

Modularity of nearly complete graphs and bipartite graphs

Colin McDiarmid, Fiona Skerman

Abstract

It is known that complete graphs and complete multipartite graphs have modularity zero. We show that the least number of edges we may delete from the complete graph K_n to obtain a graph with non-zero modularity is $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + 1$. Similarly we determine the least number of edges we may delete from or add to a complete bipartite graph to reach non-zero modularity. We give some corresponding results for complete multipartite graphs, and a short proof that complete multipartite graphs have modularity zero.

We also analyse the modularity of very dense random graphs, and in particular we find that there is a transition to modularity zero when the average degree of the complementary graph drops below 1.

1 Introduction

The modularity $q^*(G)$ of a graph G was introduced by Newman and Girvan in 2004 [18], to give a measure of how well G can be divided into ‘communities’, and now is at the heart of the most popular algorithms used to cluster real data [7]. See Section 1.1 below for precise definitions and further discussion.

We are interested here in the modularity of very dense graphs, complete bipartite graphs, and very dense random graphs. We saw in [14] that for suitable random graphs R_n , if the average degree of R_n tends to ∞ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ then $q^*(R_n) \rightarrow 0$ in probability – details are given below. But when is $q^*(R_n) > 0$ whp and when is it actually 0 whp? A key step in understanding this is deterministic.

It is known [3] and easy to see that complete graphs have modularity zero. Graphs which are close to a complete graph in that there are very few missing edges also have modularity zero. We give the precise threshold in Theorem 1.1 below.

Each graph G with at most 3 vertices has modularity $q^*(G) = 0$. (By convention a graph G with no edges has $q^*(G) = 0$.) The 4-vertex path has modularity $\frac{1}{6}$, and the 4-vertex graph consisting of two disjoint edges has modularity $\frac{1}{2}$; and indeed for each $n \geq 4$ there is an n -vertex graph G with $q^*(G) > 0$. Given an integer $n \geq 4$, let $f(n)$ be the least number of edges missing from any n -vertex graph G with $q^*(G) > 0$.

Theorem 1.1. *For each $n \geq 4$ we have $f(n) = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor + 1$.*

This corrects [21], which in the notation here says that $f(n) \geq n - 2$. Given a graph H , let $\delta^-(H)$ be the least number of edges we can delete to obtain a subgraph H' with $q^*(H') > 0$. If there is no subgraph H' with $q^*(H') > 0$ we set $\delta^-(H) = \infty$. (The only graph with $m \geq 4$ edges with this property is the m -edge star $K_{1,m}$. This can be seen by noting that $\delta^-(H)$ is finite as soon as H

contains two disjoint edges.) Thus Theorem 1.1 says that $\delta^-(K_n) = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor + 1$ for $n \geq 4$, so large complete graphs have modularity 0 ‘robustly’. The following minor extension of Theorem 1.1 will be useful to us later (in Example 2.7).

Proposition 1.2. *Let $n \geq 4$ and let G be any graph obtained from K_n by deleting the edges of a bipartite graph with $k \leq n/2$ edges: then $\delta^-(G) = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor + 1 - k$.*

We noted above that any complete graph has modularity zero. Indeed any complete multipartite graph H has modularity zero [2, 12] (see Section 3 below for a short proof), but here there is no robustness in general. We focus on complete bipartite graphs, where we can tell the complete story about robustness reasonably quickly: we find that, except for a few small examples, it is enough to add or remove a single edge to obtain a graph with positive modularity. In Section 2.4 we give some corresponding partial robustness results for complete multipartite graphs, and in Section 3 we use a recent result on graph expansion [10] to give a short and simple proof that complete multipartite graphs have modularity 0.

To state the results let us define natural counterparts to δ^- : given a graph H , let $\delta^+(H)$ be the least number of edges we can *add* (between already existing vertices) to obtain a graph H' with $q^*(H') > 0$ (where $\delta^+(H) = \infty$ if there is no such graph H'). Likewise let $\delta(H)$ be the minimum number of edits, either adding or removing edges, to obtain a graph H' with positive modularity (where $\delta(H) = \infty$ if there is no such graph H' , that is if $v(H) \leq 3$).

Theorem 1.3. *Let $G = K_{s,t}$ be a complete bipartite graph with $s \leq t$.*

- (a) *If $s = 1$ then $\delta^-(G) = \infty$, and if $s \geq 2$ then $\delta^-(G) = 1$.*
- (b) *If $s = 1$ and $t \geq 4$, or if $s \geq 2$ and $t \geq 3$, then $\delta^+(G) = 1$. In the other cases (namely when $(s, t) = (1, 1), (1, 2), (1, 3)$ or $(2, 2)$), we have $\delta^+(G) = \infty$.*
- (c) *If $s = 1$ and $t \geq 4$, or if $s \geq 2$, then $\delta(G) = 1$. If $(s, t) = (1, 1)$ or $(1, 2)$ then $\delta(G) = \infty$, and in the remaining case $(s, t) = (1, 3)$ we have $\delta(G) = 2$.*

Theorems 1.1 and 1.3 suggest that complete graphs K_n may be the ‘furthest’ from graphs with positive modularity.

Question 1.4. *Is it true that, for each graph H with $n \geq 4$ vertices we have $\delta(H) \leq \delta(K_n)$?*

Now consider random graphs. The modularity of random graphs $G_{n,p}$ and $G_{n,m}$ (see Section 1.1 below for definitions) is quite fully analysed in [14], except for the very dense case. By Theorem 1.3 of [14], when $p = p(n)$ satisfies $p \geq 1/n$ and p is bounded away from 1, we have $q^*(G_{n,p}) = \Theta((np)^{-1/2})$ whp; and by Theorem 4.1 of the same paper, when $1/n \leq p \leq 1 - c_0/n$ for a suitable (large) constant c_0 we have $q^*(G_{n,p}) = \Omega(\sqrt{\frac{1-p}{np}})$ whp. We focus here on the very dense case, when $p = 1 - \Theta(1/n)$. Note that in this case $\sqrt{\frac{1-p}{np}} = \Theta(1/n)$. It follows easily from Theorem 1.1 that when $1-p$ is very small (say $1-p \leq (1-\varepsilon)/n$) then whp $q^*(G_{n,p}) = 0$. We shall see that when $1-p$ is just a little larger (say $1-p = (1+\varepsilon)/n$) we have whp $q^*(G_{n,p}) = \Theta(1/n)$.

Theorem 1.5. (a) If $p = p(n)$ satisfies $p \geq 1 - 1/n + \omega(n)/n^{3/2}$ (where $\omega(n) \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$) then $q^*(G_{n,p}) = 0$ whp.

(b) Given $1 < c_1 < c_2$, there exist $0 < \alpha < \beta$ such that, if p satisfies $1 - c_2/n \leq p \leq 1 - c_1/n$ then $\alpha/n \leq q^*(G_{n,p}) \leq \beta/n$ whp.

Part (b) of Theorem 1.5 allows us to extend the range of p in Theorem 4.1 of [14] up to nearly $1 - 1/n$ (and part (a) shows that we cannot go much further). Using Theorem 4.1 of [14] for the lower parts of the range we obtain the following result.

Theorem 1.6. Given $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\alpha > 0$ such that if $p = p(n)$ satisfies $1/n \leq p \leq 1 - (1 + \varepsilon)/n$ then $q^*(G_{n,p}) \geq \alpha \sqrt{\frac{1-p}{np}}$ whp.

Now consider the random m -edge graph $G_{n,m}$. It follows immediately from Theorem 1.1 that $q^*(G_{n,m}) = 0$ when $m \geq \binom{n}{2} - n/2$. Thus the natural corresponding $G_{n,m}$ version of Theorem 1.5 omits part (a).

Theorem 1.7. Given $1 < c_1 < c_2$, there exist $0 < \alpha < \beta$ such that, if $m = m(n)$ satisfies $\binom{n}{2} - c_2 n/2 \leq m \leq \binom{n}{2} - c_1 n/2$ then $\alpha/n \leq q^*(G_{n,m}) \leq \beta/n$ whp.

1.1 Definitions and preliminaries

Given a non-empty graph G (with at least one edge), we give a modularity score to each vertex partition (or ‘clustering’): the modularity $q^*(G)$ (sometimes called the ‘maximum modularity’) of G is defined to be the maximum of these scores over all vertex partitions. For a set A of vertices, let the *volume* $\text{vol}(A)$ or $\text{vol}_G(A)$ be the sum over the vertices v in A of the degree d_v , also let $e(A)$ or $e_G(A)$ denote the number of edges within A , and for B disjoint from A let $e(A, B)$ or $e_G(A, B)$ denote the number of edges between A and B .

Definition 1.1 (Newman & Girvan [18], see also Newman [17]). *Let G be a graph with $m \geq 1$ edges. For a partition \mathcal{A} of the vertices of G , the modularity score of \mathcal{A} on G is*

$$q_{\mathcal{A}}(G) = \frac{1}{2m} \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \sum_{u, v \in A} \left(\mathbf{1}_{uv \in E} - \frac{d_u d_v}{2m} \right) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} e(A) - \frac{1}{4m^2} \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \text{vol}(A)^2;$$

and the modularity of G is $q^*(G) = \max_{\mathcal{A}} q_{\mathcal{A}}(G)$, where the maximum is over all vertex partitions \mathcal{A} of G .

