



A Conjecture Concerning a Limit of Non-Cayley Graphs

REINHARD DIESTEL

Department of Mathematics, University of Hamburg, Bundesstr. 55, 20146 Hamburg, Germany

IMRE LEADER

Department of Mathematics, University College London, Gower St., London WC1E 6BT, UK

Received February 9, 2000; Revised August 8, 2000

Abstract. Our aim in this note is to present a transitive graph that we conjecture is not quasi-isometric to any Cayley graph. No such graph is currently known. Our graph arises both as an abstract limit in a suitable space of graphs and in a concrete way as a subset of a product of trees.

Keywords: Cayley graph, transitive, quasi-isometry, infinite

1. Introduction

Woess [7] asked the following beautiful and natural question: does every transitive graph ‘look like’ a Cayley graph? More precisely, is every connected locally finite vertex-transitive graph quasi-isometric to some Cayley graph?

Let us recall that graphs G and H are said to be *quasi-isometric* if there exist Lipschitz mappings $\theta : V(G) \rightarrow V(H)$ and $\phi : V(H) \rightarrow V(G)$ such that $\theta \circ \phi$ and $\phi \circ \theta$ are bounded. Equivalently, G and H are quasi-isometric if there exists a *quasi-isometry* from G to H , a function $\theta : V(G) \rightarrow V(H)$ for which there are constants $C, D \geq 1$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}d(\theta x, \theta y) &\leq C d(x, y) \quad \text{for all } x, y \in G, \\d(\theta x, \theta y) &\geq \frac{1}{C} d(x, y) \quad \text{for all } x, y \in G \text{ with } d(x, y) \geq D, \\d(\theta G, y) &\leq D \quad \text{for all } y \in H,\end{aligned}$$

where as usual d denotes the graph distance (in G or H) and $d(A, y) = \min\{d(x, y) : x \in A\}$.

Thus quasi-isometry is the natural notion of ‘looks the same as, from far away.’ Many properties of a graph are preserved under quasi-isometry—for example, the space of ends is preserved. As another example, if G and H are transitive graphs that are quasi-isometric then they have the same type of growth: polynomial or sub-exponential or exponential. See [2] for background on quasi-isometry.

Let us also recall that a *Cayley graph* is a graph arising in the following way. Let G be a group, with a finite generating set S closed under inversion (i.e. $a \in S$ implies $a^{-1} \in S$).

Then the (left) Cayley graph of G with respect to S has vertex-set G , with x joined to y if for some $a \in S$ we have $x = ay$. Note that G acts freely (i.e. with no non-identity element having a fixed point) and transitively on this graph. In fact, Cayley graphs are characterised by this property: if G is any locally finite connected graph whose automorphism group $\text{Aut } G$ has a subgroup that acts transitively and freely on G then G is easily seen to be isomorphic to a Cayley graph of that subgroup. See [3] for more background on Cayley graphs. Let us also mention here that, up to quasi-isometry, the Cayley graph of a (finitely-generated) group does not depend on which generating set one chooses.

Several transitive graphs are known that are not (isomorphic to) Cayley graphs (see [4, 5]), but each of these is quasi-isometric to a Cayley graph. Indeed, the answer to Woess' question is known to be in the affirmative for several classes of graphs, including those of polynomial growth [6].

Our aim in this note is to present a graph that we believe is a counterexample to Woess' question. We construct a sequence of graphs that seem to look less and less like Cayley graphs. It turns out that this sequence has a limit when viewed in a certain natural space of graphs. We give this construction in Section 2.

Fortunately, this limit graph can also be expressed 'concretely,' as a certain subset of a product of two trees. We do this in Section 3. We hope that this should make the conjecture that this graph is not quasi-isometric to a Cayley graph more susceptible to proof.

2. A limit of non-Cayley graphs

Our starting point is the following example of Thomassen and Watkins [5] of a non-Cayley graph. Let H be the graph obtained from a T_5 (the infinite 5-regular tree) by replacing each vertex by a $K_{2,3}$ (the complete bipartite graph with vertex classes of size 2 and 3) in the following way. Replace each vertex of T_5 by a disjoint copy of $K_{2,3}$, and then, for each edge uv of the T_5 , identify a vertex of the $K_{2,3}$ corresponding to u with a vertex of the $K_{2,3}$ corresponding to v , in such a way that no point in any $K_{2,3}$ is identified more than once, and a vertex in a class of size 2 is always identified with a vertex in a class of size 3 and vice versa (see figure 1). Then H is certainly transitive (of degree 5); why is it not a Cayley graph?

