

Uniform Shared Neighborhood Structures in Edge-Regular Graphs

Jared DeLeo*

Department of Mathematics and Statistics
Auburn University
Auburn, AL 36830

August 28, 2024

ABSTRACT: A shared neighborhood structure (SNS) in a graph is a subgraph induced by the intersection of the open neighbor sets of two adjacent vertices. If a SNS is the same for all adjacent vertices in an edge-regular graph, call the SNS a uniform shared neighborhood structure (USNS). USNS-forbidden graphs (graphs which cannot be a USNS of an edge-regular graph) and USNS in graph products of edge-regular graphs are examined.

Keywords and phrases: strongly regular, edge-regular

1 Preliminaries

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a finite, simple *graph* with vertex set $V = V(G)$ and edge set $E = E(G)$. If $uv \in E(G)$ for vertices $u, v \in V(G)$, then their adjacency is denoted $u \sim v$. The *degree* of a vertex is the number of edges it is incident to. Because G is simple, the degree of $v \in V(G)$ is also the number of vertices it is adjacent to. A graph G is *regular* if the degrees of the vertices in $V(G)$ are all the same. The *open neighborhood* of a vertex u in G , denoted $N_G(u)$, is the set of vertices u is adjacent to. If G is understood, this open

*Auburn University, jmd0150@auburn.edu

neighborhood will be denoted $N(u)$. A graph G is *edge-regular* if G is both regular and, for some λ , every pair of adjacent vertices in G have exactly λ common (or shared) neighbors. If G is edge-regular, we say $G \in ER(n, d, \lambda)$, where $|V(G)| = n$, G is regular of degree d , and $|N(u) \cap N(v)| = \lambda$ for all $uv \in E(G)$.

An *induced subgraph* of G is a graph H such that $V(H) \subseteq V(G)$, $E(H)$ contains all of the edges of G among the vertices of $V(H)$, and only those edges. The induced subgraph H of G is denoted as $G[V(H)]$. If $G[N_G(u) \cap N_G(v)] \cong H$ for all $u \sim v; u, v \in V(G)$, where \cong denotes a graph isomorphism, then G has a *uniform shared neighborhood structure*, abbreviated *USNS*. For instance, letting K_n denote the complete graph on n vertices, $G = K_3 \in ER(3, 2, 1)$ has USNS K_1 .

For graphs G and H , define $G + H$ to be the graph formed from G and H where $V(G + H) = V(G) \cup V(H)$ (where $V(G)$ and $V(H)$ are disjoint) and $E(G + H) = E(G) \cup E(H)$. Further, for a graph G and positive integer m , define mG to be m disjoint copies of G . That is, $mG = G + G + \dots + G$.

Edge-regular graphs do not need to have a USNS. If G is the Cartesian product of K_4 and $\{K_6\} \setminus \{\text{a perfect matching in } K_6\}$, $G \in ER(24, 7, 2)$ has two different shared neighborhood structures (SNS): K_2 and $2K_1$. Also, a SNS for one pair of adjacent vertices may also be the SNS for a different pair of adjacent vertices. Suppose G is $\{K_6\} \setminus \{\text{a perfect matching in } K_6\}$ as in Fig. 1. Then $G \in ER(6, 4, 2)$ contains a $2K_1$ USNS, of which the pair of vertices in the USNS is shared by two pairs of adjacent vertices.




Figure 1: K_6 with a perfect matching removed

A number of studies of edge-regular graphs have focused on the parameter λ . These graphs with $\lambda = 1$ have been studied in [1] and [2], while those with $\lambda = 2$ have been studied in [3]. Additionally, in [1], [2], and [3], constructions are described for edge-regular graphs.

Outside of specific λ values, relations amongst the parameters of an edge-regular graph have also been studied, notably when $d = \lambda + k$ for $k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ in [4]. The research in [5] also examines parameter relations, specifically as it pertains to n , λ , and the number of vertices missing from any shared neighborhood.

The research presented in this paper will pertain more to the structure of edge-regular graphs, akin to the research presented in [6], which constructs a specific type of edge-regular graph, a *Neumaier* graph. Within the body of this research, there is an emphasis on families of forbidden subgraphs of edge-regular graphs, as well as corresponding constructions of graphs in these families.

2 Forbidden USNS

There are families of graphs that cannot be a USNS in any edge-regular graph; call these USNS-forbidden graphs. These results utilize constructions by contradiction. For a graph G and $u, v \in V(G)$, let $A(u, v)$ denote the set of vertices in G that are adjacent to u but not to v , and let $B(u, v)$ denote the set of vertices in G that are adjacent to v but not to u . Finally, let $X(u, v)$ denote the set of vertices in G that are adjacent neither to u nor v .

Let P_m be the path graph on m vertices.

Theorem 2.1. *If $G \in ER(n, d, 3)$ with a USNS, then the USNS $\not\cong P_3$.*

Proof. By way of contradiction, let $u \sim v$, and let $N(u) \cap N(v) = \{w_1, w_2, w_3\}$, where $G[N(u) \cap N(v)] \cong P_3$. Without loss of generality, let $w_1 \sim w_2 \sim w_3$ and $w_1 \not\sim w_3$. Then as $w_1 \sim w_2$, $G[N(w_1) \cap N(w_2)] \cong P_3$. As two of w_1 and w_2 's common neighbors are u and v , there must exist a third vertex, say z , such that $N(w_1) \cap N(w_2) = \{u, v, z\}$ and $G[N(w_1) \cap N(w_2)] \cong P_3$.