Isolated vertices are irrelevant. We need to give empty graphs (with no edges) some modularity value: conventionally we set $q^*(G) = 0$ for each such graph G , and we set $q_{\mathcal{A}}(G) = 0$ for every partition \mathcal{A} on $V(G)$. The second equation for $q_{\mathcal{A}}(G)$ expresses modularity as the difference of two terms, the *edge contribution* or *coverage* $q_{\mathcal{A}}^E(G) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} e(A)$, and the *degree tax* $q_{\mathcal{A}}^D(G) = \frac{1}{4m^2} \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \text{vol}(A)^2$. Since $q_{\mathcal{A}}^E(G) \leq 1$ and $q_{\mathcal{A}}^D(G) > 0$, we have $q_{\mathcal{A}}(G) < 1$ for any graph G . Also, the trivial partition \mathcal{A}_0 with all vertices in one part has $q_{\mathcal{A}_0}^E(G) = q_{\mathcal{A}_0}^D(G) = 1$, so $q_{\mathcal{A}_0}(G) = 0$. Thus we have

$$0 \leq q^*(G) < 1.$$

Suppose that we pick uniformly at random a multigraph (where multiple edges and loops are allowed) with degree sequence (d_1, \dots, d_n) where $\sum_v d_v = 2m$. Then the expected number of

edges between distinct vertices u and v is $d_u d_v / (2m - 1)$. This is the original rationale for the definition: whilst rewarding the partition for capturing edges within the parts, we should penalise by (approximately) the expected number of such edges.

Random graphs

Let n be a positive integer. Given $0 \leq p \leq 1$, the (binomial) random graph $G_{n,p}$ has vertex set $[n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$ and the $\binom{n}{2}$ possible edges appear independently with probability p . Given an integer m with $0 \leq m \leq \binom{n}{2}$, the (Erdős-Rényi) random graph $G_{n,m}$ is sampled uniformly from the m -edge graphs on vertex set $[n]$. These two random graphs are closely related when $m \approx \binom{n}{2}p$, see for example [6, 11].

For a sequence of events A_n we say that A_n holds *with high probability (whp)* if $\mathbb{P}(A_n) \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. For a sequence of random variables X_n and a real number a , we write $X_n \xrightarrow{p} a$ if X_n converges in probability to a as $n \rightarrow \infty$ (that is, if for each $\varepsilon > 0$ we have $|X_n - a| < \varepsilon$ whp). For $x = x(n)$ and $y = y(n)$ we write $x \sim y$ to indicate that $x = (1 + o(1))y$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

More on modularity

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a nonempty graph, and let $\nu = \text{vol}(G)$. For $U \subseteq V$, let $p_G(U) = 2e(U)\nu - \text{vol}(U)^2$. If \mathcal{A} is a partition of $V(G)$, then $q_{\mathcal{A}}(G) = \nu^{-2} \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} p_G(A)$. Since $\text{vol}(U) = 2e(U) + e(U, \bar{U})$ (where \bar{U} denotes $V \setminus U$), we have

$$\begin{aligned} p_G(U) &= 2e(U)\nu - \text{vol}(U)^2 = (\text{vol}(U) - e(U, \bar{U}))\nu - \text{vol}(U)(\nu - \text{vol}(\bar{U})) \\ &= -e(U, \bar{U})\nu + \text{vol}(U)\text{vol}(\bar{U}). \end{aligned}$$

Thus we may also write $p_G(U)$ as $\text{vol}(U)\text{vol}(\bar{U}) - e(U, \bar{U})\nu$; and this expression for $p_G(U)$ is symmetric in U and \bar{U} , so $p_G(U) = p_G(\bar{U})$. Now, if \mathcal{A} is a bipartition with parts U and \bar{U} , then

$$q_{\mathcal{A}}(G) = \nu^{-2}(p_G(U) + p_G(\bar{U})) = 2\nu^{-2}p_G(U).$$

Thus there is a bipartition \mathcal{A} with $q_{\mathcal{A}}(G) > 0$ iff there is a set U of vertices with $p_G(U) > 0$, iff $q^*(G) > 0$. We have thus shown the following result which we record as a lemma.

Lemma 1.8. *Let G be a graph with at least one edge. Then the following are equivalent : (i) $q^*(G) = 0$, (ii) $q_{\mathcal{A}}(G) \leq 0$ for each bipartition \mathcal{A} of $V(G)$, and (iii) $p_G(U) \leq 0$ for each $U \subset V(G)$.*

Here, we recall the very nice result of Dinh and Thai [5], that for any $k \geq 2$ there is a partition \mathcal{A} with at most k parts such that $q_{\mathcal{A}}(G) \geq q^*(G)(1 - 1/k)$. Note that this implies the equivalence of (i) and (ii) in the lemma (that is, $q^*(G) > 0$ if and only if there is a bipartition \mathcal{A} with $q_{\mathcal{A}}(G) > 0$).

Robustness

We shall use the following ‘robustness’ lemma from [14]. Since we set $q^*(G) = 0$ if G has no edges, we can rephrase the lemma there as the following.

Lemma 1.9. *If $G = (V, E)$ is a graph, E_0 is a non-empty subset of E , and $G' = (V, E \setminus E_0)$, then*

$$|q^*(G) - q^*(G')| < 2|E_0|/|E|.$$

Previous results on extreme modularity values and modularity of random graphs

As discussed above the following graphs are known to have zero modularity: complete graphs [3] and complete multipartite graphs [2, 12]. There are some general lower bounds which can show strictly positive modularity : if we let \bar{d} denote the average degree of a graph, then connected graphs with maximum degree $o(n)$ have modularity at least $2/\bar{d} - o(1)$ [19], and both preferential attachment graphs [19] and deterministic graphs with mild assumptions on the degree sequence [1] have modularity $\Omega(\bar{d}^{-1/2})$.

At the other extreme, which graphs have modularity near 1? De Montgolfier, Soto and Viennot [16] define a sequence of graphs to be maximally modular if their modularity values tend to 1 as their number m of edges tends to infinity. The following are known to be maximally modular: trees with maximum degree $o(m)$, graphs of bounded genus with maximum degree $o(m)$ [8], graphs where treewidth times maximum degree is $o(m)$ [13], lattices [16, 20], whp random graphs $G_{n,p}$ and $G_{n,m}$ with average degree at most $1 + o(1)$ [14], whp random hyperbolic graphs [4] and whp spatial preferential attachment graphs [19].

See also table in [14] for a summary of known modularity values; and note that since then improved bounds for random regular graphs were obtained in [9] – in particular the modularity of random cubic graphs was shown to lie in the interval $[0.667, 0.79]$ whp. Lastly, it is known that for any n -vertex base graph G , letting G_p be graph obtained by keeping each edge with probability p then $q^*(G_p) \rightarrow q^*(G)$ in probability if $e(G)p/n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ [15].

2 Proofs for new deterministic results

In this section we first prove Theorem 1.1 on $f(n) = \delta^-(K_n)$, and quickly prove Proposition 1.2. Then, after a couple of preliminary lemmas, we prove Theorem 1.3 : for all complete bipartite graphs G we determine $\delta^-(G)$, $\delta^+(G)$ and then $\delta(G)$. Finally we give a couple of examples and briefly consider multipartite graphs. (Recall that δ^+ , δ^- , δ are the minimum numbers of edges that may be added, removed or edited to obtain a graph with positive modularity - see the introduction for definitions.)

2.1 Nearly complete graphs: proof of Theorem 1.1 and Proposition 1.2

We first give a straightforward proof of the upper bound on $f(n) (= \delta^-(K_n) = \delta(K_n))$ for $n \geq 4$.

We construct a graph G on n vertices with a bipartition $\mathcal{A} = (A, B)$ where $|A| = \lceil n/2 \rceil$ and $|B| = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$, as follows. Start with all edges present, let F be the set of edges between the parts, and let $k = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor + 1$. Note that if n is even then $|F| = n^2/4 \geq n \geq k$, and if n is odd then $|F| = (n^2 - 1)/4 \geq n - 1/4 \geq k$. Form G by deleting any k edges from F , so G has $m = \binom{n}{2} - k$ edges. We shall show that $q_{\mathcal{A}}(G) > 0$, considering separately the cases when n is even, odd.

Suppose first that n is even, so $k = n/2 + 1$ and $m = \frac{1}{2}(n^2 - 2n - 2)$. Since $|A| = |B|$ and all edges are between A and B we have $\text{vol}(A) = \text{vol}(B)$ and thus $q_{\mathcal{A}}^D(G) = 1/2$. Also

$$q_{\mathcal{A}}^E(G) = \frac{2\binom{n/2}{2}}{m} = \frac{n(n-2)}{2(n^2 - 2n - 2)} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{n^2 - 2n - 2}.$$

Hence $q_{\mathcal{A}}(G) > 0$, as required.

Now suppose that n is odd, so $k = (n + 1)/2$ and $m = \frac{1}{2}(n^2 - 2n - 1)$. Then

$$q_{\mathcal{A}}^E(G) = \frac{\binom{\lceil n/2 \rceil}{2} + \binom{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}{2}}{m} = \frac{(n+1)(n-1) + (n-1)(n-3)}{8m},$$

and we may check that the numerator is $4m + 4$ so

$$q_{\mathcal{A}}^E(G) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2m}.$$

Also $\text{vol}(A) = \frac{1}{2}(n+1)(n-1) - k = \frac{1}{2}(n^2 - n - 2)$ and $\text{vol}(B) = \frac{1}{2}(n-1)^2 - k = \frac{1}{2}(n^2 - 3n)$, so

$$\begin{aligned} q_{\mathcal{A}}^D(G) &= \frac{1}{4} \frac{(n^2 - n - 2)^2 + (n^2 - 3n)^2}{4m^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \frac{8m^2 + 4m + 4}{4m^2} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{m+1}{4m^2}. \end{aligned}$$

We have $q_{\mathcal{A}}(G) > 0$ so long as $q_{\mathcal{A}}^E(G) > q_{\mathcal{A}}^D(G)$, which by the above is equivalent to $m > 1$. But $n > 3$ so $m = \frac{1}{2}(n^2 - 2n - 1) > 1$, and this completes the proof of the upper bound.