Suppose there is a subgroup S of $\text{Aut } H$ that acts freely and transitively on H , and let K be one of the $K_{2,3}$ s making up H —say K has vertex classes $\{x_1, x_2\}$ and $\{y_1, y_2, y_3\}$. Any automorphism that sends an element of $\{y_1, y_2, y_3\}$ back into $\{y_1, y_2, y_3\}$ must fix K —indeed, it must map the set $\{x_1, x_2\}$ to itself, as $\{x_1, x_2\}$ is the only pair of two vertices that has 3 common neighbours and has a common neighbour in the set $\{y_1, y_2, y_3\}$. Hence the $\theta \in S$ sending y_1 to y_2 must swap x_1 and x_2 , as must the $\theta' \in S$ sending y_1 to y_3 . But then $\theta'\theta^{-1}$ sends y_2 to y_3 and fixes x_1 , a contradiction.

Of course, H is still quasi-isometric to T_5 (which is the Cayley graph of the free group with 5 generators, each of order 2): we just have to map each $K_{2,3}$ back to the vertex of T_5 from which it was expanded. Thus the $K_{2,3}$ s are too local to affect quasi-isometry: we would like to introduce something like 'larger $K_{2,3}$ s' to have the same effect more globally. The following idea shows that these can indeed be obtained.




Figure 1. Constructing the non-Cayley graph H from T_5 .

Roughly speaking, the reason why H is not Cayley is that the insertion of $K_{2,3}$ s has introduced an ‘orientation’ which all automorphisms must preserve (but cannot all preserve without a fixed point). Indeed, each $K_{2,3}$ has a natural orientation of its edges from the 2-set to the 3-set, and put together they make H into a regular directed graph of in-degree 2 and out-degree 3. Our key observation now is that we can reverse this process of obtaining an orientation from $K_{2,3}$ s to one of obtaining $K_{2,3}$ s from an orientation. Indeed, if we *start from* a suitable orientation D_0 of T_5 , namely, the regular orientation of in-degree 2 and out-degree 3, then our directed version of H (with all its useful ‘Cayley-inhibiting’ $K_{2,3}$ s) is obtained from D_0 by one simple operation, which moreover can be iterated canonically to yield ‘larger and larger $K_{2,3}$ s’ (see figures 2 and 5): the operation of taking a directed line graph.

Let us do this in more detail. Given a directed graph D , the *line graph* of D is the directed graph D' whose vertices are the arcs uv of D , and in which such a vertex $uv \in V(D')$ sends




Figure 2. The portion of G_2 corresponding to the central $K_{2,3}$ in figure 1.

an arc (of D') to another vertex $v'w' \in V(D')$ if and only if $v = v'$. Note that if D is regular with in-degree a and out-degree b then so is D' . The operation of taking a line graph can thus be iterated on regular directed graphs without increasing their degrees—a fact that will be vital to our whole approach.

A moment's thought shows that our directed version of H is indeed the line graph of D_0 . So for $i = 1, 2, \dots$ let D_i be the (directed) line graph of D_{i-1} , and let G_i denote the undirected graph underlying D_i . (Thus, $G_1 = H$.) Since every D_i is regular with in-degree 2 and out-degree 3, all the G_i are 5-regular; it is therefore not unreasonable to expect that they converge to a graph 'at infinity' in some natural sense, and that this limit graph might not be quasi-isometric to a Cayley graph.

In order to define this limit graph precisely, let us pause to explain the (very simple) space of graphs we are working with. For a fixed positive integer r (which for us will always be 5), let $Q = Q_r$ denote the set of (isomorphism classes of) all connected r -regular transitive graphs. We introduce a metric on Q by setting $d(G, H) = 1/(n+1)$ if n is the maximum positive integer such that there exists an isomorphism from the ball $B_G(0, n)$ to $B_H(0, n)$ sending 0 to 0. (Here 0 is any particular point of G or H , and $B_G(0, n)$ denotes the set of all points at graph distance at most n from 0.) This is a natural metric to use on Q ; see for example [1]. The following easy compactness argument shows that it is indeed a metric.