Without loss of generality, suppose $z \sim u$. Then $\{w_1, v, w_3, z\} \subseteq N(u) \cap N(w_2)$, contradicting $\lambda = 3$. Thus, $G[N(w_1) \cap N(w_2)] \not\cong P_3$. \square

It should be noted that Theorem 2.1 is a special case of Theorem 2.5, found later in the paper.

Naturally, there are a variety of graphs to sum with P_3 to see if it is a possible USNS for some edge-regular graph. There is a partial result for $P_3 + H$ where H is an arbitrary graph.

Theorem 2.2. *Suppose $G \in ER(n, d, \lambda)$ with a $P_3 + H$ USNS for some graph H . If for two adjacent vertices $u, v \in V(G)$, the P_3 in $G[N(u) \cap N(v)]$ consists of the vertices w_1, w_2, w_3 , with $w_1 \sim w_2$, then $u, v \in N(w_1) \cap N(w_2)$ must be vertices in some subgraph H of $G[N(w_1) \cap N(w_2)]$ and H contains a P_4 subgraph.*

Proof. Let u, v be adjacent vertices in G , and $N(u) \cap N(v) = \{w_1, w_2, w_3, h_1, \dots, h_{|H|}\}$, where $G[w_1, w_2, w_3] \cong P_3$ and $G[h_1, \dots, h_{|H|}] \cong H$ for some arbitrary graph H such that $N(u) \cap N(v) \cong P_3 + H$.

By way of contradiction, let u and v be vertices of P_3 in $G[N(w_1) \cap N(w_2)]$. The third vertex of P_3 in $G[N(w_1) \cap N(w_2)]$ must be an element of $A(u, v)$ or $B(u, v)$. Without loss of generality, suppose the remaining vertex is $a_1 \in A(u, v)$. Then every vertex of H in $G[N(w_1) \cap N(w_2)]$ must be in $X(u, v)$, as any vertex in $A(u, v)$ or $B(u, v)$ would have an adjacency to u or v , respectively. Thus, $N(w_1) \cap N(w_2) = \{a_1, u, v, x_1, \dots, x_{|H|}\}$.

Consider the adjacent vertices u and w_2 . Notice that $\{a_1, w_1, v, w_3\} \subseteq N(u) \cap N(w_2)$, and $G[a_1, w_1, v, w_3]$ is connected. As these four vertices are part of the same component in $N(w_2) \cap N(u)$, then they cannot contain the P_3 component and thus are contained in the H component so H must contain a P_4 .

Now consider the adjacent vertices v and w_1 . As $\{w_2, u\} \subset N(v) \cap N(w_1)$ and $w_2 \sim u$, then w_2 and u are in the same component of $G[N(v) \cap N(w_1)]$. The only other vertices contained in $N(v) \cap N(w_1)$ are in $B(u, v)$, so $N(v) \cap N(w_1) = \{w_2, u, b_1, \dots, b_{|H|+1}\}$. As $|H| \geq 4$ and $|P_3| = 3$, then there must be some b_i adjacent to either w_2 or u . By definition of $B(u, v)$, $b_i \not\sim u$, so $w_2 \sim b_i$ for some $1 \leq i \leq |H|+1$. But then $N(w_1) \cap N(w_2)$ contains b_i , a contradiction. Thus, u and v cannot be vertices of P_3 in $G[N(w_1) \cap N(w_2)]$. \square

A natural corollary follows from the above theorem to forbid a union of isolated vertices with P_3 .

Corollary 2.1. *If $G \in ER(n, d, 3 + \ell)$ with a USNS, then the USNS $\not\cong P_3 + \ell K_1$, where $\ell \geq 1$.*

Proof. By way of contradiction, let u, v be adjacent vertices in G such that $N(u) \cap N(v) = \{w_1, \dots, w_{\ell+3}\}$ where $G[w_1, w_2, w_3] \cong P_3$ and $G[w_4, \dots, w_{\ell+3}] \cong \ell K_1$. Let $\ell K_1 = H$. Then $G[N(u) \cap N(v)] \cong P_3 + H$.

By *Theorem 2.2*, u and v are elements of H in $N(w_1) \cap N(w_2)$. But H has no edges and $u \sim v$, a contradiction. \square

Since P_3 is a forbidden USNS, it is natural to ask if longer paths are also forbidden. While the proof cases are more numerous, the below theorem proves that P_4 , like P_3 , is USNS-forbidden.

Theorem 2.3. *If $G \in ER(n, d, 4)$ with a USNS, then the USNS $\not\cong P_4$.*

Proof. Suppose for contradiction $\exists G \in ER(n, d, 4)$ with USNS $\cong P_4$. Let $u \sim v$, and let $N(u) \cap N(v) = \{w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4\}$, where $G[N(u) \cap N(v)] \cong P_4$ with endpoints w_1 and w_4 and $w_1 \sim w_2$. $G[N(w_1) \cap N(w_2)] \cong P_4$, as G has a P_4 USNS.