Now let us prove the lower bound. We must show that if $n \geq 4$ and we form G by removing $x \leq n/2$ edges from K_n then $q^*(G) = 0$. Let us note first one useful inequality. Let G be a graph on vertex set V , let U be a proper subset of V , and form G' by ‘moving’ an edge currently between U and \bar{U} to the location of a missing edge within U or \bar{U} . Then

$$p_{G'}(U) > p_G(U). \tag{2.1}$$

(This is similar to the ‘local rewiring’ result of [21] [Lemma 1].) To prove (2.1), note first that we may assume the edge is moved into U (since $p(U) = p(\bar{U})$). Now $e_{G'}(U) - e_G(U) = 1$ and

$$\text{vol}_{G'}(U)^2 - \text{vol}_G(U)^2 = (\text{vol}_G(U) + 1)^2 - \text{vol}_G(U)^2 = 2\text{vol}_G(U) + 1,$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} p_{G'}(U) - p_G(U) &= 2\text{vol}(G)(e_{G'}(U) - e_G(U)) - (\text{vol}_{G'}(U)^2 - \text{vol}_G(U)^2) \\ &= 2\text{vol}(G) - 2\text{vol}_G(U) - 1 \geq 1 \end{aligned}$$

since $\text{vol}_G(U) \leq \text{vol}(G) - 1$. This completes the proof of (2.1).

Now suppose that the graph H on $V = [n]$ and $U \subset V$ are such that $p_H(U)$ maximises the value $p_G(W)$ over all graphs G on V with at most $n/2$ edges missing and all nonempty $W \subset V$. Since the number of edges missing is at most $n/2 < n - 1$ there are edges of H in (U, \bar{U}) . Hence by inequality (2.1), no edges within U or within \bar{U} are missing.

Suppose that $|U| = j$ (where $1 \leq j \leq n - 1$) and x edges are missing from H . Then

$$\begin{aligned} p_H(U) &= \text{vol}_H(U)\text{vol}_H(\bar{U}) - e_H(U, \bar{U})\text{vol}(H) \\ &= (j(n-1) - x)((n-j)(n-1) - x) - (j(n-j) - x)(n(n-1) - 2x) \\ &= -j(n-j)(n-1) + 2xj(n-j) - x^2 \\ &= j(n-j)(2x - (n-1)) - x^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $p_H(U) < 0$ if $x \leq (n-1)/2$. Suppose that $x = n/2$. Then $p_H(U) = j(n-j) - (n/2)^2$, so $p_H(U) < 0$ if $j \neq n/2$, and $p_H(U) = 0$ if $j = n/2$. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.1.

We may now quickly prove Proposition 1.2. Let $n \geq 4$ and let H be a bipartite graph on $[n]$ with $k \leq n/2$ edges. There is a bipartition $\mathcal{A} = (A, B)$ of $[n]$ where $|A| = \lceil n/2 \rceil$ and $|B| = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ and such that all edges in H are between the parts. Proposition 1.2 now follows from the proof of Theorem 1.1.

2.2 Local graph modifications

We shall use the following lemma in the proof of part (a) of Theorem 1.3. Note that in the lemma below an edge between the parts is removed, whilst in (2.1) an edge from between the parts is moved to within the parts.

Lemma 2.1. *Let G be a graph and let $\mathcal{A} = \{A, \bar{A}\}$ be a bipartition with non-negative modularity score for G such that $e_G(A, \bar{A}) \geq 1$. Then for G' obtained by removing an edge between the parts we have $q_{\mathcal{A}}(G') > q_{\mathcal{A}}(G)$.*

Proof. Let G have m edges, and note that $m \geq 2$. The difference in the edge contributions

$$q_{\mathcal{A}}^E(G') - q_{\mathcal{A}}^E(G) = \frac{1}{(m-1)m} (e_G(A) + e_G(\bar{A})).$$

Let $q = \text{vol}_G(A) - m = m - \text{vol}_G(\bar{A})$. Since $e_G(A, \bar{A}) \geq 1$ each part has volume at least one and so $1 \leq |q| \leq m-1$. The difference in degree taxes is

$$q_{\mathcal{A}}^D(G) - q_{\mathcal{A}}^D(G') = \frac{(m+q)^2 + (m-q)^2}{4m^2} - \frac{(m+q-1)^2 + (m-q-1)^2}{4(m-1)^2} = \frac{m^2+q^2}{2m^2} - \frac{m^2+q^2-2m+1}{2(m-1)^2},$$

which simplifies to $-q^2(2m-1)/(2(m-1)^2m^2)$, and thus we have

$$q_{\mathcal{A}}(G') - q_{\mathcal{A}}(G) = \frac{1}{2(m-1)^2m^2} \left(2(m-1)m(e_G(A) + e_G(\bar{A})) - q^2(2m-1) \right).$$

But now $q_{\mathcal{A}}(G) \geq 0$ which implies $2m(e_G(A) + e_G(\bar{A})) = 2m^2q_{\mathcal{A}}^E(G) \geq 2m^2q_{\mathcal{A}}^D(G) = m^2 + q^2$ and hence

$$\begin{aligned} q_{\mathcal{A}}(G') - q_{\mathcal{A}}(G) &\geq \frac{1}{2(m-1)^2m^2} \left((m-1)(m^2 + q^2) - q^2(2m-1) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2(m-1)^2m^2} \left(m^3 - m^2 - q^2m \right). \end{aligned}$$

Recalling that $1 \leq |q| \leq m-1$, we have $m^3 - m^2 - q^2m \geq m^3 - m^2 - m(m-1)^2 = m^2 - m$. Thus

$$q_{\mathcal{A}}(G') - q_{\mathcal{A}}(G) \geq \frac{1}{2(m-1)m} > 0,$$

as required. □

Given an n -vertex graph G , by adding $\binom{n}{2} - \frac{n}{2} - e(G)$ edges we may form a graph G_0 with at most $\frac{n}{2}$ edges missing, and then $q^*(G_0) = 0$ since $f(n) > n/2$ by Theorem 1.1. Hence, by Lemma 1.9 (the robustness lemma), we have the following result, which extends the bound from Theorem 1.1 that $f(n) > n/2$. The notation x^+ means $\max\{x, 0\}$.

Lemma 2.2. *For each $n \geq 2$ and each nonempty n -vertex graph G*

$$q^*(G) \leq \frac{2\left(\binom{n}{2} - \frac{n}{2} - e(G)\right)^+}{e(G)}.$$

We will use Lemma 2.2 to prove the upper bound in Theorem 1.5.

2.3 Nearly complete bipartite graphs: proof of Theorem 1.3

We commented earlier that any complete multipartite graph G satisfies $q^*(G) = 0$, but there is no robustness result for complete multipartite graphs corresponding to Theorem 1.1. In this section we prove the three parts of Theorem 1.3 on $\delta^-(G)$, $\delta^+(G)$ and $\delta(G)$ for complete bipartite graphs G , in Lemmas 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5. In Section 2.4 we briefly consider complete multipartite graphs.

We start with δ^- , and see in Lemma 2.3 that $\delta^-(G) = 1$ for all complete bipartite graphs G , with the exception of stars.

Lemma 2.3 (part (a) of Theorem 1.3). *Let $G = K_{s,t}$ be a complete bipartite graph with $s \leq t$. If $s = 1$ then $\delta^-(G) = \infty$; and if $s \geq 2$ then $\delta^-(G) = 1$.*

Proof. Suppose first that $s = 1$, so G is the star $K_{1,t}$. As we delete edges we get stars $K_{1,t'}$ for $t' < t$ (together with isolated vertices) and eventually an empty graph. All these graphs have modularity zero and hence $\delta^-(K_{1,t}) = \infty$.

From now on let $s \geq 2$. We have seen that $q^*(K_{s,t}) = 0$, so we must show that removing an edge from $K_{s,t}$ yields a graph with positive modularity value. (Recall by Lemma 1.8 that $q^*(G) > 0$ iff there is a bipartition \mathcal{A} with $q_{\mathcal{A}}(G) > 0$, and hence $q^*(K_{s,t}) = 0$ follows also from the claim on line (2.2) below.)

There are two cases. We first consider the case that s and t have a common factor and show that in this case there is a bipartition $\mathcal{A} = \{A, \bar{A}\}$ with $q_{\mathcal{A}}(K_{s,t}) = 0$ and $e(A, \bar{A}) \geq 1$. Thus by Lemma 2.1, for $K_{s,t}^-$ the graph obtained from $K_{s,t}$ by removing an edge between parts A and \bar{A} we have $q_{\mathcal{A}}(K_{s,t}^-) > 0$. After that we consider the case when s and t are coprime which is only a little more complicated.

