

# Ramsey Number Counterexample Checking and One Vertex Extension Linearly Related to $s$ and $t$

Adam Lehavi<sup>a</sup>

November 11, 2024

## Abstract

The Ramsey number  $R(s, t)$  is the smallest integer  $n$  such that all graphs of size  $n$  contain a clique of size  $s$  or an independent set of size  $t$ .  $\mathcal{R}(s, t, n)$  is the set of all counterexample graphs without this property for a given  $n$ . We prove that if a graph  $G_{n+1}$  of size  $n + 1$  has  $\max\{s, t\} + 1$  subgraphs in  $\mathcal{R}(s, t, n)$ , then  $G_{n+1}$  is in  $\mathcal{R}(s, t, n + 1)$ . Based on this, we introduce algorithms for one-vertex extension and counterexample checking with runtime linearly bound by  $s$  and  $t$ . We prove the utility of these algorithms by verifying  $\mathcal{R}(4, 6, 36)$  and  $\mathcal{R}(5, 5, 43)$  are empty given current sets  $\mathcal{R}(4, 6, 35)$  and  $\mathcal{R}(5, 5, 42)$ .

**Mathematics Subject Classifications:** 05D10, 05C55

## 1 Introduction

The Ramsey number  $R(s, t)$  is defined as the smallest positive integer  $n$  such that all graphs of size  $n$  contain a clique of size  $s$  or an independent set of size  $t$ . The field of Ramsey theory explores finding exact values, upper bounds and lower bounds for given  $s$  and  $t$  values. The field began with the proof that  $R(s, t)$  must exist for all given  $s$  and  $t$ , and has transformed into a rich and well-studied subset of combinatorics over the course of the last few decades [1, 2, 3]. An extensive survey with current bounds, applications, and directions of the field can be found at [4].

Lower bounds for a given  $R(s, t, n)$  have been determined through direct mathematical proofs since the beginning of the field, and in the last 30 years saw success through the addition of computational approaches [4]. A counterexample graph for  $R(s, t) \leq n$  is a graph of size  $n$  such that there exist no cliques of size  $s$  or independent sets of size  $t$ .  $\mathcal{R}(s, t, n)$  is the set of all counterexample graphs to  $R(s, t)$  for a given  $n$ .

Next, we'll introduce basic observations.  $|\mathcal{R}(s, t, n)| > 0 \Rightarrow R(s, t) > n$ .  $|\mathcal{R}(s, t, n)| = 0$  and  $|\mathcal{R}(s, t, n - 1)| > 0 \Rightarrow R(s, t) = n$ . The discovery of nonempty counterexample sets has been used extensively to improve lower bounds, with  $R(4, 6) > 35$  and  $R(5, 5) > 42$  being current examples [5, 6]. A full database of known counterexample graphs can be

---

<sup>a</sup>Department of Mathematics, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, United States  
(alehavi@usc.edu).

found at [7]. The sets of known counterexamples for  $\mathcal{R}(5, 5, 42)$  and  $\mathcal{R}(4, 6, 35)$  are not provably exhaustive, although McKay and Radziszowski conjecture that  $\mathcal{R}(5, 5, 42)$  is [5].

McKay and Radziszowski explicitly state that the known 656  $\mathcal{R}(5, 5, 42)$  counterexamples cannot be used to generate any  $\mathcal{R}(5, 5, 43)$  counterexamples [5]. While no exact algorithm is provided, it can be assumed they used a variation of the one-vertex extension algorithm used in [3]. Exoo did not explicitly mention the use of an algorithm proving no  $\mathcal{R}(4, 6, 36)$  could be generated from the known 37  $\mathcal{R}(4, 6, 35)$  counterexamples [6].

The one-vertex extension algorithm developed in [3] has an exact description for  $\mathcal{R}(4, 5)$  but would need modification for other  $s$  and  $t$  values. Additionally, the algorithm has a runtime bound by the number of triangles and independent sets of size 4 in each counterexample, meaning for a given counterexample the runtime is bound exponentially to  $\max\{s, t\} - 1$ .

## 1.1 Contribution

We provide and prove our main theorem in Section 2. Using this, we first introduce a new algorithm for counterexample checking in Section 3. This algorithm has a runtime bound linearly to  $\max\{s, t\}$ . Then, in Section 4, we show a new algorithm for one-vertex extension, or going from  $\mathcal{R}(s, t, n)$  to  $\mathcal{R}(s, t, n + 1)$ . Our algorithm has a runtime quadratically bound to  $\max\{s, t\}$  instead of exponentially. The algorithm also works independent of choice for  $s, t$ , and  $n$ . Given an input of a known  $\mathcal{R}(s, t, n)$ , it generates the set of all  $\mathcal{R}(s, t, n + 1)$  whose subgraphs of size  $n$  are all within the known  $\mathcal{R}(s, t, n)$ , as opposed to prior algorithms that generate the set of all  $\mathcal{R}(s, t, n + 1)$  with at least 1 subgraph of size  $n$  within the known  $\mathcal{R}(s, t, n)$ . This limits the utility of the algorithm in searching a broader space but allows for efficient execution. We validate this by verifying  $\mathcal{R}(5, 5, 43)$  and  $\mathcal{R}(4, 6, 37)$  are empty given current sets  $\mathcal{R}(5, 5, 42)$  and  $\mathcal{R}(4, 6, 36)$  on a single PC in under 15 minutes.

