

THE MISSING LOG IN LARGE DEVIATIONS FOR TRIANGLE COUNTS

SOURAV CHATTERJEE

ABSTRACT. This paper solves the problem of sharp large deviation estimates for the upper tail of the number of triangles in an Erdős-Rényi random graph, by establishing a logarithmic factor in the exponent that was missing till now. It is possible that the method of proof may extend to general subgraph counts.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $G(n, p)$ be an Erdős-Rényi graph on n edges with edge probability p , that is, a random graph on n vertices where each edge is added independently with probability p . Given a fixed small graph H , let X_H denote the number of copies of H in $G(n, p)$. The distribution of X_H has been studied extensively since the work of Erdős and Rényi [10] in 1960, where the first results were given. In the very sparse case, where only a few copies of H can occur, the probability of $\{X_H > 0\}$ was studied by Bollobás [2]. A necessary and sufficient condition for the asymptotic normality of X_H (when $n \rightarrow \infty$ and p remains fixed or $p \rightarrow 0$) was obtained by Ruciński [20]. Sharp large deviation inequalities for $\mathbb{P}(X_H \leq (1 - \epsilon)\mathbb{E}(X_H))$, where ϵ is a fixed positive number were obtained by Janson, Łuczak and Ruciński [13] via the method of Janson's inequality [12].

One key question that remained open for a long time was the issue of sharp large deviations for the 'upper tail', i.e. competent bounds for

$$\mathbb{P}(X_H \geq (1 + \epsilon)\mathbb{E}(X_H)),$$

where ϵ is a fixed constant. For historical accounts of this problem, one may look in [3, 13, 15]. The problem was almost completely intractable until the year 2000, when the first general exponential tail bound was obtained by Vu [22]. However, Vu's upper bound from [22], as well as the upper bounds obtained by Janson and Ruciński [15] soon after, were quite far from the conjectured bounds. In fact, the paper [15] surveys an exhaustive array of techniques, ranging from the simple Azuma-Hoeffding inequality [11], to the powerful inequalities of Talagrand [21], in the context of this problem. But none of them yield anything close to what are believed to be the optimal

Key words and phrases. Erdős-Rényi random graph, tail bound, concentration inequalities, large deviations.

Research partially supported by NSF grants DMS-0707054 and DMS-1005312, and a Sloan Research Fellowship.

bounds. Similarly, the striking developments of Boucheron, Lugosi and Massart [5], while successful in a wide range of concentration problems, could not quite resolve the issue of the upper tail for subgraph counts.

The major breakthroughs in the ‘upper tail problem’ came with the works of Kim and Vu [18] and Janson, Oleszkiewicz and Ruciński [14] in 2004. Kim and Vu [18] showed that if H is a triangle, then for any $\epsilon > 0$, there are positive constants $C_1(\epsilon)$ and $C_2(\epsilon)$ such that whenever $p \geq n^{-1} \log n$,

$$e^{-C_1(\epsilon)n^2p^2 \log(1/p)} \leq \mathbb{P}(X_H \geq (1 + \epsilon)\mathbb{E}(X_H)) \leq e^{-C_2(\epsilon)n^2p^2}.$$

At the same time, Janson et. al. [14] proved a similar result for general H , with a difference of $\log(1/p)$ between the upper and lower bounds. (Note the lower bound is easily obtained as the probability of a single clique containing all the extra triangles.)

Kim and Vu’s technique is based on a method developed in their earlier works [17, 23], which in turn is a highly sophisticated version of the method of martingale differences [19]. The method of Janson et. al. builds on an extension of a remarkable result of Alon [1] about the maximum number of copies of a graph H in a graph with a given number of edges.

Subsequently, improvements in certain regimes were obtained by Janson and Ruciński [16], but the problem of exactly matching the upper and lower bounds has remained open for the past six years. The following theorem closes the issue for the count of triangles by proving that the lower bound is sharp.

Theorem 1.1. *Let T be the number of triangles in an Erdős-Rényi graph $G(n, p)$. For each $\epsilon > 0$ there are positive constants $C_1(\epsilon)$, $C_2(\epsilon)$ and $C_3(\epsilon)$ such that whenever $C_1(\epsilon)n^{-1} \log n \leq p \leq C_2(\epsilon)$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(T \geq (1 + \epsilon)\mathbb{E}(T)) \leq e^{-C_3(\epsilon)n^2p^2 \log(1/p)}.$$

The proof does not involve martingales or counting arguments. It is somewhat hard to decide on a nomenclature for the method; it may be tentatively called it a ‘localization argument’. It is plausible that the technique may be useful in a wider class of problems.

It must be mentioned that a couple of months after the first draft of this paper was posted on arXiv, DeMarco and Kahn [8] posted a different proof of the conjecture. The DeMarco-Kahn proof is shorter and gives a little more.

It should also be mentioned that recently, a related problem has been investigated for dense graphs (i.e. p fixed and $n \rightarrow \infty$). The objective is to find the exact constant $C(p, \epsilon)$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(T \geq (1 + \epsilon)\mathbb{E}(T)) = e^{-n^2C(p, \epsilon)(1+o(1))}.$$

In the language of large deviations, this is the problem of evaluating the large deviation rate function. The first progress in this problem was made in [6] where it was shown that given $p \in (0, 1)$, there exist $p^3/6 < t' \leq t'' < 1/6$

such that for all $t \in (p^3/6, t') \cup (t'', 1/6)$,

$$\mathbb{P}(T \geq tn^3) = e^{-n^2 I_p((6t)^{1/3})(1+o(1))},$$

where I_p is the function

$$I_p(x) := \frac{x}{2} \log \frac{x}{p} + \frac{1-x}{2} \log \frac{1-x}{1-p}.$$

However the result does not cover all values of (p, t) . The rate function in the full regime has been obtained very recently in [7] as a consequence of a general large deviation principle for dense Erdős-Rényi graphs. Two other papers in this direction are [4] and [9].