Before splitting into cases we give an expression for the modularity score of $K_{s,t}$ for bipartitions which will be useful for both cases. Write S, T for the two parts of the bipartite graph of sizes s, t respectively, and let $\sigma = |A \cap S|/s$ and $\tau = |A \cap T|/t$ be the proportions of the vertex set A in each of the bipartite parts. We *claim* that for $\mathcal{A} = \{A, \bar{A}\}$

$$q_{\mathcal{A}}(K_{s,t}) = -\frac{1}{2}(\sigma - \tau)^2. \tag{2.2}$$

Proof of Claim. The proof is by direct calculation. Note that

$$e(A) = |A \cap S| |A \cap T| = \sigma \tau st,$$

similarly, $e(\bar{A}) = (1 - \sigma)(1 - \tau)st$, and thus

$$q_{\mathcal{A}}^E(K_{s,t}) = \sigma\tau + (1 - \sigma)(1 - \tau) = 1 - (\sigma + \tau) + 2\sigma\tau. \quad (2.3)$$

Also each vertex in part S (resp. T) has degree t (resp. s) and so

$$\text{vol}(A) = |A \cap S|t + |A \cap T|s = (\sigma + \tau)st,$$

which together with the corresponding expression for $\text{vol}(\bar{A})$ yields

$$q_{\mathcal{A}}^D(K_{s,t}) = \left(\frac{1}{2}(\sigma + \tau)\right)^2 + \left(1 - \frac{1}{2}(\sigma + \tau)\right)^2 = 1 - (\sigma + \tau) + \frac{1}{2}(\sigma + \tau)^2.$$

Thus we have

$$q_{\mathcal{A}}(K_{s,t}) = 2\sigma\tau - \frac{1}{2}(\sigma + \tau)^2 = -\frac{1}{2}(\sigma - \tau)^2$$

which completes the proof of the claim.

Case 1: s and t have a common factor.

Recall that by Lemma 2.1 it is sufficient to find a bipartition $\mathcal{A} = (A, \bar{A})$ such that $e(A, \bar{A}) \geq 1$ and $q_{\mathcal{A}}(K_{s,t}) = 0$. Let $\ell > 1$ be a common factor of s and t . Then take A to have $|S|/\ell$ vertices from S and $|T|/\ell$ vertices from T . Clearly $e(A, \bar{A}) \geq 1$; and since $\sigma = |A \cap S|/s = 1/\ell = |A \cap T|/t = \tau$, by the claim on line (2.2) we have $q_{\mathcal{A}}(K_{s,t}) = 0$ and we are done.

Case 2: s and t are co-prime.

The following relation between graphs G , G^- and the modularities will be useful. Let $\mathcal{A} = \{A, \bar{A}\}$ be a vertex bipartition of G such that $e(A, \bar{A}) \geq 1$ and let G^- be any graph formed from G by removing an edge between the parts A and \bar{A} . Then

$$e(G^-)^2 q_{\mathcal{A}}(G^-) = e(G)^2 q_{\mathcal{A}}(G) - e(G) q_{\mathcal{A}}^E(G) + e(G) - 1/2. \quad (2.4)$$

To see this note that because the removed edge is between parts in \mathcal{A} , $e(G^-) q_{\mathcal{A}}^E(G^-) = e(G) q_{\mathcal{A}}^E(G)$. Similarly one may check that $e(G^-)^2 q_{\mathcal{A}}^D(G^-) = e(G)^2 q_{\mathcal{A}}^D(G) - e(G) + 1/2$ and that these together give (2.4).

Applied to our graph $G = K_{s,t}$ and $G^- = K_{s,t}^-$ obtained by removing an edge from between parts A and \bar{A} , we have

$$(st - 1)^2 q_{\mathcal{A}}(K_{s,t}^-) = s^2 t^2 \cdot q_{\mathcal{A}}(K_{s,t}) - st \cdot (q_{\mathcal{A}}^E(K_{s,t}) - 1) - 1/2. \quad (2.5)$$

Note from (2.3)

$$q_{\mathcal{A}}^E(K_{s,t}) - 1 = -(\sigma + \tau) + 2\sigma\tau = -(\sigma - \tau)^2 - \sigma(1 - \sigma) - \tau(1 - \tau).$$

Hence, substituting this and the expression for the modularity score in (2.2) we have

$$(st - 1)^2 q_{\mathcal{A}}(K_{s,t}^-) = -st(\sigma - \tau)^2 \left(\frac{1}{2}st - 1\right) + st(\sigma(1 - \sigma) + \tau(1 - \tau)) - 1/2. \quad (2.6)$$

Observe that since s and t are co-prime the linear diophantine equation $at - bs = 1$ has solutions (a, b) with a and b integers. Note also that if (a, b) is a solution then $(a + s, b + t)$ is also a solution. Hence there is a solution (a', b') with $1 \leq a' \leq s - 1$ (we cannot have $a' = 0$). Thus $b's = a't - 1$ satisfies $t - 1 \leq b's \leq (s - 1)t - 1$, and so $1 \leq b' \leq t - 1$.

Our construction is to take A with a' vertices in S and b' vertices in T then

$$|\sigma - \tau| = \left| \frac{|A \cap S|}{s} - \frac{|A \cap T|}{t} \right| = \left| \frac{a'}{s} - \frac{b'}{t} \right| = \frac{1}{st}. \quad (2.7)$$

Since $1 \leq a' \leq s - 1$, σ satisfies $1/s \leq \sigma \leq 1 - 1/s$ and hence $\sigma(1 - \sigma) \geq 1/s^2$. Similarly $\tau(1 - \tau) \geq 1/t^2$.

Hence by (2.6), substituting $|\sigma - \tau| = 1/(st)$, $\sigma(1 - \sigma) \geq 1/s^2$ and $\tau(1 - \tau) \geq 1/t^2$ we get

$$(st - 1)^2 q_{\mathcal{A}}(K_{s,t}^-) \geq \frac{1}{st} + \frac{t}{s} + \frac{s}{t} - 1 > 0 \quad (2.8)$$

and we are done. \square

Lemma 2.4 (part (b) of Theorem 1.3). *Let G be a complete bipartite graph $K_{s,t}$ with $s \leq t$. If $s = 1$ and $t \geq 4$, or if $s \geq 2$ and $t \geq 3$, then $\delta^+(G) = 1$. In the other cases (namely when $(s, t) = (1, 1), (1, 2), (1, 3)$ or $(2, 2)$), we have $\delta^+(G) = \infty$.*

Proof. Let $s = 1$ and form G^+ by adding an edge to the star $K_{1,t}$. If t is 1 or 2 then $q^*(G^+) = 0$ since G^+ has at most 3 vertices. If $t = 3$ then G^+ is K_4 less 2 edges, so $q^*(G^+) = 0$ by Theorem 1.1. But for all $t \geq 4$

$$q^*(G^+) > 0. \quad (2.9)$$

To see this, suppose that the added edge e is $\{a, b\}$, and let \mathcal{A} be the partition of the vertex set V into $\{a, b\}$ and $V \setminus \{a, b\}$. Then

$$q_{\mathcal{A}}^E(G^+) = \frac{t-1}{t+1}$$

and

$$q_{\mathcal{A}}^D(G^+) = \frac{4^2 + (2t-2)^2}{4(t+1)^2} = \frac{4 + (t-1)^2}{(t+1)^2}.$$

Thus

$$(t+1)^2 q_{\mathcal{A}}(G^+) = (t^2 - 1) - 4 - (t^2 - 2t + 1) = 2t - 6 :$$

so $q_{\mathcal{A}}(G^+) > 0$ for $t \geq 4$. This completes the proof of (2.9), and thus of the case $s = 1$.

Suppose now that $s \geq 2$. Note first that if $s = t = 2$ (so G is $K_{2,2}$) then at most 2 edges are missing from K_4 , and thus $\delta^+(G) = \infty$ by Theorem 1.1. Now assume also that $t \geq 3$. It remains to show that $\delta^+(G) = 1$.

The following relation between graphs G , G^+ and the modularity scores will be useful. Let $\mathcal{A} = \{A, \bar{A}\}$ be a vertex bipartition of G such that $e(A) < |A|(|A|-1)/2$ and let G^+ be any graph formed from G by adding an edge within the part A . Since the extra edge is added inside a part in \mathcal{A} , $e(G^+)q_{\mathcal{A}}^E(G^+) = e(G)q_{\mathcal{A}}^E(G) + 1$. For the degree tax we may calculate

$$e(G^+)^2 q_{\mathcal{A}}^D(G^+) = \frac{1}{4}(\text{vol}_G(A) + 2)^2 + \frac{1}{4}\text{vol}_G(\bar{A})^2 = e(G)^2 q_{\mathcal{A}}^D(G) + \text{vol}_G(A) + 1.$$

Thus we get an expression similar to (2.4),

$$\begin{aligned} e(G^+)^2 q_{\mathcal{A}}(G^+) &= e(G^+)^2 q_{\mathcal{A}}^E(G^+) - e(G^+)^2 q_{\mathcal{A}}^D(G^+) \\ &= (e(G) + 1)(e(G)q_{\mathcal{A}}^E(G) + 1) - e(G)^2 q_{\mathcal{A}}^D(G) - \text{vol}_G(A) - 1 \\ &= e(G)^2 q_{\mathcal{A}}(G) + e(G) + e(G)q_{\mathcal{A}}^E(G) - \text{vol}_G(A). \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

Note that making the following substitutions for total edges : $e(G) = e_G(A) + e_G(A, \bar{A}) + e_G(\bar{A})$, for internal edges : $e(G)q_{\mathcal{A}}^E(G) = e_G(A) + e_G(\bar{A})$ and for volume of A : $\text{vol}_G(A) = 2e_G(A) + e_G(A, \bar{A})$ we get

$$e(G^+)^2 q_{\mathcal{A}}(G^+) = e(G)^2 q_{\mathcal{A}}(G) + 2e_G(\bar{A}). \quad (2.11)$$

Case 1: s and t have a common factor.

Let $\ell > 1$ be a common factor of s and t . Take \bar{A} to be the part with $|S|/\ell$ vertices from S and $|T|/\ell$ vertices from T (we want to add an edge within the vertex set A , so we take $|A| \geq |\bar{A}|$). Then $|A \cap T| \geq 2$ since $t \geq 3$, and thus we may add an edge within part A - call this new graph $K_{s,t}^+$.

