - 6\}$. As we consider larger values of w , we must be more careful to avoid overcounting in order to bound the edge count by $g(D)$. For the case $w = D$, we will need a very careful argument. Throughout the remainder of the

paper, we continue to use the notation developed in the previous section; in particular, clique K of order k contains an endpoint of an edge to each clique in Q , and W of order w (containing α, β) is a maximum clique.

LEMMA 8. If $G \in \mathbf{G}$, then $e(G) \leq (3D - 2) + \binom{k}{2} + k(D - k)(1 + \binom{w}{2}) + (3D - 4 - k)h(D - 1, w)$.

Proof: To obtain the bound, we partition the edges into various sets. There are at most $3D - 2$ edges incident to vertices of P and $\binom{k}{2}$ edges within K . Because each vertex of K has at least k neighbors in $P \cup M_1$, we conclude by Lemma 6 that $|Q| \leq k(D - k)$.

Consider the edges between K and M_2 plus the edges in $\cup_{x \in K} H(x)$; the bound on these is $k(D - k)(1 + \binom{w}{2})$. There are at most $k(D - k)$ edges between K and M_2 , and we have at most one clique in Q for each such edge. If any edge from K to M_2 is incident to a clique in Q' instead of Q , we are still counting a full $\binom{w}{2}$ for the clique in Q' that receives it, so we have also accounted for the edges of these cliques in Q' .

Each remaining edge is incident to at least one vertex of $M_1 - K$ or belongs to a clique in Q' contained in the neighborhood of some $x \in M_1 - K$. We consider the potential contribution for each such x . The edges incident to x , together with the edges of any cliques in Q' wholly contained in $N(x)$, form a webbed star. We have already accounted for an edge from x to P . Hence the number of edges in the webbed star of interest is bounded by $h(D - 1, w)$. Since each vertex of $M_1 - K$ has a neighbor in P , and there are at most $3D - 4$ edges from P to M_1 , we have $|M_1 - K| \leq 3D - 4$. We have shown that the specified terms account for all the edges. \square

LEMMA 9. If $G \in \mathbf{G}$ and $w \leq \max\{D/2, D - 6\}$, then $e(G) < g(D)$.

Proof: The bound of Lemma 8 is increasing in w for each k ; we show it is below $g(D)$ for the range of w specified here. The only term that can make a contribution quartic in D is $k(D - k)(1 + \binom{w}{2})$, and the quartic contribution is at most $D^4/8$. Hence Lemma 8 already gives the asymptotic optimality of our construction. To show that a graph with small clique number cannot be larger, we must consider the cubic contribution from the last term.

If $w \leq D/2$, then $h(D - 1, w) \leq D^2/4$ and $\binom{w}{2} \leq D(D - 2)/8$. With these values, we maximize the function by setting $k = \lceil D/2 \rceil$. We obtain $e(G) \leq \frac{1}{32}(D^4 + 18D^3 - 20D^2 + 2D)$, which is less than $g(D)$ for $D \geq 4$. If $D/2 < w \leq D - 5$, then $h(D - 1, w) \leq \binom{w}{2} + \binom{6}{2}$. Again the bound is maximized at about $k/2$, where it is bounded by $\frac{1}{8}(D^4 - D^3 - 97D^2 + 800D)$. This is smaller than $g(D)$ whenever $D/2 < D - 5$. \square

For the top few values of w , we must further reduce the cubic term in the bound by considering the role of the clique W . The next argument applies whenever $w \geq D/2 + 1$. We included the simple lemma above because the argument here for disjointness of W and K is not valid when $(D - w + 2)/2 < w < D/2$.

LEMMA 10. If $G \in \mathbf{G}$ and $w \geq D/2 + 1$, then $e(G) \leq f(D, w, k)$, where

$$f(D, w, k) = 3D - 2 + \binom{w-2}{2} + \binom{k}{2} + k(D-k)(1 + \binom{w}{2}) \\ + (w-2)h(D-w+1, w) + (3D-2w-k)h(D-1, w).$$

Proof: We refine the argument of Lemma 8. Again there are at most $3D-2$ edges incident to vertices of P and $\binom{k}{2}$ within K . There are also $\binom{w-2}{2}$ edges within $W - \{\alpha, \beta\}$. Again the number of edges between K and M_2 plus those in $\cup_{x \in K} H(x)$ is at most $k(D-k)(1 + \binom{w}{2})$. These contributions are the same as in Lemma 8, except that here we have also counted the edges within W . We claim that the last two terms in the formula bound the number of other edges.

