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# Abstract 

Cops and Robbers on Graphs and Hypergraphs<br>Master of Science, 2011<br>William Baird<br>Applied Mathematics<br>Ryerson University

Cops and Robbers is a vertex-pursuit game played on a graph where a set of cops attempts to capture a robber. Meyniel's Conjecture gives an asymptotic upper bound on the cop number, the number of cops required to win on a connected graph. The incidence graphs of affine planes meet this bound from below, they are called Meyniel extremal. The new parameters $m_{k}$ and $M_{k}$ describe the minimum orders of $k$-copwin graphs. The relation of these parameters to Meyniel's Conjecture is discussed. Further, the cop number for all connected graphs of order 10 or less is given. Finally, it is shown that cop win hypergraphs, a generalization of graphs, cannot be characterized in terms of retractions in the same manner as cop win graphs. This thesis presents some small steps towards a solution to Meyniel's Conjecture.
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## CHAPTER 1

## Introduction

### 1.1. Introduction to Cops and Robbers

A well-known, anonymous quote is "Philosophy is a game with objectives but no rules. Mathematics is a game with rules but no objectives". Cops and Robbers is a game within Mathematics with both rules and objectives. Cops and Robbers is a vertex-pursuit game played on a graph for reasons that will be more clear as we give the rules for the game.

The game is played as follows. First the players, a cop and a robber, each select a vertex of a graph on which to begin the game. The cop selects the first vertex. In alternating rounds the cop and the robber take turns moving from vertex-to-vertex along edges. The object of the game for the cop is to occupy the same vertex as the robber, while the object for the robber is to prevent this from happening. We say the cop has captured the robber if the cop occupies the same vertex as the robber. A graph is said to be cop-win if after some finite number of rounds a cop can move so as to capture the robber. Otherwise, the graph is robber-win. Cop-win graphs, such as the graph in Figure 1.1, have a well known characterization based on the successive deletion of corners. This characterization will be discussed later in Section 3.3 of Chapter 3.


Figure 1.1. A cop-win graph, $G$.
Cops and Robbers can be played with any number of cops. For $k>0$ an integer, if $k$ cops are sufficient to capture a robber on a given graph, then we say that graph is $k$-cop-win. For example, the graph in Figure 1.2 is not cop-win. If the game is played on this graph with just one cop, then the robber can evade the cop indefinitely. However, if the game is played by two cops, then the cops win since there is no way for the robber to escape.


Figure 1.2. A 2 cop-win graph, $C_{4}$.

A 1-cop-win graph is simply a cop-win graph. We define the cop number of a graph $G$, written $c(G)=k$, to be the minimum number of cops required for the graph $G$ to be $k$-cop-win. For example a cop-win graph, like the graph in Figure 1.1, has $c(G)=1$. The graph in Figure 1.2 satisfies $c\left(C_{4}\right)=2$. This parameter is well-defined since placing a cop on every vertex will always result in a win (in one move) for
the cops. This fact gives a trivial upper bound on the cop number: $c(G) \leq|V(G)|$.

Cops and Robbers was introduced by Nowakowski and Winkler in [15] and independently by Quilliot in his Ph.D. Thesis [18]. Both sets of authors give a characterization of cop-win graphs. Later on, Aigner and Fromme [1] considered the game played with multiple cops.

Cops and Robbers belongs to a family of combinatorial games called vertex-pursuit games or graph searching games. These games provide a simplistic model for network security. We can think of the robber as an intruder in a network and cops as network monitors.

### 1.2. Graphs

The graph on which Cops and Robbers is played is crucial to the outcome of the game. In this section we give preliminary definitions and terminology that will be useful throughout the remaining chapters. A graph $G$ consists of a non-empty set of vertices, written $V(G)$, and a set of edges, written $E(G)$. Edges are unordered pairs of vertices. If two vertices are connected by an edge, then we say they are adjacent. If $u$ and $v$ are adjacent, then we write $u v \in E(G)$ or $u \sim v$. The order of $G$ is the number of vertices, $|V(G)|$. A graph is reflexive if all vertices have a loop. We will assume all our graphs are reflexive as this allows the cops and robbers to pass or stay on the same vertex, although we will omit reference to loops in figures. All the graphs we consider are of finite order.

A subgraph $H$ of a graph $G$ is a graph such that the vertices of $H$ are a subset of the vertices of $G$ and the edges of $H$ are a subset of the
vertices of $G$. An induced subgraph $J$ is a graph with vertices a subset of the vertices of $G$ and containing all edges of $G$ with both ends in the vertex set of $J$. That is, an edge $u v$ is in the edge set of $J$ if and only if $u v$ is in the edge set of $G$ and both $u$ and $v$ are vertices in $J$. Figure 1.3 shows a graph $G$, Figure 1.4 shows a subgraph of $G$, and Figure 1.5 shows an induced subgraph of $G$.


Figure 1.3. A graph $G$.


Figure 1.4. A subgraph of $G$.


Figure 1.5. An induced subgraph of graph $G$.

The degree of a vertex $u$ in a graph $G$ is the number of edges incident with it, and is written $\operatorname{deg}_{G}(u)$ (we drop the subscript $G$ if it is clear from context). The maximum degree of a graph G, denoted $\Delta(G)$, is the degree of a vertex with largest degree in $G$. Similarly, the minimum degree of G , denoted by $\delta(G)$, is the degree of the vertex with the smallest degree in $G$. A graph is said to be $k$-regular if all vertices in the graph have degree $k$.

A path of order $n$, written $P_{n}$, is a graph with vertices $v_{1}, v_{2}, \ldots, v_{n}$, so that $v_{i}$ is adjacent to $v_{i+1}$, where $1 \leq i \leq n-1$. A cycle, written $C_{n}$, is formed by adding the edge $v_{1} v_{n}$ in the path $P_{n}$. The graph in Figure 1.2 is a cycle. The girth of a graph, written $g(G)$, is the order of a smallest cycle contained in $G$ as a subgraph. Aigner and Fromme in [1] give the following lower bound on cop number using girth and minimum degree.

Theorem 1. Let $G$ be a graph of minimum degree $\delta(G) \geq n$ with girth $g(G) \geq 5$. Then $c(G) \geq n$.

A graph is connected if for all vertices $u$ and $v$ there exists a path from $u$ to $v$. Usually when playing the game of Cops and Robbers we consider graphs to be connected.

The neighbour set of a vertex $v$ is the set of all vertices adjacent to $v$, written $N(v)$. The closed neighbour set of a vertex $v$ is the union of $N(v)$ and $v$ itself, denoted $N[v]$. A vertex $u$ is a corner if there is a vertex $v$ such that $N[u] \subseteq N[v]$. Figure 1.6 shows a corner in a graph. We say that a vertex $v$ dominates or covers $u$.


Figure 1.6. A corner in a graph.

A dominating set $S$ of a graph $G$ is a set of vertices such that all vertices of $G$ are either in $S$ or adjacent to a vertex in $S$. The domination number, written $\gamma(G)$, is the minimum number of vertices required for a dominating set in $G$. Note that $c(G) \leq \gamma(G)$, as placing a cop on each vertex of a dominating set ensures a win for the cops. The circled vertices in Figure 1.7 show a dominating set in a graph.


Figure 1.7. An example of a dominating set in a graph.

A graph $G$ is called bipartite if the vertices of $G$ can be partitioned into two colour classes, say red and blue, such that no red vertex is adjacent to any other red vertex and no blue vertex is adjacent to any other blue vertex. Alternatively, a bipartite graph is one whose vertex set is partitioned into sets of vertices containing no edges between them. We call such sets of vertices independent sets.

Hypergraphs are a generalization of graphs. A hypergraph $H$ consists of a non-empty set of vertices, written $V(H)$, and a set of edges (or hyperedges), written $E(H)$. Edges are sets of vertices of any cardinality. The order of an edge in a hypergraph is the number of vertices contained in the edge. We will discuss hypergraphs further in Chapter 4.


Figure 1.8. A hypergraph.

### 1.3. Incidence Graphs

An incidence structure consists of a set of points and lines, denoted $P$ and $L$ respectively, together with an incidence relation of pairs of points and lines. Incidence structures are generalizations of familiar geometric structures such as planes.

We will deal with several specific incidence structures. A Steiner 2 -design or a $2-(v, k, 1)$ design is an incidence structure with $v$-many points, with lines (sometimes called blocks) containing $k$ points, such that any pair of points is contained in exactly one block. It is assumed
that $2<k<v$. A finite projective plane of order $n$ is a Steiner 2-design on $n^{2}+n+1$ points, that has blocks of size $n+1$. Projective planes are then $2-\left(n^{2}+n+1, n+1,1\right)$ designs. They can also be defined as a set of $n^{2}+n+1$ points with the properties that any two points determine a unique line and any two lines determine a unique point. Note that every point has $n+1$ lines incident with it, and every line contains $n+1$ points. The smallest example of a projective plane is the Fano plane (see Figure 1.9). It is a projective plane of order $n=2$. Projective planes are known to exist if the order $n=p^{k}$, where $p$ is prime, and $k \geq 1$. All known projective planes have such orders. In fact it is conjectured that only the only possible orders for projective planes are prime powers (see [6]).


Figure 1.9. The Fano plane.

An affine plane of order $n$ is a $2-\left(n^{2}, n, 1\right)$ design. An affine plane of order $n$ exists if and only if a projective plane of order $n$ exists. A partial affine plane is an incidence structure obtained from an affine plane by the deletion of one or more lines. An incidence graph is a graph that is constructed from an incidence structure as follows. The vertices of the graph are the points and lines, and there is an edge between two
vertices if they are incident with each other; that is, there is an edge between a vertex representing a point and a vertex representing a line if and only if the point is on the line. Incidence graphs are bipartite since no points are incident with any other points and no lines are incident with any other lines hence, the graph is the union of two independent sets. Figure 1.10 shows the incidence graph of the Fano plane from Figure 1.9.


Figure 1.10. The Incidence graph of the Fano plane.

### 1.4. Asymptotic Notation

Asymptotic notation gives a simple and succinct method for describing how a function $f(x)$ behaves for large values of $x$. This notation is especially useful for describing the running time of an algorithm, though we will also use it to describe the asymptotic behaviour of other functions. Let $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ be real-valued functions. We
write $f(x) \in O(g(x))$ if and only if there exists a constant $c>0$ and an integer $N>0$ such that for $x>N, f(x) \leq c g(x)$. Equivalently, $f(x) \in O(g(x))$ if

$$
\lim _{x \rightarrow \infty} \sup \frac{f(x)}{g(x)}
$$

exists and is finite. It is a common abuse of notation to write $f(x)=$ $O(g(x))$ or simply $f=O(g)$. If $f=O(g)$, then $g=\Omega(f)$. If $f=O(g)$ and $f=\Omega(g)$, then $f=\Theta(g)$. We say that $f=o(g)$ if

$$
\lim _{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(x)}{g(x)}=0
$$

If $f=o(g)$, then $g=\omega(f)$. Equivalently, $g=\omega(f)$ if

$$
\lim _{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{g(x)}{f(x)}=\infty
$$

Note that if $f=o(1)$, then

$$
\lim _{x \rightarrow \infty} f(x)=0
$$

We say $f$ and $g$ are asymptotically equivalent, written $f \sim g$ if

$$
\lim _{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(x)}{g(x)}=1
$$

### 1.5. Outline of Thesis

Perhaps the deepest open problem in the study of Cops and Robbers is Meyniel's Conjecture. The conjecture, due to Henri Meyniel [11], is that for a connected graph $G$,

$$
c(G)=O(\sqrt{|V(G)|})
$$

In Chapter 2, we give some background on Meyniel's Conjecture, discuss some results related to the conjecture and give the cop number of incidence graphs of projective and partial affine planes. We introduce so-called Meyniel extremal graphs which realize the upper bound in the conjecture, and give infinitely many new examples of such families satisfying certain regularity conditions. In Chapter 3 we consider the minimum orders of a $k$-cop-win graph and their relation to Meyniel's Conjecture. We also present experimental results about the cop number of connected graphs of order 10 or less, as well as the algorithms used to obtain these results. The implementations of the algorithms used in this chapter are included as an appendix. Chapter 4 discusses the game of Cops and Robbers played on hypergraphs and its relationship to the game played on graphs. Our final chapter summarizes open problems in the area and describes some future directions.

## CHAPTER 2

## Meyniel Extremal Graphs

Difficult mathematical challenges often serve to motivate study in a particular area. For Cops and Robbers, one such problem is Meyniel's Conjecture. The conjecture states that if $G$ is a graph of order $n$, then

$$
c(G)=O(\sqrt{n})
$$

Equivalently, for $n$ sufficiently large there exists a constant $d>0$ such that

$$
c(G) \leq d \sqrt{n}
$$

Although it was first introduced by Frankl in 1987 [11] the problem went largely unstudied for many years. In this initial paper Frankl proved that $c(G)=o(n)$; In particular, he proved that if $G$ is a graph of order $n$, then

$$
c(G)=O\left(n \frac{\log \log n}{\log n}\right) .
$$

This bound has been improved upon incrementally since the introduction of the topic. The best known upper bound on the cop number is the following, which was recently proven independently by three sets of researchers.

