

Note

# New upper bound formulas with parameters for Ramsey numbers<sup>☆</sup>

Yiru Huang<sup>a</sup>, Yuandi Wang<sup>a</sup>, Wancheng Sheng<sup>a</sup>, Jiansheng Yang<sup>a</sup>, Kemin Zhang<sup>b</sup>,  
Jian Huang<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Department of Mathematics, Shanghai University, Shanghai 200436, China

<sup>b</sup>Department of Mathematics, Nanjing University, Nanjing 210093, China

<sup>c</sup>Automatic Experimental Unit, Shanghai Jiaotong University, Shanghai 200245, China

Received 2 December 2005; received in revised form 2 July 2006; accepted 10 July 2006

Available online 23 August 2006

## Abstract

In this paper, we obtain some new results  $R(5, 12) \leq 848$ ,  $R(5, 14) \leq 1461$ , etc., and we obtain new upper bound formulas for Ramsey numbers with parameters.

© 2006 Published by Elsevier B.V.

*Keywords:* Ramsey number; Upper bound

For two given graphs  $G_1, G_2$ , the Ramsey number  $R(G_1, G_2)$  is the smallest positive integer  $p + 1$  such that for any graph  $G$  of order  $p + 1$  either  $G$  contains  $G_1$  or  $G^c$  contains  $G_2$ , where  $G^c$  is the complement of  $G$ . A graph  $H$  of order  $p$  is called a  $(G_1, G_2; p)$ -Ramsey graph if  $H$  does not contain  $G_1$  and  $H^c$  does not contain  $G_2$ . Let  $R(K_m, K_n) =: R(m, n)$  and  $(K_m, K_n; p)$ -Ramsey graph  $=: (m, n; p)$ -Ramsey graph. When an edge  $e$  is removed from  $G$ , we denote the graph by  $G - e$ . Let  $d_i$  be the degree of vertex  $i$  in  $G$  of order  $p$ , and let  $\bar{d}_i = p - 1 - d_i$ , where  $1 \leq i \leq p$ . And let  $f(K_r)$  ( $g(K_r)$ , resp.) denote the number of  $K_r$  in  $G$  ( $G^c$ , resp.).

In the following we always assume that  $G_1 = K_m$  or  $K_m - e$ ,  $G_2 = K_n$  or  $K_n - e$ ,  $G_1^{m-i} = K_{m-i}$  or  $K_{m-i} - e$ ,  $G_2^{n-i} = K_{n-i}$  or  $K_{n-i} - e$ ,  $m \geq 4$  and  $n \geq 4$ .

**Lemma 1** (Goodman [1]). For any graph  $G$  of order  $p$ , we denote  $i$  as its vertex,  $d_i$  as the degree of vertex  $i$ ,  $\bar{d}_i = p - 1 - d_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq p$ . Then we have

$$f(K_3) + g(K_3) = \binom{p}{3} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^p d_i \bar{d}_i.$$

**Lemma 2** (Huang and Zhang [3]). For any  $(G_1, G_2; p)$ -Ramsey graph  $G$  of order  $p$ , the following inequalities

<sup>☆</sup> This project supported by NSFC.

E-mail address: [zkmlf@hotmail.com](mailto:zkmlf@hotmail.com) (K. Zhang).

must hold:

$$(s + 1)f(K_{s+1}) \leq f(K_s)[R(G_1^{m-s}, G_2) - 1],$$

$$(t + 1)g(K_{t+1}) \leq g(K_t)[R(G_1, G_2^{n-t}) - 1].$$

**Theorem 1.** Let  $R(G_1^{m-2}, G_2) \leq \alpha + 1$ ,  $R(G_1, G_2^{n-2}) \leq \beta + 1$ ,  $R(G_1^{m-1}, G_2) \leq \gamma + 1$ ,  $R(G_1, G_2^{n-1}) \leq \delta + 1$  and  $t > 0$ . Let  $A = 2\gamma - 2 - \frac{1}{3}(4\alpha + 2\beta)$ ,  $B = (\alpha + \beta + 2)^2 + \frac{1}{3}(\beta - \alpha)^2$  and  $F(t) = \alpha + \beta + 4 - t + \sqrt{\frac{4}{3}t^2 + 2At + B}$ . Then

$$R(G_1, G_2) \leq F(t). \tag{1}$$

In particular, when  $4B - 3A^2 > 0$ , and  $t_0 = \frac{3}{4}(\sqrt{4B - 3A^2} - A) > 0$ , then

$$R(G_1, G_2) \leq F(t_0). \tag{2}$$

**Proof.** Let  $p = R(G_1, G_2) - 1$ . For any  $(G_1, G_2; p)$ -Ramsey graph  $G$ , by Lemma 2, we have  $3f(K_3) \leq \frac{1}{2}\alpha \sum_{i=1}^p d_i$  and  $3g(K_3) \leq \frac{1}{2}\beta \sum_{i=1}^p \bar{d}_i$ . Combining these two inequalities and Lemma 1, then