Each edge that remains belongs to a webbed star centered at some vertex of $M_1 - K$. The peripheral cliques of each such subgraph belong to Q' or are single vertices in M_1 . Suppose first that $W \cap K = \emptyset$. Since the edges within W have already been counted, there remains degree at most $D-w+1$ for each vertex of W in the webbed star centered at it. The term $(w-2)h(D-w+1, w)$ bounds these contributions. There are at most $3D-2w-k$ vertices in $M_1 - K - W$, each having at least one edge to P , so each has degree at most $D-1$ in the webbed star it contributes. The term $(3D-2w-k)h(D-1, w)$ bounds these contributions. Hence $f(D, w, k)$ is an upper bound on $e(G)$ when $W \cap K = \emptyset$.

Now suppose $|K \cap W| = r$; note that $r \leq w-2$. If $r > 0$, we obtain a better upper bound than $f(D, w, k)$. For each vertex of $W - K$, we count $h(D-w+1, w)$, as before. For each vertex of $M_1 - K - W$, we count $h(D-1, w)$, as before. For each vertex of $K - W$, we count $(D-k)(1 + \binom{w}{2})$, as before. For each vertex of $K \cap W$, we have already counted the $(k-1) + (w-1) - (r-1)$ edges incident to it within K and W , so the degree that remains is at most $D-k-w+r+1$. Since these vertices are in K , we may have a full clique in Q for each such edge, so the contribution from each vertex of $K \cap W$ is at most $(D-k-w+r+1)(1 + \binom{w}{2})$.

We have $|W - K| = w-r$ and $|K - W| = k-r$. Since vertices of $K \cap W$ already have neighbors in P by virtue of membership in W , we have r extra edges from P available, yielding $|M_1 - K - W| \leq 3D-2w-k+r$. In comparison to $f(D, w, k)$, the contribution from $M_1 - K - W$ may be larger by $rh(D-1, w)$, and the contribution from $W - K$ is smaller by $rh(D-w+1, w)$. The r vertices of $K \cap W$ each can contribute only $D-k-w+r+1$ cliques of Q instead of the $D-k$ counted in $f(D, w, k)$, so here we lose $r(w-r-1)(1 + \binom{w}{2})$.

Since $r \leq w-2$, we can show that the net change from $f(D, w, k)$ is negative when r is positive by proving that $h(D-1, w) - h(D-w+1, w) < 1 + \binom{w}{2}$. Because we may assume $D/2 < w \leq D$, we need only consider one range for $h(D-w+1, w)$ and one range for $h(D-1, w)$. We have $h(D-1, w) - h(D-w+1, w) = \binom{w}{2} + \binom{D-w+1}{2} - \binom{D-w+2}{2}$ for w in this range. This is indeed less than $\binom{w}{2}$. \square

LEMMA 11. If $G \in \mathbf{G}$, $e(G) \geq g(D)$ and $D \geq 5$, then $w = D$ and $W \cap K = \emptyset$.

Proof: By Lemma 9, we may assume $w \geq D/2 + 1$. In this range, the function $f(D, w, k)$ is $3D - 2 + \binom{w-2}{2} + \binom{k}{2} + k(D-k)(1 + \binom{w}{2}) + (w-2)\binom{D-w+2}{2} + (3D-2w-k)[\binom{w}{2} + \binom{D-w+1}{2}]$. The derivative of this function with respect to w is positive for all cases in this range. Hence for each choice of D, k , the function is maximized by maximizing w . When $w = D$, the function may exceed $g(D)$. When $w = D - 1$, the function is maximized (when $D \geq 5$) by setting $k = \lfloor D/2 \rfloor$, where it equals $\frac{1}{8}[D^4 - D^3 + 11D^2 + 2D - 8]$ if D is even and $\frac{1}{8}[D^4 - D^3 + 12D^2 - 3D - 1]$ if D is odd. These quantities are less than $g(D)$.

