

Irreducible Non-Metrizable Path Systems in Graphs

Daniel Cizma*

Nati Linial†

October 11, 2021

Abstract

A path system \mathcal{P} in a graph $G = (V, E)$ is said to be irreducible if there does not exist a partition $V = A \sqcup B$ such that \mathcal{P} restricts to a path system on both $G[A]$ and $G[B]$. In this paper, we construct an infinite family of non-metrizable irreducible path systems defined on certain Paley graphs.

1 Introduction

A path system \mathcal{P} in a graph $G = (V, E)$ is a collection of paths in G such that for every $u, v \in V$ there is exactly one path in \mathcal{P} connecting u and v . We say that \mathcal{P} is *consistent* if for every path P in \mathcal{P} , any subpath of P is also a path in \mathcal{P} . Every positive weight function $w : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ gives rise to a consistent path system, by putting in \mathcal{P} only w -shortest paths. A path systems that comes from such w is said to be *metrizable*. We say that $G = (V, E)$ is metrizable if every consistent path system on G is metrizable. The main findings so far in this newly emerging research area, can be briefly described as follows: Metrizable graphs are very rare, yet all outerplanar graphs are metrizable. We encourage the reader to consult our paper [CL] for a full account of what is currently known in this area, but note that the present paper is entirely self-contained. Some of these definitions and questions make sense also for *partial* path systems. Metrizability of partial path systems was investigated in [Bo].

Here we introduce the notion of an *irreducible* path system. Such path systems are "atomic", in that they cannot be decomposed into two smaller consistent path systems.

Definition 1.1. Let \mathcal{P} be a path system in a graph $G = (V, E)$. A partition $V = A \sqcup B$ with $A, B \neq \emptyset$ is called a *reduction* of \mathcal{P} if all vertices of the path $P_{u,v}$ belong to A (resp. B) whenever $u, v \in A$ (resp. $u, v \in B$). A path system with no reductions is said to be *irreducible*.

We illustrate the notion of irreducibility using the Petersen graph Π which is nonmetrizable. The diameter of Π is 2 and its girth is 5. Therefore, every two vertices in Π are connected by a single path of length 1 or 2. In \mathcal{P} , the path system that we construct, most pairs are connected by these native shortest paths. There are five exceptional pairs of nonadjacent vertices which are connected in \mathcal{P} by one of the five colored paths in Figure 1. It is easily verified that \mathcal{P} is consistent, and as shown in [CL], it is non-metrizable. However, this path system admits a reduction A, B where A and B are the set of dark and light vertices, respectively, as seen in Figure 1.

*Department of Mathematics, Hebrew University, Jerusalem 91904, Israel. e-mail: daniel.cizma@mail.huji.ac.il.

†School of Computer Science and Engineering, Hebrew University, Jerusalem 91904, Israel. e-mail: nati@cs.huji.ac.il. Supported by BSF US-Israel Grant 2018313 "Between Topology and Combinatorics".




Figure 1: A reducible non-metrizable path system in the Petersen Graph

The main result of the present paper is a construction of an infinite family of non-metrizable irreducible path systems. These systems are defined on certain Paley graphs G_p , where $p \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ is a prime integer. The vertex set of G_p is the finite field \mathbb{F}_p , and $a, b \in \mathbb{F}_p$ are neighbors iff $a - b$ is a quadratic residue in \mathbb{F}_p . We denote by R and N the sets of quadratic residues, resp. non-residues in \mathbb{F}_p .

In order for our construction to work, we need to assume that $2, 3 \in N$ are both quadratic non-residues in \mathbb{F}_p . Using quadratic reciprocity it is easy to see that if $p \equiv 5 \pmod{24}$, then $-1 \in R$ and $2, 3 \in N$. By Dirichlet's theorem on primes in arithmetic progressions, there are exists infinitely many primes $p \equiv 5 \pmod{24}$.

We define the following path system \mathcal{P}_p on G_p : Let $a, b \in \mathbb{F}_p$

- If $b - a \in R$ is a quadratic residue then $P_{a,b} := (a, b)$
- If $b - a = 3$ then $P_{a,b} := (a, a + 1, a + 2, b)$
- If $b - a \in N$ is a quadratic non-residue and $b - a \neq \pm 3$ then $P_{a,b} := (a, \frac{b+a}{2}, b)$

We prove:

Theorem 1.2. *The path system \mathcal{P}_p is irreducible and non-metrizable for all primes $p > 5$ for which $-1 \in R$ is a quadratic residue and $2, 3 \in N$ are quadratic non-residues.*

In fact, the proof that we present here shows that \mathcal{P}_p is non-metrizable for $p \geq 1711$. That the same holds also when $5 < p < 1711$ can be directly verified by a computer.

