

Crossing numbers of random graphs

Joel Spencer

Courant Institute, NYU

Géza Tóth*

Massachusetts Institute of Technology
and Hungarian Academy of Sciences

Abstract

The *crossing number* of G is the minimum number of crossing points in any drawing of G . We consider the following two other parameters. The *rectilinear crossing number* is the minimum number of crossing points in any drawing of G , with straight line segments as edges. The *pairwise crossing number* of G is the minimum number of pairs of crossing edges over all drawings of G . We prove several results on the expected values of these parameters of a random graph.

1 Introduction

A *drawing* of a graph G is a mapping which assigns to each vertex a point of the plane and to each edge a simple continuous arc connecting the corresponding two points. We assume that in a drawing no three edges (arcs) cross at the same point, and the edges do not pass through any vertex. The *crossing number* $\text{CR}(G)$ of G is the minimum number of crossing points in any drawing of G . We consider the following two variants of the crossing number. The *rectilinear crossing number* $\text{LIN-CR}(G)$ is the minimum number of crossing points in any drawing of G , with straight line segments as edges. The *pairwise crossing number* or *pair-crossing number*, $\text{PAIR-CR}(G)$, of G is the minimum number of crossing pairs of edges over all drawings of G .

Clearly, $\text{PAIR-CR}(G) \leq \text{CR}(G) \leq \text{LIN-CR}(G)$.

Bienstock and Dean [8] constructed a series of graphs with crossing number 4, whose rectilinear crossing numbers are arbitrary large. On the other hand, Pach and Tóth [27] proved that for any graph G , $\text{CR}(G) \leq 2(\text{PAIR-CR}(G))^2$. Probably this bound is very far from being optimal, we can not even rule out that $\text{CR}(G) = \text{PAIR-CR}(G)$ for any graph G .

The determination of the crossing numbers is extremely difficult. Even the crossing numbers of the complete graphs are not known. Let

$$\gamma_{\text{PAIR-CR}} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{PAIR-CR}(K_n)}{\binom{n}{2}}, \quad \gamma_{\text{CR}} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{CR}(K_n)}{\binom{n}{2}}, \quad \gamma_{\text{LIN-CR}} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{LIN-CR}(K_n)}{\binom{n}{2}}.$$

*Supported by NSF grant DMS-99-70071, OTKA-T-020914 and OTKA-F-22234.

These limits are known to exist [28] and the best known bounds are $1/30 \leq \gamma_{\text{PAIR-CR}} \leq 1/16$, $1/20 \leq \gamma_{\text{CR}} \leq 1/16$, $0.05191 \leq \gamma_{\text{LIN-CR}} \leq 0.0639$ [2, 9] (see also [17, 28]).

In this paper we investigate the crossing numbers of *random graphs*. Let $G = G(n, p)$ be a *random graph* with n vertices, whose edges are chosen independently with probability p . Let e denote the *expected number* of edges of G , i.e., $e = p\binom{n}{2}$. We shall always have $e \rightarrow \infty$ (indeed, $p = \Omega(n^{-1})$) so that G almost surely has $e(1 + o(1))$ edges.

In [26] it was shown that if $e > 10n$, then almost surely we have $\text{CR}(G) \geq \frac{e^2}{4000}$. Consequently, almost surely we also have $\text{LIN-CR}(G) \geq \frac{e^2}{4000}$. As we always *can* draw a graph with straight lines the crossing number (in any form) is never larger than the number of pairs of edges and the expected number of pairs of edges is $\sim \frac{e^2}{2}$. Our interest will be in those regions of p for which the various crossing numbers are, asymptotically, a positive proportion of the number of pairs of edges.

Let

$$\kappa_{\text{LIN-CR}}(n, p) = \frac{\mathbb{E}[\text{LIN-CR}(G)]}{e^2}, \quad \kappa_{\text{CR}}(n, p) = \frac{\mathbb{E}[\text{CR}(G)]}{e^2}, \quad \kappa_{\text{PAIR-CR}}(n, p) = \frac{\mathbb{E}[\text{PAIR-CR}(G)]}{e^2}.$$

We have $\kappa_{\text{PAIR-CR}}(n, p) \leq \kappa_{\text{CR}}(n, p) \leq \kappa_{\text{LIN-CR}}(n, p)$ for any n, p .

Theorem 1 *For any fixed n , $\kappa_{\text{LIN-CR}}(n, p)$, $\kappa_{\text{CR}}(n, p)$, $\kappa_{\text{PAIR-CR}}(n, p)$ are increasing, continuous functions of p .*

With Theorem 1 we may express (roughly) our two central concerns. At which $p = p(n)$ are $\kappa_{\text{LIN-CR}}(n, p)$, $\kappa_{\text{CR}}(n, p)$, $\kappa_{\text{PAIR-CR}}(n, p)$ bounded away from zero? At which $p = p(n)$ are $\kappa_{\text{LIN-CR}}(n, p)$, $\kappa_{\text{CR}}(n, p)$, $\kappa_{\text{PAIR-CR}}(n, p)$ close to the values $\gamma_{\text{LIN-CR}}$, γ_{CR} , $\gamma_{\text{PAIR-CR}}$, respectively? Our results for these three crossing numbers shall be quite different. We are uncertain whether or not that represents the reality of the situation. The following relatively simple result shows basically that for $p = \frac{1}{n}$ all three crossing numbers are asymptotically negligible and that for $p = \frac{c}{n}$ with $c > 1$ fixed the three crossing numbers have not reached their limiting values.

