

On packing of two copies of a hypergraph

Monika Pilsniak, Mariusz Woźniak

► **To cite this version:**

Monika Pilsniak, Mariusz Woźniak. On packing of two copies of a hypergraph. Discrete Mathematics and Theoretical Computer Science, DMTCS, 2011, Vol. 13 no. 3 (3), pp.67–74. hal-00990481

HAL Id: hal-00990481

<https://hal.inria.fr/hal-00990481>

Submitted on 13 May 2014

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.

On packing of two copies of a hypergraph

Monika Pilśniak[†] and Mariusz Woźniak[‡]

AGH University of Science and Technology, Department of Discrete Mathematics, Kraków, Poland

A *2-packing* of a hypergraph \mathcal{H} is a permutation σ on $V(\mathcal{H})$ such that if an edge e belongs to $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{H})$, then $\sigma(e)$ does not belong to $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{H})$. Let \mathcal{H} be a hypergraph of order n which contains edges of cardinality at least 2 and at most $n - 2$. We prove that if \mathcal{H} has at most $n - 2$ edges then it is 2-packable.

Keywords: packing, hypergraphs

1 Introduction

Let $\mathcal{H} = (V, \mathcal{E})$ be a hypergraph, where V is the *vertex set* and $\mathcal{E} \subset 2^V$ is the *edge set*. We allow empty edges for technical reasons, hence a complete simple hypergraph of order n has 2^n edges. We consider only finite hypergraphs. The edge of cardinality t is called *t-edge*, and 1-edge is called a *singleton*. A vertex is *isolated* if it does not belong to any edge. The number $d(v)$ of edges containing a vertex v is called the *degree* of $v \in V$. A hypergraph is *t-uniform* if $|e| = t$ for all $e \in \mathcal{E}$. Let \mathcal{H} be a hypergraph of order n . A *packing* of two copies of \mathcal{H} (*2-packing* of \mathcal{H}) is a permutation σ on $V(\mathcal{H})$ such that, if an edge $e = \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ belongs to $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{H})$, then the edge $\sigma(e) = \{\sigma(x_1), \dots, \sigma(x_k)\}$ does not belong to $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{H})$. Such a permutation (a *packing permutation*) is also called an *embedding* of \mathcal{H} into its complement. Consider a hypergraph \mathcal{H} and a permutation σ on V . We have $\sigma(V) = V$ and $\sigma(\emptyset) = \emptyset$. So, if $V \in \mathcal{E}$ or $\emptyset \in \mathcal{E}$, then \mathcal{H} cannot be packable.

We proved the following result in [4].

Theorem 1 *If a hypergraph \mathcal{H} of order n and size at most $\frac{1}{2}n$ has neither the empty edge nor its complement, then \mathcal{H} is 2-packable.*

Observe that this bound is sharp. Namely, if \mathcal{H} is a hypergraph of order n , and it has more than $\frac{1}{2}n$ edges, and each edge is a singleton, then evidently \mathcal{H} is not packable.

The aim of this paper is to show that if empty edges and singletons (and their complements, i.e. n -edges and $(n - 1)$ -edges) are excluded, then the bound on the size can be improved. We call a hypergraph \mathcal{H} of order n *admissible* if $2 \leq |H| \leq n - 2$ holds for all edges $H \in \mathcal{H}$.

We shall prove the following theorem.

[†]Email: pilsniak@agh.edu.pl

[‡]Email: mwozniak@agh.edu.pl

This research was partially supported by the Polish Ministry of Science and Higher Education

Theorem 2 *An admissible hypergraph \mathcal{H} of order n and size at most $n - 2$ is 2-packable.*

Recall that a 2-uniform hypergraph is called a graph. The packing problems for graphs have been studied for about thirty years (see for instance chapters in the books by B. Bollobás or H. P. Yap ([2],[8]), or survey papers by H. P. Yap or M. Woźniak ([9], [6], [7] and [5])). One of the first results in this area was the following theorem (see [3]).

Theorem 3 *A graph G of order n and size at most $n - 2$ is 2-packable.*

This bound is tight. Namely, if G is a star (of order n and size $n - 1$), then G is not packable.