Proposition 1 *Let $G, H \in Q$ with $d(G, H) = 0$. Then G and H are isomorphic.*

Proof: For each n , we have an isomorphism $\theta_n: B_G(0, n) \rightarrow B_H(0, n)$ sending 0 to 0. Now, there are only finitely many choices for an isomorphism from $B_G(0, 1)$ to $B_H(0, 1)$, so among the restrictions $\theta_1|_{B_G(0, 1)}, \theta_2|_{B_G(0, 1)}, \dots$ there are infinitely many that agree: say

$$\theta_{i_1}|_{B_G(0, 1)} = \theta_{i_2}|_{B_G(0, 1)} = \dots = \bar{\theta}_1.$$

Then, among the restrictions $\theta_{i_1}|_{B_G(0, 2)}, \theta_{i_2}|_{B_G(0, 2)}, \dots$ there must be infinitely many that agree: say

$$\theta_{j_1}|_{B_G(0, 2)} = \theta_{j_2}|_{B_G(0, 2)} = \dots = \bar{\theta}_2.$$

Continuing in this way, we obtain a sequence of isomorphisms $\bar{\theta}_n: B_G(0, n) \rightarrow B_H(0, n)$ with the property that for all $m \leq n$ we have $\bar{\theta}_n|_{B_G(0, m)} = \bar{\theta}_m$. It follows that the union $\bigcup_{n \geq 1} \bar{\theta}_n$ is a (well-defined) isomorphism from G to H . \square

A very similar argument shows that Q is compact:

Proposition 2 *Every sequence in Q has a convergent subsequence.*

Proof (sketch): Let G_1, G_2, \dots be any sequence of graphs in Q , each with a chosen point 0. Infinitely many of the G_i must have isomorphic 1-balls $B_{G_i}(0, 1)$: say $B_{G_{i_1}}(0, 1), B_{G_{i_2}}(0, 1), \dots$ are all isomorphic (with 0 mapping to 0). Among G_{i_1}, G_{i_2}, \dots we can find

infinitely many graphs whose 2-balls are isomorphic (extending the isomorphisms of their 1-balls), and so on.

Continuing in this way, and choosing suitable partially nested isomorphisms to some fixed reference set X of vertices, we build up a nested sequence of finite graphs whose union G is a graph on X . Then G is connected and r -regular. To show that G is transitive, it is enough to show that for every choice of $x, y \in X$ and every n there is an isomorphism $B_G(x, n) \rightarrow B_G(y, n)$ mapping x to y ; then the method of the proof of Proposition 1 yields an automorphism of G that takes x to y . But this is immediate: $B_G(x, n)$ and $B_G(y, n)$ are both contained in some ball $B_G(0, m)$; this ball coincides with the ball $B_{G_i}(0, m)$ in each of the graphs G_i of our m th subsequence; and G_i (being transitive) has an automorphism that takes x to y , and therefore also $B_G(x, n)$ to $B_G(y, n)$. Thus, $G \in \mathcal{Q}$.

Finally, it is clear that any diagonal subsequence of the subsequences of G_1, G_2, \dots that we have chosen converges to G , as required. \square

We remark in passing that, although it does not seem to help us, it is interesting to note that the set of Cayley graphs is a closed subset of \mathcal{Q} : this may be proved by arguments similar to those in the proof of Proposition 2.

Let G be any limit point of the sequence G_1, G_2, \dots (A little thought shows that this sequence is actually convergent and thus has a unique limit; we shall prove this formally in the next section.) Is G still quasi-isometric to T_5 ? No, it is not: it will not be difficult to prove (see the next section) that G has only one end, and so cannot be quasi-isometric to T_5 .

Of course, it is very hard to think about an abstract limit graph. Luckily, there is a far more down-to-earth description of G , which we give now.

