Graph Theory Part One

Outline for Today

- Graphs and Digraphs
 - Two fundamental mathematical structures.
- Graphs Meet FOL
 - Building visual intuitions.
- Independent Sets and Vertex Covers
 - Two structures in graphs.

Graphs and Digraphs



Chemical Bonds



http://4.bp.blogspot.com/-xCtBJ8lKHqA/Tjm0BONWBRI/AAAAAAAAAAAK4/-mHrbAUOHHg/s1600/



https://xkcd.com/1195/







What's in Common

- Each of these structures consists of
 - a collection of objects and
 - links between those objects.
- *Goal:* find a general framework for describing these objects and their properties.





A graph consists of a set of **nodes** (or **vertices**) connected by **edges** (or **arcs**)



A graph consists of a set of **nodes** (or **vertices**) connected by **edges** (or **arcs**)



A graph consists of a set of **nodes** (or **vertices**) connected by **edges** (or **arcs**)



Some graphs are *undirected*.



Graphs and Digraphs

- An *undirected graph* is one where edges link nodes, with no endpoint preferred over the other.
- A *directed graph* (or *digraph*) is one where edges have an associated direction.
- (There's something called a *mixed graph* that allows for both, but they're fairly uncommon and we won't talk about them.)
- Unless specified otherwise:

Se "Graph" means "undirected graph" Se

Formalizing Graphs

- How might we define a graph mathematically?
- We need to specify
 - what the nodes in the graph are, and
 - which edges are in the graph.
- The nodes can be pretty much anything.
- What about the edges?

Formalizing Graphs

- An *unordered pair* is a set {a, b} of two elements a ≠ b. (Remember that sets are unordered.)
 - For example, $\{0, 1\} = \{1, 0\}$
- An **undirected graph** is an ordered pair G = (V, E), where
 - *V* is a set of nodes, which can be anything, and
 - E is a set of edges, which are *unordered* pairs of nodes drawn from V.
- A **directed graph** (or **digraph**) is an ordered pair G = (V, E), where
 - *V* is a set of nodes, which can be anything, and
 - *E* is a set of edges, which are *ordered* pairs of nodes drawn from *V*.

- An *unordered pair* is a set $\{a, b\}$ of two elements $a \neq b$.
- An *undirected graph* is an ordered pair G = (V, E), where
 - V is a set of nodes, which can be anything, and
 - E is a set of edges, which are unordered pairs of nodes drawn from V.



How many of these drawings are of valid undirected graphs?

Respond at pollev.com/zhenglian740

Self-Loops

- An edge from a node to itself is called a *self-loop*.
- In (undirected) graphs, self-loops are generally not allowed.
 - Can you see how this follows from the definition?
- In digraphs, self-loops are generally allowed unless specified otherwise.





The Great Graph Gallery



Is this formula true about this graph? $\forall u \in V. \ \exists v \in V. \ \{u, v\} \in E$









Respond at pollev.com/zhenglian740



Is this formula true about this graph? $\exists u \in V. \forall v \in V. \{u, v\} \in E$



Is this formula true about this graph? $\exists u \in V. \forall v \in V. \{u, v\} \in E$

Walks, Paths, and Reachability









Using our Formalisms

- Let G = (V, E) be an (undirected) graph.
- Intuitively, two nodes are adjacent if they're linked by an edge.
- Formally speaking, we say that two nodes $u, v \in V$ are *adjacent* if we have $\{u, v\} \in E$.
- There isn't an analogous notion for directed graphs. We usually just say "there's an edge from u to v" as a way of reading $(u, v) \in E$ aloud.




























The *length* of the walk $v_1, ..., v_n$ is n - 1.





The *length* of the walk $v_1, ..., v_n$ is n - 1.



The *length* of the walk $v_1, ..., v_n$ is n - 1.



The *length* of the walk $v_1, ..., v_n$ is n - 1.



The *length* of the walk $v_1, ..., v_n$ is n - 1.



The *length* of the walk $v_1, ..., v_n$ is n - 1.

A *closed walk* in a graph is a walk from a node back to itself. (By convention, a closed walk cannot have length zero.)

SF, Sac, LA



The *length* of the walk $v_1, ..., v_n$ is n - 1.