Theorem 2 1. $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \kappa_{\text{LIN-CR}}(n, c/n) = 0$ for $c \leq 1$

2. $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \kappa_{\text{CR}}(n, c/n) = 0$ for $c \leq 1$

3. $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \kappa_{\text{PAIR-CR}}(n, c/n) = 0$ for $c \leq 1$

4. $\lim_{c \rightarrow 1} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \kappa_{\text{LIN-CR}}(n, c/n) = 0$

5. $\lim_{c \rightarrow 1} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \kappa_{\text{CR}}(n, c/n) = 0$

6. $\lim_{c \rightarrow 1} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \kappa_{\text{PAIR-CR}}(n, c/n) = 0$

7. $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \kappa_{\text{LIN-CR}}(n, c/n) < \gamma_{\text{LIN-CR}}$ for all c
8. $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \kappa_{\text{CR}}(n, c/n) < \gamma_{\text{CR}}$ for all c
9. $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \kappa_{\text{PAIR-CR}}(n, c/n) < \gamma_{\text{PAIR-CR}}$ for all c

Theorem 2 gives only upper bounds for the various crossing numbers. The main results of this paper, given in Theorems 3, 4, 5, deal with lower bounds for the three crossing numbers. Our weakest result is for the pair-crossing number.

Theorem 3 For any $\varepsilon > 0$, $p = p(n) = n^{\varepsilon-1}$,

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \kappa_{\text{PAIR-CR}}(n, p) > 0.$$

For the crossing number we have a much stronger result.

Theorem 4 For any $c > 1$ with $p = p(n) = c/n$

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \kappa_{\text{CR}}(n, p) > 0$$

As $\text{LIN-CR}(G) \geq \text{CR}(G)$ the lower bound of Theorem 4 applies also to the rectilinear crossing number. Our most surprising result is that with the rectilinear crossing number one reaches an asymptotically best limit in relatively short time.

Theorem 5 If $p = p(n) \gg \frac{\ln n}{n}$ then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \kappa_{\text{LIN-CR}}(n, p) = \gamma_{\text{LIN-CR}}(n, p)$$

2 Upper Bounds

First we prove Theorem 1. Let f be any real valued function on graphs. Then with $G \sim G(n, p)$

$$E[f(G)] = \sum_H f(H) p^{e(H)} (1-p)^{\binom{n}{2} - e(H)}$$

where H runs over the labelled graphs on n vertices and $e(H)$ is the number of edges of H . This is a polynomial and hence a continuous function of p , giving the second part of Theorem 1. We argue that $\kappa_{\text{CR}}(n, p)$ is an increasing function of p , the arguments in the other cases are identical. For $0 \leq p, q \leq 1$ we may view $G(n, pq)$ as a two step process, first creating $G(n, p)$ and then taking each edge from $G(n, p)$ with probability q . After the first stage consider a drawing with the minimal number of crossings X , so that $E[X] = \kappa_{\text{CR}}(n, p)$. Now keep that drawing but take

each edge with probability q . Each crossing is still in the new picture with probability q^2 . This gives a drawing of $G(n, pq)$ with expected number of crossings $q^2 \kappa_{\text{CR}}(n, p)$. We do not claim this drawing is optimal, but it does give the desired upper bound as $E[\text{CR}(G(n, pq))] \leq q^2 E[\text{CR}(G(n, p))]$, completing Theorem 1.

The first six parts of Theorem 2 will come as no surprise to those familiar with random graphs as in the classic papers of Erdős and Rényi it was shown that with $p = \frac{c}{n}$ the random graph $G(n, p)$ is almost surely planar when $c < 1$. Our argument is a bit technical, however, as we must bound the expected crossing number.

We prove only part 1, for $c < 1$. Parts 2 and 3 for $c < 1$ follow immediately, since they involve smaller crossing numbers. The statements for $c = 1$ follow from parts 4, 5, and 6, respectively. Fix $c < 1$, set $p = \frac{c}{n}$ and $X = \text{LIN-CR}(G)$ with $G \sim G(n, p)$. Let Y be the number of cycles of G and Z the number of edges of G . Then we claim $X \leq YZ$. Remove from G one edge from each cycle. This leaves a forest which can be drawn with straight lines and no crossings. Now add back in those Y edges as straight lines. At worst they could hit every edge, giving $\leq YZ$ crossings. With $c < 1$ $E[Y] = \sum_{i=3}^n \frac{\binom{n}{i}}{2^i} p^i < \sum_{i=3}^{\infty} c^i$ is bounded by a constant, say A . As Z has Binomial Distribution standard bounds give, say, $\Pr[Z > 10n] < \alpha^{-n}$ for some explicit $\alpha > 1$. As $X \leq n^4$ always, $X \leq 10nY + n^4 \chi(Z > 10n)$ where χ is the indicator random variable. Thus $E[X] \leq 10An + n^4 \alpha^{-n} = o(n^2)$. This completes the proof of parts 1, 2, and 3 for the case $c < 1$.

