

On graphs with well-distributed edge density

Syed Mujtaba Hassan* Shahid Hussain†

March 21, 2024

Abstract

In this paper, we introduce a class of graphs which we call *average hereditary graphs*. Most graphs that occur in the usual graph theory applications belong to this class of graphs. Many popular types of graphs fall under this class, such as regular graphs, trees and other popular classes of graphs. We prove a new upper bound for the chromatic number of a graph in terms of its maximum average degree and show that this bound is an improvement on previous bounds. From this, we show a relationship between the average degree and the chromatic number of an *average hereditary graph*. This class of graphs is explored further by proving some interesting properties regarding the class of *average hereditary graphs*. An equivalent condition is provided for a graph to be *average hereditary*, through which we show that we can decide if a given graph is *average hereditary* in polynomial time. We then provide a construction for *average hereditary graphs*, using which an average hereditary graph can be recursively constructed. We also show that this class of graphs is closed under a binary operation, from this another construction is obtained for *average hereditary graphs*, and we see some interesting algebraic properties this class of graphs has. We then explore the effect on the complexity of graph 3-COLORING problem when the input is restricted to *average hereditary graphs*.

Keywords: Graph theory, graph coloring, NP-Hard graph problem, graph average degree

1 Introduction

We introduce a new class of graphs that we call average hereditary graphs. There are many interesting properties regarding this class of graphs. In this paper, we explore a few of those properties. We provide a new upper bound for the chromatic number of a graph in terms of its maximum average degree, that is $\chi(G) \leq MAD(G) + 1$, we then show that this new bound is an improvement on previous results. We use this bound to find a relationship between the average degree of a graph and its chromatic number, from this, we prove a general case for which we know the exact chromatic number of an average hereditary graph. What's interesting is that the class of average hereditary graphs is quite broad as it contains many popular classes of graphs, furthermore, most graphs that occur in graph theory applications belong to the class of average hereditary graphs. So the class only restricts some extreme cases. We will analyze the computational complexity of deciding if a graph is average hereditary, and show that we can compute if a graph is average hereditary in polynomial time. This is done by providing an equivalent condition for a graph to be average hereditary.

We will then give a construction of average hereditary graphs and show that the class is closed under the graph join operation. Our construction gives us an algorithm to recursively construct average hereditary graphs. The closure under the binary operation also provides a method to construct average hereditary graphs. Furthermore, this also tells us about some interesting algebraic properties the class of average hereditary graphs has, such as the set of all average hereditary graphs is a commutative monoid. We then show that the graph 3-COLORING problem remains **NP-hard** when the input is restricted to average hereditary graphs.

The main result of our paper is the new general case upper bound on the chromatic number of graphs which is an improvement on previous bounds found in literature.

*ms06948@st.habib.edu.pk, Computer Science Department, Habib University, Karachi, Pakistan (corresponding author)

†shahidhussain@iba.edu.pk, Computer Science Department, Institute of Business Administration, Karachi, Pakistan

1.1 Preliminaries

Throughout this document, we will denote a graph as $G = (V, E)$ where G is a graph with vertex set V and edge set E . An edge is represented as a set $\{v, u\}$ for some v and u belonging to V such that $v \neq u$. Also, for a graph G we use $V(G)$ to denote the vertex set of G and $E(G)$ to denote the edge set of G . All graphs considered here are undirected and simple meaning they contain no loops, multi-edges or directed edges. We will use $H \subseteq G$ to denote an induced subgraph of G . For some $U \subseteq V$, $G - U$ denotes the subgraph of G obtained by removing the vertices in U . For $H \subseteq G$, \overline{H} denote the graph $G - V(H)$. For each vertex $v \in V$ we used $d_G(v)$ to denote the degree of v in G . We also use $\Delta(G)$ to denote the maximum degree of G and $\delta(G)$ to denote the minimum degree of G . The average degree of G , denoted by $d(G)$ is the average of all the degrees of G , which can be computed by $d(G) = \frac{\sum_{v \in V} d_G(v)}{|V|} = \frac{2|E|}{|V|}$ if V is nonempty. For a null graph, we define the average degree as 0. If the degrees of all the vertices of a graph G are equal to k , we say G is k -regular.

The edge cut $[V(H), \overline{V(H)}]$ is the smallest set of edges you need to remove from G to break G into two components H and \overline{H} , for $H \subseteq G$. The edge connectivity is the size of the smallest cut edge, denoted by $\kappa'(G)$. If a graph G' is constructed by adding a vertex x to G and connecting x to some $v \in V$ and all the neighbors of v , we say G' is obtained from G by expanding v to an edge $\{v, x\}$. We denote this as $G' = G \text{exp}(v, x)$. The join of two graphs G and H is a graph K such that K contains all the edges and vertices of G and H and in K , each vertex in G is connected to every vertex in H . We denote this as $K = G \wedge H$. The clique size is the size of the largest complete subgraph of G , we denote it by $\omega(G)$.

Coloring a graph G is assigning a color to each vertex of G such that if two vertices are adjacent then they are assigned a different color than each other. The smallest natural number k such that G can be colored with k colors is known as the chromatic number of G . We denote the chromatic number of G by $\chi(G)$. If $k = \chi(G)$ then we say G is k -chromatic. G is called k -critical if $\chi(G) = k$ and $\forall v \in V$, $\chi(G - v) < k$. \mathbb{N} denotes the set of natural numbers which includes 0.

1.2 Average Hereditary Graphs

We now define our new class of graph that we call average hereditary graphs, we then show how broad this class of graph is, in other words, we show that this class of graph is a superset of many other popular classes of graphs.

