Line graphs of hypergraphs I

Jean-Claude Bermond, Marie-Claude Heydemann, Dominique Sotteau

▶ **To cite this version:**

Jean-Claude Bermond, Marie-Claude Heydemann, Dominique Sotteau. Line graphs of hypergraphs I. Discrete Mathematics, 1977, 18 (3), pp.235-241. 10.1016/0012-365X(77)90127-3 . hal-02360671

HAL Id: hal-02360671

https://inria.hal.science/hal-02360671

Submitted on 13 Nov 2019

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

LINE GRAPHS OF HYPERGRAPHS I

J.C. BERMOND, M.C. HEYDEMANN and D. SOTTEAU

Université de Paris-Sud, Centre d'Orsay Mathématique, bât. 425, 91405 Orsay, France

We define the k-line graph of a hypergraph H as the graph whose vertices are the edges of H, two vertices being joined if the edges they represent intersect in at least k elements. In this paper we show that for any integer k and any graph G there exists a partial hypergraph H of some complete h-partite hypergraph $K^h_{h\times N}$ such that G is the k-line graph of H. We also prove that, for any integer p, there exist graphs which are not the $(h-p)$-line graph of some h-uniform hypergraph. As a corollary we answer a problem of C. Cook. Further we show that it is not possible to characterize the $(h-1)$-line graphs by excluding a finite number of forbidden induced subgraphs.

1. Introduction

1.1

A hypergraph H will always be defined by its vertex-set X and its edge-set $\mathscr{E} = \{E_i\}_{1\leqslant i\leqslant m}$. The hypergraph H is said to be h-uniform if $|E_i| = h$ for each i $(1 \leqslant i \leqslant m)$. In what follows we shall always consider h-uniform hypergraphs.

1.2

Let H be a given hypergraph, then we define the *k-line graph* of H, denoted by $L_k(H)$, as the graph (without loops or multiple edges) whose vertices (e_i) can be put in a one-to-one correspondence with the edges E_i in such a way that two vertices e_i and e_j in $L_k(H)$ are adjacent (joined) if and only if their corresponding edges in H, E_i and E_j, have at least k elements in common.

1.3

Let $K^h_{h\times N}$ be the complete h-partite hypergraph defined as follows: its vertex-set X is the union of h disjoint sets X_i $(1 \leqslant i \leqslant h)$ with $|X_i| = N$, and its edges are all the subsets E of X where $|E| = h$ and $|E \cap X_i| = 1$ for each i $(1 \leqslant i \leqslant h)$. Properties of $L_k(K^h_{h\times N})$ are studied in [2].

1.4

We define a *k-plane graph* as the k-line graph of an hypergraph H which is a partial hypergraph of $K^h_{h\times N}$ for some N.

1.5

A k-plane graph can be considered as a graph with distinct ordered h-tuples of integers as its vertex-set, in which two vertices are joined if and only if the corresponding h-tuples agree on k or more coordinates.

Such a graph is defined by Cook [3] as a plane graph in the case $k = 1$, and an arrow graph in the case $k = h - 1$.

1.6

In [3] Cook has shown that any graph G is a plane graph, that $K_4 - x$ is not an arrow graph and has asked whether any graph G is, for some h, an $(h - p)$-plane graph where p is a given integer.

In this paper we show that for any k, any graph G is a k-plane graph (Theorem 2.1), but that, for any p, there exist graphs which are not $(h - p)$-line graphs (Theorem 3.3) and consequently, not $(h - p)$-plane graphs. This answers Cook's question.

Furthermore we prove (Theorem 4.3) that, contrary to the line-graphs of graphs [1, Ch. 18], it is not possible to characterize the $(h - 1)$-plane graphs by excluding a finite number of forbidden induced subgraphs.

1.7

In what follows we shall always denote by $d(e_i, e_j)$ the distance between two vertices e_i and e_j of a graph G and by $D(e_i)$ the subgraph of G all of whose vertices are adjacent to e_i in G. We shall define an edge of an h-uniform hypergraph by the sequence of its vertices $\{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_h\}$. The notation $\{x_1, \ldots, \hat{x}_j, \ldots, x_h\}$ signifies that we consider the sequence of vertices $(x_i)_{1 \leq i \leq h}$ except x_j. All the definitions not given here can be found in [1].