Similarly to in the proof of Lemma 2.3, $\sigma = |A \cap S|/s = 1 - 1/\ell = |A \cap T|/t = \tau$ and we have $q_{\mathcal{A}}(K_{s,t}) = 0$ for the bipartition $\mathcal{A} = \{A, \bar{A}\}$. Thus by (2.11)

$$e(K_{s,t}^+)^2 q_{\mathcal{A}}(K_{s,t}^+) = 2e_{K_{s,t}}(\bar{A}).$$

But now, since \bar{A} has non-empty intersection with both S and with T we have $e_{K_{s,t}}(\bar{A}) \geq 1$ and thus $q_{\mathcal{A}}(K_{s,t}^+) > 0$ as required.

Case 2: s and t are co-prime.

As in the proof of Lemma 2.3 we may assume that $a't - b's = 1$ has a solution with $1 \leq a' \leq s - 1$ and $1 \leq b' \leq t - 1$ positive integers. Now, if either $a' > 1$ or $b' > 1$ then take A with a' vertices in S and b' vertices in T , otherwise take A to be the complement of that, i.e. with $s - a'$ vertices in S and $t - b'$ vertices in T . Let $\sigma = |A \cap S|/s$ and $\tau = |A \cap T|/t$. In either case, as in (2.7),

$$|\sigma - \tau| = 1/(st). \quad (2.12)$$

Notice also by our choice of A that the set A intersects either S or T in at least two vertices, and hence we have a place to add an edge within the set A , again we call the resulting graph $K_{s,t}^+$.

Now by (2.11) for bipartition $\mathcal{A} = \{A, \bar{A}\}$

$$e(K_{s,t}^+)^2 q_{\mathcal{A}}(K_{s,t}^+) = e(K_{s,t})^2 q_{\mathcal{A}}(K_{s,t}) + e_{K_{s,t}}(\bar{A}) = -\frac{1}{2} + e_{K_{s,t}}(\bar{A})$$

where the second equality follows because by the claim in (2.2) $q_{\mathcal{A}}(K_{s,t}) = -\frac{1}{2}(\sigma - \tau)^2$, by (2.12) and because the total number of edges is $e(K_{s,t}) = st$. Again, by construction \bar{A} has non-empty intersection both with S and with T and hence $e_{K_{s,t}}(\bar{A}) \geq 1$, and $q_{\mathcal{A}}(K_{s,t}^+) > 0$ as required. \square

The above results show that for a complete bipartite graph G , always $\delta^-(G)$ and $\delta^+(G)$ are 1 or ∞ : that is not quite the case for $\delta(G)$.

Lemma 2.5 (part (c) of Theorem 1.3). *Let G be a complete bipartite graph $K_{s,t}$ with $s \leq t$. If $s = 1$ and $t \geq 4$, or if $s \geq 2$, then $\delta(G) = 1$. If $(s, t) = (1, 1)$ or $(1, 2)$ then $\delta(G) = \infty$, and in the remaining case $(s, t) = (1, 3)$ we have $\delta(G) = 2$.*

Proof. If $s = 1$ and $t \geq 4$, or if $s \geq 2$, then $1 \leq \delta(G) \leq \delta^+(G) = 1$ by Lemma 2.4; and if $s + t \leq 3$ then $\delta(G) = \infty$. This leaves only the case $(s, t) = (1, 3)$. When $G = K_{1,3}$ we saw that $\delta^-(G) = \delta^+(G) = \infty$, and so $\delta(G) \geq 2$. But if H is the 4-vertex path then $q^*(H) = \frac{1}{6} > 0$, and so $\delta(G) = 2$. \square

2.4 Nearly complete multipartite graphs - a partial story

We start this section by showing that complete multipartite graphs G whose part sizes have a non-trivial common divisor have $\delta^-(G) = 1$ – though some such graphs G have $\delta^+(G) = \infty$, see Example 2.7. Finally we give an example of a complete tripartite graph G with $\delta^+(G) = 2$, see Example 2.8. We do not aim here to give a complete story but rather give a few partial results and examples which indicate that for complete multipartite graphs the results will be a little more involved than for complete bipartite graphs.

Proposition 2.6. *Let $G = K_{s_1, \dots, s_k}$ be a complete multipartite graph where $k \geq 2$; and let $\ell | s_i$ for each i for some integer $\ell \geq 2$. Then $\delta^-(G) = 1$.*

Proof. First note that by [2, 21] $q^*(G) = 0$, so it remains to show that we can remove an edge from G and obtain a graph with positive modularity. By Lemma 2.1 it suffices to construct a bipartition $\mathcal{A} = \{A, \bar{A}\}$ of G with $e_G(A, \bar{A}) \geq 1$ and $q_{\mathcal{A}}(G) \geq 0$.

Denote the parts of the complete multipartite graph by S_1, \dots, S_k . Construct vertex set A by including $|S_i|/\ell$ vertices from S_i for each i . We will show that the bipartition $\mathcal{A} = \{A, \bar{A}\}$ has the properties required. It is clear that $e_G(A, \bar{A}) \geq 1$ so it remains only to show $q_{\mathcal{A}}(G) \geq 0$; we show below that $q_{\mathcal{A}}(G) = 0$.

First note that

$$e(A) = \sum_{i < j} \frac{|S_i|}{\ell} \frac{|S_j|}{\ell} = \frac{1}{\ell^2} e(G);$$

that is, part A contains a $1/\ell^2$ proportion of the edges of G . Similarly, part \bar{A} contains a $(\ell - 1)^2/\ell^2$ proportion of the edges; and thus $q_{\mathcal{A}}^E(G) = (1 + (\ell - 1)^2)/\ell^2$. Also, part A has a $1/\ell$ proportion of the volume of the graph, and part \bar{A} has a $(\ell - 1)/\ell$ proportion; and so $q_{\mathcal{A}}^D(G) = q_{\mathcal{A}}^E(G)$. Hence we have $q_{\mathcal{A}}(G) = 0$, which completes the proof. \square

Example 2.7. *Let $j, k \geq 0$ with $j + k \geq 1$, and let $G = G_{j,k}$ be the complete multipartite graph $K_{2, \dots, 2, 1, \dots, 1}$ with j partite sets of size 2 and k of size 1 (and so with $n = 2j + k$ vertices), and note that $q^*(G) = 0$. We shall show that $\delta^+(G) = \infty$, and $\delta(G) = \delta^-(G) = \lfloor k/2 \rfloor + 1$ if $n \geq 4$.*

Consider $\delta^+(G)$. If $j = 0$ it is not possible to add an edge. If $j \geq 1$ we may add $\ell = j$ edges to yield the complete graph K_{2j+k} . If $j \geq 2$ we may also add $\ell < j$ edges which yields the complete multipartite graph $G_{j-\ell, k+2\ell}$. However, all such graphs have modularity zero, and so $\delta^+(G) = \infty$ as claimed.

Now let $n = 2j + k \geq 4$ and consider $\delta^-(G)$. Note that G is the complete graph K_n less the bipartite graph formed by j disjoint edges, and $j \leq n/2$. Hence by Proposition 1.2 we have $\delta^-(G) = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor + 1 - j = \lfloor k/2 \rfloor + 1$.

Example 2.8. *Let G be the complete tripartite graph $K_{1,3,3}$. We shall see that $\delta^+(G) = 2$ and $\delta(G) = \delta^-(G) = 1$.*

Note that $q^(G) = 0$ and thus $\delta^+(G), \delta^-(G) \geq 1$.*

We first show that $\delta^+(G) \geq 2$ and then that $\delta^+(G) = 2$. All graphs obtained by adding a single edge to G are isomorphic: denote this 16-edge graph by G^+ . Observe that G^+ is the complete graph K_7

less a disjoint triangle and two-edge path: a total of five missing edges. By Lemma 1.8, to show that $q^*(G^+) = 0$ it is enough to consider an arbitrary bipartition $\mathcal{A} = \{A, \bar{A}\}$ for G^+ , and show that $q_{\mathcal{A}}(G^+) \leq 0$. Without loss of generality, $|A| \leq |\bar{A}|$. Note that for every graph H and every bipartition \mathcal{B} with a part of size 1, we have $q_{\mathcal{B}}(H) \leq 0$. Thus we may assume that $|A| \geq 2$, so $|A|$ is 2 or 3.

Of the five edges missing in G^+ at most four can be between the parts A and \bar{A} , and thus $e_{G^+}(A, \bar{A}) \geq |A||\bar{A}| - 4$. Firstly, if $|A| = 3$ and $|\bar{A}| = 4$ then $e_{G^+}(A, \bar{A}) \geq |A||\bar{A}| - 4 = 8$. Hence $q_{\mathcal{A}}^E(G^+) \leq 8/16 = 1/2$, and since the degree tax of any bipartition is always at least $1/2$, in this case $q_{\mathcal{A}}(G^+) \leq 0$.

To show that $\delta^+(G) \geq 2$, it remains to check the case $|A| = 2$ and $|\bar{A}| = 5$, when $e_{G^+}(A, \bar{A}) \geq 6$. If $e_{G^+}(A, \bar{A}) \geq 8$ then as in the case $|A| = 3$ above we have $q_{\mathcal{A}}(G^+) \leq 0$. If $e_{G^+}(A, \bar{A}) = 7$ then $\text{vol}_{G^+}(A) = 2e_{G^+}(A) + e_{G^+}(A, \bar{A}) \leq 2 + 7 = 9$. The degree tax is minimised by having volumes as equal as possible, so $q_{\mathcal{A}}^D(G^+) \geq (9^2 + 23^2)/32^2$. But $q_{\mathcal{A}}^E(G^+) = 1 - 7/16 = 9/16$ so $q_{\mathcal{A}}(G^+) \leq 9/16 - 305/512 < 0$. Finally, suppose that $e_{G^+}(A, \bar{A}) = 6$. Then arguing as before we see that $\text{vol}_{G^+}(A) \leq 2 + 6 = 8$, so $q_{\mathcal{A}}^D(G^+) \geq (8^2 + 24^2)/32^2 = 5/8$. But $q_{\mathcal{A}}^E(G^+) = 1 - 6/16 = 5/8$, and so $q_{\mathcal{A}}(G^+) = 0$.

