Relative Turán Numbers of Hypergraphs

Sam Spiro UC San Diego

Joint with Jiaxi Nie and Jacques Verstraëte

This talk concerns r-uniform hypergraphs H (or r-graphs for short).

This talk concerns *r*-uniform hypergraphs H (or *r*-graphs for short). This is a set of vertices V(H) together with a set E(H) of *r*-element subsets of V(H) called edges.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

This talk concerns *r*-uniform hypergraphs H (or *r*-graphs for short). This is a set of vertices V(H) together with a set E(H) of *r*-element subsets of V(H) called edges. For example, here is a 3-graph on 6 vertices with 3 edges.



Let \mathcal{F} be a family of *r*-graphs. A hypergraph H is said to be \mathcal{F} -free if it contains no $F \in \mathcal{F}$ as a subgraph.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

Let \mathcal{F} be a family of *r*-graphs. A hypergraph H is said to be \mathcal{F} -free if it contains no $F \in \mathcal{F}$ as a subgraph. We define the Turán number (or extremal number) $ex(n, \mathcal{F})$ to be the maximum number of edges in an \mathcal{F} -free *r*-graph on *n* vertices.

Let \mathcal{F} be a family of *r*-graphs. A hypergraph H is said to be \mathcal{F} -free if it contains no $F \in \mathcal{F}$ as a subgraph. We define the Turán number (or extremal number) $ex(n, \mathcal{F})$ to be the maximum number of edges in an \mathcal{F} -free *r*-graph on *n* vertices.

Theorem (Mantel, 1907)

$$ex(n, C_3) = \lfloor n^2/4 \rfloor.$$

Let \mathcal{F} be a family of *r*-graphs. A hypergraph H is said to be \mathcal{F} -free if it contains no $F \in \mathcal{F}$ as a subgraph. We define the Turán number (or extremal number) $ex(n, \mathcal{F})$ to be the maximum number of edges in an \mathcal{F} -free *r*-graph on *n* vertices.

Theorem (Mantel, 1907)

$$ex(n, C_3) = \lfloor n^2/4 \rfloor.$$

Theorem (Erdős-Stone-Simonovits, 1946)

If F is a graph with $\chi(F) = k$, then

$$ex(n,F) = \left(\frac{k-2}{k-1} + o(1)\right) \binom{n}{2}$$

Mantel's theorem determines $e_x(n, C_3)$; what happens for triangle-free *hypergraphs*?

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

Mantel's theorem determines $ex(n, C_3)$; what happens for triangle-free *hypergraphs*? Define the loose ℓ -cycle C_{ℓ}^r be the *r*-graph with e_1, \ldots, e_{ℓ} and distinct vertices v_1, \ldots, v_{ℓ} such that $e_i \cap e_{i+1} = \{v_i\}$ and $e_i \cap e_j = \emptyset$ otherwise. For example, here is C_3^3 .



Theorem (Frankl-Füredi, 1987)

For $r \geq 3$ and n sufficiently large,

$$\operatorname{ex}(n,C_3^r) = \binom{n-1}{r-1},$$

with the extremal example being the star $S_{n,r}$ which has all r-sets containing a common vertex.

Given a family of *r*-graphs \mathcal{F} and an *r*-graph H, we define the *relative Turán number* $ex(H, \mathcal{F})$ to be the maximum number of edges in an \mathcal{F} -free subgraph of H.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Given some \mathcal{F} , we wish to determine general lower bounds for $ex(H, \mathcal{F})$ in terms of e(H) and parameters of H.

Given some \mathcal{F} , we wish to determine general lower bounds for $ex(H, \mathcal{F})$ in terms of e(H) and parameters of H. One parameter that we will *not* use is the order of H.

Given some \mathcal{F} , we wish to determine general lower bounds for $ex(H, \mathcal{F})$ in terms of e(H) and parameters of H. One parameter that we will *not* use is the order of H. Indeed, if $m \cdot H$ is m disjoint copies of H, then we have

$$\frac{\operatorname{ex}(m \cdot H, \mathcal{F})}{e(m \cdot H)} = \frac{\operatorname{ex}(H, \mathcal{F})}{e(H)}$$

Given some \mathcal{F} , we wish to determine general lower bounds for $ex(H, \mathcal{F})$ in terms of e(H) and parameters of H. One parameter that we will *not* use is the order of H. Indeed, if $m \cdot H$ is m disjoint copies of H, then we have

$$\frac{\operatorname{ex}(m \cdot H, \mathcal{F})}{e(m \cdot H)} = \frac{\operatorname{ex}(H, \mathcal{F})}{e(H)},$$

so morally speaking the relative Turán problem is the same for H and $m \cdot H$ despite their number of vertices being incomparable.