Case 1. $N(w_1) \cap N(w_2) = \{a_1, u, v, b_1\}$, such that $G[N(w_1) \cap N(w_2)] \cong P_4$ having endpoints a_1 and b_1 , with $a_1 \in A(u, v)$ and $b_1 \in B(u, v)$. See Fig. 2 for reference.




Figure 2: Beginning of case 1 in the proof of Theorem 2.3

Consider the vertices u and w_1 , which are adjacent by assumption. As vertices u and w_1 have common neighbors a_1, w_2 , and v , then there must exist another vertex in their shared neighborhood. As w_1 is not adjacent to w_3 and w_4 , and u is only adjacent to v , the w_i vertices, and vertices in $A(u, v)$, then the 4th vertex in this common neighborhood must be some $a_2 \in A(u, v)$. As $a_2 \in A(u, v)$, then $a_2 \not\sim v$. Since w_1 and w_2 cannot be both adjacent to a_2 (otherwise a_2 would be contained in $N(w_1) \cap N(w_2)$), then $a_2 \not\sim w_2$. So $a_2 \sim a_1$, and $G[N(u) \cap N(w_1)] \cong P_4$ with endpoints a_2 and v .

Now consider adjacent vertices u and w_2 . $N(u) \cap N(w_2) = \{a_1, w_1, v, w_3\}$ is completely determined from previous assumptions. As $G[N(u) \cap N(w_2)] \cong P_4$, then this must have endpoints w_3 and a_1 , so $w_3 \sim a_1$.

Now consider the adjacent vertices v and w_1 . Then $N(v) \cap N(w_1) = \{b_2, b_1, w_2, u\}$, where $b_2 \in B(u, v)$. Using similar logic to how $N(u) \cap N(w_1)$ was constructed, then we conclude that $G[N(v) \cap N(w_1)] \cong P_4$ having endpoints b_2 and u , with $b_2 \approx w_2$ and $b_2 \sim b_1$.

Now consider the adjacent vertices v and w_2 . $N(v) \cap N(w_2) = \{b_1, w_1, u, w_3\}$ is completely determined from previous assumptions. As $G[N(v) \cap N(w_2)] \cong P_4$, then this must have endpoints w_3 and b_1 , so $w_3 \approx b_1$.

Lastly, consider the adjacent vertices w_2 and w_3 . As $\{u, v\} \in N(w_2) \cap N(w_3)$, $\exists z \in \{N(w_2) \cap N(w_3)\} \setminus \{u, v\}$ such that $z \in A(u, v)$ or $z \in B(u, v)$. As $w_2 \approx a_2$ and $w_2 \approx b_2$ (from $N(u) \cap N(w_2)$ and $N(v) \cap N(w_2)$, respectively), then $z \neq a_2$ and $z \neq b_2$. As $w_3 \approx a_1$ and $w_3 \approx b_1$ (implied from $N(u) \cap N(w_2)$ and $N(v) \cap N(w_2)$, respectively), then $z \neq a_1$ and $z \neq b_1$. Without loss of generality, say $z \in A(u, v)$. Then $N(u) \cap N(w_2)$ contains $z \in A(u, v) \setminus a_1$, a contradiction. Thus, $N(w_1) \cap N(w_2) \neq \{a_1, u, v, b_1\}$.

Case 2. $N(w_1) \cap N(w_2) = \{v, u, a_1, x_1\}$, where $a_1 \in A(u, v)$ and $x_1 \in X(u, v)$. By assumption, $u \sim a_1$, $u \approx x_1$, and $v \approx x_1$, so v and x_1 are endpoints of $G[N(w_1) \cap N(w_2)]$.

Consider adjacent vertices w_1 and v . Then $N(w_1) \cap N(v) = \{u, w_2, b_2, b_3\}$ for some $b_2, b_3 \in B(u, v)$. This follows from the facts that v has no neighbors in $A(u, v) \cup X(u, v)$ and w_1 is adjacent to no w_j ; $j > 2$. Therefore, the two vertices in $N(w_1) \cap N(v)$ other than u and w_2 must be in $B(u, v)$. By assumption, u is not adjacent to any vertex in $B(u, v)$, so w_2 must be adjacent to one of $\{b_2, b_3\}$. Without loss of generality, $w_2 \sim b_2$. However, this implies $N(w_1) \cap N(w_2)$ contains b_2 , a contradiction. So $N(w_1) \cap N(w_2) \neq \{v, u, a_1, x_1\}$.

Case 3. $N(w_1) \cap N(w_2) = \{a_2, a_1, u, v\}$, where $a_1, a_2 \in A(u, v)$. By assumption, $u \sim a_2$ and $u \sim a_1$, so u is not an endpoint of $G[N(w_1) \cap N(w_2)]$. v must be an endpoint, as v is only adjacent to u . Without loss of generality, say a_2 is an endpoint and a_1 is not an endpoint in $G[N(w_1) \cap N(w_2)]$. As $a_2 \sim u$, then $G[N(w_1) \cap N(w_2)] \not\cong P_4$, a contradiction. So $N(w_1) \cap N(w_2) \neq \{a_2, a_1, u, v\}$.

