The Blow-up Lemma and growing degrees

Andreas Würfl

Technische Universität München

Combinatorics Conference in Lisbon

(joint work with Julia Böttcher, Yoshi Kohayakawa & Anusch Taraz)

Definition

(ε, δ)-SUPER-REGULAR

Let $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$. The graph $(A \dot\cup B, E)$ with $|A| = |B| = n$ is an (ε, δ)-*super-regular* pair if

- $|d(X, Y) - d(A, B)| \leq \varepsilon$ for all $X \subseteq A$, $Y \subseteq B$ with $|X|, |Y| \geq \varepsilon n$,
- $\deg(v) \geq \delta n$ for all $v \in A \cup B$.

Definition

(ε,δ)-SUPER-REGULAR

Let $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$. The graph $(A \dot\cup B, E)$ with $|A| = |B| = n$ is an (ε, δ)-*super-regular* pair if

- $|d(X,Y) - d(A,B)| \leq \varepsilon$ for all $X \subseteq A$, $Y \subseteq B$ with $|X|, |Y| \geq \varepsilon n$,
- $\deg(v) \geq \delta n$ for all $v \in A \cup B$.



- regularity ↔ "densities as expected"
- high minimum degree

The Blow-up Lemma

Komlós, Sárközy, Szemerédi, '97

For $\delta > 0$, $\Delta \in \mathbb{N}$ there is $\varepsilon > 0$ such that the following holds. If H has $\Delta(H) \leq \Delta$ and $H \subseteq K_{n,n}$ then H is subgraph of any (ε, δ)-super-regular pair $G = (A \dot\cup B, E)$ with $|A| = |B| = n$.

another proof was given by: Rödl, Ruciński, '99

The Blow-up Lemma

Komlós, Sárközy, Szemerédi, '97

For $\delta > 0$, $\Delta \in \mathbb{N}$ there is $\varepsilon > 0$ such that the following holds. If H has $\Delta(H) \leq \Delta$ and $H \subseteq K_{n,n}$ then H is subgraph of any (ε, δ)-super-regular pair $G = (A \dot\cup B, E)$ with $|A| = |B| = n$.

another proof was given by: Rödl, Ruciński, '99



$K_{n,n}$



H



G

The Blow-up Lemma

Komlós, Sárközy, Szemerédi, '97

For $\delta > 0$, $\Delta \in \mathbb{N}$ there is $\varepsilon > 0$ such that the following holds. If H has $\Delta(H) \leq \Delta$ and $H \subseteq K_{n,n}$ then H is subgraph of any (ε, δ)-super-regular pair $G = (A \dot\cup B, E)$ with $|A| = |B| = n$.

another proof was given by: Rödl, Ruciński, '99



The Blow-up Lemma

Komlós, Sárközy, Szemerédi, '97

For $\delta > 0$, $\Delta \in \mathbb{N}$ there is $\varepsilon > 0$ such that the following holds. If H has $\Delta(H) \leq \Delta$ and $H \subseteq K_{n,n}$ then H is subgraph of any (ε, δ)-super-regular pair $G = (A \dot\cup B, E)$ with $|A| = |B| = n$.

another proof was given by: Rödl, Ruciński, '99



$$H \subseteq K_{n,n} \quad \Rightarrow \quad H \subseteq G$$

The Blow-up Lemma for growing degrees

Theorem — Komlós, Sárközy, Szemerédi, '97

For $\delta > 0$, $\Delta \in \mathbb{N}$ there is $\varepsilon > 0$ such that the following holds. If H has $\Delta(H) \leq \Delta$ and $H \subseteq K_{n,n}$ then H is subgraph of any (ε, δ)-super-regular pair $(A \dot\cup B, E)$ with $|A| = |B| = n$.

The Blow-up Lemma for growing degrees

Theorem Böttcher, Kohayakawa, Taraz, W. '11

For $\delta > 0$, $a \in \mathbb{N}$ there is $\varepsilon > 0$ such that the following holds. If H has $\Delta(H) \leq \sqrt{n}/\log n$ and $H \subseteq K_{n,n}$ is a-arrangeable then H is subgraph of any (ε, δ)-super-regular pair $(A \dot\cup B, E)$ with $|A| = |B| = n$.

The Blow-up Lemma for growing degrees

Theorem — Böttcher, Kohayakawa, Taraz, W. '11

For $\delta > 0$, $a \in \mathbb{N}$ there is $\varepsilon > 0$ such that the following holds. If H has $\Delta(H) \leq \sqrt{n}/\log n$ and $H \subseteq K_{n,n}$ is a-arrangeable then H is subgraph of any (ε, δ)-super-regular pair $(A \dot\cup B, E)$ with $|A| = |B| = n$.

$G = (V, E)$ is *a-arrangeable* if there is an ordering $V = \{v_1, \ldots, v_n\}$ with $|N_L(N_R(v_i))| \leq a$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, n$.