The *length* of the walk $v_1, ..., v_n$ is n - 1.



The *length* of the walk $v_1, ..., v_n$ is n - 1.

A *closed walk* in a graph is a walk from a node back to itself. (By convention, a closed walk cannot have length zero.)

SF, Sac, LA, Phoe, Flag, Bar



The *length* of the walk $v_1, ..., v_n$ is n - 1.

A *closed walk* in a graph is a walk from a node back to itself. (By convention, a closed walk cannot have length zero.)

SF, Sac, LA, Phoe, Flag, Bar, LA



The *length* of the walk $v_1, ..., v_n$ is n - 1.

A *closed walk* in a graph is a walk from a node back to itself. (By convention, a closed walk cannot have length zero.)

SF, Sac, LA, Phoe, Flag, Bar, LA



The *length* of the walk $v_1, ..., v_n$ is n - 1.

A *closed walk* in a graph is a walk from a node back to itself. (By convention, a closed walk cannot have length zero.)

A *path* in a graph is walk that does not repeat any nodes.

SF, Sac, LA, Phoe, Flag, Bar, LA



The *length* of the walk $v_1, ..., v_n$

A *closed walk* in a graph is a walk from a node back to itself. (By convention, a closed walk cannot have length zero.)



The *length* of the walk $v_1, ..., v_n$

A *closed walk* in a graph is a walk from a node back to itself. (By convention, a closed walk



The *length* of the walk $v_1, ..., v_n$ is n - 1.

A *closed walk* in a graph is a walk from a node back to itself. (By convention, a closed walk cannot have length zero.)



The *length* of the walk $v_1, ..., v_n$ is n - 1.

A *closed walk* in a graph is a walk from a node back to itself. (By convention, a closed walk cannot have length zero.)



The *length* of the walk $v_1, ..., v_n$ is n - 1.

A *closed walk* in a graph is a walk from a node back to itself. (By convention, a closed walk cannot have length zero.)



The *length* of the walk $v_1, ..., v_n$ is n - 1.

A *closed walk* in a graph is a walk from a node back to itself. (By convention, a closed walk cannot have length zero.)



The *length* of the walk $v_1, ..., v_n$ is n - 1.

A *closed walk* in a graph is a walk from a node back to itself. (By convention, a closed walk cannot have length zero.)



The *length* of the walk $v_1, ..., v_n$ is n - 1.

A *closed walk* in a graph is a walk from a node back to itself. (By convention, a closed walk cannot have length zero.)



The *length* of the walk $v_1, ..., v_n$ is n - 1.

A *closed walk* in a graph is a walk from a node back to itself. (By convention, a closed walk cannot have length zero.)



The *length* of the walk $v_1, ..., v_n$ is n - 1.

A *closed walk* in a graph is a walk from a node back to itself. (By convention, a closed walk cannot have length zero.)



The *length* of the walk $v_1, ..., v_n$ is n - 1.

A *closed walk* in a graph is a walk from a node back to itself. (By convention, a closed walk cannot have length zero.)

A *path* in a graph is walk that does not repeat any nodes.

A *cycle* in a graph is a closed walk that does not repeat any nodes or edges except the first/last node.


The *length* of the walk $v_1, ..., v_n$ is n - 1.

A *closed walk* in a graph is a walk from a node back to itself. (By convention, a closed walk cannot have length zero.)

A *path* in a graph is walk that does not repeat any nodes.



The *length* of the walk $v_1, ..., v_n$ is n - 1.

A *closed walk* in a graph is a walk from a node back to itself. (By convention, a closed walk cannot have length zero.)

A *path* in a graph is walk that does not repeat any nodes.



The *length* of the walk $v_1, ..., v_n$ is n - 1.

A *closed walk* in a graph is a walk from a node back to itself. (By convention, a closed walk cannot have length zero.)

A *path* in a graph is walk that does not repeat any nodes.



The *length* of the walk $v_1, ..., v_n$ is n - 1.

A *closed walk* in a graph is a walk from a node back to itself. (By convention, a closed walk cannot have length zero.)

A *path* in a graph is walk that does not repeat any nodes.













A *path* in a graph is walk that does not repeat any nodes.