A more robust statistic than the order of H is its maximum degree $\Delta(H) = \Delta$.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

 $ex(H, \mathcal{F}) = ex(n, \mathcal{F})$

$$ex(H, \mathcal{F}) = ex(n, \mathcal{F}) \approx ex(n, \mathcal{F})n^{-2} \cdot e(H)$$

$$\operatorname{ex}(H,\mathcal{F}) = \operatorname{ex}(n,\mathcal{F}) \approx \operatorname{ex}(n,\mathcal{F})n^{-2} \cdot e(H) \approx \operatorname{ex}(\Delta,\mathcal{F})\Delta^{-2} \cdot e(H).$$

$$\operatorname{ex}(H,\mathcal{F}) = \operatorname{ex}(n,\mathcal{F}) \approx \operatorname{ex}(n,\mathcal{F})n^{-2} \cdot e(H) \approx \operatorname{ex}(\Delta,\mathcal{F})\Delta^{-2} \cdot e(H).$$

In particular, the best general bound we could hope to prove for graphs is

$$ex(H, \mathcal{F}) = \Omega(ex(\Delta, \mathcal{F})\Delta^{-2}) \cdot e(H).$$

Conjecture (Foucaud-Krivelevich-Perarnau, 2014)

Fix some family of graphs \mathcal{F} . Then for all H with $\Delta(H) = \Delta$,

$$\operatorname{ex}(H,\mathcal{F})=\Omega(\operatorname{ex}(\Delta,\mathcal{F})\Delta^{-2})\cdot e(H).$$

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Conjecture (Foucaud-Krivelevich-Perarnau, 2014)

Fix some family of graphs \mathcal{F} . Then for all H with $\Delta(H) = \Delta$,

$$\mathsf{ex}(H,\mathcal{F}) = \Omega(\mathsf{ex}(\Delta,\mathcal{F})\Delta^{-2})\cdot e(H).$$

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

That is, they conjectured that K_n is the "worst host" for every family of graphs \mathcal{F} .

Conjecture (Foucaud-Krivelevich-Perarnau, 2014)

Fix some family of graphs \mathcal{F} . Then for all H with $\Delta(H) = \Delta$,

$$\operatorname{ex}(H,\mathcal{F})=\Omega(\operatorname{ex}(\Delta,\mathcal{F})\Delta^{-2})\cdot e(H).$$

That is, they conjectured that K_n is the "worst host" for every family of graphs \mathcal{F} .

Theorem (Perarnau-Reed, 2014)

The above conjecture is true for any F of diameter at most 3, for $\{C_3, \ldots, C_\ell\}$, and several other families of graphs.

Conjecture (Foucaud-Krivelevich-Perarnau, 2014)

Fix some family of graphs \mathcal{F} . Then for all H with $\Delta(H) = \Delta$,

$$\mathsf{ex}(H,\mathcal{F}) = \Omega(\mathsf{ex}(\Delta,\mathcal{F})\Delta^{-2})\cdot e(H).$$

That is, they conjectured that K_n is the "worst host" for every family of graphs \mathcal{F} .

Theorem (Perarnau-Reed, 2014)

The above conjecture is true for any F of diameter at most 3, for $\{C_3, \ldots, C_\ell\}$, and several other families of graphs.

Somewhat surprisingly they were able to prove these bounds despite us not knowing what $ex(n, \mathcal{F})$ is for many of these cases.

One might also conjecture that for hypergraphs the worst host is K_n^r in general.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

One might also conjecture that for hypergraphs the worst host is K_n^r in general. If every element of \mathcal{F} is not *r*-partite, then $ex(H, \mathcal{F}) \ge (1 + o(1))\pi(\mathcal{F})e(H)$, so the interest is in families of *r*-partite *r*-graphs.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

One might also conjecture that for hypergraphs the worst host is K_n^r in general. If every element of \mathcal{F} is not *r*-partite, then $ex(H, \mathcal{F}) \ge (1 + o(1))\pi(\mathcal{F})e(H)$, so the interest is in families of *r*-partite *r*-graphs. For example, we have

$$\operatorname{ex}(K_n^3, C_3^3) = \Theta(n^2) = \Theta(\Delta^{-1/2}) \cdot e(K_n^3)$$

One might also conjecture that for hypergraphs the worst host is K_n^r in general. If every element of \mathcal{F} is not *r*-partite, then $ex(H, \mathcal{F}) \ge (1 + o(1))\pi(\mathcal{F})e(H)$, so the interest is in families of *r*-partite *r*-graphs. For example, we have

$$\operatorname{ex}(K_n^3,C_3^3) = \Theta(n^2) = \Theta(\Delta^{-1/2}) \cdot e(K_n^3),$$

so we might expect that one can prove a corresponding lower bound for all such H.

One might also conjecture that for hypergraphs the worst host is K_n^r in general. If every element of \mathcal{F} is not *r*-partite, then $ex(H, \mathcal{F}) \ge (1 + o(1))\pi(\mathcal{F})e(H)$, so the interest is in families of *r*-partite *r*-graphs. For example, we have

$$\operatorname{ex}(K_n^3,C_3^3) = \Theta(n^2) = \Theta(\Delta^{-1/2}) \cdot e(K_n^3),$$

so we might expect that one can prove a corresponding lower bound for all such H.