Theorem 2. $[\mathbf{1 3}, \mathbf{1 2}, \mathbf{2 1}]$ For a graph $G$ of order $n$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
c(G) \leq O\left(\frac{n}{2^{(1-o(1)) \sqrt{\log _{2} n}}}\right) \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Note that although the bound in (2.1) is currently the best known upper bound for general graphs, it is still far from proving Meyniel's conjecture.

In the search for proof or disproof of the conjecture it is interesting to see if there are graphs that meet the bound predicted by Meyniel's Conjecture from below. These graphs would be, in a sense, the graphs with largest possible cop number relative to their order. We present here a new infinite family of graphs, so-called Meyniel Extremal graphs, that have cop number meeting the Meyniel bound from below. To make this precise, an infinite family of graphs $\left(G_{n}: n \geq 0\right)$ is Meyniel extremal if there is a constant $d>0$ such that for sufficiently large $n$,

$$
c\left(G_{n}\right) \geq d \sqrt{\left|V\left(G_{n}\right)\right|}
$$

### 2.1. Steiner 2-designs

In order to describe Meyniel extremal families, we need some background from combinatorial designs. If $t, v, k$ and $\lambda$ are positive integers, then a $t-(v, k, \lambda)$ block design or a $t$-design, is an incidence structure with the following properties. It contains $v$ points, each block contains $k$ points, and every set of $t$ points is contained in exactly $\lambda$ blocks. A Steiner 2-design is a $t$-design in which and two points uniquely determine a block. Thus, Steiner 2-designs are 2-( $v, k, 1)$ designs. For a
general $t$-design, with $b$ blocks, it can be shown that (see [6])

$$
b\binom{k}{t}=\lambda\binom{v}{t}
$$

In a Steiner 2-design this gives that

$$
b\binom{k}{2}=\binom{v}{2}
$$

Rearranging yields

$$
\begin{equation*}
b=\frac{\binom{v}{2}}{\binom{k}{2}}=\frac{v(v-1)}{k(k-1)} \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus, the number of blocks in a Steiner 2-design is $\frac{v(v-1)}{k(k-1)}$. Let $r$ be the number of blocks incident with each point, also called the replication number. It can be shown that

$$
\begin{equation*}
r=\frac{v-1}{k-1} . \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus, each point is incident with $\frac{v-1}{k-1}$ blocks.

### 2.2. Projective Planes

With the notation of the previous section we can describe projective planes. Projective planes of order $q$ are Steiner 2-designs with $q^{2}+q+1$ points and $q+1$ points on a line. Thus, projective planes are $2-\left(q^{2}+\right.$ $q+1, q+1,1)$ designs. Projective planes are also often defined as a set of $q^{2}+q+1$ points with the following properties.
(1) There is exactly one line incident with every pair of distinct points.
(2) There is exactly one point incident with every pair of distinct lines.
(3) There are four points such that no line is incident with more than two of them.

Note that the second axiom means that any pair of distinct lines intersect and thus, there are no parallel lines in projective planes. From the definition we know that projective planes contain $q^{2}+q+1$ points and that each point is incident with $q+1$ lines. Using this information with the formulas derived above for general Steiner 2-designs, we find from Formula (2.2) that the number of lines is $q^{2}+q+1$ and from Formula (2.3) that each point is incident with $q+1$ lines (and so by duality for projective planes, each line contains $q+1$ points).

Recall that incidence structures such as $t$-designs and projective planes can be used to construct incidence graphs. Given an incidence structure $\mathcal{P}$ we will denote its incidence graph $G(\mathcal{P})$. Also recall that since edges only exist between points and blocks, $G(\mathcal{P})$ is bipartite.

The following lemma is part of folklore, and we include it for completeness.

Lemma 3. If $\mathcal{P}$ is a Steiner 2-design, then

$$
g(G(\mathcal{P})) \geq 6
$$

Proof. Since bipartite graphs cannot contain odd cycles the girth of $G(\mathcal{P})$ must be even. Suppose there exists a cycle of length four in


Figure 2.1. The incidence graph of a projective plane of order $q$.
$G(\mathcal{P})$. The vertices of a cycle of length four would be vertices corresponding to two points and two blocks in the design. This implies that two points are incident with two distinct blocks, which is a contradiction since two points determine a unique line. Therefore, $G(\mathcal{P})$ has girth at least 6 .

Lemma 3, along with a theorem due to Aigner and Fromme [1] can be used to give our first explicit family of Meyniel extremal graphs.

Theorem 4. [16] If $\mathcal{P}$ is a projective plane of order $q$, then

$$
c(G(\mathcal{P}))=q+1 .
$$

We include a proof of Theorem 4 from [16] for completeness.

Proof. Since $\delta(G(\mathcal{P}))=q+1$ and by Lemma $3 g(G(\mathcal{P})) \geq 6$ the cop number is greater than or equal to $q+1$ (see [1]). We now prove the upper bound.

We place $q+1$ cops, say $C_{1}, C_{2}, \ldots, C_{q+1}$, on a fixed set of points and consider cases for the location of the robber.

Case 1: Robber in L. Suppose the robber $R$ begins in the vertices corresponding to lines in the plane. Call the vertex that $R$ occupies $L\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{q+1}\right)$, where $x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{q+1}$ represent the points on the line. Since lines are incident with $q+1$ points, $L\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{q+1}\right)$ has degree $q+1$ in the graph $G(\mathcal{P})$. Thus, the robber has $q+1$ escape routes from which he can leave the line.

Each pair of points $\left(x_{1}, C_{1}\right),\left(x_{2}, C_{2}\right), \ldots,\left(x_{q+1}, C_{q+1}\right)$ determines a unique line by properties of projective planes. Let these lines be $L\left(x_{1}, C_{1}\right), L\left(x_{2}, C_{2}\right), \ldots, L\left(x_{q+1}, C_{q+1}\right)$, respectively. The cops can then each move to these $q+1$ lines.

Now on the next time-step the robber may remain at $L\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{q+1}\right)$ or move to any one of $x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{q+1}$. To capture the robber the cops need only to travel to $x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{q+1}$, respectively and the robber will be caught at this round or in the following round.

Case 2: Robber in $P$. Suppose the robber $R$ begins in $P$. We identify the vertex occupied by the robber as $R$.

Since any two points determine a unique line the point occupied by the robber, $R$, and the points occupied by the cops $C_{1}, C_{2}, \ldots, C_{q+1}$,


Figure 2.2. The robber has $q+1$ escape routes.
uniquely determine a set of $q+1$ distinct lines. These lines are denoted $L\left(R, C_{1}\right), L\left(R, C_{2}\right), \ldots, L\left(R, C_{q+1}\right)$.

Since the degree of the vertex occupied by the robber is $q+1$ this set of $q+1$ lines dominates the position of the robber. In order to cover the escape routes of the robber, the cops can move from their initial positions $C_{1}, C_{2}, \ldots, C_{q+1}$ to the lines $L\left(R, C_{1}\right), L\left(R, C_{2}\right), \ldots, L\left(R, C_{q+1}\right)$, respectively. The cops then win in at most two rounds.

### 2.3. Affine and partial affine planes

Affine planes are another well-known example of an incidence structures. An affine plane of order $q$ is a $2-\left(q^{2}, q, 1\right)$ design. By applying the


Figure 2.3. The $q+1$ cops can dominate the position of the robber.
formulas (2.2) and (2.3) derived for Steiner 2-designs, it can be shown that in an affine plane, any point lies on $q+1$ lines and there are $q^{2}+q$ lines in total. A projective plane can be obtained from an affine plane by the addition of a point and a line at infinity. Similarly, an affine plane can be obtained from an projective plane by the deletion of any one line and all the points incident with it. In fact, an affine plane of order $q$ exists if and only if a projective plane or order $q$ exists; see [6]. An affine plane can be defined axiomatically in a similar manner to projective planes. An affine plane is a set of $q^{2}$ points and $q^{2}+q$ lines with the following properties.


Figure 2.4. The robber again has $q+1$ escape routes.
(1) There is exactly one line incident with every pair of distinct points.
(2) Given a point $p$ and a line $L$, there is a unique line incident with $p$ and containing no point of $L$.
(3) There exist three non-collinear points.

Item (2) from the above list is sometimes referred to as Playfair's Axiom or Euclid's Parallel Postulate. Like the incidence graph for a projective plane, the incidence graphs $G$ of an affine planes is bipartite and has $g(G) \geq 6$. There are $2 q^{2}+q$ vertices in the incidence graph of an affine
plane of order $q$. By properties of affine planes the vertices corresponding to points have degree $q+1$ and vertices corresponding to lines have degree $q$. The incidence graph is then said to be ( $q, q+1$ )-regular.

Using affine planes, we derive a new family of Meyniel extremal graphs. For this, we need the notion of parallelism in affine planes.

In contrast to projective planes, where all lines intersect one another, lines in affine planes do not necessarily intersect. If two lines in an affine plane are equal or do not intersect, then they are said to be parallel to one another. Parallelism is an equivalence relation on the set of lines. Parallel classes (or parallel pencils) are the equivalence classes that partition the set of lines. Affine planes are said to be resolvable since each line can be identified with a unique parallel class. An affine plane of order $q$ contains $(q+1)$-many parallel classes, each containing $q$ lines. Note that every point in an affine plane is incident with exactly one line from each parallel class.

A new incidence structure can be constructed from an affine plane $\mathcal{A}$ by deleting the lines in some fixed set of $k>0$ parallel classes. This structure, a partial affine plane $\mathcal{A}^{-k}$ of order $q$, contains $q^{2}+q-k q$ lines and $q^{2}$ points. Each point in an affine plane is incident with $q+1$ lines and each of those lines belongs to a distinct parallel class therefore, every point in $\mathcal{A}^{-k}$ is incident with $q+1-k$ lines. Thus, the minimum degree, written $\delta(G)$, of a vertex in the incidence graph is $\min (q, q+1-k)$.

The new main result of this section is the following.

THEOREM 5. If $\mathcal{A}^{-k}$ is a partial affine plane of order $q$ with $0 \leq$ $k<q$ parallel classes deleted, then $G\left(\mathcal{A}^{-k}\right)$ are $(q+1-k, q)$-regular graphs with cop number between $q+1-k$ and $q$.

If $k=o(q)$, then the graphs described in Theorem 5 have order ( $1-$ $o(1)) q^{2}$ and cop number $(1-o(1)) q$. In particular, we can set $k=q^{1-\varepsilon}$, for $\varepsilon \in(0,1)$ and obtain infinitely many distinct Meyniel families.

Proof of Theorem 5. Since

$$
\delta\left(G\left(\mathcal{A}^{-k}\right)\right)=\min (q, q+1-k)
$$

and

$$
g\left(G\left(\mathcal{A}^{-k}\right)\right) \geq 6
$$

we know by the result of [1] that the cop number is greater than or equal to $\min (q, q+1-k)$.

This proves the lower bound, and so we now show that

$$
\begin{equation*}
c(G) \leq q . \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

To prove (2.4), we play with $q$ cops. Fix a parallel class which was not deleted, say $\ell$, and place one cop on each line of the parallel class. As each point is on some line in $\ell$, the robber must move to some line $L \notin \ell$ to avoid being captured in the first round.

Fix a point $P$ of $L$, and let $L^{\prime}$ be the line of $\ell$ which intersects $L$ at $P$. Move the cop on $L^{\prime}$ to $P$. Now the robber cannot remain on $L$ without being captured, and so must move to some point. However, each point not on $L^{\prime}$ is joined to some cop, so the robber must move
to a point of $L^{\prime}$. But the unique point on $L^{\prime}$ joined to $L$ is $P$, which is occupied by a cop.

We note that although the proof of Theorem 5 is elementary, it gives a new family of Meyniel extremal graphs.

## CHAPTER 3

# Growth Rates and Minimum Orders of $k$-Cop-Win Graphs 

### 3.1. Introduction

Meyniel's Conjecture is concerned with the cop number of a graph of a given order. The conjecture posits that the asymptotic upper bound on the cop number for a graph of order $n$ is $O(\sqrt{n})$. In this chapter we consider a different problem: How many $k$-cop-win graphs of order $n$ exist? In this chapter we define two new parameters $m_{k}$ and $M_{k}$ that describe the minimum orders of $k$-cop-win graphs. We continue to define a new function $f_{k}(n)$ to describe the number of $k$ -cop-win graphs of order $n$. In this chapter the values of $m_{k}$ and $M_{k}$ for $k=1,2$, and 3 are given. The values of $M_{3}$ and $m_{3}$ were not previously known. We also determine the values of $f_{k}(n)$ for $n \leq 10$. These values were computed by an exhaustive computer search that characterizes the cop number of all connected graphs of order 10 or less. In this chapter we also describe the algorithms used to complete this computer search. We conclude this chapter with a novel lower bound for the function $f_{k}(n)$.