A node *v* is *reachable* from a node *u* if there is a path from *u* to *v*.



A *path* in a graph is walk that does not repeat any nodes.

A node *v* is *reachable* from a node *u* if there is a path from *u* to *v*.



A *path* in a graph is walk that does not repeat any nodes.

A node *v* is *reachable* from a node *u* if there is a path from *u* to *v*.

A graph *G* is called *connected* if all pairs of distinct nodes in *G* are reachable.



A *path* in a graph is walk that does not repeat any nodes.

A node *v* is *reachable* from a node *u* if there is a path from *u* to *v*.

A graph *G* is called *connected* if all pairs of distinct nodes in *G* are reachable.

(This graph is not connected.)





A *path* in a graph is walk that does not repeat any nodes.

A node *v* is *reachable* from a node *u* if there is a path from *u* to *v*.

A graph *G* is called *connected* if all pairs of distinct nodes in *G* are reachable.





A *path* in a graph is walk that does not repeat any nodes.

A node *v* is *reachable* from a node *u* if there is a path from *u* to *v*.

A graph *G* is called *connected* if all pairs of distinct nodes in *G* are reachable.

A *connected component* (or *CC*) of *G* is a maximal set of mutually reachable nodes.

Fun Facts

- Here's a collection of useful facts about graphs that you can take as a given.
 - **Theorem:** If G = (V, E) is a graph and $u, v \in V$, then there is a path from u to v if and only if there's a walk from u to v.
 - **Theorem:** If G is a graph and C is a cycle in G, then C's length is at least three and C contains at least three nodes.
 - **Theorem:** If G = (V, E) is a graph, then every node in V belongs to exactly one connected component of G.
 - **Theorem:** If G = (V, E) is a graph, then G is connected if and only if G has exactly one connected component.
- Looking for more practice working with formal definitions? Prove these results!

Time-Out for Announcements!

Problem Set 1 Graded



Pro tips when reading a grading distribution:

- 1. Standard deviations are *malicious lies*. Ignore them.
- 2. The average score is a *malicious lie*. Ignore it.
- 3. Raw scores are *malicious lies*. Ignore them.

Problem Set 1 Graded







Problem Set 1 Graded



Problem Set Three

- Problem Set Two was due today at 5:30PM.
- Problem Set Three goes out today. It's due next Friday at 5:30PM.
- As always, ping us if you need help working on this one: post on EdStem or stop by office hours.

Preparing for the Exam

- We've posted a "Preparing for the Exam" page on the course website with full details and logistics.
- It also includes advice from former CS103 students about how to do well here.
- Check it out there are tons of goodies there!

Practice Midterms

- We've also posted two practice midterms. These midterms were from the previous summer quarters, so they should approximate the difficulty and structure of the upcoming midterm.
- Our recommendation:
 - Sometime during week 4, sit down and take Practice Midterm 1 as if it were the actual exam.
 - Identify any gaps in your understanding, and supplement with the extra practice problems as needed.
 - Sometime during week 5 (before the real exam), sit down and take Practice Midterm 2.
- Please do *not* read the solutions to a problem until you have worked through it.

Back to CS103!

Independent Sets and Vertex Covers

Two Motivating Problems

















Choose at least one endpoint of each edge.



Choose at least one endpoint of each edge.


Choose at least one endpoint of each edge.



Choose at least one endpoint of each edge.

Vertex Covers

• Let G = (V, E) be an undirected graph. A *vertex cover* of *G* is a set $C \subseteq V$ such that the following statement is true:

$\forall x \in V. \ \forall y \in V. \ (\{x, y\} \in E \rightarrow (x \in C \lor y \in C))$

("Every edge has at least one endpoint in C.")

- Intuitively speaking, a vertex cover is a set formed by picking at least one endpoint of each edge in the graph.
- Vertex covers have applications to placing streetlights/benches/security guards, as well as in gene sequencing, machine learning, and combinatorics.























Choose a set of nodes, no two of which are adjacent.

Independent Sets

• If G = (V, E) is an (undirected) graph, then an *independent set* in G is a set $I \subseteq V$ such that

$\forall u \in I. \forall v \in I. \{u, v\} \notin E.$

("No two nodes in I are adjacent.")