Now fix $c = 1 + \varepsilon$ with ε positive and small. Set $p = \frac{1+\varepsilon}{n}$, $p' = \frac{1-\varepsilon}{n}$ and let p^* satisfy $p' + p^* - p'p^* = p$ so that $p^* \sim \frac{2\varepsilon}{n}$. We may consider $G(n, p)$ as the union of independently chosen $G(n, p')$ and $G(n, p^*)$. Say the first has rectilinear crossing number X and Y edges and the second has Z edges. Then their union has rectilinear crossing number at most $X + Z(Y + Z)$ as we can draw $G(n, p')$ optimally and assume all other pairs of edges do intersect. But $E[X] = o(n^2)$ and it is easy to show that $E(Z(Y + Z)) \sim E(Z)(E(Y + Z)) \sim \frac{1}{2}n^2\varepsilon(1 + \varepsilon)$. Thus

$$E[\text{LIN-CR}(G)] \leq (1 + o(1)) \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon (1 + \varepsilon) n^2$$

from which part 4 of Theorem 2 follows. Parts 5 and 6 then also follow as they involve smaller crossing numbers.

The final three parts of Theorem 2 are also natural to those familiar with random graphs. For $c > 1$ fixed $G(n, \frac{c}{n})$ has a “giant component” with $\Omega(n)$ vertices. Outside the giant component there are $\Omega(n)$ edges all lying in trees or unicyclic components. These edges may be drawn with no crossings and that will involve a positive proportion of the potential edge crossings. Again, our argument will be a bit technical as we must deal with expectations. We state the argument only for rectilinear crossing number but it is the same in all three cases.

We first note a deterministic result: Let G be *any* graph on n vertices with e edges. Then

$$\frac{\text{LIN-CR}(G)}{e^2} \leq \frac{4 \cdot \text{LIN-CR}(K_n)}{\binom{n}{4}}$$

Fix a drawing of K_n with $\text{LIN-CR}(K_n)$ crossings. Define a random drawing of G by randomly mapping its n vertices bijectively to the n vertices of the drawing. Let e_1, e_2 be two edges of G with no common vertex, there being at most $e^2/2$ such unordered pairs. They may be mapped to a particular crossing of the drawing of K_n in eight ways, so they have probability $8 \cdot \text{LIN-CR}(K_n)/(n)_4$ of being mapped to a crossing. Now the expected number of crossings of G in this random drawing is at most, by Linearity of Expectation, $\frac{e^2}{2} \frac{8 \cdot \text{LIN-CR}(K_n)}{(n)_4}$ and thus there exists a drawing of G with at most that many crossings.

As the right hand side approaches $\gamma_{\text{LIN-CR}}$ we have

$$\frac{\text{LIN-CR}(G)}{e^2} \leq \gamma_{\text{LIN-CR}} + o(1)$$

where the $o(1)$ term approaches zero in n , uniformly over all graphs G .

With $c > 0$ fixed (this argument is only needed for $c > 1$ but works for all positive c), $p = \frac{c}{n}$ and $G \sim G(n, p)$ let X denote the number of edges and Y denote the number of isolated edges. The savings comes from noting that isolated edges can always be added to a graph with no additional crossings. Thus

$$E[\text{LIN-CR}(G)] \leq E[(X - Y)^2](\gamma_{\text{LIN-CR}} + o(1))$$

Here $E[X] \sim \frac{c}{2}n$ and $E[Y] = \binom{n}{2}p(1-p)^{2n-4} \sim \frac{c}{2}e^{-2c}n$ and elementary calculations give

$$E[(X - Y)^2] \sim E[X - Y]^2 \sim \left[\frac{c}{2}(1 - e^{-2c})n\right]^2$$

With $e := p \binom{n}{2} \sim \frac{c}{2}n$ we have

$$\frac{E[\text{LIN-CR}(G)]}{e^2} \leq \gamma_{\text{LIN-CR}}(1 - e^{-2c})^2(1 + o(1))$$

Comments and Open Questions. We note that as c approaches infinity the $(1 - e^{-2c})^2$ term above approaches one. The above bound may be improved somewhat by letting Y denote the edges in isolated trees and unicyclic components and there are even further improvements possible. Still, all these improvements seem to approach one as c approaches infinity. This leads to an intriguing conjecture: If $p(n) \gg \frac{1}{n}$ then $\kappa_{\text{LIN-CR}}(n, p) \rightarrow \gamma_{\text{LIN-CR}}$. One may make the same conjecture for all three variants of the crossing number. Indeed, this entire paper may be viewed as an attempt (thus far unsuccessful) of the authors to resolve these conjectures.

We conjecture that for any $c \geq 0$, the limits $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \kappa_{\text{LIN-CR}}(n, c/n)$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \kappa_{\text{CR}}(n, c/n)$, and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \kappa_{\text{PAIR-CR}}(n, c/n)$ exist. This follows from Theorem 2, for $c \leq 1$. If this conjecture is true, it is not hard to see that the functions $f_{\text{LIN-CR}}(c) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \kappa_{\text{LIN-CR}}(n, c/n)$, $f_{\text{CR}}(c) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \kappa_{\text{CR}}(n, c/n)$, and $f_{\text{PAIR-CR}}(c) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \kappa_{\text{PAIR-CR}}(n, c/n)$ are continuous and increasing for all $c \geq 0$.