$$\begin{aligned} p(p - 1)(p - 2 - \alpha) &\leq \sum_{i=1}^p (p - 1 - d_i)(3d_i + \beta - \alpha) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^p \{-3\bar{d}_i^2 + (3p - 3 + \beta - \alpha + t)\bar{d}_i - t(p - 1) + t\gamma\} \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^p \left\{ \frac{1}{12}(3p - 3 + \beta - \alpha + t)^2 - t(p - 1) + t\gamma \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $R(G_1, G_2) \leq F(t)$ .

From the definition of  $F(t)$ , when  $4B - 3A^2 > 0$  and  $t_0 = \frac{3}{4}(\sqrt{4B - 3A^2} - A) > 0$ , we have

$$F'(t_0) = 0, \quad F''(t_0) > 0.$$

Hence we have  $R(G_1, G_2) \leq F(t_0)$ . The proof of theorem is completed.  $\square$

Noting the symmetry of  $\gamma$  and  $\delta$ , we have the following corollary immediately.

**Corollary 1.** Under the assumption of Theorem 1, let  $t > 0$ ,  $C = 2\delta - 2 - \frac{1}{3}(2\alpha + 4\beta)$ ,  $D = (\alpha + \beta + 2)^2 + \frac{1}{3}(\alpha - \beta)^2$  and  $G(t) = \alpha + \beta + 4 - t + \sqrt{\frac{4}{3}t^2 + 2Ct + D}$ . If  $4D - 3C^2 > 0$  and;  $t^* = \frac{3}{4}(\sqrt{4D - 3C^2} - C) > 0$ , then we have:

$$R(G_1, G_2) \leq G(t^*).$$

Now we obtain another new upper bound formula with parameters  $x, y$ .

**Theorem 2.** Let  $m \geq 4, n \geq 4, R(m - 2, n) \leq \alpha + 1, R(m, n - 2) \leq \beta + 1$  and parameter  $x \in (0, 3)$ . And let

$$\begin{aligned} f(x, y) &= A + \sqrt{A^2 - B}, \quad g(x, y) = A - \sqrt{A^2 - B}, \\ A &= \frac{3(y + \alpha - \beta) - 2(1 + \alpha)x}{9 - 4x}, \quad B = \frac{(3 - x)(y + \alpha - \beta)^2 + xy^2}{(3 - x)(9 - 4x)}. \end{aligned}$$

Then

- (a)  $R(m, n) \geq 2 + f(x, y)$  or  $R(m, n) \leq 2 + g(x, y)$  if  $0 < x < \frac{9}{4}$ ;
- (b)  $R(m, n) \leq 2 + f(x, y)$  if  $x \in (\frac{9}{4}, 3)$ ;
- (c)  $R(m, n) \leq \alpha + \beta + 4 + \frac{2}{3}\sqrt{(\alpha + 2\beta + 3)(2\alpha + \beta + 3) + (\beta - \alpha)^2}$  if  $x = \frac{9}{4}$ .

*Epecially, when  $m = n$ , we obtain K. Walker’s formula once again*

$$R(n, n) \leq 4R(n - 2, n) + 2.$$

**Proof.** Let  $p = R(m, n) - 1$ . Then by using the analogous arguments of Theorem 1, the following inequalities must hold in  $(m, n; p)$ -Ramsey graph  $G$ :

$$\begin{aligned} p(p - 1)(p - 2 - \alpha) &\leq \sum_{i=1}^p \{-3\bar{d}_i^2 + (3p - 3 + \beta - \alpha)\bar{d}_i\} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^p \{-x\bar{d}_i^2 + (3p - 3 + \beta - \alpha - y)\bar{d}_i - (3 - x)\bar{d}_i^2 + y\bar{d}_i\} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4x}(3p - 3 + \beta - \alpha - y)^2 p + \frac{y^2 p}{4(3 - x)}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have  $(9 - 4x)(3 - x)(p - 1)^2 - 2(3 - x)\{3(y + \alpha - \beta) - 2(1 + \alpha)x\}(p - 1) + xy^2 + (3 - x)(y + \alpha - \beta)^2 \geq 0$ .