 Independent sets have applications to resource optimization, conflict minimization, error-correcting codes, cryptography, and more.

A Connection



Independent sets and vertex covers are related.



Independent sets and vertex covers are related.



Theorem: Let G = (V, E) be a graph and let $C \subseteq V$ be a set. Then C is a vertex cover of G if and only if V - C is an independent set in G.

What We're Assuming G is a graph. C is a vertex cover of G. $\forall u \in V. \forall v \in V. (\{u, v\} \in E \rightarrow u \in C \ \lor v \in C$) What We Need To Show

V - C is an independent set in G. ∀ $x \in V - C$. ∀ $y \in V - C$. {x, y} ∉ E.

What We're Assuming

G is a graph.

```
C is a vertex cover of G.
```

```
 \forall u \in V. \ \forall v \in V. \ (\{u, v\} \in E \rightarrow u \in C \quad \forall v \in V \quad v \in C
```

We're assuming a universallyquantified statement. That means we *don't do anything right now* and instead wait for an edge to present itself. What We Need To Show

V - C is an independent set in G. ∀ $x \in V - C$. ∀ $y \in V - C$. {x, y} ∉ E.

> We need to prove a universallyquantified statement. We'll ask the reader to pick arbitrary choices of *x* and *y* for us to work with.

What We're Assuming

G is a graph.

```
C is a vertex cover of G.
```

```
 \forall u \in V. \ \forall v \in V. \ (\{u, v\} \in E \rightarrow u \in C \quad \forall v \in V \quad v \in C
```

What We Need To Show

V - C is an independent set in G. ∀ $x \in V - C$. ∀ $y \in V - C$. {x, y} ∉ E.

> We need to prove a universallyquantified statement. We'll ask the reader to pick arbitrary choices of *x* and *y* for us to work with.

What We're Assuming *G* is a graph. C is a vertex cover of G. $\forall u \in V. \ \forall v \in V. (\{u, v\} \in E \rightarrow$ $u \in C \quad \forall \quad v \in C$ $x \in V - C$. $y \in V - C$.

What We Need To Show

V - C is an independent set in G.

 $\forall x \in V - C.$ $\forall y \in V - C.$ $\{x, y\} \notin E.$



Proof:

Proof: Assume *C* is a vertex cover of *G*.

There's no need to introduce *G* or *C* here. That's done in the statement of the lemma itself.

- **Lemma 1:** Let G = (V, E) be a graph and let $C \subseteq V$ be a set. If C is a vertex cover of G, then V C is an independent set of G.
- **Proof:** Assume C is a vertex cover of G. We need to show that V C is an independent set of G.

- **Lemma 1:** Let G = (V, E) be a graph and let $C \subseteq V$ be a set. If *C* is a vertex cover of *G*, then V C is an independent set of *G*.
- **Proof:** Assume *C* is a vertex cover of *G*. We need to show that V C is an independent set of *G*. To do so, pick any nodes $x, y \in V C$; we will show that $\{x, y\} \notin E$.

- **Lemma 1:** Let G = (V, E) be a graph and let $C \subseteq V$ be a set. If *C* is a vertex cover of *G*, then V C is an independent set of *G*.
- **Proof:** Assume *C* is a vertex cover of *G*. We need to show that V C is an independent set of *G*. To do so, pick any nodes $x, y \in V C$; we will show that $\{x, y\} \notin E$.

Suppose for the sake of contradiction that $\{x, y\} \in E$.

- **Lemma 1:** Let G = (V, E) be a graph and let $C \subseteq V$ be a set. If *C* is a vertex cover of *G*, then V C is an independent set of *G*.
- **Proof:** Assume *C* is a vertex cover of *G*. We need to show that V C is an independent set of *G*. To do so, pick any nodes $x, y \in V C$; we will show that $\{x, y\} \notin E$.

Suppose for the sake of contradiction that $\{x, y\} \in E$. Because $x, y \in V - C$, we know that $x \notin C$ and $y \notin C$.