This exhausts all possibilities for $N(w_1) \cap N(w_2)$, so G cannot have P_4 as a USNS. \square

Theorem 2.4. *Let $G \in ER(n, d, \lambda)$ with a P_λ USNS for $\lambda \geq 5$, and let $u \sim v$ in G with $N(u) \cap N(v) = \{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_\lambda\}$, where w_1 is an endpoint of $G[N(u) \cap N(v)]$. If $w_1 \sim w_2$, then $N(w_1) \cap N(w_2)$ contains exactly one vertex from $N(u) \setminus (N(u) \cap N(v))$ and exactly one vertex from $N(v) \setminus (N(u) \cap N(v))$.*

Proof. Case 1. $N(w_1) \cap N(w_2)$ contains no vertex from $A(u, v)$, without loss of generality. So $N(w_1) \cap N(w_2)$ contains u, v , a vertex in $B(u, v)$, and $\lambda - 3$ vertices in $X(u, v)$.

Consider adjacent vertices u and w_1 . Then $N(u) \cap N(w_1)$ contains v and w_2 . But as u is not adjacent to any vertex in the set $B(u, v)$ nor $X(u, v)$, the remainder of the vertices in this common neighborhood must be elements of $A(u, v)$. Yet there is no adjacency from these vertices in $A(u, v)$ to v . If any of these vertices in $A(u, v)$ were to be adjacent to w_2 , then $N(w_1) \cap N(w_2)$ would contain a vertex from $A(u, v)$, contradicting our case assumption. As $\lambda \geq 5$, then $G[N(u) \cap N(w_1)] \not\cong P_\lambda$, a contradiction.

Case 2. $N(w_1) \cap N(w_2)$ contains more than one vertex from $A(u, v)$, say m vertices from $A(u, v)$. Then u in $G[N(w_1) \cap N(w_2)]$ has degree $m + 1$. As $m \geq 2$, then $G[N(w_1) \cap N(w_2)] \not\cong P_\lambda$, a contradiction.

Thus, $N(w_1) \cap N(w_2)$ must contain exactly one vertex from $A(u, v)$ and exactly one vertex from $B(u, v)$. \square

Despite paths not being completely settled as a family of USNS-forbidden graphs, there are other families of graphs that are. The following theorems tackle a few of these families, namely the family of complete bipartite graphs of different partition sizes, star graphs, and wheel graphs.

Theorem 2.5. *If $G \in ER(n, d, m_1 + m_2)$ with a USNS, then for all $m_1 \neq m_2$, the USNS $\not\cong K_{m_1, m_2}$.*

Proof. Let $u \sim v$, and $N(u) \cap N(v) = \{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_{m_1}, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{m_2}\}$, where $G[w_1, w_2, \dots, w_{m_1}, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{m_2}] \cong K_{m_1, m_2}$ with w_1, \dots, w_{m_1} in one part and z_1, \dots, z_{m_2} in the other part.




Figure 3: A $K_{3,2}$ shared neighborhood of vertices u and v .

Consider the adjacent vertices w_1 and z_1 . Then without loss of generality, $N(w_1) \cap N(z_1) = \{u, v, a_1, \dots, a_{m_2-1}, b_1, \dots, b_{m_1-1}\}$, where $a_1, \dots, a_{m_2-1} \in A(u, v)$ and $b_1, \dots, b_{m_1-1} \in B(u, v)$. So $G[N(w_1) \cap N(z_1)] \cong K_{m_1, m_2}$, where v, a_1, \dots, a_{m_2-1} are in one part and u, b_1, \dots, b_{m_1-1} are in the other part.

Now consider the adjacent vertices u and w_1 . Then by previous assumptions, $N(u) \cap N(w_1)$ contains $\{z_1, \dots, z_{m_2}, a_1, \dots, a_{m_2-1}, v\}$. Further, as $\lambda = m_1 + m_2$ by assumption and $|N(u) \cap N(w_1)| \geq 2m_2$, then $m_2 \leq m_1$. By symmetry, $m_1 \leq m_2$, so $m_1 = m_2$. Thus, K_{m_1, m_2} is only possible as a USNS when $m_1 = m_2$. \square

As such, a graph such as the one in Fig. 3 is a forbidden USNS, where $m_1 = 3$ and $m_2 = 2$. What immediately follows from Theorem 2.5 is a fact about the *star graph* S_l , which is a graph with one central vertex and $l - 1$ vertices adjacent to it, but not to each other.

Corollary 2.2. *If $G \in ER(n, d, \ell)$ with a USNS, then for all $l \geq 3$, the USNS $\not\cong S_\ell$.*

Proof. Let $m_1 = 1$ and $m_2 = \ell - 1$. Then $K_{m_1, m_2} \cong S_\ell$. So S_ℓ cannot be a USNS by Theorem 2.5. \square

As noted earlier, Theorem 2.5 generalizes Theorem 2.1, as $P_3 \cong K_{1,2}$.

This is not to suggest that complete bipartite graphs with equal part sizes are also USNS-forbidden. On the contrary, consider K_4 , which has a $K_2 \cong K_{1,1}$ USNS.

In the following result, define the *wheel graph* W_m to be a connected graph on $m+1$ vertices, such that m vertices induce a cycle, and the $(m+1)^{st}$ vertex is adjacent to all vertices in the cycle. Note that for $m \geq 4$, W_m is not a regular graph.

