

# On clique polynomials

H. Hajiabolhassan and M.L. Mehrabadi\*

Department of Mathematical Sciences  
Sharif University of Technology  
P.O. Box 11365-9415, Tehran, I. R. Iran

## Abstract

Let  $G$  be a simple graph. We assign a polynomial  $C(G; x)$  to  $G$ , called the clique polynomial, where the coefficient of  $x^i$ ,  $i > 0$ , is the number of cliques of  $G$  with  $i$  vertices, and the constant term is 1. Fisher and Solow (1990), proved that this polynomial always has a real root. We prove this result by a simple and elementary method, which also implies the following results. If  $\zeta_G$  is the greatest real root of  $C(G; x)$  then for an induced subgraph  $H$  of  $G$ ,  $\zeta_H \leq \zeta_G$ , and for a spanning subgraph  $H$  of  $G$ ,  $\zeta_H \geq \zeta_G$ . As a consequence of the first inequality we have  $\alpha(G) \leq -1/\zeta_G$ , where  $\alpha(G)$  denotes the independence number of  $G$ .

## 1 Introduction

Throughout this paper we consider simple graphs, i.e. finite undirected graphs with no loops and multiple edges, and we use the terminology and notation of [1].

The *dependence polynomial* was first introduced by Fisher [2], who studied the following problem: How many  $n$  letter words can be made from an  $m$  letter alphabet if certain pairs of letters commute? Fisher and Solow [3] defined the dependence polynomial as follows:

$$f_G(x) = 1 - c_1x + c_2x^2 - c_3x^3 + \cdots + (-1)^\omega c_\omega x^\omega;$$

where  $\omega$  is the size of the largest clique in  $G$  and  $c_i$  denotes the number of complete subgraphs of size  $i$  in  $G$ . For a set  $S$  of words with an operation on them we assign a graph  $G_S$  such that  $V(G_S) = S$  and two vertices are joined iff they commute. Fisher [2] proved that the generating function for the above problem is precisely  $\frac{1}{f_{G_S}(x)}$ .

If we change the signs of all negative coefficients in  $f_G(x)$  to positive signs, we obtain a polynomial which is called the *clique polynomial* of  $G$ . Using the notation

---

\*Died in a bus accident 17 March 1998.

of [4] we denote it by  $C(G; x)$ . So we have:

$$C(G; x) = 1 + c_1x + c_2x^2 + c_3x^3 + \cdots + c_\omega x^\omega.$$

In [3] Fisher and Solow showed that the dependence polynomial of a graph always has a real root. In fact they prove that the smallest root (in absolute value) of  $f_G(x)$  is real. This result immediately implies the existence of a real root for the clique polynomial.

In this paper we give a simple proof of the later result. In addition, we show that there is some relation between the largest negative root of  $C(G; x)$  and that of  $C(H; x)$ , for special subgraphs  $H$  of  $G$ .

## 2 Results

We first present the following observation and then use it as the main tool to prove our main theorems.

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $G$  be a graph and let  $v \in V(G)$ . Then*

(a)  $C(G; x) = C(G \setminus v; x) + xC(G[N(v)]; x)$ ; where  $N(v)$  is the neighborhood of  $v$ .

(b)  $C(G; x) = C(G - uv; x) + x^2C(G[N(u) \cap N(v)]; x)$ ; where  $uv \in E(G)$ .

**Proof.** Let  $A_i$  be an  $i$ -clique of  $G$ . (a) Either  $v \notin A_i$ , then  $A_i$  is an  $i$ -clique in  $G \setminus v$ ; or  $v \in A_i$ , then  $A_i$  is obtained from an  $(i - 1)$ -clique of  $G[N(v)]$ . Summing up the number of these two kinds of  $i$ -cliques we obtain relation (a).

(b) Either  $A_i$  does not contain the edge  $uv$ , then  $A_i$  is an  $i$ -clique in  $G - uv$ ; or it does contain  $uv$ , then  $A_i$  is obtained from an  $(i - 2)$ -clique of  $G[N(u) \cap N(v)]$ . Summing up the number of these two kinds of  $i$ -cliques we obtain relation (b).  $\square$

To pursue our study we need the following notation:

**Notation.** *Let  $G$  be a graph and let  $\mathcal{Z}(G)$  be the set of negative real roots of  $C(G; x)$ . If  $\mathcal{Z}(G)$  is non-empty then define  $\zeta_G$  to be  $\max \mathcal{Z}(G)$  and otherwise to be  $-\infty$ .*

The following theorem plays an essential role where we reprove the result of Fisher and Solow. Also it presents a nice property of  $\zeta_G$  in conjunction with induced subgraphs.