2. NOTATION AND TERMINOLOGY

In the following, G will denote an Erdős-Rényi graph $G(n, p)$ and T will be the number of triangles in G . By convention, C will denote any positive absolute constant, whose value may change from line to line. Similarly, $C(\epsilon)$ will denote any positive constant whose value depends only on ϵ . For simplicity of notation, set

$$L := \log(1/p), \quad \ell := 1/L.$$

Given ϵ , n and p , let us call an edge in G ‘good’ if there are less than ϵnp triangles containing the edge. Any edge that is not ‘good’ will be called ‘bad’. In the same vein, call a vertex ‘good’ if it has less than $7np$ neighbors in G , and ‘bad’ otherwise. (There is nothing special about 7; any large enough constant is good for our purposes.) Define:

T' := #triangles in G with all good edges.

T_0 := #triangles in G with at least one bad edge, but all good vertices.

T_1 := #triangles in G with exactly one bad vertex and two good vertices.

T_2 := #triangles in G with exactly two bad vertices and one good vertex.

T_3 := #triangles in G with all bad vertices.

Then clearly,

$$(1) \quad T \leq T' + T_0 + T_1 + T_2 + T_3.$$

Thus, it suffices to get upper tail estimates for the summands on the right hand side. This is the program for the subsequent sections. Some further notation and terminology will be introduced along the way.

3. CONCENTRATION INEQUALITY

The following theorem is most crucial component of the proof. It gives a generic concentration inequality for sums of dependent random variables.

Theorem 3.1. *Let F be a finite set and $(X_i)_{i \in F}$, $(X'_i)_{i \in F}$, $(X_{j(i)})_{i, j \in F}$ be collections of nonnegative random variables with finite moment generating functions, defined on the same probability space, and satisfying the following conditions:*

- (a) *For all i , $X_i \leq X'_i$.*
- (b) *For all i , the random variables X'_i and $\sum_{j \in F} X_{j(i)}$ are independent.*
- (c) *For all i , $\sum_{j \in F} X_{j(i)} \leq \sum_{j \in F} X_j$.*
- (d) *There is a constant a such that for all i , when $X_i > 0$, we have*

$$\sum_{j \in F} X_j \leq a + \sum_{j \in F} X_{j(i)}.$$

Let $\lambda := \sum_{i \in F} \mathbb{E}(X'_i)$. Then for any $t \geq \lambda$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i \in F} X_i \geq t\right) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{t}{a}\left(\log \frac{t}{\lambda} - 1 + \frac{\lambda}{t}\right)\right) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{t}{a} \log \frac{t}{3\lambda}\right).$$

(Note that the second bound holds trivially for $0 < t < \lambda$ as well.)

It is a bit difficult to convey the meaning of this theorem. Hopefully, it will become more transparent as the technique is applied numerous times in the proof of Theorem 1.1. The following simple lemma is the first step in the proof of Theorem 3.1.

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose X is a nonnegative random variable with a finite moment generating function and λ and a are positive constants such that for any $\theta \geq 0$, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}(Xe^{\theta X}) \leq \lambda e^{\theta a} \mathbb{E}(e^{\theta X}).$$

Then for any $t \geq \lambda$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}(X \geq t) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{t}{a}\left(\log \frac{t}{\lambda} - 1 + \frac{\lambda}{t}\right)\right).$$

Proof. Let $m(\theta) := \mathbb{E}(e^{\theta X})$ be the moment generating function of X . From the hypothesis of the theorem, we have

$$\frac{d}{d\theta} \log m(\theta) \leq \lambda e^{\theta a}.$$

Integrating, we get

$$m(\theta) \leq \exp\left(\frac{\lambda(e^{\theta a} - 1)}{a}\right).$$

Again, for any positive θ and t ,

$$\mathbb{P}(X \geq t) \leq e^{-\theta t} m(\theta).$$

The proof is completed by taking $\theta = a^{-1} \log(t/\lambda)$. □

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Let $X := \sum_{i \in F} X_i$. Then for any $\theta \geq 0$, by the condition (d) and the nonnegativity of the X_i 's, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(X e^{\theta X}) &= \sum_{i \in F} \mathbb{E}(X_i e^{\theta X}) \\ &\leq \sum_{i \in F} \mathbb{E}(X_i e^{\theta a + \theta \sum_{j \in F} X_{j(i)}}). \end{aligned}$$

But again, due to the nonnegativity of X_i and the conditions (a) and (b), we have

$$\mathbb{E}(X_i e^{\theta \sum_{j \in F} X_{j(i)}}) \leq \mathbb{E}(X'_i e^{\theta \sum_{j \in F} X_{j(i)}}) = \mathbb{E}(X'_i) \mathbb{E}(e^{\theta \sum_{j \in F} X_{j(i)}}).$$

Finally, by condition (c) we get

$$\mathbb{E}(e^{\theta \sum_{j \in F} X_{j(i)}}) \leq \mathbb{E}(e^{\theta X}).$$

Combining the steps we get

$$\mathbb{E}(X e^{\theta X}) \leq \lambda e^{\theta a} \mathbb{E}(e^{\theta X}).$$

