



ELSEVIER

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A

www.elsevier.com/locate/jcta


Note

Unavoidable patterns

Jacob Fox^{a,1}, Benny Sudakov^{b,2}^a Department of Mathematics, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544, USA^b Department of Mathematics, UCLA, Los Angeles, CA 90095, USA

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 14 March 2008

Available online 15 May 2008

Keywords:

Ramsey theory

Ramsey-type problem for tournaments

Dependent random choice

ABSTRACT

Let \mathcal{F}_k denote the family of 2-edge-colored complete graphs on $2k$ vertices in which one color forms either a clique of order k or two disjoint cliques of order k . Bollobás conjectured that for every $\epsilon > 0$ and positive integer k there is $n(k, \epsilon)$ such that every 2-edge-coloring of the complete graph of order $n \geq n(k, \epsilon)$ which has at least $\epsilon \binom{n}{2}$ edges in each color contains a member of \mathcal{F}_k . This conjecture was proved by Cutler and Montágh, who showed that $n(k, \epsilon) < 4^{k/\epsilon}$. We give a much simpler proof of this conjecture which in addition shows that $n(k, \epsilon) < \epsilon^{-ck}$ for some constant c . This bound is tight up to the constant factor in the exponent for all k and ϵ . We also discuss similar results for tournaments and hypergraphs.

© 2008 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

The *Ramsey number* $R(k)$ is the least positive integer n such that every 2-edge-coloring of the complete graph K_n contains a monochromatic clique of order k . A classical result of Erdős and Szekeres [6], which is a quantitative version of Ramsey's theorem, implies that $R(k) < 2^{2^k}$ for every positive integer k . Erdős [4] showed using probabilistic arguments that $R(k) > 2^{k/2}$ for $k > 2$. Over the last sixty years, there have been several improvements on these bounds (see, e.g., [2]). However, despite efforts by various researchers, the constant factors in the above exponents remain the same.

If we are interested in finding a subgraph in a 2-edge-coloring of K_n that is not monochromatic, we must assume that each color is sufficiently represented, e.g., that each color class has at least $\epsilon \binom{n}{2}$ edges. Let \mathcal{F}_k denote the family of 2-edge-colored complete graphs on $2k$ vertices in which one color forms either a clique of order k or two disjoint cliques of order k . Consider a 2-edge-

E-mail addresses: jacobfox@math.princeton.edu (J. Fox), bsudakov@math.ucla.edu (B. Sudakov).

¹ Research supported by the NSF Graduate Research Fellowship and the Princeton Centennial Fellowship.² Research supported in part by NSF CAREER award DMS-0546523, NSF grant DMS-0355497, and the USA–Israeli BSF grant.

coloring of K_n with n even in which one of the colors forms a clique of order $n/2$ or two disjoint cliques of order $n/2$. Clearly, these colorings have at least roughly $1/4$ of the edges in each color, and nevertheless they basically do not contain any colored patterns except those in \mathcal{F}_k . This shows that the 2-edge-colorings in \mathcal{F}_k are essentially the only types of patterns that are possibly unavoidable in 2-edge-colorings that are far from being monochromatic. It is also clear that \mathcal{F}_k forms a minimal such family. Generalizing the classical Ramsey problem, Bollobás conjectured that for every $\epsilon > 0$ and k there is an n_0 such that every 2-edge-coloring of K_n with $n \geq n_0$ which has at least $\epsilon \binom{n}{2}$ edges in each color contains a member of \mathcal{F}_k . This conjecture was proved by Cutler and Montágh [3]. Let $n(k, \epsilon)$ denote the minimum n_0 which satisfies Bollobás's conjecture. Cutler and Montágh proved that $n(k, \epsilon) < 4^{k/\epsilon}$. Here we present a much simpler proof of Bollobás's conjecture which also gives a better bound on $n(k, \epsilon)$ when ϵ is small (e.g., when $\epsilon < 1/7$).

Theorem 1.1. *If $n \geq (16/\epsilon)^{2k+1}$, then every 2-edge-coloring of K_n with at least $\epsilon \binom{n}{2}$ edges in each color contains a member of \mathcal{F}_k .*

Using a simple probabilistic argument, one can show that the bound in this theorem is tight up to a constant factor in the exponent for all k and ϵ (see Proposition 2.3).

In this paper, we also consider an analogous problem for tournaments. A *tournament* is a directed graph obtained by choosing a direction for each edge in an undirected complete graph. A tournament is *transitive* if there is a linear ordering of the vertices such that all edges point in one direction. Erdős and Moser [5] obtained a variant of Ramsey's theorem for tournaments. Let $T(k)$ denote the minimum n such that every tournament on n vertices contains a transitive subtournament of order k . They proved that $2^{(k-1)/2} \leq T(k) \leq 2^{k-1}$.