Theorem (Nie-S.-Verstraëte, 2020)

For any 3-graph H with maximum degree at most Δ , we have

$$\operatorname{ex}(H, C_3^3) \geq \Delta^{-1/2 - o(1)} \cdot e(H).$$

One might also conjecture that for hypergraphs the worst host is K_n^r in general. If every element of \mathcal{F} is not *r*-partite, then $ex(H, \mathcal{F}) \ge (1 + o(1))\pi(\mathcal{F})e(H)$, so the interest is in families of *r*-partite *r*-graphs. For example, we have

$$\operatorname{ex}(K_n^3,C_3^3) = \Theta(n^2) = \Theta(\Delta^{-1/2}) \cdot e(K_n^3),$$

so we might expect that one can prove a corresponding lower bound for all such H.

Theorem (Nie-S.-Verstraëte, 2020)

For any 3-graph H with maximum degree at most Δ , we have

$$\operatorname{ex}(H, C_3^3) \geq \Delta^{-1/2 - o(1)} \cdot e(H).$$

To find a large triangle-free subgraph of H, we will use a triangle-free 3-graph J as a "template."

Random Homomorphisms and C_3^3

Let $\chi: V(H) \to V(J)$ be chosen uniformly at random.

・ロト・日本・モト・モート ヨー うへで

Let $\chi : V(H) \to V(J)$ be chosen uniformly at random. Let $H' \subseteq H$ be the subgraph containing the edges $e \in E(H)$ with $\chi(e) \in E(J)$, i.e. if $e = \{v_1, v_2, v_3\}$, then $\{\chi(v_1), \chi(v_2), \chi(v_3)\} \in E(J)$.

Let $\chi : V(H) \to V(J)$ be chosen uniformly at random. Let $H' \subseteq H$ be the subgraph containing the edges $e \in E(H)$ with $\chi(e) \in E(J)$, i.e. if $e = \{v_1, v_2, v_3\}$, then $\{\chi(v_1), \chi(v_2), \chi(v_3)\} \in E(J)$. Unfortunately H' typically won't be triangle-free even if J is.

Random Homomorphisms and C_3^3

Let $\chi : V(H) \to V(J)$ be chosen uniformly at random. Let $H' \subseteq H$ be the subgraph containing the edges $e \in E(H)$ with $\chi(e) \in E(J)$, i.e. if $e = \{v_1, v_2, v_3\}$, then $\{\chi(v_1), \chi(v_2), \chi(v_3)\} \in E(J)$. Unfortunately H' typically won't be triangle-free even if J is. Indeed, if $\{1, 2, 3\} \in E(J)$ then a triangle in H will survive if it's given the following assignment




▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□ ● ● ●



Redefine $H' \subseteq H$ to have the edges $e \in E(H)$ such that (1) $\chi(e) \in E(J)$

▲ロト ▲御 ト ▲ 臣 ト ▲ 臣 ト の Q @



Redefine $H' \subseteq H$ to have the edges $e \in E(H)$ such that (1) $\chi(e) \in E(J)$, and (2) for any $f \in E(H)$ with $|f \cap e| = 1$ we have $\chi(f) \neq \chi(e)$.



Redefine $H' \subseteq H$ to have the edges $e \in E(H)$ such that (1) $\chi(e) \in E(J)$, and (2) for any $f \in E(H)$ with $|f \cap e| = 1$ we have $\chi(f) \neq \chi(e)$. This solves the previous issue, but there are still issues that can happen.



Redefine $H' \subseteq H$ to have the edges $e \in E(H)$ such that (1) $\chi(e) \in E(J)$, and (2) for any $f \in E(H)$ with $|f \cap e| = 1$ we have $\chi(f) \neq \chi(e)$. This solves the previous issue, but there are still issues that can happen. For example, if J is the star 3-graph $S_{n,3}$ with common element 1, then a triangle in H will survive if it's given the following assignment



・ロト ・ 日 ・ ・ 日 ・ ・ 日 ・



◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?



It turns out that we can't get around this issue by putting stronger restrictions on the edges of H'.



It turns out that we can't get around this issue by putting stronger restrictions on the edges of H'. The solution is to consider a J which forbids other subgraphs so that the above picture can never appear.



It turns out that we can't get around this issue by putting stronger restrictions on the edges of H'. The solution is to consider a J which forbids other subgraphs so that the above picture can never appear.

Theorem (Ruzsa-Szemerédi, 1978)

There exists a t-vertex 3-graph R_t with $t^{2-o(1)}$ edges which is triangle-free and which is linear.

Claim

H' is triangle-free.



Claim

H' is triangle-free.

Assume $e_1, e_2, e_3 \in H'$ forms a triangle with $e_i \cap e_j = \{x_{ij}\}$.

Claim

H' is triangle-free.

Assume $e_1, e_2, e_3 \in H'$ forms a triangle with $e_i \cap e_j = \{x_{ij}\}$. Note that $\chi(x_{ij}) \in \chi(e_i) \cap \chi(e_j)$

Claim

H' is triangle-free.