## 2 Main Theorem

Let  $G_{n+1}$  be a simple, undirected graph of size  $n + 1$ .

**Theorem 1.** *If  $G_{n+1}$  has  $\max\{s, t\} + 1$  subgraphs in  $\mathcal{R}(s, t, n)$ ,  $G_{n+1} \in \mathcal{R}(s, t, n + 1)$*

*Proof.* Assume  $G_{n+1}$  has  $\max\{s, t\} + 1$  subgraphs in  $\mathcal{R}(s, t, n)$ . Each subgraph in  $\mathcal{R}(s, t, n)$  must be of size  $n$ , and so exclude a vertex in  $G_{n+1}$ . Let  $S = \{v_1, \dots, v_{\max\{s, t\} + 1}\}$  denote the excluded vertices in  $G_{n+1}$  for each of the  $\max\{s, t\} + 1$  subgraphs in  $\mathcal{R}(s, t, n)$ .

Assume we have a subgraph  $G'$  of  $G_{n+1}$  of size  $s$  or  $t$ . If  $G'$  excludes any  $v_i \in S$ , then  $G'$  is a subgraph of the  $i$ th subgraph in  $\mathcal{R}(s, t, n)$ . Therefore  $G'$  cannot be a clique of size  $s$  or an independent set of size  $t$ . If  $G'$  includes all  $v_i \in S$ , then it is at least of size  $\max\{s, t\} + 1 > \max\{s, t\}$  which is a contradiction.  $\square$

### 3 Counterexample Checking

We can check the belonging of a candidate graph  $G_{n+1}$  to counterexamples  $\mathcal{R}(s, t, n + 1)$  through Algorithm 1.

---

#### Algorithm 1 Counterexample Checking

---

```

for  $\max\{s, t\} + 1$  subgraphs  $G_n$  of size  $n$  of graph  $G_{n+1}$  do
  if  $G_n$  is not isomorphic to some  $G_k \in \mathcal{R}(s, t, n)$  then
    return false
  end if
end for
return true

```

---

As opposed to prior algorithms exponentially related to  $s$  and  $t$ , this algorithm requires a linear number of checks. However, other algorithms require no isomorphism checking. This algorithm requires a number of isomorphism calls linearly related to  $s$  and  $t$ , and the isomorphism must also be found to exist or not exist from a set of  $|\mathcal{R}(s, t, n)|$  possible candidates, giving an upper bound of  $(\max\{s, t\} + 1)|\mathcal{R}(s, t, n)|$  checks in the naive implementation.

Additionally, this algorithm requires knowledge of  $\mathcal{R}(s, t, n)$ . If some subset of  $\mathcal{R}(s, t, n)$  is used, or the set used is not known to be exhaustive, a false return value is possible for a candidate  $G_{n+1} \in \mathcal{R}(s, t, n + 1)$ .

### 4 One-Vertex Extension

We can extend from  $\mathcal{R}(s, t, n)$  to  $\mathcal{R}(s, t, n + 1)$  via Algorithm 2.

---

#### Algorithm 2 One-Vertex Extension

---

```

for all  $G_n \in \mathcal{R}(s, t, n)$  do
  Define  $G_{n+1} := G_n + v_{n+1}$ 
  for all  $i \in [1, n]$  do
    Graph  $G_{n-1} := G_n - v_i$ 
    for all  $G'_n \in \mathcal{R}(s, t, n)$  s.t.  $G'_n \neq G_n, G_{n-1} \subset G'_n$  do
      Assign edges between  $G_{n-1}$  and  $v_{n+1}$  s.t.  $G_{n-1} + v_{n+1} = G'_n$ 
      Add  $G_{n+1}$  to  $\mathcal{R}(s, t, n + 1)$  if it is a counterexample.
      Connect  $v_{n+1}$  to  $v_i$ .
      Add this new  $G_{n+1}$  to  $\mathcal{R}(s, t, n + 1)$  if it is a counterexample.
    end for
  end for
end for
return  $\mathcal{R}(s, t, n + 1)$ 