In order to prove an analogue of Bollobás's conjecture for tournaments, the following definition appears to be the most natural. A tournament on n vertices is ϵ -far from being transitive if the direction of at least ϵn^2 edges need to be changed to obtain a transitive tournament. We think this is a good analogue of 2-edge-colorings in which both colors are sufficiently represented. Let D_k denote the tournament with $3k$ vertices formed by taking three disjoint transitive tournaments each of size k with vertex sets V_0, V_1, V_2 , and directing all edges in $V_i \times V_{i+1}$ from V_i to V_{i+1} for $i = 0, 1, 2$, where indices are taken modulo 3. By considering the tournament $D_{n/3}$ with n a multiple of 3, which is $\frac{1}{9}$ -far from being transitive, we see that D_k is essentially the only possible type of unavoidable tournament in tournaments that are far from being transitive. We prove the following variant of Bollobás's conjecture for tournaments.

Theorem 1.2. *There is a constant c such that if $n \geq \epsilon^{-ck/\epsilon^2}$ and T is a tournament on n vertices which is ϵ -far from being transitive, then T contains D_k .*

It is easy to see that if a tournament on n vertices contains ϵn^3 directed triangles, then it is $\epsilon/3$ -far from being transitive. Indeed, each edge is in at most n directed triangles, so a tournament with ϵn^3 directed triangles contains $\frac{\epsilon}{3} n^2$ edge-disjoint directed triangles. The direction of at least one edge of each such directed triangle needs to be changed in order to make the tournament transitive. In the other direction, the following lemma demonstrates that if a tournament is ϵ -far from being transitive, then it contains many directed triangles. We will use this lemma in the proof of Theorem 1.2.

Lemma 1.3. *There is a constant $c > 0$ such that if a tournament T on n vertices is ϵ -far from being transitive, then it contains at least $c\epsilon^2 n^3$ directed triangles.*

The following simple tournament construction demonstrates that the bound in Lemma 1.3 is best possible up to the constant factor c . Let V_1, \dots, V_d be disjoint vertex sets of size $3n$, and direct all edges from V_i to V_j for $i < j$. The tournament restricted to each V_i is a copy of D_n . Note that each V_i contains n^2 edge-disjoint directed triangles and n^3 total directed triangles. The tournament on $V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_d$ we constructed has $N = 3dn$ vertices, is ϵ -far from being transitive with $\epsilon = \frac{dn^2}{N^2} = \frac{1}{9d}$, and has only $dn^3 = 3\epsilon^2 N^3$ directed triangles.

The statement of Lemma 1.3 appears similar to the well-known triangle removal lemma of Ruzsa and Szemerédi [11]. This lemma states that for every $\epsilon > 0$ there is a constant $\delta > 0$ depending only on ϵ such that if a graph on n vertices is ϵ -far from being triangle-free, i.e., at least ϵn^2 edges need to be deleted to make the graph triangle-free, then it contains at least δn^3 triangles. However, as ϵ tends to zero, in the triangle removal lemma δ goes to 0 much faster than in Lemma 1.3.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In the next section we give a simple proof of Bollobás’s conjecture and show that our upper bound on $n(k, \epsilon)$ is tight up to a constant factor in the exponent for all k and ϵ . In Section 3 we study the tournaments that are far from being transitive and show that sufficiently large such tournaments contain a copy of D_k . The last section of this paper contains some concluding remarks, including a discussion of the possible generalization of our theorems to hypergraphs. Throughout the paper, we systematically omit floor and ceiling signs whenever they are not crucial for the sake of clarity of presentation. We also do not make any serious attempt to optimize absolute constants in our statements and proofs.

The *edge density* of a graph G is the fraction of all pairs of vertices of G that are edges. In a red–blue edge coloring of K_n , the *red neighborhood* $N_R(v)$ of a vertex v is the set of vertices adjacent to v in color red, and the *red degree* of v is $|N_R(v)|$. For a vertex subset U of a graph G , the *red common neighborhood* $N_R(U)$ is the set of vertices adjacent in color red to all vertices in U . We similarly define $N_B(v)$, *blue degree*, and $N_B(U)$.

2. Proof of Theorem 1.1

We first need a lemma which shows that any 2-edge-coloring with edge density at least ϵ in each color has many vertices with large degree in both colors.

