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Abstract

In this note we present a sharp lower bound on the number of vertices in a regular graph of given degree and diameter.
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1. Introduction

The degree/diameter problem consists in determination of the largest order $N(d,k)$ of a graph with (maximum) degree $d$ and diameter $k$. An upper bound for $N(d,k)$ is the Moore bound $M(d,k) = 1 + d + d(d-1) + \cdots + d(d-1)^{k-1}$ and graphs achieving this bound are called Moore graphs. As shown in [1, 3, 5], Moore graphs exist only when $d = 2$ or $k = 1$ or when $k = 2$ and the degree is either 3 or 7 or possibly 57. For all other pairs $(d,k)$ we have $N(d,k) \leq M(d,k) - 2$, see [2, 4].

Recently, there are plenty of papers dealing with the degree/diameter problem, some of them constructing “large” graphs of given degree and diameter, which increases the lower bound for $N(d,k)$ for special pairs $(d,k)$, other decreasing $N(d,k)$ for special classes of graphs. For a nice survey see [7].

In this note we consider the inverse of degree/diameter problem. Since usually the degree/diameter problem is formulated for regular graphs (although some authors require only that $d$ is the maximum degree), we ask what is the minimum
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order \( n(d,k) \) of a regular graph of degree \( d \) and diameter \( k \). In this note we answer this question completely.

We start with some notation. Let \( G \) be a graph, \( G = (V(G), E(G)) \). For two of its vertices, say \( x \) and \( y \), by \( \text{dist}_G(x,y) \) we denote their distance in \( G \). By \( N_i(x) \) we denote the set of vertices that are at distance \( i \) from \( x \). As usual, \( N_1(x) \) is often abbreviated to \( N(x) \). The longest distance in \( G \) is the diameter \( \text{diam}(G) \).

The complete graph on \( n \) vertices is denoted by \( K_n \) and the discrete graph on \( n \) vertices (the complement of \( K_n \)) is denoted by \( D_n \). If \( G \) is a graph, then by \( G^{(1)} \) (and \( G^{(2)} \)) we denote a graph obtained from \( G \) by removing all the edges of one 1-factor (one 2-factor).

If \( G \) and \( H \) are graphs, then \( G + H \) denotes the join of \( G \) and \( H \), that is, a graph obtained from the disjoint union of \( G \) and \( H \) by adding all edges \( xy \), where \( x \in V(G) \) and \( y \in V(H) \). The sequential join of graphs \( G_1, G_2, \ldots, G_r \) is denoted by \( G_1 + G_2 + \cdots + G_r \) and is defined by

\[
G_1 + G_2 + \cdots + G_r = (G_1 + G_2) \cup (G_2 + G_3) \cup \cdots \cup (G_{r-1} + G_r).
\]

Thus, one can obtain \( G_1 + G_2 + \cdots + G_r \) from the disjoint union \( G_1 \cup G_2 \cup \cdots \cup G_r \) by adding all edges \( xy \) where \( x \in V(G_i) \) and \( y \in V(G_{i+1}) \) for \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, r-1 \).

To simplify the expressions, instead of

\[
\underbrace{\cdots + G + G + \cdots + G + \cdots}_{k \text{ times}}
\]

we write

\[
\cdots + (G)_k + \cdots.
\]

Finally, denote by \( G \div H \) a graph obtained from the disjoint union of \( G \) and \( H \) by adding all edges of one 1-factor, every edge of which joins a vertex of \( G \) with a vertex of \( H \). Obviously, \( G \div H \) is defined only if \( |V(G)| = |V(H)| \).

Analogously as in the case of join, by \( G_1 \div G_2 \div \cdots \div G_r \) we denote the graph \( (G_1 \div G_2) \cup (G_2 \div G_3) \cup \cdots \cup (G_{r-1} \div G_r) \). We can form also more complicated expressions using both + and \( \div \). In such a way, \( K_1 + D_2 \div D_2 \div K_2 \) is a cycle of length 7; see Figure 1.
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Figure 1. The graph \( K_1 + D_2 \div D_2 \div K_2 \).
2. Results

For small diameters we have the following statement.

**Proposition 1.** Let \( d \geq 2 \). We have

1. \( n(d, 1) = d + 1 \);
2. if \( d \) is even, then \( n(d, 2) = d + 2 \);
3. if \( d \) is odd, then \( n(d, 2) = d + 3 \);
4. \( n(d, 3) = 2d + 2 \).

**Proof.** The case \( k = 1 \) is obvious since \( K_{d+1} \) is the unique graph of diameter 1 and degree \( d \).

Let \( k = 2 \). Let \( G \) be a \( d \)-regular graph of diameter 2, and let \( x, y \in V(G) \) such that \( \text{dist}_G(x, y) = 2 \). Then \( \{x\} \cup N(x) = N_0(x) \cup N_1(x) \), which gives \( |N_0(x)| + |N_1(x)| = d + 1 \). Since \( y \in N_2(x) \), we have \( |V(G)| = |N_0(x)| + |N_1(x)| + |N_2(x)| \geq d + 2 \), which gives \( n(d, 2) \geq d + 2 \). However, if \( d \) is odd then \( |V(G)| \) cannot be odd and so \( n(d, 2) \geq d + 3 \) in this case. If \( d \) is even then \( K_{d+1}^{(-1)} \) is a \( d \)-regular graph of diameter 2 on \( d + 2 \) vertices, which shows \( n(d, 2) \leq d + 2 \); while if \( d \) is odd then \( K_{d+1}^{(-1)} \) is a \( d \)-regular graph of diameter 2 on \( d + 3 \) vertices, which shows \( n(d, 2) \leq d + 3 \).