We define a new class of graphs called average hereditary graphs. A graph $G = (V, E)$ is *average hereditary* if for every induced subgraph H of G , $d(H) \leq d(G)$. Note that this definition is equivalent to saying that for every subgraph H of G (not necessarily induced), $d(H) \leq d(G)$. As if $d(H) \leq d(G)$ for all $H \subseteq G$ then we have that $d(H') \leq d(G)$ for all induced subgraphs H' of G and conversely if $d(G') \leq d(G)$ for all induced subgraphs G' of G then as for every subgraph H of G there exists an induced subgraph H' of G such that $V(H) = V(H')$ and $d(H) \leq d(H')$.

One way to think about such graphs is that the edge density is more “uniformly” distributed over the graph. Most graphs that occur in usual graph theory applications or other areas belong to this class and the class only restricts some extreme cases. Most graphs we see are average hereditary. Many popular classes of graphs belong to this class of graphs. For example, all regular graphs and all trees are average hereditary. The following propositions prove these claims.

Proposition 1. *If G is a tree then G is average hereditary.*

Proof. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a tree so we have that $|E| = |V| - 1$. Therefore $d(G) = \frac{2|E|}{|V|} = \frac{2(|V|-1)}{|V|} = 2 - \frac{2}{|V|}$. Now if we induce a subgraph H from G then we can have two cases. First, if H is empty then $d(H) \leq d(G)$. If H is nonempty then we have that H is a forest. So we have that $|E(H)| \leq |V(H)| - 1$, therefore $d(H) \leq 2 - \frac{2}{|V(H)|}$ and as both V and $V(H)$ are finite, we have that $d(H) \leq d(G)$. \square

Proposition 2. *If G is a k -regular graph then G is average hereditary.*

Proof. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a k -regular graph. So $d(G) = k$. Now if we remove any set of vertices from G to induce a subgraph H then every vertex in H will have a degree of at most k . So the average degree of H is at most k . Therefore G will be average hereditary. \square

These propositions show that many popular types of graphs such as cycle, paths, star, claws, complete graphs, and Peterson graph, are all average hereditary, as we have that regular graphs and trees are average hereditary in general. Figure 1 shows some examples of average hereditary graphs.




Figure 1: Example of average hereditary graphs

Some non-example of average hereditary graphs would be $K_7 \cup K_3$ or if we connect P_{100} to a vertex of K_5 . So these non-examples are graphs which has one region with a much higher edge density and one region with a much lower edge density. But these examples are much rarer, so the class of average hereditary graphs is much broader as the class is a superset of many popular classes of graphs. Figure 2 shows a non-example of average hereditary graphs.




Figure 2: Example of Non-average hereditary graphs

We can see that these average hereditary graphs are graphs which has more “well” distributed edge density. So we don’t have that one region has a much higher edge density while another has a much lower edge density than that, as, if that were the case then removing the region with much lower edge density would give us a subgraph that has a higher average degree than the original graph. Now we explore some interesting properties regarding average hereditary graphs.

2 Computing Average Hereditary Property

From the definition computing the average hereditary property seems quite a difficult task itself. It is of interest to us to find a polynomial time computable equivalent condition for a graph to be average hereditary. Our next proposition gives that condition. The notion of maximum average degree has been an active area of research in graph theory. For a graph G , if H is a subgraph of G such that for all subgraphs G' of G , the average degree of G' is less than or equal to the average degree of H . For G we denote $MAD(G)$ as the average degree H . In other words for a graph G , $MAD(G)$ is the average degree of the densest subgraph of G . The next proposition gives us a relation between $MAD(G)$ and $d(G)$ for an average hereditary graph.

Proposition 3. *A graph G is average hereditary if and only if $d(G) = MAD(G)$.*

Proof. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph, we know that $MAD(G) \geq d(G)$. Now suppose G is average hereditary then from the definition $d(H) \leq d(G)$ for all subgraphs H of G . Then if $MAD(G) > d(G)$ we would have that there exists some subgraph H of G such that $d(H) > d(G)$ which is a contradiction, therefore

$d(G) = MAD(G)$. Conversely, suppose that $MAD(G) = d(G)$ then from the definition of maximum average degree, $d(H) \leq MAD(G) = d(G)$ for all subgraphs H of G , therefore G is average hereditary. \square

In his 1984 paper Goldberg showed that $MAD(G)$ can be computed in polynomial time [9]. Goldberg reduced computing $MAD(G)$ to a bunch of network flow problems giving an algorithm that runs in $O(M(|V|, 7 + |E|) \log |V|)$ time where $M(n, m)$ is the time required to find the minimum capacity cut in a network with n vertices and m edges [9]. The Max-flow min-cut theorem states that the minimum capacity of the cut in a network is equal to the maximum flow in a network [5, 14, 8, 4]. Now through this, we have several polynomial time algorithms to find the minimum capacity cut in a network such as Ford-Fulkerson algorithm [8], Edmonds-Karp algorithm [7], Diniz's algorithm [6], Goldberg-Tarjan algorithm [10] and many others. Furthermore, as the average degree of any graph can be computed in polynomial time we can use Goldberg's algorithm to compute if a given graph is average hereditary in polynomial time.

3 Bound on Chromatic number

Graph coloring is famously **NP-complete**. Chromatic coloring is the optimization version of the Graph coloring problem. Chromatic coloring concerns with computing the chromatic number of a given graph. Unlike the usual graph coloring problem, which isn't specifically concerns with the chromatic number of the graph, the chromatic coloring problem isn't even known to be in **NP**. Chromatic coloring is itself **NP-hard**, which means no polynomial time algorithm exists for it unless $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{NP}$. However many upper bounds exist for the chromatic number of a graph, aiming to reduce the complexity of the existing coloring algorithms. We introduce a new upper bound for the chromatic number of a graph in terms of the maximum average degree of the graph, that is $\chi(G) \leq MAD(G) + 1$. As a corollary of this, we obtain a relationship between the average degree and the chromatic number of an average hereditary graph. We compare our new upper bound on the chromatic number with previous bounds found in the literature and show that our bound is tighter than the previous bounds. To prove this bound we use two Lemmas found in literature.