Lemma 2.1. *In every red–blue edge coloring of K_n ($n \geq 4$) in which each color has density at least ϵ , the subset $S \subset V(K_n)$ of vertices that have degree at least $\frac{\epsilon}{4}n$ in both colors has cardinality at least $\frac{\epsilon}{2}n$.*

Proof. Assume for contradiction that $|S| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}n$. Note that $\epsilon \leq 1/2$ since each color has density at least ϵ . Let $R \subset V(K_n)$ be those vertices with blue degree less than $\frac{\epsilon}{4}n$, and $B \subset V(K_n)$ be those vertices with red degree less than $\frac{\epsilon}{4}n$. Then $V(K_n) = S \cup R \cup B$ is a partition of the vertex set. Assume without loss of generality that $|R| \geq |B|$, so $|R| \geq \frac{1}{2}(n - |S|) > \frac{3}{8}n$. The number of edges between R and B of color red is less than $\frac{\epsilon}{4}n|B|$ since each vertex in B has red degree less than $\frac{\epsilon}{4}n$. However, the number of red edges between R and B is greater than $(|B| - \frac{\epsilon}{4}n)|R|$ since every vertex in R has blue degree less than $\frac{\epsilon}{4}n$. Hence,

$$\frac{\epsilon}{4}n|B| > \left(|B| - \frac{\epsilon}{4}n\right)|R| > \left(|B| - \frac{\epsilon}{4}n\right)\frac{3}{8}n.$$

Rearranging the terms and using $\epsilon \leq 1/2$, we have

$$\frac{\epsilon}{4}n \cdot \frac{3}{8}n > |B| \left(\frac{3}{8}n - \frac{\epsilon}{4}n\right) \geq |B| \frac{n}{4}.$$

Multiplying both sides by $4/n$, we have $|B| < \frac{3\epsilon}{8}n$. We now give an upper bound on the number of edges of color blue. Each vertex in R has degree at most $\frac{\epsilon}{4}n$ in color blue, so these vertices participate in at most $\frac{\epsilon}{4}n|R|$ blue edges. The number of remaining edges, those contained in $B \cup S$, is $\binom{|B|+|S|}{2}$. Let $x = |B| + |S|$, so $x < \epsilon n$. Hence, the number of edges of color blue is at most

$$\frac{\epsilon}{4}n|R| + \binom{|B| + |S|}{2} = \frac{\epsilon}{4}n(n - x) + \binom{x}{2} < \frac{\epsilon}{4}n^2 + \frac{\epsilon^2}{4}n^2 \leq \epsilon \binom{n}{2},$$

contradicting that the blue edge density is at least ϵ and completing the proof. \square

The following lemma is a variant of the results in [9] and [12]. Its proof uses a probabilistic argument commonly referred to as dependent random choice, which appears to be a powerful tool in proving various results in Ramsey theory (see, e.g., [7] and its references).

Lemma 2.2. For a red–blue edge coloring of K_n , let S denote the vertex subset $S \subset V(K_n)$ such that every vertex in S has degree at least αn in each color, and $s = |S|$. If $\beta \leq s^{-k/h}$, then there is a subset $T \subset S$ with $|T| \geq \frac{1}{2}\alpha^h(1 - \alpha)^h s - 2$ such that every k -tuple in T has at least βn common neighbors in each color.

Proof. We may assume $\alpha \leq 1/2$ and $n \geq 4^{h+1}$, since otherwise we can let T be the empty set. Let $U_1 = \{x_1, \dots, x_h\}$, $U_2 = \{y_1, \dots, y_h\}$ be two subsets of h vertices from $V(K_n)$ chosen uniformly at random with repetitions, and let $W = N_R(U_1) \cap N_B(U_2) \cap S$. That is, W is the set of vertices of S that are adjacent in red to every vertex in U_1 and adjacent in blue to every vertex in U_2 . Since each vertex $v \in S$ has degree at least αn in each color and $\alpha \leq 1/2$, then

$$|N_R(v)| |N_B(v)| \geq \alpha n(1 - \alpha)n - 1 \geq \alpha(1 - \alpha)(1 - 2/n)n^2$$

for each $v \in S$. Therefore, using $n \geq 4^{h+1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|W|] &= \sum_{v \in S} \Pr(v \in N_R(U_1)) \Pr(v \in N_B(U_2)) = \sum_{v \in S} \left(\frac{|N_R(v)|}{n}\right)^h \left(\frac{|N_B(v)|}{n}\right)^h \\ &\geq \alpha^h(1 - \alpha)^h(1 - 2/n)^h s \geq \frac{1}{2}\alpha^h(1 - \alpha)^h s. \end{aligned}$$

The probability that a given set $D \subset S$ of vertices is adjacent to U_1 by red edges is $(\frac{|N_R(D)|}{n})^h$. Let Z denote the number of k -tuples in W with less than βn common red neighbors. So

$$\mathbb{E}[Z] = \sum_{D \subset S, |D|=k, |N(D)| < \beta n} \Pr(D \subset N_R(U_1)) \leq \binom{s}{k} \beta^k \leq s^k \beta^k \leq 1.$$

We similarly have that the expected number, which we denote by Z' , of k -tuples in W with less than βn common blue neighbors is at most 1.