### 3.2. Minimum orders and growth rates

For an integer $k \geq 1$, define $m_{k}$ to be the minimum order of a connected graph satisfying $c(G) \geq k$. Define $M_{k}$ to be the minimum order of a connected $k$-cop-win graph. Note that in general these values may not be the same; in fact $m_{k} \leq M_{k}$ since it may be the case that there exists a $(k+1)$-cop-win graph of order $n$ but there do not exist any $k$-cop-win graphs of order less than or equal to $n$. Although $m_{k}$ is monotonically increasing, $M_{k}$ may not be monotonically increasing. Only the first three values of $m_{k}$ and $M_{k}$ are known. It is trivial to see that $m_{1}=M_{1}=1$ as a single vertex is cop-win. The cycle of order 4 , $C_{4}$, is the minimum order 2-cop-win graph; thus,

$$
m_{2}=M_{2}=4
$$

Through a computer search we have determined that

$$
m_{3}=M_{3}=10 .
$$

Please see Section 3.3 below for the details of the computer search and a complete discussion of our results.

The following theorem gives the asymptotic upper bound of the parameter $m_{k}$ and relates Meyniel's conjecture to $m_{k}$. If Meyniel's conjecture holds, then it also gives the lower asymptotic bound for $m_{k}$ and thus, the asymptotic behaviour of $m_{k}$.

Theorem 6. Let $k>0$ be an integer.
(1) $m_{k}=O\left(k^{2}\right)$.
(2) Meyniel's conjecture is equivalent to the property that

$$
m_{k}=\Omega\left(k^{2}\right) .
$$

Hence, if Meyniel's conjecture holds, Theorem 6 tells us that

$$
m_{k}=\Theta\left(k^{2}\right) .
$$

Proof. For item (1), note that the incidence graph of a projective plane has order $2\left(q^{2}+q+1\right)$ and has cop number $q+1$, where $q$ is a prime power [16]. This implies that

$$
m_{q+1}=O\left(q^{2}\right)
$$

Fix $k$ a positive integer. Bertrand's postulate gives us a prime power $q$ such that $k \leq q \leq 2 k[7]$. Hence,

$$
m_{k} \leq m_{q} \leq m_{k+1}=O\left(q^{2}\right)=O\left((2 k)^{2}\right)=O\left(k^{2}\right)
$$

Item (1) follows.
For (2), if $m_{k}=o\left(k^{2}\right)$, then there exists a connected graph $G$ with order $o\left(k^{2}\right)$ and cop number $k$. This is a contradiction since Meyniel's conjecture implies that $c(G)=o(k)$. Therefore, by Meyniel's conjecture we have that $m_{k}=\Omega\left(k^{2}\right)$.

For the reverse direction of item (2), suppose for contradiction that $m_{k}=\Omega\left(k^{2}\right)$ and that Meyniel's conjecture does not hold. We then have that there exists a connected graph $G$ with order $n$ such that

$$
c(G)=k=\omega(\sqrt{n}) .
$$

This implies that $\sqrt{n}=o(k)$, which gives $n=o\left(k^{2}\right)$. Therefore,

$$
m_{k} \leq n=o\left(k^{2}\right)
$$

which is a contradiction.

Determining whether $M_{k}$ are non-increasing is an open problem. The first few values of $m_{k}$ and $M_{k}$ suggests that these parameters are equal, for all $k \geq 1$, but this is also an open problem.

Define $f_{k}(n)$ to be the number of non-isomorphic connected $k$-copwin graphs of order $n$. Define $g(n)$ to be the number of non-isomorphic (possibly disconnected) graphs of order $n$ and $g_{c}(n)$ to be the number of connected non-isomorphic graphs of order $n$. By definition of these functions we have that $f_{k}(n) \leq g_{c}(n) \leq g(n)$ for all $k$ and $n$. The table below presents the values of $g, g_{c}, f_{1}, f_{2}$ and $f_{3}$ for small orders. The values of $g$ and $g_{c}$ are from The On-Line Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences [22]. The values for $f_{1}$ are the result of applying the algorithm to check whether a given graph is cop-win given in $[\mathbf{1 5}]$ to the data from [14]. To compute the values for $f_{2}$, the algorithm to check whether $c(G)$ is less than or equal to two given in [4] was applied to the same data set. The value for $f_{2}$ is then the number of graphs of order $n$ that have cop-number less than or equal to two, minus the number of cop-win graphs of order $n$. The value for $f_{3}$ was computed in a similar manner. The algorithms used to complete these computations are discussed in the next section.

| order $n$ | $g(n)$ | $g_{c}(n)$ | $f_{1}(n)$ | $f_{2}(n)$ | $f_{3}(n)$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 11 | 6 | 5 | 1 | 0 |
| 5 | 34 | 21 | 16 | 5 | 0 |
| 6 | 156 | 112 | 68 | 44 | 0 |
| 7 | 1044 | 853 | 403 | 450 | 0 |
| 8 | 12,346 | 11,117 | 3,791 | 7,326 | 0 |
| 9 | 274,668 | 261,080 | 65,561 | 195,519 | 0 |
| 10 | $12,005,168$ | $11,716,571$ | $2,258,313$ | $9,458,257$ | 1 |

As a result of the classification of all connected graphs of order 10 or less we determined that $m_{3}=M_{3}=10$. Further, the graph that realizes these minimum orders, the Petersen graph, is the unique minimum order 3 -cop-win graph. The Petersen graph is a very famous graph that arises often as a counterexample in many areas of graph theory. Similar to the unique minimum order 2-cop-win graph $C_{4}$ which is 2 -regular and has girth 4 , it is 3 -regular and has girth 5 .

### 3.3. Algorithms for computing cop number

Cop-win graphs have been well understood since the introduction of the game Cops and Robbers. Both Nowakowski and Winkler [15], and Quilliot [18] give a characterization of cop-win graphs based on the idea of a cop-win ordering or elimination ordering. These characterizations can be used to define cop-win graphs in an algorithmic manner. A


Figure 3.1. The Petersen Graph.
cop-win graph can be recognized by the repeated deletion of a vertex with certain adjacency properties called a corner. A corner is a vertex whose closed neighbour set is contained in the closed neighbour set of some other vertex in the graph. More succinctly, a corner is a vertex $v$ such that $N[v] \subseteq N[u]$, for some $u \in V(G)$. Corners play an important role in the mechanics of the game of Cops and Robbers. If a robber is on a corner, then the cop can dominate the neighbour set of the robber. If the cop is on a vertex that dominates a corner, then no matter where the robber moves the cop can capture the robber on the next time-step. A critical, though elementary, fact we prove now is the following.

Lemma 7. [5] A cop-win graph contains a corner.

Proof. Consider the last move of the robber before being captured by the cop. If the cop can capture the robber on the next move, then the cop is in a position that is both adjacent to the robber and adjacent to all of the neighbours of the robber. Hence, the robber is on a corner dominated by the vertex occupied by the cop.

Moreover, this result implies that when a corner is deleted from a cop-win graph the resulting graph contains a corner. In a cop-win graph this process can be repeated until only a single vertex remains. The order in which corners are deleted is the cop-win or elimination ordering. If a graph can be reduced to a single vertex (that is, to $\left.K_{1}\right)$ by the successive deletion of corners, then it is called dismantlable. Cop-win graphs are exactly those that are dismantlable.

Theorem 8. [5] A graph $G$ is cop-win if and only if it is dismantlable.

Proof. By induction on the order of $G$, we show that if $G$ is a cop-win graph, then $G$ is dismantlable. In the base case $G$ has order 1 and so must be isomorphic to $K_{1}$, which is dismantlable. Suppose $G$ has order $n \geq 1$, where $n$ is some fixed integer. Since $G$ is cop-win, it must contain a corner, say $u$, by Lemma 7 .

Let $v$ dominate $u$. Let $H=G-u$. We claim $H$ is cop-win. If $H$ is cop-win, then $H$ itself will contain a corner, and this will prove the forward direction by induction. We consider two parallel Cops and Robbers games: one played in $G$ and one in $H$. The game in $H$ may be considered as being played in $G$; since $H$ is an induced subgraph of $G$. The strategy in $G$ may not be sufficient alone to capture the robber in $H$. For example, the robber may need to leave $H$ to be captured in $G$.

Let the cop in $H$ be labeled $C^{\prime}$. Let $C^{\prime}$ move as $C$ does in $G$; however, when $C$ moves to $u$, then $C^{\prime}$ moves to $v$. We claim this is a winning strategy for $C^{\prime}$ in $H$. Let the cop play in $G$ with $R$ restricted
to $H$. Suppose that the cop is about to win in $G$. But then $N[R]$ is contained in $N[C]$ in $G$. As $v$ dominates $u$, we must have that $N[R]$ is contained in $N\left[C^{\prime}\right]$. Hence, the robber loses in the next round played in $H$.

Now suppose $G$ is dismantlable. By induction on the order of the graph we show that $G$ is cop-win. As before in the base case $G$ is isomorphic to $K_{1}$ and hence, is cop-win. Suppose $G$ has order $n+1$ and is dismantlable for some fixed integer $n \geq 1$. Since $G$ is dismantlable, it contains a corner. Label the corner $u$ and the vertex dominating it $v$. The graph resulting from the deletion of $u, G-u$ is also dismantlable. Since $G-u$ has order $n$, it is cop-win by induction hypothesis. We will show that $G$ is cop-win. A single cop has a winning strategy on $G-u$, since it is a cop-win graph. A cop can play this strategy on $G$ with the following modification: if the robber is on the vertex $u$, the cop plays as if the robber is on $v$ the vertex that dominates $u$. We say the cop moves to capture the shadow of the robber in $G-u$. If the cop is able to capture the shadow of the robber on the vertex $v$, then the cop can capture the robber on the vertex $u$ in the graph $G$ because $u$ is a corner dominated by $v$. Since the cop has a winning strategy on $G-u$ the cop has a winning strategy for $G$. Therefore, if a graph $G$ is dismantlable, then it is cop-win.

This characterization of a graph in terms of the deletion of corners gives an algorithm for recognizing cop-win graphs. This algorithm is given below in pseudocode. In natural language it can be summarized as follows: While the graph $G$ contains a corner, delete the corner to
obtain $G^{\prime}$. Set $G=G^{\prime}$ and repeat the process. When the graph $G$ no longer contains a corner, and if $G \cong K_{1}$, then the initial graph $G$ is cop-win; otherwise, $G$ is not cop-win.

```
Algorithm 1 CHECK COP-WIN
Require: \(G=(V, E)\)
    while \(|V(G)|>1\) do
        if \(G\) contains a corner, \(x\) then
            \(V(G) \leftarrow V(G) \backslash\{x\}\)
            \(E(G) \leftarrow E(G) \backslash\{(a, b) \in E(G): a=x\) or \(b=x\}\)
        else
            return FALSE
        end if
    end while
    return TRUE
```

The process of dismantling the graph by successive deletion of corners gives a linear ordering of the vertices, called a cop-win (or elimination) ordering. The cop-win ordering can be used to construct a winning strategy for the cop. The No-backtrack strategy, first described by Clarke and Nowakowski [9], defines a strategy for the cop that results in the capture of the robber in at most $n$ moves.

Given a cop-win ordering of $G,[n]=[1,2, \ldots, n]$, define

$$
G_{i}=G \upharpoonright\{n, n-1, \ldots, i\}
$$

for $i \in[n]$. The graph $G_{i}$ is the induced subgraph of $G$ restricted to vertices not appearing in the cop-win ordering before $i$. Note that $G_{1}=G$ and $G_{n}$ is just the vertex $n$. If $u$ is a corner dominated (or covered) by $v$ in $G$, then a retraction is a mapping $f: G \rightarrow G-u$
defined by

$$
f(x)= \begin{cases}v & \text { if } x=u \\ x & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

Each deletion of a corner in the graph $G$ corresponds to a retraction. The No-backtrack strategy is defined by the cop-win ordering which can be encoded in the composition of retractions. Let $f_{i}: G_{i} \rightarrow G_{i+1}$ be the retraction mapping $i$ onto the vertex that dominates $i$ in $G_{i}$, for each $1 \leq i \leq n-1$. Define $F_{1}$ to be the identity mapping on $G$, defined by $F_{1}(x)=x$ for all $x \in V(G)$. For $2 \leq i \leq n$ define

$$
F_{i}=f_{i-1} \circ \ldots \circ f_{2} \circ f_{1} .
$$

Since the maps $f_{i}$ correspond to the deletion of corners, the maps $F_{i}$ correspond to the successive deletion of all corners the cop-win ordering up to but not including $i$. Note that for all $i$, since the retractions $f_{i}$ either map a vertex to itself or to an adjacent vertex, $F_{i+1}(x)$ and $F_{i}(x)$ are equal or adjacent because they are composed of the retractions $f_{i}$.