3. An explicit construction

Our starting point here is that the (directed) line graph D_1 of D_0 is precisely the set of all directed paths in D_0 of length 1, with path uv joined to path wx if $v = w$. Similarly D_2 , the line graph of the line graph of D_0 , can be thought of as the set of all directed paths in D_0 of length 2, with uvw joined to xyz if $v = x$ and $w = y$. And so on:

Proposition 3 *The directed graph D_n is isomorphic to the graph whose vertices are the directed paths of length n in D_0 , with an arc from $x_1x_2 \dots x_{n+1}$ to $y_1y_2 \dots y_{n+1}$ if $y_i = x_{i+1}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$.*

Proof: Induction on n . \square

Let us see what, when n is large, a ‘small’ neighbourhood (of radius much less than n) of a vertex $v \in G_n$ looks like. Let P be the path in D_0 corresponding to v . Suppose that we wish to move from v to one of its five neighbours v' in G_n : how do we obtain the path P' corresponding to v' from the path P ? If the edge $e = vv'$ is directed from v to v' in D_n , then P' is obtained from P by moving the last vertex of P to one of its three out-neighbours in D_0 , while all the other vertices of P simply move to their successors along P . Similarly, if e is directed from v' to v , we obtain P' from P by moving the first vertex of P to one of




Figure 3. A path $x \cdots y \subset D$ corresponding to a vertex $v \in D_n$, and the paths $x' \cdots y_i \subset D$ corresponding to the 3 out-neighbours of v in D_n .

its two in-neighbours in D_0 , while all the other vertices of P are forced: they just move to their predecessors on P . See figure 3.

So what does the open $n/2$ -neighbourhood N of a point $v \in G_n$ look like? If (the path of) v has start vertex x and end vertex y , then the set of the start vertices of the points of N is disjoint from the set of their end vertices: indeed, these sets are contained in the open balls of radius $n/2$ about x and y respectively. So we may view the start and end vertices as behaving ‘independently’: as long as we stay in the ball of radius $n/2$ about v , the start vertices trace out part of a tree of in-degree 2 and out-degree 1, while the end vertices trace out part of a tree of in-degree 1 and out-degree 3.

This motivates the following explicit definition of a graph G^* , which will turn out to be the unique limit of our sequence G_1, G_2, \dots . Let E be a 3-regular tree, oriented to have in-degree 2 and out-degree 1, and let F be the oriented 4-regular tree of in-degree 1 and out-degree 3. Fix a point $0 \in E$ and a point $0 \in F$. Let the *rank* $r(x)$ of a point $x \in E$ be the signed distance from 0 to x (so if the unique undirected path from 0 to x in E has s forward edges and t backward edges then $r(x) = s - t$), and define $r(y)$ in the same way for $y \in F$. Now define the directed graph D^* as follows. The vertex set of D^* is the set $\{(x, y) \in E \times F : r(x) = r(y)\}$, and D^* has an arc from (x, y) to (x', y') whenever $xx' \in E$ and $yy' \in F$ (figure 4). Finally, let G^* be the undirected version of D^* .

Let us verify that G^* is indeed the unique limit of the sequence G_1, G_2, \dots :

Proposition 4 *The sequence (G_n) converges to G^* .*

Proof: The directed graphs D_n and D^* have isomorphic $n/2$ -neighbourhoods, and so $d(G_n, G^*) \leq \frac{2}{n+2}$. \square

We remark that it is now possible to define precisely what we mean by ‘large $K_{2,3}$ s’ in the graph G^* . Given a vertex (x, y) of G^* , we have $r(x) = r(y)$ by definition of G^* and call this number the *rank* of (x, y) , denoted again by $r(x, y)$. Given an integer $k > 0$, we call each of the (isomorphic) components of the subgraph of G^* spanned by the vertices of rank between 0 and k a $K_{2,3}$ of order k . It is not difficult (if a little tedious) to write




Figure 4. All directions are from left to right.

down a formal partition of the vertex set of such a $K_{2,3}$ of order k into five classes, together with an adjacency rule between these classes based on adjacencies in G^* , so that the resulting graph is indeed a $K_{2,3}$. Instead, we offer a picture of a $K_{2,3}$ of order 4, shown in figure 5.