Hence, the expectation of $|W| - Z - Z'$ is at least $\frac{1}{2}\alpha^h(1 - \alpha)^h s - 2$ and thus there are choices for U_1 and U_2 such that the corresponding value of $|W| - Z - Z'$ is at least $\frac{1}{2}\alpha^h(1 - \alpha)^h s - 2$. Delete a vertex from every k -tuple $D \subset W$ with less than βn red common neighbors or with less than βn blue common neighbors. Letting T be the resulting set, it is clear that T has the desired properties, completing the proof. \square

Having finished all the necessary preparations, we are now ready to prove our first theorem. Recall that the Ramsey number $R(k)$ is the least positive integer n such that every red–blue edge coloring of the complete graph K_n contains a monochromatic K_k . We will use the simple bound $R(k) < 4^k$ which was mentioned in the introduction.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Consider a red–blue edge coloring of K_n with $n \geq (16/\epsilon)^{2k+1}$ in which both colors have density at least ϵ . By Lemma 2.1, there is a vertex subset S with $|S| \geq \frac{\epsilon}{2}n$ in which every vertex has degree at least $\frac{\epsilon}{4}n$ in each color. Apply Lemma 2.2 with $\alpha = \frac{\epsilon}{4}$, $\beta = \frac{R(k)}{n}$, $h = 2k$, and $s = |S| \geq \frac{\epsilon}{2}n$. We can apply this lemma since

$$\beta = \frac{R(k)}{n} < 4^k/n < n^{-1/2} \leq s^{-k/h}.$$

So there is a subset $T \subset S$ with

$$|T| \geq \frac{1}{2}(\alpha(1 - \alpha))^{2k} s - 2 \geq \left(\frac{\epsilon}{8}\right)^{2k+1} n \geq 4^k \geq R(k)$$

and every k -tuple $D \subset T$ has at least $\beta n = R(k)$ common neighbors in each color. Since $|T| \geq R(k)$, there is a monochromatic k -clique D in T . Assume without loss of generality that the color of this monochromatic k -clique is red. By our construction of the set T , $|N_B(D)| \geq \beta n = R(k)$, so there is a monochromatic k -clique X in $N_B(D)$. This gives us a coloring from \mathcal{F}_k , since the k -clique D is red, the edges between D and X are blue, and X is also monochromatic, completing the proof. \square

Next we show that the bound in Theorem 1.1 is tight up to the constant factor in the exponent.

Proposition 2.3. *If $\epsilon \leq 1/2$ and $k \geq 2$, then $n(k, \epsilon) > \epsilon^{-(k-1)/2}$.*

Proof. Consider a red–blue edge coloring of K_n with $n = \epsilon^{-(k-1)/2}$, where the red graph is taken uniformly at random from all labeled graphs with n vertices and $m = \binom{n}{2}$ edges. Since $\epsilon \leq 1/2$, then both the red graph and the blue graph each have edge density at least ϵ . Note also, that for any collection of ℓ edges of K_n the probability that the red graph contains all these edges is

$$\frac{\binom{\binom{n}{2}-\ell}{m-\ell}}{\binom{\binom{n}{2}}{m}} = \prod_{i=0}^{\ell-1} \frac{m-i}{\binom{n}{2}-i} \leq \left(\frac{m}{\binom{n}{2}}\right)^\ell = \epsilon^\ell.$$

Therefore any copy of a complete bipartite graph with parts of size k (and with k^2 edges), has probability at most ϵ^{k^2} of being red. By linearity of expectation, the expected number of red copies of the complete bipartite graph with parts of size k is at most

$$\frac{1}{2} \binom{n}{k} \binom{n-k}{k} \epsilon^{k^2} \leq \frac{n^{2k}}{2k!^2} \epsilon^{k^2} \leq \frac{\epsilon^k}{2k!^2} \leq \frac{1}{32}.$$

Similarly, the expected number of red cliques with k vertices is at most

$$\binom{n}{k} \epsilon^{\binom{k}{2}} < \frac{n^k}{k!} \epsilon^{\binom{k}{2}} = \frac{1}{k!} \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Therefore, there is a red–blue edge coloring of K_n with each color having edge density at least ϵ , with no monochromatic red clique of order k , and with no monochromatic red complete bipartite graph with parts of size k . In particular, this edge coloring of K_n does not contain a member of \mathcal{F}_k , which implies that $n(k, \epsilon) > n = \epsilon^{-(k-1)/2}$. \square

3. Proof of Theorem 1.2

We start this section with a lemma that shows that every tournament has many vertices with large outdegree and large indegree.