3 The pair-crossing number

Here we prove Theorem 3. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and set $p = p(n) = n^{\varepsilon-1}$. Our object is to show

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \kappa_{\text{PAIR-CR}}(n, p) > 0$$

This is equivalent to showing that for n sufficiently large

$$E[\text{PAIR-CR}(G(n, p))] > \delta n^4 p^2$$

for some δ dependent only on ε . For $L \geq 1$ we let $K_5(L)$ denote the following graph:

- There are five vertices x_1, \dots, x_5
- For each distinct pair x_i, x_j there is a path between them of length L .

There are no other vertices nor edges so $K_5(L)$ has $5 + 10(L - 1)$ vertices and $10L$ edges. Note that $K_5(L)$ is a topological K_5 . Hence in any drawing of $K_5(L)$ there must be at least one crossing. We shall fix L such that $L\varepsilon > 1$. We shall show that G contains many $K_5(L)$. Each $K_5(L)$ will force at least one crossing. With L fixed this is a positive (albeit only $0.01L^{-2}$) proportion of the square of the number of edges involved. When this is carefully counted over all $K_5(L)$ we shall see that the total number of crossings is at least this constant times the square of the total number of edges.

We use three results about the almost sure behavior of $G(n, p)$. In the third K is any fixed constant.

1. Every vertex has degree $\sim np$.
2. Between every pair of distinct vertices there are $\sim n^{L-1}p^L$ paths of length L .
3. For any distinct x, y, z_1, \dots, z_K there are $\sim n^{L-1}p^L$ paths of length L between x and y that do not use any of the z_j .

The first result holds whenever $np \gg \ln n$ and follows from basic Large Deviation bounds on the degree of a vertex. Both the first and the second result are examples of a more general result [29] on counting extensions. For the third we note from [29] that the probability that the number of paths of length L between fixed x and y is not in $[(1 - \varepsilon)n^{L-1}p^L, (1 + \varepsilon)n^{L-1}p^L]$ is exponentially small. Fix x, y, z_1, \dots, z_K . Consider L -paths from x to y on G with z_1, \dots, z_K deleted, which has distribution $G(n - K, p)$. The K has negligible effect and so with exponentially small failure this number is as desired – hence almost surely it is as desired for all $O(n^{K+2})$ choices of x, y, z_1, \dots, z_K .

Now we count the $K_5(L)$. There are $\binom{n}{5} \sim \frac{1}{5!}n^5$ choices for x_1, \dots, x_5 . We want to know how many ways we can add the ten paths, say P_1, \dots, P_{10} , one between each pair of vertices. Suppose we have already selected P_1, \dots, P_i . Then a constant number of vertices have been taken. Thus the number of choices for P_{i+1} is $\sim n^{L-1}p^L$. So we are making ten choices and each time we have $\sim n^{L-1}p^L$ choices so the total number of choices is $\sim [n^{L-1}p^L]^{10}$. This gives a total of

$\sim \frac{1}{5!}n^{10L-5}p^{10L}$ copies of $K_5(L)$. For each one we count one crossing. Now consider a crossing between, say, edges uv and wz . How many $K_5(L)$ do they lie on? Renumbering for convenience say the path from x_1 to x_2 has u as its i -th and v as its $i+1$ -st point and the path from x_3 to x_4 has w as its j -th and z as its $j+1$ -st point. There are L^2 choices for i, j . Now fix u, v, w, z and i, j . From the first property there are $\sim (np)^i$ paths of length i starting at u , $\sim (np)^{L-i-1}$ paths of length $L-i$ starting at v and similarly for w, z . Further these numbers are not asymptotically effected when we require that they miss a fixed number of points. So we extend u, v, w, z to some x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 in $\sim (np)^{2(L-1)}$ ways. We have n choices for x_5 and then $\sim (n^{L-1}p^L)^8$ ways to complete the remaining eight paths forming $K_5(L)$. Thus edges uv, wz lie on $\sim L^2n^{10L-9}p^{10L-2}$ different $K_5(L)$. So each crossing has been counted at most that many times and hence the number of crossings is at least asymptotically

$$\frac{\frac{1}{5!}n^{10L-5}p^{10L}}{L^2n^{10L-9}p^{10L-2}} = \frac{1}{120L^2}n^4p^2$$

as desired.

Comments and Open Questions. As we must take $L > \varepsilon^{-1}$ the constant $\frac{1}{120}L^{-2}$ in this result goes to zero as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. This is in surprising contrast to the crossing number $\text{CR}(G)$ discussed in the next section. That crossing number becomes a positive proportion of the square of the number of edges already at $p = \frac{c}{n}$ when $c > 1$. Can the pair-crossing number and the crossing number have such different behavior? We doubt it. As mentioned in the Introduction we cannot rule out the possibility that the pair-crossing number and the crossing number are always exactly the same. We can certainly make the weaker conjecture that the expectation of the pair-crossing number of $G(n, p)$ becomes $\Omega(n^4p^2)$ already at $p = \frac{1+\varepsilon}{n}$. We further note that we have no idea at which p $\kappa_{\text{PAIR-CR}}(n, p)$ gets within $o(1)$ of its limit $\gamma_{\text{PAIR-CR}}$.