2 Proof of Theorem 1.2

Let us start with the basic relevant concepts. A *path system* \mathcal{P} in $G = (V, E)$ is a collection of simple paths in G such that for every $u, v \in V$ there is exactly one member $P_{u,v} \in \mathcal{P}$ that connects between u and v . We say that \mathcal{P} is *consistent* if for every $P \in \mathcal{P}$ and two vertices x, y in P , the xy subpath of P coincides with $P_{x,y}$. Unless otherwise stated, every path system that we encounter here is consistent. A path system \mathcal{P} is said to be *metrizable* if there exists some $w : E(G) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ such that for each $u, v \in V$, $w(P_{u,v}) \leq w(Q)$ for every uv path Q .

We first prove the path system \mathcal{P}_p is irreducible. Notice that \mathcal{P}_p is cyclically symmetric. Namely, if (a_1, \dots, a_r) is a path in \mathcal{P}_p then so is $(a_1 + x, \dots, a_r + x)$, for any $x \in \mathbb{F}_p$.

Proposition 2.1. *For $p \geq 30$, the path system \mathcal{P}_p is irreducible.*

Proof. Suppose toward contradiction that $V = A \sqcup B$ is a reduction of \mathcal{P}_p . Consider the Hamiltonian cycle $C = (0, 1, 2, 3, \dots, p-1, 0)$ in G_p . This reduction splits this cycle into $2k$ segments $C = \bigcup_1^{2k} R_i$, where $V(R_{2i-1}) \subset A$ and $V(R_{2i}) \subset B$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$. Let l be the smallest length of these segments, where the length of a segment is the number of its edges. Due to \mathcal{P}_p 's rotational symmetry, we can and will assume that the shortest segment is R_1 , and $R_1 = (-\frac{l}{2}, \dots, -1, 0, 1, \dots, \frac{l}{2})$ for even l and $R_1 = (-\lfloor \frac{l}{2} \rfloor, -\lfloor \frac{l}{2} \rfloor + 1, \dots, -1, 0, 1, \dots, \lfloor \frac{l}{2} \rfloor, \lfloor \frac{l}{2} \rfloor + 1)$ for odd l .

If $l = 1$, then $R_1 = (0, 1)$ and $-1 \in R_{2k}$, $2 \in R_2$. By assumption $V(P_{-1,2}) \subset B$, since both $V(R_{2k}), V(R_2) \subset B$. However, $P_{-1,2} = (-1, 0, 1, 2)$, whereas $V(R_1) = \{0, 1\} \subset A$. The same argument works as well when $l = 0$.

We next consider the case where l is even and $2 \leq l \leq \frac{p}{4}$. Again, by symmetry we may assume that $R_1 = (-\frac{l}{2}, \dots, -1, 0, 1, \dots, \frac{l}{2})$. Since l is minimal, $|R_2| \geq l$ and $|R_{2k}| \geq l$, and hence $(\frac{l}{2} + 1, \frac{l}{2} + 2, \dots, \frac{3l}{2} + 1) \subseteq R_2$ and $(-\frac{l}{2} - 1, -\frac{l}{2} - 2, \dots, -\frac{3l}{2} - 1) \subseteq R_{2k}$. We claim next that the range $[\frac{l}{2} + 1, \frac{3l}{2} + 1]$ is comprised only of non-residues. For if $b \in [\frac{l}{2} + 1, \frac{3l}{2} + 1]$, is a quadratic residue, then by construction $P_{-b,b} = (-b, 0, b)$. This is a contradiction, since $-b \in V(R_{2k}) \subset B, b \in V(R_1) \subset B, 0 \in V(R_0) \subset A$. On the other hand, the interval $[\frac{l}{2} + 1, \frac{3l}{2} + 1]$ contains both $\frac{l}{2} + 1$ and $l + 2$, where one is a quadratic residue and the other is not, since their ratio is $2 : 1$, and by assumption $2 \in N$. When l is odd an identical argument works for the same range.