The proof of the first inequality is completed by applying Lemma 3.2. To get the second (weaker) inequality, simply observe that

$$\log \frac{t}{\lambda} - 1 + \frac{t}{\lambda} \geq \log \frac{t}{e\lambda} \geq \log \frac{t}{3\lambda}.$$

This completes the proof. \square

4. TAIL BOUND FOR T'

The objective of this section is to obtain a tail inequality for the number of triangles with all good edges. Let us begin by introducing some notation, beyond what has been already defined in previous sections. Let $V^{(2)}$ denote the set of all unordered pairs of distinct vertices uv and let $V^{(3)}$ denote the set of all unordered triplets of distinct vertices uvw . For each $uv \in V^{(2)}$, let

$$I_{uv} := 1_{\{uv \text{ is an edge in } G\}}.$$

Next, let

$$Z_{uv} := 1_{\{uv \text{ is a good edge in } G\}}.$$

For each $uvw \in V^{(3)}$, let

$$Y_{uvw} := 1_{\{uvw \text{ is a triangle in } G\}} = I_{uv} I_{vw} I_{uw},$$

and let

$$X_{uvw} := 1_{\{uvw \text{ is a triangle with all good edges}\}} = Z_{uv} Z_{vw} Z_{uw}.$$

Then note that

$$T' = \sum_{uvw \in V^{(3)}} X_{uvw}.$$

We intend to apply Theorem 3.1 to the collection (X_{uvw}) . We already have Y_{uvw} such that $X_{uvw} \leq Y_{uvw}$ and therefore condition (a) is satisfied if we set

$X'_{uvw} = Y_{uvw}$. The challenge is now to construct $X_{xyz(uvw)}$ appropriately. The rest of this section is devoted to the proof of the following result.

Proposition 4.1. *There exists a positive constant $C(\epsilon)$ depending only on ϵ such that*

$$\mathbb{P}(T' \geq \mathbb{E}(T) + \epsilon n^3 p^3) \leq e^{-C(\epsilon)n^2 p^2 \log(1/p)}.$$

Proof. Fix a triplet $uvw \in V^{(3)}$. Let K be the set of triplets that share no vertices with uvw and let K' be the set of triplets that share exactly one vertex with uvw . Let K'' be the set of triplets that share two or more vertices with uvw . Then $V^{(3)} = K \cup K' \cup K''$.

Take any $xyz \in K'$. Then xyz shares exactly one vertex with uvw . Suppose without loss of generality that $x = u$. Define the random variable $X_{xyz(uvw)}$ as follows. First, let

$$\begin{aligned} T_y &:= \#\text{triangles of the form } xy r \text{ where } r \notin \{v, w\}, \\ T_z &:= \#\text{triangles of the form } xz r \text{ where } r \notin \{v, w\}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, let

$$\begin{aligned} N_y &:= \#\text{neighbors of } y \text{ in the set } \{v, w\}, \\ N_z &:= \#\text{neighbors of } z \text{ in the set } \{v, w\}. \end{aligned}$$

Define

$$E_y := 1_{\{N_y + T_y < \epsilon l n p\}}, \quad E_z := 1_{\{N_z + T_z < \epsilon l n p\}}.$$

Finally, let

$$X_{xyz(uvw)} := Y_{xyz} Z_{yz} E_y E_z.$$

Now note that since $\{v, w\} \cap \{y, z\} = \emptyset$, the definitions of Y_{xyz} , Z_{yz} , T_y , T_z , N_y and N_z do not involve the edges uv, vw, uw . In particular, the definition of $X_{xyz(uvw)}$ does not involve the edges uv, vw, uw . This is true for any $xyz \in K'$.

If $xyz \in K$, let $X_{xyz(uvw)} = X_{xyz}$. Then clearly the definition of $X_{xyz(uvw)}$ does not involve the edges uv, vw, uw .

Finally, if $xyz \in K''$, let $X_{xyz(uvw)} \equiv 0$.

From the above construction and observations, we see that condition (b) of Theorem 3.1 is satisfied.

Next, suppose that for some $xyz \in K'$ with $x = u$, we have $X_{xyz(uvw)} = 1$ in a particular realization of G . Then xyz is a triangle, yz is a good edge, and $E_y = E_z = 1$. We claim that xy is a good edge. To see this, simply note that the number of triangles containing the edge xy is bounded by $T_y + N_y$. Similarly, xz is also a good edge. Therefore $X_{xyz} = 1$. Thus, for $xyz \in K'$, $X_{xyz(uvw)} \leq X_{xyz}$. When $xyz \in K \cup K''$, the inequality is trivially true. This establishes condition (c) of Theorem 3.1.

Finally, suppose that for some $xyz \in K'$ with $x = u$, we have $X_{xyz} = 1$ in a particular realization of G , which also satisfies $X_{uvw} = 1$. Then xv and xw are edges in G , and hence the number of triangles containing the edge xy is exactly equal to $N_y + T_y$. Therefore in this situation, $E_y = Z_{xy}$.

Similarly $E_z = Z_{xz}$. Therefore, $X_{xyz(uvw)} = Y_{xyz}Z_{xy}Z_{xz}Z_{yz} = X_{xyz}$. Thus, when $X_{uvw} = 1$, we have $X_{xyz(uvw)} = X_{xyz}$ for all $xyz \in K'$. The same is trivially true for $xyz \in K$.