Lemma 1 ([14]). *Every k -chromatic graph has a k -critical induced subgraph.*

Lemma 2 ([14]). *For a critical graph G , $\chi(G) - 1 \leq \delta(G)$.*

Theorem 1. *For a graph G , $\chi(G) \leq MAD(G) + 1$.*

Proof. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph. Let $H \subseteq G$ be a critical induced subgraph of G , then $\chi(H) = \chi(G)$. As $\chi(G) - 1 \leq \delta(H)$, then we have that $\chi(G) \leq \delta(H) + 1$. So we have that $\chi(G) \leq \delta(H) + 1 \leq d(H) + 1 \leq MAD(G) + 1$. Therefore $\chi(G) \leq MAD(G) + 1$. \square

Corollary 1. *If G is an average hereditary graph then $\chi(G) \leq d(G) + 1$.*

Proof. Let $G = (V, E)$ be an average hereditary graph. Then from Proposition 3 we have that $d(G) = MAD(G)$, and so $\chi(G) \leq MAD(G) + 1$ implies $\chi(G) \leq d(G) + 1$. \square

It is to note that as $\chi(G) \in \mathbb{N}$, $\chi(G) \leq MAD(G) + 1$ implies $\chi(G) \leq \lfloor MAD(G) + 1 \rfloor$ and likewise $\chi(G) \leq d(G) + 1$ implies $\chi(G) \leq \lfloor d(G) + 1 \rfloor$. The following corollary uses this to show a case where we know the exact chromatic number of an average hereditary graph.

Corollary 2. *If G is an average hereditary graph and $\left\lceil \frac{|V|}{|V| - d(G)} \right\rceil = \lfloor d(G) + 1 \rfloor$, then $\chi(G) = \omega(G) = \lfloor d(G) + 1 \rfloor$.*

Proof. Let $G = (V, E)$ be an average hereditary graph. From [12] we know that $\chi(G) \geq \omega(G) \geq \frac{|V|^2}{|V|^2 - 2|E|} = \frac{|V|}{|V| - d(G)}$.

From Corollary 1 we have that $\chi(G) \leq d(G) + 1$. As $\chi(G), \omega(G) \in \mathbb{N}$, then $\chi(G) \leq d(G) + 1$ implies $\chi(G) \leq \lfloor d(G) + 1 \rfloor$ and $\chi(G) \geq \omega(G) \geq \frac{|V|}{|V| - d(G)}$ implies $\chi(G) \geq \omega(G) \geq \left\lceil \frac{|V|}{|V| - d(G)} \right\rceil$. So

$$\left\lceil \frac{|V|}{|V| - d(G)} \right\rceil \leq \omega(G) \leq \chi(G) \leq \lfloor d(G) + 1 \rfloor$$

Therefore if $\left\lceil \frac{|V|}{|V| - d(G)} \right\rceil = \lfloor d(G) + 1 \rfloor$, then $\chi(G) = \omega(G) = \left\lceil \frac{|V|}{|V| - d(G)} \right\rceil = \lfloor d(G) + 1 \rfloor$. \square

We now show that our new bound of $\chi(G) \leq MAD(G) + 1$ is an improvement on previous bounds, that is to say, that in most cases our bound will be tighter than previous bounds found in the literature. We compare our bound with three previous bounds found in the literature showing that our bound is in improvement.

It is well known that in general $\chi(G) \leq \Delta(G) + 1$. We compare our bound with this general case bound and show that our bound is an improvement.

Proposition 4. $\lfloor MAD(G) + 1 \rfloor \leq \Delta(G) + 1$

Proof. For a graph $G = (V, E)$ the maximum average degree $MAD(G)$ is less than or equal to the maximum degree $\Delta(G)$. So

$$MAD(G) \leq \Delta(G) \implies MAD(G) + 1 \leq \Delta(G) + 1 \implies \lfloor MAD(G) + 1 \rfloor \leq \Delta(G) + 1.$$

□

Therefore this new bound is an improvement on the general case bound of $\chi(G) \leq \Delta(G) + 1$.

Now we compare it to the special case bound given by Brooks in 1941. Brooks showed that $\chi(G) \leq \Delta(G)$ if G is neither complete nor an odd cycle [3]. We show that our bound is an improvement on Brooks's bound when G is not regular.

Proposition 5. $\lfloor MAD(G) + 1 \rfloor \leq \Delta(G)$ if not all connected component of G containing a subgraph of maximum average degree are regular.

Proof. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph such that there is some non-regular connected component of G containing a subgraph of maximum average degree. Let M be the subgraph of G with the maximum average degree so $MAD(G) = d(M)$ and Let H be the connected component of G containing M . Without loss of generality suppose that there is a unique component H of G such that H contains a graph with the maximum average degree, else if there are multiple such components of G then we choose the component with the greatest maximum degree and obtain a graph G' by deleting all other such components of G , this way $\Delta(G') = \Delta(G)$ and $MAD(G') = MAD(G)$.

We have that $MAD(G) \leq \Delta(G)$, now suppose $MAD(G) = \Delta(G)$. We know that $d(M) \leq \Delta(H) \leq \Delta(G)$. So $MAD(G) = \Delta(G)$ implies $MAD(G) = \Delta(H)$. Now if $MAD(G) = \Delta(H)$, then as $MAD(G) \leq \Delta(M)$, we have that $d(M) = MAD(G) = \Delta(M) = \Delta(H)$, so all the vertices in M have the same degree in M therefore M would be regular. Now suppose that $U = H - M \neq \emptyset$, then as H is connected $[M, U]$ is nonempty. Then there is at least one vertex in M that has one of its incident edges in $[M, U]$, but as we have that all vertices in M have degree equal to $\Delta(H)$ in M then $MAD(G) < \Delta(H)$ which is a contradiction. So we have that $U = H - M = \emptyset$. Therefore H is regular, which is a contradiction as the connected component of G containing M is not regular, therefore $MAD(G) < \Delta(G)$. As $\Delta(G) \in \mathbb{N}$, then $\lfloor MAD(G) \rfloor < \Delta(G)$. As $\lfloor MAD(G) \rfloor \in \mathbb{N}$, $\lfloor MAD(G) \rfloor < \Delta(G) \implies \lfloor MAD(G) \rfloor + 1 \leq \Delta(G)$. □

Therefore when not all connected components of G containing a subgraph of maximum average degree are regular our bound is an improvement on the bound given by Brooks.