There remains the range $l > \frac{p}{4}$. Again, we assume that l is even since the proof when l is odd is essentially identical. As l is the length of the smallest segment and C contains an even number of segments, it necessarily follows that C splits into exactly two segments $C = R_1 \sqcup R_2$, where $R_1 = (-\frac{l}{2}, \dots, -1, 0, 1, \dots, \frac{l}{2})$, $l \leq \frac{p}{2}$.

If $P_{-a,a+1} = (-a, \frac{p+1}{2}, a+1)$ for some small $a > 0$, we again encounter a contradiction, since this path starts and ends in $V(R_1) = A$ and its middle vertex is in $V(R_2) = B$. The choice $a = 1$ won't do, since $P_{-1,2} = (-1, 0, 1, 2)$. Also, for $P_{-a,a+1} = (-a, \frac{p+1}{2}, a+1)$ to hold, $2a+1$ must be a non-square, for otherwise $P_{-a,a+1} = (-a, a+1)$. Thus, if $5 \in N$, we can use $a = 2$. If not, and $5 \in R$, then $15 \in N$ because we are assuming $3 \in N$. We can, therefore, take $a = 7$, which is "small enough" under the assumption $p \geq 30$.

Let L_p be the maximum length of a consecutive segment of non-residues in \mathbb{F}_p . We note that upper bounds on L_p can be used to derive shorter proofs of Proposition 2.1. E.g., Hummel [Hu] showed that $L_p \leq \sqrt{p}$ for every prime $p \neq 13$, and Burgess [B2] proved that $L_p \leq O(p^{1/4} \log p)$. \square

It remains to show that:

Proposition 2.2. *The path system \mathcal{P}_p is not metrizable.*

Let φ_x be the rotation-by- x map

$$\varphi_x(a_1, \dots, a_r) = (a_1 + x, \dots, a_r + x).$$

Again we use the cyclic symmetry, i.e., invariance under φ_x of G_p and \mathcal{P}_p .

Had \mathcal{P} been metrizable, there would exist a weight function $w : E \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ such that

$$w(P_{u,v}) \leq w(Q) \text{ for every } u, v \in V \text{ and every } uv \text{ path } Q. \quad (1)$$

Due to cyclic symmetry, if w satisfies (1), so does $w \circ \varphi_x$. Moreover, the set of all w that satisfy (1) is a convex cone. Therefore, if w satisfies (1), then so does the weight function

$$\tilde{w} = \sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}_p} w \circ \varphi_x.$$

Note also that $\tilde{w}(x, y)$ depends only on $|x - y|$.

We associate a formal variable x_a with every quadratic residue $a \in R$. By the above discussion, if \mathcal{P}_p is metrizable then the following system of linear equations and inequalities is feasible:

$$\begin{aligned} 2x_a &\leq x_b + x_c & a, b, c \in R, \quad 2a = b + c \neq 3 \\ 3x_1 &\leq x_b + x_c & a, b, c \in R, \quad 3 = b + c \\ x_a &= x_{-a} & a \in R \\ x_a &> 0 & a \in R \end{aligned} \quad (*)$$

Therefore, to show that \mathcal{P}_p is non-metrizable it suffices to show that $(*)$ is infeasible.

We consider instead a more general setup and ask if the following system of linear inequalities is feasible. It has $M + N$ inequalities in x_1, \dots, x_N , and it is given that $a_1, \dots, a_M \geq 2$.

$$\begin{aligned} a_m x_{i_m} &\leq x_{j_m} + x_{k_m} & m = 1, \dots, M \\ x_i &> 0 & i = 1, 2, \dots, N. \end{aligned} \quad (**)$$

We associate a digraph \vec{D} with this system of linear inequalities. Its vertex set is $V(\vec{D}) = 1, 2, \dots, N$. The edge set is defined as follows: Any inequality $a_m x_\alpha \leq x_\beta + x_\gamma$ that appears in the system gives rise to an edge from α to β and one from α to γ . We say the system of inequalities is *strongly connected* if \vec{D} is strongly connected. We observe:

Lemma 2.3. *If $(**)$ is a strongly connected system, then it is feasible if and only if $a_1 = a_2 = \dots = a_M = 2$. In this case $x_1 = x_2 = \dots = x_N$ is the only feasible solution.*