Moreover, if $X_{uvw} = 1$, the number of triangles in G sharing at least two vertices with uvw is bounded by $3\epsilon np$. Combining these observations, we see that when $X_{uvw} = 1$,

$$\sum_{xyz \in V^{(3)}} X_{xyz} \leq 3\epsilon np + \sum_{xyz \in V^{(3)}} X_{xyz(uvw)}.$$

This establishes condition (d) of Theorem 3.1 with $a = 3\epsilon np$. Thus, if we let $\lambda := \sum_{xyz} \mathbb{E}(X'_{xyz}) = \mathbb{E}(T)$, then by the first inequality in Theorem 3.1 we get

$$\mathbb{P}(T' \geq \lambda + \epsilon n^3 p^3) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\lambda + \epsilon n^3 p^3}{\epsilon np}(\log c - 1 + c^{-1})\right),$$

where

$$c = c(n, p, \epsilon) = \frac{\lambda + \epsilon n^3 p^3}{\lambda}.$$

It is easy to check that $\log c - 1 + c^{-1}$ converges to a positive constant depending only on ϵ as $np \rightarrow \infty$. This completes the proof. \square

5. TAIL BOUND FOR T_0

The purpose of this section is to obtain a tail bound for the number of triangles in G with at least one bad edge but all good vertices. We shall continue to use the notation and terminology introduced in the previous sections. We also need to introduce some additional notation. For each $uv \in V^{(2)}$, let

$$t_{uv} := \sum_{w \in V \setminus \{u, v\}} I_{uw} I_{vw}.$$

For a set $F \subseteq V^{(2)}$, let

$$t(F) := \sum_{uv \in F} t_{uv}.$$

Two elements of $V^{(2)}$ will be called ‘non-adjacent’ if they do not share a common vertex, and ‘adjacent’ otherwise. A set $F \subseteq V^{(2)}$ will be called ‘matching’ if no two elements of F share a common vertex.

Lemma 5.1. *Let A be a matching. Then for each $t > 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}(t(A) \geq t) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{t}{3} \log \frac{t}{3|A|np^2}\right).$$

Proof. Let R be the set of triplets uvw such that $uv \in A$ and $w \in V \setminus \{u, v\}$. Throughout this proof, uvw will denote a typical element of R . For each such uvw , let

$$W_{uvw} := I_{uw} I_{vw},$$

Since $t(A) = \sum_{uvw \in R} W_{uvw}$, We intend to apply Theorem 3.1 to the collection $(W_{uvw})_{uvw \in R}$.

Fix $uvw \in R$. Let D be the set of all $xyz \in R$ such that

$$(2) \quad \{xz, yz\} \cap \{uw, vw\} \neq \emptyset.$$

This can happen if $uvw = xyz$. Suppose this is not the case. Then since A is a matching, $\{u, v\} \cap \{x, y\} = \emptyset$. Thus if (2) holds and $uvw \neq xyz$, then we must have $\{x, y\} \cap \{w\} \neq \emptyset$ and $\{u, v\} \cap \{z\} \neq \emptyset$. But again because A is a matching, the choice of x determines the choice of y . Combining the above observations, we see that $|D| \leq 3$.

Since W_{uvw} depends only on the edges uw and vw , W_{uvw} is independent of the collection $\{W_{xyz}\}_{xyz \in R \setminus D}$. So, if we define $W_{xyz(uvw)} = 0$ for $xyz \in D$, $W_{xyz(uvw)} = W_{xyz}$ for $xyz \in R \setminus D$, and $W'_{xyz} = W_{xyz}$ for all $xyz \in R$, then the conditions of Theorem 3.1 are satisfied with $a = 3$ and $\lambda = \sum_{xyz \in R} \mathbb{E}(W'_{xyz}) \leq |A|np^2$. This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

Next, let us define two events:

$$E_1 := \{\exists F \subseteq V^{(2)} \text{ such that } F \text{ is a matching, } |F| > Lnp, \\ \text{and all elements of } F \text{ are bad edges in } G\}.$$

$$E_2 := \{\exists F \subseteq V^{(2)} \text{ such that } F \text{ is a matching, } |F| \leq Lnp, \\ \text{and } t(F) > \epsilon n^2 p^2\}.$$

Lemma 5.2. *There is a constant $C(\epsilon) > 0$ depending only on ϵ such that whenever $C(\epsilon)^{-1}n^{-1} \log n \leq p \leq C(\epsilon)$, we can conclude that both $\mathbb{P}(E_1)$ and $\mathbb{P}(E_2)$ are bounded by $\exp(-C(\epsilon)n^2 p^2 \log(1/p))$.*

Proof. If E_1 holds, there exists a set F satisfying the conditions for E_1 . By arbitrarily dropping some elements of F , we can find a subset F' of F such that $Lnp < |F'| \leq 2Lnp$. Then F' is again a matching, and since the elements of F' are bad edges in G ,

$$t(F') \geq |F'| \epsilon np \geq \epsilon n^2 p^2.$$

By Lemma 5.1 we know that for any fixed matching $A \subseteq V^{(2)}$ of size $\leq 2Lnp$,

$$\mathbb{P}(t(A) \geq \epsilon n^2 p^2) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\epsilon n^2 p^2}{3} \log \frac{\epsilon n^2 p^2}{6Ln^2 p^3}\right).$$

Clearly, there exists $C(\epsilon) > 0$ such that if $p \leq C(\epsilon)$, the expression of the right is bounded by $e^{-C(\epsilon)n^2 p^2 \log(1/p)}$. The number of choices of $A \subseteq V^{(2)}$ with $|A| \leq 2Lnp$ is bounded by

$$\sum_{0 \leq k \leq 2Lnp} \binom{n(n-1)/2}{k} \leq e^{CLnp \log n}.$$

Combining the above observations, we see that

$$\mathbb{P}(E_1) \leq e^{CLnp \log n - C(\epsilon)n^2 p^2 \log(1/p)}.$$

Thus, if $C'(\epsilon)^{-1}n^{-1} \log n \leq p \leq C'(\epsilon)$ for some appropriately small constant $C'(\epsilon)$, we get the required bound.

