## SOME REMARKS ON THE THEORY OF GRAPHS

## P. ERDÖS

The present note consists of some remarks on graphs. A graph $G$ is a set of points some of which are connected by edges. We assume here that no two points are connected by more than one edge. The complementary graph $G^{\prime}$ of $G$ has the same vertices as $G$ and two points are connected in $G^{\prime}$ if and only if they are not connected in $G$.

A special case of a theorem of Ramsey can be stated in graph theoretic language as follows:

There exists a function $f(k, l)$ of positive integers $k, l$ with the following property. Let there be given a graph $G$ of $n \geqq f(k, l)$ vertices. Then either $G$ contains a complete graph of order $k$, or $G^{\prime}$ a complete graph of order $l$. (A complete graph is a graph any two vertices of which are connected. The order of a complete graph is the number of its vertices.)

It would be desirable to have a formula for $f(k, l)$. This at present we can not do. We have however the following estimates:

Theorem I. Let $k \geqq 3$. Then

$$
2^{k / 2}<f(k, k) \leqq C_{2 k-2, k-1}<4^{k-1}
$$

The second inequality of Theorem I was proved by Szekeres, ${ }^{1}$ thus we only consider the first one. Let $N \leqq 2^{k / 2}$. Clearly the number of different graphs of $N$ vertices equals $2^{N(N-1) / 2}$. (We consider the vertices of the graph as distinguishable.) The number of different graphs containing a given complete graph of order $k$ is clearly $2^{N(N-1) / 2} / 2^{k(k-1) / 2}$. Thus the number of graphs of $N \leqq 2^{k / 2}$ vertices containing a complete graph of order $k$ is less than

$$
\begin{equation*}
C_{N, k} \frac{2^{N(N-1) / 2}}{2^{k(k-1) / 2}}<\frac{N^{k}}{k!} \frac{2^{N(N-1) / 2}}{2^{k(k-1) / 2}}<\frac{2^{N(N-1) / 2}}{2} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

since by a simple calculation for $N \leqq 2^{k / 2}$ and $k \geqq 3$

$$
2 N^{k}<k!2^{k(k-1) / 2} .
$$

But it follows immediately from (1) that there exists a graph such that neither it nor its complementary graph contains a complete subgraph of order $k$, which completes the proof of Theorem I.

The following formulation of Theorem I might be of some interest:
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