Assume $e_1, e_2, e_3 \in H'$ forms a triangle with $e_i \cap e_j = \{x_{ij}\}$. Note that $\chi(x_{ij}) \in \chi(e_i) \cap \chi(e_j)$, and that these vertices must be distinct (since $\chi(x_{12}) = \chi(x_{13})$ implies $|\chi(e_1)| < 3$).

Claim

H' is triangle-free.

Assume $e_1, e_2, e_3 \in H'$ forms a triangle with $e_i \cap e_j = \{x_{ij}\}$. Note that $\chi(x_{ij}) \in \chi(e_i) \cap \chi(e_j)$, and that these vertices must be distinct (since $\chi(x_{12}) = \chi(x_{13})$ implies $|\chi(e_1)| < 3$). Further, $|\chi(e_i) \cap \chi(e_j)| \neq 2$

Claim

H' is triangle-free.

Assume $e_1, e_2, e_3 \in H'$ forms a triangle with $e_i \cap e_j = \{x_{ij}\}$. Note that $\chi(x_{ij}) \in \chi(e_i) \cap \chi(e_j)$, and that these vertices must be distinct (since $\chi(x_{12}) = \chi(x_{13})$ implies $|\chi(e_1)| < 3$). Further, $|\chi(e_i) \cap \chi(e_j)| \neq 2, 3$.

Claim

H' is triangle-free.

Assume $e_1, e_2, e_3 \in H'$ forms a triangle with $e_i \cap e_j = \{x_{ij}\}$. Note that $\chi(x_{ij}) \in \chi(e_i) \cap \chi(e_j)$, and that these vertices must be distinct (since $\chi(x_{12}) = \chi(x_{13})$ implies $|\chi(e_1)| < 3$). Further, $|\chi(e_i) \cap \chi(e_j)| \neq 2, 3$. Thus $\chi(e_i) \cap \chi(e_j) = \{\chi(x_{ij})\}$.

Claim

H' is triangle-free.

Assume $e_1, e_2, e_3 \in H'$ forms a triangle with $e_i \cap e_j = \{x_{ij}\}$. Note that $\chi(x_{ij}) \in \chi(e_i) \cap \chi(e_j)$, and that these vertices must be distinct (since $\chi(x_{12}) = \chi(x_{13})$ implies $|\chi(e_1)| < 3$). Further, $|\chi(e_i) \cap \chi(e_j)| \neq 2, 3$. Thus $\chi(e_i) \cap \chi(e_j) = \{\chi(x_{ij})\}$. Thus $\chi(e_1), \chi(e_2), \chi(e_3)$ is a C_3^3 in R_t , a contradiction.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Let $e \in E(H)$. What's the probability that $e \in E(H')$?

Let $e \in E(H)$. What's the probability that $e \in E(H')$? The probability e satisfies (1) is

$$e(J) \cdot 3!/t^3$$

Let $e \in E(H)$. What's the probability that $e \in E(H')$? The probability e satisfies (1) is

$$e(J) \cdot 3!/t^3 = t^{-1-o(1)}.$$

Let $e \in E(H)$. What's the probability that $e \in E(H')$? The probability e satisfies (1) is

$$e(J) \cdot 3!/t^3 = t^{-1-o(1)}.$$

Given this, the probability that an edge $f \in E(H)$ with $|f \cap e| = 1$ has $\chi(f) = \chi(e)$ is at most $(3/t)^2$.

Let $e \in E(H)$. What's the probability that $e \in E(H')$? The probability e satisfies (1) is

$$e(J) \cdot 3!/t^3 = t^{-1-o(1)}.$$

Given this, the probability that an edge $f \in E(H)$ with $|f \cap e| = 1$ has $\chi(f) = \chi(e)$ is at most $(3/t)^2$. There are at most 3Δ edges f like this

Let $e \in E(H)$. What's the probability that $e \in E(H')$? The probability e satisfies (1) is

$$e(J) \cdot 3!/t^3 = t^{-1-o(1)}.$$

Given this, the probability that an edge $f \in E(H)$ with $|f \cap e| = 1$ has $\chi(f) = \chi(e)$ is at most $(3/t)^2$. There are at most 3Δ edges f like this, so taking a union bound we see that the probability that (2) is satisfied is at least $1 - 3\Delta(3/t)^2$.