Perhaps the most tangible evidence that we have for our conjecture that G^* is not quasi-isometric to a Cayley graph is that it is certainly not quasi-isometric to the obvious candidate of such a Cayley graph, the graph T_5 :

Proposition 5 G^* has only one end.

Proof: We show that the deletion of any finite set S of vertices from G^* leaves only one infinite component. Let r be the smallest and s the largest rank of a vertex in S , and let S' be the set of all vertices that can be reached from S by a path whose vertices all have rank between r and s . Clearly S' is finite, so it suffices to show that $G^* - S'$ is connected.

Let vertices $(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2) \in G^* - S'$ be given, and let us show that we can move a token vertex (x, y) from (x_1, y_1) to (x_2, y_2) in G^* without hitting S' . We may assume that $s < r(x_1, y_1) \leq r(x_2, y_2)$: the proof for $r(x_1, y_1) \leq r(x_2, y_2) < r$ is analogous, and any vertex of rank between r and s can be joined to a vertex of rank $> s$ by any path of increasing rank (which avoids S' by definition of S').

Starting with $(x, y) = (x_1, y_1)$, we first move (x, y) towards the right in figure 4 (formally: with increasing rank, and thus avoiding S') until x lies on a left (i.e. backward oriented) ray R in E that avoids S'_E , the set of first components of the vertices in S' . We now move (x, y) to the left, keeping x on R , until y lies to the left of y_2 in F . We then move (x, y) right again until $y = y_2$; since x stays on R during this move, this keeps us outside S' until we are back at points of rank $> s$. We now move on towards the right until x lies to the right of x_2 in E , and back again until $(x, y) = (x_2, y_2)$. \square




Figure 5. A $K_{2,3}$ of order 4 in G^* , and a (bold) $K_{2,3}$ of order 2.

How might one show that G^* is not quasi-isometric to a Cayley graph? The first hope, of course, would be to imitate our proof of why H is not a Cayley graph, using a sufficiently large $K_{2,3}$ instead of the actual $K_{2,3}$ s in H . However, we have been unable to make this approach work and are not sure that it can work: although it is straightforward to translate the canonical group action on a hypothetical Cayley graph quasi-isometric to G^* to similar ‘quasi-automorphisms’ of G^* , the fuzziness introduced seems to blur the difference between the sizes of the two vertex classes even of large $K_{2,3}$ s (which are 2^n and 3^n , respectively), a difference central to the ‘non-Cayley’ proof for H .

As a more global approach we might try to show that every quasi-automorphism of G^* preserves the natural orientation of all sufficiently large $K_{2,3}$ s, mapping their left sets (their vertices of minimal rank) to the left of the images of their right sets (their vertices of maximal rank). Then any Cayley graph quasi-isometric to G^* would have two ‘directions’ invariant under all its automorphisms (not just under its own group action), and in which it grows at different speeds: 2^n ‘to the left’ and 3^n ‘to the right’. Can this happen in a Cayley graph? (Recall that the overall growth speed of a graph is not preserved under quasi-isometries: for example, the trees T_3 and T_4 are quasi-isometric.)

Acknowledgment

We are grateful to Wolfgang Woess for many interesting conversations.

References

1. L. Babai, “Vertex-transitive graphs and vertex-transitive maps,” *J. Graph Theory* **15** (1991), 587–627.
2. M. Gromov, “Asymptotic invariants of infinite groups,” in *Geometric Group Theory*, Vol. 2, G.A. Niblo and M.A. Roller (Eds.), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993.
3. W. Magnus, A. Karrass, and D. Solitar, *Combinatorial Group Theory*, Dover, New York, 1976.
4. P.M. Soardi and W. Woess, “Amenability, unimodularity, and the spectral radius of random walks on infinite graphs,” *Math. Z.* **205** (1990), 471–486.
5. C. Thomassen and M.E. Watkins, “Infinite vertex-transitive, edge-transitive, non-1-transitive graphs,” *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **105** (1989), 258–261.
6. V.I. Trofimov, “Graphs with polynomial growth,” *Math. USSR-Sb.* **51** (1985), 405–417.
7. W. Woess, “Topological groups and infinite graphs,” *Discrete Math.* **94** (1991), 1–12.