To get the bound on $\mathbb{P}(E_2)$, we similarly apply Lemma 5.1 with fixed $A \subseteq V^{(2)}$ of size $\leq Lnp$ and $t = \epsilon n^2 p^2$, and then take union bound over all choices of A . \square

Finally we arrive at the main result of this section.

Proposition 5.3. *There is a constant $C(\epsilon) > 0$ depending only on ϵ such that if $C(\epsilon)^{-1}n^{-1} \log n \leq p \leq C(\epsilon)$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(T_0 > 15\epsilon n^3 p^3) \leq e^{-C(\epsilon)n^2 p^2 \log(1/p)}.$$

Proof. Let B' be the set of bad edges with both endpoints in the set of good vertices. We shall now show that if E_1 and E_2 are both false, then $t(B') \leq 15\epsilon n^3 p^3$. This will complete the proof of the lemma, since $T_0 \leq t(B')$.

Recall that we call two elements of B' ‘adjacent’ if they share a common vertex in G . This defines an undirected graph structure on B' . Since the degree of an endpoint of any element of B' (in the graph G) is less than $7np$, it is clear that the maximum vertex degree of the adjacency graph on B' is less than $14np$. Thus, there is a coloring of this graph with $\leq 14np+1 \leq 15np$ colors such that no two adjacent elements of B' receive the same color. (This is a standard argument in graph theory: arrange the elements of B' in some arbitrary order; color the i th element with a color that was not given to any of its neighbors among the first $i-1$ elements. This produces a coloring such that no two adjacent elements receive the same color, and it is also clear that we need at most $14np+1$ colors.)

Let us fix such a coloring. For each color c , let F_c denote the subset of B' that receives the color c . Note that each F_c is a matching by construction.

Now take the color c that maximizes $t(F_c)$. Then

$$t(F_c) \geq \frac{t(B')}{\text{number of colors}} \geq \frac{t(B')}{15np}.$$

By the falsity of E_1 we have $|F_c| \leq Lnp$; and therefore, the falsity of E_2 shows that $t(F_c) \leq \epsilon n^2 p^2$. Thus, $t(B') \leq 15\epsilon n^3 p^3$. This completes the proof. \square

6. TAIL BOUND FOR T_1

In this section we bound the probability that there are too many triangles with exactly one bad vertex and two good vertices. As usual, we will continue to adhere to the notation and terminology introduced in the preceding sections. Additionally, let us define the event

$$E_3 := \{\text{There are more than } Lnp \text{ bad vertices}\}.$$

For each $u \in V$, let d_u be the degree of u in G . For each $A \subseteq V$ let

$$d(A) := \sum_{u \in A} d_u.$$

Lemma 6.1. *Let X be a binomial random variable with mean λ . Then for any $t > 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}(X \geq t) \leq e^{-t \log(t/3\lambda)}.$$

Proof. Since X is a binomial random variable, it can be expressed as $\sum X_i$, where X_i are i.i.d. Bernoulli random variables. Setting $X'_i = X_i$, and $X_{j(i)} = X_j$ if $j \neq i$ and $X_{i(i)} = 0$, we are in the setting of Theorem 3.1 with $a = 1$ and $\lambda = \mathbb{E}(X)$. This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 6.2. *For any set of vertices A , and any $t \geq 0$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(d(A) \geq t) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{t}{2} \log \frac{t}{6n|A|p}\right).$$

Proof. Let Y be the number of distinct edges in G with at least one endpoint in A . A simple argument shows that $d(A) \leq 2Y$. Note that Y is a binomial random variable with mean $\leq n|A|p$. Thus by Lemma 6.1, the proof is done. \square

Lemma 6.3. *There is an absolute constant C such that if $p > C^{-1}n^{-1} \log n$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(E_3) \leq e^{-Cn^2p^2 \log(1/p)}.$$

Proof. For any set of vertices A with $|A| \leq \lceil Lnp \rceil$, Lemma 6.2 gives that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(d(A) \geq 7Ln^2p^2) &\leq \exp\left(-\frac{7Ln^2p^2}{2} \log \frac{7Ln^2p^2}{6\lceil Lnp \rceil np}\right) \\ &\leq e^{-CLn^2p^2}. \end{aligned}$$

The number of choices of A with $|A| \leq \lceil Lnp \rceil$ is bounded by $e^{CLnp \log n}$. Thus, if we define

$$E_4 := \{\exists A \subseteq V \text{ with } |A| \leq \lceil Lnp \rceil \text{ and } d(A) \geq 7Ln^2p^2\},$$

then there are absolute constants C' and C'' such that

$$\mathbb{P}(E_4) \leq \exp(C' Lnp \log n - C'' Ln^2p^2).$$

So, if $p \geq C^{-1}n^{-1} \log n$ for some suitable constant C , we have

$$\mathbb{P}(E_4) \leq e^{-Cn^2p^2 \log(1/p)}.$$

Next, note that if E_3 is true, then there is a set A of vertices of size exactly $\lceil Lnp \rceil$, each of which has degree $\geq 7np$. Consequently $d(A) \geq 7np\lceil Lnp \rceil \geq 7Ln^2p^2$. Thus, E_3 implies E_4 . This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

Proposition 6.4. *There is a constant $C(\epsilon) > 0$ depending only on ϵ such that whenever $C(\epsilon)^{-1}n^{-1} \log n \leq p \leq C(\epsilon)$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(T_1 \geq \epsilon n^3 p^3) \leq e^{-C(\epsilon)n^2p^2 \log(1/p)}.$$

Proof. Fix a set $A \subseteq V$ of size $\leq Lnp$. Let $R_1(A) \subseteq V^{(3)}$ be the set of unordered triplets with exactly 1 vertex from A and 2 vertices from A^c . Let $T_1(A)$ be the number of triangles in G with exactly 1 vertex from A and 2 vertices from the set of good vertices in A^c .