2. Theorem 2.1

Theorem 2.1. *Let G be a given graph, k a given positive integer, then G is a k-plane graph, that is there exist integers h and N and an h-uniform partial hypergraph H of $K^h_{h \times N}$ such that $G = L_k(H)$.*

Proof. Let G be a given graph. We shall prove by induction on the number n of vertices of G that there exist an integer h and a family $(E_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ of h-tuples of integers not greater than n with the following property: there exists a one-to-one correspondence between the vertices $(e_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ of G and the $(E_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ such that for $i, j, 1 \leq i < j \leq n$, E_i and E_j agree on at least k coordinates if and only if $\{e_i, e_j\}$ is an edge of G.

The case $n = 1$ is trivial.

Suppose that we have proved it for a graph with $(n-1)$ vertices. Then if G is a graph with n vertices $e_1, \ldots, e_n$, by inductive hypothesis applied to $G - e_n$ we can find an integer l and $(n-1)$ l-tuples $(F_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n-1}$ of integers not greater than $n-1$ such that for each i, j, $1 \leq i < j \leq n-1$, F_i and F_j agree on at least k coordinates if and only if $d(e_i, e_j) = 1$.

Let $(e_i)_{i \in I}$ be the adjacent vertices of e_n in G, $I \subset \{1, \ldots, n-1\}$, and $|I| = d$. We construct n h-tuples $(E_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ with $h = l + dk$, as follows:

$\forall i$, $1 \leq i \leq n-1$, E_i is obtained from F_i by adding dk coordinates equal to i.

The l first coordinates of E_n are equal to n and, in the dk last ones, k of them are equal to i for each $i \in I$. It is easy to verify that the family (E_i) has the required property.

3. Theorem 3.3

For Theorem 3.3 we need the following lemma:

Lemma 3.1. *Let H be a given h-uniform hypergraph with edges $(E_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n}$, p a given integer, $p < h$, and $G = L_{h-p}(H)$ with vertices (e_i), $1 \leq i \leq n$. If $d(e_i, e_j) = l$, then $|E_i \cap E_j| \geq h - lp$.*

Proof. (By induction on l). According to the definition of $L_{h-p}(H)$ it is true for $l = 1$. Assume we have proved it for $l-1$. If $d(e_i, e_j) = l$ then there exists a vertex e of G such that $d(e, e_i) = 1$ and $d(e, e_j) = l - 1$ and consequently there exists an edge E of H such that $|E \cap E_i| \geq h - p$ and, by inductive hypothesis, $|E \cap E_j| \geq h - (l-1)p$. We can write:

$$h \geq |E \cap (E_i \cup E_j)| = |E \cap E_i| + |E \cap E_j| - |E \cap E_i \cap E_j|$$

so $h \geq h - p + h - (l-1)p - |E \cap E_i \cap E_j|$, therefore $|E_i \cap E_j| \geq |E \cap E_i \cap E_j| \geq h - lp$.

Remark 3.2. In particular, if $d(e_i, e_j) = 2$, then $h - p > |E_i \cap E_j| \geq h - 2p$.

Theorem 3.3. *Let p be a given integer. Then there exist graphs G which are not $L_{h-p}(H)$ for any integer $h > p$ and any h-uniform hypergraph H.*

Proof. We shall show that for any integer p, there exists an integer N depending only on p such that the complete bipartite graph $K_{2,N+1}$ is not $L_{h-p}(H)$ for any integer $h > p$ and any h-uniform hypergraph H. It is sufficient to prove that if $G = L_{h-p}(H)$ and if two vertices e_1 and e_2 of G satisfy $d(e_1, e_2) = 2$, then $D(e_1) \cap D(e_2)$ contains a set of independent vertices of cardinality not greater than N.

Let E_1, E_2 be the corresponding edges of H. From Lemma 3.1, we have: $h-2p \leq |E_1 \cap E_2| < h-p$.

Put

$$|E_1 \cap E_2| = h-q \quad \text{with } p < q \leq 2p, \tag{3.4}$$

$$E_1 = \{x_1, \ldots, x_q, x_{q+1}, \ldots, x_h\},$$

and

$$E_2 = \{y_1, \ldots, y_q, x_{q+1}, \ldots, x_h\},$$

with $y_i \neq x_j$ for any i, j such that $1 \leq i, j \leq q$.