Pach and Tóth [27] introduced another variant of the crossing number. The *odd-crossing number*, $\text{ODD-CR}(G)$, of any graph G is the minimum number of pairs of edges that cross an odd number of times, over all drawings of G . Clearly, for any graph, $\text{ODD-CR}(G) \leq \text{PAIR-CR}(G)$. With a little modification, the above argument works also for the odd-crossing number, therefore, the statement of Theorem 3 holds also for the odd-crossing number.

4 The crossing number

Here we prove Theorem 4. Fix $c > 1$ and set $p = \frac{c}{n}$. Let $G \sim G(n, p)$. Our object is to show

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{E[\text{CR}(G)]}{\left[\binom{n}{2}p\right]^2} > 0$$

As c is constant this is equivalent to showing that for n sufficiently large

$$E[\text{CR}(G)] > \delta n^2$$

for some δ dependent only on c .

We begin by reviewing in outline form the argument of Pach and Tóth [27] which requires that c be a sufficiently large constant. We will see why their argument does not work for $c = 1 + \epsilon$ with $\epsilon > 0$ small and then how a modification of their argument, combined with results on $G(n, p)$, does work.

Define the *bisection width* of G , denoted by $b(G)$, as the minimal number of edges running between T (top) and B (bottom) over all partitions of the vertex set into two disjoint parts $V = T \cup B$ such that $\frac{2}{3}|V| \geq |T|, |B| \geq \frac{1}{3}|V|$. (The specific constant $\frac{2}{3}$ is not essential here, we need only to assure that the sizes of T and B are within a constant factor.) Leighton observed that there is an intimate relationship between the bisection width and the crossing number of a graph [20], which is based on the Lipton-Tarjan separator theorem for planar graphs [21]. The following version of this relationship was obtained by Pach, Shahrokhi, and Szegedy [24]. Let G be a graph on vertex set V with d_v denoting the degree of vertex v . Then

$$b(G) \leq 10\sqrt{\text{CR}(G)} + 2\sqrt{\sum_{v \in V(G)} d_v^2}$$

With $G \sim G(n, \frac{c}{n})$, $E[d_v^2] \sim c^2 = O(1)$ and almost surely $2\sqrt{\sum_{v \in V} d_v^2} = O(\sqrt{n})$ which proves to be negligible. For c a *large* constant basic probabilistic methods give that almost surely *every* partition $V = T \cup B$ with $\frac{2}{3}|V| \geq |T|, |B| \geq \frac{1}{3}|V|$ has a constant proportion of the edges running between them. That is, almost surely $b(G) = \Omega(n)$. Hence almost surely $\text{CR}(G) = \Omega(n^2)$.

Now suppose $c = 1 + \epsilon$ with $\epsilon > 0$ small. The difficulty is: almost surely $b(G)$ is zero! Why? From classic Erdős-Rényi results G will have a “giant component” of size $\sim kn$ with $k = k(c)$ and all other components will have size $O(\ln n)$. The function $k = k(c)$ was given explicitly by Erdős and Rényi but we need here only to note that $\lim_{c \rightarrow 1+} k(c) = 0$. For ϵ a small (actually, not so small) but fixed constant and $c = 1 + \epsilon$ the giant component has size kn with $k < \frac{2}{3}$. Place the giant component in the top T . Now take all other components sequentially. Add them to the top T if $|T|$ remains below $\frac{2}{3}n$, otherwise place them in the bottom B . This gives a partition with $\frac{2}{3}|V| \geq |T|, |B| \geq \frac{1}{3}|V|$ and no edges running between T and B .

Our approach shall be to show, effectively, that the giant component of $G(n, \frac{c}{n})$ has high bisection width for any $c > 1$. To do this we employ an “enhancement” approach which we take, with only slight modification, from the work of M. Łuczak and C. McDiarmid [22].

Theorem 6 *Let V be a set of m vertices. Let T be a tree on V . Let G be the random graph on V with edge probability $p = \frac{a}{m}$. For $a > 0$ fixed almost surely*

$$b(T \cup G) = \Omega(m)$$

That is, there exists $\eta > 0$ dependent only on a such that $\Pr[b(T \cup G) \leq m\eta]$ approaches zero as m approaches infinity.

Consider partitions $V = V_1 \cup V_2$ such that T has at most $m\eta$ cut edges. For $i \leq m\eta$ we can choose i cut edges in at most $\binom{m-1}{i} \leq \binom{m}{i}$ ways and orient them (selecting one endpoint for V_1 and the other for V_2) in at most 2^i ways. As T is connected, these choices determine the partition. Hence the number of such partitions is at most

$$\sum_{i \leq m\eta} \binom{m}{i} 2^i \leq 2^{m\eta} \sum_{i \leq m\eta} \binom{m}{i} \leq 2^{m(\eta + H(\eta))}$$

where $H(\eta) := -\eta \log_2 \eta - (1 - \eta) \log_2 (1 - \eta)$ is the standard Entropy function.