The No-backtrack strategy is as follows. The cop begins on $G_{n}$, which is just the vertex $n$. In every round the cop plays a winning strategy on the graph restricted to the vertices not appearing in the cop-win ordering before $i$, namely $G_{i}$. The cop determines the position of the "shadow" of the robber on $G_{i}$ and captures the "shadow" of the robber in $G_{i}$. In the first round the cop plays on $G_{n}$, in which there is only one possible position for the robber, $n$. Note that every vertex in $G$ maps to vertex $n$ under $F_{n}$. In the next round the cop computes $F_{n-1}(u)$ where $u$ is the vertex of $G$ currently occupied by the
robber. The vertex determined by the map $F_{n-1}(u)$ is the shadow of the robber on $G_{n-1}$. We think of the shadow as the position of the robber in the restricted graph. The cop then moves to capture the robber on $G_{n-1}$. In each remaining round the cop repeats this process. First, the cop determines the position of the shadow robber by computing $F_{i}(u)$, where $i$ is the current round numbered from $n$ to 1 and $u$ is the vertex currently occupied by the robber and then moves to capture the shadow robber. After $n$ rounds the cop is playing on $G_{1}=G$ and can capture the robber.

We now consider an example. Consider the application of the copwin algorithm to the graph $G$ in Figure 3.2 below. We note that the order in which we delete corners is not unique. The graph $G$ contains four corners: $a, c, d$, and $e$. We could begin the algorithm by deleting any one of these corners.


Figure 3.2. The graph $G$, a cop-win graph.

Suppose we begin by deleting $a$, and note that it is dominated by the vertices $b$ and $e$. Again we could choose to record either of these as the dominator for $a$, we will choose $b$. The function $f_{1}$ then becomes:

$$
f_{1}(x)= \begin{cases}b & \text { if } x=a \\ x & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

It is useful to note that every retraction $f_{i}$ maps a corner to a vertex that dominates it and keeps all other vertices fixed. In order to represent the retraction all that is necessary is the corner and dominating vertex. Thus, the first retract could be written as $f_{1}: a \rightarrow b$. It can be easily checked that ( $a, e, b, f, c, d$ ) is a valid cop-win ordering for the graph in Figure 3.2. The cop-win ordering for the graph $G$ is given in Figure 3.3.


Figure 3.3. A cop-win ordering for the graph $G$.

The following is a list of possible retractions that correspond to the given cop-win ordering:

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
f_{1}: & a \rightarrow b . \\
f_{2}: & e \rightarrow b . \\
f_{3}: & b \rightarrow f . \\
f_{4}: & f \rightarrow c . \\
f_{5}: & c \rightarrow d .
\end{array}
$$

The maps $F_{i}$ are constructed from last used to first used. The first map computed is $F_{1}$ which is the same as $f_{1}$. This function as above maps $a \rightarrow b$ and leaves all other vertices fixed. In each step of constructing the maps $F_{i}$ we only need to compose the previous $F$ map with the next $f$ map. This can be seen by noting that we can write $F_{i}$, the composition of the first $i-1 f$-maps as $F_{i}=f_{i} \circ F_{i-1}$. The next map can then be computed as $F_{2}=f_{2} \circ F_{1}$. The retraction $f_{2}$ maps $e \rightarrow b$. The function $F_{2}$ then maps both vertices $a$ and $e$ to vertex $b$ and leaves all others fixed. Here are the explicit mappings $F_{i}$ for $1 \leq i \leq 5$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& F_{1}(x)= \begin{cases}b & \text { if } x=a, \\
x & \text { otherwise }\end{cases} \\
& F_{2}(x)= \begin{cases}b & \text { if } x=a \text { or } e \\
x & \text { otherwise }\end{cases} \\
& F_{3}(x)= \begin{cases}f & \text { if } x=a, b \text { or } e \\
x & \text { otherwise }\end{cases} \\
& F_{4}(x)= \begin{cases}c & \text { if } x=a, b, e \text { or } f \\
x & \text { otherwise }\end{cases} \\
& F_{5}(x)= \begin{cases}d & \text { for all } x \in V(G)\end{cases}
\end{aligned}
$$

Now, the maps, $F_{i}$ can be used to determine the cops strategy. The cop's first move is determined by $F_{5}$, so the cop will always begin on the vertex $d$. It makes sense that the cops initial decision should not depend on the robber's actions since the cop chooses the start vertex before the robber has been placed in the graph.

Suppose the robber chooses the vertex $a$, the vertex with the greatest distance from the initial position of the cop. The next move of the cop is then computed by finding $F_{4}(a)$, which indicates the cop should move to the vertex $c$. Suppose the robber moves to the vertex $e$; since $F_{3}(e)=f$, the cop moves to $f$. Now, the robber's only option is to move to the vertex $a$. The map $F_{2}(a)=b$, tells the cop to move to the vertex $b$ which dominates the position of the robber thus, the cop wins in the next round regardless of the choice of the robber in the next round.


Figure 3.4. The cop computes her second-to-last move, $F_{2}(a)=b$, and so moves to $b$.

### 3.4. The $k$-cop-win Algorithm

The problem of deciding whether a given graph is cop-win is relatively easy computationally speaking. Although it is a more difficult problem, there is an algorithm to check whether a graph has cop number $k$ or less for a fixed $k$. This algorithm, originally due to Berarducci and Intriglia [2], relies on the idea of a graph product. The graph product of two graphs, $G$ and $H$, is a new graph. The vertices of the product are the Cartesian product of the vertices of the original graphs. That is, each vertex of the product graph is an ordered pair of vertices from the constituent graphs. There are several different types of graph product. The difference between these types of graph product is in how the edges of the product graph are determined. The edges of all graph products are determined by the edges of the original graphs. The most common graph product is the Cartesian product, denoted $G \square H$. Suppose $\left(g_{1}, h_{1}\right)$ and $\left(g_{2}, h_{2}\right)$ are two vertices in $V(G \square H)$. An edge exists between $\left(g_{1}, h_{1}\right)$ and $\left(g_{2}, h_{2}\right)$ if they are adjacent in one component and equal in the other. Note that we write $g \sim h$ if the vertices $g$ and $h$ are adjacent. More precisely, if $g_{1} \sim g_{2}$ and $h_{1}=h_{2}$ or $g_{1}=g_{2}$ and $h_{1} \sim h_{2}$. Another common graph product is categorical product, denoted $G \times H$. Edges are adjacent in the categorical product if the components are both adjacent in the original graphs, $g_{1} \sim g_{2}$ and $h_{1} \sim h_{2}$. The graph product used by the algorithm to decide whether a graph has cop number $k$ or less is the strong product, denoted $G \boxtimes H$. This notation hints at the relationship it shares with the Cartesian product and the categorical product. The edge set of the strong product can be thought of
as the union of the edge sets of the Cartesian and categorical product. There is an edge between $\left(g_{1}, h_{1}\right)$ and $\left(g_{2}, h_{2}\right)$ if and only if: $g_{1} \sim g_{2}$ and $h_{1}=h_{2}$; or $g_{1}=g_{2}$ and $h_{1} \sim h_{2}$; or $g_{1} \sim g_{2}$ and $h_{1} \sim h_{2}$. Vertices in the product are adjacent if they are adjacent or equal in each component. Figure 3.4 below shows the strong product of two graphs in terms of the Cartesian and categorical products.


Figure 3.5. The graph $G$, a cop-win graph.

The product of graphs can be generalized to the notion of the exponentiation of a graph. Like the exponentiation of numbers, exponentiation of graphs is just repeated application of products. The $k^{t h}$ strong power of a graph is constructed in a similar manner to the product of graphs. A vertex in the $k^{\text {th }}$ strong power of a graph $G$ is a $k$-tuple of vertices of $G$. A pair of $k$-tuples are adjacent if they are adjacent or equal in each component. The algorithm to check whether a graph is $k$-cop-win, for a fixed $k$ uses the $k^{t h}$ strong power, written $\boxtimes^{k} G$, to
simulate the movements of the cops. Each coordinate of the $k$-tuple represents the position of the $k$ cops in the original graph. Using this approach the algorithm rules out possible positions for the robber in the original graph. The following theorem is the basis of this algorithm. Note that $2^{V(G)}$ is the set of all subsets of $V(G)$.

Theorem 9. [2] Suppose $k \geq 1$ is an integer. Then $c(G)>k$ if and only if there is a mapping $f: V\left(\boxtimes^{k} G\right) \rightarrow 2^{V(G)}$ with the following properties.
(1) For every $u \in V\left(\boxtimes^{k} G\right)$,

$$
\emptyset \neq f(u) \subseteq V(G) \backslash N_{G}[u] .
$$

(2) For every $u v \in E\left(\boxtimes^{k} G\right)$,

$$
f(u) \subseteq N_{G}[f(v)] .
$$

We omit the proof, which can be found in [4].
The value of $f(u)$ is the set of vertices in the graph $G$ such that, if the cops occupy the $k$ vertices in $G$ specified by the vertex $u$, then the robber has a strategy to escape capture in the next round. If any one of the maps $f(u)$ is empty for some $u$ in $V\left(\boxtimes^{k} G\right)$, then the robber can be captured by the cops from this position. That is, $k$ or fewer cops have a winning strategy on the graph $G$. Algorithm 2 gives the statement of the algorithm in pseudocode.

The first phase of the algorithm is to initialize the sets $f(u)$ to be $V(G) \backslash N_{G}[u]$, where $N_{G}[u]$ contains the $k$ vertices of $G$ that make up $u$, as well as their neighbours in $G$. This step rules out the vertices that

```
Algorithm 2 CHECK K-COP-WIN
Require: \(G=(V, E), k \geq 0\)
    initialize \(f(u)\) to \(V(G) \backslash N_{G}[u]\), for all \(u \in V\left(\boxtimes^{k} G\right)\)
    repeat
        for all \((u, v) \in E\left(\boxtimes^{k} G\right)\) do
            \(f(u) \leftarrow f(u) \cap N_{G}[f(v)]\)
            \(f(v) \leftarrow f(v) \cap N_{G}[f(u)]\)
        end for
    until the value of \(f\) is unchanged or \(f(u)=\emptyset\) for some \(u \in V\left(\boxtimes^{k} G\right)\)
    if there exists \(u \in V\left(\boxtimes^{k} G\right)\) such that \(f(u)=\emptyset\) then
        return \(c(G) \leq k\)
    else
        return \(c(G)>k\)
    end if
```

are dominated by the cops when they are in the position specified by $u$. If after this initialization phase, we have that $f(u)=\emptyset$, then $k$ or fewer cops can form a dominating set in $G$. The main phase of the algorithm uses the second rule to rule out possible escape routes for the robber. The second rule of Theorem 9 guarantees that the robber will always have a way to get from one safe set of vertices to another, from $f(u)$ to $f(v)$ or from $f(v)$ to $f(u)$, along the edge $u v$. Also note that if any $f(u)$ is empty at any point in the algorithm, then by repeated application of the second rule of Theorem 9, all maps will eventually be empty. If $f(u)$ is empty for any $u$ in $V\left(\boxtimes^{k} G\right)$, then there exists a position in the graph from which the robber cannot escape and therefore there is a strategy for $k$ or fewer cops to win in $G$.

Note that Algorithm 2 has polynomial running time. The worst case running time of this algorithm $O\left(n^{3 k+3}\right)$ (see[4]). The main contribution to the running time of the algorithm comes from lines $2-7$.

Since the cardinality of $f(u)$ is reduced by at least one in every iteration of lines $2-7$. This section is then executed at most $O\left(n^{k+1}\right)$ times. In each of these iterations all edges of the product graph $\boxtimes^{k} G$ are being processed in lines $3-6$. Since there are at most $\frac{n(n-1)}{2}$ edges in the original graph, there are at most $\left(\frac{n(n-1)}{2}\right)^{k}$ edges in $\boxtimes^{k} G$. Thus, iterating through the edges of $\boxtimes^{k} G$ has computational complexity $O\left(n^{2 k}\right)$. Finally, the operation of taking intersections and finding the neighbourhoods of each vertex (lines 4-5) have complexity $O(n)$ and $O\left(n^{2}\right)$, respectively. The total running time is then the product of these complexities as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
O\left(n^{k+1}\right) O\left(n^{2 k}\right)\left(O(n)+O\left(n^{2}\right)\right) & =O\left(n^{k+1}\right) O\left(n^{2 k}\right) O\left(n^{2}\right) \\
& =O\left(n^{k+1}\right) O\left(n^{2 k+2}\right) \\
& =O\left(n^{3 k+3}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

### 3.5. Lower bounds

Recall from the beginning of this chapter that $f_{k}(n)$ is the number of non-isomorphic connected $k$-cop-win graphs of order $n$ and that $g(n)$ is the number of non-isomorphic (possibly disconnected) graphs of order $n$. As previously mentioned, we have a trivial upper bound on $f_{k}(n)$ in terms of $g(n): f_{k}(n) \leq g(n)$ for all $k$ and $n$. In this section we give an original lower bound on $f_{k}(n)$ in terms of $g(n)$. We begin with a lemma that shows that given a $k$-cop-win graph, we can construct another $k$-cop-win graph of arbitrarily large order.