Theorem 2.6. *If $G \in ER(n, d, m+1)$ has a USNS, then for all $m \geq 4$, the USNS $\not\cong W_m$.*

Proof. Suppose for contradiction $u \sim v$ such that $G[N(u) \cap N(v)] \cong W_m$ consisting of vertices w_1, \dots, w_{m+1} such that w_2, \dots, w_{m+1} are the vertices in the cycle and w_1 is adjacent to the vertices in the cycle.

Consider adjacent vertices u and w_1 . $N(u) \cap N(w_1) = \{w_2, w_3, \dots, w_{m+1}, v\}$. So w_1 is not adjacent to any vertex in $A(u, v)$.

Similarly, w_1 is not adjacent to any vertex in $B(u, v)$.

As $G[u, v, w_1] \cong K_3$ and $N(w_2) \cap N(w_3)$ contain u, v, w_1 , then this K_3 is an induced subgraph of $G[N(w_2) \cap N(w_3)]$. As $m \geq 4$, one of u, v, w_1 must be the center of this wheel.

If u is the center, the other $m - 2$ vertices in $N(w_2) \cap N(w_3)$ besides u, v, w_1 must be in $A(u, v)$, so $w_1 \sim a_i$ for some $a_i \in A(u, v)$, a contradiction.

If v is the center, the other $m - 2$ vertices in $N(w_2) \cap N(w_3)$ besides u, v, w_1 must be in $B(u, v)$, so $w_1 \sim b_i$ for some $b_i \in B(u, v)$, a contradiction.

If w_1 is the center, then as $m - 2 > 0$, u and v are adjacent vertices on a cycle C_m in $G[N(w_2) \cap N(w_3)]$ of length $m \geq 4$ which cannot contain any w_j , $j > 3$ (because $w_2 \not\sim w_j$). Then there is a P_4 $auvb$ on C_m with $a \in A(u, v)$, $b \in B(u, v)$. But then w_1 , as the center of the wheel, is adjacent in G to both a and b , whereas either adjacency contradicts a previous inference.

Thus, W_m is not a possible USNS when $m \geq 4$. □

A *component-regular* graph is a graph such that each component is regular. Every known USNS graph is component-regular, and every aforementioned USNS-forbidden graph is not component-regular. Is it true that every USNS graph is component-regular?

3 Constructions of $ER(n, d, \lambda)$ with USNS

Given graphs G_1 and G_2 , the Cartesian product of G_1 and G_2 is denoted $G_1 \square G_2$. The vertex set is defined by $V(G_1 \square G_2) = V(G_1) \times V(G_2)$. The edge set is defined by, given two vertices (u, u') and $(v, v') \in V(G_1 \square G_2)$, $(u, u') \sim (v, v')$ if and only if either $u = v$ and $u' \sim v'$ (in G_2) or $u \sim v$ (in G_1) and $u' = v'$.

It was shown in [3] that if $G_1 \in ER(n_1, d_1, \lambda)$ and $G_2 \in ER(n_2, d_2, \lambda)$, then $G_1 \square G_2 \in ER(n_1 n_2, d_1 + d_2, \lambda)$. However, it is rare that the Cartesian product of two edge-regular graphs that each have a USNS will have a USNS.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $n_1, n_2 \geq 1$ and $d_1, d_2 \geq 0$. If $G_1 \in ER(n_1, d_1, \lambda)$ with a USNS $\cong X$ and $G_2 \in ER(n_2, d_2, \lambda)$ with a USNS $\cong Y$, then $G_1 \square G_2 \in ER(n_1 n_2, d_1 + d_2, \lambda)$ has a USNS if and only if $X \cong Y$, in which case the USNS of $G_1 \square G_2$ is $X(\cong Y)$.*

Proof. Let $G_1 \in ER(n_1, d_1, \lambda)$ with USNS $\cong X$ and $G_2 \in ER(n_2, d_2, \lambda)$ with USNS $\cong Y$.

By assumption, $G_1 \square G_2 \in ER(n_1 n_2, d_1 + d_2, \lambda)$ has a USNS. Suppose $(u, v) \sim (x, y)$ in $G_1 \square G_2$. Then by the definition of the Cartesian product, either $u = x$ in G_1 and $v \sim y$ in G_2 or $u \sim x$ in G_1 and $v = y$ in G_2 .

If $u = x$ in G_1 and $v \sim y$ in G_2 , then $N_{G_1 \square G_2}((u, v), (x, y)) = \{(u, z) | z \in N_{G_2}(v) \cap N_{G_2}(y)\}$ which induces, in $G_1 \square G_2$, a graph isomorphic to Y .

Similarly, if $u \sim x$ in G_1 and $v = y$ in G_2 , then $N_{G_1 \square G_2}((u, v), (x, y))$ induces, in $G_1 \square G_2$, a graph isomorphic to X . However, $G_1 \square G_2$ has a USNS, by assumption. Thus, $X \cong Y$.

