

Towards a proof of Seymour's Second Neighborhood Conjecture

James N. Brantner, Greg Brockman, Bill Kay, Emma E. Snively

November 9, 2021

Abstract

Let D be a simple digraph without loops or digons. For any $v \in V(D)$ let $N_1(v)$ be the set of all nodes at out-distance 1 from v and let $N_2(v)$ be the set of all nodes at out-distance 2. We provide conditions under which there must exist some $v \in V(D)$ such that $|N_1(v)| \leq |N_2(v)|$, as well as examine extremal properties in a minimal graph which does not have such a node. We show that if one such graph exists, then there exist infinitely many.

1 Introduction

For the purposes of this article, we consider only simple nonempty digraphs (those containing no loops or multiple edges and having a nonempty vertex set), unless stated otherwise. We also require that our digraphs contain no digons, that is, if D is a digraph then $(u, v) \in E(D) \Rightarrow (v, u) \notin E(D)$. If i is a positive integer, we denote the i^{th} neighborhood of a vertex u in D by $N_{i,D}(u) = \{v \in V(D) \mid \text{dist}_D(u, v) = i\}$, where $\text{dist}_D(u, v)$ is the length of the shortest directed path from u to v in D (if there is no directed path from u to v , we set $\text{dist}_D(u, v) = \infty$). If D is clear from context, we simply write $N_i(u)$ and $\text{dist}(u, v)$. We also may wish to consider the i^{th} in-neighborhood of a node $N_{-i}(u) = \{v \in V(D) \mid \text{dist}(v, u) = i\}$. In addition, if $V' \subseteq V(D)$, we let $D[V']$ be the subgraph of D induced by V' .

Graph theorists will be familiar with the following conjecture by Seymour:

Conjecture 1.1 (Seymour's Second Neighborhood Conjecture). *Let D be a directed graph. Then there exists a vertex $v_0 \in V(D)$ such that $|N_1(v_0)| \leq |N_2(v_0)|$.*

In 1995, Dean [2] conjectured this to be true when D is a tournament. Dean's Conjecture was subsequently proven by Fisher [4] in 1996. Further, in their 2001 paper Kaneko and Locke [5] showed Conjecture 1.1 to be true if the minimum outdegree of vertices in D is less than 7, and Cohn, Wright, and Godbole [1] showed that it holds for random graphs almost always. And finally, in 2007 Fidler and Yuster [3] proved that Conjecture 1.1 holds for graphs with minimum out-degree $|V(D)| - 2$, tournaments minus a star, and tournaments minus a sub-tournament. While over the years there have been several attempts at a proof of Conjecture 1.1, none of these have yet been successful.

For completeness, we introduce the related Caccetta-Häggkvist conjecture:

Conjecture 1.2 (Caccetta-Häggkvist Conjecture). *If D is a directed graph with minimum outdegree at least $|V(D)|/k$, then D has a directed cycle of length at most k .*

Conjecture 1.1 would imply the $k = 3$ case of Conjecture 1.2. Much work has been done on Conjecture 1.2, including an entire workshop sponsored by AIM and the NSF, but still both Conjectures 1.1 and 1.2 remain wide open.

We do not seek to prove Conjecture 1.1 in this paper. Rather, we attempt to prove the conjecture for various classes of graphs. We then take a different tack and provide conditions that must be satisfied by any appropriately-defined minimal counterexample to Seymour's Second Neighborhood Conjecture. This provides many tools with which the conjecture can be approached; in one direction it may aid in showing the nonexistence of such a graph, while in the other direction we restrict the search space of possible counterexamples.

2 Definitions

We begin our investigation by defining some useful terms.

Definition 2.1. Suppose that D is digraph and $u \in V(D)$. We say that u is *Seymour* if $|N_1(u)| \leq |N_2(u)|$. Also, u is a *sink* if $|N_1(u)| = 0$. Note that a sink is trivially Seymour.

Definition 2.2. Let $\mathcal{A} = \{D \mid D \text{ is a simple directed graph with no Seymour vertices}\}$ be the set of counterexamples to Seymour's Second Neighborhood Conjecture. We will refer to elements of \mathcal{A} as *Seymour counterexamples*. Let $\mathcal{A}' = \{D \mid |E(D)| = \min_{H \in \mathcal{A}} |E(H)|\}$ be the set of graphs in \mathcal{A} with the fewest number of edges. Finally, let $\mathcal{A}'' = \{D \mid |V(D)| = \min_{H \in \mathcal{A}'} |V(H)|\}$ be the set of graphs in \mathcal{A}' with the fewest number of vertices. We will refer to any element of \mathcal{A}'' as a *minimal criminal*. Note that \mathcal{A}'' is empty if and only if Conjecture 1.1 is true.