Theorem 10. Given graph $G$ of order $n$ and a $k$-cop-win graph $H$ of order $m_{k}$, there exists a $k$-cop-win graph $G^{\prime}$ constructed from $G$ and $H$ with order $n+m_{k}+1$.

Proof. Construct $G^{\prime}$ as follows. Attach a new vertex, say $x$, to all vertices of $G$. The vertex $x$ is universal in the new graph $G \cup\{x\}$. Attach $x$ to a fixed vertex in $H$, say $y$, to form $G^{\prime}$ from $H$ and $G \cup\{x\}$.


Figure 3.6. The construction of $G^{\prime}$.

If there are less than $k$ cops, then the robber has a winning strategy. The robber can remain in $H$ since $k$ cops are required to win in $H$. Thus, $c\left(G^{\prime}\right) \geq k$.

Now to show $c\left(G^{\prime}\right) \leq k$ we give a winning strategy for $k$ cops in $G^{\prime}$. Place one cop on $x$ and the remaining $k-1$ cops on some vertices of $G$.


Figure 3.7. The isomorphism $h: G^{\prime} \rightarrow J^{\prime}$.

The robber cannot start in $G$ since the vertices of $G$ are dominated by $x$. The robber then begins in $H$. The cops can then all move to play their winning strategy for $k$ cops on $H$. If the robber leaves $H$, then the cops play as if the robber is on $y$. Eventually either the robber is caught in $H$ or the robber has moved to $G \cup\{x\}$. If the robber has moved to $V(G) \cup\{x\}$, then at least one cop occupies $y$. One of these cops moves to $x$ which dominates $G$ and the robber is caught in the next round.

Theorem 11. Suppose that $n>m_{k}$ and let $G$ and $J$ be connected graphs of order $n$ and $H$ be a minimum order connected $k$-cop-win graph of order less than $n$. Let $G^{\prime}$ and $J^{\prime}$ be the graphs constructed as above. If $G \nsupseteq J$, then $G^{\prime} \nsupseteq J^{\prime}$.

Proof. Suppose for contradiction that $G^{\prime} \cong J^{\prime}$, but $G \nsubseteq J$ and let $h$ be an isomorphism from $G^{\prime}$ to $J^{\prime}$. We claim that the vertex with maximum degree in $G^{\prime}$ is $x_{G}$. The degree of $x_{G}$ is $n+1$ since it is connected to all vertices of $G$ and one vertex of $H_{G}$. It is the unique vertex with maximum degree since no vertex in $H_{G}$ can have more than $n-1$ neighbours in $H_{G}$ and a vertex in $G$ has at most $n-1$ neighbours in $G$. A similar argument shows that the unique vertex with maximum degree in $J^{\prime}$ is $x_{J}$. Since $x_{G}$ and $x_{J}$ are the unique vertices with maximum degree in $G^{\prime}$ and $J^{\prime}$, respectively, $h$ must map $x_{G}$ to $x_{J}$. The vertex $y_{G}$ is the unique vertex of $G^{\prime}$ that is adjacent to $x_{G}$ and adjacent to vertices that are not adjacent to $x_{G}$. Similarly, $y_{J}$ is the unique vertex in $J^{\prime}$ adjacent to $x_{J}$ and no other neighbours of $x_{J}$. Thus, $y_{G}$ must be mapped to $y_{J}$ by $f$. This implies that $h$ maps $H_{G}$ to $H_{J}$ and that the restriction of $h$ to $G$ is an isomorphism mapping $G$ to $J$. This contradicts our assumption that $G$ is not isomorphic to $J$. Therefore, $G^{\prime}$ is not isomorphic to $J^{\prime}$.

The following theorem gives us the central result of this section. The theorem gives a lower bound for the number of $k$-cop-win graphs of a given order in terms of the function $g(n)$.

Theorem 12. (1) For all $n>1$,

$$
g(n-1) \leq f_{1}(n) .
$$

(2) For $k>1$ and all $n>2 m_{k}$,

$$
g\left(n-m_{k}-1\right) \leq f_{k}(n)
$$

Proof. For item (1), fix a graph $G$ of order $n-1$. Form $G^{\prime}$ by adding a universal vertex to $G$. The graph $G^{\prime}$ is cop-win since placing a single cop on the universal vertex is a winning strategy for a cop. If $G \nsupseteq H$, then we show that $G^{\prime} \nsupseteq H^{\prime}$. Suppose for contradiction that there exists an isomorphism $h: G^{\prime} \rightarrow H^{\prime}$. Let $G_{U}$ and $H_{U}$ be the sets of universal vertices in $G^{\prime}$ and $H^{\prime}$, respectively. The isomorphism $h$ must $\operatorname{map} G_{U}$ to $H_{U}$. Fix some vertex in $G_{U}$, call it $x$. If $h$ is restricted to the vertices of $G$ excluding $x$, then we have that

$$
h \upharpoonright G^{\prime}-x: G^{\prime}-x \rightarrow H^{\prime}-h(x)
$$

is an isomorphism. This is a contradiction since $G^{\prime}-x \cong G$ and $H^{\prime}-h(x) \cong H$, and thus, $G \cong H$. Since for every isomorphism type of order $n-1$ we can construct a cop-win graph of order $n$ it follows that for all $n>1, g(n-1) \leq f_{1}(n)$.

For (2) note that there are $g\left(n-m_{k}-1\right)$-many non-isomorphic graphs of order $n-m_{k}-1$. By Theorem 10 for each of these $g(n-$ $\left.m_{k}-1\right)$-many graphs, a $k$-cop-win graph of order $n$ can be constructed. By Theorem 11 each of these $k$-cop-win graphs are non-isomorphic so long as

$$
n-m_{k}+1 \geq m_{k}
$$

But the latter inequality is equivalent to $n>2 m_{k}$, which is our hypothesis. Therefore, there are at least $g\left(n-m_{k}-1\right)$ distinct $k$-cop-win graphs of order $n$.

## CHAPTER 4

## The Game of Cops and Robbers on Hypergraphs

### 4.1. Introduction

While the game Cops and Robbers is usually played on a graph, the game can be played on many other mathematical structures. One such structure is a hypergraph. A hypergraph is set of vertices and subsets of vertices, called hyperedges. Hypergraphs are a generalization of graphs, where hyperedges have cardinality 2 . Instead of connecting two vertices like edges, hyperedges can connect some number of vertices. In this chapter we give some definitions and notation to describe hypergraphs and discuss the game of Cops and Robbers played on hypergraph. We conclude the chapter with a discussion of some open problems.


Figure 4.1. A hypergraph with hyperedges of cardinality 3 and 5 .

### 4.2. Definitions and Notation

If a vertex is contained in just one hyperedge, then we call this vertex internal. We call a vertex that is contained in two or more hyperedges external.


Figure 4.2. The vertex $a$ is internal, the vertex $b$ is external.

In contrast to the notion of regularity in graphs, in hypergraphs, regularity describes the number of vertices in each edge rather than the number of edges incident with a vertex. A hypergraph is $k$-regular if every hyperedge contains exactly $k$ vertices. or the remainder of the chapter, all the hypergraphs we consider will be $k$-regular for some $k>1$. We say that a hypergraph is $t$-joined if each intersection of hyperedges contains exactly $t$ vertices.


Figure 4.3. A 5-regular 2-joined hypergraph.

Similar to the incidence graphs of designs, we can define an incidence graph of a hypergraph. The graph of a hypergraph $H$, written $G(H)$, is a graph with the vertices of $H$ and an edge between these vertices if they are connected by a hyperedge in $H$. That is, $V(G(H))=V(H)$ and $(u, v) \in E(G(H))$ if and only if $\{u, v\} \subseteq e$ for some $e \in E(H)$. Note that a 1-joined, 2-regular hypergraph $H$ is isomorphic to its own underlying graph.


Figure 4.4. The graph $G(H)$ for $H$, the hypergraph in Figure 4.1.

In the subject of graph theory there are many types of special graphs. Paths and cycles are among the most common of these. We define a hypergraph analogue of paths and cycles. A hyperpath is a sequence of hyperedges $E_{1}, E_{2}, \ldots, E_{k}$, such that $E_{i}$ and $E_{i+1}$ are $t$ joined, for some $t>0$, and for $i=1,2, \ldots, k-1$ and $E_{i} \cap E_{j}=\emptyset$ when $j \neq i+1 \bmod k$.


Figure 4.5. A hyperpath.

For $k>2$ an integer, a $k$-hypercycle is a collection of $k$ hyperedges, $E_{i}$, with two hyperedges $E_{i}$ and $E_{j}$ incident if $i=j+1(\bmod k)$. For more information about hypergraphs we direct the reader to the books by Berge [3] and Voloshin [23].


Figure 4.6. A hypercycle.

### 4.3. Cops and Robbers on hypergraphs

The game of Cops and Robbers played on a hypergraph is analogous to the game played on graphs. Some set of cops choose vertices to occupy, and then the robber choose a vertex. The players can move to vertices by moving from their present vertex $u$ to any vertex $v$ such that $u$ and $v$ are in hyperedge. The remaining rules of the game, along with the definition of the cop number of hypergraphs is analogous to the case for graphs.

As before, a hypergraph where one cop has a winning strategy is called cop-win. Corners are defined analogously as in graphs. Hyperpaths are cop-win. To see that a hyperpath is cop-win we will consider a strategy for a cop that relies upon the following lemmas.

Lemma 13. A cop playing on a connected hypergraph with at least two hyperedges can always move from an external vertex to another distinct external vertex.

Proof. As the cops can move from any vertex of a hyperedge to any vertex of an incident hyperedge, the lemma follows.

Lemma 14. The cop can play a winning strategy by remaining on external vertices until, perhaps, the final move of the game.

Proof. By Lemma 13, the cop can always travel from external vertex to external vertex. To capture a robber on an internal vertex, the cop needs only to occupy the same hyperedge as the robber. If the robber is on an external vertex, then the cop can follow the robber to the next edge by traveling along external vertices.

THEOREM 15. If $H_{p}$ is a hyperpath, then $c\left(H_{p}\right)=1$.

Proof. The cop begins on an external vertex of the edge $E_{1}$ at one end of the path. By Lemma 14 the cop may move from external vertex to external vertex though the path. The cop moves via external vertices from one end to the other. If the cop encounters the robber on an internal vertex, then the cop can capture the robber on the next move.

Theorem 16. If $H_{c}$ is a hypercycle, then $c\left(H_{c}\right)=2$.

Proof. If the game is played on hypergraph with a single cop, then the robber can always evade the cop. The robber evades capture by moving on external vertices around the cycle. Thus, hypercycles are not cop-win.

However, if the game is played with two cops, the following strategy for the cops is sufficient to win the game. Place the first cop $C_{1}$ on an external vertex of edge $E_{1}$, place the second cop $C_{2}$ on the edge $E_{k}$. Since there are no edges in between the edges $E_{1}$ and $E_{k}$, the
robber cannot choose to begin between the cops. The cops can then each move away from each other on each successive round, with $C_{1}$, moving to edges with higher index, and $C_{2}$ moving to edges with lower index. Eventually, the cops will occupy the same edge and the robber will be caught on the next round.

Consider a Steiner 2-design, or a $2-(v, k, 1)$ design. Recall from Chapter 2 that 2- $(v, k, 1)$ designs are a set of $v$ points, and a set of blocks of size $k$, such that any two points determine a unique block. We assume always that $v>k$. Steiner 2-designs, and indeed any other design, can be thought of as a hypergraph with the vertices being points and hyperedges defined by the blocks. In the following theorem we show that Steiner 2-designs are in fact cop-win.

Theorem 17. 2-( $v, k, 1)$ designs are cop-win.

Proof. The cop begins on some vertex, and the robber then chooses some vertex. Since any two points uniquely determine a line the positions of the cop and robber uniquely determine a hyperedge. Thus, the cop can capture the robber in the round after the robber chooses a vertex.