Let $e \in E(H)$. What's the probability that $e \in E(H')$? The probability e satisfies (1) is

$$e(J) \cdot 3!/t^3 = t^{-1-o(1)}.$$

Given this, the probability that an edge $f \in E(H)$ with $|f \cap e| = 1$ has $\chi(f) = \chi(e)$ is at most $(3/t)^2$. There are at most 3Δ edges f like this, so taking a union bound we see that the probability that (2) is satisfied is at least $1 - 3\Delta(3/t)^2$. If we take $t = 9\Delta^{1/2}$ this probability is at least $\frac{1}{2}$

Let $e \in E(H)$. What's the probability that $e \in E(H')$? The probability e satisfies (1) is

$$e(J) \cdot 3!/t^3 = t^{-1-o(1)}$$

Given this, the probability that an edge $f \in E(H)$ with $|f \cap e| = 1$ has $\chi(f) = \chi(e)$ is at most $(3/t)^2$. There are at most 3Δ edges f like this, so taking a union bound we see that the probability that (2) is satisfied is at least $1 - 3\Delta(3/t)^2$. If we take $t = 9\Delta^{1/2}$ this probability is at least $\frac{1}{2}$, thus

$$\Pr[e \in E(H')] \ge t^{-1-o(1)} \cdot \frac{1}{2}$$

Let $e \in E(H)$. What's the probability that $e \in E(H')$? The probability e satisfies (1) is

$$e(J) \cdot 3!/t^3 = t^{-1-o(1)}$$

Given this, the probability that an edge $f \in E(H)$ with $|f \cap e| = 1$ has $\chi(f) = \chi(e)$ is at most $(3/t)^2$. There are at most 3Δ edges f like this, so taking a union bound we see that the probability that (2) is satisfied is at least $1 - 3\Delta(3/t)^2$. If we take $t = 9\Delta^{1/2}$ this probability is at least $\frac{1}{2}$, thus

$$\Pr[e \in E(H')] \ge t^{-1-o(1)} \cdot \frac{1}{2} = \Delta^{-1/2-o(1)}.$$

Let $e \in E(H)$. What's the probability that $e \in E(H')$? The probability e satisfies (1) is

$$e(J) \cdot 3!/t^3 = t^{-1-o(1)}$$

Given this, the probability that an edge $f \in E(H)$ with $|f \cap e| = 1$ has $\chi(f) = \chi(e)$ is at most $(3/t)^2$. There are at most 3Δ edges f like this, so taking a union bound we see that the probability that (2) is satisfied is at least $1 - 3\Delta(3/t)^2$. If we take $t = 9\Delta^{1/2}$ this probability is at least $\frac{1}{2}$, thus

$$\Pr[e \in E(H')] \ge t^{-1-o(1)} \cdot \frac{1}{2} = \Delta^{-1/2-o(1)}.$$

Linearity of expectation then gives $\mathbb{E}[e(H')] \ge \Delta^{-1/2-o(1)}e(H)$.

・ロト・西ト・ヨト・ヨー シック

If H is an r-graph with maximum degree Δ , then

$$\operatorname{ex}(H,C_3^r) \geq \Delta^{-\frac{r-2}{r-1}-o(1)} \cdot e(H).$$

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

If H is an r-graph with maximum degree Δ , then

$$\operatorname{ex}(H,C_3^r) \geq \Delta^{-\frac{r-2}{r-1}-o(1)} \cdot e(H).$$

Is this best possible?

If H is an r-graph with maximum degree Δ , then

$$\operatorname{ex}(H,C_3^r) \geq \Delta^{-\frac{r-2}{r-1}-o(1)} \cdot e(H).$$

Is this best possible?

Proposition (Nie-S.-Verstraëte, 2020)

For $r \geq 3$ there exists an r-graph H with

$$ex(H, C_3^r) = O(\Delta^{-1/2}) \cdot e(H).$$

If H is an r-graph with maximum degree Δ , then

$$\operatorname{ex}(H,C_3^r) \geq \Delta^{-\frac{r-2}{r-1}-o(1)} \cdot e(H).$$

Is this best possible?

Proposition (Nie-S.-Verstraëte, 2020)

For $r \geq 3$ there exists an r-graph H with

$$ex(H, C_3^r) = O(\Delta^{-1/2}) \cdot e(H).$$

In particular, the worst host is *not* a clique.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ



A similar approach can be made to work for other \mathcal{F} .





A similar approach can be made to work for other \mathcal{F} . For example, let $\mathcal{K}^3_{2,2,s}$ denote the complete 3-partite 3-graph with parts of sizes 2, 2, and s.
A similar approach can be made to work for other \mathcal{F} . For example, let $\mathcal{K}^3_{2,2,s}$ denote the complete 3-partite 3-graph with parts of sizes 2, 2, and *s*. If *s* is sufficiently large it is known that

$$ex(n, K_{2,2,s}^3) = \Theta(n^{3-1/4}) = O(\Delta^{-1/8}) \cdot e(K_n^3).$$

There exists a 3-graph H with maximum degree at most $\Delta \to \infty$ such that

$$ex(H, K^3_{2,2,s}) = O(\Delta^{-1/6}) \cdot e(H).$$

There exists a 3-graph H with maximum degree at most $\Delta \to \infty$ such that

$$\operatorname{ex}(H, K^3_{2,2,s}) = O(\Delta^{-1/6}) \cdot e(H).$$

Moreover, if s is sufficiently large then for all 3-graphs H with maximum degree at most $\Delta \to \infty$ we have

$$ex(H, K^3_{2,2,s}) \ge \Delta^{-1/6-o(1)} \cdot e(H).$$

There exists a 3-graph H with maximum degree at most $\Delta \to \infty$ such that

$$\operatorname{ex}(H, K^3_{2,2,s}) = O(\Delta^{-1/6}) \cdot e(H).$$

Moreover, if s is sufficiently large then for all 3-graphs H with maximum degree at most $\Delta \to \infty$ we have

$$\operatorname{ex}(H, K^3_{2,2,s}) \geq \Delta^{-1/6-o(1)} \cdot e(H).$$

The proof of the lower bound requires two cases: one where the host H has small codegrees and one where it has high codegrees.



