A GRAPHON COUNTER EXAMPLE

SVANTE JANSON

Abstract. We give an example of a graphon such that there is no equivalent graphon with a degree function that is (weakly) increasing.

1. Introduction

A central fact in the theory of graph limits (see e.g. the book by Lovász [6]) is that each graph limit can be represented by a graphon, but this representation is not unique. We say that two graphons are *equivalent* if they define the same graph limit; thus there is a bijection between graph limits and equivalence classes of graphons.

Recall that graphons are symmetric measurable functions $W : \Omega \times \Omega \to [0,1]$, where $\Omega = (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mu)$ is a probability space. We may always choose Ω to be $[0,1]$ with Lebesgue measure, in the sense that any graphon is equivalent to a graphon defined on $[0,1]$, but it is often advantageous to use graphons defined on other probability spaces Ω too.

The characterization of equivalence between graphons is known to be complicated; it includes a.e. equality and taking the pull-back by a measure preserving map (see below for definitions), but is not limited to this. See e.g. [7], [1], [4], [2] and [5].

Given a graph limit, it would be desirable to somehow define a canonical graphon representing it (at least up to a.e. equality); in other words, to define a canonical choice of a graphon in the corresponding equivalence class. In some special cases, this can be done in a natural way. For example, see [3], a graph limit that is the limit of a sequence of threshold graphs can always be represented by a graphon $W(x,y)$ on $[0,1]$ that only takes values in $\{0,1\}$, and furthermore is increasing in each coordinate separately (we say that a function $f(x)$ is increasing if $f(x) \leqslant f(y)$ when $x \leqslant y$); moreover, two such graphons are equivalent if and only if they are a.e. equal. There is thus a canonical graphon representing each threshold graph limit.

Similarly, if a graphon $W(x,y)$ defined on $[0,1]$ has a degree function

$$\mathfrak{D}(x) = \mathfrak{D}_W(x) := \int_0^1 W(x,y)\,\mathrm{d}y \tag{1.1}$$

that is a strictly increasing function $[0,1] \to [0,1]$, then it not difficult to show that any equivalent graphon that also has an increasing degree function is a.e. equal to W. (Use (2.5) below. We omit the details.) Hence, a graphon with a strictly increasing degree function can be regarded as a canonical choice in its equivalence class.

Date: 6 September, 2019.

Partly supported by the Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation.

Of course, not every graphon is equivalent to such a graphon; for example not a graphon with a constant degree function. Nevertheless, this leads to the following interesting question. We repeat that we use 'increasing' in the weak sense (also known as 'weakly increasing'): f is increasing if $f(x) \leqslant f(y)$ when $x \leqslant y$;

Problem. *Given any graphon W, does there exist an equivalent graphon on $[0,1]$ with an increasing degree function* (1.1)*?*

The purpose of this note is to show that this is *not* the case.

Theorem 1. *There exists a graphon on $[0,1]$ such that there is no equivalent graphon on $[0,1]$ with a (weakly) increasing degree function.*

We prove this theorem by giving a simple explicit example in (2.1). The example is similar to, and inspired by, standard examples such as [6, Example 7.11] showing that two equivalent graphons are not necessarily pull-backs of each other.

Remark 2. The analogue for finite graphs of the problem above for graphons is the trivial fact that the vertices of a graph can be ordered with (weakly) increasing vertex degrees. Note that there will always be ties, so even for a finite graph, this does not define a unique canonical labelling.

1.1. **Some notation.** $[0,1]$ will, as above, be regarded as a probability space equipped with the Lebesgue measure and the Lebesque σ-field. (We might also use the Borel σ-field. For the present paper, this makes no difference; for other purposes, the choice of σ-field may have some importance.)

Let $(\Omega_1, \mathcal{F}_1, \mu_1)$ and $(\Omega_2, \mathcal{F}_2, \mu_2)$ be two probability spaces. A function $\varphi : \Omega_1 \to \Omega_2$ is *measure preserving* if $\mu_1(\varphi^{-1}(A)) = \mu_2(A)$ for any measurable $A \subseteq \Omega_2$. If W is a graphon on Ω_2 and $\varphi : \Omega_1 \to \Omega_2$ is measure preserving, then the *pull-back* W^φ is the graphon $W^\varphi(x,y) := W\bigl(\varphi(x), \varphi(y)\bigr)$ defined on Ω_1. As mentioned above, a pull-back W^φ is always equivalent to W.