Let e and e' be two other vertices of G both adjacent to e_1 and e_2, and E, E' their corresponding edges in H. We can write

$$E = \{x_i, i \in I \cup K\} \cup \{y_j, j \in J\} \cup \{a_1, \ldots, a_l\},$$

$$E' = \{x_i, i \in I' \cup K'\} \cup \{y_j, j \in J'\} \cup \{b_1, \ldots, b_m\},$$

with I, I', J, J' subsets of $\{1, \ldots, q\}$, K, K' subsets of $\{q+1, \ldots, h\}$ and $a_1, \ldots, a_l$, $b_1, \ldots, b_m$ vertices which do not belong to $E_1 \cup E_2$. Since $d(e, e_1) = d(e', e_2) = 1$, we have

$$|E \cap E_1| = |I| + |K| \geq h-p \tag{3.5}$$

and

$$|E' \cap E_2| = |J'| + |K'| \geq h-p. \tag{3.6}$$

We shall show that if e and e' are not adjacent, then $(I, J) \neq (I', J')$. Indeed assume that $I = I'$ and $J = J'$, then

$$|E \cap E'| \geq |I| + |J| + |K \cap K'|,$$

$$|E \cap E'| \geq |I| + |J| + |K| + |K'| - |K \cup K'|.$$

From inequalities (3.5) and (3.6) we deduce

$$|E \cap E'| \geq 2(h-p) - |K \cup K'|,$$

$$|E \cap E'| \geq 2(h-p) - (h-q),$$

and by (3.4), $|E \cap E'| \geq h-p+q-p > h-p$. This implies that e and e' are adjacent in G.

So the maximum number of independent vertices we can find in $D(e_1) \cap D(e_2)$ is not greater than N', the number of different (I, J), that is $N' = (\sum_{i=1}^{q} C_q^i)^2$. Since, according to (3.4), $N' \leq (\sum_{i=1}^{2p} C_{2p}^i)^2$, this yields the theorem with $N = (\sum_{i=1}^{2p} C_{2p}^i)^2$.

Corollary 3.7 (Answering Cook's problem [3, p. 116]). *For every p, there exist graphs which are not $(h-p)$-plane graphs.*

4. Theorem 4.3

Definition 4.1. Let us denote by $\mathcal{G}_p^h$ the set of graphs G for which there exist integers h and $p, p < h$, and a h-uniform hypergraph H such that $G = L_{h-p}(H)$. Let $\mathcal{G}_p = \bigcup_h \mathcal{G}_p^h$

Remarks 4.2. We have proved in Theorem 3.3 that $K_{2,N+1} \notin \mathcal{G}_p$. The value obtained in the theorem is not the best possible. For example for $p = 1$, we have $N = 9$, but $K_{2,3} \notin \mathcal{G}_1$ as it can be easily seen.

Moreover there exist non bipartite graphs which do not belong to $\mathcal{G}_p$. For example, for $p = 1$, it can be proved that there are exactly three graphs other than $K_{2,3}$ with less than five vertices which do not belong to $\mathcal{G}_1$: the two non isomorphic graphs obtained by adding an edge to $K_{2,3}$ and the graph obtained from K_5 by deleting an edge.

$\mathcal{G}_1^2$ is nothing else than the class of line graphs of simple graphs, for which many characterizations have been obtained ([1, Ch. 18]) in particular by excluding a finite number of induced subgraphs. If $G \in \mathcal{G}_p$, then any induced subgraph of G belongs to $\mathcal{G}_p$. So we can ask whether there exists a characterization for $\mathcal{G}_p$ by excluding a finite number of induced subgraphs. The next theorem gives a negative answer to this question: we shall exhibit an infinite family of graphs which do not belong to $\mathcal{G}_1$ and whose induced subgraphs belong to $\mathcal{G}_1$.

Theorem 4.3. *Let us denote by W_n the graph which is a wheel with a central vertex e_0 joined to every other vertex e_i, $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ of a cycle of length $n-1$. Thus, for any $k, k \geq 3$,*

(i) $W_{2k} \notin \mathcal{G}_1$.

(ii) *Any proper induced subgraph of $W_{2k} \in \mathcal{G}_1$.*

Proof of (i). We break the proof in two parts.

Case 1. $W_{2k+2} \notin \mathcal{G}_1^h$ for $h < k$ and $k \geq 2$.

Suppose that $W_{2k+2} \in \mathcal{G}_1^h$ with $h < k$. Then $K_{1,k}$ which is an induced subgraph of W_{2k+2} belongs to $\mathcal{G}_1^h$. Let e_i, $0 \leq i \leq k$, be the vertices of $K_{1,k}$, with $d(e_i, e_0) = 1$ for $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$, and let H be the hypergraph such that $K_{1,k} = L_{h-1}(H)$. Put $E_0 = \{x_1, \ldots, x_h\}$.

Since $d(e_i, e_0) = 1$ for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$, we must have $|E_i \cap E_0| = h - 1$, so $E_i = (x_1, \ldots, \hat{x}_{r_i}, \ldots, x_h, y_i)$.

If $0 < i < j < k$, we have $d(e_i, e_j) = 2$ and thus, $|E_i \cap E_j| \leq h - 2$ and $r_i \neq r_j$. Therefore we must find k different numbers belonging to $\{1, \ldots, h\}$, which implies $k \leq h$, contradicting $h < k$.