A typical element of $R_1(A)$ will be written in the form uvw , where $u \in A$ and vw is an unordered pair of vertices from A^c . For each $uvw \in R_1(A)$, let P_{uvw} be the indicator that uvw is a triangle in G and v, w are good vertices. Then

$$T_1(A) = \sum_{uvw \in R_1(A)} P_{uvw}.$$

We shall first compute a tail bound for $T_1(A)$. We intend to apply Theorem 3.1 to the collection $(P_{uvw})_{uvw \in R_1(A)}$ for this purpose. As usual, let $P'_{uvw} = Y_{uvw}$, where Y_{uvw} is the indicator that uvw is a triangle in G . This clearly verifies condition (a) of Theorem 3.1.

Fix $uvw \in R_1(A)$, with $u \in A$ and $v, w \in A^c$. Let $K \subseteq R_1(A)$ be the set of triplets that share no vertices with uvw and let $K' \subseteq R_1(A)$ be the set of triplets that share exactly one vertex with uvw .

Now take any $xyz \in K'$, with $x \in A$, $y, z \in A^c$. Then xyz shares exactly one vertex with uvw . Suppose the common vertex is in A^c . Then without loss of generality, $y = v$. Define $P_{xyz(uvw)}$ to be the indicator that xyz is a triangle in G , that z is a good vertex, and that the number of neighbors of y in $V \setminus \{u, w\}$ is $< 7np - 2$. If the common vertex is in A , that is $x = u$, let $P_{xyz(uvw)} = P_{xyz}$.

If $xyz \in K$, let $P_{xyz(uvw)} = P_{xyz}$. If xyz shares two or more vertices with uvw , let $P_{xyz(uvw)} = 0$.

From the above construction, it is clear that the definitions of the random variables $\{P_{xyz(uvw)}\}_{xyz \in R_1(A)}$ do not involve the edges uv, vw, uw , and therefore this collection is independent of P'_{uvw} . This verifies condition (b) of Theorem 3.1.

Another easy verification shows that whenever $P_{xyz(uvw)} = 1$, we must have $P_{xyz} = 1$. Thus $P_{xyz(uvw)} \leq P_{xyz}$. This establishes condition (c) of Theorem 3.1.

Lastly, suppose that $P_{uvw} = 1$ in a particular realization of G . If $xyz \in K'$ and $P_{xyz} = 1$ in that realization of G , then it is easy to see that we also have $P_{xyz(uvw)} = 1$. Moreover, since $P_{uvw} = 1$, there can be at most $21np$ triangles sharing two or more vertices with uvw . Thus, if $P_{uvw} = 1$, we have

$$\sum_{xyz \in R_1(A)} P_{xyz} \leq 21np + \sum_{xyz \in R_1(A)} P_{xyz(uvw)}.$$

Therefore, we have established that all the conditions of Theorem 3.1 hold, with $a = 21np$ and $\lambda = \sum_{xyz \in R_1(A)} \mathbb{E}(P'_{xyz}) \leq n^2(Lnp)p^3$. This shows that for any $A \subseteq V$ with $|A| \leq Lnp$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(T_1(A) \geq \epsilon n^3 p^3) \leq e^{-C(\epsilon)Ln^2 p^2},$$

provided $p \leq C'(\epsilon)$ for some small enough constant $C'(\epsilon)$.

Now, if $T_1 \geq \epsilon n^3 p^3$, then either E_3 happens, or there exists a set $A \subseteq V$ (of bad vertices) with $|A| \leq Lnp$ and $T_1(A) \geq \epsilon n^3 p^3$. The number of choices of such A is bounded by $e^{C Lnp \log n}$. Thus, there are constants C' and $C''(\epsilon)$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(T_1 \geq \epsilon n^3 p^3) \leq \mathbb{P}(E_3) + e^{C' Lnp \log n - C''(\epsilon) n^2 p^2 \log(1/p)}.$$

If $p > C(\epsilon)^{-1} n^{-1} \log n$ for some appropriately small constant $C(\epsilon)$, then we can combine the above bound with the bound on $\mathbb{P}(E_3)$ from Lemma 6.3 to complete the proof of the Proposition. \square

7. TAIL BOUND FOR T_2

In this section we bound the probability that there are too many triangles with exactly two bad vertices and one good vertex. As usual, we will continue to adhere to the notation and terminology introduced in the preceding sections. We prove the following analog of Proposition 6.4. The method of proof is similar.

Proposition 7.1. *There is a constant $C(\epsilon) > 0$ depending only on ϵ such that whenever $C(\epsilon)^{-1} n^{-1} \log n \leq p \leq C(\epsilon)$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(T_2 \geq \epsilon n^3 p^3) \leq e^{-C(\epsilon) n^2 p^2 \log(1/p)}.$$

Proof. Fix a set $A \subseteq V$ of size $\leq Lnp$. Let $R_2(A) \subseteq V^{(3)}$ be the set of unordered triplets with exactly 2 vertices from A and 1 vertex from A^c . Let $T_2(A)$ be the number of triangles in G with exactly 2 vertices from A and 1 vertex from the set of good vertices in A^c .

