# 1 Sparsity

Perfect sparsity characterizes infinite trees.

### 1.1 Girth

For a finite graph, sparsity is closely related to girth. Girth equals the minimum v for which the graph contains a (v, v)-configuration, i.e. a subgraph with v vertices et v edges.

**Question**. How large can the girth of an *n*-vertex *d*-regular graph be ? Denote this number by g(d, n).

Known:

$$\frac{4}{3}\frac{\log n}{\log(d-1)} \le g(d,n) \le 2\frac{\log n}{\log(d-1)}.$$

The upper bound is easy. The lower bound is due to Lubotzky-Philipps-Sarnak. An improvement from  $\frac{4}{3}$  to  $\frac{?}{7}$  was announced in 2010 but drawn back. I explain a weaker lower bound.

**Proposition 1** For all d, g(d, n) tends to infinity with n.

**Proof.** Start with a girth t d-regular graph, double it. For each edge, decide to leave it un changed in both copies, or to open both copies and join edges. Let X denote the random variable "number of t-cycles of new graph". We estimate the expectation  $\mathbb{E}(X)$ . There are only a few configurations where the new graph has more t-cycles. Remove them from the probability space. The resulting expectation is < 1, so there are configurations with girth > t.

### 1.2 Higher dimensional girth

What should be a higher dimensional generalization of girth? There are several such, depending on context.

**Question**. How large can the girth be for a 1-Steiner triple system ?

For each new face, a new vertex comes in. This suggests

**Definition 2** The girth of a 2-dimensional simplicial complex is the smallest v such that X contains a (v, v-2)-configuration, i.e. un subcomplex with v vertices and v-2 faces.

Conjecture (Erdös, early 70's). There exist Steiner triple systems with arbitrarily high girth.

Known: there are infinitely many Steiner triple systems with girth 6. There are exactly 2 Steiner triple systems with girth 7. That's all. Hard.

Steiner triple systems are special cases of latin squares (view triples as coordinates of 1 entries in a  $3 \times 3 \times 3$  array).

Question. What does a random latin square look like ?

On latin squares, there is a natural transitive Markov chain. Its mixing properties are unknown.

Easy fact: For all g, there exists a constant  $c_g$  and 2-dimensional complexes with  $\geq c_g n^2$  faces and girth  $\geq 6$ . Probabilistic method. However  $c_g$  tends to 0.

**Question**. Does there exist an absolute constant  $C^*$  and 2-dimensional complexes with  $\geq c^* n^2$  faces and arbitrarily large girth ?

Erdös' conjecture would imply that  $c^* = \frac{1}{6}$  works.

**Theorem 3 (Ruzsa-Szemeredi)** If a simplicial 2-complex has no (6,3)-configuration, then its size is  $o(n^2)$ .

This uses the same technology as Szemeredi's theorem on arithmetic progressions.

## 2 Random complexes

#### 2.1 Random regular graphs

Erdös and Renyi's G(n, p) model does not provide regular graphs. In the 1980's, a new model, the configuration model, was proposed.

**Definition 4** Start with n vertices and d-semi-edges per vertex. Then pick at random a pairing between semi-edges. If loops or double edged are formed, discard.

The last step has little impact since such accidents occur with exponentially small probability.

### 2.2 Random graphs according to Erdös and Renyi

One can view the model sequentially. Add edges one by one.

Early in the process, connected components are small (logarithmic size) and have a simple shape: either a tree or a tree plus an edge. The probability that G is a forest is positive and < 1.

Around step  $\frac{n}{2}$ , a major change takes place: a giant (linear size) component shows up. The probability that G is a forest tends to 0.

Around step  $\frac{n \log n}{2}$ , G becomes connected. Up to that time, there existed isolated vertices.

All these features are 0-dimensional and suggest higher dimensional generalizations.

## 2.3 Random simplicial complexes

**Definition 5 (Linial-Meshulam)**  $X_d(n,p)$  has a full d-1-skeleton and every d-face is added independently with probability p.

**Theorem 6 (Linial-Meshulam)** The threshold for non vanishing of  $H_d(X, \mathbb{Z})$  is  $p = \frac{d \log n}{n}$ .