2. The example

Our example is the graphon

$$W(x,y) := \begin{cases} 4xy, & x, y \in (0, \frac{1}{2}), \\ 1/2, & x + y > 3/2, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

Note that the degree function is given by

$$\mathfrak{D}(x) := \int_0^1 W(x,y)\,\mathrm{d}y = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}x, & x \in (0, \frac{1}{2}), \\ \frac{1}{2}(x - \frac{1}{2}), & x \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1). \end{cases} \tag{2.2}$$

Suppose that W is equivalent to a graphon W_1 on $[0,1]$ that has an increasing degree function $\mathfrak{D}_1(x) := \int_0^1 W_1(x,y)\,\mathrm{d}y$; we will show that this leads to a contradiction.

The equivalence $W \cong W_1$ implies by [1, Corollary 2.7], see also [6, Corollary 10.35] and [5, Theorem 8.6], that there exist a probability space (Ω, μ)

and two measure preserving maps $\varphi,\psi:\Omega\to[0,1]$ such that $W^\varphi=W_1^\psi$ a.e., i.e.,

$$W\big(\varphi(x),\varphi(y)\big)=W_1\big(\psi(x),\psi(y)\big),\qquad \text{a.e. on } \Omega^2. \tag{2.3}$$

(The probability space Ω,μ) can be taken as $[0,1]$ with Lebesgue measure, but we have no need for this. Instead, we prefer to use the notation Ω and μ to distinguish between this space and $[0,1]$, which hopefully will make the proof easier to follow.)

Since φ and ψ are measure preserving, we have for every Borel measurable $f\geqslant 0$ on $[0,1]$,

$$\int_0^1 f(x)\,\mathrm{d}x=\int_\Omega f(\varphi(x))\,\mathrm{d}\mu(x)=\int_\Omega f(\psi(x))\,\mathrm{d}\mu(x). \tag{2.4}$$

We use this repeatedly below.

In particular, (2.3) and (2.4) imply that for a.e. $x\in\Omega$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{D}\big(\varphi(x)\big)&=\int_0^1 W\big(\varphi(x),y\big)\,\mathrm{d}y=\int_\Omega W\big(\varphi(x),\varphi(y)\big)\,\mathrm{d}\mu(y)\\&=\int_\Omega W_1\big(\psi(x),\psi(y)\big)\,\mathrm{d}\mu(y)=\int_0^1 W_1\big(\psi(x),y\big)\,\mathrm{d}y=\mathfrak{D}_1\big(\psi(x)\big).\end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

Hence, for every real $r\in(0,\frac14]$, using (2.2),

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda\big\{x\in[0,1]:\mathfrak{D}_1(x)\leqslant r\big\}&=\mu\big\{x\in\Omega:\mathfrak{D}_1(\psi(x))\leqslant r\big\}\\&=\mu\big\{x\in\Omega:\mathfrak{D}(\varphi(x))\leqslant r\big\}=\lambda\big\{x\in[0,1]:\mathfrak{D}(x)\leqslant r\big\}=4r.\end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

Since we have assumed that $\mathfrak{D}_1$ is increasing, this implies

$$\mathfrak{D}_1(x)=x/4,\qquad x\in(0,1). \tag{2.7}$$

Define

$$h(x):=\lambda\big\{y:W(x,y)\notin\{0,\tfrac12\}\big\}=\begin{cases}\frac12, & x\in(0,\frac12),\\ 0, & x\in(\frac12,1),\end{cases} \tag{2.8}$$

and, similarly,

$$h_1(x):=\lambda\big\{y:W_1(x,y)\notin\{0,\tfrac12\}\big\}. \tag{2.9}$$

Then (2.3) implies, similarly to (2.5), for a.e. $x\in\Omega$,

$$\begin{aligned}h(\varphi(x))&=\lambda\big\{y:W(\varphi(x),y)\notin\{0,\tfrac12\}\big\}\\&=\mu\big\{y:W(\varphi(x),\varphi(y))\notin\{0,\tfrac12\}\big\}\\&=\mu\big\{y:W_1(\psi(x),\psi(y))\notin\{0,\tfrac12\}\big\}\\&=\lambda\big\{y:W_1(\psi(x),y)\notin\{0,\tfrac12\}\big\}=h_1(\psi(x)).\end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

This will yield our contradiction. We first calculate h_1.