Now fix a partition $V = V_1 \cup V_2$ with $\frac{m}{3} \leq |V_i| \leq \frac{2m}{3}$ for $i = 1, 2$. Let $b((V_1, V_2); G)$ denote the number of edges $\{x, y\}$ of G with x, y in different V_i . Then

$$b((V_1, V_2); G) \sim B \left[|V_1| \cdot |V_2|, \frac{a}{m} \right]$$

where B is the Binomial Distribution. As $|V_1| \cdot |V_2| \geq \frac{2}{9}m^2$

$$\Pr[b((V_1, V_2); G) \leq m\eta] \leq \Pr \left[B \left(\frac{2}{9}m^2, \frac{a}{m} \right) \leq m\eta \right]$$

This last large deviation probability can be bounded in a number of ways. For our purposes let us assume $\eta < \frac{a}{9}$ and use that (see, e.g., the appendix of [5]) $\Pr[B(n, p) \leq \frac{1}{2}np] < e^{-np/8}$.

We select $\eta > 0$ such that $\eta < \frac{a}{9}$ and

$$(\ln 2)(\eta + H(\eta)) < \frac{a}{36}$$

Each of the at most $2^{m(\eta + H(\eta))}$ partitions of V which has fewer than $m\eta$ cut edges with respect to T , has probability less than $\exp[-\frac{1}{8}\frac{2a}{9}m]$ of having fewer than $m\eta$ cut edges with respect to G , and so the expected number of partitions with fewer than $m\eta$ cut edges with respect to both T and G is at most the product. Our selection of η insures that the product approaches zero, completing the proof of Theorem 6.

Now we prove Theorem 4. Let $c > 1$ be fixed. Fix c_1, a with $1 < c_1 < c$ and $c_1 + a = c$, for definiteness we may take $c_1 = \frac{1+c}{2}$ and $a = \frac{c-1}{2}$. Set $p = \frac{c}{n}$, $p_1 = \frac{c_1}{n}$ and p_2 such that $p = p_1 + p_2 - p_1 p_2$. Note $p_2 \sim \frac{a}{n}$. We may regard $G \sim G(n, p)$ as the union of independently chosen $G_1 \sim G(n, p_1)$ and $G_2 \sim G(n, p_2)$. On G_1 almost surely there exists a ‘‘giant component’’ X with $|X| \sim d_1 n$ where d_1 is an explicit function of c_1 given in the classic Erdős-Rényi papers. Set $m = |X|$. Then $p_2 m \sim a d_1$. Then $G_1|_X$ contains some tree T . From Theorem 6 there is a constant η such that almost surely $(T \cup G_2)|_X$ has bisection width at least $m\eta \sim n(d_1\eta)$. As adding edges can only increase the bisection width $b(G|_X) > n(d_1\eta)(1 - o(1))$. Applying the basic relationship between bisection width and crossing numbers gives $\text{CR}(G|_X) = \Omega(n^2)$. Hence $\text{CR}(G) \geq \text{CR}(G|_X) = \Omega(n^2)$.

Comments and Open Questions: From Theorem 1 we know $\kappa_{\text{CR}}(n, p) \rightarrow \gamma_{\text{CR}}$ as $p \rightarrow 1$ and we have just shown that $\kappa_{\text{CR}}(n, \frac{c}{n})$ is bounded from below. How large does $p = p(n)$ need to be so that $\kappa_{\text{CR}}(n, p(n)) \sim \gamma_{\text{CR}}$? We have already conjectured that for any $p = p(n)$ with $np \rightarrow \infty$ we have $\kappa_{\text{CR}}(n, p) \rightarrow \gamma_{\text{CR}}$. But we cannot even show that $\kappa_{\text{CR}}(n, p) \rightarrow \gamma_{\text{CR}}$ when $p < 1$ is a constant. Suppose (which is surely true though we are unable to show it) that $\lim_n \kappa_{\text{CR}}(n, \frac{c}{n})$ exists and call it $f_{\text{CR}}(c)$. Then $f_{\text{CR}}(c)$ would be increasing so $\lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} f_{\text{CR}}(c)$ would exist but might be a value strictly less than γ_{CR} . Would there be a second (or even a third or more) region (something like $p = \Theta(n^{-1/2})$) or, more likely, $p = \Theta(1)$ where $\kappa_{\text{CR}}(n, p)$ increases (in some asymptotic sense) until it finally reaches γ_{CR} ?

5 The rectilinear crossing number

Here we show Theorem 5. An *order type* of the points x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n in the plane (with no three colinear) is a list of orientations of all triples $x_i x_j x_k$, $i < j < k$ [14]. Elementary geometry gives that the order type of the four triples $x_i x_j x_k, x_i x_j x_l, x_i x_k x_l, x_j x_k x_l$ determines whether or not the straight line segments $x_i x_j$ and $x_k x_l$ intersect. Let X be the set of all order types of the points x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n in the plane. We shall make critical use of a result of Goodman and Pollack [14, 15] that $|X| < n^{6n}$. We note that the Goodman-Pollack result is derived from the Milnor-Thom theorem, a now classical and very deep result concerning algebraic varieties.

First, however, we examine a fixed order type $\xi \in X$. For any graph G with vertices v_1, \dots, v_n let $\text{LIN-CR}_\xi(G)$ denote the number of crossings in the straight line drawing of G where v_i is placed at x_i in the plane and x_1, \dots, x_n have order type ξ .