Definition 2.3. Let D be a digraph. Suppose that $u \in V(D)$. We define $W_D(u) = \{v \mid \text{dist}(u, v) \neq \infty\}$ to be the *walkable neighborhood* of u with respect to D . If D is clear from context, we simply write $W(u)$.

Also define $A_{s,G}(u) = |N_1(u)| - |N_2(u)|$ to be the *anti-Seymourness* of u . As usual, if G is clear from context, we simply write $A_s(u)$. Notice that u is Seymour if and only if $A_s(u) \leq 0$.

Definition 2.4. Again let D be a directed graph. If $(u, v) \in E(D)$, we say that edge (u, v) is the *base* of a transitive triangle if u and v share a common first neighbor; that is, $|N_1(u) \cap N_1(v)| \geq 1$.

If, for distinct $t, u, v, w \in V(D)$, we have that $(t, u), (u, w), (t, v), (v, w) \in E$ then we call $\{(t, u), (u, w), (t, v), (v, w)\}$ a *Seymour diamond*. We say the edges $(t, u), (t, v)$ are the *bases* of the Seymour diamond.

We now have the tools to delve into our results.




Figure 1 — Demonstration of an edge that is the base of a transitive triangle




Figure 2 — Demonstration of the bases of a Seymour diamond

3 Directed cycles and underlying girth

In this section we show that certain classes of graphs satisfy Seymour’s Second Neighborhood Conjecture. The following theorem shows that directed cycles are necessary for a graph to be a Seymour counterexample.

Theorem 3.1. *If a digraph contains no directed cycles, then it must have a Seymour vertex.*

Proof. Let D be a directed graph. Suppose that D contains no Seymour vertices. Then D has no sink, as noted in Definition 2.1. Thus if $u \in V(D)$, we have that $|N_1(u)| \geq 1$. Now pick an arbitrary vertex $v_0 \in V(D)$, and consider the infinite sequence $\{v_i\}_{i=0}^\infty$ defined recursively by $v_{i+1} \in N_1(v_i)$ for $i \geq 0$. Since V is finite, we then have that there exist some $r \neq s$ such that $v_r = v_s$. Then we note that the sequence of edges $(v_r, v_{r+1}), (v_{r+1}, v_{r+2}), \dots, (v_{s-1}, v_s = v_r)$ defines a dicycle in D , thus completing our proof. \square

Recall now that the girth of a undirected graph is the length of its shortest cycle. The following theorem shows that any Seymour counterexample must have underlying girth of exactly 3.

Theorem 3.2. *Let G be a simple graph with girth strictly larger than 3. Then any orientation of G will result in a directed graph with a Seymour vertex.*

Proof. Let D be any orientation of G . Clearly there must exist some vertex v_0 with minimal out-degree. If $|N_1(v_0)| = 0$, then v_0 is a sink and hence a Seymour vertex. Otherwise, let $v_1 \in N_1(v_0)$. By construction, we have that $|N_1(v_1)| \geq |N_1(v_0)|$. Furthermore, the underlying graph has girth at least 4, so $|N_1(v_0) \cap N_1(v_1)| = 0$. Thus, $|N_2(v_0)| \geq |N_1(v_1)| \geq |N_1(v_0)|$, and by definition v_0 is a Seymour vertex. \square

Remark. A similar argument will show that any digraph D which has no transitive triangles as a subgraph must have a Seymour vertex. We will prove a stronger version of this result in the following section.

4 Minimal Criminals

To this point, we have been showing that classes of graphs satisfy Conjecture 1.1. In this section we reverse course and explore necessary properties of the minimal criminal graphs of \mathcal{A}'' from Definition 2.2. If Seymour's Second Neighborhood Conjecture is true, then our goal should be to derive such strong constraints on the graphs of \mathcal{A}'' that a contradiction is obtained. On the other hand, if the conjecture is false, then our goal is to find necessary or sufficient conditions for a graph to be in \mathcal{A}'' ; we provide a number of necessary conditions here.