Let us first try and adapt our random homomorphism approach.



Let us first try and adapt our random homomorphism approach. We fix some $K^3_{2,2,s}$ -free 3-graph J on t vertices and randomly choose $\chi: V(H) \to V(J)$.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

Let us first try and adapt our random homomorphism approach. We fix some $K^3_{2,2,s}$ -free 3-graph J on t vertices and randomly choose $\chi : V(H) \to V(J)$. As before we keep an edge $e \in E(H)$ provided (1) $\chi(e) \in E(J)$

One can check that with this our subgraph will be $K_{2,2,s}^3$ -free.

One can check that with this our subgraph will be $K_{2,2,s}^3$ -free. The condition $|f \cap e| = 1$ forced us to take $t \approx \Delta^{1/2}$ (because roughly each of the Δ edges intersecting *e* had probability $1/t^2$ of merging with *e*).

One can check that with this our subgraph will be $K_{2,2,s}^3$ -free. The condition $|f \cap e| = 1$ forced us to take $t \approx \Delta^{1/2}$ (because roughly each of the Δ edges intersecting *e* had probability $1/t^2$ of merging with *e*). Our new condition forces $t \approx \Delta_2$, the maximum codegree of *H*.



If H is a 3-graph with maximum codegree at most D and $ex(n, K_{2,2,s}^3) = \Theta(n^{3-1/4})$, then

$$ex(H, K^3_{2,2,s}) = \Omega(D^{-1/4}) \cdot e(H).$$

・ロト ・西ト ・ヨト ・ヨー うらぐ



If H is a 3-graph with maximum codegree at most D and $ex(n, K_{2,2,s}^3) = \Theta(n^{3-1/4})$, then

$$ex(H, K^3_{2,2,s}) = \Omega(D^{-1/4}) \cdot e(H).$$

This will give the correct answer of $\Delta^{-1/6}e(H)$ when $D \leq \Delta^{2/3}$, but we need a new approach for hosts with large codegrees.



If H is 3-partite on $V_1 \cup V_2 \cup V_3$ such that every pair in $V_1 \cup V_2$ has codegree 0 or D, then

$$\operatorname{ex}(H, K^3_{2,2,s}) \geq \Omega(\Delta^{-1/2}D^{1/2}) \cdot e(H).$$

▲ロト ▲帰ト ▲ヨト ▲ヨト 三日 - の々ぐ



If H is 3-partite on $V_1 \cup V_2 \cup V_3$ such that every pair in $V_1 \cup V_2$ has codegree 0 or D, then

$$\operatorname{ex}(H, K^3_{2,2,s}) \geq \Omega(\Delta^{-1/2}D^{1/2}) \cdot e(H).$$

Roughly take G to be the graph induced by $V_1 \cup V_2$, find $G' \subseteq G$ which is C_4 -free (using Perarnau-Reed), and then lift this to a subgraph in H.



By losing a o(1) term one can roughly reduce to the case of the previous lemma.

・ロト・日本・モト・モート ヨー うへで

By losing a o(1) term one can roughly reduce to the case of the previous lemma.

Lemma

If H has maximum codegree D then roughly

$$ex(H, K^3_{2,2,s}) = \Omega(D^{-1/4}) \cdot e(H),$$

$$ex(H, K^3_{2,2,s}) \ge \Delta^{-1/2 - o(1)} D^{1/2} \cdot e(H)$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

By losing a o(1) term one can roughly reduce to the case of the previous lemma.

Lemma

If H has maximum codegree D then roughly

$$\operatorname{ex}(H, K^3_{2,2,s}) = \Omega(D^{-1/4}) \cdot e(H),$$

$$ex(H, K^3_{2,2,s}) \ge \Delta^{-1/2 - o(1)} D^{1/2} \cdot e(H)$$

This gives $ex(H, K_{2,2,s}^3) \ge \Delta^{-1/6-o(1)}e(H)$, and further shows that if this is sharp the host must have maximum codegree about $\Delta^{2/3}$.



$$ex(K^3_{n,n,n^2},K^3_{2,2,s}) = O(\Delta^{-1/6}) \cdot e(K^3_{n,n,n^2}).$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

<□ > < @ > < E > < E > E のQ @

Theorem (S.-Verstraëte, 2020+)