A typical element of $R_2(A)$ will be written in the form uvw , where uv is an unordered pair of vertices from A and $w \in A^c$. For each $uvw \in R_2(A)$, let Q'_{uvw} be the indicator that uw and vw are edges in G , and let Q_{uvw} be the indicator that uw , vw are edges in G and w is a good vertex. Then

$$T_2(A) \leq S(A) := \sum_{uvw \in R_2(A)} Q_{uvw}.$$

We intend to apply Theorem 3.1 to the collection $(Q_{uvw})_{uvw \in R_2(A)}$ to obtain a tail inequality for $S(A)$. Clearly $Q_{uvw} \leq Q'_{uvw}$ and hence condition (a) of Theorem 3.1 is satisfied.

Now fix $uvw \in R_2(A)$, with $u, v \in A$ and $w \in A^c$. Let $K \subseteq R_2(A)$ be the set of triplets xyz such that $z \neq w$. Let K' be the set of triplets $xyz \in R_2(A)$ such that $z = w$ but $\{u, v\} \cap \{x, y\} = \emptyset$. Let K'' be the set of $xyz \in R_2(A)$ such that $z = w$ and $\{x, y\} \cap \{u, v\} \neq \emptyset$. Note that $R_2(A) = K \cup K' \cup K''$.

Take any $xyz \in K'$. Define $Q_{xyz(uvw)}$ to be the indicator that xz and yz are edges in G , and that the number of neighbors of z in $V \setminus \{u, v\}$ is $< 7np - 2$.

If $xyz \in K$, let $Q_{xyz(uvw)} = Q_{xyz}$. Lastly, if $xyz \in K''$, let $Q_{xyz(uvw)} = 0$.

As in the proof of Proposition 6.4, it is clear by construction that the definitions of the random variables $\{Q_{xyz(uvw)}\}_{xyz \in R_2(A)}$ do not involve the

edges uw and vw , and therefore this collection is independent of Q'_{uvw} . This verifies condition (b) of Theorem 3.1.

Again, if $Q_{xyz(uvw)} = 1$, we must have $Q_{xyz} = 1$. Thus $Q_{xyz(uvw)} \leq Q_{xyz}$, which establishes condition (c) of Theorem 3.1.

Finally, suppose that $Q_{uvw} = 1$ in a particular realization of G . If $xyz \in K'$ and $Q_{xyz} = 1$ in that realization of G , then we also have $Q_{xyz(uvw)} = 1$. Moreover, since $Q_{uvw} = 1$, we can easily conclude that the number of $xyz \in K''$ such that $Q_{xyz} = 1$ is bounded by $14np$. Thus, if $Q_{uvw} = 1$, we have

$$\sum_{xyz \in R_2(A)} Q_{xyz} \leq 14np + \sum_{xyz \in R_2(A)} Q_{xyz(uvw)}.$$

Therefore, we have shown that all conditions of Theorem 3.1 hold, with $a = 14np$ and $\lambda = \sum_{xyz \in R_2(A)} \mathbb{E}(Q'_{xyz}) \leq n(Lnp)^2 p^2$. This shows that for any $A \subseteq V$ with $|A| \leq Lnp$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(T_2(A) \geq \epsilon n^3 p^3) \leq \mathbb{P}(S(A) \geq \epsilon n^3 p^3) \leq e^{-C(\epsilon) L n^2 p^2},$$

provided $p \leq C'(\epsilon)$ for some small enough constant $C'(\epsilon)$.

We can now proceed exactly as in the last part of the proof of Proposition 6.4 to complete the proof by invoking Lemma 6.3. \square

8. TAIL BOUND FOR T_3

In this section we obtain a tail bound for the number of triangles with all bad vertices. First, we need a simple lemma about the minimum number of edges in a graph with given number triangles. The content of the lemma can be derived as a corollary of Theorem A of Alon [1], but the result is so simple that we give a direct proof.

Lemma 8.1. *For any real symmetric matrix $(a_{ij})_{i,j=1}^n$, we have*

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^n a_{ij}^2 \geq \left| \sum_{i,j,k=1}^n a_{ij} a_{jk} a_{ki} \right|^{2/3}.$$

Consequently, if an undirected graph has r triangles, then it must have at least $\frac{1}{2}(6r)^{2/3}$ edges.

Proof. By two applications of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we get

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{i,j,k=1}^n a_{ij} a_{jk} a_{ki} \right| &\leq \left(\sum_{i,j=1}^n a_{ij}^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{i,j=1}^n \left(\sum_{k=1}^n a_{ik} a_{jk} \right)^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{i,j=1}^n a_{ij}^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{i,j=1}^n \sum_{k,l=1}^n a_{ik}^2 a_{jl}^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &= \left(\sum_{i,j=1}^n a_{ij}^2 \right)^{3/2}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the first assertion of the theorem. For the graph theoretic conclusion, simply take (a_{ij}) to be adjacency matrix of the graph. \square

Proposition 8.2. *There is a constant $C(\epsilon) > 0$ depending only on ϵ such that whenever $C(\epsilon)^{-1}n^{-1} \log n \leq p \leq C(\epsilon)$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(T_3 \geq \epsilon n^3 p^3) \leq e^{-C(\epsilon)n^2 p^2 \log(1/p)}.$$

Proof. Take any set $A \subseteq V$ with $|A| \leq Lnp$. Let $T_3(A)$ be the number of triangles with all vertices in A . If $T_3(A) \geq \epsilon n^3 p^3$, then by Lemma 8.1, the number of edges in A must be $\geq C(\epsilon)n^2 p^2$. The probability of this event is bounded by

$$(3) \quad \binom{|A|(|A|-1)/2}{\lceil C(\epsilon)n^2 p^2 \rceil} p^{C(\epsilon)n^2 p^2}.$$