- (1) When  $0 < x < \frac{9}{4}$ , (a) follows immediately.
- (2) When  $\frac{9}{4} < x < 3$ , since  $B < 0$ ,  $g(x, y) < 0$ . Note that in this case  $(9 - 4x)(3 - x) < 0$ . Hence  $R(m, n) \leq 2 + f(x, y)$ .
- (3) When  $x = \frac{9}{4}$ , we have

$$R(m, n) \leq 2 + \frac{4y^2 - 2(\beta - \alpha)y + (\beta - \alpha)^2}{6y - 3\alpha - 6\beta - 9} =: 2 + f(y).$$

It is easy to check that when  $y_0 = \frac{1}{2} \left( \alpha + 2\beta + 3 + \sqrt{(\alpha + 2\beta + 3)(2\alpha + \beta + 3)} \right)$ ,

$$\min f(y) = f(y_0) = \alpha + \beta + 4 + \frac{2}{3} \sqrt{(\alpha + 2\beta + 3)(2\alpha + \beta + 3) + (\beta - \alpha)^2}.$$

Hence (c) follows.  $\square$

It is not difficult to generalize the results to  $R(G_1, G_2)$  for  $G_1 = K_m$  or  $K_m - e$ , and  $G_2 = K_n$  or  $K_n - e$ . Hence using (c) of the generalized Theorem 2, taking  $\alpha = 20$ ,  $\beta = 35$ , we have  $R(K_6 - e, K_6) \leq 116$  once more, which appears in [2].

Noting the symmetry of  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , we have the following corollary immediately.

**Corollary 2.** *Under the hypotheses of Theorem 2, let  $F(x, y) = C + \sqrt{C^2 - D}$ ,  $G(x, y) = C - \sqrt{C^2 - D}$ ,  $C = (3(y + \beta - \alpha) - 2(1 + \beta)x)/(9 - 4x)$  and  $D = (y + \beta - \alpha)^2/(9 - 4x) + xy^2/\{(3 - x)(9 - 4x)\}$ . Thus we have:*

- (1) If  $0 < x < \frac{9}{4}$ , then  $R(m, n) \geq 2 + F(x, y)$  or  $R(m, n) \leq 2 + G(x, y)$ .
- (2) If  $\frac{9}{4} < x < 3$ , then  $R(m, n) \leq 2 + F(x, y)$ .

Note that there is the well-known formula:

$$R(m, n) \leq R(m - 1, n) + R(m, n - 1), \tag{3}$$

and its generalized formula in [3]:

$$R(G_1, G_2) \leq R(G_1^{m-1}, G_2) + R(G_1, G_2^{n-1}), \tag{4}$$

where  $G_1 = K_m$  or  $K_m - e$ ,  $G_2 = K_n$  or  $K_n - e$ .

Up to date upper and lower bounds on Ramsey numbers are listed in [5]. Using these tables and (3), (4), 18 new upper bounds of  $R(m, n)$  obtained by (1) are shown in Table 1, where  $(-, -, -; -) = (\alpha, \beta, \gamma; t_0)$ , and the number with \* is obtained by (3).

Table 1

$n$	$m$				
	5	6	7	8	9
11	633*	1804*	4553 (632, 1712, 1803; 1756.4)	10630 (1803, 3582, 4552; 2794.2)	22325 (4552, 6587, 10629; 1162.1)
12	848 (58, 441, 237; 735.3)	2566 (237, 1170, 847; 1679.1)	6954 (847, 2825, 2565; 3488.4)	16944 (2565, 6089, 6953; 5585.5)	39025 (6953, 12676, 16943; 9110.7)
13	1139*	3705*	10581 (1138, 4552, 3704; 4215.9)	27490 (3704, 10629, 10580; 12059.2)	64871 (10580, 22324, 27489; 17928.8)
14	1461 (77, 847, 348; 1520.4)	5033 (348, 2565, 1460; 4118.6)	15263 (1460, 6953, 5032; 10099.1)	41525 (5032, 16943, 15262; 21087.03)	89203 (15262, 39024, 41524; 41657.1)
15	1878*	6911*	22116 (1877, 10580, 6910; 16179.1)	63620 (6910, 27489, 22115; 45750.3)	

**Remarks.** (1) Theorems 1 and 2 can be generalized by using the ideas in [3,4]. (2) Taking  $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, t_0)=(33, 66, 87, 45.9)$ , we have  $R(K_6 - e, K_7) \leq 202$  once more, which appears in [2].

**References**

[1] A.W. Goodman, On sets of acquaintances and strangers at any party, Amer. Math. Monthly 66 (1959) 778–783.  
 [2] Y. Huang, J. Yang, K. Zhang, A note on Ramsey numbers with two parameters, European J. Combin. 27 (2006) 574–576.  
 [3] Y. Huang, K. Zhang, New upper bound for Ramsey numbers, European J. Combin. 19 (1998) 391–394.  
 [4] Y. Li, C.C. Rousseau, W. Zang, An upper bound for Ramsey numbers, Appl. Math. Lett. 17 (2004) 663–665.  
 [5] S.P. Radziszowski, Small Ramsey numbers, Electron. J. Combin. DS1.10 (2004).