- **Lemma 1:** Let G = (V, E) be a graph and let $C \subseteq V$ be a set. If *C* is a vertex cover of *G*, then V C is an independent set of *G*.
- **Proof:** Assume *C* is a vertex cover of *G*. We need to show that V C is an independent set of *G*. To do so, pick any nodes $x, y \in V C$; we will show that $\{x, y\} \notin E$.

- **Lemma 1:** Let G = (V, E) be a graph and let $C \subseteq V$ be a set. If C is a vertex cover of G, then V C is an independent set of G.
- **Proof:** Assume *C* is a vertex cover of *G*. We need to show that V C is an independent set of *G*. To do so, pick any nodes $x, y \in V C$; we will show that $\{x, y\} \notin E$.

We've reached a contradiction, so our assumption was wrong.

- **Lemma 1:** Let G = (V, E) be a graph and let $C \subseteq V$ be a set. If C is a vertex cover of G, then V C is an independent set of G.
- **Proof:** Assume *C* is a vertex cover of *G*. We need to show that V C is an independent set of *G*. To do so, pick any nodes $x, y \in V C$; we will show that $\{x, y\} \notin E$.

We've reached a contradiction, so our assumption was wrong. Therefore, we have $\{x, y\} \notin E$, as required.

- **Lemma 1:** Let G = (V, E) be a graph and let $C \subseteq V$ be a set. If *C* is a vertex cover of *G*, then V C is an independent set of *G*.
- **Proof:** Assume *C* is a vertex cover of *G*. We need to show that V C is an independent set of *G*. To do so, pick any nodes $x, y \in V C$; we will show that $\{x, y\} \notin E$.

We've reached a contradiction, so our assumption was wrong. Therefore, we have $\{x, y\} \notin E$, as required.

Taking Negations

• What is the negation of this statement, which says "*C* is a vertex cover?"

 $\forall u \in C. \ \forall v \in C. (\{u, v\} \in E \rightarrow u \in C \quad \forall v \in V \quad v \in C)$

Respond at pollev.com/zhenglian740

Taking Negations

• What is the negation of this statement, which says "*C* is a vertex cover?"

```
\neg \forall u \in C. \forall v \in C. (\{u, v\} \in E \rightarrow u \in C \quad \forall v \in V \quad v \in C )
```
```
\exists u \in C. \ \neg \forall v \in C. (\{u, v\} \in E \rightarrow u \in C \quad \forall v \in C )
```

```
\exists u \in C. \ \exists v \in C. \ \neg(\{u, v\} \in E \rightarrow u \in C \quad \lor \quad v \in C )
```

```
\exists u \in C. \ \exists v \in C. (\{u, v\} \in E \land \neg (u \in C \lor v \lor v \in C))
```

```
\exists u \in C. \ \exists v \in C. (\{u, v\} \in E \land u \notin C \land v \notin C )
```

• What is the negation of this statement, which says "*C* is a vertex cover?"

$$\exists u \in C. \ \exists v \in C. (\{u, v\} \in E \land u \notin C \land v \notin C)$$

• This says "there is an edge where both endpoints aren't in *C*."

```
What We're Assuming

G is a graph.

C is a not a vertex cover of G.

\exists u \in V. \exists v \in V. (\{u, v\} \in E \land u \notin C \land v \notin C

)
```

What We Need To Show

```
V - C \text{ is not an ind. set in } G.\exists x \in V - C.\exists y \in V - C.\{x, y\} \in E.
```

What We're Assuming G is a graph. C is a not a vertex cover of G. $\exists u \in V. \ \exists v \in V. (\{u, v\} \in E \land u \notin C \land v \notin C$

We're assuming an existentially-quantified statement, so we'll *immediately* introduce variables *U* and *V*.

What We Need To Show

```
V - C \text{ is not an ind. set in } G.\exists x \in V - C.\exists y \in V - C.\{x, y\} \in E.
```

We're proving an existentially-quantified statement, so we *don't* introduce variables *X* and *Y*. We're on a scavenger hunt!

What We're Assuming *G* is a graph. *C* is a not a vertex cover of *G*. $u \in V - C$. $v \in V - C$. $\{u, v\} \in E.$

We're assuming an existentially-quantified statement, so we'll *immediately* introduce variables *U* and *V*.

What We Need To Show

V - C is not an ind. set in G. ∃ $x \in V - C$. ∃ $y \in V - C$. {x, y} ∈ E.