María Soto, André Rossi and Marc Sevaux showed that $\chi(G) \leq \left\lfloor \frac{3 + \sqrt{9 + 8(|E| - |V|)}}{2} \right\rfloor$ if G is simple and connected [13]. They compared their bounds with some previous bounds found in literature and showed that it was an improvement on those bounds [13]. We now compare our bound with this bound and show that our bound is an improvement on their bound as well. We first prove a lemma which we will use to prove that our bound is an improvement on the bound by María Soto, André Rossi and Marc Sevaux.

Lemma 3. For a simple and connected graph G , $\lfloor d(G) + 1 \rfloor \leq \left\lfloor \frac{3 + \sqrt{9 + 8(|E| - |V|)}}{2} \right\rfloor$.

Proof. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a simple and connected graph, then $|V| - 1 \leq |E| \leq \frac{|V|(|V|-1)}{2}$. If $|V| = 0$ or $|V| = 1$ then $d(G) = 0$ so this is trivial case. Now we consider when $|V| > 1$. We first show that $d(G) + 1 = \frac{2|E|}{|V|} + 1 \leq \frac{3 + \sqrt{9 + 8(|E| - |V|)}}{2}$

We show that the inequality holds for $|V| \leq |E| \leq \frac{|V|(|V|-1)}{2}$. We will then show for $|E| = |V| - 1$; $\lfloor d(G) + 1 \rfloor = \left\lfloor \frac{3 + \sqrt{9 + 8(|E| - |V|)}}{2} \right\rfloor = 2$ where $|V| \geq 2$.

$$\frac{2|E|}{|V|} + 1 \leq \frac{3 + \sqrt{9 + 8(|E| - |V|)}}{2}$$

$$2|E|^2 - (|V| + |V|^2)|E| + (|V|^3 - |V|^2) \leq 0$$

$$\iff \frac{|V| + |V|^2 - |V|\sqrt{9 - 6|V| + |V|^2}}{4} \leq |E| \leq \frac{|V| + |V|^2 + |V|\sqrt{9 - 6|V| + |V|^2}}{4}$$

We have that $|V| \leq |E| \leq \frac{|V|(|V|-1)}{2}$, so first we show that $\frac{|V|(|V|-1)}{2} \leq \frac{|V| + |V|^2 + |V|\sqrt{9 - 6|V| + |V|^2}}{4}$

$$\frac{|V|(|V|-1)}{2} \leq \frac{|V| + |V|^2 + |V|\sqrt{9 - 6|V| + |V|^2}}{4} \iff 9 - 6|V| + |V|^2 \leq 9 - 6|V| + |V|^2 \iff 0 \leq 0$$

Now we show that $\frac{|V| + |V|^2 - |V|\sqrt{9 - 6|V| + |V|^2}}{4} \leq |V|$

$$\frac{|V| + |V|^2 - |V|\sqrt{9 - 6|V| + |V|^2}}{4} \leq |V| \iff 9 - 6|V| + |V|^2 \leq 9 - 6|V| + |V|^2 \iff 0 \leq 0$$

So we have that for $|V| \leq |E| \leq \frac{|V|(|V|-1)}{2}$, $d(G) + 1 = \frac{2|E|}{|V|} + 1 \leq \frac{3 + \sqrt{9 + 8(|E| - |V|)}}{2}$.

Now we will then show for $|E| = |V| - 1$, $\lfloor d(G) + 1 \rfloor = \left\lfloor \frac{3 + \sqrt{9 + 8(|E| - |V|)}}{2} \right\rfloor = 2$.

For $|E| = |V| - 1$, $\frac{3 + \sqrt{9 + 8(|E| - |V|)}}{2} = \frac{3 + \sqrt{9 + 8(|V| - 1 - |V|)}}{2} = 2$ and $|E| = |V| - 1$, $\lfloor d(G) + 1 \rfloor = \lfloor \frac{2|E|}{|V|} \rfloor + 1 = \lfloor \frac{2|V| - 2}{|V|} \rfloor + 1$. as $|V| \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $|V|$ is finite and $|V| \geq 2$ then $\lfloor \frac{2|V| - 2}{|V|} \rfloor = 1$ so $\lfloor d(G) + 1 \rfloor = 2$.

Therefore for $|V| - 1 \leq |E| \leq \frac{|V|(|V|-1)}{2}$, $\lfloor d(G) + 1 \rfloor \leq \left\lfloor \frac{3 + \sqrt{9 + 8(|E| - |V|)}}{2} \right\rfloor$.

□

Proposition 6. $\lfloor MAD(G) + 1 \rfloor \leq \left\lfloor \frac{3 + \sqrt{9 + 8(|E| - |V|)}}{2} \right\rfloor$ if G is simple and connected.