```

---

This algorithm iterates over at most  $2n|\mathcal{R}(s, t, n)|^2$  candidates. Other extension algorithms look at all ways to connect a new vertex ( $2^n$ ) to an existing counterexample,

meaning they search  $|\mathcal{R}(s, t, n)|2^n$  candidates. Our value is not always lesser, but allows for the choice of  $\min\{2n|\mathcal{R}(s, t, n)|^2, |\mathcal{R}(s, t, n)|2^n\}$  candidates when performing extension. Additionally, this algorithm explores all possible graphs with at least 2 subgraphs in  $\mathcal{R}(s, t, n)$ . Because  $\mathcal{R}(s, t, n+1)$  is the set of all graphs with  $\max\{s, t\} + 1$  subgraphs in  $\mathcal{R}(s, t, n)$ , we exhaustively find all graphs in  $\mathcal{R}(s, t, n+1)$ .

Regarding checking counterexamples, we can either use existing algorithms or Algorithm 1. When using Algorithm 1, we have already verified two subgraphs, meaning we only need to run  $\max\{s, t\} - 1$  additional iterations.

Running Algorithm 2 on a subset of  $\mathcal{R}(s, t, n)$ , we only generate graphs with at least  $\max\{s, t\} + 1$  subgraphs in the subset when using Algorithm 1 to check, and at least 2 subgraphs in the subset when checking with other schemes. This is a stricter limitation than other extension algorithms that generate graphs with at least 1 subgraph in the subset.

An additional cost of this algorithm is that, in our implementation, the condition of finding that  $G_{n-1} \subset G'_n$  requires calls to an isomorphism checker.

## 5 Results

We wrote a single-threaded python implementation of the high level algorithms provided in Sections 3 and 4. Code was ran on a laptop with a single intel core i7. Much of the work leveraged the NetworkX library, in particular the VF2++ algorithm [8, 9]. We also attempted to decrement to subsets of  $\mathcal{R}(s, t, n-1)$  from given subsets of some  $\mathcal{R}(s, t, n)$  to broaden the search space, as done by McKay, Exoo, and Radziszowski [5, 6].

### 5.1 R(4,6,36)

There are no counterexamples of size 36 with at least 7 subgraphs strictly within the 37 known  $\mathcal{R}(4, 6, 35)$  examples [7]. This took 20 seconds to verify.

### 5.2 R(5,5,43)

There are no counterexamples of size 43 with at least 6 subgraphs strictly within the 656 known  $\mathcal{R}(5, 5, 42)$  examples[7]. This took 9 minutes and 5 seconds to verify.

### 5.3 Decrementing

We decremented the subset of  $\mathcal{R}(4, 6, 35)$  to a subset of  $\mathcal{R}(4, 6, 34)$  and the subset of  $\mathcal{R}(5, 5, 42)$  to a subset of  $\mathcal{R}(5, 5, 41)$  and tried reconstructing to find new counterexamples. None were found.

## 6 Conclusion

We introduce a new theorem and way to look at Ramsey theory counterexamples with regard to smaller counterexamples. We provide algorithms that leverage this, and im-

plement them to verify known results. This new approach may assist in novel methods for one-vertex extension or gluing that yield the complete sets  $\mathcal{R}(4, 6, 36)$ ,  $\mathcal{R}(5, 5, 43)$ , or  $\mathcal{R}(3, 10, 40)$  in the future.

## Acknowledgements

Thanks to Afia Anjum for her endless patience in listening to me ramble about these theorems.

## References

- [1] Frank P Ramsey. On a problem of formal logic. In *Classic Papers in Combinatorics*, pages 1–24. Springer, 1987.
- [2] K Walker. Dichromatic graphs and ramsey numbers. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory*, 5(3):238–243, 1968.
- [3] Brendan D. McKay and Stanislaw P. Radziszowski.  $R(4, 5) = 25$ . *J. Graph Theory*, 19:309–322, 1995.
- [4] Stanislaw Radziszowski. Small ramsey numbers. *The electronic journal of combinatorics*, 1000:DS1–Aug, 2011.
- [5] Brendan D McKay and Stanisław P Radziszowski. Subgraph counting identities and ramsey numbers. *journal of combinatorial theory, Series B*, 69(2):193–209, 1997.
- [6] Geoffrey Exoo. On the ramsey number  $r(4, 6)$ . *the electronic journal of combinatorics*, 19(1):P66, 2012.
- [7] Brendan McKay. Ramsey graphs, 2016.
- [8] Aric Hagberg, Pieter J Swart, and Daniel A Schult. Exploring network structure, dynamics, and function using networkx. Technical report, Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL), Los Alamos, NM (United States), 2008.
- [9] Alpár Jüttner and Péter Madarasi. Vf2++—an improved subgraph isomorphism algorithm. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 242:69–81, 2018. Computational Advances in Combinatorial Optimization.