stichting
mathematisch
centrum

MC

AFDELING ZUIVERE WISKUNDE ZW 121/78 DECEMBER
(DEPARTMENT OF PURE MATHEMATICS)

H.A. WILBRINK & A.E. BROUWER

A (57,14,1) STRONGLY REGULAR GRAPH DOES NOT EXIST

2e boerhaavestraat 49 amsterdam

Printed at the Mathematical Centre, 49, 2e Boerhaavestraat, Amsterdam.

The Mathematical Centre, founded the 11-th of February 1946, is a non-profit institution aiming at the promotion of pure mathematics and its applications. It is sponsored by the Netherlands Government through the Netherlands Organization for the Advancement of Pure Research (Z.W.O).

AMS(MOS) subject classification scheme (1970): 05B30

A (57,14,1) strongly regular graph does not exist

by

H.A. Wilbrink & A.E. Brouwer

ABSTRACT

We show that a strongly regular graph with parameters

$$n = 57, \quad k = 14, \quad \lambda = 1, \quad \mu = 4$$

((0,1)-eigenvalues: 1*14, 38*2, 18*(-5);
(1,-1)-eigenvalues: 1*28, 38*(-5), 18*9) does not exist.

KEY WORDS & PHRASES: *Strongly regular graph.*

1. TWO LEMMAS

LEMMA 1. *Let G be a strongly regular graph with parameters* n,k,λ,μ. *Let H be an induced subgraph with* N *points,* M *edges and degree sequence* $d_1,\ldots,d_N$. *Then*

$$(kN-2M) - \left(\lambda M + \mu\left(\binom{N}{2} - M\right) - \sum_{i=1}^{N} \binom{d_i}{2}\right) \le n - N$$

and equality holds iff exactly $(kN-2M)-(n-N)$ *points in* $G\backslash H$ *are adjacent to precisely two points of* H, *while the remaining points in* $G\backslash H$ *are adjacent to precisely one point of* H.

PROOF. Let there be x_i points in $G\backslash H$ adjacent to i points of H. We have

$$\sum x_i = n-N,$$

$$\sum i x_i = kN-2M,$$

$$\sum \binom{i}{2} x_i = \lambda M + \mu\left(\binom{N}{2} - M\right) - \sum_{i=1}^{N} \binom{d_i}{2}.$$

Since $\sum\binom{i}{2}x_i - \sum i x_i + \sum x_i = x_0 + \sum_{i=3}^{N}\binom{i-1}{2}x_i \ge 0$ this proves the lemma. □

LEMMA 2. *Let G be a strongly regular graph with parameters* n,k,λ,μ. *Let* s *be the smallest eigenvalue of the* (0,1)*-adjacency matrix of G, i.e., the negative root of the equation* $x^2 + (\mu-\lambda)x + \mu - k = 0$. *Then if* S *is a coclique in G we have*

$$V := |S| \le \frac{n\cdot(-s)}{k-s}$$

and equality holds iff each point outside S *is adjacent to exactly*

$$K := \frac{k\cdot V}{n-V}$$

points in S. *In this case we find a* $2-(V,K,\mu)$ *design with point set* S *and blocks* $B_z = \{y \in S \mid y \text{ adjacent to } z\}$ *for* $z \in G\backslash S$.

PROOF. Let there be x_i points in $G\backslash S$ adjacent to i points of S. We have

$$\sum x_i = n - V,$$

$$\sum ix_i = k \cdot V,$$

$$\sum \binom{i}{2} x_i = \mu \cdot \binom{V}{2},$$

so that

$$\sum (i-K)^2 x_i = \mu V(V-1) + kV - \frac{k^2 V^2}{n-V} \geq 0.$$

Writing $x = \frac{kV}{V-n}$ and simplifying (using $0 < V < n$) we see that this inequality is equivalent with

$$x^2 + (\mu \cdot \frac{n-1}{k} - k+1)x + \mu-k \leq 0$$

which is exactly the desired inequality (- note that the largest possible V corresponds to the smallest possible x, and that the middle coefficient equals $\mu-\lambda$ since $n = 1 + k + k(k-1-\lambda)/\mu$). □

2. THE NONEXISTENCE OF (57,14,1)

Let G be a strongly regular graph with parameters $n = 57$, $k = 14$ and $\lambda = 1$. Then $\mu = 4$ and the smallest eigenvalue of the (0,1)-adjacency matrix of G is $s = -5$. By Lemma 2 a coclique in G can have at most 15 points. We first derive a contradiction under the assumption that G contains a coclique of size 15, and then under the opposite assumption.