We have now seen that $\delta^+(G) \geq 2$. To show that $\delta^+(G) = 2$, let G^{++} be the 17 edge graph obtained from $K_{1,3,3}$ by adding two disjoint edges. Note that G^{++} is the complete graph less two disjoint two-edge paths. Let \mathcal{A} be a bipartition with part sizes 3 and 4 such that all four missing edges are between the parts, so $e_{G^{++}}(A, \bar{A}) = 8$. Then $q_{\mathcal{A}}^E(G^{++}) = 9/17$ and the degree tax is $q_{\mathcal{A}}^D(G^{++}) = (14^2 + 20^2)/34^2$ which gives $q_{\mathcal{A}}(G^{++}) > 0$ and thus $\delta^+(G) = 2$.

Finally, we show that $\delta^-(G) = 1$ and thus $\delta(G) = 1$. Form G^- from G by deleting an edge, we say, between the partite sets of size 3. Then let $A = \{u, w\}$ where $w \neq v$ is in the same partite set as v . Note that the 7 ‘missing’ edges in G^- form two K_3 ’s joined by an edge, and 5 of these ‘missing’ edges are between A and \bar{A} . Thus for the bipartition $\mathcal{A} = \{A, \bar{A}\}$ we have $q_{\mathcal{A}}^E(G^-) = 1 - 5/14 = 9/14$. For the degree tax of \mathcal{A} , note that $d_u = 3$ and $d_w = 4$ so $\text{vol}(A) = 7$, $\text{vol}(\bar{A}) = 21$ and thus $q_{\mathcal{A}}^D(G^-) = (7^2 + 21^2)/28^2 = (1^2 + 3^2)/4^2 = 5/8$. Hence $q_{\mathcal{A}}(G^-) = 9/14 - 5/8 = 1/56 > 0$, and so we have $\delta^-(G) = 1$ as required.

3 Short proof that complete multipartite graphs have modularity zero

We noted that complete multipartite graphs have modularity zero ([2, 12]). The proofs given for this result are based on properties of the eigenvalues of related matrices. Here we give a shorter simple proof based on graph expansion.

Theorem 3.1. *If G is a complete multipartite graph then $q^*(G) = 0$.*

Proof. We use the following recent expansion result [10]: for every graph G

$$q^*(G) = 0 \quad \text{if and only if} \quad e(A, \bar{A}) \geq 2\sqrt{e(A)e(\bar{A})} \quad \forall A \subseteq V(G).$$

Here $\bar{A} = V(G) \setminus A$, and recall that $q^*(G) = 0$ if G has no edges.

Fix a complete multipartite graph G on parts V_1, \dots, V_k for some $k \geq 2$. Let $\emptyset \neq A \subsetneq V(G)$, let $x_i = |A \cap V_i|$ and $y_i = |\bar{A} \cap V_i|$; and let $x = \sum_i x_i = |A|$ and $y = \sum_i y_i = |\bar{A}|$. Observe that

$2e(A) = \sum_i x_i(x - x_i) = x^2 - \sum_i x_i^2$, similarly $2e(\bar{A}) = y^2 - \sum_i y_i^2$, and $e(A, \bar{A}) = \sum_i x_i(y - y_i) = xy - \sum_i x_i y_i$. Thus $e(A, \bar{A}) \geq 2\sqrt{e(A)e(\bar{A})}$ if and only if

$$(xy - \sum_i x_i y_i)^2 \geq (x^2 - \sum_i x_i^2)(y^2 - \sum_i y_i^2). \quad (3.1)$$

We shall prove the theorem by showing that (3.1) holds. Let $u_i = x_i/x$ so $\sum_i u_i = 1$, and let $v_i = y_i/y$ so $\sum_i v_i = 1$. Dividing both sides of (3.1) by $x^2 y^2$ shows that it is equivalent to

$$(1 - \sum_i u_i v_i)^2 \geq (1 - \sum_i u_i^2)(1 - \sum_i v_i^2). \quad (3.2)$$

Let $s = (\sum_i u_i^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $t = (\sum_i v_i^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, so $0 < s, t \leq 1$. By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we have $\sum_i u_i v_i \leq st$. Let $\alpha = (\sum_i u_i v_i)/st$, so $0 < \alpha \leq 1$. We may now write the inequality (3.2) as

$$(1 - \alpha st)^2 \geq (1 - s^2)(1 - t^2),$$

that is

$$s^2 + t^2 - 2\alpha st \geq (1 - \alpha^2)s^2 t^2.$$

The LHS here equals

$$s^2 - 2st + t^2 + 2(1 - \alpha)st = (s - t)^2 + 2(1 - \alpha)st \geq 2(1 - \alpha)st.$$

Thus to prove (3.1) it suffices to show that

$$2(1 - \alpha)st \geq (1 - \alpha^2)s^2 t^2. \quad (3.3)$$

But both sides in (3.3) are non-negative (since $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ and $st > 0$), $st \geq s^2 t^2$ (since $0 < s, t \leq 1$), and $2(1 - \alpha) \geq (1 - \alpha^2)$ (since $2(1 - \alpha) - (1 - \alpha^2) = (1 - \alpha)^2 \geq 0$). Hence (3.3) holds, and the proof is complete. \square

4 Proofs for results on random graphs

Most of this section is taken up with proving Theorem 1.5. After that we quickly prove Theorems 1.6 and 1.7.

4.1 Proof of Theorem 1.5

Part (a). This part follows easily from Theorem 1.1. Let $p = p(n)$ satisfy $p \geq 1 - 1/n + \omega(n)n^{-3/2}$. The number of edges missing in $G_{n,p}$ is at most X , where $X \sim \text{Bin}(\binom{n}{2}, 1/n - \omega n^{-3/2})$. Now $\mathbb{E}[X] \leq n/2 - \omega\sqrt{n}/2$, and $\text{var}(X) \leq n/2$. Thus, by Chebyshev's inequality,

$$\mathbb{P}(X \geq n/2) \leq \mathbb{P}(|X - \mathbb{E}[X]| \geq \omega\sqrt{n}/2) \leq \frac{n/2}{\omega^2 n/4} = o(1).$$

Hence $q^*(G_{n,p}) = 0$ whp by Theorem 1.1. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.5 (a).

Part (b). In order to prove part (b) of Theorem 1.5 we start with three deterministic lemmas, Lemmas 4.1 and 4.3 which we will apply to the complementary graph, together with Lemma 4.2 which will be used to prove Lemma 4.3. We shall need here only the case $k = 2$ of Lemma 4.1.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $k \geq 2$ be fixed, and let the n -vertex graph G satisfy $e(G) = o(n^{3/2})$. Let $\mathcal{A} = (A_1, \dots, A_k)$ be a partition of $V(G)$ such that $\max_i |A_i| \leq n/k + o(\sqrt{n})$. Then for the complementary graph \bar{G} we have $q_{\mathcal{A}}^D(\bar{G}) = \frac{1}{k} + o(1/n)$.*

Proof. For each i

$$\text{vol}_{\bar{G}}(A_i) \leq \left(\frac{n}{k} + o(\sqrt{n})\right)(n-1) = \frac{2}{k} \binom{n}{2} + o(n^{3/2}) = \frac{2}{k} e(\bar{G}) + x$$

where $x = \frac{2}{k} e(G) + o(n^{3/2}) = o(n^{3/2})$. Hence, by the convexity of $f(x) = x^2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^k \text{vol}_{\bar{G}}(A_i)^2 &\leq (k-1) \left(\frac{2}{k} e(\bar{G}) + x\right)^2 + \left(\frac{2}{k} e(\bar{G}) - (k-1)x\right)^2 \\ &= \frac{4}{k} e(\bar{G})^2 + k(k-1)x^2 = \frac{4}{k} e(\bar{G})^2 + o(n^3), \end{aligned}$$

and so $q_{\mathcal{A}}^D(\bar{G}) \leq \frac{1}{k} + o(n^{-1})$. Also $q_{\mathcal{A}}^D(\bar{G}) \geq \frac{1}{k}$ since \mathcal{A} has k parts, which completes the proof. \square

Lemma 4.2. *Let F be an n -vertex forest with maximum degree at most d , and let $\rho \geq 1/n$. Then we can find a set of less than d/ρ edges such that deleting these edges yields a forest in which each component tree has at most ρn vertices.*

Proof. Let x be the total number of vertices in components with more than ρn vertices. Thus $x \leq n$, and we may assume that $x > 0$. Let the tree T be a component with more than ρn vertices. Pick a leaf r in T , and start following a path from r until we first reach a vertex v such that, for each new edge e incident to v (that is, not including the edge along which we arrived at v if v is not r), the component of $T - e$ not containing v has at most ρn vertices. Remove from T all the edges incident with v . This removes at most d edges, and decreases x by more than ρn . We need to repeat this less than $1/\rho$ times, and so we delete in total less than d/ρ edges. \square

Let G be a graph with n vertices and m edges. The *excess* of G is $m - n$. The *core* of G is the graph obtained by repeatedly deleting leaves, and (if it is non-empty) it is the unique maximal subgraph of G with minimum degree at least 2. We call a bipartition $\mathcal{A} = (A, B)$ *balanced* when $||A| - |B|| \leq 1$.