Let $\ell \geq 3$. If H is a 3-graph with maximum degree at most $\Delta \rightarrow \infty$, then

$$\operatorname{ex}(H, C^3_{\ell}) \geq \Delta^{-1+\frac{1}{\ell}-o(1)} \cdot e(H).$$

▲ロト ▲帰ト ▲ヨト ▲ヨト 三日 - の々ぐ

Let $\ell \geq 3$. If H is a 3-graph with maximum degree at most $\Delta \to \infty$, then

$$\operatorname{ex}(H, C^3_{\ell}) \geq \Delta^{-1+\frac{1}{\ell}-o(1)} \cdot e(H).$$

For all even ℓ there exists a 3-graph with maximum degree at most $\Delta \to \infty$ and

$$\operatorname{ex}(H, \, C^3_\ell) \leq \Delta^{-1 + rac{1}{\ell-1} + o(1)} \cdot e(H).$$

Let $\ell \geq 3$. If H is a 3-graph with maximum degree at most $\Delta \rightarrow \infty$, then

$$\operatorname{ex}(H, C_{\ell}^3) \geq \Delta^{-1+\frac{1}{\ell}-o(1)} \cdot e(H).$$

For all even ℓ there exists a 3-graph with maximum degree at most $\Delta \to \infty$ and

$$\operatorname{ex}(H, \, C^3_\ell) \leq \Delta^{-1 + \frac{1}{\ell - 1} + o(1)} \cdot e(H).$$

The upper bound uses a random host and results of Mubayi and Yepremyan.

We say that F is a Berge C_{ℓ} if it has edges e_1, \ldots, e_{ℓ} and distinct vertices v_1, \ldots, v_{ℓ} with $v_i \in e_i \cap e_{i+1}$ for all *i*. Let \mathcal{B}_{ℓ}^r denote the set of *r*-uniform Berge C_{ℓ} 's.



・ロト ・ 理 ト ・ ヨ ト ・ ヨ ト ・ ヨ

We say that F is a Berge C_{ℓ} if it has edges e_1, \ldots, e_{ℓ} and distinct vertices v_1, \ldots, v_{ℓ} with $v_i \in e_i \cap e_{i+1}$ for all i. Let \mathcal{B}_{ℓ}^r denote the set of r-uniform Berge C_{ℓ} 's.



Proposition

If $r > \ell$ then $ex(H, \mathcal{B}^r_{\ell}) = \Omega(\Delta^{-1})e(H)$, and this is best possible.

We say that F is a Berge C_{ℓ} if it has edges e_1, \ldots, e_{ℓ} and distinct vertices v_1, \ldots, v_{ℓ} with $v_i \in e_i \cap e_{i+1}$ for all i. Let \mathcal{B}_{ℓ}^r denote the set of r-uniform Berge C_{ℓ} 's.



Proposition

If $r > \ell$ then $ex(H, \mathcal{B}_{\ell}^{r}) = \Omega(\Delta^{-1})e(H)$, and this is best possible.

For the lower bound take a maximal matching of H (which works for almost all \mathcal{F}).

We say that F is a Berge C_{ℓ} if it has edges e_1, \ldots, e_{ℓ} and distinct vertices v_1, \ldots, v_{ℓ} with $v_i \in e_i \cap e_{i+1}$ for all i. Let \mathcal{B}_{ℓ}^r denote the set of r-uniform Berge C_{ℓ} 's.



Proposition

If $r > \ell$ then $ex(H, \mathcal{B}_{\ell}^{r}) = \Omega(\Delta^{-1})e(H)$, and this is best possible.

For the lower bound take a maximal matching of H (which works for almost all \mathcal{F}). The upper bound has H consisting of Δ edges containing a common set of size ℓ .

If H is a 3-graph with maximum degree at most $\Delta \to \infty$, then

$$\begin{split} & \exp(H, \mathcal{B}_{3}^{3}) \geq \Delta^{-1/2 - o(1)} \cdot e(H), \\ & \exp(H, \mathcal{B}_{4}^{3}) \geq \Delta^{-3/4 - o(1)} \cdot e(H), \\ & \exp(H, \mathcal{B}_{5}^{3}) \geq \Delta^{-3/4 - o(1)} \cdot e(H). \end{split}$$

If H is a 4-graph with maximum degree at most $\Delta \to \infty$, then

$$\operatorname{ex}(H, \mathcal{B}_4^4) \geq \Delta^{-5/6-o(1)} \cdot e(H).$$

Moreover, all of these bounds are tight up to a factor of o(1).

Let $H_{n,p}^r$ be the random *r*-graph on [n] which includes each edge independently with probability *p*.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

Let $H_{n,p}^r$ be the random *r*-graph on [n] which includes each edge independently with probability p.