**Theorem 1.** *If  $G$  is a graph and  $H$  is one of its induced subgraph, then  $\zeta_H \leq \zeta_G$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $n = |V(G)|$ . We prove the theorem by induction on  $n$ . For  $n = 1$  and  $2$  the assertion is obvious. If  $H$  is an arbitrary proper induced subgraph of  $G$ , then we can find a vertex  $v$  of  $G$  such that  $H$  is an induced subgraph of  $G \setminus v$ . Hence it is sufficient to prove the theorem for induced subgraphs of the form  $G \setminus v$ , for some  $v \in V(G)$ . Now, let  $v \in V(G)$ . If  $\mathcal{Z}(G \setminus v) = \emptyset$  then there is nothing to prove. So

we can assume that  $\mathcal{Z}(G \setminus v)$  is not empty. On other hand, by part (a) of Lemma 1 we have:

$$C(G; x) = C(G \setminus v; x) + xC(G[N(v)]; x).$$

Substituting  $\zeta_{G \setminus v}$  in both sides of the above equation and applying induction we have  $C(G[N(v)], \zeta_{G \setminus v}) \geq 0$ , thus  $C(G, \zeta_{G \setminus v}) \leq 0$ . On the other hand  $C(G, 0) = 1$ . So the theorem is proved.  $\square$

**Theorem 2.** For every graph  $G$ ,  $-1 \leq \zeta_G < 0$ .

**Proof.** Let  $u$  be a vertex of  $G$ , and  $H$  be the subgraph induced on  $u$ . Clearly  $\zeta_H = -1$ . Thus by the above theorem we must have  $\zeta_G \geq -1$ , as desired.  $\square$

Turan's theorem for triangle-free graphs is a consequence of Theorem 2 :

**Corollary 1.** If  $G$  is a triangle-free graph then  $|E(G)| \leq |V(G)|^2/4$ .

**Proof.** Since  $G$  has no triangle we have:

$$C(G; x) = 1 + |V(G)|x + |E(G)|x^2.$$

By Theorem 2,  $C(G; x)$  has a real root which implies that the discriminant of this polynomial i.e.  $|V(G)|^2 - 4|E(G)|$  is non-negative; as claimed.  $\square$

The two following propositions are obtained by considering some special induced subgraphs.

**Proposition 1.** Let  $G$  be a graph and  $\alpha(G)$  be the independence number of  $G$ . Then

$$\alpha(G) \leq -1/\zeta_G.$$

**Proof.** Consider the subgraph  $H$  induced by an independent set of size  $\alpha(G)$ . We have  $\zeta_H = -1/(\alpha(G))$  and by Theorem 1,  $\zeta_H \leq \zeta_G$ . This proves the proposition.  $\square$

**Proposition 2.** Let  $G$  be a graph which is not complete and let  $g(G)$  be the girth of  $G$ . Then

$$g(G) \leq \frac{-1}{\zeta_G^2 + \zeta_G}$$

**Proof.** Consider a cycle of  $G$  with the size  $g(G)$ . This is an induced subgraph of  $G$ . Calculating the  $\zeta$  of this cycle and applying Theorem 1 we obtain the desired inequality.  $\square$

**Remark 1.** By the same method one can prove a similar assertion with  $g(G)$  replaced by the length of the the smallest odd cycle.

The following corollary is an immediate consequence of Proposition 1:

**Corollary 2.** For every graph  $G$ ,  $\chi(G) \geq -|V(G)|\zeta_G$ .

**Theorem 3.** *If  $G$  is a graph and  $H$  is a spanning subgraph of  $G$ , then  $\zeta_G \leq \zeta_H$ .*

**Proof.** It is enough to prove the theorem in the case of  $H = G - e$  where  $e$  is an edge of  $G$ . Suppose  $e = uv$  for  $u, v \in V(G)$ . By the part (b) of Lemma 1 we have:

$$C(G; x) = C(G - uv; x) + x^2 C(G[N(u) \cap N(v)]; x),$$

where  $uv \in E(G)$ . Substitute  $\zeta_G$  in both sides of the above equation. We obtain:

$$C(G - uv; \zeta_G) = -\zeta_G^2 C(G[N(u) \cap N(v)]; \zeta_G). \quad (1)$$

On the other hand  $G[N(u) \cap N(v)]$  is an induced subgraph of  $G$  and therefore by Theorem 1 the right hand side of equation (1) is negative, which implies that  $C(G - uv; \zeta_G)$  is negative also. This together with the fact that  $C(G - uv; 0) = 1$ , implies the assertion.  $\square$

We can apply Theorem 3 to prove some necessary conditions for existence of Hamiltonian cycles and perfect matchings which are useful in some special cases.

**Corollary 3.** *Let  $G$  be a graph with  $n$  vertices. We have:*

(a) *If  $n \geq 4$  and  $\zeta_G > \frac{-1 + \sqrt{1 - 4/n}}{2}$ , then  $G$  is not Hamiltonian.*

(b) *If  $n \geq 2$  and  $\zeta_G > -1 + \sqrt{1 - 2/n}$ , then  $G$  does not have perfect matching.*

**Acknowledgement.** The authors are indebted to the Research Council of the Sharif University of Technology and the Institute for Studies in Theoretical Physics and Mathematics (IPM) for their support of this research.

## References

- [1] J.A. BONDY AND U. S. R. MURTY, *Graph theory with applications*, American Elsevier Publishing Co. Inc., New York, 1976.
- [2] D.C. FISHER, *The number of words of length  $n$  in a free "semi abelian" moniod*, Amer. Math. Monthly, **96** (1989), 610–614.
- [3] D.C. FISHER AND A.E. SOLOW, *Dependence polynomials*, Discrete Mathematics **82** (1990), 251–258.
- [4] C. HOEDE AND X. LI, *Clique polynomials and independent set polynomials of graphs*, Discrete Mathematics **125** (1994), 219–228.

(Received 6/2/98)