In fact, any position that the cop occupies in a Steiner 2-design dominates the entire graph. That is, the cop is adjacent to every vertex in the hypergraph, a universal vertex in the hypergraph. We define a corner in a hypergraph to be a vertex $x$ such that $x$ and all vertices connected to $x$ by a hyperedge are also adjacent via hyperedges to some other vertex, just as in the case of graphs. This leads us to think we
might be able to characterize cop-win hypergraphs in the same way we characterize cop-win graphs. The following theorem shows that this is not the case. The proof of this theorem shows that the result of deleting a corner in a cop-win hypergraph is not necessarily cop-win. Formally, $H-x$ is the result of removing the vertex $x$ and all edges incident with $x$ from the hypergraph $H$.

Theorem 18. There exist cop-win hypergraphs $H$, such that for all vertices $x$, the hypergraph $H-x$ is not cop-win.

Proof. We choose $H$ to be the hypergraph defined from a fixed Steiner 2-design. Since all vertices can be dominated by any vertex in the hypergraph, all vertices in $H$ are corners. Delete one of them, say $x$.

Suppose the cop begins at vertex $C_{1}$ of $H-x$. In order to avoid the cop in the first round the robber selects a vertex that is on the hyperedge that has been deleted that contained both $x$ and $C_{1}$. This hyperedge must exist and is unique since any two points determine a unique line. Call this point occupied by the robber $R_{1}$.

Now, in order to capture the robber, the cop moves to some point $C_{2}$ which is not on the line determined by $x$ and $C_{1}$. To evade the cop the robber must move to some vertex on the deleted hyperedge determined by $x$ and $C_{2}$. If the parameter $k \geq 3$, then such a vertex must exist.

If there exists a vertex $R_{2}$ that is not equal to $x$ or $C_{2}$, on the line determined by $x$ and $C_{2}$, then there is a hyperedge connecting $R_{1}$ and $R_{2}$. This hyperedge could not have been deleted since it is not


Figure 4.7. The deleted hyperedges give the robber an escape route.
incident with the deleted vertex $x$. The robber now simply moves to $R_{2}$ to evade capture. This escape strategy for the robber can be repeated indefinitely. Since the robber can escape the cop indefinitely, $H-x$ is not cop-win.

The preceding theorem gives the following corollary.

Corollary 19. Cop-win hypergraphs cannot be characterized by successive deletion of corners.

Many questions about the game of Cops and Robbers on hypergraphs remain open. The principal open problem in this area finding a characterization of cop-win hypergraphs. Many other problems about generalizing the results on graphs to hypergraphs remain open. In this chapter we give examples of 2-cop-win hypergraphs that are analogues of 2-cop-win graphs. Are there other classes of 2-cop-win hypergraphs that are not analogues of 2-cop-win graphs? Another area of interest is the asymptotic behaviour of cop-number in hypergraphs. Is there an analogue of Meyniel's conjecture for hypergraphs?

## CHAPTER 5

## Conclusions and Future Work


#### Abstract

5.1. Summary

In Chapter 2 we gave some background on Meyniel's Conjecture, and discussed some results related to the conjecture. We introduced so-called Meyniel extremal graphs which realize the upper bound in the conjecture. Using the incidence graphs of projective and partial affine planes we gave new examples of such infinite families satisfying certain regularity conditions.

In Chapter 3 we considered the minimum orders of a $k$-cop-win graph and their relation to Meyniel's Conjecture. We characterized the cop number of all connected graphs of order 10 or less. We also discussed the theoretical underpinnings of the algorithm used to obtain the computational results. We defined two new parameters $m_{k}$ and $M_{k}$ that describe the minimum orders of $k$-cop-win graphs and related the asymptotic behaviour of these parameters to Meyniel's Conjecture. In the course of characterizing the cop number of connected graphs of order 10 or less we determined the previously unknown values of $M_{3}$ and $m_{3}$. We also defined a new function $f_{k}(n)$ to describe the number of $k$-cop-win graphs of order $n$. We concluded Chapter 3 with a lower bound for the function $f_{k}(n)$.


In Chapter 4 we examined the game of Cops and Robbers played on hypergraphs. We discussed some terminology to describe hypergraphs and gave examples of hypergraphs and their cop number. The central result of this chapter was that the characterization of cop-win graphs by successive deletion of corners does not characterize cop-win hypergraphs.

### 5.2. Open Problems

Meyniel's Conjecture on the asymptotic upper bound of the cop number of a connected graph is perhaps the deepest open problem in Cops and Robbers research. The conjecture is that for a connected graph $G$ of order $n$,

$$
c(G)=O(\sqrt{n})
$$

The conjecture is far from being proven for general connected graphs. In fact, even the so-called soft Meyniel's conjecture is open, which states that for a fixed constant $c>0$ and a connected graph $G$ of order $n$,

$$
c(G)=O\left(n^{1-c}\right)
$$

Some work has been done towards proving the conjecture for some special classes of graphs such as random graphs [17]. However, there are many classes of graphs for which there is no proof of the conjecture. Another interesting problem is looking at the lower bounds for the cop number. Recently Prałat [16] showed that

$$
c(G) \geq \sqrt{\frac{n}{2}}-n^{0.2625}
$$

It remains to be shown whether this is the best possible lower bound.
Recall from Chapter 3 that in general $m_{k}$ may not be equal to $M_{k}$. It may be the case that there exists a $(k+1)$-cop-win graph of order $n$ but there do not exist any $k$-cop-win graphs of order less than or equal to $n$, thus $m_{k} \leq M_{k}$. Although $m_{k}$ is monotonically increasing, it is unknown whether $M_{k}$ is monotonically increasing. The first few values of $m_{k}$ and $M_{k}$ suggests that these parameters are equal, for all $k \geq 1$, but there is no proof of this intuition.

In Chapter 3 we determined that the Petersen graph is the unique minimum order 3-cop-win graph. While an exhaustive computer search is sufficient to show this fact, a direct proof of this fact would be preferable. The minimum order of a 4-cop-win graph remains unknown. Perhaps identifying the minimum order of a 4-cop-win graph would give insight into the structure of small graphs with large cop number. The minimum order 2-cop-win and 3-cop-win graphs suggest that minimum order $k$-cop-win graphs are $k$-regular and have relatively large girth.

The study of Cops and Robbers on hypergraphs and other incidence structures is in its infancy. As such very little is known about the game on hypergraphs. The first step towards understanding the game on these structures is developing a characterization of cop-win hypergraphs. In this document all examples of 2-cop-win hypergraphs are analogues of 2-cop-win graphs. It would be interesting to see examples of 2-cop-win hypergraphs that are not analogues of 2-cop-win
graphs. Another area of interest is the asymptotic behaviour of copnumber in hypergraphs and the problem of developing an analogue of Meyniel's Conjecture for hypergraphs.

## APPENDIX A

## Source Code

This appendix gives implementations of three algorithms from Chapter 3. All programs given here are implemented in the C programming language and were compiled using the Gnu Compiler Collection (gcc). These programs have been successfully compiled and run on Windows XP, Windows Vista and Windows 7 using MinGW and on Ubuntu. All graph data used by these program is specified by adjacency matrices in text files, delimited by the number of vertices in the graphs. The data on connected graphs used came from Brendan McKay's Homepage in the graph6 (.g6) format and was converted to adjacency matrix format using the program 'showg' from the nauty graph package. Instructions on using nauty and showg are available on Brendan McKay's Homepage. In order to convert a list of graph in the .g6 format to the adjacency matrix format used here, run 'showg' from the command line as follows:

```
showg -aq input.g6 output.txt
```

The file "input.g6" specifies the graph6 file containing the graphs to be converted to adjacency format. The arguments "output.txt" is optional and allows the user to specify the output filename. The output file from the program 'showg' can be used as the data for any of the programs presented here. For example, the following text file is
a representation of the Petersen graph that is suitable for use by these programs:

Listing A.1. Input format for the Petersen graph.

```
10
0100110000
1010001000
0101000100
0010100010
1001000001
1000000110
0100000011
0010010001
0001011000
0000101100
10
```

The first program is the cop-win checker based on the algorithm given by Nowakowski and Winkler in [15] to check whether a given graph is cop-win or not. The second program is a modification of the first program that computes a cop-win ordering of a graph and then simulates the game allowing the user to play the game against a cop controlled by the program. The third program is an implementation of the algorithm to check whether a graph has $c(G) \leq 2$. This implementation is similar in conception to the algorithm given by Bonato and Chiniforooshan in [4].

## A.1. Cop-win Checker

```
/*
Cop-win Checker
Liam Baird
liam.baird@gmail.com
Input: a list of graphs in adjacency matrix format delimited
    by the number of nodes in each graph.
Output: a list of statements that state whether each graph in
        the list is cop-win or not.
*/
#include<stdlib.h>
#include <time.h>
#include<stdio.h>
#define MAXNOV 10
#define TRUE 1
#define FALSE 0
int nov=0;
struct node {
        int val;
        struct node * next;
};
typedef struct node node;
void initialize(node *graph[]){
    int k;
    for(k=0;k<MAXNOV;k++){
        graph[k] = NULL;
    }
}
void printgraph(node *graph[],int graph_no){
    int q;
    node *curr=NULL;
    if(graph_no==0){
        printf("GRAPH:\n");
    }else{
        printf("GRAPH #%d:\n",graph_no);
```

14

```
    }
    for(q=0;q<MAXNOV;q++){
        curr=graph [q];
        while(curr!=NULL) {
                if(curr->val!=q){
                printf("(%d,%d)\n",q,curr->val);
            }
            curr = curr->next ;
        }
    }
}
void deletegraph(node *graph[]){
    int q=0;
    node *curr=NULL;
    node *prev=NULL;
    for(q=0;q<MAXNOV;q++){
        curr=graph[q];
        prev=graph [q];
        while(curr!=NULL) {
            curr = curr->next;
            free(prev);
            prev=curr;
        }
        graph[q] = NULL;
    }
}
void deletenode(int i,node *graph[]){
    int q=0;
    node *curr=NULL;
    node *prev=NULL;
    curr=graph[i];
    prev=graph[i];
    while(curr!=NULL) {
        curr = curr->next;
        free(prev);
```

```
        prev=curr;
    }
    graph[i] = NULL;
    for(q=0;q<MAXNOV;q++){
        curr=graph [q];
        prev=graph [q];
        if(curr!=NULL){
            if(curr->val==i){
                graph[q]=curr->next;
            free(curr);
            curr=graph[q];
            prev=graph[q];
                curr=curr->next;
                }else{
                    curr=curr->next;
        }
    }
        while(curr!=NULL) {
            if(curr->val==i){
                prev->next=curr->next;
                free(curr);
                curr=prev->next;
                }else{
                    prev=prev->next;
                curr=curr->next;
                }
        }
    }
}
112
113 int checkcorner(int i,int j,node *graph[]){
114 //compares two adjacency lists.
115 node *a=graph[i];
116 node *b=graph[j];
117
118
119
120 }
```

121

```
    while (TRUE){
        if (( a == NULL && b == NULL )||( a==NULL )){
            return(TRUE);
        }else if (( b == NULL )||(a->val < b->val)){
            return(FALSE);
        }else if (b->val < a->val){
            if (b->next!=NULL){
                b=b->next;
            }else{
                return(FALSE);
            }
        }else{
            a = a->next;
            b = b->next;
        }
    }
}
int hascorner(node *graph[]){
    int i,j;
    for(i=0;i<nov;i++){
        for(j=0;j<nov;j++){
                if(checkcorner(i,j,graph)){
                    if(i!=j){
                        return(i);
                    }
                }
        }
    }
    return(-1);
}
int getsize(node *graph[]){
    int q=0,size=0;
    node *curr=NULL;
    for(q=0;q<MAXNOV;q++){
        curr=graph [q];
        while(curr!=NULL) {
                size++;
                curr = curr->next ;
        }
```

```
    }
```