Theorem 7 *Let $G(n, p)$ be a random graph with vertices v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n , with edge probability $0 < p = p(n) < 1$, and let $e = p \binom{n}{2}$. Then*

$$\Pr \left[|\text{LIN-CR}_\xi(G) - \mathbb{E}[\text{LIN-CR}_\xi(G)]| > 3\alpha e^{3/2} \right] < 3 \exp(-\alpha^2/4)$$

holds for every α satisfying $(e/4)^3 \exp(-e/4) \leq \alpha \leq \sqrt{e}$.

Proof: We follow the approach of Pach and Tóth [26]. (We note that general polynomial concentration results of Kim and Vu [18] could also be used.) Let $e_1, e_2, \dots, e_{\binom{n}{2}}$ be the edges of the complete graph on $V(G)$. Define another random graph G^* on the same vertex set, as follows. If G has at most $2e$ edges, let $G^* = G$. Otherwise, there is an $i < \binom{n}{2}$ so that $|\{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_i\} \cap E(G)| = 2e$, and set $E(G^*) = \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_i\} \cap E(G)$. Finally, let $f(G) = \text{LIN-CR}_\xi(G^*)$.

The addition of any edge to G can modify the value of f by at most $2e$. Following the terminology of Alon–Kim–Spencer [4], we say that the *effect* of every edge is at most $2e$. The *variance* of any

edge is defined as $p(1-p)$ times the square of its effect. Therefore, the *total variance* cannot exceed

$$\sigma^2 = \binom{n}{2} p(2e)^2 = 4e^3.$$

Applying the Martingale Inequality of [4], which is a variant of Azuma's Inequality [6] (see also [5]), we obtain that for any positive $\alpha \leq \sigma/e = 2\sqrt{e}$,

$$\Pr \left[|f(G) - \mathbb{E}[f(G)]| > \alpha\sigma = 2\alpha e^{3/2} \right] < 2 \exp(-\alpha^2/4).$$

Our goal is to establish a similar bound for $\text{LIN-CR}_\xi(G)$ in place of $f(G)$. Obviously,

$$\Pr [f(G) \neq \text{LIN-CR}_\xi(G)] \leq \Pr [G \neq G^*] < \exp(-e/4).$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}[f(G)] - \mathbb{E}[\text{LIN-CR}_\xi(G)]| &\leq \Pr [f(G) \neq \text{LIN-CR}_\xi(G)] \max \text{LIN-CR}_\xi(G) \leq \\ &\exp(-e/4) \frac{n^4}{8} \leq \alpha e^{3/2}, \end{aligned}$$

whenever $\alpha \geq (e/4)^3 \exp(-e/4)$ (say). Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left[|\text{LIN-CR}_\xi(G) - \mathbb{E}[\text{LIN-CR}_\xi(G)]| > 3\alpha e^{3/2} \right] &\leq \\ \Pr [\text{LIN-CR}_\xi(G) \neq f(G)] + \Pr \left[|f(G) - \mathbb{E}[f(G)]| > 2\alpha e^{3/2} \right] &\leq \\ \exp(-e/4) + 2 \exp(-\alpha^2/4). \end{aligned}$$

If $\alpha \leq \sqrt{e}$, the last sum is at most $3 \exp(-\alpha^2/4)$, as required. This concludes the proof of Theorem 7.

Now we can prove Theorem 5. Fix $p = p(n)$ with $p(n) \gg \frac{\ln n}{n}$ and $G \sim G(n, p)$. Set $e = p \binom{n}{2}$. Let $C_n = \kappa_{\text{LIN-CR}}(n, 1)$. Since $\xi \in X$, $\mathbb{E}[\text{LIN-CR}_\xi(G)] = p^2 \text{LIN-CR}_\xi(K_n) \geq C_n e^2$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be arbitrarily small, but fixed. Then

$$\Pr \left[\text{LIN-CR}(G) < (C_n - \varepsilon)e^2 \right] \leq \sum_{\xi \in X} \Pr \left[\text{LIN-CR}_\xi(G) < \mathbb{E}[\text{LIN-CR}_\xi(G)] - \varepsilon e^2 \right].$$

We apply Theorem 7 with $3\alpha e^{3/2} = \varepsilon e^2$ so that $\alpha^2/4 = \frac{1}{36} \varepsilon^2 e$. The growth rate of $p(n)$ insures that this is $o(n^{-6n})$ for any fixed positive ε . The Goodman-Pollack result critically bounds $|X| \leq n^{6n}$. Hence the sum goes to zero, as desired.

Comments and Open Questions: We have not been able to determine if the condition $p \gg \frac{\ln n}{n}$ in Theorem 5 is necessary. We have already conjectured that for any $p = p(n)$ with $np \rightarrow \infty$ we

already have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \kappa_{\text{LIN-CR}}(n, p) = \gamma_{\text{LIN-CR}}$. While the Goodman-Pollack theorem itself cannot be improved asymptotically [3], it might be the case that there are few (in some sense) near optimal drawings so that the $n^{-\Theta(n)}$ error probability used in the proof of Theorem 5 may not be fully necessary. This, however, remains highly speculative.