In the other direction, $X \cong Y$ by assumption. By the definition of the Cartesian product, if $(u, v) \sim (x, y)$ in $G_1 \square G_2$, then either $u = x$ in G_1 and $v \sim y$ in G_2 or $u \sim x$ in G_1 and $v = y$ in G_2 . Similar to the previous direction, the intersection of open neighborhoods in $G_1 \square G_2$ yields a graph isomorphic to either X or Y . As $X \cong Y$, then $G_1 \square G_2$ has a USNS. \square

The tensor product of G_1 and G_2 is denoted $G_1 \otimes G_2$. The vertex set is $V(G_1 \otimes G_2) = V(G_1) \times V(G_2)$. The edge set is defined by, given two vertices (u, u') and $(v, v') \in V(G_1 \otimes G_2)$, $(u, u') \sim (v, v')$ if and only if $u \sim v$ in G_1 and $u' \sim v'$ in G_2 . By previous work in [3], if $G_1 \in ER(n_1, d_1, \lambda_1)$ and $G_2 \in ER(n_2, d_2, \lambda_2)$, then $(G_1 \otimes G_2) \in ER(n_1 n_2, d_1 d_2, \lambda_1 \lambda_2)$. The following theorem extends the work in [3] to include the preservation and structure of the USNS in $G_1 \otimes G_2$.

Theorem 3.2. *If $G_1 \in ER(n_1, d_1, \lambda_1)$ with a USNS $\cong H_1$ and $G_2 \in ER(n_2, d_2, \lambda_2)$ with a USNS $\cong H_2$, then $(G_1 \otimes G_2) \in ER(n_1 n_2, d_1 d_2, \lambda_1 \lambda_2)$ with a USNS $\cong H_1 \otimes H_2$.*

Proof. Suppose that $(u, v) \sim (x, y)$ in $G_1 \otimes G_2$. Then $(s, t) \in N_{G_1 \otimes G_2}(u, v) \cap N_{G_1 \otimes G_2}(x, y)$ if and only if $u \sim s$, $x \sim s$ in G_1 and $v \sim t$, $y \sim t$ in G_2 . Thus, $N_{G_1 \otimes G_2}(u, v) \cap N_{G_1 \otimes G_2}(x, y) = (N_{G_1}(u) \cap N_{G_1}(x)) \times (N_{G_2}(v) \cap N_{G_2}(y)) = V(H_1) \times V(H_2)$, and this set induces $H_1 \otimes H_2$ in $G_1 \otimes G_2$. \square

For example, $K_n \otimes K_m \cong K_{m, m, \dots, m} \setminus \{(n-1)\text{-factor}\}$, an n -partite graph with uniform part size m where the $(n-1)$ -factor are the column edges when the vertices are arranged in a $n \times m$ matrix. The USNS of $(K_n \otimes K_m) \cong K_{n-2} \otimes K_{m-2} \cong K_{m-2, m-2, \dots, m-2} \setminus \{(n-3)\text{-factor}\}$, an $(n-2)$ -partite graph with uniform part size $m-2$, where the $(n-3)$ -factor are column edges when the vertices are arranged in a $(n-2) \times (m-2)$ matrix.

Using the above example, given $G \in ER(n, d, \lambda)$ with USNS $\cong H$ where $|H| = \lambda$, then $K_3 \otimes G$ yields a USNS of nK_1 . In other words, the tensor

product of an edge-regular graph G with some USNS and a K_3 removes all of the edges of the USNS of G as a new USNS.

Another example: $G_1 \otimes G_2$, where $G_1 \in ER(n, d, \lambda)$ and G_2 is a triangle-free regular graph, has an empty graph USNS.

Another useful graph construction for edge-regular graphs is the shadow of a graph. Enlarging the definition in [7], given a graph G , define $D_m(G)$ to be the m^{th} shadow graph of G , by $V(D_m(G)) = \{v_j^i | i \in [m]; j \in [n]\}$, given that $V(G) = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$; the vertices v_j^i and v_l^k are adjacent in $D_m(G)$ if $v_j \sim v_l$ in G for $j, l \in [n]$ and $i, k \in [m]$. See Fig. 4 for an example.

Theorem 3.3. *If $G \in ER(n, d, \lambda)$ with a USNS $\cong H$, then $D_m(G) \in ER(mn, md, m\lambda)$ with a USNS $\cong D_m(H)$.*

Proof. Let $G \in ER(n, d, \lambda)$. Then by construction the m^{th} shadow of G contains m copies of every vertex of G , so $|D_m(G)| = mn$.

Now suppose $N_G(v_i) = \{u_1, \dots, u_d\}$. Then v_i^k is adjacent to each of $\{u_1^1, \dots, u_d^1, u_1^2, \dots, u_d^2, \dots, u_1^m, \dots, u_d^m\}$ for $k \in [m]$. So $D_m(G)$ is regular of degree md .

Using similar logic, say $v_i \sim v_j$ in G such that $N(v_i) \cap N(v_j) = \{u_1, \dots, u_\lambda\}$. Then $N(v_i^k) \cap N(v_j^l) = \{u_\alpha^\beta | \alpha \in [m]; \beta \in [\lambda]\}$ for $k, l \in [m]$. Thus, every pair of adjacent vertices in $D_m(G)$ share exactly $m\lambda$ vertices.