Proof. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a simple and connected graph, and let M be the subgraph of G with the maximum average degree. We first show that following inequality holds:

$$\left\lfloor \frac{3 + \sqrt{9 + 8(|E(M)| - |V(M)|)}}{2} \right\rfloor \leq \left\lfloor \frac{3 + \sqrt{9 + 8(|E| - |V|)}}{2} \right\rfloor. \quad (1)$$

We first prove this by showing that this inequality holds even when we remove the floor functions. That is,

$$\frac{3 + \sqrt{9 + 8(|E(M)| - |V(M)|)}}{2} \leq \frac{3 + \sqrt{9 + 8(|E| - |V|)}}{2}. \quad (2)$$

From (2) we have that, $|E(M)| - |V(M)| \leq |E| - |V|$ that is $|V| - |V(M)| \leq |E| - |E(M)|$. Let $H = G - M$ then $|V| - |V(M)| = |V(H)|$ and $|E| - |E(M)| = |E(H)| + |[H, M]|$. Now if $M = G$ then $|V| - |V(M)| = |E| - |E(M)| = 0$. Now if $M \neq G$, so $|V(H)| > 0$ and $|E(H)| + |[H, M]| > 0$. Then (2) gives $|V(H)| \leq |E(H)| + |[H, M]|$. Let S be the union of all single vertex components of H , and let $U = H - S$ so $|V(H)| = |V(U)| + |V(S)|$ and $|E(H)| + |[H, M]| = |E(U)| + |[U, M \cup S]| + |[S, M \cup U]|$. As S is the union of single vertex components of H and G is connected we have that $|V(S)| = |[S, M \cup U]|$. So from (2) we get $|V(H)| \leq |E(H)| + |[H, M]| \iff |V(U)| \leq |E(U)| + |[U, M]|$.

Now suppose that $|V(U)| > |E(U)| + |[U, M]|$. First, as G is connected and U contains no single vertex components then $|E(U)| \geq |V(U)| - 1$. Next as G is connected $|[U, M]| \geq 1$, so $|V(U)| > |E(U)| + |[U, M]| \implies$

$|V(U)| > |E(U)| + 1$ which is equivalent to $|V(U)| - 1 > |E(U)|$ which is a contradiction. So we have that $|V(U)| \leq |E(U)| + |[U, M]$ and therefore (2) holds which implies (1).

Now from Lemma 3 we have that $\lfloor d(M) + 1 \rfloor \leq \left\lfloor \frac{3 + \sqrt{9 + 8(|E(M)| - |V(M)|)}}{2} \right\rfloor$, and as $d(M) = MAD(G)$ we have that $\lfloor MAD(G) + 1 \rfloor \leq \left\lfloor \frac{3 + \sqrt{9 + 8(|E(M)| - |V(M)|)}}{2} \right\rfloor \leq \left\lfloor \frac{3 + \sqrt{9 + 8(|E| - |V|)}}{2} \right\rfloor$. \square

Therefore our new bound of $\lfloor MAD(G) + 1 \rfloor$ is an improvement on the special case bound of $\chi(G) \leq \left\lfloor \frac{3 + \sqrt{9 + 8(|E| - |V|)}}{2} \right\rfloor$ if G is simple and connected.

So we have a new bound on the chromatic number of a graph which we showed is an improvement on previous bounds. The bound is also computable in polynomial time as $MAD(G)$ can be computed in polynomial time as discussed in section 2. The bound is also often very close to the actual value of the chromatic number. Through this bound we found a relationship between the chromatic number and the average degree of an average hereditary graph, we also found a case for which we know the exact chromatic number of an average hereditary graph, this makes the class of average hereditary graphs interesting to us.

4 Construction and Closure

The class of average hereditary graphs itself has some interesting properties. In this section, we look at some of these properties. First, we show how an average hereditary graph can be recursively constructed. That is, we provide a construction method of an average hereditary graph from another smaller average hereditary graph. Next, we show that the class of average hereditary graphs is closed under graph join operation.

4.1 Recursive construction

We introduce a recursive construction method for an average hereditary graph. For this we first introduce the following theorem:

Theorem 2. *If H is a nonempty connected average hereditary graph then if u is a vertex of H with the minimum degree in H , and G is a graph obtained from H by adding a vertex x to H and expanding u by edge $\{u, x\}$, then G is also average hereditary.*

In order to prove this theorem we first prove two lemmas.

Lemma 4. *If G is an average hereditary graph then $2\delta(G) \geq d(G)$.*

Proof. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a nonempty average hereditary graph, if $V = \emptyset$ then the lemma holds trivially.

Let $u \in V$ s.t. $d(u) = \delta(G)$. Let H be a graph induced from G by removing u , then $d(H) = \frac{\sum_{v \in V} d_G(v) - 2\delta(G)}{|V| - 1}$.

So,

$$d(H) = \frac{\sum_{v \in V} d_G(v) - 2\delta(G)}{|V| - 1} = \frac{|V|d(G) - 2\delta(G)}{|V| - 1} = d(G) \left(\frac{|V| - \frac{2\delta(G)}{d(G)}}{|V| - 1} \right).$$

As G is average hereditary $d(H) \leq d(G)$ therefore from the above expression we have that,

$$\frac{2\delta(G)}{d(G)} \geq 1 \iff 2\delta(G) \geq d(G).$$

\square

Now we prove a smaller result in the next lemma which will be used in the proof of Theorem 2.

Lemma 5. *Expanding any connected k -regular graph by any vertex gives an average hereditary graph.*

Proof. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a k -regular graph. From Proposition 2 we have that G is average hereditary. Now let G' be the graph obtained from G by expanding any arbitrary vertex of G . We show that G' is also average hereditary.

Let x be the new vertex in G' and u be the vertex of G that we expanded. Let H be an induced subgraph of G . We know that we are adding a vertex with a degree more than k to G to obtain G' so we know that $d(G) < d(G')$ as all vertices of G have the same degree in G . Now for H if any of u or x is not in H then H is either a subgraph or isomorphic to a subgraph of G then $d(H) \leq d(G) < d(G')$. Suppose both x and u are in H , now we have two cases. First, suppose we only have the neighbors of u in H . We have that $\forall v \in N_G(u)$, $d_{G'}(x) = d_{G'}(u) = d_{G'}(v) = k + 1$. Now if we have the neighbors of u in H then we have at least k less vertices with degree $k + 1$ compared to G' so the degree of H cannot be more than $d(G')$. Now suppose we have at least 1 vertex from outside the neighborhood of u in H , we know that when we remove vertices from G' to induce the subgraph H , each vertex we remove has a degree of at most k .