Let \mathcal{H} be an admissible hypergraph of order n . First, denote by \mathcal{H}_k a k -uniform hypergraph of order n , which is induced by all k -edges in \mathcal{H} , and let m_k be the size of \mathcal{H}_k . Let m be the size of \mathcal{H} . Thus

$$n - 2 \geq m = m_2 + m_3 + \dots + m_{n-2}.$$

Let $\mathcal{H} = (V, \mathcal{E})$ be a hypergraph. Consider the hypergraph $\tilde{\mathcal{H}} = (V, \tilde{\mathcal{E}})$ with the same vertex set V and the edge set $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$, obtained from \mathcal{E} in the following way: if $e \in \mathcal{E}$ has at most $\frac{n}{2}$ vertices then e belongs to $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$ and if e has more than $\frac{n}{2}$ vertices, then e is replaced by $V \setminus e$, with the convention that a double edge conceivably created in this way is replaced by a single one.

Remark 4 *Let \mathcal{H} be an admissible hypergraph of order n . If the hypergraph $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ is 2-packable, then also \mathcal{H} is 2-packable. Therefore, we shall assume that \mathcal{H} of order n is restricted to have edges of size at most $n/2$ only.*

Let $\mathcal{H} = (V, \mathcal{E})$ be an admissible hypergraph, and let x be a vertex of \mathcal{H} . We define the hypergraph $\mathcal{H}' = (V', \mathcal{E}')$:= $\mathcal{H} - x$ as follows: $V' = V \setminus \{x\}$, and the set of edges is obtained from \mathcal{E} by deleting 2-edges containing x , and replacing all remaining edges containing x by new edges with x deleted. It should be noted that it may happen that the assumption of Remark 4 does not apply to the hypergraph $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$. So, if necessary, we use $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}'$ instead of \mathcal{H}' .

2 Lemmas

In the proof of Theorem 2, we shall use the following lemmas.

Lemma 5 *Let \mathcal{H} be an admissible hypergraph of order $n \geq 7$. Let x be an isolated vertex in \mathcal{H}_2 , and let y be a vertex of degree at least two in \mathcal{H}_2 . Suppose that there does not exist any 3-edge $e \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $x \in e$ and $y \in e$. If $\mathcal{H}' = \mathcal{H} - x - y$ is 2-packable, then \mathcal{H} is also 2-packable. Moreover, \mathcal{H}' is an admissible hypergraph.*

Proof: Let x and y be two vertices satisfying the assumptions. It is easy to see that \mathcal{H}' is an admissible hypergraph, since, by assumptions, there is no singleton in \mathcal{H}' , because there is no 3-edge $e \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $x \in e$ and $y \in e$. On the other hand, since $n \geq 7$, there is no $(n' - 1)$ -edge in \mathcal{H}' (where $n' = n - 2$).

Let σ' be a packing permutation of \mathcal{H}' . By the choice of x and y and the property of σ' , it is easy to see that the permutation $\sigma = \sigma' \circ (xy)$, where (xy) denotes a transposition, is a packing permutation of \mathcal{H} . □

The proof of Lemma 6 is analogous to that of Lemma 5.

Lemma 6 Let \mathcal{H} be an admissible hypergraph of order $n \geq 7$. Let x and y be two not adjacent vertices of degree one in \mathcal{H}_2 such that the neighbors x' of x and y' of y are distinct. Suppose that there does not exist any 3-edge $e \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $x \in e$ and $y \in e$. If $\mathcal{H}' = \mathcal{H} - x - y$ is 2-packable, then \mathcal{H} is also 2-packable. Moreover, \mathcal{H}' is an admissible hypergraph.

Lemma 7 Let \mathcal{H} be an admissible hypergraph of order n and size at most $n - 2$. If $m_2 \leq \frac{n}{2}$, then \mathcal{H} is 2-packable.

Proof: Using a probabilistic argument we shall show that a packing permutation exists for \mathcal{H} .