Case 2. $W_{2k+2} \notin \mathcal{G}_1^h$ for $h \geq k$.

We need the following lemma:

Lemma 4.4. *If $G = L_{h-1}(H)$ and if e_1 and e_2 are two adjacent vertices in G then $D(e_1) \cap D(e_2)$ is the vertex-disjoint union of two cliques.*

Proof. Let E_1 and E_2 be the corresponding edges of H. If $E_1 = \{x_1, \ldots, x_h\}$ then $E_2 = \{x_1, \ldots, \hat{x}_r, \ldots, x_h, y\}$ with $y \notin E_1$ and $1 \leqslant r \leqslant h$.

If e is both adjacent to e_1 and e_2, then the corresponding edge E of H satisfies $|E \cap E_1| = |E \cap E_2| = h - 1$ and there are only two kinds of such edges:

(a) $E = (x_1, \ldots, \hat{x}_r, \ldots, x_h, z)$ with $z \neq y$ and $z \notin E_1$,

(b) $E = (x_1, \ldots, \hat{x}_s, \ldots, x_h, y)$ with $1 \leqslant s \leqslant h$ and $s \neq r$.

All the edges of each kind have $(h-1)$ vertices in common, so the corresponding vertices e form a clique. Moreover, for any $z, z \neq y$ and $z \notin E_1$, and for any $s, 1 \leqslant s \leqslant h$ and $s \neq r$, we have

$$|\{x_1, \ldots, \hat{x}_r, \ldots, x_h, z\} \cap \{x_1, \ldots, \hat{x}_s, \ldots, x_h, y\}| = h - 2,$$

thus the vertices corresponding to two edges not of the same kind a or b, are not joined.

Remark 4.5. By this lemma, if in a graph $G = L_{h-1}(H)$ two vertices e and e' are both adjacent to e_1 and e_2, where $d(e_1, e_2) = 1$, but not mutually adjacent, their corresponding edges in H are each of a different kind a or b and so, if one is known, the kind of the other is well determined.

We come back to the proof of the theorem. Assume that there exists an hypergraph H such that $W_{2k+2} = L_{h-1}(H)$. Let us denote by $C(P_{2r+1})$ the graph obtained by joining a vertex e_0 to each point of a path P_{2r+1} of length $2r$. For any $r, 1 \leqslant r \leqslant k-1$, $C(P_{2r+1})$ is a subgraph of W_{2k+2}, and thus, $C(P_{2r+1}) = L_{h-1}(H_r)$ where H_r is a partial hypergraph of H. By induction on r, we shall find the necessary form of the edges of H_r for $r \in \{1, \ldots, k-1\}$.

For $r = 1$, if P_3 has vertices e_{2k+1}, e_1, e_2 and edges $\{e_1, e_2\}$ $\{e_1, e_{2k+1}\}$, put $E_0 = \{x_1, \ldots, x_h\}$; without loss of generality, we can assume $E_1 = \{\hat{x}_1, x_2, \ldots, x_h, y_1\}$ with $y_1 \notin E_0$. According to Lemma 4.4, as e_2 and e_{2k+1} are both adjacent to e_0 and e_1 but not mutually adjacent, we can suppose without loss of generality that

$$E_{2k+1} = (\hat{x}_1, x_2, \ldots, x_h, y_0) \quad \text{with } y_0 \neq y_1, \qquad y_0 \notin E_0$$

and $E_2 = (x_1, \hat{x}_2, \ldots, x_h, y_1)$ and thus H_1 is well determined.

Suppose that $H_{r-1} = (X, \mathscr{E})$ with $X = \{x_1, \ldots, x_h, y_0, \ldots, y_{r-1}\}$ and $\mathscr{E} = \{E_{2k+1}, E_i, 0 \leqslant i \leqslant 2r-2\}$, where $E_0 = \{x_1, \ldots, x_h\}$, $E_{2k+1} = \{\hat{x}_1, x_2, \ldots, x_h, y_0\}$ with $y_0 \notin E_0$, and for any $i \in \{1, \ldots, r-1\}$:

$$E_{2i-1} = \{x_1, \ldots, \hat{x}_i, \ldots, x_h, y_i\},$$

$$E_{2i} = \{x_1, \ldots, \hat{x}_{i+1}, \ldots, x_h, y_i\},$$

with $y_i \notin E_0$ and $y_i \neq y_j$ for any $j, j \neq i$.