Further, as $G[\{v_1, \dots, v_\lambda\}] \cong H$, then $N(v_i^k) \cap N(v_j^l)$ contains exactly m copies of H , one in each shadow. The edge set among these m copies of H are as defined in the m^{th} shadow graph. Thus, $D_m(G)$ has a USNS $\cong D_m(H)$. \square

Iteration of a USNS with the shadow graph function allows for additional infinite families of USNS.

Theorem 3.4. *$D_q(D_m(G)) \cong D_{qm}(G)$ for integers $q, m \geq 2$.*

Proof. Suppose $V(G) = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ and $V(D_m(G)) = \{v_j^i | i = 1, \dots, m; j = 1, \dots, n\}$. Then $V(D_q(D_m(G))) = \{v_j^{i,k} | i = 1, \dots, m; j = 1, \dots, n; k = 1, \dots, q\}$.

Alternatively, in $V(D_{qm}(G)) = \{v_1, \dots, v_{qm}\}$, relabel the vertices such that the i^{th} vertex in the q^{th} copy of the m^{th} copy of the vertices is denoted $v_i^{m,q}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. So $\{v_{qm}\} = V(D_q(D_m(G)))$.

In both cases, $v_i^{m_1, q_1} \sim v_j^{m_2, q_2}$ if $v_i \sim v_j$ in G for $i \neq j; 1 \leq i, j \leq n; 1 \leq m_1, m_2 \leq m; 1 \leq q_1, q_2 \leq q$. Then $E(D_q(D_m(G))) = E(D_{qm}(G))$. So $D_q(D_m(G)) \cong D_{qm}(G)$ for all $q, m \geq 2$. \square

As such, a chain of shadow graph functions can be processed as a single shadow graph function.

For example, $D_m(K_n) \cong K_{m,m,\dots,m} \cong T_{mn,n} \in ER(mn, m(n-1), m(n-2))$, a complete n -partite graph with uniform partition size m , commonly known as a (regular) *Turán graph*. $D_3(K_3) \cong T_{9,3}$ is shown in Fig. 4. So the USNS of $D_m(K_n)$ is $D_m(K_{n-2}) \cong K_{m,m,\dots,m} \cong T_{m(n-2),n-2}$, the Turán graph on $m(n-2)$ vertices with partition size m and $n-2$ parts.




Figure 4: $D_3(K_3) \cong T_{9,3}$ with USNS of $D_3(K_1) \cong T_{3,1} = \overline{K_3}$

As stated in the preliminaries of the paper, not all edge-regular graphs have a connected USNS. Consider \mathcal{P} , the Petersen graph; $\mathcal{P} \in ER(10, 3, 0)$.

The complement of the Petersen graph, however, is the interesting case. This graph is also already known to be edge-regular, as discussed in the $d = \lambda + 3$ case of [4]. $\mathcal{P}^C \in ER(10, 6, 3)$ with a USNS of $K_2 + K_1$.

4 Conway's 99-graph Problem

A strongly regular graph $SR(n, d, \lambda, \mu)$ is a graph in $ER(n, d, \lambda)$ such that every pair of non-adjacent vertices share exactly μ common neighbors. Conway's *99-graph problem* is an open problem that asks about the existence of a strongly regular graph on parameters $SR(99, 14, 1, 2)$ [8]. There is some work that can be done with edge-regular graphs and the Cartesian product to show the non-existence of the 99-graph strictly using Cartesian products.

First, define a graph G as a *regular clique assembly*, denoted $RCA(n, d, k)$, as a graph on n vertices, regular of degree d , and $k = \omega(G)$ (the clique number of G). An RCA graph G has three distinct properties: $\omega(G) \geq 2$, every maximal clique of G is maximum, and each edge of G is in exactly one maximum clique of G [2].

If the 99-graph G exists, then it is necessarily an edge-regular graph in $ER(99, 14, 1)$. This is equivalent to a regular clique assembly on the parameters $RCA(99, 14, 3)$ by Corollary 1 in [2]. The idea here is to try to construct $RCA(99, 14, 3)$ using a Cartesian product of two graphs G_1 and G_2 , and to show that there is no such combination using already proven facts about RCA graphs.

Theorem 4.1. *If Conway's 99-graph exists, then it cannot be constructed with the Cartesian product of two RCA graphs.*

Proof. Suppose $G_1 \in RCA(n_1, d_1, 3)$ and $G_2 \in RCA(n_2, d_2, 3)$. Then $G_1 \square G_2 \in RCA(n_1 n_2, d_1 + d_2, 3)$ by Theorem 3.1. Using the necessary conditions of RCA graphs stated in Proposition 1 of [2], $2 \mid d_1$ and $2 \mid d_2$. There are only two options for n_1 and n_2 , namely the pairs $\{33, 3\}$ and $\{11, 9\}$.

Let $n_1 = 3$ and $n_2 = 33$. As with all regular graphs, $n > d$, so G_1 must have degree 2. As such, $G_1 \in RCA(3, 2, 3) = ER(3, 2, 1) \cong K_3$. Then $G_2 \in RCA(33, 12, 3) = ER(33, 12, 1)$. By Corollary 10 of [2], $ER(33, 12, 1) = \emptyset$. So $\{33, 3\}$ is not a possible pair of vertices of G_1 and G_2 .

Let $n_1 = 9$ and $n_2 = 11$. Then for G_1 the only possible d_2 are $\{2, 4, 6, 8\}$ since $n_1 = 9 > d_1$.