2.1. <u>G has a 15-coclique</u>

Let S be a 15-coclique in G. If we identify a point z not in S with the set $B_z = \{y \in S \mid y \sim z\}$ (where $\sim$ denotes adjacency) then the points of G are the points and blocks of a 2-(15,5,4) design $(S,\mathcal{B})$. Choose a block B_0, and investigate the intersection numbers

$$x_i := x_i(B_0) := \#\{B \in \mathcal{B} \mid |B \cap B_0| = i\}.$$

Obviously, since $\lambda,\mu \leq 4$ we have $x_5 = 1$, i.e., there are no repeated blocks.

Since $\lambda = 1$, each edge is in a unique triangle, and each point is incident with 7 triangles. Of the seven triangles incident with B_0, five contain a point of S and two consist of blocks only. But if a triangle consists of three blocks, these blocks must be mutually disjoint, because $\lambda = 1$. This proves $x_0 \geq 4$.

We have the equations

$$x_0 + x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4 = 41,$$
$$x_1 + 2x_2 + 3x_3 + 4x_4 = 5 \cdot 13 = 65,$$
$$x_2 + 3x_3 + 6x_4 = \binom{5}{2} \cdot 3 = 30.$$

Consequently,

$$x_0 + x_3 + 3x_4 = 6.$$

Since $x_0 \geq 4$ it follows that $x_4 = 0$ and thus $x_0 + x_3 = 6$. But this soon leads to a contradiction:

Let B_0, B_1, B_2 and B_0, B_3, B_4 be two triangles containing B_0. Since intersections of size 4 do not occur we may suppose $|B_3 \cap B_1| = 3$, and then $|B_4 \cap B_2| = 3$.

Let B_1, B_5, B_7 be another triangle containing B_1. W.l.o.g. $|B_5 \cap B_0| = 3$.

Let B_2, B_6, B_8 be another triangle containing B_2. W.l.o.g. $|B_6 \cap B_0| = 3$.

Finally, let B_3, B, B' be another triangle containing B_3. W.l.o.g. $|B \cap B_0| = 3$.

B_0:	11111	00000	00000
B_1:	00000	11111	00000
B_2:	00000	00000	11111
B_3:	00000	11100	11000
B_4:	00000	00011	00111
B_5:	<3*1>	00000	<2*1>
B_6:	<3*1>	<2*1>	00000
B :	<3*1>	000..	00...

Since $x_3 \leq 2$ and $B_5 \neq B_6$, B must coincide with either B_5 or B_6. But then B and B_0 have at least five common neighbours: B_1 or B_2, B_3, and the three points in $B \cap B_0$. Contradiction, for $\lambda, \mu \leq 4$.

2.2. *G* does not contain a 15-coclique

LEMMA. *G does not contain a regular subgraph H with* 6 *points and valency* 3 *(i.e.,* $K_{3,3}$ *or the prism).*

PROOF. Apply Lemma 1 with $N = 6$, $M = 9$, $d_1 = \dots = d_6 = 3$.
We find $66-15 \le 51$. Since equality holds, exactly 15 points outside H are connected with two points in H. If z is a point in $G\backslash H$ adjacent to two points of H, then let H_z be the graph induced by G on $H \cup \{z\}$. Again apply Lemma 1, now with $N = 7$, $M = 11$, $d_1 = 2$, $d_2 = d_3 = d_4 = d_5 = 3$, $d_6 = d_7 = 4$. We find $76-26 \le 50$. Since equality holds again, no point in $G\backslash(H\cup\{z\})$ is adjacent to three points in $H \cup \{z\}$. It follows that if S is the set of 15 points adjacent to two points in H, then S is a 15-coclique. Contradiction. □