Acknowledgement. We would like to express our gratitude to János Pach for many very useful remarks.

References

- [1] M. Ajtai, V. Chvátal, M. Newborn, and E. Szemerédi: Crossing-free subgraphs, *Annals of Discrete Mathematics* **12** (1982), 9-12.
- [2] O. Aichholzer, F. Aurenhammer, and H. Krasser: Progress on rectilinear crossing numbers, manuscript.
- [3] N. Alon: The number of polytopes, configurations, and real matroids, *Mathematika* **33** (1986), 62-71.
- [4] N. Alon, J. H. Kim, J. Spencer: Nearly perfect matchings in regular simple hypergraphs, *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, **100** (1997), 171-187.
- [5] N. Alon and J. Spencer: *The Probabilistic Method*, Wiley, New York, 1992.
- [6] K. Azuma: Weighted sums of certain dependent random variables, *Tohoku Mathematical Journal (2)* **19** (1967), 357-367.
- [7] D. Bienstock, Some provably hard crossing number problems, *Discrete and Computational Geometry* **6** (1991), 443-459.
- [8] D. Bienstock and N. Dean: Bounds for rectilinear crossing numbers, *Journal of Graph Theory* **17** (1993), 333-348.
- [9] A. Brodsky, S. Durocher and E. Gethner: Toward the rectilinear crossing number of K_n : new drawings, upper bounds and applications, (submitted)
- [10] Ch. Chojnacki (A. Hanani): Über wesentlich unplättbare Kurven im dreidimensionalen Raume, *Polska Akademia Nauk. Fundamenta Mathematicae* **23** (1934), 135-142.
- [11] P. Erdős and R. K. Guy: Crossing number problems, *American Mathematical Monthly* **80** (1973), 52-58.

- [12] I. Fáry: On straight line representation of planar graphs, *Acta Univ. Szeged. Sect. Sci. Math.* **11** (1948), 229-233.
- [13] M. R. Garey and D. S. Johnson: Crossing number is NP-complete, *SIAM Journal of Algebraic and Discrete Methods* **4** (1983), 312-316.
- [14] J. Goodman and R. Pollack: Upper bounds for configurations and polytopes in R^d , *Discrete and Computational Geometry* **1**, (1986) 219-227.
- [15] J. Goodman and R. Pollack: New bounds on higher dimensional configurations and polytopes, *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* **555**, (1989), 205-212.
- [16] R. K. Guy: The decline and fall of Zarankiewicz's theorem, in: *Proof Techniques in Graph Theory*, Academic Press, New York, 1969, 63-69.
- [17] R. K. Guy: Crossing numbers of graphs, in: *Graph theory and applications (Proc. Conf. Western Michigan Univ., Kalamazoo, Mich., 1972)* Lecture Notes in Mathematics **303**, Springer, Berlin, 111-124.
- [18] J. H. Kim and Van Ha Vu: Concentration of Multivariate Polynomials and Its Applications, *Combinatorica* **20** (2000), 417-434
- [19] D. J. Kleitman: The crossing number of $K_{5,n}$, *Journal of Combinatorial Theory* **9** (1970), 315-323.
- [20] F. T. Leighton: New lower bound techniques for VLSI, *Mathematical Systems Theory* **17** (1984), 47-70.
- [21] R. Lipton and R. Tarjan: A separator theorem for planar graphs, *SIAM J. Applied Mathematics* **36** (1979), 177-189.
- [22] M. Luczak and C. McDiarmid: Bisecting Sparse Random Graphs, *Random Structures & Algorithms* **18** (2001), 31-38.
- [23] J. Pach and P.K. Agarwal: *Combinatorial Geometry*, J. Wiley and Sons, New York, 1995.
- [24] J. Pach, F. Shahrokhi, and M. Szegedy: Applications of the crossing number, *Algorithmica* **16** (1996), 111-117.
- [25] J. Pach, J. Spencer, and G. Tóth: New bounds for crossing numbers, in: Proceedings of 15th Annual Symposium on Computational Geometry, ACM Press, 1999, 124-133. Also in: *Discrete and Computational Geometry* **24** (2000), 623-644.

- [26] J. Pach and G. Tóth: Thirteen problems on crossing numbers, *Geombinatorics* **9** (2000), 194-207.
- [27] J. Pach and G. Tóth: Which crossing number is it, anyway?, in: Proceedings of the 39th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, IEEE Press, 1998, 617-626. Also in: *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Ser. B*.
- [28] R. B. Richter and C. Thomassen: Relations between crossing numbers of complete and complete bipartite graphs, *American Mathematical Monthly*, February 1997, 131-137.
- [29] J. Spencer: Counting Extensions, *Journal of Combinatorial Theory (Ser. A)*, **55** (1990), 247-255.
- [30] P. Turán: A note of welcome, *Journal of Graph Theory* **1** (1977), 7-9.
- [31] W. T. Tutte: Toward a theory of crossing numbers, *Journal of Combinatorial Theory* **8** (1970), 45-53.
- [32] D. R. Woodall: Cyclic-order graphs and Zarankiewicz's crossing-number conjecture, *Journal of Graph Theory* **17** (1993), 657-671.