Proof. Clearly, $x_1 = x_2 = \dots = x_N$ is a feasible solution when $a_1 = a_2 = \dots = a_M = 2$. Consider a feasible solution $(x_1, \dots, x_N) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and say that $x_\alpha = \max_{1 \leq j \leq N} x_j$. If there is a directed edge $(\alpha, \beta) \in E(\vec{D})$, then some inequality in the system must have the form $a x_\alpha \leq x_\beta + x_\gamma$. Here $a \geq 2$, and since x_α is maximal, necessarily $a = 2$ and $x_\alpha = x_\beta = x_\gamma$. By the same reasoning $x_\alpha = x_\delta$ whenever there is a directed path from α to δ in H . The claim follows since \vec{D} is strongly connected. \square

We show that the following subsystem of $(*)$ is strongly connected, and hence by lemma 2.3, it is infeasible. Let $R' := R \setminus \left\{ \frac{p+3}{2}, \frac{p-3}{2} \right\}$

$$\begin{aligned} I_{a;b,c} : & \quad 2x_a \leq x_b + x_c & a, b, c \in R', \quad 2a = b + c \neq 3 \\ I_1 : & \quad 3x_1 \leq x_b + x_c & a, b, c \in R', \quad 3 = b + c \\ I_0 : & \quad x_a > 0 & a \in R' \end{aligned} \quad (***)$$

The following theorem of Burgess [B1; B2] shows that Paley graphs resemble random $G(n, 1/2)$ graphs (see also, e.g., [BEH; AC]). This theorem is stated in terms of the Legendre's Symbol. Namely, for $0 \neq a \in \mathbb{F}_p$ we write $\left(\frac{a}{p}\right) = \pm 1$ to indicate whether or not a is a quadratic residue.

Theorem 2.4. *Let $a_1, \dots, a_k \in \mathbb{F}_p$ be distinct. Then*

$$\left| \sum_{x=0}^{p-1} \prod_{i=1}^k \left(\frac{x - a_i}{p} \right) \right| \leq (k-1)\sqrt{p}$$

We denote neighbor sets in G_p by Γ .

Lemma 2.5. *Let $x, y, z \in G_p$ distinct vertices. Then*

$$|\Gamma(x) \cap \Gamma(y) \setminus \Gamma(z)| = \frac{p}{8} + O(\sqrt{p})$$

in fact

$$\left| |\Gamma(x) \cap \Gamma(y) \setminus \Gamma(z)| - \frac{p}{8} \right| \leq 5\sqrt{p} + 1$$

Proof. Recall that $z \in \Gamma(a)$ iff $a - z \in R$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} |\Gamma(x) \cap \Gamma(y) \setminus \Gamma(z)| &= \frac{1}{8} \sum_{\substack{i=0 \\ i \neq x, y, z}}^{p-1} \left(1 + \left(\frac{x-i}{p} \right) \right) \left(1 + \left(\frac{y-i}{p} \right) \right) \left(1 - \left(\frac{z-i}{p} \right) \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4} \left(1 + \left(\frac{x-z}{p} \right) \right) \left(1 + \left(\frac{y-z}{p} \right) \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{8} \sum_{i=0}^{p-1} \left(1 + \left(\frac{x-i}{p} \right) \right) \left(1 + \left(\frac{y-i}{p} \right) \right) \left(1 - \left(\frac{z-i}{p} \right) \right) + 1 \end{aligned}$$

Expanding the sum we get

$$\frac{p}{8} + \sum_{i=0}^{p-1} \left[\left(\frac{x-i}{p} \right) \left(\frac{y-i}{p} \right) - \left(\frac{x-i}{p} \right) \left(\frac{z-i}{p} \right) - \left(\frac{y-i}{p} \right) \left(\frac{z-i}{p} \right) - \left(\frac{x-i}{p} \right) \left(\frac{y-i}{p} \right) \left(\frac{z-i}{p} \right) \right].$$

The conclusion follows from theorem 2.4. □

Lemma 2.6. *The system $(***)$ is strongly connected for large p .*

Proof. To prove this lemma we show that the following digraph \vec{D} on the vertex set R' is strongly connected. Every triple $x, y, z \in R'$ with $2x = y + z \neq 3$ gives rise to the edges $(x, y), (x, z) \in E(\vec{D})$. Also, whenever $y + z = 3$ for $y \neq z$ in R' we get the edges $(1, y), (1, z) \in E(\vec{D})$.

