34 Friendship

From last time: if G is d-regular, girth 5, diameter 2, then d = 2, 3, 7, and maybe 57. These conditions are necessary, but do the graphs exist? Remember that the graphs must have $d^2 + 1$ vertices.

d = 2: C_5 d = 3: Petersen Graph d = 7: Hoffman-Singleton graph d = 57: unknown

Definition 34.1

A graph G that is strongly regular, denoted SRG(n, d, a, c), has n vertices and is d-regular such that

- 1. For any 2 adjacent vertices, they have a common neighbors.
- 2. For any 2 non-adjacent vertices, they have c common neighbors.

From earlier, a graph with girth 5, diameter 2, must have a = 0, because 2 adjacent vertices can never share a neighbor since the smallest cycle is 5.

If two non adjacent vertices share two common neighbors, then we have a 4-cycle, which can also not happen. So we must have c = 1.

So, we have classified all n and d for SRG(n, d, 0, 1).

Theorem 34.2 (Friendship)

At a party, suppose any 2 people have exactly 1 common friend. Then the party contains a politician who is friends with everyone.

i.e. If G is a connected (finite) graph such that every 2 distinct vertices have 1 common neighbor, then there exists a vertex adjacent to all the others.

The friendship graph F_n on 2n + 1 vertices: for F_4 , this is a windmill graph.



Proof. Suppose the conclusion is false (no vertex is adjacent to all). With the "counterexample" graph, we show it must at least be a regular graph.

We then get a contradiction.

Let u NOT be adjacent to v, with $\deg(u) \ge \deg(v)$. Our goal is to show that $\deg(u) \le \deg(v)$. We then repeat this on all vertices so that they all have the same degree, which will make our graph regular.

Let deg(u) = k. Recall that any 2 vertices share exactly one neighbor.



Since v and w_2 share a neighbor, we must have some z_2 which cannot be w_3, w_4, \dots, w_k . Otherwise, u and v would have 2 common neighbors.

So for each w_i , $i \ge 2$, there is a distinct z_i that they share.

However, v may be adjacent to other vertices. So, $\deg(v) \ge k = \deg(u)$. If we repeat this process with all other vertices, all vertices must have the same degree.

Let a d-regular G be the counterexample. Suppose d = 2. This must be a cycle.

If the cycle is C_3 , then this graph does satisfy the conclusion.

If the cycle is C_4 or larger, then it won't satisfy the given assumptions (any 2 vertices have exactly 1 common neighbor).

Thus, a counterexample would require $d \geq 3$.

Let A be the adjacency matrix of a counterexample.

Then, walks of length $2 = A_{ij}^2 = \begin{cases} d & i = j \\ 1 & i \neq j \end{cases}$ Then, $A^2 = J + (d-1)I$.

Let \vec{v} be an eigenvector with eigenvalue $\lambda \neq d$ (so \vec{v} is orthogonal to $\vec{1}$).

$$\implies A^2 \vec{v} = \lambda^2 \vec{v} = J \vec{v} + (d-1)\vec{v} = (d-1)\vec{v}$$
$$\implies \lambda^2 \vec{v} = (d-1)\vec{v} \implies \lambda = \pm \sqrt{d-1}$$

Let $\lambda_1 = d$, $\lambda_2 = \sqrt{d-1}$ multiplicity m_2 , and $\lambda_3 = -\sqrt{d-1}$ multiplicity m_3 .

 $\implies 0 = \operatorname{tr}(A) = \operatorname{sum of e-values} = d + m_2(\sqrt{d-1}) + m_3(-\sqrt{d-1}).$

Rearranging and squaring,

$$d^2 = (m_3 - m_2)^2 (d - 1)$$

If $m_3 = m_2 \implies d = 0$, fails.

If $m_3 \neq m_2$, then d-1 must divide d^2 . But d-1 also divides $d^2-1 = (d+1)(d-1)$.

Then d-1 divides 2 consecutive numbers. Then $d-1=1 \implies d=2$.

But we found earlier that a counterexample must have at least $d \ge 3$. Thus we have a contradiction.