If $0<a<b<1$, then, using (2.7), (2.4), (2.10), (2.5), and (2.4) again,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_a^b h_1(x)\,\mathrm{d}x&=\int_0^1 h_1(x)\mathbf{1}\Big\{\frac a4<\mathfrak{D}_1(x)<\frac b4\Big\}\,\mathrm{d}x\\&=\int_\Omega h_1(\psi(x))\mathbf{1}\Big\{\frac a4<\mathfrak{D}_1(\psi(x))<\frac b4\Big\}\,\mathrm{d}\mu(x)\end{aligned}$$

$$= \int_\Omega h(\varphi(x))\mathbf{1}\Big\{\frac{a}{4} < \mathfrak{D}(\varphi(x)) < \frac{b}{4}\Big\}\,\mathrm{d}\mu(x)$$
$$= \int_0^1 h(x)\mathbf{1}\Big\{\frac{a}{4} < \mathfrak{D}(x) < \frac{b}{4}\Big\}\,\mathrm{d}x. \tag{2.11}$$

However, by (2.8) and (2.2),

$$\int_0^1 h(x)\mathbf{1}\Big\{\frac{a}{4} < \mathfrak{D}(x) < \frac{b}{4}\Big\}\,\mathrm{d}x = \frac{1}{2}\int_0^{1/2} \mathbf{1}\Big\{\frac{a}{4} < \mathfrak{D}(x) < \frac{b}{4}\Big\}\,\mathrm{d}x$$
$$= \frac{1}{2}\lambda\Big(\frac{a}{2},\frac{b}{2}\Big) = \frac{b-a}{4}. \tag{2.12}$$

Consequently, (2.11) and (2.12) show that for every $a \in (0,1)$ and $\varepsilon \in (0,1-a)$,

$$\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\int_a^{a+\varepsilon} h_1(x)\,\mathrm{d}x = \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\cdot\frac{\varepsilon}{4} = \frac{1}{4}. \tag{2.13}$$

However, by the Lebesgue differentiation theorem, as $\varepsilon \to 0$, this converges a.e. to $h_1(x)$. Hence,

$$h_1(x) = \frac{1}{4} \qquad \text{a.e. } x \in [0,1]. \tag{2.14}$$

We may now complete the proof. It follows from (2.14) that $h_1(\psi(x)) = \frac{1}{4}$ a.e. on Ω, while (2.8) implies that $h(x) \neq \frac{1}{4}$ a.e. on $[0,1]$, and thus $h(\varphi(x)) \neq \frac{1}{4}$ a.e. on Ω. Thus (2.10) yields a contradiction.

Consequently, there is no graphon W_1 equivalent to W with increasing degree function. □

References

[1] Béla Bollobás & Oliver Riordan: Metrics for sparse graphs. *Surveys in Combinatorics 2009*, 211–287, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser. 365, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2009.

[2] Christian Borgs, Jennifer Chayes & László Lovász: Moments of two-variable functions and the uniqueness of graph limits. *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 19 (2010), no. 6, 1597–1619.

[3] Persi Diaconis, Susan Holmes & Svante Janson: Threshold graph limits and random threshold graphs. *Internet Mathematics* **5** (2008), no. 3, 267–318.

[4] Persi Diaconis & Svante Janson: Graph limits and exchangeable random graphs. *Rend. Mat. Appl. (7)* **28** (2008), no. 1, 33–61.

[5] Svante Janson: Graphons, cut norm and distance, couplings and rearrangements. *NYJM Monographs* **4**, 2013.

[6] László Lovász: *Large Networks and Graph Limits*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2012.

[7] László Lovász and Balázs Szegedy: Limits of dense graph sequences. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* **96** (2006), no. 6, 933–957.

Department of Mathematics, Uppsala University, PO Box 480, SE-751 06 Uppsala, Sweden

Email address: `svante.janson@math.uu.se`

URL: `http://www.math.uu.se/svante-janson`