Let e and f be two edges of \mathcal{H} of the same cardinality and let σ be a random permutation on V . We say that edge e covers edge f (with respect to σ), if $\sigma(e) = f$. We denote this fact by $(e \curvearrowright f)$.

Let e and f be two k -edges. The event A such that e covers f (denoted by $A(e \curvearrowright f)$) has probability equal to

$$Pr(A(e \curvearrowright f)) = \frac{k!(n-k)!}{n!} = \binom{n}{k}^{-1}.$$

Observe, that there are m_k^2 ways to choose a pair e, f of k -edges such that e covers f . So, we have

$$Pr\left(\bigcup_{e,f \in \mathcal{H}} A(e \curvearrowright f)\right) \leq \sum_{e,f \in \mathcal{H}} Pr(A(e \curvearrowright f)) = m_2^2 \binom{n}{2}^{-1} + m_3^2 \binom{n}{3}^{-1} + \dots + m_{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor}^2 \binom{n}{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor}^{-1}.$$

Since $k \leq \frac{n}{2}$, the sequence $\left(\binom{n}{2}^{-1}, \binom{n}{3}^{-1}, \dots\right)$ is decreasing, and we have

$$\begin{aligned} m_2^2 \binom{n}{2}^{-1} + m_3^2 \binom{n}{3}^{-1} + \dots + m_{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor}^2 \binom{n}{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor}^{-1} &\leq m_2^2 \binom{n}{2}^{-1} + \binom{n}{3}^{-1} (m_3^2 + \dots + m_{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor}^2) \leq \\ &\leq m_2^2 \binom{n}{2}^{-1} + \binom{n}{3}^{-1} (n-2-m_2)^2. \end{aligned}$$

If $m_2 = 0$, then $n \geq 5$, and

$$m_2^2 \binom{n}{2}^{-1} + \binom{n}{3}^{-1} (n-2-m_2)^2 = \binom{n}{3}^{-1} (n-2)^2.$$

If $m_2 = 1$, then $n \geq 3$, and

$$m_2^2 \binom{n}{2}^{-1} + \binom{n}{3}^{-1} (n-2-m_2)^2 = \binom{n}{2}^{-1} + \binom{n}{3}^{-1} (n-3)^2.$$

If $m_2 \geq 2$, then $n \geq 4$, and

$$m_2^2 \binom{n}{2}^{-1} + \binom{n}{3}^{-1} (n-2-m_2)^2 \leq \frac{2n^2}{4n(n-1)} + \frac{6(n-4)^2}{n(n-1)(n-2)}.$$

It is easy to check that in each case

$$\Pr \left(\bigcup_{e, f \in \mathcal{H}} A(e \cap f) \right) < 1.$$

Consequently, a 2-packing of an admissible hypergraph \mathcal{H} of order n and size at most $n - 2$ exists, if $m_2 \leq \frac{n}{2}$. □

3 Proof of Theorem 2

By Remark 4, we consider only hypergraphs with edges of cardinality at most $\frac{n}{2}$. It is easy to see that for $n \leq 6$, either \mathcal{H} has only 2-edges, and we can apply Theorem 3, or the number of 2-edges is less than or equal to $n/2$, and we can apply Lemma 7. So, let $n \geq 7$.

Observe that, by Lemma 7, our claim holds if \mathcal{H}_2 is empty. Therefore, the proof will be divided into two main cases corresponding to the structure of \mathcal{H}_2 which is supposed to be non-empty.

The proof goes by induction on n . Let x, y be two vertices satisfying the assumptions of Lemma 5 or of Lemma 6. A 3-edge containing both of them will be called a *blocking edge*. Observe that if there is no blocking edge in \mathcal{H} , then the induction hypothesis can be applied. Below, we shall very often estimate the number of blocking edges in order to get a contradiction with the size of \mathcal{H} .

Case 1. There is no vertex of degree one in \mathcal{H}_2 .