As G and G' are connected we introduce a vertex of degree at most $k - 1$ when constructing H , which means the degree of H cannot be greater than $d(G')$ as all vertices of G' have degree greater than $k - 1$. Therefore $d(H) \leq d(G')$, which means G' is average hereditary. \square

We now use our lemmas to prove Theorem 2

Proof of Theorem 2. Let $H = (V, E)$ be a connected average hereditary graph such that V is nonempty, and let $u \in V$ such that $d_H(u) = \delta(H)$. Let $G = H \exp(u, x)$, we know $d_G(x) = d_G(u) = \delta(H) + 1$. Therefore we are increasing the average degree of H in G .

$$d(G) = \frac{|V|d(H) + 2\delta(H) + 2}{|V| + 1} > d(H)$$

Now we show that for any induced subgraph G_1 of G , $d(G_1) \leq d(G)$.

Let $G_1 \subseteq G$, if $x \notin V(G_1)$ or $u \notin V(G_1)$ then G_1 is either a subgraph or isomorphic to a subgraph of H then $d(G_1) \leq d(H) < d(G)$. So now we look at the case when $x, u \in V(G_1)$, we know there exists a graph $H_1 \in H$ such that $G_1 = H_1 \exp(u, x)$. We know that $d_H(u) = \delta(H) \leq d(H) \leq d(G)$. We have two cases to consider. First if $d_G(u) \leq d(H)$ then $d(G_1) \leq d(G)$. As the vertex we are adding itself has a degree less than $d(G)$ so $d(G_1)$ cannot be greater than $d(G)$. If $d_G(u) > d(H)$, we know that $d_H(u) \leq d(H)$ and $d_G(u) = d_H(u) + 1$, so we have that $0 < D = d_G(u) - d(H) \leq 1$. Now we consider two cases when $D = 1$ and when $D < 1$.

Suppose $D = 1$, here D is the largest possible. If $D = 1$ then $d_G(u) = d_H(u) + 1 = d(H) + 1$, so $d_H(u) = d(H)$ as u is the vertex with minimum degree we have that H is connected regular. From Lemma 5 we have that G is average hereditary.

Now we consider the case when $0 < D < 1$. If $0 < D < 1$ then $d_H(u) < d(H) < d_G(u)$. If we induce a proper subgraph G_1 from G such that $x, u \in V(G_1)$ we do so by removing some vertices from G (as $d(G) \leq d(G)$ so we don't need to consider that case). Now removing any vertex from G will reduce the sum of degrees of vertices by at least $2\delta(H)$. From Lemma 4 we have that $2\delta(H) \geq d(H)$. As $G_1 = H_1 \exp(u, x)$ and we know that $d(H_1) \leq d(H)$ so any increase in the average degree of the subgraph caused by removing the vertices comes from $d_{G_1}(x)$, as all the other vertices are from H_1 , and the average of their degrees without x is less than or equal to the amount of degrees removed. As u is the vertex of H with the minimum degree and $d_H(u) < d(H)$, we know that there exists $v \in V$ such that $d(H) < d_H(v)$. So we have that there exists $v \in V$ such that $d_G(x) = d_G(u) \leq d_H(v) \leq d_G(v)$.

Now if $v \in V(G_1)$ then $v \in V(H_1)$ and $d_H(v) \geq d_G(x)$ then if $d(G_1) > d(G)$ then the increase will be caused by the degree of v so then as $v \in V(H_1)$, we have that $d(H_1) > d(H)$ which is a contradiction as H is average hereditary. If $v \notin V(G_1)$ then we have a vertex in G that is in $G_2 = G - G_1$ such that the degree of v is greater than equal to the degree of x so then $d(G_1)$ cannot be greater than $d(G)$ as v is not in G_1 and degree of v raises $d(G)$ higher than $d(G_1)$.

So the average degree of G cannot be less than the average degree of G_1 . Therefore G is average hereditary. \square

So Theorem 2 provides a recursive construction for an average hereditary graph. We can start from a smaller average hereditary graph and recursively keep expanding the vertex with the minimum degree (the vertex might change after each expansion). With this, we can construct a larger average hereditary graph.

This makes the average hereditary property more interesting as not many graph properties are closed under expansion.

4.2 Closure Under Binary Operation

We now look at another interesting property that the class of average hereditary graphs has. The class of average hereditary graphs is closed under the graph join operation. That means if we take two average hereditary graphs and join them the graph we obtain is also average hereditary. The following Theorem proves this claim.

Theorem 3. *The class of average hereditary graphs is closed under the graph Join operation.*

Proof. Let $G = (V, E)$ and $G' = (V', E')$ such that G and G' are average hereditary graphs. Without loss of generality suppose that G and G' are both nonempty. We construct graph $K = G \wedge G'$ as the join of G and G' such that $V(K) = V \cup V'$ and $E(K) = E \cup E' \cup \{\{v, v'\} | v \in V \text{ and } v' \in V'\}$. We show that K is also average hereditary.

$$d(K) = \frac{d(G)|V| + d(G')|V'| + 2|V||V'|}{V + V'} \geq d(G) \quad \text{and} \quad d(K) = \frac{d(G)|V| + d(G')|V'| + 2|V||V'|}{V + V'} \geq d(G').$$

Let $k \subseteq K$, now we have two cases to consider. If $k \subseteq G$ or $k \subseteq G'$ then we have that $d(k) \leq d(K)$ as both G and G' themselves are average hereditary. Now if $k \not\subseteq G$ and $k \not\subseteq G'$ then we have that there exists $H \subseteq G$ and $H' \subseteq G'$ such that $k = H \wedge H'$.