Examples of arrangeable graphs



- trees are 1-arrangeable
- planar graphs are 761-arrangeable — Chen, Shelp '93
- planar graphs are 10-arrangeable — Kierstead, Trotter '94
- graphs without a K_p-subdivision are p^8-arrangeable — Rödl, Thomas '94

Sketch of proof: a random greedy embedding



(ε, δ)-super-regular

Sketch of proof: a random greedy embedding



(ε, δ)-super-regular

Sketch of proof: a random greedy embedding



(ε, δ)-super-regular

$$C(x) = \bigcap_{y \in N_L(x)} N_G(\varphi(y))$$

Sketch of proof: a random greedy embedding



(ε, δ)-super-regular

$$C(x) = \bigcap_{y \in N_L(x)} N_G(\varphi(y))$$

Sketch of proof: a random greedy embedding



(ε, δ)-super-regular

$$C(x) = \bigcap_{y \in N_L(x)} N_G(\varphi(y))$$

Sketch of proof: a random greedy embedding



(ε, δ)-super-regular

$$C(x) = \bigcap_{y \in N_L(x)} N_G(\varphi(y))$$

Sketch of proof: a random greedy embedding



$$C(x) = \bigcap_{y \in N_L(x)} N_G(\varphi(y))$$

Sketch of proof: a random greedy embedding



MESSAGE: respect your successors!

Sketch of proof: a random greedy embedding



(ε, δ)-super-regular

Sketch of proof: a random greedy embedding



(ε, δ)-super-regular

Sketch of proof: a random greedy embedding



Sketch of proof: a random greedy embedding



Does this always work?

Respect one successor...

... with the help of ε-regularity



(ε, δ)-super-regular

Respect one successor...

...with the help of ε-regularity





(ε, δ)-super-regular

Respect one successor...

...with the help of ε-regularity



Respect one successor. . .

. . . with the help of ε-regularity



(ε, δ)-super-regular

all but $2\varepsilon n$ vertices in $C(3)$ have “correct” degree into $C(4)$

Respect all successors…

…even if their number is growing with n

Respect all successors...

...even if their number is growing with n

Problem: each successor might *"kill"* $\varepsilon' n$ candidates

Respect all successors...

... even if their number is growing with n

Problem: each successor might *"kill"* $\varepsilon' n$ candidates

Solution: the a-arrangeability of H



Respect all successors. . .

. . . even if their number is growing with n

Problem: each successor might *"kill"* $\varepsilon' n$ candidates

Solution: the a-arrangeability of H



all successors of v_i have at most a predecessors in total

$\Rightarrow$ we have to respect at most 2^a *different* candidate sets

$\Rightarrow$ we loose at most $2^a \varepsilon' n$ candidates

The auxiliary graphs



(ε, δ)-super-regular

The auxiliary graphs



$$F_1 = (X_1 \cup V_1, E_1) \text{ with } \{x, v\} \in E_1 \text{ iff } v \in C(x)$$

One auxiliary graph, two nice properties

Lemma

With probability 1/2 all auxiliary graphs F_i inherit *some* regularity from G.
$\Rightarrow$ random embedding algorithm gives an **almost spanning embedding**.

One auxiliary graph, two nice properties

Lemma

With probability $1/2$ all auxiliary graphs F_i inherit *some* regularity from G.
$\Rightarrow$ random embedding algorithm gives an **almost spanning embedding**.

One auxiliary graph, two nice properties

Lemma

With probability 1/2 all auxiliary graphs F_i inherit *some* regularity from G.
$\Rightarrow$ random embedding algorithm gives an **almost spanning embedding**.

- preprocessing:
  select an arrangeable ordering with a stable set at its end

One auxiliary graph, two nice properties

Lemma

With probability $1/2$ all auxiliary graphs F_i inherit *some* regularity from G.
$\Rightarrow$ random embedding algorithm gives an **almost spanning embedding**.

- preprocessing:
  select an arrangeable ordering with a stable set at its end

Lemma

All auxiliary graphs have high min. degree with probability tending to 1.

One auxiliary graph, two nice properties

Lemma

With probability 1/2 all auxiliary graphs F_i inherit *some* regularity from G.
$\Rightarrow$ random embedding algorithm gives an **almost spanning embedding**.

- preprocessing:
  select an arrangeable ordering with a stable set at its end

Lemma

All auxiliary graphs have high min. degree with probability tending to 1.

- $\exists$ perfect matching in the "remaining part" of each auxiliary graph

One auxiliary graph, two nice properties

Lemma

With probability 1/2 all auxiliary graphs F_i inherit *some* regularity from G.
$\Rightarrow$ random embedding algorithm gives an **almost spanning embedding**.

- preprocessing:
  select an arrangeable ordering with a stable set at its end

Lemma

All auxiliary graphs have high min. degree with probability tending to 1.

- $\exists$ perfect matching in the "remaining part" of each auxiliary graph
- these perfect machtings define a **spanning embedding**.

The 'obvious' next step

$G = (V, E)$ is *d-degenerate* if there is an ordering $V = \{v_1, \ldots, v_n\}$ with $|N_L(v_i)| \leq d$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, n$.



The 'obvious' next step

$G = (V, E)$ is *d-degenerate* if there is an ordering $V = \{v_1, \ldots, v_n\}$ with $|N_L(v_i)| \leq d$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, n$.



Replace *const. max. degree* by *d-degenerate* in the Blow-up Lemma!

The 'obvious' next step

$G = (V, E)$ is *d-degenerate* if there is an ordering $V = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ with $|N_L(v_i)| \le d$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$.



Replace *const. max. degree* by *d-degenerate* in the Blow-up Lemma!

Far goal

For $\delta, \mu > 0$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$ there is $\varepsilon, \xi > 0$ such that the following holds. If H has $\Delta(H) \le \xi n$ and $H \subseteq K_{(1-\mu)n,(1-\mu)n}$ is d-degenerate then H is subgraph of any (ε, δ)-super-regular pair $(A \dot\cup B, E)$ with $|A| = |B| = n$.