Lemma 4.3. *Let G be an n -vertex graph with maximum degree at most d , let $\rho \geq 1/n$, and let G have at least $\rho n - 1$ isolated vertices; and suppose that the core of G has excess at most s , and has at most j components. Then there is a balanced bipartition (A, B) of $V(G)$ such that $e(G) - e(A, B) < s + j + d/\rho$.*

Proof. By removing at most $s + j$ edges from G we may reduce it to a forest F . By Lemma 4.2, by removing less than d/ρ further edges we may form a forest F' where each (tree) component has at most ρn vertices. We may find a proper 2-colouring (A', B') of F' less its isolated vertices such that $||A'| - |B'|| \leq \rho n - 1$. Now by adding the isolated vertices we can form a proper 2-colouring (A, B) of F' such that $||A| - |B|| \leq 1$. To complete the proof note that $e(A, B) \geq e(F') > e(G) - (s + j + d/\rho)$. \square

Now consider the random graph $G \sim G_{n,c/n}$. (We shall be interested in the complementary graph \overline{G} .) For each $c \in [1, \infty)$ there is a unique $x = x(c) \in (0, 1]$ such that $xe^{-x} = ce^{-c}$. Here we are following Frieze and Karonski [6]. The function $x(c)$ is continuous and strictly decreasing on $[1, \infty)$.

Lemma 4.4 (Lemma 2.16 of [6]). *Let $c > 1$ and let $x = x(c)$. Then whp the core of $G_{n,c/n}$ has $(1-x)(1-x/c)n + o(n)$ vertices and $(1-x/c)^2 cn/2 + o(n)$ edges.*

We now use the above lemmas to prove the lower bound in Theorem 1.5 (b) in the special case when the complementary graph is $G_{n,c/n}$ with c small (precisely, when $1 < c \leq 2$).

Lemma 4.5. *Let $1 < c \leq 2$, and let $G \sim G_{n,c/n}$. Then there exists $\delta > 0$ such that whp there is a balanced bipartition $\mathcal{A} = (A, B)$ of $V(G)$ with $q_{\mathcal{A}}(\overline{G}) \geq \delta/n + o(1/n)$.*

Proof. Let $x = x(c)$ as above. We shall see that we may take

$$\delta = \frac{1}{2c}((c-1)(2-c) + 2(x-1)^2). \quad (4.1)$$

It is easy to handle the degree tax for any balanced bipartition \mathcal{A} . Since $e(G) = cn/2 + o(n) = o(n^{3/2})$ whp, by Lemma 4.1 we have $q_{\mathcal{A}}^D(\overline{G}) = \frac{1}{2} + o(1/n)$ whp. We need to work to find \mathcal{A} with sufficiently high edge-contribution $q_{\mathcal{A}}^E(\overline{G})$.

By Lemma 4.4, the core of G whp has $(1-x)(1-x/c)n + o(n)$ vertices and $(1-x/c)^2 cn/2 + o(n)$ edges. So whp the excess of the core is

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \frac{x}{c})^2 cn/2 - (1-x)(1 - \frac{x}{c})n + o(n) &= (1 - \frac{x}{c})(\frac{c}{2} - \frac{x}{2} - (1-x))n + o(n) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(1 - \frac{x}{c})(c+x-2)n + o(n). \end{aligned}$$

(It is easy to check that $c+x > 2$.) Also, whp the maximum degree in G is $O(\log n / \log \log n)$, there is exactly one complex component (with more than one cycle), there are $o(n)$ (actually many fewer) unicyclic components, and there are $\Omega(n)$ isolated vertices [6]. Thus, by Lemma 4.3, whp there is a balanced bipartition (A, B) of $V(G)$ such that

$$e(G) - e_G(A, B) \leq \frac{1}{2}(1 - \frac{x}{c})(c+x-2)n + o(n).$$

But $e(G) = \frac{1}{2}cn + o(n)$ whp, so whp

$$\begin{aligned} e_G(A, B) &\geq \frac{1}{2}cn - \frac{1}{2}(1 - \frac{x}{c})(c+x-2)n + o(n) \\ &= \frac{n}{2}(c - (c+x-2) - x - \frac{x^2}{c} + \frac{2x}{c}) + o(n) \\ &= (1 - \frac{x(2-x)}{2c})n + o(n). \end{aligned}$$

Since $|A||B| \leq n^2/4$, we may see that

$$\begin{aligned} q_{\mathcal{A}}^E(\overline{G}) &\geq 1 - \frac{\frac{n^2}{4} - e_G(A, B)}{e(\overline{G})} \\ &= 1 - \frac{\frac{1}{2}e(\overline{G}) + (\frac{n^2}{4} - \frac{1}{2}e(\overline{G}) - e_G(A, B))}{e(\overline{G})} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\frac{n^2}{4} - \frac{1}{2}\binom{n}{2} - (e_G(A, B) - \frac{1}{2}e(G))}{e(\overline{G})} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} + \frac{e_G(A, B) - \frac{1}{2}e(G) - \frac{1}{4}n}{e(\overline{G})}. \end{aligned}$$

But by the above, whp

$$e_G(A, B) - \frac{1}{2}e(G) - \frac{1}{4}n \geq \delta n/2 + o(n)$$

where

$$\delta = 2 - \frac{x(2-x)}{c} - \frac{1}{2}(1+c) = \frac{3}{2} - \frac{x(2-x)}{c} - \frac{1}{2}c.$$

Thus $q_{\mathcal{A}}^E(\overline{G}) \geq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{(\delta/2)n}{e(\overline{G})} + o(1/n)$. Hence, recalling that $q_{\mathcal{A}}^D(\overline{G}) = \frac{1}{2} + o(1/n)$, we have

$$q_{\mathcal{A}}(\overline{G}) \geq \frac{(\delta/2)n}{e(\overline{G})} + o(1/n) = \frac{\delta}{n} + o(1/n) \text{ whp.}$$

We may rewrite δ as

$$\delta = \frac{1}{2c}(3c - 2x(2-x) - c^2) = \frac{1}{2c}((c-1)(2-c) + 2(x-1)^2)$$

as in (4.1), so clearly $\delta > 0$ since $1 < c \leq 2$; and this completes the proof. \square

Observe from (4.1) that if $c_1 = 1 + \varepsilon$ with ε small, then $\delta = \varepsilon/2 + O(\varepsilon^2)$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

The next lemma uses Lemma 4.5 and completes the proof of the lower bound in part (b) of Theorem 1.5. Given a graph G and $0 \leq p \leq 1$, let G_p denote the random subgraph of G obtained by considering each edge independently and keeping it with probability p (and otherwise deleting it). Thus the binomial random graph $G_{n,p}$ could be written as $(K_n)_p$, where K_n is the n -vertex complete graph.

Lemma 4.6. *Let $1 < c \leq 2$ and let $\delta > 0$ be as in (4.1). Let the probability $p = p(n)$ satisfy $p \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and $p \leq 1 - c/n$ for n sufficiently large. Then $q^*(G_{n,p}) \geq \delta/n + o(1/n)$ whp.*

Proof. Consider large n . Let $\rho = \rho(n) = p/(1 - c/n)$. We may form $G_{n,p}$ from K_n in two steps. First delete edges independently with probability c/n to give $G_{n,1-c/n}$, and then delete edges independently with probability ρ . By Lemma 4.5 there is a balanced bipartition \mathcal{A} of $[n]$ such that whp $q_{\mathcal{A}}(G_{n,1-c/n}) \geq \delta/n + o(1/n)$. Note that also $e(G_{n,1-c/n}) \geq \binom{n}{2} - cn$ whp.

Let H be a graph on $[n]$ with $e(H) \geq \binom{n}{2} - cn$, and suppose that \mathcal{A} is a balanced bipartition of $[n]$ with $q_{\mathcal{A}}(H) \geq \delta/n + o(1/n)$. It suffices to show that the random subgraph H_{ρ} of H must satisfy $q_{\mathcal{A}}(H_{\rho}) \geq \delta/n + o(1/n)$ whp. Note that $\rho \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$: let $\omega = \omega(n) \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ sufficiently slowly that $\omega(1 - \rho)^{1/2} \rightarrow 0$.

Consider $e(H_{\rho})$, which has the binomial distribution $\text{Bin}(e(H), \rho)$. By Chebyshev's inequality

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|e(H_{\rho}) - e(H)\rho| \geq x(e(H)\rho(1-\rho))^{1/2}\right) \leq x^{-2}.$$

Thus whp

$$\begin{aligned} e(H_{\rho}) &= e(H)\rho + O(\omega(e(H)\rho(1-\rho))^{1/2}) \\ &= e(H)\rho(1 + O((\omega((1-\rho)/e(H))^{1/2})) \\ &= e(H)\rho(1 + O(\omega(1-\rho)^{1/2}/n)), \end{aligned}$$

and so

$$e(H_{\rho}) = e(H)\rho(1 + o(1/n)) \text{ whp.} \tag{4.2}$$

For a graph H' on $[n]$ let $e^{\text{int}}(H') = e_{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{int}}(H')$ denote the number of internal edges within the parts of \mathcal{A} . Then, since $e^{\text{int}}(H) = \Theta(n^2)$, much as above we have

$$e^{\text{int}}(H_\rho) = e^{\text{int}}(H)\rho(1 + o(1/n)) \quad \text{whp.}$$

Hence

$$q_{\mathcal{A}}^E(H_\rho) = \frac{e^{\text{int}}(H_\rho)}{e(H_\rho)} = q_{\mathcal{A}}^E(H)(1 + o(1/n)) = q_{\mathcal{A}}^E(H) + o(1/n) \quad \text{whp.} \quad (4.3)$$