For any two integers $1 \leq b < a$, it is simple to see that

$$\binom{a}{b} \leq \frac{a^b}{b!} \leq \left(\frac{ae}{b}\right)^b = e^{b+b \log(a/b)}.$$

Applying this bound, we see that the quantity (3) is bounded by

$$\exp\left(C'(\epsilon)n^2 p^2 + C'(\epsilon)n^2 p^2 \log \frac{(Lnp)^2}{\lceil C(\epsilon)n^2 p^2 \rceil} - C''(\epsilon)n^2 p^2 \log(1/p)\right),$$

where $C(\epsilon)$, $C'(\epsilon)$ and $C''(\epsilon)$ are constants depending only on ϵ . If p is sufficiently small (depending on ϵ), the above quantity is less than $e^{-C(\epsilon)Ln^2 p^2}$. The proof is now completed by using Lemma 6.3 as in the last part of the proof of Proposition 6.4. \square

9. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

Combining Propositions 4.1, 5.3, 6.4, 7.1, 8.2, and the inequality (1), it is easy to see that there is a constant $C(\epsilon) > 0$ depending only on ϵ , such that for $C(\epsilon)^{-1}n^{-1} \log n \leq p \leq C(\epsilon)$,

$$\mathbb{P}(T > \mathbb{E}(T) + 19\epsilon n^3 p^3) \leq e^{-C(\epsilon)n^2 p^2 \log(1/p)}.$$

This completes the proof.

Acknowledgements. The author is indebted to Amir Dembo for bringing the problem to his attention and to the referees for very careful reports. The author thanks Partha Dey and Will Perkins for checking the proof, and Nick Crawford for useful discussions in the early stages of the project.

REFERENCES

- [1] ALON, N. (1981). On the number of subgraphs of prescribed type of graphs with a given number of edges. *Israel J. Math.* **38** no. 1-2, 116–130.
- [2] BOLLOBÁS, B. (1981). Threshold functions for small subgraphs. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* **90** no. 2, 197–206.
- [3] BOLLOBÁS, B. (1985). *Random graphs*. Academic Press, New York.
- [4] BOLTHAUSEN, E., COMETS, F. and DEMBO, A. (2003). Large deviations for random matrices and random graphs. *Private communication*.
- [5] BOUCHERON, S., LUGOSI, G., and MASSART, P. (2003). Concentration inequalities using the entropy method. *Ann. Probab.* **31** No. 3, 1583–1614.
- [6] CHATTERJEE, S. and DEY, P. S. (2010). Applications of Stein’s method for concentration inequalities. *Ann. Probab.* **38** no. 6, 2443–2485.
- [7] CHATTERJEE, S. and VARADHAN, S. R. S. (2010). The large deviation principle for the Erdős-Rényi random graph. To appear in *European J. Combinatorics*.
- [8] DEMARCO, B. and KAHN, J. (2010). Upper tails for triangles. *Preprint*. Available at arXiv:1005.4471v1[math.PR]
- [9] DÖRING, H. and EICHELSBACHER, P. (2009). Moderate deviations in a random graph and for the spectrum of Bernoulli random matrices. *Preprint*. Available at <http://arxiv.org/pdf/0901.3246v1>
- [10] ERDŐS, P. and RÉNYI, A. (1960). On the evolution of random graphs. *Publ. Math. Inst. Hungar. Acad. Sci.* **5** 17–61.
- [11] Hoeffding, W. (1963). Probability inequalities for sums of bounded random variables. *J. Amer. Stat. Assoc.* **58** 13–30.
- [12] JANSON, S. (1990). Poisson approximation for large deviations. *Random Structures Algorithms* **1** 221–230.
- [13] JANSON, S., ŁUCZAK, T. and RUCIŃSKI, A. (2000). *Random graphs*. Wiley, New York.
- [14] JANSON, S., OLESZKIEWICZ, K. and RUCIŃSKI, A. (2004). Upper tails for subgraph counts in random graphs. *Israel J. Math.* **142**, 61–92.
- [15] JANSON, S. and RUCIŃSKI, A. (2002). The infamous upper tail. Probabilistic methods in combinatorial optimization. *Random Structures Algorithms* **20** no. 3, 317–342.
- [16] JANSON, S. and RUCIŃSKI, A. (2004). The deletion method for upper tail estimates. *Combinatorica* **24** no. 4, 615–640.
- [17] KIM, J. H. and VU, V. H. (2000). Concentration of multivariate polynomials and its applications. *Combinatorica* **20** no. 3, 417–434.
- [18] KIM, J. H. and VU, V. H. (2004). Divide and conquer martingales and the number of triangles in a random graph. *Random Structures Algorithms* **24** no. 2, 166–174.
- [19] McDIARMID, C. (1989). On the method of bounded differences. *Surveys in combinatorics*, 148–188, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., 141, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge.
- [20] RUCIŃSKI, A. (1988). When are small subgraphs of a random graph normally distributed? *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **78**, 1–10.
- [21] TALAGRAND, M. (1995). Concentration of measure and isoperimetric inequalities in product spaces. *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.* **81** 73–205.
- [22] VU, V. H. (2001). A large deviation result on the number of small subgraphs of a random graph. *Combin. Probab. Comput.* **10** no. 1, 79–94.
- [23] VU, V. H. (2002). Concentration of non-Lipschitz functions and applications. Probabilistic methods in combinatorial optimization. *Random Structures Algorithms* **20** no. 3, 262–316.