What We're Assuming
G is a graph.
C is a not a vertex cover of G
$u \in V - C$.
$v \in V - C$.
$\{u, v\} \in E.$

What We Need To Show

V - C is not an ind. set in G. $\exists x \in V - C.$ $\exists y \in V - C.$ $\{x, y\} \in E.$

Any ideas about what we should pick *X* and *Y* to be?

Proof:

Proof: Assume *C* is not a vertex cover of *G*.

- **Lemma 2:** Let G = (V, E) be a graph and let $C \subseteq V$ be a set. If C is not a vertex cover of G, then V C is not an independent set of G.
- **Proof:** Assume C is not a vertex cover of G. We need to show that V C is not an independent set of G.

- **Lemma 2:** Let G = (V, E) be a graph and let $C \subseteq V$ be a set. If C is not a vertex cover of G, then V C is not an independent set of G.
- **Proof:** Assume C is not a vertex cover of G. We need to show that V C is not an independent set of G.

Since *C* is not a vertex cover of *G*, we know that there exists nodes $x, y \in V$ where $\{x, y\} \in E$, where $x \notin C$, and where $y \notin C$.

- **Lemma 2:** Let G = (V, E) be a graph and let $C \subseteq V$ be a set. If C is not a vertex cover of G, then V C is not an independent set of G.
- **Proof:** Assume C is not a vertex cover of G. We need to show that V C is not an independent set of G.

Since *C* is not a vertex cover of *G*, we know that there exists nodes $x, y \in V$ where $\{x, y\} \in E$, where $x \notin C$, and where $y \notin C$. Because $x \in V$ and $x \notin C$, we know that $x \in V - C$.

- **Lemma 2:** Let G = (V, E) be a graph and let $C \subseteq V$ be a set. If C is not a vertex cover of G, then V C is not an independent set of G.
- **Proof:** Assume C is not a vertex cover of G. We need to show that V C is not an independent set of G.

Since *C* is not a vertex cover of *G*, we know that there exists nodes $x, y \in V$ where $\{x, y\} \in E$, where $x \notin C$, and where $y \notin C$. Because $x \in V$ and $x \notin C$, we know that $x \in V - C$. Similarly, we see that $y \in V - C$.

- **Lemma 2:** Let G = (V, E) be a graph and let $C \subseteq V$ be a set. If C is not a vertex cover of G, then V C is not an independent set of G.
- **Proof:** Assume C is not a vertex cover of G. We need to show that V C is not an independent set of G.

Since *C* is not a vertex cover of *G*, we know that there exists nodes $x, y \in V$ where $\{x, y\} \in E$, where $x \notin C$, and where $y \notin C$. Because $x \in V$ and $x \notin C$, we know that $x \in V - C$. Similarly, we see that $y \in V - C$.

This means that $\{x, y\} \in E$, that $x \in V - C$, and that $y \in V - C$, and therefore that V - C is not an independent set of *G*, as required.

- **Lemma 2:** Let G = (V, E) be a graph and let $C \subseteq V$ be a set. If C is not a vertex cover of G, then V C is not an independent set of G.
- **Proof:** Assume C is not a vertex cover of G. We need to show that V C is not an independent set of G.

Since *C* is not a vertex cover of *G*, we know that there exists nodes $x, y \in V$ where $\{x, y\} \in E$, where $x \notin C$, and where $y \notin C$. Because $x \in V$ and $x \notin C$, we know that $x \in V - C$. Similarly, we see that $y \in V - C$.

This means that $\{x, y\} \in E$, that $x \in V - C$, and that $y \in V - C$, and therefore that V - C is not an independent set of *G*, as required.

Recap for Today

- A *graph* is a structure for representing items that may be linked together. *Digraphs* represent that same idea, but with a directionality on the links.
- Graphs can't have *self-loops*; digraphs can.
- *Vertex covers* and *independent sets* are useful tools for modeling problems with graphs.
- The complement of a vertex cover is an independent set, and vice-versa.

Next Time

- The Pigeonhole Principle
 - A simple, powerful, versatile theorem.
- Graph Theory Party Tricks
 - Applying math to graphs of people!