If $G_1 \in RCA(9, 2, 3)$, then $G_2 \in RCA(11, 12, 3)$, impossible as $n_2 < d_2$. If $G_1 \in RCA(9, 4, 3)$, then $G_2 \in RCA(11, 10, 3) = ER(11, 10, 1)$. Given that $n_2 = d_2 + 1$, then G_2 would need to be K_{11} , of which $\lambda = 9 \neq 1$, so $RCA(11, 10, 3) = ER(11, 10, 1) = \emptyset$. If $G_1 \in RCA(9, 6, 3)$, then $G_2 \in RCA(11, 8, 3) = ER(11, 8, 1)$. By Proposition 5 of [2], $3 \nmid nd = 88$, so $ER(11, 8, 1) = \emptyset$.

Finally, if $G_1 \in RCA(9, 8, 3) = ER(9, 8, 1)$, then as $n_1 = d_1 + 1$, G_1 is K_9 . Yet $\{K_9\} = ER(9, 8, 7)$, so $ER(9, 8, 1) = \emptyset$.

Thus, if the 99-graph can be constructed, it cannot be done with the Cartesian product of two graphs applied to RCAs. \square

Using similar logic, it is straightforward to show that the Tensor product of two graphs cannot yield Conway's 99-graph.

Theorem 4.2. *If Conway's 99-graph exists, then it cannot be constructed with the Tensor product of edge-regular graphs.*

Proof. Suppose $G_1 \in ER(n_1, d_1, \lambda_1)$ and $G_2 \in ER(n_2, d_2, \lambda_2)$ such that $G_1 \otimes G_2 \in ER(99, 14, 1)$. By Theorem 3.2, $n_1 n_2 = 99$, $d_1 d_2 = 14$, and $\lambda_1 \lambda_2 = 1$. Thus, $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 1$. Further, $d_1 d_2 = 1 \cdot 14$ or $d_1 d_2 = 2 \cdot 7$.

Suppose $d_1d_2 = 1 \cdot 14$ and without loss of generality, $d_1 = 1$. Then $\lambda_1 = 1 = d_1$, a contradiction as $d > \lambda$ for all edge-regular graphs. Thus, $d_1d_2 \neq 1 \cdot 14$.

Suppose $d_1d_2 = 2 \cdot 7$ and without loss of generality, $d_1 = 2$. Then as $\lambda_1 = 1$ and $d_1 = 2$, $n_1 = 3$. So $n_2 = 33$, $d_2 = 7$, and $\lambda_2 = 1$. An edge-regular graph $ER(33, 7, 1) = RCA(33, 7, 3)$ by Corollary 1 in [2]. Yet $RCA(33, 7, 3)$ does not exist by Proposition 1 in [2], as $k - 1 = 2 \nmid 7$. So $d_1d_2 \neq 2 \cdot 7$.

Thus, $G_1 \otimes G_2 \notin ER(99, 14, 1)$. Conway's 99-graph cannot be constructed using a Tensor product of edge-regular graphs. \square

References

- [1] K. Bragan, *Topics in Edge Regular Graphs*. ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 2014, thesis (Ph.D.)–Auburn University. [Online]. Available: http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?url_ver=Z39.88-2004&rft_val_fmt=info:ofi/fmt:kev:mtx:dissertation&res_dat=xri:pqm&rft_dat=xri:pqdiss:30261616
- [2] K. B. Guest, J. M. Hammer, P. D. Johnson, and K. Roblee, “Regular clique assemblies, configurations, and friendship in edge-regular graphs,” *Tamkang J. Math.*, vol. 48, no. 4, pp. 301–320, 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.5556/j.tkjm.48.2017.2237>
- [3] V. Glorioso, *Edge-Regular Graphs with $\lambda = 2$* . ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 2019, thesis (Ph.D.)–Auburn University. [Online]. Available: http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?url_ver=Z39.88-2004&rft_val_fmt=info:ofi/fmt:kev:mtx:dissertation&res_dat=xri:pqm&rft_dat=xri:pqdiss:30265876
- [4] P. D. Johnson, Jr., W. Myrvold, and K. J. Roblee, “More extremal problems for edge-regular graphs,” *Util. Math.*, vol. 73, pp. 159–168, 2007.
- [5] P. D. Johnson, Jr. and K. J. Roblee, “On an extremal subfamily of an extremal family of nearly strongly regular graphs,” *Australas. J. Combin.*, vol. 25, pp. 279–284, 2002.
- [6] R. J. Evans, S. Goryainov, E. V. Konstantinova, and A. D. Mednykh, “A general construction of strictly Neumaier graphs and a related switching,” *Discrete Math.*, vol. 346, no. 7, pp. Paper No. 113384, 11, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.disc.2023.113384>
- [7] Asmiati, W. Okzarima, Notiragayu, and L. Zakaria, “Upper bounds of the locating chromatic numbers of shadow cycle graphs,” *Int. J. Math. Comput. Sci.*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 239–248, 2024.
- [8] J. H. Conway, “Five \$1,000 problems (update 2017),” *OEIS*, p. 1, 2014. [Online]. Available: <https://oeis.org/A248380/a248380.pdf>