The degree tax is only a little more complicated. Let the parts of \mathcal{A} be A and B , and let $X = \text{vol}_{H_\rho}(A)$. Suppose that H has i edges within A and j edges between A and B , so $\text{vol}_H(A) = 2i + j$. Then X has variance

$$\text{var}(X) = (4i + j)\rho(1 - \rho) \leq 2\text{vol}_H(A)\rho(1 - \rho).$$

Hence, by Chebyshev's inequality as before, whp

$$\begin{aligned} X &= \text{vol}_H(A)\rho + O(\omega(\text{vol}_H(A)\rho(1 - \rho))^{1/2}) \\ &= \text{vol}_H(A)\rho(1 + O((\omega((1 - \rho)/\text{vol}_H(A)))^{1/2})) \\ &= \text{vol}_H(A)\rho(1 + O(\omega(1 - \rho)^{1/2}/n)), \end{aligned}$$

since $\text{vol}_H(A) = \Theta(n^2)$. Thus $\text{vol}_{H_\rho}(A) = \text{vol}_H(A)\rho(1 + o(1/n))$ whp; and similarly $\text{vol}_{H_\rho}(B) = \text{vol}_H(B)\rho(1 + o(1/n))$ whp. Hence, using also (4.2), whp

$$\begin{aligned} q_{\mathcal{A}}^D(H_\rho) &= (\text{vol}_{H_\rho}(A)^2 + \text{vol}_{H_\rho}(B)^2)/\text{vol}(H_\rho)^2 \\ &= q_{\mathcal{A}}^D(H)(1 + o(1/n)) = q_{\mathcal{A}}^D(H) + o(1/n). \end{aligned}$$

But now, using also (4.3), whp

$$\begin{aligned} q_{\mathcal{A}}(H_\rho) &= q_{\mathcal{A}}^E(H_\rho) - q_{\mathcal{A}}^D(H_\rho) = q_{\mathcal{A}}^E(H) - q_{\mathcal{A}}^D(H) + o(1/n) \\ &= q_{\mathcal{A}}(H) + o(1/n) \geq \delta/n + o(1/n) \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. \square

It remains in this subsection to prove the upper bound in Theorem 1.5 (b). Let $c > 0$ and let $p \geq 1 - c/n$. Then whp $e(G_{n,p}) \geq \binom{n}{2} - (c + o(1))n/2$, and so $\binom{n}{2} - n/2 - e(G_{n,p}) \leq (c - 1 + o(1))n/2$. Hence by Lemma 2.2

$$q^*(G_{n,p}) \leq \frac{(c - 1 + o(1))n}{e(G_{n,p})} \leq 2c/n \quad \text{whp.}$$

Thus we may set $\beta = 2c$ to complete the proof.

4.2 Proof of Theorem 1.6

By Theorem 4.1 of [14] there exist $\alpha_1 > 0$ and c_0 such that if $p = p(n)$ satisfies $1/n \leq p \leq 1 - c_0/n$ then $q^*(G_{n,p}) \geq \alpha_1 \sqrt{\frac{1-p}{np}}$ whp. We shall choose $0 < \alpha \leq \alpha_1$, so we need not consider this range of p further.

Now let $\varepsilon > 0$, and let p satisfy $1 - c_0/n \leq p \leq 1 - 1/n - \varepsilon/n$. Then

$$\sqrt{\frac{1-p}{np}} \leq \sqrt{\frac{c_0/n}{n(1-c_0/n)}} = (\sqrt{c_0} + o(1/n))/n.$$

By Theorem 1.5 there exists $\alpha_2 > 0$ such that $q^*(G_{n,p}) \geq \alpha_2/n$ whp. Let $\alpha > 0$ satisfy $\alpha \leq \alpha_1$ and $\alpha < \alpha_2/\sqrt{c_0}$. Then $\alpha_2/n \geq \alpha \sqrt{\frac{1-p}{np}}$ for n sufficiently large, so $q^*(G_{n,p}) \geq \alpha \sqrt{\frac{1-p}{np}}$ whp, as required.

4.3 Proof of Theorem 1.7

We shall use the following lemma, which is essentially Lemma A.2 in the appendix to the arXiv version of [14], where it is proved using a simple coupling argument together with a robustness lemma, stated as Lemma 1.9 above.

Lemma 4.7. *Let $m = m(n) \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and let $p = m/\binom{n}{2}$. Suppose that $q^*(G_{n,p}) \in (a_n, b_n)$ whp. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, $q^*(G_{n,m}) \in (a_n - \varepsilon/\sqrt{m}, b_n + \varepsilon/\sqrt{m})$ whp.*

Let $1 < c_1 < c_2$. Let $m = m(n)$ satisfy $\binom{n}{2} - c_2 n/2 \leq m \leq \binom{n}{2} - c_1 n/2$. Then $p = m/\binom{n}{2}$ satisfies $1 - c_2/(n-1) \leq p \leq 1 - c_1/(n-1)$, and so $1 - (c_2 + 1)/n \leq p \leq 1 - c_1/n$ for n sufficiently large. Hence by Theorem 1.5 there exist $0 < \alpha < \beta$ (depending only on c_1 and $c_2 + 1$) such that $\alpha/n \leq q^*(G_{n,p}) \leq \beta/n$ whp. Hence by Lemma 4.7 with $\varepsilon = \alpha/4$,

$$q^*(G_{n,m}) \in \left(\frac{\alpha}{n} - \frac{\alpha}{4\sqrt{m}}, \frac{\beta}{n} + \frac{\alpha}{4\sqrt{m}} \right) \quad \text{whp.}$$

But for n sufficiently large $\sqrt{m} \geq n/2$ and so $\alpha/4\sqrt{m} \leq \alpha/2n$; and thus

$$q^*(G_{n,m}) \in \left(\frac{\alpha/2}{n}, \frac{\beta + \alpha/2}{n} \right) \quad \text{whp.}$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.7.

5 Concluding remarks

We considered graphs with modularity zero, with starting point the complete graphs and complete bipartite graphs. For each such complete graph, we found the least number of edges which we may add to or delete from or edit to obtain a graph with non-zero modularity.

We also considered the modularity of very dense random graphs, and in particular we found that there is a transition to modularity zero when the average degree of the complementary graph drops below 1.

Complete multipartite graphs also have modularity zero but corresponding questions for them are still open - see Section 2.4. It is also open, see Question 1.4, whether complete graphs are the furthest (in edit distance) from graphs with positive modularity.

References

- [1] V. Agdur, N. Kamčev, and F. Skerman. Universal lower bound for community structure of sparse graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.07271*, 2023.
- [2] M. Bolla, B. Bullins, S. Chaturapruek, S. Chen, and K. Friedl. Spectral properties of modularity matrices. *Linear Algebra and Its Applications*, 473:359–376, 2015.
- [3] U. Brandes, D. Delling, M. Gaertler, R. Gorke, M. Hofer, Z. Nikoloski, and D. Wagner. On modularity clustering. *Knowledge and Data Engineering, IEEE Transactions on*, 20(2):172–188, 2008.

- [4] J. Chellig, N. Fountoulakis, and F. Skerman. The modularity of random graphs on the hyperbolic plane. *Journal of Complex Networks*, 10(1):cnab051, 2022.
- [5] T. N. Dinh and M. T. Thai. Finding community structure with performance guarantees in scale-free networks. In *Privacy, Security, Risk and Trust (PASSAT) and 2011 IEEE Third International Conference on Social Computing (SocialCom), 2011 IEEE Third International Conference on*, pages 888–891. IEEE, 2011.
- [6] A. Frieze and M. Karoński. *Introduction to random graphs*. Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- [7] A. Lancichinetti and S. Fortunato. Limits of modularity maximization in community detection. *Physical Review E*, 84(6):066122, 2011.
- [8] M. Lasoń and M. Sulkowska. Modularity of minor-free graphs. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 102(4):728–736, 2023.
- [9] L. Lichev and D. Mitsche. On the modularity of 3-regular random graphs and random graphs with given degree sequences. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 61(4), 2022.
- [10] B. Louf, C. McDiarmid, and F. Skerman. Modularity and graph expansion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.07521*, accepted to *Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science (ITCS) 2024*.
- [11] T. Łuczak. On the equivalence of two basic models of random graph. In *Proceedings of Random graphs*, volume 87, pages 151–159, 1990.
- [12] S. Majstorovic and D. Stevanovic. A note on graphs whose largest eigenvalues of the modularity matrix equals zero. *Electronic Journal of Linear Algebra*, 27(1):256, 2014.
- [13] C. McDiarmid and F. Skerman. Modularity of regular and treelike graphs. *Journal of Complex Networks*, 6(4), 2018.
- [14] C. McDiarmid and F. Skerman. Modularity of Erdős-Rényi random graphs. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 57(1):211–243, 2020.
- [15] C. McDiarmid and F. Skerman. Modularity and edge sampling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.13190*, 2021.
- [16] F. de Montgolfier, M. Soto, and L. Viennot. Asymptotic modularity of some graph classes. In *Algorithms and Computation*, pages 435–444. Springer, 2011.
- [17] M. E. J. Newman. *Networks: An Introduction*. Oxford University Press, 2010.
- [18] M. E. J. Newman and M. Girvan. Finding and evaluating community structure in networks. *Physical Review E*, 69(2):026113, 2004.
- [19] L. O. Prokhorenkova, P. Prałat, and A. Raigorodskii. Modularity in several random graph models. *Electronic Notes in Discrete Mathematics*, 61:947–953, 2017.
- [20] F. Skerman. *Modularity of Networks*. PhD thesis, University of Oxford, 2016.
- [21] S. Trajanovski, H. Wang, and P. Van Mieghem. Maximum modular graphs. *The European Physical Journal B-Condensed Matter and Complex Systems*, 85(7):1–14, 2012.