For any two vertices $a, b \in R'$, we find a path in \vec{D} from a to b . We first assume $4a \neq b$ and we find three distinct elements $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in R'$ such that $2a = \alpha + \beta$ and $2\beta = \gamma + b$. By construction, $(a, \beta), (\beta, b) \in E(\vec{D})$ is a 2-step path from a to b . Let S be the set of $\beta \in R$ for which there exist $\alpha, \gamma \in R$ with $2a = \alpha + \beta$ and $2\beta = \gamma + b$.

$$S = (\Gamma(2a) \cap R) \setminus \Gamma(b/2)$$

Indeed, fix $\beta \in R$. Notice that $2a = \alpha + \beta$ for some $\alpha \in R$ iff $\beta \in \Gamma(2a)$. Similarly $2\beta = \gamma + b$ for some $\gamma \in R$ iff $2\beta \in \Gamma(b)$, and since 2 is a non-residue $2\beta \in \Gamma(b)$ iff $\beta \notin \Gamma(b/2)$. As $R = \Gamma(0)$ and $0, 2a, \frac{b}{2}$ are all distinct we can use lemma 2.5 and to get

$$|S| = |(\Gamma(2a) \cap R) \setminus \Gamma(b/2)| \geq \frac{p}{8} - 5\sqrt{p} - 1.$$

But aside of the requirement that $\beta \in S$ we also insist that $\beta, 2a - \beta, 2\beta - b \notin \left\{ \frac{p+3}{2}, \frac{p-3}{2} \right\}$. This rules out at most 6 eligible values for β . Such a β exists provided that $\frac{p}{8} - 5\sqrt{p} - 1 > 6$. This inequality holds when $p \geq 1711$.

When $4a = b$ there is a two step path from a to b via β for any $\beta \in R' \setminus \{a, b\}$. \square

It follows from Lemma 2.6 that for large enough p , $p \geq 1711$, \mathcal{P}_p is non-metrizable. We remark that with a bit more work the bound of $5\sqrt{p} + 1$ in Lemma 2.5 can be improved to $2\sqrt{p} + 2$. This implies, in turn, that \mathcal{P}_p is non-metrizable for $p \geq 379$.

3 Open Problems

The notion of an irreducible path systems suggests many open questions and conjectures. Here are some of them:

Conjecture 3.1. *Asymptotically almost every graph has an irreducible non-metrizable path system. Specifically, this holds with probability $1 - o_n(1)$ for $G(n, 1/2)$ graphs.*

Perhaps even more is true. Let Π_G be the collection of all consistent path systems in G , and let $\mathcal{R}_G \subseteq \Pi_G$ be the collection of all those which are metrizable or reducible.

Open Problem 3.2. *Is it true that $|\mathcal{R}_G| = o_n(|\Pi_G|)$ for asymptotically almost every n -vertex graph?*

If we wish to know whether a given path system is irreducible, we currently must resort to brute force searching. So we ask:

Open Problem 3.3. *Is there an efficient algorithm to determine if a given path system is irreducible?*

A reduction $V = A \sqcup B$ as in Definition 1.1 still does not tell the whole story.

Open Problem 3.4. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph, a bipartition $V = V_1 \sqcup V_2$ of its vertex set, and path systems $\mathcal{Q}_1, \mathcal{Q}_2$ on $G(V_1), G(V_2)$ respectively. Under what conditions is there a consistent non-metrizable path system on G whose restriction to G_1, G_2 coincides with $\mathcal{Q}_1, \mathcal{Q}_2$ respectively?*

References

- [AC] W. Ananchuen and L. Caccetta. “On the adjacency properties of Paley graphs”. *Networks* 23.4 (1993), pp. 227–236.
- [B1] D. A. Burgess. “On Character Sums and Primitive Roots”. *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society* s3-12.1 (1962), pp. 179–192.
- [B2] D. A. Burgess. “The distribution of quadratic residues and non-residues”. *Mathematika* 4.2 (1957), pp. 106–112.
- [BEH] Andreas Blass, Geoffrey Exoo, and Frank Harary. “Paley graphs satisfy all first-order adjacency axioms”. *Journal of Graph Theory* 5.4 (1981), pp. 435–439.
- [Bo] Greg Bodwin. “On the structure of unique shortest paths in graphs”. *Proceedings of the Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms* (2019), pp. 2071–2089.
- [CL] Daniel Cizma and Nati Linial. *Geodesic Geometry on Graphs*. 2020. arXiv: 2007.13782.
- [Hu] Patrick Hummel. “On consecutive quadratic non-residues: a conjecture of Issai Schur”. *Journal of Number Theory* 103.2 (2003), pp. 257–266.