Finally, let \( k = 3 \). Analogously as above, let \( G \) be a \( d \)-regular graph of diameter 3, and let \( x, y \in V(G) \) such that \( \text{dist}_G(x, y) = 3 \). Then \( \{x\} \cup N(x) = N_0(x) \cup N_1(x) \), which gives \( |N_0(x)| + |N_1(x)| = d + 1 \), and \( \{y\} \cup N(y) \subseteq N_2(x) \cup N_3(x) \), which gives \( |N_2(x)| + |N_3(x)| \geq d + 1 \). Thus, \( |V(G)| = |N_0(x)| + |N_1(x)| + |N_2(x)| + |N_3(x)| \geq 2d + 2 \), and so \( n(d, 3) \geq 2d + 2 \). On the other hand, denote by \( K_{n,n} \) a complete bipartite graph on \( 2n \) vertices in which the two partite sets have \( n \) vertices each. Then \( K_{d+1,d+3}^{(-1)} \) is a \( d \)-regular graph of diameter 3 on \( 2d + 2 \) vertices, which shows \( n(d, 3) \leq 2d + 2 \).

Now we turn our attention to larger diameters. Since there are only two 2-regular graphs of diameter \( k \), namely the cycle on \( 2k \) vertices and the cycle on \( 2k + 1 \) vertices, we have the following trivial observation.

**Proposition 2.** If \( k \geq 4 \), then \( n(2, k) = 2k \).

For larger degrees we have a slightly different bound.

**Theorem 3.** Let \( k = 3j + t \), where \( k \geq 4 \) and \( 0 \leq t \leq 2 \), and let \( d \geq 3 \). Then \( n(d, k) = (d + 1)(j + 1) + t + \delta \), where \( \delta = 1 \) if either \( d \) is odd and \( t = 1 \) or \( d \) is even and \( t = 2 \). Otherwise \( \delta = 0 \).
Proof. First we prove a lower bound for \( n(d, k) \). Let \( G \) be a regular graph of degree \( d \) and diameter \( k \) and let \( x, y \in V(G) \) such that \( \text{dist}_G(x, y) = k \). Denote \( n_i = |N_i(x)|. \) Since \( x \in N_0(x) \), we have \( \{x\} \cup N(x) \subseteq N_0(x) \cup N_1(x) \). Thus, \( n_0 + n_1 \geq d + 1 \). Analogously \( n_{k-1} + n_k \geq d + 1 \) since \( y \in N_k(x) \). Further, for every \( i, 1 \leq i \leq j-1 \), we have \( n_{3i-1} + n_{3i} + n_{3i+1} \geq d + 1 \) since for \( z_i \in N_{3i}(x) \) it holds \( \{z_i\} \cup N(z_i) \subseteq N_{3i-1}(x) \cup N_{3i}(x) \cup N_{3i+1}(x) \). Finally, if \( t \geq 1 \) then \( n_{k-1-l} \geq 1 \) where \( 1 \leq l \leq t \). Summing up all these inequalities we get

\[
|V(G)| = \sum_{i=0}^{k} n_i \geq (d+1)(j+1) + t.
\]

If \( t = 2 \) then we use \( n_{k-3} \geq 1 \) and \( n_{k-2} \geq 1 \). But if \( d \) is even then \( G \) cannot have a bridge, and so \( n_{k-3} + n_{k-2} \geq 3 \). Thus, we get \( |V(G)| = \sum_{i=0}^{k} n_i \geq (d+1)(j+1) + t + 1 \) in this case.

Similarly, if \( t = 1 \) and \( d \) is odd then \( (d+1)(j+1) + t \) is an odd number. But a regular graph of odd degree cannot have an odd number of vertices, and so \( |V(G)| = \sum_{i=0}^{k} n_i \geq (d+1)(j+1) + t + 1 \) also in this case.

To prove the upper bound we construct extremal graphs, that is, regular graphs of degree \( d \) and diameter \( k \) on \( n(d, k) \) vertices. First we define an extremal graph \( G \) for odd \( d \). The case \( k = 4 \) is treated separately. If \( d = 3 \) then one extremal graph \( G \) is on Figure 2. For \( d \geq 5 \) we set \( G = K_2 + K_{d-1}^{(-2)} + D_2 \). Figure 2. An extremal graph for \( d = 3 \) and \( k = 4 \).
G = K3 + K_{d-2}^{(-1)} + (K1 + K2 + K_{d-3})_{j-2} + K1 + K2 + K_{d-2} + K_{d-1}^{(-1)} + K3, if t = 0.

Observe that in all these graphs, whenever we removed a 1-factor out of K_q, then the number of vertices q was even. Obviously, in each case G has diameter k and it is a matter of routine to check that G is a regular graph of degree d.

(For example, a vertex in the last copy of K_{d-2}^{(-1)} in the last graph is joined to 1 vertex of K_{d-2}, d-4 vertices of K_{d-2}^{(-1)} and to 3 vertices of K3, so its degree is 1 + d - 4 + 3 = d.) Also, in each of these cases the number of vertices of G attains the bound of the theorem. To verify this statement it suffices to check the number of vertices for the smallest admissible values of j since in each case in the brackets we have exactly d + 1 vertices.

By Proposition 2, if d = 2 then n(d, k) = dk. However, for higher degrees we get n(d, k) \sim \frac{1}{3}dk. Denote by n_{VT}(d, k) the minimum number of vertices in a vertex-transitive d-regular graph with diameter k. As shown in [6], for k \geq 4 and “large” d we have n_{VT}(d, k) \sim \frac{2}{3}dk, and so n_{VT}(d, k) = 2n(d, k) in this case. On the other hand, since the extremal graphs constructed in the proof of Proposition 1 are vertex-transitive, we have n_{VT}(d, k) = n(d, k) when k \leq 3.

References


Received 7 March 2012
Revised 17 September 2012
Accepted 2 October 2012