Lemma 3.1. *Every tournament T on $n \geq 2$ vertices has more than $\frac{n}{3} - 2$ vertices with outdegree and indegree at least $n/6$.*

Proof. Let A be the set of vertices of T with outdegree less than $n/6$ (and hence indegree more than $5n/6 - 1$), B be the set of vertices of T with indegree less than $n/6$ (and hence outdegree more than $5n/6 - 1$), and C be the set of vertices of T with outdegree and indegree at least $n/6$. The sets A, B, C partition the vertex set of T , so $|A| + |B| + |C| = n$. Assume for contradiction that $|C| \leq \frac{n}{3} - 2$, so $|A| + |B| \geq \frac{2n}{3} + 2$. We may assume without loss of generality that $|A| \geq |B|$, so $|A| \geq \frac{n}{3} + 1$. By averaging, the tournament on A contains a vertex with outdegree at least $\frac{|A|-1}{2} \geq \frac{n}{6}$. This contradicts the definition of A , and completes the proof. \square

Let $F(n, t)$ denote the minimum m such that every tournament with n vertices and at most t directed triangles can be made transitive by changing the direction of at most m edges. We prove the following recursive bound on $F(n, t)$.

Lemma 3.2. *For $n \geq 12$ and t , there are n_1, n_2 with $n_1 + n_2 = n - 1$ and $n_1, n_2 \leq \frac{5n}{6} - 1$ and t_1, t_2 with $t_1 + t_2 \leq t$ such that*

$$F(n, t) \leq \frac{18t}{n} + F(n_1, t_1) + F(n_2, t_2). \tag{1}$$

Proof. Let T be a tournament on n vertices with at most t directed triangles. By Lemma 3.1, there is a vertex subset C of tournament T of size at least $\frac{n}{3} - 2 \geq \frac{n}{6}$ such that every vertex in C has indegree and outdegree at least $n/6$. By averaging, there is a vertex $v \in C$ that is in at most $3t/|C| \leq 18t/n$ directed triangles. Let I be the set of inneighbors of v and O be the set of outneighbors of v . Then $|I| + |O| = n - 1$, $|I|, |O| \geq n/6$, and the number of edges from O to I is the number of directed triangles containing v , which is at most $18t/n$.

By reversing the direction of all edges directed from O to I , and letting $n_1 = |I|$, $n_2 = |O|$, t_1 denote the number of directed triangles whose vertices are all contained in I , and t_2 denote the number of directed triangles whose vertices are all contained in O , we have established (1). \square

Note that every tournament on n vertices can be made transitive by changing the direction of at most half of its edges. So for all n and t , we have

$$F(n, t) \leq \binom{n}{2} / 2 < n^2 / 4. \tag{2}$$

The following statement implies Lemma 1.3.

Lemma 3.3. For all n and t we have $F(n, t) \leq 27(nt)^{1/2}$.

Proof. Let T be a tournament with n vertices and at most t directed triangles. For a vertex subset $W \subset V(T)$, let $t(W)$ denote the number of directed triangles contained in W .

Consider the following recursive procedure. At step i , we will have a partition \mathcal{F}_i of $V(T)$ into disjoint sets, a tournament T_i on $V(T)$, and a linear order on these sets such that all edges between different subsets in \mathcal{F}_i are directed forward in T_i . Let $T_0 = T$ and $\mathcal{F}_0 = \{V(T)\}$. For all $W \in \mathcal{F}_i$, if $|W| \leq 36(t/n)^{1/2}$, then put $W \in \mathcal{F}_{i+1}$. Otherwise, we find a partition $W = W_1 \cup W_2$ of W into two subsets each of cardinality at least $|W|/6 > 6(t/n)^{1/2}$ according to Lemma 3.2 and change the direction of at most $18t(W)/|W|$ edges in T_i to make all edges between W_1 and W_2 directed from W_1 to W_2 , update the linear ordering by placing W_1 immediately before W_2 in the same place W was, and put $W_1, W_2 \in \mathcal{F}_{i+1}$. It is clear that the resulting partition \mathcal{F}_{i+1} of $V(T)$ and tournament T_{i+1} will also satisfy that there is a linear order on the sets in \mathcal{F}_{i+1} such that all edges between different subsets in \mathcal{F}_{i+1} are directed forward in T_{i+1} . Eventually, there is a step j such that each set in the partition \mathcal{F}_j has cardinality at most $36(t/n)^{1/2}$. We let $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_j$ and $T^* = T_j$.

Following this procedure, we build a tree \mathcal{T} of subsets of $V(T)$, with $V(T)$ being its root, so that $W \in \mathcal{F}_i$ is a leaf of \mathcal{T} if $|W| \leq 36(t/n)^{1/2}$ and otherwise W has two children W_1, W_2 as described above. Notice that \mathcal{F} consists of the leaves of \mathcal{T} .