The hypergraph \mathcal{H}_2 has at most $n - 2$ edges, so it has at least two isolated vertices. Denote by w the number of non-isolated vertices in \mathcal{H}_2 . Observe that $w \geq 3$ and $w \leq m_2$. Let y be a vertex of degree at least 2 in \mathcal{H}_2 . If we can choose an isolated vertex x in \mathcal{H}_2 such that there is no 3-edge containing both x and y , then we are done. So, suppose that a 3-edge containing both x and y exists in \mathcal{H} for every isolated vertex x in \mathcal{H}_2 and for any y . Observe that one 3-edge can cover at most two pairs of vertices x, y satisfying the assumptions of Lemma 5. Hence,

$$m_3 \geq \frac{1}{2}w(n - w) \geq \frac{1}{2}w(n - m_2),$$

$$2m_3 + wm_2 \geq wn.$$

Hence,

$$w(m_2 + m_3) \geq wn,$$

but $m_2 + m_3 \leq n - 2$, a contradiction.

Case 2. There is a vertex of degree one in \mathcal{H}_2 .

Let $b = m_3 + \dots + m_{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor}$. If $b = 0$, then \mathcal{H} is a graph, and the claim is true. Hence, let $b > 0$. Then $m_2 = n - 2 - b$. Denote by t the number of tree components in \mathcal{H}_2 . So, $t \geq b + 2$. Next, denote by i the number of isolated vertices in \mathcal{H}_2 , by j the number of isolated edges, by k the number of stars with at least two leaves, and by l the number of trees with diameter greater than two. Thus, $t = i + j + k + l$. We shall consider four subcases.

Case 2A. There are at least two vertices of degree at least two in \mathcal{H}_2 , and $j + k + l \geq 2$.

As above, we shall count, how many blocking edges have to be in \mathcal{H} . Denote by n_2 the number of vertices of degree at least two in \mathcal{H}_2 . By assumption, $n_2 \geq 2$. So, if we are not able to apply Lemma 5, we should have at least $(\frac{1}{2}in_2)$ 3-edges in \mathcal{H} . Similarly, if we are not able to apply Lemma 6, we should have at least $[\frac{1}{3} \cdot 4 \cdot \binom{j+k+l}{2}]$ 3-edges in \mathcal{H} . Observe that one 3-edge can cover at most three pairs of vertices x, y which satisfy the assumptions of Lemma 6. Moreover, between every two tree components with at least two leaves, there are at least four such pairs. There are $\binom{j+k+l}{2}$ such pairs. Observe that all 3-edges mentioned above have to be distinct. Hence, we have

$$\frac{1}{2}in_2 + \frac{4}{3} \cdot \binom{j+k+l}{2} \leq b \leq t-2 = i+j+k+l-2.$$

Observe that

$$\frac{1}{2}in_2 \geq i,$$

and

$$\frac{4}{3} \cdot \frac{1}{2} \cdot (j+k+l)(j+k+l-1) \geq 1 \cdot 1 \cdot (j+k+l-1).$$

Again, we obtain a contradiction.

Case 2B. There are at least two vertices of degree at least two in \mathcal{H}_2 , and $j + k + l < 2$.

Thus, we have $l \leq 1$ and $n_2 \geq 2$. Analogously as in Case 2A, we consider blocking edges in \mathcal{H} . If $l = 0$, we obtain two cases:

1) if $j + k = 0$, then

$$i \leq \frac{1}{2}in_2 \leq b \leq t-2 = i-2;$$

2) if $j + k = 1$, then

$$i \leq \frac{1}{2}in_2 \leq b \leq t-2 = i-1.$$

If $l = 1$ we have at least one blocking edge more. Then,

$$i+1 \leq \frac{1}{2}in_2 + 1 \leq b \leq t-2 = i+l-2 = i-1.$$

In all cases we get a contradiction.

Case 2C. There is at most one vertex of degree at least two in \mathcal{H}_2 , and $j + k + l < 2$.

By definition, $l = 0$. Therefore, we have three subcases to consider. If $k = j = 0$ or $k = 0$ and $j = 1$, then by Lemma 7, our claim is true. Thus, let $j = 0$ and $k = 1$. So, \mathcal{H}_2 consists of a star $K_{1,p}$ and i isolated vertices. Observe that if $p \leq \frac{n}{2}$, then we are done by Lemma 7.