In the previous section we considered G as a 2-(15,5,4) design; now we shall consider G as a GD[4,3,2;14] group divisible design: Let ∞ be some fixed point, $\Gamma := \Gamma(\infty)$ the set of its neighbours and Δ the set of its non-neighbours. Then $|\Gamma| = 14$ and $|\Delta| = 42$. G induces on Γ a regular graph with valency $\lambda = 1$, so that we find seven disjoint pairs in Γ, the *groups*. For each point $z \in \Delta$ we find a *block* $B_z = \{x \in \Gamma \mid x \sim z\}$ of size $\mu = 4$. One verifies immediately that Γ with these groups and blocks is a group divisible design GD[4,3,2;14] (in HANANI's notation).

(A) *Let* T *be the union of two groups in* Γ. *The set* R *of the six points in* Δ *not joined to any point of* T *is a* 6-*coclique*.

PROOF. For $u \in R$, let $x_i := x_i(u) := \#\{z \in \Delta \mid z \sim u \text{ and } |\Gamma(z)\cap T| = i\}$. Then

$$x_0 + x_1 + x_2 = k - \mu = 10$$

and

$$x_1 + 2x_2 = \mu \cdot |T| = 16$$

so that $x_2 - x_0 = 6$. Suppose that $u,v \in R$ and $u \sim v$. Then $x_0 \ge 1$, so $x_2 \ge 7$ and hence both u and v have at least 7 neighbours in the set (of size 12) of points with two neighbours in T. But then they must have at least two common neighbours. Contradiction with $\lambda = 1$. □

(B) Let $U = U(B)$ be the union of the three groups that do not intersect B. Let $x_i := x_i(U) := \#\{z \in \Delta \mid |\Gamma(z)\cap U| = i\}$. Then

$$x_0 + x_1 + x_2 + x_3 = |\Delta| = 42,$$
$$x_1 + 2x_2 + 3x_3 = |U|\cdot(k-2) = 72,$$
$$x_2 + 3x_3 = 12\cdot(\mu-1) = 36,$$

so that $x_0+x_3 = 6$.

Let $y_i := y_i(B) := \#\{z \in \Delta \mid z \sim B \text{ and } |\Gamma(z)\cap U(B)| = i\}$. Then

$$y_0 + y_1 + y_2 + y_3 = k-\mu = 10$$

and

$$y_1 + 2y_2 + 3y_3 = \mu\cdot|U| = 24.$$

From (A) it follows that $y_0 = y_1 = 0$ and hence $y_2 = 6$, $y_3 = 4$. We can identify these four neighbours of B intersecting U in three points: they are the blocks B_p where $p \in N$ and $p\,B\,B_p$ is a triangle.
[For: suppose B_p intersects U in less than three points. Then there is a second group $\{r,s\}$ intersecting both B and B_p. Of course $r \in B \cap B_p$ is impossible since $\lambda = 1$, so we would have $r \in B$ and $s \in B_p$. But now we find a prism on the set $\{B,B_p,p,r,s,\infty\}$. Contradiction.]

There are 42 blocks, but only $\binom{7}{4} = 35$ sets of 4 groups. Therefore, there must be two blocks, say B' and B", intersecting the same four groups (i.e., $U = U(B') = U(B'')$). Now $x_0(U) \geq 2$ and $x_3(U) \geq y_3 = 4$, so $x_3(U) = y_3(B') = y_3(B'') = 4$: the four blocks intersecting U in three points are common neighbours of B' and B", so $B' \cap B'' = \phi$ since $\mu = 4$.
But for $p \in B'$ the block B'_p intersects $\Gamma\backslash U$ only in the point p, i.e., $B'_p \neq B''_q$ for $p \in B'$, $q \in B''$. Contradiction.

Hence no graph *G* exists.

Vanløse, 781208