Theorem 4.1. *If $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{A}''$, we have the following:*

1. \mathcal{M} is strongly connected.
2. For each $u \in V(\mathcal{M})$, $A_s(u) \in \{1, 2\}$.
3. For every edge $e = (u, v) \in E(\mathcal{M})$, there exists a path of length 1 or 2 avoiding e from u to all but at most 1 element of $\{v\} \cup N_1(v)$.
4. Every edge of \mathcal{M} is the base of either a transitive triangle or a Seymour diamond.
5. For any node $u \in V(\mathcal{M})$, there exists a node $v \in N_{-1}(u)$ such that $A_s(v) = 1$.
6. There exists a cycle $C = (v_1, v_2), (v_2, v_3), \dots, (v_k, v_1)$ in \mathcal{M} such that for $1 \leq i \leq k$, we have that $A_s(v_i) = 1$.

Proof. Proof of 1: Pick an arbitrary node u from the vertex set of \mathcal{M} . Now consider $\mathcal{M}' = \mathcal{M}[W(u)]$. We now pick an arbitrary node $v \in W(u)$. Clearly, $N_{1,\mathcal{M}'}(v) \subseteq W(u)$ and $N_{2,\mathcal{M}'}(v) \subseteq W(u)$. But this implies that $A_{s,\mathcal{M}'}(v) = |N_{1,\mathcal{M}'}(v)| - |N_{2,\mathcal{M}'}(v)| = |N_{1,\mathcal{M}}(v)| - |N_{2,\mathcal{M}}(v)| = A_{s,\mathcal{M}}(v)$, and hence v is Seymour in \mathcal{M}' if and only if v is Seymour in \mathcal{M} . Since by construction \mathcal{M} contains no Seymour vertices, v cannot be Seymour in \mathcal{M}' . Thus \mathcal{M}' contains no Seymour vertices. But \mathcal{M}' is a subgraph of \mathcal{M} , and so by minimality of \mathcal{M} we have that $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}'$. Since u was arbitrary, we are done.

Proof of 2: Pick an arbitrary edge $e = (u, v) \in E(\mathcal{M})$. Consider the graph M obtained by deleting e from \mathcal{M} . Since M has fewer edges than \mathcal{M} , we have that M contains a Seymour vertex. For each vertex $w \in V(\mathcal{M})$, we note that $|N_{1,M}(w)| = |N_{1,\mathcal{M}}(w)|$ unless $w = u$, in which case $|N_{1,M}(u)| = |N_{1,\mathcal{M}}(u)| - 1$. Furthermore, we have that $|N_{2,M}(w)| \leq |N_{2,\mathcal{M}}(w)|$, except if $w = u$, in which case we have that $|N_{2,M}(u)| \leq |N_{2,\mathcal{M}}(u)| + 1$. (See Figure 3.)

Thus, we obtain that in M for $w \neq u \in V(M)$, $A_{s,M}(w) \geq A_{s,\mathcal{M}}(w)$, and hence all vertices in M besides u are not Seymour. Thus by process of elimination we have that u is Seymour in M . Thus $0 \geq A_{s,M}(u) = |N_{1,M}(u)| - |N_{2,M}(u)| \geq (|N_{1,\mathcal{M}}(u)| - 1) - (|N_{2,\mathcal{M}}(u)| + 1)$, and hence we have that $0 < A_{s,\mathcal{M}}(u) = |N_{1,\mathcal{M}}(u)| - |N_{2,\mathcal{M}}(u)| \leq 2$. Result 2 follows immediately.

Proof of 3: We see that $|N_{2,M}(u)| \geq |N_{2,\mathcal{M}}(u)|$, since otherwise $A_{s,M}(u) \leq 0$ and u is not Seymour in M , a contradiction. Consider now $X = N_{2,M}(u) \setminus N_{2,\mathcal{M}}(u)$. We note that $X \subseteq \{v\}$, since v is the only vertex that could have been added to u 's second neighborhood in M (Case 1 in Figure 3). Thus we see that $|N_{2,\mathcal{M}}(u) \setminus N_{2,M}(u)| \leq 1$, with equality only if $v \in N_{2,\mathcal{M}}(u)$.




Figure 3 — Two possible cases resulting from deleting an edge from \mathcal{M} . In Case 1, there is a length 2 path from u to v , while in Case 2 no such path exists. Note that it is possible that deleting e will increase the size of u 's second neighborhood, as shown in Case 1.