Hence we may assume $w = D$. The value $f(D, D, k)$ is maximized by $k = \lfloor D/2 \rfloor$, where it equals $\frac{1}{8}[D^4 + D^3 + 5D^2 + 10D - 8]$ if D is even and $\frac{1}{8}[D^4 + D^3 + 6D^2 + 7D - 7]$ if D is odd. These values slightly exceed $g(D)$ (for other k , the values are less than $g(D)$). For $w = D$ and $k = \lfloor D/2 \rfloor$, we consider $r = |W \cap K|$. As computed in the preceding proof (after setting $w = D$), if $r > 0$ we must reduce the edge bound by at least r times $(D - 1 - r)(1 + \binom{D}{2}) - (\binom{D}{2} - 1)$. This is minimized by $r = 1$, where it equals $\frac{1}{2}[D^3 - 4D^2 + 5D - 2]$. When we subtract this from the largest value of $f(D, D, k)$, the bound is below $g(D)$ for $D \geq 4$. Hence we may assume $r = 0$. \square

5. THE DELICATE CASE

There remains the case $w = D$ and $W \cap K = \emptyset$. Our analysis is guided by the way in which the decomposition in Fig. 2 describes the graph G_{k+1} of Fig. 1. In G_{k+1} , the clique W must be a peripheral clique, and the central $(k+1)$ -clique is $K \cup \gamma$. Hence it is natural that $f(D, D, k)$ is maximized at $k = \lfloor D/2 \rfloor$, since $e(G_k)$ is maximized at $k = \lceil (D+1)/2 \rceil$. In G_{k+1} , the vertex playing the role of γ has single edges to cliques; these cliques consist of one vertex of M_1 and one $(D-1)$ -clique in Q' . In G_{k+1} , no components of H_2 contain neighbors of W , α has degree $D-1$, and no edges link K to the rest of M_1 . The edges of G_{k+1} are completely counted by $3D - 3 + \binom{D-2}{2} + \binom{k}{2} + k(D-k)(1 + \binom{D}{2}) + (D-1-k)\binom{D}{2}$. This equals $e(G_{k+1}) = (k+1)(D-k)(1 + \binom{D}{2}) + \binom{k+1}{2}$.

To obtain this bound, we must further refine our analysis of the restrictions on edges in graphs $G \in \mathbf{G}$ that have at least $g(D)$ edges. The amount by which $f(D, D, k)$ can exceed $g(D)$ is $\frac{1}{2}(D^2 + D - 2)$, whether D is even or odd. Hence it suffices to prove that $e(G) < f(D, D, k) - \frac{1}{2}(D^2 + D - 2)$ if $G \neq G_{k+1}$. We will do this by gradually forcing the structure to match G_{k+1} . We will show that the vertices of $W \cap M_1$ have no neighbors outside W , then that α

THEOREM 12. If $D \geq 8$, the maximum size of $G \in \mathbf{G}$ is $g(D)$, achieved uniquely by G_{k+1} for $k = \lfloor D/2 \rfloor$.

Proof: If $e(G) \geq g(D)$, we already have $w = D$ and $W \cap K = \emptyset$ in Fig. 2, by Lemma 11. We want to improve the bound $e(G) \leq f(D, D, k)$ by at least $\frac{1}{2}(D^2 + D - 2) = \binom{D}{2} + (D-1)$. The computation of $f(D, D, k)$ uses $|Q| \leq k(D-k)$. For each unit reduction from $k(D-k)$ in the edges from K yielding components in Q , we reduce the bound by $\binom{D}{2}$. Two such losses bring it below $g(D)$. Hence we may have $|H(x)| = D - 1 - k$ for one

vertex x of K , but the remaining vertices of K must yield $D - k$ components in Q , and if there is such a “deficient” vertex the sets $H(x)$ are pairwise disjoint.