    }
    return(size);
    return(size);
    }
}
int main(void) {
int main(void) {
node *curr=NULL,*tail=NULL;
node *curr=NULL,*tail=NULL;
node *graph[MAXNOV];
node *graph[MAXNOV];
char ch;
char ch;
char str[5];
char str[5];
char filenamein[20];
char filenamein[20];
char filenameout[20];
char filenameout[20];
int i=0,j=0,k,c=0,q,graph_no=0,copwin_count=0;
int i=0,j=0,k,c=0,q,graph_no=0,copwin_count=0;
//initialize vertices
//initialize vertices
initialize(graph);
initialize(graph);
//prompt for filename
//prompt for filename
printf("please enter graph filename\n");
printf("please enter graph filename\n");
scanf("%19s",filenamein);
scanf("%19s",filenamein);
strcpy(filenameout,filenamein);
strcpy(filenameout,filenamein);
/lopen file
/lopen file
FILE *input=fopen(strcat(filenamein,".txt"),"r");
FILE *input=fopen(strcat(filenamein,".txt"),"r");
FILE *output=fopen(strcat(filenameout,"r.txt"),"w");
FILE *output=fopen(strcat(filenameout,"r.txt"),"w");
fgets(str,5,input);
fgets(str,5,input);
nov=atoi(str);
nov=atoi(str);
printf("nov = %d\n",nov);
printf("nov = %d\n",nov);
graph_no++;
graph_no++;
//get input
//get input
for(ch=getc(input);ch!=EOF;ch=getc(input)){
for(ch=getc(input);ch!=EOF;ch=getc(input)){
if(i==nov){
if(i==nov){
c=hascorner(graph);
c=hascorner(graph);
while(c>=0){
while(c>=0){
deletenode(c,graph);
deletenode(c,graph);
c=hascorner(graph);
c=hascorner(graph);
}
}
if(getsize(graph)==1){
if(getsize(graph)==1){
fprintf(output,"Graph \#%d is COPWIN\n",graph_no);
fprintf(output,"Graph \#%d is COPWIN\n",graph_no);
copwin_count++;
copwin_count++;
}else{

```
        }else{
```

```
        fprintf(output,"Graph #%d is not COPWIN\n",graph_no);
    }
    deletegraph(graph);
    i=0;
    j=0;
    //increment graph # counter
    graph_no++;
    //grab next line
    fgets(str,5,input);
}
else if (ch=='\n'){ //new row
    i++; /lone more row
    j=0; //start from zeroth column
    }
    else if ((ch=='1')|(i==j)){
    //add edge i,j
    curr = (node *)malloc(sizeof(node)); //allocate memory
    curr->val = j; //set value
    curr->next=NULL; //set next
    //if this is the first edge for this node
    if (graph[i]==NULL){
    graph[i]=curr;
    }
    else{
    tail->next=curr;
    }
    tail=curr;
    //increment j
    j++;
    }//end add edge i,j
    else if (ch=='0'){
    //printf("L: ch=O\n");
    //add no vertex
    //increment j
    j++;
    }
}
```

    printf("\%d of \%d graphs of order \%d are copwin\n",
        copwin_count,graph_no-1,nov);
    fprintf(output, "\%d of \%d graphs of order \%d are copwin\n",
        copwin_count,graph_no-1, nov);
    return(0);
    \}

## A.2. Cops and Robbers Game Simulator

```
/*
Cops and Robber Simulator
Liam Baird
liam.baird@gmail.com
Input: a list of graphs in adjacency matrix format delimited
    by the number of nodes in each graph.
Output: a list of statements that specify whether each graph
        in the list is cop-win or not. Also
determines a cop-win ordering. If the graph is cop-win, then
        the program simulates a game of Cops
and Robbers. The program allows the user to specify the
    movements of the robber with the program
determing the movements of the cop using the cop-win ordering.
*/
#include<stdlib.h>
#include <time.h>
#include<stdio.h>
#define MAXNOV 20
#define TRUE 1
#define FALSE 0
int nov=0;
struct node {
    int val;
    struct node * next;
};
typedef struct node node;
void initialize(node *graph[]){
    int k;
    for(k=0;k<MAXNOV;k++){
            graph[k] = NULL;
    }
}
void printgraph(node *graph[],int graph_no){
    int q;
```

```
    node *curr=NULL;
    if(graph_no==0){
    printf("GRAPH:\n");
    }
    else
    {
        printf("GRAPH #%d:\n",graph_no);
    }
    for(q=0;q<nov;q++){
        curr=graph[q];
        while(curr!=NULL) {
            if(curr->val!=q){
            printf(" (%d,%d) ",q,curr->val);
            }
        curr = curr->next ;
        }
        printf("\n");
    }
}
void deletegraph(node *graph[]){
    int q=0;
    node *curr=NULL;
    node *prev=NULL;
    for(q=0;q<MAXNOV;q++){
        curr=graph [q];
        prev=graph[q];
        while(curr!=NULL) {
                curr = curr->next;
                free(prev);
                prev=curr;
        }
        graph[q] = NULL;
    }
}
void deletenode(int i,node *graph[]){
    int q=0;
```

```
node *curr=NULL;
node *prev=NULL;
//delete node with index i
curr=graph[i];
prev=graph[i];
while(curr!=NULL) {
        curr = curr->next;
        free(prev);
        prev=curr;
}
graph[i] = NULL;
for(q=0;q<MAXNOV;q++){
        curr=graph [q];
        prev=graph[q];
        if(curr!=NULL){
            if(curr->val==i){
                graph[q]=curr->next;
                free(curr);
                curr=graph [q];
            prev=graph[q];
            curr=curr->next;
        }else{
        curr=curr->next;
        }
    }
        while(curr!=NULL) {
            if(curr->val==i){
            prev->next=curr->next;
            free(curr);
            curr=prev->next;
        }
        else{
            prev=prev->next;
            curr=curr->next;
        }
    }
```

```
    }
}
void copygraph(node *graph[], node *copygraph[]){
    int q;
    node *curr=NULL;
    node *copy=NULL;
    node *tail=NULL;
    for(q=0;q<MAXNOV;q++){
        curr=graph [q];
        while(curr!=NULL) {
            //add edge i,j
            copy = (node *)malloc(sizeof(node)); //allocate memory
            copy->val = curr->val; //set value
            copy->next=NULL; //set next
            //if this is the first edge for this node
            if (copygraph[q]==NULL){
                copygraph[q]=copy;
            }else{
                tail->next=copy;
            }
                tail=copy;
            curr=curr->next;
        }
    }
}
int checkcorner(int i,int j,node *graph[]){
    node *a=graph[i];
    node *b=graph[j];
    if ((a==NULL)| | (b==NULL)){
    return(FALSE);
    }
    while (TRUE){
        if (( a == NULL && b == NULL )||( a==NULL )){
            //equal or a smaller => corner
            return(TRUE);
```

122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161

```
        }else if (( b == NULL )||(a->val < b->val)){
            //b smaller than a => not corner
            return(FALSE);
        }else if (b->val < a->val){
        //b larger than a => increment b
        if (b->next!=NULL){
            b=b->next;
        }else{
            return(FALSE);}
        }else{
            a = a->next;
            b = b->next;
        }
    }
}
int hascorner(node *graph[],int *c,int *ci){
    int i,j;
    for(i=0;i<nov;i++){
        for(j=0;j<nov;j++){
                if(checkcorner(i,j,graph)){
                    if(i!=j){
                        *C=i;
                        *ci=j;
                    return(1);
                }
                }
        }
    }
    *C=-1;
    *ci=-1;
    return(-1);
}
int getsize(node *graph[]){
    int q=0,size=0;
    node *curr=NULL;
    for(q=0;q<MAXNOV;q++){
        curr=graph [q];
```

```
        while(curr!=NULL) {
            size++;
            curr = curr->next ;
        }
    }
    return(size);
}
void relabel(node *graph[],int labeling[]){
    int i;
    node *temp[MAXNOV];
    node *curr,*prev;
    copygraph(graph,temp);
//remove reflexive edges
    for(i=0;i<nov;i++){
        curr=graph[i];
        if(curr!=NULL){
            if(curr->val==i){
                    graph[i]=curr->next;
                free(curr);
                curr=graph[i];
            prev=graph[i];
                curr=curr->next;
            }else{
                curr=curr->next;
            }
        }
        while(curr!=NULL){
            if(curr->val==i){
                prev->next=curr->next;
                free(curr);
                curr=prev->next;
            }else{
                prev=prev->next;
                curr=curr->next;
            }
        }
```

```
288 char ch;
289 char str [5];
290 char filenamein[20];
291 char filenameout[20];
292 int cw_ord[20];
293 int cw_inv[20];
294 node *cmovelist;
295 node *rmovelist;
296 int i=0,j=0,k=0;
297 int c=0,ci=0;
298 int t=0,q=0,graph_no=0,copwin_count=0;
299 int cmovecount=0;
300 int r_move=-1,c_move=-1;
301 int r_move_valid;
302 int F[MAXNOV] [MAXNOV];
303 int f[MAXNOV];
304 int temp_f [MAXNOV];
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
314 t=0;
315
316
```

    fgets(str,5,input);
    nov=atoi(str);
    printf("The number of vertices is %d\n",nov);
    graph_no++;
    //processing input
for(ch=getc(input);ch!=EOF;ch=getc(input)){
if(i==nov){ //end processing for this graph
copygraph(graph,pgraph);
printf("the graph is: ");
hascorner(graph,\&c,\&ci);
//check graph for corner
while(c>=0){
f[c]=ci;
cw_ord[t]=c;
t++;
deletenode(c,graph);
hascorner(graph,\&c,\&ci);
}
//get last remaining element of graph
for(q=0;q<MAXNOV;q++){
curr=graph [q];
if(curr!=NULL){
cw_ord[t]=q;
}
}
if(getsize(graph)==1){
printf("COPWIN\n");
copwin_count++;
}else{
printf("NOTCOPWIN\n");
}
deletegraph(graph);
i=0;
j=0;
//increment graph \# counter
graph_no++;
//grab next character which is a newline

```
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        fgets(str,5,input);
        }else if (ch=='\n'){
            i++;
            j=0;
        }else if ((ch=='1')||(i==j)){
            //add edge i,j
            curr = (node *)malloc(sizeof(node));
            curr->val = j;
            curr->next=NULL;
            //if this is the first edge for this node
            if (graph[i]==NULL){
                graph[i]=curr;
            }else{
                tail->next=curr;
            }
            tail=curr;
            //increment j
            j++;
        }else if (ch=='0'){
            j++;
        }
    }
    //RESET variables
i=0;
j=0;
c=0;
//invert cw_ord
for(i=0;i<nov;i++){
cw_inv[cw_ord[i]]=i;
}
node *prev;
copygraph (pgraph,temp);
//print initial graph
printf("\nORIGINAL ");
printgraph(pgraph,0);
printf("\n");

```

413
414 //relabel graph with cw_ord
415 for(i=0;i<nov;i++)\{
416 //delete node from the pgraph
417 curr=pgraph[i];
418 prev=pgraph[i];
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
        while(curr!=NULL) \{
                curr = curr->next;
                free(prev);
                prev=curr;
        \}
        //assign new node lists
        pgraph[i]=temp[cw_ord[i]];
        curr=pgraph[i];
        //change labels
        while(curr!=NULL)\{
            curr->val=cw_inv[curr->val];
            curr=curr->next;
        \}
    \}
//make temporary \(f\) for computing \(f\) reordering
    for (i=0;i<nov;i++) \{
        temp_f[i]=f[i];
    \}
//print relabeled graph
    printf("\nRELABELED ");
    printgraph (pgraph, 0) ;
    printf("\n");
//FIND \(F\) and \(f\)
//reassign \(f[]\)
    for (i=0;i<nov;i++) \{
        f[cw_inv[i]]=cw_inv[temp_f[i]];
    \}
//assign \(F[0][]=F_{-} 1\)
```

    for(i=0;i<nov;i++){
        for(j=0;j<nov;j++){
            F[i][j]=j;
        }
    }
    //assigning F[1][] to F[nov][]
for(i=1;i<nov;i++){
for(j=i;j<nov;j++){
F[j][i-1]=f[i-1];
}
}
for(i=1;i<nov;i++){
for(j=0;j<nov;j++){
if (F[i][j]<i){
for(t=i;t<nov;t++){
F[t][j]=f[F[t][j]];
}
}
}
}
/* game simulation*/
//pick the start vertex
k=nov-1;
c_move=k;
k--;
printf("the cop is starting on vertex %d\nwhich vertex do
you want to start on?:\n",c_move);
scanf("%d",\&r_move);
//get initial robber position
while((r_move<0)||(r_move>=nov)||r_move==c_move){
printf("That is not a valid move, please select another
vertex\n");
scanf("%d",\&r_move);
}
printf("you are moving to vertex: %d\n",r_move);

```
```

while(TRUE){
//check possible cop moves
cmovelist=pgraph[c_move];
curr=cmovelist;
cmovecount=0;
printf("the vertices available to the cop are:\n");
while(curr!=NULL){
printf("%d\n",curr->val);
if(curr->val==r_move){
F[k][r_move]=r_move;
}
cmovecount++;
curr=curr->next;
}
scanf("");
//compute cop move
c_move=F[k][r_move];
k--;
printf("COP MOVES TO:%d\n",c_move);
//check win condition
if(c_move==r_move){
printf("the cop wins!\n");
break;
}
//check possible robber moves
rmovelist=pgraph[r_move];
curr=rmovelist;
printf("the vertices available to you the robber are:\n");
while(curr!=NULL){
printf("%d\n",curr->val);
curr=curr->next;
}
printf("where do you want to move?\n");
scanf("%d",\&r_move);

```
```

    curr=rmovelist;
    r_move_valid=FALSE;
    while(curr!=NULL) {
        if(curr->val==r_move){
            r_move_valid=TRUE;
        }
        curr=curr->next;
    }
    while(!r_move_valid){
        printf("That is not a valid move, please select another
            vertex\n");
        scanf("%d",&r_move);
        curr=rmovelist;
        //check that the robber move is in valid
        while(curr!=NULL){
            if(curr->val==r_move){
                r_move_valid=TRUE;
            }
            curr=curr->next;
        }
        }
        printf("you are moving to vertex: %d\n",r_move);
    printf("press ctrl-c to quit\n");
    while(TRUE) {}
    return(0);
    ```
    \}
\}

\section*{A.3. 2-cop-win Checker}
```