The vertices of \mathcal{T} that contain any particular directed triangle in T form a path in \mathcal{T} starting from $V(T)$. For each directed triangle D in T , define its weight

$$w(D) = \sum_{D \subset W, W \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{T})} 18/|W|.$$

Recall that if W was not a leaf of \mathcal{T} , then we changed the direction of at most $18t(W)/|W|$ edges between W_1 and W_2 . So a particular directed triangle D in W contributes at most $18/|W|$ to the number of edges between W_1 and W_2 that are changed. Hence, the sum of the weights of the directed triangles in T is an upper bound on the number of edges whose direction is changed when creating T^* from T . If $W^0 = V(T), \dots, W^i$ are the vertices of the path in \mathcal{T} that contain D , then

$$\begin{aligned} w(D) &= 18/|W^i| + 18/|W^{i-1}| + \dots + 18/|W^0| \leq \frac{18}{6(t/n)^{1/2}} (1 + 5/6 + (5/6)^2 + \dots) \\ &= 18(n/t)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

So we changed at most $18(n/t)^{1/2}t = 18(tn)^{1/2}$ edges to obtain T^* from T .

The partition \mathcal{F} and tournament T^* satisfy that each set in \mathcal{F} has cardinality at most $36(t/n)^{1/2}$ and there is a linear order of the sets in \mathcal{F} such that all edges between different sets in \mathcal{F} are directed forward in T^* . Using the bound (2), for each $W \in \mathcal{F}$, we can change the direction of less than $|W|^2/4$

edges to make W transitive. Since $|W| \leq 36(t/n)^{1/2}$ for each $W \in \mathcal{F}$, the number of edges in sets in \mathcal{F} whose direction in T^* is changed is at most

$$\sum_{W \in \mathcal{F}} |W|^2/4 \leq \frac{n}{36(t/n)^{1/2}} (36(t/n)^{1/2})^2/4 = 9(tn)^{1/2},$$

where we used that if $\sum x_i = N$ and $0 \leq x_i \leq a$ for each x_i , then $\sum x_i^2 \leq (N/a)a^2$. The resulting tournament is clearly transitive, and we have changed the direction of at most $(18 + 9)(tn)^{1/2} = 27(tn)^{1/2}$ edges of T to obtain this tournament. \square

We will also need the following lemma, which is a variant of Lemma 2.2.

Lemma 3.4. *Let H be a bipartite graph with parts V_1 and V_2 each of size n and with at least αn^2 edges. If $\beta \leq n^{-d/h}$, then there is a subset $W_1 \subset V_1$ such that $|W_1| \geq \alpha^h n - 1$ and every d -tuple in W_1 has at least βn common neighbors.*

Proof. Let $A = \{x_1, \dots, x_h\}$ be a subset of h vertices chosen uniformly at random with repetitions from V_2 , and let $U_1 = N(A)$. By linearity of expectation and convexity of $f(z) = z^h$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[|U_1|] = \sum_{v \in V_1} \left(\frac{|N(v)|}{n} \right)^h = n^{-h} \sum_{v \in V_1} |N(v)|^h \geq n^{1-h} \left(\frac{\sum_{v \in V_1} |N(v)|}{n} \right)^h \geq \alpha^h n.$$

The probability that a given set $D \subset V_1$ of vertices is contained in U_1 is $(\frac{|N(D)|}{n})^h$. Letting Y denote the number of d -tuples in U_1 whose common neighborhood has size less than βn , we have

$$\mathbb{E}[Y] < \binom{n}{d} \beta^h \leq n^d \beta^h \leq 1.$$

Hence, the expectation of $|U_1| - Y$ is more than $\alpha^h n - 1$, and thus there is a choice A_0 of A such that the corresponding value of $|U_1| - Y$ is more than $\alpha^h n - 1$. Delete a vertex from every d -tuple D in U_1 with less than βn common neighbors. Letting W_1 be the resulting subset of U_1 , it is clear that W_1 has the desired properties. \square

The classical problem of Zarankiewicz in extremal graph theory asks: given m, n, s , and t , what is the maximum number $z(m, n; s, t)$ of edges of a bipartite graph with first part of size m and second part of size n if no s vertices of the first part have t neighbors in common? A simple double-counting argument (see [1, p. 310]) demonstrates that

$$z(m, n, s, t) < (s - 1)^{1/t} (n - t + 1) m^{1-1/t} + (t - 1)m. \tag{3}$$

We will use this bound in the proof of the following theorem, which, together with Lemma 1.3, establishes Theorem 1.2.