We construct H_r from H_{r-1} by adding two edges E_{2r-1} and E_{2r} corresponding to the vertices e_{2r-1}, e_{2r} we add to $C(P_{2r-1})$ to obtain $C(P_{2r+1})$. First e_{2r-1} and e_{2r-3} are both adjacent to e_0 and e_{2r-2}. Since we have

$$E_{2r-2} = \{x_1, \ldots, \hat{x}_r, \ldots, x_h, y_{r-1}\}$$

and

$$E_{2r-3} = \{x_1, \ldots, \hat{x}_{r-1}, \ldots, x_h, y_{r-1}\},$$

by Lemma 4.4 and Remark 4.5, we must have $E_{2r-1} = \{x_1, \ldots, \hat{x}_r, \ldots, x_h, y_r\}$ with $y_r \neq y_{r-1}$ and $y_r \notin E_0$.

Moreover as $d(e_{2r-1}, e_i) > 1$ for any $i \in \{1, \ldots, 2r-3, 2k+1\}$, then $y_r \neq y_j$ for any $j \in \{0, \ldots, r-1\}$.

Furthermore e_{2r} and e_{2r-2} are both adjacent to e_0 and e_{2r-1} with $E_{2r-1} = \{x_1, \ldots, \hat{x}_r, \ldots, x_h, y_r\}$ and $E_{2r-2} = \{x_1, \ldots, \hat{x}_r, \ldots, x_h, y_{r-1}\}$. So by Lemma 4.4 and Remark 4.5 we must have $E_{2r} = \{x_1, \ldots, \hat{x}_s, \ldots, x_h, y_r\}$ with $s \in \{1, \ldots, h\}$, $s \neq r$. Moreover, as $d(e_{2r}, e_i) > 1$ for any $i \in \{1, \ldots, r-2\}$ then we have $s > r$. Without loss of generality, we can take $s = r+1$. This is possible for $r+1 \leq k \leq h$, and we have $E_{2r} = \{x_1, \ldots, \hat{x}_{r+1}, \ldots, x_h, y_r\}$. So for $r = k-1$ we have found a unique hypergraph H_{k-1} such that $C(P_{2k-1}) = L_{h-1}(H_{k-1})$.

If we want to construct H_k such that $C(P_{2k+1}) = L_{h-1}(H_k)$ there are two cases:

(a) $k = h$. By the method just shown, we find $E_{2k-1} = \{x_1, \ldots, \hat{x}_k, y_k\}$, but then we cannot construct E_{2k} such that e_{2k} is both adjacent to e_0 and e_{2k-1} but not to e_i for $i \in \{1, \ldots, 2k-2\}$ because we cannot find $s > k$ as done before. So $W_{2h+1} \notin \mathcal{G}_1^h$.

(b) $k > h$. By the same method, we find $E_{2k-1} = \{x_1, \ldots, \hat{x}_k, \ldots, x_h, y_k\}$ and $E_{2k} = \{x_1, \ldots, \hat{x}_{k+1}, \ldots, x_h, y_k\}$ with $y_k \neq y_i$ for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, k-1\}$ and $y_k \notin E_0$. But $|E_{2k} \cap E_{2k+1}| = h-2$, so e_{2k} and e_{2k+1} cannot be adjacent. Thus $W_{2k+1} \notin \mathcal{G}_1^h$.

Proof of (ii). The proof of (i) shows that the subgraph obtained by deleting one vertex (here e_{2k}) belongs to $\mathcal{G}_1$. So any induced subgraph of W_{2k} containing e_0 belongs to $\mathcal{G}_1$. If an induced subgraph does not contain e_0, it is a subgraph of a cycle which belongs to $\mathcal{G}_1$.

Problems. It would be interesting:

(a) to find a simple way to construct all the graphs which do not belong to $\mathcal{G}_1$,

(b) to study the class $\mathcal{G}_p$, for $p > 1$; in particular, is it possible to characterize the class $\mathcal{G}_p$ by excluding forbidden induced subgraphs?

Note added in proof. Further results will appear in M.C. Heydemann and D. Sotteau, Line graphs of hypergraphs II, in: Proc. Coil. Keszthely (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1977).

References

[1] C. Berge, Graphs and Hypergraphs (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1973).

[2] J.C. Bermond and J.C. Meyer, Hypergraphs et configurations in: Proc. Journées Franco–Belges sur Les Graphes et Hypergraphes, Paris, Cahiers du C.E.R.O., 17 (1975) 137–154.

[3] C.R. Cook, Representations of graphs by N-tuples, in: Proc. 5th Southeastern Conf. Combinatorics Graph theory and Comput., Boca Raton, Utilitas Math. Congressus Numeration X (1975) 303–316.