Numerically, comparison of $f(D, D, k)$ and $g(D)$ allows us to assume $3 \leq k \leq D - 3$ if $D \geq 8$. With k in this range, the remarks just made about Q imply that $e(G) \geq g(D)$ requires the following: for every component of H_2 , there is a vertex of K with no edge to that component, and every vertex of K has an edge to a clique in Q that has no edge from another vertex of K .

Let $W' = W \cap M_1$. Suppose some vertex $u \in W'$ has a neighbor v in M_2 . Choose $z \in K$ such that z has no neighbor in the component of H_2 containing v . If there is only one choice for z , then $z \notin N(\alpha)$, else we have already reduced $k(D - k)$ by at least 2 (since $k \geq 3$). If there is more than one choice for z , we can pick one outside $N(\alpha)$, since α already has $D - 1$ neighbors in W . Hence we can choose z and two vertices from an element of $Q(z)$, inducing P_3 , all non-adjacent to the vertices α, u, v , which also induce P_3 .

Hence we may assume that there is no edge between W' and M_2 . If there is any edge between W' and $(M_1 - W) \cup \{\gamma\}$, then it is counted in the contributions to $f(D, D, k)$ for the vertex outside W' . Hence we may reduce the contribution to $f(D, D, k)$ from each webbed star centered at a vertex of W' from $h(D - w + 1, w) = h(1, D) = 1$ to 0. This reduces the bound by $D - 2$, after which a further reduction of $\binom{D}{2} + 1$ will be sufficient to reach $g(D)$.

Let $M' = M_1 - K - W$. The contribution to $f(D, D, k)$ from each vertex of M' is at most $h(D - 1, D) = \binom{D}{2}$. Since $f(D, D, k)$ allots $(3D - 2w - k) = D - k$ for $|M'|$, any reduction in $|M'|$ reduces this contribution by $\binom{D}{2}$. If α, γ have a common neighbor in K , then $|M'| \leq D - k - 1$ and $|Q| < k(D - k)$, and we lose $\binom{D}{2}$ twice from the bound. If α, γ have a common neighbor $x \in M'$, then $|M'| \leq D - k - 1$. Also, the degree of x for its webbed star is now at most $D - 2$, so this star contributes at most $\binom{D-1}{2}$ to the count instead of $\binom{D}{2}$. Together, we again have a sufficient reduction in the bound. Hence we may assume that α, γ have no common neighbor outside W .

At most one vertex in $M_1 - W$ is in $N(\alpha)$; the rest are in $N(\gamma)$. If α has a neighbor $x \in M'$ that has a neighbor $y \in K$, then again $|Q|$ goes down by one and x has degree at most $D - 1$ in its webbed star, and the saving is sufficient. By the same computation, if $x \in K$ and $y \in M'$, then these vertices cannot be adjacent. Now it is possible to find an induced $2P_3$ using α, x in one path and γ, y in the other if α has a neighbor x outside W .

Hence we may assume that α has no neighbor outside W . This implies that $|M'| \leq D - k - 1$. Also, the number of edges incident to P is at most $3D - 3$, not $3D - 2$. This yields the additional desired reduction of $\binom{D}{2} + 1$ in the bound. Now $e(G) \leq g(D)$, and equality requires that all other contributions to $f(D, D, k)$ are achieved with equality. This prevents edges between W' and $M_1 - W'$, forces each vertex of the $D - 1 - k$ vertices of M' to belong to a pendant clique, and forces $k(D - k)$ cliques in Q . In short, it forces $G = G_{k+1}$. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] B. Bollobás, *Extremal Graph Theory*, (Academic Press 1978), 292-367.
- [2] F.R.K. Chung, A. Gyárfás, Z. Tuza, and W.T. Trotter, The maximum number of edges in a $2K_2$ -free graph, *Discrete Math.* 81(1990), 129–135.
- [3] M. Chung and D.B. West, Large P_4 -free graphs with bounded degree, *J. Graph Theory* 17(1993), 109–116.
- [4] M. Chung and D.B. West, Large P_5 -free and $P_3 + P_2$ -free graphs, preprint.