Theorem 3.5. *If T is a tournament with n vertices and δn^3 directed triangles with $n \geq \delta^{-4k/\delta}$, then T contains D_k .*

Proof. Consider a random partition $V(T) = V_0 \cup V_1 \cup V_2$ of the vertex set of T into three disjoint subsets each of size $n/3$. Then for every directed triangle D in T the probability that it satisfies $|V_i \cap D| = 1$ for $i = 0, 1, 2$ and the edge between $V_1 \cap D$ and $V_2 \cap D$ is directed from $V_1 \cap D$ to $V_2 \cap D$ is at least $1/9$. By linearity of expectation, there is a partition $V(T) = V_0 \cup V_1 \cup V_2$ with $|V_i| = n/3$ for $i = 0, 1, 2$ for which there are at least $\delta n^3/9$ triples $(v_0, v_1, v_2) \in V_0 \times V_1 \times V_2$ that form a directed triangle such that the direction of the edge between v_1 and v_2 is from v_1 to v_2 . We call such a triple $(v_0, v_1, v_2) \in V_0 \times V_1 \times V_2$ a *positively oriented directed triangle*. Consider the bipartite graph H with parts V_1 and V_2 , where $(v_1, v_2) \in V_1 \times V_2$ is an edge of H if and only if there are at least $\delta n/2$ vertices $v_0 \in V_0$ for which the triple (v_0, v_1, v_2) is a positively oriented directed triangle.

Note that if $(v_1, v_2) \in V_1 \times V_2$ is an edge of H , then the edge between v_1 and v_2 in T is directed from v_1 to v_2 . The number of positively oriented directed triangles which do not contain an edge of H is at most $|V_1||V_2|\delta n/2 = \delta n^3/18$. Hence, the number of positively oriented directed triangles in $V_0 \times V_1 \times V_2$ containing an edge of H is at least $\delta n^3/9 - \delta n^3/18 = \delta n^3/18$, and the number of edges of H is at least

$$\frac{\delta n^3/18}{|V_0|} = \delta n^2/6.$$

So the fraction of pairs of $V_1 \times V_2$ that are edges of H is at least $\frac{\delta n^2/6}{|V_1||V_2|} = 3\delta/2$.

By Lemma 3.4 with $d = k/\delta$, $h = 2d$ and $\beta = n^{-d/h} = n^{-1/2}$, there is a subset $W_1 \subset V_1$ of size at least $(3\delta/2)^{2d}|V_1| - 1 \geq n^{1/2}$ such that every d -tuple in W_1 has at least $n^{1-d/h} = n^{1/2}$ neighbors in H . Since $n^{1/2} \geq 2^d$, the result of Erdős and Moser (mentioned in the introduction) implies that there is a transitive subtournament in W_1 of size d . Let $X_1 = \{x_1, \dots, x_d\}$ denote the set of vertices of this transitive subtournament. The common neighborhood $N_H(X_1)$ of X_1 in graph H has size at least $n^{1/2}$, so there is a transitive subtournament in $N_H(X_1)$ of size d . We let $X_2 = \{y_1, \dots, y_d\}$ denote this transitive subtournament. Since X_1 and X_2 form a complete bipartite graph in H , then every edge between X_1 and X_2 in tournament T directs from X_1 to X_2 .

To complete the proof, we will use a variant of an argument from [10]. Consider the bipartite graph F with parts V_0 and $\{1, \dots, d\}$, where $v_0 \in V_0$ is adjacent to i if and only if (v_0, x_i, y_i) is a positively oriented directed triangle. Since each pair (x_i, y_i) is an edge of H , each $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ is adjacent to at least $\delta n/2$ vertices in V_0 in F . So the number of edges of F is at least $d\delta n/2 = kn/2$. By (3), F contains a complete bipartite graph with $n^{1/2}$ vertices in V_0 and k vertices in $\{1, \dots, d\}$, since otherwise the number of edges of F would be at most

$$\begin{aligned} z(n/3, d, n^{1/2}, k) &< (n^{1/2} - 1)^{1/k}(d - k + 1)(n/3)^{1-1/k} + (k - 1)n/3 < dn^{1-\frac{1}{2k}} + kn/3 \\ &= (k/\delta)n^{1-\frac{1}{2k}} + kn/3 \leq \frac{\delta^{2/\delta}}{\delta}kn + kn/3 < kn/2, \end{aligned}$$

contradicting that F has at least $kn/2$ edges (here recall, that by definition, $\delta \leq 1/6$).