Now we know that $d(H) \leq d(G) \leq d(K)$ and $d(H') \leq d(G') \leq d(K)$, so if $d(k) > d(K)$ the increase will come from the new edges added by the join operation, which will be a subset of $\{\{v, v'\} | v \in V \text{ and } v' \in V'\}$.

As $k \subseteq K$ every vertex of k that is in H will have less or equal edges than that vertex will have in K as $|H'| \leq |G'|$ and every vertex of k that is in H' will have less or equal edges than that vertex will have in K as $|H| \leq |G|$. So the edges per vertex of every subgraph of k will be less than or equal to the edges per vertex of K . Therefore $d(k) \leq d(K)$. So K will be average hereditary. \square

This is an interesting result as it gives another construction for an average hereditary graph that is by joining two average hereditary graphs. The closure on binary operations is also interesting algebraically. The following corollary shows how the class is interesting algebraically.

Corollary 3. *The set of all average hereditary graphs is a commutative monoid.*

Proof. Let ADH be the set of all average hereditary graphs. To show that this set is a monoid we first define a binary operation such that the class of average hereditary graphs is closed under that operation. Theorem 3 just gives us that operation which is the graph join operation. The class of average hereditary graphs is closed under the graph join operation. Now we show that graph join is associative. To show this we show that for graphs $G_1 = (V_1, E_1)$, $G_2 = (V_2, E_2)$ and $G_3 = (V_3, E_3)$,

$$(G_1 \wedge G_2) \wedge G_3 = G_1 \wedge (G_2 \wedge G_3)$$

Let $H = (G_1 \wedge G_2) \wedge G_3 = (V(H), E(H))$ and $H' = G_1 \wedge (G_2 \wedge G_3) = (V(H'), E(H'))$. $V(H) = V(H') = V_1 \cup V_2 \cup V_3$ and $E(H) = E(H') = E_1 \cup E_2 \cup E_3 \cup \{\{v_1, v_2\} | v_1 \in V_1 \text{ and } v_2 \in V_2\} \cup \{\{v_1, v_3\} | v_1 \in V_1 \text{ and } v_3 \in V_3\} \cup \{\{v_2, v_3\} | v_2 \in V_2 \text{ and } v_3 \in V_3\}$.

So we have that $H = H'$ which means that $(G_1 \wedge G_2) \wedge G_3 = G_1 \wedge (G_2 \wedge G_3)$. Therefore graph join operation is associative. Now we show that there exists an identity element in the set ADH . This is simple the identity element is $K_0 = (\emptyset, \emptyset)$. K_0 is obviously average hereditary as $d(K_0) = 0$ and the only subgraph of K_0 is K_0 itself. We have that for any graph G , $G \wedge K_0 = K_0 \wedge G = G$ as for K_0 , $V(K_0) = \emptyset$ and $E(K_0) = \emptyset$. So K_0 is the identity element in ADH . This shows that ADH is a monoid under the graph join operation. We now show that the graph join is commutative to show that ADH is a commutative monoid. Let $G_1 = (V_1, E_1)$ and $G_2 = (V_2, E_2)$. We will show that $G_1 \wedge G_2 = G_2 \wedge G_1$.

Let $K = G_1 \wedge G_2 = (V(K), E(K))$, and $K' = G_2 \wedge G_1 = (V(K'), E(K'))$. Then $V(K) = V_1 \cup V_2$ and $E(K) = E_1 \cup E_2 \cup \{\{v_1, v_2\} | v_1 \in V_1 \text{ and } v_2 \in V_2\}$. And $V(K') = V_2 \cup V_1 = V_1 \cup V_2$ and $E(K') = E_2 \cup E_1 \cup \{\{v_2, v_1\} | v_2 \in V_2 \text{ and } v_1 \in V_1\}$.

So we have that $K = K'$ which means $G_1 \wedge G_2 = G_2 \wedge G_1$. So the graph join operation is commutative. Therefore the set of all average hereditary graphs makes a commutative monoid under graph join operation. \square

This corollary is interesting as it tells us about some algebraic properties of the class of average hereditary graphs. From this, we can apply other theorems about commutative monoids to the class of average hereditary graphs.

In this section we looked at some constructions for average hereditary graphs, we also looked at how the class of average hereditary graphs has some interesting algebraic properties. This all gives us a few interesting results about this class of graphs itself.

5 NP-Hardness of Graph 3-Coloring in Average Hereditary Graphs

We looked at various properties the class of average hereditary graphs has. We now explore the effects on the complexity of the graph 3-COLORING problem when we restrict the input to the class of average hereditary graphs. We show that graph 3-COLORING remains NP-Hard when the input is restricted to average hereditary graphs. This result is interesting as it gives us insight on the effect of input constraint on the graph 3-COLORING problem. This result can also be used to study the notion of boundary classes and limit class [1, 2]. We use the reduction given by Karp 1972 [11] to prove our result.

Lemma 6 ([11]). $3\text{-SAT} \leq_P 3\text{-COLORING}$.