Hence, let $p > \frac{n}{2}$. Then, $n = i + p + 1$. Let y be the center of the star, and let x be an isolated vertex in \mathcal{H}_2 . If for any vertex z , the set $\{x, y, z\}$ is not an edge of \mathcal{H} , then we are done by Lemma 5.

If the vertex y belongs to two edges of the form $\{x, y, z\} \in \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{H})$ for any isolated vertex x , then we have the inequality

$$p + 2 \cdot \frac{i}{2} \leq n - 2.$$

Since $p + 2 \cdot \frac{i}{2} = n - 1$, we obtain a contradiction.

Therefore, there exists an isolated vertex x such that \mathcal{H} contains exactly one 3-edge $\{x, y, z\}$. Now, we construct a hypergraph $\mathcal{H}' = (V', \mathcal{E}')$ such that $V' = V - \{x, y\}$ and the set of edges is obtained from \mathcal{E} as follows: we delete all 2-edges as well as the edge $\{x, y, z\}$, and we replace all remaining edges containing x or y (or x and y) by new edges with these vertices deleted. Then \mathcal{H}' has two vertices less, and at least $p + 1$ edges less than \mathcal{H} .

We shall show that there exists a packing permutation σ' of \mathcal{H}' without fixed points.

By the choice of x and y and the property of σ' , it is easy to see that the permutation $\sigma = \sigma' \circ (xy)$, where (xy) denotes a transposition, will be a packing permutation of \mathcal{H} .

An edge of the form $\{x, s, t\} \in \mathcal{H}$ (where $s \neq y$ and $t \neq y$) will be called an x -edge. Analogously, an edge of the form $\{y, s, t\} \in \mathcal{H}$ (where $s \neq x$ and $t \neq x$) will be called a y -edge.

First, we consider the case where \mathcal{H} has either x -edges or y -edges. We construct the hypergraph $\mathcal{H}'' = (V'', \mathcal{E}'')$ as follows: $V'' = V'$, and the set of edges is obtained from \mathcal{E}' by deleting all x -edges and y -edges. So $m_2'' = 0$ in \mathcal{H}'' . Now, we use a probabilistic argument as in the proof of Lemma 7.

$$Pr \left(\bigcup_{e, f \in \mathcal{H}''} A(e \cap f) \right) \leq \binom{n}{3}^{-1} (n - 2 - p - 1)^2 \leq \frac{6(n - 6)^2}{4(n - 2)(n - 3)(n - 4)} < \frac{1}{e} - \frac{1}{n!}.$$

It is easy to observe that the last inequality holds for $n \geq 6$. (Recall that the probability that a random permutation has no fixed point is greater than or equal to $\frac{1}{e} - \frac{1}{n!}$.)

Now, suppose that there are ξ x -edges and η y -edges in \mathcal{H} . Observe that we have at least $p + 3$ edges in \mathcal{H} (there are p edges of the star, the edge $\{x, y, z\}$, at least one x -edge and at least one y -edge). Then, $p + 3 \leq n - 2$. But $p > \frac{n}{2}$, hence $n \geq 11$. In general, we have at least $(\xi + \eta + 1 + p)$ edges in \mathcal{H} . Therefore $\xi + \eta \leq \frac{n}{2} - 3$. Then a product $\xi\eta$ is maximal if $\xi = \eta = \frac{1}{2}(\frac{n}{2} - 3)$. Analogously as above, we use a probabilistic argument to show that there is a packing permutation σ' without fixed points of \mathcal{H}' . Observe that there are $\xi + \eta$ edges in \mathcal{H}'_2 , and an x -edge cannot be mapped by σ' onto a y -edge (and vice versa). We have

$$\begin{aligned} Pr \left(\bigcup_{e, f \in \mathcal{H}'} A(e \cap f) \right) &\leq \frac{2 \cdot 2\xi\eta \cdot (n - 2)!}{n!} + \binom{n}{3}^{-1} (n - 2 - p - 3)^2 \leq \\ &\leq \frac{(n - 6)^2}{4n(n - 1)} + \frac{3(n - 10)^2}{2(n - 2)(n - 3)(n - 4)} < \frac{1}{e} - \frac{1}{n!}. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to check that the last inequality is satisfied for $n \geq 11$, and consequently, there exists a packing permutation of \mathcal{H}' without fixed points.