Note that $N_{1,\mathcal{M}}(v) \subseteq N_{1,\mathcal{M}}(u) \cup N_{2,\mathcal{M}}(u)$. Let $Y = N_{1,\mathcal{M}}(u) \cap N_{1,\mathcal{M}}(v)$ and $Z = N_{2,\mathcal{M}}(u) \cap N_{1,\mathcal{M}}(v)$. For $y \in Y$, we clearly have a path of length 1 from u to y avoiding e (namely the edge (u, y)). If $|N_{2,\mathcal{M}}(u) \setminus N_{2,\mathcal{M}}(u)| = 0$, then for $z \in Z$, we therefore have a path of length 2 from u to z in M , and considering this path in \mathcal{M} yields a path from u to z avoiding e . And finally, if $|N_{2,\mathcal{M}}(u) \setminus N_{2,\mathcal{M}}(u)| = 1$, then we have a path of length 2 from u to z in M for all but 1 vertex in Z , and as before we have a corresponding path from u to z avoiding e . But in this case, there is a path of length 2 from u to v avoiding e , and hence we have obtained the desired result.

Proof of 4: Paths of length 1 from u to $v' \in N_1(v)$ yield transitive triangles with e as the base, and paths of length 2 from u to $v' \in \{v\} \cup N_1(v)$ yield Seymour diamonds with e as one of the bases. By part 3, at least one of these structures exists, and hence we are done.

Proof of 5: In \mathcal{M} , pick an arbitrary vertex u . Delete this vertex and label the resulting graph M . Then in a similar manner to before, one of the nodes in $N_{-1,\mathcal{M}}(u)$ must be Seymour in M by vertex minimality of \mathcal{M} . Label this node t . Since $|N_{1,M}(t)| = |N_{1,\mathcal{M}}(t)| - 1$, t is Seymour, and $|N_{2,M}(t)| \subseteq |N_{2,\mathcal{M}}(t)|$ (note that in contrast to deleting an edge, deleting a vertex does not allow any vertices to add nodes to their second neighborhoods), we see that we must have $|N_{2,M}(t)| = |N_{2,\mathcal{M}}(t)|$. It is then necessary that $A_{s,\mathcal{M}}(t) = 1$. Since u was arbitrary, we have obtained the desired result.

Proof of 6: We apply the same technique as we used Theorem 3.1. We present a brief sketch of our proof: by part 5, each node in \mathcal{M} has an in-neighbor having anti-Seymourness of exactly 1. If we begin at an arbitrary vertex and choose one of its in-neighbors having anti-Seymourness of exactly 1, do the same for the resulting vertex, and iterate this process, at some point we must arrive back at a vertex we have already visited. Thus we have constructed a dicycle of nodes having anti-Seymourness exactly 1. \square

We now extend some of our results from the previous theorem. In particular, we turn to a count of the number of transitive triangles and Seymour diamonds that certain edges must belong to.

Theorem 4.2. *If $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{A}''$, suppose that $e = (u, v) \in E(\mathcal{M})$ and $|N_1(u)| \leq |N_1(v)|$. Then e must be the base of at least $|N_1(v)| - |N_1(u)| + 1$ transitive triangles and the base of at least $|N_1(v)| - |N_1(u)| + 1$ Seymour diamonds.*

Proof. Since $N_1(v) \setminus (N_1(u) \cap N_1(v)) \subseteq N_2(u)$, we have that $|N_2(u)| \geq |N_1(v)| - |N_1(u) \cap N_1(v)|$. But since \mathcal{M} contains no Seymour vertices, we have that $|N_2(u)| < |N_1(u)|$. By

transitivity, we obtain $|N_1(v)| - |N_1(v) \cap N_1(u)| < |N_1(u)|$. It then follows that $|N_1(v)| - |N_1(u)| < |N_1(v) \cap N_1(u)|$, but $|N_1(v) \cap N_1(u)|$ is the number of transitive triangles having base e , so we have proved the first half of the theorem.

To prove the second half of the theorem, we consider the following cases:

Case 1: Suppose there exists a vertex u' such that $(u, u'), (u', v) \in E(\mathcal{M})$. By part 3 of Theorem 4.1, we know that u must be connected to at least $|N_1(v)| - 1$ elements of $N_1(v)$ via a path of length 1 or 2 avoiding e . But we see that u is adjacent to at most $|N_1(u) - 2|$ nodes in $N_1(v)$. Subtracting, we see that u is connected via a path of length 2 avoiding e to at least $|N_1(v)| - 1 - (|N_1(u)| - 2) = (|N_1(v)| - |N_1(u)|) + 1$ nodes in $N_1(v)$; each of which yields a Seymour diamond of which e is the base, which is the desired result.