Theorem 4. *Graph 3-COLORING is NP-hard for the class of average hereditary graphs.*

Proof. Let ϕ be a boolean expression in 3CNF with L literals and C clauses, where $L \geq 1$ and $C \geq 1$. Let $G(\phi)$ denote the graph constructed from ϕ by the reduction given by Karp in [11]. From the reduction we have that $G(\phi)$ has $6C + L + 3$ vertices, and $12C + \frac{3}{2}L + 3$ edges. We show that $G(\phi)$ is average hereditary.

$$d(G(\phi)) = 3 \left(\frac{8C + L + 2}{6C + L + 3} \right)$$

Now we show that $d(G(\phi)) < 4$. Suppose that $d(G(\phi)) \geq 4$. So we have that

$$\frac{8C + L + 2}{6C + L + 3} \geq \frac{4}{3} \iff 0 \geq \frac{1}{3}L + 2$$

This is a contradiction as $C, L \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Now for positive integers x, y, a and b , we know that $\frac{x-a}{y-b} \leq \frac{x}{y} \iff \frac{a}{b} \geq \frac{x}{y}$. For $G(\phi)$,

$$d(G(\phi)) = \frac{\sum_{v \in V(G(\phi))} d_{G(\phi)}(v)}{|V(G(\phi))|}$$

Now suppose H is some induced subgraph of $G(\phi)$ such that $H = G - U$, for some $U \subseteq V(G(\phi))$, then for H ,

$$d(H) = \frac{\sum_{v \in V(G(\phi))} d_{G(\phi)}(v) - \sum_{u \in U} d_{G(\phi)}(u) - |[V(H), \overline{V(H)}]|}{|V(G(\phi))| - |U|} = \frac{\sum_{v \in V(G(\phi))} d_{G(\phi)}(v) - d}{|V| - |U|}$$

As $G(\phi)$ is connected, and $\forall v \in V(G(\phi))$, $d_{G(\phi)}(v) \geq 2$, and no vertex with degree 2 are adjacent to each other, we have that $d \geq 2(2|U|)$, which implies $\frac{d}{|U|} \geq 4$. So, $\frac{d}{|U|} \geq 4 \geq d(G(\phi)) \implies d(H) \leq d(G(\phi))$. Therefore $G(\phi)$ is average hereditary. So we have that for each boolean expression ϕ in 3CNF, the graph constructed $G(\phi)$, by the reduction given by Karp is average hereditary. So we have that graph 3-COLORING is **NP-hard** in the class of average hereditary graphs. \square

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we introduced this new class of graph. We initially introduced this class to obtain a tighter bound on the chromatic number of graphs in this class. Our initial aim was to find a case where we can bound the chromatic number of a graph in terms of its average degree. After obtaining our bound for average hereditary graphs we were able to generalize that bound and obtain a bound on the chromatic number of any given graph in terms of its maximum average degree. We then explored the class of average hereditary graphs further. From that, we see that the class of average hereditary graphs itself is quite interesting. We looked at many interesting results regarding this class of graphs. Which includes an equivalent condition to compute if a graph belongs to this class, methods for constructing Average Hereditary graphs and computational complexity of graph 3-COLORING when input is restricted to this class.

As the class of Average Hereditary graphs is new and just introduced in this paper there are a lot of opportunities for future work regarding the class of average hereditary graphs. This makes this class more interesting.

Acknowledgments

The first author would like to thank Dr. Hans Raj Tiwary (<https://kam.mff.cuni.cz/~hansraj/>) for providing with his invaluable expertise and guidance throughout the course of this research and for being a mentor in general. Many ideas for the direction to take this research also came from him. The first author would also like to thank Rameez Ragheb (<https://habib.edu.pk/SSE/rameez-ragheb/>) for being a mentor throughout the course of this research and prior. We would also like to thank him for verifying proofs of several results and helping in working out the algebra for lemma 3. Also would like to Acknowledge Meesum Ali Qazalbash (<https://www.linkedin.com/in/meesumaliqazalbash/>) for looking at the proof and algebra presented in this paper, verifying the results, and helping in the algebra for lemma 3. The authors would also like to thank Dr. Yair Caro for suggesting proposition 3, from this we were able to prove that the average hereditary property can be computed in polynomial time. This also gave us the idea to generalize our special case bound on the chromatic number to a general case bound on the chromatic number in terms of the maximum average degree.

References

- [1] V.E. Alekseev, R. Boliac, D.V. Korobitsyn, and V.V. Lozin. Np-hard graph problems and boundary classes of graphs. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 389(1-2):219–236, 2007.
- [2] Vladimir E. Alekseev. On easy and hard hereditary classes of graphs with respect to the independent set problem. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 132(1-3):17–26, 2003.
- [3] Rowland Leonard Brooks. On colouring the nodes of a network. *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, 37:194–197, 1941.
- [4] T.H. Cormen, C.E. Leiserson, R.L. Rivest, and C. Stein. *Introduction to Algorithms, fourth edition*. MIT Press, 2022.
- [5] Reinhard Diestel. *Reinhard Diestel Graph Theory Electronic Edition 2017*. Springer-Verlag Heidelberg, 1997.
- [6] Yefim Dinitz. Algorithm for solution of a problem of maximum flow in networks with power estimation. *Soviet Math. Dokl.*, 11:1277–1280, 01 1970.
- [7] Jack Edmonds and Richard M. Karp. Theoretical improvements in algorithmic efficiency for network flow problems. *J. ACM*, 19(2):248–264, apr 1972.
- [8] L. R. Ford and D. R. Fulkerson. Maximal flow through a network. *Canadian Journal of Mathematics*, 8:399–404, 1956.

- [9] A. V. Goldberg. Finding a maximum density subgraph. Technical report, USA, 1984.
- [10] Andrew V. Goldberg and Robert E. Tarjan. A new approach to the maximum-flow problem. *J. ACM*, 35(4):921–940, oct 1988.
- [11] Richard Manning Karp. Reducibility among combinatorial problems. Proceedings of a symposium on the Complexity of Computer Computations, IBM Thomas J. Watson Research Center, Yorktown Heights, New York., 1972.
- [12] B. R. Myers and R. Liu. A lower bound on the chromatic number of a graph. *Networks*, 1(3):273–277, 1971.
- [13] Mariia Soto, Andre Rossi, and Marc Sevaux. Three new upper bounds on the chromatic number. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 159(18):2281–2289, 2011.
- [14] Douglas Brent West. *Introduction to Graph Theory*. Prentice Hall, 2001.