So there is a subset $X_0 \subset V_0$ of size at least $n^{1/2}$ and a subset $R = \{i_1, \dots, i_k\} \subset \{1, \dots, d\}$ such that every vertex in X_0 is adjacent to every vertex in R in graph F . By construction, every triple (x, x_{i_j}, y_{i_j}) with $x \in X_0$ and $1 \leq j \leq k$ forms a positively oriented directed triangle. Therefore, for each $x \in X_0$ and $1 \leq j \leq k$, the edge between x and x_{i_j} is directed from x to x_{i_j} and the edge between y_{i_j} and x is directed from y_{i_j} to x . Since $n^{1/2} \geq 2^d$, the result of Erdős and Moser implies that there is a transitive subtournament in X_0 of size k . Let U_0 be the set of vertices of this transitive subtournament, $U_1 = \{x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_k}\}$, and $U_2 = \{y_{i_1}, \dots, y_{i_k}\}$. Since $U_i \subset X_i$ and X_i is a transitive subtournament for $i = 1, 2$, then U_i is a transitive subtournament. Since $U_0 \subset X_0$, then every edge between U_0 and U_1 is directed from U_0 to U_1 and every edge from U_2 to U_0 is directed from U_2 to U_0 . Recall that every edge between X_1 and X_2 has direction from X_1 to X_2 , so every edge between U_1 and U_2 is directed from U_1 to U_2 . We have shown that the three sets U_0, U_1, U_2 form a copy of D_k in T . This completes the proof. \square

4. Concluding remarks

Although using a simple probabilistic argument it is easy to show that the bound in Theorem 1.2 has the correct exponential dependence on k , we think the dependence on ϵ can be further improved. Let $T(k, \epsilon)$ be the minimum positive integer such that every tournament T with $n \geq T(k, \epsilon)$ vertices that is ϵ -far from being transitive contains the tournament D_k .

Conjecture 4.1. *There is a constant c such that $T(k, \epsilon) \leq \epsilon^{-ck}$.*

It is not difficult to extend our proof of Theorem 1.1 to establish the following hypergraph generalization of Bollobás's conjecture.

Theorem 4.2. For each $\epsilon > 0$ and positive integers r and k , there is a minimum positive integer $N = N(k, r, \epsilon)$ such that every 2-edge-coloring of the complete r -uniform hypergraph with $n \geq N$ vertices and at least $\epsilon \binom{n}{r}$ edges in each color contains disjoint vertex subsets V_1, \dots, V_r each of size k such that for every function $f : \{1, \dots, r\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, r\}$, all the edges (v_1, \dots, v_r) with $v_i \in V_{f(i)}$ for $1 \leq i \leq r$ have the same color, but the edge coloring of $V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_r$ is not monochromatic.

The tower function $t_i(x)$ is defined by $t_1(x) = x$ and $t_i(x) = 2^{t_{i-1}(x)}$ for $i \geq 2$. The hypergraph Ramsey number $R_r(k)$ is the minimum N such that every 2-edge-coloring of the complete r -uniform hypergraph on N vertices contains a monochromatic complete r -uniform hypergraph on k vertices. It is known (see [8]) that $R_r(k) \leq t_r(ck)$, where the constant c depends on r . It would be interesting to prove a similar upper bound for $N(k, r, \epsilon)$.

Acknowledgment

We would like to thank Jonathan Cutler for sharing a copy of his paper with Balázs Montágh with us.

References

- [1] B. Bollobás, Extremal Graph Theory, Dover Publications, Inc., Mineola, NY, 2004.
- [2] D. Conlon, A new upper bound for diagonal Ramsey numbers, Ann. of Math., in press.
- [3] J. Cutler, B. Montágh, Unavoidable subgraphs of colored graphs, Discrete Math., in press.
- [4] P. Erdős, Some remarks on the theory of graphs, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 53 (1947) 292–294.
- [5] P. Erdős, L. Moser, On the representation of directed graphs as unions of orderings, Publ. Math. Inst. Hungar. Acad. Sci. 9 (1964) 125–132.
- [6] P. Erdős, G. Szekeres, A combinatorial problem in geometry, Compos. Math. 2 (1935) 463–470.
- [7] J. Fox, B. Sudakov, Density theorems for bipartite graphs and related Ramsey-type results, submitted for publication.
- [8] R. Graham, B. Rothschild, J. Spencer, Ramsey Theory, second ed., Wiley, New York, 1990.
- [9] A. Kostochka, V. Rödl, On graphs with small Ramsey numbers, J. Graph Theory 37 (2001) 198–204.
- [10] V. Nikiforov, Graphs with many r -cliques have large complete r -partite subgraphs, Bull. London Math. Soc. 40 (2008) 23–25.
- [11] I.Z. Ruzsa, E. Szemerédi, Triple systems with no six points carrying three triangles, in: Combinatorics, vol. II, Proc. Fifth Hungarian Colloq., Keszthely, 1976, in: Colloq. Math. Soc. János Bolyai, vol. 18, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1978, pp. 939–945.
- [12] B. Sudakov, Few remarks on the Ramsey–Turan-type problems, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B 88 (2003) 99–106.