Case 2D. There is at most one vertex of degree at least two in \mathcal{H}_2 , and $j + k + l \geq 2$.

Then, \mathcal{H}_2 has only tree components, $l = 0$ and $k \leq 1$.

If $k = 0$, then $j \geq 2$ and $j \leq \frac{n}{2}$ (because j is the number of isolated edges in \mathcal{H}_2). Then, by Lemma 7, the conclusion holds.

Thus, let $k = 1$ and $j \geq 1$. Denote by $K_{1,p}$ the star in \mathcal{H}_2 . If $p + j \leq \frac{n}{2}$, we are done by Lemma 7.

Hence $p + j > \frac{n}{2}$ and $n = i + 2j + p + 1$. If $j = 1$, then a 3-edge can block at most two possibilities for the choice of two leaves in \mathcal{H}_2 if one leaf is in the star. So, if we are not able to apply Lemma 6, we have to have at least $\frac{2p}{2}$ blocking edges in \mathcal{H} . If we are not able to apply Lemma 5, we have to have at least $\frac{i}{2}$ blocking edges in \mathcal{H} . Observe that in both cases the blocking edges are distinct. Hence, taking into account all 2-edges we get

$$n - 2 \geq |\mathcal{E}| \geq p + 1 + p + \frac{i}{2},$$

and

$$n - 3 \geq 2p + \frac{i}{2}.$$

On the other hand, $n - 3 = i + p$. Therefore, $\frac{i}{2} \geq p$. So, $n - 3 \geq 3p$. It follows that $p < \frac{n}{3}$, a contradiction.

Now, let $j \geq 2$. Observe that the number of 3-edges in \mathcal{H} is at least $\frac{i}{2}$ (because of Lemma 5), and at least $\frac{2pj}{2}$ (because of Lemma 6). (In the latter case, we may assume that one of the leaves comes from the star.)

We have

$$n - 2 \geq |\mathcal{E}| \geq j + p + pj + \frac{i}{2}.$$

But $j + p > \frac{n}{2}$, so

$$n - 2 \geq \frac{n}{2} + pj + \frac{i}{2}.$$

Hence

$$\frac{n}{2} - \frac{i}{2} - 2 \geq pj.$$

We know from a structure of the hypergraph that $n = i + 2j + p + 1$, so it follows from the above inequality that

$$\frac{2j + p + 1 - 4}{2} \geq pj.$$

This inequality together with the fact that $2pj \geq 2p + 2j$ for $p, j \geq 2$, implies

$$2j + p - 3 \geq 2pj \geq 2p + 2j,$$

a contradiction.

This ends the proof of the theorem.

References

- [1] A. Benhocine, A. P. Wojda, *On self-complementation*, J. Graph Theory 8 (1985), 335-341.
- [2] B. Bollobás, *Extremal Graph Theory*, Academic Press, London (1978).
- [3] D. Burns, S. Schuster, *Every $(n, n - 2)$ graph is contained in its complement*, J. Graph Theory 1 (1977), 277-279.
- [4] M. Piłśniak, M. Woźniak, *A note on packing of two copies of a hypergraph*, Discussiones Math. G. Th. 27(1) (2007), 45-49.
- [5] M. Woźniak, *Embedding graphs of small size*, Discrete Applied Math. 51 (1994), 233-241.
- [6] M. Woźniak, *Packing of graphs*, Dissertationes Math. 362 (1997), 1-78.
- [7] M. Woźniak, *Packing of graphs and permutations – a survey*, Discrete Math. 276 (2004), 379-391.
- [8] H. P. Yap, *Some Topics in Graph Theory*, London Math. Society, Lecture Notes Series, Vol. 108, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1986.
- [9] H. P. Yap, *Packing of graphs – a survey*, Discrete Math. 72 (1988), 395-404.