/*
2-cop-win Checker
Liam Baird
liam.baird@gmail.com
Input: a list of graphs in adjacency matrix format delimited
by the number of nodes in each graph.
Output: a list of statements that state whether each graph in
the list has c(G)<=2 or not.
*/
8
\#include <stdlib.h>
\#include <time.h>
\#include <stdio.h>
\#include <string.h>
\#define MAXNOV 10
\#define TRUE 1
\#define FALSE 0
int nov=0;
//defines a node
struct node {
int val1;
int val2;
struct node * next;
};
typedef struct node node;
void initialize(node *graph[]){
int k;
for(k=0;k<MAXNOV;k++) {
graph[k] = NULL;
}
}
void initializep(node *pgraph[MAXNOV] [MAXNOV]){
int j,k;
for(k=0;k<MAXNOV;k++){
for(j=0;j<MAXNOV;j++){
pgraph [k][j] = NULL;

```
```

        }
    }
    }
void initializeeff(node *eff[MAXNOV] [MAXNOV]){
int i,j;
for(i=0;i<MAXNOV;i++){
for(j=0;j<MAXNOV;j++){
eff[i][j] = NULL;
}
}
}
void printgraph(node *graph[],int graph_no){
int q;
node *curr=NULL;
if(graph_no==0){
printf("GRAPH:\n");
}else{
printf("GRAPH \#%d:\n",graph_no);
}
for(q=0;q<MAXNOV;q++){
curr=graph [q];
while(curr!=NULL) {
if(curr->val1!=q){
printf("(%d,%d)\n",q,curr->val1);
}
curr = curr->next ;
}
}
}
void printpgraph(node *graph[MAXNOV] [MAXNOV],int graph_no){
int i=0,j=0;
node *curr=NULL;
printf("P.GRAPH \#%d:\n",graph_no);
for(i=0;i<MAXNOV;i++){
for(j=0;j<MAXNOV;j++){
curr=graph[i][j];

```
```

                while(curr!=NULL) {
                        if((curr->val1!=i)||(curr->val2!=j)){
                        printf("(%d,%d),(%d,%d)\n",i,j,curr->val1,curr->
                        val2);
            }
                    curr = curr->next ;
                }
        }
    }
    }
void printeff(node *eff[MAXNOV] [MAXNOV],int nov){
int i=0,j=0;
node *curr=NULL;
printf("EFF:\n");
for(i=0;i<nov;i++){
for(j=0;j<nov;j++){
curr=eff[i][j];
printf("F([%d,%d]): ",i,j);
while(curr!=NULL){
printf("%d ",curr->val1);
curr = curr->next ;
}
printf("\n");
}
}
}
void printadj(node *adj[MAXNOV] [MAXNOV],int nov){
int i=0,j=0;
node *curr=NULL;
printf("ADJ:\n");
for(i=0;i<nov;i++){
for(j=0;j<nov;j++){
curr=adj[i][j];
printf("F([%d,%d]): ",i,j);
while(curr!=NULL){
printf("%d ",curr->val1);
curr = curr->next ;
}
printf("\n");

```
```
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126 void deletegraph(node *graph[]){
127 int q=0;
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}
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166 int i=0,j=0;
167 node *curr=NULL;
168 node *prev=NULL;
193 prev=graph[i];
198 prev=curr;
void deleteeff(node *graph[MAXNOV][MAXNOV]){
for(i=0;i<MAXNOV;i++){
for(j=0;j<MAXNOV;j++){
curr=graph[i][j];
prev=graph[i][j];
while(curr!=NULL){
curr = curr->next;
free(prev);
prev=curr;
}

```
```

187 void deletenode(int i,node *graph[]){

```
187 void deletenode(int i,node *graph[]){
188 int q=0;
189 node *curr=NULL;
189 node *curr=NULL;
190 node *prev=NULL;
190 node *prev=NULL;
```

                graph[i][j] = NULL;
    ```
                graph[i][j] = NULL;
        }
        }
}
}
    curr=graph[i];
    curr=graph[i];
    while(curr!=NULL) {
    while(curr!=NULL) {
        curr = curr->next;
        curr = curr->next;
        free(prev);
        free(prev);
    }
    }
    graph[i] = NULL;
    graph[i] = NULL;
    for(q=0;q<MAXNOV;q++){
```

    for(q=0;q<MAXNOV;q++){
    ```
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        curr=graph [q] ;
        prev=graph [q];
        if (curr!=NULL) \{
            if (curr->val1==i) \{
            graph [q] =curr->next;
            free(curr);
            curr=graph [q];
            prev=graph [q] ;
            curr=curr->next;
            \}
            else\{
            curr=curr->next;
            //prev=prev->next;
            \}
        \}
        while(curr!=NULL) \{
        if (curr->val1==i) \{
        prev->next=curr->next;
        free(curr);
        curr=prev->next;
        \}
        else
        \{
        prev=prev->next;
        curr=curr->next;
        \}
        \}
    \}
\}
int isadj(int i, int j, node *graph[])\{
//determine whether or not \(i\) and \(j\) are adjacent in graph
    node *curr=NULL;
    curr=graph[i];
    while(curr!=NULL) \{
        if (curr->val1==j) \{
```

                return(TRUE);
        }
        curr=curr->next;
    }
    return(FALSE);
    }
int iseq(int i, int j){
if (i==j){
return(TRUE);
}
return(FALSE);
}
void makeeff(node *eff[MAXNOV] [MAXNOV], node *adj [MAXNOV][
MAXNOV],int nov){
int i=0,j=0,k=0,v=0;
node *curr=NULL;
node *prev=NULL;
node *list=NULL;
for(i=0;i<nov;i++){
for(j=0;j<nov;j++){
prev=eff[i][j];
list=adj[i][j];
for(k=0;k<nov;k++){
if(list!=NULL){
v=list->val1;
}else{
v=MAXNOV+10;
}
if(k!=v){
//add node with value k
curr=(node *)malloc(sizeof(node));
curr->val1=k;
curr->val2=-1;
curr->next=NULL;

```
```

                if (eff[i][j]==NULL){
                        eff[i][j]=curr;
                }else{
                    prev->next=curr;
                }
                prev=curr;
            }else{
                        list=list->next;
            }
            }
        }
    }
    }
void makeadjacency(node *adj [MAXNOV] [MAXNOV], node *graph[
MAXNOV],int nov){
int i=0,j=0,va=0,vb=0;
node *curr=NULL;
node *prev=NULL;
node *list_a=NULL;
node *list_b=NULL;
for(i=0;i<nov;i++){
for(j=0;j<nov;j++){
prev=adj[i][j];
list_a=graph[i];
list_b=graph[j];
while((list_a!=NULL)||(list_b!=NULL)){
if(list_a!=NULL){
va=list_a->val1;
}else{
va=MAXNOV+10;
}
if(list_b!=NULL){
vb=list_b->val1;
}else{
vb=MAXNOV+10;
}
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            curr=(node *)malloc(sizeof(node));
            curr->next=NULL;
            if(va<vb){
                    curr->val1=va;
                    list_a=list_a->next;
            } else if(vb<va){
                    curr->val1=vb;
                    list_b=list_b->next;
            } else if(va==vb){
                    curr->val1=va;
                    list_a=list_a->next;
                    list_b=list_b->next;
            }
            if (adj[i][j]==NULL){
                    adj[i][j]=curr;
            }else{
                        prev->next=curr;
            }
            prev=curr;
            }
        }
    }
    }
int intersect(node *adj[MAXNOV] [MAXNOV],node *eff[MAXNOV][
MAXNOV],int i,int j, int k, int l){
node *curr_a=adj[i][j];
node *curr_f=eff[k][l];
node *prev_f=NULL;
node *curr=NULL;
node *prev=NULL;
int changed=FALSE;
int va=0,vf=0;
eff[k][l]=NULL;
prev_f=curr_f;
while(curr_f!=NULL){
if(curr_a!=NULL){

```
int main(void) \{
    node *curr=NULL, *tail=NULL,*curr_a=NULL,*tail_a=NULL,*
        tail_p=NULL;
    node *graph [MAXNOV];
    node *(eff [MAXNOV] [MAXNOV]);
    node \(*(\operatorname{adj}[M A X N O V][M A X N O V]) ;\)
    node *(pgraph [MAXNOV] [MAXNOV]);
    char ch;
```

    char filenamein[20];
    char filenameout[20];
    int i=0,j=0,k,c=0,q,graph_no=0,twocopwin_count=0;
    int x=0,y=0,u=0,v=0,u1=0,u2=0,v1=0,v2=0;
    int flag1=FALSE,flag2=FALSE,changed=TRUE,twocopwin=FALSE;
    //initialize data structures;
initialize(graph);
initializep(pgraph);
initializeeff(eff);
initializeeff(adj);
//prompt for filename
printf("please enter graph filename\n");
scanf("%19s",filenamein);
strcpy(filenameout,filenamein);
/lopen file
FILE *input=fopen(strcat(filenamein,".txt"),"r");
FILE *output=fopen(strcat(filenameout,"r.txt"),"w");
//read first character, should be a \# (need to fix, input
could be "10" ie not a single char
fgets(str,5,input);
nov=atoi(str);
graph_no++;
//loop through characters
for(ch=getc(input); ch!=EOF;ch=getc(input)){
if(i==nov){
//make product graph
for(x=0;x<nov;x++){
for(y=0;y<nov;y++){
for(u=0;u<nov;u++){
for(v=0;v<nov;v++){
if((iseq(x,u)\&\&iseq(y,v))||(isadj (x,u,graph)\&\&
iseq(y,v))||(iseq(x,u)\&\&isadj(y,v,graph))||(
isadj(x,u,graph)\&\&isadj(y,v,graph))){
curr = (node *)malloc(sizeof(node));
curr->val1 = u;
curr->val2 = v;
curr->next=NULL;

```
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                //add the node
                    if (pgraph[x][y]==NULL){
                    pgraph[x][y]=curr;
                }else{
                        tail_p->next=curr;
                }
                tail_p=curr;
            }
                }
            }
        }
    }
    makeadjacency(adj,graph,nov);
makeeff(eff,adj,nov);
printadj(adj,nov);
printeff(eff,nov);
changed=TRUE;
while(changed==TRUE){
//LOOP THROUGH vertices u1 v1
for(u1=0;u1<nov;u1++){
for(u2=0;u2<nov;u2++){
curr=pgraph[u1][u2];
if(curr!=NULL){
//pick out the vertex this is connected to
v1=curr->val1;
v2=curr->val2;
//find intersection of eff[u1][u2] and adj[v1][v2]
flag1=intersect(adj,eff,u1,u2,v1,v2);
//find intersection of eff[v1][v2] and adj[u1][u2]
flag2=intersect(adj,eff,v1,v2,u1,u2);
//CHECK FOR EMPTY EFF
if((eff[u1][u2]==NULL)| |(eff[u1][u2]==NULL)){
flag1=FALSE;
flag2=FALSE;
changed=FALSE;
}
//check for flags

```
```

                if((flag1==TRUE)||(flag2==TRUE)){
                        changed=TRUE;
            }
                }
        }
    }
    printeff(eff,nov);
    }
twocopwin=FALSE;
for(x=0;x<nov;x++){
for(y=0;y<nov;y++){
if(eff[x][y]==NULL){
twocopwin=TRUE;
}
}
}
if(twocopwin==TRUE){
twocopwin_count++;
printf("GRAPH \#%d is 2cw\n",graph_no);
}else{
printf("GRAPH \#%d is NOT 2cw\n",graph_no);
}
deleteeff(eff);
deletegraph(graph);
deletepgraph(pgraph);
deleteeff(adj);
i=0;
j=0;
//increment graph \# counter
graph_no++;
fgets(str,5,input);
}else if (ch=='\n'){
i++;
j=0;
}else if ((ch=='1')||(i==j)){
//add edge i,j
curr = (node *)malloc(sizeof(node)); //allocate memory
curr->val1 = j; //set val1ue
curr->next=NULL; //set next

```

534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
        //if this is the first edge for this node
        if (graph[i]==NULL) \{
            graph[i]=curr;
        \}else\{
            tail->next=curr;
        \}
        tail=curr;
        j++;
        \}else if (ch=='0')\{
        j++;
        \}
    \}
    printf("\%d of \%d graphs of order \%d are <=2 copwin\n",
        twocopwin_count, graph_no-1,nov);
    fprintf(output, "\% of \%d graphs of order \%d are copwin\n",
        twocopwin_count, graph_no-1,nov);
    return(0);
\}
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