



Two to three nodes, bipartite? Yes. Three to three nodes, complete/bipartite or $K_{3,3}$. No. Why? Later.

Proof of if Thm: "G is connected and has no cycles" \implies "G connected and has |V| - 1 edges" Proof: Walk from a vertex using untraversed edges. Until get stuck. Claim: Degree 1 vertex. Proof of Claim: Can't visit more than once since no cycle. Entered. Didn't leave. Only one incident edge. Removing node doesn't create cycle. New graph is connected. Removing degree 1 node doesn't disconnect from Degree 1 lemma. By induction G - v has |V| - 2 edges.

G has one more or |V| - 1 edges.







sase: e = 0, v = r = 1. nduction Step: If it is a tree. Done. If not a tree. Find a cycle. Remove edge.



Joins two faces. New graph: *v*-vertices. e-1 edges. f-1 faces. Planar. v+(f-1) = (e-1)+2 by induction hypothesis. Therefore v+f=e+2. K_{3.3} non-planarity.



Euler: $v + \frac{2}{3}e \ge e + 2 \implies e \le 3v - 6$ $K_{3,3}$? Edges? 9. Vertices. 6. $9 \le 3(6) - 6$? Sure! Planar? No. No cycles that are triangles. Cycles of length ≥ 4 . At least 4*f* face-edge adjacencies, and at most 2*e*. 4*f* $\le 2e$ for any bipartite planar graph. Euler: $v + \frac{1}{2}e \ge e + 2 \implies e \le 2v - 4$ for bipartite planar graph $9 \le 2(6) - 4$. $\implies K_{3,3}$ is not planar!

Summary

Graphs, trees, complete graphs, planar graphs. Euler's formula. Have a nice weekend!