Case 2: Suppose there is no such u' . Then again applying part 3 of Theorem 4.1, it must be that there exists a path of length 1 or 2 avoiding e to each node in $N_1(v)$. But u is adjacent to at most $|N_1(u)| - 1$ of these nodes, and as before we count that there is a path of length 2 avoiding e from u to at least $|N_1(v)| - (|N_1(u)| - 1) = |N_1(v)| - |N_1(u)| + 1$ nodes in $|N_1(v)|$. Since each of these paths yield a Seymour diamond with e as the base, we are done. \square

Finally, we show that there is not some finite nonzero number of counterexamples to the conjecture. That is, either the conjecture is true, or there are an infinite number of (non-isomorphic) graphs that violate Conjecture 1.1. We provide a constructive proof below.

Theorem 4.3. *There are either precisely zero or infinitely many non-isomorphic counterexamples to Seymour's Second Neighborhood Conjecture.*

Proof. Suppose that digraph D is a counterexample to Seymour's Second Neighborhood Conjecture. Let H be any digraph satisfying the condition $\forall v \in V(H), A_s(v) \geq 0$; that is, all of H 's nodes have nonnegative anti-Seymourness. Note that any dicycle satisfies the relevant condition, and hence there exists a choice of H on any number n of nodes, $n \geq 3$.

We now construct a graph D' on $|V(D)| \cdot |V(H)|$ nodes such that D' is a counterexample to Seymour's Second Neighborhood Conjecture, thus proving our theorem. We define our graph D' as follows:

- $V(D') = V(D) \times V(H)$
- If $u = (d_1, h_1), v = (d_2, h_2) \in V(D')$, then $(u, v) \in E(D')$ if and only if either
 1. $d_1 = d_2$ and $(h_1, h_2) \in E(H)$, or
 2. $d_1 \neq d_2$ and $(d_1, d_2) \in E(D)$.

For any vertex $v = (d, h) \in V(D')$, we calculate that

$$|N_{1,D'}(v)| = |N_{1,H}(h)| + |V(H)| \cdot |N_{1,D}(d)|,$$

by construction. Furthermore, we have that

$$|N_{2,D'}(v)| = |N_{2,H}(h)| + |V(H)| \cdot |N_{2,D}(d)|.$$




Figure 4 — A partial representation of the graph D' , given D and H . We can think about D' as being made by replacing each vertex of D with a copy of H . Note that for clarity we replace only one node in the above picture.

We then calculate that

$$\begin{aligned} A_{s,D'}(v) &= |N_{1,D'}(v)| - |N_{2,D'}(v)| \\ &= (|N_{1,H}(h)| - |N_{2,H}(h)|) + |V(H)|(|N_{1,D'}(d)| - |N_{2,D'}(d)|). \end{aligned}$$

But by our choice of H , we have that $|N_{1,H}(h)| - |N_{2,H}(h)| \geq 0$, and by our choice of D we have that $|N_{1,D'}(d)| - |N_{2,D'}(d)| > 0$. Hence we obtain $A_{s,D'}(v) > 0$, thus implying that every vertex in D' has positive anti-Seymourness. By definition, we then have that D' is a counterexample to Seymour's Second Neighborhood Conjecture. \square

5 Conclusions and Future Directions

In total, this paper has been an exploration of Seymour's Second Neighborhood Conjecture. We have neither proven nor disproven the conjecture, but instead determined some classes of graphs that do satisfy the conjecture; we have also described some properties of a family of minimal counterexamples. Moreover, we have shown that the existence of one counterexample graph implies the existence of infinitely many such graphs. Our work is intended as a stepping stone for further analysis of Conjecture 1.1, hopefully ultimately leading to its resolution.

6 Acknowledgements

This work was done at the East Tennessee State University REU, NSF grant 0552730, under the supervision of Dr. Anant Godbole.

References

- [1] Z. Cohn, E. Wright, and A. Godbole. Probabilistic versions of Seymour's distance two conjecture. *preprint*.

- [2] N. Dean and B. Latka. Squaring a tournament-an open problem. *Congre. Numer.*
- [3] D. Fidler and R. Yuster. Remarks on the second neighborhood problem. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 55:208–220, 2007.
- [4] David C. Fisher. Squaring a tournament: a proof of Dean’s conjecture. *J. Graph Theory*, 23(1):15–20, 1996.
- [5] Yoshihiro Kaneko and Stephen C. Locke. The minimum degree approach for Paul Seymour’s distance 2 conjecture. *Congr. Numer.*, 148.