Theorem (S.-Verstraëte, 2020+)

If s is sufficiently large, then a.a.s.

$$\exp(H_{n,p}^{3}, \mathcal{K}_{2,2,s}^{3}) = \begin{cases} \Theta(pn^{3}) & n^{-3+o(1)} \log n \leq p \leq n^{-\frac{-s-1}{4s-1}}, \\ n^{\frac{11s-4}{4s-1}+o(1)} & n^{\frac{-s-1}{4s-1}} \leq p \leq n^{\frac{-5}{12s-3}}, \\ p^{3/4}n^{3-1/4+o(1)} & n^{\frac{-5}{12s-3}} \leq p. \end{cases}$$

If
$$\ell \geq 3$$
 and $ex(n, \bigcup_{\ell'=2}^{\ell} \mathcal{B}^3_{\ell'}) \geq n^{1+1/\lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor - o(1)}$, then a.a.s.

$$\begin{split} & \exp(H_{n,p}^{3}, \{\mathcal{B}_{2}^{3}, \dots, \mathcal{B}_{\ell}^{3}\}) \leq p^{\frac{1}{3\lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor}} n^{1+1/\lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor + o(1)} \text{ for } p \geq n^{-3 + \frac{\lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor}{\ell - 1}}, \\ & \exp(H_{n,p}^{3}, \{\mathcal{B}_{2}^{3}, \dots, \mathcal{B}_{\ell}^{3}\}) \geq p^{\frac{1}{2\lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor}} n^{1+1/\lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor - o(1)} \text{ for } p \geq n^{-2 + \frac{\lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor}{\ell - 1}}. \end{split}$$

(ロ)、(型)、(E)、(E)、 E) の(の)

If
$$\ell \geq 3$$
 and $ex(n, \bigcup_{\ell'=2}^{\ell} \mathcal{B}^3_{\ell'}) \geq n^{1+1/\lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor - o(1)}$, then a.a.s.

$$\begin{split} & \exp(H_{n,p}^{3}, \{\mathcal{B}_{2}^{3}, \dots, \mathcal{B}_{\ell}^{3}\}) \leq p^{\frac{1}{3\lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor}} n^{1+1/\lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor + o(1)} \text{ for } p \geq n^{-3 + \frac{\lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor}{\ell - 1}}, \\ & \exp(H_{n,p}^{3}, \{\mathcal{B}_{2}^{3}, \dots, \mathcal{B}_{\ell}^{3}\}) \geq p^{\frac{1}{2\lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor}} n^{1+1/\lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor - o(1)} \text{ for } p \geq n^{-2 + \frac{\lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor}{\ell - 1}}. \end{split}$$

Note that the girth problem is trivial for general hosts since sunflowers give $ex(H, \mathcal{B}_2^r) = O(\Delta^{-1})e(H)$.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 三臣 - のへ⊙

We have a.a.s.

$$\exp(H_{n,p}^{r}, \{\mathcal{B}_{2}^{r}, \mathcal{B}_{3}^{r}\}) = \begin{cases} \Theta(pn^{r}) & n^{-3+o(1)} \leq p \leq n^{-r+3/2}, \\ p^{\frac{1}{2r-3}}n^{2+o(1)} & n^{-r+3/2} \leq p. \end{cases}$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへで

We have a.a.s.

$$\exp(H_{n,p}^{r}, \{\mathcal{B}_{2}^{r}, \mathcal{B}_{3}^{r}\}) = \begin{cases} \Theta(pn^{r}) & n^{-3+o(1)} \leq p \leq n^{-r+3/2}, \\ p^{\frac{1}{2r-3}}n^{2+o(1)} & n^{-r+3/2} \leq p. \end{cases}$$

The same lower bound holds for forbidding \mathcal{B}_3^r or \mathcal{C}_3^r , but we do not have tight upper bounds when r > 3.

Some Open Problems

<□ > < @ > < E > < E > E のQ @

Is the o(1) term in the bound ex(H, C₃³) ≥ Δ^{-1/2-o(1)}e(H) necessary?

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ
- Is the o(1) term in the bound ex(H, C₃³) ≥ Δ^{-1/2-o(1)}e(H) necessary?
- Obtain tighter bounds for ex(H, C^r_ℓ), maybe by looking at ex(H^r_{n,p}, C^r_ℓ).

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

- Is the o(1) term in the bound ex(H, C₃³) ≥ Δ^{-1/2-o(1)}e(H) necessary?
- Obtain tighter bounds for ex(H, C^r_ℓ), maybe by looking at ex(H^r_{n,p}, C^r_ℓ).

• Obtain tighter bounds for $ex(H_{n,p}^r, \bigcup_{\ell' \leq \ell} \mathcal{B}_{\ell}^r)$.

- Is the o(1) term in the bound ex(H, C₃³) ≥ Δ^{-1/2-o(1)}e(H) necessary?
- Obtain tighter bounds for ex(H, C^r_ℓ), maybe by looking at ex(H^r_{n,p}, C^r_ℓ).
- Obtain tighter bounds for $ex(H_{n,p}^r, \bigcup_{\ell' < \ell} \mathcal{B}_{\ell}^r)$.
- Prove bounds for your favorite family of hypergraphs \mathcal{F} .



sspiro@ucsd.edu

www.admonymous.co/samspiro

Link also on my website.



Thank You!

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?